UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 8

MAY 29, 1963, TO JUNE 19, 1963
(PAGES 9797 TO 11232)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt. 8

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 139: 23: *Search me, O God, and know my heart, try me, and know my thoughts.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we earnestly beseech Thee to create within us those aspirations and desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy and may they be the progenitors of lofty achievements.

Inspire our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress to meet their arduous tasks and responsibilities with composure and confidence.

Grant that their energies and efforts to discharge their duties faithfully may never be dissipated by fears and frustrations.

Help them to see clearly the definite part that they must take in every forward- and upward-looking program of thought and action.

Give them a firm grasp on life's moral and spiritual realities and verities.

May they daily witness by character and conduct that they are always in close contact and communion with Thee.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 384. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes;

S. 449. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans;

S. 583. An act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force;

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 978. An act to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; and

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western river rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—A NEW WEAPON IN THE FIGHT FOR EQUAL CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it was some 91 years ago that the 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted. That amendment provides in section 2 that if in any State Negroes are denied the right to vote, then the representation of this State in this body shall be reduced proportionately. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is time now for us to put that amendment into effect; and so, accordingly, within the next few days I shall introduce legislation to enact the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment of the Constitution by calling for a new census to be taken, without waiting until 1970, and requiring that the Census Bureau shall take into account in compiling its population figures in that new census the extent to which Negroes have in fact been denied the right to vote in Southern States, a fact that has repeatedly been reported in the reports of the Civil Rights Commission. Once these new figures are in and have been certified to the President the realinement of seats in the House as I understand it, becomes automatic, without further legislation action being required.

Here, as I see it, is one simple and effective way in which Congress can apply real pressure to those Southern States which still refuse to give the Negro the vote, or who still drag their feet in according Negroes the rights and privileges to which they are entitled under the Constitution.

Here is a bill which will provide us the easiest way I know of to break the current civil rights logjam in the South.

With recalcitrant States faced with the actual loss of seats in Congress, I am sure we could look for action that, compared with what has gone on since the historic Supreme Court decision on school integration was first handed down, would really make our heads spin.

A RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO RING BELLS AT MIDDAY ON THE 4TH DAY OF JULY EACH YEAR

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have on this day introduced a resolution calling on the American people to ring bells at midday on the 4th day of July each year. This thought originated with the third grade of Franklin School in Marion, Ind. These youngsters, encouraged by their teacher, Mrs. Schaffner, and their principal, Mrs. Ballard, have undertaken the task of encouraging the people of their city to ring every available bell on that day as a reminder that it is the day freedom was born here in America.

I recently participated in an inspirational program at Franklin School in Marion where I presented a bell and dedicated it to this inspirational and patriotic purpose. What a motivation it was to hear the expression on the part of these young Americans of their love of country and dedication to the principles of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would call upon all Americans to join with these young patriots and ring the bells proclaiming, as was proclaimed with the ringing of the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, that America is a free nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GOP: PARTY WITH A POLICY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post columnist Marquis Childs has a piece on the editorial page charging that, in the context of civil rights, the Republicans are a party without a policy. I should like to call Mr. Childs' attention to H.R. 3139, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. McCulloch], and to the 23 bills identical in content to Mr. McCulloch's introduced by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and others on this side of the aisle. This bill offers sound progress in the civil rights field. Substantive gains could be achieved by its enactment. On page 1538 of the Congressional Record, January 31, 1963, will be found a statement of the Republican position. Press releases were issued and a press conference held at the same time.

Yet, Mr. Childs and the press generally has seen fit to ignore this effort on the part of the Republicans who serve on the committee which has jurisdiction over this subject. These are the men in the Republican Party who can most effectively move this matter forward. Mr. Childs, however, chooses to overlook what they have done, and what others in agreement with them among the Republicans in this body have done. Either Mr. Childs has not done his homework or he is consciously misrepresenting the facts which exist. In either case his acts are a damning indictment of his failure to do the job of reporting with which he is charged.

And compounding the situation is the fact that Mr. Childs and his fellows in the reporting profession, or the great majority of them, have not seen fit to report the Republican efforts of which I speak. I can understand the average newspaper reader of this country accepting Mr. Childs' distortion without question, for Mr. Childs and those in his profession who share his view of the job of reporting in modern America have done their best to keep only one side of the news before the people. Here is the real threat to the continuation of our system of representative government.

A FABLE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time there was a city named "Wonderland" located in the "District of Confusion" on the banks of a river called the "Puttermuck." In that city was a great representative body whose duty was to look after the interests of the people, and it was called the Congress.

One day in May—on the 28th at 3:20 p.m.—to be exact, a Member of the Congress received a telephone call from a captain in the Navy who told the Congressman that a contract for $7,854,597 had been given to an industry which employed many of his constituents.

The Congressman had received similar calls before and suspected that he was late learning the news. He knew that there is no market for stale news, but because of the great concern of the people he represented he telephoned several hundred miles to make sure they had heard about it. That call cost the taxpayers $1.05. He learned that the news had been announced many hours earlier by another Member of the same Congress, but of a different political party, and had been printed in the afternoon papers long before 3:20 p.m. This call from "Wonderland" was duplicated by four Senators and three Congressmen by actual count. Six out of the seven who spent $1.05 each of the people's money to convey stale news wasted a total of $6.30.

Mr. Speaker, these are silly games for these make-believe people to play, and this is a foolish way for them to waste their constituent's money.

THE TORTOISE IS WINNING THE RACE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am certain all of you recall the childhood story about the race between the tortoise and the hare. As the story goes, the tortoise won the race by sheer determination and persistence. My fight for the concept of true competitive bidding in military procurement reminds me of that story, for my "persistent" efforts are bearing fruit.

One giant step forward in this long "race" toward the goal to achieve more competition in the manufacture of defense equipment occurred today when the Army canceled a proposed no-competition purchase of 240 test sets used to check operation of a gyromagnetic compass. The action came after my charge in my speech on the House floor yesterday that a false certification of "no drawings available" for the production of the equipment was being used to shut out competition and channel a contract to a past producer.

These charges were substantiated in a matter of hours yesterday after I conferred with Brigadier General Stanwix-Hay, Chief of the Army's Electronics Materiel Command in Philadelphia, on the telephone. General Stanwix-Hay checked into the matter immediately, found that I was right and took direct action by ordering the procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set—for which $220 was paid the last time a no-competition purchase was arranged—"pulled off the street" immediately and requesting a full and unbiased investigation by the Army's Inspector General of the obviously false certification. Further, he assured me that the procurement will be carried out under full competitive conditions when it is reissued soon, and he warmly thanked me for bringing the case to light.

I wish I could get the same cooperation from other officials when I pinpoint waste and worse in defense purchasing elsewhere. I congratulate General Stanwix-Hay, but at the same time, I would suggest the civil or military servant who set up the false certification should be disciplined severely. If this case had gone undetected, the contract would have gone to a favored producer at an unchallenged price. Now, I predict a bid considerably below $220 per unit will result when the 240 test sets are bought competitively. I must take sharp issue with a system which allows such obvious flouting of purchasing regulations and the law. There is something wrong when a U.S. Congressman must investigate and turn up the facts that hide behind redtape and fine print.

To briefly relate the story as it happened, upon learning of the false certification by the Army, I scrutinized the Army's own files and private business sources to prove that the test set had been purchased twice before from Winslow Electronics, Asbury Park, N.J., as a part of a June 1961 contract, and the Government paid $1,000 for and received a complete set of manufacturing drawings for the equipment. Further, this equipment is almost exactly the same as an earlier test set called the TS–1086. Made as a commercial "off the shelf" item as early as 1958 by Sorenson & Co., Stamford, Conn., this set, too, was accompanied by complete drawings. Hence, the Army has drawings for both sets.

I hope the Inspector General turns up some bodies in his investigation. Such people should be severely disciplined as an example to others. Once we see a few middle-grade paper shufflers pay for their mistakes and worse, we will see a real clean-up come about in procurement. The comparatively few bad apples in the procurement barrel make all the rest look bad.

A week ago, I lauded two Navy officers for stopping a procurement under similar conditions. The Navy swept the case under the rug. Americans should thank General Stanwix-Hay for his action which will save tax dollars and improve procurement efficiency while exposing those who misuse their positions of trust and authority. Those who rig purchases either through inefficiency or by design should not escape punishment while those who bring the facts to light and cause corrections to be made are being praised.

FAIRY STORY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amusement to the fairy story by the gentleman from Maryland, and I want to say that I think I can remedy this situation for him—at least, I will try. They did these things much better in the Eisenhower administration. There was no money wasted, and they never bothered to notify the minority at all about any of these projects. We read about them in the newspapers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Adair
Anderson
Andrews
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Battin
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Burton
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Goodell
Gray
Griffiths
Hanna
Healey
Henderson
Hoffman
Horan
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jones, Mo.
Kee
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lesinski
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Morrison
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Secrest
Shelley
Shipley
Siler
Snyder
Stephens
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 340 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FAIRY STORY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the distinguished, lovely, lovable, even-tempered lady from New York for getting me a larger audience and to say that somehow or other I cannot help being reminded of the story of Lady Astor and Sir Winston Churchill, when they had a little argument and she said, "If you were my husband, I would give you poison," to which he is reputed to have replied, "Lady, if I were your husband, I would take it."

REPLY TO FAIRY STORY

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank that courtly, even-tempered, well-mannered gentleman from Ohio. I am also happy that I had a quorum call so that some Members of the House could take an example from his courtliness, his charm, and his Old World stories. I made the quorum call because I knew the gentleman would speak again, and sometimes he is worth listening to.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 374) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That RICHARD H. ICHORD, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ATTEND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to appoint a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the Committee on Education and Labor to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 1, 1963, and June 30, 1963.

He is further authorized to appoint as alternates a member from the majority and a member from the minority of the said committee.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the aforesaid delegates and alternates from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* (1) That no member of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the U.S. Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the Members of the House today a resolution which would authorize travel to the International Labor Organization at its meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, by official representatives of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the resolution is very clear. The Members remember that just a few days ago the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and myself, by direction of the Committee on Rules, brought to the floor of the House a somewhat similar resolution. However, at that time there were some special provisions contained in the resolution which caused some Members to view it with some concern.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution which would authorize the Speaker to appoint official representatives of the House of Representatives to represent us at the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Speaker would be authorized to appoint one Representative from the majority and one Representative from the minority and also to appoint alternates in both cases. They would be official representatives of our body.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this it does require full reporting procedures and requires that the Members who may be appointed or who will be doing the traveling to be bound by the requirements of the per diem and travel arrangements and to make full disclosure and full representation of such expenditures which would not be required if these Members were traveling under the auspices of the State Department or without this official stamp of approval by this body.

It would further, of course, permit and authorize the use of counterpart funds for this travel to and from, and during the time they were in Geneva, subject to the availability of such local currencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the resolution would be approved and that the Speaker be permitted to make the appointments as official representatives.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. The reason for this resolution is the simple fact that the Education and Labor Committee does not have authorization to travel outside the continental limits of the United States. This authority was not included in their authorizing legislation permitting money to be appropriated to the committee for the conduct of their committee business. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is exactly right and I think very clearly states the need for this resolution.

Mr. BURLESON. There was some misunderstanding at the time this matter was on the floor a few days ago. There was obviously some confusion as to the necessity for this resolution to be brought before us. I thought it was well to develop this point. As the gentleman knows, this authority has been given by the Rules Committee which, of course, the gentleman is now representing, to some other committees as a blanket authorization because of the nature of their investigations and studies abroad.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from Texas, because it very clearly spells out the reasons why we are here today on this resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I should also like to ask my friends in the House to realize that this is a somewhat different resolution. In the previous resolution there was authority for this Member to make certain other trips which are not included in this resolution. I think it is also important to recognize that the House, since 1919, has always had official representation in the odd years when the Senate does not go to the International Labor Organization. The effect of the action that we took a few weeks ago was to leave the House without any official representation which I am sure, of course, was not the intent of the House.

I might also point out, and I want to speak very frankly, that the chairman of the committee is already at the ILO, not as the official representative of the House, but he is there as an invitee of the State Department. Therefore, this resolution merely brings, I think, some dignity back to the House and gives the House official representation subject to the appointments of the Speaker. Incidentally, it will require anybody appointed by the Speaker to detail the expenditures he makes, whereas if you go as an invitee of the State Department you make no report whatsoever. The ILO is a most useful body. Members of Congress have and should represent our country. I feel deeply the House should adopt the resolution before us.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the explanation of my colleague from California because I think it very ably spells out the reason for this resolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK The statement was made, I might say, that this required correct reporting. I will ask the gentleman whether or not it is his understanding that the reports have been correct in the past so we can logically believe these reports will be correct.

Mr. SISK. Of course, I might say I would not want to speculate on the accuracy or inaccuracy of any reports that have been heretofore filed. This resolution very specifically spells out the requirements of the reporting procedure. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and his committee are very vigorously watching this situation, I know, and I feel certain are going to see that proper and legal steps are taken to require the reports as we have provided under our rules.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Would it be a logical assumption, if I might direct the question to the gentleman from California, if the reports have not been filed correctly up to this time, that it is illogical for us to assume they will be filed correctly from now on?

Mr. SISK. As I said, I am assuming that the reports heretofore filed have been correct, because I have no knowledge that they have been otherwise, and therefore assume that those in the future would be correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In view of the interest which the House showed in this matter a few weeks ago, I believe we should thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for clarifying the situation and for making a very frank, correct, and to-the-point comment. I think those of us who listened carefully to his remarks appreciate his contribution in clearing the air and helping in sending this resolution to a justified true test.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree with me that when a Member of the House, denied by the House the authority to travel to a given place, then goes to the State Department and obtains financing for his trip, is defeating the will of the House of Representatives?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from Iowa, I think, shares with me the feeling that neither of us can be the judge in this case. It was my understanding, I might say to my good friend from Iowa, that certain Members of the House said that they would not attend this meeting unless such a resolution were passed, which would make their status official and they would have the consent and approval of the House. I cannot speak for anyone else.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not agree with me that the House of Representatives should take some action legislatively to halt this business of a Member being able to nullify the will of the House of Representatives in this respect?

Mr. SISK. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman from Iowa's objective. This is what we intend to do. This is in accordance with the action we took early this year in connection with travel.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I inquire of the gentleman from California who is now offering the resolution in what position this leaves the delegate that is now attending the meeting? Is he a representative of the House of Representatives? I am speaking now of the delegate who is already attending this meeting as a delegate or a representative of the State Department. Will this resolution make him also a representative of the House of Representatives?

Mr. SISK. If I could explain to the gentleman from Florida the situation as I understand it, the meeting, of course, has not yet begun. I believe it will be starting next week, as I understand, probably during the next week. This is subject to designation by the Speaker. Then the gentleman to whom my friend from Florida refers would become an official delegate, because, as I understand, these delegates are appointed through conference with the State Department, and it is my understanding that the State Department is our official representative in matters of international affairs and actually makes the approach to the Speaker for a representative of the House, or the Senate, as the case may be, that representation be made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In order to clear this matter up about Members going to the State Department and getting designated as representatives to the ILO Conference, I think it should be pointed out that the State Department made a request to the Speaker and the Speaker designated two Members of the House to go to this Conference. This is not a question of a Member going around the House to the State Department and getting designated.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of the majority leader. I think that is very clear.

I had promised to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. In view of the fact that the position of the Department of State has been referred to here, after the House turned down by an overwhelming vote to designate House Members to attend the ILO then I, having been suggested as a delegate, said I would not accept unless the House approved. Insofar as the position of the State Department is concerned, they did have the authority to send delegates, and after the House turned it down, they offered to send me. I, in turn, said I would not go unless the House acted favorably and I could be there representing the House of Representatives and not the State Department.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution has been pretty well explained by Members on both sides of the aisle up to this point. In connection with the discussion that has taken place, I would just like to recall two or three things to your attention which may not have been brought up. Once again, this is an original resolution. We are not talking about something that when we are going to adopt it, we are then going to go into Committee of the Whole. As soon as we have completed the discussion of this resolution, House Resolution 368, upon voting on it, when it is passed, that will be the end of it. I do think it is a result of our action the last time the press reported in various columns that the House failed to place brakes on POWELL or that we gave carte blanche authority to spend as much as he wanted. I think the press report is correct. I do not in any way find fault with them.

However, no Member in voting against that resolution voted for the reason to give any individual carte blanche authority to just go ahead and use all the counterpart funds they wanted. I do not think anybody had that in mind when they voted against it. I think that it was the result of confusion of some wording. It is better in this one. It has been reworded and is specific as to where the individual is going to go. I believe they will get $16 a day over there and they cannot live in Geneva on $16 a day and they will have to spend some money out of their own pockets and if they use counterpart funds, they have to report back to the House.

As far as the gentleman over there is concerned, there is a little difference of opinion among lawyers but my personal opinion as an attorney is that if he is appointed and continues to go under the State Department and does not accept counterpart funds under House Resolution 368, I do not think he will have to make any report. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] stated he intends to make a report. On this side of the aisle, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be appointed as the principal member from the minority side and that possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will be appointed as an alternate. May I say this one thing, when we are placing this responsibility on the distinguished Speaker to appoint these individuals, particularly in view of the action which we took the other day, I think we owe him the respect of passing this resolution and standing behind him, if we are asking him to appoint people to go to an organization of which we are a member and have already contributed almost $5 million over the years to the operation of the International Labor Organization. I urge approval of this resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Some suggestion was made here that these appointments are dictated by the State Department. As you will see from the resolution, two of the Members who could be appointed by the Speaker are to be representatives of the minority. I want the record to show that on such occasions as this the Speaker always confers with the minority leader and accepts our recommendation as to who is to be appointed. We confer with our members of the committee involved, and then we make the suggestion which, as I say, has always been followed by the Speaker. So far as I am concerned, I have never been conscious of any State Department intervention and, certainly, I do not go to the State Department to ask for their approval or disapproval of any designations that may be made from the minority side.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to reiterate what I said when the earlier resolution was up for consideration. It is important that we do pass this resolution and have officially designated Members of the House as participants in this ILO conference. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, we contribute substantial moneys to support the ILO, and I think it is entirely proper that we authorize these delegates.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that today we are going to turn our heads the other way, look over principle and go ahead and vote for this resolution. But I want to reiterate what I said on the floor of the House on May 14. First, however, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who was so generous in taking some of the blame for the prior defeat of this resolution, I want to say that I do not feel that the majority of the Members of the House voted against the resolution because of his additional and extended travel. I believe the majority voted against it because there was a principle involved.

At that time I said, and I repeat: "The chairman of our committee has not and will not file a correct statement of counterpart funds already expended by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1962. For us to pass this resolution, to my way of thinking, simply condones this noncompliance with the statutory law which is in title 22, section XX 1754 and makes the illogical assumption that the law will be observed in this case. You will note at the end of page 2, lines 20 to 25 and in the first four lines on page 3, that the chairman is required to make a report. I point out, however, if reports have not been filed in compliance with the law in the past, what reason is there for us to believe that suddenly we will get accurate and correct reports?

I respectfully suggest that we refuse this travel request with a positive statement that until a correct report is filed by the chairman of this committee, no travel will be authorized outside of the country. To do otherwise, would be to condone further noncompliance with the law, the very laws which, I might add, we pass and in so doing we to assume a double standard whereby we tell 188 million Americans to observe our legislative directives and then we say on the other hand to ourselves, "These laws do not apply to ourselves."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to this matter, and in order to attempt to clarify it, I would like to point out that under date of February 11, 1963, the Speaker received from the Honorable Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, a letter which reads as follows:

> DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The 47th session of the International Labor Conference is scheduled to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, from June 5 to 28, 1963. The Department, in consultation with the Departments of Labor and Commerce, is in the process of composing a delegation to represent the United States at this conference.
>
> Delegations to previous sessions of this assembly have included Members of the Congress. In view of the continuing interest of the Congress in the field of international labor, it is the hope of the Department that you will desire to nominate two Members of the House of Representatives for inclusion on the delegation as congressional advisers. Should you decide to make the nominations, it would be appreciated if they were submitted to the Department before April 15, 1963, in order to allow sufficient time for investigation by the Civil Service Commission, as required by Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 298, 82d Congress.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ——— ———.

After receiving this letter, and after consulting with the minority leader, as the distinguished minority leader has indicated, designations were made by the Speaker.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a national holiday set aside as a memorial to the dead. I wonder how many people who observe this day are familiar with its origin. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the origin of this beautiful custom of placing flowers upon the graves of our beloved dead each year, I should like to point out that this thoughtful gesture originated in my great native State of Mississippi.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that on April 25, 1866, shortly after the cessation of hostilities of that unfortunate fratricidal strife, known as the War Between the States, this custom was begun. Just a few months prior to this occasion, a bloody battle had been fought at historical Shiloh. Many brave men, both in the uniforms of the blue and gray, had fallen, mortally wounded. Some 1,500 to 2,000 of the dead were buried in the cemetery at nearby Columbus, which, up to that time, had long been known as the Odd Fellows Cemetery.

On that memorable day, April 25, 1866, the good women of Columbus gathered all of the flowers available in that beautiful little city and marched in procession to the burial ground of these soldiers. There they tenderly laid the flowers upon the graves of both friend and enemy. This act inspired Francis Miles Finch's poem, "The Blue and the Gray."

Mississippians, proud of their heritage and traditions, still observe April 25 rather than May 30 as Decoration Day.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention, incidentally, that Columbus, Miss., is also the site of another splendid first. It is the home of the first college authorized and created by State law exclusively for women in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote in part the poem by Francis Miles Finch to which I referred:

From the silence of sorrowful hours
  The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers,
  Alike for the friend and the foe—
Under the sod and the dew,
  Waiting the Judgement Day—
Under the roses, the Blue;
  Under the lilies, the Gray.
No more shall the war-cry sever,
  Or the winding rivers be red:
They banish our anger forever
  When they laurel the graves of our dead.
Under the sod and the dew,
  Waiting the Judgment Day—
Love and tears for the Blue;
  Tears and love for the Gray.

It is ironical that today, within a few miles of the site of this noble gesture on the part of the women of Mississippi, Federal troops are again bivouacked at the University of Mississippi to enforce upon the people of that great State the violation of another custom of its people, the right to control the administration of its own State university. While, at the same time, under the powerful protective wing of the same Federal Government, a minority group is defying the laws and customs of that once sovereign State, in its capital at Jackson. There, the modern carpetbaggers are endeavoring to stir up sufficient strife, conflict, and racial discord to bring about bloodshed and an excuse for another armed invasion of my beloved State.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 52, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—278

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtis
Daddario
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Leggett
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—52

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Ashbrook
Baring
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bromwell
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Dole
Foreman
Fountain
Gathings
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hechler
Huddleston
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Kastenmeier
Kornegay
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Murray
Pool
Quillen
Rich
Rogers, Fla.
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—103

Adair
Anderson
Andrews
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Battin
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Burton
Clancy
Collier
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Goodell
Gray
Griffiths
Hanna
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoffman
Horan
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jones, Mo.
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lesinski
Libonati
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Morrison
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Secrest
Shelley
Shipley
Siler
Snyder
Stephens
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Wharton
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wyman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Devine.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. King of California with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Nygaard.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Burton.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Clancy.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Andrews with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Montoya.

Mr. SKUBITZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 350, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 350 provides for consideration of H.R. 5497, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

During World War II, and until 1951, Mexican workers were admitted into the United States for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture under various authorities, none of which were entirely satisfactory either to the workers, the employers, or the two Governments involved.

In 1951, the Congress approved Public Law 78, 82d Congress, which added title V to the Agricultural Act of 1949. This legislation authorized the negotiation of an agreement with the Republic of Mexico establishing procedures for the admission of Mexican nationals into the United States for temporary employment. It also authorized the Department of Labor to undertake a recruitment and placement function with respect to such workers, assist workers and farmers to enter into contracts for agricultural employment, and guarantee the payment of wages and transportation by farmer employers.

Public Law 78 was scheduled to expire December 31, 1953. Subsequently it has been extended for 2-year periods and the present expiration date is December 31, 1963. H.R. 5497 would extend this authority for an additional 2 years, until December 31, 1965.

The program is almost entirely self-supporting and will not burden our financial structure. The user of such labor pays almost the entire costs of the program.

Mr. Speaker, this particular program has been under considerable fire for the past several years. I certainly would not deny that it is under fire today, so there is no question but what this matter is controversial. I recognize the problems involved in supporting legislation to import foreign workers into this country in the face of the fact that we have at present something over 5 percent of unemployed people in America today. However, the type of work for which these people are employed is a type of work which, frankly, Americans generally have refused to perform.

Now, I realize that there will be a great deal of discussion later on in general debate as to some of the reasons why it is impossible to recruit domestic workers to do this so-called stoop labor which is prevalent particularly in the West and in California's interior valleys especially, but it has been most difficult particularly in view of the fact that in these areas and in other areas, such as the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and in Arizona and other areas in our country, where perishable commodities are grown, and which, after all, are important to the consumers at a price which they can afford to pay—it is most difficult to harvest those commodities without some source of labor which can be quickly acquired and quickly built up in numbers to meet the emergency.

For example, a peach has to be picked within 12 hours after it reaches a certain stage of ripeness. A melon has to be harvested within a matter of 24 hours after that melon is ready, or else it rots; it is simply no good and it cannot be shipped.

Mr. Speaker, this is true of a multitude of products grown in the West and in other areas of the country as, for example, Michigan, and unless there is a readily available supply of labor to quickly move in and take care of this type of work then that fruit or those vegetables will simply rot and the consumer will be denied the use of them. To the extent that such commodities will be unavailable, the price will be substantially increased. This is basically the reason why some of the Members of the House felt that until such time as mechanization has been developed to meet the need or that a substitute domestic program had been developed that would bring the workers to the farm to do this job, it was necessary to continue this authority in the Department of Labor to negotiate with the Republic of Mexico for the use of these people.

Mr. Speaker, it will be explained later in debate that this program is surrounded with a vast number of protective regulations, rules, laws, and so on, regarding wages, working conditions, hours, housing, insurance, and all other details that go into it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not cheap labor for the farmers. That is not the purpose of it. It is much more expensive labor for the American farmer than is domestic labor, if domestic labor can be secured. So do not fall for any fallacy that this is cheap labor.

Mr. Speaker, I for one happen to believe that the farm workers of this Nation are entitled to a great deal more money than a lot of them are getting. I will repeat a statement made just 2 years ago at the time we debated this bill, that I personally supported a national minimum wage for agricultural workers. I realize that this too is controversial and that a number of my good friends from some areas of the country object. But it is my frank opinion that the domestic farm worker in this country does need an upgrading in wages, an upgrading in housing conditions and in living conditions all across the board. I for one am for doing that very thing. To the extent that we can move forward within the next couple of years to do that, it would be my hope that never again will it be necessary for me or for anyone else to take the floor of the House to seek an extension of this particular act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution which will permit the House to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of debating the issue.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I would be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. As I recall, in past years the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has given the House some very valuable information concerning the effect of this program on the small farmers of the country.

Can the gentleman tell us how he feels about the allegations to the effect that this is a program only for a handful of large farmers?

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the question which has been propounded by my colleague from California, and thank him for calling it to my attention. Here is one of the attacks that is made from time to time on this program, that all we are doing is providing workers for a small group of large corporation farmers. Now, I am not here to deny but what some large farmers do use Mexican nationals under this program. But I am here to state to the Members of the House—because we use these people in my district and I know how this program is handled—that the people who would be hurt by an abrupt ending of this program first would be the small farmer who does not have housing and who has to depend on the Mexican nationals to harvest his grapes, his peaches, his apricots, his melons, his vegetables, his tomatoes, whatever the case may be; because the small farmer does not have housing; he does not have year-round work and only uses a substantial amount of labor at harvest time.

He must have a source from which to seek and to obtain this labor. The large corporation farmers who, of course, are used as whipping boys, first by politicians and by others, let me say, do use some of this Mexican national labor. They have to justify that they cannot get their work done otherwise, but in most cases they do have substantial blocks of housing; they have a great deal of year-round work and keep a great number of people there—keep them on the ranch year round and, therefore, they are not caught in the bind that many of these small farmers are. So here again is a fallacy that is sometimes preached that it is only for a few very large farmers. That is absolutely not the fact of the case, certainly as it is demonstrated in my own particular district.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I would like to say to my friend from California, in line with this large farm situation, he is talking about the very thing that inspired me to oppose this last year. For several years, serving on the committee that writes this legislation, I tried to pass an amendment which would prohibit the use of Mexican labor for crops that have controlled acreage and price supports. I would hope that my friend from California and the people who represent areas where stoop labor is needed for crops that are not acreage controlled or price supported would assist me in amending this bill so that it would make some sense to bring in labor they cannot get in these areas. However, at the same time we are bringing in foreign labor to produce crops in the United States for which we have acreage controls and support prices, that the farmers in Tennessee, or the farmers in California, or the farmers in Michigan would like to have acres on which to produce these same crops. It just does not make sense to me to import labor to produce a crop for which an American farmer is denied an acreage allotment that he could get if this foreign labor were not brought in to produce these crops.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee I also find myself very sympathetic to the position which he takes in this matter and if I am not mistaken I believe I supported his amendment 2 years ago. I agree with the gentleman. However, I know that there are some areas of the country that have problems somewhat different from those which we have in California but, so far as my own area is concerned, I would not mind this amendment at all. I think it would be an excellent one because I agree it is foolish to bring in foreign workers to produce commodities in surplus. What I am pleading for, frankly, and that only, is at least for a short extension and an opportunity to do what I believe will be a phasing out effort. I am inclined to think that a couple of years more is about it on this program, but until such time as we can develop a source of labor supply for these perishable commodities such as fruits and vegetables, we are simply going to increase the price to the consumers across the country if we are unable to harvest them when they are ripe or mature. Otherwise they will rot. They are not controlled commodities.

Mr. BASS. This is true. As I say, I will not oppose Mexican labor coming in to produce those types of commodities but I certainly hope the people who need this assistance in the field of Mexican labor would support an amendment to restrict this against the controlled crops.

Mr. SISK. I thank my colleague from Tennessee and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 350 will authorize an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 5497, a bill entitled "Continuation of Mexican farm labor program." This is known as Public Law 78 and referred to as the "bracero program."

On each occasion that this particular program is considered I rather imagine it brings back some definite memories to many of the senior Members, for it is my understanding that this particular subject matter was under consideration at the time the shooting occurred in the Chamber some years ago.

This is a controversial subject, and my mail of recent date indicates that much of organized labor is in opposition to it. I am further aware, Mr. Speaker, that there will even be a difference of opinion among the California Members in regard to this program.

Public Law 78, for the temporary employment in U.S. agriculture of Mexican workers, will expire on December 31, 1963. H.R. 5497 will extend this authority for an additional 2 years; until December 31, 1965.

During World War II and until 1951, Mexican workers were admitted into the United States for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture under various authorities, none of which were entirely satisfactory, either to the workers, the employers, or the two Governments involved. In 1951, Congress approved Public Law 78, which added title V to the Agricultural Act of 1929. The seven major features of this legislation are set forth on pages 1 and 2 of the committee report.

Experience in this program has shown that in spite of effective recruiting programs carried on by the Federal and State employment agencies there are not sufficient people to do the kind of work being performed by the Mexican nationals that are admitted under this act. This same experience has shown that there is only one really effective way of reducing the numbers of foreign workers needed to be imported and that has been and is through mechanization and automation of the stoop tasks.

Mechanization in cotton since 1959 is proof of this statement. In 1959, 34 percent of the crop was harvested by machines—in 1961 it had increased to 59 percent. Although the figures for the 1962 crop are not in yet, the drop in the use of Mexican nationals in the cotton-producing States of Texas, New Mexico and Arkansas shows machines are replacing them at a rapid pace. In 1961 these States used 151,720 Mexican nationals and in 1962 they used 40,636, a drop of 73 percent. Agriculture is doing everything possible to reduce these stoop tasks by mechanization.

Let me point out to the Members of the House who represent urban districts that your consumers also have a stake in this program. There are those who show that the farmer could pay 20 to 50 percent more in farm wages and it would have a small effect on the retail price in the market. Statistically this is true, but they fail to also show that in the table food crops, labor often is 50 to 70 percent of the farmers' total cost of production. When you increase his cost that much he is going to shift to other crops that use less labor. This then would make table foods in short supply. I need only to remind the housewife of the sharp rise in prices last winter when crops were frozen in the South and West to show how short supply would create leaping prices. So your consumers do have an interest in a supply of labor to keep an even flow of these table foods.

There are those who would like to extend this law for only 1 year. I would like to point out that there is ample authority in this law for the Secretary of Labor to bring this program to a complete halt any day there are enough Americans to do the work.

To further substantiate the fact that this program will be needed more than 1 year, I would like to point out information from a report made by the University of California, Gianini Foundation. This report was made at the request of Governor Brown of California to study the need for imported and supplemental farm labor in the State of California. During the hearings Mr. Charles Paul, director of agriculture from California, accompanied by Mr. Donald Larin of the department of employment and Dr. Mamer of the university who made this report, testified before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the House Agriculture Committee. I would like to quote Dr. Mamer's summary of this report of the necessity of supplemental labor:

> The university as such, of which I am a part, does not take a position either on extension or the termination of this program, but we have prepared this study, which indicates that seasonality of employment will be as high in up to 1968, or higher than it is now, and, consequently, the need for supplemental labor will be as great or greater, at least 5 years hence.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House are interested in passing laws that are clear, administrable, and germane to the subject under consideration. H.R. 5497 is an act to allow and control the importation of foreign agricultural workers. It should not be made a vehicle for amendments pertaining to broad subjects concerning American farm labor. These subjects are being considered separately, and properly so, by both Houses of Congress and should not be subjects of amendment to this bill.

There are continued attacks on this program stating that it has been the vehicle for depressing farm wages. Let me call your attention to some facts that were contained in the last report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on the wages being paid by States and by regions across the United States. The highest using State of imported workers which are workers from the British West Indies is Florida. Yet the State of Florida pays the highest wages in the Southeast, and this is against many States in the Southeast who use no imported workers. The second State in the use of men from the British West Indies and the Bahamas is the State of Connecticut, and the State of Connecticut pays the highest wages in the Northeast. This same report shows that last year the State of California used more imported Mexican nationals than any other State in the Union, and California pays the highest wages in the West. If these imported workers are depressing wages, it seems strange that these Government reports would show that the three high using States are also the three highest wage States in their regions and area of influence.

Mr. Speaker, if this measure is passed extending the date to December 31, 1965, and if I am still a Member of this great body in 1965, it is my present intention not to support any further requests to extend this program. I believe that agriculture will just have to figure out some way to solve this dilemma during the next 2 years. If they are unable to harvest their crops, then the consumer will not have the benefit of them. In turn, if it costs more money to harvest them, then this will simply have to be added to the price and the consumer will have to pay.

But, in this instance, Mr. Speaker, I believe they are entitled to this additional extension and, accordingly, I urge the adoption of the rule and recommend that H.R. 5497 be passed without amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I merely want to call attention to the gentleman's reference to wages. I was wondering whether he could not insert in the Record for the benefit of those who will read the Record what those "high" wages are.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will say to the gentleman, you have figures just the same as I do. I know you are opposed to the program. You opposed it last year, and rightfully so. I just happen to be for it. The figures on wages have been reported, of course.

Mr. COHELAN. I realize that. I think the gentleman is to be complimented on his statement. We obviously disagree as to the time of termination, but I do think it is important to get data in the Record on what the wages are that we are talking about.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time, not to oppose the rule—I favor the rule—but I would like to take the opportunity and state why a great number of us—I sincerely hope a majority of us—will urge you to vote against this bill on final passage.

I should also like to say that those of us who are opposing this bill, will make our case and we will hope that on the merits we can vote it up or down at some reasonable hour this afternoon. We realize that we have a holiday tomorrow and many of us would like to get away.

I should also like to say at this point, in connection with some of the statistical data, that there is ample data available from all of the Government sources, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor, all of which I intend to put in the Record to support some of the arguments which we are going to make, particularly in terms of wage rates, the range of wage rates, the difference in wage rates, the impact of adverse effect in connection with the existing program. We are going to argue that this is a subsidy for a very specialized group and a very small group of American agriculture.

Contrary to the arguments advanced by the proponents of the measure, who want to continue the bill for 2 more years, we will show that the Bureau of Employment Security came in again this year and asked for over $1,300,000 just to administer the program. So, on top of everything else, the cost of the program is increasing in terms of compliance costs and of course this is coming out of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78 is a wartime emergency measure, which no longer has a valid place in our society. It is a program which serves as a subsidy to less than 1 percent of America's growers but which has been cited by the leaders of national farm organizations for its detrimental effects on the great majority of American farmers. It is a program which is supported by those who espouse the free enterprise system but which is a complete denial of that system by making inoperative the basic law of supply and demand.

Essentially, the Mexican farm labor program raises the important question: Should the power and authority of the Federal Government be used in such manner as to perpetuate a farm labor system rooted in underemployment, unemployment, and poverty, both at home and abroad?

H.R. 5497, by providing a carte blanche 2-year extension of Public Law 78 would answer this question in the affirmative. It would do so for it is based upon the proposition that the Nation's largest industry—agriculture—is dependent on cheap labor for its survival; that U.S. growers are incapable of solving their labor problems without help from the Federal Government. It means that growers who have benefited from this program over the years will continue to believe that the Government owes them a labor force.

I deny the validity of this proposition. I believe that it should be public policy to accomplish in agriculture what we have already accomplished in other sectors of our economy; namely, the restoration of respect and dignity, based upon good wages, good working conditions, and steady employment to the men and women who labor for hire on American farms.

If this program were to pass from the American scene—and I am convinced that its termination is long past due—I submit that an insignificant number of American growers would be affected—less than 1 percent of all the farmers and farm employers in the United States. I submit further that those growers who now use Mexican nationals would find no difficulty in getting their crops harvested. It is my firm belief that Public Law 78 is a "crutch"—an excuse for evading the very real labor problems that confront agricultural employers. I submit, further, that the extension of this program is more to the advantage of farm labor associations—which is a glorified way of saying "farm labor contractors"—and to other middlemen who provide services to Mexican nationals, than it is to farmers themselves.

Farmers are interested in having their crops harvested; they are not particularly concerned with who does the harvesting. There is no doubt in my mind that if foreign labor was not available to those few growers who have become accustomed to its use, they would institute recruitment practices which would attract domestic labor—or they would mechanize. Either solution is better than delaying the inevitable by prolonging the use of Mexican labor.

The managers and other employees of farm labor associations, who, for the past 10 to 15 years have made their living off the backs of Mexican braceros, might suffer, it is true. These are the people who recruit labor from Mexico for a living—and who live very well indeed. Very often, these are the people who fly by first-class jet from California to Washington to lobby for extension of Public Law 78. If you happen to meet them at the Carleton Hotel here in Washington, the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, or the St. Francis in San Francisco, they will wine and dine you to your heart's content. And where did the expense money come from? From the bracero program.

There are others who would grieve to see Public Law 78 fade from the American scene. The catering firms who provide board for Mexican nationals at $1.75 per person—the maximum allowed by the Government—would be very disappointed if the bracero program should be terminated. Why should they not be? For every $1.75 they receive, they spend approximately 80 cents—that is not a bad profit. The concessionaires who sell

Cokes at the reception centers for 15 cents a bottle; the Mexican officials who accept bribes from prospective braceros; the insurance companies that provide occupational insurance for braceros while they are in this country; the bus lines which transport braceros from reception centers to the central labor camps—all of these individuals and firms would hate to see the end of the bracero program. And they have been the backbone of its support for the past 10 years.

The charge is made, Mr. Speaker, that growers need Public Law 78; that American farmworkers will not do stoop labor. This simply is not true. Let me remind the House that coal mining is stoop labor, and nobody is suggesting that we import foreign laborers to do this work.

American farmworkers are available, but wages must be raised to a decent minimum wage, and recruiting programs, not unlike that involved in Public Law 78, must be inaugurated. If the money spent attempting to perpetuate the bracero system had been invested in a program to better utilize the domestic farm labor available throughout the country—a program such as that contained in the recruiting-transportation bill and other measures before the Congress—we would today have a far more sensible, more logical, and more equitable farm labor system in American agriculture. This, I submit, is the type of program we should be supporting.

Mr. Speaker, the time has came for us to recognize Public Law 78 for what it is—a subsidy to less than 1 percent of America's growers. At the same time, it is a program which works to the direct disadvantage of the great majority of America's farmers—the 88 percent which use no or very little hired labor. And, it further depresses the incomes of America's farmworkers who are already on the bottom rung of our economic ladder; a group with an unemployment rate of 7.3 percent; a group which in 1961 was able to work on the average only 134 days in agriculture for the pittance income of $881.

This is a program, Mr. Speaker, which is unnecessary and harmful—both economically and to the American conscience—and I urge that when the roll is called we vote to end this injustice by defeating this bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with leave granted I include, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, the fourth monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of April 30, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected by the President at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—a projected increase of $4,091,000,000 over actual budget revenues for fiscal year 1962. Through the first 10 months—to April 30, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 10 months of fiscal 1962—to April 30, 1962—by $4,591,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for all of fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $18,138,000,000 in the 2 months May–June 1963. In the corresponding 2 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues amounted to $18,638,000,000.

According to the recent report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt limit bill, the administration, as of April, apparently still adheres to the full year revenue estimate of $85,500,000,000.

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the pattern of budget receipts shows the months of September, December, March, and June as the peak months; and receipts in the second half of the fiscal year, January–June, are usually higher than in the first half.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected in the President's January budget at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal year 1962, of which $1,901,000,000 is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 10 months—to April 30, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 10 months of fiscal 1962—to April 30, 1962—by $5,001,000,000, of which $2,366,000,000 is for national defense and $2,635,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that budget expenditures during the first 10 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,745,000,000—somewhat less than the projected budget average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the January official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the January net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 2 months May 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $16,854,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,427,000,000 during the 2-month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,745,000,000 in the first 10 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average expenditure in the 2 months, May–June, could rise $712,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 10 months without exceeding the budgeted total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. The table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal year 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average of all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison with this, in the first 10 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 10-month average of fiscal 1962 by a little less—namely, by $500,000,000. Stated another way, in the first 83 percent of the fiscal year about 77 percent, or $5,001,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

But in connection with expenditures, it is pertinent to note from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the recent debt limit bill that as of April, the administration apparently expects budget expenditures for fiscal 1963 to total $93,907,000,000—which would be $404,000,000 less than the January budget estimate from the President—$564,000,000 less for other than national defense, partially offset by $160,000,000 more for national defense.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The January official budget estimate of the deficit for all of fiscal year 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit for all of fiscal 1962. But as noted above, the more recent official administration view, according to the report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt limit bill, is that the fiscal 1963 deficit will approximate $8,407,000,000.

Through 10 months of fiscal year 1963, the actual deficit is $10,095,000,000 or only about $410,000,000 larger than the actual deficit during the corresponding 10 months of fiscal year 1962. These figures would seem to suggest the possibility that the budget deficit for all of fiscal 1963 may be less than the $8,407,000,000 mentioned in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The comparisons and the trend will of course vary in the 2 months of May and June in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The official January budget projection is that the public debt at the end of fiscal 1963—on June 30, 1963—will be $303,494,000,000, a projected increase of $5,293,000,000 from the actual debt of $298,201,000,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962. But the Treasury's more recent estimate, according to the report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the recent debt limit bill, is that the debt on June 30 next will approximate $305,300,000,000.

The actual public debt on April 30, 1963, stood at $303,165,000,000—or $6,-

214,000,000 above the corresponding date in fiscal 1962—at April 30, 1962—and $4,965,000,000 above the total of the debt at the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 10 months of fiscal 1963 versus 10 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 10 months			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1963 compared to actual for all of fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	67,362	62,771	+4,591	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	43,648	41,282	+2,366	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	33,809	31,174	+2,635	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures (net)	77,457	72,456	+5,001	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−), line 1 minus 3	−10,095	−9,685	−410	−8,811	−6,378	[1] −2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,365			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,380			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,745	7,245	+500	7,859	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the January official budget projects an estimated increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Apr. 30, 1963.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House doubtless noted in yesterday's newspapers a reference to what was designated as the slowness of some of the committees of the House in reporting bills this year. There seemed to be especial emphasis on the desire to know why the appropriation bills are not coming to the floor at a more rapid rate.

May I say briefly that the reason is a very simple one and is both statutory and parliamentary. The Committee on Appropriations cannot appropriate a dollar—and no official of the Government can spend a dollar until its appropriation and expenditure is authorized by law.

The legislative committees of the House are in complete control of such situations. Until they get a bill through the House and Senate and until it has been signed by the President, we cannot turn a wheel on many of the measures which must be implemented by funds from the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, for some time over past years it has been necessary to call attention to this situation and to the importance of the committees reporting out the necessary authorization bills. And I am again taking up this unhappy and too often futile task of urging authorizations in order to expedite the processing of the supply bills in order to permit early disposition of the fiscal program for the session and permit prompt adjournment as required by law. We have to wait upon the legislative committees before we can proceed with the appropriation bill. We cannot appropriate a single dollar until it is authorized.

I include at this point in the RECORD a tabulation indicating the application of this requirement to which this applies to the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. The extent to which this applies to the various subcommittees is shown in the following table:

Subcommittee bill	Area of the bill	1964 budget estimate
		Billions
Department of Defense	Procurement of aircraft, ships, and missiles	$12.2
	Research and development work on aircraft, ships, and missiles	3.1
Foreign operations	Major portion of entire program: Unauthorized	3.7
	Export-Import Bank (this year only)	2.0
Independent offices	NASA, space program	5.7
Military construction	Entire military construction program $1.2	
	Some military housing .734	
		1.9
Public works	AEC plant and equipment	.4

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5497, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is a very simple piece of legislation. It extends the authority to the Secretary of Labor to maintain for an additional 2 years beyond December 31, 1963, a program of bringing in supplemental labor under a treaty arrangement with the Government of Mexico, to the extent that he determines to be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, this is a program which has been in continuous operation since 1951. It has had its difficulties, but it has worked very well, we feel, not only for the people from the Republic of Mexico who are involved, but for our people here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that we are merely extending the authority of the Secretary of Labor to conduct this program. It is he who determines the need for the program. He could operate no program if he should find that there was no need.

Mr. Chairman, in order to give the members of the Committee some brief outline as to how this works, we have a treaty with the Republic of Mexico. It will have to be extended at the end of this year. Everyone is confident it will be extended without any difficulty. The Mexican Government handles the problem of locating qualified laborers in Mexico. These workers are screened for diseases, willingness to work, and so forth, and then they are brought to the United States and are signed up under a standard work contract which provides guarantees with respect to wages, and so forth. But before any workers can be brought into any area, the Secretary of Labor has to make a determination that these workers are needed and that local labor is not available to do the same job. Further, that bringing in the Mexican workers will not have an adverse effect

on the wages and working conditions of local workers.

Mr. Chairman, we are confident that the present Secretary of Labor, as his two predecessors before him, is not anti-labor, and that he will administer this program in the best interests of the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, one of the gentlemen from California who spoke on the rule referred to this as a subsidy program. It is not. The only Government outlay involved is that for compliance features of the program. The other costs of the program are handled by fees collected from the growers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an emergency wartime program. It first went into effect in 1951, I believe, and there were other programs that were different which preceded it during the wartime period.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the only real issue here is the question, is there need for this program? I think the gentleman from California who spoke on the rule would stipulate that if there were a demonstrable need for these workers he would be for the program. So the only argument between us really is the question of the necessity for bringing in supplemental labor. On this question of need I again refer to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. Certainly he is not anti-labor. Yet he came before our committee and recommended a 1-year extension of this program, I am sure purely on the basis of finding that there was need for a 1-year extension. We support a 2-year extension because we say that the size of the program, the magnitude of it, is completely in his hands. He can make this determination of need at the end of 1 year if conditions warrant it, and I think he will do this honestly.

Furthermore, our farmers have to plan ahead. Let us take the grower of tomatoes. Tomatoes is one of the large crops in California, and the grower needs to know in advance whether he will have a source of labor available before he plants his tomato crop.

So we do not want to be involved next year with our tomato growers being uncertain at the beginning of the season whether there will be labor available to harvest the crop. We do not want to bring this up in the middle of a Presidential election year. That is why we want a 2-year program rather than a 1-year program as recommended by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, in good conscience, this is a difficult problem for us who come from farm areas where these laborers are used. We in good conscience try to represent the interests not only of our farm employers but of our farmworkers and we would not be for this extension if there were not in our own minds a demonstrated need for the program. We would be the first to request its termination if we became convinced otherwise.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the gentleman tell the Committee whether he is suggesting that he would accept the Secretary's recommendation in connection with a 1-year extension and the workmen's compensation provisions that would also be provided for?

Mr. HAGEN of California. May I answer the gentleman from California this way? The workmen's compensation provision would mean nothing in California because every farmworker is covered by workmen's compensation.

Mr. COHELAN. This is a national program. We are talking not just about California. Is the gentleman saying that this would apply in Arkansas and Texas?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I do not know what the situation is either in Texas or Arkansas. In this respect I can speak only for California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman saying that he favors the workmen's compensation provision? Because, if so, maybe we can do some talking.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer the gentleman address his inquiry in that regard to one of the gentlemen from Arkansas or Texas.

Mr. COHELAN. I should assume that the gentleman, a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, is not in favor of the workmen's compensation provisions as presented by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Let me say this to the gentleman, traditionally workmen's compensation has been a field of activity of State law. These systems vary so greatly from State to State, I think it would be an unwarranted intrusion into an existing pattern of workmen's compensation law for us to legislate at this time in connection with this program on that subject.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the folks of Texas' 16th District, and in the interest of reasonability and sensibility in our foreign assistance and self-help programs in our dealings with other countries, Mexico in particular, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to speak in favor of H.R. 5497, Mr. UDALL's bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which will extend the termination date of the act to December 31, 1965.

Along with the great majority of my colleagues and the administration, I, too, favor first consideration of U.S. citizens for employment in this country in preference to alien workers when domestic workers are available. However, after a thorough investigation of this situation, and after being closely associated with the industry, I find that there is very definitely a tremendous shortage of domestic workers in our west Texas-New Mexico area, and the hiring of braceros to help in our farm and ranch work is a necessity if we are to maintain a healthy agriculture program.

Admittedly, there are a few unemployed persons in our domestic labor market, but we are unable to get those few who are available to do the stoop-labor work necessary in our farm operations. Our big problem today, causing the unemployment that we do have, not only in Texas, but across the Nation, lies in the fact that with our high unemployment compensation rates made available through costly Federal Government assistance programs, our people can be, and are, gainfully unemployed. Too many people are looking for work and hoping they can't find it, because they make as much take-home money loafing as they do working. Also, I hasten to point out that the present act provides that any time domestic workers do become available to do the job being done by the braceros, the domestic workers have priority over the braceros and will be hired to do the work.

I strongly recommend your favorable consideration of H.R. 5497 and a continuation of the bracero labor employment program. We can achieve a threefold benefit through employing braceros in our labor-shortage agriculture areas.

First. We can boost our own economy by hiring these vitally needed workers, not now domestically available, to help in the operation of our farms and ranches. We must keep our farms in operation if we expect to have a healthy agriculture economy.

Second. We can better demonstrate and sell the free enterprise system to our good neighbors to the south by their participation in the various projects and developments on our farms and in our ranching industry. It is somewhat of a Peace Corps in reverse, you might say, and a new twist to foreign education and assistance.

Third. We can help these dependent people help themselves by the money they earn from this work, rather than giving them millions of U.S. dollars in foreign assistance programs. Since 1945, we have granted Mexico approximately $630,300,000 in assistance of one type or another, such as grants, loans, aid, and so forth. I cannot see justification in the continuance of this kind of aid plan as compared to the earn-it plan that the Mexican bracero labor program offers.

For these three primary reasons briefly discussed, and particularly, in the interest of working toward a free-market-controlled economy with decreasing Federal controls and regulations over our farmers, I respectfully urge you to vote in favor of the bill, H.R. 5497.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would explain, since he has asserted that the American agricultural worker may be indolent and lazy, if he considers the adverse rate which I notice is paid in the gentleman's State, 70 cents an hour, which incidentally was raised from 60 cents an hour last year, and which was 50 cents an hour the year before, to be an adequate incentive for this particular attitude?

Mr. FOREMAN. First of all, in reply to the gentleman, I did not say they were indolent and lazy—he did. Secondly, I say that even at $1 an hour we are unable to get these people to do the work on our farms that I indicated here. Even at $1.25 an hour we have tried in west Texas to have people who are available to do the stoop labor work that we are talking about here and we have been unable to get the people to do the work—mostly because the people are not there to do the work.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is aware that his State is using far less braceros than it used in previous years?

Mr. FOREMAN. Primarily because of continued mechanization of the work that is being done and very possibly, with an extension of this act, we will be able to completely get away from the need for bracero labor in the next 2 years.

Mr. COHELAN. The Secretary of Labor has called for a 1-year extension of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I wonder if the gentleman goes along with that program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I am very happy that by coincidence I am following my colleague from Texas because it gives me the occasion to recall the truth of an old Irish saying to the effect, "It is very easy to sleep on the wounds of another man."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] neglects to tell you that in his district there are many areas in which that very same person, who has been described as a Mexican, has faced for many years a systematic, prejudicial discrimination in salary, in housing, in minimal standards of living that we here in America take for granted. He ironically refers to a "good neighbor policy in reverse." Do you think it has been conducive to good neighborly relations to have had thousands of these same braceros herded and rounded up like cattle and thrown in concentration camps and put in a ship and sailed down the Gulf of Mexico to be disembarked at some point in Mexico far from their homes? These are things that have happened. I can conceive of my colleague from Texas speaking in the fashion and in the manner that he has spoken only because he is ignorant of how the other half is living within the 16th Congressional District. But when he says it is impossible to get the farm laborers to do the stoop labor, may I remind him that from my district comes the greatest number of migratory laborers of any point in Texas and they are so willing to work they go thousands of miles away, even as far as Oregon and Minnesota. They make these yearly pilgrimages to such distant points and they go to those places because they get more than what is offered to them in west Texas—to say nothing of the indignity to which they are subjected by signs such as I have seen in Pecos, Tex.—visible for all to see and, as I say, I myself have been there and I have seen them—"No Mexicans allowed."

To say that they are not willing to do stoop labor is not true. What they are no longer willing to do is to do stoop labor for stoop wages. They want fair, equal, and the right kind of wages for their work. In this same State from which I come, we have no minimum wage. We have reached this anomalous, ironic, unjust, and shameful point—and I call this legislation a shameful piece of legislation, because it perpetuates inequity upon inequity, and it is using the miseries of the people of one nation to trade on the miseries of other unfortunate workers in our country—that is all that this represents.

And to talk about phasing it out; so far as I am personally concerned, it ought to be phased out right now. This is the best time to phase it out.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I would like to ask the gentleman if he feels there are enough migratory workers in his district to serve the needs of agriculture in the various areas of the Nation?

Mr. GONZALEZ. The migratory laborers from my district have picked the strawberries south of my district and out of my State. They have picked cotton in the gentleman's district, the 16th District; they have picked cotton in east Texas, but they have been displaced because there are some now if they wished to remain in these very same districts would earn as little as 20 cents an hour for doing the work.

I have been to places where we have had native workers earning as little as 20 cents an hour because Texas has no minimum wage and hour law. Therefore, if we had a strict and explicit enforcement of this agreement, which is international in nature, maybe, perhaps, it would be different. But a survey was run several years ago with respect to the average wages paid to braceros, which at that time was supposed to be 50 cents an hour. That survey revealed they never received the 50 cents an hour on the average, that the total was less than 30 cents an hour. Therefore, we have competition. The native Texan can be found in many fields working shoulder to shoulder with the imported foreign worker. So this native worker who works shoulder to shoulder with the imported foreign bracero is not guaranteed a minimum; and, as I say, gets as little as 20 cents an hour. This imported bracero, if the law were enforced, would today be entitled to 70 cents an hour.

But if the gentleman is so desirous of having this inadequate supply of labor, and it becomes necessary to dip into the reservoir of this excess labor in the Republic south of us, why not do it as good neighbors? Why not let them come in as immigrants, not as slaves? The moment these people do not show satisfaction they can be deported and thrown back, with very little chance of protest. Let us give them the chance to come to America, as our parents did, and remain if they wish.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to emphasize to the Members of the House the importance of this program to agriculture in the State of Michigan. We feel it is very vital and necessary to us.

A reading of the report will indicate that we use a considerable number of these people, and we do not know how we could get these crops harvested if we did not have them. We have great concern for our domestic labor, and I agree that in every instance, where it is possible, domestic labor should be used first. However, as the report further indicates, and it refers to the Michigan Department of Labor, domestic labor is unable to do that job in Michigan. We recognize that stoop labor in the hot sun is a difficult task for those who are not used to it, and they just have not been able to do it in the past. We have had instances in my State where some of the crops spoiled in the field because we had a lack of agricultural workers, resulting in a great cost, not only to the consumer but to the grower.

We have had wonderful community relations with those who have come up to do this work in the State of Michigan. In my community, in cooperation with the Council of Churches and others, we have done everything we could to make their stay in our area pleasant. We appreciate their presence in our State. We are grateful for the work they do and have been doing for us.

We look forward to the time when it will not be necessary for them to come to our State to do this work. Mechanization and improved methods of handling these crops will in a few years eliminate our need for these workers. But as of now I cannot see how we can get along without this particular program, and I sincerely favor this extension.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members will not get the idea that this is simply a California-Texas party this afternoon, because the whole Nation is involved, and I think that our concern should go a great deal further than most of the speakers have seemed to indicate.

There is, of course, the domestic problem of how we will gather our crops. Obviously we have to have people who will do the type of work it is necessary to do if you are going to get the crops gathered. I am sure that there is always a relationship between the price that you pay and the volume of labor that you can get.

Unfortunately, agriculture has been the least remunerative of all of the business activities of the United States for a good long time and has been unable to pay the wages that other segments of our economy have been able to pay. I would, therefore, call the attention of the membership to the fact that it does not make much difference what kind of laws you pass here, you are not going to materially raise agricultural wages until you raise agricultural prices. That is just plain commonsense. It always works. You are not going to get people to pay more to gather a cotton crop or to gather a fruit crop or to gather a lettuce crop than the crop is going to sell for, so if you are going to raise these wages, as all of us would like to do, you are simply going to have to raise the price of the product. Bear that in mind.

Now, the next thing that I think we should consider is that we are moving, as several of the speakers have said, toward mechanization, and moving rather rapidly. But, I could not more disagree than I do with the gentlemen who said that if we cannot get domestic labor, let us mechanize as rapidly as possible.

Now, why should we want to do that sort of thing? Why is it desirable to take away from anybody employment whether he is an American citizen or Mexican bracero. Why should we say that it is of no value whatever to pay these wages to Mexican braceros and let them take this money home as something they have earned by the sweat of their brow rather than something that Uncle Sam reached in his pocket and handed to them as a gift?

We are handing out gifts all over the world. We are reaching into the taxpayer's wallet and handing it out without a thing in the world in return. Here we are getting something in return. We are giving Mexico aid in the very most effective way. Are there Members who are so callous that they would like to see us deny to our sister republic the opportunity to earn some aid?

Most of you talk about trade and not aid. Most of you talk about giving people an opportunity rather than giving money. Here we are giving the Mexican workers an opportunity, and yet the opponents of this bill come along and say "Why, even though it will not put one American to work, we would like to stop this use of Mexican labor and mechanize everything so that nobody would get any wages out of it." I cannot agree to such a philosophy as that.

I believe it is sound to keep these people, as many of them as we can, consistently at work. Now, it is true that we are working only about 30 percent as many as we one time used of this Mexican labor, and it is true that that percentage is going down. But, it is also true that if you repeal this Mexican bracero law and wipe out the legal method of getting Mexican labor, you are going to have a flood of "wetbacks," and somehow or other this House has never distinguished between wetbacks and braceros. There are no women and children with the braceros. That problem is entirely one of the wetbacks. There is no deportation from the United States by shipload across the Gulf of Mexico into some interior point of braceros. That is entirely wetbacks that the gentleman talked about. Those are the illegal entrants, and you wipe out the legal way of working in the United States and you but invite a repetition of the very scandalous situation that existed before we had this bracero law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is really the choice you have. You do not have a choice of providing labor for some needy American citizen from San Antonio or anywhere else. You have the choice of providing it legally through the use of braceros or providing for it illegally through the use of wetbacks.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I shall not address myself to the ignorance of any person present, as has happened here today. I am not going to personally villify any particular person for the position he has taken.

Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that because of the high unemployment that we have in this country we should not indulge in this type of program. I do not believe that can stand the test of logic. In the past 20 years on the farms in America the labor force has been reduced by one-third. This has been due to mechanization in part and also due to the fact that the production per man-hour has increased by about 5 percent per year over the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, I say this to the Members of the House today: If you want to help alleviate the unemployment problem that we have in America, you should bear in mind some simple facts. For instance, for every $1 of agricultural income $5 inures to the benefit of the nonfarm segment of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I have said in my own congressional district to the labor leaders, the union leaders, that I support this program because for every dollar of agricultural income that I help this country to obtain I am helping the nonfarm segment of this economy by an additional $5. I am creating more by keeping this program in effect, keeping more men working—union members and nonunion members, those who are in the trucking, the shipping, the packing industries and so forth.

So if you want full employment or if you are trying to attain full employment, I would say to you this program is an excellent one. It is needed. If you knock this program out today you place the American farmer in a position where he cannot continue and you will be destroying many of the resources of this country. You will be hurting and adding to the unemployment problem in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, we are not just talking about farmers today. I deplore the fact that on the floor of this House the farmers—the big farmers especially—have been knocked around a good bit of the time. Well, the time has come, my friends and my colleagues, when you cannot place the farmer in the garbage can on the floor of this House and then put him on a pedestal at campaign time. It is about time that some of you who have your heart on your sleeve recognize that.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to be faced in the next few weeks with another aspect, another program, the foreign aid program, are we not? For years this Congress has fought and struggled with the idea that we have got to get the moneys down to the people; is that not true? As a byproduct of this program—and I defy anyone to challenge it—we have a built-in process right in the bracero program which does not cost this country 1 cent.

Where does it start? It starts right down at the people. A byproduct of it here is that you have thousands upon thousands of salesmen going back into Mexico carrying a good image of this country, and the people, the taxpayers are not obligated for 1 cent of this program. None of you will challenge that, because it is absolutely true.

Remember this: We only got into the foreign aid program because we wanted to stop communism. Right now you have a serious threat of exportation of communism both to the south of Cuba and to the north. It is a very serious problem in Mexico at the present time. So, I respectfully urge each one of you gentlemen, as you vote today, you can cast a vote for foreign aid which does not cost you a cent; you can cast a vote not only for the farmer but for business and for the entire economy of this country. I respectfully urge you to do so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The gentleman said it did not cost any money. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the enforcement provision of this program costs about $1,300,000 a year?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I am aware of that, and the only reason for that is that the Department of Labor would not let the farmer pay for it himself, although he was willing to do so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. So that, when you said it did not cost any money, you meant to the extent of only $1,300,000?

Mr. MARTIN of California. Obviously that is part of the cost of the program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman and the previous speaker are talking about the fact that expenditures for hired labor constitute an undue burden upon the farmer in this country. At the appropriate time—I do not want to burden the House with statistics—I will insert in the RECORD a table showing the realized gross farm income, total production expenses, and expenditures for hired labor, in the United States and selected States for 1961, which shows in our great State of California the realized gross farm income expenditure for hired labor as a percentage of realized gross farm income is 16.5 percent and the total production expenses for hired labor are 22.8 percent.

I am very proud to say that that figure is the highest figure in a table of States that consists of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Michigan, New Mexico, and Texas. In these States these figures are considerably lower. Of course, what this shows is that as a percent of the gross expenses it is a relatively small item. I would remind the gentleman that realized gross farm income in the United States as a whole last year was $39,912 million.

Mr. MARTIN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD the table to which I have referred, and other significant tables bearing on this problem.

The tables referred to follow.

Realized gross farm income, total production expenses, and expenditures for hired labor, United States and selected States, 1961

State	Realized gross farm income (million dollars)	Total production expenses (million dollars)	Expenditures for hired labor		
			Million dollars [1]	As percent of—	
				Realized gross farm income (real)	Total production expenses
United States	39,912.0	27,109.0	3,048.0	7.6	11.2
Arizona	484.4	330.0	62.5	12.9	18.9
Arkansas	848.7	504.4	79.8	9.4	15.8
California	3,381.7	2,446.9	556.7	16.5	22.8
Colorado	712.2	560.2	52.6	7.4	9.4
Michigan	894.7	615.8	71.9	8.0	11.7
New Mexico	265.7	192.5	25.4	9.6	13.2
Texas	2,670.7	1,799.6	301.2	11.3	16.7

[1] Includes cash wages, perquisites, and social security taxes paid by employers.

Source: "Farm Income, State Estimates, 1949-61;" USDA Economic Research Service, August 1962.

Farm wage rates, Jan. 1, 1963 [1]

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes, composite rates (1910–14=100)[2]
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board or room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine	$207	$153	$39.00	$56.00			$9.50		$1.14	$1.02	595
New Hampshire	227	167	44.00	63.00			10.20		1.23	1.13	714
Vermont	206	160	41.00	56.00			9.60		1.19	1.04	668
Massachusetts	247	167	47.00	67.00			10.60		1.35	1.20	750
Rhode Island	247	167	47.00	68.00			10.70		1.36	1.22	812
Connecticut	247	168	47.00	68.00			10.80		1.36	1.22	815
New England	227	163	43.75	62.00			10.10		1.30	1.12	712
New York	218	152	38.50	54.50			9.20		1.17	.943	580
New Jersey	235	170	46.50	58.50			9.70		1.17	1.01	716
Pennsylvania	200	138	36.50	49.75			8.50		1.09	.869	694
Middle Atlantic	215	150	38.75	53.50			9.00		1.15	.929	644
Ohio	183	133				$6.70	8.60		1.11	.826	632
Indiana	190	140				6.60	8.60		1.11	.849	669
Illinois	210	160				7.90	9.60		1.15	.947	687
Michigan	220	152				7.00	9.10		1.11	.918	641
Wisconsin	208	150				7.00	9.30		1.12	.907	609
East North Central	206	150				7.20	9.10		1.12	.902	650
Minnesota	191	148				7.80	9.80		1.14	.927	587
Iowa	214	170				8.40	10.30		1.19	1.01	604
Missouri	171	119				6.30	8.00		1.05	.798	705
North Dakota	180	138				6.50	8.40		1.04	.843	509
South Dakota	195	153				7.00	8.80		1.07	.890	545
Nebraska	227	177				8.20	10.10		1.18	1.02	670
Kansas	211	160				7.70	9.70		1.16	.968	766
West North Central	198	151				7.40	9.30		1.12	.922	630
Delaware	170				$6.90		8.80	$0.95	1.05	1.06	882
Maryland	182				6.70		8.40	.97	1.06	1.04	955
Virginia					5.50		6.80	.68	.87	.784	814
West Virginia					5.10		5.90	.67	.79	.720	529
North Carolina					5.30		6.10	.65	.78	.716	762
South Carolina					3.85		4.50	.50	.59	.531	665
Georgia					4.40		5.10	.62	.73	.625	657
Florida					6.00		6.40	.81	.90	.795	731
South Atlantic					5.30		6.10	.70	.81	.730	745
Kentucky					4.55		5.60	.65	.84	.694	618
Tennessee					4.20		5.00	.53	.67	.610	565
Alabama					4.25		4.90	.55	.66	.601	595
Mississippi					4.20		4.50	.53	.59	.558	545
East South Central					4.30		5.00	.56	.68	.612	579
Arkansas					5.90		6.40	.68	.77	.771	680
Louisiana					5.00		5.50	.60	.70	.667	650
Oklahoma					7.30		8.30	.90	1.04	.995	731
Texas					6.30		6.90	.77	.89	.841	644
West South Central					6.10		6.70	.74	.85	.815	668
Montana	221	167					9.30		1.23	.994	510
Idaho	262	207					10.80		1.28	1.15	642
Wyoming	242	165					9.20		1.28	1.02	523
Colorado	246	166					9.80		1.17	1.01	662
New Mexico	192	135					7.30		.94	.799	638
Arizona	265	180					9.00		1.04	1.02	639
Utah	244	203					10.20		1.25	1.11	648
Nevada	260	180					9.80		1.30	1.08	579
Mountain	247	173					8.90		1.07	.994	599
Washington	270	210						1.24	1.35	1.32	640
Oregon	257	191						1.19	1.26	1.24	608
California	310	230						1.20	1.30	1.33	597
Pacific	305	227						1.20	1.30	1.32	609
United States	205	161	36.25	48.00	5.70	6.60	6.80	.88	1.13	.948	663

---

[1] Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

[2] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Average farm wage rates, 1961 [1]

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes of composite rates (1910-14=100)
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board or room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine	$200	$147	$37.50	$55.50			$9.50		$1.13	$0.969	$584
New Hampshire	219	159	44.50	59.50			9.60		1.16	1.02	673
Vermont	200	157	39.50	53.75			9.20		1.14	.963	634
Massachusetts	232	161	45.50	62.50			10.50		1.24	1.08	708
Rhode Island	234	160	45.75	63.75			10.70		1.23	1.10	762
Connecticut	233	160	45.00	63.75			10.90		1.32	1.13	777
New England	214	155	41.50	58.50			9.90		1.19	1.02	669
New York	213	148	38.25	54.25			9.20		1.15	.959	596
New Jersey	220	156	41.50	56.00			9.70		1.16	.952	680
Pennsylvania	189	135	35.50	47.50			8.30		1.07	.840	677
Middle Atlantic	206	145	37.75	52.25			9.00		1.13	.900	629
Ohio	177	129				$6.60	8.50		1.09	.825	625
Indiana	180	133				6.50	8.40		1.07	.823	648
Illinois	201	155				7.60	9.40		1.12	.889	659
Michigan	211	143				6.90	8.80		1.09	.867	624
Wisconsin	202	149				7.00	8.90		1.10	.866	593
East North Central	196	143				7.00	8.90		1.10	.857	630
Minnesota	190	149				8.00	9.90		1.10	.919	581
Iowa	205	164				8.40	10.30		1.16	.967	590
Missouri	159	116				6.20	7.80		1.01	.771	688
North Dakota	187	157				7.20	9.00		1.04	.860	494
South Dakota	191	152				7.30	9.00		1.05	.880	533
Nebraska	216	166				8.10	10.00		1.13	.960	640
Kansas	202	154				8.10	9.70		1.14	.933	746
West North Central	190	148				7.70	9.40		1.10	.894	617
Delaware					$6.90		8.90	$0.94	1.00	.939	861
Maryland					6.60		8.10	.93	1.04	.901	910
Virginia					5.40		6.50	.70	.84	.707	786
West Virginia					5.30		5.80	.66	.78	.647	513
North Carolina					5.10		5.80	.63	.72	.626	720
South Carolina					3.70		4.20	.46	.53	.456	616
Georgia					4.25		4.80	.57	.67	.545	619
Florida					5.70		6.20	.79	.86	.709	723
South Atlantic					5.00		5.70	.66	.74	.624	701
Kentucky					4.45		5.50	.63	.87	.654	617
Tennessee					4.05		4.80	.51	.65	.550	556
Alabama					4.05		4.55	.55	.61	.530	582
Mississippi					3.85		4.20	.48	.53	.479	515
East South Central					4.10		4.85	.53	.65	.548	565
Arkansas					5.40		5.90	.63	.73	.666	622
Louisiana					4.75		5.30	.59	.66	.597	628
Oklahoma					7.20		8.30	.89	1.01	.916	699
Texas					6.20		6.70	.69	.80	.746	617
West South Central					5.80		6.40	.68	.78	.716	634
Montana	227	179					9.60		1.16	.934	489
Idaho	255	200					10.40		1.20	1.02	594
Wyoming	230	164					9.60		1.14	.923	494
Colorado	226	167					9.70		1.13	.932	634
New Mexico	194	137					7.40		.87	.747	638
Arizona	252	179					8.80		.99	.907	617
Utah	242	206					9.80		1.23	1.01	641
Nevada	260	176					9.80		1.19	.982	546
Mountain	236	176					9.40		1.09	.921	583
Washington	271	212						1.23	1.30	1.26	620
Oregon	256	194						1.18	1.23	1.19	591
California	300	230						1.20	1.27	1.25	585
Pacific	294	226						1.20	1.27	1.25	591
United States	195	151	35.75	46.50	5.30	6.50	6.60	.90	.99	.834	642

[1] Weighted average of 5 quarters. Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

Average farm wage rates, 1962 [1]

State and region	Per month		Per week		Per day			Per hour		Composite rate per hour	Indexes, composite rates (1910–14=100)
	With house	With board and room	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	With board and room	Without board or room	With house	Without board or room		
Maine	$203	$154	$39.75	$55.50			$9.70		$1.15	$1.00	604
New Hampshire	223	163	45.00	60.50			10.00		1.20	1.06	700
Vermont	204	160	40.25	55.50			9.50		1.17	1.00	659
Massachusetts	243	165	47.25	65.50			10.70		1.31	1.14	746
Rhode Island	244	166	47.25	66.00			10.80		1.27	1.14	794
Connecticut	245	168	47.25	66.25			10.90		1.36	1.17	808
New England	221	161	43.25	59.75			10.10		1.22	1.06	695
New York	218	151	39.50	55.75			9.30		1.17	.938	583
New Jersey	224	163	45.25	59.00			10.20		1.19	.991	708
Pennsylvania	195	137	36.50	48.75			8.50		1.09	.858	692
Middle Atlantic	211	148	39.25	54.00			9.10		1.15	.920	643
Ohio	178	134				$6.70	8.60		1.10	.832	630
Indiana	185	138				6.80	8.50		1.09	.836	658
Illinois	208	159				7.80	9.70		1.16	.913	676
Michigan	218	151				7.00	9.00		1.10	.883	635
Wisconsin	206	151				7.20	9.10		1.13	.884	605
East North Central	201	148				7.20	9.00		1.12	.874	643
Minnesota	195	154				8.10	9.90		1.15	.941	596
Iowa	213	168				8.60	10.50		1.20	.996	607
Missouri	164	122				6.50	8.10		1.05	.802	716
North Dakota	194	165				7.50	9.60		1.09	.905	520
South Dakota	196	157				7.50	9.20		1.09	.905	548
Nebraska	224	172				8.40	10.30		1.17	.987	658
Kansas	212	165				8.30	10.20		1.17	.969	775
West North Central	197	154				7.90	9.70		1.14	.926	639
Delaware					$7.00		8.60	$0.95	1.05	.945	867
Maryland					6.80		8.20	.94	1.04	.907	916
Virginia					5.50		6.80	.71	.85	.725	806
West Virginia					5.20		5.90	.67	.80	.658	522
North Carolina					5.30		6.20	.65	.75	.656	754
South Carolina					3.85		4.45	.47	.55	.474	641
Georgia					4.35		5.00	.60	.69	.564	641
Florida					5.90		6.50	.78	.85	.719	734
South Atlantic					5.20		5.90	.67	.76	.646	726
Kentucky					4.50		5.70	.65	.85	.655	618
Tennessee					4.15		5.00	.53	.67	.566	572
Alabama					4.20		4.75	.55	.63	.543	597
Mississippi					4.10		4.40	.52	.59	.514	553
East South Central					4.25		4.95	.55	.66	.563	580
Arkansas					5.70		6.20	.66	.77	.697	651
Louisiana					4.85		5.30	.59	.69	.615	647
Oklahoma					7.40		8.60	.91	1.02	.935	714
Texas					6.40		7.00	.73	.83	.772	638
West South Central					6.10		6.70	.70	.81	.743	658
Montana	231	179					9.80		1.19	.956	501
Idaho	267	211					11.00		1.27	1.07	626
Wyoming	236	165					9.90		1.15	.938	502
Colorado	237	171					9.90		1.15	.950	646
New Mexico	196	142					7.60		.89	.759	649
Arizona	263	179					9.10		1.00	.927	631
Utah	251	213					10.20		1.28	1.05	667
Nevada	259	186					9.70		1.25	1.01	563
Mountain	245	180					9.60		1.12	.948	600
Washington	277	214						1.26	1.33	1.29	633
Oregon	256	193						1.19	1.26	1.22	605
California	309	234						1.21	1.29	1.27	505
Pacific	301	229						1.21	1.29	1.27	601
United States	200	155	37.00	47.75	5.60	6.70	6.90	.92	1.01	.856	658

---

[1] Weighted average of 5 quarters. Average rates paid on crop and livestock reporters' farms or in their localities for arrangements specified above. U.S. averages and State composite rates include estimates for unpublished State rates of small importance.

Impact of adverse effect rate

State	Adverse effect rate	Hourly rate most commonly paid domestic workers	
		1962	1961
Arkansas	$0.60	$0.50	$0.50
Arizona	.95	.95	.75
California	1.00	1.00	1.00
Colorado	.90	.90	.75
Georgia	.75	[1]	[2]
Illinois	1.00	[2]	[2]
Indiana	1.00	1.00	.80
Iowa	1.00	[2]	[2]
Kansas	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kentucky	.80	[1]	.50
Michigan	1.00	1.00	1.00
Minnesota	1.00	1.00	1.00
Montana	1.00	[2]	[2]
Nebraska	1.00	1.00	.95
New Mexico	.75	.75	.70
Nevada	1.00	1.00	.75
North Dakota	1.00	[1]	[2]
Oregon	1.00	[2]	[2]
South Dakota	1.00	[2]	[2]
Tennessee	.65	.55	.50
Texas	.70	.60	.50
Utah	1.00	1.00	.75
Wisconsin	1.00	[3] 1.15	.85
Wyoming	1.00	[2]	[2]

[1] No Mexican nationals employed in 1962.
[2] Mexican nationals employed only in piece rate activities.
[3] Based on only 1 survey (pea harvest).

Source: ES-232 Domestic Agricultural Wage Reports.

Adverse effect rates and peak employment of Mexicans, by State, 1960–62

State	Adverse effect rate	Peak Mexican worker employment [1]		
		1962	1961	1960
		Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
Arizona	$0.95	8.4	10.9	14.3
Arkansas	.60	6.7	21.2	31.3
California	1.00	71.7	65.4	73.4
Colorado	.90	6.4	6.6	6.6
Georgia	.75	0	.8	1.3
Illinois	1.00	.1	.1	.2
Indiana	1.00	.4	.6	.6
Iowa	1.00	.2	.2	.1
Kansas	1.00	.1	.1	[2]
Kentucky	.80	0	.1	.2
Michigan	1.00	12.7	14.3	11.2
Minnesota	1.00	[2]	.1	.1
Missouri	------------	0	0	.5
Montana	1.00	2.1	2.3	2.6
Nebraska	1.00	1.6	2.0	2.3
Nevada	1.00	.1	.1	.1
New Mexico	.75	2.0	8.0	11.3
North Dakota	1.00	0	.1	.1
Oregon	1.00	.3	.3	.3
South Dakota	1.00	.1	.3	.2
Tennessee	.65	.2	.4	.7
Texas	.70	24.2	104.1	103.7
Utah	1.00	.4	.3	.4
Wisconsin	1.00	.6	.8	1.0
Wyoming	1.00	1.3	1.6	1.2
U.S. total:				
Peak employment	------------	114.2	208.5	234.1
Number admitted	------------	195.0	291.4	315.8

[1] From ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports. The term "peak" refers to the highest employment at any time during the year.
[2] Less than 50 workers.

Man-months of Mexican labor, by State, 1959–62

State	Man-months				
	1959	1960	1961	1962	Percent change, 1959–62
U.S. total	[1] 1,630,950	[1] 1,358,058	[1] 1,148,800	[1] 716,426	−56
Texas	733,724	569,177	496,702	188,409	−74
California	560,690	487,680	406,255	378,570	−32
Arizona	110,608	104,078	86,810	61,666	−44
Arkansas	84,689	78,436	52,988	18,664	−78
New Mexico	81,368	60,362	46,783	17,888	−78
Michigan	22,776	21,381	23,788	18,361	−19
Colorado	15,747	16,112	19,192	19,690	+25
Montana	3,257	3,376	3,122	2,644	−19
Nebraska	2,733	2,712	2,474	2,715	−1
Wyoming	1,816	1,852	2,423	2,010	+11
Georgia	1,812	1,806	1,454	0	−100
Wisconsin	1,496	1,531	1,340	1,327	−11
Utah	1,837	1,804	1,276	1,850	+1
Tennessee	2,474	2,283	1,060	330	−87
All others	4,945	4,013	1,835	2,302	−53

[1] Because of rounding, sum of items may not add to total.

Source: In-Season Farm Labor Reports, Bureau of Employment Security.

Annual average Mexican worker employment, by State, 1953–62

[In thousands]

Year	United States	Texas	California	Arizona	Arkansas	New Mexico	Other States
1953	70.7	22.7	25.0	6.0	3.9	8.7	4.4
1954	85.3	34.0	30.3	7.1	3.9	6.6	3.4
1955	112.8	50.8	40.1	6.9	4.8	6.6	3.6
1956	125.7	48.9	50.3	8.1	4.8	6.2	7.4
1957	132.2	55.6	50.8	8.3	4.5	7.1	5.9
1958	131.8	60.4	46.1	10.2	3.0	7.4	4.7
1959	135.9	61.1	46.7	9.2	7.1	6.8	5.0
1960	113.2	47.4	40.6	8.7	6.5	5.0	5.0
1961	95.7	41.4	33.9	7.2	4.4	3.9	4.9
1962	59.7	15.7	31.5	5.1	1.6	1.5	4.3

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Percent distribution of annual average Mexican worker employment by State, 1953–62

Year	Percent of U.S. Mexican employment						
	United States	Texas	California	Arizona	Arkansas	New Mexico	Other States
1953	100	32	35	9	6	12	6
1954	100	40	35	8	5	8	4
1955	100	45	36	6	4	6	3
1956	100	39	40	6	4	5	6
1957	100	42	38	6	3	5	6
1958	100	46	35	8	2	6	3
1959	100	45	34	7	5	5	4
1960	100	42	36	8	6	4	4
1961	100	43	35	8	5	4	5
1962	100	26	53	9	3	3	6

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Annual average employment of seasonal hired workers in agriculture, by nationality, United States and major user States, 1959–62

State and year	Employment (in thousands)				Mexican as percent of total seasonal
	Total seasonal	Domestic	Total foreign	Mexican	
U.S. total:					
1962	702.1	631.4	70.7	59.7	9
1961	742.2	635.7	106.5	95.7	13
1960	760.9	637.8	123.3	113.2	15
1959	802.4	656.6	145.8	135.9	17
California:					
1962	134.8	102.0	32.8	31.5	23
1961	142.7	107.4	35.4	33.9	24
1960	140.9	98.8	42.2	40.6	29
1959	150.4	102.3	48.1	46.7	31
Texas:					
1962	142.9	127.2	15.8	15.7	11
1961	175.0	133.5	41.5	41.4	24
1960	184.7	137.2	47.5	47.4	26
1959	202.2	141.0	61.2	61.1	30
Arizona:					
1962	17.6	12.5	5.1	5.1	29
1961	20.4	13.1	7.2	7.2	35
1960	24.1	15.4	8.7	8.7	36
1959	23.5	14.2	9.2	9.2	39
Arkansas:					
1962	20.9	19.3	1.6	1.6	8
1961	25.8	21.4	4.4	4.4	17
1960	30.1	23.6	6.5	6.5	22
1959	33.7	26.6	7.1	7.1	21
Colorado:					
1962	7.9	6.2	1.6	1.6	20
1961	8.7	7.1	1.6	1.6	18
1960	8.5	7.1	1.3	1.3	15
1959	9.3	8.0	1.3	1.3	14
New Mexico:					
1962	3.2	1.7	1.5	1.5	47
1961	5.6	1.7	3.9	3.9	70
1960	6.8	1.8	5.0	5.0	74
1959	8.7	1.9	6.8	6.8	78
Michigan:					
1962	23.7	22.1	1.6	1.0	4
1961	24.4	22.4	2.0	1.9	8
1960	26.0	24.2	1.8	1.8	7
1959	24.9	23.0	2.0	1.9	8
All other States:					
1962	351.1	340.4	10.7	1.7	(1)
1961	339.6	329.1	10.5	1.4	(1)
1960	339.8	329.7	10.3	1.9	1
1959	349.7	339.6	10.1	1.8	1

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Employment of Mexican workers, selected States, data of peak Mexican employment, United States, 1962

[Employment in thousands]

State	Date of peak employment	Mexican	Other foreign worker	Domestic	Total	Mexican employment as percent of total seasonal
California	September	71.7	[1] 1.3	167.6	240.6	29.8
Texas	October	24.2	(2)	180.4	204.6	11.8
New Mexico	June	2.0		2.2	4.3	47.7
Arkansas	September	6.9		55.2	62.1	11.1
Michigan	August	12.7	(2)	48.5	61.2	20.8
Colorado	May	6.4		10.1	16.5	38.5
Arizona	November	8.4		15.9	24.2	34.5

[1] Japanese nationals.
[2] Less than 50 workers.

Source: ES-223 In-Season Farm Labor Reports.

Payments made under the Sugar Act to producers in States where Mexican nationals were used in sugarbeet work, 1961 [1]

State:	*Amount of payment (thousands)*
California	$10,265
Colorado	6,075
Kansas	378
Michigan	2,630
Montana	2,300
Nebraska	2,861
Utah	861
Wyoming	1,774

[1] Payments data for 1962 not complete.

Price-support costs

The table below shows the amount of cotton price-support loans on the 1962 crop which were outstanding as of January 25, 1963, in States where Mexican nationals were used in 1962 cotton activities:

State:	*Millions*
Arizona	$31.7
Arkansas	72.7
California	50.5
New Mexico	6.0
Tennessee	22.1
Texas	168.1

Since growths have until July 31, 1963, to repay loans and take their cotton out of the price-support program, it cannot be determined at this time how much of the loan amounts shown above will eventually remain outstanding. The figures for the 1961 crop provide some indication. The amount of price-support loans which the Government finally took over on the 1961 crop is shown below:

State:	*Millions*
Arizona	$18.6
Arkansas	51.6
California	9.1
New Mexico	14.3
Tennessee	23.7
Texas	158.2

Number of Mexican contract workers admitted for temporary employment in U.S. agriculture, 1942–62

Calendar year:	*Number admitted*
1942 [1]	4,203
1943	52,098
1944	62,170
1945	49,454
1946	32,043
1947	19,632
1948 [2]	35,345
1949	107,000
1950	67,500
1951	192,000
1952	197,100
1953	201,380
1954	309,033
1955	398,650
1956	445,197
1957	436,049
1958	432,857
1959	437,643
1960	315,846
1961	291,420
1962	194,978

[1] Data from 1942 through 1947 were obtained from reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] Data from 1948 through 1962 compiled from administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Mexican working force, man-months of employment, and related data

Year	Working force			Months worked by average Mexican worker [2]	Total man-months worked by all Mexican workers	Annual average Mexican employment [3]
	Total [1]	Carried over from preceding year	Admitted during year [1]			
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*
1956	526.7	81.5	445.2	2.86	1,507.8	125.7
1957	511.1	75.1	436.0	3.11	1,587.8	132.3
1958	530.2	97.4	432.9	2.98	1,581.5	131.8
1959	511.4	73.8	437.6	3.19	1,631.0	135.9
1960	387.6	71.8	315.8	3.50	1,358.1	113.2
1961	344.3	52.9	291.4	3.34	1,148.9	95.7
1962	243.6	48.6	195.0	2.94	716.4	59.7

[1] This involves duplication since the same Mexican was sometimes admitted more than once during the year.
[2] Total man-months divided by total working force.
[3] Total man-months divided by 12.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security administrative reports and in season farm labor reports.

Number of Mexican workers contracted and recontracted, by State, 1959–62

State	1959	1960	1961	1962
U.S. total	606,003	380,381	349,055	226,948
Arizona	29,779	24,557	21,352	16,906
Arkansas	44,780	42,443	34,073	12,410
California	152,746	127,658	113,169	127,002
Colorado	9,281	9,517	10,549	10,372
Georgia	1,094	1,264	777	0
Illinois	219	375	95	113
Indiana	558	710	780	587
Iowa	75	134	212	174
Kansas	42	17	145	142
Kentucky	436	269	57	0
Michigan	11,693	11,301	14,880	13,327
Minnesota	144	139	55	39
Missouri	1,203	594	0	0
Montana	2,210	2,438	2,640	1,814
Nebraska	2,144	2,289	2,162	2,119
Nevada	153	222	83	66
New Mexico	19,253	11,336	8,311	2,144
North Dakota	0	45	0	0
Oregon	418	350	327	365
South Dakota	217	240	252	98
Tennessee	1,228	1,139	703	165
Texas	225,498	140,308	135,515	36,289
Utah	582	523	415	640
Washington	0	60	0	0
Wisconsin	1,090	1,238	954	778
Wyoming	1,160	1,215	1,549	1,398

Source: Administrative reports, Bureau of Employment Security.

Mexican nationals contracting activity January through December 1962 as reported by reception centers

States	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Arizona	110	592	501	917	2,996	64	93	1,160	3,297	562	1,693	0	11,985
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	3,996	802	0	0	4,045	7	0	0	8,850
California	2,089	1,043	2,378	14,652	19,358	4,493	5,438	42,910	17,611	4,295	1,291	897	116,455
Colorado	0	0	0	0	6,556	349	966	1,163	85	0	0	0	9,119
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	25
Kansas	0	0	0	0	116	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Michigan	0	0	0	0	846	0	7,717	1,405	0	0	0	0	9,968
Montana	0	0	0	0	1,716	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,814
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	1,935	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,119
Nevada	0	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
New Mexico	0	0	110	35	608	199	22	97	307	236	20	0	1,634
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	221	0	0	0	253
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Texas	197	0	786	967	8,683	2,149	3,029	3,174	4,053	4,995	1,916	203	30,152
Utah	0	0	0	0	160	32	0	33	146	0	0	0	371
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	20	0	205	158	0	0	0	0	383
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	1,398	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,398
1962 total	2,396	1,635	3,775	16,571	48,717	8,377	17,495	50,132	29,765	10,095	4,920	1,100	194,978
United States, 1961	2,393	1,493	7,493	22,929	39,680	15,897	25,839	39,467	102,059	29,605	3,028	1,046	291,420
United States, 1963	2,478	2,209	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Source: ES-362.

Mexican nationals recontracting activity, January through December 1962, as reported by reception centers and regional offices

States	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Arizona	106	27	952	831	277	3	133	0	41	1,314	1,131	106	4,921
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	1	118	0	0	532	2,909	0	0	3,560
California	398	60	235	841	728	495	1,661	722	240	2,500	1,612	1,055	10,547
Colorado	0	0	0	0	126	61	661	360	17	28	0	0	1,253
Illinois	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	23	0	0	0	113
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	10	152	0	0	0	562
Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	75	99	0	0	0	0	0	174
Kansas	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	1	5	0	0	19
Michigan	9	1	0	0	0	0	2,076	1,273	0	0	0	0	3,359
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	0	0	0	39
New Mexico	31	16	9	10	37	49	149	50	61	61	33	4	510
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	0	0	112
Texas	662	155	236	263	366	608	1,329	571	282	477	944	244	6,137
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	118	113	38	0	0	0	0	269
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	50	259	36	20	30	0	0	395
1962 total	1,206	259	1,432	1,945	1,540	1,581	6,884	3,160	1,398	7,436	3,720	1,409	31,970
United States, 1961	1,456	1,115	5,217	1,611	3,382	6,806	6,106	12,250	4,092	6,596	5,579	3,425	57,635
United States, 1963	567	504	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Source: ES-362.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1962

State	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers [1]	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6)
	Number	Members using Mexicans	Number	Farms using Mexicans		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total, all States	231	24,492	57	6,458	2,264	33,214
Arizona	4	305	0	0	2	307
Arkansas	51	2,650	0	0	37	2,687
California	45	7,679	8	420	15	8,114
Colorado	3	204	8	3,511	65	3,780
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0	2	2
Indiana	1	25	1		6	35
Iowa	0	0	1	14	0	14
Kansas	0	6	1	18	2	26
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	14	1,369	7	57	3	1,429
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	5	5
Montana	0	0	3	832	0.	832
Nebraska	0	0	1	540	0	540
Nevada	1	11	0	0	0	11
New Mexico	13	1,250	0	0	211	1,461
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	1	37	0	0	0	37
South Dakota	0	0	1	20	0	20
Tennessee	1	18	0	0	0	18
Texas	93	10,794	17	386	1,912	13,092
Utah	4	144	0	0	1	145
Wisconsin	0	0	7	127	3	130
Wyoming	0	0	2	529	0	529

[1] Those contracting workers only for their own use.

Source: Administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1961

State	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers [1]	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6)
	Number	Members using Mexicans	Number	Farms using Mexicans		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total, all States	295	26,792	72	5,116	3,802	35,710
Arizona	4	480	0	0	2	482
Arkansas	61	2,915	0	0	97	3,012
California	47	7,162	8	420	17	7,599
Colorado	3	317	9	1,911	71	2,299
Georgia	0	0	0	0	99	99
Illinois	0	0	1	0	1	1
Indiana	1	48	2	10	10	68
Iowa	0	0	1	27	0	27
Kansas	0	0	1	11	3	14
Kentucky	1	14	0	0	1	15
Michigan	14	1,424	9	89	4	1,517
Minnesota	1	1	0	0	5	6
Montana	0	0	3	756	0	756
Nebraska	0	0	1	540	12	552
Nevada	1	11	0	0	0	11
New Mexico	16	1,698	0	0	23	1,721
North Dakota	0	0	0	10	0	10
Oregon	1	44	0	0	0	44
South Dakota	0	0	1	65	0	65
Tennessee	1	52	0	0	1	53
Texas	140	12,477	23	573	3,448	16,498
Utah	4	149	0	0	2	151
Wisconsin	0	0	11	163	6	169
Wyoming	0	0	2	541	0	541

[1] Those contracting workers only for their own use.

Source: Administrative reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Associations, food processors, and individual employers contracting Mexican nationals, by State, 1959

State	Associations		Food processors		Individual employers	Total farms using Mexicans (columns 3, 5, and 6)
	Number	Members using Mexicans	Number	Farms using Mexicans		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total, all States	305	38,715	86	4,942	5,131	48,788
Arizona	4	923	0	0	0	923
Arkansas	56	2,463	0	0	178	2,641
California	54	11,585	11	547	44	12,176
Colorado	5	266	7	1,759	35	2,060
Georgia	0	0	0	0	102	102
Illinois	0	0	0	0	3	3
Indiana	1	39	0	0	7	46
Iowa	1	10	0	0	0	10
Kansas	0	0	1	2	3	5
Kentucky	1	7	0	0	2	9
Michigan	43	3,785	8	123	13	3,921
Minnesota	1	6	1	9	6	21
Missouri	3	193	0	0	13	206
Montana	0	0	3	749	0	749
Nebraska	0	0	1	550	12	562
Nevada	2	27	0	0	0	27
New Mexico	16	1,868	0	0	20	1,888
North Dakota	0	0	1	12	1	13
Oregon	1	15	0	0	0	15
South Dakota	0	0	1	75	1	76
Tennessee	1	64	0	0	1	65
Texas	113	17,258	42	374	4,678	22,310
Utah	3	206	0	0	5	211
Wisconsin	0	0	8	207	6	213
Wyoming	0	0	2	535	1	536

Number of farms using Mexican contract workers, total number of farms, and farms reporting expenditures for hired labor, United States and selected States, 1959

State	Total farms [1]	Farms reporting hired labor expenditures [1]	Farms with Mexican contract workers		
			Number [2]	Percent of—	
				All farms	Farms with hired labor
United States [3]	3,703,894	1,782,735	48,788	1.3	2.7
Arizona	7,233	4,700	923	12.8	19.6
Arkansas	95,007	39,775	2,641	2.8	6.6
California	99,274	62,284	12,176	12.3	19.5
Colorado	33,390	19,650	2,060	6.2	10.5
Georgia	106,350	54,681	102	.1	.2
Illinois	154,644	77,092	3	(4)	(4)
Indiana	128,160	54,133	46	(4)	.1
Iowa	174,707	92,975	10	(4)	(4)
Kansas	104,347	53,454	5	(4)	(4)
Kentucky	150,986	74,506	9	(4)	(4)
Michigan	111,817	48,398	3,921	3.5	8.1
Minnesota	145,662	65,013	21	(4)	(4)
Missouri	168,672	60,232	206	.1	.3
Montana	28,959	16,143	749	2.6	4.6
Nebraska	90,475	44,175	562	.6	1.3
Nevada	2,354	1,360	27	1.1	2.0
New Mexico	15,919	7,853	1,888	11.9	24.0
North Dakota	54,928	27,596	13	(4)	(4)
Oregon	42,573	19,500	15	(4)	.1
South Dakota	55,727	26,598	76	.1	.3
Tennessee	157,688	72,576	65	(4)	.1
Texas	227,071	123,929	22,310	9.8	18.0
Utah	17,811	9,514	211	1.2	2.2
Wisconsin	131,215	59,637	213	.2	.4
Wyoming	9,744	5,352	536	5.5	10.0

[1] 1959 Census of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census.
[2] Bureau of Employment Security.
[3] U.S. totals include 48 conterminous States only.
[4] Less than 0.05 percent.

Mexican program costs

[Thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total cost	Revolving fund	Salaries and expenses	Compliance
1963 [1]	5,569	2,131	2,048	1,390
1962	5,941	2,773	2,019	1,149
1961	5,315	2,650	1,496	1,169
1960	5,426	3,216	1,337	873
1959	6,032	3,841	1,673	518
1958	5,225	2,890	(2)	(2)

[1] Fiscal year 1963 data are estimates.
[2] Separate accounting was not started until fiscal year 1959.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, as one who disagrees with the gentleman from California, I want to stand up and say that he has made the best argument for his position I have heard on this floor and I respect him for it.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 5497 which would extend the Mexican farm labor import program. I believe this bill should be defeated because it would continue an injustice to our own American citizen farmworkers and also to the family farmers of our country. In brief it is an unjustified subsidy to less than 1 percent of the growers of the United States.

Some 4 years ago, James P. Mitchell, the great Secretary of Labor during the Eisenhower administration, called attention to the evils of this program and appointed four very distinguished consultants to study it.

These consultants were Edward J. They, a former Republican Senator of Minnesota; Msgr. George G. Higgins, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. Rufus B. Van Kleinsmid, then chancellor of the University of California, and Glenn A. Garrett, then chairman of the Texas Council on Migrant Labor.

This distinguished study group pointed out the tremendous hardships and suffering which this program caused among our American citizen farmworkers. It unanimously urged in 1959 that the existing law authorizing the imported labor be extended only temporarily and then dropped.

That was 4 years ago. Certainly, now the program has continued far longer than justified.

Public Law 78, which authorizes the program is really a denial of the free enterprise system. It not only prevents competitive conditions setting the price of labor but it prevents seasonal utilization of our own American transient labor pool. It serves to increase our own unemployment and the time has come to end it once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes a mockery of the free enterprise system. If we believe in the free enterprise system, then let us practice it in all cases. Let us not simply turn to it when it serves our purposes and turn from it when that serves a purpose.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5497 and thereby bring the work begun by former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to a successful conclusion.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly concur with the observations of the gentleman from Washington insofar as the merits of the presentation of the gentleman from California are concerned, but I disagree with him very heartily on his other comments. I should like to point out that I am not sure that he and some of the other Members of the House realize that Secretary Mitchell or Secretary Goldberg could have and Secretary Wirtz can phase out this program or he can stop it right now. Not one Mexican bracero may be employed without a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that there is not a domestic prospective employee available for the job. So if Secretary Mitchell felt that way, if Secretary Goldberg felt that way, they never phased it out. Obviously Secretary Wirtz does not feel that way because he has recommended an extension.

Mr. MARTIN of California. The gentleman has brought out a very important point that is often neglected in the argument on this subject. This does not put out of work any domestic worker at all who is willing and available to work.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of California. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Furthermore, under the regulations covering this program, the domestic worker can come on the farm and displace the bracero.

Mr. MARTIN of California. That is true. If he presents himself to the employment bureau and they send him to the field, if the domestic worker and the bracero are both there, the bracero is laid off and the domestic worker is put to work. That is quite true.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, as I rise here I am reminded of the wornout story of the man who was asked how he felt when he saw his mother-in-law drive his brandnew uninsured Cadillac off the cliff. He answered that he had mixed emotions. I have mixed emotions about this bill, but I support it because I think it is necessary. I think we will phase out this program. I think it will not be with us very much longer. But I do not want to see it done with a meat ax.

Just 4 years ago 427,000 Mexican nationals came in under this program. How many last year? Only 194,000. We are phasing it out. It is down more than half in just these 4 years. I do not think we will have any extension beyond the 2 years we are trying to get today, if we are successful in getting it.

I think a lot of the arguments against this—and they are sincere; I feel deeply the emotions my friend from San Antonio [Mr. GONZALEZ] expresses—but a lot of opposition is from people who have not seen the bracero program. I want to talk to some of my city friends who are somewhat emotional against this. I share with them the concern about 5 million Americans being unemployed. You say, "How in the world can you justify bringing these Mexican nationals across the border to do this to your own people? How can you do it when Americans are hungry and do not have jobs?"

The short answer is that you are not going to help Americans by killing this legislation today. You think it will but you will not. I share the concern about the American migrant worker. We must do something for him. If we can get constructive migrant labor legislation I will support it. It is a shame that in this great, prosperous country with cars in every garage for most of us, good food, paid vacations, television, and all the rest that we have left this small number of Americans at the bottom of the economic totem pole. These people have a right to their share of our general prosperity.

The farmers who grow oranges, beets, tomatoes, peas, and the other crops did not cause the migrant labor problem. The bracero program did not cause the plight of the migrant workers. The problem was here before the bracero program and it will still be here tomorrow even if we vote this program down today.

We are told that defeat of this bill will make jobs for Americans. We are told that this program depresses the wages in the farm industry. It does not. In the time I have I am going to discuss a couple of these points.

My friends who oppose this program cannot have it both ways. They tell you in one breath it is just 1 percent of the farms that use braceros, therefore, it is a subsidy and we should do away with it. In the next breath they tell you that using braceros on 1 percent of our farms has depressed wages all over the country. I submit they cannot have it both ways.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] made another important point.

Let me tell you about the wetbacks. I have the whole Mexican border from Yuma to Douglas in my district—about 400 miles of it. Do you know in 1955 how many Mexican people came illegally across the border looking for work? There were a million of them—a million Mexicans in 1 year were rounded up by the immigration service. We had some disgraceful things happen. We did have Mexicans deported way down to the interior of Mexico when they came across several times—there were a million of them. Last year, how many came across? Because we had an orderly program to utilize Mexicans who wanted to work where they were really needed and where they would not displace American workers—not a million came last year but only 30,000—just 30,000. You will have a flood of wetbacks again if we cannot phase this out in a somewhat orderly fashion.

Now let us get another thing straight here. You would think from the arguments that you are going to hear that a farmer in his air-conditioned house picks up the telephone and says, "Please send me one gross of Mexican workers," and that they shortly arrive in a bus. That is not the case. You cannot get Mexican workers in this program unless you satisfy the Secretary of Labor. He administers this. I do not think the migratory workers of America have any better friends than Arthur Goldberg and Mr. Willard Wirtz who is now Secretary. They hold the trump cards and they run the show. You get workers only when you have tried to find them yourself and you have satisfied the Labor Department people that you cannot find them, and after the employment agencies have tried to find them for you and cannot find them. You get them only when you are willing to pay wages that will not depress the wage standard in that area as determined by the Secretray and only when you have paid for the transportation and only when workers are not available from any source. Then, and only then, do you get them. And even then at that point when they go out in your field to work, if an American worker comes up and says he is ready, willing, and able to work, you are required to lay off the bracero and put the American worker on right then and there.

These are facts which people who get emotional about this problem do not realize. I do not think that two wrongs make a right. We have done a wrong to our migratory workers. We should improve their condition. But we cannot help them by damaging the small farmer; we cannot help migratory workers by choking off the flow of strawberries and lettuce and vegetables to the eastern cities and raising the prices. Doing a second wrong is not going to right the first wrong.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Does not the gentleman feel, if all this is so, that we could at least offer the American domestic migratory worker the same thing that we are offering to the Mexican worker?

Mr. UDALL. We do substantially offer them the same thing. Of course, the situation is not exactly comparable. American migratory workers have their families with them while the braceros do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 5497, a bill extending the Mexican national farm labor program for 2 years. I want to address my remarks today primarily in behalf of the beet sugar industry. I represent a district in Colorado which produces sugarbeets. I might state that Colorado is one of the largest producers of beet sugar in the Nation. I have two beet sugar plants in my district. We use Mexican nationals in Colorado for other crops and we depend upon them to harvest several of our important crops. Mr. William M. Carson, of Weiser, Idaho, a director of the National Beet Growers Federation appeared before the committee in support of this bill. He stated that he represented the sugarbeet growers associations in 11 Western States, which included 18,000 growers of sugarbeets, who harvested 700,000 acres of sugarbeets. All of us are aware of the fact that there has been a substantial increase in the price of sugar. No doubt you are getting mail from your constituents inquiring about the reason for this increase. Three congressional committees are going to investigate this situation in an effort to determine the reasons for this sudden and unusual increase. We recognize the importance of our domestic sugar program, both cane and beet, and the necessity for expanding the same. It is very obvious to me, and should be obvious to anyone who is familiar with the production of sugarbeets, that this act is absolutely necessary for the survival and continuance of the beet sugar program.

The production of sugarbeets requires a large amount of hand labor. It is impossible to produce a crop of sugarbeets without this labor. It has been impossible to obtain this labor in the domestic market, and for many years the beet growers have relied upon the Mexican nationals to thin and weed the fields and prepare the beets for harvest.

I sincerely hope that Members of the House will realize the absolute necessity of continuing this program if the beet sugar industry is to grow and expand, as we have provided in the recent sugar bill. Certainly we must produce more sugar to meet our increasing needs, and a greater burden will be thrown on our domestic sugar industry, both cane and beet, than ever before.

I appeared before the committee and urged the extension of the present law for 2 years. I hope the bill will be passed without amendment.

We had as a witness from Colorado Mr. Bernard Teets, who is the executive director of the Colorado State Employment Service. Mr. Teets has occupied that position for the past 25 years, and certainly is in a position to know the employment needs and the agricultural labor requirements of the State of Colorado. He told the committee that about 25 percent of our farm labor in Colorado is composed of Mexican nationals. He stressed the need for continuing this program, and stated that we must have these nationals in Colorado in order to harvest our crops.

I received a letter, dated May 4, from Mr. Cover Mendenhall, of Rocky Ford, Colo., secretary-treasurer of the Southern Colorado Beet Growers Association. I would like to read excerpts from that letter, as follows:

> The consensus of opinion among the farmers, and more particularly the sugarbeet growers, of this area, is that the extension of Public Law 78 (the Mexican national bill) is vital to our diversified farming in the Arkansas Valley.
>
> I have recently received many, many calls from different farmers advising me of this and requesting that I write you concerning it. I am sure that you will appreciate the necessity for this and give it your support when it comes up on the floor of the House.

Mr. Mendenhall is in a position to know the needs of the farmers in his area. He is in daily touch with them, and he states that the extension of this law is vital to the farmers he represents.

I have always supported this program because I believe it is essential to our agricultural economy.

I call attention to the fact, and emphasize what has already been mentioned several times here today, that this program does not displace any domestic migratory workers. It should be made very clear that if there is a domestic migratory worker who is willing to do the job, then the Mexican national must be dismissed and replaced by the domestic worker. I feel this is proper. I certainly want to do everything I can to promote employment among our domestic workers. I would not support this program if I thought it would be detrimental to our own workers. I challenge those who contend that the Mexican nationals have taken jobs away from domestic workers. On the contrary, I feel that this program has been of definite help to our domestic workers. It has brought about higher wage rates and better standards of living for all farm labor.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall Mr. Teets appearing before our committee. The gentleman introduced Mr. Teets to our committee. He did a splendid job in emphasizing the value of this program for the sugarbeet growers. There are only two States in the Union that have increased the use of braceros, and I think the State of Colorado is one of them. Wyoming, another State that grows sugarbeets, is the other one. The reason being that they were needed in the harvest of sugarbeets. It is essential that this crop be provided the labor that cannot be obtained from local sources. I commend the gentleman from Colorado for his consistent work in behalf of this bracero labor program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, who has done such a fine job as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to speak in opposition to extension of the Mexican labor program and to deal specifically with the adverse effect it has on our family farms. A family farmer for purposes of this discussion, quite simply is a unit in which the operator and the members of his immediate family have accumulated and invested enough capital to provide themselves with a permanent place of employment.

On page 3 of the report on H.R. 5497 you will note that 73 percent of the farm work force qualifies as being self-employed. In the light of these facts, it is clear that the individual farm operator must not be forced to compete with artificially controlled farm wages because his income is largely controlled by the prevailing wage rate. I submit that a wage scale has never prevailed in the so-called stoop labor jobs in agriculture to indicate that it was impossible to hire domestics for these jobs. On the contrary, there is evidence that farm families have done and do these jobs as long as they can possibly remain on their farms.

It is also evident that when the return for their labor must compete with foreign labor, they no longer can afford to meet the demands made on them for capital and are forced to liquidate.

Farm wages have gone up, but are still the lowest of all major industries and the lag in farm wages continues. The following figures on family incomes are taken from the statistical abstract for 1962.

Of all families in the United States, 31½ percent of them receive incomes of less than $4,000 annually. While at the same time, rural farm families in this same income group of less than $4,000 annual income amount to 65.3 percent.

Again, if any argument prevails in the face of such evidence, it is the assertion that domestic labor will not perform the duties required in the areas employing braceros.

I have only one last figure. The Agricultural Census of 1959 shows that we have 1,047 farms in Minnesota growing cucumbers. In 1962, not one of the 39 foreign workers to be brought to Minnesota engaged in the work connected with cucumbers. Yet in this same year, another State employed all but 18 of its Mexican nationals out of over 12,000 in harvesting cucumbers at the peak period. There are also, according to the 1959 farm census, 896 farms producing sugarbeets in Minnesota. We use no bracero labor in this production.

If we go to mechanization then I suggest that our unemployed in the industrial centers will go to work building that machinery.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but I believe that some of the statements just made should be answered; that is, what effect does this program have on the small farm and the small farmer? So, I would like to refer to some testimony several people gave us in the committee hearings on this bill.

The first was Mr. Matt Triggs, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who testified in behalf of his organization in support of the bill. And, he was asked this question by me:

> I believe there are about 1,600,000 members of the Farm Bureau.
>
> Mr. TRIGGS. Right.
>
> Mr. TEAGUE of California. Can you give us any rough estimate as to the number of your members who are what are generally termed "family farmers"? In other words, farmers with perhaps one hired man, except in harvest seasons.
>
> Mr. TRIGGS. Well, certainly the great majority of our members have to be family farmers as measured by any interpretation.

Then, a little later in the day we had Mr. Charles Paul, director of agriculture, State of California, in Gov. Pat Brown's cabinet. Now, whether all of us agree with Governor Brown in all matters, certainly no one can reasonably maintain that Governor Brown is pro-big-farmer or antilabor. But, he sent this man down here and he made it entirely clear that he was speaking for Pat Brown, and he has this to say on the subject of small farms. I asked him whether he had heard Mr. Triggs' testimony, and he said:

> Yes, sir.

Then I asked him:

> With your wide knowledge of California agriculture, do you concur with that view that Mr. Triggs expressed? In other words, that this is equally important, if not more so, to the small farmer as it is to the large farmer if he is engaged in the growing of strawberries or tomatoes or something where he needs a supplemental harvest labor supply?
>
> Mr. PAUL. Yes, sir. I concur in that.

I will not take the time to read the rest of the testimony, but if any of you are interested, you can find it in the hearings.

Mr. Creuziger, president of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, testified that this was of vital importance to the small farmers in his part of the country.

Mr. Carson, representing some beet growers, testified to the same effect.

Incidentally, Mr. Creuziger testified that this program is of equal or more importance to the small grower than it is the large grower.

Mr. Teets, referred to by the gentleman from Colorado, testified the same way.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in 1951 when this bill was first introduced I spoke against it, even though it was considered a wartime measure because of the Korean conflict. There might have been some slight justification at that time, but the Korean conflict came to an end years ago. Certainly there is no justification for the continuation of this program at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, having had this problem before our Appropriations Committee every year since 1951 and studying it in some detail because of the cost of administering this program, if there was ever a slave labor piece of legislation adopted by the Congress, this is it. If there was ever a piece of legislation that could be classed as immoral, this is it.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post this morning contained an editorial concerning the continued employment of Mexican farmworkers in this country under Public Law 78. I would like to read this editorial into the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Hired Hands," and I quote:

> A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.
>
> There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be no shortage of domestic workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.
>
> Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family farmers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

I agree with that statement, Mr. Chairman, except that I would not say there was "sound justification" for starting the program in the first place. I certainly agree that there are good and valid reasons for letting this law expire.

One of the reasons is the difficulty of enforcing this law. The use of Mexican workers inevitably depresses wages in those areas where they are employed. This necessitates the holding of public hearings throughout the country in an effort to determine proper wage rates that will not have an adverse effect on our domestic farmworkers. It involves considerable effort and expense by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in finding and deporting those braceros who remain in this country illegally. It involves the constant problem of trying to assure decent housing for the braceros. The load of administrative difficulties involved in the enforcement of Public Law 78 is a constant source of irritation.

Even if we agree that the use of these braceros during the Korean action was necessary, and I do not, their continued use during a time when we are beset with the problems of declining farm employment and continued high unemployment of our own workers is indefensible. Between January 1 and May 24 of this year, approximately 63,000 braceros have been imported into the country for work. These 63,000 jobs would more properly have gone to domestic farmworkers.

It is little wonder that during the last few years in California, for example, there have been scores of strikes staged by domestic workers in protest over the continued use of braceros.

Another extremely important consideration here involves the continuing problem of the outflow of American dollars to other countries. The wages earned by braceros represent the third largest outflow of dollars to the Mexican Government, a situation that would be corrected by the demise of this law.

I must also point out that this law, with all its difficulties of enforcement and other disadvantages already mentioned, has been kept in force for the benefit of a few large, corporate farmers—representing fewer than 2 percent of all farms in this country—who use Mexican labor.

We are concerned with the growing Federal budget. The only way to reduce the budget is to cut spending. It seems to me that the Government's cost of administering Public Law 78, which last year totaled more than $3 million, is a good place to wield the shears. This cost does not include almost another $3 million drawn for this program directly out of the labor supply revolving fund financed by the employers themselves.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], made two points a short time ago. One of the points has been made several times in the past 8 or 10 years since these bills have been before Congress for extensions of this program. That point has been the wetback problem.

Mr. Chairman, this act has had practically no application to the wetback problem during the past 12 years, since 1951. In 1954 and 1955 the wetback problem was one of the biggest problems we had to face. But in some areas along the border there were not enough Immigration people and it was reported that some Immigration people were found at that time to be turning their backs and allowing these wetbacks to cross into this country and doing nothing about it. Congress was apprised of this and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] when he had his appropriation bill for the Department of Justice before the House, in 1955 I think it was, recommended an additional appropriation of about $3 million to hire more people under General Swing, to send more people down to the border and patrol the border in order to prevent the wetbacks from coming into this area. That was the only reason the wetback problem was diminished at that time. Mr. Chairman, this Mexican farm labor program had little or nothing to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how in the world we can justify on the one hand the subsidies that we are paying for cotton and other crops and then ask the taxpayers of our country to pay $3 million a year to administer a cheap foreign labor program in order to help grow more.

As far as the State of Florida is concerned, as far as the Northeast is concerned, in fact the whole east coast area, when they have a problem of digging potatoes, or picking peaches, or picking apples, or harvesting vegetables, they make their own contracts with the labor from Canada, the West Indies, or from the Bahamas, if there is not enough local labor available, and it does not cost the taxpayers of this country 1 single dime. I think special consideration, at the expense of the taxpayers, for one small segment of our agricultural economy is wrong, and I hope this bill is defeated.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN].

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the comments of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this legislation. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I make known to you that my predecessor here in the House who was on the other side of the aisle, took a similar view. I represent the counties of Sonoma, Napa, and Mendocino, Calif. In this area we have many of these perishable crops, including grapes. I have observed this program in general. It has worked out very successfully. I think possibly if I were to refer at this time to the report, wherein the justification for the current extension includes these matters, I could better substantiate my point of view. The report reads as follows:

> It is the committee's view that the benefits of the Mexican farm labor program have substantially outweighed its disadvantages. The committee would include among such benefits the following:
>
> 1. It has supplied farmers with workers that were not available from the labor force of the United States. Experience has shown that most American labor is unwilling to accept seasonable agricultural employment.
>
> 2. It has virtually eliminated the wetbacks, illegal aliens who once swarmed across our southern border. It should properly be referred to as the antiwetback bill.
>
> This is dramatically illustrated by reports of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, which indicate the tremendous drop in illegal wetback entries since the program has operated. As can be seen from the following table, the number of wetbacks has dropped from 1,075,168 in fiscal year 1954 to only 30,272 in fiscal year 1962:

Fiscal year:	*Number of persons*
1952	534,538
1953	875,318
1954	1,075,168
1955	242,608
1956	72,442
1957	44,451
1958	37,242
1959	30,196
1960	29,651
1961	29,877
1962	30,272

> Source: U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C., March 29, 1960—Mexican nationals apprehended in the United States in violation of immigration laws by fiscal years.
>
> 3. It has benefited Mexican workers and the communities to which they return, by providing employment to such workers that would otherwise not be provided, and at wages many times what they could earn in Mexico.

I could continue on in the report, but I believe it is in the RECORD. I will direct further attention to my own personal experience and background in the farming field. It is a simple fact that the program has been successful and is needed; I think we should support this. I think the fact that we have only requested a 2-year extension speaks for itself and affords an opportunity to further the efforts to encourage our domestic migrant workers to assume this responsibility. Presently they do not.

In the matter of foreign aid much has been said in this regard. I have personally devoted a substantial amount of time in the foreign field and mission field.

I have seen firsthand evidence of the benefits of such a program where these people come up into this country and have an opportunity of seeing how we do it here, and then go back and are motivated to be more self-sufficient in their own right.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the people who are liberal and the people who are conservative all ought to join in opposing this legislation. This legislation runs counter to the basic principles of the free enterprise system, in my opinion. Free enterprise must be a two-way street. It must be possible to provide the capital for the farms and equipment or what have you. Our labor should then also have a chance to participate. We have told our farm labor that they cannot have the benefit of laws for unemployment compensation and for reasonable wages and hours. Nor do we have an adequate old-age retirement system for them, nor collective bargaining. Now by this legislation we seek to repeal even the protections of supply and demand, which might provide more adequate wages and conditions for these people.

We have a shortage of jobs for people in this country. We have unemployment, we all know it. We have a great boom in this country for a Youth Conservation Corps. A great many of us when we were a little younger than we are now worked on farms. I certainly experienced work on farms when I was a boy and a young man and I am glad of it. What greater help could there be for a young man than to go to work on a farm? Why not help our own young people rather than sending our help overseas?

This labor law that we have before us today is one which in my opinion runs counter to everything which is basically American. It tells the people of America they have to go on unemployment compensation. They do not go on unemployment compensation in the farm field because they do not get compensation that way. They have to do it some other way, by getting unemployment compensation in the cities. It was an emergency matter in time of war to do this thing. Maybe it made sense then but it does not make sense today.

Some people take the position that this is immoral. I cite the opposition to it by many church groups.

Somebody said organized labor ought to be for this because it is beneficial to organized labor. I am sure most of you received a letter from the AFL–CIO saying it is against this bill because it is depressive of wages and job opportunities and everything that America stands for.

I repeat that I think if you believe in the free enterprise system you must believe in the opportunity of labor to contribute to the free enterprise system. That is exactly what you have here. I am talking about American labor. It should have the right and opportunity to have adequate wages. If we have to pay a little more for the tomatoes, so what? That is exactly how they ought to be paid for, not by income taxes all over the country. The people who consume potatoes, tomatoes, or cherries ought to pay for them. That is the way we ought to do it. That is why we should not extend this law.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. To explore the gentleman's thinking on this subject, he is aware that in Florida they bring in a large number of workers from the West Indies and they are placed under a very similar arrangement to that of the braceros. Does the gentleman advocate the termination of those labor imports also?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. That piece of legislation is not one that I have studied carefully, but I think I do oppose it. I have no reason to think I do not. I may feel politically insecure about this, but my conscience tells me I ought to feel this way about this legislation before us today.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The gentleman is talking about their being brought in under the provisions of the immigration law. One of the reasons for the bracero law is the fast setup in the immigration law to bring in more people. I think the results are more disadvantageous.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The real answer is to raise the price of commodities to cover the costs of adequate wages, not to increase immigration.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks to this bill out of practical experience with the subject involved. I state quite frankly that I have in the past been certified as eligible to employ bracero laborers on four occasions. On two of those occasions, I was successful in finding enough domestic labor, which is the aim of every farmer, so it was not necessary for me to employ braceros. But on two occasions, I employed them and I think I know something about the program.

There is no conflict of interest involved here because I am not now engaged in the type of farming which requires that I employ bracero labor. I am an orchardist now whereas I used to be a row crop man.

On February 1, about 5 years ago, I attended a meeting at the Mayflower Hotel when the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor was formed. It was a very large meeting. One of the banquet rooms was filled. I saw notable personalities and fine, well-intentioned individuals, but to my knowledge I was one of the few farmers present. This was when the program of propaganda in opposition to Public Law 78 was shifted into high gear. Since that time I have never heard more misstatements, more cliches or more misguided emotionalism than I have heard about this program.

Braceros are not treated like cattle and I defy anyone to prove that braceros are not treated just as American citizens are treated. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that in my own congressional district an Army barracks which housed U.S. troops was turned down as not being suitable for the housing of bracero laborers? Do you know that at this very minute your secretaries laboring in your offices have less cubic feet of space per person than is required under regulations concerning the quarters of a bracero laborer? Do you know that the bracero program has improved the conditions of the farm laborer in the State of California? We now have buses to transport workers to and from work. We have health programs. Have you ever eaten in a bracero camp at one of their tables—which are always spotlessly clean? Their kitchens pass rigid health inspections. I have eaten at these tables and it is good food—as good as you get downstairs in the House Restaurant.

Speaking further about the misrepresentations which have been made about this program, I would like to go back to the February 1 meeting of 2 years back, when I went to the so-called hearing where evidence was being amassed about this program. I listened to Ernesto Galarza, a labor organizer, who stood up before a mass of clubwomen who had come to this hearing. I wish I could put the word "hearing" in quotes, because it was anything but a hearing in the sense that we think of it. He stood there with a hoe, which I recognized as being a hoe that was especially adapted to the thinning of beets. They gasped and shuddered when he told them about the farmers in Watsonville, Calif., who required their workers to use these short-handled hoes. Mr. Galarza alleged that if long-handled hoes were used, the farmer could not tell from his front porch vantage point that the worker was working. With short-handled hoes it was obvious that he was working if he stooped over.

This was not true and the gentleman who uttered it knew he was not telling the truth, because there never has been any beet thinning except with a short-handled hoe.

I think it is about time that some of the cliches were cast aside and we got down to looking at some of the facts about this program. First of all, the bracero laborer does not replace the domestic laborer at all. To use that argument is to indict the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, with malfeasance of duty because he is charged under the law to restrict the certification for the use of braceros when local labor is available.

One gentleman stated on the floor of the House that these shortages were local and extended for only 5 or 10 miles. That is not true. To my personal knowledge, I know farmers who run buses daily 60 miles away from the place of employment to pick up sometimes as few as three or four laborers to bring them back to the job. They advertise on the radio and they advertise in the newspapers. They even recruit across State lines. This is not a local situation. The farm labor shortage extends over a large area.

Farmers, believe it or not, prefer local laborers if they can get them. This is the very reason why in the two times out of four when I could get local labor, I got it because I had less headaches and less to worry about in taking care of the personal requirements of my crew. It was just much better and much easier for me all the way around to use a domestic worker.

The simple fact of the matter is that domestic laborers just do not like to do stoop labor; and having done quite a bit of it in my life, I can say I do not blame them.

The bracero program, in my opinion, insures stability of employment for skilled labor in allied industries. In my congressional district, and in much of my former district, one of the great industries is food processing. Canneries preserve perishable commodities; can factories make cans for use in the canneries, truckers haul the produce and case goods to and from the market. Shipping workers earn their living because of the food industry; so do brokerage house employees. These people are dependent upon getting perishable crops harvested. If they are not harvested, they, the skilled workers, are out of work.

It is well known that only 37 cents out of every consumer's dollar spent for food in this country goes to the farmer. This means that 63 cents goes to nonfarmers, and I would presume a good part of this goes to organized labor. So for every 37 cents of farm crops which are not harvested because of a labor shortage, it means almost 63 cents worth of employment for skilled and union labor is eliminated.

Bracero labor does not depress wages. As a matter of fact, it escalates them. The States with the bracero programs have higher agricultural wages than the States that do not have the bracero program. Growers, to my knowledge, are happy to pay 5 to 10 cents an hour more for a domestic worker, rather than put up with the trouble and the regulation that goes with the hiring of braceros. As the rate goes up to attract domestic workers then the built-in protection of Public Law 78 starts to operate. A wage survey reveals that the prevailing rate for domestic labor is above that for braceros. The bracero rate is raised and the cycle starts all over again.

Farm wages have gone up at a faster rate since 1950 than have industrial wages. Farm wages, according to the committee report on this bill, have gone up 98 percent since 1950. They are not high enough yet. But I say to you that agriculture is making the best rate of progress in raising wages from an inadequate scale than industry made in the same period of time.

Fringe benefits have been improved for the domestic worker because of the bracero. Because of the requirement that domestics receive the same benefits as braceros, we now find growers furnishing transportation, public health services, and other improvements. Agricultural labor has come a long way and has further to go. But it has come a long way because the bracero program has provided the impetus for improvement instead of retarding it.

Public Law 78 is necessary in many instances to stabilize consumer prices. Let me give you one instance, and it is typical of many others that I could name. In 1961 this Congress took a long time in extending Public Law 78. If you remember, we only extended it for 6 months, from June 30, I believe, to December. For a time it was highly questionable that the law would be extended at all. This was tomato planting time in California. The farmers did not dare run the risk of planting tomatoes unless there was an assured source of labor available. As a result the planting was 20 percent off in 1961. What happened to the price? Where tomatoes had been $24 a ton in 1960, for the 1961 crop year the grower received $35 per ton due to the shortage. And, what happened to case goods and canned goods in the marketplace? They went up by an even higher percentage because the raw material is a very important factor in the cost of the canned goods. In 1962, you, the consumer, paid 25 percent more for a very basic item on the grocer's shelves, canned tomatoes, than you paid the year previously, simply because Congress did not extend Public Law 78 in a timely fashion, and the growers feared that they would not have a labor source and did not plant as many tomatoes in 1961.

The growers need stability and the insurance of a labor supply. Mother Nature does not stop the assembly line because there is a labor shortage. Once you have committed all you own, all you can borrow, to the growing of a crop and the seed is in the ground, nothing can stop it.

Some of you do not realize how critical time is in some of these crops.

Let me give you an example of a thing that a lot of us take for granted, as a simple condiment on our table, the pickling cucumber. When a producer starts picking, he divides his field in three patches. He picks the first patch Monday, the second on Tuesday, the third on Wedneday, then Thursday, back to No. 1, Friday No. 2 and Saturday, No. 3, and Sunday you lay off. If he misses 1 day, his pickle crop is down the pickle barrel, because once the cucumber has gotten just so large, the seed has formed and it has performed its biological function of reproducing itself and the fruiting is finished, the vine dies, and that is the end of the crop. One day can do this to a lifetime investment. The same is true of strawberries.

The question of foreign aid has been mentioned. I think the facts will bear me out that the land reform system in Mexico, which is such a basic part of their economy, actually depends for its existence upon the savings of braceros who come from the United States and the experience that they gain. I regret that Mexico was referred to in this debate as a miserable country, because I think our neighbors to the south have a very fine country, and I am sure they will resent the reference. Mexico is not miserable. It is a proud and noble nation.

The last point I want to address myself to is this: Is this program for the large farmer alone? By no means. The large farmer has the better housing to attract domestic labor; he has the better recruiting facilities, and he will have a more efficient operation. But if you abolish Public Law 78, it is the large farmer who will take the small farmer's domestic labor away, and the small farmer will be on the outside looking in.

When you do not have an adequate supply of farm labor, mechanization is more than desirable; it is absolutely essential. And, what happens to the small farmer if he has to mechanize? Let us consider the mechanization of tomato growing.

Right now they are developing a tomato harvester, but this requires a specially bred plant which matures all of the fruit at the same time and is expensive. And, your yield is about half of what you would normally get with seed which is commonly used today. The harvesters cost several thousand dollars as well. As a result, you must have big acreage over which your overhead can be spread in order to take care of this lowered yield and higher cost.

The small farmer cannot operate under such circumstances.

The big farmer is the fellow who can buy the D–8 tractor costing $20,000, instead of the D–4 which costs $10,000. He can disc his ground for 50 cents an acre, while the fellow with the little D—4 does it for a dollar an acre. It is just common sense that the big fellow can absorb these costs because he has the financial ability to spread his overhead over a larger acreage thereby making it profitable to operate.

If you are against Public Law 78 do not justify it on the fallacious grounds that you are helping the small farmer because you are hurting him.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is urgently required.

The arguments which have been made in favor of the extension of the bracero program are excellent. I know the time is limited but I want to join with members of the House Committee on Agriculture and others in urging passage of the pending measure.

I have watched this program operate for quite a number of years. Having observed the dramatic improvement in the wage standards and in the living standards of farmworkers in the areas where braceros are used, I find it difficult to understand the position of those who oppose this legislation. In areas where braceros are used it will be found that the wages of all farmworkers are higher than in areas where braceros are not used. The highest wages and the best living standards that are maintained in agriculture in the Nation will be found in areas where braceros are employed. The point is that braceros do not depress wages and living standards of domestic workers. The exact contrary is true.

Actually the Department of Labor has used the bracero program as a lever to raise wages and working conditions of all farmworkers. This cannot be successfully disputed.

Domestic labor has been benefited, not hurt, by the bracero program. Domestic labor has reaped a benefit in better living standards and in better wages.

In my opinion the Department of Labor has gone far afield in using the bracero program as a back door approach for fixing minimum wages for all farm labor, a procedure for which there is no authority in law.

The farmer has done an outstanding job in providing food and fiber to the people at reasonable prices. If you take away from farmers the opportunity to use a minimum number of bracero workers the farmers in certain areas will be seriously crippled in their farming operations and the general public will suffer.

The Department of Labor sees to it that bracero labor is not permitted to displace domestic labor or beat down wages. I feel strongly, as I know others do, that domestic workers should be protected and given preference. But the fact is the bracero program is urgently required to meet a serious farm labor shortage in certain areas and the proposed 2-year extension should be approved.

Those of us who represent farm districts where braceros are used are not making an unreasonable request. We urge the passage of this legislation in order to prevent undue hardship upon farmers and farm families.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on this measure while in the Committee of the Whole in general debate be given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the newest State in the Union, I have now served as a Member of this body for nearly 5 months. During these 5 months, I have been overly gratified to discover that this legislative body is truly a great body. I have learned that its Members are dedicated men and women of good will and good intentions, possessed of the highest ideals, who, when called upon, will do what is right, and only what is right.

It is with confidence in this belief that I appeal to Members of this great body to vote down H.R. 5497.

Because of the limited time allotted me, I shall confine myself to a brief discussion of two questions here involved. An issue which is perhaps bigger than the issue of pure economics presented here is the question of morals: Is it morally right for us as the greatest Nation on earth, enjoying the highest standard of living in modern civilization, to perpetuate a Federal law which not only permits but also assists the hiring of Mexican Nationals at substandard wages by our own citizen-employers? Certainly, we do not expect any of our citizen-workers to work for less than a living wage. Yet we are being asked today to continue, in effect, for another 2 years a law which permits the hiring of Mexican workers for jobs within our own borders for as little as 60 cents an hour, which is less than one-half the minimum wage otherwise determined by Congress.

Is it not significant that representatives of all three major religious faiths testified against the continuation of Public Law 78? Clergymen of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions joined in complaining vigorously about the Mexican farm labor importation program. It is also noteworthy that churches have been the strongest critics of Public Law 78. In resolutions, in public statements, and in testimony, they have gone to the extent of calling Public Law 78 immoral.

Labor unions, civic organizations, family farm groups, consumer organizations, veterans organizations have opposed this law because of the harm it continues to bring to our own domestic farm workers and family farmers. It appears that the only ones in favor of the law are the small percentage, less than 1 percent of the farmer-employers who use these so-called braceros to their own advantage.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say here quickly that I do not advocate putting these small number of growers who do use braceros out of business. I do believe that it is incumbent upon us that we do aim to improve the economic and social condition of the American farmworker.

A second basic question here involved is whether or not we should permit the free enterprise system to work. In urging an end to Public Law 78, I am appealing for the allowance of the free enterprise system to work. The two bases of this system are competition and the law of supply and demand. The Mexican farm labor importation program negates both and therefore runs counter to the free enterprise system.

Under the protection of the umbrella of Public Law 78, some of our growers have no need to compete for labor. They need not rely upon supply and demand to set the price for the labor they hire. Instead, they offer to hire domestic workers at a certain wage. This wage need not, and often is not, based upon the supply of and demand for labor. It is a low and arbitrarily set wage. If the wage is not good enough to attract domestic workers, which often is the case, the grower need not raise the wage. He can simply avail himself of the benefits of Public Law 78 by asking the U.S. Government to supply him with braceros from Mexico.

Because of the undeniable poverty in Mexico, farmworkers are readily available there. Their importation in large numbers and the willingness of the braceros to work for low wages under conditions which are alien even to our poverty stricken American farmworkers, bring about competition for the first time to the labor market in bracero-using areas. But this is competition of poverty against poverty which brings about still greater poverty to our American farmworker. It is competition which not only lowers wages but which also has seriously increased unemployment among American farmworkers, as is noted in the minority views of the committee report.

I ask that we do the right thing here today—and the right thing to do is to vote down H.R. 5497.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my friends on this side of the aisle will attach no particular significance to the fact that I was recognized by my friend on the Republican side, other than the mutual respect and esteem we hold for one another.

We have heard many times this afternoon the history of this legislation and I do not intend to go into it again, but I do want to discuss my own position on this matter briefly because of the fact that in one county, my home county in my district, we use, I think, some 350 to 450 braceros in the harvesting of the pear crop.

I have worked on this problem of migratory labor and bracero labor for some 6 years in the Oregon Legislature and I recognize many of the things which have been said here today as being valid. I recognize that this is a downtrodden group and one that is substantially unable to help itself, and one that therefore needs help from those who are stronger than they.

Also I have had the privilege of sitting in on the hearings before the committee on this particular bill and I have noted the rising opposition by church, civic and labor groups, and actually on the floor of this Congress today to the continuation of Public Law 78. In all frankness I have to admit that there is some evidence to their contentions that the use of Mexican workers has, to an extent, had an adverse effect on the employment opportunities of domestics. I was especially impressed with the eloquence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

I note also, under the migrant labor agreement between this country and Mexico that there are some benefits offered to Mexican laborers that are not offered to domestic workers. This furnishes us with an anomalous situation where U.S. nationals in looking for jobs in this country may actually be put to a certain amount of disadvantage. But there is also evidence that the total agricultural labor needs of this country cannot, at specific times and places, be met from domestic sources; and I think the key to this issue this afternoon are those words "specific times and places."

As the gentleman from California just pointed out, when the crops are planted they cannot be slowed down. When they are ready to be harvested they must be harvested or the crop is lost.

Further, I am convinced that the arguments advanced in general against the continuation of this program do not apply specifically to the situation we have in my State of Oregon. Braceros there are used only in the harvesting of pears, and that is in the Rogue River Valley. The growers in this valley conscientiously and at their own expense have tried and do try to hire domestics in times of harvest and turn to braceros only when they cannot find domestics. They work closely with our department of employment and have offered employment to all domestics who are willing to work. They have imported American labor from the southwestern part of the United States, including members of the Navajo Tribe, in what seems to me to be a conscientious effort to comply not only with the letter of this law but with the spirit of it.

Further, the wages paid in my valley, while low by industrial standards, are high by any agricultural standard. I am advised that domestics average $1.46 in my valley and that braceros average $1.76 an hour.

In addition, I speak with some pride that Oregon has what I consider to be the most advanced migratory labor legislation on its books to protect these people from exploitation and to relieve them from the most pressing of the social problems with which they are faced. These laws include laws that license labor leaders, that impose strict standards of public health with which growers must comply, safety regulations affecting the transportation of migrants on the highways and—get this—a pilot program to provide education for the children of these migrants who, because of the transitory nature of their parents' employment, frequently reach adulthood without proper education.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he is making, and call attention to the statistical tables which I will subsequently put in the RECORD, which show that Oregon has consistently used only 300 workers for use in harvesting the pear crops. Currently the Great State of Oregon has all of these requirements in its laws. The gentleman is aware, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, that this does not necessarily follow as far as the other States of the Union are concerned. I would urge the gentleman as a member of that great committee to try to get such legislation adopted in his committee.

Mr. DUNCAN. The gentleman's comment is well taken.

I would certainly commend to the other States in the Union the example of my State in this field.

I would point out, too, that in my district we have little diversification. Our economy is tied to what sometimes seem to us the gyrations of the lumber market. The little diversification we have consists, in my own home county, of pears. It is very important to us that pears be harvested when they are ripe.

I do believe we should offer employment to domestics on at least the same basis we do to braceros. Accordingly, in both the subcommittee and the full committee I offered two amendments which I thought would help to do this. Perhaps not surprisingly, since I am a freshman, my two amendments garnered unto themselves one vote each, respectively, and that of course was my own. Two amendments were suggested by the administration. One I changed a little to make it more adaptable, I think, to the situation with which we are faced. The third offered by the administration I thought was administratively impractical, and I did not offer it. These amendments, I thought, offered a middle ground to which both the proponents and opponents of this legislation could repair as all of us seek to solve a very difficult problem. Although these were not adopted, as the Congressman from the Fourth District of Oregon I intend to support this law and its extension for 2 years. I do not support the administration's proposal to extend it 1 year. I am convinced the administration has the power under the terms of this law to phase this program out should the need vanish.

I realize the great opposition to this program. I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the growers of Oregon and our own department of employment the absolute necessity of taking the next 2 years to find alternative sources for obtaining labor from the American market. I know the growers in Oregon would prefer to get this labor from the American market, and I stand ready to help in any way I can.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, this debate has been the most enjoyable debate I have heard this year. I want to express my sincere congratulations to both the proponents and opponents of this measure. I have said to those who differ with me—even though I oppose you on this bill, I am for you personally. I think it is awfully important never to make any enemy in the House of Representatives. I certainly think no one has done that this afternoon. This has been an excellent debate on the merits of this matter. Fireworks are natural because you will recall it was during this same debate when from yonder gallery some people shot at the House of Representatives a few years ago, and if I should look askance about the gallery I hope I will be forgiven.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do so because as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been convinced that we need this available supply of labor to take care of the harvesting of crops of the farmers of America—a harvesting which is necessary to give the consumers of this Nation food at reasonable prices. I would plead with my colleagues who have said that perhaps in another 2 years we would not need this bill, to think rather carefully because I am concerned over the future about the availability of manpower to harvest the crops, especially the vegetable crops of America.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to pay tribute to the great eloquence of those who pointed out the problems with reference to our migrant laborers and the braceros. I am not here, Mr. Chairman, to maintain that this type of labor has been treated perfectly or that they have been given all of the consideration that they perhaps should have been given. But yet let me emphasize again that this program, supervised as it is by the Department of Labor, and the other programs that have to do with the supply of labor for the farms of America—supervised as they are by the Department of Labor—are, in my opinion, programs that our Secretary of Labor will take great pains to see that they do not harm our migrant laborers and the braceros.

In Florida, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] mentioned, we do not have the Mexican braceros but we do have the British West Indies laborers. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we could harvest our crops in Florida without this labor. As chairman of the Committee on Family Farms of our Subcommittee on Agriculture, we have set as a brief definition of a family farm: a farm that is big enough to enable the family to make a living on it and, yet, not so big that the members of the family cannot provide 50 percent of the labor except at harvest time. That is the exception—at harvest time. The problem of the family farmer is to harvest his crops at harvest time. In my particular congressional district, is it moral to deny to the family farmer the right to employ labor when the laboring man has agreed to do the work and when the Secretary of Labor has supervised the conditions? Is it moral to say to the family farmer, "No, your particular vegetable must rot in the fields."

In connection with the harvesting of strawberries, for example, most of you ladies and gentlemen know that just a few hours means the difference between a spoiled crop and a crop that can be harvested. Immediate labor at harvest time is necessary.

Let us take the situation that we had with oranges in Florida last year when many orange crops were frozen. Is it moral to deny a man the right to harvest that fruit while it still can be used? If the fruit had been harvested and used for juice within a certain period of time, it could have been used. Of course, much of it was harvested and it was able to be used because of available labor, but to have denied the citrus producer the right to employ people in the available labor market would have denied to him the right to harvest that particular crop.

Mr. Chairman, much of this work in vegetables and citrus is paid for by the piece. It is not uncommon for a person picking oranges to make $20 a day. That is not an unprofitable operation. So, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the laborer, the consumer, and for the benefit of the family farmer, I am convinced that this program is necessary, supervised as it is by the Department of Labor. I hope the House will approve the extension of this act.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] that perhaps he would like to yield time at this point?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I come from the State of California. We have the particular problem of getting out our crops. It is a very important matter, but I come here with clean hands, because I favor man's humanity to man. Certainly I favor a national minimum wage and the highest and best wages we can pay to domestics or anybody else who comes along and can go to work. In our part of the country we have and produce about 37 percent of all the fruits, nuts, and vegetables of these United States.

I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], if he can work out some program whereby we can extend the provisions of Public Law 414 and allow Mexican nationals to come to the United States, to immigrate here, and do the work, I will support that legislation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there has been introduced a bill in the past to the effect that we would amend and authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved voluntary methods of recruiting and training agricultural workers. There are several such bills pending. I am wondering whether the gentleman would support that legislation.

Mr. LEGGETT. I would certainly support it in its proper place, but not as an amendment to this legislation.

We have a situation here where we have the bad guys versus the good guys. I am a bad guy, I suppose. But you can tell the good guys because they all come from Manhattan, Brooklyn, and downtown Oakland, and they do not have to get out the crops as in some of these rural areas. I am a Democrat, a liberal Democrat, but we have a problem in the seven counties of the Central Valley of California to get 15,000 workers in there for a period of only 3 months. We pay them the best wages in the country.

The braceros in California make $1.85 an hour. They average $1.45 an hour. We utilize every effort we can bring about to get domestics in. We make every effort to utilize the domestics, and we bring domestics from Texas, Arizona, and everywhere else. We do have a particular problem, however.

I think the sole authority in the United States, as far as whether or not the bracero program is going to affect our unemployment situation, is Mr. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

I want to call your attention to his testimony before our committee where he said:

> I think as the program is presently being administered; that is, currently being administered it is fair to say—and this is really only to say that the congressional intention is being carried out—that as it has been administered this last year it has not resulted in the displacement of any substantial number of domestic workers.

Some of the members have been talking about reforming the total agricultural problems of the United States. That has nothing to do with the total bracero program which we are here talking about.

In this respect I would like to tell you something about our recruitment efforts in the Sacramento Valley of California. In 1962 we recruited from the city of Sacramento 1,798 domestics to work in the Fourth Congressional District of California. I might state these workers come from the district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], who is supporting this legislation.

Out of a total of 1,798, 133 failed to report for work; 938 worked less than 3 days; 561 less than 7 days; 134 worked 14 days or less; 31 less than a month; and only 1 of the 1,798 worked more than a month.

We have similar records for all of California.

I have one further thing I would like to talk about in this respect, and will refer to our recruitment efforts to bring workers from out of State; that is, domestics, to California. If you are unappreciative of the contract requirements for bringing Mexicans into California under the bracero program, you should see the way they handle the domestics. I would like to read a letter written to the labor recruitment people in Yolo County; it appears at page 324 of the record made before our committee.

The letter reads as follows:

EL PASO, TEX.,
June 15, 1961.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Woodland, Calif.

DEAR SIRS: Myself and associates have opened a farm labor recruiting agency in El Paso, Tex., and are interested to know if you have growers associations in your area that may be in need of this type of laborers.

We are fully licensed and bonded, and in our operations have done everything possible to meet all requirements of the laws pertaining to the transportation of seasonal farmworkers. We will transport these men to any place in your area in fully insured buses, with a capacity of 52 men per bus load.

We have experienced men to screen these applicants for work, and will send only what we believe to be capable and willing workers, some U.S. citizens, and some so-called green-card men, who have been cleared for work in the United States by the various governmental agencies, so that growers need have no fear of any unpleasant complications of any kind. We have investigated the requirements of the law, and we can assure you that no troubles will arise from our neglect or legal violations.

The cost to the growers will be $45 per man for full loads, to be delivered in most of the California area, and any additional cost would be negligible for added cost of transportation. We will require one-half of the fee with the order, and the balance upon delivery at the designated terminal or receiving point.

We would appreciate your passing this information on to any of your members or people in your area who are in need of farm help.

We will of course want to know the wages to be paid, and general working conditions. We have all different kinds of men for the various jobs, and are in a position to furnish men suited to your particular type of work. We will send only experienced men.

Thanking you in advance for your courtesy in this matter, we are,

Sincerely yours,

EL PASO FARM LABOR
RECRUITING AGENCY,
ELMER LARSON.

Domestic recruitment, Nogales: [1]	
116 men at $21 transportation cost	$2,436.00
3 men reimbursed travel expenses	40.00
Recruiter expenses (includes telephone calls, radio ads, etc	563.63
Subsistence paid to workers for lack of work available upon arrival	180.00
Total	3,220.40
Domestic recruitment, El Paso:	
213 men at $38	8,094.00
Recruiter expenses	251.02
Legal expenses (contracts with agency in El Paso and individual workers contracts)	120.00
Total	8,465.02
Total expense	11,685.42

[1] No records of employment available.

Of 215 men shipped from El Paso, 213 arrived in Woodland; 178 actually assigned to growers, the balance disappeared upon arrival.

July 22: 30 Half Moon; 27 worked until August 3, 4 worked until August 8, replaced by braceros.

July 22: 6 Oclaray; all skipped, no melon work available, refused hoeing.

August 5—5 Nick Lopez: 2 worked 2 days, 2 worked until September 30; 24 Rose Valley: only 2 finished harvest; 4 N. D. Thomas; 3 remained until end of almonds, September 30; 1 left on August 28; 2 Rominger Bros.: 1 completed harvest, 1 left September 4.

August 4—38 Hatanaka Bros.: 10 left August 23, 6 left on September 20, 4 left on September 28, 4 left on September 30, 1 man remained until October 14; 4 John Spies: transferred from Half Moon and Rose Valley, all skipped.

August 5—7 Rose Valley, transferred from Half Moon (see above); 3 Don Mumma: 2 from Rose Valley, all completed harvest.

August 7—5 Frank Ramos: not all stayed for employment.

August 8—4 Rose Valley, transferred from Half Moon (see above).

August 9—20 Hitomi: all skipped by August 16; 21 Oclaray: 17 dumped at office at night, and skipped, balance skipped from camp, all refused further employment; 4 Frank Lopez: 1 finished harvest, 4 worked to September 2; 11 Frank Ramos: some never accepted employment; of these and the 5 on August 7, 11 were actually employed for various periods.

August 11—5 Tom Holland: from Rose Valley, 3 finished harvest.

August 13—1 A. W. Boyce: from Hitomi, stayed to October 17.

August 23—1 Holland, transferred from another grower (see above).

August 25—7 Ramos and Donaldson: 4 from F. Ramos, 2 worked full harvest, balance left during first payroll period.

August 29—1 Rominger Brothers: from Thomas (see above).

August 30—1 Ahrens: from Spies, finished harvest.

Eighteen men actually completed harvests. Many of these had been transferred from one grower to another because of their refusals to work. Of these 18, 6 were offered additional employment in walnuts and refused.

Melons: 92 assigned; 2 completed harvest, 0.2 percent.

Almonds: 88 assigned; 15 completed harvest, 17 percent.

Peaches: 16 assigned; none completed harvest.

Tomatoes: 79 assigned; none completed harvest.

(Numbers assigned differs with number shown as originally assigned due to transfers from one grower to another.)

The letter sounds like you are buying bananas. As a result we expended in this program, to take some of these fine people from Texas, $2,436 to get them in cars and bring them down there. We reimbursed three men's traveling expenses in the amount of $40. We paid recruiter expenses in the amount of $563.63, a total of $3,220.40 for 116 men. For domestic recruitment in El Paso we paid the additional sum of $11,685.42, making a total of about $15,000 for 339 men. I have the records here in our files showing where these men went, the ranches that they were assigned to, the number of days they worked on each ranch, showing they all worked less than a month, and at the expiration of a month only 18 men were left. Of these 18, 6 were offered additional employment in walnuts and refused.

Mr. Chairman, I think we do have a problem, and I want to be just as direct as I possibly can. We want to pay the best wages possible. If my good friend from Alameda County will put his people on a bus and bring them to our district, we will hire them, but to date we have not got them.

How about a final consideration of foreign aid and I ask your indulgence? I ask you, is this program not about the ideal method of foreign aid?

To begin with, what is the criticism of our foreign aid program?

First. Too much money goes to unfriendly countries who are not appreciative.

Second. Too much money is sopped up by defective foreign governments—by politicians at the top.

Third. Funds do not get to the little people.

Fourth. Funds do not get to people who help themselves.

Take a second look at the labor program with our sister country of Mexico we are here asked to extend.

Laborers are not conscripted in Mexico but they are allowed to compete for positions to come to the United States to work in agriculture.

Laborers are allowed to individually contract and terminate their contracts at will.

Third, they are allowed to work under controlled conditions of housing, safety, wages, and medical care in an admittedly very difficult occupation. The effect of setting a minimum wage for braceros has had the effect of setting a minimum wage for domestics in the State of Colorado and other States.

The bracero usually is not a chronic migratory worker, but actually saves 50 to 75 percent of his net pay which he uses to buy a tractor, improve a farmstead or buy a business. The dollars spent in Mexico are effective to improve our relations with that country because of the manner in which the money is expended.

The net effect is that little people of a friendly foreign land are allowed to earn small amounts of money which stimulates private enterprise in their own country. No expensive intervening defective governments and politicians and, best of all, not one cent goes out of the Federal Treasury.

While we have spent billions in Asia in a foreign aid effort to stimulate that economy with questionable results and a questionable check of communism, we have been effective unknowingly in our own backyard—Mexico—through the bracero program, creating a group of middle class Mexican farmers, private enterprise farmers who got their start by working with their hands—not a gift from a foreign government.

You say great, but it is at the expense of the American working man. Nonsense. More braceros work in California than any other State but simultaneously we have the highest standards in American agriculture labor, best safety conditions, minimum wages for women and children and minimum age limit for children in agriculture.

If the Secretary does not think wages are high enough he can raise them administratively. If domestic workers feel left out they can preempt bracero jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a system better than we know. The alternative to the program is obvious. Until a future depression comes along we are not going to have an adequate domestic supply of labor. As a result without a labor force the crops will not get planted or there will be an alternative stampede to further mechanization.

We are barely competitive worldwide at the present time. Like anything else, we can price ourselves out of the market and rely on an export subsidy to get our crops out of the country.

I do not think this is necessary.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roybal].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago this same piece of legislation was debated on this floor. Upon reading the Congressional Record I find that there are individuals who made the statement that that was the last time that they were going to support that piece of legislation. These are some of the same individuals that are today taking the floor in favor of it. But, the situation has not bettered itself during the last 2 years. It is still a piece of legislation that thrives on the poverty of both Mexican nationals and American farm laborers. It is a piece of legislation that relegates those American citizens who work on the farms of our country, to a status of an underprivileged minority and forces them to live in an atmosphere of poverty and squalor. I think it is well known that the farmworker of this country is the lowest paid; that he is poorly paid, poorly housed, and poorly cared for, but still we force them to compete with a foreign worker that comes into this country. I think it is also well known that the average wage for the farmworker in our country is $881. This is a good reason why they are poorly educated and with limited skills and training.

The point was made a little while ago that this was foreign aid. Well, if this is foreign aid, then this is surely foreign aid that is being made available at the expense of people relegated to this particular deplorable status and is foreign aid that is not compatible to the American way of living or the best interests of the people of this Nation.

The charge has been made that Americans will not do stoop labor; that Mexican nationals are necessary. This is just plain nonsense. The American workers today perform exhausting tasks in coal mines and steel mills and foundries and the oil fields of our land.

They work on garbage trucks, on cesspools and sewers. They work under rivers as sandhogs and in the boilerrooms of ships and factories. They perform sweaty labor in the kitchens and laundries and heavy labor in our various industries.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I think we must point out that there are Americans who exhaust themselves, their families and their resources, for the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress. This all means that the principle of hard work has not been abolished from our land. I feel that that same principle of hard work can continue to be applied by the farmers themselves who can go out and get the labor that is available to them at all times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen] yield to me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked by a previous speaker if we were familiar with the conditions under which the braceros live. As a health educator in the State of California I did enter a bracero camp, and found that their facilities were good. But then I crossed to the other side of the road, to the river, and I found our own workers eating on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the question was also asked if we had seen the sleeping quarters of the braceros, and I say that I have. I have also seen how the American worker has to live and sleep right near the bracero camp.

Mr. Chairman, we were also asked if we had seen the health facilities made available to the braceros, and I say that I have.

But, I have also seen the type of health facilities that are made available to the American workers, which are in effect no facilities at all.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the House that since I have 1 additional second in which to conclude my remarks, that I wholeheartedly request that you join me in voting down this unfair, and immoral piece of legislation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the enactment of this legislation. I am firmly of the belief that Public Law 78 should end on its termination date, December 31, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, we have no business importing foreign agricultural workers when we have an abundance of domestic workers. This domestic labor supply will be almost instantly available when wages and working conditions in the farming industry are made commensurate with American standards.

Mr. Chairman, in the Ninth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives, the domestic agricultural workers are seriously injured by the bracero program. And this is the situation throughout the United States wherever Mexican workers are imported to compete with our local people.

The reason we have the bracero program is because Mexico adjoins our southern border, and Mexico has a huge supply of poverty-stricken agricultural workers who will submit to being herded here to work on our farms under the most austere conditions at substandard wages.

I cannot agree that this program constitutes a healthy foreign aid program to Mexico when it is at the expense of our most underprivileged working group, the agricultural workers. In 1961 the average U.S. farmworker's income was $881 for the year's work. I do not think that this citizen should be financing the Mexican foreign aid program.

It was said during the hearings on this bill that the farmers need the braceros because the domestic workers will not work. This is simply not true and most insulting to our domestic work force which asks only to be afforded the opportunity for decent employment which should be the right of any resident of America.

It has also been said today by the proponents of this legislation that the growers cannot harvest their crops if they are not allowed to import the braceros. This argument is, basically, the one used for centuries to oppose all efforts to improve the lot of working people. "It will ruin business."

When George III was King of England, and Parliament was considering the law limiting children to working not more than 10 hours per day, the cotton factory owners warned that they would have to close down should this ruinous law be passed. They objected in 1842 when the State of Massachusetts limited the hours of work for children under 12 to 10 hours per day. They predicted bankruptcy and unemployment when Congress passed a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour in 1938. They said the same thing in 1961 when it was raised to $1.25 an hour.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States, if an employer needs employees, he must offer jobs at sufficiently attractive wages and working conditions. That is the traditional American way, with free employers dealing with free labor, which has contributed so much to our high standard of living. But—should an employer, wishing to avoid this free bargaining, be allowed to refuse to deal with the American workers and instead substitute a cheap imported supply? Should General Motors, for example, dissatisfied with the wages of the auto workers on the Pontiac assembly line, be permitted to import several thousand single men from Mexico who will work for a dollar an hour?

There is no great difference between separate industries. Each has its own stubborn problems. The American farmer, too, has his problems. Most of them he has worked out magnificently, with imagination, skill and devotion which have blessed this country with an abundant supply of food.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that given the necessity by our termination of the bracero program, the farmers will quickly adjust to the plentiful but neglected domestic supply, to the great benefit of themselves, the American agricultural worker, and our Nation.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a brief moment to dispel the notion that there are no domestic workers available to do the work of the bracero.

The figures supplied by the committee show the adequacy of the domestic labor supply.

The domestic migrants and local seasonal employees in every month of 1962 far exceeded the number of Mexican nationals in the farm labor force.

The cutback in farm jobs because of mechanization indicates clearly that a large part of the domestic farm labor force is being lost to agriculture. If, as the majority of the committee suggests, the average number of hired farmworkers has declined by half a million since 1950, because of technological developments, the half million is over twice the number of braceros in the country last year. If you go beyond hired hands and look at total agricultural employment you find a cut of 300,000 in 1962—this well exceeds the number of braceros in the country last year.

The long-range loss in farm employment is even more striking. The Manpower Report of the Department of Labor stated that 3 million family and hired agricultural jobs were lost between 1947 and 1962; another 1,500,000 will disappear by 1975. These lost agricultural jobs are low skill jobs—the very type that are disappearing everywhere in the Nation today. At this very moment we are struggling to upgrade and retrain our labor force. We know that even our maximum effort will not reach many of the presently untrained and unemployed. It is obvious that we need even the undesirable unskilled jobs found in agriculture to help take up slack in our structural unemployment.

We have heard the argument that stoop labor is not available in many parts of this country. Yet every job that braceros do is done by domestic labor in some part of the country.

We have heard the argument that domestic labor is undependable and erratic. True, not many of us expect American citizens to be docile and content at a wage of 60 cents an hour. However, if the same effort and organization that goes into supplying braceros and guaranteeing them benefits, went into stabilizing the domestic work force and paying them a little better wage, we could achieve the same results.

There is fear that dropping this program will cripple some farms. The present program continues until December 31, 1963, well beyond the present growing season. The large growers who use the lion's share of the braceros will have the better part of a year to recruit a domestic labor force for the 1964 growing season. Further, the elimination of roughly 200,000 braceros proposed here is less than the net drop in the bracero force between 1959 and 1962. Elimination is no more than the phase out so long promised.

Facts and figures seldom win an argument of this sort, though it is comforting to have them on our side. This is really a moral issue: Whether we allow imported peon labor to take our jobs and depress wages.

Last week in the wheat referendum the farmers struck a blow for freedom of the marketplace; let us go along and at least restore freedom of the marketplace to agricultural labor in America.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope I shall not be accused of a conflict of disinterest this afternoon, because I have never seen a farm with a bracero; I hardly know how to pronounce the word. I have never been to California, Texas, Arkansas, or to the States that use 85 percent of the farm labor. It seems to me, though, somewhere, using simple logic, perhaps I can add just a little bit to the debate this afternoon, notwithstanding what I would otherwise think is a really serious disability.

I think that we have to analyze the arguments pro and con before we reach a decision as to the enactment of H.R. 5497.

Clearly the proponents of this legislation have the burden of establishing their case, particularly since this is the sixth extension of an emergency program. It is not I who have labeled this a temporary measure, but those who have urged the development of this program.

On January 24, 1951, Mr. Hill said:

> There is another thing I want to say, and that is this is a temporary bill. This bill expires on December 31, 1953. What we are trying to do here is to take care of the situation during this war emergency (p. 7329, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

And again in 1953, when the first extension of Public Law 78 was sought, Mr. Hill said:

> All we are doing at the present time is to ask for a temporary extension (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 3, p. 3149).

On that same day Mr. Thompson of Texas said:

> The reason why this is temporary legislation, as I tried to point out a little while ago, is that the need is only temporary (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 3, p. 3153).

And in 1961, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] said:

> Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again supporting the extension of Public Law 78 as I have supported it throughout my service in Congress. I wish to make it irrevocably clear, at this time, however, that it is my opinion that this is the last time I shall take the floor in defense of this program. Certainly this is true unless there are substantive changes either in circumstances or in the application of the law as it applies across the country (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 6, p. 7707).

In determining whether or not the proponents of H.R. 5497 have made their case, let us examine their three main arguments.

First. Farmers are supplied with workers not available from the U.S. labor force.

Obviously American workers are not available at 60 cents per hour, or at any other subsidized wage that is lower than the minimum wages paid throughout the country. The farms that are the recipients of this giveaway labor are getting a labor force benefit that 99 percent of the American farms are denied—and rightly so. Would any of us in a rational moment suggest that any other industry in the United States be permitted to import foreign labor because domestic employers could not obtain sufficient labor at a substandard wage?

Second. Wetbacks, the illegal aliens who once swarmed across our southern borders, have been virtually eliminated as a result of this legislation.

Labeling this an antiwetback bill causes one to wonder why we have not legalized the sale and consumption of narcotics because that is difficult to control; or eliminated all other immigration laws because they are difficult to administer; or relieved the Federal Government from prosecuting all criminal statutes because they are either cumbersome or unenforcible. Is there anyone in this House willing to stand up and be counted for the proposition that, when a criminal statute becomes difficult to enforce, we should legalize the crime the statute was enacted to prevent?

Third. This program provides an important source of dollar exchange to Mexico, and is in effect a gentle assist to our foreign aid program.

With respect to the international aspects of this program, it would seem to me that the time and place to be for foreign aid for Mexico or for any other country is when the Foreign Affairs Committee reports out that bill. To cloak this bill with a fictional—and I might say, distasteful—claim of foreign assistance is a play on words that is wholly unjustified by the facts.

The Mexican farm labor importation program is a most serious violation of free enterprise. It prevents normal economic forces from working in the agricultural labor market. Yet all the material arguments made on both sides of this issue, I think, are infinitesimal considering the great moral issue involved. The fact of the matter is that this program permits trafficking in human beings as if they were commodities to be bought and sold in a fluctuating market. It is a sell-out of human rights and dignities which I should think should be terminated forthwith.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we have been told that the importation of Mexican braceros does not entail any substantial expense to the taxpayer, since the users of these imported workers foot the bill for administration of the program. But the large corporate farms that are the chief beneficiaries of this program do not pay the cost of assuring compliance with the law. The cost of checking payrolls to ascertain hourly rates, the cost of visiting the fields and labor camps, the cost of maintaining compliance with the International Agreement with Mexico—these costs are borne by the taxpayer, and they are high.

In the current fiscal year, they amount to some $1.4 million. This involves, Mr. Chairman, about $60 per imported worker—a heavy burden indeed on the taxpayer.

To clearly see the economic effects of this program, we need only to ask one question—what has been the trend in farm wages in areas where Mexican workers are imported as compared with farm communities that do not rely on these foreign workers? According to studies conducted over a decade by the Department of Agriculture—and I quote from information furnished to me by that Department:

> On balance, over the entire 10-year period, there has been a greater increase in wage-rates as a whole in the country than in areas where Mexican nationals have been employed.

The following tables clearly demonstrate the factual evidence in support of the foregoing statement:

WAGE TRENDS IN AREAS WHERE MEXICAN NATIONALS ARE EMPLOYED

During the 10-year period, 1953–62, the annual average hourly farm-wage rate without room or board, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, rose by about 23 percent (from $0.82 in 1953 to $1.01 in 1962) for the United States as a whole. Studies of trends in wage rates in areas where Mexican nationals are, or have been employed, show that rates in these areas tended to remain relatively stable from 1953 to 1960. In the past 2 years, rates in areas of Mexican worker employment have tended to rise at a faster rate than for the country as a whole. However, on balance, over the entire 10-year period, there has been a greater increase in wage rates in the country as a whole than in areas where Mexican nationals have been employed.

1. Between 1953 and 1958, the USDA average hourly rate increased by about 12 percent. However, in areas where Mexican nationals were employed, rates, on the average, showed little change. A study of 471 areas for which comparable wage data for 2 or more years were available showed that there was no significant change in rate, from the earlier to later years within this period, in 55 percent of the cases, while 23 percent increased and 22 percent declined.

Trends in wage rates from earliest to latest survey, 1953–58

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased	109	23
Unchanged	261	55
Decreased	101	22
Total	471	100

2. Between 1958 and 1959, the USDA average rose about 1 percent. In Mexican-using areas, however, wage rates continued to exhibit the same pattern of relative stability which has been typical of the 1953–58 period. A study of the trend in wage rates in 572 areas in which Mexican nationals were employed in 1959 showed that no significant change in rates occurred over the year in 64 percent of the activities with 20 percent rising and 16 percent declining.

Trends in wage rates, 1958–59

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased	116	20
Unchanged	365	64
Decreased	91	16
Total	572	100

3. A study was also made of the 1953–59 trend based on the 471 areas which had been the subject of the 1953-58 trend analysis. This study showed that, in 50 percent of the areas, the rates had remained substantially unchanged over the entire period, with increases occurring in 32 percent of the cases and declines in 18 percent. A comparison of trends in activities compensated on an hourly basis vis-a-vis those compensated on a piece rate basis indicated that substantially more increases occurred in hourly rated activities than in piece rated activities. Forty-one percent of hourly rated activities showed a significant increase as compared to only 25 percent of the piece rate activities. Five percent of the hourly rated activities declined as compared to 27 percent of those compensated on a piece rate basis. The average increase in all hourly rated activities was about 13 percent, as compared to the 16-percent rise in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's annual average without room or board over the same period.

Trends in wage rates, 1953–59

[Percent of cases]

Direction of change	All areas	Hourly cases [1]	Piece-rate cases
Increased	32	41	25
Unchanged	50	54	47
Decreased	17	5	27
Total	[2] 99	100	[2] 99

[1] Included 4 cases of time rates other than hourly.

[2] Adds to less than 100 percent due to rounding.

4. Between 1959 and 1960 the U.S. Department of Agriculture average farm wage rate (hourly rate without room or board) rose 2.1 percent, but in major areas where foreign workers were employed, rates remained virtually stable. A study of trends in 123 areas with 500 or more Mexican workers showed no significant change in two-thirds of the cases, although there are labor-shortage areas where wage increases would normally be expected. A significant change is a customary interval of wage payment, such as 5 cents an hour, or 1 or 2 cents in the case of most piece rates.

Trend in wage rates, major areas, 1959–60

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased	22	18
Unchanged	83	67
Decreased	18	15
Total	123	100

5. Reversing the trend noted during the 1953–60 period, wage rates in areas and activities of major Mexican worker employment in 1961 showed an increase of 2.9 percent over 1960 as compared with a year-to-year increase of 2.1 percent in the U.S. Department of Agriculture average. A study of the trend in rates in 259 major activities located in 187 crop wage areas in the 7 States—Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Michigan, New Mexico, and Texas—which accounted for virtually all of the Mexican worker employment in 1961, showed that rates increased significantly in 32 percent of the cases, while 64 percent were substantially unchanged and 4 percent declined significantly.

Trends in wage rates, 1960–61

Direction of change	Number of areas	Percent
Increased	83	32
Unchanged	166	64
Decreased	10	4
Total	259	100

6. Based on the preliminary results of a study of the 1961–62 trend in the rates paid in the same areas and activities analyzed in 1961, rates in 1962 Mexican-using areas rose about 5 percent between 1961 and 1962. This compares with an increase of about 2 percent in the U.S. Department of Agriculture average.

7. In addition to the special trends studies conducted in the past 3 years, data relating to trends in wage rates are also available from monthly analyses based upon a comparison of wage rates for comparable periods. A comparison of the data available from these surveys reveals the following:

(a) In 1960, approximately 72 percent of wage findings analyzed showed no change from the previous year, with increases and decreases occurring in about equal numbers.

(b) In 1961, the proportion of wage findings which showed no change rose to about 76 percent. However, there was a decline in the proportion of findings which decreased, aproximately 8 percent of all findings analyzed, as compared to 14 percent in 1960. The proportion of increases rose slightly to 16 percent.

(c) In 1962, increases accounted for 32.5 percent of all findings analyzed, with 62.5 percent remaining unchanged and the remainder declining.

The advocates of this legislation have conceded that this program is lacking in humanitarian appeal, but they urge passage of this bill because of "an economic necessity." It seems to me that the importation of human beings, and their treatment as if they were a commodity, is so offensive to our natural instincts that no economic necessity can justify the continuation of this program. The fact that these human beings are leased, rather than bought and sold, is hardly a softening of the moral blow. I would think that at this stage in our moral development we should permit free people to labor in a free market, rather than continue intervention in a free market with indentured foreign workers. I urge the defeat of this legislation.

In support of my stand in opposition to this bill, I include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

HIRED HANDS

A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders, and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.

There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be not shortage of domestic workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.

Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family framers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, despite the benefits that Public Law 78 may have provided in the past, both to the United States and Mexico, experience gained over the last few years offers some startling facts concerning the migrant labor program. These facts must form the firm basis for rejecting any extension of Public Law 78.

The number of migrant farm laborers coming across the border to work the farm areas in the Southwest and California has dropped dramatically over the past 5 years. In 1959, 437,643 Mexican farm laborers came to the United States for temporary employment; but last year only 194,978 braceros entered the United States. The desire for this type of work on U.S. farms has slackened so sharply that less than half of those previously coming to the United States now seek entry. The need for these workers has obviously been reduced.

Conversely, American farmworkers have seen an annual wage of $829 for 138 days of employment creep upward over the past few years to only $919. In 1962 some 1,889,000 U.S. farmworkers earned this kind of bare income. And the fact is that this number has been steadily declining—forcing, since 1959, more than 425,000 American farmworkers into other labor markets where unemployment is already significant. This situation must be blamed on this low income figure, which is caused in great part by cheap labor competition.

It seems to me that we are being asked to approve something of declining importance to another country at the same time when many people in our own land would suffer considerably from this unnecessary fetter being placed once again on their continuing struggle to improve their own standard of living. Ending Public Law 78 will offer our own underemployed citizens a decidedly better chance to provide for their families.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 5497 and urge that it be defeated, allowing the Mexican farm labor importation program to expire at the end of this year.

The program is utilized principally by the large growers as a source of cheap labor. It penalizes American farmworkers and has depressed their wages to an unwarranted degree.

Under Public Law 78, which this bill would continue, 227,000 Mexicans were brought into the United States in 1962, most of them to work on large, corporation-type farms. The program actually amounts to a Government subsidy for these large growers, who make up no more than 1 percent of the total number of the Nation's growers. It prevents the operation of the laws of supply and demand in the setting of wage rates for farm labor. It falls hardest on the small farmer who either cannot afford to pay any outside help at all or who operates in an area where Mexican labor is unavailable.

Because of this program, growers do not have to raise wages if they cannot attract sufficient numbers of U.S. workers; they simply ask the Federal Government to recruit cheap labor from Mexico. Under their contract terms, the Mexicans must work where they are contracted for and cannot search elsewhere for better conditions. Thus, the program feeds on the poverty of Mexico and creates poverty in the United States. Unemployment, a severe problem throughout the economy, is particularly severe among rural workers.

Through this program, the U.S. Government is directly intervening in the labor market, eliminating competition and blocking improvements in working conditions. It is striking a devastating blow at the rural worker and the family farm. The program has rightfully been condemned as immoral by leaders of the major religious faiths, a number of whom have protested to me.

Congress should be eager to strike down a law which has been shown to be as harmful as this one. I strongly urge the House to reject H.R. 5497.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may remain.

Mr. Chairman, we have had an excellent discussion here today of a very important piece of legislation. I think we have adequately recognized both sides of this proposal and given everyone an opportunity to be heard.

We are here arguing for this legislation because we feel it is necessary, and that is the only reason. The judgment of the Committee on Agriculture was the same as that of Secretary of Labor Wirtz with respect to necessity. He, however, recommended an extension of this program for 1 year. We are recommending 2 years. I personally trust Secretary of Labor Wirtz to administer this program in a fashion so that it will not displace any American workers from any jobs, and it will not have an adverse effect on wages and working conditions of any American workers.

I want to say to my friends from the cities you may feel that this is a vote you could cast lightly against this legislation. This is not true. It could have serious effects in your areas in terms of prices of goods to consumers in the event you made a mistake in judgment as to the necessity for this program. Again I say, the Secretary of Labor, who has great technical advice on this subject, has concluded the program is necessary.

These braceros are typically used, not entirely but typically used, in crops which do not enjoy Federal price support programs. They have not sought them. They are generally classified as field crops. I am talking about lettuce, melons, and tomatoes, these items that are sold and desired by the housewife, and the price of which, I can assure you, would skyrocket tremendously in the event they were not planted in the same quantity they are planted now or, if planted, they had to be destroyed because no one was around to harvest them. So you do have a very real stake in this program.

Those of us from agricultural areas where we try conscientiously to help both farmers and farm workers have had to wrestle with this problem not from the standpoint of the consumer but from the standpoint of doing equity to our constituents. We feel the program can be operated properly. There is a need for it. We hope you will vote for us in extending the program for another 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is needed badly to provide the labor for work that is not sought by domestic workers. The type of work the bracero does is "stoop" labor that our own people would not and are not desirous of performing. The program authorizes our Government to negotiate with the Republic of Mexico to bring into the country a supplemental labor supply. The program has worked well. It has kept the prices of vegetables, citrus, sugar, and many other food crops including cucumber pickles at a reasonable and fair price for the consuming public.

The cost of bringing these workers to American farms and to return them to Mexico is borne by the farmer almost wholly. The farmer pays all of the cost except administrative expenses of Labor Department personnel.

This labor is expensive to the Arkansas farmer. It costs him $42.60 per man which is nonreimbursable to him to pay the transportation to and from the Mexican border, hot meals en route, housing, kitchen utensils, fuel, and insurance. Our farmers would not pay this extra cost if there was available a dependable local supply of labor to do the work.

The program has built goodwill with our neighbor to the south of us, as it offers employment to their people at wages many times more than they could receive at home. It bolsters the economy of Mexico. These dollars are used to buy commodities from America and aid industry and labor here in this country.

The Subcommittee on Equipment Supplies and Manpower of the House Committee on Agriculture held 3 full days of hearings. Everyone who desired to do so was given an opportunity to testify for or against the legislation. The program was passed in 1951 originally and has been extended several times since that time.

I hope that the bill will be approved by this committee and the House.

The Employment Security Division—Department of Labor in Arkansas works tirelessly to recruit local labor to meet the needs of agriculture during the cultivation and harvest of various crops. I include some of the various appeals made through direct mail notices on bulletin boards posted in conspicuous places, newspaper articles and radio announcements urging workers to accept available farm jobs.

This material was furnished me by Mr. J. L. Bland, administrator of Arkansas Employment Division, Little Rock, Ark.:

WANTED: 1,000 COTTONPICKERS

See George E. Henry, from 5:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. at C. A. Statler's store in Egypt, Ark.; Woodrow Wallace, from 5:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. at pickup point, corner of Main and Drew Streets in Monette, Ark.; or R. J. "Dick" King, from 5 a.m. to 8 a.m. at pickup point at iceplant in Marked Tree, Ark.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION.
JONESBORO, ARK.

Workers Needed To Pick Strawberries

Workers are needed to pick strawberries in Mississippi County. The berry fields are located within driving distance of your home. The fields are clean and good wages can be made.

If your family or neighbors have a car or pickup and would be interested in driving to and from the fields daily, then you should fill out the form below, giving full information and complete mailing address.

Mail this form today to: Employment Security Division, 111 East Ash Street, Blytheville, Ark.

You will be notified when and to whom to report for work.

Your name________________________________
Address__________________________________
Telephone where you can be reached________
Number of workers in your car or pickup____
Ages:
  Males________
  Females______

(Pickers must be 16 years or older.)

Northwest Arkansas Fruit and Vegetable Area, 1962 Agriculture Harvest Bulletin

Harvest work will begin soon in the northwest Arkansas area. Out of area workers will be needed at various times during the season.

Listed below are the major crops which will require workers and the approximate harvest dates:

Strawberries: May 10 to June 1.
Green beans (early): June 15 to July 12.
Green beans (late): August 1 to frost.
Grapes: August 25 to September 20.

Other crops requiring some help include apples (transparent), tomatoes (both green wrap and ripe), and peaches.

There are some strawberry growers with farm housing available. Also others with camping space if you have camping equipment.

The Springdale labor camp will open as usual on April 15, but we do not recommend that you come to this area before May 1. The camp manager says they are short of stoves this year, so if you plan to stay in camp and have a stove, bring it along.

If you would like further information on any of this harvest, write to this office any time and we will send you the latest information we have.

Attention Students: Earn Extra Money

Did you know that you could earn spending money this fall and at the same time help the economy of your community?

You can do this by picking cotton on Saturdays during the season. Wages are good and working conditions are excellent.

If you or any of your friends are interested in this work, please contact the Helena local office of the Arkansas Employment Security Division at 728 Cherry Street where arrangements will be made to transport you to places of employment.

Plans are underway to arrange for transportation by schools and even by classes if desired.

Do you realize how much you could add to your class fund if your entire class picked cotton for three or four Saturdays, putting the proceeds into those funds? Give it some thought.

Marshall Seeking 800 Berrypickers

About 800 strawberry pickers are needed in the Marshall area, the State Employment Security Division of Little Rock said yesterday.

Workers interested in strawberry harvesting were asked to contact the employment security division farm labor information office at the intersection of U.S. Highway 67 and Highway 27 at Marshall, for picking rates and job location.

More Than 1,500 Pickers Needed at Searcy

There is a shortage of pickers for the strawberry harvest in the Searcy-Bald Knob area, the State employment security division said yesterday.

"Growers in these areas need 1,500 pickers immediately and will need 4,000 to 5,000 pickers daily by the end of the week," said J. L. Bland, employment security division administrator.

He said that workers interested in this type of employment should report to the mobile farm labor office on U.S. Highway 67 at Bald Knob across from the auction shed. The office will quote picking rates and provide specific information on job location.

Bland said that production was about 7,000 crates of berries a day. With good weather this should increase as the harvest progresses, he said.

[From the Arkansas Farm Labor Bulletin, April 1962]

Tell Your Friends

Approximately 4,000 additional cotton choppers will be needed in the Craighead-Poinsett County area by May 10. Farm-type housing, free of charge, is available for family groups.

Persons interested in chopping cotton should complete the application below, giving full information, and mail to the Employment Security Division, 528 West Monroe, Jonesboro, Ark. Upon receipt, an attempt will be made to secure a desirable job opening for you. Specific job information on wages, dates of employment, and housing will be provided by return mail.

____
(White or colored)
Ages-males________________________________
Number of choppers in your family or group?________________________________
Ages-females______________________________
Do you have complete camping equipment? Yes________________ No________________
Do you have camping equipment except shelter? Yes__________ No__________
What kind of transportation do you have? Car, ½-ton, 1½-ton, other______________
If not, would you be willing to pay a reasonable transportation fee? Yes__________ No________________

____________ ____________ ____________
(Date) (Name) (Address)

Employment Security Division.
Jonesboro, Ark.

(Or contact your nearest employment security division office.)

Day-Haul

(Radio station KXJK, Forrest City, 15-second announcement)

Attention to unemployed workers in Forrest City and vicinity:

Temporary workers helping to pick cotton this season will have free transportation daily to and from the farms. Workers are needed to pick this year's cotton crop. Prevailing wages will be paid. If you do not have a place to pick cotton contact your local employment security division office located at 807 South Washington Street in Forrest City, Ark., today, and register for a job on a farm for this harvest season. Your help is needed.

That's the Employment Security Division at 807 South Washington Street, Forrest City, Ark.

[From the Forrest City (Ark.) Daily Times Herald, Sept. 12, 1962]

Farmers in Tricounty Area Need 3,000 Cottonpickers, Official Says—Rains Damage Grade of Crop—Keeps Machines Out of Fields—Situation Termed "Acute"

"St. Francis County farmers, plagued recently by drought followed by excessive rains, now are in need of cottonpickers and the supply is not great enough to meet the demand," said Kenneth Graham of the State employment security division.

Graham said at least 2,000 pickers could be placed on day haul immediately in the St. Francis, Lee, and Cross County area. Another 1,000 are sought by farmers to live on the farms and pick, he added.

"If the weather stays fair and the fields start drying more, we'll need even more workers until it becomes dry enough to use machines," Graham said. The other two counties in the office's area, Monroe and Prairie, use machines more.

Rains already have damaged the grade of some cotton and farmers are very anxious to get the crop out of the field. Continued dry weather would alleviate the situation to some extent, Graham said, because machines would be used more.

Some Mexican labor already is in the area, but about 2,000 more than will arrive could be used. New restrictions about wages have cut the number of braceros because farmers are afraid of losing money on their crop, Graham explained.

Employment security division officials have been talking with leaders of the three counties, urging them to help recruit pickers.

Mechanical pickers will harvest about 94,600 acres in the tricounty area, and an additional 36,600 acres in Monroe and Prairie Counties. Graham said about 75 percent of the Prairie and Monroe County crop will be machine picked.

Many farmers will furnish houses to workers willing to live on the farm, and some furnish complete living facilities. Most of the ones wanting day-haul labor will furnish transportation, and all will pay prevailing wages, he said.

Graham termed the situation acute, but said it could easily become critical, depending on the weather. He requested all persons willing to work to contact his office, and they would be put in touch with farmers.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the renewal of Public Law 78 for another 2 years. In 1961 I opposed this measure as did many of my colleagues. The reasons for opposing the bracero program then are just as valid now.

The bracero program is inconsistent with the principles of a progressive nation. What we are doing in this program, whether we realize it or not, is "importing" human beings. A civilized nation does not "import" people as if they were objects. The conditions of peonage which the Mexican laborer is subjected to under this program are inconsistent with our principles. The bracero is a dependent and exploited worker. This program does not support a free labor force of which our Nation can be proud.

In addition to the immorality of the program, which I believe is sufficient reason to vote against the program, Public Law 78 is degrading to our own American farmworkers. Our own farmworkers being free men and women are unable to compete with imported captive labor.

Mr. Chairman, I believe American people would not tolerate this program if it were not concealed, hid away in the rural areas of California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Imagine what would happen if our textile mills and apparel factories raised money and asked the Government to use it to set up work camps to house foreign workers on the outskirts of the textile counties of North Carolina or the garment manufacturing areas of Pennsylvania; what would happen if Government representatives were sent to other countries to secure workers to come into the United States to work for low wages in our textile mills and factories?

We would never even consider such a program in the Congress. So how can we then vote to extend Public Law 78 for another year or two? This program was set up during the Korean war. That was 10 years ago. Unemployment was 3 percent of the labor force. There may have been some need for such a program. At least there was a war emergency.

Today unemployment is nearly 6 percent. There is no war emergency. Yet the program continues. Why? Because under the program the growers of a few of our States, a few thousand of the millions of American farmers, profit from it. We have become accustomed to operating a sweatshop-in-the-fields, under sponsorship of the Federal Government.

If anything were needed to show the true character of this program, it was revealed during the recent hearings on this legislation. The growers complain about the wages required to be offered domestic or Mexican workers under the Secretary of Labor's very weak program to establish some kind of wage standards. What are these wages they object to paying? They are unwilling to pay $1 an hour for a man or woman to endure the blazing sun of California, stooped over, cutting melons, with a 50-pound sack weighing down their shoulders. They object to paying 95 cents to pick grapefruit in Arizona. They think 70 cents an hour too much to pay for chopping cotton in the Texas Delta. Yet their neighbors in the State of Arkansas groan under the burden of paying 60 cents an hour for cotton chopping.

This is the reality behind the face of this program. The sweatshop has been driven from our cities and has found refuge on our farms.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for many years the district I represent was the leading cotton producing area in this country. While this is not necessarily true today, there is nevertheless a substantial amount of cotton produced in the blacklands located in the river bottoms. The farmers who produce this cotton need labor, and the local labor force is not sufficient to meet their demands.

While many of these farmers in my district have told me that they believe many perfections could be made in existing law with respect to farm labor, any curtailment of the law, or a repeal of the law would be disastrous to them. Most of the labor performed by the Mexican nationals is known as stoop labor and is of the type which few U.S. citizens will do, or migratory farm labor will perform. In the cotton areas it consists of weeding, hoeing, and picking of the cotton.

Failure to extend this law would be most harmful to the smaller farmers because most of the larger farmers are completely mechanized; or are in a position to recruit migratory labor from great distances and carry out complicated transportation programs. Mr. Chairman, these workers assist in the harvesting of a number of crops, and without them, there would be a dilemma in many States.

The law restricts the use of Mexicans to areas and situations where the Secretary of Labor has found that no American citizens are ready, willing, or able to do the needed work. So, the American worker is protected in every respect. The Secretary must also find that the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American farmworkers and that farmers have made reasonable efforts to obtain domestic labor. So again every protection is afforded the American laborer.

However, it is the interpretations and the regulations which have been promulgated by the Secretary of Labor on these latter restrictions contained in the law which have proved burdensome to the farmer. In spite of this, I believe an extension of the program is in order, and will support the extension.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5497, a bill designed to extend for 2 years the so-called Mexican farm labor import program, Public Law 82–78, is legislation which I cannot support.

Evidence mounts, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of this program poverty competes against poverty to produce more poverty. The program, originally enacted in the 82d Congress in 1951 as a "temporary" measure, is a reason why the American farmworkers, one of the poorest work groups in the United States, were able in calendar 1961 to earn an average of about $880 that year for the 134 days of farmwork they were able to obtain.

True, there are provisions in the existing program designed to mitigate against "adverse effect" upon American farmworkers. But in effect it has depressed farm wages where Mexican farmworkers are employed, as I shall shortly detail.

After all, what else is to be expected when the following can occur: a grower offers employment to American farmworkers at, say, 60 cents an hour. The wage is inadequate to attract American farmworkers. The grower then has only to say that he has been unable to obtain American fieldworkers and seeks permission to import Mexicans, the so-called braceros. In 1962, I am informed that about 227,000 braceros were contracted and recontracted under the program.

At this point, I introduce into the RECORD some statistics relating to the program, which to my mind amply demonstrate that the braceros program is a blight upon the national conscience:

FACT SHEET ON PUBLIC LAW 78

I. How serious are the agricultural users of braceros about eliminating the bracero program?

Peak employment of Mexican nationals

Calendar year:	*Workers*
1942	4,200
1959	291,515

This number should be considered in view of the labor shortage caused by World War II.

II. How Mexican contract nationals destroy wages.

Wages in tomato crop in San Joaquin County?

Calendar year	Picking wages	Employed	
		Number of Mexican national workers	Number of local workers
1955	18 to 32 cents per 50-pound box.	1,000	9,000
1960	11 to 27 cents per 50-pound box.	9,000	1,000

III. How farmers comply with Public Law 78:

Fiscal year 1961

	Number of investigations	Violations
Housing	10,557	[1] 3,474
Vehicles	3,300	(1)
Migrant labor agreement (wages and workin conditions)	4,424	[2] 3,094

[1] ⅓ in violation.

[2] 46 percent in violation.

Source: Page 95, Annual Report, Department of Labor, 1961.

Over 550 employers were declared ineligible to contract for the quarter ending December 31, 1962.

An additional $284,650 recovered in payment of wages to Mexican nationals as a result of the above investigations.

The above is more revealing when one realizes that the small number of compliance officers under the Bureau of Employment Security are so few in number as to make proper enforcement of Public Law 78 an impossibility.

The program also hurts the family farms, as the corporate farms are the principal employers of braceros, and are thus able to cut costs in a way not available to family farms who employ few hired workers. The import farmworker program should be ended for reasons I have just cited and because it aggravates the unemployment situation. It should be permitted to expire when the existing authority for the program ends December 31, 1963.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the May 29, 1963, edition of the Washington Post relating to the problem:

HIRED HANDS

A most impressive list of clergymen, labor leaders, and farm spokesmen have joined in petitioning Congress to put an end to Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the importation of Mexican farm laborers, known as braceros, for seasonal employment on American farms. We think that they are right in asserting that this foreign contract labor program, based on substandard wages, has operated to depress the earnings and the working conditions of American farm labor.

There was sound justification for the enactment of Public Law 78 in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war. The legislation served usefully to limit outrageous exploitation of workers who came into this country illegally from Mexico. At the present time, however, the program operates simply to provide an inexhaustible stream of laborers whose economic misery at home leads them to work for wages which discourage employers from making jobs attractive to domestic workers. There would be no shortage of domestic

> workers today if decent wages and working conditions were offered.
>
> Public Law 78 expires at the end of this year. Legislation now before Congress would extend it for 2 years; and a somewhat queasy Secretary of Labor has uneasily suggested that extension be limited to a single year. We agree with the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture who regard it as "a stinging and hurtful slap in the face to our citizen farmworkers and family farmers" and urge that it be allowed to expire on December 31, 1963.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my opposition to the bill we are presently considering. To extend for another 2 years the authorization for the recruitment of Mexican workers for U.S. farm labor, I feel can only aggravate the present high rate of national unemployment.

When our country is faced with the problem of more than 4 million unemployed Americans, it clearly is not in the national interest to import a quarter-of-a-million Mexicans to additionally burden the internal labor market. I feel a far better method of assuring an adequate work force for those farms where Mexican labor has been employed would be for this Congress to enact a similar program of recruitment, transportation and contracts for American farm workers.

Beyond enacting legislation which is plainly prejudicial to our own American labor market, the provisions of H.R. 5497 also contain adverse consequences for a large segment of our agricultural economy. Because the hired labor costs of large corporation-type farms using Mexican workers are less than those of competing family farms, the value of family farm labor becomes less. Areas which must rely on domestic farmworkers lose their markets to the production of farms with cheaper labor, further depressing farm income.

Born at a time when farmworkers were in short supply, this program performed a necessary function. Now, that need is no longer with us. The importation of Mexican farmworkers should be terminated, thereby, ending a Government subsidy to less than 1 percent of the Nation's farms.

I fully concur in the concise and well stated analysis of this issue contained in the Washington Post editorial included with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5497 even though I come from a district which last year did not use any braceros. However, it is the feeling of representatives of Idaho agriculture that this program has played an important part in making available Texas Mexicans and Navajo Indians for the seasonal work in the sugarbeet and potato industries. Failure to extend the program could result in a shortage of much needed seasonal labor in these two industries.

It is true that the sugarbeet and potato industries in Idaho are becoming more mechanized just as they are throughout the United States. However, I want to point out that it is the larger farmers that are able to mechanize first. It is the more wealthy farmer that can afford a sugarbeet thinning machine and a potato harvester. On the smaller farms the work of thinning sugarbeets and picking potatoes is still done largely by hand. It is these smaller farmers that to a large extent use the migratory labor to accomplish this work. Therefore, I feel that should the law not be extended and the predicted labor shortage follow, it would work a real hardship on the smaller sugarbeet and potato farmers of my State.

For that reason, I join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]; the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]; and the majority of the House Agriculture Committee who after hearing extensive testimony on this matter had only three dissenting votes in recommending that this program be extended.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5497, the Mexican farm labor bill. While it is true that the Mexican farm labor program has provided certain economic advantages to some U.S. farmowners, chiefly in the form of a supply of cheap labor, the disadvantages of continuing the program and the severe hardship that it causes to our rural labor force far outweigh the assistance that it gives to some of our farmers. The program should be allowed to expire.

The rate of unemployment in our rural labor force is 7.3 percent. This is an unhealthy condition that must be corrected by a variety of attacks. But surely the Federal Government has no business being a party to arrangements that aggravate the problem.

There is certainly an element of unfair competition here as well. In effect it is a kind of a subsidy to a few at the expense of the many.

The committee report in favor of the bill sets forth several arguments along the lines that the program has been a boon to the Mexican economy and to Mexican workers. But our problem is the unemployment rate here and conditions of work here. This is not to be considered a foreign aid program for Mexico.

Finally, let us not be led into voting for this bill on the grounds that Americans will not perform stoop labor. This just does not stand up under the evidence. In many cases it is true that the conditions of work and the pay are substandard so that Americans avoid the work and the area, but that is quite different from "will not." Americans are used and entitled to working for a fair wage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963", and inserting "December 31, 1965".

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is purely technical in nature.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 1, line 3, strike out "509" and insert "510".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5497) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 350, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BECKER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BECKER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5497, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 174, answered "present" 1, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—158

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Avery
Baldwin
Barry
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clausen
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Dole
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
Elliott
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Jarman
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Keith
Kilgore
Kornegay
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard

Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meader
Mills
Morris
Moss
Murray
Norblad
Poff
Pool
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Selden
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Watson
Watts
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Younger

NAYS—174

Abele
Addabbo
Ashley
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Donohue
Dulski
Edwards
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Fogarty
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Halpern
Hansen
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Lesinski
Lindsay
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schweiker
Schwengel
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stinson
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Goodling

NOT VOTING—100

Adair
Anderson
Andrews
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bromwell
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Clancy
Collier
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Gray
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Libonati
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Morrison
Morton
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Secrest
Shelley
Shipley
Siler
Snyder
Tupper
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Wharton
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wyman

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Nedzi against.
Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Laird against.
Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Siler against.
Mr. Nygaard for, with Mr. Snyder against.
Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.
Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Tupper against.
Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. McLoskey against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Ostertag against.
Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Collier against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wyman against.
Mr. Minshall for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Bromwell against.
Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Shelley against.
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Goodling against.
Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Andrews for, with Mrs. Kee against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Libonati against.
Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Keogh
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Flood.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Winstead.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and Mr. GUBSER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KING of California and Mr. BURKE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 5497 and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the legislative program for the balance of the week. While I understand that we are to meet on Friday next, the day after tomorrow, if the gentleman could announce the program for next week at this time, I am sure it would be very helpful to all the Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has correctly stated the situation. We intend to adjourn over until Friday but we have no legislative business scheduled for Friday. It is my intention to ask the House adjourn over until Friday and then to adjourn from Friday to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] advises that he will call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 5366, the 1964 appropriation bill for Treasury and Post Office Departments.

Also on Tuesday, the bill H.R. 3496, extending the Reorganization Act of 1949. That will be taken up under an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday, H.R. 6500, the military construction authorization.

Thursday and the balance of the week—the agriculture appropriation bill for 1964.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file the subcommittee's report on the investigation of the $7½ million in securities disappearing from a San Francisco bank and also including individual supplemental and additional views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS: AMERICA'S NO. 1 DOMESTIC ISSUE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the significance of Birmingham—and Greensboro, Raleigh, and others—is that gradualism as a means of eliminating segregation has failed; that moderation and accommodation by themselves are not enough.

As Max Lerner so aptly stated in a recent article appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette:

> There is an authentic Negro revolution going on in America. No moderating words among the Negroes and whites and in the Government can obscure that fact. It is a revolution in the sense that forces which had for some time been operating at a more or less regular pace have now accelerated to the point of a real breakthrough.

Or as Robert Baker stated in his excellent article of May 26 in the Washington Post:

> Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life.

And as the Washington Post itself stated in its lead editorial of May 26:

> It is true, of course, that deprivation and denial have made the Negro imperfectly prepared for full participation in democracy. But that is not his fault and can no longer be made a pretext for more denial and deprivation. The country can choose—must choose for the choice is inescapable—between integration and enmity, between a generous giving of full equality to Negroes or a violent dispute over rights which can no longer be withheld.

Mr. Speaker, there is, in my judgment, no greater task confronting us than to insure that all Americans—regardless of their race, religion, or national origin—have equal opportunities for equal treatment.

It is obvious that despite our progress, a very real gap continues to exist between our goals and our realizations; a gap which must be closed not only because it is economically wasteful, but because it is morally wrong.

Meaningful legislation has been introduced which would enable us to close that gap. I have introduced two bills which I think are of particular importance—one to establish a Federal Commission on Equal Employment Opportunities, and a second to empower the Attorney General to initiate suits on behalf of any person who is being deprived of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, religion or national origin. Other important civil rights measures have been introduced, and I urge that we in this Congress, at this session, meet our responsibilities by passing this legislation and further safeguarding the rights of all Americans.

As the dean of American columnists, Walter Lippmann, stated so incisively in his article of May 28:

> Nobody can have any doubt that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing and in public facilities * * *. The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy * * * of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

Mr. Speaker, the four articles to which I have referred, and a fifth by Ralph McGill appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette, speak pointedly to the problem we are facing, and I commend them to our colleagues' attention:

AMERICAN NEGRO IN AUTHENTIC REVOLUTION

(By Max Lerner)

There is an authentic Negro revolution going on in America. No moderating words among the Negroes and whites and in the Government can obscure that fact.

It is a revolution in the sense that forces which had for some time been operating at a more or less regular pace have now accelerated to the point of a real breakthrough. That is the meaning of Birmingham.

The Supreme Court school decision and the others that have followed have been efforts to keep the torrential energy of that revolution channeled. That is what both Kennedys and the Department of Justice staff have been trying to do as well. If they don't succeed, then things can happen at Birmingham that will be uglier than Little Rock and New Orleans and the campus of Ole Miss.

One thing we see clearly now is the perilousness of the path of peace that Martin Luther King and his fellow leaders have chosen. King has undertaken something never quite undertaken before: to use the strategy of nonviolent resistance by the whole of a minority in the midst of a hostile majority, and to do it in one of the centers of the Deep South, in a State with a violently segregationist Governor, and in a city with a tradition of police brutality.

He has undertaken, moreover, something that even Gandhi didn't dare do: to use the mass of Negro children—not only the adolescents in the high schools—but even the little children. Some have charged King with being coldly instrumental in his use of the child as shield, and one can see that the charge might have some basis if the campaign had been in more cynical hands.

PERILOUS LINE

But the whole point of civil disobedience is that you must walk a perilous line between incitement and control. This is where King has proved an impressive disciple of Gandhi. The danger of using the children was not so much that they would be used cynically as that any harm done to them might unleash potential violence and death. As it turned out, the sight of the children marching as crusaders for freedom—which for them meant freedom in the little round of their daily lives, where freedom always counts—shamed many passive and apathetic elders into joining the demonstration. And it jolted many whites, including some of the policemen into a new perspective. Both the Negroes and whites began to see the world in a new light, through the eyes of a little child.

But Dr. King also knows that every movement generates its inevitable excesses, and that so massive a movement of nonviolent resisters may well develop violent ones. That is why he has felt that the problem of controlling the movement is crucial. To have a disciplined revolution without violence is far more difficult than to have an undisciplined one without violence. It was crucial for King to keep himself and his leaders always open to negotiation for a settlement. If violence comes—and even as I write this it may still come if negotiations break down and tempers on both sides wear thin—it will not be the fault of King and the other leaders of his movement.

DEMANDS

The Negro demands are reasonable but firm: to desegregate the business places, to give Negroes a better chance at jobs they can handle, to free the thousands who have been arrested, to set up an interracial committee to prevent further trouble. Something like this has worked in Atlanta, Memphis, and Dallas. Why should it not work in Birmingham and in the remaining southern cities for whom Birmingham will be a test case to follow?

There remains the question of President Kennedy's behavior in the Birmingham crisis. If the crisis is resolved, he will apply to other situations the same tactics of quiet behind-the-scenes work in the I-am-the-leader-of-the-whole-Nation-not-a-segment spirit. If it does not work, he will be berated by those who have asked him to come out with some dramatic statement or action.

WHITE MAN NO LONGER SETTING THE RACIAL PACE

(By Robert E. Baker)

Gustave de Beaumont, the traveling companion of the more renowned Alexis de Tocqueville, wrote in 1835 that the future position of the freed Negro might prove to be the "canker in American society."

"I had seen American society dominated by a prejudice which offended against my reason, my interests, and my heart," Beaumont wrote. "Could this prejudice endure forever?

"I could not believe it. I continued to hear each day that public opinion became more enlightened on this point."

Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life.

Since the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision in 1954, many persons have called the racial issue America's No. 1 domestic problem. But many others didn't really think so; they believed that, somehow, it would go away or be solved gently and absorbed by the passage of time.

Who can honestly say today that this "canker in American society" is not our No. 1 problem?

PATTERNED AFTER GANDHI

In Birmingham, Ala., the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has succeeded, after partial failures elsewhere, in welding together an effective nonviolent action movement that forced concessions from the white community.

Perhaps there is a similarity to the suffragettes, the militant ladies in quest of a vote who hounded President Wilson and filled the jails and refused to eat. But Dr. King and the other leaders of the Negro movement have patterned their actions after Mahatma Gandhi, whose 40 years of passive resistance gained independence for India.

The Gandhian concepts of nonviolent action and civil disobedience were, in a sense, a kind of brinkmanship; although violence was disavowed, it nevertheless was a possibility. The Gandhi movement was at times marked by violence; the Negro demonstrations in Birmingham also have had violence.

The significance of the Birmingham movement is not the small concession extracted from the white community. It is the massiveness of the Negro demonstrations that punctured the white man's comforting belief that Negroes generally are satisfied with the pace of things and that militant "outside agitators" are the only cause of unrest. Local Negroes filled the jails to overflowing.

BIRMINGHAM NOT ALONE

Birmingham, the symbol of Deep South segregation, is not alone. Perhaps more significant are the Negro demonstrations and protests in Greensboro, Raleigh, and Durham, N.C., and Nashville, Tenn., Southern cities that Negroes a few months ago had called "good cities" because white leaders had shown moderation and accommodation.

These good cities are finding out that accommodation is not enough; that a city with a good reputation in racial relations today can have trouble tomorrow.

And in the North, too, the Negro is stirring because the absence of segregation laws is not enough. Negro students in Englewood, N.J., have been crashing white schools daily to protest the northern pattern of geographical segregation that locks them in an inferior status and commits them to an inferior future as surely as southern law, policy, and resistance.

In Chicago, Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims, told a reporter who obviously represented the white man:

"You are our worst enemy. We are tired of suffering, brutality, beatings, killings, just because you don't like us, and just hate us, and absolutely knowing that we are powerless to resist because you have every odd against us."

EXTREME POINT OF VIEW

This is the extreme Negro point of view that refers to Dr. King and the demonstrators as "beggars." But a white southerner who sought out Negro intellectuals while he was attending Harvard University recently was stunned to discover that, while they did not embrace the Black Muslim philosophy of complete separation from the enemy white man, neither would they turn their back on it.

James Baldwin was a relatively little known Negro novelist and essayist until recently when his words caught the ears of a massive white audience in a remarkable article in the New Yorker magazine and a subsequent book.

"The Negroes of this country may never be able to rise to power, but they are very well placed indeed to precipitate chaos and ring down the curtain on the American dream," he wrote. And, again:

"It must be added that the Negro himself no longer believes in the good faith of white Americans—if, indeed, he ever could have."

Perhaps Baldwin overstates the case. But his words are symptomatic of the frustration and irritation and growing determination of the Negro in America today.

FAILURE OF GRADUALISM

What do all these demonstrations and all these words mean?

They mark the failure of gradualism to solve the race issue. The Supreme Court packaged gradualism into its school cases in 1955 when it ordered desegregation with all deliberate speed.

But in the South, the white leaders in many cases have done the least they could do, rather than the most, within their set of circumstances. While progress from the white point of view may have been considered adequate or even remarkable, from the Negro point of view it has been disastrously slow. In the North, the Negro is registering his frustration with the black ghetto of the cities where the basic disease of discrimination is creating new victims faster than rehabilitation programs can treat them.

The Negro has often found that negotiations, on subjects from schools to lunch counters, have resulted in stalling or hollow victories.

MORE THAN TOLERATION

At this point, the white man is no longer setting the pace. The old approaches are no longer satisfactory. The Negro, with his growing unity and determination and demonstrations, is choosing the time and the place.

The Negro is looking for more than toleration. In Birmingham, the city's most influential and powerful executives recently issued a statement calling for an end to irresponsibility, violence and hate because it was keeping back the economic growth of the community.

In the circumstances, it was a welcomed action. Yet many Negroes assessed it as a hollow victory; the white people were not desegregating because it was right but because of their pocketbooks.

Some white people saw it that way, too. The Reverend Louis L. Mitchell, Jr., told the wealthy congregation of St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Birmingham last Sunday that settlement of the race issue for economic reasons was really Marxian in emphasis.

"We must affirm categorically a more excellent reason for solution to our crisis," he said and cited, as that reason, that segregation is immoral.

It seems apparent that Negro frustration and determination are developing into a genuine mass movement with nationwide impact. Negroes and whites have the responsibility for seeing that violence does not occur and that progress does.

Negro leaders must constantly reevaluate their tactics so that never will their sleeping giant, now awakened, get out of control. White leaders must accelerate the pace of desegregation and do the most, not the least, that is possible.

It is the responsibility of government, churches, politicians, businessmen, everyone.

A NATURAL YEARNING

Lewis W. White is a young Negro schoolteacher who was reared and educated in Birmingham. After the 5 weeks of demonstrations, the truce, the bombing and the riot, he sat down and put his thoughts on paper. He wrote:

"The natural yearning to attain the full status of man, a full and deserving partner in the grand and guarded experiment called democracy, this can be said to be the real and sincere design of America's problem minority: the Negro."

He wrote that the white camp is composed of a majority that engages the enemy with delay or violence and a minority of moderates not strong enough to bring about fundamental changes. The demonstrations, he said, are resorted to by the Negro "to shame his white brethren into living true to the white man's very own concept of equality before the law, full participation commensurate with ability and desire in the democratic venture."

The young Negro then called for the emergence of "superhumans committed to design a better world.

"It is surely the influence and ideas of these men which must be hastened into action," he wrote, "or the next century will accord us the same sense of frustration and guilt that has too long been Birmingham's yoke to bear."

He was writing about Birmingham. He could have been writing about the Nation.

THE PROMISED LAND

"Patience" has become an ugly word to many Negroes. Their leaders can no longer use it. And from white leaders, it stirs only exasperation. American Negroes have been incredibly patient—waiting for the freedom promised a hundred years ago when their emancipation was proclaimed, waiting for the political enfranchisement and civil rights promised when the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were solemnly ratified, waiting for the schooling promised when the Supreme Court recognized nearly a decade back that segregation cannot be equality.

All these years Negroes have waited patiently to cross into the promised land. They are not going to wait quietly any longer. James Baldwin put it very simply: "There's a bill that's been due in this country for a long time. Now, with Birmingham, it's come in and it's got to be paid."

The question is how the bill to be paid—in rancor and bitterness or in generosity and brotherhood. It is true, of course, that deprivation and denial have made the Negro imperfectly prepared for full participation in democracy. But that is not his fault and can no longer be made a pretext for more denial and deprivation. The country can choose—must choose, for the choice is inescapable—between integration and enmity, between a generous giving of full equality to Negroes or a violent dispute over rights which can no longer be withheld.

That choice by the white community will determine the choice by Negroes between leaders who counsel rational restraint and disciplined striving and respect for the community's best values on the one hand, and leaders who preach hatred and vengefulness on the other. There are no other choices. Negroes can no longer be kept in subjugation. They have liberated themselves. They can be welcomed or rejected; but one way or the other, their bill has got to be paid.

There are ways in which integration can be eased and speeded. The country has indulged in a catastrophic lethargy about this problem over the past decade. The judicial branch of the Government has been left to take the initiative without appropriate assertion of the moral imperatives on the part of Congress, the Executive or the State governments. Under the Kennedy administration, there have been gestures toward the recognition of Negro aspirations by the appointment of numerous exceptional Negroes to public office; and there has been energetic intervention by the Department of Justice when specific situations got out of hand, but now much more is needed.

Civil rights legislation is now under consideration, and two bills were introduced in the Senate on Thursday by Senators COOPER and DODD empowering the Attorney General to take action in the courts in behalf of individuals subjected to discrimination in the public schools or in places of public accommodation. This legislation would be useful if it were now in force. Consideration of it at this juncture is a little like consideration of a bill to purchase a fire engine when the town hall is aflame. Nevertheless, it ought to be enacted, and promptly, as an evidence of congressional concern and to put an additional weapon in the Justice Department armory.

But the great need now, we believe, is for dynamic national leadership to tell the country of its crisis and to win public opinion to support the dramatic changes that must take place. All through the South there are men of generosity and vision ready to throw off the shackles that have held the white people as well as the colored people of the area in servitude to an outmoded social order. If it is hard to hear their voices over the raucous bellowings of the Orval Faubuses, the Ross Barnetts, the Bull Connors, the George Wallaces, they are beginning, nevertheless, to make themselves heard.

These men, the leaders of business and industry and the professions in a hundred southern cities, are the potential shapers of the South's future. In Little Rock, in Jackson, in Birmingham, in Atlanta—and even in advance of crisis in Raleigh and Charlottesville, and Salisbury and many another town—these men have recognized reality despite the posturings of political leaders clinging to an impossible past.

And in the North as well, there are enlightened business and professional men who are well aware that the ghetto slums and the school dropouts and the closed doors of opportunity are a blight upon the whole community, not upon its Negro elements alone. These men can be mobilized, must be mobilized, to meet the most crucial social challenge of the day.

The President of the United States ought to appeal to these men and women all over America for support in a great undertaking. He can enlist the upwelling sense of decency and fairness among ordinary Americans in a crusade to rid this country, once and for all, of the poison of racial discrimination. He can set an example by the use of every power and instrumentality at his command to end discrimination in schools, in housing, in employment, in the right to vote. He must summon his countrymen now, while there is yet time, to the attainment of a peaceful revolution—and the avoidance of such disgraceful disasters as Birmingham.

If all this is done, if there is set before American Negroes not a vague promise of future concessions but a specific assertion of recognized rights at the highest level of political authority, then a little more patience can be exhorted, and the River Jordan can be crossed in harmony and order. This indeed would then become a promised land for all Americans, regardless of color.

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Suddenly, as it were, the struggle of the Negroes toward equality of status in American society has taken a sharp turn.

The demonstrations in Birmingham have proved to be something more than the work of outsiders playing upon the imaginary grievances of otherwise docile and contented masses. Nobody can now doubt that the grievances are genuine and are deep under the rule of such men as "Bull" Connor and Governor Wallace. And nobody can have any doubt either that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and that they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing, and in the public facilities.

For a hundred years since Lincoln freed the slaves, this country has relied upon the education of the Negroes and the persuasion of the whites to bring about that equality of status to which it is committed. We are now realizing that the present rate of change will not be fast enough. The redress of the grievances of the Negroes is for the new generation too slow in coming. History teaches us that when this point is reached in the struggle for what men regard as their just rights a revolutionary condition exists.

Then the supreme questions are posed. Will the ruling and privileged classes take command of the coming changes? Or will they cling to their privileges and become the immovable object in collision with an irresistible force?

The white people of this country, not only the white people of Alabama and Mississippi, are now at that crucial point where they must answer those questions. They must choose, on the one hand, between leading the movement toward equality of status and, on the other hand, standing aside and letting matters be decided by collisions between the Negro agitators and the "Bull" Connors.

The Negro rebellion is now led by men like Martin Luther King who preach and practice the Gandhian doctrine of nonviolence. It is a difficult doctrine in any country, and this is a rather violent country. The doctrine worked effectively in British India. But there the ruling power was under the restraint of the long British habit of constitutionalism.

We cannot count upon nonviolence persisting in the face of brutal and illiterate resistance. The outstanding danger is not that there may be rioting and brawling. For these can be suppressed. The outstanding danger is a loss of confidence by the Negro people in the good faith of the white people. This is where the turning point lies at the present time.

If confidence is lost that there is a legitimate remedy for genuine grievances, there will be lost at the same time confidence in the doctrine of nonviolence. What will come after that it is unpleasant to contemplate.

But those among us who are capable of learning from history will do well to remember what happened in Ireland and what happened in Palestine before the grievances of the Irish and of the Jews were redressed, and also to reflect on what is boiling under the surface in those parts of Africa where black inferiority is imposed.

The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy as it was laid down under Eisenhower and continued under Kennedy. This is the policy of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

I think this is the direction in which the President and his brother, the Attorney General, are now moving. They should move directly and boldly and take command of a cause which cannot now be left to irresponsible people. If it is still possible, and I think it is, to hold and even to recover the confidence of the Negroes in the good faith of the whites, then this is the basic principle by which to do it. It is to make plain by word and deed that the Negroes are no longer a weak and isolated minority trying to push the Nation into doing what the national law and American principles require it to do.

Then, because the national power is behind the movement toward equality of status, that national power, which will be more than sufficient, can be exercised without violence, with wisdom, and with restraint. For it is the very weak rebels who feel that they must resort to the extreme measures.

AGONY CONTINUES IN SOUTH'S CHURCHES

(By Ralph McGill)

In the South the agony of the church continues.

With certain notable and magnificent exceptions, the harsh and uncomfortable fact is that a majority of the Christian churches in the South continue to constitute the single greatest roadblock, not merely to the first great commandment, but also to the necessary amelioration of the racial problem as it relates to the simple matter of attending church.

Some southern churches have made bouncers of their ushers, reminding at least some writers of letters to the editors of the barroom or nightclub bouncers who bodily carry or throw out patrons who are no longer welcome. That such examples have been largely, but not entirely, confined to the most evangelical Protestant divisions that have a really superlative record of foreign missions support, particularly in Africa, serves merely to emphasize the agony of the situation, the bewilderment and chagrin of many of the members, and the guilt-anger and resentment of those responsible for the decisions to have ushers acting as bouncers at the church door.

Probably the greater agony is experienced by at least some of the ministers involved. In the South "the preacher" occupies a position of status perhaps higher than the ministers of other regions. Many of them write well-read religious columns for newspapers. Others appear on radio and television to proclaim the compassion and love of Christ and to assert that the outspread arms and hands of the Nazarene are for all peoples.

The statement, "Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden and I will refresh you," is a part of, or implicit in, every sermon, communion, newspaper column, TV, or radio sermon. Yet, these columns and broadcasts jar harshly with church doors closed to colored visitors. The spectacle of colored visitors being dragged from churches does violence to the principles of Christianity and makes preposterous the position of missionaries in Africa. It subjects such missionaries to mocking laughter and contempt.

Perhaps most pathetic are the explanations. It is said, "They came just to test us." "They came just to cause trouble." "They came merely for publicity." Herein is exposed the enormous burden of guilt. The truth is, as even those who have resorted to the techniques of the bouncer would admit, that those who have come have done so quietly and with no visible evidence of wishing to test or cause trouble. If admitted, they would have sat quietly through the services.

And, to be honest, if visitors did come for a test, what is the church welcoming committee and ushers to do about that, except to meet the test with Christian principle? Do they or the ministers have radar eyes to see into souls and minds? How do they know whom to admit and whom to send to the basement?

It would seem that it is a very dangerous thing to claim that the visitors came to test them. Perhaps they did. Has the Negro visitor who was bodily removed or refused admission failed any test?

The most melancholy aspect of such agony of church and private school in the South is that it is unnecessary. A growing body of experience testifies that by quietly and honestly meeting the test of what is right, one may avoid the impossible task of trying to serve both God and the building committee.

IT'S KHRUSHCHEV'S MONROE DOCTRINE NOW

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to adopt the reasoning and wording as my own of a recent statement made by Robert Morris, of Dallas, Tex.

Khrushchev has proclaimed his own Monroe Doctrine by telling us and everyone else to keep hands off Cuba. If we do not, he will pulverize us. That is clear enough.

Even more significant though, is his statement that the United States should adhere to its promises of last October or face a more serious crisis than that of last year.

There are Americans who still believe that the Monroe Doctrine is an instrument of our policy, not Khrushchev's. They know that we have signed a string of solemn treaties, under the OAS, whereby we pledged not to allow Soviet ideology, much less Soviet power, to be established in Cuba or anywhere else in the hemisphere.

Listening to Khrushchev, one might conclude that the United States has unilaterally repealed these treaties and the Monroe Doctrine itself and that Khrushchev, reflecting the posture of world communism, has jumped into the resulting diplomatic vacuum and converted even the Monroe Doctrine to his own use.

Are not the American people entitled to know what our policy is? Should not the correspondence between the President and Khrushchev of last October and later, be released to us? That would tell the story.

There is certainly no security involved because our enemy has the files. "Security" is often given as the pretext for withholding vital data from the American people. But here, that obviously cannot be the case.

Khrushchev has now publicly invoked the promises the United States made last October. Is not it time for the President to declare, if that is the case, that we have made no promises and release the correspondence as proof?

If we cannot do that, we will be made to look suspect in the eyes of the world, and particularly the OAS nations with whom we have solemn treaties pledging the contrary of what Khrushchev contends.

Actually, I cannot comprehend how the United States could unilaterally promise Khrushchev that we would break the treaties with the OAS nations. It would be illegal to do so. A promise, under the circumstances, would seem to be invalid under law as we have known it.

Castro keeps telling us that he will acquire Guantanamo Naval Base through the International Court of Justice. Maybe he knows that the International Court of Justice, with two Khrushchev judges on the bench, will have different standards of right and wrong than have existed in the past. Maybe such a body would make what looks wrong today right tomorrow.

The one explanation that I have heard for withholding the correspondence is that it would make Khrushchev lose face in the eyes of the world. This seems as fantastic as the thesis of the chief policy planner of the State Department, Walt W. Rostow, that communism is mellowing and that it should be helped in this process as we are helping it in Poland, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere.

Now that Khrushchev has once again said he will pulverize us let us have a look at the correspondence. Then we can know what our policy is. Otherwise, we must remain confused.

This does not look to the past. It looks to the future. Unless we have a Caribbean policy, how can we contend with Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic who is now carrying out a nationalization policy and building up a militia in a fashion that strongly resembles Castro's buildup to power.

Those responsible statesmen and Senators who contend that we should recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, make an excellent point. If there is a Cuban government-in-exile, it could be the focus of all the moral issues that devolve about Cuba in the councils of the world and of world opinion. It could be the rallying point of all Cuban exiles who are now suspicious and crestfallen. This government-in-exile could have its own information service, its own radio station. It could tell the Cuban people the truth about Castro—and Khrushchev. Our recognizing a Cuban government-in-exile would put us back in a legal stance with respect to the Monroe Doctrine and the OAS treaties.

But all of this would not be possible if the President did make a promise to Khrushchev. Nor would it be possible if Walt Rostow's policy paper, which indicates we should give no encouragement to the captive peoples is indeed our policy.

We have a right to know. This involves our children's future.

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development.

This Commission would study the operation of the foreign assistance program and seek to identify impediments to investment of private capital overseas. It would recommend to the President and to the Congress, policies and programs to make our aid program more effective and facilitate an increased contribution to economic development abroad by the American business community.

Monday afternoon, I will appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee, to which I assume my bill will be referred, to give testimony on H.R. 5490. I will urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to incorporate my proposal to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development in the bill which they report to the House for continuation of the foreign aid program.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6679

A bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress declares that a primary purpose of programs of foreign assistance is to raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free countries to develop their resources and improve their productivity. It is the purpose of this Act to discover ways to stimulate the creative energies of free peoples, including the fullest use of free private enterprise, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION; DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) COMMISSION ESTABLISHED.—There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Development (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in section 1, the Commission, after a complete study and investigation, shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies, and administrative and other reforms, calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States, and the conduct of trade and commerce in such countries, and between such countries and other free countries, including the United States. The study and investigation by the Commission shall include a study of the operation of the programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, with a view to determining the impact of such programs upon investment of private capital in other free countries. The Commission shall give particular attention to developing programs and policies calculated to eliminate or minimize the restrictions, hazards, and other impediments, foreign and domestic (including monopolistic and restrictive trade practices) which inhibit such investment, trade, and commerce, and to provide incentives for such investment, trade, and commerce.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Two Members of the Senate of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Vice President; and

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CERTAIN LAWS INAPPLICABLE TO COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

SEC. 8. The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 203, 205, or 207 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) COMMITTEES.—The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

(b) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

(d) SUBPENA POWER.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 11. The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1966.

INTERAMA WILL FOCUS WORLD ATTENTION ON AMERICAN CULTURAL STRUCTURE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Interama is the first international exposition which will be permanent and which will focus world attention on the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our American way of life—our progress with freedom.

It will be located in Miami, Fla., in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, and is scheduled to open in 1965.

Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments and industries of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding, and provide a center for the continuous exchange of cultures, ideas, and people.

Interama will portray the American way of life, our progress with freedom and will show, through dynamic exhibits and live performances what the Americas have achieved, without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom, within the framework of Democratic institutions.

Interama, the popular short name which means Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, will be a showcase of life in the Americas with exhibits and events, constantly updated and revised to reflect the achievements and goals of the peoples of the Americas.

One section of Interama—the international area—will be devoted to the U.S. and foreign governments—specifically to the Latin American governments; another section—the international area—will be devoted to industry; a third, the cultural area, will be devoted to culture and educational activities; and a fourth, the festival area, will be devoted to recreation and amusement.

It is in connection with the U.S. participation in this splendid project that I address myself today.

The Members of this honorable body will be interested, I am sure, in the following public utterances in recent days by the Senate of the State of Florida, by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., and by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka:

SENATE MEMORIAL 955

A memorial to the President of the United States requesting the President of the United States to approve participation of the United States with a Federal exhibit in Interama and to assist the Latin American nations to participate in Interama

Whereas the past decade has witnessed great progress in Florida's permanent population and economic growth and in the establishment of close friendly relations with our Latin American neighbors; and

Whereas Florida is attracting many more millions of visitors from all parts of the United States and from nations throughout the world; and

Whereas the State of Florida has established an agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, to create and build Interama, the first permanent international exposition to portray the American way of life—progress with freedom—to show what the Americas have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom within the framework of democratic institutions; and

Whereas Interama will be an ever-changing showcase of life in the Americas and will reflect the accomplishments and aspirations of the peoples of the Americas through dynamic exhibits, events, and live performances that are constantly revised and updated; and

Whereas Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments and industries of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding and provide a continuous exchange of cultures, ideas, and peoples; and

Whereas Interama will be worldwide in scope with special emphasis on the exhibits and pavilions of the nations of the other Americas; and

Whereas Interama has been endorsed by the Latin American nations and the spirit and substance of Interama's goals parallel and support those of the Alliance for Progress; and

Whereas the construction and operation of Interama has been proven economically feasible based on studies made by responsible survey organizations; and

Whereas Interama will contribute substantially to the progress and the economy of the United States and the State of Florida: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That on behalf of the people of the State of Florida this legislature does commend to the President of the United

States, John F. Kennedy, to view with favor and to approve the participation of the United States with a Federal exhibit in Interama and to assist the Latin American nations to participate in Interama to make it a showplace for the people of the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the U.S. Congress.

RESOLUTION 8640

Resolution requesting the President of the United States to approve the U.S. participation in Interama by providing a Federal exhibit and by assisting in the construction of exhibits of Latin American Nations

Whereas the prosperity of the United States requires the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Latin American Republics; and

Whereas international friendship and trade are founded upon the good will and mutual respect of the people of one nation for those of others, and must be based primarily upon extensive and direct personal contact and understanding; and

Whereas the natural expansion of our trade with Latin America, without subsidy or compulsion, will sustain employment and production and improve living standards both in the United States and in Latin America, preventing the infiltration of undemocratic philosophies in Latin America while promoting mutual good will, understanding and confidence, lasting trade connections, and solidarity among all the American Republics; and

Whereas, the State of Florida has established as a State agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, to create and maintain Interama in Dade County, Fla., as the first permanent international exposition to portray the American way of life—"Progress With Freedom"—to show what the Americans have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties or individual freedom within the framework of democratic institutions; and

Whereas Interama will be a showcase of life in the Americas and will reflect the accomplishments and aspirations of the peoples of the Americas through dynamic exhibits, events, and live performances that will be constantly revised and updated; and

Whereas Interama will bring together, under freedom, the governments, industries, and cultures of the Americas in a spirit of good will and understanding and provide a continuous exchange of ideas and peoples; and

Whereas Interama has been endorsed by the Congress of the United States and by Latin American nations and the spirit and substance of Interama's goals parallel and support those of the Alliance for Progress; and

Whereas the State of Florida, Dade County, and the city of Miami have already donated substantial moneys and contributed land which is now being developed as the Interama site, and the proposed construction and operation of Interama have been proven economically feasible based on studies made by responsible survey organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., That on behalf of the people of Dade County, this board does hereby respectfully request the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to approve the participation of the United States of America in Interama by authorizing the construction and operation of an appropriate Federal exhibit pavilion at Interama and by assisting the countries of Latin America in constructing their own national exhibits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the U.S. Congress.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE CITY OF OPA-LOCKA, FLA., ENDORSING THE INTERAMA PROJECT

Whereas it is apparent that the best interest of the citizens of this area and of our Nation will be better served by the completion of the Interama project as soon as possible, the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka does endorse this project for the following reasons:

1. The improvement of relations with the Latin American nations, with whom the Miami area is in close touch, so that the Miami area may become the true "Gateway to the Americas."
2. That it will improve our area's economy.
3. That it will boost the income in this area thereby triggering its development and expansion.
4. That it will provide necessary jobs, particularly in the construction field where most of the need now lies.
5. That this chamber is extremely optimistic about the benefits of Interama and feels that it will not only increase the prestige of this area and of our Nation in the eyes of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka, Fla., That the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Opa-locka does hereby endorse the Interama project and urges such action by our Federal Government as may be necessary to implement the project.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be put over until a week from today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation offered today would grant the GI bill educational entitlement of World War II and Korean conflict veterans who were unable to use these benefits to the children of these veterans. The amount of benefits to each child would be determined by the veteran himself or, if he is deceased or incompetent, by the other parent or the guardian in a manner to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Many World War II and Korean conflict veterans have told me that one of their greatest regrets is that they were not able to take advantage of the educational opportunities afforded by the GI bill. The raising of families, the necessity of engaging in full-time work, the impossibility of relocating near educational institutions, and other valid reasons prevented numerous veterans from taking advantage of a law intended to mutually benefit them and the Nation.

It seems fitting and proper that the children of these veterans should be given the advantage their parents were not able to experience. At a time when so much attention is being focused on education as one of the most important elements in the interest of national survival, it is appropriate that Congress consider legislation which has the purpose of honoring those who served our country in the past by means of extending a helping hand to those who will serve it in the future.

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the very well reasoned thoughts of Walter Lippmann in his column, appearing in the Washington Post and Times-Herald, Tuesday, May 28, in which he states that the cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, but "must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government." Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Lippmann's column with my remarks in the RECORD:

THE NEGROES AND THE NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Suddenly, as it were, the struggle of the Negroes toward equality of status in American society has taken a sharp turn.

The demonstrations in Birmingham have proved to be something more than the work of outsiders playing upon the imaginary grievances of otherwise docile and contented masses. Nobody can now doubt that the grievances are genuine and are deep under the rule of such men as Bull Connor and Governor Wallace. And nobody can have any doubt either that the new generation of American Negroes are shedding the mentality of slaves and that they will not accept quietly an imposed inferiority in education, in jobs, in housing, and in the public facilities.

For a hundred years since Lincoln freed the slaves, this country has relied upon the education of the Negroes and the persuasion of the whites to bring about that equality of status to which it is committed. We are now realizing that the present rate of change will not be fast enough. The redress of the grievances of the Negroes is for the new generation too slow in coming. History teaches us that when this point is reached in the struggle for what men regard as their just rights a revolutionary condition exists.

Then the supreme questions are posed. Will the ruling and privileged classes take command of the coming changes? Or will they cling to their privileges and become the immovable object in collision with an irresistible force?

The white people of this country, not only the white people of Alabama and Mississippi, are now at that crucial point where they must answer those questions. They must choose, on the one hand, between leading the movement toward equality of status and, on the other hand, standing aside and letting matters be decided by collisions between the Negro agitators and the Bull Connors.

The Negro rebellion is now led by men like Martin Luther King who preach and practice the Gandhian doctrine of nonviolence. It is a difficult doctrine in any country, and this is a rather violent country. The doctrine worked effectively in British India. But there the ruling power was under the restraint of the long British habit of constitutionalism.

We cannot count upon nonviolence persisting in the face of brutal and illiterate resistance. The outstanding danger is not that there may be rioting and brawling. For these can be suppressed. The outstanding danger is a loss of confidence by the Negro people in the good faith of the white people. This is where the turning point lies at the present time.

If confidence is lost that there is a legitimate remedy for genuine grievances, there will be lost at the same time confidence in the doctrine of nonviolence. What will come after that it is unpleasant to contemplate.

But those among us who are capable of learning from history will do well to remember what happened in Ireland and what happened in Palestine before the grievances of the Irish and of the Jews were redressed, and also to reflect on what is boiling under the surface in those parts of Africa where black inferiority is imposed.

The time has come when there must be a change in the American policy as it was laid down under Eisenhower and continued under Kennedy. This is the policy of leaving desegregation, which is a national commitment, to the conflict between private law suits and local authorities. The cause of desegregation must cease to be a Negro movement, blessed by white politicians from the Northern States. It must become a national movement to enforce national laws, led and directed by the National Government.

I think this is the direction in which the President and his brother, the Attorney General, are now moving. They should move directly and boldly and take command of a cause which cannot now be left to irresponsible people. If it is still possible, and I think it is, to hold and even to recover the confidence of the Negroes in the good faith of the whites, then this is the basic principle by which to do it. It is to make plain by word and deed that the Negroes are no longer a weak and isolated minority trying to push the Nation into doing what the national law and American principles require it to do.

Then, because the national power is behind the movement toward equality of status, that national power, which will be more than sufficient, can be exercised without violence, with wisdom, and with restraint. For it is the very weak rebels who feel that they must resort to the extreme measures.

THE NEGRO'S FUTURE IN THE SOUTH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report carries an interview with Gov. Ross R. Barnett, of Mississippi. This article contains a great deal of factual information which should lay at rest the many unfounded rumors and downright falsehoods constantly appearing in the national press.

The real story in Mississippi today is that 2 million white and Negro citizens are working harmoniously together for the economic betterment of both races.

Mr. Speaker, this trend will continue so long as we have the right to control our own destiny; or, until we are deprived of the right to be governed with our own consent.

I commend this article to the attention of the House:

INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNOR BARNETT OF MISSISSIPPI: THE NEGRO'S FUTURE IN THE SOUTH

(NOTE.—With pressure against racial barriers growing, is the South changing in its attitude toward the Negroes? If left to themselves, what would States such as Mississippi do about the drive for mixed schools, mixed restaurants, all the other campaigns aimed against segregation? Is a real solution to the racial problem possible without conflict and violence? To get the viewpoint of a State political leader, U.S. News & World Report invited Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, to its conference room for this exclusive interview by members of the magazine's news staff.)

Question. Governor Barnett, does the Negro in Mississippi, or in any other Southern State, have much of a future?

Answer. Yes, he does. The Negro who takes advantage of his educational opportunities and otherwise prepares himself for responsibilities has every reason to look forward to a bright future and a higher standard of living in any section of the South.

Question. As good a future as in the North?

Answer. Frankly, I think he'd have a better future in the South than in the North.

Question. Why do you say that?

Answer. Take Negro schoolteachers, for example: In Mississippi we have one Negro schoolteacher to every 119 Negro citizens. In New York, I am told, there is one Negro schoolteacher to every 500 Negro citizens and in Ohio one Negro teacher to every 485 Negro citizens. So there is one example that I think is outstanding.

Question. What other opportunities do Negroes have in the South?

Answer. In Mississippi, as in other States of the South, we have many Negro professional people, such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, dentists, undertakers, ministers, social workers, nurses and many others.

In addition, we have Negroes who own their own businesses—quite a number of them, wealthy businessmen. They own real estate. In Mississippi, there are more than 27,000 Negro farmers who own title to land valued at approximately $100 million. More than 27 percent of the privately owned homes in Mississippi are owned by Negroes.

Question. How many Negroes are there in Mississippi?

Answer. About 43 percent of the population is Negro; 57 percent is white. Two years ago it was about 45 percent Negro and 55 percent white.

Question. Then are Negroes leaving Mississippi?

Answer. Some have left, yes. But they are not leaving in great numbers.

Question. What kinds of people are leaving?

Answer. I think the better-educated Negroes are staying. Our statistics show that a higher percentage of the graduates of Jackson State College for Negroes remain in Mississippi after graduation than the graduates of any other State-supported college for either race. We believe that the better-educated Negroes stay in Mississippi because they find it easier to secure employment in the fields for which they are qualified.

Those Negroes who leave Mississippi are usually those unskilled in any type of trade or profession.

Question. Why do they leave?

Answer. We consider the lack of farm employment as one of the principal reasons for migration of Negro laborers into other areas. Farm mechanization and Government restrictions on cotton acreage have eliminated many farm jobs. Most of these migrants from the South have gone to big cities of the North.

Question. Do you think that a wider distribution of the Negro population outside the South would be a good thing?

Answer. It would be for the South, yes. Then the North and East would better understand our problem.

Question. Do you mean you think the South would be better off with fewer Negroes?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Then would you prefer it if the Negroes left the South?

Answer. No. I'm not wanting them to leave. We value our Negro citizens. But they have the freedom of choice to remain in the South or to move elsewhere.

Question. What about schools for Negroes? Are they given an opportunity to get an education in the South?

Answer. Oh, yes, sir. As far as schools are concerned, our Negro students can receive an education just as good as any other student right up through liberal-arts degrees in colleges.

Question. Do you have colleges for Negroes?

Answer. We have three State-supported colleges for Negroes in Mississippi. At Jackson State College for Negroes, in Jackson, the State capital, they have about 1,700 Negro students. Alcorn A. & M. College at Lorman, near Utica, Miss., was the first senior land-grant college for Negroes ever built in the United States. It has about 1,450 students. Then we also have the Mississippi College for Negroes at Itta Bena, Miss., with around 1,200 students.

Question. Are these colleges accredited?

Answer. Two of them are. Jackson State College and Alcorn A. & M. are fully accredited by, and are members of, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Mississippi Vocational at Itta Bena is a new institution and has not yet attained membership in the Southern Association.

All three are accredited by the Mississippi Association of Colleges and Schools and by the accrediting commission of the State of Mississippi.

I'll show you, gentlemen, how good we are to the Negroes: Since 1952, Mississippi has spent at least $100 million in building school facilities on a State level, $90 million on a local level. And 63 percent of that money went into construction of Negro school facilities.

At the college level during 1960–62 the State money spent for new buildings averaged $497 per Negro student compared with $372 per white student. Tax money provided for general support of public higher education was $580 per white student and $622 per Negro student.

Question. Was that to bring Negro schools up to the standards of the schools for whites?

Answer. It's a continuing gradual improvement. You know, until the Civil War, the Negroes were slaves, illiterate. But they've come a long way since the end of the War Between the States. Proof of the increasing quality of education in our Negro schools is the increasing number of Negro teachers who qualify for higher degrees. We now have 7,382 Negro teachers with a master's degree or above.

Question. What about professional training or graduate study? Can Negroes get that in Mississippi colleges or do they have to go outside the State?

Answer. Well, in some instances they have to go to schools outside the State. A legislative grant was passed in 1948 and went into effect in 1949. The grant provides for students who want to take up medicine, law, architecture, engineering and other courses not available in our colleges for Negro students.

The amount of grant varies from $100 to $500 per year. We pay the difference in the amount a college out of State would charge for the course, as compared to the charge in Mississippi. Travel, tuition and living expenses are provided for in the grant. Over 5,000 Negro students have been aided by this program.

Question. The only school integration you have in Mississippi is at the University of Mississippi, isn't it?

Answer. Ole Miss is not integrated today, gentlemen.

Question. But one Negro, James Meredith, is enrolled in the university——

Answer. You know what he says, don't you—that he's the most segregated Negro in America.

Question. Has he opened the door to larger integration? Do you see the time coming when there will be integration in the University of Mississippi on a broader scale?

Answer. No.

Question. People in the North usually take the position that the question of school integration, including colleges, has been settled by the U.S. Supreme Court, and the people up here keep asking: "Why don't the people of Mississippi obey the law of the land?" How would you answer that?

Answer. With all due respect to the Supreme Court—and I have the utmost respect for all courts—the 1954 decision in Brown v. Topeka Board of Education is not the law of the land. It's the law of that particular case. And I don't believe there are many lawyers in America who will disagree with me on that.

The 1954 decision applies to that case only. It does not apply to Mississippi or Alabama or Georgia or any other State. These States have their right to their day in court. All cases are just a little different—no two cases are exactly the same.

Question. Do you think that each case of a Negro seeking to enter a white school in Mississippi will have to go through a separate process in court, as James Meredith did? Or will there be a sort of mass entry of Negro students?

Answer. Nobody knows the answer to that.

Question. What would happen if public schools in Mississippi were given a direct court order to desegregate? Would the schools be closed?

Answer. I just don't know. It's legal for them to be closed in Mississippi. The trustees may close the schools. The Governor may close the schools—public schools, that is. But we'll have to wait until we get to that bridge before we cross it. The order hasn't come yet.

"SEPARATION OF RACES IN EDUCATION IS BEST FOR BOTH RACES"

Question. Why is the South so strongly opposed to integration of public schools?

Answer. We believe that separation of the races in public education is the best for both races. Because of our population ratio, if we integrate our classrooms we will have some classes predominantly Negro and some classes predominantly white. We know that a student can learn and develop himself into a good citizen if he acquires his education among classmates of his own race, with a teacher of his own race. The disgraceful situation in Washington, D.C., and other big cities where desegregation has been the final result of forced integration further proves our point that tensions exist in heavily integrated classrooms.

In the report on official investigation of the Thanksgiving Day football riot at the District of Columbia stadium, published in U.S. News & World Report, it was revealed that 316 whites and 30 negroes were injured. In addition, 145 persons reported being pushed, shoved and slapped. There were broken noses, broken jaws, dislocated jaws, and teeth knocked out. This was a deplorable racial outburst in our Nation's capital.

Question. Governor, can you foresee a time when there will be desegregation in Mississippi?

Answer. No, sir. I hope that it will never come. Do you want to know why? Because, gentlemen, we believe in the purity and the integrity of both races. And everywhere people have integrated long enough and extensively enough, it has absolutely ruined every civilization.

Question. Do you mean that you regard Negroes as inferior and that you feel intermarriage would dilute the quality of the white race?

Answer. That's exactly it. It has happened, gentlemen. History teaches us that it's happened many times.

Question. Do you foresee integration anywhere in the South on any extensive scale?

Answer. No.

WHERE THE PEOPLE STAND

Question. How do you size up the present sentiment of people in Mississippi? Are there more of them who believe in integration now than there were, say, a few years ago?

Answer. I doubt it. The people of our State are firm believers in separation of the races. They are firm and unwavering believers. I don't think many have weakened, though it may be that some were weaker than we thought they were before the 1954 school decision.

Question. There have been reports of a shift in attitude in the South recently—that more and more people there are deciding that integration is inevitable and taking this attitude: "I'm still against it, but it's going to come, so we'd better bring it on our terms instead of the Federal Government's." Do you sense such a shift?

Answer. No, sir, I don't.

Question. You don't think many people in the South feel that way?

Answer. Some weaklings do. Some moderates do. But I think the big majority of the people are still firm in their belief that integration is wrong.

Question. And they don't see it as inevitable?

Answer. No, they don't admit it's inevitable. They think the pendulum will swing back the other way.

Question. Why do they think the pendulum will swing back?

Answer. Because the northern people don't really want integration either. They don't want it any more than we do, even though they say they do. We are honest—we admit that we don't want it. That's the main difference. In the North and in the East they say they want it. They are not honest about it and we are. Now, that's the God's truth about it, gentlemen.

Question. What kind of status does a Negro have in Mississippi? Is it comparable to that of a white person?

Answer. Comparable in what way?

JOBS FOR NEGROES

Question. Does a Negro have the same freedom of choice of work and of job opportunities, for example?

Answer. Yes, if he can qualify for jobs. Then, of course, it's up to management—if management wants to hire him. You see, we believe in freedom of choice.

By custom and tradition there are still many types of jobs, of course, which have not been filled by Negroes.

Question. What types of jobs are not given to Negroes?

Answer. Well, probably secretaries, stenographers, bank tellers, such as that. There is no law which prohibits Negroes from serving in such capacities, for the hiring of personnel is regarded as free enterprise and decisions are up to management. Whomever the manager wants to hire, he has the right to hire.

Some of these same attitudes prevail in practically every State in the Union. In other words, it's up to management. I don't believe employers ever should be forced to employ people of any race if, in the employer's opinion and judgment, such a person is not fully qualified to discharge the duties and responsibilities entrusted to the job.

Question. Are Negroes permitted to vote in Mississippi?

Answer. More than 30,000 Negroes are registered to vote in Mississippi.

Question. Isn't this a small number in relation to the number of white voters? Why are there so few Negro voters?

Answer. The primary reasons for the fewer Negro voters include illiteracy, apathy, and the law requiring payment of a poll tax. So many Negroes are not qualified to vote. You see, there are certain requirements for voting in Mississippi.

Question. What are the requirements?

Answer. You not only have to be 21 years of age. You must never have been convicted of an infamous crime or the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquors within the past 5 years. You cannot be a common gambler or a habitual drunkard. You must be of good moral character. And you have to be able to prove it.

Question. Do voters have to pass a literacy test?

Answer. They have to be able to read and understand and interpret a section of the constitution of the State of Mississippi. We don't believe in having ignorant people elect our officials.

Question. How does the poll tax requirement work?

Answer. The poll tax is $2 a year, and, since two consecutive poll-tax receipts are required for voting in a primary, a voter pays $4 for this privilege. The polltax receipts, incidentally, go directly into the education fund for both races.

Question. Do all whites qualify to vote in Mississippi?

Answer. No, sir. There are plenty of whites who can't qualify. You'd be surprised. We don't believe in a government of the ignorant, by the ignorant, and for the ignorant. Like the founders of our Nation, we believe that voting is a privilege and not just a right.

Question. Can Negroes go into theaters in Mississippi?

Answer. They have their own theaters. But most of the public theaters also have accommodations for Negroes. In small cities, the balconies are often reserved for Negroes.

Question. What about restaurants?

Answer. They have their own restaurants.

Question. Parks?

Answer. They have their own parks.

Question. But they cannot go into the restaurants or parks or theaters reserved for whites?

Answer. No, sir. Now, the Jackson Municipal Park has never been segregated. Negroes don't go into the lake there, but they move about freely and enjoy other facilities.

Question. How about swimming pools? Are they integrated?

Answer. I don't think Negroes have ever gone into white swimming pools.

Question. Has there been any change in recent years? Is the Negro gaining in stature? Is his position improving?

Answer. Yes, I think it has improved a great deal.

THERE WOULD BE NO TROUBLE "IF OUTSIDERS WOULD LET US ALONE"

Question. Due to the Negro's own efforts?

Answer. Yes. Those Negroes who have justified their advancement have been able to gain that advancement.

We have Negroes who own their own businesses and who serve both white and colored customers, particularly as skilled tradesmen.

If Negroes can do the same kind of work as efficiently and are on the alert like white people they can get salaries like the white people. We have Negro auto mechanics making as much as white auto mechanics. We have Negro bricklayers and painters who get paid the same wage as white bricklayers and white painters. For schoolteachers, it's the same way.

Gentlemen, in Mississippi whites and Negroes work side by side in harmony, peace, and understanding. And if the outsiders would let us alone, we wouldn't have any trouble.

Question. What do you mean by "outsiders"?

Answer. Agitators who come in and try to poison the Negroes' minds, cause confusion and turmoil. This has gotten worse in the last few years.

Question. What is the reaction of white people in the South to those "outsiders"?

Answer. Of course, they resent agitators, "freedom riders," and such people who try to bring about turmoil and strife.

PROGRESS OR TURMOIL

Question. Is this Negro protest movement pointing toward progress for the Negro—or toward more trouble?

Answer. The agitators bring on trouble. All they leave is a lot of turmoil and strife and heartaches.

Question. What is your assessment of the attitude of Negro people in Mississippi toward the kind of agitation that you are talking about?

Answer. I'd say that at least 95 percent of the Negroes in Mississippi are unalterably opposed to "do-gooders" and agitators coming in there with their marches and their sit-in strikes and such silly and undignified acts.

Question. Do the Negroes speak up against them?

Answer. They ignore them. They tell the white people they're opposed to the agitation, because the white people are good to the Negroes in the South—in Mississippi, especially. They are good to them.

Question. Is there fear among the Negroes?

Answer. Not in the slightest. That's what the agitators try—to put fear in them. They try to poison their minds. But they have no fear.

Question. Do Negroes in the South tend to have their own economy, separate from the white economy?

Answer. They have their own doctors, their own businesses, their own schools, their own churches.

Question. What would happen if a white student were to attempt to enter a Negro college in Mississippi?

Answer. The Negroes would resent it. I'll give you an example: About 3 years ago a white man tried to build a residence and grocery store in a Negro section of Jackson. The Negroes filed a petition immediately with the city council of Jackson to prohibit it—and the Negroes won. He didn't get to build in the Negro section. They just did not want him living in their section.

Negroes in Jackson, Miss., want to live to themselves.

Question. Do you mean to say that Negroes as well as whites want segregation in Mississippi?

Answer. Yes, they do. Negroes would rather associate with Negroes. Negroes don't want Negroes to marry whites, and whites feel the same way.

Question. Why, then, does racial intermarriage occur?

Answer. It doesn't occur in our State. It's against the law.

IN BUSINESS: HARMONY

Question. How strong is the influence of economic factors in persuading Southerners to accept some integration? In Birmingham and a few other cities of the South, businessmen have stepped in to urge accommodations with Negro demands. Do you feel that the South may be hurt economically unless it yields on integration?

Answer. I know that Mississippi has made greater economic progress in the last 2 or 3 years than ever before in the history of our State.

There have been 443 new and expanded industries come into Mississippi during our administration. They are creating over 33,000 new jobs in our State—new industrial jobs. Percentagewise, Mississippi's per capita gain in income was among the highest in the Nation in 1962. During 1962, Mississippi's new and expanded plants produced capital investments of over $105 million. Our bank deposits at the end of 1962 were $200 million higher than in 1961.

Our State is growing. It's developing. The population, once declining, now is gaining. We've gained at least 70,000 population in the last 2 years. Our State revenue is growing, even though we have cut our income taxes.

Question. What is causing this development?

Answer. Industrial people admire the program that Mississippi has—our economic-development program. Our legislature in 1960 enacted one of the boldest and most far-reaching economic-development programs that any legislature ever enacted. We passed 41 economic-development laws, such as: putting a "right to work" law in our State constitution, giving new industry a 10-year tax exemption; creating an industrial and technological-research commission; adjusting our workmen's compensation laws; reducing income tax.

Industrial people also admire the attitudes of the people in our State. They are friendly. Labor is friendly toward capital. Negroes and whites are all friendly toward management and capital. Industrial people like the friendly spirit of harmony that exists between both races.

Question. Do you have labor unions in Mississippi?

Answer. Some, yes. We've put a "right to work" law in our State Constitution. Under this law, workers are not required to join a union in order to hold a job. They have the right of choice.

Question. Do labor unions press for racial integration in the South?

Answer. I haven't heard of any unions in Mississippi advocating integration.

"IF A NEGRO IS UNEMPLOYED, THAT'S CALLED DISCRIMINATION"

Question. Do unions there practice segregation?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. Do you think that the economic improvement in Mississippi will help solve the racial problem?

Answer. I think it will contribute a good deal toward easing it. More Mississippians are making more money today than ever before—including the Negroes.

In summing it all up, the Negroes are well cared for in the South.

Question. That phrase "well cared for"—does that imply a sort of paternalism on the part of the whites, and that Negroes are not able to make their way on their own?

Answer. Well, we can't help that, if they are unable to do it. But we help them to make their way. They have great opportunities in Mississippi. But you know how little progress the Negroes have made in Africa.

We have a few people in both races who are having a hard time making ends meet. Some lack education or in some cases they lack the ability, or in some cases they lack the will and the energy. You have this situation all over the United States. If a white person is unemployed in Mississippi, it's just a statistic. But if a Negro is unemployed, that's called discrimination.

AS NEGROES MOVE NORTH

Question. There has been a rather large movement of Negroes out of the South. Do you think that will develop into a mass movement?

Answer. You just can't anticipate what may happen. It may and it may not. What is happening now is that, although many Negroes have gone out of Mississippi, some of them have come back. One Negro who had been to Chicago told me: "Folks told me Chicago was the end of the rainbow. But I went up there and found the whites didn't like me and neither did the Northern Negroes. So I came back down here because here I have friends in both races and I can work and make a living."

Question. Governor, it has been suggested that, unless the South begins dealing with relatively moderate Negro leaders, it may find itself having to deal with extremists, such as the white-hating Black Muslims. Do you think the Negroes are likely to follow such extremists?

Answer. Not our Negroes in Mississippi. I can't speak for those up North and in the East.

Question. As Negroes gain in purchasing power, do you think they will make increasing and effective use of the boycott to gain their demands for integration?

Answer. They've already tried to stage a few boycotts in Jackson. But every boycott has just fizzled into nothing.

Question. How about the vote? As more Negroes vote, can they elect officials favorable to integration?

Answer. A man who would advocate integration wouldn't get 2 percent of the votes in Mississippi. He'd be laughed at.

Question. Might Mississippi vote for a Republican for President?

Answer. If both candidates—Democratic and Republican—were conservative, they'd take the Democrat. If the Democrat was a liberal and the Republican was a real conservative, then they might take the Republican.

Question. How about a third slate of independent, unpledged electors for President in Mississippi?

Answer. Mississippi will be strong for that in 1964, and I think several other States will be, too. We are asking other Southern States to join us in this movement and we are getting quite a bit of favorable response. You know, Mississippi gave its presidential votes to Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia in 1960.

Question. In 1948, there was a third presidential slate in the South—

Answer. Yes. STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, was the presidential candidate, with Governor Fielding Wright, of Mississippi, for Vice President. And you'll recall that we came very close to being able to throw the election into the House of Representatives. If a couple or three States had gone as expected, the decision would have gone to the House. And last election, in 1960, it would have taken only a slight change to have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

Question. If that should happen, Governor, what would the South ask of a presidential candidate before giving him its vote?

Answer. We would ask him to let us alone—let the State alone and let us run our own affairs as the Constitution provides.

Question. Do the people in the South feel that they are violating the Constitution when they refuse to integrate?

Answer. No. They think that the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution means exactly what it says, and it plainly says that the powers not granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government or prohibited by the Constitution to the States belong to the States respectively or to the people. The people in the South know that the Supreme Court of the United States cannot amend the Constitution by decree or otherwise.

Question. Do you believe that the South can effectively maintain its attitude on segregation?

Answer. I think we can. I think a lot of people in the East and North are soon going to want the same thing that they are trying to take away from the South today. The cities in the East and North are getting darker by the month.

Our trouble in the South, gentlemen, is in getting the facts to the people. A lot of people in the North don't know what the facts are.

Now, we don't try to dabble in the affairs of other States. I wouldn't dare to go to Ohio or New York and tell the people there what they ought to do. I don't know their problems. And they don't know ours. You've got to live with those problems a long time before you can know them. You've got to live close to the Negro and work with him for many years before you'll know him. Those people up North just don't know what they're doing.

In Mississippi, we would not attempt to solve whatever problems may exist because of Asiatics on the west coast, Mexicans in the Southwest, Indians in the Midwest, Puerto Ricans on the east coast or Harlem in New York. We leave it to those people living nearest those problems to solve them in the best moral and ethical manner available. We ask the same consideration in Mississippi.

MORE PROBLEMS AHEAD

Question. Do you feel that the Supreme Court's ruling of 1954 against school segregation has helped solve the race problem?

A. It hasn't solved anything. It has caused more trouble, more turmoil, more misunderstanding, more hatred than any 100 decisions ever made by the Court before. And I'll tell you something else that's going to happen:

Now the Federal Government has invaded the neighborhood situation, trying to force housing integration. And the next thing, they are going to move against those service clubs up North that don't have Negro members.

The more people who become affected by this integration, the more there are who become sympathetic with the South. Like I said, the pendulum is going to swing back, because the South is gaining more allies all the time.

NEED TO AMEND THE TRUCK USE TAX

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer disposes of a truck and acquires another truck during the taxable period.

Under existing law, the taxpayer must pay a Federal use tax based on the gross weight of his truck. The tax is levied on the basis of a 12-month taxable period beginning on July 1 of any year and ending on June 30 of the following year. The taxpayer is liable for the tax as of the "first use" of his truck. "First use" is understood to mean the first use of the truck on the public highways of the United States. Furthermore, the tax is computed or prorated on a monthly basis. Therefore, if the taxpayer begins using a truck any time during the month of July, he must pay the use tax for the whole 12-month taxable period. If he begins using the vehicle any time during the month of August, he must pay a tax for only 11 months, and so on.

While the tax is not owing until the taxpayer makes his first use of the truck, if the vehicle is subsequently sold, destroyed, junked, or otherwise disposed of, the taxpayer receives no credit for that unused portion of the tax which he has paid. This means that while this truck is no longer in his service, the taxpayer is paying for its use on public highways. In addition, if he subsequently or simultaneously acquires a new truck, he must pay another use tax on the new vehicle beginning with the month of his first use of that truck.

My bill would allow the taxpayer a credit for the unused portion of the tax paid on the first truck and in turn would credit this unused tax to the second truck. Moreover, under my bill, if the taxpayer did not acquire a second truck prior to the end of his current taxable period, the credit would expire.

As stated above, my bill requires that the taxpayer actually dispose of the first truck before he is eligible for the credit. He might dispose of the vehicle by sale, gift, trade-in, or any other means under which he would give up title to that truck. This requirement—a disposition of the truck—would facilitate the determination by the Internal Revenue Service that the taxpayer had actually removed the truck from use.

Under existing law, we have recognized that the taxpayer does not become liable for the tax until he actually makes use of the vehicle. However, we do not recognize that later on in the taxable period he may cease to use the vehicle. My bill would correct this situation and under it the taxpayer would no longer be paying a use tax for a truck he no longer owns and, therefore, cannot use. Inasmuch as this tax is based on use, I see little reason why we should not adopt this legislation.

THE PROSPECTS BEFORE US

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an excellent speech given by my colleague, Representative FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, to the National Federation of Republican Women at the Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, April 22, 1963, about the need for more active participation in politics and public affairs by women. I wish to commend the partial text of her remarks to the attention of my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PROSPECTS BEFORE US

(Partial text of a speech by Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, Republican, Sixth District of New Jersey, before the National Federation of Republican Women, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C., April 22, 1963)

Just the other day—last Saturday, to be exact—I talked with a group of New Jersey professional women about the need for more active participation in politics and public affairs by women. I used some figures which our Clare Williams is fond of citing, which show that there are 3,600,000 more women of voting age than there are men in the United States; that in 40 States and the District of Columbia women outnumber men of voting age; and that in the 1960 presidential election 22½ million women who could have voted failed to do so.

I suspect that Mrs. Williams has had somewhat the same reaction to these figures as I received this past weekend—a sort of stunned disbelief, amazement that women have such an impressive political potential and that so many are failing to recognize their own strength and their responsibility to devote that strength to the welfare of the country.

But there are growing indications that the situation will improve. Republican women are leading the attack on apathy and indifference. The enthusiasm and active concern expressed by our own national federation is indicative of this trend. The GROW project which, as you know, was launched by the national committee this spring for the purpose of developing a permanent program for building Republican Party support among women is, I can testify personally, a highly realistic and practical project, as one might expect from a recommendation of the 1962 Bliss Big City Report. Likewise, the 1963-64 "Win With Womanpower" campaign of the women's division of the national committee is aimed at the same target: to locate and mobilize the vast legion of so far uninterested women.

I cite this project because it is directly related to my subject tonight, "The Prospects Before Us." Make no mistake about it: Republican prospects in 1964 and the years following are significantly dependent upon the degree to which we can enlarge the present slender majority of women who support the Republican Party and vote for Republican candidates. I can speak from personal experience—the experience of a marginal congressional district divided between industrial and suburban influences—when I tell you that a well-organized, enthusiastic, informed, and convinced band of women is an almost irresistible political force. There is no question in my mind that the hundreds and hundreds of women in Union County, N.J., who signed up and contributed time, effort, and money in my campaigns of 1960 and 1962 had a decisive effect in bringing the Sixth District well above the marginal level for Republicans and keeping it there.

The success of Republican women in rounding up their unattached sisters, and of all other forms of Republican campaign activity, however, will depend on several other factors in addition to your own enthusiasm and salesmanship. It is my purpose tonight to consider a few of these factors and to relate them in an entirely personal and subjective way to what I think our Republican prospects can be. Briefly, I would say our prospects are improving. We have a long way to go, obviously, and the threat is always present that we could lose the steam and momentum we are now generating. On the other hand, if we can sustain our drive ahead and continue to keep it well-fueled with issues and personalities and organization, then there is no limit to what we can achieve.

In the final analysis, Republican prospects will be determined by the posture and the appearance we present to the American people—as the minority party, the opposition party—and by the manner in which the Kennedy administration conducts itself and discharges its responsibilities as the party in power. In many respects, the Kennedy administration is presently the Republican Party with one of its greatest opportunities. On issue after issue—in foreign policy, the national economy, civil rights, education, and a host of others—we are being invited, in effect, to reveal administration mistakes, to exploit their weaknesses, to suggest constructive alternatives.

How do we deal with this opportunity? First of all, I believe, we have to make a fundamental distinction. We must recognize and accept the fact that President Kennedy and his family are highly attractive. There is an understandable fascination for many people in the picture of this young family who inhabit the White House—a fascination which the communication media have been quick to exploit.

Our problem, it seems to me, is to separate the human image from the political reality. We must pound into the consciousness of the voter the truth that the White House is not only a social haven, but more importantly it is a political headquarters. It is not just a rich man's home, but it is the brain center of the worldwide struggle for freedom. It is not just Caroline's playyard, it is above all the focal point of all our hopes and fears.

We can join with the multitudes in warming to the human qualities of Kennedy, the man and the family, but we must insist relentlessly on the fact that it is Kennedy, the President, the politician, the world leader, who is important as the man whose actions will influence decisively the course of our country and the world.

The President is important to each of us personally, not merely as a symbol, but for what he and his administration and his party are doing to our hopes for peace and national security, to the health of our economy, to the fruits of our enterprise, to our opportunity to live the kind of life to which our talents and tastes call us, and to the basic freedoms on which we have built our Nation. In all these areas and more, the President and those he leads must be held accountable for what they do—the bad and the indifferent as well as the good. And it is up to us, the responsible opposition, to make them accountable and to open the eyes of the American people to the full truth of the Kennedy record.

What is this record? The President himself last December might well have written his own epitath. He said, "it is much easier to make the speeches than it is to finally make the judgments." Time after time, the Kennedy speeches have been magnificent, holding forth great visions of progress and growth and opportunity and new hopes for peace and freedom. Almost as often, however the Kennedy judgments have been indecisive, inconsistent, and inadequate to the needs and the promises.

Six months after the Kennedy administration took office, there might have been reason to excuse a certain amount of confusion, a lack of preparation, and a tendency to rely upon temporary expedients. But 27 months after the President's ringing inaugural address, we have no right to permit such excuses.

Look at our national economy for example. There are more unemployed people in America today than there were this time a year ago. Even the most dedicated Kennedy partisan cannot claim that the country is moving again. We are drifting along on a plateau of missed opportunities and makeshift remedies. A tax cut which the economy needed in 1961 and which both business and labor wanted is still very much in doubt—doubt created by Presidential hesitation, by delay, and by the inability to rally his own party to a timely decision. Even today, on the strength of a single month's improvement in the economic indicators, Democratic leaders are indicating there will be a further delay in determining what, if any, kind of tax bill we will have this year.

In the field of foreign policy, we have been treated to a succession of crises to which our response has too often been a shooting from the hip, a dramatic declaration which later we have been unwilling or unable to pursue. Whatever our individual views may be on the Cuban situation, how can we reconcile the unrestrained pledge of American purpose in driving the Communists out of Cuba, which the President strongly implied when he welcomed the Cuban prisoners to Miami, with the subsequent restraints we have placed on any action by the refugees themselves? A case might be made for either one, but not for both.

Civil rights is another case in point. Here, again, we have heard glowing rhetoric about equal opportunity for all our people, about the obligation to make the American promise of personal freedom a reality for all without regard to color or creed. But the actions have not been suited to the words. The administration's legislative program in civil rights is completely inadequate, much inferior to the reasonable and realistic Republican proposals. In the face of the crisis in Mississippi, the President is reduced to explaining why he cannot implement the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, a group of eminently moderate men. In the midst of the violence and intimidation of Negroes in Birmingham, Ala., the administration is watching the situation, and the President telephones Mrs. Martin Luther King. And who is it who has defined orderly government in Birmingham and is the chief intimidator of them all but Police Commissioner "Bull" Connor, an arch segregationist and the Democratic national committeeman from Alabama.

In education, the administration has chosen the easy way out. Instead of analyzing the Nation's needs and determining what the Federal Government can and should do as a matter of priority importance, the President has sent to Congress recommendations covering no less than 24 separate areas of education. He has said, in effect, that since he cannot make up his own mind he is asking for all or nothing at all. This is not leadership. This is the abdication of leadership.

The reason for all of this, I suggest, is not hard to find. The Democratic Party, over which the President presides, is not truly a national party. It is a coalition of the leftwing and the rightwing in American politics, further confused by the presence of the big city political machines. With such an amalgam of contradictory forces, a consensus within the party is almost impossible to achieve on many of the great national issues. There are unbridgeable gaps which separate Democrats. They are fundamentally unable to agree on many basic issues and thus, despite their large majorities in the House and the Senate, and despite their control of the executive branch, it is often impossible for them to obtain a working majority, to govern in an orderly fashion, or to provide consistent leadership.

Only at election time does the Democratic Party come together. While this kind of practical coalition is often effective enough to win elections, we Republicans have got to show the country that what looks like political strength is, in fact, acute governmental weakness.

How, therefore, should we meet this problem? Let me suggest a few guidelines which, from my own experience, I have found to be effective.

Above all, let us be positive and constructive. Opposition does not consist solely in being negative. It is not enough simply to say that the Democratic Party has the sole responsibility for the National Government and then to oppose them on every proposal they make. The country has a right to expect more from a Republican Party which rightfully claims to be the responsible party.

By all means, let us oppose vigorously when the national welfare requires. But in doing so, we should be mindful of the fact that the party of Lincoln was created to deal with a great national crisis and that we have never ceased to be responsible for contributing our minds and talents to the solution of every succeeding problem facing our country.

Where we oppose the administration, we must explain why our opposition is necessary. We oppose excessive government spending not because we are pennypinchers but because we know the hardships which inflation brings and because we understand that first things must come first or else we risk doing many things poorly and not enough things well.

Where there are legitimate national needs to be met, we must offer our own constructive alternatives and prove that our proposals can do a better job of serving the American people.

Second, let us be more selective in choosing issues on which to oppose the administration. Unfortunately, for the country, there is no shortage of such issues. To be effective, however, we should concentrate our attention on the issues of prime importance—foreign policy, the economy, and civil rights, for example. We can dissipate our strength and confuse the people by attacking the administration indiscriminately and on all fronts. Conversely, we can maximize our influence by emphasizing the issues most meaningful to people and through persistent and imaginative public relations make certain that people understand the factual basis of our opposition.

Third, let us not be reluctant to claim credit for our accomplishments. We can be certain that the Democratic Congress and the administration will try to place a Democratic label on any and all achievements. I see no reason, however, for conceding them this victory.

Despite our minority position, we have in the past and we will in the future force the majority in many instances to respond to our demands for greater responsibility in key areas of Government. When we trim the fat from appropriation bills, when we put foreign aid on a more manageable basis, when we strengthen a weak civil rights bill, or when we improve any of the often hastily drawn legislative proposals of the administration, let us tell the people what we have accomplished.

Since we do not control the machinery of legislation, we cannot afford to wait for total success. We can, however, make our opposition felt constructively and we can inform the people of our success.

Fourth, let us criticize the Kennedy administration not only for going too far but for not going far enough. Civil rights is not the only instance where the administration has stopped far short of its own expressed ideals and those of the American people. The President earlier this year argued persuasively that the best way to stimulate the economy would be to provide greater incentives to the private sector of the economy in the form of tax reduction. Yet, he has jeopardized this sound objective by failing to control Federal spending and by attaching to tax reduction his extraneous and highly debatable tax reform proposals.

Last year, he proposed that a pool of carefully planned public works projects be prepared which could be put into effect when unemployment had reached a dangerous level. Under pressure from his own party, he soon compromised and substituted for this sound proposal a wide-open grab-bag known as the accelerated public works program—without the careful planning and the determination of priorities, which alone can make public works an effective tool.

Finally, I would urge our party to make unity a working objective rather than the casual slogan it has often seemed to be. Unity in the Republican Party is not only necessary but it is reasonable. Certainly, there are many differences among us but within our party structure we have the room and the freedom for expressing these differences and the machinery for permitting decisions to be made from time to time as to which view will be dominant.

Ours, I believe, is the truly national party in the United States. It is the party of the center, the party best able to represent the broad consensus of our people on the great national issues. As the mood of the times and the needs of the country shift, so will the tone and the substance of our party's response. This is the responsible way. From its position in the center, the Republican Party is best able to represent the vast majority of Americans. Consequently, the place for Republicans to debate our differences and to decide our policies, to make the necessary compromises and accommodations, is inside our party—in our party conventions and party primaries.

I am led to make this observation by a letter I received from an outraged Republican who reflects, I believe, the frustrations of a small but potentially important minority of our party. My constitutent delivered an ultimatum. Unless Republican officeholders, he said, started voting just the way he wanted us to, he was going to vote and work for Democratic candidates in the next election, even though he had nothing in common with them. This man happened to be a very strong conservative. His attitude is sometimes shared by strong liberals. In either case, I believe, it is an unrealistic and irresponsible attitude.

Any Republican who cannot accommodate himself to the majority decision of his fellow Republicans—as expressed in conventions and in primaries—had better look at the realities of party politics. The essence of membership in any organization, political or otherwise, is a willingness to accept at least in general that organization's principles and objectives and to abide by the freely determined policies and decisions of the organization, in which he himself has equal voice and opportunity.

Compromise and accomodation should be easier and more logical for us than for Democrats. We do not have to strain our consciences or convictions, or stretch the people's capacity to believe, in order to accept our party's decisions.

Let me illustrate this point by referring to the case of Governor Rockefeller and Senator GOLDWATER, the two men most prominently mentioned as Republican candidates in 1964. It is commonly accepted that these men represent the two dominant wings in the Republican Party. In spite of their differences—and neither Senator GOLDWATER nor Governor Rockefeller is trying to hide these differences—both men are currently emphasizing the areas of agreement which unite them as Republican leaders. Their differences are admittedly important, but the issues on which they agree are even more important, and each man is big enough and realistic enough and sufficiently dedicated to the party's welfare to recognize that their own disagreements pale in comparison with the rockbottom barriers that separate the wings of the Democratic Party.

This is a healthy development in our party's life. The Governor and the Senator are contributing to the political dialog within the Republican Party which will provide a sound basis for a Republican decision in 1964 as to which direction and with which candidate it should move ahead. This dialog is good not only for the party but for the country, for the net result will be an honest airing of issues and the formation of a balanced Republican position which our party can take to the country. The country will be the winner and, let us hope, the Republican Party will share that victory.

I would, therefore, say to all my fellow Republicans, at every level of party activity; go thou and do likewise.

STRIP MINING STUDY BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ABELE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, for many years the people of southeastern Ohio and in several other States have manifested great interest in strip mining—its economic implications, its effect on water resources, utility of the soil, and the general appearance of the countryside.

Presently many questions have been raised relative to the adequacy of State laws to regulate surface mining, and the extent of the authority of the Federal Government in this field. In order to provide the necessary information as a background for a more constructive approach by Congress to this problem, I am proposing a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal and State officials, to make a thorough study of all aspects of strip mining in the United States.

This bill is as follows:

H.R. 6693

A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—

(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;

(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

(3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;

(4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;

(5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;

(6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;

(7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and

(8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

COMPULSORY LICENSING AND THE PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, a patent by its very nature provides an incentive for research and development by granting an exclusive right to the inventor for the production and sale of his conception for a limited period of time. In return for this right, he discloses the results of his inventive efforts for the use of everyone after the patent has expired.

Unlike a monopoly of an existing product, a patent merely provides incentives so that developments may be undertaken and financed, which add to our common stock of knowledge.

The inadequacies of compulsory licensing or Government ownership of patents have been reaffirmed by the fact that NASA is now seeking approval of the Congress to permit patent ownership by contractors on development projects which it has financed. This was a suggestion which I made during the last session of the Congress.

Now that we are confronted with intense competition with the Communist nations, it is particularly important that the inherent and valuable protections in the patent system which encourage inventors to undertake the more difficult tasks are not in any way blunted.

Experience has now indicated that, even when such activities are financed with public funds, the patent incentive can become a means of securing a more effective and rapid rate of scientific development at a lower cost to the public than under a system where no private inherent rights accrue to those who provide the inventive spark of genius to meet the needs of Government programs.

Mr. Speaker, in the private sector of our economy where our concern is entirely with the development of new products and processes for commercial use, there can be little question but that compulsory licensing would reduce our rate of economic growth and limit the flow of new products to the market, which are needed to provide job opportunities for those whose skills have been displaced.

Compulsory licensing has been advocated as a means of increasing competition—thus providing consumers with products at lower prices. Unfortunately, those who in good faith advance this view fail to recognize that without a constant flow of new products, which compete for the consumer's dollar, competition would be lessened rather than increased.

Mr. Herschel F. Clesner, Patent Coordinator for the U.S. Public Health Service, published a paper entitled, "Innovator's Payment Determination in the U.S.S.R." He shows that encouragement of inventive talents has been a major feature of Soviet economic policy. He says and I quote:

> Lacking market incentives, the Soviet system has attempted to employ capitalistic stimuli that appeal to the self-interest of the individual, to the technocrat, and the manager. These are designed as alternatives or supplements to the political and social pressures used by the regime to achieve increasing labor productivity. Yet, prior to 1959 these stimuli were obviously ineffectual, indicating that the system did not use the available material incentives adequately, that it did not stimulate basic and primary inventions or the rapid adaption of such inventions. The system, until then, was geared primarily to the achievement of greater volume output, along established technological lines, rather than to major innovation and its introduction into use.
>
> Since 1959, however, the party leadership has been pressing forward vigorously, ruthlessly, with single-minded determination and with increasing exploitation of every possible channel, has attempted to accelerate the advance in production techniques and the utilization of new technology. As part of this drive, the revision of the "Statute on Discoveries, Inventions, and Suggestions for Rationalization of Procedures" and the instructions relative to payment and computation of the payment for inventions and efficiency suggestions were revised. Clearly, the main objective of these revisions is to reward more effectively, and give greater incentive to, those immediately concerned with innovation, with a special emphasis on the decisionmakers who assume the risk of introduction. This reexamination will undoubtedly lead to the strengthening of personal material rewards for the introduction of new products and technology. It will also advance the cause of new technology by the immediate guarantee of the payment award if the innovation was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, certainly it would be folly for us to weaken the incentive now afforded under our patent system at a time when nations with a completely different concept of economics are attempting to find a way to accomplish the results which we have attained by our continued adherence to the traditional concepts of the patent system as developed by the Founding Fathers.

The keynote address to the annual conference of the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation in Washington, D.C., in 1962, was presented by Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. Under unanimous consent I insert a portion of this address at this point in the RECORD:

> In this balancing of national and international economic interests, let us not bargain away the hard core of American public policies which reinforce our leadership in industrial productivity and technological development. Economic international interdependence and a sense of self-restraint in unilateral exercise of sovereign power, to which I have previously alluded, do not mean we should not hold fast to domestic ideologies we deem distinctive American means of fostering motivations for a vigorous competitive process which preserves the independence of decisionmaking by private business enterprise.
>
> One example is found in the public policy of our patent and antitrust laws. In 1955 I published a paper in which I took the position that patents and antitrust can peacefully coexist. My thesis still is that there is no inherent conflict in the exclusivity of patent rights and the kind and quality of competition our antitrust laws seek to preserve. Both public policies are complementary parts of the paramount goals of a competitive economy. Decrees against patent misuse in violation of either the U.S. Patent Code or U.S. antitrust laws are proving to be ample safeguards in judicial decisions based upon findings that such transgressions have occurred. There nevertheless is persistence of a minority view that the exclusivity of patent rights is by nature antithetical to competitive principles. The danger is that this ideological variance from our constitutional and statutory sanctions of patent exclusivity has already found its way into the Halls of Congress where some Members have taken their cue from this reformist minority group.
>
> Fortunately, Congress in the Patent Code of 1952 reaffirmed and strengthened hard core protection of domestic patent rights. In the past Congress has also wisely rejected proposals for extensive compulsory licensing of patented inventions. This harsh remedy is sanctioned by the Supreme Court only to correct past and prevent future patent-antitrust violations found to exist. In my view, this remedy should not be extended to royalty-free compulsory licensing.

In our society, economic growth is basically the result of technological development, and a patent is an intangible property right. It represents the basis for capitalizing on years of effort, research, the use of expensive facilities, and the employment of many scientists whose collaborative efforts finally result in a useful invention.

Mr. Speaker, because the Government has acquired title to a significant number of patents under existing policies, it is possible to appraise the effectiveness of Government ownership and compulsory licensing in fostering the commercial development of new inventions. Again, this conference provided an opportunity to review the administration of the approximately 12,000 patents which have been assigned to the U.S. Government. Miss Mary A. Holman, who is the first recipient of the Thomas A. Edison Fellowship, has examined the utilization of this large bloc of patents in connection with her doctoral dissertation in economics. It is significant that the U.S. Government now owns more patents than any private corporation. Yet, Miss Holman finds that, and I quote:

> Commercial use has been reported on about 15 percent of the sampled patented inventions. For purposes of this study, commercial use was limited to mean producing the patented invention or using it in the production of goods and services.
>
> This 15-percent rate of utilization is considerably less than the estimated 50- to 60-percent rate of utilization for patents assigned to private firms and individuals. Further, there is preliminary evidence from both licensees and inventors that there are additional patented inventions owned by the Government that would be put into commercial use had these individuals and firms had title to the patent or an exclusive license to use it.
>
> Preliminary findings also seem to support the contention that those Government-owned patented inventions which are put into commercial use are those which require little or no further development. This is important when patent rights are judged to be an essential element for a managerial decision deciding whether or not costly and risky investment in plant and equipment should be undertaken.
>
> About 70 percent of the patents that were reported to have been commercialized by private firms and individuals did not need any further development.

If the purpose of the patent system is to provide the public with the disclosure of scientific knowledge and information and to encourage its utilization to enhance our living standards, our security, and our well-being, then the evidence gathered by Miss Holman does not support the view that Government ownership of patents or any form of compulsory licensing is the best means of securing a rapid rate of technological development, which is the basic requirement for economic growth, about which the administration is constantly theorizing.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Holman's conclusions are reinforced by a report to a recent meeting of the American Society for Metals by Mr. Edwin Mansfield, director of the Carnegie Research Project on Technological Change and Economic Growth. He said:

> How large is the payoff for a successful innovation? To find out, we determined which firms were first to introduce about 100 new processes and products regarded by trade journals and engineering associations as being the most important that occurred in the iron and steel and the petroleum industries since World War I. We then compared the growth rates of these innovators with those of other comparable firms. The results show that the successful innovator grew much more rapidly than the other firms, their average growth rate being in some cases more than twice that of the others. According to our best estimates, the average effect of a successful innovation was to raise a firm's percentage annual growth rate by 4 to 13 percentage points, depending on the time interval and the industry. And, as one would expect, a successful innovation had a much greater impact on a small firm than on a large one.

It is significant to note that a single innovation may have a very large impact on a small firm whereas a larger firm with a diversified product line may not be so drastically affected. Again, the devastating effect of compulsory licensing on small firms has been set forth by Mr. Albert S. Davis, Jr., an authority on the American patent system.

In an article entitled "The Patent Brouhaha," in International Science and Technology of May 1962, he said:

> All of these raises the question whether any substitute for the monopoly patent is

> equally inviting to industry and the solo inventor. To the industrial supporter of research, a first-in-the-field position is no real substitute for a monopoly patent. With a monopoly position, he can either sit on top of the heap until new invention circumvents his position, or he can license his patents for a royalty which will yield a substantial commercial advantage. First in the field gives the solo inventor no bargaining position whatever, unless he keeps his invention secret and peddles it in confidence. And if the company to which he makes his disclosure is not in a strong industry position, first in the field is of little value.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis reviews some of the arguments that have been advanced over the years for compulsory licensing—among them a mistaken concept that many inventions are patented with the direct intent of preventing the use of an invention rather than to encourage economic growth and development. The studies which have been made clearly show that patents which are not used are those which are not as effective as other patented inventions to accomplish a desired end in the competition which exists in commercial markets. Mr. Davis has made an analytical review of the problems with respect to compulsory licensing of pharmaceutical patents that were advanced by Senator KEFAUVER in S. 1552, 87th Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD a portion of Mr. Davis' article "The Patent Brouhaha," dealing with compulsory licensing:

> Since we deal with policy, we must put aside at once any argument that a patent is unique property, or that the nonuse of a patent is unique property, which cannot be compensated for. (For instance, where the nonuse of patent A enhances the value of patent B). We must also assume that there must be a reason for invoking compulsory licensing in particular cases, rather than have it apply to all patents, no matter how thoroughly they are worked in the public interest by their owners. If we do not, then the essential nature of the patent disappears; compulsory licensing carries with it at least a mild flavor of disapproval of the patent-owner. Having done this, unless we are to do violence to rather basic concepts of justice or flatly acknowledge that compulsory licensing is a penalty, we must arrange to compensate fairly and adequately the patentee or assignee whose monopoly right is broken. We must also assume that the use of the patent by a stranger to it possesses value for the public, either because the public actually needs the product or the product of the process it covers, or because the public actually needs the increased production, purchasing, employment, and profits which practicing the invention will hopefully produce. Finally, we should have a stranger to the patent who has both the wish and the full ability to make a good job of working it.
>
> The chief argument against compulsory licensing is not the neatness required in setting fair compensation, but the genuine difficulty of determining when the public interest is adversely affected by failure to use the patent. Senator KEFAUVER's proposal for compulsory licensing of pharmaceutical patents to all comers after 3 years is a negation of patent principles, for it ignores the crisis of a small company, owning a valuable patent, producing a product at entirely reasonable prices and in entirely satisfactory quantities, and opens the field to the kind of competition in which the biggest company wins. The maximum 8-percent royalty which can be charged is sorry compensation if that competition destroys the originator's business.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have shown that the initial investment to secure a patent is only the first part of the difficult task of developing a commercial product. In many cases a considerable portion of the 17-year life of the patent is employed in developing the commercial adaptation of the product. The number of years that the patent provides protection in terms of competition in real markets is quite limited. We are paying a very small price for the scientific benefits our society has derived from the mobilization of its inventive talents.

Since so large a portion of the protected period is normally used to perfect and market a product, compulsory licensing after a period of 3 years would virtually destroy any incentive to undertake the task of marketing and manufacturing new products with the knowledge that when the market had been developed by paying a royalty, others would then be free to benefit without having made any outlays for the inventor's efforts prior to the granting of the patent, or the development expenditures by the inventor or the assignee for a period of many years after the patent has been granted.

The headstart in a market, which a patent confers, does not last very long at best, and any reduction in existing protection could have but one effect: namely, to deter any extensive research and development program. It would be a disservice to our economy and would place us in the position of being a second best nation in all fields of scientific endeavor were such a step seriously undertaken.

Mr. Robert B. Semple, chairman of the board, Manufacturing Chemists Association, and president of the Wyandotte Chemical Co., appeared before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1961. His statement clearly shows the devastating effect that compulsory licensing would create. Under unanimous consent I insert excerpts from his statement at this point in the RECORD:

> It would decidedly reduce the attractiveness of acquiring a patent. This will certainly have the effect of either materially curtailing research, or of driving much of it underground. This would be particularly true in the case of a small company, because the compulsory licensing requirement of this bill would give to the larger companies early access to the new developments of the smaller companies and I know this was quite thoroughly covered by Dr. Cavallito in the preceding testimony.
>
> In the highly competitive drug and chemical industries, the larger companies, with their greater manpower, greater financial resources for development, and greater recognition in the marketplace, could effectively preempt markets for the newly developed products of a small company which chose to follow the patent route.
>
> I use the words "early access" advisedly. Although the bill provides for an exclusive patent grant for a maximum of 3 years, I believe that in most instances in practical effect the period of exclusive coverage will be considerably less, and that in many cases there will be no period of exclusive coverage at all. But even if the exclusive coverage were to last 3 years, that is an extremely short time, in my experience, to bring a new chemical development to commercial fruition. Most chemical developments that are good enough to achieve patent protection take substantially longer than 3 years to reach any degree of profitability. From my experience, I would say that from 5 to 10 years has been the usual period.
>
> In the most important new field that we have been able to commercialize in my time at Wyandotte, only now, 7 years after the initial patent was issued, and almost 12 or 13 years after we started researching, are we about to recover our research and development outlay and to begin to make a reasonable profit on our substantial investment in plant facilities.
>
> Thus, the compulsory licensing requirement of the bill would make patents far less attractive to the small companies. For a number of reasons, it will also, in many instances, make them far less attractive to the larger companies as well. For example, the compulsory licensing requirement will make it possible for companies which have not spent a single dollar on research of any kind to market a product on the heels of, or at the same time as, the patent owner who will have spent considerable sums for the research and development of the particular product.

Any form of compulsory licensing is comparable to eliminating patents altogether or establishing Government title to all inventions. It destroys the incentive for disclosure of new developments which the patent system has so wisely provided.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on September 22, 1961, when designating American Patent System Week said:

> I invite the people during that week to commemorate the American patent system, which by affording protection and encouragement to inventors as envisaged and authorized by the Constitution, contributes so greatly to the encouragement of inventive genius.

Time-tested results derived from the American patent system, which stems from the founding of our country, support the view that modifications limiting the protection now provided would not be in the public interest. They would deter the disclosure of new developments, erect a wall of secrecy around research activities, and would adversely affect the national security and economic growth of our country. These views, too, are well set forth by Mr. Franz O. Ohlson, Jr., chairman of the Patent Committee, Aerospace Industries Association of America, who said:

> President Kennedy has said many times that one of his principal concerns is the expansion of the economy. The President seeks to increase the gross national product, obtain full employment, and achieve greater prosperity. To reach these goals, the President is relying heavily on the stimulation of private business. It is apparent that among the important existing stimulations to the expansion and modernization of private business are the incentives and protection available in the patent system. The exclusivity afforded to the owner of a patent is the bulwark upon which he can risk existing capital and attract new capital for development of markets for products, marketable products, the construction of plants, the employment of labor, and increasing the gross national product. Without the protection of private ownership of patents * * * an important stimulus will have been lost, and the very objectives so strongly sought by the President will be defeated.
>
> In our technological race with communism, no action should be taken to reduce our incentives to seek new and better developments and products. Additionally,

both industry and the Government today are seriously limited by their own budgets to find needed funds for the support of promising research and development programs.

Any legislation or administrative act which prevents or reduces the investment of private funds in research and development programs adversely affects the general welfare of the United States.

I commend the statements by these distinguished authorities to my colleagues, as a bill providing compulsory licensing of patents for prescription drugs has again been introduced in the other body. In this instance, it is proposed that a compulsory license must be granted if the price of the patented drug is more than 500 percent of the cost of production of such drug. It is imperative that no ill-advised action be taken that will limit the effectiveness of the patent system by attempting to impose an arbitrary ceiling of a fair price as a prerequisite to maintaining the sole rights during the life of the patent under existing law.

COMMUNISTS ON CAMPUS

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed this body concerning the vital issue of Communist speakers on American campuses. From the viewpoint of sound education, it has been said that students will learn more of the truth about communism in 1 hour from a competent teacher or a good book than they can from many hours of listening to the speeches of Communists.

On this point, I heartily agree. The University of Washington formerly permitted Communist Party members and leaders to address students on its campus. This policy was reversed a short time ago. In denying permission for Communist Party leader, Benjamin J. Davis, to debate a member of the University Young Socialists on the campus, President Odegaard, according to the University of Washington Daily, took the following position:

> At this time Odegaard also reaffirmed a policy analogous to learning about leprosy by consulting authoritative textbooks on the subject rather than associating with lepers. He asserted that communism could be fully understood by discussion with academic authorities on the subject rather than associating with Communists by providing them with a speaking platform.

The American Bar Association standing committee on the Bill of Rights issued the following resolution in August 1962:

> BILL OF RIGHTS AS BEING INVOLVED WHERE OFFICERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A. HAVE OR SEEK SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS AT STATE-SUPPORTED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
>
> The question embraced in the foregoing title has been raised with the committee.
>
> The committee is of the opinion that no question of the Bill of Rights is involved in these campus appearances, whatever may be one's notion about academic freedom.
>
> The Communist Party has been declared by Congress to be "in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States". The Subversive Activities Control Board has found as a fact that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is foreign controlled and "operates primarily to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement", which is to "endeavor to bring about the overthrow of existing governments." All of these findings were accepted by the Supreme Court in *Communist Party of the United States* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1 (June 5, 1961; rehearing denied Oct. 9, 1961), and the registration requirements of the act were sustained in the aspect there involved.
>
> The Bill of Rights, including the right of free speech, is a series of legal rights against the State and Federal Governments. A legal right is one that may be enforced or protected in the courts. It is a mistaken notion to discuss in terms of the Bill of Rights a situation in which the right cannot be enforced in court, because the Bill of Rights is in no way involved.
>
> The committee does not believe that the officers of the Communist Party U.S.A., still fully dedicated to advance the objectives of communism, which includes the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, have a legally enforceable right in court to speak on the campus of a State-supported institution, nor, in the opinion of the committee, have the students or faculty members of such an institution a legally enforceable right to require that such Communist officers be allowed to speak on such campuses.
>
> The above is written as if a possible Bill of Rights question, in the legal sense, were involved. We leave out of account that at least some of these institutions have complete control over their properties and may lawfully deny use of campus facilities to any persons not connected with the institution.
>
> The committee is aware, as a matter of fact, that practices have varied among educational institutions, both public and private, in granting platforms on the campus to officers of the Communist Party U.S.A.; but the committee does not concern itself with notions of academic freedom not connected with the Bill of Rights in the legal sense.

In the annual report to Congress in 1962, Director J. Edgar Hoover made the following very cogent remarks regarding this invasion of the campus:

> THE THREAT FROM WITHIN
>
> Probably more Americans saw and heard a self-avowed member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in fiscal year 1962 than in the preceding 10 years. Unquestionably, the party unleashed one of the most intensive propaganda campaigns in its history.
>
> Cause of the sudden torrent of Communist lies was the Supreme Court's ruling in June, 1961, upholding the decision of the Subversive Activities Control Board to the effect that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. The party was ordered to register its members, account for its finances and identify its propaganda in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950.
>
> With typical arrogance and disrespect for constitutional law, party leaders voiced defiance. They loudly proclaimed the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Supreme Court were instruments through which all Americans would be cheated out of their basic rights. Self-righteously, they claimed to be defenders of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Tons of printed propaganda were distributed throughout the Nation; new front groups were organized; and Communist leaders began issuing public statements, appearing on radio and television programs and making speeches. The central theme of the aggressive campaign was the fraudulent claim that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was bearing the brunt of the assault on American rights.
>
> Most successful of all its efforts was its speaking campaign, especially before college groups. From late October 1961, through May 1962, leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., made 48 speeches before groups of college students all across the Nation. Approximately 43,000 persons heard these talks.
>
> Encouraged by the early success of college appearances, the party established a Lecture and Information Bureau and early in 1962 sent a letter to college newspaper editors offering speakers on communism. Near the end of the 1962 fiscal year, the party already was lining up speeches for the coming academic year.
>
> The prime objective of all the public activity on the part of the Communist leaders was to create a new image for the party—an image which connotes respectability, legitimacy as a liberal political faction and freedom from foreign dictates. Their denial of subservience to the Soviet Union, however, was clearly branded as ridiculous by the fact that several party officials were delegates to the 22d Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, in October 1961. Heading the delegation was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, national chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who, in a speech before the Congress, brazenly predicted the United States would be in the Communist orbit by 1980.

I have always wondered why so many so-called liberals practice gross discrimination in favor of Communists. Thieves, murders, tax evaders, and other criminals are not given the opportunity to present their views or their case on college campuses. Why the Communists? Even the Supreme Court, not known for being conservative, has rejected the specious claim that the Communists are members of a political party. This has also been rejected by the legislative and executive branches of our Government. Yet certain educators and public officials cling to the argument that these people should have the right to present their views at a campus forum.

The recent history of the Communist Party before our highest courts of the land is the best answer to these claims:

> Behind the facade of public activity, the Communist Party, U.S.A., remained a sinister evil constantly striving to advance the cause of communism. While the leaders raised a great public clamor and attracted the spotlight to themselves, lesser officials and rank-and-file members drew further into their shell of anonymity. Secret orders went out to tighten the structure and security of the party all along the line. Titles were dropped, committees dissolved, the size of meetings drastically cut. Added emphasis was placed on protecting party records. These actions clearly revealed the party, as its leaders had proclaimed, intended to defy the order to register.
>
> The order for the party to register with the Attorney General became final on October 20, 1961. The deadline of November 20, 1961, passed without compliance, and the obligation then fell upon certain designated party officers. The second deadline of November 30, 1961, passed, and each member of the party then became obligated to register himself by December 20, 1961. No registration was filed.
>
> A Federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1961, returned a 12-count indictment charging the Communist Party, U.S.A., with wilfully and unlawfully failing to register. A motion to dismiss the indictment was filed.
>
> Individual six-count indictments against Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., national secretary, were returned on March 15, 1962. Motions to dismiss these indictments were pending at the end of the 1962 fiscal year.

> The Attorney General on May 31, 1962, petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order 10 members of the National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., to register as party members. These individuals will be afforded a hearing before the Board to determine if their registration should be ordered.

Mr. Speaker, the old bromide "My mind's made up—do not confuse me with the facts" seems to apply here. The facts are clear: the Communists have no legal or ethical right to appear on campus. To maintain that there is a violation of their civil liberties is indeed a farce. Is it not about time that some of our educators wake up to the true nature of this conspiratorial party which by no stretch of the imagination is a political party but rather an illegal band of agents of a foreign power?

THE CARIBBEAN IS ABLAZE WITH COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few minutes to discuss the subject which I believe to be of paramount importance, and to include in the RECORD certain information concerning it.

There is no question in my mind, from information made available from numerous reliable sources, that the Caribbean is ablaze with Communist-led activities; that the Communist threat in the Caribbean is far more than limited to the country of Cuba; that there is a lack on the part of the United States of adequate action in forestalling continued subversion in many countries in the Caribbean area to prevent subversion and infiltration, to prevent arms drops which are taking place constantly, that there is a lack of policy on the part of the administration to implement the Monroe Doctrine. But instead that in effect the Khrushchev doctrine of coexistence is being condoned and being accepted by the administration. This is of great concern to many. I am sure it is of great concern to all people in this country.

The Communist buildup in the Caribbean is not only limited to the takeover in Cuba. I have stated before that in my opinion the country of Haiti, unless the United States takes firm leadership of the Organization of American States in preventing the takeover by the Communists of the country of Haiti, that eventually and not in the too distant future, as soon as an adequate vacuum occurs, that that will be the successful objective of the Communists in Haiti. And, as a matter of fact, they are tooled up, they are armed, and they are preparing to accomplish that task.

I have stated before that it was my opinion from irrefutable information that had come to my attention that in Haiti there were numerous Haitian sugarcane cutters from Cuba who had been trained in Cuban subversive schools; had been infiltrated back into Haiti; are there now, and are willing to do the bidding of the Communist dictator Castro and the Kremlin as it relates to Haiti and the eventual Communist takeover.

I have stated further that it is my opinion—and it has been confirmed by numerous sources—that Africans have been infiltrated into Haiti. There has just come to my attention some additional specific information that I believe necessitates being checked out through every possible means by the United States and by the Organization of American States relating to overt, planned Communist infiltration in Haiti. This is the information:

During the last few months, groups of Africans have been transferred from various parts of Cuba to the camps in Minas del Frio, Oriente Province. Some of these groups traveled in trucks from Pinar del Rio Province to the camps. Minas del Frio is being utilized as a training camp, where not only Africans, but also many Latin Americans, are subject to indoctrination.

After completing the training, some of the Africans were transported to a farm located near the Port of Imias, on the south coast of eastern Cuba. From this farm, small groups made up of 10 to 30 men have been and are still being shipped to the Republic of Haiti. The Communists have been using Africans for this job because the language spoken in Haiti, a mixture of French and African dialects, called Creole, is very similar to that used in some countries in Africa.

Up to the present time, a total of eight groups has been infiltrated into Haiti. They are to carry out sabotage, terrorism in the cities, as well as organizing guerrilla warfare, in this Republic neighboring Cuba.

A total of 168 Africans had arrived in Haiti up to the month of April. Infiltrations into Haitian territory, from the Port of Imias, took place on the following dates: September 21, 1962, 23 men; January 9, 1963, 14 men; January 25, 1963, 28 men; February 9, 1963, 9 men; February 19, 1963, 24 men; March 4, 1963, 32 men; March 21, 1963, 29 men; April 10, 1963, 9 men.

Further information concerning this matter is available, and I am hopeful that the Organization of American States and this Government will seek out, gather, and confirm all possible information and take necessary action in order to prevent continuing infiltration not only into Haiti by Communist means but many other countries in Latin America.

Let me cite another example, and that is the Dominican Republic. It has been stated by some of the Cuban refugee groups that it was their opinion that there was a considerable Communist buildup taking place in the Dominican Republic. One refugee group stated some time ago, on April 30, as a matter of fact, that Sacha Vollman, Russo-Rumanian, naturalized American, was the power behind Bosch's throne, and that his political sympathies lay with the Reds. This was confirmed just recently, on May 21, when Hal Hendrix, Pulitzer Prize winning newsman of the Miami News, newly arrived from the Dominican Republic, reported that:

> Subtle and peaceful Communist penetration of the Dominican Republic is progressing with incredible speed and efficiency.

Hendrix states further:

> There is ample evidence that Communist forces closely allied with Cuba and the Kremlin, aided by native supporting leftist elements are working openly and covertly to turn this country—

Meaning the Dominican Republic—

> into a second Communist-dominated bastion in the Caribbean.

Let me go on to another Caribbean area and further quote proof of the fact that Communist subversion—the Communist plan and program in the Caribbean—is becoming more and more obvious and that they are succeeding at an alarming rate. I said some time ago that there was Communist infiltration and activities in some of the Leeward and Windward Islands.

Madam Speaker, I have before me a report of Don Bonafede of the Miami Herald who went to the Islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe, which are French islands, who went to Port au Prince and other cities on those islands. This report resulted from that visit, and I quote:

> FORT DE FRANCE, MARTINIQUE.—A Communist stronghold, older than Cuba's Red menace, thrives on this French island and its sister province, Guadeloupe, unnoticed by the rest of the hemisphere.
>
> French officials concede that evidence has been uncovered of a working agreement between followers of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro and the Red Frenchman of the West Indies.
>
> Actual card-carrying Communists are pegged at 2,000 on the 2 islands, each of which has about 300,000 inhabitants. But the party's following far surpasses its paper membership.
>
> Communism's appeal is gaged at almost 40 percent of the Guadeloupe electorate and 15 percent in Martinique. In no other area of the hemisphere can the Communists boast a bigger electoral popularity.
>
> Recently, 12 members of a radical youth movement with the initials OJAM were arrested and jailed on charges of "plotting against the state." Authorities appear reluctant to bring the 13 to trial in fear of making martyrs of them.
>
> The Communist Party wields powerful influence over the agricultural unions, thereby placing it in a strategic position since the island's economy is dominated by the production of sugar and bananas.
>
> Although Catholicism is the prevailing religion, many of its members are outright Communists or fellow travelers. The current secretary general of the Communist Party Secretariat, Armand Nicholas, was as an example, formerly active in Catholic groups.
>
> COMMUNIST OFFICIALS
>
> Several of the islands' mayors are known Communists, including those from three cities in Martinique and the two largest cities in Guadeloupe.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in total at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1963]

RED OUTPOST THRIVES IN FRENCH WEST INDIES

(By Dom Bonafede)

FORT DE FRANCE, MARTINIQUE.—A Communist stronghold, older than Cuba's Red menace, thrives on this French island and its sister province, Guadeloupe, unnoticed by the rest of the hemisphere.

French officials concede that evidence has been uncovered of a "working agreement" between followers of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro and the Red Frenchman of the West Indies.

Actual card-carrying Communists are pegged at 2,000 on the 2 islands, each of which has about 300,000 inhabitants. But the party's following far surpasses its paper membership.

Communism's appeal is gaged at almost 40 percent of the Guadeloupe electorate and 15 percent in Martinique. In no other area of the hemisphere can the Communists boast a bigger electoral popularity.

Recently, 13 members of a radical youth movement with the initials OJAM were arrested and jailed on charges of "plotting against the state." Authorities appear reluctant to bring the 13 to trial in fear of making martyrs of them.

The Communist Party wields powerful influence over the agricultural unions, thereby placing it in a strategic position since the island's economy is dominated by the production of sugar and bananas.

Although Catholicism is the prevailing religion, many of its members are outright Communists or fellow travelers. The current secretary general of the Communist Party Secretariat, Armand Nicolas, was, as an example, formerly active in Catholic groups.

As 2 of the 94 departments (states) of France, Martinique and Guadeloupe are an integral part of the nation, somewhat similar to Hawaii and Alaska to the United States. Hence, they follow the French governmental system in which the centralized power of Paris is transmitted throughout the provinces by appointed prefects. Residual powers are vested in the cities.

"The important thing here is to own city hall," remarked a resident.

COMMUNIST OFFICIALS

Several of the islands' mayors are known Communists, including those from three cities in Martinique and the two largest cities in Guadeloupe.

The mayor of Fort de France, Aime Cesaire, poet, writer and intellectual, is a former Communist who broke with the party 7 years ago. One of the most popular figures in Martinique's political history, he took a large segment of his following with him, thus depriving the Reds of some of their strength.

Cesaire, however, spends almost all his time in Paris, where he also serves in the French Parliament. This absenteeism has cut into his popularity.

The danger here is that the Communists will gain in power as moderates like Cesaire whittle away their influence.

ANTIQUATED SOCIAL SYSTEM

A strong stimulant to Communist agitation is the islands' antiquated social system. A "white planter" society with its unwritten social code per still reigns, although the great majority of the population is colored.

"The French aristocracy, called beke, will go to cocktail parties with Negroes, eat in restaurants with them, have affairs with their women and do business with them—but they will not invite them to their homes and sit down at dinner with them," remarked a resident.

Mixed tennis clubs are condoned but beach parties are segregated.

Another irritant is that the great distance from Paris makes the islanders feel like distant cousins, an attitude unwittingly fostered by the French Government.

For instance, parents in Martinique and Guadeloupe receive a 25 cent daily government subsidy for each child—less than the amount given in continental France.

Also the government-appointed representative who acts as the liaison with Paris has powers far broader than his counterparts in France, and the islanders are beholden to Paris for minor favors.

The Communists seize on these inequities to promote discontent.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, these are clear-cut examples which are ever mounting of the actual overt, purposeful, intentional subversive activities by the Communists in the Caribbean—which, when added to known activities in other Latin American countries give cause for alarm.

Madam Speaker, I think the time has come, it is past, as a matter of fact, for the United States to take leadership action through the Organization of American States in carving out a meaningful program to implement the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, with the ultimate objective of ousting Castro and communism from the hemisphere.

Madam Speaker, it is proven in the past when the OAS was effective, it was effective because it had purposeful, effective leadership from the United States. The lack of that leadership was obvious in Haiti in the recent uprising that took place and the unsettled stalemate that presently exists.

Therefore, I call upon the United States to call a meeting of the Organization of American States for the purpose of carving out such a meaningful program in order to combat subversion in this hemisphere, to provide for adequate patrols of the Caribbean in order to prevent continuing and constant arms drops that are now and have been taking place, a number of them taking place on the northern coast and some on the southern coast of the Hispanola peninsula in particular, relating to two of the countries which were just mentioned, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, to provide an economic and political quarantine of Cuba, to isolate communism in Cuba and eventually to force the downfall of the Cuban Communist dictatorship, to end the flow of subversives to and from Cuba, to get all OAS countries to withdraw recognition from and to stop doing business with Cuba just to mention a few steps.

We cannot afford to wait; we cannot afford to just hope; we cannot afford to sit idly by with the do-nothing aspiration that something might go wrong in Cuba and in the Communist drive in this hemisphere because, if we wait, we will find that we will have in this hemisphere many more Communist-dominated countries in addition to Cuba.

This is a challenge which this country must accept and meet. There are many steps that have been pointed out previously that can be taken. I have mentioned previously on the floor of this House a number of them myself. Senator KEATING has proposed a number and many others have proposed measures. The Stennis committee report had a number of proposals. The Selden committee report contained a number of proposals. I am concerned about the fact that there seems to be no effort to implement any of these proposals at the present time. We cannot afford to wait until it is too late.

Mr. MOSHER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSHER. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on the very specific nature of the important information he has called to the attention of the House this afternoon. Too often we talk here only in general terms concerning the Caribbean. I think it is good to have this detailed information from a source that I consider very authentic in the gentleman from Florida. I agree with him that neither can we stand by idly and wait for events nor can the Organization of American States sit by idly and wait for events to take care of themselves.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate what the gentleman says very much. I feel it is my duty to make information that I believe to be reliable available to the proper authorities and to this Congress. I do not think it is justified to downgrade, to discount, to ignore specific information that is credible, but rather it is the duty of our country in preserving the security of the free nations in this hemisphere and in upholding the Monroe Doctrine to check out every single piece of information that would indicate that the Communists are succeeding in their efforts in this hemisphere and to act to rid the hemisphere of communism. And there is not any question concerning the degree of their success as is reported in these two committee reports of the Congress—those of the Selden committee and the Stennis committee. I would recommend to everyone that they read and digest them, because certainly they are eye openers—proving that a clear and present challenge to the peace and security of this hemisphere does exist.

AFRICA ON WAY TO BECOMING WORLD POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HANSEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, what recently happened in Africa was an event in history. I am confident that when time has brought a proper evaluation of the world-reshaping movements and decisions of the period in which we live, the conference at Addis Ababa will hold a high place in historical significance. It well may mark the emergence of the continent of Africa as a world power, somewhat to be compared to the Articles of Confederation that loosely bound our States together during the Revolutionary War and the critical period which led to the adoption of the Constitution that perfected our Union.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and speaking, I am sure, for all its members, I warmly congratulate the participants in this historic conference, commend them for their dedication to their task and their statesmanlike restraint in avoiding temporary matters of controversial differences while mapping the blueprint of the common interests and endeavors of all the peoples and nations of the mighty continent of Africa.

In the Charter of African Unity, signed by the leaders of Africa during the early morning hours of May 26 at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Africa has given today's world a glimpse of tomorrow's Africa.

In this charter the nations of Africa have established an Organization of African Unity.

By this charter they have laid the cornerstone for a strong, free, democratic and unified continent composed of nations that have pledged to respect the rights of one another, while accepting their responsibility to one another and toward other nations.

The signing of the Charter of African Unity brought to a close one of the most important meetings ever assembled in modern times. After several years of hard preparation by themselves and their officials at bilateral, multilateral, and regional meetings, an Emperor, a Crown Prince, 19 Presidents, 6 Premiers, and 3 Foreign Ministers—the leaders of 30 African States containing nearly a quarter of a billion people—gathered together in Addis Ababa.

At this conference, Africa's leaders succeeded in reconciling the views of the bold and the timid to arrive at a common ground for mutual cooperation and lay the foundation for a democratic, progressive and unified Africa by establishing the Organization of African Unity.

The leaders of Africa have said this is but the first step toward a unified Africa. But, it is a giant step—one deserving our applause, support and understanding.

AFRICA'S POLITICAL MATURITY

In creating the Organization of African Unity, Africa's leaders have demonstrated a poltical maturity of the highest order. It is an answer most convincing to those who tend to regard the nations of Africa as less politically mature, less possessed of the experience necessary to effective international cooperation than the more sophisticated developed countries who too seek political, economic and social progress through one form of unity or another.

Those who gathered at Addis Ababa were able to set aside the dramatic rhetoric which creates headlines, but often little else, to reject the use of the conference as a platform from which to advance special interests in favor of addressing themselves to the needs and interests of all of the peoples of Africa. They have declined to place emphasis on oratory as an instrument to influence other peoples of the world and instead demonstrated an understanding of the problems of others.

They have pledged their allegiance to certain basic principles but publicly acknowledged their own failure always to live up to these principles. They have rededicated themselves to helping in the achievement of independence for all who would be independent, but have recognized that independence is no end in itself; that without economic and social development there can be no lasting political independence and that this independence will only be achieved through joint action and mutual cooperation of a kind that accepts a self-responsiblity for its achievement.

All of this is reflected in the charter signed at Addis Ababa. This document is significant because it embodies the desires and the efforts of Africans to meet Africa's needs and aspirations. It is an example of truly independent action, formulated independently of the influence of this Nation—or any non-African nation—and subscribed to without promise of aid or assistance except that which the signees have pledged toward their common cause. It reflects Africa's determination to rally its own resources behind its own efforts.

CHARTER THE CREATION OF MANY MINDS

The Charter of African Unity is the joint creation of many African leaders of fine ability. It is not the creation of any one person. It represents the meeting of the minds of the able statesmen of many African nations, as our own Articles of Confederation and our own Constitution represented the thinking, not of one or two, but of the many.

The participants in the Conference joined in giving special notice to Emperor Haile Selassie in his role as host of the African Summit Conference.

His approach to African unity, his refusal to accept the preconference recommendation of the Foreign Ministers of the participating states that the drafting of the charter be postponed until a later date, and his successful insistence from the day of the Conference's commencement that the chiefs-of-state not leave his capitol until the document be approved, has been hailed by African and non-African alike.

Emperor Haile Selassie's visit to the United States in October is looked forward to as affording an opportunity for the American people to become more familiar with the blueprint for African unity, the blueprint for tomorrow's Africa, that was drawn at the Conference hosted by the Emperor. He is the head of the oldest independent nation in Africa, indeed the oldest government in the world. He was our stout ally in World War II.

Madam Speaker, I have said many times that as Africa goes so will go the world. What happened at Addis Ababa strengthened that faith. I regret that while the American press gave liberal coverage to the conference, and printed brief summaries of the African Charter, space did not permit the printing of the charter in full. I regard the All-African Charter of Unity of such importance as a statement of the common objectives of the African nations and the methods agreed upon for the advancement of the interest of an entire continent that I am extending my remarks to include the complete text:

ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

We, the heads of African States and governments assembled in the city of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, convinced that it is the inalienable right of all people to control their own destiny, conscious of the fact that freedom, equality, justice, and dignity are essential objectives for achieving the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples, conscious of our responsibility to harness the natural and human resources of our continent for the total advancement of our peoples in the spheres of human endeavor, inspired by a common determination to promote understanding among our people and collaboration among our states in response to the aspirations of our peoples for strengthening our brotherhood and creating solidarity in a larger unity transcending ethnic and national differences, convinced that, in order to translate this determination into a dynamic force in the cause of human progress conditions for peace and security must be established and maintained, determined to safeguard and consolidate the hard-won independence as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our states and to fight neocolonialism in all its forms, dedicated to the general progress of Africa, persuaded that the U.N. Charter and the universal declaration of human rights—to the principles of which we reaffirm our adherence—provide a solid foundation for peaceful and productive cooperation among states, desirous that all African and Malagasy States should henceforth unite so that the welfare and well-being of their peoples can be assured. Resolved to (preserve) the links among our states by establishing and strengthening common institutions, have agreed to create the Organization of African Unity.

A. ESTABLISHMENT

Article I: The high contracting parties do by the present charter establish an organization to be known as the "Organization of African Unity." This organization consists of the continental states, Madagascar, and neighboring islands.

B. PURPOSES

Article II: The organization shall have the following purposes:

1. To promote the unity and solidarity of the African States.
2. To coordinate and intensify their collaboration and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa.
3. To defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence.
4. To eradicate all forms of colonialism from the continent of Africa.
5. To promote international cooperation, with due regard for the U.N. Charter and the universal declaration of human rights.

To these ends, the member states shall coordinate and harmonize their general policies, especially in the following fields: (1) political and diplomatic cooperation, (2) economic cooperation, including transport and communications, (3) educational and cultural cooperation, (4) health, sanitation, and nutritional cooperation, (5) scientific and technical cooperation, and (6) cooperation in defense and security.

C. PRINCIPLES

Article III: The member states, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article I, solemnly affirm and declare their adherence to the following principles:

1. The sovereign equality of all African States.
2. Noninterference in the internal affairs of states.
3. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for its inalienable right to independent existence.
4. Peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration.
5. Unreserved condemnation of political assassination in all its forms as well as of subversive activities on the part of neighboring states or any other states.
6. Absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent.
7. Affirmation of the policy of nonalignment with regard to all blocs.

D. MEMBERSHIP

Article IV: Each independent, sovereign African State shall be entitled to become a member of the organization.

E. RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF MEMBER STATES

Article V: All member states shall enjoy equal rights and have equal duties.

Article VI: The member states pledge themselves to observe scrupulously the principles enumerated in article III of the present charter.

F. INSTITUTIONS

Article VII: The organization shall accomplish its purpose through the following principal institutions: (1) the assembly of heads of state and government, (2) the Council of Ministers, (3) the General Secretariat, and (4) the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration.

Article VIII: The assembly of heads of state and government shall be the supreme organ of the organization. It shall, subject to the provisions of this charter, discuss matters of common concern for Africa with a view to coordinating and harmonizing the general policy of the organization. It may, in addition, review the structure, functions, and acts of the organization and any specialized agencies which may be created in accordance with the present charter.

Article IX: The assembly shall be composed of heads of state and government or their duly accredited representatives, and shall meet at least once a year.

At the request of any member states, approved by the majority of the member states, the assembly shall meet in extraordinary session.

Article X: (1) Each member state shall have one vote, (2) all resolutions shall be determined by a two-thirds majority, (3) questions of procedure shall require a simple majority; whether or not a question is one of procedure shall be determined by a simple majority of all member states present and voting, and (4) two-thirds of the total membership of the organization shall form a quorum at any meeting of the assembly.

Article XI: The assembly shall have the power to determine its own rules of procedure.

Article XII: The Council of Ministers shall consist of foreign ministers or such other ministers as are designated by governments of member states. The Council of Ministers shall meet at least twice a year. When requested by any member state and approved by two-thirds of all member states, it shall meet in extra session.

Article XIII: The Council of Ministers shall be responsible to the assembly of the heads of state and government. It shall be entrusted with the responsibility of preparing conference of the assembly. It shall take cognizance of any matter referred to it by the assembly. It shall be entrusted with implementing the decision of the assembly of heads of state. It shall coordinate inter-African cooperation in accordance with the instructions of the assembly and in conformity with article II of the present charter.

Article XIV: (1) Each member state shall have one vote, (2) resolutions shall be determined by a simple majority of the members of the Council of Ministers, and (3) two-thirds of the total members of the Council shall (constitute a) quorum for any meeting of the Council.

Article XV: The Council shall have the power to determine its own rules of procedure.

Article XVI: There shall be an administrative Secretary General of the Organization who shall be appoined by the assembly of heads of state and government. The administrative Secretary General shall direct the affairs of the secretariat.

Article XVII: There shall be one or more assistant Secretaries General of the Organization who shall be appointed by the assembly of heads of state and government.

Article XVIII: The functions and conditions of services of the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries, and other employees of the secretariat shall be governed by the provisions of this charter and the regulations approved by the assembly of heads of state and government.

Article XIX: Member states pledge to settle all disputes among themselves by peaceful means, and to this end there is created a Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration, whose composition and working conditions will be defined by a separate protocol approval by the assembly of heads of state and governments. This protocol shall be regarded as forming an integral part of this present charter.

Article XX: The assembly shall establish such specialized commissions as it may deem necessary, including: (1) Economic and social commission, (2) educational and cultural commission, (3) health, sanitation and nutrition commission, (4) defense commission, and (5) scientific, technical, and research commission.

Article XXI: Each specialized commission referred to in Article XX shall be composed of ministers concerned or other ministers of plenipotentiaries designated by the governments of the member states.

Article XXII: The functions of the specialized commissions shall be arrived at in accordance with the provisions of the present charter and of the regulations approved by the Council of Ministers.

G. THE BUDGET

Article XXIII: The budget of the organization prepared by the Secretary General shall be approved by the Council of Ministers. The budget shall be financed through contributions from member states in accordance with the scale of assessment of the United Nations, provided, however, that no member state shall be assessed an amount exceeding 20 percent of the yearly regular budget of the organization. The member states agree to pay their respective contributions regularly.

H. SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF CHARTER

Article XXIV:

1. This charter shall be open for signature to all independent, sovereign African and Malagasy States and shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The original instrument, done in the African languages if possible and in English and French, all texts being equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Government of Ethiopia which shall transmit certified copies thereof to all independent sovereign African and Malagasy States.

3. Instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of Ethiopia, which shall notify all signatories of each deposit.

I. ENTRY INTO FORCE

Article XXV: This charter shall enter into force immediately upon receipt by the Government of Ethiopia of the instruments of ratification from two-thirds of the signatory states as soon as possible.

J. REGISTRATION OF THE CHARTER

Article XXVI: This charter shall, after the ratification, be registered with the U.N. secretariat through the Government of Ethiopia in conformity with article 102 of the U.N. Charter.

K. INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARTER

Article XXVII: Any question which may arise concerning the interpretation of this charter shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds of the heads of state and government members of the organization.

L. ADHESION AND ACCESSION

Article XXVIII:

1. Any independent, sovereign African state may at any time notify the administrative Secretary General of its intention to adhere or accede to this charter.

2. The administrative Secretary General shall, on receipt of such notification, communicate a copy of it to all the member states. Admission shall be decided by a simple majority of the member states. The decision of each member state shall be transmitted to the administrative Secretary General, who shall, upon receipt of the required number of votes, communicate the decision to the state concerned.

M. MISCELLANEOUS

Article XXIX: The working languages of the organization and all its institutions shall be the African languages, English, and French.

Article XXX: The administrative Secretary General may accept, on behalf of the organization, gifts, bequests, and other donations made to the organization, provided that this is approved by the Council of Ministers.

Article XXXI: The Council of Ministers shall decide on the privileges and immunities to be accorded the personnel of the secretariat in the respective territories of the member states.

N. CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP

Article XXXII: Any state which desires to renounce its membership shall forward a written notification to the administrative Secretary General. At the end of 1 year from the date of such notification, the charter shall cease to apply with respect to the renouncing state, which shall thereby cease to belong to the organization.

O. AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER

Article XXXIII: This charter may be amended or revised if any member state makes a written request to the administrative Secretary General to that effect, provided, however, that the proposed amendment is not submitted to the Assembly for consideration until all the member states have been duly notified of it and a period of 1 year has elapsed. Such an amendment shall not be effective unless approved by at least two-thirds of all the member states.

In faith whereof, we, the heads of African and Malagasy states and governments, have signed this charter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Riehlman (at the request of Mr. Halleck) on account of death in the family.

Mr. Libonati for Wednesday, May 29, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Finnegan (at the request of Mr. O'Hara of Illinois) for Wednesday, May 29, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan, for 30 minutes, on Friday next, May 31, 1963; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Roudebush, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Jarman, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 5.

Mr. Mathias, on Friday next, for 60 minutes.

Mr. Cramer, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 1 hour, on Thursday, June 6.

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MacGregor (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 60 minutes, on June 3.

Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 60 minutes, on June 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Staebler and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cohelan to revise and extend remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter and a series of tables.

Mr. Cramer in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Feighan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Wright.

Mr. White.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 384. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 449. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 583. An act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 978. An act to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western river rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, May 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

864. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1963, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

865. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to transfer a 50-foot LCM fitted as a fireboat (hull No. C–49098) to the Paid Firemen's Association, Inc., Mount Vernon Fire Department, Mount Vernon, Wash., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

866. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

867. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

868. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

870. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report concerning certain significant problems that are being encountered by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and the State highway departments in administering the program for design and construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System; to the Committee on Government Operations.

871. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend and clarify existing inspection and investigative powers, require a premarketing showing of the safety of cosmetics, assure the safety, efficacy, and reliability of therapeutic, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices, improve the statutory coordination between that act and the biological drug provisions of the Public Health Service Act, provide for cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. Report on the mysterious disappearance of $7.5 million of U.S. securities from the vault of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Calif. (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 6668. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6669. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6670. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6671. A bill to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 6672. A bill to amend Public Law 87-276, so as to extend its provisions for 3 additional years, to expand the program under that act to provide for the training of teachers of all exceptional children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 6673. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6674. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6675. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses paid or incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 6677. A bill to provide maternity benefits for the spouses of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 6678. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain unneeded Federal lands of the Fort Miles Reservation, Del., to the State of Delaware for public educational and park purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 6679. A bill to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6680. A bill for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6681. A bill to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6682. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 6683. A bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer, during the taxable period, disposes of a truck and acquires another truck; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 6684. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make urban planning grants thereunder for the provision of planning assistance to Indian reservations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6685. A bill to consent to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont, establishing an interstate school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6686. A bill to amend paragraph 1537 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 6687. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located in San Marcos, Tex., and administered by the Secretary of Interior as part of the San Marcos National Fish Hatchery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6688. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the actuarial status of the trust funds, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to increase the annual earnings includible in determining benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6689. A bill to extend the principles of equitable adjudication to sales under the Alaska Public Sale Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6690. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1(a) and chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to education under such provisions of law who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 6691. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 6692. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABELE:

H.R. 6693. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6694. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956, relating to vocational training for Indians, to include nurses' training; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6695. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6696. A bill to amend section 351 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of specially adapted housing and automobiles to certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 6697. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from assessing fees or charges for services, publications, or instruments, unless specifically permitted by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of the 150th year of peace between Canada and the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 458. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H. Res. 375. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 376. Resolution pertaining to investigations, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, travel authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 377. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation to determine whether a Reserve commission is incompatible with the holding of a seat in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 378. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 379. Resolution creating a Select Committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H. Res. 380. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the ringing of bells on the 4th day of July of each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. Res. 381. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the State of Maine Legislature recommending full development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper St. John River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting action to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Memorial No. 756, relating to citrus mortgages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as folllows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6698. A bill for the relief of Jenta Burak Falshpan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6699. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jeannie Chien nee Wu Ching-Nee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6700. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo C. Kaguyutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 6701. A bill for the relief of Rasalina Sousa Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6702. A bill for the relief of Adolf and Irena Hasenryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6703. A bill for the relief of Luther D. Stull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6704. A bill for the relief of Jamil Hanna Yousef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6705. A bill for the relief of Shirley D. Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6706. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo Puruganan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6707. A bill for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 6708. A bill for the relief of Carmelita Anciano Liaguno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1962 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $74. E. (9) $288.19.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $17,456.29. E. (9) $17.456.29.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $17,456.29. E. (9) $17,456.29.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $112.75. E. (9) $8,748.74.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $637.21.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,892.21. E. (9) $5,892.21.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $122.77.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,056. E. (9) $8,673.56.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $13,150.06.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $751.77.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John Arens, 500 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $51.11.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $73.75.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,120. E. (9) $33.22.

A. Association of Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $250.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,107.37.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,303.23. E. (9) $16,303.23.

A. J. A. Ayares, Mountain Avenue, Murray Hill, N.J.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $54.40.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.74.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $874.99.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,745.89.

A. C. Morgan Bissette, 3200 34th Street, South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $293.44.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,097.74.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $160.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarge 46, Germany.
E. (9) $250.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432.73.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,853.16. E. (9) $1,853.16.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $937.50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $17.55.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $94.83.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $319.29.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $833.33. E. (9) $7.78.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,895.69. E. (9) $289.56.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,669.29.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,575.42. E. (9) $1,824.34.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $47.60.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Casey, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Jerry Maiatico, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65,000.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, 328 Long Beach Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif.

A. Charles Patrick Clark.
B. B. Rapaport and Son, Inc., Central Street Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $28.55.

A. Paul G. Collins, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 307 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $170.74.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Don Costa, 3527 Brandon Avenue, Roanoke, Va.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $243.19.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
E. (9) $45.10.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $15.98.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $555.50. E. (9) $555.50.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Abraham A. Dash, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $555.50. E. (9) $55.50.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $731.25. E. (9) $13.74.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.46.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,495.66.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. J. D. Durand, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $100.14.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel W. Earnshaw, 983 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Members of Charter Oak Shippers Cooperative Association, Inc., Milford, Conn., and members of Progressive Shippers Cooperative Association, Shrewsbury, Mass.
D. (6) $750.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $587.01. E. (9) $11.20.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $250.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,137.50. E. (9) $15.56.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $8.89.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,437.31.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $70.90.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $15.50.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,290.35. E. (9) $234.90.

A. Goodson & Hannam, 6399 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Rossmoor Corp., Seal Beach, Calif.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,418.64. E. (9) $441.86.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) $11.50.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilson Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $10.50.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 704 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $564.03. E. (9) $555.50.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $37.90.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Joe L. Howell, Jr., 3800 U.S. Highway 51 North, Jackson, Miss.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hays-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $48.97.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $587.01. E. (9) $9.60.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22,480.66.

A. Chester W. Jackson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnson Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $187.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware Corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $16.24.

A. Kennon, White & Odom, 233 St. Ferdinand Street, Baton Rouge, La.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $210.14.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $198.56.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,888. E. (9) $568.72.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wall Street Traders, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ronald Korsan, 5343 Main Street, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $149.59.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $375.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $125.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $205.62. E. (9) $5.40.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 918 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,970.23. E. (9) $1,611.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard International, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $185.62.

A. Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation, Districts, League City, Tex.
E. (9) $192.12.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $430.08.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,040.62. E. (9) $284.77.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,312.50. E. (9) $6.50.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,340.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,860.50. E. (9) $261.40.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $0.60.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,140.66. E. (9) $324.89.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.59.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $77.12.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959 Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $649.61.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $27.05.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of N.A., 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,490. E. (9) $273.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,419.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 9 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $58.02.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $316.50.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $491.90.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,095.02.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Undergraduate & Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $154.57.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. John T. Murphy, 808 North Third Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $122.30.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $155.90. E. (9) $202.61.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $18,469.04. E. (9) $2,475.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,410.60. E. (9) $13,469.24.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,790.50. E. (9) $11,898.45.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41,797. E. (9) $1,710.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Service Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,980.75. E. (9) $2,433.60.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,922.16.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $490. E. (9) $1,099.18.

A. National Bureau for Lathing & Plastering, Inc., 755 NADA Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,198.90.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,598.52.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $39,050. E. (9) $42,169.18

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York City, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York Inc.; Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association, Tokyo; Japan General Merchandise Exporter's Association, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $50.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $168.40.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $37.24.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60,527.25. E. (9) $2,805.97.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90,165.75. E (9) $11,768.38.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,150.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,124.47. E. (9) $20,322.62.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,823.85. E. (9) $840.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,386.38. E. (9) $12,323.74.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,683.83. E. (9) $4,306.97.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $42.41.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $758.52.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $500.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,393.60.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,681.93. E. (9) $835.90.

A. Vaux Owen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,307.38. E. (9) $12.50.

A. Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rufus W. Peckham, Jr., 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $491.90.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $491.90.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $4.75.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $23.40.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.50.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grant S. Ray, 114 Huron Drive, Forest Heights, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.06.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Kollsman Industries Inc., 2005 North Hawthorne Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,598.55. E. (9) $103.75.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW.. Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $220.

A. Rossmoor Corp., Post Office Box 125, Seal Beach, Calif.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Edward C. Rustigan, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United Air Lines, Inc., Box 8800, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; et al.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
E. (9) $513.48.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,398.68. E. (9) $332.15.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $228.29.

A. Henry M. Shine, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,288.50. E. (9) $270.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,292.37. E. (9) $542.26.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Garvey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $220.02.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $577.98. E. (9) $629.33.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $50.30.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Globe Insurance Cos., 150 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.
E. (9) $100.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, Tokyo.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, No. 11, 3-chome, Denma-cho, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 4 Albany Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $10.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $909.63. E. (9) $909.63.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.33. E. (9) $5.64.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.24. E. (9) $21.60.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $60.40.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,397.71.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,034.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $24.50.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $636.35. E. (9) $636.35.

A. Arvin E. Upton and Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee on Radiation Protection & Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.12.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, ORC & B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,841.73.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $4,514.15. E. (9) $1,644.77.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $233.68.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federation Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,323.73. E. (9) $3,323.73.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,464.25. E. (9) $99.62.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,063.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1963:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

Note on Item "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. **Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans)**:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------**Total** for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------**Total** from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------**Total** now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ----------------, 19---)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	**Total**

Note on Item "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. **Expenditures (Including Loans)** in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------**Total** for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------**Total** from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------**Total** now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	**Total**

PAGE 2

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $17.50.

A. V. J. Adduci, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,284. E. (9) $659.23.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,876.22. E. (9) $9,876.22.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $903.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,911.25. E. (9) $2,911.25.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif., and 22 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $2.

A. Edwin N. Altman.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $699.99.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $67.75.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,295.73.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,384. E. (9) $25,348.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations.
E. (9) $29,393.03.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,562.50. E. (9) $19,010.89.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $187,039.90. E. (9) $7,334.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $365.37. E. (9) $425.05.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $74,108.83. E. (9) $33,299.22.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $293.86. E. (9) $10.90.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,399.98. E. (9) $73.10.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9,519.25.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $6,074.88. E. (9) $6,074.88.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $522.20. E. (9) $522.20.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,589.37. E. (9) $2,141.35.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $33,652. E. (9) $11,691.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,606.17. E. (9) $3,606.17.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $20.25.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) $216.61.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $9,750.50. E. (9) $9,750.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $72,308.50. E. (9) $400.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Larry Andrews, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Trade Relations Council of the U.S., Inc.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $24.80. E. (9) $446.65.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $2,059.74.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,178.24.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,691.60. E. (9) $8,691.60.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,544.16. E. (9) $2,544.16.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipelines, 1725 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $200.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $84.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $2,457.75. E. (9) $497.06.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $208.80.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $960.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $244. E. (9) $65.35.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $119.32.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Osmero L. Bartelli, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $374. E. (9) $92.50.

A. William B. Barton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $781.59.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.74.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $874.99.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,569. E. (9) $779.22.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,419. E. (9) $168.07.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Muncey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $9.75.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,680. E. (9) $297.92.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.
E. (9) $179.22.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $17.91.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $385.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $605.

A. James C. Black, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,262.50. E. (9) $354.75.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Benjamin W. Boley, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $164.35.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $247.55.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1209 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $45.56.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $618.34.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500 E. (9) $100.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $481.58.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,526.12. E. (9) $2,526.12.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $23.46.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,452.66.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $522. E. (9) $501.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $8.65.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Roselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $128.15.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $203.55.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $79.73.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $5,286.32. E. (9) $349.35.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $4.38.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $190. E. (9) $190.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $91.95.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.03.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $863. E. (9) $1,541.45.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.03.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $304.88.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $304.88.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Roselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,478.15.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $3,461.15. E. (9) $5,752.72.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C.3.

A. John T. Carlton.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $228.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $3,235.28.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 520 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $92.35.

A. Armand Chankalian, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. United Builders Association of New York, Inc., 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C., and 118 East 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associacion Mexicana de Empacadores de Fresa, A C., Venustiano Carranza 48-50 Piso, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jeppesen & Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $527.27.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $6.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $49.61.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Baldoras No. 36–Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $13.20.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $700.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $37.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,618.45. E. (9) $2,618.45.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,800. E. (9) $6,535.72.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $90.25.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,321.80.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $781.25. E. (9) $213.34.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 316 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $261.54. E. (9) $11.15.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $18,650.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $198.99.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, Reading, Pa.
E. (9) $228.55.

A. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $753.75. E. (9) $753.75.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,768.79. E. (9) $9,057.41.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Cooley, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $852. E. (9) $1,701.24.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,331.30.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,962.53. E. (9) $7,962.53.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $38.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fourteen cement companies.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $880.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ten Canadian investment companies.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $735.02.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Dyestuffs & Chemicals, Inc., 2307 North 11th Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Moller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The North American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass., and The British Cycle & Motor Cycle Industries Association, Ltd., Eaton Road, Coventry, England.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 200 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1.15.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $470.65.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $703.25.

A. Bryce Curry, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th & M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $67.75.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,411.12. E. (9) $3,053.50.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $764.58. E. (9) $27.14.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $35,005. E. (9) $1,025.62.

A. Clarence A. Davis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.
D. (6) $625.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $89. E. (9) $89.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15,966.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Companies, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of the District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $601.12.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $472.50.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $35.39.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $15.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $279.03.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,314.55. E. (9) $89.55.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
D. (6) $1,107.92. E. (9) $207.92.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,915.73. E. (9) $115.73.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,693.28.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $6.80.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,551.24. E. (9) $23,120.95.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas Dixon, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $285. E. (9) $111.26.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $441.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $609.25.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,874.11. E. (9) $197.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,160. E. (9) $1,527.27.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1.88. E. (9) $26.63.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. Walter A. Edward, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $3,125.04. E. (9) $328.52.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $52.15.

A. D. Howard Elliott, 207 Darlington Road, Beaver Falls, Pa.
E. (9) $80.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $63.75. E. (9) $5.29.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $48.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $2.40.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $468.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,030.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $615.39. E. (9) $58.40.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $15.70.

A. Clint Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,419. E. (9) $115.82.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $5,850. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87,823.51. E. (9) $28,857.57.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China, Chinese Government Procurement & Services Mission, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Federation of Regular Taxpayers, Route 4, Box 53, Hastings, Mich.
D. (6) $117.50. E. (9) $103.03.

A. Joseph G. Fenney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $300.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc.
D. (6) $1,415.94.

A. Edward O'Brien Fennell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 6800, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $75.55.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $367.96.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 700 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 700 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 260 Southfield Road, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,920. E. (9) $122.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $9.63.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,553.55.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $172.72.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $170.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $478.

A. George R. Frankovich.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207-11 Sheraton-Biltmore, Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $591.88.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,490.22. E. (9) $6,575.15.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $7.32.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Aubrey Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association & American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $1,211.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Philip Goldstein, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 1011 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,608.84. E. (9) $6,953.97.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $77.27.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $8,649.24. E. (9) $8,649.24.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.14.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $23.22.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $11.18.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) $23.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilson Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $17.35.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., American Mining Congress, and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $2,650.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Martime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,131.65.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $29.65.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,800. E. (9) $117.11.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $125.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $363.84.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,666.68. E. (9) $478.32.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,541.67. E. (9) $28.33.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2.481. E. (9) $619.82.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $156.25. E. (9) $12.04.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.30.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.25.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,427.75. E. (9) $1,427.75.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $28.66.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $18.53.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $806.12.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,097.16. E. (9) $972.16.

A. John K. Herbert, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,725.03.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $282.76. E. (9) $282.76.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $39.60.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $17.35.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) 75.54.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington. D.C.
D. (6) $496.25.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $52.10.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3.50.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,693.28.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.
E. (9) $30.08.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. M. Berlin, Washington, D.C., et al.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $336.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,905.10. E. (9) $9,905.10.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.75.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10,583.99.

A. International Economic Policy Association, Legislative Committee, 1625 I Street, Washington, D.C.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,750.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,762.50. E. (9) $4.20.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $730. E. (9) $985.35.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $150.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,725.01. E. (9) $63.50.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 737 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $5,981.48.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $250.64. E. (9) $7.04.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,200.19. E. (9) $137.25.

A. Ned Johnston, 4309 Saul Road, Kensington, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

D. (6) $216. E. (9) $381.45.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $35.75.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) $50.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $852.69.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $116.77.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 9864 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $82.27.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John T. Kelly, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

E. (9) $210.55.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,482.45. E. (9) $2,164.71.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,581.78. E. (9) $1,457.25.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $114.75. E. (9) $3.15.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $725.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.

D. (6) $1,775. E. (9) $1,775.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $630. E. (9) $72.32.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,540.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $25.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wall Street Traders, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,526.64.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,648. E. (9) $508.14.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,667.68. E. (9) $6,034.67.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Employer National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $2,999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195.12. E. (9) $4.20.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $98.25.

A. Philip S. Leahy, 1334 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $88.13. E. (9) $200.04.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $38.00.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $102.24.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,175. E. (9) $62.56.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,354.34.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $6. E. (9) $18.30.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,767.87. E. (9) $10,767.87.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $10.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 55 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $574.18.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,184.09.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $59.65.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen & Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue and 82d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $79.19.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,395.83. E. (9) $52.60.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.56.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 745 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,846.08. E. (9) $245.40.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $23.11. E. (9) $7.75.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,208.30. E. (9) $42.23.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Fur Manufacturers, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $222.75. E. (9) $3.34.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $91.71.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $940.50. E. (9) $174.96.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $339.34.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Peanut Butter Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $100.
A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,412.85.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4.800. E. (9) $171.50.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $537.51.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–211 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $18,120. E. (9) $2,195.88.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $187.89.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $2.60.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $389.71. E. (9) $246.20.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $463.50.

A. Lawrence S. Martin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,342.73. E. (9) $217.73.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building & Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,492.52.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $294.76.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $558.56. E. (9) $377.71.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $243.75. E. (9) $42.14.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,136.40. E. (9) $43.45.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,802.60. E. (9) $10.50.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations.
D. (6) $3,419.

A. William R. Merriam, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,450. E. (9) $3,675.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,508.45.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 912 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $60.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,090.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Abitibi Power & Paper Co., and Theisen-Clemens Co.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.,
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $429.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive, St. Louis, Mo.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $52.60. E. (9) $110.48.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,820. E. (9) $52.18.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,450. E. (9) $385.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $420.19.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Ray R. Murdock.

B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $699.99.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,203.20. E. (9) $67.90.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $493.50. E. (9) $641.12.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Co., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $16.78.

A. National Association of Electric Co., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $62,339.36. E. (9) $9,163.33.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $267.50. E. (9) $17.50.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $35,048.99. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,776.11.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,287.82. E. (9) $2,287.82.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $7,559.51.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the U.S., 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $124,752. E. (9) $1,710.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,423.10 E. (9) $2,497.60.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25,899.80 E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) $5,094.50 E. (9) $327.18.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,297.37. E. (9) $7,297.37.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $340,749.80. E. (9) $5,324.96.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $4,000.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $5,929.17.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $7,259.72. E. (9) $7,259.72.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,188. E. (9) $5,800.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,823.55. E. (9) $1,783.12.

A. National League of Insured Savings Association, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Member associations of the league.

D. (6) $400,455.08. E. (9) $2,937.16.

A. National Life & Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $56.56.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,832. E. (9) $1,832.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $3,455. E. (9) $3,455.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,811.97. E. (9) $10,354.60.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,274.65. E. (9) $4,274.65.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $785.49.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $42,570. E. (9) $18,000.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,825. E. (9) $13,640.51.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $4,696.96.

A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $30,780. E. (9) $12,697.62.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $680.10.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $230,482. E. (9) $1,988.67.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20. E. (9) $20.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $2,115.94. E. (9) $3,679.42.

A. Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,100. E. (9) $10,091.50.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $168.75. E. (9) $42.41.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $475.55. E. (9) $475.55.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman.

B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,650.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.

D. (6) $1,599.77. E. (9) $1,732.47.

A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $574.50.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $915.84. E. (9) $598.70.

A. T. A. Nooner, Jr., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,600.

A. Walter O. Noreen, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $100.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $90.66.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $446.37.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $66.38.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,724.98. E. (9) $298.37.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $28,188.70.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $424.12.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $173.40.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38.52. E. (9) $2.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,726. E. (9) $192.88.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.10.

A. William Edison Owen, 215 C Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manning Clagget, Robert Smith, John Underwood, all of Accokeek, Md.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $205.62. E. (9) $106.14.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $143.50.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $1,423.87.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $700.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $54.52.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $40.64.

A. Hart Perry, 57 East 74th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $6.05.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $9.90.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $326.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $268.13. E. (9) $50.30.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2,955.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $1,940.64.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $196,696.82. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James K. Polk, Esq., 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $23.90.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $300.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. William R. Pringle, 23640 Bryden Road, Cleveland, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1.95.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) $57.15.

A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $429.05

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $12,249.97. E. (9) $7,523.07.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $114.24.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $176.15. E. (9) $125.95.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,300.01. E. (9) $3,618.04.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $205.70.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $91,902.25.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,284. E. (9) $7,695.26.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Ind.), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $15.

A. Harry R. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $32.25. E. (9) $105.39.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Co., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,124.98. E. (9) $228.81.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $146.75.

A. Eugene Ritzner, 2400 Benedict Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. T. J. Ross & Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6,075.49.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1125 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port au Prince, Haiti.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $102. E. (9) $110.64.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $23.05.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $146.96.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $54.15.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $4,300.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred G. Seig, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $140.79. E. (9) $248.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $147.45.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,065.63. E. (9) $112.90.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $451.27.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $968.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $249.99.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $25.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,387. E. (9) $94.95.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 508 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $100.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,030.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $71.03.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $182.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,650.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,609.19. E. (9) $1,579.15.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $798. E. (9) $187.89.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.01. E. (9) $200.20.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $74.35.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,557.68.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5.458.52. E. (9) $3,768.14.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $868.90.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $45,961.17. E. (9) $4,335.52.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $8.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $127.80.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $260.

A. Frank S. Steele, Post Office Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,791.47. E. (9) $5,052.65.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $262.60.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglalla Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,272.97. E. (9) $1,215.95.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $216.84.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $22.92. E. (9) $15.96.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $46.13.

A. Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,447.91. E. (9) $24.04.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $169.58.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $345. E. (9) $7.20.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $151.77.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,062.50. E. (9) $314.41.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12,357.58. E. (9) $1,404.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $80.05.

A. Trade Relations Council of the U.S. Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,816.67. E. (9) $61.55.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,812.50. E. (9) $78.70.

A. Alben W. Barkley Truitt.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $692.35. E. (9) $25.33.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $850.

A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $12.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) $915.13.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,309.14.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $410,281.68. E. (9) $46,114.57.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $32,045.17.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $15.

A. W. M. Vaughey, Box 4268, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venn, Cole & Associates, Inc., Dupont Plaza Center, Miami, Fla.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $43.22. E. (9) $3.86.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) $519.40. E. (9) $565.59.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $552.50. E. (9) $13.91.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $298.75. E. (9) $20.83.

A. William A. Walton, room 309, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, room 309, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400.77. E. (9) $2,163.11.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $216.35.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,190. E. (9) $10,106.61.

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $603.15.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $200.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $3.13.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $16.87.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. City of Redondo Beach, Municipal Building, Redondo Beach, Calif.
D. (6) $250.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,689.98. E. (9) $440.30.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,865.06.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $78.60.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $99,517.92. E. (9) $10.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $4,625.01. E. (9) $2,428.70.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $203.97.

A. John C. White, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $1,024.05.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.86.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $2.12.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $1.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Producers Association of El Salvador, San Salvador.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $70.42.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $144.35.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $311.28.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $308.60.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $51.85.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $315.13.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.75.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,440. E. (9) $144.52.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,760.75.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1963:

(Note.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the Record, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Ablard & Harrison, 930 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basilio King, Natividad Building, Manila, Philippines.

A. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Beacon Agency, Inc., Broad & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Bergman, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. William S. Bergman, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Garvey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sam Boyce, 414 Second Street, Newport, Ark.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and National Association of Taxicab Owners, 803 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Douglas Burke, 3336 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick P. Burns, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C.3.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139-141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Toni-Michelle Chapman, 1031 Irving Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gwendolyn Clayton, 3574 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cold War Council, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Mayers Co., Inc., 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William K. Condrell, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gary Edward Crom, 45 Madison Lane, South, Newport News, Va.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mahogany Associates, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickins & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Merritt S. Deitz, Jr., 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Duane G. Derrick, Jr., 1615 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Harry J. Donohue, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ariel Dougherty, 3317 Que Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mike Ferri, 3720 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 260 Southfield Road, Detroit, Mich.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Universalist Women, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Fisher, Sharlitt, Hydeman & Gelband, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation & Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claudia M. Fraze, 3030 Macomb Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. I. C. Glendenning, 401 Thomas Avenue, Riverton, N.J.
B. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Haley, Bader & Potts, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Harris, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Holton, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Home Owners of America, Inc., 144 East 24th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Marion L. Horn, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Aaron L. Jayson, 623 Central Avenue, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.
B. National Council of Yacht Clubs, Box 125, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Edwin L. Kahn, 1000 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. League of New York Theatres, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Leary, 18 Bell's Mill Road, Erdenheim, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leslie Lincoln, 2932 Upton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James C. Lucas, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stanley J. McCutcheon, 315 Fourth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Marathon Oil Co.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National and California League of Senior Citizens.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fur Manufacturers Association, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mary McWhirter, 737 Sixth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Peanut Butter Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

A. Mahogany Association, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry Mayers, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Mayers Co., Inc., 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theaters, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Murphy, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

A. National Association of Government Employees, 10 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Council of Yacht Clubs, Box 125, Cedarhurst, Long Island, N.Y.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Neale, Newman, Bradshaw, Freeman & Neale, 705 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo.
B. Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc.

A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Noland, 1100 Circle Tower, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Southern Railway System, 15th and K Streets, Washington, D.C.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William R. Pringle, 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers, Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Scott, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions, 1422 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ben Seaver, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian H. Singman, 1832 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 2319 Lloyd Center, Portland, Oreg.

A. John T. Skelly, 161 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee to Promote American-Made Motion Pictures, 6721 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Coffee Agreement, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Menahem Stim, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Rifkin Textile Corp., 566 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Irving S. Cohen, Inc., 257 West 39th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frederick N. Suttle, Jr., 411 Hiden Boulevard, Newport News, Va.

A. Alben W. Barkley Truitt, 1404 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. William M. Vaughey, Box 4268, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Venn, Cole & Associates, Inc., Dupont Plaza Center, Miami, Fla.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. City of Redondo Beach, Municipal Building, Redondo Beach, Calif.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.

A. Linda Bell Zimmer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Burma, Nationalist China, Hong Kong, and Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the normal, human urge to gamble can be found in almost every country around the world—in Europe, in Africa, in Latin America, in the Middle East, and in the Far East. In 77 countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the Members of this House to the Far East and talk about the government-run lotteries in Burma, in Nationalist China, in Hong Kong, and in Indonesia.

Burma began its lottery operations in 1938 when the British ruled and has continued ever since. The total gross receipts for 1962 were almost $7 million. The net income to the Government came to over $2½ million. While there is no actual earmarking of the profits, lottery proceeds have been used for social welfare, housing, and similar governmental activities.

Nationalist China has only one state-operated lottery which is called the liberty lottery. In 1962, the gross annual receipts came to $3,689,000. The total income to the Government was $1,916,000 which was used for general fiscal purposes.

Hong Kong has only recently gone into the lottery business. Its first lottery was held July 7, 1962. Yet, the results of the two lotteries held in 1962 showed gross receipts of over $1 million. The total net income to the Hong Kong government was almost one-half million dollars which was allocated to expenditures for the purpose of social welfare. The fascinating part is that there was considerable interest in the lottery, and the ticket sales and profit to the government went well above its expectations—so much so that the Hong Kong lottery is firmly established as the new form of painless taxation.

Indonesia is another Far East country which sensibly and realistically recognizes that the urge to gamble is a universal, instinctive human trait which should be controlled and regulated with a national lottery. The total gross annual receipts for 1962 came to $8 million. After payment of prizes, the total net revenue to the Government came to $2 million. This revenue is paid into a special fund which finances various social welfare projects.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as smart as these governments? Why can we not be as logical and as sensible in our treatment of our own people? Yes, why can we not follow the example of New Hampshire? A national lottery in the United States can easily produce over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can help cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Civil Defense Officials Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the day-to-day rush of our duties, seldom do we in the Congress have occasion to take note of the quiet, dedicated work being carried on by our civil defense officials.

Though their numbers are few, these men and women constitute a devoted and conscientious group of public servants. Their work seldom hits the headlines, but they daily do battle with public apathy in an effort to build our preparedness against a day we pray will never come.

The work of these people was brought home to me a few weeks ago when I was privileged to take part in a ceremony marking a fallout shelter in the Fort Worth National Bank Building.

It was the first fallout shelter officially marked in Office of Civil Defense Region 5, which is under the direction of William C. Parker in Denton, Tex.

Since that time I have been informed that Noble Shepherd and the staff of the Fort Worth civil defense office have carried out a 3-day shelter stocking program called "Operation Big Lift." A total of 478,194 pounds of survival items for 47,084 shelter spaces were placed in 33 Fort Worth buildings licensed as public fallout shelters.

Forty-one truck lines, coordinated by the Fort Worth chapter of the NDTA, donated an estimated $10,000 in equipment and personnel to handle the movement. In addition, 89 volunteers assisted in the loading and unloading operations at the depot and shelter points throughout the city.

To Mr. Parker, Mr. Shepherd and the staff and volunteers devoting themselves to these efforts, I would like to extend my personal thanks and congratulations.

Results of the 1963 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listed below are the results of the questionnaire I mailed out to my district in Nebraska during the last week in March. Approximately 45,000 were mailed out and returns totaled almost 20 percent.

It is interesting to note that the people of the Third District in Nebraska want less Federal Government rather than more; that they still believe strongly in the principles of free enterprise and getting ahead through the efforts of individual initiative.

Replies, as you will note, are overwhelmingly in opposition to some of the major proposals before the 88th Congress.

There has been absolutely no demand, according to my mail, for programs such as the National Youth Opportunities Act or the Domestic Peace Corps. There is strong opposition to both of these proposals. The demand seems to come from the minds of a few social do-gooders here in Washington who would like to experiment along these lines at the taxpayers' expense to the tune of a good many millions of dollars.

One of the two most significant results of this questionnaire is question 10, which asks, "Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?" Ninety-one percent replied favorably, with only 4.5 percent in the negative. Polls by other members on this question have brought overwhelming "yes" votes.

Another answer which is particularly significant is question 13(c), which asks if they favor "taking whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime in Cuba." Sixty-eight and two-tenths percent, or over two-thirds, replied favorably and only 14 percent voted "no," with 17.8 percent "not sure."

I trust that the Members will study the results of this poll, as I believe that it is indicative of a majority of our citizens' thinking throughout the country. The recent wheat referendum was a manifesto that our citizens want less, rather than more, Government control and want a cutback in our spending program.

The questionnaire follows:

Results of the 1963 questionnaire

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a $12,000,000,000 deficit budget. Should Congress—			
a. cut taxes regardless of deficit?	10.2	86.7	3.6
b. cut taxes only if spending is reduced?	72.8	22.1	5.1
c. reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?	92.7	4.3	3.0
2. Do you favor the present feed grain program for agriculture?	14.7	56.5	28.8
3. Do you favor the present wheat program for agriculture?	13.0	60.6	26.4
4. Should the Federal Government provide funds for—			
a. public school construction?	13.6	81.3	5.1
b. public school teachers' salaries?	4.8	93.3	1.9
c. loans and scholarships for college students?	34.1	55.1	10.8
d. grants for outstanding elementary and secondary school level teachers to attend universities for further study on subjects they teach?	23.9	67.3	8.8
e. should the full responsibility for primary and secondary education be left to State and local communities?	89.6	7.2	3.2
5. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC of the thirties at a cost of $100,000,000 the 1st year?	10.6	78.6	10.8
6. Do you favor establishment of a "domestic" Peace Corps?	14.4	68.9	16.7
7. Should Congress pass my bill to increase the duties on both live animals and dressed meat imported into the United States?	86.3	6.7	7.7
8. Do you feel that the United Nations is an effective force for world peace?	26.3	52.8	20.9
9. Do you favor—			
a. The King-Anderson medicare bill which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security?	8.4	85.4	6.2
b. Federal legislation which would allow an income-tax deduction for senior citizens to reimburse them for the cost of a health and hospitalization insurance policy taken out with a private insurance company?	57.5	27.7	14.8
10. Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?	91.0	4.5	4.5
11. Do you think that Congress should appropriate $460,000,000 in Federal funds for the construction of public fallout shelters?	7.1	79.6	13.3
12. We are spending $4,200,000,000 on foreign aid this year. Do you feel that this program should be—			
a. continued at present levels?	3.7	93.2	3.1
b. continued, but cut?	63.0	30.8	6.2
c. gradually reduced until terminated?	80.3	15.2	4.5
d. immediately terminated?	35.8	53.2	11.0
13. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should—			
a. continue its present policies?	14.1	71.1	14.8
b. impose a strict embargo to prevent any additional war materials from reaching Cuba until all Communist arms and men are withdrawn?	85.7	7.2	7.1
c. Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?	68.2	14.0	17.8

The Fort Michilimackinac Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call attention to an historic observance which will take place beginning Thursday, May 30, 1963, for 4 days, at Mackinaw City, Cheboygan, Petoskey, and Harbor Springs.

I refer to the Lacrosse-Fort Michilimackinac bicentennial celebration to commemorate the massacre of June 3, 1763, at the Straits of Mackinac.

The people of the richly historic Mackinac Straits area, where Michigan's two beautiful peninsulas are tied together by the magnificent Mackinac Bridge, have arranged these activities to mark this event in the history of the settlement of the Northwest.

A dramatic reenactment of the massacre professionally produced with a cast of hundreds will take place at Fort Michilimackinac on the actual spot where the original massacre occurred. During the 4-day commemorative, beginning on Memorial Day, there will be additional activities characteristic of the period in which the original events took place. This will include tomahawk and knife throwing, muzzle-loader shoots, archery, and canoe handling. There also will be three modern games of lacrosse between two of the Nation's foremost lacrosse teams. This one concession to modernity arises out of the fact that the game from which lacrosse has been developed—the Indian game of bagataway—was the ruse by means of which the Indians were successful in achieving their goal of eliminating the garrison.

Let me tell you the story of this American Trojan horse in the very words of Capt. George Etherington, commandant of Fort Michilimackinac on that fateful day written 9 days later on June 12, 1763, to Major Gladwin, commandant of the British fort at Detroit, which itself was besieged by the Indian nations under the great Chief Pontiac. This is a direct transcript from Captain Etherington's letter:

> MICHILIMACKINAC,
> *June 12, 1763.*
>
> SIR: Notwithstanding what I wrot you in my last that all the Savages were amical and that everything seem'd in perfect tranquility—yet on the second instant the Chipaways who live in aplain near this Fort apointed to play ball, as they had done almost every day since their arrival. They play'd from morning till noon then throwing their ball close to the Gate and observing Lieut. Lesley and me afew paces out of it, they came behind us, seiz'd and carried us in to the Woods.
>
> In the mean time the rest rush'd into the Fort, where they found their squas whom they had previously planted there with their hachets hid under Blankets which they took and in an instant kild Lieut. James and fifteen rank & file and a Trader named Tracy, they wounded two and took the rest of the Garrison prisoners five of which they have since kild.

The massacre was part of the conspiracy of Chief Pontiac and developed in the backwash of the Seven Years' War between the French and British. At the conclusion of the Seven Years' War the British and French signed a peace treaty but the British either forgot to sign a treaty with the Algonquins or chose to simply ignore them.

This meant that as far as the Indians were concerned they were still at war with the British. To them the "French Father," was merely asleep and would one day awaken and regain his former eminence in the New World.

Chief Pontiac, who was shrewd and intelligent and who would have been a great general in any army, was, for the moment, however, ready to concede that the British were dominant and he is reported to have approached them with a request for a commission—the rank of general—in the British army. He was turned down. It was, in part, this slight as well as the Algonquin conviction that they were still at war with the redcoats that led Pontiac to plot a campaign which he believed would drive the British out of the Northwest forever.

His plot was simplicity itself. The British had a number of outposts around the Great Lakes which they had either won from the French or had founded themselves. Among these outposts and forts were Fort Michilimackinac, St. Joseph, Green Bay, Fort Pitt, Niagara, Sandusky. Pontiac's plan was to mount Indian attacks against all these posts simultaneously. And his plan worked, and all up and down the frontier the British outposts were falling to the Algonquins. Nine posts in all were captured at about the same time. And though Pontiac had won the day, he eventually lost his war as the British juggernaut continued to roll through the wilderness, reclaiming the outposts from the Indians.

There is much for the student, tourist, and sightseer to enjoy at the Straits of Mackinac. The old fort has been restored to its original 18th century condition through the combined efforts of Michigan State University and the Mackinac Island State Park Commission. The fort looks now just as it did on the eve of that fateful lacrosse game.

On behalf of the bicentennial committee, may I extend to all of you a cordial invitation to visit the straits area, particularly the restored forts at Mackinaw City and Mackinac Island.

1963 Armed Forces Day Celebration at Fort Devens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record I include therein a speech that I recently made on the occasion of Armed Forces Day at Fort Devens, Mass., in my district:

Remarks in Part of Congressman Philip J. Philbin on Armed Forces Day, Fort Devens, Mass.

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to join with you today at Fort Devens in your inspiring Armed Forces Day celebration.

I am very thankful to General Verbeck for his considerate invitation, and for the fine, outstanding record which he, his able staff, and all the officers and enlisted men of this great command have made for the Army and the national defense.

In community and district, we have always been most fortunate in having notable, splendid commanding officers and other officers and enlisted personnel at Fort Devens. Let me assure you that we have been very proud of the magnificent services this command has rendered to the Nation and the world throughout the years.

Fort Devens is one of our great Army posts and we have every reason always to be proud of its marked contributions to the security of the Nation.

If I may strike a personal note today, I don't suppose that Fort Devens or any other military post has ever had a finer, more capable, efficient, dedicated commanding officer than Gen. William J. Verbeck.

I know he is a man of great modesty and humility but I think it must be said here today that we consider General Verbeck as one of the outstanding commanders of our Armed Forces. A general officer of great ability and humane spirit, considerate of all the personnel of his command and most gracious and helpful in his public and community relations. I am very happy to hail and salute him as a truly great military leader and great American, and I wish for him and Mrs. Verbeck and their lovely family, continued success, good health and all choicest blessings in the future. We will long remember his fine work at Fort Devens and I will ever be grateful for his cooperation and help in behalf of our people.

Fortunately for us, for our Nation and the world, on this Armed Forces Day, we are in a position to make a high and confident appraisal of the state of readiness, efficiency and power of our armed services.

We are faced with an insidious Communist conspiracy which seeks to dominate the world and suppress the liberties of freemen and women. The one great deterrent that is effectively preventing world communism from spreading its influence and control and imposing the evils of tyranny and oppression upon the world has been, is and will continue to be, the strength, power and readiness of our armed services, our great free enterprise system which backs them up, and the will and determination of the American people to preserve our blessed heritage, come what may.

Let us ever be mindful of the great debt we owe to those in every generation who have protected our great land, and those who will continue in the years to come, as long as it may be necessary, to deter the potential enemies of this Nation and the free world, whoever they may be.

Let us today take example from the struggles and sacrifices that so many have made, and are making, to keep this Nation free and safe and inspired by our spiritual ideals, political truths and the promise and faith of our great free destiny.

On this Armed Forces Day and always, let us continue to strive harder than ever through strength, wisdom and justice for lasting freedom and enduring peace in the world.

The International Game of Russian Roulette Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Sudeten German Day will be observed in Stuttgart, Germany, on June 1 through 3, 1963. This is an annual observance which attracts between 300,000 and 500,000 German people. This year sessions of the assembly will be addressed by the President of the German Republic, Federal Minister Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, the Prime Minister of Baden-Wurttenberg and leading members of the Bundestag.

The motto of this year's assembly is "Free Homeland—United Europe."

Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the Record the message which I sent to this important European meeting:

The International Game of Russian Roulette Must Be Stopped

I am pleased to send warm greetings and best wishes to all taking part in the annual Sudeten German Day. The theme you have selected for your annual meeting "Free Homeland—United Europe" is most fitting. It expresses the basic political principles which bind together in common cause civilized people on all the continents. But it has special application to Europe, the historic seat of Western civilization, and the wellspring of the great moral and political values which undergird the foundations of free institutions in the New World.

For centuries imperial Russia, the historic seat of despotism and reactionary thought, has reaped a rich harvest from a divided Europe. It was the practice of the autocratic czars to spread the seeds of discord among the civilized European nations and to drive their leaders into conflict with one another. Every conflict between the advanced European nations increased the imperial power of Moscow. This is a fact of history we must face with reality.

The present Russian dictators are carrying on the predatory traditions of the czars. They have split Europe by the force of arms and they maintain that unnatural and dangerous partition by military occupation and government by terror. An iron curtain has been erected by imperial Russia to mark this dangerous division of civilized Europe. Behind that iron curtain are many once free and independent nations such as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Armenia, Georgia, among others. The peoples of all those captive nations have strong, historic attachments to the culture and ideals of free Europe. All of them are non-Russians who, in this century, have enjoyed the blessings of self-government. The continuing demand of these captive peoples for governments of their own free choice and their aspirations for freedom and national independence have served as a powerful brake on the aggressive and imperial ambitions of Moscow. Continued Russian resistance against the legitimate aspirations of these highly civilized peoples has made Central-East Europe into a volatile, political tinderbox. The growing aspirations of these captive peoples for freedom and national independence and the continuing efforts of imperial Russia to impose upon them a feudal and primitive way of life has created a serious threat of bloody revolutions and war.

That threat must be removed. Peaceful arbitration of that conflict is imperative. Universal application of the principle of national self-determination, under United Nations supervision, must be applied to that vast area of conflict without delay. The self-evident alternative is bloody revolutions and wars of liberation into freedom which could escalate into a thermonuclear holocaust. To delay action on the peaceful resolution of this volatile political conflict is to court disaster.

Part of this explosive political problem is the partition of Germany by imperial Russia. The people of now free Germany have established a government of their own choice, are masters of their destiny and enjoy the blessings of self-government. In fulfilling their aspirations the people of Germany have had the full support and encouragement of the Western nations. But the Russians have pursued a contrary course with respect to the German territories they occupied at the close of World War II. There a rump government of Moscow stooges has been imposed upon the people. All basic liberties and freedoms are denied the people. The feudal and primitive system of imperial Russia is being forced upon the people. Eighteen years after the close of hostilities the Russians continue a full-scale occupation of a large part of Germany. To emphasize the intention of imperial Russia to make this unnatural partition of Germany a permanent feature of European life, the Russians undertook the highly provocative action of erecting the Berlin wall. That wall stands as a testament to Russian inhumanity—an admission that only the exercise of brute force can prevent the German people from fulfilling their aspirations for a free and united Germany, under a government of their own free choice and through a system which guarantees popular consent by the governed.

President Kennedy has warned the Russian leaders that a continuation of their false partition of Germany is fraught with dangerous consequences. In his memorable reply to the most recent Russian ultimatum on Berlin and Germany, President Kennedy underscored that danger and proposed a peaceful settlement based upon the freely expressed wishes of the people directly concerned. I quote the most pertinent part of his peaceful proposal:

"The U.S. Government continues to believe that there will be no real solution of the German problem, nor any real tranquillity in central Europe, until the German people are reunified in peace and freedom on the basis of the universally recognized principle of self-determination."

President Kennedy made that proposal in July 1961, now almost 2 years ago. The Russians refused to consider it and have continued along their dangerous path of provocations and wholesale denials of basic human rights. Thus, the Muscovites are playing a game of Russian roulette with the pent-up and explosive aspirations of all the non-Russian peoples imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. We must stop that game of Russian roulette before the human explosion which is sure to result plunges the world into another war.

I know you join with me in looking forward to the early and universal application of the principle of national self-determination as the only practical means of preventing war. All people who sincerely want peace will call out for this remedy. All who believe in human freedom and justice are working toward this peaceful settlement. All of Europe must be reunited in peace and freedom. Attainment of that objective binds all civilized people in a common cause.

Commemoration of the Brave Japanese-American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there will be a poignant moment in a commemorative program on June 2, 1963, at Arlington National Cemetery when every citizen of the United States should pause to remember with remorse that Americans of Japanese ancestry were misjudged and mistreated at the beginning of World War II; that their subsequent history shows brilliant military achievement; and that they are paying respect to all American war dead and to their own sons who made the supreme sacrifice. In the war hysteria after the attack on Pearl Harbor, these people, of whom there were about 110,000 residing on the Pacific coast, had their patriotism impugned, their property confiscated, and their liberties restrained. They were taken into custody and transported to inland internment camps and the young people denied entry into military service.

The occasion for the gesture of tribute will be at services on Sunday, sponsored by the Japanese American League during which a wreath will be laid at the Tomb of the Unknowns in tribute to all war dead. The services also include commemoration of the Nisei dead in Arlington National Cemetery of whom there are 21, 4 from Idaho.

After 2 years of internment, there was a change of heart on the part of the Government and President Roosevelt declared the Nisei were eligible for military service. More than 33,000 were inducted into the Army and formed into 2 special units, the 442d Regimental Combat Team and the 101st Battalion. Their achievements in the field of battle were spectacular, gallant, and courageous.

The 101st was named "The Purple Heart Battalion" because of the tremendous casualties. The 442d became the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service. Seven unit citations were awarded and for seven major campaigns in Italy and France.

Among the 18,143 individual decorations for bravery were one Congressional Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, one Distinguished Service Medal, 28 oak leaf clusters to the Silver Star, 560 Silver Stars, 22 Legions of Merit, 15 Soldiers Medals, approximately 1,200 oak leaf clusters to the Bronze Star Medals, approximately 4,000 Bronze Star medals, 12 French Croix de Guerre, 2 palms to the French Croix de Guerre, 2 Italian Medals for military service.

President Truman declared—

> The record is documented by episodes of highest valor. Yet the noblest evidence of their devotion to America is that in fighting for their own country, those assigned to the Pacific theater had to fight their own race. This they did, knowing that in victory for the American cause was victory for all mankind.

Coming from Idaho to take part in the commemorative services are Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima of Pocatello, who have two sons in Arlington National Cemetery, and Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakama, of Pocatello, who have one son interred in the hallowed ground there. Another Idaho soldier interred there is the son of Mr. H. Nagano, Blackfoot.

As my tribute to the brave Nisei, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of their names and their parents so that the roster may become a permanent part of the archives of Congress:

NISEI INTERRED AT ARLINGTON

1. Hada, Pfc. Victor K., parents, the Hada family, Nixon, Tex.
2. Ishida, Sgt. Haruo, mother, Mrs. A. Ishida, Milwaukee, Wis.
3. Kokubu, Cpl. Jimmie T., sister, Mrs. Charles Fujisaki, Brighton, Colo.
4. Kuge, Pfc. Tamotsu Thomas, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Kuge, Chicago, Ill.
5. Masaoka, Pvt. Ben Frank, mother, Mrs. H. Masaoka, Los Angeles, Calif.
6. Matsumoto T3g. Hisao, wife, Mrs. Tayeko Matsumoto, Springfield, Va.
7. Morihiro, Pfc. Roy T., parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Morihiro, Los Angeles, Calif.
8. Murakami, Pfc. Kiyoshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakami, Pocatello, Idaho.
9. Nagano, Pvt. Hiroshi, mother, Mrs. H. Nagano, Blackfoot, Idaho.
10. Nagato, Pfc. Fumitake, parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. Nagato, Los Angeles, Calif.
11. Nakamura, Pfc. John M., mother, Mrs. William Nakamura, Flint, Mich.
12. Nakashima, Pvt. Raito, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.
13. Nakashima, Sgt. Wataru, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.
14. Oba, Pvt. Stanley Takeshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. Y. Oba, Portland, Oreg.
15. Onoye, Pfc. Lloyd Mitsuru, sister, Mrs. Ira Shimasaki, Bethesda, Md.
16. Shimizu, T. Sgt. Jimmy T., sister, Miss Mary Shimizu, Seattle, Wash.
17. Shiozawa, Pvt. Roy R., father, Heijiro Shiozawa, Clearfield, Utah.
18. Tanaka, Pfc. John, mother, Mrs. T. Tanaka, Denver, Colo.
19. Tanamachi, Pfc. Saburo, mother, Mrs. K. Tanamachi, San Benito, Tex.
20. Toyota, Pfc. Shichizo, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Toyota, Wickliffe, Ohio.
21. Yamaguchi, T4g. George T., mother, Mrs. Masaye Yamaguchi, Chicago, Ill.

And, as a tribute to the parents of all Nisei military dead and in appreciation of the living and their fine example of citizenship, I offer the closing paragraph of their touching creed:

> Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places, to support her Constitution, to obey her laws, to respect her flag, to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

The creed was written by Mike Matsaoka.

Let's Not Sell Ourselves Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the Henry and Stanley Cichon Post, the American Legion; the Cespino-Russo Post, the American Legion; and the Staten Island Memorial Day Service sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County, at Hero Park, Staten Island, N.Y.:

LET'S NOT SELL OURSELVES SHORT

Gentlemen and ladies, to those of us who have seen service in our country's wars this day holds a particular and cherished significance. It is a day the years roll away, a day when we see ourselves once again in Korea, on the beaches of Normandy or Okinawa, or perhaps in the Meuse-Argonne, or to a few in the fast-thinning ranks of 1898, on San Juan Hill. Whatever our war—and wars haven't changed basically since Caesar's time—our remembrances are much the same. We recall the comradeship, the mounting tenseness and excitement as our ships or planes neared a foreign shore, and the satisfaction of meeting hardship and hazard steadfastly and proudly. Most of the bitterness, the fear and the grief has been washed away by the healing process of time. In your reminiscences with old comrades, you dwell largely on the humorous aspects of service life—or those that seem humorous now but might have been grim indeed at the time. Such as the conversation overheard by one of my friends, whose squad was under fire from a Japanese machinegun on the island of Saipan. One of the riflemen, apropos of nothing at all, remarked to his buddy: "I wish I was a civilian." Whereupon the other, with a wondering look, replied: "Where? Here?"

Those are the bits and pieces of war that remain green and fresh in the memory. But there are other, more important memories that must be kept green and fresh if we are to be worthy of those who shared the experience of war with us but who did not live to share our reminiscenses. Each of us who saw combat can recall the sudden, crushing finality of a friend's death in action.

Let us call a muster roll of those who gave their lives in order that we might be free—and bear in mind that these few figures I give you are only those who were killed in action—in the Revolution, 4,435; in the War of 1812, 2,260; in the Mexican War, 1,733; in the Civil War, 140,414 of the Blue and 74,524 of the Gray; in the Spanish-American War, 385; in World War I, 53,402; in World War II, 291,557; and, in the Korean War, 33,629. Those totals are the cost of freedom. It is a somber balance sheet and, to those of us who were spared to carry on, it must remain a debt of honor that can be paid only if we maintain the resolute faith in ourselves and in our cause that we once so stoutly shared with those who, in Lincoln's immortal words, gave the last full measure of devotion.

We are in a period of unsurpassed material prosperity. Our standard of living has risen beyond the wildest dreams of even the most optimistic economist of two decades ago. Our industry turns out a seemingly inexhaustible array of goods that is the marvel and the envy of the world. Our political system, though it has its imperfections, is generally conceded to be the most equitable thus far devised by man. We are, on balance, the preeminent power in the world.

Yet with all this we, as a nation, seem to be in a period of self-doubt, irresolution, timidity, and even fearfulness. It is very likely that our development of the atomic bomb and our subsequent decision to end the Pacific war with it sowed the seed of guilt in some who today argue that we should strip ourselves of such weapons and entrust ourselves to the dubious mercies of the Kremlin. That the bomb saved hundreds of thousands of lives—Japanese as well as our own—by making an invasion of Japan unnecessary is seldom pointed out.

On every side we see ban-the-bomb groups, composed, I am sure, mainly of sincere, well-meaning people, advocating unilateral disarmament—on our part, of course—if that is the only means of banning the bomb. Their cry is the familiar, "Better Red than dead," and they imply that those who wish to keep our atomic defensive arsenal—on the ground of commonsense—are in some way advocating a nuclear holocaust. To me, this is akin to disarming a policeman on the ground that a hoodlum might be provoked into violence by the sight of the officer's weapon. Unfortunately, these groups create an impression out of all proportion to their numbers and through emotionalism attract many who do not take the time to think the matter out. No one in his right mind advocates a nuclear war; but neither does anyone in his right mind advocate laying down his weapons in the face of an armed enemy.

There are those, too, who are quick to seize upon any internal difficulty in the United States and, with much hand wringing, see in it the signs of decay in our democracy. The civil rights crisis in Birmingham is a case in point. Naturally, the Kremlin has wrung every ounce of anti-American propaganda out of this distressing situation. But our own Cassandras are almost as bad. Conveniently overlooking the great strides the Negro has made in the past decades, they wail that Southern opposition to integration is destroying our "democratic image" and giving aid and comfort to our enemies. To hear them talk, you would think prejudice and bigotry were American inventions. Yet how many of them do you hear condemning anti-Semitism in Russia, a country whose record of Jewish oppression is second only to that of Germany under Hitler? Examined objectively, the claims of these doomsayers that the American way is decaying are, of course, utter nonsense.

Integration is becoming a fact in the South, and peacefully for the most part. But those who take alarm at this struggle, and in the other conflicts that are part and parcel of a dynamic democracy, are persuasive, they have access to the press and the airwaves, and they succeed in sowing a certain amount of doubt in ourselves. The other side of the story is told so seldom that we tend to forget there is another side. And so we wonder * * * are we slipping as a nation? Are we becoming decadent?

When our faith in ourselves begins to weaken, we tend to endow our enemies with far more strength than they possess. It is historically true that we, as a nation, either underestimate or overestimate our foes. In the 1930's, we dismissed the Japanese threat quite airily; our Navy could sink theirs in a day; their Army was primitive; they had no industrial capacity, and so on. Then came Pearl Harbor. Overnight, the Japanese became supermen. When a lone Japanese submarine lobbed a few ineffective shells at an oil refinery on the California coast, the fainthearts spoke wildly of retiring behind the Rocky Mountains to carry on the war from there. Ultimately, of course, we realized what had been true along—though tenacious fighters, the Japanese had no chance from the start in a war with a highly developed industrial nation like the United States. But I detect signs that this lesson is being forgotten, that the doom-sayers and the propagandists have created in us a feeling that the Russians are supermen and their leader, Khrushchev, is a man of consummate cunning whose thought processes are as infallible as the reckoning of a computer. Think back to the day a few years ago when the Reds launched their Sputnik.

From the ensuing uproar you could have been led to believe that the United States had no space program. We became intently self-critical—not that I am against self-criticism, which, in moderate doses can be constructive—and began to question our educational system, our industrial know-how, and the skills of our scientists. Of course, there was nothing seriouly wrong in any of those areas. Yet, today, with the cheers for Gordon Cooper still ringing in our ears, there are those who will tell you—on scanty evidence—that the Russians are far, far ahead of us in the race to the moon. In certain aspects of rocketry, perhaps they are ahead of us slightly. But a good deal of what the Russians claim must be accepted on faith. I want to remind you that nobody, but nobody, in the free world has ever witnessed a Russian space shot. Contrast this strange secretiveness with our launchings—conducted openly with the whole world invited to watch. Yet too many of us feel, in a vague sort of way, that we are behind the Russians in the space race.

This tendency to overestimate the Russians is encroaching into another area, also—the field of history. As World War II recedes down the corridor of time, you hear and read more and more that "Russia won the war in Europe." And you hear it from those who should know better. This, of course, is what Russia wants the world to believe—the Russians also teach that they won the Pacific war singlehanded—and more and more people have been lulled into believing it. But here the Russians cannot hide behind their curtain of secrecy; there are facts and figures, long since swept under the rug, that paint an entirely different picture. Before we buy this myth of the super-Russians, let's, as Al Smith used to say, look at the record.

First, let's examine the Russians' vaunted political acumen and their so-called unrivaled intelligence system. The late tyrant, Stalin, as we know, had a reputation for perceptiveness and guile in his dealings with foreign nations. Yet how many of you know that this same, all-wise Stalin actually believed that Adolf Hitler would honor his nonaggression pact with Russia? And that despite their boasted spy network, the Russians had no inkling of the German attack until one of their division commanders noticed a cloud of dust mounting over the Polish frontier one morning in 1941? Under that cloud of dust were the Nazi armored columns.

It is known now that the Germans were vastly outnumbered in Russia; so much so that most of the general staff corps felt they were courting disaster in challenging the overwhelming and—theoretically—highly skilled Soviet army. We know what happened. The Russian troops disintegrated before the advancing Germans; thousands upon thousands of Russian soldiers simply threw down their arms and surrendered. Others joined the Germans against their own country. The Russians fell back almost to the gates of Moscow. And then, surprisingly, the tide began to turn. The Russians gave it out that their heroic troops and their mighty industry, single-handedly threw back the foe. But what actually happened? Well, we were in the war by that time, and the answer is provided in an official Army history—widely unread, I am unhappy to say—that was published some 10 years ago. It has to do with a dry subject—lend-lease aid—but in this book are facts and figures that every American should know. They will enable us to refute those who would distort history and undermine our faith in ourselves.

This history, written by T. H. Vail Motter, tells us that American deliveries through the Persian corridor to the U.S.S.R. were sufficient, by the standards of our own Army, to maintain 60—and I emphasize that figure, 60—Russian combat divisions in the line. Now, remember that the Persian Gulf corridor was only one of five routes by which we supplied the Soviets. And this corridor carried only 28.8 percent of the grand total of 17,499,861 tons of cargo shipped to Russia from the Western Hemisphere between June 22, 1941, and September 20, 1945.

Mr. Motter points out that almost half of these Russian-aid supplies reached the Soviet Union via a sealane which extended from American Pacific ports around to the north of Honshu. Because of the peculiar situation by which Japan winked at the traffic to her ally's enemy, only supplies classified as nonmilitary were carried. But the rest of these supplies were military. More than 8,500,000 tons of strictly military materiel—enough to maintain from 150 to 200 Russian divisions—were sent to the Soviet from the United States, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of tons contributed by our Allies. Now, consider this item: we shipped to Russia 14,834 military aircraft, a total that was very likely larger than the entire Soviet World War II air force. And consider this item: we shipped to Russia 409,526 trucks—a truly staggering number and a total that represented 7½ months of our output at peak war production and was the equivalent of 2 years and 7 months of the prewar capacity of the vaunted Soviet industrial machine. What this effort cost in money will be forever unknown; we wrote off the military supplies as a part of the war effort and have been negotiating, unsuccessfully, of course, with the Soviets for the balance ever since the end of World War II.

In effect, we underwrote the Russian Army—not only in tanks, planes, arms, and ammunition, but even to the point of preparing a special Red army ration in this country to be canned and shipped to the Soviets. Out of some 250 to 350 Russian divisions in the line against the Germans, we maintained at least half of them. Now the historians say that our aid was a major contribution to the Russian victory. I will go a great deal further than that. I say that the Russian victory over the Germans was "made in the U.S.A." I say further that not only did the Russians not defeat the Germans singlehandedly, as they boast, that they would have damned well lost their war if it had not been for our help. And there is something else we should remember. We accomplished this stupendous feat while raising and magnificently equipping an armed force of 10 million men; while building the greatest Air Force and Navy the world had even seen; while simultaneously fighting two wars in two hemispheres, and while maintaining an adequate if not luxurious civilian economy at home. If the label of "supermen" is to be handed out, it should be handed out to ourselves, not to the Russians. Remember this when the subtle propagandists and the doubters and the handwringers contrive to weaken your faith in yourself and in your country. Tell them of the long muster roll of the dead—those men whom we honor today—whose willingness to sacrifice their lives has proved again and again down the years that our moral fiber is as strong now as it was at Bunker Hill and at Gettysburg. When you are told that Americans are too preoccupied with material gain to fight for a cause, too lacking in stamina and spirit to fight gallantly against hopeless odds, remind them of the Alamo, of the Little Big Horn, where Custer and his troopers died to the last man, of Wake Island, and of Bastogne.

And above all, let us remind ourselves of our obligation to those to whom we do honor today. That obligation is to keep brightly burning the faith in ourselves and in our institutions that is the United States. Perhaps we are too prone to measure the caliber of our Nation in terms of its gross national product, its image abroad, and currently its posture in the space race. The greatness of a people lies in their faith, not in their production. No armed enemy will conquer this country. It can only succumb through default, and where there is faith there can be no default.

In closing, I should like to leave you with what, to me, is one of the most inspiring credos I have ever heard. It was written by Mr. Dean Alfange, who calls it, and I quote, "My Creed." It is also mine, and I hope it will be yours. I quote.

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon, if I can. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the state calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and to say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Thank you.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before the Subcommittee on Poultry of the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman appeared before the Poultry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I felt that Secretary Freeman's remarks were so important that they should be brought to the attention of every member of this body:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POULTRY, OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MAY 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this subcommittee and discuss developments in export markets for U.S. poultry, particularly in the European Common Market. I think this group knows that poultry probably represents our outstanding success story in developing a new market abroad. I can say without hesitation that I have spent as much time, as much energy, in trying to maintain and improve the channels of commerce for poultry as I have on any other product in the foreign trade field.

The history of U.S. poultry shipments to the Common Market—primarily to West Germany—is relatively recent. By this time it is fairly well known history. But it adds up to an outstanding market development effort and will bear repeating.

The export program got underway in 1956, when members of the poultry industry and officials of the Department of Agriculture concluded that West Germany could be an excellent market for U.S. frozen poultry. This feeling persisted despite the skepticism of most German food importers, who seriously doubted that they could sell frozen, yellow-skinned, ready-to-cook birds. Germans preferred, so the argument went, fresh-killed, white-skinned, unfrozen poultry. The United States nevertheless went ahead with plans to give German consumers a chance to try our product. In 1956 the Department of Agriculture provided financial assistance for the first shipment of 4 million pounds of poultry to West Germany so as to keep the price of those first samples at a reasonable level.

The German poultry trade was astounded at the reception U.S. frozen birds got. I rather suspect that the German enthusiasm surprised even the most optimistic American suppliers. At any rate, German consumers turned out to be eager buyers. Poultry stocks were soon exhausted. (At about the same time, a comparably successful sales effort was made in Switzerland, but without any Government assistance.) Exports of poultry continued to increase. From virtually nothing in 1955, poultry sales to West Germany in 1962 reached the high total of 152 million pounds.

But let me make one point right here. German consumers were enthusiastic about U.S. poultry, but the West German Government was not. Despite the fact that their duty was bound under the GATT as 15 percent they were most reluctant to remove quantitative restrictions against poultry imports. As the result of strong pressure by our Government, these restrictions were relaxed in a piecemeal fashion and finally were ended only 2 years ago. When these were removed our exports shot up dramatically. For the first 12 months after liberalization our poultry exports doubled to West Germany.

While this is an outstanding example of market development, there have been many other remarkable achievements by our agricultural groups cooperating with the Department in our market development effort. I was heartened the other day to note that our agricultural exports during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year—through April—were $4,175 million, practically as large as the $4,197 million exported through April of last year. And you will recall that last year's exports of $5.1 billion were at record high. I consider this year's performance, in the face of record competitive crops abroad, particularly of cotton and grains, and our shipping strike last December, a tribute to the merchandising efforts of our agricultural exporters and the ingenuity of our cooperators in developing and maintaining new foreign outlets for their products.

Last year we were confronted with a new situation, far more complex and difficult than the German import restrictions. I refer to the poultry regulation of the EEC Commission in Brussels—which was and is the series of rules regulating both internal and external trade of the Community.

The Common Market's protective system is not a single levy. It is a complex of levies and charges.

First of all, the EEC has established what it calls a gate price, which is simply a minimum import price. We had been told on more than one occasion that this gate price was being established to prevent dumping by state-trading countries, such as those in Eastern Europe. By the time the regulation appeared, however, the intent and purpose of the gate price had been altered drastically. The purpose of the gate price came to be a protective wall. It presumably was based upon production costs in third countries, such as Denmark and the United States, but we found no relationship between the gate price and our own costs. The gate price was established at a landed price of about 33 cents a pound for ready-to-cook broilers, and it has been a long time since our domestic prices for broilers have reflected a landed price as high as this figure.

In addition to the gate price, the EEC Commission established what they called the poultry levy. For outside countries, such as the United States, this levy consists of three parts: (1) the old ad valorem tariff existing prior to the issuance of the poultry regulation, but with a slight downward adjustment; (2) the difference in value of feed grains need to produce a pound of broilers inside and outside of the Community; and (3) a 2-percent ad valorem duty, to give a preference to producers within the Community.

I realize that these are complex details. I'll try to clarify them. They mean simply this: A few years ago German consumers were able to buy U.S. poultry by paying a 5-cent-a-pound import duty. At that rate, U.S. producers could compete with other suppliers. Today, the total import fees have been jumped to 13 cents a pound. Because our exporters can land broiler chickens at Hamburg for roughly 30 to 31 cents a pound, these levies figure out at about 43 percent ad valorem, a most highly restrictive—in fact, I should say—highly excessive rate.

I might say at this point that many months before the new poultry regulation became effective we had stressed to EEC officials that a marked, sudden increase in the 5-cent-a-pound duty could severely damage our export trade. Despite our representations, the change in duties became effective overnight. On July 29 the duty was 5 cents per pound. The next day it jumped to about 10 cents a pound, and shortly thereafter to 13 cents a pound on broilers. And of course this group knows of the harmful effects that this high protective rate had on our exports.

Only part of the problem is with broilers. West Germany used to buy millions of pounds of backs and necks from our broiler industry because of the great popularity of soups and stew in West Germany. Before EEC, these backs and necks used to be landed in Germany for about one-third of the price of whole broilers—or about 10 cents a pound. However, because backs and necks were competing with European-produced stewing hens, the EEC decided to step up the tariff on these parts to extremely high rates. And how they stepped them up. EEC set the gate price and poultry levy for backs and necks at 125 percent of that imposed on whole birds—the same percentage adopted for other poultry parts, such as breasts.

What have been the effects of this complicated system on trade?

First of all, this system has really worked to limit imports from "outside countries" to the markets of the Community, particularly West Germany. Our trade has suffered the most. For the first 9 months of the new system, West German imports of poultry from all sources have dropped to 70 percent of the previous year's comparable 9-month period.

Sharp gains have been achieved by Belgium and France, and the Netherlands has about held its own. So the drop in trade has been at the expense of outside countries—particularly the United States. Imports of U.S. poultry were only about 40 percent of the 1961–62 level and only about 75 percent of the 1960–61 level. U.S. shipments of broilers and stewing hens have been hit especially hard—in contrast to turkeys where, despite the higher levies, we have almost held our own.

But there are problems within the Community as well. The poultry regulation permits heavy subsidies—which they term "restitution"—to be made. This has permitted one Common Market country to cut its export price on shipments to West Germany over 10 cents a pound as compared with its internal prices. The use of these subsidies is being contested strongly by other member countries. As a result, the poultry market in West Germany has suffered considerable disruption. This internal squabble over conditions of fair competition is being hotly debated in Brussels, and is a matter which must be resolved by the member countries. But it certainly is adding complications to our problem.

Nor are problems created by the poultry import system of the Community ending at its borders. Spillover effects have been created. Another "outside" exporting country, whose market in the Community has been curtailed, has responded by aggressively expanding its exports to Switzerland, our second most important export outlet. It has done so, by selling poultry in the Swiss market—as best we can tell—at a price about 15 cents per pound lower than in its home market. As a result, our share of the Swiss market has been cut in half.

These in brief are the problems. What has been done about them?

We have taken vigorous steps to protect our rights. The President has taken a strong personal hand in this matter, and has urged Common Market officials to modify the protective elements of the system to improve access for our poultry. U.S. Ambassadors, our agricultural attachés, have joined in this process. I can state unequivocally that we have had the wholehearted cooperation, at both the technical and policy level, of the whole machinery of our Government in trying to achieve a reasonable solution to this problem. On all my trips to Europe, and in my conversations with Common Market officials visiting here in Washington, I have hammered away at this issue. Nor should we forget that we have had the full cooperation of the U.S. poultry industry in this effort. In this connection, I particularly want to compliment the American Institute of Poultry Industries, which has done so much to help build this market.

We've kept the poultry problem alive on the negotiating table. We haven't let it be swept under the rug.

In a sense, we feel that as poultry goes, so go our overall trade prospects. We believe we must meet the challenge to our poultry trade, not only because of the merits of the product itself, but because of the symbolic importance it has to all our agricultural trade.

What we are seeking, and what we think it is reasonable for us to obtain, according to any reasonable interpretation of international trade rules and policies, is fair access to the European market for our poultry. And we would define fair access to mean modifications in the EEC poultry system to permit us to maintain the same share of the market that we had attained prior to the start of the common agricultural policy. After all, we are providing access, in our own market, to a wide range of EEC products, including many agricultural products. I could mention a few—wines, ham, cheese, fruit and vegetable products, and even a certain amount of poultry products.

In our efforts to obtain relief, we have urged modifications of the existing system. This does not mean that we have accepted in principle the equity of the various elements of the system.

For example, we have insisted that it is unfair to impose the gate price against products received from countries—such as our own—which do not subsidize poultry exports. We have argued the inequity of applying, arbitrarily, high levies on poultry parts—such as backs and necks. We have urged reductions in the grain component of the poultry levy, because we believe that it over compensates for the costs added to poultry by the higher grain prices in the Common Market system.

Despite all our efforts, I can only list two instances where the poultry system has been liberalized. The first of these occurred late last fall when the EEC Commission decided to impose a uniform supplemental levy to replace the individual invoice method of enforcing the gate price. For a while, it appeared that the West German Government was trying to collect two gate price charges—the one under the old as well as the one in the new system. At that time I was in Europe, and protested this case of apparent double jeopardy to Commissioner Mansholt. He assured me that this threat of dual charges was a mistake, and would be corrected. It was.

Also, we had been seeking a more equitable application of the gate price and levy on poultry parts—particularly backs and necks. As I mentioned earlier, these charges originally were set at 125 percent of those imposed on whole birds. Here again, strong representations were made to Community officials. And about a month ago, the Commission lowered the protective level to 60 percent. So now the total charges collected for backs and necks are around 18 cents per pound—7 cents less than before. We still think that this level is overly protective, but it should give some measure of relief to this area of our trade.

One of the things that we have been pounding away at is the feed conversion factor used in the gate price-levy system. From the start, we have been convinced that it was set too high. In order to convince the Commission that this element of the system should be modified, we sent a team of competent poultry experts to the Community last January. I think they did an outstanding job. As a result of their efforts, and, I am sure, independent studies by Commission experts, the EEC Commission proposed in late March, a lowering of the gate price and levy—based on reduced feed conversion factors. The total amount of the reduction proposed was 1.83 cents per pound. This would mean a reduction in the total charge against imports of U.S. broilers into West Germany from just under 13 to a little over 11 cents per pound. Although we believe that the feed conversion factors are still higher than they should be, the Commission proposal is a step in the right direction.

This proposal has not yet been acted upon by the EEC Council of Ministers. It must be approved unanimously by them before it can become effective. We have, of course, lent our strongest support to the Commission proposal in representations made at the capitols of the six countries. We have made it clear that in our view we cannot wait for a resolution of this matter beyond the meeting of this Council which will take place on May 30 or 31.

We are, of course, hopeful that the decision will be favorable. But if the meeting does not bring results, I think that we will have to take an entirely different approach.

We have been patient, perhaps overly patient, in seeking a solution within the existing system. We have demonstrated to Community officials that our trade has been damaged by the new system. And the Commission has acknowledged that remedial action is called for.

The next step in the process would be to invoke our negotiating rights under the so-called standstill agreement concluded as part of the settlement in the last round of tariff negotiations with the Community. Under this agreement, the Community is committed to negotiate with us regarding access to its market for our poultry products. You remember that before the close of the Dillon round of tariff negotiations there was a great urgency to complete the tariff bargain, but we were loathe to close the book on a system such as this which could seriously hurt our trade. Finally, at our insistence, this agreement was concluded with the Community.

We would, of course, carry to the negotiating table the rights we held with respect to poultry as of September 1, 1960. We regard these as extremely valuable rights. They encompassed a large and growing volume of trade at a fixed, reasonable rate of duty.

I would hasten to explain that although the Community is required to negotiate with us, we must come to a mutual agreement as to what constitutes reasonable access for our poultry products based on our negotiating rights.

Should we fail to agree—and, of course, our aim first and foremost is to protect our poultry trade—our only recourse would be to redress the tariff bargain—which is what the Community did when we raised our duties last year on imports of carpets and glass.

Finally, let me say a few words about the implications of the recently concluded GATT ministerial meeting. At that session, the U.S. delegate, Gov. Christian Herter, said that agriculture must be included in the negotiations. He said that the United States could not agree to the closing of negotiations until satisfactory terms of access were developed for agricultural products. The Ministers accepted the recommendation of the United States that agriculture be included in the negotiations. I am greatly encouraged by this decision. Despite all the problems that remain to be worked out, the Ministers have accepted the principle that agricultural negotiations must be worked out side by side with industry.

For the first time, agriculture no longer will be sitting in the corner at these negotiations. Under this administration, agriculture will be sitting as an equal partner at the bargaining table. We're no longer Peck's bad boy. In this negotiation we will be examining, jointly with other countries, the fundamentals of our production and price policies—in other words, the elements of our different systems which affect trade. We welcome this kind of examination on a truly reciprocal basis, since for many commodities there is such widespread governmental influence on both the level of trade and the prices at which commodities are traded. I am convinced that this examination will indicate the relatively liberal access that foreign suppliers enjoy in the U.S. market for a wide range of agricultural products. On the basis of true reciprocity, I think we can expect and demand more liberal access for our exports to foreign countries.

The road ahead will be difficult, but there can be no misunderstanding of the firm intention of our Government to resolve trade problems of the kind we've been talking about today in a fair and equitable manner. Without such solutions, trade negotiations will not be concluded.

Part I. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read with grave concern the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions by Senators J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, and Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, discussing the former herein.

Senator Fulbright spoke on the subject "Is Government by the People Possible?" and answers the question in the first sentence of his article, thus:

> The question before us can be answered simply: Government by the people is possible but highly improbable.

This statement and conclusion in itself is alarming enough, but when coupled with other observations, gives cause for real concern as to the outspoken critics of the traditional American concept of "Government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Senator Fulbright, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded that "we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs" and surprisingly reaches that conclusion on the basis of two premises which he feels dictates the downgrading of congressional constitutional functions in foreign policy. The premises he uses are, first, that the foreign policy difficulties of the Kennedy administration are to be blamed on "diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches" and second, that "the foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's policy, but not itself to initiate or shape policy."

Senator Fulbright suggests that the President become endowed with greater power and authority, resulting obviously in the diminution of congressional powers by acquiescence, because "the Presidential Office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale." In support of this he quotes Walter Lippmann who makes an amazing and almost unbelievably broad indictment of representative government in stating "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the government" has developed and that "the people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern." He follows this with a general downgrading of the Congressman's will or ability to make basic decisions in the interests of the Nation.

The article follows verbatim, with an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 28, 1963, commenting thereon entitled: "A Proposal To Junk the Republic."

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1963]

A Proposal To Junk the Republic

Never before in our history would a politician in the position of Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, have dared suggest, as the Senator has, that we scrap our constitutional system of checks and balances and make it impossible for Congress to "thwart" the President's plans. He would have been instantly, almost universally, and justifiably denounced as a traitor to the principles upon which this Republic was founded.

Yet such is precisely the proposal now made by Mr. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and another Democrat, Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, in a pamphlet issued by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions under the suggestive title, "The Elite and the Electorate."

"The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution," Mr. Fulbright complains, "enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals. * * * The defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought."

Defects? Maybe there are defects in Congress, but where have the most dangerous mistakes been made? Who fumbled the Bay of Pigs invasion by pulling off air cover? Who tells us that we must allow the Government to manage our news? Certainly not Congress; these mistakes can be blamed solely on the executive branch of the Government, whose powers Mr. Fulbright would increase.

Indeed Mr. Fulbright himself is for managed news. "Public opinion," he says, "must be educated and led * * *. This is preeminently a task for Presidential leadership."

The Constitution, in Mr. Fulbright's opinion, is hopelessly outdated. "Government by the people is possible, but highly improbable." Which means, we suppose, that the Revolutionary and Civil Wars were fought in vain, and that the Gettysburg Address can be relegated to the file of historical trivia. The electorate are incapable, through their Representatives in Congress, of running the country; their duties must be handed over to the elite, who, we suppose, inhabit the west wing of the White House and the executive departments.

Congressmen are too susceptible to pressure groups, according to Mr. Fulbright. "Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected, and opportunities lost * * *. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between the executive and legislative branches."

Does Mr. Fulbright suggest that employees of the executive departments are immune to pressure? Does he prefer the risk of bad decisions made by executive fiat to the chance that good programs may occasionally be delayed by Congress? Does he forget that Congress is there as much to prevent mad programs as to enact good ones?

In the past, we repeat, Mr. Fulbright would not have dared make such suggestions. But now we're on a New Frontier, where the President can casually dismiss the Constitution as something "written under entirely different conditions," and where Ambassador Stevenson can deplore old-fashioned patriotism as an obstacle to the hegemony of the United Nations.

And a leading member of the Kennedy team asks us to junk our heritage and substitute the volatile sort of autocracy which General de Gaulle has imposed in France. We're asked to submit to the sort of one-man rule which exists under Mayor Daley in Chicago, where crooked elections are the order of the day.

Let us not forget that this is the same Mr. Fulbright who accused President Eisenhower of muzzling the generals, inhibiting free speech, and usurping the powers of Congress. What better evidence is there that his latest proposal is designed not simply to subordinate Congress to the President, but to subordinate all opposition, and indeed the whole electorate, to the will of a clique which presumptuously regards itself as the elite?

The Elite and the Electorate

(By Senator J. William Fulbright)

The question before us can be answered simply: government by the people is possible but highly improbable. The difficulties of self-government are manifest throughout the world.

The history of political thought in the last century and a half is largely one of qualification, modification, and outright repudiation of the heady democratic optimism of the 18th century. "The play is still on," writes Carl Becker, "and we are still betting on freedom of the mind, but the outcome seems now somewhat more dubious than it did in Jefferson's time, because a century and a half of experience makes it clear that men do not in fact always use their freedom of speech and of the press in quite the rational and disinterested way they are supposed to."

The major preoccupation of democratic thought in our time has been its continuing and troubled effort to reconcile the irrefutable evidences of human weakness and irrationality, which modern history has so abundantly provided, with a political philosophy whose very foundation is the assumption of human goodness and reason. The dilemma has troubled all of the free societies of the West, none more so than the United States, whose national experience until a generation ago seemed to represent the realization of classical democratic theory.

In addition to defects of concept and content, classical democratic thought is marked by a strikingly unhistoric spirit. It grandly and inexplicably conceived of democratic society as an organ created by a single act of human will and reason, ignoring the empirical lessons of the centuries of English history through which representative government had been tortuously evolving in the face of numberless obstacles and diversions. If Englishmen could fall prey to such delusions, it was far easier for Americans, whose revolution lent some credence to the abstractions of rationalist philosophy.

The revolutionaries of 1776 inherited a society that was already the freest in the world. Its freedom was built on solid foundations of English traditions and constitutional principles, which formed the bedrock of future stability. The revolution was not directed against a feudal ancien regime but against the most liberal and progressive monarchy of Europe, whose oppression of the colonists had consisted in recent and limited infringements on long-established rights. The great advantage of America, said Alexis de Tocqueville in a profound insight, lay in not having had to endure a democratic revolution.

The American experience has thus had the appearance but not the reality of a society built by fiat to the specifications of rationalist philosophy. We have been permitted the romance of imagining ourselves revolutionaries when in fact our democracy is the product of long tradition and evolution. The mischief of our rationalist illusion is that it leads to erroneous inferences about our own free society and about the prospects of government by the people elsewhere in the world. Most notably, it blinds us to the powerful limitations on human action imposed by history, to the incalculable difficulties of building a free society, and to the basic incapacity of man to create viable institutions out of the abstractions of pure reason. Society, said Edmund Burke, is indeed a contract, but as the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.

The descent from democratic optimism in Western political thought has been more than borne out by events. As a result of the great conflicts of the 20th century the worldwide dominance of the Western democracies has been lost. These conflicts and upheavals have thrown the domocracies on the defensive and generated powerful strains within the free Western societies themselves. There has developed, writes Walter Lippmann, "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the Government." "The people," he writes, "have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising, and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern."

The impact of mass opinion on vital issues of war and peace, in Lippmann's analysis, is to impose a massive negative at critical junctures when new courses of policy are needed. Lagging disastrously behind the movement of events, Lippmann contends, public opinion forced a vindictive peace in 1919, then refused to act against a resurgent Germany in the interwar years, and finally was aroused to paroxysms of hatred and unattainable hopes in a Second World War that need never have occurred. The impact of public opinion, says Lippmann, has been nothing less than a compulsion to make mistakes.

For a politican who serves at the pleasure of his constituency, the course of prudence is to adhere to prevailing views. To be prematurely right is to court what, to the politicians at least, is a premature retirement. We come at last to the ironic inversion of the classical democratic faith in the will of the people: not only does public opinion fail to hold the politician to the course of wisdom and responsibility but, on the contrary, to take the right course requires a singular act of courage on the part of the politician. A few might share the Wilsonian view that "There is nothing more honorable than to be driven from power because one was right." Far more prevalent is the outlook of Lloyd George, who on more than one occasion quite candidly rejected proposals whose merit he conceded on the grounds that he did not wish to be "crucified" at home. In the Lloyd George view, which is a prototype—and not without some merit in my opinion—there is little glory and still less constructive purpose in being defeated for failing to do the impossible.

Can we reconstruct the excessively optimistic democratic thought of the 18th century into a chastened but more realistic philosophy of government by the people? I believe we can, and this belief, I think, is prevalent among the wisest of statesmen and scholars.

The philosophers of the Age of Reason emphasized the hopes and possibilities of a free society, but the strength and viability of democracy rest not only on its aspirations but also on its accommodations to the limitations of human wisdom, to man's inability to perceive the infinite. Democracy, Winston Churchill once said, is the worst form of government men have ever devised—except for every other form. Or in Jefferson's words: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

If men are often irrational in their political behavior, it does not follow that they are always irrational and, what is more important, it does not follow that they are incapable of reason. Whether in fact a people's capacity for self-government can be realized depends on the character and quality of education. It seems to me an astonishing distortion of priorities that the American people and their Government gladly spend billions of dollars for space exploration while denying desperately needed funds to their public schools. I do not believe that a society that has shamefully starved and neglected its public education can claim to have exploited its fullest possibilities and found them wanting.

The case for government by elites is irrefutable insofar as it rests on the need for expert and specialized knowledge. The average citizen is no more qualified for the detailed administration of government than the average politician is qualified to practice medicine or to split an atom. But in the choice of basic goals, the fundamental moral judgments that shape the life of a society, the judgment of trained elites is no more valid than the judgment of an educated people. The knowledge of the navigator is essential to the conduct of a voyage, but his special skills have no relevance to the choice of whether to take the voyage and where we wish to go.

The distinction of course is between means and ends. The experience of modern times shows us that when the passengers take over the navigation of the ship it is likely to go on the rocks. This does not mean that their chosen destination is the wrong one or that an expert would have made a better choice, but only that they are unlikely to get there without the navigator's guidance.

The demonstrated superiority of democracy over dictatorship derives precisely from its refusal to let ruling elites make the basic moral decisions and value judgments of society. The core of classical democratic thought is the concept of free individuality as the ultimate moral value of human society. Stripped of its excessive optimism about human nature, the core of classical liberalism remains valid and intact. The value and strength of this concept are its promise of fulfillment for man's basic aspirations. The philosopher and the psychoanalyst agree that, whether it issues from reason or instinct, man's basic aspiration is to be a free individual.

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government, accepting the weaknesses as well as the strengths of human nature, must place heavy emphasis on the development of the human capacity for rational moral choice. The challenge to public education is nothing less than to prepare the individual for self-government, to cultivate his capacity for free inquiry and his more humane instincts, to teach him how rather than what to think, in short, to sustain democracy by what Ralph Barton Perry called "an express insistence upon quality and distinction."

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government must replace an ingenuous faith in human nature with a realistic faith in human capacity, recognizing that self-government, though the best form of political organization that men have devised, is also the most difficult. Democracy, in short, must come to terms with man's weaknesses and irrationalities while reaching for the best that is in him.

Such a revised approach to democracy has certain implications for the way in which we organize our Government and conduct its affairs. As Americans with our deeply rooted and fundamentally healthy distrust of government power, we might start by at least reexamining certain long-held convictions based on this distrust of power. We might at least consider the proposition, as expressed by Lord Radcliffe, that "liberty looked upon as the right to find and to try to realize the best that is in oneself is not something to which power is necessarily hostile," that, indeed, "such liberty may even need the active intervention of authority to make it possible."

To return to my metaphor, we must guard against allowing the navigator to determine our destination, but we must allow him to steer the ship without amateur supervision of every turn of the wheel. A political leader is chosen because of his supposed qualifications for his job. If he is qualified, he should be allowed to carry it out according to his own best judgment. If his judgment is found defective by his electors, he can and should be removed. His constituents, however, must recognize that he has a duty to his office as well as to them and that their duty in turn is to fill the office but not to run it. We must distinguish between the functions of representation and of government, requiring our elected leaders to represent us while allowing them to govern.

It may well be questioned whether the enormously complex and slow-moving procedures of the American Government are adequate to meet both the dangers and the opportunities of our foreign relations. Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected and opportunities lost because of the obstacles to decision imposed by our policy processes. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches and the accessibility of all of these centers of power to a wide variety of pressures and interests. The problem is compounded by the durable myth of Jacksonian democracy, the view that any literate citizen can do almost any job and that a democracy can do without a highly trained administrative elite.

"Foreign politics," wrote Tocqueville, "demand scarcely any of those qualities which a democracy possesses; and they require, on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those faculties in which it is deficient * * * a democracy is unable to regulate the details of an important undertaking, to persevere in a design, and to work out its execution in the presence of serious obstacles. It cannot combine its measures with secrecy, and it will not await their consequences with patience. These are qualities which more especially belong to an individual, or to an aristocracy."

My question is not whether we might wish to alter our traditional foreign policy making procedures but whether in fact we have any choice but to do so in a world that obstinately refuses to conduct its affairs under Anglo-Saxon rules of procedure.

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. There are major areas of foreign policy—those relating more to long-term problems than to immediate crises—wherein Presidential authority is incommensurate with Presidential responsibility as a result of the diffusion of power between executive and legislative branches and within the latter. The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals but not itself to initiate or shape policy. These powers, moreover, are widely dispersed within Congress among autonomous committees, each under a chairman who owes little if anything in the way of political obligation to the President.

The defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought. These pertain primarily to foreign policy. In domestic matters, it seems to me, the Congress is as well qualified to shape policy as the executive, and in some respects more so because of the freedom of at least some members from the particular electoral pressures that operate on the President. The frequency of elections and the local orientation of party organizations, however, do not encourage serious and sustained study of international relations. Congressmen are acutely susceptible to local and regional pressures and to the waves of fear and emotion that sometimes sweep over public opinion. The legislator, in short, is under constant and intense pressure to adhere to the prevailing tendencies of public opinion, however temporary and unstable.

Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster a wise and effective foreign policy. This is pre-eminently a task for Presidential leadership because the Presidential office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale. Accordingly, I think that we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs. The prospect is a disagreeable and perhaps a dangerous one, but the alternative is immobility and the paralysis of national policy in a revolutionary world, which can only lead to consequences immeasurably more disagreeable and dangerous.

The preeminence of Presidential responsibility is in no way an implied license for the legislator to evade national and international responsibility and to surrender to the pressures of local and parochial interest. I can find no better words to define this responsibility than those of Edmund Burke in his classic statement to his constituents at Bristol in 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative, to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you; to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

As a freshman Senator in 1946 I attempted in a speech at the University of Chicago to define the proper role of the legislator in relation to his constituents, to the Nation, and to his own conscience. After 17 years I see no reason to alter the views I then expressed in these words:

"The average legislator early in his career discovers that there are certain interests, or prejudices, of his constituents which are dangerous to trifle with. Some of these prejudices may not be of fundamental importance to the welfare of the Nation, in which case he is justified in humoring them, even though he may disapprove. The difficult case is where the prejudice concerns fundamental policy affecting the national welfare. A sound sense of values, the ability to discriminate between that which is of fundamental importance and that which is only superficial, is an indispensable qualification of a good legislator As an example of what I mean, let us take the poll-tax issue and isolationism. Regardless of how persuasive my colleagues or the national press may be about the evils of the poll tax, I do not see its fundamental importance, and I shall follow the views of the people of my State. Although it may be symbolic of conditions which many deplore, it is exceedingly doubtful that its abolition will cure any of our major problems. On the other hand, regardless of how strongly opposed my constituents may prove to be to the creation of, and participation in, an ever stronger United Nations Organization, I could not follow such a policy in that field unless it becomes clearly hopeless. * * *"

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate the theme of these remarks: government by the people, despite its failures and shortcomings, remains the one form of political organization that offers the promise of fulfillment for our highest aspirations. Although we have been compelled to qualify the unlimited optimism of classical democratic thought, we remain convinced that the core of that thought—the belief in the moral sanctity of the free mind and the free individual—remains the most valid of human philosophies. In Carl Becker's words: "* * * although we no longer have the unlimited and solvent backing of God or nature, we are still betting that freedom of the mind will never disprove the proposition that only through freedom of the mind can a reasonably just society ever be created."

Part II. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, commenting further on my concern over the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject, "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, by Senators J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, and Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, discussing the latter herein.

Senator Clark discusses the "Increasing Role of Government," and suggests that the executive branch be strengthened "at the expense of the legislature" and he makes it clear that the legislature includes State and local legislative bodies as well as Congress.

The seeds of distrust of the legislative process is sown by the statements such as "whether we look at any one of these, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt."

The Senator misjudges my views because I look with pride at our constitutionally founded legislative process in general as being superior to any form of government yet devised by man.

Senator Clark points derision at Thomas Jefferson's statement "that government is best which governs least" by saying, "Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least."

He adds, sweeping all criticism of Government control over our everyday lives which is ever-expanding by saying "that nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is an hallucination."

His program for decreasing the legislative function include the drastic steps of: wiping out the "advise and consent" functions of the Senate in enabling the executive "to select his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism"; amending "the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives from 2 to 4 years, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in Presidential years." This has the objective of providing the President with a "me too" Congress answerable to every whim of the President because after all they were elected at the same time and therefore the program of the President presented in the campaign is a mandate.

He adds a disturbing finishing thought intended as the coup de grace for all legislative bodies when he says:

> I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America,

local, State, and National, are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

This is must reading for anyone who has any doubts as to what the true objectives of the New Frontier and the radical liberals that are running our Government today are; or, as to the distrust of the people to govern themselves under our Constitution with balanced legislative, executive, and judicial powers on the Federal level and with the reserved powers of the States and local communities:

THE ELITE AND THE ELECTORATE—THE INCREASING ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

The expansion of government in the 20th century has been the inevitable result of revolutionary economic, social, and political forces which so threaten civilization that their control becomes essential to human survival. The size, range, and complexity of government increases—and will likely continue to do so. There seems no other feasible approach if civilization is to survive.

It can be argued, of course, that the increasing role of government is undesirable. But even though the argument may be moot, I would defend the proposition that this expansion is good—not bad. Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least. The 18th century's aversion to tyranny has become the 20th century's antitotalitarianism. In fact they are much alike; but our democratic reaction is different. We now know—as Britain and Germany know, and France has just discovered—that to be effective in today's world a national government must be capable of strong action, and have strong leadership.

Otherwise democracy cannot survive. The fallacy in Jefferson's argument is the assumption that the expansion of government leads to the curtailment of individual freedoms. This is just not true. Despite the moans of those who thought Lincoln a tyrant, Franklin Roosevelt a dictator, and now the Kennedy's a dynasty, the history of personal freedom in this country is one of which we can be proud.

Where the civil liberties of our people have not been adequately protected, as in the case of Negro Americans, the failure is one of government inaction, not government action. There are, to be sure, blots on our escutcheon from the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts to the reign of Joe McCarthy. But on the whole the force of government has been on the side of the Bill of Rights and of a free individualistic society.

That nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is a hallucination. I cannot think of one example of the "heavy hand of the Federal Government reaching out into our private lives" that has actually been restrictive of our personal freedoms or detrimental to our economy—if, that is, one accepts the concept of the police power (always to be distinguished from the "police state"), the income tax, and the need for organized society.

The Federal Government has been subsidizing education in this country ever since the Northwest Ordinance of 1784. No harm and much good has resulted. The same is true of social security, housing, urban renewal, and Government plans for health care for the aged.

The real question, of course, is not the power of the Government itself, but how that power is used to promote justice and national well-being. The influence in our essentially free economy of the corporation and the big labor unions with their potential concentrations of economic power requires the countervailing pressures of a forceful, democratic government as a watchdog. It is this sense of government as a third force, representing the public interest at home and abroad, which in my view is required to protect both freedom and democracy. It is accordingly as salutary as it is inevitable.

The need for further cooperative international action to prevent political, social, and economic chaos is so great and sensible, and intelligent men from all countries are becoming so used to working together for international advancement, that creative control over world problems will be substituted for the essentially amoral international doctrines of the past. And, alas, the recent past.

Thus, I would hope to see the role of government increase in five major international areas in the next 10 years:

1. General and complete disarmament, verified by an international disarmament organization, enforced by an internationally recruited and commanded peace force. International controversy will be settled by international judicial peace-keeping agencies with adequate budgets and power under world law to enforce their decrees.

2. An international agency, perhaps an outgrowth of the present United Nations, adequately financed with funds saved from the armament race, will direct its activities toward assisting underdeveloped nations to that economic breakthrough which is necessary to enable them to raise living conditions within their borders to standards acceptable in the modern world.

3. An expansion of the powers and activities of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will result in the establishment of a world currency as the medium of exchange for international transactions.

4. An extensive development of interlocking regional agreements for the orderly conduct of world trade, including stabilization of raw commodity prices and reduction of impediments to trade such as tariffs and quotas.

5. An international attack on the population problem.

If even some small part of these developments should occur, the role of government in the world economy will surely increase substantially.

The foregoing discussion may well seem to some unrealistic because the words communism, Russia, and China have nowhere been mentioned. It is obvious that the difficulties placed in the way of achievement of these five goals by the present policies of the Communist nations are substantial. But these difficulties are not insuperable. There can be no lasting progress on a worldwide scale unless and until we can either come to terms with, or overcome, the Communist menace to democracy and freedom. But this major problem, with all its intricacies, requires an even greater intervention of free governments than would otherwise be the case.

On the national scene fiscal policy is being taken out of the realm of morals, where it had languished ever since Ben Franklin's lay sermons on thrift two centuries ago. We treat it today as an economic matter. This is a revolutionary change in policy. Only 3 years ago the budget was still treated as a moral document. A balanced budget was prudent, honorable, sound, and good; a surplus was even more so; a deficit was imprudent, profligate, spendthrift, and bad. The terms were those of moral judgment. Today, with a remarkable bipartisan consensus, fiscal policy is couched in the language of economic consequence.

The next question is: Are our democratic governmental institutions adequate for the responsibilities that these extraordinary social, political, and economic forces are thrusting upon us?

We have inherited from our forefathers a governmental structure which so divides power that effective dealing with economic problems is cumbersome. Local, State, and national governments each have their responsibility in housing and urban renewal, in the appropriate uses of water, in transportation, labor-management relations, and education.

At each level, responsibility for appropriate action is divided between the executive and the legislature, with the judiciary prepared to step in at a moment's notice to declare unconstitutional whatever action the other two may decide upon. Under the circumstances, it is extraordinary how much we accomplish under forms of government heavily weighted against any kind of action, especially any that might alter significantly the status quo.

Of course, inaction is what the Founding Fathers intended—inaction until such time as an overwhelming consensus was prepared for action of some sort, inevitably a compromise. They were right in their day.

But they are wrong in ours.

How, in fact, do our many different governments, with power split three ways both horizontally and vertically, manage in the modern world?

On the whole, better than we have any right to expect. Local and municipal government has revived since the war. State government is the weakest link in the chain, but our Governors, many of them struggling under obsolete State constitutions which hamstring the executive at every turn, are for the most part increasingly aware of the need for their States to play a more effective part in the growth of the regional economy of which they are a part. Respect for the Office of President of the United States, whatever one's politics, has been justifiably high among serious students of government in the years since the depression. The courts, State and Federal, have played, on the whole, a wide and statesmanlike role in adjusting ancient jurisprudence to modern needs while protecting essential civil liberties.

It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down. This is where the vested interest lobbies run riot, where conflict of interest rides unchecked, where demagoguery knows few bounds, where political lag keeps needed action a generation behind the times, where the 19th century still reigns supreme in committees, where ignorance is often at a premium and wisdom at a discount, where the evil influence of arrogant and corrupt political machines ignores most successfully the public interest, where the lust for patronage and favors for the faithful do the greatest damage to the public interest.

As a former chief executive of a large American city, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, as a public servant who, in both capacities, has been obliged to know a good deal about the workings of State government, I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, State, and National are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

There is another almost equally serious defect in our democratic system, which may well result in government's failing in the role required of it in the next 10 years. We are not enticing into government at all levels the high caliber of individual we must have. The rewards of government service are inadequate, the punishments too severe. We leave the choice of careers far too much to the haggling of the marketplace. We make far too little effort to induce our able young people to fill the places where they are needed to advance American and, indeed, world civilization. In short, we are not adequately staffing that part of the army which must fight for freedom through governmental action.

Finally, the effective conduct of the regulatory agencies, local, State, and Federal, is quite definitely unfinished business. This, too, is closely tied to the problem of recruiting adequate personnel. Without adequate regulatory agencies the economy can on the one hand be strangled through redtape and foolish administration or, on the other, come under the domination of powerful special interests whose unchecked greed can destroy competition and, with it, free enterprise.

Thus I postulate that whether government will play its proper role in the next decade is part of a larger problem: Can we equip democratic government with the framework, the tools, and the men necessary to enable us to perform adequately the whole role of government?

What is necessary to staff freedom more effectively? A few suggestions may be offered:

1. The Executive should be strengthened at the expense of the legislature. Perhaps De Gaulle has shown the way. A constitutional amendment increasing the term of Representatives from 2 years to 4, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in presidential years would help to give greater authority to presidential policy and increase his ability to get it enacted. It is usually 5 years between elections in England, yet democracy is not in jeopardy. We need not fear Executive tyranny in this country merely because the legislature is more responsive to Executive recommendations.

Far too many Executive appointments require legislative confirmation. Under the Philadelphia city charter, the mayor makes all appointments without councilmanic approval, except the city solicitor, who is also the lawyer for council. This precedent might well be extended to State and National Governments to permit the Executive to select his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism.

Governors and mayors should be entitled to succeed themselves and should serve for 4-year terms. They should have executive authority over the whole range of government instead of having wide areas of executive action controlled by boards and commissions whose members are not directly responsible to the elected executive. New State constitutions and city charters are badly needed in most States and many of the medium-sized and smaller cities.

Executive pay should be adequate to enable the executive to live in comfort and to send his children to college.

2. Legislative customs, manners, traditions, rules, and procedures should be reformed in the interest of expediting action. Among the practices which render legislatures nonresponsive to democratic pressures, as distinguished from plutocratic or political-machine pressures, are:

Selection of committee chairmen by seniority rather than on ability as determined by secret ballot.

Outmoded procedures productive of delay, such as the filibuster in the Senate, the requirement that committees can meet while the Legislature is in session only by unanimous consent, and the "pickling" in committee of bills strongly recommended by the Executive.

A provision requiring legislation recommended by the Executive to be brought to a vote on its merits would be helpful, as would rules requiring proposed legislation to be reported out of committee favorably or unfavorably on motion of a specified number of committee members.

Sensible budgetary procedure similar to that presently existing in many well-governed cities would be a big help at the national level. For example, there should be a sharp distinction between capital and operating budgets and adequate advance budgetary planning.

3. Reapportionment of legislative districts, now well underway, should help.

4. Living conditions, pay, expense accounts, and working schedules of public servants should be reviewed, with a view to creating the perquisites that will attract talent.

5. The sinister influence of political machines, whose power derives from patronage and the ability to get legislation enacted or defeated, or administrative action taken or denied, at the behest of party contributors, must be destroyed. This can best be done by rigorously enforced modern, merit system legislation, by carefully devised and rigorously enforced laws dealing with political contributions, and by tax inducements to small contributors in the hope that the frightening cost of modern political campaigns can be met without reliance on "fat cats."

6. We must somehow create a climate of public opinion that stops deriding politicians as second-class citizens. To be sure, this is to some extent the problem of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. Politicians must have thick skins. They want, on occasion, to "dish it out" so they must be prepared to "take it." But they are entitled to a presumption of integrity to the same extent as the doctor, the lawyer, the banker. Fear of smear is still a deterrent to the entry into politics of many good citizens.

These are not drastic reforms. They merely modernize our existing governmental structure. Nor, if enacted, will they usher in the millennium. But they should help to make it possible for government to play adequately that role which a continuation of democracy as the most just form of government would seem to require.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until noon Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 6 seconds the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, June 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for the many days of solemn and sacred significance in the calendar of our national life.

We have been privileged to call to mind the vast multitude who gave themselves so sacrificially in order to safeguard our heritage of freedom and democracy.

May our hearts be stirred anew with a passionate longing to lift stricken and suffering mankind out of its miseries and struggles into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Make us eager to join heart and hands with all who are praying and laboring for the dawning of that blessed time when the citizens of our own beloved country and the members of the human family everywhere shall walk together on the highways of peace and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1963, was read and approved.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 368, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as delegates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 1, 1963, and June 30, 1963, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mr. Powell, of New York; Mr. Ayres, of Ohio. And as alternates to attend said Conference, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mr. Roosevelt, of California; Mr. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey.

MEXICAN LABOR BILL

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the rejection on Wednesday of the antiwetback Mexican labor bill will mean increased costs to the consuming public for vegetables and fruits starting January 1, 1964. Also, the failure of the House to extend this law may not be understood by our neighbor and friend, the Commonwealth of Mexico, as this program is in second place, next to the tourist trade in the production of dollars for that great country. An additional and more significant result of the vote on Wednesday would mean the entrance into this country of hundreds of thousands of bracero workers who will swim the river to work on American farms at wages many times the wage that they are receiving in their homeland.

The Mexican labor law brings these workers into this country under a carefully screened and highly regulated procedure by which they are contracted to employers for specified lengths of time to do a particular type of work that our own people are disinclined to perform. This House is a reasonable body and will, upon reflection, extend this law at least 1 year as recommended by the

Department of Labor, the Department of State, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We have but to recall the recent freeze in Florida and its effect upon the price of citrus to the consuming public. Scarcities can come not only from natural disasters as in the case of the Florida freeze, but can result from an inadequate supply of labor at the time required by the particular harvest. Should these food crops be permitted to deteriorate and rot without being harvested and placed into the channels of trade, the housewives will immediately feel the impact of added food costs.

Let us look at limes. Limes are at this particular time in short supply. The price has doubled in recent weeks as a result. During the longshoremen's strike, we recall the situation that resulted when no bananas were made available at America's food outlets. As the supply dwindled, the price shot upward. As the strike continued, none came into this country. If 10 carloads of lettuce is the usual amount required for use in a particular city, and there were to be a 30 percent decline in supply, the price of lettuce would be some 30 percent higher during that period of time.

The Mexican worker is recruited from far into the interior of Mexico at Monterrey, Guamas, and Chihuahua City. Should there be no orderly and systematic law on the statute books, the workers would pour across the border only from the border areas and would not be of the broad general benefit to the economy of the Republic of Mexico as is Public Law 78 at this time. These workers would work only in areas near Mexico. The crops would suffer in many other States and in border States a few miles away from the point of entry. Dollars pour into the affected provinces from which these men come, bolstering the general economy in the area. They take back to Mexico a good word for America as they are so well treated while here that they long for the time to again enter America and obtain the benefits derived from assisting in the harvest of various crops over a wide area.

The bracero worker had been used extensively in former years in the harvest of cotton. This crop is now fast becoming highly mechanized, requiring fewer and fewer supplemental workers from Mexico in the three States of Arkansas, New Mexico, and Texas where these workers were used to a great degree in cotton chopping and the cotton harvest; the number had declined from 151,720 in 1961 to 40,636 in 1962, or a drop in 1 year's time of 73 percent. This situation does not exist when it comes to harvesting tomatoes, beans, cherries, strawberries, lettuce, cucumbers, sugarbeets, and all types of citrus crops. This labor has to be available when needed or else the crop deteriorates rapidly and becomes a total loss.

The American people do not prefer "stoop labor" and would much prefer to work in industry or at some less "back breaking" endeavor. That is understandable. So many of our people are the recipients of welfare checks and commodities. As a result of these programs, it is difficult to obtain the workers that are required during the cultivation and harvest seasons in agriculture.

WHY CUBA?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Communists could have selected any one of several Latin American countries to be their first conquest in the Western Hemisphere. Why Cuba?

Many years before Castro, the Communists thoroughly studied every inch of ground in North and South America. They carefully scrutinized the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf of Mexico. They studied centers of population, rivers, railroad marshaling yards and sealanes. They studied areas of political and economic unrest. They noted carefully the religions, superstitions, prejudices, customs, and the language spoken. They studied the airwaves. The Communists came to the only conclusion obvious to modern Eurasian conquerors planning the destruction of the United States.

Cuba is the most important strategic spot in the entire Western Hemisphere from a military, economic, political, and social standpoint. Cuba in the hands of a powerful enemy could cut North America and South America literally and physically in half. Likewise, it could divide the Atlantic Ocean, north and south. Cuba could control the Panama Canal, and not only divide North America from South America, north and south, but would divide the United States and South America east and west, and thus dominate a large part of the Pacific as well as the Atlantic.

In Communist plans for world conquest, a Red Cuba is as important as a Red China or even Russia itself. Cuba is necessary to the Communists as a base to train agents, subversives, and guerrillas who can go in any and all directions. Printed propaganda is being poured from Cuba into all of the Western Hemisphere. Soon to follow will be more powerful radio and television stations aimed at exploitation of the masses in North America and South America. Jamming of our own television and radio frequencies can be expected. Of course these activities will be supported and backed up by powerful military installations aimed at the heart of our industrial and nuclear potential. Every major move in Cuba by the Communists is being screened and covered with agitation and riots in the United States. The United States is on the defense. Khrushchev won his greatest victory last fall when we guaranteed for him a Cuban sanctuary from which the Communists will assemble the instrumentalities for our own destruction—political and military. Khrushchev and Castro are celebrating that victory over the United States in Russia today. Never before has a Communist Quisling been given such royal and prolonged attention in Russia. They are planning further conquests.

Stark, open, Red communism in Cuba is the No. 1 issue before this Nation today. Each passing moment gives the Communists precious time in Cuba. Every minute strengthens their position. We have missed God-given opportunities to rid the Western Hemisphere of this ruthless menace. Time is running out. We should declare a national emergency, go on a wartime economy, and adopt whatever measures necessary to eliminate now and for all time this Communist cancer which is gnawing at the vitals of our civilization.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has under consideration H.R. 6283, a bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended.

The bill is an administration request and proposal which was introduced by me so that the administration could be heard on this subject. The proposal was transmitted to you, Mr. Speaker, by letter from the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, on February 12, 1963. The full text of that letter of transmittal, explaining the purposes of the legislation, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, to grant the President wider discretion in the assignment of top level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, including their rank and status as Ambassadors or Ministers, and to give the U.S. representative discretion to assign these top representatives to the various organs of the United Nations in accordance with workload and other considerations; to authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other international organizations; and to authorize payment of a housing allowance to certain officers assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United Nations Participation Act now authorizes a representative and a deputy representative of the United States at the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary. In addition, another deputy representative to the Security Council is authorized and the President also may appoint, from time to time, such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the agencies of the United Nations including the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

Ambassador Stevenson has found this to be unnecessarily rigid and it is proposed that the provisions specifying the number and the role of the deputies and their diplomatic titles be deleted. In lieu thereof, the proposed amendment would authorize the President to appoint such additional persons with appropriate title, rank, and status as he deems necessary to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations. In addition, these officers would, at the direction of the U.S. representative to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council and perform such other functions as the U.S. representative is authorized to perform.

These changes will permit the U.S. representative to organize his staff and assign their duties as he deems necessary to accomplish his mission effectively. In the case of the two deputy representatives, Ambassador Stevenson has in mind that they should be alter egos of the U.S. representative and available to represent the United States in any way in which he himself is able to do so. Although the proposed amendment gives the U.S. representative greater flexibility in determining assignments, it remains appropriate for an individual who was to be appointed, for example, to spend most of his time on the Economic and Social Council, to be appointed as representative to that Council, and that the Senate in advising and consenting on his appointment would consider primarily his ability and qualifications to fulfill those duties. This, however, would be on the understanding that if the U.S. representative to the United Nations found it desirable to utilize him temporarily as representative to one of the other organs, he would be in a position to do so.

The amendment also provides that persons who would represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations, including bodies that may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament would be appointed subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Persons appointed to represent the United States in other organs, commissions, and bodies of the United Nations would not require the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is not intended that enactment of this amendment would necessitate the reappointment of any person holding office at the time of its enactment.

The United States maintains a mission to the European Office of the United Nations and other International Organizations at Geneva. Geneva has become increasingly important as the site of many international conferences and organizations and the responsibilities of our mission there have increased commensurately. Therefore, it is proposed in this amendment that the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be authorized to appoint a representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. In addition to representing the United States at the European Office of the United Nations, such person shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may direct.

The proposed amendment to provide a housing allowance for officers of the U.S. mission in New York to remove the anomaly resulting from the location in the United States of the United Nations. The functions performed by the U.S. mission are essentially diplomatic in nature and the representational duties performed by the officers are identical to those performed by officers in similar positions in our Foreign Service missions abroad. However, the quarters allowances authorized by law to our representatives to foreign countries and to international organizations whose headquarters are located outside the United States, are not paid to members of the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United States, as the host nation, can expect and must respond to the many opportunities for the effective social intercourse of representational activities. Foreign delegations look upon the U.S. mission to the United Nations as bearing a special responsibility in this area and they expect to be invited to the homes of the members of the mission. Officers assigned to the U.S. mission are expected to maintain private living quarters in the vicinity of the United Nations in order to discharge their representational responsibilities more effectively for the convenience, and in the interest of the Government. These representational duties are for the most part discharged outside office hours, this being an obligation not imposed on other Federal Government officers stationed in New York.

The expansion of the United Nations to the present total of 110 countries has greatly increased our responsibilities as host government. The problem of making known our Government's policies and determining the policies of the other governments has become of paramount importance. One of the most effective means of doing this is at small social gatherings; but in the past our contacts with other delegates have tended to be largely limited to public meetings, to corridor encounters and hasty restaurant luncheons. It is my firm belief that the personal type of representation, which is least expensive in the long run, brings about a greater understanding between our officers and their colleagues. It allows for creation of a family interest and an exchange of divergent views in the relaxed surroundings of a private American home, which make a pleasant and sympathetic atmosphere for diplomacy. Such entertainment creates good will and does not leave the impression that we are only concerned with immediate and pressing problems in the United Nations. Unfortunately, most of our officers assigned to the mission in New York have not generally been able to carry out their duties in such atmosphere. The reason is that they would be subjected to considerable personal expense in maintaining quarters adequate for such representational purposes.

A major portion of the representational functions in the past have been held in public places, with the exception of those held in Ambassador Stevenson's apartment at the Waldorf. His quarters are, as you know, rented by the Government. Although he is able to bring together the mission's officers and delegates of the foreign missions at representational functions at his suite, it is not the same as these officers entertaining their counterparts in their own homes. A very limited number of our officers, using their personal funds, have been financially able to consider this problem of representation in renting adequate apartments in Manhattan. On the other hand, most of our officers have not been able to assume this added expense and either rent small apartments in Manhattan of inadequate size for representation activities, or have found it necessary to live in the suburbs where such activities are very difficult. For this reason, some of the effectiveness of these officers is lost to the mission. They themselves are placed at a disadvantage with respect to their opposite numbers in other delegations who are receiving rental allowances and other additional compensations usually enjoyed by diplomats serving abroad.

There is need for a new allowance to defray the added costs which certain officers of the U.S. mission are forced to incur if they are to obtain and maintain housing that is adequate for the proper discharge of their representational duties. The amount of this allowance would represent the difference between cost of adequate representational housing and the cost of housing which an officer concerned would have if he had no representational responsibilities. We intend to limit eligibility to those officers having more than usual representational responsibilities and the total cost for their housing allowances would be approximately $60,000 per annum.

The submission of this proposed legislation has been approved by the Bureau of

---

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

To amend the "United Nations Participation Act," as amended, 63 Stat. 734–736.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b) and (d) of section 2 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such Representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time, direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint such additional persons with appropriate titles, rank and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the Representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any Deputy Representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

(c) No change.

Budget as being consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

In the study of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be extremely helpful to my colleagues to have a comparative analysis of the existing legislation and the proposed legislation. Accordingly, I submit herewith the full text of such a comparative analysis:

ACT, AS AMENDED

EXISTING LEGISLATION

Public Law 264, 79th Congress, December 20, 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949.

To provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945".

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative and a deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Persident. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of both the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT, AS AMENDED—Continued

PROPOSED LEGISLATION	EXISTING LEGISLATION
(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative or (2) in connection with a Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter.	(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, but the representatives of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representatives. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.
Section 2 of the Act is hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g) respectively; and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection: "(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European Office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in International Organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."	
(f) [Redesignation only.]	(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.
(g) [Redesignation only.]	(f) All persons appointed in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress) for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsections (c) and (d) of this section as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.
	SEC. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

EXISTING LEGISLATION

times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraph, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle or aircraft, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That except as authorized in Section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance pro-

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

ACT, AS AMENDED—Continued

EXISTING LEGISLATION

vided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter—

"(1) the detail to the United Nations, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine, of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States to serve as observers, guards, or in any noncombatant capacity, but in no event shall more than a total of one thousand of such personnel be so detailed at any one time: *Provided*, That while so detailed, such personnel shall be considered for all purposes as acting in the line of duty, including the receipt of pay and allowances as personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States, credit for longevity and retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to such duty: *Provided further*, That upon authorization or approval by the President, such personnel may accept directly from the United Nations (a) any or all of the allowances or perquisites to which they are entitled under the first proviso hereof, and (b) extraordinary expenses and perquisites incident to such detail;

"(2) the furnishing of facilities, services, or other assistance and the loan of the agreed fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment to the United Nations by the National Military Establishment, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine:

"(3) the obligation, insofar as necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, of any funds appropriated to the National Military Establishment or any department therein, the procurement of such personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, services, or other assistance as may be made available in accordance with the request of the United Nations, and the replacement of such items, when necessary, where they are furnished from stocks.

"(b) Whenever personnel or assistance is made available pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, the President shall require reimbursement from the United Nations for the expense thereby incurred by the United States: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances, or when the President finds it to be in the national interest, he may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of such reimbursement: *Provided further*, That when any such reimbursement is made, it shall be credited, at the option of the appropriate department of the National Military Establishment, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which expenditures were made.

"(c) In addition to the authorization of appropriations to the Department of State contained in section 8 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Military Establishment, or any department therein, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse such Establishment or department in the event that reimbursement from the United Nations is waived in whole or in part pursuant to authority contained in subsection (b) of this section.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT, AS AMENDED—Continued

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Such Act is hereby amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"SEC. 9. The President may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1765 and 3648 of the revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 70, 31 U.S.C. 529), grant certain officers having important representation responsibilities as determined by the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, an allowance adequate to defray the additional housing costs necessitated by such representational responsibilities during the period such officer is assigned for duty in the continental United States as a member of the United States Mission to the United Nations."

EXISTING LEGISLATION

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

"SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923; as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel and light, as authorized by the Act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a); cost-of-living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communications services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); allowances and expenses as provided in section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress), and allowances and expenses equivalent to those provided in section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress); the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding ten years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations referred to in paragraph (a) of section 2 hereof, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the Act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U.S.C. 679), and the allotment of funds, similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said Act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)."

Approved October 10, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6283 consists of three sections:

1. SECTION 1

Section 1 amends subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 2 of the U.N. Participation Act, to provide broader authority and flexibility to the U.S. representative to the United Nations with respect to the assignment of other top-level officials appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to represent the United States in the principal organs of the U.N. and certain other U.N. commissions and bodies.

(A) PRESENT LAW

Under the present law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints the U.S. representative and the deputy U.S. representative who represents the United States in the U.N. Security Council and in "any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations."

The President also appoints, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a second deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations who may "represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of both" the U.S. representative and the deputy U.S. representative to the U.N.

Furthermore, the President appoints, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, U.S. representatives to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Finally, the President has the authority to appoint "such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations"; and to designate any officer of the United States, and any officer of the State Department, to represent the United States in any of the three U.N. Councils, first, in the absence of the regular representatives and deputy representatives; or second, in connection with a specified subject matter. This general authority is subject to the provision that "the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."

(B) PROPOSED CHANGES

Under the provisions proposed in section 1 of H.R. 6283, the President would continue to have the authority to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the U.S. representative to the United Nations. The U.S. representative, as at present, would represent the United States in the U.N. Security Council and in "any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations."

In addition, instead of appointing persons to serve specifically as the deputy U.S. representative, as the second deputy U.S. representative, as the U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council, and as the U.S. representative to the Trusteeship Council, the President would be given authority to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, such additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament—control and limitation of armament. These representatives would, at the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations.

The above changes are embodied in the proposed amendments to subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the U.N. Participation Act.

Furthermore, section 2(d) of the existing law would be revised to bring it into conformity with the changes proposed in the new subsections (a) and (b). These technical changes would not materially alter the President's current authority with respect to the appointment of persons to represent the United States in the United Nations, its organs, and related bodies.

(C) DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES

In effect, the provisions discussed in (b) would give the U.S. representative to the United Nations the authority to assign to particular jobs, the top-level men serving under him at the U.S. mission to the United Nations. These men would still be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and serve at the pleasure of the President. They would not be bound, however, as at present, to specific assignments. They could be shifted around between the various organs of the United Nations as the occasion and the judgment of the U.S. representative to the U.N. dictated.

This is the flexibility which the President asked for in recommending the enactment of section 1 of H.R. 6283.

Two other issues require comment:

First, as to the number of positions affected by the above changes:

Ambassador Stevenson and Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland testified before the subcommittee that the new authority would be applied only with respect to four of the five top positions at the U.S. mission to the United Nations—the fifth position, that of the U.S. representative to the U.N., presently carries sufficient authority to enable the person occupying it to serve in any organ of the United Nations. The wording of the bill, however, is less specific. The bill refers to "such additional persons," without imposing any numerical limitation. It is possible, therefore, that the new authority could be applied to more than four persons appointed to represent the United States in the United Nations and its organs.

This does not mean that H.R. 6283 would give the President any authority which he does not currently have to create high-level positions within the U.S. mission to the United Nations. Under the present law, the President already has the authority to appoint, in addition to the five representatives mentioned above, "such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations."

Second, as to nuclear energy and disarmament:

The law presently permits the President to appoint, subject to confirmation by the Senate, U.S. representatives to "any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."

The proposed wording of H.R. 6283 would retain the principle of Presidential appointments subject to Senate confirmation. In place of the term "atomic energy," however, the bill would insert reference to "such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament)." This change is proposed in view of the developments in the United Nations since the enactment of the present statute. It does not add to the President's authority. It merely lists explicitly what is already included in the general authority granted the President under the present statute.

2. SECTION 2

Section 2 of H.R. 6283 would add a new subsection (e) to section 2 of the United Nations Participation Act, authorizing the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status.

The U.S. representative to the European office of the United Nations would be subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. He would also perform "such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE

The United States maintains a mission in Geneva to represent our interests in the European office of the United Nations and to coordinate U.S. participation in the many meetings and conferences which continuously take place there. Most of the regularly assigned U.S. representatives to international organizations located in Geneva belong to that mission.

The mission in Geneva is presently headed by Roger W. Tubby, a Foreign Service reserve officer, with the personal rank of ambassador.

The proposed legislation would give this position statutory authorization and provide that the person who occupies it should be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

3. SECTION 3

Section 3 of H.R. 6283 would add a new section 9 to the United Nations Participation Act, authorizing the President to "grant certain officers having important representation responsibilities as determined by the representative of the United States to the United Nations, an allowance adequate to defray the additional housing costs necessitated by such representational responsibilities during the period such officer is assigned for duty in the continental United States as a member of the U.S. mission to the United Nations."

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE

For many years, U.S. diplomatic representatives serving abroad have received housing allowances authorized by the Congress.

Such housing allowances are not currently paid to U.S. diplomatic personnel assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations even though these officials have to perform the same type of representational functions as they would in overseas diplomatic posts, and even though the cost of housing in the proximity of the U.N. headquarters in New York City is very high.

The proposed amendment to the law would authorize the President to grant housing allowances to "certain officers having important representation responsibilities" at the U.S. mission to the U.N. According to the testimony of Ambassador Stevenson and Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland, such allowance would be provided to approximately 20 of the higher ranking members of the U.S. mission.

The proposed amendment specifically states that the allowance would be limited to "the additional housing costs necessitated by representation responsibilities." The witnesses mentioned above testified that if the amendment is enacted, each U.S. official at the New York mission granted a housing allowance would be required to pay the first $3,000 a year of his housing costs out of his own pocket. The allowance would apply to the cost of approved housing in excess of $3,000.

The witnesses estimated that the total cost to the U.S. Government involved in this amendment may eventually amount to $60,000 a year.

The enactment of the proposed amendment would not automatically assure the Department of State an annual appropriation of $60,000 for housing allowances for certain officers at the U.S. mission to the United Nations. The Department would have to come each year before the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate, and justify its request for such appropriation.

Hearings on this matter have been held, and printed copies will be available shortly. I trust that this discussion and analysis will enable my colleagues to weigh the matter objectively and calmly.

U.S. VESSEL STRAYS INTO SOVIET ZONE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reports this morning that a U.S. Coast Guard cutter accidentally strayed into a Soviet rocket testing area in the Pacific shows a remarkable contrast to the repeated penetrations of U.S. territorial waters off the coast of Florida by Soviet trawlers.

The U.S. cutter incident occurred earlier this month. It was reportedly confirmed by the chief of staff of the 14th Coast Guard District. The cutter was unaware of the Soviet restriction of the zone, and it left the scene as soon as it was notified.

Could the United States get such confirmation that its own home waters had been violated by Soviet trawlers earlier this month? To my knowledge, the State Department has not so much as lodged a protest of Soviet penetrations on May 14 and 23.

I urge that the appropriate committees of the Congress investigate the circumstances surrounding these incidents. I am certain that the Soviets have little intention of halting their missions in waters along our own coast. Whatever those missions, they are not in the interest of our national security, and should be stopped.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, unless upon further reflection the House concludes to reverse the unfortunate position taken last Wednesday in connection with the proposition to extend Public Law 78, we will have dealt a body blow to the small farmers of the West. The large farmers can, if necessary, in some way or other get along without the supplemental labor supply, inasmuch as they can much more easily afford to mechanize. They can, if necessary, provide more family houses; if necessary, they can go thousands of miles to try to recruit domestic labor, even though they lose money for several years in the process. But the small farmer cannot afford to do this.

The action we took the other day unless it is reversed will drive to the wall hundreds of thousands of small fruit and vegetable farmers in this country.

I sincerely trust that if a bill is introduced to extend this act for 1 year rather than 2 many Members will reconsider the decision they made last Wednesday.

SECRETARY FREEMAN NOT RELIABLE SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the massive but unsuccessful effort to get wheat-farmer approval of the bushel-acre control proposal in the May 21 referendum, the administration forced through Congress a hurry-up 2-year extension of the feed grains program.

The propaganda barrage which hit Congressmen in behalf of the feed-grain program extension paralleled the barrage which hit farmers in behalf of the wheat scheme.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman repeatedly made inflated claims about the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grains programs. These assertions began in late February and continued through the eve of final action April 25 in the House of Representatives. Assured by this Cabinet-level source that the programs cut surpluses 1.3 billion bushels and reduced storage and handling costs nearly a million dollars a day, Congressmen approved the 2-year extension by a vote of 208 to 196.

When these assertions began in late February, I challenged them and said official reports showed the surplus cutback was actually less than half what Secretary Freeman then claimed. I also disputed the claims on savings.

On March 10, I devoted a special order—page 3822—to the content of Secretary Freeman's memorandum of February 28, and I charged the Secretary with deceptive reasoning and misleading use of facts.

In a letter to Members of the House of Representatives April 19, Secretary Freeman urged support of the proposed 2-year extension.

In it, he claimed that the feed grains programs enacted in 1961 and 1962—

> Reduced feed grain stocks from a record 3.2 billion bushels in 1961—prior to the time the new feed grains programs became effective—to an estimated 1.9 million bushels at the close of the current marketing.
>
> Resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain and handling charges as compared with this date in 1961.

I immediately challenged these statements in a letter I circulated to Members April 23. But no retraction was forthcoming and undoubtedly many Congressmen, in deciding how to vote, accepted Mr. Freeman's statements as fair and factual.

They were neither, and I can now cite as proof Secretary Freeman himself.

After the bill passed the House, it was taken up by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. First witness was Secretary Freeman, appearing on May 3.

On page 9 of the printed hearings of the Senate committee, Secretary Freeman presented the following figures for total stocks of feed grains at the end of the 1961 and 1963 marketing years:

[In bushels]

	1961	1963
Corn	2,008,000,000	1,300,000,000
Oats	325,000,000	275,000,000
Barley	153,000,000	125,000,000
Sorghum grain	702,000,000	625,000,000
Total	3,188,000,000	2,325,000,000

From Mr. Freeman's own figures it is obvious the House of Representatives was misled to the extent of over 400 million bushels. Feed grain stocks were not reduced from 3.2 billion to 1.9 billion bushels.

By his own figures the reduction was from 3.2 billion to 2.3 billion bushels. When adjustment is made for other factors—increased utilization of feed grains—the negligible effect on stockpiles of the costly programs is apparent. But even if the programs are accorded full credit for the cutback, the facts Mr. Freeman gave the House vary near a half-billion bushels from those he gave the Senate.

On page 13 of the Senate printed hearings, Mr. Freeman presented table 5(a) which shows feed grain storage and handling charges for the 1961 fiscal year to be $224.8 million. Estimate for 1963 fiscal year is listed as $169 million.

From these facts, presented by Mr. Freeman himself, the daily cost of storage and handling for the entire fiscal year 1961 amounted to about $615,000.

Yet Mr. Freeman had the gall to misinform Members of the House on April 19 that storage and handling costs were down $920,000 a day compared with 1961.

By Mr. Freeman's own figures, costs were down $55.8 million on an annual basis, which figures out $153,000 a day. A country mile from $920,000 a day.

While we do not have as many calculating machines and statistical experts as Mr. Freeman, we find it extremely difficult to save $920,000 a day when the total cost, even at the peak, was less than $650,000 a day.

Testifying before the Senate committee May 6, I stated that, in my opinion, Mr. Freeman has not been a reliable source of information. Now that the printed record is available, I can establish my contention simply by quoting Mr. Freeman himself.

The House approved the 2-year extension of the feed grains program by only 208 to 196. Had the facts been accurately and fairly presented to Members of the House by Secretary Freeman, perhaps the outcome would have been different.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, news reports today tell us of the action of the European Common Market increasing the tariff on poultry and poultry products; in other words, practically prohibiting the shipment of poultry to Common Market nations. This has been an excellent market for American poultry in the past.

I would suggest that those who voted for the Trade Expansion Act last year now rise on the floor of the House, crack their best heels together at least three times and shout "Hallelujah" for the wonderful treatment we are now getting for having passed the Trade Expansion Act as bait to the European countries to treat us kindly in the matter of tariffs.

This makes me more pleased than ever that I voted against the New Frontier's free trade bill last year, and I wonder how Secretary of Agriculture Freeman feels today after having told the House Agriculture Committee only a few days ago that he fully expected the Common Market countries would reduce their tariffs on our poultry exports.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, two of our colleagues this afternoon have urged that reconsideration should be given to the extension of Public Law 78.

As you well know, I was one of the majority who opposed the extension of this law. A majority of this great body voted to terminate the bracero program at the end of this year. I can recall no time in previous years when this legislation was considered where more time was given for full debate. Moreover, ample notice was given to every Member. To permit further consideration of this well-debated issue would make a mockery of the careful and full deliberations already given this subject by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope at this time that Members of the House will take time to examine in detail the record, the very ample record which has been made on this subject. I especially call the attention of Members to the very extensive statistical data which I did not have the opportunity to develop during the time allotted me in the course of the debate last Wednesday. I am confident that a careful examination and review of this data will show that there is absolutely no valid reason why we should undertake to give this matter further consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to urge those Members of the House who were in favor of the bill and who earnestly feel that our action is going to result in injury to their particular districts, that they get behind the job stabilization proposal for migrant workers which is presently pending before the Congress. If we can act favorably on this legislation at this session of the Congress we shall have made the first constructive step to create a reliable and stable domestic agricultural labor force.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA INTO THE UNION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 1963 is the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of West Virginia into the Union.

This morning at a special ceremony here in Washington, D.C., the centennial special exhibits train was launched. This is a beautiful blue and white nine-car train including many exhibits of the history, heritage, and current attractions in this great and rugged mountain State.

It was a great honor to participate in the ribbon-cutting ceremony this morning which started the train on its way. The lovely and gracious First Lady of West Virginia, Mrs. W. W. Barron, cut the ribbon signalizing the start of the journey of the centennial train. I would like to congratulate the centennial commission and its able executive director, Carl Sullivan, Commerce Commissioner Hulett Smith, and all others who have helped make this dream come true.

I would like to pay tribute to those railroads who have provided the rolling stock necessary to send this train on its way through the hills and valleys of our State. The Chesapeake & Ohio, the Baltimore & Ohio, the New York Central, the Norfolk & Western, Western Maryland, and Pennsylvania Railroads have all cooperated to help make this venture a success.

Bill Bolden, retired manager of the Charleston Civic Center and founder of the William S. Bolden Co., machinery and tool firm of Charleston, is chairman of the centennial train committee. Harold F. Lydick, who retired recently from the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, with a record of 47 years' service of railroading, has been placed in charge of the train as trainmaster.

Twenty-four college youths have been named hosts and guides on the train for the summer tour.

A featured exhibit in the train is the original statehood proclamation signed by President Abraham Lincoln, authorizing the admission of West Virginia to the Union on June 20, 1863. This rare document was loaned by the National Archives specifically for exhibit on the centennial train.

Our great State boasts many natural resources and opportunities for tourism and recreation. But West Virginia's greatest natural resource is our young people—the hope of the future.

Mr. Speaker, between now and Labor Day this train will tour various cities in the State of West Virginia. I would like to take this opportunity to extend an invitation to my colleagues and others throughout the country to visit the rugged mountain State of West Virginia during our centennial year of 1963.

THE TROUBLED ISLAND OF HISPANIOLA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the situation on the troubled island of Hispaniola in Fidel Castro's backyard is far more serious than just a feud between the two occupants of the island—the Dominican Republic and Haiti.

There is ominous evidence that Hispaniola is the scene of intensive Marxist maneuverings.

The crises in Haiti—a turbulent nation ripe for Communist exploitation—is made more dangerous since there are obviously a number of Communists in the cabinet of Dictator Duvalier.

Adding gravity to the continuing unrest in Hispaniola are reports that the Communists are wasting no time in also attempting to make inroads in the Dominican Republic.

The advancing Communist offensive of subversive penetration in the Dominican Republic apparently is not being effectively countered by the new Dominican Government.

Since President Bosch's inauguration 3 months ago, more than 150 Communists deported during the missile crisis last fall have been allowed to return to the Dominican Republic. Many of these came from Cuba and other Soviet bloc countries. Reports from Santo Domingo state that many of these Communists now teach in a Communist-front school, and have made gains in various civic organizations.

There is also evidence that the Communists have made inroads into the Dominican police, the labor unions, the schools and student groups. The Communists are not only swelling their ranks with increased cell activity, but they are actively exploiting the leftist and nationalist movements in this new republic to accomplish their aim of deceit.

The extent to which the Communists in the Dominican Republic are relentlessly and boldly campaigning—both overtly and covertly—and the apparent failure to date of President Bosch's government to crack down on this Red thrust gives just cause for concern.

The testimony presented earlier this year to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, in hearings on Castro-Communist subversion in this hemisphere disclosed that what happened in Cuba can happen elsewhere in Central and South America.

To allow the Communists to gain toeholds in the Dominican Republic is not only a menacing danger to the newly elected government of President Bosch, but it constitutes a grave threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

This fact should be made crystal clear by our Department of State to the present government of the Dominican Republic, and it should be made now. Neither the United States nor the Organization of American States can afford to repeat past errors of tardy action—or inaction—at this dangerous juncture in the Caribbean.

A NEW LOOK AT ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that a full-scale and far-reaching social revolution is underway throughout Central and South America. But a few years ago questions were being raised about the dimensions of that revolution, whether it was being stimulated by disruptive forces directed by Moscow and whether it was like many prior revolutionary trends south of our borders—a tempest in a teapot. Today we have adequate answers to those questions provided by the passage of events and the all too clear alternatives we must face if human freedom is to be secure in this hemisphere.

A major issue now confronting American leadership is, who and what forces will direct the revolutionary ferment which grips every segment of life in Latin America. Will it be the agents of imperial communism who advocate a doctrine of violence and bloody revolution as the means of destroying the existing social-economic order of Latin America? Or will it be the forces of peaceful change based upon constructive programs and positive actions working toward the fulfillment of justice in the social order?

We have seen the results of the Communist doctrine when put into practice in the Western Hemisphere. Russian occupied Cuba stands as a symbol of what happens to people when the dictatorship of Moscow seizes control of their country. The legitimate revolutionary aims of the Cuban people were captured by a handful of Russian agents who used those aspirations of the common man to seize control of Cuba. Once they were in control a reign of terror and destruction followed. A dictatorship of the few has now imposed a ruthless tyranny upon the many in Cuba. The people of Cuba were robbed of the just fruits of their revolution. And worse, imperial Russia is now using Cuba as a base of operations to impose the new tyranny of communism on all the nations of Central and South America.

The revolutionary ferment which characterized Cuba before the Castro takeover is gathering momentum in many countries of Central and South America. This ferment has not been instigated by the agents of imperial Russia. It arises from the obvious fact that the great masses of people in that area will no longer tolerate their longstanding conditions of poverty, illiteracy, disease, hunger, and neglect. The demands of the homeless, the landless peasants, the impoverished masses for a life that accords with the dignity of man are both legitimate and understandable. Only the means to that legitimate end remains open.

We have proposed peaceful and orderly means. This we have done through the Alliance for Progress. What we have proposed accords with the political traditions of the Western Hemisphere.

Central America has become a convenient target for the operations of Communist agents. They are increasing the tempo of their conspiratorial activities in the area between Guatemala and Panama. All the countries in that area are more directly exposed to the propaganda and agent infiltration activities launched from the Russian base in Cuba. To ignore these developments is to invite another Cuba tragedy in the Western Hemisphere.

One step taken by the Alliance to meet this challenge was the establishment a few months ago of a regional office for Central America and Panama in Guatemala. A Senate report on the Alliance for Progress, transmitted by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, presents a timely and informative analysis of this development. A pertinent part of that report reads as follows:

> ### REGIONAL AID MISSION
>
> In order to deal with Central America as a unit, the United States has established an AID mission known as ROCAP (Regional Office Central America and Panama) with headquarters in Guatemala. It maintains close working relations with the Central American Bank for Economic Integration in Tegucigalpa, with the Permanent Secretariat for the Treaty of Central American Economic Integration in Guatemala, with the U.S. AID missions to the individual countries in its area, and with a variety of regional organizations which have been created to deal with the specific problems. There is, for example, a regional council on higher education which is working on the sound premise that better universities will be attained at less cost if one good veterinary school is established here, one good law school there, etc.
>
> ROCAP is only a few months old, and its precise relationship to the U.S. country missions and to Washington has not yet taken form, but its general role is clear: It is to use the AID program as a means of encouraging the Central American economic integration movement. Similarly, the basic role of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration is clear: It is to use credit as an instrument of encouraging the movement. ROCAP has able leadership, it has the strong support of the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and it has been well received by Central American leaders in the allocation of U.S. funds under the Alliance for Progress program, this regional mission should receive high priority.
>
> It seems to me that there is also a role for ROCAP to play in bringing about a greater coordination of the activities of our own country AID missions. There is a steady flow of communications between each of these missions and Washington, but apparently very little communication among the missions. In one country I visited, for example, the Education Minister was miffed because our AID mission there was building cheaper, simpler schools than our AID mission in a neighboring country. The variety of techniques used in housing programs is almost as great as the number of countries in which we have such programs. Local

conditions vary sufficiently so that it would be foolish to attempt to achieve complete uniformity. But at the same time local conditions are enough alike so that what is learned in one country has some relevance in another. There ought to be more regional conferences and seminars where AID personnel could discuss mutual problems and exchange ideas and experiences.

As it is our policy to promote integration in Central America, U.S. diplomats and aid officials assigned to Central American countries will be expected to endorse and promote this aim. If the regional mission, the regional bank, and the Common Market are the instruments chosen to achieve this goal, then U.S. officials should support them.

I have made inquiries about the work of ROCAP because I attach the highest priority to developments in the Caribbean and Central American area. It was encouraging to learn that a textbook program has been developed for first- and second-grade pupils in that area. This is a practical start in eradicating illiteracy among the masses in Central America. A brief summary of that program states:

Central America's Textbook Program

FREE READERS FOR EVERY CHILD

An Alliance for Progress project is providing free readers this winter and spring to every first- and second-grade pupil in Central America's public schools—urban and rural.

Under this mass education project, 2,200,000 commercially printed textbooks will be distributed to about 850,000 children in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. In addition, teaching guides will be provided to the children's approximately 30,000 teachers.

Distribution began in El Salvador in February 1963. It will end with the opening of schools in Nicaragua in May 1963.

The five participating countries, aided by the U.S. Government, are conducting the project.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM

These readers are the first in a series of paperback textbooks being developed under a 5-year program which will include all subjects taught through the sixth grade. All the texts will be prepared at the recently established Central American Regional Textbook Development Center in Guatemala.

Under this program, every child in Central America's public primary schools will ultimately receive free textbooks for his own use. Thus, a more standardized regional educational curriculum is envisaged for all five countries—an essential element in the region's advancing economic and social integration.

An important result of the Center's activities will be the creation of trained experts in curriculum development and specialists in writing, design, and production of textbooks. This pool of trained personnel will be created over the 5-year period during which teams of participants from the cooperating countries will work at the Center under the guidance of specialized consultants.

ALLIANCE GOAL

The first- and second-grade readers bear the Alliance for Progress symbol. They are being produced by commercial printers in each of the five countries. The master copies of the texts, written by a U.S.-sponsored group in Guatemala, were reviewed and adapted to each country's requirements by its Ministry of Education. The revisions dealt with minor language differences.

The United States and the participating countries are providing approximately $310,000 to defray the initial printing of the first- and second-grade readers. Though financing details of the 5-year program are still under study, it is expected that U.S. participation will be gradually phased out as the Central American countries' contributions increase.

The textbooks are simply bound paperback editions with large, clear type and color illustrations reflecting life within Central America. The purpose is to provide the necessary number of books in the most inexpensive but acceptable manner and thus contribute to the Alliance goal of providing the benefits of primary education to the children of Central America. Each first grader will receive three readers; the second grader two.

AID, ODECA, ROCAP

Cooperating in the program as a whole are the State Department's Agency for International Development (AID) and the Ministries of Education of the five participating countries. The Organization of Central American States (ODECA) is serving as liaison for the Ministries. Under its charter, ODECA conducts joint educational efforts regarding the region's primary and secondary schools. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, signed the project agreement between AID and ODECA at ODECA's offices in San Salvador on January 31, 1963.

Carrying out AID's role is its regional office for Central America and Panama (ROCAP) with headquarters in Guatemala. ROCAP works with the organizations established by the Central Americans themselves to help advance the region's economic and social integration. Besides ODECA, these organizations include the Permanent Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration (SIECA) in Guatemala which is implementing the Common Market; the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI) in Tegucigalpa, and the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA) in San José, Costa Rica, whose purpose is to effect regional coordination and cooperative development of higher education in Central America.

Another program being pushed by ROCAP provides medical attention for the campesino, that is, the landless peasant who comprises the bulk of the rural population in Latin America. This program operates through mobile units and is directed at helping people who need medical treatment but have neither doctors nor other medical facilities available. It concentrates on meeting needs of people in isolated rural communities. A brief summary of this practical program to fight disease and sickness reads as follows:

Medical Attention for the Campesino

Health services are underway for the rural areas of Central America and Panama through the use of mobile units under an Alliance for Progress program.

Objective of the program, when fully implemented, is to bring basic health services to approximately 2 million inhabitants of the rural areas of the Isthmus.

Three countries—El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica—have begun the mobile rural health program with the cooperation of the U.S. Government. Three others—Guatemala, Panama, Nicaragua—are expected to be ready for participation soon.

The initial phase of the program was inaugurated with formal ceremonies on December 1, 1962, at the headquarters of the Organization of Central American States (ODECA) in San Salvador. Attending were representatives of the six countries and the State Department's Agency for International Development (AID), the cooperating U.S. Government agency.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The program has two parts. First, it is to provide through mobile health teams, curative and preventive medical services to persons in isolated rural communities where no health services exist or are deficient. Secondly, it is to organize citizen committees to generate community development programs in fields allied to health such as adequate water supplies, sewage, health education and other activities which would improve community living conditions. Self-help on the part of each country and area serviced is a cardinal factor in the program.

Each participating country in the initial phase operates two mobile health units equipped with jeep-model ambulances. Each unit staff consists of a medical doctor, a nurse's aid, a sanitary inspector and a chauffeur and based at an organized health facility such as a health center or hospital. It departs daily from that center to provide health services on a regular schedule, making calls at fixed posts provided by each participating community. The bases and the communities in each country are selected by its Ministry of Health. More mobile units and other equipment and staff will be put into use as each country develops its services.

The program will encourage recent graduates of the national medical schools in the region to work with the units to help satisfy the medical schools' requirement that each graduate devote, after graduation, 1 year to rural medical service work.

The mobile units primarily provide transportation for the health teams and for patients who require emergency transport from rural centers to hospitals or organized facilities where required care can be given. They also may be used to transport food-for-peace commodities for child feeding and supplies for use at fixed facilities in communities on their fixed schedule.

REGIONAL AID STAFF

A special AID health advisory staff works with the Ministry of Health of each country. Its headquarters are in Guatemala. The staff consists of the chief medical adviser, field support officer, a sanitary engineer, health educator, a nurse and a community development adviser. All the advisers will serve all the countries, thus making the staff regional in its work.

The advisory staff is under the auspices of AID's Regional Office for Central America and Panama (ROCAP) with headquarters in Guatemala. ROCAP works with organizations established by Central Americans themselves to advance economic and social development and integration on the Isthmus. Besides ODECA, these organizations include the Permanent Secretariat for Economic Integration (SIECA) in Guatemala which is concerned with the Central American Common Market of which Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica are members and which Panama is eligible to join; the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI) in Tegucigalpa which is financed by the five Central American Republics, the United States and other entities; and the Superior Council of Central America Universities (CSUCA) in San José, Costa Rica, whose purpose is to effect coordination and cooperative development of higher education in Central America.

A good start has been made in Central America in identifying the objectives of the Alliance with the aspirations of the masses in that area. Practical programs of this type are worth volumes of theoretical plans worked up by the ivory tower thinkers and which seldom if ever have a direct bearing on the emergent needs of the masses in underdeveloped countries. Ivory tower planning has brought us a harvest of new problems and newly won enemies in many countries we sought to help. Laos stands as a classic example of the kind of trouble we must avoid in our efforts to help the people of Latin America.

But more needs to be done through direct action programs to alleviate the misery of the campesinos. These are the impoverished have-nots of Central America. They are the people for whom rapid change for the better is an imperative. Their needs are seemingly limitless. But, more than anything else they need basic instruction in how to till the land, the crops they can grow and how to grow them, how they can help one another to advance the common good and the techniques of self-help projects. A program of this type would do more to channel the revolutionary ferment into peaceful and constructive outlets than all the high-sounding plans for long-range economic development and the windy speeches made in their justification.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, we who serve in the Congress soon become well acquainted with the high-pressure tactics of special interest groups. The coordinated letter-writing campaigns, the planted and slanted news release become familiar tools in the great game of trying to influence our actions and our votes. We learn to accept these efforts for what they are.

We are currently the targets of a campaign which I am compelled to speak against. This campaign is backed by a national association of private, fee-charging employment agencies which calls itself the National Employment Association. Its purpose is to weaken the public employment service.

Last fall this association circulated a newsletter which boasted that a powerfully organized campaign would shape the congressional course of action in the field of employment and hiring.

This newsletter issued by the National Employment Association, on October 5, 1962, entitled, "Who's Hiring Who?" carried a message headlined, "Special to NEA Members Attending the 1962 Convention." This message advocated an intensive drive to develop support for fee-charging employment agencies and to discredit the public employment offices. It stated, and I quote:

> Congressional investigation of public employment agencies is one virtually certain result of a properly conducted campaign of this kind. A major cutback in tax supported employment operations is a definitely certain result. Far more public support, increased business, greater prospects for growth will be inevitable side benefits for private agency owners, but only if they get behind it with strength enough to insure success.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what this campaign against the Public Employment Service is costing, but it must be a substantial amount. The National Education Association points with pride to an exclusive club which consists of private employment agencies which have contributed a thousand dollars, or more, to be used against the Public Employment Service.

The campaign has drawn heavily upon materials prepared by a private employment agency located in Akron, Ohio. I should like to read a paragraph or two from a letter sent out by this firm to private employment agencies in April 1963:

> DEAR FELLOW PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OWNER: This * * * is a letter from a private employment agency owner the same as yourself who sees the writing on the wall unless we take action and take it now. I am greatly concerned over the future of our business and am seeking the help of all private employment agency owners in a letterwriting campaign whether they be members of a National, State, or local association or not.
>
> We must let our Government representatives know, and let them know right away and the best way we can do this is by letters from agency owners, their employees and friends.

Accompanying the letter were sample letters to be addressed to Members of Congress and editors, as well as other material for the press. The letter concluded with this:

> You are welcome to use these sample letters to the editor whichever is applicable in your area. However, only one agency in each city should use this exact letter.

I have discovered that many of the statements attacking the Public Employment Service contain language, word for word, like the sample Akron letter. The charges directed at the Public Employment Service are so serious that they must not go unanswered. What are these charges and why are they made? In the main, it is alleged that the U.S. Employment Service seeks to control all hiring in the United States, that it wishes to establish a monopoly of the labor force, and that it concentrates its effort on serving the employed and not the unemployed.

The purpose of these charges against the Public Employment Service, simply and directly put, is to restrict and curtail the operations of the public employment offices. The objective is to compel those who need employment assistance to turn to private fee-charging agencies by removing an alternative source of help.

The way this can best be achieved, say these private agencies, is to get the Congress to reduce the appropriations for the public employment service and this explains why their drive has been concentrated on members of the Appropriations Committee.

The charge that the U.S. Employment Service wishes to control all hiring is ridiculous. The fact of the matter is that no one is compelled to use a public employment office. It is only one of many hiring channels. The U.S. Employment Service does not register, interview, counsel, test or place applicants, nor does it obtain orders for job openings. It is a part of the Federal-State system, and its primary functions are to serve as a clearinghouse and provide technical assistance and services to the affiliated State employment offices. Less than 2 percent of the total budget for the Public Employment Service goes to the U.S. Employment Service. The heart of the Public Employment Service is the 1,900 local employment offices operated and administered by the States.

The allegation that the Public Employment Service is centering its efforts on the placement of employed people, rather than the unemployed, is completely without foundation. In support of this charge, the private agencies have made a completely erroneous statement that 60 percent of the people placed by the Public Employment Service last year were already employed. They have asserted this figure is based upon a statement of Administrator Robert C. Goodwin, of the Bureau of Employment Security that "three out of five new hires are employed workers changing jobs."

The fact of the matter is that this statement did not have reference to employment service placements last year, nor any year. The figure was determined by the Bureau of the Census household survey and referred to all people who got jobs through any channel.

The inaccuracy of the charge stands out clearly when you consider that almost all placements made by public employment offices are from registered job applicants, of which between 85 and 95 percent are unemployed persons. In order to secure accurate information, I have suggested that a survey be initiated in the public employment offices to determine the exact percentage of placements represented by unemployed people.

The Wagner-Peyser Act, which created the Federal-State employment service system does not provide that the employment office services should be limited only to the unemployed. In fact, it provides that all, workers and employers alike, may turn to the public employment service system for assistance.

At the present time, while high rates of unemployment exist in particular segments of our work force, such as the unskilled, there are unfilled job openings in skilled, technical, and professional occupations. There is considerable turnover in these categories and recruitment must often be undertaken over great distances. Employers and applicants with special skills are turning increasingly to the public employment offices. Of course, the private agencies would, if they could have their way, exclude all public employment service placements in this field. It is in this area that the profits are most lucrative and the highest fees can be charged.

What about the charge by the fee employment agencies that the growth of the public employment service has been excessive and that it threatens to drive the private agencies out of business?

The best measure of what has happened in the public employment service is reflected in the number of personnel employed in State employment service activities. In 1948, this totaled 17,382 employees.

During the decade of the fifties the personnel fluctuated, generally downward, and the restoration of the staff to the Public Employment Service has largely occurred in the last 2 years. In the current fiscal year, there are approximately 20,250 people engaged in such employment, which represents about a 16-percent increase in the 15-year period from 1948 to 1963.

During this same period, our population has increased 28 percent, the labor force rose by about 22 percent, the number of wage and salaried workers increased by 24 percent, and the unemployment rate has almost doubled. The fact is that the growth in the Public Employment Service has not kept pace with the growth of our labor market.

The fee agencies are required to file certain reports, under the unemployment compensation laws, from which their growth can be measured.

Over the past 10 years, since 1953, the number of fee-charging agencies increased from 810 to 2,189, which is an increase of 170 percent. The staff employed by the private agencies rose from 6,000 to 19,000 over the same period, which represents an increase of 220 percent. There is certainly no basis for a view that private agencies have been driven out of business by the Public Employment Service, no matter what measurement is used.

The fee-charging agencies have alleged that the U.S. Employment Service maintains a TWX hookup across the country. This statement is completely erroneous because the Employment Service has no such a communication system. There is an experimental, pilot research program being carried on by the California Employment Service, which has introduced a teletype communication system for nine of its offices to assist in interarea recruitment. In this project research is being conducted on how to accomplish interarea matching of applications and job orders, especially for critically important technical and professional occupations—often related to our national defense. These research projects seek to aid the human factors in placement—interviews, employment testing and counseling, and referral to and selection of applicants by employers.

The private agencies also point with alarm to advertising carried on by public employment offices. Actually, because it administers the work test for unemployment insurance, the Public Employment Service has work applications from most unemployed job seekers. However, since not all workers are covered by unemployment insurance, advertising is used on a modest basis, when needed, to inform these unemployed workers of available job openings. Advertising represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the total Employment Service budget, and averages only about $6 a week per local office. Advertising is frequently paid for by private employers for whom the recruitment is undertaken.

Finally, the private agencies complain that the Public Employment Service is spending some funds in relocating and modernizing its offices.

In my opinion, there is no need to apologize for relocating in better quarters or for providing better service to the schools, employers, workers, and the community generally. Employers know and understand the value of having efficient quarters in which to conduct business. It was an outrage that for many years people needing employment assistance were crowded into dirty, inadequate spaces. I am sorry to say there are too many communities in this country where these conditions still prevail.

I am well aware that I have dwelt at considerable length on the drive by the fee-charging agencies to curtail the activities of the public employment offices. However, this matter has a great bearing on the efforts of the Congress to deal more adequately with the problems and needs of our manpower resources, which have been receiving top priority attention in this House.

It seems to me that if we are familiar with the performance and the accomplishments of the Public Employment Service system in this country, it will be exceedingly difficult to stampede us into a course of action, based on distortions and inaccuracies, which would restrict its operations.

Here are some indications of the activities of the Public Employment Service system. Nonfarm placements rose from 5.1 million in 1958 to 6.7 million in 1962. Placements of workers age 45 and over, which totaled 1.3 million in 1962, increased 13 percent over the previous year. Among the relatively hard-to-place handicapped, a total of 281,000 placements were made, representing a 9-percent increase over 1961. The number of placements of veterans, 1.2 million, showed an 8-percent gain over 1961. This accomplishment is particularly important since the average age of this group is rising, resulting in a higher proportion of the veterans in the hard-to-place older age brackets. Veteran placements constituted 18 percent of the nonfarm placements made in 1962. During the school year ending October 1962, the number of high school graduates placed in the course of carrying out cooperative arrangements with high schools numbered 132,000, a gain of nearly 17 percent over the corresponding school year 1961. Dropouts referred to the Employment Service by the schools and subsequently placed in positions totaled nearly 23,000—over double the number placed in the 1961 school year. Overall youth placements in 1962 increased by nearly a fourth, to a total of almost 1 million.

The increased placements were accompanied by a growth in the number of nonagricultural employers who listed job orders with the public employment offices. In 1962, over 975,000 such employers requested service—an increase of 7.7 percent over 1961.

The Public Employment Service, through its operating responsibility under the Manpower Development and Training Act, has helped to establish since August 1962 over 1,197 training projects covering over 200 different occupations in 49 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These involve almost 42,000 trainees. Some 23,000 trainees have started classes in 800 projects.

Although the duration of training varies in different projects and ranges up to a year in length, about 5,000 trainees completed MDTA courses as of the end of April. Reports by State employment service agencies indicate about 70 percent of this total are finding jobs, almost wholly in training-related occupations. Of those obtaining employment, State employment services are placing 8 out of every 10 in jobs.

Although the fee-charging agencies object strongly to public employment service placement operations, they ignore many other manpower activities which are conducted by public employment offices and which are of basic importance to the Nation. This is understandable since the fee-charging agencies derive their revenues from placements.

Nevertheless, there are other services which the public employment offices provide. For example, they engage in important manpower and labor market research which includes the analysis, definition, and classification of occupations and results in the monumental publication, the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. These offices help to develop occupational tests of aptitudes, abilities and performance. One result is the "General Aptitude Test Battery," which is known and used in many parts of the world.

The labor market information collected, analyzed and published by the public employment service system provides the basis for area labor market classifications of labor supply and demand, of employment and unemployment. These in turn influence eligibility for manpower training and retraining programs under the Area Redevelopment Act, for Federal assistance on Government procurement and participation in public works activities. This labor market information contributes significantly to economic development and industrial plant location. State and local economic development groups, chambers of commerce, and employer organizations make great use of such information.

I hope I have in some measure been able to present the overall record of service and the wide range of vital responsibilities carried on daily by the public employment offices. This record, and these responsibilities are, after all, the factors that dictate that the public employment service must be allowed to continue and expand its efforts.

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the Washington Post this morning an editorial cartoon by the very distinguished editorial cartoonist Herblock, showing the shadow of the tremendous unrest in America involving civil rights overshadowing all the other problems pending before this Congress; namely, the problems of balancing the budget, tax revision, and various other matters which are pending here.

I thinks this editorial cartoon is most significant and timely because it does, indeed, illustrate the great challenge that now faces the 88th Congress in the 1st session. These manifestations of serious unrest, this impatience that is being demonstrated throughout the Nation in various communities both north and south can no longer be taken lightly by the American people, as indeed, I am sure, it is not being taken lightly by many of us here in Congress.

These demonstrations should be of concern to all of us because they not only create serious problems for our whole democratic process but also give our enemies abroad an opportunity to show to the uncommitted nations of the world that there are gaps in the democratic process. It is no accident that every time a picture appears in the American press showing violence and mob rule, that these same pictures are reproduced on the front pages of practically every newspaper throughout the world, and, in particular, behind the Iron Curtain.

One such incident in Birmingham, or in Tennessee, or in Philadelphia, or in any other part of America, can undo the 18 years of costly effort that we as Americans have been trying to exert since World War II in demonstrating to the world that ours is indeed a social order which holds out to mankind the greatest degree of hope. For this reason it is my hope that Congress will face up to the responsibility that lies ahead of us.

I am a member of the subcommittee which is presently holding hearings on the Equal Employment Opportunities Act. This legislation has been proposed to bar discrimination in hiring practices against any American because of his race, his color, his creed, his national origin, or because of his age. On the basis of the testimony that has been presented to my committee, both this year and in the very extensive hearings which we held last year, I am convinced that early enactment of this particular legislation would indeed go a long way toward bringing about a greater degree of understanding in the United States and diminishing and perhaps even eliminating much of the social unrest that is now sweeping the country.

While we can never condone mob rule, one cannot help but understand the new generation of American Negroes who are today impatient with continued denial to them of economic opportunities because they happen to be Negroes. It would be a mistake to treat this problem as one related only to the South. I think too often we here in Congress try to point the finger at Southern States and say they have not come around to understanding the dignity of human beings involved in seeking economic opportunity. The same patterns of discrimination exist in many parts of our Nation as has been demonstrated in the hearings before my committee. I am not surprised that this new young generation of American Negroes is becoming impatient with the lack of progress. I cannot think of anything that could be worse for any American citizen, whether he be white, Negro, Catholic, Protestant or Jew, regardless of his national or ethnic background, to know that he has to go through life faced with the specter of not being able to use his talents fully, not because he lacks the qualifications but because of some prejudice against his background, his color of skin, or the religion he practices.

It is imperative, therefore, that this Congress proceed as expeditiously as possible to enact into law the equal employment opportunities legislation now before my committee. Twenty-two States already have adopted various forms of this legislation including my own State of Illinois. Our committee records are replete with testimony that these State actions have not created any serious problems in the communities but have indeed brought about a better understanding, a greater respect for human dignity, and have opened up new opportunities for all of their citizens. As long as 22 States have already been able to adopt this kind of legislation which bars discrimination in hiring practices, it would appear to me that no violence will be done if national standards are adopted by the Congress to cover all 50 States. Particularly since we know that some States historically oppose this type of legislation. American citizens should not have complete, unfettered, economic opportunities to earn a living consistent with their qualifications in one part of our Nation, while these same opportunities are being denied them in another part of our Nation only because of their race, religion, ethnic background, or age. I suggest that opponents of equal employment legislation study the experience of those States that have adopted such legislation. If they will study the record of these States that have adopted this legislation they will find that indeed has helped provide a more stable labor climate.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that fair employment practices legislation, if it includes all of the elements now before the Congress, will go a long way to bring about greater understanding among the American people. There is no question in my mind that these social problems we are now experiencing in various parts of the country are going to multiply unless this Congress can act forcefully in assuring the American people that if they have the qualifications they will be able to compete on an equal basis for a job.

I suspect that too often erroneous values are placed on the end results of a program both in the Congress and in the administrative branch of our Government, both in this administration and previous administrations. For instance, take our foreign policy. We have espoused the doctrine of self-determination all over the world. We have espoused this in countries where people have no concept of what we mean by self-determination. It would seem to me that if our foreign policy were based on a recognition that man wants an opportunity to earn a living—that this is what he wants first—we would be able better to demonstrate to the world that the capitalistic system means opportunity; that the capitalistic system means that if a free man has the qualifications he can go out and earn a living and not be discriminated against because of his race, color, creed, or political beliefs. But before we can demonstrate the great strength of the capitalistic system to the rest of the world, we have got to make sure that it works here at home. And certainly we are not making sure that it works at home when we see demonstrations in Philadelphia, when we see demonstrations all over the country, because people are being denied the opportunity to get a job—not because there is no work, but because of the color of their skin.

We talk about 5 million people being unemployed in America. These figures present an American paradox, because while we have 5 million unemployed, we also have more people employed in this country today than ever before in the history of this country, or of the world. We have jobs begging. All we have to do is to look through the want ads every day and see that employers all over the Nation are looking for workers. And yet we have 5 million unemployed.

I know for a fact, based on testimony before my committee, that many of those people who are unemployed today, many of those 5 million unemployed, are unemployed because of discriminatory practices. Many of these people want to work. They want to get out and get a job and provide for their families with dignity and self-respect.

We talk about reliefers, as if this were a way of life. I know for a fact, and I do not think there is a Member of this Congress who does not know for a fact, that most of the people who are on relief today would gladly go to work and get off relief. They want to be able to walk through life with dignity. And they would if they could get a job. I say many of those people cannot get a job, not because they lack experience or do not want to work, or because they are lazy, but because of the color of their skin, or because of the church they belong to, or some other discriminatory factor. And not least important in this area is the factor of age.

All over this country, North and South and East and West, we have Americans who are qualified to do a job. Their only sin is that they happen to have been born at the wrong time of history, and they are considered too old today. These are skilled people, who have been displaced because of automation, or who have been displaced because factories have moved to other areas of the country.

In my own community in Chicago, we have people who are unemployed for no other reason than because they are considered too old to employ. The great tragedy of America is that today the Commerce Department says that any man past the age of 40, if he has lost his original job, his chances of getting another job similar to the one that he lost are 6 to 1 against him; that is, if he has passed the age of 40. These are the tragedies we are talking about. For that reason I say that we cannot any longer delay this very important legislation which reaches at the very heart of the capitalist system.

How can we preach to the world that capitalism is a way of life, a system of opportunity, that free enterprise is the great hope of mankind when in this country we have people who cannot get jobs either because of the color of their skin, or because of the religion they practice, or because of their age or their ethnic background?

People have said to me many times, "Congressman, we have a minimum wage law in this country. Why are you so concerned? If they do not come under FEPC, they come under the minimum wage law. They are not being exploited."

First of all, the minimum wage law has nothing to do with hiring procedures. It deals only with setting a minimum wage in those job classifications covered by the act. It is really alarming to me how few Americans realize the fact that out of a total labor force of 78 million in this country, only 24 million people are covered by the minimum wage standard. There are only 24 million people in this country who are subject to the minimum wage of $1.15 an hour now, and next year $1.25. But the vast army of other workers are not covered. Yes, in one area of our Nation we are today paying Negroes employed in the pulp wood industry only 30 cents an hour. Imagine, a man earning $21 a week for working 10 hours a day, 7 days a week in America. Are you surprised that this American is participating in these demonstrations? So you have these dilemmas in our democracy. On the one hand you do not have these people covered by a minimum wage. On the other hand, there is no legislation at the Federal level that would insure every American an opportunity to work. Therefore, we cannot be too surprised when we see these demonstrations all over the country.

I say the time has come when this Congress must recognize the great challenge. This Congress, I say, must be the Congress that will write into law a new series of civil rights legislation if we really want to strengthen the fibers of democracy at home, so that we can look to the world with confidence; we can then go to the other countries in the world and say "Yes, this is the system, the democratic, capitalistic system, the system of free people and free enterprise, which offers mankind the greatest hope." We can then look to the whole world with confidence. We can then talk about the shortcomings of the other systems in this great ideological struggle. But we cannot do this, in my judgment, until our Nation has accepted an Equal Opportunities Employment Act which would guarantee every single American who has the qualifications—and these are the key words—qualifications, an opportunity to seek employment regardless of his race, religion, national origin, or age. Nothing in this legislation would compel an employer to hire a worker who is not qualified. But this legislation certainly would give these millions of Americans who cannot find jobs for other reasons at least an opportunity to look to the future with confidence. It would give these young people who are coming out of the high schools of America today, the vocational schools, yes, even the colleges, who happen to be of Negro origin, an opportunity to look to the future with confidence.

There is another aspect to this problem. We have been taught to think of civil rights in terms of only the Negro, but in America we have Puerto Ricans who have been discriminated against, we have Indians who have been discriminated against, and native-born Orientals who have suffered the indignity of discrimination. There still is violent discrimination in this country against people because of their particular religious belief or ethnic background. So when we talk of equal employment opportunities legislation pending before Congress, we are not talking about only the problems of the Negro, we are talking about every single American who at one time or other faces the humiliation of being discriminated against in his search to earn a living for himself and his family.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I hope Congress will not delay, that our committee will report this legislation out, and I hope it will find a sympathetic ear on both sides of this House, and I hope it will find a sympathetic ear in the other body, so we can say to the world, "Yes, when we say democracy works, we mean democracy works."

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this year of 1963 is the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. I hope that we here in the House and Senate will truly make this a year to remember.

We are sending men into outer space on missions at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars in order to extend our writ beyond the earth. But we shrink from missions to correct here on earth the human heart unhinged and corroded by bigotry. Our greatest domestic need this year is to help to create social climates which will coax from the sullen silences of alienated men and women the shared understanding of our democratic, nondiscriminatory heritage. Understanding begets understanding; understanding gained is understanding given.

Even as I express these thoughts today, American Negroes are demonstrating their grievances at being consigned to second-class status in the country of their birth. Demonstrations are occurring in both northern and southern communities—Philadelphia, Tallahassee, Jackson, Miss., and Englewood, N.J.

Recent events in Birmingham and Jackson have, of course, startled the conscience of the United States. Children, in the forefront of antisegregation demonstrations in Birmingham, were jailed. Police dogs were sicked on Americans. Electrically charged batons, used on cattle, are employed to herd disenfranchised Americans. Mr. Bull Connor, police commissioner at the time, is to my mind, in so much trouble with the Lord that even hell would not have him.

Meanwhile, during these troubled times, what of the Congress of the United States? Are we adult Americans to remain silent on an issue at once so grave, so serious, and of such magnitude that its repercussions justly echo around the world?

Are we, as elected representatives, reluctant to state our connections? Are we fearful of what an honest discussion would bring? Are we—as elected representatives sworn to uphold the Constitution—to remain silent while women and children display the courage which we seem to lack?

I suggest there is much to be lost by this silence we maintain while individual rights are trampled upon, while the letter of the Constitution is mocked and violated. Civil order is disrupted. Fellow Americans are strangers to our historical aspirations of freedom and social justice for all.

What does this 88th Congress believe? How does this House of Representatives intend to express itself on an issue which it has consistently and intentionally avoided in any substantive sense through the decades and notably since 1954 when the Supreme Court struck down enforced segregation in public schools?

As national legislators, are we not to join in the task of establishing conditions within which will be orchestrated a reign of equal justice for all and thereby the social disharmony among our people will be corrected?

True, the cake of custom crumbles slowly.

I am pleased to be informed that President Kennedy is making efforts toward extending the fullest measure of the prestige and influence of his great office to encourage adaptability and accommodation in this time of discontent. If I understand correctly, additional legislation will be sent to Congress to carry out his intentions. We should welcome this development. It is time we turned our back on the unfounded position that it is impossible, if not undesirable, to legislate in favor of equality, tolerance, understanding, and brotherhood. We need additional legal standards by which to measure our progress and our failures toward achieving the promise of America.

We need to enact legislation against violation of individual rights, legislation against discriminatory practices in job opportunities, voting, and exercise of other constitutional rights, legislation against discriminatory housing practices, legislation against discriminatory practices by trade unions, legislation against the whole rotten fabric of social, economic, and cultural discrimination.

In February of this year, President Kennedy in the course of a message on civil rights sent to this Congress stated in graphic fashion the plight of the Negro in America today:

> The Negro baby born in America today—regardless of the section or State in which he is born—has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white boy born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 per year, a life expectancy which is 7 years less, and the prospects of earning only one-half as much.

So Birmingham is the spectacularly nasty evidence of a condition that exists not just in Birmingham, not just in Alabama, not just in the South, although this is the area by far where the juridical problem is the greatest, but in each and every State in the Union.

Now just what can we legislators do before there are other Birminghams and Jacksons. It is regrettable that part 3 of the 1957 civil rights legislation was deleted before the bill was passed. It would have permitted the Justice Department to sue in the face of violation of any individual right. At present, the Justice Department can initiate suits only in behalf of Negro voting rights. I am pleased that my able and outspoken colleague, Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN of New York, has introduced legislation this session designed to accomplish this purpose.

In addition, year after year, we here in the Congress approve new programs and extend existing programs that enable discriminatory practices in all areas of activity to continue—education, housing, industry, labor, medical care, and military service, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the March 3, 1963, editions of the Washington Post an article by John Howard Griffin, a noted novelist who after years of blindness recovered his sight only to find the blindness of prejudice which affects individuals who have always retained their sense of sight. This he learned by travels through the South while he, a white Caucasian, disguised himself as an American Negro. I commend this eloquent article for reading.

At one point, Mr. Griffin writes:

> They (the American Negro) see that America is not America, that we have cheated and beaten the American dream to death. They are sure that if we had time this dream could come to be something great again, but daily abuses of justice, daily compromises of principles tell them that time is running out, and they say now that since they were born with rights, they will not go on being patient while the system defrauds them of those rights.

And at another:

> Moderates are calling for such rare items as justice and compassion as though they were ingredients in a soup—a bit of one here, a bit of another there; and when some little something is accomplished we think the soup is beginning to smell and taste as thought it were cooked by Christ and Thomas Jefferson—a real, American nourishment. But since we whites are not obliged to eat it, we don't realize that to the Negroes, it is a thin swill.

Or as James Baldwin phrased it—"All of Africa's going to be free before we can get a lousy cup of coffee."

I ask that the text of this article by John Griffin be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Although the legal sanctions against American Negroes may be more numerous and evident in the South, Mr. Speaker, the evils of discrimination are spread throughout our Nation.

I would like to think that representative of southern opinion and that of the country at large is the viewpoint expressed by the following "Appeal to Conscience" adopted at a congress on race and religion held in Chicago on January 17, 1963. The conference was part of the centennial observance of the Emancipation Proclamation in which the Anti-Defamation League was a signatory:

AN APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE

Many religious and racial groups joined in this statement of conscience adopted on January 17, 1963, at the Conference on Race and Religion held in Chicago. The conference was part of the Emancipation Proclamation centennial; ADL participated and was a signatory to the appeal:

"We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faith held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

"Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

"We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—North and South, East and West. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

"Our appeal to the American people is this:

"Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

"We call upon all the American people to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God."

There are evidences that the voices of white Americans are becoming less muted. There is evidence that the wind of change is rising throughout our country. Men and women are beginning to ponder and consider their negligence. The troubles will not be short lived. But there is, I believe, a spring of new beginnings stirring. There are many troubled days and more dark episodes ahead, undoubtedly. Our promissory notes are being called in by our fellow Negro Americans. This is just and proper. This is overdue.

And I believe that there would be near unanimity of opinion in support of this position if we Americans did some onsite inspections of our own patches of poverty, bigotry, and ignorance within our own borders. We certainly spend a lot of time discussing onsite inspections of situations in other countries.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that historians of the future cannot say we were a Nation having appetites but no convictions.

Dante once said that the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who remain neutral in time of crisis. Let it be known through our land that the elected national legislature evidences care and concern in this agonizing hour.

The Congress of the United States has contributed mightily to the golden hours atop which our Nation stands. It is time for contributions anew.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD excerpts from a column of Eric Sevareid that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 14, 1963; excerpts from a column by Richard Starnes, entitled "A Historical Betrayal?" that appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 22, 1963; and additional excerpts from the article by John Howard Griffin, that I referred to earlier, that appeared in the Washington Post on March 3, 1963:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 14, 1963]

EXCERPTS FROM COLUMN BY ERIC SEVAREID

For America, this postwar period is surely the era of the Negro passion. The most moving voices are now those of Negroes; the most searing, lasting words are put on paper by Negro writers; their music is the American music most penetrating and persuasive to other parts of the world; no cause is now so fundamental to the health and integrity of this society as the Negro cause; of no other leaders are so much stamina and courage demanded as are now required of Negro leaders.

They are bound to win, somehow, not only because their present aims are so limited and unarguable, but because they have succeeded in involving us all, whoever we are, wherever we live within the Nation's frontiers. They have caught the attention of the whole American people and, more than that, they have caught up the conscience of the whole people, however many of us may try to deny this to ourselves. A newspaper or television picture of a snarling police dog set upon a human being is recorded in the permanent photoelectric file of every human brain.

* * * * *

Because this unfolding drama involves the automatic reflexes of the instinctive sense of justice, because it involves namable, hearable, countable individual persons of flesh and blood, it is going to dwarf the general and social pageants of this domestic era, whether they be the struggles to nationalize the inchoate megalopolis, to preserve the open spaces, to eradicate a disease, to conquer space, or whatever.

This time is coming, soon when the Negro passion will truly dominate American politics. It is going to change the prism through which we consider the problems of far-off nations; romanticism will have to give way to realism.

* * * * *

Those who are cynical or upset by the moral duality in the Negro phenomenon, by the spectacle of lofty courage and self-sacrifice among the Negro leaders, side by side with the spectacle of spreading crime and moral squalor in the slum-bound masses of the Negro poor, may learn that the first is a direct reflection of the second, its natural, not its unnatural partner. Desperation, like war, ennobles some among its victims and debases others. No true people's revolution was ever neat, clean or devoid of sad anomalies.

If the Negro passion of today is not a true people's revolution, it is as close to one as we have ever known in our land.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 22, 1963]

A Historical Betrayal?

(By Richard Starnes)

"Separate but equal" was the uneasy philosophical stickum that kept the American Negro in cultural and economic thralldom for nearly three-quarters of a century.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled this was no more than a glib contradiction; that equality meant integration. The Negro whose hopes, passions, ambitions, aspirations, and goals are indistinguishable from those shared by white persons, properly regarded the Supreme Court decisions as a promissory note. But when he set about collection, he discovered he had been the victim of a historical betrayal.

Integration came to mean Little Rock and Oxford. Here in the District of Columbia it meant that whites largely abandoned the city schools to Negroes, who now make up upward of 80 percent of school enrollment. Negro ghettos remained intact, job opportunities continued to be limited, de facto segregation was still the unshakable rule.

The only thing that had changed was that a promise had been made to the 19 million American Negroes.

The promise has not been kept, and this single fact is probably the most important thing that has happened in the United States since the Civil War. It has tempered every aspect of contemporary American history, its implications for the near future are nothing short of terrifying.

For the promise, made and not fulfilled, has changed the timetable and the leadership of the Negro community. If the "deliberate speed" decreed by the Supreme Court was not to be, then the timetable was changed simply to "now." If moderate leadership that had been willing to accept half a loaf succeeded in getting only crumbs, then immoderate leadership would conduct the Negro (and all the rest of us) along the brink of a precipice.

Thus, when Representative POWELL speaks of the "black man's revolution" that is sweeping this country, the white community would do well to heed his words and to understand what they mean. And when Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, says, "the Negro in this country is engaged in a war for his rights and for his status as a citizen," it would be wise to assume he is using the correct word to describe what he believes is going on in the United States.

In Englewood, N.J., a community beset by racial strife, Representative POWELL boasted Sunday that "the white man is scared." Along with most of what the Harlem leader says about race relations in the United States, this was true. White people who bother to think about it are scared. They are scared of the change that has come over the Negro, and they are scared by their own inability to accommodate to it.

In their consciences they know the Negro's demands are just, but when the Negro moves next door they sell their house.

It is this tragic division between what is right and what is possible that gives the racial picture in this country all its ugly, frightening portents.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

Even Shoeshine Boy Has the Dream

(By John Howard Griffin)

Two years ago when I completed a journey through the Deep South during which I lived as a Negro for a number of weeks, I sank into the despair of a Negro. This came not so much from the subhuman existence that is the Negroes' lot as from the hopelessness of its ever getting better.

Communication, a dialog of some sort, had to be established between the two groups of citizens before there could be hope for improvement. Discrimination long ago destroyed such communication. A Negro who spoke simple truths about justice or inalienable rights was not tolerated. Since most white southerners lived under the illusion that they alone understood their "nigras" and were thoroughly imprisoned in a culture that said the system was for the good of those whom it suppressed, what chance for any true communication?

This system is a complex of customs and traditions that have all the force of law, plus the actual Jim Crow ordinances. The system says in effect that the Negro is a citizen of this country, but a special kind of citizen, that he should pay taxes and defend his country but that he should not vote, have equal protection under the law, equality of educational or job opportunities, and that he should not have access to public eating places, parks, hotels, libraries, concert halls, and even hospitals.

UNDERSTOOD BY NEGROES

Every Negro understands this system, but although it is part of the southern whites' way of life, few of them have taken a close, hard look at it. The Negroes have lived it, but contrary to the beliefs of many whites, Negroes have never accepted it. They have a remarkable record for resisting subversion, for manifestating a deep love of country; but this is a love of what the country is supposed to be, the American dream—not what it is where racism is practiced.

A Negro has his secrets. He has had to accommodate or else suffer reprisals. He has had to climb his mountain of yes-yes-yes and grin at the white man. He has seen the perpetration of the southern myths that say he is happy, carefree, contented with life as southern whites have arranged it for him. He knows that these myths are a great lie which white men have had to invent in order to live with their conscience.

When I lived as a Negro we yes-yes-yessed and grinned, but when we went home for the evening we wept and said how could the white man twist his mind enough to think this death of our manhood, our hopes, our dignity—this slavery—was for our own good. The only way to accept it was to lose hope, to despair, to stop thinking and feeling and just exist. Not to give a damn. Not to give a damn for your own people or whites or anybody else—just try to make it, keep the bread on the table. Try to keep from hating. Try to keep from having your belly twisted into knots all the time.

Living under the system, only the shallowest optimist could resist the temptation to despair; but Negroes could resist temptation to hate southern whites, and this for two reasons.

First, Negroes understood that southern whites were as helplessly entrapped by the system as southern Negroes and that the whites were as devastated by it as the Negroes. Anything that dwarfed and deprived a Negro child also dwarfed and deprived a white child. This was another of the Negroes' secrets, something most white men did not know.

Second, Negroes believed that their misery came from the white trash and that the white trash, though powerful, were a minority as oppressive and painful to the good whites as to the Negroes. Negroes retained faith in the good whites, who could be counted on to behave correctly and to swing their weight in favor of justice when a showdown came. Did they not quietly tell the Negroes of their disapproval of the racist bullies, of their shame?

A GREAT MANY CHANGES

But all of this has changed, is now changing. The changes are so drastic that those who knew something about the South 10 years ago, or even 2 years ago, are misinformed if they rely on that information today.

Negroes, particularly young Negroes, have lost their illusions about the good whites. They have seen good whites equivocate endlessly and finally grow silent in times of crisis when issues were bare and words of protest on sanity would have sounded with clarion clarity. A good white's quiet words aimed sympathetically at a Negro's ears don't mean anything now; they are part of the mockery. A cracker is a cracker. The good ones are just less bad than the bad, bad crackers. They won't join the mob, but they belong to that mob that sees the Negro individual as nothing but the stereotype that talks to him about "your people" and "your problems" and tells him how much it admires the Negro race; and some say they are pro-Negro instead of saying they are pro-humanity. And all of this shows that one way or another a cracker is a cracker, more or less, and they'll never realize in time. They won't learn really to love before Negroes learn really to hate.

The new, new Negroes, the ones today, are products of this painful disillusion. They see that gradualism as practiced by southern whites is going to stretch on into eternity. They see that their children and grandchildren will have no more hope than they unless they do something about it now. They see that their actions and reactions are judged not as those of humans defrauded of their rights to grow as humans, but as "nigger reactions"—smart-alecky, cocky, disrespectful.

These American Negroes have learned to be bitter. They see that America is not America, that we have cheated and beaten the American dream to death. They are sure that if we had time this dream could come to be something great again, but daily events, daily abuses of justice, daily compromises of principles tell them that time is running out, and they say now that since they were born with rights, they will not go on being patient while the system defrauds them of those rights.

Most southern whites see it differently, of course. They hastily construct slightly better school buildings with brick veneer and with no inside finish and one toilet for a 100 students. Separate, not equal, but better than before. They say, why don't you look at these good things we are doing for you? Why don't you look at both sides of the question?

Negroes laugh and say that our tax dollars helped pay for that; we'd give more tax dollars if you allowed us to earn fairly; our tax dollars also go to support State sovereignty commissions, to pay for psuedo-scientific State-sponsored books that seek to prove we are intrinsically inferior and should be deprived of our rights of citizenship; our tax dollars also go to support public beaches and parks that we are not allowed to enjoy. Our tax dollars, sir, are used to pay for the rope that lynches us. Now why don't you look at both sides of the question? We have been shouting: "Whatever you do against me you do against yourself, against this country. And I cannot carry the load forever. You cannot expect me to go on fighting to protect America's freedoms abroad and not fight for them at home." You do not hear.

Perhaps the greatest source of frustration is the fact that more and more we have two groups of citizens with two different sets of knowledge and information. Negroes are fully aware of the many current instances of rank injustice and violations of civil rights, but the non-Negro masses are not aware of them. Uninformed, the national conscience cannot manifest itself.

For example, I have spent most of last fall on a national lecture tour. The McComb, Miss., scandals, which have shaken the Negroes, are almost wholly unknown to the non-Negro population. In speaking to thousands of interested and concerned whites, I found only one person, a professor of sociology, who had even heard of the McComb depredations. The real substance of such scandals simply does not make the local newspapers and therefore usually is not picked up by the wire services; or if it is, many newspapers choose not to run it. Newspapers are reluctant to deal with real controversy or indeed, with anything that might offend popular prejudice and therefore cause them to lose subscribers or advertising revenue.

LAG IN COMMUNICATION

This lag in communication means that we are at least two versions behind "the New Negro." He is not the "race man" protesting through Hip—not the hipster. That came and went. He is not the loud flash out to impress the white. Not any more. He is the informed, polite, rock-hard, no-nonsense man.

Southern white men—white men in east Texas—will react against this, too, will deny it. They know Negroes, see them every day, and although they are more sullen perhaps, they are otherwise no different; they don't have these complex personalities, these dreams. White men must realize that they do not know what goes on in Negroes' homes at night, what they say and think and discuss. Complex as the situation is, in a sense it is desolatingly clear. Even a concerned, sympathetic white knows practically nothing about Negroes or their real problems because he seldom stops looking upon a Negro as one of the Negroes. A Negro snatches a purse and this is all Negroes. A white man rapes and murders, but he is an individual white.

On the other hand, Negroes cannot believe any longer that white men are simply unaware. Five years ago, Negroes saw Little Rock. Last year they saw Oxford. They saw that they were identical in pattern. Five years have produced nothing.

They are not edified by southern moderates or liberals who are scarcely better informed than the masses. Moderates are calling for such rare items as justice and compassion as though they were ingredients in a soup—a bit of one here, a bit of another there; and when some little something is accomplished we think the soup is beginning to smell and taste as though it were cooked by Christ and Thomas Jefferson—a real, American nourishment.

But since we whites are not obliged to eat it, we don't realize that to the Negroes it is a thin swill. We further err in thinking that they should be overwhelmingly grateful to us for it and bide their time while we good whites think of something else to help them, some new ingredient for the soup.

James Baldwin admirably expressed the Negroes' growing disgust when he remarked, "All of Africa's going to be free before we can get a lousy cup of coffee."

How many whites realize this? Few, as far as I can tell. To most, the Negro is still the handkerchief-head, the Uncle Tom, or perhaps the hipster. A Negro's actions, his demands, are therefore misinterpreted. They bewilder and frighten many non-Negroes. This new Negro is going to do exactly what a proud white man would do in his place—either stand up and die or else get the rights that are being withheld from him, so that his children won't have to take the garbage they've always taken, so that his children won't have to despair. This new Negro says: "Nothing's worth that. I'm going to be a man." You call him "nigger" when he shines your shoes in a barber shop and he'll never show up for work there.

There is a sobering schism now in Negro leadership. Young Negroes are revolting against the established leadership. Two years ago, the Black Muslim movement could make no headway in the South, because southern Negroes still had some illusions. Today, the advocates of nonviolent resistance are losing ground to the black racists. This can be attributed to one cause—Negroes' loss of hope that white men will ever throw off the chains of racism; that they will ever do the right thing.

A year ago, on a national radio program, I condemned the Black Muslim movement as an evil that perpetrated the very racism from which the Negro in America has suffered so terribly. This year, with the rapid growth of such hate movements all over the United States, the same holds true; but we must look to causes, frankly face the fact that we are driving many Negroes to desperation, and admit that they resisted a long, long time before they decided to withdraw from further participation in the American dream.

This withdrawal is not yet a stampede, but it is one of the large lines of the movement, one that we are doing little to help correct. We are still telling Negroes that they must "earn" their rights. This makes no sense when they see the Ph. D.'s are denied, because of pigmentation, rights that we unhesitatingly accord even the most degraded white. We are still talking about Americanism and the great principles of democracy even as we witness the spread of regionalism and sectionalism and the growth of prejudice throughout the Nation.

This was nicely summed up in a letter from a minister of God addressed to "Ralph (Rastus) McGill" recently. The minister said: "I am a Mississippian first, a southerner second, an American third." Presumably, he was a Christian fourth.

DANGER GREATER THAN EVER

At the conclusion of my book, "Black Like Me," fearing intergroup violence, I wrote: "If some spark does set the keg afire, it will be a senseless tragedy of ignorant against ignorant—a holocaust that will drag down the innocent and right thinking masses of human beings. Then we will all pay for not having cried justice long ago."

I wish I could say that fear is now obsolete. No, the danger of a racial holocaust is greater now than it was then. The true issues are evaded in newspapers and other mass communications media. States still seriously claim that they have the right to do wrong. There is still a vast confusion in the public's mind about the contradistinction between inalienable rights and human positive law. Few realize that our problem is not one of race, but of racism, anti-Americanism, and that this problem affects every American regardless of pigmentation.

How can the necessary communication, the dialogue, be established? Can it ever be established as long as truths offend the whites? The Negroes? How can these two blocs of humanity keep from crashing into one another?

I have pondered this until I dream of it at night. In one of the dreams I drew up a 265-point program. As I finished typing it, a delegation of men from the Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens' Council along with one distinguished woman from a venerable-lineage society called on me. We discussed humanity and justice. Then I presented my 265-point program. They were indignant. A well informed southern Governor said: "Two hundred and sixty-five points. Who do you think you are? Why, son, even God handed down only 10 commandments, and the great Bill of Rights only contained 10 points." And in my dream, I told him. "If you will live by either or both, I will throw away my 265."

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out that with the signing 2 days ago by Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, a former Member of this body, of a bill, Hawaii has assumed the leadership of the Nation in giving tax deductions for political contributions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this law will be the forerunner of legislation to be enacted by many of our States, and of legislation which will soon be passed by the Congress of the United States.

By encouraging political contributions, the cause of democracy will be advanced. It is not in our best interest to continue to depend upon a relatively few large contributors to bear the burden of financing political campaigns in the furtherance of our democratic process of election in the United States; nor should the candidate for political office be forced into the position of dependence upon a small number of large contributors, or of going into heavy debt to finance his own campaign. I am most fearful that if something is not done to encourage political contributions, running for high public office might become a pastime reserved only for the wealthy.

The President of the United States has requested Congress to enact legislation providing for a tax credit of $10 or a tax deduction of $500 for political contributions. In submitting his request the President said:

> Our present system of financing political campaigns is deficient in that it does not insure that candidates, or the parties they represent will have sufficient funds to provide adequate exposure to the electorate, and it has not effectively encouraged small contributions from a very large number of individuals.
>
> To insure candidates will have adequate funds, and to reduce dependence on large contributions of those with special interests, the base of financial support for candidates and parties must be broadened. To accomplish this, improvement of public understanding of campaign finance, together with a system of incentives for solicitation and giving, is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Hawaii has taken the lead in meeting a truly critical situation. I hope that the remaining 49 States will follow suit, but what is even more important is that the Congress will enact the President's proposal into legislation.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, faced with the size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the Congress has found itself increasingly unable to cope with the problem of keeping its fiscal and appropriative procedures in proper perspective. Too often we lose touch with the broader aspect of these important matters in the necessary concentration on their details.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] has offered an intelligent approach to resolving our difficulties in this area. He, in his House Resolution 51, proposes the creation of a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures to look into the way in which the Congress handles these matters and the defects in the present budgetary practices of our Government. I take the greatest pleasure in joining the gentleman in sponsorship of this resolution which offers a chance for a real step forward in our quest for fiscal responsibility in our Government.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the area redevelopment legislation was passed by Congress because of the assurance of the present administration that this legislation would reduce unemployment and enable the communities benefited to place many unemployed back to work. Since its inception the law has been a failure. There has been no appreciable decrease in unemployment and if the program is continued, it will develop into the largest pork barrel in the history of this country. If town A receives relief, then why should not town B with the same problems also receive relief? If money is given to any town under this program, then most certainly every other community or town in the United States, having similar conditions, is entitled to the same consideration and to deny this certainly would be nothing short of discrimination. This program which has been such a colossal failure should be eliminated now and the money which is being spent should be placed to a more useful purpose. I believe the editorial appearing in the Casper, Wyo., Tribune, which I am including here, pinpoints the situation:

REWARD FOR FAILURE

Soon the House will have a chance to vote on a $455.5 million 2-year extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration. On its record, the House should vote "No."

Since ARA was authorized, unemployment trends have been inconclusive, but it is certain that ARA's expensive activities have had little effect for improvement. In all, far less than 1,000 new jobs per State have been created—and it is possible that in creating these jobs the program has destroyed many existing jobs.

Congress has learned details of many ARA projects, and they should not cheer a taxpayer. The agency loaned $1.8 billion to help build a motel in one city where the rate of occupancy for rooms was 54 percent.

It loaned $6 million to another city to build an auditorium, which might cheer up a depressed area somewhat, but which admittedly made no significant contribution to employment.

It has loaned money for a papermill to take business from nearby papermills, and a soybean plant to take business from neighboring soybean plants. This was specifically enjoined in the bill which authorized the agency.

It was expected by those who fought the legislation in the first place, and supporters of ARA denied it could ever happen. But it did.

If Congress continues to vote funds to be put to such uses, it will merely affirm the political adage: "The reward for failure is a larger appropriation."

LET US REMEMBER ON MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American people, true to the tradition of the past 100 years, paid homage to our honored dead, those who gave their lives in defense of their country. It is fitting that we pay this annual tribute in the spirit of the editorial from the Washington Evening Star which I include as a part of these remarks.

It occurs to me that in this same spirit of honoring our dead, we should remember for what they died. In all our wars our heroes fought to preserve this land of the free, this home of the brave, the individual liberty upon which our great Nation is founded. They did not die to trade off the sovereignty of the United States, nor to accommodate a foreign power which has threatened our destruction. They did not die to increase the political power of a party or an individual, they did not die to pave the way for dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, let us now rededicate ourselves in the words of a great leader who suffered through the years of one of our conflicts, Abraham Lincoln, "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star editorial follows:

MEMORIAL DAY

It is Memorial Day. Let us remember our dead.

Between the two great wars of this century it used to be said that the war dead could best be remembered by the efforts of the living to avoid war in the future. We know now, after Korea and while Vietnam continues, that it is not always possible to avoid war, that other alternatives may be worse. Also, while it is always our duty to work for peace, to do so is not the same thing as the simple act of memory and gratitude called for by this day.

All our wars, we think, looking back, have been fought for those principles we associate with the existence of this Nation and most have been fought for the survival of the Nation either physically or as a promise for mankind. Even those wars of which we may have retrospective doubt, such as the Mexican War and the long, sporadic war with the Indians, assuredly contributed to what now seems the inevitable growth of the United States.

Yet all our wars, whether fought to throw of the misrule of George III or to hold in check the military menace of communism—all our wars were fought by men in arms, many of whom died while so doing. It is these we remember.

Acting through the genius of Jefferson, we declared ourselves independent; but already some farmer had left his plough, taken his rifle from over the mantle, and headed for Concord, to become the first of the American war dead.

Acting through the genius of Lincoln, we kept this Nation one and we ended slavery; but to do so thousands of American soldiers died on a field that included the hills of Pennsylvania and the Mississippi delta.

Twice in our century we have faced and faced down the fury of the Germans. Each time the job was done by Americans in arms who, when the final question was asked, died for their country.

Almost since the end of World War II, we have been building a system of mutual security for free nations. Diplomatically and politically this has been a hard task. But the hardest part of it has been borne by those who have died in the process.

It is Memorial Day. Let us remember and be grateful to those who have died that America might live.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Saylor (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for Monday and Tuesday, June 3 and 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Karsten, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

874. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the ineffective programing, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Portuguese Air Force under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

875. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred because of the delay of the Army in equipping M151 utility trucks with necessary fixtures to facilitate use in airborne operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

876. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting cancellation order, pursuant to 49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e, also draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

877. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 26, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Holland Harbor-Black Lake (Lake Macatawa), Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 16, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 6710. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6711. A bill to approve the January 1963 reclassification of land of the Big Flat unit of the Missoula Valley project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with the Big Flat Irrigation District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution to require Members of Congress to file at the beginning of each regular session of each Congress a financial statement and a statement of business dealings with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 382. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 383. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal legislation for the control of barbiturates and amphetamines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to enact legislation to end the causes of unemployment in the iron ore industry in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation which would give new life to the mining industry of the Western States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon introduced a bill (H.R. 6712) for the relief of Bazyli Mac, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lyndon Johnson Delivers 20th Century Sequel to Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Memorial Day, May 30, 1963, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, delivered an oration in Gettysburg, Pa., which in my judgment shall stand for time immemorial as the 20th Century sequel to Abraham Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address.

In order for all Americans to see Mr. JOHNSON's profound announcement in its entirety, I am taking the privilege today to include it in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, Vice President JOHNSON's Memorial Day address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, MEMORIAL DAY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a Nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen at the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the Proclamation of Emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 25: 21: *Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of Thy Lord.*

Eternal God, our Father, Thou art daily drawing us to Thyself that we may share in the fellowship of Thy truth and love and attain unto greater beauty of character and nobility of conduct.

Grant that we may commit ourselves to the power and leadership of Thy holy spirit whereby alone we can find our way out of the confusion and turmoil of our day and generation.

We thank Thee for the life and significant ministry and service of our departed colleague whose spirit has entered the blessedness of Thy nearer presence.

Today we are joining the vast multitudes everywhere who are earnestly beseeching Thee to manifest Thy grace to the greatly beloved spiritual leader and devout pontiff who called us his brothers in Christ and who longed and labored so fervently for peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear our prayers through the merits and mediation of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 31, 1963, was read and approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR TRANSFERRED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule, be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders for today be transferred to tomorrow and that they be called prior to the special orders scheduled for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to insert their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and include therewith extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the year ending June 30, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce that our beloved friend and colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER, has passed on. The calmness and fortitude he displayed in his courageous fight to regain his health are a measure of those qualities which made "TAD" WALTER one of the truly great legislators of our time.

Thirty years ago "TAD" began his career in this House of Representatives. He had prepared himself well for the post of lawmaker. Born in Easton, Pa., on May 26, 1894, he attended the local schools there, later going to a preparatory school at Princeton, N.J. "TAD" received his B.A. degree from George Washington University in 1916, and his law degree from Georgetown University just 3 years later. His private practice of law in Easton began at that time, and just before his coming to Congress in 1933 he had served for 5 years as the Northhampton County solicitor.

"TAD" soon became known as an expert parliamentarian and over the years was frequently selected to preside when the House sat as Committee of the Whole for the consideration of complex and controversial legislation. He never avoided an assignment. He carried out the chores of chairman of the patronage committee well and efficiently. "TAD" also served as chairman of the Democratic caucus with fairness and dignity. He always did his best to win when he sought enactment of legislation. "TAD" always regarded as one of his greatest accomplishments the enactment, in spite of a Presidential veto, of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The passage of this controversial law did not lose him the affection and regard of those who opposed it. "TAD's" undoubted conviction that he was in the right and his scrupulous fairness in debate added to his prestige and the esteem in which his colleagues held him.

His service as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration was marked by his humanitarian sympathy for the plight of refugees. More than any other, he was responsible for the efforts to help displaced persons. Last year, "TAD" was cited by the U.S. Committee for Refugees for his deep concern for the problems of refugees and for the broad humanitarian approach of the 1962 refugee act.

"TAD" was versatile in his legislative interests and in his early years in the Congress he became known as an expert on labor legislation. In more recent years, "TAD" was active as the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, a post he filled so well that the House always voted him the funds he needed for operating expenses. As these funds were almost always larger than for other committees, his receiving them was a tribute by his colleagues that gave concrete evidence of their regard and trust.

As another indication of the affectionate esteem which "TAD" inspired in those who came to know him, I wish to read a telegram which has been received by the Speaker:

> Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
> *Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Please convey to the appropriate survivors and to all others in Congress my expression of deep sorrow on learning today that the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER passed away. I shall always remember "TAD's" many warmhearted kindnesses to me personally and to the people of Hawaii during my service as a delegate. His support of the Hawaii statehood bill both in committee and on the floor of the House was particularly effective. We in Hawaii also regard his cosponsorship of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 as a great contribution because it enabled so many of our residents to have the opportunity to accept American citizenship. Congressman WALTER will always be remembered warmly by the people of Hawaii. The Nation has lost a great American and a truly dedicated Member of Congress. I have lost a fine friend.
>
> Gov. JOHN A. BURNS.

Mr. Speaker, we can all repeat with Governor Burns that "The Nation has lost a great American and a truly dedicated Member of Congress" in the passing of our beloved colleague, "TAD" WALTER. It has been a great privilege and honor for me to serve with him in the House. I shall always cherish the most pleasant memories of our association, and I shall miss his wise counsel. In his passing, I have lost one of my closest friends. To his dear ones I extend my heartfelt condolences.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this expression of sadness over the death of one of the giants of this House and of this generation. Although "TAD" WALTER suffered from a lingering illness of a character that meant that recovery was almost impossible, I was not prepared for the shocking news flashed over the radio on Friday afternoon.

"TAD" WALTER was a man of extraordinary proportions measured by any standards. He was dynamic. He was resourceful. He was confident. He was articulate. He was resolute. He was a tower of strength in this House. He was a patriot who carried on an unyielding fight against the Communist menace. He was a great lawyer. He was a successful businessman. He was a legislative architect who had few equals in our time. The statute books are weighted with his monumental contributions. He was a skillful parliamentarian. He was a pillar of strength to every Speaker who has presided over this body in his time. He was an outstanding servant of the House and of his party in the House. He was a great asset to the House not only as a legislative craftsman, but as an example. His character, his life, and his service helped to maintain the great ideals and traditions of the House and to elevate in the public mind this institution as the most faithful servant of the American people. Rarely does the death of a man have the impact upon his day which accompanies that of the death of FRANCIS E. WALTER. A great oak has fallen, and to paraphrase Edwin Markham, there is left "a vacant space against the sky."

"TAD" WALTER was the esteemed colleague of every Member of this House. He was our friend. We shall miss him.

We extend our deepest sympathy to his family and his loved ones, and to his host of friends in the district which he represented in this Congress so well for so many years.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, what all of us feared was inevitable when we paid our tributes to "TAD" WALTER on the occasion of his recent birthday anniversary has now come to pass.

A dear friend, with us for so long, is now gone, his work on this earth finished.

It is my hope that the words of admiration and devotion spoken by so many of his colleagues just a few days ago were a source of gratification and comfort to this great American during the final days of his illness.

There were many facets to the character of this remarkable man.

He was highly capable; he backed his convictions with tremendous courage in the face of sometimes bitter opposition.

"TAD" WALTER was extremely influential in the Congress of the United States because of widespread respect for his knowledge and his integrity.

No one took his responsibilities to his country more seriously or worked with greater diligence and perseverance to meet his obligations as he saw them.

Not in my time here have I known a more effective and unrelenting foe of the Communist conspiracy and I know of no single individual who has shown more sympathy and understanding for unhappy victims of that conspiracy from foreign lands.

Literally thousands upon thousands of human beings owe their chances for a new life of freedom in America in large measure to the efforts of "TAD" WALTER.

He was a stalwart patriot and a rugged champion of the downtrodden.

But most of all, to me, "TAD" WALTER was a warm, kind, helpful, personal friend whom I shall miss more than I can say.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot find the words with which to express how deeply I personally feel the loss of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

About a week ago—on May 26, to be exact—he celebrated his 69th birthday. Confined to a hospital with an illness the genius of man has yet to find a cure, it could not be much of a birthday celebration for him. Nonetheless, it was for me a day for rejoicing. We rejoiced that "TAD" was still with us in a prayerful hope that in the miracle of life God would grant him and us the miracle of having him recover. This was not to be.

In this hour of sorrow—sorrow for countless numbers who knew "TAD"—there can be rejoicing. We rejoice that God gave us a man like "TAD," and we find consolation for our sorrow in the knowledge that he rests in peace in the great reward of life hereafter for a life fully lived on earth. A marker at his grave dwarfs into insignificance in comparison to the monument of deeds and accomplishments he himself has erected. He has indeed left his mark on all of us personally and on the history of our country which time can never erase.

As I said on this floor on the Thursday before his birthday, "TAD" was not one who simply follows. He was a leader. And because he was a leader he was often in the midst of controversy. While a political partisan, he exercised independent judgment when he felt that the issue transcended any political considerations.

It is not without significance that the late Speaker Rayburn and our present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], invariably called upon him to preside over the House as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole whenever we had before us a highly technical and very controversial bill. That was because the Speaker recognized that "TAD" had the confidence and respect of Members from both sides of the political aisle, that he had an unusually fine legal mind capable of handling any complex parliamentary question and, above all, that he would be both firm and fair in all his rulings from the Chair.

"TAD" came to Congress 2 years before I did. Over these many years we have been political adversaries, and we have been personal friends. No one could have a better friend.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of "TAD" WALTER is a loss to me personally that I feel deeper than I can say. It is indeed a great loss to the House of Representatives. I extend my sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the passing of our friend and colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, was a source of sadness and sense of deep loss to all of us. FRANCIS WALTER will be sorely missed by those of us here who were privileged to know him well and to associate with him in our legislative endeavors, and by his district, State, and Nation for which his contributions were great and lasting.

Through our democratic processes, our great country has been highly fortunate in the leaders which the people have raised up in response to the Nation's needs of the hour and the times. FRANCIS WALTER was one of those strong men who not only dared to give expression to his feelings and views but to work tirelessly and effectively to translate those views into policies which have given added strength to the Nation. He was formidable in debate, a tenacious fighter for principle, and one of the most able parliamentarians this body has known for many years. FRANCIS WALTER was a fervent patriot and an unselfish, devoted statesman. He was a man of vision, of wisdom, and great intellect.

Mr. Speaker, when we discuss the qualities of departed colleagues we often are prone to dwell on those contributions which they have made to legislation, to the policies of the Nation, and to accomplishments and achievements for their constituencies. I join with my colleagues in the expressions they have made with respect to these matters.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to allude briefly to certain of those personal characteristics which endear individuals to all of us. "TAD" WALTER was a man of courtliness and kindness, of thoughtfulness and consideration, of good will and great strength of character. These qualities, I believe, are as important as any of those which relate to contributions which he made in the field of legislation.

I extend condolences to his family and his many friends in his district.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, while all our hearts are heavy with sadness because of the passing of our dear friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, nevertheless, there is far more reason for us to be happy than to be sorrowful. To be sure, each and every Member of both parties of this House and the Senate mourn the loss of this able and outstanding American.

FRANCIS WALTER shall be missed as one of the best Congressmen who ever served in this legislative body. He was loved by his many friends and admired and respected by those who did not agree or see "eye to eye" with him. He was honest, persevering, intelligent, successful, tough, and a natural-born leader. Truly, he was a "Congressman's Congressman."

Under that self-developed and disciplined air of so-called toughness, there beat a heart filled to the brim with compassion, sympathy, helpfulness, and understanding of all his fellow men. His every action and deed have proved this statement to be true.

These are some of the things for which he shall long be missed and mourned. On the other hand, however, "TAD," as he was affectionately called, will be gratefully and happily remembered for his magnificent 30-year contribution to good government and good laws that are on the statute books today as a result of his ability, fairness, astuteness, and creative genius.

FRANCIS WALTER was a courageous man as well as a splendid legislator. As his close personal friend and one who served with him for over 18 years on both the

Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee of Immigration and Nationality, I saw at close hand how he worked, how he operated and how he reacted under fire from his critics. When he felt he was right—and generally he was—he called for full steam ahead and got the job done, his accusers and hecklers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours eulogizing this distinguished and extraordinary American who not only served his country tremendously in peace but who also wore its uniform in time of war in order to help preserve its freedom.

In my humble opinion, "TAD" WALTER needs no monument or headstone over his grave for the very simple reason that what he did here in the interest of all poor immigrants of every race, color, creed and nationality shall be deeply emblazoned in the hearts and memories of the thousands he has befriended and this shall be a perpetual and everlasting monument to him.

To all of those who loved him and for whom he had great love and devotion, I ask God's blessing. May the Good Lord rest his brave soul in peace and prepare for him a special place in his "Mansion of Rest."

Mr. Speaker—

Somewhere beyond the sunset
  Where loneliness never lies
TAD lives in a land of glory
  'Neath the blue and the gold of the skies
Not dead to those who love him
  But only gone before
For he shall live with us in memory
  And he shall forevermore.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, the country, yes, much of the world was the loser at the passing of our colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Everyone who has been a Member of Congress since "TAD" WALTER took his seat in the House more than 30 years ago knows that he was one of the most resourceful, effective, influential, courageous, patriotic Members who has served in the House in all those fateful years. His accomplishments in domestic affairs were most constructive and are legion.

In addition, his untiring and effective leadership, both at home and abroad, in helping move people from overpopulated to underdeveloped countries has provided opportunity and security to countless people who had little of either before.

The good that FRANCIS E. WALTER has done will live long after he is gone.

My deepest sympathy goes to every member of his family and to all his loved ones.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our valued colleague and friend, FRANCIS E. WALTER, has passed from this world of travail to his eternal reward. We are saddened by his death which takes from our ranks a man of strong convictions, a man of determined purpose, a man who held an unswerving devotion to his country, a man richly endowed with the qualities of raw courage and a man whose commitment to the rule of law as the heartstone of American democracy was total. "TAD," as he was affectionately known to so many of his colleagues, labored in the arena of political combat which he loved so much until called by his Maker to a life of eternal rest.

Thirty years ago last March 4, "TAD" WALTER came to Congress from the 15th District of Pennsylvania. During those years he served as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It was my privilege to serve with him on that committee for the past 20 years. He served as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1, on Immigration and Nationality for many years and for 14 of those years I sat beside him in committee meetings too numerous to recall. Most of those years were characterized by trying human problems growing out of the crisis of World War II and events in its aftermath. In the search for solutions to those problems "TAD" was always motivated by what he believed to be our best national interests. His compassion for the homeless, the persecuted and the unwanted victims of war and ruthless political systems is known to all who sought his counsel. The innocent victims of war and tyranny found in him a courageous champion of justice. Beset by the companion problems of national security rising out of the global ideological conflict his task as chairman of our subcommittee was not an easy one. Amidst controversy, impassioned plea and the doubts of an uncertain era he remained always calm, confident, and determined that a way could be found to honor our rich traditions as a land of refuge without endangering the future of our country to which he was dedicated. Standing as timeless monuments to the quality of his leadership are the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refuge Relief Act of 1953, and the emergency parole program for Hungarian refugees in 1956. Many thousands of new Americans throughout the length and breadth of our country will mourn his passing and will remember him in their prayers for the blessings of liberty they and their families now enjoy.

Great is the mark of our departed colleague and friend on the laws under which our system of self-government is preserved and strengthened. Others have spoken and more will undoubtedly speak on his remarkable career as a lawmaker and dedicated public servant. One law, in my judgment, stands out in that long record because it is identified in the public mind with the names of our departed friends Senator McCarran and Mr. WALTER. I refer to Public Law 414, 82d Congress, known as the McCarran-Walter Act.

The public controversy which attended enactment of that law does not detract from the years of work, research and public hearings required to bring into one codified statute all the then existing laws related to immigration and nationality policy. "TAD" was the first to admit the law with which his name is identified was not a panacea just as he had been among the first to advocate the need for a codified immigration law, for he knew that manmade laws, like the men who make them, are never perfect and that the tide of time makes change inevitable. Time and the test of experience will credit him with bringing a large degree of legal order into a special field of highly complicated public law.

We will miss FRANCIS WALTER in the deliberations of this body where the force of his leadership was exceeded only by his concern for the preservation of American democracy. We will miss him in the work of the Judiciary Committee where his counsel, labors and decisions over 30 years have left a distinctive mark. I will miss him as a friend. The stimulating challenge which he brought to the 20-odd years of our association will remain among my warmest memories of those eventful years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues here in the House of Representatives in paying respect to our late esteemed colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. I keenly feel the sadness of his passing because of the fact that he was my friend for many years.

The people of his district in Pennsylvania realized a long time ago that they truly had a great and dedicated representative as their Congressman. His loss will now be deeply felt by all the people of the 15th District of Pennsylvania. Even though Representative WALTER fulfilled the great responsibilities placed upon him by his many duties, as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy and as chairman of the Democratic caucus, he always remembered that his first duty and obligation was to the people who had sent him to the House of Representatives.

I shall miss "TAD" after serving with him over 19 years here in the House of Representatives.

His family has my deepest sympathy and prayers in their loss.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

We have lost an able colleague, and his loss will be keenly felt by all who knew him. "TAD" was a humble man who had a goodness of soul and kindness of heart, always affable and congenial. He dedicated his life to the service of his country and in all problems he responded with an alacrity of a man who had become a willing servant of public duty.

I cannot attempt to grasp or sum up the aggregate of his service in public life in a few words, and it is needless.

His life comprised a term of some years and produced a record that won for him the hearty commendations of the people of our State and Nation.

He was a man with the highest concepts of citizenship and a firm believer in the principles of liberty and our American way of life. His devotion to and love of country was something to be admired; always ambitious to uphold and defend the fine ideals and traditions of our Nation.

He strove mightily to attain those objectives which he thought were for the best interests of all our people and his work in the House of Representatives was most useful and constructive.

FRANCIS was a kindly man who delighted in lifting the burdens of life from the shoulders of others, a man who made the best of life as he found it, and one who was happy when any little act or deed of his added to the lives of the rest of us.

So today it is with a feeling of deep sadness that we record his passing and remember him for the many little acts of kindness that manifested his friendship and good will toward the Members of this House.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, someone has said that "he who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. But he who loses his country loses all things and all things lost will curse him."

FRANCIS WALTER gave his life trying to save his country. His country will bless him.

Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS WALTER was my friend, as I was his, and the word of his death came as a shock.

The Nation has lost a fine public servant. We in the Congress have lost a truly stalwart champion of the patriotic principles which made our Nation great.

FRANCIS WALTER was a strong, courageous exponent of those things in which he believed.

But as firm as he was in his convictions, I never knew him to be anything but that which was without question completely fair toward those with whom he differed on principle or political convictions.

Nor could anyone doubt his sincerity or his honesty. He was a man of great moral character. He was a devout Christian, and based his ideals upon his devotion to his country and Christianity. His ideals and spirit inspired many over the years he served in the Congress.

Though his spirit and example will live on in the lives of all of us, FRANCIS WALTER will be sorely missed among his colleagues.

He was so busy filling his arduous role in the Congress, he could not find time to think of himself. In addition to representing the good people of the 15th District of Pennsylvania, he served as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, chairman of the Democratic patronage committee, chairman of the Democratic caucus and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. It is no wonder that his health failed at last at age 69.

His family and loved ones can take solace in the fact that he died in service of his beloved America, and that he was one of those—

> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will;
> Men who have honor, who will not lie.

He died trying to save America. All America will bless him.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. It is a sad privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who I think was as fine a man as ever sat in this body. All of us respected him. He meant a lot to the augustness of this House of Representatives.

There is one facet of "TAD" WALTER's life that has always impressed me, and that is the way he got along with all of his committee employees. I was impressed with their devotion to him, the good work they did. I know, because I spoke to him about it, that when "TAD" WALTER went to the hospital he had on his mind taking time on the floor to pay tribute to one of the finest reading clerks the House of Representatives ever had, George Maurer. "TAD" brought him down from Pennsylvania. All of us missed him. Perhaps one of these days we will take time out to pay tribute to George Maurer, who was one of "TAD" WALTER's employees.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I feel a very personal loss in the passing of my friend, "TAD" WALTER. "TAD" WALTER and I came to this body together on March 4, 1933. We were among the large class of 164 who came to this House in the 73d Congress—151 of those Members had never served before, while 13 were former Members who had returned in that class after having missed one or more previous sessions. At the time of his unfortunate passing, he and I were the only two of that group still serving in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to associate myself with the remarks made by others here today in their high evaluation of the man, our former colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, and of the service that he rendered in this House, to his district, his State, and, above all, to his Nation.

For more than three decades, FRANCIS WALTER has served in this House as a Representative from the great State of Pennsylvania with distinction, with patriotism, and with political courage.

Mr. Speaker, he carved for himself a niche in history in a numerically large body where prominence is difficult to achieve. Unlike other numerically smaller bodies, a man, to gain public recognition and honor, must have outstanding ability. Although he served for more than 30 years, he only comparatively recently became chairman of a committee of this House where seniority plays such a prominent role. And then, that came as a result of the creation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House as a standing committee. But, notwithstanding this, it was in the Judiciary Committee, of which he was the ranking member, that he rendered yeoman service to the country and its institutions.

Possessed of a brilliant mind, he was effective in the legislative considerations of that committee. But, Mr. Speaker, possibly his most outstanding characteristic was his political courage. He never hesitated to oppose those in high places even in his own party when he thought they were wrong.

Surely, the House has lost a valuable Member and our sympathy goes out to his loved ones.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been a personal friend and close associate of Congressman FRANCIS WALTER for the past 15 years. I had the privilege of serving with him on two committees, the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Besides almost daily contact on the floor, it had become a custom for us to have private heart-to-heart talks at least once a week.

As a part of our committee work I traveled abroad with "TAD" WALTER on two occasions and we traveled together rather extensively over the length and breadth of this country. These personal and extended contacts and travels gave me a rare opportunity to know Congressman WALTER, the man, the lawyer, the parliamentarian, and the legislator.

"TAD" WALTER was a man of integrity, a brilliant lawyer and an outstanding parliamentarian and legislator. To mention just two, the McCarran-Walter Act and the Administrative Procedures Act are monuments to his legislative craftsmanship.

I learned more from him about parliamentary law and the art of legislation than from any other source or in any book.

"TAD" WALTER had a great mind, a tremendous drive, and an innate talent for leadership. As I said on the floor recently on the occasion of his birthday, he was one of the most courageous men I ever met and I have never known him to run away from an issue or to run out on a friend.

On my last visit with him at the Georgetown Hospital we talked about baseball, football, legislation, politics and everything except his own sad condition. Before leaving the room, however, I asked, "TAD, is there anything I can do for you?" And he replied, "No, there is nothing either you or anyone else can do for me, but I am ready for it. And, ED, let me give you this piece of advice. Just continue to be yourself."

"TAD" was always true to himself whether walking with kings or talking to the crowds.

Now he is gone and we his colleagues, his district, his State and his country will miss him ever so much. I extend heartfelt sympathy to his family and to his faithful and devoted administrative assistant, Ruth Miskell.

May God have mercy on his good soul and may God help me to be myself as I share and carry on even a small part of his heavy burden on earth.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was said by the admirers of a great American and a great Democrat of another day—Grover Cleveland—that they loved him for the enemies he had made.

Congressman Francis E. Walter, a great American and a great Democrat, merits this same high tribute.

Perhaps it is a measure of the effectiveness with which "Tad" Walter fought for the causes in which he believed that even in death he is not entirely spared the venom and spite which his devotion to duty brought him from some sources in his lifetime.

Thus one Washington news story since his passing, referring in a slighting and derisive vein to his service as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said that Congressman Walter was "obsessed with internal security."

Countless Americans, I am sure, will regard this intended slur as a badge of honor.

The internal security of the United States, in this dangerous and conspiratorial age of Communist subversion and aggression, was indeed and rightfully a profound concern of Francis Walter—and to that security he made monumental contributions.

Let those of us who continue for a time in positions of responsibility be as diligent and faithful in the discharge of our own stewardship.

I forbear to speak further of our distinguished and lamented colleague, my chairman, and my friend. I was honored—as we have all been honored—to know and serve with him. I extend my sympathies to those who survive.

May Francis Walter rest in peace. And his works do truly follow him.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Lord in his wisdom has taken from us one of our outstanding leaders. Francis E. Walter, a patriot and statesman has contributed much to the welfare of the citizens of the United States of America.

We pause to pay honor and tribute to this great American. Throughout his lifetime he has always been considered a man among men. It was his privilege to be a leader and that leadership has left its imprint on the destiny of America. Thirty years of devotion to the legislative field was just one contribution that he made.

Prior to his acceptance of his responsibilities as a Member of the House of Representatives he had proven to the rest of the world that he was a true loyal dedicated person at every opportunity and was in favor of our orderly process.

When any action threatened the welfare of the Nation he was the first to speak out. When his services were needed in the Armed Forces he was a volunteer. These characteristics were appreciated by those who really understood his desire to preserve the American way of life.

The span of life of each individual on this earth is indeed short. The Master in his wisdom determines the eternal call. Francis E. Walter throughout his short life was resolute and had a clear understanding of principles. His acts, conduct, and deeds will long be remembered and we, in the House of Representatives, were blessed in having a man of this strong character among us. He will be missed for many years to come. I extend my sympathy to the family and his loved ones.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that today much of the conversations in the halls will include many personal expressions of regret and sorrow over the fact that tomorrow we will say a final farewell to our dear friend and respected colleague, Francis Walter. Some will express their regrets by saying that we will be burying our friend. I should like to remind the House, however, that we will be laying in its final resting place only the bodily vehicle which has served this great patriot and son of God so ably through the past 69 years. Mr. Walter no longer dwells among us in the flesh. He has been called by God to receive his eternal reward and has left behind an empty tomb, final and visible evidence that he has dwelt among us for a time. While his colleagues who knew him cannot quench the desire to say a word of testimony in his behalf, yet in a larger sense, he needs no one to speak for him; for he has, as all of us must, spoken vividly, colorfully, and with a depth of meaning, that words of others could not convey, in his own behalf. Surely nothing we could say here or do here could alter the circumstances, regarding Mr. Walter, in which we find ourselves today. He has spoken ably with his own life. Nothing we could say here can add to or detract from the high esteem in which he is held by those who knew him intimately.

Though we shall miss his bodily presence, his wise counsel, his intelligent judgment, his warm smile, his spirit, which underlies all the attributes men could in honesty shower upon him, will continue to permeate the Halls of Congress and will serve as a constant reminder of our privileges and responsibilities as freemen.

Last week many of us stood on sacred ground made hallowed by the memories of our honored dead who fell in battle in our Nation's wars to preserve the cause of freedom. All the great words describing their sacrifices and their dedication, their love for freedom and for country, could be ascribed to the one in whose memory we pause today, for truly this man gave his life in service in war and in peace to the high and noble purposes for which our Nation stands. I am sure that as Francis E. Walter passes in review before those who have entered the Haven of Eternal Rest, he will receive perhaps the most precious ovation of all in the simple words "Well done; because of you, we who have given our lives in battle have not died in vain."

These words by Georgia Harkness have special significance as they are applied to our departed colleague:

> A giant pine, magnificent and old,
> Stood stanch against the sky and all around
> Shed beauty, grace and power. Within its fold
> Birds safely reared their young. The velvet ground
> Beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade
> Gave cheer to passers-by. Its towering arms
> A landmark stood, erect and unafraid,
> As if to say, "Fear naught from life's alarms."
> It fell one day. Where it had dauntless stood
> Was loneliness and void. But men who passed
> Paid tribute—said, "To know this life was good.
> It left its mark on me. Its work stands fast."
> And so it lives. Such life no bonds can hold—
> This giant pine, magnificent and old.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this great and historic Chamber, with the other body, constituting the Congress of the United States, is the heart of the legislative life of our country. This Chamber is hallowed by the service and memories of Members of the past who contributed to the preservation and the strengthening of our country.

Today we honor one of the great Members of this body of all time, one who during his 30 years of service in this body contributed to the maximum extent humanly possible by word and deed and action, to the strengthening and to the progress of our beloved country, our beloved late friend, Francis Walter, of Pennsylvania.

Francis Walter did not take the American heritage for granted. He considered it precious, not to be used like a spendthrift, but to keep alive, to nourish it, and to contribute to the proud traditions that he and we inherited.

I was with Francis Walter a few hours before he died; he was not conscious. I had visited with him on a number of occasions while he was in the hospital. He was still looking forward to the day when he would return to this body and continue to make his marked contribution to the progress and to the strengthening of our beloved country.

Francis Walter was a confidant and adviser of Presidents, Speakers, legislators. He was both great and good. We have lost a great American, an outstanding legislator, a warrior in the legislative service of our country and also in time of war.

While we shall miss him, we will always remember with treasured minds his charm, his grace, his strength, his ability, and his contributions not only to the stability and strength of this body but to the stability, strength, and progress of our beloved country.

Francis Walter was one of the truly great men who has ever served in the entire history of our country in the Congress of the United States. In his passing, our country has lost one of its outstanding legislators, and I have lost a personal friend. To his loved ones left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Francis E. Walter takes from this body and from among us, as individual Members, one of Pennsylvania's most outstanding sons and a man admired by everyone who knew him.

Our colleague goes to his eternal reward following a life dedicated to his country and to his State. He left a tremendous record of accomplishments in this distinguished body and I am very proud and honored to have known him and to have served in this body with him. The deliberations of this body will henceforth miss a voice which was always respected and which spoke out often for those principles which have made this country great.

This is a day of great sorrow to the United States and to Pennsylvania and we shall all miss "Tad" Walter very much.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, when one loses a personal friend it is difficult to say anything that will do much to fill the void. "Tad" Walter was a man who wanted to do things for people. Last fall he came to my district to help me in my campaign. When I urged and pleaded with him not to come because I knew he was not feeling well, he said, "Nonsense," and of course he came. Many famous people have spoken in eastern Ohio. I think of all those who have been there I will probably consider his speech as one of the greatest. He was billed with a great deal of fanfare and publicity in the newspapers as the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, but he spoke only briefly about the work of that committee.

I recall that he said, "I would hope America could resist not only the subversives on the left but the radical extremists on the right, and go down the middle road of freedom which made America great."

He spent the night at my home, and we spent the next morning driving around eastern Ohio. He was thrilled and happy to be with one of his friends as was I to have him there. I always, from the first day I came here, was proud to call him a friend. He was helpful to me as he was to dozens, yes, hundreds, of new Members on both sides of the aisle. His counsel was available. He never forced it on you but it was always there if you requested it.

I would say that those of us who have been here for many years will miss him because he always had something to contribute when you sought his advice.

His name will be remembered in this Hall as long as Congress exists as one of the men who loved the Congress, who enjoyed working as a Congressman, who made the Congress the great institution that it is.

My sympathy goes out to his loved ones in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Whalley].

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter.

Mr. Walter was an outstanding Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, very much interested in the welfare of his State and his country.

He was the eighth ranking Member of the Congress of the United States, having served over 30 years, which in itself is an exceptional achievement.

Congressman Walter once told reporters that the 1961–62 session would be his last, but he had such an intense desire to continue his congressional work, and with the permission of his doctor, he ran again for the 88th Congress. Less than 2 weeks ago, Dr. Crain announced that Congressman Walter was suffering from leukemia.

Even then, Mr. Walter said:

> With the help of God and my physician, I hope to sufficiently recover and to resume my congressional duties.

Mr. Walter worked with the same intensity in Congress, hard working and able, serving his country with integrity and distinction.

He was very kind and considerate, and will be greatly missed by all of us.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter. At this time, I extend my sympathy to his family and loved ones. They will miss him as we, Members of Congress, will miss him. I am very happy to have had the honor to have served with Francis Walter and I am sure that my life and career as a public servant was strengthened by knowing him.

"Tad" as we knew him was, I believe, an extremist. He was a man who possessed great courage—to the high degree of fearlessness. He faced all issues armed with this courage and fearlessness. Yet, under this facade he was deeply conscious of, and deeply hurt by those who challenged his many motives—his faith in his ideals, in his efforts, in his hope for peoples. He would seek out those who misunderstood his beliefs and endeavor to explain his purposes and motives. It was fortunate, under these circumstances, that he possessed a keen sense of humor and used this sense of humor to convey his many messages.

"Tad" Walter possessed great ability and capacity for work. He was a serious person. He bore his many responsibilities as one of the leaders in the House of Representatives and, as a leader, I am sure he will be missed not only by his district, but by his State of Pennsylvania and the Nation. I pray that God will guide him and bless him in his eternal home.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] and other Members of the House today in expressing our deep sympathy to the family and loved ones of our late colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable "Tad" Walter.

Seven years ago when I came to the House of Representatives as a new Republican member from the State of West Virginia, the firm hand of Francis Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, reached out and touched me after only 21 days of service in this House. It was at our initial meeting of the House Judiciary Committee that he learned that I had been a student at Lafayette College in Easton, Pa. This was his hometown. Our friendship began to grow. Several days ago the Members of the House met and paid special tribute to Congressman Walter on his 69th birthday. It was interesting to me to witness the warmth and the feeling this House had for this leading Member of the Congress especially as it was expressed by individual Members on both sides of the aisle. I think I might be a good example as one of our membership who can testify to the fact that Tad Walter in his way made himself felt on both sides of the aisle in this great Chamber. He taught me there is no such thing as a middle aisle as a dividing line between the political parties here. At a time, so very recent in my own political past, the membership of the opposition party gathered in great array against me and one friend and confidant, Francis Walter, he a Democrat, gave me the courage, the strength, and the advice to continue whatever the odds might be. Not only was he my confidant, but he was my benefactor, and as a result of his guidance and wisdom I prevailed in that particular political undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I worked with Francis Walter, as everyone in this House did, in one way or the other. Perhaps not so intimately as some, but very closely in many respects. I traveled with him widely throughout the world as we worked together on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I watched his guiding hand on the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration. I noticed and applauded the reverence that the members of the some 28 nations of this International Refugee Committee had for him and who appreciated the work of this great American.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, some several days ago the Members of this body met and paid their respects on his birthday. As I heard each of those Members, some of long years' standing and some of very few months' service in this Chamber, express their friendship and their glad tidings to him at that time, I felt what depth of a man this individual must be to have made his personality and his presence so intimately known to all of us regardless of the number of years which we had served with him.

Mr. Speaker, for me to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and say that I have lost a true friend, a close friend, one whom I dare say during the number of years I might be privileged to continue to serve in this body, I shall not merit the opportunity of knowing another so well or with so great a personal affection, is most difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure America has lost one of its great statesmen, the world has lost a man who was genuinely concerned with the trials and tribulations of the unfortunate. I have personally lost a deep, deep personal friend, and I extend my sympathy to his family and to his loved ones.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my deep-felt sorrow in the loss of our colleague, "TAD" WALTER, and extend my sympathy to the members of his family who are bereaved by the loss of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving for over 20 years in this body with Congressman WALTER. I could not begin to tell of the many favors which he has done for me, nor could I recount the many times that I went to him seeking advice on various subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that he was a sincere, dedicated man, and a most capable man in the important positions which he held. After his election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I felt that he brought to that committee a sense of purpose and a sense of steadiness which it had not had in previous years. From that time on I felt constrained to support the appropriations for this committee. I felt that in many instances "TAD" WALTER was maligned by people who did not understand him and who did not really know the character of this man.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of sitting in the Speaker's chair for 3 days as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union during the debate on the so-called Walter-McCarran bill. I listened to the debate on the floor. There was one point which struck me with a great deal of concern. A great deal of the criticism of that particular bill was directed toward segments of the bill which were in effect brought together and codified under this one piece of legislation. Our naturalization and immigration laws and provisions were scattered throughout the context of all kinds of legislation. Many of its provisions came about through riders on appropriations bills and small acts of different kinds pertaining to the subject of immigration and naturalization. I would say at least 80 or 90 percent of the Walter-McCarran bill was the bringing together of these various bits of legislation scattered throughout the code into one place where we who would be interested in an immigration problem could find and study the code provisions thereof.

Yet, it seemed like in every one of these areas that were codified, that were brought together, people who objected to the provisions of that particular section of the act cast blame and criticism upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER.

I felt, first, that he did a great job in bringing together this scattered act throughout the Code into one place; and second, I thought many of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act were timely, and I think specifically at this time of the liberalization of the law in regard to the Japanese-American citizens of California and other States which gave the right of citizenship to their parents who were not born in the United States. These rights were given in appreciation to the Japanese-Americans who served in our armed services during the war with great honor.

I voted for that bill and have defended the bill in the main, although there were some provisions I did not agree with. I think a great deal of criticism brought against Congressman WALTER was by people who did not understand exactly what that bill contained. But I sat for 3 days listening to its discussion, and I was convinced it was a good bill, and I voted for it.

We have lost a man of great stature, a man who brought dignity to the Congress, one who was known far and wide for his sympathy and understanding of the younger Members of the Congress.

I regret my words are inadequate to express the deep feeling I have at the loss which we have suffered. I know the members of my own delegation, who were great friends of Mr. WALTER, share this view. At this time I know that one of his closest friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the dean of the California delegation, who is prevented from being here today by matters beyond his control, would rise and state the same sentiments I have expressed. We have lost a great and good friend.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in FRANCIS WALTER's death this House and this country has suffered a grievous loss.

It was not my good fortune to serve closely with him, but I had many opportunities to experience his graciousness, his readiness to help not only his colleagues but all who went to him for help.

I had occasion also to see and to feel the steellike quality that was so much a part of him. Whatever touched the security of his country was to him his first duty. We did not always agree—why should we?—but at such moments one felt the quality of the man more strongly than usual. His fairness, his courage, his constant determination to give unstintingly of himself.

It has been a great privilege to serve with him in this House, for which I am grateful. His going leaves us sorrowing, yet deeply grateful for the example he has been and always will be. Such men are rare, not to be replaced. Yet he has left so much behind him for us to emulate that we should feel enriched by his living, not deprived by his death.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost one of its most valued Members. The name of FRANCIS WALTER would be one of those at the top of nearly every list if the Congress were asked to compile a listing of those most valuable, most needed, and most appreciated. The death of this distinguished public servant leaves a void that is wide and deep. Few men have been as universally admired by his colleagues or will be missed as greatly.

FRANCIS WALTER was a man of courage and a man of character. He was a man of dedication; a man who could be sincere in his convictions, but who could be kindly toward the convictions of others. That is one of the reasons he had friends, close friends, on both sides of the aisle and in every school of thought.

The touch of greatness was upon him, but he wore it gracefully. He knew how to be firm, but his firmness could be blessed with kindness. He did not aspire to a position of leadership in the House, but he exercised leadership through the affection, regard, and respect which every Member held for him.

The death of FRANCIS WALTER has taken a great American and a great statesman from our midst. There are not many who can truly be classifield as such. He fitted the mold to perfection. The memory of FRANCIS WALTER will be a guiding beacon for performance in public office of the highest order.

My delegation joins me in expressing deep and earnest sympathy for the members of his family in their great bereavement.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I was a personal friend of Mr. WALTER. That, of course, is my own loss because I never got to know him that well. As a younger Member of the House, I, of course, treated him with the respect he deserved; as a matter of fact, I always referred to him as "Mr. WALTER" or "Mr. Chairman." It was not my good fortune to know him well enough to call him by the names that have been used here today.

On three occasions in the last session I had the opportunity to speak to him. Inasmuch as my interests were so close to his in the field of subversion and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, they concerned these matters. I well recall one particular incident because I was somewhat nettled by something that had been done. He was kindly; he was interested; he was helpful. As we conversed near the doors, I saw one of the more important Members call to him saying, "FRANCIS, come here a moment." Being a younger Member, I thought perhaps he would leave and probably he should have, but he spent 5 more minutes talking to me, explaining the points I had brought to his attention.

That rather impressed me as a younger Member; that is, he had the time to answer questions—yes, even complaints of his much junior colleagues. I have a particular loss in that I came into this session, the 88th Congress, with high hopes of serving under such a great chairman. Unfortunately, every meeting of our committee so far this year has not been headed by the man whom we honor today. I say this in no way disparaging the great ability of the new chairman but merely because I had so looked forward to working with Mr. WALTER. So, I feel a personal loss, and it will never be my opportunity now to be a personal friend of Mr. WALTER.

I had looked forward to the appointment on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, looking to a closer relationship with this very great man. Now, unfortunately, that relationship will never come to pass. So, as a younger Member, who stood in awe and respect of this great man, I personally want to extend my sympathies to the family and to state that officially, as a member of this important committee, a void has been created that will never be filled. However, we can only do what he would have wanted and that is to continue his work in this committee and endeavor to uphold the very lofty and high traditions set down by this very great man. Longfellow put it well when he wrote:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime;
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

His footprints were deep; they were steady of purpose and they pointed so clearly that we, his successors, though never filling them, can at least continue in the direction of his noble and untiring efforts.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I do not know what more can be said of FRANCIS WALTER that has not already been said. I got to know him the very first term that I was in the Congress, and I have known him rather intimately ever since that time, some 18 years.

"TAD" WALTER was a kindly person who took an interest in new Members of Congress, and I found when I came here that he was always available for consultation, and his advice was always sound. We are going to miss him in this House more than we think at this time. Sometimes we did not always see eye to eye on things, but as has been so fittingly said, this is as it should be. I want to join my other colleagues in conveying to his loved ones my sincere sympathy. The State of Pennsylvania has lost one of its fairest sons.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. Before I ever came to the House of Representatives or, frankly, ever even thought of seeking to attain this office, as a man working in the news media, I had learned to respect and honor the character and the work of our late colleague. I had no idea upon being elected to Congress that I would be assigned as a member of the committee chaired by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. I can say that the 2 years, or a little better than 2 years, that I have had the privilege of serving on that committee with Mr. WALTER, only served to enhance and strengthen my admiration for this great leader in the Congress.

There are many things that one could say about him—his humility; as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] pointed out, his willingness to take time with new Members. I recall the day after I was assigned to the House Committee on Un-American Activities I went to the chairman's office expecting to spend only 3 or 4 minutes. He spent over an hour with me talking about some of the problems of the committee, and some of the attacks that had been launched against the committee. This was one side of this man.

I think all of us who are relatively new here are aware of his expertness in the field of parliamentary law. When a very particularly sticky piece of legislation was before the Committee of the Whole House we all recognized that almost without exception the Speaker would ask Mr. WALTER to become the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. Never once did he falter or hesitate in his fairness. Under his leadership on the Committee on Un-American Activities there were no party lines. There were no Republicans and no Democrats as such on that committee. It was a cause he had undertaken. He knew where he was going and he provided the leadership that kept the committee on target. He was taller than his critics. He stood above them. He studied more diligently on the subject matter than many of those who, through ignorance, through lack of information, were prone to attack.

Last week a minister was in my office only a couple of hours after he had spent some time with our honored late colleague. This minister told me of the last words as he went out of the hospital room. He turned back to Chairman WALTER and said, "Don't let your faith falter, 'TAD.'" He said that Mr. WALTER's reply was, "I have always had strong faith in the Lord throughout my entire life. It has only become stronger during these months when I knew that there was not too much time left."

What words are adequate to thoroughly express our admiration, our gratitude, our deep feelings for this great statesman? Perhaps one verse of Scripture:

> Study to shew thyself approved unto God; a workman who needeth not to be ashamed.

The late chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, our colleague, had no reason to be ashamed of any part of his service to his country. He was a great man. I only hope that if the Lord permits I can just begin to touch some of the greatness he showed to us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of my good friend and respected colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER.

"TAD" WALTER's death is an irreplaceable loss to Pennsylvania and the Nation. Few other Members of the House possessed his great understanding for the concerns and problems of his colleagues or his skill as a masterful parliamentarian and leader of men. As dean of the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation to the Congress he was a tireless worker for the many fine legislative programs that have benefited his State and his country during his long tenure in the Congress.

"TAD" WALTER served the neighboring 15th District of Pennsylvania in the Congress for over 30 years. During my 15 years service in the Congress it was my privilege to work closely with and come to know and admire this truly remarkable man.

"TAD" WALTER's love for his country knew no bounds. As a bitter foe of communism and as one who intimately recognized its dangers to our free way of life, he presided over the House Committee on Un-American Activities with dedication and fairness to all. As a result of his long familiarity and expertise with immigration matters, "TAD" WALTER was primarily responsible for admitting thousands of homeless refugees from Communist tyranny into the United States during the troubled years following World War II.

I join with his family and friends in sharing their grief and sorrow at the loss of this truly irreplaceable servant of his country and the people.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune in January of 1961 to be assigned an office on the third floor of the Old House Office Building only one suite removed from that occupied by FRANCIS WALTER. Later in the month of January it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives on which our late distinguished colleague was the ranking majority member.

The benefits which I have enjoyed by reason of these two fortuitous circumstances will remain with me as long as I live.

I feel sure that those who had the good fortune to serve longer than I with FRANCIS WALTER can tell many stories similar to the one I shall now relate. During the spring of 1961, I became concerned about some of the immigration problems facing our country; I walked into Mr. WALTER's office, seeking just a few minutes of his valuable time to set me straight on some of the history of America's immigration legislation. Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] I was accorded not just a few minutes, but close to an hour. And during that hour I received the most lucid analysis of America's immigration problems, the free world's refugee problems, and of FRANCIS WALTER's contribution to the solution of those problems that I am sure I shall ever be privileged to hear.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in expressing to the family of FRANCIS WALTER and to all those who were privileged to know him my feeling of the great loss which our country and indeed the free world has suffered in his passing.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in an expression of heartfelt lament at the passing of our colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, with whom I had the privilege of serving as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, for some 9 years.

"TAD" WALTER was one of the greatest, most conscientious and most understanding Members I have ever had the privilege of sharing friendship with in the House of Representatives. Having had the privilege of serving with him has made service in this House an even greater privilege.

If in this House we were to do, as they do with football teams, select "All Americans," FRANCIS WALTER, in my opinion, would unquestionably have been chosen the All-American Congressman. He was a team player. He was a great leader.

I remember well a number of legislative matters on which he and I conferred from time to time. I, too, am aware of the amount of time he was willing to give to the junior Members of the House in consideration of legislative matters, and his untiring efforts to assist in the passage of bills in which he believed. I refer specifically to the closing of the FBI files as the result of the Jencks decision, the amendment to the Smith Act which were passed during the last session of Congress, and others which came from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Probably the world's greatest authority on immigration matters, I refer as well to his crowning achievement, the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, the first major revision of immigration laws in a generation.

It was a privilege to serve with a great man such as FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their expressions of regret over the passing of FRANCIS WALTER. The Nation has lost a great man and one who has done much to shape history since he first became a Member of the Congress.

He was, by nature, a quiet man and preferred to do a great amount of his work behind the scenes and through personal discussions. Of course, when the occasion required it, we recall him as a forceful and dynamic speaker. History will record that whatever his choice of methods, his results were most impressive; and much fine legislation would not now be on the books had he not been with us to guide it.

Many traits distinguish Members of this body. We have watched them come and go; and we recall those factors which, to us, made them great. However, there is one that it seems to me shines out above them all in these great men and that is their intense humanity and their sympathetic understanding of our problems and the problems of our people. Coupled with these, there is always a willingness to be of assistance and to give to others of us the helping hand which means so much and which endears to us those generous souls who give it.

I have in mind an occasion some 2 years ago when a patriotic group of Galveston citizens asked me to secure the services of an outstanding speaker to discuss Americanism. I could think of no one better qualified to advise as to such a speaker than my old and dear friend, "TAD" WALTER. I asked him who he thought could and would do the job for me and my hometown people. He thought about it for a few moments and then he said: "CLARK, I will take care of that myself."

He did so; and then he generously remained over another day in order to speak to our high school students.

In the coming years, as I recall the many fine things that "TAD" WALTER did, I shall always have uppermost in my mind the recollection of this generous act.

My sympathy goes to his widow and his daughter. I hope that they will be consoled through the knowledge that Congress is a better place because "TAD" WALTER walked here with us and we are better men because of our association with him.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS E. WALTER has been classified by some as unpredictable but all agree that he was a man of honor and brought distinction to the House of Representatives by his strong character and firm belief in the fundamental principles of Americanism. It was not easy to get to know "TAD" WALTER, unless one really sought his friendship, and then the way was not difficult. Few people really recognized the high intellectual character of this man who in his student days maintained high rank in his studies. Although a lawyer by profession, he had a firm grasp on the intricate problems of the banking profession and his wise judgment and sound philosophy were frequently sought.

He was loyal in his many friendships, and his friendships were lasting and deep because of his sincerity. He would not hesitate to tell his friends just what he thought about any problem irrespective of what his friends' views might be. He explained the truth as he saw it in a firm but kindly spirit, which never jeopardized any friendship that he enjoyed. His judgment was sound and his reasoning based on solid ground, free from arrogance. He listened to the arguments of all sides, separating the dross from the gold in his conclusions.

As a legislator he had few equals and his strength in such matters was based on the solid cornerstones of enlightened thinking and rugged Americanism. He believed in the Constitution of the United States, he promoted liberty and justice, and he had no toleration for any who would undermine these American principles. He was not afraid of criticism because he believed in what he stood for and was fearless in the support of his ideals.

I offer my sympathy to his loved ones and I cannot help but feel that they must find great comfort and pride in the life of such a man. As a friend I will miss the stimulating qualities of his outstanding character and his enthusiasm for all that was honest and of good report.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I join my colleagues today in recalling the memory of our former Member from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER.

We mourn today the passing of one whose career spanned the great international and domestic issues of this century.

Many great events have taken place since FRANCIS WALTER joined this body during the 73d Congress.

His reelection to every Congress since then was an indication of the measure of respect held for him by the good people of Carbon, Monroe, Northampton, and Pike Counties in Pennsylvania.

In all instances, Mr. Speaker, he worked from the individual position of personal integrity.

A veteran of both World War I and II, he knew what service to his country meant. He worked long and hard hours in committee, Mr. Speaker, for what he felt to be the betterment of this Nation.

It would be unfair for me to say at this time that I agreed with the gentleman most of the time, because this would not be true. My views of our immigration policies differed markedly from his but it is a remarkable fact of this body that we can disagree and still respect.

I repeat this respect today, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the gentleman is resting peacefully after years of hard work for the country that he loved. This House has lost a great leader. I join in extending my deepest sympathy to his family and multitude of friends.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to join our colleagues in paying tribute to the late FRANCIS E. WALTER, an outstanding Representative of the State of Pennsylvania.

It was my privilege to know "TAD" WALTER for more than 10 years. The longer I knew him and worked with him the deeper my respect and admiration for him became. Not only was he a man of firm conviction, but also he was a man dedicated to the principles in which he believed and he had the courage to carry out those convictions even when faced with the strongest of opposition.

Few Members of this august body have been accorded the respect that "TAD" WALTER knew from both legislative friend and legislative foe.

He served well his State and our Nation. He will be greatly missed in this House of Representatives. He was a very able legislator; he was a distinguished parliamentarian; and he was a great American.

He has left to us as a testimonial of his effective service many sound laws in many fields. But he will probably be remembered in history for two major efforts: his cosponsorship of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and his chairmanship of the House Un-American Activities Committee. For his exceptional work with this committee, the entire country owes him a debt of gratitude.

We have lost a true friend and a distinguished public servant.

To his family, his constituents, his State, and his many friends, I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is my wish to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the finest men it has been my privilege to know since serving in the House of Representatives, FRANCIS E. WALTER. He was an outstanding American, a fine legislator, and a cherished friend. I will miss his counsel as will the entire membership of this Congress. His contributions to this body will be his lasting memorial.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Pennsylvania and others in paying brief but sincere tribute to the life and memory of our dear colleague and beloved friend, the late Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. Congressman WALTER was one of the most outstanding Members of this House and he will be sorely missed.

"TAD" WALTER recently completed 30 years of distinguished service in the Congress to his district, State, and Nation. He held many important assignments in the Congress and always discharged his duties tirelessly and effectively.

He was elected Speaker pro tempore in the 81st Congress, appointed Speaker pro tempore in the 82d Congress, and served as the chairman of the Democratic caucus in the 81st, 87th, and 88th Congresses. Since the 84th Congress he has served with distinction as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee; as chairman of the Speaker's Committee on Personnel and also served as chairman of two important Judiciary subcommittees.

It has been my privilege to serve with him as a member of the patronage committee and during my service with him in this capacity my already great love, respect and admiration for this noble American was increased and strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, "TAD" WALTER was a courageous Member of Congress who stood strongly and openly for what he believed to be right. He was a great and effective legislator. The McCarran-Walter Act and many other national laws stand as monuments to his legislative skill. He was a dedicated public event who served well and commanded the love and respect of his colleagues and his Nation. He was a great American, whose absence from this Chamber will certainly be felt. He will be greatly missed. My sincere sympathy to Mrs. Walter and the members of his family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we are joined today in common grief over the loss of one who was a stalwart among us, and who as much as any other on the contemporary scene did his part to arouse us to an awareness of the hovering menace that would destroy us.

Zealots for the preservation of the American way are too often neglectful of the rights of others but our late lamented brother was always careful to see that the accused who stood before him were accorded every protection under law. And he did not allow himself to be swayed from his appointed course by threats and vilification. Verily, Mr. Speaker, here was a man whom we can all be proud to claim as a fellow worker in the legislative vineyard.

"TAD" WALTER was a kind man and one who never hesitated to go out of his way to do a political or personal favor even though the petitioner was not of his political party. Indeed, I can personally attest to many kindnesses enjoyed at his hands and the solid support he always received from both parties indicated the high regard in which he was held by his constituents without regard to partisan labels.

Our departed colleague was a veteran of the First World War and, in my presence, was presented with awards and decorations from both the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary. Among the veterans of America he stood as their sure champion in the cause of ridding our Nation of those who would destroy her and his memory will be kept forever green in the hearts of all who are enlisted in the endless war against subversion. May the eternal God keep his soul in lasting peace.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, contemplating the subject of the immortality of the soul of man, Victor Hugo wrote:

> The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight, opens on the dawn.

Feeling in that manner, too, as I do, about the mortal's transition to the other side of eternity, I think that Hugo continued most eloquently to express a fundamental truth when, referring to the individual who has lived fully and usefully and fruitfully here among mankind, he added:

> When that person goes down to the grave he can say, "I have finished my day's work," but not that "I have finished my life."

For, Mr. Speaker, his day's work "will begin again the next morning." And that is so because, in truth and in fact, "we shall live again."

There is not the slightest doubt that the noble spirit of our dear friend, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER—a great and good man, and an outstanding Congressman, in the fullest sense of the meaning of those designations—lives among us today, here in this body where he served with such high merit and rare distinction over a period of three decades. And there is no doubt, either, that so long as we shall live—those of us, his colleagues, who were blessed over the years by his friendship and influence and counsel—his spirit shall continue to illuminate and serve to strengthen our lives.

It was only a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, that many of us had the opportunity of paying tribute to "TAD," as we fondly addressed him with warm affection, when he was approaching, in his final days of life here on earth, his 69th birthday anniversary; so, as for myself, I shall not undertake again today to recount some of the innumerable sterling qualities and characteristics of his life and his work that were reviewed in those birthday greeting messages.

Let it suffice, in this hour of personal grief, for me to say that "TAD" WALTER left the imprint of his interest and efforts and ability upon much of our Nation's progress during his 30 years of service in the Congress. Our Nation is much the stronger because of "TAD" WALTER, and the world is indeed a better place in which to live because he lived in it.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing deep and heartfelt sympathy to our dear friend's bereaved surviving loved ones. May God's grace sustain and strengthen them.

And may "TAD" WALTER's immortal soul rest in peace.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Congressman WALTER, Pennsylvania and the Nation have lost a devoted and conscientious public servant. His was a life dedicated to the service of his Nation.

An editorial in yesterday's Philadelphia Inquirer is most appropriate:

CONGRESSMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER

Pennsylvania and America have lost a dedicated public servant, a staunch patriot, and a courageous fighter in the death of U.S. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER.

The Congressman from Easton was in his 31st year of continuous service in the House of Representatives. He was the senior ranking member of the Pennsylvania delegation in the House. His 16 consecutive election victories by substantial majorities are a measure of the high esteem in which he was held by his northeast Pennsylvania constituents, not only by his fellow Democrats but by Republicans and independents as well.

Representative WALTER's unwavering devotion to duty in his capacity as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee won him well-earned national recognition as a fair and relentless foe of communism and subversion.

Delaware Valley residents are forever indebted to Mr. WALTER's heroic endeavors, dating back to the mid-1930's, in the development and conservation of water resources. Flood control, power, navigation, recreation, pollution control, drinking supply—in every area of water improvement he had the foresight and the followthrough that, despite difficult and continuing obstacles, have helped to make the Delaware River and its tributaries the mainstream of progress for millions of people.

He was a fearless defender of principles and never lacked the fortitude to stand up for what he believed to be right, regardless of criticism or controversy.

FRANCIS E. WALTER served his constituents, his State, and his country with extraordinary distinction.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, within several days of my having been sworn in as a Member of the 86th Congress, "TAD" WALTER came over to say "Hello" and visit with me. This action by one of the leaders of the opposite party, and the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation, impressed me very much since I had never met him before. Immediately he made me feel that we were friends by establishing the fact that we were graduates of the same prep school. Our personal friendship grew from this auspicious start.

From the very beginning I have admired "TAD" WALTER's effective work in the Congress, particularly when he served so ably as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House during debate on important bills. He was firm, fair, and impartial while serving in the chair. During his long service here in Congress, "TAD" has been an outstanding asset to his community and to his State. He has also been a leader within his party at the national level, which fact was recognized by his election as majority conference chairman.

This country has lost a great and good American who dedicated his life to the service of his Nation. His family can derive solace and comfort in the knowledge of this great service.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman MORGAN, who succeeds the late Congressman WALTER, as the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives, in his remarks concerning the passing of our outstanding former colleague.

When I was first elected to the House I was assigned to the Judiciary Committee as the only other Pennsylvanian beside Congressman WALTER and I watched his work as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 on Immigration and Naturalization and was greatly impressed with his proficiency and great effort in this field. I also observed his work with the Pennsylvania delegation which was consistent, cooperative, and fair. I watched him in his work which resulted in the passage of the Delaware River Compact Act and for which he is entitled to a great deal of credit.

I served in the Pennsylvania General Assembly with the Honorable Jeanette Reibman an outstanding legislator who also had a great regard for our late colleague who was the U.S. Representative from her district. He also was very courteous to the members of the Pennsylvania delegation and was ready to give advice and suggestions on any problem.

I agree with my colleagues that we have lost a great legislator and a great American.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved colleague from Pennsylvania, we and the country have experienced a loss which will long be felt. He was a giant among statesmen, a leader with the human understanding always to inspire respect and usually to inspire strong allegiance for his causes. His objectives were invariably for the strength of our country and were characterized by his strong belief in democracy and the basic good intentions of human kind. He has left a record of great achievement in legislation. His indomitable courage and persistence for the good of mankind have made for him a secure place in immortality.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1963, Sidney Yudain, editor and publisher of the newspaper of Capitol Hill, Roll Call, said:

> The prolonged illness of veteran Representative **FRANCIS E. WALTER**, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has been a severe blow to the operation of Congress. His absence leaves a gaping leadership vacancy to be filled.

The high esteem in which Congressman WALTER was held is summarized in the following article by Mr. Yudain. It is nice to know that FRANCIS WALTER had a chance to read this before his absence from the House became permanent:

> TAD WALTER'S ABSENCE NOTICEABLE IN CONGRESS
>
> The prolonged illness of veteran Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylanvia, has been a severe blow to the operations of Congress. His absence leaves a gaping leadership vacancy to be filled.
>
> Although best known nationally as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, WALTER is more familiar to his colleagues as one of the real backstage managers of the House. He is among the handful of key lawmakers in the unwieldy body of 435 who actually run the show.
>
> Most of WALTER's committees have been limping along without him. The House Democratic caucus, of which he is chairman, has, however, been practically stalemated.
>
> One result of WALTER's ailment has been to place in jeopardy the continued existence of House Un-American Activities Committee. Elimination of the controversial committee, long an objective in some quarters, might be now accomplished if WALTER does not seek reelection.
>
> Pressures to reduce House Un-American Activities Committee to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee would gain added force in the next Congress if such an action did not involve the prestigious WALTER. However, other members of House Un-American Activities Committee could be expected to oppose such a plan.
>
> The extent of WALTER's illness became known last week when his physician, Dr. Darrell C. Crain, said tests had confirmed that WALTER, 69, suffers from leukemia.
>
> The Congressman issued a statement saying that: "I have been struggling for several weeks to regain my strength.
>
> "With the help of God and my physicians I hope to sufficiently recover and to resume my congressional duties. I have requested Dr. Crain to issue a weekly report on my condition unless otherwise indicated.
>
> "I want to thank my friends and well-wishers who through their cards and encouraging letters and beautiful flowers have helped to make my hospital stay brighter and the days shorter."
>
> WALTER's office said "the Congressman has actively transacted his congressional duties from his bed at George Washington University Hospital throughout the greater part of his confinement." He has been hospitalized for most of the year.
>
> One of WALTER's jobs has been to head the House Patronage Committee which clears administrative employees of the Chamber. This group has reportedly kept fairly up to date on filling the vacancies which occur, held one meeting Monday.
>
> WALTER is second-ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, which this year will consider a series of legislative proposals on civil rights. An expert parliamentarian, he presided during House passage of the last civil rights bill and will be sorely missed in efforts to pass a new one.
>
> A Congressman for 31 years, WALTER holds chairmanships of two Judiciary Subcommittees which will have to be filled if he does not run again. Representative PETER RODINO, Democrat, of New Jersey, whose district has many Americans of foreign extraction, could receive the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.
>
> Because of persistent liberal efforts to abolish or downgrade the House Un-American Activities Committee, Representative WALTER is known to some Americans as its almost sinister chairman. To his colleagues, however, he is "TAD" WALTER—a warm, friendly, and immensly capable lawmaker.
>
> In remarks on the House floor last week, top members of the leadership of both parties lauded WALTER as a valuable and highly respected Congressman.
>
> House Democratic Whip HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, leading the tribute, put it this way:
>
> "TAD" WALTER is one of the ablest men I have ever served with. He is able and effective in everything that he undertakes.
>
> "His brilliant and penetrating mind, his instinctive capacity for leadership, his thoroughness as a legislative student, his firmness and fairness as a presiding officer, his ability to work with other men and to get other men to work together, his quiet, deeply felt patriotism—these are but a few of the qualities that have made "TAD" WALTER a big name and a big figure in this House of Representatives for so many years."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing over the weekend of the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER.

A man who served his district, his State, and his country for many years with a thorough and unflinching dedication to his point of view, Congressman WALTER shall be missed by many.

I know that every Member of the House of Representatives will feel his loss. The passing of this veteran legislator and parliamentary expert will be mourned here by many of us—from those who worked with him on his various committees to those who came to respect his dedication to his point of view and further to those who knew him on the floor of the House as a capable legislator.

I particularly recall our departed colleague's work as one of the key Members in leading the fight to give the President discretionary powers in dealing with Communist-dominated countries.

His ability and dedication in other congressional fields also is well-established.

First, we well know his work as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and as a Member of House of Representatives since the 73d Congress.

Second, "TAD" WALTER conceived and guided through Congress legislation which opened our doors to many displaced persons who had been driven from their homes by World War II. He also lent capable assistance to other immigration laws.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his family. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his many friends.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I have only recently had occasion to say about the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

When we referred to him as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we intended more than an idle formal expression, for he was in truth a gentleman in every sense which that word connotes. As gentlemanly and as genteel as he was, he was not wanting in that quality of firmness, without which no gentleman can be a true man. That quality of firmness, born of deep dedication to principle and courage of conviction enabled him to stand steadfastly when the storms of controversy would have dislodged a lesser man.

As the ranking member, I have been privileged to serve under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary. Never has any chairman of any committee or any subcommittee of the House of Representatives enjoyed more universal and more unreserved respect among the members of his committee.

Congressman WALTER was not only the sponsor and the patron but the principal architect of the Walter-McCarran Act, which is generally acknowledged to be the most generous immigration and naturalization statute on the books of any modern nation of the world. He was also the moving force in the establishment of the International Committee on European Migration, which has resettled countless thousands of displaced persons, the hapless victims of tyranny and persecution.

Perhaps no man in the history of the world has touched more lives in more remote and isolated areas of the world in a more benevolent way than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "TAD" WALTER.

To his family and his numberless friends, I extend my deepest sympathy. His spirit will linger long in all our hearts and will continue to influence the course of the Nation's destiny. Richly he has earned the tribute, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber today a place is vacant, a strong voice is stilled, because an extraordinary man has just passed from our midst.

We assemble in a period of sadness to honor a departed comrade and friend who faithfully and honorably served the people of his district and the best interest of the Nation for 30 years.

"TAD" WALTER was my personal friend and colleague for many of those 30 years. He was an able statesman, a good confident and adviser, and his passing is a sad loss to both the State of Pennsylvania and our country. Because of his keen foresight, legislative knowledge, and untiring efforts much solid and progressive legislation has been written into the statute books.

His departure leaves a vacuum in this House that will be felt by most of us who knew him and respected him during his many valiant struggles in the interest of all people and in good government.

FRANCIS E. WALTER has gone to meet his Maker, and I am certain that he will receive much of the reward that was due him on earth. We here will miss him. The people of his home district and the State will miss him, as will this great Nation miss him.

It was a privilege and an honor to serve with him, lo, these many years. His toil on this earth has ended. May he rest in peaceful sleep.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise to pay tribute to FRANCIS WALTER. Many times I have personally known his great kindness and thoughtfulness. I shall miss his presence in this House.

Many newspaper articles in the last few days have discussed FRANCIS WALTER's great power in this House and who will be his inheritors. Most of us will probably agree that his influence was so much a product of his own personality that no one can actually take his place. FRANCIS WALTER was the true exemplar of the great legislator—one who holds great power because of his personal standing with his colleagues. His unique combination of intelligence, fairness, diligence, and unfailing courtesy gave him a special role in this body. "TAD" WALTER's speeches during general debate could sway votes, many votes. Speaker Rayburn was known to have commented often on FRANCIS WALTER's great qualifications for leadership in this House.

The name of FRANCIS WALTER has become so associated with the fields of internal security and immigration that it is often forgotten that he was active in many other legislative fields. "TAD" WALTER began his legislative career in the 73d Congress in 1933 with the start of the New Deal. The assumption by our Government of new responsibilities for the establishment of social justice and equal opportunity owe much to his energetic support. Indeed he was the author of an early minimum wage act which required corporations working on Government contracts to pay the prevailing wage.

Perhaps FRANCIS WALTER's most shining achievements have resulted from his championship of persons made homeless by war. Europeans have acclaimed the great humanitarian service he performed for those displaced by World War II. Long after most others had forgotten about the plight of those displaced by war and social upheaval, FRANCIS WALTER was concerned that the United States continue to be a haven for the world's "tired, poor, and huddled masses." Congressman WALTER was also instrumental in permitting the emergency entry into this country of the refugees from the Hungarian revolution and from Communist China and Cuba.

FRANCIS WALTER left many testimonials to his career in this House. His name was synonomous with the legislative fields of internal security and immigration. But, above all else, I think I shall remember "TAD" WALTER for his great personal qualities of kindness and fairness. Those qualities were always so well demonstrated in his customary role as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. When especially controversial measures were scheduled for House debate, FRANCIS WALTER was usually chosen as presiding officer because his fairness and parliamentary skill were so universally recognized. Though many disagreed with FRANCIS WALTER on various issues, there were few who did not admire him for the ability, conscientiousness, and fairness that so often gained him overwhelming tribute from both sides of the aisle at the end of a long legislative battle. We will miss his wise counsel, his friendship, and guidance in the days ahead.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death on Friday, May 31, 1963, of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, gives us an opportunity for once to take the funeral oration out of its accepted context of eulogy and bereavement merely, and place it more in the light of a profound lesson for the living. When I first got news of his passing it caused me to reflect upon the fact that only a handful, including the Speaker, had served with him in this Chamber longer than I have. It caused me to reflect upon the fact that, like Representative WALTER, perhaps the greatest men of our country, and those who contributed most to it, and, indeed, perhaps the greatest men of all time, even in the field of religion, were what is known as "controversial personalities."

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Mr. Speaker, belongs eminently in a galaxy of the most controversial figures of our era, and for this, as for so many other qualities that made his life and his career so worthy, he was another of those legislative heroes who belongs in any well-conceived compilation of America's profiles in courage. Representative WALTER's passing caused me to reflect upon the fact that in his more than 30 years in this Chamber I had come to appreciate him as a complete legislator. The complete legislator has to have knowledge in depth of his subject. The complete legislator has to have an understanding of the political practicalities of the problem in his hands. The complete legislator has to have a sensitive finger on the pulse of his people. He has to have a grasp and respect for the judgments of his colleagues even when they are most violently opposed to his own. He has to have the common touch and a mastery of the elite refinements of political maneuver on the highest levels of the science called politics. Then, at the trigger moment in a legislative campaign for some major policy, he stands or falls on the courage, the patriotism, the risks which determine his character as a man as well as a politician.

On all these points the life and career of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER are an inspiring lesson to the living.

For, of course, having observed him closely and fought at his side—and not always with him—through more than three decades and a harrowing series of crises, I had come to recognize in him the legislators' legislator. He was what I would call the scholar of the legislator's craft. And he had that quality that made other men of ability and distinction recognize his capacity for leadership. The interests that engaged him and the breadth of his knowledge on a wide spectrum of subjects made him one of the best informed legislators in this Chamber. It may be correct to say that he majored here as a legislator in the fields of naturalization and immigration and the judiciary. On his passing, as we all know, he was on the Un-American Activities Committee as its chairman, on the Judiciary Committee and on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. His knowledge in all these areas was precise, total, and rich in the thinking he applied to what he knew.

Thus, I think my emphasis justified, that what distinguished Representative WALTER more than any one quality, so far as his basic equipment was concerned, was the sweep and scope of his knowledge, and his genius for applying it to the problems that confronted our country through two wars, a shocking economic depression, Korea and all the strategic and dirty little crises of the Communist-agitated cold war. Oh, I know there have been those who, while not thinking ill of Representative WALTER, complained that he frequently blew hot and then he blew cold. What they really mean is that he was judicial, and that he blew cold when they disagreed with him, but that he blew warm when he was on terms of legislative amiability with those who professed not to understand him. When I say he was judicial I mean that he had no lopsided view of the functions of the Un-American Activities Committee. He had no prejudices per se against any form of thought however abhorrent it might be from the standpoint of the American tradition. What he had prejudices against—and powerful prejudices—were the enemies of our country. What he had prejudices against was an outspoken, obvious, proved, brazen, flouting international conspiracy that had its collaborators, its apparatus, its underground, on this soil.

In this, too, I insist, there is a profound lesson for the living.

For as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee he fought hard and did right by his country although forces aligned against him—many of them from, no doubt, decent motives—made him and his committee the targets of a continuing attack that could hardly be termed either fair, judicial, or objective. The Congressman from Pennsylvania, whose death all of us here so deeply mourn knew no lawful and legislative limits to a constitutionally correct onslaught upon fascism or communism. It made no difference to him when either threatened the peace of this land, whether the threat was formidable, as it was insidious, or whether the threat was half-concealed and merely the pusillanimous connivings of cellar-hiding mischiefmakers.

By the same token our colleague held out the hand of legislative friendship and acceptability to refugees and emigrants when it was a matter of decency and compassion and not a matter of fighting infiltrating foreign enemies. It was Representative WALTER, after all, who made possible passage of immigration and refugee legislation for which as recently as 1962 he was cited with applause by the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

But it is wrong to assume that the life and activities of Congressman WALTER centered upon our Communist and Fascist enemies or was concerned with merely the periphery legislation that these enemies of our country evoked. The range of Representative WALTER's legislative accomplishments went further and beyond this field and was effective and beneficial in the whole range of congressional legislation over the decades. It was effective because his leadership was effective. It was effective because while he was not holding any major committee chairmanship he had the respect and the support, the loyalty and the affection, of colleagues who saw in him—because they were close to him—what his not too just and less restrained critics were incapable of appreciating. If one-tenth of 1 percent of the criticism leveled against Representative WALTER were true he could not have risen to the position of eminence, based on character, he so much enjoyed in this Chamber.

Perhaps the greatest tribute of all consists in the tributes paid to Representative WALTER during his illness with leukemia which finally caused his end in Georgetown hospital. These tributes came from the very colleagues in this House—many of them—who had opposed WALTER's major legislative proposals most bitterly. It is impossible under the democratic process to live legislatively with a colleague for more than 30 years and agree with him on all points. But what I sincerely believe all of us here were agreed upon was the industry, the judicial aspect of his hard fighting, and the justice that Representative WALTER brought to his legislative job.

There is a vast body of legislation now on our statute books, some of the most progressive and forward looking legislation of the century, which owes its most powerful support to Representative WALTER. Often this support was determining and immensely fruitful. Our country and the whole free world has become a better place to live in because of the prodigious efforts in the legislative field of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, a great statesman, our esteemed colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER, has passed this way, spent his expert and superior legislative talents here, and retired through the portals of immortality to give an account to the final judge of his stewardship.

A few days ago—May 26—he received in this House the merited plaudits and encomiums of his colleagues on the celebration of his 69th birthday. His long service in this body—30 years—added to his stature as a statesman, parliamentarian, and advocate. His duties in Congress encompassed many fields in the area of legislation. As chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee he wielded tremendous powers over the lives and reputations of our citizenry who were subpenaed as witnesses under subversive charges. In this delicate operation he was subjected to the most caustic criticism ever leveled against a public servant.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Matters again he received the critical lambastings of ethnic groups who questioned the quota limitations of the McCarran-Walter Act affecting their respective groups.

Yet, in recent years "TAD," as he was affectionately called by his intimates, had not only improved procedure both in the field of investigation and the conduct of hearings, but he also tightened the rules of the admissibility of evidence.

He was conscious of the purposes of the committee and perfected its aims as the strongest disciplinary arm of Government operating for the security of the Nation against their persons and subversive programs to undermine our Government. Yet in spite of a burning patriotism to destroy these activities by official exposure to the public—he controlled his feelings and conducted these hearings in a cold impervious way protecting the rights of witnesses and with analytical judgment enforced the rules of procedure as a court of inquiry.

After the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act he continued the study of the immigrant question which resulted in a new appraisal of certain levels in the immigration problem.

He pioneered the liberalizing of these immigration limitations by the passage of bills permitting the unification of families; the entry of adopted orphans, and he made it possible for thousands to join their kin.

His legislation to permit the entry of trained artisan immigrants whose talents as marble and stone men and tailors and so forth were needed by industry was a contribution to the economy.

His parliamentary astuteness as chairman of the party caucus, of the whole House, or on the floor went unquestioned.

We of the Illinois delegation regret his great loss to the Congress, the citizens of the Nation and the State of Pennsylvania of a most distinguished statesman, lawyer, and patriot. We extend to his family our heartfelt condolences and join in prayer with them that God reward him with blessed peace and rest everlasting.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a great man, a great legislator and a great patriot has been summoned from our midst here to the Heavenly Council above.

Few men have equaled the contribution of legislative knowledge, parliamentary skill, directive guidance and presiding justice that Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER made to this body over a period of more than 30 years. Although his time, because of the many offices he held, was at a premium, he always could spare as much of it as was needed to teach and counsel colleagues with lesser knowledge and experience.

"TAD" WALTER was steadfastly determined in the accomplishment of what he believed was legislatively right, but he was the first to insist that those of different convictions be heard. He was a man of unusually varied background and projection, which perhaps accounted for his extraordinary understanding, insight, and instinct.

It was my honor to be closely associated with "TAD" WALTER as a fellow member of the House Judiciary Committee, and I was privileged to call him friend. His genius and his talents will be sorely missed in that committee and in this Chamber. The Nation has lost one of its dedicated legislators and I, with many of my colleagues here, am deeply saddened by the departure of a close friend.

Although "TAD" WALTER has been called to a higher place, the spirit of his inspiring guidance and genius will forever remain a part of the hallowed atmosphere of this Chamber. While we join in our prayers for our beloved colleague, we extend our deepest sympathy to the bereaved members of his family.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS WALTER and myself were friends for many years. His passing leaves a vacuum. I cannot believe that I shall not see him again.

The force of his personality was such that he was a felt presence in the House. His carriage, his voice, his smile, are etched in my memory. There was a side to FRANCIS WALTER not many outsiders knew—his wit and his humor, for example. Often on the way to the floor, he would pass my office, stick his head in the door to tell me the latest story or witticism he had heard and knew I would appreciate. He had a personal magnetism which could not be denied.

Not many knew of his quiet kindness—the number of boys he had sent through college, the toys that he had distributed to the underprivileged, his fight for adequate housing and water resources to help the oppressed. He never advertised these deeds of goodness, and I did not learn them from him, but from those who were the beneficiaries of his deeds.

Few of the general public were aware of the fact that he sponsored legislation and had it enacted to help refugees throughout the world and to reunite families. He was the father of the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration, and it was from his strength and support that the organization gained sustenance.

All of us, here, knew how he loved the House of Representatives. His duties and responsibilities were heavy but he never evaded them. He could have, had he so wished, retreated from many of these responsibiliites and there would have been none to blame him, but it was not his nature to do this.

His unmatched parliamentary skill is a fact known to all. His knowledge of the law he proved over and over again at committee meetings from which he was rarely absent. It was a thing of beauty to watch him preside when major bills were before us. Every earmark of leadership was stamped upon him. He had courage, decisiveness, intelligence.

I shall miss him keenly. The House of Representatives will not be the same without him.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, who died last week after a long and courageous fight against leukemia.

It has not been my privilege to have served a long time in this body, but during the 15 months I have been here I have had ample opportunity to observe the affection and respect the House of Representatives had for Congressman WALTER.

His career in the House of Representatives spanned a period of 30 years, and in that time he carved a remarkable and memorable niche for himself as a powerful and influential Member of the Congress. He was an able and dedicated public servant, and will be sorely missed by his friends and associates.

May I extend my deep and sincere sympathies at this time to his wife and his family.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, while all of us as individuals have lost a valued friend in the late Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, this House has lost one of its most outstanding figures—one whose skill as a parliamentarian was reflected in the confidence which all of us placed in his fairness and integrity during the many instances when he presided over the Committee of the Whole House on extremely complex legislation.

The news accounts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's [Mr. WALTER] death have all noted the controversial nature of some of his legislative activities. I know of no Member of the House whose public image as a storm center on controversial issues was less in keeping with the graciousness with which he treated all of us. I differed from time to time with "TAD" WALTER on specific issues, but I never doubted for one moment the vast grasp of his knowledge on the issues on which he took controversial stands.

Those who remember the controversial nature of some of his legislative proposals forget that FRANCIS WALTER was probably more directly responsible than any single individual in our Nation for providing a haven for the dispossessed and hopeless displaced persons whose plight after World War II seared the conscience of decent peoples everywhere.

I am grateful for having known Congressman WALTER, for having had the opportunity to serve with him in the 87th Congress on the Democratic caucus and the Democratic steering committee. I shall miss his warm smile and his helpfulness. He was an outstanding American.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has suffered a tragic loss in the passing of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER.

It was my privilege to serve with "TAD" WALTER on the House Judiciary Committee and to come to admire his outstanding skill as a lawyer, his mastery of parliamentary procedure, his talents in the legislative art of compromise, and his courageous independence of thought and steadfast devotion to principle.

My most recent association with "TAD" was last November, when we both served on the American delegation to the 17th session of the Council of the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva. It was obvious that the delegates from the 28 other nations held Representative WALTER in the highest regard and valued his judgment on the proposals considered at the Council meeting. Indeed, this program which in a 10-year period resettled surplus European populations to areas of the world where their skills and talents would help develop natural resources was largely the brainchild of "TAD" WALTER.

We all know "TAD" WALTER's unflinching courage as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House when he, personally, as well as the committee, were subjected to vicious, unfair attacks.

I am sure it was "TAD" WALTER's experience with that committee and the filming of the demonstration in San Francisco which convinced him that House committees should not be denied the use of television, radio, and photography, so that the American people could know by firsthand observation the truth about committees and their work. At the beginning of the 87th Congress, we discussed reform in House procedure and he assured me that he had urged the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MCCORMACK, to rule that the committees, in their discretion, could allow the coverage of their public hearings through the use of these new modern media of communication.

I mention this because while "TAD" WALTER, as one of the senior members of the Democratic Party in the House, was a good team player and a part of the House leadership, he was at the same time independent and determined sometimes to the extent of battling others in his own party when he was strongly convinced on a matter of principle.

We on the Judiciary Committee especially and all Members of the House will miss his judgment, the knowledge of parliamentary rules and the wise counsel and assistance of this able lawyer and legislator.

I extend my deep sympathy to Congressmen WALTER's family, his congressional staff, and the staff of his subcommittee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep appreciation for the services that he gave to his fellowman and to me personally that I join in paying tribute to the life of our late colleague and friend, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

To me, it is a truism that every member of the human race wants to live so that when his time comes to say farewell that he will be missed by his loved ones and by his coworkers. I know that "TAD," as we affectionately called him, would be pleased, in all due humility, at this memorial service which is being tendered to his memory today. His abilities and contributions have been voiced far more ably by my colleagues who have preceded me than I could possibly do and still render to him the proper evaluation and respect which his memory deserves.

I became acquainted with "TAD" soon after coming to Congress and our association grew into a friendship which I have appreciated very much throughout the years. In all of the dealings which I had with him, and they were many and varied, he was always a courteous gentleman, an understanding colleague, and a charitable friend. Thus, to his noble character and his dedication I pay my most sincere respect. We shall miss him sorely as the days come and go. We can join, however, in testifying before mankind that the world is a better place because "TAD" WALTER was privileged to have walked a part of the way with his fellow man.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the influence which accrued to FRANCIS WALTER in his long tenure in the House of Representatives, many American institutions and beliefs have been indelibly marked. Sometimes his actions stirred controversy, but whether one shared his beliefs fully or not, no one who worked with him ever doubted the sincerity and integrity and devotion to his country which animated all his actions. As a newcomer to Congress I found him to be extremely helpful in advancing special legislation for the relief of my constituents.

The House of Representatives will never be quite the same again. I extend my condolences to his family with the hope that they will find comfort in the respect and esteem we all tender to him today.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, only 2 weeks ago I joined with other Members of the House in noting the forthcoming birthday of FRANCIS WALTER. Like other of his colleagues and friends, I extended birthday greetings and wished him a speedy recovery. Also, I took occasion to express my admiration and respect for this great American.

Today, again, with others I pay tribute to "TAD" WALTER, but, Mr. Speaker, this time our words are spoken in sadness, for we can only add to what we said the other day an expression of sorrow and sense of loss that he has passed from this life into the great beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure those of us who were noting FRANCIS WALTER's birthday all had in our minds at that time that he was desperately ill, and probably would never return to continue the important work which he had carried on here for so many years. I am sure, also, that we all hoped that our expressions of friendship and admiration would reach his ear and convey our feelings of friendship and respect. In any event, it is certainly gratifying to have paid our tribute while he was alive. We can only add on this occasion our sense of loss, personally and to the Nation, and I am sure that there is no Member of this House who does not recognize how great that service was and what a unique place he had in this Congress.

It is difficult to translate into words the emotions that fill one's heart at a time like this. However, I think that I can best express my own thought by saying that FRANCIS WALTER will have a very high place in the history of our country, both for public service and for patriotic devotion to country. Likewise, as every Member can testify, we who are Members of Congress have had a great privilege in being able to serve with him, and all of us will cherish this experience for the rest of our lives.

My wife joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Walter and the members of his family. I know that they will be sustained in this sad time by the recognition that their loved one was a great American, besides being a man of highest personal character and endearing qualities.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when the Members of the House lose a colleague, and it is particularly so in the loss of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, for he was for so many years identified as a vital and integral cog in the complex machinery of the House of Representatives. Though it is well known that at times he and I were in violent disagreement, he never failed to treat me with utmost courtesy and fairness. I always received from him a ready welcome to discuss even the most controversial issues on which we were divided, and though I would stand fast in my position, he was never ungracious nor did he seek revenge. Mrs. Roosevelt and I wish to express to the members of "TAD" WALTER's family our most sincere sympathy and condolences.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of FRANCIS WALTER. It would be difficult to add very much to the glowing and well-deserved tributes which have already been paid to our departed friend and colleague.

I had not been in Congress very long before I discovered that FRANCIS WALTER was a man of real stature. His record of performance reflects great credit upon the people of the district who kept him in Congress for so many years. He served them well. He not only served the people of his district; he served the people of the Nation and the world.

These are difficult and trying days, and the wise counsel and sturdy hand of FRANCIS WALTER will be missed. His record of service presents a challenge to those of us left behind.

We honor ourselves in honoring the memory of FRANCIS WALTER.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying a brief tribute to a good and a great man, my beloved friend, FRANCIS WALTER, affectionately known to all of us as "TAD." By his dedicated public service and his great devotion to duty and especially by the courageous and courteous manner in which he discharged the important functions of his high office, he distinguished himself in the service of his country and endeared himself to his colleagues in Congress. I have seen him in the discharge of important duties here on the floor of this House and I have seen him in places of great responsibility in performing official services in foreign countries. "TAD" WALTER was held in high esteem both at home and abroad. He went placidly into the noise and the haste of the world in which he lived, but he at all times remembered that there was peace in silence. He spoke the truth quietly and clearly but he was always willing to listen to others. To him even the dull and the ignorant had their stories to tell. So with great patience and tolerance he went about his busy life in a modern world.

May the love and sympathy of his friends soften the sorrow of his loved ones. I extend my warm and sincere sympathy to the members of his family. May the God of mercy bless and keep him.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the sturdiest oaks in the forest has fallen. Sometimes we must await the opening against the sky left by the falling of a mighty tree for us to realize how large a man really loomed in life.

Such was true of our old friend and colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, whose spirit has now been liberated from the ills that afflict mortals and who has gone to that place from which there is no return.

FRANCIS WALTER's life was a long pilgrimage of service to his generation, his country, and the homeless and discouraged of many nations. He was born with and always lived up to the highest traditions of public service. Almost every man in public life is willing to undertake the deeds of public service which may bring him commendation and applause, but the great public servant is one who accepts the hard and bitter tasks, knowing in advance that they will bring him abuse and painful derogation. Yet these men who are willing to drink their share of the bitter duty of public life are those who emerge in the light of history as the builders and the guardians of nations.

No American of this decade received more unthinking, unreasonable, and in some cases deliberately malicious criticism than did "TAD" WALTER in his capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He did not want the job—he dreaded it—but when he was selected by his peers to undertake this unpleasant role, he responded like the good soldier of democracy that he was always.

So it was in so many of the tasks of public life which this brave man accepted as a normal part of his duty to his country and to the cause of the freedom that he cherished.

He was a man of strong convictions about legislation, convictions which certainly were not shared by, and in some cases, were bitterly opposed by, many of his colleagues. "TAD" WALTER never allowed a difference of opinion over political issues to stand in the way of being a true friend to every colleague with whom he ever served. He had a high regard for the personal welfare of his colleagues whether or not they agreed with him. And as might have been expected of this man, time after time he came forward to help Democrats in their campaigns, even when those Members had feelingly opposed him in this House of Representatives on some of his most deeply held convictions.

"TAD" WALTER was a man who believed that "to guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." He had very strong opinions on the restriction of immigration into this country, yet when he saw the human misery resulting from war, destruction and revolution in the years after 1945, he stepped forward and said to this country, "America must do her share to help these homeless, these friendless, to take up a new life in new lands."

Across this earth today there are not just thousands, but hundreds of thousands of human beings who got a second chance at life because of the compassion, the determination, and the legislative skill of our fallen friend. It does not matter that only a tiny handful of these rescued human beings ever heard the name "TAD" WALTER. For recognition he cared little, but for accomplishment in terms of human compassion he cared a great deal.

So "TAD" WALTER needs no monuments of stone. His monuments across the earth are living men, women, and children of many colors and many origins who were rescued from the depths of misery and despair and placed once again on the high road to human happiness, faith, and dignity.

All of us will miss our old comrade in arms, but throughout the years that remain to each of us, our hearts will be warmed by the memory of a great friend, a noble public servant, FRANCIS "TAD" WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

To his loved ones we extend what solace there is in that their loss is shared by so many. Those who in the future aspire to public service may well remember "TAD" WALTER's example, that one may strive mightily for his convictions in the arena of public service and yet remain a devoted friend to all.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the sadness of the occasion renders speaking difficult, and yet I would like at this time to pay my respects to our late colleague, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the Pennsylvania 15th District. I knew him well, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to record as my belief that it will be quite a while before another such as he sets foot again within this Chamber.

Indeed, his very manner—the manner of the upright, modest, clear-spoken citizen—lent a kind of grace and class to this body, to which he was in all ways a major contributor. And in the matter of honesty—so vital to the public interest—he, as a man schooled in the art of banking and finance, led the way, for all others to follow, his honesty a symbol for all to observe and to respect.

In courage, both physical and moral, none exceeded FRANCIS E. WALTER, who volunteered his military service in two world wars, fought for America whenever possible, and displayed in the political arena a will of iron and an unshakable nonpartisan respect for truth, fearless of the consequences.

We shall miss his presence, Mr. Speaker. There was only one FRANCIS E. WALTER and he is gone from us today.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House to pay tribute to "TAD" WALTER. His passing will leave a serious void in each of our hearts, in these legislative halls and in the entire Nation.

For 8 years I was privileged to occupy an office on the same hall with "TAD" WALTER and to know him as a neighbor and friend. Congressman WALTER was a great partisan in the finest traditional sense, but this did not prevent him from being a considerate and true friend to those of us of the opposite party. Each of us has suffered a personal loss.

The contributions made by "TAD" WALTER in these legislative halls were above the ordinary. He was sincerely devoted to preserving our national strength. He had the foresight to recognize danger and the courage to fight against it, sometimes at the risk of personal popularity. Congressman WALTER was a true expert in the field of immigration and exhibited his typical tenacity in adhering to immigration principles which he believed were in the national interest.

The Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have lost one of those rare individuals in history who would pursue a deeply felt conviction in spite of opposition which would have turned lesser men to the path of compromise.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of FRANCIS WALTER will leave a vacant spot in this House that can hardly be filled. He was honored and revered by practically every Member of this body. He possessed qualities of statesmanship that became widely recognized and appreciated. He was courageous, forthright, and always wise in his legislative conduct.

As chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he was a thorn in the side of the Communists and their fellow travelers. He exposed them and their nefarious activities to the light of the midday sun. He never faltered in the performance of his duties.

Recognized as one of the most able legal minds in the Congress, FRANCIS WALTER contributed immeasurably to the orderly advancement of legislation on many occasions. He was listened to and his advice was always respected. It will be difficult, indeed, to fill the vacant shoes left by the unfortunate passing of this distinguished American. I personally feel that I have lost a friend and I know the Nation has lost a great statesman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to join the distinguished array of my colleagues who are today paying tribute to a great life of significant service on the part of our late and beloved colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. He was the very symbol of what a Congressman ought to be—of absolute integrity, honesty, dedication, hard work, and knowledge.

When I first saw Mr. WALTER he was presiding over a Democratic caucus which I attended when I first came to Washington in 1957. The deftness with which he handled the parliamentary tasks assigned to him and the confidence which the leaders of his party, and in fact, the entire group assembled, accorded him, quickly gave me to know that this was a man I should know and respect.

I never had the privilege of being an intimate friend, but I have had the privilege of talking with him and being in the same group with him on numerous occasions and I never found his advice anything but accurate, nor his judgment other than sure.

In a personal way he was always pleasant. He was quick to speak to even the younger Members, and knowing of the long service and great stature that he had, it meant something to us to receive his recognition. As the years passed on, and I began to know him better, I realized that this man was not only an outstanding Congressman, but a statesman in his own right. He was fearless, he was patriotic, and he led the fight against the Communists despite all sorts of criticism which might have appalled a man of lesser courage.

His family has suffered a great loss, and his district has suffered the loss of a Congressman they could be proud of every minute of every day, and whose memory they can and should cherish. His Nation has lost a great public servant, a leader in every sense of the word, a citizen whose time and talents were valuable to his time, and whose contributions will continue to be of value in the years to come.

Like every other Member of Congress, I feel I have lost a good friend. To his family and his friends, I express my deepest sympathy. I hope they find comfort in reflection on his great life of service.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER is a great loss to our Nation and to freedom-loving people throughout the world. Sad though this occasion may be to all of us who were privileged to be closely associated with "TAD" WALTER, I could not let the occasion go by without joining my colleagues in an expression of appreciation for his life of service to his country.

Shortly after entering upon my service in the House of Representatives I was privileged to be assigned to the Judiciary Committee. The ranking Democratic member of our committee through those years has been the late Congressman WALTER. His position of leadership on that committee, as well as his work as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was always outstanding. Equally outstanding, I think, was his interest in his colleagues and his desire to be of assistance to all of us who called upon him for advice and aid.

The steadying influence exerted by our departed colleague was one of the noteworthy features of the House of Representatives during his long service as a Member. When others were concerned and confused about the issues of the day and the course that should be taken by our Government, they could always look to "TAD" WALTER for calmness and forthright leadership in their efforts to make the correct decisions. This benefit that we have all had through his many years of service will now be missing as a tangible force in the legislative work of the House. As an intangible force, however, I am sure that the influence of "TAD" WALTER will remain for many years to come with those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and working with him in the legislative arena.

At this time when we are all experiencing heavy hearts because of the loss of our comrade, FRANCIS E. WALTER, I join with my colleagues in expressing to his fine family and the people of the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania my deepest sympathy in the great loss which they share with all who have been the beneficiaries of his incalculable service to mankind.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the saddest occasions that I have ever risen to speak. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a figure of noble, courageous strength for 30 years in this body. His devotion to his Nation, to his constitutents, to his colleagues has already been well noted in the RECORD of our proceedings and in the press.

But more than simply a great and brave leader, in the House and its committees, "TAD" WALTER was a loyal, generous friend whose wise counsel and warm comradeship I shall never forget. Especially in my first days in the House, when I was a stranger among the many distinguished Members who were already veterans, "TAD" never waited to extend himself to me, to help me learn my new duties, to help me feel at home.

His record as a legislator needs no descriptive phrases from me at this point. For his place in the history of this body and in that of our Nation has long since been assured. "TAD" WALTER will not pass this way again; but those of us whom he passed along the way will long remember.

My deep sympathy goes to his bereaved family in this moment of their great loss.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound personal sorrow that I offer tribute to our departed colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democratic Congressman from Pennsylvania's 15th District. It is very difficult, indeed, for me to visualize or imagine the House of Representatives without the presence of this distinguished legislator.

FRANCIS WALTER was a personal inspiration to me from the moment I entered the 79th Congress in 1945. His advice was wise and of great assistance to me as a new Member. His help at the outset of my congressional service is something I shall never forget and his spirit of benevolence was the beginning of our strong friendship through the years.

It did not take one long to become aware of his keen mind and to realize the value of his rich experience. One quickly learned he was the master of his fate and the captain of his soul. He demonstrated there is never any easy acquiescence in meeting difficult situations.

Not only were our congressional districts in Pennsylvania adjoining, but our congressional offices were located across the hall. The hours that I shared with my friend and colleague have been highlights of my service in Washington.

From early life Representative WALTER understood and appreciated the importance of our form of government. The personal qualities which accounted for his outstanding success are the virtues needed by the statesmen of our time—honesty, perseverance, modesty, insight, and friendliness.

He had a great capacity for handling the complexities of government. He championed with great wisdom and courage what he knew to be in the best interests of his country, and his Commonwealth.

Congressman WALTER came to the 73d Congress with a distinguished background as a trial lawyer. He soon demonstrated that he was a lawmaker of great ability. He abhorred careless legislating. He believed that the Congress of the United States could and should serve the requirements of an ever-growing Nation.

In the mind of many citizens Representative WALTER set a standard for Americanism, not only in his fight against communism and subversive influence, but in his determination to preserve our constitutional form of government. His work will serve as a living inspiration to those who desire to preserve the American Constitution and our form of government.

In his political life FRANCIS WALTER extended good influence, shared his wisdom, and trod the path of enlightened judgment. He never overworshipped the past, but by the same token he never permitted pending problems of the present to warp his judgment. Looking back on his public career, we can be impressed with the broad scope of good government with which FRANCIS WALTER was identified.

To his family I extend my deep and sincere sympathy and ask them to remember his extreme courage during his hours of adversity.

He will be remembered as one of Pennsylvania's outstanding statesmen and I am proud to have called him my friend. In parting, I salute his leadership and honor his memory.

His congressional district has lost a distinguished Representative, the State of Pennsylvania has lost an outstanding citizen, this Nation has lost a great American, and I have lost an old and very dear friend.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely saddened at the news of the passing of our good friend, "TAD" WALTER.

During my first year in the Congress I had some difficult problems with immigration matters. Congressman WALTER not only assisted me in obtaining passage of a bill to solve them, but he did so in such a cheerful and willing manner that he made me well aware of the fact that he enjoyed giving new Congressmen a helping hand.

He was always easy to approach. Every new Member soon found that there were a number of the older Members who were not only willing to aid them but wanted to go out of their way to help a new Member learn the ropes and become more useful to his constituents and the country as a whole.

This was the kind of a man that "TAD" WALTER was. He loved his fellow man and he was willing to work long hours, go great distances, and devote himself wholeheartedly to a life of service to others.

Congressman WALTER will be sadly missed. He has rendered a great service to the country as a legislator. The statutes, the committee hearings, and the committee reports on which he worked will long make him remembered as a Congressman who got things done. He nobly and ably served not only the people of his district in Pennsylvania but the people of all of these great United States.

Our loss in the Congress is a great one. However, I feel that all who knew and worked with this great man had their lives enriched by this association.

I offer my sincere sympathy and condolences to his family and loved ones. They can take great pride in the life and work of this great American.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again the flag of our country flies at half mast over the Capitol. Again we gather within this historic Chamber to voice, as best we may within our frail human limitations, and all too inadequately, what is deep within our saddened hearts.

For 30 years the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER was a Member of the House. He was seventh in seniority on the Democratic side. He was chairman of the Democratic caucus. He was chairman of the Democratic patronage committee. Ability of the highest quality and industry that knew no rest had brought to him a recognition by his colleagues seldom equaled in unanimity and in measure. He was on many occasions Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and, no matter how bitterly controversial the issue, always when the Committee rose he had been thunderously applauded because of the fairness of his rulings and his matchless efficiency as a presiding officer.

But it is not the power and prestige and acclaim that were his that is in our minds and hearts today. We are crushed in grief by the passing of a beloved colleague and friend.

I shall miss "TAD" WALTER very, very much. I shall miss the warmth of his smile, the warmth of his human understanding. I am thinking now of that day and night in Chicago when he stood many hours, shaking hands and participating in all the activities, on the occasion of the opening of a new community house for the Chinese-Americans. He even then was not in good health. The occasion held no political or personal advantage for him. But his presence there did mean a great deal to these good Americans of Chinese birth or descent who were joined with other Americans in the common cause of advancing the interest and the welfare of our own United States. So "TAD" WALTER came, at great personal inconvenience, and remained hour after hour until he must have been physically exhausted.

His interest in the refugees, his drive to find homes in new lands for the homeless people of the world, was but one of the indexes to the humanitarian character of the "TAD" WALTER we knew through close association as colleagues here in the House.

I have been enriched by my personal friendship with "TAD" WALTER during many years. To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROUSH. My own heart is saddened by the death of our colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER. He was a man who possessed an alert and imaginative mind. He had a deep and abiding loyalty to his country. He lived by high ideals. He was an able leader of men and a skilled parliamentarian. These qualities he carried into his work as a Member of this great House of Representatives. As a result he became a great Congressman, admired and respected by his colleagues and constituents.

We shall miss him. Our prayers and condolences go to his family and loved ones. May God sustain them in this hour of sorrow and in the loneliness of the days ahead.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the passing of our beloved friend and esteemed colleague, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER. His loss is truly an irreparable one.

"TAD" WALTER's great and extraordinary personal virtues and qualities were well known to me through our mutual, dear friend, the famed Mr. N. V. "Swede" Nelson, a preparatory schoolmate of his, long before I came to Congress.

It was not long thereafter when it was my happy lot to know for myself that the great "Swede" Nelson had quite appropriately described the tremendous gifts, charming, magnetic personality, and manysided versatilities and talents of this incredibly great illustrious son of the great Keystone State, Congressman WALTER.

"TAD" was portrayed to me as an accomplished athlete of great skill, resourcefulness, and determination, a man of real courage and swift action—one who worked hard and earnestly at every task and brought a strong sense of humor and spirit of fair play into everything he did, a loyal friend whose whimsical characteristic was that he often liked to put across a good, lusty joke on some of his schoolmates and teammates—a recognized leader and stalwart, trusted companion and warm, loyal friend.

It was easy, therefore, for me as I progressed in my service in this great body, to recognize in "Tad" the very same outstanding qualities of ability, leadership, loyalty, and cordial good fellowship that had distinguished him in the joyful, adventurous days of his youth, with this difference, that a mature, well-trained mind and the passage of time and ripe experience had served to enrich and perfect the talents, qualities, and rare aptitudes for honorable, able public service of this great American and outstanding Member of the House, whose career in this body was so distinguished and truly memorable.

As a lawyer of first magnitude, a debater of unique capacity and skill, "TAD" WALTER brilliantly served our great House Judiciary Committee in the Congress, his own district, and the Nation with exceptional ability, zeal, and dedication. He was one of the greatest Americans ever to serve in the House and he was beloved, respected, and admired, not only by those of us who are his devoted and admiring colleagues, but by all who knew him.

It is with a very heavy heart that I join his family and his friends and constituents and colleagues in mourning the passing of this outstanding public servant. He will be sorely missed in the Halls of this great legislative body where he contributed so much to the Nation.

To his beloved family, I tender my most heartfelt sympathy in the great sorrow that has come to them. May the Good Lord keep him in His heavenly home and give him external peace and rest.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this body has lost, in the death of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, a true American, able legislator and a humanitarian. While he may be forgotten within a short time to many people, he will always be remembered here for his contributions to the legislative history of the House. He was an expert parliamentarian, and I well remember his ability to preside over this body during its deliberations on the knottiest of bills.

The district of Pennsylvania which he represented so well will miss him sorely. He was acutely aware of the problems which faced his constituents and his State, and was constantly striving to fulfill his capacity of their Representative in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the sadness of this occasion, the sense of loss which we all feel in the death of our distinguished and able colleague, and the personal grief I feel in knowing that I can no longer seek the counsel of an old friend will make my tribute to FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, shorter than might be appropriate in any other such tragic case.

His brothers here know his unfailing courtesy, his intense energies, his devotion to his district, his State, and his country. His abilities were of the extraordinary kind that make the born legislative leader. But his leadership was tempered with the concern for common problems and ordinary people which shows that heart as well as mind are the motivating forces in a man's life.

The courage that he always showed in matters before the committee and subcommittee which he chaired, and on the floor of this House, that courage he showed to the fullest in his last days. He entered the hospital in February for what were described as tests; he returned to the hospital for the last time in April. In the face of death his spirits did not flag, his courage never ebbed. He died the fighter that he always was.

Others will detail here today his achievements and accomplishments in the years he served in this House. I wish merely to note that I knew him in his early days in Pennsylvania. I was proud to be able to say then that he was my friend. I am heartbroken to say today that my friend is gone.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER was a man whom I did not have the privilege of knowing personally. As an active citizen for many years and now as a Member of Congress, I have been aware of his fine record of accomplishments for his State and the Nation.

His qualities of leadership and knowledge of the intricacies of the workings of the Congress were remarkable. All Members held this man in high respect. Pennsylvania has lost a distinguished public servant. The Congress has lost an outstanding leader.

I add my personal expression of sympathy to Mr. WALTER's family and to his many friends. He will be remembered as a truly dedicated man to the America in which he firmly believed and for which he fought.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the news of the loss of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, was a severe blow to many causes of importance to the country.

In his long career of able service to the House, Congressman WALTER had won the wholehearted respect of all who knew him well and shared his continuing concern for the strength and security of the Nation.

As chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, FRANCIS WALTER was a tireless and courageous fighter against the Communist Party and its insidious conspiracy.

He was particularly vigorous in his attacks upon loose and careless personnel security practices in Government, and hit hard against any official who appeared to take lightly the dangers of espionage and subversion in our Government.

While a few in this body have at times questioned the aggressive methods of our colleague in his constant battle to strengthen our Nation's internal security, I have never heard any Member question either his sincerity or his dedication to duty.

FRANCIS WALTER was a strong and fearless man who spoke out vigorously in support of his convictions, and he consistently and effectively supported efforts to build our Nation's defenses and improve its readiness to defeat its enemies.

It was a privilege and an honor to serve with this able American, who will be sorely missed in these Halls for a long time to come.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend and our esteemed colleague, FRANCIS "TAD" WALTER, leaves me with a sad feeling of personal loss and removes from this body one of its most able and influential Members.

"TAD" WALTER was my friend and mentor when I first came to Congress and his expert guidance proved invaluable to me. Through the years he remained a loyal and true friend, always ready to extend a helping hand with any problem.

But aside from my personal feeling of loss, all of us here are going to miss his expert knowledge, his fearlessness, and his readiness to fight for what he considered was right and just. He was a man of strong beliefs and great sincerity and while many of us were not always in agreement with his views, we always admired his courage, his integrity, his ability, and his devotion to duty. We have lost a most able colleague and the Nation has lost a great American.

"TAD" WALTER was a devoted husband and father and to his widow and his daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened at the death of FRANCIS WALTER. Over the years he has been so kind and helpful to me that I will miss him an awful lot.

His office was near mine and we saw each other frequently. Many of my problems I talked over with him. Knowing him and having him for a friend was a grand experience.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my remarks to the many that have been made by Members in memory of our late colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. His death was sudden, and he leaves a bereft family and saddened colleagues in the House. I am one who often found himself in opposition to our late colleague on the floor of this body. But whatever the extent or depth of our disagreement we personally remained good friends and respected each other's point of view. If memory serves, following every exchange we ever had in committee or on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was far senior to me, would extend to me a kind word, or a bit of humor. He had a fine sense of humor, and an ability to laugh at himself which few people have. I join our colleagues in extending to our late colleague's family and friends my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, no coward soul was "TAD" WALTER.

He faced life squarely, defied criticism, resisted extremists who pressed in upon him, guarded the American heritage he treasured.

He was an outstanding legislator, faithful to his ideals, relentless to those who would destroy his government.

He was never unconcerned when it came to colleagues who needed guidance. He led, but always in a gentle manner.

His spirit will linger long in our hearts and will continue to influence the course of this Nation's destiny.

To his family and friends I extend my deepest sympathy.

We will all miss "TAD" WALTER.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak as all the members of our Pennsylvania congressional delegation do when I express my profound sadness and sorrow on the passing of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, our beloved dean.

"TAD," as we all called him, was our guiding light and our inspiration. He was our pillar of strength, our teacher, our confidant, and foremost—our friend.

When I first came to the Congress, I was, like all first termers, lost, but with the helping hand of "TAD" WALTER, I found my way very rapidly. For this I was grateful—and through the years that followed, his advice and his wisdom helped me immeasurably.

I will greatly miss Mr. WALTER and my family extends to his family our deepest sympathy in this—their hour of sorrow.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our senior colleague, Mr. WALTER, grieves us all. He was a legislator of stanch integrity and deep dedication to the Republic in which we live.

Some of the legislative areas in which I am deeply interested came within the province of Mr. WALTER's work. I found him willing to counsel and advise, but he was always a strict and fair adherent to the spirit and purpose of the law in which he had taken an active part as draftsman.

He had earned a burden of controversy, and was the target of many people who sought to change the laws with which he worked. He bore this burden equably and moved quietly and steadily on. In all instances, he had a clear and sharp understanding of the problems involved.

Those of us who serve in the House have known him as a stanch and loyal Member, one who believed in organization as the essence of orderly progress, and whose quiet methods could preserve parliamentary discipline and justice against the challenges of highly tense situations. He has left the stamp of his service on the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend and our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER. This great legislative body has lost a pillar of strength, our country has lost a leader, the district he so ably represented for 31 years has lost a devoted servant, and I have lost a valued friend.

"TAD" WALTER was in the Congress when I was first elected in 1936, and if there was anyone more willing to help, more anxious to assist, or more readily available to advise and counsel, it was not my privilege to meet him. "TAD" WALTER had an understanding of people that was unsurpassed, and time and again used this great understanding to unite and solidify divergent forces behind an issue that would surely have failed without such support. He was a skilled parliamentarian, and possessed such a brilliant legal mind, that he often was given the responsibility of the chair in securing passage of the most heated and controversial legislation. During his service in the House, he was honored by many high and responsible positions, which was a tribute to the quality of his service and dedication, and at the time of his death was chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, chairman of the Democratic caucus, chairman of the Patronage Committee, and chairman of two subcommittees of the House Judiciary Committee. Truly a great record of accomplishment by a great American.

It has been a privilege for me to know and work with such an outstanding individual, and I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I note the passing of a dedicated American, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. Representative WALTER, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding sons, served 16 terms on Capitol Hill, an outstanding Congressman, dedicated to his own District and region, his party, and above all, the United States of America. His concern with the welfare of his country was manifested in his chairmanship of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, where he sought out subversive elements and would grant no quarter to those who attempted to undermine his beloved country. His colleagues in Congress last supported the efforts of his committee by a vote of 412 to 6, silencing those who while opposing his work never doubted his sincerity.

The memory of FRANCIS E. WALTER will not fade in the minds of Americans who cherish freedom and deeply resent attempts to subvert the greatest Nation in the world. As long as we have men the caliber of FRANCIS E. WALTER, our Nation will be secure from within and we will be capable of defeating any enemy from without.

It was an honor and privilege to serve with this able legislator who must be remembered as a great American.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal sadness that I join my distinguished colleagues in mourning the passing of a good friend and a great American, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. Having been closely associated with "TAD" WALTER has inspired and enriched my own life and I am confident that the same can be said by many, many Members of the Congress. Although a man of undaunted courage, he was a kind man, a man who loved his friends and who was willing to go "the second mile" to be helpful to them. The loss of our beloved colleague has created a void in the House and in the Nation that will be difficult indeed to fill.

The name of FRANCIS WALTER was synonomous with Americanism. As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, his contributions to the security of our country will stand as a monument to him throughout the years. To be sure, he left many other testimonials of a great career and even though many of these have been enumerated, it would be impossible to evaluate them all. Suffice to say, FRANCIS WALTER died as he lived—in the service of his country—and those of us left here to carry on the work would do well to emulate his worthwhile life.

I extend deep and sincere sympathy to his family and to the devoted members of his staff.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that very few people in the history of the House of Representatives have exercised a greater influence on the course of the Nation and composition of its laws than our late colleague, "TAD" WALTER. He possessed in very large measure the attributes of greatness as a legislator.

One of the marks of that greatness, I believe, was his willingness to advise and assist less senior Members of the House in the sometimes difficult problems that they faced. My own personal experience with "TAD" WALTER amply demonstrated this facet of his character. During my first term in the Congress I discovered that "TAD" WALTER, in spite of the many important projects in which he was engaged and the heavy demands on his time, was a person to whom I could turn for valuable help and counsel.

I believe that it was this feeling for his colleagues more than any other aspect of his character and career that made "TAD" WALTER a respected and beloved leader of the House of Representatives. We who were his colleagues shall miss him very much. More importantly, the country has lost a great leader whom it shall be very difficult to replace.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my expression of deep sorrow at the passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Like so many others who were privileged to associate with Mr. WALTER, I feel his absence as a keen personal loss. I did not have the opportunity, as did some, to serve closely with him over many years. However, I was privileged to have him as the dean of my delegation, and as such, he was of course one of the first persons I met when I came to Congress.

I shall never forget how kind and helpful he was to me in my earliest days here. Despite his heavy responsibilities he had the time to give me the benefit of his advice and counsel. Since that time he always continued to exhibit the same gracious interest at any time I had occasion to call upon him.

I was deeply impressed with the conscientiousness and sincerity of Mr. WALTER. He was obviously a man who was truly dedicated to public service. The author of much controversial legislation, he was often the target of bitter criticism, but no one could deny his good motives nor fail to admire his stanch conviction. I felt extremely fortunate to be the beneficiary of his long experience and good judgment.

As time went on I of course became more aware of the important role being played by Mr. WALTER in the House of Representatives. As one observed his unusual qualities of leadership and his brilliant understanding of the law, it was not difficult to see how he had attained his position. He was indeed an outstanding legislator.

It was because of his superior ability as a legislator that Mr. WALTER was so often called upon to preside when the House was considering very complex legislation. It was an inspiration to watch him on such occasions. His knowledge of the rules of the House and his precise understanding of the provisions of the law were remarkable. His skill as a parliamentarian was such as to often command words of praise on the floor of the House after he had presided over the consideration of a controversial bill.

It is not often that a single Member of Congress can make his presence felt as keenly as did "TAD" WALTER. He leaves behind a record of performance that will be long remembered. And he leaves behind many friends who have profited by knowing him.

Mrs. Moorhead and I extend our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD two telegrams from representatives of the Japanese-American Citizens League, now meeting here in Washington, with respect to the late FRANCIS E. WALTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 1, 1963.*

HON. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.:

Chapters of Eastern District Council, Japanese American Citizens League meeting here in Washington, after learning of passing of Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, unanimously approved resolution paying tribute to the dedicated public service of Congressman WALTER, over 30 years in National House of Representatives. Always an able and courageous lawmaker, he also had compassion for those less fortunate and he championed causes of those who needed a champion in the National Legislature. After World War II, when heroic war record of Japanese-American troops in every theater of war became known, he assumed leadership in securing corrective and remedial laws of benefit to those of Japanese ancestry. He was instrumental in enactment of evaluation claims legislation to partially compensate Japanese Americans for their wartime losses. He led the fight to prevent the deportation of alien Japanese stranded in this country during war who had sons in our Armed Forces in World War II. He helped draft and enact the Immigration and Nationality Act that bears his name, which repealed race as a qualification for naturalization and quota immigration. We join the Nation in mouring his loss, for our country and our citizens have lost a devoted and inspired legislator for the common good.

Eastern District Council, Japanese American Citizens League, John Yoshino, Chairman; Edwin Mitoma, Chairman of the Board, Washington, D.C. Chapter; Toshio Kaneme, Chairman of the Board, Philadelphia Chapter; Kiyomi Nakamura, President, Seabrook, N.J., Chapter; Roy Kurahara, Chairman of the Board, New York Chapter; Mike Masaoka, Washington Representative, Washington, D.C.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 1, 1963.*

HON. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the 88 chapters of Japanese American Citizens League, may we join with our fellow Americans in paying our respects to the late Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania. Throughout the early post-World War II years, he provided much of the leadership for corrective and remedial legislation for Americans of Japanese ancestry, recognizing that we were the unfortunate victims of wartime prejudice and bigotry. Then, he championed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and particularly those so-called Asian provisions that extended the privilege of citizenship to all lawfully admitted resident aliens without regard to race and repealed the Japanese exclusion law of 1924 by extending token immigration quotas to Japan and all other Asiatic countries. The naturalization provisions enabled our parents who had been in this country for more than half a century and who had sons in our Armed Forces in World War II to become naturalized citizens of the country of their adoption and of their children's birth. All Americans, and especially those of Japanese ancestry, will miss his leadership and counsel in the troubled years ahead when our country will need clear, sound, and constructive leadership.

K. PATRICK OKURA,
National President, Japanese American Citizens League.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Sergeant at Arms, I wish to make the following announcement. Funeral services will be held for our beloved colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER, at 10 a.m. Tuesday, June 4, at the Fort Myer Chapel, Arlington Cemetery. The Sergeant at Arms wishes to advise that transportation will be furnished for the delegation, leaving at 9:30 a.m., in front of the House steps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the subject of our beloved colleague, FRANCIS E. WALTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 384).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-six Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. HALLECK, Mr. CELLER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POFF, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JOHANSEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CURTIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. NIX, Mr. MILLIKEN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TOLL, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. WEAVER.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXI, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

878. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

879. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report

on substantial amounts of little-used nontactical construction equipment being held on Okinawa by the military services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

880. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on ineffective utilization of supply items resulting from deficiencies in the Federal catalog system within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

881. A letter from the chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia relating to its financial condition and expenses for the period June 1, 1962, to May 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 86-531, 86th Congress; to the Committtee on the District of Columbia.

882. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6754. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6713. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6714. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6715. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6716. A bill to permit the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter mailed in a State where lotteries are legal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6717. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6718. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 6719. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6720. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 6721. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 6722. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6723. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6724. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 6725. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6726. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 6727. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6728. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 6729. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 6730. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 6731. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6732. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 6733. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6734. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6735. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6736. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 6737. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 6738. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6739. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6740. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 6741. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6742. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6743. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6744. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6745. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code (copyrights) to bar actions for infringement of copyright in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 6746. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6747. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received and to increase the number of general trustees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 6754. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the observance of the centennial of Gettsyburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting participation of the United States with a Federal exhibit in Interama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and transmitting a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56, relating to commending those who played significant roles in providing for retarded children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALLECK:

H.R. 6748. A bill for the relief of J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 6749. A bill for the relief of Rui Ferreira Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 6750. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6751. A bill for the relief of Efrosini D. Tsarouhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6752. A bill for the relief of Horace H. Easterday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 6753. A bill for the relief of Manojlo Vrzich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

144. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Rand Smith, executive director, Advertising Club of Greater Boston, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the U.S. frigate *Constitution* be retained at the Charlestown Navy Yard instead of sending it to the New York World's Fair; to the Committee on Armed Services.

145. Also, petition of Fay Lawrence, Inyo County clerk, Board of Supervisors of Inyo County, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging adoption of Senate bill 1275, relating to Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

146. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting that there be published a biographical directory of the American Federal Judiciary from 1789 to date; to the Committee on House Administration.

147. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., petitioning the House of Representatives to expel a Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

148. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to urging the House of Representatives to defeat the bill H.R. 6160, a bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies, this being special treatment and class privilege legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the U.S. Constitution provision for populational proportionality in State legislative structure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Ethiopia, Ghana, Morocco, and Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 weeks, I have brought to the attention of this House, several foreign countries which utilize government-run lotteries as a revenue-raising device. Today, I would like to take the Members of this House to Africa, and discuss the lotteries conducted in Ethiopia, in Ghana, in Morocco, and in Nigeria. These are 4 of 77 foreign countries that tie the gambling urge of their people together with the governments' need for additional revenue.

Ethiopia started its national lottery last year. Because of the newness of the project, inadequate distributions, and advertising methods, the gross receipts did not reach the anticipated level. However, the total gross annual receipts for 1962 were $800,000. The net income to the Government came to $138,000 which was used for support of charitable projects and the general treasury.

Ghana, a poor country, first established a lottery in 1958 as a means of raising badly needed revenues. The gross annual receipts for 1962 came to $756,000. The total annual net income to the Government was $311,000 which was applied to its general revenue.

Morocco does not operate its own lottery but is the recipient of benefits derived from the operation of a private lottery and the French national lottery both of which function there. The total gross annual receipts from the sale of lottery tickets in 1962 came to about $2 million. The Moroccan Government collected about 25 percent of the value of total lottery sales which came to one-half million dollars. These funds are earmarked for charitable purposes.

Nigeria has a premium bond lottery which was started last December 1962. This type of lottery is patterned after the British premium bond lottery and India's prize bond program. Nigeria realizes that a recognition of the normal gambling urge of its people can be a great help in handling the nation's finances. The proceeds of the sales of the bonds are intended to help finance Nigeria's economic development program.

Mr. Speaker, if we showed similar courage and wisdom in the United States and capitalized on our own people's gambling thirst we could raise over $10 billion a year which could be used to cut our heavy taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt. New Hampshire set the example, how about following it?

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States.

President Kennedy has stated:

> We need not only more professional personnel—more doctors, nurses, teachers, and social workers—but an even greater number of dedicated volunteers to support the professional in every area of service.

But where will we find the professionals and volunteers so badly needed to help solve our country's human problems? A National Service Corps program can help solve these problems by—

First. Providing opportunity for full-time dedicated service to men and women, young people just out of school, and older people retiring from regular employment or housework. The experience of serving others might well motivate many of the young people to choose lifelong careers in the helping professions.

Second. Adding manpower to local volunteer programs which carry on, for the most part, unsung though not unappreciated.

Third. Most important, focusing attention on the increased need for part-time volunteers to join the many volunteer service programs in their own communities.

The cost of this proposal is modest, Mr. Speaker, in comparison with the cost of most items of expenditure. It is minuscule in comparison with the need, and I predict that each dollar expended for a National Service Corps could return tenfold to the Treasury as human lives are rehabilitated, as clinic and hospital services are augmented, and as illiteracy and idleness are replaced by the self-supporting independence that comes with learning and skill.

The goals of a National Service Corps, Mr. Speaker, are fourfold:

First. To work with people in great need: The program would provide full-time opportunity for dedicated service. At the request of local public and private community groups, national service corpsmen will work with those Americans in greatest need in both urban and rural areas of the United States and its territories and trusts.

Second. To motivate other citizens to give service: The corpsmen—men and women working full time in the program—could, by their example, motivate many more citizens to give part-time service in their own communities. This would build an even greater voluntary effort directed at the most critical needs of our people.

Third. To dramatize human needs: Many Americans in greatest need are far removed from our daily lives—many are unseen and forgotten. By dramatizing their human needs, a national service program—while not itself solving these problems—should spur action on many fronts in an attack on forces causing deprivation in America.

Fourth. To attract more Americans into helping professions: The experience of serving others could well inspire many people to choose careers in the service professions—social work, teaching, nursing—which suffer from critical shortages of trained personnel.

Accomplishment of these goals, in my judgment, would demonstrate to the Nation and to all its citizens the extent of human needs and the means of attacking them. The corps would thus act as a catalyst to greater effort by individual citizens for the elimination of deprivation.

Khrushchev's Cuban Toe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, my report to the people of the Second District of Washington State for the month of May concerns Cuba. This subject is perhaps more in the minds of the people I represent than any other issue outside Government spending. I base this observation on the many answers I have received from my annual questionnaire.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include my newsletter, "Khrushchev's Cuban Toe," in the Record:

Khrushchev's Cuban Toe

So much has been written, spoken, and debated about Cuba and the presence of Russian troops on that island in the last year that I thought my voice would only add to the confusion that seems to exist. Not that I haven't made my views known as far back as the summer of 1960 when I urged the Republican leadership to take military action to protect American lives and property, and last fall when I congratulated the President for taking positive action, action which I think all Americans applauded—and wondered why it had taken so long.

Since then, I have read many reports and I have talked to exiled Cubans, to people who were involved in the Bay of Pigs fiasco and heads of Latin-American countries. From these studies I have come to conclusions which, as your Representative, I think I should communicate to you.

1. The Monroe Doctrine, as we have known it for almost 200 years, is dead in the eyes of the world. We have failed through our inaction to keep it alive.

2. The report of the Stennis (Senator from Mississippi) committee confirms the belief of almost all Members of Congress that (a) there are still a substantial number of Russian troops in Cuba (from a minimum of 14,000 to as high as 60,000); (b) that Cuba is no longer run by Cubans, but by Russians; (c) that Cuba is the center of the Communist attempt at subversion and intrigue in the Western Hemisphere; (d) the fact that an acknowledged foreign power (Communist Russia and China) has established a base of operations in the Western Hemisphere despite our actions is a tremendous political disadvantage to us in all our dealings with the Soviets. Incidentally, this report was signed unanimously by Democrats and Republicans.

In September of 1960, President Kennedy said, "If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America * * * then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure."

Tell me, are we helping or hindering establishment of a permanent Communist foothold? Why do we take a position of "let the dust settle" rather than take affirmative action?

Why don't we support those who want to attack the Communist government? We do it in Vietnam. We do it in Nationalist China. We did it in Korea, and we did it in Lebanon. Are we afraid to step on Khrushchev's Cuban toe?

Why did we dismantle our NATO weapons in Turkey and Italy? Was there a "deal"?

In my belief it is past the time for us to not only assert our views, but also to act. If we had the courage of our Central American friends we would support all activities taken to bring about the overthrow of Castro and communism. Don't ever forget we are the strongest Nation in the world. We are the leaders of the free world, or are we?

What do you think?

Sincerely yours,
Congressman Jack Westland.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of June 1, 1963:

Washington Report by Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas

ATTACKS ON AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ANSWERED

Conservatism came under attack in the House of Representatives on May 20 when a group of liberals directed an attack upon the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Members of Congress who were given ACA awards. The attack accused the ACA and those honored by it of "doing the Devil's work in American politics," and lumped conservative constitutionalists into one group including ACA, John Birch, and others. The viciousness of the attack was based on inuendo, half-truths, and guilt by association which the so-called liberals have long deplored, but did not hesitate to use when it suited their own purposes in attempting to smear opponents of the Kennedy-liberal program of big government, big spending, big welfare state.

This week it was my privilege to refute the charges and to defend the Americanism and patriotism of ACA as an organization as well as those who have been honored by it. In this task I was joined by a number of my colleagues, including Congressman Utt of California, Curtis of Missouri, Haley of Florida, Foreman of Texas and Teague of California. Our presentation did not deal in personalities, nor smears, nor character assassination. We based our arguments on the basic differences between the two philosophies of government which now confront the people of the United States—the liberal conception that a strong Federal Government, directing the lives of the people is better than individual liberty and State and local initiative—opposed to the conservative view that constitutional-limited government in which individual liberty is paramount.

The debate was marked by an attempt on the part of one member of the opposition to prevent my speaking. Although no member of the Republican side nor conservatives on the Democratic side who had been attacked the previous week made any move to prevent the speakers from stating their views, my effort was immediately challenged and the stalling procedure of asking for roll calls was used so that 1 hour and 20 minutes was consumed in calling the roll of the Members twice before I was able to proceed.

It is not possible to present the entire debate, but I believe it is important that you know some of the facts brought out. I endeavored to present what the ACA stands for and started by reading what the Americans for Constitutional Action consider themselves to be.

"Americans for Constitutional Action is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide political action organization which is dedicated to these theses: (1) That the Constitution of the United States as originally conceived provides a sound foundation upon which the structure of our free social order has been erected, and (2) if we are to preserve that social order in America, it is imperative that we protect its foundation against erosion or destruction.

"To this end ACA has undertaken to help elect to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States individuals who, by their actions, have proved their allegiance to the original spirit and principles of the Constitution. Many important and vocal elements among our people have subscribed to the thesis enunciated by the prominent Swedish Socialist, Gunnar Myrdal, who was cited favorably by our Supreme Court, that 'The Constitution of the United States is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions.' They have supported measures designed to weaken and nullify many of the Constitution's provisions. Unfortunately, their efforts have been successful, in part at least. Their ends have been accomplished, first, by tortuous legislative, executive, and judicial interpretations of the 'general welfare' and 'commerce' clauses and the various amendments of the Constitution. Second, by an ill-advised constitutional amendment (the 16th—graduated income tax) which confers upon Congress the power to confiscate all of the income from private property and all of the fruits of the individual citizen's labor, without limitation. Third, by judicial decisions of questionable jurisdiction, rationalized by the so-called New Social Doctrine. Fourth, by abdication by Congress of its constitutional authorities and responsibilities in favor of an all-powerful Chief Executive, and fifth, by bribery of the sovereign States with 'handouts' from the Federal Government which are financed by tax extortions from the States' own citizens. Concurrently, the States are required to sanction an ever-increasing surrender of power to the Government centralized in Washington."

In alining myself with these fundamental beliefs as expressed by ACA and in evaluating the effectiveness of our Constitution as a political instrument designed to provide a "government of laws, not of men," I was pleased to recall the statement of the great British Prime Minister, William E. Gladstone, in 1878, that "the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The seven guidelines on which ACA bases its index in evaluating congressional votes, and to which I wholeheartedly subscribe are: For safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government; for sound money and against inflation; for the private competitive market and against government interference; for local self-government and against central government intervention; for private ownership and against Government ownership; for individual liberty and against coercion; for National sovereignty.

My concern, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen of this land, rests in the fact that I unabashedly am seeking to preserve three things, the most constructive theses I know, in order to maintain the society which I inherited and which, God willing, we will preserve and pass on to our children.

These three concepts are first, capitalism. I am for the profit motive, unapologetic, unashamedly, a capitalist. Second, preserving the sovereignty of the United States. Third, preserving the Republic as a form of government.

For these beliefs, the ACA and others of us subscribing to them, were accused of doing the "Devil's work." It seems almost unnecessary that we had to take the floor of the House to answer the charges as it is almost certain that the thinking American people would laugh them to scorn. I hope the debate this week was not merely a rebuttal of baseless charges, but the beginning of a determined fight by conservatives to preserve the principles for which we stand, a fight which will be conducted in the Congress, in forums across the land, and at the polls.

LIBERAL PROGRAM SEEKS OPPOSITE GOALS

Recognized spokesman organization for the liberal point of view in America is the ADA. It is proper, therefore, to point out what the liberal organization believes. My research shows they believe that it is possible for a police state to be obedient to the popular will; that the apparatus of such a state can be so affected by benevolence that it can produce—through such coercive measures as compulsory union membership, enforce fraternization, a confiscatory share-the-wealth tax system and a strong centralized bureaucracy—a guaranteed annual wage for everybody, complete freedom from fear, want, and anxiety for all, and total economic welfare from the cradle to the grave for the entire populace. Before it is too late American citizens should compare these platforms, ADA, Socialist, Communist to each other and the ACA.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Results of the Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we submitted 10 questions to some 16,000 of our constituents who are on a monthly mailing list with the following results:

RESULTS OF THE OPINION POLL

Questions	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps?	25.2	61.6	13.2
2. Do you favor a drastic cut in foreign aid?	79.2	15.3	5.5
3. Do you favor increase in social security tax to provide hospitalization for all?	21.3	69.8	8.9
4. Do you favor a tax cut without corresponding reduction in Federal appropriations?	12.1	82.0	5.9
5. Do you favor several hundred million dollars Federal aid for local rapid transit systems?	16.2	75.6	8.2
6. Do you favor an increase in Federal debt limit?	8.1	85.9	6.0
7. Should we trade with Communist countries?	18.0	70.5	11.5
8. Should our payments to the United Nations be limited to our just share?	88.6	8.0	3.4
9. Are you satisfied with U.S. handling of Cuban affairs?	10.5	80.4	9.1
10. Should the State Department be investigated?	60.4	17.9	21.7

Also, the Advance-Star, of Burlingame, Calif., published the same questions requesting that their readers clip the poll and return it to the newspaper office. This was to be a poll separate and apart from our mailing list. This poll showed the following results as published in the Green Sheet of the Advance-Star:

Questions	Answer	Percent
1. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps?	No	50
2. Do you favor a drastic cut in foreign aid?	Yes	80
3. Do you favor increase in social security tax to provide hospitalization for all?	No	66
4. Do you favor a tax cut without corresponding reduction in Federal appropriations?	No	77
5. Do you favor several hundred million dollars Federal aid for local rapid transit systems?	No	70
6. Do you favor an increase in Federal debt limit?	No	82
7. Should we trade with Communist countries?	No	67
8. Should our payments to the United Nations be limited to our just share?	Yes	87
9. Are you satisfied with United States handling of Cuban affairs?	No	74
10. Should the State Department be investigated?	Yes	65

The Carney Hospital of Boston: 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1963, 100 years of progress in patient care will be celebrated by Carney Hospital in Boston, Mass.

Crumbling records from the hospital's archives show that on the morning of June 9, 1863, precisely a century ago, the first patient, a housemaid named Ann Mallon, was admitted to Boston's newest but most modest hospital, a converted framehouse equipped with 40 brass beds. Carney was the first Catholic hospital in New England.

Today, after serving over 300,000 patients and providing close to 3,500,000 treatments for outpatients and accident patients, Carney is a 318-bed general hospital, housed in a complex of new buildings in Dorchester, Mass.

The hospital's founder, Andrew Carney, came to America from Ireland in 1794 at the age of 22 and prospered as a tailor and merchant.

Following the Irish famines of the early 19th century when a great many impoverished Catholic immigrants arrived in Boston, creating a need for good medical care, Carney decided to build a Catholic hospital.

To help establish the hospital he sought the assistance of Sister Ann Alexis of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul who had been working in Boston since 1832.

Early in 1863, Mr. Carney purchased for $13,500 the J. Hall Howe estate on the southwestern slope of Dorchester Heights in South Boston close to the entrenchments erected by George Washington to compel the evacuation of the British during the Revolutionary War. Two years after the hospital opened, it was able to care for 175 wounded soldiers returning from the Civil War.

Before his death in 1864, Andrew Carney donated a total of $75,000 to his hospital. But because these funds were used for capital expenses, the task of maintaining the hospital was assumed by the Sisters of Charity. The history of the hospital has been filled with financial crises. During the early years the sisters were often forced to beg in the streets of Boston to keep the hospital going.

In spite of the hospital's chronically poor financial position, high standards of patient care have always been maintained and there have been instances of true greatness in medicine and surgery.

It was at the hospital in 1882 that Dr. John Homans performed his early ovariectomies and thus opened up the field of abdominal surgery and gave the hospital and himself an international reputation.

Dr. Henry I. Bowditch was the pioneer of New England in treatment of diseases of the thorax and in pleurisy with effusion. It was Dr. Bowditch who introduced the practice of withdrawing the fluid from the thoracic cavity by the process of aspiration or thoracentesis.

Rubber gloves were used in the operating room at Carney for the first time in Boston by Dr. Frederick W. Johnson. For his eccentricity, Dr. Johnson was dubbed by his contemporaries as the "Dude from Back Bay."

The first cervical cesarean operation in New England was performed by Dr. Louis Phaneuf. Up to that time it was almost always fatal for a woman to have two or more cesarean sections.

Faithful to the Andrew Carney stipulation that the hospital, "be used by the Sisters of Charity where the sick without distinction of creed, color, or nation shall be received and cared for," Carney has traditionally provided medical care for anyone who needed it, regardless of his race, religion, or financial situation, and has responded to every demand of epidemic, war, and disaster.

In 1898, casualties from the Spanish-American War arrived in Boston aboard the steamer *Lewiston* and were taken to Carney for treatment. Because the hospital was crowded at the time, tents were pitched on the hospital grounds and some of the sisters gave up their own rooms to make provisions for the wounded soldiers and sailors.

In 1918, an influenza epidemic struck the city and Carney cared for over 600 victims. Later that year, the whole hospital was offered to the War Department for the care of wounded servicemen returning from World War I.

At the conclusion of the Second World War, the hospital was old and the facilities outmoded. The buildings were held together by the sheer determination of the Sisters of Charity and the hospital's inventive maintenance men. After an intensive investigation, it was decided to rebuild rather than renovate.

His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, sounded the cry, "Save the Carney Hospital," and Bostonians of every race and creed responded to his appeal.

The new hospital became a reality in November of 1953. In its magnificent new buildings, the hospital has been able to sharply increase its services to the sick. Last year the hospital cared for over 12,000 inpatients and gave 33,000 treatments to outpatients and accident patients.

Since the new hospital was built, two wings have been added. The first wing constructed in 1956 and named for Richard Cardinal Cushing, contains quarters for house doctors and an auditorium. The second wing, housing the hospital's research program, was built 2 years ago.

Carney is a teaching hospital of Tufts University Medical School, operates its own schools of anesthesia and medical technology and is a sponsoring hospital of the Catherine Laboure School of Nursing.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the original Carney and the 10th anniversary of the new hospital.

The history—the trials and financial difficulties of Carney Hospital during the past 100 years—is a remarkable story in itself, as well as the story of the various sister administrators, and other sisters assigned to this hospital.

As was well said on the occasion of its golden anniversary on June 9, 1913, that "one can realize the enormity of this undertaking—with no endowment—and the struggle which it entailed."

It was due to the dedicated Sisters of Charity, who have served Carney Hospital during its first 100 years, that this hospital has been able to survive, prosper, and grow; and loyally supporting these good sisters were countless of generous friends.

However, without the ardor of the Sisters of Charity and those sisters who served, Carney Hospital could not have survived.

As was well said again, 50 years ago, worthy of repeating now, "Had the motive of this work been one of gain or otherwise, merely human failure would, without doubt, have been the outcome; but, because devotion to the cause of suffering humanity was the underlying principle, it claimed the cooperation of generous-hearted people, and the blessing of God rested upon the hospital," and I might well include the sisters of today and yesterday.

With the blessing of God, Carney Hospital and the Sisters of Charity can look forward with faith and confidence in serving God, mankind, country, and suffering humanity, for the next 100 years of the existence of Carney Hospital.

Equal Rights for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. **ROYBAL**. Mr. Speaker, who can forget that stirring phrase, "To show the world that democracy really can compete?"

This is how America's latest astronaut, Maj. Gordon Cooper, emphasized the urgent need for success in our national space program.

And now Congress is finally beginning to realize how much more important is our success in the struggle to secure equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans regardless of race, creed, or color.

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

President Kennedy has characterized this struggle as being "in the highest traditions of American freedom," and has called for faster congressional action on a series of wide-ranging legislative proposals in the civil rights field.

Prospects are now much brighter for favorable congressional action this year on the President's major proposals: First, to promote equal voting rights for all citizens in Federal elections; second, to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts in the process of desegregating their facilities; third, to extend the Civil Rights Commission another 4 years; fourth, to authorize the Government to initiate court action against discrimination in education; and fifth, to outlaw discrimination in public facilities and public accommodations.

INTERNATIONAL REPERCUSSIONS

No one will dispute that we are in a life and death competition with the forces of international communism. We must compete, and we must win, for the freedom-loving peoples of the world look to us for leadership, and for inspiration and guidance in the maintenance of human dignity and individual worth.

When we fail, as we have at Little Rock, at Oxford, and more recently at Birmingham, our voice in international affairs is muted, our friends are embarrassed, and our enemies take heart from our failure.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS

On this 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is only too apparent that we have a long way to go before every American is guaranteed equal rights and equal opportunities in education, in employment, in voting, in housing, in the administration of justice, in the use of public facilities, and in equal access to public accommodations.

As Vice President Johnson declared only last week:

> Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact.

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM

The mounting crescendo of sit-ins, stand-ins, kneel-ins, freedom walks, and other racial demonstrations occurring across the country is, in many respects, an extremely healthy sign.

To me, it indicates that the spirit of freedom is as much alive today as it was on that September day in 1787 when the framers of our Constitution joined together "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty" for themselves and for us, their posterity.

TRAGICALLY SLOW

If it is actually a self-evident truth, as the Declaration of Independence unmistakably asserts, that all men are created equal, and further, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, then the United States has been tragically slow in making this 187-year-old doctrine a reality for millions of American citizens.

Nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that public schools must be integrated with all deliberate speed, less than one-half of 1 percent of all Negro pupils in the Deep South attend desegregated classrooms. And the absence of segregation laws in the North, Midwest, and West does not produce school integration.

ALABAMA WISDOM

However, in a most encouraging development—in view of the recent Federal court order requiring admission of two Negro students to the University of Alabama—President Frank Rose pledged that the university "will maintain its dignity, its integrity, and our students will walk as honorable men and women."

Then he offered a quotation that citizens and community leaders throughout the United States might well ponder:

> Great economic and social forces flow like a tide over half-conscious people. The wise are those who foresee the coming events and seek to shape their institutions and mold the thinking of the people in accordance with the most constructive change.

A CONTINUING REVOLUTION

The founders of this country did not for a minute think they had fashioned a perfect instrument of government that would never require change. In fact, they specifically provided a multitude of constitutional means whereby the laws and customs of the country could be brought up to date.

They gave us a flexible instrument that would adapt itself to the times and not break under the stresses and strains that were bound to come.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Now is the time for Americans in all walks of life to join in a noble crusade that will rid this country, once and for all, of the poison of racial and minority group discrimination.

We cannot rest our efforts until the phrase "second-class citizen" is banished from our vocabulary, and the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality is fulfilled for all Americans.

SENATE

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, who amidst the shifting sands of time standest sure, and whose throne is forever steadfast though often obscured by earthborne clouds, from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God.

O Thou light that followest all our way, we would yield to Thee the flickering torch of our doubts, our fears, our willfulness, and our moral failure.

At this high altar in the temple of public stewardship, we thank Thee that daily we may find:

A little place of mystic grace,
  Of self and sin swept bare,
Where we may look upon Thy face
  And talk to Thee in prayer.

Hear the prayer we bring, that we may maintain in ourselves fidelity to our possible best, knowing that in such testing days as these, of those to whom much has been given, much will be required. Lift us to greatness to match these days. In Thy providence may this dear land of our hope and prayer, with all its privilege and power, be the quarry whence shall be fashioned the white stones of a new order whose alabaster cities shall gleam undimmed by human want and woe.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 28, 1963, and Friday, May 31, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Francis E. Walter, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Hays, Mr. Zablocki, Mrs. Kelly, Mr. Adair, and Mr. Mailliard were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 28, 1963,

On May 29, 1963, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; and

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report by National Aeronautics and Space Administration on Construction of Building at University of Michigan

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a building at the University of Michigan, to be used for space research; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Reports on Number of Officers on Duty With Headquarters, Department of the Army, and Army General Staff

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff, as of March 31, 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, To Provide Gold Star Lapel Buttons for Certain Relatives of Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incident (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Transfer of Fireboat to the Paid Firemen's Association, Inc., Mount Vernon Fire Department, Mount Vernon, Wash.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of a fireboat to the Paid Firemen's Association, Inc., Mount Vernon Fire Department, Mount Vernon, Wash.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Civil Air Patrol, Inc.

A letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, Inc., Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Securities Acts Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Federal Power Act To Prohibit Abandonment of Certain Facilities and Service

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Authorization for Certain Personnel of the U.S. Government To Accept and Wear Decorations

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Problems Associated With the Statutory Requirement for Design of the Interstate System To Accommodate Traffic Forecast for the Year 1975

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on problems associated with the statutory requirement for design of the Interstate System to accommodate traffic forecast for the year 1975, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Ineffective Utilization of Supply Items Resulting From Deficiencies in the Federal Catalog System Within the Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the ineffective utilization of supply items resulting from deficiencies in the Federal catalog system within the Department of Defense, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Substantial Amounts of Little-Used Nontactical Construction Equipment Being Held on Okinawa by the Military Services

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on substantial amounts of little-used nontactical construction equipment being held on Okinawa by the military services, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on the Ineffective Programing, Delivery, and Utilization of Aircraft and Related Equipment Furnished to the Portuguese Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the ineffective programing, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Portuguese Air Force under the military assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred Because of Delay of the Army in Equipping M-151 Utility Trucks With Necessary Fixtures

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred because of delay of the Army in equipping M-151 utility trucks with necessary fixtures to facilitate use in airborne operations, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Cancellation of Irrigation Charges Against Non-Indian-Owned Lands Under the Wind River Indian Irrigation Project, Wyoming

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Act Relating to Establishment of a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Improvement of Judicial Procedures for Serving Certain Documents

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence and proving documents in litigation with international aspects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend and clarify existing inspection and investigative powers, require a premarketing showing of the safety of cosmetics, assure the safety, efficacy, and reliability of therapeutic, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices, improve the statutory coordination between that act and the biological-drug provisions of the Public Health Service Act, provide for cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Sec. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission,' and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Passed by the assembly, February 12, 1963.

"——— ———,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"Nathan T. Hurst,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"Passed by the Senate, January 31, 1963.

"Paul Lasalt,
"President of the Senate.
"Leslie H. Armstrong,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 16

"To His Excellency, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"1. That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary to, placement of the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities;

"2. That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation suspending the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), with respect to the intercoastal transportation of lumber;

"3. The secretary of state shall send copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the

United States, and to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

“Adopted by house April 3, 1963. Readopted by house May 15, 1963.

“CECIL L. EDWARDS,
“Chief Clerk of House.
“CLARENCE BARTON,
“Speaker of House.

“Adopted by senate May 13, 1963.

“BEN MUSA,
“President of Senate.”

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

SENATE MEMORIAL 756

“Memorial to the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture urging that the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, make available rehabilitation loans for the purpose of refinancing the obligations of citrus growers in Florida counties declared disaster areas due to the freeze of December 1962

“Whereas 34 Florida counties have been declared disaster areas due to severe crop losses caused by the December 1962 freeze; and

“Whereas citrus growers in this area direly need some means of refinancing loans previously made and still unpaid, said loans having been secured from local lending agencies on short terms and at higher interest rates than those charged by the Farmers Home Administration; and

“Whereas the present program permits the Farmers Home Administration to secure a moratorium on payments of principal only and such obligations continue to require capital to pay the 6 percent annual interest thereupon; and

“Whereas the restoration to full productivity of citrus groves sustaining tree damage from freeze entails a number of years of effort and the investment of substantial sums without immediate returns thereupon; and

“Whereas Florida Citrus Mutual, a citrus growers cooperative organized under the laws of the State of Florida for the promotion of citrus production and sales, has estimated that tree damage results in 53 percent reduction in citrus production in affected areas, with some counties sustaining a loss of as much as 95 percent of their productive capacities due to trees killed or damaged by the freeze; and

“Whereas present policies of the Department of Agriculture require that revolving funds established to finance rehabilitation loans be kept as liquid as possible, and thus makes them unavailable for refinancing purposes; and

“Whereas alteration of such policies would aid immeasurably in rehabilitating the Florida citrus industry: Now, therefore, be it

“Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture are requested to take all actions needful to provide for a relaxation of restrictions on Farmers Home Administration rehabilitation loans so that such loans may be made available for the refinancing of first and second mortgages on citrus groves in the State of Florida within the declared disaster areas resulting from the 1962 freeze; and be it further

“Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

“Resolved, That this resolution shall be spread upon the journals of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, and released to the various news media of the State.

“Attest:

“TOM ADAMS,
“Secretary of State.”

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works:

“SENATE MEMORIAL 163

“Memorial to the Congress of the United States to authorize the extension of Interstate Highway 75 from Tampa via Bradenton, Sarasota, Venice, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, and Naples to Miami, Fla.

“Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

“Whereas no provisions were made to link Tampa, Fla., with Miami, Fla., the two most populous and fastest growing areas in our State; and

“Whereas Cuba is now a vast fortress under Communist domination, and Russian troops are now located only 90 miles from our shore; and

“Whereas critical unrest exists in many areas of Latin America, and a limited-access highway in southwest Florida is essential for the movement of troops and equipment; and

“Whereas the Communist threat further emphasizes the need for such a road for the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of our citizens in case of atomic attack; and

“Whereas authorization of the ‘missing link’ between Tampa and Miami in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways will relieve the dangerous bumper-to-bumper congestion on existing roads and is important to our economy, agriculture, industry, and tourism; Now, therefore, be it

“Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to authorize the extension of Interstate Highway 75 from Tampa, Fla., via Bradenton, Sarasota, Venice, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, and Naples to Miami, Fla.; and be it further

“Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; and to the Secretary of Commerce.

“Attest:

“TOM ADAMS,
“Secretary of State.”

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

“SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

“Concurrent resolution to commend Louisiana’s role with respect to mentally retarded children

“Whereas mentally retarded children have long been the concern of the humanitarians and of those interested in the well-being and happiness of mankind; and

“Whereas Louisiana has been a pioneer in the field of research with respect to the mentally retarded child and a forerunner in making adequate provision for the care of such children; and

“Whereas Louisiana has shown both foresight and humanitarianism in this field and has been the leading State therein; and

“Whereas the programs adopted in this State have set the example for other States and have been reviewed and followed by States now entering this important field; and

“Whereas it is only appropriate that there should be legislative recognition of the foresight and the humanitarianism of the State of Louisiana in foreseeing the needs in the field of mentally retarded children and in setting an exemplary pattern to be followed by the other States: Therefore, be it

“Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby commend all of those in the State of Louisiana who played significant roles in providing for retarded children and who by their foresight were the forerunners in this field and have set the example to be followed by other States; and be it further

“Resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Governor of Louisiana, the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

“______ ______,
“Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
“______ ______,
“Speaker of the House of Representatives.”

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

“HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

“Resolution relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

“Whereas at the 2d session of the 87th Congress of the United States, begun and held at the city of Washington on Wednesday, the 10th day of January, 1962, it was resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, within 7 years from the date of its submission, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution, viz:

“ ‘ARTICLE—

“ ‘SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

“ ‘SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.’: Therefore be it

“Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 122d General Assembly of the State of Delaware, the Senate concurring therein:

“SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Delaware and shall be to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution of the United States.

“SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and concurrent resolution shall be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C.

“SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby directed, to deliver to the said Governor certified copies of this resolution at their earliest convenience.”

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

“RESOLUTION 7

“Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to end the causes of unemployment in the iron ore industry in the State of Minnesota

“Whereas imports of iron ore produced in areas outside the United States are supplanting in U.S. markets ore produced in mines located in the United States, resulting in the unemployment of American iron miners;

"Whereas sale by integrated steel companies of iron ore mined by them in foreign countries, and not needed for their steel production, supplants ore produced by American independent, nonintegrated ore producers, endangering the survival in business of such independent producers, and further resulting in unemployment of American iron miners;

"Whereas agencies of the Federal Government have been giving financial assistance to development of iron ore mining in areas outside the United States, further resulting in unemployment of American iron miners;

"Whereas shipping rates add to the cost of marketing Minnesota iron ore, which may affect unemployment of American iron miners;

"Whereas the widespread unemployment of American iron miners, and the hardship such unemployment raises, requires immediate Federal action: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*, That the Congress of the United States is requested to take all necessary steps to stop the further unemployment of American iron miners, including:

"1. Restricting importation of foreign ores, in a manner similar to restrictions now imposed on foreign petroleum, to a level which would supplement but not supplant domestic production in U.S. markets;

"2. Preventing integrated steel companies from selling their excess incremental iron ore mined in foreign countries;

"3. Ending financial assistance by agencies of the Federal Government for development of iron mining in foreign countries;

"4. Determining the effect of transportation rates on the sale of Minnesota iron ore; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"H. Duxburgh,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives*.
"Paul Keith,
"*President of the Senate*".

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Resolution relating to Federal legislation for the control of barbiturates and amphetamines

"Whereas, the interstate traffic in barbiturates and amphetamines is increasing and the form in which they are consumed renders the determination of their place of origin ordinarily impossible; and

"Whereas, investigation by the law enforcement agencies has revealed that heroin users cut off from their normal sources of illegal supply are turning with increasing frequency to the use of these drugs, and in particular methedrine which is known to produce violent and dangerous reaction, including delusions and hallucinations; and

"Whereas, under present systems of control it is both cheaper and easier to obtain these drugs to satisfy this morbid and depraved habit to the great injury of both the addicted user and society as a whole; and

"Whereas, there is an ever increasing use of these preparations especially among the youths of the United States, and their use opens the door to the use of marijuana, heroin and other narcotics; and

"Whereas, there is great and urgent need for Federal legislation controlling the interstate traffic in these preparations: now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to amend United States law to protect the health and public welfare of the United States by providing for legislation similar in form to that contained in Senate bill 1939, 87th Congress, 1st session, which controls the compounding, processing, and distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Resolution relative to Federal aid to schools

"Whereas the 81st Congress in recognition of the responsibility of the United States for the impact which certain Federal activities have on local educational agencies in the various States and areas in which such activities are carried on, declared it a policy of the United States to provide financial assistance in the form of construction aid and Federal payments as payments in lieu of taxes, pursuant to the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874; and

"Whereas Congress in recognition of this continuing burden of Federal activities on local educational facilities and the resulting financial drain, has seen fit to continue this program of aid by amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874; and

"Whereas these programs assist districts in which local revenues for schools have been reduced due to the acquisition of real property by the United States, districts which provide education for children living on Federal property or whose parents are employed on Federal property, and districts experiencing a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance because of Federal activities; and

"Whereas the conditions and problems created by Federal activities which constrained Congress to originally grant Federal aid to education, have been ameliorated in some degree but have not been eliminated; and

"Whereas because of its strategic geographic location at the gateway to the Pacific Ocean and the Far East, and because of its diverse climate and topography which is desirable to the Armed Forces, and because of its large and progressive industrial facilities which are able to manufacture any item for national defense, California is particularly affected by Federal activities and the resulting impact on educational facilities; and

"Whereas this program of aid which originated under Public Laws 874 and 815 of the 81st Congress and continued by subsequent amendments will expire on June 30, 1963, unless renewed by amendment and because this Federal aid is imperative to maintenance of educational standards: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to continue the vitally needed programs of assistance to public education in Public Laws 815 and 874 by amending the pertinent provisions in the present law to extend it beyond the June 30, 1963, expiration date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Resolution, relating to the growth of vegetation on levees

"Whereas structures and facilities constructed by the United States for local flood protection are maintained under rules adopted by the Secretary of the Army (pt. 208 of title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations); and

"Whereas these rules prescribe general standards which apply on a nationwide basis without regard to peculiar local problems; and

"Whereas these rules contain a general prohibition against brush, trees, and wild growth on project levees; and

"Whereas the network of waterways formed by the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and Deltas has been made possible by a unique system of levees and presents special problems of maintenance peculiar to that system only and which constitutes an important recreation area, as well as flood protection facilities for the people of California; and

"Whereas levees devoid of trees, brush, and wild growth provide only minimum recreation values; and

"Whereas the State of California is endeavoring to develop a levee maintenance program that will effectively serve both flood control and recreation values; and

"Where the State of California and private interests are participating in levee construction and maintenance for flood control purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Army to authorize the U.S. Corps of Engineers to participate with the State in a series of experiments to determine whether present standards can be modified to permit controlled vegetation on levees to meet the multiple uses applicable to both flood prevention and recreation interests; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in Congress, and to the Secretary of the Army."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Resolution, relative to excluding California State employees from the Hatch Act (Hatch Political Activities Act of Aug. 2, 1939, as amended)

"Whereas while the Legislature of the State of California is in hearty agreement with the well-established principle that public employees should not engage in activities which are inconsistent, incompatible, or in conflict with their official duties and functions as representatives of their public agency, it is also the belief of this body that it is necessary that we be vigilant that in the guise of controlling such activities we do not infringe upon the rights of individuals or unduly impede their participation in citizenship activities; and

"Whereas the Federal Hatch Act (Hatch Political Activities Act of Aug. 2, 1939, as amended), among other things, prohibits all California State employees whose positions are financed in whole or in part by funds from Federal sources from participating in political activities; and

"Whereas this act is designed primarily to prevent persons in political positions from applying undue pressure on public employees to be politically active on a partisan basis; and

"Whereas the provisions of article XXIV of the California constitution and the various restrictions upon the activities of public employees contained in the California statutes effectively meet the evil at which the Hatch Act is aimed insofar as employees of the State of California are concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress, and the Civil Service Commission of the United States to exclude the employees of the State of California from the operation of the Federal Hatch Act; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61

"Resolution relative to the observance of the centennial of Gettysburg

"Whereas November 19, 1963, will mark the 100th anniversary of the dedication at Gettysburg, Pa., of a national cemetery upon a portion of a great battlefield of the American Civil War, 1861–65, and recalls the occasion of the delivery by President Abraham Lincoln of what has become known to posterity as the Gettysburg Address; and

"Whereas in a Nation now happily reunited, the wounds and ravages of a civil war have been overcome and today all sections of the United States of America comprise one united people and country; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, and particularly the younger generation of our citizens, should be reminded of the effect and importance of the great fundamental principles expressed in the Gettysburg Address; and

"Whereas the California Civil War Centennial Commission is dedicated to the commemoration of the centennial in California of the great War Between the States and the commission has endorsed the observance of the centenary of the Gettysburg Address and events related thereto: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, the Assembly thereof concurring,* That the Governor of the State of California is respectfully urged to proclaim Tuesday, November 19, 1963, as Gettysburg Address Centennial Day; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Governor of the State of California is respectfully requested to proclaim the week of November 17, 1963, as Gettysburg Centennial Week for attention in the schools, homes, churches, and public assemblages in California; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the California State Board of Education is urged to take appropriate recognition of November 19, 1963, sufficiently in advance of that date, to the end that all educational leaders, officials, teachers, and pupils may become increasingly aware of the lasting significance of the great events at Gettysburg 100 years ago; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, the President, and the Vice President, respectively, of the United States of American, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the chairman of the California Civil War Centennial Commission, the Executive Director of the United States Civil War Centennial Commission, the chairman of the State board of education, and the chairman of each county board of supervisors within this State."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the county of Union civil defense and disaster control, of Scotch Plains, N.J., signed by Jack R. Karel, relating to civil defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, recommending development of electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and Upper St. John River, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE), on May 27, 1963, p. 9413, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS MOTOR CARRIERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Motor Carriers Association at a meeting of its board of directors in Topeka, on May 16, 1963, unanimously approved a resolution regarding pending legislation in Congress, H.R. 4700 and S. 1061.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution as referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS MOTOR CARRIERS ASSOCIATION

The backbone of the development of this country's whole economic life has been the equality and relativity of freight rates. For almost 75 years, the Congress of the United States wisely has charged the Interstate Commerce Commission with the responsibility for the regulation of transportation rates and charges governing interstate commerce.

Rail-sponsored proposals now before the Congress (identified as H.R. 4700 and S. 1061) would strip the Interstate Commerce Commission of its minimum rate power with respect to bulk commodities and agricultural products.

The Kansas Motor Carriers Association, representing the highway transportation industry in this State and speaking in behalf of the communities of Kansas, is flatly opposed to these measures.

Passage of H.R. 4700 and S. 1061 would eliminate the ICC's authority to regulate minimum rates on commodities which constitute 70 percent of rail tonnage. The rails have admitted that they would support deregulation of the remaining 30 percent of what they haul in a short time.

The motor carrier industry's' opposition to these measures is based on the following facts:

1. There is no crisis in transportation. The railroads are in excellent financial condition, as evidenced by their own financial reports. A crisis will be created if this legislation passes.

2. Elimination of minimum rate controls would be the signal for ruinous rate wars. The Interstate Commerce Commission itself has reaffirmed its opposition to removal of the minimum rate power.

3. Discrimination between large and small shippers, and between large and small communities, would become rampant. In a State such as Kansas, with many small communities and small shippers, the effects would be disastrous.

4. The pending legislation would leave the ICC with the responsibility for dealing with discrimination, preference, and prejudice—but without the necessary authority.

5. The railroads would be turned loose from antitrust restrictions. Even if all the antitrust laws were applied fully, however, competitors of the railroads would be irreparably damaged before remedial action could occur.

6. Since railroad rates on bulk and agricultural commodities already are the most depressed in the rail rate structure (frequently yielding less than out-of-pocket cost), simple logic defies advertised savings of "billions" in further rate cuts.

The motor carrier industry firmly believes that what the railroads really seek is a right to destroy. The financial ills of the railroads can be traced to two principal factors—unprofitable passenger service and heavy investment in obsolete facilities. The issues at stake in H.R. 4700 and S. 1061 would not improve these rail problem areas.

The Kansas Motor Carriers Association respectfully requests that members of the Kansas congressional delegation oppose H.R. 4700 and S. 1061 in the interest of the citizens of Kansas. The economy of this State could not survive the results of this legislation.

We direct attention also to the fact that President Kennedy, in his transportation statement of March 5, 1963, recommended removal of existing exemptions as an acceptable alternative to what the railroads advocate.

Further, it would seem appropriate that Congress adopt Senate Resolution 136, introduced by Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana. This resolution would establish a special committee to study railroad mergers and to determine the true financial position and structure of the railroads.

We believe it is in the national interest that an investigation be undertaken as soon as possible and that the true facts of the railroad financial situation be established. Congress and the public then can determine whether changes should be made in a system which has produced the most efficient transportation industry in the world today.

Attest:

J. R. HALLADAY,
Managing Director and Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1194. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 204).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 206).

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE CASE OF ARIZONA VERSUS CALIFORNIA, ET AL.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 150) authorizing the printing as a Senate document the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the State of Arizona versus the State of California, et al., which was placed on the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, there is at the desk a resolution which today has been reported favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, rendered on June 3, 1963, in the case of the State of Arizona, versus the State of California, et al.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150) was considered and agreed to.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE STUDY ENTITLED "PROBLEMS AND TRENDS IN ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP—II"

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 152) to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a staff study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II", prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that six thousand additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1642. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kennenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1644. A bill to provide for the reduction of the basis of representation of States denying or abridging the right of its citizens to vote, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of Shirley M. Simpson Lehnert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1646. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Steigel De Pravda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1647. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1648. A bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, to provide for the indemnification of certain persons suffering injury or loss as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, and for other purposes; and

S. 1649. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McIntyre, and Mr. Beall):

S. 1650. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1651. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Engle when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Clark):

S. 1652. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Ante Cibilic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of Emma M. Ratmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1655. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word "owner"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Vincent S. Lukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1657. A bill to incorporate the Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. Goldwater):

S. 1658. A bill to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hayden when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1659. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, in order to insure that the salaries of the police for the National Zoological Park shall equal those of members of the U.S. Park Police having comparable duties; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1660. A bill to permit the State of Texas to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1661. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; and

S. 1662. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S. 1663. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1664. A bill to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1665. A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Symington):

S. 1666. A bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1667. A bill for the relief of Maria-Asuncion Pernas Fanego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CASE OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, VERSUS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 150) authorizing the printing as a Senate document the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the State of Arizona, versus the State of California, et al., which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when agreed to, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 151) relative to the death of Pope John XXIII, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE STUDY ENTITLED "PROBLEMS AND TRENDS IN ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP—II"

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 152) to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. NEUBERGER (for Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 153) relative to the death of Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when agreed to, which appears under a separate heading.)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in recent days suit was filed in Federal Court in the District of Columbia charging illegal deprivation of the right to vote, and seeking remedy under section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Section 2 provides that any State which denies or abridges the right to vote of any of its citizens shall have its membership in the House of Representatives reduced proportionately.

I make no attempt to prejudge the lawsuit, nor do I intend to discuss its merits.

However, I cite it to call attention to this latest effort to utilize the language of section 2 of the 14th amendment—one of the most ignored sections in our Constitution.

The 14th amendment has been a part of the Constitution since 1868—nearly 100 years.

Yet section 2, which seeks to insure every citizen his right to vote, has never been implemented, despite section 5 of the same amendment, which states:

> Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provision of this article.

As I understand it, the lawsuit—even if successful—would not provide for the mechanics of endorsing section 2.

One proposed means of implementing section 2 is contained in the bill which I have introduced today.

My bill would work in the following manner:

First, establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation, composed of nine members each from the House and Senate.

Second, following each biennial House election, the joint committee would meet to decide whether any State has violated section 2 of the 14th amendment. It would calculate by how much such State's representation should be reduced.

Third, the joint committee would report its findings to Congress by May 1 of the year following the election.

Fourth, Congress would then, through a concurrent resolution, have an opportunity to disapprove the joint committee's findings.

Fifth, should Congress not act to disapprove within 30 calendar days of continuous session, the reduction would go into effect. The reduction would apply to the next Congress and only for that Congress.

Sixth, in no case, would a State's representation be reduced below one.

I would like to point out that any House seats taken away from States would not be lost for that Congress. These seats would be allocated to other States on the basis of population, thus keeping the total number of House seats at 435.

Mr. President, this bill is not completely new to the Senate.

I first introduced it as an amendment to the civil rights legislation before the Senate in 1957.

Subsequently, I have reintroduced it as a bill in each succeeding Congress.

Today our country probably is more conscious of civil rights problems than at any time in recent history.

Yesterday's desires for equal treatment and first class citizenship for all Americans are today's demands.

Hopefully, those demands will be met through the exercise of good will, understanding, and justice and not through violence.

But in any event I think it is becoming clear to all Americans that those demands are going to be met somehow.

Congress has pending before it many suggested new laws in the field of civil rights.

The administration is to present new civil rights proposals to the Congress.

I am sure a number of these laws would be most beneficial if enacted.

What seems rather incredible is that, thus far, we have refused to fully use the laws we already have—in this case the most basic of our laws—the Constitution.

For almost 100 years section 2 of the 14th amendment has been simply a facade with nothing behind it.

This is particularly frustrating, since that section deals with the very foundation of America's strength—the right of its citizens to vote.

The right to vote might be considered a keystone of the civil rights structure.

Once it is insured, and cannot be prevented arbitrarily or capriciously, the other building blocks of a truly free and equal America will fall into place much more swiftly.

It is to bring that day closer that I introduce my bill to carry out the full mandate of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1644) to provide for the reduction of the basis of representation of States denying or abridging the rights of its citizens to vote, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Representation Act of 1963."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation (hereinafter in this part referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than five members shall be members of the same political party.

FUNCTIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee shall, as soon as practicable following the date of each biennial election for Representatives in Congress in the several States as established by section 25 of the Revised Statutes, but not later than May 1 of the year following such election—

(1) determine whether any State has, in violation of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, denied or abridged the right of inhabitants of such State to vote as prescribed in such section since the preceding biennial election for Representatives in Congress;

(2) calculate, in the manner prescribed in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution the number (if any) of

Representatives in Congress which each State shall be then entitled as the result of any such denial or abridgment; and

(3) utilize such services of the United States Commission on Civil Rights and the United States Census Bureau as are necessary to achieve the required determinations and calculations.

(b) The joint committee shall, on or before May 1 of the year following each biennial election for Representatives in Congress, submit to the Congress a statement indicating, with respect to each State, the number (if any) by which such State's Representatives in Congress shall be decreased or increased under section 11(a) for the Congress which commences after the date of such statement. The joint committee shall submit with such statement a full and complete report of the facts upon which such statement is based. A copy of such statement shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TIME CHANGES BECOME EFFECTIVE

SEC. 4. The changes prescribed in such statement shall become effective, with respect to the Congress which commences after the date of submission of such statement, upon the expiration of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date of submission of such statement, but only if between the date of submission and the expiration of such thirty-day period the Congress has not passed a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not approve the statement. For the purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the thirty-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

DISAPPROVAL OF JOINT COMMITTEE'S ACTION

SEC. 5. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) As used in this subsection, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the Two Houses of Conrgess, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not approve the statement relating to representation in the ——— Congress submitted to the Congress by the Joint Committee on Congressional Representation on ———, 19—.", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled.

(c) A resolution with respect to a statement shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same statement shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d)(1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a statement has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such statement which has been referred to the committee.

(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to such statement), and debate hereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to such statement.

(e)(1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a statement, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f)(1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from the committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a statement, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a statement shall be decided without debate.

(g) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a statement, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to such statement, then—

(1) if no resolution of the first House with respect to such statement has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to such statement may be reported or (despite the provisions of paragraph (d)(1)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge; and

(2) if a resolution of the first House with respect to such statement has been referred to committee—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such statement which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such statement had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such statement the resolution from the other House with respect to such statement shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

VACANCIES; SELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 6. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not, except as provided in section 8, affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the members from that House.

POWER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) In carrying out its functions, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall apply in the case of the failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 8. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary, but no statement shall be submitted to the Congress pursuant to subsection (b) of section 3 unless it shall have been agreed to by a majority of the authorized membership of the joint committee.

EXPENSES

SEC. 9 (a) Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the joint committee.

(b) The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE

SEC. 10. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the service, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

NOTICE TO THE STATES OF DECREASES OR INCREASES IN CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

SEC. 11. (a) Effective for the Eighty-eighth Congress and each succeeding Congress, the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for appointment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended, is hereby altered by the number of Representatives shown in the statement submitted for such Congress under subsection (b) of section 3, if such statement has not been disapproved by the Congress as provided in sections 4 and 5. Any change under this subsection in the number of Representatives to which a State is entitled shall be effective only with respect to the Congress for which such statement is submitted.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or if there be no Clerk, such other official of the House of Representatives as the joint committee may designate, within fifteen calendar days, after a statement submitted under subsection (b) of section 3 has become effective, to transmit to the executives of those States whose representation in Congress is altered pursuant to section 2 of the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution and section 22 of the Revised Statutes for the Congress which commences after the date of submission of such statement a certificate specifying the number by which such State's Representatives in Congress decreased or increased for such Congress.

(c) The provisions of subsection (c) of section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for appointment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended, shall be effective with respect to any States whose congressional representation is changed pursuant to the provisions of this part.

(d) No State's representation in the House of Representatives shall be reduced below one Representative.

SEC. 12. Section 22 of the Revised Statutes (Act of February 2, 1872, ch. 11; 2 U.S.C. 6) is hereby repealed.

The summary presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

SUMMARY BY SECTION

Section 2: Establishes a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation, to be composed of nine Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House. No more than five members of the committee from each House to be members of the same political party.

Section 3: Authorizes and directs the joint committee by May 1 following each biennial congressional election to determine whether any State has denied or abridged the rights of its citizens to vote in the preceding election. The joint committee would calculate, in the manner prescribed in section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the number, if any, by which the representation of each State should be increased or decreased. The findings would be reported to the Congress, with a full explanation of the facts on which the findings were made. Any change would affect the Congress commencing after the date of the joint committee statement.

Section 4: Provides that the findings of the joint committee concerning the change of representation would go into effect 30 days after the submission to Congress, unless before the expiration of the 30 days, Congress passes a concurrent resolution expressly disapproving the findings of the joint committee.

Section 5: Establishes rules of procedure should a resolution of disapproval be introduced, including discharge of the committee to which the resolution has been referred and rules of debate on the resolution.

Section 6: Provides for the filling of vacancies on the joint committee and for the internal organization of such committee.

Section 7: Establishes the powers of the joint committee in holding investigations, hearings, and issuing subpenas.

Section 8: Provides that any statement submitted to the Congress by the joint committee under section 3 must be approved by a majority of the joint committee's authorized membership.

Section 9: Provides for the expenses of the joint committee.

Section 10: Provides for clerical and other staff assistance for the joint committee.

Section 11: Sets forth that any change in representation called for in the statement of the joint committee and not disapproved by Congress become effective in the succeeding Congress; but the change would be effective only for the Congress for which the statement was submitted. In no case would a State's representation be reduced below one.

Section 12: Repeals section 22 of the Revised Statutes.

TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region. This measure is the recommendation of President Kennedy submitted to Congress with the formal National Capital Transportation Agency report, the latter required by the Agency Enabling Act of 1960.

In my judgment, there are few matters of deeper concern to the future well being of the Nation's Capital area than an efficient transportation system that meets its main purpose—service to the public. The President's recommendation and the agency report provide a working basis for Congress to consider the Washington metropolitan area's increasingly critical transportation problems.

Mass transportation in the National Capital region has held the attention of the Senate through the last three administrations. The problem is a visible one, since it is laid out before all our eyes at least twice each day. In fact, each of us is a part of the problem—one which will get worse before it gets better.

With each passing day, the Washington metropolitan area population explosion increases. And there are reasons. Few cities in the world can point to the construction of a greater amount of office building space than is going on in Washington, D.C., today.

Washington's downtown daytime population is already the fourth greatest of any city in the Nation. Within 2 miles of this Chamber, during the normal course of a day, 600,000 persons are at work, or here as visitors—more than in any downtown section outside New York, Chicago, or Philadelphia.

Only two metropolitan regions in this hemisphere—Houston and Los Angeles—are expanding with greater rapidity than that which encompasses the Capital of the United States. Between 1940 and 1960, the Washington area expanded by 108 percent, outdistanced only by Houston with 135 percent and Los Angeles with 132.

Forecasters tell us that today's Washington metropolitan area population of 2,200,000 will be 3,400,000 by 1980 and 5 million by the year 2000.

We must provide a system that can be achieved at reasonable cost to the individual, whether the money comes through the fare box or from the gasoline tax pennies that are used to pave the highways—or, in my considered judgment, from a sound, balanced combination of both.

This subject is not new to Congress. In 1955 when the magnitude of the growing transportation problem became agonizingly apparent, the Congress authorized a thoroughfare and mass transportation study. In 1959, a joint congressional Committee on Washington Metropolitan Area Problems was ordered into being by Congress, and I had the honor of serving as its chairman, through 2 years of exhaustive hearings.

Our joint committee's consideration of the problems led to congressional enactment of the National Capital Transportation Agency Act in 1960. Today, the recommendations of that Agency together with the President's views are before Congress for action.

The main issue now is creating a balanced transportation system—a system for moving great numbers of people, a system that will make the greatest use of all forms of transit without detriment to or unrealistic overemphasis upon any single system, and without burdensome new expense to the Government. Those of us who have labored in this area are hopeful that Congress may make some answers this year.

Speaking as the chairman of the Senate committee which will handle this legislation, I express the sincere hope that this transit development subject will not evolve into an adversary proceeding between the prohighway and the antihighway supporters, or between the equally ardent and vocal prorapid transit and antirapid transit proponents. The Washington Evening Star, in its lead editorial of Wednesday, May 29, expressed this view more pointedly, saying:

> There is a very real danger of a knockdown drag-out fight on Capitol Hill between those who think that people will stop driving their cars if a transit system is built, and those who are so equally blind as to think that only automobiles count. Both sides are spoiling for a fight—not alone to win their own points, but to do the other in. If it comes to that, the National Capital will be the loser. Washington needs rapid transit and freeways. Congress must see that it gets them both.

Certainly, what Congress does—and I hope it may be done this year—will determine this Capital area's transportation and traffic pattern for the next 50 years or more. A solution has already been delayed too long.

Therefore, I am hopeful that a cooperative attitude toward a common goal will prevail.

The transportation crisis in the Washington region reflects a problem that is epidemic in every metropolitan region in this country. The difficulty of moving people into, through, and out of American cities, is compounding itself daily.

In its service to the American people, the Congress and the Federal Government have not been found neglectful.

We have measured the American talent, and have found it capable of great achievements in military invention and logistics. We have given the world sound, enlightened, and thoughtful leadership through the perilous reefs of Communist aggression. We have confidence in the ability of our scientists to find ways of getting man into and back from outer space, or even the moon.

To these great world-shaking achievements, we must, and we shall, add discoveries of new and faster ways to get people to and from the cities and their downtown business cores.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter submitting the formal National Capital Transportation Agency report, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1647) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 27, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The transportation needs of the National Capital region have now been under continuous study for 7 years. In July 1959 a 4-year survey concluded that the needs of the Capital required the development of a rapid transit system, in addition to an expanded highway network. Hearings on that proposal in the Congress indicated virtually unanimous agreement with that conclusion. In response to a proposal by President Eisenhower, the Congress enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, which directed the drawing of plans for such a system, and created the National Capital Transportation Agency to perform the task.

On November 1, 1962, in compliance with the 1960 act, the Agency submitted to me its report for transmittal to the Congress. That report recommends a 10-year transit development program, which would provide for the National Capital region an extensive rail rapid transit, commuter rail and express bus system. High-speed and high-capacity trains would connect the Capitol and Union Station by subway with the major Federal and commercial employment centers in downtown Washington, and radial routes would run in several directions into the more densely populated sections of the District and suburbs. A commuter rail route would utilize existing rail facilities into the District, and express bus service would be developed on several freeways and express parkways.

The Agency's proposed transit development program is, in my judgment, both sound and necessary. I am transmitting to the Congress today the Agency's report "Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region" and its "Summary Report on the Transit Development Program." I am also transmitting a bill which would authorize the Agency to proceed with the construction of the system in accordance with the transit development program. I hope that this proposed legislation will receive both prompt and favorable congressional action.

There is no questioning the fact that, as: stated in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, an improved transportation system for the region "is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital." Nor can it be doubted that improved transportation must include a major rapid transit system. The alternatives would be steadily worsening congestion with all that congestion means in losses of time and money, or an enlarged highway and freeway program entailing additional expense, major disruption of persons and businesses, and substantial impairment of the appearance and attractiveness of the city.

Good urban transportation can shape as well as serve urban growth. The year 2000 plan, proposed in 1961 by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, outlines the development of a series of corridors of relatively high-density population radiating from the central city as the most promising method of guiding the economic growth of the National Capital area. The plan assumes that rapid transit will be decisive in the development of these radial corridors. I have recently requested all departments and agencies of the Federal Government to support this plan. Prompt approval by the Congress of the transit development program will encourage efforts already underway by local governments in the region to relate their physical growth forecasts and economic development plans to this corridor concept.

The Agency estimates that it will cost $793 million to construct the proposed system over a 10-year period. While any estimate is subject to modification upon the completion of more detailed engineering, the Agency's figures provide a reasonable basis for authorization of the program.

In accordance with the directives given it in the 1960 act, the Agency has provided so far as possible for payment of system costs by users, with the remaining costs to be distributed among the Federal and local governments of the region. The bulk of the capital costs, which would be ultimately payable from system revenues, would be financed by borrowing from the capital market. The remainder of those costs would be financed by Federal and local grants in the same proportion as that proposed in the national mass transportation program which I have recommended. The Agency has concluded that necessary borrowing can be repaid from fare box revenues within 36 years. Even under adverse circumstances, it seems reasonable to conclude that the borrowing could be repaid within a period of 50 years.

Under the Agency's proposed financial plan grants would be used to begin construction of the system and there would be no recourse to borrowing until 1966. Accordingly, Congress can and should authorize the projected rapid transit system and appropriate funds for the start of its construction without deciding at this time upon the nature of the organization, whether it be a regional compact agency, a Federal agency, or a corporation which would ultimately have responsibility for financing the system and providing for its operation. The 1960 act stated an intent to promote the solution of regional problems through regional compacts, and gave the consent of Congress to negotiations among the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia for a compact creating a regional transportation agency. A suitable regional compact agency with adequate financing power is the most logical organizational framework for this regional program, and I am hopeful that the compact negotiations which are now in progress will reach a successful conclusion.

Meanwhile, the National Capital Transportation Agency should be provided with initial appropriations to begin immediately on the transit development program. In the event a satisfactory regional compact has not been negotiated and approved by the Congress at the time that market borrowing is required, the Agency's proposal for the establishment of a Federal corporation would be appropriate.

The improved transportation system for the National Capital region which is the goal of the 1960 act is not, of course, solely a matter of rapid transit. Rapid transit must be related to, and coordinated with, the movement of people and goods by freeways and parkways, roads and streets. I am keenly aware that there is no single touchstone that will resolve the relative roles of highways and rapid transit facilities in providing for total regional transportation needs, and that wide difference of opinion exists as to the proper course to follow on specific highways and bridges in the National Capital region.

I am convinced that, before all of these problems can be resolved, there is need for a careful reexamination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the transit development program, and the social, economic and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's Capital. I am requesting the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to undertake this reexamination in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies. Such reexamination will, of course, be closely related to the needs and desires of the surrounding jurisdictions. Meanwhile, work can go forward on the very large portions of the highway network that are not in controversy.

In my message to the Congress on the District of Columbia budget I stated that I was withholding from the 1964 fiscal year budget certain highway projects which were in controversy, and that following the review of the National Capital Transportation Agency's report I would transmit appropriate budget amendments. Decisions can be made at this time to proceed with two of these projects, the proposed east leg of the inner loop and the Fort Drive Parkway. No budget amendments are necessary, since these projects can be funded within the total funds already requested in the 1964 budget for the District of Columbia Department of Highways. I have directed the Commissioners to advise the Congress promptly as to the details. Decisions on the appropriate highway facility for the north leg of the inner loop, particularly whether it should be built to interstate standards, should await the outcome of the reexamination which I have outlined above. Since the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge as an interstate facility appears to depend upon the decisions which must be made with respect to the north leg, its construction should likewise be deferred until all the alternatives have been fully reexamined. For similar reasons, no further commitments at this time should be made with respect to the Potomac River Freeway.

In the last analysis, an intelligent decision on any portion of the transportation problems of the National Capital region should be made on the basis of a plan which encompasses both mass transit and highways. One portion of that plan—a modern, high-speed and high-quality rapid transit system—has been tentative. Other plans have reflected the lack of sure knowledge that such a system would be built. The time has now come to answer that question. The transit development program of the National Capital

Transportation Agency presents a carefully conceived and attractive plan. It has commended itself to me, and I hope it will commend itself to the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy, for the establishment of self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Already joining as cosponsors of this bill are the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who for many years has been in the forefront of the home-rule fight here; the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], an outspoken home-rule advocate for many years; the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], who so effectively handled the home-rule bill when it cleared the Senate several years ago; and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who this year is so capably dealing with key legislation for the Nation's Capital City.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week, to permit other interested Senators to join as cosponsors. I sincerely hope my colleagues will join as sponsors of this bill, and thereby will give emphasis to a keystone of democratic government—the right of the governed to choose those who govern.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, home-rule legislation for the District of Columbia is not new to the Senate. Five times in the last 14 years the Senate has passed similar bills, but each time the bill has failed of enactment. The President of the United States is an active supporter of this proposed legislation, just as he was an advocate of home rule for the District when a Member of the House of Representatives and when he was a Member of this body. His support should provide helpful impetus toward enactment of this bill.

Principally, the bill provides for:

First, a locally elected mayor, a seven-member legislative council, and a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives.

Second, full participation by District residents in election campaigns.

Third, a specific formula for annual payment by the Federal Government of its share of the expenses of the District government. As the President states in his message to Congress, such formula "would enable the District government to stabilize its long-range fiscal plans and its tax and borrowing programs."

Fourth, transfer to the District government of certain independent agencies which currently perform essentially municipal functions.

The District council is to be given local legislative power, including taxing and borrowing power, subject to certain restrictions and to the overriding constitutionally granted power of the Congress to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself, under the terms of its exclusive legislative authority over the District of Columbia.

This delegation of authority would relieve the Congress of the task of legislating housekeeping and municipal matters for this city. Since the Federal interest must be protected in Washington, D.C.—the Capital City of every American—the bill provides for a veto by the President of acts passed by the council.

In my years as a member and as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I believe I have learned something about this great city, whose problems are multiplied manifold by the inability of the local residents to govern themselves.

Washington, D.C., actually has dual roles. First and foremost, it is the seat of our Federal Government, a symbol of our great Republic, reflecting the spirit, history, and personality of our country.

Second, Washington is a great American city, with all the problems, increasing as they are, that New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles has. The influx of record populations into urban centers, such as Washington, and the accompanying social upheavals that flow from this urbanization are dramatic evidence of increasingly critical situations.

In my judgment, Washington, D.C., cannot continue to meet its growing needs by the present system of half-way government in which all its housekeeping and municipal legislative problems must be weighed on the national scale by the Congress.

If some form of self-government is right and proper for every other city, town, or hamlet across this land, then is it not equally right and proper for the capital city of that land? The cornerstone of our American way of life is self-government.

I am not wedded to any rigid concept of home rule for the District. However, I do believe that Congress in its wisdom can, and should, hammer out some form of self-government for the three-quarters of a million people who live here.

As a consistent supporter of both national suffrage, as represented by the 23d amendment, and self-government for the District, I do not subscribe to the doctrine that a little democracy is enough for Washington.

Today, the bulk of this city's $250 million-plus annual budget, or 87 cents out of every dollar spent here on local governmental activities, is financed through taxes on local residents. This Nation was founded 185 years ago on a successful crusade against taxation without representation. Is the crusade today in that Nation's Capital city any less right and proper?

Mr. President, it is my intention to schedule early hearings on this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the President's message submitting his home-rule proposal to the Congress, together with the District Commissioners' accompanying letter, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the message and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1650) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The message and letter presented by Mr. BIBLE are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 3, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith for consideration by the Congress a proposed District of Columbia Charter Act. This bill is designed to reaffirm, at the seat of our National Government, our basic American belief that government should be responsible to the governed. We should no longer delay in restoring to the people of the District a fundamental enjoyed as a matter of course by all other Americans—the right to self-government by the elective process.

The proposed bill is basically the same as the one which I recommended to the 87th Congress. It would authorize (1) a locally elected mayor, a seven-member legislative council and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives; (2) full participation by District residents in election campaigns; (3) a specific formula for annual payment by the Federal Government of its proper share of the expenses of the District government, which will enable the District government to stabilize its long-range fiscal plans and its tax and borrowing programs; and (4) the transfer to the District of certain independent agencies which perform essentially municipal functions closely related to other functions now performed by the District government.

My present proposal also reflects the changes which have been made by Public Law 87–849 in laws dealing with conflicts of interest; reflects certain proposals which I transmitted to the Congress on February 11, 1963, in relation to the Federal payment to the District and the District's borrowing authority; and contains a number of other perfecting changes. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which I am also enclosing, describes the provisions of the draft bill in some detail.

The proposed bill gives full recognition and protection to the substantial interest which the National Government has, and must continue to have, in its Capital City. Not only would the President be authorized to review and disapprove any District legislative action which would adversely affect the Federal interest, but Congress would retain full authority to enact legislation overriding that enacted by the District government.

I strongly believe that enactment of this legislation not only would eliminate a constitutional anomaly which has already persisted much too long, but also would secure for the District more effective governmental organization and management. It would also, and more importantly, place the responsibility for solving local problems where it belongs in the American scheme of government—in the people of the District of Columbia and their elected representatives. I hope that early hearings can be held on the proposed bill and that favorable action by the Congress will follow.

A letter identical to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You submitted to the 87th Congress a proposed District of Columbia Charter Act providing for an elected mayor, an elected Council and an elected nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives. In your District of Columbia budget meassage to the Congress in this session you again urged that the Congress restore to District residents the basic right to local self-government. You pointed out that the urgency of the District's present problems underscores the necessity to place responsibility for dealing with municipal problems in the people of the District themselves, with appropriate provisions to assure continued consideration by the Federal Government of the Federal interest.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia again have the honor to submit a proposed bill to carry out these purposes. An analysis of the proposed bill follows.

The District Council is given local legislative power, including taxing power and borrowing power, within specified limits, but subject to the overriding power of the Congress to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself. This delegation of authority relieves the Congress of the necessity of legislating in respect to matters of particular concern to the District. The Council could, for example, determine how the school system should be administered. It could provide for an elective or an appointive school board, or a department of education with a single administrator.

The fact that the District is the Nation's Capital distinguishes it from every other American city and also calls for special measures to protect the Federal interest from the possibility of a local legislature enacting laws harmful to that interest. The bill therefore provides for review by the President of acts passed by the Council with the power to disapprove any which he is satisfied adversely affects the Federal interest.

THE MAYOR

The mayor is elected for a 4-year term and his compensation is fixed at $20,000. He must be a qualified voter; he must have resided in the District for 3 years prior to nomination; he may not hold any other office for which compensation is paid out of Federal or District funds; and he may not hold any other elective public office. He has the usual administrative and executive powers and duties, including power to disapprove acts of the Council. He is charged with responsibility for administering the financial affairs of the District. The bill provides for a District civil service system and the mayor is authorized to appoint and remove personnel in the executive branch of the District government.

A vacancy in the office of mayor shall be filled at the next general election for which it is possible for candidates to be nominated following the occurrence of such vacancy. A person elected to fill a vacancy holds office for the duration of the unexpired term to which he was elected. Until a vacancy in the office of mayor can be filled by election, the vacancy shall be filled by appointment by the District Council.

After the mayor has been in office for 6 months, the qualified voters may petition for his recall. The petition must be signed by at least 25 percent of the number of voters voting at the last preceding general election and must set forth the reasons for the demand. If a majority of the voters voting on the petition vote to recall, the office of mayor is vacated and is then filled as vacancies caused otherwise are filled.

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

The Council consists of 7 members, 1 from each of 7 wards, and elected at large. The term of office is 2 years. Compensation of Council members is $9,000 per annum except that the chairman's pay is $10,000. To hold office as a member of the Council, a person must be a qualified voter; during the 3 years next preceding the nomination he must have resided in the District; for the year preceding his nomination he must have resided in the ward from which he is nominated; he must hold no other elective public office; and he may not hold any appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds.

Vacancies in the Council are filled by appointment by the mayor.

THE DISTRICT DELEGATE

The Delegate to the House of Representatives is elected for a term of 2 years. His compensation is fixed by Congress in the same manner as Members of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the office is filled by appointment by the mayor, with the advice and consent of the Council, for the unexpired portion of the Delegate's term.

AGENCIES ABOLISHED

The bill abolishes a number of agencies, including the Board of Commissioners, the Board of Education, Zoning Commission, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Armory Board and the National Capital Housing Authority. Their functions are transferred to the Council (except that some functions are transferred to the mayor) for exercise in such manner and by such persons as the Council may direct.

MUNICIPAL COURTS

The Council is given jurisdiction over the municipal courts in all matters pertaining to their organization and composition and to the appointment, qualification, tenure and compensation of the judges.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

The present Board of Elections is continued in office until the current terms of the respective members expire. Their successors are appointed by the mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council.

Each Board member would be paid $1,500 per annum.

The Board's duties include, among others, the maintenance of a permanent registry; the conduct of registrations and elections, and the certification of nominees and the results of elections.

The bill also provides that the Board of Elections shall divide the District into seven wards "as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular, contiguous and compact as possible, and establish voting precincts therein." Within 6 months after each decennial census or any more recent official population census of the District, the Board of Elections is required to redivide the District into seven wards in accordance with the foregoing criteria.

ELECTIONS

Provisions dealing with elections are based on the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 817) which implemented the 23d amendment. Some provisions of the act of August 12, 1955, as amended by the act implementing the 23d amendment have been incorporated in the draft bill either by reference or verbatim.

The Board of Elections is required to conduct the following elections:

1. A primary election in September of even-numbered calendar years to nominate each political party's candidates for elective offices. To vote in this primary, voters must have been registered as affiliated with the party;

2. A general election in November of even-numbered calendar years at which all registered voters, whether or not registered as affiliated with a specific political party, may vote to elect the candidates of the political parties nominated in the September primary and such independent candidates as may have qualified by a nominating petition; and

3. Special elections which may be held under certain conditions and at which voters may vote on bond issues, referenda to repeal acts of the Council, referenda on propositions on which the Council desires a vote of the people, or on the question of recall of the mayor.

In addition to the usual qualifications as to citizenship, mental competence, and nonconviction of a felony, a qualified voter must on the day of any election be at least 18 years old and have resided in the District for the 6-month period immediately preceding the election. Absentee registration and voting is permitted. Persons covered by the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 are permitted to use the Federal post card application for an absentee ballot. Such applications, duly executed and filed, shall be accepted as evidence of registration.

Any candidate desiring to run for nomination for office on the September primary ballot of a political party may do so if he meets the residence and other requirements of the office, is registered as affiliated with the party, files a declaration of candidacy, and pays a nonreturnable filing fee. The winners of each of the party primary elections become the party candidates on the November general election ballot.

An independent candidate wishing to have his name placed on the November general election ballot may qualify by filing a nominating petition signed by a specified number of registered voters and paying the required nonreturnable filing fee. The filing fees and the number of signers required on a petition are as follows:

	Filing fee	*No. of signers*
District Delegate	$200	500
Mayor	200	500
Council members	50	100

In a nominating petition for a Council member all signers must be registered in the ward from which the candidate seeks election.

Each voter is entitled to cast one vote each for delegate and mayor and seven votes for Council members, but not more than one vote for a Council member from each of the seven wards. The form and arrangement of the ballot is determined by the Board of Elections, except that the position on the ballot of the names of candidates for any one office is determined by lot. The Board is required to arrange the ballot so that a voter may, in his discretion, (1) vote for a complete slate of candidates by a single mark, or (2) cast his vote individually for each candidate regardless of party or slate affiliation.

The bill authorizes the Board to close the registry of voters for not more than 30 days before any regular or special election. Provision is also made for handling challenged registrations, ballots, and appeals, and contested, tied, and uncontested elections.

Consistently with the bill's purpose to authorize partisan elections, the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147) is modified so as to permit full participation by Government employees in political campaigns in connection with elections in the District of Columbia under the Charter Act.

BORROWING

The bill authorizes the District to borrow money by the issuance of bonds. The limitation on debt, including debt to the United States under existing law, is fixed at not more than 12 percent of the average assessed value of the real and tangible personal property (including Federal) in the District as of the first day of July of the 10 most recent fiscal years. Bond issues must be approved by the voters except that not exceeding one-sixth of the aforementioned 12 percent limitation may be authorized by the Council without the approval of the voters. For purposes other than construction or acquisition of capital projects connected with highway, water and sanitary sewage works and other revenue-producing projects debt may not exceed one-half of the aforementioned 12 percent limitation.

THE FEDERAL PAYMENT

A specific formula for computing the annual Federal payment toward the expenses of the District government is spelled out. In lieu of the presently authorized payment of $32 million, there is provision for an annual payment computed in accordance with the formula. It is estimated that, under current conditions in the District, the formula would result in an annual payment to the general fund of the District of approximately $53 million. The factors included in the formula are: (1) the taxes lost to the District on real property owned and used exclusively by the Federal Government; (2) the taxes lost to the District on real properties exempted from taxation by special acts of Congress and certain properties exempted under the general tax exemption act of December 24, 1942; (3) the taxes lost to the District on personal property owned and used by the Federal Government (exclusive of objects of art, museum pieces, statuary, and libraries); and (4) an amount equivalent to the business income and related taxes which would be collectible from the Federal Government if it were a private business as measured by the relative numbers of Federal Government employees and employees in private business in the District.

Present arrangements for Federal payment of charges for water and sanitary sewer service are continued.

Your approval of this legislation is most strongly urged, not only because it would relieve the Congress, burdened as it is with grave problems of national and international importance, of the necessity of legislating on matters which are the direct and primary concern of District residents, but also because inherent justice requires that District residents be given the right to participate directly in their local government by electing their governing officials.

The Commissioners recommend that you submit the bill to the Congress with your approval.

Very sincerely yours,

Walter W. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners, D.C.

EMBARGO ON CERTAIN FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1651) to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products, introduced by Mr. Engle (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1498 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word "owner."

This legislation is being introduced at the request of the Department of Justice. According to the Attorney General, the purpose of this bill is to permit only the "owner" of a patent as defined by the Supreme Court to bring suit under section 1498.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Attorney General, dated April 24, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point, as part of my remarks.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1655) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word "owner," introduced by Mr. McClellan, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1963.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate reference a draft bill "To amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to define the word 'owner'."

Subsection (a) of section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, provides for suit against the United States by the owner of a patent used or manufactured by or for the United States without license of the owner. The Court of Claims, which has exclusive jurisdiction of suits under section 1498, has recently interpreted "owner" to include licensees who held no legal title interest in the patents alleged to have been infringed. In other instances the court has permitted licensees to maintain suits by naming the owners of the patents as joint plaintiffs, without their consent.

Permitting suits by licensees without legal title opens the door to multiple suits by multiple licensees under the same patent for the same alleged infringement. Moreover, this would appear to be contrary to the legislative intent of the Congress in enacting the statute, and to the uniform decisions on the point by the Supreme Court.

In the congressional proceedings on the original act of June 25, 1910, it was stated that the measure was intended to waive sovereign immunity as to, and provide a remedy for, only the owners of patents, and also that the bill was not intended to permit suits by licensees under the patents (H. Rept. 1288, 61st Cong.; Congressional Record, June 22, 1910, pp. 8755–85).

The draft bill would amend subsection (a) of section 1498 to define the word "owner" to mean the person who, at the time of the alleged use or manufacture, held legal title to the whole patent, comprising the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention throughout the United States, or an undivided part or share of the whole patent, or the whole patent within and throughout a specified geographic part of the United States. In doing so, it adopts the definition given by the Supreme Court in *Waterman* v. *Mackenzie* (138 U.S. 252, 255–6), *Crown Co.* v. *Nye Tool Works* (261 U.S. 24, 40–41), and other cases cited in those decisions.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, after 11 years of litigation, the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday adjudicated and determined the conflicting water rights between the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River.

We in Arizona are grateful that the Court has now removed all doubt as to our legal right to a fair share of the water of the river. Arizona's water shortage is rapidly becoming critical. It is imperative that we proceed as promptly as possible with construction of the central Arizona project in order to alleviate this critical water shortage.

On February 21, 1950, and again on June 5, 1951, legislation authorizing construction of this project was adopted by the Senate.

On April 18, 1951, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives adopted a resolution that consideration of bills relating to the central Arizona project "be postponed until such time as use of the water in the Lower Colorado River Basin is either adjudicated or binding or mutual agreement as to the use of the water is reached by the States of the Lower Colorado River Basin."

Arizona instituted this litigation in 1952, which culminated in yesterday's Supreme Court decision. Having determined our legal rights, we now ask the Congress to reconsider legislation authorizing our project. I introduce, Mr. President, for myself and for my colleague [Mr. Goldwater], legislation authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of our central Arizona project.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1658) to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hayden (for himself and Mr. Goldwater), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLORADO RIVER WATER RIGHTS—ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a historic decision involving the State of California and my own State of Arizona concerning the adjudication of rights in the Colorado River. This has been a subject of controversy between our two States for a period of 40 years. We of Arizona are very happy that the controversy is settled. I am sure our neighbors in the West will join with us as both States begin to benefit more fully from the waters of the Colorado River.

My senior colleague from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] today introduced a bill to authorize the Central Arizona project. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject appear following the remarks of the senior Senator from Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR POLICEMEN IN TEXAS CITIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize social security coverage for policemen in the smaller Texas communities. This bill would give effect to recent action by the Texas Legislature, which, in conjunction with this bill, would lift the present ban on social security coverage of policemen under local and State retirement systems with respect to Texas cities having a population less than 250,000.

There has been a longstanding conflict as to the desirability of social security coverage for policemen and firemen within those respective groups. I am very much pleased that under the leadership of Dayton B. Murray, president of the Texas Municipal Police Association, this controversy has been resolved with respect to policemen. The bill would allow the policemen in the cities under 250,000 in population to come under social security coverage and protection. In view of the inadequacy of many present retirement systems in the smaller communities, this has been a very urgent need of these policemen for many years. Under President Murray's leadership, a sensible compromise has been reached; and the Texas Legislature has taken appropriate action to effectuate it, in contemplation of passage of this bill I introduce today. This bill is a companion to H.R. 6620, introduced by Representative Clark Thompson, of Texas, who has greatly assisted in this effort.

It is gratifying to know that we are on the verge of success in bringing social security coverage to this group which has needed it for so long. My own efforts toward this end have extended over three Congresses. We know that other public employees in Texas also are in need of social security coverage, and I hope in time it will be possible to work out such a sensible arrangement for them. In the meantime, enactment of this bill would be a concrete step toward providing retirement protection for hundreds and hundreds of Texas police officers who have devoted their lives to community protection and service.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1660) to permit the State of Texas to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the agreement with the State of Texas entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act may, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (d)(5)(A) of such section and the references thereto in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(3) of such section, be modified pursuant to subsection (c)(4) of such section to apply to service performed by employees of such State or any political subdivision thereof in any policeman's position covered by a retirement system, but only upon compliance with the requirements of subsection (d)(3) of such section. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, a retirement system which covers positions of policemen and other positions shall, if the State of Texas so desires, be deemed to be a separate retirement system with respect to the positions of such policemen.

A BILL TO GIVE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AN INCENTIVE FOR ACCUMULATING SICK LEAVE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give Federal employees an incentive for accumulating unused sick leave. At present, Federal employees are allowed 13 days a year of sick leave, which they may accumulate indefinitely against the day when some catastrophic illness may overtake them. Thus, many employees who enjoy good health arrive at the time when they are to retire or leave Government service with a large amount of accumulated sick leave.

A recent survey by the Civil Service Commission shows that employees in their final year of Government service use 3 times as much sick leave as other Federal employees. It is strongly implied that this indicates a possible misuse of this leave by many employees, but I think rather we should look at the system which allows the accumulation of large quantities of sick leave without recompense or recognition for the employee. All but a few Federal employees who retire or leave service do so with accumulated sick leave to their credit. I doubt that abuses are widespread, but we must recognize that any day of sick leave taken when not justified is a loss to the Government of that employee's pay for that day. Why should we not save money by taking positive steps to encourage employees not to use sick leave in marginal cases of need?

The bill I introduce today would provide this incentive by allowing Federal employees to credit unused sick leave in their retirement annuity computations, or alternatively to be paid at half-pay for the unused leave. These formulas, I think, are indications of the route we should follow in working out an equitable equivalent for unused sick leave. It may be that some other fraction or equivalent may prove to be more desirable after close study.

I think the merit of this approach is self-evident. Many who are in a position to observe the workings of our Federal employee laws and regulations say that the enactment of this bill would save money for the Government, since it is usually necessary to replace those absent on sick leave. The experienced man being more efficient than a substitute, further costs necessary in the use of temporary employees could be avoided. There would be a reduction in the use of sick leave.

This proposal in no way derogates or downgrades sick leave for those who need it. Substantial parity is still preserved for those not fortunate enough to enjoy perfect health when other Government policies are considered, such as the Federal employees health insurance program and the exclusion of sick pay from income tax liability.

This bill is a needed step toward efficient and equitable management of our Government's employees. I hope it will be possible to study the subject thoroughly, perfect the proposal, and enact it in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1661) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) One-half of the amount of accrued and accumulated sick leave at retirement shall be compensated for in cash as severance pay, or the entire number of whole days of such accrued and accumulated sick leave shall be added to the length of service of the employee before computing his annuity. The employee shall have the option to select either plan. If the employee dies while on the active rolls, his beneficiary or beneficiaries shall receive payment for the unused sick leave equal to one-half of the cash value of such leave."

A BILL TO ELIMINATE UNJUST INEQUITIES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the inequities presently done to those retiring who wish to provide a survivorship annuity for their spouse. If a married Federal employee retires, he may obtain an annuity for his wife only by accepting a reduction in his own annuity of 2½ percent of the first $3,600 used in computation plus 10 percent of the balance. For an average employee this reduction may amount to $50 or more a year of a total annuity of less than $2,000. No such reduction is required under social security retirement or railroad retirement to provide a survivor's annuity.

The greatest inequity comes if the retiree's spouse should predecease him. Then, even though the reason for the survivorship annuity is gone, his annuity still continues only at the reduced rate. His full annuity is not restored, even though he no longer has need for an annuity for his survivor. Further, even should the retiree remarry, there is no way to transfer the survivorship annuity rights from the deceased first spouse to the second, even though the retiree's annuity is still at the reduced rate.

The bill I introduce today would eliminate these inequities by doing away with the reduction in the annuity completely. If this approach is thought by some to be too broad, the bill will serve as a vehicle by which it is hoped we can review this program, and eliminate the chief inequities done to Federal retirees under it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1662) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (c), and (e) of section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) If an employee or member dies after having retired under any provision of this Act or under prior retirement laws and is survived by a wife or husband to whom he or she was married prior to retirement, or for at least three years if married after retirement, such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 per centum of the annuity received by such annuitant at the time of death. The annuity of such survivor shall begin on the first day after the date of death of the retired employee or Member, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death or remarriage."

"(c) If an employee or Member dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, the surviving wife or husband of such employee or Member shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the employee or Member. The annuity of such wife or husband shall begin on the first day of the month after the date of death of the employee or Member, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon death or remarriage of such wife or husband."

"(e) In case an employee or Member separated from service with title to a deferred annuity under this Act or prior retirement laws, either prior to, on, or after the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956, shall hereafter die before having established a valid claim for annuity and is survived by a wife or husband to whom married at date of separation, or at least three years preceding death if married after separation, such wife or husband (1) shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 percentum of the deferred annuity of such employee or Member beginning the first day following the date of death of such employee or Member and terminating upon the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or husband or (2) may elect to receive a lump-sum credit in lieu of annuity if such wife or husband is the person who would be entitled to the lump-sum credit and files application therefor with the Commission prior to the award of such annuity."

SEC. 2. Subsections (h) and (i) of section 1 and subsection (g) of section 9 are repealed: *Provided,* That the remaining subsections of such sections are redesignated as appropriate.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be retroactive to grant annuities to the unremarried spouse of all retired employees or Members who died prior to its approval.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following its enactment and all annuities affected hereby shall be recomputed on such date as though this Act had been in effect at the time of original computation: *Provided,* That no resulting annuity or increase in annuity shall be payable before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits provided by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

IMPROVING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, on which I am the minority member, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act.

I am delighted to report that the drafting of this bill has been carried on jointly with the Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure of the House, under the chairmanship of that very wonderful man, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, who for more than 30 years has been a great and good friend of many of us who have served with him, and whose passing over the past weekend has been of such great sorrow to all of us. In the drafting of the bill we have had the help of the able counsel to that subcommittee, Mr. Joseph Hyman.

This is indeed an historic occasion, because after years of study and months of legislative drafting we are approaching a consensus, not only on what ought to be done, but also on how it must be done.

The bill deals with the manner in which the agencies of the Government go about their work. There is scarcely any facet of the life of anyone in this country which is not affected by one or another of the myriad of Federal agencies. The prices of things the public buys and the conditions under which the public works are determined in a large measure by the decisions of Government agencies. They regulate the price of milk and the content of a tube of lipstick. They award benefits and pensions, as well as Government contracts. They regulate the truckers, the railroads, and the airlines. They regulate radio and that new giant—TV. They even regulate union elections.

A decade ago Mr. Justice Jackson said:

> The rise of administrative bodies probably has been the most significant legal trend in the last century and perhaps more values today are affected by their decisions than by those of all the courts.

But that was a decade ago; and since then their decisions have multiplied beyond belief. It is a celebrated—but not unusual—statistic, about which one member of an administrative agency testified before the subcommittee, of which I am a member, when he said that in 5 years he had made 18,000 decisions; and he is only one of the many men making such decisions.

We are usually so occupied with the hundreds of government problems as they arise that we may not give much thought to the fact that the federal administrative agencies, taken together, constitute the major part of our government. Though they are not provided for in the Constitution, they exercise functions which would otherwise be exercised by the Congress, the executive, and the courts. They operate outside of the system of checks and balances established in our Constitution as they make policy, execute it, and sit as judges in cases involving the public. Indeed, they have become almost a government unto themselves, and they act with such independence and are subject to so little control that they have become known as the headless fourth branch of Government.

Neither the Congress nor the executive have been unaware of this problem. As far back as 1933, Senator Norris introduced a bill to create a court of administrative justice; and in the same year the American Bar Association appointed a special committee to look into the problem. A little later, President Roosevelt appointed a Committee on Administrative Management in the executive branch of the Government, which in 1937 issued a report recommending a complete separation of the adjudicatory functions and personnel from those having to do with investigations or prosecution.

In the next decade, many of the famous Members of Congress were associated with this problem—not only Senator Norris, but also Senator Logan and our late colleague and good friend, Senator Pat McCarran. On the House side, the burden was carried by two very able men. One is the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the other is our late beloved colleague, Mr. Walter, who labored so long and hard on the drafts of this bill.

The efforts of all these great men resulted in the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946. It was a great step forward; but it was taken 17 years ago, and under the relentless pounding of the proliferating administrative agencies and their ever-increasing workload, much that it attempted to do has been washed away. The time has come when we must shore it up again.

Every President has felt this problem important enough for high-level consideration. President Truman appointed the Hoover Commission, which studied administrative procedures, and made recommendations for reform. Early in his administration, President Eisenhower established the Conference on Administrative Procedure, under the chairmanship of Judge Prettyman; and that conference studied the problem for 2 years, and made many recommendations. Then, in 1960, President Eisenhower laid the groundwork for another national conference on administrative procedure; and the idea was carried on by President Kennedy, who sent to the Congress a message urging consideration of the problem of administrative reform. He also established a new Administrative Conference of the United States, with Judge Prettyman again as its Chairman. This Conference completed its work in December of last year, and also made a number of recommendations. Non-Government organizations, such as the American Bar Association and the other bar associations, have made intensive studies of this problem; and they, too, have made recommendations.

At the same time, we in the Congress have not been idle. For 4 years the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, has been making detailed studies of the troublesome areas and problems in administrative procedures. A special subcommittee in the House has also been at work on this problem, under the chairmanship of Mr. Walter, and for many months now has, with our Senate subcommittee, carried on a joint effort to draft a bill.

This bill, which is introduced today, is the result of all these efforts. It is based upon the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the two Conferences on Administrative Procedure chaired by Judge Prettyman. It has drawn heavily upon the recommendations of the American Bar Association and other bar associations. Significant contributions have also been made by faculty of the Harvard Law School and the other schools. Almost every one of the provisions of this bill has already been the subject of searching comment by the Federal administrative agencies, as they have been embodied in legislative proposals introduced in the last few years.

POLICY AND PARTICULAR CASES

The bill is a long bill; and at this time I shall mention only some of its significant provisions. The first is the manner in which the bill deals with a major problem which has been compounded in the last few years by some court decisions. It grows out of the fact that the provisions in the existing law dealing with agency rulemaking apply not only to general policy matters but also to particular cases. As a result, some difficulties have arisen because what is an appropriate manner in which to make policy decisions is not necessarily the best way to decide cases. Policymaking requires a certain amount of flexibility and a broad outlook. Particular cases require a look at the facts in the record. The important thing is that policy should apply fairly and equally to everybody; there should not be one policy for one person and a different policy for another person. And so the bill provides that when an agency is dealing with questions of policy it should have all of the flexibility and all of the freedom it needs, but when the agency is applying that policy to the facts of a particular case, it should be limited to the facts in the record.

There may be a great hue and cry by the agencies that they cannot possibly determine in advance all of the policies necessary to fit all of the particular situations which may arise in the future. That is true. From time to time policies will have to be made as the issues arise in particular cases. All that this bill requires is that the agencies make it clear to the public when they are dealing with matters of policy and when they are applying that policy to the facts of a particular case.

The bill also deals with another aspect of this problem. No matter how carefully an agency makes its policy there will always be the inevitable situation in which a general rule works an unintended hardship in a particular case. At the present time, if any relief is to be given in such a case, an agency must either change or disregard its rule, or engage in some fine and probably illogical distinction on the facts. None of these alternatives is a wholly satisfactory solution and the bill provides a different alternative. It would permit an agency to grant an appropriate exception to a rule which worked an unintended hardship, based upon the particular facts presented by the person affected. The matter would be determined on the record after a hearing. This procedure would hold a number of advantages. It would be an advantage to the public because it would not be necessary for the person affected to show that the whole rule should be changed or abolished, but only that an exception was warranted on the facts of his case. The procedure would also be advantageous for the agency because it would not have to consider the tough problem of whether the harm done in the particular case by the general rule made it necessary to change or abolish the rule. Instead, the agency would only have to consider whether an exception should be granted on the particular facts presented. To keep the opportunity to seek exceptions from being abused, the bill provides a summary procedure which can be used by the agency.

THE TROUBLE WITH ADJUDICATION

There are a host of complaints about the conduct of adjudicative proceedings. I have discussed some of them on this floor from time to time. It seems that much of the difficulty stems from the fact that adjudicative proceedings are frequently longer and more complex than the situation requires. A vast percentage of all adjudicative matters are actually noncontested and, in those cases, the procedures which are required add unnecessary steps to the case. On the other hand, in a contested proceeding, the present procedures do not seem to lead to a simple and direct result. Indeed, at times, they appear to encourage the parties to unduly complicate the proceeding. Any improvement in the situation requires some changes in the way such proceedings are conducted.

PREHEARING CONFERENCES

First, there is a great need for an adequate prehearing conference procedure. It should be under the guidance of the presiding officer assigned to the case and it should begin as soon as practicable after the pleadings are completed and not end until the hearing is about to begin. A continued effort should be made at these conferences to dispose of the various issues of fact and law involved in the case. Too often the agency and the other parties seem to regard the prehearing conference as just "going through the motion." The parties and the presiding officer come to the prehearing conference with little or no preparation and completely unable to enter into a serious discussion of what is involved in the case.

Some teeth are needed in such a procedure. The presiding officer should not only be prepared himself, but he should be able to require the parties to make oral or written statements of the facts and issues and to argue in support of their position at the conferences. This is the time for the parties to reveal the strength of their case and point out the weakness of the opponent's case. This is the time to disclose the secret weapon which would end the proceeding. I predict that after a good prehearing conference, or series of such conferences if need be, the hearing itself will proceed much more expeditiously to a fair result because the fat will have been cut out of the case and its bones will have been laid bare.

STREAMLINED PROCEDURES

Second, there is a need for a streamlined procedure in many cases. Right now, the law requires the same procedures in a noncontested case as in a contested case. This is not good, and the bill provides a lawful alternative, an informal procedure. But the procedure would have many other applications as well. The formal adjudicative proceeding has been likened to a court procedure. The informal proceeding provided by the bill would be a truly administrative proceeding in which the agency would have the fullest opportunity to exercise its talent and expertise in arriving at an acceptable decision in the public interest.

However, to the extent that the decision was not acceptable to the parties and they are entitled by the Constitution or by statute to a decision on the record after an opportunity for a formal hearing, the bill provides that any party may file objections to the decision and that such objections will be heard and determined in a formal proceeding. Now these objections must be specific so the issues remaining to be resolved in the formal proceeding will be narrow, and I have noticed that the burden of being specific has generally worked quite well in limiting the issues which lawyers raise on appeal to those which are material.

So I think by this device we will have to cut down the record and issues in the formal hearing to what really counts.

LIMITED REVIEW

Third, the bill changes the manner in which decisions are made and reviewed. Several years ago a critic of the administrative process said that decisions were made "on the dark side of the moon." That is the place, they say, that a little group of men meet and rewrite the decision of the officer who presided at the hearing. This little group of men have not heard the evidence or seen the witnesses. They have not heard the argument but they have the ear of the members of the agency and the power to pick and choose from the record which has been prepared as they rewrite the decision of the presiding officer. It is said they sometimes torture that record to get the result they want.

That is a dark picture indeed, if the allegations are true. But we do not have to decide whether the allegations are true or whether they are false. It is enough if they could be true. I suggest that we bring this dark side of administrative proceedings into the public view just as we are trying, in our space efforts, to bring the dark side of the moon itself into public view. Last year the Administrative Conference of the United States approved a recommendation which would bring decisionmaking out into the open. Under this proposal the decision of the presiding officer would not be subject to being rewritten by a little group of men on the dark side of the moon. Instead, it would only be subject to review on the issues presented in written exceptions which spelled out how some error was committed by the presiding officer in making his decision or some specific question which should be reviewed. Everyone will then know what is being reviewed and why. Although the agency staff can file exceptions as a party the bill goes further to satisfy some doubts and provides that either the agency itself or the appeal board, whichever is reviewing the matter, can raise any other questions of fact or law which are material, provided it gives reasonable notice of such questions to all parties and permits the parties to present arguments thereon.

DELEGATION

I have commented in the past that with the thousands upon thousands of decisions which the administrative agencies must make, I do not believe we can expect the agency members who are only human beings to be able to devote enough time to making agency policy if they are also required to make the final decision in every case as well. Therefore, the bill proposes that the agencies be permitted to establish agency appeal boards to review the decisions of presiding officers unless the agency itself decides to grant the application of a private party, which is a party other than an agency, and review the matter itself.

I believe this carries out the principle intent of the reorganization plans submitted by the President 2 years ago, without the vice which I found in those plans. That vice was a very simple one and yet a very major one, because it denied any appeal from the decision of the presiding officer at the discretion of the agency. This bill provides a right of appeal to the appeal board and a discretionary right in the agency to hear the appeal. By so doing it constitutes a parallel procedure to that adopted by our courts.

THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO KNOW

The bill also takes a good look at the public information section in the present law. This is the section which requires the agencies to provide information to the public. So far as the subcommittee has been informed there are relatively few complaints about information not being published in the Federal Register if the present law requires it. The great problem is that often the information is stated in official gibberish making it almost impossible to understand. I am told that the Federal Register is working hard to alleviate this problem and that the Administrative Conference has made certain recommendations in this regard, but it is not a problem which can be effectively dealt with by statute. All that we can do is to put some additional teeth in the penalty which an agency suffers for failure to properly publish the required information.

Where we begin to have trouble is with the reluctance of the agencies to make available to the public all the rules adopted by them which affect the public and all of the decisions in cases concerning the public. The agencies have been very generous in their interpretation of the exceptions in the existing law. So generous at times that they have been able to ignore the intent of the Congress that this information should be available to the public. So here again, we have to do a bit of shoring up to bring things back the way they are supposed to be.

However, the greatest problem comes in the availability of agency records and here let me tell you a little story that actually happened. There was a farmer out in my State and he found to his dismay a year or so ago that his acreage allotment had been cut by the county committee. He went before the local committee and protested and showed them his figures. After considering the matter the committee gave him back his acreage allotment but the next thing the farmer knew his acreage allotment was reduced again. He made another trip to the county committee and he asked why. He was told that the committee had received evidence against him. He asked what that evidence was so he could properly meet it and he was told that under section 3 of the Administrative Procurement Act that information could be withheld from him. This puzzled him because the law says that matters of official record shall be made available to "persons properly and directly concerned" and certainly he was properly and directly concerned. Oh, the agency said, you may be properly and directly concerned but the law also provides that we can withhold information for good cause found and we have determined that to show you the information given against you by your neighbors would "impair the interests" of your neighbors and that is good cause for withholding the information from you. The farmer asked how he should meet the case against him if he did not know what it is but he received no other answer. This matter went all the way to the Secretary of Agriculture. Let me read the reply of Secretary Freeman:

> This is in reply to your letter of July 17, 1962, requesting advice as to the specific authority relied upon by the Department of Agriculture in withholding from a producer the names of persons supplying information adverse to him in connection with his participation in the feed grain program.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Department regulations governing the availability of information and records comply with the requirements of section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 1002. Such section provides in part as follows:
>
> "SEC. 3.—
>
> "(c) PUBLIC RECORDS.—Save as otherwise required by statute, matters of official record shall in accordance with published rule be made available to persons properly and directly concerned except information held confidential for good cause found."

So we have tackled this problem in this bill.

There is another aspect of public information which is also important and that is the right of the general public and the news media to the facts connected with the operation of this Government. Under the terms of the present statute they are often denied access to information on the ground that they are not directly concerned. And so we have made a change in the law in order that the people can know what is happening in their Government.

TRIAL BY PUBLICITY

The last major point I wish to discuss is the provision in the bill which will protect the public from trial by publicity where the agency has not actually commenced a proceeding.

I am always greatly disturbed when I read statements by agencies that they intend to accomplish their purposes by publicity rather than by deciding cases. In plain terms this means that that agency is going to exert the full power of the Government's publicity resources against some individual without going to the trouble of proving its case. The bill puts a stop to this. It provides for the Supreme Court to set up rules governing the release of information by the agency prior to the actual commencement of a proceeding and it permits punishment for contempt for any violation of such rules.

The bill also provides a restraint on the institution of proceedings by an agency without good cause merely to provide a basis for a publicity blast. This restraint would be similar to one which we already use and which is historic in our system of justice when we require a prosecutor, however fairminded and right he may be, to first show reasonable grounds for the indictment to a grand jury before he can get an indictment against a man. The bill applies the same idea to administrative cases by providing that the agency must show to a special grand jury, hearing administrative matters only, that the agency has probable cause to begin a proceeding for the issuance of certain types of sanctions. You will note that they include only those administrative proceedings which are of a serious nature and restrict or affect the freedom of people, or impose a penalty or fine, or revoke or suspend a license, or take or seize property, or some similar compulsory or restrictive action.

PROTECTION OF THE PEOPLE

These are the highlights of the bill. It deals with the protection which the people of this country must have when they are caught up in the labyrinth of the administrative proceedings. It deals with the problems of all the people of this Nation when they are faced with the might of the Federal Government. Taken individually their problems are lost in the sweep of the great issues of the hour. But to each of them their problems are of significant and often overwhelming importance. We cannot afford to say that the passage of time will solve these problems because they will be forgotten by the people when the case is over. If the procedures of the agencies are inadequate, they should be reformed and we must do the job. The Federal agencies are increasing in number every year and their activities are expanding into every area and facet of our lives. More cases are started every year than are finished during the year. The number of such cases keeps growing by the tens of thousands.

The committees of the Senate and House have given the matter of reform lengthy and detailed consideration. The problem has been studied and considered by conferences called by every President for the last decade and a half. The bar associations and other legal groups have worked tirelessly to bring these problems to the fore. I urge that the most careful consideration be given to this bill and that we proceed with it with good speed.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1663) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, a friend and a member on the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, in introducing the bill to make a number of amendments in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Although I have been chairman of this subcommittee for only a relatively short period of time, I am attracted by many of the features of this revision of the Administrative Procedure Act, particularly those which were long ago adopted by the courts to speed up their procedures in contested cases.

To the extent that we can do so consistently with due process, we should revise the Administrative Procedure Act to reduce the time and cost of administrative proceedings. As examples of proposed changes looking in this direction I want to point out, first of all, the section on prehearing conferences. I have heard from all sides how much a good system of prehearing conferences would improve the conduct of administrative proceedings. I do not see how we are ever going to reduce the size of the tremendous records in these agency matters, unless we find a way to get the parties and their representatives to sit down with the agency and with the presiding officer in advance of the hearing and make a determined effort to reduce the number of issues and questions in dispute. When this has been done in court cases, it has been most beneficial. Why should it not be helpful in administrative proceedings?

There should also be a great time economy for both the agency and the members of the public by more use of the informal procedures; the draft bill so provides. One of the basic justifications for deciding things in an administrative agency instead of in court is supposed to be the fact that an agency can move in an informal and expeditious manner while court proceedings are often lengthy and cumbersome. It seems, however, that this is no longer true because agency proceedings are often longer and more cumbersome than those of the courts. Therefore, if we are going to find a valid purpose for administrative proceedings, we must place more emphasis on some form of informal procedure. Yet, at the same time, we do not want to take away the statutory right which anyone has to a decision on the record after a formal hearing. This right is preserved in the bill by the provision that any party who is dissatisfied with the decision reached in the informal proceedings may file specific objections to it, and these objections will be determined on the record in a formal proceeding.

There is still another provision in the bill which is worthy of very careful consideration and that is the provision for discovery. There is probably no faster way of getting to a decision in a matter than getting at the facts before the actual hearing when the time of everyone is not taken up with endless cross-examination, which may in the long run be unnecessary. And the more facts which are found before the hearing begins, the shorter the hearing itself will be.

The proposed revision also contains provisions on consolidation and on settlement and I feel that they add to the emphasis to the plain and simple fact that it is necessary to take account of all the necessary factors if we are to get on with an administrative proceeding and reach an acceptable result.

In looking over the statistics which have been prepared on the length of time it takes an administrative matter to get from the initial decision by the presiding officer to the final agency decision, I do not believe anyone can fail to appreciate that something must be done in this area. The matter was very carefully considered by the Administrative Conference and by the staff of the subcommittee in the past few years; and there is general agreement on the concept that much greater emphasis must be given to the decision of the presiding officer. The proposed bill follows the recommendation of the Administrative Conference that his decision shall be subject only to specific exceptions showing where it is in error. Thus, in one stroke there would be wiped out two time-consuming aspects of present procedure. First of all we would have eliminated the idea that there must be two decisions—an initial decision and a "final" decision; and second, we would have limited the need for agency review of the decision to specific exceptions rather than to all of the issues which have already been heard and determined by the presiding officer.

The bill takes another important step in the area of agency review by providing that the agencies may establish appeal boards to hear and decide the exceptions. This should greatly reduce the time taken to reach the final result in agency proceedings because the work can be divided up among the agency members or delegated to appellate level hearing examiners. It will also mean that the agency members will have more time to devote to agency policymaking and this, in turn, will provide better guidance to the members of the public and the staff of the agency in connection with the work of the agency.

For the first time too, the amendments proposed in the bill provide specifically for the court in which the review can be had and for the procedure to be used in seeking review; and these improvements should provide a much better guide to the public in seeking judicial review of agency action.

There are many other aspects to this bill which I believe deserve very careful consideration because of the assistance which they may be to the public, such as provisions for the narrowing of the areas in which the agencies can act without notice or hearing, for the granting of the right of counsel which is now quite limited and for the opportunity to obtain a transcript of the proceeding.

I should like to call particular attention to the redraft of section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act in the omnibus proposal being introduced by Senator DIRKSEN. It is identical with another proposal which I, Senator DIRKSEN, and other Senators are introducing today.

The primary purpose of introducing a separate bill on this public information section is to expedite action and focus attention on this important part of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 3 is a difficult part of the Administrative Procedure Act, but one which is in urgent need of revision. The separate bill on the subject has a long history and has wide bipartisan support, and we should be able to have our hearings on it this summer.

Although it may not be necessary, I wish to add a caveat to my sponsorship of Senator DIRKSEN's omnibus bill and my introduction of the separate bill on section 3. Numerous and serious changes in the law are being proposed. I do not necessarily endorse all of them in principle or detail; but all of them have been suggested by responsible individuals and groups, and they are more than worthy of our study and consideration.

I believe that Senator DIRKSEN will join me in this caveat. We are convinced that the Administrative Procedure Act is in drastic need of overhaul. The way to get started is to introduce a bill which contains a number of suggested changes. These can be studied and commented upon by all interested parties. Only then can we say that we have made a real beginning.

Tribute should be paid, not only to Senator DIRKSEN for taking the lead in this matter, but also to Mr. Cornelius Kennedy, his very able counsel, who has done the bulk of the drafting work. Much credit is also due to the help and cooperation of our recently departed friend, Representative Francis Walter, and his able counsel, Mr. Joseph Hyman.

PERMANENT ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the most revered and highly deserving organs of Government today is the Judicial Conference of the United States. Its purposes and achievements with respect to improving our Federal judicial system are too well known to require recounting.

Unfortunately, there is no comparable permanent organ of Government to suggest improvements in the operating methods of the myriad quasi-judicial regulatory agencies, which govern such a large part of our national well-being. A permanent Administrative Conference could make invaluable suggestions for ways to cut down on the length and cost of administrative procedures without endangering due process of law.

The bill which I am about to introduce is for this purpose.

This particular draft was completed by the Bureau of the Budget, with the assistance of the very able chairman of the temporary Administrative Conference, Judge E. Barrett Prettyman. The Bureau of the Budget has had the benefit of the views of various agencies concerned with the work of the Administrative Conference and has had the advice of the Council of the Administrative Conference appointed by the President.

By introduction of this bill, I am not in any way derogating the valuable work done by the previous two temporary Administrative Conferences. To the contrary, their success on a temporary basis points to the valuable service such an institution could perform if established on a permanent basis.

On December 17, 1962, the second temporary Conference, created by Executive order of President Kennedy in April 1961, submitted to the President its Final Report, including a recommendation that there be created by legislative enactment just such a permanent Conference.

The temporary Conference consisted of some of the best and most experienced minds drawn from Federal executive departments and administrative agencies, the practicing bar, scholars in the fields of administrative law and government, and other persons of special qualifications. The Conference labored effectively and has produced studies and recommendations of utmost importance and value. In fact, I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee will print their final report and selected documents of the Conference.

I am convinced that the temporary Conference is sound in its conclusion that there is an overwhelming need for a permanent body which will give continuous attention to these problems.

The problems of Federal regulation have grown so big, and the impact upon our economy is so great, that it is no longer good enough to operate under a system where these problems are allowed to grow and multiply until a supposed scandal hits the headlines, with a resultant demand for reform, and the appointment of another intermittent study group whose recommendations frequently vanish into thin air after the body goes out of existence.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, I am convinced that the crying need is for continuous and objective attention to the manner in which Federal administrative regulation is functioning; for constant reexamination and reevaluation of existing methods, techniques and procedures to determine whether they can be improved, and to determine whether changes can or need to be made which would render administrative proceedings more effective and more fair.

Experience has taught us that the important objectives cannot be accomplished with maximum effectiveness if each Government agency is left to its own devices. Government agencies or departments are made up of normal human beings, subject to the normal human motivation to believe that things are fine as they are and that no change is required. In addition, agency personnel are so weighed down by the pressures of their immediate responsibilities that they are rarely able to devote substantial or significant force to the study of such procedural problems. It takes an effective complementary force to serve as a catalytic agent, to break down the resistance to change, to stir the agencies into an alert awareness of these problems and to urge them to make a serious reexamination of their methods and procedures.

In the past, such a force has come from the studies and investigations conducted from time to time by congressional committees, bar association groups, and other interested sources. Although the work done by such groups has been useful and fruitful, it is inevitably sporadic and intermittent in nature and cannot provide an effective long-range answer to the broad and complex problems involved here. Experience has demonstrated that in the absence of a permanent expert body, charged with responsibility for making continuous studies and investigations in this field, the situation degenerates into one where each new group set up from time to time to attack these problems commences its examination all over again from point A—and occupies itself during a substantial part of its existence with a review of the material prepared by all of the preceding intermittent committees, which themselves started out at point A.

Experience also shows that under such a system, the conclusions reached and the recommendations made somehow ultimately vanish into thin air and never see the light of day in terms of their implementation by the agencies involved. Dramatic proof of this thesis was provided by the first Conference on Administrative Procedure, established in 1953. After 2 years of arduous effort, it submitted its final report and recommendations to the President in early 1955. Yet when the recent Administrative Conference of the United States was established by the President on April 13, 1961, it was felt by many people that only a very few of the recommendations of the first Conference had been carried into effect by the agencies in the ensuing 6-year period.

There is good reason to fear that the extensive and important recommendations for improvements in many areas of the administrative process, submitted to the President in December 1962 by the last Administrative Conference may well have a similar fate unless a permanent body, with a continuing interest and responsibility for implementing those recommendations, is created promptly by appropriate legislation.

The bill which I am introducing would provide for a full-time Chairman to be appointed by the President for a 5-year term; it would have a council of 11 members, including agency heads, distinguished members of the bar and others. The main body of the Conference, the Assembly, inter alia would additionally contain the heads of independent regulatory agencies, the heads of other major administrative programs, members of the bar, and scholars in the field of administrative law.

I wish to acknowledge the work done on this problem by Mr. Elmer Staats, Mr. Harold Seidman, and Miss Hazel Guffey of the Bureau of the Budget. I also wish to thank Mr. Harold Russell, a distinguished lawyer and high officer in the American Bar Association, for his most valuable contributions to our thinking on this problem; he has been extremely helpful and very patient. I know that he and other American Bar Association representatives will have a number of helpful suggestions to make at our hearings, which will be held on June 12, 13, and 14, 1963.

In conclusion, let me stress that the time to act on this problem is now, while the impetus of the work done by the last Administrative Conference and the interest in this subject is still live and fresh.

Congress has created these administrative agencies and has a vital interest in seeing to it that administrative regulation, with all its tremendous impacts upon our economy, functions with maximum effectiveness and fairness.

This is an objective upon which every Member of Congress can agree, admitting of no possible controversy.

This bill provides the opportunity for Congress to now take a giant step forward, by creating the machinery which will make the greatest possible contribution in the long run toward insuring that these objectives are met.

I ask that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1664) to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Administrative Conference Act."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) Administration of regulatory and other statutes enacted by Congress in the public interest substantially affects large numbers of private individuals and many areas of business and economic activity;

(b) The protection of public and private interests requires continuing attention to the administrative procedure of Federal agencies to ensure maximum efficiency and fairness in achieving statutory objectives;

(c) The diversity of Federal activities frequently precludes the establishment by statute of administrative procedure which would be generally suitable for use by all agencies;

(d) Responsibility for assuring fair and efficient administrative procedure is inherent in the general responsibilities of officials appointed to administer Federal statutes;

(e) Experience has demonstrated that cooperative effort among Federal officials, assisted by private citizens and others whose interest, competence, and objectivity enable them to make a unique contribution, can find solutions to complex problems and achieve substantial progress in improving the effectiveness of administrative procedure; and

(f) It is the purpose of this Act to provide suitable arrangements through which Federal agencies, assisted by outside experts, may cooperatively study mutual problems, exchange information, and develop recommendations for action by proper authorities to the end that private rights may be fully protected and regulatory activities and other Federal responsibilities may be carried out expeditiously in the public interest.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) "Administrative program" includes any Federal function which involves protection of the public interest and the determination of rights, privileges, and obligations of private persons through "rulemaking" or "adjudication" as those terms are defined in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001), except that it should not include:

(1) Any function or matter specified in section 4 (1) or (2) of the Act except to the extent that such function or matter consists of proceedings and decision-making required to be conducted in conformity with sections 7 and 8 of the Act or the imposition of penalties on private persons through agency action not subject to sections 7 and 8; or

(2) Any matter specified in section 5 (1), (3), (5), and (6) of the Act.

(b) "Administrative agency" includes all executive departments and any other Federal agency, including a constituent agency of an executive department, which carries out an administrative program.

(c) "Administrative procedure" means procedure used in carrying out an administrative program and shall be broadly construed to include any aspect of agency organization, procedure, or management which may affect the equitable consideration of public and private interests, the fairness of agency decisions, the speed of agency action, and the relationship of operating methods to later judicial review, but shall not be construed to include the scope of agency responsibility as established by law or matters of substantive policy committed by law to agency discretion.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Administrative Conference of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Conference").

(b) The Conference shall be composed preponderantly of Federal officials and personnel, including:

(1) A full-time Chairman, who shall be appointed for a five-year term by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman shall receive compensation at the highest rate established by law for the chairman of an independent regulatory board or commission, and may continue to serve until his successor has been appointed and has qualified;

(2) The chairman of each independent regulatory board or commission;

(3) The head of each executive department or other administrative agency which is designated by the President;

(4) When authorized by the Council, an appointee from any such board, commission, department or agency, designated by the department or agency head or, in the case of a board or commission, by the chairman with the approval of the board or commission;

(5) Persons appointed by the President to membership on the Council hereinafter established who are not otherwise members of the Conference; and

(6) Other members in such number as will assure adequate representation of the viewpoints of private citizens and the utilization of diverse experience, who shall be appointed by the Chairman, with the approval of the Council, for terms of two years. Members appointed by the Chairman shall be members of the practicing bar, scholars in the field of administrative law or government, or others specially informed by knowledge and experience with respect to Federal administrative procedure.

(c) Each member under paragraphs (b) (2) and (b) (3), above, may designate an alternate member to represent him, as occasion requires, in plenary sessions or other activities of the Conference. The alternate member shall have all the obligations and privileges of full membership in the Conference on such occasions.

(d) Members of the Conference other than the Chairman shall receive no compensation for service, but members appointed from outside the Federal Government shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons serving without compensation.

DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE CONFERENCE

SEC. 5. To carry out the purposes of this Act the Conference is authorized to:

(a) Study the efficiency, adequacy, and fairness of the administrative procedure used by administrative agencies in carrying out administrative programs;

(b) Make recommendations to administrative agencies, collectively or individually, and to the President, the Congress, or the Judicial Conference of the United States, as it deems appropriate;

(c) Arrange for interchange among administrative agencies of information potentially useful in improving administrative procedure; and

(d) Collect from administrative agencies and publish such reports of operating statistics as it deems useful for evaluating and improving administrative procedure.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

SEC. 6. (a) The membership of the Conference meeting in plenary session shall constitute the Assembly of the Conference. The Assembly shall have ultimate authority over all activities of the Conference. Specifically, it shall have power to (1) adopt such recommendations as it deems appropriate for improving administrative procedure: *Provided,* That any member or members who disagree with a recommendation adopted by the Assembly shall be accorded the privilege of entering dissenting opinions and alternative proposals in the record of Conference proceedings, and the opinions and proposals so entered shall accompany the Conference recommendation in any publication or distribution thereof; and (2) adopt bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with this Act for carrying out the functions of the Conference, including the creation of such committees as it deems necessary for the conduct of studies and the development of recommendations for consideration by the Assembly.

(b) The Conference shall include a Council composed preponderantly of Federal officials and personnel. The Council shall consist of the Chairman of the Conference, who shall be the Chairman of the Council, and ten other members appointed by the President for three-year terms, except that the Council members initially appointed shall serve for one, two, or three years, as designated by the President, and each member may continue to serve until a successor is appointed. The Council shall have power to (1) determine the time and place of plenary sessions of the Conference and the agenda for such meetings; (2) propose bylaws and regulations, including rules of procedure and committee organization, for adoption by the Assembly; (3) make recommendations to the Conference or its committees upon any subject germane to the purposes of the Conference; (4) receive and consider reports and recommendations of committees of the Conference and transmit them to members of the Conference with the views and recommendations of the Council; (5) designate a member of the Council to preside at meetings of the Council in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman and Vice Chairman; (6) designate such additional officers of the Conference as it may deem desirable; (7) approve or revise the Chairman's budgetary proposals; and (8) exercise such other powers as may be delegated to it by the Assembly.

(c) The Chairman shall be the chief executive of the Conference. In that capacity he shall have power to (1) make preliminary inquiries into matters he deems important for Conference consideration, including matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government; (2) be the official spokesman for the Conference in relations with the several branches and agencies of the Federal Government and with interested organizations and individuals outside the Government, including responsibility for encouraging Federal agencies to effectuate the recommendations of the Conference; (3) request agency heads to provide information needed by the Conference, which information shall be supplied to the extent permitted by law or agency regulations; (4) recommend to the Council appropriate subjects for action by the Conference; (5) appoint, with the approval of the Council, members of committees authorized by the bylaws and regulations of the Conference; (6) prepare, for approval of the Council, estimates of the budgetary requirements of the Conference; (7) appoint employees, subject to the civil service and classification laws, define their duties and responsibilities, and direct and supervise their activities; (8) rent office space in the District of Columbia; (9) provide necessary services for the Assembly, the Council, and the committees of the Conference; (10) organize and direct studies ordered by the Assembly or the Council, utilizing from time to time, as appropriate, experts and consultants, who may be employed as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; (11) upon request of the head of any agency, furnish assistance and advice on matters of administrative procedure; and (12) exercise such additional authority as may be delegated to him by the Council or the Assembly. The Chairman shall preside at meetings of the Council and at each plenary session of the Conference, to which he shall make a full report concerning the affairs of the Conference since the last preceding plenary session. The Chairman shall, on behalf of the Conference, transmit to the President and the Congress an annual report and such interim reports as he deems desirable.

(d) The President may designate a member of the Council as Vice Chairman, who shall serve as Chairman in the event of a vacancy in that office or in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted that my frind the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] as introduced the bill to create a permanent Administrative Conference. I was an official delegate to the last Conference, representing the Senate; and I found that the Conference accomplished many good things. I have some reservations about some of the provisions in this bill drafted by the Bureau of the Budget, however; and I hope that in the course of hearings and committee consultation we shall be able to arrive at a bill which will be acceptable both to the Bureau and to the public and civic organizations which oppose parts of this bill.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both.

That paragraph should be printed in quotation marks, which were omitted to emphasize the present validity of a statement made almost 200 years ago. It was made by James Madison, who was chairman of the committee which drafted the first amendment.

Madison also pointed out that—

> The right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication thereon, is the only effectual guardian of every other right.

Madison's contemporary, Thomas Jefferson had this to say on the subject:

> The basis of our governments being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right. The way to prevent [errors of] the people, is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that these papers shall penetrate the whole mass of the people.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for anyone to improve on the way in which our distinguished Founding Fathers stated these verities. I shall certainly not attempt to do so.

However, this does not prevent my reiteration of their absolute validity today as much as in the days of Jefferson and Madison.

The public is helpless if it cannot obtain the facts about its government. Without the facts it will inevitably excuse the errors of its public officials. And public officials in all ages and places are prone to hide their errors behind a cloak of secrecy.

As we all know, there must be more limits to public knowledge of governmental facts. For example, we must apply restrictions for purposes of national defense.

However the restricted areas should be confined to the narrowest possible extent if the ends of good government are to be served.

One place where the restricted areas are much broader than the dictates of popular democracy require is in section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

This section, which governs the information policies of all of the so-called independent regulatory agencies and several more executive agencies, is much too weak and loosely drawn to satisfy the requirements of an informed public.

There is no need to quarrel with the drafters of that section or the earlier Congress which approved it. However, time and interpretation have shown that it is woefully inadequate today.

Each year brings new instances of Government agencies and bureaus withholding information which the public has a right to have. We in the Congress have a duty to see that it is made available.

We cannot effectively complain that the regulatory agencies are withholding needed information from the public when we, the Congress, passed the law under which they do so.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, CASE, DIRKSEN, GRUENING, HART, KEATING, KEFAUVER, METCALF, MORSE, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, and SYMINGTON, I introduce a bill which will revise this section of the law, and which is aimed at providing greater "freedom of information." It is an honor to have a large number of my distinguished colleagues as cosponsors.

Our objectives in introducing this bill are to make information in Government agencies more readily available and to delineate more clearly the areas in which and the purposes for which information may be withheld.

This year has brought added interest to the "freedom of information" problem, perhaps because of the charges of "managed" news. But, managed news is an elusive term, a term which does not truly highlight the problem. All news is managed in some way; in the way it is selected for reporting, in the way it is written, edited, and placed in a newspaper.

As stated recently in a report to the American Society of Newspaper Editors by its freedom of information committee:

> There has been a growing awareness among the press and the public of the problems of news handling. Still, there is not always a clear understanding of the distinction between news management—a misnomer because all news is "managed" in some fashion—and the denial of access to news sources or the outright distortion of news by official sources.

Primarily, it is this latter problem to which we address ourselves.

Government agencies control billions of taxpayer dollars each year, and the regulatory agencies control many billions more of consumer dollars in the vital areas of power, transportation, fuel, communications, securities, and trade. In order to insure that this money is being wisely spent and our industries properly controlled, we must be able to have continuous supervision over their activities. The past has disclosed many instances where our Government officials have not exercised the wisest discretion. But, many more have gone undiscovered, partly because information of such indiscretions has been covered with the cloak of secrecy.

As I said earlier, only an informed electorate can ride herd over these agencies. But we must be truly informed. The mimeographed release of the agency alone is not enough. The records which are kept by agencies are public records; the rules and orders which agencies issue are for the benefit of the public; the opinions which our regulatory agencies issue—including dissenting opinions—are also for the benefit of the public; and public these records must be.

Agencies may suppress information merely to preserve what they conceive to be their public image and to avoid harsh criticism. But it is this very possibility of criticism which plays such an important role in keeping Government in check.

Granted, it would be far easier to label a piece of adverse information "classified" than make it accessible and have to suffer the consequences—but when this is done, the public has lost a right.

One of the most interested parties in the whole area of "freedom of information" has been the American press. The national professional journalism fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and many other journalism groups have long worked for news availability both on the State and National level. They are to be congratulated for their stubborn refusal to give up the fight. Their determination has strengthened the resolve of those of us in this Congress who insist on waging the same struggle.

Particular credit should go to the Freedom of Information Center which was created in the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri in 1959. This center, which is a first in the field, has dedicated itself to preserving the freedom of press and speech. We in Missouri are justifiably proud of the fine record that the Center has established in our Nation.

The American Bar Association has also done a great deal in the effort to pass progressive legislation in this important field. They have helped draft legislation and have worked tirelessly for its passage.

The history of the "freedom of information" movement has been long, varied, but, for the most part, unsuccessful. At the present time there is no Federal law setting forth an adequate general information policy. In the 85th Congress, the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and Congressman JOHN E. MOSS introduced bills to revise the old "housekeeping" statute. The resulting act provides that the statute shall not be construed as an excuse for secrecy. Senators John A. Carroll, William Proxmire, Philip A. Hart, and myself introduced S. 1567 in the 87th Congress, but no legislation was passed.

In summary, the bill which we are introducing today would—

First. Require each agency to publish in the Federal Register (a) descriptions of its organization and places where the public may obtain information, (b) statements of the general course and procedure by which its functions are performed, and (c) substantive rules and statements of general policy.

Second. Make available for inspection and copying all final agency opinions, statements of policy and interpretation for the guidance of the public.

Third. Require an index be kept of opinions, rules, and orders; and deny agencies the right to use an order, opinion, or rule as a precedent unless it has been made available to the party in issue.

Fourth. Require agencies to specify times, places, and procedures for the inspection of their records.

Fifth. Require agencies to make public the individual votes of each member.

The bill provides for three main exceptions: First, where there is a statute providing for exemption; second, where a matter relates solely to the internal workings of an agency; and third, where secrecy is vital to the national defense.

As has been said before, the great strength of a democracy is that it does not operate behind closed doors. It is my hope that this time legislation will result, that it will strike a blow at agency secrecy, and that in the end it will provide for greater economy and fairness in government.

Mr. President, as the text of the bill is very short, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill, for appropriate reference; and I ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk for a calendar week, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

The bill (S. 1666) to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of chapter 324 of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—Except to the extent that there is involved (1) any function of the United States requiring secrecy in the public interest or (2) any matter relating solely to the internal management of any agency, every agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register (A) descriptions of its central and field organization including delegations by the agency of authority and the established places at which, and methods whereby, the public may secure information or make submittals or requests; (B) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, including the nature and requirements of all formal or informal procedures available, rules of procedure, descriptions of forms available and instructions as to the scope and contents of all papers, reports, or examinations; (C) substantive rules adopted as authorized by law and statements of general policy or interpretations formulated and adopted by the agency for the guidance of the public and (D) every amendment, revision or repeal of the foregoing. No person shall in any manner be required to resort to, or be bound or adversely affected by any organization, procedure, or other rule, statement, or interpretation thereof required to be published in the Federal Register and not so published.

"(b) AGENCY OPINIONS, ORDERS, AND RULES.—Except to the extent that matter (1) is specifically exempted from disclosure by statute, or (2) involves any function of the United States requiring secrecy to protect the national defense and is specifically exempted from disclosure by executive order or (3) relates solely to the internal employment rules and practices of any agency, every agency shall, in accordance with published rules, make available for public inspection and copying all final opinions (including concurring and dissenting opinions) and orders made in the adjudication of cases and all rules, statements of policy and interpretations adopted by the agency and affecting the public, unless such opinions, orders, rules, statements and interpretations are promptly published and copies offered for sale. To the extent required to protect the public interest an agency may delete identifying details when it makes available or publishes an opinion, order, rule, statement or interpretation; however in such cases the justification for the deletion must be fully explained in writing. Every agency also shall maintain and make available for public inspection and copying a current index providing adequate information for the public as to each final order, opinion, rule, statement of policy and interpretation. No final order, opinion, rule, statement of policy or interpretation may be relied upon, used or cited as precedent by an agency against any private party unless it has been indexed and either made available or published as provided in this subsection.

"(c) AGENCY RECORDS.—Every agency shall, in accordance with published rule stating the time, place and procedure to be followed make its records promptly available except those particular records or parts thereof which are (1) specifically exempt from disclosure by statute; (2) specifically required by executive order to be kept secret for the protection of the national defense; and (3) the internal memoranda of the members and employees of an agency relating to the consideration and disposition of adjudicatory rulemaking matters. The District Court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency is situated shall have jurisdiction upon complaint to order the production of any agency records or information improperly withheld from the complainant by the agency and to assess against the agency the cost and reasonable attorneys' fees of the complainant. In such cases the court shall determine the matter de novo and the burden shall be upon the agency to sustain its action by a preponderance of the evidence.

"(d) AGENCY PROCEEDINGS.—Every agency having more than one member shall keep a record of the individual votes of each member in every agency proceeding and except to the extent required to protect the national defense such record shall be available for public inspection.

"(e) LIMITATION OF EXEMPTION.—Nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting the availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this section, nor shall this section be authority to withhold information from Congress."

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, TO EXTEND THE CHILD LABOR PROVISIONS TO CERTAIN CHILDREN EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 523) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FARM LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 524) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSIGNER OF MINORITY VIEWS ON MIGRATORY LABOR BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], that his name be added to the minority views which have been filed on the migrant labor bills, S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, and S. 525.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STATE PARK AGENCIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] be added as cosponsors of my bill S. 1238, to provide for the donation of Federal surplus property to State park agencies.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS FOR S. 1517

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors of my bill, S. 1517, which authorizes and directs the Postmaster General to issue a special U.S. postage stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Let me express my fervent commendation of the distinguished Senator from Oregon for taking leadership in the fight against the scourge of cancer.

I would be very grateful if she would include my name among the cosponsors of her legislative proposal authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer.

Without going into lengthy personal details, let me say that my wife of more than 40 years and also one of my sons have died of cancer.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I certainly extend my profound sympathy to the Senator from Ohio. He knows, as I do, the terrible effect which this dread disease has upon any family.

I ask unanimous consent that his name be included among the cosponsors of Senate bill 1517, authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the crusade against cancer.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 27, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1610. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes: Mr. Church, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, and Mr. Magnuson.

S. 1614. A bill to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets: Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. 1617. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Simpson.

S. 1622. A bill to prevent certain discriminatory practices by persons engaged in businesses affecting commerce: Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] today introduced, by request, S. 1642, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. This bill represents the legislative program submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission for consideration by the Congress this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with Chairman Cary's letter of transmittal and a short summary of the bill, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill, letter, and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Securities Acts Amendments of 1963".

Sec. 2. Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following four paragraphs:

"(18) The term 'person associated with a broker or dealer' means any partner, officer, director, or branch manager of such broker or dealer (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions), or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such broker or dealer, including any employee of such broker or dealer. The Commission may by rules and regulations classify, for the purpose of any portion or portions of this title, persons, including employees, controlled by a broker or a dealer. In such rules and regulations the Commission shall appropriately exclude from the scope of subsection (b) (other than paragraph (3) thereof) of section 15 hereof persons associated with a broker or dealer whose functions are clerical or ministerial.

"(19) The terms 'investment company,' 'affiliated person,' and 'insurance company' have the same meanings as in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

"(20) The terms 'investment adviser' and 'underwriter' have the same meanings as in the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

"(21) The term 'person associated with a member' means a person who is registered with a registered securities association pursuant to its rules or who is associated with a broker or dealer which is a member of such association."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 12(b) of said Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subparagraphs (I) through (K) of paragraph (1) are redesignated as (J) through (L), respectively.

(2) A new subparagraph (1)(I) is added to read as follows:

"(I) material contracts, not made in the ordinary course of business, which are to be executed in whole or in part at or after the filing of the application or which were made not more than two years before such filing, and every material patent or contract for a material patent right shall be deemed a material contract."

(3) A new paragraph (3) is added to read as follows:

"(3) Such copies of material contracts, referred to in paragraph (1)(I) above, as the Commission may require as necessary or appropriate for the proper protection of investors and to insure fair dealing in the security."

(b) Section 12(f) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any national securities exchange, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, (1) may continue unlisted trading privileges to which a security had been admitted on such exchange prior to the effective date of subsection (g) of section 12 of this title, or (2) upon application to and approval of such application by the Commission, may extend unlisted trading privileges to any security duly listed and registered on any other national securities exchange. If an extension of unlisted trading privileges to a security was originally based upon its listing and registration on another national securities exchange, such privileges shall continue in effect only so long as such securities shall remain listed and registered on any other national securities exchange.

"No application pursuant to this subsection shall be approved unless the Commission finds, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, that the extension of unlisted trading privileges pursuant to such application is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"The Commission shall by rules and regulations suspend unlisted trading privileges in whole or in part for any or all classes of securities for a period not exceeding twelve months, if it deems such suspension necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or to prevent evasion of the purposes of this title.

"On the application of the issuer of any security for which unlisted trading privileges on any exchange have been continued or extended pursuant to this subsection, or of any broker or dealer who makes or creates a market for such security, or of any other person having a bona fide interest in the question of termination or suspension of such unlisted trading privileges, or on its own motion, the Commission shall by order terminate, or suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months, such unlisted trading privileges for such security if the Commission finds, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, that such termination or suspension is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"In any proceeding under this subsection in which appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing are required, notice of not less than ten days to the applicant in such proceeding, to the issuer of the security involved, to the exchange which is seeking to continue or extend or has continued or extended unlisted trading privileges for such security, and to the exchange, if any, on which such security is listed and registered, shall be deemed adequate notice, and any broker or dealer who makes or creates a market for such security, and any other person having a bona fide interest in such proceeding, shall upon application be entitled to be heard.

"Any security for which unlisted trading privileges are continued or extended pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed to be registered on a national securities exchange within the meaning of this title. The powers and duties of the Commission, under subsection (b) of section 19 of this title shall be applicable to the rules of an exchange in respect of any such security. The Commission may, by such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, either unconditionally or upon specified terms and conditions, or for stated periods, exempt such securities from the operation of any provision of section 13, 14, or 16 of this title."

(c) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) Every issuer which is engaged in interstate commerce, or in a business affecting interstate commerce, or whose securities are traded by use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce shall—

"(i) within 120 days after the last day of its fiscal year ended after the effective date of this subsection on which the issuer has total assets exceeding $1,000,000 and a class of equity security (other than an exempted security) held of record by 750 or more persons; and

"(ii) within 120 days after the last day of its fiscal year ended after two years from the effective date of this subsection on which the issuer has total assets exceeding $1,000,000 and a class of equity security (other than an exempted security) held of record by 500 or more but less than 750 persons

register such security by filing with the Commission a registration statement (and such duplicate originals as the Commission may require) with respect to such security containing such information and documents as the Commission may specify comparable to that which is required in an application to register a security pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Each such registration statement shall become effective 60 days after filing with the Commission or within such shorter period as the Commission may direct. Until such registration statement becomes effective it shall not be deemed filed for the purposes of section 18 of this title. Any issuer may register any class of equity security not required to be registered by filing a registration statement pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. The Commission is authorized to extend the date upon which any issuer or class of issuers is required to register a security pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in respect of—

"(A) any security listed and registered on a national securities exchange;

"(B) any security issued by an investment company registered pursuant to section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940;

"(C) any security, other than permanent stock, guaranty stock, permanent reserve stock or any similar certificate evidencing nonwithdrawable capital, issued by a savings and loan association, building and loan association, cooperative bank, homestead association, or similar institution, which is supervised and examined by State or Federal authority having supervision over any such institution;

"(D) any security of an issuer organized and operated exclusively for religious, educational, benevolent, fraternal, charitable, or reformatory purposes and not for pecuniary profit, and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(E) any security of a foreign issuer, including any certificate of deposit for such a security, unless the Commission, by rules or regulations, or by order after notice and opportunity for hearing, on its own motion or upon application of an interested person, finds that a substantial public market for the equity securities of such issuer or of a class of issuers which includes such issuer exists in the United States and that continued exemption of securities of such issuer or class of issuers is not in the public interest or consistent with the protection of investors.

"(3) Registration of any class of security pursuant to this subsection shall be terminated 90 days, or such shorter period as the Commission may determine, after the issuer files a certification with the Commission that the number of holders of record of such class of security is reduced to less than 300 persons. The Commission shall after notice and opportunity for hearing deny termination of registration if it finds that the certification is untrue. Termination of registration shall be deferred pending final determination on the question of denial.

"(4) For the purposes of this subsection the term 'class' shall include all securities of an issuer which are of substantially similar character and the holders of which enjoy substantially similar rights and privileges. The Commission may for the purposes of this subsection define by rules and regulations the terms 'total assets' and 'held of record' as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors in order to prevent circumvention of the provisions of this subsection."

(d) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(h) The Commission may by rules and regulations, or upon application of an interested person, by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, exempt in whole or in part any issuer or class of issuers from the provisions of subsection (g) hereof or from sections 13, 14 or subsection 15(d) of this title or may exempt from section 16 hereof any officer, director or beneficial owner of securities of any issuer, any security of which is required to be registered pursuant to subsection (g) hereof, upon such terms and conditions and for such period as it deems necessary or appropriate, if the Commission finds, by reason of the number of public investors, amount of trading interest in the securities, the nature and extent of the activities of the issuer, income or assets of the issuer, or othewise, that such action is not inconsistent with the public interest or the protection of investors. The Commission may, for the purposes of any of the above-mentioned sections or subsections of this title classify issuers and prescribe requirements appropriate for each such class."

(e) Section 12 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(i) In respect of any securities issued by banks the powers, functions and duties of the Commission pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be delegated in whole or in part to the Federal banking regulatory agency or instrumentality which has jurisdiction to examine or supervise the business of such banks, upon the request of such agency or instrumentality."

Sec. 4. Section 13(a) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every issuer of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title shall file with the Commission the information, documents and reports below specified (and such duplicate originals as the Commission may require) in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the proper protection of investors and to insure fair dealing in the securities—

"(1) Such information and documents as the Commission shall require to keep reasonably current the information and documents required to be included in or filed with an application or registration statement filed pursuant to section 12.

"(2) Such annual reports, certified if required by the rules and regulations of the Commission by independent public accountants, and such quarterly reports, as the Commission may prescribe.

Every issuer of a security registered on a national securities exchange shall also file a duplicate original of such information, documents and reports with the exchange."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 14(a) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, by use of the mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce or of any facility of a national securities exchange or otherwise, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, to solicit or to permit the use of his name to solicit any proxy or consent or authorization in respect of any security (other than an exempted security) registered pursuant to section 12 of this title."

(b) Section 14(b) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any member of a national securities exchange, or any registered broker or dealer, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, to give, or to refrain from giving a proxy, consent, or authorization in respect of any security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title, and carried for the account of a customer."

(c) Section 14 of said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(c) Unless proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title are solicited by or on behalf of the management of the issuer from the record holders of such security in accordance with subsection (a) of this section and the rules and regulations thereunder, prior to any annual or other meeting of the holders of such security, such issuer shall, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, file with the Commission and transmit to all record holders of such security information substantially equivalent to the information which would be required to be transmitted if a solicitation were made."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 15(a) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No broker or dealer shall make use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security (other than an exempted security or commercial paper, bankers' acceptances, or commercial bills) otherwise than on a national securities exchange, unless such broker or dealer (A) is registered in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and (B) is a member of a securities association which is registered pursuant to section 15A of this title.

"The Commission may by such rules and regulations or orders as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, either unconditionally or upon specified terms and conditions or for specified periods, exempt from clauses (A) or (B), or both, of this subsection (a) any broker or dealer or category of brokers or dealers specified in such rules, regulations or orders. Clause (B) of this subsection (a) shall be inapplicable with respect to: (i) all brokers and dealers during any period in which there is no registered securities association, and (ii) any broker or dealer during any period in which the rules of each registered securities association preclude the membership therein of such broker or dealer solely because of the geographical location of, or type of business done by, such broker or dealer."

(b) Section 15(b) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) A broker or dealer may be registered for the purposes of this section by filing with the Commission an application for registration, which shall contain such information in such detail as to such broker or dealer and any persons associated with such broker or dealer as the Commission may by rules and regulations require as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Except as hereinafter provided, such registration shall become effective 30 days after the receipt of such application by the Commission or within such shorter period of time as the Commission may determine.

"An application for registration of a broker or dealer to be formed or organized may be made by a broker or dealer to which the broker or dealer to be formed or organized is to be the successor. Such application shall contain such information in such detail as to the applicant and as to the successor and any person associated with the applicant or the successor, as the Commission may by rules and regulations require as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Except as hereinafter provided, such registration shall become effective thirty days after the receipt of such application by the Commission or within such shorter period of time as the Commission may determine. Such registration shall terminate on the forty-fifth day after the effective date thereof, unless prior thereto the successor shall, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, adopt such application as its own.

"If any amendment to any application for registration pursuant to this subsection is filed prior to the effective date thereof, such amendment shall be deemed to have been filed simultaneously with and as part of such application; except that the Commission may, if it appears necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, defer the effective date of any such registration as thus amended until the thirtieth day after the filing of such amendment.

"Any provision of this title (other than section 5 and subsection (a) of this section 15) which prohibits any act, practice, or course of business if the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce are used in connection therewith shall also prohibit any such act, practice, or course of business by any broker or dealer registered pursuant to this subsection or any person acting on behalf of such a broker or dealer, irrespective of any use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection therewith.

"(2) The Commission shall, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order censure, deny registration to, suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months or revoke the registration of, any broker or dealer if it finds that such censure, denial, suspension, or revocation is in the public interest and that such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated, (A) has willfully made or caused to be made in any application for registration or report required to be filed with the Commission under this title, or in any proceeding before the Commission with respect to registration, any statement which was at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or has omitted to state in any such application or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein; or (B) has been convicted within ten years preceding the filing of the application or at any time thereafter of any felony or misdemeanor which the Commission finds: (i) involves the purchase or sale of any security, (ii) arises out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer, or investment adviser, (iii) involves embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds or securities, or (iv) involves the violation of section 1341, 1342, or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore or hereafter amended; or (C) is permanently or temporarily enjoined by order, judgment, or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction from acting as an investment adviser, underwriter, broker, or dealer, or as an affiliated person or employee of any investment company, bank, or insurance company, or from engaging in or continuing any conduct or practice in connection with any such activity, or in connection with the purchase or sale of any security; or (D) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, or of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, or of the Investment Company Act of 1940, or of this title, as any of such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes; or (E) has willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured the violation by any other person of the Securities Act of 1933, or the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, or the Investment Company Act of 1940, or of this title, as any such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes or has failed reasonably to supervise, with a view to preventing violations of such statutes, rules, and regulations, another person who commits such a violation, if such other person is subject to his supervision; or (F) is subject to an order of the Commission entered pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection (b) barring or suspending the right of such person to be associated with a broker or dealer, which order is in effect with respect to such person. For the purposes of clause (E) of this paragraph, no person shall be deemed to have failed reasonably to supervise any person, if (i) there have been established procedures, and a system for applying such procedures, which would reasonably be expected to prevent and detect, insofar as practicable, any such violation by such other person; and (ii) such person has reasonably discharged the duties and obligations incumbent upon him by reason of such procedures and system without reasonable cause to believe that such procedures and system were not being complied with. Pending final determination whether any such registration shall be denied, the Commission may by order postpone the effective date of such registration for a period not to exceed fifteen days, but if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing (which may consist solely of affidavits and oral arguments), it shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to postpone the effective date of such registration until final determination, the Commission shall so order. Pending final determination whether any such registration shall be revoked, the Commission shall by order suspend such registration if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, such suspension shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Any registered broker or dealer may, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may deem necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, withdraw from registration by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the Commission. If the Commission finds that any registered broker or dealer, or any broker or dealer for whom an application for registration is pending, is no longer in existence or has ceased to do business as a broker or dealer, the Commission shall by order cancel the registration or application of such broker or dealer.

"(3) The Commission may, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order censure any person, or bar or suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months any person from being associated with a broker or dealer, if the Commission finds that such censure, barring or suspension is in the public interest and that such person has committed or omitted any act or omission enumerated in clauses (A), (D) or (E) of paragraph (2) of this subsection (b) hereof or has been convicted of any offense specified in clause (B) of said paragraph (2) hereof or is enjoined from any action, conduct or practice specified in clause (C) of said paragraph (2). It shall be unlawful for any person as to whom such an order barring or suspending him from being associated with a broker-dealer is in effect, willfully to become, or to be, associated with a broker or dealer, without the consent of the Commission, and it shall be unlawful for any broker or dealer to permit such a person to become, or remain, a person associated with him, without the consent of the Commission, if such broker or dealer knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care, should have known, of such order."

(c) Section 15(c) of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) If the Commission finds, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that any person subject to the provisions of sections 12, 13 or subsection (d) of section 15 of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder has failed to comply with any such provision, rule or regulation in any material respect, the Commission may publish its findings and issue an order requiring such person to comply with such provision or such rule or regulation thereunder upon such terms and conditions and within such time as the Commission may specify in such order.

"(5) If in its opinion the public interest and the protection of investors so require, the Commission is authorized summarily to suspend trading, otherwise than on a national securities exchange, in any security (other than an exempted security) for a period not exceeding ten days. No broker or dealer shall make use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in which trading is so suspended."

(d) Section 15(d) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Each issuer which has filed a registration statement containing an undertaking which is or becomes operative under this subsection as heretofore in effect, and each issuer which shall hereafter file a registration statement which has become effective pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall file with the Commission, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, such supplementary and periodic information, documents, and reports as may be required pursuant to section 13 of this title in respect of a security registered pursuant to section 12 of this title. The duty to file under this subsection shall be automatically suspended if and so long as (1) any issue of securities of such issuer is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title, or (2) the securities of each class to which the registration statement relates are held of record by less than

300 persons at the end of its last fiscal year subsequent to the conclusion of the offering and immediately preceding the date on which such information, documents, and reports would otherwise be required to be filed. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'class' shall be construed to include all securities of an issuer which are of substantially similar character and the holders of which enjoy substantially similar rights and privileges. Nothing in this subsection shall apply to securities issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 15A(b) of said Act is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (3) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the rules of the association provide that any broker or dealer who makes use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security otherwise than on a national securities exchange, may become a member of such association, except such as are excluded pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection: *Provided,* That the rules of the association may restrict membership in such association on such specified geographical basis, or on such specified basis relating to the type of business done by its members, or on such other specified and appropriate basis, as appears to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors and to carry out the purpose of this section; rules adopted by the association may provide that the association may, unless the Commission directs otherwise in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to direct, deny admission to or refuse to continue in such association any broker or dealer if (i) such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (ii) any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated, has been and is suspended or expelled from a national securities exchange or has been and is barred or suspended from being associated with all members of such exchange, for violation of any rule of such exchange;"

(2) Paragraph (4) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the rules of the association provide that, except with the approval or at the direction of the Commission in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to approve or direct, no broker or dealer shall be admitted to or continued in membership in such association, if (i) such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (ii) any person associated with such broker or dealer, whether prior or subsequent to becoming so associated (A) has been and is suspended or expelled from a registered securities association (whether national or affiliated) or from a national securities exchange or has been and is barred or suspended from being associated with all members of such association or from being associated with all brokers or dealers which are members of such exchange, for violation of any rule of such association or exchange which prohibits any act or transactions constituting conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, or requires any act the omission of which constitutes conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, or (B) is subject to an order of the Commission denying, suspending for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoking his registration pursuant to section 15 of this title, or expelling or suspending him from membership in a registered securities association or a national securities exchange, or barring or suspending him from being associated with a broker or dealer, or (C) by his conduct while associated with a broker or dealer, was a cause of any suspension, expulsion, or order of the character described in clause (A) or (B) which is in effect with respect to such broker or dealer, and in entering such a suspension, expulsion or order, the Commission or any such exchange or association shall have jurisdiction to determine whether or not any person was a cause thereof;"

(3) Paragraphs (5) through (10) thereof are redesignated as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively, and a new paragraph (5) is added to read as follows:

"(5) the rules of the association provide that, except with the approval or at the direction of the Commission in cases in which the Commission finds it appropriate in the public interest so to approve or direct, no person shall become a member and no natural person shall become a person associated with a member, unless such person is qualified to become a member or a person associated with a member in conformity with specified and appropriate standards with respect to the training, experience, and such other qualifications of such person as the association finds necessary or desirable, and in the case of a member, the financial responsibility of such member. For the purpose of defining such standards and the application thereof, such rules may (A) appropriately classify prospective members (taking into account relevant matters, including type of business done and nature of securities sold) and persons proposed to be associated with members, (B) specify that all or any portion of such standards shall be applicable to any such class, (C) require persons in any such class to pass examinations prescribed in accordance with such rules, (D) provide that persons in any such class other than prospective members and partners, officers and supervisory employees (which latter term may be defined by such rules and as so defined shall include branch managers of members) of members, may be qualified solely on the basis of compliance with specified standards of training and such other qualifications as the association finds appropriate, (E) provide that applications to become a member or a person associated with a member shall set forth such facts as the association may prescribe as to the training, experience, financial responsibility, and other qualifications of the applicant and that the association may adopt procedures for verification of qualifications of the applicant, and (F) require any class of persons associated with a member to be registered with the association in accordance with procedures specified by such rules (and any application or document supplemental thereto required by such rules of a person seeking to be registered with such association shall, for the purposes of subsection (a) of section 32 of this title, be deemed an application required to be filed under this title)."

(4) Redesignated paragraph (9) is amended to read as follows:

"(9) the rules of the association provide that its members and persons associated with its members shall be appropriately disciplined, by expulsion, suspension, fine, censure, or being suspended or barred from being associated with all members, or any other fitting penalty, for any violation of its rules;"

(5) Redesignated paragraph (10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) the rules of the association provide a fair and orderly procedure with respect to the disciplining of members and persons associated with members and the denial of membership to any broker or dealer seeking membership therein or the barring of any person from being associated with a member. In any proceeding to determine whether any member or other person shall be disciplined, such rules shall require that specific charges be brought; that such member or person shall be notified of, and be given an opportunity to defend against, such charges; that a record shall be kept; and that the determination shall include (A) a statement setting forth any act or practice in which such member or other person may be found to have engaged, or which such member or other person may be found to have omitted, (B) a statement setting forth the specific rule or rules of the association of which any such act or practice, or omission to act, is deemed to be in violation, (C) a statement whether the acts or practices prohibited by such rule or rules, or the omission of any act required thereby, are deemed to constitute conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, and (D) a statement setting forth the penalty imposed. In any proceeding to determine whether a broker or dealer shall be denied membership or whether any person shall be barred from being associated with a member, such rules shall provide that the broker or dealer or person shall be notified of, and be given an opportunity to be heard upon, the specific grounds for denial or bar which are under consideration; that a record shall be kept; and that the determination shall set forth the specific grounds upon which the denial or bar is based; and"

(6) Section 15A(b) is further amended by adding two unnumbered paragraphs at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"The rules of the association shall include provisions governing the form and content of quotations relating to securities sold otherwise than on a national securities exchange which may be disseminated by any member or any person associated with a member, and the persons to whom such quotations may be supplied. Such rules relating to quotations shall be designed to produce fair and informative quotations, both at the wholesale and retail level, to prevent fictitious or misleading quotations, and to promote orderly procedures for collecting and publishing quotations.

"*Provided, however,* That the rules of a registered securities association which was registered on the effective date of the amendments to this subsection (b) contained in Public Law No. — need not conform to the requirements of such subsection as so amended until — 1964. After — 1964, the Commission may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend the registration of any such association if it finds that the rules do not conform to the requirements of this subsection (b) as so amended and any such suspension shall remain in effect until the Commission issues an order determining that such rules have been modified to conform with the requirements of this subsection (b) as so amended."

(b) Section 15A(d)(2) is amended by striking the figure "(9)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(10)".

(c) Section 15A(g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) If any registered securities association (whether national or affiliated) shall take any disciplinary action against any member thereof or any person associated with such a member or shall deny admission to any broker or dealer seeking membership therein, or shall bar any person from being associated with a member, such action shall be subject to review by the Commission, on its own motion, or upon application by any person aggrieved thereby filed within thirty days after such action has been taken or within such longer period as the Commission may determine. Application to the Commission for review, or the institution of review by the Commission on its own motion, shall operate as a stay of such action until an order is issued upon such review pursuant to subsection (h), unless the Commission shall otherwise order, after notice and opportunity for hearing on the question of a stay (which hearing may consist solely of affidavits and oral arguments)."

(d) Section 15A(h) is amended to read as follows:

"(h)(1) In a proceeding to review disciplinary action taken by a registered securities association against a member thereof or a person associated with a member, if the Commission, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, upon consideration of the record before the association and such other evidence as it may deem relevant, shall (A) find that such member or person has engaged in such acts or practices, or has omitted such act, as the association has found him to have engaged in or omitted, and (B) shall determine that such acts or practices, or omission to act, are in violation of such rules of the association as have been designated in the determination of the association, the Commission shall by order dismiss the proceeding, unless it appears to the Commission that such action should be modified in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Commission shall likewise determine whether the acts or practices prohibited, or the omission of any act required, by any such rule constitute conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, and shall so declare. If it appears to the Commission that the evidence does not warrant the finding required in clause (A) or if the Commission shall determine that such acts or practices as are found to have been engaged in are not prohibited by the designated rule or rules of the association, or that such act as is found to have been omitted is not required by such designated rule or rules, the Commission shall by order set aside the action of the association.

"(2) If, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, the Commission finds that any penalty imposed upon a member or person associated with a member is excessive or oppressive, having due regard to the public interest, the Commission shall by order cancel, reduce, or require the remission of such penalty.

"(3) In any proceeding to review the denial of membership in a registered securities association or barring any person from being associated with a member, if the Commission, after appropriate notice and hearing, and upon consideration of the record before the association and such other evidence as it may deem relevant, shall determine that the specific grounds on which such denial or bar is based exist in fact and are valid under this section, the Commission shall by order dismiss the proceeding; otherwise, the Commission shall by order set aside the action of the association and require it to admit the applicant broker or dealer to membership therein, or to permit such person to be associated with a member."

(e) Section 15A(k)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Commission may in writing request any registered securities association to adopt any specified alteration of or supplement to its rules with respect to any of the matters hereinafter enumerated. If such association fails to adopt such alteration or supplement within a reasonable time, the Commission is authorized by order to alter or supplement the rules of such association in the manner theretofore requested, or with such modifications of such alteration or supplement as it deems necessary if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, it appears to the Commission that such alteration or supplement is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or to effectuate the purposes of this section, with respect to: (A) The basis for, and procedure in connection with, the denial of membership or the barring from being associated with a member or the disciplining of members or persons associated with members, or the qualifications required for members or persons associated with members or any class thereof; (B) the method for adoption of any change in or addition to the rules of the association; (C) the method of choosing officers and directors; and (D) affiliation between registered securities associations."

(f) Section 15A(l)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order to suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or to expel from a registered securities association any member thereof, or to suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or to bar any person from being associated with a member thereof, if the Commission finds that such member or persons (A) has violated any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder, or has effected any transaction for any other person who, he had reason to believe, was violating with respect to such transaction any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder, or (B) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or of any rule or regulation thereunder, or has effected any transaction for any other person who, he had reason to believe, was willfully violating with respect to such transaction any provision of such Act or rule or regulation."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 16(a) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial owner of more than 10 per centum of any class of any equity security (other than an exempted security) which is registered pursuant to section 12 of this title, or who is a director or an officer of the issuer of such security, shall file, at the time of the registration of such security on a national securities exchange or by the effective date of a registration statement filed pursuant to subsection (g) of section 12 of this title, or within ten days after he becomes such beneficial owner, director, or officer, a statement with the Commission (and, if such security is registered on a national securities exchange, also with the exchange) of the amount of all equity securities of such issuer of which he is the beneficial owner, and within ten days after the close of each calendar month thereafter, if there has been a change in such ownership during such month, shall file with the Commission (and if such security is registered on a national securities exchange, shall also file with the exchange) a statement indicating his ownership at the close of the calendar month and such charges in his ownership as have occurred during such calendar month."

(b) Section 16 of said Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (d) thereof as (e) and adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to any purchase and sale, or sale and purchase, and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to any sale, of an equity security not then or theretofore held by him in an investment account, by a broker or dealer in the ordinary course of his business and incident to the establishment or maintenance of a primary or secondary market for such security. The Commission may, by such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or appropriate in the public interest, define and prescribe terms and conditions with respect to securities held in an investment account and transactions made in the ordinary course of business and incident to the establishment or maintenace of a primary or secondary market."

SEC. 9. Section 20(c) of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any director or officer of, or any owner of any securities issued by, any issuer required to file any document, report, or information under this title or any rule or regulation thereunder without just cause to hinder, delay, or obstruct the making or filing of any such document, report, or information."

SEC. 10. Section 32 of said Act is amended by striking subsection (b) thereof and by redesignating subsection (c) thereof as "(b)".

SEC. 11. Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The provisions of section 5 shall not apply to any of the following transactions:

"(1) Transactions by any person other than an issuer, underwriter, or dealer; transactions by an issuer not involving any public offering; or transactions by a dealer (including an underwriter no longer acting as an underwriter in respect of the security involved in such transaction), except (a) transactions taking place prior to the expiration of forty days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter, (b) transactions in a security as to which a registration statement has been filed taking place prior to the expiration of forty days after the effective date of such registration statement or prior to the expiration of forty days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter after such effective date, whichever is later (excluding in the computation of such forty days any time during which a stop order issued under section 8 is in effect as to the security), or such shorter period as the Commission may specify by rules and regulations or order and (c) transactions as to securities constituting the whole or a part of an unsold allotment to or subscription by such dealer as a participant in the distribution of such securities by the issuer or by or through an underwriter. With respect to transactions referred to in subparagraph (b), if securities of the issuer have not previously been sold pursuant to an earlier effective registration statement the applicable period, instead of forty days, shall be ninety days, or such shorter period as the Commission may specify by rules and regulations or order.

"(2) Brokers' transactions, executed upon customers' orders on any exchange or in the over-the-counter market, but not the solicitation of such orders."

SEC. 12. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as follows:

(1) The effective date of subsection 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by the Securities Act Amendments of 1963 shall be July 1, 1964.

(2) The effective date of the amendments to section 15(a) of said Act contained in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963 shall be July 1, 1964.

(3) The amendments to section 15(d) of said Act contained in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963 shall apply to every registration statement pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933 which becomes effective after the date of enactment of said amendments.

(4) All other amendments contained in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1963 shall take effect on the date of enactment.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1963.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit legislative proposals unanimously recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission with the hope that they will be introduced and enacted in this 1st session of the 88th Congress. These proposals amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and—in one respect—the Securities Act of 1933. In large part they are based on that section of the Report of the Special Study of Securities Markets (chapters I–IV, and IX) delivered to the Congress on April 3 of this year—a study authorized and directed by the Congress to evaluate the adequacy of investor protection. In making these proposals, we have singled out those measures which both the Commission and the securities industry regard as constructive and vitally needed. They are designed to deal with areas where the present statutory structure of the securities acts is inadequate. In the opinion of the Commission, the enactment of these proposals will represent a major achievement in the area of securities regulation, will materially increase existing investor protection, and thus will maintain and enhance investor confidence.

Our program is directed at the following: (1) improving investor protection in the over-the-counter market by extension of the reporting requirements, proxy rules, and "insider trading" provisions—now applicable to "listed companies"—to certain companies whose securities are traded in the over-the-counter market; (2) strengthening the standards of entrance into the securities business, extending the coverage of self-regulation, and refining Commission disciplinary controls over brokers, dealers and their employees; and (3) assuring more adequate dissemination of information about companies that for the first time raise public capital through a registered offering by lengthening the period for delivery of prospectuses, with corresponding authority in the Commission to shorten this period. These proposals are detailed in the enclosed statement.

We emphasize the interrelationship of our legislative recommendations and their common goal—the raising of standards in the securities markets, particularly in the over-the-counter market. Basic and reliable facts concerning companies traded in the over-the-counter market are a necessary adjunct to higher qualifications for those who deal in over-the-counter securities. Improved standards in the securities markets are best assured by the combination of better information about securities, on the one hand, and better qualified persons to utilize and evaluate that information, on the other. Each proposal would be an important advance; but it is the sum of all of them which will produce the maximum benefit in the public interest.

I should also like to acknowledge the substantial and beneficial cooperation offered the Commission by representatives of the securities industry in connection with our legislative proposals. With the concurrence of the chairman of our congressional committees, I invited leaders of industry organizations to appoint committees to consult with the Commission. Since the middle of April, the Commission and its staff have been working with those representatives. The aim has been to present to the Congress legislation which represents a substantial and important advance for investor protection and which the securities industry will support as constructive and practical. We believe that this aim has been achieved. In view of the pressures of time, we have neither asked for nor received a binding commitment that the industry as a whole will support our proposals; but we do have assurances from the leaders of major securities organizations that they regard all of the proposals submitted here as constructive and in the public interest. We thus fully anticipate their public support.

In our letter of transmittal dated April 3 and in a succeeding letter to the Honorable Oren Harris, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, dated April 19, we indicated that three additional proposals might be submitted. The first of these would relate to security credit regulation; the second to over-the-counter quotations; and the third to false and misleading corporate publicity. We have decided to defer their submission at this time. As we previously indicated in our letter of transmittal, any recommendation relating to security credit regulation will be transmitted only after consultation with the Federal Reserve Board. This work has not been completed. The material underlying a quotation statute has not yet been delivered to the Congress and, of course, is not available to the securities industry. Under these circumstances, it seems undesirable to submit this legislation until we have had an opportunity to secure the benefit of industry views. Finally, as to legislation on corporate publicity, we have not arrived at a satisfactory formula. Legislation dealing with the above areas may be recommended to the Congress at a subsequent date, but probably not in time for consideration during this session.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

By direction of the Commission.

William L. Cary,
Chairman.

Statement With Respect to Legislative Proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission To Amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Securities Act of 1933

The legislative proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission may be divided, for discussion purposes, into three general areas: (1) Improving investor protection in the over-the-counter market by extension of the reporting requirements, proxy rules, and "insider trading" provisions—now applicable to "listed companies"—to certain companies whose securities are traded in the over-the-counter market; (2) strengthening the standards of entrance into the securities business, extending the coverage of self-regulation, and refining Commission disciplinary controls over brokers, dealers, and their employees; and (3) assuring more adequate dissemination of information about companies that for the first time raise public capital by lengthening the period for delivery of prospectuses in an initial registered offering, with corresponding authority in the Commission to shorten this period.

It should be emphasized that these recommendations are interrelated and have a common goal—the raising of standards in the securities markets, particularly in the over-the-counter market. Basic and reliable facts concerning companies traded in the over-the-counter market are a necessary adjunct to higher qualifications for those who deal in over-the-counter securities. Improved standards in the securities markets are best assured by the combination of better information about securities, on the one hand, and better qualified persons to utilize and evaluate that information, on the other. Each proposal would be an important advance; but it is the sum of all of them which will produce the maximum benefit in the public interest.

I

A substantial void in the present statutory framework would be closed by an amendment extending the reporting, proxy solicitation and "insider trading" requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934—now applicable to "listed companies"—to certain over-the-counter companies. The dramatic expansion and increased importance of the over-the-counter market, as demonstrated by the Special Study of Securities Markets, have greatly accentuated the need for stronger investor protection in that market. In part, this will be achieved through strengthening the qualifications of those in the securities industry, as more fully outlined in part II of this statement. In addition, the financial information which would be made available to the public as a result of this amendment will greatly mitigate numerous problems and abuses in the over-the-counter market, including improper selling practices, misleading public relations, irresponsible investment advice and erratic "after markets" for new issues. The disparity between the protections denied investors in over-the-counter securities and those afforded owners of listed securities has long been recognized as illogical and unwarranted. As the majority report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency stated in 1957, "as a general policy, it is in the public interest that companies whose stocks are traded over the counter be required to comply with the same statutory provisions and the same rules and regulations as companies whose stocks are listed on national securities exchanges."

Initially companies having $1 million in assets and a class of equity securities held of record by 750 or more persons would be covered. After 2 years, or a longer period if the Commission so determines, the stockholder requirement would drop to 500. In the case of bank stocks, the functions of the Commission would be assumed by one or more of the Federal banking regulatory agencies upon the request of such an agency. This recognizes the special status of banks and would permit integration of the proposal into the Federal banking regulatory pattern.

This proposed amendment would not apply to foreign companies, unless the Commission finds any such company, or a class of such companies, should be included because of an active trading market in the United States. This recommendation is predicated upon the difficulties of enforcing U.S. law with respect to foreign companies generally, but it would give the Commission power to deal with these companies in terms of concrete cases.

The present provisions of the Exchange Act—now applicable to listed securities—which provide for recovery of short-swing profits and which prevent short sales by insiders would be extended to include the securities of all over-the-counter companies that become subject to the bill. Dealers who make markets in over-the-counter securities would be exempted to the extent of their market-making activities, subject to terms and conditions to be prescribed by Commission rules. This would permit a firm to make a market for a company's stock while represented on its board of directors. Protections against abuses would be provided by the extension of the requirement to file reports, which would reflect all securities transactions of the dealer, and by the Commission's general supervision over the activities of brokers and dealers.

The Commission would have broad powers to exempt issuers, affected persons and securities from these provisions. Exercise of these powers will permit a responsible accommodation of the requirements of the public interest with the varied circumstances of over-the-counter securities and their issuers. For example, if there were any company with no business activity or very limited trading interest, it could be exempted from all but minimal reporting requirements.

Other provisions are intended to make the basic disclosure philosophy of the securities acts more effective. One proposal would require periodic filing of reports by any company which offers its securities under a registration statement, provided it had 300 security holders of record. This section is only a modification of the present law, which reflects a general congressional intention that a company which goes to the public for funds should not subsequently be free to seal off its operations from disclosure. In addition, a company not soliciting proxies would be required to furnish shareholders with information equivalent to that contained in a proxy statement. A related recommendation would obligate both listed and over-the-counter companies subject to the reporting requirements to file their "material contracts." This information is of substantial importance to investors and is now available to them only in the case of companies registering securities under the Securities Act of 1933 and only at the time of registration. Under another proposal, if a company filed a false or misleading report, the Commission could issue an opinion pointing up this fact and require the company to correct its filing. In addition, the Commission recommends the repeal of section 32(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which provides for a fine for certain issuers who have failed to file reports. This provision has proven to be administratively unworkable.

Other proposals would also establish controls over the over-the-counter market comparable to those which the Commission now exercises over the exchange markets. For example, the Commission now may regulate the transmission by brokers of proxies with respect to exchange securities; the bill would extend this power to the proxies of over-the-counter companies. The Commission would also be able to suspend summarily over-the-counter trading in any security for a 10-day period as it may do with an exchange security, when the public interest so requires.

Finally, section 12(f)(3) of the Exchange Act, which authorizes unlisted trading privileges on an exchange where a company is subject to disclosure requirements, would be repealed. In the event that over-the-counter companies are required to make continuing disclosures, it is estimated that approximately 4,000 additional companies would then be eligible for unlisted trading under this section. This Commission believes that repeal of the clause will assure a desirable conformance by issuers with the listing requirements of a registered exchange as a prerequisite to enjoying the privileges of trading on that or other exchanges. Another provision would amend the tests for extending or terminating unlisted trading privileges so as to allow the Commission to evaluate all factors pertinent in the public interest.

II

A most important aspect of the proposed bill deals with qualification standards and controls over those in the securities business. The report of the special study has provided clear support for, and confirmation of, the Commission's conviction that the present statute does not afford an adequate basis for establishing reasonable controls over the qualifications of those who seek to enter the business. With the exception of the major exchanges, standards of training, experience, competence, and minimum capital are not adequate. Furthermore, significant sectors of the industry, including certain distributors of mutual funds and real estate securities, are not subject to the discipline of self-regulation. Finally the report of the special study demonstrated the rigidity and artificiality of the statutory scheme for disciplining violators, in neither providing for direct action against individual wrongdoers, nor expressly authorizing useful and intermediate sanctions against a firm short of revoking registration.

The proposed legislation would require all brokers or dealers registered with the Commission to become members of a registered securities association. (At present the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., is the only such association.) While self-regulation has contributed to investor protection by the establishment and enforcement of ethical standards, the report of the special study has recommended—and the Commission agrees—that the responsibilities of the self-regulatory agencies be substantially expanded and made more effective in various areas. Under these circumstances, where uniform application of standards is so vital, it would be anomalous to allow any broker or dealer, at his option, to exempt himself from the structure of self-regulation simply by choosing not to join a self-regulatory agency. The requirement of agency membership would be subject to a power in the Commission to grant appropriate exceptions. The increasing responsibility of the NASD is further reflected in an amendment requiring its adoption of rules designed to produce fair and informative quotations of over-the-counter securities.

Another proposal would shorten from 60 to 30 days the time for appealing to the Commission from disciplinary action taken by the NASD or its denial of membership. This reduction will expedite Commission review proceedings and still allow ample time for appeals. In this connection, it has also been provided that the Commission may order, after a hearing, that the appeal of an NASD disciplinary action will not stay the judgment of the NASD pending final decision on review by the Commission. At present, an appeal automatically operates as a stay. It is contemplated that this new power to lift the stay would be sparingly used; however, its use would be proper where an appeal is clearly taken for delay and injury to the public should be prevented pending the Commission's final action.

The self-regulatory agencies, under Commission supervision, are particularly equipped to develop and administer qualification standards for persons in the securities industry. Accordingly, responsibility would be given to the NASD for the establishment of such standards, including those relating to training and experience for its members and their employees and capital requirements for members. In this manner all persons dealing in over-the-counter securities would have to meet certain basic qualifications, which could vary with the responsibilities of the job—thus, branch office managers would be subject to higher requirements of experience than salesmen. In establishing standards, the NASD could adopt appropriate "grandfather" clauses exempting existing members or their employees, either permanently or for a transition period, from some or all of the qualifications required of new entrants. The Commission would have to approve these standards and could change them if necessary in the public interest. The NASD would also be authorized to adopt rules, subject to Commission approval, which would permit exclusion from its membership of persons who have been suspended or expelled from an exchange for violation of any of the exchange's rules. It is anticipated that only serious misconduct of a nature affecting the protection of investors would be grounds for exclusion and any such action would be subject to Commission review. This provision would resolve a problem existing primarily between the NASD and the New York Stock Exchange with regard to the collateral effects of the latter's disciplinary proceedings.

As a supplement to strengthening entrance requirements through the medium of the self-regulatory agencies, the Federal bases for disqualification of brokers and dealers would be expanded to a limited extent. These would include a broadening of the category of offenses and injunctions so as to conform with the provisions recently approved by the Congress in the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

The proposed legislation would also add needed flexibility to the Commission's disciplinary powers over those in the securities business. First, the Commission could proceed directly against an individual who had violated the securities laws without proceeding against his firm. (The power of the NASD so to act would also be clarified.) At present, the Commission may act only against an entire firm, which may involve many persons who are wholly innocent. Furthermore, the Commission could impose sanctions intermediate to the revocation of a firm, such as temporary suspension or a censure, appropriately tailored to the violations found.

The exemption from broker-dealer registration for those whose business is "exclusively intrastate" would be eliminated. This exemption creates a gap in the regulatory pattern for investor protection. This void would become more striking if all other brokers and dealers are required to become members of self-regulatory bodies. Moreover, if the Commission suspends registration for a limited period, a firm should not be able to avoid the impact of this suspension by conducting an exclusively intrastate business during the period specified. Since intrastate brokers or dealers are presently subject to the antifraud and financial responsibility sections of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Congress has already placed a responsibility upon the Commission to assure that their operations are carried out in compliance with those sections. Registration will assist the Commission's execution of that responsibility.

Finally, the proposed legislation would dispense with proof of the use of the mails or jurisdictional facilities in the case of Exchange Act violations by registered broker-dealers. This would avoid instances where fraud or other offenses by such firms go unpunished simply because use of these facilities in the particular transaction cannot be shown.

III

In its study of so-called hot issues, the special study found that in many cases a substantial redistribution, or delayed distribution, of new issues occurred in the aftermarket through trading firms and others without the ultimate purchaser receiving the benefit of the financial and business information contained in a prospectus. Under section 4(1) of the Securities Act of 1933, a dealer effecting transactions in registered securities must deliver a copy of a prospectus to each purchaser for a 40-day period after commencement of the offering. In accordance with the recommendation of the special study, it is proposed to amend section 4(1) to extend the 40-day requirement for delivery of a prospectus to 90 days for offerings of companies filing a registration statement for the first time. Furthermore, the present 40-day, or the new 90-day, period could be shortened by Commission rule or order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to announce the scheduling of hearings on S. 1642. This bill incorporates the legislative program which the Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed for consideration by the Congress this session.

As chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I intend to hold hearing on this legislative program beginning on the 18th of June. All persons interested in appearing before the subcommittee or in presenting material for its consideration are requested to notify Mr. Otto Lowe, Jr., assistant counsel, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Public Law 87–196 authorized and directed the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations. The study was intended to be a broad one.

The Commission appointed Mr. Milton H. Cohen, a prominent Chicago lawyer with substantial background in the securities field, as director of the special study. With a staff of 65 men, Mr. Cohen for nearly 2 years conducted an intensive investigation of the securities industry. On April 3 of this year the Commission submitted to Congress the first installment of the special study report, complete with general recommendations. The legislative proposals on which I intend to hold hearings were based in large measure upon these recommendations.

Since the submission of its report, the Commission has held extended conferences with representatives of the securities industry. It is my understanding that industry recommendations have been given careful consideration in the drafting of the SEC's legislative program for this year.

The program has three general objectives: First, to extend reporting requirements, proxy rules, and insider-trading provisions, now applicable to listed companies, to the larger, more widely held companies whose securities are traded in the over-the-counter market; second, to set meaningful standards of entrance into the securities business and to extend the application of self-regulation within the industry; and, third, to supplement existing full-disclosure provisions by extending from 40 to 90 days, with certain exceptions, the period during which prospectuses of companies going public must be delivered to prospective purchasers of stock.

Mr. President, these proposals are not revolutionary; their substance should not be unfamiliar to Members of the Senate. For example, measures which would extend reporting requirements, proxy rules, and insider trading provisions to the larger firms traded in the over-the-counter market—that is, the so-called Frear-Fulbright proposals—have been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency for nearly 15 years.

Former Senator J. Allen Frear, of Delaware, now an SEC Commissioner, introduced the first legislation of this type in August of 1949. Extensive hearings have been held on similar proposals, culminating on July 28, 1957, with the reporting of S. 1168, introduced by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. The bill, however, did not proceed beyond the Senate Calendar.

Those proposals in the program of the Commission which are designed to raise the standards of entry into the securities business also have a legislative history. On February 26, 1959, Chairman ROBERTSON (for himself and Senator Capehart) introduced S. 1179, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Securities, I conducted hearings on S. 1179 and other bills during June of 1959. The full committee reported S. 3770, a clean bill, on June 28, 1960, and the Senate passed it less than a week later on July 2. Like the proposal introduced today, this bill contained provisions which, for example, would have excluded from registration broker-dealers who had committed certain offenses.

By the same token, proposals which would extend the application of self-regulatory procedures within the industry are not unknown to Senators. Self-regulation is one of the underlying principles of the Securites Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by the Maloney Act of 1938.

Although the proposals which the Commission has presented to Congress are not, of course, identical to measures considered previously by the Banking and Currency Committee, there is, nevertheless, a strong similarity between their objectives and those of many proposals which were reported favorably by the committee since the early thirties.

It is a tribute to the foresight and judgment of both the SEC and the Banking and Currency Committee of earlier years that the extensive research of the special study group supports conclusions consistent with positions taken by the Commission and the committee in the past.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the special study of the securities industry as a unit of proposed reform. Each of the proposals, beneficial in itself, reinforces and strengthens each of the others. For example, the proposals which would set meaningful standards for salesmen will complement the Frear-Fulbright measures which would extend the philosophy of full disclosure to securities of larger unlisted companies in the over-the-counter market.

The primary objective of the legislative program is to protect the interests of investors. Chairman Cary stated the issue clearly when he made the observation that "each proposal would be an important advance; but it is the sum of all of them which will produce the maximum benefit in the public interest."

I would like to commend the present Commission on the judicious manner in which it has conducted the study of the securities industry as authorized and directed by Congress. I also compliment the securities industry on its cooperation with the Commission during the course of this study and in particular on its responsible approach to the findings of the Commission in the first installment of its April 3 report.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 29, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1409) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

His introduction of, and principal address by, Hon. R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, at the 75th anniversary commencement recognition convocation of Salem College, Salem, W. Va., May 28, 1963.

TRIBUTES TO POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the life of John XXIII, Holy Father of the Roman Catholic Church, has ended.

I believe that no religious figure in this century has so lifted the hearts of his fellow human beings as did this man. Perhaps it has been longer than that since a man like Pope John moved among us; but comparisons with figures from the past are futile. If ever a man lived in the present, if ever a man dreamed and worked for the future liberation of mankind from the prisons of the spirit, it was Pope John.

Because his personality has made its mark on the world so deeply, it is hard to recall that day less than 5 years ago when the princes of his church chose Cardinal Roncalli as successor to the throne of St. Peter. Most of us in America knew nothing of his work and thought. We knew that he was older than most who have assumed that high office. How were we to know that the years had only deepened his sagacity, his humility, his power to understand the longings of men in every walk of life and in every country?

Before many months had passed, stories of his wit, his compassion, and the vigor of his leadership began to circulate throughout America, and throughout the world. For every story about Pope John one told another, the other had two more to add. Gradually there took hold the idea that here was a unique, life-giving leader of the Roman Church, a voice of wisdom for the mighty, a voice of courage for the weak, a voice of hope for the hopeless. His homely face, often smiling in self-amusement, became one of the more beautiful faces we grew to know. The hand he lifted to bless the faithful was lifted to bless those outside the Roman Catholic fold, as well as those within; in a profound way he became a father to us, too.

This fatherhood revealed itself through the quality of love he bore for all of mankind, East and West. It was a father's love, not a doting uncle's. It challenged us; it demanded the best of us. Last fall he said:

> We supplicate all rulers not to remain deaf to the cry of mankind. Let them do everything in their power to save peace. By so doing, they will spare the world the horrors of a war that would have disastrous consequences, such as nobody can foresee. Let

them continue to negotiate, because this loyal and open attitude is of great value as a witness for the conscience of each one and in the face of history. To promote, favor and accept negotiations, at all levels and at all times, is a rule of wisdom and prudence which calls down the blessings of heaven and earth.

Pope John himself was a negotiator, a diplomat, without peer. His 20 years in the Balkans, working with the Eastern Orthodox Church; his years in France, where he became known and loved by millions whose faith had almost been shattered by the long disaster of war and occupation; and finally his papacy, from which he reached out to men of every persuasion—these testified to his faith in the universal dignity of man, and his determination to break down the walls that have come to separate nations and races in our time.

Now he has left us. Now the book of his great life is closed. Still we have the testament of his example before us; and while we pray for the repose of his soul, we pray for ourselves, as well—that in the crises and portents of the days to come, we shall not forget that wisdom, that love, that humanity by which the last few years have been illuminated.

In the next few weeks there will be many accounts of his life and service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two excellent editorials—one from the Washington Post of this morning and one from the New York Times—be printed in the Record as further testimonials to the great respect, love, and affection which the people of America and people throughout the world hold for this beloved and blessed man who has walked among us and has done so much for humanity.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1963]

Nunc Dimittis

It is not too soon to say that the pontificate of John XXIII, brief as it was, will be one of the most memorable and significant in all the long history of the papacy. It has marked the end of an epoch of ecclesiastical history which began with the counter Reformation of the 16th century and the beginning of another. The direction of the new epoch can as yet be only dimly discerned, but in the meantime the wall of separation and interdict between the two great divisions of Western Christianity has largely disappeared, and the wound, aggravated by the rancors and jealousies of a 1,000 years, which has divided Christians of the ancient Roman and Byzantine allegiances seems at least partly healed. Christian and non-Christian have been brought into a more intimate understanding.

All this was accomplished, humanly speaking, by the personality of the Pope—by his peasant simplicity and directness, by his imperturbable amiability, by his manifest goodness of soul, and by his determination to include every human being of whatever creed or persuasion in his pastoral affection and solicitude. "Every one who does good," he once said, "is a Christian, even though he does not know it." Before his election he had exemplified this principle in his close personal friendships with persons outside his faith and tradition, and these had included an anticlerical French Freemason, the late Edouard Herriot, and a Turkish Moslem, Naman Menemengioglu.

And yet when Angelo Giuseppi Cardinal Roncalli, Patriarch of Venice, was elected to the papacy on the 12th balloting of the conclave of October 1958, the announcement took Rome and most of the world by surprise. His name had not been mentioned in the welter of speculation that preceded the conclave. He seems to have been only slightly known to all except the French cardinals and he was almost totally unknown in the United States. Most of his career, until his nomination 5 years earlier to the see of Venice, had been spent as an apostolic visitor or apostolic delegate in Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey and as papal nuncio to France in the earlier days of the Fourth Republic. Another surprise was the name the new Pontiff had chosen for himself, a break in the 297-year succession of Clements, Innocents, Benedicts, Leos, and Piuses. Among the Popes now acknowledged to have been legitimately elected, there had not been a John since the days of the Avignon papacy in the 14th century. But other and still greater surprises were to follow.

At the time of the conclave Cardinal Roncalli was at the threshold of his 78th year. From this it was widely surmised that he had been chosen as an interim, or "caretaker," Pope, from whom no radical reforms or innovations were to be expected. Pope John quickly dispelled this illusion. He broke with papal custom by dining in company, by permitting himself to be observed during his daily walks in the Vatican, by going frequently through Rome on visits to prisons, orphanages, hospitals, and schools, and by engaging in impromptu conversations with Vatican employees. Rome and the world were electrified by the news that he intended to summon an ecumenical council for the purpose of promoting Christian unity and of revitalizing the church by bringing its thought and activity abreast of the contemporary world.

It is no secret that many of the curial cardinals, especially those identified with the integralist attitude toward church policy, were opposed to the council and that finding themselves unable to prevent it, endeavored to restrict the scope of its deliberations, and that they were thwarted by the intervention of the Pope in behalf of "holy liberty" in discussion. The bishops who had privately or secretly believed in the need of sweeping reforms were astonished to find themselves in a majority and tacitly assured of papal support. The future of the Second Vatican Council now becomes, of course, a matter of doubt, since it will depend upon the views and disposition of Pope John's successor; but the dynamic forces released at last year's sessions of the Council cannot well be arrested.

Another great surprise was the encyclical called "Mater et Magistra" dealing with the economic problems of the world in such length and detail as to make it one of the longest papal documents ever promulgated. Many interpreted it as a tacit approval of the socialistic tendencies of the modern state, even though socialism in all its forms had been severely condemned by some of Pope John's immediate predecessors. An even greater surprise was the Pope's attitude toward the rulers of Soviet Russia, his polite response to the birthday greetings of Premier Khrushchev, the audience granted to Alexei Adzhubei, the reported promise, as the price for the attendance of the Russian Orthodox observers, that the question of communism would not be raised in the council. Two years before his elevation to the papacy, Cardinal Roncalli, as patriarch of Venice, had denounced the "opening to the left" as an alliance with "the deniers of God and the oppressors of human liberty," but as Pope he was represented as favoring the policies of Signor Fanfani. Certain passages in the encyclical "Pacem in Terris" have been interpreted in some quarters as admitting the possibility under certain circumstances of the peaceful coexistence of Christianity, and communism, and some members of the right have gone so far as to blame this encyclical for the startling gains of the Communists in the recent Italian elections.

The validity or fallacy of these criticisms of papal policy must await the judgment of time. It is well, however, to remember that Pope John's techniques of diplomacy were not learned in the papal secretariat, but in his intimate daily contacts with all sorts and conditions of men, many of them alien in culture as well as religion. He said himself that he remained all his life a parish priest at heart and that all his diplomatic activities were conducted in the spirit of pastoral love. As he put it in his first address to the Venetians:

"Providence took me away from my native village and led me to travel the roads of the world east and west, bringing me in touch with peoples of different religions and ideologies, and in contact with acute and threatening social problems. Safeguarded by my loyalty to the principles of Catholic belief and morality, I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than that which divides and gives rise to differences."

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1963]

The Pope of Goodwill

John XXIII was a Supreme Pontiff who made history. He will not be just one more name in a long list going back to St. Peter.

For us, who lived with him in time, his brief but extraordinarily fruitful pontificate had a personal quality that touched Catholic and non-Catholic alike. The countless millions all over the world who followed his last agony responded to the man, the human being, who died as sublimely as he lived. It was a great heart that ultimately gave way—resigned, serene, humble.

Yet the extraordinary tenacity was still there in the little he could still do and say to assure the perpetuation of the idea behind the ecumenical council that he called last autumn and should be resumed this fall. He was determined that the Roman Catholic Church, historically so doctrinally exclusive, should work to bring all humanity, all races, all religions, closer to each other than they have ever been. Unity, as Pope John knew, was a far-off goal; but anyone who travels around the United States or Europe or Latin America these days can only be impressed at the progress thus far made toward religious harmony and understanding. The Pope seemed to have caught at the flood one of those tides in the affairs of men. It will surely flow onward to make our tormented age a little less divided.

His pontificate will be long remembered for its deep impact on current social, political, and even economic history. His essentially liberal attitude toward politics was remarkable. Even in questions of religious statement he made changes in prayers and rites that carried a broad and tolerant vision.

The encyclical "Mater et Magistra" of 1961 is already having as great an influence on working conditions and the social attitudes of business and labor as did Leo XIII's "Rerum Novarum" of 1891. No document of our times is more apposite to contemporary problems or more socially advanced.

The other encyclical of Pope John's that stirred the world was his recent "Pacem in Terris." Addressed to men of all religions and political persuasions, even the Communists, it is essentially a plea for universal peace, and a formulation of the means to reach the goal of a worldwide and united political community. The vast, bold sweep of the ideas, and the humanity that pervaded the whole encyclical, immediately stamped it with the seal of greatness.

This was, then, by any reckoning, an extraordinary pontificate as he was a truly

> extraordinary Pontiff. It has always been an impressive feature of the Roman Catholic Church that some of its noted Popes came from the most humble surroundings. Angelo Roncalli was the son of a poor Lombard sharecropper. He remained a down-to-earth man, with a good sense of humor, a love of life and a simplicity that was both genuine and deceiving because it masked a depth of wisdom and understanding that could only come from long study, thought, experience—and a noble character.
>
> He will be mourned by many more than those who hold the same faith, because he gave something good, useful, even precious, to an era that needed his qualities and his gifts most desperately.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been said that there can be no reconstructed society without the reconstruction of individuals. Probably the greatest force in the world in bringing about a reconstruction of the human heart and the human mind in the interest of a sweeter and better ordered society is the light that shines in the heart and in the mind of a highly spiritual person.

A few years ago it was my privilege to have a private audience with His Holiness Pope John. I was both entranced and deeply impressed by the spiritual vigor and the spiritual force of the man.

Wherever he might be, he was a shining light that touched every heart and every mind. So he became a great force for the illumination of the world and for greater understanding. As a leader he will be missed, and he will be mourned as a great driving force for a better world.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to join Senators who are paying tribute to Pope John XXIII, for in all truth he was a great man of peace. Regardless of nationality, religion, geographical location, or national origin, men, women, and children mourn his passing. The loss of his voice and wisdom at a time like the present comes at a critical moment when we desperately need his type of vision.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we pay tribute to the late pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, His Holiness Pope John XXIII. But even more we express our deepest sympathies upon the passing of one of the most beloved and popular figures of modern times.

Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, born to the peasantry, married to the Catholic Church, and having died in the Chair of Peter, has won a firm and abiding place not only in the hearts of the 900 million adherents of his faith but in the hearts of men of all faiths around the globe.

While the world waited apprehensively for death to gain its inevitable advantage over the stout resistance of His Holiness, there was a sense of universal sorrow felt by millions because the man, who had done so much to strengthen Christian unity, while acting as the faithful shepherd over his own flock, would soon be forced to cease his valiant work. The world experienced an overwhelming regret that Pope John XXIII should not live to continue this same effort in the years to come.

Nevertheless, in the short time he stood as the vicar of Christ on earth, Pope John had many outstanding accomplishments to his credit. In a vigorous show of energy which belied his 77 years, he set out to adapt his church's whole life and position to the vast changes in science, economics, and politics that characterize the modern world. By convening the first ecumenical council in almost a century he set in motion ideas and forces which will have universal application for men the world over. The man who set out to endow the Christian faith with a new spirit, a new Pentecost, lived just long enough to see this feast commemorating the birthday of his church, celebrated on its liturgical calendar.

This new spirit which the Roman pontiff sought to infuse aimed not only at modernizing the Catholic Church, but at combating the disunity and misunderstanding which have often divided the world's established religions in the past. Representatives of all denominations were invited to observe the ecumenical council's proceedings. Unlike many of its predecessors, this council was not called specifically to combat heresy but to gain the opinions of Catholic prelates, who though separated by thousands of miles, face the same problems which the evolution of modern history has created.

Pope John will be particularly remembered as a great humanist and as a great innovator, who often overlooked customary precedents which he felt might hinder closer contact with his flock. This good shepherd was known on numerous occasions to have left the confines of the Vatican to visit orphanages, jails, churches, and schools.

In his brief reign the ruler of the world's largest religious institution received 32 heads of state, more than any other pontiff. For the first time since the era of the Byzantine emperors he welcomed the ruler of the Greek Orthodox Church, the first archbishop of Canterbury since 1500, the first prelate of the U.S. Episcopal Church, the first moderator of the Scottish Kirk and the first Shinto high priest.

Pope John will live on in the pages of history as the Pope of peace, whose frequent pleas have crossed national boundaries drawing sympathetic responses from such traditional enemies as the head of the atheistic Communist state. "Pacem in Terris," his encyclical, presents a liberalized approach to the problem of securing peace consistent with the dogmatic principles of earlier papal pronouncements on the subject.

Seldom has the world been so powerfully influenced in so short a time by a figure of such humble and unassuming a stature, and I venture to say that seldom will a human being be mourned by so many of the earth's citizens. To the Catholic, John XXIII was the kind father, who has fostered a closer relationship between clergy and laity; to Christians in general he will be remembered as the gentle pastor who embraced all of God's children within his ministry; to men of Jewish faith he will stand out as the protector who rescued so many of their number from death during the Second World War; and to the world at large he represented the spirit of fraternity incarnate, the constant reminder that we are all members of the same human family. The long vigil in St. Peter's Square has ended, but the memory of the lasting contribution which Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli gave to the world will linger long after his successor has been chosen.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the world lost a great and gentle man yesterday in the passing of Pope John XXIII. He was a leader who had the touch of the common man and whose life was an inspiration to all who have faith in God.

Pope John has left his imprint upon mankind. His humility and his dedication to tolerance, mutual understanding, and world peace will inspire all of us to be a better people.

He was a man who relished progress founded on unchanging principles. The unquestioned was not above questioning of his keen and realistic mind.

His philosophy of life was summed up last November 25, his 81st birthday:

> Any day is a good day to be born, and any day is a good day to die. We have arrived at the start of our 82d year. Will we arrive at the end of it? We are not excessively concerned.

And on another occasion, when his ecumenical council was uppermost on his mind, Pope John said:

> One year is not a long time. I may not be here, but if I'm not there certainly will be another Pope.

The concern expressed by leaders of all faiths upon his approaching death is testimony to the love and esteem he enjoyed.

Pope John's compassionate encyclical, "Peace on Earth," will remain as his monument to mankind. It was a declaration of constitutional principles, calling on governments and peoples everywhere to strive not only for social betterment but for universal peace. In it, he coupled his understanding of the dangers of the Communist world with his prayerful hope that it may yet be saved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, men of all faiths have reason to mourn the passing of Pope John XXIII. The world will truly be an emptier place without him.

His personal example of compassion, goodness, and love was, and I hope will be, an enduring inspiration to us all in this troubled world. His frequent visits to schools, hospitals, orphanages, and prisons were truly human and ennobling acts.

Pope John not only provided extraordinary and contemporary leadership of his church, he also worked tirelessly to heal the breaches and promote unity among all Christian faiths.

Perhaps the most eloquent testament to his greatness was the pontiff's last and greatest encyclical, "Peace on Earth," which was significantly addressed not only to members of the Catholic faith, but to "all men of goodwill."

As the New York Times described it, it was one of the "most profound and all-embracing formulations of the road to universal peace that has ever been written."

Mr. President, it would be a fitting honor to Pope John if we all, as individuals, were to rededicate ourselves to the tasks and the goals set forth in this monumental encyclical.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, every person on the face of God's earth who has love in his heart and a feeling for his fellow man, deeply mourns the death of Pope John XXIII.

This noble and humble man, born of peasant stock, rose in his lifetime to the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church. And, yet, he seemed never to have left the common people. By his words and deeds he showed that he loved them and was one with them.

His earnest desire for closer ties within world Christianity reflected a deep belief in the brotherhood of man. His heartfelt pleas for peace—so eloquently stated in his encyclical—will stand immortal. In this great document, Pope John called upon each of us to rise above the differences of belief and race, and to realize that we are inseparably bound together by our common humanity.

The Pope felt that if we are to survive in this thermonuclear age, we must seek out that which we have in common rather than that which separates us. In his brief days as Pope, John XXIII has left us much to think about and, if we are to survive, act upon.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, long expectation has not dulled the grief the world feels at the death of Pope John XXIII. Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, son of a poor farmer, child in a family of 10, lived all his life in a warmly affectionate relationship with all those about him, particularly with those most in need of friendship and help. As Pope, he used both his official position and his personal charm to aid and encourage the poor and prisoners, to establish warm, friendly relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews, to improve the position of Negroes in predominantly white regions, and to continue and extend Pope Pius XII's policy of building up the native clergy and the native heirarchy in Asia and Africa. Both before and since his elevation to the Papacy, Pope John showed a sensitive concern for the orthodox and other separated oriental churches. More than any Pope for centuries past, he has reached out in friendship and goodwill toward the Protestant churches of the world. He has received, in private audience, the highest ecclesiastical officials of some of the major Protestant denominations, meeting them on the common ground of Christian faith, mutual charity, and human friendliness.

Pope John's character was such as to remind one of the riddle of Samson, in the Book of Judges, "Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." Pope John's every word and action seemed to come out of the calm, jovial confidence of a man big in all senses of the word; out of a richness in experience and knowledge, out of unflinching courage, out of unqualified kindness, and out of a strong Christian faith.

By his appointments of new bishops and cardinals, by his reorganization of offices and staffs in the Catholic Church, by his selection of persons for canonization or beatification, and by his encyclicals and other messages, Pope John has striven consistently and vigorously toward the strengthening of the Church's influence, as well as to the liberalization of its typical attitudes. He has particularized and expanded, in his encyclical, "Matter et Magistra," the Church's doctrines on the relations of labor and capital, adding significantly to the contributions of Leo XIII, in "Rerum Novarum," and of Pius XI, in "Quadragesimo Anno." In his latest encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," he has made what may well prove to be a great stride toward the realization of the ideal expressed in the title of the letter, "Peace on Earth."

In taking office, Pope John expressed the hope that his pontificate would be characterized by its pastoral nature; and this hope has been fulfilled to a remarkable extent. He has been an approachable Pope, to staff and servants in the Vatican, to visitors in unprecedented numbers. He has been, to an unimaginable degree, a real pastor to his parishioners in the Vatican, and a real bishop to those who belong to his diocese of Rome. To each individual he has known in his long and varied life, and to each region and country with which he has been associated, he has maintained ties of the warmest affection. With the universal mourning for his death we mingle our gratitude that so good a man has been able to exert his influence so powerfully for the improvement of the world. May his memory long inspire us to imitation of his splendid character.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to pay my personal tribute to Pope John XXIII. My children and I had an opportunity to see this great leader of the Roman Catholic Church at an audience in Rome not so many months ago.

First, the humbleness and absolute charm of the pontiff was most impressive not only to me but also to my young children. He was the embodiment of the kind of graciousness and loving kindness with which his name is properly identified in the world.

Though it is too early to make a historical appraisal, I believe Pope John will go down in history as one of the most extraordinary Popes who has ever reigned, because of his calling together the Ecumenical Council, dedicated to bringing down the walls between faiths. Devout as he was, the Pope recognized that it could be done without jeopardizing in any way the doctrine or integrity of his own church, which is jealous of its doctrine and integrity, or that of any other church.

I hope the endeavor will be continued by Pope John's successors. It is most promising for all mankind. It is very much part of the great encyclical on peace, which the Pope signed, entitled "Pacem in Terris," which forever identifies him in that field.

In his encyclical on peace, I know of no greater contribution that the Pope himself could have made to what he hoped was the embodiment of his reign—his effort to bring down the barriers of an adverse relationship between faiths. The faiths are monolithic in their belief in God and their convictions on morality. So may it be. I pray only that, in memory of this dear and devoted human being who graced our earth, his work may be continued. That work is very much of a piece with the moral challenge in the civil rights field, of which we have been speaking, and which is essential to the future of mankind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, every human being who has sipped from the cup of idealism of Pope John, and each one of us who has been inspired by hope and faith in a Divine Being, is a better human being because Pope John lived.

Many memorials and tributes, and many monuments of one kind or another will be erected to his memory. In my opinion, the monument that will last will be the record of his living, his ideals, and his spiritual faith. I feel that the best tribute I can pay to this great human being is to express my belief that he was one of the most Christ-like men of our time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today our thoughts and our prayers are centered on the late Pope John XXIII.

The death of Pope John takes from us the outstanding leader in the cause of peace and Christian unity.

The world will always be better for the fact that he walked among us.

John XXIII was elevated to the papacy at an advanced age. He was not supposed to leave a large mark on world history. But he has. He broke new ground in many areas, and became in less than a few years, one of the most beloved of the spiritual leaders of the church.

He left the confines of the Vatican to mingle with the people. He convoked the ecumenical council, in which the church has taken the lead in unity among believers in Christ. He was an apostle of tolerance, of peace, and of piety all of which are so important to catholicism in the modern world.

The vicar of Christ is not a ruler of nations or a commander of armies. The world nevertheless looks to him for leadership. Joseph Stalin once asked "How many divisions has the Pope?" His question showed he did not realize what could be done by the militant mobilization of faith. The Communists have since learned this as they failed to take over Italy, France, South Vietnam, and other Catholic countries.

Pope John was a great human being and a great Pope. Men and women of all faiths can best show their appreciation of him by carrying forward, in their own lives, the ideals he held so dear.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a resolution, which is being submitted on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], minority leader, and myself, as acting majority leader.

I send the resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 151) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has received with profound sorrow the news of the death of Pope John XXIII.

Resolved, That the Senate sympathizes with the communicants of the Roman Catholic Church in this country and abroad upon the death of a preeminent spiritual leader who endeared himself to peoples of all nations and all faiths by his untiring efforts to promote unity among religions, to advance the dignity of the individual, and to maintain international peace.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Papal Secretary of State, the Vatican City.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HEROISM ON THE SNAKE RIVER

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I recently returned to Washington from a wonderful weekend in Wyoming, where I attended the premiere of an exciting new film entitled "Spencer's Mountain." The setting is at Jackson Hole and the Tetons of our West.

During the visitation there occurred what might have been a very serious incident that turned out happily.

In one of our tourist attractions, a boat trip down the Snake River, one of the rafts collapsed. Five foreign news correspondents were thrown into the icy waters of the Snake River. One swam ashore, two were rescued by another raft, and one of the other correspondents was going under. A young Wyoming lad by the name of Francis Fox dove into the water and saved that man's life.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his courage and bravery. I hope that one of the appropriate organizations will consider him as a candidate for a citation for heroism.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, several months ago I launched a program in the State of Wyoming designed to compensate for the penalty that we in the wonderful Rocky Mountain area sometimes pay for being so far from the Nation's Capital. As a former schoolteacher, I have been impressed with the opportunity that students in the high schools of the East have to come to Washington and study democracy in action in this greatest living laboratory of free government.

In an effort to fill the gap that exists in the West because of the distance, we instituted among the high school students of our State an essay contest on the subject "How To Make Democracy Work Better." The two winners of that contest were to spend a week in Washington in a Senate internship, where they could observe the workings of our representative government at first hand.

I am happy to note the presence in the gallery today of the two State winners of that contest. They are Miss Jean Aherns, of Torrington, Wyo., and Mr. Courtney Johnson, of Cheyenne, Wyo. Both of those students are distinguished leaders in their respective high schools. Jean was the valedictorian of her class. Courtney, ranking second, was admitted to Harvard University for the continuation of his academic career.

I should like to read one or two of the thoughts that those two brilliant young leaders have written in their essays.

For example, in her essay Jean wrote that—

> Each of us must have the freedom to work out his destiny under the protection of rule by law, and we must strengthen that framework of law against any encroachment * * *. We must act ever to broaden the base of power and prevent its falling into the hands of the few.

Courtney in his essay, which was entitled "The Moment of Truth," reminds us that the right of countless Americans to discriminate among ideas, to engender individual thoughts, and to exercise all the freedoms inherent in the Constitution constitute one main freedom—the tool of our democracy. That freedom is the tool for true thinking individualism.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for an additional 30 seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the essays of these two outstanding Wyoming high school students be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Making Democracy Work Better

The Greeks had words for it. The words? Demos means "the people," and kratein, "to rule," and it is from these that we derive our word democracy.

In a true democracy all the citizens of a country meet together to make their own laws. This pure form of democracy has seldom existed long in history and is impossible on any large scale in modern society. The closest we can approach it today is in our town meetings where any man can be heard, and the right of dissent is cherished. As we use the term today, democracy means a representative government in which the people elect others to make the laws and conduct affairs for the common good.

Democracy is a relatively new form in the history of the world's governments, as it remained for the new world to develop the democracy we know today. In the 17th century the Pilgrims fled the autocratic governments of Europe, but their first attempt at government was a form of communism. This proved to be unsuccessful and was abandoned. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony the Puritans first lived under totalitarianism which, however, was soon given up in disgust. Our forefathers tested these other systems of rule, but each was discarded and finally began the evolution of our democracy.

Lincoln's definition, government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" has become the answer we give when asked: "What is democracy?"

Government of the people means just that. We bow to the will of the majority as that will is expressed in our laws. But there are matters in which the Government, by law, cannot interfere. Our minority rights are protected. We have the basic and essential freedoms of speech and of assembly, freedom from fear and from want. Observation of our laws and respect for our country and its flag is the foundation for making democracy work.

If democracy is to be truly a government by the people, then all the people are to participate. This obviously cannot be. The immature, the incompetent, noncitizens, and others should not be allowed this privilege and responsibility. These are legally denied the vote. There are others that are illegally denied the vote. There is a blot on our national character, and an important one it is, especially in the eyes of the newly independent countries of the African and Asian blocs. Before we can hold our national head up high, before we can gain the total respect of large sections of the world, we must erase this blot. Segregation, north or south in our land of the free, is not democracy. Therefore, the first step, the very first step, toward making democracy better is to make it work for everyone. We do not have a large Negro population in wonderful Wyoming, but I would like to think that the people with darker skins could be as easily assimilated into our society as the Spanish-Americans have been.

The second step is that having the right to vote, the privilege of governing ourselves, we must exercise that right. The percentage of registered voters to qualified voters is shameful, and the percentage of actual voters to registered voters is even more so. The argument that "my vote doesn't count that much" is a myth which has been disproved time after time and most recently by the close gubernatorial race in Minnesota where the result was decided by a difference of only 91 ballots. Almost any election we have had in this country could have been swung the other way by the vote of those who neglected their right, their privilege, their responsibility, their very duty to vote.

The vote should be an informed vote, however. Thus, the third step in making democracy work better is improving our educational standards. We must strive to make our educational system, already one of the best in all the world and in all of history, even better and more encompassing. Intensification of studies; perhaps less emphasis on extra-curricular activities; deeper and more thorough courses in history, in geography, in world government, and in American government—national, State, and local; indoctrination in the principles and functions of democracy; all these should be stressed in our curriculums. School sponsored visits to legislative bodies in session would be informative. Boys' State and Girls' State give wonderful opportunities to take part in government-in-action. Instruction in the actual working of the totalitarian forms of government, as well as their theories, should be included so that we might be better prepared to resist subversion.

The fourth step is to encourage people to express their convictions: To impress upon them the realization that public policy is greatly influenced by letters to their congressional representatives, that speaking up at public gatherings, that letters to the editor, that active participation in government, in society, and in business associations is the responsibility of each of us. The questioning of oppressive laws, of closed-door negotiations, of secret treaties, or of devious methods, will tend to eliminate abuses of positions of power. If all of us withhold our opinions, our ideas, our criticisms, how can democracy succeed? Expressing ourselves will make democracy work better.

Government for the people does not mean paternalism nor the imperious decrees of a despot. Each of us must have the freedom to work out his destiny under the protection of rule by law, and we must strengthen that framework of law against any encroachment. "Eternal vigilence is the price of freedom;" we must be eternally vigilant. Our system of rule has cost the honor, the fortunes, and the lives of literally countless unsung heroes. We must not allow their sacrifices to have been fruitless. No government in the political history of mankind was more designed to benefit the little man. We must protect it, we must cherish it, we must act ever to broaden the base of power and prevent its falling into the hands of the few. We do this by active participation, by at least an interest in, and an understanding of local, national, and international issues. The rights of minorities are protected, we must be zealous for the maintenance of those rights. There is no establishment of religion nor restriction of the practice thereof; we must be tolerant. We must not be impatient of the delays in legal procedures—safeguards have been established to protect the rights of the most humble of our fellows; we must respect those safeguards, those rights. We must analyze the motives of the demagogue and the motivation behind any line of propaganda; we must be aware. We must accept the right and the duty to dissent against injustice or unfairness of any kind. We must uphold the American way.

Somehow, somehow, we must enliven our patriotism; we must more actively stimulate pride in our country, its accomplishments, its potential, its real heroes past and present. Basically this lies within the province of our educational system. Yet we cannot be only nationalistic in our thinking. We have been abundantly blessed by the Creator to whom all our people and their leaders have acknowledged debt, and we have a moral obligation to share that endowment. Making democracy work better cannot be a selfish for-ourselves-only thing. We must help other peoples to achieve the freedoms, the prosperity, the advantages that we have. First, by setting the example and thereby proving that democracy is the closest yet to an ideal government. Second, by providing technical aid, by sharing the advances we have achieved in medicine, in agriculture, in mass production, and in mass markets, we can help the newly emerging nations to achieve their destiny as rapidly as they are able to assimilate this help. This is making democracy work better for the whole wide world. But we must always remember that democracy, like charity, begins at home, and we must not kill the well chicken to make broth for the sick chicken. We can be too profligate of our substance and lose all in the end.

THE MOMENT OF TRUTH

Scientists tell us that time is a constant in our universe. They say that the duration of each second, each hour, or each year has remained the same from the Stone Age to this modern age of the atom. This concept of constant time may be useful when solving a problem in space technology, but when dealing with the humanities, with history, philosophy, or government, each moment of time no longer has a set value. Instead of being measured by the swing of a scientist's pendulum, each historical—or rather, let's call this—each abstract moment of time represents not only an historical event, but also a moment of decision, or a moment of inspiration of a new idea. Let's now think of each abstract moment of time, not by length, as measured by the scientist, but by the event itself taking place in this time. This idea of abstract moments fits precisely the subjective connotations of our constitutional democracy; the historical moment represents an event in our history; the moment of decision indicates our privilege to discriminate among various ideas and to choose our own beliefs; and the moment of inspiration denotes the opportunity we have for original thought. What's even more important, though, is that moment when each person truly identifies his responsibilities and ideals with the opportunities provided by our democracy; this is the moment of truth.

One hundred seventy-six years ago delegates from 12 of the 13 Colonies gathered at the Constitutional Convention—one of the truly great historical moments. The Articles of Confederation under which the new Nation had been living had proved inadequate, for they had failed to give any real power to the National Government, and the Nation was suffering from the exploits of the individual States. It was the job of the Convention to devise a sound national structure. At this meeting James Madison said, "We are framing a system we wish to last for ages, and one that might decide forever the fate of Republican government." Also at the Convention, Gouveneur Morris of Pennsylvania commented, "Gentlemen must extend their views beyond the present moment of time." And this they did. When the delegates devised the Constitution, they set up a sound democracy, a democratic structure not subject to ephemeral notion. But they tempered its protective rigidity with provision to modify judiciously or to abolish existing laws and to create new laws, as the need arose. Article V of the Constitution allowed for the addition of amendments—major changes in national law. In fact, the entire structure of our democratic framework provided for prudent change, modification, and interpretation of laws through the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government. For example, only 3 years after the Constitution was ratified, it was amended for the first time with 10 guarantees of freedom—the Bill of Rights. In 1935, when the Nation recognized the need for a program of social insurance and public assistance, Congress passed the Social Security Act. And, less than a decade ago, our Supreme Court decided the red-hot issue of school integration. Yes, when the delegates framed the Constitution they extended their views beyond their present moment of time, leaving for posterity the responsibility to preserve the Nation whose structure they had fashioned and to adapt this Nation prudently to their own needs. And by leaving this democracy in the hands of posterity, they left it in the hands of each American.

What an imposing responsibility it is for you and for me, for each citizen, to have, by law, an integral part in the Government—to have the responsibility of making our already smooth running democracy work even better. But this responsibility need not be so formidable if the full opportunities under the Constitution are realized and taken advantage of. Our national laws provide basic freedoms; we have freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from unjust punishment, freedom to choose our officials and leaders—to name just a few. In short, we have the freedoms to live without fear and to make the most possible out of our autonomous government. Yet all these freedoms inherent in the Constitution propound one main freedom, the tool of our democracy: that each citizen has the right to his own personal thoughts, his own way of living. If our Government weren't organized to this end of freedom of personal beliefs, do you suppose you could find a Communist Party of America, a John Birch Society, a Kiwanis Club, or even a Democratic or Republican Party? Freedom of personal beliefs in our democracy is the keynote of the second and third types of abstract moments: the moment of decision or discrimination, and the moment of inspiration. Being exposed to divergent ideas instead of to the single gray fact of collectivism or socialism, our thoughts are sometimes shocked, but, we have the chance to sample, to savor, to evaluate, to choose or to reject, and to interpret ideas. In much the same way as we sample new or exotic foods at a restaurant, so we sample ideas freely and indulge in fresh thought through books and newspapers, radio and television, and through uncurbed discussion. Ideas are to be tasted, and, as Francis Bacon said of books, "some few to chewed and digested." By this liberal exposure to a smorgasbord of ideas the individual can pick out what he wants from life. And by selecting an idea from "here and there and over there," and by putting these together, often, by a mysterious process called originality, he can come up with a fresh new thought, a provoking idea, in a moment of inspiration. This right to countless moments to discriminate among ideas and the right to engender individual thought—the right to a moment of discrimination and the right to a moment of inspiration—together form the complex, basic freedom inherent in our democracy, the freedom which is the tool for true thinking individualism. This individualism is the primary ingredient for making democracy work better. But in order for this individualism to have more than a stereotyped significance, the thought of each true individual must be the result of his own search for self-identity—a search to sample, to evaluate, to seek out, and then to choose what he wants from life: whether he wishes to be a Communist or a Democrat, whether he wishes to be an agnostic or a Christian, or whether he wishes to experiment freely in life and form his own original set of standards. When a person achieves this cardinal thought for himself, then he experiences the greatest of all moments—the moment of truth. And in our democracy of free thought, anyone can find his moment of truth.

Our Nation is constructed on this basis of individual moments, for the divergent opinions and ideas of the populace, as a whole, adapt and build our system of ever-changing laws. This has been true for 175 years. Today we are still, as Madison said so long ago, "framing a system which we wish to last for ages." When modifying our laws for the good of the democracy we must think and "extend our views beyond the present moment of time." That is, with objective strictness as to keeping with basic constitutional principles and with subjective personal judgment, we must consider a new proposal or idea, not on its present merit alone, but on its potential and on its probability of future repercussions.

Now we are at the apex of democratic existence. But think for a moment about the words of Dr. John Stambaugh, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University: "The historical cycle of the body politic indicates that man progresses from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, and from freedom to abundance. Then comes the waning, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependency, and from dependency right back into bondage again." To insure that our democracy will continue to improve and will not face this mortifying degradation—to make democracy work even better than it already is working—each citizen must identify his responsibility to find his own individually significant part under our constitutional structure. Some may say, "Oh, come on now; all this sounds fine, but what can I really do to serve my country and to make democracy work better?" The answer with a profound, unselfish desire for both the immediate and future good of the Nation—a true desire to make our democracy work better—realize deeply the historical, discriminatory, and inspirational moments in your life and in those of others' lives, experience, taste, and interpret life to the fullest, and carefully choose your own ideals so that each moment in your life is a moment of truth.

THE GOP A PARTY WITHOUT A POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a great deal of selectivity in the attacks mounted against the administration by members of the opposition party. It is apparent that there is lacking in this year a so-called "safe issue" with which they can harass the party in power.

An excellent summation of the dilemma I refer to is contained in a column written by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Wednesday edition of the Washington Post.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOP A PARTY WITHOUT A POLICY

(By Marquis Childs)

Except for a few individuals speaking on their own, the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and emancipation, has taken no clear stand on the outstanding domestic issue of the day—integration versus segregation. To a few Republicans acutely concerned with the dilemma of their party this seems a striking illustration of failure after failure to take advantage of wide-open opportunities that arise from a vulnerability of a Democratic administration following a hesitant and compromising line.

There has been a lot of talk about candidates and who is to be the GOP presidential nominee in 1964. But, putting aside the power of a Democratic President running for reelection, if the Republicans cannot pull together on some major issues, and, equally important, if they cannot seem to offer a constructive alternative, the value of the nomination is a large question mark.

A bit of dialog in the Senate restaurant the other day pointed this up:

"Don't you know," one of the workers in the GOP vineyard asked a leading Republican Senator, "that 'Bull' Connor (Eugene Connor, until last week Birmingham's police commissioner) is the Democratic national committeeman from Alabama? Couldn't you make a lot out of that? Doesn't it show the bind the Democrats are in?"

"Yes, I know that's true," the Senator replied, "but you see I'm afraid a lot of our people down there feel the same way about the race question as 'Bull' Connor."

In both the Senate and House Republicans have voted heavily against principal administration measures. This promises to prevail through the present session. Efforts of moderates such as Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, to line up a minority to push for urban renewal and other programs, about which President Kennedy talks much with little or no result, invariably fail. The regulars are simply not interested and, with the old club spirit predominating, they tend to intimidate the moderates.

In private, Republicans keenly aware of the party's history, speak gloomily of 1964. They cannot forget what happened in 1936. That was the GOP's alltime low. Republicans based their campaign on opposition to every New Deal measure with attack, attack, attack. That same sound comes from the Republican minority in Congress today.

The difference today is that foreign policy is a big issue while it was not 30 years ago. An outsize blunder—or simply a bad turn of fate in a precarious world—could put the administration on the spot. But it could also put the Nation in jeopardy and the response might be to rally around present leadership.

The second difference is the threat of defection by the Democrats in the South. The Republican dilemma here is acute. The gains they have made in the Deep South have been mostly thanks to conservatives who see the Democratic Party as a radical and an integrationist party. A candidate and a platform tailored for them could never carry the 15 or 20 States with large-scale industrial development.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller would have a better chance than any of the candidates so far talked about to win Negro support and attract moderates and independents in the cities. But the formidable reaction against his remarriage for the time being has put him virtually out of the picture.

The party faithful love Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. Conceivably his supporters can carry through their plans to combine delegates from the South, Midwest, and the Mountain States to nominate him. But almost no one believes he could be elected.

Since Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, has successfully kept out of the glare of discussion, this leaves at the moment Gov. George Romney, of Michigan. The feeling is growing that in the end he will be the nominee. In the Eisenhower tradition of a nonpolitical citizens assault on the problems of Government, he has with his attractive personality wide appeal.

In 1936 President Roosevelt talked about issues scarcely at all. If only because he seemed to feel no pressure to discuss the great unfinished task before America, he moved across the country like a benevolent bishop visiting his diocese. In November he carried every State except Maine and Vermont.

One thing rides high in President Kennedy's consideration—to win by a much larger margin than the squeak of 1960. With no positive pressure of the great issues of the day in a year of prosperity he might conclude it would be shrewd to emulate the Roosevelt approach.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I direct the attention of my colleagues to the growing support for the Youth Employment Act recently passed by this body and now being considered for action in the House of Representatives.

A recent poll taken by my Minnesota colleague, Representative ANCHER NELSEN, indicated that 67 percent of the respondents in this predominantly rural area, approved of the proposal to set up a Youth Conservation Corps.

In addition, our office has received a considerable amount of mail in support of the proposal from professional people, judges, social workers, probation officers and law enforcement officials who recognize the importance of this legislation in attacking the problem of high school dropouts and juvenile delinquency.

In a statement to the Beverly Evening Times, Beverly, Mass., Police Chief Edward Aucone, has pinpointed the urgency for passage in the House of the Youth Employment Act. His words, come from the background of many years of experience in the law enforcement field and dealing with juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Beverly Evening Times be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

As I noted during the floor debate on the Youth Employment Act, the outpouring of public support in favor of this legislation was most gratifying. During the Senate hearings on S. 1, 60 public and private witnesses appeared in support of the Youth Employment Act; one lone witness appeared in dissent. Dozens of other organizations filed supporting statements; two statements were filed in opposition. There was a most impressive galaxy of witnesses supporting the Youth Employment Act.

I am pleased to see this support continues to grow. I indeed hope that the House of Representatives can give the Youth Employment Act prompt consideration. This legislation offers our country a historic opportunity to begin making inroads in the national crisis over jobless youth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beverly Evening Times, Beverly (Mass.) May 16, 1963]

CHIEF AUCONE ASKS SUPPORT OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL

Police Chief Edward Aucone today called upon the citizens of Beverly to contact their Congressman and urge him to vote favorably for the youth employment and conservation bill which will provide work and training opportunities for our young Americans.

Chief Aucone said: "This bill was passed by the Senate April 10 and it is expected to go before the House in the immediate future; therefore it is important that you write or wire your Congressman immediately.

"Favorable House action on the youth employment and conservation bill will provide work and training for youths from the age of 16 through 21.

"Members of the Youth Conservation Corps will receive $60 a month in wages. They will be given lodging, board, work clothes, tools and equipment, medical and other necessities. The corpsmen will be under the direct supervision of adult conservationists, foresters, rangers, and others.

"They will work on—and receive training in—various jobs and projects involving general areas as erosion, stream control, reforestation, and construction of outdoor recreation and camp facilities.

"In addition, the corpsmen will be given technical training and educational skills through classroom periods after work hours.

"The youth conservation program acts both as a preventive of youth delinquency and as a needed asset in the conservation of our natural resources.

"The need for these projects is now, and it is an extremely pressing need. Kindly ask your Congressman to give these Presidential recommendations priority and swift, hearty endorsement."

MONGERS OF HATE AND HYSTERIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on June 3, 1963, the Evening Star published an editorial by the columnist William S. White entitled "Mongers of Hate and Hysteria." The editorial puts in proper perspective many of the points as well as the principles in controversy in relation to the racial tensions now raging throughout our Nation.

Mr. White is always objective in his thinking and in his presentations. He has rendered a service to the Nation in the writing of the editorial.

In order that the editorial might have wider distribution and come to the attention of all Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 3, 1963]

MONGERS OF HATE AND HYSTERIA

(By William S. White)

This country, which has not in fact ever been very strong on hatred, is being warned, rightly if excessively, against the "merchants of hate."

We ought, however, to be alerted to another sort of merchant, too. This is the monger of hysteria and the peddler of a double-thick based upon double standards of truth and objectivity.

All over this land he is suddenly overstating and inflaming, rather than sensibly seeking to abate, the current racial tensions of the United States.

To say that these are ugly tensions is to say the truth. To "warn" as many are doing as though on signal, that these tensions are the foreshadowings of national revolution is to speak inflammable falsehood. But this dangerous falsehood can become dangerous reality if the hysteria monger is not quieted or will not quiet himself and so cease bellowing "fire" in a crowded national theater.

For now he is raising demands not simply for the just vindication of the Negro's actual rights. He is demanding the creation, for the Negro alone, of false rights which are not now, and never have been in all the long centuries of an Anglo-American concept based on orderly freedom, the rights of anybody at all.

Fairminded men—and being fair now requires fairness to the majority as well as to the minority and fairness also to constitutional truth—will agree that the actual rights thus far denied the Negro must be granted to him. These actual rights include the ballot and an equal opportunity in all the public facilities—the schools, the parks, transportation, and so on.

But they do not include and will never include—unless the Kennedy administration is to seek that destruction through Congress or the Supreme Court—the destruction of the most ancient and irreplaceable right of man in an open society. This is the right of privacy outside his public obligations, including the private operation, wise or unwise, of private property.

If a shopkeeper can be compelled by unexampled Federal force to serve all who appear there and if on refusing, his business can be disrupted with Federal blessing by demonstrators swarming in from the streets, the institution of private property is finished. When the institution of private property is finished, personal privacy is finished.

The lawyer who prefers to choose his clients—or his clerks—can find his law office seized and occupied by those he has rejected. So can the doctor. So can any editor or other professional man. The employer undoubtedly can be told whom to fire and whom he must not fire.

Private property and private attitudes, however sourly run the one and however wrong the other, are not public utilities nor publicly established and paid-for enterprises. They are not buses on which all are free to ride by dropping in a dime.

And take note of this: This is no longer simply a problem for the South, that region of minority economic power, minority political power, and minority opinionmaking power. So long the South has been the very safe, and very rewarding, whipping boy for the hysteria monger comfortably established far from the scene of tortured dilemma.

But no more. Involved here is all of this country and every man in it, of every color. For, consciously or not, the hysteria monger—that collective symbol for demagogic politicians and emotionally transfixed opinion molders—is reaching for something far different from equal justice for minorities. He is, consciously or not, reaching for the end of orderly freedom.

And he is doing so by a blackmail of fear; fear that unless administration and Congress submit, they—the Negroes—will turn in violence upon their country.

This is more than a libel on the Negro race. This is creating an intolerable either/or climate alien to all that this Nation is.

A terrible issue is being approached not on such criteria as what in fairness and lawfulness should be done, but rather upon what must be done lest "they" bring anarchy and revolution.

Let those who ceaselessly warn of what must be done pause before it is altogether too late and ask themselves:

Am I really warning, or am I inciting violence and thus repaying past injustice to one minority with immense and irreparable future injustice to all Americans and to the American vision of unity in diversity which is the greatest gift in all history to free government?

COMMUNISTS IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Committee for Collective Security recently directed an open letter to the President concerning U.S. policy toward Cuba. The letter was printed in the Hartford, Conn., Courant of April 29 and has been particularly called to my attention.

Mr. President, I am firmly convinced that the first step toward an effective Cuban policy is a widespread public understanding of the issues involved and the threat that is presented to our Nation and this hemisphere by Soviet troops securely stationed 90 miles from our shores. In my judgment, this letter clearly explores the issues that we must consider, and offers a number of proposals for policy initiatives. Without fully endorsing all that is contained in the letter, I believe it is a constructive contribution to national thinking on the subject. I hope it will have full consideration from our policymakers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this open letter to the President, signed by Roderick Stevens, Sr., be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLICY FOR CUBA

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Communism has secured a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere through the military buildup in Cuba by Soviet Russia. The United States is therefore confronted with a choice between the use of force as by invasion, the acceptance through inaction of coexistence with Cuban communism controlled by Soviet Russia, and effective counteraction. Aerial observation, to learn what is happening in Cuba cannot reveal concealed troops, penetrate prepared camouflage, or monitor submarine delivery of military supplies. Whether or not there are defensive or offensive weapons in Cuba presenting a military threat to countries in the Western Hemisphere, the fact remains that, even if Russian military forces are withdrawn, Cuban infiltrators, and guerrillas will have been trained for the invasion and subversion of Latin American countries. Subversion is a form of aggression and can be psychological as well as physical—Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists without the firing of a single shot.

The most important means of preventing the spread of communism in Latin America is through the Alliance for Progress whose purpose is to assist each country to raise its standard of living by attacking the basic problems of poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

The United States, however, should call for an immediate meeting of the Organization of American States, and urge it to take measures, short of the use of force, to deal with the Cuban situation.

Following are suggested proposals for consideration by the Organization of American States:

Control the movement of individuals to and from Communist countries, especially Cuba.

Sever telegraphic and telephonic communication and airplane service between the member states and Cuba.

Forbid the use of ports of member states to vessels trading with Cuba.

Establish a Spanish language radio station for standard broadcasting into Cuba.

Jam radio propaganda from Cuba.

Prevent the flow of Communist propaganda through the mails.

Eliminate the right of asylum on university campuses where pro-Communists, many of whom take courses only to foment agitation, claim near-immunity from arrest.

Urge the countries of the free world to reduce and possibly discontinue their purchase of sugar from Cuba.

RODERICK STEPHENS, Sr.,
Vice Chairman, Policy Committee,
Committee for Collective Security.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

SUPPORT FOR CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the question of support for the 9 percent of American students in religiously supported secondary schools and colleges and the 13 percent in church-related elementary schools is a veritable thicket of thorns that has too long prevented action on needed priorities in Federal aid to education. The Congress has been under attack for its failure to grasp these thorny branches and clear a path to educational betterment for our citizens.

Last week our colleague Senator RIBICOFF made bold to deal with this problem. He introduced bills that would provide a $1,500 income tax deduction for parents of college children and deductions of $100 for each child in a private secondary or elementary school. He further proposed Federal recognition of the concept of shared time, whereby children in church-related schools may use public school facilities for special purposes. He advocated assistance for special-purpose instruction and laboratory equipment, teacher training, auxiliary services such as school lunches and bus transportation, and assistance to institutions of higher education. Senator RIBICOFF's bills reveal a nice understanding of constitutional limitations and a most enlightened awareness of the problems of church-related and private educational institutions.

I commend him for his forthright approach to this issue. I warmly support the carefully drawn programs he has studied, prepared, and advocated in the Senate of the United States. It is my strong hope that his bold initiative may receive the support it must have if the needs of church-related schools are to be met and this tiresome, harmful issue laid to rest where it can no longer distract us from the important objective of adequate education for all Americans.

APPLICATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS TO MEXICO

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the finest and most illuminating discussions of the Alliance for Progress which I have seen in some time appeared in a recent "Letter to Maine" prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. MUSKIE].

The observations in the letter are the result of a visit Senator MUSKIE made to Mexico as a member of the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. The Senator follows a cogent summary of the general concepts of the Alliance with a penetrating analysis of their application in Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that this clear and concise and very well written letter to Maine be printed in the RECORD, so it may be read all the way from Maine to Hawaii.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO MAINE FROM SENATOR MUSKIE

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1963.

DEAR FRIENDS: For the past several weeks, political events in Canada, culminating in the general election this week, have drawn our attention to the north. There we watched our friendly neighbors, entangled in domestic issues, reflecting their frustration over the economic and military impact of the dominating U.S. presence. Very similar frustrations influence our friends to the south in the Republic of Mexico. Both countries are basically friendly toward us. Nevertheless, even good friends can fall out unless there is continuing effort to resolve our differences.

From March 15 to 24, I was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. We met with our Mexican counterparts in Guanajuato, located 230 miles northwest of Mexico City.

The agenda included: (1) An appraisal of the Alliance for Progress; (2) a perspective on the Alliance for Progress; (3) specific mutual problems including tourism, border trade, Mexican migratory farmworkers, and cultural exchange; and (4) peace, disarmament, collective security and international relations. Separate committees were appointed to each of these four general areas. I served on the first committee. We were provided with an instantaneous translation of everything said by our Mexican counterparts so that the discussions moved along rapidly. The talks were friendly, but remarkably frank and even blunt on both sides.

The purpose of the Alliance for Progress, which my committee discussed, is to promote economic development in Latin America and to insure that the fruits of that development are equitably distributed. The concept of the Alliance was announced by President Kennedy. Subsequently it was formalized at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, on August 16, 1961. All Latin American countries, except Cuba, became partners in the Alliance. Thus, each of these countries has pledged itself to internal reforms which are needed if the fruits of economic growth are to be distributed equitably.

Why are the objectives of the Alliance for Progress important? Poverty, ignorance, disease, oppression breed discontent and unrest, which undermine political stability and constitute an invitation to Communist infiltration. The turbulent and revolutionary history of Mexico is illustrative of the explosive forces which can be generated when the masses of the people are forced to live at less than subsistence levels without hope for improvement. The revolution of 1910–17 was the result of just such an explosion. The Government of Mexico ever since has devoted itself, with fluctuating success, toward the objective of closing the gap between the very rich and the very poor. In effect, it had been pursuing the objectives of the Alliance for the past century.

The economic growth of Mexico during the past 20 years has been phenomenal. Industrial production has gone up 160 percent, agricultural production up 180 percent, and real national income up 170 percent. Notwithstanding this growth, however, the lot of the very poor is still very poor. The average per capita income in rural Mexico today is $100 per year, and in urban Mexico is $400 per year.

Three objectives of the Mexican Government seem to me of particular importance in Mexico's future: (1) agrarian reform; (2) tax reform; and (3) educational reform.

Agrarian reform is the redistribution of land by breaking up the large feudal estates of old Mexico and making them available to the peasants. Since 1910, approximately 110 million acres of land have been distributed to 2 million peasants. Nevertheless, land hunger is still a potentially explosive political force. This is so, in part, because land redistribution has not been accompanied by sufficient increase in land productivity. Small peasant land holders do not have the technical know-how and the credit resources to attack this problem. Water is Mexico's great resource deficiency. Only 9 to 12 percent of the land is arable. Both the Governments of Mexico and the United States are applying themselves to this problem under the Alliance for Progress.

Tax reform is a critical need in Mexico. The tremendous tasks which face the country are such as to strain the resources of Mexico at best. Yet, in 1958 only 700,000 of 7 million taxpayers were paying taxes. Income tax reform was introduced in 1962, and is the first order of business in the current session of the Mexican Congress.

Educational reform, to develop literacy and skills which are vital to the long-term progress of the country, is another important objective. In 1958, 42 percent of the children who should have been in the primary schools were not; and more than half of these were out because of lack of schools and teachers. The country is in the middle of the 11-year $581 million plan designed to double the number of teachers and classrooms for primary schools.

The Mexican participants advised us that their government is aware of these problems, that it is moving to solve them with determination and, that the results to date are a source of encouragement. The U.S. program of aid to Mexico has largely taken the form of loans, rather than grants, and the Mexicans want it that way. They have an excellent record of repayment. On the question of trade, the Mexicans hit hard, urging that U.S. policies toward Mexican exports to our country be liberalized.

In terms of exports and imports, the balance of trade between Mexico and the United States is favorable to us. However, American tourists in Mexico and Mexican agricultural workers employed in the United States are responsible for a flow of dollars into Mexico which more than offsets Mexico's unfavorable trade balance with us.

I pointed out that the United States must have a favorable balance-of-payments situation if it is to continue to support the defense of the free world and its programs of assistance to underdeveloped countries. I emphasized the great burdens which the United States is carrying and tried to make it clear that, great as our resources are, they are not unlimited and must be used wisely. I also pointed out that unrestrained imports into the United States can be harmful to our domestic industrial structure.

The attitude of the U.S. delegates in the discussions was one of great interest in the problems of Mexico, of a desire to work together in our mutual interests, and of emphasis upon the fact that U.S. resources are not unlimited.

In closing, I would like to state some overall impressions:

1. Having been subjected to U.S. intervention in their affairs over so much of their history, Mexicans are instinctively anti-interventionist; and this view colors their attitude toward the Cuban situation.
2. The main thrust of Government policy is near the Mexican middle of the road, which is somewhat to the left of the American middle of the road, but a long way from being Communist leaning.
3. Mexico is committed to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, is moving toward them and has achieved important progress, but has a long way to go.
4. The attitude of most Mexicans toward the United States is friendly, but there are mutual problems which need constant attention in a climate of mutual understanding.
5. Most Mexicans want no part of Fidel Castro and his works for themselves.

Sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

"LONELY WONDERS OF KATMAI," BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, PUBLISHED IN THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE, JUNE 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, since I presume most of my colleagues have as little time as I do for reading material which does not directly apply to legislation on which one plans to testify in the morning, or vote on next week, I want to call to your special attention the article by the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] entitled "Lonely Wonders of Katmai," in the June 1963 issue of National Geographic. I promise it will provide you with some of the most engrossing reading you have ever had, and its spectacular illustrations will be imprinted forever on your memory.

Katmai National Monument in southern Alaska is the largest unit of the National Park Service, and can be reached by air, and then by jeep over a new trail to the Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, a valley created by a volcanic cataclysm 50 years ago. You will be fascinated, I am sure, by the Senator's vivid prose describing, first the volcanic action "whose cumulative release of energy no hydrogen bomb could match," and then the weird and pastel wasteland left by the holocaust. You will be delighted by the Senator's account of his own adventures, of his trudge through volcanic debris, harder to navigate than desert sand, and of his struggle up Novarupta's still steaming sides, with each step a possible breakthrough to a smoldering cavern beneath, as he made his way to the lava which now plugs the volcano's cone.

You will enjoy, also, the pictures of this hardy solon resting for a moment after a strenuous hike, or swimming in the 60° temperature waters of Lake Brooks, and I think you will agree with me that he is without question our youngest junior Senator in both spirit and endurance.

I would like to put the entire article in the RECORD, but since so much of its impact depends on its spectacular pictures as well as the flowing Gruening prose, I shall have to be satisfied with commending it to you for early reading.

SMOKING AND LUNG CANCER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, later this week I plan to introduce a bill which suggests one way to curb the galloping epidemic of lung cancer which science now seems pretty well agreed is caused, in part at least, by excessive cigarette smoking.

As brickwork for an understanding of this bill, and my motive in introducing it, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article which appeared in the Washington Post of May 30 entitled "Lung Cancer Cases Nearing Epidemic, Says Science Pair."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUNG CANCER CASES NEARING EPIDEMIC, SAYS SCIENCE PAIR

(By Nate Haseltine)

The United States, as well as a number of other countries, is in the throes of a lung cancer epidemic, and the major cause is excessive cigarette smoking.

This is the conclusion of a husband-wife prize-winning pair of science writers after appraising the evidence available in collaboration with editors of Consumer Reports and other authorities.

There is reason to believe the worst is yet to come, concluded Edward and Ruth Brecher, in their comprehensive report entitled "Smoking and Lung Cancer" in the June issue of Consumer Reports. This is the monthly advisory publication of Consumers Union of the United States, nonprofit organization which advises consumers on the merits of products.

STATISTICS CITED

The Brechers cited a statistical presentation of the American Public Health Association to show that if present trends continue, lung cancer will claim the lives of more than 1 million present schoolchildren in this country before they reach the age of 70 years.

The special report, admittedly, contains no new information. It analyzes the cumulative evidence against cigarette smoking to show there is no remaining room for reasonable doubt that cigarette smoking does cause lung cancer.

Discussing autopsy records, death certificates and the apparent invulnerability of nonsmoking Seventh Day Adventists to lung cancer, the authors concluded:

"We are living in the midst of a major lung cancer epidemic. This epidemic hits men first and hardest, but has affected women as well. It is occurring not only in the United States but in a number of other countries.

WORST TO COME

"It cannot be explained away by such factors as improved diagnosis. And there is reason to believe that the worst is yet to come."

Regarding other countries they say are caught in the epidemic wave, the authors said the increase in lung cancer in men has been even steeper (than in the United States) in Scotland, England, Wales and some other countries.

They said almost every study made on the controversial subject can be subject to attack, due to qualifications and limitations. But putting them all together, they said, they found a wall of evidence against cigarette smoking.

The science writers offered solace, however, to inveterate cigarette smokers who say they can't or don't want to kick the habit:

"Even among those who smoke two packs or more a day from boyhood to old age, 8 or 9 out of 10 will die of something else," they wrote.

They left open the fact that some of that "something else" may be deaths attributable to other effects of cigarette smoking. A preface to the 15-page report noted that it represents about one-fifth of a book in publication entitled "The Consumers Union Report on Smoking and the Public Interest."

Not included in the June issue, it was noted, is "the other half" of the medical section of the new book. This will review evidence linking smoking to other types of cancer, to cardiovascular diseases of many kinds, to various other conditions, and to general health.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

The Brechers leaned heavily on Seventh Day Adventist studies to bolster conclusions of the cause and effect relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

The studies, previously publicized, were made by Dr. S. Ernest L. Wynder, Frank R. Lemon, and Irwin J. Bross at Seventh Day Adventist hospitals throughout the country. The hospitals treat patients of all creeds, the Brechers pointed out.

They found that patients who were not Seventh Day Adventists showed the same relationship between smoking habits and lung cancer as had already been shown in many previous studies. Among Seventh Day Adventists, whose creed prohibits smoking, lung cancer was almost totally unknown.

"Only two cases were diagnosed among many hundreds of patients dying of other diseases," the author noted. "And both of these cases, interestingly enough, were among recent converts to Seventh Day Adventism * * * and both converts (had) smoked a pack a day or more for 20 years or longer prior to their conversion."

BACK CHECKING

The authors also pointed out that no controlled retrospective (back checking after lung cancer's development) study has shown the absence of an association between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

"If a single population could be found—urban or rural, domestic or foreign, red, yellow, black or white—in which an increase in lung cancer is not linked with heavy, prolonged smoking, the case against the cigarette would concededly be weakened," the authors said. "But no such population has been reported."

Cigarette smoking, they conceded, is not the only cause. Heredity may play a role; viruses may be involved, and air pollution is quite probably a factor, they said. Nor has the possibility been ruled out that smoking and air pollution may have a combined effect which is greater than either factor considered separately.

"NOW VERY CLEAR"

"But it is now very clear," they concluded, "that the risk of lung cancer for cigarette smokers as a group is enormously increased, and that the risk is directly proportional to the amount smoked."

The authors pointed to experiences in Iceland regarding smoking, air pollution, and lung cancer. People in Iceland, they noted, took to cigarette smoking later than those in other countries, "and the lung cancer epidemic hit Iceland later than it hit other countries."

The Icelandic increase, they said, cannot be attributed to air pollution where, for at least since 1943 Reykjavik (where most of the deaths have occurred) has had the purest air in Europe. This was attributed to the fact that both coal and oil for heating purposes there have been replaced by a municipal heating system based on hot springs near the city.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue to make insertions in the RECORD, which will require approximately 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently my distinguished colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three of a series of four articles on the radical right written by that able reporter for the Washington Post, Julius Duscha. The first three articles dealt with the activities of the John Birch Society and its allies in my State of Utah and in the neighboring State of Idaho.

I now ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the last of the series of articles, which discusses Birchism in Wyoming, and the editorial carried in the Washington Post which sums up the series.

There is no question in my mind that the Birchers and the other members of their countrywide alliance—the States rightists, the ruralists, the racists, and the rightwing extremists—are out to win the West. They are not a feeble organization of crackpots, as some people like to dismiss them, but a well-organized, well-financed, and efficient machine.

Because I agree so strongly with the Washington Post that "publicity is the one antidote to Birchite poison" I hope that the series of articles on them which the Post carried will be widely read and weighed.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 22, 1963]

SEEDS OF SUSPICION SOWN—RIGHTWING RADICALS ACTIVE IN WYOMING

(By Julius Duscha)

CASPER, WYO.—A University of Wyoming professor refused to speak at a seminar on the rightwing movement because he was "not ready to leave Wyoming."

A teacher who is deeply disturbed about rightwing influence in his school system declined to talk with me about it even on an off-the-record basis because he feared for his job.

An editor who is out of sympathy with the rightwing radicals stipulated that he would talk with a visiting reporter only if his name was not mentioned.

This fear of vituperative attack and economic retaliation is one of the most disturbing aspects of the rightwing resurgence in the Mountain States.

POLITICALLY EFFECTIVE

In Wyoming, as in other Western States where the rightwing radicals have stepped up their activities, the number of extremists is small, but they are politically effective.

The Republican-dominated and extremely conservative Wyoming Legislature approved a series of eight States rights proposals being promoted by the rightwing radicals.

They would restrict the power of the Supreme Court in matters involving State laws and the reapportionment of legislatures and allow legislatures to propose constitutional amendments without the concurrence of Congress.

Other memorials endorsed by the Wyoming legislators call for the repeal of the law setting up a disarmament agency and oppose further increases in social security taxes.

Significantly, a memorial urging an end to all Federal aid (and to U.S. participation in the United Nations) was approved by the Wyoming house but not by the senate.

The Federal Government owns most of the land in thinly populated Wyoming, but Federal assistance to the State in the form of irrigation and other projects is important.

Although memorials in Congress are no more than expressions of a point of view, they receive a great deal of publicity and unquestionably affect the political climate of a State.

ACTIVE IN PTA

In addition to their activities during the legislative session, the rightwingers have also been active in parent-teacher associations.

When the rightwing radicals are not talking about "the conspiracy," in Washington, by which they mean practically all Republicans and Democrats in positions of power, they are denouncing "the brainwashing" in the public schools, by which they mean any objective discussion of public policies.

In Casper, a pleasant, sophisticated oil town with a population of more than 45,000, rightwing radicals tried to take over the Grant School PTA.

They tried to move in after the National Education Association sent a questionnaire to all PTA's seeking their views on Federal aid to education and other issues affecting schools.

Rightwingers in the PTA sought to use answers to the NEA questions as a rallying point for their views, but lost their fight at a stormy meeting.

TEACHERS CAUTIOUS

The immediate battle may have been lost by the rightwingers, but teachers are known to be carefully watching what they say. Some are also staying away from discussions of even mildly controversial issues.

And when the Democratic Women's Club in Casper decided to hold a seminar on the rightwing movement, it ran into considerable difficulty when it tried to get college and university professors to participate because of fears of retribution from the rightists.

Senator Gale W. McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming, a liberal, is convinced that the rightwing activity ir Wyoming is part of an effort to unseat him in 1964.

Much of it undoubtedly is aimed at McGee, but the rightwing radicals in the Mountain States are doing more than challenging liberal and even moderate politicians in either party.

The members of the John Birch Society and all of the other rightwing radicals are sowing seeds of suspicion and distrust by trying to undermine government itself.

They are doing this by peddling half-truths, by using innuendoes and by deliberately misrepresenting facts and policies.

And when the rightwingers are challenged, they seek to cut off opposition through name-calling and economic retaliation. The stifling of debate which results from these tactics is perhaps the greatest danger of the rightists in the Rockies.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1963]

Resurgent Right

The John Birch Society and other extremist groups no longer can be dismissed simply as cranks. As the series in this newspaper by Julius Duscha documents, the Birchites and their fellow travelers are concentrating their campaign of fanaticism in the sparsely settled Mountain States. Their strategy is to use every device of propaganda and intimidation in areas where a few votes can swing an election. And in the process they are sowing distrust for all American institutions—schools, courts and government, State and local—in a manner that a dedicated Communist would surely applaud.

Relentless publicity is one antidote to the Birchite poison. It is quite one thing for a group of Americans to advance a dissenting position, using legitimate means of advocacy. But is quite another to employ libelous name-calling of a kind that matches Communist tactics in virulence. The saddest consequence of the extremist campaign, as recounted by Mr. Duscha, is that moderate community leaders are afraid to take issue with the Birchites because of the anonymous phone calls and slanderous attacks that result.

Pick up the rocks anywhere in the country and some strange creatures are bound to be there. What is especially disquieting in the Mountain States is that some Americans who should know better are lending comfort to the night crawlers and know-nothings.

FERRY AT HITE, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I read with considerable interest a nostalgic article in the Salt Lake Tribune of May 19 about the ferry at Hite, Utah. This ferry, venerable and picturesque, will be covered next month by the creeping waters of Lake Powell, as the Glen Canyon Dam fills behind its mighty barrier.

Were the swallowing up of the ferry to end the only Colorado River crossing within a hundred miles, the event would indeed be a sad one for the people of a vast area of Utah. But, as the article points out, this is only the end of one era and the beginning of another, because the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has approved $3 million for the construction of a bridge which will span the rising waters.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I was successful in having the funds to build this bridge written into the Federal Aid Highway Act. I was given a strong hand in this accomplishment by the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, who was chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill. Credit for the bridge belongs not to the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which is carrying out the congressional mandate, but to the body which was responsible for appropriating the funds—the Congress of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune article be carried in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eviction of Hite Ferry

(By Bob Holden)

Hite, Garfield County.—Time is running out for historic Hite Ferry.

Once the only crossing on the Colorada River in this isolated southeastern Utah area, the picturesque ferry will be swallowed sometime in July by the rising waters of Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam.

Its demise will mark the end of an era—and herald the beginning of another.

In place of the venerable wooden craft, floating on four pontoons and powered by an old automobile engine, three graceful bridges will reach across two river chasms and one canyon.

Surveyors are peering through transits, mapping out a projected route which may some day carry traffic between Blanding and Hanksville—opening the gates to the awesome, rugged region.

The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has approved $3 million for construction of the spans. The money was allocated from Federal public lands funds last January, and no State money will be required for construction.

No provision, however, was made for funds to improve 135 miles of roads between Hanksville, Wayne County, and Blanding, San Juan County. The authorized bridges would serve traffic between these points.

While State planners are deciding whether State Road 95 project is important enough to displace projects already on priority lists, highway crews are moving ahead with temporary routes to the proposed bridge sites.

One road on the Blanding site of the Colorado River already is passable.

Highway planners, supervised by District 4 Engineer J. Q. Adair, Price, are mapping a temporary road to the sites from the Hanksville side.

Another preliminary step is possible relocation of the ferry to about 6 miles upstream.

But, even then, the ferry's quaintness will succumb to progress as two outboard motors will power it across the river.

A projected routing of the new road takes off from the present State Road 95 about 6 miles from Hite Ferry. Hugging shale and sandstone ledges it would wind northeast to the 300-foot span over the Fremont (Dirty Devil) River.

From there it would continue east 6 miles to a massive 600-foot bridge over the Colorado, then wind in a southeasterly direction across a third 300-foot span over White Canyon. Finally, it would join the present U95 running to Blanding.

If priority lists are shuffled—and if the road is completed—area promoters foresee a day when carloads of tourists will glide along the highway viewing some of the Nation's most unusual scenic attractions.

BARBARA WARD'S WILLIAMSBURG SPEECH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, almost everyone I have talked with in the last 2 days has mentioned the extraordinary speech delivered by Barbara Ward, the noted economist, on June 1 at the annual Williamsburg, Va., observance of the 50 days in 1776 when the youthful American Colonies asserted their insistence on independence.

This brilliant and articulate Englishwoman often says what Americans want said about their democratic heritage and forefathers, and what should be said about present-day attitudes and leadership far better than we seem able to say it for ourselves.

Miss Ward declared that "the whole world is astir with the aspirations of 1776—except, perhaps the Atlantic Community within which they first came to birth and where, now, they are in danger of degenerating to the level of Fourth of July rhetoric."

She asks that the same vision be applied to the world's predicament today as was applied by the men of 1776 to the problems they faced, and suggests that the United States, "the first free Federal experiment on a continental scale" take the lead and be the model. Only then, she says, can "we transform the decade of development from rhetoric to fact."

This is the essence of her eloquent challenge:

> If we do not dream today, tomorrow will belong to those who do. The visions of 1776 have proved to be harder and more realistic than the fears and conservatisms of those who opposed them.
>
> What will be the visions of 1963? Who will dream them? And if freemen have no more visions, how soon will the great tradition of 1776 perish from the earth?

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Miss Ward's stirring address delivered in the historic hall of the House of Burgesses in Virginia's colonial capital, as it appeared in the Washington Post, be carried in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Barbara Ward's Williamsburg Speech

(Note.—Following is the text of Barbara Ward's "Prelude to Independence" address given at Williamsburg, Va., yesterday.)

If we look back on the men who framed the Virginia Declaration of Rights over the interval of nearly two tumultuous centuries, our first impression must surely be one of amazement at the universality and audacity of their political imagination. They were themselves heirs of one of the great pioneering ventures of humanity—the drive which took the cockleshell boats of Europe round the world and established for the first time, against fearful hazards, the concept of a single, terrestrial habitation for the human race. Then, within little more than a century of this first revolutionary expansion, here were the sober burghers of Williamsburg making quite as remarkable a set of affirmations about the political needs and aspirations of this one human family.

We must note that they did not speak for Virginians only, or even for Americans. The universal note is struck in the first great formulation of American liberties: "All men are equally free and independent," "all have certain inherent rights," "government"—in other words, all governments—"ought to be instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community." There is nothing restricted or parochial here. These forefathers of ours, in their wigs and kneebreeches and flowered waistcoats, believed themselves to be acting beyond any local custom or tradition. They believed that they spoke for all mankind.

The aspiration is all the more remarkable when we remember the apparent narrowness of their political scope and the real inhibitions of their physical endowment. Here they were, 13 separate Colonies, not yet certain whether neighbors would be ready to share sovereignty, even less certain whether the power of Britain could be successfully withstood. To seawards lay uncertainty and hostility; inland, a vast unknown where French pretentions and Indian enmity had still to be reckoned with. So, faced with odds which only seem favorable because we know the outcome, they spoke not as beleaguered citizens but as heirs and perpetuators of human freedom itself. We have to try with all our imaginative powers to recreate the magnificence of their audacity. Custom has staled it for us. We take for granted what should still leave us speechless with surprise.

EARLY OBSTACLES CITED

Their audacity stands in all the sharper contrast because of their physical insufficiencies. Communication and transport tended to separate them rather than draw them closer. Coming to share in these festivities, I could breakfast in London and take luncheon in New York. In Jefferson's day, one would have not reached half way to Baltimore. Farming still aimed at self-sufficiency. Industry was so little advanced that, while John Adams could explain that "many curious engines have been constructed to facilitate business," Jefferson wrote to Harvard complaining that the study of America's mineralogy "was still untouched." Education was widespread, true, and Yankee inventiveness had already made its mark.

But the Colonies were still, as we should say now, in a very early stage of development, still 40 or 50 years away from takeoff, still a century away from a fully articulated industrial system. The dreams of these men were palpably ahead of their tools, their ends of their means, their visions of their workaday abilities. The disparity did not daunt them. They simply went ahead to create the first free continental society known to human history.

Such is the true perspective of 1776—unlimited vision, limited means. What, then, would the men of 1776 say of our present predicament?

Let us be clear about one thing at the outset. They would be staggered, overwhelmed by the ample quality of our means. Surpluses in wheat and meat which drown the market, threatened tropical surpluses which will do the same, steel mills working at 60 percent of capacity because of oversupply, oil markets threatened by Russian crude, European coal mines by Anglo-Saxon output, all fuel by future atomic energy, a 5 percent unemployment rate in America because of surplus labor—and although at least $100 billions a year are spent by all protagonists on arms and perhaps $12 billions on space, the surpluses persist while annual increases in Atlantic income are never less than 2 percent a year, with over a 5 percent rate of growth in Western Europe—and, incidentally, over 10 percent in Japan. Such a cornucopia of capacity has bestowed on mankind a freedom which the Founding Fathers could not even envisage—the freedom which springs from a physical ability to realize virtually any goal the community may choose to set.

GOALS CHANGED

And what are the goals? Here, surely, we find ourselves in exactly the opposite position from the men of 1776. Nothing was limited about them except their means. Everything is limited about us except our means. The world today is smaller than the continent they faced. The unity of human experience which they proclaimed has been demonstrated not only by the science that abolishes space and time but by the aspirations which unite whole communities in the desire for modernity and technological breakthrough. The Thirteen Colonies, underdeveloped States 180-odd years ago, are now the leaders of a human column all of whom, virtually without exception, march forward intent upon securing the same elbow room and sharing in the same abundance. Life—they want, too, to extend their human span from 20 to 70 years. Liberty—they want, and have nearly achieved, the self-respect of self-governing communities. The pursuit of happiness—at least they know happiness does not lie in sickness, in hunger, in racial subjection, in unremitting toil. The whole world is astir with the aspirations of 1776—except perhaps the Atlantic Community within which they first came to birth and where, now, they are in danger of degenerating to the level of Fourth of July rhetoric.

Have we confident economic goals? We may proclaim a decade of development—our hearts are not in it. The 1 percent of national income to be dedicated to development is reached by no more than one or two wealthy nations. In America, in spite of steady support by public opinion, political pressure is all to cut back the American contribution on the grounds that the effort is failing to give the expected return.

Yet the reasons given are hardly convincing. It is forgotten how much aid has simply sustained Western exports during the recent fallaway in primary prices. It is forgotten to what degree Western trade policies discriminate against the poorer nations. It is forgotten that the span of successful development in any society is not less than a couple of generations. Today, after only a decade, Western governments seem to expect results they could not have achieved themselves in a comparable period. It is forgotten in how many countries education, the foundation of all skills, has still to be built. It is forgotten how much, over the last decade, has in fact been learned, how many foundations laid, roads opened up, dams built, the habits of saving and investment introduced. And even if it is reasonable to concentrate resources on the more promising experiments, this is no reason for an absolute overall cut.

IMPATIENCE SCORED

If the men of 1776 had attempted the opening up of America with the testy impatience of so many politicians today, they would barely have crossed the Adirondacks. England at the time of the Luddites was about at the stage reached by many developing countries today. But to the light of flaring barns, to the sound of anger in the streets, with the fury of the urban mobs behind them, the men of that age did not stop investing. They passed the Reform Bill instead. Must we be less steady in our long-term perspectives?

Seen in the aspect not of a single decade but of the 50 or 60 years needed for full modernization, economic assistance to our crowded world could seem as challenging as our space ventures and far more rewarding. To set young minds afire, to create new opportunities for creative work, to break the millenial dependence on hatchet and hoe, to open up the streams of lifegiving water, to make the desert blossom, to give all mankind some share in the patrimony of 1776—this would seem a physical ideal not unworthy to stand beside space probes and infinitely more rewarding than the endless proliferation of the means of death.

And if our economic vision wholly fails to match our physical means, what are we to say of our political goals? Timidly, hesitantly we edge our way round the problems of supra-national order in a world in which the largest nation state can give no more formal security than could Virginia in 1776. But the Virginians seized on the logic of their predicament. They adopted first for the Continental Congress and when its cohesion proved insufficient, went on to full-blooded federalism.

Our task today may be more difficult. Or is it that our vision is less intense? After all, we shall never know the full force of the difficulties facing the men of 1776 in ridding themselves of British rule—which many citizens still supported—in transcending local state rights—which many profited by—and in preparing to open up a whole uncharted and potentially hostile continent. We cannot gage the obstacles because they were overcome. Today, while not decrying obstacles, we must remark a certain flaccidity of political will in which the positive vision of Atlantic interdependence hangs in the balance while lesser but sterner nationalisms seek to frustrate this "grand design."

VISION CALLED FOR

Since, then, an essential part of the political will is that citizens should give reason for the faith that is in them, let those who believe the principles of 1776 to be in a profound sense universal and the men of 1776—indeed to speak not only to the present in colonial America but to the whole future of the human experiment—let them apply those principles with the same vision and courage to the predicaments of today.

Let the United States, the first free federal experiment on a continental scale, be the model. Let us match it now with the completion of the European experiment first by Britain's entry into Europe and then by Europe's dedication to free, federal and supranational institutions. Let the two Atlantic sister federations establish those joint institutions that are needed to serve their common life, including the trading and investment agencies which can transform the decade of development from rhetoric to fact.

Then let the legitimate influence of such economic policies be dedicated to encouraging in Africa and Latin America and, where appropriate, in Asia, first common markets and then federal unions to which, as they advance toward mature industrialization, the common institutions of the Atlantic world may be extended, thus giving underpinning and substance to that concept of a "world authority" which, we all instinctively know, must be secured if postatomic man is to survive. A confederation of sister federations—may not this be the next institutional pattern of the human city? And is it not a more humane and flexible vision than the single sovereignty of totalitarian control?

Visionary—you will say—impracticable, idealist, utopian, ridiculous—but was it more visionary in 1776 to proclaim democracy in the age of monarchs, self-government in the age of empires, the rights of man in a colonial-feudal world, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a world still held in chains? If we do not dream today, tomorrow will belong to those who do. The visions of 1776 have proved to be harder and more realist than the fears and conservatisms of those who opposed them. What will be the visions of 1963? Who will dream them? And if freemen have no more visions, how soon will the whole great tradition of 1776 perish from the earth?

SUPREME COURT OPINION IN ARIZONA AGAINST CALIFORNIA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am happy to inform the Senate that yesterday, June 3, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its long-awaited opinion in the case of Arizona against California. The decision is a momentous one with respect to American water law, and I regret to have to report that the Court split 5 to 3, with the Chief Justice, who was formerly Governor of California, taking no part in the consideration of the case.

This decision should clear the way for action on legislation for maximum development of the water resources of the entire Colorado River Basin. Some of this legislation, such as S. 26, for the Dixie project in Utah, is pending, but has been objected to on the ground that further projects on the lower Colorado should await the Arizona against California decision; other legislation, possibly for construction of the famed central Arizona project, very probably will be introduced soon and action pressed.

The importance of Arizona against California has been both congressionally and judicially noticed. The suit was a direct result, inter alia, of the directive of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress which in 1951 approved a motion postponing further consideration of bills relating to the central Arizona project "until such time as use of the water in the lower Colorado River Basin is either adjudicated or binding or mutual agreement as to the use of water is reached by the States of the lower Colorado River Basin."

Again, the special master of the Supreme Court of the United States in his report to the Court on the case found:

> Its (*Arizona* v. *California*) determination will inevitably have a profound effect upon a great and rapidly developing territory, considerably larger in area and population than many nations, and containing political subdivisions therein as diverse and distant as Phoenix and Los Angeles or Las Vegas and the Imperial Valley.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this decision, and its relation to pending administrative and legislative action, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the majority and minority opinions be published in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Supreme Court of the United States, No. 8, Original, October term, 1962]

STATE OF ARIZONA, PLAINTIFF, *v.* STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL.—COMPLAINT

(June 3, 1963)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

In 1952 the State of Arizona invoked the original jurisdiction of this Court[1] by filing a complaint against the State of California and seven of its public agencies.[2] Later, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and the United States were added as parties either voluntarily or on motion.[3] The basic controversy in the case is over how much water each State has a legal right to use out of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries. After preliminary pleadings, we referred the case to George I. Haight, Esquire, and upon his death in 1955 to Simon H. Rifkind, Esquire, as Special Master to take evidence, find facts, state conclusions of law, and recommend a decree, all "subject to consideration, revision, or approval by the Court."[4] The Master conducted a trial lasting from June 14, 1956, to August 28, 1958, during which 340 witnesses were heard orally or by deposition, thousands of exhibits were received and 25,000 pages of transcript were filled. Following many motions, arguments and briefs, the Master in a 433-page volume reported his findings, conclusions, and recommended decree, received by the Court on January 16, 1961.[5] The case has been extensively briefed here and orally argued twice, the first time about 16 hours, the second, over six. As we see this case, the question of each State's share of the waters of the Colorado and its tributaries turns on the meaning and the scope of the Boulder Canyon Project Act passed by Congress in 1928.[6] That meaning and scope can be better understood when the Act is set against its background—the gravity of the Southwest's water problems; the inability of local groups or individual States to deal with these enormous problems; the continued failure of the States to agree on how to conserve and divide the waters; and the ultimate action by Congress at the request of the States creating a great system of dams and public works nationally built, controlled, and operated for the purpose of conserving and distributing the water.

The Colorado River itself rises in the mountains of Colorado and flows generally in a southwesterly direction for about 1,300 miles through Colorado, Utah, and Arizona and along the Arizona-Nevada and Arizona-California boundaries, after which it passes into Mexico and empties into the Mexican waters of the Gulf of California. On its way to the sea it receives tributary waters from Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, and Arizona. The river and its tributaries flow in a natural basin almost surrounded by large mountain ranges and drain 242,000 square miles, an area about 900 miles long from north to south and 300 to 500 miles wide from east to west—practically one-twelfth the area of the continental United States excluding Alaska. Much of this large basin is so arid that it is, as it always has been, largely dependent upon managed use of the waters of the Colorado River System to make it productive and inhabitable. The Master refers to archaeological evidence that as long as 2,000 years ago the ancient Hohokan tribe built and maintained irrigation canals near what is now Phoenix, Arizona, and that American Indians were practicing irrigation in that region at the time white men first explored it. In the second half of the nineteenth century a group of people interested in California's Imperial Valley conceived plans to divert water from the mainstream of the Colorado to give life and growth to the parched and barren soil of that valley. As the most feasible route was through Mexico, a Mexican corporation was formed and a canal dug partly in Mexico and partly in the United States. Difficulties which arose because the canal was subject to the sovereignty of both countries generated hopes in this country that some day there would be a canal wholly within the United States, an all-American canal.[7]

---

[1] "The judicial Power shall extend * * * to Controversies between two or more States * * *.

"In all cases * * * in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction." U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2. See also 28 U.S.C. § 1251(a)(1).

Three times previously Arizona has instituted actions in this Court concerning the Colorado River. *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423 (1931); *Arizona* v. *California*, 292 U.S. 341 (1934); *Arizona* v. *California*, 298 U.S. 558 (1936). See also *United States* v. *Arizona*, 295 U.S. 174 (1935).

[2] Palo Verde Irrigation District, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, City of Los Angeles, City of San Diego, and County of San Diego.

[3] 344 U.S. 919 (1953) (intervention by United States); 347 U.S. 985 (1954) (intervention by Nevada); 350 U.S. 114 (1955) (joinder of Utah and New Mexico).

[4] The two orders are reported at 347 U.S. 986 (1954), and 350 U.S. 812 (1955).

[5] 364 U.S. 940 (1961).

[6] Boulder Canyon Project Act, 45 Stat. 1057 (1928), 43 U.S.C. §§ 617–617t (1958).

During the latter part of the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth centuries, people in the Southwest continued to seek new ways to satisfy their water needs, which by that time were increasing rapidly as new settlers moved into this fast-developing region. But none of the more or less primitive diversions made from the mainstream of the Colorado conserved enough water to meet the growing needs of the basin. The natural flow of the Colorado was too erratic, the river at many places in canyons too deep, and the engineering and economic hurdles too great for small farmers, larger groups, or even States to build storage dams, construct canals, and install the expensive works necessary for a dependable year-round water supply. Nor were droughts the basin's only problem; spring floods due to melting snows and seasonal storms were a recurring menace, especially disastrous in California's Imperial Valley where, even after the Mexican canal provided a more dependable water supply, the threat of flood remained at least as serious as before. Another troublesome problem was the erosion of land and the deposit of silt which fouled waters, choked irrigation works, and damaged good farm land and crops.

It is not surprising that the pressing necessity to transform the erratic and often destructive flow of the Colorado River into a controlled and dependable water supply desperately needed in so many States began to be talked about and recognized as far more than a purely local problem which could be solved on a farmer-by-farmer, group-by-group, or even State-by-State basis, desirable as this kind of solution might have been. The inadequacy of a local solution was recognized in the Report of the All-American Canal Board of the United States Department of Interior on July 22, 1919, which detailed the widespread benefits that could be expected from construction by the United States of a large reservoir on the mainstream of the Colorado and an all-American canal to the Imperial Valley.[8] Some months later, May 18, 1920, Congress passed an Act offered by Congressman Kinkaid of Nebraska directing the Secretary of the Interior to make a study and report of diversions which might be made from the Colorado River for irrigation in the Imperial Valley.[9] The Fall-Davis Report,[10] submitted to Congress in compliance with the Kinkaid Act, began by declaring that "the control of the floods and development of the resources of the Colorado River are peculiarly national problems . . ."[11] and then went on to give reasons why this was so, concluding with the statement that the job was so big that only the Federal Government could do it.[12] Quite naturally, therefore, the Report recommended that the United States construct as a government project not only an all-American canal from the Colorado River to the Imperial Valley but also a dam and reservoir at or near Boulder Canyon.[13]

The prospect that the United States would undertake to build as a national project the necessary works to control floods and store river waters for irrigation was apparently a welcome one for the basin States. But it brought to life strong fears in the northern basin States that additional waters made available by the storage and canal projects might be gobbled up in perpetuity by faster growing lower basin areas, particularly California, before the upper States could appropriate what they believed to be their fair share. These fears were not without foundation, since the law of prior appropriation prevailed in most of the Western States.[14] Under that law the one who first appropriates water and puts it to beneficial use thereby acquires a vested right to continue to divert and use that quantity of water against all claimants junior to him in point of time.[15] "First in time, first in right" is the short-hand expression of this legal principle. In 1922, only four months after the Fall-Davis Report, this Court in *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, 259 U.S. 419, held that the doctrine of prior appropriation could be given interstate effect.[16] This decision intensified fears of Upper Basin States that they would not get their fair share of Colorado River water.[17] In view of California's phenomenal growth, the Upper Basin States had particular reason to fear that California, by appropriating and using Colorado River water before the upper States, would, under the interstate application of the prior appropriation doctrine, be "first in time" and therefore "first in right." Nor were such fears limited to the northernmost States. Nevada, Utah, and especially Arizona were all apprehensive that California's rapid declaration of appropriative claims would deprive them of their just share of basin water available after construction of the proposed United States project. It seemed for a time that these fears would keep the States from agreeing on any kind of division of the river waters. Hoping to prevent "conflicts" and "expensive litigation" which would hold up or prevent the tremendous benefits expected from extensive federal development of the river,[18] the basin States requested and Congress passed an Act on August 19, 1921, giving the States consent to negotiate and enter into a compact for the "equitable division and apportionment * * * of the water supply of the Colorado River."[19]

Pursuant to this congressional authority, the seven States appointed Commissioners who, after negotiating for the better part of a year, reached an agreement at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on November 24, 1922. The agreement, known as the Colorado River Compact,[20] failed to fulfill the hope of Congress that the States would themselves agree on each State's share of the water. The most the Commissioners were able to accomplish in the Compact was to adopt a compromise suggestion of Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, specially designated as United States representative.[21] This compromise divides the entire basin into two parts, the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin, separated at a point on the river in northern Arizona known as Lee Ferry. (A map showing the two basins and other points of interest in this controversy is printed as an Appendix at p. 53.) Article III(a) of the Compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity 7,500,000 acre-feet of water[22] a year from the Colorado River System, defined in Article II(a) as "the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America." In addition, Article III(b) gives the Lower Basin "the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use[23] of such waters by one million acre-feet per annum." Article III(c) provides that future Mexican water rights recognized by the United States shall be supplied first out of surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in (a) and (b), and if this surplus is not enough the deficiency shall be borne equally by the two basins. Article III(d) requires the Upper Basin not to deplete the Lee Ferry flow below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any 10 consecutive years. Article III (f) and (g) provide a way for further apportionment by a compact of "Colorado River System" waters at any time after October 1, 1963. While these allocations quieted rivalries between the Upper and Lower Basins, major differences between the States in the Lower Basin continued. Failure of the Compact to determine each State's share of the water left Nevada and Arizona with their fears that the law of prior appropriation would be not a protection but a menace because California could use that law to get for herself the lion's share of the waters allotted to the Lower Basin. Moreover, Arizona, because of her particularly strong interest in the Gila, intensely resented the Compact's inclusion of the Colorado River tributaries in its allocation scheme and was bitterly hostile to having Arizona tributaries, again particularly the Gila, forced to contribute to the Mexican burden. Largely for these reasons, Arizona alone, of all the States in both basins, refused to ratify the Compact.[24]

---

[7] "[The All-American Canal] will end an intolerable situation, under which the Imperial Valley now secures its sole water supply from a canal running for many miles through Mexico." S. Rep. No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 8 (1928).

[8] Department of Interior, Report of the All-American Canal Board (1919), 23–33. The three members of the Board were engineers with long experience in Western water problems.

[9] 41 Stat. 600 (1920).

[10] S. Doc. No. 142, 67th Cong., 2d Sess. (1922).

[11] *Id.*, at 1.

[12] The reasons given were:

"1. The Colorado River is international.

"2. The stream and many of its tributaries are interstate.

"3. It is a navigable river.

"4. Its waters may be made to serve large areas of public lands naturally desert in character.

"5. Its problems are of such magnitude as to be beyond the reach of other than national solution." *Ibid.*

[13] *Id.*, at 21.

[14] This law prevails exclusively in all the basin States except California. See Weil, Water Rights in the Western States § 66 (1911); Hutchins, Selected Problems in the Law of Water Rights in the West 30–31 (1942) (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Misc. Pub. No. 418). Even in California it is important. See 51 Cal. Jur. 2d Waters §§ 257–264 (1959).

[15] *Hinderlider* v. *La Plata River & Cherry Creek Ditch Co.*, 304 U.S. 92, 98 (1938); *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423, 459 (1931).

[16] The doctrine continues to be applied interstate. *E. g.*, *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589, 617–618 (1945).

[17] "Delph E. Carpenter, Colorado River Commissioner for the State of Colorado, summarized the situation produced by that decision as follows:

"'The upper State has but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower State until the uses within the upper state have reached their maximum. The States may avoid this unfortunate situation by determining their respective rights by interstate compact before further development in either State, thus permitting freedom of development in the lower State without injury to future growth in the upper.'

"The final negotiation of the compact took place in the atmosphere produced by that decision." H.R. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. 22 (1948).

[18] H.R. Rep. No. 191, 67th Cong., 1st Sess. (1921).

[19] 42 Stat. 171 (1921).

[20] The Compact can be found at 70 Cong. Rec. 324 (1928), and U.S. Dept of Interior, Documents on the Use and Control of the Waters of Interstate and International Streams 39 (1956).

[21] H.R. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. 22 (1948).

[22] An acre-foot of water is enough to cover an acre of land with one foot of water.

[23] "Beneficial consumptive use" means consumptive use measured by diversions less return flows, for a beneficial (nonwasteful) purpose.

Seeking means which would permit ratification by all seven basin States, the Governors of those States met at Denver in 1925 and again in 1927. As a result of these meetings the Governors of the upper States suggested, as a fair apportionment of water among the Lower Basin States, that out of the average annual delivery of water at Lee Ferry required by the Compact—7,500,000 acre-feet—Nevada be given 300,000 acre-feet, Arizona 3,000,000, and California 4,200,000, and that unapportioned waters, subject to reapportionment after 1963, be shared equally by Arizona and California. Each Lower Basin State would have "the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of such tributaries within its boundaries before the same empty into the main stream," except that Arizona tributary waters in excess of 1,000,000 acre-feet could under some circumstances be subject to diminution by reason of a United States treaty with Mexico. This proposal foundered because California held out for 4,600,000 acre-feet instead of 4,200,000[25] and because Arizona held out for complete exemption of its tributaries from any part of the Mexican burden.[26]

Between 1922 and 1927 Congressman Philip Swing and Senator Hiram Johnson, both of California, made three attempts to have Swing-Johnson bills enacted, authorizing construction of a dam in the canyon section of the Colorado River and an all-American canal.[27] These bills would have carried out the original Fall-Davis Report's recommendations that the river problem be recognized and treated as national, not local. Arizona's Senators and Congressmen, still insisting upon a definite guaranty of water from the mainstream, bitterly fought these proposals because they failed to provide for exclusive use of her own tributaries, particularly the Gila, and for exemption of these tributaries from the Mexican burden.

Finally, the fourth Swing-Johnson bill passed both Houses and became the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, 45 Stat. 1057. The Act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a dam and other works in order to control floods, improve navigation, regulate the river's flow, store and distribute waters for reclamation and other beneficial uses, and generate electrical power.[28] The projects authorized by the Act were the same as those provided for in the prior defeated measures, but in other significant respects the Act was strikingly different. The earlier bills had offered no method whatever of apportioning the waters among the States of the Lower Basin. The Act as finally passed did provide such a method, and, as we view it, the method chosen was a complete statutory apportionment intended to put an end to the long standing dispute over Colorado River waters. To protect the Upper Basin against California should Arizona still refuse to ratify the Compact,[29] § 4(a) of the Act as finally passed provided that, if fewer than seven States ratified within six months, the Act should not take effect unless six States including California ratified and unless California, by its legislature, agreed "irrevocably and unconditionally * * * as an express covenant" to a limit on its annual consumption of Colorado River water of "four million four hundred thousand acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact." Congress in the same section showed its continuing desire to have California, Arizona, and Nevada settle their own differences by authorizing them to make an agreement apportioning to Nevada 300,000 acre-feet, and to Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet plus half of any surplus waters unapportioned by the Compact. The permitted agreement also was to allow Arizona exclusive use of the Gila River, wholly free from any Mexican obligation, a position Arizona had taken from the beginning. Sections 5 and 8(b) of the Project Act made provisions for the sale of the stored waters. The Secretary of the Interior was authorized by § 5 "under such general regulations as he may prescribe, to contract for the storage of water in said reservoir and for the delivery thereof at such points on the river and on said canal as may be agreed upon, for irrigation and domestic uses." Section 5 required these contracts to be "for permanent service" and further provided, "No person shall have or be entitled to have the use for any purpose of the water stored as aforesaid except by contract made as herein stated." Section 8(b) provided that the Secretary's contracts would be subject to any compact dividing the benefits of the water between Arizona, California, and Nevada, or any two of them, approved by Congress on or before January 1, 1929, but that any such compact approved after that date should be "subject to all contracts, if any, made by the Secretary of the Interior under section 5 hereof prior to the date of such approval and consent by Congress."

The Project Act became effective on June 25, 1929, by Presidential Proclamation,[30] after six States, including California, had ratified the Colorado River Compact and the California legislature had accepted the limitation of 4,400,000 acre-feet[31] as required by the Act. Neither the three States or any two of them ever entered into any apportionment compact as authorized by §§ 4(a) and 8(b). After the construction of Boulder Dam the Secretary of the Interior, purporting to act under the authority of the Project Act, made contracts with various water users in California for 5,362,000 acre-feet, with Nevada for 300,000 acre-feet, and with Arizona for 2,800,000 acre-feet of water from that stored at Lake Mead.

The Special Master appointed by this Court found that the Colorado River Compact, the law of prior appropriation, and the doctrine of equitable apportionment—by which doctrine this Court in the absence of statute resolves interstate claims according to the equities—do not control the issues in this case. The Master concluded that, since the Lower Basin States had failed to make a compact to allocate the waters among themselves as authorized by §§ 4(a) and 8(b), the Secretary's contracts with the States had within the statutory scheme of §§ 4(a), 5, and 8(b) effected an apportionment of the waters of the mainstream which, according to the Master, were the only waters to be apportioned under the Act. The Master further held that, in the event of a shortage of water making it impossible for the Secretary to supply all the water due California, Arizona, and Nevada under their contracts, the burden of the shortage must be borne by each State in proportion to her share of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet allocated to the Lower Basin, that is, 4.4/7.5 by California, 2.8/7.5 by Arizona, and .3/7.5 by Nevada, without regard to the law of prior appropriation.

Arizona, Nevada, and the United States support with few exceptions the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations of the Special Master's report. These parties agree that Congress did not leave division of the waters to an equitable apportionment by this Court but instead created a comprehensive statutory scheme for the allocation of mainstream waters. Arizona, however, believes that the allocation formula established by the Secretary's contracts was in fact the formula required by the Act. The United States, along with California, thinks the Master should not have invalidated the provisions of the Arizona and Nevada water contracts requiring those States to deduct from their allocations any diversions of water above Lake Mead which reduce the flow into that lake.

California is in basic disagreement with almost all of the Master's Report. She argues that the Project Act, like the Colorado River Compact, deals with the entire Colorado River System, not just the mainstream. This would mean that diversions within Arizona and Nevada of tributary waters flowing in those States would be charged against their apportionments and that, because tributary water would be added to the mainstream water in computing the first 7,500,000 acre-feet available to the States, there would be a greater likelihood of a surplus, of which California gets one-half. The result of California's argument would be much more water for California and much less for Arizona. California also argues that the Act neither allocates the Colorado River waters nor gives the Secretary authority to make an allocation. Rather she takes the position that the judicial doctrine of equitable apportionment giving full interstate effect to the traditional western water law of prior appropriation should determine the rights of the parties to the water. Finally, California claims that in any event the Act does not control in time of shortage. Under such circumstances, she says, this Court should divide the waters according to the doctrine of equitable apportionment or the law of prior appropriation, either of which, she argues, should result in protecting her prior uses.

Our jurisdiction to entertain this suit is not challenged and could not well be since Art. III, § 2, of the Constitution gives this Court original jurisdiction of actions in which States are parties. In exercising that jurisdiction, we are mindful of this Court's often expressed preference that, where possible, States settle their controversies by "mutual accommodation and agreement."[32] Those cases and others[33] make it clear, however, that this Court does have a serious responsibility to adjudicate cases where there are actual, existing controversies over how interstate streams should be apportioned among States. This case is the most recent phase of a continuing controversy over the water of the Colorado River, which the States despite repeated efforts have been unable to settle. Resolution of this dispute requires a determination of what apportionment, if any, is made by the Project Act and what powers are conferred by the Act upon the Secretary of Interior. Unless many of the issues presented here are adjudicated, the conflicting claims of the parties will continue, as they do now, to raise serious doubts as to the extent of each State's right to appropriate water from the Colorado River System for existing or new uses. In this situation we should and do exercise our jurisdiction.

---

[24] Arizona did ratify the Compact in 1944, after it had already become effective by six-State ratification as permitted by the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

[25] Hearings on H.R. 5773 before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 402–405 (1928).

[26] *Id.*, at 30–31. Arizona also objected to the provisions concerning electrical power.

[27] H.R. 11449, 67th Cong., 2d Sess. (1922); H.R. 2903, S. 727, 68th Cong., 1st Sess. (1923); H.R. 9826, S. 3331, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. (1926).

[28] Another purpose of the Act was to approve the Colorado River Compact, which had allocated the water between the two basins.

[29] The Upper Basin States feared that, if Arizona did not ratify the Compact, the division of water between the Upper and Lower Basins agreed on in the Compact would be nullified. The reasoning was that Arizona's uses would not be charged against the Lower Basin's apportionment and that California would therefore be free to exhaust that apportionment herself. Total Lower Basin uses would then be more than permitted in the Compact, leaving less water for the Upper Basin.

[30] 46 Stat. 3000 (1929).

[31] California Limitation Act. Cal. Stat. 1929, c. 16, at 38.

[32] *Colorado* v. *Kansas*, 320 U.S. 383, 392 (1943); *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589, 616 (1945).

[33] E.g., *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 185 U.S. 125 (1902); *New Jersey* v. *New York*, 283 U.S. 336 (1931).

I. ALLOCATION OF WATER AMONG THE STATES AND DISTRIBUTION TO USERS

We have concluded, for reasons to be stated, that Congress in passing the Project Act intended to and did create its own comprehensive scheme for the apportionment among California, Arizona, and Nevada of the mainstream waters of the Colorado River, leaving each State its tributaries. Congress decided that a fair division of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of mainstream water would give 4,400,000 acre-feet to California, 2,800,000 to Arizona, and 300,000 to Nevada; Arizona and California would each get one-half of any surplus. Prior approval was therefore given in the Act for a tri-State compact to incorporate these terms. The States, subject to subsequent congressional approval, were also permitted to agree on a compact with different terms. Division of the water did not, however, depend on the States' agreeing to a compact, for Congress gave the Secretary of the Interior adequate authority to accomplish the division. Congress did this by giving the Secretary power to make contracts for the delivery of water and by providing that no person could have water without a contract.

A. Relevancy of judicial apportionment and Colorado River Compact: We agree with the Master that apportionment of the Lower Basin waters of the Colorado River is not controlled by the doctrine of equitable apportionment or by the Colorado River Compact. It is true that the Court has used the doctrine of equitable apportionment to decide river controversies between States.[34] But in those cases Congress had not made any statutory apportionment. In this case, we have decided that Congress has provided its own method for allocating among the Lower Basin States the mainstream water to which they are entitled under the Compact. Where Congress has so exercised its constitutional power over waters, courts have no power to substitute their own notions of an "equitable apportionment" for the apportionment chosen by Congress. Nor does the Colorado River Compact control this case. Nothing in that Compact purports to divide water among the Lower Basin States nor in any way to affect or control any future apportionment among those States or any distribution of water within a State. That the Commissioners were able to accomplish even a division of water between the basins is due to what is generally known as the "Hoover Compromise":

> "Participants [in the Compact negotiations] have stated that the negotiations would have broken up but for Mr. Hoover's proposal; that the Commission limit its efforts to a division of water between the upper basin and the lower basin, leaving to each basin the future internal allocation of its share."[35]

And in fact this is all the Compact did. However, the Project Act, by referring to the Compact in several places, does make the Compact relevant to a limited extent. To begin with, the Act explicitly approves the Compact and thereby fixes a division of the waters between the basins which must be respected. Further, in several places the Act refers to terms contained in the Compact. For example, § 12 of the Act adopts the Compact definition of "domestic,"[36] and § 6 requires satisfaction of "present perfected rights" as used in the Compact.[37] Obviously, therefore, those particular terms, though originally formulated only for the Compact's allocation of water between basis, are incorporated into the Act and are made applicable to the Project Act's allocation among Lower Basin States. The Act also declares that the Secretary of the Interior and the United States in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the dam and other works and in the making of contracts shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact.[38] These latter references to the Compact are quite different from the Act's adoption of Compact terms. Such references, unlike the explicit adoption of terms, were used only to show that the Act and its provisions were in no way to upset, alter, or affect the Compact's congressionally approved division of water between the basins. They were not intended to make the Compact and its provisions control or affect the Act's allocation among and distribution of water within the States of the Lower Basin. Therefore, we look to the Compact for terms specifically incorporated in the Act, and we would also look to it to resolve disputes between the Upper and Lower Basins, were any involved in this case. But no such questions are here. We must determine what apportionment and delivery scheme in the Lower Basin has been effected through the Secretary's contracts. For that determination, we look to the Project Act alone.

B. *Mainstream apportionment:* The congressional scheme of apportionment cannot be understood without knowing what water Congress wanted apportioned. Under California's view, which we reject, the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of Lower Basin water, of which California has agreed to use only 4,400,000, is made up of both mainstream and tributary water, not just mainstream water. Under the view of Arizona, Nevada, and the United States, with which we agree, the tributaries are not included in the waters to be divided but remain for the exclusive use of each State. Assuming 7,500,000 acre-feet or more in the mainstream and 2,000,000 in the tributaries, California would get 1,000,000 acre-feet more if the tributaries are included and Arizona 1,000,000 less.[39]

California's argument that the Project Act, like the Colorado River Compact, deals with the main river and all its tributaries rests on § 4(a) of the Act, which limits California to 4,400,000 acre-feet "of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact." And Article III(a), referred to by § 4(a), apportioned in perpetuity to the Lower Basin the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum "from the Colorado River System," which was defined in the Compact as "that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America."

Arizona argues that the Compact apportions between basins only the waters of the mainstream, not the mainstream and the tributaries. We need not reach that question, however, for we have concluded that whatever waters the Compact apportioned the Project Act itself dealt only with water of the mainstream. In the first place, the Act, in § 4(a), states that the California limitation, which is in reality her share of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of Lower Basin water, is on "water of and from the Colorado River," not of and from the "Colorado River System." But more importantly, the negotiations among the States and the congressional debates leading to the passage of the Project Act clearly show that the language used by Congress in the Act was meant to refer to mainstream waters only. Inclusion of the tributaries in the Compact was natural in view of the upper States' strong feeling that the Lower Basin tributaries should be made to share the burden of any obligation to deliver water to Mexico which a future treaty might impose. But when it came to an apportionment among the Lower Basin States, the Gila, by far the most important Lower Basin tributary, would not logically be included, since Arizona alone of the States could effectively use that river.[40] Therefore, with minor exceptions, the proposals and counterproposals over the years, culminating in the Project Act, consistently provided for division of the mainstream only, reserving the tributaries to each State's exclusive use.

The most important negotiations among the States, which in fact formed the basis of the debates leading to passage of the Act, took place in 1927 when the Governors of the seven basin States met at Denver in an effort to work out an allocation of the Lower Basin waters acceptable to Arizona, California, and Nevada. Arizona and California made proposals,[41] both of which suggested giving Nevada 300,000 acre-feet out of the mainstream of the Colorado River and reserving to each State the exclusive use of her own tributaries. Arizona proposed that all remaining mainstream water be divided equally between herself and California, which would give each State 3,600,000 acre-feet out of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of mainstream water. California rejected the proposed equal division of the water, suggesting figures that would result in her getting about 4,600,000 out of the 7,500,000. The Governors of the four Upper Basin States, trying to bring Arizona and California together, asked each State to reduce its demands and suggested this compromise: Nevada 300,000 acre-feet, Arizona 3,000,000, and California 4,200,000.[42] These allocations were to come only out of the mainstream, that is, as stated by the Governors, out "of the average annual delivery of water to be provided by the States of the upper division at Lees Ferry under the terms of the Colorado River compact." The Governors' suggestions, like those of the States, explicitly reserved to each State as against the other States the exclusive use of her own tributaries. Arizona agreed to the Governors' proposal, but she wanted it made clear that her tributaries were to be exempted from any Mexican obligation.[43] California rejected the whole proposal, insisting that she must have 4,600,000 acre-feet from the mainstream, or, as she put it, "from the waters to be provided by the States of the upper division at Lee Ferry under the Colorado River Compact." [44] Neither in the States' original offers, nor in the Governors' suggestions, nor in the States' responses was the "Colorado River System"—mainstream plus tributaries—ever used as the basis for Lower Basin allocations; rather, it was always mainstream water, or the water to be delivered by the upper States at Lee Ferry, that is to say, an annual average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of mainstream water.

---

[34] E.g., *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, 259 U.S. 419 (1922); *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589 (1945).

[35] H.R. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 22 (1948).

[36] "'Domestic' whenever employed in this Act shall include water uses defined as 'domestic' in said Colorado River compact."

[37] The dam and reservoir shall be used, among other things, for "satisfaction of present perfected rights in pursuance of Article VIII of said Colorado River compact."

[38] Secs. 1, 8(a), 13 (b) and (c).

[39] Also, California would reduce Nevada's share of the mainstream waters from 300,000 acre-feet to 120,500 acre-feet.

[40] Not only does the Gila enter the Colorado almost at the Mexican border, but also in dry seasons it virtually evaporates before reaching the Colorado.

[41] See 69 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9454 (1928).

[42] See 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 172 (1928).

[43] Hearings on H.R. 5773, supra note 25, at 30–31.

With the continued failure of Arizona and California to reach accord, there was mounting impetus for a congresional solution. A Swing-Johnson bill containing no limitation on California's uses finally passed the House in 1928 over objections by Representatives from Arizona and Utah.[45] When the bill reached the Senate, it was amended in committee to provide that the Secretary in his water delivery contracts must limit California to 4,600,000 acre-feet "of the water allocated to the lower basin by the Colorado River compact * * * and one-half of the unallocated, excess, and/or surplus water." [46] On the floor, Senator Phipps of Colorado proposed an amendment which would allow the Act to go into effect without any limitation on California if seven States ratified the Compact; if only six States ratified and if California legislature accepted the limitation, the Act could still become effective.[47] Arizona's Senator Hayden had already proposed an amendment reducing California's share to 4,200,000 acre-feet (the Governors' proposal), plus half of the surplus, leaving Arizona exclusive use of the Gila free from any Mexican obligation,[48] but this the Senate rejected.[49] Senator Bratton of New Mexico, noting that only 400,000 acre-feet kept Arizona and California apart, immediately suggested an amendment by which they would split the difference, California getting 4,400,000 acre-feet "of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by the Colorado River compact," plus half of surplus.[50] It was this Bratton amendment that became part of the Act as passed,[51] which had been amended on the floor so that the limitation referred to waters apportioned to the Lower Basin "by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact," instead of waters apportioned "by the Colorado River compact." [52]

Statements made throughout the debates make it quite clear that Congress intended the 7,500,000 acre-feet it was allocating, and out of which California was limited to 4,400,000, to be mainstream water only. In the first place, the basin Senators expressly acknowledged as the starting point for their debate the Denver Governors' proposal that specific allocations be made to Arizona, California, and Nevada from the mainstream, leaving the tributaries to the States. For example, Senator Johnson, leading spokesman for California, and Senator Hayden, leading spokesman for Arizona, agreed that the Governors' recommendations could be used as "a basis for discussion." [53] Hayden went on to observe that the Committee amendment would give California the same 4,600,000 acre-feet she had sought at Denver.[54] Later, Nevada's Senator Pittman stated that the committee "put the amount in there that California demanded before the four governors at Denver," and said that the Bratton amendment would split the 400,000 acre-feet separating the Governors' figure and the Committee's figure.[55] All the leaders in the debate—Johnson, Bratton, King, Hayden, Phipps, and Pittman—expressed a common understanding that the key issue separating Arizona and California was the difference of 400,000 acre-feet,[56] precisely the same 400,000 acre-feet of mainstream water that had separated the States at Denver. Were we to sustain California's argument here that tributaries must be included, California would actually get more than she was willing to settle for at Denver.

That the apportionment was from the mainstream only is also strongly indicated by an analysis of the second paragraph of § 4(a) of the Act. There Congress authorized Arizona, Nevada, and California to make a compact allocating to Nevada 300,000 acre-feet and to Arizona 2,800,000 plus one-half of surplus, which, with California's 4,400,000 and half of the surplus, would under California's interpretation of the Act exhaust the Lower Basin waters, both mainstream and tributaries. But Utah and New Mexico, as Congress knew, had interests in Lower Basin tributaries which Congress surely would have protected in some way had it meant for the tributaries of those two States to be included in the water to be divided among Arizona, Nevada, and California. We cannot believe that Congress would have permitted three States to divide among themselves water belonging to five States. Nor can we believe that the representatives of Utah and New Mexico would have sat quietly by and acquiesced in a congressional attempt to include their tributaries in waters given the other three States.

Finally, in considering California's claim to share in the tributaries of other States, it is important that from the beginning of the discussions and negotiations which led to the Project Act, Arizona consistently claimed that she must have sole use of the Gila, upon which her existing economy depended.[57] Arizona's claim was supported by the fact that only she and New Mexico could effectively use the Gila waters, which not only entered the Colorado River too close to Mexico to be of much use to any other States but also was reduced virtually to a trickle in the hot Arizona summers before it could reach the Colorado. In the debates the Senators consistently acknowledged that the tributaries—or at least the waters of the Gila, the only major Arizona tributary—were excluded from the allocation they were making. Senator Hayden, in response to questions by Senator Johnson, said that the California Senator was correct in stating that the Senate had seen fit to give Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet in addition to all the water in the Gila.[58] Senator Johnson had earlier stated, "[I]t is only the main stream, Senators will recall, that has been discussed," and one of his arguments in favor of California's receiving 4,600,000 acre-feet rather than 4,200,000 was that Arizona was going to keep all her tributaries in addition to whatever portion of the main river allocated to her.[59] Senator Johnson also argued that Arizona should bear more than half the Lower Basin's Mexican burden because in addition to the 2,800,000 acre-feet allotted her by the Act she would get the Gila, which he erroneously estimated at 3,500,000 acre-feet.[60] Senator Pittman, who had sat in on the Governors' conference, likewise understood that the water was being allocated from "the main Colorado River." [61] And other interested Senators similarly distinguished between the mainstream and the tributaries.[62] While the debates, extending over a long period of years, undoubtedly contain statements which support inferences in conflict with those we have drawn, we are persuaded by the legislative history as a whole that the Act was not intended to give California any claim to share in the tributary waters of the other Lower Basin States.

C. The project act's apportionment and distribution scheme: The legislative history, the language of the Act, and the scheme established by the Act for the storage and delivery of water convince us also that Congress intended to provide its own method for a complete apportionment of the mainstream water among Arizona, California, and Nevada.

First, the legislative history. In hearings on the House bill that became the Project Act, Congressman Arentz of Nevada, apparently impatient with the delay to this much needed project, told the committee on January 6, 1928, that if the States could not themselves allocate the water, "there must be some power which will say to California 'You cannot take any more than this amount and the balance is allocated to the other States.' " [63] Later, May 25, 1928, the House passed the bill,[64] but it did not contain any allocation scheme. When the Senate took up that bill in December, pressure mounted swiftly for amendments that would provide a workable method for apportioning the waters among the Lower Basin States and distributing them to users in the States. The session convened on December 3, 1928, on the fifth the Senate took up the bill,[65] nine days later the bill with significant amendments passed the Senate,[66] four days after that the House concurred in the Senate's action,[67] and on the twenty-first the President signed the bill.[68] When the bill first reached the Senate floor, it had a provision, added in committee, limiting California to 4,600,000 acre-feet,[69] and Senator Hayden on December 6 proposed reducing that share to 4,200,000.[70] The next day, December 7, Mr. Pittman, senior Senator from Nevada, vigorously argued that Congress should settle the matter without delay. He said,

---

[44] Id., at 402.

[45] H.R. 5773, 70th Cong., 1st Sess.; 69 Cong. Rec. 9989–9990 (1928).

[46] S. Rep. No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1928).

[47] 70 Congressional Record 324 (1928).

[48] *Id.*, at 162.

[49] *Id.*, at 384.

[50] *Id.*, at 385.

[51] 45 Stat. 1057 (1928). Arizona's Senators Ashurst and Hayden voted against the bill, which did not exempt the Gila from the Mexican burden, 70 Congressional Record 603 (1928).

[52] 70 Congressional Record 459 (1928). That this change was not intended to cause the States to give up their tributaries may reasonably be inferred from the fact that the amendment was agreed to by Senator Hayden, who was a constant opponent of including the tributaries.

[53] *Id.*, at 77.

[54] *Ibid.* Later, Senator Hayden said his amendment incorporated the Governors' proposal. *Id.*, at 172–173.

[55] *Id.*, at 386.

[56] *Id.*, at 164 (King), 165 (Johnson, Bratton), 382 (Hayden, Phipps), 385 (Bratton), 386 (Pittman). Senator Hayden's statement is representative: "I want to state to the Senate that what I am trying to accomplish is to get a vote on the one particular question of whether the quantity of water which the State of California may divert from the Colorado River should be 4,200,000 acre-feet or 4,600,000 acre-feet." *Id.*, at 382.

[57] *E.g.*, Report, Colorado River Commission of Arizona (1927), reprinted in Hearings on H.R. 5773, *supra* note 25, at 25–31; 69 Congressional Record 9454 (1928) (Arizona's proposal at Denver).

[58] 70 Congressional Record 467–468 (1928). See also *id.*, at 463–464, 465.

[59] *Id.*, at 237.

[60] *Id.*, at 466–467.

[61] *Id.*, at 469. See also *id.*, at 232.

[62] See *id.*, at 463 (Shortridge); *id.*, at 465 (King).

[63] Hearings on H.R. 5773, *supra* note 25, at 50.

[64] 69 Congressional Record 9990 (1928).

[65] 70 Congressional Record 67 (1928).

[66] *Id.*, at 603.

[67] *Id.*, at 837–838.

[68] 45 Stat. 1057.

[69] See S. Rep. No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1928).

[70] 70 Congressional Record 162 (1928).

"What is the difficulty? We have only minor questions involved here. There is practically nothing involved except a dispute between the States of Arizona and California with regard to the division of the increased water that will be impounded behind the proposed dam; that is all. * * * Of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water let down that river they have gotten together within 400,000 acre-feet. They have got to get together, and if they do not get together Congress should bring them together." [71]

The day after that, December 8, New Mexico's Senator Bratton suggested an amendment splitting the difference between the demands of Arizona and California by limiting California to 4,400,000 acre-feet.[72] On the tenth, reflecting the prevailing sense of urgency for decisive action, Senator Bratton emphasized that this was not a dispute limited simply to two States:

"The two States have exchanged views, they have negotiated, they have endeavored to reach an agreement, and until now have been unable to do so. This controversy does not affect those two States alone. It affects other States in the Union and the Government as well.

"Without undertaking to express my views either way upon the subject, I do think that if the two States are unable to agree upon a figure then that we, as a disinterested and friendly agency, should pass a bill which, according to our combined judgment, will justly and equitably settle the controversy. I suggested 4,400,000 acre-feet with that in view. I still hold to the belief that somewhere between the two figures we must fix the amount, and that this difference of 400,000 acre-feet should not be allowed to bar and preclude the passage of this important measure dealing with the enormous quantity of 15,000,000 acre-feet of water and involving seven States as well as the Government." [73]

The very next day, December 11, this crucial amendment was adopted,[74] and on the twelfth Senator HAYDEN pointed out that the bill settled the dispute over Lower Basin waters by giving 4,400,000 acre-feet to California and 2,800,000 to Arizona:

"One [dispute] is how the seven and a half million acre-feet shall be divided in the lower basin. The Senate has settled that by a vote—that California may have 4,400,000 acre-feet of that water. It follows logically that if that demand is to be conceded, as everybody agrees, the remainder is 2,800,000 acre-feet for Arizona. That settles that part of the controversy." [75]

On the same day, Senator Pittman, intimately familiar with the whole water problem,[76] summed up the feeling of the Senate that the bill fixed a limit on California and practically allocated to Arizona her share of the water:

"The Senate has already determined upon the division of water between those States. How? It has determined how much water California may use, and the rest of it is subject to use by Nevada and Arizona. Nevada has already admitted that it can use only an insignificant quantity, 300,000 acre-feet. That leaves the rest of it to Arizona. As the bill now stands it is just as much divided as if they had mentioned Arizona and Nevada and the amounts they are to get.

* * * * *

"As I understand this amendment, Arizona today has practically allocated to it 2,800,000 acre-feet of water in the main Colorado River." [77]

The Senator went on to explain why the Senate had found it necessary to set up its own plan for allocating the water:

"Why do we not leave it to California to say how much water she shall take out of the river or leave it to Arizona to say how much water she shall take out of the river? It is because it happens to become a duty of the United States Senate to settle this matter, and that is the reason." [78]

Not only do the closing days of the debate show that Congress intended an apportionment among the States but also provisions of the Act create machinery plainly adequate to accomplish this purpose, whatever contingencies might occur. As one alternative of the congressional scheme, section 4(a) of the Act invited Arizona, California, and Nevada to adopt a compact dividing the waters along the identical lines that had formed the basis for the congressional discussions of the Act: 4,400,000 acre-feet to California, 300,000 to Nevada, and 2,800,000 to Arizona. Section 8(b) gave the States power to agree upon some other division, which would have to be approved by Congress. Congress made sure, however, that if the States did not agree on any compact the objects of the Act would be carried out, for the Secretary would then proceed, by making contracts, to apportion water among the States and to allocate the water among users within each State.

In the first section of the Act, the Secretary was authorized to "construct, operate, and maintain a dam and incidental works * * * adequate to create a storage reservoir of a capacity of not less than twenty million acre-feet of water * * *" for the stated purpose of "controlling the floods, improving navigation and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof for reclamation of public lands and other beneficial uses * * *," and generating electrical power. The whole point of the Act was to replace the erratic, undependable, often destructive natural flow of the Colorado with the regular, dependable release of waters conserved and stored by the project. Having undertaken this beneficial project, Congress, in several provisions of the Act, made it clear that no one should use mainstream waters save in strict compliance with the scheme set up by the Act. Section 5 authorized the Secretary "under such general regulations as he may prescribe, to contract for the storage of water in said reservoir and for the delivery thereof at such points on the river * * * as may be agreed upon, for irrigation and domestic uses." To emphasize that water could be obtained from the Secretary alone, § 5 further declared, "No person shall have or be entitled to have the use for any purpose of the water stored as aforesaid except by contract made as herein stated." The supremacy given the Secretary's contracts was made clear in § 8(b) of the Act, which provided that, while the Lower Basin States were free to negotiate a compact dividing the waters, such a compact if made and approved after January 1, 1929, was to be "subject to all contracts, if any, made by the Secretary of the Interior under section 5" before Congress approved the compact.

These several provisions, even without legislative history, are persuasive that Congress intended the Secretary of the Interior, through his § 5 contracts, both to carry out the allocation of the waters of the main Colorado River among the Lower Basin States and to decide which users within each State would get water. The general authority to make contracts normally includes the power to choose with whom and upon what terms the contracts will be made. When Congress in an Act grants authority to contract, that authority is no less than the general authority, unless Congress has placed some limit on it.[79] In this respect it is of interest that in an earlier version the bill did limit the Secretary's contract power by making the contracts "subject to rights of prior appropriators."[80] But that restriction, which preserved the law of prior appropriation, did not survive. It was stricken from the bill when the requirement that every water user have a contract was added to § 5.[81] Significantly, no phrase or provision indicating that the Secretary's contract power was to be controlled by the law of prior appropriation was substituted either then or at any other time before passage of the Act, and we are persuaded that had Congress intended so to fetter the Secretary's discretion, it would have done so in clear and unequivocal terms, as it did in recognizing "present perfected rights" in § 6.

That the bill was giving the Secretary sufficient power to carry out an allocation of the waters among the States and among the users within each State without regard to the law of prior appropriation was brought out in a colloquy between Montana's Senator Walsh and California's Senator Johnson, whose State had at least as much reason as any other State to bind the Secretary by state laws. Senator Walsh, who was thoroughly versed in western water law and also had previously argued before this Court in a leading case involving the doctrine of prior appropriation,[82] made clear what would follow from the Government's impounding of the Colorado River waters when he said, "I always understood that the interest that stores the water has a right superior to prior appropriations that do not store." He sought Senator Johnson's views on what rights the City of Los Angeles, which had filed claims to large quantities of Colorado River water, would have after the Government had built the dam and impounded the waters. In reply to Senator Walsh's specific question whether the Government might "dispose of the stored waters as it sees fit," Senator Johnson said, "Yes, under the terms of this bill." Senator Johnson added that "everything in this scheme, plan, or design" was "dependent upon the Secretary of the Interior contracting with those who desire to obtain the benefit of the construction." He admitted that it was possible that the Secretary could "utterly ignore" Los Angeles' appropriations.[83]

---

[71] *Id.*, at 232.

[72] *Id.*, at 277, 385.

[73] *Id.*, at 333.

[74] *Id.*, at 387.

[75] *Id.*, at 467. See also *id.*, at 465.

[76] For example, Senator Pittman's active role in resolving the whole Colorado River problem was acknowledged by Senator HAYDEN on the Senate floor:

"When Congress assembled in December 1927, no agreement had been made. The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman], in continuation of the earnest efforts that he has made all these years to bring about a settlement of the controversy between the States with respect to the Colorado River, invited a number of us to conferences in his office and these we talked over the situation." *Id.*, at 172.

[77] *Id.*, at 468–469.

[78] *Id.*, at 471. The Senator added, "We have already decided as to the division of the water, and we say that if the States wish they can enter into a subsidiary agreement confirming that." *Ibid.*

[79] In the debates leading to the passage of the bill, Senator Walsh observed that "to contract means a liberty of contract" and asked if this did not mean that the Secretary could "give the water to them [appropriators] or withhold it from them as he sees fit," to which Senator Johnson answered "certainly." 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 168 (1928).

[80] See Hearings on H.R. 6251 and 9826 before the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. 12 (1926).

[81] See *id.*, at 97, 115.

[82] *Bean* v. *Morris*, 221 U.S. 485 (1911). This case was relied on by Mr. Justice Van Devanter in *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, 259 U.S. 419, 466 (1922).

In this same discussion, Senator HAYDEN emphasized the Secretary's power to allocate the water by making contracts with users. After Senator Walsh said that he understood Senator Johnson to be arguing that the Secretary must satisfy Los Angeles' appropriations, Senator HAYDEN corrected him, pointing out that Senator Johnson had qualified his statement by saying that "after all, the Secretary of the Interior could allow the city of Los Angeles to have such quantity of water as might be determined by contract." Senator HAYDEN went on to say that, where domestic and irrigation needs conflicted, "the Secretary of the Interior will naturally decide as between applicants, one who desires to use the water for potable purposes in the city and another who desires to use it for irrigation, if there is not enough water to go around, that the city shall have the preference."[84] It is also significant that two vigorous opponents of the bill, Arizona's Representative Douglas and Utah's Representative Colton, criticized the bill because it gave the Secretary of the Interior "absolute control" over the disposition of the stored waters.[85]

The argument that Congress would not have delegated to the Secretary so much power to apportion and distribute the water overlooks the ways in which his power is limited and channeled by standards in the Project Act. In particular, the Secretary is bound to observe the Act's limitation of 4,400,000 acre-feet on California's consumptive uses out of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of mainstream water. This necessarily leaves the remaining 3,100,000 acre-feet for the use of Arizona and Nevada, since they are the only other States with access to the main Colorado River. Nevada consistently took the position, accepted by the other States throughout the debates, that her conceivable needs would not exceed 300,000 acre-feet, which, of course, left 2,800,000 acre-feet for Arizona's use. Moreover, Congress, indicated that it thought this a proper division of the waters when in the second paragraph of § 4(a) it gave advance consent to a tristate compact adopting such division. While no such compact was ever entered into, the Secretary by his contracts has apportioned the water in the approved amounts and thereby followed the guidelines set down by Congress. And, as the Master pointed out, Congress set up other standards and placed other significant limitations upon the Secretary's power to distribute the stored waters. It specifically set out in order the purposes for which the Secretary must use the dam and the reservoir:

"First, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses and satisfaction of present perfected rights in pursuance of Article VIII of said Colorado River compact; and third, for power." § 6.

The Act further requires the Secretary to make revenue provisions in his contracts adequate to ensure the recovery of the expenses of construction, operation, and maintenance of the dam and other works within 50 years after their construction. § 4(b). The Secretary is directed to make water contracts for irrigation and domestic uses only for "permanent service." § 5. He and his permittees, licensees, and contractees are subject to the Colorado River Compact, § 8(a), and therefore can do nothing to upset or encroach upon the Compact's allocation of Colorado River water between the Upper and Lower Basins. In the construction, operation, and management of the works, the Secretary is subject to the provisions of the reclamation law, except as the Act otherwise provides. § 14. One of the most significant limitations in the Act is that the Secretary is required to satisfy present perfected rights, a matter of intense importance to those who had reduced their water rights to actual beneficial use at the time the Act became effective. § 6. And, of course, all of the powers granted by the Act are exercised by the Secretary and his well-established executive department, responsible to Congress and the President and subject to judicial review.[86]

Notwithstanding the Government's construction, ownership, operation, and maintenance of the vast Colorado River works that conserve and store the river's waters and the broad power given by Congress to the Secretary of the Interior to make contracts for the distribution of the water, it is argued that Congress in §§ 14 and 18 of the Act took away practically all the Secretary's power by permitting the States to determine with whom and on what terms the Secretary would make water contracts. Section 18 states:

"Nothing herein shall be construed as interfering with such rights as the States now have either to the waters within their borders or to adopt such policies and enact such laws as they may deem necessary with respect to the appropriation, control, and use of waters within their borders."

Section 14 provides that the reclamation law, to which the Act is made a supplement, shall govern the management of the works except as otherwise provided, and § 8 of the Reclamation Act, much like § 18 of the Project Act, provides that it is not to be construed as affecting or interfering with state laws "relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation * * *."[87] In our view, nothing in any of these provisions affects our decision, stated earlier, that it is the Act and the Secretary's contracts, not the laws of prior appropriation, that control the apportionment of water among the States. Moreover, contrary to the Master's conclusion, we hold that the Secretary in choosing between users within each State and in settling the terms of his contracts is not bound by these sections to follow state law.

The argument that § 8 of the Reclamation Act requires the United States in the delivery of water to follow priorities laid down by state law has already been disposed of by this Court in *Ivanhoe Irr. Dist.* v. *McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275 (1958), and reaffirmed in *City of Fresno* v. *California*, 372 U.S. 627 (1963). In *Ivanhoe* we held that, even though § 8 of the Reclamation Act preserved state law, that general provision could not override a specific provision of the same Act prohibiting a single landowner from getting water for more than 160 acres. We said:

"As we read § 8, it merely requires the United States to comply with state law when, in the construction and operation of a reclamation project, it becomes necessary for it to acquire water rights or vested interests therein. But the acquisition of water rights must not be confused with the operation of federal projects. As the Court said in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming, supra*, at 6:15: 'We do not suggest that where Congress has provided a system of regulation for federal projects, it must give way before an inconsistent state system.' * * * We read nothing in § 8 that compels the United States to deliver water on conditions imposed by the State." *Id.*, at 291–292.

Since § 8 of the Reclamation Act did not subject the Secretary to state law in disposing of water in that case, we cannot, consistently with *Ivanhoe*, hold that the Secretary must be bound by state law in disposing of water under the Project Act.

Nor does § 18 of the Project Act require the Secretary to contract according to state law. That Act was passed in the exercise of congressional power to control navigable water for purposes of flood control, navigation, power generation, and other objects,[88] and is equally sustained by the power of Congress to promote the general welfare through projects for reclamation, irrigation, or other internal improvements.[89] Section 18 merely preserves such rights as the States "now" have, that is, such rights as they had at the time the Act was passed. While the States were generally free to exercise some jurisdiction over these waters before the Act was passed, this right was subject to the Federal Government's right to regulate and develop the river.[90] Where the Government, as here, has exercised this power and undertaken a comprehensive project for the improvement of a great river and for the orderly and beneficial distribution of water, there is no room for inconsistent state laws.[91] As in *Ivanhoe*, where the general provision preserving state law was held not to override a specific provision stating the terms for disposition of the water, here we hold that the general saving language of § 18 cannot bind the Secretary by state law and thereby nullify the contract power expressly conferred upon him by § 5.[92] Section 18 plainly allows the States to do things not inconsistent with the Project Act or with federal control of the river, for example, regulation of the use of tributary water and protection of present perfected rights.[93] What other things the States are free to do can be decided when the occasion arises. But where the Secretary's contracts, as here, carry out a congressional plan for the complete distribution of waters to users, state law has no place.[94]

---

[83] 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 168 (1928). Other statements by Senator Johnson are less damaging to California's claims. For example, the Senator at another point in the colloquy with Senator Walsh said that he doubted if the Secretary either would or could disregard Los Angeles and contract with someone having no appropriation. Ibid. It is likely, however, that Senator Johnson was talking about present perfected rights, as a few minutes before he had argued that Los Angeles had taken sufficient steps in perfecting its claims to make them protected. See *id.*, at 167. Present perfected rights, as we have observed in the text, are recognized by the Act. § 6.

[84] 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 169 (1928). At one point Senator HAYDEN seems to say that the Secretary's contracts are to be governed by state law: "The only thing required in this bill is contained in the amendment that I have offered, that there shall be appointed to each State its share of the water. Then, who shall obtain that water in relative order of priority may be determined by the State courts." Ibid. But, in view of the Senator's other statements in the same debate, this remark of a man so knowledgeable in western water law makes sense only if one understands that the "order of priority" being talked about was the order of present perfected rights—rights which Senator Hayden recognized, see *id.*, at 167, and which the Act preserves in § 6.

[85] 69 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9623, 9649 (1928). We recognize, of course, that statements of opponents of a bill may not be authoritative, see *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384, 394–395 (1951), but they are nevertheless relevant and useful, especially where, as here, the proponents of the bill made no response to the opponent's criticisms.

[86] See e.g., *Ickes* v. *Fox*, 300 U.S. 82 (1937); cf. *Best* v. *Humboldt Placer Mining Co.*, 371 U.S. 334 (1963); *Boesch* v. *Udall*, No. 332 (May 27, 1963).

[87] "Nothing in . . . [this Act] shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of such sections, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing . . . [herein] shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof." 43 U.S.C. § 383 (1958).

[88] *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423 (1931).

[89] *United States* v. *Gerlach Live Stock Co.*, 339 U.S. 725, 738 (1950).

[90] *First Iowa Hydro-Elec. Coop* v. *Federal Power Comm'n*, 328 U.S. 152, 171 (1946). See *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.*, 229 U.S. 53, 62–72 (1913); *United States* v. *Willow River Power Co.*, 324 U.S. 499 (1945).

Before the Project Act was passed, the waters of the Colorado River, though numbered by the millions of acre-feet, flowed too haltingly or too freely, resulting in droughts and floods. The problems caused by these conditions proved too immense and the solutions too costly for any one State or all the States together. In addition, the States, despite repeated efforts at a settlement, were unable to agree on how much water each State should get. With the health and growth of the Lower Basin at stake, Congress responded to the pleas of the States to come to their aid. The result was the Project Act and the harnessing of the bountiful waters of the Colorado to sustain growing cities, to support expanding industries, and to transform dry and barren deserts into lands that are livable and productive.

In undertaking this ambitious and expensive project for the welfare of the people of the Lower Basin States and of the Nation, the United States assumed the responsibility for the construction, operation, and supervision of Boulder Dam and a great complex of other dams and works. Behind the dam were stored virtually all the waters of the main river, thus impounding not only the natural flow but also the great quantities of water previously allowed to run waste or to wreak destruction. The impounding of these waters, along with their regulated and systematic release to those with contracts, has promoted the spectacular development of the Lower Basin. Today, the United States operates a whole network of useful projects up and down the river, including the Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, Parker Dam, Headgate Rock Dam, Palo Verde Dam, Imperial Dam, Laguna Dam, Morelos Dam, and the All-American Canal System, and many lesser works. It was only natural that the United States, which was to make the benefits available and which had accepted the responsibility for the project's operation, would want to make certain that the waters were effectively used. All this vast, interlocking machinery—a dozen major works delivering water according to congressionally fixed priorities for home, agricultural, and industrial uses to people spread over thousands of square miles—could function efficiently only under unitary management, able to formulate and supervise a coordinated plan that could take account of the diverse, often conflicting interests of the people and communities of the Lower Basin States. Recognizing this, Congress put the Secretary of the Interior in charge of these works and entrusted him with sufficient power, principally the § 5 contract power, to direct, manage, and coordinate their operation. Subjecting the Secretary to the varying, possibly inconsistent, commands of the different state legislatures could frustrate efficient operation of the project and thwart full realization of the benefits Congress intended this national project to bestow. We are satisfied that the Secretary's power must be construed to permit him, within the boundaries set down in the Act, to allocate and distribute the waters of the mainstream of the Colorado River.

II. PROVISIONS IN THE SECRETARY'S CONTRACTS

A. *Diversions above Lake Mead:* The Secretary's contracts with Arizona and Nevada provide that any waters diverted by those States out of the mainstream or the tributaries above Lake Mead must be charged to their respective Lower Basin apportionments. The Master, however, took the view that the apportionment was to be made out of the waters actually stored at Lake Mead or flowing in the mainstream below Lake Mead. He therefore held that the Secretary was without power to charge Arizona and Nevada for diversions made by them from the 275-mile stretch of river between Lee Ferry and Lake Mead[95] or from the tributaries above Lake Mead. This conclusion was based on the Master's reasoning that the Secretary was given physical control over the waters stored in Lake Mead and not over waters before they reached the lake.

We hold that the Master was correct in deciding that the Secretary cannot reduce water deliveries to Arizona and Nevada by the amount of their uses from tributaries above Lake Mead, for, as we have held, Congress in the Project Act intended to apportion only the mainstream, leaving to each State its own tributaries. We disagree, however, with the Master's holding that the Secretary is powerless to charge States for diversions from the mainstream above Lake Mead. What Congress was doing in the Project Act was providing for an apportionment among the Lower Basin States of the water allocated to that basin by the Colorado River Compact. The Lower Basin, with which Congress, was dealing, begins at Lee Ferry, and it was all the water in the mainstream below Lee Ferry that Congress intended to divide among the States. Were we to refuse the Secretary the power to charge States for diversions from the mainstream between Lee Ferry and the dam site, we would allow individual States, by making diversions that deplete the Lower Basin's allocation, to upset the whole plan of apportionment arrived at by Congress to settle the long-standing dispute in the Lower Basin. That the congressional apportionment scheme would be upset can easily be demonstrated. California, for example, has been allotted 4,400,000 acre-feet of mainstream water. If Arizona and Nevada can, without being charged for it, divert water from the river above Lake Mead, then California could not get the share Congress intended her to have.

B. *Nevada contract:* Nevada has excepted to her inclusion in Paragraph II(B)(7) of the Master's recommended decree, which provides that "mainsteam water shall be delivered to users in Arizona, California and Nevada only if contracts have been made by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to § 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, for the delivery of such water." While the California contracts are directly with water users and the Arizona contract specifically contemplates further subcontracts with actual users, it is argued that the Nevada contract, made by the Secretary directly with the State of Nevada through her Colorado River Commission, should be construed as a contract to deliver water to the State without the necessity of subcontracts by the Secretary directly with Nevada water users. The United States disagrees, contending that properly construed the Nevada contract, like the Secretary's general contract with Arizona, does not exhaust the Secretary's power to require Nevada water users other than the State to make further contracts. To construe the Nevada contract otherwise, the Government suggests, would bring it in conflict with the provision of § 5 of the Project Act that "No person shall have or be entitled to have the use for any purpose of the water stored as aforesaid except by contract [with the Secretary] made as herein stated." Acceptance of Nevada's contention here would not only undermine this plain congressional requirement that water users have contracts with the Secretary but would likewise transfer from the Secretary to Nevada a large part, if not all, of the Secretary's power to determine with whom he will contract and on what terms. We have already held that the contractual power granted the Secretary cannot be diluted in this manner. We therefore reject Nevada's contention.

III. APPORTIONMENT AND CONTRACTS IN TIME OF SHORTAGE

We have agreed with the Master that the Secretary's contracts with Arizona for 2,800,000 acre-feet of water and with Nevada for 300,000, together with the limitation of California to 4,400,000 acre-feet, effect a valid apportionment of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of mainstream water in the Lower Basin. There remains the question of what shall be done in time of shortage. The Master, while declining to make any findings as to what future supply might be expected, nevertheless decided that the Project Act and the Secretary's contracts require the Secretary in case of shortage to divide the burden among the three States in this proportion: California 4.4/7.5; Arizona 2.8/7.5; Nevada .3/7.5. While pro rata sharing of water shortages seems equitable on its face,[96] more considered judgment may demonstrate quite the contrary. Certainly we should not bind the Secretary to this formula. We have held that the Secretary is vested with considerable control over the apportionment of Colorado River waters. And neither the Project Act nor the water contracts require the use of any particular formula for apportioning shortages. While the Secretary must follow the standards set out in the Act, he nevertheless is free to choose among the recognized methods of apportionment or to devise reasonable methods of his own. This choice, as we see it, is primarily his, not the Master's or even ours. And the Secretary may or may not conclude that a pro rata division is the best solution.

It must be remembered that the Secretary's decision may have an effect not only on irrigation uses but also on other important functions for which Congress brought this great project into being—flood control, improvement of navigation, regulation of flow, and generation and distribution of electric power. Requiring the Secretary to prorate shortages would strip him of the very power of choice which we think Congress, for reasons satisfactory to it, vested in him and which we should not impair or take away from him. For the same reasons we cannot accept California's contention that in case of shortage each State's share of water should be determined by the judicial doctrine of equitable apportionment or by the law of prior appropriation. These principles, while they may provide some guidance, are not binding upon the Secretary where, as here, Congress, with full power to do so, has provided that the waters of a navigable stream shall be harnessed, conserved, stored, and distributed through a governmental agency under a statutory scheme.

---

[91] See *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423 (1931); *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589, 615 (1945); *First Iowa Hydro-Elec. Coop.* v. *Federal Power Comm'n*, 328 U.S. 152 (1946).

[92] *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589 (1945), holds nothing to the contrary. There the Court found it unnecessary to decide what rights the United States had under federal law to the unappropriated water of the North Platte River, since the water rights on which the projects in that case rested had in fact been obtained in compliance with state law.

[93] See *First Iowa Hydro-Elec. Coop* v. *Federal Power Comm'n*, 328 U.S. 152, 175–176 (1946), where this Court limited the effect of § 27 of the Federal Power Act, which expressly "saved" certain state laws, to vested property rights.

[94] By an Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1726, the Secretary must supply water to Boulder City, Nevada. It follows from our conclusions as to the inapplicability of state law that, contrary to the Master's conclusion, Boulder City's priorities are not to be determined by Nevada law.

[95] The location of Hoover Dam is a result of engineering decisions. As Senator Pittman pointed out, "There is no place to impound the flood waters except at the lower end of the canyon." 68 Cong. Rec. 4413 (1927).

[96] Proration of shortage is the method agreed upon by the United States and Mexico to adjust Mexico's share of Colorado River water should there be insufficient water to supply each country's apportionment.

None of this is to say that in case of shortage, the Secretary cannot adopt a method of proration or that he may not lay stress upon priority of use, local laws and customs, or any other factors that might be helpful in reaching an informed judgment in harmony with the Act, the best interests of the Basin States, and the welfare of the Nation. It will be time enough for the courts to intervene when and if the Secretary, in making apportionments or contracts, deviates from the standards Congress has set for him to follow, including his obligation to respect "present perfected rights" as of the date the Act was passed. At this time the Secretary has made no decision at all based on an actual or anticipated shortage of water, and so there is no action of his in this respect for us to review. Finally, as the Master pointed out, Congress still has broad powers over this navigable international stream. Congress can undoubtedly reduce or enlarge the Secretary's power if it wishes. Unless and until it does, we leave in the hands of the Secretary, where Congress placed it, full power to control, manage, and operate the Government's Colorado River works and to make contracts for the sale and delivery of water on such terms as are not prohibited by the Project Act.

IV. ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO GILA CONTROVERSY

Arizona and New Mexico presented the Master with conflicting claims to water in the Gila River, the tributary that rises in New Mexico and flows through Arizona. Having determined that tributaries are not within the regulatory provisions of the Project Act the Master held that this interstate dispute should be decided under the principles of equitable apportionment. After hearing evidence on this issue, the Master accepted a compromise settlement agreed upon by these States and incorporated that settlement in his findings and conclusions, and in Part IV (A) (B) (C) (D) of his recommended decree. No exceptions have been filed to these recommendations by any of the parties and they are accordingly accepted by us. Except for those discussed in Part V, we are not required to decide any other disputes between tributary users or between mainstream and tributary users.

V. CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES

In these proceedings, the United States has asserted claims to waters in the main river and in some of the tributaries for use on Indian Reservations, National Forests, Recreational and Wildlife Areas, and other government lands and works. While the Master passed upon some of these claims, he declined to reach others, particularly those relating to tributaries. We approve his decision as to which claims required adjudication, and likewise we approve the decree he recommended for the government claims he did decide. We shall discuss only the claims of the United States on behalf of the Indian Reservations.

The Government, on behalf of five Indian Reservations in Arizona, California, and Nevada, asserted rights to water in the mainstream of the Colorado River.[97] The Colorado River Reservation, located partly in Arizona and partly in California, is the largest. It was originally created by an Act of Congress in 1865,[98] but its area was later increased by Executive Order.[99] Other reservations were created by Executive Orders and amendments to them, ranging in dates from 1870 to 1907.[100] The Master found both as a matter of fact and law that when the United States created these reservations or added to them, it reserved not only land but also the use of enough water from the Colorado to irrigate the irrigable portions of the reserved lands. The aggregate quantity of water which the Master held was reserved for all the reservations is about 1,000,000 acre-feet, to be used on around 135,000 irrigable acres of land. Here, as before the Master, Arizona argues that the United States had no power to make a reservation of navigable waters after Arizona became a State; that navigable waters could not be reserved by Executive Orders; that the United States did not intend to reserve water for the Indian Reservations; that the amount of water reserved should be measured by the reasonably foreseeable needs of the Indians living on the reservation rather than by the number of irrigable acres; and, finally, that the judicial doctrine of equitable apportionment should be used to divide the water between the Indians and the other people in the State of Arizona.

The last argument is easily answered. The doctrine of equitable apportionment is a method of resolving water disputes between States. It was created by this Court in the exercise of its original jurisdiction over controversies in which States are parties. An Indian Reservation is not a State. And while Congress has sometimes left Indian Reservations considerable power to manage their own affairs, we are not convinced by Arizona's argument that each reservation is so much like a State that its rights to water should be determined by the doctrine of equitable apportionment. Moreover, even were we to treat an Indian Reservation like a State, equitable apportionment would still not control since, under our view, the Indian claims here are governed by the statutes and Executive Orders creating the reservations.

Arizona's contention that the Federal Government had no power, after Arizona became a State, to reserve waters for the use and benefit of federally reserved lands rests largely upon statements in *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan*, 3 How. 212 (1845), and *Shively* v. *Bowlby*, 152 U.S. 1 (1894). Those cases and others that followed them[101] gave rise to the doctrine that lands underlying navigable waters within territory acquired by the Government are held in trust for future States and that title to such lands is automatically vested in the States upon admission to the Union. But those cases involved only the shores of and lands beneath navigable waters. They do not determine the problem before us and cannot be accepted as limiting the broad powers of the United States to regulate navigable waters under the Commerce Clause and to regulate government lands under Art. IV, § 3, of the Constitution. We have no doubt about the power of the United States under these clauses to reserve water rights for its reservations and its property.

Arizona also argues that, in any event, water rights cannot be reserved by Executive Order. Some of the reservations of Indian lands here involved were made almost 100 years ago, and all of them were made over 45 years ago. In our view, these reservations, like those created directly by Congress, were not limited to land, but included waters as well. Congress and the Executive have ever since recognized these as Indian Reservations. Numerous appropriations, including appropriations for irrigation projects, have been made by Congress. They have been uniformly and universally treated as reservations by map makers, surveyors, and the public. We can give but short shrift at this late date to the argument that the reservations either of land or water are invalid because they were originally set apart by the Executive.[102]

Arizona also challenges the Master's holding as to the Indian Reservations on two other grounds, first, that there is a lack of evidence showing that the United States in establishing the reservations intended to reserve water for them, and, second, that even if water was meant to be reserved the Master has awarded too much water. We reject both of these contentions. Most of the land in these reservations is and always has been arid. If the water necessary to sustain life is to be had, it must come from the Colorado River or its tributaries. It can be said without overstatement that when the Indians were put on these reservations they were not considered to be located in the most desirable area of the Nation. It is impossible to believe that when Congress created the great Colorado River Indian Reservation and when the Executive Department of this Nation created the other reservations they were unaware that most of the lands were of the desert kind—hot, scorching sands—and that water from the river would be essential to the life of the Indian people and to the animals they hunted and the crops they raised. In the debate leading to approval of the first congressional appropriation for irrigation of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, the delegate from the Territory of Arizona made this statement:

> "Irrigating canals are essential to the prosperity of these Indians. Without water there can be no production, no life; and all they ask of you is to give them a few agricultural implements to enable them to dig an irrigating canal by which their lands may be watered and their fields irrigated, so that they may enjoy the means of existence. You must provide these Indians with the means of subsistence or they will take by robbery from those who have. During the last year I have seen a number of these Indians starved to death for want of food." Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 2d Sess. 1321 (1865).

The question of the Government's implied reservation of water rights upon the creation of an Indian Reservation was before this Court in *Winters* v. *United States*,

---

[97] The Reservations were Chemehuevi, Cocopah, Yuma, Colorado River, and Fort Mohave.

[98] Act of March 3, 1865, 13 Stat. 541, 559.

[99] See Executive Orders of November 22, 1873, November 16, 1874, and May 15, 1876. See also Executive Order of November 22, 1915. These orders may be found in 1 U.S. Dept. of Interior, Executive Orders Relating to Indian Reservations 6–7 (1912); 2 *id.*, at 5–6 (1922).

[100] Executive Orders of January 9, 1884 (Yuma), September 19, 1890 (Fort Mohave), February 2, 1911 (Fort Mohave), September 27, 1917 (Cocopah). For these orders, see 1 *id.*, at 12–13, 63–64 (1912); 2 *id.*, at 5 (1922). The Chemehuevi Reservation was established by the Secretary of Interior on February 2, 1907, pending congressional approval.

[101] See, *e.g.*, *United States* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 19, 29–30 (1947); *United States* v. *Holt State Bank*, 270 U.S. 49, 54–55 (1926).

[102] See *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.*, 236 U.S. 459, 469–475 (1915); *Winters* v. *United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908).

207 U.S. 564, decided in 1908. Much the same argument made to us was made in *Winters* to persuade the Court to hold that Congress had created an Indian Reservation without intending to reserve waters necessary to make those reservations livable. The Court rejected all of the arguments. As to whether water was intended to be reserved, the Court said, at p. 576:

"The lands were arid and, without irrigation, were practically valueless. And yet, it is contended, the means of irrigation were deliberately given up by the Indians and deliberately accepted by the Government. The lands ceded were, it is true, also arid; and some argument may be urged, and is urged, that with their cession of the waters, without which they would be valueless, and 'civilized communities could not be established thereon.' And this, it is further contended, the Indians knew, and yet made no reservation of the waters. We realize that there is a conflict of implications, but that which makes for the retention of the waters is of greater force than that which makes for their cession."

The Court in *Winters* concluded that the Government, when it created that Indian Reservation, intended to deal fairly with the Indians by reserving for them the waters without which their lands would have been useless. *Winters* has been followed by this Court as recently as 1939 in *United States* v. *Powers,* 305 U.S. 527. *We follow it now and agree that the United States did reserve the water rights for the Indians effective as of the time the Indian Reservations were created.* This means, as the Master held, that these water rights, having vested before the Act was passed in 1929, are "present perfected rights" and as such are entitled to priority under the Act.

We also agree with the Master's conclusion as to the quantity of water intended to be reserved. He found that the water was intended to satisfy the future as well as the present needs of the Indian Reservations and ruled that enough water was reserved to irrigate all the practicably irrigable acreage on the reservations. Arizona, on the other hand, contends that the quantity of water reserved should be measured by the Indians' "reasonably foreseeable needs," which, in fact, means by the number of Indians. How many Indians there will be and what their future uses will be can only be guessed. *We have concluded, as did the Master, that the only feasible and fair way by which reserved water for the reservations can be measured is irrigable acreage.* The various acreages of irrigable land which the Master found to be on the different reservations we find to be reasonable.

We disagree with the Master's decision to determine the disputed boundaries of the Colorado River Indian Reservation and the Fort Mohave Indian Reservation. We hold that it is unnecessary to resolve those disputes here. Should a dispute over title arise because of some future refusal by the Secretary to deliver water to either area, the dispute can be settled at that time.

The Master ruled that the principle underlying the reservation of water rights for Indian Reservations was equally applicable to other federal establishments such as National Recreation Areas and National Forests. We agree with the conclusions of the Master that the United States intended to reserve water sufficient for the future requirements of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Havasu Lake National Wildlife Refuge, the Imperial National Wildlife Refuge, and the Gila National Forest.

We reject the claim of the United States that it is entitled to the use, without charge against its consumption, of any waters that would have been wasted but for salvage by the Government on its wildlife preserves. Whatever the intrinsic merits of this claim, it is inconsistent with the Act's command that consumptive use shall be measured by diversions less returns to the river.

Finally, we note our agreement with the Master that all uses of mainstream water within a State are to be charged against that State's apportionment, which of course includes uses by the United States.

VI. DECREE

While we have in the main agreed with the Master, there are some places we have disagreed and some questions on which we have not ruled. Rather than adopt the Master's decree with amendments or append our own decree to this opinion, we will allow the parties, or any of them, if they wish, to submit before September 16, 1963, the form of decree to carry this opinion into effect, failing which the Court will prepare and enter an appropriate decree at the next Term of Court.

It is so ordered.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, No. 8, Original, October term, 1962]

STATE OF ARIZONA, PLAINTIFF, *v.* STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL.—COMPLAINT

(June 3, 1963)

(Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting.)

I

This case, I think, has been haunted by several irrelevancies. First, is the fact that the only points from which California can take the water of the Colorado River System are on the mainstream above Laguna Dam, there being no tributaries in that State. This fact, I think, leads the Court to the inference that the tributaries which come in below Laguna Dam contain waters to which California has no rights. The controversy does concern the waters of the lower tributaries, but only indirectly. California does not seek those waters. She merely seeks to have them taken into consideration in the formula that determines the allocation between her and Arizona.

Another irrelevancy is the fact that only 2½% of the Colorado River drainage basin is in California, although 90% of the water which California appropriates leaves the basin never to return. If we were dealing with problems of equitable apportionment, as we were in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming,* 325 U.S. 589, that factor would be relevant to our problem. And it would be relevant in case we were dealing with litigation concerning waters in excess of the amount granted California under the Project Act. But it is irrelevant here because the only justiciable question that involves the volume of water is one that concerns the source of supply out of which California's 4,400,000 acre-feet will be satisfied—a matter which I think Congress resolved differently than has the Court.

Third, is a mood about the controversy that suggests that here, as in the cases involving multipurpose Federal dams, Federal control of navigable streams controls this litigation. The right of the Federal Government to the flow of the stream is not an issue here. We deal with a very unique feature of the irrigation laws of the 17 Western States.

The question is not what Congress has authority to do, but rather the kind of regime under which Congress has built this and other irrigation systems in the West. Heretofore those regimes have been posited on the theory that state law determines the allotment of waters coming through the irrigation canals that are fed by the federal dams.

Much is written these days about judicial law-making; and every scholar knows that judges who construe statutes must of necessity legislate interstitially, to paraphrase Mr. Justice Cardozo, Selected Writings (1949 Hall ed.), p. 160. The present case is different. It will, I think, be marked as the baldest attempt by judges in modern times to spin their own philosophy into the fabric of the law, in derogation of the will of the legislature. The present decision, as Mr. Justice Harlan shows, grants the federal bureaucracy a power and command over water rights in the 17 Western States that it never has had, that it always wanted, that it could never persuade Congress to grant, and that this Court up to now has consistently refused to recognize. Our rulings heretofore have been consistent with the principles of reclamation law established by Congress both in nonnavigable streams (*Ickes* v. *Fox,* 300 U.S. 82, 94–96) and in navigable ones. *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming,* 325 U.S. 589, 612. The rights of the United States as storer of waters in western projects has been distinctly understood to be simply that of "a carrier and distributor of water." *Ickes* v. *Fox, supra,* p. 95. As we stated in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming, supra,* p. 614:

"The property right in the water right is separate and distinct from the property right in the reservoirs, ditches or canals. The water right is appurtenant to the land, the owner of which is the appropriator. The water right is acquired by perfecting an appropriation, i.e., by an actual diversion followed by an application within a reasonable time of the water to a beneficial use."

And that result was reached even though under those other projects, as under the present one, the Secretary had broad powers to make contracts governing the use and disposition of the stored water. See, *e. g.,* 43 U.S.C. §§ 389, 440.

The men who wrote the Project Act were familiar with western water law. *Wyoming* v. *Colorado,* 259 U.S. 419, had recently been decided, holding that priority of appropriation was the determining factor in reaching an equitable apportionment between two Western States. *Id.,* at 470. Yet, S. Rep. No. 654, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. 26–27, contains no suggestion that Congress, by § 5, was displacing a doctrine as important to these Western States as the doctrine of seizin has been to the development of Anglo-American property law. Instead, only 25 lines of that report are devoted to § 5, and those lines clearly support Mr. Justice Harlan's conclusion that the section was designed primarily as a financial tool.

The principle that water priorities are governed by State law is deepseated in western reclamation law. In spite of the express command of § 14 of the Project Act, which makes the system of appropriation under State law determine who has the priorities, the Secretary of Interior is given the right to determine the priorities by administrative *fiat.* Now one can receive his priority because he is the most worthy Democrat or Republican, as the case may be.

The decision today, resulting in the confusion between the problem of priority of water rights and the public power problem, has made the dream of federal bureaucracy come true by granting it, for the first time, the life-and-death power of dispensation of water rights long administered according to State law.

II

At issue of the other main phase of the case is the meaning of the California limitation contained in § 4(a) of the Project Act. The Court, however, does not use the present litigation as an occasion to determine Arizona's and California's rights under that Act, but as a vehicle for making a wholly new apportionment of the waters in the Lower Basin and turning over all unresolved problems to the Secretary of the Interior. The Court accomplishes this by distorting both the history and language of the Project Act.

The Court relies heavily on the terms and history of a proposed tri-State compact, authorized by § 4(a) *but never adopted by the States concerned, viz., Arizona, California* *and Nevada*. The proposed tri-State compact provided for a division of tributary waters identical to that made by the Court, insofar as the Gila is awarded to Arizona. The Court in reality enforces its interpretation of the proposed tri-State compact and imposes its terms upon California.

The Court, however, cannot find in the proposed tri-State compact (the one that was never approved) an allocation of the tributaries other than the Gila; and in order to justify their allocation to Arizona it is forced to turn to the terms of "proposals and counter proposals over the years," instead of to the language of the Project Act. The result is the Court's, not that of Congress, whose intent we have been called upon to discover and effectuate. The congressional intent is expressed in § 4(a), which provides that California shall be limited to the use of 4,400,000 acre-feet "of the waters apportioned to the Lower Basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact" (the compact that was approved) and to not more than half of "any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact."[1] These waters are defined in the Colorado River Compact as *system* waters, and not as waters in the mainstream. Yet the Court restricts California to *mainstream waters*. That is the essence of the difference between us.

III

As I read the Colorado River Compact and § 4(a) of the Project Act, California is entitled to add all uses of system waters by Lower Basin States in the tributaries to those waters available in the mainstream to determine (1) how much water she can take out of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned to the Lower Basin States by Article III(a), and (2) whether there are excess or surplus system waters, including Article III(b) waters, of which California has a right to no more than one-half.

I disagree with the Court's conclusion that § 4(a) of the Project Act refers only to the water flowing in the mainstream below Lee Ferry. The Project Act speaks clearly, and only, in terms of the waters apportioned to the Lower Basin States by Article III(a) of the Compact, *viz.* California may take no more than 4,400,000 acre-feet "of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River Compact." Article III(a) of the Compact apportions "from the Colorado River System in perpetuity to the Upper Basin and to the Lower Basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum." The term "Colorado River System" is defined in Article II(a) as including the entire mainstream and the tributaries.[2]

There is, moreover, not a word in Senate Report No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., reporting the Project Act, that indicates, suggests, or implies that the Colorado River is to be divided and California or any other Lower Basin State restricted to mainstream water. The Report indeed speaks of "enthroning the Colorado River Compact" (*id.*, p. 16), which embraces the entire river system in the United States, not just the mainstream. See Article II(a). Arizona's fears that California would take 5,400,000 acre-feet from the first 7,500,000 acre-feet, if the entire system were used as the source are, I think, unfounded. Out of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet of system water California would be entitled only to 4,400,000 acre-feet. Out of the balance or 3,100,000 acre-feet, California would be excluded.

How much of this 3,100,000 acre-feet should go to Arizona and how much to Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah cannot be determined on this record, the relative findings not being made in light of the construction which has been given to the Project Act, the Compact, and the Limitation Act. We cannot take as a guide the provisions in the second paragraph of § 4(a) of the Project Act, *viz.*, the 300,000 acre-feet proposed for Nevada and the 2,800,000 acre-feet proposed for Arizona, *because those provisions come into play only if Arizona, California, and Nevada enter a compact, which to date they have not done.* The division of 3,100,000 acre-feet should, I think, be made among Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah pursuant to the principles of equitable apportionment. *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589.

The evidence is clear that the dependable Lower Basin supply does not exceed 8,000,000 acre-feet if the river system is taken as a whole. By Article III(b) of the Compact the Lower Basin States can increase their beneficial use by 1,000,000 acre-feet, *if additional water is available.* By § 4(a) of the Project Act California is entitled to not more than one-half of any excess that is "unapportioned by said compact." The amount apportioned to the Lower Basin States by the Compact is 8,500,000 acre-feet, *viz.*, Article III(a) waters in the amount of 7,500,000 "in perpetuity" plus Article III(b) waters, which are highly contingent. After the Upper Basin is given its 7,500,000 acre-feet, the "unapportioned" excess described in Article III(b) would be available. As noted, the present permanent supply for the Lower Basin would not exceed 8,000,000 acre-feet from the mainstream and the tributaries. As I read the Compact and the Project Act, California would get out of the 8,000,000 acre-feet 4,400,000 acre-feet *plus* not more than one-half of Article III(b) waters which, under the foregoing assumption, would amount to one-half of 500,000 acre-feet. If there is a further surplus (either in the sense of Article III(b) or in the more remote sense in which § 4(a) of the Project Act uses that word)[3] the division between the Lower Basin States should follow the principles of equitable apportionment which we applied in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming*, 325 U.S. 589. If § 4(a) is to be read as referring to system waters, California's total rights in available Lower Basin waters would amount to not more than 4,650,000 acre-feet annually (4,400,000 plus 250,000). She would also have a right, albeit highly contingent, to any additional Article III(b) waters that become available to the Lower Basin and to such share of the waters in both Basins over 16,000,000 acre-feet (7,500,000 to Upper Basin, 7,500,000 to Lower Basin under Article III(a), plus 1,000,000 to Lower Basin under Article III(b)) as is equitable. *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming, supra.*

Under the Court's reading of § 4(a), however, a far different division is made. The Court says that the language of § 4(a) limiting California to 4,400,000 acre-feet "of the waters apportioned to the Lower Basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact" (7,500,000 acre-feet per annum) is just a "shorthand" way of saying that California is limited to 4,400,000 acre-feet of the water available in the mainstream. According to the Court, California has no rights in system waters, as this would include rights in the tributaries, and the Court has decided that the tributaries belong exclusively to Arizona. Thus, if California is to obtain any "excess or surplus" waters, the surplus must be flowing in the mainstream. That is, California can assert her right to "surplus" waters only when the flow of the mainstream is more than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. But if, as the evidence shows, the dependable Lower Basin supply of *system* waters is only 8,000,000 acre-feet per annum, 2,000,000 of which are in the tributaries, California can look only to 6,000,000 acre-feet in the mainstream. Thus, California will never be entitled to any of the additional Article III(b) waters (500,000 acre-feet) in the Lower Basin system. Those "surplus" waters would necessarily be in the tributaries, and under the Court's interpretation they belong exclusively to Arizona, § 4(a) to the contrary notwithstanding.

As a practical matter, the only place California can get system waters is from the mainstream, there being no tributaries of the Colorado River in California. The question to be decided is whether or not under § 4(a) of the Project Act California can take into consideration Arizona's uses on her tributaries in determining her (California's) right to divert water from the mainstream. The Court says California cannot, because when the Project Act refers to her rights in *system* waters as the measuring rod, it really means her rights in mainstream waters. With due respect the majority achieves that result by misreading the Colorado River Compact, the Project Act, and by misreading the legislative history leading up to the California Limitation Act. An analysis of the legislative history will show, as already noted, that the Court's analysis is built mainly upon statements made by the various Senators in arguing the terms of a proposed tri-state compact that was never made.

---

[1] The relevant provisions of the Project Act, the California Limitation Act, and the Colorado River Compact are set forth in the appendix.

[2] See the appendix for the relevant portions of Article III.

[3] It is said that the § 4(a) language referring to surplus or excess waters, one-half of which is to go to California, the other to Arizona, is meaningless if read literally. That turns on the meaning of the words "excess or surplus waters unapportioned" by the Compact. They mean, it is said, all waters unapportioned by Article III (a) and (b), because Article III(c) defines or speaks of surplus in such manner as to indicate that surplus is only that water over and above Article III (a) and (b) water. This is true, at least for the limited purpose of Article III(c). From that premise it is reasoned that § 4(a), literally construed, would allow Arizona and California to split equally all waters over 16,000,000 acre-feet, that is after 7,500,000 acre-feet went to each of the Basins, and after the Lower Basin received an additional 1,000,000 acre-feet under the provisions of Article III(b). If that is true and if California and Arizona were allowed to divide up the rest, the Upper Basin States would forever be limited to their initial 7,500,000 acre-feet, something not contemplated by Article III(f), which specifically provides for apportionment of waters in excess of 16,000,000 between the Upper and Lower Basins. Thus, it is argued that the words "excess or surplus waters" as used in § 4(a) are meaningless and in hopeless conflict with the terms of the Compact if read literally.

This interpretation is ill-founded. The first paragraph of § 4(a) contains only a limitation; it apportions no water. The tri-state compact authorized by the second paragraph of § 4(a) has never been made. But, even if it had been made it could affect only the rights of its signatories vis-a-vis each other. For § 4(a) explicitly provides "that all of the provisions of said tri-State agreement shall be subject in all particulars to the provisions of the Colorado River compact."

The words "excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact" mean, I think, Article III(b) waters plus all waters in the entire System in excess of 16,000,000 acre-feet. Not only does this interpretation allow the Project Act and the Colorado River Compact to be construed as a harmonious whole, but it is also compelled by the legislative history. See 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 459-460.

IV

The Project Act needs the Compact to achieve a settlement of the issue of the apportionment of water involved in this case. It is argued that an apportionment, constitutionally, can be achieved only in one of two ways—by an interstate compact or by a decree of equitable apportionment. That proposition need not, however, be resolved here, because (apart from a contingency not relevant here) the Project Act by the express terms of § 4(a) is dependent on the ratification of the Compact.[4] If the Compact is ratified, it and the Project Act are to supply the measure of waters which California may claim.[5]

The overall accounting of the waters is provided for in Article III of the Compact. By Article III(a) "the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum" is apportioned "in perpetuity to the Upper Basin and to the Lower Basin, respectively," meaning that each basin gets 7,500,000 acre-feet. By Article III(b) the Lower Basin is given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use by 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum. By Article III(c) any deficiency owed Mexico "shall be equally borne by the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin." The Lower Basin by definition includes California. Article II(g). Tributary uses in Arizona diminish California's right under Article III(c) to require the Upper Basin States to supply water to satisfy Mexico. California is to be charged with water from the Gila when the accounting is made with Mexico. That is, California is presumed to enjoy the waters from the Lower Basin tributaries for purposes of Article III(c) of the Compact. It is manifestly unfair to charge her with those waters under Article III(c) of the Compact and to say that she is entitled to none of them in computing the 4,400,000 acre-feet which the Limitation Act and the Project Act give her out of the waters of Article III(a) of the Compact.

Section 1 of the Project Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate the Boulder Dam "subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact." By § 4(a) the Project Act is not to be operative unless and until the seven States "shall have ratified the Colorado River *compact*"; and if they do not, then "the provisions of the first paragraph of Article XI of said *compact*" must be waived. Moreover, the 4,400,000 acre-feet allotted to California by § 4(a) are described in terms "of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River *compact*." Section 4(a) describes the "excess or surplus" waters in terms of those "unapportioned by said *compact*"; and it makes all "uses always to be subject to the terms of said *compact*." The *compact* is, indeed, the underpinning of the Project Act.

The Compact apportions the waters "from the Colorado River System" which by definition includes the mainstream and its tributaries in the United States. And California's Limitation Act, containing the precise language of the allocation of waters in § 4(a) of the Project Act, describes the 4,400,000 acre-feet in terms "of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph 'a' of article three of the said Colorado River compact."[6]

So it seems that the Compact is the mainspring from which all rights flow. The 7,500,000 acre-feet of water apportioned by Article III(a) of the Compact "from the Colorado River System" to the Lower Basin is the supply out of which California's 4,400,000 acre-feet is to be taken.

To repeat, the words "excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact," as used in § 4(a) of the Project Act, mean, in my view, all waters available in the Lower Basin in excess of the first 7,500,000 acre-feet covered by Article III(a) of the Compact.[7]

The additional 1,000,000 acre-feet described in Article III(b) was added to the Compact "to compensate for the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries being included within the definition of the Colorado River System." *Arizona* v. *California*, 292 U.S. 341, 350–351; and though Arizona has long claimed those 1,000,000 acre-feet as hers, that construction of Article III(b) of the Compact was rejected long ago. *Arizona* v. *California*, *supra*, p. 358.

V

While the legislative history of the California limitation contained in § 4(a) looks several ways, much of it is legislative history made with a view to its favorable use in the future—a situation we have noticed on other occasions. See *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384. I think an objective reading of that history shows that the tri-State compact authorized by § 4(a) of the Project Act (a compact never made) was the one and only way visualized by that Act through which Arizona could get the exclusive use of the waters of the Gila River. For the second paragraph of § 4(a) of the Project Act states that the tri-State compact, if made, shall give Arizona "the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of the Gila River and its tributaries" within the boundaries of Arizona. Fears that this appropriation would injure New Mexico are not relevant to our problem, since the proposed tri-State compact would not hurt New Mexico unless she agreed to it. The legal rights of States not parties to the Compact would be unimpaired, as *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423, 462, holds. The same applies to any concern that Upper Basin rights would be imperiled by the tri-State compact.

After much discussion, the amendment allocating 4,400,000 acre-feet to California by § 4(a) of the Project Act was finalized by Senator Phipps, Chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, who identified those 4,400,000 acre-feet as system waters. He made it unmistakably clear by adding to § 4(a) the words "by paragraph (a) of Article III" of the Compact which in his words "show that that allocation of waters refers directly to the 7½ million acre-feet of water" described by Article III(a) of the Compact. 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 459. That amendment was agreed to without a roll call. 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 473. Prior to that time Senator Phipps had proposed that California receive 4,600,000 acre-feet. *Id.*, p. 335.

The following colloquy took place:

"Mr. HAYDEN. Under the circumstances I should like to inquire of the Senator from Colorado how he arrives at the figure 4,600,000 acre-feet of water instead of 4,200,000 acre-feet as proposed in my amendment?

"Mr. PHIPPS. It was just about as difficult for me to arrive at 4,600,000 acre-feet as it would have been to arrive at 4,200,000 acre-feet. The arguments pro and con have been debated in the committee for quite a period of time. The contentions made by the Senators from Arizona have not been conclusive to my mind. For instance, I will refer to the fact that *Arizona desires to eliminate entirely all waters arising in the watershed and flowing out of the Gila River*.

"Mr. HAYDEN. There is nothing of that kind in the Senator's amendment.

"Mr. PHIPPS. There is nothing of that kind in the Senator's amendment, but that has been one of the arguments advanced by California as being an offset to the amount to which Arizona would try to limit California.

"Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator thought there was force in that argument, I should think that he would have included in his amendment a provision eliminating the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries, as my amendment does.

"Mr. PHIPPS. I do not consider it necessary because the bill itself, not only the present substitute measure but every other bill on the subject, *ties this question up with the Colorado River compact*.

"Mr. HAYDEN. My amendment does that.

"Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; that is true, but under estimates of engineers—one I happen to recall being made, I think, by Mr. La Rue—notwithstanding all of the purposes to which water of the Gila may be put by the State of Arizona, at least 1,000,000 acre-feet will return to the main stream. Yet Arizona contends that that water is not available to California; whereas today and for years past at least some of the waters from the Gila River have come into the canal which is now supplying the Imperial Valley.

"It is not a definite fixed fact that with the enactment of this proposed legislation the all-American canal is going to be built within the period of seven years; as a matter of fact, it may not be built at all; we do not know as to that. But I do not think that the water from the Gila River, one of the main tributaries of the Colorado, should be eliminated from consideration. I think that California is entitled to have that counted in as being a part of the basic supply of water."

It is plain from this colloquy that Senator Phipps thought that his amendment, limiting the amount California can claim, "ties this question up with the Colorado River Compact" and that the Gila River (below Lake Mead) should be "counted in as being a part of the basic supply of water" which California is entitled to have included in the computations for the Lower Basin States.

The word of Senator Phipps, who was chairman of the committee and who offered the amendment, is to be taken as against those in opposition or those who might be making legislative history to serve their ends. *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Corp.*, *supra*, pp. 394-395: "The fears and doubts of the opposition are no authoritative guide to the construction of legislation. It is the sponsors that we look to when the meaning of the statutory words is in doubt."

---

[4] Under § 4(a) of the Project Act it is provided that if all seven States fail to ratify the Compact in six months (which in fact they did fail to do), the Project Act shall not take effect until six of the States, including California, ratify the Compact and waive the provisions of Article XI of the Compact (which required approval of all seven States) and the President has so declared by public proclamation. A further condition was the passage of California's Limitation Act. The Presidential Proclamation is dated June 25, 1929. 46 Stat. 3,000; and California's Limitation Act was approved March 4, 1929, and became effective August 14, 1929.

[5] The Colorado River Compact is referred to many times in the Project Act—§ 1, § 4(a), § 6, § 8, § 12, § 13, § 18, and § 19.

By § 18 the rights of the States to waters within their borders are not interfered with "except as modified by the Colorado River Compact or other interstate agreement."

By § 8(a) "all users and appropriators" of water are "subject to and controlled by said Colorado River Compact * * * anything in this Act to the contrary not withstanding."

[6] It was indicated in *Arizona* v. *California*, 292 U.S. 341, 357, that the Limitation Act incorporates the Compact:

"It may be true that the Boulder Canyon Project Act leaves in doubt the apportionment among the States of the lower basin of the waters to which the lower basin is entitled under Article III(b). But the Act does not purport to apportion among the States of the lower basin the waters to which the lower basin is entitled under the Compact. The Act merely places limits on California's use of waters under Article III(a) and of surplus waters; and it is 'such' uses which are 'subject to the terms of said compact.'"

[7] See note 3, *supra*.

If California were restricted by the Project Act to the use of 4,400,000 acre-feet out of the mainstream, it is difficult to believe that Senator Ashhurst of Arizona would have expressed his bitter minority views in the Report on the Project Act. S. Rep. No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 2. He said that the bill "sedulously and intentionally proposes to sever Arizona's jugular vein" (*id.*, p. 3), that "the amount of water apportioned to California * * * is not warranted in equity, law, justice, or morals" (*id.*, p. 4), that the bill is "a reckless and relentless assault upon Arizona." *Id.*, p. 38. He apparently never imagined that the proposed legislation would confine California to mainstream water. He indeed charged that the bill "authorizes California, which comprises only 2½ percent of the Colorado River Basin and contributes no water, to appropriate * * * over 38 percent of the estimated constant water supply available in the main Colorado River for all seven States in the basin and for Mexico." *Id.*, p. 5.

Like Senator Ashhurst and like the Chairman of the Senate Committee, Senator Phipps, I too read the Project Act to speak in terms of the entire Colorado River system in the United States.

APPENDIX

Section 4(a) of the Project Act provides in relevant part:

"This Act shall not take effect and no authority shall be exercised hereunder and no work shall be begun and no moneys expended on or in connection with the works or structures provided for in this Act, and no water rights shall be claimed or initiated hereunder, and no steps shall be taken by the United States or by others to initiate or perfect any claims to the use of water pertinent to such works or structures unless and until (1) the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming shall have ratified the Colorado River compact, mentioned in section 13 hereof, and the President by public proclamation shall have so declared, or (2) if said States fail to ratify the said compact within six months from the date of the passage of this Act, then, until six of said States, including the State of California, shall ratify said compact and shall consent to waive the provisions of the first paragraph of Article XI of said compact, which makes the same binding and obligatory only when approved by each of the seven States signatory thereto, and shall have approved said compact without conditions, save that of such six-State approval, and the President by public proclamation shall have so declared, and, further, until the State of California, by act of its legislature, shall agree irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of this Act, that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California, including all uses under contracts made under the provisions of this Act and all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist, shall not exceed four million four hundred thousand acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact.

"The States of Arizona, California, and Nevada are authorized to enter into an agreement which shall provide (1) that of the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually apportioned to the lower basin by paragraph (a) of Article III of the Colorado River compact, there shall be apportioned to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet and to the State of Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet for exclusive beneficial consumptive use in perpetuity, and (2) that the State of Arizona may annually use one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, and (3) that the State of Arizona shall have the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of the Gila River and its tributaries within the boundaries of said State, and (4) that the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries, except return flow after the same enters the Colorado River, shall never be subject to any diminution whatever by any allowance of water which may be made by treaty or otherwise to the United States of Mexico but if, as provided in paragraph (c) of Article III of the Colorado River compact, it shall become necessary to supply water to the United States of Mexico from waters over and above the quantities which are surplus as defined by said compact, then the State of California shall and will mutually agree with the State of Arizona to supply, out of the main stream of the Colorado River, one-half of any deficiency which must be supplied to Mexico by the lower basin, and * * * (6) that all of the provisions of said tri-State agreement shall be subject in all particulars to the provisions of the Colorado River compact."

By § 1 of the California Limitation Act it was provided that when the seven States approved the Compact and its approval is proclaimed by the President that:

"The State of California as of the date of such proclamation agrees irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the states of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of the said 'Boulder canyon project act' that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California including all uses under contracts made under the provisions of said 'Boulder canyon project act,' and all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist, shall not exceed four million four hundred thousand acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph 'a' of article three of the said Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact."

Article III of the Compact provides in relevant part:

"(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River System in perpetuity to the Upper Basin and to the Lower Basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

"(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the Lower Basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by one million acre-feet per annum.

"(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River System, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then, the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin, and whenever necessary the States of the Upper Division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

"(d) The States of the Upper Division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any period of ten consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, No. 8, Original—October term, 1962]

STATE OF ARIZONA, PLAINTIFF, *v.* STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL.—COMPLAINT

(June 3, 1963)

(Mr. Justice Harlan, whom Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Stewart join, dissenting in part.)

I dissent from so much of the Court's opinion as holds that the Secretary of the Interior has been given authority by Congress to apportion, among and within the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada, the waters of the mainstream of the Colorado River below Lee Ferry. I also dissent from the holding that in times of shortage the Secretary has discretion to select or devise any "reasonable method" he wishes for determining which users within these States are to bear the burden of that shortage. (In all other respects Mr. Justice Stewart and I—but not Mr. Justice Douglas—agree with and join in the Court's opinion, though not without some misgivings regarding the amounts of water allocated to the Indian Reservations.)

In my view, it is the equitable principles established by the Court in interstate water-rights cases, as modified by the Colorado River Compact and the California limitation, that were intended by Congress to govern the apportionment of mainstream waters among the Lower Basin States, whether in surplus or in shortage. *A fortiori*, state law was intended to control apportionment among users within a single State.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Court's conclusions respecting the Secretary's apportionment powers, particularly those in times of shortage, result in a single appointed Federal official being vested with absolute control, unrestrained by adequate standards, over the fate of a substantial segment of the life and economy of three States. Such restraint upon his actions as may follow from judicial review are, as will be shown, at best illusory. Today's result, I venture to say, would have dumbfounded those responsible for the legislation the Court construes, for nothing could have been farther from their minds or more inconsistent with their deeply felt convictions.

The Court professes to find this extraordinary delegation of power principally in § 5 of the Project Act, the provision authorizing the Secretary to enter into contracts for the storage and delivery of water. But § 5, as is more fully shown below, pp. 13–19, infra, had no design resembling that which the Court now extracts from it. Rather, it was intended principally as a revenue measure, and the clause requiring a contract as a condition of delivery was inserted at the insistence not of the Lower but of the Upper Basin States in an effort to insure that nothing would disturb that basin's rights under the Colorado River Compact. There was no thought that § 5 would give authority to apportion water among the Lower Basin States. Indeed, during the hearings on the third Swing-Johnson bill when § 5 took its present form, one of its principal proponents, Delph Carpenter of Colorado, specifically stated that the proposed condition of a contract was intended to require "that the persons who receive the water shall respect and do so under the compact. It has nothing to do with the interstate relations between Arizona and California."[1]

And Representative Swing, coauthor of the bill, made virtually the same point in explaining the provision before the House Rules Committee:

"The act says (in § 5) 'The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such general regulations as he may prescribe, to contract for the storage of water.' Whose water? It does not say. It might be a community like Imperial Valley that has already acquired a water right * * * or it may be someone who hereafter will acquire a water right, but that right will not be acquired under this bill; not from the United States Government. He will acquire his water right, if he acquires one, from the State and under the laws of the State, in which he puts the water to a beneficial use. There is nothing in this bill which puts the Government in conflict with the water laws of Arizona or Utah or any other State. As a matter of fact, the reclamation law is adopted by section 13 of this bill (now § 14), and section 8 of the reclamation act says that what the Government does must not be in conflict with the water laws of the States, so there can be no violence done State laws on this score."[2]

The Court concedes, as indeed it must in the face of such unequivocal evidence, that this third Swing-Johnson bill, like its predecessors, established "no method whatever of apportioning the water among the States of the Lower Basin." *Ante*, p. 10. This concession, one would think, would end this aspect of the controversy, since § 5 as ultimately adopted is virtually the same as that proposed in the third bill.[3] Yet a method of Federal apportionment is discovered in the fourth Swing-Johnson bill as finally enacted, a method which ends by delegating to the Secretary of the Interior the awesome power over the "water" destiny of three States. To what provision does the Court attribute this startling metamorphosis? The fundamental change in approach is apparently found in § 4(a), which as adopted contains provisions (1) conditioning the effectiveness of the Act on seven-State ratification of the Colorado River Compact or alternatively on California's agreement to limit its annual consumption of Colorado River water, together with six-State ratification of the Compact; and (2) giving permission to California, Arizona, and Nevada to enter a further compact apportioning certain waters to the latter two States pursuant to a stated formula.

It is manifest that § 4(a), on which the Court so heavily relies, neither apportions the waters of the river nor vests power in any official to make such an apportionment. The first paragraph does not *grant* any water to anyone; it merely conditions the Act's effectiveness on seven-State ratification of the Compact or on six-State ratification, plus California's agreement to a limitation, *i.e.*, a *ceiling*, on her appropriations. The source of authority to make such appropriations must be found elsewhere. And the second paragraph of § 4(a), suggesting a particular interstate agreement, similarly makes no apportionment of water among the States and delegates no power to any official to make such an apportionment. Indeed, it was accepted by the Senator from California (Mr. Johnson) only after the following colloquy with its proponent, Senator Pittman of Nevada:

"Mr. Johnson. What I want to make clear is that this amendment shall not be construed hereafter by any of the parties to it or any of the States as being the expression of the will or the demand or the request of the Congress of the United States.

"Mr. Pittman. Exactly, not.

"Mr. Johnson. Very well, then.

"Mr. Pittman. It is not the request of Congress.

"Mr. Johnson. I accept the amendment, then." 70 Congressional Record 472.

Senator Johnson would surely have been surprised to learn that the formula which was not even "the request of Congress" was in truth one which the Secretary was authorized to force down the throats of the States if they did not voluntarily agree to it.

Even this brief summary, I think, casts the gravest doubts upon the Court's construction of the Project Act as abolishing state law and accepted principles of equitable apportionment in effecting allocations of water among the States. A more detailed analysis will, I believe, demonstrate the incorrectness of the Court's conclusions on this score and will reveal the constitutional difficulties inherent in the uncontrolled delegation of power resulting from those conclusions.

II. THE BACKGROUND OF THE BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT

Judicial apportionment of interstate waters was established long before the Project Act as an effective means of resolving interstate water disputes. *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 206 U.S. 46. Its acceptability had never been questioned. Priority of appropriation, the basic determinant of judicial apportionment as enunciated in *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, 259 U.S. 419, was the law in six of the Colorado Basin States,[4] and senior appropriations were respected in the seventh.[5] The law of appropriation, which rests on the basic principle that a water right depends on beneficial use and which gives priority of right to the appropriator first in time, had been repeatedly declared to be indispensable to the development of the arid lands of the West.[6]

This backdrop of firm dedication to the principles of appropriation and of judicial apportionment is critical to an understanding of congressional purpose with respect to the Project Act. It is also critical to recognize that congressional compromise with these deeply respected principles was only partial; the problems facing Congress as a result of *Wyoming* v. *Colorado* were narrow. No Senator or Representative ever suggested that judicial apportionment was generally inappropriate; no Senator or Representative ever inveighed against the law of appropriation as such. The first problem was simply this: Interstate application of the doctrine of priority, unlimited by equitable considerations, threatened to deprive the four Upper Basin States of their fair share of the Colorado River because they were not so quick as California in development. The purpose of the Compact was simply to limit traditional doctrines to the extent necessary to avoid this extreme and harsh result, and to eliminate long and costly litigation.

It was perfectly plain that the Colorado River Compact merely guaranteed to the upper States a specified quantity of water immune from priorities below, subject to stated delivery requirements; it did nothing whatever to interfere with the law of priorities or the principles of equitable apportionment among the States of the Lower Basin.[7] It was precisely because it did not that Arizona refused to approve either the Project Act or the Compact until something was done to safeguard her share of Lower Basin water.[8] Similarly, the upper States feared that in the absence of ratification by Arizona, California would be free to appropriate all the Lower Basin's share under the Compact, and Arizona, not limited by that document, would be free to appropriate, as against the upper States, water the Compact sought to apportion to the Upper Basin.[9]

The remaining problem, therefore, was that California's acquisition of priorities as against Arizona and the upper States had to be further limited. A ceiling had to be put on her interstate appropriative priorities. Solution of this narrow problem likewise did not require complete abrogation of the principles of priority and interstate judicial apportionment.

Still another, and profoundly significant, factor in understanding the effect of the Project Act on the law of appropriation and judicial apportionment is the pervasive hostility that many westerners had to any form of Federal control of water rights. Colorado's Delph Carpenter, who was as much responsible as any man for both the Compact and the contract requirement of § 5 of the Project Act, testified in 1925 to what he termed an insidious and calculated policy of the National Government, fostered particularly by the Departments of Interior and Justice, to encroach upon State prerogatives and supersede State authority with respect to the distribution of water. He made it clear, as did Wyoming's Senator Kendrick, that he deemed this policy oppressive, destructive, and deplorable.[10] Utah's Senator King made the same objection on the floor of Congress. 69 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10262. When it was suggested that Congress might legislate to meet the problem of California's threatened preemption of the river, a storm of doubt arose as to its constitutional power to do so. Upper Basin and Arizona spokesmen—those who were to be benefited by limiting appropriations—repeatedly insisted that the only constitutional ways of apportioning the river were by suit in this Court or by interstate compact.[11] And Senator Bratton of New Mexico, hardly an opponent of the Project Act, objected that by merely suggesting in § 4(a) the terms of a compact which the States were free to modify or to reject, Congress was infringing upon State sovereignty. 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 470–471.

---

[1] Hearings before House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H.R. 6251 and H.R. 9826, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. 163.

[2] Hearings before House Committee on Rules on H.R. 9826, 69th Cong., 2d Sess. 116. The bill then under consideration, as recommended by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, appears in H. Rept. No. 1657, 69th Cong., 2d Sess. 29–34.

[3] The only change that need be noted for present purposes is the addition of a clause requiring contracts to conform to § 4 (a), discussed below, as well as to the Compact.

[4] Arizona: *Clough* v. *Wing*, 2 Ariz. 371, 17 P. 453; Colorado: *Coffin* v. *Left Hand Ditch Co.*, 6 Colo. 443; Nevada; *Jones* v. *Adams*, 19 Nev. 78, 6 P. 442; New Mexico: *Albuquerque Land & Irr. Co* v. *Gutierrez*, 10 N. Mex. 177, 61 P. 357; Utah: *Stowell* v. *Johnson*, 7 Utah 215, 26 P. 290; Wyoming: *Moyer* v. *Preston*, 6 Wyo. 308, 44 P. 845.

[5] California: *Osgood* v. *El Dorado Water and Deep Gravel Mining Co.*, 56 Cal. 571.

[6] *E.g.*, *Coffin* v. *Left Hand Ditch Co.*, 6 Colo. 443, 446–447, 449–450; *Stowell* v. *Johnson*, *supra*, 7 Utah 215, 225, 26 P. 290, 291; *Willey* v. *Decker*, 11 Wyo 496, 515–524, 73 P. 210, 215–218. "Irrigation," said the Nevada court, "* * * would be strangled by the enforcement of the riparian principle." *Twaddle* v. *Winters*, 29 Nev. 88, 106, 85 P. 280, 284.

[7] Ward Bannister, Denver attorney and spokesman for the Upper Basin States, said that "[t]he purpose of the Compact is to provide the three lower States with a fund of water from which they may appropriate and the four upper States with a fund of water from which they may appropriate." Hearings before House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H.R. 2903, 68th Cong., 1st Sess. 232.

[8] See the remarks of Senator Hayden, 70 Cong. Rec. 388.

[9] See, *e.g.*, H.R. Rep. No. 1657, 69th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, 3–4; Hearings, *supra*, note 2, at 34–37.

[10] Hearings before Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation pursuant to S. Res. No. 320, 68th Cong., 2d Sess. 663–675. "It was the oppression of the National Government strangling development, preventing development in the States. . . . These two experiences and others taught Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico the extent to which a department of the United States would go in overriding State authority and oppressing whole communities. . . . Thus it came to the attention of the States, that the United States Government intended to supersede all State law and override State authority on that river. . . . [A]ny desire by a governmental bureau to ultimately, by insiduous [*sic*] or other methods, take over the control and dominion of the streams within the States and to override State authority at once becomes not only

Congress' entire approach to the problems of prior appropriation was governed by this deep-seated hostility to Federal dictation of water rights. When plans for development of the Lower Basin threatened the rights of the upper States, they did not seek the simple solution of a legislative apportionment. They employed instead the cumbersome method of interstate compact, which required authorization by Congress and by seven State legislatures prior to negotiation and ratification by the same eight bodies thereafter. When it began to appear that Arizona would not ratify the Compact, Congress still did not legislate a general apportionment. It built the statute around the provisions of the Compact, insisting on ratification by as many States as possible, even at the cost of further delaying the already overdue Project Act. It simply conditioned the use of government property and of water stored behind the dam on compliance with the Compact. Attempts to divide the Lower Basin water by interstate agreement continued through the Denver Conference called by the Upper Basin Governors in the summer of 1927—nearly five years after negotiation of the Compact. Yet it was not until 1927 that an amendment was first offered to protect Arizona by a statutory limitation on California's consumption, and it was not until 1928 that the proposal was adopted into the bill.[12]

Finally, when Congress ultimately resigned itself to the necessity of legislating in some way with respect to the division of Lower Basin waters, it used narrow words suitable to its narrow purpose and to its regard both for the system of judicial apportionment and appropriation and for the rights of the States. Even then Congress did not attempt to legislate an apportionment of Lower Basin water; it simply prescribed a ceiling for California. In the words of Senator Johnson, "We write, then, that California shall use perpetually only a specific amount of water, naming the maximum amount which may be used." 69 Cong. Rec. 7250. Even this, Congress was unwilling to do directly. As reported from committee, the bill contained a provision directing the Secretary of the Interior to limit California's consumption in the exercise of his power of contract.[13] But this was replaced by the present provision, which reached the same result not via the Secretary's contract authority but by the awkward device of requiring California's legislature to consent to the limitation as a condition precedent to the effectiveness of the Project Act. And this was not all; to end the tale Congress added to § 4(a) specific authorization to Arizona, California, and Nevada to enter into an agreement to complete the division of the Lower Basin water—the same cumbersome substitute for direct congressional apportionment that had been abortively mooted for six years.

This history bears recapitulation. *First,* the law of appropriation, basic to western water law, was greatly respected, and the solution of interstate water disputes by judicial apportionment in this Court was well established and accepted. *Second,* the problems created by these doctrines as applied in *Wyoming* v. *Colorado* were narrow ones, not requiring for their solution complete abrogation of well-tried principles; existing law was quite adequate to deal with all questions save those Congress expressly solved by imposing a ceiling on California. *Third,* Congress throughout the dispute exhibited great reluctance to interfere with the division of water by legislation, because of a deep and fundamental mistrust of Federal intervention and a profound regard for State sovereignty, shared by many influential members. *Finally,* when Congress was forced to legislate with respect to this problem or face defeat of the entire Project Act, it chose narrow terms appropriate to the narrow problem before it, and even then acted only indirectly to require California's consent to limiting her consumption.

It is inconceivable that such a Congress intended that the sweeping Federal power which it declined to exercise—a power even the most avid partisans of national authority might hesitate to grant to a single administrator—be exercised at the unbridled discretion of an administrative officer, especially in the light of complaints registered about "bureaucratic" and "oppressive" interference of the Department which that very officer headed.[14] It is utterly incredible that a Congress unwilling because of concern for States' rights even to limit California's maximum consumption to 4,400,000 acre-feet without the consent of her legislature intended to give the Secretary of the Interior authority without California's consent to reduce her share even below that quantity in a shortage.

III. THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE PROJECT ACT

The Court holds that § 5 of the Project Act, which empowers the Secretary to contract for water delivery and forbids delivery of stored water without a contract, displaces the law of apportionment among the Lower Basin States, giving the Secretary power to divide the water by contract and to distribute the burden of shortages, without respecting appropriations.

But it does not follow that because no user is entitled to stored water without a contract the Secretary may award or withhold contracts independently of priorities. In fact, § 5 reflects no such intention. The Secretary's power to contract upon appropriate financial charges for water delivery, not included in the early bills, was added during the 1926 hearings in response to a request from Secretary of the Interior Work that users of water, as well as of power, be made to bear the cost of the project.[15] At the same time § 4(b) for the first time provided that no work under the Act should begin until these revenues were assured by the Secretary's contracts. There was yet no provision prohibiting deliveries without contracts.[16]

Thus originally purely a financial tool, the contract power was later made to serve the additional purpose of enforcing the Compact's provisions against Arizona in the absence of her ratification. At the urging of the upper States § 8 had been amended to subject the United States in operating the dam to the Compact, to condition the enjoyment of the dam's benefits on compliance with the Compact, and to require that contracts from the United States should so provide.[17] The upper States then insisted on inserting the requirement in § 5 that no one was to receive stored water without a contract, expressly and solely for the purpose of tying the Compact's enforcement to the

---

abhorrent but gives rise to a feeling of bitter resentment and sounds a call to arms for self-defense." *Id.*, at 663, 665, 671, 673. See also his remarks at Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 146–157.

[11] Senator King: "If the Senator means by his statement that the Federal Government may go into a stream, whether it be the Colorado River, the Sacramento River, or a river in the State of Montana, and put its powerful hands down upon the stream and say, 'This is mine; I can build a dam there and allocate water to whom I please, regardless of other rights, either suspended, inchoate, or perfected,' I deny the position which the Senator takes." 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 169. The Senator in question was CARL HAYDEN; he denied that his statement, which concerned his authorization for a compact among the three lower States, meant any such thing.

Senator Phipps: "I am firmly convinced that there must be voluntary ratification on the part of each interested State in order to make the Compact effective. This is the only method of settling possible controversies permanently and of putting the water of the stream to its highest beneficial use. It is the only satisfactory method; it is the only legal method to avoid proceedings in the courts which would prove costly and almost interminable." 68 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4514.

Senator Hayden: "There are only two ways in which this controversy can be settled. Either the States can agree upon an equitable apportionment of waters of the Colorado River or, in the absence of a compact, the Supreme Court of the United States can determine what the rights of the various States are in on [*sic*] that stream. Arizona denies that it is within the power of Congress to apportion the waters of an interstate stream among the States." Hearings, *supra*, note 2, at 75, 76.

Representative Colton: "I have been informed that an attorney for the Reclamation Service of the United States claims that Congress has the power to allocate and apportion all of the Colorado River among the States regardless of their wishes in the matter. Such a theory is abhorrent to our whole plan of government and particularly to the theory on which our whole system of water rights has been built up." Hearings before House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H.R. 5773, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 414.

Representative Leatherwood: "[T]here are only two agencies that can allocate the waters of this great river, the States themselves by treaty ratified by the Congress of the United States, or by the judicial branch of the Government; for the Congress has no power to allocate any of the waters of this river or any other river where the doctrine of prior appropriation is in force." Hearings, *supra*, note 2, at 31.

Ward Bannister: "[T]here is nothing in the Federal Constitution upon which to base the power of the Federal Government to divide this water among the States. . . . [T]he same thing that would invalidate a provision inserted by Congress direct would invalidate any rule promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior under Congressional permission, and the upper States would find themselves utterly helpless." Hearings, *supra*, n. 7, at 195.

[12] 63 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4763; S. Rept. No. 592, 70th Cong. 1st sess. 2.

[13] S. Rept. No. 592, 70th Cong., 1st Sess. 2.

[14] See note 10, *supra*, and accompanying text.

[15] Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 6, 46.

[16] H.R. 9826, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., § 5.

[17] S. 1868, 69th Cong., 1st Sess.; H.R. 6251, 69th Cong., 1st Sess.; H.R. 9826, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. This amendment, wrote Secretary Work in recommending the bill, "provides for the distribution and use of all water for irrigation, power and otherwise, in accordance with the Colorado River Compact." Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 8.

contract power.[18] There was no intent to confer absolute power to grant or withhold. Indeed, to give effect to priorities in time of shortage, up to the maximum quantities permitted California by § 4(a), tends to promote the stability of water uses, a policy Congress sought to further in § 5 itself by requiring that contracts be for permanent service. In short, disregard of appropriations in one State in favor of those in another, except as required by the inter-basin apportionment of the Compact or by the California limitation, was no part of the purpose of this section; it was designed to insure revenue and to enforce the Compact and the California limitation.[19]

When the provision for water delivery contracts was first inserted in the Swing bill in 1926, it prescribed that "Contracts respecting water for domestic uses may be for permanent service but subject to rights of prior appropriators." [20] Proponents of the bill altered this provision to apply to irrigation contracts as well as to require, rather than simply to permit, that contracts be for permanent service.[21] At the request of the upper States, the phrase "subject to rights of prior appropriators" was deleted.[22] The Court concludes from this bit of history that Congress considered but rejected the suggestion that the law of appropriation govern the distribution of water stored in Lake Mead. But deletion or rejection of a proposed amendment is not strong evidence of legislative intention; the reasons for deletion may be any of a great number, not the least frequent of which is that the suggestion is redundant. Here it seems clear that there was a further reason for the change. The phrase was dropped at the same time the provision *requiring* each user to have a contract was added. Under the bill as it stood prior to this no contract was required, and new contracts were made junior to all prior appropriators, even those initiating or perfecting rights only after the statute became effective. As amended the bill required a contract of every user of stored waters, and the deleted clause was no longer in accord with the contractual plan. It is surely stretching things to suggest that deletion of this no longer accurate language signifies that the Secretary may award contracts on his own authority, without regard for priorities that would obtain under State law.

In support of its construction of § 5 the Court relies in large part upon an exchange between Senator Johnson and Senator Walsh of Montana. 70 Cong. Rec. 168. The only thing this colloquy seems to make clear is that Senator Johnson had not comprehensively analyzed the relationship between § 5 and the law of appropriation. First he thought the Secretary would be required to deliver water to those who had appropriated it; then he said this would be required "[i]f they contract"; then he agreed the Secretary might withhold water "as he sees fit"; then he "doubt[ed] very much" whether the Secretary could disregard Los Angeles appropriations; finally he said "possibly" the Secretary might utterly ignore appropriations. This shifting dialogue can scarcely be deemed an authoritative, or even useful, aid to construction of the statute.

Nor is there warrant for the Court's reliance on the statements of such opponents of the bill as Utah's Representative Douglas and Arizona's Representative Colton. Objections of opponents of a bill are seldom significant guides to its construction. See *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384, 394–395. And in any event in this instance the opponents themselves were far from consistent in their views.[23]

Of far greater significance are the statements of the bill's supporters, which confirm that no power to ignore appropriations was given to the Secretary.[24] Representative Swing, author of the bill, responded to Mr. Hayden's assertion that such a power was given with an emphatic denial: "the distribution will either be by agreement between the States or under their respective laws." House Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 32. The following year he explained that the United States would not dispose of water rights under the bill; it would merely store water belonging to persons acquiring their rights under State law. See p. 3, *supra*. In 1928, defending the House bill against an Arizona witness' charge that California might appropriate the entire Lower Basin supply, Mr. Swing did not dispute the statement as to California's rights but reinforced it by declaring that Arizona was free to make appropriations too. House Hearings, *supra*, note 11, at 57–58. He later assured the House that notwithstanding the bill Arizona "still has the benefit of the law of prior appropriation, and she still has the right to the beneficial use of any of the water she is able to put to use." 69 Cong. Rec. 9781. Delph Carpenter, proponent of the § 5 contract requirement, said that it was designed to burden storage water with the Compact, and thus to protect the Upper Basin, and that "[i]t has nothing to do with the interstate relations between Arizona and California." [25] Senator Johnson, sponsor of the Senate bill, told the Senate the bill was made a part of the reclamation law, which "specifically protects each State in its water rights and in the rights of the citizens of those States to water." 68 Cong. Rec. 4292. Senator Pittman insisted there was nothing in the bill (prior to the California limitation) to prevent either Arizona or California from appropriating all the water she could use.[26] Senator Phipps, whose amendment became the California limitation, declared that any dispute over the relative rights of Arizona and of Los Angeles would be resolved by the Secretary in accordance with priority of appropriation and the normal preference for domestic over agricultural use.[27]

Of further weight in supporting the view that Congress did not construe § 5 to destroy the law of appropriation and apportionment is the fact that the entire controversy over the California limitation took place after § 5 was added to the bill. Utah was so certain that Arizona remained free to appropriate water despite § 5 that she repealed her ratification of the six-State Compact thereafter.[28] While the original committee amendment to the Act would have required the Secretary to limit California's appropriations, the debates evidence no conviction that the Secretary had even a permissive authority to do so by virtue of the unamended § 5.

IV. THE BEARING OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE PROJECT ACT

Nothing in the Project Act expresaly gives the Secretary power to ignore appropriations so long as financial conditions are met and the compact and limitations are observed. Senator HAYDEN and Pittman, as the Court notes, did indicate that § 4(a) provided for an apportionment of the water, although even they did not suggest that § 4(a) gave any authority to the Secretary to make an apportionment by his contracts or to allocate the burdens in time of shortage. But in any event, as already noted, pp. 4–5, supra, § 4 does not by its terms make an apportionment; rather it simply requires six-State ratification of the compact and an agreement by California to limit her share as conditions on the effectiveness of the Act, and authorizes an apportionment by the States themselves. In the words of Senator JOHNSON, the provision "* * * does not divide the water between Arizona and California. It fixes a maximum amount beyond which California cannot go." 70 Cong. Rec. 385.

---

[18] See notes 1, 2, *supra*, and accompanying text. Contracts were later made subject also to the California limitation in § 4(a).

[19] It is significant to contrast the language giving the Secretary authority to enter water delivery contracts with that in § 5(c), relating to the distribution of electrical power. The latter provision explicitly gives the Secretary authority to resolve conflicts in applications, referring him for the governing standards to "the policy expressed in the Federal Water Power Act as to conflicting applications for permits and licenses."

[20] Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 12.

[21] *Id.*, at 115.

[22] *Id.*, at 97, 115.

[23] Thus, almost in the same breath with which Representative Colton made his then seemingly dire prediction of national control, he declared that "Arizona is not a party at all to this compact. She and her citizens may appropriate water at any time." 69 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9648. Arizona, as has already been pointed out, was busily opposing the bill on the specific ground that it left California free to appropriate from the river.

[24] The one apparent exception to the unanimity of view among the bill's supporters is the statement in Representative Smith's report of the third Swing bill to the House: "All rights respecting water or power under the project are, under the terms of the bill, to be disposed of by contract by the Government. It is not reasonable to assume that the Government will do anything of an unfair or prejudicial nature to Arizona." H.R. Rep. No. 1657, 69th Cong., 2d Sess. 11.

[25] See note 1, *supra*, and accompanying text. Mr. Carpenter's remarks also included the following: " 'Except by contract made as herein stated' means this: If the flow of the Colorado River is controlled and regulated by the construction of the Black Canyon Dam, and any person in the State of Arizona attempt to take any water out of the stream which has been discharged from the reservoir and is being carried in the stream bed, as a natural conduit, for delivery to lower users, this law would be brought into effect and he would be prevented from using any of that water independent of the Colorado River Compact but unincumbered by any other condition for the benefit of California and Nevada. In other words, the compact does not disturb the rights between Arizona, California, and Nevada, *inter sese*, as to their portion of the water." Hearings, *supra*, note 1, at 163.

[26] "If a dam shall be built at Boulder Canyon it will impound certain waters and equate the flow below. The water below will be subject to appropriation and use by both California and Arizona . . . . In other words, there is nothing in this proposed legislation that could prevent Arizona from appropriating from the Colorado River within her borders all of the water she could use for irrigation." 68 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4412.

[27] "It seems to me that in resolving such a difficulty, should it arise, there would be taken into consideration the fact that water for domestic use should take priority over water intended for purposes of irrigation. Aside from that, these filings are first in point as compared with those to which the Senator from Arizona referred. They are for a superior use, and, in addition thereto, the applicant who has made the filing has pursued the proper course in developing the manner of appropriation or the manner of diverting the water and putting it to the highest beneficial use. I do not anticipate any difficulty on that score in resolving the question of priority by the Secretary of the Interior." 70 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 169.

[28] See 68 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3064–3065; Hearings, *supra*, note 11, at 191, 193, 214–215.

Nor does § 6, which requires that the dam be operated for the satisfaction of "present perfected rights" among other purposes, indicate by negative implication that the Secretary may ignore all other appropriations. This provision was drafted by the Upper Basin States in order to insure that the condition of the Compact had been met to relieve them from the claims of perfected users below.[29] That condition was the construction of an adequate storage reservoir against which those claims could be asserted; the Compact has nothing to do with whether rights perfected under State law since 1929 may be ignored by the Secretary in awarding contracts. Section 8(b), which subjects the United States and all users of the Project to any compact allocating among the Lower Basin States "the benefits, including power, arising from the use of water accruing to said States," and subjects such an agreement, if made after January 1, 1929, to any delivery contracts made prior to its approval, is similarly no authority for the Court's conclusion. Legislative history is virtually silent as to the reason for giving such contracts precedence, but the provision seems simply to have been intended to promote the entering of contracts by insuring their permanence in accordance with the requirement of § 5.[30] There is no indication in § 8(b) whether or not the Secretary is free in awarding contracts to ignore existing appropriations; it merely evidences a policy that rights so perfected as to have been reduced to a contract for delivery at a consideration, whatever the basis on which they should be awarded, ought not to be destroyed by a subsequent interstate agreement.

If the statute were completely silent as to whether the Secretary may disregard appropriations, the normal inference would be that Congress did not mean to displace existing law. Enough has been said of the statute's history to buttress this inference beyond question. Moreover, the statute is by no means silent on this matter. The references in § 8 (a) and (b) to "appropriators" of water stored or delivered by the Project, and in § 4(a) to the taking of steps "to initiate or perfect any claims to the use of water" made available by the dam, are only the least evidence.[31] Section 14 provides that the Reclamation Law shall govern the operation of Hoover Dam except as the Project Act otherwise provides. Section 8 of the Reclamation Law, 32 Stat. 390, 43 U.S.C. § 383, directs the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out his duties under the Act to proceed in accordance with State and territorial laws and declares that nothing in the Federal act "shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof."

Both Representative Swing and Senator Johnson emphasized that this provision was deliberately incorporated into the Project Act to safeguard from Federal destruction the rights of the States to their shares of the water.[32] This Court made clear in *Wyoming* v. *Colorado,* 259 U.S. 419, 463, that by thus protecting the rights of any State in an interstate stream Congress intended to leave untouched the law of interstate equitable apportionment. *Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist.* v. *McCracken,* 357 U.S. 275, 291, despite its dictum that § 8 applies only to the acquisition of rights by the United States and not to its operation of a dam, holds only that the clear command of § 5 of the Reclamation Law, 32 Stat. 398, 43 U.S.C. § 431—that water deliveries to each user not exceed the quantity required for 160 acres—prevails over State law, not that State law does not generally govern priorities in the use of water from Federal reclamation projects under § 8.[33] The Court in *Ivanhoe* expressly stated that it was reaching its narrow conclusion: "without passing generally on the coverage of § 8 in the delicate area of Federal-State relations in the irrigation field" 357 U.S., at 292.

This general question, with reference to what is undoubtedly the most important single water project in the United States, is precisely the question before us today. In view of the language of the Project Act, as well as its background and legislative history, there can, I think, be no doubt of the answer.

V. THE LACK OF STANDARDS DEFINING THE LIMITS OF THE SECRETARY'S POWER

The Secretary, the Court holds, has already apportioned the waters of the mainstream by his contracts with Arizona and Nevada and has done so in accordance with the formula suggested as a basis for an interstate agreement in § 4(a). This holding may come as a surprise to those responsible for a statement such as that in the Arizona contract, which provides that its terms are "* * * without prejudice to, any of the respective contentions of said State and water users as to * * * (5) what limitations on use, rights of use, and relative priorities exist as to the waters of the Colorado River system."

But whether the quantum of the Secretary's apportionment was intentional or inadvertent, the Court holds that such an apportionment has been made, and the relevant question for the future is the one that is perhaps primarily responsible for this litigation: How is the burden of any shortage to be borne by the Lower Basin States? This question is not decided; the Court simply states that the initial determination is for the Secretary to make.

What yardsticks has Congress laid down for him to follow? There is, it is true, a duty imposed on the Secretary under § 6 to satisfy "present perfected rights," and if these rights are defined as those perfected on or before the effective date of the Act, it has been estimated that California's share amounts to approximately 3,000,000 acre-feet annually. This, then, would be the floor provided by the Act for California, assuming enough water is available to satisfy such present perfected rights. And the Act also has provided a ceiling for California: the 4,400,000 acre-feet of water (plus one-half of surplus) described in § 4(a).

But what of that wide area between these two outer limits? Here, when we look for the standards defining the Secretary's authority, we find nothing.[34] Under the Court's construction of the Act, in other words, Congress has made a gift to the Secretary of almost 1,500,000 acre-feet of water a year, to allocate virtually as he pleases in the event of any shortage preventing the fulfillment of all of his delivery commitments.

The delegation of such unrestrained authority to an executive official raises, to say the least, the gravest constitutional doubts. See *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States,* 295 U.S. 495; *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan,* 293 U.S. 388; cf. *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer,* 343 U.S. 579, 587–589. The principle that authority granted by the legislature must be limited by adequate standards serves two primary functions vital to preserving the separation of powers required by the Constitution.[35] *First,* it insures that the fundamental policy decisions in our society will be made not by an appointed official but by the body immediately responsible to the people. *Second,* it prevents judicial review from becoming merely an exercise at large by providing the courts with some measure against which to judge the official action that has been challenged.

The absence of standards under the Court's construction is an instructive illustration of these points. The unrestrained power to determine the burden of shortages is the power to make a political decision of the highest order. Indeed, the political pressures that will doubtless be brought to bear on the Secretary as a result of this decision are disturbing to contemplate. Furthermore, whatever the Secretary decides to do, this Court will surely be unable effectively to review his actions, since it will not know what guides were intended by Congress to govern those actions.

These substantial constitutional doubts do not, of course, lead to the conclusion that the Project Act must be held invalid. Rather, they buttress the conviction, already firmly grounded in the Act and its history, that no such authority was vested in the Secretary by Congress. Its purpose instead was to leave these matters to State law, and developed principles of equitable apportionment, subject only to the explicit exceptions provided in the Act.

For these reasons I respectfully dissent from the construction which the Court puts upon this aspect of the Act.

THE FARMER'S LESSON

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the wheat growers on May 21, by a very decisive vote, rejected the administration's wheat proposal. The country knows knows now, very clearly, what the farmers do not want. It does not have a very clear idea, however, of what they wish to do.

One thing I think is definite, and that is the farmers want a voluntary program instead of the rigid controls which were a part of the defeated wheat proposal.

While there is general disagreement as to the program that should be adopted, I think there is very little doubt that there must be a reasonable price support for wheat until we have an opportunity to work off the present surplus of wheat. If we do not have a reasonable price support program until we have been able to reduce the crop surplus, it will result in a real economic hardship.

---

[29] See Hearings, *supra,* note 1, at 98, 116, 117.

[30] Delph Carpenter said that the Secretary's contracts should be lagged for only a limited period of time in order to give the States complete freedom to agree. *Id.*, at 204.

[31] It should also be noted that, as the Master held, § 18, quoted *ante,* p. 35, clearly leaves each State free to apply its own law in determining rights among users within its borders. The Court's strained reading of this provision emasculates it entirely and sacrifices even matters of solely intrastate concern on the altar of Federal supremacy.

[32] See pp. 3, 17–18, *supra.*

[33] Nor is anything said in *City of Fresno* v. *California,* 372 U.S. 627, relevant here, since the Court there stated only that if the Government exercises its power of eminent domain, "the effect of § 8 in such a case is to leave to State law the definition of the property interests, if any, for which compensation must be made." 372 U.S., at 630. *Fresno* did not consider the question now presented: the effect of § 8 in the *absence* of any exercise of the Federal power of eminent domain.

[34] Nor, I submit, does the Court suggest any standards. Certainly, there is nothing in the enumeration of purposes in § 6 which will be of any assistance in helping the Secretary allocate the burden of shortages among competing irrigation and domestic uses within and among the Lower Basin States.

[35] See the discussion in Comment, 14 Stan. L. Rev. 372.

It is not only the wheat farmers who will suffer, but rural communities in the wheat growing areas. The hardship will spread beyond its source to a whole sector of the economy. And it is idle to suppose that it will not have its effect on employment throughout the country.

What is called for, in my opinion, is a serious reassignment of the whole apparatus of wheat control and support price. It is my contention that the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Wheat Growers, cooperative organizations, and the private grain trade should have an opportunity to get together and work jointly for a program in the interest of not only the farmer, but a program that will provide a market for our wheat, both foreign and domestic.

The wheat growers of our Nation are concerned about and interested in a voluntary program. They realize also in the present situation, where we have a large surplus of wheat, it is not possible to go immediately to a supply and demand program.

Congress has approved feed grain legislation on a voluntary basis, and I sincerely hope we can work out a wheat program of the same type. To do this, we must have the cooperation of the present administration, farm organizations and others interested in a sound and practical program.

First. It seems to me that we must make every effort to secure legislation before this session of Congress adjourns.

Second. We must redouble our efforts to find new markets and new uses for wheat, both at home and abroad.

Third. We must not permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its surplus stocks of wheat to affect adversely the price of this year's crop of wheat.

With these suggestions in mind, I am hopeful that the decisive vote of the wheatgrowers of this Nation will bring about a better program than was offered this year.

On May 30 the Washington Post carried an excellent editorial entitled "The Farmer's Lesson." This editorial stresses the need for legislation affecting wheat and stresses the fact that unless some action is taken in this session of Congress there will be economic repercussions not only in the wheat-producing areas but also in the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Farmer's Lesson

Income of American wheatgrowers in 1964 simply cannot be allowed to decline $700 million below 1962. The Congress knows it. The administration knows it. The wheat farmers know it. No matter how irritated the Government may be with the farmers for voting against a system of compulsory acreage and marketing controls that probably would have produced an income of $2.3 billion, the country will not be willing to stand by and allow to go into effect the only existing alternative plan under which income might be nearly a billion dollars less.

Several proposals for an alternative plan have emerged in Congress and it is plain that there is recognition on the Hill that the country is not ready for such an economic disaster. It is not just a matter of rural prosperity that is involved. Seventy-five percent of wheat acreage allotments are in the five Northern States of Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and the Southern Plains States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. Economic disaster cannot be inflicted upon this whole broad region without producing nationwide economic dislocation.

The hardship imposed upon the wheat farmers would carry over to the growers of feed grains and livestock, all of whom ultimately would share in the certain distress. It is not possible to confine such a dislocation to one segment of agriculture.

Nor is it possible to keep this sort of reverse confined to one segment of the national economy. All the 7 million workers engaged directly on farms will be hurt. And in addition, there will be effects on 6 million workers in the farm supply business and on 10 million persons employed in transporting, processing and distributing farm products. Farmers in 1960 spent $4.8 billion for feeds, $1.5 billion for fertilizer and $3.4 billion for machines and vehicles. It is idle to suppose that their hardships will not be transferred to their customers and suppliers.

The United States Census calls only that part of the population living on farms or in cities of less than 2,500 rural, but a far better definition of rural is that of Prof. Andrew Hacker who points out that 90 million Americans or nearly half the population still live on farms or in towns with fewer than 25,000 population. You cannot punish the wheat farmer without punishing rural America and you cannot punish rural America without punishing the whole national economy, urban and rural alike. Disaster in the wheat belt would spread throughout rural America, make itself felt in unemployment in agricultural suppliers and processors and then translate itself into rising unemployment in urban centers far from the farm regions. Farm income rose in 1962 nearly $750 million over 1961 and the Department of Agriculture estimated that this rise created 200,000 new jobs in the whole country. These workers and no one knows how many thousands more would be idled by the sort of farm depression that is going to happen unless the Government intervenes.

It is too bad the farmers turned down Secretary Freeman's compulsory control plan. It may have been a good one. Apparently a lot of farmers would not have described it as Gladstone described the Constitution and probably it wasn't the greatest work ever struck off by the hand of man. Anyway, it was voted down. A workable and acceptable alternative is needed. Farm workers who get less than half the pay of urban workers are not overpaid and they deserve better of the country. They don't need to be "taught a lesson" and if they did, the lesson would be more costly than the country could afford.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is recognized.

MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in Ohio there is what is known as the Miami Conservancy District. It was established 50 years ago after the flood which inundated the Scioto River Valley and the Miami River Valley.

During the 50 years of the existence of that conservancy district the taxpayers, on their own, have expended $50 million in the construction of flood control projects. Neither the Federal Government nor the State Government contributed toward the financing of the works which were necessary to control the inordinate flow of water when high rains and melting snows came.

I have before me an article, published in the Dayton Daily News of Ohio, reporting that the directors of the Miami Conservancy District have recently announced two new projects involving a cost of approximately $524,000, which will be built with moneys provided by the local taxpayers. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Conservancy Unit OK's Levee Plans

(By Carl V. Roberts)

Flood protection for Miami Villa in Wayne Township and Coleman plat in Miami Township has been approved by the Miami Conservancy District board of directors, it was announced today.

Cost of the Miami Villa project is estimated at $284,100 and that of the Coleman plat at $240,000, said L. Bennett Coy, secretary-treasurer of the district.

The work in each case will include a levee and some channel improvement. Some 125 homes on 73 acres will receive flood protection at Miami Villa. At Coleman plat, it is 40 homes and several businesses on 65 acres.

The plans will be presented to the conservancy court on June 21. That body is made up of nine common pleas judges, one from each county in the district. If the plans are approved by the court, there will be 30 days for the filing of objections.

If approval is obtained all down the line, the next step will be acquiring land needed for the levees.

It is hoped clearing of the land can get underway this fall, said Conservancy Chief Engineer Max L. Mitchell, with work on the flood control projects proper to start in the spring.

Levees in both plats will be about 4,000 feet long, 10 feet wide at the top, and with an average height of 8 feet.

At Miami Villa, a second and smaller levee will be built along a little stream called Myd Run.

The main levee will run from a point 200 feet east of Rip Rap road, at the northeast corner of the plat, curving around the plat along the east bank of the Miami River to the southwest corner at Rip Rap road.

There will be some 4,000 feet of channel improvement, including deepening and widening, and the banks will be cleared of trees and underbrush.

Less channel work is required in Coleman plat, Mitchell said. That levee will run from the present levee at the southern end of Miamisburg, along the east bank to the New York Central Railroad tracks.

Both projects were instituted by petitions of the residents. Conservancy district decision to acquire some of the adjacent flood plain land cut the originally estimated cost of both projects—from $298,000 of both projects—from $298,000 in Coleman plat and from $366,000 at Miami Villa.

The total costs are assessed on a benefit basis, involving property value and depth of flooding. In round figures, one-third is charged to all county residents, including those in the township and the plat; one-third to all township residents, again including those in the plat, and one-third to plat residents alone.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I thank the citizens of the area for not coming to me to ask the Federal Treasury to provide the moneys for the projects that are envisioned. It demonstrates that the citizens in the Miami Conservancy District recognize that the financial burdens of the Federal Government, in fulfilling the functions imposed upon it by the Constitution and providing the moneys needed to prepare our country for defense, are so grave that the Federal Treasury ought to be spared, as frequently as it possibly can be, from adding on expenses that can be taken care of on a local and domestic basis.

STATUS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO HOLD COMMISSIONS IN THE MILITARY RESERVES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently the question was raised by the Scripps-Howard newspapers as to whether it was proper for a Reserve officer of any of the services to serve in the Congress of the United States. Shortly after the newspaper raised this perfectly proper question, I submitted a resolution in this body asking that the Judiciary Committee determine this question, inasmuch as no determination has been made on the subject since 1916, and that was in the case of National Guardsmen. The effort which was made in 1921 failed.

I wrote a letter to each of the Reserve officers who is a Member of Congress, explaining the law I had found on it; and I ask unanimous consent that that letter be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dear Fellow Reservists: Recently the Scripps-Howard papers have raised the interesting question of whether a Reserve officer can serve as a Member of Congress. In order that this question might be resolved, although I think it already has been, I have introduced the enclosed resolution on which Major General Thurmond, U.S. Army Reserve, joined me.

In introducing this resolution I made the following comments on the floor of the Senate:

"The pertinent portion of article I, section 6 of the Constitution is as follows:

"'And no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.'

"A sampling of the legislative precedents on the question of incompatible offices:

"Year 1861: A Member of House 'not entitled to his seat since he was mustered into the military service of the United States.'

"Year 1901: Referred to active list of military being prohibited from serving in Congress.

"Year 1916: A House resolution asked Judiciary Committee to investigate the question of Members holding commissions in National guard. The committee's report quoted the following U.S. Supreme Court case which defined 'office' as used in article I, section 6 of the Constitution. 'In *United States* v. *Hartwell* (6 Wall. 385) the Supreme Court of the United States said that the term 'public office' embodies the ideas of tenure, duration, emoluments, and duties, and that the duties are continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary.

"The committee decided: 'The only question, then, to be considered is whether as an officer he is disqualified to fill a seat in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. From the earliest time it has been recognized as a plain principle of public policy that "where two offices are incompatible they cannot be held by the same person." Incompatibility exists where the nature and duties of the two offices are such as to render it improper, from consideration of the public policy, for one incumbent to fill both, the rule being that the acceptance of the second office vacates the first. From the further discussion of the duties and requirements of the two offices under consideration it will clearly appear that they are incompatible. The question here presented, however, is not to be determined by any general rule of public policy as promulgated by the Court and dependent upon a finding of incompatibility; but rests upon the plain prohibition contained in the clause of the Constitution already quoted.'

"'No line can be drawn between the large and small office. The Constitution prohibits a Member of Congress from holding "any office under the United States while a Member of either House." If a Member should hold any office under the United States, the prohibition of the Constitution at once intervenes and declares that he shall not "be a Member of either House."

"'It follows that the seats of those Members of the House of Representatives who shall accept commissions in the National Guard of the various States under the acts of Congress of June 3, 1916, will at once become vacant. The only action necessary would be to declare such vacancy by resolution as a matter of convenience and to aid the Speaker and others in discharging their public duties. It would not change the legal effect of accepting such an office in the National Guard.'

"Year 1921: The House questioned the constitutional rights of a Member to hold a commission in the Reserve Corps of the U.S. Army. A resolution to this effect was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The committee failed to report on this resolution.

"In legislation first enacted in 1961 and amended several times in the intervening years, members of the National Guard and the Reserves have been specifically permitted to serve in civil service and in other Federal Government positions."

Since introducing the resolution I have come across another piece of the law that I think firms up my conviction that reservists can serve in Congress.

The statute which is most pertinent to the question of congressional incompatibility is found in the United States Code, title V, section 30R. (d):

"STATUS OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARDSMEN WHEN NOT ON ACTIVE DUTY OR WHEN ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING

"When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer of trust or profit or discharging any official function under it, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowance received in that capacity."

The legislative history of this statute that I have studied thus far, contains no reference to any question involving Members of Congress. Nevertheless, the statute constitutes a strong precedent to the effect that being a Reserve officer is not incompatible with holding a seat in the House or the Senate under the Constitution.

Sincerely,

Barry Goldwater,
Major General, U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I want to read one short paragraph of the letter which is new to the material I introduced at the time I submitted the resolution:

Since introducing the resolution I have come across another piece of the law that I think firms up my conviction that reservists can serve in Congress:

The statute which is most pertinent to the question of congressional incompatibility is found in the United States Code, title V, section 30R. (d):

"STATUS OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARDSMEN WHEN NOT ON ACTIVE DUTY OR WHEN ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING

"When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer of trust or profit or discharging any official function under it, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowance received in that capacity."

I believe that is the most pertinent law we have come across. I offer it at this time because I hope the Judiciary Committee will take a proper surveillance of this question, so that those of us who are reservists may have whatever stigma may be attached to double service removed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, referring to the matter just discussed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I call attention to the fact that on May 15 a resolution (S. Res. 142) was submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] on behalf of himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] to clarify the status of Members of Congress who hold commissions in the military reserves. This resolution which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry to determine whether the holding of a commission as a Reserve member of any of the Armed Forces by an individual is incompatible with the holding of office by such individual as a Member of the Senate, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable time its findings and its conclusions thereon.

At this time I would like to insert at this point in my remarks an advance copy of an editorial prepared for the Officer, magazine of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, which reviews the history of Reserve forces programs, cites the basic statutes enacted by the Congress authorizing services in the Reserves and discusses the alleged "conflict of interest" issue which has been raised in connection with this matter. I strongly support the sentiments expressed by this editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where Lies the Conflict of Interest?

The development of a subtle attack upon the Minute Man tradition is one of the contradictions of the times in the United States of America.

That this philosophy should become evident in the Congress makes it all the more baffling. Yet, in the year 1963, history must record that this vital principle was assailed. From mysterious sources came the suggestion that the system embraced a "conflict of interest": a Congressman, it was suggested, could not with objectivity pass upon military appropriations and consider military policy if he were firmly dedicated to "adequate national defense."

The Minute Men in the Congress, representing a constituency which had sent them to Washington because they had demonstrated their patriotism and leadership, and competence, were suspect.

Conflict—between those who believe in a strong defense and those who would undermine it—is part and parcel of the basic history of our association. This is what brought ROA into being—it is our greatest challenge today.

America has been strong enough to repel her enemies through nearly 200 years because of the steadfastness with which the Nation has clung to the philosophy that a nation can remain free only as long as her citizens will it. The will, of course, embraces an eagerness to make sacrifice when it becomes unavoidable to save the precious elements of our liberty.

The dedication of every citizen to this principle is simplified by dramatization of the citizen-reservist tradition. In the unfolding of the human story, in the fast-moving change of the 20th century, and the 21st century which is almost upon us, when slogans and catch phrases are indispensable to public understanding, the Minute Man tradition conveys everything that comprises the character of the United States which guarantees our national safety.

This is the fundamental purpose of ROA's new Memorial Building. It will be the result of the first national reminder at the doorstep of the Congress, that the United States cannot accept a policy that is not sufficiently sturdy to guarantee adequate national security.

The Minute Man tradition is in the warp and woof of the United States of America.

In mobilizing our strength in the past, it has been necessary quickly to call from every walk of life the able-bodied men and women who then gathered their arms and went forth to assail the aggressor. Up to this point in history there has not been raised any very serious question about the willingness of the citizenry to risk their lives on the altar of liberty.

The 20th-21st century has brought a major change in the minuteman tradition—namely, a system which makes impracticable time-consuming conscription and training programs. The minutemen of tomorrow must be ready now. The Congress, assaying the problems presented by this necessity, adopted a series of laws to encourage the citizen-reservist to join in this gigantic defense system which today is the Nation's Ready Reserve Forces—not fully understood, inadequately supported, and sometimes ridiculed. It is still true that to be a reservist requires a strong stomach as well as a fierce dedication to national freedom. Yet, the Reserve program while crying out for a better support from the public—and strongest of all from the civilian makers of defense policy—still represent the U.S. determination to remain free.

The Congress, in establishing the modern Armed Forces Reserve sought to provide incentives which would attract into the program men and women from every walk of life. There is no military class in this country, and the development of such a class would be inconsistent with our law and tradition.

In the national manner then, the Reserves come from everywhere. From farms, shops, stores, schools, churches—north, east, south, west—from every profession, every section, and every economic strata. For a time they would be under the leadership of those officers who were combat experienced from their service in the free world's greatest victory; whose irreplaceable experience was vital to sound programs.

Those who created this new system by law joined in setting the example. A substantial number of the Members of Congress, who are selected from the strong fabric of our Nation, particularly volunteered to remain in the Reserves.

They, too, like the men and women of the farms, the stores, the shops, the schools, and the churches, would be ready to go if the need came.

The provision of law, and a Supreme Court decision, had added a spark of incentive to the reservist: The reservist's right to any other status in the Nation would not be affected by his status as a reservist.

In 1947, in order to strengthen the Reserve Forces programs, so essential to an effective national defense system, the Congress enacted legislation which is the basic incentive for the modern Ready Reserve (sec. 30r, title 5, U.S. Code):

"(c) Acceptance of Civilian position; pay and allowances; practice before Federal departments:

"Any Reserve or member of the National Guard may accept any civilian position under the United States or the District of Columbia and may receive the pay incident to that employment in addition to pay and allowances as a Reserve or member of the National Guard. Membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the National Guard does not prevent a person from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before, or in connection with, any department of the United States.

"(d) Status of Reserves and National Guardsmen when not on active duty, or when on active duty for training:

"When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer or employee of the United States or a person holding an office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received in that capacity." (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, sec. 29, 70A Stat. 632; Sept. 2, 1958, Public Law 85-861, sec. 13, 72 Stat. 1557).

It is to the credit of the Congress that most of its Members who had been officers, who were trained in the military, and combat experienced joined in making the Armed Forces Reserve Act effective. Military service is no picnic; most men, including the wartime officers, severed their military connections at the first opportunity, a fact which made the incentive programs essential.

That a substantial number of Senators and Representatives continued to train as Reserve officers, because they too are a cross section of the United States, has been a stimulus in the cold war defense posture of our Nation. It has made an incalculably valuable contribution to the morale of the Reserves. They have publicly displayed a national determination to survive, serving symbolically side by side with their fellows from the farms, the factories, the stores, shops—men and women from all walks who are united to defend our freedoms—as well as with others who serve in the highest offices in the land.

This association respects and honors the reservists in the Congress; we are convinced they serve in the finest tradition of the minuteman who throughout our history has saved this Nation from destruction.

It is in appreciation of their service, and all that it implies, that ROA's new memorial building will include a congressional hall as a tribute to men of the greatest free legislative body in the world who represent not only the people of the United States in the Congress but who also symbolize before all the world—and particularly to our enemies—that the United States has no group which exempts itself from the deepest commitment to our freedom.

Those who seek to brand our patriotic reservists in the Congress with conflict of interest simply because they make themselves available to the Nation and train to maintain their readiness have indeed erected a strawman; for there can be no conflict of interest when patriotism is involved. Nor can there be a conflict of interest when the safety of our country is at stake.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a great many Members of the Congress have served with distinction in the military forces of this Nation, many during World War II. Their military service, reflecting, as it does, a devotion to this Nation's freedom and a willingness to risk their life to preserve it, is something to be honored.

For more than a decade our Nation has been involved in a cold war, which it appears, will continue for some years to come. This has made necessary a system of national military preparedness which has never before in the history of our Nation existed in peacetime. A vital part of this system of preparedness is the Reserve Forces in all of the military services.

The Congress has enacted laws establishing this system. We have called upon men and women in all walks of life to join in maintaining our Reserve strength, a vital part of this Nation's military power. The Reserves are also symbolic of the commitment of the entire citizenry of this Nation to make any necessary sacrifice to preserve our freedoms.

I am not a Reserve officer today. My service as such long ago ended. There is no honor, emolument, or recognition due me as a result of any future course which may be decided for our Reserves.

But I do know that those Members of Congress, who are setting a splendid example for the reservists in other walks of life, are making a very great contribution to our Nation's security.

A Congressman, or a Senator, is a leader in his State. His example influences a great many people. When he serves in the Nation's Reserves, as well as in the Congress, he is setting a fine example for other reservists, who also must carry on their Reserve training out of the time they are not required to apply themselves to their life careers. I believe we should honor and not impugn the motives of our colleagues who are serving as reservists.

Mr. President, I strongly hope that the able members of the Committee on the Judiciary, at an early date, may report to the Senate their findings and recomendations upon Senate Resolution 142, and that at such time the Senate may go on record in giving its speedy approval of the continued holding of Reserve Commissions by Members of Senate, along with its strong commendation of those who by such service and by their example are making a great contribution to the security of our Nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On behalf of all the reservists in the Congress, especially in this body, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his comments and observations. They come from a man with great experience. He is one of the few Members of the Congress who holds the second highest award for bravery which he attained for service in the Air Corps in World War I. I am very grateful for his contribution to this discussion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am more than grateful for those comments. No one has made a finer contribution in the military services of our Nation than the two distinguished authors of the resolution in question, both of them major generals in the reserve forces of the Nation—the "General Senator from Arizona" and the "General Senator from South Carolina." I honor them. I want the Senate very speedily to set this question at rest, which is the reason for my speaking today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labeling and Packaging of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of which subcommittee is the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am reluctant to object, but the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, who has been very active on the subcommittee, is unavoidably absent today. Therefore, I must object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that a meeting of the subcommittee was scheduled for 1:30 this afternoon. Am I correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will that meeting be held?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It will not be held?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois objects.

I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that the Administrative Practices and Procedures Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIVERSION OF FEED GRAINS FROM AUSTRIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on Friday, May 31, issue of the Des Moines Register, there is a new item captioned "Barter Grain Shifts Hurt U.S. Exports." The article indicates that an investigation by the State Department has revealed that some 500,000 tons of feed grains have been diverted from Austria, to which they were supposed to have been sent under a barter program under Public Law 480, begun in 1959. As of December 1962, some 750,000 tons of feed grains were destined for Austria, but only about 250,000 actually ended up there. The other 500,000 tons went somewhere else, and as of now we know that at least 25 percent of the diverted feed grains went to West Germany. Naturally this would mean a reduction in requirements of our normal export of feed grains.

I am advised that the barter program under Public Law 480 comes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. Accordingly, I have directed a letter to the Secretary on this date, calling attention to the Des Moines Register article and asking the Department to make an investigation to determine the following:

First. How did this multimillion dollar diversion of feed grains, contrary to the barter agreement, take place without being brought to light until now?

Second. What steps has the Department taken to see to it that there is no repetition of this diversion—either under our barter agreement with Austria or under a barter agreement with any other country?

Third. Has there been any similar diversion of feed grains or other agricultural commodities under any other barter program with any other country?

Fourth. In the case of any diversion, including the one involving Austria, where did the diverted commodities go? Specifically, did any of this go into Communist-bloc countries, and to what extent did the diverted commodities have an adverse impact on our regular export trade?

Inasmuch as Public Law 480 programs other than barter programs—for example, Food for Peace—fall under the jurisdiction of the Agency for International Development, I have also directed a similar letter to the Director for AID, because it would seem that diversion of agricultural commodities, and feed grains and wheat especially, could well have occurred under these programs. In addition, I have asked the Director to state whether or not any of the feed grains or wheat shipped under these programs have, in turn, been used for export by the recipient country or to replace similar commodities exported by the recipient country. I have mentioned Yugoslavia as one country I am particularly interested in, because my recollection is that while we were shipping wheat to Yugoslavia under Public Law 480, Yugoslavia was exporting wheat during the same period.

The Des Moines Register article indicates that Government investigators in the Austrian case have obtained evidence that some large U.S. grain firms are involved in a collusive arrangement with the Austrians and Germans, but no criminal action has yet been initiated. Accordingly, I have directed another letter to the Attorney General requesting information about what action, if any, the Justice Department has taken or proposes to take.

Whether this entire matter warrants an investigation by one of the congressional committees, such as the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, may well depend upon the responses received to these letters I have written. We shall hope that investigations reveal that the Austrian case, which is bad enough, is only an isolated case of abuse and laxity in administration. However, the immensity of the Public Law 480 programs naturally gives rise to concern over whether similar breakdowns in administration have been occurring elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the Des Moines Register article, my letters to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Agency for International Development, the Attorney General, and a table from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's March 1, 1963, "Reports on Barter for the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 1963," appearing on pages 5 and 6 and setting forth the dollar value, by country of destination, of barter programs from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1962, be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, May 31, 1963]

BARTER GRAIN SHIFTS HURT U.S. EXPORTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Government investigators have uncovered evidence indicating that nearly 500,000 tons of surplus feed grains have been diverted from a barter program with Austria.

State Department Inspector General Kenneth Mansfield said investigators have traced 25 percent of the diverted grain to West Germany, where it was displacing normal U.S. sales of wheat, corn, and barley.

Investigators for the State Department said manganese and industrial diamonds, bartered to the United States for the feed grain, were shipped to the United States in foreign ships in violation of U.S. policy, which is to use American ships to cut down on the outflow of gold.

The United States entered into a barter arrangement with Austria in 1959 on the theory that it was better to trade our surplus wheat, corn, and barley for industrial diamonds and manganese that would be easier to store.

A survey in December 1962, indicated that about 750,000 tons of feed grain had been shipped to Austria.

With the help of Austrian officials it was established that only about 250,000 tons had actually been unloaded at Austrian ports. The other 500,000 tons had been moved immediately to other ports in Western Europe.

Nine Austrians were arrested on criminal charges of mislabeling U.S. barley as Argentine barley to get a higher price for it.

Although Government investigators have obtained evidence indicating that some large U.S. grain firms are involved in a collusive arrangement with the Austrians and Germans, no criminal action has yet been initiated.

The Agriculture Department has stopped its barter arrangements with Austria pending a complete study of the evidence.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I invite your attention to the enclosed copy of an article appearing in the May 31 issue of the Des Moines Register.

I understand that the barter program under Public Law 480 comes within the jurisdiction of your Department. Accordingly, I would very much appreciate it if you would conduct an investigation which would provide answers to the following questions:

1. How did this tremendous diversion of feed grains, contrary to the barter agreement, take place without being brought to light until now?

2. What steps has the Department taken to see to it that there is no repetition of this diversion—either under our barter agreement with Austria or under a barter agreement with any other country?

3. Has there been any similar diversion of feed grains or other agricultural commodities under any other barter program with any other country?

4. In the case of any diversion, including the one involving Austria, where did the diverted commodities go. Specifically, did any of this go into Communist-bloc countries, and to what extent did the diverted commodities have an adverse impact on our regular export trade.

The Des Moines Register article indicates that the grain under the Austrian barter program was transported in foreign ships. I recognize that the Cargo Preference Act (Public Law 664, 83d Cong.) does not require shipment in American flag ships under a barter program, as is required for other shipments under Public Law 480. However, I would appreciate knowing why foreign ships were used for this purpose rather than American flag ships.

If the answers to some of the foregoing are not readily available, I would appreciate a periodic report from your Department.

Sincerely,

JACK MILLER.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: I invite your attention to the enclosed copy of an article appearing in the May 31 issue of the Des Moines Register.

Although I understand that the barter program under Public Law 480 does not come under your jurisdiction, it would appear that the possibility of diverting agricultural commodities, and particularly feed grains and wheat, shipped under other provisions of Public Law 480, which do come under your jurisdiction, exists. Accordingly, I would very much appreciate it if you would make an investigation to determine whether there has been any diversion of agricultural commodities shipped under Public Law 480 programs (other than barter programs); and if there has been, where the diverted commodities ended up. I would particularly appreciate a report with respect to shipments to Yugoslavia and whether, at the same time wheat was being shipped to Yugoslavia under Public Law 480, Yugoslavia was, in turn, exporting wheat, and if so, how much and whether American wheat was involved in these exports.

Your earliest attention to the foregoing is requested.

Sincerely,

JACK MILLER.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I invite your attention to the enclosed copy of an article appearing in the May 31 issue of the Des Moines Register.

It is noted that the article states that evidence has been obtained indicating that some large U.S. grain firms are involved in a "collusive arrangement" with the Austrians and Germans, but that no criminal action has been initiated.

Accordingly, I would appreciate your advice as to what action, if any, the Justice Department has taken or proposes to take in this case.

Sincerely,

JACK MILLER.

Value of agricultural commodity exports by country of destination[1] *(July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1962)*

	Thousands
Aden	$70
Algeria	981
Angola	19
Antigua	28
Australia	8, 418
Austria	59, 248
Azores	261
Bahamas	40
Bahrein	22
Belgium-Luxembourg	119, 754
Bermuda	70
Bolivia	7, 393
Brazil	32, 381
British Guiana	20
British Honduras	622
Cambodia	38
Cameroon	58
Canada	3, 345
Canal Zone	144
Canary Islands	12, 735
Cape Verde Islands	36
Ceylon	1, 315
Chile	3, 348
China (Taiwan)	8, 012
Colombia	12, 982
Congo (Leopoldville)	2, 997
Costa Rica	983
Cuba	5, 526
Cyprus	1, 806
Denmark	10, 621
Dominican Republic	523
Ecuador	33
El Salvador	831
Ethiopia	166
Finland	5, 594
France	63, 495
French Somaliland	183
French West Africa	3, 250
Germany, West	143, 404
Ghana	4, 674
Greece	11, 629
Greenland	35
Guam	53
Guatemala	3, 082
Haiti	6, 377
Honduras	203
Hong Kong	13, 895
India	38, 423
Indonesia	1, 604
Iran	759
Iraq	2, 838
Ireland	41, 689
Israel	41, 280
Italy	33, 317
Japan	187, 686
Jordan	1, 697
Korea	3, 679
Kuwait	148
Laos	46
Lebanon	4, 321
Liberia	291
Libya	8
Madeira	160
Malaya, Federation of	898
Malta	624
Mauritius	15
Mexico	19, 659
Morocco	3, 014
Mozambique	4, 627
Netherlands	142, 517
Netherlands Antilles	37
New Zealand	271
Nicaragua	633
Nigeria	2, 964
Norway	29, 027
Okinawa	$824
Pakistan	52
Panama	175
Peru	27, 122
Philippines	9, 814
Poland	3, 161
Portugal	6, 669
Portuguese India	54
Qatar	10
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of	466
Ruanda-Urundi	91
Sao Tome	46
Saudi Arabia	801
Sierra Leone	80
South Africa, Republic of	5, 063
Spain	30, 275
St. Pierre-Miquelon	88
Surinam	13
Sweden	14, 478
Switzerland	3, 318
Syrian Arab Republic	7, 244
Thailand	4, 536
Togo	82
Trieste	1, 371
Tunisia	938
Turkey	17, 585
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	11, 203
United Kingdom[2]	289, 881
Uruguay	1, 212
Venezuela	1, 607
Virgin Islands	77
West Indies Federation[3]	1, 853
Yugoslavia	19, 049
Others[4]	27
Undistributed[5]	3, 433

See footnotes at end of table.

Total number of countries, 120.
Total value, $1,575,630,000.

[1] Contractors are not in all cases required to export agricultural commodities to the country of origin of materials.

[2] Includes data for other British Commonwealth countries for contracts entered into prior to July 1957. It is estimated that about 89 percent of the value shown covers shipments to the United Kingdom; the remaining 11 percent covers shipments to other countries of the British Commonwealth including Australia, Canada, and Union of South Africa.

[3] Includes Jamaica, Trinidad, and unidentified sections.

[4] Includes small quantities to Argentina, Barbados, British West Africa, Iceland, Masqat and Oman, Paraguay, Portuguese Guinea, Puerto Rico and Vietnam.

[5] Shipments for which documents showing country of destination have not been processed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader what the program will be for the remainder of the day and, so far as he knows, what it will be for the rest of the week.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 171, S. 331, which relates to contracting for the hospital and medical care of certain veterans in the Republic of the Philippines. This bill will supersede the business that was announced as pending last week.

During the remainder of the day there will be routine business and speeches. At the end of the session today, it is proposed to have the Senate adjourn until Thursday.

I understand that on Thursday a number of bills will be introduced and that appropriate speeches will be made relating to consumer interests and consumer problems, and that that program will be under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

On Monday next, it is proposed to have the Senate consider the measures which are known as the migratory labor bills, beginning with Calendar No. 180 and continuing through Calendar No. 185, Senate bills 521 through 526, inclusive. The consideration of these bills is being delayed because certain Senators who are vitally interested in them have other commitments. In order to accommodate all Senators, it has been decided that it would be most appropriate to consider these bills on Monday next. So I now serve notice that Senators who are interested in these particular bills should be present then and ready to vote. I expect some yea and nay votes to be taken next Monday on amendments to those bills.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is prepared to handle these measures. The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] will be present. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is very much interested in the bills, as are other Senators.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX RELIEF TO SENIOR TAXPAYERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was gratified to learn of the tentative action taken last week by the House Committee on Ways and Means, which action if finally approved will give some much needed relief to our senior taxpayers.

The proposal by the committee would permit homeowners who had attained the age of 65 to dispose of their homes, without incurring a crushing tax burden, providing that they had owned the home for 5 years or more. Any sale up to $20,000 would be without tax, beyond that figure some tax would be due.

Mr. President, this tentative action is in line with the proposal which I offered last year and which was adopted by the Senate. It gives recognition to the peculiar problem of our older retired citizens who often are living on reduced incomes, and it provides some relief for them in the event they desire to dispose of a home which they now find too large for their needs.

Although this action by the Committee on Ways and Means is not a part of the administration's tax proposal, I hope that it will be retained by the committee. The small amount of revenue which might be lost by such tax relief is far outweighed by the obligation which we owe these retired persons who have practiced thrift and hard work throughout their lives in order to raise their family, and to acquire and maintain a home.

NEED FOR REVISION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF TAX CODE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have long felt that our tax code needed to be revised and simplified. Its complexity defies description, it is an enigma to the average taxpayer and to most businessmen. I recently offered a concurrent resolution directing the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to prepare such a revision and simplification. That resolution is now before the Finance Committee. A similar resolution has been offered in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, within the past few days the section of taxation of the American Bar Association met here in Washington. They discussed this very problem, and made certain recommendations which were approved by the Board of Governors on May 21, 1963.

In making their recommendations the committee advised:

> The national administration's proposals for "structural revision" of the Internal Revenue Code do not accomplish the type of basic reform required to provide for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, to promote incentives for work and investment, and to simplify the provisions of the code for the benefit of taxpayers and the Government alike. The administration's proposals would, for the most part, merely serve to complicate the tax system without accomplishing the underlying objectives of improving the system.
>
> A detailed analysis of the administration's proposals for so-called tax reform discloses that the recommendations do not in any sense constitute basic reform but on the whole add even greater complexity to an already overburdened code. The history of the development of the Internal Revenue Code demonstrates that the piecemeal approach, such as reflected in the administration's proposals, inevitably produces exception upon exception and piles complexity upon confusion. In this sense, it is a move in the wrong direction. Only a basic redrafting of the entire code, accompanied by a substantial reduction in rates, can clear out the barnacles which have attached themselves to the Federal income tax laws over the past five decades. Therefore, if Congress acts on the proposals in this session, it should defer consideration of major structural changes until a basic tax reform program can be enacted.

Mr. President, I believe that we should give careful consideration to the recommendations of this committee. The members are the elite of the tax attorneys in our country. They deal with tax matters day in and day out. Their recommendations are based on their own experience as professionals in this complex field. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation and report as submitted by Ralph W. Thrower, chairman of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association appear in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendation and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ON MAY 21, 1963, AND REPORT OF THE SECTION OF TAXATION

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association after careful study recommends to the Congress:

1. That the national administration's proposals for structural revision of the Internal Revenue Code would not accomplish the type of basic reform required, but are piecemeal in nature and add greater complexity; and

2. That the Congress should defer consideration of major structural changes until it can enact a program of basic reform in the income tax structure; and

3. That, if rate reductions are enacted in 1963—

(a) The Congress should enact at this time a measure which will have the effect of reducing the present rates on individual incomes by the same proportion in each bracket, except that, in the interest of achieving fairness and equity and of encouraging work and stimulating investment, the rates in the upper brackets after such reduction should be further modified so that no rate will be higher than 65 percent; and

(b) The Congress, to the extent that any reductions in rates on corporate incomes are deemed appropriate in addition to the adjustments in individual rates referred to in subparagraph (a) above, should enact at this time reductions in corporate income tax rates which apply proportionately to large and small corporations alike; and, in this connection, if the Congress should enact provisions for the further acceleration of corporate tax payments, it should not thereby largely remove the immediate cash benefits accruing to a corporation from rate reduction; and be it further

Resolved, That the section of taxation is directed to urge the foregoing recommendations upon the proper committees of Congress.

REPORT OF THE SECTION OF TAXATION

The national administration's proposals for structural revision of the Internal Revenue Code do not accomplish the type of basic reform required to provide for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, to promote incentives for work and investment, and to simplify the provisions of the code for the benefit of taxpayers and the Government alike. The administration's proposals would, for the most part, merely serve to complicate the tax system without accomplishing the underlying objectives of improving the system.

A detailed analysis of the administration's proposals for so-called tax reform discloses that the recommendations do not in any sense constitute basic reform but on the whole add even greater complexity to an already overburdened code. The history of the development of the Internal Revenue Code demonstrates that the piecemeal approach, such as reflected in the administration's proposals, inevitably produces exception upon exception and piles complexity upon confusion. In this sense, it is a move in the wrong direction. Only a basic redrafting of the entire code, accompanied by a substantial reduction in rates, can clear out the barnacles which have attached themselves to the Federal income tax laws over the past five decades. Therefore, if the Congress acts on the proposals in this session, it should defer consideration of major structural changes until a basic tax reform program can be enacted.

The American Bar Association has taken no position on the question as to whether or not it is desirable as a stimulus to the economy to have an immediate reduction in tax rates. It is believed, however, that if there is to be an immediate reduction in rates, such reduction in rates should be proportionately across the board, except that in no event should rates in the top brackets be higher than 65 percent. If the range of progressive individual income tax rates is ever to be made reasonable and realistic so as to remove the very high rates, which so many now agree stifle incentives, the graduation in rates must be narrowed so that the disparity btween the lowest rate and the highest rate is not nearly so great as at present. A step in this direction would be to cut off the top brackets at 65 percent. Reducing rates proportionately across the board, except as noted above, would tend to maintain the status quo with respect to rates until the broad tax reform program can be enacted.

The application of this recommendation with respect to possible reductions in taxes may be illustrated by the following examples: If the reduction were on the order of 10 percent, the revenue effect would be a loss of $4.7 billion, assuming the tax base remains the same; if the progression to the top brackets were cut off at 65 percent, the additional revenue loss would be $112 million. If the reduction were limited to a 12.5 percent overall reduction in present rates, the revenue loss of such reduction applied to the present base would be $5.9 billion, plus an additional loss of $88 million attributable to cutting off the revised top rates at 65 percent.

The administration's proposals for corporate rate revision (including reversal of surtax) and for accelerated payments for certain corporations would, if enacted, produce the net result of an immediate tax outlay for large corporations and a tax decrease for small corporations. It is believed that whatever total reductions in taxes are not absorbed in individual rates should go proportionately to large and small corporations alike. It would seem that the general objective of providing an economic stimulus to the economy by a tax cut would be fostered by providing an immediate cut to corporations who are large employers and purchasers of machinery and equipment as well as small corporations. The increased cash for improvement and expansion, resulting from reduced taxes of corporations, should not be offset by cash demands to put corporations on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph W. Thrower,
Chairman, Section of Taxation.

ELOQUENT ADDRESSES BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished Vice President of the United States—the Honorable Lyndon Johnson—recently delivered two stirring messages that should be read and pondered by every Senator. I found them eloquent and challenging.

On Memorial Day Vice President Johnson delivered what could well qualify as the second Gettysburg Address at memorial services held at Gettysburg. Just as President Lincoln spoke of the great internal struggle that divided the Union one century ago, the Vice President directed his remarks to the continuing struggle that still divides many of our citizens, the unfinished struggle for civil equality for every citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed.

I should like to quote the Vice President's closing sentences:

> Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Can any American say we have not fallen grievously short? We have done so in both North and South. No section of the country can claim any special honors in meeting fully its responsibilities as spelled out in the Emancipation Proclamation.

We have—both the country and Congress—a brief time in which things can still be set right. I hope we do not let this last opportunity slip from our grasp. As the Vice President said so eloquently:

> In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

On June 2, Vice President Johnson also addressed the commencement of MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill., on the "New Horizons of Home." As he has done so eloquently in the past, the Vice President spoke of the great challenges that face America, both domestic and foreign. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the addresses by Vice President Johnson delivered at Gettysburg and MacMurray College be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Memorial Day, Gettysburg, Pa., May 30, 1963

On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen at the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

New Horizons of Home

(Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson prepared for delivery at commencement, MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill., June 2, 1963)

In the first decade of this 20th century, there was a stirring in our country. Americans found themselves dissatisfied with many aspects of the life they led. They also found themselves awakening to new capabilities, new talents, new concepts which, if put to use, might cure the blight and bring a better life.

There was a moment of hesitation in the Nation, as many were reluctant to reach for the new and better life because to do so meant letting go what was familiar even though undesirable.

In this climate, an American poet, Edward Arlington Robinson, wrote three lines which say as much about Americans now as about our countrymen when the century began.

> "We lack the courage to be where we are—
> We love too much to travel on old roads,
> To triumph on old fields."

We have come to such a time again today.

For you—and your 500,000 fellow members of the class of 1963—this is the most important fact facing you in your graduation year.

There is much all about us in American life with which we are dissatisfied. At the same time, all of us sense—even if we do not clearly and fully understand—that we have new capabilities, new talents, new genius.

But we are not yet reaching for the new. We are not yet bringing our greater abilities to bear on meeting our greater needs. We dwell on our least weakness at the moment of our greatest strength. We are more masters of the future than of the past but we allow the hand of the past to rest heavily upon us.

> "We lack the courage to be where we are—
> We love too much to travel on old roads,
> To triumph on old fields."

We stand today nearer the three-quarter mark of the 20th century than to the midpoint of the century. While we have hardly digested the 1950's, the 1970's and the 1980's are being placed before us. Much more than we realize, the dimensions of America are changing—and the dimensions of our domestic responsibilities are changed accordingly.

Today there are 180 million of us.

Before most of you become 40, there will be 260 million of us.

By 1980 you will be living in a nation of 100 million more Americans than when you were born.

What we most need to realize is that these relatives of ours—and the responsibilities they bring with them—are not awaiting our convenience to arrive. We don't have a month or a year or a quarter century to straighten the house and get the guest room in order. Our future is coming in on the afternoon train and plane—today and every day.

Our population over 65 increases by 1,000 every day. Our population of 16-year-olds increases by 20,000 every week. Our need for new jobs increases by more than 200,000 every month. Our school enrollment grows by nearly 1.5 million every year.

Our challenge, our responsibility, our American future is here—now. Our choice is not when we act—our only choice is what we do.

In the early 1900's—during the period I have mentioned—one of the national magazines made the observation, "To stay where you are in this country, you have to keep moving." Times have not changed.

When Americans aren't talking politics, there is very little difference among us about the kind of life we want in this country for all of our people. We don't want slums and sweatshops. We don't want poorhouses and potters' fields. We may not want the other fellow to be richer than we are but we don't really want anyone to be poor or sick or unemployed or denied justice and opportunity because of his color and his creed. But if 260 million Americans are going to stay where 180 million of us are now, we have to keep moving.

The question is do our public programs and private attitudes and social patterns permit us to move as we must—or is the hand of the past resting too heavily upon us?

In our public programs, a nation at the threshold of the 21st century is in many sectors bound to policies, practices, and concepts originated in and for the late 19th century or very early 20th century.

This is true of our Federal laws governing competition, credit, banking, transportation, regulation of monopoly, and other areas. It is true of our local tax structures supporting public education—the costs of which have increased a hundredfold since 1900.

As every automobile owner knows, our cities—where three-fourths of the people live—are still built around street patterns laid out before the automobile for the convenience of horses and mules.

Much this same pattern is present in our private sector—in industry, commerce, finance, labor, all aspects of our society. We have not merely preserved the past, we have embalmed it and are keeping it in our parlor.

At today's pace, the sum of human knowledge is being doubled every decade. On a relative basis, the class of 1963 may well be three centuries of learning ahead of the class of 1933. But we are asking a generation capable of going to the moon to live in a world ordered and fixed by generations which scarely knew the model T—and that makes no real sense.

"We love too much to travel on old roads, to triumph on old fields."

Throughout the lifetime of your class of 1963, the eyes of America have been turned to the horizons of the world. The day has not come—the day will never come again—when we can look the other way. Isolation is dead. A responsible nation has buried it—forevermore.

In going out into the world, we carried much that is good with us—high ideals, noble goals, a deeply rooted sense of purpose. But for having gone, we have much more now with which to enrich our own society—more maturity, more wisdom, more faith in ourselves, more dedication to our system. These capabilities we must put to work.

But since the 1930's, we have not had the time or taken the time to make a concerted effort toward enriching and improving our own national life at home. It is difficult to believe that we could not today improve upon the work done 30 years ago.

Our Nation now is strong—the strongest in the world. Our people have never been so universally well educated. The differences in ability and talent among our regions has never been so small. As a people and as a nation, we have capacities we did not have when last we were doing our domestic homework.

We have lived through times of awful dread. We have groped our way toward free world unity along the overhanging ledge of nuclear war. That peril has not ended—nor will it end soon.

Our enemies abroad are implacable. The destructive elements of hate and suspicion among us at home are relentless. We must not underestimate either danger—nor compromise with either, nor appease either.

America will neither be pulverized by Communists nor demoralized by extremists. America will still be thriving when the last chains of communism have rusted into dust.

Americans know this. In this springtime of 1963, the American spirit is not cowering in terror or quaking with doubt. There is an unmistakable quickening in the forward stride of a confident nation and a confident people. It is not coincidence that this comes as we attend to our homework.

We have done our homework on space. We have come from far behind in space to shake off the needless anxiety produced by past neglect. We are doing our homework on governmental reform. We are attending to the reform required of our outmoded and out-of-date Federal revenue policies. We are applying ourselves more energetically to the problem in the lives of our people—and the hand of the past is resting less heavily upon us.

The lesson is inescapable—just as the prospect for the future is unmistakable. A stronger America, a wiser America, a more capable America will, by broadening the horizons of home, add to its strength to lead freedom toward broader horizons in the world.

You of the class of 1963 will not be a stay-at-home generation or a runaway generation. The world will be your home and you will do its work everywhere. But it is possible to believe you will have a special part in a new age for your own country—an age when a mature, wiser, responsible America will fulfill its finest hour.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am happy to know that the Senator from Minnesota has placed in the RECORD the truly great speech delivered by Vice President JOHNSON at Gettysburg on Memorial Day. I had planned to place the speech in the RECORD later today, but I am delighted to join with the Senator from Minnesota now in having it printed in the RECORD.

Few really great speeches are delivered in any year. In my judgment, the speech delivered by the Vice President of the United States at Gettysburg on Memorial Day is the greatest speech on the civil rights issue that has been delivered in this country in the last quarter century.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I could not pay a higher or more deserved tribute to the Vice President's speech than that. It will go down in American oratorical history.

As is always the case in any period of time, when the compilation of great speeches of this particular period is published, the speech delivered by the Vice President at Gettysburg on the civil rights issue will be an important one in such a compilation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I, too, read the very moving speech delivered by Vice President JOHNSON at Gettysburg. I wholeheartedly concur in the sentiments expressed by the two Senators. The speech will go down in history as one of the truly great speeches of our time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Archie N. Hain, to be postmaster at Wellington, Colo., and Jay H. Woolhiser, to be postmaster at Three Bridges, N.J.; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 10 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to be retired, and 53 nominations of flag and general officers for appointments and promotions in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from California.

The nominations are as follows:

William H. Klenke, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps Reserve, for appointment in the Marine Corps;

Lt. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Theodore William Parker, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President to serve in the grade of general;

Maj. Gens. Harold Keith Johnson, Army of the United States, and Creighton William Abrams, Jr., Army of the United States (brigadiers general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, to serve in the grades of lieutenants general;

Lt. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to serve in the grade of lieutenant general;

Gen. Samuel E. Anderson (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and sundry other officers, to be placed on the retired list;

Vice Adm. George F. Beardsley, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

James W. Kelly, of the Chaplain Corps of the Regular Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral; and

Brig. Gen. John Farnsworth Smoller, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Army of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I also report favorably the nominations of approximately 10,000 officers, for promotions and appointments in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades of colonel and commander, and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The nominations are as follows:

Elmond H. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Michael W. Acker, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Robert O. Beals, Jr., and sundry other graduates from the Navy Enlisted Scientific Education program, for assignment in the Navy;

John Z. Fichtner, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Louis N. Anciaux, and sundry other graduates from the Navy Enlisted Scientific Education program, for assignment in the Navy;

Oliver K. Jones, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, from the temporary disability retired list;

Michael R. Caporale, Jr., and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

James R. Moyers, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for permanent assignment in the Navy.

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Crockett, of Nebraska, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Strong, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN LUMBER ABOARD FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a flood of Canadian lumber continues to arrive in U.S. Atlantic coast ports aboard foreign-flag vessels. Records of waterborne shipments from British Columbia reveal that our northern neighbors are moving lumber in record quantities into this domestic market. British Columbia shipments of more than 93 million board feet in April brought the 4-month Canadian total to 378 million board feet, compared to 376 million board feet in the same period last year.

Meanwhile, cargo mills of Washington, Oregon, and California shipped 57 million board feet to the Atlantic market in April, for a 4-month total of 165 million board feet, compared to 177 million board feet a year ago. The 4-month figure for Canadian shipments is the largest ever moved by water to the Atlantic coast market. The 4-month total for U.S. west coast cargo mills is the lowest since the wartime suspension of lumber shipments during World War II.

The big upturn in British Columbia shipments and the dropoff in west coast shipments coincides with the lowering of foreign charter rates to Canadian shippers, while U.S. merchant marine rates to west coast shippers have remained fixed. This shipping cost difference, which has the effect of a tariff against west coast shippers in our domestic market, averages $12 to $14 per thousand board feet.

Mr. President, I cite these figures to illustrate the basis on which members of the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon recently made a decision to adopt House Joint Memorial 16. This memorial urges that the Congress and the President give immediate attention to placement of the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers. Also, the memorial requests that the Congress enact legislation suspending the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, the so-called Jones Act, with respect to the intercoastal transportation of lumber. Some weeks ago, I introduced S. 1050, a bill which would give effect to the action requested by the Oregon Legislature.

On behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I ask consent for the text of House Joint Memorial 16 to be included in the RECORD, with my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

To His Excellency the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*

"(1) That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary to, placement of the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities.

"(2) That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation suspending the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), with respect to the intercoastal transportation of lumber.

"(3) The Secretary of State shall send copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation."

HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think even a casual reading of the press of today will indicate that topic A, major national issue A, is now that of civil rights. One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation is, I think, high time that this should be the case.

For many years I have participated in this struggle; and I am in it now in many details. I say a few words on this subject today only because it seems to me that the issue is now becoming critical and that therefore we should have it in focus in its totality.

I understand that the President will send to us a message asking for civil rights legislation far greater in consequence than the three measures—one dealing with voting, one dealing with desegregation in public schools, and one dealing with extension of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—which he thought adequate for us at the beginning of this Congress. It is high time that he did so, Mr. President, for many of us were very critical of the inadequacy of those measures.

The members of my party in the Senate are having a conference tomorrow morning to discuss their policy on the burning issue of civil rights. States find their governmental machinery and their consciences sorely tried by the determination of their Negro citizens no longer to accept second-class status.

I speak today only to add emphasis on this matter, because the national issue before us so deeply troubles the conscience of America that it is an acid test of our desires and commitments under the Constitution. It is also an acid test of our capability for leading the world. This is all too little noted. We have the power and the influence to lead; the question is whether we have the moral weight and the moral probity to do it. This issue raises that question.

Mr. President, I believe that this year, 1963, is the year when major civil rights legislation should be passed. Each of our parties, the President and the country must understand that if we undertake a commitment, it may very well, as the very distinguished deputy majority leader said the other day, extend the present session of Congress perhaps to the end of the year. I can never look at my distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], without having ring in my ears the words he has uttered here so often: Our duty is to do the job, no matter how long it takes. So today I emphasize the moral character of the issue as well as its constitutional character, and that we cannot allow ourselves to be swayed, deterred, or intimidated by the fact that it will be a long, hard session and that the issue will be bitterly fought. Tempers may flare. People may become irritated and annoyed. Neither the country nor the Negroes can longer tolerate the situation.

We know that the issue must be dealt with in the Congress.

Now that the issue has boiled up to become the number one issue, Congress must deal with it. I hope very much that my colleagues will be understanding of those like myself and many others who, because of the things that we do and advocate, are committed to the struggle. But I am convinced in the deepest good conscience that the issue must be fought now, for if we do not fight it now, we shall seriously jeopardize both the domestic tranquillity and the international peace leadership of our Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York. I am glad that he plans tomorrow to have the conference on civil rights legislation to which he has referred. In the two great parties there is a vehicle for the expression of points of view of the members of each party in relation to the pledges that the parties made in their 1960 platforms.

After the Senator from Ohio speaks, I shall introduce one civil rights bill. I shall introduce others later. It is important that the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of the Government at least keep pace with the courts, for, in my judgment, the courts have led the way. We in the Congress have failed to fulfill our obligations. We know some of the barriers that must be overcome in connection with the adoption of a legislative program that would have the effect of delivering for the first time to the Negroes of America the Constitution of the United States; for the Constitution of the United States, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, has never been delivered to the Negroes of America. The white people of America have kept it locked up and away from the Negroes.

The Senator has talked about fighting the issue out on the floors of the Congress between now and the end of this session. We had better fight it out on the floors of Congress rather than have it fought out in the streets of the cities of America.

Mr. JAVITS. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his support. We have been friends for years, and I do not think we are ever more deeply locked in association than in relation to matters of the very character of which we are speaking. When the Senator speaks of disorders in the streets of the cities of America, I assure my colleague that what is so deeply troubling to all of us is that he is not speaking alone of the southern cities, but the most populous cities of our Nation—the pride of our Nation—not only in the South, but in the North. The issue is deeply troubling to many of us. We all may not agree, but we all can certainly understand the despair which surrounds a people who for 100 years have not been able to realize and enjoy their fundamental rights as Americans. At long last the issue has broken loose beyond the bounds of containment. Now is the time to deal with it.

PILSEN UPRISING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Saturday marked the 10th anniversary of the heroic revolt of the people of Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, against the tyrannical Communist regime. The Pilsen uprising which flared up on June 1, 1953, was led by the workers of the Skoda plant and was the first revolutionary uprising of the workers against Communist tyranny in the captive nations. The fact that this uprising originated among and was led by workers once again confirmed Masaryk's statement that Communist dictatorship of the proletariat is in fact, dictatorship over the proletariat.

On the morning of June 1, workers left the Skoda plant and started their march through the streets of Pilsen where they were joined by workers from other plants and by the citizens of the city. What had begun as a protest of workers against a currency reform was quickly transformed into an expression of general disgust of the people with the Communist system of political oppression and economic exploitation and an open fight for national freedom and human rights.

The people trampled on the picture of Stalin, displayed the American flag, and swore faithfulness to the political heritage of Thomas Masaryk at his statue. By noon Pilsen was free but completely isolated and unable to withstand the brutal attack of the police corps and military units of the Prague garrison. The demands of the people for freedom and bread were met with the murderous fire of machine guns.

On the 10th anniversary of the memorable and at the same time tragic uprising at Pilsen, the political tensions and unrest within Czechoslovakia are once again becoming apparent to the outside world. Prominent party leaders have been demoted and courageous criticisms of present conditions by writers and poets have appeared. In addition, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet demonstrations were conducted on May Day by a group of students in Prague. Pressures for improvement and change are growing and serious doubts have been raised about the Communist regime's control of Czechoslovakia. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the brave people of Pilsen on the occasion of the anniversary of their heroic uprising and to all of the people of Czechoslovakia who will never resign themselves to the tyrannical regimes of Communist dictatorship and Soviet imperialism and who continually aspire to regain their political freedoms and human dignity.

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, enjoys an enviable status in the thinking of patriotic Americans. It has withstood assault from lesser figures for many years. I was particularly happy to see the Houston Chronicle, in an editorial of May 11, take note of Mr. Hoover's guiding genius as head of the Bureau. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

> J. Edgar Hoover's name is synonymous with the initials FBI—Federal Bureau of Investigation. It's also a snarl to the archenemies of the United States and an incantation to kids who play cops-and-robbers. It has been for 40 years.
>
> Hoover's appointment was a stroke of national good fortune that has spanned six Presidential administrations. Under his executive tutelage, the FBI leaped from an obscure bureau of the Justice Department with a few hundred agents to a sprawling but highly efficient network of more than 6,000 special agents.
>
> Along with his genius and dedication, Hoover brought glamour to his law-enforcement body. The FBI belongs to the American people. It is politics-free and its notable record of duty engenders high respect for the law.

DEDICATION OF GENERAL MIHAILOVICH MEMORIAL HOME IN CHICAGO, ILL., ON MAY 31, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in Chicago, Ill., a dedication ceremony took place on May 31, 1963. The former guerrilla soldiers of the Yugoslav Army in the homeland during World War II dedicated national committee headquarters to the name of their wartime leader and supreme commander, General of the Army Draza Mihailovich, the man who was the first guerrilla leader in then conquered Europe; the man who was described in America as "Balkan eagle," "The Robin Hood of Serbia," and the "white hope."

The significance of the contribution by General Mihailovich and his forces for the delayed German military operations and of the final victory of our Nation in World War II, as well as the tragic consequences of his abandonment by the Western democracies undoubtedly justifies my commemoration of this great hero and martyr today. On the other hand, the Senate of the United States, upon recommendation of the present administration, will discuss in the near future once again the question of the most-favored-nation clause for the Communist regime of today's Yugoslavia. Consequently, this intention of mine does not seem only justified; it is, in my opinion, a logical consequence of the responsibility of a Member of the Congress of the United States.

History is a teacher of peoples, says a very old proverb. With respect to this philosophy and the case of General Mihailovich, it seems necessary to ascertain whether we, of the free world and the United States as its leader, have learned something from the tragedy of General Mihailovich, our stanchest ally of the war period. With deep regret, my answer, like that of all those worried for the future of democracy, must be in the negative. And, by commemorating General Mihailovich today, let me prove this regrettable conclusion in the most concise way.

Like Gen. Charles de Gaulle 2 years earlier, thus General Mihailovich in April 1941, when his own government and general staff accepted the capitulation to Hitler's hordes, General Mihailovich like Leonidas at Thermopylae had to say:

> Capitulation? I do not know what capitulation is. I have served in the army for many years, but I never heard this word.

All Allied commanders without exception have had only praise for General Mihailovich and his daring men, as President Roosevelt called them. Let me mention here only the most famous of them—Dwight D. Eisenhower, then the Allied Supreme Commander; Field Marshal Alan Brook; Air Marshal Tedder; General Auchinleck; Admiral Harwood; Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

However, the highest praise and admission regarding the value of his role and contribution was given by Hitler himself by saying:

> Having in view the danger contained in Mihailovich's movement, I have already, in anticipation of all eventualities, issued orders for the destruction of all his supporters on the territory occupied by my troops. The liquidation of Mihailovich's movement at the present time will no longer be an easy matter because of the forces he has at his disposal (February 16, 1943).

Although such orders were given by Hitler, and alike by Mussolini, General Mihailovich's movement was not destroyed. He fought and persevered although the Allies as Mr. Churchill admitted:

> We were not able to send any aid or supplies except a few droppings from airplanes.

General Mihailovich never ceased to fight and to help our military plans against the occupiers. And, even when abandoned by us General Mihailovich continued to save our airmen, who were brought down by the German flak-artillery. Many hundreds of them have to thank General Mihailovich and his forces, who regardless of their own losses and German revenge against the civilian population, returned these hundreds of American sons to our country.

To its own shame and sorrow the Western World in silence accepted the Communist thesis of General Mihailovich's crime. But, what actually was the crime of this courageous warrior? Col. Robert H. McDowell, the last chief of our liaison mission in General Mihailovich's headquarters testified on this subject as follows:

> The real crime of which General Mihailovich is accused is that, in the minds of 80 percent of the Yugoslav population, he became and remains the symbol of the simple, sturdy Yugoslav peasant resistance to tyranny, foreign and domestic.

For this crime, and for this crime alone General Mihailovich was slandered, persecuted, tried, sentenced, and murdered by his and our adversaries and enemies, the Communists of Yugoslavia.

Mihailovich's only crime was that he was a devoted friend of the West and an enemy of the Communists.

The living presence of Mihailovich alone in Yugoslavia would have made a Communist government impossible. The people inspired by this hero would have routed Tito and his henchmen.

A frightening crime was perpetrated against this legendary hero and his native country by the shortsightedness of the naive leaders of the Western world. They treated Mihailovich differently than Communist Tito—our foe and the foe of Mihailovich. As David Martin stated, for example:

> When Lt. Col. William Deakin and Brig. Fitzroy MacLean came back from Tito's headquarters, bringing with them high eulogies of the partisan commander, they were permitted to make public statements to the British press. But when Colonel Bailey, Colonel Hudson, Brigadier Armstrong, and the other members of the British mission to Mihailovich returned to England, they were placed under quarantine. In the United States, Lt. Col. Louis Huot and several other officers who were sympathetic to Tito were also given complete freedom of speech. But when Lt. Col. Albert Seitz and Capt. Walter Mansfield, who had gone into Yugoslavia to report on Mihailovich, returned to Washington in early 1944, not even Members of the House Military Affairs Committee were permitted to see them (New Leader of Apr. 13, 1946).

Though wronged and the victim of criminal misconduct, General Mihailovich did not change his feelings of loyalty toward this country. He is one to whom the verse of Samuel Butler is most applicable:

> For loyalty is just the same,
> Whether it win or lose the game.

The wartime leaders of the Western World, unfortunately, have chosen to support Communist Tito, and not Mihailovich. In this way they helped sovietization of Yugoslavia, although Tito assured Mr. Churchill that "as he had stated publicly, he had no desire to introduce the Communist system in Yugoslavia."

What happened later to Yugoslavia is so well known that it is not worthy of repetition.

Western democracies not only supported Tito, but actually saved his skin when Germans made their dessant to Drvar in Bosnia and when the entire partisan movement was on the brink of total destruction. For recognition of such protection and rescue by the British, Tito secretly left for Moscow to receive the final instructions from his master in the Kremlin. Through Mr. Churchill's orders Tito received during 1944, 100,000 rifles; over 50,000 light machineguns and submachineguns; 1,380 mortars; 324,000 mortar bombs; 336,000 bombs; over 97.5 million rounds of small arms ammunition; 700 wireless sets; 1,750,000 suits of battle dress; 260,000 pairs of boots—Fitzroy McLean, "Escape to Adventure," page 359.

Compare the above-mentioned figures with these "few droppings from airplanes" given to General Mihailovich and his forces during the entire period of so-called assistance—from May 1941 to December 1943.

When Tito was expelled from the Cominform, we then hurried to save his skin and his terroristic regime over the peoples of Yugoslavia. Like the British during the war after they supplied Tito with huge quantities of war material, we were very much disturbed with his attitude and statements at the Peace Conference of Belgrade. This reaction of our country was perfectly normal having in mind that we poured practically $2 billion of economic and military aid to Tito, then finding that when Communist Russia violated the agreement on the test treaty, Tito—as the head of the Belgrade Conference of Neutral Nations—uttered not one word against what Red Russia had done. He not only was silent about the Soviet violation of the agreement made with the United States about discontinuing nuclear tests, but he went on to rub salt into the wound by rallying the neutrals against our country.

As human beings we all make errors but we should not be permitted to justify previous errors with new and similar ones.

When we chose Tito and abandoned Mihailovich, we offended the virtue of loyalty, faithfulness, and justice, and threw our lot with a Communist whose true love lies not with the United States but with the Communist bloc. Moreover, if we committed wrongs against General Mihailovich while he lived, we should not compound those wrongs by committing new offenses against his memory and ideals, against ourselves and our country.

From his unknown grave General Mihailovich is reminding the entire free world, and especially the Members of Congress that by helping Tito's Communist government, we are helping the masters in the Kremlin prepare the final defeat of democracies and the victory of communism.

General Mihailovich's soldiers and followers, who are now loyal American citizens, and who dedicated the General Mihailovich Memorial Home in Chicago, are to be especially commended. For they laid down a physical and most demonstrative link between their famous leader and supreme commander, a great soldier of liberty, with the spirit and soil of this country of liberty; and particularly because the General Mihailovich Memorial Home will be a reminder to future American generations of one of our most loyal allies.

To those who dedicated the memorial home in Chicago to the noble name of their wartime leader and supreme commander, I wish to say the following:

In the future be proud as you were in the past of your leader and supreme commander, General Mihailovich. Continue to follow his way as you did in the past, and be sure that sooner or later the injustice he suffered will be corrected. History corrects its errors and lifts just men out of their graves. An old soldier never dies. The memory of General Mihailovich, gallant warrior, great patriot, and great man, will live eternally.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL AND JEAN ULEN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues the principals of a distinguished educational achievement—Paul Victor Ulen and Jean Grigor Ulen, husband and wife, teachers of art at the West Technical High School in Cleveland, Ohio, who this month are completing 40 years of exemplary service to their community. They have excelled as educators in the great tradition, revealing to many the quickening quality of distinction in the arts. Two hundred and eighty scholarship awards attest their achievement. Artists and scholars by providence, adepts of the Cleveland School of Art attending the Slade School, University of London, 1923 and 1928, both tolled the Laureate Bell. Ably they have, these four decades, fostered and presented the classic traditions of cultural thought to an appreciative audience. Their students have become artists, educators, and curators; several being artists of international stature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Helen Borsick, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and another article by Marjorie Schuster, of the Cleveland Press, describing further the activities of this remarkable couple be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 28, 1963]

Art Teachers Stage Late Show

(By Helen Borsick)

Paul and Jean Ulen, who have been teaching art for 40 years and are about to retire, are having an exhibit of oils, watercolors and drawings in Circle Gallery. It is their first major show and so is a belated debut. It also is a kind of testament to a point of view, with respect to the fine draughtsmanship, observation and honesty that the Ulens have impressed upon thousands of students.

The West Technical High School art department under the Ulens' direction has become notable both for the high level of technical proficiency it produces generally and for the achievements of its students.

They include, to mention a few in commercial, fine and administrative art and teaching here, Elmer Novotny, Charles Lakofsky, Clarence Van Duzer, Paul Riba, George Dorsey, Alan and Richard Chiara, Leonard Becker, Edward Henning, William Ward, Robert Woide, William McGill, William Scheele.

One thing the Ulen alumni have in common is that they worked their heads off, back at West Tech where a student could major in and give half his time to art. And while there certainly were philosophic asides, the Ulens' secret in turning out packs of good artists was 4 years of steady drill in drawing and painting, lettering, basic design. An engineer, Ulen says by way of analogy, has to know his mathematics.

Bedrock in the Ulen school is a frank distaste for contemporary—either abstract or no-object—art. ("Oh, it has possibilities for bath mats and such.") Students with an urge to experiment are told they can do as they like—after they leave West Tech.

The Ulens consider contemporary art a dead end street filled with imitators of imitators, and artists who have just plain lost the way. And the public, they fear has been tricked.

The vocabulary of modern art, Mrs. Ulen said, is "the biggest hoax of all time"—pure mumbo jumbo that people believe because they don't know what it means. Same as the art. If a picture looks like a blob of nothing, don't worry, the thing to say is "Such sensitivity, such depth, such feeling."

There have been times over the years when the Ulens felt lonesome in these views but they say things are looking up. People are catching on; the wind's beginning to change; a Rembrandt brought $2.3 million.

The Ulen exhibit—and there are some very handsome drawings—opens with a preview 3 to 5 p.m. today and will be on view through May 12. Works are moderately priced. Circle Gallery is open 1 to 5 p.m. daily except Monday.

[From the Cleveland Press, May 2, 1963]

Former Students To Dine and Toast the Ulens, Now Leaving West Tech

(By Marjorie Schuster)

Teachers Paul and Jean Ulen are experts in the pleasant art of togetherness.

For 25 years they've taught art in adjoining classrooms on the third floor of West Tech High School.

Now, together, they are about to retire to a life of travel and painting and just resting.

Ulen, West Tech art department head, has been at the school 40 years. His wife taught at other Cleveland schools before her husband became her boss at West Tech.

Many of the hundreds of students they have taught will honor the Ulens Saturday at a tribute dinner in Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland.

"We try never to lose track of any of them," Ulen said.

This semester he has 140 students and his wife 70. They are especially proud of the fact that 110 West Tech pupils currently are majoring in art. But commercial art jobs, they report, are scarcer and scarcer in the Cleveland area.

In style, the Ulens themselves are traditionalists.

"Nature is the basis of all art," explained Mrs. Ulen. "Abstract art is a hoax and a fad. The abstractionists have run themselves into a blind alley."

The Ulens used to show many of their works in the Cleveland May Show. But they don't enter it any more.

"It's tragic—only a craft show now," continued Mrs. Ulen. "Most people really don't understand the abstractionists, but they're afraid to say they can't really see the meaning of all those blobs and squiggles."

They are showing their own paintings and drawings through May 12 in a special exhibit at the Circle Gallery, Euclid Avenue and Mayfield Road.

The Ulens will keep their home at 15312 Clifton Boulevard, Lakewood, but will continue to spend summers in Michigan.

They'll also travel abroad this year, making London the jumping-off place for trips to places they've never seen—like Egypt and Greece.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL R. FAIR

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a devoted public servant, Mr. Russell R. Fair in this year of 1963 will retire as superintendent of the Richmond Heights, Ohio, local school district. Thirty-five years ago he was one of two teachers in the Richmond Heights Village School which consisted of 3 rooms and 50 pupils in grades 1 through 8.

In his service to Richmond Heights, he occupied respectively the positions of teacher, principal, and superintendent.

He has been a devoted, diligent, and efficient teacher and official.

He will be honored by his fellow citizens for the faithful service which he gave to his community in the last 3½ decades. He will be remembered tenderly and respectfully by the pupils whom he taught and guided. His imprint upon the community educationally, socially, and morally will be his permanent monument.

THE MORAL LEADERSHIP OF AMERICAN RADIOLOGISTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this day and age when there seems to be a feeling among the people that when a problem arises we should let the Government handle it; it is most refreshing to have come across a desk in a senatorial office a program devised for the good of all Americans by private enterprise.

I refer to the education program which is being sponsored in many communities throughout the United States by the American College of Radiology. The American College of Radiology formed a committee on radiologic aspects of disaster planning in 1962 with the purpose of preparing radiologists for a responsibility to provide expert knowledge of radiation hazards and precautions under emergent conditions. They have prepared kits which are made available to radiologists in the communities of the country. Because of the significance of the effort which this group expended they have been joined in that effort by both the Radiological Society of North America and the American Roentgen Ray Society.

Through a series of formal and informal discussions, the Committee on Radiologic Aspects of Disaster Planning of the American College of Radiology has digested current thinking in the fields of radiation protection and civil defense enabling them to provide a tightly packed kit of basic information. With this material, a radiologist should be able to provide a highly authoritative input of expert knowledge for local disaster planning programs in almost all our communities. This can be done through parent-teacher associations, church groups, luncheon groups, and any other civic minded organizations who are working within their respective communities to educate their citizens to the dangers which would exist if a nuclear war should come to pass.

In addition, much of the material will be useful in evaluation of peacetime radiological protection factors and hazards. Several items available to these radiological experts make for useful and informative luncheon speeches to lay audiences enabling them to counteract many unfounded rumors on radiology.

I want to commend this fine group for its leadership in this highly technical field. All Americans can be proud of the American College of Radiology because it saw a need and did not wait for the Government to come forward to meet a problem so real in this world in which we live today. I am especially proud that a prominent and highly talented South Dakota radiologist has participated in this venture. All South Dakotans compliment Dr. James P. Steele, of Yankton, S. Dak., for the leadership which he has taken in this field in our State and as a part of this program for all radiologists throughout the world.

Mr. President, in the May 1962 issue of Radiology, a publication of the Radiological Society of North America, there appeared an editorial authored by Dr. Charles G. Campbell, of La Jolla, Calif., entitled "The Moral Leadership of the American Radiologist in a Free World's Hope for Survival." I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at this point with my remarks and I commend it for the reading of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL LEADERSHIP OF THE AMERICAN RADIOLOGIST IN A FREE WORLD'S HOPE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Charles G. Campbell, M.D.)

At no other time in the history of man have so many presumably informed people in a free society such as ours gone peacefully on their way for so long a time, with their eyes closed, refusing to think, talk, or act as a group about the greatest threat of the ages, the possible annihilation of man. For years—after the first glimpse of the overwhelming dangers of nuclear weapons and the realization that our not-so-friendly neighbors now possessed these same horrible means of annihilation—we have either (1) tried not to think about it, (2) have thought about it but through totally false assumptions decided that, should we be attacked, there would be no hope for survival, (3) have shrugged it off as another complete responsibility of the Federal Government, looking to it to save us by constructing shelters for us all—"if these shelters would protect us, let them take care of us and build them for us"—or (4) have taken the information which, on a limited civil defense budget, the U.S. Government has been putting out for years, enrolled in a course, read the literature, and begun preparing.

As physicians and radiologists we know more about the effects of radiation than any other group in the world. Yet, what have we done, as a group or individually, to back up the efforts to arouse the American public from its lethargy and fantastic fatalistic attitude (that our enemy has gleefully applauded as our weakness) that, if the nuclear peril should come, our entire population would be no more. Is there one among us who does not shield himself—with confidence—in his daily exposures to the powers of radiation? The know-how we are aware of as no other group. In the everyday practice of our specialty it takes a man who is skilled in this field to control both the exposure to his patient and to himself. If the horrors of lung cancer can be altered by elimination of smoking, our worthy colleagues do not hesitate, as a group, to announce such convictions. If polio can be prevented by vaccination, oral or otherwise, our medical conferees are not afraid to promote mass vaccination programs in the press, in public forums, or on radio and TV. If heart trouble may be associated with cholesterol levels and can be altered by diet and other means, the cardiologists do not suffer pangs of conscience for advancing these theories. Not all, of course, can be saved from heart disease, but the point is that many can and many will be. The physician feels it is his moral responsibility to his fellow man to back up the findings of the scientists by adding to the hopes which they offer the emphasis of his personal prestige as a medical practitioner and his personal knowledge in his own specialized field.

Slowly the information has filtered out from experts in the field of nuclear war that perhaps our people can survive a nuclear attack if they are properly prepared and protected. Heretofore this has in many instances been an unpopular subject, as perhaps were open discussions about treating social disease. Undoubtedly, in days past, leprosy and the plague were mentioned on a hushed note for fear of panicking the world if rumor of a threatened outbreak leaked out. But it was the leaders in the field of medicine who backed up public health measures and thus encouraged the people in their communities to prevent the outbreak of such diseases at local levels. The prestige of these American doctors was at as high a level then, as it is and should be now. They did not expect Uncle Sam to do everything for each community, since each community had its own problems. Are we doing our part in our disinterested silence, in failing to have the courage as a group to stand firmly and strongly behind the earliest stages of a program, which, unless it is carried through from the bottom up, may be the end of a way of life we have all believed in? Most of us are willing to die as soldiers for our country. But is it right to watch quietly from the background and remain impassive on the sidelines to the threat to our country of the mass disease of the effects of nuclear war? Fallout radiation looms like a terrible, uncontrollable monster, so that the very thought of it immobilizes our people in a state of fear—fear that there is no hope, fear that we may bargain away the existence of the free world rather than heed the cries of the ever so few who preach the positive ideas of preventive measures.

It is the responsibility of each of us to make the effort in his own community, at each local level, to encourage adequate preparedness. A few of us have disregarded the pessimistic traits of our misinformed neighbors and have individually planned or executed the construction of protection against a mass attack from our obvious enemy. Some on local levels have even set up groups to study plans for community shelters—plans which would protect even more than the few individual families who already have their own protection. We have helped organize teaching programs for the communities, for the school and PTA, expedited approval of city plans for shelters, and attempted to have legislation passed to make shelters tax exempt.

But where have we been in this embryonic stage of mass education which, without our support, has in some instances encouraged the attitude of let the Government do it for us? The Federal Government, with all of its many efficiencies, is still made up of the mass of the people who are represented by the elected few. The red tape, the apprehension of voting billions in taxes and appropriations, and the machinery required for operation of an adequate program leave many with a natural anxiety over the growing powers of centralization. The Office of Civilian Defense is financed by the Federal Government as a stimulus for activity among the local and State governments. In each community civil defense is only as good as the people in the community who run it and only as effective in disseminating information as the mental and moral climate of that community desires it to be. It should therefore be a matter of conscience for us as physicians and radiologists to assume a role of leadership in a positive program of intelligently assisting in the education of the people of our own areas in respect to the real possibilities of protection by local efforts against a mass suicide caused by ignorance and apathy. Through calm attitudes we can give our Nation hope. By educating ourselves to both the weaknesses and strengths of our local civil defense and thereupon encouraging our own city and State leaders to put forward every effort, we can show our enemy that we will as a people fight not to die but to live. They cannot bury us. The greatest, most subtle weapon of the Communist world is what they consider our greatest weakness—apathy of our civilian population, a fatalistic philosophy that nothing can be done, and lack of confidence in our leadership and in ourselves. We will not sit back and wait and see what—if anything—the Federal Government is able to do and will do.

It is accepted by many today that the Russians will use any means to take us over. The worry, and rightly so, that she is trying every propaganda means to capture our minds, plant Communists in every vulnerable spot, is justified. We have confidence in our police force, military services, and FBI to handle this aspect. We find ourselves reexamining our heretofore complacent educational efforts in alerting our people to the strength and values and deep morality of a free democratic life that—like our wives—we have lived with so long that we take them for granted. We build up our arms as we have been forced to do; we compete constantly in the missile race; we are beginning to realize that power is the only thing that the Soviet understands and respects.

I am seeking another weapon. It will be not only passive but also aggressive. But wait. They are far ahead of us in one particular area of power; they can afford to rattle atomic weapons and scare us because, like the third little pig who built his house of brick, so that not all huffing and puffing of his enemy could blow it down, the Soviet has made sure of the safety of its house—underground. It has a respect for the dread of nuclear attack and radiation effects. We can do the same—our voices can help. The prestige of our group is such that, by taking action in our own communities to see that perhaps not all need be lost from the holocaust of nuclear malady, by inoculation of the idea of our preparedness and hope, we can make our people realize that they can survive as a nation and rebuild our free society should the disaster of nuclear warfare fall upon the world.

THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at 10 o'clock today the World Food Congress was formally opened at our State Department here in Washington. Delegates from countries in all parts of the world will meet from now until June 18 to discuss the problems of world hunger, nutrition, and agriculture.

This historic Congress represents the mid-point highlight in the 5-year freedom from hunger campaign launched by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in 1960.

The Congress opens on the 20th anniversary of the great International Food Conference called by President Franklin Roosevelt at Hot Springs, Va., in 1943. It was at that meeting of some 20 years ago that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N. was born.

Since that time the FAO has led the way toward an intelligent, constructive international attack on the problem of world hunger.

The people of the United States have from the first heartily endorsed the high purpose of the FAO. We have underscored our own great concern with the hunger of the world through our own unilateral food-for-peace effort. The food-for-peace effort which I was privileged to direct during 1961 and 1962 is now headed by Mr. Richard Reuter, the very capable former director of CARE. Mr. Reuter is advised by a citizens Food for Peace Council under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul Willis, of New York City.

The United States is cooperating with the FAO Freedom from Hunger campaign through a private Freedom From Hunger Foundation whose honorary chairman is former President Harry Truman and whose president is Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. Other officers and members of the board of trustees include the following:

Robert R. Nathan, first vice president; Thomas M. Ware, second vice president; Alvin Shapiro, chairman; Douglas R. Smith. treasurer; Arthur C. Ringland, secretary; Richard Schifter, legal counsel; Clarence G. Adamy; Miss Marian Anderson; Dwayne Andreas; Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold; Homer Brinkley; Detlev W. Bronk; Thomas C. Butler; Harry B. Caldwell; Philip V. Cardon; Mrs. Raymond Clapper; Lucius D. Clay; Russell Coleman; Norman Cousins; Howard A. Cowden; Matthew Culligan; Burton A. Daugherty; Aled P. Davies; Dr. Novice G. Fawcett; Tom Gill; Dr. Grace Goldsmith; J. Peter Grace; Fowler Hamilton; Mrs. Vance Hartke; Frederick W. Hatch; Fred Heinkel; Mrs. Charles Hymes; Charles E. Jackson; Eric Johnston; Marvin Jones; Burton Joseph; Edgar F. Kaiser; George Killion; Mrs. Albert D. Lasker; Herbert H. Lehman; Murray D. Lincoln; Rev. Henry McCanna; George McGovern; George Meany; Raymond W. Miller; Herschel D. Newsom; Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn; Dr. F. D. Paterson; Walter P. Reuther; J. Louis Reynolds; David Sarnoff; H. Christian Sonne; Lionel Steinberg; Adlai E. Stevenson; Herbert J. Sudgen; Arthur Hays Sulzberger; Edward E. Swanstrom; Charles P. Taft; Howard M. Teaf, Jr.; S. G. Tipton; Harold A. Vogel; Dr. LeRoy Voris; Dr. Oliver S. Willham; Paul S. Willis; Mrs. Arthur L. Zepf.

It is significant that the purposes of the FAO and the freedom from hunger campaign were given new force by the special interest of Pope John XXIII, whose death yesterday deprived the world of its most effective voice for peace and brotherhood. In a historical encyclical, "Mater et Magistra" Pope John said:

> We cannot fail to express our approval of the efforts of the institute known as FAO which concerns itself with the feeding of peoples and the improvement of agriculture.

The pontiff added:

> Perhaps the most pressing question of our day concerns the relationship between economically advanced commonwealths and those that are in process of development. The former enjoy the conveniences of life; the latter experience dire poverty. Yet, today men are so intimately associated in all parts of the world that they feel, as it were, as if they are members of one and the same household. Therefore, the nations that enjoy a sufficiency and abundance of everything may not overlook the plight of other nations whose citizens experience such domestic problems that they are all but overcome by poverty and hunger, and are not able to enjoy basic human rights. This is all the more so, inasmuch as countries each day seem to become more dependent on each other. Consequently, it is not easy for them to keep the peace advantageously if excessive imbalances exist in their economic and social conditions.
>
> Mindful of our role of universal father, we think it opportune to stress here what we have stated in another connection: "We all share responsibility for the fact that populations are undernourished. Therefore, it is necessary to arouse a sense of responsibility in individuals and generally, especially among those more blessed with this world's goods."

It was my high privilege to have a private audience with His Holiness, the Pope, in March of 1962 at the end of a worldwide food-for-peace tour. I shall always remember the warmth of his spirit as he spoke about responsibility of those who are blessed with abundance to share that abundance with those in need.

Mr. President, it is my urgent hope that my colleagues in the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives will attend as many sessions as possible of the food conference now in progress. We need to hear the insights of our brothers in other parts of the globe and we need to contribute of our own knowledge to better understanding of the problems of food and agriculture.

There is no more urgent task before mankind than to banish hunger from the face of the earth. We now have the technical capacity to do that. Will we match our technological capacity by an equal demonstration of moral and political strength?

Mr. President, the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, who has inspired the world by his lofty vision and steadfast purpose is Dr. B. R. Sen, of India, former Ambassador of his country to the United States. Dr. Sen delivered a provocative and profound address on the challenge of hunger at the National Press Club yesterday noon. He was followed last night by Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland who delivered a historic address at the State Department commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Hot Springs International Food Conference.

It is my good fortune to be a personal friend and admirer of both Dr. Sen and Secretary Cleveland. They were a special source of inspiration to me during the time that I was working directly with the Nation's food-for-peace effort. I was also privileged to work closely with both of these dedicated men and with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in the early stages of the development of the world food program which now makes possible the utilization of food through the FAO and the United Nations system.

Mr. President, because of the significance and the excellence of the addresses by Dr. Sen and Secretary Cleveland, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a biographical sketch of Dr. Sen.

There being no objection, the addresses and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF HUNGER

Mr. President, members and guests of the Press Club, it is a great privilege for me to be invited to address the distinguished members of this great institution. I have had the opportunity of appearing before you in another capacity in the past, and I am, therefore, fully conscious of the highly discriminating audience that I face. Indeed, most of you know more about the great issues of our day than any guest speaker you invite. If I have responded to your invitation with enthusiasm it is because in the most formidable task which faces mankind today in fighting hunger and misery, the United Nations have in you one of their greatest allies.

Twenty years ago, to the very day, when the world was locked in a mortal combat, a great President of this country called the nations together to the Hot Springs conference to draft the charter of FAO in order to lay the foundation for an enduring peace. During the last 20 years, while science has increasingly developed man's capacity to remove hunger and want, the extent of the latter has nevertheless continued to grow, due largely to the unprecedented rate of population growth facilitated by the advance of medical science. Never before has it been possible to produce more food on an acre of land, yet never before have the victims of hunger been more numerous in the world.

The "Third World Food Survey" which FAO has just published makes revelations staggering in their starkness. More than one-half of the world's population lives in the Far East on only one-quarter of the world's food supply. Ten to fifteen percent of the world population, that is 300 to 450 million people, live actually below the breadline, and from one-third to one-half of mankind suffer from either undernutrition or malnutrition, or both. This is the measure of the human misery, and of the waste of human resources we are confronted with today. Can physical impairment, moral despair and slow death on so vast a scale be tolerated without undermining the very foundations of an orderly and just society?

You are aware of the view that nothing much can be done to improve the living standards of the poorer countries without some kind of population control. There can be no question that rapid economic and social development would be far more practicable if population increases were substantially smaller than what they are at present. As the experience of the past 15 years has shown the small gains achieved in food production in many developing countries have been wiped out by population growth. However, population stabilization is a highly complex matter, and needs to be looked at from the individual, family, social, economic, political, and religious points of view. In any case, we have to face the fact that at least during the remainder of this century we cannot count very much upon the contribution of population control measures. In the developing societies today, children under 15 years of age tend to constitute between 37 and 42 percent of the total population. While that group is passing through the child-producing ages, natural increase will continue to be high even if the family size is falling. Moreover, falling mortality itself will also tend to increase the proportion of young people, since reductions in death rates will occur mainly among infants and children. Demographic experts believe that under no circumstances will the rate of growth of world population fall below 1.7 percent per year during the next 30 or 40 years, and the probabilities are that it will be exceeded.

We know that the nutritional needs of populations living and working under different climates and conditions must vary. The generally accepted assumption among nutrition scientists today is that in order to avoid hunger and malnutrition an average diet must provide per person per day about 2,400 calories including 70 grams of protein of which not less than 20 grams should be of an animal origin. On this basis it has been calculated that by A.D. 2000, to meet the needs of the population, the supply of food would have to be increased fourfold in Asia and the Far East, between threefold and fourfold in Latin America, threefold in the Near East, and between twofold and threefold in Africa.

Can such increases in food production be achieved at all during the next three or four decades? In theory, yes. The world potentials for increasing food production are very substantial indeed. New lands can be brought under the plough, and yield per unit of land can be substantially increased through intensive cultivation, using improved cultural practices, better seeds, irrigation, fertilizers, pesticides and so on. It is unrealistic, however, to attempt to answer this question for the world as a whole.

In Europe, North America and Oceania, food production exceeds the rate of population growth, and dietary levels are satisfactory. Moreover, due to the advance of science and technology, the capacity to produce is growing. Even though production has been held down, huge stocks of surpluses have piled up, especially in North America. In Europe, surpluses will appear in almost all of their agricultural products by 1965. Obviously, there is no danger of shortages in these regions at the current rates of population growth.

The picture is quite different in the developing regions. In Latin America and Africa, the physical resources are unquestionably ample to meet the estimated increases required. The outcome will depend primarily upon the establishment of progressive and stable governments that are willing and able to mobilize their own resources and make effective use of foreign aid. In the Near East, an increase of production more than three times the present levels would push utilization of resources much closer to the limits set by the technical knowledge presently available. Water being the main limiting factor, there can be a breakthrough if the researches on desalinization at costs economic for irrigation show some success. It is, however, in the Far East where the most serious situation will undoubtedly arise. FAO's study of the Lower Ganges-Brahmaputra Basin has revealed that by a maximum utilization of land and water resources of the area a fourfold increase in crop yields is possible. This is, however, an area where unused potential is substantially above average for the region, and a fourfold increase thus represents the upper limit of expansion in the rest of the region where such ideal conditions do not exist. Unless early steps are taken to plan the optimal use of the existing resources there can be no doubt that serious shortages and even famines will appear before 1980.

Throughout history man's ingenuity has met and overcome challenges which had appeared insuperable. Need we despair if all the nations, rich and poor alike, resolve together to face the present crisis and gear their political and social apparatus accordingly? You may ask what I mean in concrete terms. I shall give you my own ideas.

The real effort, of course, must come from the governments and peoples of the developing countries themselves. For development is essentially an organic process; to be real it must come from within. The forces for development, however, can best be mobilized by giving the first priority to national planning; that is, planning for balanced development of the country's material and human resources, for adapting the social and institutional framework to the successful application of science and technology, and for stimulating savings and investment in improving infrastructure. The process of development will be helped if conditions are created to give hope and incentive to the producer to share in the fruits of his labor, if national and international measures aimed at stabilizing prices of primary products are pursued with genuine enthusiasm. With regard to the latter, I may say that between 1955 and 1961 the loss to those countries which rely for their foreign exchange earnings on the export of primary products has been some $20 billion; this because at the same time as the prices of their primary products declined, they had had to pay increasing prices for manufactured goods they needed. Expansion of international trade in primary products, commodity price agreements, international liquidity of investment funds and compensatory financing of trade in agricultural products, are among the essential requisites for assisting the economic development of developing countries. The World Conference on Trade and Development to be held next year under the auspices of the U.N. family will, we hope, help to establish clearer lines of action to deal with this problem.

Though the main effort for development, as I have said, must come from the governments and peoples of the developing countries themselves, aid in cash, equipment and skills will still play an important catalytic part. The current levels of external aid to the developing countries which now run at about $9 billion a year will need to be substantially raised. The eminent world leaders who, at my invitation, attended a special assembly in Rome on March 14, compared these figures with the global expenditure on armaments amounting to some $150 billion in 1962, and in a joint manifesto they issued, spoke of the immense assistance that even a partial diversion of these funds could give to the world campaign against hunger.

I may say a word here about the food surpluses that are arising in some countries, especially in North America. There are some who believe that these food surpluses alone can solve the worldwide problem of hunger. But the fact is that even if it were possible physically to distribute all the surpluses as outright grant or aid, they could not feed the people in need for more than a few weeks. This is not to say, however, that food aid cannot be a valuable source of assistance to the developing countries. Food aid can help these countries to build food reserves against bad seasons and thus check rising food prices and inflation. It can assist in easing their foreign exchange problem, and can be used as capital for financing labor-intensive projects. It can be of great value in resettlement programs and in meeting rising food demands in urban areas caused by progress in industrialization. On the whole, food aid can play an important role in the economic and social development provided it is integrated in the overall development programs of the receiving countries. Under the multilateral World Food Program, recently set up by the United Nations and FAO, the possibilities of wider utilization of food aid for economic and social development are being currently explored and projects are being developed to that end. In this context a question of policy of a far-reaching character which nations face is to what extent they are prepared to produce for a developmental market in addition to the commercial market; in other words, to carry an excess producing capacity to help the development of the poorer countries.

The greatest need today is for a conscious recognition that no country, any more than an individual, can afford to be an island unto itself, and that an active faith in the togetherness of mankind alone can guide us along the road to survival, peace, and prosperity. The revolution in communications in recent decades has brought races and peoples closer than ever before. But unless it leads to a greater understanding and a more purposeful sharing, it may ironically lead to increasing frictions and disorder. Nowhere is this understanding and cooperation more vital than in the provision for all of the basic needs of life. His Holiness Pope John XXIII—the great and good man for whose recovery universal prayer now rises—in his encyclical letter "Pacem in Terris" defines "the right to life and a worthy standard of living" as one of man's universal, inviolable and inalienable rights, and explains that this right comprises the right to the means which are necessary and suitable for the proper development of life, including primarily food and other necessary goods and services. His Holiness further enjoins that it is not enough to acknowledge and respect every man's right to the means of subsistence; one must also strive to insure that he has actually enough in the way of food and nourishment.

The World Food Congress, sponsored by FAO as an integral part of its freedom-from-hunger campaign, opens here in Washington tomorrow. At this Congress we want to hear a free and frank exchange of views from leading experts in the economics and sociology of hunger from both the developed and developing nations. The main aim of the Congress is to bring into a single focus the viewpoints of statesmen, scientists, social thinkers, economists, administrators, and voluntary workers dedicated to the fight against hunger, so that a consensus may emerge regarding how best to tackle the problem on a global scale.

The task of abolishing hunger is so immense and the obstacles so formidable that even under the most favorable conditions of international cooperation it may take generations to achieve the goal. One essential condition for success is that both national and international effort at the governmental level must be supported and stimulated by the understanding and cooperation of people in every land. In the development of this understanding and cooperation you who represent the press, radio, and television, can make a vital contribution. I consider it my privilege to appear before you today, and to ask for that contribution in an increasing measure.

"THE TOASTED BREADCRUMBS OF THE FUTURE"

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the commemorative dinner in honor of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Food and Agriculture Organization, Washington, D.C., Monday, June 3, 1963)

I

Tonight each of us consumed at these tables as much nourishment as is eaten in a day and a half by more than 50 percent of the people of the world. If we were suddenly to join that less-fortunate half of the human race, our next meal would be a late lunch on Wednesday. And our menu on that occasion would be one small bowl of cooked rice and perhaps a piece of fish about 1 inch square.

You and I wouldn't stand for such treatment. Neither will the world's hungry people—at least not for long. And that is why, 20 years ago today, men and women from 44 countries, exhausted but exhilarated, met in their final plenary session at a mineral water spa in Hot Springs, Va., to approve the final act of an historic meeting.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt had set the tone for their labors in his message to the conference:

"We know * * * that each freedom is dependent upon the others; that freedom from fear, for example, cannot be secured without freedom from want.

* * * * *

"[The nations] must see to it that no hindrances * * * be allowed to prevent any nation or group of citizens within a nation from obtaining the food necessary for health.

"In this and other U.N. conferences we shall be extending our collaboration. Only by working together can we learn to work together, and work together we must and will."

The short history of how we started to work together, in the midst of a great war, is worth this moment of commemoration. Each nation represented at Hot Springs has its own story of how it got there. Let me tell you the story as it looked from Washington at the time.

II

Franklin Roosevelt was mindful of the strictures of John Maynard Keynes that the failure of Versailles and the League of Nations was due to the lack of concrete "ideas * * * for clothing with the flesh of life the commandments which [Woodrow Wilson] had thundered from the White House." So a group of planners under Leo Pasvolsky, a special adviser to the Secretary of State, actually began postwar planning as early as the autumn of 1939.

But President Roosevelt early developed the principle—which he practiced but never preached—that an ultimate pattern of peace must be put together over a period of time out of its major fragments. It was too much, he seemed to feel, to build a peace all at once, in a single stroke of diplomacy, from such a ruin as the Second World War might make of the world.

So in the early months of postwar planning the planning was in bits and pieces, reaching into every specialized corner of the Government. The dynamics of specialist enthusiasm would be used to provide motive power for building the peace—out of building blocks which would take the form of international organizations for special as well as general purposes—for technical as well as political functions.

Thus, over in the Treasury Department, the first planning papers that were to lead to the Bretton Woods Conference, and later the World Bank and Monetary Fund, were drafted early in the war.

Across town in the Public Health Service, doctors dreamed of a World Health Organization.

Elsewhere, university people began talking about a world education agency; the labor movement worked hard to preserve the International Labor Organization, temporarily exiled from Geneva to Montreal; and the forecasters of weather, already organized for almost 70 years in an international organization began the rethinking that found expression in the World Meteorological Organization.

And, as a neophyte in Government, employed in the Department of Agriculture, I remember working on postwar food planning in 1941, several months before the United States was actually engaged in fighting the war we assumed from the first would be won.

But the idea that food would have to play a central part in the building of the peace, and that in a peaceful world every citizen should have enough of it was not confined to Washington.

In wartime London was Stanley Bruce, a former Prime Minister of Australia and Australia's representative in the War Cabinet. With him was F. L. McDougall, son of a one-time Lord Mayor of London, who had gone to Australia, experienced a hard time as a farmer, joined Bruce in the League of Nations, and developed a crusading zeal for global attack on hunger.

In the midthirties, when the League of Nations as a political organization was already on its last legs, Bruce and McDougall were hobnobbing with John Boyd Orr of Scotland and others, promoting an international marriage between health and agriculture—and borrowing words from the 16th century heretic Hugh Latimer to describe their efforts. After one eloquent outburst in the League Assembly, Bruce wrote to Orr that "we have this day lighted such a candle, by God's grace, in Geneva as we trust shall never be put out."

John Winant was in wartime London also as American Ambassador, his shy manner and curiously formal handshake obscuring a passion for people—and a hatred of poverty.

Shuttling back and forth across the ocean was Paul Appleby, newspaper editor and Under Secretary of Agriculture, later to become a philosopher of public administration—and our guest tonight.

Earlier talks in London about an international wheat agreement led to further talk of a broader food organization; and in the cold of wartime London the Hot Springs Conference was conceived.

The scene shifts now to Washington where Winant, according to one story, had sold the idea to President Roosevelt. Another version, that of Gove Hambidge in "The Story of FAO," is that McDougall sold it to Mrs. Roosevelt who in turn sold it to Mr. Roosevelt. (That there should be conflicting claims to the parentage of a successful idea is not surprising. I personally know 5 people who invented the Marshall plan and 17 people who first thought of point 4.) In any event, if Mrs. Roosevelt was the effective courier, it was not the first—or the last—time that she put a bee in the President's bonnet.

But whoever sold him the idea of a World Food Conference, the President bought it as the first fragment of a still obscure pattern of peace. And on March 20, 1943, the President announced in a press conference that the United States would host a meeting to "deal with long-range problems of the nutritional standards of all countries."

III

It is worth remembering that in 1943 it was a much more exotic idea to have a world conference than it is today. During the 19th century our own Nation participated in an average of hardly more than one international conference per year. Our career as a nation of conferencegoers started in 1826 when a youthful United States, preoccupied with its own internal development, took a wary look at its first invitation—from Simon Bolivar—to attend the Panama Congress of American States. This meeting is generally counted as the beginning of our international conference program—but in fact the U.S. delegates were not confirmed by a suspicious Senate in time to take part in the sessions.

Nowadays, Congress and the rest of us take international conferences as part of a familiar landscape. We are attending about 450 of them this year on almost every imaginable subject from atomic energy to zinc. In the last 26 months, the U.S. Government has participated in as many international conferences as we attended in our entire history from the founding of the Republic in 1789 to the Hot Springs Conference in 1943. Few had been more important than that one and I am confident that few will be more important than the World Food Congress that starts here tomorrow morning.

In any case, when President Roosevelt announced at a press conference on March 19 that we would host a World Food Conference, it was big news. It was especially newsworthy that day in the State Department, which had not previously known that it was planning a World Food Conference.

Certainly the 1943 Food Conference was regarded as news by the newsmen gathered around the President that day, and the resulting questions and answers produced one of those hilarious occasions which President Roosevelt always seemed to enjoy so much. Asked if the conference would be in Washington, the President said he hoped not because it would be dreadful to subject the delegates to Washington. He thought it should be held in some small town, to encourage the delegates to get to know each other.

Asked if newsmen would be permitted to cover the Food Conference, the President said he hoped not, and laughed. We are seeking efficiency in the food discussions, he said. Then, of course, he was asked whether reporters were not efficient. Sometimes, said the President, they were too efficient and this slowed down the discussions.

If all this sounds rather up-to-date, so does the furor which developed from the President's announcement that he would not permit reporting at the Hot Springs Conference. Under Roosevelt's guidance, said Arthur Krock in the New York Times of April 4, 1943, "this administration has been more assiduous in attempts to suppress unwelcome news than any other this correspondent has observed in action." Quoting a colleague, he went on: "The President's notion of a free press is quite different from our own. We talk of freedom of information, really, whereas he talks of how to get his point across. His interest is in how a free press can best be used." I remind you that these timeless opinions are from the ancient history of 20 years ago.

But the most eloquent protest came from an Army wife who complained to the President in a letter to the Kansas City Star that, "You don't seem to want us housewives, via the newspapers, peeking over your shoulders while you measure in the baking powder and the toasted bread crumbs of the future. We've got to eat the stuff."

IV

Whether by design or by accident, the fact that the Hot Springs Conference was surrounded with soldiers resulted in far more publicity than the organizers of a conference generally manage to procure for it by the more normal means of piquing the curiosity of journalists. Newspaper readers and radio listeners were privileged in those weeks to learn something about the postwar food problem because the press corps, outraged at its exclusion from the proceedings, descended on Hot Springs determined to report every scrap of information it could get.

Once the Conference got going, the American delegation persuaded the White House to loosen up on security arrangements and let reporters mingle with the delegates in the hotel grounds—though not to attend the Conference sessions. But no one ever found out—because no one ever asked—whether President Roosevelt's press conference remarks about excluding reporters were made to keep them out or to excite their interest. My own guess is that the purpose was to get more coverage rather than less.

The State Department may or may not have learned about the Hot Springs Conference first in the newspapers, but it certainly lost no time in getting on with the job. Nowadays, we plan a gathering like tomorrow's World Food Congress more than a year in advance. But President Roosevelt's first announcement was in March and the Conference was in full swing 2 months later, in May. Judge Marvin Jones, soon to be U.S. War Food Administrator, lent his distinction and his political experience to the exacting task of chairing the Conference. And buried deep among the technicians in the Canadian delegation was a bright young career diplomat named Lester Pearson.

In the midst of the uproar about news reporting, the Hot Springs Conference got down to business in framing proposals that were news indeed. An interim commission, chaired by Lester Pearson, was set up to produce a specific plan for a permanent organization in the field of food and agriculture. Three months after the war was over, the labors of Mr. Pearson and his colleagues had produced, at a meeting in Quebec, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The story of the infancy and—the adaptation and maturation of the FAO—the gradual shift from emphasis on collection and exchange of information to emphasis on executive direction of operational programs over the past 18 years—is too well known to this audience to bear repetition here.

V

I think we can agree it is a good thing that the pattern of peace was allowed to develop in a fragmented way. In the first place, it is much easier to reach international agreement in the relatively "safe," relatively nonpolitical subjects with which the specialized agencies deal. In the second place, the world of the 1940's and 1950's was far from ready for an enforceable peace system; and progress in one field of endeavor could not be made to depend on simultaneous progress in all the others.

In the third place, the excuse for creating another international organization—adding another fragment to a world pattern for peace—is the very progress of science and technology. Each scientific breakthrough produces international cramp and tension until it is matched by an institutional breakthrough in the same field.

Thus, nobody thought of starting a malaria eradication program until, less than 20 years ago, the scientists demonstrated in Sardinia and Egypt and elsewhere that malaria could in fact be stamped out. Then it suddenly seemed ridiculous not to eliminate it from our planet altogether.

Before the invention of the radio there was no need for an international body to divide up the spectrum of radio frequencies. Now, so many new uses are elbowing each other in that narrow spectrum that we are to have a big conference in Geneva this autumn, to reserve a bloc of frequencies for experimentation in outer space.

Until very recently, all the weather bureaus could do in the way of international cooperation was to exchange the information each collected with its own national facilities. But now we can take big strides in combining three new kinds of technology—picture-taking meteorological satellites, communications satellites, and high-speed computers—to collect weather information from all over the world, interpret it, and draw a world weather map fast enough to stay ahead of the quick changes in the weather itself. For the first time a World Weather Watch becomes a feasible proposition. And thus does new technology set new tasks for international organization.

Civilization does progress by stages. It is good that within the frontiers of specialties like agriculture, health, and the physical sciences, we are beginning to demonstrate that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of friction and confusion—just as we are beginning to demonstrate within the frontiers of nations that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of bloodshed.

It is good that scientists can "speak the same language" even through an interpreter; that physicians can cooperate with each other in a global war on disease; that farmers can teach each other how to get higher yields without politics getting too much in the way.

So we salute the growth of the FAO and its sister agencies, and we shall continue to press for steady improvement in their operations.

VI

All this is good but it is not enough. The spawning of new technologies is not all beneficent. The technology of atomic fission and fusion can provide electric power for national development; it can also incinerate all life in the Northern Hemisphere.

The parochialism of each major field of knowledge is not necessarily an improvement on the more familiar parochialism of nation-states, unless the demonstration that experts working with each other on food and health leads in fact to nations working with each other to keep the general peace.

A civilization which guarantees people enough to eat and longer life—and then exposes them to lethal radioactivity—is not moving onward and upward. It is moving sidewise toward a precipice. So the ultimate worth of every specialized or functional body must be measured partly by whether it helps develop the general or political bodies charged with peaceful solution of international conflicts. Every step to strengthen the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations must in conscience be matched with steps to control arms and develop the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations organization itself. For if a workable pattern of peace must be constructed patiently by building first its component parts, the parts in the end must fit a pattern that makes enough sense to keep us not only healthy but also alive.

VII

All this was foreseen by the wise men at Hot Springs 20 years ago when they provided that the international food organization aborning there should become a part of the yet-unborn United Nations family of agencies.

And it was foreseen explicitly by the founders of the United Nations when they wrote in the preamble to the charter that "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" we must "promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." Enough food for all, available in fact to all, is the first elemental breadcrumb of a future in larger freedom.

Indeed, the role of the FAO as part of a pattern for peace, including the political agencies, was forecast by the story that Judge Jones told when he came back to his former colleagues of the House Committee on Agriculture to report on the Hot Springs Conference—and it applies just as well to rivalries among the international agencies as it does to quarrels among the nations.

"In one of McGuffey's Readers," said Judge Jones, "was the story of a man with six sons who were always quarreling. One day he called them together, showed them a bundle of sticks bound together and offered a prize to any one of them who would break the bundle. They all tried and reported it could not be done. 'That is easy,' said the old man, who then unbound the sticks and broke them one by one. 'Anyone could do it that way,' the boys replied. 'So it is with you, my sons,' declared the father, 'if you stick together no one can hurt you, but if you continually quarrel and fight among yourselves you can be broken separately.'"

In a fundamental sense, then, the FAO is more than a food and agriculture organization: It is part of a pattern for peace which is far from completed. Yet we know that when we improve the political machinery for keeping the peace we strengthen the functional agencies—and when we improve the functional agencies we strengthen the prospects for peace. And that brings us back to the business at hand: the FAO's goal of a world free from hunger.

Can we do it? Can we feed 6 billion people by the year 2000? Can we double total farm production and triple the output of milk, meat, eggs, and fish? On the record—the record of miraculous technology—we surely can.

If Ceylonese motorboats can multiply by 10 the fish brought in by boats propelled by oar; if a general use of hybrid corn would double the world's supply of corn; if a dairy cow in one part of Asia can produce 25 times the milk of her counterpart in other parts of Asia; if the Japanese can produce more rice per square inch than anybody else; if only 1 acre of land is now cultivated for each person in the world and another 2½ acres is probably tillable; if the world's most densely populated nation can earn foreign exchange as a net exporter of food; if in this country one farmer can feed his own family and 27 others; then surely our work is cut out for us, surely there is still plenty of room for the human race on this compacted globe; and surely the vision of a world free from hunger is a realistic goal and not a pipe dream.

After 20 years of working at it, the members and staff of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the U.N. system have only just begun on what Lester Pearson, in his report of the first FAO Conference, called so bold an aim as that of helping nations to achieve freedom from want. Watching the World Food Congress over the next 2 weeks some observers may say, as one historian of the U.N. Charter said of Hot Springs: "Its immediate results consist largely of fairly obvious generalizations and recommendations."

Obvious? Yes, it long has been an obvious generalization that too many people are hungry. But 20 years ago it was not so obvious to many that much could be done about it. Now it is. And I predict that it soon will be just as obvious that we who have inherited the vision and the work begun at Hot Springs are going to do more and more about it—and with such will that another generation will know a world for the first time free from hunger.

BINAY RANJAN SEN, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FAO

Binay Ranjan Sen was born in India in 1898. He was educated at Calcutta and Oxford Universities. He joined the Indian Civil Service in 1922 and served for many years as a district officer in Bengal which brought him into intimate contact with the rural life of a typically underdeveloped country.

Dr. Sen held many important posts in the Bengal and central governments, including the secretaryship of the Central Food Ministry. His war-time assignments in India included administration of food policies at a time of severe shortages. He was Director General of Food in the Government of India (1934–46). As Revenue Secretary in the Bengal Government (1940–42), he was responsible for the administration of relief measures during one of the worst natural calamities in Midnapur district, and also for the rehabilitation of refugees from Burma during the early days of the war.

After India's independence, Dr. Sen went to Washington as Minister in the Indian Embassy (1947–50). Later diplomatic assignments included Ambassador of India to Italy and Yugoslavia (1950–51 and 1953–54), to the United States of America (1951–52), and to Japan (1955–56). He represented India at several international conferences and led Indian delegations to ECOSOC and other United Nations bodies (General Assembly and Security Council). He was elected Director General of FAO in November 1956.

During Dr. Sen's tenure as Director General, there has been a notable expansion in FAO's world-wide activities, with increasing emphasis on those of an operational nature. The Secretariat has been reorganized and strengthened to deal with the expanded technical assistance program, the United Nations Special Funds projects, and other multilateral programs in the fields of food and agriculture.

With a view to reviving the original idealism and enthusiasm that led to the foundation of FAO and drawing the world's attention to the continuing problem of hunger and malnutrition affecting millions of people in the developing countries, Dr. Sen initiated the freedom-from-hunger campaign which was adopted by FAO conference in 1959 and has since been endorsed by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. One of the most important international initiatives to arise out of the campaign is the FAO/U.N. world food program which aims at the utilization of food surpluses for economic and social development.

Dr. Sen has traveled widely in the member countries of FAO in order to acquaint himself with their problems. He regards his present job as the most challenging and potentially the most rewarding of his career.

Dr. Sen is a connoisseur of Western music and is a keen amateur photographer.

THE SPIRIT OF 1776 AND THE 1960's

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most provocative and profound students of today is the British author, Barbara Ward. In recent years she has addressed her great talent to the problems of the developing world and the challenge that these problems present to the West.

Recently, she delivered a memorable address at Williamsburg, Va., "Prelude to Independence." Her address is a stirring call to the nations blessed with abundance to use that blessing with courage and imagination in lifting all of the children of the earth to better standards of life.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Miss Ward's significant address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 2, 1963]

TEXT OF BARBARA WARD'S WILLIAMSBURG SPEECH

(NOTE.—Following is the text of Barbara Ward's Prelude to Independence address given at Williamsburg, Va., yesterday.)

If we look back on the men who framed the Virginia Declaration of Rights over the interval of nearly two tumultuous centuries, our first impression must surely be one of amazement at the universality and audacity of their political imagination. They were themselves heirs of one of the great pioneering ventures of humanity—the drive which took the cockelshell boats of Europe round the world and established for the first time, against fearful hazards, the concept of a single, terrestrial habitation for the human race. Then, within little more than a century of this first revolutionary expansion, here were the sober burghers of Williamsburg making quite as remarkable a set of affirmations about the political needs and aspirations of this one human family.

We must note that they did not speak for Virginians only, or even for Americans. The universal note is struck in the first great formulation of American liberties: "All men are equally free and independent," "all have certain inherent rights," "Government"—in other words all governments—"ought to be instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation or community." There is nothing restricted or parochial here. These forefathers of ours, in their wigs and kneebreeches and flowered waistcoats, believed themselves to be acting beyond any local custom or tradition. They believed that they spoke for all mankind.

The aspiration is all the more remarkable when we remember the apparent narrowness of their political scope and the real inhibitions of their physical endowment. Here they were, 13 separate colonies, not yet certain whether neighbors would be ready to share sovereignty, even less certain whether the power of Britain could be successfully withstood. To seaward lay uncertainty and hostility; inland, a vast unknown where French pretensions and Indian enmity had still to be reckoned with. So, faced with odds which only seem favorable because we know the outcome, they spoke not as beleaguered citizens but as heirs and perpetuators of human freedom itself. We have to try with all our imaginative powers to recreate the magnificence of their audacity. Custom has sealed it for us. We take for granted what should still leave us speechless with surprise.

EARLY OBSTACLES CITED

Their audacity stands in all the sharper contrast because of their physical insufficiencies. Communication and transport tended to separate them rather than draw them closer. Coming to share in these festivities, I could breakfast in London and take luncheon in New York. In Jefferson's day, one would have not reached halfway to Baltimore. Farming still aimed at self-sufficiency. Industry was so little advanced that, while John Adams could exclaim that "many curious engines have been constructed to facilitate business," Jefferson wrote to Harvard complaining that the study of America's mineralogy was still untouched. Education was widespread, true, and Yankee inventiveness had already made its mark.

But the Colonies were still, as we should say now, in a very early stage of development, still 40 or 50 years away from takeoff, still a century away from a fully articulated industrial system. The dreams of these men were palpably ahead of their tools, their ends of their means, their visions of their workaday abilities. The disparity did not daunt them. They simply went ahead to create the first free continental society known to human history.

Such is the true perspective of 1776—unlimited vision, limited means. What, then, would the men of 1776 say of our present predicament?

Let us be clear about one thing at the outset. They would be staggered, overwhelmed by the ample quality of our means. Surpluses in wheat and meat which drown the market, threatened tropical surpluses which will do the same, steel mills working at 60 percent of capacity because of oversupply, oil markets threatened by Russian crude, European coal mines by Anglo-Saxon output, all fuel by future atomic energy, a 5-percent unemployment rate in America because of surplus labor—and although at least $100 billions a year are spent by all protagonists on arms and perhaps $12 billions on space, the surpluses persist while annual increases in Atlantic income are never less than 2 percent a year, with over a 5-percent rate of growth in Western Europe—and, incidentally, over 10 percent in Japan. Such a cornucopia of capacity has bestowed on mankind a freedom which the Founding Fathers could not even envisage—the freedom which springs from a physical ability to realize virtually any goal the community may choose to set.

GOALS CHANGED

And what are the goals? Here, surely, we find ourselves in exactly the opposite position from the men of 1776. Nothing was limited about them except their means. Everything is limited about us except our means. The world today is smaller than the continent they faced. The unity of human experience which they proclaimed has been demonstrated not only by the science that abolishes space and time but by the aspirations which unite whole communities in the desire for modernity and technological breakthrough. The Thirteen Colonies, underdeveloped States 180-odd years ago, are now the leaders of a human column all of whom, virtually without exception, march forward intent upon securing the same elbow room and sharing in the same abundance. Life—they want, too, to extend their human span from 20 to 70 years. Liberty—they want, and have nearly achieved, the self-respect of self-governing communities. The pursuit of happiness—

at least they know happiness does not lie in sickness, in hunger, in racial subjection, in unremitting toil. The whole world is astir with the aspirations of 1776—except perhaps the Atlantic community within which they first came to birth and where, now, they are in danger of degenerating to the level of Fourth of July rhetoric.

Have we confident economic goals? We may proclaim a decade of development—our hearts are not in it. The 1 percent of national income to be dedicated to development is reached by no more than one or two weathy nations. In America, in spite of steady support by public opinion, political pressure is all to cut back the American contribution on the grounds that the effort is failing to give the expected return.

Yet the reasons given are hardly convincing. It is forgotten how much aid has simply sustained Western exports during the recent fall-away in primary prices. It is forgotten to what degree Western trade policies discriminate against the poorer nations. It is forgotten that the span of successful development in any society is not less than a couple of generations. Today, after only a decade, Western governments seem to expect results they could not have achieved themselves in a comparable period. It is forgotten in how many countries education, the foundation of all skills, has still to be built. It is forgotten how much, over the last decade, has in fact been learned, how many foundations laid, roads opened up, dams built, the habits of saving and investment introduced. And even if it is reasonable to concentrate resources on the more promising experiments, this is no reason for an absolute overall cut.

IMPATIENCE SCORED

If the men of 1776 had attempted the opening up of America with the testy impatience of so many politicians today, they would barely have crossed the Adirondacks. England at the time of the Luddites was about at the stage reached by many developing countries today. But to the light of flaring barns, to the sound of anger in the streets, with the fury of the urban mobs behind them, the men of that age did not stop investing. They passed the reform bill instead. Must we be less steady in our long-term perspectives?

Seen in the aspect not of a single decade but of the 50 or 60 years needed for full modernization, economic assistance to our crowded world could seem as challenging as our space ventures and far more rewarding. To set young minds afire, to create new opportunities for creative work, to break the millenial dependence on hatchet and hoe, to open up the streams of life-giving water, to make the desert blossom, to give all mankind some share in the patrimony of 1776—this would seem a physical ideal not unworthy to stand beside space probes and infinitely more rewarding than the endless proliferation of the means of death.

And if our economic vision wholly fails to match our physical means, what are we to say of our political goals? Timidly, hesitantly we edge our way around the problems of supranational order in a world in which the largest nation-state can give no more formal security than could Virginia in 1776. But the Virginians seized on the logic of their predicament. They opted first for the Continental Congress and when its cohesion proved insufficient, went on to full-blooded federalism.

Our task today may be more difficult. Or is it that our vision is less intense? After all, we shall never know the full force of the difficulties facing the men of 1776 in ridding themselves of British rule—which many citizens still supported—in transcending local State rights—which many profited by—and in preparing to open up a whole uncharted and potentially hostile continent. We cannot gage the obstacles because they were overcome. Today, while not decrying obstacles, we must remark a certain flaccidity of political will in which the positive vision of Atlantic interdependence hangs in the balance while lesser but sterner nationalisms seek to frustrate this grand design.

VISION CALLED FOR

Since, then, an essential part of the political will is that citizens should give reason for the faith that is in them, let those who believe the principles of 1776 to be in a profound sense universal and the men of 1776—indeed to speak not only to the present in Colonial America but to the whole future of the human experiment—let them apply those principles with the same vision and courage to the predicaments of today.

Let the United States, the first free federal experiment on a continental scale, be the model. Let us match it now with the completion of the European experiment first by Britain's entry into Europe and then by Europe's dedication to free, federal and supranational institutions. Let the two Atlantic sister federations establish those joint institutions that are needed to serve their common life, including the trading and investment agencies which can trasform the decade of development from rhetoric to fact.

Then let the legitimate influence of such economic policies be dedicated to encouraging in Africa and Latin America and, where appropriate, in Asia first common markets and then federal unions to which, as they advance toward mature industrialization, the common institutions of the Atlantic world may be extended, thus giving underpinning and substance to the concept of a "world authority" which, we all instinctively know, must be secured if postatomic man is to survive. A confederation of sister federations—may not this be the next institutional pattern of the human city? And is it not a more humane and flexible vision than the single sovereignty of totalitarian control?

Visionary—you will say—impraticable, idealist, utopian, ridiculous—but was it more visionary in 1776 to proclaim democracy in the age of monarchs, self-government in the age of empires, the rights of man in a colonial-feudal world, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a world still held in chains? If we do not dream today, tomorrow will belong to those who do. The visions of 1776 have proved to be harder and more realist than the fears and conservatisms of those who opposed them. What will be the visions of 1963? Who will dream them? And if free men have no more visions, how soon will the whole great tradition of 1776 perish from the earth?

U.S. FOREIGN AID DOLLARS BENEFIT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since the end of World War II the United States has engaged in the most gigantic international aid program in the history of the world. Over $100 billion in American commodities and money has been made available to our friends abroad.

A program of this size inevitably develops certain weaknesses and disappointments. Nevertheless there has been many victories on the foreign aid front not the least of which is the restoration of Western Europe as a flourishing area of the globe. Japan is another shining example of the helpful impact of foreign assistance. The nations of Europe and Japan today constitute fruitful commercial customers of the United States.

Today our oversea aid program is concentrated in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. The problems in these areas are more difficult of solution because of the local lack of education, trained technical and civil service and critical problems of nutrition and health. Nevertheless, progress is being made.

Recent public opinion polls indicate that the American people are overwhelmingly in support of our oversea aid effort. It is well that they should be, because this program is not only based on sound, moral principles but is in our own self-interest.

Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick has noted in an article appearing in the Washington Post of last Sunday that 77 cents of every U.S. foreign dollar spent for commodities now goes to American firms. I was constantly reminded during the 2 years I served as our country's Food For Peace Director of the constructive role which the program placed not only in relieving human hunger abroad but also in providing constructive outlets for our farm production. For example, one out of three acres of the U.S. wheat now go into the food-for-peace program. Imagine the impact on American agriculture if these outlets were not used.

Mr. Kilpatrick reminds us that other segments of the U.S. economy have been significantly stimulated by our oversea aid program. Thus, we see the blend of humanitarianism and self-interest as we utilize our abundance to raise standards of living in other parts of the globe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kilpatrick's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID DOLLARS WIN FRIENDS HERE

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Early last summer a steel mill in Birmingham was preparing to close because of lack of orders. At the last moment, the company obtained an order to produce 56,000 tons of railway track and fastenings for Pakistan.

The order meant that the jobs of an estimated 1,100 persons at the mill or in the railroads and factories that service the mill were saved.

It meant employment and income to the Port of Mobile, which handled the shipments, and payments of $1.4 million to American-flag lines which transported the equipment to Pakistan.

This was a foreign aid order. It is only one of a large number of examples of the impact of foreign aid on the domestic economy. In the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, 77 cents of every foreign aid dollar spent for commodities went to American firms.

Because of this increasing reliance on American suppliers to fill foreign aid requirements, foreign aid is gaining an important constituency. It is too early to measure exactly the strength of the constituency and its influence on Congress, but its weight has been felt.

Farmers long have known that were it not for food-for-peace shipments their surpluses would be larger and their incomes smaller. Shippers also have recognized the direct benefit to them from foreign aid. Now business and labor are learning that they have a stake in the aid program.

The Agency for International Development (AID) does not award contracts to American suppliers. It authorizes loans to a country and requires the country to buy materials for the aid project in the United States to the largest extent possible. The recipient country, working through middlemen, makes the awards to individual suppliers in the United States.

Recently a number of business advisory services have provided American businessmen with advice on how to get these orders. The Commerce Department provides free service in line with its efforts to promote exports.

Some Congressmen are pleased to be able to announce that the XYZ company in their district has just received an order to manufacture roadbuilding equipment for Ecuador or drugs for India. Some other Congressmen complain that AID is using these announcements to try to influence their votes.

When AID learns that an order has been placed with an American company, it gives the information to the Senator and Representative from the State and district involved so that they may make the original announcement, if they wish to do so.

Whatever the long-range effect on Capitol Hill, the announcements have another unplanned side effect. They reinforce the Communist argument that the United States is engaged in foreign aid largely because the program stimulates the domestic economy. The argument is an old one. It has been used without significant effect from the beginning of the first aid programs in the early postwar years.

As late as 1960, 49 cents of every American aid dollar used to buy commodities was spent in Western Europe. Now only about 8 cents of every dollar is spent in Europe.

Procurement in the underdeveloped countries, which is still encouraged, has increased from 10 cents on the dollar in 1960 to 15 cents at present. Most of the purchases in the underdeveloped countries consist of such items as petroleum, crude rubber, lumber, and fiber products.

The American share of commodity expenditures increased from 40 cents on the dollar in fiscal year 1960 to 41 cents in 1961, 64 cents in 1962 and 77 cents in the first half of fiscal 1963.

Forty-four States and the District of Columbia shared in the business last year. AID press releases report such orders as $20,615 to a Troy, Ohio, supplier of welding equipment for India; $37,943 to a Scranton, Pa., manufacturer for yarn for South Korea; $6,586 to a Connecticut pharmaceutical company for drugs for South Vietnam; $3.1 million to Trans World Airlines for aviation equipment for Ethiopia.

Military assistance is almost entirely in American-built material and American-supplied training. Virtually all the loans of the Export-Import Bank are disbursed to American producers of capital equipment for use overseas.

Officials estimate that aid expenditures now create 700,000 jobs in the United States.

THE CASE FOR TAX REFORM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Joseph Pechman has written an article in the Reporter magazine for June 6 in which he argues the case for tax reform.

The narrow and special interest groups have been flooding Congress with mail against the tax reforms which the President has proposed. In almost every case they fail to take into consideration the fact that the tax cuts which the President has proposed more than offset the small increases in revenue from loophole closing.

The net result of the President's program is that every income class will be better off if the entire program is passed than if it is not passed.

Mr. Pechman makes a very strong case for tax reform and I personally think that the tax reform provisions of the President's program are as important—if not more important—than the tax cuts.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD so that Members of Congress and the public in general may have access to at least one article in which the narrow and selfish view of tax reform is not advanced.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR TAX REFORM

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

Early this year the President sent to the Congress a bold and unique set of tax recommendations, which he appropriately regards as the key to his legislative program on domestic affairs. These recommendations included $13.6 billion of tax rate cuts for both individuals and corporations, with offsetting tax reforms of $3.4 billion. The net cuts of $10.2 billion are intended to get the economy back to full employment and to promote economic growth. The tax reforms, which are long overdue, are intended to improve the fairness of the income tax by closing loopholes and relieving hardships.

In the hulabaloo over the tax reduction, the tax reform part of the package has been virtually forgotten. WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon still insist that the Revenue Act of 1963 will contain significant reforms, and the committee is now hard at work on the administration's proposals. But the consensus of informed observers is that the final bill will have only a few face-saving amendments to permit the reformers to get off the hook.

The Kennedy reform proposals represent a serious attempt to reverse the erosion of the income tax base—a process that has been taking place quietly but relentlessly for many years at the expense of equity and at a substantial cost in revenue. Since tax reform is a painful process, it was easy to predict that the attempt would raise a chorus of protest from every taxpayer group whose pet tax advantage was being threatened. With this in mind, the administration decided that the best time to propose tax reform is when the pain of tax reform can be relieved by large tax cuts.

The strategy backfired for three reasons: First, the administration's key base-broadening proposal—the 5-percent floor on personal deductions—turned out to be too complicated for the public to understand; second, in an atmosphere of tax reduction, Congress hesitates to alienate even a small minority of voters whose taxes might be increased by reform; and third, the antireform groups have aligned themselves with proponents of quick tax reduction in a hard-to-beat combination.

What the public does not appreciate is that the tax reform proposals are among the most progressive recommendations made by President Kennedy since he took office. Included in the package in addition to the 5-percent floor are revisions of the capital-gains tax, repeal of the dividend credit, a device to raise exemptions for low-income taxpayers, a more rational tax-relief system for the aged, and many other constructive provisions. Furthermore, the tax reforms are heavily weighted in favor of the low- and middle-income groups; without them the proposed rate reductions would be a bonanza for the high-income classes. Both the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have warned that rejection of the reform proposals would require a complete restructuring of the rate cuts to prevent a loss in equity among income groups.

CAPITAL GAINS

The most far-reaching proposals are those concerning capital gains—profits from the sale of stocks, bonds, real estate or other assets. Short-term gains—profits made on assets held less than 6 months—are now taxed as any other income. Gains on assets held more than 6 months—the so-called long-term gains—are subject to half the rates on ordinary income, up to a maximum of 25 percent.

In addition to the overwhelming rate advantage, the law permits capital gains to go completely free of income tax if transferred from one generation to another through bequests. And in the case of gifts, the gain is taxed only if the assets are later sold by the recipient. The result is that increases in the value of securities and real estate held in wealthy families for generations may never be subject to income tax. For example, General Motors stock is now selling at about $70 per share. An investor who bought 100,000 shares years ago at a price of $20 per share has a capital gain of $5 million. If he sold the stock, he would pay a tax of $1.25 million. If he left the stock to his children, no tax would ever be paid on the $5 million gain. (There is a separate estate tax on such stock, but this tax applies whether or not the gain is taxed.)

In this year's reform plan the President recommended the taxation of gains on assets held up to a year (instead of up to 6 months), at full rates, on the sound principle that there is no basis for preferential treatment of such gains in a tax system based on an annual accounting period. More important, he also proposed to tax unrealized capital gains when they are transferred by gift or death, at the same rates that apply to realized gains.

It is hard to exaggerate the significance of this proposal. Estimates of the amount of income escaping tax through the gift and death loophole range upwards of $5 billion per year. This is unfair not only to the millions of taxpayers who realize capital gains during their lifetimes and pay tax on them, but also to the tens of millions receiving other incomes that are taxed in full. An income tax with this loophole can hardly be regarded as a model of fairness.

As the price for this reform, the President agreed to reduce the tax on long-term gains to 30 percent of the proposed tax on ordinary incomes. The rate would range from 4.2 percent in the first bracket (where the ordinary rate would be 14 percent) to 19.5 percent in the top bracket (where the ordinary rate would be 65 percent).

The danger of suggesting such a trade is that Congress may accept the rate reduction without closing the loophole on unrealized gains. If that were to happen, the damage to the fairness of the tax system would be immeasurable. To avoid any misunderstanding, the President has said that unless the loophole is closed "there would be no justification for any reduction of present capital gain rate schedules."

THE DIVIDEND CREDIT

Few issues in taxation evoke a greater emotional response than the so-called double taxation of dividends. Corporate profits are subject to the corporation income tax and the dividends from these profits are later taxed under the personal income tax. Many tax experts defend this double taxation on the ground that a modern tax system would be incomplete without a separate tax on corporations. Furthermore, the double taxation argument has merit only if a significant portion of the corporation tax rests on the stockholder. If it is passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, it is actually a sales tax in disguised form.

To the extent that dividends are taxed twice, the heaviest burden is imposed on dividends received by persons in the low- and middle-income brackets, not—as many believe—on those at the top of the income scale. Suppose a corporation pays a dividend of $48. With our present corporate tax of 52 percent, the income before tax from which this dividend was paid amounted to $100. If this $100 had been subject to personal income tax rates only, nontaxable individuals would have paid no tax on it; the excess burden of the corporate income tax in this case is the full $52 tax. By contrast, a taxpayer subject to a 90-percent rate pays a personal income tax of $43.20 on the dividend and the total tax burden on the original $100 of corporate earnings is $95.20. But since he would pay $90 under the personal income tax in any case, the excess burden is only $5.20. In other words, the double tax ranges from $52 for the lowest-income stockholder down to $5.20 for the highest-income stockholder.

To reduce double taxation, the law now gives stockholders a flat credit of 4 percent of their dividends against their personal tax. Although this credit appears to be uniform, it is a much more handsome double-taxation allowance for high-income stockholders than for those in the lower- and middle-income bracket. At 4 percent, the credit on the $48 dividend in the example just given is $1.92, thus removing 37 percent of the $5.20 double tax on the 90 percent stockholder. The same credit removes only 5 percent of the double tax for stockholders subject to a 30-percent rate and does nothing for the stockholder whose total income is so low that he is not taxable. (The law also exempts the first $50 of dividends from personal income tax, but this hardly balances the advantages of the credit at higher income levels.)

There are various ways to moderate the double taxation of dividends in an equitable manner. The President chose the straightforward method of doing away with both the 4 percent credit and the $50 exclusion, substituting a cut in the corporation tax rate from 52 to 47 percent. The 5-point reduction would automatically remove almost 10 percent of the double tax for all shareholders regardless of their income. It also makes a good deal of sense to reduce the corporate rate, which is extremely high by other standards as well.

THE 5-PERCENT FLOOR

Seldom has a major tax proposal been so thoroughly—and unjustly—maligned as the floor on personal deductions. Although the proposal seems to be dead, the matter of deductions will be reviewed by the Ways and Means Committee and it is worth understanding the rationale of the administration's position.

The proposal is to require taxpayers who itemize their deductions to subtract 5 percent of their income from the total deductions claimed. The option of using the standard deduction would remain unchanged. For example, a taxpayer with a $20,000 income and $3,000 of personal deductions, would reduce this by 5 percent of his income, or $1,000, leaving $2,000 to be deducted. A taxpayer with the same income and only $1,500 of deductions would have only $500 left after subtracting the 5 percent floor; it would be to his advantage to switch over to the standard deduction, which amounts to $1,000 at his income level.

The Treasury has had to defend itself against a number of unfair critcisms of this plan, two of which are most persistent. First, it is said that the 5-percent floor would discourage charitable contributions. But data from tax returns show the average taxpayer who itemizes today has deductions amounting to over 15 percent of his income. His State and local taxes alone may equal the 5-percent floor. Most of the other deductions, such as medical expenses, interest, and alimony would continue regardless of any changes in the tax law. Under the circumstances, most taxpayers who itemize would still be able to deduct their contributions.

Second, it is alleged that the floor will more than offset the rate reductions in the middle-income group, which is usually defined to be between $10,000 and $20,000. Nothing could be further from the truth. The rate reductions at this level average about 20 percent, but the 5-percent floor will amount to less that a quarter of this reduction. On balance the net tax reduction would average 15 percent in the $10,000–$20,000 class.

The Treasury has justified the floor mainly on the ground that without it the new rates would have to be substantially higher in the middle- and high-income brackets. But most people react negatively to a proposal that is justified on revenue grounds alone. The plain fact is that the personal deductions in our tax law are too generous. An income tax is designed to tax all persons with the same income and family responsibilities alike. Through the deduction system, our law makes allowances for specific expenditures as well, and many of these deductions do violence to the principle of tax equality.

A strong case can be made for permitting deductions for medical expenses, which are often involuntary and unpredictable and may exhaust a large proportion of the family income. In keeping with the purpose of the allowance, present law limits the medical deduction to an amount in excess of 3 percent of income. Other deductions are not so limited, and they are much more difficult to justify. Why should homeowners be given a large tax advantage over renters? Should interest on personal loans be deductible? Most people give something to charity regardless of tax incentives; if the purpose is to stimulate contributions, would it not be more efficient to allow a deduction for gifts in excess of some small proportion of income, just as it is in the case of medical expenses?

Since 1944, deductions on taxable returns have risen from $12.5 billion to more than $50 billion, and they now cost more than $12 billion of revenue annually. The 5-percent floor is a device to recapture $2.3 billion of this lost revenue without fighting a battle over each deduction.

Even if the floor is abandoned, it should be possible to achieve the objectives of the proposal through some other method. The most straightforward way would be to eliminate the unnecessary deductions and place separate floors on the others.

The personal exemption has remained at $600 per capita since 1948 because even a modest increase would be expensive. To give some relief to those in the bottom brackets, the administration recommended—in addition to the $600 exemption—a minimum standard deduction of $300 plus $100 for each additional dependent, up to a maximum of $1,000. This would be an option in lieu of the present standard deduction of 10 percent for those with incomes below $10,000. Under this plan, single persons would not be required to pay any tax until their income exceeded $900, as compared with the present combined personal income and standard deduction of $667. A married couple with two children, now paying tax on an income of $2,667 or more, would be exempt up to $2,900.

More than 13 million low-income taxpayers would benefit from this proposal and of these 1.5 million would be completely removed from the tax rolls.

The tax law shows more concern for our senior citizens than for any other population group. Individuals more than 65 years of age have an additional exemption of $600, pay no tax on their social security benefits, receive a tax credit of up to $240 on other retirement income, and are not required to reduce their medical deductions by 3 percent of their income, as other taxpayers must.

It is difficult to see why our income tax, which is graduated on the basis of income after deductions for personal exemptions and extraordinary medical expenses, would not automatically allow for the special circumstances of the aged if it did not contain these provisions. Nevertheless, the relief they now receive seems to have the approval of most of our citizens, young or old. The objection to this system of relief is that it goes to those among our aged who need it least. The $600 additional exemption is worth nothing to a nontaxable individual, $120 to one who is taxable at the 20-percent rate and $300 to one who is taxable at a 50-percent rate.

The administration recommended replacing the extra exemption for the aged and the retirement income credit with a flat credit of $300 against tax, giving the high- and low-income aged the same dollar tax benefit. Married couples more than 65 years of age would not be subject to any tax unless their income exceeded $5,800 as compared with the present $2,667. For single persons, the corresponding limits would be exactly one-half of those for married couples.

This plan would reduce the taxes of persons over 65 by an additional $320 million—over and above the proposed rate cuts—and it would distribute the tax benefits much more fairly among them. It would have been even fairer to give similar benefits to the nontaxable aged through increased social security, but unfortunately income taxes and social security are never considered simultaneously by the Congress.

Aside from the foregoing major changes, the President sent Congress a long list of less dramatic proposals that would nevertheless have significant effects on the distribution of the tax burden. Some would relieve hardships and lose revenue; others would close loopholes and gain revenue.

The relief measures include a more liberal child-care deduction for employed women, widowers, and divorced men; a new method of averaging income for authors, artists, actors, and others with highly fluctuating incomes; and a deduction for moving expenses for employees who change jobs. The suggestions for tightening include revisions of the stock-option provisions, elimination of tax shelters for real estate, taxation of lump-sum pension and profit-sharing payments as ordinary income rather than as capital gains, and correction of some unintended benefits in the special tax privileges of oil and mining industries.

TOO IMPORTANT TO BE SHELVED

Although there may be legitimate differences of opinion regarding details, the program is well thought out and it warrants serious consideration by the Congress. But with unemployment still in excess of 5½ percent, there is a premium on speedy action on the tax-reduction part of the package. Consideration of tax reform, on the other hand, will inevitably slow up the legislative process. Under the circumstances, it would be better to push through at once a simple reduction in the income tax rates—say, a flat cut of three or four points in all individual and corporate rates—to buy more time for the tough job of hammering out a tax reform bill. Otherwise, most of the reforms may go down the drain in the attempt to pass a bill before the end of this year.

WILBUR MILLS and Douglas Dillon are determined to push a bill providing for both tax reduction and tax reform through Congress this year in the face of these difficulties. It looks as though they have an impossible job, but it would be premature to sell this high-powered combination of political and economic talent short.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER—ADDRESS OF SENATOR TALMADGE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague Senator HERMAN

TALMADGE is a man whose interests and abilities carry into a wide range of activities. He has few peers in the field of agriculture and agricultural problems, not only in Georgia and the South, but his knowledge of agriculture and its related conservation work is nationwide in scope.

In an address before the 10th National Watershed Congress, meeting in Philadelphia on May 27, he clearly pointed out the need for a rapidly accelerated national watershed program to assist in the solution of our Nation's water problems, specifically those of supply, variability, distribution, floods, quality, and pollution.

Senator TALMADGE knows whereof he speaks. He is chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Watershed Development of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Before coming to the Senate, while Governor of Georgia, his programs in behalf of watershed development and water conservation were tremendously successful in keeping safe for the future Georgia's abundant, yet precious, water resources.

I commend his magnificent address to all those interested in watershed development and water conservation, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING URGENCY FOR WATERSHED UNDERSTANDING

(Speech of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE before the 10th National Watershed Congress, Philadelphia, Pa., May 27, 1963)

I am honored by the privilege of your platform.

I have long supported the small watershed conservation program in my own great State of Georgia.

And as chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Watershed Development it has been my privilege to become familiar in depth with this great movement and to support it nationally.

This experience has strengthened my belief in the small watershed program. The program makes sense. It is sound. And, perhaps most important of all, it provides for genuine teamwork among all affected interests.

I am proud to participate in your 10th National Watershed Congress.

Ten years ago—on May 21, 1954—many of your number met in the Nation's Capital in what you called the 1st National Watershed Congress.

You had assembled to explore ways and means of giving impetus to the concept of achieving conservation by treaty the small, upstream watersheds.

This was not an entirely new idea. It had been discussed for years by progressive conservationists. It had been tried, more or less experimentally, in a few areas.

But suddenly, in the early 1950's, it had caught on. The idea of beginning to control water where it first falls—largely on the private lands in the countless little watersheds of America—had captured the imagination of many people.

The word "watershed," itself not commonly used in ordinary conversation, began to be bandied about by informed and uninformed people alike.

Claims and counterclaims began to be heard. The extremists, those who thought the small watershed approach was the complete and only answer to all resource conservation problems, and those who thought it had absolutely no merit, were choosing up sides.

The Congress, just a few months before, had appropriated $5 million to start a pilot watershed program. This was intended to answer some of the questions, to show how community watershed problems could be tackled by the local people with Government assistance.

Legislation to implement the small watershed program permanently was in the making.

That was the setting when your first National Watershed Congress convened. The Nation was on the threshold of a new conservation movement that rivaled a similar development launched 17 years earlier—the soil conservation district.

Indeed, some of the leadership of the soil conservation district movement was intimately involved in setting up the first watershed congress.

But they were not alone. And that was part of the phenomenon—the almost spontaneous favorable reaction of conservation organizations, business, industry, and agriculture—groups that had not been noted for their eagerness to work together in the past.

But they were drawn together by the magic of an idea they each believed in. And they wanted that idea developed to its highest potential in a way that would serve all Americans. They did not want it to founder on the rocks of dissention or made ineffective and inoperative by intemperate supporters or by selfish opponents.

Your goal 10 years ago was to do all in your combined power—and you were representative of the most powerful groups in the land—to get the small watershed program started in the right way so that it could eventually come to full flower.

Your impact was timely. And it was effective. And through the succeeding years you have watched carefully over the infant you helped to create. Each year, through the past decade, you have met annually to take a close look at the program.

You have met, not to adopt resolutions, promote projects, or take any action. You have met to review and discuss watershed programs, problems, and progress. As a group you have been and are dedicated solely to improved natural resources management and use on a watershed basis.

I counted on your program the names of some 26 organizations listed as participating organizations in the 10th National Watershed Congress. You are farm organizations. You are conservation organizations in the field of soil, water, forestry, fisheries, recreation, and wildlife. You are civic planners. You are State officials. You are manufacturers. You are businessmen. Surely no other institution has a more imposing and varied list of sponsors nor a higher and more unselfish purpose than yours.

You have a right to be proud of the small watershed program, for in no small way it is a creature of your making. And Americans everywhere should be proud of you and your efforts in their behalf.

One of the major problems is the small watershed program has not yet reached its full stride even though the dream you had 10 years ago has become a reality, and considerable progress has been made.

There is indeed a growing urgency for watershed understanding, for almost every part of the United States faces current or potential water problems.

The Select Committee on National Water Resources of the U.S. Senate, headed by the late Senator Bob Kerr, of Oklahoma, published a series of significant and far-reaching reports on the national water situation in 1960.

Briefly, we must solve six major kinds of water problems—supply, variability, distribution, floods, quality, and pollution.

Supply is a problem in the Southwest, where potential water demand exceeds the long-term supply, streamflow has been developed to near ultimate capacity, and withdrawals from ground water exceed recharge.

Variability in streamflow is most severe in the Great Plains and the Southwest.

Distribution problems are severe in the West, where major streams are few and far between.

Floods are a problem everywhere in the United States except part of the Southwest. They are a serious problem in New England, along the Atlantic coast from Washington, D.C., to New England, in the Ohio River region, Missouri River region, Columbia River region, and lower Mississippi region.

Concerning quality, chemical, and sediment problems are especially troublesome in the Great Plains, Southwest, Great Basin, a narrow strip paralleling the lower Mississippi River, and in the Piedmont area of the Carolinas, Virginia, and Maryland.

The Kerr committee reported that current national water use is about 250 billion gallons per day. By 1980 it will be about 600 billion gallons per day.

Since the manageable supply of water available is 1,160 billion gallons per day, the presently known problems can in general be solved, although some of the solutions may be costly. We have an adequate water supply if we manage it properly. But we must manage our water resources more skillfully than we have in the past.

The very first recommendation of the Kerr committee was watershed management. The committee said: "Land and water resources are inseparable, and therefore watershed improvement programs are a basic and extremely important part of the Nation's overall water resources development program."

Those are just a few highlights from the Kerr committee reports, with which most of you are familiar. They emphasize how essential it is for us to move forward rapidly in our water management programs.

These hard facts tell us we can't afford to go on wasting water, in our homes, in our industry, on our farms.

That we can't afford to go on squandering our watershed resources—water, soil, timber, and grass.

That we cannot afford to let good, usable water run off to waste, eroding our farmlands, flooding our valleys, and silting up our reservoirs and waterways in the process.

That we can't afford to pump our ground water reservoirs dry.

These hard facts tell us it is later than we think. They tell us that we must make haste to promote watershed understanding, to speed up the great work that has begun.

I believe one of the reasons the small watershed program has caught on is because it has been the very first approach that actually provided a place for all interests to join forces.

I know that we have been saying for years that city folks and other nonlandowners and nonfarmers have a stake in what happens to the land. Nobody could rightly dispute this, for it is indeed a truth.

But precious few gave the idea more than lip service. And, to be honest, there was perhaps little they could personally do about land and water problems except give support to conservation programs.

Farmers and other landowners, on the other hand, actually experienced the problems of erosion and silting, and uncontrolled water—and they fought it as best they could with their own hands.

But the job was too big for them as individuals. Their great day arrived with the soil conservation district.

This gave them a mechanism to attack the job on a communitywide, planned basis, and with expert technical and other help on a cooperative basis with their local, State and Federal governments.

This set a pattern that was followed in the development of the small watershed program. But there was an important difference. Because it dealt with water as well as land, it caught the attention of the man on the street for he had daily, intimate experiences with water.

Water out of the tap to drink. Water to bathe in. Water for cooking. Water to wash the family car. Water to fight fires. Floodwaters that damage streets, bridges, homes.

Yes, practically every man, woman and child could associate himself with water. It was a greater common denominator than land.

Have we taken full advantage of this natural urban interest? Have we exploited the advantages of the watershed approach to community development?

Do enough of our rural-urban communities—the farms and small towns of America—fully understand that a small watershed project can provide for immediate benefits to all citizens in the form of flood protection, water supply, recreation, agricultural water management—and at the same time be the incubator for future community and industrial development?

Have we made it clear throughout the length and breadth of the land that resource development through a watershed project can boost the economy of any community almost overnight, and that the benefits, if the project is properly planned for multiple-purpose use, will continue to grow year by year?

How many Americans realize that these developments are really not expenditures but actually investments in the future, that they return in benefits as much as 8 percent and more per year?

Are community leaders fully aware of the thoroughly democratic way in which a watershed project is developed? That it must be initiated and sponsored by the local people, through a responsible local organization.

That the plan is the peoples' own, designed to meet their own needs. That they must help develop the plan, put it into effect, help pay for it, and operate it and maintain it. That no agency of State or Federal Government dictates a single move.

On this point let me repeat a statement I made about the small watershed program in January 1961. I said that this program is a perfect example of Federal aid in its proper, constitutional perspective. It utilizes the greater resources of the Federal Government while recognizing that local needs can best be determined and fulfilled by local people working on the local level.

Many examples of the benefits of watershed projects could be cited in support of the questions I have asked. Let me quickly give you just one, and you'll pardon me if it comes from my own State, which I'm proud to say, is one of the national leaders in the small watershed program.

In our Little Tallapoosa River watershed, two new industries—one at Temple and one at Carrollton—have been attracted to the area because of the water supply development in the watershed project reservoirs. The two plants employ 700 people, most of whom live on small farms in the area. Farmers in the area need industry jobs to supplement their income. They also want work for their sons and daughters who otherwise would leave the community.

To attract the plant and 300 jobs cost Temple $4,363, the price of adding 72 acre-feet of water storage in the reservoir. Mayor Johnson of Temple expects industry will increase several hundred percent in the town as a result of the improved water supply.

Villa Rica, another town in the watershed, will add 445 acre-feet of storage in another flood detention reservoir to take care of future town and industry needs. The town now has 12 industries employing 1,200 people, a large part of whom are from farms.

Aside from these benefits, the project has provided much needed flood protection for valuable farm bottom land and to roads and bridges, and in a 10½-inch storm in February 1961, the project prevented the Carrollton waterworks from being flooded and thereby contaminated. This alone saved the town thousands of dollars.

But let's get back to how we can appeal to urban interests in watershed development. Another question: Is it generally known that the upstream and small watershed floodwater retarding dams stand guard over the big reservoirs—effectively catching most of the sediment? Do people generally realize that the small dams steady the flow of the main stream and clean up the water by controlling sediment and catching debris?

The useful life of the major reservoirs where upstream measures are practiced can be lengthened from 50 years to 100 years. This means these major dams, which are costly, can be twice as valuable as when they are supplemented by small watershed projects.

Have we stressed the compatibility of downstream and upstream measures to manage our water resources? These two programs are not and should not become competitive. Both have a role to play. Both are needed.

I note with pleasure the increase of multiple-purpose watershed projects, which incorporate all the needed features for sound land and water management and for economic and social development.

According to my information, about 36 percent of the 443 projects authorized for operations as of last November included structural measures with purposes other than flood prevention. This compares with 33 percent of all approved projects containing multiple-purpose structures as of June 1962, and 30 percent as of June 1961. Of the 58 projects approved for operations between July 1 and November 1, 1962, 32 projects, or 55 percent, included multiple-purpose structural measure.

Of the 443 projects approved for operations as of last November 1, 160 included structural measures incorporating one or more purposes other than flood prevention. Agricultural water-management features were included in 106 projects, fish and wildlife or recreational developments in 54 projects, and municipal water supplies in 32 projects for a total of 192 purposes other than flood prevention included in 160 multiple-purpose projects.

The recent amendments to the Watershed Act by the Congress broaden Federal authorities to provide assistance to local organizations in developing recreational facilities and water supplies for future municipal or industrial use in watershed projects.

This should accelerate the already desirable trend toward more multiple-purpose watershed projects—projects that look to the future of our countless rural-urban communities.

I note with pleasure another item that appears to be on the rise. I refer to the fact that 29 State governments and local organizations are providing approximately $2 million during 1963 to speed up watershed planning in their respective States.

May I say that this area—the area of State participation in watershed development—is one of the keys to speeding up progress.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, one of the reasons for the popularity of the small watershed program, in my opinion, is that it provides for genuine teamwork of all interests. In other words, it affords an opportunity for everybody to "get into the act."

How many of our State agencies are actively participating in the development of watershed projects—in planning, in financing, in operating and managing? Fortunately, there are quite a few. But not enough.

If the State legislatures have seen fit to pass some 192 pieces of legislation designed to facilitate progress under Public Law 566, it seems to me that all agencies of the State should be anxious to contribute in every possible way to projects that promise so much for the present and future welfare of the State.

Small watershed projects have proved themselves in less than 10 years.

They have demonstrated they can and must play a vital role in river basin development.

They have demonstrated they can stop soil erosion and water run-off damage on rural lands, stop destructive floods that damage both country and town, provide for irrigation and more efficient drainage, supply water for municipal needs, attract new industries, and provide new recreational opportunities.

They have demonstrated that by providing the foundation for economic and social betterment they can revive stagnating communities that otherwise would eventually disappear.

They are demonstrating something else—something that includes not only economic and social betterment but a host of intangibles that cannot be figured in dollars and cents but are equally precious.

They are preserving the identify of rural America, from which our great Nation sprang, from which we have drawn our democratic ideals, from which came most of our great leaders.

They are preserving a way of life that should never be permitted to perish in this land of ours—rural life, small town life, family farm life.

Rural America is a precious part of our great heritage.

At all costs it must be developed, improved, and protected.

Ten years ago you began a great new movement dedicated to these ideals. You have come far, but you have much, much further to go. And the time is growing shorter. I wish you Godspeed in the next decade.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on May 28 a number of plaintiffs and the legal defense fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to order the implementing of section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. This action by the NAACP is to be commended, and it represents another vigorous effort by the NAACP to secure through court action the equal protection of the laws and the full enforcement of all constitutional rights for Negroes. In this as well as in other ways, the NAACP is helping to make our Constitution prevail.

Section 2 of the 14th amendment provides for the reduction of the number of representatives in Congress apportioned to any State which denies or abridges the right to vote. This reduction is required to be in the proportion which the number of citizens otherwise eligible but denied the right to vote bears to the whole number of citizens eligible to vote, these facts to be determined by a census and reported to Congress.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported in 1961 that the denial of the right to vote because of race was largely confined to eight States of the South. In those eight States, there were 3.7 million nonwhites of voting age, but only about 1 million of these were registered to vote and still fewer actually voted. A constitutional reduction in the 69 House seats now held by these States might result in the loss of 15 or more of them.

The right of all citizens to vote and to have their vote counted is a basic right explicitly guaranteed by the Constitution as amended. The facts show that this right is being denied to many citizens through the poll tax, literacy tests, and intimidation.

Moreover, an inequitable situation exists for the rest of the Nation because, as a matter of fact, the political representation of the whites in many Southern States has been disproportionately increased since emancipation. Before emancipation three-fifths of the number of slaves was counted to determine a State's apportionment of House seats, but after emancipation all the adult Negro males were counted for this purpose despite their not being permitted to vote. Now we still have a situation in which the full number of adult Negroes, as determined by the census, are counted in determining apportionment, but in the Black Belt counties certainly less than one-third are permitted to register to vote and probably less than one-quarter actually face the intimidation and vote.

I believe, therefore, that it is proper and desirable that this suit be brought to order the Secretary of Commerce and the Census Bureau to implement this section of the 14th amendment by reporting the required reductions to Congress. Of course, should the States immediately stop their practices of denying Negroes and others the right to vote, then their representation in Congress would not be affected. If further legislation is needed to assist in making a court order for reduction in representation effective, I shall join with other colleagues in sponsoring such legislation.

MAN AGAINST TIME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on Friday, May 24, 1963, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze spoke before the National Conference on Social Welfare at the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel in Cleveland, Ohio.

My good friend, Tony Celebrezze, who in the short time he has been in his important post has gained the admiration and respect of citizens and leaders of both political parties, made an outstanding address on the many serious problems confronting our Nation in the field of public welfare. He also reemphasized the need for a plan of hospitalization and nursing home care for the elderly under social security.

I commend this important speech to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN AGAINST TIME

(By Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the general session, National Conference on Social Welfare, Cleveland, Ohio, May 24, 1963)

It is a pleasure to meet with you, and it is a special pleasure to meet with you in Cleveland.

I am sure that during the course of this week you have found Cleveland to be a stimulating setting for the exchange of ideas. The achievement represented by the 50th anniversary of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland being observed this year is a reflection of the traditional sensitivity and response to social welfare needs which are characteristic of this forward-looking community.

Characteristic, too, are such current developments as Springbrook, the housing, health, and activities center for older citizens, the Hough area "Community Action for Youth" program, the magnificent job of financial support of welfare programs done here through the United Appeal, and many other equally notable achievements in the welfare field.

In 9 years as a mayor, I have seen firsthand the heartbreaking problems of slum neighborhoods and the pressing human needs that they present.

In the past 9 months, as a member of the President's Cabinet, with responsibility for health, education, and welfare, I have been privileged to see these vast problems and these needs in the larger context of our national interest.

It is on the basis of this bifocal view that I would like to add whatever dimension I can to your consideration of the social welfare challenge—present and future—which has engaged your attention during the course of this week.

It is encouraging that in Cleveland, and elsewhere throughout the Nation, a real effort is being made to carry forward constructive welfare programs. This assemblage has offered impressive evidence of the dedication and imagination with which the great challenges of the social welfare field are being faced on an ever-broadening front. Yet our social problems continue to multiply. We race against time.

Henry Adams, at the turn of the century, foresaw our predicament with exceptional clarity. Writing in 1904 about the demands that would be placed on Americans who were born in the 20th century, he said that the new American would be "the child of incalculable coal power, chemical power, electric power, and radiating energy, as well as new forces as yet undetermined."

As Adams saw it, we would need to develop "a new social mind" to save ourselves from the excesses of the almost unlimited energy at our command and thus to avoid social chaos.

This "social mind" is developing; our social world has been changing along with our physical world. But the race is far from over, and the outcome is not yet certain.

The most obvious hazard, of course, is the threat of destruction by nuclear warfare. This threat is so appalling that it is a temptation to believe that, if we can just avoid this particular tragedy, everything will be all right.

But there are other dangers not always as clearly recognized. Equally as urgent as our efforts to cope with the threat of death from nuclear warfare are our efforts to provide men, women, and children with the opportunities which will enable them to live successfully in an increasingly complex world. Only as we achieve that goal can we be certain of winning our race against time.

Today in the United States, the richest and most advanced nation in the world, far too many people are denied the opportunities that our society offers.

With all our advancing technology, our rising standard of living, and our increasing affluence, we still have left a large number of families and individuals in the shadow of poverty and have accentuated the plight of the hard core of the very poor.

This poverty is all the more disturbing because, to a greater extent than ever before, it is self-perpetuating—and it presents a sharper contrast than ever before to the kind of life which our general technical, economic, and social advance could reasonably be expected to bring within reach of everyone.

There has been growing recognition of the fact that both the causes and cures of poverty and, as well, the lack of opportunity to rise above poverty are based on factors within the individual himself and on factors in his environment. There has been growing recognition, too, of the interrelationship of these factors.

For example, opportunity is denied for some even before they are born. Many of the 126,000 new cases of mental retardation that occur each year are congenital. We need more research to shed more light on the causes of this handicap, but we already know that an alarmingly high proportion of these children are born to mothers who do not have adequate medical care.

The risk of mental retardation does not end at birth. As children grow up in crowded slum homes, without benefit of pediatric or even sufficient day-by-day care, the problem grows.

It is encouraging to know that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare earlier this week favorably reported on President Kennedy's broad mental retardation and mental health bill. This is an important step forward.

But poverty often limits opportunities for the successful development of the full potentialities of normal children. Since 19 million children—almost 30 percent of all American children—are growing up under the cruel handicap of deprivation.

What do these children do without? You know because you deal with many of the most deprived. You know the makeshift arrangements that are made for the children of working mothers. There are 4 million of these children under 6 years of age, and all the licensed day-care centers in the entire country combined can accommodate only 185,000 of them. There are more latchkey children roaming our streets today than there were at the height of World War II.

You know that many children do without the food they need. Too many children do without medical supervision, immunizations, dental care. Obviously they also do without adequate living space and the cultural influences that stimulate the learning process in the home.

Studies of schoolchildren in the core cities of our 14 largest metropolitan areas have revealed that a third of them were so culturally deprived as to be incapable of learning by usual classroom methods.

Is it any wonder that the school dropout rate is high? Forty percent of our present generation of young people fail to finish high school. Only 13 percent go to college—and this at a time when our whole economy rests upon mastery of complex technology.

I have stressed the needs of children, because meeting those needs must be the focal point if we are to break the cycle of self-perpetuating poverty which will involve increasing numbers of each new generation unless we act now.

In meeting those needs, the distribution of assistance funds to needy families to provide a minimum of decency and comfort is only a first step—a stopgap at best. But it is an important first step and should be taken in such a way as to assure not only that the funds go only to those truly in need but also that the misfortunes of the parents, whether deserved or not, are not visited upon the children. I fail to understand the point of view that would deny sustenance to children because of their parentage or other conditions over which the children have no control. I believe, too, that it is ironical that, while the desertion of children by their fathers has long been a cause for serious concern and while provision has been made for such children under the Social Security Act from the time it was enacted, it took us 26 years to amend the act so that assistance could be given to needy children whose fathers had not deserted; that is, children with a father in the home but unemployed. Even now, such assistance is possible in only 15 States.

Beyond treating the symptoms of poverty and dependency through distribution of assistance funds is the necessity for getting at the underlying causes.

One of the greatest challenges we face is to obtain wide public understanding of this need for action. There must be public understanding, too, that dependency and poverty are no longer, if they ever were, islands of misfortune—outside the mainstream of our national life. We simply cannot permit pockets of human despair to exist behind the leading edge of social, cultural, and economic advance if our progress and growth and role of leadership in the free world are to continue.

Scores of complex issues are clamoring for the citizen's attention today. It is difficult to grasp even the salient facts about them all. There is a tendency, because of this, to oversimplify the issues—to accept easy and often wrong answers.

But welfare is your business. You know, on the basis of long experience, that you cannot cure social ills by intensifying their causes. You see welfare issues in their true light. But unless you explain them and bring them to his attention, how is the average citizen to be wise about welfare? This is but one of the many issues which the citizen in a democracy must understand.

Unfortunately, we cannot set priorities on all the issues and study them carefully one by one. Yet we could lose our race against time by neglecting any of them.

This administration's broad social welfare program is based on the premise that the citizens of this Nation want to understand these problems and want to act on the basis of that understanding. Much of the necessary social legislation was recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy earlier this year in five special messages: on health, on education, on mental health and mental retardation, on youth, and on aging.

The President's proposals would supplement and reinforce the impressive amount of social legislation passed in the last 2 years: the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and many others.

To this audience, I need not detail these forward-looking programs.

You know that we must have people better educated to grasp the complex issues of public policy which will determine our survival as a democracy. And you know how far our present educational system falls below our requirements, particularly for the culturally deprived.

You know how important it is, in dealing with today's No. 1 health problem of chronic illness, to apply a team approach. You know that the social worker, the physician, the therapist, and many other specialists must work together to provide the broad spectrum of services the chronically ill require. And you know how few of the 19 million Americans whose activities are limited by chronic impairments are currently getting this modern type of service.

And who knows better than you the toll of mental illness and mental retardation? Or the folly of placing—as we do still place—our chief emphasis on vast institutions and custodial care instead of upon community programs of prevention and rehabilitation?

Many of you can call by name some of the thousands of youths who roam our streets, out of school, out of work, and ripe for trouble. Isn't the Youth Employment Act a better answer than rising rates of juvenile delinquency?

Not only from your own caseloads but from your own experiences with elderly relatives, you also know what irony there is in prolonging life without providing opportunities for its enjoyment. The economic security of our aged demands hospital insurance under the Social Security System.

Hospital insurance is the most important legislation for older people that the President has called for, but we hope it will not be the only measure passed.

The tax reform bill would save senior citizens $790 million in income taxes.

The Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act would provide grants for multipurpose activities centers and support other State and local programs. It would fill many of the gaps in services and facilities needed by older people in all income groups.

The public assistance amendments would reduce the residence requirements that bar many older people from the aid they need, would put standards on rental housing for recipients of old-age assistance, and provide for other improvements that you have long advocated.

You also know of the need to expand day-care programs and other child welfare programs. These too are called for in the President's welfare program.

As the specialists in this field, you can do much to alert your fellow citizens to the urgency of the problems which this new legislation is designed to meet.

You can help also in creating broader understanding of the objectives of the public welfare amendments of 1962.

President Kennedy rightly described these amendments as the "most far reaching revision of our public welfare laws since they were created in 1935." Here at last you have the authority for the approach you know is the only way to break the poverty cycle—through preventive and rehabilitative services offered by persons who have been professionally trained for that work.

To those who call for economy, you can readily demonstrate that this is economy.

In Maricopa County, Ariz., workers, whose caseloads have been reduced to manageable sizes, gave services which cut assistance costs by $5,700 a month within 3 months.

In the District of Columbia a pilot project for mothers and children who are receiving public assistance provided job training for the mothers and good day-care facilities for the children. The result: In the first class, 28 out of 32 mothers got jobs after 4 to 6 months of training.

The vocational rehabilitation program is another illustration of economy by way of service. In 1962, the Federal-State programs reached an alltime record of rehabilitating 102,377 persons. Before being rehabilitated, 70 percent of these people were not working at all, and the remainder earned low wages. Now they are earning over $210 million annually.

To those who think public assistance aids and abets immorality, present the facts. When a teenager can stay in school instead of having to look for work to help support the family, isn't he better equipped for good citizenship? Public assistance makes this possible. More often than not, it is public assistance that puts new heart and hope into people. Over 60 percent of the needy families with dependent children, despite their heavy handicaps, become self-supporting within 3 years.

I believe that it is of crucial importance that the purpose of programs such as those embodied in the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 be well understood. That purpose is to enable people to exercise self-reliance and initiative and to achieve the personal independence that is so much a part of the American tradition.

We were thrilled last week by Major Cooper's orbital feat. You will recall that the ultimate success of his flight depended upon his maintaining his capsule in what astronauts call a proper "attitude." It became his individual and personal task in the last stages of his flight, when automatic controls had ceased to function, to keep his capsule in proper position to reenter the earth's atmosphere and reach his rendezvous point in the Pacific.

I suggest that an analogy exists in the field with which this conference is concerned. The success of efforts to meet the Nation's social welfare needs depends on maintaining our social order in proper "attitude" in relation to human need and human aspirations. This is done through a system of laws, administered by public agencies, through a vast network of volunteer organizations and efforts, all backed up by professionally trained technicians and administrators in the social welfare field. This is necessary. But there comes a point where the maintenance of this proper "attitude" depends not on our laws, not upon volunteer organizations, not upon the trained social worker but upon the individual. There comes a point, no matter how effective public and private welfare program support may be, where the maintenance of a proper "attitude" becomes a highly personal matter on the part of each individual.

Whether in outer space or in the heart of our great cities, there is no substitute for personal initiative, for acceptance of personal responsibility, and for a sustained personal effort.

Unless our efforts as public and private agencies and as individuals working in the social welfare field encourage, preserve, and strengthen individual responsibility, they will be in vain. We must make it possible for every individual to have this opportunity without regard to race, color, or creed.

As you know, we have put together in the Department an able team of people who are expert in the welfare field. Wilbur Cohen is our Assistant Secretary in charge of all legislation. Robert Ball is the able Commissioner of Social Security.

We have created a Welfare Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to help you build increasingly effective, efficient, and constructive public welfare programs in your areas. We have appointed as Commissioner of Welfare Ellen Winston, a woman noted for her ability to do a good job. We have asked for funds to carry out the Federal responsibility for developing more effective and more efficient public welfare programs. The next moves are yours. Here are some questions to suggest what those next moves may be:

Has your State established a program of medical assistance for the aged?

Is your State prepared to offer the welfare services that will qualify it, on July 1 of this year, to receive 75 percent of the cost of such services from Federal funds?

Is your State taking full advantage of the Federal aid available for training public welfare personnel?

Does your State make payments to the second parent in needy families with dependent children?

Has your State extended child welfare services to all political subdivisions?

Does your State allow needy young people and the aged to keep some earnings without having their assistance checks reduced?

Do you have a sound community work and training program for the unemployed parents of dependent children?

Is your State moving ahead with homemaker programs, day-care facilities, reduction of caseloads?

Is your State's vocational rehabilitation agency equipped to serve all on public assistance who can benefit from such aid?

As you and your fellow citizens answer "yes" to more and more of these and similar questions, we move ahead. We improve our chances of keeping man the master of an ever more complex and demanding world.

I believe it is of crucial importance that in our public programs and in our activities as private agencies and as individuals we continue to make every effort to strengthen individual responsibility.

I also believe that it is of crucial importance that the purpose of programs which are intended to strengthen individual responsibility be well understood.

The program embodied in the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 is one of the major programs for accomplishing this purpose—the purpose of enabling people to exercise self-reliance and initiative and to achieve the personal independence that is so essential a part of the American tradition.

We need to have this purpose understood, and we need to have it implemented in the public welfare and private welfare fields. But we need, still further, to press ahead toward the accomplishment of the same kind of purpose in a different area.

In our social security system we have in operation a highly successful and widely accepted instrument for providing economic security and for preventing destitution and dependency. In social security we have at hand a valuable tool for accomplishing the purpose of enabling people to be self-reliant and to achieve personal independence. The system can be and should be used much more effectively for this purpose.

Social security is based on the concept that security for the individual should, to the extent possible, grow out of his own work. Whether a person is entitled to benefits and the amount of his benefits are related to a record of his earnings. Basing eligibility on a demonstration of work and providing variable benefits related to the level of a person's earnings fits in with the general system of economic incentives.

Furthermore, since benefits are paid regardless of income from savings, pensions, investments, and the like, the worker is encouraged to supplement the basic protection afforded by his social security benefits with whatever additional protection he is able to build. The system operates to prevent need and dependency, and it does this as a result of the work and contributions of the individual himself.

Over time, the benefits will need to be increased so that they will make as full a contribution to the prevention of dependency as they can make. And the method of social insurance, which is embodied in our social security program, needs to be applied to an additional risk—the risk of hospital costs for those over age 65.

The idea behind the President's recommendation in this area is very simple. It is to add hospital insurance protection to the cash retirement incomes that people are building under social security. The President proposes that this addition be handled in the same way as is the present program; that is, working people would pay contributions during their working lives and at age 65 would have paid-up hospital insurance protection.

There is no practical and satisfactory way to meet the hospital and related costs of the aged except on the basis of insurance. Hospital costs fall very unevenly, and where they do fall the burden is very great. There is no other sensible way to meet such costs but through a pooling of risks; that is, through insurance.

Because of their relatively low incomes, the aged need insurance to an even greater extent than do those in the lower age brackets. But there is no way for health insurance for most of the aged to be made really workable except through a system like social security, in which payments are made during the working years and no payments are required after retirement. The reason for this is that since older people have much more need of expensive care than do younger people, premiums paid in old age have to be high to cover the cost, and yet this is the very time when incomes are low.

This set of facts explains why private insurance has not been able to do an adequate job of providing this protection. The commercial companies and Blue Cross do a good job of affording protection for younger employed workers, but the protection for retired people is usually inadequate, and for more than half of those who are retired it is nonexistent. Generally, people in old age cannot pay what good insurance protection costs.

The President's proposal is solely a mechanism, like Blue Cross, for the payment of bills. The Government will not provide services. As now, every person will choose his own doctor, his own hospital. The proposal is not, of course, socialized medicine. What is proposed is solely a way of helping older people meet part of the costs of medical care through advance planning—as part of the advance planning for retirement they already do under social security. It will cost the average worker about $1 a month while he earns—and nothing after he retires.

I want to emphasize that we do not regard the proposed hospital insurance program as a substitute for medical services for the needy under public assistance. The two programs supplement one another. At present 25 States, the District of Columbia, and 3 territories have medical assistance for the aged programs in action. Four more States will start programs July 1. Legislative proposals are under consideration in other States. The Department encourages and welcomes this interest and activity. We provided—and will continue to provide—consultation and planning help to States at every opportunity.

But the problem of costs of medical care in old age will not be solved solely by MAA, just as it will not be solved solely through private health insurance plans. We need all three: social security as a first line of defense, private health insurance as a supplement, and public assistance as a backstop.

I want to repeat what President Kennedy has said: "Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now."

Many years ago, a historian wrote: "All that is human must retrograde if it does not advance." The language has a touch of the archaic, but the thought is as fresh as when it was penned. The words are those of Edward Gibbon in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

You who have chosen careers in welfare have taken on many heavy burdens. I believe I speak for the great majority of Americans when I say that we appreciate the vital importance of what you are doing and the dedication, competence, and zeal you are devoting to the task of advancing the social welfare of all Americans.

INTEGRATION OF THE RACES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues several newspaper articles on recent and proposed Court and Executive actions on the subject of integration of the races. These articles bear particularly on the recent Supreme Court decision in the sit-in cases, administration actions to force integration through various techniques involving the application of power, and the proposed so-called civil rights legislation which is expected to be presented to the Congress by the administration next week. In view of the interest which has been manifested in this entire subject area by so many Members of this body, I commend to my colleagues the reading of these articles. They are as follows: Two columns by Mr. David Lawrence, the first being entitled "Congress and Desegregation: Law Requiring Integration of Schools and Restaurants Held Never Enacted" as printed in the Evening Star of May 29, 1963; the second being entitled "Private Business and Integration: Power of Dictatorship Seen in Proposal for Law To Close Establishments" as printed in the Evening Star of May 31, 1963. Also I offer for inclusion in the RECORD a column by Mr. Richard Wilson entitled "New Aspect of Integration Issue: Question of a Person's Own Choice of Action Reached in the Debate" as printed in the May 29, 1963, issue of the Evening Star, and also a column by Mr. Arthur Krock entitled "In the Nation: Deepening Twilight Over Private Rights" as printed in the May 30, 1963, issue of the New York Times; an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "In the Name of Equality: Public Places Integration Heads Into Private Rights" which was reprinted in the Columbia Record. I also offer an editorial entitled "Beam in Washington's Eye," printed in the June 3, 1963, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, and an editorial entitled "The Law of the Land Changes" as printed in the May 30, 1963, issue of the Jasper County News, of Ridgeland, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that all of these articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 29, 1963]

CONGRESS AND DESEGREGATION: LAW REQUIRING INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS AND RESTAURANTS HELD NEVER ENACTED

(By David Lawrence)

There's worry about the "image" of America being created abroad nowadays. Secretary of State Dean Rusk attributes it to the controversy over racial discrimination.

But Mr. Rusk doesn't tell the whole story—that part which is conveniently overlooked by almost everybody because it's easier to do so than face the facts. The facts are that not a single law has ever been passed by Congress requiring desegregation or integration of public schools, restaurants or hotels, and not a single law has been adopted prohibiting discrimination in employment.

America's racial controversy today points up another omission in the field of law. The Supreme Court of the United States, consisting of nine men, is not a legislature. It cannot lawfully substitute its will for that of Congress. But it has done so. Also, two Presidents of the United States—in 1957 and 1962, respectively—have used Federal troops to secure the enforcement of court orders relating to school integration, but no laws covering the subject have been passed by Congress. This creates abroad an "image" of dictatorship tactics.

The 14th amendment itself makes no mention of schools or private or public employment, but declares all citizens have a right to the "equal protection of the laws." This same amendment says explicitly that Congress is given the power to pass laws to enforce the provisions of the article. No laws dealing with desegregation in the schools have ever been passed by Congress.

This truth is beginning to be recognized at last by some leaders in Congress who, this very month, have introduced bills setting forth what racial discrimination covers and what shall be prohibited.

The United States has always been portrayed abroad as a free republic. America, it has been emphasized, has a government of laws—not of men. But foreign observers have noted that an oligarchy of nine men—who hold office for life—has attempted to write the laws. Thoughtful students of democratic government abroad have been amazed at this departure from the very words of the Constitution, and this tends to hurt the "image" of the United States as supposedly a free republic governed by a written constitution.

Commendable efforts have been made recently by local communities in different parts of the United States to try to settle the racial question by moral suasion These efforts were making progress when "demonstrations" heralded as "nonviolent" stirred up racial violence. The episodes have not been confined to the South. They have spread to all parts of the United States. Riots and other disturbances are frequent. Every day the press dispatches tell the world that some Americans are relying on a form of mob rule to convince citizens who disagree with all this that they had better give in or their businesses will be ruined.

Has America learned anything in 100 years about how to deal with the race problem? In the 3 years after the War Between the States ended in 1865, a faction in Congress arbitrarily deprived several States of their seats in both Houses here, imposed military rule on the South, and sent in troops with bayonets to compel State legislatures to ratify the 14th amendment as the price of membership in the Federal Union. It was an example of lawlessness about which most Americans prefer not to read, though the facts are indelibly written in history books.

The way out of all this is to follow the procedure stipulated in the Constitution—to submit in a lawful manner a new 14th amendment which will specify school integration and anything else that two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and the majority of the people in three-fourths of the States of the Union want to declare as "the law of the land." Then there will be ample power for Congress to stipulate by statute just what shall be done about discrimination in public or private activities.

It is never too late to right a wrong—even one committed 100 years ago. If, as is widely assumed, an overwhelming majority of the American people would support such an amendment to the Constitution, this process need not take long. The 21st amendment repealing prohibition, for example, was adopted in only 9 months. The "image" of America abroad would then truly be portrayed as a government of laws—not of men.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 31, 1963]

Private Business and Integration: Power of Dictatorship Seen in Proposal for Law To Close Establishments

(By David Lawrence)

Negro leaders are high-pressuring the Kennedy administration to coerce the dissenters on the segregation issues, even if it means the ruin of many private businesses which are caught in the emotional collision between rival groups in local communities.

President Kennedy apparently has decided to pass the buck to Congress. He has gone much further without law than any other Chief Executive to compel what is called "equal rights." But the Negro leaders—stimulated by the immunity granted by the Supreme Court recently to participants in street demonstrations which have provoked violence—say Mr. Kennedy hasn't done enough. So the President concedes in effect, that he cannot proceed without a law, and now is about to ask Congress for more sweeping authority over business than has ever been given a Chief Executive in the Federal statute. If Congress balks, Mr. Kennedy can say he at least did his part.

The proposal is that the President be given the right to close down any business if it insists on choosing its own customers or if it refuses to serve those who may be disorderly or otherwise engage in provocative acts that offend other customers and cause them to abstain from patronizing the business.

Nothing in the Constitution, of course, authorizes any such use of power by the President. But Mr. Kennedy need worry little about this slight omission, for the chances are that no Congress will ever pass such legislation. It would mean, if enacted, the delegation to a President of the power of dictatorship over all private businesses throughout the country. Many a Member of the Senate or House who votes for such a statute would find an aroused and resentful electorate in 1964 imposing its only form of redress—the defeat of those who voted for such a bill.

The campaign issue would not be based on the racial controversy alone. It would reach into every kind of economic activity in the country. For the proposed law would declare, in substance, that the Federal Government can erase all State lines for business operations and decide that every business can be regulated from Washington. Controls can then be imposed as to the customers a business must serve and the employees it must hire.

The intention of those who now are drafting a bill on the subject is to rely on that provision of the Constitution which says Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." Again and again throughout American history, the Supreme Court has decided dozens of cases involving Federal laws that endeavored at first to distinguish between businesses operating within a State and those whose operations extended outside a State. Gradually the court has inclined to the view that all businesses can be affected by interstate commerce. The emphasis, however, has been on their interstate character and on commodities—their manufacture or production or transportation.

Only rarely has the Congress sought to deal with individuals in interstate commerce, and then only with the conditions of employment of those who are directly connected with businesses on either a local or national level. Never has the Congress or the Supreme Court held that a business cannot choose its customers or cannot discontinue operations permanently or for a short time if it feels so inclined.

The Supreme Court nowadays, however, is a quasi-political body. Just a few days ago the court ruled that those who provoked street demonstrations under cover of "civil rights" demands—often resulting in injury to other citizens—were guiltless and couldn't be disciplined as violators of local ordinances designed to preserve law and order.

So, if Congress should pass a law giving dictatorship powers to a President, a majority of the present Supreme Court Justices could be expected to uphold it. They probably would disregard the article in the Constitution which says no person can be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The only barrier which really remains is that which the voters themselves can erect in expressing their opposition to those individual Members of Congress who might be inclined to vote for a measure giving the President control of the operations of every business—not only as to customers chosen but as to employees hired. For the Federal Government would be able to compel the hiring of applicants who had been turned down. Irrespective of the protest of the employer that he was hiring on the basis of efficiency, Federal officials would be authorized to require acceptance of applicants in private business on whatever basis these officials chose to determine in each case.

The inspiration for this new move by the Kennedy administration is evidently the concurring opinion rendered recently by Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court. Although the explicit issue was not before the court in that case, he wrote at length his view that every private business which today operates under a State, city or county license thereby becomes "State-connected" and thus within the Federal concept under the 14th amendment, and that it can, therefore, be constitutionally restricted in accordance with specifications laid down by Congress.

No other issue in the 1964 campaign will affect the entire electorate so penetratingly as the one raised by the prospective legislation about to be sponsored by the Kennedy administration. The economic impact of this move might be such that the debate will no longer be confined to the racial problem but will raise the question of whether a free-enterprise system could long survive under such totalitarian controls.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 29, 1963]

New Aspect of Integration Issue: Question of a Person's Own Choice of Action Reached in the Debate

(By Richard Wilson)

After about 20 years of turbulent step-by-step progress toward race equality, the point has now been reached where the morality of personal choice comes stronger into question.

Many people, particularly in the Northern States, have philosophically supported racial integration as a principle of American government while conducting their own lives so as to minimize racial contacts. Or, these philosophical supporters of integration have indulged in token contacts which give the semblance of avoiding hypocrisy.

For more than 25 years, beginning in 1938, the courts have been ordering the elimination of segregation in public facilities, most notably in the public schools, but also in transportation, and to a lesser degree in housing and on public golf courses, beaches, swimming pools, libraries, and amusement parks.

The major emphasis—in fact, it may be said the only legal emphasis—in this field has been on the equal use and benefits of public facilities.

We find now, as a result of the Supreme Court's rulings in the sit-in demonstration cases, the introduction of a newer element which has been implicitly present all the time but not so strongly brought forward.

This is the question of private segregation.

A great many individuals claim the right to conduct their lives in their own way and in the tradition of the English common law. They claim this right in their homes, their churches, their means of making a livelihood, and other phases of their lives which need not be directly involved with the state.

They claim the right to make fools of themselves, to choose weak or transient friends, to drink too much or eat too much, to be rude to their neighbors and to be surly and intolerant with their fellow man because they do not like his looks or the way he scratches himself.

There are some, probably millions, who wish to practice private segregation by belonging to clubs, and going to or operating restaurants, stores, churches, theaters and social assemblies where there are not any Negroes. This may be a misguided and reprehensible way of life, but it is not one which is prohibited by the 14th amendment to the

Constitution of the United States, as currently interpreted.

Whether or not this will continue to be wholly the case is the question.

In the rulings freeing some 40 sit-in demonstrators, the Supreme Court came to the fringes of the question. These rulings were based on the illegality of attempting to enforce segregation laws which are unconstitutional.

Left open was the question of whether a storekeeper or restaurant operator can of his free choice conduct his own private segregation unaffected by law. If he cannot, then there will have been a moral breakthrough which in due time would undoubtedly have a wider ranging effect. The Court will have an opportunity in the near future to rule more narrowly on this question in a Maryland case which has been assigned for reargument.

It may well be that the very nature of operating a business which caters to the general public will be found to be so affected by the interests of the State that it must be open to all, white and colored. The fact that such a business abuts a public street or must get public licenses of one form or another may be found to invest it with the character of a public facility.

The morality of personal choice, while not yet judged legally by the Supreme Court, has always been in question in the Kennedy administration. This was first seen in the advocacy by the Kennedys of the admission of Negroes to all-white private clubs, and more recently in the President's proposal that more Negroes and whites visit each other's homes and share each other's eating habits. In the District of Columbia the question is rising as to whether a person offering a home for public sale can legally refuse to sell to a Negro for the sole reason of the prospective buyer's color.

In view of these trends of thought, the observations of the Court's lone dissenter, Justice Harlan, are worthy of long consideration. He said:

"An individual's right to restrict the use of his property, however unregenerate a particular exercise of that right may be thought, lies beyond the reach of the 14th amendment.

"Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors; to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit; to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from Government interference."

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1963]

In the Nation: Deepening Twilight Over Private Property Rights

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, May 29.—If the President recommends, Congress accepts, and the Supreme Court validates the proposal now before President Kennedy—a legislative ban on customer discrimination by the private owners of public accommodation facilities—the long-existing judicial, executive, and legislative concept of private property rights will not be the only casualty.

The proposal Mr. Kennedy is seriously considering is to expand by Federal statute the antidiscrimination bans of the 14th amendment to all commercial establishments which sell articles that have crossed State lines in their progress from the producer and processor to the vendor. That would be accomplished by including these transactions within the constitutional power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce.

In addition to the total extinction of a long-affirmed private right of free choice, the following would be the effects of this proposed law if validated:

1. Legislation by Congress, for the first time since the lapse of certain Reconstruction statutes, in areas of discrimination not yet preempted by the Federal courts.

2. The end of the geographical paradox, with respect to forms of antidiscrimination by private property owners of facilities of public accommodation, created by the Supreme Court's sit-in decisions 2 weeks ago.

Section 5 of the 14th amendment declares that "Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." These provisions forbid "any State to abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" to "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law" or to "deny the equal protection of the laws" to any citizen. For a number of years, in the continued refusal of Congress to accept as "appropriate legislation" of the amendment a ban on racial segregation in the public schools, public recreational and accommodation areas within any State, the Supreme Court has superseded the unemployed legislative process by imposing these bans as the final interpreter of the Constitution. Congress, under the proposal before President Kennedy, by use of authority granted by another part of the Constitution—the interstate commerce clause—would enter a private property sector of discrimination the Federal courts have not reached.

THE REGIONAL DECISIONS

The geographical paradox of the sit-in decisions would vanish, because such a validated statute would make this customer discrimination unconstitutional everywhere in the United States. The decisions apply only to States and communities where segregated service is imposed by law or by public policy of the authorities in the absence of a law. The proposed statute would make this segregated service as unconstitutional in Montana as the Supreme Court has held it to be in the Southern States and communities.

But the law would be a violent departure from the long-affirmed constitutional concept of private rights in this country. These have already been threatened in practice by judges, politicians of both parties, and by self-serving social agitators who encourage mass coercion as a method of accomplishing any objectives which population groups self-adjudge to be constitutional because they want them, regardless of their violation of the legal rights of others.

But Justice Harlan should not long remain the only high Federal official to stress that in the current racial controversy is "a clash of competing constitutional claims of a high order: liberty and equality;" and that "* * * freedom of the individual to choose his associates * * * and use his property as he sees fit," even though "irrational and even unjust" is "entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference."

In Paris today, where his official duties have pleasingly dispatched him, Representative Adam Clayton Powell repeated his prediction that Congress will pass a firm equal rights bill this year because "the white man is scared." If the provisions of the measure satisfy the demands of one group of Americans at the expense of the rights of others, this will lend credibility to Powell's boast in that "world opinion" which haunts the policies of the administration.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Reprinted From the Wall Street Journal]

In the Name of Equality: Public Places' Integration Heads Into Private Rights

If you are a restaurant operator in a city with an ordinance upholding segregation, or where prevailing sentiment favors it, you plainly do not have full freedom of choice as to whom you will serve. If you serve Negroes, you invite either prosecution or ostracism.

That is one of the things wrong with such local laws; the effect is to limit the freedom of all concerned. And that is why the Supreme Court ruled last week, in the several Southern cases before it, that Negroes cannot be prosecuted by the local authorities for sit-ins in these private establishments.

PROBLEMS

Unfortunately the ruling also raises new problems that seem sure to trouble the future of race relations. The free choice of the restaurant operator is not improved. If he serves Negroes, he transgresses local law or custom; if he refuses, they can trespass on his property with impunity. He is left with little control over private decisions which traditionally in this country are up to the individual.

The local police, moreover, are left in a dilemma. One obvious way out is for the appropriate lawmakers to repeal segregation ordinances where they exist. But unless or until that is done, the police do have the duty of upholding law and maintaining order. How do they do that when sit-ins and other demonstrations threaten violence? How do you keep order if the violators of local law are immune from prosecution?

As a practical matter, the Supreme Court ruling is likely to encourage the increasingly widespread, and increasingly violent, trend of the demonstrations. So the problem of maintaining order is compounded—and not just in the South.

PARADOX

For the ruling has also produced an instant geographical paradox. In a Northern area where no public insistence on segregation exists, a private businessman is free to discriminate against a Negro or anyone else.

One proposed piece of legislation to deal with the paradox would in effect outlaw discrimination anywhere by any private business which must operate under State or local licensing, and that covers a lot of businesses. This sort of solution would remove the geographical paradox, all right, but as the New York Times' Arthur Krock observes, the "long-established judicial and legislative concept of private property rights would disappear with the paradox."

The Supreme Court, then, is skirting treacherous waters in this question of desegregation in private as opposed to public places. Justice Harlan, in his partial dissent, calls the issue "a clash of competing constitutional claims of a high order: liberty and equality."

He continues: "Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden, in the name of equality, if the strictures of the 14th amendment were applied to governmental and private actions without distinction."

PRIVATE RIGHTS

It is more than a little disturbing that, in less than 10 years, the just and proper outlawing of segregation in public places is heading into the area of private rights. Not only is liberty affected; equality is getting some new definitions.

Thus there is a developing viewpoint that Negroes must not only be afforded equality of treatment but in fact be made "more equal." The law, that is, must do more than permit free association in public places; it must be bent to force integration in schools, businesses and housing throughout the country.

This feeling apparently stems from a realization that legal desegregation does not bring actual integration; that neither the white nor the Negro people as a whole are prepared to manage wholesale integration.

We may deplore the fact, but it is a fact nonetheless. It shows up in the general preference of northerners, in practice, for separation in housing. It shows up dramatically in the phenomenon of the extremist Black Muslims, whatever proportion of Negro sentiment they reflect; they do not want integration but the opposite; Negro hegemony in areas of their own, as exists in the new nations of Africa.

HARD FACT

This being a hard fact of human nature at its present stage of development, some whites and some Negro leaders reason that human nature must be forced—by legal means or violence or both—to accept what it will not so far voluntarily accept. It is a viewpoint that does not yet enjoy the force of law, but it is the direction in which the Supreme Court seems to be moving. If so, it is not difficult to see how things can get out of hand.

For our part, we certainly believe the Negroes must be given the constitutional rights and privileges accorded all other citizens. We also believe that a degree of integration manageable by both the white and the Negro communities will come if it is permitted to come gradually.

But we are sure the whole Nation, white and Negro, stands to lose greatly if it ever assumes that individual rights and ordinary commonsense should be smashed in the name of equality.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, June 3, 1963]

Beam in Washington's Eye

Kennedy administration strategists have been burning the midnight oil the past few days, preparing two new civil rights bills which are scheduled to be presented to Congress this week. The flurry of activity was set off by a wave of demonstrations across the Nation in behalf of equal rights for the Negro.

Even as the Justice Department lawyers worked to complete the hurried-up legislation, however, the rights of citizens to walk the public sidewalks were being effectively denied just a few blocks away. The reason, of course, is a worsening wave of Washington crime which has now become a national disgrace. Yet there is no evidence that the Justice Department has lifted a finger to eliminate these injustices on its own doorstep.

But if the alarming incidence of vicious crimes in the Nation's Capital has yet to inspire administration action, at least it has begun to receive long overdue recognition in the national press. In the current issue of Look magazine, Washington Correspondent Fletcher Knebel writes a "Portrait of a Sick City." His article begins:

"Behind its domes, spires, monuments and broad, tree-bowered avenues, Washington, D.C., is a sick city. Only a few blocks from the great, scrubbed Federal buildings lies a savage urban jungle where life is cheap and human dignity is an alien term. Within a mile of the glittering White House state dinners, 'latchkey' kids who know no family restraint roam the midnight streets, yoking, mugging, beating, and gang-raping. The Nation's Capital probably boasts more civilized brainpower and more good intentions to the square mile than any city in the world. Yet there are miles and miles of Washington streets on which no sensible woman dares to walk at night.

"The District of Columbia, proud symbol of the American dream since the days of John Adams, is a city in disgrace. In its public schools, discipline is a mocked word. The dropout rate, 39 percent, runs above the national average. Brawls, vandalism and pillage abound. Police answer frequent school alarms. Teenage pregnancy is widespread.

"It is a city where crime stalks the streets and alleys and forces the doors of unwary apartment dwellers. Wives, daughters and secretaries of prominent citizens, both military and civilian, are mugged, robbed, raped. Washington has more aggravated assault than any U.S. city in the 500,000-to-1,000,000 population bracket. Even churches have installed thug-proof iron bars to protect their female clerical workers from the danger of attack."

Knebel pulls no punches in discussing the source of most of the crime.

"The Nation's Capital," he writes, "has come face to face with a disagreeable fact: Crime and school hooliganism spring overwhelmingly from the large Negro population. As whites migrated to the suburbs and Negroes took over its core, Washington became the only large city in the United States with a black majority."

The injustices perpetrated by Negroes in Washington offer no justification, of course, for injustices against Negroes in other sections of the Nation. But the contrast between Federal action in the wake of temporary terror in Birmingham and Federal inaction in the wake of persistent terror in Washington should be obvious.

Moreover, the lesson to be learned from Washington's experience should not be lost on those who seek to change the racial patterns of the Nation overnight. In Washington, implementation of the Supreme Court's desegregation edicts has been more revolutionary than in any other city where segregation was customary. The ugly results are there for all to see.

Despite the tone of immediacy in the Negro agitators' current demands and the Federal Government's responses, a gradual evolutionary approach—motivated by responsible men of all races in each individual community—remains the only real avenue of progress in American race relations.

Maybe law-abiding Washingtonians will have to demonstrate in the streets and convince the administration the Nation's "image" is being impaired before they will regain the right to use their sidewalks in safety.

But even if the Nation cannot find an early cure for Washington's sickness, let us at least gain something from our knowledge of its causes.

[From the Jasper County (S.C.) News]

The Law of the Land Changes

In our day and time, we wonder what is the law of the land. For over 50 years the law of the land was, separate but equal schools were constitutional. This was ruled by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Pless case.

This was the days before nine old misfits composed the Court. In 1954 these nine old misfits ruled that this was no longer the law of the land, although Congress never changed the laws in this period of time.

Recently, Judge Scarlett ruled that the Negro pupil did not make a showing that warranted integration. However, three southern Federal judges overruled him and said that this was an abuse of his discretion. We did not hear of any such ruling in 1954. They also stated that a person did not have the right to ask the United States to reverse its previous ruling. If only the courts had taken that position in 1954. Again, we say it is not who you are, or what you are, but what color you are.

As demonstrations on a mass scale continue in Birmingham, Ala., the danger of a serious explosion increases by the hour, for the demonstrators appear determined to test to the limit the restraint of law enforcement officers.

Citizens of this country have a right to peaceably assemble. The 1st amendment forbids Congress from making any law abridging that right, and the 14th amendment (adopted illegally in 1868) has been held by the Supreme Court since the midtwenties to impose the same prohibition on the States.

However, it should be remembered that only peaceable assembly is sanctioned, and any violence can be punished. The Court has repeatedly ruled that abuses of rights are punishable just as any other offense. In fact, the Supreme Court has itself upheld a Federal court injunction prohibiting assembly of segregationists during school integration crises because such assemblies "threatened to incite a riot."

The courts have also held that States, under their police power, can prohibit blocking of traffic on public streets and highways for the simple reason that streets were made to carry traffic and regulation is necessary to protect the public welfare.

Also germane to the present demonstrations in Birmingham is the fact that the right of a State to enforce school attendance laws has never been questioned seriously by the Federal judiciary.

Now this has all changed—if your color is right you can riot and demonstrate and you can miss school to join these riots and demonstrations and the local authorities can do nothing to you, according to the Federal courts.

WHAT IS A WAR DETERRENT?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most often used terms in discussion of foreign military policy in recent years is "deterrent." Judging from the context of the statements which include the use of this term, one must conclude not nearly all who use the term are referring to the same concept. It is well, therefore, that this term be defined.

In the spring 1963 issue of Orbis, Gen. Dale O. Smith has defined the term in an article entitled "What Is a War Deterrent?" Not only does General Smith in this article define a war deterrent, but he also carefully analyzes the two principal conflicting schools of thought on the composition or nature of a war deterrent in the United States today. I would commend this article to the reading of every Member of the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Is a War Deterrent? [1]

(By Dale O. Smith)

It should not be beyond the ingenuity of man to govern his affairs in such a way as to reduce the possibility of war, or limit its violence. To this end, much brainpower has been expended, with a great burst of intellectual activity in the last decade. No doubt the awesome power of nuclear weapons, coupled with the fear of an unfriendly and powerful rival nation, has accelerated the search for greater international stability.

I

Broadly speaking, the search for a war deterrent has given birth to two conflicting schools of thought. One, the traditional school, and the one upon which our national policy has successfully rested since the Korean war, is that of military superiority.

---

[1] This article was prepared with assistance from the Committee of National Security Policy Research of the Social Science Research Council. Observations are those of the author and should not be construed as policies of the U.S. Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the Department of Defense.

Through our military superiority, according to this school, the rival will be deterred from attacking.

The other concept is rather new to military thought and has been arrived at through intellectual speculation. It is born of the despair of achieving a true military superiority. If, the question is asked, the United States wins a war but loses a large proportion of its population, has it really won at all? Answering in the negative, as one must when considering the present balance of forces, followers of the new school propose a novel solution. They reason, taking a leaf from the book of feudal wars when the contenders sealed the status quo by the exchange of hostages, that by making hostages out of millions of people in each country, stability will be assured.

In other words, if each country possesses relatively invulnerable "hard" intercontinental nuclear weapons (and only strategic weapons of this sort, such as buried Minutemen and submerged Polarises), and neither country can intercept the other's missiles, each country's cities are hostage to the other. In this way, each side can withstand a first strike and retaliate with enough nuclear power to destroy the other's principal centers of population. A mutual threat of so frightening a kind is believed to provide a mutual deterrent to war. Such an arrangement is called a stable deterrence. The term "stable" is derived from the notion that each country can still retaliate after a surprise strategic attack; if neither country relies on "soft" weapons which might be destroyed in a surprise attack, neither of them will be forced to strike first in order to utilize these vulnerable weapons.

There is a widespread belief and confidence in the possibility of a "stable" deterrence of war between the United States and Russia. Other terms, such as "balance of terror," "finite or minimum deterrence," or, an extreme version, "nuclear parity," identify variants of the same strategic philosophy. Essentially, they refer to a hypothetical international condition in which the two great powers have deployed enough hardened or hidden long-range nuclear weapons to destroy one another's cities, no matter which one strikes first.

The "stable" deterrent concept, reduced to military phraseology, represents a defensive strategy. It is reasoned that, if weapons are made so invulnerable that there is no military need to strike first, the sheer horror of nuclear war and the certainty of devastating counterattacks on one's unprotected cities will deter both countries from assuming the initiative. Conversely, it is argued, unhardened and well-targeted offensive weapons (such as bombers) are only suitable for a first strike and thus cause instability by both threatening and inviting a surprise attack. These are the so-called provocative weapons. Refining this further, some argue that in order to reduce the arms race our national strategy should point toward an agreed finite number of hardened or hidden offensive weapons on both sides. Some advocates assert that only a few hundred are needed to lay waste to cities of the other side.

The final step in this reasoning is that defensive measures against these offensive weapons, such as anti-ICBM's or even civil defense, should also be equated or mutually reduced so that neither side would gain a strategic defensive advantage: a country well defended against ICBM's might be tempted to risk a first strike.

This concept is closely linked to that of conventional "limited" war. The "stable" deterrent school concedes that international conflict may lead to certain ancillary wars; but the stable deterrent would restrain each side from employing nuclear weapons of any sort. To employ nuclear weapons of any sort would probably lead, according to this theory, to an "escalation" resulting eventually in unleashing an intercontinental holocaust.

Herein lies a basic inconsistency. If the "stable" deterrent were truly effective, use of nuclear weapons in limited wars would not lead to escalation and therefore would not trigger a mutually destructive exchange on rival cities. In other words, if the argument holds true that major nuclear war would be deterred because of the mutual threat to hostage cities, it should hold true whether or not nuclear weapons are used tactically against purely military targets.

Should the postulated limited war be a central one—a war between the two principal antagonists—the advocates of the "stable" deterrent contend that each side would voluntarily limit itself to conventional weapons rather than risk the mutual nuclear exchange. Thus, war would be fought along the lines of World War I rather than World War II. One must keep in mind that "provocative" aircraft (by refueling, most warplanes can carry megaton weapons over intercontinental ranges) have largely been eliminated in the "stable" deterrent equation. So the conventional war would largely be tied to the ground as it was in 1914–18.

There can be no doubt that the putative strength of an enemy's military forces, the difficulty of destroying his forces, and his counterattack capability have always furnished deterrents to war. Whenever it is believed that an enemy has superior power of this sort, the deterrence is comparably stronger. But one must always realize that in war, or in the contemplation of war, there is usually a wide disparity between the actual balance of military power and what is believed to be the balance. This fact tends to weaken the prospects for a stable deterrent.

II

It is doubtful that any political or military analyst could ever find an equality of power between any two countries. The elements of national power are infinite, varying from the confidence and resolve of one individual to the emotional heat generated in a legislative body by an international incident; or from the firepower of one rifleman to that of an ICBM; or from the patriotism of a school teacher to the callous opportunism of a racketeer. National power cannot possibly be measured by counting ICBM's. The sources of national power are dynamic, ever-changing and inconceivably complicated. Any attempt to compare the power of one nation to that of a near-equal rival will fail to assess many imponderable and unknown factors. National power is directly affected, too, by political and foreign policies. If the U.S.S.R., for example, were as unaggressive as Switzerland, the world power structure would differ considerably from the actual one. Hence it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to equate the power of two nations regardless of how armaments are measured, balanced and manipulated, simply because armaments alone provide only a fraction of the total power of any state.

Most stable deterrent philosophers argue, however, that the novel function of intercontinental nuclear warfare makes it possible today to achieve a measured standoff in destructive capacities. Yet, there seems to be no reason why the same logic did not apply in a world without nuclear weapons. Two opposing land powers of an earlier century, each with comparable military force, could conceivably fight until every city was destroyed and every human being on either side was killed. This has never happened in history, simply because no matter how equally matched, few peoples have displayed that kind of collective resolve which would permit continued fighting to the point of suicide. One or the other belligerent usually gave up long before reaching the point of mutual annihilation—or one side only was annihilated.

Is there any reason to believe that states will behave differently under nuclear attack? After one or two massive exchanges of destructive power, it would seem very likely that one or both of the contestants would "throw in the sponge." But the side most likely to hold on would be that side which believed it was ahead and believed it could survive. As always, the side which first lost hope of winning would capitulate.

Members of the stable deterrent school will argue that even one or two nuclear attacks in force would cause so many millions of casualties that the contemplation of any such exchanges is out of the question. Nevertheless, most military attention has been paid to offensive means of warfare. Each side contemplates the destruction of enemy weapons on the ground. It is generally recognized that the spillover from these attacks is bound to obliterate some cities and fill the air with lethal fallout. Today, neither side has adequate defenses against such attacks.

Thus, if the present standoff situation prevails, the stable deterrent may provide a way to turn back the clock so that both sides will prefer to fight with conventional weapons. The fallacy in this assumption lies in the fact that the dynamism of power is bound to oscillate, and one side or the other will probably develop defenses for blunting offensive attacks to the degree that they might be endured and countered. Even now, means are available to provide fairly effective defenses, but public understanding of both the danger and the means to counteract it is apparently insufficient to cause the necessary steps to be taken. More confidence seems to be placed in the stable deterrent philosophy and its handmaiden, nuclear parity, than in taking reasonable measures for defense.

Unconvincing also is the argument that, given a large but equal number of nuclear weapons on each side, an increase on one side of a few more, or a technological improvement by one country, would not upset significantly the balance of power. Military historians frequently point out that a minor military advantage can cause a major difference in the fortunes of war. More important, a believed advantage or disadvantage can spell this vital difference between defeat and victory even though the facts may be unrelated to the beliefs. Often this advantage cannot be measured or predicted in advance of the actual conflict. A typical example is supplied by the German advance in 1940 across Belgium and northern France. The German Army overcame an impregnable fortification (the Maginot Line) with fewer troops and less armor than the Allies had. What was the elusive quality which accounted for its overwhelming victory? This and similar historical riddles might be pondered by the nuclear parity school.

Fallout shelters and city evacuation plans and drills could save millions of lives in the event of war. So could effective anti-ICBM's. Who knows what technology and military science could develop were resources for defensive measures as readily available as they have been for offensive weapons systems? What could we be doing in space exploration and in space defense today if our vision had been a shade clearer in 1945?

III

Past failures to predict the future, however, should not cause us to throw up our hands and cry "all is lost." We can, now that we can understand nuclear strategy better, improve our military posture. We can find ways to strengthen our air and space defense in order to prevent an Armageddon. We can also find ways to reduce arms production and forces-in-being without risking national security.

Consider for a moment the advantage which would accrue to the Soviets if they were the first to introduce an effective evacuation and shelter program. They could launch an all-out surprise attack against us with not too much fear of a retaliatory strike. If we were not equally prepared in civil defense, the Soviets would have achieved a rather stable deterrent in their favor. The same would work in reverse if we first achieved effective defensive systems, active or passive, which could insure the safety of most of our population. It is a military (if not a natural) axiom that effective defenses are stabilizing. A porcupine gets into few fights.

But most stable deterrent advocates wish to limit defensive weapons. Otherwise, they say, the logic of deterrence breaks down: when cities are protected, their populations are no longer hostages. Few seem to have considered the political problem of convincing the American voter that, as a hostage, he must not seek to improve his chances for survival. Perhaps the American voter will not wish to play the role of hostage.

But there are more basic weaknesses in this stable deterrent hypothesis. It conceives of a balanced and nearly static world which never existed, and certainly does not exist today. Could the physical scientists who compose an important group within the stable deterrent school be picturing the finely balanced scales of a laboratory? The distinction is that human societies cannot be weighed as are chemicals, or measured as are elements of physical force. One cannot contemplate balancing anything unless the materials on both sides of the scales are inert. In world power politics, this is patently impossible. In terms of technology it is equally farfetched. One cannot predict what tecnnological breakthroughs might occur, but one can predict that any agreement on balanced numbers or kinds of nuclear weapons would be out of date before the agreements were fulfilled. In this age of scientific and technological explosion, nothing remains stable very long.

Since the end of World War II, there have been at least three complete changes of strategic weapons systems—from B–29's and B–36's, to B–47's and B–52's, to B–52's and ICBM's. Since technological progress seems to advance at an ever-increasing rate, weapons systems actually become obsolescent before reaching operation status.

The advocates of stable deterrence seek to forestall the destabilizing effect of technological change by providing for the control and inspection of research and development. This measure would seem even harder to achieve. To order people to stop inventing is like telling them to stop thinking. Many kinds of research for presumably peaceful purposes might have world-shaking military application. The research which led to the atom bomb initially bore no relation to any military research program. Neither did the invention of the airplane or the rocket, the railroad, telegraph, telephone, automobile or radio.

Regardless of arms control agreements, men will continue to think, to experiment and to invent. The knowledge that man now has of this world will always provide a springboard for the acquisition of more and more knowledge.

The designers of the stable deterrent hypothesis may have been influenced by the traditional British principle of "balance of power." One must look at this principle carefully to realize that the British were never quite content with a true balance of power, even if such a state of things had been possible. What they sought were combinations of alliances which tipped the balance in their favor. In the 19th century, Great Britain maintained a fleet able to outgun any combination of fleets which might have been allied against her. This condition hardly signified a balance. It was only when the German High Seas Fleet approached parity and the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente arrangements began to balance landpower, that a most unstable situation prevailed. When the balance became unstable Germany saw a chance for victory in superior tactics, i.e., in rapid mobilization and attack, a course she pursued in 1914.

Even though exact parity is never possible, today the military power of the United States and U.S.S.R. are comparable. One can hardly contend that this near-parity is creating a condition of stability. There can be little doubt that the trend is in the opposite direction. Each nation, struggling for ways in which to achieve an imbalance in her favor, and failing to do so, is creating the very instability which can lead to nuclear war.

International stability will probably not obtain until one side or the other achieves a clearly recognizable advantage. This does not mean, necessarily, that the stronger will inevitably conquer the weaker. World public opinion and economic motives have protected—at least, for some time—the independence of many weak states throughout history. But the philosophy of international communism will not tolerate the existence of the alliance of free states—if it becomes obviously weaker.

To assume a stable situation when, in the words of former President Eisenhower, "two atomic colossi confront each other across a trembling world," is to oversimplify and misread history and the dynamics of international politics.

To reiterate, a mechanical balance is not possible in any live social environment. Consider the effort to equate two individuals in a contest as closely controlled, regulated, and inspected as a boxing match. Could one say that because the two rivals weigh the same they are equally matched? Could a stable deterrent deter either? Imponderable factors such as courage, speed, stamina, reaction time, motivation, muscular coordination, experience, coaching, and so on, would more than likely determine the outcome of the match. The multiplicity of factors which determine success in any situation, and the infinite variety of circumstances, preclude exact measurements of power balances. The meaningful axioms are few. There is one that seems to hold in any contest: the most skillful player, possessed of resources comparable to those of his opponent, wins.

States, like people, can, in the heat of controversy, blind themselves to the consequences of their acts. A country, prey to uncontrollable emotions, may go to war against impossible odds, with no logical chance of victory. Paraguay fought against an overwhelming alliance of Brazil, Argentina, and Chile in 1864. Serbia stood up to the great Austro-Hungarian empire in 1914. England and France declared war on Germany in 1939 when they felt themselves to be grossly inferior.

Almost any country can be pushed too far, as was Hungary in 1956. It then feels compelled to fight regardless of the consequences. Patrick Henry's declaration, "Give me liberty or give me death," is not an isolated expression of human defiance of an intolerable situation.

Probably no military force, regardless of how superior it may be, could ever assure an absolute deterrent. People have been known to fight against whatever odds if sufficiently provoked. But if military superiority cannot provide an absolute deterrent, neither can nuclear parity. If war has been joined, nuclear parity will result in a mutual slaughter of populations with little chance of either side exploiting an advantage. On the other hand, the side possessing military superiority will at least dominate the enemy, dictate terms, and establish its pattern of government in the postwar world. In other words, a nuclear parity strategy would not provide for winning a war once the deterrent fails; yet millions would be killed. In a war fought by the United States from a position of military superiority in which enemy military forces alone are targeted, the civilian population would be spared deliberate destruction and hence fewer casualties would result. The political outcome would certainly favor the stronger power.

Neither eventuality is very attractive; the only winners in either event may be those who do not fight. But if military superiority provides the best chance of deterring war and of winning, should war occur, and of causing fewer casualties, a policy of seeking to assure this superiority would seem to offer the American people the best protection available in the nuclear age.

BIAS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reports from Moscow disclose that the Soviet Russian attacks on Jews—only 1½ percent of the population of the U.S.S.R.—are continuing, and that at least 83 Jews have been executed out of a total of 140 persons in the U.S.S.R. sentenced to death for alleged economic offenses. Mass trials in many cities have been strongly anti-Jewish in character. At the same time Soviet sensitivity to charges of anti-Semitism is reflected in Moscow's propaganda efforts to rebut such accusations. Soviet newspapers deny the existence of a Jewish problem, deny the existence of prejudice, and feature testimonials allegedly from Jews praising the fair treatment they receive. None of these testimonials, however, refers to the almost insoluble difficulties Jews face in trying to maintain their religious rituals and observances like denying them Passover matzoth and to the virtual nonexistence of Yiddish cultural activities in the Soviet.

These Soviet "trials" are the subject of a significant analysis by Roscoe Drummond. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record his syndicated column entitled "Jews Are Target of Campaign," which appeared in the Washington Post and other newspapers on May 27; and the Moscow dispatch to the New York Times, which appeared on May 31.

There being no objection, the column and dispatch were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1963]

JEWS ARE TARGET OF CAMPAIGN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A vast and many-sided campaign against "economic parasites" is being carried out in the Soviet Union today—with ominous overtones.

Its declared objective is understandable. It is to eradicate widespread economic crime in which large numbers of Soviet citizens apparently engage in one degree or another.

Three powerful instruments of the state are being used in this concerted operation. They are: Mass show trials, a mounting number of death sentences, and a nationwide propaganda drive in the Soviet press.

In dozens of Soviet cities people are being mobilized to witness the trials and to endorse the convictions (which always come out the same way: "Guilty"). The crimes are described as embezzlement of public funds and property, currency speculation, and bribery. In groups of 8 to 60, the accused are tried and sentenced—without right of appeal and generally to long imprisonment.

Steadily the toll has mounted of those sentenced "to death by shooting." It has reached more than 140. This stark fact of meting out capital punishment for economic offenses is beginning to shock humane opinion and stir protests even from friends of the U.S.S.R.

While world attention has been riveted on the death sentences, there is another aspect of this campaign which is even more ominous. This most ominous fact is that in the show trials, in the death sentences, in the press propaganda, Soviet Jews are being uniquely singled out for attack, for calumny, and for death. Most of the mass trials have been anti-Jewish in character and of the more than 140 sentenced to death, at least 83 have been Jews.

Many thousands of spectators witness the trials, but it is the official Soviet press coverage which magnifies the audience to millions. This is the audience at which the anti-Semitic campaign is directed. What is this audience being told?

I have examined full translations of many of these articles. They reveal an unmistakable pattern of hostility to Jews. In many of them the religious affiliation of the accused is explicit. But even if the word "Jew" is not used, the Jewish names of the accused are prominently featured.

The campaign plays many variations on one central theme: The Jews is antihero in the Soviet Union. It pulls out all the stops on the traditional anti-Jewish stereotypes. The Jew is described as having "an insatiable thirst for money and skill at its acquisition." Jews are portrayed as "conniving," "lying," and "bribing." Again and again they are depicted as "the initiators and masterminds of criminal gains." The suggestion is repeatedly made that there would be no economic crime among non-Jews if the Jews didn't put them up to it.

It is a careful statement to say that this campaign conjures up a version of the traditional anti-Semitic fantasy of an international Jewish financial conspiracy. It does so in the most offensive and prejudicial terms. The tone of the Soviet press toward Jews is bitter, spiteful, contemptuous. It heaps upon Jewry blanket condemnation, ridicule, insult, and shame.

The result and, one cannot doubt, the purpose are to encourage and perpetuate the deep-rooted anti-Semitic prejudices that are widespread among large segments of the Soviet population, and to implant them where they do not already exist.

The significance of this campaign is clear, especially since so much of it appears in the same Soviet papers which feature false and degrading images of the Jewish religion. It informs the conditioned Soviet reader that their government believes that the tiny community of Soviet Jews—1 percent of the population—is responsible for 60 percent, in some cases 90 and even 100 percent, of the economic offenses warranting the death sentence.

It is, of course, quite reasonable that Soviet officials should be anxious to reduce the mounting economic crimes in Soviet society, but it evokes a painful memory of Nazi Germany to see Jews again used as the scapegoat.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1963]

SOVIET JEWS' DENIAL OF ANTI-SEMITISM PRINTED IN IZVESTIA

Moscow, May 30.—Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, printed today excerpts from letters by Soviet Jews denying that there was anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

The lengthy article was the second in 2 weeks to dwell on the subject. On May 18, Izvestia printed a report on anti-Semitism in the United States as shown by the exclusion of Jews from some hotels and social clubs.

The publication of this material appeared to be part of a campaign to rebut charges in the West that the presence of many Jews among Soviet citizens tried for economic crimes such as embezzlement and profiteering was evidence of anti-Semitism.

The campaign was set in motion earlier this year with a letter by Premier Khrushchev to Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, denying discrimination against Jews in the Soviet effort to eradicate fraud and mismanagement in the economy.

The general tenor of the letters quoted by Izvestia was that Jews were not discriminated against in any sector of Soviet life. None of the letters discussed the virtual nonexistence of Yiddish cultural activities in the Soviet Union. They appeared to have been written by assimilationist Jews who had no interest in Jewish traditions.

"I never thought about the fact that I was a Jew," wrote an officer in the border guard, Lt. Col. D. Geifman. "I was graduated from a military school, became a Communist, and was entrusted with a most honorable duty—to stand guard over our motherland."

Izvestia commented that it was precisely the desire of Soviet Jews to rid themselves of traditional isolation and become part of the socialist brotherhood of peoples that aroused bourgeois ideologists, Zionists, and nationalists of all breeds."

DIFFERENT TREATMENT DENIED

A Siberian airline pilot, G. Fridmanovich, wrote: "Neither I nor my children ever feel that we are being treated differently from other nationalities."

Jews are regarded as an ethnic group in the Soviet Union but they lack many of the cultural opportunities given to other nationalities.

Except for a bimonthly literary journal, Sovetish Heimland (Soviet Homeland), published in Moscow, and a few traveling folk singers and variety troupes, there are no activities identified with the Yiddish culture.

Unlike most Soviet nationalities including Germans who also are widely scattered throughout the country, Jews have no nationally distributed newspaper, no elementary schools with instruction in their language, and virtually no literature.

"OPERATION ALERT"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two news accounts which appeared in the May 25 issues of the Arkansas Democrat and the Arkansas Gazette. I believe that many Members of Congress and other readers of the RECORD will find these accounts of interest.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, May 25, 1963]

HARGIS, WALKER HIT HOST OF ENEMIES, BEMOAN EVIL DAY

(By Ernest Dumas)

Billy James Hargis and Edwin A. Walker whaled away at the enemies of conservatism for almost 3 hours last night at the auditorium and proclaimed the times as "the evil day forecast in the Scriptures."

It is the day, said Hargis, the Tulsa evangelist, when the Supreme Court tries to banish God from America, when the churches yield to the Communists, and when the colleges and universities indoctrinate their students with communism and against God.

It is the day, said Walker, a former major general, when the United Nations and Russia, with the consent of America, take over Cuba and when Americans cannot declare war without asking the United Nations.

Hargis and Walker spoke for 2 hours and 45 minutes to a crowd estimated at 700 to 800 persons. Melvin White, inspector for the Little Rock Fire Department, estimated the crowd at 750.

Walker spoke much of his time attacking what he called the Kennedy administration's no-win policy and suggested that Premier Fidel Castro blackmailed President Kennedy into calling off air support for a Cuban exile attack on Cuba in 1961.

TRAGIC STORY

"There's a tragic story going around," he said, "that Castro, through the Catholic Church, blackmailed the White House * * * I'm not saying that it is true * * * but there's some interesting information going around and I don't mind spreading it."

He said that the story he heard was that Castro got the word to Mr. Kennedy that if air cover were provided over Havana, he would purge every Catholic in Cuba.

Hargis and Walker ranged over many world issues but they said part of the explanation for the sorry shape of things was right at home.

Hargis struck the keynote when with arms akimbo after a long harangue against administration liberals and the Supreme Court, he said:

"I do not understand one thing: What's happened to us? * * * I know the people of this area. They are good conservative Americans * * * and yet I cannot understand what in the world prompts you to send a man like Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to the U.S. Senate. What in the world prompts us to send men like Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, to the Senate. They're all like Senator WAYNE D. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York. They're just like these birds."

BOTH ATTACK FULBRIGHT

Hargis returned to FULBRIGHT repeatedly and Walker took up the cudgel when he spoke. He said that FULBRIGHT didn't like the Military Establishment because it knew too much.

Both men attacked the Arkansas Gazette throughout. Hargis affected a slip of the tongue at the outset calling it the Arkansas Red-er-Arkansas Gazette, and referred to it often as the "Redzette." He said that he decided to come to Little Rock because of the Gazette's attacks on him.

The theme of Walker's talk was that in 1964 the Americans will have only two choices for President and Vice President. One will be the slate of the United Nations—President Kennedy and Governor Rockefeller, of New York—and the other will be the slate of the United States. He didn't know who the latter would be.

Walker's promoters before the meeting had proclaimed a revelation of the "inside story of Little Rock." Walker, as commander of the Arkansas military district, was in charge of the Federal troops at Central High School in 1957.

What he said about this was that he had been on the wrong side and that he had written a letter of resignation from the Army on August 4, 1959, because of "the misuse of American forces," and the resignation was rejected. He also suggested that Communists stirred up the trouble at Little Rock and the trouble at the University of Mississippi last fall when Negro James Meredith broke the racial barrier at the school.

PRESS DENOUNCED

Walker and Hargis assailed the press bitterly. The news services, along with "the liberal press," are deceiving Americans and the only way the truth can be disseminated is through such things as the Hargis-Walker speaking tour, they said.

Hargis directed most of his fire at communism's attack on the churches and he criticized the Supreme Court stridently.

"Unless we do something about the Supreme Court, legally," he shouted, "one day it will take God out of all the schools and out of all public life."

The State-supported colleges and universities are helping the Communists in the onslaught against God, Hargis said. While he was speaking at Seattle recently, Hargis said, a group of students from the University of Washington got in, apparently through a fire exit, and booed every time he mentioned God or Christ. Walker referred to the incident, too, and said, "That's the students who are being brought up in our universities today."

Hargis said that there would be no need of his Christian Anti-Communist Crusade if the churches of America took a stand against communism. He said that his organization had printed the names of 7,000 clergymen who had joined Communist-front organizations since the 1930's.

BIRCHISTS DEFENDED

Both men defended the John Birch Society. "You people who don't know what's going on ask the Birchers—they'll tell ya." Walker said. Each mention of the society got applause.

The audience, which paid a dollar a person to hear the talks, responded warmly, greeting both Walker and Hargis with standing ovations and interrupting them often with applause.

Hargis plugged his books, pamphlets and records, along with others, written by Walker, all of which were on sale at three tables in the foyer. Sales apparently were good. Envelopes containing blank checks were distributed to everyone and men with white buckets went around at the end of Hargis' talk to collect them.

SAYS THEY SPLIT MONEY

The two men split the money, Hargis said. If a person gave $100, he said, $50 went to the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade and $50 went to Walker to continue his work.

"You say that you believe in us but where are you when it comes to paying the bills?" Hargis asked. He said that the members of the crusade, many of whom were in the audience, "know how we have to struggle and beg."

Walker said that every dollar he could find was going into his fight against the liberals and the Communists. "A dollar is not worth 50 cents today if it's not going into this cause," he remarked.

Robert Medlock, administrative aid to Governor Faubus spoke briefly, and said that he was glad Walker returned to Little Rock as a civilian "rather than as the commandant of Fort Central High School."

After the meeting, a representative of the National States Rights Party passed out postcards that were to be mailed to Birmingham for a party membership application form and a free copy of the party newspaper, the Thunderbolt.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, May 25, 1963]

"OPERATION ALERT" SCORES FULBRIGHT, SUPREME COURT

(By John L. Ward)

Evangelist Billy James Hargis thinks Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT is a disgrace to the U.S. Senate and he can't imagine why the good people of Arkansas send him back.

This turned out to be one of the milder lashes that Hargis and former Gen. Edwin Walker laid on the backs of the press, Supreme Court, Kennedy administration, military leaders, United Nations, Republican and Democratic Party leadership, NAACP, National Council of Churches and others last night.

They were the features of an "Operation Alert" meeting in Robinson Auditorium, part of a tour the two are on.

They spoke for about 3 hours to some 700 persons (many from out of town, according to a show of hands) and spent part of the time taking up a collection.

The crowd also paid $1 each at the door, and material such as books and pamphlets written by Hargis and Walker was on sale out front.

Hargis spoke first. He said, "We know the people here aren't afraid to stand up and be counted for God and country."

But the press rules applied here as elsewhere. Walker emphasized them—no photographs of the crowd except from the back.

A representative of Governor Faubus, Robert Medlock, spoke briefly at the opening of the meeting. He said it is good to have Walker here "as a citizen instead of the commandant of Fort Central High School."

On the tail of his stinging lash against FULBRIGHT, Hargis pointed out that the Christian Crusade (the organization he founded 17 years ago) "doesn't take a stand politically."

"We're anti-Communist," he said, but did not say he thinks FULBRIGHT is a Communist.

"We're fighting for the Constitution, God, the New Testament and Jesus Christ, the hope of the world," Hargis said.

He said that recently a group of about 50 college students "booed me every time I mentioned God." That, Walker surmised when he spoke later, "is the kind of students we're raising in our schools today."

Hargis described the local churches as "the most important institutions in the world," and he urged the persons hearing him to become associated with one, as long as it isn't affiliated with the National Council of Churches.

Turning to the Supreme Court, Hargis said, "We can get along without it," and made a prediction:

"I hope I'm wrong," he told the audience, "but I think the Supreme Court will rule all prayer in the public schools is unconstitutional." He was including the third stanza of the National Anthem in this.

Hargis was bluntly critical of Georgia farmers. He said they cry loudly about Federal intervention in matters in that State, yet "80 percent of them voted for Kennedy's farm program."

He called the program a Federal handout and warned "you don't get anything for nothing."

Going a step further, Hargis said "It's wrong to take money for not planting a crop."

When it was time to take up the collection, Hargis made an impassioned appeal. He said he and Walker "paid for this auditorium out of our own pockets," that it cost $75,000 a month to keep his radio programs going and "we don't have any guaranteed income."

He urged "some of you should give $100 tonight" and said, "You cannot deposit a 'God bless you' in the bank."

The collection will be split half-and-half between he and Walker, Hargis said, to carry on the fight.

The program got underway shortly before 8 p.m. After the collection, which was over about 9:15, Hargis ordered a stretch session for the audience, then brought on Walker.

Both men got standing ovations from the audience, and frequently their remarks were punctuated with shouts of approval and an occasional "amen."

Both Hargis and Walker bitterly attacked the Nation's newspapers, wire services, and other news media. All are managed and controlled from Washington, they commented, and in fact neither mentioned any news media they liked.

Walker described U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, as "a Marxist by his own writings," and linked Rev. Martin Luther King with Communists. King is leading the effort to desegregate facilities in Birmingham.

Walker urged those in the audience to stop voting by political party.

"The liberals are voting for liberals," he told them, "but the conservatives haven't learned that yet * * * they're still voting Republican or Democrat." And the Republicans and Democrats are the same at the top, he added.

The question is a U.S. or a U.N. candidate in 1964, Walker reiterated. Both Nelson Rockefeller of New York and President Kennedy will be running on the U.N. ticket, he said, "and I don't know who is going to run on the U.S. ticket."

Somebody in the audience said "GOLDWATER" and there was a spattering of applause. Walker didn't comment.

THE EXAMPLE OF NEIGHBORS, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in these days when reports of racial conflict are shaking the Nation, it is heartening to discover a situation where such conflicts do not exist. Hence, in the heart of the Nation's Capital, despite incidents recently reported around the world, there is a neighborhood where white and Negro citizens not only live side by side in peace, but work together daily on concerns of mutual interest.

White and Negro mothers together operate car pools, baby sitting pools and recreational activities; fathers join in PTA and home and school affairs, as well as in the planning of events such as a forthcoming art and book festival. Several hundred persons are involved in planning this festival; meetings of various committees occur almost nightly and are held in the homes of volunteers in alphabetical order; whether the host is white or colored is of no importance.

Real estate pressure to turn the area into a Negro ghetto has been successfully resisted; white and Negro residents work together to see that housing opportunities are open to both races. Most of the new white residents are young families with children, who prefer this integrated experience to the artificial segregation of the suburbs.

Such a situation does not occur by accident. Guiding this peaceful stabilization is a nonprofit organization called Neighbors, Inc., which was founded 5 years ago as the area first began to change its racial character. A grant from the Meyer Foundation, of Washington, D.C., made possible the first year's operation; other foundation grants, memberships and contributions enable the organization to continue working.

Since Neighbors is pioneering in an experiment which is of great concern to all our Nation's larger cities and, indeed, to the entire country, I should like to ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material describing in some detail the methods used by this remarkable group.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT, 1962, NEIGHBORS, INC.

FOUR AND ONE TO GROW ON

On June 27, 1962, Neighbors, Inc., celebrated its fourth birthday. We are proud, of course, of our physical growth. By the time we cut our fourth birthday cake we numbered nearly 1,000 members. We began with only a handful. But even more important has been our growing influence. At the risk of sounding immodest, NI does not think of itself as a candle anymore but as a beacon light.

There was considerable evidence in 1962 of growing interest locally and nationally in the Neighbors, Inc., experiment. The idea of a genuinely integrated community has begun to touch the imagination of residents in the segregated neighborhoods of the Washington metropolitan area. It is commonplace now to hear such people say, "We need a Neighbors, Inc., here."

City officials and White House representatives are giving more thought to what our venture means to the future of the Nation's Capital. The prospect of a largely Negro capital surrounded by white suburbs alarms them. NI suggests there is a constructive and democratic alternative.

Yet our success must be measured not only by how far we have come, but how far we have yet to go. Our justifiable pride must not weaken our sense of urgency. We realize that our efforts must be quickened and expanded. Above all, we must create an awareness that our significance is no longer limited to a single residential district. What NI accomplishes within the boundaries of its area will, we now know, affect to some degree all of metropolitan Washington—just as present developments bear importantly on the future of our own neighborhood.

So more than ever, we were acting on two levels. We were engaged in our own 250 block triangle of Northwest Washington, whose base is Ingraham Street, N.W., and sides are Rock Creek Park and Blair Road. And we cooperated with efforts to promote freedom of residence throughout the metropolitan Washington area.

NI ON THE LOCAL LEVEL

1. Our new community organization specialist, Mrs. Eleanor Garst, spent part of her first year in Shepherd Park, as this section of our area was bearing the brunt of efforts by real estate speculators to scare white families out. Mrs. Garst's door-to-door visits, organization of block meetings and areawide forums on local schools, religious institutions and real estate, did much, we feel, to allay panic and keep families from fleeing. She is now shifting her activities to other sections of the NI area.

2. Shepherd Park was also the scene of NI's first spring home tour. Seven fine houses were opened to the general public and a garden tea ended the event. More than 150 "tour-ists" came to look and 18 of them later asked NI's help in finding homes in our neighborhood.

3. Public schools: Keeping the high standards and reputations of our local schools was another NI activity. The most ambitious project of this kind was the one undertaken by a group of area residents headed by NI members, Lee White (Assistant Special Counsel to President Kennedy) and Nancy Good (wife of NI's new president, Robert Good). They are attempting to bring new prestige to Paul Junior High School, already one of the best schools in the city. The new program, "American Democracy in Action," is an intensive workshop, curriculum in American government. Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, Federal department heads and District officials are participating.

4. NI's relations with business, clergy and youth. Under NI's stimulus businessmen in the area last year formed the Brightwood Business Men's Association. In recognition of NI's importance to the area, Margery Ware, our executive director, was invited to meetings and now serves as publicity chairman. Clergymen in the area have continued to meet at sessions the clergy on NI's board of directors helped organize. Their first joint project was a letter to their congregations warning them against unscrupulous real estate tactics and counseling them to stay in the neighborhood.

Junior Neighbors was begun during this past year and it is our hope that with proper guidance the organization will engender in the children of the area the same civic spirit NI arouses in their parents.

5. Continuing community activities—and new ones. NI's annual spruce up campaign was one of our big spring projects, and we also sponsored another "over the back fence" evening in one of the alleys of the area to stimulate clean yards and good sanitation.

NI's prize-winning garden club continued to flourish; we were successful in securing added swimming periods at the Takoma swimming pool; a local sculptor and art teacher conducted a ceramics class for NI members; we continued to sponsor family fun nights with the YWCA; and during the Christmas-Hanukkah seasons a group of NI members roamed the streets singing songs suitable for both holidays.

6. NI's free housing information service has increased the number of its volunteers from 2 to 6 and reports that 50 white and 9 Negro families have found houses in the NI area through its efforts.

7. NI members on their own: Anyone with a good idea gets encouragement from NI. Last year one member undertook a tutoring program at Paul for pupils with reading and other academic difficulties; it is now being carried on by the school and she is going on to teach corrective speech to children at one of the local elementary schools. An amateur musician organized the Little Community Singers of Washington, a group under one of the best choral directors in the Washington area, whose purpose is to teach children the songs of many nations in the original language. Another newcomer to our neighborhood, a National Girl Scout officer, organized the area's first integrated troop.

NI IN THE BROAD COMMUNITY

Speeches, testimony, and consultation service brought NI's story to the rest of the metropolitan area and to the country. Mrs. Ware, Mrs. Garst, and former president Marvin Caplan spoke to dozens of groups during 1962. Mr. Caplan went the farthest to do so. He was invited by Temple Beth Am in South Shore Chicago to fly there and describe NI's work.

NI was also invited by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to testify during its April hearings on housing discrimination in Washington.

NI staff and board members also offered advice and guidance to several white suburban neighborhoods to help reduce tension and prevent panic after colored families moved in.

NI's increasing contribution to the broad community did not go unnoticed. Omega Psi Phi, the Capital Press Club, the D.C. League of Women Voters, and the Northwest Community Group all chose NI or one of its officers or its executives last year as recipients of special civic awards. The Washington Post recognized NI with the first long feature article it has done on our group and then hailed its significance in an editorial. The locally popular folk singer Joe Glazer voluntarily gave NI a free benefit concert to show his support of our program. The American Jewish Committee and the Antidefamation League commended NI's promotional literature to their members.

OPTIMISM AND A SENSE OF URGENCY

Perhaps the most important change in the past year was the shift from defensive tactics to a mood of optimistic planning. The new families moving in have encouraged us to believe it is within our grasp to control the destiny of our area.

There are still many problems for which we need more effective solutions. How to keep integrated schools is one. How to get residents with low income involved in the activities of a predominantly middle-class neighborhood is another. And improving our defense against panic peddlers and money-minded speculators is still a third matter of major concern to us.

But our general direction is set. We are no longer an experiment. Our techniques have largely been tested. We know how to contain many of the forces that threaten neighborhood stability. The challenge now is to multiply our limited success rapidly enough to achieve enduring stabilization. This means mobilizing resources—many more volunteers from within the neighborhood, a much increased budget for professional staff and program, and a concerted effort to achieve freedom of residence throughout the greater Capital area.

In short, we no longer question whether our goal is attainable. We are certain that if we can gather resources effectively and quickly, we can make permanent here a truly democratic community, various and stimulating because it truly welcomes people of all races and religions.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, 1962–63

Dr. Robert C. Good, president; Warren K. Van Hook, vice president; Charles M. Rodgers, treasurer; Mrs. J. C. James, secretary; Rabbi A. Nathan Abramowitz, Mrs. Lewis K. Atkinson, Rev. Harry L. Bennett, Marvin H. Caplan, Gilbert A. Diggs, Samuel H. Grant, Dr. Lawrence Graves, Mrs. Eunice S. Grier, Dr. Clifford C. Ham, Mrs. T. J. Hutchins, Rev. Donald D. M. Jones, Rev. Patrick Kemp, Mrs. Donald M. Slaiman, Tighe E. Woods.

Ex officio: Norman L. Brown, George W. Grier.

STAFF

Mrs. Margery T. Ware, executive director; Mrs. Eleanor Garst, community organization specialist; Mrs. Doris H. Jordan, administrative assistant; Mrs. Ruth Telfair, secretary.

[From Concern, Dec. 1, 1962]

THE CHANGING NEIGHBORHOOD

(By Warren Kornberg, member Neighbors, Inc.)

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court in its school desegregation decision found that, in essence, racially separate schools are inherently unequal. Since that time, while some segregated school systems have resisted and others gone along, a more basic evil—one which contributes more than any other to separateness in the schools—has lacked official attention and concern. It is the insidious evil of segregated neighborhoods, an evil which contributes to the death of the gains accomplished by efforts to desegregate the schools.

Discrimination in housing and segregated neighborhoods are insidious because they are often harder to pinpoint and combat than segregation in such an identifiable and measurable institution as a school system. Not necessarily as a result of official policy, often accompanied by official unconcern, neighborhoods remain either predominately white or prodominately Negro, or change from white to Negro, because of the inability of the disorganized opponents of change to stand against those who profit by and approve it. But it is also now becoming apparent that, once goaded into action, those who seek stability in integrated neighborhoods need not remain helplessly unorganized as stability is destroyed.

The experience of a group in the Nation's capital is a case in point. The group, organized four years ago as Neighbors, Inc., is demonstrating that the traditional ease with which neighborhoods can be subjected to racial change by greed and cynical unconcern for democracy are neither inevitable nor irreversable components of midcentury American life. And in the process Neighbors, Inc., is making a section of Washington, D.C., a case study in social action in opposion to a seeming inescapable trend.

Washington is a peculiar city in several ways. Not only is it the seat of the democratic municipal government (it is governed by the Congress through Presidential appointees), but it is largely a transient's city. It is also a gateway to the North for Negroes seeking freedom from their southern heritage of selective degradation.

These factors contribute to the high rate of movement in the city's real estate market and to the fact that, as white families adopt suburbia, Washington has become the Nation's only major city with more Negro than white residents. The influx of Negroes combined with the replacement of slum areas with middle- and upper-income housing has created a pressure within the Negro community for desirable or even adequate housing. And such housing in the Nation's Capital is not easy to find, if the seeker is Negro.

WHITE AND NEGRO DIVISION

The city and its suburbs are fairly rigidly divided into white and Negro provinces, with large areas of the city and the bulk of the suburbs closed to Negroes altogether. But the 1954 Court decision created an atmosphere conducive to aspirations of equality and created the city's first mass exodus of young white families. Since then the pressure of Negroes demanding adequate housing in Washington has been building.

Its safety valve has been the inevitable speculator and blockbuster, aided by the panicked resident and the tightly closed neighborhood elsewhere. These have combined to turn houses, blocks, and whole neighborhoods over a rapid though selective rate. They have also created an ever-expanding ghetto from which many Negroes flee. But few succeed in escaping.

Faced with restrictions, covenants, real estate manipulations, and the need for housing, Washington area Negroes have ended up by being concentrated, perhaps despite themselves, in blocks which are open to them almost at the whim of manipulators.

Consequently, the pattern in Washington, as in so many American cities, is one of the racial waves—whites fleeing from block after block in fear of change they make no effort to understand; Negroes advancing in search of housing suited to their rising economic and social aspirations and competence.

In Washington, the Negro community has been moving block by block, up the east side of Rock Creek Park, which divides the city's western, still exclusive portion from its much larger eastern segment. The movement is currently approaching the city's northern limit. So far it has failed to create any appreciable breach in the barrier the park represents.

The effect of the barrier has been enhanced by several things. These include the practices of the city's real estate industry members, exploiters of the racial situation and innocent alike. They tend to divert white families away from the eastern portion, refuse to sell to Negroes west of the park, and encourage the calcification of the Nation's Capital into separate but unequal portions. The effect is also enhanced by a morality which prevents white families in white neighborhoods from being the first to sell to Negroes, by agreement or otherwise, and by the understandable, but nevertheless deplorable, unwillingness of many Negro families to become the "pioneers" who desegregate previously all-white neighborhoods. Out of this pattern has developed a community in which far more than 80 percent of the school population is Negro, with the bulk of the schools effectively segregated.

THE CHANGING NEIGHBORHOOD

The rare exception to the segregated neighborhood and school is the frontier area into which Negroes have moved but from which the white families have either refused or not had time to flee. Washingtonians are not yet confident enough to refer to these as integrated neighborhoods. They are instead changing neighborhoods, ranging in their Negro-white ratios from 70-30 to 10-90. It is these neighborhoods, approaching Rock Creek Park on the east near the top of the city, incorporating some of the city's loveliest established neighborhoods, which are being written off as undesirable. And it is in these neighborhoods that Neighbors, Inc., is operating.

Neighbors is the outgrowth of an informal collection of white and Negro residents who balked at goaded change and the pattern of flight of white residents at the appearance of Negro families. They got together initially, not for anything as dramatic as a stand, but to see if an experiment in neighborhood communication couldn't result in an alternative to panic, flight, and manufactured ghettos.

Neighbors, Inc., 4 years later is a relatively complex organization, with a professional staff and a program embracing many facets of the problem of the changing neighborhood. It has had some dramatic successes and some doldrums. In balance its record is one of moderate success. It has been called the most significant citizen's group in the country today. Its program might offer encouragement to the formation of similar groups in other cities, where similar problems exist.

Neighbors, with the support of funds from several foundations, has been able to mount its campaign on several fronts. Its most dramatic, and perhaps its most immediately meaningful effect has been on the housing situation itself. Through its own real estate committee and with the cooperation of some real estate brokers who appreciate having customers referred to them, it has been able to slow and, in some cases, reverse the trend toward total turnover in parts of its area.

Working principally with volunteers from among its 1,000 members, guided by trained social workers on the staff, Neighbors also seeks to expose and campaign against exploitive blockbusting tactics and to prevent neighborhood panic at the appearance of a Negro family. It also attempts to establish or maintain harmony in neighborhoods which become racially mixed for the first time and to induce white families to move into available housing. It further helps Negro families understand that, while their presence might contribute to a negative situation in a given block at a given time, in another part of the area no such thing may be true.

Paralleling its real estate activity, Neighbors also cooperates with other city and suburban groups seeking to break down segregation barriers in other parts of the metropolitan area and to expand the free choice of housing available to Negro families.

MUCH WORK NECESSARY

Neighbors' work is not all as dramatically significant as the attempt to maintain racial balance in integrated neighborhoods and the search for roads to area-wide desegregation of housing.

Some is as mundane as the long and sometimes effective effort to insure enforcement of zoning laws, slackness which has often led to the myth of declining quality and value in changing neighborhoods.

Neighbors' problem is a continuing one and is mirrored in all major cities. It is not one which can be eliminated by legislation, ordinance, or edict, since their enforcement without the good will of the citizens is difficult, if not impossible. Neighbors' success so far in Washington, and the success of this and similar organizations in the future, depends on the determination of residents not to be pushed into or out of neighborhoods by fiction-based, profitable panics. Success also hinges on the developing realization in the broader society that democracy, if it is to survive, must have a block-by-block foundation.

[From the AFL-CIO News, June 16, 1962]

Neighbors, Inc., Helps Areas To Integrate

The ease with which panic and greed defy professions of democracy and turn neighborhoods into Negro ghettos is almost a mid-century American legend. But there is growing evidence in Washington, D.C., that the process is neither inevitable nor irreversible.

While the ghetto-makers press to turn a "frontier" area of the nation's capital into one more all-Negro enclave, a growing interracial group of residents who won't be panicked, pushed or bulldozed is defending homes and neighborhoods and setting an example in neighborhood democracy.

The motives of the group—called Neighbors, Inc.—are mixed. Because its members are residents of the area, they are fighting for their homes and neighborhoods against panic at the appearance of a Negro family and against the unscrupulous real estate agent looking for quick profits by turning over a neighborhood which to him is just so many parcels of commission-bearing real estate. They are fighting, too, because they believe that a racially-mixed neighborhood can be a good neighborhood.

To understand a situation in which residents of the nation's capital must fight for residential democracy, it is necessary first to understand a little of the capital itself. It is the only major city in the nation in which more than half the residents are Negro. With a reputation for being—or having been—a southern city in character, its white population dropped sharply immediately following the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court school desegregation decision.

One large part of Washington and the bulk of its suburbs are white residential areas; another large and growing section, and its schools, are virtually all Negro.

Between is the "frontier" area into which come Negro families seeking to escape their ghetto and find decent housing for their families in accord with their rising social and economic levels. They are accompanied by the real estaters and speculators.

Neighbors, Inc., was formed in this no-race's land by a group of white and Negro residents determined to block the profiteers and prove—initially to themselves but now to the world—that integration can be more than a word in a court edict and a cover for segregated housing.

Though no city is identical to any other city, what is happening on the Washington "frontier" is a carbon copy of similar situations in other American cities. The experience of Neighbors, Inc., may show other groups a way to beat segregation by real estate practice.

Once people—including whites and Negroes in a mixed or changing neighborhood—start talking to each other, many of the things of which they may be afraid take on a truer, less frightening dimension and neighborhoods can be stabilized. This is part of Neighbors' job—to get people together and talking and to see that also present are the facts needed to combat myths—about race, myths about plummeting real estate values.

Neighbors, Inc., is also concerned—and effectively—with violations of a zoning ordinance against roominghouses, for instance, violations which can do more to break a neighborhood down than can racial change. It works on real estate people, and some will cooperate, to end the proliferation of "for sale" and "sold" signs and the phone and mail harassment which sow uneasiness among neighbors. It works on the municipal government (which in voteless Washington includes Congressmen) to tighten up and enforce zoning and real estate regulations. It fights deteriorating streets and alleys. It does its own real estating to bring white families into its area and to help place Negro families in homes while preparing neighbors to live beside them.

Neighbors, Inc., is almost 4 years old. But it has been successful, more in some ways than in others. The number of real-estate people who will cooperate with it is small, but growing. It has brought more than 30 white families into its integrated area, while preventing others from selling in panic.

[A fact sheet on Neighbors, Inc.]

NEIGHBORS, INC.: WHAT'S THAT?

Neighbors is a nonprofit organization of residents in the Shepherd Park, Takoma, Brightwood, and Manor Park areas, who are successfully demonstrating that stable values and a cosmopolitan atmosphere can be maintained in integrated neighborhoods.

WHAT DOES NI DO?

NI promotes neighborhood stability through a free housing information service, helping both buyers and sellers. This encourages a normal housing market rather than panic selling.

NI cooperates with other groups seeking freedom of residence in the entire metropolitan area.

NI works with community resources to develop such outstanding programs as "American Democracy in Action" at Paul Junior High School.

NI holds public forums on problems of urban living, such as the new Executive order affecting housing.

NI makes sure that District government services are adequate for the needs of each area.

NI sees to it that the unique advantages of this beautiful residential area are communicated far and wide.

WHY AN ART AND BOOK FESTIVAL?

Neighbors must raise about half of its budget—the rest is foundation supported. Individual contributions and memberships must be supplemented with fund-raising projects. Your contribution of books, records or magazines will help immensely. (Of course, you're most welcome as a member, whether or not you live in the area.)

Then too, we're very proud of our local artists—and of Washington's share in the national culture. We want you to come and see our displays of local and citywide talent June 8–10 at Marjorie Webster Junior College, 17th and Kalmia Road NW, District of Columbia. We want to welcome you to the pleasant streets and attractive homes that make up the Neighbors' area.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1962]

INTERRACIAL GROUP TRIES TO MAKE LIVING EASIER IN CHANGING NORTHWEST NEIGHBORHOOD

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

An interracial group of residents in Northwest Washington is trying to create a stable, integrated, and vital neighborhood in an increasingly Negro section of the city.

This 3-year-old effort by Neighbors, Inc., whose idea is bounded roughly by Ingraham Street, Blair Road, the District line, and Rock Creek Park, amounts to a far-reaching social experiment in the dynamics of metropolitan life.

THE FLIGHT TO THE SUBURBS

If the effort pays off—Neighbors, Inc., claims only modest successes so far—it could help put spine back into the central city, give Negroes their first major chance to join the larger middle-class American community, keep the area attractive for whites, and answer some nagging questions about good will and democracy.

Neighbors is not stuffy or doctrinaire, and its 600 member-families—out of about 40,000 people, of which 7 in 10 are white—would probably groan under such a daily weight of challenge.

Students of the problem point out that whites and Negroes generally do not know how to live with each other. The exodus of whites to suburbs has served to accentuate the racial separation.

From 1950 to 1960 the District's Negro population rose from 281,000 to 412,000; the number of whites fell from 518,000 to 345,000. Individual census tracts swung between extremes. And this happened in a land-limited city while most new residential construction was in white-only apartments west of Rock Creek Park.

This massive transformation was well under way before Marvin H. Caplan, a big, breezy, candid journalist, bought a roomy house in Manor Park in 1957.

Manor Park was "changing." Caplan saw the Whittier Parent-Teacher Association lose three white board members in a term. Membership was dropping in white churches. The neighborhood was tense.

"I HAVE NO CHOICE"

The Caplans did not cast themselves as hard-charging integrationists. But they liked their attractive new home and they wanted to make their new neighborhood click. As Caplan wrote in the Atlantic magazine in 1960:

"Do I believe in brotherhood? Do I believe we are all born free and equal? Do I believe in the sacredness of the individual? Suddenly I am pushed beyond easy platitudes into that difficult and stony place where we are forced to take a stand for our professed convictions or abandon them."

With others, Caplan got the white Manor Park Citizens Association to hold an open meeting for a talk on integrated neighborhoods. The meeting generated further discussions in the Caplans' living room. Meanwhile the Association juggled the question of admitting Negroes. It looked as though that issue would hang fire over the summer.

Rather than risk a becalming of community interest during the summer doldrums, Caplan called a meeting in the Brightwood Park Methodist Church one evening in June 1958.

About 100 people, half Negro and half white, showed up. Neighbors, Inc., was born. Community contributions were sought. (Assistance has also been provided by the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation and the Taconic Foundation of New York.)

The comfortable-looking domain of Neighbors, Inc., includes Manor Park, Shepherd Park, Brightwood, Brightwood Park, and Takoma. The homes, largely single-family and owner-occupied, cluster in the $20,000 range, with most exceptions on the high side. Georgia Avenue is the business street.

An office at 5802 Georgia Avenue is headquarters for Neighbors' two paid staffers, Executive Director Margery T. Ware, formerly with the Washington Urban League, and Eleanor Garst, a community organizations specialist who worked with the Adams-Morgan demonstration projects. They marshal a small secretarial force and volunteers from the membership.

PRIDE AND ENTHUSIASM

Many members are vigorous young professionals with children; State Department aids, scientists, professors, doctors, journalists. Less upbeat-sounding people belong, too. Their prime quality is neighborhood pride.

In fact, a conversationally unleashed Neighbor is something to behold, rhapsodizing on his area's big, fairly priced homes, its grown trees and green lawns, proximity to downtown jobs and culture, lower-than-suburban taxes, its "lovely and vital" character. He makes you feel like a louse for living anywhere else.

Neighbors' tools are facts and sense. With the one it hopes to induce the other, so that the pace and kind of change will not unbalance the health of the community and the peace of mind of its residents.

It puts out information about real estate values and practices, the cost of moving, neighborhood housekeeping, and ways to stifle panic. It works through membership meetings, neighborhood receptions, community speakers, newsletters, block organizations, consultations with key people, negotiations with other groups and with real estate men.

It has sponsored clean-up campaigns, a public reception for resident diplomats, clinics for real estate salesmen, programs to help the schools. It helps responsible citizens move in, tries to retain others. The list is as long as Neighbors' imagination can make it.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MONEY

Neighbors knows, however, that it is bucking powerful psychological and commercial currents of change; that is, the reasons people move out, and the real estate men who hustle them along.

Mrs. Ware says some whites view the prospect of Negro neighbors with concern because of these fears:

Decline in property values. Neighbors disputes this with an eight-city survey (not including Washington), by economist Luigi Laurenti, indicating that values generally rise in changing neighborhoods. Georgia Avenue real estate men point to specific homes and blocks and largely agree, conceding that a panicked homeowner sells for less than true value. Parenthetically, a hardware dealer says he sells five times more grass seed to Negroes than he ever sold to whites for the same lawns.

Deterioration of schools. Neighbors, while not denying the cultural disadvantages of many Negroes, cites the notable and persisting achievement records of such schools as Paul Junior High and Coolidge High.

REAL ESTATE PROBLEM

"Inundation" by Negroes. Neighbors whole program works against this fear, particularly its efforts to slow down change and to bring in white families. Many whites of good will, it says, simply don't want to be "the last white family on the block."

Loss of status. Some whites feel they will be stigmatized as residents of a "colored neighborhood." Again, Neighbors tries to build pride and decency, noting the superior education, jobs and finances of many of its area's Negroes.

The high-pressure and often subtly racist practices of some fiercely competitive real estate men are another problem, perhaps the toughest that Neighbors faces. Hair-trigger sensitive to the implication that they profiteer on prejudice, the brokers can fairly state that they are filling a real need of house-hungry Negroes and that no such complaint to the District Real Estate Commission has ever been substantiated.

But the commission is worried. It has in the works new regulations that would bring speculators, like brokers, under license and hence under some control. A broker acts for another for a fee; a speculator buys and sells for himself.

A walk through Shepherd Park, one current focus of real-estate action, is instructive here.

A retired white musician is enraged at harassment by real-estate men—up to 10 calls in a single Sunday. He's happy to have as neighbors anyone who'll keep the area the pleasant place which attracted him. He feels strongly that Negroes deserve the best homes they can afford. His children are grown and gone.

A MOOD TO MOVE

Another man cites two standard white fears: Of being engulfed by Negroes and of the academic and social ills he thinks his daughter will meet next year at Paul Junior High. Mind you, he's got nothing against Negroes. He's in a mood to move.

Across the street live a Negro Government employee and his school-teacher wife who, typically, "just wanted a nice place to live."

They sought "a house they built for white people," a house of quality. Their worries about their three children were largely dissolved by a happy trick-or-treat reception.

They feel their dream house would have cost whites perhaps $2,000 less. At another house a white neighbor overheard the agent jacking the price by that amount to a Negro prospect.

Another white homeowner, an immigrant, fears he'll lose maybe $5,000 on his $45,000 home if he sells. They say he'll lose. Some neighbors soon removed the "for sale" signs that greeted the block's first Negro, but this man remains jittery. After all, "my life is in this house."

FAILURES OF CONTACT

None of these people belong to Neighbors, Inc., but all have heard of it; most area residents apparently have. Neighbors would like to reach them all. So far it has failed to make significant contacts with three key neighborhood groups: Churches and synagogues, citizens associations, and businessmen.

Most religious institutions, despite pacesetting stands by a few clergymen, have simply not busied themselves with the factors behind the flight of their congregations. Nor have they particularly welcomed Negroes.

Generally, citizens associations have held back through their policy of white-only membership and their traditional concern with such other matters as public works.

Businessmen now seem to be realizing that neighborhood health means good business. Caplan finally got a speaking invitation from the Brightwood Lions Club and a member said businessmen are "grateful" that Neighbors is at work.

Nobody knocks the group except a few brokers with burned fingers who claim that Neighbors is trying to keep Negroes out.

Neighbors itself is painfully aware of its own limitations. Only after 3 years, Mrs. Ware feels, does it have the roots and organization to become effective. Except for stiffer real estate regulations, "we're not yet at the point of knowing exactly how to ask the city to help," she says.

As Neighbors' main feats, Mrs. Ware cites a palpable lessening of tension and the nurturing of a feeling that this is a socially valuable neighborhood. The woman buying new carpeting who told the clerk she "went to a meeting of Neighbors and decided to stay" is pure gravy.

President Caplan feels that Neighbors has yet to handle effectively the problems of unstable low-income Negro families moving into the fringes of its essentially middle-class realm. "We're not a social-work agency," he observes.

He counts as a significant plus the 20 or more white families brought in directly by Neighbors. He thinks other community groups are "coming around—distrust is disappearing."

Caplan would like District and Federal officials to practice what they preach by moving into an integrated neighborhood. He wants all aspects of discrimination removed: "You touch everything."

Most importantly, he and Mrs. Ware believe that Negroes must have as wide a choice in the whole area's housing market as do whites, so that Negroes will not funnel out of one ghetto into another.

NEIGHBORS, INC., ART AND BOOK FESTIVAL

Dr. Robert C. Good, president, Mrs. Lewis Atkinson, Mr. Samuel Halperin, Mrs. Don Slaiman, festival chairmen.

FESTIVAL SPONSORS

The Honorable Chester Bowles.
The Honorable Angier Biddle Duke.
The Honorable Ernest Gruening.
The Honorable Philip A. Hart.
The Honorable Kenneth G. Holum.
The Honorable Charles A. Horsky.
The Honorable Jacob K. Javits.
The Honorable Marjorie Lawson.
Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr.
The Honorable Esther Peterson.
Mr. Frank Reeves.
Dr. David Z. Robinson.
The Honorable Carl Rowan.
The Honorable William Fitts Ryan.
Mr. J. C. Turner.
Dr. Marjorie Webster.
The Honorable Lee C. White.
The Honorable G. Mennen Williams.
Mr. Theodore Bikel.
The Honorable John B. Duncan.
Rev. Duncan Howlett.
Dr. Mordecai Johnson.
The Honorable Adlai Stevenson.
The Honorable Walter Tobriner.
Mr. Sterling Tucker.

AN ACT OF LIBERAL STATESMANSHIP

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the Members of this body know, the Vice President of the United States on Memorial Day delivered a distinguished address at Gettysburg. The Vice President in these memorable remarks has again shown his leadership by his timely and eloquent emphasis on the urgent need of our times, truly equal justice for our Negro citizens.

His act of liberal statesmanship has evoked wide and deserved acknowledgment. In my own State the editors of the Boston Globe, in recognition of the Vice President's remarks printed them in full, and in an editorial expressed special appreciation of his unique contribution to our Government.

Mr. President, I believe that these thoughts should be preserved in the permanent RECORD of this body. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and the Vice President's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HAPPY VICE PRESIDENT

LYNDON B. JOHNSON is no ordinary Vice President. He showed this at Gettysburg on Memorial Day when he urged racial cooperation because "in this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake, it is our Nation."

Moreover, the Vice President is described as a happy one, content with his job, holding several top administrative assignments and taking part regularly in executive department policymaking. No Throttlebottom, he.

In this he is perhaps more active than even his predecessor, Richard Nixon. Others before them have been less happy, for they merely presided over the Senate; Calvin Coolidge, under Harding, was no blithe spirit, nor did his own Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, really enjoy the job. Perhaps today the job has grown with the man.

THE NATION: ABOVE NEGRO AND WHITE

(By Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg.

We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom. We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock.

The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough.

But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it but neither can the law serve any who do not use it.

The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law.

Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perserverance.

Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen at the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation.

Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "now"; others say, "never."

The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact.

To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week marks the 17th anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Italy.

On June 2, 1946, after suffering for two decades under a Fascist dictatorship and after bearing the ravages of war throughout their historic land, the people of Italy formed their Republic. They made their choice freely by an orderly democratic referendum, and their democratic government endures today.

We can be proud that the statesmanship of our Government was instrumental in assisting the citizens of Italy to form their government and fulfill their aspirations. But it was the character and resolution of the Italian people and the strength of their leadership which ultimately achieved the progress being made in Italy.

It has been my privilege to visit Italy and witness the achievements that are being made. Italy's rate of growth has been higher than that of any other country in the Common Market. In 1962, its national income increased by about 6 percent over the previous year, well up to the yearly goal set 10 years ago. Moreover, along with this growth, the pattern of the Italian economy is being changed, from a predominantly agricultural economy to a more industrialized one with greater production of capital goods. This economic miracle has been accomplished against the constant resistance of the Communists, through strikes and violence.

This progress has been remarkable, but it has not been surprising. History has repeatedly evidenced the strength of purpose, the quality, and the genius of the Italians. Their contribution to the culture, the arts, the sciences, the industry and the agriculture of nearly every country in the world—the Old World and the New World as well—is immeasurable.

As we celebrate this anniversary, we recognize these accomplishments, and we reaffirm the bonds of friendship, respect, loyalty, and purpose which Americans share with the men and women of Italy, and with their Republic which stands as a vital ally against totalitarian communism.

Mr. President, I salute the Republic of Italy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUR INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT UNGUARDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, an organized effort is now underway which, if successful, will undermine the Constitution of the United States and might possibly destroy our federal system of government.

Since the 1954 desegregation decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, certain elements in our society have continually attacked the Court and its individual members in an attempt to undermine public confidence in this great institution. For the most part, these attacks have been the work of scattered lunatic rightwing fringe organizations and have been ineffective.

However, today the anticourt forces have adopted a different strategy and are mounting another attack through three proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. They are using an amendment process provided in the Constitution but never successfully invoked. This is for the legislatures of two-thirds of the States to petition Congress to call a national constitutional convention.

It is amazing that the three constitutional amendments now being circulated through State legislatures and being considered in the General Assembly of Ohio—I repeat, it is amazing and startling that these proposals, which in effect would repeal the 20th century, would ignore the results of the Civil War fought 100 years ago, and would turn back the United States and give us yesterday, are being seriously considered by anyone. I know the old days were good. They were simple and relaxed. However, we live in a new era, a space age of change, challenge, and exploration.

One proposed amendment would give State legislatures, if enough of them combined, power to amend the Constitution of the United States without the participation of the Congress. Were it to be adopted, an estimated 15 percent of the population could change the fundamental law. Fancy that. Such a proposed amendment is absolutely unnecessary. Of course, it is an evil proposal. The citizens of every State have a very easy remedy. If they do not like the actions of any of their Congressmen, they may elect new Congressmen. If they do not like their Senator, they have the same remedy available.

As was stated earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON made one of the truly great speeches of this generation at Gettysburg on Memorial Day.

However notwithstanding the fact that the Civil War was fought and decided a hundred years ago, there are today lunatic rightwing fringers in the North as well as racists in other sections of our country who now sponsor the second reactionary proposal, which would nullify the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision requiring reapportionment of State legislatures to end rural domination. That was an important and high-minded decision of the Supreme Court.

Then there is the unthinkable reactionary proposal to set up a super Supreme Court of the Chief Justices of each State—a court embodying 50 chief justices of 50 States, as if any such court could seriously deliberate and act. Some racists or lunatic rightwing fringers must have thought this one up. They want to give this so-called super court the power to overrule decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Talk about court packing. This proposal would create a third national legislative body. It would make a lawyer's paradise, because it would present an eternal state of chaos and confusion as to what is the law of the land.

Now the fantastic fact is that 12 States have already acted favorably on at least one of these proposed amendments. In Ohio two pending resolutions have been receiving substantial backing from the ultra conservatives, and the John Birch Society and other lunatic fringe organizations, who probably have not even read the proposals but jump to support them—and call themselves "loyal Americans" in doing so.

Mr. President, in my view these three proposals represent the first step toward the destruction of our form of government, our American way of life and the end of our democracy as Americans have known it for more than 170 years. It would take us back to the days of the Articles of Confederation. It would more than repeal the 20th century.

The cause of States rights would be much better served if those extremists who are pushing these radical proposals would devote their time and efforts to fulfilling the guarantees presently in the Constitution.

They claim to be conservatives, but they dishonor that appellation. They are not acting to conserve the American way of life and the traditions that form the foundation of our country. These proposals aim, not at the preservation or conservation of our form of government, but at the subversion of the balance of Federal-State relations which has enabled us throughout our history to escape the evils of despotism and totalitarianism. They stand opposed to the cardinal principle of our democracy—that we are a united nation, having a unified interest in the maintenance of our Federal Constitution, and expressing that interest through national deliberations and decisions and through our national Constitution. That principle is being ignored by the promoters of these unsound proposed amendments.

Unfortunately, some of the proposed amendments have already been approved by the legislatures of as many as 13 States. Until recently this has been done quietly and with little publicity. There was so little public debate on this great issue that the Chief Justice of the United States was compelled to speak out and warn the Nation of the impending disaster.

I pay tribute to him for his rebuke of the leaders of the American legal profession for their failure to stand up for a way of life of which they are supposed to be leaders.

There was so little public debate on this great issue that, in speaking before the American Law Institute, our great Chief Justice urged lawyers to show more concern over guarding our precious institutions. He warned that "without the guidance or even the concern of the legal fraternity our institutions are left unguarded."

The legal profession—and I speak as one who has been in the past the president of two bar associations in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, where I live—has the responsibility of explaining to the American people the dangers of these proposed amendments to the Constitution. It seems to me that the legal profession—and I say "amen" to the statement of our great Chief Justice—should naturally take leadership in opposing the adoption of these proposals by the various State legislatures.

Likewise, the newspapers of our Nation have a similar responsibility. In this regard I express my high regard and respect for one of the great newspapers of our Nation, the Toledo Blade, and its publisher, Paul Block, Jr., for the leadership they have taken in keeping Americans aware of this problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Once again the Senator from Oregon is moved to compliment and congratulate the Senator from Ohio for his courage, his insight, his foresight, and his statesmanship when he, once again, rises on the floor of the Senate to warn the American people about a great issue that concerns them in regard to which they are doing so little, because the people, too, are suffering from apathy in the whole matter of citizen statesmanship.

It is well that the Senator is making these comments this afternoon. It so happens that I am in the midst of a research project dealing with these three proposed amendments. I hope to have it finished within the next 2 or 3 weeks, preparatory to presenting a rather lengthy, detailed research study on the evil effects of each one of the amendments, should the impossible come to pass, namely, that the American people will sleep long enough to permit the amendments to become the law of the land.

I cannot imagine such a Rip Van Winkle act on the part of the American people, but the alarm bells need to be sounded, and the Senator from Ohio is doing a magnificent job today in ringing them.

He is quite justified in making his plea to the legal profession, of which he and I happen to be members. The legal profession has a particular responsibility, in a field such as this, to warn the American people by setting forth the facts as to what would be the results of the adoption of any one of these amendments. I join him in his high praise of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in speaking before the American Law Institute and for his plea to the bar associations of this country that they give some attention to the very serious danger that is rising that may plague the whole system of government in the United States.

The Senator from Ohio is quite right. The adoption of any one of these amendments would change our form of government in many ways. We must not let the ultrareactionaries, which have so many characteristics of the Fascist mind, prevail in this matter.

I am also glad the Senator from Ohio is paying his compliments to the Toledo Blade, for I am familiar, as a result of my research on this subject, with the journalistic leadership of the Toledo Blade. There have been some other newspapers which have shown it—for example, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York Times—but there are few in number in the field of journalism that have taken up the cudgels in support of our form of government, because that is what is at issue in connection with these three amendments.

I join the Senator in complimenting and congratulating the Toledo Blade for its journalistic statesmanship in this field.

I also wish to pay tribute to every editor in this country who has had the courage to stand up and be counted against one of the most subtle, invidious, and dangerous propaganda drives that the American people have been subjected to in recent times—the drive the Senator from Ohio has been talking about on the part of ultraconservative forces that believe the time has come when they may slip through these amendments while the American people are in a deep Rip Van Winkle sleep, which would be so costly to future generations of Americans.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I express my gratitude to the great Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I feel somewhat more firm in my view, and am reinforced in the justice of this cause, when I know I have his wholehearted, fervent support and endorsement of what I have been saying. I shall be on the job, and shall listen with interest to the great statement I know he will make after he has completed his research on this subject.

Also, I am thankful to him for his comments regarding the Toledo Blade, a truly great newspaper, and its great publisher, Paul Block, Jr. It is a fact, as the Senator has said, that many of us perhaps have been emulating Rip Van Winkle. As we know from our schooldays, Rip Van Winkle went to sleep at the time King George was the ruler of the Colonies. He awakened in a new country, at a time when George Washington was President of the United States. He had slept through the entire Revolution. As the great Senator from Oregon has said, God help the American people if they sleep through this period.

Mr. President, long before the situation came to the attention of most Americans, Paul Block, Jr., publisher of the Toledo Blade, and the Toledo Blade were fully and continually discussing and warning of the danger inherent in these so-called States rights amendments. If they are to be prevented from being enacted into law, it will be in great part due to the intelligence and alertness of Americans such as Paul Block, Jr., and newspapers such as the Toledo Blade.

In the Washington Post of Monday, June 3, 1963, there appeared a full page advertisement by the Toledo Blade which should be brought to the attention of all citizens. It is captioned "Our Institutions Are Not Unguarded." Without knowing the facts, I daresay that Paul Block, Jr., obligated himself to pay as much as $3,000 for the insertion of the advertisement in the Washington Post. I understand it was also printed in the New York Times. He was not content with keeping the readers of the Toledo Blade adequately informed on this great issue, but took the leadership and assumed the added responsibility of helping to bring this issue to the attention of all Americans.

I commend the statement of the Toledo Blade to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT UNGUARDED

Question: "If lawyers are not to be the watchmen for the Constitution, on whom are we to rely?" (Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.)

In an address to the American Law Institute on May 22, 1963, Chief Justice Warren took the Nation's lawyers to task. He criticized their apparent lack of concern over efforts to amend the U.S. Constitution to curb the powers of the judicial and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

Stating that "very little public mention has been made of them," the Chief Justice warned that "without the guidance or even the concern of the legal fraternity * * * our institutions are left unguarded."

While lawyers unquestionably do have a responsibility of leadership in efforts to preserve the Constitution, are they the sole guardians?

As active participants in one of the foundation rocks of constitutional freedom, the newspapers of Ohio—including the Blade in Toledo—have, in the natural course of their function, fully and continuously discussed these so-called States rights amendments. So, too, have a great many leading newspapers throughout the country.

For example, on December 5, 1962, a day before the delegates to the General Assembly of the States endorsed these amendments, the Blade published an editorial criticizing them and charging that they would be a disservice to State government itself. The Blade sent its specialist in State affairs from Columbus to Chicago to cover that meeting and reported its proceedings at length.

Actually, as far back as February 1962, the Blade sent that same correspondent to Nashville, Tenn., to provide background information on the case that led up to this nationwide controversy. That was a month before the U.S. Supreme Court sanctioned Federal intervention in reapportionment.

Opposition to that decision set off the controversial amendment proposals. But readers of the Blade were prepared for what developed by the Blade's Washington bureau chief, George Jenks, whose background articles in 1961 explained the national significance of all of those related issues.

After the Chicago meeting brought matters to a head last December, the Blade editorially supported efforts by State Senate Minority Leader Frank King to kill the proposed amendments in the Ohio General Assembly. Subsequent editorials condemned the resurrection of one of those amendments and commended the forthright stand against them by Michigan's Governor Romney.

On the front page of its Sunday editorial section 1 week ago yesterday, the Blade ran a story by Mr. Jenks on Chief Justice Warren's contention that there was an absence of national debate over the issues, along with the text of his remarks.

Throughout this period, the Blade gave its readers full news coverage as the controversy developed. But it was not alone; so did every other major newspaper in Ohio. It was well they did.

For recently, a concerted effort was begun to push through one of the amendments in Ohio. It was an attempt to crack the solid front against the amendments among Northern industrial States by concentrating on a renewed legislative drive here.

Ohio's large newspapers are an independent lot. They never act in concert. Rarely are they all in agreement on major issues or the amount of attention they give to them.

But in this instance, it is amazing and significant to find in a study of the large

> cities in Ohio that newspapers of such normally divergent viewpoints as the Plain Dealer and the Press in Cleveland, the Enquirer and the Post-Times Star in Cincinnati, the Akron Beacon-Journal, the Daily News and Journal-Herald in Dayton, the Youngstown Vindicator, the Canton Repository and, of course, the Blade, sounded individual alarms with extra intensity.
>
> So up to now, despite substantial national and State pressures, efforts behind the scenes to ram one of the proposed amendments through the Ohio Senate have been halted.
>
> You asked, Mr. Chief Justice, upon whom can the Nation rely. Upon the newspapers of America.
>
> Answer: "The Nation's newspapers; among them, the Blade, Toledo, Ohio, one of America's great newspapers."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, these amendments, as I have said, are at this moment pending before the General Assembly of Ohio and before the legislatures of many other States. The attempt to nullify the U.S. Supreme Court reapportionment decision has gone so far as to have been approved by the State government committee of the Ohio State Senate. It is a committee in which reactionary legislators in my State seem to be in the majority. It is significant that most of the major newspapers of Ohio, many of them with widely divergent views on the public questions of the day, have editorially spoken out, as has the Toledo Blade, strongly against the proposed amendments.

At a later date, when some further research that I am making on this subject has been completed, I expect to speak further on the subject and submit for publication in the RECORD in connection with my remarks other editorial comment from Ohio newspapers.

The Founding Fathers of our Nation showed great wisdom in providing against easy alteration of our Federal Constitution. None of the proposed amendments has obtained anywhere near the approval of two-thirds of the legislatures of the States, which is required for their consideration before a Constitutional Convention. I believe that we can safely predict that ultimately they will find their way into the same rubbish heap of all rejected attacks on the Supreme Court, including the proposals to impeach the Chief Justice and other members of the Court. However, we must be alert; the newspapers of this country must be alert; and the lawyers of this Nation, and their bar associations, must be alert, and see to it that these attacks are rejected, in the same way that the stupid, half-baked proposals to impeach our great Chief Justice have been rejected. Daily, letters come to me from misguided and ill-informed citizens of my State urging the impeachment of Earl Warren, a great, patriotic, and loyal American, one of the great men of our time, a man who was the vice presidential candidate of his party, and an outstanding jurist.

The only way to make certain that these proposals will be defeated, discarded and fully rejected is to follow the leadership of newspapers of our country such as the Toledo Blade, and for all Americans to show strong concern lest we permit our democracy and our way of life to be damaged by these lunatic right-wing extremists.

DENIAL OF FEDERAL FUNDS IN SEGREGATED STATE OR LOCAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants or beneficiaries. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that it remain at the desk for 7 days for the signatures of other Senators who may wish to join with me in cosponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

The bill (S. 1665) to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill I am now introducing would require all Federal agencies administering Federal grant-in-aid programs to States or local communities to assure that none of the Federal money is used in segregated State or local activities. The bill can be described as a Powell amendment of general application to all grants-in-aid, or any other kind of Federal assistance.

State-supported segregation is illegal, and has been so for 9 years. The Federal Government must no longer be a party to this illegality. This is quite different from terminating all Federal aid as a penalty to Southern States, whether it involves discriminatory programs or not. My bill would require only that all Federal money be spent in accordance with the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution, as defined by the Supreme Court.

Of the three branches of the Federal Government, Congress has done the least to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States in its application to colored Americans. As I said earlier this afternoon, in my opinion the Constitution of the United States has never been delivered to the colored people of America. It has been kept locked up by the white people of America—kept locked up by way of a denial of constitutional rights to the colored people. The time is long overdue for delivery of the Constitution to the colored people of our country. It cannot be delivered fully unless Congress does so by a legislative deliverance. It is necessary to enact legislation to implement the Constitution, so far as making its rights and privileges available to the colored people of America is concerned.

This is the first of a series of civil rights bills that I shall introduce, if it becomes necessary to introduce more in the weeks ahead, because I agree with the remarks made earlier this afternoon by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that this session of Congress is the session of reckoning in the history of the United States with respect to civil rights. In my opinion, time has run out on the American people with respect to the nondeliverance of the Constitution to the colored people of the country.

The Emancipation Proclamation is more than 100 years old. The 14th amendment, giving full citizenship to former slaves, is now 95 years old. The colored citizen is asking in tones that no longer can be ignored that he be accorded all the rights of citizenship.

I want Congress to face this issue on its merits, and to stop using the nonsegregation rider as a political weapon against general aid legislation. I have opposed the so-called Powell amendment rider, as it has been offered to bill after bill. I shall continue to oppose it on that basis because in my opinion, it fails to meet the issue on its merits.

Today, I am introducing a broad bill, one which would simply lay down as the law of the land that Federal funds may not be expended illegally in connection with any program. In my judgment, the expenditure of Federal funds under any Federal aid program, which is administered on a segregated basis, is a violation of constitutional rights and must be brought to an end.

My bill would not penalize Southern States that continue illegal segregation by cutting off Federal aid that may be unrelated to segregation or discrimination. It does require that where Federal money supports any State or local program, that program with its benefits and its facilities may be available equally to all citizens without regard to their race or color. It merely requires that all Federal money used to aid State and local community programs be spent in accord with the Constitution.

The measure would apply not only to the mental health activities, to which a rider was offered last week, nor only to schools, which are the subject of a rider in the House of Representatives. It would apply to every program of Federal aid to the States on their subdivisions in the planning, surveying, construction, support, or administration of facilities or services.

But whether Congress acts on the bill or not, the executive branch also has a responsibility in this field. I find it hard to believe that the administrators of these programs have no choice but to continue extending Federal aid to illegal activities merely because Congress fails in its duty to enact a directive concerning them.

Congress and the administration will continue temporizing on this issue at their own grave peril. We cannot allow the exercise of cherished rights of American citizenship to be determined in the streets and alleys of America. That those rights are going to be exercised can no longer be denied. Changes will be made. I do not want those changes to come over dead bodies. But they will come in that way unless Congress and the administration act.

Certainly criticisms will be hurled against this bill and against its author. But the reckoning is at hand on the issue of civil rights in this country. I know it will be said that the bill, if it is pressed for action on the floor of the Senate, may hold Congress in session for months. I am ready to stay in session for months. The Senate had better get ready to stay in session for months, because as the American people, with increasing tempo, begin to understand the import of the great civil rights issue that now faces the country, I am satisfied that their mandate to the elected officials of the people of the country—to Congress—will be: Stay on the job for as many months as may be required to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America, for they have waited for that delivery for many decades.

We shall have to face what may be a momentous challenge in the Senate concerning the passage of necessary civil rights legislation. But I shall not be deterred by any argument that the bringing up of civil rights measures would create a logjam of other proposed legislation that also ought to be passed; for we shall have to face the situation. We should have faced it sooner. We must not face it later. We must face it now. I will not be intimidated to the slightest degree by arguments of expediency, to the effect that if we fight on the front of civil rights legislation, we may jam up the legislative works and delay for a long time the passage of other needed legislation. The time has come to face that delay. I am satisfied that a determined Senate can break any filibuster that is aimed at the human rights guarantees provided by this Republic.

I am satisfied that if we have the courage to fight out this issue legislatively at this session, the overwhelming majority of the people of this country will make clear to the Senate, that they support us in that fight. I think the people of this country would prefer to have the civil rights issue fought to a finish on the floor of the Senate than in the streets, alleys, and shops of the Nation.

If, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I had to name the five most critical foreign-policy issues which face our people this year, two of them would be as follows: The first would be that involving the schools of our country. We must stop wasting the brainpower of our Nation by denying to tens upon tens of thousands of young men and young women a college education because of their economic inability to attend school or because you and I, Mr. President, and the rest of the 180 million American people have for so long caused so many of our young people to attend grade schools and high schools which are so low in their scholastic standards that those who attend them cannot qualify for college.

The second issue in the group of five that I would name as vital foreign-policy issues is that of civil rights. Mr. President, in international conference we are developing the same reputation that the Union of South Africa has acquired from its shocking treatment of Negroes in that country and in South-West Africa, over which the Union of South Africa holds an old League of Nations mandate, and the same reputation that Portugal has acquired in Angola and Mozambique.

During my service in the Senate, I have participated in international conferences at which I have had to answer criticisms which were hurled at our Nation because of the differences between the preachments of our representatives at international conferences and our practices at home. In the eyes of the rest of the world, our country has been found guilty—and it is guilty—of stark, rank, shocking, inexcusable hypocrisy in connection with its professings about freedom. We have never given to the Negro in America his rights of freedom, for no person is really free unless he is economically free; and the Negroes of America are not economically free. They cannot be economically free so long as we continue the record of economic discrimination against the colored man in America.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let the labor leaders take note of the comment I have just made in regard to economic freedom. Not only is there economic discrimination by many employers against the Negro, but there is also economic discrimination by many unions against the Negro. That, too, must pass, for economic freedom is essential to the preservation of political freedom.

Of course the American Negro can never be free until he is guaranteed the same voting rights that the white man of America enjoys. However, when there are established plans designed to cheat the American Negro out of his right to cast a ballot, we cannot go before any international conference and talk about freedom in the United States.

Mr. President, as I close my remarks, I would have my colleagues in the Senate do a little historical research; I would have them consider the time when our Republic was born and when this great parliamentary body came into being as the representatives of a free electorate; and I would have my colleagues take note of the fact that the great civil rights issue being raised today is an old, old one in the life of our Republic. Periodically it rises to plague freemen.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must settle this issue. In my judgment, it should be settled legislatively. It should be settled by the application of the rules of reason to a complex and admittedly difficult problem, but nevertheless a human rights problem involving basic issues of morality. We know on which side of the issue the morals are. My plea is that we apply the rules of reason to the moral issue, to the legal issue, to the political issue, to the economic issue, and—yes, Mr. President, and above all—to the constitutional issue. If we do that, in carrying out our responsibilities of trust and statesmanship as Members of this body, we shall before the end of this session pass the legislation necessary to enable us—for the first time in the history of our Republic—to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I should like to compliment the Senator from Oregon on his statements on the constitutional morality of our Nation, and especially on his statements made from the great vantage point of his position on the Foreign Relations Committee and his understanding of the international implications of this civil rights struggle to our Nation and to the rest of the world.

I have offered civil rights amendments to various bills, including the mental health bill. It is my sincere conviction that there is a necessary place for such amendments when we deal with programs such as the mental health program, when we know that unless we do something about civil rights in that connection, the programs will be administered in a discriminatory way. I also think there is a place for such amendments when we deal by indirection with the financing of, for example, airports, when the part financed by the Federal Government would not be segregated, but the part built around it would be segregated.

So I believe there is a proper place for such amendments. However, I have too much respect for the Senator from Oregon, and I value too highly his alliance in this fight, to be critical in that regard.

I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon is carrying out his basic principles and his fundamental beliefs by introducing generic legislation.

I never had any doubt as to his attitude on this question. His proposal embodies it in practical legislative terms.

I hope that the Senator will join with me—I know he will; I only say that rhetorically—in expressing the belief that the authority resides in the President to withhold Federal funds, collected from citizens without regard to race, from State programs which are racially segregated or discriminatory. The Federal funds could be withheld by the various departments. They should be withheld. The introduction of generic legislation of the character proposed, expressing, as it does, the deep conviction of the Senator from Oregon, certainly will not diminish his own fight one whit. A number of us are fighting the battle to see that that authority is exercised now in appropriate cases.

As my colleague knows, even in the Mississippi case, which the U.S. Civil Rights Commission so hotly assailed, the Commission said that the President should consider that possibility on a selective basis. Who could disagree with that statement? It was seized upon as being an across-the-board desire to force the State of Mississippi. But that was the view taken by the Commission's enemies and not its friends. I know the Senator's feelings on that. I know the Senator will not diminish for a minute his efforts with a number of us—the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and myself particularly to do our utmost to see that, until such time as a generic statute is passed, the President nonetheless exercises the authority that we are deeply convinced he has now to withhold funds. Presidents have done so previously, for example, in respect to airplanes and in respect to a highway scandal in Indiana, where there was a charge of corruption. Surely when the Constitution is being violated by a State, the President has the right to, and should, withhold funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator for his statement and his contribution. I share the point of view he has expressed as to the obligation of the executive branch of the Government to fulfill its right and duties under the Constitution in carrying out its executive functions.

I should like to reread a very brief paragraph from my formal statement which I made a few moments ago bearing out my agreement with the Senator. I said:

> But whether the Congress acts on it or not, the executive branch also has a responsibility in this field. I find it hard to believe that the administrators of these programs have no choice but to continue extending Federal aid to illegal activities, just because Congress fails in its own duty to enact a directive concerning them.

Both the executive branch of the Government and the Congress need to catch up with the courts of America. The courts are so far ahead of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government in making available to the Negroes of this country their rights under the Constitution of the United States that we in the Congress ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1665

A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States that, in all programs administered or executed by or for the benefit of the States or their political subdivisions and supported, in whole or in part, with funds provided by the United States, no individuals participating in or benefiting from such programs shall be segregated or otherwise discriminated against because of race or color.

SEC. 2. No moneys shall be paid by the United States to or for the benefit of any State or political subdivision thereof under any program of Federal assistance—

(1) to plan or provide facilities, services, benefits or employment in such State or political subdivision,

(2) to defray administrative expenses of a program in such State or political subdivision, or

(3) to defray the cost of carrying out a program in such State or political subdivision,

if the participants in or beneficiaries of such program in such State of political subdivision are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, because of race or color.

SEC. 3. The programs of Federal assistance referred to in this Act include, but are not limited to, programs—

(1) to assist the construction of hospitals, schools, highways, airports, parks and recreational areas, community facilities, and public works generally;

(2) to provide old-age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, assistance to needy families with children, assistance for maternal and child welfare, assistance to the blind, assistance to the disabled, and public health and welfare assistance programs generally;

(3) to provide financial assistance to the unemployed and assistance in the training, retraining, and placement of workers;

(4) to provide assistance to business, including agriculture;

(5) to provide assistance to educational institutions and to individuals for educational purposes; and

(6) to provide assistance to National Guard and civil defense activities.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

SHIPS SUPPLYING COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in keeping with my practice of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the number and names of ships which have been supplying Communist Cuba, I wish to bring the record up to date at this time.

During the period May 8, 1963, to May 17, 1963, 11 free-world freighters and tankers totaling 85,077 gross tons called in Cuba. In the course of this period four Lebanese freighters of a combined weight of 28,710 gross tons stopped in Cuba. This tonnage places Lebanon at the head of the list for this period. In connection with the increased appearance of Lebanese vessels in Cuban ports, it is only fair to note that Lebanon under its laws is capable of exercising only slight control over the movement of its vessels. I am advised by reliable sources that over 50 percent of these vessels traveled in ballast to Cuba to accommodate the exportation of Cuban sugar products. Lebanon is currently revising its statutes and regulations relative to the registry of its merchantmen to the end that more effective control can be maintained over its flagships. It is my understanding that Lebanon is holding the registration of new vessels in abeyance until such time as new regulations can be enacted. A perusal of the names on the list of Lebanese ships calling in Cuba since January 1, 1963 would lead one to believe that they are for the most part the proprietary interests of Greek nationals. I intend to pursue this further and provide my colleagues with a full report at a later date because if such is the case it is most unfortunate in light of the Royal Hellenic Government's recent action to curtail Greek shipping to Cuba. The flag of registry and tonnage of those ships calling in Cuba during the period May 8, 1963, to May 17, 1963, is as follows:

Ardgem, British, 6,981; *Athelmere*—tanker—British, 7,524; *London Victory*—tanker—British, 12,132; *Embassy*, Greek, 8,418; *Maria Santa*, Greek, 7,217; *Malou*, Lebanese, 7,145; *Giorgos Tsakiroglou*, Lebanese, 7,240; *Mantric*, Lebanese, 7,255; *Noemi*, Lebanese, 7,070; *Achille*, Italian, 6,950; *Trebisnjica*, Yugoslav, 7,145.

CUBAN MILITARY BUILDUP

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 9, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate issued an interim report on the Cuban military buildup. The report was based not on the opinion of the subcommittee, nor on the opinion of any one member of the subcommittee, but on the facts as the subcommittee found them to be. The report of the subcommittee was concise and contained a minimum of editorialization.

Unfortunately, some people have, nevertheless, made a great effort not to comprehend what the report said. One of the best jobs of misreading the report appeared in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post on Tuesday, May 28. I ask unanimous consent that this letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTELLIGENCE IN THE CRISIS

As a Naval Reserve intelligence officer, I cannot let Roscoe Drummond's analysis of the recent Stennis subcommittee report on our intelligence in the Cuban crisis, which appeared on May 20, go unchallenged.

Mr. Drummond says something needs to be done because of the inability of John A. McCone and our other intelligence chiefs to convince the subcommittee that all Soviet long-range missiles have been removed from Cuba.

Well, this report is a wondrous document: you can prove either side of the question by it. I suppose this comes from a desire for unanimity. But there is a grave question, when as fundamental an issue as the integrity and competence of our Nation's intelligence services are concerned, whether the public interest is really served by an inquiry that stops short of a clear-cut verdict just to keep everybody happy.

In any event, one thing is clear: all of the report's conclusions which refute charges against our intelligence services are based on facts, while those which give aid and comfort to the critics are either self-contradictory or rest on nothing more substantial than theoretical skepticism.

Take the matter of strategic missiles, for example. The intelligence chiefs to a man conclude these missiles have been removed. To oppose this impressive professional judgment the committee offers only absolutes and philosophical skepticism. Theoretically, to be sure, anything is possible. But is this really any way to run a railroad—or a country?

Likewise, the substantial errors the committee says resulted from a belief by some intelligence officials that the Soviets would never put missiles in Cuba vanish in the face of facts appearing elsewhere in the same document.

For example, from July 1962 on, all rumors about such missiles—whether contrary to subjective beliefs or not—were scrupulously checked out, we are told, with uniformly negative results. Until the pictures came in from that October 14 U-2 flight nobody—either in the Senate or out—had any confirmation of any long-range missile rumors.

So what substantial errors were there? What more could intelligence have done, even had they believed otherwise? Should they have represented as confirmed fact rumors for which no confirmation could be found? Or was the subcommittee perhaps indulging some of the administration's more vocal critics in its midst by taking the intelligence community to task for a failure to manifest psychic powers prior to October 14?

Whatever the ultimate answer to our troublesome problems in Cuba, it can only be complicated by an unwillingness on the part of those in possession of the facts to repudiate unequivocally unfounded charges against an intelligence community that actually turned in a magnificent and highly successful performance last October.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Member, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives.

Mr. THURMOND. Among other charges hurled at the report is the allegation that one can prove either side of the question by it.

Mr. President, if there is this much misunderstanding about the report, I think it should be translated into the simplest possible language for the benefit of those who will understand it only in four letter words. I will, therefore, attempt to paraphrase in simple English the major findings of the subcommittee.

The U.S. intelligence chiefs do not know if Soviet nuclear missiles are now in Cuba or not. They do not believe there are any Soviet missiles in Cuba. They do believe there could be Soviet missiles in Cuba. They do not know how many Soviet missiles came into Cuba last year. They photographed a lesser number of missiles in Cuba than the 42 Premier Khrushchev said he took out. They cannot testify that they know the Soviet missiles in Cuba last fall are gone.

The intelligence chiefs testified that there are thousands of caves in Cuba and that many of the caves are suitable for storing concealed nuclear missiles. They do know that some of these caves are being used for military purposes. They have seen military activity going on around the mouths of the caves. They do not know what is inside, but they prefer to believe the caves are used only for ordinary, nonnuclear military supplies.

Our intelligence chiefs rely primarily on photographs taken from high-altitude U-2 planes for our information on Cuba. The method is good, but not perfect, for seeing what is lying around on open ground in the daytime. The method is susceptible to camouflage. It cannot see through forests. It cannot see what takes place at nighttime, and obviously, it cannot see inside caves. Almost everything our intelligence chiefs know about Cuba now is what can be seen on open ground in the daytime from a high altitude.

Our intelligence services also do not know how many Soviet troops are in Cuba now, or how many were there at any other time. Last October we came very close to having to fight in Cuba, this time with American troops, not refugees. At that time our intelligence services estimated considerably less than 8,000 Soviet personnel in Cuba. Now they say there were at least 22,000 Soviet troops in Cuba last October. They do not know if that number is high enough because they cannot see to count troops deployed under forest cover or in hilly areas with the primary method which they are using for gathering intelligence. What a surprise would have been in store for our GI's had they gone into Cuba last October to find the enemy at least 3 times stronger than expected.

Officials in the executive branch have told the American public that our intelligence shows some Soviet troops have been withdrawn from Cuba. Our intelligence chiefs say they believe 5,000 Soviets left Cuba between October and November 1962, leaving 17,500 Soviets in Cuba. They believe another 4,000 to 5,000 Soviets left since January 1963. They also state, however, that there are left in Cuba about 17,500 Soviet troops. Either our intelligence chiefs cannot do simple arithmetic, or they just plain do not know what number to start subtracting from or adding to. Whatever the reason, it is obviously the administration's policy to fix a certain number for the Soviet troops in Cuba, whether it is true or not. Furthermore, our intelligence chiefs do not know how many Soviet troops are arriving in Cuba each week. They do not know whether the number of Soviet troops they believe left Cuba were withdrawals or merely rotations. Last, but far from least, they have no evidence that any combat ground troops for the Soviet mobile armored groups in Cuba have been withdrawn.

Our intelligence chiefs refuse to accept human resource reports of refugees and others of 40,000 Soviets in Cuba—just as they refused to accept human resource reports of Soviet missiles in Cuba last summer—but they do concede that Soviet military strength in Cuba is so great that a revolt from within or an invasion by refugees from without is impossible. Unlike the time of the Bay of Pigs, today an invasion of Cuba would take an all-out assault, on the order of Iwo Jima or Salerno in World War II. This should answer those who complain that the Cuban people should rise up and get rid of the Communists.

One of the excuses for our lack of intelligence last fall is a story reported by the news media of a jealous fight between CIA and the Air Force. According to this publicly disseminated story, there was a photography gap between September 5 and October 15 while CIA and the Air Force squabbled over who was going to run the reconnaissance missions. So far, the administration has not given the subcommittee any evidence of a photography gap or any facts to support the rumored squabble.

We did find that the evaluation of intelligence information during the crisis last fall was hopelessly poor. Official estimates were based primarily on negative information; that is, that the reports of the Soviet military buildup could not be confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt. This attitude by our intelligence evaluators was the result of an unfounded belief that it would be against Soviet policy to undertake a nuclear buildup in Cuba. This belief had official sanction, recognition, and approval, and, for that reason, the intelligence services were in the awkward position of having to come up with absolute proof beyond a reasonable doubt in order to challenge this official, but false, belief on Soviet policy.

Although our intelligence on Soviet military power in Cuba is inadequate, incomplete, and in some cases obviously untrue and unreliable, the subcommittee feels that our intelligence people deserve credit for proving last October beyond a shadow of a doubt that Soviet nuclear missiles were indeed in Cuba, and for doing a job that can be considered competent under such unfavorable political conditions and limitations as they experienced here in Washington.

However, our intelligence services do not really know very much about Cuba, and the subcommittee is deeply worried over the intelligence community's restriction to aerial photography, most of it high altitude, in gathering intelligence on Soviet nuclear threats to America's heartland, which are at such close range in Cuba as to allow us practically no warning time and perhaps not even time to retaliate.

As for the hemisphere as a whole, although our intelligence chiefs know that the strategic island of Cuba is today a bristling armory of Communist weapons and troops, they are restricted from really finding out the whats, the whys, and the wherefores of guerrilla and subversive threats to every Latin American country.

No matter how well designed are the slick public relations programs aimed at quieting the fears of the American public about Cuba, they cannot change the facts. The Soviets know what they have in Cuba, and no public relations lullaby is going to erase their knowledge of the threat of the armaments in Cuba. Nor is any public relations program going to help us know what is in Cuba, and, for now, we just do not know.

One thing we do know: the intelligence chiefs testified that if the missiles systems and their personnel are available in Cuba in a state of maximum readiness, the Soviet medium range nuclear ballistic missiles can be made operational within a matter of hours. Even if the missiles are in storage in Cuba, they can be taken out and fired within a matter of hours after Moscow gives the order. From these admittedly limited findings of the subcommittee so far made, several facts are obvious. First, aerial reconnaissance alone, particularly when it is limited almost exclusively to high-altitude flights in the daytime, gives us only very limited intelligence about Communist military forces in Cuba. For instance, we still do not know how many missiles came into Cuba before last October, nor where they were during the time between their arrival in the islands and the time they were conspicuously displayed for us to photograph. Intelligence chiefs admit that this period of successful concealment of nuclear missiles in Cuba was not less than 1 month.

From this, it is not difficult to deduce the fact that we shall remain in ignorance of the precise nature and size of the military buildup in Cuba until we either demand and get onsite inspections, or until we untie the hands of our intelligence services and allow them to use the broad spectrum of intelligence collection devices and methods in which they are trained, rather than making them stick primarily to aerial reconnaissance.

This, in simple language, is what the report has to say. Had the facts developed by the subcommittee shown that our intelligence collection and evaluation was totally creditable, the report would have said so. On the other hand, had the facts developed by the subcommittee shown the work of our intelligence services to be all bad, the report would have said so. As it is, the report has pointed out the defects and lack of knowledge which generally prevailed and still prevails, while commending the intelligence services for doing a very creditable job last October with aerial photography when they were given the all-out go ahead to do so.

The chairman of the subcommittee has announced that the investigation will continue. I am sure that all members of the subcommittee would like to state to the Senate in a final report that our intelligence services are then doing a thoroughly creditable job, both in collection and evaluation, and that they know precisely what is going on inside Cuba. This can only happen, however, if the intelligence community is turned loose to use all means at their disposal without any restrictions based on the hope of preventing irritants to the Kremlin bosses.

It is now within the power of the subcommitteee to give the intelligence services the go-ahead. Unfortunately, the subcommittee can only report the facts, and cannot make them. It would be a sad day indeed if the subcommittee did nothing more than climb on the bandwagon of the public relations campaign to downgrade the military buildup in Cuba.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel I should suggest the absence of a quorum before bringing up a conference report.

I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that I shall then be recognized to present the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SISTER CITY PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, what I consider to be a most worthwhile project of the people-to-people program is being observed in my State of Kansas and 37 other States across the Nation. It is the sister city program which fosters mutual understanding between communities in this country and abroad. The sister city portion of the people-to-people program is one of its most important functions. Headquarters of the program, with which many Senators are familiar, is in Kansas City, Mo. President John F. Kennedy is honorary national chairman, and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is chairman of the board of trustees.

Sister city affiliates are promoting international friendships which better serve to cement relationships among our other friends throughout the world by actual and continuous contact among the lay citizens and the officials of the cities and towns of this Nation and their affiliated cities abroad.

I am particularly interested in this program, Mr. President, because Kansas has two cities, Leavenworth and Wichita, which are participating in the sister city plan. Leavenworth's sister city is Wagga Wagga, New South Wales, Australia, and Wichita has Orleans, France, as her sister city.

Last week, I had the pleasure of visiting with Miss Jeanette McGarry, representing the people of Wagga Wagga, who had just completed a 3-week stay in Leavenworth, Kans. Former Leavenworth Mayor J. F. Mitchell organized the sister city program in his area in 1961, and it was at that time that Leavenworth selected Wagga Wagga. During Miss McGarry's 3-week stay, she was the guest of the present Leavenworth mayor, Victor Shalkoski, Jr.

Included in this young lady's busy itinerary while in Leavenworth were tours of such projects as county soil conservation areas, Girl Scout troops, League of Women Voters meetings, volunteer hospital groups, art galleries, and churches. In addition, she visited our State capitol at Topeka, where she was given a tour of our State government offices. With this impressive tour by Miss McGarry, I know that the social and governmental bond between Wagga Wagga and Leavenworth has become more understandable to her, and has given her a clearer picture of our communities and their way of life. In October, Vera Lee McGinnis, who was chosen Miss Leavenworth, will repay Miss McGarry's visit, and spend 3 weeks meeting and becoming acquainted with the residents of Wagga Wagga.

Miss McGarry's hosts while a visitor in our country were Lt. Col. and Mrs. W. H. Wansley, of the Australian Joint Services Mission to the United States. I compliment Miss McGarry for the fine representation she offered while visiting Kansas, and I believe the sister city plan of the people-to-people program is accomplishing a most beneficial purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of those States with cities having sister city programs be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Active Town Affiliations by State (as of March 1963) Compiled by American Municipal Association

ARIZONA

Phoenix—Orange, France.
Tucson—Trikkala, Greece.

CALIFORNIA

Alameda—Lidingo, Sweden.
Alhambra—Granada, Spain.
Arcadia—Tripolis, Greece.
Artesia—Koudekerk-aan-den-Rijn, Netherlands.
Bakersfield—Wakayama, Japan.
Bellflower—Los Mochis, Mexico.
Burbank—Inchon, Korea.
Burbank—Solna, Sweden.
Campbell—Vohburg, Germany.
Chula Vista—General Roca, Argentina.
Claremont—Guanajuato, Mexico.
Claremont—Kumasi, Ghana.
Coronado—Puerto Montt, Chile.
Delano—Asti, Italy.
Delano—Morelia, Mexico.
Downey—Guadalajara, Mexico.
El Segundo—Guaymas, Mexico.
Fresno—Lahore, Pakistan.
Fresno—Moulmein, Burma.
Gardena—Ichikawa, Japan.
Glendale—Hiraoka, Japan.
Gonzales—Somoto, Nicaragua.
Hemet—Cootamundra, Australia.
Lodi—Kofu, Japan.
Lodi—Lodi, Italy.
Long Beach—Valparaiso, Chile.
Los Angeles—Elath, Israel.
Los Angeles—Nagoya, Japan.
Los Angeles—Salvador, Bahia, Brazil.
Menlo Park—Galway, Ireland.
Merced—Albury, Australia.
Merced—Fort Archambault, Chad.
Merced—Mercedes, Uruguay.
Modesto—Barranquilla, Colombia.
Monrovia—Monrovia, Liberia.
Montebello—Ashiya, Japan.
Napa—Como, Italy.
Norwalk—Hermosillo, Mexico.
Oakland—Fukuoka, Japan.
Pasadena—Ludwigshafen, Germany.
Pasadena—Mishima, Japan.
Palo Alto—Palo, Philippines.
Redlands—Hino, Japan.
Redondo Beach—La Paz, Mexico.
Redondo Beach—Managua, Nicaragua.
Richmond—Shimada, Japan.
Riverside—Sendai, Japan.
Sacramento—Manila, Philippines.
San Bernardino—Tachikawa, Japan.
San Diego—Yokohama, Japan.
San Francisco—Osaka, Japan.
San Jose—Okayama, Japan.
San Jose—San José, Costa Rica.
San Leandro—Ribeirao Preto, Brazil.
Santa Ana—Santa Ana, El Salvador.
Santa Barbara—Cuzco, Peru.
Santa Cruz—Ajaccio, Corsica.
Santa Fe Springs—Santa Fe, Argentina.
Santa Monica—Mazatlán, Mexico.
Sausalito—Vina del Mar, Chile.
Sonoma—Chambolle-Musigny, France.
South Gate—South Gate, England.
Stockton—Shimizu, Japan.
Studio City—Ajijic, Mexico.
Torrance—Konya, Turkey.
Vallejo—Trondheim, Norway.
Paso Robles—Aquas de Lindoia, Brazil.

COLORADO

Boulder—Meppel, Holland.
Colorado Springs—Fujiyoshida, Japan.

Denver—Brest, France.
Denver—Takayama, Japan.
Littleton—Bega, Australia.

CONNECTICUT

Bristol—Bristol, England.
Darien—Mercara, India.
Glastonbury—Glastonbury, England.
Hartford—Thessaloniki, Greece.
New Haven—Madras, India.
Newington—Talca, Chile.
West Hartford—Concepción, Chile.
Westport—Marigny, France.
Woodbridge—Linquere, Senegal.

DELAWARE

Dover—Lamia, Greece.
Newark—La Garde Freinet, France.
Wilmington—Kalmar, Sweden.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington—Bangkok, Thailand.

FLORIDA

Clearwater—Nagano, Japan.
Coral Gables—Cartagena, Colombia.
Fort Lauderdale—Medellin, Colombia.
Hollywood—San Salvador, El Salvador.
Homestead—David, Panama.
Miami—Bogotá, Colombia.
Miami Beach—Fujisawa, Japan.
Orlando—Goiania, Brazil.
Pensacola—Chimbote, Peru.
Pensacola—Miraflores, Peru.
Royal Palm Beach—Teresopolis, Brazil.
St. Petersburg—Takamatsu, Japan.
Tampa—Cordoba, Argentina.

GEORGIA

Savannah—Guatemala City, Guatemala.
Thomasville—Luneburg, Germany.

HAWAII

Honolulu—Bruyeres, France.
Honolulu—Hiroshima, Japan.
Honolulu—Naha, Okinawa.

ILLINOIS

Chicago—Milan, Italy.
Deerfield—Ludinghausen, Germany.
Glen Ellyn—Calatayud, Spain.
Western Springs—Rugeley, England.

INDIANA

Mishawaka—Soest, Germany.
Terra Haute—Taijima, Japan.

IOWA

Davenport—Kaiserslautern, Germany.
Des Moines—Kofu, Japan.
State of Iowa—Yamanashi Prefecture, Japan.

KANSAS

Leavenworth—Wagga Wagga, Australia.
Wichita—Orleans, France.

KENTUCKY

Lexington—Deauville, France.
Louisville—Montpellier, France.
Louisville—Quito, Ecuador.
Shelbyville—Bitburg, Germany.
Versailles—Versailles, France.

LOUISIANA

Alexandria—Kochi, Japan.
Monroe—Lajes, Brazil.
Pineville—Omagari, Japan.

MAINE

Calais—Calais, France.
St. Stephen—New Brunswick, Canada.
Scarborough—Scarborough, England.

MARYLAND

Frederick—Landau, Germany.
Forest Heights—Villaviciosa, Philippines.
Hagerstown—Wesel, Germany.
Rockville—Pinneberg, Germany.
Takoma Park—Jequie, Brazil.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst—Arcachon, France.
Boston—Kyoto, Japan.
Boston—Strasbourg, France.
Newburyport—Binh Hung, Vietnam.
Wellesley—Vohenstrauss, Germany.
Weston—Rhombas, France.

MICHIGAN

Bay City—Ansbach, Germany.
Bay City—Mechelen, Belgium.
Benton Harbor—Judiai, Brazil.
Detroit—Toyota, Japan.
Escanaba—Levadia, Greece.
Frankenmuth—Gunzenhausen, Germany.
Harper Woods—Epernay, France.
Harper Woods—Ettlingen, Germany.
Kalamazoo—Kingston, Jamaica.
Kalamazoo—Numazu, Japan.
Kalamazoo—Fougeres, France.
Saginaw—Tokushima, Japan.
Wyoming—Manizales, Colombia.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis—Santiago, Chile.
Montevideo—Montevideo, Uruguay.
New Ulm—Ulm, Germany.
St. Paul—Nagasaki, Japan.
Worthington—Crailsheim, Germany.

NEBRASKA

Oakland—Hammenhog, Sweden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Laconia—Lilienfeld, Austria.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City—Royan, France.
Cedar Grove—Vilshofen, Germany.
Franklin Township—Kuusjarvi, Finland.
Hackensack—Passau, Germany.
Levittown—Avila, Spain.
Madison—Seven Oaks, England.
Montclair—Graz, Austria.
Newark—Newark-on-Trent, England.
New Brunswick—Tsuruoka, Japan.
Trenton—Jundiai, Brazil.

NEW YORK

Albany—Nijmegen, Netherlands.
Buffalo—Kanazawa, Japan.
Cortland—Peshawar, Pakistan.
Garden City—Aix-en-Provence, France.
Garden City—Coburg, Germany.
Jamestown—Jacobstad, Finland.
Long Beach—St. Marc, Haiti.
Lynbrook—Tobaru, Okinawa.
New York—Tokyo, Japan.
New Rochelle—La Rochelle, France.
Niagara Falls—Ise, Japan.
Niagara Falls—Lome, Togo.
Rochester—Rennes, France.
Rye—Rye, England.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville—Petropolis, Brazil.
Charlotte—Arequipa, Peru.
Fayetteville—Thiers, France.
New Bern—Bern, Switzerland.
Winston-Salem—Bucaramanga, Colombia.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo—Kaolack, Senegal.

OHIO

Barberton—Mishima, Japan.
Berea—Verria, Greece.
Chillicothe—Tulua, Colombia.
Dayton—Augsburg, Germany.
Lakewood—Koza City, Okinawa.
Mansfield—Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika.
Toledo—Toledo, Spain.

OKLAHOMA

Clinton—Jujuy, Argentina.

OREGON

Corvallis—Antofagasta, Chile.
Coos Bay—Larvik, Norway.
Eugene—Chinju, Korea.
Forest Grove—Bornova, Turkey.
Klamath Falls—Rotorua, New Zealand.
Lake Osewego—Pucon, Chile.
Medford—Alba, Italy.
Milton-Freewater—Waimate, New Zealand.
Milwaukie—Nago, Okinawa.
Portland—Sapporo, Japan.

PENNSYLVANIA

Berwick—Berwick-on-Tweed, England.
Bethlehem—Tondabayashi, Japan.
Chambersburg—Gotemba, Japan.
Cheltenham—Cheltenham, England.
Manheim—Mannheim, Germany.
Pittsburgh—Bilbao, Spain.
Swarthmore—Stade, Germany.
York—Arles, France.
York—Asunción, Paraguay.

RHODE ISLAND

Newport—Shimoda, Japan.

TENNESSEE

Johnson City—Guaranda, Ecuador.

TEXAS

Corpus Christi—Yokosuka, Japan.
Dallas—Dijon, France.
Eden—Kordel, Germany.
El Paso—Jeddah, Saudia Arabia.
Houston—Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China.
Lubbock—Hannover, Germany.
New Braunfels—Braunfels, Germany.

UTAH

Ogden—Hof, Germany.
Salt Lake City—Matsumoto, Japan.

VIRGINIA

Abingdon—Abingdon, England.
Hampton—Southhampton, England.
Luray—Luray, France.
Norfolk—Moji, Japan.
Portsmouth—Dunedin, New Zealand.
Richmond—Richmond, England.

WASHINGTON

Bellingham—Tateyama, Japan.
Bremerton—Olongapo, Philippines.
Port Angeles—Rosenheim, Germany.
Seattle—Kobe, Japan.
Spokane—Nishinomiya, Japan.
Tacoma—Kokura, Japan.
Vancouver—Arequipa, Peru.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fayetteville—Lezoux, France.

WISCONSIN

Beloit—Pinerola, Italy.
Racine—Montelimar, France.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 4, 1963, p. 10058, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a relatively brief statement on the conference action on H.R. 5366, the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964.

The conference report contains a total of $6,045,466,000. This is $48,440,000 over the House bill, $24,000,250 under the Senate bill, $383,951,830 over 1963, but $101,376,000 under the estimate.

For the Treasury Department, the conference bill contains $1,103,650,000, an increase of $106,614,530 over 1963. The amount allowed is $49,580,000 under the estimate, and $8.5 million under the Senate bill. Contained in this total is $552 million for the Internal Revenue Service. This is $48,900,000 over 1963, $6 million over the House allowance, and $26,300,000 under the estimate, and the sum allowed provides for a total of approximately 61,000 average positions, an increase of approximately 600 employees over the 358 provided in the House bill—for a total increase of approximately 900 average positions over 1963. The amount allowed is $3 million and 500 average positions less than the Senate bill provided, but was all to which the House conferees would agree.

For acquisition, construction, and improvement in the Coast Guard, there is included $51 million, the same as proposed by the House, $3,750,000 under the amount proposed by the Senate. This sum permits, among other projects and programs, the construction of two medium-sized cutters.

For operating expenses of the Coast Guard, there is included $249 million instead of $248 million proposed by the House and $250 million proposed by the Senate.

For the Bureau of Customs, there is included $72,370,000. This is an increase of $4,487,00 over 1963 and $3.7 million under the estimate.

For the Bureau of the Mint, there is included $7,500,000. This is an increase of $475,100 over 1963.

For the Bureau of Narcotics, there is included $5,350,000. This is an increase of $582,850 over 1963.

For the Secret Service, salaries and expenses, the conference allows $6,830,000. This sum is $430,000 under the estimate and $70,000 over the House allowance. The additional sum is to be used for the hiring of additional personnel for suppressing the continuing increase in counterfeiting and for investigating check and bond forgeries. The sum also provides for Vice Presidential protection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

For the Post Office Department, the bill appropriates $4,925,500,000, an increase of $276,575,700 over 1963 and represents a reduction of $51,464,000 in the estimates. The amount allowed is $40,500,000 over the House figure and $15,250,000 under the Senate bill.

The House allowance for "operations" was $3,890 million. The conference bill allows $3,925 million for this item. The amount recommended is $34,814,000 under the estimate and $15 million under the Senate figure. The conference bill will provide for 7,115 additional man-years of employment over 1963 as compared to 873 man-years allowed under the House version and 8,915 under the Senate bill.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

For the Bureau of the Budget, the bill appropriates $6,500,000, an increase of $627,700 over 1963 and represents a reduction of $200,000 in the estimates.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the 1963 appropriations, the 1964 budget estimates, the House and Senate action, and conference action on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Conference table]

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, H.R. 5366, fiscal year 1964

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Appropriation title	1963 appropriation [1]	1964 estimates	Bill		Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—		
			House version	Senate version		1964 estimates	House version	Senate version
Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses	$4,685,750	$5,080,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	−$80,000		
Bureau of Accounts:								
Salaries and expenses	3,882,170	4,100,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	−50,000		
Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement	28,239,000	31,500,000	30,750,000	30,750,000	30,750,000	−750,000		
Total, Bureau of Accounts	32,121,170	35,600,000	34,800,000	34,800,000	34,800,000	−800,000		
Bureau of Customs	67,883,000	76,100,000	72,000,000	72,670,000	72,370,000	−3,730,000	+$370,000	−$300,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing, air conditioning of buildings	300,000	5,380,000				−5,380,000		
Bureau of the Mint	7,024,900	7,720,000	7,300,000	7,629,000	7,500,000	−220,000	+200,000	−129,000
Bureau of Narcotics	4,767,150	5,450,000	5,250,000	5,450,000	5,350,000	−100,000	+100,000	−100,000
Bureau of the Public Debt:								
Administering the Public Debt	48,296,250	48,600,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	−600,000		
Coast Guard:								
Operating expenses	222,536,000	251,100,000	248,000,000	250,000,000	249,000,000	−2,100,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	33,330,000	60,000,000	51,000,000	54,750,000	51,000,000	−9,000,000		−3,750,000
Retired pay	32,350,000	33,600,000	33,600,000	33,600,000	33,600,000			
Reserve training	16,500,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000			
Total, Coast Guard	304,716,000	363,500,000	351,400,000	357,150,000	352,400,000	−11,100,000	+1,000,000	−4,750,000
Internal Revenue Service	503,100,000	578,300,000	546,000,000	555,200,000	552,000,000	−26,300,000	+6,000,000	−3,200,000
Office of the Treasurer	16,450,000	16,800,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	−100,000		
U.S. Secret Service:								
Salaries and expenses	5,784,000	7,260,000	6,760,000	6,901,250	6,830,000	−430,000	+70,000	−71,250
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	1,524,000	1,732,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	−32,000		
Salaries and expenses, guard force	383,250	408,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	−8,000		
Total, U.S. Secret Service	7,691,250	9,400,000	8,860,000	9,001,250	8,930,000	−470,000	+70,000	−71,250
Public Enterprise Funds:								
Funds for payment of losses in shipment	[2] (525,000)	1,250,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	−700,000		
Payment to check forgery insurance fund		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			
Total, title I, Treasury Department	997,035,470	1,153,230,000	1,095,910,000	1,112,200,250	1,103,650,000	−49,580,000	+7,740,000	−8,550,250
General provision		[3] Language						

See footnotes at end of table.

[Conference table]

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, H.R. 5366, fiscal year 1964—Continued

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Appropriation title	1963 appropriation [1]	1964 estimates	Bill: House version	Bill: Senate version	Conference allowance	Conference allowance compared with—: 1964 estimates	Conference allowance compared with—: House version	Conference allowance compared with—: Senate version
Administration and regional operation	$75,600,000	$85,700,000	$83,500,000	$83,500,000	$83,500,000	−$2,200,000		
Research, development, and engineering	12,000,000	13,700,000	11,500,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	−1,700,000	+$500,000	
Operations	3,679,824,300	3,959,814,000	3,890,000,000	3,940,000,000	3,925,000,000	−34,814,000	+35,000,000	−$15,000,000
Transportation	594,500,000	611,750,000	611,000,000	611,000,000	611,000,000	−750,000		
Facilities	167,000,000	195,000,000	185,000,000	190,250,000	190,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000	−250,000
Plant and equipment	120,000,000	111,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	−7,000,000		
Total, title II, Post Office Department	4,648,924,300	4,976,964,000	4,885,000,000	4,940,750,000	4,925,500,000	−51,464,000	+40,500,000	−15,250,000
TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
Compensation of the President	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000			
The White House Office	2,545,000	2,730,000	2,730,000	2,730,000	2,730,000			
Special projects	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000			
Executive Mansion grounds	658,000	671,000	671,000	671,000	671,000			
Bureau of the Budget	5,872,300	6,700,000	6,300,000	6,700,000	6,500,000	−$200,000	+$200,000	−$200,000
Council of Economic Advisers	601,100	622,000	615,000	615,000	615,000	−7,000		
National Security Council	550,000	585,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	−10,000		
Emergency Fund of the President	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Expenses of management improvement	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000			
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President	13,076,400	14,058,000	13,641,000	14,041,000	13,841,000	−217,000	+200,000	−200,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES								
Tax Court of the United States	$1,803,000	$1,893,000	$1,890,000	$1,890,000	$1,890,000	−$3,000		
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	375,000	385,000	385,000	385,000	385,000			
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	300,000	312,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	−112,000		
		[4] Language						
Total, title IV, independent agencies	2,478,000	2,590,000	2,475,000	2,475,000	2,475,000	−115,000		
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV	5,661,514,170	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	6,069,466,250	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	+$48,440,000	−$24,000,250

[1] Includes supplementals (H.R. 5517).

[2] Derived by transfer.

[3] Would provide for 5 percent transfer authority between appropriation items.

[4] Authority requested to expend not to exceed $1,000 for representation purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thank the conferees on the part of the Senate for their fine cooperation and help in the conference. I hope the Senate will be willing to accept the conference report. It was signed by all members of the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President I commend the chairman of the conference committee and of the subcommittee on the appropriations we are considering today. This is the first appropriation bill to be reported to the Senate and the first one that we shall pass. I commend the chairman for that achievement. He did excellent work. He expedited the hearings before the subcommittee, and did a masterly job in the conference in working out the differences between the House and the Senate. He has kept the appropriations down as much as possible, at the same time making it possible for the departments to carry on their activities. I speak especially about the Post Office Department. It will be recalled that the Senator from Virginia has told us that $4,925,500,000 of the $6,045,466,000 is for the Post Office Department.

It will be found that approximately 3 percent of the number of individual packages which will be carried during future years will more than pay for the difference in the appropriation between the present year and the coming year. That is no increase at all, in my opinion, when we consider the fact that we must take into consideration the number of employees who come into the Department from year to year and advance in status and are therefore paid higher wages in accordance with the pay increases approved by Congress.

Therefore, the chairman should be commended for the work he has done in connection with the appropriation we are now considering. I have watched his work in the subcommittee and in the conference, and I give him credit for the work that he has done on the pending bill. I am satisfied, looking over the attendance in the Senate at this time, and knowing that the appropriation will come before the Senate at this time, that the Senate must be pleased also with the work that our chairman has done. For that reason I hope that the Senate will adopt the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, knowing the instinct for frugality and economy that our distinguished friend from Virginia has always cherished and displayed, not only as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill now before us, I commend him for his achievement in preparing the bill that is now before us.

However, I must remark that it falls far short of what we thought our objectives and goals were going to be. I must remind the Senate again that from time to time the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] presents to the Senate a statement by the President of the United States with respect to holding the 1964 cash budget at the level of 1963.

As the conference report comes to us for approval today, there are two things about it; first, while it is well below the budget, it is still above the 1963 level, and, second, there are still a substantial number of new positions that have been added in the Post Office Department and in the Treasury Department.

Notwithstanding failures in that field, I still commend my distinguished friend for the efficient work he has done.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. No one would welcome more than the junior Senator from Virginia the ability to hold appropriations at the 1963 level. Unfortunately, Congress passed a pay bill, which the junior Senator from Virginia voted against, that established the pay of all postal workers at the present level. That accounts for the biggest increase in the bill.

Another reason for the increase is that the Nation is becoming a little more prosperous. The population is increasing. A larger percentage of mail must be handled. When more mail must be handled, it is necessary to have more personnel. It is also necessary to pay more for the services rendered by railroads, airlines, and other carriers.

Then, too, more brides and bridegrooms are moving into the suburbs, and we must provide more service there. That, too, brings up the amount of the appropriation.

But we have held the appropriation to the minimum which will enable us to have those services rendered. It is easy to follow what the Postmaster General said. He said, "We must have that $93 million restored." But the conferees restored only $40.5 million. So the Postmaster General then said, "I will do my best to keep the service up." We said that we would look to him to do so.

We hope and believe that while we have cut the appropriation mighty close, he will still be able to get by with it. So he will have to take this amount and make the most of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only say, in answer to the Senator from Virginia, that during my long period of years in Congress, I have seen very few Cabinet heads and very few administrators who have not asked the Senate to restore reductions made by the House. If we open the door, so that they are not in violation of Budget Bureau requests, they will ask for even more. This increase can be offset only by greater efficiency in government. In the case of the Post Office Department, it will require more and more automation, unless we allow the Department to build its appropriation to astronomical proportions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true. In this instance, the door was opened only a little, to enable us to talk with the Postmaster General through the opening, so to speak, to get his assurance that he will deliver the mail. We did not want to reduce the appropriation and then have the Postmaster General close the post offices and discontinue mail deliveries on Saturdays.

The Postmaster General has now said that he will make an honest effort to deliver the mail; and that is what we believe he will do. In the event, we have saved some money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Having served for a long time on the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, I know how those little cracks in the doorway are opened. It is something like the question the teacher asked Johnny: "If there are 20 sheep in the barn, and you let 1 sheep out, how many will be left?"

Johnny said, "None."

The teacher said, "Johnny, you know that 1 from 20 leaves 19. You don't know your arithmetic."

Johnny said, "Teacher, you don't know your sheep."

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with Johnny.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just open the door a little, and pretty soon the whole flock will be out.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is always the danger; but we were in a sort of hot place: We had to deliver the mail; and the volume of mail is increasing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 171, S. 331.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 331) to amend section 632 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the period during which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may contract for hospital and medical care of certain veterans in the Republic of the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill proposes to extend for another 5 years the program of reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected veterans of the Commonwealth Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. It would at the same time, extend the program for outpatient care for this same group of service-connected veterans of that Commonwealth Army. The present program expires on June 30, 1963, and now includes, in addition, outpatient treatment furnished by the Veterans' Administration. It permits the Philippine Government to hospitalize veterans who do not have service-connected disabilities, but at the expense of the Philippine Government. The basic legislation contains no bar to the Phillippine Government to hospitalize individuals without veteran status.

This bill places a $500,000 ceiling on hospital payments for any fiscal year after 1963. The Veterans' Administration estimates that the entire cost for the additional full 5 years would be less than $2 million. That is a reduction. In the past, this program cost more; but there has been a declining use of this provision by the veterans of the Commonwealth Army.

In addition, the cost to the Veterans' Administration for the supplementary outpatient part of the program is now approximately $300,000 per year, and this annual rate should not be materially exceeded during the additional 5 years of the proposed extension.

In 1948, a program was begun which, when it reached maturity, provided a modern Veterans Memorial Hospital in Manila in 1955 and, in 1958, outpatient medical care for Commonwealth Army veterans with service-connected disorders. The program was designed to serve the twofold purpose of meeting an obligation to comrades in arms at the same time that we contributed to their postwar development. Our efforts have not gone unrewarded. Thousands of Filipino veterans injured in World War II have received treatment and have thus been enabled to resume productive pursuits and occupations. The Veterans Memorial Hospital stands today as a fitting symbol of the friendly relations and solidarity of the two nations. The 722-bed institution is one of the finest hospitals in the Far East. It furnishes high-quality hospital care and, in addition, has affiliated itself with outstanding universities and medical colleges for the training of doctors, nurses, dentists, and other medical personnel so vitally needed in the Philippines.

The Philippine Government will eventually assume full responsibility for the operation of the hospital and the treatment of veterans. Lowering the ceiling on hospital care from $2 million to $500,000 is a step in this direction, as the Government of the Philippines step by step assumes complete responsibility for the hospital and medical care program.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> That the second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "five consecutive fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "ten consecutive fiscal years,"; and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence "ending before July 1, 1963, nor $500,000 for any one fiscal year beginning on or after such date".
>
> Sec. 2. Section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such agreement may also provide that during the contract period specified in paragraph (1) of this section, payments for hospital care and for medical services provided to Commonwealth Army veterans or to United States veterans may consist in whole or in part of available medicines, medical supplies, and equipment furnished by the Administrator to the Veterans Memorial Hospital at valuations therefor as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to furnish through the revolving supply fund, pursuant to section 5011 of this title, such medicines, medical supplies, and equipment as necessary for this purpose and to use therefor, as applicable, appropriations available for such payments."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this amendment would make S. 331 conform with H.R. 249, a bill which has already passed the House of Representatives. It would permit payments for hospital and medical services provided for Commonwealth Army veterans or U.S. veterans partly in the form of medicines and medical supplies. However, this arrangement would require an agreement between the two Governments and is by no means a mandate that this procedure must be followed.

It is reported that the Veterans Memorial Hospital has frequently been required to pay more for medicines through purchases in the open market in the Philippines or the open world market than if they were available through the Veteran's Administration supply operation. Problems of adequacy and continued availability from present sources also exist. Moreover, these supplies obtained through the Veterans' Administration would be of consistently high quality and uniform in content so that U.S. veterans in the Veterans Memorial Hospital, as well as Philippine veterans, would be assured that drugs and medicines administered would be of the highest quality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget submitted favorable reports on the bill (S. 331) and recently submitted a favorable report on the amendment identical to the one under consideration which was placed on H.R. 249. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to the Honorable LISTER HILL, chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, and dated April 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 26, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following comments are furnished in response to your request for a report by the Veterans Administration on H.R. 249, 88th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on April 1, 1963.

The general purpose of the bill is to extend for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected conditions of Commonwealth Army veterans who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. The bill would also extend for the additional period the special program of outpatient care for this group for service-connected disabilities.

The first section of the bill is identical, in substance, with S. 331, 88th Congress, on which we furnished a favorable report to your committee on March 1, 1963. That report was similar in all respects to our report of the same date to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, on H.R. 249 prior to the addition of section 2 to that bill (see H. Rept. 70 dated Mar. 6, 1963, to accompany H.R. 249).

We shall not extend the present report by repeating the considerations in support of the first section of the bill which were set forth in our previous report on S. 331. For the reasons therein stated, we continue to favor the extension of the hospital reimbursement and outpatient programs for Philippine Commonwealth Army veterans on account of service-connected conditions for another 5 years beyond June 30, 1963, under the terms set forth in the first section of the bill.

Section 2 was recommended by the House committee and added on the floor of the House of Representatives. It would simply permit payments during the additional 5-year period for hospital and medical services to be made by the Veterans' Administration to the Veterans' Memorial Hospital in whole or in part in the form of medicines, medical supplies, and medical equipment. This would be an optional procedure, however, and could be used only if, and to the extent, the agreement between the United States and the Philippine Government provided that payments due by the Veterans' Administration for hospital care and medical services could be handled in this way. The Administrator would be specifically authorized to furnish these items through the VA revolving supply fund operations with the use of appropriations available for purposes of meeting the payments involved.

We agree with the reasons presented in the report of the House committee in support of the committee amendment which became section 2 of this bill. The Veterans' Memorial Hospital in Manila has at times been required to pay more for medicines and medical supplies in the open market than if they were available through the VA supply operation. Problems of adequacy of existing supply sources and continuing availability arise. If these supplies were obtained through the Veterans' Administration there would also be assurance of their consistently high quality and uniform content. As a result, both U.S. veterans and Philippine veterans under treatment in the Veterans' Memorial Hospital would benefit from the administration of drugs and medicines of the highest quality.

Cost factors with respect to the first section of the bill have already been indicated in the report on S. 331. In view of the provision that medicines and medical supplies may be furnished at valuations determined by the Administrator and will simply constitute payments for hospital care or medical services on account of which obligations have been incurred, it is not anticipated that section 2 of the bill will involve additional cost to the Government.

For the foregoing reasons in behalf of section 2 of the bill and for the reasons applicable to the first section as fully set forth in our report on S. 331, we recommend favorable action on this legislation to continue for 5 years the existing program of hospital and medical care for Commonwealth Army veterans, with the added authority to make payments, as may be authorized by agreement between the two countries, in the form of medicines, medical supplies, and medical equipment.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an identical bill (H.R. 249) has been passed by the House of Representatives and is presently pending in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 249 and that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 249) to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 249) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 331 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 331 is indefinitely postponed.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 384), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Francis E. Walter, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 36 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT), I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 153) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Francis E. Walter, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the presiding officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I request the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 153) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT) as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect for the memory of the deceased Representative Walter, I move that the Senate, under its order of today, do now stand in adjournment until Thursday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1963:

U.S. Circuit Judge

Harry Phillips, of Tennessee, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit, vice John D. Martin, Sr., deceased.

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

Rear Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Ray C. Needham, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Paul H. Ramsey, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Frank O'Beirne, U.S. Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

In the Coast Guard

The following named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Donald C. Greenman
Lloyd R. Lomer
Joseph K. Shartiag, Jr.
Robert A. Ingalls
Paul D. Russell
Leroy G. Krum
Jack W. Lewis
Robert J. Finan
Terry L. Lucas
Robert A. Burt
Ian S. Cruickshank
Michael R. Johnson
Roderick Y. Edwards, Jr.
Allen J. Taylor
Charles W. Craycroft
Harry E. Obedin
Neal F Herbert
Kenneth M. Rappolt
Frederick P. Karres
Robert J. Cheney, Jr.
Gerald F. Corcoran
Robert A. Creighton
Leonard F. Alcantara
Robert A. Schwartz
James T. Leigh
William T. Troutman
Richard E. Haas
John R. Hay
John T. McKean
Robert M. Wood
Thomas N. Sullivan
David H. Freese, Jr.
William R. Allen
Frederick M. Casciano
Robert A. Ginn
Robert E. Isherwood
David S. Smith
Richard R. Kuhn
William J. Walsh
Ralph E. Giffin
Joseph S. Blackett, Jr.
John R. Sproat
James G. William
Ronald P. Hunter
Alfred D. Utara
Eugene J. Hickey, Jr.
Carl E. Kunkel, Jr.
Edwin J. Roland, Jr.
John A. Schmidt
Richard W. Zins
John E. McCarty
Jefferson J. Walsh IV
Martin J. Moynihan
Charles L. Keller
Joseph B. Goodwin III
Marlin G. Nygren
Wesley G. Davis, Jr.
James D. Partin
Jerome M. Myers
Michael F. Maurice
Hugh D. Williams
James W. Haugen
Manuel Josephs, Jr.
Michael B. Dunn
William H. Hall, Jr.
Donald F. Jenkins
Robert G. William
Paul K. Hinkley
Paul R. Lewis
James F. Butler
Merrill C. Louks
Paul A. J. Martino
Donald A. Naples
Michael P. Munkasey
David F. Cunningham
William H. Hayes, Jr.
Michael A. Duke
Leon E. Beaudin
Laurence A. Kidd
Lloyd C. Burger
Daniel F. Bobeck
James H. Parent
Jerome P. Foley
William E. Ecker, Jr.
Eugene M. Kelly
Theodore H. Purcell
Carl M. Brothers
Alan F. Miller
Kenneth C. Cutler
Robert S. Bates.
Gerald F. Hotchkiss
Bailey M. Geeslin
William H. Neal
Charles H. King, Jr.
John N. Faigle
John H. Hill
William H. Low, Jr.
Richard W. Long
Jan D. Long
Douglas A. Hlousek
Richard O. Buttrick
James E. Margeson, Jr.
Donald R. Casey
John F. Otranto, Jr.
George F. Ireland
Gary F. Crosby
Walter T. Leland
George H. Moritz III
William C. Park III
Ronald C. Pickup
Randolph DeKroney
David L. Parr
Thomas B. Irish, Jr.
Kyle A. Shaw
James V. Sayers
David E. Ciancaglini
Thomas Y. Lawrence, Jr.
William J. Campbell
John K. Witherspoon, Jr.
William J. Ecker
Wayne E. Rentfro
Frederick A. Hill
Angus McKinnon
Clifford G. Spelman, Jr.
Gregory A. Penington
Gary J. Boyle
Keith P. Pensom
George H. Peck III
Leo N. Schowengerdt, Jr.

In the Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

Michael Canelis

To be senior assistant surgeons

David J. Brecount
Samuel M. Cohen
Robert A. Hartley
Irvin D. Milowe
David W. Templin

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John E. Butts
Tomm H. Pickles
Emil L. Rigg
Garrit M. Ye

To be senior sanitary engineer

Edmund S. Jacobsen

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Ronald A. Venezia

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Charles D. Larson
Robert S. Runkle

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Ira P. Leggett, Jr.
Bernard R. Sacks

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Donald H. Boone
Robert G. Patzer

To be assistant pharmacists

John J. Piecoro, Jr.
Michael J. Tuohy
Arthur C. Willman

To be junior assistant pharmacists

Jackie L. Knight
Gerald A. Mankowski

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Arthur B. McIntyre, Jr.

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Verna L. Nickelson

To be assistant therapist

Lauren E. Lane

To be junior assistant therapists

George H. Hampton
Philo S. Short

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Bernard W. Dahl

Regular Corps of the Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior surgeons

Alfred S. Nelson
Claire F. Ryder
Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr.
Edward J. O'Rourke
George Moore
Samuel M. Fox III
Victor E. Archer
Charles J. Buhrow
Ernest G. Hanowell
Charles A. Jarvis
Robert H. Aronstam
James W. Osberg, Jr.
James R. Lewis
Harvey A. Itano
Charles F. Sparger
Ernest Cotlove

To be surgeons

John F. Lee, Jr.
Jack Durell
James D. Tovey
Richard J. Bouchard
Marcus M. Key, Jr.
Donald A. Henderson
John E. Applen
John E. Manire
Thomas F. Flynn
James W. Mosley
Kenneth H. Hyatt
George M. Berg
Jerome G. Green
Joseph J. Noya
Harry W. Weller
Lewis R. Thompson, Jr.
Peter J. T. Beeton
John R. McDonough
Pindaros R. Vagelos
Philip S. Brachman
Jean R. L. Herdt
Arthur Karmen
Donald C. Walsh
Alan H. Nicol
Donald E. Bedingfeld
William C. Larsen

To be senior assistant surgeon

Richard E. Mansfield

To be senior dental surgeons

Alfred Popper
John W. Heck
Quentin M. Smith
Reuben L. Turner

To be dental surgeons

Charles H. Davis
George E. Garrington
Lawrence E. Vankirk, Jr.
Dale E. Smith
Ernest C. Leatherwood, Jr.
Charles S. Stitt, Jr.
Joseph Plumbo
James T. Lovett
Robert K. Davis
George E. Mitchell

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Robert A. Winkler
Charles E. Tomich
Blair W. Thurgood
Thomas C. Francis
Vincent L. Gillis
Paul D. Frazier
Marvin L. MacIntyre
Kenneth J. Richter
Gerald S. Morrill
Roger A. Meyer

To be senior sanitary engineers

William B. Page
Robert L. Stenburg
Ernest C. Tsivoglou

To be sanitary engineer

Warren F. Smith

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John J. Henderson
Phillip E. Searcy
Donald P. Dubois
George R. Elmore, Jr.
John A. Frierson
Lee R. Lunsford
James R. Buchtel
Rodger L. Leupold
William L. Wagner
Albert W. Bromberg
Donald G. Fox
James R. Coleman
John T. Talty
Oscar E. Dickason

To be assistant sanitary engineers

George L. Christensen
Robert L. Bolin, Jr.
Dale S. Bryson
Charles E. Tharp
Donald T. Oakley
Roger C. Grimm
Frank P. Partee
William L. Brinck
Richard G. Hunsinger
John D. Clem
Troy Marceleno

To be pharmacists

Albert B. Ripley
Mario C. Baratta
Joseph N. Salvino
Bertram J. Baughman
Salvatore D. Gasdia
Billy G. Wells
Kenneth E. Hanson

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Sheldon Gaslow
John J. Lucas
Larry A. Wood
Clair G. Wetmore
Thomas B. Poux
Donnie L. Powell

To be assistant pharmacists

Robert E. Miller
Jules M. Meisler
Andrew J. Passeri, Jr.
Gordon R. Aird
Robert J. Schollard
John T. Gimon
James A. Resko
Nancy B. Finch

To be senior scientists

Robert R. Omata
Robert K. Gerloff
Byron L. Harriman
George J. Burton

To be scientists

Adolph R. Brazis
Robert J. Ellis
Virgil R. Carlson
Eskin Huff
Ronald H. Thompson
Roslyn Q. Robinson
Kenneth K. Takemoto

To be senior assistant scientists

Kenneth O. Phifer
John R. Newbrough

To be sanitarians

James A. Clark, Jr.
John Greenley
James E. Cowan

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Joseph Lovett
Thomas C. Rozzell
Bobby F. Craft
David B. Moses

To be senior veterinary officers

Robert L. Rausch

To be veterinary officers

Robert H. Huffaker
Richard L. Parker

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Robert G. Scholtens
John O. Iversen

To be nurse officers

Shirley A. Middleton
Marjory E. Lewis
Jean C. Casey
Catherine E. Twomey
Elizabeth Edwards

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Margaret J. Howe

To be dietitian

Elaine M. Gaddis

To be senior assistant dietitians

Elizabeth K. Witter
Betty L. Beach

To be therapists

Josef Hoog
Janeva I. Porter
Robert N. Zimmerman

To be senior assistant therapists

Frank H. Troske, Jr.
James D. Ebner
Carol A. Wendell
James L. Witt
Herbert R. Pruett

To be assistant therapist

Jonathan T. Spry

To be health services officers

Robert J. Savard
William B. Parsons
Stanley E. Crawfort
Walter R. Sceery
Desmond O'Hara

To be senior assistant health services officer

Richard A. Mackey

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1963:

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

William J. Crockett, of Nebraska, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

AMBASSADOR

Robert C. Strong, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 4, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

Archie N. Hain to be postmaster at Wellington, in the State of Colorado.

Jay H. Woolhiser to be postmaster at Three Bridges, in the State of New Jersey.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 4: 9: *But as touching brotherly love, ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another.*

Almighty God, may these moments of prayer inspire us to accept the challenge of facing the unseen and unknown events and experiences of each new day with cheer and with courage.

May we be coworkers and partners with Thee and with one another to help mankind cultivate mutual understanding and insight to read the meaning of life in terms of freedom, fellowship, and service.

We penitently confess that our pride and prejudice frequently prevent us from accepting the great fact that human brotherhood is not a relationship which man has established but which was divinely ordained by Thee in the process of creation.

Grant that we may play our part faithfully and heroically in lifting mankind out of its narrow, provincial self and may we live for the common good and seek to establish helpful contacts with all humanity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPRESSION OF SORROW OF U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN XXIII

The **SPEAKER**. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] assume the chair?

(Mr. **ALBERT** assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. **McCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, the world is grieved at the passing of Pope John XXIII whose great leadership was evidenced during his lifetime, the spirit of which will continue for countless and countless decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 385) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House of Representatives has heard with profound sorrow of the death of His Holiness Pope John XXIII, who exerted the most challenging and sincere efforts for world peace, who manifested the broadest tolerance toward mankind and all creeds, and who pleaded for the protection of oppressed minorities;
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary of State be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to the Papal Secretary of State at the Vatican.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, the death of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII is a tragic occurrence at this juncture in world history.

The times demand great men, and Pope John gave substance to our times. In his humility he was great and in his greatness he was humble.

Without him, there is a strangeness that prevails. It is a loneliness that escapes words.

His departure creates a vacuum. It is as though suddenly a roof had blown off a house, and the poor creatures inside huddle together for warmth that cannot be found.

From the village of Scotto Il Mondo to the pompous palaces of the would-be-great, there is a mourning, a loss that cannot be recovered, a lack of warmth.

And then suddenly there appears light, the light of the world. In this light there is refuge; in this light there is warmth.

The ideas of Pope John provide, even at this moment of travail, the light necessary for the creatures that he has left behind.

These were the ideas of an eventual peace among men, the sanctity of the individual and the fruitlessness of the insane arms race.

Listen to him speak, shortly after his ascension to the papacy on October 29, 1958:

> Why should the resources of human genius and the riches of nations be turned more often to preparing arms—pernicious instruments of death and destruction—than to increasing the welfare of all classes and particularly of the poorer classes?

Or again, listen to the son of Giovanni Roncalli, a landless sharecropper:

> But the principle must always be reaffirmed that the presence of the state in the economic field, no matter how widespread and penetrating, must not be exercised so as to reduce evermore the sphere of freedom of the personal initiative of individual citizens.

This man, Mr. Speaker, will be remembered evermore. His genius and humility will continue to light the world in which we live.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN THE GOOD

Mr. **CHARLES H. WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, a great and good man has just passed away. Many important people will be paying him their last respects this week, and I cannot be numbered among those distinguished heads of state and leaders of the various religious faiths.

However, I feel deeply about the death of John XXIII. I am not a member of his faith, and have not always agreed with the policies of his church—but that is not an issue today.

At times in the history of mankind comes a person who rises above the issues and personalities of his day—who radiates a human warmth and love for his fellow men that overrides all other considerations. Such a man was Pope John XXIII.

We knew him first as Cardinal Roncalli, the humble son of Italian peasants who had risen to be a prince of the church. We did not expect great deeds from him—we believed his reign would be quiet and unmarked by strong currents of change.

From the first, however, we began to see that this was not to be the case. His visits to the poor and the sick. His visits to those in prison and in need. His great, pure love for the common men of every race and creed; all this began to be apparent.

His great, abiding desire to unite the splintered fragments of the Christian faith, and his wish for reforms within his own church; all this captured our imaginations. We realized the world had a most unusual servant in John XXIII.

Newspapers are attempting to call him the Pope of Peace. I do not think this is an accurate description of the man. He strove for peace with all his might, but this is not the whole story of his life. Others are calling him the People's Pope, and this is a better description for he was the Pope of the common people everywhere in the world.

However, I choose to call him simply "John the Good." He was the Pope of Peace, and he was the People's Pope, because first of all he was John the Good. It will be a long time before the world is blessed again with such a man. His final words were:

> May they all be one.

We can all join in this and say, Amen. God rest you John XXIII, you will take a high place in the councils of our Lord.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing the deep sorrow of the House in the passing of Pope John XXIII. While his reign was a short one, nevertheless, the impact of this saintly man will be felt for many centuries to come.

He was more than a maker of history, he was possessed of the compassion that reached into the heart of every human being. He reigned during a time of great scientific progress and yet he more than anyone in our times realized that if man is to make real progress it can only come about through the understanding and good will that can only originate in the heart of man.

In these great days, when men are reaching beyond the stars, Pope John reached into the hearts of men to become one of the giants of our times.

The world is saddened at his passing and yet, because he walked among us, the world is brightened by the hope he inspired. He has left us a legacy of hope with a renewed faith in God and in ourselves.

TRIBUTE TO POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a great citizen of the world, a man beloved by the entire world, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, has died, leaving behind him works that will influence the world for centuries to come.

Pope John XXIII in his brief reign as Pope from autumn of 1958 to June 3, 1963, established himself as one of the giants of our time. His encyclical, "Mater et Magistra," issued in 1961, urged the prosperous countries of the world to help the underdeveloped. He pointed out that it is the duty of the communities which possess abundant means of livelihood not to remain indifferent to poverty, misery, and hunger and lack of elementary human rights suffered by the people of less fortunate nations. He thus reminded the world that we are our brothers' keepers, and this was a great restatement of an ancient philosophy enunciated by Jesus Christ himself.

His encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," released on April 10 of this year was a powerful call for fraternal unity among nations to avoid war. It focused men's attention to the essential social problems of our time and revitalized the age-old Christian principle against unjust trespass on the rights of others.

Pope John XXIII gave modern man one of his greatest hopes for peace in this strife-torn world by his leadership in the ecumenical movement. This was in keeping with his philosophy of resolving differences between peoples through a realization of common goals.

Mr. Speaker, the recorded actions and the words of this great man will provide guidance not only to the Catholic world but to the non-Catholic world as well for years to come. We can indeed be grateful that he lived among us in our age. His influence will without doubt continue beyond the grave.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Small Business Committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAYS, ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. ADAIR, and MAILLIARD.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISCHARGE PETITION FILED ON MEDICAL CARE

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have filed a discharge petition on the subject of medical care, a subject which has been languishing in this House for three sessions now.

Mr. Speaker, I know the difficulties involved in this matter, but I feel if a sufficient number of my colleagues will sign this petition, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means being reasonable people, will realize that we want the right to express ourselves on it and will perhaps reconsider their attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sign this petition so that we may have the right to express ourselves on one of the key issues of our times.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Speaker of the House has received the following telegrams from the 22d District County of San Diego Department of California American Legion and from the Philippine Ambassador to the United States expressing sympathy on the death of our late distinguished and beloved colleague, Representative Francis E. Walter.

The telegrams are as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 3, 1963.*

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the 22d District, County of San Diego, Department of California, American Legion, grieve the loss of one of our greatest statesmen, Francis E. Walter, and did on this day, June 2, close our annual preconvention meeting in memory of this great American. The American Legion, 22d District, San Diego County, sincerely requests that you as Speaker of the House, do convey to the fellow statesmen of Representative Francis E. Walter our deepest sympathy for this great loss.

ROBERT W. DICE,
Commander.

WASHINGTON, *D.C., June 3, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of my Government and Filipino people I extend sincerest condolences and deep sympathy on the death of Representative Francis E. Walter, a patriot and a great American, who was a stanch defender of the free way of life.

AMELITO R. MUTUC,
Philippine Ambassador to the United States.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER**. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AT VA INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. **FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AGE LIMITS—APPOINTMENTS TO U.S. PARK SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4893) relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Service.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1963

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4837) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **FORD**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two from someone on the committee concerning this legislation. My first question is, Does this give blanket authority to the executive branch of the Government to make these adjustments without any subsequent approval or disapproval by the Legislature?

Mr. **OLSEN** of Montana. That authority administrative bodies already have. This is giving the general authority over all Federal employees, that if reinstated from discharge or if restored from a demotion they will be paid their backpay without coming to the Congress for a private bill. In most instances this is the case today, but there are some few areas where they have to come to the Congress for a private bill. This would eliminate that process and the employee would be paid his backpay if upon hearing he is found to have been unjustly discharged or unjustly demoted.

Mr. **FORD**. It is my understanding that the estimated additional cost per year if this bill is approved is about half a million dollars.

Mr. **OLSEN** of Montana. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission gave us that figure and then he said that that would be the cost in any event, because an employee who is reinstated or regains his position from demotion is entitled to all of the benefits, he is entitled to the backpay, and as a matter of fact this has been the history. For instance, the Civil Service Commission says, I think in 8 cases out of 88 they have restored people to positions after hearing and deciding that they were unjustly discharged. That is in the sphere of this legislation.

They say in the other areas where people have come for back pay they have gone to Congress and gotten it. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission says in his testimony after he gave these figures of $500,000, that this would be the total cost in any event. If we are going to give people what they are entitled to after being reinstated, we must restore their pay and make them whole. Further this back pay is made from the agencies regular budget—that is absorbed by budget so that there is thus no additional cost in reality.

Mr. **FORD**. Under present circumstances if a hearing is held on the petition of a person allegedly discriminated against and his point of view is approved by the Board, is there not automatic readjustment of his pay?

Mr. **OLSEN** of Montana. There is, for classifications such as veterans and many other classifications, piecemeal, which have been given this relief. The legislation would fill in all the gaps of employees who are not so treated.

Mr. **FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I must confess I am not entirely clear and I am not entirely convinced as to the merits of this legislation. Under these cirstances I will withdraw my reservation and ask that the bill be passed over. I will subsequently discuss the matter with the gentleman from Montana in order to get more details about it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONVEY LANDS TO CITY OF HENDERSON, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2461) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That within five years after he has advised the city of Henderson, Nevada, of the appraised fair market value of the lands involved, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to said city the fifteen thousand acres of public lands described in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. The lands to be conveyed under section 1 of this Act are hereby segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, until said Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register, and comprise those fifteen thousand acres situated in the State of Nevada more particularly described as follows (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

(1) The east one-half and southwest quarter of section 21; all of section 27; the southwest quarter of section 28; and all of sections 29, 33, and 34 in township 22 south, range 63 east;

(2) all of sections 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, township 22 south, range 62 east;

(3) the south half of section 24; and all of sections 25, 35, and 36, township 22 south, range 61 east;

(4) all of section 32, township 21 south, 23 south, range 61 east;

(5) all of section 32, township 21 south, range 63 east; and

(6) the southwest quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 21 south, range 62 east.

SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made upon payment of the fair market value of the lands on the effective date of this Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, plus reimbursement for the cost of appraisal, if accomplished by contract, and subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in section 2 of this Act, and to any reservations, restrictions, or conditions considered necessary by the Secretary of the Interior to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

SEC. 4. The city of Henderson, State of Nevada, may purchase, in accordance with this Act, such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such city elects; and the purchase by the city of only a portion or portions of such lands shall not constitute a waiver or relinquishment of its right to purchase, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands or any portion thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "advised" insert ", by certified mail, the mayor of".

Page 2, line 16, after "section 32," insert "lots 8 and 9, the south half of the southwest quarter, southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35,".

Page 2, lines 18, 19, and 20, strike out all of paragraph (6) and insert:

"(6) the southwest quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 34, township 21 south, range 62 east."

Page 2, line 22, after the words "payment of the" insert "sum of the".

Page 2, line 25, after the word "contract," insert "minus any adjustment in the purchase price made by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 5 of this Act,".

Page 3, line 4, strike out "States." and insert "States, its permittees, lessees, or licensees."

Page 3, after line 4, insert the following:

"Any conveyance under this Act of section 32, the south half of the southwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, lots 8 and 9, section 35, township 21 south, range 63 east; the east half of section 21, and sections 27 and 34, township 22 south, range 63 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, Nevada, or of any portion of such lands, shall specifically reserve to the United States the right to use any of such lands so conveyed for reclamation purposes and for any purpose reasonably incident to the proposed southern Nevada water supply project."

Page 3, after line 13, add the following new sections:

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of the Act, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the city of Henderson providing for adjustment of the purchase price determined by appraisal to reflect any expenditures incurred by the city of Henderson in facilitating transfer of the lands during the period between enactment of this Act and notice to the city of Henderson of the appraised fair market value.

"Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the city of Henderson from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.).

"Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land as of the date of issuance of patent is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

"Sec. 8. With respect to the conveyance of any land under this Act, which land is, at the time of issuance of patent therefor, subject to a mineral lease, permit, or license, for which mineral the land is deemed at that time by the Secretary of the Interior to be not valuable or prospectively valuable, the patent shall not convey such mineral rights in such lands until the mineral lease, permit or license, or any extensions or renewals thereof, shall terminate or be relinquished, but upon such termination or relinquishment all the right, title and interest of the United States to such mineral deposits shall automatically vest in the patentee.

"Sec. 9. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act to the contrary, the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the city of Henderson, may, prior to the transfer of title to the city of Henderson, grant rights-of-way in, over, across, upon, through, or under any of the lands described in section 2 of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5222) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601–604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved for use of the Department of the Navy for a period of five years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the reservation may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of the Navy upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Navy shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Navy at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing.

Sec. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the area described as follows: Approximately 252,126 acres, more or less, within the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, California, and more fully described as follows:

township 9 south, range 16 east, that portion of section 9 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 10 lying southerly of the northerly line of the Niland-Blythe Road and southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 11 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 13 lying southwesterly and southerly of the southwesterly and southerly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 14 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, section 15, that portion of section 16 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 20 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 21 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, sections 22 and 23, that portion of section 24 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, sections 25 to 28 inclusive, that portion of section 29 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 31 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 32 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 9 south, range 17 east, that portion of section 19 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 20 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, section 26, that portion of section 27 lying southeasterly of the southeasterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 28 lying southeasterly, southerly and southwesterly of the southeasterly, southerly and southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, that portion of section 29 lying southwesterly of the southwesterly line of the Niland-Rannells Road, sections 30 to 36 inclusive;

township 10 south, range 15 east, that portion of section 12 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 13 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 14 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 15 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 21 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 22 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, sections 23 to 28 inclusive, sections 33 to 36 inclusive;

township 10 south, range 16 east, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, that portion of section 5 lying easterly of the westerly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 6 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, that portion of section 7 lying southeasterly of the northwesterly line of the Niland-Blythe Road, sections 8 to 36 inclusive;

township 10 south, range 17 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 10 south, range 18 east, sections 6 to 8 inclusive; sections 16 to 22 inclusive, and sections 25 to 36 inclusive;

township 10 south, range 19 east, sections 31 and 32;

township 11 south, range 15 east, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, and section 12;

township 11 south, range 16 east, sections 1 to 18 inclusive; sections 20 to 28 inclusive, and sections 34 to 36 inclusive;

township 11 south, range 17 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 11 south, range 18 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 11 south, range 19 east, sections 4 to 11 inclusive, sections 14 to 23 inclusive, and sections 26 to 35 inclusive;

township 12 south, range 16 east, sections 1, 2, and 12;

township 12 south, range 17 east, sections 1 to 18 inclusive, sections 20 to 28 inclusive, and sections 35 and 36;

township 12 south, range 18 east, sections 1 to 36 inclusive;

township 12 south, range 19 east, sections 2 to 10 inclusive, north half of section 11, sections 15 to 22 inclusive, and sections 27 to 34 inclusive;

township 13 south, range 18 east, sections 1 to 6 inclusive, east half of section 8, and sections 9 to 11 inclusive;

township 13 south, range 19 east, north half of section 5, and north half of section 6; San Bernardino base and meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4839) for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury—

(1) to be liable to the United States by reason of the negotiation, or presentment for payment, of any forged or fraudulent check which, during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending March 31, 1958, both dates inclusive, was drawn on the Treasury of the United States and issued or procured as a result of fraud at Parks Air Force Base, California; and

(2) to have negotiated such check or presented it for payment, without actual knowledge of any fact which would constitute notice of an infirmity in such check or defect in the title of the person negotiating it;

is hereby relieved of liability to the United States arising out of his negotiation of such check, or his presentment of such check for payment.

SEC. 2. (a) In the case of any person who has paid to the United States, on account of any check referred to in the first section of this Act, any amount for which the liability of such person would have been relieved by such first section if this Act had been in effect when such amount was paid to the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to such person, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to all such amounts so paid to the United States by such person, reduced by any amounts recovered by such person from any prior endorser of such check.

(b) In the case of any person who has paid to a subsequent endorser of a check referred to in the first section of this Act any amount for which the liability of such person to the United States would have been relieved by such first section if such liability had required payment to the United States and this Act had been in effect when such amount was paid, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to such person, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to all such amounts so paid to any subsequent endorser, reduced by any amounts recovered by such person from any prior endorser of such check.

SEC. 3. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which liability is relieved by the first section of this Act, but nothing in this section shall preclude the recovery from any such certifying or disbursing officer of the amount of any loss incurred by the United States because of fraud or criminality on the part of such officer.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to relieve any person of liability to refund to the United States any amount received by him by reason of fraud or bad faith on the part of such person in connection with the negotiation of the checks referred to in paragraph (1) of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 5. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF BINGHAMTON, N.Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5495) for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of Binghamton, New York, the sum of $10,130. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the city of Binghamton and Our Lady of Lourdes Memorial Hospital against the United States for payment of civil defense matching funds for an emergency generator for an addition to such hospital which payment was not made in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, because funds were not available for such purpose, and cannot now be made because of regulations which prohibit the retroactive payment of such funds: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agency or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86–272

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6441) to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of Public Law 86–272 (73 Stat. 556), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. The committees shall report to their respective Houses the results of such studies, together with their proposals for legislation on or before March 31, 1964."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE FOR GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5905) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28 OF UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5907) to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in procedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1825 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding the following paragraph:

"In all proceedings, in forma pauperis, for a writ of habeas corpus or in proceedings under section 2255 of this title, the United States marshal for the district shall pay all fees of witnesses for the party authorized to proceed in forma pauperis, on the certificate of the district judge."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike "at the end thereof" and insert "after the first paragraph of the section".

Page 1, following line 9, add:

"And the last paragraph of section 1825 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Fees and mileage need not be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued in behalf of the United States or an officer or agency thereof, or upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of a party, authorized to proceed in forma pauperis, where the payment thereof is to be made by the United States marshal as authorized in this section.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, by agreement with the ranking minority member of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Small Business Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be allowed to sit during general debate the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CATALINA PROPERTIES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2262) for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Catalina Properties, Incorporated, the sum of $29,425.01, representing the amount determined by the Court of Claims pursuant to H. Res. 235, Eighty-sixth Congress, to be the amount equitably due to said Catalina Properties, Incorporated, from the United States. The payment of such amount shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of said Catalina Properties, Incorporated, arising from rental payments on the Catalina Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida, which were lost during the period from about December 15, 1952, to about March 15, 1953, because of inaction of certain officers and employees of the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASTERIO QUITORIANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1232) for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Asterio Quitoriano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 19, 1958, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien, as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "residence as of" strike out "July 19, 1958" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERICO LOPEZ-BLANCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1276) for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Federico Lopez-Blanco shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permament residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(31) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Federico Lopez-Blanco may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIGI GIUSEPPE LURASCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2309) for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 352 (a)(1) shall be inapplicable in the case of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi: *Provided,* That he establishes residence in the United States not later than September 3, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILMER R. BRICKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1191) for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker.

There being no objection, the Clerk will read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Wilmer R. Bricker, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, an employee in the postal field service, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $388.53. Such sum represents the amount of certain overpayments of compensation made to the said Wilmer R. Bricker through administrative error in the determination of his longevity benefits as a postal field service employee. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wilmer R. Bricker, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Postmaster General as the sum of amounts paid to the United States by the said Wilmer R. Bricker, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1192) for the relief of William C. Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That William C. Doyle, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, an employee in the postal field service, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $310.15. Such sum represents the amount of certain overpayments of compensation made to the said William C. Doyle through administrative error in the determination of his longevity benefits as a postal field service employee. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William C. Doyle, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Postmaster General as the sum of amounts paid to the United States by the said William C. Doyle, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. LEON M. GERVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1281) for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Leon M. Gervin, United States Army, retired, of Los Gatos, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $120.33, representing an overpayment of accrued leave paid to him by the United States Army through an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Leon M. Gervin an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHRYN MARSHALL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1458) for the relief of Kathryn Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Kathryn Marshall, 2320 Villa Road, Springfield, Ohio, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $571.20, representing an overpayment of salary between the period July 3, 1960, and July 3, 1962, due to an error in computation by Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kathryn Marshall the amount certified to her by the Secretary of the Air Force as the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Kathryn Marshall, or withheld by the United States from amounts due her, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5: Strike "$571.20" and insert "$565.20".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN WILLIAM HORLING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1475) for the relief of John William Horling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John William Horling, United States Navy, retired, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, is hereby relieved of liability in the amount of $22,756.34 representing an obligation to pay the United States the amount he received for the services he rendered the Post Office Department at Grand Rapids, Michigan, as a civilian employee (custodial laborer) from November 17, 1956, through June 29, 1962, which employment was subsequently held to have been subject to the restrictions of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62).

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said John William Horling an amount equal to the aggregate of amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him including the lump-sum payment in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. WOODHOUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1726) for the relief of William H. Woodhouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William H. Woodhouse, chief warrant officer, United States Navy, retired, of Levittown, Pennsylvania, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $836, representing salary paid him during the period from June 25, 1962, through September 6, 1962, while he was an employee of the Department of Defense, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 162), as amended, the said William H. Woodhouse, having been erroneously advised by the Department of Defense prior to his employment that such Act was not applicable to him.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William H. Woodhouse, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the salary payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2244) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Osmundo Cabigas, of Washington, District of Columbia, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of his claims against the United States on account of the death of his son, Airman John O. Cabigas, who lost his life when struck by an aircraft at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, on January 8, 1962, while serving on active duty with the United States Air Force: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HURLEY CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2944) for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Hurley Construction Company, of Saint Paul, Minnesota, the sum of $19,664. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hurley Construction Company against the United States arising out of extra items of work performed by Hurley Construction Company at Duluth, Minnesota, involving alteration of rough trusses after installation in order to remove undesired camber, removal and replacement of backfill adjacent to exterior building walls, providing and placing straw around building footings for winter protection, changes of methods and procedures required for placement of subflooring sand in basements of the larger housing units, changes in methods and procedures in handling and storing of construction materials and requiring employment of additional blocktenders and carpenters' helpers, additional expenses incurred for extra labor and materials by reason of requirement that all concrete blocks be saw-cut, and additional labor and material expense incurred in heating basements of the larger housing units during construction, all as required by the contracting officer, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in the course of performance by the Hurley Construction Company of contract numbered DA-21-018 ENG-1088 dated May 26, 1956, for the construction of family housing units, site work and utilities at Duluth Air Force Base, Duluth, Minnesota, for which payment has not been made, because sufficient funds are not available therefor to the Department of the Army: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EDWIN AND BRUCE BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3219) to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin Bennett, of Sunderland, Massachusetts, the sum of $50, and to his brother, Bruce Bennett, of Sunderland, Massachusetts, the sum of $50. The payment of such sums is made in recognition of the honesty and integrity displayed by the said Edwin Bennett and Bruce Bennett when, on September 8, 1959 (being then twelve and seven years of age respectively), they found and turned over to the proper authorities certain bonds, cash, and other valuables which had been hidden by a deceased recluse who died in 1950 leaving his entire estate to the United States, and as an expression of grateful appreciation by the United States Government, which received approximately $1,200 as a result of their action.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORDON E. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4144) for the relief of Gordon E. Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gordon E. Martin, San Diego, California, is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $235.44, representing the amount paid by the United States for temporary storage of his household effects for the periods April 8, 1952, to October 7, 1952, and April 7, 1953, to October 7, 1953. The said Gordon E. Martin could have avoided such liability by having such household effects shipped, at a cost to the United States in excess of $1,500, to his new duty stations at the time of his changes of permanent duty stations during his active service with the United States Navy in 1952 and 1953. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which the said Gordon E. Martin is relieved of liability by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY F. BERNARDO AND AMBROSE A. CERRITO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4501) for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anthony F. Bernardo, supervisor equipment specialist "general", GS-9, Department of the Navy, the sum of $648, and to Ambrose A. Cerrito, equipment specialist "general", GS-5, Department of the Navy, the sum of $211.68. Payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of the respective claims of such claimants against the United States for overtime pay for work actually performed by them, as civilian employees of the Department of the Navy, in connection with automotive and construction equipment at McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, early in 1962, to which they would have been entitled if section 603 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1112; 5 U.S.C. 943), and Navy civilian personnel instruction numbered 610 issued pursuant to such section, were not applicable in their cases: *Provided,* That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOYLE A. BALLOU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5144) for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doyle A. Ballou, of Miami, Florida, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $18,971.90, representing overpayments of civilian compensation received by him for the period from April 22, 1959, through May 24, 1962, while he was employed by the Federal Aviation Agency, such overpayments having been made through administrative error in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), and which were received in good faith by him after having been assured by Government authorities that he was not barred from Federal employment, because of his status as a retired Navy chief warrant officer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doyle A. Ballou, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ERNEST P. IMLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5305) for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doctor Ernest P. Imle, of Adelphi, Maryland, the sum of $1,613.25 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for per diem in lieu of subsistence for the period September 3, 1954, to March 13, 1955, during which he was assigned to a special liquidation project at Beltsville, Maryland, by the Department of Agriculture: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUNZIATA SABATINI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2239) for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annunziata Sabatini shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Gaetano Sabatino (Sabatini) and his wife, Paolina Moscardini Sabatino (Sabatini), citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annunziata Sabatini may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gaetano Sabatini, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUANA BRANDARIZ SANCHEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2251) for the relief of Juana Brandariz Sanchez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juana Brandariz Sanchez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juana Brandariz Sanchez shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Jose Antonio Sanchez, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIN SOOK (RENEE) WHANG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2287) for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Shin Sook (Renee) Whang, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Gladys Mary Patricia Lindsay, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, a petition filed in behalf of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang by Gladys Mary Patricia Lindsay may be approved pursuant to the provisions of section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE TCHERNOSVITOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2289) for the relief of Marie Tchernosvitoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Tchernosvitoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Marie Tchernosvitoff. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Marie Tchernosvitoff shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MABEL CONSTANCE KENNEDY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2444) for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 245(c) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY JOSEPH CALANDI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5834) for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony Joseph Calandi may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Salvatore and Frances Calanni, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRKO JAKSIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2765) for the relief of Mirko Jaksic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mirko Jaksic shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Mirko Jaksic, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and

Nationality Act, Mirko Jaksic may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Mirko Jaksic, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO DI GIACOMO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2207) for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francesco Di Giacomo may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELMINA GINTEBURG SCHLEIFER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2789) for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrests, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMINDA P. VISEU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6101) for the relief of Arminda P. Viseu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond which may have issued in the case of Arminda P. Viseu. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Arminda P. Viseu shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warants and orders have issued.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1964, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 353)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$72,370,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$249,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$552,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "seventy-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,925,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$190,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
GALE MCGEE,
CARL HAYDEN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
GORDON ALLOTT,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1—Bureau of Customs: Appropriates $72,370,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $72,000,000 as proposed by the House and $72,670,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount approved, the sum of $70,000 is to be used for rental of office space at Newark, Honolulu, Chicago, and Boston.

Amendment No. 2—Bureau of the Mint: Appropriates $7,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $7,300,000 as proposed by the House and $7,629,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed, $120,000 is to be used for the purchase of three coining presses for use at the Denver Mint; and $80,000 for purchase of smaller items of equipment.

Amendment No. 3—Bureau of Narcotics: Appropriates $5,350,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $5,250,000 as proposed by the House and $5,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Coast Guard: Appropriates $249,000,000 for "Operating expenses" instead of $248,000,000 as proposed by the House and $250,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Coast Guard: Appropriates $51,000,000 for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements" as proposed by the House instead of $54,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Internal Revenue Service: Appropriates $552,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $546,000,000 as proposed by the House and $555,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Secret Service: Provides for the purchase of 79 vehicles instead of 75 as proposed by the House and 84 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Secret Service: Appropriates $6,830,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $6,760,000 as proposed by the House and $6,901,250 as proposed by the Senate. None of the amount allowed is to be used for the employment of protective research specialists; the conferees feel that the Secret Service should use existing Government facilities and equipment in this field which the conferees believe are adequate.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 9—Research, development, and engineering: Appropriates $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Operations: Appropriates $3,925,000,000 instead of $3,890,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,940,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Facilities: Appropriates $190,000,000 instead of $185,000,000 as proposed by the House and $190,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 12—Bureau of the Budget: Appropriates $6,500,000 instead of $6,300,000 as proposed by the House and $6,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table with reference to the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I present to the House today the first conference report on an appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1964. You will recall that the total budget request of the Treasury, Post Office and Executive Office of the President was $6,146,842,000. The House bill carried appropriations of $5,997,026,000, a reduction of $149,816,000 in the request. The Senate restored $72,440,250 of the amounts cut by the House.

The conference report provides total appropriations of $6,045,466,000 which is $48,440,000 above the House figure, and $383,951,830 more than the appropriation for 1963, including the supplementals.

In other words, the report provides for a cut of $101,376,000 in the original request which sustains 68 percent of the cuts originally made by the House.

Of the $48,440,000 increase to which the House conferees agreed, $40,500,000 was for the Post Office Department and $6 million was for the Internal Revenue Service. Of the $40,500,000 added to the Post Office appropriation $35 million was for "Operations," $5 million for "Facilities," and $500,000 for "Research, development, and engineering."

The restoration of these funds insure that none of the essential services of the Post Office will be curtailed and that necessary facilities will be adequately provided for the operation of the Post Office during the next fiscal year.

I include a table at this point in the RECORD showing the appropriation for each activity of the departments for 1963, the budget estimates for 1964, the amount allowed in the House bill, the amount allowed in the Senate bill, the conference action and the final appropriations for 1964 compared with the budget estimates, the House bill and the Senate bill. This table furnishes the complete details of each step in our procedures:

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Bill, 1964 (H.R. 5366)

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Item	Appropriation, 1963 (including supplemental)	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1963 (including supplemental)	Budget estimates, 1964	House	Senate
Office of the Secretary	$4,685,750	$5,080,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	+$314,250	−$80,000		
Bureau of Accounts:									
Salaries and expenses	3,882,170	4,100,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	+167,830	−50,000		
Division of Disbursement	28,239,000	31,500,000	30,750,000	30,750,000	30,750,000	+2,511,000	−750,000		
Total, Bureau of Accounts	32,121,170	35,600,000	34,800,000	34,800,000	34,800,000	+2,678,830	−800,000		
Bureau of Customs	67,883,000	76,100,000	72,000,000	72,670,000	72,370,000	+4,487,000	−3,730,000	+$370,000	+$300,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	300,000	5,380,000				−300,000	−5,380,000		
Bureau of the Mint	7,024,900	7,720,000	7,300,000	7,629,000	7,500,000	+475,100	−220,000	+200,000	−129,000
Bureau of Narcotics	4,767,150	5,450,000	5,250,000	5,450,000	5,350,000	+582,850	−100,000	+100,000	−100,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	48,296,250	48,600,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	−296,250	−600,000		
Coast Guard:									
Operating expenses	222,536,000	251,100,000	248,000,000	250,000,000	249,000,000	+26,464,000	−2,100,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	33,330,000	60,000,000	51,000,000	54,750,000	51,000,000	+17,670,000	−9,000,000		−3,750,000
Retired pay	32,350,000	33,600,000	33,600,000	33,600,000	33,600,000	+1,250,000			
Reserve training	16,500,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	+2,300,000			
Total, Coast Guard	304,716,000	363,500,000	351,400,000	357,150,000	352,400,000	+47,684,000	−11,100,000	+1,000,000	−4,750,000
Internal Revenue Service	503,100,000	578,300,000	546,000,000	555,200,000	552,000,000	+48,900,000	−26,300,000	+6,000,000	−3,200,000
Office of the Treasurer	16,450,000	16,800,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	+250,000	−100,000		
U.S. Secret Service:									
Salaries and expenses	5,784,000	7,260,000	6,760,000	6,901,250	6,830,000	+1,046,000	−430,000	+70,000	−71,250
White House Police	1,524,000	1,732,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	+176,000	−32,000		
Guard force	383,250	408,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	+16,750	−8,000		
Total, U.S. Secret Service	7,691,250	9,400,000	8,860,000	9,001,250	8,930,000	+1,238,750	−470,000	+70,000	−71,250
Public enterprise funds:									
Losses in shipment	(525,000)	1,250,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	+550,000	−700,000		
Check forgery insurance fund		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	+50,000			
Total, title I, Treasury Department	997,035,470	1,153,230,000	1,095,910,000	1,112,200,250	1,103,650,000	+106,614,530	−49,580,000	+7,740,000	−8,550,250

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Bill, 1964** (H.R. 5366)—**Continued**

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Item	Appropriation, 1963 (including supplemental)	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1963 (including supplemental)	Budget estimates, 1964	House	Senate
Administration and regional operation	[1] $79, 277, 450	$85, 700, 000	$83, 500, 000	$83, 500, 000	$83, 500, 000	+$4, 222, 550	−$2, 200, 000	----------	----------
Research, development, and engineering	12, 000, 000	13, 700, 000	11, 500, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	----------	−1, 700, 000	+$500, 000	----------
Operations	[2] 3, 693, 519, 850	3, 959, 814, 000	3, 890, 000, 000	3, 940, 000, 000	3, 925, 000, 000	+231, 480, 150	−34, 814, 000	+35, 000, 000	−$15, 000, 000
Transportation	594, 500, 000	611, 750, 000	611, 000, 000	611, 000, 000	611, 000, 000	+16, 500, 000	−750, 000	----------	----------
Facilities	167, 000, 000	195, 000, 000	185, 000, 000	190, 250, 000	190, 000, 000	+23, 000, 000	−5, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000	−250, 000
Plant and equipment	[3] 102, 627, 000	111, 000, 000	104, 000, 000	104, 000, 000	104, 000, 000	+1, 373, 000	−7, 000, 000	----------	----------
Total, title II, Post Office Department	4, 648, 924, 300	4, 976, 964, 000	4, 885, 000, 000	4, 940, 750, 000	4, 925, 500, 000	+276, 575, 700	−51, 464, 000	+40, 500, 000	−15, 250, 000
TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT									
Compensation of the President	$150, 000	$150, 000	$150, 000	$150, 000	$150, 000	----------	----------	----------	----------
The White House Office	2, 545, 000	2, 730, 000	2, 730, 000	2, 730, 000	2, 730, 000	+$185, 000	----------	----------	----------
Special projects	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Executive Mansion and Grounds	658, 000	671, 000	671, 000	671, 000	671, 000	+13, 000	----------	----------	----------
Bureau of the Budget	5, 872, 300	6, 700, 000	6, 300, 000	6, 700, 000	6, 500, 000	+627, 700	−$200, 000	+$200, 000	−$200, 000
Council of Economic Advisers	601, 100	622, 000	615, 000	615, 000	615, 000	+13, 900	−7, 000	----------	----------
National Security Council	550, 000	585, 000	575, 000	575, 000	575, 000	+25, 000	−10, 000	----------	----------
Emergency Fund for the President	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Expenses of management improvement	200, 000	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000	−100, 000	----------	----------	----------
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President	13, 076, 400	14, 058, 000	13, 641, 000	14, 041, 000	13, 841, 000	+764, 600	−217, 000	+200, 000	−200, 000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES									
Tax Court of the United States	$1, 803, 000	$1, 893, 000	$1, 890, 000	$1, 890, 000	$1, 890, 000	+$87, 000	−$3, 000	----------	----------
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	375, 000	385, 000	385, 000	385, 000	385, 000	+10, 000	----------	----------	----------
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	300, 000	312, 000	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000	−100, 000	−112, 000	----------	----------
Total, title IV, independent agencies	2, 478, 000	2, 590, 000	2, 475, 000	2, 475, 000	2, 475, 000	−3, 000	−115, 000	----------	----------
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV	5, 661, 514, 170	6, 146, 842, 000	5, 997, 026, 000	6, 069, 466, 250	6, 045, 466, 000	+383, 951, 830	−101, 376, 000	+$48, 440, 000	−$24, 000, 250

---

[1] Includes $3,677,450 derived by transfer from "plant and equipment" account.

[2] Includes $13,695,550 derived by transfer from "plant and equipment" account.

[3] Excludes $17,373,000 transferred out as shown in footnotes 1 and 2 above.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is a very satisfactory settlement of the controversy which has arisen over the appropriations for the Post Office Department and I trust that it will be the pleasure of the House to accept the conference report.

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6500

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 386, Rept. No. 357) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6500) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, June 7, to file a report on H.R. 6755, which would include separate views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TRAVEL AUTHORITY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 376, Rept. No. 356), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is hereby authorized to send not more than six of its members on June 8, 1963, to Paris, France, on aviation matters.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee in carrying out its official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code:

Provided, (1) That no member of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Baring
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Bow
Bruce
Buckley
Casey
Clausen

Cooley
Diggs
Fogarty
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Grant
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Harding
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
King, Calif.
Knox
Kyl
McLoskey
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Mosher
O'Konski
Powell
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Westland

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENDING THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3496) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such Act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a simple continuation of the existing Reorganization Act, which expires in June of this year. It provides for an extension of 2 years so the Reorganization Act will expire again in June of 1965.

I favor the rule and I favor the bill. I think the Reorganization Act should be continued so that there will be an opportunity of coordinating the various and sundry agencies of the Government. However, the very controversial part about it would be in the form of an amendment which would provide—I do not know who is going to offer the amendment but it will be offered—that the authority granted under this Reorganization Act shall not extend to the creation of new departments of Government of the Cabinet level.

Personally, I shall support that amendment. The reason for it is this, that under the power to create new departments of Government, we could be confronted at any time with a reorganization plan that would create a new department in any area of Government. If that should happen, we would have numerous independent agencies of the Government included in the proposed new department. Of course, as my colleagues know, there are some agencies that exercise independent, semijudicial, and judicial functions. It has always been the theory of the operation of this Government that agencies which have actually judicial powers or semijudicial powers should occupy an independent position and not be under any other department of Government.

For instance, the National Labor Relations Board performs judicial functions. So does the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission. Now, if we should receive a recommendation for a reorganization that would for instance, cover the Federal Trade Commission, which performs judicial and semijudicial functions, then under the act the powers of the House would be very limited in the consideration and in the debate on such measures. For instance, there would be just 1 hour of debate allowed and further such resolutions are not subject to amendment. If, for example, we had a resolution to create a department which would include the Federal Trade Commission, a great many Members of this House would feel we would like to amend that resolution and strike out the Federal Trade Commission or—strike out some other independent agency of the Government which we feel should not be under any other particular department.

But, if it came up in the form of a reorganization recommendation there would be no opportunity for amendment and you would have to vote it either up or down. And we might vote down some good reorganization plans just because the Congress disagreed with some one feature of that reorganization plan. I feel in a matter of this kind, as in other matters, the House ought to have a free opportunity for debate and there ought to be free opportunity for amendment of such measures and changes in the forms of legislation that is presented to us.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall support a reasonable amendment to put on a limitation, that reorganization plans may not recommend the creation of new departments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 373 makes in order for consideration, under 2 hours of general debate, a very simple bill, H.R. 3496, which would amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 by striking out the words "June 1, 1963," the date upon which the act expired, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "June 1, 1965."

Mr. Speaker, some of the Members may recall, that I was the legislative father of the so-called two Hoover Commissions, and that I represented the House of Representatives as a member of both Commissions. Some may also recall that the Reorganization Act of 1949 was passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Truman as the result of the many recommendations and findings which had been made by the first Hoover Commission as to ways and means through which greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public business might be obtained, through the consolidation of various agencies, the elimination of those that were rendering the same sort of services. Under the provisions of that act, the Reorganization Act of 1949, President Truman did send to the Congress a number of reorganization plans which proved very helpful in bringing about a greater efficiency and a greater economy in the conduct of our national affairs. That act at that time was changed a bit. We had a reorganization act before at different times, but the act was changed a bit so as to give the Congress itself a greater influence over what could or could not be done under a reorganization plan.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members will remember that at about the same time the Hoover Commission had recommended that instead of having a Secretary of War and a War Department, a Secretary of the Navy and a Navy Department, and other different military establishments, that they be placed together in one new department to be known as the Department of National Defense, or the Defense Department. The Hoover Commission not only recommended that, but President Truman recommended it. A bill was presented to the Congress—not a reorganization plan, but a bill was presented to the Congress—to create that new department. The Congress by its action did create under law and by statute the great Department of Defense. Then later on—and there had not been much question in the minds of many of us as to what the meaning of the Reorganization Act really was as contained in section 5 to which I will refer in a moment—but later on under the Eisenhower administration a reorganization plan was sent to Capitol Hill to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the submission of a reorganization plan which, by the way, was not disapproved by the Congress. However, we had as a Member of the Congress at that time, as many of you remember, a very able lawyer and a very conscientious man by the name of Clare Hoffman from the great State of Michigan, who insisted that such was not the proper way or the constitutional legal way to create a department.

The question was discussed among different lawyers who had different viewpoints as to whether or not, under the Reorganization Act of 1949, authority was granted to create a new department and thus change the basic structure of government, through a reorganization plan. As a result of this some of us became a little worried about that situation.

Mr. Hoffman then introduced a joint resolution in which he embodied all of the provisions set forth in the reorganization plan creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a part of his resolution. That joint resolution was adopted legally by the House, then by the Senate, then signed into law by the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, so as to actually make the new department effective many, many days ahead of the time it could possibly have become effective, even if the reorganization plan arrangement had been legal and had not been under question at that time.

The next move that came, which brought this whole section of law into question, was under the present administration, when a reorganization plan was sent to Congress to create a new department to be called the Department of Urban Affairs, all by a reorganization plan, remember, one that could not be amended, one that could not be changed but had to be voted up or down.

The Congress, feeling that a new department should not be created by a reorganization plan, because it was changing the basic structure of the Government, defeated that plan overwhelmingly.

Legislation was then introduced to do the same thing, and that legislation was defeated, evidently because of the controversy that had been engendered over the reorganization plan that had been submitted.

That left the law, the reorganization plan, in a sort of nebulous position, with a great difference of opinion as to just what section 5 of the plan really meant and what could be done under it.

Section 5(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949—and this is what the controversy was all about within the committee, a controversy that must be settled here on the floor today—reads:

> No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—
>
> (1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof.

And so forth.

Now, that says what in plain English? That you cannot, through the use of a reorganization plan abolish a department. The President cannot do that. He cannot change it, he cannot combine Departments, he cannot change the basic structure of government by abolishing such department, and, of course, by direct inference, if you cannot abolish a department neither can you create it, because the power has to react both ways.

The question rose. Witnesses were divided in their testimony before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations as to just what this section meant. Some of us took the position we should at least clarify the section so that there could be no longer any dispute, no longer any question, such as has been brought to a head several times in the past few years. If this Reorganization Act was to be continued, it should be and must be clarified so there can be no misunderstanding as to the purpose and intent of the Congress that no President by a reorganization plan can change the basic structure of the Federal Government, like creating a new department that never existed, where the Congress had not had the opportunity to pass upon it in the usual parliamentary and legislative way.

An amendment was offered, and that amendment was defeated by the narrow margin of one vote in the subcommittee, and it was defeated by an almost party line vote, I might add, in the full committee. The amendment that will be offered is to simply add these words after (1) in section 5, after the sentence (a): "(1) creating any new executive department or," so that the new act, as amended, if it is amended, would read:

> No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—
>
> (1) creating any new executive department or abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

Now, it is a very simple clarifying amendment. It does fix for once and for all the intent and the purpose of the Congress. It does limit the right and the authority of the President. It takes out of the argumentative stage the constitutional law problem as to whether or not he can or cannot do this thing, because it does say plainly that he cannot transfer, he cannot abolish, therefore neither can he create a new department as a part of the structure of basic government. Now, that is the amendment I expect to offer at the close of general debate.

I have supported the Reorganiaztion Act passage in the past. I have supported it because I thought that perhaps it was the best way to do these things. Now, there are some things that have been done under the Reorganization Act that I have not always approved but on which Congress had the opportunity to work its will in a more effective way than on this particular matter. I did stand here in the well of the House, as many of you may remember—and the present Speaker of the House cooperated at that time—when we did take back into the hands of the Congress a greater control over the handling of these reorganization plans, so that these reorganization plans could be defeated or rejected, if you wish to use those words, by a simple majority in either House, because it requires only a simple majority in either House to either pass or defeat a bill if you follow the usual legislative process. That has helped a great deal in the past in the consideration of some of the reorganization plans that have been sent up.

I feel that perhaps the Reorganization Act as a plan, as an idea, as a vehicle, as a method, as a means to reorganize the executive branch of the Government has served its day, has perhaps done most of its good work. Most of them came about—I believe some of the members of the committee have gone through those days with us—following the work of the two Hoover Commissions, when the bipartisan, nonpartisan Hoover Commission, with the help and the support of two Presidents of different political parties, by the way, did bring to different Congresses, once a Republican Congress and once a Democratic Congress, recommendations and reorganization plans that have been very helpful in the past.

How much help we may be able to obtain in the future from the proper use of the Reorganization Act, if it is extended, I do not know; but, I do know, and I am convinced of one thing, having spent more than 20 years on this subject and having studied it and followed it as closely as anyone could, that in order to protect the basic structure of our Government we must adopt this clarifying amendment at this time to take from the field of controversy, from the question of who is right and who is wrong under the Constitution, this question as to whether or not a President by a reorganization plan can create a new department and thereby change the whole basic structure of the Federal Government, without the Congress passing on the subject in the usual legislative way as provided by the Constitution of the United States. I sincerely hope that when the time comes to vote upon the amendment that I shall offer, a very simple amendment, that the thinking Members of this House will support the position I have taken that the amendment is simply the right thing to do, the proper thing to do, and the safe thing to do. No one can be hurt or injured by it in any way. The rights of the President and no one else will be taken away, but the rights of the Congress and the American people will be protected fully.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to request Members to study the additional views on page 20 of the committee report, in which I was joined by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY] in which we set forth the reasons why we believe that the extension of the reorganizing power in the President should not be granted at this time.

I intend to discuss those reasons fully in general debate, but I believe that Members should be aware of the problem which faces them today before they cast their vote on granting this legislative power to the President for the next 2 years.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3496) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3496, with Mr. SISK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3496 has for its purpose to continue for 2 more years the reorganization authority given the President by the act of 1949 to transmit to the Congress for its approval or its disapproval reorganization plans in the executive branch. Under the law with which we are all familiar, because it has been in effect for many years, unless affirmative action is taken within 60 days by a simple majority of either the House or the Senate to veto the plans, the plans become law.

For many years the law has worked well. It has made for economy and efficiency. It has in no way impaired the historic prerogatives of the Congress.

The legislation dates back to 1932 when it was strongly recommended by then President Hoover. All the Presidents since then have made frequent use of it. Agencies like the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been abolished under reorganization plans. Functions of other agencies and bureaus have been transferred or consolidated. In one case, back in 1953, Republicans and Democrats joined to approve a reorganization plan sent up by President Eisenhower to set up the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a new department.

The act with which we are concerned today was first enacted back in 1949, and it came as a recommendation of the Hoover Commission. It was extended in 1953 for 2 years; in 1955 for 2 years; in 1957 for 2 years; in 1959 this body again voted its extension. In 1961 the authority was reinstated for 2 more years to expire on June 1, 1963. And that is why we are here today, under the bill to extend it for 2 more years.

In this whole 14 years of the act as we now know it, there has been only one change, a change to insure that the action of the House and Senate was even more certain and secure. In 1957 we voted an amendment which makes it possible, as it is today, for a simple majority of those present and voting in either body to knock down any reorganization plan with which we disagree, whereas prior to 1957 it took a much larger so-called constitutional majority to knock down a reorganization plan.

The mechanics under the plan are simple indeed. The President drafts a plan, based on studies of the executive branch, and sends it to the Congress.

The statute lists the goals of such a plan:

To promote the better execution of the laws and the more efficient management of the executive branch of the Government.

To reduce expenditures and promote economy.

To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable.

To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government.

To reduce the number of agencies, if there are too many.

To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Under the law the President submits his plan to both bodies.

Under the rules of this body, the plan is referred to the committee which brought the bill before you this afternoon, the Committee on Government Operations. Any Member of the House may file a resolution of disapproval. There follows detailed hearings by the Committee on Government Operations. In the past your Committee on Government Operations has been meticulous to consult the legislative committees which may have some concern with the executive agency under discussion. For example, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been consulted at length and in detail when matters within its jurisdiction are before us. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has likewise been consulted in the past when it had interests at stake.

In order to prevent any unreasonable delay in action on a resolution of disapproval, any Member may offer such a resolution after the plan has been under consideration for 10 days. If either House approves the resolution, the plan is dead. Only if the resolution fails to pass in both Houses after 60 days, does the plan become law. To insure there is adequate time for full debate on these resolutions, the statute provides 10 hours, divided between the majority and minority.

Since 1949, 47 reorganization plans have become effective. In 1961 President Kennedy submitted seven plans, and four become law. Last year one out of two became law.

There is now pending before Congress a reorganization plan which came up last month to transfer certain functions from the Department of the Interior to the General Services Administration.

Reorganization is a necessary and a continuing function of our Government. We have 10 executive departments, 50-odd agencies, and almost numberless bureaus. Our Federal civilian personnel alone is on the order of 2.5 million. We need constant attention to now provide efficiency and economy, and avoid waste and duplication. Under the reorganization plan procedure, we put the mandate on the President to come up and tell us whenever he sees an opportunity for making the executive branch run more efficiently. Before we had the reorganization law, in the bad old days before 1932, Congress had to originate all these changes itself. Congress, as President Hoover then pointed out, was at a virtual stalemate in the field of reorganization.

There are those today who would end the reorganization process which has been going forward since 1932. They want to turn the clock back, not just back of President Kennedy, back of President Eisenhower, back of President Truman, back of President Roosevelt, but back of President Hoover, who first suggested this legislation.

We ought to bear in mind that all in the world this legislation does is to put on the President the burden, the duty, and the responsibility of telling the Congress, via a reorganization plan, whenever he thinks the executive branch can be improved and made more efficient. The power of rejection remains in the Congress. We have exercised it many times. We have not lost any prerogatives and we have not lost any legislative functions, but there has been a tremendous gain in efficiency and economy of the Government.

If anyone here is interested in striking a blow for waste and mismanagement and inefficiency, he can very well do so by voting today against the Reorganization Plan Act and its continuance.

It has been suggested by certain Members of the minority that President Kennedy has not made a case for the renewal of the Reorganization Act which has, as I say, been rolling along ever since 1932. The short answer to this is that President Kennedy has very strongly requested the renewal of the reorganization power. Its renewal was mentioned in his budget message of this year. The representatives of the administration testified at length before your Committee on Government Operations asking for its extension.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], a moment ago, served notice that he would introduce at the appropriate time an amendment to change the Reorganization Act as we have known it since 1949. He would add to the language of the Reorganization Act an express prohibition which would remove the power the President now has to put to the Congress, by Executive plan, a new department.

Back in 1949 the Congress considered at length this question. Prior to that the law said that the President could not create a new department by a reorganization plan. In the 1949 act the other body, with the most meticulous care and caution, put into the act a provision expressly permitting the President to create a new department under the reorganization plan procedure. This was argued out in the conference committee, and in the conference report. This body expressly agreed to that change in the law under which language which would have forbidden the President from creating a new department was removed. So from 1949 to today, there has not been the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone who could read the English language that the President is empowered to use the Reorganization Act to create, if he deems it in the interest of economy and efficiency, a new department.

Former President Eisenhower did just that. In 1953 he sent a reorganization plan to the House creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. And gentlemen on this side of the aisle joined with the then majority on the Republican side of the aisle in seeing that that reorganization plan went into effect.

Former President Hoover, back in 1949, when he sent his Hoover Commission report to the Congress in his letter of January 13, 1949, to the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman Dawson, said:

> The Commission recommends that such authority should be given to the President and that the power of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitations or exemptions. Once the limiting and exempting process has begun, it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results.

That is the end of President Hoover's quotation, and it makes clear that the whole philosophy of the Hoover bipartisan commission was to impose on the

President the duty of setting forth before the Congress reorganization plans of all kinds, whether they involve the transfer of bureaus or whether they involve the abolition of offices and agencies or whether they involve the creation of a new department, provided only that they satisfy the purposes of the act and that they add to the economy and efficiency and good management of the executive branch; of that last, of course, the Congress was, is, and remains the final judge.

Mr. Chairman, I point out again that we Democrats supported President Eisenhower when he sent up his plan to make a group of scattered agencies into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When the bill to renew the authority of President Eisenhower to send up reorganization plans, including the power to set up new departments, came before this body in 1953, the House passed that plan by a vote of 389 to 5. I am proud to say that on this side of the aisle, the Democrats supported President Eisenhower by 183 for to 2 against.

Mr. Chairman, that is a pretty good record of support, and a pretty good record of confidence by the Demorcrats in the ability and responsibility of President Eisenhower to send up constructive reorganization plans to this body.

Mr. Chairman, in 1955 we renewed that power. Once again Democrats by an overwhelming voice vote joined with Republicans in giving President Eisenhower that power.

In 1957 the same thing. And again in the last year of President Eisenhower's administration in which this reorganization plan was before us, in 1959, Democrats joined with Republicans in overwhelmingly arming President Eisenhower with this power.

In 1963, with a new President, a Democrat, in the White House, we come to our friends on the minority side and ask that they apply to us the golden rule that "You do unto Kennedy what we did unto Eisenhower;" that you give a Democratic President the same powers and responsibilities—not one whit more, but neither any less—than we gave to a Republican President. We ask, therefore, if the Brown amendment which has previously been discussed is presented, that it be overwhelmingly voted down. For what it represents is the golden rule in reverse, and an attempt to deny President Kennedy what we Democrats cheerfully and wholeheartedly gave to former President Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, let us extend the Reorganization Act for another 2 years. Let us not take any unnecessary slap at the incumbent of the highest office in this country. Let us get on with the job of giving to the President the responsibility to send up reorganization plans when he sees fit, in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief in favor of the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I have been a consistent supporter of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and its various extensions.

I have sought to improve the act on occasion over the years, as have many others—and may I say at this point that I am in sympathy with and shall support the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and I have not been entirely without reservation as to the manner in which the act has sometimes been utilized.

But, on the whole, I think it has borne out the Hoover Commission belief that it would prove a useful device for the attainment of sound organization and management in the executive branch.

I should like to comment on two arguments most frequently advanced against the continued existence of the Reorganization Act.

They are, first, that the procedure set in motion by the act is an improper way to legislate, and that we are relinquishing too much legislative power to the Executive; and second, that the act has been abused by the submission to the Congress of reorganization plans outside the intended scope of the act.

It is true that the procedure by which a reorganization plan either becomes law or is rejected involves essentially reversal of the normal legislative process. But it seems to me the important questions to be asked are "Who passes final judgment on a reorganization plan?" and "Does the act contain essential safeguards to insure that the Congress can fulfill its legislative responsibility?"

I think the answer to both must be affirmative.

Certainly the Congress has the final say—it passes final judgment.

Any reorganization plan can be rejected with utmost finality by a simple majority of either House.

No President can ram down the throats of this Congress any plan which a simple majority in either House does not want.

A committee of the House cannot of its own volition sit on a reorganization plan to prevent the House from taking action during the 60-day incubation period.

The law provides for a resolution of disapproval which may be introduced by any Member and forces the committee to either report the resolution to the floor within 10 calendar days or invite a highly privileged motion that it be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

Thus, the machinery is written into the law insuring that a majority of the House, in one form or another, can exercise its will on any reorganization plan.

History demonstrates that the Congress has been anything but a passive rubberstamp for executive reorganization plans.

From 1946 to the present, 74 such plans have been submitted to the Congress and 27 have been defeated.

Since the act of 1949 became law, 67 plans have been transmitted to the Congress and 20 have been defeated. Since 1953, 7 of 16 reorganization plans have been disapproved by the Congress.

So it can be seen that the Congress does have the machinery to fulfill its legislative responsibilities in this area and that those responsibilities have been, by and large, fulfilled.

The law reserves to the Congress effective powers of review and disapproval.

As for the argument that the act has been subjected to abuse by the executive branch in the past, I am of the opinion that this may well reflect substantial discredit on any administration that would use the act for purposes outside the scope of legislative intent, but I certainly do not feel it reflects discredit on the act itself.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, although not without flaws, is sound in principle and should not be made a whipping boy merely because it has been abused by some administration.

The source of such abuse does not lie with the act, and therefore we must look elsewhere to apply the remedy.

And the responsibility for its unwise use is not alone that of the executive branch.

This act will not be abused as long as the Congress exercises its responsibility to carefully evaluate and intelligently judge the reorganization plans that come before it.

I think this has been demonstrated in the past.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I believe one of our principal objectives as elected Representatives must be to strive continually for a more efficient and economical operation of the Government and the Reorganization Act of 1949 has been and should continue to be an important means by which this objective can be realized.

I urge your support of H.R. 3496.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly on the rule and called the attention of the committee to the additional views commencing on page 20 of the committee report in which I was joined by two of my colleagues on the Government Operations Committee.

Let me say that I approach this problem on the basis of principle.

My primary motive for seeking service in this body was to strengthen and modernize the Congress of the United States so that it could recapture some of the policymaking authority which it had permitted to drift away from it, largely to an ever-expanding bureaucracy, in the last three decades. That is the principle which is involved in the bill before you which would extend for 2 years the legislative power we have granted to the Executive to propose changes in existing law, subject to a veto within 60 days by either House of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this, in my judgment, is unusual power. There has been a question in the minds of many of the authority of Congress to transfer legislative power vested in it by article I of the Constitution. So, I say that we should not grant this legislative power to the bureaucracy lightly. We should grant it only upon a showing of need, a showing that it will improve the executive branch of the Government, leading to economy and efficiency, to the elimination of unnecessary functions, to the elimination of unnecessary jobs, and to the elimination of duplication, overlapping, and waste.

When a showing of that kind has been made, I have supported granting this authority to the President; in fact, from memory I say that I believe that every extension of the Reorganization Act which has become law I have voted for.

Two years I voted to grant this power to President Kennedy in the belief that taking over the Government after having presented a program to the country, he ought to have the flexibility to reshape the executive branch of the Government so as to carry out his program. And, I say to you that I would vote to extend this authority today if a showing were made that it would be used in line with its original purposes.

I want to direct my remarks to two points: First, that there is a total absence of any showing to justify continuing this legislative authority in the President; and second, to cite the record during the 87th Congress in which I say the President used this authority in submitting nine reorganization plans in a way which Congress never contemplated and which was an abuse of the reorganizing power. Those plans were not at all in conformity with the purposes for which the power was originally granted.

April 9 of this year the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee conducted hearings on this proposal, this bill before you, to extend the Reorganization Act for 2 years.

The principal witness on behalf of the administration was Harold Seidman, Acting Assistant Director for Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget. He was accompanied by Assistant Chief Fred E. Levi and Mr. Harold Hovey.

Our colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON]—and this passage appears on page 13 of the hearings—addressed this question to the administration witness:

> Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Seidman, I thought it would be both helpful and interesting to the subcommittee if you could apprise us of what plans the administration might have in mind if this extension does become law; what we might expect during the next few months.
>
> Mr. SEIDMAN. At this point there is nothing that has been taken up with the President, so obviously I am not in a position to disclose proposed reorganization plans. There are three or four potential reorganizations that are under current consideration. Whether these will eventually be plans that will be transmitted to the Congress within the next several weeks, before June 1, I am not certain. This will have to go to the President.

I challenge members of the committee to examine the remainder of Mr. Seidman's testimony and find that any case has been made for granting this extraordinary legislative power to the President at this time.

Subsequently the President did send up a plan, just 5 days before the act expired, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963.

The importance and the character of that plan supports my contention that the administration does not have any substantial reforms in mind; that there is no need for this power at this time.

What does plan No. 1 of 1963 propose to do? Parenthetically, I might say that I immediately introduced two measures to accomplish through the ordinary legislative process the reform contained in plan No. 1 of 1963.

What did it do? It transferred the functions of maintenance and operation of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library from the Department of the Interior to the General Services Administration. What does that involve? It involves 10 guards, 1 repairman, and 2 janitors, at a total cost of $87,000 a year.

If this is the best reform that the administration can find in order to prove that the continuation of this power of reorganization is necessary, then there is not any real need for this power because there are no substantive, real worthwhile reforms which the administration has in mind.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemean yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. The Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1963, to which the gentleman refers, is an admittedly rather simple little reorganization plan to remove the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library from its present joint custodianship by the General Services Administration and the Department of the Interior, and to vest it solely under the General Services Administration, so that a scholar who wants to visit the restroom does not have to pass from the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration to that of the Department of the Interior on his way. Surely the gentleman from Michigan does not object to this.

Mr. MEADER. I have just completed saying that I introduced a joint resolution which would advance the effective date of the plan, and I introduced a bill which contained the proposal. Hearings will be held on those tomorrow morning by the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member, and I intend to appear and testify in favor of my bill.

Does the gentleman realize, though, that there is not one word in any Presidential message, not one word in the debates on the floor of the House or the Senate advocating this rather earth-shaking reform? Nobody knew of its existence until it seemed necessary to prove that the Reorganization Act should be extended by sending up some kind of a plan.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I do not want to yield for the moment because I have another point that I need to make.

There is not the slightest reason why this rather minor reform, even though it is salutary, to avoid having two agencies functioning in the same place, should not be done and done rapidly by the Government Operations Committee even before the end of this fiscal year and not wait for 60 days until a reorganization plan can take effect. I would like to prove that the legislative process can work, and I hope that the gentlemen on the committee will help us expedite this very salutary reform.

Incidentally, do you know why this change was necessary?

Using this same reorganization power in 1946 the functions of maintenance and operation were taken away from the agencies in which they had existed and put under the National Park Service in the Interior Department. They had previously been under the Archivist and the Public Buildings Administration, both of which agencies were subsequently by law covered into the GSA; and the functions would be where they belong, if the law had been let alone and this reorganization power had not been hastily used in 1946.

I say there is nothing wrong with the Congress maintaining control and knowing what it is doing. Every one of the plans adopted in the first session of the 87th Congress dealt with the regulatory bodies which Congress had created to carry out a policy and vested in them judicial, legislative, and administrative powers.

Because of this concentration of power, and to prevent its abuse, Congress surrounded those regulatory bodies with safeguards and limitations, such as bipartisan boards, limited terms, confirmation of members by the Senate and sometimes Congress even specified qualifications for Commissioners. Congress could hold those Commissioners accountable.

Every one of the plans sent up in 1961 had the result of destroying the safeguards, doing away with or minimizing the limitations with which Congress had surrounded this concentration of power. This meant, therefore, an augmentation of the power in these regulatory bodies which deal with our business community in the field of communications, transportation, securities, labor relations, et cetera.

Those plans were an abuse of the reorganizing power. Four plans came to our Government Operations Committee which, if they had been bills, would have gone to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has developed an expertise in those fields, both in its membership and in the staff of the committee, and has developed congressional policy.

This reorganizing power is a means of circumventing congressional policy and preventing thorough consideration of proposals, because the Government Operations Committee, which cannot be expert in everything, gets only 10 days in which to hold hearings and advise itself on the advantages and disadvantages of these plans.

In the light of the abuse of the reorganizing power during the past 2 years and in the light of the failure of the administration to make any showing justifying its continuance at this time we ought to withhold granting legislative power to the Executive until he can make a case for it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 3946, comprises but a few lines, simply proposing to extend until June 1, 1965, the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which expired this month. As the report of our committee, under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman DAWSON, points out, this is one of several successive extensions of the 1949 act. When originally passed, it had a duration of 4 years. In 1953, during the 83d Congress, it was extended for 2 more years; and again in 1955 and 1957 for 2 years. After a lapse of authority in 1959, it was reinstated in 1961 and expired on June 1, 1963.

All we are asking for in this bill is an extension of the 1949 Reorganization Act for 2 years. Actually, I believe that the Reorganization Act should be made permanent legislation, although that is not the matter before us today.

This legislation is an important and useful tool of Government. It gives the President the opportunity for initiative and flexible response to the ever-changing demands of Government by reorganizing the executive branch with the help of the Congress. This is a partnership or cooperative working relationship for good Government. It was evolved through the years. It has been tested and modified by experience. It makes sense. We should give our endorsement once again.

In wartime, as in World Wars I and II, the Congress has given the President complete blanket authority to reorganize agencies high and low for wartime purposes by Executive action alone. In peacetime this has been a cooperative relationship between the President and the Congress, with the President proposing and the Congress disposing—that is, having the right to disapprove.

The basic authorizing legislation for these reorganization plans has varied in form and content since 1932, when the first authorization measure was enacted as part of the Economy Act. Generally the evolution of these laws has been to eliminate exemptions of various agencies, so that the President could reorganize across the board; and more opportunity and facility in the Congress to disapprove if the wisdom of Congress so dictated.

Under the pending bill, as in the extension enactments since 1957, a simple majority of either House can vote to reject a Presidential reorganization plan. Any Member of either body has the right at any time, after a plan is submitted by the President, to introduce a disapproving resolution. And the law has procedural safeguards that confer upon such resolutions the high privilege of floor consideration, if the committee of jurisdiction fails to report them out within 10 days. This consideration takes place within the 60-day waiting period during which a reorganization plan lies before the Congress. So there is ample opportunity for any Member to let his endorsement or opposition be known and to have his position formally considered on the floor of either House.

Two Hoover Commissions have given basic support and endorsement to this legislation. Indeed, without such legislation, many of the reorganizations recommended by the Hoover Commission would have been impossible to achieve. I may speak with some knowledge of the subject, having served as a member of the second Hoover Commission and as chairman of the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee which analyzed the reorganization plans stemming from the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission.

The reorganization plan concept and the basic enabling legislation have been truly innovations in democratic government which have proved their worth, which, as I just said, are now well tested. In my opinion, they have contributed greatly to making our Government responsive to the swiftly changing demands imposed by revolutionary technology and international crises of the greatest magnitude and severity.

Since the Reorganization Act of 1949 was passed by the Congress, 67 reorganization plans have been transmitted to the Congress, of which 48 have taken effect. This shows that the Congress has approved, and it has also rejected. The most recent reorganization plan approved by the Congress was the establishment of the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President. In that way, we gave formal status to an office and a function of the highest import in the discharge of presidential duties during a time when scientific knowledge and technology are crucial to our very survival as a nation.

I believe the Members understand the positive contributions to effective Government which have been made by this legislation and the Presidential reorganization plans submitted thereunder. There are, as I understand, some who would support the bill only on the condition that it delete authority of the President to create an executive department by reorganization plan. Under the bill, the President could create an executive department from existing agencies; he could not eliminate an executive department, that is, he could not reorganize an executive department out of existence by reorganization plan.

Now, I do not believe that there should be any valid objection at all to retention of the President's authority to create an executive department, as I will show in a brief review of the history of this provision in the law. The Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 did not confer authority upon the President to create an executive department from among existing agencies by the instrument of a reorganization plan. If either of those laws had contained such authority, undoubtedly the Federal Security Agency in the late 1930's or early 1940's would have been invested with departmental status, as it was later under the Eisenhower administration, made possible by the 1949 Reorganization Act. The 1949 act made this change in reorganization authority. As pointed out at the time, the previous limitation on creating an executive department had served no real purpose since agencies had been created by reorganization plan which had the status but not the name of executive departments.

Our Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the administration bill, H.R. 1539, early in the year 1949. I recall that Herbert Hoover was a witness before the committee urging enactment of the bill, and the late Henderson Lanham, a good friend and respected colleague, specifically asked Mr. Hoover what he thought about the new authority in the 1949 bill giving the President authority to create departments with Cabinet status. Mr. Hoover replied in substance that the President should have this authority, that the authority does not give him new timber to build anything; but merely to recreate a department from existing agency functions. Mr. Hoover clearly was in favor of the new provision—hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on H.R. 1569, 81st Congress, 1st session, January 1949, page 141.

The law did not then, nor does this bill now, authorize the President to create new functions and new authorities which the Congress has not itself expressly legislated. Creating an executive department is not creating new functions, merely combining or integrating existing functions and agencies.

Our committee, in deference to Judge Lanham's and perhaps others' concern, deleted this authority in a new bill, H.R. 2361, which passed the House. However, the other body favored the new authority to create executive departments by reorganization plan, and in conference the Senate version prevailed. Thus since 1949, in the four successive extensions of the act, the Presidential authority to create an executive department by reorganization plan has been retained.

In the more than 30 years since we have had reorganization laws on the statute books, proposals to create a department by a reorganization plan have affected but two Departments: the reorganization of social security, health, and welfare functions into a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the reorganization of housing and related activities into a Department of Urban Affairs. The HEW proposal was first submitted by President Truman in several variations, but there were strong feelings in the Congress, as I recall, against Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, as the likely nominee for the new Department post. Cries of "socialized medicine" were heard in the land and in the Halls of Congress, and the Truman plans for the Department were defeated.

When President Eisenhower came into office, departmental status was given to the social security, health, and welfare functions, after some revisions in the plan were made—made even to the satisfaction of the American Medical Association, which supported the plan as proposed by President Eisenhower.

When Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, creating the new Department, was submitted to the Congress, we held, as I recall, joint hearings by the House and Senate subcommittees of the Government Operations Committees. We heard testimony from then Budget Director Joseph Dodge, an eminent Detroit banker; and Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, who was slated to become Secretary of the new Department, and other distinguished persons. Even President Hoover sent a telegram endorsing the plan.

So you see that there was no objection in 1953, neither by the then majority nor for that matter by the minority, to presidential exercise of this authority to create a department of Cabinet rank by reorganization plan.

The stumbling block to approval of the pre-1953 versions of the departmental plan was political and perhaps personal. There was the issue of socialized medicine and the issue of President Truman's proposed nominee, Oscar Ewing. In a different time, in a different context, we might say that failure of this House to approve President Kennedy's reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs also involved an issue and a possible nominee. I am not going to go into detail on this matter except to say I am no more concerned today with the position of the National Real Estate Boards than I was in 1952 with the position of the American Medical Association. As for possible nominees, the Members know very well what I am talking about. And if anyone is going to make objection to this bill on a personal or political basis, then I can only express my profound regret.

H.R. 3496 is sound, it is needed, it carries forward legislation based on principles and practices well known to this House. I urge its passage.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Is it not true that under the Eisenhower administration in 1959 the act was allowed to lapse?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. STINSON. So, just to make this point clear, all through the Eisenhower administration that administration did not have the power to reorganize; is that not correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Is it not a fact in 1959, the year in question, this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, overwhelmingly voted to continue under President Eisenhower the power to reorganize which had been his all during his administration?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is my understanding. The House passed the Reorganization Act of 1959, the Senate failed to pass the act.

Now we know why the HEW proposal was defeated. There is no use going into the reasons why it was defeated. But we also know it was passed by this House under President Eisenhower later on and Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby and others appeared before our committee representing the administration and we did pass that bill. This showed the willingness of the Democrats to go along with the Republican administration and not take away from the President certain powers.

I am very much amused at my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader]. He argues that because the President has not used this power it should be taken away from him, because he has not used it as much as he thinks he could have used it. Would you take away all the powers of the President just because he does not happen to use them on a particular occasion when he does not think he should?

Is it not true that the powers of the President are to remain in reserve and to be used when in his judgment he thinks it is necessary to use them, and does he have to exercise them every day in order to retain them?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has mentioned my name, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is talking about the reorganizing power. That is not a power vested in the President by the Constitution. That is a power vested in the President because we gave him a part of our legislative powers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And did we not get that power from the Constitution to give him that power?

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman will yield further, the legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States. In the Reorganization Act we transferred a part of that legislative power to the President.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And do we not do it under the rights given Congress in the Constitution?

Mr. MEADER. I say it is our power, and not his. We have a right to withhold it unless he makes a case that he needs it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is quibbling over words. If the Congress does not have the right to give the President the power to send up a plan for our consideration, then why did not the gentleman fight that power every time under the Eisenhower administration when it was extended?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a bipartisan statement in opposition to this legislation. Certainly it cannot be questioned but that this legislation is proposed to extend for a 2-year period a delegation of legislative authority to the executive branch of the Government. The purpose of the original legislation which in a somewhat different form dates back to 1935 was to simplify reorganization and changes in the executive branch to effect economies and greater efficiency in Government. Those who were at the hearing when former President Hoover appeared in 1949, I believe it was, will know that the principal argument which he made in support of this legislation was that if the Congress did not grant this authority to the Executive to originate legislation there would be a great hue and cry from all of the different departments and agencies of the Government whose functions were to be transferred or abolished and they would get people from around the country to support them and making it virtually impossible for the Congress to act originally with regard to reorganizing, consolidating, and abolishing departments and agencies of Government. The principal impetus for such economies occurred following the first and second Hoover Commission recommendations. For instance, in 1946 there were three far-reaching reorganization plans proposed to the Congress by the Executive under the 1945 act.

In the reorganization plans of 1946, for instance, the plans are replete with language which provided that functions, duties, bureaus, offices, and boards shall be transferred from one department to another. Other paragraphs of the plan provided for agencies and functions to be abolished.

Following the enactment of the 1949 act which we are reviewing today there were 27 reorganization plans. These were adopted for the most part in carrying out the recommendations of the Commission headed by former President Herbert Hoover. A number of the plans covered a considerable detail of the functions which were transferred or eliminated—details covering the operation of departments and agencies under the executive which covered 20-some pages in volume 62 of the U.S. Statutes at Large.

The final report to the Congress on the reorganization of the executive branch of Government was filed in June 1955. Since that time there has been virtually no action taken on the Hoover Commission recommendations. The two reorganization plans offered in 1962 proposed the creation of new departments in the executive branch—a legislative function which did not appear to be contemplated by the original legislation, and under the amendment which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] would be specifically eliminated from the extraordinary authority contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, although the constitutionality of the Reorganization Act does not appear ever to have been tested, it would be well at this time for the Congress to review again its legislative prerogatives as therein set forth. How, for instance, is this constitutional admonition satisfied in the bill now before us? Article I, section 7, says:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.

There would be little likelihood of questioning the constitutionality of formal and technical enactments which effect a streamlining and economical arrangement of the executive branch.

However, in recent years, the Congress has noted attempts on the part of the Executive to expand authority under this legislation through attempts to establish new departments, new Cabinet officers, and various other functions, positions, and regulations not theretofore in existence. Without questioning the wisdom of the creation of the Office of Science and Technology in plan No. 2 of the 1962 session, we have to point out the sharp distinction between this type of legislation and that which was embodied in the numerous reorganization plans adopted pursuant to the Hoover Commission reports. For instance, in creating the Office of Science and Technology the act commences:

> There is hereby established in the executive department—

I think that today the legislative prerogatives of the Congress are challenged, and I think it would be well for every Member to give consideration to the impact of this legislation, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The act goes on to create offices, salaries, functions, and other legal rights and obligations. Nevertheless the act provides for this new Department and agency to replace a less sophisticated body which had existed for some years.

Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, are sensitive to the tremendous growth which has occurred in the executive branch of Government. The pattern by which principal legislation is received and enacted by the Congress leads to the view that the Executive is originating and frequently demanding legislative action which the Congress itself is authorized to enact. The growth of legislation by regulation of departments and bureaus represent legislative authority which is beyond the wildest dreams of the framers of our Constitution. Now is not the time for any further surrender of legislative authority to the executive branch. The pending measure, which the present Executive has considered as his authority to create new and additional executive departments—unless the Congress shall take positive action within 60 days to question such authority—presents the clearest possible threat to our legislative prerogatives. Even if the argument is made—and it was not made before the committee—that this extraordinary authority will be utilized to effect a transfer of some of the functions at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library from the Secretary of the Interior to the Administrator of General Services—still this same action could be taken by exercising the usual legislative processes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a work which has been published recently entitled "Forge of Democracy," by Neil MacNeil, who sits up here in the Press Gallery and has observed the work of our body and who comments on the effect that has taken place in recent years with regard to legislation and the surrendering of legislative authority by the House and Senate, on pages 268 to 269, where he said:

> Larry O'Brien had but one hesitancy. He would not enter the gallery of the House either to listen to debate or to watch the House vote. He had as much right to enter the gallery as any of the thousands of tourists who streamed through the Capitol: it was a public place. O'Brien felt however, that because of his position as the President's man on Capitol Hill it would not be proper for him to be seen in the gallery of the House or that of the Senate. He could read the debate and count the vote in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next day. To appear in the gallery, however, might smack of an impropriety; it might seem that he was asserting an undue pressure on the Members of Congress. O'Brien's sensitivity here was a trace, a faint trace, of the old constitutional separatism between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. There were scarcely any others left. The rest had been eroded by the imperious demands of modern America. The nature of the American Government, altered to meet the ever-increasing complexity of American life, had been profoundly changed—not the Presidency alone, but the Congress and the courts as well. In mid-20th century, no major bill could move through the House of Representatives without the active interest and frequently the intervention of the President in the proceedings. The President had become, in terms of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the chief advocate, the chief lobbyist, and the chief legislator of the United States.

There was a logical reason for making this legislation temporary and providing for its automatic termination. That time has come and the law should be permitted to expire by its own terms.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, the original intent of Congress in passing the Reorganization Act was to enable the President to effect economies and efficiencies in the executive branch of Government. This was undoubtedly a splendid idea. An argument can be made for a new President to have the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government when he takes office if the ultimate result is to achieve economy and save the taxpayers money. Two years have now passed and the reorganization plans proposed by the administration have not resulted in any significant economies or relief to the American taxpayer. Two years is sufficient time for the Congress to transfer part of its constitutional legislative authority to the executive branch. However, to continually give the power to the President to legislate would be permanently abdicating Congress' constitutional power to the executive branch of Government. The Founding Fathers intended and provided in the Constitution that Congress would have power to legislate and the Executive would have the power to veto. The Reorganization Act reverses this process and gives the executive branch the power to legislate and provides Congress with the power to veto that legislation proposed by the executive branch.

The Reorganization Act provides that the Government Operations Committee will have a period of only 10 days to study legislation proposed by the executive branch and it is very possible that proposed legislation could be on a subject completely foreign and alien to the knowledge of the Members. Ten days' study on these reorganization plans is not nearly long enough for the Government Operations Committee to make an adequate study. Also, the Reorganization Act type of legislation provides an all or nothing program to Congress. Congress cannot amend a reorganization plan. The normal processes of consideration by legislative committees in Congress is circumvented by a reorganization plan and the country is not allowed to benefit by the years of experience in specialized fields by the membership of our capable legislative committees. If the Congress does not block a reorganization plan, it automatically becomes law. I would also bring to the attention of the gentlemen present that during the latter part of the Eisenhower administration the Reorganization Act was allowed to lapse because the Senate voted against its extension. The burden to prove that legislative power is needed by the executive branch should lie with the executive branch. And when the executive branch can come before Congress and show a need, then perhaps Congress should consider an extension of the reorganization plan. To date, no need has been shown to Congress and no proposals have been made that could not be taken care of by simple legislation. I ask the gentlemen of the House to return to the intent and principles of the Constitution and reassert their responsibility of legislating for the United States of America.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the discussion and debate on the extension of the Reorganization Act in the Committee on Government Operations and here on the floor of the House, I get the impression that some people believe that this is a new and novel authority that has been given to the President in the 1949 act. Somewhat to my surprise, however, and permitting a personal note a little research shows that I was only 8 years old when President Hoover proposed the first reorganization act on February 17, 1932, and I was barely 9 years old when the first reorganization act was approved on June 30, 1932.

In his 1932 message, President Hoover used language which is as applicable today as then. He stated:

> We may frankly admit the practical difficulties of such reorganization. Not only do different factions of the Government fear such reorganization, but many associations and agencies throughout the country will be alarmed that the particular function to which they are devoted may in some fashion be curtailed. Proposals to the Congress of detailed plans for the reorganization of the many different bureaus and independent agencies have always proved in the past to be a signal for the mobilization of opposition from all quarters which has destroyed the possibility of constructive action.
>
> There is little hope for success in this task unless it is placed in the hands of some one responsible for it, with authority and direction to act. Moreover, the consummation of a comprehensive reorganization at one moment is not in the best public interest. Such reorganization should be undertaken gradually and systematically, predicated on a sound and definite theory of government and effectuated as the result of study and experience gained in the actual process of reorganization.

The legislation which President Hoover proposed in 1932 and which was enacted, was quite similar to the law we have today. A reorganization plan—then called an Executive order—could be disapproved by a resolution in either House of Congress within 60 days after it was presented. The 1932 act did not prohibit the use of the act to create a new department but did prohibit its use to abolish a department.

Since 1932, four other reorganization acts have been passed, following the same basic pattern. Two of them, the 1939 and the 1945 acts, prohibited the use of plans to create new departments. However, upon the urging of the first Hoover Commission that the Presidential power to reorganize be not limited, Congress returned, in 1949, to the pattern of the original 1932 act by eliminating this prohibition.

Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy proposed a creation of a new department by reorganization plan. The results flowing from these proposals are so well known I shall not bother to repeat them here.

The proponents of the amendment to prohibit the use of a reorganization plan to create a new department state that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 which President Eisenhower submitted to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which President Kennedy submitted as a proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, both violated paragraph 4 of section 5(a) of the Reorganization Act. That section provides that no plan shall have the effect of "authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress."

This argument has absolutely no factual or legal basis. It is completely erroneous and without merit.

The legislative history of the Reorganization Act of 1949 makes it crystal clear that Congress intended the President to have power to propose the creation of a new department through a reorganization plan. The conference report on the bill said this in so many words. That report stated:

> The conference substitute therefore authorizes the President to provide for a new executive department in a reorganization plan.

The conference substitute was adopted by both Houses. Consequently, it cannot be validly claimed that the normal administrative and advisory functions of a department head and of his assistants, such as overseeing the department's operations, sitting in on Cabinet meetings, and giving advice to the President, are the types of new functions which section 5(a)(4) of the act is intended to exclude from reorganization plans.

As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower's and President Kennedy's plans merely transferred functions from the heads of the Federal Security Agency and of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the heads of the new proposed departments. Basically both plans provided only for raising those existing agencies to Cabinet status. Neither plan created any new function nor authorized any agency to exercise any function which was not authorized by law at the time the plan was transmitted.

No one can show any new function, as the term is used in the act, in either plan because none was created. The arguments of the proponents of the amendment on this point are completely deceptive. They ignore both the wording of the act and its legislative history; they are contrary to the definitely and unmistakably expressed intent of Congress; they disregard the content of the plans themselves; and they are totally without merit.

I have heard the extension of the Reorganization Act and the proposed amendment discussed before the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations and the full committee, as well as here on the floor of the House. There is no doubt in my mind that the method of procedure provided by the act is a sound one, and is the only way that many necessary reorganizations can be brought about. The present act places a clear duty on the President to submit proposed plans to Congress when he determines that reorganizations will improve the efficiency and economy of the Government in executing the laws. Further, the act requires the President to constantly examine and reexamine the operations of the Government to determine what changes are necessary to accomplish the laudable purposes of the act.

I am convinced that we should not relieve the President of these duties of examining the execution of the laws and making recommendations to Congress. This act does not give away legislative power. It is, rather, an exercise of the best type of legislative authority to force the President to work cooperatively with Congress in improving the organization of the Government, in securing more efficient execution of the laws that Congress enacts, and in achieving economy in governmental operations.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the extension of this authority in 1953, 1955, 1957, and 1961. I did not support its extension in 1959. I filed a statement of my views which I felt should be very carefully considered by this House. The arguments I advanced at that time were overwhelmingly defeated by this House. I think it must be assumed that they were not persuasive. I have listened with great care here today. I have read with equal care the minority views filed on this resolution and I find nothing new, nothing more persuasive than that which has been advanced on each and every other occasion.

Now it is contended here that 2 years of this authority to the present administration is adequate. To me that is not a persuasive argument. I think it far more likely that an administration, having gained the experience of 2 years, would be better equipped to propose reorganizations of our Government which would contribute to economical and efficient operation than one just assuming office. But there is a more important reason to me. I watched rather carefully the way the Congress handled the controversial reorganization plans sent it in 1961. I saw no evidence there of abandonment of our responsibility in the field of legislation. I saw no power given the President which restricted our right or our opportunity to act and act decisively. We rejected plans, we permitted some to become operative and in at least one notable instance we substituted amendment of statute for the adoption of the plan itself. I think it demonstrated that the dangers, the fears many of us envisioned as flowing from this authority were mere bogeymen, that we did not have to be frightened of any usurpation on the part of the Executive of the prerogatives of the Congress.

But I am impressed by the fact that one of those plans most bitterly opposed is, in my judgment, the real underlying reason today for the opposition to the continuation of this reorganization authority by the President. I think we might as well face up to the fact that the controversial plan was to create a Department of Urban Affairs. There were many facets of controversy involved in the submission of this plan. I think every Member of this body is cognizant of what those elements of controversy were. But it could not be contended by any man that the Committee on Government Operations denied the opponents of this plan every opportunity for the most extensive of hearings. I participated in those hearings and the opponents were accorded every opportunity to present every fact and every argument they could possibly conjure up; and I might say that they were indeed most prolific in the spinning of arguments of little validity in many instances.

It was the mere fact of the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs, not because there was any great opposition to vesting the President with the authority to create new departments. That falls on the record. The record shows that a new department was proposed to be created following the extensive authority in 1953, and yet in 1955, 1957, 1959, and 1961 the Congress extended that authority. Granted, in 1959 the other body did not go along, but this body extended in every instance, knowing full well that the authority of the President to create new departments was clear and uncontroverted. So I think we must look to the substance of what was proposed in 1961, a Department of Urban Affairs. The feeling is that you can beat it better today if it does not come down as a reorganization proposal. I may or may not have enthusiasm for a particular new department but I am perfectly willing to base my opposition to a proposal on its merits and not take the oblique approach hoping that by that approach I can bring about the defeat of something which I might not accept as being completely in accordance with my views. But make no mistake that the foundation of the opposition today is based solely on the history flowing from the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and I think we should face up to the fact that that stares at us as we consider this proposal.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the report that was filed and which accompanies H.R. 3496 indicates that there were minority views by three members of the committee who were totally opposed to the extension and reform of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I would point out that in addition to those views there were also additional views submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], and the Speaker, in which we indicated, that we are certainly not opposed to the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949 provided that there be an amendment to section 5(a)(1) of that act.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], my genial and distinguished friend, who somewhat plaintively remarked in his opening statement that this act had been extended time and again since 1949 without change; therefore, there was something wrong, something sinister, in proposing a change at this time.

I think it was President Kennedy who in one of his eloquent statements the other day said that change is the law of life. I think probably experience under this act has taught us that this is the time to make an eminently desirable change.

The gentleman from Wisconsin also said if we adopt the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Ohio we are in effect tying the hands of the President or taking a slap at the present incumbent of the White House. I think we heard a variation of the Golden Rule: "Do unto President Kennedy as we have done unto President Eisenhower."

I remind the members of the committee that never has a new department been created by virtue of the Reorganization Act. In 1953, when President Eisenhower did send down Reorganization Plan No. 1 to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, thereafter a resolution was submitted, was adopted by this House, and was signed into law by the President. It stopped the running of the 60-day period provided for in the Reorganization Act. I think, therefore, I am on solid ground when I suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established by organic law.

All of you know, of course, what happened with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. By a vote, I think, of 268 to 150 the House turned that plan down. We decided that the extraordinary power granted to the President by this act is something that should not be used to set up and create a new department of Government with all of the new functions it will bring about.

So to say that we are taking away from President Kennedy a power which President Eisenhower had, is beside the point. It is a power that has never been assented to by the House of Representatives. Therefore, we cannot go very far wrong, I would suggest, if we adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio and simply amend the reorganization act to provide in section 5(a)1 that it shall not be used and it shall not be employed to set up a new department. The gentleman from Ohio who, after all, by virtue of his position as legislative father of the Hoover Commission and by virtue of his long years of service on this particular committee is probably better versed in reorganization matters than anyone else in this House, has made some of the very points I have sought to bring out in these remarks this afternoon.

Back in 1949 and 1950, President Truman twice tried to use the reorganization act to reconstitute the Federal Security Agency as a Cabinet department. One of those attempts was reorganization plan No. 1 of 1949 and the other was in reorganization plan No. 27 of 1950. In both of these instances the Congress in effect reiterated its intent that no reorganization plan should have the effect of making functional changes in the executive branch of Government.

So I would submit again, and I say it by way of emphasis, in effect the Congress has on at least four previous occasions expressed its will that the reorganization act should not be used for the purpose of creating a new executive department. Therefore, we certainly do no violence to the spirit of the reorganization act and we do not tie the hands of the President and we do not make it difficult for him to use the act for the six purposes set out in section 2 of the act; to reorganize the executive branch and make it more efficient and to introduce efficiency and eliminate waste if we insist that the reorganization authority cannot be used to establish new Cabinet posts. The aims and objectives of greater efficiency and economy in Government can be accomplished through a legitimate use of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I would certainly take issue with those of my colleagues who feel that it should not be extended; that because there has been something less than glowing success in the use of this act during the last 2 years that, therefore, we cast it by the wayside.

It seems to me when you look over the proliferating growth of the executive branch and when you see the payroll and the personnel costs mounting almost hourly that if we ever needed a Reorganization Act, and if we ever needed a Chief Executive with a will to use the act in the spirit in which it was originally framed and passed by this House and by the other body, that time is now. So I hope very much that not only the gentlemen on my side of the aisle but also on the other side of the aisle will join with me and will join with the gentleman from Ohio in amending the act so that we can wholeheartedly support it and so that we can really move forward and accomplish some of the economies that I think can be made possible under the act.

We are merely bringing into the act the internal consistency that ought to be there when we amend it along the lines suggested. I do not think it is possible to have it both ways. We cannot, as we say in one section of this act, have a bar or a prohibition against the creation of new functions by virtue of a reorganization plan—and at the same time permit the creation of a new department. I submit that those two concepts are entirely inconsistent. Therefore, this would be in a sense a clarifying amendment. It was pointed out, I think by one of the previous speakers, that back in 1949 when this act was introduced in the House, the House did have a section which provided that it should not be used to create a new department. It went over to the other body and a conference report was later adopted which eliminated that particular section of the act as it had passed the House.

It was suggested that as a result the House had agreed that hence and forevermore there would be no bar to the creation of a new department under the powers granted the President in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman who was at that time the majority leader and who is now the distinguished Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. [McCORMACK]. He said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 6, page 7838:

> The House for all practical purposes was compelled to capitulate to the Senate.

It would not seem from that statement that there was very much agreement by the majority of the Members of this House to the change that I have indicated was made in 1949 by the action of the other body.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Despite the colorful language of the gentleman from Massachusetts which has just been quoted, the House did recede and agree with the Senate in the conference report, which clearly and distinctly gave to the President the power to create new departments, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would suggest in answer to the gentleman's question that the colorful prose used by the Speaker of the House at that time indicates there was a most grudging assent and that really the gentleman from Massachusetts realized that the intention of this body was that the Reorganization Act contain a prohibition against the creation of new executive departments.

Mr. REUSS. If the gentleman will yield further, it did, however, remain on the statute books of this Nation from 1949 until the introduction of the amendment today, is that not right?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has remained on the books. But to repeat what I have already said. In 1953 this House took affirmative action to make it clear that a new department should not be created by virtue of the provisions of this act. This House in 1962 in voting down Reorganization Plan No. 1 of that year made it quite clear that it would not go along with the idea that this procedure should be employed.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point which I desire to make with respect to the Department of Urban Affairs which has been mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS]. I think it is unfortunate in a sense that we have to talk about this particular provision in the context of the bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. But, after all, it does represent the most recent, indeed, the only effort by the present administration to create a new department. So, there is not much else we can use by way of an example.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that my opposition would extend equally—and I think the gentleman from Ohio would join me in this—that our opposition would extend equally to the creation of a Department of Veterans' Affairs or any new governmental department, because we think that in the creation of a new department, new functions are created inevitably in the executive branch.

As we have already stated, last year the President sought to create a Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs through exercise of the powers granted him by the Reorganization Act of 1949, the act which H.R. 3496 would extend for 2 additional years. This was Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

The merits or lack of merits of a Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs is certainly not germane to the consideration of this bill or the amendment which I have offered.

However, the circumstances surrounding the use of the Reorganization Act to create a Cabinet-rank executive department last year underscore the arguments advanced here today that the act should not be so employed. Let me explain.

In April 1961, the administration submitted to the Speaker of the House the draft of a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The draft was subsequently introduced as H.R. 6433. I want to emphasize that this was the administration requesting the Congress to consider legislation to create an executive department. The President had the right to create such a Cabinet-rank department by submission of a reorganization plan, but, nevertheless, thought the matter sufficiently important to request the employment of the full legislative process to create the executive department.

Subsequently, after extensive hearings, the House Government Operations Committee initiated the introduction of another bill, H.R. 8429, which met some of the opposition to the administration's original bill. I refer to the role of the Federal Housing Administration in the new Department. On August 1, 1961, the committee reported favorably H.R. 8429 with several amendments which were designed to meet further objections to the measure.

H.R. 8429 was considered by the House Rules Committee in January 1962, and a majority of the Committee declined to clear the bill for action of the House.

Incidentally, the rule was denied by a House Rules Committee which had been increased by three members, upon the urging of the administration, in order to clear for House action the legislative proposals of the administration.

Thus the exercise of the regular legislative process in January 1962 failed to bring about the administration's desired objective of creating a new executive department.

Had the legislative process continued to be employed, perhaps the House would ultimately have worked its will on the bill by amendments which would be offered on the floor.

The reaction of the administration to this denial of a rule was the submission of a reorganization plan to bring about the creation of this executive department unless either the House or the Senate within 60 days approved a resolution of disapproval.

However, and this is most significant, the reorganization plan differed substantially from the bill as reported by the House Government Operations Committee. For example, the reported bill would have provided for a Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration to be appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate. This was done to preserve the stature of this agency in the new executive department. The reorganization plan did not include this important amendment.

Now let me emphasize that the reorganization plan to create the Department of Urban Affairs could not be amended but had to be voted up or down. Thus for the House to be forced to vote on the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 was tantamount to the House Rules Committee amending the reported bill and sending it to the House floor under a closed rule. This, of course, would have been fantastic, yet that was the result of the abortive effort of the administration last year to create an executive department through use of a reorganization plan in lieu of the regular legislative process.

The issue is a simple one. Is the creation of a new executive department sufficiently important to warrant the Congress reserving the right to determine the department's structure, its functions, the number of under secretaries, assistant secretaries, their compensation, duties, and so forth?

Or must these matters be determined in their entirety by the executive branch without the right of the Congress to amend or modify them?

Creating a new executive department is an important substantive step in the development of the executive branch. It is important enough to dictate the employment of the full legislative process. Surely, the Congress in 1949 when the Reorganization Act was first enacted must have assigned a special role to the status of the executive departments because the act contained a prohibition against use of a reorganization plan to abolish an executive department, or to consolidate two existing departments.

The amendment that will be offered not only preserves but strengthens this special regard which the Congress for many years—and the administration—has consigned to the status of executive departments.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed to, so that this legislation can continue to enjoy the same bipartisan support that it has in the past.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman on the very fine presentation that he has made in support of this amendment. I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] in setting forth these additional views which are contained in the report.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the extension of the reorganization plan and this bill. But I do feel that it is important to adopt this amendment and to have this amendment so that the limitation which this Congress has had on the procedure will continue.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee which has reported the bill to continue for 2 years the authority given the President by the Reorganization Act of 1949, I wish to state my support of an amendment which would further clarify the intent of Congress.

The amendment I favor would assure that no reorganization plan under this act could be used to create an executive department. This would be accomplished by amending the section of the act which now provides a similar prohibition against abolishing or transferring an executive department.

By adopting this amendment, Congress can establish definite policy in line with the originally enacted limitations on reorganization powers. The language of the law states:

> No reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress.

Failure to write this clear statutory definition will only further threaten our Federal system with unintended expansion of Executive powers. Far-reaching functional changes were never meant to come within the scope of the Reorganization Act.

Reducing expenditures, increasing efficiency, and promoting economy through the grouping, coordination, and consolidation of Government effort are indeed laudable goals. Their accomplishment under the Reorganization Act demonstrates the utility of this statute.

Now, Congress has an opportunity to amend the act and prevent its misuse or possible abuse.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, those who argue that the Congress gives up nothing by this type of legislation overlook a very important element in the legislative process.

In the making of laws, it is the burden of the majority to effect change. Upon those who would alter the status quo rests the task of winning the majority to their cause. Those who favor no change, or at least do not favor the change proposed, do not have that burden.

Under the Reorganization Act, the situation is entirely reversed.

Upon receipt of a reorganization plan from the President, a legislative burden in the Congress is cast upon those who oppose the change which the President proposes. It is up to them to get together a majority.

This shifting of the burden of proceeding is an unnatural alteration of the legislative process and imposes upon the opposition a responsibility which should not be placed upon it.

Another essential element in the legislative process which operation under the Reorganization Act denies the Congress is the power to amend. This power to improve or perfect a legislative proposal does not exist in the Congress in its consideration of reorganization plans.

Neither the Congress nor any of its committees can alter the plan in any respect. It must vote it up or down.

Under the Reorganization Act, it is the President who legislates, and the role of the Congress is reduced to that of a veto.

I have never believed that such an arrangement is constitutional and oppose an extension of the act on that ground.

This is not to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am opposed to changes in the executive branch of the Government. I believe that the President should be encouraged to make proposals by message to the Congress, setting forth in as much particularity as he deems desirable, such changes in the branch of Government over which he presides as will effect economy and efficiency of operation. He and his administrative leaders in the Congress should retain the same burden of carrying forward a legislative program to accomplish those changes as they exercise in other fields of legislative activity.

There is no meritorious change that the Congress cannot accomplish if it wills.

I consider the Reorganization Act as it stands a delegation of legislative power to the Executive which I believe to be unconstitutional and I deplore this erosion of the congressional function.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation without the amendment which will be proffered by my distinguished colleague who preceded me.

I would like to discuss very briefly the question of making a case for the need of the legislation which I think those who oppose the measure have made very well. It is a fact that the Reorganization Act has been successfully used and that the Congress has had the opportunity to act upon all of the plans which have been sent up here.

Furthermore I will not assume that the status quo will remain in the executive branch of Government. Those who oppose this legislation are those who think that Government will stand still forever. In my opinion and judgement, the executive branches of Government will not always remain in status quo, and there is and will continue to be need for the benefits which were visualized by the Hoover Commission and by this Congress in passing the Reorganization Act. History indicates the truth of this statement. The fact is that history indicates that this act has been and will continue to be a useful tool for us in the management of our executive agencies, and ought to be continued by this body. Over the years 67 reorganization plans have been submitted. Republican and Democratic Presidents both have used the Reorganization Act to bring efficiency and economy in Government.

Those who would oppose this legislation because, they say, it has been abused, again it seems to me have presented a case which is directly contradictory of the point which they seek to make. How do they seek to prove the abuse? They seek to prove their position in saying that certain plans submitted by this administration were not approved by Congress.

How can the President abuse the right granted to him by Congress when he, pursuant to law, exercises the right, and the law further provides that the Congress may disapprove by resolution the action of the President?

How can it be said that the Reorganization Act has been abused because of its use by the President when the purpose of the act is that it be used? In fact, there are some here who seek to make a case against the legislation because it has not been used. How contradictory can the opponents get?

I do not think any reasonable person can interpret the use of the act as an abuse and at the same time cite nonuse of the act as a reason why it should not be extended.

There has been some discussion here about loss of our legislative prerogatives. What is the right to legislate? Is it the right to discuss a bill in committee? Has anyone contended since the Reorganization Act was adopted that there has not been committee action on the plans which have been presented? They have not because in each case the plans have been reviewed by a committee of Congress.

What is legislative prerogative? The right to discuss a matter on the floor of the House in open forum before the citizens of this country? Does anyone contend that under the Reorganization Act this is denied? They do not because the act provides for speedy consideration by the full House even when a committee to which a plan has been referred does not act.

What is legislative prerogative? The right to vote yes or no? Does anyone contend that he has not had the right to vote yes or no on plans brought to the floor of the House?

What is legislative prerogative? The right to introduce a bill? Is there anything in the Reorganization Act which prohibits a Member of this body from introducing a bill seeking to reorganize all or any part of the executive branch of Government? Of course there is not. Those who claim that the Reorganization Act takes away the right of Congress to legislate are in obvious error. Congress can legislate but with the Reorganization Act it has provided another method by which the President can achieve reorganization of the branch of Government within his responsibility; but always the exercise of such right by him is subject to the action of Congress.

The Reorganization Act is an alternative. What power has been lost to any member? Any member may introduce a bill at any time to reorganize. The bill will be referred to the proper legislative committee. If you do not think the Committee on Government Operations is the committee to consider specific reorganization plans, this method is always open to each of us. We have the right to legislate; the reorganization act does not take that away from us.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to section 2 of the act of 1949, page 12 of the report. Section 4 provides that one of the purposes of the act is "to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes." In the opinion of the gentleman, would that not contemplate the possibility of the use of a new department?

Mr. FASCELL. There is no question about that, and that has been done.

Mr. MOORHEAD. So the proposed amendment would be inconsistent with the basic purposes of the act.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct and I thank him for calling attention to this fact.

Mr. MOORHEAD. In subsection 5 it provides "to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government." I would like to ask the gentleman if that does not contemplate the possibility of the use of a new department.

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, the gentleman is right.

Those who oppose the extension of the Reorganization Act for another 2 years use one of their arguments the contention that President Kennedy abused the act in sending to Congress several reorganization plans in 1961 which authorized the regulatory agencies to delegate some of their decisionmaking power to hearing examiners and panels of the agency with a discretionary right of review to be exercised on the vote of one less than the majority of the agency. The plans also consolidated in the agency chairman the housekeeping function of the agency.

Contrary to the contention of those arguing that these plans were not proper, the fact is that they follow closely the very purposes and methods prescribed in the Reorganization Act itself.

There is no doubt that the Reorganization Act applies to the regulatory agencies. This matter has been thoroughly researched by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service which concluded:

> An analysis of the Reorganization Act of 1949, chapter 226, 63 Stat. 203, as amended, 71 Stat. 611 (1957), and of its legislative history, clearly indicates that the act fully applies to the independent regulatory agencies.

Section 2(a) of the act states the purposes for which reorganization plans may be submitted. The first three purposes are:

> (1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;
>
> (2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;
>
> (3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable—

Section 3 then sets out the types of reorganizations a plan may make. Among these are:

> (4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or
>
> (5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions.

Persons may have thought the reorganization plans submitted by President Kennedy were undesirable for a number of reasons. As a matter of fact, three plans were defeated and four were allowed to go into effect in 1961.

Whether or not one favored the plans, it cannot be denied that they authorized officers to delegate functions as prescribed in paragraph 5 of section 3 of the act and that they consolidated part of the agency functions with another part of the same agency, specifically the chairman, as prescribed in paragraph 4.

The plans required action by the agency to carry out any of the delegations which were authorized and provided full protection to the minority by requiring an agency review of any delegated action upon a vote of a majority of the Commission less one.

It is clear then that those who proclaim that the plans of 1961 were an abuse of authority under the act simply ignore the precise language of the act itself. The charge is completely without merit.

Those who make this argument also ignore the cold realities of agency dockets. Since the regulatory agencies were first created, the number of matters presented to them for decision have multiplied far beyond the expectations of those who initially created the agencies. They have been literally overcome by a flood of work which has jammed their machinery and made modernization of their procedure absolutely essential. This the 1961 plans sought to do.

Machinery must be provided whereby the members of the commissions or boards can devote their attention to the important and key matters before the agency and permit the vast routine of matters to be decided by qualified hearing examiners or agency panels subject to a discretionary review. Congress recognized this in allowing four of the seven plans to go into effect.

Some examples of the tremendous increase in the regulatory agencies' dockets follow:

The number of registration statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission increased from 981 in 1956 to 1,628 in 1960. The number of interpretive letters issued increased from 1,981 in 1956 to 3,097 in 1960. The number of investigations commenced by the Commission increased from 362 to 519 in the same period. The number of investment adviser registration applications filed increased from 207 to 305 and the number of broker-dealer registration applications filed increased from 764 to 1,077.

The burden of work upon the members of the Federal Trade Commission also has increased tremendously. For example, the number of cases pending before the Commission itself at the end of the year increased from 213 in 1956 to 449 in 1960 and by April 30, 1961, had reached 522. In 1956 the Commission issued 181 orders of which 173 were orders to cease and desist. In 1960 it issued 372 orders of which 354 were cease and desist orders. In 1956 it issued 192 complaints and in 1960 it issued 503.

The National Labor Relations Board has become a prime example of an agency which has been literally overcome by a flood of work. The total number of petitions and charges filed each year with the Board averaged about 14,000 during the first 10 years of the Taft-Hartley Act, 1948–57. Then the caseload started soaring and reached over 24,000 petitions and charges filed in 1962. Unfair labor practice cases now constitute the majority of cases filed with the Board. In fiscal year 1957 there were 5,500 such cases filed; in 1962 there were 13,479. It now takes about 2¼ years from the time an unfair labor practice charge is filed until an effective judicial decree results. Over half of this time is consumed before the Board. For practical purposes this amounts to a denial of justice in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to an analysis of this subject by the American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, of the Library of Congress. That brief prepared by Donald M. Leive, legislative attorney states:

> An analysis of the Reorganization Act of 1949, chapter 226, 63 Stat. 203, as amended, 71 Stat. 611 (1957), and of its legislative history, clearly indicates that the act fully applies to the independent regulatory agencies. The language of the act itself leaves little room for doubt. Section 2(a) states that, "The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes are necessary." Section 7 defines "agency" as "any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government."
>
> While it perhaps might be argued that the regulatory commissions are not in the executive branch of the Government, and that independent establishment in any case does not refer to them, both the legislative history and the other sections of the act negate this interpretation. Nowhere in the act is there any separate mention of the independent regulatory agencies; nowhere else is there language which might indicate an intention to exclude them from the operation of the act, or to accord them preferential treatment. Section 3, which specifies the findings to be made by the President, refers throughout to "agency." More importantly, section 5, which specifies the limitations on the President's powers with respect to reorganizations, does not limit those powers as to the regulatory agencies, or indeed as to any agencies. In this respect, it is significant that the previous version of section 5 (Reorganization Act of 1945, ch. 582, 59 Stat. 613) contained exemptions for specified regulatory agencies and extensive restrictions on the President's power to effect the reorganization of others. None of these provisions were included in the 1949 act. An analysis of the legislative history of the act reveals that this omission of the exemption provisions of the 1945 act was carefully considered and generally agreed upon.
>
> At the outset, it would be well to specify in detail the provisions so omitted from the 1949 act. Section 5(b) of the 1945 act specifically excepted the following agencies: ICC, FTC, SEC, Nat. Med. Bd., Nat. R. Adj. Bd., Railroad Retirement Bd. Section 5(c) exempted the civil functions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Section 5(d) specified that reorganization plans for the following agencies had to be submitted to Congress separately: FCC, FDIC, U.S. Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration. Section 5(a)(6) provided that no reorganization shall impose, "in connection with the exercise of any quais-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization."
>
> The original House bill, as introduced on February 8, 1949, by Chairman Dawson, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Branch, contained no exemption for the regulatory agencies, nor the restriction found in section 5(a)(6) of the 1945 act. (H.R. 2361, 81st Cong. (1949).)
>
> Both President Truman and former President Hoover, Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, strongly urged adoption of the bill without any exemptions. In a letter to Congress on January 17, 1949, the President declared that "the new reorganization act should be comprehensive in scope; no agency or function of the executive branch should be exempted from its operation." (H. Rept. No. 23, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 3 (1949).) Similarly, Mr. Hoover, in a letter to the Speaker, January 13, 1949, declared that, "the power of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitation or exception." (Ibid., p. 4.)
>
> Both men suggested that the best protection against unwise reoganization plans lay in the authority of Congress to reject any reorganization plan affecting the independent agencies submitted to it pursuant to the act. Similarly, the great majority of speakers at the House committee hearings favored an act without exemptions or restrictions. See, for instance, hearings on H.R. 2361 before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, 81st Congress, 1st session, 135.
>
> The committee report, in noting that the proposed bill differed significantly from the 1945 act, stated that, "It is felt that exceptions even of major regulatory commissions, would seriously hinder the reorganization effort. Many of the regulatory commissions have nonregulatory functions which appropriately might be assigned to a different type of agency." (House report, supra, 7.)
>
> There was general agreement during the House debates that the bill should not include outright exemptions of any kind. See, for instance, 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 893 (Remarks of Mr. HOLIFIELD). Mr. HALLECK expressed the general consensus on this point, "I think probably it has been pretty well agreed on the advice of Mr. Hoover and others that such exemptions should be kept out of this bill." (Ibid., 895.)

Only one amendment providing for exemption was offered, by Mr. Rogers of Florida, to exclude the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, but it was easily defeated. (Id. 914, 918.) As finally passed by the House, the bill contained no outright exemptions. (Id. 923.)

Efforts to limit the President's power to reorganize the regulatory agencies focused instead on a provision similar to section 5(d) of the 1945 act, requiring the submission to Congress of separate reorganization plans for specified agencies, the so-called one-package proposal. Section 5(b) of the original House bill named four agencies, the National Military Establishment, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, ICC, SEC. (H.R. 2361, supra.) In recommending this provision, the House report stated that its purpose was to insure that reorganization plans of those agencies would not be mingled with plans affecting other agencies. Congress then could pass on the merits of the reorganization of that particular plan "without being obliged to weigh the merits of each reorganization as compared with the merits or demerits of reorganizations affecting other agencies." (House report, supra, 10–11.)

Proponents of a strong bill believed, however, that it would be crippling to require a separate reorganization plan to be introduced for each agency, because Congress could more easily express disapproval of a single plan. (95 Congressional Record 896 (remarks of Mr. McCormack).) (It is interesting to note, in this regard, that it was generally stated that the 1945 act contained 11 exemptions, while, in fact that act contained outright exemptions for 7 agencies, and separate plan requirements for the other 4.) Several efforts were made to increase the number of agencies under this provision. The House initially rejected an amendment by Mr. Halleck requiring separate plans for the National Med. Bd., Nat. Railroad Adj. Bd., Railroad Retirement Bd., FCC, CAB, USTC, NLRB, FTC, FDIC. (95 Congressional Record 912, 914); a subsequent amendment to delete the entire provision, now listing 7 agencies, failed, and the bill, as thus amended, passed the House (95 Congressional Record 923).

However, this restrictive provision provoked strong objections when the Senate later considered its own bill and the House approved measure. The original Senate bill, like its original House counterpart, had contained no exemptions. (S. 526, 81st Cong., 1st Sess.), introduced by Mr. McClellan on January 17, 1949. And the Senate Report, written after the House had already acted, stated that, "In order that the President might include essential Government reorganization in conformity with the recommendations of the Commission the committee was reluctant to include exemptions for specified agencies or to retain the House amendments placing certain of them in a restricted category, in the belief that such exemptions might interfere with realinements [sic] that would be desirable and in the public interest." (S. Rep. No. 232, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 15 (1949).) The committee then refused to include Section 5(b) of the House bill; it also rejected an amendment to exempt the Corps of Engineers, supra, 17.

During the Senate debates, Mr. McClellan stated that, "There is no exemption in it, there is not an exception. Every agency, every branch, every function of the executive branch of the Government is treated alike, and the President is granted full authority to submit reorganization plans that might affect any agency or any function of the executive branch of the Government." (95 Congressional Record 6225.) The Senate version soon passed with no exemptions or restrictions whatsoever. (Ibid., 6231.)

The bill that emerged from the subsequent conference had deleted section 5(b), the one-package proposal of the House measure. (Conference report (H. Rept. No. 843), 95 Congressional Record 7827–7829.) The conference report, one of the conferees stated, "eliminates all exceptions or one-package proposals." (95 Congressional Record 7835 (Remarks of Mr. Lovre).) The House approved the changes, and the bill was signed by the Speaker on June 20, 1949 (95 Congressional Record 7934).

There had been even less disagreement over the omission of section 5(a)(6) of the 1945 act. Both the original House and Senate bills omitted the provision. (H.R. 2361, supra, S. 526, supra.)

Mr. Hoover had urged that, "the inclusion of general language intended to prevent the submission of any plan which imposes limitations upon the independent exercise of quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions would, in the Commission's judgment, be unwise. The phrases are extremely vague and of uncertain meaning. Ingenious and plausible argument can be made to apply them to a wide range of functions that should clearly be subject to reorganization procedure." (H. Rept. No. 23, supra, 5.) The committee, without counsel, recommended the omission of this section of the bill.

The Senate report accompanying the bill, in stating its reasons for omitting the provisions, echoed Mr. Hoover:

"The meaning of the provision is vague and its effect would be to make it extremely difficult or impracticable to deal by reorganization plan with independent agencies having important quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions. There is a great deal of precedent in the Government for the administration of quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions by departments * * * yet this provision would prevent the President and the Congress from even considering whether the transfer of a regulatory function from an independent agency to a department by a reorganization plan would be desirable. While it is recognized that the administration of regulative functions must be properly safeguarded, it is felt that a reorganization act should not contain limitations which might seriously interfere with needed improvements in organization. The appropriate safeguard against undesirable changes lies in the authority of Congress to reject a reorganization plan of which it does not approve." (S. Rept. No. 232, supra, 7–8.)

There was little discussion of this provision in either the House or Senate debates, and no amendments were offered to include it. In general, this inaction may be attributed to the belief, expressed by Mr. McCormack, that the President would not divest these agencies of their quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function, but that if he attempted to, Congress could reject his plan by a vote of either House (95 Congressional Record, 896).

We shall now briefly consider the six reorganization plans affecting the regulatory agencies submitted by President Truman pursuant to the 1949 act and approved by Congress (5 U.S.C. 133z–15). It should be noted that in 1950, three other reorganization plans submitted by the President, for the vesting of certain functions in the Chairmen of the ICC, FCC, and NLRB, were rejected by the Senate and hence failed of enactment (House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Department, final calendar, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 27). The plans were disapproved "in view of the fact they would disrupt basic statutory structures under which these agencies operated as provided in specific laws approved by the Congress." (Reorganization of the Federal Government, S. Doc. No. 91, 82d Cong., 2d sess., 3 (1952).) The instant report has not attempted, by analyzing in detail these and other rejected reorganization plans, to determine the limitations effectively being imposed by Congress on the President's power to reorganize. Suffice it to say that very broad powers are granted under the Reorganization Act, and the Congress is always free to reject any plan it chooses.

Five of the reorganization plans approved are quite similar, those for the U.S. Maritime Commission, Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949, 14 F.R. 5228, 63 Stat. 1069; FTC, Reorg. Plan No. 8 of 1950, 15 F.R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1264; FPC, Reorg. Plan No 9 of 1950, SEC, Reorg. Plan No. 10 of 1950, 15 F.R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1265; and the CAB Reorg. Plan No. 13 of 1950, 15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1266. They all provide for a transfer of certain executive and administrative functions from the Commission itself to the Chairman; these are specified as (1) excepting the USMC, the appointment and supervision of personnel, the distribution of business among such personnel, and the use and expenditure of funds; (2) appointment by Chairman of the heads of the major administrative units, subject to the Commission's approval; (3) excepting the USMC and the CAB, the President is given the power to appoint the Chairman.

The sixth reorganization plan was broader in scope. Creation of the Federal Maritime Board, Reorg. Plan No. 21 of 1950, 15 F.R. 3178, 64 Stat. 1273. A Federal Maritime Board was established within the Department of Commerce, but independent of its control as to its regulatory functions, which were transferred to it from the USMC. The remaining, largely promotional functions of the USMC, were transferred to a newly created Maritime Administration, within the Commerce Department, and the USMC itself was abolished.

Lastly, we here briefly examine prior reorganization plans affecting the regulatory agencies. (For a detailed historical review of reorganization efforts, see S. Rept. No. 638, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (1945).) The first reorganization provisions are found in the Economy Act of 1932, chapter 314, title IV, 47 Stat. 382, 413 (1932). This act granted the President power to consolidate an executive agency or effect certain transfers. Section 402(2) contained a separate definition of an "independent executive agency," as "any executive agency not under jurisdiction or control of any executive department." The act contained no specific exemptions for regulatory agencies such as are found in the 1945 act. Because of the impending change of administration, no plans were approved under this law.

The act was revised in March 1933, chapter 212, title II, chapter 16, 47 Stat. 1489, 1517, as amended, chapter 3, title III, section 1, 48 Stat. 16. The term "independent executive agency" was dropped, and a new definition of "executive agency" substituted, which closely resembled the present definition. (Sec. 402.) One of the stated purposes of the act was "to segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character." (Sec. 401(f).) The President's powers under the act were comparable to those contained in the 1949 act, section 403. Again, the act did not contain any outright exemptions or restrictive provisions.

Special treatment for the regulatory agencies first emerges in the Reorganization Act of 1939, chapter 36, 53 Stat. 561. Section 3(b) prohibited the transfer, consolidation, or abolition under the act of 21 named agencies or their heads, or of all or a part of their functions, including all the then existing regulatory agencies. Since this exemption was so complete, there was apparently no need for a provision like section 5(a)(6) of the 1945 act, and in fact the 1939 act contains no such restriction. This brings us to the Reorganization Act of 1945, chapter 582, 59 Stat. 613, whose restrictive provisions have already been noted above. Section 5(a)(6), then, was a new provision, first appearing in the 1945 act, confusing and unclear,

and quickly dropped from the 1949 act. More notably, the 1945 act reduced the number of exemptions for independent agencies from 21 to 7, with another form required to submit separate plans. The trend towards a Reorganization Act without exemption of any kind resulted in the 1949 act.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and beloved chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, we have reported to the House a bill, H.R. 3496, which simply extends the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. This legislation originated in our committee in 1949, and we have supported it over the years. Our conviction is that it is a useful means of maintaining order, improving efficiency, and cutting down waste in this gigantic Government of ours. It is one way to save the taxpayers of this country some money. It was recommended by the Hoover Commission and supported by a majority on both sides of the aisle.

The Committee on Government Operations receives plans. We study and analyze them. We find flaws. We reject some of them.

If they are properly drawn and in the best interests of the country, we support them.

Our members have dedicated their lives to better government. Our subcommittees and their great chairmen are constantly ferreting out and exposing waste and inefficiency in all of the agencies. We work closely with the General Accounting Office and put pressure behind their reports and recommendations. We stay with them until the job is done.

We oppose this amendment to limit the actions of our President. We gave this power to former Presidents. We believe that they used it well. We believe that our committee has done a fine job for the Congress. We take pride in the Congress as a great legislative body. We are jealous of its every prerogative. There are those of us who would not leave the Congress to go to the executive branch in any capacity, because we love the things that we do here and we love the attitude of the membership here. We believe that the Government Operations Committee has done this Congress a great service. As this power has been given to us in the past we have not abused it. This act should be extended. Only last night I went over the reports of the Hoover Commission once again, and they were emphatic in the stand they took where the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government is concerned. I do not believe there is any Member of this Congress who believes that we are dominated, that is, that the leadership of this committee is dominated by the executive department. We are jealous of the prerogatives of the Congress and we do not yield them to the President nor to anyone else. Nor do we cut down on them or mitigate those prerogatives in any way within our power. In carrying out the purpose of the committee it has not been our purpose to bypass any one of the standing committees. There is not a standing committee of the House that would be affected by any plan that was submitted where we did not confer with the chairman of that standing committee and did not work with him and agree with him, and I am happy to say we have the backing and the support of most of the committees of the Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to confirm what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations just said. During the last 2 or 3 years I suppose the reorganization plans affecting agencies of the Government that would come under the jurisdiction of our committee have been just about as numerous as those coming to any other committee of the Congress, if not more so. The gentleman from Illinois, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and other members of the committee, have extended to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the courtesy of discussing these proposals and have extended to us the courtesy of appearing before their committee.

I think the proposals that have been offered have been reasonable. Those that we favored, we appeared before the gentleman's committee and supported. Those that we opposed, we rejected. Some, therefore, were rejected and some of them were approved. That is as it should be.

As far as I am personally concerned I am satisfied with the actions that have been taken by the gentleman's committee and by the House on these proposals. I think a great deal has been accomplished. I think it is a reasonable plan.

I should like to say, if the gentleman will permit further comment, that if there were reasons in 1932 and in 1949 for granting the powers of reorganization to the executive department for the purposes that are so well set out in the present act, and which are again restated in the gentleman's report, then it seems to me that there is a greater need now because we have these agencies of the Government scattered all throughout, not only here in Washington, but the country.

I am interested in the statement that was made by the gentleman's committee some time ago that there is an ever-present need for making changes. I think we are going to see that because we are living in a day and an age, and I think it is going to be accelerated in the future, when these changes are going to be necessary. I for one would like to compliment the gentleman's committee. I do not know at the outset that I was tremendously impressed with this approach to legislation, but insofar as the purposes and intent are concerned, I think it is a good thing and I am going to support the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. DAWSON. At this time I want to express my deep appreciation to the members of the Government Operations Committee on both sides of the aisle. I think we are here to do a job for the people of this country and we should not bring political feelings into it.

I am vice chairman of the Democratic national committee, but I have never brought politics into my handling of the affairs of the Government Operations Committee. I try to do a job as a Congressman. I am grateful for the great support that the membership of this committee has given to me and to the things that we stood for.

I think we can say and say truthfully that we have endeavored to work with both sides. The fact that you are a Republican and I am a Democrat does not overcome the fact that we are here as Congressmen to do a job for the people of the country. I think the Government Operations Committee has done that job, and that is shown by the confidence reposed in the Government Operations Committee by both sides of this House in most matters affecting our committee. We seem to have their confidence and we have tried not to abuse it.

I am hoping that this bill will pass as it came out of the committee because in the committee we gave every opportunity to everyone to be heard. We took a vote on every matter that could be brought to the floor of the Congress. In the judgment of the Government Operations Committee the bill you have before you today as passed by our committee, should have your approval. I think it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the support and consideration you have given us in the past. I hope we will always justify it in the future.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will support the amendment to restrict the power of the President, but I would much prefer to vote against the bill for the amendment makes the present act only a little less worse.

If the President is interested in reorganizing any department or agency of the Government he can send legislation to either the House or Senate, or both, as he does with all other legislation which he desires to sponsor. This is the regular and proper procedure. There is no necessity for extension of the Reorganization Act which effectively puts the legislative machinery in reverse by requiring that Members vote affirmatively if they desire to reject a reorganization plan, and vote negative or not at all if they favor it.

This is a strange and wholly unnecessary procedure, and if it should develop that there is no roll call on final passage I want the record to show that I am opposed to the extension of this act for another 2 years.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3496, extending the Reorganization Act of 1949 for 2 years to June 1, 1965, is a bill which merely allows certain types of reorganization to take place. It does not propose or insure any reorganization at all.

What this country needs is a complete new look at the executive structure of our Government. The last Hoover Commission reported almost 10 years ago. It is time for a new look. There have been vast changes and growth with an ever-increasing amount of bureaucracy and duplication in our executive branch of Government.

I suggest a bill I introduced on the first day of this Congress, H.R. 965, which would fill this need by setting up a new Hoover Commission, with former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower as its head. This commission would have the necessary interest and direction to present efficiency and economy to our executive branch of Government.

I wish the chairman and members of the Comimttee on Government Operations would start hearings on this bill, H.R. 965, without further delay.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z–3), as last amended by the Act of April 7, 1961 (75 Stat. 41), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1965".

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Page 1, immediately after line 7, add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; U.S.C. 133z–3) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "'(1) creating any new executive department, or abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or'."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes to discuss this amendment because I am sure its content and import are well known to everyone here. It has been discussed all afternoon, more or less. Simply, the amendment adds just 5 words to section 5, subsection (a), paragraph (1) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, so as to read:

> (1) creating any new executive department, or

The old act before amendment read, "abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof".

So as the amendment is applied here, the section would read:

> (1) creating any new executive department, or

That is the new language—

> abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof.

And so forth.

The purpose of this amendment is very simple. As explained earlier in debate, it is to clarify the meaning of this section, so that by Executive order it would be impossible to creat any new, basic function of Government, that is, a new department; and that any new department of Government, as a part of the basic structure of the Federal Government, would have to be constituted through legislative action, to wit, the passage of a bill through both the House and Senate and its approval by the President.

I am sure there is no question in anyone's mind as to what this amendment would do.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Brown amendment, although surely not in opposition to its author, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. He is a most valuable member of our Committee on Government Operations and a most genial and wise Member of this body. I rise in opposition because the great impetus behind the amendment seems to be to clarify things. Of all the laws in Congress which do not need clarification, this is it.

The Congress in 1949 expressly gave the President the complete power of reorganization, including the power to create a new department, just as former President Hoover had asked us to do. That power has remained inviolate all the years from 1949 to 1963. Several times, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, it has been availed of by the President. So about the only thing this clarifying amendment will do is clarify the effect which it will have, namely, to take an unwarranted slap at a great President, President Kennedy, who is trying, as President Eisenhower did before him, within his lights and according to his abilities, to send to the Congress from time to time such reorganization plans as will make for economy and efficiency.

But I am going to rest my case on some wise words that were spoken here on this floor just 4 years ago when this body was being asked to give to President Eisenhower once again the complete power of reorganization, including the power to create new departments. These wise words, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 7, page 9190, are as follows:

> There has been a great deal of argument and a great deal of talk here on the floor by those who oppose the continuation of this legislation, saying that it interferes in some way with our right to legislate. Someone said it interferes in some way with the right of the Congress to legislate. But it does not interfere whatsoever in any way with the right of the Congress to legislate on any matter affecting the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government or any of its agencies and departments.

Here I end my quote, I heard those words back in 1959, and I was persuaded by the rightness, justice, and eloquence of the man who spoke them. I am glad to say that an overwhelming majority of Democrats voted to give President Eisenhower that power. The man who said those words is with us today and he is the author of this amendment—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will reconsider his amendment and will search his soul to see whether he was not right in 1959 when he urged us to give those powers to President Eisenhower, and if he will not, by withdrawing his amendment this afternoon, make it possible for us to do unto President Kennedy what we did unto President Eisenhower.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the young man from Wisconsin—

Mr. REUSS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As the years come and go, he will learn that often men say and do things when they are young that they will regret very much when they grow older.

Mr. REUSS. I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, that so far as he is concerned, he is still young and I hope he will prove he is as young in 1963 as he was in 1959.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, wisdom does come with age.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am sure it is in order to commend this distinguished committee and its distinguished chairman for again bringing this legislation to the floor of the House, legislation which we have considered time and again over the years, legislation which grew out of recommendations of a committee headed by a great former President of the United States—a committee on which incidentally our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] served, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Chairman, the question of clarifying and deciding this issue, I think, has been settled time and again. The Congress has clarified the issue and I think it settled the issue in 1953 when this law was requested by a Republican-controlled Congress, and at a time when President Eisenhower was the Chief Executive of this country. I hope the Republicans will do as well by President Kennedy as the Democrats did by President Eisenhower at that time. Because at that time the Democratic vote for the extension of this proposal was 183 for and 2 against. The Republican vote was 205 for and 3 against.

To my Democratic friends may I say that again in 1959 when this matter was up and when our party controlled the House, we passed this matter by a voice vote. We passed this matter of giving President Eisenhower the same authority that we had given President Truman and the same authority which President Kennedy requests.

In 1957 when a motion to recommit was up, with a Republican in the White House, the Democrats voted 164 against recommittal and only 36 for. The Republicans voted 174 against recommittal and only 10 for.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us want to be fair. I think Republican Members who thought this authority was required in 1949, 1953, in 1955, in 1957, in 1959 and 1961, will think that it is required today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California, [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wish to make this remark, that the bill that we voted on and the numbers that the gentleman has recited referred to an extension bill identical with the bill that is before us, not a changed bill. At that time the minority nor the majority did not advance an amendment to curtail the President's power.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman has made my case better than I could make it myself. I stated when I started my remarks that this issue has been debated; this issue has been clarified, this issue has been decided overwhelmingly every time it has been up in favor of giving the President this essential power.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 97, noes 54.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REUSS and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 81.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3496) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans submitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 373, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 175, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—226

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Everett
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—175

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bass
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Secrest
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weltner
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—31

Baring
Bates
Battin
Buckley
Burton
Casey
Clausen
Fogarty
Forrester
Glenn
Gray
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kyl
McLoskey
Morton
Mosher
O'Konski
Powell
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Utt
Westland

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McLoskey for, with Mr. St Germain against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Burton for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Forrester with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Tollefson with Mr. O'Konski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MEADER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MEADER moves that the bill, H.R. 3496, be recommitted to the Committee on Government Operations.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL FROM THE OREGON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a memorial of the Oregon State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlemen from Oregon, Congressmen Ullman and Duncan, and myself, I place in the Congressional Record copies of the Oregon House of Representatives Joint Memoral No. 16, dealing with the problems confronting the vital lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest; also Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 regarding Federal water resources and their use for recreational purposes. Both of these resolutions have been approved by the full legislative assembly.

Senate Joint Memorial 2

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas a question has arisen as to what policy should govern the use of Federal water resources having recreational value; and

Whereas the waters of the coastal ports of Oregon are to a considerable extent within the Federal water resources projects; and

Whereas existing Federal policy takes into consideration industrial development only, and fails to consider recreational development; and

Whereas recreational development and the benefits thereof to the public should be evaluated and charges as an expense thereof should be distinct from other costs of the projects; and

Whereas Senate bill 121 would accomplish these objectives; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact into law Senate bill 121.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

House Joint Memorial 16

To His Excellency, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary to, placement of the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities.

2. That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation suspending the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), with respect to the intercoastal transportation of lumber.

3. The secretary of state shall send copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

GREAT WORLD LEADER

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for days now, an anxious world turned its eyes toward the holy city of Rome where a great man prayerfully awaited the end of his mortal life here on earth.

Then, the whole world was profoundly touched and grieved by the passing of Pope John XXIII.

Born in the foothills of the Alps of humble parents, during his short reign as Holy Father he had miraculously brought new hope and courage to the afflicted peoples of the earth.

Heartfelt compassion permeated his very being. Men and women everywhere were lifted up from human and spiritual bondage to the realization of a new and imminent promise of relief from suffering and oppression, from the dread of widespread bloodshed and total extinction of civilization.

No man since the time of the Saviour himself has so stirred the imagination and the souls of men and women throughout the world.

Pope John XXIII, great in death as in life, mourned by mankind, has taken his enduring place in history as one of the outstanding leaders humanity has ever had.

In but a few short years, his ideas and example have brought the peoples of the world closer together than they have ever been.

Through his vision, his kindness, his infinite love of human kind, this great spiritual leader has done more for peace than the statesmen and armaments of the combined governments of the earth.

Humble and saintly, his love for his fellow human beings knew no bounds. He has left the entire world a precious legacy. It is for peoples everywhere, regardless of color, creed or class, to take courage and inspiration from the exalted work of this great leader, so that in accordance with his plan the world may be liberated at last from the shackles of prejudice, tyranny and war, and may find in Pope John's holy life and love of humanity the promise of universal peace and brotherhood.

Yes, though his eloquent lips are sealed in death, and he has gone to his heavenly reward, for him there is no death. The great work of Pope John will go on until that great day, we pray is not too distant, when earthly man will find the totality of the divine blessings which Pope John's wisdom, unselfish dedication, inspired teachings, and selfless labors have now made possible.

History will record Pope John's name in gleaming letters of gold as one of the greatest encouragers and deliverers of the afflicted, the helpless, and the oppressed. Honored and beloved by all, his great work will persevere and his blessed memory will be with the saints.

In this troubled, strife-torn world, we may all thank God for such a man. May we all be given the strength and purpose to move forward in his lofty spirit toward his cherished goals.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Pope John XXIII has been greeted with universal sadness not only because of his position as Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church but also because of the tremendous personality he was able to project to the world.

This personality, however was not a temporary, vanishing thing but a result of deep-seated convictions and efforts toward the establishment of a world of peace. The universal grassroots effectiveness of Pope John's personal role of leadership in bringing the world closer to lasting peace was certainly felt by Communist rulers who could not disregard, even in their own minds, the effect of the Roman Catholic Pontiff's impact on people throughout the world.

Since the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church is never merely a spiritual ruler, but due to the universal nature of his church is, at least indirectly, a factor in humanitarian and peaceful pursuits, the reign of Pope John XXIII has been duly noted as one of the most active and important periods in the history of the Catholic Church.

He demonstrated effectively that the artificial barriers imposed by rulers of many nations could be pierced by messages worldwide in their concept and altruistic in their content. He has left an indelible mark, and in his passing he is being rightfully acknowledged as a man whose contributions will be recognized for ages to come.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 30 years of service that "Tad" Walter provided the people of his district and the Nation in the House, he achieved a role of leadership and a reputation for personal integrity, and was certainly one of the most respected and effective Members of this body.

His legislative activities in the House were particularly concerned with two vital, dramatic and controversial areas—immigration and un-American activities. As chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he was a constant target of an organized Communist conspiracy designed to discredit the committee and its individual members. The tremendous support the committee received from the Members of the House was in large part a tribute to the effective leadership of "Tad" Walter.

In his capacity as chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, he achieved a nationwide reputation for his knowledge of our intricate immigration laws. Few Members of the House ever devoted themselves as zealously and continually to their responsibilities in such technical fields as "Tad" Walter.

All of us who served with him will remember him as an outstanding colleague, a great American, and an effective leader in a complex legislative body.

He was a warm friend, a straightforward individual; his presence will be missed, and the vacuum his loss has created will be most difficult to fill.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and to his loved ones.

TWIST AN ARM—GET MONEY

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a searching editorial in the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, an independent daily newspaper, under date of May 22, 1963. The lead editorial for that issue caught the eye of many readers with its bold caption: "Twist an Arm—Get Money."

The text of the editorial reveals an apparent violation of the Corrupt Practices Act on the part of an officer of a well-known corporation and challenges "a few more Republicans in the Congress" to do something about this revelation.

As one of the Republican Members of Congress, I accept the challenge and insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. With this act, I serve notice that whatever can be done to bring to justice those who would flout the laws of the land—whatever their political affiliations—will be the order of business for me and for every Member of this honorable body who believes our Government to be—now and forever—a government of laws enacted, enforced, obeyed, and respected by all.

TWIST AN ARM—GET MONEY

One of the Nation's largest aircraft corporations—and several of its subcontractors—may have been euchred into a possible violation of the Corrupt Practices Act by going along with a new method of fund-raising now practiced by at least one segment of the Democratic Party.

The Republican Newsletter, a partisan publication, reveals that on May 1 a letter on the stationery of the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. and bearing the signature of a corporation vice president was sent to Grumman subcontractors. The letter openly solicited advertising for the Nassau (N.Y.) Democratic County Committee Journal, a publication to be circulated at the committee's $100-a-plate dinner to be held at Garden City (N.Y.) on June 1.

The Journal, it would appear, is nothing more than a dinner program. Advertising is being solicited—by an executive of a company holding heavy Government contracts—at the rate of $3,000 a page. The letter soliciting this advertising says: "We have been assured that the placing of an ad with the Nassau Democratic County Committee will excuse any obligation for giving to the National Democratic Committee."

This sort of shenanigan is in direct violation of title 18, section 611 of the United States Code, which says: "Whoever, entering into any contract with the United States or any Department or Agency thereof * * * directly or indirectly makes any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office, or to any person for any political purpose or use; or whoever knowingly solicits any such contribution from any such person or firm, for any such purpose * * * shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The Republican Newsletter queried the office of the Department of Justice about this case and was told that the executive who had signed the letter was not an "individual" and therefore not in violation. Under further questioning the Department spokesman admitted that the heading of section 611 specifically states that it applies to "firms" and that the definition of "whoever" in the United States Code includes corporations.

The issue here is—who has put the arm on business; who is the force in the Government who has told executives of corporations holding immense Government contracts to raise money in this way for the Democratic Party and why? Will the contracts go somewhere else if the money isn't raised? Is the pressure so heavy that a responsible executive of a great corporation is willing to risk breaking the law?

The administration has managed to evade the issue on flagrant violations of the Hatch Act last fall when Government employees were required to make donations to the second inaugural anniversary salute to President Kennedy. There were no prosecutions because, the Justice Department said, no specific complaints had been received.

The little businessmen, the subcontractors to Grumman Corp., are the ones being pressured in this case uncovered by the Republican Newsletter.

Four New York Republican Representatives have asked Grumman to withdraw from this fund-raising scheme—there must be a few more Republicans in the Congress who are concerned with this apparent violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

We ask—what are they doing?

OIL AND DEFENSE

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, communism and capitalism are locked in a life-and-death struggle. Only one can win. In the United States oil has been called the natural resource needed for defense. Russia has become a competitor in this resource which is the lifeblood of our military defense.

General Clay testified before the Ways and Means Committee that this Nation must have oil reserves above and below ground ready to meet any attack in case of national emergency.

Against this somber background of stark reality we find this administration endeavoring to impose additional hardships on the oil and gas industry which even now is in trouble. Drilling costs are up. There is less exploration. Unemployment is resulting. Wells cost more. They must be dug deeper. The cost is greater. The risk is greater. Most important the profit is down, so much so that the profit of the oil industry is only 9.1 percent of invested capital as compared to 10.4 percent average of all other industries.

At this critical time, therefore, it hardly seems sensible to impose an additional $280 million taxation on this heavily burdened industry and yet that is precisely what this administration is attempting to do. This is not just a passing error in judgment. This could well endanger the entire military protection of this Nation. It is high time that the citizens of our country and our colleagues in Congress join to remind the administration that this industry must remain free and profitable rather than gradually be destroyed by burdensome taxation and then taken over by Government through subsidy and eventual control. Because of the seriousness of

this situation, I am including as a part of these remarks a studious discussion, "Russian Oil: Its Impact on the Free World" by Ira H. Cram, an address before the men's forum of the Houston Club, Houston, Tex., which speaks for itself:

RUSSIAN OIL: ITS IMPACT ON THE FREE WORLD

(By Ira H. Cram, chairman of the executive committee, Continental Oil Co., New York)

Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the Houston Club and guests—I got a big charge out of being invited to address this distinguished group on one of my pet subjects—Russian oil; in fact, I feel highly honored. I welcomed the opportunity of imparting to you my thoughts on a subject which I, and apparently you, think is of more than momentary importance.

As an oilman, I might cry crocodile tears over the emergence of a new, rough competitor in this period of surpluses when making an honest dollar is not child's play. But I become more concerned when I contemplate that the great strides made by the Russian oil industry in recent years add immeasurably to the overall power of our arch rival in world affairs. Russian oil is not just an oilman's headache. It is an item of great concern to everybody in the free world. And since oil and gas permeate modern industrial society, an awesome number of problems have been dropped in the free world's lap. I wish I were the omniscient one who could enumerate them and offer solutions.

Much of what I have to say can be gleaned from the voluminous and growing literature on Russia. Perhaps, however, I can add a note or two to the printed page since it was my good fortune in 1960 to spend the month of August in Russia traveling over 7,000 miles while inspecting four oilfields, four refineries, and three research institutions and conferring with members of five planning organizations. I was a member of a delegation of American oilmen under the auspices of the State Department and the American Petroleum Institute.

Then during the first 2 weeks of last September I had another opportunity to meet Russian oilmen and talk shop. This occasion was the second symposium on the development of petroleum resources of Asia and the Far East held in Tehran, Iran, under the sponsorship of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, which is one of the regional economic commissions of the United Nations. Through these contacts with the Russians I obtained some additional information—undoubtedly some misinformation too—learned something about their competency and their way of thinking, and was jarred into doing some serious thinking.

RUSSIA A MAJOR PRODUCER

For many years the Russians had not been a factor in the oil business of the free world. They had once been. Most of us were not around at the turn of the century when Russia was producing more crude oil than we were. Most of us have forgotten that until 1945 Russia outranked Venezuela as a producer of crude oil. And then many of us with these convenient memories probably talked ourselves into believing that the Russians could not amount to much as competitors because they were saddled with a system that made them incompetent to win the oil from their obviously lush hunting grounds.

As it turned out, they were competent enough to drill a mile deep hole in an old shallow oilfield and find a new prolific pay zone. A new major producing province was opened up, the Ural-Volga. After finding the combination they discovered many oilfields in this province, and production now exceeds 2 million barrels per day. Oil and gas fields have been found in other provinces too, and as a result Russia in 1960 regained the position of No. 2 producer of crude oil among producing nations.

Last year's production of 3.7 million barrels per day was almost half ours and nearly one third of the Eastern Hemisphere's. They were producing last year over 15 percent of the world's crude oil whereas in 1945 their production accounted for about 6 percent. Incidentally, in the same period our country's share of worldwide crude oil production declined from 66 to 30 percent.

Of immense importance in their energy picture is the rapidly increasing production of natural gas. Last year's production of 2.7 trillion cubic feet was 8.4 times 1955 production. Russia is now the number 2 producer of natural gas as well as crude oil.

SEEK NEW GAINS

So the Russians have been going great guns. Such performance has whetted their appetite for further gains. Their published goal is to increase production steadily so that in 1970 crude oil production will be double and natural gas production quadruple 1962 production. Since production in the rest of the world is not expected to increase to such an extent, the attainment of these goals would increase Russia's percentage of worldwide production of both oil and gas.

You immediately wonder if such performance is in the cards. Since an increase in production of this magnitude cannot be accomplished without additional discoveries, you may well question the quality of their remaining hunting grounds and question further their ability to improve their technology in order to cope with the many problems that arise as development proceeds from the easy-to-find fields to the hard-to-find ones. A doubting Thomas may opine that they have just been lucky and cannot keep up the pace. So let's spend a few minutes examining critically their potentialities.

The area in which oil and gas fields can be found in Russia covers approximately 4 million square miles, an area 1.7 times as large as the prospective area of the United States, including Alaska. The Russians have one-fifth of the world's hunting grounds; we have one-eighth. The geology of the Russian prospective area is in many respects similar to the geology of ours. The multiplicity of oil and gas fields in the United States is due to a great variety of geological conditions, and Russia appears to have a similar assortment. So the oil and gas resources planted in Russia ought to be larger than ours.

Furthermore, they have just started to find and develop their oil and gas fields, and we are well along. At the end of 1962 they had produced only 15.2 billion barrels of crude oil, and we had produced 70.7 billion. Since there are no signs that the end of discovery is in sight in the United States, I can only conclude that the remaining resources of a geologically similar, larger and less combed-over area are importantly large.

But what about Russia's ability to find, develop and produce oil and gas fields down the line? Resources not reduced to possession are of no consequence. Recent outstanding results could not have been achieved without ability nor could they have been achieved without the benefit of most of the technology developed in the Western World, mostly in the United States. Back in 1934 when we had produced a little more crude oil than they have to date and presumably had explored our country to about the extent they have explored theirs, our explorers and producers would have had a gravy train if they had had 1962 or even 1945 technology. That is the situation in Russia today. Their job has been a relatively easy one. True, they have had their share of luck, but their luckiest break was the inheritance of a great deal of the Western World's modern technology. Modern technology hastens development; witness the rapid development of oil fields in Libya.

TECHNOLOGY LAG NO DRAWBACK

Judging by what we saw and heard and read on our trip, Russian petroleum technology is not up to our par. The technological improvements borrowed from the Western World together with their own improvements in such equipment as the turbo drill and electro drill add up to an overall technology about as advanced as U.S. technology was in the mid-1940's. This is not the serious handicap it might appear to be. In a country in the early stage of development, the Russians can find, develop, and produce for some time to come an abundance of crude oil and natural gas by employing 1945 equipment and concepts. They can meet their specifications for refined products and manufacture all such products they need. They can transport the crude oil, natural gas, and petroleum products efficiently by pipelines.

However, if Russian equipment, concepts and practices were strictly up to date, their costs would be lower. Moreover, Russian extravagance is striking. In oil fields and refineries according to U.S. standards, there are too many people on the payroll and too much idle equipment. The units within a refinery are too numerous, too small and located too far apart. Safety standards in both oil fields and refineries are less rigorous than ours. Training people for the great expansion ahead is their excuse for excess personnel. This appears to be a partial answer; the main reason is surely Government ownership and management. Such extravagance increases costs whether measured in money or construction work not done. In a country with an admitted manpower shortage and in a hurry to advance along a broad front, wasted manpower and material are costly, indeed.

FIND OIL WITH LESS EFFORT

Nevertheless, it has without question taken less effort to find and develop production in Russia than in the United States in recent years. I venture a guess that the dollar costs of the producing end of their business are lower than those of most companies operating in the United States. However, when one makes reasonable comparisons with the Middle East and stretches imagination to the limit, Russian finding, developing, and producing costs are assuredly much higher than the low costs of the Middle East before payments to the sovereigns.

Russian oil men understand that finding problems multiply beyond the skimming-of-the-cream stage, that developing and producing problems mount with deeper drilling, and that refining problems increase with the inevitable demand for more and better products in an advancing industrial society. All of this means that technology must grow with the problems.

Whether or not the Russians can match our performance in advancing technology, they are in all probability adequate to the task of progressively improving their technology and results while borrowing from the rest of the world many new developments. Their technical people are smart and well trained, they work, and they study the world's literature avidly. Authority is still highly concentrated in Moscow, but the degree of decentralization achieved in recent years should improve results.

As always, they also will need some good luck in exploration. Their task of scheduling discovery is as difficult as ours—perhaps more so, since Lady Luck is more likely to smile upon the collective efforts of a multiplicity of competing operators. Herein lies their great weakness. They have the resources, they have smart technologists, they have a modicum of competition among the Soviet states, but they do not have thousands of competing independent operators striving daily to outdo the other. Without a shadow of doubt our success in developing our resources—our success in all other fields—is due to the competition of individuals large and small. At some unpredictable date when the Russians have to depend upon the smaller, deeper, more obscure—harder to find—oil and gas fields, they will discover that such are found in quantity only by a multiplicity of effort with each operator gambling his own money on his own ideas. No amount of state planning can simulate this amazingly productive process. Would-be planners in Washington please take note.

NEW FINDS

But let us not assume that this flaw in their armor will work to their disadvantage in the near future. They can ride along for several years highgrading their resources. Their geological and geophysical program is large and far flung. They were operating more geophysical crews in 1961 than the entire free world, and are still expanding the effort. Exploratory and development drilling more than doubled in the last 10 years and is still on the increase.

In recent months they have discovered oil fields east of the Ural Mountains. Previously only gas fields had been found in this western Siberian Basin. New oil and gas fields have also been discovered east of the Caspian Sea, and the Russians are particularly proud of one of the oil fields. Their large scale water injection program should increase production and ultimate recovery of producing fields. In short, their production goal of 4.8 million barrels of crude oil per day in 1965 (an increase of 29 percent over 1962) appears attainable, and perhaps they can reach the natural gas goal of 14.5 billion cubic feet per day. But it would be no great surprise if the targets were not reached or were surpassed. Such is the unpredictable nature of the producing end of the oil business. After 1965 deficiencies in Russian drilling and production equipment and shortages of oil field tubular goods may hamper considerably the required stepped-up drilling campaign.

LEARN FROM UNITED STATES

The No. 1 problem of any extractive industry is capturing the mineral that Mother Nature has cleverly hidden in the earth's crust. The Russians have solved this problem, at least for a few years. We taught them many of the tricks of finding and developing oil and gas fields, and we taught them and the rest of the world how to put oil and gas to work. It is no secret today that there is a close relationship between the consumption of energy, particularly hydrocarbon energy, and a nation's industrial strength and well-being. Having taught the world the might and comfort of petroleum, we now see Russia and other industrialized nations going our way in the matter of consumption of liquid and gaseous petroleum and see practically every other country, however impoverished, struggling to industrialize in a hurry and striving to develop within their borders the energy indispensable to industrialization, particularly oil and gas. They all have something else in mind—petrochemicals—knowing, no doubt, that the value of petrochemicals produced in the United States last year was more than half the value of all chemicals.

In the 1950's the rate of increase in the consumption of energy was greater in the Iron Curtain countries than in other regions of the world, and the rate of increase in their consumption of oil and gas was exceeded only by the Far East. The Russians are definitely moving toward us in the consumption of energy; for instance, replacing their poor, expensive coal rapidly with natural gas. They have a long way to go, however. The United States consumes 2.2 times as much total energy and almost 4 times as much hydrocarbon energy as Russia. Our per capita consumption of total energy is 2.7 times theirs, and our per capita consumption of hydrocarbons is about 4.6 times theirs. Worldwide, there is a close, though inexact correlation of per capita national income and per capita consumption of energy. Our per capita national income has been estimated to be 3.3 times Russia's.

ANTICS IN EXPORT

Unquestionably, Russia has become stronger industrially and a little more comfortable by stepping up the consumption of petroleum products and natural gas and assuredly their policy of exporting crude and products strengthens them further internally and externally. Since their antics in the export field are the subject of world-wide debate, I shall devote a moment or two to the subject.

Exports to the free world began in 1955 with 116,000 barrels per day of crude oil and products, equivalent to 8 percent of Russian crude oil production but less than 1 percent of the free world's production. Last year such exports were over 600,000 barrels per day, almost 17 percent of Russian crude oil production, and a little over 3 percent of the free world's production. During this period their exports grew at a compound rate of 32 percent per annum while free world consumption grew at a compound rate of only 6 percent per annum. It is estimated by several observers that their exportable surplus may reach 1 million barrels per day in 1965 with internal consumption still on the rise.

OIL BRINGS IN MONEY

One might ask, "Why don't they keep the stuff at home, build more roads and automobiles, improving the lot of their people? Don't they know it's a little awkward to brag about the high standard of living in Russia when our motor road mileage and our motor vehicles per capita are about 23 times theirs?" The answer is pretty obvious. Petroleum is their only source of lots of hard money to be used to buy the things they need including technology and incidentally, to buy political influence. The Russians need metals, metal shapes, transportation machinery, tankers, machine tools, complete manufacturing plants, electronic equipment and large diameter line pipe, to mention a few, most of which are products of advanced technology. The building of their elaborate system of large diameter crude oil and natural gas pipelines has been greatly hastened by imports of such pipe from Italy and West Germany. This pipeline system will not only improve the efficiency of operations within the Soviet Union but will facilitate exports to the Free World and satellites. The gas pipelines will result in the displacement of coal but will also make more crude oil and products available for export.

There are also military advantages in such a distribution system. Apparently, they are willing to pay a premium for these products of the Free World's advanced technology. In 1960 they charged their satellites almost twice as much for a barrel of crude oil as they charged the Free World. Although they overcharged their satellites, in effect making their satellites subsidize a part of their export program, they undercharged West Germany and Italy, for instance, possibly selling the oil below cost but getting the big pipe and other indispensable material.

POLITICAL USE OF RESOURCES

But it would be hard to convince any oil man competing in the world marketplace today that they do not have another motive in mind—a sinister one. It is surely the spreading of Russian ideology and influence throughout the world by exploiting their newly acquired oil prowess to the fullest. There is no finer example of the contribution of free, competitive enterprise to the welfare of people than the oil business. This business has grown throughout the world because its operations were not planned by the state. The planners of Russia simply must remove, or at least discredit, this fine example of success without state planning—must discredit this glowing symbol of how to do a better job without communism, if you please.

One facet of the attack is in the field of pricing. When the Russians sell oil in the free world at prices which oil men could not meet without incurring losses or making, at best, Lilliputian profits, these oil men are weakened. Government-to-government barter agreements weaken seriously the basis for continued private trading in oil. The Russians, hard traders, must figure a profit has been made on each trade, but they are at liberty to compute profits in ways unavailable to competing businessmen, large or small, who are subject to rigorous economic discipline. Profit can as well be measured in terms of political hay made as in terms of scarce materials traded for. The Russians are well aware of their favorable trading position and are pushing it relentlessly.

The other facet of the attack impresses me as just as serious, maybe more so, with far-reaching implications to the free world. Do you know that 30-odd nations have organized government controlled national oil companies to operate some portion of the oil business? Certainly you know that when a government organizes a national company to engage in competitive business, it has taken a long stride toward a planned economy, Soviet style. The Russians recognizing this are active in supporting these national companies with long-term, low-interest loans and technological assistance. Some of the countries—India, for example—have accepted such aid. Of course, the largest government controlled oil company is in Russia. Significantly, about 62 percent of Russian exports of crude oil go to countries with government controlled oil companies. Wouldn't it be lovely, Ivan says, if all the oil business were in the hands of government controlled oil companies. We must have more of them.

PROMOTING THEIR SYSTEM

At the ECAFE meeting in Teheran, Iran, I saw the Russians in action promoting their system. The meeting was attended by representatives of privately owned oil companies and government owned oil companies together with officials of the various governments. The entire spectrum of politico-economic ideologies was convened in one room with the Russians at the totalitarian end and the Americans at the opposite, free enterprise end of the spectrum. Discussion was lively. When the representatives of government owned oil companies, all ambitious to achieve self-sufficiency in oil in a hurry, raised questions as to how to reach their goals, the Russians always jumped to their feet with an answer. State planning, Russian style, gets the job done. Russian technology, superior to all, gets the job done. Recent performance in Russia is proof sufficient. And incidentally, the international oil cartel is not only incompetent but it will bleed you to death. The way to accelerate exploration and development in developing countries and outstrip the supposedly feeble efforts of the privately owned oil companies is obviously to accept Russian aid.

So at the drop of a hat, the Russians promote their system aggressively and must make some political hay in the increasing number of totalitarian minded countries. Seemingly, the powers-that-be in a budding planned economy find it palatable and reassuring to trade and agree with those of an established planned economy. It was distressing to me that at no time did an ECAFE nation or the United Nations Secretariat decry the increasing degree of government control of the oil business.

Even though national oil companies have proven to be generally inefficient, they survive in spite of the economic facts of life. Furthermore, they do have a monopoly on some portion of the business, thereby reducing the opportunities of the privately controlled companies to expand as the market expands. Truly, nationalism is working relentlessly in the direction of whittling down the strength of our international companies, the strength of our largest foreign investment, if you please, and hence our overall power in the world. To the extent our own Government may directly or indirectly finance these national companies it is working against itself. Moreover, when a government nationalizes an industry with a degree of success, other traditionally competitive industries are more subject to the same treatment. And the process, if carried out to conclusion, results in the creation of another totalitarian state. Whether or not the process goes that far, I think you can see that the world outside the Iron Curtain known as the free world becomes less free almost daily with the help of the Russians using oil as another weapon in their propaganda arsenal.

PROPAGANDA WEAPON

I also think that by now you know I have concluded that Russian oil is seeping into, and complicating, the lives of everybody outside Russia. Anybody who calculates he is insulated is just dreaming. He who gambles that the present troublesome aspects of Russian oil will, somehow, fade away is the kind of customer they love in Las Vegas.

Gentlemen, we found that we had a tough competitor on our hands soon after the close of World War II. Now we find he is basically tougher at home and abroad by virtue of the discovery of important quantities of oil and gas. Remember always that we are no longer unique among the large industrial nations as being more than self-sufficient in oil and gas. Our most aggressive adversary in world affairs also now has supplies of oil and gas within his borders adequate to make him more than self-sufficient. Oil and gas in quantity have increased the industrial and military power and comfort of his people. The satellites which consume more hydrocarbons than they produce are at his mercy for he can supply them and insists upon doing so, thus increasing his hold upon them. He now has money in his pocket to buy from the more advanced countries beyond the Iron Curtain those things he needs to make him still stronger. And his newly acquired wealth and accompanying prestige enable him to pursue more relentlessly and with more success his old hobby of converting others to his Communist faith.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved colleague and friend, Francis Walter, the Nation has sustained a great loss. We have lost more than a skilled legislator and parliamentarian. Gone now is his valued counsel in domestic and foreign affairs; gone too, is the quiet example of a dedicated public servant who by the strength of his character and the sincerity of his convictions gained the respect of all those who knew him.

For 14 years, though representing different States, "Tad" Walter and I shared a common district boundary, with the commonality of problems and aspirations that go with such geographical closeness. He was as ready to apply the great experience of his 30 years in Congress to our common interests as he was to use it with respect to the grave national and international problems of the day.

His legislative triumphs stand as a constant reminder of his sincere interest in the distress of the less fortunate, and of his concern for the security of his country. "Tad" Walter's parliamentary skill could almost be classed as legendary in the annals of this great body. By the fairness and dignity by which he conducted himself in his office he enhanced the image of the legislative branch as a whole.

For all these things, Francis Walter will be remembered. I choose to remember him, also, as a fellow member of Phi Delta Theta fraternity, whose interest in the education and activities of today's college student endeared him to us all.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation will miss Francis Walter as a dedicated public servant, just as the Members of this body will miss him as a friend and respected colleague. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones.

EXTEND BENEFITS OF WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the War Claims Act to provide compensation for persons who at the date of enactment of this bill are American citizens and who "while serving in the military, naval or air forces of any government allied or associated with the United States during World War II, were taken and held as prisoners of war by any government with which the United States was at war during World War II," and who "while nationals of the United States or of any government allied or associated with the United States during World War II, were imprisoned contrary to the standards established by international law in any jail, prison, or concentration camp during World War II by any government with which the United States was at war during World War II."

These two groups actively helped us to win the war. They are American citizens now, and their valid claims should be considered by our Government, since there is no one else to whom they may look for relief.

The War Claims Act of 1948 provides a payment of compensation for the members of American combat units held and mistreated by the enemy in prisoners of war camps. The same act established standards and rates for the compensation.

The amendment of 1959—Public Law 744 of the 83d Congress—extends the benefits of the War Claims Act for the American citizens who "served in military or naval forces of any government allied with the United States."

My amendment would extend the same benefits for the same reason to those who at the day of enactment of this bill will be American citizens.

The estimated value of the claims would not exceed $36 million for approximately 12,500 claimants. This includes also about 200 native-born Americans who were held prisoners in German concentration camps.

No tax revenues would come out of the Treasury to fulfill these claims. The balance of the war claims fund after payments under Public Law 87-846 would be used as the source of payment.

In view of the settlement of claims of alleged owners of General Aniline & Film Co. sufficient funds will be available not only to satisfy the provisions of Public Law 87-846 but also to pay claims under my amendment.

POPE JOHN THE GOOD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Pope John the Good is dead. The world mourns its loss. It grieved over his suffering. It wondered why this great and good man should lie in torment. Yet it is through his illness that the world became most aware of his greatness and his goodness. Day by day the world listened for word of him and gave thought to his inspiring life, his concern for humanity, his efforts to find a solution for its ills, his application of true Judeo-Christianity, and his extention of its message of peace to all mankind. His good deeds, his greatness of spirit, his magnitude of soul—these were brought to the minds of men the world over through his pain, as he neared his end.

Has it not been ever thus? The world seldom pauses to praise, to appreciate its fellows until for them there is the pain of ending. Few persons hear their eulogies. Still fewer are aware how far their candle sheds its light, either in life or in death, in the present or in generations to come.

The Pope was too ill to know that millions were saddened the world over; that his praises were broadcast from country to country, with restrained emotion, with profound respect, with unbiased sincerity. Christians, non-Christians, persons of all faiths, and even professed nonbelievers were joined in sorrow and appreciation of Pope John the Good. This unity of thought which stretched around the world was prolonged by his illness. As he lingered on, not only did the world become more and more aware, but history will record that, if only for a moment, there was unity, that many elements were sublimated to a oneness of thought, a sincere accord in concern and reverence for this man of peace, this man of God. The extension of this moment would be the fulfillment of his dream. For it is well known that the three stated aims of Pope John were the reform of his church, the unity of all Christians, and the joining of the world in the cause of peace.

Before he became Pope this man of the cloth had been actively engaged in humanitarian actions of benefit beyond the churchly limits of his profession, in the liberalization of those limits, and in his application of his tenets that true Christianity consisted of deeds as well as words evidencing one's love of God and of one's neighbor as oneself.

Highly significant was his little publicized action in saving many Jews from their desperate plight in Hungary under the Nazis. Through his influence, as Cardinal Roncalli, they were baptized, aided in escape, and eventually found refuge in the United States. Their story is told by a high official appointed by Roosevelt to do refugee work, who later became one of the chief officers of UNRRA—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Ira Hirschman, in his recent book, "Caution to the Winds"—pages 181 to 184.

The Pope's personal liberalization of thought, his concern for all humanity, his desire to take concrete measures in the promotion of world peace was further evidenced by his willingness to give audience to all men. The world noticed when he received the son-in-law of Khrushchev. The Christian world was pleased when he was visited by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the highest dignitary of the Protestant Church of England. Applied Christianity, in the truest sense of the world, brotherhood, and concern for a peace that is worldwide—these are the principles for which Pope John the Good has stood, has worked in definite and unusual ways to promote, and has instilled in the minds of those who heed his message.

The universal respect which he gained in the few years that he was Pope bears witness to the remarkable fact that one man in his time can do so much good, and that his goodness and greatness will live on for future generations.

It was my honor and privilege to be a member of the first congressional delegation which His Holiness received after he ascended to the Papacy and to again be received by him as a member of the President's delegation to the Centennial on Italian Unification.

I will always remember his response when I was presented to him and he was advised that I was of the Jewish faith. The Holy Father responded, "We are all God's children; if it were not for Judaism there would be no Christianity."

On May 26, 1963, the board of trustees of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, of which I am a member, unanimously recommended the transmittal to Pope John of the following message:

> The board of trustees of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations meeting at its annual spring board conference at the Union of American Hebrew Congregations' House of Living Judaism, 838 Fifth Avenue, New York City, on behalf of our 650-member Reform Jewish Congregations and over 1 million adherents in North and Central America herewith convey to you our formal and sincere commendation for your inspired religious vision which your Encyclical on Peace has given to mankind. We pledge ourselves to join with men of good will of all faiths and races in building that war-less world in which children of God may live in one brotherhood as envisioned by the Prophets of Israel.
>
> We especially send our profoundest hopes for your speedy recovery and for continuing years of good health.

A saintly man of peace has been called to his eternal rest. May his memory be for a blessing forever.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, "Ut unum sint." These were the words of Christ at the Last Supper. And with these words, "That they be one," Pope John XXIII, the Pope of unity and peace, breathed his last.

And the whole world mourns him, this humble priest whose life was dedicated to uniting the peoples of the world into the human family. There was a singleness of purpose in his priesthood and in his life, and he sought to demonstrate it by his wisdom, his humility and his great love and deep understanding of the problems of man. Truly he was Pontiff—a "bridgebuilder"—so that those who walked as strangers in different parts of the world stream might one day walk together in understanding—with love and faith as the divine spark uniting them.

His goal was to reach the heart of mankind and this he did with a love that was born of God. His greatness was in his humble simplicity—and he was rich with giving.

And though he was John, he carried sealed in his heart the eternal words of St. Francis of Assisi:

> Lord, make me an instrument of Thy Peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.
>
> O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved, as to love, for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

Is it any wonder that the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Episcopal Washington Cathedral, sums up so eloquently his description of Pope John:

> Men loved him, because he so obviously loved. Not just his own flock, but all Christians will, I think, accord Pope John the affectionate preeminence that love alone can earn among the leaders of Christendom in this century. I have no doubt he will be remembered as first among us all.

In his own words to his neighbors in Venice, Pope John said:

> I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than that which divides and gives rise to differences.

In the words of the lead editorial in today's New York Times:

> He will be mourned by many more than those who hold the same faith, because he gave something good, useful, even precious, to an era that needed his qualities and his gifts most desperately.

BAN ON BRACEROS: A BETTER ALTERNATIVE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to the excellent and timely editorial in the New York Times on June 3 expressing approval of our recent action to terminate Public Law 78 at the end of this year.

As this article so clearly points out, and as the arguments and statistical data presented during the extensive debate in the House on May 31 make perfectly clear, "The time has come for the clean cutoff the House has ordered when the present law expires December 31, 1963."

I would again urge those who feel that this cutoff will result in injury to their districts, to join in the effort to provide adequate programs of housing, recruitment and transportation for American farmworkers; for those workers who in 1961 were able to find, on the average only 134 days labor in agriculture for the completely inadequate income of $881; for those workers who have an unemployment and underemployment rate equivalent to 1,400,000 fully unemployed persons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early and favorable action on this needed legislation which has been introduced by me and many other Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the editorial from the New York Times and a copy of H.R. 4518:

BAN ON BRACEROS

> America's most disadvantaged workers—the half-million migratory farm laborers and their families—will be the chief gainers from the decision of the House of Representatives to end the program under which hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros have been brought into the United States to help harvest our crops.
>
> The program was started during the Korean conflict to relieve an acute shortage of agricultural labor and to halt the illegal flow of "wetbacks" across the Mexican border. It has become a device for perpetuating the exploitation of domestic farm workers by permitting growers to draw on a limitless pool of low-wage labor from south of the Rio Grande. With 4 million Americans jobless, the only difficulty farm owners still have in getting enough workers stems from the abysmal standards of pay, housing and health that attend agricultural employment.

The great bulk of the Mexican workers go to a relatively few large corporate farms. Numerically, these make up only 1 percent of the national total, and the availability of braceros has given them an extra advantage over the vanishing family farm. Unquestionably, the withdrawal of cheap labor will spur the huge "factories in the field" to more rapid mechanization. But no one will mourn the contraction of jobs that pay as little as 60 cents an hour for backbreaking toil. For all migratory workers, average earnings remain less than $1,000 a year.

Since 1959 the number of Mexican farmhands brought here for seasonal work has dropped from 437,000 to 195,000. More decent wages and fuller use of the recruitment facilities provided by the U.S. Employment Service will overcome any adjustment problems in cutting off further importation. Since farm labor costs now account for only 5 cents of every dollar the consumer pays for food, retail prices should not be greatly inflated by more economic justice for the reapers of our crops. Any damage to the Mexican economy should be offset through direct foreign aid, not through an involuntary subsidy by the poorest of American workers.

The program's one real benefit has been in combating the influx of "wetbacks." Their total has shrunk from more than 1 million in 1954 to 30,000 last year. But the stability of the figure in recent years indicates that vigilance by the Immigration Service should be adequate to keep it from becoming a major problem again. The time has come for the clean cut-off the House has ordered when the present law expires December 31.

H.R. 4518

A bill to amend the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (48 Stat. 113; 29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), is amended by inserting the heading "TITLE I" before the first section, and by adding at the end of such Act a new title as follows:

"TITLE II—VOLUNTARY FARM EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

"Legislative findings and declaration of policy

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress finds that (1) an adequate supply of agricultural labor is essential to the Nation's health and welfare; (2) the insecurity and instability of agricultural employment has rendered such employment relatively unattractive; (3) in many cases agricultural workers have traveled unnecessarily long distances to obtain agricultural employment when such employment was available at relatively shorter distances; (4) shortages of agricultural labor in some areas have existed at the same time that surpluses of such labor existed in other areas; (5) the filling of such shortages with qualified, dependable agricultural workers would aid in reducing the serious rural unemployment and underemployment in this country; (6) the need for agricultural labor can be met and fuller employment for agricultural workers can be provided in many cases only through assisting such workers to travel, in many instances across State boundaries, to areas in which agricultural labor shortages exist; (7) steadily increasing mechanization has resulted in greater demand for skilled agricultural workers; and (8) the need for agricultural labor can be better met, agricultural employment can be made a more stable and attractive means of earning a living, and fuller employment can be promoted through improvements in the recruitment, training, transportation, and distribution of agricultural workers.

"(b) It is hereby declared that the policy of the Congress is to meet the Nation's needs for agricultural labor, to make agricultural employment a more stable and attractive means of earning a living, and to promote fuller employment. It is the purpose of this title to effectuate such policy by authorizing the Secretary to develop and maintain, through the voluntary cooperation and the voluntary participation of employers and workers, improved methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers.

"Supplemental nature of program

"SEC. 202. The authority of the Secretary under this title shall be in addition to and not in place of any authority under title I of this Act.

"Preservation of individual choice

"SEC. 203. Nothing in this title shall be construed as denying (1) the right of any worker to accept or refuse agricultural employment with any employer, or his right to refuse to enter into an agreement to perform work of a nature he does not wish to perform, or (2) the right of any employer to refuse to offer agricultural employment to any worker, or the right to offer agricultural employment to any worker of his choice.

"Definitions

"SEC. 204. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'agricultural employment' means services and activities defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended.

"(2) The term 'employer' means any person for whom agricultural employment is performed, or association of such persons, but shall not include any employment or labor contracting agent.

"(3) The term 'worker' means any individual who is a permanent resident of the United States and engaged in or available for agricultural employment.

"(4) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor or his duly authorized representative.

"(5) The term 'United States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"Program authorized

"SEC. 205. (a) In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) recruit qualified, willing, and able workers to fill orders placed by employers for workers recruited under this title;

"(2) provide for the medical examination of such workers to assure that they are physically capable of performing agricultural employment and suffering from no communicable disease;

"(3) furnish such workers with transportation to and return from areas of agricultural employment;

"(4) furnish such workers with food, housing, and emergency medical care during such transportation and while arrangements are being made for the employment of such workers or their departure from an area of agricultural employment;

"(5) provide such facilities as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title; and

"(6) establish a revolving fund sufficient to pay the cost of transportation, food, housing, and emergency medical care authorized under this title.

"(b) An order by an employer for agricultural workers recruited under this title shall include such information as the Secretary finds necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this title, including information with respect to the type of agricultural employment to be performed, the time and place at which such employment is to be performed, and any particular qualifications or experience that the employer desires the workers to possess.

"(c) No worker shall be made available under this title to an employer unless the Secretary has determined that—

"(1) sufficient qualified, willing, and able workers who reside permanently in the area where the agricultural employment is to be performed are not available for such employment;

"(2) reasonable efforts have been made to attract such workers for such employment (including the offering of wages, hours, and working conditions comparable to those specified under section 207 for workers recruited under this title); and

"(3) the employment of workers recruited under this title will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the area where such employment is to be performed.

"Employee and employer qualifications

"SEC. 206. (a) No worker shall be made available under this title to an employer unless—

"(1) the Secretary has determined that such worker is (A) qualified, willing, and able to perform the agricultural employment specified in the employer's order, and (B) physically fit to perform such employment and suffering from no communicable disease, as determined by a medical examination;

"(2) such worker has been interviewed by the employer (or an opportunity for an interview has been afforded) and has not been rejected by him;

"(3) such worker has agreed (A) to accept agricultural employment, specified as to type, time, and area; and (B) to enter into an agreement, as provided in section 207, with each employer with whom he accepts such employment; and

"(4) such worker has agreed that if, without good cause, he fails to comply with any agreement entered into by him pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection and such failure is a material violation of such agreement, such worker will reimburse the United States for expenses incurred by it in furnishing him transportation, food, housing, and emergency medical care under this title. The amount of the reimbursement in any such case shall be determined by the Secretary, taking into account the amount of employment performed by the worker pursuant to his agreement under paragraph (3) (A) of this subsection.

"(b) No worker recruited under this title shall be made available to an employer unless such employer has agreed that if he employs such worker he will—

"(1) pay the United States a fee, not to exceed $15 (without charging the worker therefor) to cover expenses incurred by the United States in furnishing transportation, food, housing, and emergency medical care to workers recruited under this title;

"(2) furnish transportation (without charging the worker therefor) from a point designated by the Secretary in the area of employment to the point of such worker's employment and return;

"(3) enter into an agreement with the worker, or his representative, as provided in section 207; and

"(4) maintain such records relating to the earnings, deductions, and hours of employment of the worker, as the Secretary may by regulation require.

"Employment agreement

"SEC. 207. Any agreement between any employer and any worker, or such worker's representative, entered into pursuant to subsections (a)(3)(B) and (b)(3) of section 206, shall clearly specify—

"(1) the period of the employment, and a guarantee that the worker shall have the opportunity to work at least three-quarters of full time during the period of the employment (forty-eight hours per week to be considered full time); but in the event an agreement is terminated by an employer for reasons beyond his control, the three-quarters work guarantee shall apply only to the period beginning on the day after the worker's arrival at the place of employment and ending on the date the agreement is terminated;

"(2) the wage rate to be paid the worker, which shall be not less than the prevailing wage rate paid by employers to workers similarly employed in the area in which the work is to be performed;

"(3) the intervals at which wage payments will be made, which shall be no less frequent than those established for other workers similarly employed by the employer, and in no event less frequent than semimonthly;

"(4) that any housing and sanitary facilities made available by the employer will conform to minimum standards prescribed by the Secretary;

"(5) that the employer will provide, at no cost to the worker, workmen's compensation insurance in jurisdictions in which the law permits coverage of the employee; and that in jurisdictions in which such coverage cannot be obtained, the employer will provide, at no cost to the worker, insurance coverage sufficient to provide for the payment of all expenses for hospital and medical care and treatment necessitated by work-connected accident and disease, and, in addition, in cases of work-connected dismemberment, disfigurement, or death indemnities in amounts not less than those required to be provided foreign workers admitted to the United States pursuant to title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; and

"(6) that the worker will perform all agricultural work required of him with proper application, care, and diligence during the period of employment agreed upon; that he will exercise reasonable care and diligence in the use of any housing and sanitary facilities made available to him by the employer; that he will comply with all rules and regulations specified in the agreement relating to safety, discipline, and the care and maintenance of property; and that he will not, except by mutual agreement, perform work for any other employer during the period of the agreement.

"Replacement workers and reimbursement

"SEC. 208. In any case in which the Secretary determines that a worker has failed to carry out the terms of an agreement entered into by him pursuant to section 206(a)(3)(B), and that such failure is a material violation of the agreement, the Secretary shall—

"(1) supply a replacement worker to the employer and furnish such worker transportation to the place of employment without charging an additional fee under section 206(b)(1), or reduce the amount of the fee paid or to be paid with respect to the worker who violated the agreement by an amount that is directly proportional to the period of the agreement that such worker failed to complete; and

"(2) in any case in which a replacement worker is supplied, reimburse the employer in an amount equal to any amount expended for transportation under section 206(b)(2) in excess of the amount such employer would have had to expend if no agreement violation had occurred, or, in any case in which a replacement worker is not supplied, reimburse such employer for transportation expenses incurred under such section with respect to the worker who violated his agreement, taking into account the portion of the period of employment provided for in the agreement not completed by the worker.

"Compliance

"SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary may refuse to make the services afforded under this title available to any employer or worker upon a determination, made after notice and an opportunity to be heard, that such employer or worker has failed, without good cause, to comply with (1) any provision of this title, any rule or regulation implementing this title, or any agreement with the Secretary entered into pursuant to this title, if such failure is of such a nature as substantially to impair the effective administration of this title, or (2) any agreement entered into pursuant to section 206(a)(3)(B) or section 206(b)(3), if such failure is a material violation of such agreement.

"(b) The services afforded under this title may be furnished to an employer or worker who has previously been refused such services pursuant to subsection (a) if such employer or worker demonstrates, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, that he will in the future comply with the requirements of this title.

"General provisions

"SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a system of recording, utilizing, and making available to employers information concerning the willingness, ability, and specific qualifications of individual workers to perform agricultural employment.

"(b) The Secretary may provide, and may require reimbursement from the worker for the expenses of, transportation, food, housing, and emergency medical care to the members of such worker's family if he determines that the furnishing of such services is a practicable and desirable means of carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(c) Private employment agencies and labor contracting agents may be permitted, to the extent authorized under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to participate under this title in the recruitment and placement of workers.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to enter into such agreements with State and local agencies as he deems proper for carrying out the purposes of this title, and may utilize the services of any other department or agency of the Federal Government for such purposes on a reimbursable basis.

"(e) Any money received by the Secretary pursuant to section 206(a)(4), section 206(b)(1), or subsection (b) of this section shall be credited to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 205(a)(6) of this title.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 211. Any person aggrieved by any order or determination of the Secretary made under this title may obtain judicial review of such order or determination by filing in the United States district court for the district in which such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, within sixty days from the date such order or determination was made, a written petition praying that the order or determination of the Secretary be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Secretary and thereupon the Secretary shall file in the court a transcript of the record upon which such order or determination was made. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of the record and shall have power to affirm, set aside, modify, or enforce the order or determination of the Secretary, in whole or in part. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. Service of process in such action shall be made in accordance with the rule for service of process upon the United States prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts.

"Special studies and projects

"SEC. 212. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Secretary is authorized to undertake such special studies and conduct such experimental, pilot, and demonstration projects as he determines have promise of leading to fuller utilization of underemployed rural Americans and to meeting the labor requirements of employers. Such studies and projects may include, but shall not be limited to, special job training, counseling, resettlement, overnight transient camps, community exchange services, and special placement services. The Secretary is authorized to expend an amount not to exceed $200,000 per annum for the purpose of carrying out such studies and projects.

"Authorization for appropriations

"SEC. 213. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Short title

"SEC. 214. The provisions of this title may be cited as the 'Voluntary Farm Employment Service Act'."

SEC. 2. The Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), is further amended by inserting at the end of title I (as designated by the first section of this Act) the following new section:

"SEC. 14. As used in this title, references to 'this Act' shall be deemed to mean 'this title,' and any reference to the provisions of this Act in any other law or in any regulation shall be deemed to refer to title I hereof unless the text clearly indicates otherwise."

REPORTED INCREASED COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House of Representatives last week, I raised the serious question of reported increased Communist activities in the Dominican Republic. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, and as one who wholeheartedly endorsed efforts to create a free and democratic Dominican Republic, I share the common hemispheric concern that freedom and democracy should flourish in that Caribbean country.

When the Dominican Republic was ruled by Raphael Trujillo, its current President, Juan Bosch, desired and sought the active interest of the U.S. Government and our people in the affairs of his country. By his response to my statement of last week, however, Mr. Bosch apparently sees matters in a different light now that he himself has assumed power.

In his response to my statement, President Bosch significantly had nothing to say about the substance of my remarks—that a growing Communist network poses a danger to the future of Dominican freedom and democracy. Mr. Bosch instead addressed his attention to a personal attack, accusing me of attempting to "dictate the best way" of running the Dominican Republic.

Indeed, I cannot nor would I seek to dictate to the Dominican people or their legitimate representatives regarding the operation of their government. My sole interest, along with that of every other American, is in assuring that no other person again dictates to the Dominican people—whether such a dictatorship is of the right or of the left.

In short, Mr. Bosch should have no illusions that the hemisphere is interested in the elimination of one Dominican dictator in order to create conditions conducive to another. As the first freely elected leader of his people in three decades, he has the great task of creating and guarding a democratic tradition for the Dominican Republic. It is hardly encouraging, therefore, that he chooses to attack U.S. friends of Dominican freedom, while he apparently ignores threats posed to that freedom by Communists operating within his own borders.

But the matter of Communist infiltration of the Dominican Republic is not a specter created by non-Dominicans, as President Bosch's remarks might have us believe. Democratic spokesmen within that country are increasingly alarmed over their President's tolerance toward the country's Communist apparatus, and at the Bosch regime's growing intolerance toward criticism. In a recent report, Jules Dubois, of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, states that Mr. Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party "is preaching class hatred in its radio programs and in speeches, and those who dare to criticize the government are subjected to intimidation and smears."

This report bears an ominous similarity to reports emanating from Castro Cuba during the embryo stages of that regime's march toward Marxist-Leninism. And while the U.S. Government today is officially supporting the Bosch regime in the Dominican Republic, we cannot permit our hopes for the best in that country to blind us to on-the-scene observers' fears for the worst. The Department of State misjudged Castro and miscalculated in Cuba. As a result, communism has a base and satellite in the Caribbean. A repetition of State Department miscalculation regarding a Communist threat to the Dominican Republic would in effect make a Red Sea of the Caribbean, and embolden international communism at tremendous risk to world peace.

Only President Bosch holds the power to set the course of Dominican affairs away from totalitarianism and to reassure friends of his country's freedom that he, as the elected leader of his people, means to preserve that hard-won freedom. No friend of Dominican freedom would attempt to dictate to the Dominican Republic concerning the best way to set this course. But President Bosch disregards the impersonal dictates of history and experience to the peril of his country's freedom. If he believes that he can permit uncontrolled Communist activity within his borders without endangering the freedom of his country, history and experience prove otherwise. If he believes that the inter-American system is disinterested in the fate of the Dominican Republic, history and experience—indeed, the very existence of his government—prove otherwise.

In my remarks concerning the current situation in the Dominican Republic I speak as a Representative in the Congress of the United States and as a longtime supporter of hemispheric freedom and security. And although I do not speak for official U.S. policy—only our executive branch reflects that policy—my duties require that I maintain an active interest in the progress of nations which call upon our own for assistance.

As long as I remain a Member of Congress and chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I intend to carry out those duties.

In this connection, a recent report on the Dominican Republic by Hal Hendrix, Latin American editor of the Miami News, is in agreement with my statement of last week and deserves the study and consideration of all Americans interested in this vital hemispheric matter.

The first report of a six-part series by this recent Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter follows:

RED TIDE RISING IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By Hal Hendrix)

(NOTE.—Is the new "democratic left" Government of the Dominican Republic paving the way for a second Communist conquest in the Caribbean? The Miami News' Pulitzer Prize-winning Latin American Editor Hal Hendrix finds ominous signs in that tortured island nation which he reports in this first article of a five-part series.)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—Subtle and peaceful Communist penetration of the Dominican Republic is progressing with incredible speed and efficiency.

There is ample evidence—ominous evidence—that Communist forces closely alined with Cuba and the Kremlin, aided by naive supporting leftist elements, are working both openly and covertly to turn this country into a second Communist-dominated bastion in the Cafibbean.

It is not a noisy and spectacular transition such as the world witnessed in Cuba. It is being accomplished with considerable sophistication and has managed so far to use a number of well-meaning Americans and Latins as dupes.

Echoes and reflections of Cuba in mid-1959, a few months after Fidel Castro catapulted to power in Havana, are becoming increasingly audible and visible. Missing from the Dominican scene are the "barbudos," Castro's bearded gun-toting guerrillas, and the quick elimination of the organized armed forces at the Castro-type executive walls. Otherwise, many of the sounds and sights are alarmingly similar to those which punctuated the early "social revolution" days of 1959 in what has since become a Communist regime in Cuba.

The transformation process is being unhampered by the often proclaimed democratic government of President Bosch, which was inaugurated only 2 months ago and hailed by the U.S. Government and some Latin American nations as a "champion of democracy."

Top officials and behind-the-scenes advisers in the Bosch government steadfastly deny that communism here poses any real threat or that its influence in Dominican politics and life is growing.

These officials argue vigorously that after 31 years of dictatorial rule by Rafael Trujillo and a year of council-of-state government, the Dominican Republic is at last becoming a "true democracy," and that contrary statements are only the work of last year's election losers. However, behind this smokescreen, the government of the Dominican Republic today is slipping rapidly into Communist control.

One Western diplomat, familiar with the Communist takeover in Cuba, declares that the situation here "is moving 10 times faster than it did in Havana, and this has been called a 'showcase of democracy.'"

There is, unfortunately, puzzling evidence that Washington, which has extended its wholehearted support and praise to the Bosch regime, is not being candidly advised of the sustained Communist developments here by U.S. Ambassador John Barlow Martin.

Sources closely familiar with the American Embassy confide that full reports on the gravity of the situation here have not been transmitted by Ambassador Martin to the State Department or to the White House.

And it is known that one of Bosch's key advisers, Rumanian-born Sasha Volman, who is a naturalized U.S. citizen, has a direct line to a Presidential aid in the White House to press the Bosch government's position, philosophies and line. The Western diplomatic colony here, apart from the American Embassy, feels that Washington consequently is getting a "snow job."

The lack of accurate communication between the American Embassy here and Washington is viewed by some responsible observers as another echo of Havana in mid-1959, when the U.S. envoy, Ambassador Philip Bonsal, was bottling up significant trends and developments.

MISJUDGED CASTRO

As a result, U.S. policy planners in Washington gravely misjudged Castro and the unfolding pattern in Cuba for a prolonged period.

Many responsible Dominicans and others here fear that the State Department and White House now are similarly miscalculating the true Dominican picture and developments.

They point out that the deception taking place in the Dominican Republic is made easier because, relatively speaking, the historically troubled nation which shares the turbulent island of Hispaniola with Haiti has experienced a remarkably peaceful period in the wake of the assassination of dictator Trujillo 2 years ago May 30.

There was no great blood bath after the collapse of the prolonged one-man dictatorship, even though long pent-up hatreds made it susceptible. The chances also were enhanced by the power vacuum which was Trujillo's principal legacy.

While a seven-man Council of State ruled the country last year, an orderly and free election was held last December and Bosch, who had spent more than half his life out of the country as a political exile, won the Presidency as head of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD).

It had been expected that after the death of Trujillo, the Communists would move in quickly to take advantage of the anticipated chaos and confusion. They were only moderately successful in their infiltration schemes.

Last fall, during the October crisis over Soviet offensive missiles and bombers, secretly implanted in Communist Cuba, the ruling Dominican Council of State ordered deportation of known Communists under an emergency law.

COMMIES DEPORTED

A substantial number of Communists were expelled, but the council was somewhat lax in carrying out its announced cleanup of known Red troublemakers.

However, since President Bosch's inauguration, more than 150 of the deported Communists have been allowed to return home and circulate freely.

Some have found government jobs. Others are teaching in a new Communist-front school called the Institute of Social Sciences and Economic Planning. Still others have infiltrated into labor organizations and the University of Santo Domingo.

Many of the returning Communists came from Cuba. Others are known to have returned from Prague. Some came from the Soviet Union and various Iron Curtain countries by way of Paris.

"You can bet your life that these Communists just aren't sitting around enjoying the sunshine after the trips to Havana and Eastern Europe," commented a responsible and concerned Dominican professional leader.

Since the Communists began returning last March, the Bosch government has laid the foundation for a civilian militia. Ostensibly this organization is supposed to merely be for the purpose of protecting sugarcane fields from fires. But many observers here point out there is no need for firefighting vigilantes to have political indoctrination and militia-type drill instruction.

There also is puzzlement over the need for 17,000 of the so-called fire watchers.

INFILTRATION OF ARMY

There are continuing reports that there has been some Communist infiltration in the ranks of the Dominican Army, especially among the lower ranking officer corps and enlisted personnel. A similar toehold is suspected in the police ranks.

Military and police field grade officers are frankly worried about the visible Communist gains in political and public fields—and the lack of a firm stand against it by President Bosch.

There is growing whispered conversation that the day soon may be approaching when the military will demand that Bosch adopt a firm position against the Communists.

The Dominican business community is plainly scared about the Communist direction in the country.

Foreign investors also are apprehensive. There has been no new foreign investment in the country for the last year, and the Bosch regime did nothing to encourage it by driving the Standard Oil Co. (Esso) out of business here shortly after taking office.

"There won't be 10 centavos' worth of new investment in this country until Bosch speaks out in favor of Western policies and against the Communists, especially against Communist Cuba," declared one Dominican business executive.

EVENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the membership of the House the following editorial which recently appeared in the Chattanooga News Free Press:

> A reader has confessed some "confusion" over the flow of recent events.
>
> Why is it, he has asked, that the disorderly crowd that demonstrated at the University of Mississippi last fall was described almost universally as a "mob," but that throughout the North and elsewhere the disorderly crowds in Birmingham have been described as "nonviolent demonstrators" although they degenerated into mobs that stabbed police officers, burned buildings, tore up a brick sidewalk to supply missiles that were used along with broken bottles and bricks to defy law enforcement authorities?
>
> And why, the reader asked further, was there such quick Federal action in Mississippi to arrest Gen. Edwin A. Walker on an insurrection charge, and whisk him away in defiance of his legal rights to an out-of-State mental institution (with charges being dropped several months later) when General Walker's "offense" was his presence at the demonstration and his voicing of disapproval of the Federal force being used—but that Martin Luther King in Birmingham confessed and boasted that he had stirred the mobs and organized them and sent them into the streets to make the demonstrations that became violent, yet King instead of being criticized by Federal authorities has been recipient of solicitous telephone calls from President Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy, and various others of the Kennedy administration?

These questions, of course, are easy to answer—but the answer is impossible to justify.

> It is not good politics in liberal political circles to curb or even speak out against integrationist mobs, whatever they destroy. It is preferable in those circles to condemn the police officers seeking to restore order against great odds and to hail the rioters as virtuous noblemen.
>
> It is good politics in liberal political circles to flout the legal safeguards of our society to victimize, terrorize, and blackmail for a time a decorated hero of our Nation's military service, if he opposes unconstitutionally forced integration. But it would be extremely bad politics in those circles even to speak harshly of an integrationist agitator who admits participation in mob activity.
>
> This is an example of a double standard that exists today—for under our Nation's present political leadership the principle of government by law has been subverted in favor of government by men seeking their own advancement, upholding their own favorites, and persecuting their foes.
>
> There should be equal application of the law to all mobs and to any who incite them.

WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN LEGISLATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, you know, of course, that immediately after the defeat of the wheat referendum, a score of Members of the House, including myself, all representing agriculture districts, introduced wheat and feed grain bills which apply to wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, and at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, oats and rye.

All of these bills are quite similar. Congressman James Bromwell, of Iowa, himself an Iowa farm owner, joined with me in a bill which embodies all the provisions of the other bills. Facts are, that our bill differs from the other bills only in that our bill provides for more liberal payments to participating farmers than do the other bills, our reasons being that since all our bills use only payment-in-kind for making diversion payments, and since Uncle Sam—you—has already bought and paid for with your tax dollars all of these billions of dollars' worth of price depressing surplus grains, we must, instead of spending more billions of your dollars from our already empty U.S. Treasury, use these surplus grains to pay the bill. It is completely justified and proper to make such payments quite liberal in order to induce sufficient participation which will as quickly as possible reduce these surpluses to manageable, safe, ever-normal granary size.

Such a program, Mr. Speaker, will encourage greater and necessary participation. Thus, all grain prices will quickly and steadily increase and the price of livestock and poultry will steadily increase from the present low to a profitable level.

But even more important to all the people is the fact, as records prove, that when the farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents in buying power, they purchase more than twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods annually than do the other average Americans, due to the high cost of all farm machinery, trucks, tractors, building materials, and so forth which most farmers must have in this era of scientific farming. During the past decade, manufacturers and businesses of every nature and our entire economy has suffered the bad effect of our farmer's 80-cent dollar.

My bill is H.R. 6556, Mr. Bromwell's bill is H.R. 6552, and both bills are identical. Here are the main features of the B-J farm bill:

First. It is voluntary. Price support and diversion payments made available only to participants in the program.

Second. It requires land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. A minimum acreage reduction of 20 percent is required with an optional and additional 30-percent reduction allowed.

Third. It provides for only payment-in-kind for making diversion payments. The Secretary could, however, advance the producer cash in accordance with a specific provision in our bill in anticipation of the sale of grain, but there would be no direct payments as is provided under the 1963 feed grain program. If a farmer chose to take the actual grain, however, he would be entitled to a 15-percent bonus.

Fourth. It is based on a market economy. The CCC release price for surplus grain in inventory cannot be less than 105 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. When the supply of grain is back to a normal supply this release price would be 115 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges and CCC would be required to make equivalent market purchases for grain which has been sold as being "out of condition." The release price for grain used to redeem payment-in-kind certificates would be at the current support price, less reasonable carrying charges. Other major provisions include:

Time: Applicable to 1964 and subsequent crops; support price: 65 to 90 percent of parity; base period: 1959–61; diversion rates: Up to 80 percent of normal production times county support rate on first 20 percent reduction, also up to 80 percent on next 30 percent reduction; longer term retirement: Up to 80 percent diversion payment for acreage diverted for periods of from 3 to 5 years; advance payments: Up to 50 percent at sign-up time; diverted acres: Control weeds and pests, allow oilseed crops at up to one-half regular diversion rates; small farms: Allow retirement of entire farm base if less than 40 acres.

After the present surplus of wheat and feed grains had been reduced to a normal supply, price supports on wheat and feed grains would be set on the designated grains at 90 percent of the previous 3-year market average. All acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the designated grains would be repealed. There would be no referendum since this would be a voluntary program.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be given the necessary authority for the next 5 years to extend expiring contracts on farms now included in the Conservation Reserve program. Under our bill, these contracts could be renewed on a bid basis for an additional 5 years. In 1964 some 7.4 million acres of Conservation Reserve land is scheduled to come back into production due to expiration of contracts in 1963.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be given specific authority to take action before the U.S. Tariff Commission for the relief of any surplus U.S. farm commodity suffering from excessive imports from foreign nations. Present law limits his authority to action on commodities under price support. This provision would give the Secretary a valuable legal tool to help U.S. livestock farmers. Such a law is now a must, as foreign imports of livestock and processed meat are coming into our country by the millions of tons annually in competition with our domestic producers, which has driven the price of livestock down already almost to a point of no return. Hence, the time is long past due to protect our own livestock raisers and feeders with a tariff on such imports high enough to warrant all the risks they take in keeping the American table supplied with good, wholesome, properly inspected meat at a fair and reasonable price.

FOR CORN

In order to make the effect of our bill easy to understand, let us assume that a farmer has a corn base of 60 acres, and he decides to reduce these acres by 25 percent or 15 acres, and his average yield is 70 bushels per acre. He would receive a Government certificate for 80 percent of 1,050 bushels, which is 840 bushels, and on the basis of $1.20 per bushel support price under our bill, amounts to $1,080, plus a 15-percent bonus if taken in grain, $151.20, the gross is $1,231.20, less say a 4-percent carrying charge of $49.25, the net is $1,181.95, or about $78.80 per acre less trucking costs from CCC bins.

FOR WHEAT

If, for example, a farmer has a wheat base of 15 acres, which many in Iowa especially have, he could put the entire 15 acres in the program. Let us assume that his average per acre yield is 40 bushels. He would receive a Government certificate for 80 percent of 600 bushels, which is 480 bushels, and on the basis of price supports under our bill of $1.62 per bushel amounts to $877.60, plus a 15-percent bonus if taken in grain, $131.64, the gross is $1,009.24, less 4 percent carrying charge of $40.37, the net is $968.47, or about $64.56 per acre less trucking costs from CCC bins.

Payments to compliers for reducing grain sorghum and barley acres are made on the same relative basis as corn and wheat. Any two, three, or four of these crops that have been arised on any one farm can be combined for acreage reduction payments-in-kind, if such total does not exceed 50 percent of the total base period average acres for the farm.

The Government certificate which the participating farmer receives entitles him to take the grain for his own use or he can sell the certificate on his own terms to a local elevator, or to a neighbor, or to any private citizen who wants the grain for resale, or for his own use. At any rate, the grain will be taken from the CCC bins and soon gone forever, hence, no more storing expense on that grain.

We sincerely hope our bill will be made law, and if so, it will be a rather simple chore for the ASC office located in every county, where up to date records are kept of each farm to assist the individual farmer who desires to participate in the program to fill out his compliance form.

There may be those in other sections of the country who on first thought will feel our bill provides greater benefits to the farmer than is needed, but the facts are that not only our farmers, but it is plain to see that every segment of our people will benefit greatly over the long pull if our bill is made law, due to the enormous dollar saving, but quite possible even more important, it might well prove to be the impetus we need to get our entire economy off dead center.

We have asked the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee to give us a hearing on our bill at an early date.

WEST VIRGINIA STILL SHORTCHANGED?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will debate the military construction bill, H.R. 6500. The Committee on Armed Services has issued a report accompanying that bill which details authorization of construction at military installations totaling $1,633,472,000. On pages 60 through 69 of the committee report is included a State-by-State breakdown, as well as a listing of those areas outside the United States where the military construction is authorized.

The report indicates that during the fiscal year 1964 there will be military construction in Canada, Canal Zone, France, Germany, Guam, Italy, Japan, Korea, Midway Islands, Northern Ireland, Okinawa, Puerto Rico, Republic of Philippines, Scotland, Wake Island, and "various locations" overseas. The report also summarizes within the United States the proposed fiscal year 1964 military construction authorization by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Defense Atomic Support Agency, the Defense Supply Agency, and the National Security Agency.

The report further indicates that in the State-by-State breakdown of projected construction for the fiscal year 1964, it is contemplated that construction will be carried out in military installations in 49 States and the District of Columbia. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that not one red cent of this military construction is projected for the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployment of any State in the Union. Recently, on the floor of this House, I pointed out that not 1 cent in prime contracts for the fiscal year 1962 had been awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the State of West Virginia. I would be the first to protest, Mr. Speaker, if Government expenditures of any type—military, space, or other categories—were based on geographical considerations. The taxpayers of this Nation cannot afford the luxury of logrolling boondoggling, or whatever you want to call it, when it comes to determining the prime rules for where it is most economical and effective in the Nation's total strength to locate installations. Decisions on our military strength, or on where it is most efficient and effective to let prime contracts, must not be marred by political considerations.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it is very strange that the State of West Virginia should be consistently overlooked in view of the fact that West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation. The Department of Labor indicates that in 1962 the unemployment rate in West Virginia was 10.9 percent, the highest in the Nation. There is an ample supply of available manpower in West Virginia. Land is relatively cheap and readily available for sites. Transportation facilities are excellent. The State of West Virginia is easily accessible to the Atlantic seaboard. At the present time, Federal contributions to unemployment insurance and other categories of welfare and relief payments are proportionately higher by reason of the large number of unemployed in West Virginia.

Thanks to the stimulus of Federal programs like the Accelerated Public Works Act and the Area Redevolpment Act, as well as the increased emphasis which has been put on placing military and other contracts in West Virginia, a number of economic improvements have taken place in the State in recent months. The State has advanced from the bottom of the heap to 30th in the Nation in the per capita value of military contracts awarded. The unemployment total has dropped, even though it is still much too high.

Nevertheless, a great deal remains to be done to bring West Virginia's employment rate up to closer to the national average. The point I wish to make is that all other considerations being equal, some attempt should be made to see that West Virginia is not consistently and persistently overlooked and shortchanged in so many aspects of Federal expenditures and location of installations.

CHICKENS HATCHED BY PRESIDENT'S TRADE POLICIES COME HOME TO ROOST

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last year when Congress was debating the legislation to give President Kennedy almost unrestricted powers to regulate tariffs, some of us warned that the President's trade policies would result in failure to protect American industry.

Our protests against relinquishing the constitutional power of Congress to regulate tariffs were met with loud cries of "obstructionists," and it was said we must give the President this unusual power in order to stimulate trade.

Now, we find the predictions coming true. Our friends in Europe are not about to make any tariff concessions. In fact, in the usual manner, they have thumbed their noses at the United States and in their latest action have responded to our offers for mutual concessions by increasing the tariff on chickens.

Once again the American people are witnessing a Kennedy failure. It seems impossible for the President to be successful in any area of responsibility. He has made a debacle of civil rights with the result we are actually suffering civil disorders and defiance of law which borders on revolution. He has failed to check inflationary trends. Government spending is on the rise, not decreasing. His restrictive measures against American business and industry are contributing to continuing unemployment. He has failed to check Communist aggression even along our own borders until the security of the Nation is menaced by Russian troops and weapons from Cuba. His failure in dealing with the Common Market and in the area of trade and tariffs keeps his record intact.

The action taken by the Common Market should serve warning to Congress that we had better reassert our constitutional responsibility over tariffs. We dare not take the chance in continuing the delegation of this responsibility to the President and his unrealistic advisers who seem to be more concerned with satisfying political commitments with other nations than in protecting American industry.

The extent of the confusion among administration policymakers and the probable results of the failure to enact tariffs in the self-interest of the United States is brought out in the two following articles. I include them as a part of these remarks, and call your attention to "Jolt From Europe for U.S. Farmers," from the U.S. News & World Report of June 10, and "A Disintegrating Alliance," editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 3:

JOLT FROM EUROPE FOR U.S. FARMERS

BRUSSELS.—On May 30, the European Common Market suddenly raised its tariff on American chickens. Effective June 10, the levy will be 14.25 cents a pound, instead of about 13 cents.

The action was just the opposite of what U.S. officials had expected. It came a day after U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman warned that Common Market countries will get no tariff concessions from the United States unless they give American farm products fair access to their markets.

The tariff-boosting decision was made by agriculture ministers of France, West Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

In West Germany alone, U.S. chicken exporters were building up a $50 million a year business. American officials regarded the action on chickens as a portent of what may await the $1.3 billion market for U.S. farm products in the Common Market area.

The Americans had been working for months to get the tariff on chickens reduced.

Comment of one U.S. official: "We've done everything but send a battleship up the Rhine."

A DISINTEGRATING ALLIANCE

The Western Alliance which has borne up bravely under threat of Soviet missiles may yet collapse over such a nonexplosive item as a frozen chicken.

In increasing the tariff on imported fryers, the European Common Market council has hauled off and kicked Uncle Sam in the shins once too often.

It is not that U.S. frozen fryer exports constitute a major share of our foreign trade. They amounted to less than $50 million a year at the peak, 2 years ago, and have been reduced to almost half that by Common Market tariff increases.

United States negotiators had expected to get the chicken tariff reduced. Instead it was raised a little over a cent a pound, to 14.25 cents.

The action perhaps telegraphs Common Market intentions as to tariffs on other U.S. agricultural products being sold to Europe, a commerce now amounting to nearly $1.3 billion a year.

And it also hints coming events in the negotiations for generally lowered tariffs following the passage, last year, of the U.S. Trade Expansion Act. The recent preliminary session on this subject barely was saved by a makeshift agreement designed to meet the objections of France.

Since then the French veto of even continuing conference between a British mission and permanent staffs of the European Economic Committee indicates the extent of President de Gaulle's scorn for President Kennedy's vision of a free-trading Atlantic community.

The Trade Expansion Act has been hailed as the supreme achievement of the Kennedy administration. Given even modest European cooperation, this should be a sound appraisal. But the whole idea of reciprocal tariff reduction is endangered by the De Gaulle concept of a little Europe, surrounded by a high tariff fence.

The six nations composing the Common Market have risen from war devastation to a prosperity they seem unable to stand largely by means of American billions in foreign aid. We have, moreover, borne the lion's share of European defense since the last war, and are continuing to bear it, and that is a substantial reason for our embarrassing balance of payments deficit.

If these recent European decisions indicate the way things are to be, then the United States must reappraise its whole European policy, an exercise which is long overdue anyhow. Action must be substituted for wheedling. This action should include U.S. tariffs so placed as to hurt severely European export business with this country. And we should start reducing our military forces on the continent.

A trade war among military allies against communism is a shocking prospect but it needs to be demonstrated that U.S. patience under insult and ingratitude is not endless. The Europeans must be confronted with the results of their folly. That is the best chance of reversing this reactionary trend and saving the alliance from disintegration.

LET'S GROW MORE SUGAR IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, now that there is general concern about the price of sugar, this is a good time to consider again what can be done to provide us with a more stable, economical supply of sugar.

When the sugar bill was considered last year I testified before the House Committee on Agriculture suggesting that the legislation allow farmers in the Wabash Valley the opportunity to growing and refining more beet sugar.

This would have many advantages. It would increase the stable supply of sugar, grown in our own country and not subject to the sudden changes which interfere with our trade with other countries. It would allow those farmers to divert these acres from other production, such as feed grains which are already grown in great surplus. It would mean that our own farmers would have additional income from this new crop, and that we would not be increasing the drain on our gold reserves by oversea purchases.

However, this point of view was ignored because of considerations of international relations which were pushed by the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture.

Now when the price of sugar has spiraled tremendously, the Department of Agriculture suddenly tells farmers they can grow all of the sugarbeets they want to this year and next. Does this offer any real solution to the problem? Does it offer any real incentive to Hoosier farmers, for instance, to turn to beet production?

No, it does not. To go into beet production on a sound basis these producers need a reasonable assurance that they will be able to continue to produce beets not for 1 year, but for several years.

Economical and efficient production requires the establishment of refining facilities centered in the production area. Obviously the creation of such facilities cannot be undertaken on the basis of a crash quota assignment which will last only 1 year.

Consequently if the Department of Agriculture wants to make the freeing of quotas on beet producers meaningful, it must commit itself to work for a permanent assignment of beet quotas to these other areas.

We can quickly test the good faith of the Department in this matter. If they do not indicate a move in this direction, then the press releases about removing limitations on beet production are just part of the smokescreen being used in a futile effort to conceal the economic loss which the sugar price increase has caused.

TAX REFORMS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that tax reforms proposed by the administration have, as their ultimate goal, stimulation of the industrial economy of the Nation.

This goal is immediate. The more distant aim is to generate more tax dollars from an expanded economy. This is probably a necessity when the full impact of deficit spending is recognized.

It appears obvious to me that the imposition of additional tax burdens on any basic industry would tend to defeat the stipulated goal. Yet that is precisely what is proposed by the President who is advocating new and more stringent tax policies on oil and gas production.

The President's tax recommendations which affect the oil and gas industry would:

First, reduce the percentage depletion rate by requiring losses in any year on a mineral property to be carried over to subsequent years solely for the purpose of adversely affecting the otherwise allowable deduction for percentage depletion.

Second, repeal the provision which today permits a taxpayer to aggregate into one property several mineral interests for the purpose of computing percentage depletion.

Third, tax gains on the sale of a mineral property at the higher ordinary income rate rather than the capital gains rate when a taxpayer sells his mineral properties to the extent he has deducted intangible development expenditures and depletion up to the cost basis of the property.

Fourth, disallow foreign development expenditures against U.S. income.

It is axiomatic that the greater the tax burden carried by an industry, the harder it is for that industry to be productive. Carried to its extreme, an industry could quickly be rendered impotent solely due to an unrealistic tax policy. I am very fearful that enactment of the new tax proposals having to do with this industry could be disastrous. These proposals if enacted could bring on more adverse changes all of which would further discourage an already struggling industry.

When we talk of the oil and gas industry, we talk of an industry which is now in a depressed condition. We are speaking of an industry which has found it necessary to reduce drilling activity from a peak of 58,160 wells in 1956 to only 46,179 in 1962. This is a decline of nearly 12,000 wells.

In my State of Kansas, drilling activity reached a peak of 4,958 completions in 1955. During last year, 1962, only 3,961 wells were drilled in Kansas. This is a decline of nearly 1,000 wells, or of 20 percent. Exploratory crew activity is down approximately 30 percent over the same period. This is indicative of fewer discoveries in the years ahead for actual exploratory drilling is only undertaken after a search for subsurface conditions favorable to the accumulation of oil and gas.

These facts foretell fewer wildcat wells in the future, a further decrease in development drilling, less employment, dwindling county, State, and Federal taxes, and declining development of this vital and basic resource.

The facts also foretell a decline in the active search for methods to increase recovery from reserves already proven. Were this effort to produce only 1 percent more of the known reserves in Kansas, more than 43 million barrels of additional oil, subject to taxes, would ultimately be recovered with a present market value of over $125 million.

However, there must be a reasonable economic expectation to result from this effort before it is justified. And this relates to production from wells of less than 100 feet, or greater than 8,000 feet, both of which we have in Kansas.

It is disheartening to one from an oil State to be aware of the depressed condition of an essential industry and to witness its gradual deterioration in so brief a number of years. It is disillusioning to now be faced with a proposition, as outlined in the President's tax message, that would further suppress the normal and natural progress of a great industry.

To add to the tax burden of the industry, as suggested in the President's message, would not be an act of tax reformation; it would be an act of stagnation.

Speaking of the tax burdens, one often hears the charge that the oil and gas industry does not pay its fair share of taxes. This is a fallacious charge; and in rebuttal thereto, I wish to state that according to a recent study by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., it was found that the tax bill on U.S. petroleum companies and their products exceeded by far the total tax burden imposed upon any other industry and its products.

This study found that the petroleum industry and its products in 1961 paid to all U.S. governmental units—Federal, State, and local—a total of $7.8 billion or 6.7 percent of the total of all such taxes paid. Further, the domestic oil industry's tax bill, exclusive of the excise and sales taxes on its products, in relation to income, is approximately 5 percent. This percentage is above or about the same as that paid by most other industries.

Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to broaden its industrial economy, if it is to spur development of our natural resources, if it is to increase tax revenues as a result of increased industrial activity, then we cannot afford to take a negative approach. Instead, we must be positive. This industry must be encouraged, not suppressed.

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IS A MOVEMENT OF ENORMOUS PROMISE—IT CREATES NEW JOBS AND NEW INDUSTRIES AND ADDS TO THE NATION'S TOTAL OUTPUT OF GOODS AND SERVICES—BY CREATING EMPLOYMENT, IT ADDS TO THE NATION'S DEMAND FOR GOODS AND SERVICES AND RESULTS IN A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING FOR OUR PEOPLE—ADVANCING SEED-CORN MONEY TO CREATE A NEW INDUSTRY HAS RESULTED IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GETTING BACK MORE IN TAX REVENUES THAN IT LENT, AS WELL AS GETTING BACK THE LOAN PLUS INTEREST—NEW INDUSTRY MUST BE CREATED IN THE DISTRESSED AREAS IF FULL EMPLOYMENT IS TO BE ACHIEVED—THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH LOANS AND GRANTS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE DISTRESSED AREAS IS ABOUT 1 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL FUNDS ALREADY LENT OR GRANTED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR THIS PURPOSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include a list of States and otherwise of projects affected by the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act, and to include tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I propose to take inventory of the Area Redevelopment Act. Just what has been done in each State of our Union? I think you will be amazed by the record, and it is a good record; good because the law as enacted by Congress has been overwhelmingly and effectively used by the individual States to bolster sagging elements of their economies. It is good, because just as Congress provided, the States have participated in this grassroots free enterprise program to create new jobs. Local economies have been stimulated through Federal seeding of the overall economic potentials of the individual areas.

On examination, we find that not one of the 50 sovereign States is free of pockets of unemployment or underemployment, for the elimination of which the Congress passed the Area Redevelopment Act.

Not one Member of this Congress has been elected from a State which can honestly say, "There is nothing the Area Redevelopment Act can do to help us help ourselves."

What have the individual States thought of the Area Redevelopment Act? How have they made use of the Area Redevelopment Act which requires each

State to pass on each project before it is sent on to ARA for consideration?

FORTY-FOUR STATES HAVE APPROVED PROJECTS

The accounting record shows that 44 of our sovereign States have passed and and approved projects which have been forwarded to ARA for approval and financing.

More than 36 million Americans live in areas eligible for Area Redevelopment Act assistance. Now, let me say this. For us who are about to pass again on the wisdom and necessity for continuing this work so well begun, let us go on with the task.

Let us continue this needed work for our own people, just as we have helped the stranger in a foreign land. Let us hold out our helping hand to our economically bypassed brother in all our States and help him attain a truly American economic level of living.

CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT AND PERSISTENT UNDEREMPLOYMENT

Let it be said of this Congress that it had the strength to carry forward the attack upon chronic unemployment and persistent underemployment in this country. Let us provide the tools for expanding and creating new industries, building needed public facilities, for the technical help so many of our communities need, and for the training and retraining which is proving so successful wherever it has been tried.

Let us go on with this attack which benefits us all—the newly employed, the enterprising businessmen, the States, and our Federal Government.

ALL FUNDS NOW SPOKEN FOR

The work of ARA is well begun. On June 1, 1963, all the funds you have authorized to do the job have been spoken for on deserving projects, prudently arrived at, carefully selected by the States and either approved or awaiting approval by ARA.

If there is no new authorization of funds at this time, there is nothing to do but to close shop and turn away any new applicants for ARA assistance.

Who will tell the Americans in the underdeveloped domestic areas that they may not borrow and repay enough from their Government to help them create their own jobs?

Let me repeat: If we do not supply additional authorizations for ARA, there will be no funds with which the governments of your States can approve projects for ARA consideration. We will close the door on our own good citizens.

NO CONFLICT BETWEEN AREA REDEVELOPMENT AND ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

For those of you who would like the specifics, I am inserting in the RECORD at the end of my remarks State-by-State summaries of activity under the Area Redevelopment Act and under the Accelerated Public Works Act as well. The latter act applies to the same areas but also includes labor surplus areas in addition to redevelopment areas, and includes all 50 States. By the way, these acts are not in conflict, they do not overlap; but they do very closely dovetail and complement each other.

Following these summary tables I am also inserting in the RECORD a detailed listing of the projects that have been approved in each area either under the Area Redevelopment Act or under the Accelerated Public Works Act. This is a magnificent record of accomplishment.

Some of the historians have said that it was more than coincidence that the Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" both appeared in the same year: 1776. Both docments breathe the same fire of freedom and emphasize the dignity and worth of the individual—one in the civil and political realm and the other in the economic realm.

PRODUCTION IS THE WEALTH OF NATIONS

One of the great contributions of "Wealth of Nations" was to make it unmistakably clear what the wealth of nations consists of. The wealth of a nation is not rated by its stock of money, its hoard of gold or silver, or its inventory of any other assets. The wealth of a nation is measured by the amount of goods and services it produces. A nation which produces only a small amount of goods and services per capita is a poor nation. Similarly a nation which has high unemployment of its labor force and its productive machines is a great deal poorer than it need be.

UNITED STATES IS POORER BECAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The United States is a much poorer nation than it ought to be because today we have more than 4 million of our workers completely unemployed, and perhaps almost as many underemployed, engaged only in part-time work or at makeshift work which is far below the skills and capabilities of the people involved. For at least 5 years now such unemployment has been with us. In these years the totally unemployed have amounted to well over 5 percent of the total labor force.

LOSS ESTIMATED AT $35 TO $50 BILLION

As a consequence, the loss of wealth we have suffered and are suffering is immense. It is variously estimated that we are losing between $35 and $50 billion a year in goods and services that would be produced if we did no more than reduce unemployment to 4 percent of the labor force. Just think of it—many people bemoan the fact that we have a Federal budget of almost $100 billion—that the Federal Government is taking almost $100 billion of our current production, our real wealth. Yet the fact is that the Nation is throwing away between one-third and one-half of this amount annually simply by not producing what it would produce if we achieved the administration's very modest goals of having only 4 percent of the labor force unemployed.

How can we recoup this wealth? How can we prevent the erosion of our opportunities and capabilities and prevent all of this potential wealth going down the drain?

ARA BILL WILL MAKE AMERICA WEALTHIER

One thing that we can do which will be tremendously helpful is to pass a revised area redevelopment bill which the House will debate and act upon next week.

I would not wish to overstate the importance of the area redevelopment bill because it is certainly not the whole answer to our unemployment problem. To achieve full employment and the full output of wealth that our Nation should produce will require many things. Such achievement will require the right kind of monetary and fiscal policy on the part of our Federal Government; more and better education for our people to equip them for the kinds of jobs present day technology requires; better and more vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws to improve the self-adjusting processes of the market place; and other things. But the area redevelopment program is most certainly an essential part of any program to improve employment and it is tremendously important to the whole Nation.

Within the past few days the Washington Post and Times Herald has carried two pieces on this matter which I believe the Members of the House will find most informative and most persuasive.

FARM FAMILIES MOVING TO CITIES

One of these was the feature editorial which appeared yesterday, June 3, titled "Industry Going Farmward." Here the Post points out quite correctly that millions of farm families have been streaming into the cities to find jobs and that while most of them find jobs many are added to the unemployed who live in city slums and in any case this exodus of the population from the rural communities is adding to the confusion and the acute social problems of the big city. The Post expresses the view that the effort which the Federal Government is making to help create new industry and create industrial jobs for the lower income farm families is a movement of enormous promise. It adds:

> It is better all around if useful employment can be found for many of these people near to their rural homes.

The area redevelopment program is, of course, designed not just to help the depressed farm areas. There are many areas suffering from depressed local conditions because resources have been exhausted. Some particular industry on which the area depended has died out or moved away because of changes in production methods, changes in the demand for products, etc. In all of these cases the problem is to help the local area develop new profitable industries to provide productive employment for those people who have been displaced through changes in industry, relocations, or in industrial manpower requirements.

JOBS MUST BE CREATED WHERE THE PEOPLE ARE

Unless new industries are created locally to provide jobs, many of the unemployed and the underemployed will not be put to work under any circumstances. Despite the tremendous waves of migration which have been taking place, a great many people living in the depressed areas will not leave their local communities even under extreme economic pressures. As we know, many people have very strong ties to their local communities and cannot easily pull up stakes and move to the city in search of a job. There are family ties, commitments to a home mortgage, and dozens of other considerations which prevent the family from moving. Even if it were not otherwise undesirable to have all the American people piled up in a few great cities, it would still be a case of either helping to develop industries in the rural and small town communities or having the Nation lose the wealth that a large percentage of the labor force might turn out. Rural America is undergoing a great exodus. Notwithstanding the fact that the population of the Nation increased by 18½ percent between the last two census years—1950 and 1960—more than half of the 3,134 counties of the country lost population. Some 1,536 counties, of which at least 1,300 are rural counties, showed a net decline in population within the decade.

FARMERS PENALIZED FOR INCREASING EFFICIENCY

In 1950 some 23 million people, or 15.3 percent of our population, still lived on farms. By 1960 the number living on a farm was down to 15.6 million, or only 8.7 percent of the total population. By last year, 1962, another million people had left the farms, leaving only 7.7 percent of our total population living on farms.

It is a wonderful thing, of course, that less than 8 percent of our workers can produce the food and natural fiber needs of the country and, in addition help to feed millions of people in countries less fortunate. As you know, a nation can enjoy the luxury of industrialization and enjoy the high standard of living and the variety of goods and services which industry turns out only when its agriculture progresses to the point that labor can be freed from the more essential pursuits of feeding the nation. We are told, for example, that in Russia today it takes at least half of the population to feed the nation and in many of the less developed countries of the world almost the entire population is engaged in the pursuit of trying to feed themselves.

FARM PRODUCTIVITY SHOULD BE A BLESSING TO THE NATION

Accordingly, we can feel very proud of American agriculture. Despite all the so-called farm props, helps and aids from the Federal Government that are said to keep inefficient and marginal farmers in business, farm productivity has increased, since World War II, at three times the rate of the productivity increases that have taken place in the rest of industry and commerce. According to Department of Labor reports, output per man hour of work in nonagricultural businesses increased by 48 percent between 1947 and 1962 while in the same period productivity per man hour of work in agriculture increased by 140 percent. The race continues and agriculture continues to stay ahead. Each year agriculture enjoys a productivity increase of approximately 6 percent over the preceding year while nonfarm industry shows productivity increases of substantially less than 3 percent. This ability of American farms to produce more and more farm products with less and less labor results from increased mechanization, increased uses of fertilizers and insecticides, new hybrid plants and animals and better farm methods.

When farm labor is displaced and the labor moves away, so too the small towns and villages are displaced because there is now less need for the services which the small towns and villages grew up to supply.

Yes, it is a fine thing that more of the population are being freed from the basic policy of feeding the Nation and being made available for jobs in industry and in the services. But where will be the displaced farmworkers and the younger generations leaving the farm find these jobs? The answer is that more jobs must be created and they must be created in the local towns and communities where the people are. We do not want to relocate jobs, of course. We want to increase the total number of jobs in the Nation and increase the total industry, services, and output of wealth in the Nation.

HOW A SEED-CORN LOAN HELPED LONE STAR STEEL AND REPAID ITSELF MANY TIMES

The area redevelopment program is not a Federal handout. It is a program which offers help to those communities that want to help themselves. Under this program the Federal Government is, in effect, advancing the seed-corn money by which the local communities can create new industries and new jobs and new wealth for the whole Nation.

In my own district—the First Congressional District of Texas—I have seen a very good example of how seed-corn money supplied by the Federal Government can benefit the community, benefit the whole Nation, and pay back the money to the Federal Government many times over.

After World War II, the Federal Government through the RFC, lent funds to the Lone Star Steel Co. to build a steel mill at Lone Star, Tex. The total Federal loan involved was some $75 million.

Recently I wrote the head of that firm asking how much Federal taxes had been paid by this company. He wrote back saying that in 11 years—1952 through 1962—the company has paid in income taxes to the Federal Government $39,211,000 and paid income taxes from taxes withheld from the employees' earnings in the same period of $28,318,000, making a total of taxes paid of $67,529,000. In other words, the company has generated directly Federal income taxes in 11 years alone almost equal to the total amount of the loan. We have no way of estimating what additional Federal taxes have been paid by private contractors and service people doing business generated by this company. I suspect that it would equal or exceed the $67 million of direct taxes paid by the company.

More than this, the investment of this seed-corn money has resulted in between 4,000 and 5,000 new jobs and the Federal loan has been repaid with interest, although partly so through refinancing with private sources of finance.

The amount of funds which the Federal Government is being asked to put in the ARA program is a very modest sum indeed. It is modest compared to the size of the job to be done and it is modest compared to what we have done along the same lines for other countries.

PROPOSED HELP TO DISTRESSED AREAS AT HOME ABOUT 1 PERCENT OF AID GIVEN ABROAD

Two years ago the area revedelopment bill authorized loans and grants aggregating $395 million for the program. The present bill, on which we will act next week, will expand the authorization for the program by $455 million to carry the program over the next 2 years. In other words, all of the funds authorized as of 2 years from now will amount to $850 million. In contrast we have authorized for assistance to foreign countries some $66½ billion.

In other words, the total amount of funds we will have authorized for the area redevelopment program, after we enact the expanded ARA bill, will be slightly over 1 percent of the amount of funds we had lent or granted to foreign countries in the period since World War II through June 30 of last year. The amount for each of our foreign financing programs is shown in the table below. In the case of international agencies, only the amount for the U.S. subscription to the agency is shown. It is as follows:

U.S. foreign aid, including international financial institution

[Cumulative to June 30, 1962—Estimated projection for fiscal 1963–64]

	Billions
World Bank—IBRD	$0.635
International Finance Corporation	.035
Inter-American Development Bank	.190
IDA	.135
Export-Import Bank	[1] 7.506
American foreign aid and related programs	[2] 57.954
Total foreign aid	66.455

[1] Long-term loans (over 5 years).

[2] Includes: Grants and loans of AID; social progress trust fund; food for peace (Public Law 480); other U.S. economic programs excluding U.S. contributions to international financial institutions listed in tabulation.

A second most interesting piece to appear in the Washington Post was one by Julius Duscha, appearing in the Post on May 31. It describes the condition of an area of Indiana and a new factory built in that area to bring industrial jobs to displaced farmworkers.

Both the Post editorial I referred to and the piece by Julius Duscha are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1963]

INDUSTRY GOING FARMWARD

Secretary Freeman's tour of numerous rural areas development projects in southern Indiana has focused attention upon the transformation that is taking place in many farm regions. Federal funds spent through the Department of Agriculture and the Commerce Department's depressed-areas program are helping to take industrial jobs to low-income farm families. It is a movement of enormous promise.

With the general mechanization of farms, millions of farm families have been streaming into the cities. Most of them find jobs, but some are added to the lists of the unemployed who live in city slums, often in worse circumstances than they experienced on the farm. Meanwhile they add to the congestion and the acute social problems of the big cities. It is better all around if useful employment can be found for many of these people near to their rural homes.

In some instances industry, too, is finding substantial advantages in locating plants in rural areas. Cheap land is available for such establishments, congestion is avoided, and ample labor for small operations is at hand in many rural sections. The natural advantages plus governmental aid have brought a remarkable increase in this type of enterprise. The proportion of the employed population living on farms and working in nonagricultural pursuits nearly doubled between 1940 and 1960.

In many instances farmers work part time in their fields and part time in factories. If nonfarm jobs are available, the wives and the sons and daughters of farmers can join the Nation's work force without leaving home. Department of Agriculture studies show that 40 percent of the farm population who are gainfully employed have some kind of job off the farm.

This is a trend that merits much encouragement. The national health requires well-rounded development, with rural as well as urban areas participating in growth and prosperity. Social, economic, and political problems could be seriously complicated with too much of the country's population concentrated in enormous metropolitan centers. It is greatly to our advantage that 8 percent of our workers can feed the Nation, but as this percentage continues to decline it is infinitely better to take industrial jobs to the farmer, wherever feasible, than to force him into congested metropolitan centers in order to eke out a living.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1963]

Factory on Hill in Indiana Brings Work to Farmers of Declining Area

(By Julius Duscha)

Salem, Ind., May 30.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman walked across a freshly plowed field, picked up a shiny shovel and planted a tree in a ceremony that symbolized the vast changes swiftly overtaking rural areas.

The field had not been plowed for corn; it will be the front lawn of a modern shoe factory located on a southern Indiana hill.

Already employed in the factory are farmers, their wives, and daughters. Before and after their day on the assembly line the farmers and their families milk cows, feed hogs, water cattle, and till fields.

The Bata shoe factory at Salem is one of scores of new factories that are springing up in corn and cotton fields under the spur of the Commerce Department's depressed areas program and the Agriculture Department's rural areas development program.

The factories bring work to rural areas like southern Indiana where young and old have been leaving the farms and small towns for jobs in the cities.

But the factories in the fields are also raising economic and political questions of great importance to the entire Nation.

Freeman visited the shoe factory during a 2-day tour this week of State, local, and Federal rural development projects in southern Indiana.

He saw a water system being built for a small town, small earth dams being constructed to prevent creeks from flooding, trees and grass being planted to stop erosion on hillsides, houses and other farm buildings being improved with Government loans, and tourist traffic being encouraged with new parks and camping and picnicking grounds.

There were other commercial enterprises—a furniture factory rebuilt with Federal help, a new glass plant using long-neglected silica sand deposits and a fishing resort developed by a farmer.

During his tour Freeman stressed the importance of local initiative in developing declining rural areas, but few of the projects that are making life better on the farms and in the small towns would have been possible without Federal loans and grants.

Indiana is regarded as a bastion of conservatism. The very mention of the State's name conjures up visions of the self-sufficient America of James Whitcomb Riley and Booth Tarkington.

But however much the people of Indiana want to help themselves today, it is the Federal Government that has provided the push—and cash—needed to lift depressed areas like southern Indiana out of the nostalgia of Riley's 19th century farm and Tarkington's turn-of-the-century small town into the prosperity of the 1960's.

Everywhere I went with Secretary Freeman in southern Indiana I heard talk about new Federal highways, more Government loans and grants from Washington and additional technical assistance from Federal agencies.

Everyone wants water and sewage systems, dams, new farm houses and barns and better parks, but the biggest prize of all in the rural redevelopment race is new industry.

Freeman reflected rural sentiment when he told a luncheon at the new Bata shoe plant: "We want to provide places for your youngsters to work where they can look out on this beautiful countryside."

Through the plant's picture windows the luncheon guests could see the rolling hills of southern Indiana, a vista far more desirable than smoke-filled industrial slums of a Chicago or a Detroit.

But industry is more interested in the view from its own ledgers than in the view from its windows. Before a company like Bata would locate at Salem it had to be given several Federal favors.

SOME RAISED LOCALLY

Bata, a worldwide manufacturer of tennis and other canvas shoes, has moved into a $758,000 plant. Most of the cost will be financed by an Area Redevelopment Administration loan from the Federal Government. The U.S. loan totals $474,300. The rest of the money was raised locally.

The company is also getting Federal aid for training its workers. More than $64,000 in U.S. funds is being used to train 340 men and women to work on sewing and rubber-molding assembly lines in the new plant. None of the work is highly skilled.

Bata's own investment in the new plant is the cost of its machinery, which is believed to be considerably less than the $758,000 cost of the plant building itself.

Although the company seems fully able to finance its own expansion, of which the Salem plant is a part, and to train its own workers, Federal aid is being given the firm because this is apparently the only way most industry can be lured to depressed areas.

In addition to the federally and locally financed plant, which Bata has agreed to lease for 20 years, the company was attracted to southern Indiana by what its manager calls "the help situation."

By this the manager means men and women who generally will work for less than will people in the cities. The beginning wage at the Bata plant, for example, will be only $51 a week. Under piecework rates, the company says that women will be able to make up to $90 a week and men up to $110.

It will also be harder for a union to organize a plant in a rural area where jobs of any kind are scarce and where unions are considered an alien influence.

The industrial trees that are beginning to sprout in the countryside thus have far-ranging national as well as rural ramifications.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Area Redevelopment Administration

Status of APW projects, by States, pending and approved, as of May 31, 1963

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Pending		Approved	
	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost
United States	4,274	$868,735	2,956	$345,808
Alabama	148	32,312	93	10,121
Alaska	45	11,372	29	4,434
Arizona	4	580	29	5,010
Arkansas	103	12,977	93	6,344
California	108	26,669	106	12,374
Colorado	16	3,274	27	2,436
Connecticut	31	6,037	36	3,932
Delaware	5	746	4	351
Florida	94	27,393	42	5,898
Georgia	72	15,173	85	6,170
Hawaii	2	12	6	545
Idaho	11	1,370	45	3,634
Illinois	143	19,083	94	10,631
Indiana	61	8,302	54	6,098
Iowa	5	342	1	385
Kansas	25	3,759	9	602
Kentucky	177	35,273	121	17,792
Louisiana	148	59,531	88	14,136
Maine	21	1,703	29	2,456
Maryland	10	1,502	15	966
Massachusetts	75	20,797	36	8,286
Michigan	258	75,730	239	25,405
Minnesota	134	18,708	82	6,303
Mississippi	111	13,252	72	6,953
Missouri	92	20,398	83	5,051
Montana	25	6,881	39	3,021
Nebraska	20	$1,249	19	$1,318
Nevada	4	119	2	250
New Hampshire	5	2,472	7	1,114
New Jersey	146	44,724	60	18,769
New Mexico	45	5,341	96	7,066
New York	192	55,853	67	11,524
North Carolina	73	13,359	72	6,879
North Dakota	---	---	6	472
Ohio	164	33,450	56	9,750
Oklahoma	126	19,424	88	7,783
Oregon	70	9,252	47	5,872
Pennsylvania	444	91,317	191	31,741
Rhode Island	34	13,980	19	6,030
South Carolina	35	3,441	46	5,147
South Dakota	45	3,918	6	956
Tennessee	125	24,185	61	8,599
Texas	102	20,070	71	9,399
Utah	65	7,989	39	3,359
Vermont	2	853	4	385
Virginia	26	4,406	47	1,981
Washington	51	8,409	88	7,294
West Virginia	127	33,346	113	17,637
Wisconsin	109	9,096	76	3,535
Wyoming	12	824	11	663
American Samoa	---	---	---	---
Guam	---	---	1	100
Puerto Rico	324	38,221	104	8,521
Virgin Islands	4	258	2	330

Financial assistance projects, pending and approved, as of May 31, 1963

[Amounts in thousands]

State	Number of eligible areas	Pending						Approved					
		Industrial and commercial		Public facility loans and grants		Total		Industrial and commercial		Public facility loans and grants		Total	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	40	5	$4,847	3	$301	8	$5,148	7	$1,204	10	$1,450	17	$2,654
Alaska	22	17	6,140	1	98	18	6,238	3	1,990	2	1,772	5	3,762
American Samoa	1	1	476			1	476						
Arizona	13	1	217			1	217						
Arkansas	48	2	1,044	12	3,763	14	4,807	5	895	5	1,405	10	2,300
California	10	11	7,187	2	1,799	13	8,986			1	458	1	458
Colorado	9	1	380			1	380						
Connecticut	3	4	4,064			4	4,064	2	1,121			2	1,121
Delaware	2												
Florida	12	3	1,390			3	1,390	4	3,592	1	28	5	3,620
Georgia	73	10	10,476	5	708	15	11,184	5	1,988	5	2,399	10	4,387
Guam	1	1	728			1	728						
Hawaii	1	3	3,452			3	3,452	1	351	1	437	2	788
Idaho	9	4	2,596			4	2,596	2	463			2	463
Illinois	18	7	1,460	1	12	8	472	7	1,540	2	786	9	2,326
Indiana	27	6	4,352	2	477	8	4,829	6	1,836	4	1,714	10	3,550
Iowa	2												
Kansas	2	2	48			2	48	1	1				
Kentucky	54	13	4,815	12	15,209	25	20,024	13	2,037	6	2,973	19	5,010
Louisiana	25	11	17,093			11	17,093	4	233			4	233
Maine	11	16	2,430	3	220	19	2,650	6	1,902			6	1,902
Maryland	7	6	5,616			6	5,616	2	765	2	772	4	1,537
Massachusetts	10	3	2,021	1	149	4	2,170	5	652	2	587	7	1,239
Michigan	53	21	12,809	4	1,056	25	13,865	11	6,309	1	400	12	6,709
Minnesota	18	15	2,958	2	172	17	3,130	9	481	1	6,100	10	6,581
Mississippi	60	3	1,196	2	863	5	2,059	3	1,162	2	189	5	1,351
Missouri	23	6	3,284			6	3,284	1	81	3	1,759	4	1,840
Montana	16	1	429	1	51	2	480	1	188	1	337	2	525
Nebraska	13												
Nevada	3									1	75	1	75
New Hampshire	3	3	737			3	737						
New Jersey	6	4	1,888			4	1,888	4	2,341			4	2,341
New Mexico	23	3	702	2	373	5	1,075	1	195			1	195
New York	13	4	15,230			4	15,230	7	3,391	2	375	9	3,766
North Carolina	34	13	12,396	3	702	16	13,098	3	697	1	175	4	872
North Dakota	5												
Ohio	10	14	3,841	4	661	18	4,502	4	468			4	468
Oklahoma	33	16	6,661	5	1,747	21	8,408	11	4,903	4	11,886	15	16,789
Oregon	9	8	1,631	3	1,547	11	3,178	1	1,307	2	1,198	3	2,505
Pennsylvania	41	15	6,807	6	433	21	7,240	17	4,766	12	3,298	29	8,064
Puerto Rico	56	9	8,803			9	8,803	1	1,600			1	1,600
Rhode Island	1	1	286	1	45	2	331			2	1,257	2	1,257
South Carolina	24	4	4,754	2	658	6	5,412	4	352	2	405	6	757
South Dakota	7												
Tennessee	45	11	6,191	4	200	15	6,391	1	130	9	2,411	10	2,541
Texas	54	17	27,368	2	190	19	27,558	12	9,083	2	664	14	9,747
Utah	11	2	607			2	607	4	1,889			4	1,889
Vermont	3	2	153			2	153						
Virginia	15	4	1,095			4	1,095	1	30	1	25	2	55
Virgin Islands	1												
Washington	16	6	1,523	2	2,379	8	3,902	3	605	1	146	4	751
West Virginia	37	10	18,071	14	48,747	24	66,818	10	4,047	8	2,124	18	6,171
Wisconsin	21	9	4,032	3	230	12	4,262	1	418	1	65	2	483
Wyoming	4	4	3,927	1	50	5	3,977	1	357			1	357
Total	1,058	332	228,211	103	82,840	435	311,051	191	65,369	104	47,670	295	113,039

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ALABAMA				
Anniston area (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development Alabama National Forest	20		
	City Hall, Anniston	24		
	Improve streets, Jacksonville	237		281
Autauga County, 5(b)	Autauga Terrazo Tile, Inc.: Expand present tile production facilities		52	
	Water facilities, Prattville	118		
	Post office improvement, Prattville	16		186
Barbour County, 5(b)	Training: Boot and shoe production worker		90	
	Sewers, Clayton	22		
	Recreation facilities, W. F. George Reservoir	50		
	Road improvement and well. Biological District No. 4	30		192
Bibb County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	16		
	do	40		
	Highway addition, Federal Highway No. 13	173		229
Birmingham area (LS)	Courthouse, Birmingham	1,485		
	Sewers, Warrior	23		
	Sewer facility, Fultondale	326		
	Post office, courthouse, Birmingham	90		
	Waste treatment facility, Fultondale	236		
	Water facility, Irondale	55		
	Sewers, Hueytown	575		2,790
Blount County, 5(b)	City of Onronta, gas and sewer board—water and sewage facility		108	108
Bullock County, 5(b)				
Butler County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, West Chapman	25		25
Cherokee County, 5(b)				

***Approved projects, including accelerated public works** (as of May 31, 1963)*—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ALABAMA—continued				
Chilton County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator (Thorsby Manufacturing Co.)		12	
	Repair reservoir, Thorsby	8		
	Roads reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	30		50
Choctaw County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Choctaw	124		
	Sewer facility, Butler	98		
	Sewers, Butler	58		280
Clarke County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facilities, Biological District No. 7	21		21
Clay County, 5(b)				
Conecuh County, 5(b)				
Coosa County, 5(b)				
Crenshaw County, 5(b)	Water facility, Rutledge	57		57
Cullman County, 5(b)	City Hall, Cullman	255		
	Courthouse, Cullman	666		921
Dallas County, 5(b)	Water facility, Selma	241		
	Roads reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	1		
	do	30		272
DeKalb County, 5(b)	City of Fort Payne: Extend sewage system		110	110
Elmore County, 5(b)				
Fayette County, 5(b)	Town of Fayette: Sewage disposal system for expanding industry		346	
	Town of Berry: Expand water and sewage facilities		257	603
Florence-Sheffield area, (LS)				
Gadsden area, 5(a)	Attala Pipe & Foundry Co.: Reopen and modernize foundry		453	
	Training: Cablemaker (Elgin Watch Co.)		19	
	Training: Sewing machine operator (Gressler Manufacturing Co.)		3	
	Fire station, Gadsden	22		
	Library, Gadsden	272		
	Channel improvement, Little Cove	83		
	Sewers, Glencoe	22		
	Sewers, Attalla	46		
	Waste facility, Gadsden	195		
	Waste treatment facility, Altoona	31		
	Post office improvement, Gadsden	18		
	Water facility, Altoona	56		1,220
Green County, 5(b)	Post Office, Eutaw	13		13
Hale County, 5(b)	Moundsville Industrial Committee: Extend water and gas lines and install railroad crossing signals.		68	
	Greensboro Packing Co.: To expand meatpacking plant		231	
	Roads reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	11		
	do	80		
	Sewers, Moundville	58		
	Water and sewer facility, Moundsville	64		512
Heflin Area, (LS)				
Jackson County, 5(b)	Water and sewer board of Stevenson: Expand sewerlines		30	
	City Hall, Scottsboro	150		
	Sewer facility, Scottsboro	159		
	Library, Scottsboro	42		
	Conservation measures, Jackson	3		
	Waste treatment facility, addition, Scottsboro	185		
	Wildlife facilities, Scottsboro	10		579
Jasper area, 5(a)	Industrial Development Board of Dora: Building, machinery, and equipment to lease to toy manufacturer.		120	
	Industrial Development Board of Dora: Water system and access road to industrial park.		42	
	Gas Board, Town of Dora: Establish a natural gas system		410	
	Walker County, Ind., Development Board (applicant): Analysis of expansion opportunities.		29	
	Sewers, Cordova	43		
	Waste treatment facility, Parrish	10		
	Sewer facility, Cordova	126		
	Sewer facility, Jasper	114		
	Post Office, Courthouse, Jasper	20		518
Lamar County, 5(b)	Town of Vernon: Water and sewage system		28	28
Limestone County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Limestone	270		
	Conservation measures, Limestone	4		
	Sewer facilities, Athens	258		
	Wildlife facility	35		567
Lowndes County, 5(b)	County office, Haynesville	27		27
Macon County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	8		
	Hospital improvement, Tuskegee	92		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	40		
	Waste treatment facility, Natasulga	30		170
Marengo County, 5(b)	Griffith Packing Co.: Expand meatpacking plant		146	
	Hospital addition, Demopolis	68		
	Hangar, Demopolis	14		228
Marion County, 5(b)(6)	Hackleburg Development Corp.: Constructing new factory building to be leased to the Valient Tile Corp.		138	
	Winfield General Hospital, Winfield	428		566
Marshall County, 5(b)	Municipal building, Gunterville	250		
	Library, Albertville	52		
	Courthouse, Gunterville	180		
	Addition, recreation facilities, Gunterville	41		
	Conservation measures, Marshall	3		526
Perry County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	8		
	do	50		
	Watershed, Prarie Creek	126		184

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ALABAMA—continued				
Pickens County, 5(b)	Carpenter and Shirley Lumber Co.: Expand sawmill operations		64	
	Health center, Pickens	30		
	Water facility, Reform	61		
	County Jail, Carrollton	79		234
Russell County, 5(b)				
St. Clair County, 5(b)	Town of Springfield: Expand water and sewer facilities		51	51
Shelby County, 5(b)	Fish facility, Oak Mountain Park	83		83
Sumter County, 5(b)	Sewers, York	39		
	Jail, Livingston	70		
	Sewage facilities, York	95		204
Talladega Area, (LS)	Health Center, Childersburg	30		
	Waterworks, Talladega	48		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	10		
	Nursing Home, Sylacauga	168		256
Washington County, 5(b)	Water system, Millry	59		
	Municipal building, Chatom	32		
	Improve wildlife facilities, biological district No. 7	7		98
Wilcox County, 5(b)	Courthouse repair, Camden	79		79
Winston County, 5(b)	Training: Layout man, sheetmetal worker, mechanical assembler, trailer assembler, spray painter, general woodworker, machine tool operator, refrigeration mechanic.		118	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Alabama National Forest	67		
	do	100		285
State totals:				
5(a) ageas		1,058	1,076	
5(b) areas		5,719	1,849	
L.S		3,327		
All areas		10,121	2,925	13,046
ALASKA				
Election district No. 1 (Ketchikan, Prince of Wales), 5(b)(5).	City of Saxman: Constructing port facility, breakwater, and warehouses		1,500	
	Training: General clerks		17	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, South Tongass National Forest	5		
	do	20		
	Community center, Cook Inlet	60		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, South Tongass National Forest	109		
	do	50		1,761
Election district No. 2 (Wrangell-Petersburg) 5(b)	Alaska Pacific Co.: Expand and modernize sawmill		1,500	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, South Tongass National Forest	14		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 7 Petersburg	313		1,827
Election district No. 3 (Sitka), 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, S. Tongass National Forest	63		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, national forest	30		
	Post office, courthouse, Sitka	15		108
Election district No. 4 (Southeast Indian Reservation) 5(b).				
Election district No. 5 (Lynn Canal-Icy Straits), 5(b)(1).				
Election district No. 6 (Cardova-Valdez), 5(b)	Sewer facility, Cordova	383		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chugach National Forest	53		
	Water system, Cordova	400		
	Recreation facility, addition, Mankom Lake	16		852
Election district No. 7 (Palmer-Wasilla-Talkeetna), 5(b).	Repair greenhouse, Palmer	10		
	Greenhouse, Palmer	55		
	Repair warehouse, street, district No. 9	48		113
Election district No. 8 (Anchorage), 5(a)	Training:			
	Electronic mechanic, clerk-stenographer		38	
	Clerk-stenographer		16	
	Millwright		35	
	Drainage improvement, Anchorage	522		611
Election district No. 9 (Seward), 5 (b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chugach National Forest	49		49
Election district No. 10 (Kenai-Cook), 5(b)(4)(5)	Alaska Hardwoods Co., reopen a sawmill		230	
	Seldovia, Alaska: Rebuild and expand water facilities		272	
	Recreation facility, Kenai Moose	200		702
Election district No. 11 (Kodiak), 5(b)	Alaska Ice & Storage, Inc.: Expand fish processing and cold storage firm		260	260
Election district No. 12 (Aleutian Islands), 5(b)	Repair housing, Pribilof	380		380
Election district No. 13 (Bristol Bay), 5(b)	Sewer, recreation facility, street, national monument	100		
	Water and sewage, Hydaburg	175		275
Election district No. 14 (Bethel), 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, North Pole	31		31
Election district No. 15 (Yukon Kuskokwim), 5(b)	Road, McKinley, North Pole	100		
	Recreation facility, addition, Eagle Lake	21		121
Election district No. 16 (Fairbanks), 5(b)(5)	Department of Agriculture:			
	Integrated economic development program		7	
	Economic planning and project implementation in 16th election district		1	
	Training: General clerk		18	
	Water facility, Fairbanks	737		763
Election district No. 17 (Barrow Kobuk), 5(b)				
Election district No. 18 (Nome-Norton Sound Reservation), 5(b).	Community center, Norton Sound	120		120
Election district No. 19 (Wade Hampton), 5(b)	Community center, southeast	365		365

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ALASKA—continued				
Statewide	Department of Agriculture (RAD): Feasibility study of proposed sawmill and lumber finishing facilities.		2	
	Arthur D. Little: Production and processing reindeer meat, fish, tannery, and fur		50	
	University of Alaska: Methods to increase and expand Alaskan native arts and crafts.		40	
	Arthur D. Little: Feasibility of harvesting, processing, and marketing sea lions		48	
	Department of Agriculture (FS): Guidepost for future industries utilizing the forest products.		15	
	Southeastern Islands Development: Feasibility and market survey for bottom fish processing.		40	195
State totals:				
Statewide			195	
5(a) areas		552	89	
5(b) areas		3,912	4,000	
All areas		4,434	4,089	8,523
AMERICAN SAMOA				
American Samoa	Department of agriculture: Technical counsel on production, marketing		10	
	Department of agriculture (ERS): Study of marketing and distribution practices		10	
	Training: Agricultural extension works, home extension workers		35	55
State total:				
5(a) areas			0	
5(b) areas			55	
All areas			55	55
ARIZONA				
Apache County, 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Apache National Forest	100		
	do	70		
	Erosion control, Fort Apache	95		
	Water and sewers, Chinle	250		515
Coconino County, 5(b) IR	Johannessen and Girard: Study adequate water supply and expand tourism		29	29
Gila County, 5(b) IR	Road improvement and erosion control, Hopi Reservation	400		
	Water and sewer facility, San Carlos	105		505
Graham County, 5(b) IR				
Maricopa County, 5(b) IR	Western Management Consultants, Inc.: Study industrial development potential		26	
	Improve immigration and naturalization facility, Maricopa County	44		
	Road, Papago	400		
	Erosion control, Salt River	38		508
Mohave County, 5(b) IR	Recreation facility, Lake Mead	400		
	Erosion control, Hualapai	25		425
Navajo County, 5(b) IR	Jensen and Wallen Mapping and Forest Service: Utilization of Navajo forest products industry.[3]		6	
	Training: Solderer (electronic equipment)		33	
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 17, Navajo	312		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, national forest	145		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Navajo National Forest	100		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Rocky Mountain development	30		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, national forest	80		
	City Hall, Winslow	150		
	Highway, Navajo Reservation	400		
	Erosion control, Navajo Reservation	282		
	Timber stand, Navajo Reservation	200		
	Water and sewage facility, Navajo Reservation	94		
	Soil conservation, Navajo Reservation	203		
	Water and sewer, Navajo Reservation	250		
	Recreation facility, Petrified Forest	163		2,448
Pima County, 5(b) IR	Water and sewer, Santa Rosa	81		81
Pinal County, 5(b) IR	Erosion control, Gila River Reservoir	390		
	Road erosion control, Gila River Reservoir	82		
	Water improvement, Casablanca	100		572
Yuma County, 5(b) IR	Training: Farm machine operators		26	
	Western Farm Management Co.: Study potential for food processing industry		18	
	Erosion and soil conservation, Colorado River Reservation	21		65
Statewide	Checci & Co.: Assist Indian reservations in developing potentialities[1]		7	7
State totals:				
5(a) areas		0	0	
5(b) areas		5,010	145	
All areas		5,010	145	5,155
ARKANSAS				
Ashley County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Wilmot	22		
	Water and sewer facility, Wilmot	50		72
Baxter County, 5(b)	Gassville, Water Improvement District No. 1, new water system		160	
	Surveys and Research Corp.: Study impact of Mar Bax Shirt Co. on Gassville economy.		3	
	Roads, reclamation, roads development, Ozark National Forest	19		
	do	40		222
Benton area (LS)				
Berryville area (LS)				
Blytheville area (LS)				
Boone County, 5(b)	Boone Hospital, addition, Harrison	480		480
Brinkley area (LS)	Sewer facility, Clarendon	29		
	Repair water supply system, Brinkley	34		63
Camden area, 5(a)	Water facility, Camden	474		474

See footnotes at end of table.

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ARKANSAS—continued				
Chicot County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing-machine operator		17	
	Sewer facility, Dermott	65		
	Flood control, Mississippi River	73		
	Sewers, Dermott	58		213
Clark County, 5(b)	Water facility, Arkadelphia	176		
	Water facility, Amity	32		208
Cleburne County, 5(b)	City of Heber Springs: Extend water and gas line (see statewide projects for additional financial assistance project).		83	83
Cleveland County, 5(b)				
Columbia County, 5(b)				
Conway County, 5(b)	City of Morrilton: Sewage-treatment plant and access road to industrial park		255	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	4		
	do	10		
	Improve watershed, Westfork	125		
	Waste-treatment facility, Plumerville	17		
	Training: Clerk-stenographers		12	423
Crawford County, 5(b)				
Crittenden County, 5(b)	Storage shed, Clarkdale	5		
	Repair water supply system, West Memphis	195		
	Sewer facility, Turrell	20		220
Des Arc area (LS)				
Desha County, 5(b)	Post office	220		
	Water supply system, Reed	16		236
Drew County, 5(b)	Water facility, Monticello	153		
	or			
	Repair water supply system, Tillar	16		
	Repair water supply system, Wilmar	17		186
England area (LS)				
Faulkner County, 5(b)	Game and fish development, Faulkner	25		25
Forest City area, (LS)				
Franklin County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Ozark National Forest	31		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	35		
	do	50		
	Water facility, Ozark	62		178
Fulton County, 5(b)	(See statewide for ARA projects)			
	Water facility, Mammoth Spring	70		70
Grant County, 5(b)	Public building, Sheridan	160		160
Hope area, (LS)				
Hot Spring County, 5(b)				
Independence County, 5(b)	City of Batesville, water system, expansion, and improvement		432	432
Izard County, 5(b)	City of Calico Rock, constructing railroad spur to wood-treating plant		7	
	Waste treatment facility, Calico Rock	29		
	Waste treatment facility, Melbourne	9		
	Water facility, Calico Rock	90		135
Jackson County, 5(b)				
Johnson County, 5(b)	Training: Boatbuilders		8	
	Ozark Lumber Industries, Inc.: Establish new wood plant		478	
	Waste treatment facility, Clarksville	28		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	45		
	do	50		609
Lafayette County, 5(b)	Training:			
	All-round machine operators		40	
	Furniture upholsterers		20	60
Lawrence County, 5(b)	Training: All-round farm-machine operator		29	
	Waste treatment facility, Hoaxie	29		
	Water and sewers, Hoaxie	104		
	Water, sewers, Walnut Ridge	71		233
Lee County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	3		
	do	40		
	Flood control, Mississippi River	28		
	Water supply system, Marianna	21		
	Drainage facility, Marianna	145		23
Lincoln County, 5(b)	National Wire Fabric Corp.: Construct new plant		69	
	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		14	
	All-round farm machinery operator		56	
	Combination welder		26	
	Production worker, wire fabric		28	
	Gould watershed, Grady	185		
	Administration building, Star City	35		413
Little River County, 5(b)	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		11	
	All-round farm machinery operator		19	30
Logan County, 5(b)				
Madison County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator		8	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	6		
	Do	9		
	Do	50		73
Marion County, 5(b)	Training: Carpenter		10	
	Recreational facility, Bull Shoals	80		
	Sewer facility, Flippin	80		170
Miller area (LS)	Water facility, Texarkana	235		235

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ARKANSAS—continued				
Montgomery County, 5(b)	Water and sewer, Mount Ida	91		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Quachita National Forest	47		
	do	30		
	Waste treatment facility, Mount Ida	14		
				182
Murfreesboro area (LS)				
Nevada County, 5(b)				
Newton County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	20		
	do	8		
				28
Perry County, 5(b)	Brooks & Associates: Determine acceptability and potential of new drill bit		29	
	Waste treatment facility, Perryville	17		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Quachita National Forest	18		
	do	10		
	do	20		
	Dam and fish lake, Overcup Lake	113		
	Water facility, Perryville	46		
				253
Phillips County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-stenographer		9	
	Training: All-round farm operator		66	
	Waste treatment facility, West Helena	108		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	7		
	do	10		
	Sewer facilities, West Helena	128		
	Helena Hospital, Helena	300		
	Water facility, Helena	58		
	Water supply system, West Helena	213		
				899
Piggott area, (LS)				
Polk County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Quichita National Forest	15		
	do	60		
	Water facility, Cove	67		
	Sewer facility, Wickes	70		
				212
Pope County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	40		40
Randolph County, 5(b)				
Rogers area, (LS)				
Scott County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Quichita National Forest	20		
	do	20		
	do	20		
				60
Searcy county, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	3		3
Sevier County, 5(b)	Water facility, Horatio	82		
	Waste treatment facility, Horatio	13		
	Rubber Corp.: DeQueen, build factory		332	
				427
Sharp County, 5(b)	(See statewide for financial assistance project)			
	Training: Apprentice carpenters		9	
	Sewer facility, Evening Shade	63		
	Training: Clerk-stenographer's		13	
				85
Stone County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	16		
	do	40		
				56
Truman area, (LS)				
Van Buren County, 5(b)	City of Clinton: Expand water and sewer facilities		475	
	(See statewide projects for financial assistance project)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ozark National Forest	1		
	do	40		
				516
White County, 5(b)	Water facility, Searcy	300		
	Lake area development, White	18		
				318
Woodruff County, 5(b)	Training: Heavy machine equipment operators; farm machine operators		62	
	Waste treatment facility, McCrory	4		
	Sewer facility, Patterson	39		
				105
Wynne Area, (LS)				
Yell County, 5(b)				
Statewide, (Cleburne County, 5(b)(6), Fulton County, 5(b)(3), Sharp County, 5(b)(1), and Van Buren County, 5(b)(1)(2)(3)).	Ozark Foothills Handicraft Guild Association, construct 4 roadside handicraft display buildings.		16	16
State totals:				
5(a) areas		474		
5(b) areas		5,572	2,786	
L.S. areas		298		
All areas		6,344	2,786	
				9,130
CALIFORNIA				
Del Norte County, 5(b)	City of Crescent City: Construct seawall, beach front area, and general facilities for commercial recreation and tourism.		458	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Six Rivers	15		
	do	57		
	do	23		
	Water facility, Crescent	84		
	Construct public facility, Del Norte	18		
				655
Eureka area (LS)	Waste treatment facility, King Salmon	44		
	Recreation facility, King Range	220		
	Family housing, Samoa	200		
	Flood control, Mad River	137		
	Water facility, Fortuna	115		
	Sewer facility, Blue Lake	11		
	Sewer facility, Cutten	197		
	Post office, courthouse, Eureka	15		
	Sewer facility, King Salmon	36		
	Fish facility, Luffenholtz	10		
	Fish facility, Cock Robin	32		
				1,017

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
CALIFORNIA—continued				
Fresno Area, (LS)	Border station, Fresno	44		
	Waste treatment facility, Sanger	124		
	Waste treatment facility, Carruthers	40		
	St. Agnes Hospital addition, Fresno	137		
	General hospital addition, Fresno	889		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Sierra National Forest	130		
	Recreation facility, Kings Canyon	246		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Sierra National Forest	50		
	do	7		
	Waste treatment facility, Coalinga	148		
	Sewer facility, Carruthers	85		
	Sewer facility, Fresno	140		
	do	376		
	Sewer facilities, Fresno	99		
	Sewer facility, Riverdale	17		
	Construction public facility, Fresno	20		2,552
Lassen County, 5(a)	Recreation facility, Lassen National Forest	250		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lassen National Forest	57		
	do	90		397
Modesto County, 5(b)	Community building, Modesto	355		
	Post office, Modesto	15		
	City hall, Turlock	110		480
Plumas County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Plumas National Forest	140		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lassen National Forest	43		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Plumas National Forest	60		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lassen National Forest	5		
	Plumas Hospital improvement, Quincy	14		
	Recreation facility, Volcanic National Park	17		279
Redding area (LS)	Recreation facility, Whiskey Town	200		
	Recreation facility, Volcanic National Park	15		
	Road, Shasta	34		249
Riverside County, 5(b)	Recreation facility, Joshua Tree	31		31
San Benito County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Hollister	72		
	Roads, Pinnacles	71		143
San Bernardino County, 5(b)				
San Diego area (LS)	Waste treatment facilities, Tomerado	107		
	Border station, Campo	44		
	Building, San Diego	915		
	Waste treatment facility, Oceanside	120		
	do	20		
	Waste treatment facility, Palm City	30		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cleveland	270		
	do	55		
	Administration building, Imperial Beach	116		
	Sewer facility, Chula Vista	234		
	Improve building, San Diego	17		
	Sewer facility, La Mesa	19		
	Coroner office, San Diego	138		
	Receiving home, San Diego	281		
	Welfare building, San Diego	185		
	Maintenance building, San Diego	276		
	Water facility, Vista	112		
	Municipal building, Carlsbad	48		
	Water facility, Fallbrook	21		
	Traffic system, La Mesa	8		
	Sewer facility, La Mesa	4		
	Sewer facility, Fallbrook	100		
	Community building, National City	26		
	Drainage, National City	45		
	Drainage, National City	20		
	Water and sewers, Oceanside	16		
	do	19		
	do	60		
	Sewer line, El Cajon	10		
	do	18		
	do	10		
	Post office, San Diego	33		3,377
Sierra County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Tahoe National Forest	100		
	do	60		160
Siskiyou County, 5(b)	Hospital facility, addition, Yreka	141		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Klamath National Forest	130		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shasta Trinity National Forest	47		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 93, Siskiyou	390		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Klamath National Forest	75		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shasta Trinity National Forest	5		788
Stockton area (LS)	Waste treatment facility, Stockton	624		
	San Joaquin Hospital addition, French Camp	370		
	Post office, Stockton	30		
	Drainage, Ripon	120		
	Sewer facility, Escalon	13		1,157
Trinity County, 5(b)	Recreation facility, Trinity	135		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mendoci National Forest	103		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Six Rivers	75		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shasta Trinity National Forest	60		
	Channel improvement, Weaver Creek	232		605

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
CALIFORNIA—continued				
Ukiah area, 5(b)	Training: Machine tool operator		44	
	Roads improvement, Red Mountain	120		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mendocino National Forest	55		
	Recreation facility, Coyote Valley Dam	400		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 7, Mendocino National Forest	350		
	Sanitary facility, Sheldon Creek	9		
	Public facility, Heeser Dr	8		986
Statewide	Checci & Co.: Assist Indian reservations in developing tourist potentialities [1]		7	7
State totals:				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		4,022	502	
LS areas		8,352		
Statewide			7	
All areas		12,374	509	12,883
COLORADO				
Alamosa County, 5(b)	Training: Farm tractor and equipment maintenance and operator		15	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Isabel	16		
	Fence and walls, Alamosa	54		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Rio Grand	20		105
Clear Creek County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Arapaho National Forest	50		50
Conejos County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Rio Grand	164		
	Road improvement dam, Conejos	81		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Rio Grand	25		
	do	90		
	Boat ramp, Conejos	9		
	do	1		
	Water ponds, Sego Spring	9		379
Costilla County, 5(b)	Training: Farm tractor and equipment maintenance and operation		15	15
Creede area (LS)				
Dove Creek area (LS)				
Fremont County, 5(b)	Construct deer fence, Canon City	3		3
Gilpin County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Roosevelt National Forest	70		
	do	25		95
Huerfano County, 5(b)	Training: All round farm machine operators		13	
	General hospital, Walsenburg	14		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, San Isabel National Forest	72		
	Improve dam, Huerfano	40		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, San Isabel National Forest	5		
	Road construction, Horseshoe	2		
	Sanitary facility, Walsenburg	1		139
Las Animas County, 5(b)	Training: Poultry farmers		22	
	Training: Auto mechanic helper		13	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Isabel National Forest	32		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, San Isabel National Forest	10		
	Construct 8 dikes	7		84
Pueblo area (LS)	Water facility, Pueblo	1,185		
	Street improvement, Pueblo	21		1,206
Teller County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Pike National Forest	50		
	Improve Federal Highway 50, Teller County	380		430
State totals:				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		1,230	78	
LS areas		1,206		
All areas		2,436	78	2,514
CONNECTICUT				
Ansonia area, 5(a)	Program Research, Inc.: Design programs to reduce unemployment [3]		8	
	Training: Machine tool operator		56	
	Training: Machine tool operator, auto mechanic		40	
	Water facility, Ansonia	216		
	Fire station, Derby	64		
	Post office, Ansonia	15		399
Bridgeport area (LS)	Sewer facility, Bridgeport	60		
	Hangar, Bridgeport	274		
	Sewer facility, Fairfield	250		
	Sidewalks, Fairfield	100		
	Police station, Fairfield	25		
	Stadium, Bridgeport	475		
	Improve wildlife facility	11		
	Garage, Fairfield	25		
	Fish facility	8		1,228
Bristol area, 5(a)	West-Cap East Corp.: Expand operations		146	
	Ingraham Co.: Construct building to expand watch and clock manufacturing		975	
	Brown Engineers: Feasibility study for feeder airport and ancillary industrial park.		15	
	Training: Machine tool operator, electronic assembler		32	
	Training: Machine tool operator, toolsetter, machine shop inspector		89	
	Fire station, Bristol	108		
	do	31		
	Utility and street, Bristol	190		
	Wildlife facility improvement, Bristol	1		
	Stream improvement	1		1,588

See footnotes at end of table.

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
CONNECTICUT—continued				
Danielson area, 5(a)	Training: Machine tool operator, ship electrician, chemical operator		67	
	Training: Ship electrician, outside machinist, injection molding machine operators		85	
	Training: Combination welder (Spickler Co.)		5	
	Training: Electronic assembler		23	
	Training: Welder (Spickler Co.)		10	
	Dyer, Schoeller & Wirth: Commercial and industrial expansion and diversification.		30	
	Waste treatment facility, Danielson	97		317
Middletown area (LS)	Buildings, Marlboro	10		10
New Britain area (LS)	Street improvement, New Britain	80		
	General Hospital addition, New Britain	143		223
Norwich area (LS)	Reservoir addition, Voluntown	6		
	Wildlife facility improvement, Norwich	4		
	Fish facility, Voluntown	1		
	Wildlife facility, Hartland	6		
	Interceptor sewer		249	269
Torrington area, (LS)	Wildlife facility, Colchester	10		
	Wildlife facility improvement, Torrington	6		
	Streets, Torrington	56		
	Channel improvement, Torrington	115		
	Sanitary sewer, Torrington	136		
	Hospital addition, Sharon	426		
	Fish and wildlife improvement, Litchfield	26		775
Waterbury area, (LS)	Sewer facility, Waterbury	500		
	Garage, Goshen	22		522
Willimantic area, (LS)	Water facility, Willimantic	176		176
State totals:				
5(a) areas		723	1,581	
5(b) areas				
LS areas		3,209		
All areas		3,932	1,581	5,513
Jenkins County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Millen	48		
	Water facility, Millen	72		
	Sewer facility, Millen	36		156
Johnson County, 5(b)	City of Wrightsville: Extend water system		31	31
Jones County, 5(b)	Shed, Jones	1		1
La Grange area, (LS)				
Laurens County, 5(b)	Courthouse, Dublin	450		
	Water facility, Rentz	5		
	Improve sewer facility, Dublin	38		493
DELAWARE				
Kent County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Wyoming	67		
	Waste treatment facility, Clayton	26		
	Wildlife facility, Garrison Marsh	32		
	Sewer facility, Camden	226		351
Sussex County, 5(b)				
State totals:				
5(a) areas: None				
5(b) areas		351		
All areas		351		351
FLORIDA				
Calhoun County, 5(b)	Coastal Timber, Land & Pulp Corp.: Establish a hard and softboard manufacturing plant.		2,873	2,873
Fort Lauderdale area (LS)	Hospital addition, Ft. Lauderdale	186		
	City hall, Oakland Park	59		
	Drainage, Pompano Beach	15		
	City hall, Miramar	122		
	Fire station, Hollywood	52		
	Beach, boardwalk, Hollywood	19		
	Municipal building, Pompano	72		
	Water facility, Pompano Beach	160		
	Water facility, Miramar	126		
	Library, Oakland Park	24		
	Streets, Fort Lauderdale	277		
	Fire station, Fort Lauderdale	56		
	Incinerator, Margate	566		
	Drainage facility, Margate	20		1,754
Franklin County, 5(b)	City of Appalachicola: Water and sewage facilities		28	
	Florida Seafood Canning Co., Inc.: Seafood processing company		652	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Florida National Forest	50		730
Holmes County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Holmes	83		
	Restoration, State forest, Franklin	1		84
Jackson County, 5(b)	Department of Agriculture (ERS): Study of economics and financial feasibility of frozen foods and/or cannery.		6	
	First Research Corp.: Feasibility study for a port		7	
	Training: Attendant, children's institute		40	53
Jefferson County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-typist		22	22
Lafayette County, 5(b)				
Liberty County, 5(b)	Sewage improvement, Liberty	4		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Florida National Forest	100		
	do	30		134

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
FLORIDA—continued				
Miami area (LS)	Hospital improvement, Miami Beach	236		
	Hospital addition, Miami	200		
	Water facility, North Miami	261		
	Sewer facility, Dade County	161		
	Streets and sewers, Miami	360		
	Library, Miami	46		
	do	44		
	do	43		
	Heart institute addition, Miami	116		
	Cedars of Lebanon, addition, Miami	530		
	Streets and sewers, North Miami	117		
	Water facility, Miami Beach	164		
	Water facility, Medley	75		
	Southern Miami Hospital, Miami	104		
	Children's Hospital, Miami	755		
	Fish facility, Miami Canal	42		
	Other buildings, North Miami	42		3,296
Pasco County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Newport, Ritchey	348		348
St. Lucie County, 5(b)				
Sumter County, 5(b)				
Seewanee	McMullan Food Bank: Expand frozen food plant		52	52
Walton County, 5(b)	Restoration, State forest	8		
	Fish facilities, Juniper Lake	39		47
Washington County, 5(b)	Ross Deal Co.: Establish new rubber products plant		15	
	Hospital addition, Chipley	168		
	Restoration, State forest, Washington	17		200
Statewide	George Aase & Associates: Study to develop cement and lime industries (northwest Florida).		27	27
State totals:				
Statewide			27	
5(a) areas		0	0	
5(b) areas		500	3,695	
LS areas		5,398		
All areas		5,898	3,722	9,620
GEORGIA				
Bainbridge area (LS)				
Baker County, 5(b)				
Baldwin County, 5(b)	Water facility, Milledgeville	73		
	Baldwin Hospital, Milledgeville	23		101
Banks County, 5(b)				
Barrow County, 5(b)	City of Winder: Improve water and sewage system		1,363	
	Hospital addition, Winder	188		1,551
Bryan County, 5(b)				
Bulloch County, 5(b)				
Burke County, 5(b)	Drill well, Burke	1		
	Drill well, Burke	1		
	Water facility, Midville	64		66
Calhoun County, 5(b)				
Camilla area (LS)				
Carrollton area, 5(a)	Water facility, Carrollton	322		
	Water facility, Temple	59		381
Cedartown-Rockmart County, 5(a)	Training: Stenographer, general clerk, draftsman, bookkeeper		74	
	Polk general addition, Cedartown	240		554
Chattahoochee County, 5(b)				
Clay County, 5(b)	Headquarters building and well	2		2
Coweta County, 5(b)				
Crisp County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Cordele	102		
	Streets, Cordele	158		
	Gas system, Cordele	83		343
Dade County, 5(b)				
Dawson County, 5(b)				
Dooly County, 5(b)	Administration building, Vienna	45		45
Dougherty County, 5(b)	Repair garage-State building, Albany	2		
	Sewer facility, Dougherty	442		
	Water facility, Albany	115		
	Construction storage shed, Albany	2		561
Early County, 5(b)				
Elbert County, 5(b)	Georgia Tech Research Institute: Granite industry study		50	
	Water and sewers, Elberton	66		116
Forsyth County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Cummings	79		
	Sewer facility, Cummings	37		116
Franklin County, 5(b)	City of Lavonia: Extend water and sewer system		723	
	Move tower, Franklin	1		
	Recreation facility, Hartwell Reservoir		54	778
Gilmer County, 5(b)				
Glascock County, 5(b)				

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
GEORGIA—continued				
Gordon County, 5(b)	Fletcher Bros. of Georgia: Construction modern meatpacking plant		390	
	Glasrock Products, Inc.: Expand ceramic plant		520	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	3		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	60		
	Shed and shop, Gordon	3		
	Water facility, Calhoun	63		
	Constructing equipment storage, district headquarters	2		1,041
Habersham County, 5(b)	University of Georgia: Exploration of mineral deposits		42	
	Water facility, Cornelia	65		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	8		
	do	60		
	Fish facility, Habersham	2		
	City hall, Clarkesville	27		204
Hancock County, 5(b)	Shed, Hancock	1		1
Hart County, 5(b)	Fish and wildlife facilities	14		14
Heard County, 5(b)				
Henry County, 5(b)	Recreational facilities, Henry	5		5
Hinesville area (LS)				
Jasper County, 5(b)				
Jefferson County, 5(b)	City of Wadley: Extend water and sewer systems		232	
	Recreational facilities, Jefferson	5		
	Water and sewers, Louisville	57		294
Lee County, 5(b)				
Lincoln County, 5(b)				
Lumpkin County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	4		
	do	80		84
Macon County, 5(b)				
Marion County, 5(b)				
McIntosh County, 5(b)	Move tower, McIntosh		1	1
Meriweather County, 5(b)				
Montgomery County, 5(b)	Headquarters and well improvement, Montgomery	1		1
Moultrie area (LS)	Building, Moultrie	125		125
Murray County, 5(b)				
Oglethorpe County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	5		
	Move tower, Oglethorpe	1		6
Pulaski County, 5(b)				
Quitman County, 5(b)				
Rabun County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	10		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 1, Rabun	250		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	20		
	Fish facility, Rabun County	2		282
Randolph County, 5(b)	County offices, Randolph County	4		4
Schley County, 5(b)				
Screven County, 5(b)	Screven Industries Corp.: Build ladies' garment manufacturing plant		154	
	Sewell & Associates, Inc.: Determine suitable sites for industrial development		6	
	Improve Federal building, Sylvania	203		
	Water facility, Sylvania	36		
	Post office, Sylvania	22		421
Stewart County, 5(b)	Water facility, Lumpkin	6		6
Sumter County, 5(b)	Nurse, home, Americus	850		850
Talbot County, 5(b)				
Taliaferro County, 5(b)				
Taylor County, 5(b)	CFA, water facility, Reynolds	110		110
Telfair County, 5(b)				
Terrell County, 5(b)	Water-sewer facility, Dawson	38		
	Post office, Dawson	12		
	Streets, Dawson	3		53
Toombs County, 5(b)	Vidalia Development Authority: Construct building for lease to Chickasha Mobile Homes, Inc.		85	85
Towns County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	21		
	Fish facility, Towns County	2		23
Treutlen County, 5(b)				
Twiggs County, 5(b)	Water facility, Jeffersonville	125		125
Union County, 5(b)	Georgia Mountain Enterprises: Construction tourist facility		839	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	152		
	do	10		
	do	90		
	Water and sewer, Blairville	50		
	Waste treatment facility, Blairville	29		
	Fish facility, Union County	2		1,172
Walker County, (LS)	Water facility, Lafayette	212		212
Walton County, 5(b)	Post office, courthouse, Monroe	14		14
Warren County, 5(b)				
Washington County, 5(b)	Water facility, Sandersville	80		
	do	85		165
Waycross area (LS)	Training center, Ware County	32		32
Wayne County, 5(b)	Improve Federal building, Jessup	294		
	Post office, Jessup	38		332
Webster County, 5(b)				
Wheeler County, 5(b)	Aircraft hangar, Wheeler	7		7

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
GEORGIA—continued				
White County, 5(b)	(See Habersham County for technical assistance project)			
	City of Helen: Extend water system		50	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		6	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Georgia National Forest	4		
	do	60		
	Fish facility, White County	2		122
Wilkes County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator		10	
	Administrative building, Tignall	3		13
Worth County, 5(b) statewide	Georgia Institute of Technology: Effectiveness of interdisciplinary approach to development of industry.		40	
	Department of Agriculture: Research to step up marketing of peach products (southern Georgia).		33	
	University of Georgia: Establish recreation experiment station (northern Georgia)		23	96
State totals:				
Statewide			96	
5(a) areas		621	74	
5(b) areas		5,180	4,501	
LS areas		369		
All areas		6,170	4,671	10,841
GUAM				
Guam territory, 5(b)	Housing units	100		100
Totals:				
5(a) areas		0	0	
5(b) areas		0	0	
Territory		100		
All totals		100		100
HAWAII				
Hawaii County, 5(b)	Kailua Kona: Sewage disposal system		437	
	Inter-Island Resorts, Inc.: To construct 50-room addition to hotel		351	
	Training: Waiter, waitress		2	
	Visitor facilities, Volcanoes	134		
	Roads, Kalapana	100		
	Cleanup, Refuge National Park	175		
	Volcanic observatory project, Hawaii	80		
	Construct and improve Federal building	53		
	Warehouse, west of Hilo	3		1,335
State totals:				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		545	790	
All areas		545	790	1,335
IDAHO				
Bannock County, 5(b) IR	Road Fort Hall	400		400
Benewah County, 5(b)	Benewah Lumber Co-op, Inc,: Replace lumber-finishing plant		143	
	Training: Clerk-stenorgapher		11	
	Waste treatment facilities, Plummer	12		
	Waste treatment facilities, St. Maries	51		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, St. Joe National Forest	66		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway 50, Benewah	236		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, St. Joe National Forest	65		
	Office, Benewah	2		
	Sewer facilities, Plummer	26		612
Bingham County, 5(b) IR				
Bonner County, 5(b) IR	Schweitzer Basin, Inc.: Develop ski resort		320	
	Training: Clerk-stenographer		10	
	Waste treatment facilities, West Bonner	6		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kaniksu National Forest	113		
	do	80		
	do	30		
	do	45		
	Residence, Bonner	10		
	Recreation facilities, Albeni Falls Reservation	145		
	Improve fishing and wildlife, Bonner	18		
	Sewer facilities, West Bonner	30		807
Boundary County, 5(b)	Miscellaneous improvements, Port Hill	155		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kaniksu National Forest	67		
	do	25		
	do	10		
	Border station, Eastport	22		
	Wildlife and fishing facilities, Boundary	11		290
Caribou County, 5(b) IR				
Clearwater County 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clearwater National Forest	91		
	do	90		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, St. Joe National Forest	20		
	Water facilities, Orofino	163		364
Idaho County 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Payette National Forest	89		
	Roads, reclamation, land development	10		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nez Perce	200		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nez Perce National Forest	55		
	Roads, reclamation, land development	45		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway, Idaho	375		774
Kootenai County 5(b)	Training: Clerk-stenographer		11	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Coeur d'Alene	100		
	Camps, Latour Creek	80		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Coeur d'Alene	130		
	do	5		
	Improve fish and wildlife, Kootenai	9		
	Post office and courthouse Coeur d'Alene	43		
	Water supply system, Spirit Lake	67		445

***Approved projects, including accelerated public works** (as of May 31, 1963)*—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
IDAHO—continued				
Lewis County 5(b) IR				
Nez Perce County 5(b) IR	Robert R. Nathan Associates: Study of recreation and tourist development		36	
	Erosion control, Nez Perce Reservation	47		83
Payette area (LS)	Conservation, Brownlee Reservation	87		87
Power County 5(b)				
Shoshone County 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, St. Joe National Forest	74		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway 50, Shoshone	164		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, St. Joe National Forest	65		303
State totals:				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		3, 547	531	
L S areas		87		
All areas		3, 634	531	4, 165
ILLINOIS				
Cairo-Metropolis area, 5(a)	Good Luck Glove Co.: Expand operations		174	
	Rend Lake Conservancy District: Road relocation prior to location of reservoir		550	
	Corps of Engineers: Study construction of industrial reservoir		45	
	Training: Glove sewer		10	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		7	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee, National Forest	25		
	Waste treatment facilities, Cairo	265		
	Water facilities, Thebes	23		
	Wildlife facilities, Horseshoe Lake	33		
	Well and sewer system, Massac	10		
	Massac hospital addition, Metropolis	555		
	Fishing facilities improvement, Massac	15		
	Corps of Engineers: Advanced planning of proposed reservoir, Rend Lake		450	2, 102
Calhoun County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Brussels	83		
	Sewer facilities, Hardin	91		174
Carroll County 5(b)	Wood Production, Inc.: Expansion of wood products industry		30	30
Centralia area 5(a)	Waste treatment facilities, Bartelso	6		
	Waste treatment facilities, Carlyle	52		
	Sewer facilities, Breese City	19		
	Water and sewer, Bartelso	108		
	Improve water facilities, Carlyle	31		
	Water facilities, Keyesport	102		
	Water system, Junction City	70		
	Water and sewers, Odin	152		
	Sewer facilities, Salem	22		
	Fish ponds, Marion	160		
	Waste treatment facilities, Odin	76		
	Municipal building, Centralia	51		849
Danville area (LS)	Fishing facilities, Kickapoo Park	50		
	Post Office and courthouse, Danville	28		78
Edwards County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, West Salem	44		44
Harrisburg area, 5(a)	Training: Nurses aid and orderly		7	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee National Forest	55		
	do	98		
	Highway Improvement Federal Highway 3, Hardin	215		
	Highway Improvement Federal Highway 20, Hardin	250		
	do	130		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee National Forest	100		
	do	25		
	Waste treatment facilities, Carrier Mill	70		
	Fishing facilities improvement, Saline	59		1, 009
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort area, 5(a)	Technical Tape Corp.: New plant		605	
	Carbondale Industrial Corp.: For expansion of Technical Tape Corp		670	
	Training:			
	Production workers (paper goods)		109	
	Production workers (nonferrous metal alloys and metal, McNair Metal Products Co.).		33	
	Sewing machine operator		4	
	do		27	
	Nurse aid		6	
	Arc welder, trailer assembler		32	
	Sewing machine operator (Smolar Bros., Inc.)		23	
	Extrusion press operator, tapping machine operator, furnace operator, casting operator, press saw operator, extrusion handler, conduit threading machine, press break operator.		32	
	Production worker (paper goods)		119	
	Psychiatric aid		59	
	Highway improvement: Federal Highway No. 7, Union	231		
	Franklin hospital addition, Benton	653		
	Recreation facilities, Frankfort	12		
	Roads, reclamation, land developments, Shawnee National Forest	35		
	Waste treatment facilities, DeSoto	14		
	Sewer facilities, DeSoto	71		
	Waste treatment facilities, Johnson	58		
	Wildlife facilities, Johnson	400		
	Area water headquarters, Johnson	14		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee National Forest	10		
	Portable water supply headquarters	11		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway No. 9, Jackson	250		
	Community Hospital, Pinckneyville	346		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee National Forest	91		
	do	35		
	Wildlife facilities, Union County	8		3, 961
Jersey County 5(b)	Wildlife facilities, Jersey	50		50
Kankakee County (LS)	Hospital improvement, Kankakee	1, 356		1, 356

***Approved projects, including accelerated public works** (as of May 31, 1963)*—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
ILLINOIS—continued				
Knox County (LS)	Waste treatment facilities, Oneida	22		
	Waste treatment facilities, Yates City	27		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Wataga	40		
	do	31		140
Litchfield area, 5(a)	Lake of the Seven Fingers: To improve and expand recreation area		61	
	Training: Clerk typist, clerk-stenographer		35	
	Training: Nurse aid, combination welder		18	
	Training: Welders		12	
	Training: Hotel and restaurant cooks		6	
	Training: nurse aid		5	
	Sewer facilities, Edinburg	160		
	Water facilities, Medora	100		
	Fish and wildlife, Macoupin	18		
	Waste treatment facilities, Bunker Hill	23		
	Hospital addition, Carlinville	123		
	Water facilities, Nilwood	36		
	Improve water facilities, Gillespie	222		
	Water facilities, White City	64		
	Waste treatment facilities, Witt	15		
	Waste treatment facilities, Farmersville	9		
	Water facilities, Schram City	123		
	Sewer facilities, Witt City	127		
	Water facilities, Farmersville	83		1,122
Macon County (LS)	Water facilities, Decatur	125		
	Waste treatment facilities, Decatur	533		658
Marshall County, 5(b): Mattoon area, 5(a)	Water facilities, Mattoon	144		
	Water facilities, Jewett	62		206
Mercer County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Sheppard	30		
	Waste treatment facilities, Matherville	33		
	Waste treatment facilities, New Boston	36		
	Sewer facilities, Matherville	102		
	Sewer facilities, Sheppard	74		
	Sewer facilities, New Boston	102		377
Monroe County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Valmeyer	22		
	Waste treatment facilities, Columbia	19		
	Water and sewers, Valmeyer	135		176
Moultrie County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Bethany	31		
	Waste treatment facility, Lovington	29		
	Water and sewers, Lovington	133		
	Water and sewers, Bethany	151		444
Mount Vernon area, 5(a)	Training: Power sewing machine operator		28	
	Roads, Ham	62		
	Road, Wayne	18		
	Waste treatment facility, Fairfield	27		
	Water-sewer, Fairfield	271		
	Water facility, Sims	75		
	Water facility, Wayne City	25		506
Randolph County, 5(b)	City of Sparta: Improve water distribution system		236	
	Boathouse, Randolph	18		
	Water facility, Steelville	96		
	Water-street, Sparta	332		682
Richland County, 5(b)	Training: Sewer (shoe)		12	12
Shelby County, 5(b)				
Warren County (LS)				
Statewide	Clark, Daily & Dietz: Study of intercommunity water distribution system		20	
	University of Illinois: Study to improve potential development of agricultural areas.		17	
	Clark, Daily, Dietz & Associates, Rend Lake Conservation District: Water supply feasibility study.		10	47
State totals:				
Statewide			47	
5(a) areas		6,210	3,127	
5(b) areas		2,369	278	
LS areas		2,052		
All areas		10,631	3,452	14,083
INDIANA				
Clark County, 5(b)	Bordon Cabinet Corp.: Rebuild plant destroyed by fire		577	
	City of New Providence: Water ystem to service Bordon Cabinet Corp		17	
	Illinois Glass Sand Corp.: Establish plant		69	
	Depot, Jeffersonville	105		
	Sewer facility, Charlestown	35		
	Water facility, Charlestown	105		908
Clay County, 5(b)				
Connersville area (LS)				
Crawford County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hoosier National Forest	14		
	Bridge improvement, Federal Highway No. 5, Crawford	44		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hoosier National Forest	60		118
Dearborn County, 5(b)				
Evansville area, 5(a) (see Henderson, Ky.)	City of Evansville: Extend sewage system		1,100	
	Training: Automobile screw-machine operator, tool and gage inspector, automobile mechanic.		232	
	Training: Automobile mechanic helper, machine operator		66	
	Wellborn Hospital, Adevansville	961		2,359
Greene County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-stenographer		18	
	Waste treatment facility, Worthington	75		93

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
INDIANA—continued				
Harrison County, 5(b)	Indiana Glass Sand Corp.: Establish plant		471	
	Waste treatment facility, Corydon	144		
	Additional fire road, Harrison County	1		
	Sewer facility, Corydon	194		810
Jasper County, 5(b)	Hospital, Rensselaer	283		
	Nursery improvement, Jasper	15		298
Jennings County, 5(b)	North Vernon Processing Co.: To rebuild and expand forging operations after fire		115	
	North Vernon Building Co.: To construct plant for Electronic Systems, Inc.		130	
	Water facility, North Vernon	138		383
La Porte area (LS)				
Lawrence County, 5(b)	Road, reclamation, land development, Hoosier National Forest	24		
	do	100		124
Martin County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Loogootee	102		
	Develop public facility, Loogootee	13		115
Monroe County, 5(b)	Incinerator, Bloomington	45		
	Fire station, Bloomington	45		
	Buildings, Bloomington	150		240
Morgan County, 5(b)	Fire headquarters improvement, Morgan	1		
	Waste treatment facility, Morgantown	57		
	Sewer facilities, Morgantown	97		
	Additional fire road, Morgan County	1		156
Muncie area (LS)	Sewer facility, Muncie	360		360
New Castle area, 5(a)	Water facility, New Castle	233		233
Ohio County, 5(b)				
Orange County, 5(b)	Bridge improvement, Federal Highway No. 2, Orange	150		150
Perry County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Troy	37		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hoosier National Forest	50		
	Water facility, Troy	39		126
Pike County, 5(b)	Water facility, Winslow	120		120
Pulaski County, 5(b)	Remodel manager's house, game preservation	4		4
Richland County, 5(b)	Training, hand sewers		12	12
Ripley County, 5(b)	City of Milan: Improve water system		362	362
St. Joseph area (LS)	Sewer facility, South Bend	545		
	Street, South Bend	160		
	Sewer facility, Mishawaka	34		
	Street improvement, Mishawaka	46		
	do	45		
	do	28		
	City garage, Mishawaka	47		
	Street improvement, Mishawaka	20		
	do	41		
	Streets, St. Joseph County	41		1,007
Scott County, 5(b)				
Spencer County, 5(b)	Lincoln National Memorial	39		
	Waste treatment facility, Dale	56		
	Gas system, Grandview	49		144
Starke County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Knox	77		
	Sewer facility, Knox	317		394
Sullivan County, 5(b)	Water facility, Dugger	43		43
Switzerland County, 5(b)				
Vermillion County, 5(b)				
Vincennes area (LS)	Water facility, Monroe City	100		100
Washington County, 5(b)	Training: Production worker (boot and shoe), various occupations		64	
	Salem Redevelopment Corp.: To purchase land and construct building for Bate Shoe Co.		474	
	City of Salem: To provide water and sewage facilities		235	
	Sewer facility, Campbellsburg	98		
	Water facility, Campbellsburg	116		
	Waste treatment facility, Campbellsburg	31		
	Additional fire road, Washington	1		1,019
State totals:				
5(a) areas		1,194	1,398	
5(b) areas		3,437	2,182	
LS areas		1,467		
All areas				
All totals		6,098	3,580	9,678
IOWA				
Appanoose County, 5(b) (see Monroe County for training project).	Highway improvement: Federal Highway No. 1, Appanoose	385		385
Monroe County, 5(b)	Training: Combination welder		21	21
Statewide	Iowa Development Commission: Technical assistance to facilitate economic growth of Iowa.		50	50
Totals:				
Statewide			50	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		385	21	
LS areas				
All totals		385	71	456
KANSAS				
Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons (LS)	Waste treatment facilities, Parsons	24		
	Sewer facilities, Oswego	71		
	Water facilities, Edna	20		115

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
KANSAS—continued				
Pittsburg area, 5(a)	Training: Stenographer		8	
	Training: Nurse aid		4	
	Water facilities, Columbus	125		
	Waste treatment facilities, McCune	24		
	Waste treatment facilities, Cherokee	23		
	Sewer facilities, Arma	154		
	Sewer facilities, McCune	93		431
Rice County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Alden	68		
	Robert L. Horn: Establish plant to manufacture mosaic stone		1	69
Totals:				
5(a) areas		419	12	
5(b) areas		68	1	
LS areas		115		
All totals		602	13	615
KENTUCKY				
Adair County, 5(b)				
Allen County, 5(b)				
Barren County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Cave City	142		
	Sewers and streets, Glasgow	27		
	Sewers, Glasgow	87		
	Waste treatment facilities, Cave City	63		319
Bath County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	20		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 64, Bath	290		
	Water facilities, Sharpsburg	156		466
Boyd County, 5(b) (part of Huntington and Ashland, W. Va.).	Training:			
	Nurse aid		4	
	do		8	
	Sewing machine operator		13	
	Corrective institution improvement, Ashland	300		
	Repair prison, Ashland	30		
	Sewers, Catlettsburg	465		
	Water facilities, Ashland	51		871
Breckinridge County, 5(b)	Recreational facilities, Rough River	80		
	Waste treatment facilities, Cloverport	89		169
Butler County, 5(b)				
Calloway County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Hazel	5		
	Watershed, Clark River	23		
	Street, Murray	24		52
Carlisle area (LS)				
Carlisle County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Arlington	33		
	Watershed, Obion Creek	32		
	Sewer facilities improvement, Arlington	39		104
Carrollton area, (LS)				
Casey County, 5(b)				
Clinton County, 5(b)				
Corbin area, 5(a)	Williamsburg Industrial Corp.: Erect and equip wood products plant for lease to Kentucky Mills.		39	
	Fishing facilities, Corbin	110		
	Water facilities, Manchester	294		
	Courthouse, Barbourville	310		
	Replace Rock Castle Bridge approach	190		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	20		
	do	35		
	City Garage, Corbin	47		1045
Crittenden County, 5(b)				
Cumberland County, 5(b)				
Danville area, 5(a)	Sewer facilities, Danville	9		
	Waste treatment facilities, Lancaster	92		
	Sewer facilities, Lancaster	121		222
Edmonson County, 5(b)	Marco Development Corp.: To construct motel and restaurant complex		640	
	Park improvement, Mammoth Cave	143		
	Recreational facilities, Holin Reservoir	27		810
Elizabethtown area, 5(a)	Recreational facilities, Rough River Reservoir	120		
	Sewer facilities, Radcliff	751		
	Fort Knox Depot, Elizabethtown	67		
	Waste treatment facilities, Radcliff	89		
	Water facilities, Upton	90		1,117
Eminence area (LS)				
Flemingsburg area (LS)				
Florence area (LS)				
Frankfort area (LS)				
Fulton County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Fulton	59		59
Green County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid		3	3
Hart County, 5(b)	City of Munfordville: Water system to service bedding factory		67	
	Munfordville Industrial Foundation: Construct building for bedding factory		200	
	Louisville Bedding Co., Inc.: Machinery and equipment in new plant		170	
	Water and sewers, Munfordville	212		
	Waste treatment facilities, Horse Cave	56		
	Waste treatment facilities, Munfordville	59		764
Hazard area, 5(a)	University of Kentucky: Establish wood-use demonstration center		642	
	Training: Clerk-stenographer, auto transmission specialist		23	
	Training: Bench hand jewelry (Jewel Craft, Inc.)		3	
	Training: Clerk-stenographer		13	
	Courthouse, Jackson	330		
	Water facilities, Whitesburg	231		
	Administration buildings, Whitesburg	351		
	Water and sewers, Hazard	860		
	Street improvement, Hazard	169		
	Administration building, Hazard	342		
	Kentucky Mountain Craft: Plant for manufacture of handicraft and furniture		23	
	Training: Clerk-stenographers		8	
	do		13	3,008

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
KENTUCKY—continued				
Henderson County, 5(a) (part of Evansville, Ind., area).	Sewer facilities: Henderson	229		
	Fire Station: Henderson	89		
	Sewers: Henderson	166		484
Hickman County, 5(b)	Sewers: Clinton	55		55
Hopkinsville area, 5(a)	City of Princeton: Extend water system		1,785	
	Training: Clerk-stenographer		25	
	Training: Motor analyst		21	
	Facilities: Hopkinsville	204		
	Fire stations: Christian	372		
	Administration building: Hopkinsville	24		
	Waste treatment facilities: Elkton	151		
	Waste treatment facilities: Cadiz	170		
	Sewer facilities: Cadiz	254		3,006
Lawrence County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities: Louisa	68		
	Flood control: Big Sandy	200		
	Waste treatment facilities: Louisa	75		
	Administration building: Louisa	154		497
Lawrenceburg area (LS)	Fishing facilities addition: Beaver Creek	92		92
Lebanon area (LS)				
Lee County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	20		
	Highway: Lee	105		125
Lewis County, 5(b)	Water facilities: Vanceburg	76		76
Livingston County, 5(b)				
Logan County, 5(b)	City of Lewisburg: New water system		244	
	John A. Graham Manufacturing Co.: Rebuild church furniture factory		145	
	Training: Gasket cutter		4	
	City Hall, Russellville	29		
	Waste treatment facilities, Russellville	238		
	Waste treatment facilities, Adairville	91		
	Training: Nurse aid		14	765
Lyon County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid (also Warren County)		14	
	Waste treatment facilities, Kuttawa	39		
	Wildlife refuge, Lyon	300		353
Madisonville area, 5(a)	City of Madisonville: For water and sewage system		211	
	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		33	
	Nurse aid		7	
	Building, Madisonville	38		288
McCreary County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 27, McCreary	210		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	65		275
Menifee County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 64, Menifee	335		335
Metcalfe County, 5(b)				
Middlesboro-Harlan area, 5(a)	Harlan Wood Products: Build dry kiln lumber and dimension mill		163	
	Training: Upholstery machine operators, upholsterers		11	
	Sewer facilities, Pineville	157		
	Waste treatment facilities, Loyall	109		
	Reservoir addition, Harlan	184		
	Sewer facilities, Loyall	32		
	Fishing facilities, Harlan County	41		
	Tree planting, Harlan area	10		
	Waste treatment facilities, Cumberland	359		
	Roads, Cumberland	183		
	Water facilities, Harlan County	80		
	Recreational facilities, Buckhorn	45		1,374
Monroe County, 5(b)	Tompkinsville Industrial Foundation, Inc.: To construct building for Hayes Garment Co.		188	
	City of Tompkinsville: Water, sewage, and gas lines		24	212
Morehead-Grayson area, 5(a)	Mico Manufacturing Co.: New building and equipment for expansion		220	
	Sewer facilities, Grayson	16		
	Sewer facilities, Greenup	80		
	Waste treatment facilities: Greenup	62		
	Water facilities: Russell	273		
	Courthouse: Greenup County	171		
	Roads, reclamation, land development: Cumberland National Forest	25		847
Morgan County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid, clerk-stenographer		9	9
Morganfield area (LS)				
Mount Sterling area (LS)				
Nelson County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator		4	
	do		9	13
Nicholasville area (LS)				
Oldham County, 5(b)				
Owensboro area (LS)	Courthouse, Owensboro	375		375
Owenton area (LS)	Storage sheds: Twin Eagle	7		7
Owsley County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development: Cumberland National Forest	50		50
Paducah area, 5(a)	D. J. Enterprise: Feasibility of a processing plant for deposit of natural bleaching clay.		13	
	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		13	
	Sewing-machine operator		8	
	Nurse aid		18	
	Waste treatment facilities: Wingo	20		
	Building: Paducah	580		652

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
KENTUCKY—continued				
Paintsville-Prestonburg area, 5(a)	Starfire Motel and Restaurant, Inc.: Construct and equip 30-unit motel and restaurant		150	
	Porter Electric Co.: Enlarge plant		45	
	Kentucky Hills Handicraft, Inc.: Expand facilities		33	
	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		13	
	Automobile mechanics		27	
	Bench worker, assorted materials (Kentucky Hills Handicraft)		34	
	Waste treatment facilities, Prestonburg	146		
	Sewer facilities, Prestonburg	163		
	Recreational facilities, Dewey Reservoir	20		
	Courthouse, Floyd	299		
	Water system, Knott City	269		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Shawnee National Forest	4		1,203
Paris area (LS)				
Pendleton County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Falmouth	22		22
Pikeville-Williamson area, 5(a) (See Mingo County, W. Va.).	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer, wheel alinement mechanic, motor analyst, automatic transmission specialist.		49	
	Nurse aid, hospita. orderly		10	
	Waste treatment facilities, Pikeville	627		686
Powell County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	30		
	Waste treatment facilities, Stanton	92		122
Pulaski County, 5(b)	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer		13	
	Clerk-stenographer		13	
	Nurse aid		3	
	Peach grower		9	
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 57, Pulaski	155		
	Bridge improvement, Federal Highway No. 5, Pulaski	195		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	25		
	Recreational facilities, Wolf Creek Dam	37		
	Sewer facilities, Somerset	512		962
Richmond area, 5(a)	Jackson Charcoal & Wood Co.: Establish new firm		21	
	Spindletop Research, Inc.: Feasibility of establishing structural clay products plant.		11	
	Waste treatment facilities, Irvine	480		
	Water and sewer facilities, Irvine	290		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	31		
	do	45		
	Sewer facilities, Richmond	247		1,125
Russell County, 5(b)	Repair dam, Wolf Creek	70		70
Scott County 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Georgetown	85		
	Waste treatment facilities, Georgetown	88		173
Shepherdsville area (LS)				
Simpson County, 5(b)				
Springfield area (LS)				
Taylorsville area (LS)	Waste treatment facilities, Taylorsville	15		15
Warren County, 5(b)	Training: See Lyon County for additional project.			
	Water facilities, Richardsville	47		
	Sewer facilities, Bowling Green	280		628
Wayne County, 5(b)				
Williamstown area (LS)				
Winchester area (LS)				
Wolfe County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cumberland National Forest	15		15
Statewide	McDonald Associates, Inc.: Study possibilities for commercial development of timber-based industries.		33	
	First Research Corp.: Standards of critiques relative to OEDP's		20	
	Present findings related to previous forestry study		1	
	Study possibilities of establishing a hardwood pulp and paper mill		24	
	Assistance to implement investment plan for recently completed wood-use study		24	102
Totals:				
Statewide			102	
5(a) areas		11,409	3,685	
5(b) areas		5,894	2,371	
LS areas		489		
All totals		17,792	6,158	23,950
LOUISIANA				
Acadia Parish, 5(b)	Water facility, Morse	75		
	Waste treatment facility, Crowley	160		
	Community center, Crowley	58		293
Alexandria area, (LS)	Fish facility, Grant County	5		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kisatchie	100		
	Sewers, Lecompte	85		
	Fish facility, Rapides County	6		196
Allen Parish, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Oberlin	40		
	Sewer facility, Oakdale	18		
	Sewer improvement, Oakdale	19		
	Water facility, Kinder	202		
	Water facility, Oberlin	168		
	Construct boat landing, Allen	3		
	Fish facility. Allen County	9		
	Waste treatment facility, Kinder	88		547
Ascension Parish, 5(b)	Construct boat landing, Ascension	5		5

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
LOUISIANA—continued				
Avoyelles Parish, 5(b)	Avoyelles Farmers Cooperative: Establish grain storage facility		39	
	Sewer system, Plaucheville	211		
	Sewers, Marksville	96		
	Sewer facility, Marksville	214		
	Water facility, Hessmer	15		
	Marketing facilities, sweet potatoes, Avoyelles Warehouse Corp		45	620
Cameron area (LS)	Repair controls, Mermentau Reservation	110		110
Catahoula Parish, 5(b)	Construct boat landing, Catahoula	5		
	Fish facility, Catahoula	6		11
Concordia Parish, 5(b)	Water facility, Ferriday	192		
	Waste treatment facility, Ridgecrest	35		
	Water facility, Clayton	151		
	Fish facility, Concordia	18		396
De Ridde area (LS)				
East Carroll Parish, 5(b)	Harbor, Lake Providence	200		
	Flood control, Mississippi River	99		
	Construct boat landing, East Carroll	5		
	Fish facility, East Carroll	7		311
East Feliciana Parish, 5(b)				
Evangeline Parish, 5(b)	Reddell Creosote Co.: Establish new plant		105	
	Clyde Vendrine Potato Shed, Inc.: Equip sweet potato processing and storage plant.		44	
	Sewer facility, Ville Platte	132		
	Waste treatment facility addition, Ville Platte	78		359
Franklin Parish, 5(b)	Construct boat landing, Franklin	2		2
Hammond area, 5(a)	Water facility, Ponchatoula	159		
	Sewer facility, Ponchatoula	130		
	Waste treatment facility, Ponchatoula	148		
	Waste treatment facility, Hammond	230		
	Water and gas facility, Hammond	78		745
Homer area (LS)				
Jena area (LS)				
Jennings area (LS)				
Lafayette Parish, 5(b)	Drainage, Lafayette	420		
	Water facility, Lafayette Parish	50		
	Memorial Hospital, Lafayette	1,325		
	Waste treatment facility, Broussard	77		
	Construct boat landing, Lafayette	2		1,874
Lake Charles area (LS)	Waste treatment facility addition, Sulphur	150		
	Sewerline, West Lake	65		
	Construction boat landing, Calcasieu	9		
	Fish facility, Calcasieu	5		229
Livingston Parish, 5(b)				
Madison Parish, 5(b)				
Mansfield area (LS)				
Monroe area (LS)	Post Office, Courthouse, Monroe	15		15
Napoleonville area (LS)				
Natchitoches Parish, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kisatchie	35		
	Roads, Natchitoches	100		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kisatchie	25		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 47, Natchitoches	365		
	Water and sewer, Provencal	48		
	Water facility, Natchitoches	75		
	Post Office, Natchitoches	50		
	Construct boat landing, Natchitoches	7		
	Fish facility, Natchitoches	11		716
New Iberia (LS)				
New Orleans area (LS)	Waste treatment facility, Harahan	117		
	Sewer facility, New Orleans	2,555		
	Waste treatment facility, Jefferson	251		
	Waste treatment facility, Kenner	863		
	Waste treatment facility, Jefferson	1,042		
	Laboratory addition, Grand Terre Island	75		
	Sewer facility, Gretna	252		
	Wharf (part of New Orleans)	637		
	Waste treatment facility, East Bank	565		
	Waste treatment facility, New Orleans	137		
	Waste treatment facility addition, New Orleans	177		
	Fish facility, Orleans	6		6,677
Opelousas area, 5(a)	Fish facility, St. Landry	8		8
Red River Parish, 5(b)				
Ruston area (LS)				
Sabine Parish, 5(b)				
St. John the Baptist Parish, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Reserve	330		330
St. Martin Parish, 5(b)	Water facility, Breaux Bridge	155		
	Water improvement, Martinsville	30		
	Fish facility, St. Martin	5		190
Tensas Parish, 5(b)				
Thibodaux area (LS)	Sewers, waterproof	50		
	Fish facility, Tensas County	24		107
Vermilion area, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Abbeville	17		17
Vernon Parish, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Newllano	15		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kisatchie	40		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 53, Vernon	51		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 54, Vernon	150		
	Water, Newllano	33		
	Water facility, Newllano	26		
	Fish facility, Vernon	12		327

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
LOUISIANA—continued				
Washington Parish, 5(b)				
Webster Parish, 5(b)	Roads, relcamation, land development, Kisatchie	8		
	do	70		78
West Carroll Parish, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Epps	51		51
Statewide	Department of Agriculture: Potential for specified agricultural marketing and processing facilities.		14	14
State totals:				
Statewide			14	
5(a) areas		745		
5(b) areas		6, 090	233	
LS areas		7, 301		
All areas		14, 136	247	14, 383
MAINE				
Aroostook County, 5(b)	Lime Products, Inc.: Expand facilities		39	
	Eric W. Kelly Peatmoss Co.: Expand operations		28	
	Presque Isle Furniture Co.: Establish furniture manufacturing plant		306	
	Greater Presque Isle Development Corp.: For expansion of potato processing plant		1, 040	
	Dumond Cedar Co.: To establish a plant for manufacturing cedar fencing		56	
	Training: Stenographer (refresher)		9	
	Waste treatment facility, Caribou	191		
	Waste treatment facility, Mars Hill	32		
	Water facility, Mars Hill	135		
	Sewer facility, Madawaska	25		
	Construct headquarters building, Ashland	12		
	Post Office, Presque Isle	10		
	Water facility, Madawaska	39		1, 922
Biddeford-Sanford area, 5(a)	Grafton Lumber Co.: New lumber processing operation		433	
	Department of Agriculture (SCS): Aerial survey of York County		6	
	Surveys and Research Corp.: Study impact of loan to Grafton Lumber Co		2	
	Training: Nurse aid		5	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		80	
	do		5	
	Training: Stenographer		11	
	Training: Sewing machine operator (Aletta Manufacturing Co.)		4	
	Sewers, Sanford	69		
	Garage, Sanford	52		
	Administrative building, Kennebunk	18		
	Sewer facility, Old Orchard	112		797
Hancock County, 5(b)	Repair recreation facility, Acadia	145		
	Water supply, buildings, roads, Craig Barracks	121		
	Concrete denil, Dedham	3		269
Knox County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator		4	
	do		4	8
Lewiston-Auburn (LS)	Sewer facility, Auburn	99		
	Buildings, Lewiston	50		
	Building, Lewiston	93		
	Streets, Lewiston	147		389
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid		4	
	Sewer facility, Boothbay Harbor	12		
	Water facility, Boothbay Harbor	74		
	Waste treatment facility, Boothbay Harbor	226		
	Water and sewers, Wiscasset	33		349
Penobscot County, 5(b)				
Piscataquis County, 5(b)				
Washington County, 5(b)	Department of Agriculture (Forest Service): Forest resources inventory		12	
	Recreation facility, Moosehorn	360		
	Down East Hospital, Machias	105		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 46, Washington	261		
	Concrete, Machias	6		
	Construct headquarters building, Machias	12		
	Construct fishway, Whitneyville	5		
	Warden dwelling, Washington	9		770
Statewide	Maine Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries: Study of shellfish industry		44	44
State totals:				
Statewide			44	
5(a) areas		251	546	
5(b) areas		1, 816	1, 502	
LS areas		389		
All areas		2, 456	2, 092	4, 548
MARYLAND				
Calvert County, 5(b)	Training: Assembler (electric)		11	11
Cambridge area, 5(a)	City of Cambridge, sewage facilities		272	
	Maryland Port Authority: Construct deep-sea port		500	
	Airpax Electronics, Inc.: Replace manufacturing company destroyed by fire		660	
	Garage, Cambridge	12		
	Recreational facilities, Blackwater National Refuge	125		
	Streets, Cambridge	8		
	Conservation, Glen Martin	100		
	Conservation, Glen Martin	100		
	Sewer, Cambridge	133		
	Waterline, Cambridge	15		1, 825
Cecil County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Rising Sun	21		
	Sewer, Perryville	223		244

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MARYLAND—continued				
Cumberland area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		19	
	Machine tool operator		29	
	Sewing machine operator		5	
	Flood control, Cumberland	200		
	Sewer, Cumberland	8		
	Water and sewer, Cumberland	7		
	Regional headquarters, Allegany	11		279
Garrett County, 5(b)	Training: Knitter, looper, seamer (knit goods)		27	27
Hagerstown area, 5(a)	Hancock Development Corp.: Construction of new apparel factory (leased by Londontown Manufacturing Co.).		105	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator, electronic mechanic		168	
	Machine operator		43	
	C. & O. Canal, Hagerstown	32		
	Harpers Ferry National Monument, Harpers Ferry	68		
	Habitat improvement, Washington	3		419
Somerset County, 5(b)				
Statewide	University of Maryland: Study of soft shell clam industry		25	
	Natural resources, Institute of University of Maryland: Processing and product improvement of soft shell clam.		25	50
Totals:				
Statewide			50	
5(a) areas		722	1,801	
5(b) areas		244	38	
All totals		966	1,889	2,855
MASSACHUSETTS				
Attleboro area, 5(a) (part of Providence-Pawtucket area).	Waste treatment facilities	181		181
Barnstable County, 5(b)				
Brockton area (LS)	Waste treatment facilities, Brockton	1,350		1,350
Dukes County, 5(b)	Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources: Develop shellfish industry		84	
	Monitor study of shellfish industry		5	89
Essex County, 5(b)	Sewage facilities, Gloucester	313		
	Street improvements, Gloucester	62		375
Fall River area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		36	
	Arborist		20	
	Sewing machine operator		7	
	Machine tool operator		62	
	Arborist		11	
	Post office, courthouse, Fall River	34		170
Lawrence-Haverhill area (LS)	Hospital addition, Lawrence	1,750		1,750
Lowell area, 5(a)	Merrimack Magnetics Corp.: Expand operations		12	
	Semi-Onics, Inc.: New electronics firm		98	
	City of Lowell: Sewer and water lines and access road		212	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		13	
	do		20	
	Oil burner serviceman and installer		11	
	Hospital addition, Lowell	946		
	Bridge, Lowell	162		
	Parking facilities, Lowell City	146		
	Improve bridge, Lowell	36		1,656
New Bedford area, 5(a)	Shawnee Mills, Inc.: Equip rayon and acetate textile plant		72	
	City of New Bedford: Construct dock facilities and dredge a ship channel		375	
	New Bedford Institute of Technology: Study scallop and flounder industry		90	
	Department of Interior (Bureau of Commercial Fisheries): Monitor study being done by New Bedford Institute of Technology.		5	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operators		101	
	Auto mechanic helpers		15	
	Sewing machine operators		9	
	Public library, New Bedford	178		
	Incinerator, New Bedford	101		
	Training: Machine tool operators		44	
	Manhattan Bottling Co.: Expand facilities		44	1,034
Newburyport area 5(a)	Waste treatment facilities, Newburyport	689		689
North Adams area, 5(a)	Training: Stenographer		12	
	Water facilities, Williamstown	125		137
Plymouth County, 5(b)				
Franklin County, 5(a) (part of Providence Pawtucket area).	T. E. Barnicle Macarone Co.: Construct new plant		426	426

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MASSACHUSETTS—continued				
Springfield-Chicopee Holyoke area (LS)	Resurface streets, Springfield	250		
	Sidewalks, Springfield	235		
	Sewers, Springfield	147		
	Water facilities, Palmer	81		
	Street construction, E. Longmeadow	46		
	Municipal garage, Westfield	50		
	Waste treatment facilities, Agawam	151		
	Municipal building, South Hadley	49		
	Sewer facilities, Agawam	154		
	Electric facilities Holyoke (improve street lighting)	99		
	Noble Hospital addition, Westfield	266		
	Street improvement, Wilbraham	214		
	Sewer facilities, West Springfield	28		
	Post Office, Holyoke	14		
	Water supply system, Wilbraham	85		
	Water system, Hadley	63		
	Sewer and water, East Hampton	73		
	Street improvement, East Hampton	39		
	Municipal building, South Hadley	89		
	Sewer facilities, Northampton	171		
	Water system, South Hadley	88		
	Administration building and water supply system, Hadley	21		2,213
Statewide	Technical Planning Association, Inc.: Develop definitive program, Northern Berkshire.		60	60
Totals:				
Statewide			60	
5(a) areas		2,598	1,695	
5(b) areas		375	89	
LS areas		5,313		
All areas		8,286	1,844	10,130
MICHIGAN				
Adrian area, 5(a)	Training: Clerk typist, clerk-stenographer		15	
	Water treatment plant, Adrian	138		
	Sewer facility, Adrian	18		
	Storm sewer, Adrian	18		
	Sewer facility, Morenci	21		
	Municipal building, Tecumseh	21		231
Alger County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	46		
	do	40		
	do	25		
	County jail, Munising	80		
	Wildlife facility, Michigan	2		
	Fish facility, Alger County	5		
	Fish habitat, Alger	4		202
Alpena County, 5(b)	Fire station, Alpena	40		40
Antrim County, 5(b)	Shanty Creek Lodge Co.: Develop year-round resort motel		891	
	Training: Waitress		4	
	Raceways, Jordan River	400		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	1		
	Fish facility, Antrim County	8		1,304
Arenac County, 5(b)	Street and sewer, Standish	104		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	10		114
Baraga County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	20		
	do	60		
	Wildlife facility, Michigan	8		
	Fish habitat, Baraga	5		93
Battle Creek area (LS)	Fish facility, Calhoun County	5		5
Bay City area, 5(a)	Training: Clerk-stenographer, ignition and carburetion mechanic		29	
	Water facility, Pinconning	256		
	Extend water main, Linwood	4		
	Wildlife facility, Bay City	8		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	2		299
Benzie County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-typist, clerk-stenographer		9	
	Hospital addition, Frankford	79		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	9		
	Fish habitat, Benzie County	13		110
Branch County, 5(b)				
Charlevoix County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Charlevoix	46		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	1		47
Cheboygan County, 5(b)	North Michigan Development Council: Center for economic development		100	
	Sewer system, Mackinaw	162		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	5		
	Fish habitat, Cheboygan	9		
	Fish facility, Cheboygan	5		281
Chippewa County, 5(b)	Training: Cook		21	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	66		
	Building, national forest	60		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	30		
	do	50		
	Repair lock, Mary's River	118		
	Highway, Chippewa	175		
	Wildlife facility, North Michigan	8		
	Fish habitat, Chippewa	13		541
Clare County, 5(b)	Water, Clare	88		88
Crawford County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Michigan National Forest	31		
	do	40		
	Improve wildlife facility, North Michigan	1		
	Improve fish habitat, Crawford	18		
	Fish facility, Crawford County	8		98

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MICHIGAN—continued				
Detroit area, 5(a)	Ash Stevens Co.: Establish new organic chemistry research facilities		182	
	Clinton Gables, Inc.: Modernize and equip motor hotel		96	
	Ponchartrain Hotel: Construct deluxe hotel		1,895	
	Cooperative Services, Inc.: Establish optical center		126	
	London Inn Motel: To build and equip motel and related facilities		336	
	Goodman Bros. & Co.: Build a 120-unit motor hotel		1,044	
	Booz, Allen & Hamilton: Proposed industrial port study of Detroit		105	
	Training:			
	Clerk typisit, stenographer		120	
	Clerk typist, bookkeeper		30	
	Brake mechanic, motor adjustor, ignition and carburetor mechanic, transmission and differential repairman.		42	
	Clerk typist, clerk stenographer		32	
	Nurse aid		22	
	Sales person		16	
	Stenographer (refresher)		13	
	Floral designer		18	
	Ignition and carburetor mechanic		10	
	Water facility, Harrison Township	45		
	Waste treatment facility, Utica	172		
	Water, sewer, streets, Garden City	87		
	Waste treatment facility, Warren	1,034		
	Sewer, Romeo Village	34		
	Sewer facility, Mount Clemens	270		
	Municipal garage, Frazer	88		
	Water supply system, Macomb	234		
	Municipal Building, Farmington	63		
	City hall, Madison Heights	267		
	Drainage, Pontiac	262		
	Safety building, Huntington Woods	50		
	Waste treatment facility, Oakland	273		
	do	1,378		
	Water, Oak Park	67		
	Water and sewers, Oakland County	258		
	Office building, Royal Oak	289		
	Improve streets, Wixon	75		
	Water and sewer facility, Clawson	322		
	Water facility, Hazel Park	68		
	Administrative building, Hazel Park	92		
	Sewer facility, Pontiac	13		
	City hall, Southfield	545		
	Sewer facility, Inkster	137		
	Water system, Detroit	1,446		
	Water facility, Detroit	1,755		
	Hospital addition, Highland Park	142		
	Sinai hospital addition, Detroit	210		
	Hospital addition, Wyandott	261		
	Hospital improvement, Detroit	255		
	Waste treatment facility, Wayne	54		
	Waste treatment facility, Detroit	154		
	do	167		
	Water supply, Huron Township	240		
	Office building, Dearborn	268		
	Waste treatment facility, Grosse Ile	819		
	Sewer, Detroit	552		
	Waste treatment facility, Riverview	456		
	Garage, Grosse Pointe Wood	36		
	Municipal building, Grosse Pointe	146		
	Sewer extension facility, Wayne	474		
	Water line, Garden City	29		
	Public garage, Inkster	55		
	Extend sewer lines, Dearborn	583		
	Municipal building, Plymouth	256		
	Extend trunk sewer, Livonia	86		
	City office building, Northville	137		
	Bridge span, Dearborn	546		
	Building, Harper Woods	81		
	Fire station, Redford	75		
	Library, Dearborn	126		
	Sewer, River Rouge	102		
	Improve sewer, Wyandotte	393		
	Extend sewer facilities, Wyandotte	13		20,127
Dickinson County, 5(b)	Hospital improvement, Iron Mountain	49		
	Sewer facility, Iron Mountain	111		
	Water facility, Iron Mountain	57		
	Water, King Ford	14		
	Improve wildlife facility, North Michigan	8		
	Improve fish habitat, Dickenson	5		
	Fish facility, Dickinson	5		249
East Tawas area (LS)				
Emmet County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Mackinaw	40		
	Sewer, Harbor Spring	19		
	Improve wildlife facility, North Michigan	2		61
Excanaba area, 5(a)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	70		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	5		
	Recreation facility	250		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	85		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	7		417
Gogebic County, 5(b)	Gogebic Range Ski Club: Recreational facilities		400	
	Training:			
	Woodworking assembler, machine tool operator, combination welder, clerk-typist, clerk-stenographer.		67	
	Cook		25	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	331		
	Construct Federal building, Iron Wood	120		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, National Forest of Ottawa	210		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	202		
	Post Office, Ironwood	14		
	Improve fish habitat, Gogebic	11		
	Fish facility, Gogebic County	5		1,385

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MICHIGAN—continued				
Gratiot County, 5(b)	Library, Alma	47		
	Recreation facility, Alma	25		
	Sewers, St. Louis	179		
	Storage buildings, Gratiot	3		
	Improve wildlife facility, Gratiot	11		265
Hillsdale County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, Hillsdale	2		
	Fish facility, Hillsdale	8		10
Houghton County, 5(b)	Construction Federal Building, Houghton	344		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	20		
	do	10		
	do	13		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	2		
	Post office, Houghton	7		
	Improve fish habitat, Houghton	3		
	do	12		411
Huron County, 5(b)	Channel improvement, Caseville	364		
	Improve wildlife facility, Huron	1		365
Iron County, 5(b)	Northboard, Inc.: New market for aspen		203	
	Training: Particle board man		31	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	192		
	do	160		
	do	60		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	3		
	Improve fish habitat, Iron	7		
	Fish facility, Iron County	10		666
Jackson area (LS)	Hospital addition, Jackson	99		
	Waste treatment facility addition, Jackson	393		492
Keneewa County, 5(b)				
Lake County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lower Michigan National Forest	10		
	do	30		
	Improve wildlife facilities, northern Michigan	5		
	Improve fish habitat, Lake	9		54
Lapeer County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, Lapeer	6		
	Improve fish habitat, Lapeer	9		15
Livingston County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Howell	76		
	Drainage system, Macomb	29		
	Wildlife facility, Livingston	5		110
Luce County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	3		
	Water facility, Newberry	84		
	Improve fish habitat, Luce	2		89
Mackinac County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	49		
	do	10		
	do	50		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	2		
	Improve fish habitat, Mackinac	6		
	Fish facility, Mackinac County	3		120
Manistee County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	135		
	do	20		
	Breakwater and piers, Arcadia	65		
	Improve water filter, Township	22		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	4		
	Improve fish habitat, Manistee	8		254
Marquette area, 5(a)	Marquette & Huron RR. Co.: Renovate and activate scenic railroad for tourist and recreational center.		195	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator, stenographer, welder, clerk-typist		216	
	Stenographer		34	
	Sewer facility, Ishpeming	149		
	Waste treatment facility, Ishpeming	65		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	20		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	5		
	Waste treatment facility, Ishpeming	345		
	Improve fish habitat, Marquette	8		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	2		1,039
Mecosta County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Big Rapid	153		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Hiawatha National Forest	2		
	Do	15		
	Improve wildlife facilities, northern Michigan	3		
	Fish facilities, Mecosta County	10		183
Menominee County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility addition, Stephenson	46		46
Missaukee County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facilities, northern Michigan	8		8
Monroe County, 5(b)	Arthur D. Little: Determine cost and location of deep-water sites		19	19
Montmorency County, 5(b)	Improve fish habitat, Montmorency	5		5
Muskegon Heights area (LS)	Drainage, Muskegon Heights	314		
	Waste treatment facility addition, Muskegon Heights	355		669
Oceana County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Hart	370		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lower Michigan National Forest	55		
	do	15		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	1		
	Post office, Hart	11		
	Improve fish habitat, Oceana	10		462
Ontonagon County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	10		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	1		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	20		
	Improve fish habitat, Ontonac	3		34
Osceola County, 5(b)	Fish facility	5		
	Improve fish habitat, Osceola	6		
	Municipal building, Reed City	94		105

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MICHIGAN—continued				
Otsego County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	4		
	Improve fish habitat, Otsego	5		9
Port Huron area, 5(a)	Motel Development Corp.: Tourist and recreation development		1,000	
	Training: Slide forming machine operator; torsion spring coiling machine operator		28	
	Waste treatment facility, Capac	96		
	do	214		
	Improve street, Marine City	110		
	Civil defense headquarters, St. Clair County	34		
	Wildlife facility addition, St. Clair	33		
	Storage buildings, St. Clair	3		
	Improve wildlife facility, St. Clair	8		
	Improve fish habitat, St. Clair	2		1,528
Presque Isle County, 5(b)	Recreation, park, building, Rogers	22		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	3		25
Roscommon County, 5(b)	do	7		
	Improve fish habitat, Roscommon	13		
	Fish facility, Roscommon	3		23
Sanilac County, 5(b)	Improve wildlife facility, Sanilac	4		4
Traverse City County, 5(a)	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	6		
	Improve fish haibtat, Traverse	2		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	11		
	Improve fish habitat, Kalkaska	12		
	Public works, program, Traverse City	1		
	Improve fish habitat, Leelanau	4		36
Tuscola County, 5(b)	Water and sewer facility, Caro	60		
	Storage buildings, Tuscola	4		
	Improve wildlife facility, Tuscola	12		76
Van Buren County, 5(b)	Improve fish habitat, Van Buren	6		
	Fish facility, Van Buren	5		11
West Branch area (LS)				
Wexford County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lower Michigan National Forest	15		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ottawa National Forest	4		
	Building construction, Wexford	110		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lower Michigan National Forest	10		
	Improve wildlife facility, northern Michigan	7		
	Improve water, Manton	39		
	Improve fish habitat, Wexford	18		
	Caberfae Corp., expand ski operations		341	544
Statewide	Robert Nathan Associates: Preliminary work on task force, Upper Peninsula		2	
	Michigan State Library: Develop central research materials for community development in Upper Peninsula.		3	
	Robert Nathan Associates: Demonstration project for multicounty economic development.		123	
	Study economic expansion program in 33 counties		99	
	Training: nurse aid		12	239
State totals:				
Statewide			239	
5(a) areas		18,319	5,604	
5(b) areas		5,920	2,360	
LS areas		1,166		
All areas		25,405	8,203	33,608
MINNESOTA				
Becker County, 5(b) IR				
Beltrami County, 5(b) IR	Edmonds & Sons Machine & Tool Co.: Machinery and equipment		27	
	Nursing home, Bemidji	53		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chippewa National Forest	7		
	do	10		
	Land treatment, Beltrami	15		
	Construction, Beltrami	15		
	Land treatment, Beltrami	7		134
Brainerd-Grand Rapids area, 5(a)	Minnesota Wild Rice Harvestors Association: Establish rice processing plant and warehouse.		29	
	Zontelli Bros.: Test western Mesabi ores		65	
	Data Management, Inc.: Establish successful semiconductor plant (Itasca)		155	
	Waste treatment facilities, Hill City	19		
	Waste treatment facilities, Aitkin	97		
	Water control	175		
	Land treatment, Aitkin	1		
	Construction, Aitkin	12		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chippewa National Forest	35		
	do	35		
	Land treatment, Cass County	18		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 2, Cass County	400		
	Construction, Cass County	12		
	Land treatment, Crow Wing County	8		
	Waste treatment facilities, Crosby	61		
	Waste treatment facilities, Ironton	30		
	Construction, Crow Wing County	8		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chippewa National Forest	185		
	do	55		
	do	30		
	do	25		
	Land treatment, Itasca County	14		
	Construction, Itasca County	12		1,471

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MINNESOTA—continued				
Carlton County, 5(b)	Mercy Hospital construction, Moose Lake	115		
	Construction, Carlton	12		127
Clearwater County, 5(b)	Sun Plant Products, Inc.: Construct new plant		82	
	Construction, Clearwater	3		85
Cook County, 5(b)	Recreational facilities, Grand Portage	81		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Superior National Forest	361		
	Pier and wharf, Duluth	160		
	Sewers, Duluth	22		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Superior National Forest	30		
	do	110		
	Road construction, Cook	2		766
Crookston area (LS)	Construction, Polk	2		2
Douglas County, 5(b)	Nursing home addition, Alexandria	370		370
Duluth-Superior area, 5(a)	University of Minnesota: Economic base study of city of Duluth		18	
	City of Duluth: Construction arena		6,100	
	Training:			
	Cook		5	
	Electronic assembler		44	
	Electronic assembler (Duluth Avionics Corp.)		51	
	Stevedore		19	
	Cook		12	6,249
Hallock area (LS)	Construction, Kittson	2		2
Hibbing-Virginia area, 5(a)	Kainz Bros.: Establish new lumber finishing plant		94	
	Echo Timber Products, Inc.: Expand logging camp, convert wood processing plant.		52	
	Giants Ridge, Inc.: Develop ski facilities		65	
	Atscott Manufacturing Co.: Establish a new tool and die manufacturing plant		68	
	Diamond Grover Association: Papermill feasibility study		32	
	Training: Electronic assembler (Hoffman Electric Co.)		1	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		5	
	Water facility, Chisholm	455		
	Water facility, Virginia City	131		
	Electric facility, Virginia City	62		
	Street lights, Virginia City	30		
	Water facility, Virginia City	86		
	Maintenance building, Virginia City	145		
	Waste treatment facility, Meadowlands	45		
	Waste treatment facility, Nichols	4[illegible]		
	Thin timber, St. Louis	400		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Superior National Forest	465		
	Roads, St. Louis County	32		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Superior National Forest	160		
	do	230		
	Land treatment, St. Louis	6		
	Waste treatment facility, Floodwood	70		
	Waste treatment facility, Cook	55		
	Waste treatment facility, Iron Junction	7		
	Post office, courthouse, Duluth	30		
	Construction, St. Louis	2		2,770
Hubbard County, 5(b)	Land treatment, Hubbard	21		
	Construction, Hubbard	5		26
Kanabec County, 5(b)	Fire tower, Kanabec County	4		
	Construction, Kanabec	12		16
Koochiching County, 5(b)	Green Forest, Inc.: Construct and equip plant for producing cedar fence palings		18	
	Waste treatment facility, Big Falls	25		
	Land treatment, Koochiching County	22		
	Municipal hospital, Littlefork	26		
	Post office, International Falls	17		
	Sewer facility, Big Falls	33		
	Construction, Koochiching County	2		143
Lake County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Superior National Forest	224		
	do	80		
	do	30		
	do	265		
	Land treatment, Lake County	15		
	Construction, Lake County	8		622
Lake of the Woods County, 5(b)	Pioneer Nursing Home replacement, Baudette	85		
	Construction, Lake of Woods	12		97
Mahnomen County, 5(b)				
Pine County, 5(b)	Sturgeon Lake, Ind.: Establish sawmill and charcoal industry		46	
	Waste treatment facility, Hinckley	161		
	Construction, Pine County	8		
	Atscott Manufacturing Co.: Establish a new tool and die plant, Pine City	68		283
Pennington County, 5(b)	Expand and remodel northwest hospital, Thief River Falls	143		
	Construction, Pennington County	1		144
Princeton area (LS)				
Red Lake Falls area (LS)				
Roseau County, 5(b)	Construction, Roseau County	13		13
Warren area (LS)	Wildlife facility, Marshall	39		39

***Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)*—Continued**

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MINNESOTA—Continued				
Statewide	W. S. Moore Co.: Develop blast furnace feed from fine-size ore		208	723
	Southwestern engineering: Study of Krupp-Renn process on low-grade iron ores		175	
	Abe W. Mathews Engineering Co.: Feasibility study for Redwing Peat Corp.		10	
	Bureau of Mines: Feasibility study of North Range Mining Co.		5	
	Ford, Bacon & Davis: Study Strategic-Udy process on low-grade Mesabi iron ores (Eastern Mesabi Range).		14	
	Aguar, Jyring & Whiteman: Study of tourist and recreation potentials on 9 Indian reservations (Minnesota and Wisconsin).[4]		27	
	Burns & Roe: Mineral study of Indian reservations (Minnesota and Wisconsin) [5]		32	
	Arrowhead Resources Corp.: Upgrading northeastern Minnesota tourist industry		75	
	Training: Pipe welder, electronic mechanic, diesel mechanic (northeastern Minnesota).		119	
	Training: Combination welder, machine tool operator		58	
State totals:				
Statewide			723	
5(a) areas		3,675	6,815	
5(b) areas		2,585	241	
LS areas		43		
All areas		6,303	7,779	14,082
MISSISSIPPI				
Amite County, 5(b)	Water system, Liberty	134		137
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	3		
Attala County, 5(b)	Water facility, Kosciusko	94		144
	Natchez Trace Parkway	50		
Benton County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	7		47
	do	40		
Bolivar County, 5(b)	Water facility, Winstonville	30		192
	Sewer facility, Shaw	122		
	Flood control, Mississippi River	40		
Calhoun County, 5(b)				
Carroll County, 5(b)				
Chickasaw County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	13		340
	Water facility, Houston	29		
	Improve street, New Houlka	87		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	40		
	Sewers, Okolona	30		
	Sewage treatment plant, Okolona	141		
Choctaw County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	8		100
	Drainage improvement, Choctaw	72		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	20		
Claiborne County, 5(b)				
Clarke County, 5(b)	Fire station, Quitman	15		15
Clay County, 5(b)	Carlose Well Supply: Study of subsurface water conditions in Clay County		10	10
Copiah County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Wesson	150		305
	Resurfacing road, Copiah	155		
Covington County, 5(b)	Water and sewer, Seminary	97		97
De Soto County, 5(b)				
Franklin County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	2		102
	do	100		
Greene County, 5(b)				
Grenada County, 5(b)				
Hancock County, 5(b)	Post office, Bay St. Louis	14		14
Harrison County (LS)	Drawbridge, Gulfport	600		686
	Airport facility, Gulfport	86		
Holmes County, 5(b)	Mississippi Land & Timber Co.: Establish lightweight papermill		801	909
	Sewer and water, Tchula	94		
	Sewers, Tchula	14		
Humphreys County, 5(b)				
Issaquena County, 5(b)				
Jasper County, 5(b)	City of Bay Springs: Build sewerage system and plant		115	135
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	20		
Jefferson County, 5(b)	Highway construction, Federal Highway No. 6, Jefferson	110		110
Jefferson Davis County, 5(b)				
Jones County, 5(b) IR				
Kemper County, 5(b)	Water and sewer, De Kalb	375		420
	Waste treatment facility, De Kalb	45		
Lafayette County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	18		68
	Repair reservoir, Oxford	20		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	30		
Lawrence County, 5(b)				
Leake County, 5(b)	Roads and sewer improvement, Leake County	180		180
Le Flore County, 5(b)	Bridge, Greenwood	455		455
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Highway resurfacing, Lincoln	155		155
Lumberton area (LS)				
Madison County, 5(b)	AMID Plastic Manufacturing Co.: Expansion of plastic manufacturing		325	564
	Sewer facility, Canton	13		
	Madison—Nachez Trace Parkway	226		
Marion County, 5(b)				
Marshall County, 5(b)	Construct office building, Holly Springs	15		35
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	20		

See footnotes at end of table.

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MISSISSIPPI—continued				
Neshoba County, 5(b)				
Newton County, 5(b)				
Noxubee County, 5(b)	Conservation, Noxubee	150		
	do	250		
				400
Oktibbeha County, 5(b)				
Panola County, 5(b)	Water facility, Crenshaw	66		66
Perry County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	12		
	do	40		
				52
Pike County, 5(b)	City of Magnolia: Rebuild independent water system		74	74
Pontotoc County, 5(b)				
Prentiss County, 5(b)				
Quitman County, 5(b)				
Scott County, 5(b)				
Sharkey County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	11		
	do	40		
				51
Simpson County, 5(b)				
Smith County, 5(b)	Henry N. Toler: Geological survey of lime deposits		29	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	18		
	do	40		
				87
Sunflower County, 5(b)	Water facility, Doddsville	44		44
Tallahatchie County, 5(b)	Streets, Charlestown	52		52
Tate County, 5(b)				
Tippah County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	20		20
Tunica County, 5(b)				
Tupelo area (LS)	Water system, Tupelo	640		
	Waste treatment facility, Tupelo	167		
				807
Walthall County, 5(b)				
Warren County, 5(b)	Vicksburg recreation facilities	400		
	Post office, courthouse, Vicksburg	21		
				421
Washington County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	30		
	Flood control, Mississippi River	44		
	Bridge and street, Greenville	102		
	Water and sewer, Hollandale	50		
	Streets, Greenville	95		
				321
Webster County, 5(b)				
Wilkinson County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	20		
	Highway construction, Federal Highway No. 17, Wilkinson	155		
				175
Winston County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	2		
	Do	30		
	Administrative building, Louisville	174		
				207
Yalobusha County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mississippi National Forest	4		
	do	30		
				34
Yazoo County, 5(b)	Concrete Block Pipe & Supply Co.: Construct new plant to expand activities		36	
	Water facility, Yazoo City	276		
				312
Statewide	Mississippi Industrial & Technical Research Commission: Input-output analysis of Mississippi's economy.		40	40
State totals:				
Statewide			40	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		5,460	1,390	
LS areas		1,493		
All areas		6,953	1,430	
				8,383
MISSOURI				
Anderson area (LS)				
Bollinger County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Lutesville	84		
	Fire tower, Bollinger	3		
	Waste treatment facility, Lutesville	15		
	Wildlife facility, Bollinger	28		
				130
Cape Girardeau area (LS)	Waste treatment facility, Cape Girardeau	810		810
Carter County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Carter	230		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twin National Forest	15		
	do	20		
				265
Dallas County, 5(b)	Wildlife facility, Bennett Spring	7		
	do	1		
				8
Dent County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	6		
	do	15		
	do	10		
	do	60		
	Construct fire tower, Dent	3		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 33, Dent	112		
	Fish facilities	9		
				215
Douglas County, 5(b)	Ava Independent Development Corp.: Expand plant for Rawlings Manufacturing Co.		81	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	11		
	do	10		
	do	20		
	County courthouse, Douglas	49		
				171

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MISSOURI—con.				
Flat River area, 5(a)	City of Pilot Knob: Construct municipal water system		35	
	Program Research, Inc.: Develop program for acceleration of economic development.[3]		8	
	Training:			
	Electrical appliance repairmen, auto mechanic, nurse aid		24	
	General clerk, cook, nurse aid		38	
	Nurse aid		12	
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 22, Flat River	350		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	3		
	do	10		
	do	5		
	do	5		
	Sewer facility, Desoldge	79		
	Post office, Farmington	13		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	5		587
Grundy County, 5(b)	City of Trenton: Construct water facilities		1,510	
	Post office, Trenton	14		1,524
Hannibal area (LS)				
Harrisonville area (LS)				
Hickory County, 5(b)	Training: Mechanic repairman		11	
	Recreation facility	365		
	Improve wildlife facilities, Hermit	9		385
Howell County, 5(b)	Mount View Resources & Development Association, Inc.: Study feasibility of industrial tract.		4	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	9		
	Construct fire tower, Howell	3		
	Construct dam, Howell	21		37
Jefferson City area, (LS)	Water facility, Freeburg	74		74
Laclede County, 5(b)				
Lafayette County, 5(b)	Hospital addition and improvement, Lexington	350		
	Dike, Missouri River	185		
	Waste treatment facility:			
	Lexington	100		
	Waverly	44		
	Water facility:			
	Bates City	44		
	Waverly	136		859
Mercer County, 5(b)	Water facility, Mercer	70		70
Monette area (LS)				
Oregon County (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	11		
	do	20		
	Sewer facility, Alton	82		113
Ozark County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	11		
	do	30		41
Pemiscot area (LS)	Post office, Caruthersville	20		20
Poplar Bluff area (LS)				
Reynolds County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	7		
	Water facility, Bunker City	47		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	60		
	Recreation facility, Clearwater	19		133
Richmond area (LS)				
Ripley County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	21		
	do	20		
	Construct fire tower, Ripley	3		
	Water facility, Naylor	86		
	Sewer facility, Doniphan	46		176
Shannon County, 5(b)	Water facility, Winona	46		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	2		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	13		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	40		
	do	40		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	60		
	2 fire towers, Shannon	6		207
Stone County, 5(b)	Training: Small motor repairman, cook, general clerk		44	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	10		
	do	10		
	Recreation facilities	182		246
Taney County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mark Twain National Forest	11		
	do	20		
	do	15		
	Fire tower, Taney	3		
	Recreation facility, Bull Shoal	71		
	Construct road, Taney	5		125
Texas County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Cabool	115		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	32		147
Washington area, 5(a)	Repair dike, Missouri River	215		
	Sewer facility, Washington	140		
	Water facility, Pacific	20		
	Construct fire tower, Washington	3		378
Wayne County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Clark National Forest	7		
	do	50		57
Wright County, 5(b)	do	40		
	City of Hartville: Improve sewerage		214	254

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
MISSOURI—continued				
Statewide	Ebasco Services, Inc.: Feasibility study of manufacturing plants using Missouri timber.		50	
	University of Missouri: Study potential market for feeder pigs		21	71
State totals:				
Statewide			71	
5(a) areas		848	117	
5(b) areas		3,186	1,864	
LS areas		1,017		
All areas		5,051	2,052	7,103
MONTANA				
Big Horn County, 5(b)IR				
Blaine County, 5(B)IR	Community center, Fort Belknap	47		47
Butte area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Nurse aid, rodman, diesel mechanic, welder		63	
	Miner (Avaconda Co.)		11	
	Rodman		13	
	Miner (hardrock)		100	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Deer Lodge National Forest	60		
	Cattle guards and gates	160		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Deer Lodge National Forest	30		437
Carbon County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Custer National Forest	50		
	Trails-bridge, Carbon	50		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Custer National Forest	5		
	do	25		
	Sewers facility, Bridger	88		
	Water facility, Roberts	38		256
Chouteau County, 5(B)IR				
Daniels County, 5(B)IR				
Deer Lodge County, 5(b)IR	Department of Interior (BM): Study of proposed steel mill		13	
	Montana Hotel Corp.: Preserve and renovate motel		188	
	Training:			
	Structural steel worker		8	
	Ward attendant		9	
	do		9	
	do		6	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Deer Lodge National Forest	38		
	do	80		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Beaver Head	70		421
Flathead County, 5(b) IR	Department of Interior (BIA): Inventory of timber resources and study for location of wood-using industries.		75	
	Recreation facility, Glacier National Forest	400		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Flathead National Forest	45		
	Water and sewer, Flathead National Forest	48		568
Glacier County, 5(b) IR	Water and waste facilities	62		62
Hill County, 5(b) IR	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Erosion control, Rocky Boys	210		210
Kalispell area, 5(a)	Big Fork Sewer Improvement District: Improve sewage disposal		337	
	Training: Motor analyst, stenographer, rodman, lumber grader, fishing equipment assembler, logger equipment mechanic.		52	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kootenai National Forest	100		
	do	65		554
Lake County, 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Flathead National Forest	3		
	Sewer facilities, Polson Lake	49		
	Sewer facilities, Ronan	38		90
Missoula County, 5(b) IR	Roads, Flathead Reservation	51		51
Musselshell County, 5(b)	Wildlife refuge, Lake Mason	40		40
Park County, 5(b)				
Phillips County, 5(b) IR				
Pondera County, 5(b) IR	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Erosion control, Blackfeet Reservation	165		
	Water and sewer, Blackfeet Reservation	38		203
Ravalli County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Bitterroot National Forest	90		
	do	50		
	do	65		205
Roosevelt County, 5(b) IR	Training: Nurse aid		3	
	Water and sewer, Fort Peck	166		169
Rosebud County, 5(b) IR	Erosion control, Cheyenne Reservation	276		276
Sanders County, 5(b) IR	Recreation facility, Bison Range	40		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lolo National Forest	90		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kaniksu National Forest	20		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Lolo National Forest	55		
	do	20		
	do	50		275
Sheridan County, 5(b) IR				
Valley County, 5(b) IR				
Yellowstone County, 5(b) IR	Erosion control, Crow Reservation	91		91
Statewide	K. B. Wood & Associates, Inc.: Study quantity and condition of timber on Indian Reservation.[6]		33	
	U.S. Department of Agriculture: Economic opportunities for expanded livestock feeding and slaughter.		10	
	Georgia Institute of Technology: Development of technical assistance program		1	44
State totals:				
Statewide			44	
5(a)		415	576	
5(b)		2,606	358	
LS				
All areas		3,021	978	3,999

See footnotes at end of table.

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NEBRASKA				
Boone County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Albion	21		27
	Waste treatment facility, St. Edwards	6		
Buffalo County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Gibbon	14		14
Burt County, 5(b) IR				
Cuming County, 5(b) IR				
Custer County, 5(b)	Public building improvement, Broken Bow	39		339
	Post office, Broken Bow	300		
Dawson County, 5(b)	Construct Federal building, Lexington	190		210
	Post office, Lexington	20		
Dixon County, 5(b) IR				
Garfield County, 5(b)	Street improvement, Burwell	245		245
Greeley County, 5(b)				
Howard County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Farwell	20		20
Loup County, 5(b)				
Nance County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Fullerton	28		54
	Sewers, Genoa	4		
	Sewer facility, Fullerton	22		
Sherman County, 5(b)	Sewers, Litchfield	4		58
	Sewer facility, Litchfield	21		
	Construct access road, Sherman Reservation	20		
	Waste treatment	13		
Thurston County, 5(b)	Erosion control	25		51
	Erosion control, Omaha Reservation	26		
Valley County, 5(b)	Construct municipal hospital, Ord City	300		300
Wheeler County, 5(b)				
State totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		1,318		
LS areas				
All areas		1,318		1,318
NEVADA				
Goldfield area (LS)				
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Training: Group worker		17	134
	do		17	
	Recreation facility, Meadow Valley	100		
Mineral County, 5(b)	Board of Commissioners: Modernize Hawthorne Municipal Airport		75	242
	Training: Group worker		17	
	Construct fences	150		
Washoe County, 5(b) IR	International Development Services, Inc.: Study and report on recreation and economic development of Pyramid Lake IR.		38	38
Statewide	University of Pennsylvania: Study Indian ability to operate potential business enterprises.		5	5
State totals:				
Statewide			5	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		250	164	
All areas		250	169	419
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Grafton County, 5(b)	Construct Alice Peck Day Memorial Hospital, Lebanon City	370		925
	Roads, reclamation, land development, White Mountain National Forest	50		
	do	35		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 8, Grafton	208		
	Waste treatment facility, Hanover	170		
	Water facility, Lebanon	92		
Rockingham County (part of Lawrence-Haverhill area 5(a).	Waste treatment facility, Lawrence-Haverhill	189		189
Statewide	Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Study of postwar economic revival (Nashua).		5	5
State Totals:				
Statewide			5	
5(a) areas		189		
5(b) areas		925		
LS areas				
All areas		1,114	5	1,119
NEW JERSEY				
Atlantic City area, 5(a)	Training:			1,061
	Tractor operator		23	
	do		24	
	Assembler (solderer)		13	
	Sewer facility, Atlantic City	90		
	Kessler Memorial Hospital, Hammonton	59		
	Atlantic City Hospital addition, Atlantic City	598		
	Roads addition, Atlantic City	24		
	Improve streets, Atlantic County	85		
	Addition, headquarters building, Atlantic City	111		
	Training: Boatbuilder—wood entry		34	
Bridgeton area, 5(a)	Vineland & South Jersey Co-op Egg Auction: Modernize and expand facilities		42	1,278
	National Cup & Container Co., Inc.: New plant		968	
	Training: Tractor operator		22	
	Electric systems conversion, Greenwood	52		
	Hospital additions, Paterson	194		
Burlington County (LS)	Sewer and drainage, Burlington	63		72
	Sewer facility, Bordentown	9		

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NEW JERSEY—continued				
Camden area (LS)	Sewer facility, Camden	300		
	Waste treatment facility, Lawnside	79		
	Waste treatment facility, Gloucester	422		
	do	190		
	Fishing vessel, Camden	100		
	Sewer facility, Camden	200		
	Streets, Camden	493		
	Sewer facility, Lawnside	238		
	Water facility, Camden	230		2, 252
Gloucester area (LS)	Waste treatment facility, National Park	215		215
Jersey City area (LS)	Sewer facility, Jersey City	340		
	County building, Hudson County	657		
	Maintenance building, Hudson County	430		
	Lutheran Home addition, Jersey City	95		
	Garage and maintenance building, Jersey City	1, 115		
	Municipal recreation facilities, Hoboken	715		
	Improve streets, Bellmawr	16		3, 368
Lakewood-Toms River area, 5(a)	Sica Skiffs, Inc., and Marine City, Inc.: Constructing marina and boatbuilding plant.		641	
	Lagoon Parks, Inc., and Orsand Realty Corp.: Expand prefab housing plant, boat repair shop, and construct marina complex.		690	
	Training: Planker, painter, marine machinist, entry joiner (Sica Skiffs, Inc. and Marine City, Inc.).		75	
	Water facility, Pine Beach	203		
	Stone: jetties construction, Barnegat Light	147		
	Jetties along beach front, Beach Haven Borough	183		
	Storage facility, Surf City	74		
	Tree planting, Ocean County	56		2, 069
Long Branch area, 5(a)	Fitkin Hospital addition, Neptune	360		
	Sewer facility, Asbury Park	64		
	Stone seawall, Sea Bright	791		
	Streets, Asbury Park	115		
	Water facility, Englishtown	200		
	Sewer facility extension, Keanesburg	100		
	Repair buildings, Asbury Park	75		1, 705
New Brunswick area, (LS)	Administrative building, Middlesex County	2, 000		
	Improve streets, Piscataway	150		
	Post office, New Brunswick	24		2, 174
Morris area, (LS)	Waste treatment facility:			
	Denville	117		
	Netcong	152		269
Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May area, 5(a)	Erosion control, Ocean City	400		
	Sewers, Wildwood	40		
	Waste treatment facility, Wildwood	75		515
Paterson-Passaic area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Ward attendant		12	
	Auto mechanic		39	
	Machine tool operator		30	
	do		53	
	Arc welder, acetylene welder, heli-arc		30	
	Salesperson		11	
	Sewer facility, Paterson	788		
	Waste treatment facility:			
	Wayne	1, 138		
	Pompton			
	Lakes Borough	283		
	Barnert Hospital, Paterson	533		
	Sewer facility:			
	Wayne township	1, 485		
	Pompton Lakes	610		
	Additional sewer facilities, Passaic	500		
	Additional fire station, Passaic	103		
	Drainage facility:			
	Clifton	305		
	Clifton	32		
	Public health center, Wayne	95		5, 996
Somerset area (LS)	Sewer, Bridgewater	483		
	GSA Depot, New Brunswick	19		502
Statewide	New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development: Economic impact on interstate area of bridge and ferry crossings.		33	33
State totals:				
Statewide			33	
5(a) areas		9, 917	2, 707	
5(b) areas				
LS areas		8, 852		
All areas		18, 769	2, 740	21, 509
NEW MEXICO				
Bernalillo County, 5(b) IR	Training: Electronic technician, coil winder assembler in Isleto Pueblo Indian Reservation.		64	
	Community center, Isleta Reservation	68		132
Catron County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 22, Catron	400		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	3		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Apache National Forest	45		
	do	50		
	do	80		
	do	10		88
Colfax County, 5(b) IR	Fish facility, Charette Lakes	10		10

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NEW MEXICO—continued				
Grant area (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Gila National Forest	195		
	Erosion control, Grant	120		
	Sewer, Central	20		
				335
Guadalupe County, 5(b)				
McKinley County, 5(b)IR	Jensen & Wallen Mapping, Forest Service: Utilization of Navajo forest products industry.[3]		6	
	(See statewide projects for training project in Zuni Indian Reservation.)			
	Western Farm Management: Feasibility of establishing meat processing plant		14	
	Training:			
	Sawmill operators		81	
	Sheep shearer		8	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	70		
	Sewer, Gallup	121		
	Livestock wells and water storage, McKinley	150		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	30		
	do	60		
	Road improvement, Ramah Reservation	30		
	Erosion control, Zuni Reservation	149		
	Municipal warehouse, Gallup	60		
	Irrigation facility, Gallup	110		
	Post office, Gallup	128		
				1,017
Mora County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	20		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Carson National Forest	10		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	40		
	Mora Valley medical unit, expansion-Cleveland	90		
	Waste treatment facility:			
	Mora	8		
	Wagon Mound	12		
	Fish facility, Bertclancy	5		
	Sewer facility, Wagon Mound	42		
	South of Mora: Construct dam	1		
	Telephone and electric lines, Wagon Mound	11		
				239
Otero County, 5(b) IR	(See statewide projects for training project in Mescalero Indian Reservation)			
	Timber improvement, Mescalero	100		
				100
Rio Arriba County, 5(b) IR	(See statewide projects for training projects)			
	Erosion control, Rio Grande	25		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Carson National Forest	135		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	34		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Carson National Forest	30		
	Water and sewer, Jicarilla Reservation	152		
	Wildlife facility, Rio Arriba	1		
	Fish facility addition, Rio Chama	2		
				379
Sandoval County, 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	96		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	26		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	95		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	20		
	do	30		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	35		
	Erosion control, Jemez Reservation	36		
	Erosion and soil conservation, Jicarilla Reservation	98		
				436
San Juan County, 5(b)IR	Civil center, Azteck	61		
	Erosion control, road, Navajo Reservation	400		
	Recreation facilities, Angel Park	400		
	Wildlife facilities, San Juan	3		
				864
San Miguel, 5(b)	Study of small crafts industry		50	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Sante Fe National Forest	88		
	Water facilities, Las Vegas	21		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	45		
	do	70		
	Recreation facilities, Conchas Reservation	223		
	Wildlife facilities, San Miguel	2		
	Fish facilities, Colin Neblitt	4		
	Stream development, Cowles	4		
				507
Santa Fe County, 5(b)IR	Training: Combination welder		16	
	Erosion control roads, Santa Clare Reservation	400		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Santa Fe National Forest	67		
	do	35		
	do	40		
	Community centers	30		
	Erosion control, San Idlefon	25		
	Community centers:			
	Tesuque Reservation	25		
	Pojaque Reservation	25		
	Fish facilities, Santa Cruz Lake	3		
				666
Socorro County, 5(b)	Socorro Packaging Co.: Establish new soft drink bottling plant		195	
	R. W. Brooks Associates: Aid in development of county		6	
	Training: Clerk-stenographer		15	
	Water facilities, Magdelene	16		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	37		
	do	30		
	do	20		
	Socorro General Hospital, Socorro	95		
				414
Taos County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for training projects)			
	Recreation facility construction, Rio Grande	340		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Carson National Forest	60		
	Community center, Taos	100		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Carson National Forest	30		
	do	90		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Taos	20		
	Wildlife facilities, 5 counties	2		
	Fish facilities improvement, various lakes	4		
	Reseed area, Taos	10		
				656

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NEW MEXICO—continued				
Torrance County, 5(b) 3	Training: Sewing machine operator		5	
	do		3	
	Roads, Reclamation, Land Development, Cibola National Forest	64		
	do	100		172
Valencia County, 5(b) IR	(See statewide projects for training project in Acoma Indian Reservation)			
	Waste treatment facilities, Los Lunas	42		
	Highway, Navajo	400		
	Recreation facilities building, Los Lunas	15		
	Repair building, Los Lunas	12		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cibola National Forest	30		
	Sewer, Belen	34		
	Roads, Laguana Reservation	106		
	Highway improvement, Valencia	302		
	Improve water facilities, Belen	58		
	Wildlife facilities, Valencia	2		
	do	5		
	do	8		1,014
Statewide	Checci & Co.: To assist Indian reservations in developing tourist potentialities [1]		7	
	Indian Reservations Zuni, Mescalero, Acoma, and Taos and Rio Arriba Counties: Training, solderer (electrical equipment, electronics).		33	40
Totals:				
Statewide			40	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		6,731	463	
LS areas		335		
All totals		7,066	503	7,569
NEW YORK				
Amsterdam area, 5(a)	Fort Plain Development Corp.: Restore and expand milk plant		227	
	Co-op Association of Milk Producers: Machinery and equipment for restored milk plant.		303	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		15	
	Wildlife, Amsterdam	11		556
Auburn area, 5(a)	Industrial Development Foundation o. Auburn and Cayuga County: Removal of railroad tracks to permit expansion of industry.		25	
	Determine location for sugarbeet refinery (contract to be awarded)		25	
	Plant study of sugarbeet growth feasibility		100	
	Water facility:			
	Sennett	102		
	Locke	62		
	Aurelius	21		
	Wildlife, Auburn	13		
	General Products Corp.: Construction of new plant		234	582
Batavia area (LS)	Wildlife, Batavia	8		8
Buffalo area (LS)	Library, Aurora	123		
	Sewer facility, Grand Island	82		
	Street improvement, Sloan	103		
	Sewer facility, Lancaster	385		
	Sewer facility, Erie County	400		
	Sewer facility, Buffalo	270		
	De Graff Memorial Hospital addition, North Towanda City	1,231		
	Hospital addition, remodel, Buffalo General Hospital	779		
	Sewer, Grand Island	30		
	Water facility, Hamburg	74		
	Water facility, Boston	528		
	Water facility, Eden	214		
	Courthouse, Buffalo	92		
	Water facility, Newfane	288		
	Border Patrol Station, Niagara Falls	44		
	Water facility, Niagara County	81		
	Water facility, Buffalo	514		
	Repair Pier, Olcott, Niagara County	273		
	Wildlife, Buffalo	9		5,520
Cattaraugus area (LS)	Water facility, Olean	104		
	Water facility, Delevan	125		229
Elmira area (LS)	St. Joseph Hospital, Elmira	902		
	Post office, courthouse, Elmira	10		
	Wildlife, Elmira	5		917
Essex County 5(b)	Adirondack Development Corp.: New product to create high brightness combination filler and coaster.		90	
	Sewer lines, Port Henry	199		
	Stream improvement, Essex	23		312
Gloversville area, 5(a)	Training. Sewing-machine operator		29	
	Sewer facility, Johnson City	438		467
Geneva-Canandaigua area (LS)	Recreation facility, improvement, Naples	3		3
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls area (LS)	Town hall, Hague	8		
	Water facility, Queensbury	439		
	Wildlife, Glens Falls	4		
	Recreation facility improvement, Metawee River	4		455
Greene County, 5(b)	Water facility, Catskill	37		
	Stream improvement, Greene County	3		40

See footnotes at end of table.

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NEW YORK—continued				
Jamestown-Dunkirk area, 5(a)	R.S. Development Corp.: Construct and improve industrial plants		422	
	Progress Park, Inc.: Purchase property for lease to Roblin Seaway Industries		350	
	Roblin Seaway Industries: Expand steel rolling mill		1,036	
	Jamestown Area Development Corp.: Construct building for Flakeboard Corp		325	
	Ernst & Ernst: Ret. of Alco Products, Inc		20	
	Hospital addition, Jamestown General Hospital	202		
	Drainage, Dunkirk	488		
	Stream improvement, Jamestown-Dunkirk	3		
	Wildlife, Jamestown-Dunkirk	7		2,853
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon area (LS)	Incinerator, Beacon	394		
	City Hall, Beacon	115		
	Putnam Community Hospital, Carmel	456		965
Oneonta area (LS)	Water facility, Oneonta	257		
	Sewer facility, Oneonta	125		
	Streets, Oneonta	143		
	Wildlife, Oneonta	18		543
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone area, 5(a)	Norfolk Development Corp. and St. Lawrence Pulp & Paper Corp.: Reopen and modernize abandoned pulp and paper plant.		844	
	Wildlife, Ogdensburg-Malone	5		
	Water, Governeur	260		
	Waste treatment facility, Brasher	31		
	Water facility, Norfolk	122		
	Sewer facility, Brasher	97		
	Wildlife, Ogdensburg-Malone	8		1,367
Orleans County, 5(b)				
Plattsburgh area, 5(a)	Bridge, Plattsburgh	174		
	Waste treatment facility, Champlain	71		
	Waste treatment facility, Dannemora	38		
	Water facility, Rouses Point	210		
	Wildlife, Plattsburgh	5		498
Schenectady area, 5(a)	Post Office, Schenectady	22		
	GSA depot, Scotia	191		213
Schoharie County, 5(b)				
Watertown area (LS)	Wildlife management, Watertown	8		8
Wellsville area (LS)	Wildlife management, Wellesville	29		
	Recreation facility, Genesee River	4		33
State totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas		2,581	3,955	
5(b) areas		262	90	
LS areas		8,681		
All areas		11,524	4,045	15,569
NORTH CAROLINA				
Alleghany County, 5(b)				
Anson County, 5(b)	Polkton Manufacturing Co.: Expand facilities		177	
	Town of Polkton: New water system		175	352
Ashe County, 5(b)				
Avery County, 5(b)	Bureau of Mines USDI: Feasibility of experiment of magnetite mining production. (See Statewide project for additional technical assistance project.)		5	
	Training:			
	Carpenter (apprentice)		17	
	Nurse aid		3	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	6		
	do	30		61
Bertie County, 5(b)				
Bladen County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility:			
	Clarkton	36		
	Elizabethtown	75		111
Carteret County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	10		
	Dock and raod improvement, Moorehead	200		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	40		250
Cherokee County, 5(b)	do	44		
	do	30		
	Highway improvement:			
	Federal Highway No. 19, Cherokee	150		
	Federal Highway No. 33, Cherokee	60		284
Chowan County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Edonton	164		164
Clay County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	8		
	Conservation measures	4		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	60		
	do	50		122
Columbus area, 5(b)	City Hall, addition, Whiteville	15		
	Water facility, Whiteville	47		
	Post Office, Whiteville	11		73
Durham area (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	10		10
Edgecomb area (LS)	Courthouse, Rocky Mount	600		
	Municipal building, Tarboro	81		681
Elizabeth City area (LS)	Municipal building, Elizabeth City	190		
	Water facility, Hertford	20		210

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NORTH CAROLINA—continued				
Fayetteville area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Stenographer, sewing machine repairman, combination welder, apprentice carpenter.		67	
	Stenographer		17	
	Electrical applianc repaireman, gas engine repairman		30	
	Carpenter, apprentice		10	
	Nurse aid		5	
	Bricklayer (apprentice)		12	
	Custodian		3	
	Water facility, Fayetteville	48		
	Waste treatment facility, Fayetteville	67		
	do	166		
	Sewer, Fayetteville	167		
	Water and sewer, Hope Mills	115		707
Gates County, 5(b)				
Graham County, 5(b) IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	28		
	do	50		
	Water facility, Robbinsville	39		
	Water and sewers, Cherokee	177		294
Greene County, 5(b)				
Halifax County 5(b)				
Henderson-Oxford area, 5(a)	Water and sewer, Louisburg	191		
	Office building, Grandville	75		
	Library, Oxford	90		
	Water and sewer, Oxford	299		
	Waste treatment facility, Oxford	108		
	Recreation facility, John Kerr	203		966
Henderson County (LS)	Pardee Hospital addition, Hendersonville	50		50
Hoke County, 5(b)	Raeford Cold Storage Warehouse, Inc.: Construction and equipment plant		195	195
Hyde County, 5(b)	Housing and roads, Mattamusk	150		150
Jackson County, 5(b)IR				
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Leslie Fay, Inc.: To establish textile plant		325	
	Training: Knitting machine operator (Leslie Fay Co.)		17	
	Training: Mender (textile) (Leslie Fay Co.)		3	
	Construction Federal building, Lincolnton	295		
	Post office, Lincolnton	38		678
Lumberton area (LS)				
Macon County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	79		
	do	45		
	do	40		
	do	45		
	Post office, Franklin	27		236
Madison County, 5(b)	Hammer & Co. Association: Economic feasibility of developing specific type of recreation facilities.		18	
	Training: Sewing machine operator (Smoler Bros.)		10	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	12		
	do	30		70
Manteo area (LS)				
Mitchell County (LS)	See statewide projects for technical assistance project			
	Training: Clerk-stenographer, typist, nurse aid		20	
	Training: Sewing machine operator (Spruce Pine Manufacturing Co.)		5	
	Training: Hosiery pairer		3	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	2		
	do	40		70
Northampton County, 5(b)				
North Wilkesboro area (LS)	Water facility, Wilkesboro	250		
	Recreation facility, Earl Scott Reservoir	100		350
Person County, 5(b)	Water facility, Roxboro	289		
	Administrative building, Roxboro	243		532
Pitt County, 5(b)	Water facility, Greenville	285		
	Water facility, Ayden	38		
	Water and sewage, Farmville	177		500
Rockingham-Hamlet area, 5(a)	Sewer facility, Hamlet	81		
	Post Office, Hamlet	12		
	Post Office, Courthouse, Rockingham	78		171
Sampson County, 5(b)	Sewer facility, Clinton	77		77
Surry area (LS)	Improve streets, Mount Airy	24		24
Swain County, 5(b)IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	2		
	do	30		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 4, Swain	200		232
Tryon area (LS)				
Tyrrell County, 5(b)				
Warren County, 5(b)	Recreation facility, John Kerr Reservoir	148		
	Sewer facility, Norlina	94		242
Washington County, 5(b)				
Watauga County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Blowing Rock	44		44
Yancey County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Training:			
	Nurse's aid		3	
	Carpenter		16	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, North Carolina National Forest	9		
	do	30		58

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
NORTH CAROLINA—continued				
Statewide	Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, all 5(b)—North Carolina State College: Task force proposal for technical assistance.		19	19
State totals:				
Statewide			19	
5(a) areas		1,749	144	
5(b) areas		3,763	962	
LS areas		1,367	28	
All areas		6,879	1,153	8,032
NORTH DAKOTA				
Benson County, 5(b) IR	Training: arts and crafts		25	
	Soil conservation, Fort Totten	95		120
Dunn County, 5(b) IR	Training:			
	Clerk-stenographer, all round farm machine operator		26	
	Indian arts and crafts		25	
	Carpenter (construction) entry		10	
	Water and sewers, Fort Berthold	65		126
Eddy County, 5(b) IR				
McKenzie County, 5(b) IR				
McLean County, 5(b) IR				
Mercer County, 5(b) IR				
Mountrail County, 5(b) IR				
Nelson County, 5(b) IR				
Ramsey County, 5(b) IR				
Richland County, 5(b) IR				
Rolette County, 5(b) IR	Training: Clerk typist		8	
	Soil conservation, Turtle Mountain	180		
	Wildlife facility, Wapoka case	5		193
Sargent County, 5(b) IR				
Sioux County, 5(b) IR	Training:			
	Clerk typist		7	
	Arts and crafts		13	
	Cattle rancher		10	
	Roads, Standing Rock	67		
	Water and sewers, Standing Rock	60		157
Statewide	U.S. Department of Agriculture: feasibility study of co-op livestock feedyard and stock-rendering complex.		10	10
State totals:				
Statewide			10	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		472	124	
LS areas				
All areas		472	134	606
OHIO				
Ashtabula-Conneaut area, 5(a)	Water and sewer, Conneaut	188		
	Sewer facility, Conneaut	88		
	do	131		407
Athens-Logan-Nelsonville area, 5(a)	Arcadia Rest Home, Inc.: Purchase, enlarge and convert motel to 60-bed nursing home.		128	
	Training: Nurse aid		4	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wayne National Forest	5		
	Channel improvement, Tom Jenkins	30		
	Water facility, Jacksonville	61		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 6, Athen-Logan	130		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wayne National Forest	10		
	Tree planting, Hocking County	3		371
Batavia-Georgetown-West Union area, 5(a)	Training: Lumber grader		17	
	Water facility, Fayetteville	93		
	Hospital addition, Georgetown	150		
	Sewer facility, Hammersville	110		
	Water facility, Aberdeen	94		464
Bellmont area, 5(a) (part of Wheeling, W. Va., area)	Candeub, Cabot & Associates: Demonstration program to identify industrial sites.		24	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		45	
	do		28	
	Stenographer		38	
	Hospital addition, Barnesville	45		
	Water facility, Barnesville	604		
	Sewer facility, Brookside	5		789
Cambridge area, 5(a)	Training:			
	Electronic mechanic		59	
	Electronic mechanic (RCA)		47	
	Repair dam, Musk Seneca	20		126
Canton area (LS)	Repair gate, Beech City	55		
	Sewer facility, Massillon	117		
	Sewer facility, Canton	37		209
East Liverpool-Salem area (LS)	Salem Hospital addition, Salem	99		99
Fremont area (LS)	Nursing home, Green Spring	496		496
Hamilton-Middletown area (LS)	Hospital addition, Middletown	1,132		1,132
Highland County, 5(b)	Collins Packing Co.: Expand meatpacking plant		213	
	Metco. Inc.: Expand tool manufacturing facilities		70	
	Training: Nurse aid		4	
	do		4	291
Kent Ravenna area, 5(a)	Fabricators, Inc.: New machinery and equipment to expand production of machinery components.		57	57
Lawrence area, 5(a). (See Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.).	Federal Highway No. 3, widen and surface	304		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wayne National Forest	10		314

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
OHIO—continued				
Lorain-Elyria area (LS)	Hospital addition, Elyria	23		
	Sewer facility, Lorain	209		232
Lucas County (LS)	Water facility:			
	Oregon	1,791		
	Maumee	80		
	Mercy Hospital addition, Toledo	191		
	Municipal building, Holland	11		2,073
Monroe area, 5(a). (See New Martinsville, W. Va.)	Sewer facility, Beallsville	95		95
Morgan County, 5(b)				
Perry County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 715, Perry	38		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wayne National Forest	10		
	Tree planting, Perry County	2		50
Portsmouth-Chillocothe area, 5(a)	Stanley Engineering Co.: Feasibility study of establishing commercial docking facility in Scioto County.		26	
	Training:			
	Home attendant		3	
	Nurse aid (Jackson County)		3	
	Hospital improvement, Wakefield	100		
	Road repairs, Chillicothe	100		
	Hospital addition, Chillicothe	183		
	Waters and sewers, Clarksburg	70		
	Repair lock, Green Up	153		
	Training: Bookkeeper II, Entry		12	650
Washington County, 5(b)	Jack Drilling Co.: Test drill and equipment, rock salt wells		125	
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 11, Washington	272		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wayne National Forest	3		400
Youngstown-Warren area (LS)	Water facility	27		
	Streets and sewers	146		
	Waste treatment facility, Youngstown	743		
	Water facility, Mahoning	150		
	Improve courthouse, Mahoning	86		
	Streets, Struthers	3		
	Water facility, Struthers	10		
	Streets and sewers, Struthers	4		
	Sidewalks, Youngstown	591		
	Hospital addition, Warren	113		
	Building, Warren	85		
	Water facility, Miles City	254		
	Sewer facility improvement, Hubbard	114		2,326
Zanesville area (LS)	Sewer facility, Zanesville	76		76
Statewide	University of Ohio: New products and industries survey (southeast Ohio)		80	80
State totals:				
Statewide			80	
5(a) areas		2,782	491	
5(b) areas		325	416	
LS areas		6,643		
All areas		9,750	987	10,737
OKLAHOMA				
Adair County, 5(b)	Stillwell Area Development Corp.: Expand water facilities		747	
	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	Erosion control, Adair	50		
	Clear acres, southwest of Stillwell	4		813
Atoka County, 5(b)	Building, Atoka	175		175
Cherokee County, 5(b)	Erosion control, Cherokee	50		
	Sewer improvement, Tahlequah	58		
	Road improvement, Tahlequah	15		
	Recreation facility, Tenkiller Ferry	40		
	Clear acres, Cherokee	3		
	Construct fence, Cherokee	11		177
Choctaw County, 5(b)	Red River Valley Products Co.: Expand grain processing and storage plant		69	
	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	do		12	93
Clinton area (LS)				
Coal County, 5(b)	Coalgate Community Inn of America: Construct and equip a 50-unit motel		310	
	Erosion control, Coal	20		
	Dam construction	100		430
Delaware County, 5(b)	Water and sewers, Colcord	45		
	Erosion control, Delaware	50		
	Jay Memorial Hospital, Jay	297		
	Sewer improvement, Grove	16		
	Waste treatment facility, Colcord	7		
	Clear acres, Spavinaw	5		420
Durant area (LS)				
Grady County, 5(b)	Industrial Development Trust: Build factory for lease to American Optical Co.		46	
	Sequoyah Mills, Inc.: Plant to manufacture tufted carpeting		390	
	Training:			
	Tuttle: Farm mechanic		12	
	Chickasha: Farm mechanic		12	
	Water and sewer, Rushsprings	75		
	Water facility, Chickasha	380		
	Repair reservoir, Chickasha	120		
	Watershed, Roaring Creek	61		
	Construct marshes, Grady	3		1,099
Greer County, 5(b)	Republic Gypsum Co.: To establish new plant for gypsum products		2,637	
	Sewer improvement, Mangum	64		2,701

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
OKLAHOMA—continued				
Haskell County, 5(b)	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	Sewer improvement, Stigler	177		
	Waste treatment facility, Stigler	110		299
Hughes County, 5(b)	Farm Ranch Corp. Association: Establish feed and grain mill		68	
	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	Erosion control, Hughes	20		
	Water improvement, Holdenville	27		
	Watershed, Big Wewoka	150		
	Waste treatment facility, Holdenville	73		350
Jefferson County (LS)				
Johnston County (LS)	Conservation Tishomingo Reservation	121		121
Latimer County, 5(b)	Training:			
	General clerk, welder		26	
	Combination welder		13	
	University of Oklahoma, Bureau of Business Research: Study of charcoal and wood alcohol plant.		2	41
Le Flore County, 5(b)	Training: Power sewing machine operator (Hamlin Manufacturing Co.)		8	
	Training:			
	Farm mechanic		12	
	Auto mechanic		11	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Ouachita National Forest	110		
	Sewer facility, Wister	49		
	Roads, reclamation, land development Quachita National Forest	65		
	Bridge, Federal Highway No. 5, Le Flore	211		
	Le Flore addition, Poteau	97		
	Sewers Wister	61		
	Sewers, Panama	40		
	Wildlife facility addition, Le Flore	22		
	Sewer facility, Panama	63		
	Fish facility, Holson Creek	5		754
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Community centers, Kickapoo Reservation	70		
	Community centers, Iowa Reservation	70		
	Watershed. Big Wewoka	116		256
Love County, 5(b)	Training: Power sewing machine operation, (Marietta Sports Wear Manufacturer)		74	
	Wildlife facility, Hickory Creek	7		
	Timber clearing, Hickory Creek	11		92
Marshall County, 5(b)	Erosion control, Marshall	20		
	Conservation, Tishomingo	50		70
Mayes County, 5(b)	Hudgens, Thompson, Bell & Associates: Determine new uses for World War II explosives plant.		35	
	Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority: Mid-American industrial district: Industrial park and related developments.		35	
	Erosion control, Mayes	50		
	Clear acres, Mayes	2		122
McAlester area, 5(a)	Marine Engineering & Equipment Co.: Construct office building and showroom		55	
	Oklahoma Lake Development Authority: Tourist center		10,331	
	Training:			
	Stenographer, general clerk		36	
	Power sewing machine operator		41	
	Streets, improvement, McAlester	157		
	Sewer and water, Krebs	116		
	Hospital addition, McAlester	300		
	Waste treatment facility, Krebs	82		11,118
McClain County, 5(b)				
McCurtain County, 5(b)	City of Idabel: Improve water system		459	
	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	University of Oklahoma, Bureau of Business Research: Study of plant to utilize sawmill residues.		2	
	Water facility, Idabel	129		
	Erosion control, McCurtain	13		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Quachita National Forest	40		
	do	25		
	City game preservation, McCurtain	8		
	Administration building, Idabel	263		951
McIntosh County, 5(b)				
Murray County, 5(b)	Sulphur Community Inn: Construct new motel		455	
	Buildings, Platt	75		
	Watershed, Kickapoo-Sandy	75		605
Muskogee area, 5(a)	Training:			
	General clerk, clerk (refresher), key punch operator, stenographer		56	
	Machine tool operator		13	
	Water and sewer, Muskogee	375		
	Sewer, Porum	27		
	Streets, Muskogee	456		
	Sewer facility, Porum	48		977
Nowata County, 5(b)	AMKO, Inc.: Establish new metal products plant		189	
	Training: General clerk, welder		15	
	Nowata General Hospital addition, Nowata	58		
	Sewer, Delaware	38		
	Wildlife facility improvement, Nowata	13		313
Okfuskee County, 5(b)	Water facility, Okfuskee	371		371
Okmulgee-Henryetta area, 5(a)	University of Oklahoma: Study of a traffic service center		7	
	University of Oklahoma: 3 feasibility studies		6	
	Training: Office clerk, stenographer, auto transmission specialist, ignition carburation specialist, dry cleaning finisher, cook.		69	
	Training: Teletypeset operator		15	
	Sewers, Delaware	61		158

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
OKLAHOMA—continued				
Ottawa County, 5(b)	Shangri-La recreational complex: Acquire land and construct resort motel and marina.		650	
	Training: Power sewing machine operator (Glen Berry Manufacturing Co. and Burlington Manufacturing Co.).		43	
	Erosion and soil conservation, Ottawa	30		723
Pontotoc County, 5(b)	Gualt Tool Co.: Expand operations		34	
	Ada Industrial Development Corp.: Extend water and sewage facilities and build access roads.		349	
	Building, Ada	179		
	Sewer facility improvement, Ada	100		
	Construction Federal building, Ada	225		
	Watershed, Boggy Creek	188		
	Public building improvement, Ada	126		1,201
Pushmataha County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, Antlers	35		
	Utility improvement, Antlers	72		
	Fish facility, Pushmataha	9		
	Clear acres, South Clayton	6		122
Rogers County, 5(b)				
Seminole County, 5(b)	Watershed, Big Wewoka	150		150
Sequoyah County, 5(b)	Training: Farm mechanic		12	
	Dam, Sequoyah	208		
	Watershed, Sallisaw	96		316
Shawnee area (LS)	Sewers, Shawnee	24		
	Water improvement, Tecumseh	62		86
Wagoner County, 5(b)	Sewer improvement, Wagoner	49		
	Wildlife facility, Fort Gibson	8		
	Recreation facility, Fort Gibson	40		97
Waurika area (LS)				
Statewide	Training: Farm mechanic, general clerk, stenographer, machine tool operator, welder.		121	121
State totals:				
Statewide			121	
5(a) areas		1,622	10,629	
5(b) areas		5,954	6,787	
LS areas		207		
All areas		7,783	17,537	25,320
OREGON				
Albany area (LS)	Surface road, Boulder Creek	250		
	Road, Quartzville	200		
	Road, reclamation, land development, Willamette National Forest	50		500
Baker area (LS)				
Bend area (LS)				
Clackamas County, 5(b) IR				
Clatsop County, 5(b)	(See Statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Sewer facility, Astoria	543		
	Small boat harbor, Astoria	31		574
Columbia County, 5(b)	(See Statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Water facility, St. Helens	132		
	Repair dike, Willamette River	50		182
Gold Beach area (LS)				
Hood River County, 5(b)	Port of Hood River: Establish industrial site		239	
	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mount Hood National Forest	35		
	do	88		362
Jefferson County, 5(b)IR				
Josephine County, 5(b)	Josephine Plywood Co.: Expand operations		1,307	
	Training: Electronics unit assembler (Oregon technical products)		8	
	Recreation facility, construction measures, south west Oregon	207		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siskiyou National Forest	40		
	do	35		
	Waste treatment facility, Cave Junction	17		
	Water supply systems, Cave Junction	55		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siskiyou National Forest	195		1,864
Klamath Falls area (LS)	Recreation facility, Klamath	380		
	Roads, reclamation, land development: Winema National Forest	180		
	Fremont National Forest	100		
	do	35		
	Winema National Forest	45		740
Lakeview area (LS)				
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Oregon State University: Establish marine science research center		959	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siuslaw National Forest	95		
	Slope stabil, Lincoln	50		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siuslaw National Forest	20		
	Repair jetty, Yaquina Bay	170		
	Sewers, Newport	208		1,502
Marion County, 5(b)				
North Bend-Coos Bay area (LS)	Warehouse, Coos Bay	42		
	Airport, Coos	90		
	Sewer facility, Coos Bay	157		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siskiyou National Forest	5		
	Timber improvement, Coos Bay	154		
	Bridge, road, Coquilla	268		
	Waste treatment facility, Eastside	76		660
Ontario area (LS)	Administrative building, Vale	103		103

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
OREGON—continued				
Roseburg area (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Umpqua National Forest	140		
	Road, Union Creek	225		
	Recreation facility, Roseburg	29		
	Road, West Fork	175		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Siuslaw National Forest	150		
	Waste treatment facility addition, North Roseburg	141		1,010
Salem County (LS)				
Sherman County, 5(b)				
Wasco County, 5(b) IR	Fenton, Conger, and Bellaire: Development of Kehneeta Hot Springs resort		10	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mount Hood National Forest	152		
	do	40		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 42, Wasco	380		
	Roads, Warm Springs Reservoir	64		646
Yamhill County, 5(b)	(See Statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Grade road, Bold Mountain	140		
	Construct dike, William River	43		
	Sewers, Lafayette	31		
	Sewers addition, McMinnville	38		252
Statewide	Columbia, Hood River Counties: Survey of potential industrial sites		10	
	U.S. Department of Agriculture: Construction of automated feedlot		9	
	Northwest Oregon, including Clatsop, Columbia, Hood River, and Yamhill Counties, 5(b): U.S. Department of Agriculture (FS): Report on forest resources and wood industries potentials.		10	29
State totals:				
Statewide			29	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		2,859	2,523	
LS areas		3,013		
All areas		5,872	2,552	8,424
PENNSYLVANIA				
Altoona area, 5(a)	Boyer Bros., Inc.: Expand and modernize candy manufacturing facilities		455	
	Cove Apple Packers Corp., Inc.: Establish fruit storage and packing complex		86	
	Fire road, Blair	2		
	Water facilities, Altoona	111		
	Water improvement, Altoona	58		
	Water facilities, Duncanville	109		821
Bedford County, 5(b)				
Berwick-Bloomsburg area, 5(a)	Berwick Industrial Development Corp.: Purchase facilities of ACF, Indiana		951	
	Berwick Industrial Development Corp.: Purchase facilities of ACF for Berwick Forge Fabricating Co.		605	
	Repave fire lane, Columbia	1		
	Water facilities, Bloomsburg	187		1,744
Bucks County (LS)	Water and sewers, Morrisville	170		
	Waste treatment facilities, Levittown	60		
	Water facilities, Bristol	442		672
Butler area, 5(a)	Community Development Corp.: Access road and water to industrial site		46	
	Community Development Corp.: Purchase land for new packaging plant		16	
	Water facilities, South Butler	136		
	Construction and repair, Butler	40		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Butler	1,273		1,511
Clarion County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-stenographer		17	
	Waste treatment facilities, Foxburg	35		
	Water facilities, Foxburg	33		85
Clearfield-DuBois area, 5(a)	Pike Township Municipal Authority: Extension of water system		53	
	Community Planning Services, Inc.: Feasibility of developing recreation-tourism at Clearfield interchange		35	
	Water facilities, Curwensville	62		
	Reclamation of mine, Clearfield	39		
	Fire land, Clearfield	3		192
Clinton County, 5(b)	Library, Lockhaven	54		
	Water facilities, Mill Hall	12		
	Fish raceways, Lamar	150		
	Trail streets, Clinton	2		
	Reclamation of mine, Clinton	30		248
Delaware County (LS)	Bridge, Delaware	36		36
Erie area, 5(a)	Standard Chair Co.: Plant expansion		237	
	Training:			
	Combination welder, machine tool operator		25	
	Welder, machine tool operator		32	
	Clerk-stenographer		33	
	Machine tool operator		12	
	Courthouse, Erie	1,605		
	do	32		
	Post office, Erie	25		2,028
Forest County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Allegheny National Forest	80		
	do	45		125
Fulton County, 5(b)				
Gettysburg area (LS)	Amphitheater, Gettysburg	29		29
Green County, 5(b)	(See Statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Sewer facilities, Waynesboro	67		67
Huntingdon County, 5(b)	Petersburg Area Redevelopment Corp.: Water and sewer system		23	
	Training:			
	Production worker		54	
	Coil assembler		9	86
Indiana area, 5(a)				
Jefferson County, 5(b)	Flood control, Mahoning Creek	370		370

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
PENNSYLVANIA—continued				
Johnstown area, 5(a)	Community Planning Services, Inc.: Develop Prince Gallitzin State Park		65	
	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Training: Draftsman		38	
	Hospital addition, Johnstown	676		
	Repave fire lane, Cambria	1		
	Water facilities, Johnstown	62		
	Building, Ebansburg	89		
	Detention hall, Cambria	111		
	Post office, Johnstown	11		
	Roads, Richland Township	15		
	Waste treatment facilities, Rockwood	136		
	Roads, Jefferson	22		
	Street improvement, Somerset	67		1,293
Kittanning-Ford City area, 5(a)	Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp.: Expand operations		390	
	Repair dam, Pittsburgh	30		420
Lewiston area, 5(a)	Water facilities, Somerset	12		
	Highways, Lewistown	127		
	Water facilities:			
	McVeytown	58		
	do	75		
	Newton	43		315
Lycoming County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Williamsport	40		
	Streets, Williamsport	76		
	Firehouse, Williamsport	34		
	Waste treatment facilities, Williamsport	277		
	Water facilities, Layalsock	80		
	Correctional institution, Allenwood	365		872
McKean County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Allegheny National Forest	151		
	Sewer facilities, Bradford	310		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Allegheny National Forest	25		
	do	25		
	Sewer, Bradford Township	83		
	Water facilities, McKean	32		626
Meadville area, 5(a)	W. P. Johnson: Feasibility study of industrial park		1	
	Program Research, Inc.: Design program to reduce unemployment[3]		8	
	Training: Shoe production worker		31	
	Water, Titusville	407		
	Recreational facilities, Erie	70		517
Monroe County, 5(b)				
Montgomery County (LS)	Hospital addition, Norristown	526		
	Waste treatment facilities, Upper Gwynedd	378		
	Water facilities, Pottstown	450		1,354
New Castle area, 5(a)	Building improvement, New Castle	24		
	Roads, New Castle	100		124
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, 5(b)				
Perry County, 5(b)	Training: Shoe production worker		54	
	Repair fire lane, Perry	1		55
Philadelphia area (LS)	Sewer facilities, Philadelphia	45		
	Water facilities, Philadelphia	27		
	do	97		
	Building, Philadelphia	159		
	Sewer facilities, Philadelphia	64		
	Building, Philadelphia	697		
	City hall, Phoenixville	93		
	Recreational facilities, Philadelphia	40		
	do	76		
	do	37		
	Hospital addition, Philadelphia	887		
	Restoration, Independence Hall	273		
	Hospital addition, Philadelphia	1,100		3,502
Pike County, 5(b)				
Pittsburgh area, 5(a)	Smith Township: Improve water system		550	
	Greater Charleroi Independent Development Corp.: Water, sewer, gas, and road facilities to industrial park.		60	
	Composite Metal Products, Inc.: Establish metal fabricating plant		271	
	Regional Industrial Development Corp.: Study of grain milling complex		25	
	Training:			
	Fireman, building maintenance man, typewriter salesman		55	
	Appliance repairman, auto service specialist		38	
	Registered nurse (refresher)		3	
	Clerk, general office (medical)		11	
	Sewer facilities, O'Hara	168		
	do	42		
	Projects 16, 32-34, Pittsburgh	1,175		
	Sewer facilities, Allegheny	30		
	Reservoir, Allegheny	125		
	Water facilities, Allegheny	50		
	do	125		
	do	100		
	do	125		
	Storage tanks, Allegheny	50		
	Water, West View	747		
	Sewer facilities, Munhall	12		
	Waste treatment facilities, Glen Willord	143		
	Street improvement, Pittsburgh	250		
	Building improvement, Fayette	41		
	Sewer facilities, Etna	50		
	Water facilities, Shaler	168		
	Building, New Braddock	220		
	Building, Monroeville	86		
	Building, Snowden	36		
	Streets, West Mifflin	287		
	Water facilities, West Mifflin	384		
	Building, Allegheny	118		
	Streets, Munhall	30		

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
PENNSYLVANIA—continued				
Pittsburgh area—Continued	Repair dam, Pittsburgh	117	--------	
	Water facilities, Crescent	172	--------	
	Municipal building, Franklin	59	--------	
	Municipal building, Breckenridge	41	--------	
	Water facilities, Forward Township	260	--------	
	Electrical system, Homestead	43	--------	
	Street improvement, Greentree	52	--------	
	Post office, courthouse, Pittsburgh	77	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Duquesne	112	--------	
	Street, Aspinwall	11	--------	
	Building, Canonsburg	174	--------	
	Building, Washington	218	--------	
	Street improvement, Roscoe	21	--------	
	Water, Charleroi	191	--------	
	Hospital addition, North Charleroi	71	--------	
	Building improvement, Ellsworth	12	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Westmoreland	175	--------	
	Building, New Kensington	35	--------	
	Sewer facilities, New Kensington	445	--------	
	Repair fire lane, Westmoreland	1	--------	
	Waste treatment facilities, Latrobe	1,178	--------	
	Hospital addition, Beaver	346	--------	
	Rochester General Hospital, Rochester	1,192	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Center Township	10	--------	
	Sewer improvement, Conway	50	--------	
	Water facilities, Mowaca	18	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Harmony	45	--------	
	Water facilities Hopewell	254	--------	10,955
Potter County, 5(b)	--------	--------	--------	
Pottsville-Lehighton area, 5(a)	Ashland Community Enterprises: Reopen abandoned mine, construct gage railroad for tourism.	--------	39	
	Greater Tamaqua Industrial Development Enterprises: Sewer lines and access road to Tidewater Industrial Park.	--------	42	
	Greater Pottsville Industrial Corp.: Purchase building	--------	198	
	Roustabout Co.: Purchase machinery and equipment	--------	144	
	Underground Storage & Exploration, Inc.: Engineering and economic feasibility studies for liquid petroleum gas, storage and petrochem study.	--------	82	
	Candeub, Cabot & Associates: Study of watershed area	--------	24	
	Training:			
	Sheet metal machine operator, maintenance mechanic	--------	89	
	Auto transmission mechanic	--------	20	
	Sheet metal machine operator, maintenance mechanic (extension of December 1961 project)	--------	51	
	Nurse aid	--------	18	
	Repair fire lane, Carbon	4	--------	
	Pottsville Hospital, Pottsville	2,313	--------	
	Water facilities, Jim Thorpe	545	--------	
	Library, Schuylkill	89	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Cressona	269	--------	3,927
St. Marys area, 5(a)	Reclamation of mine, Elk	29	--------	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Allegheny National Forest	55	--------	
	Roads and streets, Elk	1	--------	85
Sayre-Athens-Towanda area, 5(a)	Building, Towanda	40	--------	40
Scranton area, 5(a)	Scranton-Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., Inc.: Extend sewer lines, railroad spur and access road to heating and air-conditioning plant.	--------	424	
	Scranton-Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., Inc.: Construct new plant for lease to heating and air-conditioning plant.	--------	1,349	
	Scranton-Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., Inc.: Construct building for lease to printing firm.	--------	485	
	Training:			
	Auto transmission specialist, machine tool operator, electronic mechanic	--------	159	
	Semiauto arc welder (Fab-Weld Corp.)	--------	11	
	Streets, Dunmore	10	--------	
	Building, Lackawanna	167	--------	
	Hospital addition improvement, Scranton	511	--------	
	Repair fire lane, Lackawanna	1	--------	
	Streets, Dunmore	39	--------	
	Building, Old Forge	92	--------	
	Building, Scranton	347	--------	
	Street, Scranton	24	--------	
	Road improvement, Scranton	97	--------	3,716
Sharon-Farrell area, 5(a)	Streets, Sharpsville	95	--------	
	Sewer facilities, Grove City	9	--------	
	Streets, Grove City	19	--------	
	Water and street, Farrell	150	--------	273
Sullivan County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Eagles Mere	46	--------	46
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, 5(a)	Shamokin Area Development Corp.: Construct railroad siding	--------	119	
	Mount Carmel District Industrial Foundation: Construction of building for lease to Arcwire.	--------	59	
	Arcwire Corp.: Expand operations	--------	90	
	Training: Sewing machine operator	--------	7	
	Fire control, Mount Carmel	84	--------	
	Repair fire lane, Northumberland	2	--------	
	Community hospital addition, Sunbury	11	--------	
	Modification of towers, Lewisburg	105	--------	477
Susquehanna County, 5(b)	--------	--------	--------	
Tioga County, 5(b)	--------	--------	--------	

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
PENNSYLVANIA—continued				
Unlontown-Connellsville area, 5(a)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Training:			
	Welder		65	
	Welder (extension of previous project)		7	
	Arc welder		37	
	Sheet metal fabricating machine operator		10	
	Sheet metal worker		11	
	Inter-Community Industries: Sewerage		11	
	Recreational facilities, Fort Nece	64		
	Repair fire lane, Fayette	1		
	Street improvement, North Union	93		
	Water facilities, North Union	107		
	Administration building, South Union	48		
	Building, South Connellsville	38		
	Improve roads, Connellsville	172		
	Fire station, Uniontown	27		
	Street, South Union	47		
	Recreational facilities, Uniontown	22		
				749
Venango County, 5(b)	Arnold Graphics Ind.: Machinery for expansion		286	
	Venango County Industrial Development Corp.: Railroad, sewer, and water to industrial park.		305	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		14	
	Clerk-stenographer		15	
	Offset press operator		10	
	Collater machine operator		7	
				637
Warren County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Sheffield	225		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Allegheny National Forest	156		
	do	50		
	do	25		
	do	55		
	Water facilities, Sheffield	66		
	Post office, Warren	14		
				591
Wayne County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Honesdale	130		130
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton area, 5(b)	Goldsmith Mills, Inc.: Machinery and equipment		56	
	Wilkes College: Construct scientific research center		400	
	Hazleton City Water Development Authority: Water system to industrial park		325	
	Training:			
	Welder		12	
	Welder, stenographer		58	
	Machine tool operator		58	
	Power sewing machine operator		27	
	Building, Luzerne	104		
	Courthouse, Luzerne	327		
	Building, Kingston	41		
	Library, Kingston	73		
	Sewer facilities, Luzerne	55		
	Waste treatment facilities, Neccopeck	183		
	Streets, Hazleton	28		
	Streets, Luzerne County	63		
	Building, Hazleton	51		
	Sewer facilities, Nanticoke	17		
	Improve streets, Freeland	9		
	Sewer facilities, Wilkes-Barre	182		
	Administration Building, Dupont	39		
	Streets, Nanticoke	251		
				2,359
Wyoming County, 5(b)				
Statewide	Area, Inc.: Economic planning (Cambria and Somerset Counties, Johnstown area, 5(a); Fayette County (Uniontown-Connellsville area), 5(a); and Greene County 5(b)(3)(5)).		32	
	Pennsylvania Department of Commerce: Forest survey and timber utilization study.		65	
	Drexel Institute of Technology: Develop opportunities for small business		109	
	Pennsylvania State Planning Board: Study to develop major historical and recreational area in Southern Laurel Highlands. (Somerset County: Johnstown area, 5(a); Fayette County: Uniontown-Connellsville area, 5(a); and Westmoreland County: Pittsburgh area, 5(a)).		21	
	Western Pennsylvania: Unemployment study		100	
				327
Totals:				
Statewide			327	
5(a) areas		21,904	7,699	
5(b) areas		4,244	1,730	
LS areas		5,593		
All areas		31,741	9,756	
				41,497
PUERTO RICO				
Aquadilla, 5(a)	Water facility, Aguadilla	18		
	Roads, Aguada	125		
	Sewer facility, Aguadilla	13		
	Roads, Aguadilla	149		
				305
Adjuntas, 5(b)				
Aibonito, 5(b)				
Anasco, 5(b)				
Arecibo, 5(a)	Water facility, Arecibo	37		
	do	10		
	Utilities, Arecibo	186		
	Water facility	75		
	Roads, Arecibo	67		
	Water facility, Hatillo	25		
	do	9		
	do	4		
	Roads, Hatillo	33		
				446
Barranquitas, 5(b)	Barranquitas health center, Barranquitas	357		357

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
PUERTO RICO—continued				
Cabo Rojo, 5(b)				
Caguas, 5(a)	Water facility, Caguas	141		
	Roads, Juncos	50		
	Water facility, Caguas	26		
	Roads	9		
	do	8		
	do	6		
	do	37		
	do	25		
	Sewer facility, Juncos	116		
	Water facility, Guarbo	12		
	Roads, Gurabo	118		548
Carolina, 5(a)	Water facility, Loiza	10		
	Utilities, Carolina	9		
	do	70		
	Roads, Loiza	158		
	Roads, Carolina	16		
	Sewer facility	114		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Institute of Tropical Forestry	15		392
Cayey, 5(b)				
Ceiba, 5(b)	Roads:			
	Ceiba	45		
	do	16		61
Coamo, 5(b)				
Comerio, 5(b)	Comerio	89		89
Corozal, 5(b)	Corozal	72		72
Culebra, 5(b)				
Dorado, 5(b)				
Fajardo, 5(b)	Reclamation, land development, TropicalForestry, Institute of	25		
	Water facility, Fajardo	9		
	do	110		
	Roads:			
	Luquillo	62		
	Fajardo	20		226
Guayama, 5(a)	Guayama	213		
	Water facility, Patillas	10		
	Roads, Patillas	72		
	Additional road:			
	Pollos	38		
	Guardarraya	31		
	Guardarraya	38		
	Roads, Arroyo	35		
	Roads improvement, Guayama	94		531
Hormigueros, 5(b)				
Humacao, 5(b)	Water facility, Humacao	10		
	Roads, Humacao	74		
	do	63		
	Sewer facility, Humacao	36		
	do	31		214
Isabela, 5(b)				
Jayuya, 5(b)				
Juana Diaz, 5(b)				
Lajas, 5(b)				
Lares, 5(b)				
Las Marias, 5(b)				
Las Piedras, 5(b)	Water facility, LasPiedras	86		86
Luuillo, 5(b)				
Manati, 5(b)	Water facility:			
	Manati	17		
	El Rayo	12		
	Morovis	15		
	do	39		
	Street improvements, Barceloneta	147		
	Roads	33		263
Maricao, 5(b)				
Maunabo, 5(b)	Water facility, Maunabo	10		10
Mayaguez, 5(a)	Sewer facility, Mayaguez	450		450
Moca, 5(b)				
Naguabo, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Institute of Tropical Forestry	15		
	Bridge, Federal Highway No. 1, Maguzo	185		200
Naranjito, 5(b)	Water facility, Naranjito	38		38
Orocovis, 5(b)	Health center addition, Orocovis	103		103
Penuelas, 5(b)				
Ponce, 5(a)	Hospital addition and improvement, Ponce	568		
	Pila nurse home, Ponce	445		
	Water, Ponce	10		
	Sewer facility, Ponce	23		
	do	50		
	Roads, Ponce	162		1,258
Quebradillas, 5(b)				
Rincon, 5(b)				
Rio Grande, 5(b)				
Sabana Grande, 5(b)				
Salinas, 5(b)	Roads, Salinas	11		11
San German, 5(b)				

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
PUERTO RICO—continued				
San Juan (LS) (eligibility status terminated July 19, 1962).	Racquet Club, Inc.: Establish a resort hotel		1,600	
	Training:			
	Construction carpenter, construction plumber, entry electrician, combination entry welder, clerk-typist, clerk-stenographer, accounting clerk		75	
	Waiter, waitress		13	
	Sewing machine repairman, alterer, upholsterer, refrigerator mechanic, autobody repairman, and painter.		28	
	Construction, San Juan	400		
	Seawall addition, San Juan	50		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Institute of Tropical Forestry	25		
	Drainage, Puerto Neuvo	484		
	do	322		
	Municipal hall, Luna	21		
	Roads, Bayamon	56		
	Water facility, Buena Vista	10		
	Electrical system, Buena Vista	4		
	Roads, San Juan	285		
	Water facility, Santurce	18		
	Electrical system:			
	Cerro Gordo	1		
	Minillas	4		
	Roads, Buena Vista	106		
	Streets improvement, Hermanas	75		
	Roads:			
	Barrio Nuevo	95		
	Guatnabo	87		3,750
San Sebastian, 5(b)				
Santa Isabel, 5(b)				
Toa Alta, 5(f)				
Toa Baja, 5(b)				
Trujillo Alto, 5(b)	Roads, Trujillo Alto	26		26
Utuado, 5(b)				
Vega Alta, 5(b)	Roads, Vega Alta	182		182
Vega Baja, 5(b)	Roads, Vega Baja	62		
	do	51		
	Utilities, Vega Baja	49		
	Sewer facility, Vega Baja	41		203
Vieques, 5(b)				
Villalba, 5(b)				
Yabucoa, 5(b)	Drainage, Yabucoa	4		
	Water facility, Yabucoa	61		
	Utilities, Yabucoa	25		
	Roads, Yabucoa	200		290
Yauco, 5(a)	Roads, Guanica	30		
	Water facility, Guanica	53		
	Water facility, Las Palomas	34		117
Territorywide	U.S. Department of Agriculture: Study development of food processing industries		60	60
Total:				
Territorywide			60	
5(a) areas		3,714		
5(b) areas		2,764		
LS areas		2,043	1,716	
All areas		8,521	1,776	10,297
RHODE ISLAND				
Providence-Pawtucket area, 5(a)	Woonsocket Industrial Development Foundation: Improve and extend water system to industrial park.		186	
	Providence Redevelopment Corp.: Access road, street, water, and sewer to industrial park.		1,071	
	Training:			
	Typist, auto mechanic, machine tool operator		158	
	Bookkeeping machine operator, combination welder, sheetmetal worker, typist electronic mechanic, machine tool operator.		283	
	Tabulating machine operator, console computing operator		161	
	Sheetmetal worker		19	
	Keypunch operator		15	
	Machine operator, general		25	
	Sewer facilities, Warwick	1,827		
	Waste treatment facilities, Woonsocket	440		
	Hospital addition, Pawtucket	19		
	do	88		
	do	68		
	do	344		
	Water facilities, Providence	125		
	Water facilities, Woonsocket	270		
	Water facilities, Providence	13		
	Sewer facilities, Cranston City	333		
	Sewers, Blackstone	68		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Providence	68		
	do	193		
	Waste treatment facilities, Warwick	1,549		
	Sewers, Cranston	239		
	Rhode Island Hospital addition, Providence	83		
	Hospital addition, Woonsocket	128		
	Hospital, Cranston	125		
	Hospital addition, Woonsocket	50		7,948
Totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas		6,030	1,918	
5(b) areas				
LS areas				
All totals		6,030	1,918	7,948

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Aiken County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Aiken	76		
	Sewer facilities, Aiken	354		430
Allendale County, 5(b)				
Bamberg County, 5(b)	Pir-o-Wood industry: Reopen and modernize wood firm		130	
	Gas system, Bamberg	167		
	Hospital improvement, Bamberg	52		349
Barnwell County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Barnwell	152		
	Improve fishing facilities, Barnwell	5		
	Fish and wildlife facilities	7		164
Beaufort County, 5(b)	Port Royal, Ind.: Establish woolen knitting and manufacturing facilities		20	
	Water facilities, Hilton Head	80		100
Berkeley County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, South Carolina National Forest	80		
	do	175		
	do	50		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway No. 23, Berkeley	140		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway No. 24, Berkeley	140		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway No. 34, Berkeley	34		
	Fish facilities, Berkeley	19		
	Improve recreational facilities, West Bonneau	16		654
Calhoun County, 5(b)				
Chester County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, South Carolina NF	25		
	do	200		
	Construct storage shed, Chester	2		227
Chesterfield County, 5(b)	Chesterfield County Garment Corp.: Establish plant to make children's clothing		32	
	Town of Jefferson: Improve water system		188	
	Town of Pageland: Water and sewer facilities		217	
	Water facilities, Cheraw	84		
	Sewer improvement Chesterfield	121		
	Public building improvement	33		
	Waste treatment facilities, Chesterfield	37		712
Clarendon County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Manning	202		
	Administration building, Summerton	16		
	Construct field headquarters, south of Jordan	12		230
Colleton County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Williams	38		
	Construct manager residence, Bear Island	10		48
Conway area, 5(a)	Training: Machine tool operator		53	
	Hospital addition, Conway	249		
	Waste treatment facilities, Conway	66		
	Water facilities, Conway	245		613
Darlington County, 5(b)	Municipal Hall, Darlington	137		
	Courthouse, Darlington	610		747
Dorchester County, 5(b)	Dorchester Ceramics, Inc.: Erect and equip new brick manufacturing facility		170	
	Water facilities, Harleyville	75		245
Gaffney area (LS)				
Hampton County, 5(b)	Hampton Hospital addition, Varnville	25		25
Jasper County, 5(b)				
Kershaw County, 5(b)				
Lancaster County, 5(b)	Training: All-round farm machine operators		9	
	Water facilities, Lancaster	361		370
Lee County, 5(b)	Post office, Bishopville	23		23
Marlboro County, 5(b)				
McCormick County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Sounty Carolina National Forest	15		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 41, McCormick	87		
	Recreational facilities, Clark Hill	180		
	Construct storage shed, McCormick	2		284
Orangeburg County, 5(b)	Hospital addition, Orangeburg	123		
	Water and sewer, Orangeburg	237		
	Waste treatment facilities, Orangeburg	93		
	Building construction, Orangeburg	30		
	Fish and wildlife facilities	6		745
Sumter County, 5(b)				
Williamsburg County, 5(b)	Training: General maintenance man, factory		13	13
Totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas		560	53	
5(b) areas		4,587	779	
LS areas				
All totals		5,147	832	5,979
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Bennett County, 5(b) IR	Training: Carpenter		13	
	Sewers, Pine Ridge	240		253
Bon Homme County, 5(b) IR				
Brule County, 5(b) IR	Roads, Crow Creek	38		38
Buffalo County, 5(b) IR				
Charles Mix County, 5(b) IR	Erosion control, Yankton	100		100
Corson County, 5(b) IR	Training: Cattle rancher (ranch management)		9	9
Dewey County, 5(b) IR	Training: Cattle rancher		9	
	Erosion control, Cheyenne River	68		77

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
SOUTH DAKOTA—continued				
Gregory County, 5(b) IR				
Haakon County, 5(b) IR				
Hughes County, 5(b) IR				
Hyde County, 5(b) IR				
Lyman County, 5(b) IR				
Marshall County, 5(b) IR				
Meade County, 5(b) IR				
Mallette County, 5(b) IR	Conservation measures, Rosebud Reservation	400		400
Perkins County, 5(b) IR				
Roberts County, 5(b) IR	Construct roads, Sisseton Reservation	110		110
Shannon, 5(b) IR				
Stanley County, 5(b) IR				
Todd County, 5(b) IR				
Tripp County, 5(b) IR				
Washabaugh County, 5(b) IR				
Ziebach County, 5(b) IR				
Statewide	Harland Bartholomew & Associates: Study recreational and tourist facilities (Big Bend area).		41	41
Totals:				
Statewide			41	
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		956	31	
LS areas				
All totals		956	72	
				1,028
TENNESSEE				
Athens area (LS)				
Benton County, 5(b)	Town of Camden, extend water system		120	
	Water facilities, Camden	249		
	Conservation measures, Benton	5		
	Improve pumping station, Big Sand	27		
				401
Bledsoe County, 5(b)	Water supply system, Pikeville	132		132
Chattanooga area (LS)	Airport addition:			
	Chattanooga	372		
	Lovell Field	498		
	Chattanooga	144		
	Sewers, East Ridge	26		
	Building, Chattanooga	110		
	Water reservoir, Red Bank-White Oak	390		
	Conservation measures, Hamilton	6		
	Recreation facilities, Chickamauga Dam	60		
				1606
Clay County, 5(b)	Recreation facilities, Dale Hollow	52		52
Cocke County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Cocke	1,444		1,444
Cumberland County, 5(b)				
Decatur County, 5(b)	Town of Decatursville: Install sewer facilities		25	
	Conservation measures, Decatur	2		
				27
De Kalb County, 5(b)	Vesco, Inc.: Establish a furniture plant		130	
	Water facilities, Alexandria	129		
	Recreation facilities, Center Hill	36		
				295
Dickson County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Van Leer	67		
	Recreation facilities, Cheatham	74		
				141
Dyersburg area (LS)	Clear land:			
	Tigrett	31		
	Ross Island	13		
				44
Fayette County, 5(b)	Gas system, Moscow	233		
	Improve recreation facilities, Fisherwalk Lake	5		
				238
Fentress County, 5(b)	Water and sewer, Jamestown	283		283
Franklin area (LS)				
Grainger County, 5(b)				
Greenville area, 5(a)				
Grundy County, 5(b)	Water, Big Creek	640		640
Hancock County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Sneedville	19		
	Water supply system, Sneedville	49		
				68
Hardeman County, 5(b)	Watershed, Pott Creek	44		44
Hardin County, 5(b)	Training: General clerk, combination welder, electrical appliance serviceman, all-round farm machine mechanic.		95	
	(See statewide projects for additional training project.)			
	Conservation measures, Hardin	2		
	Recreation facilities, Pickwick Dam	70		
	Maintenance building, Pickwick Dam	90		
				257
Harriman-Rockwood area, 5(a)	Streets, Kingston	153		
	Conservation measures, Rockwood	3		
				156
Haywood County, 5(b)	Fish and wildlife	120		120
Hickman County, 5(b)	Town of Centerville: Extend water and gas lines		117	117
Houston County, 5(b)	City of Erin: Extend water system		50	
	Conservation measures, Houston	2		
				52
Humphreys County, 5(b)	Conservation measures, Humphrey	1		1
Jackson County, 5(b)				
Johnson County, 5(b)	Mountain City: Water and sewage		106	
	Post office, Kingsport	15		
	Dam, Doe Creek development	9		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Cherokee National Forest	150		
				280

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
TENNESSEE—continued				
Johnson City area (LS)	Hospital addition, Johnson City	76		76
LaFollette-Jellico-Tazewell area, 5(a)	City of La Follette: Construct dam		733	
	Claiborne County Utility District: Install water system		250	
	Towns of Tazewell and New Tazewell: Construct sewage system		685	
	Training:			
	Auto mechanic, machine tool operator, TV and radio repairman, combination welder, woodworking millman.		83	
	Millman, welder		28	
	Strip mine, reclamation	9		
				1,788
Lake County, 5(b)				
Lauderdale County, 5(b)				
Macon County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Lafayette	48		48
Marion County, 5(b)	Water, Jasper	113		113
Martin area (LS)	Construct fish preserves, Garrett Lake	2		2
McNairy County, 5(b)	Training. (See statewide project for training project.)			
Morristown area (LS)	Improve sewer facilities, Morristown	294		294
Overton County, 5(b)	Water and sewers, Livingston	427		427
Perry County, 5(b)	Conservation measures, Perry	1		1
Pickett County, 5(b)				
Putnam County, 5(b)	Sewers, Cookeville	351		
	Waste treatment facilities:			
	Monterey	62		
	Cookeville	130		
	Addition recreation facilities, Burgess Fall	10		
				553
Rhea County, 5(b)	Huntley & Huntley: Study to determine quantity and quality of iron ore deposits		23	
	Conservation measures, Rhea	3		
				26
Robertson County, 5(b)	Water improvement, Springfield	207		
	City of Springfield: Establish plant to manufacture pet foods		325	
				530
Scott County, 5(b)				
Sequatchie County, 5(b)				
Sevier County, 5(b)	Water and Sewer, Sevierville	163		
	Construction, Great Smoky Mountain	219		
	Rehabilitation, Great Smoky Mountain	174		
	Conservation measures, Sevierville	3		
				559
Smith County, 5(b)	Water, Carthage	346		346
Tipton County, 5(b)				
Unicoi County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development Cherokee National Forest	150		150
Union City area, (LS)	Repair levees, Southwest Obion	66		66
Union County 5(b)				
Van Buren County, 5(b)				
Wayne County, 5(b)	Stevens & Wilkinson: Study natural bridge facility and its development		11	
	Training. (See statewide projects for additional training projects.)			
	Road, Natchez Parkway	131		
				142
White County, 5(b)	Training: Millman (woodworking)		18	18
Statewide	Arthur D. Little: Preservation and development of industrial sites along Tennessee waterways.		50	
	Training:			
	General clerk, combination welder, electrical appliance serviceman, all-round farm machine operator (Hardin County. 5(b)(3)(5), McNairy County, 5(b)(5), and Wayne County, 5(b)(5)).		48	
	Nurse aid (Hardin-McNairy-Wayne Counties)		4	
	All-round farm machine operator (Hardin, McNairy, and Wayne Counties)		11	
	Clerk, general office (Hardin, McNairy, and Wayne Counties)		12	
	Welder (combination) (Hardin, McNairy, and Wayne Counties)		16	
	Electrical appliance serviceman		16	
				157
Totals:				
Statewide			157	
5(a) areas		165	1,779	
5(b) areas		6,346	1,161	
LS areas		2,088		
All totals		8,599	3,097	
				11,696
TEXAS				
Anderson County, 5(b)				
Angelina County, 5(b)	Angelina County Development Association: Plywood plant processing proposal		7	
	(See Statewide projects for additional technical assistance project.)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	28		
	do	180		
	Recreational facilities, Bend Reservation	125		
	Building, Diboll	32		
				372
Beaumont-Port Arthur (LS)	Drainage, Port Arthur	575		
	Street improvement, Port Arthur	563		
	Water facilities, Jefferson Co.	72		
	Sewer facilities:			
	Beaumont	209		
	Groves	550		
	Street improvement, Nederland	479		
	Streets, Orange	100		
				2,548
Bowie County, 5(b)	Baltech, Inc.: Establish a precision machinery plant at Texarkana		119	
	Water and sewers, Nash	234		
	Waste treatment facilities, Nash	30		
	Water and sewers:			
	New Boston	300		
	De Kalb	38		
	Texarkana area redevelopment: Plant to manufacture tires		7,035	7,756
Brownsville-Harlington-San Benito area (LS)				
Camp County, 5(b)				
Cass County, 5(b)	Training: Chemical operator (Texas Chemical Intermediates Co.)		12	
	Construct Federal building, Linden	56		
	Recreational facilities	350		
				418

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
TEXAS—continued				
Cherokee County, 5(b)	Hallmark Industries: Establish new synthetic marble plant		10	
	Southwest Design Co.: Machinery and equipment to establish furniture plant		56	
	Water facilities, Alto	114		
	Waste treatment facilities, Alto	32		
	Sewers, Rusk	69		
	Water and sewer improvement, Rusk	100		381
Collingsworth County, 5(b)				
Cotulla area (LS)				
Crystal City area (LS)				
Delta County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Pecan Gap	7		
	Sewer facilities, Pecan Gap	40		47
Dimmit County, 5(b)				
Falls County, 5(b)	Hospital improvement, Marlin	96		96
Franklin County, 5(b)				
Freestone County, 5(b)				
Frio County, 5(b)				
Galveston-Texas City area (LS)	Water and sewers, Galveston	355		355
Harrison County, 5(b)	Aquatic Controls, Inc.: Pilot project to harvest and process Caddo lake aquatic plants.		62	62
Henderson County, 5(b)	Texas Clay Tile Co.: Establish new firm to produce structural tile and face brick		414	
	Norman Pottery, Inc.: Expand factory		23	
	Water facilities, Chandler	110		547
Hopkins County, 5(b)				
Houston County, 5(b)	Audio Electronics, Inc.: Establish an electronics plant		383	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	25		
	do	110		518
Jasper County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	8		
	Water facilities, Kirbyville	177		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	110		
	Water facilities, Buna	30		
	Sewers, Kirbyville	50		
Kenedy County, 5(b)				
Kinney County, 5(b)				
Lamar County, 5(b)				
Laredo area, 5(a)	Training:			
	All-round farm machine operator		11	
	Farm machine operator		13	
	All-round farm machine operator		13	
	All-round metal mechanic		36	
	Irrigator		10	
	Auto mechanic		13	
	Stenographer (import and export)		9	
	All-round farm machine operator		13	
	City of Laredo: Expand water system		190	
	Caudill, Rowlett & Scott: Study of an international civic and cultural center		10	
	Training:			
	Service station attendant		12	
	Stenographer (export-import)		16	
	Auto mechanic entry		13	359
Leon County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Buffalo	25		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Centerville	19		44
Limestone County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Groesbeck	61		
	Water facilities, Coolidge	105		166
Madison County, 5(b)				
Marion County, 5(b)	Rady & Associates: Development of tourism		19	
	Recreational facilities, Ferrells Bridge	255		274
Mathis area (LS)	Sewer and water, Ingleside	1,200		1,200
Maverick County, 5(b)				
McAllen area (LS)				
McCulloch County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Brady	189		189
Montgomery County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	90		90
Morris County, 5(b)	Naples Community Inn of America: Construct 50-unit deluxe motel		325	325
Nacogdoches County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Water and sewers, Nacogdoches	400		400
Newton County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project)			
	Waste-treatment facilities addition, Newton	40		
	Water and sewers, Newton	100		140
Panola County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Beckville	62		
	Waste-treatment facilities, Beckville	31		93
Pleasanton area (LS)				
Polk County, 5(b)				
Rains County, 5(b)				
Raymondsville area (LS)				
Red River County, 5(b)	Red River County Industrial Foundation: Water and sewer systems in cities of Detroit and Clarksville.		474	
	Pats-Co Athletic Manufacturing Co.: Build and equip plant		26	
	Red River County Industrial Foundation: Construct building for lease to expanding firm.		43	
	Training:			
	Sewing machine operator		10	
	Sheet metal operator		13	
	Training:			
	Athletic equipment worker (Pats-Co.)		17	
	Nurse aid		4	
	Water facility, Avery	56		643
Rockport area (LS)				
Robertson County, 5(b)	Street improvement, Hearne	166		166

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
TEXAS—continued				
Rusk County, 5(b)	Red Dot Plastic Industries: Establish plastic and zinc molding facility		229	
	Water facilities, Overton	41		270
Sabine County, 5(b)	(See Statewide project for technical assistance project)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	15		
	do	10		
	Sewer facilities, Hemphill	11		36
San Augustine County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	4		
	do	5		
	Recreational facilities	275		
	Water facilities, San Augustine	34		318
San Jacinto County, 5(b)	Hare & Hare: Industrial planning proposal for Livingston Lake		18	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	11		
	do	150		179
Shelby County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	4		
	do	80		
	Water facilities, Tenaha	31		
	Gas system, Bullard	154		269
Smith County, 5(b)	Gas system, Winona	48		48
Starr County, 5(b)				
Terrell County, 5(b)	Construction, Sanderson	44		44
Titus County, 5(b)				
Trinity County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Texas National Forest	5		
	do	50		55
Tyler County, 5(b)	Woodville Community Inn: Construct community inn		420	
	Sewer improvement, Woodville	68		488
Upshur County, 5(b)	Construct Federal building, Gilmer	127		127
Val Verde County, 5(b)	Construction, Comstock	9		9
Van Zandt County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Canton	114		114
Waller County, 5(b)				
Wood County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Alba	52		52
Zapata County, 5(b)	Caudill, Rowlett, and Scott: Study recreation resources of Falcon LakeReservoir		7	7
Statewide	University of Texas: Mineral study of 42 east Texas counties		40	
	Deep East Texas Electric Co-op, Inc.: Planning adjacent to proposed reservoir for recreational purposes (McGee Bend Lake).		19	
	Battelle Memorial Institute: Study extent of iron ore deposits		75	
	U.S. Department of Interior: Market and resource study, Pasadena Refining Corp.		2	
	Booz, Allen & Hamilton: Feasibility study of floor tiling plant (Angelina, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Sabine, San Augustine, and Shelby Counties).		21	157
Total:				
Statewide			157	
5(a) areas			359	
5(b) areas		5,651	9,822	
LS areas		3,749		
All totals		9,399	10,338	19,737
UTAH				
Beaver County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Fishlake National Forest	107		
	do	30		
	do	15		152
Carbon County, 5(b)	Blue Flame Coal Co.: Expand mining operations		81	
	Colombine Coal Co.: Reopen, improve, and expand mining operations		325	
	Roads improvement, Uintah	140		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Manti La Sal National Forest	29		
	Recreation facilities, Carbon	140		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Manti La Sal National Forest	5		
	do	30		750
Duchesne County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Duchesne	175		175
Emery County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Manti La Sal National Forest	45		
	Road, Emery	40		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Manti La Sal National Forest	40		
	do	10		135
Garfield County, 5(b)	Recreational facilities, Garfield	217		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Dixie National Forest	160		
	do	70		447
Grand County, 5(b), IR				
Juab County, 5(b)	Juab County Economic Development Corp.: Revive a turkey poultry processing plant.		251	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Uinta National Forest	12		
	do	50		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Fishlake National Forest	11		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Fishlake National Forest	10		
	do	10		344
Provo-Oren area (LS)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Uinta National Forest	250		
	Construct trails, Utah	224		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Uinta National Forest	165		
	Sewer, Salem	64		
	Water facilities, Provo	61		
	Sewage facilities, Salem City	147		
	Construct boat, Provo	4		
	Sewer facilities, American Fork	134		1,049

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
UTAH—continued				
Roosevelt area (LS)				
St. George area (LS)				
San Juan County, 5(b)	Jensen and Wallen Mapping and Forest Service: Utilization of Navajo forest products industry.[2]		6	
	Recreational facilities, Canyonland	400		
	Erosion, Navajo Reservation	86		492
San Pete County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Manti LaSal National Forest	70		
	do	40		
	do	7		117
Summit County, 5(b)	United Park City Clay Mines Co.: Convert mining area into recreational and tourist facility.		1,232	
	United Park Clay Mines Co.: Location study for ski facility		3	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wasatch National Forest	220		1,455
Uintah County, 5(b), IR				
Wasatch County, 5(b), IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Uinta NF	25		
	do	80		
	do	5		
	Access road, Wasatch	31		141
Totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas				
5(b areas		2,310	1,898	
LS areas		1,049		
All totals		3,359	1,898	5,257
VERMONT				
Alburg, area (LS)				
Caledonia County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facility, St. Johnsbury	366		366
Essex County, 5(b)	Fish facilities	14		
	Wildlife	4		18
Orleans County, 5(b)	Fish facilities	1		1
State totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		385		
LS areas				
All areas		385		385
VIRGINIA				
Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, 5(a)	Reed Research, Inc.: Proposal to create new products and growth industries		26	
	Training: Sewing machine operator		12	
	Waste treatment facility, Jonesville	47		
	Water and sewer, Pennington Gap	250		
	Water supply system, Jonesville	123		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	67		
	Conservation measures, Big Stone	8		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	30		
	Sewers, Coeburn	85		
	Waste treatment facility, Big Stone Gap	100		
	Water supply system, Norton	210		
	Water facility Coeburn	150		1,108
Buchanan, 5(b)				
Carroll County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	1		
	Soil control, Blue Ridge	255		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	30		
	Highway improvement Federal Highway No. 27, Carroll	15		301
Chincoteague area (LS)	Construct dike, East Saxie	35		35
Cumberland County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Improve Pond Bridge, Cumberland	30		30
Dickenson County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	7		
	do	30		
	Waste treatment facility, Clintwood	46		83
Fluvanna County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Sewers, Scottsville	15		15
City of Galax, 5(b)				
Grayson County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	4		
	Recreation facility, Blue Ridge	111		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	50		
	Highway improvement	58		223
Lancaster County, 5(b)				
Northumberland County, 5(b)	Callas Foods, Inc.: Reopen a canning plant		30	30
Richlands area (LS)				
Richmond County, 5(b)				
Russell County 5(b)	Town of Honaker: Water system		25	25
Scott County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Jefferson National Forest	21		
	do	150		171
Westmoreland County, 5(b)	Courthouse addition, Montross	53		53
Statewide	College of William & Mary: economic survey for type and location of industrial development (Accomack and Northampton Counties)		23	
	Virginia Polytechnic Institute: economic study re unemployment in mining (Cumberland, Fluvanna, and Buckingham Counties).		3	26
State totals:				
Statewide			26	
5(a) areas		1,070	38	
5(b) areas		876	35	
LS areas		35		
All areas		1,981	119	2,100

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
VIRGIN ISLANDS				
St. Croix, 5(b)	Recreation facilities	291		
	Reservoir, St. Croix	39		330
Totals:				
Statewide				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		330		
LS areas				
All areas		330		330
WASHINGTON				
Aberdeen area, 5(a)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Olympic National Forest	48		
	Water facility, District No. 2	25		
	Recreation facility improvement, Olympia National Park	116		
	Landing, Grays Harbor	75		
	Construct dikes, Johns River	10		274
Anacortes area, 5(a)	Farwest fisheries: Purchase and expand cannery operation		355	
	Ivan Bloch & Associates: Summary analysis of industrial site locations		2	
	Water facility, Anacortes	303		
	do	220		
	Waste treatment facility, Anacortes	3		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mount Baker National Forest	69		
	Addition, wildlife facility, Skagit	27		
	Waste treatment facility, Burlington	132		
	Sewer facility, Burlington	29		
	Sewer project, Mount Vernon	4		
	Improve game range, Skagit	4		1,148
Bellingham area (LS)	Border station, Lynden	44		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Mount Baker National Forest	71		
	Sewer facility, Bellingham	142		
	Soil and moisture conservation	91		
	Headquarters, Whatcom	53		
	Bridges and Federal Highway No. 25, Whatcom	100		
	Water and sewer facility	50		
	Post office, Bellingham	190		741
Centralia area, 5(a)	Cowlitz Forest Products, Inc.: Establish new plywood plant		140	
	Water facility, Winlock	8		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 13, Lewis	200		
	Road improvement, Chehalis	30		
	Water facility, Chehalis	25		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Snoqualm National Forest	25		
	Headquarters, Lewis	25		
	Sewer facility, Toledo	47		500
Clallam County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid		12	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Olympic National Forest	44		
	Headquarters, Clallam	15		
	Flood control, Dungeness	297		368
Ferry County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Colville National Forest	44		
	do	45		
	Water and sewers, Colville	44		
	Border station, Laurier	18		
	Training: Nurse aid		6	157
Goldendale area (LS)				
Jefferson County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 1, Jefferson	156		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Olympic National Forest	8		
	Headquarters, Jefferson	18		182
Kittitas County, 5(b)	Central Washington Power Association: Hydraulic jet coal mining pilot plant facilities.		15	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Snoqualm National Forest	80		
	Recreation facility, Kittitas	30		
	Roads and bridges, Colockum District	10		135
Klickitat County, 5(b) IR				
Moses Lake area (LS)				
Okanagon County, 5(b)	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 32, Okanogan	400		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Okanogan National Forest	100		
	do	115		
	Headquarters, Okanogan	5		
	Recreation facility, Joseph	45		
	Border station, Oroville	31		696
Pacific County, 5(b)	Northwest Oyster Farms, Inc.: Machinery and equipment for expanding		110	
	Port of Ilwaco: Expand small boat mooring facilities		146	
	U.S. Department of the Interior (BR): Multipurpose reservoir in Willapa River		80	
	Waste treatment facility:			
	Raymond	220		
	South Bend	124		
	Sea View	68		
	Sewer facility, Raymond	173		921
Pend Oreille County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kanikso	100		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Colville National Forest	30		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kanikso National Forest	20		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Colville National Forest	40		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Kanikso National Forest	20		210
San Juan County, 5(b)				
Spokane (LS)	Streets, Spokane	742		
	Water facility, Deer Park	90		
	Sewer facility, Medical Lake	165		
	Waste treatment facility, Medical Lake	122		1,119

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
WASHINGTON—continued				
Stevens County, 5(a) IR	Ivan Bloch & Associates: Marketing of sodium sulfate and other saline deposits		77	
	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Border station, Colville	28		
	Recreation facility, Coulee Dam	130		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Colville National Forest	76		
	Roads, Spokane Reservation	95		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Colville National Forest	45		
	do	60		
	Construct buildings, Stevens	26		537
Wenatchee, 5(a)	Water facility, Wenatchee	153		
	Waste treatment facility, Lake Chelan	39		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wenatchee National Forest	130		
	Water facility, Chelan	70		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Wenatchee National Forest	30		
	do	20		
	Recreation facility	25		
	Waste treatment facility, White Swan	70		537
Yakima, 5(a)	Training: Tree pruner (fruit thinning)		17	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Snoqualm National Forest	131		
	Water facility, Wapato	69		
	Sewer facility, Sunnyside	18		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Snoqualm National Forest	10		
	Timber stand improvement, Yakima Reservation	176		
	Water facility, Union Gap	31		
	Sewers, Toppenish	112		
	Water and sewers, Wapato	44		
	Additional wildlife facility, Oak Creek	10		
	Water facility, Zillah	50		
	Post Office, Sunnyside	14		
	Post Office, Yakima	47		729
Statewide	Washington State University: Production of high quality particle board		3	
	U.S. Department of Agriculture (Forest Service): Study of forest resources and wood industry potentials, northeast Washington State (Ferry, Pend Oreille, Stevens, and 3 non-ARA counties).		10	
	Graham Development Co.: Conversion of logging residue to salable products (Lewis, Clallam, Cowlitz, Clark, and Skamania Counties).		25	
	University of Washington: Study of factors affecting success of new business in redevelopment areas.		48	86
State totals:				
Statewide			86	
5(a) areas		3, 134	591	
5(b) areas		2, 300	369	
LS areas		1, 860		
All areas		7, 294	1, 046	8, 340
WEST VIRGINIA				
Barbour County, 5(b)				
Beckley area, 5(a)	West Virginia Department of Natural Resources: Develop Grandview State Park		211	
	Beckley Business Development Corp.: Construct building for electronics firm		70	
	Macinar, Inc.: For new firm to manufacture steel wool soap pads (see statewide projects for technical assistance project).		190	
	Training: Machine tool operator, combination welder		24	
	Building, Beckley	168		
	Shop and parking, Beckley	63		
	Waste treatment facilities, Beckley	54		
	Recreation facilities, Raleigh	1, 200		
	Town Hall, Mabscott	6		1, 986
Bluefield area, 5(a)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance project.)			
	Training: Machine tool operator, stenographer		21	
	Parking, Bluefield	191		
	Water facilities, Midway	11		
	Water facilities, Bluefield	428		
	Library, Princeton	115		
	Waste treatment facilities, Bluefield	17		
	Water facilities, Glenwood	338		
	Sewer facilities, Bluefield	319		1, 440
Braxton County, 5(b)	West Virginia Forest Products Co.: Establish particle board and plywood plant		1, 321	
	State road commission: For bridge and access road		98	
	Recreation facilities	341		1, 760
Calhoun County, 5(b)				
Charleston area, 5(a)	Irving Bowman & Associates: Kanawha Airport modernization program and industrial park development.		9	
	Training:			
	Machine tool operator, spray painter, sheet metal machine operator, assistant cook, dry cleaner, inert gases welder.		98	
	Vehicle tester, machine shop inspector, forklift operator		36	
	Welder, machine tool operator		130	
	Welder (inert gases—mig. aluminum process)		38	
	Welder (inert gases—sigma steel process)		60	
	Painter—spray		3	
	Welder (arc refresher)		34	
	Library, St. Albans	60		
	Hospital addition, Kanawha	645		
	Water facilities, St. Albans	149		
	Install mooring, Kanawha	131		
	Water facilities, River Bend	42		
	Improve street, Bluefield	94		
	Water facilities, Chesapeake	148		1, 677

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
WEST VIRGINIA—continued				
Clarksburg area, 5(a)	Training: Auto mechanic, machine tool operator, typist, stenographer, nurse aid, aircraft riveter.		95	
	Training: Stenographer-typists		12	
	Training: Nurse aid		3	
	Training: Riveter (air conditioning)		9	
	Water and sewer, Lumberport	140		
	Water facilities, West Milford	69		
	Streets, Clarksburg	602		
	Water facilities, Grafton	211		1,141
Clay County, 5(b)				
Fairmont area, 5(a)	Johnson, Harrigan & Yaple. Engineering survey and feasibility study in development of an industrial park.		7	
	William P. Johnson: Consulting service re study on industrial park		1	
	Training: Machine tool operator, auto mechanic		18	
	Water facilities, Fairmont	199		
	Water facilities, Mannington	192		417
Gilmer County, 5(b)	Sewer facilities, Glenville	71		
	Waste treatment facilities, Glenville	211		282
Grant County, 5(b)	Training: Farm mechanic, typist, stenographer, sewing machine operator		39	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongan National Forest	6		
	do	5		
	Flood control, Bayar	168		218
Hampshire County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Washington National Forest	10		10
Hardy County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, Moorefield	49		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Washington National Forest	113		
	do	15		177
Huntington-Ashland area, 5(a)	American National Rubber Co.: Machinery and equipment for expansion		33	
	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Standard printing and publishing: Expand facilities		187	
	Training:			
	Psychiatric aid		18	
	Auto transmission specialist, electrical appliance repairman, route salesman, nurse aid, waiter and waitress, stenographer, typist.		119	
	Water facilities, Huntington	106		
	Orthopedic hospital addition, Huntington	1,005		
	Waste treatment facilities, Ceredo	18		
	Recreation facilities, Greenup	60		
	Water facilities, Spring Valley	59		
	Sewer facilities, Fort Gay	50		1,655
Lewis County, 5(b)				
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities, West Hamlin	66		
	Courthouse, Hamlin	396		462
Logan County, 5(b)	Courthouse	1,208		1,208
Martinsburg area (LS)	Water facilities, Martinsburg	236		
	Waste treatment facilities, Martinsburg	550		
	Clean up, Harpers Ferry	250		
	Fish hatchery, Leetown	203		1,239
Norgan County, 5(b)				
Morgantown, 5(a)	City of Morgantown: Expand sewage system		122	
	Hewlett Coating Co., Inc.: To establish new firm		20	
	University of West Virginia: Build a wood products research center		808	
	Training: Auto mechanic		13	
	Streets, Westover	110		
	Community building improvements, Morgantown	9		
	Airport, Morgantown	397		1,479
New Martinsville, 5(a)	Building, Sistersville	49		49
Nicholas County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, George Washington National Forest	8		
	do	60		
	Highway improvement, Federal Highway No. 39, Nicholas	208		
	Courthouse, Summersville	165		441
Oak Hill-Montgomery, 5(a)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Training: Machine-tool operator		14	
	Waste-treatment facilities, Montgomery	107		
	Improve stadium, Mount Hope	32		153
Parkersburg area, 5(a)	Mental institute, St. Marys	450		
	Improve heating, St. Marys	13		
	Sewer facilities, Cairo	66		
	Road, Vienna	14		
	Streets, Parkersburg	70		
	Post office, Parkersburg	38		651
Pendleton County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, George Washington National Forest	87		
	do	30		
	do	50		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forest	30		197
Pikesville-Williamson area (Mingo County part), 5(a). (See Kentucky.)	National Seating & Dimension Co.: Establish new firm		572	
	Training: Auto mechanic, electrical appliance repairman, machine tool operator, nurse aid, typist, stenographer, woodworking millman.		70	
	Waste facilities, Williamson	272		
	Water and sewer, Chattaroy	178		1,092
Pocahontas County, 5(b)	West Virginia Department of Natural Resources: Rehabilitate railroad		576	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forest	85		
	Highway improvement	186		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forest	100		
	do	60		
	do	55		
	Bridge replacement	253		1,315

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
WEST VIRGINIA—continued				
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, 5(a)	Community Health Association: Build hospital facility		317	
	West Virginia Industrial Development Corp.: Construct resort motel		1,065	
	Streets, Ravenswood	117		
	Waste-treatment facilities, New Haven	33		
	Streets, Point Pleasant	325		
	Sewer facilities, New Haven	84		1,941
Preston County, 5(b)				
	Waste-treatment facilities, Rowlesburg	83		
	Water facilities, Rowlesburg	147		
	do	32		262
Randolph County, 5(b)	City of Elkins: Water and sewer systems to permit construction of men's garment plant.		195	
	Water facilities, Beverly	80		
	Roads, reclamation, land development Monongah National Forests	40		
	do	80		
	do	20		
	Federal office building, Elkins	50		465
Roane County, 5(b)				
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, 5(a)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Highway improvement	267		
	do	291		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forests	40		598
Summers County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Recreation facilities, Blue Stone	10		
	Courthouse, Hinton	13		
	Improve Building, Hinton	13		
	do	54		90
Tucker County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forest	56		
	do	30		86
Upshur County, 5(b)	Water facilities, Buckhannon	25		25
Webster County, 5(b)	Webster County 4-H Club: Construction of administration building and assembly hall.		104	
	Training: Millman		23	
	Hospital addition, Webster Springs	76		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Monongah National Forest	19		
	do	150		
	do	10		
	Streets, Addison	57		439
Welch area, 5(a)	Training: Mine maintenance machinist, auto mechanic, machine tool operator, combination welder.		39	
	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	Construction, Kimball City	5		
	Buildings, Kimball City	7		
	Streets, Kimball	7		
	Water, Keystone	26		
	Administration building, McDowell	50		
	Roads, Welch	141		275
Wheeling area, 5(a)	Ohio Valley Industrial & Business Development Corp.: Construct plant for lease to rifle manufacturer.		272	
	Candeub Cabot Associates: Feasibility study for needs of civic auditorium		2	
	Training: Machine tool operator, auto mechanic draftsman, machine pressman, seamstresses.		65	
	Water facilities, Wheeling	858		
	Sewer, Bethlehem	183		
	Post office-courthouse, Wheeling	45		
	Recreation facilities, Wheeling Park	137		1,562
Wyoming County, 5(b)	(See statewide projects for technical assistance projects.)			
	U.S. Army Engineers: acceleration of Guyandot River aerial survey (Justice Dam and Reservoir).		10	
	Oceana municipal water works, extension		10	20
Statewide	U.S. Department of Interior (Bureau of Mines): Effects of pipeline transmission on coal mining.		25	
	U.S. Department of Interior: Survey of proposed Allegheny Parkway New River Gorge (Fayette, Mercer, Raleigh, and Summers Counties).		20	
	Checchi & Co.: Tourism and recreational study, New River Gorge (Fayette, Mercer, Raleigh, and Summers Counties).		36	
	Marshall Foundation, Inc.: Economic base study of area of Justice Dam (Wyoming County and adjoining counties on Guyandot River).		9	
	Concord College Center for economic development (Mercer, McDowell, Summers, Monroe, Greenbrier, Raleigh, and Wyoming Counties).		67	157
Totals:				
Statewide			157	
5(a) areas		12,981	4,805	
5(b) areas		3,417	2,376	
LS areas		1,239		
All totals		17,637	7,338	24,975
WISCONSIN				
Ashland County, 5(b), IR	Training:			
	Machine tool operator		21	
	Clerk-stenographer		14	
	Machine tool operator		41	
	Musical instrument repairman		11	
	Arc welder		21	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequamegon National Forest	49		
	do	15		
	do	70		
	Highway addition, Ashland	5		
	Waste treatment facilities, Mellon	39		
	Roads	115		401

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
WISCONSIN—continued				
Bayfield County, 5(b), IR	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequame National Forest	65		410
	do	20		
	do	70		
	Road improvement, Bayfield County	71		
	do	175		
	Fishing facilities, Bayfield County	9		
Burnett County, 5(b), IR	Training: Machine tool operator		40	261
	do		40	
	Waste treatment facilities, Webster	26		
	Sewer facilities, Webster	110		
	Community building:			
	Webster	15		
	Burnett	25		
	Tree planting, Burnett County	5		
Door County, 5(b)	Hospital, Sturgeon Bay	120		367
	Federal building, Sturgeon Bay	240		
	Post office, Sturgeon Bay	7		
Douglas County, 5(a) (part of Duluth-Superior)	Training:			273
	Machine tool operator		16	
	Nurse aid		5	
	do		7	
	Highway, Douglas	16		
	Waste treatment facilities, Superior	65		
	Building, Poplar	16		
	Municipal building, Superior	50		
	Street improvements, Superior	70		
	Wildlife facilities, northwest area	5		
	Wildlife facilities, Douglas County	3		
	Superior-Douglas County: Study of wood products industry		20	
Florence County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nicolet National Forest	40		49
	Fishing facilities, Florence	9		
Forest County, 5(b)	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nicolet National Forest	157		206
	do	40		
	Fishing facilities, Forest	9		
Iron County, 5(b), IR	Training:			122
	Machine tool operator		22	
	Stenographer (clerk)		17	
	Arc welder		22	
	Metal machinery		24	
	Phone system addition, Iron	24		
	Site development, Iron	4		
	Fishing facilities, Iron	9		
Suneau County, 5(b)	Training: Combination welder		8	284
	Hospital, Mauston	57		
	Waste treatment facilities, Necedah	55		
	Sewer facilities, Necedah	164		
La Crosse area, 5(a)	Training:			118
	Nurse aid (medical service)		5	
	Stenographer		18	
	Administration building, Bangor	20		
	Sewer facilities, Shelby	75		
Langlade County, 5(b)	Training:			65
	Small engine repairman		17	
	Cook (entry)		18	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nicolet National Forest	30		
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Tomahawk Paper Co.: Establish new paper products manufacturing plant		418	474
	Repair streets, Tomahawk	56		
Marinette County, 5(b)	City of Marinette: Extend sewage, water, and storm drain systems		65	233
	Sewer facilities, Marinette	51		
	Waste treatment facilities, Wausaukee	26		
	Sewer facilities, Wausaukee	91		
Menominee County, 5(b)				
Oneida County, 5(b), IR	Training:			420
	Small-engine repairman		16	
	First cook		19	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nicolet National Forest	35		
	Roads, Flambeau Reservoir	18		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Nicolet National Forest	25		
	do	35		
	Water facilities, Minocqua	272		
Polk County, 5(b), IR				
Price County, 5(b)	Training: Clerk-stenographer		18	237
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequame National Forest	96		
	do	10		
	do	100		
	Wildlife facilities, Northwest area	5		
	Road addition, Price County	8		
Rusk County, 5(b)	Training: Sewing machine operator		12	97
	Water facilities, Weyerhauser	63		
	Waste treatment facilities addition, Ladysmith	22		
Sawyer County, 5(b)	Training: Cook (kitchen chef)		40	177
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequame National Forest	44		
	do	5		
	do	50		
	Sewers, Winter	8		
	Sewer facilities, Winter	22		
	Fish facilities, Sawyer	8		

Approved projects, including accelerated public works (as of May 31, 1963)—Continued

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars]

	Project	APW	ARA	Total
WISCONSIN—continued				
Taylor County, 5(b)	Training: Nurse aid		7	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequamegon National Forest	10		
	do	40		
	do	58		
	Wildlife facilities, Pershing	6		121
Vilas County, 5(b)	Waste treatment facilities addition, Eagle River	15		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Chequamegon National Forest	8		
	do	85		108
Washburn County, 5(b)	Road construction	3		
	Sewers, Minong	23		
	Water and sewer, Minong	58		
	Site development, Washburn County	3		
	Community building, Shell Lake	22		
	Fish facilities	34		143
Statewide	MacDonald Associates, Inc.: Preparation of detailed plan for conversion of local forest resources.		10	
	Aguar, Jyring & Whiteman: Study of tourist and recreation potentials of 9 Indian reservations (Minnesota and Wisconsin).[4]		28	
	Burns & Roe: Mineral study of Indian reservations (Minnesota and Wisconsin) [5].		31	60
Totals:				
Statewide			69	
5(a) areas		320	71	
5(b) areas		3,215	960	
LS areas				
All totals		3,535	1,100	4,635
WYOMING				
Big Horn County 5(b)	Sidewalk improvement, Lovell	164		
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Bighorn National Forest	45		209
Fremont County 5(b), IR	K. B. Wood & Associates: Study quantity and condition of timber [6]		18	
	Erosion control, Wind River	44		
	Water and sewer, Wind River	70		132
Hot Springs County 5(b), IR				
Lincoln County, 5(b)	Star Valley Lumber Co.: Construct wood processing plant		357	
	Roads, reclamation, land development, Bridger National Forest	100		
	do	55		
	Sewers, Kemmerer	38		
	Recreation facilities, Lincoln	2		556
Rock Springs area (LS)	Fence, Sweetwater	116		
	Wildlife facilities, Sweetwater	21		137
Teton County, 5(b)	Recreation facilities, Teton	4		4
Totals:				
State				
5(a) areas				
5(b) areas		526	375	
LS areas		137		
All totals		663	375	1,038

---

[1] Study covers Arizona, New Mexico, and California. Total cost of $21,750 is prorated.

[2] Study covers Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Total cost of $17,500 is prorated.

[3] Study covers Ansonia, Conn., Meadville, Pa., and Flat River, Mo. Total cost of $24,000 is prorated.

[4] Study covers Minnesota and Wisconsin. Total cost of $55,000 is prorated.

[5] Study covers Minnesota and Wisconsin. Total cost of $63,000 is prorated.

[6] Study covers Blackfeet and Rocky Boy's Indian Reservations in Montana, and Wind River Indian Reservation in Wisconsin. Total cost of $48,500 is prorated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60 I was detained en route to the Capitol from Dulles Airport by a traffic jam, due to the rerouting of traffic caused by a visitor to the Nation's Capital. If this had not occurred, I would have been here in time and answered to my name on quorum call No. 60.

Mr. Speaker, this is becoming a sore and troublesome spot in the District of Columbia. I and several other Members intend to make a study of this situation and see if something cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly want to pay all due respect to our distinguished visitors, but let us arrange for less inconvenience to the people who live and work within the District of Columbia.

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN of Georgia). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], and I have each asked for 1 hour of special orders this afternoon in order to talk about the crisis in America on race relations. We want to talk specifically about the legislative role on this subject. We think that we have something to say. We have been talking about this since January and we have been doing some legislative work on the subject. We have attempted to make a point to the executive branch of the Government and to the country as a whole.

On yesterday 24 of us introduced a second civil rights bill, supplemental to one that 10 of us on the minority side on the House Judiciary Committee and about 30 other Members on the minority side introduced in January. Yesterday the four minority members of the House Judiciary Committee who had authored the second bill called a press conference. These were the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and myself. In that press conference we said as follows:

> We have today introduced the second civil rights bill designed to safeguard Bill of Rights protection for individuals. The bill

(1) enables individuals and the Federal Government to initiate civil cases to enforce 14th amendment guarantees in the use of public facilities; and (2) it enables the Attorney General to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals by initiating civil injunctive actions on their behalf.

Insofar as the public facilities aspect of this is concerned, as the gentleman from Minnesota will discuss at greater length, we have chosen to go the route of 14th amendment protections. We do not know what the administration is going to do because all we know is what we see in the newspapers, and so far it has done nothing. But the rumor is that the administration will approach the subject of public facilities by means of the interstate commerce clause. We think a better way to do this is the 14th amendment route. The 14th amendment traditionally is used to insist that States live up to their obligations and responsibilities to the citizens in those States. The interstate commerce clause has traditionally been used to release States of their obligations. The second provision is the well known title III provision, which enables the Attorney General to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals by initiating civil injunctive actions on their behalf.

The 14th amendment preserves the concept of the States, in that the Federal Government's function is to see to it that States safeguard Bill of Rights protections for the citizens of those States. We do not think the States should be relieved of these responsibilities which is what the interstate commerce clause does. By the same token it is important to bear in mind that the title III safeguard is only an enabling act. What it does is to give the Federal Government——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN of Georgia). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if they are going to clutter up the RECORD with this stuff, I think the rest of the Members ought to be present to hear it. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 62]

Alger
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baker
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clausen
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Fogarty
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gavin
Glenn
Grant
Hanna
Harding
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Holifield
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Leggett
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Nebr.
May
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morton
Nix
O'Konski
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Udall
Vanik
Vinson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Younger

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I move that the House do now adjourn, and I ask for a division on the question.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 35, noes 106.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Mississippi for providing an audience for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and myself, who took this time tonight to talk about the No. 1 question in the United States today, which is race relations and civil rights.

When the quorum was called I was beginning to describe the bills introduced yesterday by 24 Members on the minority side. There have been 5 or 6 additions since yesterday and the number now is around 30. These bills, Mr. Speaker, supplement measures we introduced in January.

The new legislation we have introduced, Mr. Speaker, will enable individuals and the Federal Government to use the civil side of Federal courts to enforce 14th amendment guarantees in the use of public facilities. Second, it will enable the Attorney General to invoke the protection of the Bill of Rights in seeking injunctions in civil rights cases on behalf of individuals. It was at the moment when I was talking about the 14th amendment and Abraham Lincoln that the interruption occurred.

We think that the 14th amendment is the proper way for Bill of Rights protections to be safeguarded. This amendment in the Constitution requires the States to live up to their responsibilities to citizens who are residents of those States.

We think also that it is high time that the so-called title III, which incidentally passed the House of Representatives in 1957, promulgated by the Eisenhower administration, be enacted by the Congress. The 1957 measure died in the other body. This is a measure which would enable the Government to invoke the protections of the Bill of Rights on behalf of individuals who are not in a position to invoke the protections of the Bill of Rights on their own behalf.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, since 45 or 50 Members have left the floor, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum now is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that a call of the House has been ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brotzman
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clausen
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Forrester
Fountain
Garmatz
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Gray
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Long, Md.
McDowell
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Nebr.
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Morton
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Talcott
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Wharton
White

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, civil rights hearings have been loafing along in the House Judiciary Committee for 1 month. We have been trying for that entire month to get just one spokesman for the administration up to Capitol Hill to tell us what they have in mind on this subject. Not one has yet appeared.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. And now when some of us would like to talk to the House on this subject my distinguished friend on the majority side is attempting either to break it up, or he thinks it is important enough so that we should have a larger audience.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I do not yield for the moment because we have barely gotten started; besides I do not have the floor. We have only 1 hour and 50 minutes left between the two of us, the gentleman from Minnesota and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have a speaking engagement tonight in my district and I am canceling it. I am prepared to stay here all night if necessary. The gentleman from Minnesota has an engagement at 7 o'clock and has canceled that and is prepared to stay here all night if necessary, as are the rest of the Members of the House who want to talk about the civil rights bills which we have introduced in this session.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal]?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman declines to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LINDSAY. By the way, I should state I do not have the floor, but the gentleman from Minnesota has the floor so I am in no position to yield or not yield.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal]?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield at this time except to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] because we are trying very much to develop a reasonable explanation of the legislation we introduced yesterday and we would like to have the opportunity to do just that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota declines to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GARY. A preferential motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his preferential motion.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order at the present time unless the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] yields for the purpose of the gentleman from Virginia making that motion.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota respectfully declines to yield for the purpose just stated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield. The gentleman from Minnesota has yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, at the time that I was speaking when last interrupted we were talking about the 14th amendment and Abraham Lincoln. I was talking about the two bills that 30 to 40 minority Members of the House introduced in January and yesterday. I was in the middle of a sentence about title III. That was the measure that passed the House in 1957, drafted by the Eisenhower administration. We think that the House ought to pass it now. This provision gives the Attorney General power to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals on their behalf.

It should be remembered that title III is not designed to enhance any other power of the Federal Government. On the contrary it is designed to protect individuals from all organized power groups, including governments. It is not the usual governmental power working against individuals. It is designed solely for the individual—to protect his rights.

Now, we intend to cooperate, Mr. Speaker, with the Democratic majority in getting a meaningful bill out of the Judiciary Committee and we expect the majority to do the same in respect to our proposals.

As I stated a moment ago, although we have been in hearings for 1 month the administration has not yet made a presentation. Therefore we do not know where it stands other than by rumors in the press. Apparently it has taken rioting in the streets to bestir the administration into some kind of action on this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 154, noes 2.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Ashbrook
Aspinall
Baker
Baring
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boiling
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clausen
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Duncan
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fisher
Forrester
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Gray
Hanna
Harsha
Hébert
Holland
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Latta
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDowell
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Morton
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Pepper
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Sisk
Staebler
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceeding under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams) there were—ayes 213, noes 8.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion comes too late.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was on my feet seeking recognition.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a number of us tonight want to talk about the legislative approach to this subject, and we think we have an interesting analysis to give to our colleagues in the House. But, over and above any legislative approach—and I am concluding my remarks here for the time being and then later I will ask the gentleman to yield to me again—we think that it is time that the President exerted a high degree of moral leadership in respect to race relations and Negro rights in our country. We ask that he publicly commit himself to the country on behalf of the legitimate goals of Negroes in our country because it is right to do so. We think he should do this by forthright presentation to Congress without any further delay—we have already had too much delay—and to the country by a nationwide television and radio presentation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. He should stand for the Bill of Rights. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MacGREGOR. The gentleman from Minnesota respectfully declines to yield other than to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDSAY. He should stand for the Bills of Rights, recalling that the first amendment protects free speech, freedom to assemble peaceably, and freedom to petition against grievances, and that the 14th amendment guarantees to every citizen the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me. I intend to ask him later on in the discussion if he will be kind enough to yield to me again.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield now?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose here today to develop the constitutionality of the first section of the proposed Equal Rights Act of 1963 introduced initially on June 3, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota now yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully decline to yield until I have had an opportunity, for which I have been waiting more than 2 hours, to develop a point of constitutional law which I think will be of interest to all of the Members.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Section 101, subdivision (a) of the Equal Rights Act of 1963 introduced yesterday reads as follows:

> Whoever, in the conduct of a business authorized by a State or political subdivision of a State or the District of Columbia, providing accommodations, amusement, food, or services to the public, segregates or otherwise discriminates against customers on account of their race or color shall be subject to suit by the injured party in an action at law, or suit in equity.

The key words here, insofar as the constitutional issue is concerned, are "a business authorized by a State or political subdivision of a State."

The sponsors of the legislation under discussion have elected to reach their intended goal of nondiscrimination down what is popularly called the 14th amendment route. In short, we have based the constitutionality of our proposal on the language of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution rather than on the commerce clause or the general welfare provision.

There is a most important reason for desiring to use the 14th amendment route. We seek to work within our Federal structure of governmental responsibilities to strengthen the hand of State and local governments in conforming to the law of the land. It is not our intention to inject the Federal Government into every crossroads community. The reverse, however, is true of the commerce clause route, for in employing this constitutional vehicle the Congress invariably enlarges the scope and range of national governmental power at the expense of State and local governmental responsibility.

What precisely does the 14th amendment provide? In its provisions here applicable the 14th amendment reads as follows:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; * * * nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.
>
> The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EVERETT. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Ashbrook
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fisher
Forrester
Garmatz
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Holland
Horan
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Latta
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDowell
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Morton, Md.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Whitten
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call may be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 210, noes 0.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully decline to yield to the gentleman from California for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I regret we have not been afforded the opportunity of here presenting our points of view without repeated interruptions. I regret the inconvenience that these frequent quorum calls and other delaying tactics have worked upon all of my colleagues. If forbearance were shown by the opposition, I am advised that those of us who wish to present our views would complete our remarks in not to exceed 30 minutes. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure each and every Member that those of us who feel strongly about this matter will continue our passive resistance to the harassing tactics of the opposition until we are given a reasonable opportunity to present our views on this vitally important subject.

Mr. Speaker, recent articles in the press have taken the view that the 14th amendment is an improper constitutional base upon which to predicate civil rights legislation. Such comments appeared in the Washington Star of last Saturday and in the New York Times of today. Specifically, the New York Times in its article stated:

> The Justice Department discarded the 14th amendment approach for several reasons. If it was challenged the Supreme Court could uphold it only by overturning an earlier decision that voided an 1875 law making it an offense to deny full and equal enjoyment of accommodations of inns, public conveyances, theaters, and other places of public amusement.

The Justice Department presumably relies on five cases decided together by the U.S. Supreme Court on October 15, 1883. The first among this group of cases is United States against Stanley, reported in 109 United States Reports at page 3.

May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that this year these decisions will be 80 years old, and further that the court was divided in its opinion; a most learned dissenting opinion was written by Mr. Justice John M. Harlan. Quite aside from those relevant factors, however, it is true that in this case a majority of the court held sections 1 and 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to be unconstitutional. A portion of that act had previously been declared by the court to be constitutional. The pertinent provisions under consideration in the case of United States against Stanley and others were sections 1 and 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1875, and they read in part as follows——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Quoting from the Civil Rights Act of 1875:

> SECTION 1. That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement.
>
> SEC. 2. Any person who shall violate the foregoing section by denying to any citizen the full enjoyment of any of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, or privileges in said section enumerated shall for every such offense forfeit and pay the sum of $500 to the person aggrieved thereby to be recovered in an action in debt with full costs; and shall also for every such offense be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 or shall be imprisoned not less than 30 days nor more than one year.

It will readily be seen, Mr. Speaker, that there are substantial differences between the Civil Rights Act of 1875 in the sections which have just been read, and the proposal which we introduced yesterday. In the Supreme Court decision of 1883, and I read now from headnote 2 of the Court's opinion, the Court stated as follows:

> The 14th amendment is prohibitory upon the States only and the legislation to be adopted by Congress for enforcing it is not direct legislation on the matters respecting which the States are prohibited from making or enforcing certain laws or doing certain acts, but is corrective legislation such as may be necessary or proper for counteracting and redressing the effect of such laws or acts.

It is clear that the Supreme Court in its 1883 decision, presumably relied upon by the Justice Department, made an obvious distinction between direct legislation and corrective legislation. This is developed more fully by the Court on pages 13 and 14 of its opinion, where the Court holds:

> The legislation which Congress is authorized to adopt in this behalf is not general legislation on the rights of the citizen but corrective legislation; that is, such as may be necessary and proper for counteracting such laws as the States may adopt or enforce, and which by the amendment they are prohibited from making, or enforcing, or such acts or proceedings as the States may commit and take and which by the amendment they are prohibited from committing or taking.
>
> It is not necessary for us to state, if we could, what legislation would be proper for Congress to adopt. It is sufficient for us to examine whether the law in question is of that character.
>
> An inspection of the law shows that it makes no reference whatever to any supposed or apprehended violation of the 14th amendment on the part of the States.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the 1875 legislation, the bill which we introduced yesterday is specifically tied to the language of the 14th amendment.

Now, continuing from the Court's opinion:

> It is not predicated on any such view—

Referring to the 1875 act:

> It proceeds ex directo to declare that certain acts committed by individuals shall be deemed offenses, and shall be prosecuted and punished by proceedings in the courts of the United States. It does not profess to be corrective of any constitutional wrong committed by the States; it does not make its operation to depend upon any such wrong committed.

This is the thrust of the opinion; namely, that the legislation in the sections referred to is unconstitutional because it is not corrective legislation tied to the 14th amendment——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. MACGREGOR (continuing). And because its operative effect does not depend on any wrong committed by a State or State authority.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 98, noes 105.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 53, nays 277, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—53

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews
Ashmore
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Bonner
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Chelf
Colmer
Davis, Ga.
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Elliott
Everett
Flynt
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Grant
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hardy
Harris
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Huddleston
Jensen
Landrum
Long, La.
Michel
Mills
Passman
Poage
Pool
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Secrest
Selden
Stephens
Taylor
Tuck
Tuten
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Williams
Winstead

NAYS—277

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashley
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Barry
Bass
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hoeven
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—103

Ashbrook
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boggs
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clausen
Cooley
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs

Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Fisher
Forrester
Garmatz
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Griffiths
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Holland
Horan
Jones. Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
McDowell
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Morton
Multer
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Whitten
Willis

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. King of California with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Powell with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Nix.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Slack.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Denton.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Forrester with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Scott with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Senner.

Mr. OSTERTAG and Mr. PELLY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALBERT. I withdraw my motion for a call of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The motion is withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, let me state once again that those of us who would like the opportunity to express our views on what we regard to be a basic issue facing this Congress would conclude our remarks in the course of not to exceed 20 minutes if given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. For what purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not going to make any motion. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I simply wanted to state to the gentleman that now that the House has voted not to adjourn I intend to make sure that a quorum stays on the floor.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder, if in the interest of the affairs of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Minnesota, knowing that there are a number of special orders in order for this evening, would give us some idea about what we might expect; if he has consulted with the other Members of the House who have special orders, what we might expect in the way of a termination of the discussions that have been taking place.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I will state to the distinguished minority leader that it is my understanding that there are two Members holding special orders scheduled to follow the special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay]. His special order directly follows mine. Thus may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that I cannot speak for those to follow the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay]. With respect to those of us who wish to be heard on our civil rights bill—and our remarks are going to be as brief as reasonably possible—we will conclude in not to exceed 20 minutes, but may I say further that I regard a basic individual right to be that of the opportunity to be heard, even though briefly, on a critical issue, and I think we ought to have that opportunity.

I regret the inconvenience which the dilatory tactics employed by those who apparently oppose our right to explain our views have visited upon the Members of the House, but I assure the distinguished minority leader and all Members that if given an opportunity to do so each and every sponsor of this bill and each and every Member of the minority side wishing to be heard will cut his remarks to the bone to the end that we may conclude in not more than 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am delighted to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman understands I did not intend by this interrogation to shut off his debate, or statement, or that of any other Member, but I thought only that I might contribute something to an understanding about where we are going and what we are going to do this evening. If the gentleman, as he has now stated, feels that he and his associates who have their special orders can conclude in 20 minutes, I express the hope that there would be no more quorum calls; that we might permit the Members to speak who want to speak, and that we could then adjourn.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the distinguished minority leader. Most assuredly I did not mean by my remarks to indicate that I felt the minority leader was in any way seeking to inhibit our right to be heard on this matter. On the contrary, I appreciate the constructive efforts by the minority leader to reach some reasonable agreement. Let me emphasize that we will conclude in not to exceed 20 minutes if we have the opportunity to proceed in uninterrupted fashion.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it should be said the gentleman should be congratulated on his forbearance. The gentleman and I asked for 2 hours of special orders and we got 2 hours of special orders because we needed that time. One reason why was because a great many Members had put in a great many hours of work on drafting and writing some very important measures. In January, and since January, these Members have worked on and have introduced these important measures. They have asked us for time to speak on the subject. Each of these gentlemen has agreed to cut to the bare bones his presentation that he has prepared. I should add that we have not sought these delays. We very much want to get on with what we have to say. My special order for 1 hour follows the gentleman from Minnesota. As I said, a number of Members have worked hard on this subject and have asked me to yield to them and I had hoped to do so. I have a number of statements that Members have asked me to put in the Record for them. They have agreed to this procedure, but I do think that the right of the Members to be heard on the floor has to be respected.

Thirty-five of us on the Republican minority side have today introduced a second civil rights bill designed to safeguard Bill of Rights protections for individuals. The bill, first, enables individuals and the Federal Government to initiate civil cases to enforce 14th amendment guarantees in the use of public facilities; second, enables the Attorney General to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals by initiating civil injunctive actions on their behalf.

We intend to cooperate with the Democratic majority in getting a meaningful bill out of the Judiciary Committee and we expect the majority to do the same in respect of our proposals. Although the House Judiciary Committee has been in hearings for a month, the administration has not yet made a presentation. Therefore we do not know where it stands other than by rumors in the press. Apparently it has taken rioting in the streets to stir the administration into action.

In any event, we call upon the President to exert moral leadership in regard to race relations and Negro rights.

We ask that he publicly commit himself to the country on behalf of the legitimate goals of the Negroes in our country because it is right to do so. He should do this by a forthright presentation to Congress and to the country by a nationwide television and radio presentation.

He should stand for the Bill of Rights, recalling that the 1st amendment protects free speech, freedom to assemble peacefully, and freedom to petition against grievances, and that the 14th amendment guarantees to every citizen the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would hope that the gentleman who is now in the well and those who are scheduled to follow him will not feel constrained to limit their remarks unduly. This body thus far this year has been proceeding at what has been described as a slowdown from a snail's pace, and perhaps it might now be the time, in June, having convened in January, to get about the business of the United States of America, for which I congratulate the gentleman in the well and those to follow him for taking up this evening and asserting some initiative that heretofore seems to have been sadly lacking with respect to this body.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am delighted to yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this comment at the risk of being misunderstood. In view of the series of quorum calls and the parliamentary procedure which followed I am afraid we may miss the point, that is whether deliberately or not, the gentleman from Mississippi has contributed greatly to the occasion because otherwise the gentleman would not have the interest of the House that he has had in the last 3 hours.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that fair, frank, and candid appraisal of the situation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question briefly?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for the reason which I have stated fully, I must respectfully decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that not all of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 was declared by the U.S. Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. Rather, section 4 of that act was specifically declared to be valid. Section 4 reads in part as follows:

> That no citizen, possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law, shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States, or of any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

In commenting on this particular portion of section 4, and in finding it to be constitutional and in reaffirming that constitutionality, the Supreme Court in 1883 stated as follows:

> Whether the statute book of the State actually laid down any such rule of disqualification, or not, the State, through its officer, enforced such a rule: and it is against such State action, through its officers and agents, that the last clause of the section is directed. This aspect of the law was deemed sufficient to divest it of any unconstitutional character, and makes it differ widely from the first and second sections of the same act which we are now considering.

So, too, Mr. Speaker, the language of the legislation which we introduced on June 3d, 1963, ties its operative provisions to the authorizing acts of a State or a political subdivision thereof, thus it divests itself of any unconstitutional character.

Mr. Speaker, arguments may properly lie as to the necessity and propriety of the legislation we have introduced. I personally believe that the need is urgent and that the legislation is well reasoned and entirely proper and constitutional. In truth, there can be no serious question but what legislation in the civil rights field, predicated on the 14th amendment, is entirely constitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this point to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that in view of the lateness of the hour I would prefer to have the gentleman yield to other Members and then if there is sufficient time, I shall say a few words.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I was very happy to join in introducing a bill yesterday to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes. There are four points that I and my colleagues, I think, would like to make, amongst others.

One, in introducing this legislation we are doing so in a nonpartisan spirit, because civil rights are too important for narrow politics.

Second, we need legislation. The Congress should act. I believe that the experience of the New York State Commission for Human Rights and other State commissions clearly indicates that there is no substitute for law.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. One hundred and eighty-six Members are present. A quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Adair
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen
Cooley
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Friedel
Garmatz
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Holland
Horan
Ichord
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roybal
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams) there were—ayes 203, noes 15.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The vote shows that a quorum is present.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

GROUP RELATIONS AND RACE RELATIONS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, as one of the sponsors of this legislation, I have patiently sat on this floor expecting that my friends from that side of the aisle would at least show the courtesy to the minority to be heard. It was my hope that it would not be necessary for me to make any observations at all in order to obtain the attention of my friends. Now, I would say that this is not my observation, but I thought the House might like to have the observation of a disinterested, objective observer who was sitting up in the gallery and who happens to be a visitor of mine——

The SPEAKER. Reference to anybody in the gallery is not consistent with the rules of the House.

Mr. CAHILL. I beg the Chair's pardon.

I would say then, may I quote to you the observation of a visitor who told me——

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is the gentleman referring to a visitor in the Chamber, or in the gallery, or a visitor in Washington?

Mr. CAHILL. No; I would say——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman referred to a visitor and it is not the Chair's duty to penetrate his mind.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for the purpose of his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BASS. Since it is the prerogative of the Members to inquire into the minds of the other Members, may I request of the Member to divulge if this speaker is in the gallery or on the floor?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker rules that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, does the Member now making the parliamentary inquiry have the right to inquire of the Member making the statement as to whom he refers?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman yields for that purpose.

Mr. CAHILL. I would be delighted to yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have the floor. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee for the purpose that he mentioned in his observation?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the gravity of the issue here being discussed, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee that his injection of levity is not entirely unwelcome, but in view of the fact that we on this side are endeavoring to give those who want to be heard that opportunity, and to conclude these special orders, I respectfully decline to yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. BASS. The gentleman defers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I will merely say this: That without characterizing him as a visitor, I will merely say that he is a distinguished member of the bar of the State of Michigan, and he having made certain observations, suggested to me that we rightly here in the House could use one of the inventions of the great State of Michigan, that is, after a quorum has been established in this House we should install seat belts.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I will be happy to yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully decline to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully decline to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, having yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey for the purpose of expediting the discourse we are pursuing here today.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, let me make for just a minute or two a serious observation. I hope that my friends on this side of the aisle will permit those of us who have, in spite of the levity between the distinguished Member and myself, a serious interest in civil rights, to be heard for the next 15 or 20 minutes.

I know, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that nothing I can say will influence you as far as the field of civil rights is concerned. To some it is a political issue; to some it is a matter of tradition; to some it is a matter of conviction. All of us have our own views on it and it is not my purpose, desire, or ability to influence any Member of this House.

But let me say this to you in all sincerity, in all honesty, and with all conviction. Yesterday a great man, a wise man, and a good man died. He was called John XXIII. And he will go down in history as a man who tried to unite all peoples, all religions. He had something to say on this issue; and if you do not listen to me, listen to him and hear what the Pope, now deceased, had to say on this vital, all-encompassing, all-important subject of civil rights. He said this in Easter of 1960:

> Our sorrowing gaze turns also to the other children of God everywhere, suffering because of race, of economic conditions * * * or through limitation on the exercise of their natural and civil rights.

I say to the Members of this House in closing that whether you listen to the minority or whether you listen to the majority today, tomorrow you are going to listen to your conscience and you are going to listen to the voice of America. And one of these days, whether it is the 88th Congress or Congresses that follow, we will have in the United States of America an effective civil rights bill. And if we of the minority have done nothing else I hope that by our efforts we have brought the attention of America to the need for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, there are just four brief points I would like to make with regard to the legislation we have introduced.

One, it is nonpartisan, because civil right is just too important for politics.

Second, that we need legislation. There is no substitute for law.

Third, we need moral leadership by all Americans, by the Congress, and by the President; indeed, a sense of moral commitment to equality of opportunity under the law for all.

And in this connection I would call the attention of the House tonight to a letter of the Reverend Martin Luther King to his fellow clergymen—a letter written in the Birmingham city jail, April 16, 1963.

In it he said:

> Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly.

The fourth point that I would like to make is that this bill that we have introduced, along with the bills of my colleagues previously introduced, is an initial step. I feel there is a need for an FEPC bill. I feel that there is a need for legislation dealing with apprentice training.

And so let me conclude by saying this. Let the voice of Congress on this moral and legislative issue be heard across the land. No American today can plead moral indifference. Whoever belittles one American's rights belittles all Americans' rights. We must walk as one Nation under the law with human dignity and equality for all.

I hope the Congress will pass this legislation. In so doing the Congress will help to revitalize the spirit of democracy. In so doing the Congress will help to make human liberty and equality of opportunity a reality; in short, will take action to live up to and to keep faith with the American dream.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I was born and I have lived and my home now is in the city of Frederick, Md. That is south of the Mason-Dixon Line. In many ways it is a southern city.

I can understand very fully the emotional reaction of many people in this House and in this country to the legislation that was proposed yesterday, the supplemental 1963 civil rights bill. I can assure you that for myself I take no partisan pleasure in having introduced such a bill nor in speaking in support of it tonight. I have introduced the bill. I rise to speak for it tonight because I believe that it proposes action——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a quorum present to hear the gentleman. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] has expired.

Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, before I insist on it. Do we have further speakers?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] has 60 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is enough, Mr. Speaker. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will withhold that for a moment, the Chair lays before the House the following personal requests.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. Van Pelt), for 1 day, on account of illness.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, from Thursday, June 6 through June 15, on account of official business.

Mr. Talcott (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. Bates (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for June 4, 5, and 6, on account of a death in the family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi renews his point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Two hundred twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams) there were—ayes 23, noes 176.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair just counted 223 Members and it is evident to the Chair that a quorum is present.

The motion to adjourn was rejected.

CIVIL RIGHTS OF U.S. CITIZENS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I was going to ask for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all special orders today heretofore entered I may address the House for 5 hours on the subject of, "Where Were All These Republicans During the 8 Years of the Eisenhower Administration?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object but I must observe that we had a Democratic Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any more time than is necessary. The Members who have asked to be heard have agreed to cut their talks down to the bare bones, and if we can just move ahead we will be finished in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are, of course, many people here who feel very strongly about their opposition to the civil rights proposal which has been made by my colleagues and myself. In good season they will have their time to speak.

It is the glory of this House that they can speak and that they will speak, the efforts to prevent our remarks this evening notwithstanding. Of course, what has happened this evening could well have been expected. Debate has been limited already in this session of the Congress on civil rights amendments to the medical education bill and the impacted areas program. As some wag has said, the frustration of those who are seeking civil rights in America is increased by the fact that the subject is talked to death in the other body and that we are not allowed to talk about it at all in this body. So tonight, in spite of the news that we receive daily which is disturbing, distressing, and deplorable, some people have remained cynical about this subject of civil rights.

They have felt that it was politics and not principle which was the motivation for our civil rights proposals. Tonight I think it is manifest that a deep and abiding principle is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation men and women are risking their lives and their property on this question. I think it is evident that before this session is over every Member of this House will have an opportunity to say at least one word when the roll is called.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this supplemental civil rights bill by so many rank-and-file Members at this time vindicates both the logic and the necessity, both the logic and necessity of title III of President Eisenhower's 1957 Civil Rights Bill. In that year, at the urging of such distinguished Members as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating], who was then a Member of this body, and who now serves with such distinction in the other body, and the present ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], this House did enact a bill which comprehended what has come to be known as title III. The other body, unfortunately, defeated that provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the prophets of the press indicate that President Kennedy will also recommended some form of title III this year. Whether he will or not, he has not said. I hope that he does so, and I hope he uses his influence to pass the bill which includes title III in this body and in the other body where he is the leader of a party with so large a numerical advantage.

Mr. Speaker, in proposing this bill we think we have been moderate, we think we have been constructive and positive. I think the fact that we have been moderate is indicated by the sequence of events. Earlier this year the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and other Republican Members of the House, led by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], did propose a civil rights program. At that time we went no further than we felt the situation in the country demanded.

Mr. Speaker, since that time there has been a drastic change in our national picture which has presented us with urgent problems.

Accordingly, we have felt it necessary to supplement the original proposal. But even now we have restricted the provisions of this bill so that the Federal Government shall not invade any area of American life where it is not absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we were not moved to file this bill by any intensely partisan heat, but only because it seemed so necessary. Evidently we need action because every day we hear that there have been 500 people jailed here or that 700 hundred people have been jailed there. Mr. Speaker, this is not the spirit of America, and it must not continue to be the shame of America.

There has been comment lately in the press that the President would submit a program of civil rights to the Congress, and there has been some speculation that he would not. It is uncertain whether the program would be submitted this week or next. The Attorney General of the United States has had four dates at different times upon which he was going to appear before the Judiciary Committee to talk about civil rights and to the position of the executive branch of our Government on this question. What they do or do not do is their responsibility.

I would think that tonight rather than obstruct the attempt of Members—rank-and-file Members of this House—to introduce a legislative proposal every Member of this House, regardless of how he feels about the merit of the bill, would be proud that the membership of this House is proposing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when this House scorned a bill drafted outside its membership, and there was a time when a bill drafted by the Executive was viewed with suspicion by the Members of the House. This is a bill which has been framed and drafted by the Members of the House—by the rank-and-file Members of the House—and I say that I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the careful consideration of this bill by the Members of the House at this session of Congress.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, by the introduction today of two bills which would enact an Equal Rights Act of 1963 and a Civil Rights Act of 1963, I join a number of my distinguished colleagues in an urgent call for prompt, effective action to solve the critical civil rights problem which confronts our Nation. We must not—we cannot afford to—delay any longer in according full rights to every citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color.

It is 100 years since the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. Tragically, a full century has not yet provided equal opportunity for Negroes in voting, education, employment, housing, the administration of justice, and public accommodations.

I need hardly remind my colleagues of the more glaring evidences of this problem. They have been brought dramatically to our attention in recent weeks in stories datelined not only in the South but also the North. We from the northern part of this Nation must not hypocritically lull ourselves into believing this is a sectional problem confined to the South. Such is most certainly not the case. With increasing regularity, our Nation is seeing outward manifestations of the fires which have been smoldering so long in the North as well as the South. My own State within the last week has witnessed demonstrated unrest in the City of Brotherly Love.

This is not a problem which our leaders and our people can continue to view with complacency. The urgency is alarmingly apparent. No longer can we deprive a group of citizens of the rights which most of us have taken for granted. The Negro is entitled to no more rights than his fellow citizens; but most certainly he should be accorded no less.

It is high time that the leadership and the citizenry of our Nation face up to the fact that we have a long way to go in civil rights and that we cannot take long to travel the distance. The problem cries out for quick, decisive solution. The gravity of the situation is such that every citizen should be aware of the problem and searching his soul for answers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Adair
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring, Nev.
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland, Mass.
Bolling, Mo.
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Jr., Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cannon, Mo.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent, Pa.
Denton
Diggs, Jr.
Dingell
Edwards
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen, Jr.
Garmatz
Gavin, Pa.
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Griffiths
Gubser
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Holland
Horan
Ichord
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee, W. Va.
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell, Jr.
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Jr., Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall, Ohio
Morrison
Morton, Md.
Mosher
Multer
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Jr.
Osmers, Jr.
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner, Jr.
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack, Jr.
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Jr., N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS OF U.S. CITIZENS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, realize it or not each citizen has an enormous stake in the solution to this human problem because each has a vested interest in the future of our great country. Each should be vitally concerned about a prompt solution. I fervently hope that not only the Congress will be aroused to enact long overdue effective civil rights measures but also that the people in all parts of the country will not remain apathetic to the pressing need for action. Let us no longer twiddle our thumbs while Rome burns.

I commend the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota and their colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary who have long seen the need for this action. I wish to associate myself with their efforts to press for this most important legislation.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to join with the gentleman from New York and more than 20 other Members in introducing this bill which was introduced in the House yesterday.

In the interest of time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I fully join in the comments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] on this bill.

It is time that this Congress express itself strongly and clearly in opposition to segregation in places of business serving the public in opposition to segregation in restaurants and theaters, in opposition to segregation in hotels and motels, and in opposition to segregation in public parks, in public transportation, and in other public facilities.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-two members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Adair
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen
Corbett
Cunningham
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Edwards
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Garmatz
Gavin
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Griffiths
Gubser
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Holland
Horan
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minshall
Monagan
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 278 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS OF U.S. CITIZENS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Is there any way, Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD to show that when the Speaker last counted for a quorum and counted 170 Members, that only about 40 of them were on the Republican side?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not the subject of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to dispute the count of the last gentleman to whom you yielded. It was inaccurate. There was a fair proportion of Members on both sides of the aisle when the Chair made his count, and the RECORD should accurately so reflect.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, lest there be failure of a quorum in the future, at this moment I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not sure that I am going to object to this request. May I ask the gentleman how much time he intends to use with this kind of colloquy?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the distinguished gentleman, I will say that we are going to do our very best to hold this down to 10 or 15 minutes at the outside.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is too much time, Mr. Speaker. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred and thirty Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, someone far from the South can fully realize tonight that people because of different color of their skin have been denied the right to eat in certain restaurants and attend certain theaters and public places, for today right here in this House there has been attempted through parliamentary procedure to deny us the right to speak on this vital issue before the Nation today. Some could do well to tear a page from the book of Voltaire when he said:

> I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the last drop of my blood your right to say it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. LINDSAY. I will be delighted to yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts I think has seen an instance in which the majority, and certainly the majority leaders, have stayed here when we had complete control so far as votes were concerned, and have protected the rights of minority Members. I think this is an instance of that. We respect the rights of minority Members. Individual Members have their own rights and prerogatives, but the majority party has stayed here and has voted against adjournment and has protected the rights of the minority Members.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything the majority leader has said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the gentleman from Massachusetts be permitted to complete his statement and then I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that the majority leader has said, and I will go one step further and say that our good Speaker of the House has handled the gavel with fairness and impartiality to all parties concerned in this discussion here today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor for me to join in this discussion with my distinguished Republican colleagues. In introducing the civil rights legislation yesterday, we continued to demonstrate that our party is taking the lead in the civil rights discussion that is taking place in this country. But even more important is the movement for equality itself. At this moment, the struggle for Negro equality is on the march throughout the world. This surging force cannot and will not be stopped and it is our responsibility as legislators to see that additional civil rights legislation is enacted immediately. For this reason the bill that I was happy to introduce with, among others, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], and the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] and Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is a powerful and meaningful bill in this era of the Negro movement.

That expert news commentator, Eric Sevareid, said this recently about the movement:

> By its dominant voices, its most unforgettable faces, and its chief acts of bravery does a generation recognize itself and history mark it. For America, this postwar period is surely the era of the Negro passion [and] * * * because this unfolding drama involves the automatic reflexes of the instinctive sense of justice, because it involves namable, hearable, countable, individual persons of flesh and blood, it is going to dwarf the general and social pageants of this domestic era.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the call today is clearly for the rights of all individuals. The bill that we introduced will provide the tools to aid the Negro in his valiant crusade.

The bill would eliminate segregation in public accommodations and vest in the Attorney General broad legal authority in all areas of civil rights.

As a sponsor of the Republican civil rights bill this past January, I am proud to sponsor this additional legislation. Our last Republican civil rights bill was hailed throughout the Nation and the New York Times international edition, published during the newspaper strike, called this legislation the most powerful civil rights bill in a decade.

Added to the proposals of the January bill, this legislation will insure the necessary rights of our Negro citizens.

It will give the Attorney General authority to take legal action against any owner or operator of a business supplying accommodations, amusement, food or services to the public, if such business is authorized by the State or local subdivision, where the business segregates or otherwise discriminates against customers because of race or color. The Attorney General, under the terms of this legislation, may also bring legal suit against any State or local official who seeks to require or encourage segregation or discrimination.

This proposed legislation also contains the so-called title III provision which was passed by the House during the Eisenhower administration but failed in the Senate. This provision grants the Attorney General authority to institute legal proceedings against State and local officials who are depriving or denying individuals' rights to equal protection of the law because of race, creed, color or national origin.

If this House Mr. Speaker, would enact this legislation, along with the legislation our party introduced in January, we would be making a significant contribution to the historical movement that has already begun and which will continue until all men are given their rights as citizens of this great Nation and, even more significantly, as human beings created by God who deserve to live peacefully within the brotherhood of all men.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred and twenty four Members are present. A quorum is present.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my voice in support of those who would bring dignity to all of our citizens and by so doing bring dignity, a more complete dignity, at any rate, to this great Nation, which has been a symbol of freedom to so many.

I am also proud to be a cosponsor of both civil rights bills referred to, and the author of one amendment to the medical education bill, which would have guaranteed equal protection under the law to all applicants to medical schools to insure they would not be discriminated against on the ground of race, creed, or national origin, but which the Democratic majority defeated.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to stop hiding behind the skirts of people with less responsibility than we have in this area and to stand up and be counted as the elected representatives of all the people.

Only by rule of law can we avoid a great national catastrophe which stands in the wings, and only those of us in the Congress can provide the laws which are so long overdue. The Republican Party has a particular responsibility as it did 100 years ago due to the clear inability of any Democrat, no matter how high his office, to rally his whole party to this great cause.

The clearest evidence of this is presented by what has happened to civil rights in Congress this session and during the 87th Congress, despite the words of the Democratic candidate for President in Los Angeles on September 9, 1960, when he said:

> When our next President takes office in January he must be prepared to move forward on three broad fronts: as a legislative leader, as Chief Executive, and as a moral leader.
>
> First, as a legislative leader the President must give us the legal weapons needed to enforce the constitutional rights of every American. He cannot wait for others to act. He himself must draft the programs, transmit them to the Congress, and fight for their enactment—taking his case to the people if the Congress is slow in acting.
>
> And much legislation is needed. We must continue and strengthen the President's Civil Rights Commission. We must grant the Attorney General power to enforce all constitutional rights—not just the right to vote. We must wipe out discriminatory poll taxes and literacy tests, and pass effective antibombing and antilynching legislation. And we must continually strengthen the legal framework which will allow us to move toward economic, educational, and political equality.
>
> Such legislation is already being prepared. I have asked Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman CELLER, of New York, to prepare a bill embodying all of the pledges of the Democratic platform. And this bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January.

Assuming his sincerity, I say that we in the Republican Party stand anxious to support him if he can lead his own party. But if he cannot, then we intend to fight on until his pledges and ours are redeemed.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with other colleagues in speaking out on new and vital civil rights legislation which we have recently introduced in this Congress.

Legislation is not the cure-all. But it is the keystone upon which meaningful enjoyment of fundamental rights can be assured. It sets the norm. It provides a forum for, and sanctions for enforcement when rights are denied.

Justice Goldberg commented to the nub of the problem in a recent Supreme Court decision. He stated:

> The individual's rights are "present rights"; they are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now.

The momentous Brown against the Board of Education decisions were a landmark. They gave hope. But progress has been painfully slow. In those decisions the Supreme Court declared that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. It called for the equal access and enjoyment of the most fundamental of rights—opportunity for self-improvement through our institutions of public education, with all deliberate speed.

Many of the States have responded, by mere token compliance. The idle emptiness of unenforced laws has been a source of continuing and great disappointment.

This legislation we have introduced would take some necessary steps toward guaranteeing full realization of these most basic rights.

While progress in education has been painful and slow, effective denial of voting rights and privileges has been more than slow.

The right to vote and to have that vote counted is the cornerstone of our democracy. Yet overwhelming evidence and stark statistics outline widespread denial and abridgment of the right to vote in several States. This wrong is by no means confined to any particular geographical area.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights disclosed statistics involving 158 counties with a majority Negro population located in 11 States. In 51 of these counties, 3 percent or less of the Negroes were registered. In 51 other counties, 10 percent or less were registered, and only in 11 counties were there more than 30 percent of the Negroes registered.

A catalog of discriminatory devices, some more subtle than others, stands ready to strip minorities of their voting rights: The poll tax, literacy tests more stringently applied to minorities than to whites, requirements of registering in a person's own handwriting, requirements for registering without error on forms provided, and requirements for passing constitutional interpretation tests applied more strenuously to minorities than to whites. And there are many more.

The judiciary has invalidated numerous discriminatory devices: The grandfather clause, the white primary, and the Jaybird Scheme have been invalidated. The Supreme Court has tempered the outer fringes of the powerfully abusive and more flagrant denials. But this modicum of judicial strength must be reinforced.

This proposed legislation would strike down discriminatory literacy tests in Federal elections and it would do much more to guarantee the franchise.

It is my further belief that one of the major concerns of racial and religious minorities today is the lack of opportunity for employment and for advancement once placed. This again involves education because, in many cases discrimination as to the acquiring of education and training in skills has been practiced.

Today a very large proportion of our underemployed persons are Negroes. Recent Department of Commerce statistics reveal that the unemployment rate among nonwhites is more than twice that of whites. Yet, even given an adequate educational background, many of the opportunities for further training through such programs as vocational education and manpower retraining are effectively closed to minority members because of the pigment of their skin.

Testimony before the Education and Labor Committee has disclosed evidences of blatant discrimination. While there might be training opportunities in some States, in others, training courses open to minorities often involve training in kitchen skills such as dishwashing, or in the laundry trade involving pressing and cleaning of clothes. Training opportunities for the more lucrative jobs such as welding, electronics, and administration are effectively denied.

The report disclosed that, in 1960, 69.1 percent of the eligible nonwhites in one Southern State were not registered to vote, while only 27 percent of the whites were not registered.

Education, voting, justice, employment, housing—whichever way the discerning investigator probes, evidences of discrimination can be uncovered.

Today from coast to coast and border to border, the pent-up grievances of the Negro community decry the social unrest. By Justice Department count, there were 43 major and minor racial demonstrations during the week ending May 25, of which 10 were in the North.

It is tragic that violence must bring into sharp focus the patent denial of freedom to certain of our citizens.

War was fought 100 years ago to reaffirm certain of these basic rights. These freedoms have not yet been fully won, nor fully realized. The fight to guarantee these freedoms continues to be fought.

An alarmed public today, as never before, is overwhelmed by the injustices inherent in the rising tide of exploding racial relations.

The shameful denial of basic God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights must be rectified.

Equality and equality of opportunity must become reality, not mere plaudit.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] for developing this legislation. I am happy to join with them in introducing this bill. I think this, together with the bill that was introduced earlier this year, is sound legislation and is in the direction that we ought to go. I think we ought to go even further than this, however, and toward this end I will be working and that is whenever there is Federal money spent in a program where that money or the benefits of that money are denied to people because of race, color, or creed that such Federal money shall be denied to any such area or any such group. I speak specifically of one area in the field of education where the Federal Government is assisting in the field of vocational education and in federally impacted areas where money is now going which is denied to certain individuals because of discrimination, and for this reason I will support legislation which will deny Federal funds in any Federal program where the benefits of that program are denied to people because of race, color, or creed. I hope we can take that action in the Congress, and I will support an amendment on any bill that provides Federal funds for such programs, on each bill as it comes up for consideration by the House, but I would favor most of all legislation which would deny such Federal money to any program where discrimination exists.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Judiciary Committee, but I rise to commend the minority members of the committee who have joined in sponsoring the Equal Rights Act of 1963. I particularly want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] and his able colleagues on the committee including the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] for their remarkable work and superb leadership they are giving in this field. They have been a credit to the minority party in this House.

As one who has made civil rights legislation a prime concern since I came to the House of Representatives I am pleased to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues in support of this bill and to have joined with them in its introduction. Submission of this bill is a positive and forceful collective move for meaningful action in the field of civil rights.

Earlier this session, as in the 86th and 87th Congresses, I sponsored and called for action on a number of specific civil rights bills. One would restore part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as it was drafted in the original legislation. This would give the Attorney General the authority to institute suits where one's civil rights have been violated. This is the very guts of any civil rights legislation. Others would outlaw racial discrimination in employment, provide protection from lynching and mob violence, protect the right to vote, make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent body, aid States to desegregate their schools, protect the rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment, establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity, and prohibit segregation in places of public accommodation.

Many of these objectives, I am pleased to note are covered in the Equal Rights Act of 1963 which was introduced yesterday and which is being discussed here today.

Mr. Speaker, I need not tell this House the importance of the issue of equal rights to our Nation and to the peoples of the world. Everyday developments highlight the stark reality of the situation and the compelling need for legislative action.

All of us know this problem is not peculiar to any one section of the country. The recent unfortunate events in Mississippi and Alabama may provide more drama for newspaper stories, but they are no more reprehensible than many practices common in the Northern States. It would be hypocrisy of the highest magnitude to suggest that discrimination on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin, is somehow less evil because it is accomplished with greater subtlety.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln allowed 100 days' notice between the issuance of his first and second proclamations. We have been on notice for 100 years to face up to our responsibilities in the field of civil rights. This goes beyond all the requirements of reasonable notice. It is high time we put our own moral house in order. What was unreasonable to expect in the 1860's, cannot reasonably be denied a century later.

I have constantly heard claims that the press of other congressional business, admittedly vital to the Nation's welfare, is more than enough to occupy the attention of Congress. The conspicuous absence thus far of administration civil rights legislation seems to imply this. I do not question the sincerity behind such contentions any more than I have to be reminded of the vast amount of unfinished business before this House. But what business has been before this House longer than the business of civil rights? And, Mr. Speaker, when—at what point in time—did matters of human dignity and individual rights cease to be the primary concern of this House?

In the 87th Congress, those of us who introduced civil rights legislation looked hopefully to the White House for support. We were amazed and shocked when it was announced that "the President," and I quote, "does not consider it necessary at this time to enact new civil rights legislation." This response was a far cry from the statements made by candidate Kennedy during his campaign. If, as he said then, "The Presidency is a place of moral leadership," why has the President avoided the fertile field of civil rights legislation for the exercises of that leadership? The implication was that other legislation took precedence over questions involving fundamental constitutional rights. Civil rights supporters bided their time, in the hope that after Congress had fulfilled its function with respect to the trade bill and other vital concerns, the President would then turn his attention to this urgent matter in the 88th Congress.

This Congress has been in session 5 months. Member after Member of this House and in the other body have cried out for action on civil rights. Scores of bills have been introduced on the subject. But where has the administration been? The President has had ample opportunity before this to speak to us—to give us forceful, enlightening leadership that is so vital in this field. As one commentator recently observed, "the administration has broken no lances in Congress."

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the reasons there can be no question of the administration's weakness in the field of civil rights. There has been no drive, no leadership. As a result, the image of America held by people abroad has suffered. We want the world to think of our country as a nation of freedom and justice, where human dignity is paramount. We fall short of presenting such a picture when the rights of so many Americans are still violated.

Mr. Speaker, recent developments make it apparent that there cannot be any compromise with the morality and justice of this issue. It has taken a long time for the administration to realize this and now it is announced that the President will shortly present a strong program to Congress. I hope he will. And I trust it will be a bold one. I hope it will cover such basic principles as embodied in this equal rights bill under discussion today.

I fervently urge that priority will be given to this issue. We will fail in our obligations to uphold the Constitution, to act in the national interest, if we do not move quickly and decisively. The time to enact legislation to secure every American in his constitutional rights is now. Too much time has already elapsed. For 100 years we have given the Negroes of the Nation only a soiled kind of citizenship. It is high time that Congress acted to clean it up.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for us to criticize and another thing to come up with a positive program. That is why I was delighted with the earlier constructive action on the part of the minority members of the Judiciary Committee and to join with them in introducing legislation to make the Civil Rights Commission permanent and to give it broader power, to establish a commission to assure equal employment rights by employers or unions engaged in Federal contracts, and public employment agencies; to curtail the use of literacy tests, to provide assistance to schools seeking to desegregate, to authorize the Census Bureau to secure complete voter registration figures and to give the Attorney General the legal right to enforce school desegregation.

And that is why I am so pleased with the new action by this distinguished group of minority members of the Judiciary Committee in drafting this new legislation and to be associated with it. The bill introduced yesterday is a broad, workable and meaningful one. It meets the basic needs for effective action. I commend it to the committee and to the House.

It includes the section on title III which, as I said earlier, puts the guts into the Civil Rights Act that is sorely needed. This House passed this provision during the previous administration but it failed to get through the other body. Title III grants to the Attorney General authority to institute legal proceedings against State or local officials who are depriving or denying individuals' rights to equal protection of the law because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Other provisions of the Equal Rights Act of 1963 would give the Attorney General, as well as individuals, authority to take legal action against any owner or operator of a business supplying accommodations, amusement, food, or services to the public, if such business is authorized to operate by a State or local subdivision, where the business segregates or otherwise discriminates against customers because of race or color. A legal suit may also be brought against any State or local official who seeks to require or encourage segregation or discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge of the 1860's was given eloquent expression by President Lincoln when he said: "This Government cannot endure half slave and half free." The challenge of the 1960's is equally clear: can a democracy long endure which denies a substantial body of its citizens the equal protection of the laws. The answer in both cases is the same.

In the words of the Civil Rights Commission's report: The inequities—which exist in the area of civil rights—should not be taken as an indictment but as a challenge. This Nation has always responded to any threat to freedom from abroad; yet for more than a century we have been divided over issues of racial equality and freedom of opportunity at home. The time has now come to answer the challenge within—the denial of civil rights to Americans by other Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation we can and must support. In a larger sense it is not mere legislation. It is a challenge to this House and to the administration to place and keep our Nation in the forefront of the fight for freedom, equality, and the dignity of individuals throughout the world.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], for taking the leadership in bringing this matter to the floor of the House.

However, I just want to say that as fine as this legislation is, there are things which in my opinion are even greater than the right to vote or the right to a good house, and that is the right to a job.

Mr. Speaker, we may talk about all of these principles we want to, but until there is no discrimination in this country for men who are willing to work, on account of their color or their race or their creed then and then alone will civil rights be a reality.

Mr. Speaker, while there was talk of the President bringing up a program, I want just to remind the Members of the House that the House will pass the program and I hope it will be a good one, because the President in 1961 issued an order for the carrying out of fair employment practices. It seems to me every time his own Executive order pinches a little bit they make an exception. I certainly hope they will not do it in the case of civil rights.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the broad civil rights bill which was introduced by Republicans last January, and as a sponsor of the bill we are discussing now, I wish to associate myself proudly with my colleagues in this important legislative endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, we propose civil rights legislation, as we have, because it is right. We propose this legislation in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln and Memorial Day just past. We propose this legislation because we are morally committed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we propose this legislation because we feel that government by law is preferable to forcing people into the streets and into mobs and into the arms of extremists to assert rights which all Americans, and I repeat, all Americans, have died to preserve through the proud years of this Nation's history.

We invite the support of all Members for our legislation. In doing so we pledge our support to any workable, sound, and progressive legislation proposed by this House to cope with the grave civil rights crisis facing our Nation.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for giving me this opportunity to address the House. There are times in a person's life when he becomes very proud of America and very proud to be an American.

I can recall landing with the amphibious forces in North Africa, the landing in Italy, and I recall not too many days ago hearing Astronaut Cooper as he talked to a joint session of Congress telling us about his orbiting of the earth. These are great moments in the life of an American.

Today, as a part of this Congress, I am very proud of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], I am proud of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], and the others who have supported this legislation. I am particularly proud of the manner in which the Speaker, Mr. McCormack, has handled the proceedings of this House; I am proud of Members on both sides of the aisles as they have resisted the pressures to attempt to keep gentlemen from speaking who had these special orders on a very important matter that involves all of America today. It seems to me one of the greatest issues facing America is this problem of race relations and the giving to each American an equal opportunity.

Today democracy in America is anemic, and until this Congress, until the people of America, assure each and every citizen an equal right to share in all the benefits and all the privileges of this great country, this democracy will not be a healthy democracy. So it seems to me that as this legislation is presented, we here in the Congress should pick up this challenge and do our best to make certain that our democracy is not going to continue to be an anemic democracy, and that all Americans and the world can be proud of this Congress and its leadership in making certain that all American citizens have their equal rights and their equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with 25 of my Republican colleagues in introducing the "Equal Rights Act of 1963." Set against the backdrop of serious racial difficulties, the enactment of this legislation can assure the equal protection of the laws to which every citizen is entitled.

The bill I have introduced would grant broad authority to the Attorney General to act in behalf of Negro citizens currently being deprived of their constitutional guarantees. Events as current as those reported this morning on the front pages of newspapers across the country dictate that this Congress take responsible action in the area of civil rights.

Under the provisions of the legislation I am offering, there would be authority for the Attorney General to take the necessary legal steps to bar segregation and discrimination in any business which supplies accommodations, amusements, food, or services to the public.

Beyond providing this legal tool, this bill would make those State or local officials who require or encourage segregation or discrimination subject to a legal suit. The rights of an individual citizen are greater than the desire of any official to enhance his status and must be guarded on that basis.

My bill also contains the so-called title III provision which was passed by the House during the Eisenhower administration, but failed in the Senate. This legislative language would give to the Attorney General the authority to institute legal proceedings against State or local officials where they are depriving or denying an individual his right to equal protection of the laws because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second occasion I have had to introduce civil rights legislation. Earlier this year, I offered a bill to assure voting and employment rights. This first bill also would provide financial assistance to schools seeking to desegregate.

Hearings have been conducted on this first bill by the House Judiciary Committee. Yet, to date, it has not had any backing from leading administration officials who profess to be vitally concerned with these problems.

I feel this new bill—H.R. 6740—and the earlier bill—H.R. 4034—can bring to bear a number of legal sanctions. These will help to reduce racial tensions in our country and assure the Negro and others suffering the inhumanity of discrimination the protection which is rightfully theirs as American ctizens.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of laws. No man nor any group of men is above these laws. To that end, this Congress took action nearly 100 years ago to amend the Constitution and reinforce this democratic principle. Through the amending process, the several States ratified this congressional action and the 14th amendment became the law of the land.

We are today confronted with the same kind of racial injustice that led to that action of the 1860's. It is, therefore, our responsibility to make certain that this vital guarantee is uniformly applied. The people of the United States look to us for that kind of determined action.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] and I would like to thank the Members who participated in this colloquy and all Members who allowed us to put our remarks in the body of the Record. The two of us who controlled the time on this subject further would like to express our special thanks to the Speaker for the fair and impartial manner in which he presided over this session here today.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this day to come to a conclusion without paying tribute to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the majority leader for their repeated demonstrations of fairness and the protection of the rights of the minority in this House today. This has been clearly demonstrated, and I hope as time goes on and as other speakers may follow, whoever they may be, we may take from the pages of today's Record a record of the protection of the rights of the minority in the House of Representatives at all times.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] for bringing this important, timely, and valuable discussion before the House today. In addition to commending them I wish to associate myself with the concern for the rights of all citizens which they have so ably voiced.

Any person on the floor of the House today, and indeed the American people as a whole, should no longer have any doubt as to where the sincere concern and support for individual rights lies.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has introduced legislation to insure civil rights for all citizens, I rise in support of this important legislation and trust that the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary will report a meaningful bill that will allow the Congress of the United States to right a wrong that has prevailed for too long a time. The legislative process, it seems to me, is the correct road to follow on this vital subject and I sincerely trust that action will no longer be delayed. It is my belief that the racial unrest that is manifesting itself today will be quieted if we take the responsible action of recognizing the rights of everyone to first-class citizenship.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, every American citizen has a personal stake in the legislation which many of us introduced yesterday; legislation to enforce constitutional rights including my own bill, H.R. 6736.

If we, the free people of a free nation, genuinely believe in freedom and in the dignity and worth of every human being as the moral and legal basis of our free way of life, then we cannot rest in good conscience until all our people are assured the equal protection of our laws.

Despite the clear and unequivocal guarantees contained in the U.S. Constitution, our daily experience confirms repeatedly the dismaying fact that millions of our fellow citizens are not free; they have never known equal opportunity or what it means to get an even break; they do not receive equal protection of the laws.

The Constitution, however, is not a self-enforcing document. It requires interpretation and application by the courts and implementing legislation by the Congress. In the area of civil rights, the courts have spoken frequently and clearly and decisively and have given life to the principles of the Constitution and to the highest ideals of our people. Congress, unfortunately, has been slower, more hesitant and less clear about its own responsibility in this regard.

Congress cannot open the hearts and liberate the minds of those who insist on practicing discrimination in their personal lives, but we can and must deny to segregation and every other form of racial discrimination any shadow of public sanction or support.

This is not coercion. It is prevention. It is not our purpose to punish or to intrude, but to protect people and to enforce the law of the land, equitably and humanely. If, in seeking to accomplish this end, it should interfere with local customs or institutions, it will only be because those customs and institutions have been built upon an indefensible foundation—injustice, discrimination, and disregard for the primary rights of human beings. Our freedom cannot extend to the point where we are free to deprive others of their freedom, whether we live in the North or in the South.

We owe a great public debt of gratitude to our Negro citizens who have refused to resort to violence in their struggle to obtain a minimum recognition of their rights. They have willingly suffered abuse, brutality, deprivation, and humiliation to obtain rights which should always have been theirs without question and which the rest of us take for granted.

How long can we expect restraint, if we do not join wholeheartedly with those who seek nothing more than justice? How legitimate are our appeals for moderation, if all we mean is to perpetuate the status quo? How much respect for law and order can we expect, if the law is not used to protect the underprivileged and the disadvantaged?

As a matter both of principle and of prudence, Congress must not delay in equipping the Government with authority to protect quickly and effectively the legal rights of all our people, regardless of color, religion, or economic position, whenever these rights are threatened. This is the entire purpose of our Republican civil rights legislation.

The means we propose would be simple and effective and they are constitutionally sound. Our bill provides what the Constitution already implies, that places licensed by public authority to offer service and accommodation to the general public must not discriminate or segregate against part of that general public because of race or color, and it empowers the Attorney General to institute legal proceedings against State or local officials who deprive persons of their legal rights to equal protection of the law on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

There is nothing partisan, Mr. Speaker, about this bill or about the civil rights bill we jointly introduced in January. Nor does this legislation seek to substitute for the even more fundamental necessity of personal commitment and private action in the field of civil rights. We call upon all people of good will to join with us in this noblest endeavor of our times.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, although the statements today have no doubt been permeated with politics, I think that the proceedings today have been all to the good.

No matter what our motivation, it is gratifying that at long last both major parties are setting their sights on meaningful civil rights legislation.

I for one do not care which party gets the credit. If Democrats and Republicans team up to obtain a breakthrough in the wall of inhumanity and hate, America itself will get the credit. And that is fine with me.

I congratulate and join with all my colleagues who are yearning to be a part of a Congress that faces up to the challenge of our times. The day I can cast my vote for mutual self-respect and human dignity will be the finest in my own public life. Let us all work together in a spirit of brotherhood toward that shining moment in history.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues in introducing a civil rights bill which will go far toward insuring all Americans the rights they have been so unjustly denied, in the most critical areas of race relations today.

This bill will prohibit businesses operating under State authority from denying their services to members of the public solely on the basis of race or color. Furthermore, it will extend private and Federal authority to bring civil suits to prevent further deprivations of constitutional rights.

This will be a tremendous source of new strength for the efforts to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations and in public education. Our Nation is not free so long as we deny any American child equal education, equal opportunity, indeed, equal existence.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am particularly sensitive to the impact of the recent events in some parts of the Nation. These events are grist for the Communist mills which daily proclaim our inability to secure the promise of our Constitution even to our own citizens.

But it is not for international opinion that we must pass this legislation. We must do it because it is right and because it is just.

The time for deploring the growing tension in our race relations has long since passed. A firm expression of congressional conviction is needed more than ever before.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I submitted the following statement to Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration during the current hearings on civil rights and in support of my bill, H.R. 3148, to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957:

> The struggle of man for freedom is both a foreign and domestic problem for the United States. Abroad we are fighting the Communists so that men around the world might enjoy freedom. At home we are struggling with our neighbors to maintain a dual society.
>
> Many of our citizens who would be willing to fight a war and to die to see a man be fully free in South Vietnam or Cuba would face violence rather than allow a Negro his full freedom at home.
>
> It is a matter of conscience. We have already seen the day pass when new legislation makes a significant difference. Not the law, but lack of intention is at fault here.
>
> Nevertheless, as a lawmaker I must try to make use of the tools at my disposal. I have sponsored the civil rights bill, H.R. 3148, and state that each section is self-evidently justified. It will do for my neighbor what I would have him do for me. It should be passed not because it will solve the problem but because it will help. It is a small step, but it is in the right direction.
>
> We have been witness to a lot of meaningless and childish statements concerning civil rights lately—both pro and con. What we need is mature reflection not only on the questions of integration and equality, but on man's dignity, our neighbor's and our own.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have never appeared before the House for a cause that I felt more deeply about than the cause of civil rights.

The civil rights we ask for is a basic and acknowledged American right.

Since coming to Washington as the Representative of the First District of Iowa I have come to realize much more the meaning and importance of the American ideals under which we function here. This Capital area is the focal point of this great Republic, a place where more has happened to benefit people than has happened anywhere else in all the rest of history.

And we have learned from our history that as we give more freedom to others we have more freedom ourselves. In doing this we have served ourselves and our system well. Following this precedent we have assured a spiritual growth that has also given us great material benefits and many comforts.

It is not hard for me to see that these advantages I have mentioned would have been even greater had we been more zealous in our efforts in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, it has been just 101 years since our most American American, Mr. Lincoln, issued the Proclamation of Emancipation. It was 100 years ago last December since he said, in making a plea to Congress for his proclamation—that we should remember that—

> As we give freedom to the slave we give freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and in what we preserve.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in reading the newspapers of recent weeks and the visiting of the schools in the District of Columbia, has revealed to me the awfulness of the problems that arise when the ordinary civil rights of the people are not recognized and granted.

I would also like to say that it is awfully late in the history of the free world to still find a need to sponsor a bill in the Congress of the United States implementing the oft-stated principle of freedom and equality.

It is not only late, but it is a tragedy of monumental significance, to note that the spirit, aims, and ambitions of our forefathers have not yet been fully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with urgency and with deep feeling on this important subject. I voice the hope the better spirits and judgments will soon prevail and that we can more fully implement the moral forces on which this great American ideal is built.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in order that the failure of joinder on the part of the majority in the special order taken by the gentleman from New York on the question of civil rights not be interpreted that the majority is not at least as interested in the equal rights of all Americans irrespective of race, creed, or color as is the gentleman from New York.

This is not a matter only for words; it is a problem which requires active participation in order to prove one's position. While I do not condone violence and believe unequivocally in adherence to the laws of our country, I am proud to say that not only have I raised my voice in behalf of those of our citizens who are being deprived of their rights under law by appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary but I have picketed, along with other loyal but distressed citizens of New York City, in front of establishments in New York City, in protest to their policies of discrimination in their branches in other parts of the country. I have appeared at rallies sponsored by responsible, intelligent groups, advocating equal rights for all citizens of this country and shall continue to appear at such rallies and raise my voice in protest until such time as every individual in this country is permitted to vote, to attend the school of his choice, eat in the restaurant of his choice, live where he desires, receive medical attention by the physician and hospital of his own choosing so long as he has the wherewithal to cover the costs.

Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken but where are the deeds which would openly and publicly support these protestations of liberalism?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HIS HOLINESS, POPE JOHN XXIII

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of his Holiness, John XXIII, Pope of Goodness and Mercy.

John exerted the most sincere efforts for world peace. He worked to help mankind cultivate mutual understanding.

The activities of Pope John XXIII, were dominated by the theme of peace, and it was that theme on which he had based his first message to the world.

Though he remained chiefly "the good pastor," the peaks of his regime were the ecumenical council and two encyclicals that expounded the rights of man and nations. One was "Mater et Magistra"—"Mother and Teacher"—and the other "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth."

In tribute to the memory of Pope John, I would like to refer to the latter of the two encyclicals mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a period in our Nation's history which has many paradoxes—a period of extreme prosperity in certain segments of our economy and yet, in others, many of our people live a marginal existence where the Government must assist them with surplus foods. Our Nation has held a torch of liberty and justice longer and higher than any other nation in the world, and yet those who desire freedom of equality in certain sections of our country must fight for their rights as street fighters in guerrilla warfare—house by house, alley by alley, street by street. We live in a period where our Nation's defense budget exceeds $50 billion a year which should insure our protection against the enemy from without; and yet the risks of war seem to multiply with each passing day.

Our daily lives are filled with these conflicting circumstances where portend difficulties and where extreme solutions are impossible.

The President, we in Congress, and the people we represent are all faced with finding areas where progress can be made.

On the domestic front, progress to insure that each man has his inalienable rights is complicated by the interrelation of our States and our Federal Government.

On the international scene, progress toward peace with honor is endangered by a conflict in ideologies which could be ignited into a nuclear holocaust if either side miscalculated the intentions or the capabilities of the other.

It is not difficult to suggest "easy" solutions to our domestic problems nor to solve the potential international tinderboxes which are smoldering from Cuba to the Plaine des Jarres. The difficulties lie in working out acceptable solutions in the complex middle grounds between absolutes. It is in this area that our democratic society has shown its greatest strength.

To assist men of good will throughout the world and in the high councils of all governments, a profound message of deep philosophical import came early this month, when His Holiness Pope John XXIII proclaimed his encyclical "Pacem in Terris." In this latest encyclical, Pope John set forth the rights of man to liberty, a worthy standard of living, the right to respect for his person, and the right to choose freely one's state of living. The Pontiff also entreats all to eliminate racism.

In discussing economic and political rights, the encyclical strikes at the heart of Communist tyranny because, as we know, the Communists do not tolerate political and economic thoughts which are not in their interests. We have only to look at the stark reality of the Wall of Shame in Berlin to see the rights of men violated in contravention to that portion of the encyclical which states:

> Every human being has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the confines of his own country; and, when there are just reasons for it, the right to immigrate to other countries and take up residence.

The Pontiff, in his encyclical, called attention to the problems confronting the entire world's population, and he particularly noted with deep sorrow the enormous stocks of armaments that are being piled up; and in that portion of his encyclical devoted to disarmament, he called attention to the necessity for negotiations before the inevitable collision caused by the arms race.

Here it seems to me was a voice of reason, a voice that did not take an extreme position and, although the Catholic church is militantly anti-Communist, its leader called for negotiations so that the world may have peace not only in our time, but in the future which we are all building for our children and our children's children.

Pope John called for the diversion of the flood of intellectual talents of our political and scientific leaders away from development of implements of war into the deep and quiet channels of peaceful works for the benefit of mankind.

To illustrate his point, he cited the warning of Pope Pius XII:

> Nothing is lost by peace, everything may be lost by war.

It is worthwhile for all of us to note that for the last 15 years we have lived in a period of danger and that as we have progressively developed more sophisticated weapons of destruction, it seems another paradox has developed. As the capability to destroy major portions of civilization has increased, our people have become adjusted and hardened to living under the nuclear sword of Damocles. The inevitability of war has become, in many quarters, an acceptable thing. The word "peace" has become identified by some extremists as a position amounting to surrender.

As the church has done many times in its almost two thousand years of existence, it has again shed a light into the darkness which threatens to engulf us. I believe that we should all note carefully the Pontiff's opening statement:

> Peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed. The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit.

I urge all of us to reject easy solutions and to take the hard road to negotiate peace with honor and to reflect on the guiding spirit and wisdom of the Papal Encyclical of April 11 which can show us the way.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Pope John XXIII yesterday in Rome was a loss that will be mourned by many the world over. For Pope John belonged, in a sense, to all mankind, and his efforts toward fulfilling mankind's fondest hopes and most urgent needs will never be forgotten.

The accomplishments of this man, who rose from peasant stock to become the spiritual leader of 550 million Roman Catholics, are evident to all.

He led the movement for unity among all those of Christian belief, emphasizing the essential bonds between those who believe that baptism is a sacrament and the Bible divinely inspired.

In two encyclicals, he brought the Catholic Church once again in the forefront of world social thought, proclaiming the dignity and rights of the individual worker.

He became a symbol of the search by mankind for peace. A man of peace himself, he gave expression to the yearnings of countless millions for a peaceful world.

Pope John, believing in the brotherhood of all men, regardless of race, creed or color, was a strong spokesman against the abuses of racism.

His life and reign were examples of the best and greatest in the human spirit. His was a greatness of charity and love. His was a greatness of personal warmth and understanding. His was a greatness of ideas at a time when much of the world seems bound in a pervasive mediocrity.

Pope John's ideas and teachings were significant because he set in motion ideas and force that will affect not only Christians but the whole world's population long after our temporal concerns on this tense globe have subsided, and long after the last peal of oratory resounds through this House.

Despite his power and his triumphs, Pope John was a deeply humble man. After he had risen to the papal throne he wanted merely to be known as "the good shepherd defending truth and goodness" and not as a renowned world leader in the political, diplomatic, or intellectual sphere.

Throughout his life, he strove to be the good shepherd, whether he was visiting hospitals or prisons, or extending a papal audience to a visiting head of state.

It was in this role, as shepherd and holy father of the Roman Catholic Church, that he felt the need to renew the Christian spirit and called the Ecumenical Council. It was a decision that will be marked in history, and would have been sufficient to mark him as one of the truly great Popes in the history of the church.

But he insured his place in history when, last April, he published the encyclical, "Pacem in Terris." It is a document that speaks to all men of good will throughout the world.

Through this encyclical, Pope John has left us with a renewed sense of optimism and a strengthened hope that some day peace on earth may become a reality.

As Pope John XXIII would have wanted it, his death links us all in a universal sorrow, and leaves with us a sense of the family of man. His invitation to us all to work for a better world will be remembered in the days ahead.

It is my earnest belief, as it is of all my colleagues, that Pope John XXIII, who has done so much to bring peace to the world rests now in the eternal peace of his Creator.

THE POPE OF GOOD WILL

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the world has been saddened by the death of one of its great spirits, His Holiness Pope John XXIII. A man of infinite compassion who had the rare gift of matching power with wisdom, his two great encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris" brought and will continue to bring all of mankind to a closer realization of the universal dream of peace and happiness. In today's New York Times there is an editorial paying tribute to the greatness of Pope John. I wish to bring the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

> #### The Pope of Good Will
>
> John XXIII was a Supreme Pontiff who made history. He will not be just one more name in a long list going back to St. Peter.
>
> For us, who lived with him in time, his brief but extraordinarily fruitful pontificate had a personal quality that touched Catholic and non-Catholic alike. The countless millions all over the world who followed his last agony responded to the man, the human being, who died as sublimely as he lived. It was a great heart that ultimately gave way—resigned, serene, humble.
>
> Yet the extraordinary tenacity was still there in the little he could still do and say

to assure the perpetuation of the idea behind the Ecumenical Council that he called last autumn and should be resumed this fall. He was determined that the Roman Catholic Church, historically so doctrinally exclusive, should work to bring all humanity, all races, all religions, closer to each other than they have ever been. Unity, as Pope John knew, was a far-off goal; but anyone who travels around the United States or Europe or Latin America these days can only be impressed at the progress thus far made toward religious harmony and understanding. The Pope seemed to have caught at the flood one of those "tides in the affairs of men." It will surely flow onward to make our tormented age a little less divided.

His pontificate will be long remembered for its deep impact on current social, political, and even economic history. His essentially liberal attitude toward politics was remarkable. Even in questions of religious statement he made changes in prayers and rites that carried a broad and tolerant vision.

The encyclical "Master et Magistra" of 1961 is already having as great an influence on working conditions and the social attitudes of business and labor as did Leo XIII's "Rerum Novarum" of 1891. No document of our times is more apposite to contemporary problems or more socially advanced.

The other encyclical of Pope John's that stirred the world was his recent "Pacem in Terris." Addressed to men of all religious and political persuasions, even the Communists, it is essentially a plea for universal peace, and a formulation of the means to reach the goal of a worldwide and united political community. The vast, bold sweep of the ideas, and the humanity that pervaded the whole encyclical, immediately stamped it with the seal of greatness.

This was, then, by any reckoning an extraordinary pontificate as he was a truly extraordinary Pontiff. It has always been an impressive feature of the Roman Catholic Church that some of its noted Popes came from the most humble surroundings. Angelo Roncalli was the son of a poor Lombard sharecropper. He remained a down-to-earth man, with a good sense of humor, a love of life, and a simplicity that was both genuine and deceiving because it masked a depth of wisdom and understanding that could only come from long study, thought, experience—and a noble character.

He will be mourned by many more than those who hold the same faith, because he gave something good, useful, even precious, to an era that needed his qualities and his gifts most desperately.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of a great spiritual leader. In the almost 5 years that he was Pope, late in his life, he brought about a century of progress. The "Encyclical on Human Rights and Obligations" was the most dramatic document ever issued by a spiritual leader in modern times. It called for reason, justice, and peace. It appealed to all people of all faiths.

The Ecumenical Council brought discussion to the front and paves the way for the building of new structures and new institutions leading toward peace in a world beset by troubles.

All of this was done by a single man who had the inspiration of the Almighty. Pope John has chartered a course for the rest of mankind to follow and to continue. In his lifetime he demonstrated that simplicity, humility, and sacrifice are forces for the good far greater than the sword.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pope John XXIII has deprived the Catholic world of a beloved father, the Christian world of a true shepherd, and the entire world of a good friend. For truly Pope John was a friend to all people of good will everywhere as his great encyclical "Pacem in Terris" reveals.

He did not live to see the completion of his great dream and undertaking in the Ecumenical Council but he did lay the ground work for the bridging of differences among religions. I pray that the spirit of ecumenism will be with us all, through his successor, for many years to come.

Though Pope John had a long list of titles, the one that seemed to fit him best was that of "Pontifex—Bridgebuilder." Morris West, the noted Australian author, expressed this so beautifully in a recent article in Life, as follows:

BUILDER OF BRIDGES FOR US POOR DEVILS

(By Morris L. West)

I am very close to tears as I begin to set down these words. What can I say of a man so manifestly good, so manifestly the victim—or is it the victor—in a drama of divine irony whose poignant prayer as he lies stricken is not for the salvation of his own soul but for the salvation of a work begun in the name of God?

I have no dignity in the church. I have no personal merit to commend me for the task of writing a eulogy, save perhaps this—that I am, in the spirit, a stumbling son of Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli. And, as a son, I want to say what his living and the thought of his dying have meant to me and to other souls still vagrant on this puzzling planet.

I live 12,000 miles from Rome. I stand with 550 million other believers on the lowest level of the complex hierarchic order of the church. But I wander widely and I am troubled by the spectacle of misery and poverty, and injustice and oppression, and the million faces of despair. I wrestle daily with the mystery of how all this could have issued, as the deposit of faith affirms it does, from the single creative act of an all-good and all-knowing divinity.

To me Angelo Roncalli presented himself always as a man who carried the burden of the same mystery, who shared the agony that it imposes on the human spirit, who knew the wild and risky leap demanded by the act of faith—and who knew, too, from how many millions the grace to make it has been withheld.

From the day of his election the makers of legends were busy about him. But even they could not obscure the true nature of this man—shrewd, pragmatic, kindly, too simple to be seduced by eminence, too gregarious to be happy in the baroque enclave of the Vatican, a man with a sense of fraternity and a gift of compassion which even the formalities of Vatican communication could not distort.

The Romans named him un Papa simpatico. And everyone wished he were younger, so that the imprint of his personality might be deeper on the corporate life of the church and the common life of the world. We had had a surfeit of princes and politicians and theologians—even of conventional saints. We needed a man who spoke the language of the heart, who understood that the dialog of God with man is carried on in terms far different from the semantics of professional philosophers. We have had him too briefly.

Many of my generation felt that the traditional relationship between clergy and the people had become defective. We acknowledged without reservation the dignity of the priestly office, its divine function in the renewal of the sacrificial act and in the dispensation of sacramental grace. We respected the abnegation and dedication imposed by the celibate state. We supported our pastors according to their needs and our capacities. We built schools and monasteries and hospitals. We financed missions and works of charity. We carried double and triple burdens to educate our children in the faith.

But many of us felt, not without reason, that there was too much emphasis on the magisterium of the hierarchy—their authority as moral arbiters, interpreters of dogma and administrators of the temporal structure of the church. We felt that there was not enough understanding of their ministerium—the service of the Creator through and by spiritual and temporal service rendered to the people.

In half a generation the vista of the universe had exploded into galactic dimensions. The human spirit was being submitted to monstrous tensions—moral, political, economic. And while we clung desperately to the deposit of faith, we longed for a renewal of the intellectual and pastoral life of the Church so that we might live—through the faith—hopefully and actively in the world into which we were born.

We were not cenobites. We were men of the 20th century and we could not opt out of it. We were not only members of a church, we were members of the diverse human family as well and we could not opt out of that either. It was like the breaking of a new day when we heard the call of John XXIII for an aggiornamento—for an updating of the church, her manners, her customs and her interpretation of the deposit of faith into the language of this millennial century.

When John XXIII was elected pontiff, he abrogated nothing of the primacy of his office. Yet one of his first acts was to make himself more readily available to his brother bishops. Later he intervened in the debates of the Ecumenical Council and in the lobbyings of its members to affirm that the Roman Curia was not the Pope, and that the Pope was brother to every bishop in Christendom and servant of every human soul in the world.

Of all the recent Popes, it seems that John XXIII has been least afraid of schism, of heresy or of the militancy of non-Christian religions. A man of simple faith, he believed in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the promise of perpetuity made by Christ to the church. He put no store in interdicts or excommunication because he was also a man of simple charity who understood that, although human beings are limited by God's covenant with them, God Himself is not so limited. He knew that all men must live with the burdens and confusions of their own history, and that salvation or damnation hangs, in the last resort, upon God's judgment of the final direction of a man's will—toward Him or away from Him. He claimed without reservation his right as the supreme pastor to preach truth and refute error, but he gave the impression of a man ready at all times to suspend judgment on human confusion and human delinquency. All other pontiffs knew these things—preached them, too. What has made John XXIII so different is his lively and intimate sense of their application to the commerce of life, immortally reflected in "Pacem in Terris," his encyclical on peace.

I am chary of miracles; but I think there has been a kind of miracle in the way Pope John managed to impress his charity upon the church and upon the world. Most people have seen him only in photographs. His own voice has not often been heard. Mainly his words filtered out to the faithful through newspaper reports and the variant voices of preachers, good and bad. But somehow we have all felt him, and felt that God was with him. In his hands the crosier of the bishop has meant what it was meant to mean—the crook of the kindly shepherd, to whom the wayworn and the stragglers meant more than those penned safely in the sheepfold.

When he was elected Pope, he became heir to a long list of titles: Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Sovereign of the Vatican City State. Yet the title which has seemed to sit most comfortably on him is that of Pontifex: the builder of bridges. He goes too soon and he leaves his work unfinished, but the bridges he planned are already abuilding—bridges of understanding and tolerance between the separated families of Christendom and the nations of East and West.

The formula on which he based all his architecture was very simple: "I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than with that which divides. * * *"

He was never a polemical man. He disliked contention and preferred to rely upon discussion and persuasive prompting rather than to invoke the authority of his office. He ordered that even the admonitions and of the holy office be couched in moderate language so that men of good will might have room to move through the most risky speculations to a fuller understanding of the truth. He was never a political man. He was a diplomat long enough to know that political action creates more problems than it solves.

There was a great boldness in his planning, a devastating directness. He encouraged the most daring speculations of modern theology, and he lent the weight of his influence to those ecumenical dialogues which aimed at breaking down semantic and historic barriers between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians.

There are some in the church who were disappointed because he did not take a more militant line against Russian communism. There are some who were shocked because he accepted birthday greetings from the Premier of Russia and then received his son-in-law in private audience. Yet the incident illuminated his whole attitude to the affairs of human souls. He knew that every society and every system survives by virtue of what is good in it, just as human beings are kept from the ultimate madness of despair by that in their nature which is good and conformable to a Divine pattern.

John XXIII is to leave us—a great man, and a great Pope. For this very reason there is rare tragedy in his passing. The tragedy is that, having begun so much, he will not be permitted to see the fruits of his labor; he has seen only the first faint buds. Yet in this, as in all else, his life has been patterned on that of the Christ whose vicar he was. He has walked for all too short a time, scattering the seeds of truth and charity on good ground and stony soil, and has endured the painful crucifixion of illness and frustration. Now, at the end, he must abandon himself and all his unfinished work into the hands of God.

How has he felt during these last months, perched on his lonely eminence with the world spread beneath him like a campaign map and above him the monstrous mystery of the Godhead? There must have been times when his aged shoulders bent under the burden and even his stout peasant heart quailed at the thought of things undone. Even the mercy of death has been delayed for him—as it was for his Master.

History will be kind to him, I think, because he has been a kindly man who had compassion on the multitudes, "seeing them harried and abject, like sheep that have no shepherd." Princes and priests are mourned as rarely as they are thanked, but many will weep for this one because he has been, in truth, what he was named to be: a servant of the servants of God.

Will they canonize him and make him, officially, a saint in the calendar? In a way I hope not. For my part I do not want to see him idealized by a Vatican painter, lit by a thousand candles in St. Peter's, reproduced in plaster and gilt and sold to pious pilgrims. I want to remember him for what he has been—a loving man, a simple priest, a good pastor, and a builder of bridges across which we poor devils may hope one day to scramble to salvation.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, all of humanity stands today with heads bowed in deep sorrow at the loss of one of the great spiritual leaders of all times, His Holiness, Pope John XXIII. He was known as the Pope of unity, the Pope of peace, but he will perhaps best be characterized in history as the Pope of the people, one who best understood the people and was most loved and revered by them.

To men of all faiths and all walks of life he represented compassion, patience, gentleness, good will, and love of humanity. He was possessed of a great ardor for hard work, he had boundless energy for a person of his advanced age, and conducted a vigorous reign which resulted in notable achievements in the few short years that he headed the Catholic Church.

In a world which often darkens perceptibly at noon because of the evil deeds of some men, Pope John XXIII shone forth as a beacon of light and hope. The guidance he gave to mankind was encouraging at all times. His work and his aims remain unfinished, but the greatest monument to the memory of a man who went forward so zealously for all mankind is the deep affection and boundless love for him by people everywhere on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the Record a very fine editorial which best expresses my sentiments and feelings in the loss we have just sustained in the death of Pope John XXIII. The editorial was published in the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, June 4, 1963, and reads as follows:

Pope John XXIII

The world mourns today the loss of one of its most outstanding leaders and undoubtedly one of the greatest rulers of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation.

With the death of Pope John XXIII not only the church, which he loved and served so well, but others of every faith and creed will feel the sting which the naturalness of death always leaves in the loss of a beloved father and friend. He died as he lived with a tranquillity and submission to God's will which is the characteristic of one full of grace.

It has been part of the greatness of Pope John XXIII that no matter what anyone's past reaction to Rome, people of virtually all persuasions have liked him. No other Pope in modern history has been so popular.

Ascending the throne of Peter the Fisherman in 1958, Pope John immediately set a new pace in ecclesiastical circles. He defied tradition and while some, at first, thought to criticize his actions in leaving the Vatican for visits to neighboring places, they quickly agreed that this approach to human problems aided in forming a new opinion of the church.

Pope John went out of his way, it seems, to come down to the people. He was known to visit prisons, hospitals, homes for the aged. He entertained artists, actors, dignitaries, and others when his health permitted.

The beloved pontiff was known and will go down in history as the Pope of unity. This is a common and apt designation for this great spiritual leader.

As a result of his innovations, new ties have been formed with other churches, and they have entered into real conversations, not only through the second Vatican council but in cities and towns throughout the world.

Church leaders agree Christianity has witnessed developments that would have been considered impossible only a few years ago. Pope John, in one of his first official acts, provided the first liaison between Rome and Protestantism since the Reformation. He declared that both sides had been at fault in the past and should seek mutual ways back together.

He began sending Catholic observers to Protestant-Orthodox gatherings and also received a succession of Protestant, Orthodox leaders, sitting down in what was termed, warm and informal conversation. Noteworthy among his non-Roman visitors was Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, former Archbishop of Canterbury, the spiritual leader of the Anglican church. This, in itself, was unprecedented and was the first time in 400 years that such a visit had been staged.

His heart, however, went out in a special way to Orthodox Christians and he accomplished much to help heal the breach which occurred between the two branches of the church in the 11th century.

"There burns in my heart," he was heard to say not long ago, "the intention of working and suffering to hasten the hour when for all men the prayer of Jesus at the Last Supper will have reached its fulfillment."

That prayer was, "That they all may be one."

In his quest for peace Pope John explored new paths in relations of the Roman Catholic Church with Communist countries. His death leaves that papal initiative unfinished.

As the Pope lay dying Friday, Nikita Khrushchev sent a message for the Pope's recovery saying, "This news moved us deeply."

The extent of the good this Pope had done during his short reign on Peter's throne will be fully realized only in time. He enters now into the blessed company of God and His saints.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it appropriate that I say a word reflecting the anguish and deep sorrow caused the world and particularly the Jewish people over the death of Pope John XXIII.

In my city of New York the board of Rabbis called upon its members to offer prayers for Pope John XXIII during his illness. The call emphasized that he "has given heart and courage to all men of good will," and quickened the hope of people everywhere for world peace. Throughout Israel and Argentina as well as in this country, prayers for the Pope's recovery were held in synagogues.

As a Representative in the Congress, and as a member of the Jewish faith, I desire to say on behalf of those of my faith whom I represent that we shall remember him in death as we appreciated him in life. He served as the good shepherd of his church and enriched and blessed mankind with the greatness an nobility of his spirit. His goodness and humbleness were recognized and appreciated by Christians and Jews throughout the entire world.

Several Popes had expressed interest in the Jewish people, but none matched Pope John XXIII in embodying that interest in specific acts. As Archbishop Angelo Roncalli, he was apostolic delegate to Greece and Turkey, based in Istanbul, during World War II. When told of the plight of several thousand Jews, including a number of children, slated for deportation to death at Auschwitz, he instantly made available thousands of baptismal certificates for use for the doomed Jews, without conditions, thus saving thousands from the Nazi furnaces.

Early in his papacy, he ordered the elimination from the Good Friday liturgy of the reference to "perfidious Jews," which he knew was offensive to Jews and which, it was understood, he considered not a doctrinal matter but a carryover from the polemical history of the past.

He had strong personal feelings about the need to remove the bases of animosity and hostility between religious communities, particularly in regard to Jews who, he was known to feel, had a special role in "salvation history." This was reflected again during the recent Good Friday when, according to press reports, the celebrant of the mass at the Vatican, either from habit or through use of a missal not brought up to date, again made a reference to "perfidious Jews." The Pope halted the service and had it repeated in its entirety with that reference omitted.

This attitude was exemplified again when, in January 1959, he appointed Cardinal Bea as president of the secretariat for promoting Christian unity for the Ecumenical Council. Cardinal Bea's commission has within it a smaller group with specific responsibilities to improve relationships between Catholics and Jews by removing inherited doctrinal sources of animosity through changes in Catholic teachings and liturgy. The Pope was known to have been kept acquainted with everything this commission was doing, and Cardinal Bea consistently had strong support from the Pope for the work of this commission.

His assistance to Jewish rescue missions earned him congratulations on his election as Pope from the then Chief Rabbi of Israel, Dr. Herzog. He received further praise in October 1960, when he gave an audience to 130 members of the United Jewish Appeal, who presented him with a scroll. He said to them in greeting, "I am Joseph, your brother," a reference to the Old Testament story of Joseph.

His dedicated efforts for a solution to the world's ills will serve as a beacon of guidance for all who labor for peace on earth and good will toward all men.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the death of that great and good man, Pope John XXIII, has occasioned universal mourning. In country after country, around the world, bells are tolled, flags lowered to half-staff, and crowds gather for memorial services and prayers. These official tokens of mourning, and the others such as formal messages and resolutions, are to be expected upon the death of a man in his high public position. What especially marks the present occasion, however, is that this vast demonstration of public lamentation is deserved by Pope John, not as a public personage alone, but simply for his personal and human excellences; and that the official actions of heads of states and churches, and the demonstrations of crowds, grow out of a genuine individual grief and sense of loss felt by each of a vast number of individuals.

There are innumerable instances of Pope John's warm sympathy with, and insight into, the needs and desires of human beings in all sorts of different situations. Out of a clear mind and warm heart, he would take an immediate right action, or speak a simple and memorable word. Typical was his visit to inmates of a Roman prison, when he introduced himself simply, and explained his presence, by saying, "You could not come to me, so I came to you."

Brief as the pontificate of John XXIII was, it will probably be one of the most memorable and significant in all the long history of the papacy.

This was achieved by his unique personality—by his peasant simplicity and directness, by his imperturbable amiability, by his manifest goodness of soul, and by his determination to include every human being of every creed, race, or faith in his pastoral affection and solicitude.

I should like, at this point, to testify to my own experiences of Pope John's courtesy and consideration. In January 1960, when he was forced by illness to cancel an audience to which he had kindly granted Mrs. Halpern and me, he had extended in his name an invitation to attend a musical recital that night at the Vatican in honor of the College of Cardinals. He recovered sufficiently to attend and we were privileged to share that memorable evening. When we were in Rome again, in October of 1961, we did have the opportunity of a personal audience with Pope John, and, though we are non-Catholics, we count this among the greatest experiences of our lives. In our talk, I was deeply impressed by his clear and perceptive insight into world problems, his humility, and his quick sense of humor. He commented upon my own travels, and mused about his own immobility because of his role. During this talk, he stressed his hope for peace, and praised the efforts America has been making to achieve world peace.

May Pope John's memory long live, to inspire his church and the world with his admirable qualities of heart and soul, and to help us all toward the achievement of the ideals for which he labored.

CIVIL RIGHTS DISCUSSION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the the gentleman from Illinois. I would just like to say to the Members of this House that while we all join in the great tribute to our Speaker, it should, however, not pass unnoticed that this was not a debate. This was very distinctly a one-sided presentation. The time will come, I think, when the words of today may well be tested. It seems to me that the minority members of the Committee on Rules have been put on the spot by their members today. I wonder whether they will vote to vote out the kind of a civil rights bill which will come under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the long-time defender of civil rights, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. And, I wonder also, Mr. Speaker, if we should not just point out, in passing, the fact that it is a Democratic Congress that has the record of passing civil rights legislation. When the minority were the majority, they did not pass a civil rights bill out of this Congress. And, it seems to me that while the words of today are those of the Johnny Come Lately, we are glad to have him, but the proof of the pudding will be when we come to vote on the passage of civil rights bills in the future.

I would also just like to say that while I believe in civil rights, the right to vote, while I think all of these are important, it disturbs me that there is not any support, except at least in the smallest way, for the equal opportunity job bill, because if one does not have a job, one is not going to be interested in voting. And, I hope the other side of the aisle will give equal fervor when they have the opportunity to support an equal opportunity bill, which they will at this session of the Congress.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I regret very much that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]—whom I respect very highly and have said this many times on the floor—in his closing remarks did not see fit to thank the Members of the majority who stayed here all evening. It is now 9:35. We stayed here to provide a quorum when the gentleman needed it, and I think certainly the RECORD will show, when it is studied tomorrow, that it was indeed the Democratic majority, the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, who stayed here until 9:35 to give the gentleman of the minority an opportunity to make their case.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. **WILLIAMS.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what subject he intends to speak on.

Mr. **McCULLOCH.** I would like to reply to the statement of the gentleman from California.

Mr. **WILLIAMS.** Does he intend to continue this maligning of the southern people?

Mr. **McCULLOCH.** No. I would like to reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] who made a statement not strictly in accordance with the facts, and I know that he did not intend to make such a statement.

Mr. **WILLIAMS.** Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman's own party has had 5 hours on this subject. I am not going to object, Mr. Speaker, at this point, but I will say that if we continue this throughout the rest of the night, that certainly I intend to keep a quorum present.

Mr. **HAYS.** Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I asked earlier for time to address the House, which was denied by an objection. Normally if it were almost anybody on the other side of the aisle, or even this side of the aisle, except my distinguished colleague from Ohio, I would object to his request, but I want to say I have known him for many years before I came here. That was 15 years ago in the Ohio Legislature. He was Speaker there. He was eminently fair and I have the highest regard and respect for him. Although my request one time in 15 years for a special order was objected to, I want to hear the gentleman from Ohio. Therefore I will not object to his request, but I promise you there will not be many more special orders this year.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. **McCULLOCH.** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank by colleague from Ohio [Mr. Hays] with whom I served in the Ohio Legislature many years ago. His service was interesting and rewarding, as was public service for us both.

The statement that I wish to correct, of my good friend from California [Mr. Roosevelt], was that the Republicans took no real part and no leadership in civil rights legislation in the last 3, 4, 5, or 6 years. I do not remember exactly what it was. I would like to remind my good friend from California and those of the House if any need reminding, that the Civil Rights Act of 1960 was a joint effort by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], who has so many times kindly referred to the legislation as the Celler-McCulloch Act. Furthermore, in 1957 the chairman of our committee, Mr. Celler, and Senator Keating, who was then the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and the person who is now speaking, were in large part, with the help of interested persons on both sides of the aisle, responsible for passing in the House title 3 of which we have heard so much both on the floor and in the newspapers in recent days.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record speaks for itself on behalf of those on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle who have done so much in the field of civil rights.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. **ROOSEVELT.** May I say to my good friend I would be the last one to say he has not contributed greatly to all civil rights measures considered in this House. What I did say was that the measures that were passed were passed in Democratic Congresses when the leadership of the House was the responsibility of the Democrats, and when the responsibility in the 83d Congress was the responsibility of Republicans, I think the gentleman will agree that there was no civil rights legislation.

Mr. **McCULLOCH.** I refer again to the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the amendment to which was made in order by the action of the Rules Committee, led by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable Clarence J. Brown, which it was agreed by all was the most effective piece of civil rights legislation in 100 years of our history.

I thank you.

THE LATE POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DADDARIO.** Mr. Speaker, the world mourns a true man of peace. Pope John came to the highest throne in the church just a short time ago, following the reign of a Pope, Pius XII, who had worked hard and brilliantly for a better world in his career. The new Pope was much less well known. He surprised the world in his choice of a name, which had not been used by a Pope for 624 years, and then swung vigorously into a program which sought to broaden the basis of agreement among mankind, to the greater glory of God.

He lived and served in a modern world, and he recognized the great scientific and technological progress with which the world is moving. He was to warn, in the great encyclical on "Master and Magistra," that in man's success in extending his knowledge of nature and in producing great works, he is in danger of forgetting and of destroying himself.

There were those who had thought him too advanced in his years to be very active, but they were surprised when he broke quickly with tradition. He began leaving the Vatican for visits to schools, hospitals, homes, and even jails in the city of Rome, or on one occasion, to the shrines of northern Italy more than 100 miles away.

His great leadership was evidenced by his decision to call an Ecumenical Council, to explore ways in which the church could affirm and demonstrate its pertinence to the modern world, and seek out the possibilities of greater understanding among all people. Christian unity was his strongest aim. His mind was serene, magnanimous, and optimistic, and in this he held out hope and justice to others. The full impact of the Council is yet to be measured, but it will be substantial.

We mourn a beloved citizen of the world. He has left his mark upon the globe, in his beseeching for tolerance, his quest for peace. The manner of his passing drew the prayers, the compassion of the entire world, but he can best be memorialized by heeding his guidance.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE LIFE AND SERVICES OF THE LATE POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the Record on the life and services of the late Pope John XXIII.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. **NYGAARD.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **DWYER.** Mr. Speaker, the death yesterday of Pope John XXIII is a loss to every person on earth, and a deeply felt personal loss to millions of people throughout the world of every religious faith and of none.

It has been said that he was the most beloved of all the world's rulers. This must be true. The love and affection which he attracted was only the reflection of the love which he so obviously and so unaffectedly felt toward all of his fellow men.

He was a great Pope of the Roman Catholic Church. But he was also a great human being whom the whole world has received as father and brother. He combined the skills of the experienced diplomat with the warmth, the kindliness and the direct simplicity of a man who was always close to the people he served.

In any age, a man of his character is rare. In ours, he has seemed to stand alone. He has taught us all, not by words alone, but by the example of his own life about the true meaning of brotherhood, of justice, of freedom, and of peace. And we have all listened—Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Orthodox, Moslem, Hindu—and we have been grateful that such a man has lived among us.

In the 5 short years of his reign as supreme pontiff, he has left an imprint of goodness on this world which we cannot begin to measure, for it is in the minds and hearts and spirits of people.

The action of the House this afternoon in approving a resolution of condolence at the death of Pope John speaks for all the people we represent. We have loved and honored him in life, and we shall remember him in death.

A REPORT TO MR. LINCOLN: AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE FRED SCHWENGEL, OF IOWA, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY, HARROGATE, TENN., MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, delivered the commencement address at Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., Monday, June 3, and used this occasion to make a "Report to Mr. Lincoln," which was both appropriate and unique.

Because this is one of the finest speeches of its kind that I have read, and because I know that it will be appreciated by those of us who could not be present at the time of its delivery, I have asked for the privilege of placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All of us know about Congressman SCHWENGEL's interest in Mr. Lincoln and the continuous contribution he makes to the Lincoln story. In this address he adds new chapters and a new dimension which will be welcomed by Lincoln scholars here and abroad.

In connection with his role as commencement speaker at the graduation exercises at Lincoln Memorial University this year, Congressman SCHWENGEL was presented the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award, which was established by the New York Southern Society in 1925 in honor of Mr. Sullivan who was the society's first president.

Each year, the society and Lincoln Memorial University arrange jointly for the issuance of medallions, symbolic of the award, to students of the university and to others who, "because of the quality of their lives are judged to be appropriate recipients of that distinction."

FRED SCHWENGEL is indeed an appropriate recipient. He embodies these high qualities which are perpetuated by this award—those qualities "which ennoble and beautify the living and bind man to man in mutual love and helpfulness." Just as Algernon Sydney Sullivan exerted an inspiring and spiritual influence upon those who were brought in contact with him, so does FRED SCHWENGEL inspire others by word and deed to be better citizens in the mold of the man he calls the "most American American—Abraham Lincoln."

Congressman SCHWENGEL's "Report to Mr. Lincoln" follows:

A REPORT TO MR. LINCOLN

This is probably the most pertinent platform in the world from which to talk about Abraham Lincoln.

For this is the Lincoln Memorial University of Harrogate, Tenn.

In one of your catalogs of quite recent years, it is written—and I quote: "In the autumn of 1863, President Lincoln while speaking of the military operations around Cumberland Gap, said to Gen. O. O. Howard, 'Howard, if you come out of all this horror and misery alive, I want you to do something for these people who have been shut out from the world all these years.' "

So spoke Abraham Lincoln.

"This college which Howard helped to found" as your catalog reveals "is thus not only a memorial to Lincoln, but a college founded at his direct request and for the people in whom he was especially interested—the people of the southern highlands."

This, therefore, seems to me to be a sacred place from which to make what I call: "A Report to Mr. Lincoln."

For the time has come, it seems to me, to paraphrase a certain more or less famous utterance—when we must ask ourselves not what has Lincoln done for the country but what have we done for Mr. Lincoln and the tradition he left us.

So, Mr. Lincoln, here is my report.

The history of your country and ours since you left us that tragic night in 1865, Mr. Lincoln, has not been without gallantry.

And it has not been without shame.

We have, with a measure of your kind of valor, tried to hold high the torch you handed to us. On a minor scale but valiantly we fought for liberty in 1898.

This Nation and the people, for whom, Mr. Lincoln, as our 16th President you did so much, reached in their story, since your time, some of the highest plateaus of human courage, endurance and fortitude.

The metal of our character as a people was tested in the ruthless fires of two incredibly vast world wars.

Each of these wars was the greatest in terms of death and treasure in the history of all time—the second greater than the first.

We were tested, Mr. Lincoln, in a depression that laid bare the very inner soul of this people—a harrowing economic and social agony.

And we were tested in Korea and a cold war that, for sheer Machiavellian duplicity and dishonor on the part of our enemy, is without parallel in the twisted chronicle of human civilization.

The gallantry of our people—your kind of gallantry—is recorded in the graves of our dead and their blood and the blood of their comrades, on a thousand battlefields from one end of the earth to the other.

Again and again we faltered and almost fell.

For—we, too, had our Antietam.

We, too, were in the depth of a despondency that shook our people down to the roots of their being as a Nation.

Oh, we knew we would survive.

But would we survive as a free people? That was the question.

Would we survive in the spirit of the tradition you enobled so magnificently?

Or would all that is so rich in human decency, that you held up to us so nobly, be lost?

Lost in a holocaust of blood and terror, tumult and greed, prejudice and meanness?

In all of this—the shame of the Reconstruction period, the cynical stupidity of the Know-Nothing Party, the disgrace of prohibition and its concomitant crime and dishonor, the Ku Klux Klan and its beetle-browed philosophy of racial hate, the Silver Shirt kind of thing, the current Birch Society—in all of this, the best of us and the best in us clung to your name; we hold on as one holds on to a lifeboat on a stormy sea.

Your name—just the name—Mr. Lincoln, was an antidote.

It was and is a kind of inexhaustible national strength.

It gave to American politics its religion. It shored up the moral forces without which there can be no real freedom.

Men could quote words and the words came to a nation like a balm from Gilead when you said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all." When you reasoned that "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us." When you admonished that "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves." When you said "Universal idleness would speedily result in universal ruin." When as sage you said: "I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other men's rights."

No President, not even Thomas Jefferson, is quoted so frequently and with such intensity of feeling and the quality of human grandeur, as you, Mr. Lincoln.

And your service to humanity did not end that dreadful night at Ford Theater.

Indeed, as we have been told, now you belong to the ages.

In this very hour, on this very platform, in centuries yet to come, on numberless platforms, in institutions of learning, from pulpits, in classrooms, at picnics, with celebrations and in legislative halls your words will ring out and lift and stir the human heart everywhere on earth.

"Act well," you enjoined us, "for there all honor lies."

When men riveted to the past stood stubbornly like an impassable wall of obstruction, your words rang out, and they ring out today; I quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present, the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Your words were always unifying and reconciling without abjuring the necessities of forensic combat in a democracy. You said: "When an election is past, it is altogether fitting a free people—that until the next election they should be one people."

And you said at Cooper Union in New York City, February 1860: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Again and again, you spoke as the prophets of old. The words you uttered are now engraved forever on the heart of the American conscience. You said: "If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

And this, Mr. Lincoln, needs to be said again and again and needs to be chiseled into the granite of our conscience and for emphasis I quote again: "If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Sometimes the tone of your language, as well as the content, make people's eyes well with tears.

Such words as: "the last full measure of devotion," "these honored dead," and "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Mr. Lincoln, against a thousand and one indignities that we commit against our own tradition of freedom, against the shame of white citizens' councils and dogs set on human beings, and fire hoses turned on schoolchildren, we have, like a great cry in the wilderness, the immortal ring of your name.

We turn, Mr. Lincoln, in our guilt and our self-disgrace, to you.

We hold you up against the horizon before the whole of living mankind.

We say to all the world—to all the world—we say this:

We say: No, Birmingham in the year of our Lord, 1963, is not the American tradition. Nor is a Little Rock of yesterday.

Nor is the disgrace of the inadequate schools for the Negroes and whites in the District of Columbia—in the shadow of the Capitol Building that symbolizes the ideals you loved so devotedly.

No, Mr. Lincoln, with a piteous cry out of the depth of the American conscience, we hold you up to the light, and we proclaim here and throughout the land with all the sincerity of a free people, right out of the marrow of our bones, we declare, we pledge that—not Birmingham, not Little Rock, not Faubus, nor Wallace, not "Bull" Conner, but here in you, Mr. Lincoln, is the true genius of the American people.

The proof that you, in fact and in truth, represent the American spirit, and that our real selves as a people, is not represented in the cowardice of the lowest of the white people among us, is to be found in our authoritative governmental position in this hour.

Our authoritative position, Mr. Lincoln, is the position you left us. For always, except in dire emergency, you moved with authority of the law and asked for law to give authority.

It is the position that is the very warp and woof of the American tradition, as you so profoundly restated it by your life, by your Presidency, by your words.

Thus the President of the United States, whether he is Eisenhower or Kennedy, Hoover or Roosevelt, Wilson or Harding, speaks in the sense and the meaning, if not the actual terminology you left us. And, more than that, as the record of action in our generation shows, they decide and move in implementation of their words which are but an echo of your own.

The authoritative record of the Government of the United States is a Lincoln record. Thus speaks the U.S. Supreme Court. Thus speaks the Congress of the United States. Thus speaks—the highest law officers of the Nation—the Attorney Generals. Indeed, thus speak the platform of the Democrat and Republican Parties.

The authoritative position of the Government of the United States is the position this Nation inherited from the restatement you left us of the meaning of free government; that is government of the people, by the people, for the people—as originally stated by the Founding Fathers.

Not some people—all people.

With your immense help, Mr. Lincoln, we have buried many of the injustices of the past, not wholly, but impressively just the same, under a phenomenal record of achievement on behalf of justice and tolerance.

Have we not lived down, in blood and agony, the infinite ugliness of the Dred Scott decision that the colored man had "no rights which the white man was bound to respect?"

Have we not lived down the social degradation inherent in the verdict against a white woman in Norfolk, Va., found guilty in 1853 of teaching colored children to read and write?

Today, Mr. Lincoln, many Representatives in the Congress of the United States, cry to high heaven with righteous indignation, because the schools where Negroes predominate are not on a par—on a par, I repeat, with the very best public schools and the highest standards in the Nation.

When today the nation speaks—officially and authoritatively—the voice may be said to be the voice of Abraham Lincoln, sir.

When the mob speaks, whether under a painfully misled local government, or from the hysteria normal with mobs, there is the voice you fought and that we, as a whole people, are fighting today.

Because of the foundation laid by you and by the Founding Fathers before you, the Negroes in the United States, as a people, have made more progress over the period of a century or more, than any people, in like circumstances, in the whole history of mankind.

This is my personal conviction.

To put it another way, I believe there is no parallel in the whole story of the human race, since antiquity, for the advances made from slavery by the colored man on American soil. It began from the hour you issued the Proclamation of Emancipation.

But that superb chapter in the annals of man has been marred and muddied.

It has been besmirched by prejudice and hate and the evil that you so brilliantly lead the fight against.

And no small part of the world, aided and abetted by Soviet propaganda, now believes that the truth about us is to be found in a police official setting dogs on human beings, and not in the heritage of decency that is the true picture of the American dream. It is not unlike kindred groups of Americans who equate one criminal colored man with the whole of the colored race.

But we have, among others, one mighty and powerful weapon against this deliberate distortion of the American image.

That weapon is you, Mr. Lincoln.

You.

All of the immediacy, the skills, the worldwide reach of modern communication media called into play to make the United States ugly before mankind, is discounted to a remarkable degree by the profound hold, you Mr. Lincoln, have upon the human heart in every nook and cranny of the earth. For you are the best known of all Americans.

There are Lincoln statues in London, Manchester, Edinburgh.

There are portraits and casts of Lincoln's hands in all lands where there is a spirit of freedom. There are Lincoln fellowships all over the world.

Today, there are interesting collectors of Lincolniana and collections about you, Mr. Lincoln, all over this land and one of the finest here in this school.

Authors win Pulitzer Prizes writing about you.

Carl Sandburg, who seems to be a sort of projection of you into our own time on this soil, once wrote. And I quote: "The facts and myths of his (Lincoln's) life are to be * * * shared widely over the world, for thousands of years, as the tradition of Knute or Alfred, Lao-tse or Diogenes, Pericles or Caesar, are kept. This because he was not only a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships and an artist in the personal handling of life from day to day, but a strange friend and a friendly stranger to all forms of life that he met."

Mr. Lincoln, your interest in science inventions is well known—not so well known is that, according to reports in the New York World of June 20 and 27 and the Boston Journal, June 21, 1861, that you, on June 19, 1861, with Prof. Thadeus S. C. Lowe ascended in a balloon to a height of 500 feet. Thus, you demonstrated your avid interest in the phase of science that is helping us to conquer space and you became the first President to ascend into the air in a heavier than air contraption. And now we have an economy and a world that depends on air travel. Missiles have become instruments of exploration and implements of war and with missiles we can circle the earth in outer space in less than 2 hours. An American astronaut, Gordon Cooper, has just become an American hero by circling the earth 22 times. Trips to the moon are feasible and we are planning to go there. In fact, scientists tell us we are on the limitless road to conquer space.

We have it in our hands to remake the world for the freedom you cherished so much. It is, I believe, within our competence to achieve the greatest dreams of the ages. And in these prodigious projects one source of our greatest strength will be in the faith we have in Almighty God. Our strength will derive meaning from the direction given us by one of His most favored sons—Abraham Lincoln.

So I say, as you said it, Mr. Lincoln: "If we do right, God will be with us, and if God is with us, we cannot fail."

And we will not fail if we, like you, lead the ancient landmarks that lead to freedom and do our all to achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all.

No, Mr. Lincoln, we are here today with young people who are graduating from Lincoln Memorial University. They have fulfilled the requirements of a program planned by the faculty and the board of governors of this institution of learning. They are going into a world of great change, but into a time when the rate of change is greater than ever before; when the responsibilities of freemen on the world scene are grave and when opportunities to serve are also great.

Just as you learned, in the university of experience at Salem, Ill., so these students from the experience and learning here at Lincoln Memorial University will know how important it is to read good books. They will know, just as you knew, that few books are needed if they are good books and if they are mastered well.

They have been here given at least a moderate education and through education able to appreciate the value of our free institutions—they know, as you did, that it is their business to make other men wiser and better as they can find or as they can make opportunity to do so.

Just as you, Mr. Lincoln, were beset with fanatics, radicals, and extremists (abolitionists and secessionists) so are we today plagued by successors of their kind and just as they flew under the cloak and color of patriotism so do those in our time display themselves as superpatriots.

In answer to this problem of our time we recall and remind ourselves of your reaction and response when you said "in grave emergencies moderation is generally safer than radicalism." And that "as it now stands we must appeal to the sober sense and patriotism of the people," and that "We will make converts day by day"; and that "We will grow stronger by calmness and moderation."

Finally, Mr. Lincoln, we pledge ourselves to a better understanding of the doctrine of our forebearers that you understood so well.

We shall continue to have faith in philosophies of our declarations—especially yours.

We shall continue to encourage the seeking and sharing of the knowledge available in such abundance and in so many places today.

We shall continue as you did to press onward and upward to the goals you envisioned for us and for the vast future of the world.

And with you realize anew that no doctrine, faith, or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action.

This, Mr. Lincoln, may, as compactly as I know how, express the essence of this report to you.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 2 hours on Tuesday, June 11, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to vacate his special order for today and that it be placed on the calendar for tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NYGAARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEROUNIAN in four instances.
Mr. MATHIAS.
Mr. JENSEN.
Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELLEY.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. ST. ONGE.
Mrs. KELLY.
Mr. CORMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

883. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

884. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

885. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and to authorize the loan of a naval vessel to a friendly foreign country, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

886. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on procurements of aluminum caps and cans without adequate pricing data by the General Electric Co. from the Aluminum Company of America under Atomic Energy Commission cost-type contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

887. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred for rehabilitating to original appearance and serviceability military equipment donated to foreign nations under the military assistance program, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

888. A letter from the Acting Legal Adviser, Department of State, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1962, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

889. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

890. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 26, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Philips Inlet, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

891. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 376. Resolution pertaining to investigations, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, travel authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 6500, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 6242. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 247. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; with amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5930. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; with amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6755. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6756. A bill to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6757. A bill to prohibit discrimination in education, housing, public accommodations, and employment, or against public officials because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H.R. 6758. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period during which an individual citizen of the United States must be present in a foreign country or countries in order to exclude his earned income for such period from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 6760. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6761. A bill to provide for the redesigning of the 5-cent George Washington regular postage stamp so as to incorporate George Washington's immortal words, "To bigotry no sanction"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6762. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr GILL:

H.R. 6763. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 6764. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6765. A bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 6766. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 6767. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6768. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6769. A bill to protect the right of all qualified persons to attend public schools and to prohibit discrimination against any person on account of race or color in the furnishing of the advantages, privileges, and facilities of any business or business activity affecting the public which is conducted under State license; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6770. A bill to add a new title XI to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period during which an individual citizen of the United States must be present in a foreign country or countries in order to exclude his earned income for such period from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 6772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deductions for certain payments for the use of, or interest payments on mortgages on, industrial plants financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6773. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 6774. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026) providing for construction, maintenance and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6775. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to permit the serving of school lunches to children attending kindergarten in certain nonprofit private schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6776. A bill to amend section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to agreements concerning the use of an access to rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6777. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6778. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6779. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 6780. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to exclude from the provisions of that act wool products with respect to which the disclosure of wool fiber content is not necessary for the protection of the consumer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6781. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 6782. A bill to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for retired persons 65 years of age and older through the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 6783. A bill to define the permissible scope of work measurement systems within the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6784. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 6785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on obligations issued by tax-exempt colleges and universities to provide funds for educational buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 6786. A bill to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 6787. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6788. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend and clarify existing inspection and investigative powers, require a premarketing showing of the safety of cosmetics, assure the safety, efficacy, and reliability of therapeutics, diagnostic, and prosthetic devices, improve the statutory coordination between that act and the biological-drug provisions of the Public Health Service Act, provide for cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6789. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6790. A bill to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to the issuance of securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6791. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 6792. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6793. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6794. A bill to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6795. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 6796. A bill to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 6797. A bill to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6798. A bill to authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6799. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 6800. A bill to provide for the construction of an 840-bed Veterans' Administration hospital in the vicinity of the University of New Mexico's School of Medicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6801. A bill to provide that the representation in the House of Representatives of each of the several States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 387. Resolution declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church to be a major faith in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6802. A bill for the relief of Enrique Panlilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6803. A bill for the relief of Rahel S. Chelico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6804. A bill for the relief of Jacques Laniado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6805. A bill for the relief of Ruby Z. Belcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6806. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as

James K. Georgaras); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6807. A bill for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6808. A bill for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of Clarence Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Raineri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6811. A bill for the relief of Stefania Anc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Textile Industry Needs Immediate Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of a statement I am submitting to the Special Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry, Senate Committee on Commerce, of which Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island is the chairman. The subcommittee recently conducted hearings on the subject. My statement is as follows:

Statement of Congressman William L. St. Onge, Before the Special Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry, June 4, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for having this opportunity to present to you a few brief thoughts in connection with your study of the textile situation. First, I desire to express my deep appreciation to your committee for undertaking this study. We can only hope that much good will come of it to benefit all those associated with this industry, which should also prove beneficial to the Nation's economy as a whole.

Those of us representing constituencies in the New England States are particularly perturbed over the very serious situation which the textile industry in this area is experiencing. In May 1961 President Kennedy announced a seven-point program to deal with the problem and emphasized at the time the need for action. Unfortunately, little has been done to implement the President's program of action during these past 2 years, while textile imports have risen sharply. The result has been that since then more textile mills were forced to close down and additional thousands of workers have been forced to join the ranks of the unemployed.

We have particularly felt the blow of these developments in Connecticut, which until recent years prided itself in having a very prosperous textile industry. Now, many of these mills and plants in Connecticut towns are the silent reminders of yesterday's prosperity and today's unemployment. Many people in our area, both in the ranks of industry and labor, are very much concerned over this situation. Many are worried that, unless specific action is taken in the near future, there will be tragic consequences for the remainder of the textile industry and for other communities.

Recent statistics of the Textile Workers Union of America show that the employment of production workers in the textile industry in January 1963 was 3 percent lower than in January 1962, and the number of unemployed textile workers had reached 60,700 in January of this year. The Northern Textile Association reported in March that imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961 and imports of manufactured textile products rose 39 percent. The same organization reported that 18 wool mills closed down in 1962.

These figures attest to the erosion of an entire industry. Steps must be taken to stop this, whether by restraining imports, or the development of certain controls or voluntary agreements on the part of textile exporting nations, or a combination of these steps.

While I am not prepared to say which of these steps should be taken first, it might perhaps be most wise to start out with immediate implementation of President Kennedy's seven-point program. I feel certain that your committee, in its wisdom and knowledge of the facts and in its desire to be helpful, will give this matter very earnest consideration and will recommend the proper action.

Dr. Herman M. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an eminent citizen of my congressional district, Dr. Herman M. Wilson, who has just retired from a long and fruitful career; a career which has added greatly to the creativity, the joy, and contentment of our senior citizens.

For 36 years, Dr. Wilson was administrator of the Asbury Home for the Aging at Gaithersburg. He is a past president of the National Association of Methodist Hospitals and Homes, and is a charter member both of the National Council on Aging and of the National Gerontological Society. In addition, he also serves on the Montgomery County Commission on Aging.

A graduate of George Washington University, Dr. Wilson also earned a degree in law at the University of Maryland, as well as a master's degree from the Emory University. Upon completion of his theological studies at the Yale University Divinity School in 1927, Dr. Wilson became administrator of the Asbury Home. There he had his lifetime ministry.

From a one-building home in 1927, Dr. Wilson guided the institution until today it has 6 interconnecting buildings and 160 resident guests. Dr. Wilson pioneered in creative activity for senior citizens, seeking to dispel the notion that homes for the aging are places where people just sit and rock and wait to die. The name of the Asbury Home for the Aging underlines his philosophy that aging is a process to be enjoyed, and a time for creative work. According to Dr. Wilson, the word "aged" implies that a process has been completed and a person put on a shelf. More than 60 clubs, activities and interest groups keep the Asbury Home residents busy and informed. In honor of Dr. and Mrs. Wilson, the trustees of the home have renamed the main building "Wilson Hall."

I join their many friends in Maryland in wishing for Dr. and Mrs. Wilson a long and happy retirement, full of continued activity and creativity.

Relief Against Medical Expenses, No—Socialized Medicine, Yes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the proverb "actions speak louder than words" was aptly demonstrated yesterday in action by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I am pleased to include in my remarks herewith a release from the office of the Honorable John W. Byrnes, ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. His statement speaks for itself:

The defeat by a solid bloc of Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee of the amendments which I offered to encourage voluntary insurance against medical expenses is a strange paradox for those who claim to be concerned over the health and medical needs of our Nation. Today's action means that the Democratic Party is not interested in the health of our citizens, but only in providing for a socialized system of Government medicine under the administration's program for medical care for the aged under the social security system. Any proposal which seeks to encourage private initiative in forestalling citizens from becoming "public charges" with respect to their medical needs is opposed by the Democrat majority.

Because the 3-percent floor applicable to the present deduction for medical expenses has the effect of nullifying any deduction for such premiums for health and accident insurance, I initially offered an amendment to permit the full deduction for premiums paid on health and accident insurance for the taxpayer and his dependents. Notwithstanding the professed concern of the administration over medical care, the amendment was rejected by the committee by a tie vote (12–12), with one member voting present. All 10 Republican members supported the amendment.

I then offered to limit the deduction to prepaid health and accident insurance which would provide medical coverage for the taxpayer, his spouse and their parents upon reaching age 65. This would enable taxpayers to provide in their working years for medical insurance to cover them and their parents in later life. This, likewise, failed by a tie vote.

Finally, I offered to limit the deduction to prepaid medical insurance purchased by the taxpayer for himself and spouse for coverage upon reaching age 65. This provision could have been adopted with a minimum revenue loss of less than $10 million. By a tie vote the committee failed even to adopt this amendment—thereby flatly refusing any relief to the taxpayer who might insure against future medical expenses.

A Tribute to the Service of Japanese Americans in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1963, the Japanese American Citizens League held a special 20th anniversary service in honor of all Japanese Americans, living and deceased, who served in World War II. There was a ceremony befitting this memorable occasion in the flagpole area adjacent to the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington Cemetery, sponsored by the Japanese American Citizens League.

This occasion offered all Americans, regardless of race or ancestry, an opportunity to recall with gratitude the unusual bravery and heroism displayed by Japanese Americans throughout the war.

There were over 33,000 Nisei in the U.S. Army and an extraordinary proportion of these were volunteers, since Nisei were not regularly drafted into the Army between March 1942 and January 1944. Thousands of these volunteers were from the relocation centers and Hawaii.

The famed 100th Battalion, called the Purple Heart Battalion because almost every member received at least one wound, participated in the landing at Salerno and in every major Italian action. It drove four times across the Volturno River, held the front lines in Cassino 40 days, led the breakthrough in the march on Rome, and spearheaded the U.S. attack on Livorno in the campaign to drive the Germans from the upper ranges of the Italian peninsula. The fortitude and intrepidity displayed by the officers and men of this 100th Battalion reflected the finest traditions of the U.S. Army. This battalion is said to have been the most decorated unit in the war. It wrote a brilliant chapter in the history of the fighting men of America.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Japanese ancestry performed some of the most valuable work of the war in the Pacific theater as well. They not only proved their deep loyalty to the United States, but they voluntarily risked their lives in order to perform important frontline services, in combat, in intelligence, in training U.S. troops shifted from the European theater to the Pacific, and in many other ways. Three thousand Nisei soldiers bought $100,000 in war bonds within 2 days after the announcement of the execution of American fliers. Important radio broadcasts of the Office of War Information beamed to Japan were made with the aid of Japanese Americans. Nine hours every day in San Francisco, the staff of 21 Nisei translators and announcers waged psychological warfare in World War II. All proved themselves efficient as language craftsmen and as fine human beings. Nisei were invaluable in teaching the Japanese language to Army and Navy personnel throughout the country.

The part played by American citizens of Japanese descent in preserving freedom and opportunity in America is as inspiring as it was heroic. Not only in the military, but also in the arts, sciences, and the professions, Japanese Americans have made outstanding contributions to American culture.

In commemorating the outstanding service of Japanese Americans the words of President Roosevelt spoken 20 years ago ring with special meaning. He said with special reference to Japanese Americans:

> The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart. Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race and ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Japanese American Citizens League for making arrangements for this notable event. Mr. Masao Satow, national director, and Mr. Mike Masoaka, chairman, 20th anniversary commemorative committee to honor Nisei in military service in World War II, are to be commended for their splendid efforts in this regard for they remind us again that these Japanese Americans served the United States with loyalty, courage, and honor and our Nation is the better for their having done so.

His Holiness, Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the heart and voice of His Holiness, John XXIII, has been stilled by death but what he infused in the hearts of people everywhere and what he inspired their minds to work for will not be diminished by his death. The infusion was of paternal loving kindness; the inspiration was of a fraternal will for peace among all peoples in the world of here-and-now.

To Christians he was the embodiment of a vision of unity achievable with common charity and mutual forbearance from ancient antagonisms not rooted in faith or reason.

John XXIII truly was, and will be, in memory forever the Pope of the people though he be hailed as the Pope of peace. For peace for the sake of peace is not the concern; rather, peace for the sake of people. Peace is but a state of affairs or an abstraction of the intellect. His Holiness' dedication of self to peace was in essence, therefore, a dedication of himself to the people of the world as the beneficiaries of peace. He dedicated his whole life to them that he might leave them a legacy of peace and fraternity. What greater gift could he give? What greater legacy could he leave?

May he rest in peace even as he now prays that we shall live in peace—and may God so will it.

Adult Education Program of Los Angeles Area Enters 76th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few decades we have seen great accomplishments for the advancement of society. We have developed to the point where basic needs no longer trouble us. Credit for these advances is largely due to our educators, engineers, technicians and scientists who have opened whole new vistas in the realm of space exploration and seemingly endless possibilities for the constructive use of atomic power. To continue the rapid rate of progress in these and other new and challenging areas, we must continue to expand our educational facilities, constantly adapting ourselves to the nascent exigencies of modern society, of the society of the future. There are countless ways of meeting the demands made upon our educational facilities: our public primary and secondary schools, vocational training programs, universities. One of our increasingly important programs is that of adult education.

Generally adult education programs are providing training for unemployed, potential workers, fitting them for a widening field of vocational opportunities. Also these programs offer opportunities for more specialized training, adapting workers to more complex jobs or switching them to other fields where automation has not yet replaced the employee.

Such a program has enjoyed a successful history in the Los Angeles area. Today there are nearly 200,000 adults enrolled in over 2,000 classes in the city of Los Angeles alone. The program started 76 years ago through the efforts of a Los Angeles journalist, Walter Mellick, who began teaching other adults to finance his higher education. His school immediately interested the educators of the area who brought Mellick into the public school system in 1887. The program was given great impetus by the waves of immigrants who settled in the county. Not until 1933 did the adult education program receive an overall adviser expressly concerned with its unique needs. This man, E. Mansfield Evans, developed the program for 26 years into a position of strength. Since then the program has been constantly expanding in response to new needs.

Classes are available to meet a variety of requirements of the enrollees. There are classes in Americanization and citizenship for new arrivals to the United States; there are also classes of regular academic work open to people over 18 who have begun to feel the need to obtain a secondary degree; classes in vocational instruction in response to the changeover from newly automated industries to those which require technicians with special skills; classes in homemaking; classes in health, public affairs, business, and the fine arts.

Wide as the program is, it is just as flexible. English is offered to those of other nationalities and there are many courses of a sociological nature which attempt to adjust the individual to a society in a state of flux. At first the program was primarily a means of assimilating immigrants into the State; then later during the depression it offered instruction to alleviate the consequences of a depression economy; and later still, after World War II it placed veterans and people employed in wartime industries in a position to take advantage of new job opportunities. Today the program serves an increasing number of women and emphasis is gradually being placed upon improvement of intellectual understanding, rather than on purely vocational training.

This program is only part, but a vital part, of what has become an important nationwide project. Already counting all kinds of schooling for Americans over 18, one out of every two adults is enrolled in some kind of education. There are 50 million adults studying now, and it is estimated that by 1975 the number will reach the 70 million mark. Of all the many educational opportunities available to our population, such a program as is offered by the Los Angeles School District is one of the most basic and perhaps one of the most generally beneficial. It is to be hoped that similar projects on both the local and national levels will continue to operate in the future, adapting our citizens to the changing needs of modern society.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Pope John XXIII the world has lost one of the truly great men of our age.

No man was too humble to receive the Pope's attention, and no problem too great to benefit from his intelligence and counsel.

In addition to serving his church, Pope John XXIII was a true servant of world peace. He identified his church with the aspirations of men everywhere for freedom and dignity, for equality, for a decent standard of living, for scientific progress, and for mutual understanding among men and nations.

Probably no man in modern times has expressed the fundamental human desire for world peace more eloquently than the late Pope in his recent encyclical, "Pacem in Terris":

> Peace founded not on fear, suspicion and mutual diffidence; insured not by the threat of terrible destruction that would mark the complete ruin of the whole human race but established on a right ordering of human relations; order founded on truth, constructed according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity and put into effect in freedom. This is the peace that the race of man ardently desires as a most precious divine gift without which it is not possible to expect any constructive progress, lasting well-being and safe future for the young generations, for families and for nations.

Here is a beacon of counsel and guidance for all those who labor for peace in the worldly vineyard.

Skepticism—Or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a statement I made before the class of 1963, Columbia College, New York, on Friday evening, May 30, 1963, at the annual senior dinner. The statement follows:

SKEPTICISM—OR ELSE

Do not fear. I have no intention of standing up here patronizingly to pat you on your collective head and play Polonius. Fifty-three years ago when I sat where you do now, I could not know that an era was ending, that I was to step forward into a world that was to be radically reshaped by the thinking of three men—Freud, Marx, and Einstein. Nor could I foresee the tragedy and degradation of man in wars and massacres—nor, for that matter, could I foresee the splitting of the atom, nor, for example, the release of man's energies in the overthrow of colonialism—nor his soaring into space, and so forth. In short, I could not foresee the admixture of good and evil, the bafflement and the wonder, the despair and the elation that was to mold the world as we know it today. Hence, how certain can I be that that which I say today will remain valid in a tomorrow which neither you nor I can really envision.

Nonetheless, I want to try.

In the over 40 years I have been in Congress, the most dismaying, even defeating, experience I have had is to see good minds rust in the illusion that the facts of their youth are the facts of today. They shun the pain of reexamination. Believe me, it is easier to hold on to a conviction than to release it. Because, once, a greater number of men dwelt on the land than in cities, Congress overrepresents the rural. Because so many, in Congress, are self-made men, they deny bitterly that there are those who need help. There are those who vehemently denounce Federal spending but see no contradiction in requesting another dam, another post office, another Federal building for their district. There are those who would make a canon of faith of the "balanced budget." As a matter of fact, only the very poor balance their budget.

The corporation is in debt to its bondholders because it must seek expansion, lest it petrify. The businessman borrows for the future. The family has a mortgage on its home. When the Federal Government spends for conservation, for slum clearances, for aid to education, it is not burdening the future generations; it is enriching them. The Federal Government has its assets to cover borrowing as do the others. The Government's assets are its natural resources, its harbors and ports, its rivers, its manpower, among others. In fact, the very man who relentlessly bedevil the "unbalanced budget" would fold up in horror were business and individuals to balance their budgets. The very wheels of commerce would stop. Yet, it can be political suicide for any politician to challenge the virtues of the "balanced budget." Politically, it would be safer for one to deny his own mother and embrace sin.

Let's turn to another much prated of concept. "A good Congressman is one who never retreats." At all costs, he must stand firm, unyielding, cloaked in self-righteousness, impervious to compromise. Nonsense. Imagine 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, each one of them standing on his own dime, muttering through his teeth "never." Were that so, we'd still be fighting over the Articles of Confederation. In 1957 and again in 1960, I was criticized because I had authored Civil Rights Acts that were not strong enough. Had I and others held on to the A-little-is-insufficient-but-nothing-is-enough-attitude, there would have been no Civil Rights Acts. As Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am now conducting civil rights hearings on 104 bills. We will get a strong bill this session, but only because we now have the legal blocks upon which to build—the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. This is not to deny the impetus given civil rights legislation by the occurrences in Birmingham, and in Oxford, and Jackson and in other parts of the North and South. But had the same conditions existed without the two former acts, we would have had to begin on a much lower key.

And so it has been with immigration legislation. Slowly, slowly, there has been liberalization—permanent legislation on the admission of orphans, the expansion of the use of the parole system which enabled the Hungarians and other such to enter, the more expeditious reuniting of families, the wiping out of 10-year waiting lists by declaring them nonquota. Verily, there is a time for sowing and a time for reaping.

I am not saying that one always compromises, nor am I saying one never compromises. What I am saying is that one has to understand the gap between illusion and reality. Rigidity is incompatible with political life.

The years of our life would be simple if we could indeed sink into the soft comfort of the cliche. Let's look for a moment at the criticism of the United States, both abroad and at home. In every country I have visited—India, Italy, Pakistan, Egypt, Germany, Spain, Brazil—I have found the opinionmakers in those countries of the same mind on one aspect of American life. With curious unanimity, they bewail the materialism of the United States—its gadgetry, its washing machines, the automatic automobile shift, and so forth. At home, in orgy of self-flagellation, we beat our own breast, as guilt ridden, our opinionmakers take the same line. I'll ask the same questions here I asked of the Indian intellectual when he scornfully referred to American materialism and gadgetry. "What is so noble about dragging a pail of water 2 miles and up four flights of stairs? What is so degrading about turning a tap and having the water flow? Does back-breaking labor render a person more sensitive to beauty? More sensitive to human relations? Is a woman per se nobler because she washes her linen in the river, pounding upon it with rocks?" On the contrary, I have found that comfort doesn't add fat to the soul—that instead, it releases man's energy so that he can turn his attention from self, alone, and look to what others in society need—that he can, in his time, cultivate the arts and the sciences. Is it a condition precedent to creative to starve in a garret? Could it not be that we have romanticized poverty too long? A materialistic America? When we have sent billions of our wealth to restore shattered nations abroad. Materialistic? When we have sent our Peace Corpsmen to all parts of the world to give help to the less privileged. Materialistic? When we embrace the system of compulsory public education for all, regardless of class or creed. Materialistic? When we have created the largest middle-class group in the world.

Thrown in for good measure is the criticism that we are addicted to cleanliness. Am I being told that we are boors because we don't scratch ourselves when we write or paint—or that it is easier to play the piano in a roomful of scuttling rats? I know that he who accepts the easy generalization, be he conservative or liberal, businessman or artist, farmer or city dweller, suffers from mental anemia.

Will you be capable of asking, "Is this really so?" Will you be capable of saying, "I never thought of that in this way before" when premises are set before you?

So many of our creative people today in the new writing, in art, and in the Theater of the Absurd, are given over to the dramatization of the sick, sick, sick, the lonely, the battered, the despairing. There is an irritating sameness. Imitation follows imitation follows imitation. We ridicule the conformity of fashion but we feel somehow ashamed to apply the same satire to the conformity of art. But, then, again, let me amend that. Perhaps, I, too, have been frozen into attitudes formed in my youth. Perhaps I've missed the impact of the search for new forms of expression. Because there is some conformity, let me not make the mistake of saying there is conformity everywhere.

Let not the mind be cast in stone, enduring but unendurable. Let it, rather, be like the running waters, forever refreshing itself and reflecting the lights and the shadows of living.

Well, I did turn into Polonius, after all.

All the Centralists Need Is To Get Their Little Toe in the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased and proud to insert a genuine American speech by our highly esteemed colleague, the Honorable WALT HORAN, of Wenatchee, Wash., a farmer-statesman. WALT is a top member of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I, too, have the honor of being a member. I know his heart beats like every deep-thinking American. WALT is deeply worried about the reckless, wasteful spending of our taxpayer dollars and our seemingly mad rush to a centralized state.

I, too, commend and admonish all our local and State officeholders to continue to be ever on guard at our portals of freedom, as does Mr. HORAN in this speech which follows:

SPEECH OF HON. WALT HORAN BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WENATCHEE, WASH., MAY 22, 1963

The prodigal son was a liberal spender and the fatted calf was killed to make a feast when he returned to his father's house. But, he was not put in charge of the family purse. That was left in control of the elder son who continued to work in the field and create income.

Today I want to talk about spending. I hope we can all derive some semblance of what constitutes wise spending.

On my office wall is a quotation: "Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

I am especially happy to have this opportunity today to talk to you folks who are those closest to the people—the elected county officials of our great State of Washington. You are the men and women who, when corruption raises its ugly head at the county level, consider it to be a family sorrow. You know the facts as only a close association with the people can give them to you. Partisanship among you is the exception, and not the rule. Above all, you, by instinct, have some concept of what is a wise and moral test for the expenditure of public funds, whether they be Federal, State, or yours. You know what the impacts will be, or ought to be.

By now, I think you know, that I'm not going to talk about the man who drove to Las Vegas in a $10,000 automobile and returned home in a $100,000 bus. I am going to talk about a responsibility we jointly share in the protection and the future of those who labor in the vineyards and whose toil makes all else possible. You know these people personally.

Let me say that I am familiar with your home rule theme:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately;

"Use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle;

"Utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval;

"Reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate;

"And for the continuing responsibilities that only National Government can undertake."

As your Federal Representative from this proud Fifth Congressional District, I am sure you can readily understand that I am greatly concerned with the last two items in this theme:

"Reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

I must note that this theme, upon which your entire national convention last year in New York City was based, follows closely the findings of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, set up in 1957, after President Eisenhower made suggestions before the Conference of Governors.

I wholeheartedly favor these findings. And, I believe it is only fair to note that former President Eisenhower tried repeatedly, in budget messages and in many other ways, to retard and reverse the trend toward an eventual monolithic, completely authoritarian state. He recognized that there is no natural stopping place short of that—except the emergence of State and local governments that see clearly the effect of the drift toward centralism on their eventual status as regions and branch offices. Today there is a resistance to being called a depressed area or chronic disaster county or State. The reasons are obvious. Five months after the Area Redevelopment Administration program began, the Secretary of Commerce, who is finally responsible for the ARA program, said he wished more officially designated depressed areas would conduct their own economic development programs. "Psychologically, it's bad to be called a 'depressed area'," he said. The Secretary also voiced impatience with the slow pace of ARA approvals of redevelopment projects.

However, little more than a month after the Secretary's criticism, the ARA Administrator issued another complete list of areas eligible for assistance under the area redevelopment program. This list contained 823 areas, covering 1,035 counties which would be eligible for aid. This figure represents nearly one-third of all counties in the United States. I must here insert a word of warning—three times as many projects have been programed than there is money to carry them out. And new applications pour in.

Several reasons are stated for the failure of Eisenhower to check the trend toward centralism.

1. The very momentum of that trend. It had its start in the 1920's as the Nation grappled with the adjustments that followed World War I. It grew with the great depression when frameworks of centralism were built into our system. The "march to Washington, D.C.," really began. Who can forget the National Recovery Administration or the Works Progress Administration, to name but two.

Millions of voters now in their thirties have known centralism as a natural fact of government. Yet, I have witnessed a resistance upon the part of our present crop of new voters, who take the time to analyze the inhibitions that the rising tide of monolithic authority imposes. They want to be liberated so that in a new freedom they can exercise their abilities to get ahead unshackled by the rising flood of controls, regulations, limitations and tax burdens. Their future is indeed our hope.

The second reason poses even greater concern. The shift in population patterns. Many who were reared in the atmosphere of rural self-reliance, moved to urban dependencies, where they made the tragic surrender to welfare as a way of life—and they vote that way.

3. The lack of stronghearted support by bureaucrats, who have floated so long in the swift channels of centralism. They have just rested on their oars. There is a race to be won in which you are admittedly concerned—but, bureaucracy cares for its own.

4. The force of circumstances which gave the articulate centralists, in and out of public life, readily understandable rallying slogans. There was Sputnik which begat missile gap; and the 1957–58 recession which begat various forms of Federal shots-in-the-arm and pump priming.

5. A deluge of disclosures regarding Soviet education, not always factual, sometimes misleading. These added form and direction

to great Federal programs in education in order to match the Russians.

6. For 6 years, Eisenhower did not control the Federal Congress and it is but natural that the frictions of politics reared its head to the final failure of any hope of the restoration of balance and the basic virtues of home rule.

7. The erosions of minority groups seeking dubious special privileges from the Federal Government.

It is like a breath of fresh air when I read the proceedings of your New York meeting. Here, I see you, a body of men, close to the people, witnessing the impacts of our changing world. You are diligently seeking the ways to meet the challenges of urbanization without losing the same principles of home rule. You are looking for wisdom in the expenditures of public money so that waste and squandering will not add momentum to the decline of the dollar. You resist the atmosphere of centralized despair so that our educated youth can see and seek the golden opportunities of the future. You know the problems your localities face—yet, you refuse to be overwhelmed by them. You see trees as just a part of the forest.

It is refreshing to me to see a group of men, orienting themselves so as to protect local government from improper excursions of their State governments, and from the invasion of the deadening uniformity of wasteful, costly, Federal programs with all their Federal Register ground rules, limits and stipulations. I do not attack the Federal Government—I merely applaud the logical courage of local government.

Yes, as I ponder your theme, I rejoice that you are the hope of the Nation, for you seek the restoration of the proper balance that will impede our mad rush toward the authoritarian state.

And, then I read this: "A Domestic Peace Corps—An Idea Worth Trying." It's the title of an editorial in the May issue of the County Officer by the executive director of your national organization.

Let me tell you—all the centralists need is their little toe in the door! Mighty oaks from little acorns grow; $120 billion worth of foreign aid grew out of a chance remark by General Marshall at Harvard shortly after World War II. The so-called "Volunteer," nonsalaried Peace Corps now spends over $60 million a year. That grew from a chance remark, too. The opening has to be mighty small that the centralist can't crawl through. Yet Congress is expected to pass a bill for such a program—and its eventual director has already been appointed.

Now, your executive director as an individual is entitled to his own opinion, but in his capacity as the executive director of your national organization, I suggest that he read the foreword that he, himself, wrote for your hearings at last year's convention, and particularly the speech by Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina. Also, I suggest he read excerpts from the hearings of my Agriculture Appropriations Committee held early this year.

My good friend, Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, allowed me to insert into our hearings two of his letters at the time we had the very able Dr. York of the Extension Service before us. We were discussing the subject so familiar to all of you—how can countries help themselves to permanent progress. The Domestic Peace Corps was mentioned. Senator LAUSCHE has been an outspoken opponent of it. In a letter to a young lady who agreed with him, he wrote, and I quote in part:

"What the members of this Peace Corps are to do has not yet been identified, nor has any description of it been sought to be given. If they are to do in the United States, the work which is now being done in foreign countries as the Peace Corps, they will be acting as teachers, social workers, and training an alleged underdeveloped people, to adopt advanced methods of fighting social, economic, and scientific confrontations.

"We have legions of Peace Corps workers already in our country. We have the ministers, priests, rabbis, the parents in the homes, teachers in our schools, the social workers in our governmental and private agencies, recreational workers in Federal, State, and local governments, the police and juvenile court officials, and the parole officers. We are reaching the point where we will have more guides working for the Government, than we have people to guide. In other words, the number of officers will exceed the number of soldiers who are to be commanded and directed."

Senator LAUSCHE pointed out that according to the 1960 census, we have 1,521,590 elementary and secondary school teachers; 96,686 social and welfare workers; 36,355 recreational welfare group leaders; 252,194 policemen and detectives; 23,930 sheriffs and bailiffs; 5,090 marshals and constables; 200,999 in the clergy.

He concludes: "This is a grand total of 2,147,663. The 1960 census shows that we have a population of 27,309,055 juveniles of the age bracket of 12 to 21 years. Without the parents, we have 1 worker to every 13 juveniles. This is another step in the direction of centralizing power in the present bureaus already existing in Washington."

You will note that the Senator does not mention boys' clubs, the YWCA or YMCA, the Boy Scouts, or Camp Fire groups, or any number of a whole legion of very worthwhile activities very much in this field. And, I might bring to your attention that an excellent article in Newsweek 2 years ago pointed out the encouraging fact that 97 percent of our juveniles are A-OK.

In Senator LAUSCHE's other letter to a gentleman who didn't agree with him, he commented: "For the Federal Government to supply workers to perform services in local and State communities will further deteriorate the Federal fiscal position and break down the integrity and independence of State and local governmental units."

Does it mean anything to you that we had to pass a bill allowing teachers to maintain discipline in Washington, D.C.'s schools by other than a stern look?

Just where are we? Our national debt exceeds the national debt of the nations of the entire world by an estimated $24 billion. For the free world, our presumed allies, our debt exceeds theirs by nearly $102 billion. As of April 5, 1963, our national debt stood at $303,470,080,480 and rising in the present atmosphere. The combined national debt of the rest of the free world is, in round figures, $201,500 million. Against the credit of our Nation are obligations such as social security and others that exceed $1 trillion. "Certainly," as CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, said, in commenting on the current budget, "this is no time for us to spend money we don't have for things we can get along without."

Personally, I reject this "living dangerously" in fiscal matters. Our Federal finances have been written in red ink for 28 of the last 34 years—and now we are asked to accept a "planned deficit" and to pass some sort of tax reduction at the same time. That's what a southerner would call "sorry management." We ought to be bending our efforts to reduce the national debt. It's costing $10 billion a year in carrying charges.

The spectacle of Uncle Sam standing on two horses like a Roman rider, with one foot perched precariously on the gaudy colors of tax reduction, and the other resting on the back of the sad silks of "planned" deficit spending, is a disturbing sight. Obviously these horses are not going to run in the same direction. Uncle Sam is going to have his leg pulled plenty—in fact, both of them—and he might even lose his pants.

It looks suicidal.

I am somehow reminded of the effervescent man about town who was sitting in the barber's chair, eyeing the pretty blonde manicurist appreciatively. "How about a date tonight?" he asked. "I don't know how my husband would feel about that," said the blonde. "Ask him," said the playboy. "Ask him yourself," the blonde replied, "he's shaving you."

Let's not flirt with the idea that Federal money is "free" money. Behind it all lies the stark fact that a preponderance of your tax dollar goes for, what we call in terms used in appropriations justifications, "salaries and expenses." As an example, figures from my Agriculture appropriations for fiscal 1963, show: $219 million to administer Commodity Stabilization and related agencies; $37 million to administer the Farmers Home Administration (it cost $37 million, yet here is an agency that I subscribe to—it has saved productive men, has restored taxpayers); $10½ million to administer REA; and, the Department of Agriculture is asking for $51½ million to run the food stamp plan in fiscal 1964—and, it is still listed as a "pilot" program. It costs a lot of money just to give things away. I mention Agriculture because I have been on that Appropriations subcommittee for 18 years. Administrative costs elsewhere are comparable.

Yes, it costs money to run these centralist programs—the big print too often tells you what you can do—and the small print tells you what you can't do.

As the farmer said about his insurance policy: "The big type gives it to you, and the small type takes it away."

It isn't quite as simple as the guide on the Washington, D.C., sightseeing bus described: "See all these fine big buildings—wonderful, aren't they. They don't cost the people a cent—the Government pays for it all."

The current issue of Nation's Business has a searching featured article: "Budget Cuts Would Boost Economy." The premise rests on: "An examination of the facts shows that dollars spent by taxpayers themselves contribute more to economic strength than Federal spending for two reasons: They create more jobs, and, they add more to productivity."

The article is fair and worth reading for those of us truly concerned with the wise expenditure of public money.

It's hard work, I know, for us to face up to some of these things, especially when the allurement of Federal money is so attractively waved at us. It looks like free money—one wants to embrace it to meet an immediate urgency. But, I like what Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina, told you last July in New York:

"I know how hard it is to get tax money locally, but it will cost all of us less if we get it locally to spend locally rather than letting the Federal Government get it locally to spend locally. This is like pouring buttermilk from one glass to another. By the time it gets to the third glass, there is about 20 percent less to drink."

We have been busy at the national level. While the President insisted that his budget for fiscal 1964, the largest in peacetime by far, was a "tight" budget, your Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, in the House, have so far reduced it by over a billion dollars. And, since we began to look over President Kennedy's shoulder, he, himself, has recommended further reductions of $674,078,000.

One can hope the Senate will help—but that remains to be seen. One reason they are sometimes called the "Upper" House is derived from their "upping" the appropriation bills we in the House send over there.

I have grown extremely suspicious of the glittering and platitudinous proposals that promise everything and produce such meager and such atrophying results.

I find myself voting "No" on so many proposals that lead away, in my honest opinion, from the encouragement of proud statehood and self-reliant local government.

Our vaunted Federal Government is not great within itself. Its power rests upon the greatness of the individual citizen whose sweat creates income and national credit, and whose freedom results in the glories of our cherished standards of morals and income.

Do you wonder that I am concerned about our ponderous debt, our sliding dollar, our bloated budgets that lead us headlong to the spurious pot-of-gold at the end of the rainbow?

I share with the President of the Union a desire to get this country going. Yet, after two years, unemployment remains virtually the same. The growth of centralism is the one thing that has really got going. The one promise that we politicians are usually careful not to make, is the promise that our election will assure the growth of bureaucracy. We would not run on a platform espousing the primrose path to the central, authoritarian state.

One of the most intriguing and disturbing programs before us is that of Federal participation in the business of rural and area economic improvement.

It began in 1955 with a proposal, the rural development program, to improve depressed rural counties. Some real gains have been recorded, surprisingly enough without the use of Federal money. The economic self-analysis that has honestly been faced by local people has been healthy in many ways. Secretary of Commerce Hodges apparently saw this when he said that he wished depressed areas would conduct their own economic development program.

Now we face a whole phalanx of alluring proposals, involving the injection of Federal moneys in a multitude of local communities. As I have said, far more than the money appropriated will allow. There is no doubt but that certain of these projects can be fully justified. If they lead to permanent progress, if they spell permanent jobs for taxpayers and are essential, they'll get all the support I can give or muster for them, for then local strength and initiative will follow.

But, I just can't bring myself to vote, as a palliative, for Federal money for swimming pools and golf courses. I can't bring myself to spend money we don't have for things we can get along without. The sad fact is that so much in the accelerated public works proposal, sounds like the old Works Progress Administration, and one cannot resist the thought that the centralists are going back to 1933, when our debt was $16 billion, to solve the problems of 1963, when our debt is over $300 billion. It is my belief that the Government, of, by, and for a free people should so liberate its industry that its own economy will produce these advantages for us; that is, if Federal bureaucracy will let us.

I believe that there is still sense in Ben Franklin's admonition that we should not build two fireplaces when we have fuel but for one.

I hope, by now, I have convinced you that I would have every American at least 9 feet tall as far as creative purpose is concerned—no matter what his stature or physical handicaps may be. I would build, if I could, the desire to measure up to the glory of this flag, this land of freedom—as a land of love, self-reliance, and opportunity.

It can be done. I have seen it in my time. From the sod houses of the Midwest, the log cabins of all States, the row houses of Baltimore and Washington, D.C., the tenement slums, the mansions, the tents, the trailers—wherever there is love and purpose—there comes forth a useful life. It is the product of family and local influence. Heavens. This is where the Federal Government collects its taxes.

Our destiny in the history of civilization rests with our strength, and not in a fruitless recitation of our weaknesses no matter what the moment's political advantage.

When I sometimes meditate on the conditions that made this country great, I arrive at the inescapable conclusion that there are a lot of laws we could well do without.

I hope you, too, will give some time to such thoughts. Think of the frustrations, the limitations, prohibitions and inferiority complexes that are so often the byproduct of statutes that began with such musical titles and even noble intent. We need to liberate the men and women who labor and create—not fence them in. Government should exist for them, as well—to further their cause too—not just for the purpose of spending excessive amounts of time and money on the unproductive.

Your meeting here today is an evidence of your desire to work in that direction. Our need is interdependence of an honorable partnership of local, State, and Federal Government—a stop to this ever-growing rush toward centralism.

Thank you for inviting me to be with you today, and allowing me to participate in this most constructive meeting and to enjoy such a refreshing atmosphere where men join together to discuss the problems of the very foundation upon which our great Nation rests.

Hon. R. Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, Gives Significant Address at 75th Anniversary Commencement of Salem (W. Va.) College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 is a significant year for all West Virginians, particularly those who have been closely associated with the steady growth of my alma mater, Salem College.

Located in Salem, W. Va., this small, private, liberal arts college is observing the anniversaries of events important in its life as an institution which molds American youth. This is the 10th year in which the helpful programs of the American Humanics Foundation have been in existence on the campus. Likewise, this is Salem's diamond jubilee year, and the 75th anniversary of its first commencement exercises held in 1888.

Finally, this is "Centennial '63"—West Virginia's 100th year of statehood, and the time set aside for commemoration of our past, and rededication to challenges of the future.

It was my privilege to be present at a portion of the 75th anniversary commencement exercises, and related programs at Salem College, which lasted from Friday, May 24, through Thursday, May 30.

On Tuesday, May 28, Mrs. Randolph and I hosted a luncheon in honor of the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps. In attendance were members of the faculty and board of directors of Salem College. Distinguished guests included: Charles R. Van Horn, assistant to the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; Mayor and Mrs. Roger E. Garrett, of Clarksburg, W. Va.; T. Edward Davis, chairman of the Salem College board of directors; Byron Randolph, West Virginia counsel for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation; Attorney Eugene Eason, of the Clarksburg committee; U.S. Attorney Robert Maxwell; Mrs. Samuel Kistler, chairman of the faculty committee; and Miss Alta Van Horn, academic consultant.

Also participating in the luncheon program was Dr. Alfred T. Hill, executive secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. Dr. Hill expressed a meaningful tribute to Director Shriver and to Salem College, indicating that our West Virginia institution is contributing much to the advancement of quality education.

I request that the comments of Dr. Hill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, a second gathering of special note took place on Tuesday, May 28, at Salem College—the recognition convocation, at which the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver gave the inspiring message. It was my privilege to introduce the Peace Corps Director, and to comment on his commendable achievements as leader of this worldwide venture toward improved international understanding.

Director Shriver presented a dynamic address, discussing the qualifications of America as the leader of the free world. He pointed out that we have entered a grave period in which both our capabilities and our resolve will be sorely tested, and expressed the confidence that young Americans would respond with determination.

I request that my introductory greeting, and the address of Hon. Sargent Shriver at the recognition convocation of Salem College, May 28, 1963, be reprinted at the conclusion of these remarks.

The 75th anniversary commencement exercises of Salem College were held on Thursday, May 30, and were attended by approximately 1,000 persons.

Focal point of the week's activities was reached when Dr. K. Duane Hurley, president of Salem College, conferred degrees on a graduating class of 133, one of the largest in Salem's history. However, an effective part of the program was carried forward by the students themselves.

John Griggs, student federation president for the coming year, thanked those organizations and private groups which have materially assisted in the expansion of Salem College. Larry Miller, student federation president for 1962–63, spoke of the support that Salem has received from individuals through the years. He especially singled out for praise the late Michael L. Benedum, Dr. and Mrs. A. S. Burdick, Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Davis, and Mr. and Mrs. Harper Ramsburg. The final student speaker was Jennings Randolph, Jr., great grandson of Jesse Randolph, first chairman of the board of Salem College. He pointed out ways in which the Federal Government can participate in education, in making possible long-range plans, student loans, and programs for housing, building and research.

President Hurley announced that in keeping with the commencement theme "Partners in Education," specific recognition would be given to organizations and persons whose interest in education has made academic excellence possible at Salem. Members of the Salem College Board of Directors presented citations and plaques to the recipients, as follows: Edwin Bond, of Salem, to William Wilson, C.I.T. Financial Corporation representative; Mrs. Oscar Nelson, of Charleston, to Attorney Byron Randolph, attorney for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation; Board of Directors Chairman T. Edward Davis, of Salem, to James Hosey, representative of the United States Steel Foundation; Sanford Randolph of Clarksburg, W. Va., to Walter Koupal, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation representative; and, Harley D. Bond of Plainfield, N.J., to H. K. Baer, secretary of the State board of education. As a member of the board of directors of Salem College it was my joy to present an award to Jay DeVon, director of the College Housing Branch of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. Almost $1 million in loans have been made for buildings on the campus.

Dr. William C. Sanborn, academic dean, presented to President Hurley the graduating class. Degrees were awarded and the ceremonies were concluded with the reading of the beautiful poem, "This Is Salem College," by the author, Dr. John Nelson, of Clarksburg.

I request that the poem "This Is Salem College" be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

Also taking part in the commencement exercises were: Rev. W. S. Patterson, minister of the Salem Methodist Church, who gave the invocation; Rev. Edward W. Turns, pastor of the Salem Baptist Church, who read the scripture; Rev. C. W. P. Hansen, pastor of the Salem Seventh Day Baptist Church, who gave the opening prayer; and Rev. Mendell L. Gainer, pastor of the Salem Evangelical United Brethren Church, who offered the benediction.

At the baccalaureate service, held Sunday evening at the Nathan Goff Armory, Clarksburg, W. Va., an inspirational and meaningful message was brought by Dr. M. S. Harvey, minister of the First Methodist Church of Akron, Ohio. In his sermon "Six Weeks 'Til Frost," Dr. Harvey made reference to the life and worthwhile work of the famed West Virginia oil tycoon, Michael Late Benedum. Col. Paul G. Benedum, nephew of the late industrialist-philanthropist, received an honorary doctorate in humanities at the baccalaureate. Col. Benedum is now president of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, a group which has been instrumental in advancing many educational projects in the Mountain State.

During the observances of the 75th anniversary commencement a degree was also conferred on Hon. R. Sargent Shriver. The Peace Corps Director received the honorary degree of doctor of humanics at the recognition convocation, May 28.

Mr. President, Salem College has proven itself a valued and respected member of the academic community, and has been faithful in its service to the citizens of West Virginia. For three-quarters of a century Salem has existed for no other purpose than to provide for its sons and daughters a sound background of intellectual, moral, and spiritual discipline. Its success has added significantly to the dignity and strength of this Nation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greetings to Salem College

(By Alfred T. Hill, executive secretary, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges)

Senator Randolph, Mr. Shriver, President Hurley, distinguished guests, and friends of Salem College, it is my privilege and pleasure to bring you greetings on the 75th anniversary of Salem College from the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

I believe, Mr. Shriver, that you and I have more in common than we have realized. You have been dealing through the Peace Corps with what have been called underdeveloped countries. They might now more appropriately be called the fastest growing countries. I have been working through Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges with what were once described as underdeveloped colleges. They are now known as America's fastest growing colleges.

Seven years ago, when Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges was founded, it was characterized by the slogan, "the forgotten colleges." In order to boost its own morale in its early days, the council adopted the slogan, "the noise you hear is progress." Now it is living up genuinely to its more mature slogan, "advancing quality education."

Salem, on its 75th anniversary, with a booming enrollment, several new buildings recently completed and another just started, recent acceptance into membership of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, a recent grant of the $25,000 quality improvement award from the United States Steel Foundation, and a long-range development campaign in progress, is a good example of the last two slogans. Certainly it is no longer a "forgotten college."

One of the reasons why it will never be forgotten is the friendship and influence of men like Senator Jennings Randolph. His grandfather, Jesse Randolph, was the first chairman of the board of Salem in 1889. His father, Ernest Randolph, was the first degree graduate from the college in 1894 and served on the board for 11 years. Senator Randolph was graduated from Salem in 1924 and has been a trustee for 40 years. His son, Jennings Randolph, Jr., will graduate from Salem this week. This record of four generations of one family in close association with this college is one of the more unusual stories of higher education in America—a story in which we can all take pride.

I hope some day the phrase, "Federal aid to education," will be abolished and in its place will be substituted the phrase, "Federal investment in education." What I mean by this is well illustrated by the case of Salem College. The Federal Government has contributed billions of dollars to higher education covering a wide range of activities and penetrating the system in depth. And in return each generation has reaped the reward of the investment made by the preceding generation. Take Salem, for example. This one small college has contributed four U.S. Senators, two U.S. Congressmen, two State Governors, and hundreds of alumni serving in the public school systems within a radius of 200 miles. In other words, the investment of public funds has produced a high yield in terms of public service from this small college far out of proportion to its size, age, and wealth This story could be repeated in essence by many similar small colleges across the country.

Salem College is a great institution not because of its size but because of the intellectual content of its curriculum. It is great not because of the research or publications of its faculty members, but because of their dedication to good classroom teaching. It is great not because of the number of courses listed in its catalog, but because of its traditions of patriotism, scholarship, and preparation for public service. It is great not because of its distinguished alumni, but because of the moral content of its academic program. Salem has been dedicated for 75 years to the main task of higher education, namely, the development among its students of ideas and ideals.

This is why I consider it an honor to bring greetings and congratulations on its 75th anniversary to Salem College from the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges—an organization of small, private, liberal arts colleges dedicated to advancing quality education.

Remarks of Senator Jennings Randolph in Introduction of Hon. R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, Recognition Convocation, Salem College, Salem, W. Va.

It is a genuine privilege to participate in the recognition convocation ceremonies honoring the Salem College graduating class of 1963.

This is a particularly significant occasion, not merely because of the fact that Salem is my alma mater, or because of my more-than-casual acquaintance with one of the degree candidates [Jennings Randolph, Jr.]; today is an important day because it is in a sense the anniversary of achievements which have become meaningful in the history of our college.

This is the 10th year in which the helpful programs of the American Humanics Foundation have been in existence on this campus. For a decade, service-minded young men and women have had the opportunity to receive training for lives of youth leadership—careers in guidance and counseling, scouting, or as leaders of other community-oriented organizations.

And, this is Salem College's Diamond Jubilee Year. For three-quarters of a century this institution has existed with no other aim than to provide for its sons and daughters a sound background of intellectual, moral, and spiritual discipline. The life of each graduate is testimony to this goal.

Finally, these exercises are held during "Centennial '63"—West Virginia's 100th year of statehood and the time set aside for commemoration of our past, and a rededication to the tasks of the future. This, too, lends solemnity to the occasion.

Members of the Salem College class of 1963, are fortunate to graduate amid such history and recognition. However, in my view, they are not the only favored ones. Every young American who will finish his undergraduate education in May and June will be entering a world of challenge, a world of change, a world of contradiction. There is vital work to be done. There are monumental problems which must be overcome and bitter conflicts which must be resolved.

Youth will find myriad opportunities to participate in the struggle to achieve for mankind a better way of life, and to bring forth new understanding among the peoples of the earth. Each in his indilvdual way will contribute to the sum total of this effort and each role is important. We remember the words of Edward Everett Hale, who said: "I am only one, but still I am one. I cannot do everything, but still I can do something." My young friends, you possess the power to "do something." I trust you possess the purpose.

There is in the world today an ideal example of people that "do something." They are found at the far corners of the earth, teaching mathematics to Filipinos * * * helping Peruvians to build roads * * * bringing modern health methods and medicines to Nigeria * * *. The pay is small, the hours long—but the personal rewards are abiding. They are the men and women of the Peace Corps, an organization ably headed by our speaker.

Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver is a "doer" also. He is a gifted administrator, a keen judge of personnel, a determined worker. With what eminent news analyst Edward P. Morgan has called "a touch of genius and a truckload of determination" he and his coworkers have welded a heterogeneous group of volunteers into an effective force for improved global understanding. He is harnessing the vigor, enthusiasm, and fresh ideas of youth and the maturity of older folk, with results that have evoked favorable reactions from knowledgeable leaders throughout the world.

Our honored guest brought rare and valuable qualifications to his present assignment. He has seen service as a school board member, lawyer, and editor, as well as being active in interracial groups, charity endeavors, and educational activities. He has been general manager of the Merchandise Mart, in Chicago, the world's largest commercial office building, has served aboard submarines and battleships during World War II, and received honorary degrees from seven institutions.

Director Shriver personifies the trend toward young ideas and the fresh approach. In its information program on Capitol Hill the Peace Corps has the disturbing habit of distributing information about itself that is not always completely complimentary. When questioned on this unusual policy, Mr. Shriver explained that it was planned that way so that no one could accuse the Corps of spending money just to praise itself. And he has displayed a decided penchant for economy, frequently using less than his budget, and insuring that Corps volunteers are accorded no special privileges. This intent to keep his own house in order and willingness to see all sides of a situation are winning for Mr. Shriver a position of genuine respect.

The Peace Corps is an international human relations force manned by "doers." It expresses to nations and, equally important, to peoples of good will the sincere concern of America. It promotes global harmony through the mutual understanding of joint effort. It has for its leader one of the truly dynamic young Americans in public life.

Friends, I present the Director of the Peace Corps, the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, DIRECTOR, PEACE CORPS, AT SALEM COLLEGE

In speaking to you men and women of Salem College, I want to set forth not the doctrine of what Theodore Roosevelt called ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the demanding life, the life of sacrifice and service, of work and toil in the interest of your country.

Around this globe people are wondering if Americans can live that doctrine as well as they preach it. There is one big question: Is America qualified to lead the free world? Why are they asking it? Why is there doubt? Because of the evidence that Americans have gone soft and are no longer capable of sustained personal sacrifice for their country. The president of one of our largest universities says we are beset by "spiritual flabbiness." I recently heard it said that we are producing a strange new kind of human being—"a guy with a full belly, an empty mind, and a hollow heart."

John Steinbeck, writing to Adlai Stevenson, pointed with alarm to four impressions of the American people he has gained in the last few years: First, a creeping, all-pervading immorality; second, a hunger, a thirst, a yearning for something unknown; third, the violence, cruelty, and hypocrisy symptomatic of a people which has too much; and, fourth, the surly, ill temper that afflicts human beings when they are frightened.

Where do we go to gather additional evidence? We might pick up the New York Times and glance at the accounts of price-fixing in the business community and featherbedding in the labor movement.

We might call as a witness Forrest Evashevski, athletic director at Iowa State, who would tell us that when he recommended a top graduate for a job with a major American company, the first question the young man asked was: "What are the pension benefits?"

Americans are not alone, however, in doubting the intellectual and spiritual fiber of modern America. I encountered these doubts all around the world on my first trip. "Yours was the first revolution," I was told in India by Ashadevi, a vigorous, woman associate of Mahatma Ghandi. "Do you think young Americans possess the spiritual values they must have to bring the spirit of that revolution to our country? Your Peace Corps must touch the idealism of America and bring that to us. Can you do it?"

She put that question to me and I pass it on to you—to those of you who may be saying, as college graduates often do: "I cannot think of anything to do."

Let me tell you that a world is waiting for you, and there is plenty to do.

On May 3 the new Prime Minister of Nyasaland in Africa, Dr. Hastings Banda, sent a personal letter to our President at the White House in Washington. Here is what he wrote:

"I should like you, personally, to know how very greatly I and my people appreciate the fine work which is being carried out by your Peace Corps volunteers in Nyasaland.

"These young men and women are true ambassadors—with their youth and vigor, their friendliness and kindness, their sense of mission, their conception of service to the community, their dedication to the work in hand, their feeling for justice and their tolerance—they embody characteristics to which your Nation, Mr. President, owes much of its greatness.

"I am most grateful to them and to your Government, sir, for the services which they are rendering to my people.

"In addition to expressing my appreciation of the work and influence of the Corps in Nyasaland, I have one other motive in writing this letter.

"It is to express the hope that you and your Government will be able to provide me with the services of more volunteers.

"We shall shortly be in great need of a considerable number of additional trained personnel—particularly doctors, nurses, engineers, lawyers, and secondary school teachers.

"It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that you and your Government will feel able to help my people in this way. Indeed we look to you for such assistance until we have produced a sufficiency of trained men and women for our own purpose. I venture to hope, sir, that we shall not look in vain."

Dr. Banda's request for more Peace Corps volunteers in Nyasaland is duplicated in 50 countries. Our files are full of such letters.

Why is it that this African patriot, the George Washington of Nyasaland, so ardently speaks about the work of the Peace Corps volunteers while he advocates Africa for the Africans? Why do President Nkrumah of Ghana, President Sekou Toure of Guinea, and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia request more Peace Corps volunteers and at the same time politely deport thousands of skilled European technicians?

Why is it that in the late 1950's we were all shocked at the spectacle of the Vice President of the United States being spat upon and derided in Latin American universities, and "Yankee, Go Home" was a popular slogan of the underdeveloped world. Yet today the Peace Corps volunteers are being received warmly and worldwide.

Why is this?

First, of overwhelming importance is the fact that the Peace Corps volunteers are members of a new generation in the United States, members of your generation, not mine. They represent what you think and believe in, not what your parents or grandparents thought. They are not burdened with old prejudices. They are not tired, or bored—they are not self-satisfied, they do not think they have all the answers—they are willing to learn from other nations and other cultures. They enjoy the chance to work on their own without constant supervision by their elders. They are confident; they are courageous; they are eager to serve their fellow man.

Peace Corps volunteers average 26 years of age. Of them, 4,324 are now serving in 45 countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. By Christmas 9,000 of them will be at work overseas. They are teachers, farmers, nurses, fishermen, mechanics, geologists, librarians, electricians, bricklayers, athletic coaches, community development workers. They are free American citizens who have volunteered to work in a foreign country, free to operate in their assignments as they think best, and subject only to the rules of conduct observed by any responsible adult in a free society. They aré not forced to follow some party line which we enunciate from Washington.

A Peace Corps volunteer, therefore, is really a "rare bird." He is unique. He goes to a foreign country to work within that country's system; he helps fill their needs as they see them; he speaks their language; he lives in the way they live and under their laws; he does not try to change their religion; he does not seek to make a profit from conducting business in their country; he does not interfere in their political or military affairs.

And because of this he has been welcomed where others were turned away.

But I do not believe the tremendous response to the Peace Corps was an accident—or the result of a mere desire for adventure. Its success is because it reflects the deepest currents of the American tradition. A tradition nowhere better exemplified than here in West Virginia.

It is the tradition summed up by Lincoln when, at Edwardsville, Ind., he admonished his countrymen: "What constitutes the bulwark of your own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements or bristling sea coasts. * * * our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in lands everywhere."

I would be the first to admit that we have not always been true to this tradition. We have not always supported freedom abroad nor fully realized it at home. At times we have been aggressive in our attitude toward others or unjust in our attitude toward our own citizens. We have sometimes failed to understand the aspiration of people in other lands or to fulfill the hopes of our own people—and no one knows this better than the people of West Virginia.

These principles are still deeply embedded in the lives of those who live across our land. It is because the men and women of the Peace Corps are the inheritors of these beliefs, because they have absorbed them in the schoolrooms and churches, on the farms and cities of our country, that they have been able to cross barriers of language and culture, religious faith and social structure, to touch the deep chord of common hope and principle which belongs to all men.

The first of these principles is the conviction that the goals of the American Revolution against colonial rule were universal goals. We were not simply fighting for American values; we were part of the greater revolution of man as he struggles to be free. It was expressed by Thomas Jefferson when in a letter to George Washington, he wrote, "Every man and every body of men on earth possess the right of self-government. They receive it with their being from the hand of nature." Today others are fighting for the same right of self-government throughout this world. And it is because our volunteers believe that no nation has the right to impose its will on others that they welcome the opportunity to go out and help others carry forward this great work. Our debt of gratitude to the developing and emerging nations of the world is that they have reminded us of our own traditions. We were in danger of losing our way among the television sets, the supermarkets, and the material abundance of a rich society. By letting us participate in their struggles they have given us a chance to find ourselves.

The second of these principles is our deep belief in a pluralistic world society. We built a country out of many lands and from people of a hundred different backgrounds and beliefs. Today our President is the grandson of an immigrant to Boston. His predecessor came from the rural heartland of America. Our Original States warred against each other for commerce and territory. And today there are still frictions and difficulties between regions and faiths and colors. But the success we have had in building a free nation lies in our confidence in a society which contains many societies. Our strength lies in the richness of our differences. And thus we do not fear the liberating discords of a pluralistic world society. We do not seek to impose a monolithic creed or system on the rich diversity of humanity. Thus our volunteers go out, not to change peoples but to help them build their own societies as they themselves desire to build them.

Third of these principles is the belief in the power of individual moral conscience to remake the world—that man has a higher duty than his obligation to party or state: a duty to conscience and common humanity. This belief in man's inner moral conscience not only makes the welfare of the individual the first concern of man, but compels men to dedicate their energies to the service of others. In the last analysis it is not governments or organization which will bring fruition to man's hopes but the energies and talents of millions of individuals working across national borders and dedicated to the service of mankind.

A great American philosopher expressed this when he wrote: "Let our affection flow out to our fellows; it would operate in a day the greatest of all revolutions." That same belief is the root of the Peace Corps idea.

The last of these principles is American optimism—the belief that all things are possible to men of determination and energy and a willingness to toil. This belief came naturally to those who threw off the bonds of colonial rule and succeeded, with their own efforts, in subduing a wild and rich continent. But this same sense of man's limitless capacity is also moving now in Africa, in Asia, in Europe, and Latin America. It has brought freedom to millions and inspires tireless efforts to build new societies.

These principles are fundamental human beliefs. On them rests the strength of our Nation. They have now stirred us to action in sending out thousands of Americans dedicated on a world scale to the same cause which built our Nation. As we help others to build their societies, they, in turn, help us to strengthen ours.

These are the American principles which have given shape and meaning to the Peace Corps. This is what the Peace Corps represents.

And because it is your Peace Corps, I envy you.

Other generations of West Virginians have had the chance to fight for these principles on the field of battle. And they responded with immense determination and courage.

You can now struggle for the same cause with the tools of peace and progress—your skills and thought and dedication.

A Peace Corps volunteer, David Crozier, was killed in a motor vehicle accident in Colombia. He had written his parents: "If it came to it, I had rather give my life helping these people rather than looking down a gun barrel at them."

Across the world are hundreds of millions of people struggling to break the bonds which chain them to lives of poverty and disease and hoplessness. You, the citizens of this historic State, have the chance—through the Peace Corps and in a dozen different ways to help them break those bonds.

By rising to this challenge—this unprecedented opportunity never before offered to any generation of Americans—you will carry forward, across the world, the same ideals which your ancestors labored for here in these hills and farms. You will be giving the answer to those who doubt whether America still has the toughness and dedication which made her great.

This Is Salem College (Diamond Jubilee)

(By John F. Nelson)

"In the beginning, God,"
These hills, this lovely valley,
A colony, a yearning,
A valley of learning.
This is Salem College.

What depth of soil has settled here,
Whence waters run to the sea,
What eagerness of mind,
So sure to find,
With masters of life and logic,
What God designs to be.
This is Salem College.

Carefully nursed in infancy,
Its childhood gravely shaken
By fears and tears,
While across the years,
Battles were lost but campaigns won
With a generalship that cost
Bended knees and wee hours—
This is Salem College.

Not at the top does learning begin,
But somewhere farther down;
Minds, like skyscrapers, are deeply bound
To ancient rock, yet alive and free,
Building vigor, honor, and knowledge,
Not a "tower of Babel,"
But a temple of humility.
This is Salem College.

New times require new maps,
More space and quality;
Challenged by modernity and awe
With poundings at the door,
How can we meet the call?
"Go forward," said God, "and see."
So often, in the crucial hour,
Came decisive forces—and more.
This is Salem College.

From everywhere, they came
To this magnetic center,
They worked; they played;
Made friends and prayed;
Endeared to their alma mater,
Never rejecting,
Always respecting.
See them on the slopes of life;
Servants of man on every plateau;
With some at the very top,
The glory of God, reflecting.
This is Salem College.

So here we are in sixty-three
Our diamond jubilee.

These hills, this lovely valley,
But behold:
A wider community yearning;
A greater valley of learning.
This is Salem College.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 2: *Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth.*

Eternal God, our Father, may we daily feel the urge to ascend and reach up to new heights of dedication to Thee and to the true, the beautiful, and the good.

May we be eager to respond to the call of our country to give our very best and have our life count in making our social order nobler and better.

Help us to protect our Nation from those disintegrating and diabolical forces which would undermine those foundation stones of morality and religion upon which the Founding Fathers sought to build our Republic.

Give us a passion for justice and righteousness and a longing to be obedient to law and order and to contribute to the honor and prestige of our democracy.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

Senate Resolution 153

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Francis E. Walter, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Thursday next.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—TRAVEL AUTHORITY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 376, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is hereby authorized to send not more than six of its members on June 8, 1963, to Paris, France, on aviation matters.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee in carrying out its official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code:

Provided, (1) That no member of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is simply an authorization to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to send not more than six of its members on June 8, 1963, to Paris, France, on aviation matters. It also provides that for the purposes of the trip the six members of the committee may expend counterpart funds, but that they must account for the same as set forth in the resolution. These members will attend an international aviation conference, where there will be lectures and demonstration of new aerial equipment, and aviation systems.

This resolution writes into law the safeguards which it spells out. Had we had these safeguards in the past, Members of the House would have avoided the criticism that has been heaped upon them in connection with foreign travel.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy over this resolution. However, I would say that the significance it has is that it might become the format for travel authorizations for membership of the House. Therefore, the ramifications of it might be a little broader than as applied just to this one convention or this one circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well to point out that this resolution, I think, deals in specifics rather than in some rather nebulous terms which has been true heretofore. Therefore it comes to the floor of the House without opposition from the Rules Committee. If there is opposition to the resolution it has not come to the attention of the members of the Rules Committee.

In the first place, it provides travel to a place——

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this subject and the interest that the membership should have in it, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Berry
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Chenoweth
Clausen
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Edwards
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gill
Goodell
Gubser
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Holifield
Long, Md.
McLoskey
Miller, Calif.
Montoya
Morris
Morton
Nedzi
O'Konski
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Colo.
Rostenkowski
Roybal
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Watson
Westland
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall, 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—TRAVEL AUTHORITY

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I stated just before the quorum call that in my judgment the importance or significance of this resolution is not so much in the authorization itself, but that it very well could become a format for the travel authorization resolutions of other Members of the House subsequently.

I was about to point out that this resolution, different from some others that we have had before the House, deals in specifics. It designates the place to which members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expect to travel. It states there will be no more than six members to take this trip, and it has some very severe—and I think that is right—severe limitation on what their spending limitation will be. It is even less flexible than the general resolution favorably considered by the House some weeks ago, and now pending in the other body. That resolution, if you will recall, authorizes a Member, at his choice, to elect whether he will accept a per diem that is scheduled for each foreign country or whether he will elect to itemize and be reimbursed for such items as are reimbursable. This particular resolution removes the option. There is no option on this. He cannot elect to itemize such items as are reimbursable. He can spend no more and expect to be repaid or reimbursed for no more than the per diem that has been scheduled by the Bureau of the Budget. That varies, of course, from country to country.

I am advised by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that there is some very narrow flexibility and that would be for some members of the executive branch and of the House, but basically—basically, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it would be the amount that is stipulated in that schedule.

The other two restrictions are that the Member is limited to the actual cost of transportation and further that wherever counterpart funds are available they will be utilized rather than appropriated funds.

If there is interest, and I am sure there is, on the part of the Members of the House, as to why the committee is going to Paris, France, as is recited in the resolution, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now on the floor and he can elaborate on that, if necessary. It is to attend an international aviation conference and there is certain experimental equipment in the way of flight control and technical control centers that will be demonstrated and they will be observed by these members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the regular business of the House and special orders previously entered into, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say, I know of no objection to this resolution. If there is any objection, it has not come to the attention of the members of the Committee on Rules or at least it has not come to the attention of this particular member. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit while the House is in session today and engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—TRAVEL AUTHORITY

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], in order that the gentleman may propound a question, I presume, of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The statement was made that this resolution represented the format which would be used in future resolutions. I would like to know whether or not it would be appropriate to include in this and future resolutions some brief statement indicating what the purpose of the trip may be so that the Members of the House could have this information and so that the resolution, when passed would specify the purposes of the trip. As the resolution now stands, the only indication shown is that the trip is on "aviation matters." This appears to me to be a bit general. Possibly this is not appropriate, but I am curious to known what the answer would be.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolution as stated provides that the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would attend a program of aviation matters in Paris, France. We included more than just the flag show of the World Aviation Industry to be held in Paris at that time, because the Federal Aviation Agency, under the 1958 act, has control of navigation aids for the military; that is, the Navy and the Army. We have a good many control tower operations in Europe and of course from the United States across the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, the C–135 is a laboratory ship. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency intends to conduct his usual tests of these navigation aids across the Atlantic and of those control operations in Europe with this laboratory ship while it is there. For that reason we included more than just going directly to Paris and back.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I see. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for that response, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] for yielding.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I might say to the gentleman that it is a highly important aviation meeting. It is one which is sponsored periodically by France. Representatives of the aviation industry throughout the world attend these meetings.

I might say for the benefit of the Members of the House that the laboratory ship, the C–135, which is a 707, is going to be on display for a period of 2 days during this meeting so that the aviation industry throughout the world may observe the operations of the United States with reference to such a ship, if they so desire. We expect there will be many who will go through it. We are invited to go with them on the trip; that is, on the ship which is making the trip. There will be no transportation costs involved because we are going on the plane which will be on display.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a question.

I wonder if there could be some encouragement given at this time to American manufacturers to buy American-made jetplanes instead of foreign-made jetplanes? I notice that one airline is buying six or seven big foreign-made jets that will take a good many millions of dollars out of this country and add to our distressed balance of payments situation.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman raises a very propitious question. It is true that one of our American international carriers did on yesterday announce the purchase of six of these supersonic planes that are being now developed through the joint cooperation of the British and the French Governments, so I am reminded.

It is also true that our own aviation industry should give a lot of attention—and I happen to know that it is—but it would cost this Government a great deal of money—toward the development of supersonic jets, and it has been suggested that on this particular mission that not only our committee but the Committee on Armed Services, which is likewise going to have a group on this particular mission, not with us but during the same time, that consideration be given to the supersonic plane.

We decided, however, we would not have the time to go into that; therefore, we did not ask for authority to look into that problem when we were there. I do hope later on we will have occasion to do it because it is going to be highly important in the future of the aviation industry of this country if we do not do something.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to point out that at the present time practically every international airline in the world is using American jets, which has brought a lot of money into this country. The reason they are using them is because they are the fastest and best they can buy. At the moment nobody in this country is developing a supersonic jet. Not wanting to be left behind when other airlines buy supersonic jets, Pan American placed an order at the only place where they are available. I think this might be a little argument to spend some money to develop these planes so that we can stay No. 1 in the world in providing airplanes for international travel.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to commend Pan American for its usual vision and farsightedness in making a contract with the British and French Governments for the delivery of one of these planes on a rotation basis with our own Government. I might say that the ones that are being developed have a speed of 1,400 miles an hour. I think that will give a boost to our own aviation industry so that we can develop one that is superior to this one that is now on the board of the British and French Government.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said that we were putting on exhibition at the meeting in Paris a supersonic airliner.

Mr. HARRIS. No. The gentleman did not say we were putting on an exhibition of supersonic planes. I said they were having this aviation show and we were putting on exhibition the FAC-C-135. This is what we call a laboratory ship with all the test equipment necessary for the Federal Aviation Agency to carry out its responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. We make no supersonic airliners?

Mr. HARRIS. There are none at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman from Ohio said they were buying supersonic airliners?

Mr. HARRIS. I mentioned the fact they entered into a contract for the purchase of six, but they will not be delivered until probably 1968.

Mr. GROSS. I am unable to understand what they are getting that is so much better from the French and British Governments than our own aircraft factories can produce.

Mr. HARRIS. To get an airplane that will travel 1,400 miles an hour instead of 700 miles an hour.

Mr. GROSS. And a good deal cheaper; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. I would not say that. We do not know what the cost will be.

Mr. HAYS. It should be said that the development of this airplane is going to cost a lot of money. Up to now the three companies, Douglas, Lockheed, and Boeing, have not been willing to risk their own capital in developing these planes. This plane is on the drawing boards of the British and French combine, but they say they can deliver one in 1968 that will travel 1,400 miles an hour. Boeing spent a good many millions of dollars in developing one that would do 500 miles an hour. They said they would perform as they stated they would perform and many airlines bought airplanes from Boeing and Douglas, but it cost them a lot of money to develop this. The record will show that both Douglas and Lockheed have lost money on the jets that are now flying. I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that Pan American should be congratulated for having the foresight to contract for planes which will keep them in business; because, as I understand it, if in 1968 you can fly the Atlantic in 1½ or 2 hours, you are not going to take a plane that takes 6 hours.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have somewhat digressed from our original discussion of the resolution, I am inclined to make a further comment myself on the subject which we have just discussed. Probably one of the most desirable commercial planes that we have now is the Boeing 707. Where did the Boeing 707 come from? It was the old KC-135. It was a modification from a military plane.

Now, I would like to remind the Members of the House that we have had another project on the drawing boards of the Department of Defense and related industry. The B-70, now the RS-70. So, if you talk about mach 2 or mach 3 planes, I would admonish you to review the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] when the House debated the military procurement bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman from Kansas made reference a moment ago to the B-70 and insisted that the House should reconsider its position in regard to that aircraft. I might just comment to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the House has already appropriated something on the order of $1.3 billion for the development of three B-70 aircraft, mach 3 aircraft, which could conceivably, if it becomes successful, be used as a supersonic plane. The other day the Air Force announced that the schedule for flying this plane was further delayed, and the sentiment now is that it will not be in the air for another 5 or 6 months. In other words, we have done everything this House could do to speed up this kind of plane. We do not need elaborate radar equipment for the B-70 to make a supersonic airplane, and I join the gentleman from Kansas in the hope that the B-70 will get up in the air, and if it does not work as a bomber, it may work as a supersonic airliner.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 388) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, be, and he is hereby elected chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 386 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6500) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 386 provides for consideration of H.R. 6500, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6500 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1964.

The bill as approved by the Committee on Armed Services totals $1,633,472,000 and provides construction authorization in support of the Active Forces, the Reserve components, defense agencies, and family housing.

The military construction requirements outlined in the bill were developed on the same basis as were the Departments' requirements previously presented to the Congress for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. This involves the so-called package program concept of identifying out military force structure with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities required to discharge, most effectively, these assigned mission responsibilities.

The authorization program for fiscal year 1964 is based on a 5-year projection of the missions and forces to be supported through fiscal year 1968. Such projects are particularly important in planning military construction, in view of the leadtime required for many construction projections.

The authorizations requested in this bill, generally speaking, will cover construction which is required to be in place no later than the end of fiscal year 1966.

The total amount of new construction authority originally requested by the departments for fiscal year 1964 amounted to $1,941 million. The Department of Defense together with the Bureau of the Budget reduced the total of these military department requests approximately $814 million.

The Committee on Armed Services, after extensive hearings by the full committee on the departments' request, reduced the bill another $243 million. The action of the committee in reducing the bill does not in any way impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor does it in any way jeopardize our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 386.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, with all of the distinguished members of the Committee on the Armed Services who are here present today and who will discuss the bill later in general debate, there is little need for a member of the Rules Committee to utilize very much time of the House. I will only say this: The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] advised the Rules Committee that this was the best bill that he had ever brought to the floor of the House. For a Member who has been bringing bills before the House for 50 years, I would say that would make this a pretty classical matter, and inasmuch as most of the bills he has presented to us have passed with very little opposition I would say that we need not be greatly concerned as to the merits of the matter we will discuss and probably not debate here this afternoon.

Any comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, would not be to the detailed provisions of the bill, because this would be adequately covered, I am sure, later on in general debate.

I think there are about two or three policy provisions though that have been enunciated or pointed out on this bill which should be spread on the record at this point. They are not actually new but were new last year and have been further supported by provisions of the section of the bill.

No. 1, there shall be no Capehart authorizations approved by Congress. They were terminated last year. That policy is set forth further in this bill this year. In other words, there will be no FHA guaranteed loans for military housing. Such military housing as will be constructed will be made possible by appropriated funds. In that connection I think that the chairman told us yesterday there are 10,000 new units provided for in this bill. This is a few less than were requested by the Department of Defense.

In that same connection another statement was interesting, one I had not heard before; and I hope that the staff and the Members will check to see if I understood it properly. That is, that the military, despite all the existing military housing and it seems that we have quite a bit, still depends on non-Government-owned housing for 80 percent of their requirements. I think this is a rather interesting observation. On that basis I think we may probably anticipate that there will be continued requests for more military housing from year to year as long as our Armed Forces are kept up to their present strength.

Another policy concerned housing and military construction. The chairman advised the Committee on Rules that it has been their policy in the last 2 or 3 years to equate authorizations with funded projects; in other words, not to tolerate a long lead of authorized projects for which there are no requests for funding; where the authorization has been approved and the funding has not been provided by the Committee on Appropriations. The committee now has a policy that they will repeal any unfunded authorization that has been standing for a period of 3 years or more.

A further point which does not involve precisely a policy matter, but was interesting, is that there is very little real estate that is being authorized for acquisition in this bill. The Department of Defense had requested about 17,000 acres plus. This has been reduced to about 2,500 plus.

The committee report states also that there are no new major installations authorized in the bill that we have today. But there is authorization for approximately 400 separate bases in the bill covering in total about 1,390 individual projects. So it is a very detailed bill and a very technical bill.

The committee advises that they have made individual analysis of each one of these projects and as a result have made reductions that have been recited by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative business today and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I must concur in what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] had to say, that the gentleman from Georgia, when he appeared before the Committee on Rules, explained with extreme satisfaction that in his 50 years this was the greatest piece of legislation of this type he had brought before the Congress. So I am sure the gentleman from Georgia will discuss, in his own erudite and learned manner, the details of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say only as a further observation, and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] will join me in this, and that all of us hope that the gentleman from Georgia will be bringing bills before us for 50 more years.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6500) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6500, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1964.

The bill as approved and reported by the Committee on Armed Services totals $1,633,472,000.

COMPARISON WITH LAST YEAR'S MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

Last year, the Congress authorized a total of $1,449,642,500 in military construction authorization for fiscal year 1963.

Since the committee is now recommending an authorization bill of $1,633,472,000 for fiscal year 1964, it would appear that this is a substantial increase over that provided last year. I am happy to say this is not the case.

In accordance with section 507 of last year's military construction authorization, no appropriations can be made in general support of military family housing unless they have been specifically authorized by the Congress.

Consequently, this year's military construction bill for the first time includes an authorization reflecting all general support costs for military family housing.

These are routine costs such as operation and maintenance costs, minor construction and planning costs, and debt retirement.

The bill contains $508,800,000 for this purpose. Since no authorization of this kind was contained in last year's bill, to compare the present bill with that approved by Congress last year, it becomes necessary to deduct this amount from the current bill. When this is done, we find that the current bill is actually $325 million less than that authorized last year.

For purposes of the RECORD, I will insert a table reflecting a comparison of H.R. 6500 with last year's authorization.

Comparison of H.R. 6500 (fiscal year 1964 military construction program) with Public Law 87–554 (fiscal year 1963 military construction program)

	Fiscal year 1963, Public Law 87–554			
General construction	$1,185,659,000	[1]$1,142,055,000	$940,610,000	−$245,049,000
Family housing	263,983,500	219,543,000	[2]184,062,000	−79,921,500
Housing support	([3])	(516,857,000)	(508,800,000)	([4])
Total	1,449,642,500	1,361,598,000	1,124,672,000	−324,970,500

[1] Includes $14,400,000 requested by OSD for Army Air Defense subsequent to introduction of H.R. 4825.

[2] Includes:

New housing, 10,000 units	$181,519,000
Trailer parks, 1,539 spaces	2,543,000
Total	184,062,000

[3] Authorization not previously required.

[4] Not applicable.

COMMITTEE REDUCTIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

The military construction request of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964 as received by the Committee on Armed Services amounted to $1,876,455,000.

The Committee on Armed Services reviewed this authorization request for more than 2 months. The full committee met on 29 separate occasions and carefully reviewed every one of the approximately 1,400 line items in the bill.

As a consequence of this painstaking effort by the committee, the bill has been reduced $242,983,000 to a new recommended authorization total of $1,633,472,000.

The reduction made by the committee amounts to approximately 13 percent across the board. However, exclusive of the authorization provided the departments to support the military housing program, the reduction made by the committee against other line item authorizations requested by the departments, amounts to approximately 17 percent.

Despite the substantial reductions in the departments' request, the committee is of the firm conviction that these reductions will in no way impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor do they in any way jeopardize our national security.

GENERAL FACTS

Before beginning a detailed analysis of the nature of the authorizations provided in H.R. 6500, I would like to briefly review certain general facts which will be of interest to members of this Committee.

There are no new installations proposed for construction in H.R. 6500.

The bill as submitted by the Department affects approximately 400 military installations and involves approximately 1,400 line items.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense requested authorization for the acquisition of 17,121 acres of land. The committee approved the acquisition of only 2,623 acres and, consequently, reduced the Department's request by 14,498 acres. Of the acreage authorized for acquisition, approximately 1,752 acres are proposed for acquisition in fee with the balance simply representing acquisitions of leasehold interests or easement rights.

Included in the bill are authorizations for medical facilities amounting to approximately $32 million. Approximately half of this total amount is allocated for the construction of four new hospital projects.

These include hospitals at Fort Rucker, Ala.; Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex.; Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The military construction authorization for fiscal year 1964 as contained in H.R. 6500, contains two distinct parts:

First, it provides authority to construct new facilities in the amount of $940,700,000 to support the Active and Reserve Forces.

This is authorization for the construction of new operational facilities in support of the various military missions and programs of the Department of Defense.

Second, included in this bill for the first time is general authority for support of military family housing costs in the amount of $692.8 million. Of this total, $184,062,000 represents authorization for new construction of family housing and trailer spaces, and the balance of $508,800,000 reflects maintenance and operation costs of all family housing together with debt payment, planning costs minor construction costs, and so forth.

OPERATIONAL FACILITIES

The allocation of $940.7 million to provide new operational facilities can generally be described as follows:

First. Strategic retaliatory forces: In support of our nuclear striking forces, we have provided authorizations amounting to $177 million. These support our Polaris facilities, ballistic missile facilities, and our SAC bases.

Second. Continental air and missile defense forces: The bill provides $107 million for facilities directly concerned with our continental air and missile defense requirements. This includes our fighter interceptor aircraft facilities, NORAD, our Nike-Hercules facilities, and various other air base facilities.

Third. General purpose forces: The committee has allocated $195 million of new construction in support of our general purpose forces. These include such things as improvements in support of new Army ROAD divisions and STRAC units; Marine Corps facilities; Navy fleet and shore base facilities; and various projects to provide storage, maintenance, and training facilities for the Department of the Air Force.

Fourth. Air lift and sea lift forces: The committee provided $13 million for the Air Force to construct support facilities for troop carriers, cargo aircraft, and the Military Air Transport Command.

Fifth. Reserve forces: The committee approved, without reduction, $34,200,000 proposed in support of the Reserve facilities construction program.

Sixth. Research and development: The committee authorized new construction in support of various research and development programs amounting to $83 million. Approximately $58 million of this amount represented the cost of constructing new laboratories and support facilities. The balance related to improvements to missile facilities.

Seventh. General support: As might be anticipated, the largest single element in the military construction program is the provision of general support facilities.

The committee authorized $293 million for this category of construction. This includes $81 million for new troop housing, $41 million for military training facilities, approximately $31 million for medical facilities, and the balance in support of miscellaneous operational, supply maintenance, and administrative facilities.

Eighth. Emergency unforeseen requirements: Included in this year's military construction authorization is $37½ million to provide contingency unfunded authorizations for the three military departments. This authorization, as in past years, enabled the Department of Defense to proceed with construction made necessary by changes in military missions and responsibilities resulting from unforeseen security conditions.

As members of this Committee know, the unused portion of this emergency authorization automatically expires on September 30 of each year following enactment, thus preventing the accumulation of unused balances.

FAMILY HOUSING

As previously mentioned, this year, for the first time, the military construction authorization bill covers all costs of housing. The committee authorized a total of $692,862,000 in support of military family housing.

Of the $692,862,000 authorized by the committee for use during fiscal year 1964 in support of military family housing, only $184,062,000 represents new construction costs for family housing and trailer spaces.

The committee authorized the construction of 10,000 units of new family housing at an estimated cost of $181,519,000.

The committee also authorized the construction of 1,539 trailer spaces at an estimated cost of $2,543,000.

The balance of family housing authorizations approximating $508,800,000 is identified as follows:

For acquisition of Wherry housing (2,023 units)	$3,000,000
For improvements to acquire Wherry units	6,400,000
For improvements to existing Government quarters	8,771,000
For improvements to substandard units of military family housing	4,520,000
For minor construction	3,509,000
For planning and design of military family housing	1,000,000
For rental guarantee payments	1,200,000
For operating expenses of military family housing	183,565,000
For maintenance of military family housing	115,354,000
For leasing of family housing units	18,559,000
For retirement of Capehart indebtedness	121,880,000
For retirement of Wherry indebtedness	35,861,000
For retirement of Commodity Credit indebtedness	6,000,000
For servicemen's mortgage insurance	4,381,000

These items, less certain reimbursements, amount to $508,800,000 and together with the $184,062,000 for new construction, reflects the total authorization provided by the committee in support of family housing in the amount of $692,862,000.

JUSTIFICATION FOR FAMILY HOUSING

The Congress has through various devices, provided the military departments with a substantial military housing inventory. This inventory includes a total of approximately 378,000 units of military family housing.

This housing asset represents a capital investment of over $5 billion and an outstanding indebtedness of almost $2½ billion.

The Department of Defense requested 12,100 units of new family housing for construction during fiscal year 1964. In recommending this new increment of family housing construction, Secretary McNamara, in his appearance before the committee, stressed the desire of the Department to satisfy its housing deficit of approximately 62,000 units within the next 5 years.

Secretary McNamara and supporting witnesses from the Department, pointed out that there are more than 1 million military personnel who are eligible for family quarters. They are all male, commissioned, and enlisted personnel in pay grades E-4—4 years' service—and above.

The military departments have consistently followed a policy of attempting to satisfy military family housing requirements through the availability of private rentals in adjacent communities. However, in those instances in which community support is not adequate to meet military family housing requirements or in those instances where personnel must be immediately available on the post, the services have built and acquired family housing.

Representatives of the Department of Defense estimate that approximately 300,000 service families are not properly housed. The Department hopes that approximately 80 percent of this housing requirement will nonetheless be satisfied by future community support. Therefore, the Department estimates that the remaining 20 percent of this housing requirement must come from units constructed and supplied by the departments.

Based on this requirement, the Department estimated that it will require approximately 62,000 new units of family housing over the next 5 years. It hopes to reach this objective by a 5-year program providing an increment of approximately 12,000 new housing units each year.

As I have previously mentioned, the Congress has provided substantial additions to the military family housing inventory over the past few years. Despite that fact, the military family housing program has not been adequate to meet the increased requirements placed upon it.

For example, whereas prior to World War II single men constituted 70 to 75 percent of the peacetime military establishment, today 50.2 percent of our active duty male personnel are married, and these married men constitute the bulk of our career personnel.

These are the men who occupy the key positions and who possess the professional leadership, and technical skills essential to a modern military establishment.

Not only has the proportion of married men risen in recent years, but the average of their family has increased significantly and today closely approximates that of the civilian population. Indeed, the number of military families with three or more children has more than doubled in the last 5 years.

According to the latest military housing survey, as of June 30, 1962, more than 49,000 military families were involuntarily separated simply for lack of suitable housing.

This figure does not include some 83,000 military families that are voluntarily separated for various reasons including service at duty stations where the men cannot bring their families.

It is a fact that a great many of the men currently involuntarily separated from their families for lack of housing, have been forced to live apart for very substantial portions of their married lives as a result of a combination of their military duties and the lack of suitable available housing.

I wish to point out that these military members are not at these various locations by choice; rather, they are there by orders of their Government.

The Government, therefore, has a special responsibility to care for their needs and this responsibility is one, I am sure, we will not shirk.

The committee in reviewing this departmental request accepted as valid the justification for a minimum requirement of 62,000 new family housing units. However, rather than a 5-year program, the committee recommends the adoption of a 6-year program with the addition of approximately 10,000 new units each year.

I believe this is a thoroughly justifiable program, and one which certainly should receive the endorsement of the entire Congress.

COMMITTEE CHANGES IN THE BILL

H.R. 6500 is a clean bill. The departmental request as submitted was embodied in H.R. 4825. On reviewing the Department's request, the committee modified and amended the bill in many particulars and, consequently, directed that these changes be reflected in a clean bill.

The significant changes made by the committee to the Department's original request are as follows:

First. Reduction in authorization: As previously mentioned, the committee reduced the Department's request for new construction authorizations from $1,876,455,000 to $1,633,472,000, a reduction of $242,983,000. The committee's action resulted in a total reduction in the bill of approximately 13 percent. However, exclusive of the authorization provided the departments to support the military housing program, the reduction made by the committee against other line item authorizations originally requested by the departments amounts to approximately 17 percent.

Second. Reduction in family housing: The committee reduced the total number of new family units that could be constructed by the Department during fiscal year 1964 from a proposed figure of 12,100 units, costing approximately $217 million, to an authorized figure of 10,000 units costing approximately $181,519,000. The committee, in effecting this reduction in the number of housing units proposed for construction by the departments, recognized that Congress during fiscal year 1963 had failed to appropriate sufficient funds to finance the construction of housing units previously authorized.

Last year Congress authorized the construction of 13,792 units of family housing in Public Law 87-554; however, only 7,500 units were funded.

The Department's current request for approval of 12,100 units of new family housing included 2,949 units authorized in prior years and 9,151 units of housing not previously authorized.

The Department further advised that this level of construction was required to satisfy, over a 5-year period, an estimated housing deficit of 62,000 units.

The committee accepted the validity of this total housing requirement but was of the opinion that in view of previous funding difficulties and because of possible unanticipated increases in community support that may become available in metropolitan areas, the housing program of the Department should properly be spread over a 6-year period rather than a 5-year period. Consequently, the committee advised the Department that it would support a 6-year program involving an annual authorization of approximately 10,000 units of family housing. The housing authorized in this bill, therefore, reflects this committee policy.

The location of the family housing units outlined in the bill are those developed by the departments within priorities which reduce the total of 12,100 units to the 10,000 units authorized by the committee.

Third. Leasing authority: The Departments had requested an extension of its leasing authority which permitted leasing of 7,500 units of family housing. Under the terms of the current law, this leasing authority is limited to leasing on a family or individual unit basis and would not, therefore, permit block leasing as requested by the Departments.

The committee in discussing this departmental request learned that the actual cost of this program amounted to approximately $168 per unit of leased housing. The Departments had pointed out that they had not exceeded the statutory limit of $150 per month on the actual rental, but had incurred additional operation and maintenance support costs by separate contracts which averaged approximately $28 per month.

The committee in initially authorizing the original leasing program had not contemplated expenditures in excess of $150 per month and, therefore, seriously questions the propriety of the departmental action which resulted in an average cost per leased unit of $168 per month. Nonetheless, the committee believes that this leasing authority should be continued and, accordingly, approved the Departments' request in this regard subject to an increase in the statutory limit to $170 per month which would accommodate the Departments' actual total costs in providing these leased units of family housing.

Fourth. Rental guaranty authority: The Department of Defense requested authority under which it could continue a rental guaranty program to provide housing in foreign countries. Under the provisions of the Department's request, no specific limitation would have been placed upon the number of units which the Department would be permitted to acquire under the guaranty program. The proposed legislation also made no provisions for the cost of operation and maintenance on such units.

The committee believes that a sound rental guaranty program is an essential requirement for the provision of family housing in foreign countries and, therefore, authorized the continuation of the program subject to the establishment of a statutory ceiling of 5,000 units and the provision that the $150 statutory cost will include the cost of operation and maintenance of these units.

Fifth. Commodity Credit Corporation payments: The Department of Defense was authorized by section 407 of Public Law 83-765 to construct housing overseas utilizing foreign currencies obtained from sale of surplus commodities made available pursuant to Public Law 83-480. Approximately 9,466 units of family housing have been built in foreign countries using this authority. The total cost incurred in developing this housing was approximately $137 million. Approximately $30 million of this amount will have been returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation by the end of fiscal year 1963 under procedures outlined in 10 U.S.C. 2681(b).

Briefly, this provision of law provides that retirement of the cost of this housing will be based upon the quarters allowance obtained from military families utilizing this housing. The annual amount recovered in this fashion approximates $6 million a year. However, the Department points out that the bookkeeping involved is complex and time consuming and requested that the law be changed to permit a flat $10 million payment annually.

The committee was of the opinion that the current procedures established in the law are adequate for this purpose and, therefore, denied this departmental request.

Sixth. Substandard housing: The Department of Defense requested that the law relating to the elimination of substandard housing from the inventory of military family housing by 1965 be modified to permit the Secretary of Defense to exclude from that requirement any substandard housing which he determined had a remaining useful and economic life.

At the present time, there are approximately 46,000 units of substandard housing in the military inventory. The Department advised that it hoped to retain approximately 22,000 of these units. The committee concurred with the Department's request but provided a 22,000 ceiling on the number of units that could be exempted from this current disposal requirement in the law.

Seventh. Facilities for defense agencies: Section 610 of Public Law 87-554 contains a provision which insures that the maintenance, rehabilitation, repair, and construction of real property facilities for agencies of the Department of Defense would be accomplished through one of the military departments. The provision also provided that real property facilities utilized by various defense agencies would be under the jurisdiction of one of the military departments.

The purpose of this provision was to preclude the Department of Defense or any of its agencies from engaging in construction activities. The Department advised the committee that this provision has not adversely affected the Department's activities. Therefore, the committee elected to incorporate this provision into permanent law and, accordingly, directed that it become section 2862 of title 10, United States Code.

Eighth. Repeal of unused authorizations: The committee has incorporated in H R. 6500 a provision which would repeal outstanding and unexecuted construction authorizations—other than military family housing—more than 2 years old. The committee also included a provision which would repeal unexecuted family housing authorizations more than 1 year old. This will insure against the accumulation of unused authorizations.

Ninth. Research and development: The committee considers that it has taken a major step toward proper congressional cognizance of important and expensive activities carried on within the Department of Defense through its addition as section 610 of an amendment to section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149.

The original law, enacted in 1959, required for the first time that before appropriations could be made for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, authorizing legislation would be necessary.

Subsequently that basic law was amended to require that similar authorizing legislation would be necessary for research, development, test, and evaluation associated with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

As the committee held further hearings and gained greater experience in this new area of authority, it became evident that the law should be expanded even further. This expansion is reflected in the amendments appearing as section 610 which will require authorizing legislation prior to appropriations for all research, development, test, and evaluation, and not only that associated with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

It should be remembered that where formerly the characteristic pattern for equipping the military Departments with weapons involved a relatively brief period of research and development followed by a long production run. Modern weapons systems have become so complex that the period of research and development has been prolonged and the production period shortened. Furthermore, as the weapons systems become more and more complex, it is more and more difficult to determine the point at which the development passes into production.

The need for this legislation in order to maintain proper cognizance over the operations of the Department of Defense is dramatically illustrated by the funds required for fiscal years 1963 and 1964 where in each year, the Department expended something in the order of $7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. Of this amount in each of these years only about half related to aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. It is obvious that here lay a large, important, and extremely expensive area of activity which was left unsurveyed by the Armed Services Committee. This gap has now been filled and the committee is wholly persuaded that not only will it be better informed but that the Congress also will be better informed. From information comes progress and the committee feels that the progress in this area will be reflected in savings over the years.

Tenth. Reserve facilities: The Department had requested an amendment to section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, to provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to approve construction projects for Reserve components other than the National Guard which are located on real property not owned in fee by the Federal Government. The committee learned that this authority was requested in order to provide certain facilities for the Naval Reserve in installations of the New York Naval Militia at Troy and Rochester, N.Y.

The committee approves the proposed project for Troy and Rochester, N.Y., but sees no reason to change the general law on the subject. Therefore, the committee denied the Department's request for a change in the permanent law but provided a waiver of this provision of law in respect to the projects at Troy and Rochester, N.Y.

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Now, in summary, this is the allocation of the proposed new construction authorization for fiscal year 1964 for the respective service departments:

Title I (Army)	$200,672,000
Title II (Navy)	205,277,000
Title III (Air Force)	493,950,000
Title IV (Defense agencies)	6,511,000
Title V (family housing)	692,862,000
Title VII (Reserve Forces)	34,200,000
Total	1,633,472,000

In addition, the bill provides deficiency authorizations for construction projects previously authorized. This amounts to $3,356,000. $3,209,000 of this relates to Army construction projects, $60,000 for an Army Reserve project, and $87,000 for a Navy project.

This concludes my review of the proposed authorizations in H.R. 6500, and I trust it will meet your approval.

Fiscal year 1964 Reserve Forces facilities program, tentative lists of projects in support of lump-sum authorization requests

Title VII (Reserve Forces):	
Army National Guard	$3,600,000
Army Reserve	4,700,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	5,700,000
Air National Guard	15,600,000
Air Force Reserve	4,600,000
Total	34,200,000

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

State totals from tentative fiscal year 1964 program

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Army National Guard	Army Reserve	Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	Air National Guard	Air Force Reserve	Total
Alabama						
Alaska		472				472
Arizona				685		685
Arkansas		374		369		743
California		852	169		1,750	2,771
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware				638		638
District of Columbia						
Florida		64	977	177	1,530	2,748
Georgia			361	1,143		1,504
Hawaii				88		88
Idaho						
Illinois			960	780		1,740
Indiana			769			769
Iowa			339	468		807
Kansas		35				35
Kentucky						
Louisiana				177		177
Maine						
Maryland				323		323
Massachusetts			127			127
Michigan		1,614	403			2,017
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri				181	893	1,074
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada						
New Hampshire				596		596
New Jersey		60				60
New Mexico						
New York			700	2,687		3,387
North Carolina				100		100
North Dakota						
Ohio				1,797		1,797
Oklahoma						
Oregon				278	500	778
Pennsylvania		195	152	1,310		1,657
Puerto Rico				278		278
Rhode Island				297		297
South Carolina			11	55		66
South Dakota				210		210
Tennessee				330		330
Texas		355	632	264		1,251
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia				854		854
Washington		164		249		413
West Virginia			60			60
Wisconsin				1,320		1,320
Wyoming						
Land acquisition		501				501
Total	[1] 3,600	4,686	5,660	15,654	4,673	34,273
Amount in H.R. 4825	3,600	4,700	5,700	15,600	4,600	34,200

[1] No list available until new stationing plans are developed and completed, based on reorganization of Army National Guard.

Proposed fiscal year 1964 authorization, U.S. Army Reserve construction program—Recapitulation, Dec. 12, 1962

Number of facilities:	
100-man	3
125-man	1
200-man	2
600-man	
1,000-man	3
Special projects	
Sep MS	1
Total projects	10
Total rated capacity	3,825

	Estimated cost
Total projects	$4,125,000
Land acquisition	501,000
Deficiency authorization (Morristown, N.J., authorized by Public Law 86-1489, fiscal year 1960)	60,000
Total fiscal year 1964 authorization	4,686,000

Summary

Location	Objective strength	Assigned strength	Size facility		Estimated cost
			Rated capacity	MS (bay)	
			Men		*Thousands*
Alaska: Fort Richardson	217	133	125	2	$472
Arkansas: Jonesboro	170	174	200	2	374
California: Oakland	1,538	1,024	1,000	5	852
Florida: Daytona Beach	123	85	100	1	64
Kansas: Hutchinson	150	127		1	35
Michigan:					
Detroit (No. 3)	981	821	1,000	5	807
Detroit (No. 4)	1,050	822	1,000	5	807
New Jersey: Morristown [1]	331	314	(2)		$60
Pennsylvania: Bloomsburg	119	111	100	1	195
Texas: Victoria	184	184	200	2	355
Washington: Bellingham	87	90	100	1	164

[1] Not a project.

[2] Deficiency authorization.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Fiscal year 1964 military construction program

PROGRAM V, NAVAL RESERVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

Location	Item	Estimated cost
NAVAL RESERVE AVIATION		*Thousands*
NAS, New York, N.Y	Barracks, 180-man	$400
NAS, Dallas, Tex	Barracks, 396-man	407
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa	Subsistence building alteration	152
NAS, South Weymouth, Mass	BOQ alteration, 92-man	64
NAS, Glenview, Ill	BOQ alteration	326
NAS, Atlanta, Ga	Officers' mess closed	160
NAS, Grosse Ile, Mich	Barracks alteration	153
Do	BOQ alteration	250
NAS, Atlanta, Ga	Barracks, 100-man	201
Total		2,113
NAVAL RESERVE SURFACE		*Thousands*
NRTC, Brockton, Mass	Training Center Addition	$63
NMCRTC, South Bend, Ind	Reserve training building addition	434
AFRTC, Joliet, Ill	Training center	414
AFRTC, Daytona Beach	do	513
NRTC, Spartanburg, S.C	Site acquisition	11
AFRTC, Cedar Rapids	Training center	339
NRTC, Troy, N.Y	Training center activity	200
NRTC, Santa Barbara	Training center addition	91
NRTC, Rochester, N.Y	Training center rehabilitation	100
NREF, Harlingen, Tex	Training facility addition	68
NREF, Laredo, Tex	Training facility	66

Fiscal year 1964 military construction program—Continued

PROGRAM V, NAVAL RESERVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION—Continued

Location	Item	Estimated cost
NAVAL RESERVE SURFACE		*Thousands*
NREF, Santa Rosa, Calif	Training Facility	$78
NREF, Fairmount, W. Va	do	60
NREF, Sarasota, Fla	do	100
NREF, New Braunfels, Tex	do	91
Total		2,628
MARINE CORPS GROUND		*Thousands*
MCRTC, Orlando, Fla	Training center	$364
NMCRTC, South Bend, Ind	Reserve training center	335
AFRTC, Joliet, Ill	do	220
Total		919
Grand total, program		5,660

Fiscal year 1964 Air National Guard construction authorization program

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	Quantity	Estimated cost	
		Item	Base
Andrews Air Force Base, Md			$323
Warehouse, base [1]	10,000 square feet	$103	
Apron, operational	11,951 square yards.	220	
Alvin Callender Field (Naval Air Station, New Orleans), La.			177
Storage, ammunition addition (GAR-11).		177	
Bellingham, Wash			249
Communications training facility [2]	12,500 square feet	176	
Shop, auto maintenance	2,400 square feet	73	
Berry Field, Nashville, Tenn			330
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft	1 each	330	
Byrd Field, Richmond, Va			854
Runway-taxiway extension	1,000 feet	576	
Group operations and training building	18,600 square feet	278	
Capitol Airport, Springfield, Ill			681
Taxiway extensions	2, at 1,000 feet	681	
Cochran Field, Macon, Ga			345
Communications building [2]	22,815 square feet	345	
Des Moines Municipal Airport, Iowa			468
Storage, ammunition, addition (MB-1)		468	
Douglas Field, Charlotte, N.C			100
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft [3]	2 each	100	
Ellington Air Force Base, Tex			177
Storage, ammunition, addition (GAR-11).		177	
Fort Smith Municipal Airport, Ark			369
Apron, operational	28,000 square yards.	369	
Foss Field, Sioux Falls, S. Dak			210
Storage, ammunition, addition (GAR-11).		210	
Floyd Bennett Field, Naval Air Station, N.Y.			1,657
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft	2 each	660	
Apron, operational (strengthen and extend).[1]		997	
General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis			914
Storage, avgas	150,000 gallons	179	
Shop, A/C maintenance [2]	20,000 square feet	193	
Squadron operations and training building.[2]	do	264	
Group operations and training building	18,600 square feet	278	
Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pa			980
Apron, operational (strengthen)	62,000 square yards	539	
Apron, operational (new) [1]	17,500 square yards	231	
Storage, ammunition addition (Gar-11).		210	
Grenier Field, Manchester, N.H			596
Apron, operational (strengthen and extend).		596	
Hickam AFB, Hawaii			$88
Security sentry house (GAR-11 complex).		$88	
Imeson Airport, Jacksonville, Fla			177
Storage, ammunition addition (GAR-11).		177	
Kelly AFB, Tex			87
Security sentry house (GAR-11 complex).		87	
Lambert Field, St. Louis, Mo			181
Apron, operational	14,500 square yards.	181	
Mansfield Municipal Airport, Ohio			1,519
Runway-taxiway extension	3,400 feet	1,519	
McEntire Air National Guard Base, S.C			55
Hangar, alert (open)	8,960 square feet	55	
New Castle County Airport, Del			638
Apron, operational (strengthen)	35,000 square yards.	374	
Apron, operational (new)[1]	20,000 square yards.	264	
Niagara Falls Airport, N.Y			400
Runway, primary (strengthen)	Lump sum	400	
O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill			99
Taxiway, apron access	5,400 square yards	99	
Olmsted Air Force Base, Pa			330
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft	1 each	330	
Portland International Airport, Oreg			278
Group operations and training building	18,600 square feet	278	
San Juan International Airport, P.R			278
Group operations and training building	18,600 square feet	278	
Sky Harbor Municipal Airport, Phoenix, Ariz.			685
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft	2 each	685	
Theodore Francis Green Airport, R.I			297
Operations and training building	20,000 square feet	297	
Toledo Express Airport, Ohio			278
Group operations and training building	18,600 square feet	278	
Travis Field, Savannah, Ga			798
Runway-taxiway (strengthen)	208,333 square yards.	798	
Truax Field, Madison, Wis			406
Wing/group operations and training building.	26,600 square feet	406	
Westchester County Airport, N.Y			630
Hangar, maintenance (modification)	Lump sum	138	
Maintenance dock, medium aircraft	1 each	330	
Taxiway, runway access (widen)	14,700 square yards.	162	
Total			15,654

[1] Quantity and estimated cost reduced as a result of analysis of space requirement.

[2] Comparative analysis of functional space to be submitted prior to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1) notification to Congress.

[3] Revised estimated cost submitted by Air Force.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Fiscal year 1964 military construction program

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	Quantity	Estimated cost	
		Item	Base
1. Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif			$900
(a) Hangar, Reserve Forces	64,000 square feet	$900	
2. Homestead Air Force Base, Fla			1,530
(a) Apron, operational	82,600 square feet	950	
(b) Wing A. & T. building	18,600 square feet	580	
3. March Air Force Base, Calif			400
(a) Maintenance dock, large	1 each	400	
4. McClellan Air Force Base, Calif			450
(a) Hangar addition (2)	Lump sum	450	
5. Portland International Airport, Oreg			$500
(a) Maintenance dock, large	1 each	$500	
6. Richards-Gebaur, Mo			893
(a) Hangar addition without lean-to	Lump sum	230	
(b) Maintenance dock, large with lean-to.	1 each	438	
(c) Taxiway apron access	15,000 square feet	225	
Total			4,673

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. I assume that the hospitals—the new hospital construction provided in this bill—will be on bases where there is a high degree of assurance that they will not be abandoned or closed; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When we locate a hospital we try to look at the future to such an extent as to determine the fact that that base is going to be there as permanently as anything can possibly be predicted by the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Did I read something recently that the Government is having difficulty with what they call relocatable housing for the military?

Mr. VINSON. We have a house that is really not fixed—it is a movable house which they are developing—and it is sometimes referred to as relocatable housing. This type of house is needed at remote AC/W sites and if that site is later abandoned, the house can be put on a truck and moved elsewhere.

This type of house is being used, to a limited degree, but the bulk of these 10,000 houses will be permanently fixed to the ground and constructed of a standard design as far as possible.

Mr. GROSS. Have they not been having difficulty moving these on the highways?

Mr. VINSON. Of course they cannot move them without certain difficulties. That is to be expected. However, very few of the 10,000 units authorized will be of this type.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a substantial amount of money in this bill for movable houses?

Mr. VINSON. I do not recall any specifically. It is grouped as housing. There is nothing earmarked in the bill for it.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is little that need be, or can be, added to the detailed explanation of our Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], as to the contents of this $1.6 billion military construction bill presently before us. I shall confine myself to a few general observations to which I believe the special attention of the House should be directed.

We are now in the sixth month of the session. In all this time the Congress has taken final action on comparatively few major pieces of legislation. As a matter of fact, we have yet to act on many of the appropriations bills that we must initiate, and we are less than 30 days from the beginning of a new fiscal year. It is quite apparent that this will be another unusually long session if we are to take action on any appreciable part of the administration's recommended program.

The "why's" and "wherefore's" of this month after month, week after week, lack of a legislative program presently needs no comment. But worthy of comment at this time is that there has been no undue delay on the part of our Armed Services Committee in getting before this House the measures under our jurisdiction. It is characteristic of our committee to act thoroughly and expeditiously on all matters that come before us. In this our committee takes pride.

We also take pride in the quality of the leadership furnished our committee by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. To him goes no small measure of the credit for the expeditious and thorough manner in which our committee continues to operate. That he has had the cooperation of the entire committee membership in long and arduous meetings, mornings and afternoons, on highly complex matters involving many millions and millions of dollars, merely bespeaks the high quality of his chairmanship.

This is the fourth major bill to be brought before the House this session from our committee. In the order of their floor consideration they were: First, extension of the draft and reserve programs; second, the weapons procurement bill; third, the military pay raise bill; and fourth, the military construction bill now before us.

On each of these measures, particularly the weapons procurement bill and the military pay bill, there were differences among the committee members on various items. In the weapons bill, for example, there were differences expressed with respect to the RS-70 and two additional nuclear submarines. In the instance of the military pay bill there were honest differences over the allowance of combat pay, particularly when the administration itself had recommended the elimination of existing sea and foreign duty pay, and difference of opinion with respect to the treatment of retirement benefits. And, as the ensuing debate will disclose, there were differences of opinion on certain items in the pending measure.

These differences were not political in any respect. Not a single vote in committee was a party line vote. The bills our committee reported to the House were not in any sense either a Republican measure or a Democrat measure, although admittedly our friends on the other side of the aisle have a committee majority to report whatever they decide a bill should embody. All this is significantly confirmed by the fact that each bill was reported with virtually an unanimous vote, and that the weapons procurement bill had only 33 votes against it when passed by the House and the military pay raise bill had only 10 votes in opposition.

Thus it may be said that the measures reported by our committee were committee bills in the fullest sense of the word. And the same applies to the military construction bill now before us. I have every reason to believe that it will also receive the overwhelming support of the House.

Our committee is deeply conscious of the fact that national defense is the largest single item in our national budget. While we are determined to maintain a national defense second to none, whatever the cost, we recognize that such a defense is not necessarily maintained by the mere authorization and appropriation of dollars, for whatever items in whatever amounts the administration recommends. Just as there are many items in our overall national budget that can be eliminated, deferred, or reduced without adversely affecting any phase of our national welfare, there are items in our defense budget itself that can be eliminated, reduced, or deferred without injury to our national security.

As our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has pointed out, our committee spent more than 2 months in a painstaking study of each and every item requested by the Department of Defense to be authorized. And in getting together the voluminous data for our committee and assisting in its evaluation, I wish to commend our excellent committee staff, particularly Mr. Frank Slatenshek who handled this particular measure. Our full committee met on 29 separate occasions on this single measure and carefully studied every one of approximately 1,400 line items in the recommended bill.

The result is that we are able to present to you an authorization bill which is approximately 17 percent, approximately $243 million, below that requested by the Department. We have not cut the authorization simply to cut it. We have asked ourselves what do we actually need for defense purposes, and that is what we propose to authorize, no less and no more. We are fully convinced that the reduction our committee has made will not in any way impair the operational effectiveness of our armed services nor in any way jeopardize our national security.

There is an understandable tendency on the part of all of us to use the budget request as the yardstick in measuring our progress in reducing government costs. This is not, in and of itself, a valid measure, particularly considering how of late the budget itself has been juggled in its preparation, dealing more with a political objective than an economic reality. A more accurate measure, therefore, would be to compare this year's authorization with that of last year for the same program.

With this as our yardstick as to dollar costs, I am pleased to be able to say that this bill, excluding the support costs relating to family housing, is actually $324,970,500 less than last year's military construction bill.

You have doubtless noted that in the comparison I referred to the exclusion of the support costs relating to family housing. This is because this year, for the first time, the military construction bill carries this item.

This specific item of family housing has a special significance to which I should like to direct your attention. In the first place, it is the earnest desire of our committee to make certain that our military personnel, at home and abroad, have adequate family housing. While we now have a capital investment of over $5 billion in military family housing and an outstanding indebtedness of almost $2½ billion, as well as a departmental leasing authority program, we do not presently have adequate military family housing.

This was taken into account by our committee, not only in the preparation of this bill but also in connection with the recent military pay raise bill. In addition to what is allowed military personnel for housing purposes, we incorporated in the pay bill the new provision relating to "family separation allowance." It is all a part of our desire to provide the best possible for our service people.

In this connection I might mention that the bill before us authorizes approximately $16 million for four new military hospital projects.

Aside from the committee's determination to see that our military personnel have the best possible medical care and adequate housing, there is still another significance to the inclusion in this bill, for the first time, of the family housing support costs item. It bespeaks our committee's determination to retain the maximum possible control over military expenditures. Our purpose is to provide the committee with a complete review of all housing costs, whatever they might be.

The efforts of our committee to keep a strong hand on defense costs, and not simply "pass the buck," so to speak, to the Appropriations Committee is further evidenced by the provision in the bill—section 610—which extends existing law so that authorization is required not solely for research, development, and evaluation in connection with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels but for any research and development of the Department of Defense.

For the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 the Department expended something like $7 billion for research and development. This is an extremely important and an extremely costly activity of the Defense Department. But our committee found that only about one-half of the tremendous amount spent in this area required authorization. That we may regularly review all research and development programs, in which there is undoubtedly some duplication and some lack of realism, our committee now proposes to require authorizations in this area. It should be borne in mind that our Government is spending billions of dollars annually in all kinds of research projects under the direction of more than the Department of Defense.

There is a great need for a greater coordination of all these research and development undertakings. Our committee proposes to accomplish that in the operations of the Department of Defense, and we believe that over the years we can make substantial dollar savings without in any way retarding research and development efforts.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other provision in this bill to which I direct your attention. It is a matter of great importance to those of us who really want economy. That we may better control defense costs, our committee has incorporated in the bill a provision which repeals outstanding and unexecuted construction authorizations (other than military family housing) where the authorization is more than 2 years old. In the case of military family housing the authorization is repealed where it is more than 1 year old.

By thus insuring against the accumulation of unused authorizations we insure against the waste of precious tax dollars. This is one way that the Congress can better retain its control over what is spent, how it is spent, and when it is spent.

I commend this action of our committee to other committees having jurisdiction over expenditures for the numerous programs and projects undertaken by the Federal Government. There has been an all too prevalent practice on the part of the Congress to make additional spending authorizations when only a part of that already authorized has been used. There has likewise been an all too prevalent practice on the part of the Congress to make additional appropriations for a program or project where sufficient carryover funds are available from a previous appropriation.

This accumulation of unused authorizations and accumulation of unused appropriations year after year is one of the basic ways that Congress divests itself of control over the Nation's purse.

It is hardly necessary for me to point out to you the various programs and projects where this has taken place. It is only pertinent to our discussion here on the military construction bill to point out that our Committee on Armed Services is doing something about this insofar as the operations of the Department of Defense are concerned. I sincerely hope that other committees will likewise take steps to bring the departments and agencies and the programs they administer under regular scrutiny and rigid fiscal control.

Our committee report, supplemented by the remarks of our able committee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], presents the title by title, item by item, detail of $1.6 billion authorized by the pending measure. The burden of my remarks has been that our committee has carefully scrutinized each and every item and has reported a bill 17 percent below—or around $243 million—the Department's recommendation, and of even more significance, $325 million below the military construction bill of last year.

Not only has our committee found ways and means to make this saving without in any way jeopardizing our national defense, but we have also written into this measure provisions that will better enable our committee and the Congress to oversee the Department's operations and realize substantial savings in the future.

This is the fourth major bill brought before the House from our committee. All four bills are committee drafted bills in the fullest sense of the word and at no time, on any one of the four—draft act, weapons procurement, military pay, and the pending military construction bill—did political considerations enter into the committee's decision. I hope the House will pass this important bill as recommended to you by our committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes because I can sense that the committee, with the usual confidence in the fine explanation made by our distinguished chairman, implemented by that excellent statement on the part of the ranking minority member, is willing to accept these two explanations.

I just want to say this by way of emphasis, supplementing what these two distinguished gentlemen have said. We have reinforced, reorganized, and further retained tighter control on the part of the Congress on those installations of which this bill is a part, and of the military, including the research and development. I commend to the House and the Congress the contents and the provisions of this proposed legislation. This is, as the chairman said, the finest product we have given to the Congress in this area of construction. We have done a good job. As the chairman has said, there are 1,400 line items and over 400 installations. We are making the military report promptly on their operations and their progress in these areas. I shall not take up any more time.

I welcome the opportunity to speak briefly in favor of enactment of the military construction authorization bill, H.R. 6500. It is my belief that our committee, with the able leadership of our chairman, has produced a tight but well balanced program for each of the military services.

I invite your attention to the Navy's program in title II of the bill. This program totals $205,277,000 of new authorization, representing 12½ percent of the total bill. This is the program to which I particularly wish to address my remarks.

As you know, I have a continuing interest in seeing that the combat capabilities of our Navy and Marine Corps are maintained, not only now, but also in the future. The program was presented to the committee in terms of program elements which alined facility requirements according to basic military missions. Each line item supports one or more military objectives and is a part of the intelligent and forward looking planning that is clearly evident in this program.

The greatest amount of dollars, $90,591,000, is in the program to support the general purpose forces. These forces include ships, aircraft and weapons systems. With their capability for engaging in conventional and limited scale actions, the type of overt warfare which is most probable under conditions of nuclear parity, these forces are invaluable in preventing, or drawing to a quick conclusion, local conflicts that could cause world war III. Forty-four percent of the Navy's program is for construction to support these forces.

Thirty-five percent amounting to $71,494,000 is for a general support program. This portion includes vital logistic support to keep the fleet in a ready condition. Included in this program are line items supporting naval and Marine Corps training, naval communications and security group activities. Personnel support items such as chapels, that our fighting men may have a decent place to worship God, barracks and messhalls, that are so badly needed but have been deferred in past years so that the Navy could concentrate on operational facilities, are included in this element.

Eleven percent, amounting to $22,658,000, is for research and development. In this enlightened age when winning wars depends so much on men using their mental capacities and their skills to develop our sophisticated weapons systems, facilities must be made available for research and development of better systems. Our scientist must be given the necessary facilities to implement our technological progress. Included in this program is a science laboratory, a technical support building and a number of related facilities to support scientific endeavor.

One and seven-tenths percent or $3,426,000 is for strategic retaliatory forces. This includes support facilities for the Polaris submarines, our most effective deterrent force against nuclear war. Lastly, 2.3 percent or $4,608,000 will help in our antisubmarine defense effort. In addition, $12.5 million has been reserved in the Navy total for emergency construction. It is essential that each of the military departments have this limited flexibility in their construction programs in view of the conditions existing in the world today. This provides them authority to proceed with emergency construction, which, because of its urgency, should not be deferred until next year's regular program. The Armed Services Committee, of course, monitors the use of this authority before the actual start of the construction.

The great effectiveness of our modern fleet cannot be realized unless the shore establishment is also modernized to keep abreast of the new weapons systems and increasing technical complexities of our ships and aircraft.

I assure you that these are all valid requirements which represent the minimum essential facilities necessary to provide a proper working and living environment and a high combat capability for our naval and Marine Corps forces. I wish to emphasize that, in my opinion, the committee has developed a soundly conceived bill. I recommend that you approve it in its entirety.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6500, the proposed military construction authorization for fiscal 1964. The House has received an excellent explanation of the provisions of the bill from the chairman and I will not presume on your time to repeat this information. However, I feel it important to call attention to the importance of the research facilities which are contained in this authorization.

This Nation of ours has achieved an impressive number of brilliant successes in the space and ballistic missile programs. We have every reason to be very proud of these accomplishments. They have been unprecedented in many instances. Most all of them have been very spectacular. They have received wide publicity. And most important of all, they have been accomplished under the pressure of extreme urgency.

My immediate purpose is not to tabulate the specific achievements, however. I want to stress the means rather than the ends. When we see a booster lifting its payload toward outer space, or when we see the culmination of a manned orbital flight, how many of us stop to think about how it came to be? How many of us realize the magnitude of the scientific effort required to make the events possible? Do we ever take the time to tabulate the original ideas and creative thoughts that led to the success?

The Department of Defense, and especially the Air Force, is making very vital contributions to the national missile and space programs. In practically all instances, these contributions stem from the knowledge and experience gained in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Our experts are applying this knowledge and experience in the many areas of research, development, and testing that are a part of these space programs. In other words, the military efforts represent the forerunner of our space achievements.

Our people did not gain this knowledge and experience from text books, however. Air Force research and development work has provided much of the technological foundation. The successes of which we are justly proud have been made possible to a large degree by the efforts of the scientists in Air Force laboratories. New material, improved communications, life support systems, advanced power supplies, exotic fuels, and a host of other things result from the labor of these dedicated people.

Now, we can depend on industry to provide many of our new developments—and this is as it should be. However, industry cannot do the entire job for our total military capability. We must depend on the laboratories of the armed services to provide the knowledge and ideas that are aimed primarily at military applications. These laboratories, therefore, are absolutely essential for two very major reasons: First, to foster research that is vital to our space efforts yet has little commercial appeal; and second, to review and evaluate the results of research which is privately sponsored or accomplished by contract with the Government.

Right here I would like to underscore a point of great concern to every thinking American. The efforts of the scientists in our laboratories of the services have not been given the kind of publicity that is so rightly deserved; our progress in the space technology field is in direct proportion to the genius of these people. Many of these men are acknowledged leaders in their individual specialties. It behooves every one of us to recognize their accomplishments and to applaud them. And it is also essential that we provide these individuals with adequate, up-to-date facilities so that they can do the work that is needed to advance our space effort.

With this in mind, we have provided funds for facilities at Edwards Air Force Base to continue research work in new and improved rocket fuels.

Funds are also provided for improvement and refinement of launch facilities at Cape Canaveral in support of advanced rocket boosters. The newer rocket boosters will have much greater thrust. Facilities supporting the current type of boosters will be inadequate to meet the needs of the new ones.

The bill also contains funds for improvement of the Atlantic missile range capability to provide essential telemetry, communications and bio-astronautical support of our space programs.

Additional funds have also been included to provide laboratory facilities and upgrading of existing laboratories at Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.; Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.; Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex.; Sacramento Peak, N. Mex.; and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. These facilities are vital to the continued success of the Air Force research and development program.

Finally, this bill provides facilities to support the development and testing of the mobile medium range ballistic missile and various facilities to improve the worldwide satellite control and tracking system.

I do not need to remind any of you of the critical importance of this total national space program. We know very well what is happening behind the Iron Curtain. We know that the Soviets respect hard capabilities when they respect nothing else. It is therefore in our best national interest to take every reasonable, productive action to guarantee the kind of superiority which we have consistently maintained throughout the life of this great Nation of ours. Where technological advances are essential to national survival, we can give no less than the best available support.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force fiscal year 1964 military construction program contains requests for $155.8 million for intercontinental ballistic missiles. This includes $140.7 million for the sixth Minuteman wing composed of three squadrons to be located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., and $5.1 million for test and training facilities to support the improved Minuteman. In addition, $10 million is programed for modifications to existing Atlas and Titan facilities to improve their reliability and safety.

Great progress has been made since the start of the ballistic missile program less than 10 years ago. All 13 Atlas squadrons are complete and operational. Construction of operational facilities to support the 12-squadron Titan weapon system has been completed and 6 Titan I squadrons are now operational. The remaining six Titan II squadrons are in the last stages of assembly and checkout. In view of the magnitude of this engineering achievement and the caliber of perfection required for systems which must perform with unprecedented accuracy and reliability, we all can be thankful and proud of this accomplishment.

Construction of operational facilities for the Minuteman weapon system is complete on 2 wings for a total of 300 launchers and 30 launch control centers. By September 1964, 800 hardened and dispersed silo launchers and 80 launch control centers will be completed at a cost of approximately $634 million.

The facility cost per missile is only $800,000 as compared to several million for our earlier Atlas and Titan missiles. The relative simplicity of the Minuteman weapon system with its extended readiness periods without maintenance and its quick reaction time, either singly or in groups, provides us with the best cost effectiveness of all the ballistic missile systems. This reversal in the traditional trend toward increasingly complicated, more costly defense systems is frequently forgotten in evaluations of expenditures for ballistic missiles. However, the sharply climbing numerical curve of operational missiles, while a very important aspect of positive progress, does not altogether account for the attitude of confidence we have in our ICBM program. The increased hardness being provided for Minuteman facilities coupled with the dispersal of the missile silos impose ever increasing demands on a potential enemy's force structure and targeting requirements. This, plus the advantages it implies for us in terms of survivability, reaction time, and strikeback capability, adds up to a force effectiveness equation that far exceeds mere numbers.

The sixth Minuteman wing requested in this program will increase the total Minuteman launchers to 950 and give additional strength to this country's, if not the world's, "guardian of peace."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6500. I feel that nothing would do more to build up the morale of our military servicemen and women than to have adequate housing for their families. Inasmuch as all Members of the Congress are in support of this bill, I shall not dwell on the merits of it.

Despite my support of the housing program of the Department of Defense, I am greatly disturbed by a recent bureaucratic action that it has taken in respect to the sale of private housing.

It is my understanding that before an individual can use a Government bulletin board for the purpose of posting a notice for the sale of his privately owned home, he is required, as a condition precedent to use of the board, to sign a certificate under which he will agree to sell his property to anyone who wishes to purchase it. I believe this is an infringement of a personal property right. Certainly, I should have the right to sell my home to anyone I wish, and I find it incredible that the Department of Defense would require that individuals using their bulletin boards forfeit this personal right.

I questioned Secretary McNamara on this specific issue. The colloquy between the Secretary and me, which appears on pages 2793 and 2794 of the printed committee hearings, is as follows:

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Secretary, of course, we are all for adequate housing. But you referred to the resale of military homes, that they were having difficulty in the resale * * *.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That leads me to ask you a few questions about some order on resale of military homes.

I believe you will agree with me that the military personnel should have the same rights to resell homes that they buy with their own money, that you or nobody else in the Defense Department has anything to do with, the Government has not financed, or assisted in any way. The military man should have the same right you and I would have to sell that home without any further obligation to anybody.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I certainly agree.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Do you have an order that they cannot publish on your bulletin boards the sale of these homes without first signing agreements to the Department of Defense that they will not refuse to sell to certain——

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, not to my knowledge, Mr. WINSTEAD.

You may be referring to——

Mr. WINSTEAD. The reason I asked that, I couldn't believe that you would subscribe to such a policy.

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, sir; I don't believe there is any such restriction. I will be happy to check into it and see.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would be glad if you insert such orders as you have issued into the record.

Secretary MCNAMARA. That relate to resale.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I could not believe that you yourself would subscribe to that.

Secretary MCNAMARA. I will certainly do so, orders that relate to resale of privately owned homes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Privately owned homes.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Be happy to.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Because if that went into effect, a lot of the people would refuse to sell to military personnel if they were concerned about the resale.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Certainly, I would be very happy to do so.

(In response to this request the Department of Defense submitted the following information for the record:)

"There are no restrictions imposed by the Department of Defense governing the conditions of resale of private housing by military owners. Military personnel have the same rights to resell their homes as do all other citizens.

"On March 8, 1963, Secretary McNamara issued a memorandum directing that leases for family housing on behalf of the United States contain a nondiscrimination clause. The memorandum also directed that 'listings maintained by base housing offices of available private housing shall include only those units which are available without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.' The full text of the memorandum follows:

"WASHINGTON, *March 8, 1963*.

"Memorandum for: The Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force.

"Subject: Nondiscrimination in family housing.

"Effective immediately, all leases for family housing which are executed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the authority contained in section 515, Public Law 161–84, as amended, shall contain the following clause: 'It is understood and agreed that the Government will assign the demised premises to military personnel in accordance with Executive Order No. 11063, dated November 20, 1962, which provides that housing and related facilities shall be available without discrimination among tenants because of race, color, creed, or national origin.'

"In addition, effective immediately, listings maintained by base housing offices of available private housing shall include only those units which are available without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

"Addressees shall insure implementation of these directives and provide copies to my office.

"ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
"*Secretary of Defense*."

This directive was based on Executive Order 11063 and the supplement to the Executive order by the Defense Department was to this effect—"effective immediately, listings maintained by base housing officers of available private housing shall include only those units which are available without regard to color, race, creed, or national origin."

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is this: I was questioning the Secretary solely on the right to post on the bulletin boards private homes which are for sale. Military personnel coming to a new base check these bulletin boards for homes available for purchase. In this connection, I call your attention to the following item which appeared in the Washington Daily News, Tuesday, May 14, 1963:

ASIDEMS: A little drama has taken place on the employees main bulletin board at the Pentagon. For years it has been very popular with folks wanting to buy or sell houses. The other day, an official notice was placed in the center of the board. The notice said that "house for sale" notices could be posted only if the seller agreed not to discriminate as to the race of the buyer. Within the next day or so, the board became practically empty.

If an individual owns a duplex and lives in one part of that home, why should he not determine the person to whom he would rent that home, without getting permission from the Department of Defense or anyone else?

For example, Mr. Chairman, at one time I sold my own home. I was considering the sale of that home to a highly respected individual of the town. Some of my neighbors called me and said to me, "We know this is a prominent person"—I am talking about a white person and not a Negro—"but we had rather not live in the community with that person." When they gave their reasons, which made sense to me, I did not sell the house to that particular individual because of my respect for the people of my community.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of this House if we have reached the low level in this country where individuals have no right over their own families and their own homes, we have reached, in my judgment, a pitifully low mark.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. VINSON. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I believe we agree that any individual should have a right to resell his own home, which the Government has never touched one way or the other, to anyone he sees fit, regardless of race, creed or color. I can understand where, in certain sections of America, a community might have a new development and for some reason or other the members of that community might not want Chairman VINSON, the gentleman being from Georgia, or they might not want me or you; they might not want Secretary of Defense McNamara or they might not want Attorney General Bobby Kennedy living in that community. I submit to you that an individual should have a right to sell his home or not to sell his home to anyone that he sees fit.

This bill provides for $692 million for military housing—approximately $200 million of which is for construction. However, with this Executive order and supplement in force, if continued, we will need more military housing next year than this year.

This will not result in the addition of a single home being sold to a Negro, a white man, a foreigner, or anyone else. But it will bar many men from having the opportunity to find available homes.

I was disappointed when the Defense Department failed to put the whole record in the proceedings. However, upon further request an Assistant Secretary of Defense came to my office yesterday, June 4, with additional information:

U.S. ARMY SERVICE CENTER
FOR THE ARMED FORCES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

DEAR ———: Executive Order No. 11063 as implemented by the Secretary of Defense in a memorandum to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, states in part:

"In addition, effective immediately, listings maintained by base housing offices of available private housing shall include only those units which are available without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin."

The Pentagon Housing Office has a unit(s) currently listed which is (are) owned or operated by you. Should you desire to abide by the provisions set forth in the above paragraph, please so indicate on the reverse of this letter.

Failure to acknowledge this correspondence by ——— will be construed to mean that you desire to withdraw your listing(s).

Sincerely yours,

RALPH H. SMITH,
Colonel, TC, Commanding.

COMMANDING OFFICER,
U.S. Army Service Center for the Armed Forces, Attn.: Chief, Housing Branch, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The housing unit(s) which I have listed (wish to list) with your office is (are) available without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin of prospective tenants.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
(Signature)

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my friends, regardless of what position they and I may take on integration or segregation or on any other issue, will never fall to the low level of playing cheap politics, because intelligent people of all races know this is hypocritical and will not aid a single Negro in purchasing a home and represents a disadvantage to other citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to pursue this matter further with the Defense Department. From his testimony before our committee, I do not believe Secretary McNamara was familiar with the supplement to the Executive order. I, therefore, hope he will take the necessary steps to revoke it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, our able chairman has discussed in detail the scope of this important authorization and the principles adhered to by our committee in approving these line items. This careful scrutiny has paid dividends in reducing the total sum we are recommending. In general, the committee has tried to avoid any elimination which would in any way impair the effectiveness of our defense program. However, where deferral seemed reasonably possible, we felt it to be in the national interest to do so. The entire committee has cooperated in the effort to bring out this sound and effective measure.

The leadership of our chairman has reflected his vast experience. It has been a pleasure to work on this bill, despite the long hours and myriad of details. The result reflects a team effort on the part of the chairman, the members of the committee, as well as our competent staff.

I am impressed that our chairman considers it to be the finest bill that he, in his long service, has been privileged to bring to the floor. Its passage will represent sound support of our defense effort of which the House may well be proud.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased with H.R. 6500 as it has come out of the Committee on Armed Services. This bill shows the results of hard work, close scrutiny, and commonsense. I congratulate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the distinguished ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], on their leadership throughout the 2 months of intensive hearings which produced this legislation we are considering this afternoon.

The total authorizations within the bill have been reduced $242,983,000 below the administration recommendations. To achieve such reduction without in any way adversely affecting the security of the United States required painstaking line item consideration of over 1,300 individual budget requests, as well as numerous onsight inspections in connection with them.

The achievement of a 13-percent reduction in the military construction budget is somewhat unprecedented in these times.

In my opinion, this indicates that the Committee on Armed Services has duly recognized the fact that economies in the operation of the United States are essential, that spending beyond the country's means is unwise, and that continual deficit spending in times in which no great emergency exists can constitute a grave danger to the country.

There is little use in providing the Nation with the world's most powerful Military Establishment if at the same time we spend the United States into insolvency. I therefore heartily support H.R. 6500 and urge its adoption. It provides full authorization of funds for essential construction of operational facilities for the Active and Reserve Forces and for family houses, but not one penny more.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I almost forgot to ask a question which I usually ask the chairman, Mr. VINSON. I could not discover anything in the way of a line item in the bill for it. Is there anything in this bill for the Truman Airport at Grand View, Mo.?

Mr. VINSON. Knowing that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would follow the usual course which he has been following in reference to this item for the last 16 years, I have prepared myself.

Richards Gebaur Air Force Base—formerly named Grandview Air Force Base—is an Air Defense Command installation located 16 miles south of Kansas City, Mo.

The 29th Air Division Headquarters and Combat Center, a fighter interceptor squadron, a combat support squadron, and a Reserve troop carrier wing with two squadrons are stationed at this base.

All of these organizations are scheduled to remain at this base for the foreseeable future.

Air Force investment in land and improvements at Richards Gebaur is $46 million. Personnel strength is 3,800, including military and civilians.

No construction projects for the Active Forces at Richards Gebaur Air Force Base are contained in H.R. 6500.

Three projects for the Air Force Reserve Forces at Richards Gebaur Air Force Base are being considered for construction under the lump sum authorization in title VII. The tentative program calls for the construction of a taxiway, a large aircraft maintenance dock, and a hangar addition at a total cost of $393,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I thank my friend from Georgia for the splendid job of research he has done with respect to the Truman Airport and ask him if the Continental Air Command has yet been moved out there.

Mr. VINSON. No; it is still out there where it was.

Mr. GROSS. It is still where it was 12 or 14 years ago?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Continental Army Command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, $1,091,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $19,362,000.

Fort Jay, New York: Utilities, $131,000.

(Second Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Training facilities, $454,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $297,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,256,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, and utilities, $237,000.

Fort Monroe, Virginia: Operational facilities, and utilities, $315,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Utilities, $267,000.

Fort Story, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $890,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $3,665,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,886,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,621,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, $6,100,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $9,026,000.

Fort McPherson, Georgia: Troop housing, $166,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $5,823,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $430,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $7,018,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $216,000.

Camp Wolters, Texas: Operational facilities, $257,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,355,000.

Detroit Defense Area, Michigan: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $654,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,822,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,883,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing and community facilities, $861,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $8,163,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, $1,715,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Utilities, $610,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California: Training facilities, $979,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,295,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Supply facilities, $278,000.

(Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)

Cameron Station, Virginia: Supply facilities, $250,000.

United States Army Materiel Command

(United States Army Materiel Command, Headquarters)

Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts: Research, development and test facilities, $3,408,000.

(United States Army Missile Command)

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $821,000.

(United States Army Munitions Command)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $410,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, $89,000.

(United States Army Supply and Maintenance Command)

Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia: Administrative facilities, $49,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $1,754,000.

Oakland Army Terminal, California: Medical facilities, $532,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Utilities, $1,204,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $152,000.

Utah Army Depot, Utah: Utilities, $88,000.

(United States Army Test and Evaluation Command)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, troop housing and community facilities, $1,891,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, $1,017,000.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, and utilities, $849,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $1,248,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Community facilities, $373,000.

Signal Corps

East Coast Radio Transmitter Station, Woodbridge, Virginia: Utilities, $88,000.

United States Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, and utilities, $2,291,000.

Army Security Agency

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, $222,000.

Vint Hills Farms, Virginia: Operational facilities, and medical facilities, $1,306,000.

Army Component Commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $22,560,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $1,711,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Hawaii Defense Area, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $150,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $913,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Utilities, $74,000.

Outside the United States

Army Materiel Command

Various locations; Research, development and test facilities, $740,000.

Army Security Agency

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $5,798,000.

Army Component Commands

(Pacific Command Area)

Japan: Utilities, $461,000.

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $11,442,000.

Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,554,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $3,666,000.

Germany: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $9,485,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Real estate, $111,000.

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Community facilities, $442,000.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $8,900,000.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $12,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1964, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 104. (a) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Defense Atomic Support Agency" with respect to National Naval Medical Center, Maryland, strike out "$1,891,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,852,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502, "$79,499,000" and "$146,429,000" and inserting in place thereof "$80,460,000" and "$147,390,000", respectively.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 87–57 is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical services facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Lexington Signal Depot, Kentucky, strike out "$33,000" and insert in place thereof "$56,000".

(2) Under the subheading "Army Component Commands (Pacific Command Area)", with respect to various locations, strike out "$814,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,156,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "$76,918,000" and "$130,406,000" and inserting in place thereof "$77,283,000" and "$130,771,000".

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 87–554 is amended in section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the heading "Inside the United States", and under the subheading "Continental Army Command (Sixth Army)", with respect to "Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California" strike out "$159,000" and insert in place thereof "$232,000".

(2) Under the heading "Outside the United States", and under the subheading "Army Security Agency", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "$4,684,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,494,000".

(b) Public Law 87–554 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "$101,743,000", "$29,699,000" and "$148,442,000" and inserting in place thereof "$101,816,000", "$31,509,000" and "$150,325,000", respectively.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

(Naval shipyards)

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, and utilities, $169,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $842,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $3,171,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California: Utilities, $850,000.

Naval Shipyard, New York, New York: Administrative facilities, $200,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $5,382,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development and test facilities, $2,921,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, $90,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, $574,000.

Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, $522,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $274,000.

(Fleet support stations)

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina: Community facilities, $62,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Administrative facilities, and utilities, $823,000.

Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $625,000.

Fleet Training Group, Naval Station Annex, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $194,000.

(Research, development, test and evaluation stations)

Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, $1,770,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $754,000.

Naval Command Systems Support Activity, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $986,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Utilities, $226,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities, $94,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $2,355,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $786,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $208,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Operational facilities, $289,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Utilities, $73,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and utilities, $251,000.

(Field support stations)

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,765,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, $477,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $94,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, $268,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities, $946,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $884,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $8,031,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Maintenance facilities, $2,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $3,242,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,358,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $657,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and utilities, $834,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,092,000.

Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,138,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, $80,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $538,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $740,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,400,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,042,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, $621,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility: New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $2,034,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Training facilities, $276,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Supply facilities, $259,000.

(Fleet readiness stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $952,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, $694,000.

Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington: Research, development and test facilities, and real estate, $258,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Utilities, $932,000.

(Research, development, test, and evaluation stations)

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Research, development and test facilities, $1,268,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Research, development and test facilities, $780,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, and research, development and test facilities; at Point Arguello, research, development and test facilities, and troop housing; and, on San Nicolas Island, research, development and test facilities, $3,869,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $6,173,000.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, $490,000.

Supply Facilities

Fleet Material Support Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $352,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,892,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Training facilities, $735,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California: Community facilities, and utilities, $179,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, and troop housing, $12,819,000.

Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland: Utilities, $70,000.

Naval Schools, Mine Warfare, Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $819,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California: Utilities, $163,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $1,812,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, and utilities, $3,235,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $65,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Utilities, $175,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $79,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California: Troop housing, $336,000.

Communication Facilities

(Communication stations)

Naval Radio Station, Cutler, Maine: Community facilities, $240,000.

(Security group stations)

Naval Security Station, District of Columbia: Troop housing, $231,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California: Utilities, $341,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, and utilities, $282,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,730,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, $965,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $1,469,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities, $171,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,490,000.

Outside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of Philippines: Community facilities, $255,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $1,365,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Training facilities, $202,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational and training facilities, $287,000.

Naval Station, Midway Islands: Community facilities, and ground improvements, $581,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naples, Italy: Operational facilities, $310,000.

Naval Station, Sangley Point, Republic of Philippines: Operational facilities, $57,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Camp Smedley B. Butler, Okinawa: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $6,135,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Barrigada, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $414,000.

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland: Operational facilities, $517,000.

Naval Radio Station, Summit, Canal Zone: Utilities, $65,000.

Naval Radio Station, Totsuka, Japan: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,116,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $70,665,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $12,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy or his designee shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public works undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1964, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Communication facilities", with respect to the Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland, by striking out "$151,000", and inserting in place thereof, "$238,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602, the amounts "$81,558,000" and "$140,663,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$81,645,000" and "$140,750,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, and medical facilities, $677,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $659,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $675,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $808,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and medical facilities, $213,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,048,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $7,000,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Utilities, $91,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $131,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,659,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $212,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $907,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $447,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $681,000.

Air Force Logistics Command

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $2,717,000.

Kelley Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,345,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,801,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $983,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,706,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,170,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,025,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,993,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,060,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, research, development and test facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,155,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development and test facilities, $9,660,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, $5,110,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, $196,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,035,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Troop housing and community facilities, $602,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,119,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, $2,889,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $7,856,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $4,154,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,763,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational facilities, $829,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,561,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Training facilities, and hospital facilities, $2,958,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $1,754,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,741,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Troop housing, $974,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $1,475,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, utilities, and real estate, $504,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $2,225,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, $236,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and real estate, $756,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, $125,000.

Unidentified location: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $3,134,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $765,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $852,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,853,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,689,000.

Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska: Medical facilities, $145,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $160,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $9,759,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,696,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $1,284,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, $520,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $766,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, $487,000.

Orlando Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Training facilities, $191,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Operational facilities, $145,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, $2,716,000.

Pacific Air Force

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,373,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $392,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, $470,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $463,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational facilities, $174,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $549,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, $168,00.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $868,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $163,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $329,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, $70,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $709,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Troop housing, $653,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, $51,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,391,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $633,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $853,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $722,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilites, and community facilities, $1,646,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, and utilities, $297,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Medical facilities, and community facilities, $609,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Maintenance facilities, and medical facilities, $186,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $1,408,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, $135,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $663,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $410,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $89,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational facilities, $94,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $653,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $6,666,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $1,332,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, $80,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $547,000.

Tactical Air Command

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $886,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $4,226,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,067,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational facilities, $130,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $99,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $123,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $797,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $3,783,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,786,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $650,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,087,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,731,000.

Outside the United States

Air Defense Command

Various locations: Operational facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,132,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Albrook Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Medical facilities, and troop housing $291,000.

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $347,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Wake Island: Supply facilities, $34,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,198,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $24,767,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,407,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $23,884,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $11,610,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $252,629,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security consideration, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construciton authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $12,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1964, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $1,200,000.

Sandia Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Community facilities, and utilities, $389,000.

Defense Communications Agency

Navy Service Center, Arlington County, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $342,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Administrative facilities, $718,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $200,000.

Defense Intelligence Agency

Arlington Hall, Arlington County, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $61,000.

Naval Station, Anacostia Annex, District of Columbia: Training facilities, $164,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, and utilities, $623,000.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $809,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia: Administrative facilities, and utilities, $309,000.

National Security Agency

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $261,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, utilities, and real estate, $1,435,000.

TITLE V

Military family housing

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities, in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units for—

(1) the Department of the Army, 1,727 units, $33,952,000.

Fort Greely, Alaska, 62 units.

Petroleum Distribution Pipeline, Alaska, 19 units.

Fort Richardson, Alaska, 100 units.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, 33 units.

Fort Irwin, California, 65 units.

Fort Ord, California, 200 units.

Fort Carson, Colorado, 280 units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, 132 units.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, 32 units.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, 100 units.

Fort Detrick, Maryland, 40 units.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, 30 units.

Army Security Agency, location 04, 60 units.

Army Security Agency, location 23, 84 units.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, 490 units.

(2) the Department of the Navy, 4,228 units, $74,892,000.

Naval Station, Kodiak, Alaska, 250 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 100 units.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, 300 units.

Marine Corps Cold Weather Training Center, Bridgeport, California, 40 units.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California, 100 units.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, 400 units.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California, 300 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 100 units.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California, 124 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, 100 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, 400 units.

Naval Radio Station, Cutler, Maine, 12 units.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York, 8 units.

Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, 75 units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, 200 units.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, 592 units.

Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, 1 unit.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, 280 units.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, 300 units.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, 100 units.

Naval Radio Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland, 30 units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, 90 units.

Naval Radio Station, Thurso, Scotland, 26 units.

Classified location, 300 units.

(3) the Department of the Air Force, 4,045 units, $72,675,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, 290 units.

George Air Force Base, California, 150 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 150 units.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado, 200 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 100 units.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 100 units.

Bellows Air Force Station, Hawaii, 20 units.

Hickam-Wheeler Air Force Bases, Hawaii, 150 units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, 150 units.

L. G. Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 200 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 100 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 200 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 300 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 300 units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 100 units.

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee, 40 units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 100 units.

F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 200 units.

Various locations, 245 relocatable units.

Goose Air Base, Canada, 200 units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 100 units.

Naha Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

Clark Air Base, Philippine Islands, 250 units.

Site QC, 200 units.

(b) Trailer Court Facilities for:

(1) The Department of the Army, 383 spaces, $657,000.

(2) The Department of the Navy, 172 spaces, $279,000.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, 984 spaces, $1,607,000.

SEC. 502. Authorizations for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The cost per unit of family housing constructed in the conterminous United States, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico, shall not exceed—

$22,000 for generals or equivalent;

$19,800 for colonels or equivalent;

$17,600 for majors and/or lieutenant colonels or equivalent;

$15,400 for all other commissioned or warrant officer personnel or equivalent;

$13,200 for enlisted personnel;

(b) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units shall not exceed $32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed $40,000.

(c) The cost limitations provided in subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied to the five-foot line.

(d) No project in excess of 50 units in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at an average unit cost exceeding $17,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(e) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding $26,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. Sections 4774(b), 7574(b), and 9774(b) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended to read as follows: "(b) the maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, air base, or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position."

SEC. 504. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army, $3,231,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,677,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $3,863,000.

SEC. 505. Section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1964 through and including 1966, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installations. Not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time, nor may the rental for any such unit exceed $170 a month, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

SEC. 506. Section 407(g) of Public Law 85–241 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594(g)), is amended by changing the period to a semicolon and adding the following: "and *Provided, further,* That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may exempt, not to exceed 22,000 units, from this requirement any housing at any particular installation as to which he determines that (1) the housing is safe, decent, and sanitary, so as to be suitable for occupancy; (2) the housing cannot be made adequate as public quarters with a reasonable expenditure of funds; (3) the rentals charged to, or the allowances forfeited by, the occupants are not less than the costs of maintaining and operating the housing; and (4) there is a continuing need which cannot appropriately be met by privately owned housing in the area."

SEC. 507. For the purpose of providing military family housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders of such housing a rental return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which the builders would receive from the tenants if the housing were fully occupied: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into in any fiscal year shall not exceed, on an annual basis, such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units: *Provided further,* That no such agreement shall guarantee the payment of more than 97 per centum of the anticipated rentals, nor shall any guarantee extend for a period of more than ten years, nor shall the average guaranteed rental on any project exceed $150 per unit per month including the cost of maintenance and operation.

SEC. 508. The Secretary of Defense or his designee is authorized to acquire and rehabilitate not to exceed two thousand and twenty-three units of housing under the authority granted by section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594a), in an amount not to exceed $9,400,000.

SEC. 509. There is authorized to be appropriated, for use by the Secretary of Defense or his designee in support of military family housing, an amount not to exceed $490,629,000 for the following purposes: Improvements to inadequate units of family housing; minor construction; planning; rental guaranty payments; leasing; operating expenses; maintenance of real property; payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred and payments for equities acquired pursuant to title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594 et seq.); payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation; and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m).

TITLE VI

General provisions

SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $144,573,000; outside the United States, $34,699,000; section 102, $8,900,000; section 103, $12,500,000; or a total of $200,672,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $110,808,000; outside the United States, $11,304,000; section 202, $70,665,000; section 203, $12,500,000; or a total of $205,277,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $164,058,000; outside the United States, $64,763,000; section 302, $252,629,000; section 303, $12,500,000; or a total of $493,950,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of $6,511,000.

(5) for title V: For construction, including acquisition, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and operation, maintenance, and debt payments, including leasing and minor construction of family housing for a total of $692,862,000.

SEC. 603. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projcts inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 604. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 605. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 606. (a) As of October 1, 1964, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1962, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions:

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1964, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223, 241), the authorization for utilities and ground improvements in the amount of $125,000 for Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Service School Facilities" of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 172).

(b) As of October 1, 1964, all authorizations, for construction of family housing which are contained in this Act or any Act approved prior to July 28, 1962, are repealed except (1) the authorization for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1964; and (2) notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223, 241), the authorization for—

(1) construction of twenty-seven family housing units for the Joint United States Military Mission, Golcuk, Turkey, which is contained in section 201 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 174);

(2) construction of two hundred family housing units for the Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, which is contained in section 201 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 173);

(3) construction of one hundred family housing units and community facilities at Site I–5, which is contained in section 301 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 181); and

(4) construction of one hundred family housing units at Site 1–D, which is contained in section 301 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 181).

SEC. 607. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 608. The last sentence of section 2674 (a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by changing the figure "$5,000" to "$25,000."

Sec. 609. (a) Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2682. Facilities for defense agencies

"The construction, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair, alteration, addition, expansion, or extension of a real property facility for an activity or agency of the Department of Defense (other than a military department) financed from appropriations for military functions of the Department of Defense will be accomplished by or through a military department designated by the Secretary of Defense. A real property facility under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense which is used by an activity or agency of the Department of Defense (other than a military department) shall be under the jurisdiction of a military department designated by the Secretary of Defense."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"2682. Facilities for defense agencies."

(b) Section 610 of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223, 242), is repealed.

Sec. 610. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1963, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for any research, development, test, or evaluation, unless appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates."

Sec. 611. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1964."

TITLE II

Reserve Forces facilities

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $3,600,000.

(b) Army Reserve, $4,700,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $5,700,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $15,600,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,600,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. As of July 1, 1964, all authorizations for specific facilities for Reserve Forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1961, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except the authorizations for facilities for the Reserve Forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1964, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

Sec. 704. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 501 with respect to Morristown, New Jersey, by striking out "$317,000" and inserting in place thereof "$377,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1)(a) of section 504 "$21,530,000" and inserting in place thereof "$21,590,000".

Sec. 705. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may construct, expand, rehabilitate, convert, or equip existing facilities of the New York Naval Militia at Rochester, New York and Troy, New York, without regard to the provisions of section 2233(b) of title 10, United States Code.

Sec. 706. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1964."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill, that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, attention has been called repeatedly to the fact that the State of West Virginia is consistently avoided in awards for military installations. In conformity with practice in the past, appropriations for the year 1964 provide for expenditures in 49 States of the Union, plus outlying territories, plus a number of foreign countries. But not West Virginia. It is said that one time may represent an accident, two times a coincidence, but three times makes a habit. Is there some good reason for the repetitious omission?

The situation becomes especially puzzling when we consider that West Virginia, possesses characteristics and resources that are normally considered desirable for military installations. We have a superabundance of power, coal, gas, oil, huge electrical development. Chemical industries are highly developed, particularly those which are needed in war. Land is cheap, and native labor is available under favorable terms. The State is largely made up of valleys guarded by steep mountains, apparently an ideal place to defend against attack. Transportation by air, by rail, by highway, and even by navigable streams is well organized. Have these facts not been brought to the attention of the agencies which dispense military construction contracts?

One military award was once made to West Virginia. That was the Naval Radio Research Station at Sugar Grove, once called the Big Ear. It was erected at a cost of nearly $100 million and then abandoned. It was designed to pick up information from all over the world, and to provide dependable communication with the world. The reason given for abandoning the project was that the Telstar and other like systems, operated by private industry, could do the job better. Yet a nation which is a firm friend of ours, Great Britain, has taken up where we left off in developing a ground-based "Big Ear." England is not convinced that our control over space vehicles is sufficiently reliable to place our safety in their hands.

Not long ago President Kennedy had occasion to say that West Virginia has contributed a greater percentage of fighting men to the service of the Nation during its hundred years of existence as a State than any other State in the Union. Actually, West Virginia was born in war. Her citizens adhered to the Union when others around her deserted the flag. Some of them, a multitude of them, lie in the last long sleep all over the surface of the globe. They fought for liberty because, as Washington said, mountaineers will always be free. Far be it from West Virginia to desire war because it is profitable to some. The price of patriotism is not to be measured in dollars. But the descendants, the survivors, of those who demonstrated with their bodies their allegiance to the high principles of our Nation deserve to be made equal with their brothers in other States in the advantages which accrue from the heroic effort they made. If war and preparation for war is to be made a means of advancing the economic interests of citizens elsewhere, as it most unfortunately is, our claims for recognition should not be ignored.

In the absence of any readily perceived reason for neglect in West Virginia, it might be feared by some that vast financial power pulls appropriations away from West Virginia. For there is intense competition for the rich rewards which big military contracts bring to any area. West Virginia is a great industrial complex of fuel and railroads and chemicals and glass, and also a persistent unemployment sore. The industries are owned largely by outside capital. The unemployment is native. West Virginia resources enrich financial power everywhere, except in West Virginia. In a sense, West Virginia is a vassal State. A hundred years ago West Virginia separated from the mother State for the purpose of throwing off one tyrant. Are we to fall into bondage to still another? These are serious questions, and deserve a more responsible consideration than they have been given as yet. I have no hesitation in voicing my bitter disappointment that West Virginia is continually treated as a redheaded stepchild in the matter of passing out Federal favors.

The Federal Government in pursuing its large national policies is compelled to call for sacrifices on the part of some areas of the Nation, as well as to award valuable favors. Here again West Virginia bears the brunt of the sacrifices. West Virginia is the greatest coal producing area in the world. But in order to promote general national interests, it has been decreed that coal must give place to imported residual oil. One result—40,000 coal miners unemployed, and the State losing population every year.

Further, if there is one industry for which West Virginia has superior resources, it is the glass industry. This industry, too, has been virtually destroyed in our State by foreign trade agreements which are intended to stimulate the economies of nations who were recently our bitter enemies. If the strength and the survival of our Nation demands it, we are willing to tighten up our belts and hold on. But how about some of the sweet along with the bitter?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. Briefly for an explanation, that is all.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that not so long ago a former naval installation was sold to a private industry for the purpose of building military vehicles, and there is a tremendous amount of defense dollars going into West Virginia as of right now.

Mr. STAGGERS. Just 1 minute now. Will you tell me where that defense installation was located that was sold?

Mr. HARDY. It is located in the district of the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK]. And if the gentleman would like to know specifically to whom it belongs, I can tell him.

Mr. STAGGERS. No; I heard your clerk say that. I know to whom it belongs. It is Food & Machinery Corporation. It was an obsolete installation and it was put there during the First World War. That is as far as I want to yield. I know the next argument. You will say there is nothing in this for any new installations. I know there is a lot of new construction going on. As previously pointed out, President Kennedy made a statement recently that West Virginia contributed percentagewise more soldiers to the defense of America than any other State since 1863 and more of our boys are lying on foreign battlefields and in graves in this Nation than any other State.

I do not understand this. I am not saying anything against the committee but they are the watchdogs on this. There are 49 other States allowed for here. West Virginia is not. Once it could have been a mistake; a second time it could have been a coincidence, but the third time it becomes a habit.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this: The next time a military construction bill comes before this House, will he try not to leave out just one State but see that West Virginia is considered along with the other 49 States? It does still belong to the Union and it pays its taxes just like the rest of the States.

I ask that we be given justice and the committee consider us.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia it was a continuing pleasure for a long time to cooperate with our former colleague, Mr. Bailey, in reference to military installations that were militarily justified for West Virginia. After some study of the matter it was decided to construct a new naval research facility at Sugar Grove, W. Va. We spent approximately $95 million at that location doing certain things that were highly classified. Unfortunately, it has been decided to discontinue the project. We did so after that enormous expenditure, due to the fact that technological developments had made continuation of the project impractical.

I have been trying to help the delegation from West Virginia ever since I have had the privilege of serving with you and the other Members and I can assure you, and any other Member of the House, if the military justification warrants it I will be glad to do what I can. However, I will not commit myself at any time just to put military installations in any State when there is no military justification for them. I hope the jusification will be there. If it is there you will have my support, but if it is not, with all deference to you or any other Member I will not lend my support to it.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to say this to the gentleman: A lot of military men have said West Virginia is ideally situated with its mountainous terrain. It has available the energy in the form of coal, gas, oil, water, and manpower. I cannot understand why some consideration has not been given to it. You mentioned the fact of Sugar Grove. Yes, $35 million was spent.

Mr. VINSON. $95 million.

Mr. STAGGERS. Just a minute, my friend. It was not spent. It has to be spent in order to close it up and to comply with the contracts that have been let. Today, England is doing some of the things that were supposed to have been done in West Virginia and they are saying it is necessary.

Mr. VINSON. Whether it has been spent or not—the fact remains that this project will ultimately cost about $95 million to completely satisfy our Government's obligations.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right, but only $30 to $35 million was spent on construction.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this: There are other activities which the Department of the Navy and the other military departments are reviewing, in the hope that they may find some utilization of the great expenditure made there. There is no need for the gentleman to get excited about it. If the facts warrant it, an activity will be put there. I am hoping the facts will warrant installations going into West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say again to the gentleman that it depends on who is looking at the facts and who wants to see what is justifiable and what is not. But I would say, as the gentleman is chairman of this committee, with the power he does have, and the power of suggestion, that perhaps they could see to it that West Virginia could qualify for one of these installations. That is all I am asking, that we be given consideration as one of the sovereign States of the Nation which has given so much to this Union.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman that he will receive full consideration. I assure the gentleman that I am a great champion of providing something in West Virginia if the facts warrant its going there.

Mr. STAGGERS. I appreciate that; that is what I wanted to hear.

Mr. VINSON. May I say, if the gentleman will bear with us, and not be too critical of us——

Mr. STAGGERS. I am not being personal. I want to assure the gentleman that I am not being personal. I believe in his integrity and I know of his great and dedicated service to the Nation.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my able colleague from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] for bringing this problem so forcefully to the attention of this Committee. I believe the facts he has brought out are very convincing. Yesterday, I addressed the House on the same subject and pointed out that whereas the State of West Virginia had the highest unemployment rate of any State in the Union in 1962, West Virginia received not a single red cent in this military construction bill. It is very true that since 1961 West Virginia has made great progress in increased military contracts, in great plants like the Food Machinery Corp., and in Area Redevelopment Administration and accelerated public works grants. But West Virginia still has a long way to go to regain a semblance of equality with other States in military installations.

I would like to pose this question: Is it not true that with a scarcity of military installations in West Virginia, there is a military argument for placing installations into an area that does not constitute so large a strategic target?

Mr. STAGGERS. Certainly that would be true. We are close to the great populations of the East. We are in an area that would be impregnable from the standpoint of its natural terrain. We have some of the largest caverns of the Nation that would be available to install underground installations for defense. There are other factors that would make the State ideally located for a defense installation.

Mr. HECHLER. As I pointed out to the House yesterday, the State of West Virginia has the highest unemployment rate of any State in the Union. I would be the first to protest against making military decisions on geographical or political considerations. But I share the gentleman's feeling, and I am very hopeful that in the future, all other considerations being equal, some attention will be given to locating military installations in those areas where there is a large pool of unemployed and available manpower. By placing more installations in West Virginia, we would also benefit the taxpayers of the Nation by reducing the amount of welfare and unemployment payments, and adding to the strength of the whole economy. I certainly trust that more attention will be paid to West Virginia in the future.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his observations. I thank the chairman of the committee for the time he has given and his answers to my questions. I do hope that the next time West Virginia will be considered, when 49 States and 15 foreign powers are recognized with installations, with none in West Virginia.

West Virginia will be one of the—economically, culturally, and socially—powerful States of the Nation 10 years from now—regardless of what is done here today or in the intervening years. We have the brains, the brawn, and the natural wealth. All we need is the catalyst which is being applied now.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from West Virginia did not give me an opportunity to complete the statement that I was about to make in connection with the food machinery installation. I can appreciate the fact that the gentleman may feel somewhat sensitive about there not being military installations in West Virginia. But I think he should bear in mind that the Committee on Armed Services does not undertake to make military decisions with respect to the location of military installations until there is at least some indication from the military themselves concerning them. The military have made no such suggestion for West Virginia so far as this year's construction program is concerned. As a consequence the only thing that was included in the bill this year had to do with the Sugar Grove matter, which the committee did defer, as has been explained by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

I tried to point out to the gentleman that although there are no military construction funds for West Virginia in this bill the military does spend a considerable amount of money in West Virginia, and I am delighted that it does. If they did not find it economically desirable and profitable to do so they would not do it, nor would I support them in so doing because I think we have to base expenditures on economic and military justifications alone. I do not think the gentleman would want any member on the Committee on Armed Services to approach it from any other angle.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chiarman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman mentioned food machinery.

Mr. HARDY. I am completely familiar with that. The gentleman of course knows they bought the property from the Navy.

Mr. STAGGERS. Was it obsolete?

Mr. HARDY. Whether it was obsolete or not, it had usefulness, and it is being used for industrial purposes now.

I will support any authorization for West Virginia where there is a proper military and economic justification for it. Except on that basis I shall not support one dime for any location.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say this, that if you will investigate West Virginia you will find it has as much natural wealth as any State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY. I must say to the gentleman I would not contest that with him for 1 second. That is not the point at issue. The gentleman is bringing up spurious arguments here to support what he may feel to be a perfectly reasonable proposition, to put military installations in West Virginia. If they are not militarily desirable or economically desirable, they have no business being there.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Would the gentleman from Virginia agree that from the standpoint of being out of the strategic target area, where you do not have any surrounding military installations, there is a real military argument for dispersal?

Mr. HARDY. I would agree with the gentleman that argument can be made and probably made very forcefully. I would say to him, however, that that argument should be made to the military and weighed along with other military considerations. I feel certain that has been done in the case of West Virginia. It may not have been adequately weighed but this is not the proper forum to bring up this argument.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] to know that West Virginia is not alone in not getting any military construction under this bill, because the State of Vermont also has nothing provided for it herein. I do not think the reason for our exclusion is that we did not back the Democratic administration during the last presidential election.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] indicates, military considerations are the proper criteria to determine where military construction should occur. I join the gentleman from West Virginia in the hope that in another year the necessary criteria can justify Vermont as well as West Virginia for military construction.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, from what the chairman and other members of the Armed Services Committee have said here today the committee spent many days going over the military construction authorization bill, and in the final analysis reduced the requests for authorization by $242,983,000. This reduction made by the committee amounts to approximately 13 percent across the board. We are assured that these reductions will in no way impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

Despite this assurance I regret that the committee has seen fit to delete one item which is of considerable importance to the capabilities of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in my district. This was a large crane which had been requested for use in connection with a large drydock located at this yard. It is the world's largest drydock and was completed over a year ago—except for additional increments such as the crane. In order for the drydock, which was constructed at considerable cost, to be fully utilized it should have a crane that can reach halfway across its width. Some members of the committee have told me that while they realize the eventual need of the crane the full committee felt that provision for it could be put off until a later date. They have given me assurance that it, together with many other deleted items, will be considered in the next authorization bill. I respectfully disagree with them and believe the crane ought to be authorized this year so that there will be no unnecessary delay in is construction should one of the supercarriers need repair or overhaul work done at the yard.

However, I recognize the futility at this point of offering an amendment to restore the item. As usual, the House would support the committee position and defeat the amendment. This would make it difficult for the House conferees to accept the item in conference should the Senate see fit to include it in their authorization bill. At this time, therefore, I desire only to register my views and to urge the House conferees to give favorable consideration to the crane item should it be brought up in conference.

It seems to me that having authorized and constructed the drydock at great expense we ought to complete the whole project as quickly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Willis, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6500) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 386, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor this morning to say a few words about the question of Hungary.

According to this morning's press reports, the question of accepting the credentials of the representative of the Hungarian regime to the United Nations will be considered today by the credentials committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is also anticipated that today—for the first time since 1956—the U.S. Representative to the United Nations will not oppose the acceptance of those credentials.

This anticipated action represents a dramatic shift in our Government's policy on the question of Hungary. It is a shift which I deplore, and with which I cannot agree.

In 1957, as the chairman of a Special Study Mission to Europe, I submitted a report to the Congress which dealt with the question of Hungary. The number of that report is House Report 531, 85th Congress, 1st session. I would like to quote from that report, because I believe that the facts it outlined—and the position it took—are as valid today as they were in 1957.

Addressing itself to the brutal suppression of the Hungarian uprising by Soviet tanks and troops, the report stated:

> The Hungarian revolution demonstrated that Soviet policy toward the satellite nations is a policy of ruthless colonialism and overlordship of both human and natural resources without parallel in modern history. * * *
>
> The Hungarian revolution demonstrated to the whole free world that Soviet force cannot suppress the basic desire of people for freedom. It exploded the myth that constant indoctrination and savage suppression of fundamental liberties could destroy that basic desire among the workers, the intellectuals, and, most important, the youth of a nation.

Our report then went on to address itself to the issue of U.S. policy toward Hungary—and toward the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian uprising—in these words:

> The United States is justly regarded as a great power. The people of the free world and those behind the Iron Curtain feel that the United States has not utilized its power effectively. In stating this, they do not have reference solely to military forces or expenditure of money, but rather to the exercise of leadership in marshaling world opinion and promoting the ideas underlining the Western way of life. The failure of U.S. foreign policy, as highlighted by the failure of our action toward Hungary, has indicated to the world that while the United States can marshal its forces effectively for all-out military purposes, it has failed to prepare for the kind of war where weapons subtler than guns and tanks are needed.

This, to me, is the crux of the problem which confronts us today.

The problem centers on our leadership in the free world.

I believe that we cannot maintain a position of leadership unless we are willing to lead—to lead, and fight, and sometimes to lose when standing up for our principles.

We are told by the Department of State that our Government is going to withdraw its opposition to the acceptance of the credentials of the representative of the Hungarian regime because we are afraid that our position may lose in the credentials committee.

This, to me, is no reason for giving up the fight and "throwing in the sponge."

The Hungarian regime is still the same regime which collaborated with the Soviets in a brutal suppression of the Hungarian people.

It is still the same regime which has been condemned by the United Nations and which has repeatedly flouted United Nations' resolutions.

There is no reason, therefore, for us to change our position.

We should stick to our position even though we may lose in the U.N. credentials committee. Our cause is just and right. Unless we uphold it, we forfeit our claim to leadership in the worldwide battle for the survival of the principles which are dear to each and every one of us.

SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS AS OPPOSED TO RIGHT OF A PERSON TO OWN AND CONTROL HIS OWN PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, including white and colored, face a crisis brought about by those who would destroy lawful procedures in the quest for power. Public officials are not serving the cause of justice for minority groups when they attempt to use the power of the Federal Government to take away the right of a person to own and control private property.

William S. White, in an article entitled "Mongers of Hate and Hysteria," states that some Negroes are demanding the creation of false rights. Yes, all people are entitled to vote and use public facilities, but public facilities do not include private property that is not public utility in nature.

The article referred to follows:

MONGERS OF HATE AND HYSTERIA—THEY INFLAME RACIAL TENSIONS IN UNITED STATES; BLACKMAIL OF FEAR THREATENS FREEDOM

(By William S. White)

This country, which has not in fact ever been very strong on hatred, is being warned, rightly if excessively, against the "merchants of hate."

We ought, however, to be alerted to another sort of merchant, too. This is the monger of hysteria and the peddler of a double-think based upon double standards of truth and objectivity.

All over this land he is suddenly overstating and inflaming, rather than sensibly seeking to abate, the current racial tensions of the United States.

To say that these are ugly tensions is to say the truth. To warn, as many are doing as though on signal, that these tensions are the foreshadowings of national revolution is to speak inflammable falsehood. But this dangerous falsehood can become dangerous reality if the hysteria monger is not quieted or will not quiet himself and so cease bellowing "fire" in a crowded national theater.

For now he is raising demands not simply for the just vindication of the Negro's actual rights. He is demanding the creation, for the Negro alone, of false rights which are not now, and never have been in all the long centuries of an Anglo-American concept based on orderly freedom, the rights of anybody at all.

Fairminded men—and being fair now requires fairness to the majority as well as to the minority and fairness also to constitutional truth—will agree that the actual rights thus far denied the Negro must be granted to him. These actual rights include the ballot and an equal opportunity in all the public facilities—the schools, the parks, transportation, and so on.

But they do not include and will never include—unless the Kennedy administration is to seek that destruction through Congress or the Supreme Court—the destruction of the most ancient and irreplaceable right of man in an open society. This is the right of privacy outside his public obligations, including the private operation, wise or unwise, of private property.

If a shopkeeper can be compelled by unexampled Federal force to serve all who appear there and if on refusing his business can be disrupted with Federal blessing by demonstrators swarming in from the streets, the institution of private property is finished. When the institution of private property is finished, personal privacy is finished.

The lawyer who prefers to choose his clients—or his clerks—can find his law office seized and occupied by those he has rejected. So can the doctor. So can any editor or other professional man. The employer undoubtedly can be told whom to fire and whom he must not fire.

Private property and private attitudes, however sourly run the one and however wrong the other, are not public utilities nor publicly established and paid-for enterprises. They are not buses on which all are free to ride by dropping in a dime.

And take note of this: This is no longer simply a problem for the South, that region of minority economic power, minority political power, and minority opinionmaking power. So long the South has been the very safe, and very rewarding, whipping boy for the hysteria-monger comfortably established far from the scene of tortured dilemma.

But no more. Involved here is all of this country and every man in it, of every color. For, consciously, or not, the hysteria-monger—that collective symbol for demagogic politicians and emotionally transfixed opinion-molders—is reaching for something far different from equal justice for minorities. He is, consciously or not, reaching for the end of orderly freedom.

And he is doing so by a blackmail of fear; fear that unless administration and Congress submit, they—the Negroes—will turn in violence upon their country.

This is more than a libel on the Negro race. This is creating an intolerable either-or climate alien to all that this Nation is.

A terrible issue is being approached not on such criteria as what in fairness and lawfulness should be done, but rather upon what must be done lest they bring anarchy and revolution.

Let those who ceaselessly warn of what must be done pause before it is altogether too late and ask themselves: Am I really warning, or am I inciting violence and thus repaying past injustice to one minority with immense and irreparable future injustice to all Americans and to the American vision of unity in diversity which is the greatest gift in all history to free government?

UNITED STATES SHOULD PROTECT OUR FISHING VESSELS IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Ecuador has fined two U.S. fishing boats a total of $20,688 on charges of violating Ecuador's territorial waters.

Ecuador claims its territorial waters extend 200 miles off its coast, whereas international law historically has recognized a 3-mile limit.

As I understand, under previous policy our State Department has reimbursed fishermen for any such illegal fines. However, I think this is really the same as our Government paying ransom and I hope the Appropriations Committees of Congress can limit the use of such funds.

Meanwhile, I think it would be proper to reduce our foreign aid to Ecuador by the amount of $20,688. Using a former U.S. Navy landing craft to intercept our fishing vessels in international waters, Ecuador under international law is practicing piracy.

Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to get an amendment to the foreign aid bill so that any illegal fines such as under this recent incident will be deductible from our foreign economic aid, of which since 1946 we have given Ecuador a total of $113 million plus military aid in the amount of $29 million.

I am urging our State Department to afford our fishing industry protection under the Constitution and to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, June 7, 1963, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 6791, to continue for 2 years the existing reduction and exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents and for other purposes, together with any supplemental views.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the following is a telegram that I have sent to His Eminence Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, the Vatican, on the passing of His Holiness Pope John XXIII:

JUNE 3, 1963.

HIS EMINENCE AMLETO CARDINAL CICOGNANI,
Secretary of State,
The Vatican, Italy:

The death of His Holiness Pope John XXIII is a great loss to mankind. His holiness has made a profound imprint on the pages of history of the Catholic Church and the world as a whole. His love of God and of mankind was always evident by his utterances and his actions. The spirit of his saintly life and of his leadership will always live to guide others in the years that lie ahead. Speaking for the Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and for myself personally and as Speaker, I extend our deepest sympathy in the passing of His Holiness Pope John XXIII.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives.

FALLOUT LIMITATION TREATY PROPOSED

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, after 5 years of negotiation we are no closer to a comprehensive test ban treaty than in 1958 when the Geneva test ban merry-go-round opened for business. Then it was billed principally as the sure cure for whatever measure of fallout headaches the world suffers. Since then it has received a variety of top billings as the sure cure for a succession of other international ills as they assumed temporary prominence from time to time.

According to a number of Members of the other body, the time has come for the Geneva carousel to revolve around again to the matter of fallout. They have presented a resolution calling for a reduction in scope of the negotiations to take dead aim on a simple treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere and underwater. This proposition the Soviets already have twice rejected and are more than likely to reject once more.

Simultaneously, and apparently as an accommodation to the McMillan government's efforts toward political survival in the face of forthcoming general elections in the United Kingdom, the White House is in the process of further scaling down the U.S. negotiating position in an attempt to meet Soviet demands for a comprehensive treaty full of holes in which to bootleg clandestine tests without fear of discovery.

It is long past time to get off the Geneva test ban merry-go-round. Put another way, the U.S. administration should stop tilting windmills and direct its attention to practical steps to deal with whatever future risks may be involved in continued unrestricted atmospheric testing.

The dismal Geneva years are now on their death bed. The resolution in the other body is the coup-de-grace. The time is at hand to pull ourselves out of the numbing quicksands of the past. By the course of events over the last few months the United States has opportunity to seize the initiative if its current leaders have the vision to see that opportunity. During these months the obstructionism of the Soviets has become apparent for all the world to see. During these months the American people, by widespread discussion, have been given the chance to see the test ban issue as it is in reality, rather than as it seemed from rather dewy-eyed assessments of the State Department and Disarmament Agency.

There is now an avenue open to make a bold move, leave the dismal failures of the past behind and travel in a direction which will restore the United States to its natural and proper position of leadership in world affairs. That avenue is one which both Soviet self-interest and the pressure of outside opinion upon the Kremlin might have some effect. It does not involve the chancy business of freezing U.S. nuclear progress in return for no more than an unpoliced Soviet promise to freeze its progress.

The suggestion I make here is in that context and at a time when fallout from previous Soviet tests is most severe.

During the past 2 years, 1961 and 1962, the U.S.S.R. detonated a total of 300 megatons of which 85 megatons was fission yield. This is a ratio of almost 8 to 1 compared with the restricted and discriminate total yield of U.S. tests during the same period. The ratio of Soviet fission yield to U.S. fission yield for this 2-year period is more than 5 to 1.

Therefore, I call upon President Kennedy to invite the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and France, nations which possess nuclear capabilities, to a conference on fallout limitation with the end in view of achieving a simple, workable treaty placing reasonable limitations upon the amount of fallout creating radionuclides which will be placed in the world environment.

There is precedent for such action in the International Whaling Convention signed in Washington, D.C., in 1946. The whaling nations of the world established hunting seasons, catch limits, and other restraints for the general benefit of all. An International Whaling Commission was established to handle the continuing details of the agreement.

A similar treaty respecting fallout would also have elements of mutual self-interest to the nuclear powers and would be equal among them as to the effects of the attitudes of nonnuclear powers toward the participants. Any nation subsequently achieving nuclear testing capability could become subject to the obligations of the treaty under arrangements which would not involve diplomatic recognition, such as the possible case of Red China.

Nonnuclear nations should not be made parties to the negotiations, not because they are not concerned with fallout, but because experience indicates they constitute an impediment to reaching agreement. For similar reasons the negotiators should avoid such historically nonproductive sites for negotiations as Geneva while carrying on their duties.

The lesson should have been learned from the Geneva negotiations that the whole course of Soviet intransigent nonnegotiation in good faith on a comprehensive test ban is totally convincing evidence they do not want such a treaty. They only want a steady, convenient platform for dissemination of propaganda and opportunity for the continual humiliation of the United States and United Kingdom by arrogance in summarily dealing with repetitious softenings of the Western position.

The call for the fallout limitation conference must be carefully designed to deny such opportunities to the Soviets and keep them strictly to the business at hand. Also, before issuing the call, the State Department should review carefully every trick relating to financing, administration, operations, policy determination, technical matters, and other areas which the Soviet Government has resorted to in the past to stymie negotiations, render treaties ineffectual and paralyze international organizations, such as the United Nations. With these matters in mind, the call for the conference and any U.S. proposals thereat should be designed to avoid or negate each and every Soviet potentiality for mischief in the dirty tricks department.

If the U.S. State Department possesses the skill which it claims, but thus far has failed to demonstrate, then both the negotiating sessions and any resultant treaty should establish workable limitations on fallout and an administrative setup free from paralysis and capable of meeting future problems involved with the limitations as and when they arise, free from Soviet obstruction, veto or contumacy.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week the European Common Market increased its duties on U.S. poultry by another 1¼ cent per pound. This comes on the heels of an increase last year from 5 cents to 13 cents per pound. Naturally, the consequences are to raise an insurmountable trade barrier to exclude American poultry from the marketplace in the nations belonging to the European Economic Community. It has been said with justification that this action amounts to a total embargo.

The Common Market's decision has been greeted with surprise here. If there were inklings that tariffs were to be increased, it was a carefully guarded secret in the White House and the State and Agriculture Departments. Last January, at a meeting February 8 called by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that negotiation to dismantle the complex of tariffs, levies, and restrictions against poultry was proceeding. At that time, he explained, there was reason to hope for a fair solution. He said:

> Our problem now is to negotiate and seek to enforce (our) rights. We do not go to Europe asking for concessions. We go there properly asking for consideration.

A few days ago, on May 29, Mr. Freeman appeared before the Subcommitee on Poultry of the House Agriculture Committee. The optimistic or at least hopeful tone of January was still apparent although negotiations had dragged on without results for many months. At that time, he said:

> We have taken vigorous steps to protect our rights. The President has taken a strong personal hand in this matter, and has urged Common Market officials to modify the protective elements of the system to improve access for our poultry. I can state unequivocally that we have had the wholehearted cooperation * * * of the whole machinery of our Government in trying to achieve a reasonable solution to this problem.

Several days later, despite the vigor of the "whole machinery of our Government," the blow fell and the barriers were raised. We had expected with reasonable assurance that a reduction of several cents per pound would be agreed upon. Under the circumstances, we have reason for dismay.

The American poultry industry is seriously imperiled by the arbitrary and unreasonable action. Although this industry is relatively new, the loss of the European market involves a loss of $50 million of export income. Additional losses, the industry has pointed out, will result in depressed domestic prices if the export volume is forced back into domestic channels. Had there been no exports in 1960, for instance, producers would have suffered losses from various related causes totaling almost $100 million. What this means in terms of jobs and local economic problems is not difficult to imagine—particularly in view of the fact that poultry production is relatively concentrated. North Carolina has been and will continue to be hard hit by this denial of access to European markets.

American poultry is being walled out of the EEC countries because it is competitive in price. The European action is an example of classical protectionism at a time when this country has proceeded to throw open its markets to foreign trade competition.

Trade policy legislation enacted last year gives the President unprecedented powers to lower and abolish our own tariffs even though production costs, including labor costs, in countries abroad provide significant price advantages to foreign producers. In Secretary Freeman's statement of May 28, he conceded that "we have been patient, perhaps overly patient, in seeking a solution within the existing system."

It looks to me that we have played our cards badly or we have not played them at all. The time has come for us to get into this game and stop assuming that our domestic industries can be harmed or bankrupted without doing irreparable harm to our entire economic system.

There has been so much daydreaming about free trade that its concepts have become an institutional religion. We have prated about "reciprocal trade" so much that the two words are united in holy matrimony. Reciprocity exists if we earn it through hard bargaining in international negotiations and the record is clear enough that we have not.

Unfortunately, there are plenty of examples where we have bargained away trade advantages and allowed our own markets to be invaded by a huge flow of low-cost products from abroad. There is little reason for other nations to hesitate to bar American products if they feel they can do it with impunity and at the same time enjoy the advantage of expanding operations in the American market.

This administration has been inactive and ineffectual in dealing with trade issues of many kinds. The poultry problem is only one. Cotton textile imports are flooding our markets and threaten economic disaster for our domestic cotton textile industry. If this were an issue of free trade competition, it would be one thing, but it is not. Foreign textile producers are sold American cotton at a price far lower than it can be bought by American companies. Then, the foreign producers with all their accumulated price advantages are invited to bring their wares back into our domestic market. This is a disgraceful mess. The administration, having painted itself into a corner, has shown a singular lack of imagination about how to get out. While it flounders in "freetradeland," the textile industry struggles with overpowering problems imposed and retained by the Federal Government in Washington.

Import competition problems are besetting the American shoe industry. Yesterday, I signed a petition to the President urging that voluntary quotas on imports be negotiated by our Government. We have had a long and unhappy experience with "voluntary quotas," but they seem to be a minimum action required by the shoe import situation today.

Still another facet of our faltering trade policy can be seen in the delay in placing an embargo on the export of walnut logs. Virtually every other country possessing this resource has long taken this step. We see evidence of the dissipation of our resources of walnut and the situation is alarming. Still, the administration takes no action.

These examples can be multiplied many times in industries with which the Members of the House are familiar. The pattern is the same, however.

The President possesses tremendous powers he has claimed he must have to deal effectively with international trade problems. Nevertheless, the problems are compounded. We need to follow rules in a world as it is, not as it ought to be or as we would like it to be. Such rights as we may have need to be asserted. Failure to assert these rights is, in fact, an attitude of "sweet unreasonableness" that can stimulate the very kind of suicidal trade war that the administration hopes to avoid. We are already well down that road now and more obliviousness, mistaken for the virtue of patience, can only push us closer to the abyss.

PERFORM SOMETHING WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 3, I had the privilege of speaking at the commencement exercises at Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., which is located in the district represented in Congress by the Honorable JAMES H. QUILLEN. On this same date Congressman QUILLEN was in Johnson City, Tenn., addressing the graduates of Steed College of Technology.

This was a memorable occasion and Congressman QUILLEN's remarks were equal to the occasion. He made a fine address, "Perform Something Worthy To Be Remembered." I have had the privilege of reading Congressman QUILLEN's speech and hasten to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Congressman QUILLEN serves with me on the Public Works Committee. I know firsthand of his ability and dedication and especially his devotion to duty. He just joined the Congress this year, but he has already made a significant mark and has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues. He carries on the fine tradition of outstanding representation which the First District of Tennessee has had over the years through the Honorable Carroll B. Reece and his wife, Louise Goff Reece.

It is also appropriate for me to include some remarks about Steed College of Technology and pay a special tribute to Dr. C. C. Steed, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, and all those interested in this institution for the fine work that they are doing.

Since the time when Steed Tech was chartered by the State of Tennessee as an institution of higher learning, it has gained a coveted reputation and national recognition.

The first aim of Steed Tech is to train its students in the development of high standards of Christian living and moral character. Steed Tech believes that this is the only foundation upon which an individual or a business can achieve permanent and enduring success. These values stimulate and develop in a person an effective philosophy of life and appropriate habits of action, which are essential if a person is to master the challenges of the future and secure for himself a successful, happy life.

The objectives of Steed Tech are clearly defined and definitely technological. It devotes its entire time to training young men and women in the professions within the fields of business, commerce, and industry.

Steed Tech offers courses with a major emphasis covering the full scope of the field of its particular objectives. The subjects of business, commerce, and industry, although highly specialized within themselves, are so broad and big that each course or degree offered by Steed Tech is so comprehensive in its content that it gives one of the most liberal and cultural kinds of education.

When Congressman QUILLEN delivered the commencement address, he was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws. I join my colleagues in offering sincere congratulations to Congressman QUILLEN. His commencement address, "Perform Something Worthy To Be Remembered," follows.

PERFORM SOMETHING WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED

(An address by the Honorable JAMES H. QUILLEN, of Tennessee, at the graduation exercises of Steed College of Technology, Johnson City, Tenn., June 3, 1963)

Members of the graduating class, members of the faculty, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to have been invited to deliver this commencement address, and there is no college from which I would rather receive the honor you have bestowed upon me in asking me to be here this evening. Nor is there any area which I could be prouder to represent in the Congress of the United States than this one.

This is one of the most beautiful areas in all of the world, and it is a better place in which to live as a result of Steed College of Technology.

At this time, I want to congratulate Dr. Steed and the members of the board of trustees for the fine contribution they are making to our American culture in the operation of this fine college.

The underlined principles of individual worth and independent enterprise have been the chief motivating factors of American democracy for almost two centuries. They jointly represented the real genius of our greatness as a free nation. The fact that the independent school embodies these principles accounts for the secure position it has reached and holds as an educational force in our democracy and in our community here in this area.

Steed Tech, its administrators, and faculty have earned widespread respect and confidence of professional, business, industrial, and governmental leaders since the founding of this college some 23 years ago. It has specialized in higher education for business and industry. Its success is a shining example of its value to the community and to its students.

To the members of the graduating class, you are gathered here this evening, living in the most gorgeous area in all of the world, but be not overconfident because this is a serious hour in the history of America and a critical period in your own lives. This commencement marks an adventurous brink in your lives where a beckoning world challenges you with its rich opportunities. Your future success and happiness will greatly depend upon how you meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Your college is a living idea. It is a vital transfer between the world of ideas and the world of actions. And it is based firmly upon the recognition that Christian principles are the ideas upon which the most significant actions must be based.

The fact that we are meeting tonight, in this church, to mark the completion of such worldly studies as yours is in itself a fitting symbol. Whether in commerce or in technology, our greatest challenge of this serious time is to maintain firmly and enduringly the foundations of our religious convictions as the firm footing for our path in the material world.

The Book of Proverbs has a phrase for us particularly tonight. "Wisdom," it says, "is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting get understanding." What is so important for us, I think, is that the Bible in that passage speaks so clearly of a difference between mere learning and true understanding. Learning to do something is far different from knowing or understanding the fullness of our actions. Your college places particular emphasis on that, on the interrelationship of techniques, which can be learned, and true understanding which must be developed and with which we will find wisdom.

Now, however, you face the challenge of exposing the understanding that you have gained here to a world increasingly hostile to the whole man and increasingly inferior to what we might call the incomplete man.

We see, for instance, entire political systems developing on the dedication to such principles of incompleteness. Under socialism, particularly, man is reduced to animal essentials. His appetites are the goal. His spirit is renounced. His individuality is denounced. And in the shambles that results, finally, neither appetite nor spirit is served.

Such colleges as yours, of course, stoutly resist that course and brilliantly prove that self-reliant, independent men and women need not abandon their spirits in the glittering maze of technology. That, indeed, it is the spiritual principles themselves that can best guide us through that maze, retaining our mastery of it and preventing it from mastering us.

But, as I say, your hardest challenge lies ahead. You are well-trained, knowledgeable persons. You have worked hard in the field of your specialization. You will work hard at the jobs that those specializations will win for you. But you will have to work just as hard at being whole men and women in order to fulfill the greatest promise that your education has set before you.

Presently our ability to meet the challenges of tomorrow is limited by the number and quality of trained people, particularly, the skilled technician. As important as scientific discoveries are, they remain worthless until shaped for production by technology. Ideal conditions would have one scientist or engineer backed by three technicians, but unfortunately we are not producing even one technician for each three science or engineering graduates. Needed are teams of trained personnel whose combined skills enhance the usefulness and productivity of each individual. The graduates of this school are a priceless asset in the effort to improve our technical strength.

I remember hearing a story about a young man who was employed as a carpenter in the new building which was to be the meeting place of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. This young man was observed by his foreman to put special interest in the chair in which was to sit the chief justice of the supreme court. The foreman asked this young man, just fresh out of college, why he spent so much time on this particular chair. He replied, "Someday I will sit in this chair as the chief justice of this State." Years later, this young man did become the chief justice of the supreme court in the great State of Oklahoma. He set for himself, as a young man, a high goal and worked toward that end. It is no small wonder that his ambition was crowned with ultimate success.

I hope the graduates of this college and the young people of America, seeing the shortcomings of this generation, will set for themselves the goal of rectifying the chaos we find in this world. I hope you graduates, in facing the menace of foreign ideologies, and isms which would enslave the world, will be bold and aggressive, and that you will have no fear. The foreign policy of our great country tonight seems to be predicated on what Russia might or might not do. Fear hysteria is sweeping the country. Fear cannot solve the problem of this great Nation.

The Bible says the things which we greatly fear will come upon us. As you face the future, with its stupendous task of arriving at lasting peace, I know you will face those tasks with the same type of fortitude that our forefathers had when they founded the early American Republic. They were afraid of nothing, except to do wrong.

The motto of the late Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, is found on the monument at his resting place in Crawfordville, Ga. This motto reads: "I am afraid of nothing on the earth, under the earth, or above the earth, except to do wrong. In the path of duty I shall ever endeavor to walk, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences." And what a wonderful motto that would be for the people of America in this age.

France and England, in the years preceding World War II, contributed to the outbreak of that war by being afraid to stand on principle and back up the little nations who desired freedom. They were, by their policy of fear and appeasement, just as guilty of starting the war as were the aggressor nations. A bold, determined stand by these two nations for righteousness and the regard of treaties in 1938 would have prevented World War II. Whenever any nation surrenders principle for a temporary respite or fleeting expedience that nation later will pay a terrible price in blood.

America has reached the coveted position it now occupies in the world because of its belief in God and in freedom of opportunity. Our forefathers were builders. They gave us, on a silver platter, this land as we know it today. We have the highest standard of living that any people in world history have ever enjoyed.

I enjoy living in America. I am proud of my American citizenship, as I know each and every one present here this evening is also proud. We should be grateful to God and the Founding Fathers of our Republic for the great America we see every day. No civilization has ever excelled ours in religious tolerance or freedom from class hatred.

Strong moral and spiritual beliefs have always placed our Nation on the side of right and principle as opposed to greed and oppression. Our democratic form of government has created an American citizen who is tolerant, self-reliant, intelligent, and conscious of his rights and the rights of others.

Abraham Lincoln was born in a one-room log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky. With little formal education, he gradually ascended the ladder of fame. He was defeated for Congress and for the U.S. Senate. But, he did not become disillusioned and embittered. Instead, he continued onward and became the President of the United States.

Alfred E. Smith was born in the East Side of New York City. He worked in the fish markets and, as he grew up, saw little of the world except the slum sections of that great city. But Al Smith was four times elected Governor of New York State and was the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency in 1928.

Immorality in government and among the American people is today posing as a great threat to true democracy. This threat is paralleled by complacency and indifference on the part of the American people. If we are to preserve democracy, we must use democracy. If freedom is to grow, we must use that freedom.

How many people today exercise the privilege of publicly stating their views on the state of the Nation? One-half of the American people are members of no church of any denomination whatsoever. Yet, America was founded and has prospered on Christian principles and a belief in God.

I do pay special tribute tonight to the press and radio for exercising the sacred privilege to write and discuss the things which they believe.

If any man, woman, or child in this audience tonight were to go home, get in bed, and lie flat on your back for a year without exercising the limbs, you would lose the use of arms and legs. We maintain the physical limbs of our body by constant use and exercise. So it is with the four freedoms and our democratic way of life. If we do not use them, we will surely lose these sacred privileges.

I am thinking tonight of scientific advancements. The men who made the atomic bomb were but little older than you who sit in this graduating class. The average age of the members of the American Association of Atomic Scientists is 29 years.

Let us turn to the field of literature. William Cullen Bryant began writing poetry at an early age and wrote until he was past 80. Yet the greatest poem he ever wrote was "Thanatopsis," written as a young man. Byron, Keats, and Shelley, of England, were all young men when they wrote their masterpieces.

In the realm of government and politics, William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 24. He is acclaimed by most historians as the greatest Prime Minister Britain ever had, greater even than Winston Churchill. William Pitt saved England in the greatest of Napoleonic wars.

In America, Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 33 years of age. Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American currency and one of the founders of the American Constitution, was adjutant to Gen. George Washington at the age of 20 and helped to plan the campaigns which made this country independent. Madison and Monroe were both young men when they fought for the American Constitution. John C. Calhoun, was elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 28 and in a few months was one of the outstanding leaders of the country. Henry Clay was U.S. Senator at the age of 29. A few years later on the same day he took his oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was elected Speaker of the House, at the age of 34.

In the field of music, Mozart was playing publicly at an early age and did his greatest work as a young man.

In military science and tactics, the greatest generals the world has ever produced were young men, little older than you. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years old. Napoleon was a lieutenant general at the age of 27, and dominated Europe at the age of 31. Hannibal was commander of the Norwegian Army at the age of 19. These three men are credited by most historians as being the greatest military generals of all times. They were at their best when they combined their great intellect with the vigor and imagination of youth.

But we must not forget the ladies. Joan of Arc was a French leader while a young woman. Florence Nightingale also made great accomplishments early in life. And behind every great man there is always a great lady.

Jesus Christ hung on Calvary's cross at the age of 33, after He had started a movement which is still growing today and has hundreds of millions in its ranks. And today a young evangelist in America—Billy Graham—has won hundreds of thousands of Americans to the cause of Christianity.

We are never too old nor too young to serve our country.

Let us not be discouraged by the cynics and those who would have us wait while America may be passing through its hour of greatest danger. Our country needs us today. Tomorrow may be too late. The past generation has failed to give us the peace that they promised, the security that was to be ours. Let us not make the same mistake and pass on to the next generation a world of chaos, of war, of fear, and of apprehension. We must act now, before it is too late, to save our country in this hour of crisis.

What we might yet accomplish within your lifetime is beyond the scope of imagination. The science fiction of yesterday is fast becoming the reality of today.

The peaceful, creative, constructive uses of science can transcend the greatest hopes of man. We stand on the brink of what could be the greatest era in the history of the world. The profound question is will we use our potentialities for good. I believe that with courage and conviction, with renewed faith in our Maker, and with a rededication to the principles upon which our country was founded, we can succeed on the frontiers of the future.

You have a great and inspiring part to play if you will. Inscribed over the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives in Washington are the eloquent words of Daniel Webster:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

May each graduate and all of you here tonight perform something worthy to be remembered.

I wish you great success in the years ahead. May you serve your community, your State, and your Nation as well as yourselves and your families. Congratulations on your fine achievements in this college, and God bless each of you.

VICE PRESIDENT'S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS—AN APOLOGY FOR FAILURE

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged to attend the graduation exercises at the U.S. Naval Academy where one of my appointees, Richard George Bachmann, graduated with distinction. The commencement speaker was the Vice President of the United States.

He inflicted upon those present a political harangue of apology for the failure of the Kennedy administration in foreign policy. He said that the New Frontier had "contained" communism.

If having missiles in Cuba, over 20,000 Russian troops there, and billions of dollars in Russian ammunition and arms is "containment," then he speaks a different language than the American people.

We have practically handed over Laos and Vietnam to the Communists; we have helped pro-Communist Sukarno grab a chunk of the Dutch Empire; we do not even protect the rights of our fishing boats to earn their livelihood in international waters.

All in all, the Vice President's remarks were in very bad taste. The polite applause which followed his introduction and his political tirade was an indication of respect for the office and not necessarily for the individual nor what he said.

On the same platform with the Vice President was one of our great fighting admirals, Adm. George W. Anderson, the present Naval Chief of Staff, whom the Vice President helped bounce. Admiral Anderson dared to want a strong and respected America. President Kennedy is now sending him out to pasture in Portugal.

Suffice it to say that the graduates did not hear anything very inspiring from the Vice President of the United States.

OAS FINDS COMMUNISTS TURN CUBA INTO SOVIET MILITARY CAMP AND TRAINING BASE FOR SUBVERSION

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, report after report confirms the fact that Cuba is now a clear and present danger to the security of this hemisphere. This is again confirmed by the most recent report of the OAS eight-nation committee.

The Cuban resolution passed by Congress in 1962 called for action on the part of the United States, unilaterally or in conjunction with the OAS under these circumstances. When is there to be a meaningful program to stop subversion from Cuba and to rid Cuba of major Soviet weapons and personnel? This question can well be asked again in view of the OAS findings—that international Communists have turned Cuba into a Soviet military camp and a training base for Latin American Communists.

Are we going to sit idly by and wait until it is too late? Are we going to continue to indulge in the wishful thinking that something might miraculously happen?

This further information developed after extensive investigations is alarming. The UPI report on the findings follows:

> WASHINGTON.—The organization of American States was told today that international Communists have turned Cuba into a Soviet military camp and a training base for Latin American Communists.
>
> The report was made by an eight-nation committee of the OAS after a lengthy investigation of Communist subversive activities in Latin America.
>
> At the same time, the OAS committee called on the 20-nation organization to ban all travel to Communist Cuba as a means to isolate the Fidel Castro regime and curb Communist agents in the area.
>
> "Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America," the committee said in its first 60-page report. It added:
>
> "It is no exaggeration to say that Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military camp. It is also clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and for the spread of communism."
>
> The reporting OAS committee, formed in 1962 when Cuba was ousted from the organization, urged a high-level meeting of intelligence experts to deal with the Communist threat.
>
> It also called for specific measures that OAS governments have pledged themselves to take in order to curb the travel of Communist agents, funds, and propaganda to other Latin American republics.
>
> It is officially estimated that there are now more than 250,000 Communist Party members in Latin America. Of these, only about 60,000 are reported to be in Cuba.
>
> The committee said that Communist agents are operating freely throughout the area and are making flagrant inroads into Latin American governments, labor unions, student organizations, and professional groups.
>
> "It is important to mention that there are some 60 centers for culture and friendship with Cuba in the American republics," the report said, adding these were obvious Communist "fronts."
>
> The Communist machinery in Latin America, according to the committee report, is geared to "provoke social and economic chaos, weaken governments, and bring the masses into a prerevolutionary situation."
>
> "To develop their subversive campaign, the countries of the Communist orbit abuse, in ever more alarming fashion, the prerogatives that countries grant to diplomatic missions," the report said.
>
> Through special agitation and propaganda sections in Moscow, Peking, and Havana, the committee said that "instructions on the general topics they should develop" are outlined.
>
> Typical of the guerrilla training effort in Latin America, the report said, is Castro's offer of 1,000 scholarships for Latin students that wish to be trained in Communist techniques.
>
> "It is estimated that at least 1,500 persons from other American republics traveled to Cuba during 1962 for this purpose," the report said.

HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, he was a man of God and a friend of man. The eulogies to his achievements, and the tributes to his spirituality of character occasioned by his death, are inappropriate by the extent to which they fail to mirror his own simplicity and greatness. Yet something must be said at a time of such a grievous loss, and I believe it would be part of his great understanding to realize that we are attempting to solace ourselves by speaking in praise of him.

In our grief at his passing we yet realize that the Catholic Church to which he devoted his life and consecrated his death will endure in its sacramental mission, and that part of its strength now derives from his efforts. For his sense of fatherhood was universal in its scope. The short and fruitful years of his pontificate were unparalleled in modern times in the efforts made to reach unity and understanding among groups long estranged.

He has stated that the calling of the ecumenical council was the result of Divine suggestion. He announced his intention of calling the council to the cardinals present in Rome at the celebration of the feast of Saint Paul in January 1959, and told them that the council's primary purpose was to the care of souls, a pastoral purpose, as his was a pastoral pontificate. He said then of the council that it was to be "not a speculative assembly, but a living and vibrant organism which in the light and love of Christ sees and embraces the whole world."

When he assumed his august office as the Father of Christendom he announced that he sought to be a "good shepherd," following in the steps of the Divine Shepherd.

The care of his paternal spirit reached to all men, for all men were made in the likeness of their Creator, and had been redeemed by Christ, his Son.

In the brief years of his pontificate the papal throne came to have new meaning, and no longer occasioned any of the fears which once troubled the Protestant and Orthodox communities. A Protestant professor of divinity noted after the first session of the Council that—

> The Protestant world can no longer state that the Holy Father is not willing to discuss freely all the problems that we face.

His greeting to the Jewish groups which visited him was always, "I am Joseph, your brother."

He was indeed the Holy Father, the spiritual father of all mankind.

As the servant of Christ, the Prince of Peace, it was appropriate that the last public function that Pope John attended was a ceremony honoring him for his work in the cause of world peace. This was the occasion of the presentation of the Balzan Peace Prize, held on May 11 in the Quirinal Palace. The citation accompanying the prize declared that the award was "a public recognition of your activity in favor of brotherhood among men, and among all peoples, through appeals for peace and to the good will of men, and of your recent intervention on the diplomatic level."

Replying, Pope John, less than a month from his death, asked the indulgence of his audience in allowing him to remain seated while he spoke. He said:

> This humble Pope who speaks to you is fully aware of being something very small before God. He can only humble himself, and thank God who has so favored him.

His encyclicals, "Pacem in Terris," and "Mater et Magistra" reflected his consuming zeal and devotion in the cause of peace. The realism of the encyclical "Peace on Earth" addresses itself directly to the problems of suffering mankind.

As a good shepherd he visited the poorest sections of Rome and even the city's jails. In one, he told the inmates that, "Because you could not visit me, I came to visit you," and in a gesture of simple and affectionate humanity he threw his arms around one of the prisoners who was an old man, as was he.

He is gone from us, but he is with his Saviour. The example of his life and his love for us can never die.

EMIL V. PACINI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to join with many others who express their sympathy over the passing of Mr. Emil V. Pacini, a former alderman in the city of Chicago, who was serving as ward committeeman of Chicago's 10th ward at the time of his death.

Emil was first elected to the city council by the residents of the 10th ward in 1945 and he served these people until April of this year. Having had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee, I can say he was a sympathetic man and a person who believed in doing everything possible for the welfare of his people. He was a diligent, hardworking public servant.

He will be missed, and his passing is a loss not only to the residents of the 10th ward he so ably represented, but to the city of Chicago. As an expert on building and zoning he achieved a great deal for the benefit of Chicago's citizenry.

I wish to extend condolences to Mrs. Pacini and the family in the loss of this splendid man.

THE INDEPENDENT ORDER OF VIKINGS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Order of Vikings will hold their 56th national annual convention in the city of Boston during the week of June 9, 1963.

I wish to commend this fine fraternal organization founded in 1890 by Scandinavian-Americans who migrated here from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. It is dedicated to those charitable and social ventures befitting the precept of the brotherhood of man and these descendants of the Vikings, historically recorded as the founders of the New World, have brought their culture, enterprise, and loyalty to these United States, enriching our land with their wholesome heritage.

We in the city of Boston are honored by the presence in convention of this honorable and progressive organization.

"Viking," from the Icelandic "vik," a bay or fiord, and the termination "ing," implying one who belongs to or is descended from one of the bands of Northmen who scoured European seas during the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries. The wrong syllabic division of this word as "vi-king" instead of "vik-ing" has caused it to be frequently confounded with sea-king, a term which is applied to a man of royal race, who took by right the title of king when he assumed the command of men, although only of a ship's crew; whereas the former term is applicable to any member of the bands. The Scandinavian Vikings were excellent shipbuilders and expert seamen, and were able to navigate in the open sea by the aid of the sun, moon, and stars. It has come to be the recognized designation of the Scandinavian adventurers who, by daring, hardihood, and endurance, fought their way to thrones, and established kingdoms, principalities, and dukedoms in all parts of Europe, from southern Russia to Britain.

Among the important kings of the Vikings was Harald Fairhair, who in 861 started to conquer all 31 small kingdoms of Norway, and in 10 years became King of all Norway.

He was followed by his son Eirik in 934 who was soon displaced by his brother Hakon, who had been brought up in England by King Athelstan. He professed Christianity and sought to bring Christ to his countrymen, who were still pagan, and was partly successful.

Eirik and his followers made raids upon several countries. They lived in England and then made their headquarters in Denmark. After Eirik's death his sons made trouble for Hakon. But before King Hakon died from an arrow wound in battle with them, he left his Norway kingdom to them as he had no son.

Another King who followed later was Olaf, son of Trygve. He was a heathen until he came in contact with a hermit who converted and baptized him. He then did what he could to convert his own pagan people. Also he sent priests to Iceland, where many were gradually changed and baptized.

King Olaf was a great shipbuilder and made better and larger boats than the long boats of his ancestors. He named two the *Serpent* and the *Long Serpent*.

Other kings were Olaf Haraldson, or Saint Olaf, and King Knut and King Magnus the Good. Some of these kings ruled England as well as Norway and Denmark. Gradually, after the 11th century, raids ceased.

Iceland was discovered by a Viking named Naddod in 861. Others who followed were Gardar and Floki. A hundred years later Thorvald, banished from Iceland, discovered Greenland. Two years later he returned to Iceland and told his son Red Eirik of the land he had discovered, and they went there with well manned ships and lived there.

Lief, a son of Red Eirik, and a friend named Tyrker discovered a warmer country which they called Vinland because of the grapes growing there. Lief's brother Thorvald and a Viking named Karlsefni were the last to visit Vinland until after Columbus discovered America in 1492.

The details of the life and explorations of Leif Ericsson are obscure. It seems probable that Leif, one of three sons of Eric, was born in Iceland somewhere around the year 970. In 985 or 986, Eric sailed with his family and a band of followers to establish a settlement in Greenland. He established his new home at Brattahlie in Ericsfiord.

In 999, when he was only about 20 years old, Leif set out to see the world. Instead of following the old sailing directions by way of Iceland, he boldly set his course directly east of Norway. There he visited King Olaf Tryggvason. He stayed at the king's court during the winter, and there, under Olaf's influence, became a Christian. When he set out for Greenland the following summer, he took with him a priest and some teachers to undertake the task of converting the settlers in Greeland.

The history of the Vikings has left its mark on civilization. These great men braved the unknown in the open seas and pioneered the way throughout the northern part of Europe and Western America to bring culture to our early civilization.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE LIBERALS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I had intended earlier today to ask permission to put my special order over to another date. But I have been advised that objections are being raised to special orders. Therefore I feel there is little choice but to proceed with the remarks which I have been preparing for presentation at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely understandable that here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, under special orders and otherwise, since the very beginning of this session, there has been a great deal of thunder against the administration from the right; namely, from the Republican minority. We heard some of it yesterday. We will hear more of it before this session is completed.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that criticism is entirely proper and in order. Indeed, the Republican Party not only has an obligation and responsibility but a duty, as the minority party, under our two-party system to engage in criticism whenever individual members of that party feel such criticism is in order against any actions of this Democratic administration or the majority party. Indeed, I think the vigor of our Republic stems from the fact that we do have a two-party system and, further, that in this body we can hear debate on the merits or demerits of our conflicting philosophies.

I welcome the thunder from the right as a democratic expression of our freedom in America.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks today shall be directed to the "snoop and shoot" sniping that has been going on against President Kennedy; against the Democratic leadership of this Congress, and against the majority in this Congress from the left. In particular, Mr. Speaker, the sniping from some of the more liberal columnists in America and some of the normally pro-Democratic organizations which have expressed objection that we are not moving along fast enough and far enough in our programs. I daresay there are some energetic snipers within the ADA—Americans for Democratic Action—who have on occasion criticized the President for not moving as fast as they would want him to move. I believe these people also have a right to engage in criticism, which is the strength of the Democratic Party.

As the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCormack, has said many times, the Democratic Party is a national party; the only national party in America. Certainly, therefore, we must find areas of differences, areas of dissension, within a national party. We do not view with any great alarm when members of the Democratic Party engage in criticism of their leadership, the Democratic administration, the President, or of any individual Congressman. It is indeed this exchange of views and dissension which gives the Democrats this vitality. But it would appear to me to be a mistake if our silence were to be interpreted as acquiescing in this criticism from the left.

In my judgment, the record to date shows that President Kennedy has brought to the United States, to the White House, to our Government, yes, to the world, a degree of determined leadership that was urgently needed in these critical times.

I should like to quote briefly from an article by Seymour E. Harris which appeared in the New Republic in which Mr. Harris attempts to answer some of the liberals who have engaged in criticism of President Kennedy and his administration. Mr. Harris is professor of political economy at Harvard University. He points out, among other things:

> Comparing Kennedy's record for 1961–63 (the latter part of 1963 projected on the best estimates I have been able to find) and President Eisenhower's from 1952 to 1960.
>
> In consumer prices, Eisenhower's administration experienced an average increase of 1.5 percent; the Kennedy administration 1 percent. Despite the great emphasis on stopping the creeping inflation, the Republican administration experienced a rise of prices 50 percent in excess of that of the Kennedy administration. This is a great achievement for any administration and especially for a Democratic one, for Democrats, in contrast to the Republicans, tend to stress objectives such as growth and full employment somewhat more than rigid price stability.

Mr. Harris points out further:

> One reason for the better price record of the Kennedy administration is the pressure put upon labor to keep wages in line with productivity gains; and on industry to relate price increases to wage increases. Whereas, in the year 1952–60 wage rates in manufacturing rose by 5 percent, the estimated rise in 1961–63 is only 3 percent—annual averages.

Certainly, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, this record in holding the line on inflation bespeaks well of the President and the leadership he has provided to this Nation.

The liberals complain about President Kennedy's unwillingness to spend and incur "adequate deficits." They argue that President Kennedy has not achieved larger advances in the welfare area and they urge stepped up activity in this field even if it means a larger degree of deficit spending. These same advocates of deficit spending apparently ignore the fact that in the first 3 years under President Kennedy, expenditures rose by $17 billion, with three quarters of this increase ordered by the President to be spent on building up the Nation's defense posture and related activities.

We are not surprised when people complain that maybe we are not moving fast enough on some of the welfare programs, but we cannot dispute the fact that in these grave times of peril, the President has to make difficult decisions. I think he has made a wise decision in coming before the Congress and urging increased expenditures for defense so that the United States can today confidently protect and defend the freedom and dignity of her people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is to the credit of the leadership of this Congress and the majority party, yes, and of those members of the minority party, who support these defense expenditures. We have built up today the most awesome Military Establishment in the history of the world. That we can today pray for peace with some confidence of maintaining peace, is only because the President had the courage and the foresight to come before the Congress and say: "These are the things we need for an adequate Defense Establishment, and we need them even if it means a further deficit."

Certainly, many of the welfare programs had to be revised downward; many programs had to be curtailed and trimmed simply because we had to spend this money on our very first objective, and that is defense. We have turned back the timeclock on Mr. Khrushchev's boast of 2 years ago. Mr. Khrushchev threatened us and told us to get out of Berlin by the first of January 1961, or suffer the full consequences. Well, here it is June 4, 1963, and we are still in Berlin. We have not budged an inch. We have served notice on Mr. Khrushchev that any violation of the peace of the world would carry retaliation, and the President has been able to make this statement stick because he has a strong Defense Establishment to back up his determination. Survival of freedom in West Berlin is a monument and a tribute to the leadership of the President. In Vietnam we are holding our own. We were threatened with extinction in Vietnam, gateway to the Far East. Yet we have been able to support freedom's cause in Vietnam, because the President ordered a determined course of action there. If we did not have the Defense Establishment we have today, obviously the President would not have been able to hold the line in this vital outpost of hope for freedom's survival. It seems to me, therefore, that those who would be quick to criticize the President in not moving fast enough in the welfare field ought to ponder the alternatives available to President Kennedy.

No one denies the fact that money which could have been spent on schools, clinics, hospitals, and all the other needs of our Nation has been diverted to a stronger defense program. And, this strong defense establishment has guaranteed for this country and the entire world the one thing that every American can unite behind, whether he is a Democrat, Republican, conservative or liberal, and that is peace. This is the thing we wanted; peace with honor; peace with dignity; peace without retreat. This we have today, under the leadership of President Kennedy.

Our impatient liberal critics will do well to remember also that a keystone in the Kennedy administration is a tax cut to keep the Nation's economy healthy. Of course, if we cut taxes, we will have less money to spend, and something has to give. The administration has presented to Congress a budget for 1964 which reflects a great concern over deficit spending; holding the line on nondefense essentials and, of course, encouraging greater expansion of those programs we must have for our survival.

The fact of the matter is that in the President's proposed tax cuts, we see a formula for sustained prosperity. We have reason to believe that if all of the predictions of the most responsible economists of the country come true, we can have a tax cut, we can have continued prosperity, and we can have additional income coming into the Federal Treasury to ultimately offset the temporary losses. Continued economic growth to meet the challenge of our increasing population and the attendant increase in our labor force has been President Kennedy's most earnest domestic goal. For with continued prosperity can come all the other blessings of a democracy, including civil rights and equal opportunities. Full employment is still the most effective antidote to automation and all of our other social problems.

Mr. Harris goes on to point out that:

> President Kennedy in his campaign and platform urged a growth of 5 percent per year. He has not achieved this and the Democrats were too optimistic. Nevertheless, the growth record is better than the Eisenhower record—3 percent for the years 1952–1960 as against 3.7 percent average in 1961 and 1962 and an estimated 4.3 percent in 1961–63.
>
> What is more, the inflationary cost of each percentage of growth was much less under Kennedy. In 1952–1960, the ratio of percentage rise of growth over percentage rise of prices was 2.0; in 1961 and 1962, 3.7 and in 1961–63 (1963 estimated) 4 plus.
>
> In assessing the relative growth one should also consider several unfortunate handicaps under which Kennedy operated. One is the continued pressure of the dollar, or balance-of-payments problem which restricts expansionary policies.

Another is the inheritance from the previous administration of a sluggish economy with 4.5 million unemployed, or 6.4 percent unemployed in 1961. I should like to mention something about this unemployed ratio.

Last Sunday night Mr. Howard K. Smith on his nationwide program devoted half an hour to a discussion of the dilemma in a democracy when we have the largest number of Americans ever employed on the one hand and we still have almost 5 million Americans unemployed. Speakers participating in this program submitted various ideas. Among these was Dr. Keyserling, whom I respect very highly as one of the Nation's outstanding economists, although I must say I do not agree with Dr. Keyserling in his analysis. Among the things that Dr. Keyserling has said—and he has been one of those who has criticized the administration rather severely—is that this administration is not going to solve the problem of unemployment until it spends more money. Dr. Keyserling stubbornly argues that greater Federal expenditures are indeed the road to full employment. He is, of course, entitled to his views. However, I do have one observation to make: The fact remains that in 1958, Congress approved the most ambitious, the biggest, the costliest public works program in the history of any nation when it adopted the $40 billion national defense highway program. In 5 short years, this nationwide program has reached the staggering cost of $60 billion. Certainly here was money that was being siphoned into every community of America for public works. Sixty billion dollars was being pumped into the economy of this country in the hope of stimulating continued employment. As a matter of fact, that particular bill was rushed through the Congress as an emergency antirecession measure by the Eisenhower administration in the hope of stimulating the economy in 1958 when the country was slipping into a hopeless economic downswing which led to a $12½ billion Federal deficit for that year alone. Even though Congress did pass this huge public works program, the net result was that while it provided beautiful highways for America, highways which we all want, appreciate, and enjoy, the fact of the matter is that in those same 5 years we went through two recessions. It would appear, therefore, that bigger spending programs in themselves are somewhat suspect as the ultimate device for full employment. Perhaps the program Mr. Kennedy has followed of an accelerated public works program working in harmony with a whole series of other stimulants, including tax credit as an incentive to new investment, accelerated depreciation schedules, and on a tax cut are the sounder approach albeit not as glamorous as increased spending.

I submit, in order to understand the full complexity of this unemployment problem we have to understand who are the unemployed. I am privileged to report that Congressman HOLLAND, the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve in the House Committee on Education and Labor, will hold hearings to determine the profile of America's unemployed.

This is what I believe we will find when we are all through: We will find that perhaps 1 million or almost 1 million of those unemployed are young men between the ages of 18½ to 26. These are the young men who are today of draft age, the young men who could work but who are being denied jobs simply because an employer does not want to commit himself to holding a job for 2 years after the young man has been called into active duty. I do not think employers resent the idea of hiring a 1(a) in the first instance, but they do fear the fact that when they hire a young man of draft status, and he is called to active duty, his employer must freeze this job for two years so that when the young man comes back, he will have a job waiting for him.

Of course, this provides a dilemma for the employer. If he is to hire another worker to replace his soldier-employee for those 2 years, when the soldier returns from active duty, what does the employer do? Fire the replacement? Provide employment for two men? These are problems employers have been avoiding merely by not hiring young men of draft age. This discrimination against young men in hiring practices for decent jobs because they happen to be 1(a) is one of the great tragedies of our times. Yet, there are thousands of parents throughout America who know it exists.

Earlier this year when Congress voted to renew the draft program for 4 years, I stood here in the well of this House and pleaded with the House to reduce the draft age from the present 18½ through 26, to a new 18½ through 21. My amendment proposed that any young man reaching his 22d birthday before his draft call came through would be excused from military service. My amendment was not capricious nor was it designed to hurt in any way the military problem of recruiting some 700,000 replacements in the Defense Establishment every year. But I say that within the age group of 18½ through 21, we have in this country today a backlog of 7 million young men eligible for military service. The number of young men reaching draft age is 1½ million every year. And so while we are only taking less than 100,000 young men each year into the service by way of the draft and while another 600,000 enlist voluntarily each year, we are bringing into the pool 1½ million young men every 12 months. Even if we had to draft all 700,000 of our replacements needed every year, we still would have 800,000 young men left over to be added to the cumulative pool of 7 million every 12 months.

It would be my hope that those in the liberal ranks who are concerned about unemployment in this country would get behind an effort to urge the President, through Executive order, to lower the draft age. I am glad, if nothing else developed in the debate on the draft bill, that it was clearly established by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that the President now has the Executive authority to bring down the draft age. It would be my hope that with this directive, the President would reduce the draft age to include young men of the age 18½ through 21. In this way he would free vast numbers of young men who today cannot get employment, who could go into employment. All you have to do is to look at the want ads in any newspaper in America, in any community, and you will see jobs begging. There are jobs in this country. There is a manpower shortage in many industries, but that shortage is not being met for many reasons. I submit that one of the reasons is the fact that these young men of draft age cannot get these jobs until they reach the age of 26 or complete their military service earlier.

Mr. Speaker, secondly we have approximately 2 million people in this country who are unemployed for no other reason than because they were born at the wrong time. There is nothing wrong with these people. They are perfectly healthy, physically fit people, experienced people, people who want to work. But because the chronological calendar shows them to be past the age of 40 they are being discriminated against under the hiring practices in existence. All over this country there are people who cannot find jobs for no other reason than because they are considered to be too old. You know and I know that in personnel office after personnel office in America, in employment office after employment office, a man goes to ask for a job and the first question he is asked is, How old are you? And if he is past 40, regardless of his other qualifications, he is too old for the job.

We have developed an entirely new employment concept in this country. Perhaps there are those who would deny this, but the fact remains that when I went to work on my first job some 25 years ago, the employer told me to hang up my coat and go to work. Today, with all the fringe benefits, the pensions, the health and welfare programs and all the other parts of a wage structure—all these things have to be considered by the employer. So properly that employer must take into consideration how much more does it cost him to hire an older person than a younger person.

I am not blaming industry for this phenomenon. Nor am I blaming labor. But if I were a businessman I certainly would have to think in terms of how much I could afford in order to keep my business solvent.

Therefore, I proposed legislation—and I hope those of our liberal supporters who are concerned about this unemployment problem will take a look at it; I hope they will look at H.R. 3431, which is a bill to permit an employer to take a tax credit for whatever is the difference, if there is a difference, in cost between hiring an older worker and a younger worker capable of doing the same job.

I submit that the social workers in the Department of Labor have been approaching this problem of unemployment among the older workers of America purely on a social basis. They have been putting tons of pamphlets pointing out that it is good, sound business to hire older people. Nobody quarrels with that. Of course it is good, sound business to hire older people. But the fact is that if there is an economic factor involved, that economic factor has to be removed. Therein lies my hope that those who have been quick to criticize the President, who talk about the lagging solution to the unemployment problems, would look to new ideas.

I am not at all distressed about Professor Keyserling's saying we ought to spend more money on public works projects to stimulate the economy, but it would be my hope that from the ranks of the liberals, from the ranks of the ADA, would flow some new concepts to meet the needs of a changing society. This is, after all, the definition of a liberal, one who is able to understand the needs of changing times. I have to differ with those who are quick with their criticism, those who stand on various podiums and criticize the administration, but who too often espouse the same old bromides that have been tried for a quarter of a century and found to have only little or no merit. It would be my hope that those who are so quick to criticize the President would supply some new concepts of how to meet this unemployment problem in America.

Finally, we come to the remaining 2 million unemployed. These are the unfortunate Americans who have in many instances migrated from rural areas of America, where job opportunities on the farm are diminishing very quickly, into large urban areas of America, totally unprepared for urban life, totally unprepared to take a job in a factory; people who have earned a living, a very meager living, in the corn and cotton fields of America and who today, because of technology, have been forced into the large urban areas. In this category also fall the tragic victims of racial discrimination. These are the people who are not only unemployed but too often, because of racial bars, are unemployable.

It seems to me that if we really want to do something about these people we need a crash program of dealing with the problem. It would be my hope that this Congress before it adjourns will enact legislation dealing with giving all Americans equal employment opportunities.

Yesterday in this body we heard some dramatic speeches about civil rights. We talked about legislation being introduced by the minority members on the Judiciary Committee urging Federal legislation to permit every single American access to public places. I think this is good legislation. But if we really want to do something about this vast army of unemployed Americans, many of whom are unemployed today because of discrimination because of either the color of their skin, their religious beliefs, their ethnic background, or their age; if we really want to do something in this Congress, then I say both sides must get behind the Equal Employment Opportunities Act in this session. I submit that when you establish consumer purchasing power among these people, regardless of what their race or creed or ethnic background may be, you are going to see many of the other problems involving civil rights in America quickly disappear. This has been proven time and again in northern communities which are completely integrated. Where the Negro has been given an opportunity to obtain employment with dignity, that Negro has not remained on relief.

Too often we hear criticism of the relief program. We hear people talk about laggards and lazy people and people who do not want to work. The fact of the matter, I think, is that every American wants to work. I think every American wants to bring his children up in dignity. I think every American wants to be able to face his neighbors and say, Yes, I work for a living instead of living off the dole.

But when you look at these 5 million people who are unemployed and you analyze these people and look at the anatomy and the profile of this huge army of unemployed, when you analyze the factors which have led to this unemployment, then, of course, you start to realize that this problem is not so easy to solve. Finally, in this unemployed army, in a great many cases there are people who have been affected by automation. Congress certainly must do something about that. Congress already has, under the leadership of President Kennedy, dealt partially with this problem. Last year we passed the Manpower Retraining Act. It is my hope that that act will be amended. It is my hope that that act will be made more workable. I think we are beginning to see there are many shortcomings in that legislation. One of the things I would like to see tried in the Manpower Retraining Act is to give some direct assistance to an employer who wants to retrain his permanent workers who otherwise would have to be displaced because of automation. It is estimated to cost approximately $1,000 to retrain an American worker under the Manpower Retraining Act. It would appear to me then completely logical and certainly not in any conflict with the basic concept of our economy to give at least some of that money directly to an employer who is willing to undertake the responsibility of trying to retrain a worker that he otherwise would have to displace because of automation. I think this is an area where we can improve the program and make it more workable.

I hope also that this Congress will pass without any delay the vocational training program which is now before my committee. These programs are such that those who want to criticize this administration could get behind and marshal their forces of support behind these programs so that we can come out of this Congress with a great record, which I am sure we will.

As to the vocational training program, this morning we began marking up the bill. It is a bill that envisions spending $180 million by 1967 for vocational education in America. It is my hope that these are the provisions which will find recognition and support from those who are so quick to criticize Congress.

Finally, we know there are great problems in our balance of trade. This is a problem that President Kennedy has inherited. Many of our liberal friends have been very loose in their criticism, but I have not seen too many suggestions on how to resolve the problem. It would be my hope that this Congress would give serious consideration and, indeed, those who have been quick to criticize the President would give serious consideration to a proposal which I have submitted, H.R. 587, which would transfer part of the decisionmaking power in international trade from the hands and complete control of the Department of State and give some of that responsibility to the Department of Labor. There is no question in my mind that foreign imports are hurting the working people of this country. I am not one to argue that we ought to have high tariffs and that we ought to close ourselves off from international trade. Certainly, we want to maintain our lines of economic communication with the whole world. But I am not persuaded by those who try to tell me that we have a favorable balance of trade because we export $24 billion worth of goods and we import $22 billion worth of goods. Here again I am disappointed in the great liberal minds of America who are taking these facts and figures at their face value without probing beyond the realm of normal assumption.

When we look at these figures and break them down, what do we find? It is true that we are exporting $24 billion, but we are exporting grain; we are exporting heavy machinery; we are exporting raw materials; we are exporting scrap metal. These are the things that we are exporting.

Mr. Speaker, then we look at the things we import. We are importing consumer goods. We are importing electronics equipment which has driven many American electronics producers out of business. Mr. Speaker, we are bringing in dressed meat from countries around the world which is putting the butchers out of work in Chicago. We are bringing in all sorts of consumer goods, putting American workers out of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts which I think this Congress has to face up to and understand and realize. I would recommend, and strongly recommend, the Congress give some serious consideration to the proposal which I have introduced which would give authority to the Secretary of Labor that whenever foreign imports are found to be hurting an American industry to the peril point, where it is threatened with extinction, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to conduct a study of the wage structure, cost of raw material, and so forth—the unit cost of production of the American industry and of the competing nation's industry. The Secretary would determine a competitive ratio. When the unit cost of a foreign product drops below the acceptable ratio, the Secretary has the right to recommend to the President either increases in tariffs or reductions in quotas.

Mr. Speaker, the competing nation can purge itself of such a recommendation merely by increasing its own standard of living through increases in wages, thus bringing its products into a more reasonable competitive ratio with American made goods. I do not presume to say that I expect every other nation of the world to maintain the same high living standards and wage standards that we maintain in this country. But I think we would provide much more vigor in our foreign policy if we started preaching around the world the concept of international minimum wage standards. Those people in Africa, those people in the Far East; yes, even those people behind the Iron Curtain, if they were convinced that the capitalistic system, that free enterprise, means a higher standard of living, they would support our concepts. Too long, Mr. Speaker, has the State Department dominated our international trade relations as based only on international political considerations. One sometimes wonders if the State Department is not more concerned with what happens in Tokyo than in Chicago or Dubuque, or any other community in America.

It is my hope that we will find some support to strip the State Department of some of this misguided power.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed briefly today some of the criticism that has been voiced against the Administration by people within our own party. I strongly believe these critics in our own party have the right to criticize. I think they are doing a great service when they criticize, because this is what indeed gives our party vigor and strength and vitality. The fact remains, however, that we here in Congress who see perhaps the broader aspect of the problem would be derelict in our duty as members of the majority party if we did not from time to time respond to this criticism.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that President Kennedy has done an outstanding job. He has not been panicked either by the thunder from the right or the sniping from the left. Indeed, I think, as the great President that he is, he has charted an effective course under most perilous conditions. Particularly today, we Americans can look upon our country with great pride. We are indeed holding our own with honor. We have preserved peace throughout the world. We are holding our own in Berlin; we are holding our own in the other troubled spots of the world. At home we indeed have prosperity.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about 5 million people being unemployed. We are concerned about the civil struggle going on all over America. We are deeply concerned about the Communists in Cuba. But these are problems which I think we are going to solve by working together. I think the President has demonstrated his ability, to chart a course with courage, without being panicked by extremists on either side.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of course which I think America needs today. This is the kind of course which makes me personally proud to be an America. This is the kind of course which makes me proud to be a Democrat and a member of the party of President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article to which I have previously referred, written by Mr. Harris in the New Republic, be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

When the Kennedy administration took over, it could look back to three recoveries that endured for 45, 35, and 25 months. There was considerable fear that this trend might continue and the President would be confronted with another recession in the near future. We now have had 27 months of recovery; and it may well continue from 30 to 45 months. The Kennedy administration wants a continued recovery which would assure the country a stable and growing economy, and would be, as a byproduct, a political windfall, and it seems to realize that in a completely free market recoveries are not likely to be long sustained.

In one area the Eisenhower administration performed better than the Kennedy administration: unemployment averaged 4.9 percent under Eisenhower. But note a steady trend upward. Under Truman the average had been 4.2 percent. Under Kennedy, the average was 6.7 percent in 1961 (reflecting the inherited recession), 5.6 percent in 1962 and an informed guess puts it at 5.4 percent in 1963. Improvement here has been slow. Yet the Kennedy administration fought for and got a Manpower Training Act which would deal directly with areas of infection. Unfortunately with 5- to 6-percent unemployment the number of unfilled vacancies is bound to be small. The tax cut and accompanying rise of GNP beyond $25 billion per year are likely to cut unemployment in 1963 and 1964.

In monetary policy, there is no comparison in the achievements of the two administrations. The Eisenhower administration and its financial agencies had a complex on inflation, with the result that interest rates were steadily pushed up, with unfortunate effects on investment. To take an important example: from 1952 to 1960 the yield on corporate Aaa bonds rose from 2.96 to 4.41 percent, or by almost 50 percent; from 1960 to 1962, the yield dropped from 4.41 to 4.33 or by 2 percent. It is most unusual for rates to drop consistently in a long recovery period. This did not happen without hard work. The President, Dillon, Heller, and Roosa must have made the needs of adequate supplies of money clear to the Federal Reserve, and yet without raising troublesome issues of the independence of the Fed. This cheap money policy, the new depreciation and investment credit policies and the tax cut are beginning to be reflected in a rising volume of investment.

Perhaps in no area has the Government dissuaded from introducing a fiscal policy. In the midst of the Berlin crisis in 1961, the President at first wanted a tax increase to match the rise of military outlays. He was dissuaded from introducing a fiscal policy that would be more associated with Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower, and Secretaries Humphrey and Anderson than with Democratic policies. By May 1963, as revealed in his brilliant address to the Committee for Economic Development, the President proved that of all Presidents, he alone had learned the lessons of modern economics.

His tax-cut program is not perfect. Many would have sought less of a stretch-out and more tax cuts in the early stages. But the President saw the heavy political costs involved in the perfect program from an economist's viewpoint, and what is more important, the unacceptability of a program that might involve a $15 to $20 billion deficit in 1 year. But at any rate, for the first time we have a President who is prepared to incur deficits as the price of a sustained recovery and of a rise of GNP large enough to keep unemployment from rising and even to reduce it to some extent.

Finally, what of the troublesome problem of the balance of payments? It is still a threat to the expansionist policies. But at least strong measures have been taken and a substantial improvement achieved; whereas, from 1958 to 1960 the average deficit in the balance of payments was $3.7 billion, in 1961 and 1962 the average was only $2.2 billion; and the excess of exports of goods and services over imports was $2 billion in the earlier period and $5 billion under Kennedy.

On almost every economic front the Kennedy administration has achieved a great deal—not as much as they anticipated, for the obstacles were hidden to the candidate, but in view of the bad breaks, inclusive of the Republican-Southern coalition, the advances have been substantial. Some may say Kennedy has not accomplished as much as President Franklin Roosevelt, but action is more likely when a tiger is in one's home than when the invader is a colony of ants. The President has been willing to lead—for example, on medicare and fiscal policy—and at times by a considerable distance. But as TRB agrees, he cannot move ahead too far. He has lost many battles and some of them tough ones; it would be foolish to waste ammunition in battles that cannot possibly be won.

I do not understand why so many liberals continue to say that the President does not try hard enough. What President has worked as hard, for example, to put over modern fiscal policies and has been courageous enough to present his views to groups of businessmen, business editors, bankers, CED, Yale alumni, who on the whole (with the exception of the CED), tend to be allergic to modern economics? His major responsibility is our security. What astonishes me is how much time the President devotes to the economic problems, how interested he is in them and how much he has learned in the last 2 years.

TRB is also concerned over the President's determination to get on with businessmen. I agree there are difficulties here. Business and government do not always see eye to eye, and one must be careful not to yield too much to business demands. But in a capitalist system, the confidence of the businessman is important. Businessmen were no heroes to Keynes. But on February 1, 1938, Keynes, disturbed by Roosevelt's harassing of businessmen and the emergency of a new recession, wrote in a famous letter to the President:

"It is a mistake to think that they (businessmen) are more immoral than politicians. If you work them into the surly, obstinate, terrified mood, of which domestic animals, wrongly handled, are so capable, the Nation's burdens will not get carried to market."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SPONSORED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES ARE POTENTIALLY DESTRUCTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks today not only to my colleagues in this House, but to all Americans, for our constitutional form of government is presently facing its greatest challenge since 1861.

Three proposed constitutional amendments have been introduced in the legislatures of a number of States. These potentially destructive amendments are sponsored by the General Assembly of States, which is affiliated with the Council of State Governments. The amendments would:

First. Bypass Congress and the national will by making it possible for the States to propose and ratify constitutional amendments completely on their own. This has been approved by the legislatures of Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

Second. Wipe out Federal jurisdiction over the proper apportionment of seats in the State legislature. Approved by the legislatures in Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wyoming, and, in slightly different form, Utah.

Third. Make it possible for certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court to be overruled by a States-controlled "Court of the Union," composed of the chief justices of each State. Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming have, as of this date, approved this.

These amendments would drastically alter our entire form of government. They would reverse time-honored and tested principles of a representative democracy. They would reduce our Nation to an ineffective confederation, bound by ephemeral ties and immeasurably and irreparably crippled by the forces of disunion and disagreement. These amendments would take from the hands of all the people their equality in government. These amendments would make it possible for the States with the least number of people to wield the most power. These amendments would revive and in many cases perpetuate inequities of representation and participation in the decisionmaking process which our Founding Fathers thought they had solved in 1787. They would remove Congress from the amending process, deny many Americans the right of equal representation, and weaken constitutional guarantees of liberty, justice, and equality by reducing the power of the Supreme Court.

I think these proposed amendments are dangerous and devisive and would wreck the system of government which has served us so well for so many years.

I am shocked by the number of States which have acted on them. And I cannot emphasize too strongly the clear and present danger which these amendments present to the bedrock of our way of life—our Constitution.

Those States which have acted on one or all of these proposals have done so without fanfare, often without debate. It is to the credit of our citizens, however, that this country is slowly but surely awakening to the dangers implicit in these proposals. The President has focused attention on them; the American Bar Association has registered its objections; the Chief Justice of the United States has issued grave warnings.

Among the first to call public attention to these proposals was Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of the Yale University School of Law. Professor Black, an outstanding expert on the law, is the Henry R. Luce Professor of Jurisprudence, Yale Law School. At the end of my remarks, I shall request permission to insert in the Record the text of Professor Black's article on the threat proposed by these amendments, which clearly illustrate the legal objections to these proposals, as well as articles which have appeared in the New Haven Register, the New York Times, and Congressional Quarterly.

All Americans should review for a moment some of the philosophies expressed in the Constitution—some of the great contributions which have been made by the document itself and those who framed it.

Our Constitution was no mere accident of fate, no jumble of words agreed upon hurriedly and arbitrarily. It was the result of studied deliberation and the trial-and-error method of government typified by the failure of the Articles of Confederation. The weaknesses of the Articles were many and prompted Alexander Hamilton to say:

> A full display of the principal facts of the Confederation would show that the evils we experience do not proceed from minute or partial imperfections, but from fundamental errors in the structure of the building which cannot be amended otherwise than by alteration in the first principles and main pillars of the fabric.

In fact, so strong was the reaction against the form of government based on this loose Confederation—a confederation the General Assembly of States would revive—that the preamble to the Constitution, itself, states clearly and unequivocally that the framers were not creating a mere league of States.

In the words of Charles Beard:

> The Articles of Confederation had declared explicity that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence"—the high power which State legislatures had been exercising. Respecting the sovereignty, freedom, and independence of the States as such, the Constitution contained not a word, and what it did to the pretentions of States to full sovereignty stood out boldly in the lines imposing restraints on their powers. The announcement that the Constitution and Federal laws were to be supreme over all State actions conflicting with them was unmistakable in its brevity and import.
>
> The preamble declared that the Constitution was a constitution ordained and established by the people of the United States—not mere articles of agreement between the Thirteen States.

The men who gathered in Philadelphia in 1787 to decide upon a strong form of government for the new Nation were aware of the economic and personal problems faced by the States under the Articles of Confederation. Unity was a matter of whim—change required unanimity, a state of mind which was virtually impossible to reach. The self-interest of the several States was paramount, and no single argument was sufficient to bring about unanimity on any subject. The economy was in a state of chaos—the States acted in every form but a unified one. New York, for example, taxed firewood from Connecticut and vegetables from New Jersey. There had been Shay's Rebellion, and a growing wave of hostility to the Government threatened the already unstable Confederation.

Accordingly, such sophisticated and agile political thinkers as James Madison and Hamilton proposed the calling of a convention to remedy the inequities set forth in the Articles. Describing this unique meeting of minds, Charles A. Beard has said:

> It is not merely patriotic pride that compels one to assert that never in the history of assemblies has there been a convention of men richer in political experience and in practical knowledge, or endowed with a profounder insight into the springs of human action and the intimate essence of government. It is indeed an astounding fact that at one time so many men skilled in statecraft could be found on the very frontiers of civilization among a population numbering about 4 million. It is no less a cause for admiration that their instrument of government should have survived the trials and crises of a century that saw the wreck of more than a score of paper constitutions.

These men, rich "in political experience" and "endowed with profounder insight into the essence of government" understood that only a strong Central Government could assure the growth and stability of this young Nation.

It is difficult to describe exactly what ingredient has made the Constitution of the United States durable. Perhaps it is the elasticity with which it adapts to the increasing complexities of our civilization, a change that the framers of the Constitution wisely anticipated. Perhaps the greatness of this document lies in the proceedings which gave it birth—in the ability of men to reach logical solutions to knotty problems. These rational and often brilliant solutions represent not so much compromise as an expression of a formula which manages to combine all ingredients without the diminution of the effect of any single part. It represents a political "law of relativity" which accurately and enduringly established the prime responsibility of Government, the political basis for all phases of this responsibility and the means by which all levels of government can be protected from the unwarranted encroachment by any other level. It is a marvelous document, perhaps the greatest achievement of any political system devised by man.

But there are those who would change it, who would render Congress powerless to act as the representatives of all the people. There are those who would replace the zealously guarded principle of judicial review with a 50-member court whose function could at best be only dilatory and confusing. There are those who would alter the entire fabric of our Government and the precious principle which guarantees a "republican form of government" by destroying the provision which governs the reapportionment of State legislatures.

But perhaps the greatest injustice implicit in these amendments is the proposal to circumvent Congress in the matter of the process to amend the Constitution. Perhaps the Constitution is difficult to amend, but I would point out that Madison used the very existence of this difficulty to illustrate the safeguards of liberty implicit in the Constitution. Writing in the Federalist Papers, he said:

> The mode (for amendment of the Constitution) preferred by the Convention seems to be stamped with every mark of propriety. It guards equally against that extreme facility, which would render the Constitution too mutable; and that extreme difficulty, which might perpetuate its discovered faults. It,

> moreover, equally enables the general and the state governments to originate the amendment of errors, as they may be pointed out by the experience on one side, or the other.

The framers of the Constitution were extremely careful to find a solution which would recognize that even a document as carefully drafted as the Constitution might require amendment. At the same time, any amendment process must assure that hasty, ill-conceived or destructive changes would not be made without full participation of the people, both through their nationwide representatives in the Congress and their State's own legislature.

To alter the amending process, as suggested by the States' rights advocates, is to destroy a fundamental part of our entire system of checks and balances and to place the future of our citizens in the hands of what can only become a loosely organized and weak confederation rather than our present Federal Republic founded upon the principle of representative government.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, in their masterful Federalist papers warned constantly against the dangers of "splitting ourselves into an infinity of little, jealous, clashing, tumultous commonwealths, the wretched nurseries of unceasing discord, and the miserable objects of universal pity." Of course, we realize that the Federalist was a series of documents urging the ratification of the Constitution and might tend to exaggerate the dangers of the alternatives. But it represents perhaps the finest example of the American genius for political pamphleteering, and the truth of its arguments has not been diminished with time. In fact, the Federalist today is the strongest rebuttal that could be made against the amendments proposed by the General Assembly of the States.

Professor Black has written brilliantly on the legal problems posed by one of these proposals—the placing in the hands of the States of the responsibility and authority for amending the Constitution. I would like to add, however, that a careful review of the official proceedings of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 points up rather clearly the intent of the framers of the Constitution. The original amendment proposal as presented to that convention read as follows:

> On the application of the legislature of two-thirds of the States in the Union, for an amendment of this Constitution, the Legislature of the United States shall call a Convention for that purpose.

There was substantial controversy over this method. Hamilton, Madison, and Gerry all felt strongly that the Federal Government should be supreme. Mr. Hamilton argued that State legislatures would not apply for amendments except with a view toward increasing their own power. He felt that whenever two-thirds of each branch of the Federal Legislature should concur, a convention should be called. In his words:

> There could be no danger in giving this power, as the people would finally decide in the case.

Madison, too, took exception to the proposed amending process. He said the vagueness of the terms "call a Convention for the purpose" was sufficient reason for reconsidering the entire article. He asked how this Convention was to be formed, by what rules it was to be run, what was to be the force of its acts? It is interesting to note that these questions are being asked today regarding the proposed amendment to article V.

Compromise was finally proposed by Mr. Sherman, the distinguished delegate from my State of Connecticut, who suggested that the original language be amended by adding "or the Legislature—Congress—may propose amendments to the several States for their approbation, but no amendments shall be binding until consented to by the States."

The ensuing debate brought out the fact that, while the framers realized the necessity to provide for amendment by the States, they wished to give primary authority to the Congress. Since the Constitution was to affect the entire Nation, any revision should be made with an eye to nationwide import and impact.

The final language of article V established the principle of dual origination of amendments, making the process difficult, yes, but also protecting both the States and the Federal Government from unwarranted encroachment by either. Article V, as adopted, reads:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The amendment to article V proposed by the Assembly of the States revives the initial controversy. The result of the proposed amendment would be chaos, the dissolution of the Republic and the forming of a confederation which would spell disaster for our country. The arguments used against this by Madison and Hamilton in 1787 are equally valid today.

The second of the amendments, relating to judicial power, similarly reverses a principle considered axiomatic by the framers of the Constitution. The checks and balances form of government was devised by men who knew too well the dangers of tyranny on the part of any sector of the population, be it the government itself or mob rule. To again quote Charles Beard:

> The unity of the country was also symbolized by the Constitution in the creation of a Supreme Court, the members of which were to be chosen by the President with the consent of the Senate. Congress might at will establish inferior courts, district and circuit, but the Supreme Court was anchored in the Constitution. Its Justices might be divided as to cases before it, but its decisions made by a majority of them were to be binding at law throughout the land. Thus in matters of Federal concern the will of one high court was to be substituted for the clashing wills of 13 or more State courts.

I wish to call particular attention to this last sentence, since its implication is certainly applicable to the proposed creation of a 50-State court.

The question of reapportionment of State legislatures is eloquently set forth by Professor Black and, indeed, his entire presentation is worthy of the very close attention of each Member of this House and every American citizen. We should not—indeed, dare not—take lightly this threat to our entire form of government.

Of the reapportionment amendment, Professor Black has stated:

> This proposal, if passed, would constitute the first diminution, since our history began, of any Federal constitutional guarantee of liberty, justice, or equality.

The maintenance of these guarantees, to continue Professor Black's review, "is in the national material and moral interest, and is to be implemented by the substance of constitutional law and by the Federal judicial process."

I wish to insert Professor Black's article and copies of some of his correspondence on this matter and also several newspaper articles which have appeared recently. These are proof of the growing awakening of this country to a serious problem and grave threat to our future. This Congress and the American people must heed this warning. We must challenge this threat to our Government as this country as successfully challenged—and conquered—all other threats to the continuation of our great experiment in democracy.

The article, correspondence, and newspaper articles follow:

[From the Yale Law Journal, vol. 72:957]

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE V: A THREATENED DISASTER

(By Charles L. Black, Jr.)

Three proposals for amending the Constitution have recently come from the Council of State Governments, and are being propelled down the never before used alternative route of article V—the route via State applications to Congress for the calling of a convention.[1] Of the three, one (which would establish a Court of the Union, composed of the State chief justices in all their multitude, to meet on extraordinary occasions to review judgments of the Supreme Court)[2] is so patently absurd that it will probably sink without trace. Another, eradicating[3] *Baker* v. *Carr*[4] concerns a special subject, and hence does not generally affect the Federal power or the whole shape of the Union. The third is of supreme interest to students of constitutional law. Its adoption would effect a constitutional change of a higher order of importance than any since 1787—if one excepts (and that only doubtfully) the de facto change implicit in the result of the Civil War.

---

[1] All are set out in full, with an account of their espousal by the council, in "Amending the Constitution To Strengthen the States in the Federal System," 36 State Government 10 (1963).

[2] Id. at 13–14.

[3] By abolishing all substantive Federal guarantees against malapportionment, thus making action by Congress as well as by Court impossible, and by withdrawing the subject entirely from Federal judicial power, 36 State Government at 12.

[4] 369 U.S. 186 (1962) (14th amendment claim against State legislative malapportionment held within Federal judicial jurisdiction).

It is wonderful that this proposal—which has already commended itself to a number of State legislatures[5]—has been so little noticed. This is doubtless because the proposed change is in procedure. But a change in the procedure of constitutional amendment—unless it is purely formal, and this one is not—is a change in the distribution of ultimate power. The proposed article V, if adopted, would make it easily possible for a proportion of the American people no greater than that which supported Landon in 1936 to impose on the rest of the country any alteration whatever in the Constitution. The people who could do this would be, by and large, those inhabitants of the less populous States who reside in the districts that are overrepresented in their own State legislatures. "Unto him that hath it shall be given." This component of the population—to which we are all accustomed to conceding a veto power on constitutional amendment, as on many other matters—would under the proposed plan have something very different from a veto power. It would have the affirmative power of forcing its will on the majority, as to anything which may be the subject of constitutional amendment—that is to say, as to everything. Such a proposal ought to be scrutinized with the very greatest care, and the same careful scrutiny should be given to the method by which its proponents hope to coerce its submission to the State legislatures for ratification as an amendment.

THE PROPOSED NEW ARTICLE V

If this proposal were to win its way through, article V would read as follows: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."[6]

It may be convenient to the reader to have set out the text of the present article V: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."[7]

The proposed plan, it will be seen, abolishes the (never used) "convention" way of amendment, and puts in its place a method wholly under the control, as to substance and procedure, of the State legislatures. It does this by making it mandatory that Congress submit for ratification any amendment called for by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, and by simultaneously taking away Congress' power to elect the State convention mode of ratification.

At present, an amendment may be passed (and all have actually passed in this way) if two-thirds of each National House wants it, and if it is ratified by three-fourths of the States in the manner chosen by Congress. One might also pass if (on proper application of two-thirds of the States) a convention, summoned by Congress and having such structure as Congress thought wise to give it, proposed the amendment, and if it were then ratified in the manner chosen by Congress.

Along the new route opened by the proposed article V, Congress would control neither substance nor procedure. Three-fourths of the State legislatures, without the consent of any other body, could change the presidency to a committee of three, hobble the treaty power, make the Federal judiciary elective, repeal the 4th amendment, make Catholics ineligible for public office, and move the National Capital to Topeka. These are (in part at least) cartoon illustrations. But the cartoon accurately renders the de jure picture, and seems exaggerated only because we now conceive that at least some of these actions have no appeal to anybody. Some amendments—e.g., something like the Bricker amendment—would be very likely of early passage. At present the main dangers would be to civil and political rights, to national conduct of foreign relations, and to the Federal taxing power. But (particularly since the proposed change would be absolutely irreversible, 13 States being enough to block its reversal) the cartoon does not exaggerate the possibilities of the long future. A country in which the large majority would have to dread and sometimes submit to constitutional innovations appealing only to a minority could not call itself, even poetically, a democracy, and the possible tensions between consensus and Constitution would be dangerous in the extreme.

At present, when an amendment passes the House and the Senate by two-thirds, there is fair ground for the inference that there is national consensus upon it; at least the means of ascertaining that crucial fact, though rough, are fairly well adapted to the end. If the national convention method, under the present article V, were ever to be used, Congress, in setting up the convention, could insure that it be so representative as to be likely to express a national consensus. Congress even retains control over the ratification process; if the State legislatures were in its view to come to be dangerously unrepresentative, Congress could provide for ratification by State conventions so chosen as accurately to reflect the views of each State's people. Properly used, the present article V can insure that no constitutional change be effected which is disliked, deplored, or detested by a distinct majority of the American people.

What is the situation under the proposed new article V? Here one must talk numbers—even statistics of a rough kind. Let us note first that the 38 least populous States, whose legislatures could under the proposed article V repeal the full faith and credit clause, contain about 40 percent of the country's population.[8] That really ought to be enough. That these particular people should, in the name of federalism, have a veto power, is acceptable; at least it is accepted beyond change. What rational ground could there be for giving them, in addition, the power affirmatively to govern the rest of the people?

But of course one cannot stop there. The power given by the new article V is not in the States but in their legislatures. It cannot be too strongly stressed that one need not approve of *Baker* v. *Carr*[9] in order to accept the fact, as a fact, that the State legislatures do not accurately represent the people of their States—that a majority in each house of most State legislatures can be made up of votes representing a distinct minority of the State's people. This situation may have a certain romantic appeal;[10] even if one does not appreciate its beauty, one may not think the remedying of it a fit job for the Federal courts. But neither of these judgments supports the conclusion that the uncontrolled power of Federal constitutional amendment should be turned over to bodies so constituted.

So back to numbers: In the best table accessible,[11] relevant data are given for 34 of the 38 least populous States of the Union. On the average, it takes 38 percent of the people in one of these States to form the constituencies of enough State senators or representatives to pass a measure through the more accurately representative house of the State legislature. Taking this figure as good enough for present purposes, if the proposed article V were in force, the income tax could be abolished, by repeal of the 16th amendment, if about 15 percent of the American people were represented by legislators who desired that result.[12]

Now of course it can be replied that such a coalition cannot be formed without the implication that a good many other people are like minded with it. Granted. But the margin is enormous. If the right 30 percent of the people favored some amendment, its chance of passage would be very great indeed, whatever the other 70 percent might think. And it is very important that the distortion is not random but systematic—it is a distortion operating steadily in favor of rural districts and small towns. It is not too much to say that the proposed article V would enable the inhabitants of such districts to effect any change they persistently wanted in the Constitution of the United States. They may be better and wiser than the rest of us; perceptive fiction and the exacter sociology are not clear on this, but let us assume it is so. Does that justify turning the Constitution over to them, affirmatively and negatively, to keep or to change as they will?

Reference was made above to the result of the Civil War. The proposed article V rests on the theory, at least in part, that that result ought to be revised. The several States now have a crucial part in the process of constitutional amendment; the new proposal would (as far as one alternative method is concerned) give it entirely into their hands, setting at nothing the concept of national consensus among the American people considered as a whole people. It is a proposal for State rule only, on the basis of State-by-State count only, and through State institutions only, with the popular and national principles together submerged. If history has any lessons, our history teaches that such a location of ultimate power would put us in mortal danger.

---

[5] According to information informally received, the Legislatures of Arkansas, Florida, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Wyoming have already passed the resolution set out in text accompanying note 13 infra. In about an equal number of States, one house has passed it.

[6] 36 State Government 11–12 (1963); see text accompanying note 13 infra.

[7] U.S. Constitution, art. V.

[8] Calculated from the 1960 Census, 1963 World Almanac 255. The author is ill at reckoning, but the figures given here are not far off.

[9] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[10] See Perrin, "In Defense of County Votes," 52 Yale Revised 16 (1962), especially at 24.

[11] Compiled by the National Municipal League, N.Y. Times, Mar. 28, 1962, p. 22, col. 3.

[12] The figure is arrived at by taking 38 percent (the percentage of people in the relevant States necessary, on the average, to control the legislature) of 40 percent (the percentage of the American people residing in the 38 least populous States).

It should only be added that this proposal as a corollary to its discard of the concept of national consensus as a prerequisite to amendment, does away with national consideration and debate as a part of the amendment process. Under the present article V, any amendments must be examined and considered in a fully national forum—whether Congress or Convention—before it goes out to the several States. Such debate focuses national attention on something which is above all of national concern. Under the proposal, the only public debate would be in 50 separate State legislatures; the rest of the process would be ministerial only. This short-circuiting of national deliberation is actually one of the most offensive features of the plan.

THE MODE OF PROPOSAL

The plan of the proponents of this amendment is to see it introduced into each of the State legislatures, in the form of a resolution in the following terms:

"A (joint) resolution [13] memorializing Congress to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof.

"*Resolved by the house of representatives* (*the senate concurring*), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission,' and be it further,

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

The hope is that, if two-thirds of the legislatures submit such a petition, Congress will consider itself bound, under the present article V, to call the "convention" requested.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

A number of questions arise; some of these will be considered here—not as judicial questions, but as questions sure to come into the mind of any Congressman or Senator conscientiously seeking to do his duty.

Is the document quoted above an application within the meaning of article V? Article V lays down that Congress shall "call a convention for proposing amendments," on "application" of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States. The "application" which can raise a conscientious obligation on Congress' part must be one that asks it to "call a convention for proposing amendments." A good case can be made for the proposition that the quoted document is not such an "application," but an application for something quite different—for a "convention" to consider whether an amendment already proposed shall be voted up or down.[14]

The process of "proposal" by Congress, contained in the first alternative of article V, obviously includes the process of plenary deliberation upon the whole problem to which the amendment is to address itself. It entails choice among the whole range of alternatives, as to substance and wording. It is "proposal" in the most fully substantial sense, where the proposer controls and works out the content and form of the proposition. It is very doubtful whether the same word two lines later, in the description of the second alternative, ought to be taken to denote a mechanical take-it-or-leave-it process. Under the procedure followed by the draftsmen and proponents of the present "application," the "convention" would be in true function a part of the process of ratification.

This doubt is reinforced by the fact that the delegates who approved this language at Philadelphia were just completing the work of a convention of their own. Is it not likely that to them the phrase "convention for proposing amendments" mean a convention with a mandate somewhat like the one under which they had worked—a mandate to consider a set of problems and seek solutions?

The difference here is not merely formal, but sounds the deeps of political wisdom. The issue is whether it is contemplated that measures dominantly of national interest should be malleable under debate and deliberation at a national level, before going out to the several States. Such a conception of the convention contemplated by article V makes the second route to amendment symmetrical with the first, in the vital respect that, under both, the national problem must be considered as a problem, with a wide range of possible solutions and an opportunity to raise and discuss them all in a body with national responsibility and adequately flexible power. The Congressman or Senator persuaded by this distinction would be justified in concluding that the present applications," even if two-thirds of the States joined, was not of the sort that obliged Congress to call a convention.[15]

Assuming these applications are not within article V, it may still be suggested that a sort of reformation might be applied—that Congress, even if not persuaded that the present applications asked for the thing contemplated by article V, ought to call such convention as it thinks it would have been obliged to call if the applications had been of the right sort. This seems clearly wrong, for several reasons. Generally, a high degree of adherence to exact form, at least in matters of importance, is desirable in this ultimate legitimating process; a constitutional amendment ought to go through a process unequivocally binding on all. Congress is given no power to call a constitutional convention when it wants to, or thinks that on the general equities perhaps it should; if Congress desires an amendment, article V very clearly tells how that desire is to be made known. Congress' power as to conventions is not discretionary but strictly conditional, and if the condition is not met Congress not only need not but may not call a valid convention.

It is, moreover, illegitimate to infer, from a State's having asked for a "convention" to vote a textually given amendment up or down, that it desires some other sort of convention. It is not for Congress to guess whether a State which asks for the one kind of "convention" wants the other as a second choice. Altogether different political considerations might govern.

On the whole, then, no Member of Congress could be held to have disregarded a conscientious obligation if he took the view that the "application" quoted above, even if sponsored by two-thirds of the State legislatures, did not make obligatory a convention call. Indeed, he might conclude that Congress would be exceeding its powers in calling such a "convention," the condition to such a call, on a fair construction of article V, not having been met.

If Congress is obligated to call a convention, what sort must it call? The short fact here is that neither text nor history give any real help. When and if the article V condition is met, Congress "shall call a Convention * * *"; that is all we know. Fortunately, that is all we need to know, for the "necessary and proper" clause,[16] and the commonsense of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*,[17] give all the constitutional guidance required. Since Congress is to call the convention, and since no specifications are given, and since no convention can be called without specifications of constituency, mode of election, mandate, majority necessary to "propose," and so on, then Congress obviously may and must specify on these and other necessary matters as its wisdom guides it. (It may be noted that continuing control by Congress of the whole amendment process must have been contemplated, for Congress is given, under article V, the option between modes of ratification, no matter what the method of proposal.)

---

[13] This resolution should be in whatever technical form the State employs for a single resolution of both houses of the legislature which does not require the Governor to approve or veto (36 State government 11–12 (1963)).

[14] Even this much is more than the resolution literally allows; it asks for a convention "for the purpose of proposing" the amendment set out. Is it possible that the sponsors think the convention's role can be made ministerial?

[15] It should be noted that another and quite independent defect might be thought to vitiate these applications. They demand the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment which is, by its own text, to be ratified by the State legislatures; Congress can be under a duty to comply with these applications, then, only if such applications in sufficient number can place it under a duty to abdicate its own discretionary function, as clear as anything in the Constitution, of choosing between the modes of ratification, whatever may have been the mode of proposal. It is certain, on the face of article V, that no applications from any number of State legislatures can put Congress under a moral or legal obligation to do that. This quite patent error ought to lead to some suspicion of the whole theory on which these applications are drawn—the theory that Congress and the desired convention can be very narrowly confined in function, and that their work can be done for them in advance by the State legislatures.

[16] U.S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 8.

[17] 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, (1819).

If this is accepted, then no Senator or Representative is bound to vote for a convention call which in its form fails to safeguard what he believes to be vital national interests. Specifically, insistence would be thoroughly justified on an allocation of voting power by population rather than by States, on the election at large of a State's delegation or its choice in fairly apportioned districts, and on Federal conduct of the election of delegates, to prevent racial and other discrimination. Provision for a "two-thirds" rule might well be thought wise, in order to insure the same kind of consensus on this branch of article V as on the other. Since the adoption of this proposed amendment would make easily possible the future amendment of the Constitution without anything like popular consent, it is thoroughly reasonable for Congress to insist that this surrender be fully voluntary for at least this generation, unless (as is not true) some positive constitutional command to the contrary prevents.

It will probably be argued that the voting in any convention must be by States, since the voting in the original Constitutional Convention was by States. On this point, the analogy is not persuasive. The States then were in a position of at least nominal sovereignty, and were considering whether to unite. The result of the Convention would have bound no dissenting State or its people; the same was true of the acceptance of the new Constitution by the requisite nine. All these conditions are now reversed. We are already in an indissoluble union; there is a whole American people. The question in an amending convention now would be whether innovations, binding on dissenters, were to be offered for ratification. The propriety of a vote by States in the one convention surely cannot settle its rightness in the other.

Has the President a part in the Convention call process? Article I, section 7, clause 3 is as plain as language can be: "Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States, and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

Clearly, this language literally applies to actions of Congress taken under article V.

In *Hollingsworth* v. *Virginia*,[18] it was contended that the 11th amendment had not been validly proposed, since the resolution proposing it had not been sent to the President. Against this and other arguments, the Court, in a brief opinion not touching substance, upheld the amendment. In the course of argument, Justice Chase remarked: "The negative of the President applies only to the ordinary cases of legislation; he has nothing to do with the proposition or adoption of amendments to the Constitution."[19]

Since that time, the practice has been not to send amendment proposals to the President. These precedents apply, of course, only to the first method prescribed by article V, since that is the only method that has been used. *Hollingsworth* v. *Virginia* is inherently weak, as the unreasoned decision must be. It introduces an exception by flat into the entirely clear language of article I, section 7. But it need not be unfrocked in its own parish, since it is possible that the Court may have had in mind a ground for taking the first alternative of article V out of the veto process; since the congressional proposal must be by two-thirds in each House, it may have been thought that the requirement for overriding the veto was already met. This is not perhaps a very good ground, but the point about it here is that it would not exist at all if Congress, by simple majorities, called a "convention" under article V. Unless some other ground (better than Justice Chase's mere assertion) be stated for holding the contrary, it would seem that such a congressional action would fall as clearly as may be under the terms of article I, section 7, clause 3.

If this is right, then the grounds upon which the President might exercise his veto need be no less than those proper in the case of a Congressman voting on a convention call. If the President believed the structure and mandate of the "convention" significantly wrong, and dangerous to the national well-being, then he would surely be justified in vetoing the resolution.

SUMMARY

This proposal for amending article V is dangerous. It is to be hoped that it will be defeated in the State legislatures, but they are, after all, voting for or against increasing their own powers. If "applications," in the form quoted above, reach Congress in sufficient number to force the issue, there is still authentic constitutional ground on which to stand. It may be that these "applications" call for something not contemplated by the second alternative in article V, and hence need be treated, at most, only as memorials to Congress to propose this amendment, a plea addressed entirely to discretion. It is as certain as any such matter can be that no Congressman or Senator is bound to vote for a Convention call, even on impeccably proper application, wherein prudent conditions as to mandate, structure, constituency, voting, proper selection of delegates, and all the rest, are not met. There is no real reason why Presidential veto, on the same grounds, is not proper in this matter.

If all this terrain is fought over, then the American people will surrender this ultimate power into the hands of a minority only if they want to, and if they want to nobody can stop them.

JANUARY 7, 1963.

I have received your letter of December 29, 1962, describing the three proposals recently approved by the Assembly of the States (meeting under the auspices of the Council of State Governments), and enclosing copies of these and of a report of that Assembly's National Legislative Conference Committee on Federal-State Relations. I note that the Assembly has recorded its support of:

(a) An amendment to article V, to make obligatory the proposal of amendments endorsed by two-thirds of the State legislatures (without action by Congress or by a national convention), and providing for the ratification of proposed amendments by the State legislatures only, eliminating Congress' present option to submit them to State conventions.

(b) An amendment which would eliminate Federal judicial authority over the apportionment of State legislatures, and wipe out substantive Federal guarantees respecting this matter.

(c) An amendment to establish a "Court of the Union", composed of the chief justices of the States, with authority to review Supreme Court decisions relating to the rights reserved to the States under the Constitution.

These proposed amendments are set out at large in the other enclosures in your letter. If you will allow me I will comment on them as briefly as may be.

It must be a matter for astonishment that such proposals should find support among those to whom the honored word "conservative" is often applied. The proposals are radical in the extreme. They aim not at the preservation but at the subversion of that balance in Federal-State relations which has, in the words of a report advocating them, enabled us to escape "the evils of despotism and totalitarianism." They negate one of the best authenticated master principles of our American political being, the principle that we are a unified nation, having a unitary interest in the maintenance of our Federal Constitution, and expressing that interest through national deliberations and decisions, and (since we are a people attached to law) through our national courts. They constitute, collectively, one more attempt, so late in the day, at converting the United States into a confederation, wherein the interests of the American people as a whole people, acting together politically and morally, would be shattered into disjecta membra. The wisdom of peace and the sacrifices of war alike warn against starting down that ruinous road.

Since the first and third of the proposals are more general than the second, they more generally illustrate the characteristics referred to, and may therefore be taken up first.

The first proposal is that article V be so changed as to make obligatory the proposal of amendments desired by two-thirds of the State legislatures, without any congressional deliberation and without the calling of a national convention. The most striking (and perhaps most shocking) characteristic of this proposal is that it provides for amendment of the National Constitution without there having been, from first to last, any national deliberation anywhere. Like all political structures, this one expresses a political idea—the idea that the American people are not a unified people, and that the adoption of amendments to their Constitution is of no concern to them in their character as citizens of a nation. National questions ought surely at some stage to be deliberated upon in a national forum. Only thus can the attention of the Nation be brought to a focus upon them; only thus can they receive the consideration of representatives whose responsibility in office is the welfare of the country as a whole.

As contrasted with the method of amendment always hitherto used, the proposal clearly has another shocking characteristic; it altogether eliminates the popular principle from the amendment process, by taking the House of Representatives out of that process. Under the method heretofore used, to put the matter summarily, an amendment, to be proposed, must not only pass through the Senate, where the States are represented equally, but also the House of Representatives, where the people are (at least roughly) represented pro rata. This long-sanctioned method transfers to the amendment process the basic compromise on which our Nation was formed. The present proposal destroys this balance; paradoxically, it makes it possible for an amendment to be proposed and passed without any assent from a body representing the national citizenry as such, though a simple act of Congress cannot be passed without such assent. Again, the theoretical underpinning is clear—the American people are seen not as a people, but as the distributed inhabitants of a confederacy.

This want of popular representation in the proposed amending process is made the more dangerous by the fact that many of our State legislatures are grossly unrepresentative of the people within their States. Whether or not we approve of *Baker* v. *Carr*, and whatever may be the appropriate Federal constitutional standards for representation in State legislatures considered strictly in their local character, how could we wish to commit the process of Federal constitutional amendment to the uncontrolled action of legislatures that (as published statistics irrefutably show) are very far from reflecting with accuracy the composition even of their own State citizenry? (This point is underscored by the fact that the proponents of this scheme, in their report, are concerned to eliminate the State Governors from the amendment process.)

---

[18] 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 378 (1798).

[19] Id. at 380 n.a.

It may be said that, under the alternative and never-used convention method of article V, Congress may now be compelled, by State initiative, to call conventions for the purpose of proposing constitutional amendments, and that the House of Representatives may thereby be circumvented. But article V does not provide that, in such a convention, the popular principle of representation is not to be expressed, and the House of Representatives (or, for that matter, the Senate), as a condition to its assent to the call, might insist on appropriate provision to this end. Such provision would be consonant with the whole spirit of our Government, which is based squarely on the notion that, in the making of national decisions, both the people and the States are to be represented.

The amendment proposal, then, would subvert the deepest principle of our political life—that we are a whole nation, and that the resolution of national questions calls for debate and action in a national forum. It would remove from the amendment process the necessity for the assent of the American people, in that body where they are represented as such. It would make possible the changing of any feature of our national political structure wholly by the disjoined and divided actions, severally debated and taken, of the representatives, it might be, of a minority of the people. It sets at nothing all the wisdom we have gained at great price, and ought to be firmly rejected.

The third, or "court of the Union," proposal, is vulnerable to a number of criticisms which may be considered minor only in relation to its major fault in principle. This "court" would lack two prime characteristics of courts in our legal tradition; it would be, beyond argument, too large for effective judicial deliberation, and, meeting sporadically, it could never form any institutional tradition. Its members would be judges chosen for their attainments and promise in other fields than Federal constitutional law. In the main, they would be elected by diverse electorates; whatever may be the suitability of this method for the choosing of State judges, its rejection, for the judges who were principally to interpret the Constitution, was a prime point with the framers, and has served us well for nearly 2 centuries. A majority of this "court" could easily represent a very small minority of the American people. Its members would be subject to State legislature pressure. The mind staggers at the notion that the wisdom of article III and of section 25 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, repeatedly reenacted in material substance, should come down to this—that the master-work of Marshall and Story, of Taney, of Taft and Hughes and Holmes, should be turned over to a "court" so constituted.

But the radical fault of the proposal lies deeper. The American people are committed, as firmly as they are to anything, to the powerful and life-giving idea that our Constitution is law, and that its character as national law can only be upheld by giving its final interpretation into the hands of a national judiciary. In the selection of that judiciary both the States and the people are now well represented, by the President and by the Senate. But the Federal judge himself is an officer of the Nation, expressing, as light is given him, the interest of the Nation in the even maintenance of its constitutional balances. The destruction of this idea, and the substitution of the idea that final judgment on constitutional questions is to be made by judicial representatives of the States, taken one by one, again can rest only on the theory, denied by the best thought and the best blood of our history, that we are not a Nation but a league.

The second proposal (the reversal by constitutional amendment of *Baker* v. *Carr*) goes to a more specific problem than does either of the proposals discussed above. What it amounts to is a withdrawal of Federal protection from a designated area of political life.

This proposal, if passed, would constitute the first diminution, since our history began, of any Federal constitutional guarantee of liberty, justice, or equality. More specifically, the equal protection clause has up to now been left as it came into the Constitution, entirely general; "equal protection of the laws," not as to some matters but as to all, is one of the chief things our Nation promises us in return for what it asks of us. To begin cutting down our constitutional guarantees, to begin introducing exceptions here and there into the concept of equality under law, are solemn steps indeed. The possibility (and it remains no more than that) that some of the grosser present abuses in State apportionments may be weeded out by Federal judicial action is not an appealing ground for embarkation on these treacherous seas.

And this proposal goes very far. It would reach beyond the 14th amendment "equal protection," and sanction the States in using "apportionment" as a guise for rank racial discrimination, in contravention of at least the purpose and spirit of the 15th amendment. (The *Tuskegee* gerrymander case makes this possibility far from fanciful.) It would open a breach in the Federal guarantee, thought essential by the framers, of a "republican form of government" in each State, for by its clear terms it would prevent not only the judiciary but Congress from acting to implement that guarantee, as long as malapportionment, however gross, was the vehicle of oppression. Whatever the constitutional provision concerned, the proposal would make invulnerable not merely such abuses in State representation as now exist, but also others far more gross; we would be over-optimistic, in view of the British experience and of our own shifting population trends, if we assumed that these could not occur. This proposal, moreover, would remove from any Federal control that abuse in State government which is the most likely to be self-perpetuating, since its correction, absent such control, must come from those who profit by it.

In association with the other two proposals, this one takes on an even darker tone. Together, these proposals would, at one and the same time, place the amending power in the uncontrolled hands of the State legislatures, place the final construction of the Constitution in the hands of judges whose offices are created and whose salaries are paid by the State legislatures, and then exempt the same State legislatures from any effective policing, by Court or Congress, of their representative character. That such proposals should be thrust forward as a means of restoring a balance between Nation and State benumbs comment.

Against them may be put the basic postulates that have served us since 1787. First, questions of national import, including most preeminently questions having to do with the amending of the Constitution, are for national debate, in a national forum, by people whose offices give them national responsibility; such questions are to be dealt with, in part, by a body such as our House of Representatives, so constituted as to represent the American people in a true numerical proportion, and not only State by State. Secondly, the Constitution is law, to be interpreted, as all law must be interpreted, in court; since its interpretation concerns the entire and integral American Nation, final judgment, which must rest somewhere, is to rest with the judicial officers of the whole Nation, selected on a national basis, by a national process, wherein both States and people have a part. Thirdly, the maintenance of basic guarantees of liberty, justice and equality, cutting across all the concerns of public life, is in the national material and moral interest, and is to be implemented by the substance of constitutional law and by the Federal judicial process. These things are at the heart of our greatness as a nation; let us hope that we will not, as these proposals would have us do, fritter them away.

With all best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. BLACK, Jr.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 19, 1963]

OPPOSITION SLOWS AMENDMENT PUSH—PUBLICITY IMPEDES PROGRESS OF STATES RIGHTS PROPOSALS—IMPORTANT TESTS DUE

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The campaign for three States rights amendments to the Constitution is running into stiffening opposition.

Politicians, newspapers, good-government groups, labor unions and civil rights organizations are beginning to speak out against the proposals. As a result, the rapid progress they made in the early months of 1963 has slowed almost to a stop.

However, conservative forces are still pressing hard for the proposals. Critical tests are coming up soon in Ohio and New Jersey.

The proposed amendments are being pushed by a committee of State legislators and officials. The backers are using the device, never before invoked, of petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention on the proposals. Two-thirds of the State legislatures, 34, would have to ask Congress to call the convention.

One amendment would remove all constitutional restrictions on how the States apportion their legislatures, and bar Federal courts from dealing with the problem. The effect would be to wipe out the Supreme Court's apportionment decision of 1962, which opened legislative districts to the scrutiny of Federal courts.

The second amendment would permit the State legislatures themselves to amend the Constitution in the future without consideration in any national forum. Amendments must now be approved either by Congress or by a national convention.

The third amendment would set up a "Court of the Union" to review decisions of the Supreme Court. It would be made up of the chief justices of the 50 States.

A dozen State legislatures have approved the apportionment amendment, 11 the proposal on the amending process and 3 the suggested Court of the Union.

All this progress has been made since just last January. For most of this period the campaign for the amendments went on in virtual silence, with no publicity and frequently no debate in the legislatures voting for the proposals.

PUBLICITY STARTED

National publicity about the campaign began last month. This has apparently been responsible for arousing various forces that could be expected to oppose the amendments once they knew about them.

Newspapers and other communications media began to note the swift progress of the amendments, Chief Justice Earl Warren commented, in a speech, on the lack of attention they had been getting.

Then, last week, President Kennedy spoke critically of the proposed amendments at his news conference. He said he believed that the efforts to pass them would "come to nothing, and I will be glad when they do."

Other critical comments were made by such groups as the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and American Jewish Congress, the Liberal Party in New York and others concerned with the civil liberties. Branches of the League of Women Voters began taking an interest.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights organizations also started to protest. They said the apportionment proposal could be used to rig legislatures against Negroes—a politically powerful argument in northern urban States.

SITUATION IN OHIO

In Ohio, the apportionment amendment was before a State senate committee. No opposition had been expressed, and sponsors of the proposal expected that it would be approved without debate in the committee and on the senate floor.

Then a Cleveland radio station, WCLV, carried a broadcast about the amendment campaign.

Major Ohio newspapers began to write about the proposals, and some editorialized against them. The State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and the League of Women Voters worked hard against them, talking to individual State senators.

The senate committee met last week to consider the apportionment proposal. The committee lineup was 7 to 2 Republican. The Republican chairman, a supporter, expected easy approval.

Instead, the committee killed the amendment by a vote of 5 to 3, with one member absent. A Republican senator who had introduced the companion proposal on the amending process abandoned it, saying, he had "become aware that certain groups on the ragged fringe were pushing it."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer called the vote, "one of the biggest upsets of this legislative session." It attributed the result to "mounting pressures from civic organizations" and to its own and other newspapers' opposition.

ACTION REVERSED

Then, 2 days ago, two committee members switched their vote and the apportionment proposal was reported out. A test on the floor of the State senate is expected soon.

This Ohio vote could be extremely important. If opponents of the amendment are unable to beat this one in a northern, urban State such as Ohio, their prospects elsewhere would seem much weaker. And the Ohio Senate is more equitably apportioned than the House.

In New Jersey the State senate had unanimously approved both the apportionment amendment and the one on the amending process. No major political figure had spoken against them, and assembly passage was expected.

But after some publicity the situation changed. Last week Gov. Richard J. Hughes denounced the amendments at the State Democratic convention, and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE did the same at the Republican convention.

Both men suggested that the State senate recall the amendments or that the Assembly kill them. An assembly committee has scheduled a hearing on them for May 27.

The Essex County (Newark) Bar Association this week adopted a strong resolution against the amendments.

TWO VOTED IN TEXAS

The only recent favorable action on the States rights amendments has come in Texas. The legislature there approved both the apportionment and the amending proposals.

The sponsors of the campaign now say they erroneously included South Carolina among those approving these two amendments in earlier tabulations. Only the lower house has acted there, they say, although they hope for senate action.

The revised list of States that have approved the apportionment amendment is: Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wyoming and, in somewhat different language, Utah.

States that have voted for the change in the constitutional amendment process are Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. New Hampshire had not been included in earlier lists.

The States that have approved the Court of the Union amendment are Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming. Some earlier lists had erroneously included Alabama.

In addition to the other forces now working against the amendments, there have been signs of arousal in the legal community. Some bar groups are studying the proposals, and law professors are speaking against them.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, May 28, 1963]

SILENT AMENDMENTS: THORNY PATH LIES AHEAD FOR CONSTITUTION CHANGES

(By Stanley Meisler)

WASHINGTON.—States righters quietly trying to push three new amendments into the U.S. Constitution have a long, rocky, weaving road ahead.

Without fanfare, the legislatures of 16 States have approved resolutions asking Congress to call a national convention to consider these amendments aimed at curtailing the powers of the Federal Government.

But the States vary in their likes and dislikes, and not all 16 have voted for the same amendments. Only one amendment so far has attracted as many as 12 States. The States righters need at least 34 States to take a long first step on the rough constitutional road.

The road would be eased in the future if one of these amendments does become a part of the Constitution some day. This amendment would change the way of amending the Constitution.

ROUGHEST PATH

But the supporters of the amendments now have to follow one of the routes outlined in the present Constitution. All these routes are rough, and the States righters have picked the roughest. It is so rough, in fact, that it never has been followed successfully before.

The three proposed amendments would:

1. Make it possible for the States to propose and ratify constitutional amendments completely on their own.
2. Wipe out Federal jurisdiction over the apportionment of seats in the State legislatures.
3. Make it possible for certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court to be overruled by a States-controlled "court of the Union."

Of late, these amendments have provoked a chorus of opposition that includes President Kennedy, Republican Governor George Romney, of Michigan, and Senators from both the Democratic and Republican parties. Chief Justice Earl Warren has called for a great national debate.

NO GREAT DEBATE

But, so far, there has not been a great debate. Most advocates of these amendments have failed to stand up and reply to the critics. Instead, they have continued their quiet drive to push the amendments through the legislatures.

By the route used, States righters first must line up 34 States—two-thirds of the 50—for each of the amendments.

If they succeed, Congress, under the Constitution, would have to call a convention to consider the amendments. Since this never has been done before, legal experts are not sure what power the convention would have. Most likely, it either would approve or reject the amendments. But some experts think it might become a general constitutional convention considering a wide range of alternatives as well as the three proposed amendments.

In any case, under the Constitution, amendments approved by this convention would be submitted to the States for ratification. If 38 State legislatures or State conventions—three-fourths of the 50—ratified the amendments, they would become part of the U.S. Constitution.

The 23 amendments now in the Constitution were approved by a less complicated method: They were proposed by a two-thirds vote in Congress and then ratified by three-fourths of the States.

EASIER WAY TRIED

States righters have not overlooked this more usual, less complicated way. The proposed amendments have been introduced in the House and Senate. But so far they have gotten nowhere, and supporters of the amendments have their hopes pinned on the State legislatures.

Now let us see how much simpler all this would be if the States righters had their way and their first proposed amendment was accepted.

Under it a constitutional amendment could be approved if proposed by two-thirds of the State legislatures and then ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures. The whole idea of a national convention would be eliminated, though Congress, by a two-thirds vote, still would have the power to propose amendments.

Those who favor this amendment see it simply as an easier way for the States to get their point of view into the U.S. Constitution.

NO NATIONAL DEBATE

But the opponents disapprove of the amendment because it leaves open the possibility of an amendment becoming part of the U.S. Constitution without any national deliberation—either by Congress or by a national convention.

Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of Yale Law School says that amendment also "would make it possible for a proportion of the American people no greater than that which supported Alfred Landon in 1936 to impose on the rest of the country any alteration whatever in the Constitution."

In addition, Black figures that under this amendment the Constitution could be changed "if about 15 percent of the American people were represented by legislators who desired that result."

The professor bases this figure on the fact that the 38 least populated States—enough to propose and ratify—have only 40 percent of the American population and that even in these States, the legislatures are weighted in favor of the less populated rural areas.

The board of governors of the American Bar Association has voted its disapproval of this proposed amendment because it believes "that the Congress should not be excluded from the constitutional amending process."

But Brevard Crihfield, executive director of the Council of State Governments, replies that Congress would not be excluded because it still could propose amendments by a two-thirds vote.

This amendment has won the approval so far of 11 States: Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

South Carolina will make the total 12 as soon as it completes some minor details on the resolution. Nebraska would have made it 13 but Democratic Gov. Frank Morrison vetoed the proposal after the legislature voted for it.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, May 29, 1963]

SILENT AMENDMENTS: WARREN CHARGES BAR ABDICATES ROLE BY SILENCE ON CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

(By Stanley Meisler)

WASHINGTON.—Chief Justice Earl Warren has chided America's lawyers for their silence about three proposed constitutional amendments.

Warren's irritation is not surprising. Two of the amendments are aimed right at his Court.

"For the bar of America to be as inactive as it has been in this situation," he said recently, "is almost an abdication of its responsibility to the public."

As head of the Supreme Court, Warren did not take a position on the amendments, but he clearly was concerned that, with little or no debate, 16 State legislatures had approved at least 1 of the 3 amendments.

If any amendment wins support from 34 States, Congress must call a national convention to accept or reject it.

The proposed amendments would:

1. Make it possible for the States to propose and ratify constitutional amendments completely on their own.

2. Wipe out Federal jurisdiction over the apportionment of seats in the State legislatures.

3. Make it possible for certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court to be overruled by a States-controlled "court of the Union."

The first amendment generally would help the cause of States rights, but the other two, while also concerned with States rights, directly touch the heart of the Supreme Court.

REVERSE DECISION

The amendment about legislative apportionment, in fact, would reverse a historic decision of the Court in March 1962.

In the decision, the Court ruled that citizens could seek relief in Federal courts when unequal representation of State legislatures violated their constitutional rights. This was a blow to many rural-dominated legislatures that had refused to reapportion themselves to meet population changes of the 20th century.

The proposed amendment would say, first, that no provision of the Constitution can restrict the apportionment of a State legislature, and, second, that the Federal courts have no jurisdiction over any suit relating to the apportionment of State legislatures.

Speaker Robert D. Hasse of the Wisconsin House says that nothing short of this amendment can stop the Federal Government from interfering in reapportionment—which he considers a basic right of the States.

THREATENS GUARANTEE

But Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., of the Yale Law School says "this proposal, if passed, would constitute the first diminution, since our history began, of any Federal constitutional guarantee of liberty, justice, or equality."

The board of governors of the American Bar Association, which opposes the other two amendments, has withheld action on this amendment.

The amendment has been proposed by the legislatures of 12 States: Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wyoming and—although this resolution is worded somewhat differently from the others—Utah.

South Carolina will make the total 13 as soon as it completes some minor details on its resolution. Nebraska would have made it 14 but Democratic Gov. Frank Morrison vetoed the proposal after the legislature voted for it.

The court of the Union amendment is longer and somewhat more complicated than the others.

CHIEF JUSTICES

Under this proposal, a court of the Union would be made up of the chief justices of the 50 States, but it would not be active all the time. The court would be convened upon request of the legislatures of any five States without a common boundary.

The court of the Union would have only one function. It would decide whether a particular decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was constitutional.

But the court of the Union would not have complete jurisdiction over Supreme Court decisions. The court of the Union could rule only when the decision involved powers of the States or the people. If the Supreme Court made a ruling about war or foreign commerce or coining money or any other power reserved to the Federal Government, the court of the Union could not decide whether the ruling was constitutional.

The agreement of 26 justices on the court of the Union would be needed to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court.

DOING—NOT SAYING

Representative Warren L. Wood, of the Illinois House says this amendment represents the first and only attempt to do something about the drift of State power to Washington instead of just talking about it.

Wood says the amendment would help make the Constitution work as it did "when the United States grew to the greatest Nation on earth."

But Professor Black says this amendment would destroy "the powerful and lifegiving idea that our Constitution is law, and that its character as national law can only be upheld by giving its final interpretation into the hands of a national judiciary."

The American Bar Association's board of governors—too long silent in Chief Justice Warren's view—decided last week to announce its disapproval of this amendment because it was "inconsistent with the constitutional concept of our court system."

The amendment has been approved by four States: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming. South Carolina will make it five as soon as it completes some minor details on its resolution.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, May 5, 1963]

CONSERVATIVE GROUPS PUSH THREE AMENDMENTS IN A UNIQUE WAY

WASHINGTON.—The last time the United States held a constitutional convention was in 1787 when the Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia to draw up the Constitution of the United States. But if a group of conservatively oriented State legislators have their way, there will be another national constitutional convention soon.

The Constitution provides two methods of amendment. The only method used so far has been for the Congress, by two-thirds vote in both Chambers, to approve a new amendment, after which it is submitted to the States and becomes effective if three-quarters of them ratify.

The Constitution also permits the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, by passing resolutions, to require Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider a specific amendment. If the convention should approve such an amendment, it would then be submitted for the approval of three-fourths of the States.

The second method has never succeeded in the past, either because the legislative memorials to Congress lacked uniform wording, or because the memorials were passed many years apart, destroying their effectiveness as a single mandate to Congress.

Backers of a limit on the income tax, for instance, claim that three-quarters of the States have submitted some type of memorial on this subject. But the record shows that the memorials date back as far as 1938, contain widely differing wording and provisions, and that some States have even attempted to rescind their resolutions.

Congress has never set down a policy as to how many years apart memorials must be, whether States can rescind memorial resolutions, how a constitutional convention would be organized, who would sit in it, and the like. But some congressional committees are currently considering calling hearings on the subject this summer.

The specific impetus for a fresh congressional look at the second method of amending the Constitution comes from the campaign recently initiated by the General Assembly of the States, a group of State legislators affiliated with the Council of State Governments.

This group is seeking to persuade two-thirds of the States to memorialize Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider three States rights amendments.

The general assembly approved the three amendments at its December 6, 1962, meeting in Chicago and recommended that "to the fullest extent possible" all State legislatures be in session in early 1963 for the purpose of passing the memorials in identical form, thereby avoiding the past defects of the little-used amending process.

The three proposed amendments and their success to date:

Prohibit the U.S. Supreme Court or any other Federal court from exercising jurisdiction in any case "relating to apportionment of representation in any State legislature."

This amendment is intended to nullify the effects of the March 1962 Supreme Court decision in the Tennessee apportionment case (Baker against Carr), which has resulted in court cases in 36 States and reapportionments—almost all benefiting urban or suburban areas at the expense of rural counties—in 17 States.

The reapportionment memorial resolution was approved so far in 11 States—Arkansas, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. It was also passed in Nebraska but vetoed by Gov. Frank B. Morrison, Democrat, who said it would weaken the U.S. Constitution.

Establish a "court of the Union" composed of the chief justices of the supreme courts of the 50 States, with power to review and reverse decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court "relating to the rights reserved to the States or people."

Four States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming—have asked Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider this amendment.

Change the amending process of the Constitution so that two-thirds of the States could directly propose constitutional amendments without obtaining, as is now required, the approval of Congress or a constitutional convention.

This amendment has been endorsed by the legislatures of nine States in memorials to Congress—Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT GALLAUDET COLLEGE DELIVERED BY HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Texas, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, on last Monday, June 3, had the honor of delivering the commencement address at Gallaudet College, the only senior college for the deaf in the world.

As many of you may know, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] is the son of deaf parents. He has taken a keen interest in the welfare of the deaf and since early in 1949 has served as a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, having originally been appointed to this position by the late beloved Speaker, Mr. Rayburn. As a member of the board he has been active in helping to raise the standards of the college and to obtain badly needed physical facilities. On the campus is the Mary L. Thornberry Hearing and Research Center, named in memory of his mother.

In delivering the following splendid and significant address, Mr. THORNBERRY used the sign language in presenting the introductory part of the speech, having learned the sign language from his parents.

I know you will agree with me that the gentleman's address was a timely and thoughtful one, and I am happy to ask that it be included as a part of my remarks:

THE AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY

The honor of being your speaker today is an honor deeply felt, and most gratefully received. Long before I entered public life, long before I, myself, reached the proud moment of graduation, I was most intimately aware of and concerned with the problems and opportunities of the deaf, for I was born the child of parents both of whom were deaf.

I am grateful that my years of service in the Congress have permitted me to fulfill the privilege of serving on the board of this finest educational institution of its kind in the Nation—and in the world. Grateful as I am for Gallaudet, for the role it fills, for the example and inspiration it offers, I am and we all should be the more grateful for the society and system which supports efforts such as this to open wider the doors of opportunity to all.

One of our great scholars of history, Arnold Toynbee, has said that the mark and measure of a civilization is its attitude toward its older people. I would add to this measurement the test of a society's attitude toward all segments who, for reasons physical, economic, or hereditary, occupy an exceptional status. Only if the doors of opportunity are open to all can a society expect to be strong, or deserve to be called great.

Our land has made and is continuing to make such an effort—and we are stronger and greater because of that effort.

The prospects facing you of the class of 1963 at Gallaudet clearly underscore this point. We have a long history of effort in this country toward education of the deaf. That effort deserves the honor we accord it. However, if I may speak from my own intimate experience with the field, I know, you know, and many of your parents know such education has in the past often been what could only be described as patronizing to the deaf themselves. It has been regarded as honorable always—but many have seemed to wonder if there were really any purpose other than humanitarianism alone.

I raise this now on your graduation day, not to recall a better-forgotten past or to cast a shadow of gloom across an otherwise happiest of occasions. On the contrary, I raise this because the foremost fact of your graduation day, and of the world you enter, is that we in America no longer need to avoid the topic. You enter a world now that needs you, that wants you, that welcomes you and will during your lifetime, open many more doors of opportunity to you than are open even now.

The contrast between the opportunity for your class and the class of 1933 or even the first class of Gallaudet cannot be measured in years—it must be measured in centuries. Of this progress we can all be very proud; and for this, we each should be most thankful.

What has happened, what is happening, and what will continue to happen is that your country is growing, our responsibilities are growing, and the demand we have for the educated mind requires us to make the fullest use of every talent we can produce.

Where there were about 160 million Americans when you were born, there are more than 180 million today—and there will be more than 200 million by 1970, our population is growing rapidly. This alone would require us to mobilize and use all our resources more effectively to meet the demands of a vastly larger population for food, clothing, housing, education, jobs, and all that is essential to American life.

But despite the increase in our population, despite the continuing high level of unemployment, the fact is that America is facing in the next two decades the most serious shortage in our history of well-trained, well-educated, well-prepared young people. We have in our economy now approximately 4 million unemployed. At the same time there are approximately the same number of job vacancies which are unfilled because persons of adequate training are not available to perform the work required. This is in many respects the heart of the most urgent domestic problem we face in this decade, and in this generation.

The investment we have made in education, in mass free education through our public schools and institutions of higher learning, is yielding dividends for us now. We have come to the beginning of what has been called the second industrial revolution—a great forward surge of our productive capacity and output made possible by our research and study advancing the horizons of human knowledge. We are moving forward; we are moving upward. Yet as we reach for new heights on earth and out in space, our national conscience is troubled by the fact that many are being left behind.

Over 400,000 young persons are out of school and out of work. Unemployment rates for youths under 25 are three times greater than the unemployment rate for adults. The rate of long-term unemployment for young men and women under 25 has grown by 70 percent in just the last 5 years.

The one cause almost entirely responsible for this condition is the lack of education. Those with college degrees have very little need to worry about not having a job. Those without high school diplomas, however, have only a very slim chance of finding a job if they don't already have one.

What we in America must awake to is the tremendous annual loss we are suffering—in dollars and cents—because of our complacency about the nearly unbelievable numbers of youth who are not completing high school education. In this decade of the 1960's, 7.5 million young people will drop out of school. At the present rates, 40 out of every 100 pupils in our fifth grades will never finish high school. In the slum areas of our larger cities, as many as 75 out of 100 will not get a high school diploma.

We are allowing too much human capital to go to waste. Human capital is the secret of our economic strength and our economic growth in this country. We thought for a long time that America was as rich as it has long been, as prosperous as it is, as strong as it is chiefly because of the endowment of natural resources and our investment in plants and other facilities, today we know that this is only half the story. About one-half of the growth of our gross national product has been the result of education, training and research. From 1929 to the late 1950's, we increased the output per worker in our economy by nearly 60 percent. Investment in new plants and new equipment accounted for only 10 to 20 percent of that gain. The largest single factor—roughly about two-fifths—is attributed by the economists to the improvement in the quality of our labor force resulting from increases in formal education.

In the last 10 years—since 1952—we have had the most rapid rise in the quality of education of our working force in all our history. The median level of school years completed by the men in our working force increased by one-fifth during that time. The percentage of our workers who are college graduates will soon have doubled over 1951. Only during the past 10 years have we achieved the point where for the first time more than half of our workers have had at least some high school education.

We are moving forward. We are moving upward. We must be continually concerned that we do not leave behind us a scrap-heap of human waste—young people, boys and girls, men and women, who cannot participate effectively and usefully in our working force because of inadequate education.

Over your own lifetime your college education will mean much more to you than you may suspect in terms of economic benefits. Where a person completing elementary school can expect a lifetime earning power of about $150,000, and a high school graduate can expect a lifetime earning power of around $200,000, those who have completed 4 years of college can expect to earn nearly $400,000, close to half a million. In our economy at present, college graduates are earning annually more than twice the income of those who drop out after elementary school, a college graduate receives $900 per year for each year of his college schooling above the earning power of those who start but do not finish college.

Education in our society means far more in terms of a better life for those who receive it. Our failure to give the time and effort we should to being certain that every boy and girl completes his education is costing the Nation, however, something on the order of $30 to $40 billion annually in goods and services we could be producing but are not producing.

I say this to you today because the class of 1963 at Gallaudet stands apart from all the other classes preceding you here in terms of opportunity open to you. The economy and the society into which you enter places the highest of values on your mind, on your individual capabilities as a person. You have prepared yourself well—you will be accepted and rewarded on that basis.

Many of you will enter the teaching professions, helping to teach others who are deaf, also, so that they may prepare themselves as you have done for a higher order of participation in our American life. This is important and vital work on which you enter. The next 20 years will be the years of most dramatic change and gain in our American economy. As we move further in our space exploration, as we develop better our capacity for production in our domestic economy, as we participate more freely in the trade and commerce of the world, there will be for the deaf many more openings to participate effectively and profitably in the scientific and productive activity of America.

We are told that we can anticipate individuals having to change their field of principal employment at least three times during the course of their careers. Our rate of progress is so fast that many professions and individual skills become outmoded almost before we can put them to use. I would feel very certain that many of you will start in one profession and end your careers 40 or 50 years from now engaged in far different and far higher levels of occupation.

An automated economy, an economy where bright minds are in short supply, an economy engaged in brainwork more than musclework, is an economy which permits the deaf to compete and to lead in a manner never before possible or conceivable. This prospect is exciting to me and it should be exciting to you.

But I would say to you that you have a special obligation which goes with your special opportunity. You are, by virtue of your degree here, leaders. You have a role to fill and a job to do in leading and inspiring other young people—not only those who may be deaf, but all of those with whom you come in contact—to continue their educations actively and vigorously. You have an obligation to use your full abilities and influences to keep before our public policymakers at all levels—Federal, State, and local—the rewards that can be returned from investment in education such as you have received here at Gallaudet. Not only do we need to expand, but we can always improve. Much has been opened to you. You can honor what is yours by giving much in return.

Above these personal concerns, you will, I am sure, keep before you the realization that our country and our society are not created and designed to serve individual groups but for all groups and all individuals to serve the whole. As our President has said, the test for each of us is not what we expect our country to do for us, but what we do for our country.

We live in a world of peril and danger, but we do not live and we must not live as men and women afraid and insecure. The danger is great. But our American strength is great, far greater than some of our countrymen would permit us to believe.

We must maintain our strength. We must also maintain our confidence in that strength and in ourselves—the strength of our arms and the strength within ourselves so that freedom will prevail over tyranny.

We must concern ourselves always with perfecting the rule of law in our own land and everywhere. The heart of our system is sure, even, and equal justice under law for all men. We must perfect our own standards of justice and, by so doing, be an inspiration to other nations to continue their efforts toward that same high goal.

We must keep open the channels of individual advancement within our society. Initiative must have its rewards as misfortune has its compassion. We must never allow those channels of individual progress and growth to be obstructed by any groups, any prejudices, any passions of the moment. We must expect the institutions of business and labor and education to examine and reexamine the level of their performance; and we must expect and demand the same from government itself at all levels.

I believe that you are graduating into a time of rising optimism when we can be and will be more confident, more hopeful, more secure in doing the work we must do at home and abroad. America is not a weak Nation; America is not a sick Nation; America is not a Nation on its knees begging for mercy. We are strong. We must stand erect in the world, be proud of our country, proud of our freedom, proud of our schools, proud of our young people, proud of our special destiny as world leaders of the cause of freedom.

I congratulate each of you on your success in completing the work here. I congratulate you more especially on the broader opportunities which are open before you today. Fulfill your opportunities. Make the most of the better chance which is yours. You are qualified to be leaders. We of America look to you and expect of you leadership worthy of the abilities you have shown at Gallaudet.

REAPPORTIONMENT UNDER SECTION 2 OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT, A LONG-NEGLECTED CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, PROVIDED FOR IN H.R. 6801

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he begins his statement?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the point that I have not given up my fight against these special orders. I had a previous engagement of long standing with 10 Brazilian students to talk with them, and I was out of the Chamber when a number of these special orders were obtained.

I do not propose to make a point of order this afternoon, but I do point out that no Member can feel safe in his office or on business downtown during these special orders, which are to my mind a great waste of the taxpayers' money and a great waste of the time of the Members. The employees have to stay here, the Members cannot attend to their business, and I just want to serve notice I will continue to object to special orders on either side of the House.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio; I appreciate his explanation of his failure to interrupt the request for this order. The gentleman, of course, is accountable to himself, but I certainly do not intend to permit any one Member of the House to prevent my exercising the rights and privileges of a Member of the House to which the people of the 35th District of New York elected me. If any Member intends to exercise his rights, to try to prevent my speaking he is going to have to be here to do it at all and at every opportunity, and spend a lot of time on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made a moment ago to some discussion we had here yesterday on the subject of civil rights in between the quorum calls that marked most of the afternoon and evening. I was interested in that discussion, I was interested in the legislation that was presented. I was one of those who consistently voted against adjournment of the House because I wanted an opportunity for those who had a civil rights bill to discuss it and to point up the thinking behind it.

I was a little distressed, as I think some of us on this side of the aisle were, at an occasional reference during the course of the remarks that implied that only those on the Republican side of the aisle were interested in civil rights, and that somehow or other there was a partisan contest over this vital subject. This misconception was cleared up, at least to some extent, later on during the evening, but the implication will persist in the RECORD. I have therefore taken this time today in an effort to try to explain as fully as I can the purpose and the nature of important civil rights legislation which I announced my intention of introducing last week and which I did introduce yesterday, having had an opportunity in the meantime to consider some of the complicated legal questions involved.

The legislation I introduced yesterday, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6801, is a bill designed to make the second section of the 14th amendment to the Constitution a reality. It is a rather surprising thing, but it is true, that after more than 90 years that particular section of the basic law of our land still has not been enforced and still is inoperable. Because so much attention has been paid to the first section of the 14th amendment, which actually came as something of an afterthought, I would like to read again section 2, to which my legislation is addressed. It reads as follows:

> SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crimes, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

That is the section. It provides for a reduction in representation in the House of Representatives on the part of any State which in any way denies or abridges the right of any citizen to vote for any reason other than participation in rebellion or some other crime.

Now, I think this section has a good deal of relevance to our present civil rights controversy. Members may be aware that the other day a group representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People introduced a suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to compel the enforcement of this section through the courts. Actually I had been considering introducing legislation along this line before the NAACP suit was filed. Now that it has been filed I think joint action both in the courts and in the Congress is indicated.

First of all, let me try to give a brief history of the background of this amendment. As you know, the 13th amendment to the Constitution eliminated slavery, and when it did so, it also of course eliminated the provision of article I, section 2 of the Constitution which said that in counting the population of the several States in an effort to determine the number of Representatives to which they were entitled in the House, each slave should be counted as only three-fifths of a person. Well, when slavery was repealed by the 13th amendment, the three-fifths provision obviously was no longer applicable.

The Congress was clearly aware that when you started to count freed slaves as individual persons, those States in which the slaves had resided were going to have a larger population and therefore a larger representation in this body than had been the case before the adoption of the 13th amendment. Since the representation of those original slave-holding States was thus going to be increased in this body and their influence proportionately increased, Congress was concerned that those citizens on the basis of whom this increase was being made possible should at least be protected so that they were allowed to exercise the same right to vote as other citizens of the Republic. It did this by providing that any restriction of the right of these new citizens—who had made possible this increase in representation—in exercising their right to vote would result in a corresponding reduction in the representation of their State in this body.

In other words, if the former slaveholding States were to get and to keep the increased representation the end of slavery gave them, then they would have to insure their new citizens the right to exercise full voting citizenship.

It ought to be pointed out, incidentally, that section 2 of the 14th amendment does not refer either to color or to race. It does not say that when people are denied the vote because of color, or because of race, or because of previous condition of servitude there should then be a corresponding reduction in representation. It says rather, that this reduction shall take place when any male inhabitant being 21 years of age, and a citizen of the United States, has his right to vote either denied or in any way abridged for any reason except participation in rebellion, or some other crime. Actually, there was in the Congress an earlier formulation of this section which did include a reference to color and to race, but that was deleted because the Members of that earlier Congress wisely recognized that there could indeed be more than one way to skin a cat, and that, as the reports of the Civil Rights Commission have frequently detailed, there are many ways of getting around the explicit stipulations of the 15th amendment to the Constitution without mentioning either color or race.

The interesting thing about this section is that once it was adopted, there has been only one attempt to enforce it in all of the years that have slipped by since then. That was in the 42d Congress which met in 1871 and 1872, when a statute was adopted virtually repeating the wording of the amendment itself. This statute can now be found in Title II of the United States Code, Section 6 (1958). But except for repeating the text of the amendment in a statute, Congress has never done anything further to carry out or to implement its provisions.

There have, of course, been attempts on the part of individual Members of Congress to try to get the section enforced. One of those attempts was made by Representative Prescott in the 56th Congress. An attempt was made on several occasions by Representative Shattuc in 1901, and another attempt was made in 1904 by the late U.S. Senator from my own State of New York, Thomas C. Platt. A series of attempts were also made by the late Representative George H. Tinkham, of Massachusetts, from the 63d to the 71st Congresses. The most recent attempt of all was by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], who introduced legislation to this effect in 1959, and has reintroduced it in each subsequent Congress and, in fact, reintroduced it again on yesterday in the other body. It is Senate bill 1644, and both the bill itself and the Senator's discussion of it appear on page 9947 of the Congressional Record for June 4.

Incidentally, the Senator's bill proposes to deal with this problem by creating a joint Senate and House committee to determine the extent of possible deprivations or abridgments of the right to vote, and then to provide for the readjustment in seats in the light of that determination.

I would like to discuss this aspect of the Senator's proposal in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the text of S. 1644, and a short summary, by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

S. 1644

A bill to provide for the reduction of the basis of representation of States denying or abridging the rights of its citizens to vote, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Representation Act of 1963."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation (hereinafter in this part referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than five members shall be members of the same political party.

FUNCTIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Sec. 3. (a) The joint committee shall, as soon as practicable following the date of each biennial election for Representatives in Congress in the several States as established by section 25 of the Revised Statutes, but not later than May 1 of the year following such election—

(1) determine whether any State has, in violation of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, denied or abridged the right of inhabitants of such State to vote as prescribed in such section since the preceding biennial election for Representatives in Congress;

(2) calculate, in the manner prescribed in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution the number (if any) of Representatives in Congress which each State shall be then entitled as the result of any such denial or abridgment; and

(3) utilize such services of the United States Commission on Civil Rights and the United States Census Bureau as are necessary to achieve the required determinations and calculations.

(b) The joint committee shall, on or before May 1 of the year following each biennial election for Representatives in Congress, submit to the Congress a statement indicating, with respect to each State, the number (if any) by which such State's Representatives in Congress shall be decreased or increased under section 11(a) for the Congress which commences after the date of such statement. The joint committee shall submit with such statement a full and complete report of the facts upon which such statement is based. A copy of such statement shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TIME CHANGES BECOME EFFECTIVE

Sec. 4. The changes prescribed in such statement shall become effective, with respect to the Congress which commences after the date of submission of such statement, upon the expiration of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date of submission of such statement, but only if between the date of submission and the expiration of such thirty-day period the Congress has not passed a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not approve the statement. For the purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the thirty-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

DISAPPROVAL OF JOINT COMMITTEE'S ACTION

Sec. 5. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) As used in this subsection, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not approve the statement relating to representation in the ———— Congress submitted to the Congress by the Joint Committee on Congressional Representation on ————, 19—.", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled.

(c) A resolution with respect to a statement shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same statement shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d)(1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a statement has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such statement which has been referred to the committee.

(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to such statement), and debate hereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to such statement.

(e)(1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a statement, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f)(1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from the committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a statement, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a statement shall be decided without debate.

(g) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a statement, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to such statement, then—

(1) if no resolution of the first House with respect to such statement has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to such statement may be reported or (despite the provisions of paragraph (d)(1)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge; and

(2) if a resolution of the first House with respect to such statement has been referred to committee—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such statement which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such statement had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such statement the resolution from the other House with respect to such statement shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

VACANCIES; SELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 6. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not, except as provided in section 8, affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the members from that House.

POWER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) In carrying out its functions, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall apply in the case of the failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 8. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary, but no statement shall be submitted to the Congress pursuant to subsection (b) of section 3 unless it shall have been agreed to by a majority of the authorized membership of the joint committee.

EXPENSES

SEC. 9. (a) Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the joint committee.

(b) The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE

SEC. 10. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the service, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

NOTICE TO THE STATES OF DECREASES OR INCREASES IN CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

SEC. 11. (a) Effective for the Eighty-eighth Congress and each succeeding Congress, the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for appointment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended, is hereby altered by the number of Representatives shown in the statement submitted for such Congress under subsection (b) of section 3, if such statement has not been disapproved by the Congress as provided in sections 4 and 5. Any change under this subsection in the number of Representatives to which a State is entitled shall be effective only with respect to the Congress for which such statement is submitted.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or if there be no Clerk, such other official of the House of Representatives as the joint committee may designate, within fifteen calendar days, after a statement submitted under subsection (b) of section 3 has become effective, to transmit to the executives of those States whose representation in Congress is altered pursuant to section 2 of the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution and section 22 of the Revised Statutes for the Congress which commences after the date of submission of such statement a certificate specifying the number by which such State's Representatives in Congress decreased or increased for such Congress.

(c) The provisions of subsection (c) of section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for appointment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended, shall be effective with respect to any States whose congressional representation is changed pursuant to the provisions of this part.

(d) No State's representation in the House of Representatives shall be reduced below one Representative.

SEC. 12. Section 22 of the Revised Statutes (Act of February 2, 1872, ch. 11; 2 U.S.C. 6) is hereby repealed.

SUMMARY BY SECTION

Section 2: Establishes a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation, to be composed of nine Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House. No more than five members of the committee from each House to be members of the same political party.

Section 3: Authorizes and directs the Joint Committee by May 1 following each biennial congressional election to determine whether any State has denied or abridged the rights of its citizens to vote in the preceding election. The Joint Committee would calculate, in the manner prescribed in section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the number, if any, by which the representation of each State should be increased or decreased. The findings would be reported to the Congress, with a full explanation of the facts on which the findings were made. Any change would affect the Congress commencing after the date of the Joint Committee statement.

Section 4: Provides that the findings of the Joint Committee concerning the change of representation would go into effect 30 days after the submission to Congress, unless before the expiration of the 30 days, Congress passes a concurrent resolution expressly disapproving the findings of the Joint Committee.

Section 5: Establishes rules of procedure should a resolution of disapproval be introduced, including discharge of the committee to which the resolution has been referred and rules of debate on the resolution.

Section 6: Provides for the filling of vacancies on the Joint Committee and for the internal organization of such committee.

Section 7: Establishes the powers of the Joint Committee in holding investigations, hearings, and issuing subpenas.

Section 8: Provides that any statement submitted to the Congress by the Joint Committee under section 3 must be approved by a majority of the Joint Committee's authorized membership.

Section 9: Provides for the expenses of the Joint Committee.

Section 10: Provides for clerical and other staff assistance for the Joint Committee.

Section 11: Sets forth that any change in representation called for in the statement of the Joint Committee and not disapproved by Congress become effective in the succeeding Congress; but the change would be effective only for the Congress for which the statement was submitted. In no case would a State's representation be reduced below one.

Section 12: Repeals section 22 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it ought also to be pointed out that not only have all these individual attempts failed, but what is even more surprising, the basic implementing statute dealing with congressional reapportionment does not even bother to include the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment. That reapportionment statute was adopted in 1941, and can be found in title II of the United States Code, section 2(a), 1958, as follows:

(a) On the first day or within one week thereafter, of the first regular session of the Eighty-second Congress and of each fifth Congress thereafter, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, as ascertained under the seventeenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population, the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member.

(b) Each State shall be entitled, in the Eighty-third Congress and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under this section or subsequent statute, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement required by subsection (a) of this section, no State to receive less than one Member. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within fifteen calendar days after the receipt of such statement, to send to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under this section.

The surprising thing, Mr. Speaker, about that legislation, of course, is that it does not contain, either in sections (a) or (b), any reference to the fact that somebody along the line, either the President or the Clerk of the House, ought to be required to deduct from the statement of the whole number of persons in each State, the number of persons, if any, whose right to vote has either been denied or abridged under the conditions set forth in section 2 of the 14th amendment.

Incidentally, it goes without saying that the reference in the section to male citizens was subsequently nullified by the 19th amendment, extending the right to vote to women, and therefore the appropriate deduction should be made for women who are denied the right to vote, as well as for men.

So in a very real sense, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this basic reapportionment statute on which we operate today may well be unconstitutional because it flouts the clear wording of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is the situation we are in today. Here we have this basic part of our Constitution which has been on the books for more than 90 years, and yet we still have done nothing to implement it. In fact, we have passed a basic reapportionment law ignoring that it even existed.

I mentioned a moment ago the action begun the other day in the U.S. district court by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to compel the Census Bureau to compile these figures contemplated in the 14th amendment in the 1970 census and then deduct them from the total number of persons in each State, so that the reapportionment in this House which would develop following the election of 1972 as a result of the 1970 census would reflect those changes required by the 14th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question whether the proper forum for this kind of action should be the courts or the Congress. I certainly think there is a strong case to be made for the legal action which has already been taken in the courts but I do not think we in this body can therefore duck our responsibility. We have the right, in fact, we have the duty, as section 5 of the 14th amendment itself states, to enforce the provisions of this article "by appropriate legislation." So, no matter what may happen in the lawsuit, we in Congress do have a responsibility and we should certainly exercise it.

Mr. Speaker, may I at this point call to the attention of my colleagues a very thoughtful discussion of the basis for this court action to compel observance of the provisions of the 14th amendment which appeared in the Cornell Law Quarterly, volume 46, No. 1, in the fall of 1960, by Prof. Arthur Earl Bonfield of the University of Utah Law School. It is a very detailed and well-documented discussion which I think may be of interest to Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the text of the bill I have introduced:

H.R. 6801

A bill to provide that the representation in the House of Representatives of each of the several States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of section 141 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Each census taken under this section shall also include a computation of the total number of inhabitants of each of the several States, being then twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, whose right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, has, within four years before the census date applicable to that census, been denied or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 141 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In determining the total population of any State for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives, the number of inhabitants determined with respect to that State under the last sentence of subsection (a) shall be subtracted from the whole number of persons in such State, excluding Indians not taxed."

(c) Such section 141 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall, in the year 1964, take a census of population as of the first day of April which shall be known as the census date."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 2), is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", (2) by striking out "the seventeenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population" and inserting in lieu thereof "the most recent census of the population conducted under section 141 of title 13", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) On the first day, or within one week thereafter, of the first regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, as ascertained under the census of the population conducted under section 141(c) of title 13, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one member."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my bill does three things. First, it would require a new census to be conducted in 1964. I do not think we ought to wait until 1970. The current crisis in civil rights is developing very rapidly, much more rapidly than many of us perhaps had thought would be the case. If we are going to do anything effective, if we are going to exercise any leverage at all to compel equal recognition and consideration for all American citizens, we are going to have to act quickly. We cannot afford to wait 7 years. So my legislation would require the holding of a new census in 1964.

The thought has been expressed that since many bills have been introduced calling for a midterm census in 1965, we might wait 1 additional year. I have no objection to that, whether the year be 1965 or 1964, but I do think we are facing some real urgency and it seems to me we ought to get this new census conducted as rapidly as possible, so that the effect of it can be felt as rapidly as possible. Otherwise it would not be until 1973 that there would be any change in the membership of this House as a result of an amendment adopted more than 100 years earlier.

The second question arises, how are you going to determine which citizens have been denied or abridged in their right to vote? As I mentioned a moment ago, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. McNamara, in his legislation, S. 1644, sets up a joint congressional committee to decide this. I think we all can see that as a matter of practicality, if you have a special congressional committee trying to decide this question we will be in session a lot longer than we were in session last night. We would get embroiled in discussions, debates, arguments, and controversy and we would come out, I am afraid, exactly nowhere.

My bill leaves this operation entirely up to the Census Bureau. After all, the Census Bureau conducts the census, and finds out how many people there are in the whole country. If anybody suggests that determining whether anybody has or has not been denied the right to vote or whether his right to vote has or has not been abridged is a somewhat speculative thing and is perhaps not subject to completely precise measurement, I can only say that when you stop to think of it, determining the exact total number of persons in the United States or in any one State is also a somewhat speculative matter too.

But the Bureau of the Census has gotten this down just about as precise as you can get it, and I think they could also determine with a reasonable degree of precision and accuracy the number of individuals whose right to vote has either been denied or abridged. As a matter of fact, we already have a good deal of reliable information on this subject in the various reports of the Civil Rights Commission which have been presented to the Congress in the past.

In fact, it is my understanding that the Census Bureau has already got some figures on this general subject, figures which apply to the 1960 census. But that apportionment is already over and done with, so we would have to have a new census in order for these figures to have any real meaning in regard to a reapportionment of this House.

I might also point out in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of the 14th amendment make it clear that an individual does not actually have to be deprived of the right to vote in order to be counted against a State's quota. His right to vote only has to be abridged; and I think it is quite clear that this means not just those who went to the polls and were turned away would have to be counted, but those who did not go to the polls in the first place because they well knew they would be turned away if they went, either because of a complicated literacy requirement or for some kind of complicated test on the meaning of the Constitution or any of these other ingenious devices that have been used to deprive our Negro citizens of the right to vote in many of our Southern States.

Then, finally, the third thing which my legislation does is to provide that when the total population figures are in, and when the figures on the numbers of citizens, if any, who have either been deprived of the right to vote or whose right to vote has been abridged, are in, that second total shall be deducted from the total population in the case of each individual State, and then the Census Bureau shall transmit to the President the appropriate apportionment of congressional seats to which each State is entitled as a result of having had the one total subtracted from the other. In other words, Mr. Speaker, once we have the figures on how many have had their right to vote either denied or abridged, the rest is automatic and requires no further action on the part of the Congress. All we have to do to discharge our responsibility is to pass my bill, H.R. 6801, and then the Census Bureau and the President and the Clerk of the House will perform the rest of the operations automatically, in an administrative and ministerial way.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple and direct way to deal with our problem, a problem that in all conscience should have been dealt with a long, long time ago.

Already, Mr. Speaker, there have been some expressions of sentiment along this same line. The distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Case, for example, is quoted in the Congressional Record for May 28 at page 9710, to this effect:

> We should not need this suit to prod us to an awareness of our responsibilities. I hope it will be successful. But I believe we should not await its outcome to do what we should long since have done—that is, act to assure that there is a census to carry out the provision of section 2 of the 14th amendment. We do not have to wait for a court decision. We can and should act now.

Well, I would say "Amen" to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman at the other end of the Capitol and I feel certain he would want to join in supporting this legislation of mine because it does call for a new census, and a new census right away.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like at this point to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 3, 1963, entitled "Article XIV, Section 2." I ask unanimous consent that the text of that editorial be included in the Record at this point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Article XIV, Section 2

An ingenious lawsuit planned by the NAACP legal defense fund seeks to revive an almost forgotten provision of the Constitution: section 2 of the 14th amendment. That section requires that any State denying or abridging its citizens' right to vote have its representation in the House proportionately reduced. The lawsuit, just filed, asks that the Census Bureau be ordered to determine the extent of such restrictions on the franchise in the 1970 census and calculate the next congressional apportionment with appropriate reductions. One estimate is that under this rule the Southern States could lose as many as 25 of their 106 seats in the House.

Whether the courts can appropriately resurrect this constitutional provision is for them to decide. But the suit serves an important purpose in any case. It reminds us, dramatically, that 95 years after the framers of the 14th amendment thought they were outlawing discrimination at the polls, citizens of the United States are still denied the ballot because of the color of their skins. This country knows no worse disgrace.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, let me quote just the final sentence of this editorial which says:

> Whether the courts can appropriately resurrect this constitutional provision is for them to decide, but the suit serves an important purpose in any case. It reminds us dramatically that 95 years after the framers of the 14th amendment thought they were outlawing discrimination at the polls citizens of the United States are still denied the ballot because of the color of their skins. This country knows no worse disgrace.

Now one final point, Mr. Speaker, what would be likely to happen if this legislation were adopted? Well, it is my information that the figures which have already been compiled, at least on a tentative basis, by the Bureau of the Census and which would unquestionably be confirmed in the new census which my bill provides, unless, of course, there were some sudden and dramatic change in the South, would require the loss of at least one seat in some three or four States of the Union where this type of discrimination is, in fact, now going on. That would also mean, of course, that the same number of States in generally the northern part of the country would pick up one additional Representative apiece. This would not be a dramatic change, but it would certainly be a significant change and one that would surely be felt by every affected State.

Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that when the representation in the House changes the electoral vote of these States changes as well. Those States which lose seats as a result of practices that are contrary to the provisions of the 14th amendment would then find themselves with a smaller electoral vote—whether that vote is cast by pledged electors or unpledged electors. By the same token those who would be in line to pick up the seats that are lost would acquire a correspondingly larger electoral vote.

Mr. Speaker, very frankly my legislation is designed not so much to penalize any particular State or to reduce the representation of any State in the House of Representatives, as it is designed to provide a powerful incentive for extending civil rights and equal treatment, both at the polls and elsewhere, to our Negro citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we have just passed in this body earlier today a very massive and expensive military construction program, part of an overall military budget this year of some $54 billion. We are spending that kind of money in the military field not because we want to fight a war but precisely because we hope that by putting this money in we will actually be able to prevent a war by being prepared and deterring enemy aggression.

Mr. Speaker, in the same way I hope this legislation of mine will prove to be preventative rather than curative, and that the adoption of this legislation will actually bring about such an improvement in the right to vote for all of our citizens, regardless of color or race, that no reapportionment will be needed at all. But you cannot prevent speeding if you do not pass some laws against it.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we cannot expect the enforcement of our basic American constitutional rights to rest entirely with the courts. Certainly we cannot expect them to rest entirely in the hands of the individual citizens who are being so sorely discriminated against. We in the Congress also have a responsibility, and a very grave and a very urgent one.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with my colleagues who spoke yesterday on that score. We do need to have some kind of a push made here. We do need to provide some kind of leverage. We do need to begin to move rapidly forward in dealing with the civil rights problem. And if we do not do that, and do it quickly, then I fear we are likely to go through a very tragic and dangerous time in the history of our country.

Congress has not lived up to its responsibilities in this field in the past. But I for one do not think we can wash our hands of the job or that we can abdicate our responsibility simply for that reason and turn it over to the courts or to individual citizens. There is still time for us to exercise our responsibility, and I believe we can exercise it with the prompt passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to conclude my remarks by inserting here a very thoughtful study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress dealing with this 2d section of the 14th amendment. I am frank to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not entirely agree with everything contained in this study. It raises some questions that are perhaps unnecessary, but I believe that as long as this subject is up we ought to have as full and as free and as frank discussion of it as possible. The Library of Congress has certainly done an extensive and outstanding job here, as they always do. I think it may be helpful to Members who may be interested in this whole subject if their discussion of it can thus be made available to them here in the RECORD in connection with my foregoing remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STUDY ON SECTION 2 OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

(By Vincent A. Doyle, legislative attorney, American Law Division, Library of Congress)

AMENDMENT XIV

"Sec. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial Officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

This never used, all but forgotten, provision was considered by many of its framers to be the heart of the 14th amendment.[1] By a rather curious quirk of history, the first section of the amendment, requiring the States to give "equal protection of the laws," which was, relatively speaking, an afterthought, has far overshadowed the second section in the extent of its effects on the rights of the former slave race and indeed on the rights of all citizens. There are some, however, who would attribute the demise of the second section not to any curious quirk, but rather to deliberate design. James G. Blaine in volume II of "Twenty Years of Congress," at page 418, said:

"The adoption of the 15th amendment seriously modified the effect and potency of the 2d section of the 14th. * * * The prime object [of the 14th amendment] was to correct the wrongs that might be enacted in the South, and the correction proposed was direct and unmistakable; viz, that the Nation would exclude the Negro from the basis of apportionment wherever the State should exclude him from the right of suffrage.

"When, therefore, the Nation by subsequent change in its Constitution declared that the State shall not exclude the Negro from the right of suffrage, it neutralized and surrendered the contingent right, before held, to exclude him from the basis of apportionment. Congress is thus plainly deprived by the 15th amendment of certain powers over representation in the South, which it previously possessed under the provisions of the 14th."

Another who suggests that the section was abrogated by the 15th amendment is R. A. Maurer in his article entitled "Congressional and State Control of Elections Under the Constitution," 16 Georgetown Law Journal 314, 338 (April 1928). The plain fact, however, is that the 15th amendment does not expressly repeal the 2d section of the 14th. Moreover, the prohibitions of the 15th amendment are expressly limited to denials or abridgements of the right to vote by reason of race, color or previous condition of servitude while the 2d section of the 14th is not so limited at all. As a matter of fact, the section contains no prohibitions.

PAST EFFORTS AT ENFORCEMENT

It is not quite true to say that Congress has never attempted to enforce this section. After the Ninth Census, when Congress was considering the bills for reapportionment of Representatives, it entertained and adopted an amendment to one of them which restated the second sentence of section two.[2] Although this amendment was proposed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the House, by resolution, had earlier instructed the Secretary of Interior to determine "the number of male inhabitants in each State being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, whose right to vote in such State is denied, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime."

Although the Secretary reported that there were 43,329 such persons, with the largest number, 9,265 being in the State of Missouri, he indicated that he placed very little reliance on his statistics. There is no indication in the congressional debate on what the statistics were based or how they were acquired but we do know that the application of the figures to a House of Representatives composed of either 243 or 283 Members made no difference in the number which would be apportioned to each State.[3]

Although we have found no indication that the Bureau of the Census has made any attempt since the Ninth Census to compile statistics which would furnish the Congress with a reasonable basis for enforcing the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment from time to time there have been advocates of congressional action in this area. When the Select Committee on the Twelfth Census reported an apportionment bill which did not take into account any denial or abridgment of voting rights, Representative Crumpacker, of Indiana, wrote a 25-page dissent to the report.[4] Mr. Crumpacker emphasized the extent to which literacy requirements tended to disenfranchise Negroes and concluded that the representation of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina should be reduced by three each. Although Mr. Crumpacker's effort was unsuccessful, the Republican platform of 1904 contained a plank calling for the introduction of a bill to effect enforcement of the amendment. No evidence has been found, however, to indicate that any real effort was made to enact such a law.

Around 1920, the NAACP became active in pressing for legislation to require reduction in apportionment for denial of voting rights. It was contended that representation in some of the Southern States would be reduced by as much as 40 percent if the amendment were enforced. Ten thousand votes in Mississippi were as powerful as ninety-seven thousand votes in Indiana because of restrictions against Negroes. It was about this time that George H. Tinkham, a Representative from Massachusetts, became the perennial advocate of enforcement of section 2, the champion of equal representation. In December of 1920 he introduced a resolution asking that the Committee on the Census be authorized to inquire into the denial of voting rights and requiring that representation be reduced in those States where disenfranchisement was found. At a hearing before the committee on January 4, 1921, Mr. Tinkham made an 18-page statement, replete with charts, in which he argued that the principal laws under which Negroes were disenfranchised were those requiring the ability to read or write and the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting. His contention was that the very existence of the laws gave Congress the right to act and that no evidence was needed to show that the laws were being administered in a discriminatory manner.[5] The bill as reported by the committee did not take into account the provisions of the 14th amendment and the managers on both sides of the House refused Mr. Tinkham floor time in which to speak to this question. He finally offered an amendment which after lengthy debate was ruled out of order as not germane to the matter before the House.[6]

---

[1] See e.g. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st sess. (1866) 2459, where Representative Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, stated: "The second section I consider the most important in the article. It fixes the basis of representation in the Congress. If any State shall exclude any of her adult male citizens from the elective franchise, or abridge that right, she shall forfeit her right to representation in the same proportion. The effect of this provision will be either to compel the States to grant universal suffrage or so shear them of their power as to keep them forever in a hopeless minority in the national Government."

[2] Act of Feb. 2, 1872, ch. 11, sec. 6, 17 Stat. 29; 2 U.S.C. sec. 6.

[3] Globe, 42d Cong., 2d sess. (1872), p. 617. See also pp. 609–610, 612, 617, 618, 674–675, and 678 for other references to the amendment.

[4] H. Rept. No. 2130, 56th Cong., 2d sess. (1900).

Throughout several sessions of Congress, Mr. Tinkham continued to press for enforcement of this section. Though he was concerned for the Negro, his principal interest seems to have been to secure equal representation for all under the provisions of the Constitution. One of his last efforts to enforce the section, so that "fraudulent majorities in Southern States [could not] elect the President and control the Congress" seems to have been made in 1927–28. On December 25, 1927 he introduced another resolution which would require the Committee on the Census to make diligent inquiry into the question of denial or abridgment of voting rights. On February 28, 1928, he spoke at length before the House urging that action be taken but 70th Congress took no action.[7] On June 24, 1929, he offered an amendment from the floor to the census and reapportionment bill which would require the Bureau of the Census to ascertain the number of inhabitants in each State being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, whose right to vote at the election next preceding such census has been denied or abridged except for rebellion or other crime. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 109 to 122 (71 Congressional Record 2348). On January 27, 1931, he introduced House Joint Resolution 484 which would have substituted for the method of apportionment set forth in section 2 of the 14th amendment one in which representation would be based upon the average number of citizens 21 years of age or over in each State who voted under the laws of the State at the last two presidential elections preceding the apportionment which would be made every 10 years. No action beyond reference to the Committee on the Judiciary was taken on the resolution.

Although no exhaustive search has been made in the Record to identify all measures which have been introduced to give effect to the 2d section of the 14th amendment, the only ones which have readily come to light since the days of Mr. Tinkham are those introduced by Senator McNamara, of Michigan, in the 85th and 86th Congresses.

The McNamara proposal would establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Representation to determine after each biennial election whether the representation of any State should be reduced in accordance with the provisions of amendment XIV, section 2. The Senator first introduced this proposal as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 when H.R. 6127 was being debated in the Senate. Senator Morse, of Oregon, Senator Javits, of New York, and Senator Case, of New Jersey, associated themselves with the Senator from Michigan in advocating it. By voice vote, however, the Senate rejected the proposal (Congressional Record, vol. 103, pt. 10, pp. 13464–13465). The bill was reintroduced as S. 2709 but the 85th Congress took no further action on it. Senator McNamara introduced the proposal again as S. 1084 on February 17, 1959. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary but as yet the 86th Congress has taken no further action on the proposal.

THE MEANING OF SECTION 2

Before considering any questions about the possibility of desirability of enforcing this section, it seems appropriate to consider some of the questions which arise in trying to determine what it means. We know that all of the States in the exercise of their power to establish qualifications for voting have disenfranchised many groups of people for reasons besides participation in rebellion or other crime. (Tables summarizing these qualifications and describing the groups disqualified are included as appendixes to this report.) R. A. Maurer (op. cit.) asks:

"Did Congress and the States, when they approved this section, mean to deprive the States of their well-established and fully recognized power to fix reasonable restrictions upon the right to vote, such as residence, intelligence, property, tax payment, idiocy or lunacy, guardianship, pauperism?" (16 Geo. L. J. 314, 338.)

How similar this question is to one asked by Senator Clark, of New Hampshire, during the Senate debate on section 2.

"If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I wish to inquire whether the committee's attention was called to the fact that if any State excluded any person, say as Massachusetts does, for want of intelligence, this provision cuts down the representation of that State" (Globe, 39th Cong., 1st sess., p. 2767).

The answer given him by Senator Howard, of Michigan, speaking for the Committee of Fifteen which did the major work in framing the reconstruction measures including this one, was as follows:

"Certainly it does, no matter what may be the occasion of the restriction. It follows out the logical theory on which the Government was founded, that numbers shall be the basis of representation in Congress, the only true, practical, and safe republican principle. If, then, Massachusetts should so far forget herself as to exclude from the right of suffrage all persons who do not believe with my honorable friend who sits near me [Mr. Sumner] on the subject of Negro suffrage, she would lose her representation in proportion to that exclusion. No matter what may be the ground of exclusion, whether a want of education, a want of property, a want of color, or a want of anything else, it is sufficient that the person is excluded from the category of voters, and the State loses representation in proportion" (ibid.).

The general principle seems clear but it becomes less so when we try to apply it to particular situations. If a State denies the right to vote to any one who has not paid a poll tax, does the section contemplate excluding from the population count all those males over 21 who did not pay the tax, or only those who could not pay the tax? If a State establishes a literacy test as a voting qualification, is it necessary that a man take the test and fail it before he is discounted? The theory on which Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Tinkham based their recommendations for reduction in apportionment would have discounted those who did not pay the tax and those who were considered illiterate whether they attempted to pass the test or not. Although the debate in 1866 gives no conclusive answer to these questions, those who did speak to them probably leaned to the meaning given the section by Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Tinkham. If this be the true meaning, it would have to be applied to every restriction, however reasonable it might be. If one State denied the right to vote to all who had resided in the State less than 6 months, then all who fell in that class would be discounted whether they made any attempt to vote or not. If another State denied the right to all who resided in the State less than 10 years, all who fell in that class would be discounted. Presumably an equitable result would be reached because the less reasonable restriction would ordinarily embrace a much larger number of persons.

There is yet another difficulty in discovering the meaning of section 2. It refers to rights which have been "abridged" as well as "denied." In ordinary usage, the terms are not necessarily synonymous, though they are sometimes used interchangeably. More significant is the fact that two such words would not ordinarily be used in a statute unless they were intended to have different meanings. It seems safe to say, however, that if "abridged" means anything less than "cut off" or "refuse to grant" the section cannot be enforced. If, for instance, a right is to be considered abridged when a condition is put upon it then no State would be entitled to any Representatives at all, because every State has placed some condition on the right to vote other than those mentioned in section 2. Another of Mr. Howard's replies sheds a little light on this question. When Senator Stewart, of Nevada, asked how the word "abridged" would operate, Senator Howard said:

"The word 'abridged' I regard as a mere intensitive, applicable to the preceding sentence.

"I suppose it would admit of the following application: A State in the exercise of its sovereign power over the question of suffrage might permit one person to vote for a member of the State legislature, but prohibit the same person from voting for a Representative in Congress. That would be an abridgment of the right of suffrage; and that person would be included in the exclusion, so that the representation from the State would be reduced in proportion to the exclusion of persons whose rights would be excluded?" (Ibid.)

Senator Stewart pressed for further clarification, asking:

"Taking a case of this kind, suppose that in the South they should allow the Negroes to vote who had been in the Army, or who had educational qualifications; would those who did vote be included in the basis of representation, or would that be an abridgment of that class of persons so that they would be excluded?" (Ibid.)

Though Senator Howard's answer could have been clearer, it seems safe to say that it was his understanding that no one who voted would be excluded regardless of the conditions he had to meet in order to be qualified to vote.

There is one additional problem of interpretation for us which did not exist for those who were considering the meaning of the section at the time of its adoption. What effect has the 19th amendment had on it? Since the States have been prohibited from denying the right to vote on account of sex, must Congress exclude the females over 21 years of age whose right to vote has been denied or abridged? Logically, section 2 of the 14th amendment should be construed as having been modified by the 19th amendment. If a State were to set up voting qualifications which discriminated against females, it would be only equitable to reduce its representation in the proportion which the number of such female citizens bears to the whole number of males and females 21 years of age in the States. As a practical matter, the result would be relatively the same whether women were taken into account or not, because there are no States which discriminate against females and because the number of males and females of voting age is relatively equal.

---

[5] Hearings before the Committee on the Census on apportionment of Representatives, Dec. 28 and 29, 1920, and Jan. 4, 5, and 6, 1921, 63d Cong., 3d sess., pp. 97–115. See also pp. 28, 35, 68, for other statements advocating enforcement of amendment XIV, sec. 2.

[6] 60 Congressional Record, 1434, 1648, 1682–1688.

[7] 69 Congressional Record 3727–3132.

There is one final comment which should be made about the meaning of section 2. It provides that the "representation shall be reduced." This language is materially different from that which is used in the last sections of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments which provide that "the Congress shall have the power to enforce" them "by appropriate legislation." The language of section 2 is mandatory, seeming to impose a duty of enforcing it, while the language of the other sections simply gives Congress the power to enact legislation or not as it sees fit.

In summarizing the meaning of section 2 we can say that although the congressional debate at the time of its adoption makes it quite clear that its primary purpose was to encourage the Southern States to enfranchise the Negro without requiring that they do so, by providing for a reduction of a State's political power in proportion to the number denied the right to vote, it is also quite clear that the section was consciously framed in language broad enough to require reduction in the representation of any State which denied the right to vote to any male citizen, black or white, 21 years of age or over, for any reason except participation in rebellion or other crime. To enforce the amendment as its plain meaning and the congressional debate at the time of its adoption seem to indicate it was intended to be enforced. Congress would have to take into account denials of the right to vote based on literacy, idiocy, insanity, pauperism, length of residence, payment of taxes, or subscription to a loyalty oath, and whatever other restrictions a State imposes on the right of franchise.

THE MEANS OF ENFORCEMENT

Once the meaning of section 2 has been established the next question to be answered is, "How can the Congress enforce it?" The answer to this question is not difficult to find but the numbers on which a reapportionment would be based certainly are. The most obvious way for Congress to enforce the section would be to direct the Bureau of the Census to ascertain for each State the number of citizens over 21 who were denied the right to vote for any reason except participation in rebellion or other crime.

In order to gather such statistics each census taker would have to be familiar with the State election qualification laws and the questions he asked would have to be framed very carefully in order to determine whether an individual who made no attempt to vote would have been ineligible under the law even if he had tried.

In some States this would be relatively easy to determine. Under Michigan law, for instance, the only reason a citizen 21 or over may be denied the right to vote is that he has lived in the State for less than 6 months and in a city or township for less than 30 days. There are several other States in which the determination would be almost as simple as it would be in Michigan. Among them are Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky and Tennessee.

In many other States the determination would be exceedingly difficult. In Alabama, for instance, in addition to longer residence requirements, the law requires that the person be of good character and embrace the duties and obligations of citizenship under the Constitution of the United States and Alabama, that he be able to read and write in English any article of the Constitution of the United States which may be submitted to him by the board of registrars and that he must have paid all poll taxes due for the 2 preceding years. He would also be disqualified if he were an idiot or insane person. There are at least 19 States which have some sort of literacy requirement; 5 which require a poll tax payment; 44 which exclude idiots, insane persons or persons under guardianship; and 9 which exclude paupers. The most difficult determinations for the census taker to make would be those in connection with character and literacy. Little need be said about character determinations. Literacy determinations need more attention.

Although the Bureau of the Census publishes estimates of illiteracy, statistics by age for States were last available from the 1930 census. By Bureau definition, illiteracy is "the inability to read and write either in English or any other language." The following paragraph was included in a recent Bureau report containing a table of estimates of illiteracy by States as of 1950:

"Statistics collected in the current population survey show that about three-fourths of the population with no schooling and somewhat more than one-half of those with only 1 year of school are illiterate, and progressively smaller proportions of persons with 3, 4, and 5 years of school report that they cannot read and write. All persons with 6 or more years of school completed are assumed to be literate. Since educational attainment tends to be low among older persons, rural residents, and nonwhites, the presence of a large proportion of these persons in the population of a State tends to be associated with a lower level of education of the population and, hence, a higher proportion of illiterates" (Current Population Reports, series P–23, No. 6).

The estimated number of illiterates 15 years old and over runs from a low of 3,000 in Nevada to a high of 407,000 in New York; and in percentages, from a low of 0.9 in Iowa to a high of 9.8 in Louisiana. In addition to the fact that these statistics include people under 21 and aliens they are not useful for 14th amendment purposes for another reason. They would be inadequate for States, like New York, which disfranchise a significant number of citizens who are literate in languages other than English, or for those States in which, by discriminatory administration of literacy tests, people who can read and write English are disqualified from voting.

There is an additional problem which will be considered here, though it may properly belong in the earlier discussion on the meaning of section 2. In States which require previous registration as a condition for voting, how should the man be counted who is turned away from the polls because he has not registered? And what of the man who has not registered and does not bother to appear at the polls because he knows he would be turned away. In each of these cases we presume a man who is otherwise qualified to vote. If such persons are to be excluded in apportioning Representatives their number might be much larger than those excluded for all other reasons put together. If such persons are not excluded, would the constitutional mandate be truly carried out? Probably not. And this answer leads us to our next question.

If Congress should decide to enforce section 2, must it base its reduction in apportionment upon an actual count of all kinds of denials of the right to vote or may it base the reduction upon something less? May it, for example, single out denials because of failure to meet literacy requirements and ignore denials for any other reason? And may it base the reduction upon estimates rather than upon an actual count? Representatives Crumpacker and Tinkham would agree that Congress may base the reduction upon estimates and may ignore denials for reasons about which it has no adequate information on which to base a reduction. Not all would agree with these gentlemen, however. As a matter of fact, Mr. Tinkham, in a statement before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Census, calls attention to a committee resolution of June 2, 1951, which reads:

"It is the opinion of the committee that these provisions [of sec. 2] clearly require as proper procedure the introduction of a bill or resolution providing for an investigation with reference to a particular election in a specific State or States, as to whether in such election in such State or States the right to vote was denied, within the meaning of the Constitution, to citizens entitled to the right to vote.[8]

Whatever may be the correct answer in terms of the intention of those who adopted the amendment, or of its true meaning or in terms of reaching a just and equitable result, the answer in terms of the sheer power of Congress seems quite clear. Congress can do whatever it chooses to do without much likelihood of any court review of its action, or of its refusal to act. In an action brought on the theory that Virginia would be entitled to four rather than nine Representatives if section 2 were enforced, a U.S. district court upheld a motion to dismiss based on the ground that "questions relating to the apportionment of Representatives among the several States are political in their nature and reside exclusively within the determination of Congress." In affirming the judgment of the lower court, the court of appeals stated:

"We think that this contention presents a question political in its nature which must be determined by the legislative branch of the Government and is not justiciable. It is well known that the elective franchise has been limited or denied to citizens in various States of the Union in past years, but no serious attempt has been made by Congress to enforce the mandate of the 2d section of 14th amendment, and it is noteworthy that there are no instances in which the courts have attempted to revise the apportionment of Representatives by Congress."[9]

If the Congress did act to enforce the second section of the amendment, any complaint that the apportionment was wrong would presumably be based upon the alleged failure of the United States to guarantee to the States a republican form of government as required by Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution. But the Supreme Court has indicated that questions arising under this section rest with the Congress to decide.[10]

---

[8] Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Census on Apportionment of Representatives, House of Representatives, 67th Cong., 1st sess., June 27, 28, 29, 1921, p. 7.

[9] *Saunders* v. *Wilkins*, 152 F. 2d. 235, 237–238 (4th Cir. 1945); cert. denied, 328 U.S. 870 (1946); rehearing denied, 329 U.S. 825 (1949).

[10] *Luther* v. *Borden*, 7 How. 1, 42 (1849).

In summary, it may be said that, however difficult it might be to acquire the information on which to base a reduction in apportionment, such information can be obtained and the 2d section of the 14th amendment can be enforced. The most logical source for information on which to base a reduction in apportionment is the same source on which the Congress relies for statistics on which to base apportionment, the Bureau of the Census. The Congress, however, must give the Bureau more than a restatement of section 2 like the one which appears in section 6 of title 2 of the United States Code. It must tell the Bureau in specific terms what information it wants.

SHOULD THE 14TH AMENDMENT, SECTION 2, BE ENFORCED?

If it be admitted that section 2 of the 14th amendment was not repealed by the 15th amendment and that it is intelligible enough to be enforceable then there is no valid ground on which to base an argument that it should not be enforced. Every provision of the Constitution must be given full operational effect. Failure to enforce any provision of the Constitution necessarily weakens the basic charter of the Government.

Not all are willing to admit, however, either that meaning of the section is clear, or that the section has not, in effect, been repealed by the 15th amendment. And, even among those who admit these premises, there are many who think it would be unwise to penalize a State for exercising the rights derived from article I, section 2, and reserved to it under the 10th amendment, to establish reasonable requirements of residence and literacy for qualifying its electorate.

In the next two sections of the paper, an effort will be made to set forth some illustrative arguments both for and against enforcement without any conscious attempt to favor one position or another.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST ENFORCEMENT

1. Section 2 of the 14th amendment has been repealed by the 15th amendment. The purpose of section 2 was to encourage the Southern States to enfranchise the Negro. It did not prohibit the States from denying the Negro the right to vote but required reduction in representation to the extent of such denial. There were many who advocated an outright grant of the franchise to the Negro and others who thought it too soon for the Negro to exercise that right intelligently. Section 2 was a compromise between these opposing positions and with the adoption of the 15th amendment it became obsolete and was in effect repealed.

2. The Constitution, from its adoption, gave the States the right to establish qualifications for its voters. It is inconceivable that this section contemplated the imposition of a penalty on the States for making the right to vote depend upon reasonable conditions like residence, literacy, or even sanity. Democracy derives its strength from the sound judgment of the electorate in casting its vote. How can a stranger in town vote wisely in the selection of a mayor? Or how can one vote intelligently for State or Federal officers if one is not reasonably familiar with the institutions of government?

3. The section is so unintelligible that it cannot be enforced. Or if its meaning be clear it would be impossible to make the determinations and assemble the statistics which are necessary in order to make a thoroughly equitable reapportionment based on denials of the right to vote in each of the States.

4. Whatever attempt is made to reduce apportionment because of denials of the right to vote the Congress cannot and should not confine itself to the consideration of denials on account of race or color. At the time the 14th amendment was adopted it was proposed that such denials be the only ones considered and the proposal was rejected. If representation is unequal now, to ignore denials for other reasons while weighing denials because of race would cause an imbalance in representation in the other direction. Such result was not intended by the amendment.

ARGUMENTS FOR ENFORCEMENT

1. The section has not been expressly repealed by the 15th amendment. Nor can any repeal by implication be read into it. The 15th amendment deals only with denials or abridgments of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It prohibits the States from making such denials. Insofar as the 14th amendment impliedly permitted such denials, it may have been repealed. But it cannot be understood that if a State should make such denials, its apportionment can no longer be reduced. Moreover, section 2 of the 14th amendment is not limited to denials because of race or color. It embraces all denials for any reason except participation in rebellion or other crime. Whatever effect the 15th amendment could have on denials because of race or color, it could have no effect on denials for any other reason.

2. Section 2 does not prohibit the States from establishing reasonable voter qualifications or for that matter from establishing unreasonable voter qualifications. It simply sets up an entirely new system of apportioning Representatives. The primary basis for representation is to be the whole number of persons in a State. But that number is to be reduced in the proportion which the number of citizens 21 years of age or over who are denied the right to vote save for participation in rebellion or other crime bears to the total number of citizens 21 or over. If a State establishes property qualifications, which under the Constitution it is permitted to do, its representation is to be reduced in proportion to the number of people of voting age who do not meet the qualification. This is true for any other condition on the right to vote. It is quite clear from the legislative history of the section that this was intended to be its effect.

3. The section is not unintelligible. The reluctance to enforce it may be due to an unwillingness to accept the plain meaning of the section rather than to any innate obscurity in the section itself.

4. So long as the section remains unenforced the House of Representatives does not have the balance the Constitution intended that it have. Because the statistics necessary to enforce it would be difficult to obtain is no reason to neglect to obtain them. It is difficult to ascertain the total number of persons in a State. Yet this must be done. And when it is done there are sometimes disagreements about the results which are obtained. After the census in 1920, some States, including Kansas and Mississippi, objected to the results which were obtained. Yet the apportionment was made. Unquestionably whatever statistics were obtained to furnish a basis for reduction in apportionment would also give rise to some objections. But no one can complain if a reasonable effort is made to obtain valid statistics and then apply them in a manner which is reasonably calculated to result in the kind of equitable apportionment of Representatives contemplated by section 2.

TABLE I.—*Residence requirements*

State	Time in State	Time in county	Time in precinct or ward
Alabama	2 years	1 year	3 months.
Alaska	1 year		30 days.
Arizona	do	30 days	Do.
Arkansas	12 months	6 months	1 month.
California	1 year	90 days	54 days.
Colorado	do	90 days (30 days in city or town).	15 days.
Connecticut	do	6 months	
Delaware	do	3 months	30 days.
Florida	do	6 months	
Georgia	do	do	
Idaho	6 months	30 days	
Illinois	1 year	90 days	Do.
Indiana	6 months	60 days in township	Do.
Iowa	do	60 days	
Kansas	do		Do.
Kentucky	1 year	6 months	60 days.
Louisiana	do	1 year in parish	3 months.
Maine	6 months	3 months in city, town, etc.	
Maryland	1 year	6 months	6 months.
Massachusetts	do	6 months in city or town.	
Michigan	6 months	30 days in city or township.	
Minnesota	do		30 days.
Mississippi	2 years	1 year in city or town.	1 year.
Missouri	1 year	60 days	
Montana	do	30 days	
Nebraska	6 months	40 days	10 days.
Nevada	do	30 days	Do.
New Hampshire	do	6 months in town	
New Jersey	do	60 days	15 days (in city of 4th class).
New Mexico	12 months	90 days	30 days.
New York	1 year	4 months	Do.
North Carolina	do		Do.
North Dakota	do	90 days	Do.
Ohio	do	40 days	40 days.
Oklahoma	do	6 months	30 days.
Oregon	6 months		
Pennsylvania	1 year		2 months.
Rhode Island	do	6 months in town or city.	
South Carolina	2 years	1 year	4 months.
South Dakota	1 year	90 days	30 days.
Tennessee	12 months	3 months	
Texas	1 year	6 months	
Utah	do	4 months	60 days.
Vermont	do	3 months in town	(To vote for representatives to general assembly or justices.)
Virginia	do	6 months	
Washington	do	90 days	30 days.
West Virginia	do	60 days	
Wisconsin	do		10 days.
Wyoming	do	60 days	Do.

TABLE II.—*Other requirements*

State	U.S. citizenship required	Age	Literacy required	Poll tax prerequisite for voting	Loyalty oath
Alabama	X	21	X	X	X.
Alaska	X	19	X		
Arizona	X	21	X		
Arkansas	X	21		X	
California	X (at least 90 days before election).	21	X		
Colorado	X	21			
Connecticut	X	21	X		X.
Delaware	X	21	X		
Florida	X	21			X.
Georgia	X	18	X [1]		
Idaho	X	21			X.
Illinois	X	21			
Indiana	X	21			
Iowa	X	21			
Kansas	X	21			
Kentucky	X	18			
Louisiana	X	21	X [1]		
Maine	X	21	X		
Maryland	X	21			
Massachusetts	X	21	X		
Michigan	X	21			
Minnesota	X (at least 3 months before election).	21			
Mississippi	X	21	X	X	X.
Missouri	X	21			
Montana	X (by election)	21			
Nebraska	X	21	(1)		
Nevada	X	21	(1)		
New Hampshire	X	21	X [1]		
New Jersey	X	21			
New Mexico	X	21			
New York	X (at least 90 days before election).	21	X		
North Carolina	X	21	(1)		X.
North Dakota	X	21			
Ohio	X	21			
Oklahoma	X	21	(1)		
Oregon	X	21	X		
Pennsylvania	X (at least 1 month)	21			
Rhode Island	X	21	(1)		
South Carolina	X	21	X [1]		
South Dakota	X (must have resided in United States 5 years).	21			
Tennessee	X	21			
Texas	X	21		X	
Utah	X (for 90 days)	21			
Vermont	X	21			X.
Virginia	X	21	(1)	X	
Washington	X	21	X [1]		
West Virginia	X	21			
Wisconsin	X	21			
Wyoming	X	21	X		

[1] Unless civil rights have been restored.

TABLE III.—*Persons disqualified from voting*

State	Idiots, insane, under guardianship	Commission of felony or infamous crime	Paupers	Others
Alabama	X	X		Vagrants and others.
Alaska	X	X [1]		
Arizona	X	X [1]		
Arkansas	X	X		
California	X	X		Aliens ineligible to citizenship.
Colorado	X			While in prison.
Connecticut	X	X [1]		
Delaware	X	X	X	Convicted of election offenses; disenfranchised 10 years.
Florida	X	X [1]		Interested in election wager.
Georgia	X	X [1]		
Idaho	X	X [1]		Chinese or Mongolian descendants not born in United States.
Illinois	X	X [1]		
Indiana	X	X [1]		While imprisoned.
Iowa	X	X		
Kansas	X	X [1]		Dishonorably discharged soldier, bribery.
Kentucky	X	X [1]		In prison for penal offense.
Louisiana	X	X [1]		Inmates of prison or charitable institution, deserters and those dishonorably discharged from armed services unless reinstated.
Maine	X		X	
Maryland	X	X [1]		
Massachusetts	X		X	Corrupt election practices, disfranchise for 3 years.
Michigan				
Minnesota	X	X [1]		See body of report under "Qualifications for Voting" regarding Indians.
Mississippi	X	X		Indians not taxed.
Missouri	X	X [1,2]		While in prison or poorhouse.
Montana	X	X [1]		
Nebraska	X	X [1]		
Nevada	X	X [1]		Duel.
New Hampshire		X [1]	X [1]	Violation of election law.[1]
New Jersey	X	X		Do.
New Mexico	X	X [1]		
New York	X	X [1]		Election, offenses—shall not vote at such election.
North Carolina	X	X [1]		
North Dakota	X	X [1]		
Ohio	X	X [1]		2d offense under election laws.
Oklahoma	X	X [1]		While in poorhouse or prison.
Oregon	X	X [1]		
Pennsylvania				Election offense—disfranchised 4 years. Bribery at election—* * * for such election.
Rhode Island	X	X [1]	X	Residing on lands ceded by Rhode Island to United States.
South Carolina	X	X [1]	X	While in prison.
South Dakota	X	X [1]		
Tennessee		X [1]		
Texas	X	X [1]	X	
Utah	X	X [1,3]		
Vermont				Bribery for vote disfranchised for such election.
Virginia	X	X	X	Duel.
Washington	X	X [1]		Indians not taxed; subversive activities.
West Virginia	X	X [4]	X	Bribery in election (while under conviction).
Wisconsin	X	X [1]		Bribery;[1] duel; election wager—disenfranchised for such election.
Wyoming	X	X [1]		

[1] Unless civil rights have been restored.
[2] Connected with election.
[3] Treason or election offense.
[4] While under conviction.

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ACT AND MOBILIZATION FOR YOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, a 3-year program of grants were to be made to many of our major cities to plan programs that would prevent further increases in the crime rate among so many of our young people. These programs were to find ways and means of preventing juvenile delinquency by providing constructive and useful alternatives to crime.

The first target area chosen was the lower east side of Manhattan which I have had the honor to represent in this Congress since 1957. New York City received funds to put into operation a program which was to concentrate largely on job training and improving the vocational skills of the area youth to enable them to find employment in private industry.

An article recently appeared in the New York Times which commented on the progress of New York's mobilization for youth project. The article included pictures of some of the young people taking part in the program and showed them in training programs ranging from operating gasoline stations and learning auto mechanics to operating and waiting on tables in a neighborhood luncheonette. In all, the article pointed out that nearly 500 young people are currently undergoing job training, and some 180 are already employed in private industry.

The guiding philosophy of mobilization for youth is explained by Mr. James McCarthy, the project director. He comments in the article that "Delinquency can be prevented only if young people are given a genuine opportunity to behave differently." There can be no doubt that training these young people to hold responsible positions of employment is a worthwhile undertaking; and I am delighted that such an ambitious program was started in my city and in that part of my district which houses so many of the underprivileged youth of today.

Mr. Speaker, I think that others might find the New York Times article of considerable interest for, in addition to describing the progress that is being made in New York, the article indicates that the help provided by the Congress has been meaningful. The Juvenile Delinquency Act has resulted in new and comprehensive programs to combat juvenile delinquency in our cities that would not otherwise have been possible. These programs will not only aid our young people, but will lead to a stronger America as well.

I submit for my colleagues' consideration the article of May 23, 1963, by Layhmond Robinson entitled "Juvenile Project Making Headway":

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1963]

JUVENILE PROJECT MAKING HEADWAY

(By Layhmond Robinson)

At a gas station on the Lower East Side a carowner gets the same cheerful, efficient service he finds at most other modern filling stations.

But he quickly detects this difference: All the attendants, except the manager, are teenagers.

And, as he prepares to drive out of the station, at East Houston Street and Avenue B, he is handed this note by a polite youth:

"You have been served by a trainee of Mobilization for Youth. We have similar work training programs in a number of occupations. We would appreciate your help in finding jobs. Won't you please call OR 7-0400 to place your job order?"

The station is an "MFY" station, operated under the auspices of Mobilization for Youth, Inc.

EFFORT TO SOLVE A RIDDLE

The youths, the services station, the manager and the telephone number are all part of the most ambitious and best-financed effort in the Nation to solve the riddle of juvenile delinquency.

Armed with an experimental, 3-year blueprint and $13 million Mobilization for Youth seeks to find the most practical approaches to the problem of preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency.

The youths at the MFY gas station are trainees who are paid $1.25 an hour. Like others at the MFY luncheonette; the MFY woodwork shop and similar projects, they are supervised by professionals in their particular line of work.

More than 1,000 youths have applied to participate in the program since it began last October 15. Nearly 500 are currently undergoing training. About 180 are holding down jobs in private industry.

COMPOSITION OF PROJECT

Mobilization for Youth is a nonprofit corporation of representatives of settlement houses, welfare agencies, religious institutions and other groups on the lower East Side.

Its history began in 1957 when increasing juvenile delinquency in the area led these representatives to begin developing a program of research and action. Its blueprint was completed last July.

Researchers from Columbia University are studying data compiled from its operations as the basis for recommendations for a permanent antidelinquency project in the city and the Nation.

The program is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health; the New York City government; the President's Committee on Delinquency and Youth Crime, and the Ford Foundation.

The area in which the project's directors seek the solution to delinquency spans 67 blocks. Its delinquency rate increased 70 percent over a 3-year period before Mobilization for Youth began its program.

The area is one of the most ethnically diverse sections of the city, with Jews and Puerto Ricans predominating but with large numbers of Negroes and residents of Italian and Irish lineage.

"Our operation is based on what we believe to be a very practical theory," says James E. McCarthy, the project's big, pink-faced administrative director.

"It is that delinquency can be prevented only if young people are given genuine opportunities to behave differently. We provide them with natural and stimulating work programs and with creative educational programs. But we don't stop there. We work with their families too.

HANDICAPS OF POVERTY

"Essentially we are attacking the handicaps imposed by poverty. We are trying to stimulate a neighborhood of some 107,000 people to recognize that they have the means—if they try—to change their condition, that they can influence their own futures, that they can fight city hall, that they make their neighborhood a much better place in which to live.

"We don't expect to revolutionize the Lower East Side. But we expect to leave behind techniques that will help this neighborhood to manage its own affairs and to give its children some goals to shoot for."

A conspicuous part of the project is its work program. This seeks to prepare both high school graduates and drop-outs for jobs in private industry.

They include boys and girls who because of their lack of skills—or because of their attitudes, grooming habits, speech, fear of racial discrimination or other factors—are not deemed "employable" by private industry.

They are trained in actual work programs for 3 to 6 months until they learn the skills and the social graces needed in a competitive society. They are then referred by Mobilization for Youth to jobs throughout the city, through a liaison with the New York State Employment Service.

ARRANGEMENT WITH UNION

The organization has recently arranged with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union to give instruction to selected trainees in the needle trades. Others are going into a training program for nurses aids and hospital orderlies. Some are working in department stores.

The program has stirred the community and has drawn both heavy applause and sharp criticism.

Recently a group of teenagers picketed the headquarters of Mobilization for Youth at 214 East Second Street. They charged that the project was showing favoritism in job training to members of juvenile gangs.

Mr. McCarthy denies this. "We, of course, have some children with records of delinquency in our work groups," he says.

"That is one of our projects—to work with them," he goes on. "But we do not show favoritism to anyone and we are pleased to note that the pickets were trying to get in—not out—of our program."

OTHER CRITICISM HEARD

Other criticism has been made by Congressmen and civic leaders who feel the $13 million given to the project can be better spent on other programs. Some shopkeepers grumble that the project's operations compete with their own businesses.

But Mr. McCarthy and his colleagues roll with the punches.

"We expect criticism," he asserts. "Some of the things we are doing are challenging to some of the vested interests, such as the slum lords who exploit the poor."

"One of the popular notions we've already disproved," says George A. Brager, the director of the project's action programs, "is that slum children don't want to work. We've found they're very eager to learn if they have the opportunity to learn and to work."

Mr. McCarthy said that the organization planned extensive campaigns to educate lower East Side residents in their rights and obligations as tenants and in the uses of the ballot to effect social changes.

Another part of the MFY program is its hiring of high school students to tutor younger children. The tutors work 6 hours a week.

Other projects include efforts to curb narcotics addiction, activity to stimulate better housekeeping habits among mothers, and individual and family guidance.

CHANGES IN THE TAX TREATMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as is the desire of all Members of the House, I am strongly in favor of eliminating whatever inequities may exist in our present tax laws. I am equally committed to whatever revisions may be necessary to spur the national economy.

I am deeply concerned, however, with some of the administration's proposals now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. I refer particularly to changes in the tax treatment of natural resources.

The four pending changes in the natural resources tax provisions would:

First. Revise the method of computing the 50-percent net income limitation on percentage depletion by providing that any loss sustained on a given property in 1 year be carried over into subsequent years for the purpose of reducing the net income from that property in succeeding years upon which the 50-percent limitation is based.

However, to lessen the impact of such a change on depletion in a single year, the administration recommends that the application of the carryover in any 1 year be limited to an amount which will reduce depletion no more than one-half of the amount otherwise allowable.

Second. Revoke the option previously granted in 1954 permitting separate properties within an operating unit to be combined and treated as one property for depletion purposes.

This would restore the property rules which were in effect under the 1939 code. If enacted, any aggregations of properties previously formed would have to be broken up and treated as separate properties after 1963.

Third. Provide that gains on sale of mineral properties be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of drilling and depletion deductions taken after 1963.

This would be a recoupment provision requiring that prior deductions for depletion—up to cost—and drilling costs be restored to income by denying capital gain treatment. This would tend to discourage future sales of oil properties including ABC sales.

Fourth. Make a dual change involving mineral exploration and production in foreign countries: one, further restricting the allowance of foreign tax credits; the other, preventing the deduction of foreign exploration and development costs to the extent that they exceed foreign income.

Reduction of percentage depletion, or adverse changes of other tax measures applying to exploration and production and sale of oil and gas reserves, would admittedly result in greater tax revenues in the period immediately following the taking of such measures. But this would be only a transient condition.

I do not believe that is what we are looking for.

In the event that tax provisions applying to oil and gas production were adversely rearranged, impairment of a great and essential industry would be inevitable.

Exploration and production budgets would necessarily be curtailed to conform with a new level of recovery of capital. Drilling would decline. In Oklahoma, where there are over 18 million nonproductive acres under lease, we would expect many lease blocks to be dropped. This would be to the detriment of landowner income. And remember, the farmer or landowner pays a Federal income tax on lease bonuses and rentals.

There would be less employment on drilling rigs and producing properties; less income, and fewer taxes. The vast research projects aimed at increasing the recovery of petroleum from proven reserves would be restricted. Steel for drilling rigs and steel for pipelines would be in shorter demand. This would adversely influence taxable income all the way back to the Mesaba iron ore deposits of Minnesota and the steel furnaces of Pittsburgh.

While the oil industry could not balance its budget overnight, I can easily foresee conferences being held in every oil company office across the country the very first day of business following a change in the petroleum tax picture as proposed by measures we now have under consideration. And petroleum tax consultants would be besieged by thousands of small, individual producers.

Adverse tax action in this area would also shrink the risk dollars that are constantly being sought by the industry to supplement its own capital in the financing of exploratory and development ventures. Present tax laws applying to petroleum give recognition to the risks involved. Were the Congress to reduce these tax factors, this risk money would dwindle, possibly to the vanishing point. The only alternative would be for Congress to also reduce the risks and I doubt seriously this can be done.

Every county in my district in Oklahoma is productive of oil and gas. Generally speaking, the cost of each drilled well approaches $100,000. It requires economic fortitude of high caliber to assign capital in the suggested amounts to a venture that may not recover a dime in profits. Those of you who have ventured into a part interest in an exploratory well can appreciate the reality of my statement.

In conclusion, independent oilmen in addition to trying to unravel and expose the oil tax proposals for what they really are, are equally concerned about new proposals that may lie ahead. There is cause to think that the current proposals—launched as they were under the misleading banner of correcting unintended defects—are merely forerunners to an all-out attack upon the oil and gas tax structure. On the other hand, this may be the beginning of a series of backdoor attacks on oil tax provisions designed to accomplish indirectly the same end result.

Adverse tax action on petroleum would take its toll, over the long term, in decreased Federal taxes. There would be regression of a basic industry from its present level of activity to a new and lower plateau.

Instead of such action, I submit that we must keep our resources working for us. Only by that means can we be assured of a sound tax base and an expanding industry.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER, A FINE AMERICAN

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join so many others of this House in paying last respects to our late distinguished colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

One of the most senior Members of this House—ranking sixth in order of seniority—the Honorable Francis Walter was the longest serving Democratic Party Representative from his native State.

A man cannot spend 30 years as a Member of this body without leaving a mark on the pages of American history. Mr. Walter left his mark. Coauthor of the Immigration Act that bears his name; chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; second-ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee—there was no major legislation that passed through this House that Mr. Walter did not involve himself with.

I did not know him well. I wish I could have had that privilege. For he was a just man and a good man. He was attacked by many vocal individuals and groups for his work with the Committee on Un-American Activities, and he was attacked for his work in the area of immigration laws. However, Francis Walter accepted attacks and criticism because he believed he was doing the best he could for his country.

This is the one feature that stands out in my recollection of our distinguished colleague. Here was a man that truly loved America. He loved his country so much he was prepared to bear any criticism—any attack—to do right for America, and he was not only a fighter on the floor of this House; in both World Wars Mr. Walter served his country in uniform.

Surely here is a proud record. Francis Walter served this House well. He served his country well. We shall not soon forget this man, and his sense of patriotism can inspire us all. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to so fine an American.

THE LATE EMIL V. PACINI

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned of the passing of Emil V. Pacini in Chicago.

Mr. Pacini was a very dear friend of mine for many years. He was an outstanding Chicagoan, having been a leader in the civic and political life of Chicago for many years.

Mr. Pacini was the Democratic ward committeeman of the 10th ward of Chicago and represented that ward in the Chicago City Council for over 20 years. His major contribution to the city was the enactment of the legislation of the Chicago Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, and the modernization of the Chicago Building Code.

My association with him in the city council and the County Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Cook County enabled me to become aware of his strong character and devotion to his public duties.

The city of Chicago will experience great loss, especially the people of the South Chicago community. My sympathy to Mrs. Pacini and family in this great hour of grief.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Foreman (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Stinson, for Friday, June 7, and Monday, June 10, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Skubitz (at the request of Mr. Arends), for June 6 and 7, to attend funeral in Kansas of his administrative assistant, Col. Robert L. Thompson.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter therein.

Mr. Stratton, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Nygaard), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, June 12, 1963.

Mr. Bruce (at the request of Mr. Nygaard), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, June 12, 1963.

Mr. Weaver (at the request of Mr. Nygaard), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, June 11, 1963.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Vinson to revise and extend remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 6500 and to include a table relating to the Reserves.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Nygaard) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Albert) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in his special order for today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Rosenthal.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Leggett and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Daddario.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

893. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of automatic data processing operations at the Chicago, Ill., Regional Disbursing Office, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

894. A letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Air Patrol for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 476, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

895. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Buckhorn-Mesa, Ariz.; Tupelo Bayou, Ark.; Naalehu, Hawaii; Caney Creek, Okla.; Bear-Pierce-Cedar Creek, Nebr.; Thompson Creek (supplemental), Tenn.; and Bellwood, Nebr., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

896. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting additional material relating to a letter dated August 31, 1962, pertaining to estimated cost of certain facilities projects for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

897. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to deter overinsurance and to curtail certain free coverage under the Federal employees health benefits program which is administered by the U.S. Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

898. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

899. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) (ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

900. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Big Nance Creek, Ala.; Apache Junction-Gilbert, Ariz.; Williams-Chandler, Ariz.; Little Tallapoosa River, Ga.; Chuquatonchee Creek, Miss.; Stillwater Creek, Okla.; and Guayanes River, P.R., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3050. A bill to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3999. A bill to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5781. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 6812. A bill to amend section 1804(c) of title 38, United States Code, to clarify the requirement that veterans' housing loans be made only to veterans occupying, or intending to occupy, the housing as their homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6813. A bill to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6814. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6815. A bill for the relief of the town of Hancock, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6816. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 6817. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 6818. A bill to amend section 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation 20 percent or more of the voting stock of which is owned by another foreign corporation in which a domestic corporation has a substantial stock interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6819. A bill to amend section 902(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the allowance of a credit to corporate stockholders for foreign taxes paid by certain foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 6820. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from discriminating against any area of the country in the sale or delivery of feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6821. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6822. A bill to amend the International Peace and Security Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere police force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6823. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6824. A bill to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphan's educational assistance, of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount of allowances paid pursuant to such chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 6825. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 6826. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education, and an additional credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6827. A bill to promote better racial relations through the establishment of a U.S. Intercultural Center; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6828. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6829. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make urban planning grants thereunder for the provision of planning assistance to Indian reservations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6830. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit premium compensation of firefighting employees to be considered as basic salary for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6831. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6832. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6833. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6834. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6835. A bill to amend section 202 of the Federal Power Act, to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 461. Joint resolution amending the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 to provide for the development of a tax assessment system which will effectively halt the creation and spread of blight and slums in the District of Columbia, and to stimulate and assist private redevelopment and rehabilitation of real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 389. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees in the office of the Doorkeeper of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 390. Resolution authorizing increases in basic compensation of certain employees in the office of the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 391. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees in the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 392. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to legislation authorizing the minting of a 50-cent coin commemorating the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg address; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6837. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanora Vasconi (nee Trentanove); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6838. A bill for the relief of Sotirios John Pappathasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6839. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Googins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 6840. A bill for the relief of Francisco K. Melich (also known as Franz Kuntner Melich) and his wife, Maria Melich (also known as Maria Toth De Melich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6841. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6842. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Soldavini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6843. A bill for the relief of David Sheppard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

150. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the chairman, Board of Supervisors, Del Norte County, Crescent City, Calif., expressing support for S. 1275 relating to water rights in the Western States, and urging its adoption by the Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been written and millions more could be written to extol the many virtues of Eleanor Roosevelt. Those who have mourned her passing do not fall within a particular party, age, group, sex, or nationality for she was known throughout the world by men and women of all ages and in all walks of life.

Due to the affliction of her famous husband, Mrs. Roosevelt assumed a role that went far beyond that of a wife and mother. For a long period of time she was the eyes and ears of the President. Her deep feelings for and her efforts in behalf of the less fortunate endeared her to millions who never actually saw her, or heard her, or read her many books and articles.

Eleanor Roosevelt considered the problems of misfortune and misery as her own, regardless of where they occurred in the world. Her efforts in behalf of America's poor and unfortunate were not a recent thing since she labored tirelessly at a time when civil rights and civil liberties were not the outstanding subjects of the day.

It must also be said that her efforts gave courage to many other women and women's organizations throughout the country for she appeared on the American scene at a time when women were not easily accepted as leaders. To assume this role, she overcame a natural shyness in order to help further the political career of her illustrious husband, as well as to espouse the many causes that motivated her entire life.

Her many trips to Hartford, Conn., will long be treasured in the memory of those women with whom she worked so unselfishly. She spoke to many groups and she supported the causes in which she believed, invigorating all who came to know her in this community.

Government-Operated Lotteries in Israel, Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I should like to take the Members of this House to the Middle East and acquaint them with the government-operated lotteries conducted in Israel, Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon.

These are 4 more countries out of the 77 foreign nations throughout the world which appreciate the additional revenues derived from properly regulated and controlled gambling.

Israel started its lottery program in 1951 and, during its 12 years of existence, has proven not only satisfactory but profitable as well. Last year, the gross receipts came to over $16 million. The Government received, after payment of prizes, almost $5 million which was applied for the building of hospitals and schools.

Iran operates a nationwide lottery under the auspices of the Imperial Social Services Organization which is associated with the Shah's family. Last year, the total gross receipts of the lottery amounted to $8 million. The organization withheld for the Central Government about $2 million which was used to establish dispensaries, hospitals, and schools.

Iraq has two national lotteries managed by Government agencies. One is the Public Health Lottery and the other is called the National Union Lottery. The gross annual receipts from both lotteries in 1962, was $1,700,000. After payment of prizes, the Ministry of Health received almost one-half million dollars for its hospital construction program and about $300,000 was contributed to benevolent societies and various other philanthropic purposes.

Lebanon established its national lottery in 1943. The gross receipts for 1962 were over $3 million. The net income to the Government amounted to about one-quarter million dollars which were earmarked and used for social development purposes, such as the Red Cross, scholarships, trade unions, Government employees' retirement fund and libraries.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: Why can we not, like Israel, and all of these other foreign countries, overwhelm the hypocrites, bluenoses and moralists? Why can we not follow the recent example set by New Hampshire? If we can only wipe out hypocrisy in the United States, we could, with our own national lottery, pump into our Government Treasury over $10 billion a year in new revenue which could be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Bill Introduced To Amend Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to further amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The amendments I propose, which are being introduced for the first time in this House, would close what is in my judgment a serious lag in Federal regulation of these products, many of which can be dangerous or even lethal to humans if they are not stored, handled, or used properly.

The regulatory gap to which I refer is this: Under present law, the Department of Agriculture may find a specific compound too hazardous to be marketed, but it cannot by reason of its scientific finding alone prevent manufacturers from selling the lethal product. As the statute now reads, the Government must await a tragedy—death or disease as a result of the specific bug or rodent killer. Only then may the Government intervene to prevent further sale and use of the dangerous chemical.

As the House is aware, this gap existed for many years in the case of drugs, chemicals added to foods, and certain other products. In recent years, however, we have wisely amended the legislation in this field to provide for pretesting and clearance by the Food and Drug Administration before a dangerous product is marketed and an otherwise avoidable tragedy occurs.

It is now time, in my opinion, for this sound regulatory principle to be applied to the economic poisons that are the subject of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. Hearings on the hazards of improper use of economic poisons are underway or scheduled by some of the appropriate committees. I therefore recommend this bill to the consideration of my colleagues.

I am informed that the principles applied in this bill have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, but that the administration has not yet submitted a bill because of the problem of reconciling views of the various administrative agencies. My bill follows the principles and procedures of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to pesticides. I believe the measure I propose will therefore serve at least as the basis for consideration by the appropriate committee, and I strongly urge early action.

More than a month ago, I proposed that the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, hold hearings on the need for additional legislation in this field. However, no action was taken on my request for such an investigation.

Let us not delay, Mr. Speaker, until another thalidomide tragedy proves anew the wisdom of pretesting and regulatory approval prior to marketing.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, Pope John XXIII, in the simplest of language which so characterized the greatness of this man, stated in his papal encyclical "Pacem in Terris," the rights and the duties of all men. He told us of the order in the universe as well as the order in human beings. His encyclical was a testimony of how simple life really is, but too, how difficult the application of these principles of life by the human being can be.

In the introduction to his encyclical, he outlines the order that should exist in human beings when he states:

> How strongly does the turmoil of individual men and people contrast with the perfect order of the universe. It is as if the relationships which bind them together could be controlled only by force. But the Creator of the world has imprinted in man's heart an order which his conscience reveals to him and enjoins him to obey: This shows that the obligations of the law are written in their hearts, their conscience utters its own testimony. And how could it be otherwise? For whatever God has made shows forth His infinite wisdom, and it is manifested more clearly in the things which have greater perfection.
>
> But fickleness of opinion often produces this error, that many think that the relationships between men and states can be governed by the same laws as the forces and irrational elements of the universe, whereas the laws governing them are of quite a different kind and are to be sought elsewhere; namely, where the Father of all things wrote them, that is, in the nature of man. By these laws men are most admirably taught, first of all how they should conduct their mutual dealings among themselves, then how the relationships between the citizens and the public authorities of each state should be regulated, then how states should deal with one another, and finally how, on the one hand, individual men and states, and on the other hand, the community of all people, should act toward each other, the establishment of such a world community of people being urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good.

Pope John was a man for all seasons and for all people. The entire world mourns his passing and it is evident that many who understand his efforts at bringing peace to the world will lose heart because he is not of this world. However, we should draw added strength from the knowledge that John has left the blueprint for our future success. We mourn his passing, but we rejoice his legacy.

He did not describe the world in terms of the common man solely, nor the intellectual, in this age of scientific achievement. He steadfastly reminded us that this is not the world of the scientist but the world of man, and that the most difficult theorums that we must master today are not mathematical, but human.

At this particular time in our history we should realize these truths and draw the strength of character and of mind from his lesson. If we as a Nation do this, we will solve not only our problems of human rights, but be the example to all of mankind that will guarantee peace on earth.

You Figure It Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a section which we are considering in H.R. 4955, a bill which would expand vocational education into every conceivable direction. We often mention bureaucratic jargon and I wish to point out a formula which literally requires a Univac computer to determine. Consider the formula which is set out in section 3 of H.R. 4955:

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $90,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $135,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $180,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this Act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) Ninety-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) an amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) an amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(4) an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) (1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645) (relating to Federal school construction assistance in federally affected areas), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

NASA and the Boston Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are times when the awarding of Government contracts creates controversy and much speculation on the part of those sources that consider themselves well-informed on Washington affairs.

We have another such case before us at the present time. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after considerable study and qualified discussion, wish to locate their new Electronics Research Center in the Greater Boston area.

I understand that questioning voices are already making themselves heard on this matter. The substance of the criticism appears to be that this is "a political payoff," or that this is "undoubted favoritism."

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by this carping criticism. Because the Bay State is represented in the executive branch of our Government, must it be excluded from every consideration? Can the State of Massachusetts not be given a simple research center? I trust that this is not the case.

My own State of California has qualified for many Government contracts. Primarily, this is due to the excellent academic and technical skill available there. In Massachusetts we have a similar situation. One of the greatest institutes of higher learning in the world—MIT—is located in the Greater Boston area. Several outstanding universities and colleges are also located there.

Mr. Speaker, when this country has been in great need it has always gone to the areas of competence. This is the reason the Nation has gone to California for aircraft manufacture, for missile manufacture, and now for spacecraft and other items related to the space program. It is totally logical, therefore, for NASA to go to the Greater Boston area to locate its new Electronics Research Center. Once again the Nation will be taking advantage of existing resources.

As I understand it, the Government does not presently have the broad-based skills in electronics and related sciences to meet the future requirements in the space field. Based on studies conducted by NASA, the officials there were led to the conclusion that they needed an increase in their scientific knowledge in order to provide the support required for future space efforts.

The establishment of a new NASA center, specifically planned for research in the field of electronics and related sciences, appeared to have clear advantages. Concentration of research talent, with the absence of any conflicting development missions in other fields, and the availability of comprehensive research facilities would contribute to the creation of a major capability in electronics research as quickly as possible.

While other areas in the country have electronic competence, it seems to me that the real heart of the electronics industry is in the Greater Boston area. This section has the University and Industrial strength that will provide the necessary stimulating environment for the proposed center.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would be the first to criticize NASA if it accepted less than the ablest contractor—less than the ablest method of providing preeminence in space for this country—or less than the best location in the Nation for the Electronics Research Center which is so vitally and rapidly needed.

Let us forget parochial and provincial arguments. Let us have an end to this unconstructive and petty criticism. Let us go forward and build the new research center and see that this Nation of ours assumes its rightful place—first in technical know-how, and first in the space race.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. **LEE METCALF**, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Reverend Canon George McNeill Ray, of Trinity Episcopal Cathedral, Phoenix, Ariz., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee to bless America with honorable industry, profound learning and knowledge, and pure manners. Save us, in these days of uncertainties, from violence, discord, and helpless confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from all evils that would hurt and harm the souls of men. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people those who come to our shores in search of freedoms we enjoy. Endue with wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice, compassion, understanding, and peace at home. Through obedience to Thy laws may we show forth Thy praise among all nations.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2244. An act for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas;

H.R. 2251. An act for the relief of Juana Brandariz Sanchez;

H.R. 2262. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2289. An act for the relief of Marie Tchernosvitoff;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2461. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 2789. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schliefer;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 3496. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965;

H.R. 4144. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Martin;

H.R. 4501. An act for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.

H.R. 5144. An act for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou;

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 5305. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle;

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 5907. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis;

H.R. 6101. An act for the relief of Arminda P. Viseu;

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date; and

H.R. 6500. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2244. An act for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas;

H.R. 2251. An act for the relief of Juana Brandariz Sanchez;

H.R. 2262. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2289. An act for the relief of Marie Tchernosvitoff;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 2789. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schliefer;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3219 An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 4144. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Martin;

H.R. 4501. An act for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 5144. An act for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou;

H.R. 5305. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle;

H.R. 5495 An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 5907. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; and

H.R. 6101. An act for the relief of Arminda P. Viseu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2461. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada; and

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3496. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6500. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations.

Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1961.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Air Force be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations may be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Construction of a Space Science Building at the University of California

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a space science building at the University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Construction at Guggenheim Laboratories, Princeton University

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the additional construction at Guggenheim Laboratories, Princeton University; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Various States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on the Buckhorn-Mesa watershed, Arizona; Tupelo Bayou watershed, Arkansas; Naalehu watershed, Hawaii; Caney Creek, Okla.; Bear-Pierce-Cedar Creek, Nebr.; Thompson Creek (supplemental), Tenn.; and Bellwood watershed, Nebraska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Loan of Naval Vessels to Friendly Foreign Countries

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Extension of Certain Naval Vessel Loans

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and to authorize the loan of a naval vessel to a friendly foreign country, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Review of Automatic Data Processing Operations, Chicago Regional Disbursing Office, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing operations, Chicago Regional Disbursing Office, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Procurements of Aluminum Caps and Cans Without Adequate Pricing Data by the General Electric Co.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the procurements of aluminum caps and cans without adequate pricing data by the General Electric Co. from the Aluminum Co. of America under Atomic Energy Commission contracts, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Excessive Costs Incurred for Rehabilitating to Original Appearance and Serviceability Military Equipment Donated to Foreign Nations

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the excessive costs incurred for rehabilitating to original appearance and serviceability military equipment donated to foreign nations under the military assistance program, Department of Defense, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Need To Deter Overinsurance and To Curtail Certain Free Coverage, Federal Employees Health Benefits Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to deter overinsurance and to curtail certain free coverage, Federal employees health benefits program, U.S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of State

A letter from the Acting Legal Adviser, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Inclusion of Certain Officers and Employees of the Department of Labor Within Provisions of Law Relating to Assaults and Homicides

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Various States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Big Nance Creek, Ala., Apache Junction-Gilbert watershed, Arizona, Williams-Chandler watershed, Arizona, Little Tallapoosa River, Ga., Chuquatonchee Creek, Miss., Stillwater Creek, Okla., and Guayanes River, Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

This year we as a nation commemorate the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It would appear to the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that an appropriate gesture would be the minting of a 50-cent coin for this occasion: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to mint a 50-cent coin with appropriate inscription in order to commemorate the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

We hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution Serial No. 107, introduced by Senators James S. Berger and Charles R. Weiner, adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 12th day of February 1963, and concurred in by the House of Representatives on the 27th day of May 1963.

Raymond P. Shafer,
President of the Senate.
Mark Gruell, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.
W. Stuart Helm,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. P. Stimmel,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 777. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees (Rept. No. 215).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 684. A bill to clarify certain provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act and to place transactions involving unifications or acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the provisions of section 5 of the act (Rept. No. 234); and

S. 1031. A bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act (Rept. No. 207).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance on July 4 of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence (Rept. No. 208).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 603. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Rept. No. 210); and

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day (Rept. No. 209).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 192. A bill for the relief of M/Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army (Rept. No. 211);

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Lloyd G. Dougherty (Rept. No. 212);

S. 380. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354) (Rept. No. 213);

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Sister Laura Saraniti (Rept. No. 214);

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez (Rept. No. 216);

S. 657. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham (Rept. No. 217);

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Marija Lovsin (Rept. No. 218);

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Amalia Seresly (Rept. No. 219);

S. 966. A bill for the relief of Yukio Iseri (Rept. No. 220);

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier (Rept. No. 221);

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae (Rept. No. 222);

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Rafael I. Fernandez (Rept. No. 223);

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells (Rept. No. 230);

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat (Rept. No. 231);

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter (Rept. No. 232); and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 219. A bill for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr. (Rept. No. 224);

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Danusia Radochonski (Rept. No. 225);

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Yeng Burdick (Rept. No. 226);

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Misako Moriya (Rept. No. 227); and

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Peter Hopeton Maylor (Rept. No. 228).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras (Rept. No. 229).

REPORT ENTITLED "REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES" (S. REPT. NO. 235)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate resolution 293, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Refugees and Escapees," which I ask may be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report and statement are as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL 1963 AND MARCH 1963, AND PAY, MARCH 1963 AND FEBRUARY 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total[1]	2,494,945	2,485,738	+9,207	$1,260,292	$1,190,931	+$69,361
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,438,925	1,429,054	+9,871	718,398	678,071	+40,327
Department of Defense	1,056,020	1,056,684	−664	541,894	512,860	+29,034
Inside the United States	2,325,978	2,316,153	+9,825			
Outside the United States	168,967	169,585	−618			
Industrial employment	557,044	557,454	−410			
Foreign nationals	165,580	166,463	−883	28,916	26,336	+2,580

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1963 and comparison with March 1963, and pay for March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	105,492	102,847	2,645		$46,752	$44,303	$2,449	
Commerce	31,056	30,428	628		18,810	17,585	1,225	
Health, Education, and Welfare	78,393	78,308	85		39,612	38,014	1,598	
Interior	68,953	66,632	2,321		33,967	31,888	2,079	
Justice	31,787	31,736	51		20,165	19,566	599	
Labor	9,161	9,102	59		5,330	4,981	349	
Post Office	584,794	583,683	1,111		274,511	258,472	16,039	
State [1] [2]	41,778	41,698	80		20,939	19,882	1,057	
Treasury	91,495	89,893	1,602		50,001	47,604	2,397	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	370	364	6		250	236	14	
Bureau of the Budget	465	465			406	386	20	
Council of Economic Advisers	38	58		20	36	33	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	76		1	50	35	15	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29			27	25	2	
National Security Council	40	40			32	31	1	
Office of Emergency Planning	430	436		6	347	336	11	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1963, and comparison with March 1963, and pay for March 1963, and comparison with February 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President—Continued								
Office of Science and Technology	67	45	22		29	27	2	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation[3]	5		5					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	28	34		6	21	20	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	411	400	11		83	77	6	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,026	7,026			5,143	4,871	272	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	604	601	3		392	372	20	
Civil Aeronautics Board	828	831		3	617	592	25	
Civil Service Commission	4,084	4,102		18	2,467	2,359	108	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	80	86		6	51	49	2	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	284	3		193	182	11	
Farm Credit Administration	238	239		1	170	164	6	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,831	45,593	238		30,544	28,942	1,602	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			$4	$4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,425	1,427		2	961	945	$16	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,230	1,231		1	792	749	43	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,227	1,221	6		801	777	24	
Federal Maritime Commission	240	228	12		162	149	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391			342	317	25	
Federal Power Commission	1,112	1,108	4		756	711	45	
Federal Trade Commission	1,151	1,144	7		799	749	50	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	129	119	10		71	58	13	
General Accounting Office	4,524	4,541		17	2,915	2,776	139	
General Services Administration	32,088	31,934	154		15,026	14,599	427	
Government Printing Office	7,110	7,176		66	4,112	3,645	467	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,906	13,888	18		8,531	7,929	602	
Indian Claims Commission	23	23			21	19	2	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,370	13		1,601	1,525	76	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,586	27,163	423		20,007	19,025	982	
National Capital Housing Authority	449	433	16		207	186	21	
National Capital Planning Commission	61	60	1		41	35	6	
National Capital Transportation Agency	84	84			59	54	5	
National Gallery of Art	325	321	4		131	128	3	
National Labor Relations Board	2,001	2,012		11	1,366	1,297	69	
National Mediation Board	139	137	2		114	114		
National Science Foundation	928	1,025		97	645	578	67	
Panama Canal	15,117	15,741		624	7,974	5,100	2,874	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	49	52		3	37	30	7	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,989	1,989			1,095	1,034	61	
Renegotiation Board	213	211	2		172	159	13	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	157		2	93	91	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,381		2	922	886	36	
Selective Service System	6,879	6,837	42		2,150	2,034	116	
Small Business Administration	3,267	3,226	41		2,026	1,919	107	
Smithsonian Institution	1,416	1,391	25		691	655	36	
Soldiers' Home	1,080	1,066	14		344	341	3	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	29	33		4	25	31		$6
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1	22	21	1	
Tariff Commission	266	266			194	185	9	
Tax Court of the United States	155	156		1	120	116	4	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,027	17,465	562		10,505	9,809	696	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	134	128	6		106	103	3	
U.S. Information Agency	11,687	11,614	73		5,001	5,018		17
Veterans' Administration	173,536	173,146	390		76,227	72,964	3,263	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,143	1,075	68		273	162	111	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,438,925	1,429,054	10,763	892	718,398	678,071	40,350	23
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			9,871				40,327	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,123	2,115	8		1,620	1,555	65	
Department of the Army	379,338	378,677	661		187,790	177,087	10,703	
Department of the Navy	342,396	341,729	667		185,784	175,703	10,081	
Department of the Air Force	301,264	303,448		2,184	151,523	145,120	6,403	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,011	2,008	3		978	932	46	
Defense Communications Agency	556	539	17		368	250	118	
Defense Intelligence Agency						197		197
Defense Supply Agency	25,193	25,117	76		12,143	10,988	1,155	
Office of Civil Defense	1,056	1,054	2		819	771	48	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	39			32	30	2	
Interdepartmental Activities	14	14			8	8		
International Military Activities	58	58			47	27	20	
Armed Forces Information and Education Activities	423	420	3		202	192	10	
Classified Activities	1,549	1,466	83		580		580	
Total, Department of Defense	1,056,020	1,056,684	1,520	2,184	541,894	512,860	29,231	197
Net change, Department of Defense			664				29,034	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [4,5]	2,494,945	2,485,738	12,283	3,076	1,260,292	1,190,931	69,581	220
Net increase, including Department of Defense			9,207				69,361	

---

[1] April figure includes 16,655 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,603 in March and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 4,229 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,202.

[2] April figure includes 946 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 898 in March and their pay.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11100, dated Mar. 30, 1963.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[5] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	April	March	Change
Agriculture Department	6,568	6,907	−339
Interior Department	7,887	7,354	+533
Tennessee Valley Authority	62	44	+18
Veterans' Administration	146	113	+33
Department of the Army	753	564	+189
Total	15,416	14,982	+434

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive Departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	104,228	101,659	2,569	--------
Commerce	30,390	29,773	617	--------
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,786	77,708	78	--------
Interior	68,360	66,032	2,328	--------
Justice	31,434	31,384	50	--------
Labor	9,046	9,005	41	--------
Post Office	583,332	582,223	1,109	--------
State [1] [2]	10,647	10,616	31	--------
Treasury	90,868	89,269	1,599	--------
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	370	364	6	--------
Bureau of the Budget	465	465	--------	--------
Council of Economic Advisers	38	58	--------	20
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	76	--------	1
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29	--------	--------
National Security Council	40	40	--------	--------
Office of Emergency Planning	430	436	--------	6
Office of Science and Technology	67	45	22	--------
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation [3]	5	--------	5	--------
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	28	34	--------	6
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	--------	--------
Atomic Energy Commission	6,994	6,992	2	--------
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	604	601	3	--------
Civil Aeronautics Board	827	830	--------	3
Civil Service Commission	4,080	4,096	--------	16
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5	--------	--------
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7	--------	--------
Commission on Civil Rights	80	86	--------	6
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Export-Import Bank of Washington	287	284	3	--------
Farm Credit Administration	238	239	--------	1
Federal Aviation Agency	44,796	44,572	224	--------
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7	--------	--------
Federal Communications Commission	1,423	1,425	--------	2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,228	1,229	--------	1
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,227	1,221	6	--------
Federal Maritime Commission	240	228	12	--------
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391	--------	--------
Federal Power Commission	1,112	1,108	4	--------
Federal Trade Commission	1,151	1,144	7	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	86	76	10	--------
General Accounting Office	4,436	4,454	--------	18
General Services Administration	32,076	31,922	154	--------
Government Printing Office	7,110	7,176	--------	66
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,719	13,704	15	--------
Indian Claims Commission	23	23	--------	--------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,370	13	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,575	27,152	423	--------
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Housing Authority	449	433	16	--------
National Capital Planning Commission	61	60	1	--------
National Capital Transportation Agency	84	84	--------	--------
National Gallery of Art	325	321	4	--------
National Labor Relations Board	1,967	1,977	--------	10
National Mediation Board	139	137	2	--------
National Science Foundation	913	1,012	--------	99
Panama Canal	167	153	14	--------
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	49	52	--------	3
Railroad Retirement Board	1,989	1,989	--------	--------
Renegotiation Board	213	211	2	--------
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	157	--------	2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,381	--------	2
Selective Service System	6,726	6,684	42	--------
Small Business Administration	3,212	3,171	41	--------
Smithsonian Institution	1,399	1,374	25	--------
Soldiers' Home	1,080	1,066	14	--------
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	29	33	--------	4
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27	--------	1
Tariff Commission	266	266	--------	--------
Tax Court of the United States	155	156	--------	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,026	17,463	563	--------
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	134	128	6	--------
U.S. Information Agency	3,268	3,240	28	--------
Veterans' Administration	172,527	172,138	389	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,374,490	1,364,280	10,478	268
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	10,210	
Department of Defense:				
Office of Secretary of Defense	2,056	2,050	6	--------
Department of the Army	327,368	326,550	818	--------
Department of the Navy	317,889	317,349	540	--------
Department of the Air Force	273,329	275,261	--------	1,932
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,011	2,008	3	--------
Defense Communications Agency	524	508	16	--------
Defense Supply Agency	25,193	25,117	76	--------
Office of Civil Defense	1,056	1,054	2	--------
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	39	--------	--------
Interdepartmental Activities	13	13	--------	--------
International Military Activities	38	38	--------	--------
Armed Forces Information and Education Activities	423	420	3	--------
Classified Activities	1,549	1,466	83	--------
Total, Department of Defense	95,1488	951,873	1,547	1,932
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	385	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,325,978	2,316,153	12,025	2,200
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	9,825	

---

[1] April figure includes 2,756 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,736 in March.

[2] April figure includes 665 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 617 in March.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11100, dated Mar. 30, 1963.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,264	1,188	76	--------
Commerce	666	655	11	--------
Health, Education, and Welfare	607	600	7	--------
Interior	593	600	--------	7
Justice	353	352	1	--------
Labor	115	97	18	--------
Post Office	1,462	1,460	2	--------
State [1] [2]	31,131	31,082	49	--------
Treasury	627	624	3	--------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	404	393	11	--------
Atomic Energy Commission	32	34	--------	2
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1	--------	--------
Civil Service Commission	4	6	--------	2
Federal Aviation Agency	1,035	1,021	14	--------
Federal Communications Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	--------	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	43	43	--------	--------
General Accounting Office	88	87	1	--------
General Services Administration	12	12	--------	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	187	184	3	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	11	--------	--------
National Labor Relations Board	34	35	--------	1
National Science Foundation	15	13	2	--------
Panama Canal	14,950	15,588	--------	638
Selective Service System	153	153	--------	--------
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	55	55	--------	--------
Smithsonian Institution	17	17	--------	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	2	--------	1
U.S. Information Agency	8,419	8,374	45	--------
Veterans' Administration	1,009	1,008	1	--------
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,143	1,075	68	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,435	64,774	312	651
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	339	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	67	65	2	--------
Department of the Army	51,970	52,127	--------	157
Department of the Navy	24,507	24,380	127	--------
Department of the Air Force	27,935	28,187	--------	252
Defense Communications Agency	32	31	1	--------
Interdepartmental Activities	1	1	--------	--------
International Military Activities	20	20	--------	--------
Total, Department of Defense	104,532	104,811	130	409
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	279	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	168,967	169,585	442	1,060
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	618	

---

[1] April figure includes 13,899 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,867 in March. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 4,229 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,202.

[2] April figure includes 281 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 281 in March.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,858	3,825	33	
Commerce	5,542	5,518	24	
Interior	7,709	8,565		856
Post Office	252	253		1
Treasury	5,268	5,254	14	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	256	256		
Federal Aviation Agency	3,021	2,990	31	
General Services Administration	1,741	1,760		19
Government Printing Office	7,110	7,176		66
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,586	27,163	423	
Panama Canal	7,660	8,110		450
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	156		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,895	14,280	615	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,143	1,075	68	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	86,196	86,381	1,208	1,393
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			185	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,490	[2] 134,235	255	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,270	[2] 4,284		14
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	195,677	195,537	140	
Outside the United States	1,286	1,282	4	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	132,104	132,621		517
Outside the United States	1,128	1,199		71
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,893	1,915		22
Total, Department of Defense	470,848	471,073	399	624
Net decrease, Department of Defense			225	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	557,044	557,454	1,607	2,017
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			410	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1963, and comparison with March 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Canada	32	36					32	36
Crete	62	61					62	61
England	3,060	2,838			111	111	2,949	2,727
France	21,010	21,114	17,628	17,731	11	10	3,371	3,373
Germany	80,563	81,190	68,320	68,647	86	85	12,157	12,458
Greece	252	254					252	254
Greenland		136						136
Japan	51,671	51,819	18,374	18,433	14,390	14,379	18,907	19,007
Korea	6,207	6,205	6,207	6,205				
Morocco	2,115	2,204			761	763	1,354	1,441
Netherlands	54	51					54	51
Trinidad	554	555			554	555		
Total	165,580	166,463	110,529	111,016	15,913	15,903	39,138	39,544

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,494,945 as compared with 2,485,738 in March. This was a net increase of 9,207, including a net increase of 434 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	
March	2,485,738	2,227	
April	2,494,945	9,207	

The Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of April was 1,438,925, an increase of 9,871 as compared with the March total of 1,429,054. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,056,020, a decrease of 664 as compared with 1,056,684 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Agriculture Department with 2,645, Interior Department with 2,321, Treasury Department with 1,602, and Post Office Department with 1,111. Increases in Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury Departments were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decrease in civilian employment was reported by the Air Force Department with 2,184. The larger increases were reported by the Navy Department with 667 and the Army Department with 661.

Inside the United States, civilian employment increased 9,825 and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 618. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in April totaled 557,044, a decrease of 410.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies and compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,494,945 civilian employees certified to the Committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed by U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 165,580 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during April who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 166,463. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	32			32
Crete	62			62
England	3,060		111	2,949
France	21,010	17,628	11	3,371
Germany	80,563	68,320	86	12,157
Greece	252			252
Japan	51,671	18,374	14,390	18,907
Korea	6,207	6,207		
Morocco	2,115		761	1,354
Netherlands	54			54
Trinidad	554		554	
Total	165,580	110,529	15,913	39,138

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1668. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Araujo; and

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Lucie Samuelian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1670. A bill for the relief of Spyridon G. Kallimanis and his wife, Ekaterini Kallimanis; and

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Nikoloudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Miller, Mr. Symington, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Kefauver):

S. 1672. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1673. A bill to provide for the transfer of powers, duties, and functions under the Trading With the Enemy Act to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. 1674. A bill to provide for the submission to the Congress by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of periodical reports concerning the administration of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1675. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1676. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising on rights-of-way adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a higher education or in providing a higher education for his children and dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of Margaret Ann Cover; and

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Dr. Presentacion Medina Foronda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. McNamara):

S. 1680. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Sheung Wan Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S. 1682. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1683. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the U.S. courts of appeals to review certain determinations made by other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1684. A bill for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 1685. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE GREAT RIVER ROAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Douglas, Dirksen, Eastland, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, Miller, Symington, Fulbright, Nelson, and Kefauver, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide assistance for the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road.

This road will provide one of the great scenic parkways in North America. Traversing both banks of the Mississippi River for 2,470 miles, it will link the extremes of the North American Continent and will join its South American counterpart, the Pan-American Highway. The Great River Road will connect the Trans-Canada Highway, leading to Alaska and the Atlantic seaboard, with our great southern highway system that follows the Gulf of Mexico. When completed, the Great River Road will constitute one of the most scenic and historic routes in our national highway system, and will provide a visible sign of our desire for greater communication with our Latin American neighbors.

The Great River Road will be a scenic parkway, not a high-speed turnpike. It will enhance the beauty of the Mississippi River Valley by preserving the unspoiled countryside and by restricting roadside development. Existing parkways will be utilized wherever possible. Roads which do not meet the standards of parkway construction will be brought up to approved specifications.

The bill will be a spur to acquisition by the States of lands for public recreation along the shores of the Mississippi.

The Great River Road will traverse countryside rich in the folklore and history of America. In Louisiana, for example, the road will wind among the historic plantation houses of the ante bellum sugar barons. It will pass through the battlefields of the Civil War, such as Vicksburg. The traveler along the Great River Road will see the new industrialism of the South, as found in Memphis; the historic river towns of Missouri and Illinois, such as Cape Girardeau, Cairo, Hannibal, and Quincy. The road will climb northward, through the plains of Iowa and such cities as Davenport, Dubuque, and Marquette. Finally, as the source of the Mississippi is approached, the traveler will come to the exhilarating north country of Minnesota and Wisconsin. Needless to say, I could dwell at some length on the beauty of the Mississippi as it passes through such cities and towns as Winona, Wabasha, Lake City, Red Wing, Hastings, St. Cloud, Little Falls, among others, and, of course the great Twin Cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul. Surely this route should be traveled by every American. It provides a living portrait of our land and our people that is incomparable.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $2 million for the fiscal year 1964, and a like sum for the fiscal year 1965, to be used to purchase rights-of-way to construct roads, recreational facilities, rest areas, parking areas at historical sites, and to construct roads and facilities which can be improved to acceptable standards.

The Mississippi River Parkway, or the Great River Road, is not a new idea. In August 1949, Congress instructed the Bureau of Public Roads and the National Park Service to make a survey of the route. From a joint report by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior in 1951 emerged a new conception in interstate highway development—the Federal-aid highway. The plan called for close cooperation between Federal and State authorities and utilization of the best elements of the existing road system. The general location of the State highways along the proposed route is such that it is possible to link all of them together and to obtain nearly complete control of access, without disrupting the local highway patterns.

The bill I now introduce was drafted in close cooperation with the Mississippi River Parkway Planning Commission. In view of its careful planning and great desirability, I urge that this bill be supported by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Resolution 2 of the 1963 Minnesota Legislature, memorializing Congress to establish the Great River Road, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the Record, and that the bill remain at the desk for 5 calendar days, to permit additional Senators to become cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1672) to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 2, of title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"214. Great River Road

"(a) For the purpose of expediting and providing Federal assistance in the construction of a continuous highway and appurtenances thereto, to be known as the Great River Road, traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, in conformity with applicable provisions of this title and the recommended plan in the joint report submitted to the Congress on November 28, 1951, by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 626), there is authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965, which shall be apportioned among such ten States by the Secretary of Commerce as necessary to carry out the recommendations in such report for land purchases as provided in this subsection. The amount apportioned to each such State shall be paid to such State as needed for the purchase of lands and interests in land, including scenic easements, in addition to the normal rights-of-way required for the Great River Road. Such lands and interests in land may include parkway features such as lands necessary for recreation, safety rest areas, and the conservation of natural scenic beauty including such areas as submarginal lands, faces of adjacent hillsides, islands, lakeshores and riverbanks, swamps and residual parcels and areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, in accordance with such joint report and the plan prepared by such State and approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 2. The analysis of Chapter 2 of title 23 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"214. Great River Road."

The resolution presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

RESOLUTION 2

Resolution memorializing Congress to establish a great river road as an interstate system from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico

Whereas the Mississippi River has its source in the State of Minnesota, and is a matter of pride and interest to the citizens of the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas many citizens of the States of Minnesota, Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, being the States bordering the Mississippi River, have sought and worked toward the planning of the ultimate construction and maintenance of a National Scenic Route extending along the route of the Mississippi River and leading from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. In furtherance of this goal the citizens of the said States have coordinated their efforts by the organization and support of the Mississippi River Parkway Commission; and

Whereas these citizens and this organization dedicated to the final construction and maintenance of such National Scenic Route are firm in their belief that such National Scenic Route could be of great economical and recreational benefit to a large segment of the population of North America; and would materially aid the conservation of the natural treasures of this Nation, protect the wildlife, natural beauty, and natural shorelines, and would further aid and bring relief to the highway authorities of the various aforesaid States; and

Whereas it is the belief of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that the most feasible and effective way to bring about completion of the aforementioned National Scenic Route is for the Congress of the United States of America to designate and create an interstate system of parkways and scenic routes comparable in principle to the interstate highway system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation establishing an interstate system of parkways and scenic routes in the United States along the Mississippi River extending from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to each member of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

L. L. DUXBURY, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
A. M. KEITH,
President of the Senate.
Approved March 1, 1963.
ELMER L. ANDERSEN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ON CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1676) to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising on rights-of-way adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall make a brief explanation of the bill; then I shall defer to the Senator from Oregon.

The bill which we introduce would amend the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 and would extend for a period of 2 years the time in which States can take advantage of section 131 of the Interstate Highway Act. This section has been known as the antibillboard section of the Interstate Highway Act.

Mr. President, let me refer briefly to the history of this legislation. In 1956, Congress enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act, establishing an interstate and defense system approximately 41,000 miles in length, to be financed by the Federal Government and the States; but 90 percent of the total cost is contributed by the Federal Government.

In 1958—2 years later—a great Senator, whom we remember with affection and whom we honor, the late Senator Richard Neuberger of Oregon, led a fight in the Senate to have incorporated in the Federal Aid Highway Act a provision to protect the areas adjacent to the Federal Interstate Highway System against the establishment of billboards and other advertising. As a result of his great fight—and in that connection, I also pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who joined the Senator from Oregon in that fight—the section was added to the Highway Act. In section 131, Congress declared, as the national policy, that the regulation and control of advertising along the interstate roads was necessary for safety and convenience of travelers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time available in the morning hour to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Congress also declared that policy to be necessary to preserve the beauty of the areas along the interstate roads.

Our amendment does not change the policy or provisions of the Interstate Highway Act with respect to advertising. It only extends this provision of the act until June 30, 1965, the time in which the States can take advantages of its provisions. I think sometimes we in Congress and the States must enact legislation, and adopt necessary procedures to control advertising to a distance of 660 feet from the right-of-way of the interstate roads. When the State has acted, agreements can be entered into with the Secretary of Commerce under which the Federal Government can pay to such State a sum equal to one-half of one percent of the total cost of that portion of the Interstate Highway System within the State which qualifies. Thus far, only 17 States have taken advantage of this provision.

When the 2-year extension is made—from June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1965—I hope the remaining States will take action and that conservation groups throughout the country will be as interested in action by Governors and State legislators, as they are in action by the Congress.

There is strong opposition to this section of the Interstate Highway Act; but I would point out that those who wish to advertise on public roads can place advertisements of almost any sort along approximately 800,000 miles of roads, in the Federal aid system to the cost of which the Federal Government contributes 50 percent; and they are at liberty to use more than 2 million miles of other roads which are not included in the Federal system and do not receive Federal aid. Surely it is in the national interest to preserve the beauty of the areas adjacent to the 41,000 miles of the Interstate and Defense Highway System, for the enjoyment of all the people of the Nation.

I again pay tribute to the late Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, who in 1958 was a leader in the fight to achieve this result, and to our colleague, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; and I see on the floor the able Senator from Colorado [Mr.

ALLOTT] and others, who contributed their great abilities to this fight.

In 1961, I had the honor of joining with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], in sponsoring legislation extending section 131 for 2 years.

Mr. President, today we have another opportunity to extend this provision—this time, for another 2 years. In this endeavor, I am very glad to join the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in sponsoring this measure to extend beyond June 30 the billboard-control features of the Federal Highway Act.

I am particularly pleased that the Senator from Kentucky has given great credit in this connection to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. It may not be widely known that at first Senator KUCHEL was not completely in sympathy with the plan to control billboard advertising and other forms of advertising along these roads; but he showed his statesmanship and his great breadth of vision by coming around to the viewpoint of Senators on both sides of the aisle who favored this provision; and today California is about to pass enabling legislation in this field. I understand the bill is already part way through the California Legislature.

The Senator from Kentucky has also referred to the stake of the Federal Government in the Interstate Road System. Inasmuch as 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System is paid by the taxpayers of the Federal Government, it seems altogether fitting and proper that the Federal Government have some control of the land along those highways, which would be without value to advertisers but for the investment made by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, Congress must decide within a very short time on continuing the Federal policy for billboard control under the national system of interstate and defense highways. Under the 1958 Act, cooperative Federal-State agreements for billboard control could be entered into; and under them the participating States would receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of highway costs. In 1961, after an extensive Senate debate, and through the efforts of my colleague, Senator COOPER, this deadline was extended to June 30, 1963.

As has been stated, to date 17 States have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for billboard controls. Awaiting the Secretary's approval is an agreement with the State of New Hampshire. Prospects appear good that billboard-control legislation will be enacted in New Jersey and California. State legislatures are meeting at this time.

I do not believe that States presently considering billboard-control legislation should be deprived of an opportunity to participate in the program. But this is precisely what will happen if the June 30 deadline is allowed to pass.

President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress in 1961, urged that the billboard-control section be extended for 4 years; but the present law expires in 1963, not in 1965 as the President recommended. In seeking the 2-year extension we are not requesting a change of policy; we are asking that the policy established in 1958 by Congress be maintained.

To date, no State has yet received its billboard-control bonus payment. It was not until late last year that Congress appropriated the funds and applications could be submitted. Applications from a number of States are presently being considered by the Bureau of Public Roads. I am hopeful that payments will start in the near future.

Mr. President, let me say that Oregon is looking forward to the receipt very shortly of this bonus of one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. President, a very important survey was completed this year for the New York State Thruway Authority by Consulting Engineers Madigan-Hyland, Inc. This study comes to the conclusion that advertising devices are a factor in accidents, principally because they distract the motorist's attention. Truly, anything which would limit the high vehicle accident rate would be of tremendous benefit. If this were the only reason, billboard controls would be highly desirable.

But we have a great responsibility in protecting the scenic beauty of our Nation, as well as in giving protection to the dollars spent for highway construction. We have an opportunity to preserve the beauty of our Nation's fields and forests, mountains and prairies, and to protect our highways from the billboard jungle. As the Nation becomes more and more urbanized, it is essential that we preserve our heritage of nature's beauty.

Mr. President, the question is whether the view from the highway will be "purple mountain majesties" or ads for cigarettes.

It is worth remembering that the 41,000 miles of the Interstate Highway System, costing the taxpayers more than $40 billion, gives the billboard its value. Without the highway, the billboard is worthless. But as the American Automobile Association has ably stated:

> Unless corrective action is taken, this great dream system may become a $41 billion billboard nightmare.

The proposed legislation which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I are introducing provides only for a 2-year extension of time for States to elect to participate in the billboard-control program. We are facing the deadline of June 30. Other desirable changes to strengthen the fight against billboards, which I believe are needed, are omitted from the bill, because of the time situation. To try to do more at this time might well mean that no legislation of this sort would be enacted.

Mr. President, I urge the Congress to give careful, prompt, and favorable consideration to continuing the national billboard-control program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, which I introduced on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], to amend the Interstate Highway Act, be held at the desk until June 14, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EDUCATIONAL TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1963. If enacted, this bill would provide income tax credit for certain expenditures entailed in financing higher education. Earlier in the session I introduced two bills to establish a program of Federal scholarships (S. 389) and a program of Federal loan insurance (S. 390). The legislation I propose today stands as a necessary complement to the scholarship and loan programs.

Since introducing these two earlier bills, I have been attempting to determine the most equitable formula for providing financial assistance to all persons engaged in the pursuit of higher education. Many students will not qualify for Federal merit scholarships; loan funds will remain only a partial answer to the existing financial needs. To supplement these sources of funds, it is essential that an across-the-board tax credit program be initiated to assist every person currently facing the considerable expenses associated with higher education.

In the 87th Congress over 100 bills were introduced to provide assistance for higher education through such fiscal devices as tax deductibility, additional exemptions, or tax credit. Approximately 120 such bills have been introduced to date in the 88th Congress. I have sponsored similar tax credit legislation for many years. However, the bill I introduce today is, in my opinion, a significantly improved measure over all earlier versions.

Tax deductible, additional exemption, and tax credit bills share a common dual purpose: First, to assist persons financing a college education and, second, to provide indirect assistance to the institutions of higher education. But although these three types of tax bills share this purpose, they are very dissimilar in their actual effects. The tax deductible approach results in greatest benefit for those persons who need financial assistance the least, that is, those persons with incomes in the higher tax brackets. As Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, testified before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recently:

> Both methods (tax deduction or additional exemption) have been criticized for giving the greatest benefit—up to 91 percent—to persons in the high brackets and only 20 percent to those of moderate income.
>
> A tuition boost would cost a student or his family of low income 80-percent net, while the net cost to those in high brackets would be only 50 percent, 31 percent, or as little as 9 percent. This, of course, may be explained as the result of our steeply graduated income tax schedule. But it would largely defeat the purpose of granting tax concessions in higher education.

Mr. President, tax credit proposals generally provide for a credit equal to a fixed percentage of the cost of one item of higher education expense, the cost of tuition. For example, I introduced a bill in the 87th Congress (S. 634) to provide a 30-percent credit on tuition expenses up to $1,500. Close analysis, however, reveals that this approach provides disproportionately greater assistance to persons attending private schools with higher tuition. Moreover, in State institutions certain administrative fees are used to supplement low tuition charges.

With these considerations in mind, I am proposing that a Federal tax credit program be established on the following schedule: a 75-percent credit granted on the first $100 expended on tuition, fees, books, and supplies; a 40-percent credit on the next $400; a 30-percent credit on the next $500; and a 20-percent credit on the next $500. Credit would be granted in any calendar year on expenditures by the student or his spouse, by a parent in behalf of a son, daughter, stepson or stepdaughter, or by an individual in behalf of a legal dependent. Maximum credit allowable under this formula would be $485, although few persons would qualify for full credit.

Tuition, fees, books, and supplies are continually increasing items of expense in higher education. Surveys indicate that 50 percent of the institutions of higher education raised their tuition charges an average of 11 percent during the past academic year.—Washington Report, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, May 17, 1963. Rising costs will force additional increases as other sources for public and private colleges and universities are extended to the utmost in the immediate future.

Our concern for expanding capital investments in higher education through the construction of buildings, laboratories, scientific equipment, and so forth, should not blind us to the equally pressing need for assisting the individual student to meet his financial obligations. In 1959–60 tuition and fees accounted for one-quarter of the total income of colleges and universities. This percentage has been fairly consistent over the years. As recently as 1949–50, however, the Federal Government provided 16 percent of the total income of these institutions through payment of tuition and fees under the GI bill. Today the Federal Government provides an infinitesimal 0.1 percent of tuition and fees paid to these institutions.—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1956–58. As these statistics indicate, we stand in danger of pricing higher education out of the reach of a great many of our able young people. This is not only a deep personal tragedy for those so denied but a loss to the Nation that we cannot afford. Incidentally, these figures also indicate the need for prompt action on S. 5, the cold war GI bill of rights, as sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The sliding tax credit schedule provides a sensible and workable system of Federal assistance that helps every student, indirectly helps both public and private institutions, and does so in a manner that in no way interferes with individual or institutional freedom or policies. This bill, providing for a declining tax credit for expenditures on tuition, fees, books, and supplies mitigates the distortion found in the large majority of bills that rely on tax deductions, additional exemptions, or nonvariable tax credit. The higher levels of credit will assist those students in schools with lower tuition and fees. Traditionally, a large majority of students needing financial help attend public colleges and universities where tuition and fees are lower. However, the bill also will provide a basic level of support for those students attending the private institutions with substantially higher levels of tuition. The average student, or qualified person contributing to his education, would be entitled, at present cost levels, to a Federal income tax credit of $233 or 13.2 percent of the average annual total cost of $1,772, including room and board—based on estimates of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education.

This sum would represent significant help for this country's approximately 4.5 million students who will be enrolled in colleges and universities during the 1963–64 academic year. The bill would also help persons enrolled in trade and vocational schools and pursuing approved training above the 12th grade level. The importance of such vocational training was clearly demonstrated during the recent Senate debate on the Youth Employment Act.

If a student holds a scholarship, fellowship, or is receiving veteran's benefits, the amount of that assistance would be deducted before the tax credit could be computed. This would enable institutions to distribute available scholarship and fellowship funds among a wider number of needy students without decreasing the total financial support available to students presently holding scholarships.

While this tax credit proposal would not solve all the financial problems related to higher education, it would represent a significant contribution well within our national means. It would provide this assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about Federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations. Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

Support in the Congress has been growing for this general approach to the problem of Federal aid to higher education. I know the appropriate committees in both Houses are giving these proposals careful scrutiny and consideration. I hope that the administration will consider seriously requesting such legislation from the Congress.

The pressing need for vastly increased financial resources to support higher education in this country cannot be ignored. This legislation would provide this urgently needed assistance at a time of maximum need. It would represent a capital investment in the minds and talents of our youth and the future of our society. Let us, then, meet this challenge with honesty and courage before this time of great need has passed and millions of American youth have been denied their educational birthright.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the average level of tax credit available at a number of representative institutions of higher education be printed in the RECORD at this point. This table was based on the tuition and fees listed in "Basic Student Charges, 1961–62," U.S. Office of Education.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated level of credit for qualified persons at representative institutions of higher education under the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1963

Institution	State	Average credit level
University of Minnesota	Minnesota	$180
Mankato State College	do	146
St. John's College	do	310
Bethany	do	208
Gustavus Adolphus	do	367
Carleton	do	449
University of Houston	Texas	279
Pennsylvania State	Pennsylvania	271
University of Louisville	Kentucky	316
University of South Carolina.	South Carolina	190
Mississippi State College for Women.	Mississippi	165
University of Illinois	Illinois	163
University of Missouri	Missouri	157
Ohio State	Ohio	191
University of San Francisco.	California	215
Nebraska Wesleyan	Nebraska	280
Wake Forest	North Carolina	295
Luther College	Iowa	330
Grinell	do	456
University of Maine	Maine	231
University of Miami	Florida	397
California Institute of Technology.	California	466
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.	Massachusetts	485
Average, all students of higher education.		[1] 233

[1] Or 13.2 percent of the total cost of higher education.

Source: Estimates based on tuition and fees listed in "Basic Student Charges, 1961-62," Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Books and supplies estimate of $91 per student from the Bureau of Educational Research and Development, Office of Education.

NOTE.—Total costs of higher education are increasing at an estimated 2.7 percent per year, with books and supplies increasing at a 4 percent rate, and tuition and fees also increasing at more than the 2.7 percent rate. Number of students in public institutions of higher education is currently 61.6 percent of total enrollment, and estimated from present trends to go to 65.7 percent in 1970.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a most revealing study, "The Outlook for Higher Education: Underlying Economic and Demographic Projections," by Dr. Harold Wolozin, professor of economics, the American University, Washington, D.C., be printed in the RECORD. The statistics contained in this study demonstrate the tremendous burdens that will fall on our institutions of higher education in future years. I urge every Senator to study this material carefully.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The Outlook for Higher Education—Underlying Economic and Demographic Projections

(By Harold Wolozin, professor of economics, the American University, Washington, D.C., March 1963; prepared for Sidney G. Tickton, the Fund for the Advancement of Education)

FACTS FOR PLANNING

This report presents key data and projections on the outlook for higher education in the decades ahead. It describes the basic trends in population, occupations, incomes, etc., affecting the demand for higher education and the pattern of growth on the Nation's campuses in recent decades.

Building on available trend projections, I have projected college enrollments in the United States to the year 1985. This basic underlying information can be particularly useful guidelines for anyone interested in developing State and regional trends and projections, and can also serve as a framework for more intensive studies and planning for the coming wave of college enrollments. The figures in this report are largely based upon extensive data, published and unpublished, of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Office of Education, and the Department of Labor. I have also utilized the research and analysis of other independent research organizations concerned with the problems of growth and economic development such as the National Planning Association, the Committee for Economic Development, etc. I am in great debt to a great number of people in these organizations for their help and wise counsel. (Mr. Anthony Chaitin, of American University, was my statistical assistant in this project and I am deeply indebted to him for his competent and helpful work.)

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

Population

By 1985 the population of the United States will have risen to 285 million. This is a rise of about 60 percent in the 25 years between 1960 and 1985. Continuing the movement begun in the last two decades, population will tend to gravitate toward urban areas—the standard metropolitan areas as classified by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In addition, rates of population growth by major areas will differ from the national average; often dramatically, ranging from a 40 percent increase in the New England States by 1985, to 68 percent in the East North Central and 80 percent in the Mountain States (census major areas). Particularly significant for the educational outlook will be a dramatic doubling during the next two decades in the prime college age segment of the population—the 18-to-24-year-olds. By 1985 there will be over 32 million 18-to-24-year-olds compared with approximately 16 million in 1960.

Jobs for the educated

Forecasts of the kinds of jobs that will be available in the decades ahead show a continued and predictable shift toward the more skilled occupations requiring more education. The demand for professional and other technical workers will be even greater than it has been in the past decade. Unskilled workers, as has been the case already, will find jobs harder and harder to get. Retraining or additional educational training will be sought by increasing numbers of the work force as continued mechanization and automation shrink the demand for unskilled hands and place a premium on more education. As a consequence, the demand for higher education will rise even faster than the population.

College enrollments

Reflecting these population and occupational changes, college and university enrollments will burgeon over the next two decades. According to present indications, fall enrollments in the Nation's colleges and universities will climb from a little over 4 million in 1962 to approximately 12.8 million in 1985. Although the campuses will service increasing proportions of older students, the bulk of enrollments will come out of the 18- to 24-year-old population. As a proportion of this group, projected enrollments will increase from approximately 25 percent in 1962 to about 40 percent in 1985. This reflects a complex of economic and social factors impelling increasing proportions of this group, as well as older age groups, onto the Nation's campuses.

Another aspect of the enrollment picture is that a relatively larger share of the projected increase will go to public rather than private institutions. Continuing the trend which has manifested itself over the last decade or so, enrollments in private institutions of higher education will likely fall from 38 percent of the total in 1962 to approximately 20 percent in 1985. They should then level out at this proportion. A combination of factors will be responsible for this trend: geographical shifts in the college population, the widespread emergence of community junior colleges, a relatively greater expansion in graduate study, financial pressures, an increasing emphasis by the private institutions on streamlining programs and limiting expansion to practicable limits, an increased emphasis on specialized education, etc. Another factor which will swell enrollments in the public institutions is an expected increase in the proportion of part-time as opposed to full-time students. Part-time enrollees are expected to increase from 31 percent of total enrollments in 1962 to about 40 percent in 1985.

Paying for increased enrollments

Expenditures for higher education—the educational and general expenditures excluding research—are expected to rise even faster than total enrollments. By 1980 they are likely to reach $15 billion—rising from a level of a little over $4 billion in 1961–62. This projection assumes a rate of increase in costs equal to the recent past. If prices rise even faster, the expenditures are likely to be even greater.

The basic data

Following is a description and analysis—table by table—of the basic data gathered in this study. As the reader will see, I have (benefiting from my earlier work in this area) been highly selective in singling out those data and projections which seemed most directly relevant to the scope of this study. I hope, thereby, to bring out the full dimensions of the shape of things to come in higher education and the most important factors involved.

Population on the move—Projections to 1985

On the basis of modest birthrate assumptions for the future, the population of the United States can be expected to increase approximately 60 percent, to 285 million by 1985. And if births were to rise faster than the moderate rates of the late 1950's, population might even double in this period. Further breakthroughs in controlling the fatal diseases of old age would also work in the same direction although this would not increase the demand for higher education as much as increasing numbers of children. By major area, dramatic changes are in prospect; increases in population range all the way from a low of 40 percent for the period in New England to about 70 percent in the Pacific, and 80 percent in the mountain regions. (Tables 1 and 2.)

In addition to the area population shifts, there has been a general movement of the population out of rural areas into suburban concentrations—a trend which will probably continue. By 1985 approximately 70 percent of the Nation's population will reside in or near cities—what the Bureau of the Census classifies as "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" [1] (table 3).

Table 4 presents the official Bureau of Census population figures—total United States as well as by nine major areas—for the period 1930 to 1960. My projections of total population to 1985 are based upon Bureau of Census series II projections. (Their series I projections, based upon a 10-percent increase in birth rates, are considerably higher.)

Where necessary I interpolated to obtain intermediate years and extrapolated the trend from 1960 to 1980 to obtain my figures for 1985. I chose the census series II projections upon which to base my tables because I felt that they were the most probable, given the uncertainties upon which any projections of the future must be based. In arriving at this decision, I carefully analyzed alternative census projections as well as many others including those of a number of private research groups such as the National Planning Association, Resources for the Future, etc.

The projections of population by major areas lean heavily upon a set of area population projections published in Report No. 23 of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The Commission makes two sets of estimates, based upon two sets of assumptions about the rate of migration ("moving") between areas. These in turn reflect assumptions about shifts in industrial patterns and growth. I chose a midpoint between the alternative ORRRC assumptions, their "low" and "high" migration. The low migration assumption was that between 1960 and 1985 the migration rate will be half that of the last two decades; the high migration assumption that the relatively high annual rate of migration of the most recent decade will prevail to 1970. At that time the rate would revert to the annual average migration of the past two decades. Adopting higher migration rate assumptions would result in my figures showing an even further acceleration of the movement of population particularly into the East North Central and Pacific areas.

Table 1.—*Number of births in the United States, 1930–62*

Year of birth	Number of births	Year birth group is 18 years of age
	Thousands	
1930	2,203	1948
1940	2,360	1958
1945	2,735	1963
1950	3,554	1968
1955	4,047	1973
1960	4,258	1978
1961	4,282	1979
1962	4,167	1980

Source: Vital Statistics of the United States, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table 2.—*Birth rates in the United States, 1940–80*

Year	Rate (per 1,000 of mid period population)
1940	19.4
1941	20.3
1942	22.2
1943	22.7
1944	21.2
1945	20.4

---

[1] These are defined as "a county or group of contiguous counties which contains at least 1 city of 50,000 inhabitants or more or 'twin cities' with a combined population of at least 50,000. In addition at least 75 percent of the labor force of the county must be in nonagricultural occupations."

TABLE 2.—*Birth rates in the United States, 1940–80*—Continued

Year	Rate (per 1,000 of mid period population)
1946	24.1
1947	26.6
1948	24.9
1949	24.5
1950	24.1
1951	24.9
1952	25.1
1953	25.0
1954	25.3
1955	25.0
1956	25.2
1957	25.3
1958	24.6
1959	24.3
1960	23.7

TABLE 2.—*Birth rates in the United States, 1940–80*—Continued

Year	Rate (per 1,000 of mid period population)
1961	23.4
1962	22.4
1960–65 [1]	24.0
1965–70 [1]	24.9
1970–75 [1]	26.0
1975–80 [1]	26.7

[1] Estimated.

Source: (1) Vital Statistics Report, vo., 11, No. 12, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (2) Current Population Reports, series II, No. 251, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

TABLE 3.—*Population of the United States, by standard metropolitan area*

[In millions]

	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985
Standard metropolitan areas	72.8	89.3	112.9	141.2	179.3	196.7
Rest of United States	60.4	61.5	66.4	73.0	80.3	88.3
Total population	132.2	150.8	179.3	214.2	259.6	285.0

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1940–60, Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.

TABLE 4.—*Total population of the United States, by major area*

[In thousands]

Area	1930	1940	1950	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985	Percent change, 1960–85
New England	8,166	8,437	9,314	10,510	11,498	11,503	12,634	13,939	14,991	40
Middle Atlantic	26,26'	27,539	30,163	34,171	37,438	39,181	43,031	47,477	51,499	51
East North Central	25,297	26,626	30,399	36,229	39,694	44,451	48,819	53,863	60,904	68
West North Central	13,297	13,516	14,061	15,395	16,874	17,994	19,763	21,805	22,543	46
South Atlantic	15,794	17,823	21,182	25,960	28,451	31,790	34,914	38,522	43,035	65
East South Central	9,887	10,778	11,477	12,050	13,205	13,410	14,728	16,249	17,100	41
West South Central	12,177	13,064	14,537	16,953	18,581	21,015	23,080	25,465	26,989	59
Mountain	3,702	4,153	5,078	6,855	7,515	8,547	9,387	10,357	12,312	80
Pacific	8,621	9,733	14,486	21,203	22,953	26,327	28,915	31,902	35,625	68
Total	123,202	131,669	150,697	179,326	196,217	214,222	235,275	259,584	285,000	59

Source: (1) Census of the Population of the United States, 1930–60; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. (2) Current Population Reports, No. 251; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. (3) Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force, and Leisure and Transportation; Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Study Report No. 23.

NOTE.—Figures may not total due to rounding

The workforce in flux

Figures on conventional occupational groupings of the population cannot alone adequately portray the profound changes which lie ahead for the American worker—changes which will place new burdens on higher education. They will challenge it to produce not only larger numbers of graduates but more truly educated men with new skills and insights to meet and cope with the impact on our social and political structure of automation, accelerated economic growth, and revolutionary changes underway, or gathering, in many parts of the globe. What may look at first glance like a greatly expanded need for a utilitarian education may turn out on second and third glance to be a desperate need for an education calculated to develop the mind.

Some inkling of what's ahead—just in terms of the higher levels of training required and the college trained teachers to provide it—can be obtained from the numbers in table 5 depicting the pattern of occupational changes in the Nation's population. To cite but one example from these columns of figures, the share of professional persons needed is expected to rise from about 7 percent of the total employed in 1960 (5 percent in 1950) to approximately 16 percent in 1985—more than a doubling.

Although it is difficult to combine these categories into groups reflecting levels of skill and required education, some rough approximation of this is attempted in table 6. It is easy to see that the great increase in employment will occur in the skilled and service groups.

These occupational tables are based upon the U.S. census of population data. My projections are, by and large, consistent with Labor Department projections of trends in the labor force although I have made some assumptions on labor force mix which differ somewhat from those of the Labor Department.

TABLE 5.—*Total population, by selected occupational groups, 1950–85*

Occupational group	1950	Percent of total employed	1960	Percent of total employed	1970	Percent of total employed	1980	Percent of total employed	1985	Percent of total employed
1. Employed persons:										
(a) Professional, technical and kindred workers	4.92	8.74	7.23	11.19	12.6	13.3	15.9	14.2	18.3	15.8
(b) Farmers, farm managers, farm foremen, farm laborers	6.70	11.93	3.92	6.06	3.8	5.3	3.7	4.5	3.5	3.0
(c) Managers, officials, and proprietors (excluding farms)	5.04	8.95	5.39	8.38	9.6	10.7	11.4	10.7	12.4	10.7
(d) Clerical and kindred workers	6.95	12.34	9.29	14.38	14.2	15.9	17.3	16.2	19.7	17.0
(e) Sales workers	3.91	6.94	4.66	7.21	5.9	6.7	7.2	6.7	7.7	6.7
(f) Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	7.81	13.87	8.75	3.54	11.4	12.8	13.7	12.8	14.8	12.8
(g) Operators, including private household workers	11.10	19.71	13.57	21.00	15.2	16.9	17.3	16.3	17.7	15.3
(h) Service workers (excluding households)	5.70	10.12	5.43	8.40	12.2	13.8	15.5	14.3	18.2	15.7
(i) Laborers (excluding farm and mine)	4.17	7.40	6.36	9.84	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.3	3.5	3.0
Subtotal, employed persons	56.3	100.00	64.6	100.00	88.9	100.00	106.6	100.00	115.8	100.00

TABLE 5.—*Total population, by selected occupational groups, 1950–85*—Continued

Occupational group	1950	Percent of total employed	1960	Percent of total employed	1970	Percent of total employed	1980	Percent of total employed	1985	Percent of total employed
2. Other persons not included above:										
(a) Going to school	30.0	31.5	43.8	38.3	50.2	40.0	65.8	43.0	74.5	44.0
(b) Housewives not included above	22.8	24.3	28.0	24.4	30.7	24.5	37.5	24.5	41.5	24.5
(c) Children below school age	16.6	17.7	20.32	17.5	18.8	15.0	22.9	15.0	25.3	15.0
(d) Members of the labor force classified as unemployed, military retired persons, inmates of penal or mental institutions, and persons not in the labor force, etc	24.9	26.5	22.5	19.6	25.6	20.5	26.8	17.5	27.9	16.5
Subtotal	94.3	100.00	114.62	100.00	125.3	100.00	153.0	100.00	169.2	100.00
Total, population	150.7		179.3		214.2		259.6		285.0	

NOTE.—Figures may not total due to rounding.

Source: (1) U.S. Census, 1960, Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce. (2) Manpower Report of the President and a Report of Manpower, Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training, Department of Labor.

TABLE 6.—*Employment in the United States, by categories, 1950–85*

Category	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985
Skilled workers other than farmers (including professional people, proprietors, craftsmen, clerical and sales people)	28.63	35.32	53.7	65.5	79.2
Service workers, including private household workers	5.70	7.15	12.2	15.5	18.2
Other workers (mainly unskilled)	15.27	18.21	19.2	21.9	21.2
Farmers and farmworkers	6.70	3.92	3.8	3.7	3.5
Total, employed persons	56.3	64.6	88.9	106.6	115.8

Source: Table 5.

The Nation's youth

The youth of the Nation, the 18 to 24 year olds, will continue to provide the largest share of future college enrollments, even though increasing numbers of older students will go to college as pressures for advanced training and retraining mount. Tables 7 and 8 present data and projections of both 18 to 21 and 18 to 24 age groups, for the total country and by major geographic area. In using these tables it is particularly important to bear in mind the fact that increasing proportions of these age groups will be entering college and staying there longer. Thus, though my projections show a doubling of the numbers in the 18- to 24-year-old group by 1985, this would be an understatement of the expected increase in college enrollments from this group.

The projections are built up on a cohort basis, utilizing actual birth figures through 1962 and the estimates of birth rates presented earlier. Standard survival rates are assumed. The totals are then distributed by area in accordance with area population projections.

TABLE 7.—*18- to 21-year-old population in the United States, by geographic area, 1930–85*

[In thousands]

Area	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985
New England	602	627	540	559	760	913	1,017
Middle Atlantic	1,928	2,032	1,755	1,821	2,591	3,111	3,495
East North Central	1,857	1,965	1,773	1,931	2,490	3,530	4,134
West North Central	951	997	816	821	1,190	1,429	1,530
South Atlantic	1,161	1,315	1,230	1,384	2,102	2,524	2,921
East South Central	728	794	666	642	886	1,065	1,160
West South Central	895	964	843	904	1,389	1,669	1,832
Mountain	274	305	296	365	565	678	835
Pacific	631	754	881	1,116	1,741	2,091	2,418
Total	9,027	9,753	8,805	9,547	14,169	17,014	19,346

NOTE.—Figures may not total due to rounding.

Sources: (1) Current Population Reports No. 251, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; (2) Census of the Population, 1930–60; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; (3) "Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force, and Leisure and Transportation," Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, No. 23.

TABLE 8.—*18- to 24-year-old population in the United States, by geographic area*

[In thousands]

Area	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985
New England	879	1,059	968	948	1,305	1,580	1,688
Middle Atlantic	2,828	3,461	3,146	3,087	4,447	5,382	5,800
East North Central	2,723	3,347	3,177	3,273	5,045	6,106	6,859
West North Central	1,431	1,699	1,462	1,391	2,042	2,472	2,539
South Atlantic	1,701	2,242	2,205	2,346	3,608	4,367	4,846
East South Central	1,064	1,353	1,194	1,088	1,522	1,842	1,925
West South Central	1,310	1,642	1,511	1,532	2,385	2,887	3,039
Mountain	397	519	531	619	970	1,174	1,386
Pacific	928	1,285	1,579	1,893	2,988	3,617	4,012
Total	13,261	16,607	15,778	16,181	24,317	29,431	32,009

NOTE.—Figures may not total due to rounding.

Sources: (1) Current Population Reports No. 251, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; (2) Census of the Population, 1930–60; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; (3) "Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force, and Leisure and Transportation," Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, No. 23.

High school graduates

The Nation's high schools will graduate more and more students in the decades ahead (table 9). And the odds are that an increased share of these will be prepared and anxious to go on to college. By 1985 the high schools will be turning out more than twice as many graduates a year as now even under relatively modest assumptions of the extent to which the successful solution of the dropout problem in high schools and other factors will increase the proportion of high school graduates relative to the numbers of 17- and 18-year-olds in the population. For illustrative purposes we have expressed the actual and projected high school graduates as proportions of 18-year-olds (table 10).

The data on high school graduates is based upon actual statistics and projections of the Office of Education. For the years 1980 and 1985 I extrapolated the trend of the Office of Education projections for 1965–70. The geographic distributions are based upon the area population projections. The projections of the 18-year-olds are built up on a cohort basis.

TABLE 9.—*High school graduates in the United States, public and private, by geographic area, 1940–85*

Area	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985
New England	77, 930	73, 661	108, 996	145, 527	177, 210	212, 715
Middle Atlantic	254, 555	239, 220	354, 888	495, 659	603, 570	730, 751
East North Central	246, 127	241, 619	376, 278	562, 325	684, 750	864, 203
West North Central	124, 956	111, 212	159, 960	227, 640	277, 200	319, 881
South Atlantic	164, 776	167, 718	269, 700	402, 164	489, 720	610, 644
East South Central	99, 550	90, 817	125, 178	169, 646	206, 580	242, 640
West South Central	120, 803	114, 931	176, 142	265, 851	323, 730	382, 966
Mountain	38, 232	40, 429	71, 238	108, 129	131, 670	174, 700
Pacific	94, 542	120, 089	217, 620	333, 059	405, 570	505, 500
Total	1, 221, 475	1, 199, 700	1, 860, 000	2, 710, 000	3, 300, 000	4, 044, 000

Sources: (1) Release "Number of High School Graduates, etc.," Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; (2) Census of Population, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; (3) Extrapolations.

TABLE 10.—*High school graduates compared with the number of 18-year-olds, 1930–85*

[In thousands]

Year	Number of high school graduates, public and private	Number of 18-year-olds in the population	Graduates as a percentage of the 18-year-old age group
Actual:			
1930	667	2, 357	28. 29
1940	1, 220	2, 582	47. 25
1950	1, 200	2, 182	54. 99
1958	1, 506	2, 285	65. 90
1960	1, 860	2, 606	71. 37
1962	1, 925	2, 755	69. 87
Estimated:			
1965	2, 638	3, 716	71. 0
1970	2, 710	3. 654	74. 2
1975	3, 128	4, 079	76. 7
1980	3, 300	4, 167	79. 2
1985	4, 044	5, 055	80. 0

Sources: (1) Census of Population; (2) table 9.

College and university enrollments

By 1985 college and university enrollments will be approaching the 13 million mark even on the basis of fairly conservative projections (table 11). Enrollments in U.S. colleges and universities should rise, according to an extension of the trend of Office of Education 1975 projections, from 4.2 million in the fall of 1962 to 12.8 million in the fall of 1985. Assuming that the bulk of enrollments will come from the 18 to 24 year old group (table 12), even though there will be increasing numbers of older students, total enrollments as a proportion of that age group will rise from 24 percent in 1962 to 40 percent in 1985. It is highly likely that an increasing share of these enrollments will flow to the Nation's public institutions.

By 1985, even though enrollments in the private colleges and universities will have risen by about 1 million—over a 60-percent rise from 1.6 million in 1962 to 2.6 millions in 1985—this will be only 20 percent of total enrollments in contrast to 38 percent in 1962. The expenditures of private colleges, however, may rise more than proportionately to their share of the future enrollment burden.

An increasing share of total enrollments will consist of part time students (table 13), rising from 30.5 percent of total enrollments in 1962 to 40 percent in 1985.

TABLE 11.—*Fall enrollments in colleges and universities, 1950–85, in public and private institutions*

[In thousands]

Fall of year	Public		Private		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Actual:						
1950	1, 154	50. 3	1, 142	49. 7	2, 296	100. 00
1959	2, 003	58. 9	1, 399	41. 4	3, 402	100. 00
1960	2, 136	59. 2	1, 474	40. 8	3, 610	100. 00
1961	2, 352	60. 4	1, 540	39. 6	3, 892	100. 00
1962	2, 597	61. 7	1, 610	38. 3	4, 207	100. 00
Estimated:						
1965	3, 341	64. 0	1, 879	36. 0	5, 220	100. 00
1970	4, 693	67. 0	2, 310	33. 0	7, 003	100. 00
1975	6, 241	78. 0	2, 426	28. 0	8, 667	100. 00
1980	7, 505	75. 0	2, 501	25. 0	10, 006	100. 00
1985	10, 272	80. 0	2, 568	20. 0	12, 840	100. 00

Sources: (1) Fall enrollments, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; (2) trend projections.

TABLE 12.—*Total fall enrollments in colleges and universities, 1950–85, compared with the number of 18- to 24-year-olds*

Fall of year	Total enrollments	Number of 18- to 24-year-olds	Percent
Actual:			
1950	2, 296	15, 778	14. 5
1959	3, 402	15, 689	21. 6
1960	3, 610	16, 116	22. 4
1962	4, 207	17, 440	24. 1
Estimated:			
1965	5, 220	20, 077	26. 0
1970	7, 003	24, 317	28. 8
1975	8, 134	27, 115	30. 0
1980	10, 006	29, 431	34. 0
1985	12, 840	32, 099	40. 0

Source: Table 11.

TABLE 13.—*Total fall enrollments in colleges and universities, 1959–85*

Fall of year	Full time		Part time		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Actual:						
1959	2, 342	65. 5	1, 233	34. 5	3, 575	100
1962	2, 922	69. 5	1, 285	30. 5	4, 207	100
Estimated:						
1965	3, 550	68. 0	1, 670	32. 0	5, 220	100
Estimated—Con.						
1970	4, 552	65. 0	2, 451	35. 0	7, 003	100
1975	5, 467	63. 0	3, 210	37. 0	8, 677	100
1980	6, 104	61. 0	3, 902	39. 0	10, 006	100
1985	7, 704	60. 0	5, 136	40. 0	12, 840	100

Sources: (1) Various publications, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; (2) trend projections.

The costs of higher education and national income

The expenditures to run the Nation's institutions of higher learning will have to rise at a fairly spectacular rate if the colleges and universities are to accomplish the job facing them in the decades ahead. Expenditures (net of research) on higher education as projected by the Office of Education (table 15) should rise from 0.8 percent of GNP in 1962 to 1.6 percent of projected GNP (table 14) in 1975; a doubling in the span of 15 years. On the whole, these figures may turn out to be on the conservative side and will probably have to be adjusted upward. I have not attempted to allocate the expenditures between private and public institutions.

For my estimate of gross national product through 1980 I am using Edward F. Denison's high employment projections of GNP (in 1962 dollars) which he made in his study of economic growth for the Committee for Economic Development. I am using his projected rate of growth in GNP to obtain my 1985 figure and also using it to project personal income, so as to place the income side of the story into perspective.

TABLE 14.—*Personal income in the United States, 1950–85*

Calendar year	GNP	Personal income	Personal income as a percentage of GNP
	Millions	*Millions*	
Actual:			
1950	$284.6	$228.5	80.3
1951	329.0	256.7	78.0
1952	327.0	273.1	78.7
1953	365.4	288.3	78.8
1954	363.1	289.8	79.8
1955	397.5	310.2	78.0
1956	419.2	332.9	79.4
1957	442.8	351.4	79.3
1958	444.5	360.3	81.0
1959	482.7	383.9	79.5
Actual—Continued			
1960	$503.4	$400.8	79.6
1961	518.7	416.4	80.2
1962	553.6	440.5	79.6
Estimated:			
1965	626.0	498.0	80.0
1970	740.0	588.0	80.0
1975	875.0	696.0	80.0
1980	1,036.0	824.0	80.0
1985	1,226.0	975.0	80.0

Sources: (1) Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce; (2) Denison, Edward F., "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us," Committee for Economic Development; (3) "Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force, and Leisure and Transportation." Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, No. 23.

TABLE 15.—*Educational expenditures at colleges* [1] *and universities, 1951–80*

Year	Education and general	Research	Educational and general less research	Percentage of gross national product
1951–52	$1,933,645	$320,362	$1,613,783	0.49
1953–54	2,288,351	374,922	1,913,429	.52
1955–56	2,788,799	506,922	2,282,702	.71
1957–58	3,634,142	733,887	2,900,255	.65
1959–60	4,536,056	1,024,399	3,511,657	.72
1961–62			4,295,918	.83
1971–72			$10,265,255	1.38
1975–76			13,969,970	1.60
1980			[2] 15,000,000 [2] 16,000,000 [2] 17,000,000	1.45 1.54 1.64

[1] Assumes costs will continue to increase as in past.

[2] Range of estimates.

Source: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and computed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Current population reports, population estimates, projections; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Denison, Edward F., "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us," Committee for Economic Development, New York, 1962.

Digest of Educational Statistics, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1962.

Economic Report of the President, January 1963, Washington, D.C.

Fact Book of Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

Harris, Seymour, "Higher Education, Resources, and Finance," McGraw Hill, New York, 1962.

Manpower report of the President and a report of manpower, requirements, resources, utilization, and training, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1963.

Mushkin, Selma J., editor, Economics of Higher Education, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1963.

"Number of High School Graduates from Public and Nonpublic Schools, 1939–40 to 1959–60, and Projections to 1969–70: United States"; Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1962.

"Opening (fall) enrollment in Higher Education, Analytical Report," Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

"Projections to the years 1976 and 2000; Economic Growth, Population, Labor and Transportation"; Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, study report No. 23, Washington, D.C., 1962.

Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

"Summary Report on Survey of Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees"; Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

U.S. census of population, 1930–60, Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C.

Vaizey, John, "The Economics of Education," Free Press, New York, 1962.

Vital Statistics of the United States, 1960, volume I, section I, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the "Educational Tax Credit Act of 1963" be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1677) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a higher education or in providing a higher education for his children and dependents, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Educational Tax Credit Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. (a) Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 40, and by inserting after section 38 the following new section:

"SEC. 39. EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year in providing an education above the twelfth grade for—

"(1) himself or his spouse,

"(2) his son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter, or

"(3) an individual who is a dependent (as defined in section 152(a)) of the taxpayer or his spouse.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $100,

"(B) 40 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $100 but does not exceed $500,

"(C) 30 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,000, and

"(D) 20 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $1,000 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) PRORATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS EXPENSES.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'expenses of higher education' means—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(B) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) NONCREDIT AND RECREATIONAL, ETC., COURSES.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), section 37 (relating to retirement income), and section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

"(e) DISALLOWANCE OF EXPENSES AS DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expense of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of higher education of any taxpayer who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of his section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of higher education.
"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Guy W. Hixon, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Florida, term of 4 years, vice John E. Maguire, Sr., transferred.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, June 13, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN M. CANNELLA TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 14, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John M. Cannella, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of New York, vice Irving R. Kaufman, elevated.

At the indicated time and place, persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1664, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE OF FEDERAL AGENCIES BY CREATING AN ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that hearings will be held before the subcommittee on S. 1664.

The hearings will be held in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on June 12, 13, and 14, 1963, beginning at 10 a.m. daily.

Inquiries with respect to the hearings should be directed to the staff of the subcommittee in room 3214, New Senate Office Building, telephone CA 4-3121, extension 5617.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has scheduled an executive meeting for 2 o'clock on Wednesday, June 12, in room 2300 of the New Senate Office Building. One of the important matters that we will consider at that time will be the pending proposals on Presidential inability.

We have allowed a dangerous constitutional gap to continue in our presidential system—out of apathy when our Presidents were well, and out of a concern that we would rock the boat when a President's health was poor. As a result, there is no clear constitutional authority to allow a Vice President to exercise the powers and duties of the President, in case the President is ill, or is suffering from some other disability.

During the administration of President Eisenhower, three situations arose when the President's illness prevented him from discharging the powers and duties of his office, and yet Vice President Nixon did not have a clear constitutional authority to act in his place.

Later, Attorneys General Herbert Brownell and William P. Rogers both stated that the Constitution should be amended to provide for any future Presidential inability. Vice President Nixon subsequently stated in his book, "Six Crises," that he did not feel that he had adequate authority to act in case of a military emergency, and that the Constitution should be amended to give the Vice President such powers.

Now that we have a young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President, we should take advantage of the situation to hold a thorough and open discussion and decide what to do in case of a physical or mental disability of some future President.

Therefore, Mr. President, we have scheduled a hearing on this subject for 10:30 a.m., on Tuesday, June 11, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, among others, will testify on this subject.

The subcommittee will then vote on the pending proposals at its meeting on June 12.

PESTICIDES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1605, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes, when the bill is next printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY RAILROAD FINANCING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 136, establishing a Select Committee To Study Railroad Financing, which I submitted in the Senate on May 8, 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

An address delivered by him on Memorial Day, May 30, 1963, at Victor, W. Va.

An address to the alumni of Concord College at Athens, W. Va., June 1, 1963.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Commencement address delivered by him to the Seymour High School graduating class, Seymour, Tenn., May 31, 1963.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONSENSUS OF SENATE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday the Republican minority of the Senate held a conference in the morning, in the afternoon, and late into the evening, and agreed upon a consensus regarding the important problem of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent that this consensus of the Republican conference of June 5, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the consensus was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 5, 1963.

It is the consensus of the Senate Republican conference that:

The Federal Government, including the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, has a solemn duty to preserve the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States in conformity with the Constitution which makes every native-born and naturalized person a citizen of the United States as well as of the State in which he resides.

Equality of rights and opportunities has not been fully achieved in the long period since the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were adopted and this inequality and lack of opportunity and the racial tensions which they engender are out of character with the spirit of a nation pledged to freedom and justice.

Since the days of Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness have been cardinal principles of the Republican faith, and the equal opportunity to obtain these rights has consistently and uninterruptedly been reaffirmed in the platforms of the Republican Party.

For the first time in more than fourscore years civil rights legislation of a meaningful character and purpose was placed on the Federal statue books as a result of the initiative of Republican leadership in Congress and President Eisenhower.

Republican Members of the U.S. Senate in this the 88th Congress reaffirm and reassert the basic principles of the party with respect to civil rights and further affirm that the President, with the support of the Congress, consistent with his duties as defined in the Constitution, must protect the rights of all U.S. citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

We deem it the President's duty as provided in the Constitution to enforce the laws insuring the rights of citizens of the United States and preserving domestic tranquillity as basic objectives of a constitutional government.

In pursuance of these objectives, we as Republican Members of the Senate will support further appropriate legislation required to help solve the problems of our Nation in the field of civil rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased that the Senator from Massachusetts has made this statement a part of the official RECORD of the Senate.

I commend the Republican conference for its action yesterday. I feel that if any civil rights legislation is to be passed by this Congress—and such legislation must be passed—it will require the complete cooperation of the Members of Congress who belong to the Democratic Party, those who belong to the Republican Party, and also the cooperation of their respective leaderships. Certainly there must be consultation; and it must be held between the Members of the Senate, the party leadership, representatives of the Senate, Members of the House and its leadership, and the congressional committee leadership, as well as with the President of the United States. Congressional Members of both political parties must be consulted.

I assure the Senator from Massachusetts that everything I can do and any word I can speak will be devoted to the realization of that objective.

I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota.

As chairman of the conference, I sat through the entire 5½ hours during which this subject was discussed intimately and frankly; and the resulting consensus—it is a consensus, rather than a resolution—expresses, I believe, the feeling of the great majority of those who were present.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am gratified by the action which the Republican minority took yesterday by way of the consensus; and I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of our conference, who presided yesterday, has placed the context of the consensus in the RECORD, for all to read.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As one who attended the Republican conference yesterday and participated in the discussion, I emphasize what was made clear at the conference; namely, that this document is not a binding document to be attached to any proposed civil rights legislation which might be introduced, but that we Republican Senators reserve the right—as we always do as Senators—to pass upon individual pieces of proposed legislation which have been introduced or which will be introduced.

However, I believe that all Republican Senators would vote for sensible civil rights legislation; but I do not think we shall be bound to vote for any measure which may come along, particularly any measure destructive of States' rights. I wish to make that position clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what the Senator from Arizona has stated is a proper expression of what was discussed yesterday at the conference.

I note particularly that the conference brought forward a consensus. It is not in any way a resolution; it is not binding on any particular Senator. But the Senator from Arizona expresses my feeling, that it is a general consensus of feeling on a matter of the utmost importance, which is the subject of widespread consideration and discussion at the present time; and also that every Republican Senator is free to vote on any individual measure as he sees fit and in accordance with what he believes to be the wisest thing to do at the time. The consensus is not binding in any way, but is a general expression of opinion on a subject of the utmost importance to our country at the present time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the consensus which came from the conference of Republican Senators yesterday. I wish to state a word or two upon that subject. Others have made their observations. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear at that point in the RECORD where the question was discussed earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I consider the consensus very important. I consider it a meangful step forward in terms of the sentiment on this side of the aisle for civil rights legislation at this session of the Congress. Those who assume that it represents an idle gesture are completely wrong and will be found to be completely wrong, for we are purposeful and serious men. The fact that we met and deliberated about civil rights indicates that it is an issue of the highest national importance.

Second, it is unique, and so unique as to be worthy of particular notice, that a conference on either side of the aisle does not deal generally with a matter as controversial as this one and come forth with a consensus unless it represents a deep expression of the sentiment of a substantial majority, and unless the issue is of such magnitude that a great political party as represented by its representatives in the Congress is willing to take a position.

So the fact that there was a conference, and the fact that we came from that conference with a consensus, which was put before the world as the consensus of view of that conference, are of themselves facts of the greatest significance.

Third, the conference crystallized sentiment in my party that legislation on civil rights was needed this year. Again, that is a very significant step forward.

Fourth, I feel that those who purposefully, with serious intent, and after great discussion resolved that meaningful civil rights legislation was needed at this session will also follow through when the real showdown vote comes, which will be a cloture vote on meaningful civil rights legislation.

So I feel that a measurable step forward has been taken in marshaling a very important body of votes—and I use that word instead of "sentiment"—for what is needed in terms of the most urgent problem facing the country domestically today, a problem having inherent in it the morality of the country and obedience to the Constitution and its validity, as well as deep questions of public order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that the conference will be considered a first, helpful, and measurable step toward the final result. No one knows better than I that no civil rights legislation is possible, and no cloture is possible, except through bipartisan action in this Chamber. The Senate Chamber is where the issue will be decided. Let us not forget that. No matter what happens on the question of civil rights in the House, it will have to happen here, because our rules of debate have made this Chamber what is properly called the graveyard of much civil rights legislation.

So this is a critically important crystallization of sentiment of one element of the bipartisan coalition, which in this case must include a substantial majority of the 33 Republican Senators, in order to elicit a desirable result. It is generally calculated that at the very minimum, 20, and probably as many as 27, out of the 33 Republican Senators would have to support cloture on a civil rights measure in order to enable us ever to reach a vote on the measure itself.

So the importance of what has been done is very clear to me. It is a measurable step forward by my party. I am deeply gratified by what my party did, and I feel it is a step from which we will and can proceed further.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I was not present in the Senate Chamber earlier when the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the president of the Republican conference, commented on the action of the Republican conference yesterday, declaring a consensus upon the question of civil rights.

I, too, would like to join the Senator from New York and other Senators who have spoken today. I hold that our party yesterday took a historic step in affirming the traditional position of the Republican Party, and its purpose for the future. The consensus represents a substantial achievement and has a substantial purpose. It states the principle that we support the equality of rights promised by the 14th and 15th amendments, and we hold that these rights must be insured, not alone by the President of the United States, but also by the action of the Congress.

The statement goes further. Looking to the future, it declares that we, as Republican Senators, "will support further appropriate legislation required to help solve the problems of our Nation in the field of civil rights."

While it expresses a consensus, it is a strong and genuine position, and looks toward legislation.

I have said before that it is of great value to negotiate—to use reason and moral persuasion to the fullest extent to secure the recognition and acceptance of civil rights. But I have always believed that the efforts of those who negotiate—whether it be the President, the Attorney General, officials of States or private citizens—all of which are to be commended, must be supported by law. Unfortunately, with the exception of the field of voting, the administration has not requested, and the Congress has not enacted, statutory measures providing the constitutional and equal rights of all citizens can be better enforced.

A few weeks ago I spoke in the Senate, expressing my concern that my own party's position on civil rights had deteriorated since President Eisenhower's administration. I also expressed my concern that the national problem would be left to the States. The States do have responsibility. But the Federal Government, the President, and the Congress have responsibility also.

I am proud and happy that the statement of our party, made after 7 hours of thoughtful discussion and consideration—in which I believe nearly every member of our conference participated—reasserts the historic position of our party.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his always astute and statesmanlike statement on this subject.

ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Sunday, June 2, Italy observed an important historical anniversary. On that date in 1946, the Italian people went to the polls and voted to abolish their constitutional monarchy and to establish a Republic.

The new Italian Republic was faced with many serious problems. World War II had left the country in ruins, physically, economically, and politically. The vibrant spirit of the Italian people had been severely undermined by Mussolini and the Fascists. The human misery, a natural consequence of a great war in which many lives were lost, many people were injured, families were separated, and homes and property destroyed, had to be replaced with a will and determination to live and rebuild. The new Government was required to deal immediately with poverty, unemployment, hunger, and the very serious problems of an unstable currency and rising inflation.

The resoluteness with which the Italian people went about improving conditions produced gratifying results. With the aid of UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and other U.S. military and foreign-assistance programs, a plan to revitalize the nation was undertaken immediately. From a state of almost complete economic disaster in 1946, economic stability has evolved, with a continuing increase in the country's gross national product and national income level. The discovery of methane gas, providing an inexpensive source of power, was instrumental in developing new industries.

Employment has risen steadily. Rapid industrial expansion has led to a growth in international trade, with a significant rise in both imports and exports. Italy now enjoys a favorable balance of payments, and is an important member of the European Economic Community. The lira has been stabilized, and inflation has been checked.

From a state of near anarchy, following the breakdown of the totalitarian machinery at the end of the war, a republican government was established, and it has been successful in bringing about a political climate which has provided the Italian people with the optimum conditions in which to carry out their recovery program.

The initial instability of the Republic and Italy's strategic location made her particularly vulnerable to possible Communist advances. But the will and determination of the Italian leaders, buttressed by the support of a populace firmly committed to democratic principles, have kept this nation alined with the free nations of the West. Italy has assumed an important role in the Atlantic Community and has become a full-fledged member of the European Common Market, NATO, and the United Nations. Her early acceptance of missile bases on her soil was a forthright indication of her willingness to cooperate with the nations of the West, and she has proved to be a forceful leader in the efforts to unify Europe.

In honoring this important event in Italy's history, we also pay tribute to her people, who have worked so tirelessly for her success. We in the United States are fortunate that many Italians have migrated to our shores. I am proud to say that many have chosen to settle in Massachusetts. People of Italian ancestry have made a significant contribution to the development of our State, and many have been elected to positions of great responsibility in our State government.

Today, all Italians can point with pride to the transformation that has come over their native land. The example which they have set in the past 17 years in courageously meeting the challenge of rebuilding an exhausted and war-torn nation is one which will serve as an incentive to all countries who uphold the ideals of freedom and liberty in the democratic tradition. I should like to join with other Americans and friends of Italy everywhere in congratulating her for her remarkable achievements and in wishing her every success in the future.

THE BUREAUCRATIC BLIGHT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this week I have seen another example of Washington's most prevalent disease—the bureaucratic blight. Somehow the best intentions of dedicated and hard-working civil servants are undermined by a departmental attitude that steadfastly maintains, "We can do no wrong."

I know the problems of a vast bureaucracy. I had plenty of them at HEW. So I can certainly sympathize with the problems that an able and hard-working man like Orville Freeman has at the Department of Agriculture. It is impossible for a Secretary to know everything that is going on in a vast department. But that is no excuse for departmental officials to hide what is going on or to try and kid a Secretary, the press, the public, or a U.S. Senator.

Last week I learned that officials of the Department of Agriculture had refused to give to the press the names of pesticides being sold to the public under protest registration. That is the practice whereby a manufacturer can sell his product even though the Department has disapproved it. One ground of disapproval is failure to establish safety.

On Tuesday of this week I requested the Department to disclose the names of these products immediately, or I would disclose them myself.

That afternoon the Department issued a list of seven products now on sale under protest registration. Accompanying the list was a note to correspondents which made the following claim:

> The list of products registered under protest * * * has always been available, and would have been made available at any time to any reporter who requested it from the Department's Office of Information.
>
> The list of products was refused to one reporter by one scientist in the Department and not by the Department.

Mr. President, to this fantastic claim, I submit the following bill of particulars:

First. Last year a reporter for Newsday spent several days at the Department of Agriculture, preparing a five-part series on the problem of pesticides. He interviewed several officials of the Department including an official of the public information office. Not one official disclosed to him the names of these products and several officials specifically told him that it was the policy of the Department not to disclose them.

Second. A reporter for Business Week recently sought to obtain the list and it was refused him.

Third. A reporter for the Health Bulletin recently sought to obtain the list, and he too was refused it.

Fourth. Last week, after we received word of these refusals, a responsible official of the Department confirmed to my office that it was the policy of the Department not to disclose the names and this had always been the policy.

Fifth. Earlier this year the Department of Agriculture furnished a list of products under protest registration to the Library of Congress. Typed across the top of this list are the words, "Not for publication."

Sixth. An official of the Department, explaining this notation to the Library of Congress, said "the release of this information would be unfair to the manufacturers."

Seventh. The list of products released by the Department was not complete at that time. It included only those products which the Department knew were still being shipped in interstate commerce. However, there were five other products which had been offered for sale under protest registration and which may or may not have been still on the market. The truth is nobody knew for sure. The manufacturer had never withdrawn his protest registration. The Department said interstate shipment had apparently been discontinued, but that just means they had not seen any recently.

I understand the Department was quite willing to make the names of these products public.

In order to be completely accurate, Mr. President, I checked with the Department just this morning regarding the status of the five products referred to above. It seems that since I was furnished the information that these products were "apparently discontinued" a closer check by the Department's inspectors has been made and it can now be reported that as of today all five either have been corrected or are definitely off the market and their protest registrations canceled. I want to congratulate the Secretary and the people in the Pesticide Regulation Division for the speedy action that has been taken to clear up this situation.

So that the record will be complete, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the names of the seven products now marketed in interstate commerce under protest registration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Eighth. The Department's policy toward disclosure of these names is really not surprising in view of the attitude it has expressed in the past toward the whole practice of protest registration. The position has been to ignore the practice, even to imply that it did not exist.

For example, when the Department filed a memorandum with the House Committee on Government Operations in September 1961, explaining the entire process of pesticide registration, protest registration is not even mentioned.

The memorandum does include this statement:

> It is because of the existence of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and its aggressive enforcement that it can be said with confidence that the best guide to the proper use of a pesticide is the label registered with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

That is cold comfort to the purchaser of a product marketed under protest registration, because the label on these products makes no mention whatever of Government disapproval.

Ninth. Another example of the apparent effort to make believe protest registration never existed is found in the Department's statement of registration policy for lindane vaporizers. This statement is prepared by the Department for use in answering inquiries from the public. The lindane vaporizer is one of the products that is now being sold to the public without any warning that the Department has disapproved it for home use.

The Department's policy statement says, "prominent warnings against home use are required in all cases."

This completely ignores the fact that whenever protest registration is used, the lindane vaporizer is sold without any warning against home use.

Tenth. The Department now says it will issue a press release every time a new product is registered under protest. This commendable development is obviously of very recent origin. Just last week, the very day after I introduced a bill to end protest registrations, two new lindane products were registered under protest because the label failed to warn against home use. The departmental mimeograph machines were strangely quiet.

I think the point is clear. The Department had been following an unfortunate policy. It had paid little attention to protest registration in the past. It had a policy of not disclosing the names of products so registered. To his credit the Secretary of Agriculture has strongly supported closing this loophole and ending the practice of protest registration.

But officials of the Department will not help matters if they try to pretend that mistakes were never made.

I am glad these developments have come to light. I think the bureaucracy of the Department of Agriculture now understands, if it ever had any doubts, that our inquiry into the field of environmental hazards will be searching and thorough. I know Secretary Freeman supports such an inquiry, and I believe most of the hard working and dedicated personnel of the Department share his view. I hope that they will not again be victimized by the handful of people in every department who suffer chronically from the bureaucratic blight.

Exhibit I

Pesticides Registered Under Protest

The following pesticide products, registered with the Department of Agriculture "under protest" in accordance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, are currently marketed interstate:

Pesticide	Manufacturer	Date registered	Remarks
"Lindane Pellets for Use in Bug Death Vaporizer".	B. D. Products Corp., Rialto, Calif.	Jan. 28, 1960	Label failed to carry warning "not for home use."
"Algimycin '200" (swimming pool algaecide).	Great Lakes Biochemical Co., Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 4, 1962	Use of this mercury compound in swimming pools as directed on the label not considered safe.
"Algimycin '300" (swimming pool algaecide).	do	do	Same as above.
"Perma-Guard for Treatment of Alfalfa Crown for Seed".	Phoenix Gem Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.	Mar. 25, 1963	Previous registration canceled on basis of information not available earlier indicates product not effective for purpose stated on label.
"Hari-Kari Neodane Pellets" (Lindane).	Neodame Co., Torrence, Calif.	Apr. 9, 1963	Label failed to carry warning "not for home use."
"Lindane Tablets (Bug Pills)."	Vapor Chemical Co., Jackson, Mich.	May 28, 1963	Do.
"Lindane Tablets (Vapo Tabs)."	do	do	Do.

HENDRIK DE KAUFFMANN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those of us who remember him will be greatly saddened by the news of the death of Henrik de Kauffmann, who served for 19 years, from August 1939 to October 1958, as Denmark's Ambassador to the United States. No finer representative of the Danish people or of the profession of diplomacy could possibly have been chosen. He was a patriot in the fullest and finest sense of the word. It was during those years so tragic for his country, with its ruthless occupation by the Nazis, that Henrik de Kauffmann exhibited his great vision and statesmanship. Unwilling, naturally, to take orders from the self-installed masters of his occupied country, which had temporarily lost control of its sovereignty, he acted independently and on his own initiative, and strongly supported the United States and Allied effort against Adolph Hitler. Meanwhile, his compatriots were stubbornly resisting, and to a considerable degree, thwarting, the purposes of their invaders.

It is appropriate, perhaps, at the same time to pay tribute to the Danish people, than whom no more civilized folk exist on earth. When Schleswig-Holstein was annexed by force by Germany in World War I and by the Treaty of Versailles was to be returned to Denmark, the Danes, of their own volition, inaugurated a plebiscite in that province which had been torn from Denmark to determine whether a majority of its people wished to return to Danish sovereignty or to stay with Germany. Analogous to this was the ready granting of full independence to Iceland, which had long been a Danish colony.

As we look around the troubled world at this time, we note nations endowed with all the natural resources that imagination can conceive, yet floundering around in their own incapacity, unable to stabilize their government, unable to develop a viable economy, unable to establish for their people the basic elements of freedom.

The Danes, whose country is poor in natural resources, without minerals, without water power, living on a little spit of land thrust into the cold waters of the Baltic, have, by dint of their character, their enterprise, their ingrained sense of personal and collective responsibility, established not only a society which is free in the fullest sense of the word, enjoying all the basic liberties—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship—but have at the same time created a viable, sound economy based on agriculture. In Denmark we do not see the extremes of wealth and poverty. No one is very rich, few are very poor. But nearly all are happy. Here is the finest product of civilization. If other nations in the world were like Denmark and their people like the Danes, many of the problems which obsess and confront mankind, some of them nigh insoluble, would not exist.

Henrik de Kauffmann, whom all who knew him remember with admiration and affection, incarnated the spirit, the character, the idealism, and the example of Denmark. It was a tragic quirk of fate that brought his life and that of his lovely and devoted American-born wife to an untimely end. However, his service and its contributions to the freedom of men, are unforgettable. Here, as well as in their own country, their memory will ever be fragrant.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press dispatch printed in the New York Times this morning about the death of the de Kauffmanns be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Danish Envoy, Ill, Is Killed by Wife—She Takes Own Life—He Was Free Danes' Leader

Copenhagen, Denmark, June 5.—Henrik Kauffmann, Danish diplomatic hero of World War II, was found dead today. The police said his American wife had taken his life, apparently to save him the agonies of incurable cancer of the prostate gland, and then killed herself.

He was 74 years old and she was 63. They had been married 36 years.

The bodies were found by a nurse in their luxury suite in the Skodsborg Sanitarium, a clinic Mr. Kauffman entered secretly last month. Mrs. Kauffmann slit her husband's throat and killed herself with the same knife, the police said.

Mr. Kauffmann was a proud and handsome diplomat who spoke for free Denmark in the darkest hours of World War II. He was Ambassador to Washington until his retirement 5 years ago. His wife was the former Charlotte MacDougall of Beaufort, S.C., daughter of Rear Adm. William D. MacDougall.

The police said Mrs. Kauffmann had left letters addressed to relatives and friends explaining why she took her husband's life.

"She killed him to stop his suffering," a police spokesman said.

Mr. Kauffmann was revered here as a great patriot and friend of the United States. Honored in many countries other than his own, he was remembered chiefly for the role he played in Washington while his country lay under the Nazi heel.

The extent of private dealings between Mr. Kauffmann and the Danish Government, which reluctantly agreed to cooperate with the Nazis after the 1940 invasion, has not been established. His personal stand was clear.

He rallied other Danish diplomats overseas to the side of the Allies. He declined to take orders from Copenhagen and acted almost as a government-in-exile on his own.

U.S. ROLE IN GREENLAND

In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, he signed an agreement for U.S. defense of Greenland, then a Danish colony. A few months later he proclaimed Denmark as a formal partner of the Allies against Hitler's Germany.

He had served between the wars as Danish Ambassador to Italy, China, Japan, Thailand, and Norway. As the son of a courtier, he commanded respect for both his background and his achievements.

Mr. Kauffmann and his wife stayed on in Washington after World War II. He headed the Danish delegation at the foundation of the United Nations and was named Ambassador to the United States in 1947.

Only close friends knew of his illness.

After his retirement in 1958, Mr. Kauffmann accepted a directorship in Denmark's huge East Asiatic Co.

FATHER TRAVELED WIDELY

Mr. Kauffmann was born in Frankfurt, Germany, on August 26, 1888, a son of Aage Kauffmann, Chamberlain to the Danish King, and the former Mathilde von Bernus.

The father was an architect who took his family to France, Switzerland, Italy, and Germany, where he had commissions.

Young Kauffmann studied at the Metropolitanskolen in Copenhagen, Oxford University, and the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He received a degree in jurisprudence from Copenhagen University in 1911.

After German forces moved into Denmark in 1940 and King Christian X submitted to save his country from destruction, Mr. Kauffmann said at a news conference in Washington: "I am not prepared to take orders from the German Government. I represent Denmark and the King of Denmark here, and nobody else."

Mr. Kauffmann held honorary degrees from Bates College and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPERSONIC SPEED VERSUS SNAIL'S PACE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an important piece of news is that Pan American World Airways, 2 days ago, released the information that it had ordered six supersonic aircraft which are being developed jointly by British and French manufacturers. These are expected to fly at 1,500 miles an hour, making the transatlantic crossing in somewhere between 2 and 2½ hours. This is one of the miracles wrought by modern invention. It is another evidence of the rapidity with which our world is shrinking. It is fraught with significance and far-reaching concomitants.

It was likewise extremely gratifying that President Kennedy promptly reacted to this news, announcing in the course of his visit to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, where he delivered the commencement address, that our Government should immediately commence a program of partnership with our own private aircraft industry to develop, at the earliest practical date, supersonic planes. That is splendid. Since the United States was the pioneer in the development of heavier-than-air aircraft, owing to the genius of the Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur, and in the extension of commercial aviation around the globe, which Pan American Airways initiated, it is fitting and proper that we should make every effort to maintain our country's leadership.

However, it would seem advisable concomitantly to speed up the functioning of another important segment of aviation—indeed the link between Government and the industry—namely, the Civil Aeronautics Board. Why must we exhibit the pathetic contrast of having in our service planes flying at supersonic speeds when the agency which wields such tremendous power and degree of control over the activities of commercial aviation moves at only a snail's pace? There are many examples of this lethargic performance by the Civil Aeronautics Board. One in particular, which concerns only Alaska, may, however, be cited.

Over 13 months ago, two companies long serving Alaska—Pan American World Airways and Wien Alaska Airlines—thought it advisable, both in their mutual interest and that of the public, to transfer a particular segment of route from one to the other. Pan American World Airways, which pioneered commercial aviation between the lower 48 States and Alaska, and now serves the route between Seattle, Ketchikan, Juneau, and Fairbanks, felt it desirable to transfer the leg from Juneau to Fairbanks to Wien Alaska Airlines, which has developed most successfully the intra-Alaskan aviation in the northern part of Alaska, and likewise felt this transfer desirable in its own and the public interest.

The evidence for this relatively minor but locally important transfer was presented to the Civil Aeronautics Board over a year ago.

Everyone was in favor of it. No appreciable costs were involved. The move was approved by every segment of the public concerned with it. It was endorsed by the Governor of Alaska and the interested legislators in Alaska. It was warmly supported by the Alaska congressional delegation. It has been before the Board for 13 months. It was recommended by the examiner over 4 months ago.

The tourist season is at hand in Alaska. Great numbers of visitors are coming to Alaska, and yet this important segment in our transportation picture is impaired because of the utterly inexcusable, though not uncharacteristic delay in the Civil Aeronautics Board.

One of the arguments that President Kennedy used early in his administration, in seeking congressional support for his purpose to reconstitute and revivify our regulatory agencies, was their needless and unconscionable delays in performing their prescribed service to the public. But President Kennedy's hopes and purpose have been frustrated in more than one instance.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has been particularly remiss not only in this respect but in others. Again, let me point out that there is a striking paradox in our moving with ever-increasing speeds through the air as a result of the achievements of invention and private initiative when in the meanwhile the Government agency concerned needlessly keeps its foot on the brake.

THE EQUAL PAY ACT: A GOOD STEP FORWARD—HALFWAY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which now awaits the signature of the President will help bring salary equality to approximately 7 million working women. I understand a more precise coverage figure is now being assembled. We know the act will bring equality to those workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I have supported the Equal Pay Act of the 1963 because in common justice and fairness I consider it to be an overdue necessary step forward. Now I hope we will get to work and extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act so that the many millions of men and women presently excluded, such as those employed in hotels, restaurants, and laundries, will be covered.

I am certain that the majority of Americans do not approve of conditions, for example, which make it possible for some employers to pay a cook $30 per week if the cook is female, or $45 per week if the cook is male.

Fortunately, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 will afford some assistance to women who work in our retail stores.

The Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 1949 approved laws which prohibit a wage differential based on sex of employee. As Governor of the then territory at the time, I had urged that this be done.

And today, the laws of the State of Alaska specifically prohibit discrimination by an employer in any way in the payment of wages as between the sexes, or employment of any female at salary or wage rates less than rates paid to male employees for work of comparable character, or work in the same operations, business, or type of work in the same locality.

The laws of Alaska specifically empower a representative of the State to enter a place of employment and to inspect and copy the payrolls and other employment records and to compare the work on which employees are engaged as well as to question the employees to obtain necessary information. The laws of the State permit the examination of witnesses under oath, following the issuance of subpenas. The State may, if it desires, issue administrative regulations.

In Alaska, employers are required to keep and maintain wage records. Employees may bring suits to collect unpaid wages and a representative of the State is empowered to bring legal action on behalf of employees who have been discriminated against. Violation of the State laws in this important equal pay area is a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine of not more than $500.

According to information I have received, Alaska is 1 of 15 States of the Union which specifies a fine under court action.

When she testified before the Senate subcommittee on behalf of an equal pay bill, able Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson said that in talking with women workers around the Nation, she found "that unequal pay is something that is really bothering many of them." Mrs. Peterson then cited a number of examples of differences in pay.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 will to a certain extent correct the inequities which confront workers in the United

States, but we need to speed action on legislation which will erase all inequities.

Mr. President, I commend the work of the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in reporting S. 1409. Women in the United States can be justly proud of the efforts on their behalf by the committee under the illustrious leadership of the committee chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. And I wish, too, to commend my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], who has demonstrated so ably his awareness of the need to end wage discrimination.

Mr. President, the eminent columnist, Doris Fleeson, has written a cogent column commenting on the equal pay victory. She suggests that the indifference to the achievement for such a long period of time by women in general is not unlike the indifference which has hindered racial equality. I ask unanimous consent that the column by Doris Fleeson entitled "Women Achieve Another Right," which appeared in the Friday, May 31, 1963, edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star be printed in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Women Achieve Another Right—Equal Pay Victory Recalls Their Struggle for the Vote That Once Was Ridiculed

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Kennedy this week signs a bill guaranteeing women pay equal to that of men for doing equal work.

The legislation is an acknowledgement that economic justice is an inescapable corollary of political justice. It comes just 2 years short of a century since the suffragette struggle truly began. Actually it is less than 50 years ago that women were having to engage in violent conflict for the right to vote with a courage that historian Roger Fulford has found to be astonishing, admirable, and even sometimes absurd.

Yet that effort, well within the memory of the middle aged, reminds him today of a deserted fairground from which humanity has departed, leaving only echoes of falling stone, a tinkle of glass or a policeman's whistle.

In his wise, witty, and compassionate study of women on the warpath in Britain, Votes for Women, Mr. Fulford recreates all the excitement, danger, and fun of the fair. He still soberly hails it for opening up part of the human mind where prejudice and convention had formerly reigned in darkness.

The President, 1 year old when British women began to vote, only 3 when American women followed suit, may perhaps wryly rejoice that he was spared political leadership in that struggle. The women had to bear the harsh fire of ridicule, but they were not easy on the men, either, including their own allies among them.

Their drive for equality was, of course, different in many aspects and in the context of time from the war for racial status which has engulfed the President. But it is still relevant to the present.

Rights for women seem now a piece of natural justice, elementary and obvious. Even the jokes about it appear contrived. But the rights had to be won, they were not largess freely dispensed. Too many women, having now what they want in status, seem strangely disinclined to plunge into the racial struggle in all the confidence-promoting, good neighbor ways open to them.

That same indifference on the part of the mass of women hindered their pioneers and led to a leadership by extremists which held them back at critical moments when it appeared their cause could be won without violence. The so-called moderates also too often stood aside.

President Kennedy thought he had time. He has hoped by symbolic moves, court pressures and appeals to reason to ameliorate and finally to solve racial injustice. History has, however, caught up with the United States, abroad and at home.

If the bulk of public opinion here stands aside, as Mr. Fulford reminds us it did in the suffrage struggle, "like curious Romans watching the lion enjoy its Christian dinner," events may not always prove to be under the President's control.

He is being urged to commit himself faster and more deeply than he had expected. If he is compelled to stand very much alone, except for the admonitions of the clergy, only the extremists will profit.

PROPOSED PAY INCREASE FOR GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is anticipated that within the next several days the Randall committee, appointed by the President to make a study of salaries paid to Supreme Court Justices; Cabinet members; agency heads, assistant secretaries, and commissioners; and salaries paid to other Federal employees will make its report and recommendations.

The recommendations anticipated are that the salaries of Supreme Court Justices be increased to $60,000 a year; that salaries of Cabinet members be increased to $50,000 a year; and that salaries of agency heads, assistant secretaries and commissioners be increased to between $30,000 and $50,000 a year.

I wish to go on record early in expressing the judgment that if such recommendations are made and carried into effect serious complications will result. We cannot increase the salaries of these public officials without creating in the minds of all Federal employees a purpose of again asking for increased salaries for themeselves.

If we should increase the salaries of Supreme Court Justices from $35,000 to $60,000; and salaries of commissioners, agency heads, assistant secretaries and others to between $30,000 and $50,000; this would likewise act as a stimulus, encouraging other employees to demand increased salaries. Moreover, union leaders will seize this as an argument for asking for increased wages and salaries from industry.

The argument has been made that there are people unemployed in our country. Practically every week on the floor of the Senate arguments are made encouraging Federal spending so that people may be put to work.

There is only one sound method of putting people to work, and that is to create a healthy industrial economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the unemployed of our Nation are to be assigned jobs, those jobs must come through an atmosphere which induces people to buy. People will not buy if the prices of things are constantly being raised. We will not be able to sell in the world markets if we put ourselves into a noncompetitive position.

The argument also will be made that we cannot get able people to take jobs in government, that we cannot get able persons to run for Congress at salaries of $22,500 a year, and therefore the salaries ought to be increased to $35,000.

If we reduced salaries of Members of Congress, we could not get them out of the Capitol with a shotgun. We need no increased amounts to keep them here.

When there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court, there are countless people asking for appointment. A Supreme Court Justice who retires after having served 15 years and having reached the age of 70 receives $35,000 a year pay to the end of his life. A district judge receives $22,500 a year, and an appellate court judge $25,500 a year.

I respectfully submit that if a recommendation is made and carried into effect to raise the salaries I have mentioned, instead of solving problems it will make them worse. The taxpayer will sweat and will bow to carry the load. I think it ought not to be done, and I shall oppose the proposal when it comes before the Senate.

DEVELOPMENT OF SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to echo the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] only a few minutes ago in his comments with respect to Pan American Airways and the announcement yesterday by the President of the position the United States will take on the development of supersonic aircraft.

I was astounded, as I know everybody else was, to read in the newspapers yesterday the intention of Pan American Airways to purchase six supersonic transport airplanes about to be produced, as a joint venture, by the British and French Governments.

The decision by Pan American, I am told, was reached with mixed emotions. Historically Pan American has utilized American made aircraft during its 36 years of existence.

Since the day it was conceived, Pan American has been a pioneer not only in charting new air routes, but also in stimulating aircraft designers and builders into creating the air vehicles necessary for the long-range mission of the United States to bring nations closer and closer by way of reasonably priced air travel.

I am proud to say that Pan American had its inception in Florida. From that humble beginning—which was a 90-mile flight from Key West to Havana, Cuba—Pan American World Airways has become today what the phrase implies.

The first plane making that historic run in 1927 was a Ford trimotor, engineered, built, and operated by American people.

Ever since, Pan American has depended upon the imagination, the skill, and the enterprising endeavor of American craftsmanship to produce the aircraft and the people to operate them.

The DC-3, the DC-4, the Boeing 314, the DC-6, the DC-7, and its variations—all were conceived by American minds and created by American hands.

At a time when it appeared that our friends across the sea would come up with the first commercial jet aircraft, Pan American entered into preliminary negotiations with the British.

Lacking any guarantee that the U.S. Government and American initiative would produce a commercial jet aircraft able to compete with its immense foreign competition, Pan American thought—quite seriously—of pioneering with the British Comet.

It was of tremendous importance, Mr. President, that Pan Am—at the moment of truth a privately owned company operating with a minimum of assistance in the form of Federal subsidy—should be able to compete equitably with its Government-owned counterparts.

In the final analysis Pan American did not purchase foreign-built aircraft. Rather, it paid a penalty—a financial penalty—by preferring to hold confidence in the ingenuity of the American jet potential.

I understand that the arrangement which has been made with the British and the French is such that, if Pan American does not choose to buy the British-French planes at the time they will be flyable, Pan American will lose something like a million and a half dollars. I am sure that will be the decision of Pan American, in light of the fact that we have indicated that we are going forward with the supersonic aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. In 1955, Pan Am announced plans to purchase Boeing 707's and Douglas DC-8's. These aircraft began flying commercially in October of 1958 and Pan Am's faith in our ability to get the job done appeared justified.

Today, the 707 and the DC-8 and their variations are the jet commercial aircraft of the world. But the pioneering, the willingness to take the calculated risk, had to come from within. It did, in the image of Pan American. Ironically, most of Pan Am's worldwide competition originates with American-made aircraft.

I know all of us were pleased to note the speech yesterday of the President of the United States in addressing the Air Force Academy in Colorado, when he stated:

> May I add at this point a comment and an announcement. Civilian aviation, long both the beneficiary and benefactor of military aviation, is of necessity equally dynamic. Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permit us to stand still in this area.
>
> Having reviewed their recommendations it is my judgment that this Government should commence immediately a new program in partnership with private enterprise to develop, at the earliest practicable date, the prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that now being undertaken in any other country.

Mr. President, I believe the particular plane which we will make, by reason of our know-how and capability, will more than meet the competition which we may have. The necessity has been shown for our going forward with this type of program, a program of building an airplane that will carry 200 or more passengers, and fly 8,000 or more miles, at a speed of 2,000 miles an hour.

Certainly, there is an element of risk. There is no guarantee that, even with substantial Government participation in this enterprise, we will develop a really successful supersonic aircraft. However, I am satisfied that, provided with the know-how, which we already have, and provided with the technicians, which we already have, we shall see America maintain its place in the world with respect to building the greatest aircraft that can be developed anywhere in the world.

MEETING OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR AUTHORIZING NASA'S 1964 BUDGET

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, speaking as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I am gratified by the response of the chairman to my letter of May 10, 1963, in which I pointed out that our committee has a special obligation at this time to investigate thoroughly the objectives, programs, and budget represented by NASA's request for fiscal year 1964.

The chairman has announced that our authorization hearings will be scheduled to permit eminent scientists to express their views on our space program. The result is that on June 10–11, our committee will provide a forum for witnesses who are recognized as experts in their respective fields. They will have an opportunity to analyze our space objectives and to air their views, pro and con, on the manner in which we are seeking to achieve national goals.

There are a number of reasons why we need to clarify the exact nature of our responsibility in authorizing NASA's budget for fiscal 1964. This is a task which has been delegated by the Senate to its Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Not only our own committee members, but all Members of the Senate, look to our committee to study and report upon our space activities in such a manner as to provide the basis for an informed judgment concerning the authorization of funds for the coming year. And beyond this interest of the entire Senate, and the corresponding concern of the House of Representatives, are the people who pay the taxes which make the space program possible. They need to be reassured that the decisions of their elected representatives have been made in the public interest.

Our committee reports to the Senate every year on the authorization of funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Why, then, is this particular year of unusual significance?

First, there is a tremendous increase in NASA's budget request and there seems to be no ceiling in sight for succeeding fiscal years. NASA's budget, a little more than half a billion dollars in fiscal 1960, rose to $926,200,000 in 1961. In 1962, NASA had new obligational authority of $1,796,000,000, rising to $3,622,600,000 in 1963, with a budget request for fiscal 1964 of $5,663,600,000. This is by no means the only money which the United States has spent, or is planning to spend, on space activities. The total space budget which includes, in addition to NASA, the activities of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, Weather Bureau, and National Science Foundation, has risen from $3,280,100,000 in 1962 to $5,513,800,000 in 1963, and the budget request for new obligational authority in fiscal 1964 comes to a total of $7,614 million. While the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences does not authorize funds for these other four agencies, the comprehensive space activities of the entire Government must be known in order to place NASA's program in perspective as well as insure coordinated procedures to effect economies and prevent unnecessary duplication. The Appropriations Committees, of course, report their recommendations for all space budgets and the Congress votes for the separate amounts which add up to funds for the total U.S. space program. Primary responsibility for our civilian space efforts has been given to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and at a time when its budget is growing at the rate of $4 billion in 2 years, it is essential that Congress exercise the closest scrutiny over its program.

The second reason why our hearings this year are of unusual significance is that NASA's funds are largely committed to landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth during this decade. The priority given this project, which has been variously estimated to cost between $20 and $40 billion, raises the question of adequate funding of other space activities. As I wrote the chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Hon CLINTON P. ANDERSON, on May 10:

> I realize that the recent objectives of our space program were sent by President Kennedy to the Congress on May 25, 1961, when he defined "urgent national needs," and that since then Congress has twice voted in favor of annual appropriations for the space goals of accelerating worldwide space communications, a satellite weather system, a nuclear rocket; and "before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth." I recall, too, that at that time the President asked Congress for a judgment in accepting a "firm commitment" to the manned lunar program which was estimated after 1962 to be between $7 to $9 billion additional over the next 5 years.

I pointed out that—

> As we know, one Congress cannot legally commit succeeding Congresses to long-range future courses of action, although it is usual

> for programs in the public interest, strongly supported by public opinion, to be consistently continued.

I explained to the chairman of our committee that—

> It is not, however, for this legal reason that I think our committee should study the objectives of our space activities, the allocation of our resources, and the benefits we hope to derive from the uses and exploration of outer space. Rather, it is because I think the priority given the manned lunar program is more of an issue now than it was 2 years ago. At least the criticisms have crystallized more, and now is the time to study the types of objections which are being raised and to find answers which people will understand.

The third reason for the timeliness of our investigation this year is that President Kennedy said at his press conference on April 3, 1963, that—

> It may be that there's waste in the space budget. If there's waste, then I think it ought to be cut out by the Congress and I'm sure will be.

It is disturbing to think that a space budget request already sent to the Congress may contain items which represent waste, and it is equally disturbing to consider the implication that Congress is responsible for identifying those areas and cutting them out. This poses quite a problem for the appropriate congressional committees.

I explained my reaction to this situation, that having served for many years on the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, I am familiar with examples of waste which have been discovered after unnecessary expenditures have already been incurred. In such cases, there is not much that can be done except to regret that essential facts were not marshaled in time for the committees and the Congress to use with foresight in preventing needless expense. I am sure that most Members of the House and Senate will share my conviction that timely advice should head off the possibility of wasteful spending.

Our committee would face the task of evaluating the plans for our future space activities in any event, but when we combine the size of the space budget, its allocation primarily for the manned lunar landing project, and the possibility of waste in space expenditures, only one conclusion can be reached—that we must get all the facts and informed opinions in order to determine the amount of money required for our space program. We try, of course, to meet our responsibility on a continuous basis all through the year, and we are already aware of some of the main issues which require resolution at this time.

These issues appear to be of two types—those which relate to the manned lunar landing, and those connected with other objectives which are justified in NASA's 1964 budget. Since differences of opinion are a normal feature of democratic government, it is not surprising that strong pro and con positions have been taken on the policy of landing a man on the moon and bringing him safely back to earth during this decade.

We are told by some observers that the moon is a "crash" program undertaken solely in the spirit of a prestige race with the Russians. From others we hear that this is not a crash but an "optimum" program geared to a realistic level of advancing technology and undertaken so that the United States will have a preeminent position in exploring and using the space environment.

There are those who say that the manned lunar program has no military significance because deterrent defense measures can be better accomplished from the earth and airspace. Others contend that the earth can be controlled, at least for blackmail purposes, from bases on the moon. Some would like to have manned spaceflight developed with more regard for missions to be performed in earth orbits than for those connected with the moon.

Some experts say that unless we attach a deadline date such as "this decade" for reaching the moon, we will stretch out the attainment of the goal indefinitely. The opposite opinion is that a slower pace would provide greater safety to the astronauts, assure more scientific returns, and cost much less money.

One position is that the manned lunar landing program will absorb so many of our scientists and engineers that we shall not have enough for other necessary tasks. The opposite opinion is that the space program is a stimulant to our educational system and will lead to more students choosing a professional career in science and engineering.

And then we have the conflict of values between those who insist that society would benefit more from money spent for a variety of purposes other than space exploration, while the other group insists that more money should be spent for space projects other than the moon landing.

Some people want to explore the moon with instruments because they say it would be cheaper and just as effective as landing men on the moon. Those in favor of the manned program, however, say there is no substitute for the judgment of a man in accommodating himself to changing circumstances. But even within this group there is disagreement between those who would like to include scientists among the first travelers to the moon and those who are satisfied with our training of the astronauts.

The existence of such a series of diametrically opposite opinions indicates that serious questions are being raised about the basic policy of designating the lunar landing as an "urgent national need." There are many times when we accept a policy—for example, the policy of maintaining a strong national defense—and our questions are then concerned with the adequacy of the program and budget designed to implement that policy. The fact that the policy itself is being questioned underscores the wisdom of having a thorough investigation of NASA's budget request for 1964.

There are other issues involved. As we proceed with the authorization hearings, we shall want to find the answers to many such questions as these:

First. What percentage of the funds authorized by Congress for fiscal 1962 and 1963 has not been obligated by NASA, and what percentage has not been committed for expenditure?

Second. What is the history of NASA's actions in reprograming and reallocating funds previously granted by Congress?

Third. Assuming NASA were to receive its 1964 budget request, how much unobligated money would be carried over into fiscal 1965 from previous authorizations?

Fourth. Will NASA be able to find and employ the additional personnel for which funds are requested in the fiscal 1964 budget?

Fifth. To what extent does NASA award contracts without competitive bidding?

Sixth. What is the financial relationship between NASA and the Weather Bureau in the meteorological satellite program? Who decides which agency shall pay for parts of this program?

Seventh. Is there maximum cooperation between NASA and the Department of Defense in the use of facilities such as ships, tracking stations, research organizations and so forth?

Eighth. What research does NASA expect to perform for the Communications Satellite Corporation? How much will this cost?

Ninth. Since the delay in the Gemini project had not been taken into account when the budget was prepared, what effect does this now have on the budget request for fiscal 1964?

Tenth. Will we be asked next year to spend more money for scientific research? For example, is the amount of money programed for space medical research considered adequate for future interplanetary exploration?

Eleventh. How much of the system we build for going to the moon and back will be usable after this objective is accomplished?

Twelfth. Do we have an adequate program for manned spaceflight missions near the earth as distinguished from those required for lunar flights?

To ask a dozen questions of this type is only the beginning. We must determine whether or not our space priorities have been established correctly as well as examine the justifications for specific budget items within the budget as presented. The problem of allocating the budget within NASA is not a new kind of problem for the Congress. We have had this kind of problem with the defense budgets as they relate to the roles and missions of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. This is, of course, a different kind of problem from that of determining whether or not a particular program is operating efficiently.

I suppose no one is in a position to say that there is absolutely no place where a particular agency's budget can be cut, but part of our answer to this question must be based upon information concerning the manner in which NASA's budget was formulated. Who participated in drawing up NASA's budget request, and what kind of review did it undergo before being sent to Congress? I have noticed that Congress is often blamed for authorizing the reduction of specific items in a budget. But Congress may also be criticized for making a percentage cut in a total budget, even though this type of reduction may be easier for an administrator to absorb, particularly if he has large carryover funds available. In making our determinations, therefore, it is very important for us to establish whether there is a possibility of waste in the space budget because a particular objective does not justify the cost or whether waste can occur because specific projects are not being pursued efficiently.

To enable the committee to evaluate the justifications presented for NASA's 1964 budget, all pertinent points of view must be considered. We have already held our scientific and technical hearings as a basis for trying to get the policy, program, and budget to operate on the same wavelength. Soon we shall be going into the meticulous detail of examining proposals for the expenditure of $5,663,600,000. Before we start this process we are receiving testimony from a group of experts who are recognized as outstanding specialists in their various fields. Theirs will not be the only voices to be heard, nor will theirs be the only evidence to be taken into account in making decisions on NASA's future. They will be among those who are making a contribution to the democratic process.

In a democracy we must consider the views of many groups, of those who are specialists and those who have contributed to an understanding of the general relationship between science and government policy. As elected representatives of the people, it is our function to reconcile these views in the public interest. Ultimately the decisions on authorizing and appropriating money are not made by specialists in NASA, the Department of Defense, or elsewhere. In our democracy these decisions are made by the Congress and the President.

FISHING FOR FUN—AND TO WASH YOUR SOUL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in order that I may pay a tribute to former President Herbert Hoover, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, to all who love to fish and to all troubled spirits who have never learned the restorative effects of "still waters and green pastures," I warmly commend the new book by former President Herbert Hoover—Random House—entitled "Fishing for Fun—And To Wash Your Soul."

It has been my good fortune to spend my life within the shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains where I have enjoyed wonderful opportunities to hunt and fish. Consequently, I was delighted when President Hoover decided to build, while he was in the White House and at his own expense, a fishing camp on the Rapidan River which was only about 125 miles from my home. At that spot in the Blue Ridge Mountains, President Hoover purchased 165 acres, which included approximately 5 miles of the Rapidan River. Incidentally, that river was named by our colonial ancestors for Queen Anne and that surname was qualified by the fact that that bold stream of cold, clear water tumbled rapidly from the top of the Blue Ridge Mountains to where it flowed into the Rappahannock River just about Fredericksburg.

After President Hoover left the White House and the Congress authorized the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park, he donated his fishing camp to the Federal Government to be incorporated in the Shenandoah National Park. Thus Hoover's favorite trout stream, the Rapidan, is now open to public fishing but "for fun only" because the fishermen are required to use artificial flies with barbless hooks and to return to the water all fish that are taken.

In 1929 in recognition of the impetus that President Hoover, by example as well as precept, had given to the sport of fishing and enjoyment of the out of doors, the Virginia chapter of the Isaak Walton League purchased from the Shakespeare Co. the best fly rod that it manufactured and I, then serving as chairman of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, was given the cherished privilege of presenting that rod to Fisherman Herbert Hoover on the White House lawn.

On April 30, 1951, President Hoover testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. When he had completed his prepared statement, I said:

> This is not on the present subject but do you still have that fishing rod that I presented to you when you were in the White House?

When President Hoover got back to his suite at the Mayflower that afternoon, he wrote me the following note in his own handwriting:

> As you remarked today, "This is not on the present subject." I still have that rod and you never asked for an RFC loan.
>
> Every spring renews my gratitude for the rod—and the friendliness that came with it.

That simple note indicates the great heart of a noble man whose work for the relief of war-torn countries during World War I brought him national fame and whose contribution as President of the United States to the preservation of the American system of private enterprise deserved a better reward than the stock market crash of 1929 and the following depression of the thirties.

As I turned this week from the consideration of a plethora of bills alleged to be offered on behalf of civil rights, I found great satisfaction in reading on page 3 of "Fishing for Fun" that "all men are equal before fish." The same thought, of course, was expressed by the great John Adams of Massachusetts in the summer of 1776 when his wife wrote him from Boston in great distress asking why he could have been so foolish as to sign a statement that all men are born equal. Promptly, Adams replied:

> DEAR ABIGAIL: You do not understand what we meant. All that we meant in the Declaration of Indpendence on that subject was that all men are born men and not some men and some whales.

In the coming weeks of debate over what is really meant by equality it will pay Members of the Senate to bear in mind the type of equality that is recognized by the fish. Incidentally, there are plenty of brook trout in the Rapidan River which will laugh at the neophyte who thinks that he can cast a dry fly as well as Herbert Hoover.

In the foreword to his charming book, President Hoover said:

> Fishing is a chance to wash one's soul with pure air, with the rush of the brook, or with the shimmer of the sun on the blue water.
>
> It brings meekness and inspiration from the scenery of nature, charity toward tacklemakers, patience toward fish, a mockery of profits and egos, a quieting of hate, a rejoicing that you do not have to decide a darned thing until next week.
>
> And it is discipline in the equality of man—for all men are equal before fish.

As I already have said when we get involved in the Senate in the forthcoming debate over civil rights legislation which we of the South feel was conceived in political expediency and born of a punitive spirit against the South, I hope all Members of the Senate will read "Fishing for Fun—And To Wash Your Soul," by former President Herbert Hoover. That book may help us to remember the words of a wise man called Solomon:

> Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator's reference to the book by former President Hoover is well taken, and I wish to join with him in that part of his speech. There are certain other references which the Senator from Virginia has made which I would like to set aside for the moment and in which I do not wish to be associated with him.

However, while fishing is good in Virginia, and though it is recognized that there lives no greater exponent of the art of fishing and the pleasure that is derived from fishing than the distinguished Senator from Virginia, I say to the Senator and other Members of the Senate that they should come to Minnesota, because there they will find excellent fishing in Basswood Lake, in Winnibigoshish, Lake Vermilion, Itascal, and Leech Lakes, or in any one of our 22,000 lakes. If they will come there, it will be a wonderful experience for them.

There is the walleyed pike, which is a wonderful fish; the trout, a marvelous fish; the northern, excellent; bass, superb; all in the good cold, fresh, blue waters of Minnesota.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I readily concede that, although President Cleveland said that the best bass fishing in the United States is to be found in the James River of my State, we all know that there is a greater ratio of water to land in Minnesota than in any other State of the Union. It is the land of Minnehaha and the sky-blue waters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And Hiawatha.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And Hiawatha. I will be in St. Paul next Wednesday, and I have been invited to fish in the St. Croix, in which, it is said, bass fishing is as good as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That has the advantage of being a border river, and therefore enjoys the blessings of two States, Minnesota and Wisconsin; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. NELSON in the chair) must not say a word at this moment. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. The other Senator from Wisconsin is seeking recognition. I have fished in Wisconsin and in Minnesota and in Michigan, all three of them good bass States. However, the main point that I wish to emphasize at this time is what I said about equality, that all men are equal before fish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in a rowboat.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot remain silent while mention is made of the good fishing in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Virginia without suggesting to Senators that they come to the shores of Lake Erie in Ohio, where they will find an abundance of fish.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is the season of the year when many of our colleagues in the Senate will grace commencement exercises at colleges and universities and schools across the land.

Therefore I am particularly interested in inquiring of my able friend, the acting majority leader, with respect to the exertions which the majority party has in mind for the Senate tomorrow and Monday, since both those days are of some importance to some of our brethren on both sides of the aisle—and sisters also.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted that the Senator amended his reference to include sisters, because we have had some discussions with Members of the Senate of both sexes.

It is the intention of the majority, at the conclusion of the Senate's business today, to move to adjourn the Senate until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

It is the intention to take up on Monday what are known as the migratory labor bills, Calendar No. 180, S. 521, through Calendar No. 185, S. 526. It is hoped and expected that these bills will be acted upon without yea-and-nay votes. However, if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on any bill or any amendment thereto, that item will be laid over until Tuesday, so that Senators who are not deeply interested in the pending proposed legislation, known as the migratory labor bills might feel free to commence in the commencement exercises starting Friday, commence all day Friday and all day Saturday, even commence a little on Sunday in baccalaureate exercises, and continue to commence on Monday, but then return promptly for the session on Tuesday.

Mr. KUCHEL. The deep interest that every Member of the Senate shares in the migratory labor bills will continue. However, I am grateful that the acting majority leader indicates now that the Members of the Senate whose presence will be required elsewhere on the frontier of education may, if the occasion arises, have the opportunity to return on Tuesday without having missed any opportunity to be recorded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from California is correct. Also, there will be no votes today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat my thanks to my able friend from Minnesota.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the freedom of information bill introduced Tuesday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], who has done so much excellent work in fighting for clean, honest, unbought elections.

The difficulty of gaining access to information held by the executive branch of the Federal Government is recognized by newsmen, legislators, and other interested parties, yet as the years go by little is done to correct this situation.

In this day of big government it is essential that the lawmaker, the press and the public be given access to the facts. A Federal Government which spends close to $100 billion yearly cannot afford to shroud the decisions upon which the spending of this money is based in a veil of secrecy. A Federal Government which daily makes judgments which affect not only the lives of its citizens but the virtual existence of all men cannot afford to capriciously withhold facts on which these judgments are based.

It is for these reasons that I am pleased to become a cosponsor of this proposed legislation whose provisions have already been outlined by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG].

MINOW ASKS REPLACE FCC WITH ADMINISTRATOR AND COURT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate confirmed the nomination of Judge Loevinger to replace the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton Minow, who has retired from that position. Mr. Minow has recommended that the Federal Communications Commission be abolished and replaced by a court and an administrator. Mr. Minow certainly speaks with the authority of having been until now the head of the FCC, and in my judgment its most brilliant Chairman. His recommendation is similar to that of Louis Hector, with regard to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Others have made similar recommendations with respect to other regulatory agencies.

The power of regulatory agencies is enormous. Their decisions involve billions of dollars. Still, as the Landis report and similar studies have shown, they do not follow judicial procedures. They have not developed—certainly the FCC has not developed—consistent criteria or precedents. The result is that numerous inquiries have shown that lawyers who appear before the FCC and other regulatory bodies have complained, not so much about the decisions—many of the practitioners have been victorious lawyers—but about the fact that there is no settled law; there is no basis on which they can expect what is likely to happen. Political and economic pressure under these circumstances is almost sure.

There is also a lack of public faith in the way public bodies have been administered, although there have been some brilliant exceptions among administrators, such as in the case of Mr. Minow. Under those circumstances, the recommendation of Mr. Minow deserves very careful and thoughtful consideration by the Senate and House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Minow Urges Replacing FCC With Court and Administrator," written by Anthony Lewis, and published in the New York Times of June 5, 1963. The article discusses the statement of Mr. Minow and its implications.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINOW URGES REPLACING FCC WITH COURT AND ADMINISTRATOR

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—Newton N. Minow, former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, believes that the agency should be abolished and its functions divided between a single administrator and a court.

He made this proposal in a letter to President Kennedy dated May 31, Mr. Minow's last day in office. White House aids are now considering his ideas.

To a large extent, the Minow approach parallels that advocated by Louis J. Hector when he resigned from the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1959. In a 72-page memorandum, Mr. Hector said that the administrative agencies could not effectively perform the varied jobs assigned to them.

Mr. Minow restricted his comments to the Federal Communications Commission. He emphasized what he called its inability to judge cases and make policy at the same time, or to do either well.

The main failing of the present organization is the failure of the seven-member commission to lay down clear policies for the broadcasting and other fields it is supposed to regulate, Mr. Minow said.

"The multi-member agency," he said, "has great difficulty resolving differences among the members in their approach to basic policies.

"The result is to not formulate the policy—and to postpone the policy decision to resolution on a case-by-case basis, which all too often means inconsistent decisions, with the public and the regulated industry not knowing the ground rules.

"More important, its consequence is that vital planning and policy measures are not undertaken."

The principal example given by Mr. Minow was the Commission's proceedings in choosing one among many applicants for a television or radio channel.

Over the years the Commission has laid down many criteria for choosing one applicant over another. Mr. Minow said, as many observers have, that these criteria were mutually inconsistent and were applied in such a way that no one knew what the Commission wanted in a station owner.

Instead of this system, Mr. Minow proposes a single administrator to lay down the criteria. Then the administrative court would apply them in a legal contest among the competitors.

"The administrator would have had to articulate effective, logical policies," Mr. Minow said, "or the administrative court would be at a loss in deciding the comparative case.

CRAZY-QUILT PATTERN SEEN

"And the court would have long ago established a coherent line of comparative decisions, rather than an unpredictable, crazy-quilt pattern."

Mr. Minow's single administrator would be a member of the executive branch of the Government, under the President, instead of an independent agency like the FCC. He said this would be an advantage in making policy on matters touching many departments, such as space satellite communications.

At present, Commission members cannot be good judges of such matters, he argued.

First, they have to judge cases they have initiated themselves.

"I do not believe it is possible to be a good judge on Monday and Tuesday, a good legislator on Wednesday and Thursday and a good administrator on Friday," Mr. Minow said.

Second, and more important, Commission members are so burdened with administrative matters that they do not have time to work on cases the way a judge should, he said. They do not write their own opinions or even read the record of a case in detail.

Mr. Minow called for serious study of his general proposal. He said he would be glad to "be of any help I can in furthering this study."

HIGH INTEREST RATES STEM ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has proposed as his major domestic bill this year the reduction of taxes. Historically, two methods have been used by the policymakers in our Government to stimulate the growth of our economy. One has been the monetary policy, which has been used generally; and now a fiscal policy, which has been used less often. The monetary policy is the traditional, conservative way to stimulate the economy.

At a time when the President has proposed a reduction in taxes to promote economic growth, the monetary policymakers are moving in exactly the opposite direction. The managers of our money are marching rapidly in the other direction, the direction of making money tight.

On May 27 of this year, the Washington Evening Star published an article entitled "Policy Shifts to Tight Money," written by Lee M. Cohn. It is a very competent analysis of the situation. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY SHIFTS TO TIGHT MONEY

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The Federal Reserve Board has shifted its policy in the direction of tighter money during the past week or two, experts said today.

If the shift goes far enough and lasts long enough, it may lead to higher interest rates and less easily available credit for all those who borrow money.

The trend during the next year or so probably will run that way in any case, because of natural market forces. A deliberate policy shift by the Federal Reserve would accentuate the trend.

Evidence available to date indicates that the Federal Reserve's move toward tighter money is moderate. In fact, experts maintain it would be accurate to describe the policy as less easy, rather than tighter.

The big unsettled question is whether the policy shift will be temporary or long lasting.

EVIDENCE IS ABUNDANT

No announcement of the change in policy has been made or will be made until next year. The Federal Reserve reports publicly on such policy decisions in its annual report, issued late in the winter of the following year.

Evidence of the move toward tighter money is abundant in technical statistics and in reports on the feel of the money market.

One item of evidence is the sharp decline in the banking system's net free reserves. Banks in the Federal Reserve System must maintain reserves equal to a percentage of their deposits. Reserves exceeding requirements are available for lending, and are known as free reserves.

Some banks must borrow on any given day to meet reserve requirements, while other banks have free reserves. Net free reserves for the system as a whole are one yardstick of the banks' potential lending capacity, and so indicate the degree of monetary ease or tightness.

NET RESERVES SHRINK

Net free reserves averaged about $500 million during most of 1961, then declined to around $400 million during 1962. The Federal Reserve's open market committee decided last December to tighten policy slightly. This decision—confirmed in the annual report last March—reduced net free reserves to about $300 million during the early months of 1963.

During the past couple of weeks, net free reserves have dropped even lower, indicating that the Federal Reserve aims to keep them at around $200 million to $250 million. Net free reserves averaged $161 million daily during the week ended May 22, down from $260 million the preceding week.

Net free reserves are only one indicator of monetary tightness or ease. Standing alone it would not be conclusive. But there is other evidence, including the relatively high interest rates paid recently by banks borrowing to meet reserve requirements.

Less concrete but perhaps more significant is the general "feel" of tightness in money markets. This feel reflects the difficulty encountered by banks and bond dealers in obtaining credit.

SHIFT TOWARD TIGHT MONEY

The Federal Reserve influences the tightness or ease of money in various ways, most often through open market operations affecting the level of free reserves.

When the Federal Reserve buys Treasury bonds, notes and bills on the open market, it adds to bank reserves. This increases the banks' lending capacity, and tends to make credit more easily available at lower interest rates. When the Federal Reserve sells Treasury securities, there are converse effects and money becomes tighter.

All the evidence indicates that the Federal Reserve's open market committee has directed its manager in New York to reduce bank reserves by selling securities.

The basic reason for the shift toward tightness is the continuing problem of large deficits in the United States balance of payments and losses of gold from Government stocks.

The United States has a payment deficit because the Government and private citizens spend, lend, invest and give away more money abroad than they receive from foreign sources. Deficits are settled partly through sales of gold to foreign governments and central banks. Large deficits and gold losses can undermine confidence in the dollar.

Some progress has been made in reducing the payments deficit and the outflow of gold, but the gains have been disappointing. A major item on the debit side of the ledger is the outflow of capital invested or lent for short periods.

Efforts to curb the outflow of short-term capital and gold have concentrated on keeping U.S. short-term rates competitive with foreign rates. The United States is trying to keep American short-term rates up and urging foreigners to cut their rates.

The key to the short-term area is the level of interest rates on 3-month and 6-month Treasury bills. The Treasury has maintained upward pressure on bill rates by increasing the amount auctioned each week.

But the congressional battle over raising the ceiling on the Federal debt has interfered with this program. The debt is so close to the legal ceiling that the Treasury cannot continue increasing sales of bills.

In this situation, the Federal Reserve apparently has stepped in to keep the bill rate from declining, by shifting toward tighter money. The rate has been maintained at around 2.9 percent, which is high enough to discourage large outflows of capital and gold.

TEMPORARY OR LONG LASTING?

It is possible that the tighter policy will be temporary. It may end when Congress gives the Treasury a higher debt ceiling, permitting increased sales of bills.

But it also is possible that the policy shift will be more long lasting. There is considerable sentiment for actions to push interest rates up.

The argument for more aggressive action to raise rates is that urgent measures are needed to eliminate the payments deficit and curtail the gold outflow. But some members of the Federal Reserve are skeptical about the effectiveness of such action.

Until recently, the arguments against aggressive moves to tighten money and raise rates have prevailed because of a fear that such action would retard domestic economic activity.

But the domestic economy has made impressive gains this spring. As the economy improves, the fear of hurting business through tighter money recedes, and the odds shift in favor of aggressive action to deal with the payments deficit and the gold outflow.

Therefore, the Federal Reserve's current move toward tighter money may be the start of a basic, long-lasting policy change. The Federal Reserve now may be willing to experiment, at least, with tighter money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another article, entitled "Commercial Bank Free Reserves Off Sharply in Week," was published in the Wall Street Journal of recent date. The article begins as follows:

> The commercial banking system's supplies of cash immediately available for lending and investing declined sharply in the week ended Wednesday to their lowest level since July 1960.

Free reserves are an excellent, clear indication of the tightness of our money supply. As the Wall Street Journal reports, the supply is now lower than it has been in 3 years.

As a result, according to an article in the Wall Street Journal of the day before yesterday, interest on Treasury bills has reached a 3-year high. Detailed implications are spelled out in the article of June 4.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles published in the Wall Street Journal printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commercial Bank Free Reserves Off Sharply in Week—Level Lowest Since 1960; FRB Action To Prop Short-Term Interest Rates Indicated—Loans to Business Dropped

NEW YORK.—The commercial banking system's supplies of cash immediately available for lending and investing declined sharply in the week ended Wednesday to their lowest level since July 1960.

These free reserves, on a daily average basis, fell to $161 million in the latest statement week from $260 million the week before, according to figures released by the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

FRB ACTION INDICATED

There were indications the Federal Reserve acted to further reduce free reserves of the commercial banks in an attempt to help prop short-term interest rates by making credit somewhat less readily available. The system has sought to sustain short-term interest rates to prevent investment funds from being attracted abroad by higher rates paid overseas. Such a flow would contribute to the adverse U.S. balance of payments—the excess of money flowing out of the country over receipts from foreigners. The U.S. payments deficit in the 1963 first quarter widened to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $3.3 billion from $2.2 billion for all 1962.

Until recently, the Treasury was able to play a major role in propping domestic short-term interest rates by pumping a liberal supply of Treasury bills into the money market, where these obligations tend to set rate patterns. Heavy bill supplies ordinarily exert downward pressure on bill prices and result in a corresponding rise in bill yields, which move inversely to prices.

Lately, however, the Treasury has had to slow down the supply of new bills introduced into the market, because the national debt has been moving rapidly toward the legal ceiling allowed for it. At its present level of $304 billion, the national debt is only $1 billion below the ceiling, and Treasury Secretary Dillon yesterday warned that unless Congress acted swiftly to raise the ceiling, the debt would pierce the present ceiling next week.

SALES MATCH MATURITIES

Until this week, the Treasury for some time had been selling $100 million more short-term bills each week than were maturing. Last Monday, however, with debt approaching the ceiling, the Treasury sold only as many bills as were maturing, and next week it also will sell only as many bills as mature.

Free reserves of commercial banks have hovered at or below $300 million in most of the weeks since last December when the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System voted for a policy of "less active" credit ease. Before that, the daily average free reserve level had been around $400 million for most weeks during 1962 and around $500 million for most of 1961. (See Federal Reserve Reports on p. 22.)

Free reserves of the Nation's banks haven't been lower than the latest week's level since the week ended July 27, 1960, when such reserves averaged $124 million.

Reserves of commercial banks are the percentage of deposits the banks are required to set aside as deposits at Federal Reserve banks or as cash in their own vaults. On a given day, some banks may have reserves that exceed their requirements, while other banks may have to borrow from Federal Reserve banks to meet requirements. The margin by which aggregate excess reserves top total borrowings constitutes free reserves, or immediately available cash.

A major factor tending to reduce commercial banks' free reserves in the latest week was a $419 million decline in the Federal Reserve System's daily average holdings of Government securities. When the Federal Reserve sells securities, funds are siphoned out of the commercial banking system as buyers draw on their bank balances to pay for the securities.

BILL YIELDS RISE

Yields on short-term Treasury bills have been trending upward in the last few days. The 13-week issue auctioned Monday at 2.922 percent yield sold yesterday at 2.95 percent, and Monday's 26-week issue, sold at 3.005 percent, was quoted yesterday at 3.06 percent bid. These rates are above British treasury bills, quoted late yesterday at a net yield of 2.92 percent, but below comparable Canadian short-term issues, quoted yesterday at a 3.23-percent net yield.

U.S. Treasury gold stocks remained unchanged at $15,828 million in the week ended Wednesday for the second consecutive week, other Federal Reserve data showed. That left the gold drain for the year to Wednesday at $150 million, compared with a drain of $455 million during the like period of 1962. The drain for all 1962 was $877 million, compared with $912 million in 1961.

Commercial and industrial loans at major New York City banks declined $61 million to $11,492 million in the week ended Wednesday, down $259 million from the start of the year, other Federal Reserve figures showed. In the like 1962 week, such loans dropped $83 million to $10,794 million, or $253 million below their total at the start of that year.

In Chicago, business loans declined $18 million in the latest week but remained $19 million above their total at the start of the year. In the 1962 week, Chicago business loans declined $21 million, but were $72 million above their total at the beginning of that year.

The New York reporting banks' loans to sales finance and business credit companies, reported separately from business loans, declined $121 million in the latest week to $1,221 million, down $385 million from the start of the year. In the 1962 week, such loans dropped $44 million to $1,043 million, down $119 million from the start of that year.

From Wednesday to Wednesday in the latest week, the Federal Reserve System reduced its holdings of U.S. Government securities by $454 million. Of this, $439 million was in securities maturing in less than a year, and the remaining $15 million comprised securities maturing in 1 to 5 years.

Interest Rates on Short-Term Notes Increase—Rise Follows Gain in Treasury Bill Yields, Signs FRB Is Tightening Credit Supply—Most Boosts Are of One-Eighth of a Point

NEW YORK.—Short-term interest rates moved upward on a broad front in the money market.

Several major sales finance companies raised rates by one-eighth percentage point on some maturities of promissory notes they issue and sell directly to investors.

Increases of one-eighth point were posted also by commercial paper dealers on 4- to 6-month maturities of notes they market for industrial firms and smaller finance companies. Dealers in banker's acceptances similarly announced an increase of one-eighth point on all maturities of that type of money market paper.

The rate boosts followed a continuing upward trend in the yields on Treasury bills, which are short-term Government obligations that tend to set the pattern for all short-term rates.

Yields on the Treasury's latest issue of 13-week bills, auctioned yesterday, jumped to 3.028 percent from 2.974 percent last week. The yield was the highest since the 3.184 percent of May 28, 1960. The companion 26-week bills yesterday brought buyers a yield of 3.098 percent, up from 3.055 percent last week and the highest since last July. In the resale market the yield on the 13-week bills issued last week climbed to 3.03 percent and on the 26-week issue to 3.10 percent. Both figures were the highest since last summer.

The general uptrend in money market rates was regarded also as a reflection of growing evidence that the Federal Reserve System is moving to tighten the supply of available bank credit. One effect of that pressure would be to raise the general level of interest rates.

Commercial Credit Co. started the latest round of increases on directly placed finance company paper with a one-eighth point boost on its notes maturing in 90 to 179 days. It quoted 3⅛ percent on notes due in 30 to 89 days and 3¼ percent on 90 to 270 days. Its former scale was 3⅛ on 30 to 179 days and 3¼ percent on 180 to 270 days.

C.I.T. Financial Corp. and General Motors Acceptance Corp. posted new rate scales different from that of Commercial Credit. They quoted 3⅛ percent on 30 to 90 days, 3¼ percent on 90 to 179 days and 3⅜ percent on 180 to 270 days.

In comparison with those firms' former scale, GMAC's rates rose one-eighth point on all maturities except those of 240 to 270 days, which were unchanged. Those of C.I.T. went up one-eighth point on all its maturities except 30 to 89 days, which stayed unchanged.

In Detroit Ford Motor Credit Co. posted a slightly different new scale, quoting 3⅛ percent on 30 to 89 days, 3¼ percent on 90 to 239 days and 3⅜ percent on 240 days and longer. The effect was a one-eighth point rise on maturities of 90 to 179 days, with other maturities unchanged.

Sears Roebuck Acceptance Corp., International Harvester Credit Corp. and Associates Investment Co. made the same change as Commercial Credit. But several other large finance companies said they had no immediate rate changes to announce.

The new scale on commercial paper marketed through dealers raises rates on maturities of 4 to 6 months by one-eighth point to a range from 3⅜ percent on notes of top-rated industrial firms to 3⅞ percent on those of lesser known concerns and smaller finance companies. The rate change on dealer-marketed 90-day notes stayed at 3¼ percent to 3¾ percent; formerly those rates applied also to the longer maturities.

On bankers' acceptance the new scale posted by major dealers, up one-eighth point on all maturities, is 30 to 90 days, 3⅜ percent bid, 3¼ percent asked; 91 to 120 days, 3½ percent bid, 3⅜ percent asked; 121 to 180 days, 3⅝ percent bid, 3½ percent asked.

Acceptance dealers quoting those high rates include Briggs, Schaedle & Co., Salomon Bros. & Hutzler, First Boston Corp., Discount Corp. of New York and M & T Discount Corp.

Bankers' acceptances principally are bills to finance the export, import, shipment or storage of goods. Such a draft is "accepted" when a bank guarantees payment at maturity. This makes it negotiable and enables it to be traded in the open market.

Both the notes placed directly with investors by about a dozen large finance firms and those marketed through dealers by other business borrowers are classed as commercial paper.

TREASURY 13-WEEK BILL YIELD HITS 3.028 PERCENT, A 33-YEAR HIGH; 26-WEEK RATE UP TO 3.098 PERCENT

WASHINGTON.—The yield on the Treasury's latest issue of 13-week bills rose to the highest level in 3 years.

The new issue brought buyers an average return of 3.028 percent, up from 2.974 percent last week and the highest since the 3.184 percent of May 28, 1960.

The yield on the companion issue of 26-week bills rose to 3.098 percent from 3.055 percent last week, and was the highest since the 3.103 percent of July 24, 1962.

It was the third consecutive weekly rise in yields on short-term Treasury securities. It occurred despite the fact that the Treasury, for the third week in a row, had refrained from adding to the supply of new bills, which it had been doing for 8 weeks previously. It offered $2.1 billion in bills to replace $2.1 billion maturing, thus doing no new net borrowing.

When the Treasury expands the bill supply available for market trading, it tends to lower prices and put upward pressure on yields. The yields are determined by the difference between the price paid and the face value. Higher yields are in line with Government policy of keeping short-term U.S. interest rates up to discourage investment abroad, which adds to the potential drain on U.S. gold.

Accepted bids on the 13-week issue ranged from a high of 99.238 (3.015 percent) to a low of 99.233 (3.034 percent), and an average price of 99.235 (3.028 percent). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 50 percent was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 13-week issue totaled $2,189,067,000. The Treasury accepted $1,302,616,000, including $212,934,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are in addition to those dated March 7 1963, and mature September 5, 1963.

On the 26-week issue, accepted bids ranged from a high of 98.438 (3.050 percent) to a low of 93.431 (3.104 percent), and an average price of 98.434 (3.098 percent). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 72 percent was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 26-week issue totaled $1,551,800,000. The Treasury accepted $800,218,000, including $50,929,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are dated June 6, 1963, and mature December 5, 1963.

PRAISE OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Communications Workers of America is currently celebrating its 25th birthday. I would like to say a few words in tribute to this fine union and its long-time president, Joseph A. Beirne.

The CWA today represents 360,000 communications industry workers, with over 800 local unions. When it was formed in 1938 under the name of National Federation of Telephone Workers it had only 27 affiliates, a membership of 92,000 and assets of only $10,000. This represents significant growth and progress. But it only is the inevitable byproduct of the wisdom and integrity which has characterized the administration of this union from its inception.

Today the CWA is strong and financially stable. It carries on extensive education programs for members, not only as to their responsibilities as union members in a democratic society, but as to their place in that society as cultured human beings. For example, groups of union members will attend summer institutes at major colleges this year to hear lectures on labor history, collective bargaining, sociology, the art of public speaking, and U.S. history.

Similarly, the CWA drew public praise from President Kennedy in 1962 for its Operation South America. This is a public-spirited people-to-people program wholly financed by union members' dues and has made a great contribution to discouraging the myth of Yankee imperialism.

These and other highly commendable programs are administered by CWA's president, Joseph A. Beirne. I would like publicly to express my administration and friendship for this man who has so ably directed the fortunes of CWA since 1943. His well-known interest in community affairs led to his election as chairman of the AFL–CIO community services committee after the AFL–CIO merger in 1955. He was also elected an AFL–CIO vice president and a member of its executive council. He has discharged these additional responsibilities with the same dedication he brings to the CWA.

Ultimately, of course, the strength of CWA lies in the alertness of its members. Victor Riesel wrote of the CWA convention:

> I have covered conventions from Atlantic City to Tokyo. I have not run into the practice of democracy in so dedicated a fashion.

Communications Workers of America members display a spirit of awareness and participation in public affairs that is a model for each of us. A sense of public responsibility has been a vital ingredient in keeping America strong; the CWA has met its responsibility in highly commendable fashion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article relating to the history of the CWA, published in the New York Times of April 7, 1963, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

A MODERN UNION FOR A MODERN WORLD

In our dynamic, democratic society, the only thing that is constant is change.

In the last quarter century America has risen from depression to posterity. Population has soared. The pace of communication and transportation has vastly accelerated. New technologies revolutionize industry, creating the boon of more efficient production and the terrible bane of displaced jobs and disrupted lives.

To function effectively in our society * * * indeed to insure its future existence, today's labor union must be modern; it must be prepared to adjust to change, not, like King Canute, to spend its time in futile resistance to inevitable progress. It may even have to be reborn.

The Communications Workers of America, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO, is now celebrating its 25th anniversary. CWA takes pride in its efforts to build for the future, to be always modern, to make the changes in program and attitude that are required by the dynamic changes in mid-century America.

This special supplement in the New York Times fills two important functions. It is a record of the progress made possible by the devotion and sacrifice of telephone workers throughout the United States and Canada during the last 25 years as they worked together to create a strong democratic union. It is, equally important, a public testament of CWA's pledge to the public to stand true to its democratic ideals while resisting dogma and decay.

We want you, the public, to know * * * why CWA's more than 300,000 members have faith in the future of the union and in the future of our Nation.

J. A. BEIRNE,
President, Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

A UNION IS PEOPLE—CWA REMEMBERS ITS HERITAGE, AND IS READY FOR THE FUTURE

People are important in the CWA—the Communications Workers of America.

CWA is a union built by decent folk, by average working men and women. People interested in improving their lot in life. People interested in improving their working conditions and wages. People interested in building a union worthy of their own respect and the esteem of their fellow citizens across the United States and Canada.

It is no accident that the human factor looms so large in a union like CWA, made up as it is of employees of the Nation's most automated industry. The people of CWA, having seen at firsthand the impersonality of modern technology, have developed even greater pride in their fundamental concept of human dignity.

An alert membership

In its first 25 years CWA has never lost the human touch. This is not a union dominated by so-called union bosses, who keep their eyes on the union's balance sheet instead of on the union's membership.

This is a union in which racketeers have never gained the slightest toehold. An alert membership, conscious of its citizenship rights and proud of its union's potential would never permit CWA to fall into evil hands.

Scandals, indefensible financial practices, cynical disregard for ethical practices and member rights and obligations—attitudes and practices which have blighted the reputation of some unions, among them some of the Nation's largest—have never been a problem in CWA.

New challenges ahead

Although its basic principles have stood the test of 25 years' experience, CWA is not afraid of change—the flexibility necessary to adapt its functions to changing needs and problems.

The communications industry is undergoing changes of a truly revolutionary character. The first Telstar is, in fact, only a harbinger of other devices and processes to make more efficient and more speedy the modes of communication among people.

CWA welcomes the progress of the communications industry. As employees of that great industry, CWA members take pride in its scientific advances. As members of an effective union, CWA people know that a responsibility exists—for the telephone companies, for the Government, and for the union—to insure that the benefits of technological change are fairly distributed, and that the hurtful impact of automation upon individual workers is minimized.

The only thing in life that is constant is change. Much as we may like to, we cannot return to the "good gray days of the past."

John Adams wrote, in the days when our country was beginning its Revolutionary War for freedom: "All great changes are irksome to the human mind, especially those which are attended with great dangers and uncertain effects."

Changes are irksome? Perhaps. Challenging? Without a doubt. Beneficial to humanity? Certainly, if strong democratic unions like CWA continue to use their strength, their intelligence, and collective bargaining skill to help solve the great economic and social problems of our times.

To work constructively to find solutions to these challenging problems of the second half of the 20th century is the solemn pledge of the Communications Workers of America. CWA makes that promise to its own people; to the industry in which they work; and to the people of Canada and the United States, to whom all the free world looks for unfettered thinking and dynamic leadership.

When the bespectacled clerk in the U.S. Patent Office on March 7, 1876, assigned No. 174,465 to a patent sought by Alexander Graham Bell, he probably had no idea he was helping launch a giant industry.

It must have been beyond his comprehension that he was also helping make possible a big, responsible union representing the workers in that new industry. In those days, most Americans weren't thinking about labor unions, even though the Noble and Holy Order of the Knights of Labor had been formed a few years before.

Indeed, it would take another full decade, until 1886, before the American Federation of Labor came into being. Telephone unions were to come much later still.

Even in 1909—more than 30 years after the introduction of the telephone—the U.S. Government could locate only five unions of telephone operators, all directly affiliated to the AFL and none, at that time, very effective.

A strong telephone union was to come much later. When workers in other industries were organizing into trade unions, telephone workers were grouped into employees' associations whose policies almost universally mirrored the attitudes of telephone management. Passage of the Wagner Act in 1935 and the declaration of its constitutionality by the Supreme Court 2 years later spurred organization of workers in many industries—including telephone.

A new era for unions

Separation of the employees' associations from the companies was all but complete early in 1938 when representatives of 17 independent telephone union groups within the Bell System met to take their first uncertain steps toward formation of a national organization. The era of modern telephone unionism had arrived.

When a national meeting was called at Chicago in June 1938, some 31 organizations were on hand representing 140,000 workers. Later that year at New Orleans, the National Federation of Telephone Workers was chosen as the name for the new union.

The NFTW had its first formal meeting under its new rules on June 5, 1939, in New York's Hotel Astor. The fledging group had 27 affiliates, a membership of 92,000, and a budget set at a modest $10,000. Its dues were unrealistically low—only 10 cents a year for each member, not enough on which to run a union properly.

Life was far from easy and uncomplicated for the young NFTW. There were rivalries with other unions of the AFL and CIO, and internal stress as each affiliate of NFTW jealously guarded its autonomy and independence of action. Regulation of wages during the World War II years further complicated the role of negotiations.

Inevitably, the postwar years brought a spate of strikes. The most important of these—the first and only national strike in the telephone industry—was called April 7, 1947. With more than 350,000 telephone workers off their jobs, the strike was effective in all except nine States. The major disputes were settled by May 20, all of the other issues by early June.

A strike had been won, but the NFTW was shaken to its foundations. The ink was scarcely dry on the final agreements when delegates from NFTW and several other telephone unions met to create the Communications Workers of America. About 200 men and women were present when the first CWA convention was called to order in Miami on June 19, 1947.

TODAY CWA PLAYS THE MAJOR ROLE IN TELEPHONE UNIONISM

For the first time telephone workers were forming 1 national union instead of an assembly of some 50 different, vigorously autonomous organizations. An observer of the convention scene might have been pardoned some cynicism about the prospects of CWA, considering its assets of less than $20,000 arrayed against the wealth of the Bell System and other big telephone companies.

CWA's first convention tried to remedy some of the structural faults in a union organization that had grown like Topsy, without much planning. Some of these groups continued to insist on their own identity within the new union; others declined to affiliate at all.

Four years later, in 1951, the union democratically adopted a "two-level" structure—a national union with subordinate districts based either on geography or the nature of the job. This major reform completed the progress of CWA toward an efficient organization, possessing clear channels of responsibility running among the membership, the locals, the districts and the national headquarters.

All this seems routine now, a normal phase in union development. But, in fact, it represented a trusting sacrifice by intermediate officers of the union. They recognized that if CWA were to survive and to function effectively in dealing with big telephone companies, the more narrow interests of special divisions of the union must be sublimated to the greatest good for the greatest number within CWA.

Part of AFL–CIO merger

In 1949, CWA explored the question of affiliation with a major labor group, either the AFL or the CIO. The decision as to which was left to the membership. In a general referendum the balloting ran more than 2 to 1 in favor of CIO affiliation; on May 9 1959, CWA formally became one of the family of unions within the CIO. In 1955 it participated in the creation of the AFL–CIO.

Joseph A. Beirne, son of Irish immigrant parents, had become president of NFTW in 1943 and was elected head of CWA at its founding convention. He has been reelected at each convention of CWA.

When the AFL–CIO merger took place in 1955, Mr. Bierne was elected an AFL–CIO vice president and member of its executive council. He is chairman of the AFL–CIO Community Services Committee, and has received numerous special assignments from AFL–CIO President George Meany.

Growing with the times

Now 25 years old, CWA has achieved a stature its founders could never have envisioned. The union meets telephone industry management as an equal, and it negotiates earnestly and effectively.

CWA has not—and never will—relinquish the right to strike, but as the union and the company have grown with the times, they have developed collective bargaining approaches that have won substantial gains for the members. The last major CWA strike, against the Southern Bell Co., was 8 years ago, in 1955.

Representing approximately 360,000 communications industry workers through its more than 800 local unions, CWA sets the pattern for labor-management relations in the entire industry. CWA is recognized as a union of integrity. CWA conventions are demonstrably democratic. CWA's financial accounting methods keep an alert membership informed of the disbursement of every dues dollar.

In the communities where they live and work, CWA members are active citizens who play important roles in civic affairs.

In big cities and small towns throughout the United States and Canada, CWA members have made clear they want their union to be an accepted part of the community—an organization of working men and women which brings economic and social benefits not only to its own members but to the whole society.

CWA: DEMOCRATIC UNION

(By Victor Riesel)

It was a hectic morning in the White House last April 11. A phone jangled on the President's desk. He took the call though at the moment, he and most of his administration were duelling with some of the Nation's biggest steel corporations. The caller was a union president, well known to John Kennedy. The President took the call not only because it came from a union leader but because of the kind of union the caller leads. At the other end of the line was Joe Beirne, leader of the Communications Workers of America (CWA). He pledged support to the President in his own name and that of the union.

President Kennedy, a labor expert in his own right, enthusiastically accepted the pledges of both. John Kennedy knew well from his days on the House Labor Committee and the Senate Select Committee and more recently from his months in the White House that unions are of many kinds. There are unions, literally crusades, led by idealists. To them the rank and file is master. They do not try to master it.

There are unions led by crooks. To them the idealist is a sucker, the crusade is something to muscle in on, to whip into a gimmick, a dues maw, a treasury to be pilfered, a rank and file to be sold and bartered like bolts of cloth, a fount of money on which to make a cut if lent by the millions to the right guy who'll deal you in or give a buddy a finder's fee.

That crowd I call the muscle-hood. It has no right to the word brotherhood.

CWA'S UNIQUE CONVENTIONS

Brotherhood belongs to the Joe Beirnes of American labor. I've spent some time with members of the CWA. I've heard them talk in their conventions. Unique affairs. Over 2,000 delegates. No fear of speaking.

Across the floor are special telephone booths. These are connected to a small switchboard on the speakers' platform. If a CWA delegate wants to speak in favor of a resolution, he or she goes into the "Yes" booth, lifts the phone, is connected with the platform, listed as a pro-speaker and awaits his or her turn. Opposition speakers go to "No" booths. Those objecting to procedures walk to the Point of Order booth.

Everybody gets his or her turn. If they feel especially aggrieved they can stride into the personal privilege booth—and be recognized when they lift the phone.

I have covered conventions from Atlantic City to Tokyo. I have not run into the practice of democracy in so dedicated fashion.

This is a union of many women and there is emphasis on youth, and gayety and, of course, keeping that youthful look. In St. Louis, the CWA ran a special beauty culture course for its female members. Not only pointers on coiffures, but on how to walk attractively and how to dress through proper fashion guidance.

"Don't get the idea we're squares," one official told this writer, "because we're active unionists. Our people like to dance.

"Many of our locals now are experienced in disentangling our girl members from sharpie dance studio operators who get the girls to sign outrageous contracts for dance lessons."

There is, of course, more than charm and the dance in this union of girls who handle the hundreds of millions of telephone calls a day; or of repairmen without whom dials and phones would break down into buzzing sounds and incoherency after a while; or installers who make it possible for our astronauts to talk with the ground crews and scientists, or whip together massive switchboards, or hook up our vast secret networks of attack warning lines.

In Southern California, CWA locals have sponsored exchange trips between local school kids and Mexican youngsters for visits of several days. This children-to-children program soon brings people closer to people of other lands.

In Washington, D.C., CWA members raised over $8,000 to buy a 30-passenger school bus for the Barney neighborhood Settlement House. In Milwaukee, a local sponsored a troop of Sea Scouts and helped them get their own boat.

On scores of campuses throughout the Nation, there can be found CWA officers in 1- or 2-day institutes on all phases of union operations—from conducting a meeting to bargaining with the Bell system.

At the University of Chicago in 1959, the entire CWA official family went to school—officers, all staff people, organizers, attended a special 1-week seminar on the humanities.

OTHERS COULD BENEFIT

Maybe James R. Hoffa of the Teamsters could benefit from a course like this, no matter how short, in the humanities.

I find Mr. Hoffa's union keeps mighty strange company. Under his leadership the Teamsters have boasted of their pact with the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Denver—which was ousted from the former CIO for devout following of a line paralleling that of the Soviet Union.

I find that despite Mr. Hoffa's occasional forays into college seminars, there have been few Teamsters seminars, mighty little expenditure of funds on the humanities. But I do find the deposit of $200,000 to guarantee a loan for the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union.

I find that Mr. Hoffa, who covets some of the CWA membership and who protests so loudly that he has cleansed his own union, has not quite done so. Therefore the Government is giving him a hand. At least 40 officials have been indicted on various grim charges related to a disregard for the sanctity of private property when it comes to other people's money. The records of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's department will prove this number to be a conservative estimate.

Unionism is of many kinds. Some of it is led by pocket-stuffing crooks. Some of it is of the stuff that crusades are made. All of it depends on the rank-and-file. The membership pays its dues, pays its devotion, and takes its choice.

It is the membership which decides who leads it in collective bargaining, for the benefit of their community as well as for their fellow workers.

THE UNION: CERTAINLY A GOOD WAY TO A BETTER LIFE

(By Leo Perlis, director AFL–CIO community service activities)

Ever since the shoemakers organized in Philadelphia late in the 18th century, the American labor movement has known that the collective bargaining agreement is only the beginning—and not the end.

The union, to those who belong, may not be a way of life but it is certainly a good way to a better life—not only on the job but off the job as well. It has been the sense of the AFL–CIO that the union member is is not only a skilled producer but also a good neighbor.

"Labor," said AFL-CIO President George Meany in addressing the Nation recently, "is your neighbor—a neighbor who wants not only higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions but also, in the words of the late CIO President Philip Murray, 'a picture on the wall, a carpet on the floor, and music in the home'."

The merged labor movement, at its first constitutional convention in 1955, declared that members of the AFL-CIO function "first and foremost as citizens of their communities." At the same convention, the AFL-CIO established a standing committee on community services.

President Joseph A. Beirne of the Communications Workers of America has been chairman of this committee from the very beginning. Under his leadership the AFL-CIO has made great strides in extending the interest and the influence of organized labor beyond the plant gates and into the community as a whole.

HELPING THEIR COMMUNITIES

CWA members have taken this thought to heart, and all across the country the skills they have learned in helping to organize their union they are now applying in helping to organize their community for better health, welfare, and living conditions for their fellow citizens. Here CWA members have made a notable contribution toward making our communities more representative of all the people and more responsive to all the people's needs—an elementary but fundamental act of first-class citizenship.

CWA members have contributed voluntarily not only hundreds of thousands of pints of blood but also to the building of hundreds of nonprofit blood banks.

CWA members have not only acted as volunteer hostesses at USO centers but have sponsored also, for several holiday seasons, a phone-your-mother program for GI's overseas.

CWA members have not only manned the telephone lines during floods, tornados and other disasters but have contributed also much money and manpower to both voluntary and public agencies providing disaster emergency service, including the Red Cross and Civil Defense.

Thousands of CWA men and women are contributing their experience and points of view in the formulation of policies and programs of community agencies as board and committee members.

CWA members are serving their communities as officers and members, on a voluntary basis, of public welfare commissions, united funds, community chests, volunteer firemen, police commissions, park commissions, boards of education, PTA's child welfare leagues, family service societies and many more public and voluntary social service organizations.

UNION COUNSELING SERVICE

Thousands of CWA members who have received training as union counselors in AFL–CIO community service classes across the country are now giving aid and comfort to fellow workers with problems by referring them to the proper agencies and following through. In this way persons with marital problems, child problems, and health problems, including alcoholism and emotional illness among others, are helped.

In the final analysis, it is here where the future of the American labor movement lies—in service and in complete identification with the health and welfare of all the people.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: AS PRACTICED BY CWA, IT SERVES THE PUBLIC AS IT SERVES THE UNION'S OWN MEMBERS

"Collective bargaining" is a phrase known to most Americans. Unfortunately, they usually see the collective bargaining process only when it breaks down. Then harsh language, or strike action, or governmental intervention breaks into the newspaper headlines and on the TV screens.

For the Communications Workers of America, however, a substantial portion of the union's activity revolves around the job of making collective bargaining work well. And it has. As a result, telephone workers have benefitted, economically and socially. The benefits have been passed on into the communities where CWA members live.

Furthermore, because smart collective bargaining works for mutual advantage, telephone management knows that the successful bargaining performed by CWA for its members has not interfered with the growth and financial stability of the companies themselves.

In CWA, collective bargaining is something more than an annual "adversary proceeding," in the language of lawyers. As CWA views it, collective bargaining is basically the art of seeking to live together on the job.

In earlier years, the collective bargaining process—in telephone and in other industries—was often bitter, personalized, hostile. Today, thanks to generous doses of common sense and experience, collective bargaining is usually less personal and more effective.

In the telephone industry, collective bargaining has become a conversation between equal force. Neither side dominates or controls the other, and each knows it couldn't if it wanted to. Recognition of that important fact has led to mutual respect and sensible progress.

In the communications industry, collective bargaining takes place every day of the year, for the collective bargaining process does not revolve solely around the annual negotiation of basic agreements. These are the culmination of daily collective bargaining processes which take place as CWA members talk to each other, talk to their staff representatives, talk to management representatives—and as each of these groups carries out its respective functions and responsibilities.

A DEMOCRATIC FRAMEWORK

Up until 1957, CWA's collective bargaining policies were established in annual convention. In 1957, the convention amended CWA's Constitution and established a collective bargaining policy committee made up of 59 members.

There is one representative for each 8,000 CWA members in each geographic district; 7 representing special nationwide groups like Western Electric installation, sales and Long Lines; 6 special representatives like CWA's airline council representatives; and CWA's 15 executive board members.

The policy committee meets annually and reviews carefully all collective bargaining items referred to it by members, by local officers and by other levels of the union. It studies economic and other data prepared by CWA's research and other departments.

In addition, leading authorities in the field of pensions, health and welfare matters, economics and other matters relating to collective bargaining give the committee the benefit of their knowledge.

In the past, this committee has discussed these problems with Leon Keyserling, once chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, and with Walter Heller, the Council's present Chairman; with John Diebold, a leading authority on automation; with Dr. John Galbraith, Harvard professor of economics and Ambassador to India.

In 1962, the full committee met with President Kennedy to hear first hand his views on the role of collective bargaining.

IT'S MANY THINGS

But in CWA there's a lot more to collective bargaining than top-level policy views and statements.

Collective bargaining in CWA is a member complaining to a union steward that when his wife went to the hospital for an operation, the hospital was improperly paid under the CWA-negotiated major medical program; it's the steward taking up that grievance until a satisfactory answer is received or a proper adjustment is made.

Collective bargaining is a CWA staff representative sitting down with a group of members or local officers and reviewing the contract clause on overtime—to determine whether or not the company is scheduling people properly and making the right payments for the time worked.

Collective bargaining is a group of telephone operators sitting in the company cafeteria discussing the difficulties of work, evenings and nights, and how it would be better for everyone if these undesirable tours were all shortened to 6 hours and other tours reduced to 7 hours.

Collective bargaining includes a group of company supervisors reading carefully the latest issue of CWA News, to better understand and interpret the union's goals and programs.

Collective bargaining is a local meeting in which a union staff representative is told by the members that better pensions or better health insurance or better vacations are the most important things that folks are looking for in the upcoming year's negotiations. Or it's an indignant letter from a pensioner protesting company deduction of social security payments from his pension check.

Collective bargaining is a lot of things happening each and every day of the year in literally hundreds of communities where communications employees work.

ANNUAL NEGOTIATIONS

All this activity and discussion funnel into the preparation for, and the formal negotiations with, the companies, which take place about once a year around the collective bargaining table.

In CWA, these negotiations are conducted by a bargaining committee made up of local union members. The chairman of the union committee is generally a CWA staff representative with many years' experience in the industry and the union.

When the chairman and the local committee talk, they are responding to the daily and weekly pressures, demands and requests which filter through the democratic machinery of the union and which are formally recognized by the collective bargaining policy committee.

PATTERN AND LOCAL BARGAINING

CWA's major negotiations take place at two levels: the national level and the local level. The major agreements with units of the Bell and General Telephone Systems follow a combination of pattern and local bargaining. CWA's 160 contracts terminate during almost every month of the year.

The first major agreement of the year with a subsidiary of each of these large nationwide corporations forms a pattern for all succeeding settlements. The pattern establishes a floor below which no local group can go, but above which each group can seek to improve additional provisions for local wages and working conditions.

This procedure permits the stronger groups to help the weaker ones. Further, it permits a unified and relatively uniform approach to such basic collective bargaining matters as health insurance, pensions, vacations, sick pay, and other matters of common interest to all workers in a particular company.

The unified approach has permitted CWA in recent years to make tremendous strides in improving the wages and working conditions of its members. Since this new approach in bargaining originated in 1959, the union has been able to negotiate two major pension improvements, one in 1959 and one in 1960. It has negotiated the introduction of one of the best company-paid major medical programs in American industry today and a life insurance program partially paid for by management.

In 1959, CWA negotiated the first 4 weeks' vacation in the Bell System, for workers with 25 years' service. Geographic differentials have been narrowed, wage progression schedules shortened and literally hundreds of jobs reclassified. In addition, the average wages of communications workers have been moving up and in the direction of reestablishing the industry as a wage leader.

Collective bargaining is hard, continuous work. It is the heart of the union's activity.

CWA'S PROUD RECORD

American labor's record in collective bargaining is impressive. CWA's progress and gains are part of that record.

It is this attention to the basic purposes of unions that have been the foundation and strength of the American labor movement. Labor's gains have gone far beyond the worker himself; they have contributed much to the financial vitality and stability of American business.

The fact that the American worker is able to buy the wealth produced by American industry is the key to the continuing growth of our economy. Collective bargaining as practiced by CWA is the proven, tested way toward that kind of progress for the years ahead.

CWA'S MAJOR GAINS SINCE 1959

1. Two major pension improvements.
2. Establishment of major medical insurance program.
3. Life insurance.
4. Four substantial basic wage increases.
5. Progression schedules shortened.
6. Geographic differentials narrowed.
7. Shorter hours of work; improved evening differentials.
8. Vacations up to 4 weeks.
9. Job security—Automation contract clauses.
10. Towns-and-jobs wage rates reclassified upward.

CWA'S FUTURE GOALS

1. Company-paid basic health insurance program.
2. Improved wages and job security.
3. More adequate pensions.
4. Better life insurance policy.
5. Improved vacations.
6. Additional town-and-job wage-rate reclassifications.

"Meet Our Friend, Pepe Larco"—How a Union's Good Neighbor Policy Helps Latin American Working People

Aiding refugees from Castro's Cuba; building free unions across Latin America; broadcasting democracy's message; supporting labor's effective foes of communism. These are just some of the many activities that constitute the Communications Workers' Operation South America.

It started back in 1959 as a union-to-union project. But telephone workers, already community conscious, quickly converted it to a warm, friendly people-to-people project of an almost personal sort.

The project began in a small way when Ray Hackney, a vice president of the union, attended an international meeting in Peru in 1959. He was unhappy with the poverty he saw—and the weakness of the labor movement. Unions in Latin America were failing to make substantial progress and in some countries they stood in imminent danger of being taken over by Communists.

A SYMBOL IN ECUADOR

Returning to Washington, Hackney discussed his reactions with Louis Knecht, CWA's west coast director who had also been to Latin America, and emphasized the need for action. Knecht responded immediately, going to the 80 local unions in his district to secure their pledges of only $2 a month from each local union. That launched a program of financial aid that eventually broadened into Operation South America.

Perhaps the best symbol of that project is Jose (Pepe) Larco, general secretary of the Federation of Telecommunications Workers in Ecuador. Sustained by these contributions from CWA members in the United States, Pepe Larco is working to mobilize, train and inspire a free and democratic union movement in his country.

Last year, the 1,500 delegates to CWA's annual convention in Milwaukee voted enthusiastically to make Operation South America a national union program.

HELPING CUBAN REFUGEES

One CWA district, for instance, is helping to meet the expenses of the Federation of Telephone Workers of Cuba in Exile, with headquarters in Miami. This organization maintains contact with more than 500 Cuban telephone workers who have fled Castro's tyranny.

Leader of the group is Vicente Rubiera, a stanchly anti-Communist unionist who was once marked for death by Castro.

Another district of CWA financed the visit of a Colombian union official to this country for training. He is back home now, working to secure better wages and conditions for workers in his native land.

High in the Andes Mountains of Peru, another union man, trained and supported by CWA, is conducting educational classes and building a union of postal, telegraph and telephone workers.

In the Dominican Republic, a prime need has existed for reestablishing a labor movement ruthlessly crushed by the Trujillo regime. The man whose modest income is based on gifts from these CWA hometown local groups is a union official who knows the terrors of dictatorship.

This amazing union oversea aid project, still pushing forward to new goals, is operating on contributions from the average CWA member of less than the price of one pack of cigarettes per year.

CWA President Joseph A. Beirne is confident the union's program for hemispheric cooperation will grow.

STRONG INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS

"The projects they have developed," Beirne said recently, "the effective work they are doing, are going far to explode the myth of Yankee imperialism among people in South and Central America. The success of Operation South America exposes the lies of the Communists and the Castro agents. Our fellow workers in Latin America know they can look to us for friendship and help."

The Postal, Telegraph, and Telephone International is a worldwide organization of free trade unions in the communications field, and Mr. Beirne is a member of its executive committee and executive board. With headquarters in Berne, Switzerland, PTTI represents more than 2 million workers in 64 countries. The organization has conducted educational courses for Latin American trade union leaders at a CWA-owned lodge in Front Royal, Va.

The PTTI Trade Union Training Institute at Front Royal has, in a series of stages, developed into the American Institute for Free Labor Development.

This newer organization has the support of Latin American leaders, and prominent figures in North American public affairs, business, and labor compose its board of trustees. Endorsed warmly by the AFL-CIO, the institute has drawn on CWA's unique experience and training in Latin American labor affairs for its program. Mr. Beirne is secretary-treasurer and an active member of its directing group.

A WELL-ROUNDED PROGRAM

The institute offers training to young labor leaders of Latin America in the fundamentals of organizational technique, methods for building democratic unions, and fighting Communists and racketeers. Beyond these functions, the institute has embarked on a program of fostering housing and self-help producer cooperatives.

To defeat communism in Latin America, CWA believes, there must be a challenge to totalitarians. But there must also be a challenge to the poverty that engulfs millions of our good neighbors to the south.

To help win that twin-pronged battle is the aim of the communications workers here in the United States and Canada.

TELEPHONE WORKERS' DUES: WHERE THEY GO, HOW THEY ARE SPENT

Next July groups of serious men and women will stroll into colleges across the land from Cornell to UCLA, from Penn State to the University of Nebraska.

In addition to bread-and-butter union studies, they'll hear lectures on sociology, the art of public speaking, how to run a meeting according to "Robert's Rules," and a bit of U.S. history.

Labor history and practical advice on union contracts will be on the schedule, of course. For the students will come from the ranks of the Communications Workers of America. The summer institutes are one result of members' monthly investment in dues.

REVENUES ARE PUT TO WORK

Few other labor organizations in America return so much to their membership in education. It is estimated that CWA now spends $480,000 a year to broaden and train the leaders who must administer the day-to-day problems of its 300,000 members.

Is a new member interested in how a union functions? The CWA offers him 3-day institutes in his hometown, paid out of the national union's treasury, to answer his questions.

On the theory that off-plant and campus lectures aren't enough, the CWA this year plans to set up a whole new series of courses, running from 3 days to a week long, to help job stewards interpret their contracts and process disputes more efficiently in CWA's 800 locals.

These education programs are part of the CWA philosophy. It must put revenues to work, like the good servant in the parable of the talents. Most of the money from dues is paid right out again by the national union—in training, administering contracts, and providing more services than those rendered by any other union.

All expenses of collective bargaining are paid for by the national union, unlike many other labor organizations. The national union picks up the bill for all grievance and arbitration cases, a costly process. Last year CWA handled some 150 arbitration cases at a cost ranging from $1,000 to $3,000 apiece.

Long before the Federal labor legislation of 1958–59 required unions to report how they managed funds, the CWA was processing data at its Washington headquarters and sending monthly reports on every penny of income to each local.

HOW THE INCOME IS SPENT

Among the ways the CWA's income of $6,607,187 was distributed last year, salaries and travel expenses of 175 full-time staff employees plus part-time help accounted for 55 percent. (President Joseph A. Beirne's annual salary is $24,500, one of the lowest in the labor movement for a union of CWA's size. Some smaller unions pay their top men more than double this amount.)

Last year CWA recorded a surplus, enabling it to set aside $124,152 toward reducing the mortgage on its new national headquarters building in Washington. It expects to acquire other buildings later for various district offices around the Nation, also as an investment in improved services.

Back in the 1940's, a lean era for CWA, it often sent its president to conferences via bus, and in the words of one official, "he ate the Blue Plate special."

But through the years CWA leaders have asked, "What does the membership need? What is best for them?" These questions, not a balanced budget, are of paramount consideration.

One measurable reward for this approach: Between 1947 and 1960, according to a U.S. Labor Department study, average earnings of communications workers in America increased by 105 percent.

"We are a service organization, not a business in the sense that a corporation is a business," Secretary-Treasurer William A. Smallwood told members at the union's annual convention in Milwaukee last year.

"Our operation can be planned, but they are planned around the needs of people."

CWA's financial status as reflected by the certified public accountant's financial statement for the fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1962

GENERAL FUND

[Fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1962]

Income [1]	$6, 607, 187. 45
Expenditures	6, 439, 968. 86
Excess of revenues over expenditures	167, 218. 59

ANALYSIS OF EXPENDITURES

[Fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1962]

Salaries	$2, 887, 916. 62
Travel expenses	708, 414. 65
Supplies and printing	229, 503. 75
Postage, freight and express	87, 073. 66
Rental and maintenance of equipment	51, 297. 63
Contract services	40, 011. 25
Telephone and telegraph	178, 691. 21
Rent	356, 143. 24
All other	70, 484. 00
Total cash expenditures	4, 609, 536. 01
Adjustments to accrual basis—Expenses accruing but unpaid:	
Apr. 1, 1961	(51, 902. 28)
Mar. 31, 1962	46, 145. 05
Total	4, 603, 778. 78
General:	
Organizing fund	125, 000. 00
Contributions	6, 095. 00
Legal and professional	144, 642. 26
Convention—CWA	48, 366. 70
Executive board	35, 545. 83
Committees	33, 418. 50
CWA news	106, 761. 57
CWA pension fund	265, 500. 00
Insurance	134, 018. 15
Taxes	95, 086. 58
Affiliation dues	296, 262. 06
Contingency	84, 614. 17
Equipment additions	38, 984. 16
CWA building fund	124, 152. 28
Building repairs	5, 296. 66
Public relations	57, 754. 80
Operating reserve fund	192, 994. 00
Foreign affairs	41, 697. 36
Total	1, 836, 190. 08
Total expenditures	6, 439, 968. 86

CWA's financial status as reflected by the certified public accountant's financial statement for the fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1962—Continued

GENERAL FUND

[Mar. 31, 1962]

Assets:	
Cash in banks	$542, 921, 26
Deposits, accounts, and loans and notes receivable	56, 986. 43
Advances for expenses	94, 018. 22
Investments—stocks	2, 394. 30
Amount due from defense fund	2, 278. 96
Total assets	698, 599. 17
Liabilities:	
Accounts payable	95, 585. 81
Due to employees and others	27, 538. 52
Accrued affiliation dues payable	32, 146. 37
Accrued payroll and withholding tax	73, 169. 23
Total liabilities	228, 439. 93
Amounts to be distributed:	
Locals, defense fund, and others	356, 429. 73
To be transferred to Operating Reserve fund	4, 126. 00
Total	588, 995. 66
Net assets—general fund	109, 603. 51

DEFENSE FUND

[Mar. 31, 1962]

Assets:	
Cash in banks	5, 872, 491. 66
U.S. Gov't. and Govt. agency securities	1, 450, 000. 00
Loans and notes receivable	102, 158. 74
Amounts due from general fund	84, 487. 00
Miscellaneous	62. 55
Total assets	7, 509, 199. 95
Liabilities:	
Amounts due to general fund	2, 278. 96
Net assets—defense fund [2]	7, 506, 920. 99

[1] Almost exclusively from members' dues.

[2] During the fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1962, the CWA defense fund expended $114,894.45 for strike assistance, legal and professional services and special public relations activities designed to avert strikes. Income to the defense fund during the same period amounted to $1,804,431.96, of which the great majority came from per capita allocations from the membership.

COMMUNICATION WORKERS OF AMERICA OFFICERS

Joseph A. Beirne: International president since 1943. Industry experience: Started in 1929 as Western Electric utility boy in New York area. Has worked at circuit testing, relay adjusting, other skilled jobs. In union work since 1937, when unionism first emerged in the industry, one of prime movers in building strong telephone labor movement.

William A. Smallwood: Secretary-treasurer since 1955. Industry experience: Started in Southern Bell plant in 1929 as central office repairman, has done a number of craft jobs, led in formation of the union in the southern area.

John L. Crull: Vice president since 1947, plant craftsman in Kansas starting in 1919, in union work since 1937. Has held many union offices, local and international, helped build union in southwestern area.

Ray Hackney: Vice president since 1956. Wide range of telephone company and union assignments back to 1935 when he began work as a construction lineman. Full-time union work since 1944.

James Massey: Vice president since 1957. Began work for Western Electric in 1927, active in union work from the start of his employment, held a number of elected offices, local and international.

Mary H. Hanscom: Director, district 1 (New England, New York, New Jersey). Started work for the phone company in New Jersey in 1925 as operator, later service assistant, in full-time office for CWA since 1947.

William J. Walsh: Director, district 2 (Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia) since 1956. Started work as installer in Ohio in 1930, has done a number of other craft jobs, in union work since 1945, full-time since 1949.

George Gill: Director, district 3 (entire Southeastern United States) since 1955. Started work for the telephone system in the South in 1936. Has done most plant craft jobs, led in forming the union in southern area, has been in full-time union work since 1946.

Walter Schaar: Director, district 4 (Michigan and Ohio) since 1951. Started for Michigan Bell in 1929, toll testman. Began union work in 1939 as local president, held a number of other union jobs before becoming district director.

Ray Dryer: Director, district 5 (Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana) since 1947. Started telephone work in Wisconsin in 1923, plant craftsman, in union work since 1933, led in formation of the union in his area.

D. L. McCowen: Director, district 6 (entire Southwest) since 1951. Started work for the phone company in 1929, lineman, combination man, installer-repairman, headed up southwestern unit since 1938.

D. K. Gordon: Director, district 7 (Northwestern States) since 1957. Started telephone work in 1929, held a number of jobs in the plant department, union experience goes back to the late 1930's.

Fred L. Garrett: Director, district 8 (Mountain States). Began work in industry in 1937, has been a combination man, TWX installer, and other craft jobs, union work began in 1937, was elected district director in 1961.

Louis B. Knecht: Director, district 9 (Pacific coast) since 1955, started for the plant department of Pacific Telephone in 1946. Active in union work from start of his employment, full-time union work since 1951.

William M. Dunn: Director, district 10 (all of Canada). Has worked as a lineman in Ohio, also held plant engineering and clerical posts. Has been active in telephone unionism since 1939, formerly served as assistant to CWA's president.

Elaine T. Gleason: Long-lines director since 1955. Began work in industry in 1945. Has worked as operator, traffic clerk, teletype operator. Union work began in 1946, full time in 1953. Has served in a number of union positions, steward, local president, representative, before becoming national director.

Frank J. Novotny: Western Electric sales director since 1959. Began work in industry in 1929, W-E manufacturing, later transferring to W-E sales and distribution. Has done a number of jobs in both manufacturing and sales. In union work since 1937, full time since 1950.

Patrick J. Morgan: National director Western Electric installation. Began his telephone industry career in Pennsylvania, became an installer, an active telephone union member since 1950, assumed present post in 1962.

J. Curtis Fletcher: Non-Bell director since 1951. Industry experience all in independent branch of telephone industry, starting in 1945—includes lineman, installer, switchman, PBX repairman, plant assigner, testman, union experience dates from 1945, full time from 1951.

DEAR JOE: Please accept my warm best wishes on the 24th annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America. The union for which you provide such excellent leadership is a large and important one, situated in a critical segment of our economic life. In your negotiations you have observed the responsibility that is inherent in such a position, and you have thus forwarded the welfare of our citizens as well as that of your membership.

I would like to extend a special word of thanks to you personally for the fine work you are doing to aid our Alliance for Progress program. You are aware of my own deep interest in this program. It is vital to the future of freedom in the world. I believe the Nation can have justifiable confidence in our resolution to stimulate the progress of this hemisphere because of the character of the men, like yourself, who are contributing to the effort.

I would be grateful if you would extend my good wishes and greetings to the men and women assembled in the convention.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(The above message from the President was read to the CWA convention in 1962 by the then Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, November 14, 1962.

Mr. JOSEPH A. BEIRNE,
President, Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEIRNE: The Communications Workers of America has earned friendship and respect during its 25 years of existence. As a union whose members live in every section of the Nation, CWA has consistently maintained a high degree of consciousness for the needs of the entire community.

CWA, together with the telephone companies whose employees you represent, has provided evidence that responsible collective bargaining can and does produce significant benefits mutually for workers and management. Labor and management in the telephone industry have met the challenge of advanced technology and automation, and both have benefited as a result. In addition, the public has also benefited through increasingly improved service.

I feel confident that the fine record established by the Communications Workers of America during its first quarter century will continue in the challenging years of the future.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1962.

Mr. JOSEPH A. BEIRNE,
President, Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I am pleased to salute the Communications Workers of America on its 25th anniversary. In the past quarter century, the CWA has become widely recognized as one of the foremost labor organizations in the United States and Canada.

Overcoming serious obstacles from employers and in the face of rapidly advancing automation, the CWA has organized some 300,000 men and women in a vitally important industry. In the realm of collective bargaining, CWA has maintained steady progress toward obtaining fair American standards for the men and women of the telephone industry. In your union the tradition is strong and vital that labor must serve not only to its own members but the entire community, a fact strongly underlined by your own excellent work as chairman of the AFL–CIO Community Services Committee.

The AFL–CIO is proud of the Communications Workers of America, an affiliated union. On CWA's silver anniversary, the American labor movement unites in wishing you continued trade union progress in the years ahead.

Fraternally yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the issue of nuclear testing and the effort to secure an agreement banning the testing of nuclear weapons is immensely complex—technically and politically.

More than ever today, we need clear thinking and informed reporting on this issue. Marquis Childs, chief Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has consistently reported developments on the nuclear testing issue with intelligence, accuracy, and clarity.

His latest article on this subject appeared in the June 2 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This article is an excellent summary and assessment of the significant aspects of the nuclear test ban effort and its relation to the nuclear arms race. I commend Mr. Childs for this contribution to our understanding of the issue, and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FASTER ARMS RACE OR TEST BAN? TIME FOR CHOICE IS SHORT

(Resumption of Soviet nuclear shots could come in late August; complexity of issue and secrecy are cited as reasons for public unawareness of consequences that world is facing.)

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—The choice just ahead appears to be whether or not the arms race is to be stepped up to a more intensive pace. It is a choice weighted with immeasurable consequences for the uncertain balance between an unstable peace and nuclear war.

Yet for many reasons in this moment of pause, there is little or no awareness of what the outcome can mean. One reason is secrecy and the complexity of the nuclear test ban issue.

But a far more important reason is the fact that there will be no political penalty for failure to reach a test ban agreement. In fact, should an agreement be reached in coming months—the odds are perhaps 10 to 1 against it—President John F. Kennedy would have to stake some of his personal popularity in a real fight to get it ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate.

In a curious combination, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, an advocate of a test ban with inspection safeguards, and Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, who has argued against such a ban, proposed an agreement outlawing all tests in the atmosphere and under the water. This would stop further contamination of the air and leave both Russia and the United States free to test underground.

The proposal is expected to be rejected by the Soviets. The United States has conducted more than 70 underground tests since 1961. The Soviet Union, according to the best information available, has conducted fewer than 10, perhaps only 2 or 3.

In this disparity lies the heart of the matter. Underground testing is costly in terms of results in improvement of tactical nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has ruled it out because of the cost and because of the conviction that, once nuclear weapons of any size or kind are used, a war would swiftly become an all-out nuclear war.

The current arms race is straining the Soviet economy. Premier Khrushchev must decide in coming weeks, with hard line pressure from the Chinese Communists as one factor, whether to risk an even greater strain in an effort to catch up with America's considerable nuclear superiority. What he told a recent visitor is considered significant.

He said to Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, who had a private talk with him, that the United States had conducted overall about 65 percent more tests than the Soviet Union. This is believed to be approximately correct. Therefore his military leaders were pressing for new tests, and he did not know whether he could resist them.

Khrushchev also expressed the view advanced by others below him. that he had been given private assurance that two or three on-site inspections would meet American requirements. This goes back to a conversation in New York in December between Arthur Dean, America's negotiator at the Geneva talks last year, and Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov. Kuznetsov apparently informed Moscow that Dean had privately indicated his approval of two or three inspections. Dean denies this.

When Cousins returned, he reported to President Kennedy on his talk, stressing what seemed to him Khrushchev's genuine sense of having been let down after reversing the earlier Soviet position against any onsite inspections. The President is said to have agreed that the Soviet Premier appeared to have some justification for feeling as he did.

If the Soviet decision is to go ahead with new atmospheric tests in an effort to catch up with the United States, the response will be immediate here. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have opposed a nuclear test ban, arguing that further testing is essential if an effective anti-missile-missile is to be developed. A stepped-up arms push in the Soviet Union would give new impetus to what President Eisenhower in his farewell address called the military-industrial complex. This complex, with its ramifications in industry, government, and politics, would have a powerful influence on opinion. Even as he was presenting his $52 billion defense budget to Congress in January, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara indicated that for the following year it would have to be perhaps $54 billion.

In England, where the urgency behind a test ban agreement is far greater than here, Prime Minister Macmillan has joined with Mr. Kennedy in one more appeal to Khrushchev. The door may still be open but it is open only a crack.

Altogether 34 Senators, including 6 Republicans, joined in sponsoring the Humphrey-Dodd resolution. One Senator actively interested in a test ban who declined to sign was Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin. In a recent speech, Proxmire made the case for a test ban agreement with seven annual inspections. He based much of his argument, as have other advocates, on greatly improved methods of detection and of distinguishing earthquakes from nuclear explosions, that do not depend on first-hand inspection of sites where cheating is suspected.

Proxmire, extremely sensitive to currents of popular opinion, pointed out to this reporter that in his own State in a poll years ago more than 80 percent expressed themselves in favor of a control system with inspection. Recent soundings have indicated that roughly this same ratio of opinion prevails, he says.

Yet active and influential opponents of a test ban agreement have continued a campaign against it, insisting that the Senate would never ratify it. One of the most active is Senator Stuart Symington, of Missouri. Several Senators have reported his arguments to them in behalf of sustaining the view of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee which is reported to be opposed to a test ban. The committee has long been under the influence of the Pentagon.

In an appearance on "Meet the Press," Symington took the occasion to disclose that Harold Brown, the Pentagon's Chief of Research and Development, had in testimony indicated a willingness to go below seven inspections to possibly five. Some critics charged him with giving away America's bargaining position in advance. Brown, formerly opposed to a test ban, is now in favor of it on the ground that the United States is so far ahead that for each side to go into a new series would mean a net loss for this country. McNamara favors a test agreement.

Another active and articulate opponent is Representative Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California, a member of the Joint Committee. Inspiration for many of the opponents has come from Edward Teller, noted physicist who has been called "father of the H-bomb." Teller, a persuasive and tireless talker, has campaigned actively against any suspension of testing. While equally distinguished scientists have favored a test ban agreement, they have not matched his emotional drive against it.

If the decision in Moscow is for more atmospheric tests, the new series would probably come in late August or September. This is the most favorable time for the Russians to operate in the extreme north, as was shown when, in 1961, they broke the moratorium that had been in effect for more than 2 years.

It can be expected that a new test series would be preceded by propaganda charges against the United States—a warming up of the cold war, including possible moves at key trouble spots. Such a propaganda barrage would help to provide what the Soviets would consider justification for a new start in the nuclear race.

Both sides are believed to have carried forward extensive preparations for further testing. The military, whether in Moscow or Washington, will never be satisfied with what is often called "the state of the art." On each side there will always be one more jump to a theoretical defense against a known offensive capacity.

In each country, as it happens, the leaders are preoccupied with internal problems and politics. Khrushchev has grave troubles, both with the economy and in the leadership of the Communist bloc. President Kennedy is struggling with the race problem as an election year draws near.

Prime Minister Macmillan faces an election in a greatly weakened position. The opposition to nuclear armaments is stronger in Britain than in any other country. While Labor Party leaders outwardly support a strong nuclear deterrent under American or allied control and oppose a national nuclear force for Britain, they will not find it difficult to put the onus of a new round in the arms race on the embattled Conservatives. That, together with a growing sense of the peril to the world, explains the urgency which Macmillan is putting into a last ditch effort to renew a meaningful negotiation and prevent another nuclear round.

Fallout levels from the tests of last year are likely to be at new highs. Russian tests in the atmosphere will be matched by American tests in the atmosphere—only such testing can prove out an antimissile missile. And beyond that and a stepped-up arms race what may happen is anyone's surmise.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FONG BEFORE CHINESE REFUGEE RELIEF COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on May 22 the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] addressed the Chinese Refugee Relief Committee, which was meeting in Washington. Throughout his career, Senator Fong has had a keen interest in the plight of the homeless of all lands. This address is another expression of his knowledge and concern about both refugees and ethnic groups which have made important contributions to the plural society of which we in the United States are so rightly proud.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by Senator Fong before the Chinese Refugee Relief Committee on May 22 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong, of Hawaii

Madam Chairman, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to be here with all of you this evening. It is a pleasure to participate in this dinner of the Chinese Refugee Relief Committee.

I wish to extend my heartfelt commendation to the committee for its humanitarian endeavors. In caring for the displaced, the uprooted, the homeless who are desperately in need, you are truly following the moral precept that you are your brothers' keepers.

Ours has been called the "century of the homeless man." And so it would seem. Statistics show that there are about 50 million uprooted and displaced peoples in the world, victims of tyranny, oppression, wars—man's inhumanity toward man. In Asia alone, there are over 25 million refugees, 700,000 of them Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

The plight of these homeless Chinese, like the plight of most of the world's refugees, is a tragic story of human need which will not be alleviated without the assistance of those of us who are in more fortunate circumstances. There is a need for food, clothing, shelter, and medicine. There is a need for resettlement and assimilation.

Private, voluntary organizations, such as the Chinese Refugee Relief Committee, which help to give them hope, human dignity, and a better life, are most worthy and merit our highest praise.

Your plans to build two refugee vocational centers—one in Taiwan and one in Hong Kong—are most practical and your solicitation of funds for these projects deserves strong support.

Your unflagging efforts to obtain asylum for more Chinese refugees in the nations of the free world deserves strong encouragement as well.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees and the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, I am cognizant of your interest in having the United States admit a larger number of Chinese refugees than were recently paroled and in raising the immigration quota of Chinese persons from its present small figure of 105 per year.

I know you are keenly aware that whenever the question of admitting Chinese or other orientals either as immigrants or as refugees is raised in America, there arises fear in some circles that an increase in the number of persons of oriental ancestry will upset the cultural and historical pattern of American life.

An objective examination of the facts dispels this fear as groundless. According to the 1960 census, there were 464,332 persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States, or 26/100 of 1 percent of the total population; 237,292 persons of Chinese ancestry, or 13/100 of 1 percent; 176,310 persons of Filipino ancestry, or 9/100 of 1 percent; and 218,089 persons of "all other" ancestry, including persons of Korean, Indian of the Far East, Polynesian, and other nonwhite ancestry, except Negroes and American Indians, or about 12/100 of 1 percent of the total population.

There were, then, in the United States in 1960 only 1,096,023 persons of oriental and Polynesian extraction, or about three-fifths of 1 percent of our total population of 180 million people.

Today, from the vast area of Asia and the Pacific, wherein reside more than one-half of the world's population, our immigration laws permit the entry of only 2,390 immigrants out of the 154,000 worldwide immigration quota allowable annually. The Asia-Pacific areas' share of the total quota is a very, very small 1½ percent.

These figures clearly show that there is no need to fear that America's cultural and historical pattern will be upset by allowing a reasonable increase in the number of persons of oriental ancestry in the United States.

The history of Chinese immigrants to America follows the usual immigrant experience, in that, as time went by, they became assimilated in the American community. Like other immigrants, the Chinese made noteworthy progress and noteworthy contributions.

Those of Chinese ancestry who came to America were an industrious, law-abiding people. They were heirs to a proud and rich cultural heritage. Many of their most ancient traditions such as family devotion and honor, veneration of their elders; and respect for the virtues of learning and education have served our communities well.

Most of these immigrants settled in the western part of our Nation beginning in the latter part of the 1800's. They helped to build the railroads, they worked the mines; they cut timber; they built roads; they reclaimed vast marshlands; they farmed the land; they fished the ocean. As the years passed, they branched out into many trades, businesses, and occupations—in fact in every field of endeavor, be it teaching, law, medicine, ministry, architecture, engineering, art, science, the military, finance, industry, and others. These Americans of Chinese ancestry added significantly to the development, growth, and progress of our country, probably in far greater proportion than their small numbers would indicate.

My own State of Hawaii illustrates what American citizens of Chinese ancestry have done. There are approximately 38,000 American citizens of Chinese ancestry in Hawaii, comprising only 6 percent of the total population. In addition, in Hawaii, although their numbers are not known, there are many American citizens of part-Chinese ancestry. These American citizens of Chinese and part-Chinese ancestry have made an impressive record in Hawaii. Many of them are leaders in government, business, the professions, indeed all aspects of our island community. There are over 100 medical doctors; over 100 dentists; at least 70 lawyers; many architects; engineers; accountants; and other professional men and women; hundreds of businessmen; hundreds of schoolteachers, and scores of university professors and instructors.

Time does not permit me to name all these eminent persons, but a few will illustrate my point.

Former Lt. Gov. James Kealoha; present Lt. Gov. William Richardson; State Senator Francis Ching; State Representatives Donald Ching and Frank Loo; chairman of the county government of Maui, Edward Tam; chairman of the county government of Kauai, Raymond Aki; chief of the Honolulu Police Department, Daniel Liu; members of the Governor's cabinet, Andrew Ing, Shelley Mark, Rear Adm. (retired) Gordon Chung-Hoon, and William Among; member of the board of regents of the University of Hawaii, Dr. L. Q. Pang; former presidents of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, Judge William Heen and Herbert Lee; former Circuit Judge Chuck Mau; financiers Chinn Ho, Ruddy Tongg, and Hung Wo Ching; bankers William Mau, Lawrence Lau, K. J. Luke, Buck Hung Wong, C. T. Wong, and Clarence Ching.

Notable and laudable also are the contributions to Hawaii and to the Nation, of the American citizens of Japanese, Filipino, Korean, Polynesian, and other ancestry. Beyond this, they and their brethren of Chinese ancestry perform a special mission in behalf of America by serving as a bridge of understanding and friendship between the East and West.

Likewise, you of this Chinese Refugee Relief Committee, American residents and citizens stretching a helping hand to the Chinese refugees, serve to strengthen that bridge of understanding and friendship. For you are tangible evidence that the people of America have not forgotten them and that the spirit of brotherhood espoused by Americans throughout our history is alive today and embraces the Chinese refugee in his hour of need.

I salute you and congratulate you on your fine work. Success, Godspeed, and aloha.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour is not concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator has an address to make which will take 20 to 25 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If there is no further morning business——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized during the morning hour for the purpose of making a short statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last year, when the independent offices appropriation bill was before the Senate, there was considerable discussion about a supersonic transport plane. At that time, it was the position of the senior Senator from Colorado that the United States should proceed with all haste to build the plane. I gave as my chief reason that we could not afford to yield superiority in transport to any government or country on earth. I am sorry to say that at that time I received very little support in behalf of the appropriation, although the appropriation was made.

Since that time I have endeavored to keep in touch with the FAA to find out their plans with respect to the supersonic transport plane. However, I have not been able to obtain any practical or up-to-date information, although Mr. Halaby and I have been trying to get together during the last few days.

In the June 5, 1963, issue of the Washington Star there appeared an article entitled "Pan-Am Orders 6 Concorde Planes, Will Fly Ocean in 2½ Hours in '70"—which means 1970. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN-AM ORDERS SIX CONCORDE PLANES: WILL FLY OCEAN IN 2½ HOURS IN 1970

(By Dow Jones)

Pan-American World Airways has ordered six Concorde supersonic-speed jet airliners from European manufacturers. No price was named in the announcement.

The Concorde is to be built jointly by British and French aircraft makers. It will be able to fly from New York to London in 2½ hours, according to a Pan-Am spokesman.

Reportedly the first Concorde is to be delivered about 1970. The order was announced by Pan-American president Juan Trippe at the close of a directors' meeting yesterday. It was confirmed by the French nationalized firm, Sud Aviation, which is developing the 1,400 mile-per-hour plane in cooperation with the British Aircraft Corp.

Although no price was given, estimates of the cost of supersonic airliners range from $8 million to over $15 million each. A U.S. supersonic airliner is expected to cost at least $15 million, but the price for a European-built craft would probably be a bit lower, according to airline authorities.

The United States has been talking about developing a supersonic plane for several years but has taken no firm action. Opinion among Government and aviation officials is that U.S. plane manufacturers cannot undertake the development without a Federal subsidy. Congress already has appropriated about $30 million to the Federal Aviation Agency for studies of the operating feasibility of a supersonic and its financing aspects.

A high-level intra-Government committee is expected to hand President Kennedy a recommendation shortly on whether the Government should subsidize development of the craft and, if so, how.

Pan-Am's announcement is a breakthrough for the British-French supersonic plane.

U.S. plane makers ever since World War II have dominated the world market for passenger transport aircraft. However, Pan-Am's decision seems to give the British-French effort a lead that a U.S. supersonic, if it is developed may find hard to overcome.

Pan-Am, the largest U.S. flag international airline and one of the world's leading oversea air carriers, apparently decided to order the British-French supersonic to remain competitive with British Overseas Airways Corp. and Air France.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is significant that the reporter who wrote the article has repeated what I was trying to say and what I have said not only on the floor of the Senate, but in many other places. He states—

> U.S. plane makers ever since World War II have dominated the world market for pas-

senger transport aircraft. However, Pan-Am's decision seems to give the British-French effort a lead that a U.S. supersonic, if it is developed, may find hard to overcome.

While we are talking about getting to the moon, I suggest that this is an area in which the United States might get on the ball, and by doing so perhaps we can gain and then retain the lead for the design and development of supersonic transport as we have for subsonic transport.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT POLICIES HURT LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Defense Department continues to pursue procurement policies which tend to aggravate rather than alleviate the economic problems of labor surplus areas.

It is shocking how in practice the administration persistently ignores its avowed policy of channeling more defense orders to labor surplus areas. Its policies of procurement are creating worsening difficulties in labor surplus areas in New York State. The Defense Department must begin to strengthen and better direct its administrative mechanism for awarding defense contracts to labor surplus areas, including its new procedure whereby preference awards are made to firms producing in areas not classified as having substantial unemployment which certify that they will perform or subcontract certain specified percentages of the work to areas of substantial unemployment. This new procedure has certainly been of no assistance to New York, as subsequent statistics will clearly demonstrate.

New York State's two major labor surplus areas—Buffalo-Niagara and Utica-Rome—suffered substantial drops in their share of prime defense contracts, instead of improving, during the first quarter of 1963.

The new Defense Department figures show that contracts to the Buffalo area in the January–March 1963 quarter totaled only $9,984,000—a 43-percent drop from the same quarter in 1962, when contracts totaled $17,408,000. The Utica-Rome area showed an even more serious drop. Contracts to that area in the first quarter of 1963 totaled only $1,829,000, a drop of 81 percent from the same quarter in 1962, when contracts totaled $10,268,000.

These declines are not isolated cases but reflect an accelerated decline in New York State's percentage of total military prime contract awards. For example, New York State's share of total prime contract awards declined from $670 million in the first quarter of 1962 to $595 million in the first quarter of 1963—a decline of 11.2 percent. New York State's share of total prime contract awards has shown a steady decline through the years—from 17.1 percent in fiscal 1954; 12.2 percent in 1957; 12.0 percent in 1961; 10.7 percent in 1962; and for the first 9 months of fiscal 1963, 8.9 percent.

Of New York State's 13 smaller areas of substantial labor surplus, 8 showed unrelieved declines and 5 areas showed small gains in their share of prime defense contracts. The five areas showing gains were: Elmira, Geneva-Canandaigua, Gloversville, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone, and Watertown. The eight areas showing declines are: Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Newburg-Middletown-Beacon, Wellsville, and Plattsburg.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table showing recent trends in prime defense contract awards in the New York State area of substantial unemployment printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Trends in prime defense contract awards of $10,000 or more in New York State areas of substantial labor surplus, January–March 1961–63

[In thousands of dollars]

Areas	Contract awards	January-March 1961	January-March 1962	January-March 1963	March 1963 as compared to January-March 1962
Major:					
Buffalo-Niagara	Total	25,028	17,408	9,984	−7,424
	Preference	211	542	478	−64
Utica-Rome [1]	Total	11,593	10,268	1,829	−8,439
	Preference	11	52	42	−10
Smaller:					
Amsterdam [2]	Total	913	672	542	130
	Preference	0	0	0	0
Auburn	Total	184	284	135	−149
	Preference	0	70	28	−42
Batavia	Total		253	104	−149
	Preference		0	0	0
Geneva-Canandaigua	Total			195	+195
	Preference			114	+114
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls	Total		117	22	−95
	Preference		45	0	−45
Gloversville	Total	234	179	215	+36
	Preference	0	0	0	0
Jamestown-Dunkirk	Total	665	1,211	746	−465
	Preference	0	12	0	−12
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon	Total	524	5,080	3,435	−1,645
	Preference	0	16	108	+92
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone	Total	58	77	354	+277
	Preference	0	26	306	+280
Plattsburgh	Total	5,946	5,510	1,001	−4,509
	Preference	18	145	43	−102
Watertown	Total		635	991	+356
	Preference		0	0	0
Wellsville	Total	272	2,244	281	−1,963
	Preference	0	0	0	0
Elmira	Total	2,378	585	1,148	+563
	Preference	0	0	0	0

[1] Removed as an area of substantial unemployment in July 1962 and reinstated in January 1963.

[2] *Italicized* are areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus. Such areas are eligible for first preference in the awarding of Federal contracts placed under the provisions of defense manpower policy No. 4 and related programs.

LIBRARIES ARE VITAL TO ALASKA LIFE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, one of the most important and yet one of the least discussed sections of the President's aid to education program is the assistance proposed for State and local libraries.

There is little discussion—and less dispute—of this section because of the considerable success of the Library Services Act over the last 7 years.

The Library Services Act, with an authorization ceiling of $7½ million, has provided on a matching basis, funds for books, periodicals, reference materials, equipment and furniture. This has been of inestimable value to libraries in every State of the country.

The aid to education bill now in committee, S. 580, provides for both the extension and the expansion of this program:

Annual authorization of matching grants to the States would be increased from $7.5 to $25 million a year for library services under title 6, part C.

This part also provides a $20 million annual authorization of matching grants for library construction. Of this money, each State is guaranteed a minimum allotment of $80,000 provided, of course, the State is willing to commit its share of the library construction costs. The Federal share of construction and service costs is to be determined on the basis of a formula tied to State per capita income. However, the Federal share will never be more than 66 or less than 33 percent of the total.

Under part C, the Library Services Act is to be extended for the first time to nonrural, urban communities.

S. 580 provides, in title 2, part D, a program of library assistance to nonprofit colleges and universities whether private, religious or publicly supported. This program would provide up to $15 million in fiscal 1964 for library materials; up to $25 million in 1964 for the construction and equipment of library facilities.

S. 580 also provides training opportunities for libraries in the form of graduate fellowships, teacher institutes, and specialized training.

I believe all of these proposals will be of considerable value to the people of Alaska.

Some Alaskan communities are small and separated by many, many miles. The majority of the cities and towns of Alaska are dependent upon the airplane as their only means of access to the outside world.

From this brief description, Mr. President, Senators will see why libraries have become such an important part of the Alaskan community. They are often the only available source of instruction and recreation. Alaska's towns and villages are proud of their libraries and they value them highly and they work to improve them.

An example of this is found in what Alaska has done with the relatively small amounts of money allotted to it from the Library Services Act. In the 7 years it has received aid, never more than $49,000 went to Alaska in any given year from this program. Yet, in these 7 years, the book resources of the State library at Juneau have been added to substantially and new libraries have been incorporated in Anchor Point, Bethel, College, Delta Junction, Kasilof, Kotzebue, Moses Point, Soldotna, and Tok. In addition to these libraries which have been newly established under State law, unincorporated libraries have begun service in 11 other communities and 9 other public libraries have begun receiving local appropriations for the first time.

In any community, libraries are important; in Alaska they are even more important. In spite of the pioneer work that has been done with the assistance of the Library Services Act there remain an estimated 130,000 Alaskans still without local library services. It is for this reason that I so strongly support the library provisions of the national improvement education act. Mr. President, it was once said that education consists of a student sitting on one end of a bench and Mark Hopkins sitting at the other.

I am not so sure.

Education consists of books—good books, bad books, mediocre books, magnificent books—but always books. And for books, Mr. President, one goes to a library.

I support assistance to libraries.

CONFUSION AND INADEQUACIES IN OUR RADIATION CONTROLS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Tuesday, June 4, 1963, I had the privilege of testifying before the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, chaired by the able Representative in Congress, MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois.

This subcommittee is holding hearings on a most important and complex subject: The ever-increasing amounts of fallout coming to earth and our Federal program for handling the problem.

Chairman PRICE summed up the situation well in his closing remarks when he said:

> Unless the Federal Radiation Council acts with dispatch, a Pandora's box of ill-timed, ill-advised, and uncoordinated action may be opened. Moreover, responsible Government officials will have abdicated their solemn responsibility for dealing with this problem. Such an intolerable situation must not be permitted to develop.

I ask unanimous consent that the chairman's statement and my own statement on the ill-prepared and confused Federal program for radiation control may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSING STATEMENT FOR MR. PRICE

I believe that our hearings thus far have added a great deal to the fund of public knowledge available on fallout. In particular, we have learned a great deal about the amounts of radioactivity injected into the atmosphere as a result of the 1961 and 1962 nuclear weapons tests.

Nevertheless, after all this information is in, we are faced with the regrettable conclusion that the public does not have criteria for discerning when radioactivity from nuclear weapons testing has reached a level at which remedial action is required. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been concerned with this problem for well over a year.

On June 18, 1962, we wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, asking whether the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council were applicable to the problem of fallout. "If not," we asked, "is the development of further supplementary criteria needed * * *?" In response, the Secretary made clear that the guides established by the Federal Radiation Council were not applicable to fallout. The Secretary emphasized that "There is a continuing need for the development of guidance in this field."

Later during the summer of 1962, we reiterated our concern to the Secretary in these words:

"It is extremely important that this matter be clarified, in order to alleviate public concern over the hazards of ionizing radiation and to minimize the possibility of uncoordinated and ill-advised actions being taken should certain radionuclides reach undesirable levels in the environment."

The importance of the joint committee's warning was illustrated by the confusion within the Federal Government and between the Federal Government and the States when protective measures against fallout were invoked by public health officials in the State of Utah.

Nevertheless, 1 year later, we find that no action has been taken to clarify this situation. It may be true that current levels of radioactivity are within the acceptable limits of the radiation protection guides. And I believe it would be generally concluded by all the witnesses who have testified before this committee that there is no present danger as a result of fallout from nuclear weapons testing.

However, this is not a sufficient answer for the public. Nor is it sufficient to tell the people of this country that adequate administrative mechanisms exist within the Federal Government for taking action in the event that fallout reaches undesirable levels. The public has a right to know that criteria—call them numbers; call them guides; call them ranges—exist for determining when protective measures should be invoked.

We have been told by Dr. Tompkins—the now acting Executive Director of the FRC—that "Within the next year the Council will make some positive recommendations dealing with this problem." It is my hope that the FRC will not require a full year to arrive at a solution to this problem. I would hope that within the next few months the Federal Radiation Council would arrive at radiation protection guides which are applicable to the problem of fallout.

Unless the FRC acts with dispatch, a Pandora's box of ill-timed, ill-advised and uncoordinated action may be opened. Moreover, responsible Government officials will have abdicated their solemn responsibility for dealing with this problem. Such an intolerable situation must not be permitted to develop.

I would hope that Secretary Celebrezze will have some comments on these matters when he appears to testify on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

Recess until 10 a.m., June 6.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT BEFORE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND RADIATION SUBCOMMITTEE, JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE, JUNE 4, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is both an honor and a privilege to appear before you today.

Once when addressing a group at Cambridge University, Dean Acheson noticed D. W. Brogan, the great British expert on American culture, sitting in the audience. "I felt," said Mr. Acheson, "like the preacher who looked up from his sermon and noticed God sitting in his congregation."

Surrounded as I am today with scientists and doctors I understand how Mr. Acheson felt.

I am neither a scientist nor a doctor. I cannot speak as an expert on fallout levels and protection guides.

I am, however, a citizen and a Senator. As both it is my duty to speak out when I believe the Government is failing to meet the responsibility given it by the people.

The protection of the public health is one of the most important of the trusts given to Government by the people. This trust has been fully assumed by all levels of government, local, State, and Federal. The American people have full faith and confidence in their public health officials, as well they should have. Over the years, these officials have given America the highest standards of public health ever attained.

FALLOUT: A NEW PUBLIC HAZARD

The continuing discovery of the benefits arising from the use of radioactive materials in medicine and the discovery of controlled atomic fission have presented public health officials with a problem of growing dimensions. The exposure of large population groups to low but ever rising levels of radiation from a variety of sources constitutes a most worrying, most unknown, and unfortunately most easily and hysterically exaggerated situation.

I sympathize with the Federal Radiation Council and with the Public Health Service as they attempt to establish the policies and controls necessary to protect the American people. So little is known of the genetic and somatic effects of radiation doses on large populations, so important are the consequences of a mistake in judgment, and so varied and vocal are the differing points of view that I can see that inaction and indecision would hold great attraction to those responsible for public policy. I understand the paralysis that has seized policymaking in this field.

Yes, I sympathize and I understand.

I do not, however, condone.

In the coming year levels of fallout are expected to increase fourfold. In the years ahead, no one can say that these levels will drop; many would bet they will continue to increase. If we continue to drift, as a nation, putting off decisions as to the amounts of poisonous radiocontaminants we will allow ourselves to absorb, thereby postponing the implementation of protective countermeasures in the isolated cases where they are needed, we may find one of these years that it is too late. Let us not dwell on the dimensions of such a discovery.

Our present efforts in the field of radiation measurement and control are inadequate and they are confused. The U.S. Government is not doing what it could or should do in this field.

THE RADIOACTIVE CARIBOU

In past weeks on the Senate floor I have spoken in some detail on the shortcomings of our present radiocontamination control program. With the consent of the chairman I should like to place two statements which were given on April 4 and on May 14 into the hearing record at this point.

The April 4 statement outlines the grave and potentially hazardous contamination of the Arctic food chain with strontium 90 and cesium 137. The Arctic food chain is an ecological pyramid in which inland Alaska Eskimos are largely dependent upon caribou meat for their winter food; the caribou in turn is largely dependent upon lichen. It is the property of lichens, unlike other plants, to depend for its water and nutrients upon the atmosphere and not upon the soil. In effect it sifts the air and—in so doing—absorbs directly and without dilution all fallout material in the air. Thus it is that Arctic lichens are very, very contaminated with cesium 137 and strontium 90. The caribou feeding upon lichen have received substantial doses of these contaminants, and there is reason to believe that the Eskimos feeding upon the caribou have in turn absorbed doses at least substantially higher than those received by their fellow Americans in the lower 48.

Since making this statement I have received reports that lead me to believe that levels in the coming months and years will rise a good deal higher than figures now available indicate.

I am told that Scandinavian scientists measuring contamination levels in the Arctic Lapland food chain are now finding—and for the first time—that levels are well into the third range of the Radiation Protection Guide. As the committee is well aware—and I quote the Public Health Service—"The Federal Radiation Council has recommended that measures limiting intake of radioactive materials should be considered when indications are that levels averaged over a year will be within range III."

This range is now being reached in Lapland.

As Dr. Donald Chadwick, Director of the Division of Radiological Health, Public Health Service, has pointed out, there is floating about in the atmosphere far more contamination than has fallen to earth. Over the months and years ahead this radioactive debris will continue to fall onto and into the arctic food chain. The extremely long half-life of strontium 90 combined with the long life of the lichen makes it certain that here and there across the Arctic hot spots are going to get hotter and hotter.

A responsible official of the Public Health Service has informed me that it is reasonable to expect that in some instances individuals in the American Arctic will begin receiving exposures well into range III in the near future. The new estimates from the Federal Radiation Council on increased dietary intake of strontium 90 would appear to bear this out.

Until quite recently nothing whatever was being done by the Government to keep track of this hazard—although it is true that within the limited framework of Project Chariot studies in northwestern Alaska some useful information was obtained.

I am well pleased that now at least a limited program of monitoring and surveillance is to be undertaken this year in the Arctic. I would wish that a study of countermeasures to protect the Eskimo citizen were also underway. It is not. I would wish a policy decision had been made as to when and how countermeasures would be applied in the Arctic. It has not.

IODINE 131 IN MILK

My statement of May 14 spoke to a more general area of concern, that of the contamination of milk by iodine 131.

The radiation protection guide for a 12-month intake of iodine 131 is set at 36,500 micromicrocuries "as an acceptable health risk for large population groups for a lifetime, comparable with the orderly development of nuclear industry in the United States." This level is set conservatively in order to protect the infants, children and the unborn who are particularly sensitive to contaminant. Should this level be reached the Public Health Service advises that "countermeasures to limit the intake of contamination should be considered and surveillance increased."

According to a Public Health study, 10 percent of all male infants under 1 year drink 1.3 liters of milk.

A child in Palmer, Alaska, consuming 1 liter of milk a day from September 29, 1961, to September 29, 1962, would have received 39,660 micromicrocuries of iodine 131.

A child in St. Louis, Mo., consuming a liter of milk a day for the year from May 1957 to April 1958 would have received 91,250 micromicrocuries of iodine 131.

A child in Salt Lake City, Utah, consuming a liter of milk a day from October 25, 1961, to October 25, 1962, would have received 37,040 micromicrocuries of iodine 131.

A child in Minneapolis, Minn., consuming a liter of milk a day from October 25, 1961, to October 25, 1962, would have received 32,060 micromicrocuries of iodine 131.

Children in Salt Lake City, St. Louis, Palmer, and Minneapolis have received more—some have received far more—iodine 131 than is considered an "acceptable health risk."

No countermeasures of any kind have been suggested or ordered by the Federal Government. There is even some question whether the Federal surveillance network analyzes samples quickly enough to make countermeasures effective. There is, however, no doubt the network is so loosely constructed that many, many cases of high iodine 131 contamination go entirely undetected and unevaluated.

HIGHER AND HIGHER

In both these cases, Mr. Chairman, the so-called safe levels, as established by the Radiation Protection Guide, are being exceeded. There is every reason to believe, as the world is presently constituted and with the increased development of atomic arsenals by more and more nations of atomic weapons, that the levels of exposure for population groups will continue to mount. Third range readings, now fortunately so rare, may become commonplace.

Now, before this happens, strong leadership and sensible policies are needed.

I realize that we know very little about radiation effects on large population groups and that as a result nothing can be said with great certainty. And, so, in this and coming years, our decisions in this field will have to be of a pragmatic nature, using what knowledge is available, and allowing as large a margin of safety as humanly possible. We cannot, however, at peril to ourselves and to our children allow the absence of concrete knowledge to be the excuse for inaction. We cannot wait until we have large-scale observable effects from radiation on population groups. It will then be too late.

An article in the May 16, 1957, issue of the Reporter magazine, by Paul Jacobs entitled "Clouds from Nevada" points out the casual and inattentive manner in which the immediate country around the Yucca Flats proving ground in Nevada was monitored. This led to certain communities receiving extremely high levels of contamination during the atomic tests prior to 1957. Today, in 1963, we must not allow inattention or indecision to endanger again the safety of our people.

I understand that this afternoon the subcommittee is to hear a discussion on the application of radiation protection standards to large population groups. I should, in closing, like to propose some questions which the subcommittee might wish to consider.

1. Does or does not the Radiation Protection Guide apply to fallout?

2. If it does not, why do Public Health Service press releases, official statements, and reports continue to use the guide as a measuring device?

3. If the Radiation Protection Guide originally designed for the analysis of peaceful atomic uses does not apply to fallout, why not? Does the source of radiation have any effect upon its potency? I fail to understand the distinction between radiation caused by normal peacetime use and radiation caused by atomic fallout.

I cannot help feeling that the hesitancy in applying the Radiation Protection Guide to fallout is caused by the fear that range III levels may be obtained and that countermeasures may, therefore, be called for. Officials responsible for such matters have publicly expressed concern that the application of countermeasures might have unpleasant economic consequences.

The fear of the economic consequences resulting from the implementation of countermeasures should have no place whatever in the calculation of acceptable limits of exposure.

There is time enough to worry about the economic consequences after the public has been protected.

When a can of food is infected with botulism, the Food and Drug Administration does not hesitate to inform the public because it fears the economic results of its announcement.

4. If the Federal Radiation Council is not prepared to recommend countermeasures when third-range levels are obtained, then why does it not say so and clearly? If the guide does not apply, let us be told; let the Government stop using it. Let it be dropped at once. It is irresponsible and indefensible to continue its use and at the same time refuse to act when its guidelines indicate action.

5. Is the Federal Radiation Council prepared to order countermeasures at any time? What situation would call forth countermeasures? How high must the level of contaminants be before the Federal Radiation Council is willing to act?

The Federal Radiation Council must make its decision now as to when countermeasures will be taken, based upon whatever knowledge is presently available. If, in the future, new knowledge makes new judgments necessary, then let them be made. In the meantime, decisions are necessary now or we shall drift along and countermeasures will never be taken.

6. What makes the authorities so unwilling to recommend countermeasures? Both Minnesota and Utah last year, on their own initiative and contrary to the advice of the Federal Radiation Council took positive protective and temporary steps. What was the effect of this action? Was there public panic? Was there severe economic dislocation? I doubt it. The American people are sensible; they would take temporary diet substitutions in their stride.

In fact, if the American citizen was confident that countermeasures would be taken when unusual amounts of fallout was present, a good deal of the mistrust and apprehension that surrounds the subject in the public mind would disappear.

7. In 1959, the National Advisory Committee on Radiation recommended a program of growth for the Division of Radiological Health of the Public Health Service to bring its activities to the level of $50 million a year by 1964. Considering the possible scope of the problem, this was a modest proposal. This recommendation was strongly endorsed

by the Gross committee report on environmental health in 1961. Yet the budget request sent to the Congress for fiscal 1964 provides only $18,776,000 to be used for research, surveillance, and protective action, if needed, with regard to the radioactive hazards from all sources facing the whole Nation. This, quite obviously, is not enough.

I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare for me a table of the budget requests made by the Division of Radiological Health since its inception. With the consent of the subcommittee, I would ask that this table be made a part of the hearing record at this point. Let the record show that the initial budgets of the Division, over the years, have been halved before they reached the Congress. Over the years, the Congress has given substantially all the funds which the Executive has asked for radiation protection.

The development of an effective and adequate program of radiation protection has not been blocked by the Congress. It has been blocked by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the Bureau of the Budget. My question, Mr. Chairman, is why?

I deeply appreciate the subcommittee's courtesy in hearing me this afternoon.

Radiological health appropriation requests, fiscal years 1959–64

	Original division request to bureau chief	Bureau request to OSG	PHS request to department	Department request to Budget Bureau	Request to Congress	Appropriation
1959	$3,974,200	$3,874,200	$2,214,200	$1,044,200	$652,200	$634,100
1960	4,260,200	4,260,200	4,260,200	2,658,600	1,701,100	2,489,100
1961	10,655,325	9,411,700	6,239,300	6,207,600	6,219,000	6,719,000
1962	22,432,000	18,306,000	15,246,000	11,714,000	9,147,000	10,647,000
1963	35,157,600	35,157,600	35,157,600	28,303,000	17,775,000	15,875,000
1964	39,977,000	39,977,000	39,977,000	21,849,000	18,776,000	[1] 18,745,000

[1] House allowance.

CANADA EXTENDS TERRITORIAL WATERS TO PROTECT CANADIAN FISHERMEN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson on Tuesday, June 4, announced to the Canadian Parliament that Canada will adopt the base line principle and a 12-mile territorial limit to protect its offshore fishing resources. The United Kingdom has recently called for a conference among European nations for the purpose of considering the multilateral extension of the territorial waters in respect to fishing rights. Our Federal Government, which has the power to do so, has not taken unilateral action to establish base lines outside the 1958 Geneva Convention nor have we taken any action in terms of extending our territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limit to protect our fishery resources. The basis of our inaction could well have been founded on a fear that unilateral action on our part might excite other nations to act independently. But while we have been waiting, Canada has acted on its own and European nations are moving in concert in that direction.

We must move ahead in the same direction.

It has been argued that an extension of the territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limit for all purposes, including that of commerce and navigation, would in effect be detrimental to our defense interests. It is necessary, they say, that our naval fleet not be blocked by such restrictions. However, I have never heard it argued that the extension of our territorial waters solely to protect our fishery resources without regard to free access for commerce and navigation would have any such dire result. In fact, Mr. President, I have pointed out repeatedly that it may well be in our defense interest to prohibit foreign fishing vessels, particularly Russian fishing vessels, from engaging in fishing activities within 12 miles of our coast. This action will, in my opinion, strengthen our defense position by keeping the hundreds of Russian fishing vessels now operating off our coast at a safer distance. In April, between 180 and 200 Soviet fishing vessels were off the coast of Alaska. Recently Cuba announced that the proposed Russian fishing base in Cuba would handle 180 vessels, including 130 Russian craft.

Now that Canada has acted in this matter, I sincerely hope that the State Department will proceed with speed to give equal protection to our fishery resources and our fishermen. I ask unanimous consent that the report of this action by Canada to impose the 12-mile limit to exclude foreign fishermen, carried by the New York Times of June 5, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1963]

OTTAWA.—Canada will establish a 12-mile territorial limit for the exclusive use of Canadian fishermen, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson told Parliament today.

The proposed limit would become effective in mid-May of 1964. The present limit is 3 miles.

In measuring the zone, Canada will employ the headland-to-headland straightline principle. The strict application of this could bar foreign fishermen from enormous waters, including the entire Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy on the Atlantic side, and Queen Charlotte Sound on the Pacific.

Prime Minister Pearson repeated his recent pledge to President Kennedy that traditional and treaty rights of the United States in the affected waters would be taken into consideration. When the 12-mile limit was broached by Mr. Pearson at Hyannis Port, Mass., in April, Mr. Kennedy replied that the United States would reserve its rights.

The opposition leader, former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, warned of possible retaliation by the United States. Reminding Mr. Pearson that the United States buys about 70 percent of Canada's fish exports, Mr. Diefenbaker said the Government's action might have serious consequences to Canada's economy. He asked for assurances that the move would not hurt the export market.

Mr. Pearson replied that the time had come for firm and national action because of a failure to obtain international agreement on the 12-mile limit. He said that more than 40 countries had unilaterally extended their territorial waters and that many had extended their fishing limits.

Canada and the United States have always enjoyed friendly relations on fishing, Mr. Pearson said, and his Government hopes and believes that no strain would result from its decision.

FRANCE ALSO AFFECTED

He said his Government would hold discussions starting immediately with the United States and France, the countries most seriously affected, to determine what rights were claimed and how these claims might be met.

Canada was obliged to act because of the depletion of coastal fisheries and because of other problems, Mr. Pearson said. He did not disclose the other problems. Soviet fishing boats have appeared on both of Canada's coasts.

The headland-to-headland principle, also known as the straight-baseline principle, means that Canadian territorial waters will be measured in a straight line from a point 12 miles off the coast where the coast extends farthest into the sea. Previously the 3-mile zone followed coastal contours.

Canadian sources recalled that the headland-to-headland principle was recognized by international law in a 1951 decision by the International Court of Justice.

UNITED STATES WILL DISCUSS CHANGE

WASHINGTON.—The State Department reserved its position today on the announced intention of the Canadian Government to establish a 12-mile exclusive fishing zone off Canadian coasts.

The matter is to be discussed with the Ottawa Government. The United States has stood for the traditional 3-mile limit.

ISSUE IN LONG CONTROVERSY

The measuring of national fishing zones and territorial waters has been a matter of international controversy for many years.

In the spring of 1960, 87 nations met in Geneva for a conference on the law of the sea. In several weeks of discussion, little was accomplished toward establishing a universal limit in measuring territorial waters. A similar conference 2 years earlier also failed.

The 3-mile limit was established in the days when that distance was the limit of a cannon shot—a measuring device widely regarded as out of date in the missile age.

The United States proposed at the 1960 conference a 6-mile limit for territorial waters and an additional 6-mile zone under a coastal nation's fishing jurisdiction.

That proposal would have continued traditional fishing rights of other nations, with limitations on size and type of catch. The proposal was endorsed by Britain.

The Soviet Union and other nations have demanded a 12-mile limit for territorial waters, and some Latin American nations have called for fishing jurisdiction in sea areas extending from 18 to 200 miles.

William L. Standard, cochairman of the maritime law section of the Inter-American Bar Association, observed yesterday that "fishing rights were never a basis of great, meaningful differences between the United States and Canada."

Longstanding disputes over salt water rights have caused recent conflicts between Brazil and France over lobster fishing rights off Brazil and between the United States and Ecuador over tuna fishing off Ecuador.

Ecuador claims a 200-mile zone in the Pacific and has impounded fishing boats from San Diego, Calif.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the family of man mourns the passing of one who must surely be the greatest soul of our time. Pope John XXIII was a simple peasant who rose in the last years of a long life to the most exalted office in Christendom. When named to that lofty place in his church 5 years ago, at the age of 77, it was widely believed that John would would be an undistinguished "caretaker" pope who would leave no unique imprint either on the church or on the world. But in fact he has warmed this troubled, conflict-ridden world by demonstrating unmistakably the redeeming power of love and brotherhood.

As a Protestant, I join a multitude of other Protestants, Catholics, Jews and, those of no religious affiliation at all, in grieving the loss of this most remarkable man.

Why, more than his predecessors, did this particular pope seem to warm the hearts and emancipate the minds of people around the world—communicants and noncommunicants alike.

Perhaps it was his humility and simplicity—his capacity to preserve the common touch—a capacity that led him to delight in friendly, homely conversation with the gardeners and custodians around the Vatican.

Perhaps it was his tolerance for the frailties of others—a tolerance which once led him to tell a group of prisoners in a jail he was visiting that he had a special sympathy for them because one of his own relatives had served a jail term.

Perhaps it was his twinkling humor—a humor which led him to tell such stories as the following:

> In Italy there are three ways of losing one's money—women, gambling and farming. My father chose the most boring of the three. He became a farmer.

But most significant of all, Pope John let the love of God shine through his eyes, his heart, his head, and his hands. Although robed in the magnificance of the Vatican, he said that all his life he remained at heart a humble parish priest. His love for others radiated as naturally across international, denominational, and political lines as it did to his immediate brother bishops.

He frequently startled fellow churchmen by simple, direct questions about accepted patterns of thought and form. Some of his utterances, such as the following, were equally unexpected: "Everyone who does good is a Christian, even though he does not know it."

Presiding at a time of international tension and terrible danger to mankind, Pope John threw the full force of his personality and his office behind what he called "the attainment of the common good of the entire human family."

I will always treasure the private audience which I enjoyed with the Pope at the close of a globe-circling food-for-peace mission early in 1962. His face radiant with love and compassion, he spoke in moving terms of the hungry, afflicted children of the earth. A sense of humility came over our five-member Government mission as he told us that the American people were engaged in a divine work in using our agricultural abundance to feed the hungry.

There are three chapters in the all-too-brief reign of this great Pope that I think he will be especially noted for by historians of the future: First, his thoughtful encyclical of 1961, "Mater et Magistra," which set forth a forward-looking application of Christian principles to present-day social and economic conditions; second, his hopeful call to world peace and brotherhood, "Pacem in Terris," the encyclical of 1963; and third, the great worldwide ecumenical conference which is reverberating at the time of his death.

All three of these magnificent efforts were permeated by his conviction that differing religious viewpoints, competing economic and political systems, and even an "iron curtain" cannot blot out the essential unity of mankind. He never compromised his essential religious convictions, but, as Time's editors put it:

> By his example of love, he encouraged church leaders and scholars to join in discovering how much of the Christian faith they shared.

When Mater et Magistra appeared in the summer of 1961, I knew after reading and rereading it that the world had been given a great new voice for peace and brotherhood.

Today—

Read that moving encyclical—

> men are so intimately associated in all parts of the world that they feel, as it were, as if they are members of one and the same household. Therefore, the nations that enjoy a sufficiency and abundance of everything may not overlook the plight of other nations whose citizens experience such domestic problems that they are all but overcome by poverty and hunger, and are not able to enjoy basic human rights.

But it seems to me that it was in the areas of war and peace where Pope John spoke most significantly to the conscience of modern man. Four years ago he noted:

> If—which God prevent—a new war breaks out, nothing else will await or comfort all peoples but appalling destruction and ruin, and this whether they are victor or vanquished.

Just a short 3 weeks before he died his words appeared:

> Peace founded not in fear, suspicion and mutual diffidence; insured not by the threat of terrible destruction that would mark the complete ruin of the whole human race but established on a right ordering of human relations; order founded in truth, constructed according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity and put into effect in freedom. This is the peace that the race of man ardently desires.

Calling attention to the fact that the English translation of "Pontiff" is "bridgebuilder," Morris L. West concluded a moving sketch of Pope John in Life magazine with these words:

> I want to remember him for what he has been—a loving man, a simple priest, a good pastor, and a builder of bridges across which we poor devils may hope one day to scramble to salvation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Pronouncements of Pope John XXIII appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, June 2; a beautifully written piece by Walter Lippmann from today's Washington Post, an article by the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Protestant Episcopal Cathedral appearing in the Washington Post of Tuesday, June 4; an article by Morris L. West, "Builder of Bridges," from the June 7, 1963, issue of Life; and a column in the Washington Star of June 4 by the distinguished writer David Lawrence, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1963]

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRONOUNCEMENTS OF POPE JOHN XXIII

ON WAR

If—which God prevent—a new war breaks out, nothing else will await or confront all peoples (such are the dreadful armaments which our age brings into play) but appalling destruction and ruin, and this whether they are victor or vanquished (July 2, 1959).

ON COMMUNISM

It is necessary to remember that there are today widespread philosophical positions and practical postures that are absolutely irreconcilable with Christian faith. We shall continue with serenity, precision, and firmness to affirm that irreconcilability (Sept. 29, 1959).

ON THE PRESS

Its (the press') mission is not only informative but also formative, for it aims to educate. No one can deny that the organs of the press are not only the means by which public opinion expresses itself but also instruments of guidance, of formation, and therefore sometimes of deformation of public opinion. It is not love of knowledge, culture, or truth that guides some pens, but the unhealthy fire of certain passions (Dec. 8, 1959).

ON RACIAL PERSECUTION

And our sorrowing gaze turns also to the other children of God everywhere, suffering because of race and economic conditions, at once complex and giving reasons for anxiety, or through the limitation of the exercise of their natural and civil rights. At the same time, our word of heartfelt sympathy longs to pour forth into the hearts of each one an expression of human and Christian solidarity, which in the day marked by divine providence will come to flower (Apr. 17, 1960).

ON THE IRON CURTAIN

Many of our brethren do not enjoy any kind of real freedom, personal or civil, or religious; but for year after year have been enduring restraint and violence, and perfecting a sacrifice wrought in silence and in continuous oppression (Apr. 17, 1960).

ON WORLD AID

We wish * * * to hope that, once the legitimate aspirations of the people for freedom and independence have been satisfied, the richer will aid the poorer, the stronger will support the weaker, the more advanced will hold out a helping hand to the less developed, so that in the end all will feel that they are brothers, for all are sons of the same loving Father, who is in Heaven (Jan. 16, 1961).

ON EMPLOYERS AND WORKERS

We * * * hold as justifiable the desire of the employees to participate in the activity of the enterprise to which they belong as workers. This demands that the relations between the employers and directors on the one hand, and the employees on the other, be marked by appreciation, understanding, a loyal and active cooperation, and devotion to an undertaking common to both, and that the work be considered and affected by all the members of the enterprise, not merely as a source of income, but also as the fulfillment of a duty and the rendering of a service (July 13, 1961).

ON PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

The right of private ownership of goods, of productive goods inclusively, has a permanent validity, precisely because it is a natural right founded on ontological and finalistic priority of individual human beings as compared with society (July 13, 1961).

ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

Unfortunately, the entire Christian family has not yet fully attained this visible unity in truth. The Catholic Church, therefore, considers it her duty to work actively so that there may be fulfilled the great mystery of that unity, which Jesus Christ invoked with fervent prayer from His Heavenly Father on the eve of His sacrifice (Oct. 11, 1962).

ON RULERS

We supplicate all rulers not to remain deaf to the cry of mankind. Let them do everything in their power to save peace. By so doing, they will spare the world the horrors of a war that would have disastrous consequences, such as nobody can foresee. Let them continue to negotiate, because this loyal and open attitude is of great value as a witness for the conscience of each one and in the face of history. To promote, favor, and accept negotiations, at all levels and at all times, is a rule of wisdom and prudence which calls down the blessings of heaven and earth (Oct. 25, 1962).

ON SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

The church applauds man's mastery over the forces of nature. Thanks to those men who harbor thoughts of peace, mankind could dedicate itself, in noble rivalry, not only to the great economic and social tasks which confront it, but to the continuing exploration of space and to the bold achievements of modern technology (Dec. 23, 1962).

ON AMERICA

The citizens of America have explored the sea and air. They have given open-handed hospitality and employment to people immigrating from every land. America has continued to overcome with courage the various difficulties that have arisen from time to time and to render her legislation ever more in keeping with the dignity of the human person. It is a source of satisfaction to us to pay such a tribute to that illustrious nation as an augury for further advances in spiritual progress (Mar. 17, 1963).

ON NEGOTIATIONS

Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes which arise between states should not be resolved by recourse to arms, but rather by negotiations (Apr. 10, 1963).

ON THE UNITED NATIONS

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization * * * may become even more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights that derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights (Apr. 10, 1963).

ON DISARMAMENT

All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less, of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner convictions: unless, that is, everyone sincerely cooperates to banish the fear and anxious expectations of war with which men are oppressed. If this is to come about, the fundamental principal on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms, but in mutual trust alone (Apr. 10, 1963).

ON PEACEFUL RELATIONS

Let men give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level; an adjustment founded on mutual trust, on sincerity in negotiations, on faithful fulfillment of obligations assumed (Apr. 10, 1963).

ON PEACE

Peace founded not on fear, suspicion and mutual diffidence; insured not by the threat of terrible destruction that would mark the complete ruin of the whole human race but established on a right ordering of human relations; order founded on truth constructed according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity and put into effect in freedom. This is the peace that the race of man ardently desires as a most precious divine gift without which it is not possible to expect any constructive progress, lasting well-being and safe future for the young generations for families and for nations (May 11, 1963).

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 6, 1963]

THE MIRACLE OF POPE JOHN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reign of Pope John has been a wonder which grows more astounding the more we think how amidst the angry enmities of our time he became so greatly loved. It is a modern miracle that anyone could reach across all the barriers of class, caste, color, and creed to touch the hearts of all kinds of people. There has been nothing like it, certainly not in the modern age. The miracle is a proof which we sorely needed that all the varieties of men do actually belong to one human family. Otherwise, so many could not have heard and understood and responded to Pope John.

That they have responded is proof that the enmities and divisions of mankind are not the whole reality of the human condition. There is in men a capacity, unplumbed and perhaps unmeasurable, to be reached by loving kindness. The miracle of Pope John is that he knew this and believed it and had faith to act upon it, and that he was proved to have been right. So, as he lies dead, he is revered and blessed by all sorts and conditions of men all around the globe.

We know that the miracle of Pope John will not transform the world. The condition of man is a hard one, and his struggle to survive and to prevail will not disappear with the appearance of a saint and the proclamation of a saving truth. We shall not suddenly become new men. But the universal response which Pope John evoked is witness to the truth that there is in the human person, however prone to evil, an aptitude for goodness. That is why we must never despair that the world can be better than the world we live in.

It is evident to anyone who reads the two great encyclical letters, "Mater et Magistra," "Mother and Teacher," and "Pacem in Terris" "Peace on Earth," that Pope John, far from being naive and unwordly, had an encyclopaedic and acute knowledge of the complex and stubborn problems of the daylight world. The encyclical letters do not suppose that the world can be cured before the problems that harass it are brought to solution. The encyclical letters are, therefore, directed to the solution of human problems by ordinary men. They are cornerstones of an imposing construction which, as it is carried forward, will become acceptable and increasingly self-evident to men who deal toward each other with respect for the human person and for his reason.

The belief that there are such self-evident concepts and propositions has been denied by many in the modern age. Yet our own American institutions were founded by men who had been taught to think it self-evident that men are capable of reason and that this is a universe which can be lived in rationally. The Founding Fathers inherited this belief. For modern secular men, who have been taught to reject it, an act of faith is needed. When the belief exists, as it did so profoundly in Pope John, it can become the intellectual core of what can be a human doctrine which transcends conflicting diversity.

The movement to bring the teachings of the church to bear upon "the process of radical change" in the modern "economic, and political situation" begins, says Pope John, with Pope Leo XIII. The first of the great modernizing social messages is the encyclical "Rerun Novarum," of May 15, 1891, on "The Condition of the Working Classes." Pope John carried forward this movement not only in his two great encyclical letters but by calling together the Ecumenical Council.

What will now come of all this will be of critical importance not only to the Catholic Church but to all churches and to all governments. In any event, the modernizing movement can perhaps be arrested but it cannot for long be turned back. For what Pope John began will have very big consequences, and the history of our world will be different because he lived.

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1963]

MEN LOVED THE HOLY FATHER BECAUSE HE LOVED ALL MEN

(By Francis B. Sayre, Jr.)

Men loved him, because he so obviously loved. Not just his own flock, but all Christians will, I think, accord Pope John the affectionate preeminence that love alone can earn among the leaders of Christendom in this century. I have no doubt he will be remembered as first among us all.

For this old man, with courage unsurpassed, girded up the whole of his generous life to lead his church anew into the presence of Christ. His summons was to a council that could dare acknowledge an era ended, a new hope at hand. He opened that meeting in the Vatican upon his knees; the world listened as he begged the Lord to overrule the deadly stiffness and forgive the convenient accommodations of human failing, even in the church. And we saw how he loved, how he went out to the poor, how he suffered for the offended, how he embraced those whom he called "separated brethren."

I do not know that men were ever reconciled, or faith renewed, by theologians arguing their ponderosities in high ecclesiastical negotiation. Not of such august exercise is Christian reunion sewn. But of the love of a simple peasant, who would not lose his inborn honesty, even when he was Supreme Pontiff, are old wounds healed and new grace born. He was not content, as shepherd of the church, to entangle God's people in obsolete alliance with bygone power structures. Nor would he countenance the disguise of truth through Biblical dogmatics.

It is now clear that Pope John, while he was not himself the author of the far-reaching reforms proposed at the Vatican Council, liberated a movement that must have been long in germination. Many have been astonished at how wide and deep is the stream which he brought to the surface, and which may yet succeed in cleansing and kindling the Roman Catholic Church in a measure surpassing any dreams of the Protestant reformers. As one of the observers at the council remarked, "At first I felt smug to see the reformation reproposed in much the terms of my dissenting forefathers 400 years ago; but then I was breathless to see how much further this ancient church was perhaps prepared to go. Much further than we."

What passionate conscience, what humble yet imaginative courage, could call forth such a revolution? It remains of course to see how far the daring will be consummated; but one thing is sure, and that is that a movement of faith thus liberated within the church will certainly survive the death of its deeply lamented midwife. What Pope John set free will never go back into the bottle.

For the separated brethren the work of this humble and godly man may well impose upon their conscience the most searching question since the time of Martin Luther. For if indeed, in God's providence, the Roman Church succeeds in those reforms of itself for lack of which the Una Sancta was severed, Protestants will have to answer to Christ the reason for their continued separation. What valid reason could there be for further aloofness? And if it seems a difficult and discomforting prospect to alter the habits and sacrifice the establishments of 300 or 400 years, and then let us think of the willing trust of a Pope to whom 1,900 years of war and peace, sin and success, were only a prelude to new departure for the mission of God in the world. Who can say that in his heart he can dare to love so much as this holy man, who was our Christian brother?

There were no timidities in this man. His wisdom, ripened through the years, sprang from intimacy with the ways of God as over against those of man. It was this intimacy that gave Pope John the freshness of freedom—freedom from the sediment of churchly vanities; freedom, too, from the narrow categories of political conflict. When he instructed us in the ways of peace, the world listened, because somehow it perceived the peace that was rooted in the Pontiff's heart. It was that peace which no manmade war can shake, no ideology challenge, because it is the sacred gift of God. Of that peace Pope John was a good and generous trustee, for he knew that it was God's and not his own.

[From Time magazine, June 7, 1963]

BUILDER OF BRIDGES FOR US POOR DEVILS

(By Morris L. West)

I am very close to tears as I begin to set down these words. What can I say of a man so manifestly good, so manifestly the victim—or is it the victor—in a drama of divine irony whose poignant prayer as he lies stricken is not for the salvation of his own soul but for the salvation of a work begun in the name of God?

I have no dignity in the church. I have no personal merit to commend me for the task of writing a eulogy, save perhaps this—that I am, in the spirit, a stumbling son of Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli. And, as a son, I want to say what his living and the thought of his dying have meant to me and to other souls still vagrant on this puzzling planet.

I live 12,000 miles from Rome. I stand with 550 million other believers on the lowest level of the complex hierarchic order of the church. But I wander widely and I am troubled by the spectacle of misery and poverty, and injustice and oppression, and the million faces of despair. I wrestle daily with the mystery of how all this could have issued, as the deposit of faith affirms it does, from the single creative act of an all-good and all-knowing divinity.

To me Angelo Roncalli presented himself always as a man who carried the burden of the same mystery, who shared the agony that it imposes on the human spirit, who knew the wild and risky leap demanded by the act of faith—and who knew, too, from how many millions the grace to make it has been withheld.

From the day of his election the makers of legends were busy about him. But even they could not obscure the true nature of this man—shrewd, pragmatic, kindly, too simple to be seduced by eminence, too gregarious to be happy in the baroque enclave of the Vatican, a man with a sense of fraternity and a gift of compassion which even the formalities of Vatican communication could not distort.

The Romans named him un Papa simpatico. And everyone wished he were younger, so that the imprint of his personality might be deeper on the corporate life of the church and the common life of the world. We had had a surfeit of princes and politicians and theologians—even of conventional saints. We needed a man who spoke the language of the heart, who understood that the dialogue of God with man is carried on in terms far different from the semantics of professional philosophers. We have had him too briefly.

Many of my generation felt that the traditional relationship between clergy and the people had become defective. We acknowledged without reservation the dignity of the priestly office, its divine function in the renewal of the sacrificial act and in the dispensation of sacramental grace. We respected the abnegation and dedication imposed by the celibate state. We supported our pastors according to their needs and our capacities. We built schools and monasteries and hospitals. We financed missions and works of charity. We carried double and triple burdens to educate our children in the faith.

But many of us felt, not without reason, that there was too much emphasis on the magisterium of the heirarchy—their authority as moral arbiters, interpreters of dogma and administrators of the temporal structure of the church. We felt that there was not enough understanding of their ministerium—the service of the Creator through and by spiritual and temporal service rendered to the people.

In half a generation the vista of the universe had exploded into galactic dimensions. The human spirit was being submitted to monstrous tensions—moral, political, economic. And while we clung desperately to the deposit of faith, we longed for a renewal of the intellectual and pastoral life of the church so that we might live—through the faith—hopefully and actively in the world into which we were born.

We were not cenobites. We were men of the 20th century and we could not opt out of it. We were not only members of a church, we were members of the diverse human family as well and we could not opt out of that either. It was like the breaking of a new day when we heard the call of John XXIII for an aggiornamento—for an updating of the church, her manners, her customs and her interpretation of the deposit of faith into the language of this millennial century.

When John XXIII was elected pontiff, he abrogated nothing of the primacy of his office. Yet one of his first acts was to make himself more readily available to his brother bishops. Later he intervened in the debates of the Ecumenical Council and in the lobbyings of its members to affirm that the Roman Curia was not the Pope, and that the Pope was brother to every bishop in Christendom and servant of every human soul in the world.

Of all the recent popes, it seems that John XXIII has been least afraid of schism, of heresy or of the militancy of non-Christian religions. A man of simple faith, he believed in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the promise of perpetuity made by Christ to the church. He put no store in interdicts or excommunication because he was also a man of simple charity who understood that, although human beings are limited by God's covenant with them, God Himself is not so limited. He knew that all men must live with the burdens and confusions of their own history, and that salvation or damnation hangs, in the last resort, upon God's judgment of the final direction of a man's will—toward Him or away from Him. He claimed without reservation his right as the supreme pastor to preach truth and refute error, but he gave the impression of a man ready at all times to suspend judgment on human confusion and human delinquency. All other pontiffs knew these things—preached them, too. What has made John XXIII so different is his lively and intimate sense of their application to the commerce of life, immortally reflected in Pacem in Terris, his encyclical on peace.

I am chary of miracles; but I think there has been a kind of miracle in the way Pope John managed to impress his charity upon the church and upon the world. Most people have seen him only in photographs.. His own voice has not often been heard. Mainly his words filtered out to the faithful through newspaper reports and the variant voices of preachers, good and bad. But somehow we have all felt him, and felt that God was with him. In his hands the crosier of the bishop has meant what it was meant to mean—the crook of the kindly Shepherd, to whom the wayworn and the stragglers meant more than those penned safely in the sheepfold.

When he was elected Pope, he became heir to a long list of titles: Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Sovereign of the Vatican City State. Yet the title which has seemed to sit most comfortably on him is that of Pontifex: The builder of bridges. He goes too soon and he leaves his work unfinished, but the bridges he planned are already abuilding—bridges of understanding and tolerance between the separated families of Christendom and the nations of East and West.

The formula on which he based all his architecture was very simple: "I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than with that which divides."

He was never a polemical man. He disliked contention and preferred to rely upon discussion and persuasive prompting rather than to invoke the authority of his office. He ordered that even the admonitions and censures of the holy office be couched in moderate language so that men of good will might have room to move through the most risky speculations to a fuller understanding of the truth. He was never a political man. He was a diplomat long enough to know that political action creates more problems than it solves.

There was a great boldness in his planning, a devastating directness. He encouraged the most daring speculations of modern theology, and he lent the weight of his influence to those ecumenical dialogs which aimed at breaking down semantic and historic barriers between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians.

There are some in the church who were disappointed because he did not take a more militant line against Russian communism. There are some who were shocked because he accepted birthday greetings from the premier of Russia and then received his son-in-law in private audience. Yet the incident illuminated his whole attitude to the affairs of human souls. He knew that every society and every system survives by virtue of what is good in it, just as human beings are kept from the ultimate madness of despair by that in their nature which is good and conformable to a divine pattern.

John XXIII is to leave us—a great man, and a great pope. For this very reason there is rare tragedy in his passing. The tragedy is that, having begun so much, he will not be permitted to see the fruits of his labor; he has seen only the first faint buds. Yet in this, as in all else, his life has been patterned on that of the Christ whose vicar he was. He has walked for all too short a time, scattering the seeds of truth and charity on good ground and stony soil, and has endured the painful crucifixion of illness and frustration. Now, at the end, he must abandon himself and all his unfinished work into the hands of God.

How has he felt during these last months, perched on his lonely eminence with the world spread beneath him like a campaign map and above him the monstrous mystery of the Godhead? There must have been times when his aged shoulders bent under the burden and even his stout peasant heart quailed at the thought of things undone. Even the mercy of death has been delayed for him—as it was for his Master.

History will be kind to him, I think, because he has been a kindly man who had compassion on the multitudes, "seeing them harried and abject, like sheep that have no shepherd." Princes and priests are mourned as rarely as they are thanked, but many will weep for this one because he has been, in truth, what he was named to be—a servant of the servants of God.

Will they canonize him and make him, officially, a saint in the calendar? In a way I hope not. For my part I do not want to see him idealized by a Vatican painter, lit by a thousand candles in St. Peter's, reproduced in plaster and gilt and sold to pious pilgrims. I want to remember him for what he has been—a loving man, a simple priest, a good pastor, and a builder of bridges across which we poor devils may hope one day to scramble to salvation.

Universal Tributes to Pope John

(By David Lawrence)

A strange phenomenon in world history emerges in the almost universal tributes being paid today on the passing of a Pope at Rome. Prayers in churches of all religions in Europe and elsewhere signify not merely the reverence of Roman Catholics but the eminence which a spiritual leader can attain in a world where political controversy so often ignores the ethical teachings of religion.

Popes have come and gone during the centuries, but few in recent decades have managed to win the respect and esteem which Pope John XXIII achieved by reason of his penetrating judgment and keen understanding of the currents of public opinion and the conflicting philosophies of an age in which nuclear war stands as a constant threat of self-destruction.

In America, where the Constitution forbids the enactment of any law "repecting an establishment of religion" by government, there have been fluctuations in the power and influence of individual churches and much controversy of late even over the extent to which prayers shall be allowed in public schools, though no restrictions are invoked as yet in public legislatures and on occasions of governmental ceremonies of various kinds. Prejudices as between religious denominations unfortunately even reached the point where this became an issue in the last presidential campaign.

Yet, in the face of all the arguments of the past about the place of the Roman Catholic Church in the political, economic or spiritual life of America, the utterances of Pope John XXIII have received wide acclaim from all sections of the press in this country and even from many church leaders irrespective of denomination. Prayers for Pope John were offered last Sunday by many congregations in Protestant and Jewish as well as Catholic churches around the world.

Long after the reign of Pope John has passed into history, it will be wondered just what was the secret of this Pope's popularity. Was it because he made significant moves toward bringing about greater unity among the sects of Christianity? Was it because he showed a tolerance toward believers in communism, though rejecting their destructive aims? Was it because he revealed no hostility toward worshipers in all other religions—indeed, held out the open hand of friendship—so that the world came to recognize him as a holy man who truly practiced the doctrine of brotherly love, which so many leaders preach but do not always apply in the perplexing controversies of the hour?

Those persons who are expert in the nuances and strategies of modern diplomacy may see in Pope John's friendly references to the Communists a simple means of winning for the many millions of Catholics still behind the Iron Curtain some of the same tolerance by the Communists which His Holiness himself showed toward them. After all, if the spirit of religion is to be maintained inside the satellite countries, it is there that Christians require help to keep their faith as they grimly face hardships every day in an atmosphere of disillusion and discouragement.

It may be argued for a long time whether the example of tolerance that Pope John XXIII endeavored to impress upon the Communists caused some Italians in Italy to vote for the Communist Party in the recent electon there because they mistook tolerance of communism for a supposed acquiescence in its pernicious demands. But the Pope's move will some day be regarded as a step in the direction of better contact and closer communication between those who live inside the Communist countries and those who are trying from the outside to keep alive the spirit of human courage among the oppressed peoples.

Pope John eased the way for a better understanding of rules and discipline among Catholic worshipers and received praise for revisions he proclaimed as in line with changing times.

But what truly impressed hundreds of millions of people everywhere was the tremendous impetus the Pope gave to moral force in lieu of military force. He influenced, by his utterances, not only the Roman Catholics of the world—particularly in the Latin countries where the population is predominantly of that faith—but also those of us in this and other lands who are not members of the Roman Catholic Church, yet who admire its steadfast pressure for a society of better morals and for a world of reason. For these are times when, in an instant, a trigger can send nuclear missiles through the air to inflict destruction on peoples, irrespective of their religions or their faiths.

Pope John has not relinquished his spiritual throne—the voice of a great man never dies.

Mr. SCOTT. Great leaders are men who influence human history not only through their ideas but through their personalities as well. We do not need retrospective wisdom to know that two such men have moved among us and have shaped the course of our century. These men are Sir Winston Churchill and the late Pope John XXIII.

Some historians have already placed Pope John among the greatest spiritual leaders in the history of the Western World. This tribute is unquestionably deserved. The great encyclicals, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," were eloquent expressions of his ideas. The Ecumenical Council reflected the light of his personality. He forcefully introduced into our troubled, modern consciousness the theme of man's unity under God. Pope John's efforts on behalf of the brotherhood of all men were, regretfully, cut short. Yet the tribute he has received shows beyond all doubt that these efforts were not in vain.

Our future decisions will reveal how thoroughly we will have understood Pope John's inspiring legacy. The world deeply mourns the loss of one of her great leaders.

JOSEPH ALSOP COMMENTS ON THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in the June 4 issue of the Washington Star, the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, presents some stimulating views on the current crisis in agriculture. Mr. Alsop calls attention to the fact that it is unrealistic for anyone to propose high agricultural price supports without production controls.

He suggests that Senator TALMADGE may be on the right track in proposing legislation geared primarily to assisting small, independent type farmers through direct payments. He points to the fact that "great nations have always tended to decline when independent farmers were driven out by industrial farming."

Mr. President, I think it will be worth the time and effort of every Member of Congress to read Mr. Alsop's stimulating column.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grotesque Mess

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the chilly aftermath of the wheat referendum, everyone seems to be having second thoughts. Farm State Republicans and their allies of the Farm Bureau are belatedly but visibly worried about having freed the wheat farmers at a probable cost of $1.10 to $1.20 wheat and severe disruption of the markets in some other agricultural products as well.

The Kennedy administration, meanwhile, is visibly worried about being too coldly negative. The President will certainly veto any bailout bill returning to the old, thoroughly vicious system of high price supports without production controls. Nonetheless, it is a bit too coldly logical to say nothing to the wheat farmers except: "You've made your bed, now lie in it, even if it means $1.10 wheat."

Hence consideration is being given to more positive approaches. The one most discussed is an indication of willingness to take a wheat bill based on the principles of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE's cotton bill. Whether this will be the final decision remains to be seen. But it is certainly worth examining the Talmadge bill principles. There are two of them:

First, that those who need help ought to get it, but no one else ought to get it.

Second, that the help ought to be given in a way that keeps the U.S. Government out of the commodity management business.

If there is any excuse at all for Government aid to America's immensely overproductive agriculture, the excuse is social and biological. Farmers able to make the very large capital investments needed for mechanized, large-scale farming ought either to accept the prices of the marketplace or take their capital somewhere else. But millions of farmers are not in this happy position; and they constitute the social-biological problem.

The people who want to get rid of production controls and abandon farm price supports really want to drive this huge group of undercapitalized, small-scale farmers off the farms.

This was the program of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, in whose pious ministry the grotesque farm mess nearly quadrupled both in size and in cost. The worst criticism of Benson is that he never had the guts to say that he wanted the smaller, less efficient farmers to go to the wall.

Meanwhile, there are strong special and biological arguments against letting millions of the smaller American farmers go to the wall. The old pattern of our rural life has its own value. Furthermore, it is an unexplained fact of history, but an undoubted fact despite its mystery, that great nations have always tended to decline when independent farmers were driven out by industrial farming.

Thus the Talmadge cotton bill defines the undercapitalized small-scale producers as those who need help. It gives this group of farmers fairly generous help, in the form of high production payments. It provides much lower production payments to the large producers, although here Senator TALMADGE has unwisely compromised by removing his former $25,000 ceiling on the payment permissible to any individual cotton producer.

The justification for this kind of selectivity in helping the cotton farmers ought to be glaringly obvious. More than 600,000 cotton farmers were in the cotton program last year, but just a little more than 31,000 cotton farmers produced over half the crop—and therefore got over half the Federal aid.

The meaning of these figures is hard to credit. But consider: The cotton program cost the taxpayer $600 million in subsidies, plus $400 million in administrative costs for the storage, marketing, transport, and export of cotton. The entire cost of $1 billion is of course chargeable to aid to the cotton farmers.

Thus a few more than 31,000 Americans get aid from the taxpayer to the tune of more than $500 million. This is like giving half a billion dollars of urban renewal money to a very small and extremely prosperous suburban community. Grotesque is a mild word for it.

Yet that is not the worst of it. This particular Federal venture in commodity management not only has a price tag of $400 million for administrative charges alone. It also has the effect of maintaining an artificially high domestic cotton price, while we all but give cotton away abroad.

Hence the American cotton textile manufacturers are beginning to be driven out of business.

For this reason, the Talmadge bill, while aiding those farmers who really need aid by high, though carefully limited production payments, also gets the Government out of commodity management, at least for cotton. Broadly speaking, it allows the domestic cotton price to be set by the market place.

If these principles are not adopted, it will still be cheaper and more effective to help those who really need help by junking the existing cotton program. If every cotton farmer still in business is simply given an annual Federal check for $600, with no questions asked, the majority will get more than they now receive. And the taxpayer will save rather more than $600 million per annum.

ADDRESSES BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND SECRETARY FREEMAN BEFORE THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Tuesday I took the floor of the Senate to call attention to the opening of the World Food Congress in Washington. Again today, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this historic conference which will be in progress in our Capital until June 18.

The delegates and guests of the conference were privileged on Tuesday to hear an inspired address by the President of the United States.

President Kennedy said:

> So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved; so long as two-thirds of the nations of the world have food deficits, no citizen, no nation can afford to feel satisfied or secure. We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the will.

Also addressing the delegates was our courageous and able Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman. Secretary Freeman expressed the hope that the deliberations of the Food Congress will lead to "a renewed inspiration to mobilize every appropriate available resource and dedicate it to the achievement of our common goals, a greater awareness of the problems involved, and a better understanding of effective means for solving those problems."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two superb addresses by President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 4, 1963

President Radhakrishnan, Dr. Sen, Secretary Freeman, members of the World Food Congress, welcome to the United States and to Washington.

Twenty years ago—in May 1943—the first World Food Congress was held. Today we have gathered to rededicate ourselves to the objective of that Congress—the objective that all nations, all peoples, all inhabitants of this planet, have all the food that they need. We are here to renew a worldwide commitment to outlaw and banish hunger.

At the launching of the first World Food Congress, President Franklin Roosevelt declared: "Freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand." That is still true today.

During the past 20 years, there have been revolutionary changes affecting these matters—revolutionary changes in farm technology, in trade patterns, in economic development, and in population trends. Today, the average farmer in the United States can produce three times as much as he did then. New trading blocs have been formed; blocs which can be used either to strengthen the free world or to divide it. This Nation and others have provided unprecedented amounts of economic and technical assistance to less wealthy nations struggling to develop viable economies.

And population increases have become a matter of serious concern; not because world food production will be insufficient to keep pace with the 2-percent rate of increase, but because the population growth rate is too often the highest where hunger is already the most prevalent.

The same central problem that troubled President Roosevelt when he called together the first World Food Congress in 1943 is unfortunately still with us today. Half of humanity is still undernourished or hungry. In 70 developing nations, with over two billion people, malnutrition is widespread and persistent.

So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved—so long as two-thirds of the nations of the world have food deficits—no citizen, no nation can afford to feel satisfied or secure. We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the will.

In the Food and Agriculture Organization, which is sponsoring this meeting, we also have the machinery. Under the able leadership of Dr. Sen, the FAO has embarked on a vigorous and imaginative program which is now at the halfway mark. Through thousands of projects initiated during the past 2½ years, the freedom from hunger campaign has already helped conquer livestock diseases, increase crop yields, and multiply fishery catches.

The United States pledges its full support for this campaign—through food for peace shipments, Alliance for Progress operations, the Peace Corps, and the international efforts directed by the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Through our food for peace program, the people of the United States have contributed more than $12 billion worth of food and fiber to less fortunate people during the past decade. These donations now bring food to 100 million people in 100 countries of the world—including 40 million schoolchildren. We are grateful for the opportunity our agricultural abundance offers us to share our food resources with the hungry of the world.

But the distribution of food to the needy is only a part of the answer. It can take care of emergency needs—resulting from famine, floods, and other catastrophes. It can be used to feed refugees and to nourish children. It is a useful supplement to perennially short diets in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

But it is not a permanent solution. All of our stored abundance, even if it could be distributed evenly to all the undernourished of the world, would provide a balanced diet for less than 1 month. And many nations lack the necessary storage, transportation, and distribution facilities. Many people are inhibited by traditional eating habits from using foods that provide rich nourishment. And, perhaps most importantly, modern, efficient agricultural training and education is too often unavailable in the very nations most dependent on it.

The real goal, therefore, must be to produce more food in the nations which need it most. Know-how is not the problem. For the first time in the history of the world, we do know how to produce enough food—enough to eliminate all hunger completely. Farm production has undergone a scientific revolution which may well rival, in its social consequences, the industrial revolution that introduced the factory system.

But this means that agriculture departments and ministries must make a greater, more systematic effort to share this knowledge—to help transmit and adapt new farm technology across the barriers of ignorance and suspicion. The key to a permanent solution to world hunger is the transfer of technology to food deficit nations—and that task, second to none in importance, is one of the basic reasons for this Congress.

It would be easy to say that this task is too great for any organization or conference.

Most of man has been undernourished for most of human history. Even today, as the death rate drops, it means in too many places that more people are simply living longer in misery and hunger. But a balanced and adequate diet for the whole human race is now, for the first time, within our technological capacity—and we are gathered today to devise the necessary machinery, to mobilize the talents and interests required from many nations to do this job.

We realize, of course, that this problem, in its broader dimensions, neither begins nor ends on the farm. It involves the whole economic and social structure of each nation. It involves the building of new institutions, the training of a new generation of young people. Above all, it involves—and requires—the urgent, priority attention of us all.

In the course of your deliberations over the next 2 weeks, I would suggest five basic guidelines to be constantly kept in mind:

First, the persistence of hunger is unacceptable either morally or socially. The late Pope John, in his recent encyclical, spoke of the conviction that "all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity." That same dignity—in the 20th century, certainly—requires the elimination of large-scale hunger and starvation.

Second, we must recognize the fact that food-deficient nations, wtih assistance from other countries, can solve their own food problems. The freedom from hunger campaign is based on this solid premise.

Third, international cooperation, international organization and international action are indispensable. A contracting world grows more interdependent. This interdependence requires multinational solutions to its problems, particularly those involving basic human wants and needs.

Fourth, no single technique of politics, finance or education can, by itself, eliminate hunger. It will require the coordinated efforts of us all to level the wall that separates the hungry from the nourished half of humanity.

Fifth and finally, world opinion must be concentrated upon the international effort to eliminate hunger as a primary task of this generation. Over 1,900 years ago the Roman philosopher, Seneca, said: "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by prayers." Human nature has not changed since Seneca's time; and world peace and progress cannot be maintained in a world half-fed and half-hungry.

But the weapons against hunger have vastly improved in 1,900 years. Our task is to take advantage of those weapons and to use them with skill and dedication. The war against hunger is truly mankind's "war of liberation." For victory in this war will liberate the energies and the talents and the creative abilities of an entire half of mankind. Victory will not come next year—or the year after next—perhaps it will not finally come in the sixties—but it can and must come in our lifetime.

For we have it within our power to win this battle. It is a more important, more glorious battle than any other in the history of man—for it involves the power to build, rather than destroy. We shall win that battle, my friends. And all of us here today can consider ourselves privileged to gather at this moment in history to seek, to commit ourselves to achieving, and perhaps at some future time to see, a world of plenty for all.

A Challenge To Use All Abundance To Create Abundance for All

(By Orville L. Freeman)

The United States, its people and its government, extend a most cordial welcome to the World Food Congress and to each participant in these meetings.

We welcome this Congress as a fitting opportunity to pay tribute to those pioneers who launched this effort to combat hunger at the conference in Hot Springs just 20 years ago.

We welcome it as an opportunity to give an additional thrust to the 5-year freedom from hunger campaign, the objectives of which the United States supports by a wide variety of economic assistance operations, including food-for-peace shipments, Alliance for Progress operations, Peace Corps activities, and support for the joint efforts of the FAO, the U.N., the OAS, the Colombo plan, and other international approaches.

We welcome it particularly because of our high hopes that out of these 2 weeks of deliberations may come definite gains, among them a renewed inspiration to mobilize every appropriate available resource and dedicate it to the achievement of our common goals, a greater awareness of the problems involved, and a better understanding of effective means for solving those problems.

As Chairman of the World Food Congress I wish to pay high tribute to the many dedicated people who have done so much to prepare for this Congress and pave the way to its success.

We deeply appreciate the leadership of Dr. B. R. Sen, the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the effective work of the FAO officials and staff, the support given by the President and the Congress of the United States and the many executive departments involved. We especially want to acknowledge the contributions made by industry and by agricultural organizations, and the work of citizens, through their religious, service and other voluntary organizations—including the American Food-for-Peace Council and the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation—that have meant so much in helping to make this a real people-to-people endeavor.

Finally, may I pay tribute to the thousand individuals who are participating in the Congress. Each of you is here because of your deep concern about one of this world's major problems. Each of you is in a position to make a substantial contribution to its solution. The success of this World Food Congress depends on each one of you.

As we begin our working sessions, I should like to point out the nature of this gathering, to emphasize the urgency of its purpose, and to suggest some approaches to the achievement of its goals.

Throughout my presentation I should like to urge that we commit ourselves to a determined effort to win the campaign for freedom from hunger; to win that campaign so decisively that we can proceed to enlarge and broaden our goal so that it will encompass the positive approach that is the logical corollary to the elimination of any evil or hazard. Freedom from the evil of hunger then becomes freedom for positive good—freedom to enjoy the better things of life that are possible only when hunger is conquered—freedom to develop all those human qualities that characterize man and distinguish him from the other animals of this earth that can also suffer from hunger—freedom to progress toward higher levels of living—freedom for the kind of life that can be within the reach of all the people of the world in an age of abundance.

Throughout this discussion I would ask you to keep in mind the fact that science and technology have now—in this generation—opened the door to a potential for abundance for all. In some nations this abundance has already been achieved, particularly with regard to food, to such an extent that we have not as yet learned how to use effectively all that we produce. Let us accept this challenge of abundance with a determined effort to use all abundance to create abundance for all.

The nature and makeup of this Congress is, in my judgment, particularly suited to a consideration of this challenge. It is sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization—an international agency through which member nations seek to work together toward common goals. Yet it is truly a people-to-people meeting in the sense that participants have been invited as individuals. Scientists in many fields; representatives of governments, universities, and international organizations; leaders in farmers' organizations, industry, women's groups and other citizen bodies; men and women from developed and developing countries—all are here encouraged to discuss common problems fully and frankly.

The heterogeneous nature of the participation in this Congress is perhaps matched by the varied nature of the kinds of effort that will be required to achieve the goal of freedom from hunger, and to progress toward the use of all abundance to create abundance for all. The achievement of that goal will require more than action by governments—more than action by international organizations. It will require a high degree of public understanding and a mobilization of public opinion. It will require action by agriculture and by industry, by citizens' groups, by individual leaders.

It will require planning and coordination at many levels. It will include action by the governments of developing nations and of developed nations. It will include bilateral action as well as multilateral agreements. It will require experimentation and pilot programs. It will require flexibility. It will require the kind of exchange of information and experience that will enable us to develop, expand, extend, and adapt those methods, techniques and programs that work the best. It will require a pragmatic and pluralistic approach.

There will be no formal, binding document voted upon, signed and sealed at this Congress. The real success of these meetings will not be measured by any piece of paper, or even by a volume of published proceedings. The measure of the success of this Congress will be determined—in part, but only in part—by the quality of the addresses and papers presented here, and the maturity, vision and realism that will characterize the discussions that take place. Its success will be measured, most significantly, by the extent to which the individual participants—inspired and informed by their experience here—are encourged and stimulated to take positive action, after the Congress is over, each in his own nation and within his own sphere of influence, toward plans and programs that will advance the goals we seek.

These goals are among the most important and the most urgent of the many goals shared by all men everywhere. Men have sought freedom from hunger since before the dawn of human history. Long before men formulated slogans—indeed, before they had developed much use for words—they struggled in response to the primary human drive for food.

But if the desire and drive to achieve freedom from hunger is as old as life itself, there exists today two new elements of utmost importance.

One of these elements is symbolized by the fact that we are meeting here today in a World Food Congress to express our common concern about a universal goal. This represents one of the brightest hopes of this critical age in which we live—the hope that arises because we now seek, in a conscious and articulate manner, freedom from hunger for all men all over the world, and we seek to find ways in which we can work toward these goals in cooperation with each other.

This is something new in history. Primitive man sought food for himself, or at most, for his family. Later a tribe, still later a nation, became the unit within which members acted to achieve freedom from hunger for the group.

During much of recorded history men and nations have been forced by the prevailing fact of scarcity to seek freedom from hunger for themselves at the expense of their neighbors. They have struggled against each other for the fertile valleys and the flood plains. They migrated into new, forbidding, sparsely occupied areas of the world when population pushed too hard against the supply of food. Countless wars have been fought to gain enough territory to secure enough food to survive.

It was left to our period of history for men to develop a concern to combat hunger for all people throughout the world, to recognize that survival depends more on cooperation than on conflict, and thus to launch international efforts to combat hunger. This fact is one new element of utmost importance.

The second new element is likewise a product of our age. For the first time in history science and technology have progressed so far that we can envision the day when no one on earth need suffer for want of material necessities of life. We can see the possibility of the conquest of hunger and cold and other physical and natural hazards for all men everywhere. The fact of scarcity that has dominated the past can now be replaced by the potential for abundance that is the promise of the future.

This dawn of the age of abundance was recognized by those pioneers who met at Hot Springs 20 years ago. They declared: "that the goal of freedom from want of food suitable and adequate for health and strength of all people can be achieved."

Two years ago, when the FAO put out its basic study on "Development Through Food," this recognition was tinged with even greater optimism. That publication states: "If action which is well within our means is taken, freedom from poverty can be achieved for most of the world in one generation's time."

And in FAO's publication, Third World Survey, in a discussion as to whether its targets for Freedom from Hunger can be reached, I find this statement: "There should be little room for doubt on one score: the world could grow enough food to meet all these needs, if we made rational use of nature's bounty."

Within those nations that have come to be called the developed nations of the world this new potential for abundance has in many respects become a reality—most conspicuously in the production of food. Here in the United States, for example, agriculture has dramatically demonstrated its productive success. Millions of our farmers, spurred by the incentive, and pride of ownership inherent in the American family farm economy, have applied new discoveries, and new methods to their own operations to produce a striking increase in productivity that overshadows increases in other major sectors of our economy. We have produced food to spare and to share. And our economists point out that crop production in the United States could easily be increased by 25 percent by 1967.

Other developed nations in the world are doing likewise. Economists in the U.S. Department of Agriculture have produced a study, entitled "The World Food Budget," evaluating world food needs, balancing them with world food supplies, and projecting them into the future under certain possible and probable circumstances. They have come up with the forecast that, assuming a likely rate of growth in population and income, and a continued growth of agricultural productivity at the rate that prevailed between 1953 and 1960, the developed countries of the world, by the year 2000, would have a potential for food production at almost double the expected demand. This projection dramatically illustrates the potential for abundance that scientific and technological progress offers to the people of the world.

As we examine the rapidly accelerating rate of progress in these fields we can foresee the end of the physical barriers to an age of plenty. Yet for most of the people that inhabit this earth abundance is only a dream. But it is a dream that becomes more insistent and more impelling every day.

We are meeting here today because we believe that, in a world in which abundance is possible, all people have the right to aspire to make that dream a reality.

We know that in today's world the contrast between those who have enough and those who have too little is too sharp and too disturbing to be tolerated. A little more than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln told the people of the United States that this Nation could not long exist half slave and half free. Today, when we can circumnavigate the globe in far less time than it would have taken Lincoln to travel from the east to the west coast of this Nation, it is doubtful whether the community of nations inhabiting this earth can long exist half hungry and half well fed.

The security of the world demands that this unbalance be corrected. The security of the world demands that measurable progress be made without delay. The half of the world that is hungry is increasing in numbers faster than the other half. Unless steps are taken to accelerate the rate at which growing numbers of people in developing nations can reach satisfactory levels of living, the world must face what the Roman philosopher Seneca referred to 1,900 years ago when he said: "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers."

This is a measure of the urgency of the goals we seek here.

We meet in this World Food Congress because we recognize this urgency. Whether we live in the developed nations, in which abundance is sometimes called surplus, or in the developing nations, in which food deficits handicap both personal welfare and national economic development, we are meeting here because we believe it is in our own interest, as well as the common interest of us all, to cooperate in a campaign against hunger throughout the world. We meet in order to learn from each other how the abundance that exists in parts of the world can be used to mutual advantage to create abundance for all.

We meet, not only to consider a vision of progress that may be possible, but also to study realistically and practically the problems that must be solved if that possibility is to become a reality. Each of the quotations about potential abundance that I presented earlier is a qualified one. One of them says that our goal can be achieved, not that it will be. One says that poverty can be conquered in this generation if we take the necessary action. One says we can reach our targets if we make rational use of nature's bounty.

The goals we seek are not easily reached. There are roadblocks in the way of our progress toward abundance. Many of them are serious. Some seem almost insuperable. Every one of the efforts made—by the FAO, by governments, singly and in cooperation with each other, by citizens groups and voluntary organizations—every one of these efforts has helped to make us aware of the nature and magnitude of the obstacles that lie in our way. I, therefore, ask you to consider with me some of the most serious roadblocks, with a view to finding practical means by which they can be overcome.

THE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE

One obstacle to progress has been an inadequate recognition of the importance of the role of agriculture in economic growth. A new steel mill seems much more dramatic than an improved rice paddy. Many of the developing nations have allocated their limited resources to industrial growth at the expense of agriculture to a degree that has intensified hunger and hardship and even threatened all economic growth.

An examination of our own economic history here in the United States shows how massive has been the contribution of agriculture to economic growth, particularly when our Nation was in the developing state. It released workers to industry as it became more productive. It lowered food costs in relation to income. It provided an expanding market for industrial goods. It produced large earnings from the export of farm products; sustained output during economic depressions; and met wartime needs for food and fiber. It now contributes to world economic growth by assisting in the economic development of other countries.

Agriculture can make comparable contributions to growth in all of the developing nations. In fact, it must make such contributions if development is to succeed.

Experience has shown how serious are the consequences when food and agriculture are neglected by a developing nation that is pushing rapidly for industrialization. As workers are drawn from the farms without any accompanying increase in efficiency, an already scarce supply of food becomes scarcer. As incomes in industry rise a little the demand for food increases, and either rationing or inflation is likely to result unless food can be provided from an outside source.

Adequate recognition of this roadblock is the first step toward overcoming it. When it is fully understood that a major factor limiting economic development is a low level of agricultural productivity, programs can be planned to increase that productivity at a proportionate rate.

The program at this Congress offers much opportunity for study and discussion of the essential role of agriculture in economic development. If, out of this Congress, could come an increased awareness of its significance, a greater familiarity with successful agricultural development programs and projects, and a determination to act to make sure that agriculture is accorded its proper place in planning and programing for economic growth, this roadblock could be eliminated.

THE BUILDING OF INSTITUTIONS

This leads to a consideration of other roadblocks in the way of progress in agriculture and rural development. Too often, here, the major roadblock is the failure to build the kind of institutions under which agriculture can make its major contribution. It seems much easier to see the need for better seed, fertilizer, machinery and irrigation systems than it is to develop institutions for education, effective marketing, adequate farm credit, and a sound system of land tenure and ownership.

Permit me to note, very briefly, some of the institutions that have contributed so much to agricultural progress in the United States. I do this, not because I mean to insist that institutions that work best in my country are necessarily the best for all, nor because I would ignore the vast differences in conditions that prevail; but rather because I believe that some of these institutions are based on principles that are valid everywhere, that can be adapted to meet many diverse conditions.

I think I would rate, at the very top, general education for all of the people. Unless farmers are literate and informed they face almost insurmountable handicaps in achieving greater efficiency and higher levels of living. The one single input that has contributed the most to progress and economic growth in all fields, here in the United States, is popular education.

Higher education and research, so well illustrated by our land grant colleges, have made contributions of immeasurable value to our agricultural development. Our extension system has brought new knowledge to farmers in their own homes and their own communities. Our land grant colleges have already made a good start in helping the developing nations, and extension systems are being developed in many parts of the world.

Educational institutions from both developing and developed nations are represented here at this Congress. If our deliberations here can promote greater exchanges of ideas and knowledge, increased cooperation and assistance, great strides forward can result.

Further research and new knowledge, about the requirements for adequate nutrition and the efficient production of various foods to meet those requirements, will always be needed to meet our constantly expanding needs and goals. But, in the allocation of scarce resources for education it is important to remember that the foundation must rest on broad, general educational opportunity for all of the people. Early in our history, Thomas Jefferson cautioned the people of this Nation that "if you expect to be both ignorant and free you expect what never has been and never can be." Popular education is a basic requirement on which all other institutional development depends.

Economic institutions are also essential; and, if agricultural advance is to maximize its contribution to higher levels of living, institutions for the handling, transportation, storage, processing, marketing and distribution of food must also progress as agricultural productivity increases. As the cultivators of the land seek to raise their efficiency and productivity they need institutions that will assure adequate credit on favorable terms.

Among the institutions that can help to meet many development needs are cooperatives, one form of private enterprise through which members can pool their resources to help themselves. It is possible that cooperatives can contribute even more in the developing countries than they have in the United States. Laws enacted in this country since the 1920's have encouraged the development of farm cooperatives, and our foreign assistance legislation specifically provides for aid in developing cooperatives abroad.

One institution that has proved its worth by its results is the system of land tenure that is based on ownership and control by those who till the soil, and which, therefore, provides the farmer with a most powerful incentive to improved operations. No other incentive stimulates capital improvements on the land as well as the farmer's assurance that he owns those improvements. No other system has been able to produce the abundance of food that this one has demonstrated so effectively and dramatically. I commend it as emphatically as I know how.

In emphasizing the building of appropriate social and economic institutions as an indispensable part of programs of development, I do not intend to minimize the importance of the physical and material things. These are essential. But they are also easier to come by. Without the right institutional framework they can be, and have been, used to exploit rather than develop the people themselves. In other words, physical progress and material resources do not necessarily in and of themselves, bring about abundance for all.

On the other hand, institutional development can bring abundance to areas where material resources are scarce. Some of the best-fed people in the world live in Norway, where the proportion of arable farmland is very low. Some of the people with the highest standards of living in the world live in Switzerland, a country rich in resources of beauty and people, but lacking in resources such as coal, iron, and petroleum.

If, out of this Congress, there can come a renewed awareness of the importance of institutions, a constructive sharing of experience in institutional development, and a determination to build the kind of institutions that will most surely and effectively build for abundance for all, then indeed this Congress will have been a success.

USE OF ABUNDANCE

A third roadblock along the road of progress toward plenty is the failure to make the most effective possible use of existing abundance, abundance available and at hand, to help to achieve greater abundance where scarcity still dominates. I refer to the abundance of technical knowledge as well as to the abundance of food.

We in the World Food Congress are challenged to a major effort to develop methods and consider plans and programs whereby the abundance of food that exists in part of the world can be used most effectively to promote the economic development that will create abundance for those where scarcity still dominates. In issuing this challenge I want to emphasize a clear recognition that the contribution of food as part of an assistance program is never a goal in itself. The goal of every developing nation is to be able to stand on its own feet. But food assistance can be a most powerful tool, a most effective instrument, in progress toward that goal. It is a tool that we have at hand, if we will only use it to best advantage.

Many of the developed nations, including the United States, can and do produce more food than can possibly be consumed by their own people. This productivity is increasing. As I stated earlier, projections indicate that if trends in 30 developed nations continue, by the year 2000 they will be able to produce nearly twice the food that their populations can consume. Let us contrast this with projections for the developing nations.

Such projections cannot, of course, be made very specific, because of the tremendously wide variations in the developing countries, and because of the many differing and unpredictable factors that will influence rates of growth. However, it is possible to make certain generalizations on which most will agree.

The most optimistic picture for accelerated economic growth in the developing nations, in the aggregate, indicates that they can and will increase their own domestic food production. But the most optimistic predictions fail to give any assurance that, in the generation immediately ahead, they will be able to increase it fast enough to meet the increasing demand. This demand will be exceptionally high for several reasons.

First, the rate of population increase in most of these nations is very high, and will perhaps go higher before it can be expected to tend to stabilize. Production will have to increase susbtantially in order to just keep up with population—it will have to increase still faster if it is to meet real nutritional needs.

Second, as economic growth proceeds, real incomes will increase, and with each increase in income comes an increased demand for food. Unless enough food is available to meet the demands created by both increased numbers and higher incomes, the lack of food will become a significant factor limiting economic progress.

It is perhaps one of the most fortunate coincidences of history that at a time when the developing nations of the world are in a takeoff stage in which more food is desperately needed if they are to take off successfully—at that same period the developed nations are producing and can produce an abundance so great that it is sometimes embarrassing. It is up to us, from developed and developing countries alike, to take full advantage of this fortunate coincidence.

It will not be easy. We, in the United States, are eager to share with others in this conference the experience we have gained in the distribution of more than $12 billion worth of food in our food for peace program during the past 9 years. We have learned that it is not easy to give away food. We have learned that careful planning and close cooperation with receiving nations is essential in order to insure that the food is used to best advantage both to allay hunger and to promote local development. We have learned of the fears of other food-exporting nations, and of our own commercial exporters, who are concerned lest food that is donated might diminish commercial demand. We have learned that however rigorously we avoid any such result it is still difficult to allay the fear. We have also learned how much depends on the capacity and ability of the receiving country to transport, store, distribute, and use the food it receives to best advantage.

We are only beginning to learn how effectively food aid can be used to promote economic growth directly. It has long been used, and should continue to be used, to relieve hunger in emergencies, and to prevent inflation in countries going through a stage of development I described earlier. Its use in school lunch and child feeding programs is an investment in the health and vigor of the rising generation, and is in a very real sense a capital investment in human resources. But it is only recently that we have begun to develop ways that food can be used as a direct input for economic growth.

Food is being used with dramatic success as part payment for work on labor incentive programs—irrigation, roadbuilding, the building of schools and other public facilities. It is being transformed into an investment that helps to build cooperatives and other forms of private enterprise. It is being used to help resettlement of farmers on new lands. It can be used to provide a high proportion of the capital investment required for the development of many programs essential for economic growth. Discussion, consultation and further experience can result in the improvement and extension of these methods of using available food as capital in improving agriculture and hastening economic development.

Let us, here at this Congress, determine to find new and better ways to use to greatest advantage this instrument of abundance that we have at hand. Let us determine to overcome the difficulties that lie in the way of its maximum use. This is a challenge to both the developing and the developed nations.

The highly productive nations are challenged to find better ways and develop better methods—by national, multinational and international means—by which agricultural abundance can make its most constructive contribution to the goal of abundance for all.

The developing nations are challenged to learn how to handle and use food that they receive, as well as to produce more domestically. They are challenged to study and evaluate the techniques, methods, and institutions that have proved effective in contributing to abundance, productivity, and economic growth, and to adapt all of these to the needs of their own people.

Both are challenged to work together and coordinate their efforts toward that end.

There are other tools available to us which we must perfect and use more effectively. It is hardly necessary to emphasize to this Congress the importance of the sharing of knowledge and experience under technical assistance programs. People ranging from world renown scientists to young Peace Corps volunteers have done yeoman service in the campaign for freedom from hunger, through programs carried out by the United States and many other nations, and through international activities carried out by the FAO and other international bodies.

And, although it is not directly within the province of this World Food Congress, I believe it is in order for us all to bear in mind the importance, to the overall achievement of our goal, of the expansion of world commercial trade. Many of the food deficit nations depend on the export of a single exportable food commodity, such as coffee, and to them international arrangements that would regularize and stabilize trade in that commodity are crucially important. To all nations, developed and developing alike, expanding world trade brings abundance closer to reality.

I would like to conclude by repeating the challenge faced by this World Food Congress, a challenge to each one of us who participates in these deliberations, a challenge to win so complete a victory in our freedom from hunger campaign that we can fix our goal on freedom for the higher levels of living that can characterize an age of abundance—a challenge to use all abundance to create abundance for all.

I have suggested that we consider here several major roadblocks that stand in the way of advance toward our goal. I have urged that we give full recognition to the indispensable role of food and agriculture in economic development. I have tried to point out the importance of learning how to build social, political, and economic institutions under which greatest progress can be made. And I have urged that we here and now determine to make full use of the abundance we have—abundance of food and abundance of scientific and technical knowledge—as effective instruments to create abundance for all.

The challenges are not easy ones, but they are supremely important. To meet them we face not only scientific and technological problems, but also the more formidable barriers that are social, political, and economic in their nature.

There are barriers of nationalism—and other isms, barriers of prejudice, of outworn customs, of misunderstanding and lack of understanding. Most important, and intertwined with all of these, is the barrier of ignorance.

I should like to emphasize that the barrier of ignorance applies not only to the illiterate, not only to those who have not yet learned how to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, although this is serious enough. But the barrier of ignorance applies as well to the learned and the powerful—to the statesmen of the world who have not yet learned how to put into effect elements of social engineering that will make it easier to extend the potential for plenty to all people.

The gap of ignorance that cries most urgently to be filled today is the gap between man's ability to create power, on the one hand, and, on the other, his lack of knowledge of how to control that power and direct it to the well-being of all men. For the same power that can destroy a city can light a million homes.

It is our challenge and our responsibility to close that gap.

Let us accept that challenge.

Let it never be said of this generation that we were able to orbit the earth with satellites, but that we were unable to put bread and rice into the hands of hungry children. Let it never be said that a generation that could literally reach for the stars was unable to reach for—and grasp—the potential for plenty, and progress, and peace that is at hand.

AFRICAN GENESIS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the emergence of sovereign nations in Africa is one of the major events of the 20th century. As all of us know, this development is presenting U.S. foreign policy with some sharp challenges to its ingenuity. Above all, it is giving us excellent opportunities to revitalize America's dedication to our revolutionary heritage and our democratic traditions.

I believe, Mr. President, we are meeting our challenges forthrightly in Africa, and are taking a firm stand in favor of freedom and independence for the peoples of that vast continent. And this is as it should be. The magnificent service given to America and the free world by the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, is proudly recognized by the people of Michigan, who knew him as our six-term Governor.

A recent development in Africa deserves our attention and encouragement. I refer to the significant stride toward African unity in the charter signed in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, creating the Organization of African Unity. The desire for unity, both regional and Africa-wide, is dear to the heart of every African leader. I know this well from being a part of the Senate study mission which went to Africa in the fall of 1961.

Americans should be happy to see the lively interest Africans are taking in cooperative endeavors. This course can be an important contribution to a stable and strong continent, and the security of world peace and freedom.

An editorial on this subject appeared in the Washington Post on May 28, 1963. I commend it to Senators, and ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICAN GENESIS

While both the Western and Communist worlds are in varying degrees of disarray, the newly independent states of Africa have taken a significant stride toward unity. The initial achievement of the meeting at Addis Ababa was that it was held at all. Until recently, some of the leaders of free Africa were not even on speaking terms; the new nations themselves were divided into rival blocs and the outlook seemed bleak for the unity that all factions professed to want.

But the conference did take place, and 30 independent African states laid the groundwork for a continental organization. For this, much credit is due to Emperor Haile Selassie, who brought the countries together and kept the sessions on even keel. "Unless political liberty for which Africans have for so long struggled is complemented and bolstered by corresponding economic and social growth," the Ethiopian monarch asserted, "the breath of life which sustains our freedom may flicker out."

The new charter creating the Organization of African Unity will not of itself assure growth; but without some form of coordinating body, growth would be infinitely more difficult. Still, cohesion cannot come quickly among countries as different as Egypt and Liberia, Ghana and the Sudan. What made a successful start possible was agreement to begin gradually on functional problems before tackling (as Mr. Nkrumah had urged) political questions first. By not trying to do too much, the assembled African states were able to do something.

The general tenor of the remarks at Addis Ababa evidenced an increasing pragmatic temper among the African leaders. Most of the countries present may have been born yesterday, but the leadership did not react in a naive way to African problems. While there was unanimity on the question of eliminating colonial remnants from Africa, there was a marked diminution in the tendency to equate the West with wickedness and the East with virtue. It was gratifying to read Premier Sékou Touré's sensible remarks on Birmingham: "We cannot say that the American people are racists—racism exists everywhere, even in Guinea. We know that in the United States a fight is being organized by the Government of President Kennedy. We approve without reserve of this policy by President Kennedy."

Only time will tell if the bright dream of a united Africa will prevail. But the beginning is auspicious and the immediate goals are realistic. That this should have occurred under the aegis of the 71-year-old Emperor of Africa's oldest independent country confirms again Pliny's remark that there is always something new out of Africa.

JEWS AND JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, tragic, but important, is the report by Dr. Richard C. Hertz, chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Dr. Hertz is a learned and distinguished citizen of Michigan, the rabbi of Temple Beth El, and the report he makes summarizing the general situation of Jews behind the Iron Curtain should be of interest and concern to all of us. It throws light on an aspect of the anti-Jewish and anti-Western program of the Kremlin, sometimes unnoted. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report recently published in the yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWS AND JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

(By Dr. Richard C. Hertz)

Nearly 3 million Jews in the U.S.S.R. are being slowly strangled spiritually by the Soviet policy of forcible assimilation. Jewish identification is insisted upon by the government but allowed to have no real content. Cultural and religious discrimination against the Jewish minority is widely practiced. Jewish synagogues are gradually being closed, their leaders arrested and disappearing in a mysterious manner reminiscent of Stalinism. No Jewish education can be given to the young. No Jewish schools and Jewish organizations are allowed. No Jewish religious books are published. No voluntary associations of Jews are permitted to meet. No contact with other Jewish congregations or with the outside Jewish world is tolerated. No young people are to be found in the synagogues still operating—just old people whom the Kremlin allows to let die off along with their withering Judaism and their faded, tattered taleisim. The young people seem to have little spiritual or moral determination to resist the drying up of the Jewish stream. Many have intermarried or surrendered to the Communist pounding that religion is "the opiate of the masses."

Many have swallowed the Lenin-Stalin line about religion and today are largely antireligious, atheistic, law-abiding Russian citizens.

Meanwhile discrimination against the Jews is widely practiced, especially in the military and diplomatic and higher echelons of education and government. Anti-Jewish feeling in Russia, so deeply rooted since the days of the czars, is still rampant despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. Jews must carry on their internal identification card the stamp "Jew" and thereby subject themselves to discrimination, subtle or overt. Though Jews have minority status, they are permitted none of the rights or privileges of that status, such as having cultural autonomy with their own press or language or gathering place. Jews are not permitted to be reunited with their families who have emigrated to other parts of the world. Their mail is censored. Jews are not permitted to engage in any of the national cultural exchange. Every effort to arrange such an exchange has thus far failed to be approved by the Soviet authorities.

Thus, Soviet Jews appear to be Jews without leadership, without faith, without organization, without commitment, even without the will to survive as Jews. As one college student visiting Russian Jewry wrote home to his parents last summer, "Just as Catholicism in Poland, Judaism grows stronger in the basements and catacombs of refuge than in a synagogue. As for now, the Jews in Russia remain a chosen people—chosen for economic discrimination and cultural extinction."

Although Mr. Khrushchev has expounded at great length on the sins of Stalin, he has completely gilded over and bypassed the sins of Stalin against the Jews in his black years. The Jews of Russia are silent. They cannot speak out, and their spirit is in chains of fear lest the Stalinist methods return.

The real danger of the U.S.S.R.'s type of anti-Semitism is the discriminatory policy militating against the survival of Jews as a national and religious minority. It is a policy of cultural genocide. Soviet anti-Semitism is not just an official policy against its Jewish citizens. It is much more subtle. It is against Jewish culture, Jewish learning, Jewish religion. It is against the men who perpetuate those values—the rabbis, the teachers, the writers, the journalists, the poets, and others who are identified with a distinctly Jewish culture. By way of contrast, Soviet anti-Semitism is different from czarist pogroms. Then it was the destruction of Jews that was determined, but Judaism survived. Now, Jews manage to make a living in the U.S.S.R., but the destruction of Judaism is the target.

The battle for Jewish survival runs low in the U.S.S.R. Time is on the side of the Kremlin. After 45 years of communism, Khrushchev does not have to make the same mistake as Hitler. He can patiently wait out the deaths of those over 60, who remember the days of their youth. Time is slowly de-Judaizing the young Russian Jews who have lost their synagogues, their Yeshivas, their Rabbis, their prayerbooks, their Bibles, their Talmuds, their Hebrew language. Only folk memories remain as a nostalgic leftover of the once proud and virile Russian Jewry.

Still, as dark as the picture looks, there are a few—the "saving remnant"—who have retained an unshaken loyalty to Judaism and a historic attachment to the Jewish people. They dare not be vocal yet, but they are there, strong, unmistakable, anxious to have contact with Jews outside of their prison walls, famished for some bread of the spirit. As long as they carry on, the time has not yet come to write off 3 million Jews in Russia.

U.S.S.R. AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

What about the U.S.S.R.'s relations with Israel this year? Only as recently as 1948, when Israel declared its independence, the U.S.S.R. rushed to recognize the new Jewish state at once. But Russia's diplomatic support of Israel was not motivated by any love for Jews or for Zionism. Self-interest and self-advantage dictated Soviet moves as in all Soviet diplomatic maneuvering. Russia was anxious to discredit Britain and expose the malfeasance and chaos which British imperialism had brought in its wake. This was effective Communist propaganda.

However, since 1948, the U.S.S.R. has steadily and openly set upon a course of infiltration into the Middle East, wooing the Arabs and trying to establish there a sphere of interest. This past year showed that Soviet power is not influential as the Kremlin might hope. Signs that Nasser is weakening his ties with Moscow came to light. Disappointed with its lack of success in the Middle East, the Kremlin initiated an even stronger propaganda drive against Israel. Arab realists, both in Egypt and in Syria, are beginning to realize that the vast supply of arms and economic aid from Moscow is not motivated by altruistic reasons but has been a purely political maneuver in the cold war. Russia has brought fierce charges against "the Zionists who always use imperialism to consolidate their position in the Middle East."

A new low in anti-Zionist denunciation was reached this year in Moscow broadcasts. Zionist leaders were accused of "maintaining links with German revenge seekers, with Portuguese butchers, with Franco and even with the extremists in Algeria." The Zionists, the broadcasts alleged, were prepared to aid "everyone they thought might be useful with arms, espionage, information and everything else."

Even the Israeli diplomats of the Israel Embassy in Moscow, always trailed by Soviet plainclothesmen, were ordered to sit in a separate section of the Moscow Central Synagogue when they attended Sabbath services. This would segregate them by a corde sanitaire and prevent them from having conversation or contact with Moscow Jews.

The new Soviet drive against Israel this year, therefore, seems like an additional link in the pattern of the anti-Jewish, antiforeign, anti-Western program of the Kremlin. It could only be construed as a fresh attempt to prevent a settling down of relations in the Middle East, where news of Israel progress and prosperity was already reaching Arab ears. Exploiting anti-Israel sentiment in the United Nations, as well as in the Middle East, seems motivated by the traditional Russian technique of fomenting suspicion and insecurity, two elements which suit Russia's aims and have long been associated with her tactics for winning the world for the Communist conspiracy.

MEN IN WHITE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Washington Post in an editorial on June 3 spotlights again an area where the efforts of all must continue in order that racial barriers be removed. This editorial cites discrimination in making staff appointments in hospitals in the District of Columbia.

The truth is that this problem exists in major cities throughout the Nation. Only yesterday Richard H. Austin, a member of the Michigan Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, testified before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission and broadening its functions. Mr. Austin cited as one of the most urgent civil rights problems in Michigan discrimination in hospital and medical services, including such factors as denials on the basis of race of internship and residency training, professional staff membership, and training of nurses.

He added to the record of the subcommittee hearing the text of a speech by Frances A. Kornegay, executive director of the Detroit Urban League, which cited this as one of the critical problems facing Detroit.

As the Washington Post suggests, in many areas in this country outside of the South, racial discrimination is explained by reference to the low economic condition and the meager education of the Negro. The Washington Post reminds us that such alibis cannot be applied to the Negro professional man and woman. With rigorous scholastic training and professional experience, it is inexcusable that Negro physicians are unable to obtain hospital staff appointments so that they can minister to their own patients.

This editorial reminds us once more of the complex and difficult challenge we face in assuring to all our citizens the right to develop and contribute their full abilities and skills to our community life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Washington Post be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 3, 1963]

MEN IN WHITE

Racial discrimination is usually defended, in this part of the country, with animadversions upon the low economic circumstances of the average Negro and his meager education. Discrimination is most indefensible, then, when it is directed at men who have won admisssion to the most rigorously self-regulated of all the professions.

Negro physicians find it more difficult than their white colleagues to obtain staff privileges at most of the city's hospitals. Without these privileges, the physician must turn over to other men all those patients requiring hospital care. He also is cut off from the hospital as a center for the dissemination of new knowledge.

In its survey of the 10 private hospitals in Washington, the Urban League's hospital committee concluded that out of some 1,700 active staff positions, 13 were being filled by Negroes. Of about 3,000 courtesy staff positions, 112 were held by Negroes. Application for staff appointments requires in the typical case two letters of recommendation from staff members. It is at this point that the Negro application encounters difficulty.

As one hospital explained to the league, turnover on active staffs is slow and sometimes qualified Negro doctors decline appointments because of the demands of their own practices. But it is quite clear that race is among the many reasons for the disparity in these figures. Perhaps it is not totally irrelevant to recall that most of these hospitals were built with substantial Federal and municipal assistance. The scale of the public investment there suggests that they hold a very broad responsibility to contribute actively to the standards of medical practice throughout the entire community.

THE PASSING OF THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an article entitled "The Passing of the General Practitioner" which appeared in the May issue of Medical Times.

This article, by my friend and constituent, Dr. Max Seham, deplores the trend toward ever-increasing specialization in medicine and pays tribute to the devotion and altruism of the oldtime general practitioner.

Dr. Seham points out that the general practitioner "is not a spokesman for organized medicine and rarely reaches high office in medical politics." He is, however, one who knows his patients as individuals rather than case histories and reaps the rewards of personal friendship and social services as many specialists do not.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Seham's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PASSING OF THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER

(By Max Seham, M.D.)

The general practitioner through no fault of his own has become a modern casualty. As television has supplanted to a large extent the neighborhood movie, as the jet has encroached on the profits of the earlier aeroplane, so specialization in medicine is rapidly usurping the role of the general practitioner.

In 1928, 74 percent of the medical practitioners were general practitioners, and 26 percent were specialists. As of 1961, 38 percent are general practitioners and 62 percent specialists. Because medical education today favors specialization, because of the increasing trend toward specialization on the part of the majority of the medical students and because of the increasing demand on the part of the public for their services, there is a strong possibility that "the old-fashioned family doctor" may become obsolete.

In my early days of practice the home of the patient played the most important role in the care of the sick. The sick were nursed in the home by the members of the family. A midwife delivered more babies than the family doctor, sometimes with—but usually without his help. Hospitals were used only in emergencies. Nurses were few and far between. Home calls were more popular than office visits. During bad weather the doctor came to the patient and not the patient to the doctor as now. When the doctor removed his office from the neighborhood to the center of the town, the relationship became more impersonal, and when receptionists and nurses took over, the relationship was further formalized. Soon the care of serious diseases shifted from the home to the hospital; with this change, hospital services were reshaped to the needs of the specialists. This shift reduced the doctor's opportunity to acquire firsthand knowledge of the family setting and the economic status of his patients.

In the primitive days of the practice of medicine, the general practitioner was a generalist. He diagnosed and treated not a single organ or a disease, but the whole man in relation to his total environment. His charges were modest; he often paid for the prescription he wrote and he often forgot to send a bill for his services.

Never have I seen such selflessness and altruism displayed by any other group as that shown by the medical profession during and right after the depression. While the bankers were still doing business as usual, getting an eye for an eye, and employers were discharging old and faithful employees who knew not where their next dollar would come from, the doctors were carrying on their books families that were unable to pay for medical care, and at best exchanged their services for the necessities of life. Like my colleagues, in exchange for medical services, I got groceries, clothes and gas for my car.

Unfortunately there are many in the medical profession who look upon the general practitioner as obsolete. It is of course impossible for the general practitioner to possess all the medical know-how. But that does not preclude him from playing an important role in the practice of medicine. On the contrary he is more necessary today than ever. The standards of the general practitioner have been raised and his skill improved through competition with the specialists. The clinical and laboratory methods which were once used only by the specialists such as X-ray, the electrocardiograph and other mechanical and chemical tests, are now part of the equipment of the general practitioner, or at his disposal through special service laboratories. Each year finds the general practitioner adding new weapons to his arsenal. It is left to the general practitioner to bring the resources of modern medicine as far as possible to people in smaller towns and rural areas, and to those in the lower income brackets in the larger cities. The services furnished by the general practitioner determine the quality of medical care for the majority of the people.

Most diseases are self-limited and usually respond favorably to "Vis Medicatrix naturae" (a term coined by Hippocrates, the father of medicine), the curative strength of nature. It is not an exaggeration to say that about 85 percent of all diseases can be successfully diagnosed and treated by the general practitioner. The small number of diseases that are rare and beyond his comprehension can always be referred to a consultant. General practitioners take care of about 75 percent of the children in this country. In the larger centers, it has become customary for the obstetrician to refer newborns to their favorite pediatricians. In the absence of pediatricians the general practitioner can well manage the preventative care and the minor disturbances during infancy.

I believe that patients by and large would get just as efficient and competent care if they depended on a "generalist" in whom they have confidence, one who has been in the family for years, and who is known in the local community for all around competence and integrity. Such a doctor would certainly want to call for consultation if he felt that someone else could do better than he or had more experience in the rarer diseases.

It seems to me that we need more general practitioners rather than more specialists to take care of the increasing number of minor illnesses including psychosomatic disorders. We need more generalists who are more interested in persons than in technics. The general practitioner will never make as much money as the specialist, but the intangible rewards of friendship and service may be just as great. The old-fashioned general practitioner enjoyed something rare which the modern specialist does not have, something that could not be translated in terms of the dollar, a warm relationship that is absent in the atmosphere of a consulting room or a hospital.

Too many specialists are supercilious about the usefulness and the ability of the general practitioner. They look upon him as a traffic cop directing the patient to the specialist. But to interpret the findings of the specialist, to bring comfort to the patient and his family in times of anxiety, and to mollify the alarm created by the specialist is indeed a worthy and necessary function. Also in this day of radio and television propaganda for drugs and health fads, the public can fall back upon the general practitioner for honest advice regarding the many claims made by drug industries.

The general practitioner is really the keystone of medical practice. It is true he does not make discoveries. He is rarely a writer of medical articles and books. He is not the spokesman for organized medicine and rarely reaches high office in medical politics. He does not profess to be more than he is—an unheralded public servant dedicated to the medical needs of the simple, decent, loyal people in his community.

Taking up the cudgel for the general practitioner, a recent president of the Academy of General Practice lashed out at the "selfish and unscrupulous men in the profession whose greed is exceeded by their lack of integrity." He charged that increasing emphasis on specialization "forces the public to pay more than it should for medical care, wastes time and effort for both doctor and patient, and causes national maldistribution of doctors. * * * The intense competition between the general practitioner and the specialists for patients," he adds, "has been largely responsible for such evils as exorbitant fees, unnecessary fee splitting." This cold war is more than a personal economic feud among private practitioners. It denotes a failure of the present fee-for-service system in which some doctors get higher fees than others for the same kind of service, wherein some doctors gain more prestige than others even though they are not more deserving and where the specialists have become the chosen in political power and wealth.

It seems to me that the problem should not be labeled general practitioner versus specialist. It can only be solved for the benefit of the people, by cooperation and integration, each to do what he can do best for the welfare of the sick and the prevention of illness. It would be a tragedy if the reward for his many sacrifices and individual accomplishments would be liquidation by the competitive fee-for-service system.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HART BEFORE 58TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on May 18 the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] spoke at the 58th Annual Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy. His address includes his careful reflections on a number of important issues, including those of civil rights and congressional reform. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, 58TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, HOTEL AMERICANA, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 18, 1963

You honor me with your invitation and it is a good feeling to be with men and women whose eyes and hearts are seeking solutions to the problems crowding in on our country today, not just identifying the problems.

Your conference program evidences your awareness of the complex nature of the needs in our Nation today, and your determination that we not tie an arm behind our back as we move to solve these problems.

Most of the people of our country share, in their hearts, your desire to get on swiftly and constructively with a positive and hopeful approach.

Yet at times it appears that a majority of the citizens of this most affluent of societies are indifferent to the hardships of the less fortunate—the unemployed, the underemployed, the school dropouts—or to our unmet needs in housing, at all levels of education, in health care, and the whole list of unmet needs.

It was on these issues—on the proposition that our Nation could meet the demands of mid-20th century and start moving again—that the people cast their votes in 1960. There is a record of substantial accomplishment in the 2½ years of the Kennedy administration. We would do poorly to discount it. But there remains much to be done if, as a people, we are to gain the goals we set for ourselves when we brought a new administration to Washington.

In these 1960's—today—we see the convergence at one point in time of two great revolutionary movements in American life. These revolutions are speeding like great rivers flowing down mountains—gaining speed at an ever-accelerating pace. Like some rivers, they are moving closer to each other and there is a confluence where the rushing waters merge, and it becomes impossible to distinguish between the two.

I speak of the technical-scientific revolution that speeds us toward automation on earth and the unknown of outer space.

I speak, also, of the human revolution, the struggle for equal rights—civil and economic—by our Negro citizens which at long last has caught the conscience of almost all Americans.

American society is a revolutionary society. It is within our concept of freedom and equality to provide for the constant change that must come when revolutions of such magnitude are underway. This mobility of our spirit and flexibility of our system of government gives this Nation a tremendous dynamism. Ours is not a static society, unhappy though we may be with delay and frustrated though we may be with evasion.

As we view in some perspective the first of these revolutions—technological—we have seen a perennial state of change resulting from automation, mergers, industrial shifts, a change of product demands—textiles to dacron, coal to oil, wood to plastic, steel to aluminum. Together these have been the elements of this technological revolution speeding through our lifetime.

There are none among us who propose we move to restrict or stop such changes. The $15 billion a year spent on research and development in a constant, persistent search for new methods, for cheaper and easier ways to produce better products and do business, is wisely committed, if not always well spent.

Parenthetically, it would be well if some small part of the resources expended on finding ways of eliminating jobs were directed toward creating new jobs. We have learned to question the old assumption that more jobs are the result of advance.

Today the old occupations are less significant as a result of this revolution of machines. Mining, railroads, textiles are declining and becoming steadily less important in our economy. Less than 175,00 coal miners remain in that giant of industries where 500,000 were employed only 15 years ago. And it will continue to be less though new ways of utilizing coal are found.

There are only 700,000 railroad workers today; there were 1½ million about 20 years ago. And yet, given even major developments in urban transportation, the automated rail system could be bought for a song today.

The challenges these shifts in employment patterns present can be met but not just by letting nature take its course. There is nothing automatic about the job-producing potentials of automation and the technical revolution, and all of us know it. It follows then that our society, our governments, have a direct responsibility to respond in the form of fiscal reform, investment in the public sector of our society, and in the programs of human betterment, not the least of which is education and training in its broadest sense. Some steps have been taken—much is still to be done. But before estimating the prospects of getting this done, I believe we must focus on the second revolution of our time.

In this 100th year following the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, we are witnessing the quickening onrush of the struggle of the American Negro to achieve political freedom and social equality in our society. Involved in this struggle is the undeniable fact that to achieve these goals the Negro must be integrated fully into the economic life of the Nation.

The pattern of history tells us unmistakably that in the struggle for human liberty and freedom the pace quickens, takes on new urgency, evokes more conflict, as the oppressed people move closer to their day of freedom.

For this reason our second great revolution in America is seemingly coming to an ever increasing crisis level as month follows month. There is no moment when the Nation again can say "wait." Indelible on the minds of all the people, black and white alike, are the pictures of our time; this day—the neatly starched first grader walking straight to her first day at a white school; the terror of the night at Oxford; the dog unleased on the kneeling demonstrator in Birmingham.

Murray Kempton writes of 9-year-old James Gordon, of Clay, Ky., who asked his mother, "Mommy, why can't I go to the white school?" And her reply came back, "If you got the guts to go, I got the guts to take you."

This is not a revolution in the South alone. Today's drama is there, but no major American community is untouched. And it is well that we understand that it is in all our great cities (where by 1975 85 percent of all the people of the Nation will live) that the most critical and pressing demands of the revolution for equality must be fulfilled.

As we think of these two great revolutions as streams merging on our Nation, let us note the obvious effect one is having on the other. To the Negro worker, it is partly the technical revolution that is making economic equality so difficult. Sixty percent of the unemployed of Detroit today are Negroes although they represent only 20 percent of the population. It is extraordinarily difficult for a Negro boy graduating from high school to find a steady job.

In the Nation today there is no skilled craft in which Negroes constitute more than 2 percent of the workers. Yet it is in the semiskilled and unskilled groups that the impact of automation strikes first. This conference knows the cruel fact: the relative position of the Negro in our labor force has been static for many years. There is all too meaningful evidence that our technical revolution is threatening to worsen the Negro's relative position.

The roots of this phenomenon—poor education, inadequate housing, lack of training, job discrimination in industry and union, the Negro ghettos of our cities—these roots must be eliminated if our Negro citizens are to achieve full economic equality.

We are all in essential agreement, I am sure, that our National Government must move more decisively if we are to utilize fully the opportunities for growth and well-being latent in both these revolutions. To fail in this can only turn these revolutionary forces away from their constructive potential and bring irreparable harm to the future of our Nation and to freedom itself.

Many tools exist today in on-going national programs that must be brought to bear with new urgency and perspective on the job to be done in our cities—especially to make these programs work in and among the people of our center cities.

Our Federal housing programs have financed the white suburbs of the sixties—they must now be redesigned to meet the needs of low income families and break the racial pattern that has worsened because of this neglect. The President's Executive order is one of the vital first steps by this administration. I am sure there will be more such steps, for there must be.

Already underway are the beginnings of job retraining. But even these beginnings are hampered by restrictions requiring availability of local jobs, lack of personnel, the absence of courses of study designed for the unskilled. We must accelerate the redirection of our training and vocational education programs. It is of critical importance that these programs go first into the center city and to our Negro citizens.

Many of our communities are facing insurmountable programs in providing schools to meet the onrushing tide of students—and one of our worst school crises is centered in our Negro communities, in downtown America. Old unequipped schools must be replaced. Teachers must receive better salaries. A shocking example makes the point: the federally assisted school lunch program is being used least in the older downtown schools, where most of our underprivileged children go. It's the new suburban school with the new cafeteria that provides a noon lunch. How turned around can we be?

In short, I am saying many existing Federal and Federal-State programs can and must be redirected if making them work among the citizens of our center cities is of high national priority. I believe it is. This does not require new legislation. It requires a new direction.

But there are additional legislative moves that will be required if we are to meet the challenge of the two revolutions.

Much of the list is well known to you: Tax and fiscal policy reform; meaningful aid to education; health care; and most importantly, a list of unmet so-called civil rights measures, including an effective new approach to equal employment guarantees.

In an effort fully to utilize our Nation's human resources, we have yet to come up with the kind of imaginative governmental innovations that conceived the TVA—whose anniversary we celebrate this week. Here was a governmental innovation which permitted utilization of the natural resources of a whole region of our Nation. The economic returns to the Nation would be enormous if we could bring to each individual the opportunity to achieve the full measure of contribution he can make to our society.

Why the hesitancy at our national governmental level to move on with these jobs? The simple facts are that every significant economic or social proposal submitted to the Congress is affected by the political facts resulting from the denial to the American Negro of his full civil rights. It is an old, but sometimes forgotten, truism that there is a remarkably close interplay between the achievement of full civil and full economic rights in America today.

As now constituted, we have a national legislative system drastically in need of internal reform, moving at a snail-like pace in an age that demands much more. Congress, I suspect and fear, is almost incapable of procedural and structural reform from within—really basic reforms. As you know, we lost again the key Senate fight this year to bring majority rule to that body. The President's victory on the House Rules Committee fight was a minimum victory. We have not freed either House of the Congress from the impediments to the legislative process which have relegated the legislative branch of our Government to a secondary role during the last three decades.

What reforms are needed?

Already mentioned, we need a rule to limit debate by a majority vote. A rule of germaneness in debate would be of tremendous value. There is no effective way a majority of a committee can express its will if the chairman chooses to exercise the extraordinary powers he has over committee actions. This should be changed.

Joint hearings by House and Senate committees would be appropriate in many instances—on appropriation matters, for example.

Strange as it may seem, we need a rule whereby Senators appointed to conference committees to work out differences between the two Houses on a piece of legislation would be Senators who support the position of a majority of the Senate. Too often now conferees are Senators who oppose the very position they are to defend in conference.

Looking back, we see the decades of the thirties and early forties as the decades of the Presidency; the decade of the fifties as the decade of the Supreme Court. But to do a job on the problems of the sixties, Congress must be unchained from 19th century rules, and brought to bear proper relationship to the challenges of our times.

The President is confronted today with the fact that control of Congress continues to rest precariously with men who have found much of their political base in districts and States where Negro political participation was virtually unknown.

Two critically important forces are working throughout the South to change not only the political pattern of that region, but quite directly the political domination of the Congress. First is the increasing force of the Negro vote. Second is the historic Supreme Court decisions requiring reapportionment and fairer representation. Together, these forces will bring new life to the Congress. Their impact will be felt as Congress struggles with its own reform.

These two great revolutionary streams merging on American life today, test our basic moral and constitutional beliefs. The political realities that seem to restrain the Government from moving vigorously to harness these rivers need critical examination. All the tools and resources of our economy and Government must be unleashed if we are to meet these challenges successfully.

No matter where you enter the circle of problems, we confront the need for a better life and housing for one-fourth of our people; the challenge of automation; the struggle with our megapolis; the lack of full and decent employment; the need for adequate training and education; 100 years of delay in fulfilling the true meaning of the emancipation compounds each of them and makes the solution of each at once more difficult and more urgent.

There are many chains yet to be broken, economic and political. As we looked at the pitifully small demands of the demonstrators in Birmingham these past weeks, I hope everyone realized again how very far we have to go, how little time is left, and how very urgent and special must be our Nation's effort to get there for all of our people and for decency in this world.

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND SCIENCE: PARTNERS IN NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks on May 23 to the 17th conference of the Board of Governors and the Aerospace Manufacturers Council, Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND SCIENCE: PARTNERS IN NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I am pleased and honored by your invitation.

I want to talk about the partnership of Government, business, and science which has evolved in the years since Pearl Harbor.

This partnership not only made possible victory in the Second World War, but it is also the foundation of national security in the atomic age. It can work amazing feats like Telstar and Cooper's historic flight. If we realize its full potential, this partnership can make immensely important contributions to the welfare of mankind.

The partnership of Government, business, and science is here to stay. If we are going to make it constructive, the first requirement is to talk with each other—and to listen.

I thought I would start the discussion by raising two matters which are at the center of my own concern.

First, I think we need some plain thinking and plain talk about a fallacy that is taken for granted today in a wide circle of Americans. As the frustrations of the cold war pile up, some people are becoming susceptible to a new version of the devil theory of history.

All too often in history men have invented a villain on whom all their troubles could be blamed. For Marx it was the capitalist. For Hitler it was the Jew. For some among us—I have no label to apply to them—it is the military-industrial complex.

Who started the cold war? Who compels us to spend so much of our national income on defense? Who blocks a nuclear test ban agreement and progress toward disarmament? To some Americans the answer is: the military-industrial complex.

To an alarmist it is the bunch that tries to take over the country in a sensational novel like "Seven Days in May." In the mind of Fred Cook, author of "The Warfare State," its influence is already "supreme"—that is Cook's word—in every area of national life.

What disturbs me about this notion is its tendency to creep into the thought of persons in responsible positions in American life: editors, journalists, political leaders, ministers, educators, businessmen, labor leaders, and others—there are some in each of these groups whose ideas tend to reinforce the fictions of the alarmists.

Some people take for granted that a so-called "military-industrial complex" wants a war every so often—to stimulate business.

This recalls Senator Nye and the munitions makers. In the thirties we so nearly persuaded ourselves that a munitions lobby had caused the First World War that we almost ignored the Axis threat. And is there any historical evidence to prove that democratic nations with a large industrial base start wars? I know of none. Certainly, many military conflagrations have been lit by countries which were weak, and did not even have a munitions industry. Others have been started by dictatorships in which a demagog like Hitler, bent on aggression, had managed to seize power.

Some people talk as though the reason for our big defense program is a conspiracy of some sort between the military and industry.

Obviously, this view ignores the three great factors which have compelled the United States, for the first time in our history, to create and maintain a large permanent military establishment—the expansionist drive of world communism; the historic shift of world power westward to the United States and eastward to the Soviet Union; and the permanent scientific and technological revolution.

Some people talk as though the arms race is a fact of modern life leading straight to catastrophe—and that this is due to the weight of the industrial-military combination.

But what arms race are people talking about? The United States is not engaged in an arms race. We are not even trying to build as many arms as possible as fast as possible. We could easily build more and build them faster. What we are trying to do is to build a defense establishment adequate, together with allied forces, to uphold our vital interests and to keep the peace.

The maintenance of international peace and security depends, first of all, on a power relationship which will discourage expansionist states from using force to expand. It depends, if you will, not on a balance of power—in which the strength of the peacekeeper is just equal to that of the peace-upsetter—but on an imbalance of power favorable to the defenders of peace.

And, of course, this is exactly why disarmament or arms control is a difficult goal to achieve. The would-be aggressor is not, and cannot be, satisfied with this power relationship. He is unwilling to accept any arms control agreement which can be relied upon to preserve international peace and security, because he must upset the peace to achieve his aims.

No one supposes that the purposes of the United States can be accomplished merely by military power. It can defend the frontiers of freedom and keep open the opportunities to act with others to build a truly peaceful world order. But, though military power alone will not achieve our purposes, adequate military power is a precondition to their achievement.

Let us debate the real issues on the merits.

Obviously, the price of national security these days is high. Obviously, too, we rely mainly on private industry to do most of the research and build most of the new weapons systems needed for national defense—and I believe that is the way all of us would want it.

Those who think our defense program is too large should say where they think it could safely be reduced. Nothing is gained when they attack a vague, undefined "they" by giving them an ominous and conspiratorial label.

Now I come to my second point: How are we going to assure, so far as humanly possible, the integrity of our defense procurement system?

Defense business is big business, running annually into the billions. The livelihood of some communities is heavily dependent on it. The success or failure of defense bids may mean life or death for large and small business firms. In these circumstances there is a strong and understandable temptation to influence procurement decisions, if possible.

We want a procurement system in which everyone has confidence—even when he loses out—confidence that it is a system in which decisions are made on the merits. This confidence depends above all on rules of the game that are known and understood by all concerned and apply impartially to all. They should be as tamperproof as human ingenuity can make them.

Over recent years the controlling principle has been competition on its merits—to get the best weapons system at the lowest possible cost to the Government. Professional military committees, helped and assisted by career civilian scientists and technical people, have had the responsibility to recommend what weapon best meets their requirements, within the terms of a competition explicitly set out at the start.

This tested system has been virtually tamperproof—because it involved so many professional people—civilian and military—with professional careers, drawn from different services, checking and balancing each other. There have been so many expert and qualified people in the process that no lobby and no politician could reasonably expect to influence their conclusions.

There is nothing accidental about the procurement system that has worked so well over the years. It is based on the lessons of experience in awarding billions of dollars of military work under several administrations. It has built-in guarantees which guard against the arbitrary or capricious acts of any one person.

Moreover, reliance on the recommendations of military-professional committees, and the integrity of their procedures, has provided a Secretary of Defense and a President the protection they need to help fend off the political pressures that tend to focus on their offices.

The procurement system was not devised overnight. But it can be destroyed overnight. If we violate the tested system and abuse its basic principles, I believe we open the entire procurement process to the spoils system and to graft—political and industrial pressures on the White House and from the White House, and similar pressures on a Secretary of Defense and from a Secretary of Defense.

Industrial contractors, rather than trying to meet the exacting standards of stiff competition and professional military evaluation boards, would be led to put major emphasis on pressures and influence where it could count. This could disastrously compromise the quality of weapons for the free world arsenal.

The controlling principle of competition on its merits, as I see it, does not preclude including in the original conditions and terms of a competition provisions that some percentage of work under the contract should be done in areas officially designated as depressed or areas of high unemployment. But this, or any other public interest condition, should be set forth in the original terms of the competition—and not introduced arbitrarily at the close of the competition.

Civilian control is not in question or in doubt with the military. No military man today is raising the slightest question as to their subordination to civilian control.

But civilian control does not mean civilians make all the decisions, or that civilians are entitled to make arbitrary decisions. And one clear occasion when civilian control could be called into doubt is when civilian officials encourage a defense procurement system that invites tampering and becomes shot full of political rinky-dink.

Few elements are more decisive to the survival of freemen than having the best weapons. We need to think long and hard before we lend ourselves to any procurement system that could give us second-rate weapons.

In conclusion, let me just add this: I believe that problems are things to be tackled with the conviction that what man has messed up, man can straighten out.

But we have to look at the problems squarely, honestly, and fearlessly. One recalls the man who said: "Don't confuse me with the facts. My mind already is made up." No convenient cliches can provide answers to problems that thinkers of the last century did not imagine.

In testifying recently before our subcommittee which is studying national security administration, General Norstad made this wise comment: "Sometimes people talk as though success were a state of affairs in which there were no problems. But as I see it a successful country, like a successful man, will never see the day that does not bring a fresh quota of problems, and the mark of success is to deal with them effectively."

PHYSICAL FITNESS—A LIVING EXAMPLE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, recently a rather remarkable feat took place which I am anxious to call to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Harry Duell, Park Rapids, Minn., completed a 90-mile walk from that city of Fargo, N. Dak. The amazing aspect of his feat is that Mr. Duell is 73 years of age. The Hubbard County Independent of Park Rapids, commended Mr. Duell on his accomplishment in a recent editorial. As the editorial notes:

> The abilities and qualities which enabled him to do it are the characteristics which make Harry Duell worthy of being called a living example to all the people of America, whether they be 9 or 90.

C. B. (Bud) Wilkinson, Consultant to the President on Physical Fitness, singled out Mr. Duell for his walk as an indication of the value of a sound physical fitness program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Hubbard County Independent along with the letter to Mr. Duell from Mr. C. B. (Bud) Wilkinson, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIVING EXAMPLE

Harry Duell, age 73, recently completed a 90-mile walk, from Park Rapids to Fargo. The apparent reason for this almost unbelievable feat was to publicize the Park Rapids High School Band, the Park Rapids resort area, and the Fargo Band Festival, in which more than 5,000 youngsters participated.

These are worthy causes in themselves, but the real reason he did it and the abilities and qualities which enabled him to do it are the characteristics which make Harry Duell worthy of being called a living example to all the people of America, whether they be 9 or 90.

First of all, he has always kept himself in excellent physical condition, never indulging in smoking or drinking or in any excesses which would impair his body. This is only part of the reason.

He made the effort because his good friend R. H. Barry asked him if he would like to do it, and he likes to do things for his friends. Also, we believe he realizes, subconsciously at least, that his approach to life is a good example to young people.

A very humble man, Harry was more concerned about the other people involved than about himself. Once embarked on the project, he was anxious to complete it successfully so he wouldn't let anyone down.

After the first day out, his feet were so badly blistered a doctor said he'd never make it and would have preferred Harry to stay in bed. With characteristic determination, Harry treated his feet, took all the precautions possible and went on to finish what he started.

Well meaning persons offered him rides to relieve the strain and make it easier for him. Harry was indignant; he would not "budge" 1 inch. He said, "I said I would walk 90 miles and I'll walk the full 90 miles."

He gained nothing for himself by this effort. He did it for others and for the good example he could set for them. He did it humbly and with complete integrity. He was the one who was concerned for everyone else and cheered the rest of us up when it looked rough.

We didn't know Harry Duell when it started, but we have learned much from him and have a great respect and admiration for this man. We now feel privileged to think of him as a good and cheerful friend.

Everyone in America would do well to follow the examples he sets before us—congratulations.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 8, 1963.

DEAR MR. DUELL: The President joins me in expressing congratulations upon your 90-mile walk. Your youthful vigor and enthusiasm vividly illustrate for all Americans the value of regular exercise. We appreciate your assistance in stimulating public interest in the physical fitness program.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. WILKINSON,
Consultant to the President on Physical Fitness.

COMMENDATION OF PROGRAM OF NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Dr. James V. Warren, the president of the American Heart Association, recently wrote Dr. Ralph E. Knutti, the Director of the National Heart Institute, to convey the congratulations and the high regard of the American Heart Association Research Committee, a group of eminent scientists in the field of cardiovascular research, for the program of the National Heart Institute. The endorsement of the American Heart Association Research Committee for the progress we are making in combating heart diseases through the National Heart Institute is high praise and richly deserved recognition.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter of Dr. Warren printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, March 7, 1963.

Dr. RALPH E. KNUTTI,
Director, National Heart Institute,
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. KNUTTI: The American Heart Association Research Committee, composed of scientists in the field of cardiovascular research has asked me to transmit to you their views concerning the research program of the National Heart Institute. I am pleased to do this because I am sympathetic with the observations that they wish to make.

The Heart Association's committee congratulates the National Heart Institute and its National Advisory Heart Council on their program. In particular, they know the productive intramural research activities, including the well known epidemiological study of coronary artery disease and hypertension in Framingham, Mass. They also commend the Institute on the broad and significant role in many of the important advances in the cardiovascular field since establishment of the Institute in 1948. A particular feature of this program has been that the investigator has been able to pursue his search for new knowledge with a minimum of restriction and a maximum of effectiveness.

Members of the American Heart Association Research Committee note, however, that recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives (Fountain committee) were critical of certain aspects of the extramural program of the National Institutes of Health. It is unfortunate that although only a small fraction of the program appears to have been directly involved, the implication has been made that the criticism applied to a sizable portion of this extramural support activity. Although certain changes in administrative procedure for research awards may be necessary as the extramural program matures and expands, the research committee of the American Heart Association wishes to reaffirm its confidence in the research support program of the National Heart Institute. Our committee has grave concern that as a result of these investigations restrictions may come into effect that would seriously interfere with the quest for new scientific knowledge.

As a physician and medical scientist, I am pleased to transmit the foregoing sentiments of the American Heart Association Research Committee and assure you that the Association looks forward to continued cooperation between the Institute and the Association as together we continue to move along the path leading to ultimate conquest of cardiovascular diseases.

Sincerely yours,

James V. Warren, M.D.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a little over a month ago, I inserted in the Record an editorial dealing with facets of the President's tax program which appeared in the Baltimore Sun. I said at that time that I was disturbed over the reception which the President's tax program had been receiving. Needless to say, I am still concerned.

I am convinced of the importance of reducing our present level of unemployment, stimulating industrial investment, and raising our rate of economic growth. I believe that proposals to revise our tax rates downward are an important factor in accomplishing these objectives.

Recently, the Sun had an editorial commenting on the endorsement by 50 of the country's corporate leaders of the administration's tax-cut proposal. I hail this as a significant push for the President's program, and I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 27, 1963]

How To Grow

Half a hundred of the country's corporate leaders, with some 200 more expected to concur, have given the administration's tax cut proposal the push it may need for passage.

The group was formed at the suggestion of the Treasury, but as a spokesman makes plain it "wrote its own script." While it does not agree in detail with the President's tax program, and while many members undoubtedly have their particular points of disagreement, the group comes out squarely and persuasively in favor of Mr. Kennedy's main thesis.

Applying the principles of private business to the national economy, these executives are unimpressed by the argument that because the national economy today is better off than had been foreseen, nothing need be done. They believe that with the national economy, as with a corporation, a fair situation must be exploited to create a better.

They are dissatisfied with the economy's rate of growth, and believe it should and can be accelerated.

One way of creating faster growth, they are convinced, is through substantial tax cuts soon. They emphasize the necessity for governmental economies, and call for a "reasonable balance between Federal income and expenditures" at an early date, but for this year they put tax cuts above budget balancing. That is, they agree essentially with Mr. Kennedy's and Mr. Dillon's contention that the way to sound budgets lies through economic growth.

The business executives suggest that any broad tax reforms be postponed, a view close to the one that the President—whose initially proposed reforms are a hodgepodge of some good and a lot of bad—has been coming around to. They see a lowering of the tax structure as the priority reform, and they are right.

These powerful businessmen are not saying that what's good for them is good for the country. They put it the other way round: What's good for the country is good for them, and for all. Their contribution to the tax discussion is most valuable, for its tone of responsibility and as much or more for its expression of vision and confidence.

FARM PROBLEM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on May 26, there appeared an editorial in the New York Times calling for a renewed effort to solve the so-called "farm problem."

For many years now I have watched the evolution of our farm program with some misgivings. I have consistently opposed the extension of this program, which I felt merely continued woefully ineffective Government participation in our farm economy.

Most recently, I vigorously opposed the adoption of the Feed Grain Act. As we all know, it passed. I also opposed and urged the farmers of Maryland to vote "No" on the wheat referendum. The farmers of Maryland voted against the imposition of the most stringent set of price and production controls ever imposed on any segment of the American economy by more than a 4 to 1 vote. I applaud their action and the action of the farmers throughout the country.

Opposition alone would be irresponsible. I believe that it is now our duty to evolve new solutions for this thorny problem. Because the Times editorial writer has expressed so well the present situation vis-a-vis our agricultural economy, I ask unanimous consent to have the attached editorial printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Battle Over Farm Policy

Now that the administration has lost its fight for rigid controls over wheat production, the battle over farm policy enters a new and crucial stage. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is tempted to let the farmers stew in their own juice and discover for themselves the harsh realities of an abrupt return to the free market. The Republicans want to make political hay out of the wheat vote by continuing to offer protection to the farmers. Either course would be a mistake.

The administration has to face up to the fact that wheat is too important to be left to the wheat growers. President Kennedy, who won the White House in 1960 without the aid of the farm States, may stick to his position, taken before the referendum, that the administration will resist any attempt to bail out the farmer. Like the old gray mare, the farm vote isn't what it used to be. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture can cite the precedent of 1939, when the tobacco growers rejected controls only to restore them the following year after suffering a severe drop in income.

But the price of doing nothing on wheat, the Nation's largest field crop and third largest cash crop, is enormous. It will mean a vast addition to our already swollen granaries and poverty for many marginal farmers. It is unfair to punish farmers for their decision when the Government's past policies are at least partly responsible for the present situation.

Even the American Farm Bureau Federation, champion of the free market in agriculture and leader of the fight against controls, does not favor complete abandonment of the farmer. But its proposals, and those sponsored by Republicans in Congress, amount to a reward for defeating the administration. Their plan of a handout, of greatest benefit to the big and efficient farm units, would be an even bigger mistake, because it would do nothing to eliminate either poverty or the surpluses.

With farmers turning thumbs down on high price supports and tight controls, the only permanent solution lies in a return to a free market, while the Government takes steps to spare farms unnecessary hardship in making the transition. This means the gradual elimination of all price supports on crops, which will restore a single price system in both the domestic and world markets. Direct payments should be made to marginal farmers, who should be encouraged to leave agriculture by being given retraining. Direct payments also should be made to all farmers who agree to curb or divert production.

The road back to a free market will not be short or easy. Nor will it be inexpensive. But the problem of plenty amid poverty will grow worse if the administration and its opponents remain attached to the old and unworkable solutions. The only hope is in a brandnew approach that will end the overproduction of crops and substandard farm incomes.

OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AND DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on February 7, I introduced in the Senate S. 738, which would divest the Federal Aviation Agency of the responsibility for ownership and operation of Washington National and Dulles International Airports. By so doing, it would eliminate an important conflict of interest which presently threatens the economic life of Baltimore's Friendship Airport. Under present law, the Federal Aviation Agency is charged with regulating air commerce in order to promote its development and safety in the public interest. Also under current law, it is charged with the ownership and operation of airports which compete with other airports that are subject to its regulations. It is my firm belief that such an arrangement is contrary to the public interest as well as the public safety.

The citizens of the State of Maryland and of the city of Baltimore, on their own behalf and through their elected representatives, have been making a very great effort since the opening of Dulles International Airport at Chantilly, Va., to prevent this new facility from undermining the service and economy of Friendship Airport.

Every effort has and is being made on the part of Maryland's elected officials to bring about a proper solution to this problem. Friendship Airport has no fear of open and fair competition. Friendship Airport is threatened by the withdrawal of flights to the new Dulles facility, resulting from its accreditation by the CAB as the official Washington area airport for jet service.

These efforts on the part of Maryland officials are being reinforced in many significant ways by the efforts of business and civic groups and individual citizens throughout the State. Many of my colleagues may have noticed in their travels through surrounding Maryland the thousands of automobiles carrying bumper stickers urging continued support for Friendship Airport.

I have recently received a resolution of the County Council of Baltimore County which urges industry, commerce, and private citizens throughout Maryland to continue their exclusive use and support of Friendship International Airport. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas since the construction and opening of the multimillion dollar air terminal in Chantilly, Va., known as Dulles International Airport, the use of Friendship International Airport as a passenger terminal has been greatly affected; and

Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce estimates that Baltimore is losing more than $1,000 per day as a result of unfair competition from Dulles, which they believe results from the FAA acting as both airline policeman and airport landlord; and

Whereas this loss of business to Baltimore is adversely affecting not only Baltimore City, but also the surrounding metropolitan area, including Baltimore County; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the County Council the leaders of industry and commerce and the private citizens should be made aware of the need for support of Friendship International Airport and be encouraged to give and promote such support: Now therefore, be it,

Resolved by the County Council of Baltimore County, Md., this first day of May, 1963, That industry, commerce and private citizens be urged to use and support Friendship International Airport exclusively and to foster and promote its exclusive use and support throughout the Baltimore Metropolitan area; be it further

Resolved, That the citizens urge their elected representatives of the Senate and Congress of the United States to promote and support an increase of airline service to and from Friendship International Airport; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators and eight Representatives to the Congress from the State of Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the County News Week in Baltimore County, Md., there appeared a report on present operations at the new Dulles facility at Chantilly, Va. In the interests of having the record perfectly clear, and because I am certain that my colleagues will be interested in the present status of this multimillion dollar project, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AIRPORT REPORT

From the air and from the ground, Dulles International Airport is a dream come true. Set down boldly with the help of millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars, Dulles is everything an airport should be—and then some. To say that no expense has been spared to create this colossus would be an understatement of fact.

Passengers—few as they may be—never really get a good look at the monster they and millions of other nonflying Americans have created. To get the proverbial bird's-eye-view, one needs to fly into the field in a light aircraft at about 8,000 feet on a clear afternoon. This we did late last week.

Much as we hate the word "complex" to describe a king-size engineering venture, the word does have its uses—especially when it comes to Dulles International. For Dulles is not an airport at all, but a mammoth labyrinth of endless concrete runways, taxiways, aprons and buildings spread out over a vast area of virgin countryside. It has, in fact, including the airlines and their would-be passengers, no real relationship to anything. Perhaps Dulles can best be compared to Brazil's enormously expensive and completely unusable capital, Brasilia.

Fifteen minutes out of Dulles over downtown Washington we called the tower for routine clearance. The crisp voice of the FAA employees came back instantly loud and clear. "Proceed on present course. No local traffic." This was the tipoff on what we were to find. No traffic—local or otherwise—is the bane of Dulles' existence.

In making our approach to the field, two large jet aircraft—one TWA and the other American—crouched snugly in front of their hangars a country-mile from the Administration Building. These two and a few private aircraft such as ours were the only flying machines in evidence.

Since our objective was the main terminal building, we switched over, upon landing, to the "ground control" frequency and requested permission to park our peanut size airplane on the wide, glistening concrete apron. "Permission denied. Proceed to parking area for private aircraft."

We proceeded for about 8 minutes and finally wound up away off in the boondocks.

Half a dozen light airplanes were parked on the broad concrete apron in front of the offices of the company which has the concession to handle noncommercial planes. We were directed to a spot hard by a chemical outdoor privy and relieved of a $2.50 landing fee charge. This fee, fortunately, included a station wagon ride to and from the main terminal about a half mile away. "How's business?" we inquired of the station wagon driver. He gave us a sickly, hollow laugh.

If the terminal building at Dulles International has received no architectural awards, it is somebody's serious oversight. Bold, challenging in design, well laid out and encompassing another vast "complex" of stores, escalators, a nursery, duty-free shop, waiting rooms, a memorial court, and anything else you care to mention, the terminal could pass for a mausoleum anywhere. A lone, elderly woman was the sole occupant of the enormous waiting room. Less than half of the airline ticket counters were manned. And the principal customers at the glittering news and cigarette counters, as far as we could judge, were terminal employees.

Like cats who had been caught swallowing canaries, all of the permanent staff at Dulles seemed to be acutely embarrassed by the lack of activity at the facility. When asked whether she was doing much business, the pretty girl who ran the duty-free shop for outgoing oversea passengers (Bourbon whiskey, men's toiletries, razors and the like) laughed wryly and replied: "Are you kidding?" Upon being pressed as to the actual volume of daily business, the fair maiden immediately took fright and advised us that we would have to take this financial matter up with the owner of the concession who operated out of an office in downtown Washington.

The busiest ticket counter, leased by United Airlines and boasting three uniformed employees and no passengers, were extremely gushy when asked to pose for a photograph. Near panic ensued when we proclaimed ourselves representatives from Baltimore's Friendship International and the spokesman for the group, with pathos in his voice, said: "We ain't saying nothing."

The only really aggressive person we met on our entire tour of Dulles International was a gentleman in uniform who looked like a cross between a brigadier general in the Mexican Army and the doorman in front of a snappy Park Avenue hotel. His superbly embroidered shoulder patch (FAA) proclaimed him to be a guard employed by the Government which not only runs the airport but is currently engaged in the dubious distinction of trying to thug reluctant airlines into using this all but vacant facility.

"Hey, Mac," he said eyeing the camera, "are them photographs going to be for publication? If so, you ain't supposed to be taking them in here without permission."

We explained quite patiently that Dulles International, as a creature of us poor taxpayers, is public property and that permission to take photographs of property for which we, personally to some small extent, had paid for was ridiculous.

Mr. FAA demanded that all three of us descend to the bowels of the terminal where the captain of the guard was located. We countered by refusing to go and suggesting that the captain of the guard ascend to the main waiting room and interview we insignificant fellows who were paying his salary. Mr. FAA retired to a nearby telephone and came back with the word that the captain of the guard did not want to see us and that we were free to take any number of photographs without interference.

Two rather unusual features of the terminal building rather struck our fancy. One was the subterranean swimming pool which served as the catchment basin for a spout of water reminiscent of a whale blowing off steam. This not unimpressive bit of masonry, we gathered, was by way of being a tribute to the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, for whom the airport is named. Much more frightening from the taxpayers' standpoint is the enormous line of enormously costly "mobile lounges" which, mostly unused, line the front apron of the terminal building. The function of these self-propelled mastodons which are nearly the size of a freight car is to transport passengers from the terminal to the waiting jets which are located 5 or 6 minutes away across the giddy convolutions of concrete and greensward.

If ever the taxpayers were had in a big way, this is it, this is it, this is it.

Nearly half or more of the passenger ticket counters at Dulles International are not presently manned. However, each of these vacant counters has a direct-line phone on the counter to the offices of the airline in downtown Washington. We picked up a couple at random. In each case we announced ourselves as an incoming passenger from the West awaiting service to another city. And here are the answers we got from polite young ladies at the other end of the direct line.

Allegheny Airlines: "No, we aren't running any service out of Dulles. No, we don't know when service out of Dulles will start. Yes, we do have a plane to Harrisburg later this afternoon from Washington National, but you had better leave in plenty of time to get into town. The limousine service out there isn't very good so far."

Lake Central: "Where did you say you are? Oh, Dulles. No, as far as I know we don't have any plans to run air service out of Dulles at the present time. You'll have to come downtown in a limousine to catch one of our flights out of Washington National."

Suddenly the tomb-like silence was broken by an electrifying announcement. American Airlines evening flight to the west coast would shortly be boarding. We rushed to the American counter, where about 18 passengers were checking in. All of the airline employees at the other counters rallied around to watch this phenomenon. Bags were weighed, tickets were checked, and the passengers were herded into the midsection of the waiting room where one of the numbered gates suddenly lit up.

And then, wonder of wonders, the "mobile lounge" ambled slowly up the apron, opened its doors and engulfed the paying customers.

Having watched the grand finale, we returned by station wagon to our small plane near the portable chemical privy. As we rethreaded the maze of concrete taxiways, we called the tower. We were advised to hold short of the runway until the American Airlines jet had cleared the field. The huge red and silver plane roared smoothly down the 11,500-foot runway in front of us, was silhouetted briefly against the setting sun and then disappeared into the darkening skies.

Once more came the crisp voice from the tower. Almost apologetically the tower operator informed us that it would not be necessary to taxi to the end of the runway. "You still have 4,200 feet of runway from your intersection. I think that will be enough."

Our little plane rose easily after a run of about 1,200 feet and we left Dulles International to darkness and an army of employees looking for customers.

GRADUATION DAY ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, graduates of our great Military and Naval Academies have played distinguished and significant roles in American life throughout our history. They continue to make an inestimable contribution to our Nation's strength, to the preservation of our freedom, and to the protection of free peoples throughout the world.

Now that the air age has progressed into the space age, the Air Force Academy promises to make similar contributions—on our own planet and beyond.

Since 1845, the U.S. Naval Academy has been located at Annapolis, Md. My State is proud to be the traditional home of the Academy, and of the many young men who have taken advantage of the opportunities for service which the Academy offers.

Yesterday 871 young officers were graduated from the Naval Academy. The commencement address was delivered by the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is with great confidence in the futures of these young men and the contributions they will make to our society, and with great pride that I ask unanimous consent to have the Vice President's remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY JUNE 5, 1963—THE INTEGRITY OF NATIONAL STRATEGY

I am proud as a citizen to come to this honored institution and to have a part in the graduation exercises for the Naval Academy class of 1963.

I am also proud for certain personal reasons to be here—the first being, the uniform of a naval officer which I was privileged to wear in the South Pacific in 1942; and the second being, a certain pin of a kind well known to each of you—and to your fiances—which is worn by my older daughter, at least most of the time.

I would not, of course, want to leave any impression of partiality to one service. The Army Chief of Staff in the early thirties, Gen. Malin Craig, once told President Roosevelt, "Sir, I don't mind when you speak of the Army as 'them,' but I find it disturbing that you always refer to the Navy as 'us.' "

On this day 30 years ago, in 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt was the speaker here—and he awarded the bachelor of science degree for the first time in the Naval Academy's history. I know each of you is proud of your new commission. I am sure you are equally proud of your degree.

You have completed a demanding and difficult 4-year course at the finest institution of its kind in the world. You go now to what is—what must always be—the strongest Navy on the seas.

There is no contradiction in our Nation's reliance upon classroom and campus for training those to be entrusted with the leadership of our arms. On the contrary, it would be incompatible with our character as a Nation if those who command our fleets and armies were not trained first in the values of the society they defend.

The world you confront today is a complex world. Yet complex as it is, the choices of the world in this period are greatly simplified. We have—and mankind has with us—the choice of freedom or slavery, liberty or tyranny, alliance or subjugation, cooperation or destruction.

The basic choices are not hard. Actually, they are easy choices—and we in America made them long ago. But the choice once made is not so simply fulfilled. Choosing freedom and having freedom are two entirely different exercises—and keeping freedom is the most complex and difficult of all.

A hazard of our open society is the tendency to assume that the simple choice simply made will be fulfilled by a succession of other simple choices. But this is not the case. If given your choice, I suppose some few of you might choose the life of an admiral over the life of a midshipman—or even of an ensign. That choice is simple. But with all due respect to your past 4 years, the choices an admiral must make are hardly so simple as the choice between his rank and yours.

Americans have made their choice of freedom. But there is a less than perfect understanding among us that decisions necessary to support, preserve, and extend that freedom are not so simple nor are they so simply made.

In the history of our American politics, the traditional partisan appeal has been a promise to the people of a better life. Generations of political leaders have offered to the people the hope of "a full dinner pail," "a chicken in every pot," "two cars in every garage," "a square deal," "a new deal," "a fair deal." If sometimes the words have gone sour—to the embarrassment of the political "ins" and the delight of the political "outs"—this cumulative promise of a better life at home is a promise fulfilled.

But in recent years, there appears to be a new climate of thought in which some chant slogans that are not merely extravagant but totally illusory—and dangerous to our existence as a free people.

The path of responsibility is described as appeasement. Highsounding—but low content—phrases are put forward as spurious alternatives to national policy.

We are told that we should take "strong action" and our international troubles will evaporate. But when the advocates of this "strong action" are pressed for specifics they offer only "strong" words—like the little boy shouting defiance at the neighborhood bully after he has gone home to supper.

We are told that we should take a "firm stand" and the hobgoblins of international turmoil will go away. But when we ask where this "firm stand" is to be taken where it has not already been taken—upon what ground, upon what battlefield—it always turns out that the sloganeers mean in the pages of their favorite, slick paper magazine.

We are told that our national goal must be "victory" and that then our success will be assured. But when we ask who is against victory for our country, it always turns out that the champions of this phrase are not talking about victory for our country but "victory" for their own, partisan clique over the current administration, whatever it may be.

It is unfortunate that these slogans, though empty, are dangerous. They are dangerous because they can serve as a substitute for hard, adult thought. And they also prepare the psychological climate for the type of irresponsibility that can mean disaster in the age of the nuclear reactor and outer space.

Sadly, it is true that there are forces, however small, that would play the juvenile game of "chicken" with our national life and our national destiny.

We must not libel the roads that lead to peace or glamorize the roads that lead to war. We learned at a tragic price the folly of heeding orators who insisted our national strategy be permanent isolation. We would pay a higher price for heeding orators who insist our national strategy be instant intervention.

Our concept of civilian control over the military has served us well. But we must never permit partisan political passions to force irresponsibility upon our military strategies. Every totalitarianism we have opposed in this century grew up around demagogs dictating national strategies from atop a soapbox or from the beer cellars of party halls.

You have been well grounded in studies of your own government and our political and economic institutions. You fully appreciate, as President Kennedy said from this platform 2 years ago, "Few of the important problems of our time have in the final analysis been solved by military power alone."

Because there has been more delay than decision in many of our domestic realms, the political community in the United States faces today some of the most complex and difficult dilemmas and concerns of the 20 years since World War II.

In our national commitment to freedom, we have never had, we do not have now, we shall never have any goal or any objective short of victory. We know that victory lies only at the end of the road of responsibility. We have built the strength we now maintain, we have fashioned the unity which now shields freedom, we have offered our helping hand to those who would enjoy freedom with us so that we might together make peace, rather than separately make war.

America does not strive to avoid war because we fear it—but because we hate it. We do not strive for peace because we are weak—but because we are strong. If I may say so, we are not patient because we as a nation lack guts—but because we as a nation have guts.

Because we have courage, we must likewise insist always that civil government meets its domestic responsibilities without using our security commitments as an excuse for delay in overcoming insecurity in the lives of any of our people.

We have for nearly 200 years kept this Republic. The dynasties and crowns and thrones and seats of empire which stood when this young land was born have passed into oblivion. Our Government of the people, by the people, and for the people has risen to the pinnacle of history.

Our Nation has stood against the aggressors—the mightiest aggressors of history. The line we drew 15 years ago through Greece and Turkey and across Western Europe, is a line which has remained unchanged. The enemy of freedom has been contained.

Our purpose now, our goal now, is more than mere containment for our adversaries. We hope, we aim, we pray, and we work to achieve the ultimate breakthrough of freedom into all the world around us and among the other worlds of space above us.

The services into which each of you enters—and the armed forces into which you of our Allied Nations will go—are instruments supporting the free community's determination to keep the peace and to fulfill the high promise and potential of freedom. If not in a day, if not in a year, if not in a lifetime our work is to be complete, we can still live with the confidence that our individual contributions in the military or in the civil realm will be contributions toward peace for all the world.

You have chosen an honorable career. You leave now for an honored work. We as your elders, as your parents and as your fellow Americans say to you, "Well done, and Godspeed."

RECENT COMMON MARKET ACTION AGAINST U.S. POULTRY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to say that I was disappointed at the action taken by the Ministers of the European Economic Community last Friday on the poultry tariff is an obvious understatement. Although we had been led to expect the Ministers to approve some slight reduction in the tariff level, the Ministers increased the levy to a total of 14.29 cents per pound.

This action illustrates the impossibility of working out mutually acceptable trade policies with the Common Market as long as they follow a protectionist approach openly designed to keep a sizable portion of our agricultural products at a permanent disadvantage. In reality it makes little difference if the tariff level is 15 cents, 10 cents or even 5 cents a pound, as long as the basic policy is to keep our products out of their markets. The Common Market cannot expect to establish sound trade relations with us, or any other country, as long as it follows a policy which permits their tariffs to be run up and down at will like a flag on a pole.

The idea of protectionism regardless of the consequences will prove to be extremely costly to the European Economic Community and, indeed, the entire free world. Unless there is a drastic change in the Common Market approach to agricultural trade matters, we have no choice but to take retaliatory action. No one can win if this policy of excluding poultry should force us to exclude German and French automobiles and French perfumes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news article from the Washington Post and an editorial from the New York Times about the recent EEC action on poultry.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 1, 1963]

UNITED STATES WARNS MARKET ON POULTRY RATE

(By Julius Duscha)

The United States struck back yesterday at Western Europe's stiff restrictions on poultry imports in an action that may have wide repercussions on American relations with the Common Market.

Christian A. Herter, the President's special trade representative, announced that the United States was requesting a formal meeting with the Common Market to discuss its poultry import levies.

The American request followed a Common Market decision on Thursday to raise the levies for the second time in less than a year.

ACTION DEPLORED

Herter said in a statement that the United States "deplores" the Common Market decision and was "particularly shocked by this action since we have been working patiently for a reduction rather than a hike in tariff walls."

He went on to warn the Common Market that should the formal poultry negotiations fail, the United States was prepared to retaliate by increasing its tariff on goods Western Europeans want to sell to Americans.

"Our primary aim, of course, will be to obtain improved terms of access for our poultry in the EEC (European Economic Community) market," Herter said.

POLITE WARNING

But in diplomatic language, he added:

"It must be recognized that failure to obtain this objective will call for our insistence on balanced compensation elsewhere in our trade exchanges."

Until yesterday the United States had tried through informal talks with the Common Market to get a reduction in the poultry levy increase put into effect by the Western European countries last August.

The American decision to get tough with the Common Market over poultry, which represented only $50 million of the $1.2-billion-a-year U.S. farm exports to Western Europe, is the result of domestic as well as international political and economic considerations.

President Kennedy has been under strong pressure from powerful Democrats in Congress who represent Southern States that have become large poultry producers in recent years. They want him to retaliate against the Common Market poultry levies.

The first reaction to Thursday's Common Market decision on poultry came from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and leader of the southern Democrats in the Senate.

He said that the Common Market is following a "heads-I-win, tails-you-lose" policy and that the Western European countries "are demanding the right to export freely to this country while raising sky-high tariff barriers on our products to enable them to have time to develop a poultry industry built on information gleaned from a study of our system of production."

FULBRIGHT HITS ACTION

Georgia is one of the Nation's biggest poultry producers, as is Arkansas, which is represented by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who has also denounced increased Common Market levies on poultry.

The first increase in Common Market levies on poultry last summer has reduced American poultry exports to Western Europe by 70 percent.

The latest increase, which goes into effect June 10 and raises levies 3½ cents a pound to a total of 14¼ cents, is expected to reduce American exports still further. RUSSELL charged that it "amounts to a total embargo."

It was reported from RUSSELL that the Common Market's Council of Ministers raised the complicated system of levies on poultry because poultry prices in such nonmember countries as the United States and Denmark had been falling.

SET ASIDE FOR STUDY

The United States had hoped that the Common Market would adopt a proposal before the Council to reduce the poultry levies by 2 cents a pound. This plan was put aside by the Council for further study.

The United States fears that if the Common Market poultry restrictions go unchallenged, the Western European countries will next try to exclude other American farm products. Grain is the principal U.S. agricultural commodity exported to Western Europe.

Since last summer Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and other American officials have been talking tough about what the United States would do if the Common Market did not reduce its poultry levies.

But Herter's decision to request negotiations with the Common Market under a protocol to the Dillon round of tariff negotiations concluded a year ago with the first American action in the long-simmering poultry dispute.

TOUGHNESS IS SURPRISE

Until yesterday there was a feeling both on Capitol Hill and in Europe that the United States would not act as tough as it had been talking about poultry, because the poultry problem was really not that important to either side.

At the recent meetings in Geneva on ground rules for the Kennedy round negotiations to be carried out next year under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) the United States insisted that farm matters be considered on the same parity as industrial questions. The United States won that argument.

Among other Members of Congress protesting the latest Common Market action on poultry was Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland.

"This action will bring severe hardship to our Nation's poultry industry and particularly to the Delmarva Peninsula, where the economy is dependent upon the poultry industry," BEALL said in a statement.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1963]

TARIFFS AND THE COMMUNITY

The simmering crisis in the European Economic Community has again been demonstrated. A new meeting of its ministers in Brussels broke up in complete disagreement, with all the other five members pitted against France over relations with Britain. The "friendly five," led by West Germany, wanted continuing discussions between the permanent representatives of the Inner Six and the British ambassador to the Community. But France, which vetoed Britain's entry into the Community, vetoed even this slight gesture on the ground that it would give Britain too big a voice in the Community's affairs. As the Community is still governed by the rule of unanimity, the French prevailed.

It is not yet clear how this conflict will affect the "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations starting next year. But a foretaste was provided when the Economic Community raised its tariff on American frozen chicken, despite a previous proposal to lower it. The reason given is that American prices on this product have dropped, making it necessary to protect the European farmers. But Agriculture Secretary Freeman is warning that the United States will make no tariff agreements unless American farm products are granted fair access; and the State Department is already considering retaliatory measures.

The frozen chicken tariff may not be a world-shaking event. Nor is the new French veto the end of European unification. But taken together, they again raise the whole question as to whether the European Economic Community is to be an inward-looking high-tariff club or a liberal trade partner of the United States. On the answer to that question may depend the future shape and even the fate of the Atlantic community.

YOUNG COLUMBUS AMBASSADORS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a longtime proponent of cultural exchange programs involving people-to-people visitations, by which better understanding is achieved and the bonds of friendship are strengthened, I want to take a moment of the Senate's time to call attention to one such project carried on annually by a large number of daily newspapers throughout the United States in cooperation with Parade magazine.

This is the "Young Columbus" trip in which newspaper carrier boys are selected to participate.

Parade magazine has sponsored this program for a great many years in cooperation with the daily newspapers which carry the family Sunday supplement.

In my home State, the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader is the cosponsor of the Young Columbus trip, a journey which has been named after the famous explorer because on these oversea visits the carrier boys are discovering a new part of the world as did Christopher Columbus nearly five centuries ago.

Gregory Voigt of Spencer, S. Dak., was the Argus-Leader carrier who participated in the recent Young Columbus journey.

These trips were conceived by Parade magazine as a way to honor the newspaper carrier boys and to help build good will between the youth of our country and the countries visited.

The recent trip, I think, demonstrates the extent of this annual Young Columbus program.

This visit was made to the countries of Switzerland and Germany, from May 3 through the 15th. Eighty-three carriers from all over the United States made this trip, accompanied by 7 outstanding counselors from leading universities, and an escort group from Parade magazine.

The group, traveling on a chartered jet plane, landed in Zurich, spent time in Lucerne, Berne, Munich, Heidelberg, Frankfurt, and Wiesbaden, as well as many other interesting and educational cities.

The entire program was worked out with the cooperation of our State Department and the German and Swiss Governments.

The boys, selected for their outstanding character, good citizenship, and their ability to run their newspaper routes with a minimum of complaints, assembled in New York where they were entertained by celebrities and provided with special blazers which carry the Young Columbus insignia.

Overseas the boys were honored guests at official banquets held by mayors of Bern, Lucerne, Munich, and Frankfurt. They presented the mayors with gifts representative of their hometowns, and the boy from Washington, D.C., carried letters of greeting from the President.

At all of these receptions, the important point stressed by the Government officials was the part that the youth of these countries were to play in our future and they all felt, as I am certain many of us do, that trips such as these are most helpful to the cause of world peace by promoting better understanding and friendship among the countries involved.

In recognition of the part that Parade magazine is playing in helping to promote better understanding between our youth and those of foreign countries, Parade has been presented with a people-to-people citation, honored by the Irish Government, the Portuguese Government, and is to be honored by the Swiss Government.

I might also note that a documentary film has been made of this most recent trip. This is used for showing on television, in the school systems, before parent-teacher associations, and other interested groups and organizations. The U.S. Information Agency also has a film of the last trip and is using it for distribution to posts throughout the world.

Mr. President, in bringing this to the attention of the Senate, I want to personally pay tribute to Parade magazine and to the daily newspapers of America who are participating in this most worthwhile effort to strengthen the bonds of friendship of peoples throughout the world.

While one can never fully measure the value of such programs as these, it can be safely assumed that the contributions are indeed great—and this I know from my own personal contact with participants and sponsors from my own State, the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader and the boys who have made these annual trips.

I am convinced that our Young Columbus "unofficial ambassadors" are creating a tremendous amount of good will in each of the countries in which they visit, and in turn, they are receiving benefits of an educational nature which can well serve as an incentive in their later years to continue to promote the cause of peace through activities of a like nature.

Mr. President, I congratulate Parade magazine and the daily newspapers for this wonderful project. These papers include: Akron Beacon Journal, Albuquerque Journal, Allentown Call-Chronicle, Asheville Citizen-Times, Baton Rouge Advocate, Beaumont Enterprise, Binghamton Press, Boston Globe, Bridgeport Post, Buffalo Courier-Express, Cedar Rapids Gazette, Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Chattanooga Times, Chicago Sun-Times, Dallas Times-Herald, Dayton News, Denver Rocky Mountain News, Detroit Free Press, El Paso Times, Erie Times-News, Evansville Courier and Press, Fargo Forum, Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Fresno Bee, Greenville News, Harrisburg Patriot-News, Hartford Courant, Houston Chronicle, Indianapolis Times, Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger/Daily News, Jamaica Long Island Press, Knoxville News-Sentinel, Lincoln Journal and Star, Little Rock Arkansas Gazette, Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram and News, Macon Telegraph and News, Madison Wisconsin State Journal, Miami Herald, Modesto Bee, Newark Star-Ledger, New Bedford Standard-Times, Newport News-Hampton Press, Oakland Tribune, Pasadena Independent-Star-News, Peoria Journal Star, Portland (Maine) Telegram, Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Reading Eagle, Riverside Press-Enterprise, Roanoke Times, Sacramento Bee, St. Joseph News-Press, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Paul Pioneer-Press, St. Petersburg Times, San Bernardino Sun-Telegram, San Diego Union, San Jose Mercury-News, Scranton Scrantonian, Sioux City Journal, Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Springfield (Ohio) News-Sun, Syracuse Herald-American, Tucson Star, Washington Post, Wheeling News-Register, Yakima Herald, and Youngstown Vindicator.

TENNESSEANS IN IMPORTANT REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, an editorial in the May 16 issue of the Nashville Tennessean reminds us that the Honorable E. William Henry, the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, brings to three the number of Tennesseans now heading Federal regulatory agencies. The others are the Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

All Tennesseans are naturally proud of these men and, as the Nashville Tennessean editorial so rightly observes:

> If Mr. Kennedy is doing as well in selecting his appointees from other States, the caliber of Federal service is at a high level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 16, 1963]

FEDERAL SERVICE AT A HIGH LEVEL

In selecting Mr. E. William Henry of Memphis to head the Federal Communications Commission, President Kennedy continues to show his high regard for Tennesseans to run the Federal regulatory agencies.

Mr. Henry, at 34, will be the youngest FCC Chairman in history, but this doesn't mean he comes to the post without experience. He has been serving on the Commission since last August and already has developed a reputation as a tough-minded regulator in the tradition of the retiring Chairman, Mr. Newton Minow.

Mr. Henry joins two Nashvillians—previous appointments of Mr. Kennedy—as chairmen of regulatory agencies that perhaps directly affect more people than any others in Government.

The other chairmen are Mr. Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission, and Mr. Joseph C. Swidler of the Federal Power Commission.

All three are men of demonstrated ability. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Swidler have long experience as Government career men.

All three are known to thousands of Tennesseans and they are known to be men of dedication who won their appointments on the basis of ability and desire to give service.

If Mr. Kennedy is doing as well in selecting his appointees from other States, the caliber of Federal service is at a high level.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the recent visit by President Kennedy to Tennessee occasioned many warm editorial expressions by the newspapers of my State.

Among these are an editorial of welcome in the Nashville Tennessean and another, in the Johnson City Press Chronicle, praising the President for his speech at Vanderbilt University in which he set forth the responsibilities of American citizenship.

I think both of these editorials should be read widely. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, May 18, 1963]

NASHVILLE AND TENNESSEE SAY WELCOME, PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Today's visit to Nashville by President Kennedy will be a memorable and significant event—memorable because it is the first visit here of a President since 1936, and significant because it marks and honors three impressive occasions.

One is the 30th birthday of the Tennessee Valley Authority which has caused the valley to bloom as few regions have. Another is the commemoration of the 90th anniversary of the founding of Vanderbilt University. While he is here, the Chief Executive will press the button to signal beginning of construction of Cordell Hull and Percy Priest Dams.

The dissimilarity is less than it might appear, for there is a commonality of purpose to all three. Just as the TVA has provided the impetus to take a valley into the mainstream of national life, so does a university bring knowledge and skills into the mainstream of higher education.

Both are devoted to the furthering of human welfare, and this in turn depends on the joining of technological power and democratic freedoms. Without such technological concepts as TVA, the people of a great valley would be slaves to a river and a declining economy. Without education, men would be destined to be slaves of one another.

Neither the cause of education nor concepts like the TVA can be advanced without the dream, and without the vision that sees far into tomorrow.

The TVA exists today because of the dream of such men as Pinchot, Norris, Hill, and Roosevelt. Vanderbilt exists because of the dream of Bishop McTyeire. One was a dream of conserving natural resources in an underdeveloped area. The other was a dream of conserving human resources in a war-ravaged South. Both are great because men of vision and leadership moved them steadfastly onward to a fruitful place in the sun.

President Kennedy will not see much of this flourishing valley, but he will see enough to be impressed again by what the TVA has meant and means. He will not, perhaps, catalog all its triumphs, for they are many. He will, it is hoped, catalog the challenges that still exist for that agency, and infuse in all a rededication to its original concepts which show to the world how peoples may share in the fruits of civilization under freedom.

This Nation is caught at this precise time in the whirl of technological and social change. An American astronaut has traveled 22 times around the globe and fixed man's eyes on even more ambitious voyages to the planets. Other Americans are seeking their own breakthroughs into the space of fuller citizenship.

Technological change comes swifter than man can grasp it. Social change comes more slowly. But change is in the wind and America must move with it. It cannot rest here at this hour in this place. Neither can the hands of time be turned backward.

President Kennedy has provided strong leadership and vision to make this an even greater Nation. He stops off today in Nashville which is the home of another frontiersman, Andrew Jackson, who turned his back on the safe mediocrity of the past to lead his country forward.

The burdens of the Presidency are formidable ones, stretching to far away places such as Vietnam and Berlin. It is gratifying that President Kennedy has been enabled to take the time to come to Nashville to join with the people of this area for two symbolic occasions and, with the press of a button, to mark the beginning of other great projects.

The three things which the President will mark are implicit illustrations of the advancement of human welfare and of the Nation's ability to explore new things, to change, to grow, and to adapt itself to the dynamics of a world where patterns are shifting hour by hour.

With that in mind, today is indeed a momentous occasion. President Kennedy, Nashville and Tennessee salute you, and say welcome.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, May 19, 1963]

PRESIDENT CHALLENGES US

In his speech at Vanderbilt University yesterday, President Kennedy laid down three major obligations of educated citizens.

He personalized them as: "Your obligation to the pursuit of learning;

"Your obligation to serve the public; and

"Your obligation to uphold the law."

We who have been proclaiming the newly won status of East Tennessee State University might profitably consider his words.

On the pursuit of learning: "If the pursuit of learning is not defended by the educated citizen, it is not likely to be defended at all. For there will always be those who scoff at intellectuals, who cry out against research, who seek to hamstring and hamper our educational system.

"The educated citizen knows that only an educated and informed people will be a free people—that the ignorance of one voter in a democracy impairs the security of all."

On the obligation to serve the public: "The educated citizen has an obligation to serve the public. He may be precinct worker or President. He may be a scientist or a statesman. He may give of his talent at the courthouse, the statehouse, or the White House. He may be a civil servant or a Senator, a candidate or a campaign worker, a winner or a loser. But he must be a participant and not a spectator.

"At the Olympic games, Aristotle wrote, 'It is not the finest and strongest men who are crowned, but those who enter the lists—for out of these the prizemen are selected. So, too, in life, of the honorable and good, it is they who act who rightly win the prizes.' I urge all of you here today—particularly the students—to enter the lists of public service, and rightly win the prizes."

On the obligation to uphold the law:

"The educated citizen has an obligation to uphold the law. This is the obligation of every citizen in a free and peaceful society—but the educated citizen has a special responsibility by virtue of his greater understanding. For whether he has studied history or current events, ethics or 'civics,' the rules of a profession or the tools of a trade, he knows that only a respect for the law makes it possible for freemen to dwell together in peace and progress.

"He knows that law is the adhesive force in the cement of society, creating order out of chaos and coherence in place of anarchy. He knows that for one man to defy a law or court order he does not like is to invite others to defy those which they do not like, leading to a breakdown of all justice and order. He knows, too, that every fellow man is entitled to be regarded with decency and treated with dignity. Any educated citizen who seeks to subvert the law, to suppress freedom, or to subject other human beings to acts that are less human, degrades his heritage, ignores his learning and betrays his obligation.

"Certain other societies may respect the rule of force—we respect the rule of law.

"Others may pursue their ends through the use of terror and repression—we adjust our differences through courts and conciliation."

Well said.

The President has given all of us, whatever our political philosophies, some sound instruction in citizenship.

And to Vanderbilt University, East Tennessee State University and all others he has given an exhortation toward ever stronger efforts to turn out better educated men and women and more responsible citizens.

After all, there is more to life—much more—than just knowing how to turn a dollar.

NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NEGLECTED DOMESTIC RESOURCES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most boldly imaginative men in America recently admonished us that our country can never fulfill its responsibilities in world leadership without first developing the neglected resources of our own land to the fullest.

This proposition was laid down by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, an early Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and later Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a speech at Decatur, Ala., marking the 30th anniversary of the TVA.

Mr. Lilienthal does not argue that we are spending too much money in our world leadership activities; this, he maintains, we can easily afford. What he does object to is that we are turning away from the needs of our "underdeveloped" Nation right here at home through "emotional binges over Russia, India, Cuba, and the moon—everything except what happens here where we live." And Mr. Lilienthal urges that the pioneering spirit which infused the TVA and made it the success that it is today, be applied to other parts of our country whose potentials, as Mr. Lilienthal points out, "have barely been touched."

Mr. President, an article summarizing Mr. Lilienthal's remarks appeared in the Chattanooga Times on May 18, and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILIENTHAL ASSERTS NATION NEEDS THE SPIRIT OF TVA—SAYS CONCEPT OF AGENCY PROVIDES A PATTERN FOR PROGRESS AT HOME, SHOULD BE PUT ABOVE WORLD, SPACE PROBLEMS

DECATUR, ALA.—David E. Lilienthal declared here Friday night that unless the American people give top priority to total development of their domestic resources and opportunities with something of the spirit that catalyzed the Tennessee Valley Authority, the cause of world freedom and betterment could be lost.

Invigoration of every phase of national life in broad dimensions patterned after the TVA concept would restore luster to domestic challenges, spur all levels of our leadership to look homeward and again make this Nation the showcase for full human development, Lilienthal said.

He urged that the Nation disengage in some measure from its concern with a multitude of overseas commitments, warning that what had been a commendable exuberance in meeting the plight of others is now nearing a self-defeating stage through "emotional binges" and profligate preoccupation with problems in farflung lands and even outer space.

While this Nation since World War II has shouldered global leadership nobly and has written a matchless record in human idealism, Lilienthal said, it is now in danger of becoming "a kind of universal mother's helper for the troubles of the world."

In what he clearly regarded as a major plea to the American people, to be measured against his leadership experience in such historical landmarks as the development of the Tennessee River Valley complex and the control and development of atomic power, Lilienthal asserted that TVA still constitutes the most meaningful mirror of America's "special genius" for mankind.

"A passion for developing to its fullest this underdeveloped country of ours in every way—human, physical, cultural, and spiritual—is more rewarding, more exciting, more challenging, more important to the destiny of all men everywhere, than anything we shall find in space or in the remote and exotic parts of the world," Lilienthal observed.

Lilienthal's speech, entitled "Look Homeward, America," was delivered to a communitywide meeting in this city's high school in commemoration of the signing of the congressional act creating TVA 30 years ago Saturday.

President Kennedy will commemorate the Federal agency's anniversary Saturday with a speech and personal tour of the TVA's facilities at nearby Muscle Shoals, Ala.

Lilienthal, former Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors and former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, is now board chairman and president of Development and Resources Corp., an organization specializing in aiding underdeveloped nations harness natural resources. It is now engaged in a number of such projects in Asia and South America.

DRAMATIC REMINDER

Lilienthal told his audience that he had chosen Decatur and its setting in the heart of the TVA experiment to make an appeal to the American people for reexamination of national purposes for the simple reason that TVA is yet the most dramatic reminder of the American people's special genius—"that rare capacity to get things done."

He said the demonstration in this one valley of our special genius for doing things has not been lost on the rest of the world. Indeed, he added, the TVA still represents all over the world the most meaningful of our Nation's accomplishments because its results are the kind that concern the daily lives of the people of the world—the hungry and poorly housed billions to whom food production alone is more impressive than any other achievement.

Consequently, he said, the TVA is still "a kind of mecca for visitors from all over the world" because these other civilizations have not yet solved the basic problem of getting things done so that people can live without hunger, with less disease and in adequate shelter.

Judging by our national standards and by the great success story of TVA, Lilienthal said, this country has not advanced adequately in many areas of our life. Any neglect on our part to put our genius for getting things done, any diverting of our energies from fully developing our human and natural resources, would mean that we would "let down not only ourselves but the rest of the world," Lilienthal warned.

SEES UNITED STATES AS WORLD HOPE

He said the "basic proposition that needs to sink into our souls" is that the hopes of the modern world for freedom, productivity, human tolerance and equal opportunity for all will take place in this country if it takes place at all in human history.

Therefore, he added, it is essential that we pur our historic role into perspective, that we recognize that not only charity begins at home, but also strength and humaneness begin at home if this Nation is to fulfill its great and special destiny.

"As one once responsible for our nuclear weapons," Lilienthal declared, "I say in the utmost seriousness that the security of this country and the rest of the world now depends first and foremost upon how well we demonstrate to other nations that the physical, cultural and spiritual foundations of this Republic have been strengthened, mellowed, and developed.

"The future of people everywhere depends upon how well we in America show that the concept of a civilized people in one great area of the world, this country, has not been diluted or eroded by a too great occupation with other parts of the world."

Lilienthal said he doesn't feel that we are spending too much money on our world leadership activities, but rather it was an overspending of emotional energy, a kind of fatal escape from the challenges and demands at home simply because dynamic and talented leaders were lured to seemingly more romantic and exotic projects away from home.

He noted that the President can arouse many people by appeals to reach the moon before the Russians, but that when the President pleads for great and demanding causes at home he gets few listeners.

Lilienthal cataloged the great domestic opportunities calling for enriched development—science, technology, education for excellence, population expansions, urbanization, water pollution and housing.

All of these matters could be made exciting and could be solved by a concentration of emotional energies on projects at home along with the conviction that a challenge in the area of Denver, of Newark, of Salt Lake City, of Anchorage, Alaska, must be given priority over problems of any other part of the world.

"A conviction that the defense of the free world and the defense of the concepts of the freedom and culture that are deep in our hearts must be made first of all in our own country," Lilienthal declared.

THE ORDEAL OF JOHN HENRY FAULK

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a case of modern witchhunting that is just now receiving the kind of widespread publicity such cases deserve.

The principal in this case, Mr. John Henry Faulk, told a part of his story on a recent Jack Paar television program, which I saw. I wrote to Mr. Paar and Mr. Faulk asking for more details, and they referred me to an article which appeared in the May 7 issue of Look magazine. The article, written by Mr. Joseph P. Blank, is entitled, "The Ordeal of John Henry Faulk."

Although I shall not ask that the article be printed in the RECORD, I do commend it to my colleagues in something of a "lest we forget" spirit. It is not a particularly pleasant story, but one that should be read.

Mr. Faulk, who was a well known and successful political satirist and radio performer in the early 1950's, became deeply concerned with the un-American practice in the radio-television industry of permitting private vigilante groups to blacklist from the entertainment field all performers whose political views were disapproved by the vigilante groups.

In fact, Mr. Faulk went so far as to run for election as vice president of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, with a pledge to fight blacklisting.

Much to his surprise, Mr. Faulk was elected. And that is when his troubles began.

Because he was troublesome, he himself was blacklisted and, as the Look magazine article points out, was unable to find any work in the entertainment field for years.

Mr. Faulk was rescued from his nightmare by a very famous trial lawyer, the distinguished Mr. Louis Nizer, of New York.

Mr. Faulk recently won a lawsuit against the blacklisters and the damages were set by the jury at $3.5 million. As important as the money is to Mr. Faulk, vindication of his position and principles must have been even more important.

In my view, the jury's action in this case helped to erase one of the worst blots on the reputation and good name of our country in its whole history. The jury buried an era which never should have been. Let us hope that it is not soon repeated.

THE FALL IN CATTLE PRICES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, several committees in both Houses of the Congress, as well as many individual Members, have expressed deep concern over the low state of the beef cattle market since the first of this year.

Between November 1962 and March of this year, the average price of choice steers sold for slaughter at leading stockyards across the country dropped about $5.50 per hundredweight. Prices are still down, after a fall from the $28 to $29 area prevailing in November.

We have discussed this problem with officials of the Department of Agriculture, and also with representatives of the industry in Missouri and other States.

The basic explanation offered us by the Department of Agriculture is an "oversupply" of beef cattle during the past winter; but many in the industry question whether oversupply is the root of the problem.

They believe much of the trouble results from pressure from food retailing organizations to drive "live animal" and wholesale prices down, without any comparable reduction in retail prices.

If the latter contention is true, then the consumer as well as the producer has an interest in what has been happening to beef prices at the several market levels—stockyards, wholesale, and retail.

We have a study made by three industry sources—the Kansas City Stockyards Co., the livestock commission firm of Wilson, Flynn & Laws of Kansas City, and James P. Regan, livestock producer of Omaha, Nebr.

This study shows that, from March 1962 to March 1963, the average price paid for live choice-grade steers at 20 leading stockyards dropped from $26.24 to $23.15 per hundredweight; the wholesale price for choice grade carcass dropped from $44.67 to $40.65; but the retail value increased from $59.79 to $61.49.

In a memorandum accompanying this table, the question is asked:

> Had this additional amount been passed on to the consumer as it occurred during January, February, and March, 1963, how much stimulation to consumer demand might have resulted?

And in a notation to other matters bearing on beef cattle supplies furnished by this same source, the statement is made:

> Chainstores pressed slaughterers to lower beef carcass values starting in November and succeeded. * * * In other words, the lower price on carcass beef was not passed along to the consumer to any degree of consequence, and, as a result, that broader demand that would have resulted with materially lower prices to the consumer to move the commodity was not put into effect.

We believe an effective contribution was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, when he recently urged food retailers to pass price reductions on to consumers, and thereby stimulate an increased consumption of beef.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary received last April 1 on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: I have had reports on your meeting with some members of my staff regarding your deep concern about livestock prices, a concern I share with you as we all do here in the Department. I can assure you that this development is under intensive review and we are already taking such actions as we feel we can, and we will continue to keep on top of it and do all possible to relieve the situation.

I thought you might be interested that just today I have sent letters to the National Association of Food Chains, Supermarket Institute, Independent Grocers Alliance, and Cooperative Food Distributors of America, and others. I am attaching a copy of a letter I sent to the National Association of Food Chains.

We are urging these trade associations to request that retailers reflect to consumers the drop in cattle prices and to continue to aggressively merchandise pork and beef products.

As you know, we have a Plentiful Food Program which is used each month to promote the sale and consumption of particular commodities. In April and May the Plentiful Food Program will feature beef and pork, and I hope that through this device to assist in helping meet the current problem.

During the last month we have more than doubled our purchase of canned meat products for distribution under the section 32 program to needy families.

These are some of the things we are doing and have done, and we are doing to continue our efforts during the coming days and weeks.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate often considers the question of fair dealing with the consumer. Should we not also be concerned with the farmer and stockman receiving a reasonable reward for their production? In this case, all these categories, including the consumer, are suffering.

Being certain my colleagues will be interested, I ask unanimous consent that the data of May 29 from the livestock industry be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the data was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLE SUPPLIES AND PRICES

The attached statement, supplying figures from USDA publications regarding slaughter tonnage and prices, of prices during the late fall and winter of the past 2 years, is largely self-explanatory. These figures offer some evidence that live cattle prices were lower prior to any material increase in the cattle run. This matter should be further explored.

Chainstores pressed slaughterers for lower beef carcass values starting in November and succeeded. In general they forced $1 per hundredweight off the value of choice steers in December, $2 in January, $2 in February, and another $2 by mid-March. (Some recovery in steer values in late March.) While live-fed beef cattle prices were being "raided," price spreads between the lower wholesale beef carcass values were generally widened or enlarged $3 to $6 per hundredweight. In other words, the lower price on carcass beef was not passed along to the consumer to any degree of consequence, and, as a result, the broader demand that would have resulted with materially lower prices to the consumer to move the commodity was not put into effect.

What would have been the price for choice slaughter steers during February and March had only the usual markups on beef carcasses moving from wholesale or slaughter level to retail can only be estimated. The records show that on a 600-pound choice carcass, which would be the approximate amount of beef realized from a 1,000-pound steer, the spread was over $20 per hundredweight, or more than $120 per 600-pound carcass. The spread on a 700-pound carcass and up, of choice grade, according to the record, at the average wholesale market would have been over $140 per carcass. This extra spread on beef between wholesale and retail during the late winter could easily have amounted to $3 per hundredweight, and certainly in many instances $4 per hundredweight. The cattle feeder is an integral part of our great beef production industry. He is entitled to some protection from his live products being forced downward to such ridiculously low prices under the conditions that existed.

Federally inspected slaughter—All cattle, covering 2 5-month periods

November 1961	1,686,000
December 1961	1,562,000
January 1962	1,781,000
February 1962	1,467,000
March 1962	1,649,000
November 1962	1,683,000
December 1962	1,589,000
January 1963	1,795,000
February 1963	1,559,000
March 1963	1,694,000

Average price, all cattle, federally inspected

November 1961	$21.00
December 1961	22.10
January 1962	22.24
February 1962	22.43
March 1962	22.85
November 1962	23.36
December 1962	23.85
January 1963	23.11
February 1963	21.73
March 1963	20.73

Average price per hundredweight, all slaughter steers, 7 markets

November 1961	$24.54
December 1961	24.92
January 1962	24.84
February 1962	24.94
March 1962	25.24
November 1962	28.47
December 1962	27.60
January 1963	25.80
February 1963	23.89
March 1963	22.32

Much publicity has been given to the public that reason for the big decline in fed-cattle prices during the late fall and winter months of 1962 and 1963 was the large bulge in receipts. The above figures are taken from the USDA published record of federally inspected slaughter for the year ago period, as well as this last winter period. It is evident the big bulge in receipts also occurred in the early winter of 1962, as well as in the winter of 1963. (See USDA release April 1, 1963, which states January through March marketings of fed cattle were 3 percent more than for the same period in 1962.)

The USDA publication "Commercial Livestock Slaughter and Meat Production, March 1963" under date April 30, 1963, states:

"January–March Red Meat Output Up 3 Percent From Last Year." The report states in detail during this period beef production was up 3 percent from a year earlier, veal down 7 percent, pork up 5 percent, and lamb down 8 percent.

April 30, 1962: "January–March Red Meat Output 4 Percent Above Last Year." This report covering same period a year earlier, beef production up 3 percent from year earlier, veal down 4 percent, pork up 5 percent, lamb unchanged.

THE TUMBLE IN FED-CATTLE PRICES NOVEMBER 1962–MARCH 1963

The attached table of figures supplies on a monthly basis the decline in choice fed-steer prices that occurred from November 1962 through March 1963. The statement also provides price history on such steers from February 1, 1962. The wholesale value of the carcass and byproducts, and the spread is shown under item 3, which is the difference between the live animal price and wholesale value. It will be noted the spread taken by the slaughter did not vary extensively during the period of changing price of choice steers.

Under the heading on the statement "Wholesale to Retail Spreads" it will be noted that the spread taken by the retail store in moving the beef into retail channels increased from $13.14 per 100 pounds in the month of October 1962 to $20.84 for the month of March 1963. During the month of November 1962 the spread in getting 100 pounds of choice beef from the wholesale level through the retail store was $15.94. As the price of live cattle went downward, as shown in column 1 under "Live animal price," the spread at retail level was increased sharply during the 5-month period.

The increase in the spread from November through March amounted to approximately $5 per hundredweight of choice beef. On the basis of a 600-pound carcass of choice beef, which is close to the yield from a 1,000-pound live weight choice steer, would be $30. Had this additional amount been passed on to the consumer as it occurred during January, February, and March 1963 how much stimulation to consumer demand might have resulted. Certainly to the producer of the 1,000 pound steer it would have represented $3 per hundredweight on the animal. Sales promotion by the retail store outlets of the country, along with passing to the consumer the lower prices of the wholesale beef to the retailer, could have reduced the decline to the cattle feeder nearly half of what actually occurred. Huge losses were suffered by the cattle feeding industry during this period, and the losses are continuing as of this date.

Beef: Live animal prices, wholesale and retail values, and marketing spreads

Date	Live to wholesale spreads			Wholesale to retail spreads			
	Live animal price [1]	Wholesale value [2]	Spread [3]	Wholesale price [4]	Retail value [5]	Spread [6]	Spread, 600-pound carcass [7]
February 1962	$25.7	$28.72	$2.94	$44.1	$59.79	$15.69	$99.14
March 1962	26.24	29.09	2.85	44.67	59.79	15.12	90.72
April 1962	26.57	29.11	2.54	44.63	60.01	15.38	92.28
May 1962	25.73	28.83	3.10	44.03	59.72	15.69	94.14
June 1962	25.31	28.46	3.15	43.34	59.02	15.71	94.26
July 1962	25.72	28.65	2.93	43.70	59.35	15.65	93.90
August 1962	26.99	30.01	3.02	46.07	60.38	14.37	86.22
September 1962	28.18	31.27	3.09	48.04	64.53	16.49	98.94
October 1962	28.11	30.56	2.45	46.80	59.94	13.14	78.84
November 1962	28.62	30.88	2.26	47.40	63.34	15.94	95.64
December 1962	28.10	30.74	2.64	47.42	63.49	16.07	96.42
January 1963	26.67	29.72	3.05	45.81	63.27	17.46	104.76
February 1963	24.68	27.88	3.20	42.95	62.83	19.88	119.28
March 1963	23.15	26.53	3.38	40.65	61.49	20.84	125.04

[1] Weighted average price of Choice grade beef steers at 20 leading public stockyards.

[2] Wholesale value of carcass and byproducts.

[3] Difference between live animal price and wholesale value.

[4] Weighted average of prices of Choice grade beef carcasses in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle.

[5] Calculated from average retail prices of major retail cuts of meat in urban areas, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The retail value per 100-pound carcass weight is 74 percent of average retail cost of 100 pounds of retail cuts for beef because fat, bone, and trim are sold by retailers at nominal prices.

[6] The difference between wholesale price and retail value.

[7] Price spread basis 600 pounds of carcass beef which approximately represents 1,000 pounds Choice steer. The foregoing table of prices and spreads has been taken from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Market News Bulletin, which is published weekly and supplies statistics regarding livestock, meat and wool. The figures used above were taken from the issue that carries information once each month under the title "Live Animal Prices, Wholesale and Retail Values, and Marketing Spreads" excepting col. 7, which was added to show the price spread on a Choice 600-pound steer carcass, whereas spread under col. 6 represented only 100 pounds of Choice beef.

SUPPORT FOR MIGRATORY LABOR BILLS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a few days the Senate is scheduled to consider six important migratory labor bills. These measures—S. 521, S. 522, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525, and S. 526—have been carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. There is wide national support for this legislation, Mr. President, as has been again demonstrated by numerous telegrams which I have received during the past few days. Many of the telegrams request that I call the attention of the Senate to these supporting views, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that these expressions of support be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 4, 1963.*

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you colleagues on voting out of committee six bills on migrant farm labor. Request you advise colleagues in the Senate of our support of bills S. 521 to S. 526.

MSGR. WILLIAM QUINN.
REV. RALPH J. DUGGAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 3, 1963.*

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Your outstanding efforts in behalf of America's forgotten people, the migrant farm workers, is much appreciated.

Please advise the Senate that the department of rural education of National Education Association strongly supports S. 521 and the other five bills.

DR. ROBERT M. ISENBERG,
Executive Secretary,
Department of Rural Education.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 4, 1963.*

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Consumers League commends you and the members of your committee for your efforts on behalf of the pitifully deprived migratory farmworkers in the United States. We strongly urge you and the other Members of the Senate to take prompt and favorable action on S. 521 to S. 526 and also to pass a farm labor recruitment bill as soon as possible in view of the probable expiration of Public Law 78 at the end of 1963.

SARAH H. NEWMAN,
General Secretary, National Consumers League.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 4, 1963.*

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Words cannot express appreciation due you and Senate colleagues for your persevering efforts on migratory farmworkers problems reporting six migrant bills S. 521 to S. 526 to U.S. Senate is a tribute to your work. We strongly support these measures as manifested by our previous testimony. We request that you advise the Senate of our support and urge their passage.

Father JOHN A. WAGNER,
National Council for the Spanish Speaking.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 4, 1963.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The department of migrant work of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America continues to express support of principles involved in pending legislation relating to education, day care services, child-labor protection, labor contractor registration and sanitation. We are grateful for the positive and constructive position taken by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, and you as its chairman, in these matters we consider central and vital to welfare of migratory farm labor. Please convey these sentiments to those of your committee and other colleagues.

E. RUSSELL CARTER,
Acting Director, Department of Migrant Work, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 4, 1963.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We fully support S. 521 and related legislation for the migrant worker. Sincerely hope that it will be reported out favorably by your committee.

ROBERT A. LUKE,
Executive Secretary, National Association of Public School Adult Educators Department of the N.E.A.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 4, 1963.*
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and thanks for your continuous work for migratory farmworker. I strongly support U.S. Senate bills 521 and 526. Passage of these bills is urgently needed to give meaning to the subexistence of our domestic migrants.

CHARLES S. CUELLAR,
Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 4, 1963.*
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

National Education Association urges passage of S. 521 and other migrant labor bills. We commend you on your outstanding leadership in this program.

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director, Division of Federal Relations.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 4, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers reaffirms its support of the series of migratory labor bills. Especially the three regarding day-care education and child labor as outlined in our statement filed earlier with your subcommittee. Our membership of over 12 million volunteers, located in every 1 of our 50 States urges favorable action on these bills.

Mrs. F. L. BULL,
Legislation Chairman.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 3, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and your Senate colleagues for your untiring efforts in behalf of the migrant farmworkers. We strongly support the six migrant bills, S. 521 to S. 526, which have been reported to the Senate and urge their prompt passage. Please advise.

ELI E. COHEN,
Executive Secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 3, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We again commend you and the subcommittee members for your vigorous legislative efforts on behalf of migrant workers. We wholeheartedly endorse S. 521, S. 522, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525, S. 526, and urge their prompt passage. Request that you advise the Senate of our strong support.

FAY BENNETT,
Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 3, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Migratory Labor Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to migratory subcommittee in reporting out migrant bills S. 521 to S. 526. Strongly urge Senate passage.

ROBERT E. JONES,
Unitarian Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 3, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On more than one occasion the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has found occasion to commend and thank you and your subcommittee on migratory labor for your dedicated, persevering, and skillful work in developing proposed legislation for the benefit of migratory farmworkers. We are indeed gratified that now six of your bills S. 521 through S. 526 are coming up for floor action in the Senate. We most heartily endorse these bills and urge that the Senate approve them. If the occasion allows, I request that you make our views and recommendations known to all of the Members of the Senate.

Rev. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 4, 1693.*
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and your Senate colleagues for your persistent efforts to eliminate poverty from rural America by your work on migratory farm labor problems. We are delighted the committee has reported six migrant bills—S. 521 to S. 526. We strongly support these measures as in the best interests of both mirgant workers and family farmers. We urge their prompt passage and request you advise the Senate of our views and support.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

WATSONVILLE, CALIF., *June 4, 1963.*
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and your colleagues for your effective work on migratory farmworkers problems and your efforts to help their children through reporting to the Senate six bills—S. 521 to S. 526. We strongly support these measures and urge their prompt passage. We request that you advise the Senate of our views.

Mrs. HUBERT WYCKOFF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Families Who Follow the Crops.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 4, 1963.*
Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

United Presbyterian General Assembly on May 21 overwhelmingly endorsed migrant labor legislation substantially embodied in six bills—S. 521 to S. 526. You and your colleagues are to be highly commended for continuing efforts to find solutions to migrant labor problems and for bringing to the Senate a legislation program that gives substance to these efforts. Please inform Senate of our desire for favorable consideration of this legislation.

WILLIAM A. MORRISON,
General Secretary, Board of Christian Education.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the wide range of problems facing migratory farmworkers and their families, the problem of adequate housing is one of the most critical. While migrant families move from one area to another during the harvest seasons for fruits, vegetables, and cotton, they are often housed during their short stays in each area in units that are totally inadequate—inadequate whether viewed in terms of living space, in terms of running water, sanitary facilities and drainage, or in terms of insulation against cold weather or ventilation and screening in hot weather.

A few weeks ago at hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, a witness who was himself a migrant worker described for the subcommittee the housing conditions he met with on the road:

> They are filthy; they are no good. People, especially when they work in the cabbage fields, have the rain and cool weather. It is kind of cool. They haven't no heat or anything, and when you go home tired, after working all day long, 10 hours in the field, harvesting the heavy cabbage, then you want to go to a warm place, but you have nothing but a cool place. You might catch pneumonia or anything. It has mice and rats and everything else.

With this background on the poor quality of migrant housing in many parts of the country, I have been greatly pleased to learn of the excellent progress that the farmers of New Jersey have been making in this area of farmlabor housing. A report recently received from the New Jersey Bureau of Migrant Labor shows that in the past 3 years, a total of 117 new labor camps have been constructed, 55 of them in the last year alone. It is noteworthy also that the trend has been away from frame buildings in favor of cinder block units, which are, of course, more durable, cooler in summer, and warmer in winter. In addition to the construction of new camps, many improvements have been made in existing housing facilities. For example, over half the camps in New Jersey now have piped hot water and washroom and bathing facilities. Ironical as it may seem to cite, as an achievement, the fact that hot water is available in over half the camps, this is truly a remarkable accomplishment in the migratory labor field.

Many of the farmers who are providing these facilities are able to do so only by taking on heavy financial burdens. The difficulties of financing improvements stem largely from the fact that migrant housing is useful only during the harvest season and stands idle the rest of the year. As a result, loans for this purpose commonly have to be secured by a mortgage, not just on the housing itself but on the entire farm enterprise.

The New Jersey figures I have quoted clearly demonstrate that farmers are interested in improving housing facilities for migratory workers, despite the financial difficulties involved. There is, in fact, a force at work here that may make it economically necessary for them to do so, for the quality of available housing is often the most significant single factor in a farmer's ability to compete for an adequate labor force.

To help farmers in making these necessary housing improvements, I introduced a bill earlier this session—S. 981—which would liberalize the financial assistance available for farm labor housing under the Housing Act of 1949. I plan shortly to introduce another bill on farm labor housing, this one to give a tax benefit to the builder by permitting him to amortize his investment at an accelerated rate. It is my hope that these two measures will help and encourage more farmers who use migratory labor to follow the fine example being set in my own State of New Jersey.

DEATH OF SAM SPAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the U.S. Congress and the American people lost a valuable and dedicated servant, Mr. Sam Spal, staff member of the House Commerce Committee. As a member of that committee for many years, I personally witnessed Mr. Spal's tireless efforts on behalf of Congressmen of both parties. It was a pleasure to confer with Sam Spal on legislative problems. He understood perfectly all the intricacies that so often characterize our legislation, and his lucid summaries and presentations were of immense assistance to all the members of his committee.

Sam Spal specialized in the fields of railroad retirement, motor, inland water, food and drug, and Federal trade legislation. An interested individual could always count on him to provide clear and concise information about the latest developments in these fields. Yet his speciality fields did not exhaust Mr. Spal's interests; he was well versed in all the business that came before the Commerce Committee.

Sam Spal's contribution to the committee's work appears in numerous of its reports, bills, and special studies. In this way his contribution has become a significant part of American legislative history.

Mr. President, I join many of our colleagues in the House in expressing heartfelt sympathy to Mr. Spal's family.

NEBRASKA PIONEERS IN ATOMIC AGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska has been a State less than a century. Yet within that period of time it has developed the rich and worthy legacy left by the early pioneers.

One of the most recent and dramatic manifestations of the progress which has marked the past 100 years of Nebraska's history took place last week in the little town of Hallam, not far from our capital city of Lincoln.

There, at 10:02 a.m. on May 29, 1963, electricity produced from the world's first full-scale sodium-graphite power reactor went on the line to thousands of Nebraskans. It was an achievement of a new type of pioneer—pioneers in peaceful use of atomic power. It was an achievement that the sodbuster of 100 years ago would be proud of. It is an achievement every citizen of this Nation can be proud of.

This reactor is supplying electricity to the farms, homes, and industries of the great State of Nebraska. Outstanding atomic scientists from throughout the free world have come to Hallam, to see and marvel at the nuclear triumph pioneered in Nebraska.

This project is a partnership program between the Atomic Energy Commission and Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska. The reactor was built by Atomics International for Consumers, under the supervision of the AEC. For untold years it will serve the electrical needs of thousands of Nebraskans and stand as another monument to the perpetual, progressive pioneering that has, and will continue, to make Nebraska the great State that it is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Duane Snodgrass' account of the opening of a new era in Nebraska, as it appeared in the Lincoln Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR LIGHT BULB'S GLOW STARTS WITH ATOMIC HEAT

(By Duane Snodgrass)

At precisely 10:02 a.m. Wednesday, electricity produced in the world's first full-scale sodium graphite reactor at Hallam charged through transmission lines into Lincoln and two-thirds of eastern Nebraska.

The throwing of a switch at the multimillion-dollar nuclear power plant at Hallam significantly opened a new era for the State, the Nation and the world.

The historic moment was witnessed by public power officials, scientists, a handful of the plant's employees, photographers and newsmen.

SWITCH THROWN

Shortly before 10 a.m., the power officials and newsmen entered the complex control room on the second story of the rambling plant.

Four men, each instrumental in bringing the nuclear plant from the drawing board to reality, approached a control panel and pushed the switch.

At the same time, behind them, other switches were thrown by other employees.

And at exactly 2 minutes past 10, eastern Nebraska received atomic-generated electrical power.

EIGHTY MILLION DOLLARS

Few—in fact only those at the site—knew what had happened. No lights dimmed or brightened. The only evidence was a dial on another control board, slowly sweeping upward to indicate that the plant had gone from 15 percent of its power to 100 percent.

Behind the throwing of the switch lay an expenditure of more than $80 million by the Federal Government and Consumers Public Power District—and years of planning.

The throwing of the switch instantly shot a total of 50,000 kilowatts of electrical power onto the lines leaving the Hallam plant.

CAPABLE OF MORE

"We are now capable of producing more than that—75,000 kilowatts—if the need arises," officials explained. "But 50,000 is all that is being sought from us right now. As the need for more power arises, we will be able to meet it."

Seventy-five thousand kilowatts would easily provide all the wanted power for a city of more than 300,000 persons.

Although the Hallam plant's potential for enhancing the State's economy is "unlimited," according to Consumer's officials, the average electrical consumer probably will not be able to tell the difference in his electrical bill.

Said Jim Owens, field representative of Atomics International, builders of the reactor:

"You cannot tell the difference now, and will not for a few years. This is due primarily to the fact that the cost of generating electricity is less than 10 percent of the billing cost."

Consumers will eventually be able to undersell any other power agency in the State thanks to the atomic generating plant, Consumers General Manager Ray Schacht of Columbus said.

But Schacht said it would take several years before the Hallam operation becomes more efficient than conventional steam generation plants.

Meanwhile, Consumers won't be losing anything.

Under its arrangement with the Atomic Energy Commission to operate the plant, Consumers is assured its generation costs will not be greater than normal.

Schacht said this was the way it had to be since Consumers, as a public agency, had no capital to risk.

Dr. Emerson Jones, a nuclear physicist acting as a special consultant to Consumers, said a clause in the contract offers Consumers an option to purchase the plant itself for $1. He said this will be after the AEC decides it has gotten its money's worth out of the plant. He explainted the AEC is primarily interested in the plant as an experimental project.

The Hallam plant would not be included in any takeover of Consumers' distribution facilities in the future by municipalities.

The atomic-generated power from Hallam will cease Saturday for another in a series of many tests that have been conducted at the plant since it began generating power in the spring of 1959.

About noon Saturday, the plant will convert from the atomic powered electricity to the conventional steam method.

The test will last about 10 or 12 hours, officials said, and will test the ease and effectiveness of converting from one generating source to the other.

"The only difference will be in the fuel it takes to fire the boiler," said plant superintendent J. Denny Cochran.

Located less than a mile north of Hallam, population 264, the imposing nuclear plant is located on a 640-acre site, although only about 15 acres are currently being used.

SITE SELECTION

Why was such a pioneering, ultra-modern facility built near such a small town? These are Consumers' answers:

Hallam is located in the center of an electric load center, a fact proved by continuing, scientific electric analyzer studies by Consumers.

Hallam has a plentiful underground water reservoir for cooling purposes.

Electric transmission lines move in nearly all directions from the area.

An abundance of railroad facilities exist.

The area satisfied all Atomic Energy Commission requirements.

Who was responsible for building the Hallam plant?

Atomics International, a division of North American Aviation Inc., designed and carried out the research and development work on the plant under an Atomic Energy Commission contract.

The Bechtel Corp. of San Francisco was designated by the AEC as architect-engineers, and Stearns Roger of Denver was Consumers' consulting engineering firm on the Sheldon Station steam plant.

Here is a breakdown of the nearly $80 million the plant represents:

Of the $50,178,000 in Federal funds appropriated by the 85th Congress, $18,165,000 went for pre-construction research and development; $24,013,000 for constructing the atomic section of plant; and $8 million for post-construction assistance.

Consumers invested approximately $11 million in the turbo-generator equipment, approximately $10 million in the steam boiler, high-voltage substation and other facilities; and $5,220,000 in the reactor portion of the atomic plant.

During the height of the construction period at the plant, more than 400 men were employed. Now that the plant is in full operation, between 70 and 80 persons will operate the entire facility, Consumers said.

THE GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to hear a most succinct, yet thoroughly thoughtful, discussion of the relationship between Government regulation and private industry.

The speaker was Mr. Herrell F. DeGraff, executive vice president of the American Meat Institute, at a meeting of the institute's board of directors with several Members of the Senate.

Mr. DeGraff made a point which is often overlooked by those who loudly proclaim their championship of the American consumer in their attacks on American business.

> The meat-processing industry surely did not achieve its present stature—

Mr. DeGraff told us—

> by failing in its service to its consumers.

The same statement could be made about almost any segment of business in this country today. The high standard of American living did not come about because the purveyors of goods and services are ruthlessly seeking to deceive and cheat and rob the consumer. It would not be in their own self-interest to do so.

By offering dynamic, imaginative, competitive marketing and manufacturing, business in this country has created an abundance unknown anywhere else in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of Mr. DeGraff's remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments by Herrell F. DeGraff, Executive Vice President, American Meat Institute, at a Meeting of the American Meat Institute Board of Directors With Members of the Congress, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1963

As a new member of the American Meat Institute staff, I feel personally honored to have this opportunity to meet you distinguished gentlemen of the Senate and your gracious ladies, and to greet you also in the name of the American Meat Institute Board and staff.

You of the Senate hold high office and bear grave responsibility of legislating for the rising millions of citizens who, in the aggregate, comprise this great Nation. Your interests and concerns are with people—all the people who comprise the Nation—and with the social and economic system through which our people pursue both their collective purposes and their diverse individual goals. Our objectives likewise are in service to people—because only through services that prove to be satisfactory to our customers in the competitive marketplace can we be successful in our day-to-day and year-to-year business operations. We like to believe—and do believe—that our trade association, the American Meat Institute, plays a responsible and vital role in the well-being not only of the industry it represents, but also of livestock producers on the one side of us and the consuming public on the other.

We believe one of our most important functions is to help translate to you, and other members of Government, some of the peculiar problems of our industry—and equally, to help translate to our industry some of the problems with which you must contend in government. Indeed, this is why we hold this meeting here at the Nation's Capital—that this necessary two-way flow of communication and understanding may be enhanced.

You gentlemen are skilled practitioners of the art of the possible. As long as individual hopes, and goals, and purposes shall vary—and that will be for as long as there are free and articulate citizens—there will be endless divergent views on endless important questions. In our Congress is hammered out on the anvil of debate, the compromises of opposing views that eventually prevail as our laws under which all of us operate.

In the economic revolution that has occurred in our Nation in our lifetimes, we have seen the proportion of our population engaged in producing agricultural commodities decline to a mere 8 percent. But these few are characterized by a productivity that is the envy of the world—and this, of course, is what has released so amazingly much of our national energies to go into other phases of our economy. We can, indeed, have both space flights and dishwashers.

Inherent in this revolution has been the inevitable separation of the consumer from first-hand knowledge of food production and processing. Increasing dependence on food-processing industries to be the "kitchen" for the consumer has led to requests, registered in the Congress and the administrative branch of Government, for more and more consumer-protective safeguards.

While recognizing that this is a normal development of an increasingly urbanized society, we urge another point also. It is that the meat-processing industry surely did not achieve its present stature by failing in its service to consumers.

We in the meat industry have had long experience with regulation by Government, through the Meat Inspection Act and the Packers and Stockyards Act. By and large, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has served well the interests of consumers, and also of livestock producers and meat processors. And by no means are the interests of these groups always divergent. Over the years there has been general recognition that regulation and protective devices are necessary, but also that these must not become barriers to new ideas, new techniques, to changes in production, or to new methods of processing or distribution. A disservice not only to the dynamic food-processing industry, but also to the consumers whom it serves, could flow from an ill-advised protective attitude in legislation or administrative interpretation that would, in fact, prevent the development of the still better products or the still more efficient services that otherwise will come into being.

We must, working together—you representing the people, we being an industry that can succeed only by serving the people—do all we can to see that the rule of reason prevails in carrying out the consumer-protective functions that we both recognize are necessary. We know and accept the competitive challenge of the marketplace. Meat products can hold their own among foods and among other appeals for consumer spending only if the livestock and meat industries remain at least equally dynamic with their competitors for consumer favor. This requires the maintenance of operating flexibility and only such restrictions as are most carefully and maturely considered with full play of the "rule of reason."

Concern for the well-being of the consumer—we feel sure you will agree with us—is not a monopoly of Government. To us, it is bread and butter—and meat.

In more ways than one, we regard Government as a partner in our business—and we thank you for this opportunity to be with you, to speak with you, and for all opportunities to work with you who carry such heavy responsibilities of so many kinds, and to so many groups.

Again, our thanks.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PILSEN REVOLT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, increasingly numerous are the complaints which reach us from behind the Iron Curtain—grievances relating to shortages of food; voices denouncing assistance to other Communist regimes in the face of domestic shortages; calls for the liberalization of political conditions.

It is, therefore, most appropriate that the Council of Free Czechoslovakia has just issued a proclamation marking the 10th anniversary of the first open storm of resistance against a Communist regime, the revolt of the people of Pilsen.

This was more than a venting of opposition to the debilitating inefficiency of Communist rule which abolished all human rights in Czechoslovakia and which brought a society with a good living standard down to the level of Soviet misery. It was more than a protest to the fact that the Communist system had wasted away the country's wealth inherited from previous democratic governments. The revolt was more importantly a call for democratization and a public expression of rejection of Communist rule.

On June 1, 1953, Czechs and Slovaks in Pilsen, Ostrava, Handlova, and other industrial centers of Czechoslovakia, who had by then endured 5 years under the Communist usurpers, rose against the tyrants and thus made the first attempt to revolt against a Communist regime since the famous uprising of Soviet sailors in Kronstadt. The rebels sought to get rid of their self-established rulers who not only had turned their democratic republic into a harsh police state, but had also managed to destroy its prosperous economy.

The masses stormed the Pilsen townhall, removed symbols of the Communist regime, hoisted American flags and hailed General Eisenhower and Presidents Masaryk and Benes. The regime immediately sent the local police, militia, and military units against the workers. Instead of subduing them, however, the armed forces involved joined with the rebels, and strong, special Soviet-trained police formations had to be called in from Prague to suppress the uprising.

Finally, the revolt was put down; the commander of the rebellious military unit and a number of the civilian participants were executed. But the uprising did not remain without decisive aftereffects.

A few days later, there followed the June 17 revolution in East Germany on a larger scale. Under the impact of these developments in the two most industrialized areas, Moscow had to introduce the so-called New Course which brought a certain measure of liberalization to the captive nations. But even these measures were not sufficient to prevent the 1956 revolutions in Hungary and Poland. Although, here too, the Kremlin finally succeeded in quelling them, it never again managed to restore its tyrannical power to the previous extent.

Accordingly, Mr. President, it is in order at this time to salute those brave workers of Pilsen and honor those who gave their lives. The least the free world can do is to mark the anniversary with a rededication to the cause of liberty for which they fought.

THE AGE OF EDUCATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, recently I had the honor of making the commencement address to the graduating class of the West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, W. Va. In pointing out to the graduates that the space race is, in large part, a race for greater knowledge, I urged them to consider the advantages of seeking graduate degrees.

Mr. President, there is a vital relationship between educational achievement and national survival. The race between the free world and the forces of communism is largely a struggle involving science and technology. Our first line weapon is brainpower. Our front lines are the classrooms. We need to encourage the young people of our Nation to educate themselves as far as possible.

Because I believe this subject is of great importance to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Age of Education

(Address by Senator Robert C. Byrd at commencement exercises, West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, W. Va., June 2, 1963)

It is indeed an exciting privilege for me to be addressing the 1963 graduating class of the West Virginia Institute of Technology. I share your feeling that this day marks the attainment of a goal on the road toward a fuller and more productive future.

Fifteen years ago one could have addressed a graduating class such as this and assured the graduates that they were indeed a privileged few. In 1948 about 272,000 college students won degrees. This year, approximately 441,000 degrees will be received by college students. By 1970 the number may reach 730,000.

There is a reason for this substantial growth. We are living in an age in which demands for additional training skills have made a college diploma a necessary admission card to an economic arena where automation, nuclear power, and outer space are challenges which can only be met by trained brainpower.

In this day when the bunsen burner is being supplanted by the atom smasher in our laboratories, when the text books in use now are obsolete tomorrow, the pace of this scientific and technological evolution calls for ever greater educational achievements on the part of all Americans.

If we are to continue to receive the blessings of our heritage, and strive to promote the progress of our country, insure our liberty, and fearlessly face the future, then more of our college graduates must pursue graduate studies.

There is a vital relationship between educational achievement and national survival. The race between the free world and the forces of communism is largely a struggle of science and technology. Our first line of defense is not our stockpile of deadly weapons. These can be as old fashioned as the horse and buggy by tomorrow. Rather, our first line of defense is brainpower—the developed mind that is capable of contriving ways and means for reaching and tapping new reservoirs of scientific knowledge and economic wealth.

In a sample survey made in 1960, it was determined that there were 9,700,000 living Americans who had received a college degree. At that time, our population was about 180 million. By 1970 the number of living Americans with college degrees may approximate 14 million. However, in 1960 the number of living Americans who had acquired doctorate degrees totaled 170,000, excluding medical degrees. This year, about 12,400 doctorates will be awarded. It is presently estimated that 18,300 graduate students will receive doctorates in 1970.

If brainpower is the purposeful arsenal of our Republic, if our society is to remain free and to flourish, then we must put an end to our crawling pace toward mental supremacy. We must encourage graduate study so that by 1970 we can pridefully award at least 50,000 doctorate degrees. This should be our goal. Any smaller achievement in this direction will be a serious failure fraught with awesome consequences.

Few nations in the world today are more passionately committed to education than is the Soviet Union. The Soviets regard education as one of the chief resources and techniques by which they can "Reach and overreach America," and as a means to the eventual conquest of the world. For this reason, the Russians start to prepare their students in grade school and in high school for excellence in higher education, particularly in the fields of science and technology.

Children in the Soviet Union go to school 6 days a week for 10 years. Certain education reforms are underway and the 10-year school will eventually be succeeded by the 11-year school.

Mathematics, Russian language and literature, and physical education are required in all grades. A foreign language—usually French, German, or English—is required in the basic curriculum, beginning in grade 5 and continuing through grade 10. Classes in Arabic, Chinese, and other oriental languages have been introduced.

Botany is taught in grades 5 and 6; zoology in grade 7; chemistry is taught in grades 7 through 10; physiology in grade 8; general biology in grade 9; calculus and astronomy in grade 10.

As compared with the Russian curriculum, only two science courses and one or two mathematics courses represent the typical training of American high school graduates. Only one-third of our American students take chemistry, and one-fourth take physics. About one-third are found in intermediate algebra, but less than 10 percent study trigonometry or solid geometry. Hence, the average Russian 10-year school graduate will have a much greater amount of instruction in chemistry, physics, biology, and mathematics including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, than the average American high school graduate.

As to the structure of graduating classes, about 57 percent of the Soviet graduates from secondary schools in 1960 consisted of engineering, natural and physical science, and applied science majors. In the United States, on the other hand, only about 25 percent of the total 1960 graduates were in the engineering and other natural and physical science fields. Engineering graduates alone constituted only 10 percent of the total U.S. graduating class, as against 32 percent in the Soviet Union.

These comparisons emphasize dramatically the trend which has prevailed through the fifties. While the Soviet Union trails behind the United States in aggregate annual numbers of higher education graduates, its carefully planned emphasis upon scientific and technical training has already achieved an unquestioned numerical advantage in these strategic fields. The U.S.S.R. now maintains an annual flow of scientific and professional manpower from its higher educational institutions which is double that in the United States.

While the United States made a greater effort to provide higher education for a larger number of people in various nonspecialized fields, and thus to promote the aims of general higher education, the Soviet Union's scientific and technical manpower buildup has become the principal source of Communist strength, in spite of the denial to the Soviet people of educational opportunity in other fields of human knowledge—the humanities, the social sciences and other areas of general and liberal higher education. Our principal source of strength must be greater excellence in all fields of knowledge.

It is idle, of course, to say that Russia, by concentrating on developing engineering and technical brainpower, is neglecting the rounded educational needs of her people. The whole truth of the matter is that the needs of people have never been the concern of the Kremlin hierarchy in their blind ambition for total world conquest. The Soviets see only the need of excellence in computer technology—in making scientific breakthroughs in rocketry and in space which can give them the edge in terror.

Conversely, in our free society, as I have already indicated, we see education in its broader context—as serving the total needs of the individual, the State, and the Nation. This concept is good and wholesome. In the light of the present international situation, however, this concept of education seems to be hardly sufficient. We must, while maintaining a thorough and well-rounded curriculum, place a greater emphasis, than in the past, on scientific and technical courses and we must work harder and study harder to excel the Soviets once again in these vital areas of knowledge. We must take inventory of our strengths and our weaknesses and strive to overcome our shortcomings.

In certain important professions, for example, our numerical deficiences are monumental. We have an estimated shortage of 84,000 qualified public school teachers; a deficiency of about 239,000 engineers; a probable need for 50,000 more doctors; a need for an approximate 300-percent increase above the current numbers of mathematicians, scientists, and technicians. These shortages could be our undoing.

If we are to lose our edge in the cold war, it will be due in part, at least, to the fact that we have not measured our educational needs as we do our military needs. None of us would deny a single dollar that can usefully be spent for defense or for space exploration. It is important, however, that we meet our educational requirements in the same interested and determined and urgent manner. There is nothing more inconsistent and detrimental with regard to our national well-being, than the halfhearted attempts we have been making to produce a growing flow of needed brainpower. We must act to correct this situation.

The power and the potential of education cannot be overstated. While we must strive for excellence in all fields of knowledge, the need for expanding the ranks of our scientists and technologists is imperative. Our concern in this matter must be greater than lipservice.

There is evidence today that more highly trained professional people are returning to colleges and universities for midcareer educational instruction, thanks to the mutual dependency of both business and Government on highly trained brainpower and the willingness on the part of both to underwrite the cost of such graduate study. This trend must be made to swell, for this is the kind of investment that could unlock the treasures of our mountains and valleys, and send pioneers to the moon and the stars.

I know that each step up the ladder of learning is more difficult and more challenging. I know what it means in motivation, and drive, and sacrifice to complete years of college studies. I know that many of you feel that you are entitled to settle back and enjoy that hard-earned diploma. But I call upon you—each and every one of you—to aspire for additional education. In doing so, you will not only make your own future more secure, but also that of your country.

THE INDONESIAN THREAT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are numerous spots in the world where a potential for crisis is created by Communist expansion. Officially the Government seems slow to recognize these potential areas of crisis and to take steps to deal with the situation before the crisis develops. Just such a critical area is Indonesia, as is pointed out in the Washington Report for June 3, 1963, of the American Security Council which is written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, guest editor. This report entitled "The Indonesian Threat" is most informative and I commend it to the reading of all Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Indonesian Threat

(By Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the Charleston, (S.C.) News and Courier, a member of the ASC's Strategy Staff, and a major contributor to military journals in the United States, France, Australia, and Japan)

In mid-May, an Australian Air Force general and a senior U.S. Air Force general of the Pacific Command sat deep in serious conversation on the veranda of the Army-Navy Club in Manila. The Aussie, having just returned from an extensive trip through Indonesia, was saying, "It's not the fact that practically overnight Sukarno has built himself a modern radar warning system that bothers me. What I'm concerned about is that every radar I saw was located on the southern fringes of the island chain sited so as to cover the approaches to Australia." This incident is but one of many which confirms that while the United States focuses attention on Communist attacks on the southeast Asian mainland, a new danger zone is emerging in Borneo and the neighboring islands of the Indonesian Archipelago. The ultimate danger is posed to Australia, the bulwark of Western civilization in the Southern Hemisphere.

Little noticed in this country was the endorsement by Indonesia in late April of Communist China's policies regarding Asia. In a joint statement issued in Djakarta, President Sukarno of Indonesia and Liu Shaochi, President of Red China, declared: "The two parties (Indonesia and Communist China) unanimously have held that imperialism and colonialism were the root cause of the threat to world peace and of international tension." The Indonesian leader announced support for what he called "the just struggle" for the peaceful unification of Vietnam. He also condemned U.S. aid for South Vietnam and backed Red China's policy for Korea.

Referring to the Red Chinese head of state as a "comrade in arms," Sukarno said that Djakarta and Peiping are united in opposition to the uniting of North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei and Malaya in a Federation of Malaysia, scheduled to be set up on August 31.

This statement was hardly necessary, for the Indonesian guerrilla war against British North Borneo and Sarawak already had begun. Over a hundred green uniformed soldiers struck a police station at Tebedu, 3 miles inside Sarawak on April 12. The raiders were Dyak tribesmen who came from the Indonesian State of Kalimantan, which covers two-thirds of Borneo, the third largest island in the world. Trained by the Indonesian Army and reportedly directed by Brigadier General Magenda, the Chief of Intelligence of the Indonesian Combined Forces staff in Djakarta, their obvious purpose was to create an insurgency situation throughout British Borneo which would prevent the formation of Malaysia.

Indonesia's aggressive designs toward Northern Borneo can be discerned in the statements of Indonesian leaders over a period of months. On January 20, 1963, Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio announced that his Government had adopted a policy of "confrontation" against Malaysia. This statement was significant because "confrontation" was the official designation for Dictator Sukarno's campaign against the Dutch in New Guinea. The full significance of this language was revealed in early May when Gen. A. H. Nasution, Chief of Staff of Indonesia's armed forces, declared that northern areas of Borneo constituted Indonesia's "first line of defense." Addressing a youth congress, General Nasution said: "Support our brothers in northern Borneo with all your means. You must keep up your struggle until our brothers attain their independence." This statement is regarded as a call for the so-called freedom fighters of North Borneo, an Indonesian guerrilla group, to take action.

The joint Indonesian-Chinese statement on Borneo is of special interest because of the presence of a large Chinese population on the island. About 1 million Chinese live on Borneo. This population is largely concentrated in Sarawak and North Borneo, which are the objects of Sino-Indonesian pressure. They provide the ideal cover population needed in a guerrilla war—precisely as was the case in the Malayan rebellion.

The territory will be difficult to defend against guerrillas operating from secure bases in Indonesian-held portions of Borneo, the entire area of which constitutes a classic "privileged sanctuary." Hills and mountain ranges characterize the entire border area. It is precisely the type of terrain which favors guerrilla operations. British sources say that the dedicated Communists in Sarawak are members of the Clandestine Communist Organization (CCO) which operates primarily in the western half of the country. Already the CCO has an estimated hard-core guerrilla potential of 1,500 men of whom approximately 500 are already armed, equipped, and trained.

Malayan security experts have studied reports from Borneo and concluded that Communists on that island intend to use the same guerrilla tactics employed in the Malayan rebellion that lasted from 1948 to 1960. According to these reports, the attack on Sarawak, North Borneo, and the sultanate of Brunei will be based on terrorist principles established by Chin Peng, secretary general of the Malayan Communist Party. Encouraged by his Communist Chinese friends, Sukarno's strategy is to alternate the use of force and threat that brought him the easy victory in West Iran. These tactics will provide him with another emotional "anticolonial" issue which will serve to distract the attention of his people from the chaotic economic situation at home.

The guerrilla war in Borneo may thus turn out to be the most difficult conflict to suppress since the Korean war. In February, the Indonesian War Veterans' Legion announced that it was ready to organize 70,000 volunteers to help fight the British forces in Kalimantan Utara (North Borneo). Maj. Gen. Achmad Jani, the Indonesian Army Chief of Staff, has been even more specific, referring to "two divisions" being formed to support the "independence struggle." He told reporters during a personal visit to the British Borneo border area earlier in the year that preparations were being made, but that it was necessary to remain "coolheaded and await orders" from President Sukarno.

Backing up any such all-out subversive or insurgency effort stands a modern, billion dollar Indonesian armed forces organized and equipped for offensive operations by the Soviet Union. Its 40,000-man navy operates 250 ships, totaling 350,000 tons. This fleet includes one 19,000-ton heavy cruiser of the *Sverdlov* class, with another due from Russia in the near future; two *Riga* class frigates mounting ship-to-ship guided missiles, approximately 20 submarines, 7 modern destroyers, a Russian-built antisubmarine helicopter squadron, with a second due to arrive during 1963, around 60 motor torpedo boats and a dozen patrol craft.

The Indonesian Air Force numbers 23,000 men and has about 100 Soviet Mig–15, 17 and 19 fighters, plus 18 long-range, twin-jet 1,200-mile-per-hour Mig–21's. Bombers include 20 IL–28 turbojet aircraft and 10 pure jet TV–16's with a range of nearly 5,000 miles. In addition, U.S. C–100's, Soviet troop carriers, and C–47's provide a respectable transport capability. The Indonesians are reliably reported to have around 100 Soviet SA–2 "Guideline" surface-to-air missiles. These are effective to 60,000 feet. First displayed in Djakarta during the armed forces day parade last October 5, they were accompanied by a 200-man team of Russian military specialists.

The army includes about 350,000 men organized into some 130 battalions. Of these, 20 have been supplied with American infantry weapons. Others have Soviet equipment and the remainder share a mixture of arms purchased from more than a dozen nations. An extensive paratroop training program has been underway since last year which produces 200 graduates each month.

Coupled with this alarming growth of Soviet influence through massive programs of military assistance and economic credits is the country's steady drift to the left. In the offing, though not yet implemented, is Sukarno's political concept to organize a "Nasakom" cabinet which would represent what he calls the "three major elements of Indonesian society—nationalism, religion and communism." Naturally, this has the full support of Mr. D. N. Aidit, the chairman of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), whose 2 million members constitute the largest Communist party outside the bloc, and of the giant leftwing "Sobsi" Trade Union Federation. This thinly veiled proposal to bring the Communists into a coalition government on equal terms with nationalist and religious leaders has encountered polite but firm opposition from the army, the principal "nationalist" organization in the country. However, the army was unable to prevent the recently completed Afro-Asian Journalists Conference from being converted into an open forum for Communist propaganda. Similarly, if economic conditions continue to deteriorate, it may also be impossible for the army to resist Sukarno's tempting proposals for a solution to these problems through a reorganization of the government. Of course, Indonesia's expansionist policy on the island of Borneo is strongly supported by the PKI, which months ago denounced the concept of Malaysia.

Thus, for the first time since the outbreak of the cold war, the forces of the free world could be faced with the problem of putting down a Communist-directed guerrilla war that is supported by a pro-Communist government which has a powerful air force and numerous surface and subsurface warships. This means that Indonesia is in a position to transport all necessary supplies for guerrillas, to ferry raiders, and to bring over Chinese Communist guerrilla war experts, if they deem that necessary. However, experts consider the Indonesian Army as one of the most skillful in the world at small-unit operations in swamp and jungles such as the terrain bordering Sarawak.

What the Borneo situation amounts to then is an unholy alliance of two Communist nations—Russia and Red China—and one pro-Communist country—Indonesia—all dedicated to elimination of anti-Communist forces from an island chain stretching more than 3,000 miles, which is the key to all the lands and waterways linking the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

Their technique is the now familiar one of guerrilla warfare and insurgency under the guise of the propaganda theme of "national liberation" from colonialism and imperialism. Actually, of course, the Indonesian attacks on Sarawak can hardly be classed as anything else than armed aggression against a fellow Asian state; and Sukarno's opposition to the United States of Malaysia is nothing but slavish adherence to the basic Communist directive to sabotage any voluntary grouping of free, democratic states.

Actually, Indonesian imperialism against fellow Asians is an old story. An example is the little-known Indonesian aggression against the people of the South Moluccas. These people, living on the so-called Spice Islands between the Philippines and the Australian Continent, have resisted the Indonesian state since 1950. A South Moluccan exile journal pointed out not long ago:

"Now for nearly 13 years a forgotten war is raging on in the jungle-interior of the island of Ceram, on the border territory of Asia and Australia. Under the sago and nutmeg trees, in the mountains and valleys of this rich tropical paradise, soldiers of the Free South Moluccan forces, with firearms, arrows, knives and even with their bare hands are fighting the Indonesian troops. Our appeal to the United Nations has been an unsettled point of the Security Council's agenda for nearly 13 years."

With a pro-Communist power controlling all of Borneo, the Communists would be in a position to subvert both Malaya and the Philippines. Consolidation of power in Borneo also could enable Indonesia to move against Portuguese Timor and the Australian-held portions of New Guinea. With the accomplishment of these political and military goals, Indonesia would stand ready to apply direct pressure against Australia itself. The long-range Communist plan for the conquest of the Indonesian archipelago, with its nearly 100 million people, clearly envisions a subsequent takeover of Australia, with its population of only 10½ million. Red China also sees in Australia an opportunity for a new China across the seas; an area where she can find relief from the terrific population pressure on the Asian mainland.

The combined Communist and pro-Communist governments in Asia have a common stake in eliminating anti-Communist control of the northern portions of Borneo. The United States and its free world allies likewise have a tremendous stake in denying Indonesia, Communist China or the U.S.S.R. any further degree of control on the island of Borneo. A successful guerrilla rebellion in Borneo could seriously hamper U.S. efforts to support a free Vietnam. It would amount to the outflanking of all that the United States is attempting to do in southeast Asia and would imperil both the Philippines and Australia, two of America's closest allies, in the global struggle against Communist domination. The United States, therefore, can no more afford a nondefense policy with respect to the free Borneo areas than it could afford to abandon the defense of South Korea in 1950.

The United States has already announced its support "in principle" for the proposed Malaysian Federation. It is high time we threw some active diplomatic and political support behind its organization. It is high time also that we reconsidered our policy of aid to Sukarno, the Red-leaning Hitler of the Indies.

OUR CUBAN POLICY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of America's most distinguished and best informed citizens on foreign affairs, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, has given eloquent and forceful expression to the feelings of millions of Americans who want to see the Communist cancer in Cuba eradicated. In an address at Newberry College on June 2, 1963, this senior American statesman, who has served his country with distinction not only as Secretary of State but also in the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Supreme Court, as Assistant President during World War II, and as Governor of South Carolina, has urged that effective action be taken to remove communism from the Western Hemisphere.

So many who have called for a tough policy on Cuban communism have been derided as being warmongers and extremists. These terms, however, cannot possibly be applied with any degree of validity to a man who himself has gone through many great ordeals in meeting Communist leaders "eyelash to eyelash" in crises which this Nation has faced in the cold war struggle with the forces of world communism. Because of his great record of service to his country at the highest levels of Government, and particularly on foreign policy matters, I feel that every Member of this body should have the opportunity of reading Governor Byrnes' outstanding address entitled "Our Cuban Policy—Facts and Fears." I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this address printed at the conclusion of these remarks, with editorial comments on the address as printed in the Greenville Piedmont of Greenville, S.C., on June 4, 1963, and the State of Columbia, S.C., on June 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the address and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CUBAN POLICY—FACTS AND FEARS

(Address by Hon. James F. Byrnes at Newberry College, June 2, 1963)

I wish I could tell you that you were going into a peaceful and carefree world with unlimited opportunities to contribute to the welfare of mankind and promote your own happiness. That has been made impossible by the policy of the Communists to seek the control of the world and dominate its people.

In the closing days of World War II when I accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta, I heard Stalin say it was essential to the Soviets to have adjoining their country only friendly governments. In September of the same year when I was Secretary of State and attended the first meeting of the Foreign Ministers Council in London, I learned from Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, that while they were interested in countries adjoining the Soviet Union, their real interest was to acquire one of the Italian colonies in order to have a naval base in the Mediterranean and they also wished to influence all decisions made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who by agreement had been made Supreme Commander in the Pacific. I knew they had not abandoned their policy to gain control of the world.

The more Molotov complained of MacArthur's failure to follow the advice of the Communists, the more convinced was I of the correctness of the course the general was following. He demonstrated that he not only was one of the greatest combat generals ever to serve in the U.S. Army, but also was a statesman.

From recent history you know something of the postwar record of the Soviet Government. Whenever their military forces entered a country, they were never withdrawn. Today they completely control Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. They had military forces in North Korea for a few days prior to the cessation of hostilities with Japan. They not only retained possession of North Korea but attemped to have their North Korean puppets secure control of all Korea. In the effort to stop them, thousands of Americans lost their lives.

In Germany, the Soviets refused to make a treaty of peace because they had an opportunity to brainwash the leaders of East Germany and, as a result, they are still in control of that section of Germany and in Berlin have erected a wall to prevent the escape of the enslaved people.

Having spent the greater part of 2 years in conferences with the Soviets at international conferences, I know they will live up to an agreement only when it is to their interest. When representatives of the free world meet them in international conferences, there is doubt as to what the Soviets will get out of the meeting but never any doubt that we will get only experience.

With this history of our relations with the Soviets since World War II and with full knowledge that there has been no change in the determination of the Communists to control the world, it is surprising that our Government and our people were put to sleep as to what was happening in Cuba. For several years we knew of Castro's violent denunciation of the United States. We knew of his seizure of the property of Americans and many of us were confident he had become a puppet of the Soviets. But we took no steps to remedy the situation.

As early as September 14, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy said "If Communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America, then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure." He was absolutely right. This was a few months before he became President. Today Communism has a foothold in Latin America. Whether or not that foothold is permanent depends upon whether we have the wisdom to realize the danger and the courage to demand the removal of that threat against this hemisphere.

There have been so many conflicting statements about the Cuban problem that many people do not know what is fact and what is fiction. About a month ago a report was filed in the U.S. Senate by a subcommitee of the Armed Services Committee. It is known as the "Stennis committee" and is composed of four Democrats and three Republicans. That report which was unanimous was submitted only after many months of careful investigation, and was based primarily upon testimony of the intelligence chiefs. However, 70 witnesses who hold no official position and countless officials of government were heard.

It is my opinion that in an effort to secure a unanimous report on a controversial subject, the committee refrained from making some deserved criticisms of the Central Intelligence Agency and the other intelligence officials of the military services. The facts stated in that report certainly cannot be successfully denied and the report, because of its judicial character, should have received wider circulation.

I say the intelligence agencies deserved criticism because when we now learn of the missiles, tank and other Soviet weapons of war in Cuba, we wonder what they were doing when this equipment was being transported by land in the Soviet Republic, loaded on ships, taken more than half way around the world to Cuba, and there unloaded, uncrated and transported to selected bases. This was not done overnight. Surely it required many months, but according to the record, it was not until the summer of 1962 that this movement of weapons and equally important movement of combat troops, received serious attention from our intelligence. Even then, according to the Stennis committee, the information received was not accurately evaluated. Why? Because many of those charged with that duty had the conviction—not facts—mind you—that Khrushchev would not consider arming Cuba with offensive weapons. This caused them to place little credence in the continued reports to them by Cuban exiles and others as to the military buildup on our doorsteps.

How completely they were deceived is illustrated by the committee's statement that as late as "October 22 our intelligence people estimated that there were from 8,000 to 10,000 Soviets in Cuba." They now say that at the height of the buildup there were at least 22,000 personnel on the island.

Today it is agreed by the intelligence services that even prior to July 1962 vast amounts of Soviet military equipment had been brought to Cuba and the Cuban Army was one of the best equipped in Latin America. This is their hindsight, but not until photographic evidence was obtained on October 14, did our intelligence finally conclude that there were offensive missiles on the island of Cuba. Now this was many weeks after Senator KEATING of New York and Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, had charged on the floor of the Senate that strategic missiles had been placed by the Soviets in Cuba, less than 90 miles from our shores. These Senators were charged with being warmongers and with making reckless statements, even though it was obvious their statements were based upon information from the Pentagon. I am proud that one of the two Senators who had the courage to present the facts was a South Carolinian.

There is cause for fear when even a week after the President's speech, in an unclassified brochure published by the Defense Department, entitled "Cuba," the Soviet personnel on the island was estimated to be only 5,000.

Before admitting a Cuban crisis, our officials wanted what they called "hard evidence." That was secured by a U-2 reconnaissance and in the taking of the pictures a gallant South Carolinian, Major Anderson, of Greenville, lost his life. Those pictures convinced the President and his security aids of the duplicity of the Soviets.

Khrushchev had gone to extreme lengths to put us to sleep and to keep us asleep. Through a representative in the Soviet Embassy he expressed the hope that Americans would understand that any weapons he was sending to Cuba were intended for defensive purposes only.

After the President had received the photographic confirmation of the presence of strategic missiles in Cuba, the Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, called on the President. He discussed only the siutation in Berlin, obviously trying to divert the attention of the President from Cuba, which was mentioned only incidentally. The President read to Gromyko his warning issued a month earlier that if Russia turned Cuba into an offensive military base we would do "whatever must be done."

The Soviets believe that a successful diplomat must be a successful liar. Gromyko then demonstrated his talent by telling the President Russia "would never become involved in offensive military capability in Cuba." With the photographs the President had, he knew that statement was false. He conferred with his security aids and with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and determined upon the course which on the evening of October 22 he announced to the world.

As he spoke, I could hear the voice of Teddy Roosevelt demanding respect for the United States; I could recall hearing Woodrow Wilson address the Congress in 1917, urging with reluctance that we declare war upon Germany; I could hear Franklin Roosevelt the day after Pearl Harbor calling upon the Congress to recognize that a state of war existed between the United States and the Axis powers.

The people of the United States with unanimity expressed support of the Government in the steps the President proposed to take to put an end to the Khrushchev-Castro threat to freedom. No man has ever spoken from a position of such great power and strength as did the President on October 22. The moment he began, an order was given in the Pentagon that resulted in an immediate worldwide alert of the U.S. Military Establishment. That included every unit of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. It included our nuclear strength, which admittedly is far superior to that of the Soviets. That order was a shock to Khrushchev, who respects only force.

There is some justification for believing that ever since his first meeting with President Kennedy at Vienna, Khrushchev has believed he could expect a softer attitude from us. There is no other way of explaining his unexpected action to make of Cuba a Communist Gibraltar. As he proceeded for 2 years to establish a bastion of military power at our very door, with atomic power sufficient to destroy not only the United States but all of Latin America outside of Cuba, he truly changed the balance of power in the world. Instead of consuming a year or two in building long-range missiles which from bases in Russia could strike a target in the United States, now he could use short-range missiles from his Cuban bases to destroy this hemisphere.

Suddenly he was confronted by the President with a demand to remove his weapons. That demand was backed by action. He yielded, to the gratification of every American. But what has happened since October does not justify gratification; it does cause some fears.

In the light of the duplicity which had victimized us, the President, in his demand, insisted upon the right to have "on-sight inspection" to assure removal of the offensive weapons.

For years, in negotiations to restrict the use of atomic weapons we have insisted upon inspection by an international commission. In view of this demand as to atomic bases in Russia, we could ask no less with the actual threat in Cuba.

Last October the President, referring to this subject stated "the United States intends to follow closely the completion of this work through a variety of means, including aerial surveillance, until such time as an equally satisfactory international means of verification is effected."

When Khrushchev agreed to the removal of the strategic weapons, he indicated agreement to on-site inspection by United Nations authorities. A few days later we were told that Castro refused to agree and the Soviets would have to support Castro's position.

I am confident the Soviets could force Castro to agree to the inspection at any time. That was only an excuse. However, we abandoned our demand and no one of us is certain of the number of Soviet weapons and combat forces in Cuba today.

Our embargo was removed in 30 days after it was imposed. There was evidence while it lasted that certain weapons were removed although there is no assurance that all offensive weapons were removed or how many have been brought in since that time. We are told by our intelligence that it is impossible to know what weapons are hidden in the caves of Cuba. Are we in any more secure position today than we were prior to October 22?

In view of the deliberate falsehoods told us for 2 years, we cannot accept the word of Khrushchev as to the character of weapons there. There is an old Indian adage that seems fitting:

"Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

The Soviets have fooled us not only twice but on every occasion when it was to their interest and they thought they could get away with it.

Our Cuban policy apparently has been to isolate Cuba diplomatically and cripple her economically. Apparently, it has been our hope that the Soviets would find it economically burdensome, would tire of shouldering the burden and abandon its interest in Cuba. There is no justification for such hopes. To isolate the United States is part of their long-range plan. Regardless of your optimism, you must realize how futile is that hope after the recent demonstration in Moscow.

In the presence of thousands of spectators Khrushchev pledged all-out support of his Communist brother Castro and of Cuba. This pledge has been heralded to the world. Upon it Castro is certain to rely and may act. Nor is there justification for the hope that the Cuban people will revolt against Castro while Soviet troops are there. The people have the example of Hungary and East Berlin.

The permanent foothold of which Senator Kennedy expressed fear in 1960 is now a reality unless the United States shall take steps to prevent it.

The Senate committee concluded its report with this wise statement, "The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad are certain to doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorsteps."

It is obvious that for similar reasons Latin American Republics will conclude that we are unable to protect them. They will be subverted one by one until all of South America is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Responsible sources tell us that after Khrushchev's agreement to remove offensive weapons from Cuba, the United States removed strategic weapons from its bases in Turkey. It is said that this was done because our atomic submarines make the retention of such bases no longer a necessity. We hope this was a fact and not an excuse for action that might appeal to the Soviets as appeasement. Appeasement never stops a war, it only postpones it.

Ambassador Chip Bolen, who in my opinion is the best informed American in public life as to Russia and its people, is credited with having said that Khrushchev is fond of quoting a Lenin adage that goes like this: "If a man sticks out his bayonet and hits cold steel, he pulls back, but if he strikes mush, he keeps on pushing."

We have another fear: Sources usually reliable report that the Soviets are establishing several submarine bases in Cuba. The explanation offered for the harbor improvements, is that it is for a fleet of fishing boats.

Because of the doubt that exists as to the removal of offensive weapons; the number of Soviet combat personnel brought into Cuba recently, and the development of submarine bases, the United States should renew the demand by the President last October for on-site inspection by an international commission.

Khrushchev knows that by his duplicity he put us to sleep for more than a year. He must not be allowed to think that when we awoke last October we turned over and went back to sleep.

This is not political criticism of the administration. It has always been my belief that in the field of foreign affairs there should be no partisan politics. Wars are fought by men of all political parties. Soviet bombs from Cuba would make no political distinction among people.

Instead of looking to the past and indulging in charges and countercharges about the responsibility for what are deemed mistakes, we should look to the future and unite in making secure the safety and freedom of our people.

I am aware of the fear that any effort to force Castro to submit to on-site inspection may result in nuclear war. Khrushchev knows of our fears and he has used it to frighten us. But he is aware that if he attacks us, with our superior atomic weapons, we will destroy the Soviet Republic within a few hours.

Should the President renew his demand for on-site inspection by an international commission, the Soviet Premier may again agree and persuade his puppet Castro to agree. In such case, all fears on this score would be removed.

If Khrushchev or Castro refuses, then I hope the President will immediately renew his quarantine of Cuba by air and sea to make certain that no more Soviet offensive weapons or combat troops are landed in Cuba. I suggest this action because the President took such steps last October and announced his intention to follow through.

If these steps do not result in the removal from Cuba of Soviet arms and troops, then I hope the President, after conferring with his military advisers, will take whatever steps are necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons and combat troops and keep them out. The President can act with the assurance that the peaceful but courageous people of the United States will support any action he may take to accomplish this and insure the safety and freedom of the people of this hemisphere.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, June 4, 1963]

Byrnes on Cuban Threat

James F. Byrnes has put into clear and precise words the feeling of many, many Americans who are concerned about Cuba.

Speaking at Newberry College commencement exercises, South Carolina's senior statesman called for a tougher U.S. policy toward the Castro-Soviet state, for on-site inspections to uncover any Russian missiles or other weaponry and, if necessary, a quarantine of Cuba enforced by a U.S. sea and air fleet.

"If these steps do not result in the removal of Soviet arms and troops, then I hope the President, after conferring with his military advisers, will take whatever steps are necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba," Mr. Byrnes said.

While Mr. Byrnes carefully disclaimed any intention of criticizing the Kennedy administration, the fact remains that the President has continually minimized the danger from Cuba to the United States while allowing the Monroe Doctrine to be destroyed.

No one aware of the Communist goal of world domination can possibly doubt that Russian troops and weapons in Cuba were put there in the first place as a threat to the United States; no one can possibly think that their continued presence there does not still pose a threat.

The threat will remain until the United States wipes it out. That is what Mr. Byrnes sees as necessary. That is what millions of other Americans see as necessary, too.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 5, 1963]

Who Will Listen?

In addressing the graduates of Newberry College Sunday, Governor, Justice, Secretary of State-Assistant President James F. Byrnes said the President should take whatever steps may be necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons and combat troops from Cuba; that the President could act with assurance that the people of this country would support him in assuring the safety and freedom of this hemisphere; that Russia has deceived us whenever she could get away with it; that the President's speech of October 22 was equal to any in power and was a shock to Khrushchev "who respects only force," but that we had abandoned our demand and "Khrushchev probably thinks the sleeping United States awakened only long enough to turn over and go back to sleep."

Mr. Byrnes, as usual, is right and justified. It is also true that some of his words have a familiar ring. Others, including The State, have long since pointed up the fact that the Russians, who live by force, respect only force.

Yet we persist in the wishy-washy, no-win policy, making a show of courage only to back down and leave the field to the aggressors.

Mr. Byrnes has spoken well, as others have spoken well. But who will listen? What must it take to shake the leaders of this country out of their apathy and timidity and put them on the path of courage and determination?

Perhaps, if enough respected and patriotic citizens raise their voices in protest against the present policies the continuous drip-drop on the stony consciousness of the administration may wear down the passive resistance to reason and awaken it to positive and stalwart action. Mr. Byrnes has made his contribution.

INDIAN AGGRESSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a news article from the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., dated June 3, 1963, and entitled: "Indian Aggression—Rivers Supports U.S. Arms Aid to Pakistan." This article reports on a newsletter by Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina in which the distinguished Representative of the First District issues an important warning against U.S. military aid to India at the expense of our stanch ally, the Government and people of Pakistan.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to visit Pakistan last fall and to have conferences with many Pakistan officials, including President Ayub Khan. This visit confirmed beyond any question the value of this nation to the free world and its sincere desire to continue its friendly relations with our country if we will but permit her to continue to be our ally and friend.

Pakistan is a nation which has risked much to join the Western camp. It borders on Afghanistan, India, and Iran, and is close to the Soviet Union. Of the countries sharing a common border with Pakistan, only Iran is any way connected with the Western World in the struggle against communism. Afghanistan is virtually a puppet of the Soviet Union, and until Red China attacked neutralist, socialist India, India was leaning heavily toward the Red side. But, little Pakistan—and it is not so little from the standpoint of population, having more than 90 million inhabitants—chose early to stand with the Western World.

Our country has known for some time of the bitter feuding, and at times, fighting, which has ensued between Pakistan and India over religious differences and also over the Pakistan-oriented country of Kashmir. The United Nations has supported a plebiscite for the people of Kashmir, but the Indian Government has refused to permit such a plebiscite because the Indians know the results would be against Indian wishes.

With the Pakistanis, their primary concern as a nation is Kashmir and their long fight with India. Communism is also a threat, but each country is always more concerned about its most immediate and primary threat—and in this case it comes from India. In fact, while I was in Pakistan last fall, Mr. Nehru had more troops massed on the Pakistani border than he did facing the Chinese Reds who were waging war against Indian forces in the Himalayan Mountains.

When President Ayub Khan, of Pakistan, visited this country last year, he received firm assurances from the President of the United States and the State Department that our Government understood his concern about India and the possible additional threat which his country might face if India were supplied with arms from this country. He maintains he was told that we would consult with him before giving any arms to India.

However, as soon as Mr. Nehru made his first screams for aid against the Chinese Communists, our country ran to India's assistance. In fact, this was one of the swiftest responses our country has ever made to any act of Communist aggression, and this aggression was not directed at our Nation or that of an ally, but rather at a pro-Red neutralist country. Our Government gave military aid to Mr. Nehru and did so without consulting President Khan. We only gave him a perfunctory notice of the fact that aid was being given to his arch enemy.

This and other acts in recent months on the part of the United States have seriously jeopardized our relationship with Pakistan and even upset some high officials in the Department of State. In Pakistan, a country deeply dedicated to the Moslem religion, the breaking of one's word is considered a very grave act of bad faith, regardless of the reason for such an act. Everywhere my group went in Pakistan this act of bad faith was brought up as much as the fact that we were giving aid to India, Pakistan's primary enemy, even without getting any firm assurances that this military aid would not later be turned against our own ally.

While I was in Pakistan, the question was asked over and over again as to which side the United States was on and whether we intended to stand by our allies or whether we intended to forsake them and try to form new friends with neutralist or pro-Communist nations.

I was particularly impressed with an address given our group of visitors by the Chief of Staff of the Pakistani Army. He told us that the United States would have to make a choice as to which countries we wanted as our friends and that the United States must determine to use its power and to stand up to communism as we had when we demanded that the missiles be removed from Cuba, if we were to earn and maintain the support and respect of the peoples of the world. He pointed out further that not just Pakistan but the leaders of other nations are perplexed by U.S. foreign policy and at times question whether we want to be neutralist in the cold war or whether we want to really fight the cold war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. President, Congressman Rivers has pointed up clearly our obligations to our ally, Pakistan, and that country's justifiable concern about U.S. military aid to India. Because of the excellent job he has done in making these points, I ask unanimous consent that this article in his newsletter be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, June 3, 1963]

Indian Aggression: Rivers Supports U.S. Arms Aid to Pakistan

Representative L. Mendel Rivers warned of future Indian aggression against Pakistan and advocated the armed support of the tiny nation in such an eventuality in his weekly newsletter.

"The Pakistani are deeply disturbed and desire assurances we will not stand idly by if India should employ her newly developed military strength against her.

"Considering the reliability of the perfidious Nehru, I suspect the Pakistani have just cause for alarm."

Though Nehru still professes his neutral stand, he showed the Pakistani his true colors when he romped over little Goa, the Congressman said, and heightened their fears of Indian imperialism. It is my understanding some limited assurances have been given the Pakistani, but not enough to quell their anxiety.

"When the United States decided to extend military aid to Pakistan in 1954, India was assured that if any of our aid was misused, the United States would take appropriate action both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression. This pledge also was given to Pakistan.

"However, Pakistan now points out—and rightly so—that the Chinese threat to India's border has receded, and thus the need for assistance is lessening. Consequently, they definitely oppose any further military buildup for India," the low-country lawmaker continued.

If Nehru would settle with Pakistan over the disputed territory of Kashmir, India would have no need for further assistance in any event. This alone would immediately release six to seven divisions of the best equipped Indian troops to deal with any Chinese threat to her border. Now, these divisions remain aimed at Pakistan.

Everyone with an ounce of knowledge of foreign affairs knows that Nehru has been a "biased" neutral for years, Representative Rivers stated. He is neutral only when it is to his decided advantage. But when he takes our aid and then hurts us with allies upon whom we depend for military bases—such as Portugal—then I think it is time to call it quits.

India's aggression in Goa drove a wedge into the many, many years of the most cordial friendship with Portugal, a member of NATO and a friend who furnishes us base rights in the Azores—the "Crossroads of the Atlantic"—for our military aircraft.

"India has never been our friend," he concluded. "Her vote nearly always has been against us in the United Nations and with the Soviet interest group—clearly showing her preference.

"But, on the other hand, we should bear in mind that in Pakistan the United States has an ally who is committed to the West, is a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and is a close associate in the Central Treaty Organization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has not been laid before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 181, S. 522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

TOBACCO AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the thalidomide scandal of last year, which so gravely concerned the American people and the Congress, served as a sobering reminder that it is the continuing duty of the Congress to be alert to any threat to the health of the American people.

I submit that such a threat does now exist and that the Congress has not only the duty but a rare opportunity to take appropriate steps to ensure a greater degree of protection to the American people from that threat. I am referring specifically to the hazard to health inherent in the enormous consumption of smoking products by Americans, both children and adults.

Smoking has become so prevalent in this country that its enormity becomes obscured by its very presence. Prior to the first World War, most smoking products consisted of pipes, cigars, chewing tobacco, and even snuff. But from 1920 to 1960, cigarettes came to the fore, so that their consumption in this country shot up from 750 cigarettes a year for each adult American to nearly 4,000 a year per adult. In the same period—although other smoking products fell off by 70 percent—the cigarette consumption was so great that the total consumption of smoking products went up by 30 percent. In 1961, it was estimated that the American people smoked nearly a half a trillion cigarettes—an increase of almost one-third over 1954. That meant that enough cigarettes were sold in 1961 for every man and woman over 15 years of age to smoke over a half a pack a day.

And, as we all know, people are beginning to smoke earlier and earlier. A recent survey of 22,000 high school students in one of our major cities showed that more than one out of three boys and more than one out of four girls were smoking by the time they became seniors.

While all this was happening, some other interesting statistics were taking place.

Although the total death rate, from all causes, has declined since 1900, the death rate from lung cancer has shot upward—until by 1960 nearly as many Americans were dying of lung cancer as were dying in traffic accidents. Perhaps it is only a coincidence, but the undeniable facts are that medical researchers have found lung cancer to be an extremely rare cause of death among nonsmokers.

If lung cancer mortality continues at its present rate, there are today—based upon statistics of the American Public Health Association—1 million schoolchildren who will die of lung cancer before they reach 70 years of age.

As horrible as the lung cancer story is, it still is heart disease which accounts for most deaths in this country. Heart disease afflicts nonsmokers, of course. But the heart disease death rate is 70 percent higher among smokers. And medical researchers have been able to demonstrate, time and time again, that the death rate from heart disease increases progressively with the amount of cigarette smoking.

As a nation, we take all manner of steps to protect our people from hazards to their health and their lives. The Government has laws and regulations designed to reduce traffic accidents, to protect people against industrial accidents, to guard against every sort of communicable disease, to assure consumers of receiving pure and unadulterated products in the marketplace. We even have strong laws protecting the health of dogs, cats, horses, cows, sheep, and pigs.

Yet what do we do to protect people from the ravages of the growing menace of lung cancer and the worst killer of them all, heart disease?

It is a fact so incredible that it borders upon a national scandal; but the undeniable truth is that this Government affords the American people not the first shred of protection against the poisonous and other harmful effects of smoking products.

We have Federal laws and regulations which protect people—and animals—against the very same poisons from which the men, women, and children of this Nation are totally unprotected when those poisons appear in smoking products.

I am therefore introducing today, for myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which would place all smoking products under the authority of the Food and Drug Administration.

Specifically, this amendment would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the act, the authority to promulgate appropriate rules and regulations in labeling smoking products such as he now has regarding foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

This would mean that the American people at least would be given warning against poisons and other harmful effects of smoking products. They now enjoy under the Food and Drug Administration protection against poisons appearing in foods, drugs, and cosmetics, but receive only inducement and encouragement to smoke tobacco. The effect of the bill would be to expand the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to the Food, Drug, Cosmetic, and Smoking Act.

It is ironic that this country, which prides itself on being ahead of the rest of the world in its health and general living standards, now lags behind other countries in protecting the public from the hazards of smoking.

In England, after a damning report from the Royal College of Physicians, the British Government initiated a program for distributing literature warning its people of the dangers of smoking. The Government is developing guidelines to prevent television advertising which unduly emphasizes pleasure to be obtained from cigarettes, features heroes of young people, appeals to pride or general manliness, attributes social status to smoking, or implies smoking is associated with romantic situations. Manufacturers supplying 90 percent of the British cigarette market voluntarily have agreed not to advertise on television before 9 p.m., in deference to the health of children. One cigarette manufacturer voluntarily withdrew its product from vending machines.

In Denmark, the National Society for Combating Cancer issued a strong antitobacco report, urging prohibition of tobacco advertising and even restrictions on young people's smoking. The tobacco industry there has agreed voluntarily not to use testimonials from sports heroes.

In Italy, the Government has banned all tobacco advertising.

The amendment I am proposing does not deal with advertising of smoking products. Instead, it seeks to approach the problem on a more scientific and realistic basis.

Is this another prohibition amendment?

No, it is not a proposal that would make it illegal for people to smoke.

Although it might make this a far, far healthier nation of people if we could prevail upon everyone not to smoke, I would not be so rash or so unrealistic as to suggest we undertake to accomplish that goal, however worthy, through another "noble experiment" in prohibition.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am interested in the procedure the Senator is undertaking today to further call attention to the close connection and relationship between tobacco and health. I am especially glad about his comments relating to prohibition. I think my efforts in this field, as I know the Senator's efforts are, have proceeded in the knowledge that we are not a nation of prohibitionists. We are proceeding on the basis of a scientific approach and the obvious research that has brought about the remarks the distinguished Senator is making.

I should like to interpolate that we intend to call upon the Food and Drug Administration, as the Senator has suggested, to produce evidence of this connection. On the other hand, the great Government of the United States considers tobacco as one of its five basic crops, along with wheat, corn, peanuts, and cotton.

It seems to me a little irrational that we are about to ask one arm of the Government to talk about harmful effects of tobacco while, on the other hand, we support it as a basic crop. Perhaps, before we are through with this program, we shall have to realine ourselves in that respect.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator for her interesting comment. The fact that tobacco is considered one of our five basic crops underlines the tremendous economic ramifications and also underlines the tremendous increase in the use of tobacco, about which I spoke in the beginning of my speech. The use of cigarettes has become all but uinversal in our country, and it has spread throughout the world. But now we are beginning to pile up evidence that, in my mind, is wholly convincing that it has brought about the tremendous increase in the bodily ills of our people, particularly in the field of lung cancer and heart involvement.

The Senator from Oregon has been a leader in this field and has constantly called attention to the growing problem. I appreciate her interest. I have been glad to join with her in the many attempts she has made to bring this problem to the attention of the American people.

To continue with my address, I asked myself another question: Is this an amendment which proscribes specific standards?

No. The Congress of the United States is no place to be writing the details of health regulations.

We do not attempt to do this regarding food, drugs, and cosmetics; we properly leave such determinations to be made by the FDA after careful scientific study by its laboratory technicians, in consultation with those from the affected industries. This system works well, and I propose we follow it in placing smoking products under the FDA.

Is this some sort of radical departure?

No. It is entirely in keeping with the history and tradition of accepted Federal activity in the field of consumer health protection.

Even before the original pure food and drug law, which dealt only with foods and drugs, was enacted in 1906, there had been a series of legislative enactments in this country dating all the way back to a 1784 Massachusetts act, which was the first general food law in the United States. And that was an outgrowth of the first English food law proclaimed by King John in 1202, prohibiting adulteration of bread.

In 1938, our Federal Food and Drugs Act was rewritten as the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and provided for such expanded safeguards as the pretesting and certification of coal tar colors which can be used safely in foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

In 1954, the increased use of pesticides brought about the necessity for an amendment which afforded greater public protection against the residue of pesticides on foods. In 1958, the act was amended to include pretesting for food additives, due to the greater use of chemical substances for technological and nutritional purposes.

In 1960, the act was amended to require the establishment of safe amounts of colors used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. The same year, the FDA was given responsibility for the labeling of hazardous household substances.

And, of course, there are the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962, arising out of the thalidomide scandal, which gave the FDA even greater enforcement authority over the interstate commerce in drugs.

All of these acts and amendments are in the tradition of our society's concern about the purity of products offered for public consumption.

Not only is this proposed amendment in keeping with the approach which the Congress has taken in dealing with the protection of the consuming public, it is also consistent and logical.

It is the intent of the American people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, that the Federal Government, through the FDA, should protect them, as consumers, against poisonous and other harmful substances entering their bloodstream through what they eat as foods, consume in a variety of ways as drugs, and apply as cosmetics. Therefore, it is only consistent and logical that the Government, through the appropriate agency, should protect the American people also against the same poisons and harmful substances which reach their blood stream when inhaled as smoking products.

Indeed, in the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960, the FDA was given jurisdiction, insofar as labeling is concerned, over household products which contain poisonous and harmful substances that are likely to be inhaled. While smoking products are not included by name in this category, it appears that the act could be interpreted to include them. Even so, it would afford protection to the public only regarding labeling.

My own feeling is that if a product is sufficiently poisonous and harmful as to require it, under the 1960 act, to be labeled as "dangerous," then that is all the more reason why it should be subjected to the overall FDA regulations which protect the public entirely against consumption of such products.

Let us assume for purposes of illustration that a certain tomato catsup product is found, under the 1960 act, to require a labeling of "dangerous." If it is that dangerous it has no business being allowed on the consumer's table in the first place, or until the poisonous and harmful substances are eliminated to the point where the FDA is able to certify that the product is safe for consumption.

For these reasons, I do not feel an amendment to the 1960 Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act specifically including smoking products would be adequate.

The big, yawning gap we have in the whole consumer health protection picture is the absence of absolutely any Federal protection of the American people against poisons in smoking products. And that is why I am proposing this amendment to the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Let me cite just three of the poisons found in cigarette tobacco smoke. Bear in mind these figures are from a laboratory analysis of the smoke of a filter-tip cigarette which is recognized, and so advertised, as the safest of the major cigarettes.

The first poison found in that cigarette smoke was nicotine.

We sometimes tend to forget that nicotine, which is found naturally in tobacco, actually is a poison. In fact, it is so poisonous that it is used very effectively as an insecticide to kill bugs and pests. It is one of the pesticides which the FDA will allow to be present in food only to the extent of 2 parts in 1 million. Yet—since smoking products do not come under the protection of the FDA—this poison was found, in the smoke of this so-called safest cigarette, in an amount 6,000 times greater than it is permitted in food by the FDA.

This becomes highly significant when you consider the effect of nicotine upon the human body. Nicotine in tobacco smoke has been demonstrated by numerous medical studies to constrict the blood vessels, which in turn requires the heart to pump harder and much more rapidly. This is why there is such growing concern in the medical profession over the incidence of smoking, which has been found to have a close correlation with the incidence of cardiovascular disease—the No. 1 killer in our society.

A second poison found in that cigarette smoke was arsenic.

What was it doing there? Well, I understand that even when arsenic no longer is used as an insecticide on tobacco crops it takes years before it is entirely removed from the soil and no longer finds its way into the growing plant. But it gets into the bloodstream through cigarette smoke, just the same.

A third poison found in cigarette smoke is one I am sure most of us never heard of before. It is coumarin, which is used as one of the flavoring agents in cigarette tobacco.

This is such a toxic poison that the FDA bans it altogether from foods and drugs. Yet—again because the FDA lacks jurisdiction in this field—coumarin was found in the smoke of this so-called safest cigarette in the amount of 2 parts in 100,000—which is 10 times more than the maximum amount of arsenic or nicotine permitted by the FDA in foods.

Even so, this is smoking we are talking about. Is not this different from eating foods or taking drugs?

Yes, inhalation of smoke is different. But it is a difference without any real distinction, so far as the consequences are concerned. Any physician can tell you that the impurities contained in smoke which you inhale into your lungs are absorbed directly into the bloodstream.

Perhaps the recent study made by E. Cuyler Hammond, director of the statistical research section of the American Cancer Society, published in the July 1962 issue of the Scientific American, most succinctly describes the result of tobacco smoke on the human body. Dr. Hammond writes:

> On inhalation, air and any smoke it may contain passes through the bronchial tubes of decreasing diameter, which finally deliver it to the tiny sacs called alveoli. The alveoli have thin walls supported by fibers of connective tissue. These walls contain capillary tubes through which blood flows from the pulmonary arteries to the pulmonary veins. During its passage through these capillaries the blood releases carbon dioxide and absorbs oxygen. At the same time carbon monoxide, nicotine, and other impurities that may be present in the air or smoke are absorbed into the blood.
>
> Recently we have studied the alveoli in relation to cigarette smoking. We found extensive rupturing of the walls of a great many alveoli in the lungs of heavy cigarette smokers, a considerable amount in lighter cigarette smokers and very little in nonsmokers. The rupturing of the walls is usually accompanied by a fibrous thickening of the remaining alveolar walls, together with a fibrous thickening of the walls of blood vessels in the vicinity. This probably results from the mechanism outlined above, since cigarette smoking produces coughing as well as hyperplasia of the bronchial tubes and increased secretion of mucus.
>
> Ruptures in the walls of the alveoli destroy the capillary tubes located in the walls. If many are destroyed, far greater pressure is required to force the same quantity of blood through the remaining capillaries. All the blood must pass through them each time it circulates through the body, and the right ventricle of the heart has to supply the pressure. As a result the workload of the heart is increased in proportion to the degree of destruction of the alveoli.
>
> Since oxygen is supplied to the blood through the capillaries in the alveoli, destruction of this tissue reduces the oxygen supply on which all the tissues of the body depend. In smokers this is compounded by the inhalation of carbon monoxide, which combines with hemoglobin more readily than oxygen does.
>
> Because of its great activity heart muscle requires an abundant supply of oxygen. The inhalation of tobacco smoke increases the workload of this muscle and at the same time reduces the quantity of oxygen available to the muscle. In addition the action of nicotine on the nervous system produces a temporary increase in the heart rate and a constriction of the peripheral blood vessels, which in turn produces a temporary increase in blood pressure. This also puts an added strain on the heart.
>
> Atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries (and Dr. Hammond states that the majority of American men suffer from that disease at least to some degree) tends to reduce the volume of blood delivered to the heart muscle per minute. Therefore if a person with atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries is also a cigarette smoker, his heart muscle receives far less than the normal supply of oxygen per minute. At the same time, because of the effects of smoking, a heavy workload is placed on his heart muscle. In my opinion this combination of conditions is sufficient to account for the finding that the death rate from coronary artery disease is higher in cigarette smokers than it is in men who never smoked, that the rate increases with the amount of cigarette smoking, and that it is lower in ex-cigarette smokers than it is in men who continue to smoke cigarettes.
>
> Not only the heart but also all other organs of the body require oxygen obtained through the alveoli of the lungs and distributed by the blood. Thus a reduction in oxygen supply resulting from smoking may have a serious effect on any diseased organ, and in some instances it can make the difference between life and death.

The Federal Government can protect the consuming public against poisons which come by way of the stomach but not against poisons which come by way of smoking products through the lungs. This amendment seeks only to close that dangerous gap.

If the poisons are so terrible in smoking products, why are not smokers dying left and right?

Well, the ugly truth is they are. This does not mean everyone who takes a puff of a cigarette is going to topple over dead from nicotine poisoning. Before the passage of the Food and Drugs Act people were not dropping dead like flies from eating adulterated food products which somehow got on the market. But this did not deter the Congress from passing the necessary legislation setting up the FDA to protect the American public from the cumulative effects of poisonous substances which over the months and years might appear in the foods and drugs they were consuming.

No, people do not light up and drop dead. But they are dying sooner than they would if they did not smoke, and there is a growing body of medical evidence which substantiates this.

Here are some of the medical reports which constitute the increasing competent evidence of the dangers to the health of the American people due to the total lack of any protection against harmful substances in smoking products:

Journal of American Medical Association, March 8, 1958, and March 15, 1958, "Smoking and Death Rates—Report on 44 Months of Follow-Up of 187,783 Men":

> The mortality ratio rose from 1.00 for men who never smoked to 1.34 for smokers of under one-half pack a day, to 1.70 for smokers of one-half to one pack a day, to 1.96 for smokers of one to two packs a day, and to 2.23 for smokers of two packs or more a day. In other words, the death rate of men smoking regularly at a rate of less than one-half pack of cigarettes a day was 34 percent higher than that of men who never smoked, the death rate of men smoking one to two packs a day was 96 percent higher than that of men who never smoked, and

the death rate of men smoking two packs or more a day was 123 percent higher than that of men who never smoked.

All things considered, these figures suggest that cutting down from a high amount to a low amount of cigarette smoking results in a reduction of the death rate.

Between January 1 and May 31, 1952, information was obtained on the smoking habits of 187,783 white men between the ages of 50 and 69. These were then traced through October 31, 1955. A total of 11,870 deaths were reported during that period of time. The total experience covered 667,753 man-years. Age being taken into consideration, the death rate of men with a history of regular cigarette smoking only was found to be 68 percent higher than that of a comparable group of men who never smoked. The death rate of cigarette smokers increased with the amount of cigarette smoking. Among men with a history of regular cigarette smoking only, the death rate of those smoking two or more packs of cigarettes a day in 1952 was 123 percent higher than that of men who never smoked. Also the death rate of men with a history of regular cigar smoking only, 22 percent higher than that of men who never smoked, and the death rate of men with a history of regular pipe smoking only was 12 percent higher than that of men who never smoked.

The death rate of men who had smoked only occasionally was not significantly different from the death rate of men who never smoked, and the death rate of men who had given up cigarette smoking for a year or more before being enrolled in the study was lower than that of men who were smoking cigarettes regularly at the time. The findings in the last 2 years of the study fully confirmed the findings which had previously been reported for the earlier part of the study.

Many checks were made to determine the reliability of these findings, and no errors or biases were found that could have a serious effect on them.

Coronary artery disease is of particular importance because it accounts for a large proportion of all deaths in the United States, the highest rates being among men in the older age groups. In this study, it accounted for 44.6 percent of all deaths. Therefore, even a moderate percentage increase in deaths from this cause has an appreciable effect on the total death rate. In all four age groups the death rates from coronary artery disease were far higher among men with a history of regular cigarette smoking than among men who never smoked. There were 3,361 deaths from this cause among the cigarette smokers, whereas only 1,973 would have died if their age-specific death rates had been the same as for men who never smoked. As shown by the mortality ratio of 1.70, the death rate from this cause of these cigarette smokers was 70-percent higher than a comparable group of men who never smoked. Death rates due to coronary artery disease increased with the amount of cigarette smoking. Among men with a history of regular cigarette smoking only, the mortality ratio rose from 1.29 for men smoking less than one-half pack of cigarettes a day to 2.15 for smokers of one to two packs a day, and to 2.41 for smokers of two packs or more a day.

Summary: There is a high degree of association between total death rates and cigarette smoking, a far lower degree of association between total death rates and cigar smoking, and a small degree of association between total death rates and pipe smoking. The available source of information for this study, on diseases involved, was cause of death as recorded on death certificates, supplemented by more detailed medical information in cases in which cancer was mentioned.

The following relationships with cigarette smoking are evident: (1) an extremely high association for a few diseases, such as cancer of the lung, cancer of the larnyx, cancer of the esophagus, and gastric ulcers; (2) a very high association for a few diseases such as pneumonia and influenza, duodenal ulcer, aortic aneurysm, and cancer of the bladder; (3) a high association for a number of diseases, such as coronary artery disease, cirrhosis of the liver, and cancer of several sites; (4) a moderate association for cerebral vascular lesions; and (5) little or no association for a number of diseases, including chronic rheumatic fever, hypertensive heart disease, other hypertensive diseases, nephritis and nephrosis, diabetes, leukemia, cancer of the rectum, cancer of the colon, and cancer of the brain. The relative importance of the association listed above is dependent on the number of deaths attributed to each disease, as well as on their degrees of association with cigarette smoking. It was found that the death rate of men with lung cancer who had given up cigarette smoking for a year or more before being enrolled in the study was lower than the death rate of men who were smoking cigarettes regularly at that time. An extremely high association between cigarette smoking and death rates for men with this disease was found in rural areas as well as in large cities. If smoking habits are taken into consideration, the lung cancer death rate was somewhat higher in cities than in rural areas.

The Gallagher report of March 11, 1963—volume XI, No. 10—deals effectively with the "Day of Reckoning" which it says is about to confront the cigarette industry. It predicts that the U.S. Surgeon General's report, authorized by President Kennedy, will declare that cigarettes are definitely a health hazard. The report predicts that "sure to follow" will be Federal and State laws restricting advertising and sale of cigarettes. The pertinent portions of the Gallagher report follow:

Day of reckoning for $7 billion cigarette industry. Public pressure will jeopardize entire market. Reader's Digest publicized anticigarette report by Britain's Royal College of Physicians. Air Force ruled against free distribution of cigarettes in its hospitals, eliminated cigarettes from flight lunch boxes. Federal district court jury ruled Chesterfields contributed to lung cancer of a Pittsburgh victim (though he smoked at his own risk). Article in February 23 issue of Catholic weekly America indicates growing opposition among religious groups. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has asked Federal Communications Commission how broadcasters can serve public and continue to accept cigarette advertising. Blast by National Association of Broadcasters' LeRoy Collins on cigarette advertising to young people hit industry where it hurts. New York State distributes a pamphlet telling young people that smoking is a serious health hazard. A group of high school teachers asks professional athletes to stop endorsing cigarettes.

U.S. Surgeon General's report. Authorized by President Kennedy. Due shortly. Will declare cigarettes a definite health hazard. American Medical Association also commissioned a study. Will take an official stand. Sure to follow: Federal and State laws restricting advertising and sale of cigarettes. Existing State laws against sales of cigarettes to minors not enforced. Changes coming. Chicago now forbids cigarette-vending machines in unsupervised locations. Bills proposed to Congress would restrict cigarette advertising, require labels specifying amount of tars and nicotine in cigarettes.

Brave front kept up by cigarette companies. Annual industry figures show gains in cigarettes sold. Up 2 percent in 1962 over 1961. But 1962 combined profits of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco, American Tobacco, P. Lorillard, Liggett & Myers, Philip Morris dropped below last year. Biggest drain: increased advertising needed to keep cigarette sales moving. Now 7 cents a carton. Only companies moving ahead are R. J. Reynolds and Philip Morris. Both have diversified. Reynolds is expanding Archer aluminum division (foil), just bought Pacific Hawaiian Products Co. (fruit juice cake mixes, shoeshine equipment). Twenty percent of Philip Morris sales are from A.S.R. Products Co. (razor blades, shaving supplies), Milprint Inc. (packaging materials), Polymer Industries Inc. (adhesives, chemicals). All cigarette companies accelerating diversification plans.

From Insiders' Newsletter, October 8, 1962:

The idea of banning teenage smoking won strong academic support this week, from research that indicates smoking may or may not stunt your child's physical growth, but definitely does affect his brainpower. So say Dr. Eva Salber and a team of doctors at Harvard University, who have just ended a study of the smoking habits of 6,810 children between the 7th and 12th grades. The burning conclusion: There is a strong relationship between achievement and abstinence from smoking—those who don't smoke run rings around their classmates. The unfiltered facts:

High school students who didn't smoke had higher IQ's, did better consistently in school, went farther in their education than smokers. More nonsmokers made the advanced studies.

The student smokers who consumed less than a pack a week had higher IQ's and grades than the heavier consumers.

The difference between the nonsmokers and the smokers as far as their academic studies were concerned was most striking among the boys.

From Kiplinger's Changing Times, March 1962:

More than a decade ago investigators began the search for the cause of the big increase in lung cancer. Since then 28 studies have been conducted by scientists in 8 different countries. The findings, remarkably alike in result, all point to cigarette smoking as a prime culprit—probably the prime culprit, though not the only one—in causing cancer of the lung.

The American Cancer Society contends that cigarette smoking is responsible for three-fourths of all lung cancer cases. This means that, but for smoking, there would be only 9,825 deaths from this disease this year instead of the expected 39,300.

The American Cancer Society and others base their opinions on the following statistics:

Ten times as many smokers as nonsmokers die of lung cancer. Among men who smoke as much as 2 packs a day, the rate is 25 to 30 times higher than for nonsmokers.

Death rates increase significantly with the number of cigarettes smoked. The lung cancer death rate among persons who never smoked is 12.8 per 100,000; 95.2 among those who smoke less than a half a pack a day; 107.8 among those who smoke from a half to 1 pack a day; 229.2 among those who smoke between 1 and 2 packs a day; and 264.2 among those who smoke 2 or more packs.

Lung cancer is exceedingly rare among nonsmokers. Still, there is continuing study into the question of why some nonsmokers contract the disease.

Death rates increase with the degree of inhalation, and this is believed to be the reason that pipe and cigar smokers are not included with cigarette smokers in the high-risk group.

> Smokers—even heavy smokers—who quit the habit lower their chances of contracting lung cancer significantly.
>
> All of these factors may turn out to be involved in the lung cancer rate, but nearly every important health and medical group in this country and many others agree that, at the very least, cigarette smoking is a major cause of the disease. And the American Cancer Society says that it is the major cause.

U.S. Surg. Gen. Dr. Leroy E. Burney, in 1959, said:

> The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer * * * cigarette smoking particularly is associated with an increased chance of developing lung cancer.

Circulation, the official journal of the American Heart Association, volume XXII, July 1960, said:

> Up to the present, a number of medical studies have been made, nearly all demonstrating a statistical association between heavy cigarette smoking and mortality (death) or morbidity (illness) from coronary heart disease. In these studies, death rates from coronary heart disease (heart attacks) in middle-aged men were found to be from 50 to 150 percent higher among heavy cigarette smokers than among those who do not smoke. This statistical association does not prove that heavy cigarette smoking causes coronary heart disease, but the data strongly suggest that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary heart disease or its complications.

From the New York Times, July 15, 1962:

> WASHINGTON, July 15.—Preliminary findings show that premature births occur more frequently among mothers who smoke than among nonsmokers.
>
> This was one of the results of a long-range study being coordinated by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, a research arm of the U.S. Public Health Service.
>
> The data have been compiled from tests on more than 23,000 expectant mothers and 17,000 children enrolled at 15 medical centers, including Columbia University and New York Medical College.
>
> The Public Health Service announcement said that the findings "confirm the results of previous studies which have shown a relationship between cigarette smoking during pregnancy and prematurity."
>
> Birth weight was found to be inversely proportional to the amount of smoking—the greater the smoking, the lower the weight at birth.
>
> The researchers also found that more than 40 percent of a group of infants diagnosed as abnormal during a psychological examination had suffered from breathing difficulties at birth.

From the Washington Post, February 11, 1963:

> Philadelphia researchers reported yesterday they found impairment of breathing ability is three times as common among cigarette smokers as among nonsmokers.
>
> The findings came from ventilatory functions tests conducted by Drs. William Weiss, Katherine R. Boucot and David A. Cooper.
>
> The breathing tests, called forces expirograms, were made on 287 subjects, 50 to 70 years of age, who volunteered for periodic checks in the Philadelphia Pulmonary Neoplasm Research Project, supported by the American Cancer Society.

From the report of the Royal College of Physicians of London, 1962:

> The most reasonable conclusions from all the evidence on the association between smoking and disease are: that cigarette smoking is the most likely cause of the recent worldwide increase in deaths from lung cancer * * * it is an important predisposing cause of the development of chronic bronchitis * * * cigarette smoking probably increases the risk of dying from coronary heart disease.

From a resolution of the American College of Chest Physicians, September 1962:

> The committee on cancer of the American College of Chest Physicians for a number of years has been studying the effect of cigarette smoking on the pulmonary and cardiovascular systems. The members of the board of regents of the college are convinced that sufficient evidence has been accumulated to warrant issuing an official statement regarding cigarette smoking and health. Accordingly, a resolution connecting cigarette smoking with various pulmonary and cardiovascular conditions was approved by the board and issued by the college.
>
> The resolution stated that the weight of scientific evidence distinctly indicates that cigarette smoking and the inhalation of other atmospheric pollutants have an association relation strongly suggesting a causal connection with chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema, corpulmonale, cardiovascular diseases, and cancer of the lung.

From the New York Times, December 5, 1957:

> The U.S. Public Health Service, in a study of almost 200,000 veterans, has found that the death rate among persons who smoke or have smoked is 32 percent greater than for persons who have never smoked at all. Among regular cigarette smokers, the study found the ratio of deaths from lung cancer was approximately 10 times that for nonsmokers.

Dr. Howard C. Taylor, writing in the Journal of the American Medical Association, September 1, 1962, said:

> The evidence implicating cigarette smoking with lung cancer seems complete enough, far more precise, in fact, than that which has been accepted by physicians as adequate to take action against the causes of other plagues.
>
> The relative difference in mortality rates between smokers and nonsmokers is considerably less for heart disease than for lung cancer. Nevertheless, cardiac deaths are so much more numerous than deaths from lung cancer that the net excess of deaths from coronary artery disease in heavy smokers over nonsmokers is approximately four times as large as the number of excess deaths from lung cancer. Higher death rates for smokers than for nonsmokers have been reported also for cancers of the oral cavity, larynx, esophagus and urinary bladder, from peptic ulcer, from bronchiectasis and chronic bronchitis and from certain forms of vascular disease.

A directive issued September 17, 1962, by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Air Force, said:

> The ever-increasing evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer, pulmonary diseases, cardiovascular diseases, etc., can no longer be ignored.
>
> The Surgeon General, U.S. Air Force, has taken a firm stand on this issue and has informed tobacco companies that gift cigarettes are no longer acceptable.
>
> To allow the free distribution of cigarettes in our hospitals and in flight lunches suggests to our personnel that the Air Force Medical Service, in effect, condones cigarette smoking.
>
> To do so is to repudiate the overwhelming evidence of many medical research teams working independently on a worldwide basis.

The New York Times, October 20, 1961, said:

> A biological explanation in part of how cigarette smoking may be linked to heart disease was presented here today to the American Heart Association.
>
> Suspicions that heart and major blood vessel afflictions—which are the leading cause of death in the United States today—may be linked to cigarette smoking first came several years as a byproduct of studies designed to find the role of smoking in lung cancer.
>
> In the case of lung cancer it is usually assumed that tar smoke may injure lung tissue. But a biological explanation for the link between heart ailments and cigarette smoking has been missing.
>
> Dr. Alfred Kershbaum, Dr. Samuel Bellet, Dr. Raymond F. Caplan, and Dr. Leonard J. Feinberg of the Philadelphia General Hospital provided explanations at least in part. They reported that in tests with recovered heart attack victims it was found that nicotine from cigarette smoking stimulated the nervous system and the adrenal glands to produce the hormones epinephrine and norepinephrine. These hormones release into the blood the free fatty acids stored in the fat tissues of the body.
>
> Cholesterol is known to be formed in the liver from free fatty acids. Furthermore, high cholesterol levels in the blood have been associated with heart diseases. Therefore, the assumption is that smoking causes a rise in blood cholesterol through the free fatty acid pathway.

In Redbook, June 1960, the following appeared:

> CIGARETTES: ARE THE FACTS BEING FILTERED?
>
> Scientific evidence linking cigarette smoking to the almost invariably fatal disease of lung cancer has been accumulating for more than a decade. In the past 10 years many public health officials, physicians, and scientists here and abroad have become convinced that heavy cigarette smokers are far more likely to die of lung cancer than nonsmokers; that the more a person smokes, the greater his chances of getting lung cancer; and that giving up cigarettes even after smoking them for years lessens the danger.

From a statement to Redbook magazine:

> Meanwhile, statements by Surgeon General Burney identifying smoking as the principal causative factor in the increase in the rate of lung cancer are consistent with the statutory responsibility of the Public Health Service to inform the medical profession and the public on matters involving important public health issues. I feel that Dr. Burney and his associates have rendered a valuable public service in giving us their frank conclusions on this major issue.
>
> ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
> *Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.*

From the Reader's Digest, June 1962:

> LUNG CANCER AND CIGARETTES—HERE ARE THE LATEST FINDINGS
>
> Out of London last March came a chill blast which sobered cigarette smokers and

jolted the tobacco industry on both sides of the Atlantic. The venerable 444-year-old Royal College of Physicians, which never deals with trivia or sensationalism, completed an exhaustive study and published a fact-filled report, "Smoking and Health," intended to give to doctors and others, evidence on the hazards of smoking so that they may decide what should be done.

The Royal College report stated unequivocally:

"Cigarette smoking is a cause of lung cancer and bronchitis, and probably contributes to the development of coronary heart disease and various less common diseases.

"Cigarette smokers have the greatest risk of dying from these diseases, and the risk is greater for the heavier smokers.

"The many deaths from these diseases present a challenge to medicine; insofar as they are due to smoking they should be preventable."

The report had immediate repercussions in Parliament. It also stirred some nervous activity in Washington, where bureaucrats and Congressmen have dodged or pigeonholed the smoking-health issue for the past 10 years.

Sir Robert Platt, president of the Royal College of Physicians, commented: "Naturally every possible opposition has been raised to the idea that these diseases are due to cigarette smoking. But not one of the opposing theories will hold water, whereas everything confirms the evidence against cigarettes."

Smoker's heart: Coronary heart disease is a more frequent cause of death among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers. But the British report does not find evidence that cigarette smoking is a cause of coronary heart disease. Nonsmokers, too, commonly have coronaries although those who give up smoking have a reduced death rate.

"The association of coronaries with smoking," the Royal College finds, "is clearest in middle age; and then various other factors such as mental strain, sedentary occupation and indulgence in fatty foods, which are thought to increase liability to coronary thrombosis, are also commonly associated with heavy smoking. It seems reasonable at present to agree with the recent statement of the committee on smoking and cardiovascular disease of the American Heart Association, that present evidence strongly suggests that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary disease or its complications, at least in men under the age of 55."

Smoker's ulcer: Tobacco smoke has demonstrable reactions in the stomach and intestines. Gastric hunger contractions, for example, cease after a few puffs on a cigarette. Nonsmokers seem to have better appetites than smokers; and exsmokers commonly put on weight as soon as they quit the habit. While there is no evidence that smoking causes gastric or duodenal ulcers, most physicians have seen an adverse effect of heavy smoking on patients who already have stomach ulcers.

The Royal College report states that the "effect of smoking on the healing of gastric ulcers has been carefully recorded in a controlled study in Britain." Hospital patients with gastric ulcers (all smokers) were divided into two groups. Group A was told to quit smoking, group B was not; otherwise, both received the same medical treatment. "It was noticeable that in patients who continued to smoke, the ulcer actually increased in size while this deterioration was not observed in any of those who gave up smoking." The conclusion: "Smoking does not appear to be a cause of ulcers in the stomach, but probably exacerbates and perpetuates them."

From the American Journal of Public Health, volume 49, No. 11, November 1959:

CIGARETTE SMOKING AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

(By Daniel Horn, Ph. D., F.A.P.H.A.A.; Frederick A. Courts, Ph. D.; Robert M. Taylor, M.A.; and Erwin S. Solomon, M.A.)

The accumulation of scientific evidence implicating cigarette smoking as a health hazard, and particularly as the major cause of lung cancer, has led to an increased sense of responsibility among individuals and agencies concerned with public health to see that young people are made aware of these hazards before they have established smoking as a regular habit.

From the American Cancer Society, 1962:

ANSWERING THE MOST-OFTEN-ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT CIGARETTE SMOKING AND LUNG CANCER

Question. Does smoking contribute to any fatal diseases beside lung and upper respiratory cancers?

Answer. Smoking definitely contributes to other causes of death: heart and vascular diseases, ulcers of the stomach and duodenum, emphysema, cancers of the bladder and prostate.

Question. What is the connection between smoking and heart disease?

Answer. Death rates of cigarette smokers from coronary heart disease are at least double that of non-smokers. A possible cause of this greater incidence of coronary heart disease is vasospasm, or constriction of arteries, caused by nicotine inhaled in cigarette smoke; which means that the arteries carry less blood to the heart, thus damaging heart tissue.

Question. What is the connection between smoking and ulcers?

Answer. Death rates from duodenal and gastric ulcers are significantly higher among cigarette smokers than among non-smokers. Smoking has an adverse effect on the healing of ulcers.

Question. Will a cigarette smoker live as long as a person who does not smoke?

Answer. Of American men aged 35, 41 percent of two-pack-a-day smokers, as compared with 23 percent of non-smokers, may expect to die before age 65. Put another way, it is estimated that a 20-year-old male cigarette smoker loses 4½ years of life expectancy compared with a non-smoker.

Question. Does smoking make the heart beat faster?

Answer. Yes. Smoking does increase the pulse rate. Probably this is due to nicotine in the smoke.

From Parents' Magazine, October, 1960:

THE FACTS ON TEENAGE SMOKING

(By Leona Baumgartner, M.D., Commissioner of Health, New York City)

The statistical evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer (and increasingly with other diseases, particularly coronary artery disease) has, as of today, been confirmed so many times and on such a broad experimental scale that where it was considered suggestive a few years ago, it is now considered by all but a hard core of diehards, well-nigh conclusive.

The following abstracts are quotations taken from the Medical Bulletin on Tobacco printed by the following four national health agencies: The American Public Health Association, the American Health Association, the American Cancer Society, and the American Tuberculosis Association:

SMOKING AND ITS RELATION TO CORONARY DISEASE

Abstract: [1] A study of 3,000 white males of similar ethnic background in the New York Metropolitan area relates smoking habits to the occurrence of myocardial infarcts, coronary insufficiency, and angina pectoris. A statistical association was observed between heavy cigarette smoking and the occurrence of coronary atherosclerotic heart disease and this was most significant under the age of 51. Heavy cigarette smoking also was associated with higher serum cholesterol levels. The authors state that there is suggestive evidence that cigarette smoking may play a role in the precipitation of acute myocardial infarction in individuals who already have advanced coronary atherosclerosis. They found no positive association between cigar smokers, pipe smokers, or those who had stopped smoking and the occurrence of coronary atherosclerotic heart disease.

STATISTICAL RELATIONSHIP OF CIGARETTE SMOKING TO CORONARY DISEASE CONFIRMED BY CHICAGO STUDY

Abstract: [2] A prospective study of 1,938 male employees of a Chicago manufacturing firm, aged 40 to 55, randomly selected and followed for 4½ years, identified 89 new cases of coronary heart disease. Differences in habits, diet, and physical conditions of these cases are compared to those without disease. Observations included medical history, physical examination, dietary intake, psychologic evaluation, somatotyping, electrocardiogram, chest X-ray cholesterol determination. The study showed significant associations between coronary heart disease and cigarette smoking, tachycardia, hypertension, elevated cholesterol levels, and nonanginal chest discomfort. No significant association was shown between coronary disease and intake of calories, carbohydrate, protein, animal fat, vegetable fat, cholesterol, saturated fatty acids, or mono- and polyunsaturated fatty acid. The coronary group consumed significantly more coffee, but there was no difference between the groups in intake of alcohol. Those developing coronary disease showed significantly higher measures of hypomania, depression, and psychasthenia. The data on somatotyping did not confirm the predilection of mesomorphs to developing coronary disease."

FIBROSIS AND EMPHYSEMA RELATED TO CIGARETTE SMOKE INHALATION

Abstract: [3] Results are reported of pathological examination of 640 tissue specimens from the lungs of 242 persons dying and coming to autopsy at the Veterans Hospital in East Orange, N.J. Each section, microscopically examined, was assigned a random number coded for identification with smoking habits, occupation and residence history obtained by interview with relatives. Four types of histologic changes were observed: (1) Fibrosis or thickening of alveolar septa, (2) rupture of alveolar septa, (3) thickening of walls of small arteries, and (4) thickening of walls of arterioles. These changes were most advanced and occurred most frequently in current cigarette smokers and were related to the number of cigarettes smoked. Among cigar and pipe smokers the changes were slightly greater than among those who never smoked. The authors conclude that inhalation of cigarette smoke can produce all of the changes characteristic of pulmonary fibrosis and emphysema."

---

[1] "Smoking Habits and Coronary Atherosclerotic Heart Disease," by David M. Spain and Daniel J. Nathan, J.A.M.A., vol. 177, No. 19, pp. 683–688, Sept. 9, 1961.

[2] "Coronary Heart Disease in an Industrial Population Study," by Oglesby Paul, Mark H. Lepper, Adrian Ostfeld, Anne MacMillan, William H. Phelan, and Wesley Dupertuis. Presented at 35th scientific sessions, American Heart Association, Cleveland, Ohio, October 1962.

[3] "Smoking in Relation to Pulmonary Changes: Rupture of Alveolar Septa—Fibrosis, and Thickening of Walls of Small Arteries and Arterioles—A Preliminary Report," by O. Auerbach, A. P. Stout, E. C. Hammond, and L. Garfinkel; presented at 28th annual meeting, American College of Chest Physicians, Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1962.

TWO-CITY STUDY SHOWS HIGHER DEATH RATES FOR CIGARETTE SMOKERS

Abstract: [4] Combining data from two prospective studies: 1,838 male residents of Albany, N.Y., aged 39 to 55, and 2,282 men living in Framingham, Mass., aged 30 to 62 years, the authors present results of follow-up for 6 years for the Albany group and 8 years for the Framingham subjects. Both populations were classified as to smoking habits based on interviews. Annual medical histories were taken and examinations made, including laboratory tests and electrocardiograms. Among those free of disease at the start of the study, the results showed a twofold greater mortality from all causes for cigarette smokers. Heavy cigarette smokers experienced a threefold increase in death rates from all causes compared with noncigarette smokers. Former smokers and current cigar and pipe smokers had the same morbidity and mortality rates as those who never smoked. The authors found that cigarette smoking is apparently unrelated to the incidence of angina pectoris.

It is this increasing evidence which justified the President, upon the advice of the U.S. Public Health Service, to initiate a long-overdue study of the effects of smoking upon health. This study, under the auspices of the Surgeon General, is being conducted by a committee of eminent scientists and physicians. Its report is due late this year or early in next year.

Then why not wait until this report is out?

The answer to that is quite simple. This Congress has a responsibility to the American people. That responsibility exists now. It is not a responsibility which is in a state of suspended animation and does not come into being until another branch of the Government gets around to fulfilling its responsibility.

It is a responsibility which has been with us all this time and which grows with every passing day. For with each passing day in which we in the Congress fail to carry out our responsibility in this area, the American people are being needlessly poisoned—yes, and killed—by the absence of any protection whatsoever regarding poisonous substances in smoking products.

When the Surgeon General's committee report is finally issued, the Congress at that time can enact whatever additional legislation, if any, may be required by virtue of the information contained in the report.

Nor is there a single feature of this proposed amendment which could in any way detract from the findings of that report or work at cross-purposes to additional legislation which might properly develop out of the report.

In fact, there is much to be said for the Congress taking sound action now, before it is placed in the uncomfortable position of appearing to be acting only in response to prodding from another branch of the Federal Government. I am sure that none of us relishes a repetition of the thalidomide situation.

So, I propose that the Congress assume—and retain—the initiative on this one.

Just within the past month, the California Medical Association decided there was no point in its waiting upon the Surgeon General's report. At its annual convention, the California Medical Association voted to publicize the harmful effect of smoking.

As the New York Times said in a recent editorial supporting the American Cancer Society arguments against smoking as a health hazard, where health, well-being and life span are involved, it should not be necessary to wait for 100-percent proof.

There is no sound reason why we should not act at once to bring smoking products under the same regulations which now protects foods, drugs, and cosmetics from poisonous materials.

All the evidence that we possibly could need to justify such legislation—indeed, all the evidence which is needed to require it—is already in hand. We do not need to know the exact tolerances for such poisons as nicotine, arsenic, and courmarin which should be imposed on smoking products in order to assure the American people of the same protections they now enjoy in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Those are technical decisions which we are not competent to make, but which the FDA is. That is why this amendment simply places smoking products under FDA jurisdiction, along with foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and leaves it up to the FDA and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promulgate the appropriate regulations needed for the protection of the health of the American people.

All that we really need to know is that such poisons do occur in smoking products and that there is absolutely no legal means now in existence for protecting the consumers of those smoking products from the harmful effects of those poisons.

If we enact this amendment and the FDA finds that the amounts of poisons now occurring in smoking products are not large enough to be of danger to the health of smokers, then everybody can light up and exhale great smoke rings of relief. But at least we took precaution.

On the other hand, if we enact this amendment and the FDA finds that the amounts of such poisons occurring in smoking products are too great for the safety of the health of smokers, then it can promulgate the appropriate regulations governing just how much can be safely tolerated and we will have done a splendid service to mankind.

Who would argue that foods and drugs and cosmetics should be stripped of the protection now afforded by the FDA? Who would advocate turning the clock back to the days before the Food and Drug Act was adopted?

By the same token, then, who can genuinely say the American people should be denied the same protection in what they consume by smoking?

It may be argued that a vast industry—the tobacco-raising and smoking product-manufacturing industry, along with its allied sales and advertising industries—may be damaged.

But we do not know for certain that this will happen. To argue with certainty that this will be the result is to concede the worst about the harmful effects of smoking. And if that is the case, then there can be no logical argument against protecting the health of the American people through such an amendment.

No, we do not know for certain—not until the FDA has had an opportunity to subject smoking products to the same health-safety tests as it now subjects food, drug, and cosmetic products. And this, in itself, is yet another argument for the need of such an amendment.

It may be argued that the Government would lose considerable revenues from tobacco taxes.

But this is not necessarily so. For this amendment does not propose that tobacco or tobacco products be outlawed. It proposes only that no smoking products be permitted to contain poisonous substances above a level which the FDA finds to be the limits which safely can be tolerated in accordance with good health practices.

The food, drug, and cosmetic industries have not gone out of business—and the Government has not suffered from loss of revenue on such products—because these products fall within the jurisdiction of the FDA. On the contrary, it is in part because of the public confidence which such FDA jurisdiction has instilled that these industries have prospered so handsomely—and the Government has benefited commensurately in revenues.

It may be argued that this amendment will impose burdensome governmental regulations upon private industry. Just the opposite. This amendment may well turn out to be the salvation of the tobacco industry. Unless the Government does require manufacturers of smoking products to observe the same safeguards against poisonous ingredients as do other manufacturers of personal-consumption products, once the American people have all the facts Congress will be confronted with a monumental upsurge of outraged public demand that it do something. Should that come to pass, the remedies which would be proposed then could be considerably more severe than this amendment.

The best insurance the tobacco industry could expect to obtain in the troubled days which obviously lie ahead would be to require that all smoking products meet the same standards now required of manufacturers of food, drug, and cosmetic products. It is quite likely that an impartial, industrywide regulation under the FDA could bring about the needed reforms which it would be virtually impossible to bring about by individual company action in an industry with such an incredibly acute competitive nature.

---

[4] "Cigarette Smoking and Coronary Heart Disease," combined experiment of the Albany and Framingham studies; J. T. Doyle, T. R. Dawber, W. B. Kannel, A. S. Heslin, and H. A. Kahn, New England Journal Medicine, vol. 266, No. 16, pp. 796–801, Apr. 19, 1962.

However, for the sake of argument, let us assume that such negative arguments are valid. Assume that a large industry is impaired. Assume that the Government does lose revenues. Assume that regulations do prove burdensome. And then ask:

Which comes first—the profit of any industry or the health of the people of America?

Which is dearer—any amount of revenues or the health of the people of America?

Which is the greater burden—a Federal regulation or an unhealthy America?

This amendment is fair, is logical, is consistent, is in keeping with the approach of the Congress and is long overdue. We can do no less for the protection of the health of the people who have sent us here and who are looking to us for leadership.

I send to the desk, for myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The bill would place all smoking products under the authority of the Food and Drug Administration. I ask that the bill lie on the desk for 5 days for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1682) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and Mr. Clark), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I again congratulate the Senator from Utah upon his excellent presentation in the Senate today. I should like to emphasize the point which the Senator made at the conclusion of his remarks; namely, that it is within the province of the Federal Government to concern itself with the general welfare of the people.

Congress has before it for consideration a bill relating to the danger to the public health from the indiscriminate use of pesticides. I believe there is a relationship between the use of tobacco and the use of pesticides.

It was pointed out that the Federal Government has a right to enter into consideration of this subject. For example, we accept the right of the Federal Government to insist on the inspection of meat and of slaughter houses, for our own safety and well-being. The fact is that a sort of bogeyman has been created with respect to the Federal Government always annoying us. But how often in our daily lives do we realize how dependent we are upon the Federal Government to look after our interests? The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], who is in the Chamber, knows the importance of the Pure Food and Drug Act, in which he has taken a deep interest. He is aware of the danger from pesticides.

I hope the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] will be successful in pressing for adoption of his amendment with respect to the use of tobacco.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for her comments. I commend her for her outstanding leadership in this field. As I indicated earlier, I wonder how many of us would be willing to return to the time before there was a Food and Drug Act, an act which protects us with respect to the use of food and other products that we take into our bodies. We take the act for granted today. We never feel greatly concerned about entering a restaurant or drinking water in a strange city. We do all these things because of general regulations which assure us, as consumers, that they are helpful and protective in the fields of foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

My bill is merely an extension of that basic idea. I believe that such protection lies within the province of Congress, and I think the time to act is now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] for the speech he has just made upon introducing his bill in the nature of a tobacco amendment to the Federal Food and Drug Act. I am indeed happy to be a cosponsor of the bill. I hope it will be given prompt hearings in committee and reported to the Senate at an early date.

In the course of his remarks, a copy of which he was kind enough to furnish me, but which unfortunately I could not be in the Chamber to hear, did the Senator from Utah make any reference to the decision of the Supreme Court of Florida, which is reported in the newspapers this morning?

Mr. MOSS. I did not have the opportunity to refer to that decision. It is a very timely subject. I would appreciate having the Senator from Pennsylvania comment upon it and include the newspaper report of it in the Record at this time, because it seems to me to be of great importance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think this decision is of great importance. By a vote of five to two, the Supreme Court of Florida held that under the law of Florida a tobacco company—in this case, the manufacturer of Lucky Strikes—might be held legally liable to the estate of a person who died from lung cancer, when there was a medical finding that the cancer had been caused by excessive smoking of cigarettes of that particular brand. This decision is an advisory opinion rendered by the Florida Supreme Court at the request of a U.S. circuit court of appeals which has pending before it litigation involving the responsibility of tobacco companies for deaths due to lung cancer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, an article entitled "Tobacco Firm Can Be Held Liable for Death Caused by Smoking, Florida Top Court Says." The article was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tobacco Firm Can Be Held Liable for Death Caused by Smoking, Florida Top Court Says

The Florida Supreme Court said in an advisory opinion that a tobacco company can be held liable for damages for a death caused by cigarette smoking, according to wire service reports.

The State court's advice was given to the U.S. circuit court of appeals in New Orleans, which is hearing a suit brought by the widow and son of Edwin Green against American Tobacco Co. The suit, asking $250,000 damages, charges that Mr. Green's death in 1958 from lung cancer was due to smoking of Lucky Strike cigarettes, made by American Tobacco.

The U.S. appeals court, and earlier a Federal district court, both had agreed that cigarette smoking was the probable cause of Mr. Green's death. But both rejected the argument that the company was legally liable. However, the appeals court granted a rehearing in the case and asked the Florida court to determine if State law there, where Mr. Green had lived, imposed a liability on the manufacturer.

APPEALS COURT TO STUDY OPINION

The Florida court's opinion will be considered by the U.S. Court of Appeals. The Florida court, by a vote of 5 to 2, said no valid objection would be made to placing liability on the manufacturer "if the public health is to be protected in a practical sense from exploitation by those who, for a profit motive undertake to supply the vast and everincreasing variety of products which the people * * * are daily urged to use and consume."

The Florida opinion is counter to that reached in a previous well-publicized cigarette trial in Pittsburgh. A Federal district court jury there last November found that Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., maker of Chesterfield cigarettes, wasn't liable for damages in a suit brought by Otto Pritchard. Mr. Pritchard, a 64-year-old carpenter whose right lung was removed because of lung cancer, had sued the company for $1,250,000, including $1 million punitive damages on the grounds of wilfull negligence.

The jury in the Pritchard case, as in the Green case in Florida, agreed that cigarette smoking was the direct and probable cause of lung cancer. But it said Mr. Pritchard voluntarily assumed a risk when he smoked and that the company had given no express warranty of the cigarette's safety.

MORE RULINGS IN NEAR FUTURE

These legal decisions, and others likely to come in the near future, are considered vital by the tobacco industry. A dozen or more such lung cancer cases are pending, according to industry sources. The opinion of the

> Florida court, especially if it is supported by a decision in the Federal courts, could become an important precedent.
>
> The tobacco industry denies that scientific evidence has established cigarette smoking as a cause of lung cancer. But many scientists believe the evidence is strong. The British Royal College of Physicians says cigarette smoking "is a cause of lung cancer." In the United States, the American Medical Association and the U.S. Public Health Service have taken no official stand, though the PHS is sponsoring a review of smoking and health by a committee of expert scientists. The committee's first report is expected later this year and could have broad repercussions.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that the entire question in regard to the effects of nicotine on human life is closely allied with the excellent work he has been doing in connection with assuring that the drug industry maintain its responsibilties to the American public. I thank the Senator for yielding to me; and again I commend the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] for the bill he has introduced, and I pledge my strong support to doing what can be done to obtain its enactment.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE HONORABLE IAIN MACLEOD, OF THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take note of the fact that we have a distinguished visitor with us today. He is a Member of the British Parliament. In fact, he is the leader of the House of Commons and the chairman of the Conservative Party in Great Britain. I am glad to present to the Senate the Honorable Iain Macleod.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure Mr. Macleod is acquainted with Lady Elliot, although I believe Lady Elliot is a member of the Labor Party.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. No; she is a Conservative.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My colleague from Oregon, who knows the women politicians better than I do, reminds me that I am in error, and that Lady Elliot is a Conservative. She is a very delightful and effective Member of Parliament.

PROPOSED OFFICE OF CONSUMERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, McGEE, McINTYRE, METCALF, MORSE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of Ohio, BAYH, and McNAMARA, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an Office of Consumers. I am highly honored by having so distinguished a group of Senators decide to join in the sponsorship of this most important measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week to enable other Senators to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 1680) to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this is my third introduction of a bill to establish a separate agency to represent the interests of consumers. In 1959, I joined a number of other Senators in introducing Senate bill 1571; in 1961, this effort was again repeated, with S. 1688. I am hopeful that this will be the last time I shall introduce such proposed legislation, and that the need for consumer representation in our Government structure has become so widely recognized that such a bill will be passed at this session of Congress.

When I introduced consumer legislation in 1959, I stated:

> The American consumer is losing the battle to inflation. No matter how careful the purchasing and how expert the marketing, the American consumer cannot possibly protect himself against the steady and continuing rise in prices.

That situation is even more true today. Between 1947 and 1958, the Consumer Price Index rose 29 percent. But between 1947 and 1962, it rose 35 percent; and it is still going up. In 1947, the Consumer Price Index on all items was 77.8; in 1962 it was 105.4. The latest figure available—that for April 1963—shows a rise to 106.2, which sets a new high in our economy.

The cost of this inflation is almost beyond comprehension. Between 1947 and 1962, the gross national product, stated in current dollars, increased by $319 billion; however, stated in constant dollars—that is, 1962 dollars—the increase was only $225 billion. The difference—$94 billion—represents pure inflation. It is an interesting fact that most of the inflation in recent years has stemmed from price increases in highly concentrated industries whose prices are administered. By that, I mean prices which are largely immune to the automatic controls of the market.

In industries characterized by the free play of price competition, protection to the consumer is afforded by the forces of the marketplace. High prices invite the entry into the industry of newcomers who increase the supply of the commodity and bring down prices. The inefficient producers are weeded out in this process; the more competent thrive and prosper. Increasingly, however, these automatic controls of the market have atrophied in many industries, particularly those characterized by a high degree of concentration. This does not mean competition is wholly absent; rather, it means that an insulation has been constructed around competition manifested in downward price changes.

There is great need for an effective voice in Government for consumers. Today, in this country there are about 18 million people aged 65 and over—approximately 10 percent of the total. Their average income is less than $2,000 annually. A large proportion of these citizens are exclusively consumers; a still larger proportion are primarily consumers, although their roles as producers in our money economy continue in some degree. An estimated 8 million live in great poverty; at least 1 million on less than $600 a year. These are consumers who are caught in the vise of a fixed low income and a rising price level. They have little or no way to increase their annual cash income, and the steady incline in prices makes it constantly more difficult for them to maintain even the most meager existence. At the present time, no government agency is empowered to represent this important segment of our population and to represent their interest as consumers.

But our elderly citizens are not the only ones with whom I am concerned. Altogether in this country there are between 40 and 50 million Americans earning less than $2,000 a year for a single person, and $4,000 for a family of four. They are the migrant workers; the unskilled and unorganized laborers in our society; the victims of automation, who are untrained for other employment; farmers eking out an existence on tiny, marginal operations; the casualties of economically depressed areas. In our Government there is no powerful organization to plead their cause, for they are a disorganized minority, with no spokesman, and no formal organization to receive their just complaints. Theirs is a silent voice; and the tragedy is that, increasingly, they are thrust out of sight and are ignored, in the midst of our own prosperity.

There are only two ways in which the economic well-being of people in all of these categories can be improved—if their money incomes are raised or if prices are lowered. But those on pensions, those who are unemployed, those who have few, if any, skills, those who work on fixed, low salaries in white-collar occupations have few, if any, ways at their disposal to increase their money income. To all of these citizens, reductions in prices would constitute the most immediate method to help provide them with ways and means to secure the necessities and minimum social amenities of life. At the same time, further increases in the price level can serve only to make their marginal existence worse.

The time has now arrived for legislative action on behalf of consumers. The great public interest evoked by Senator HART's hearings on deceptions in packaging shows that the people want additional protection for consumers. The hearings conducted by Senator HART show the great need for the corrective legislation embodied in his truth-in-packaging bill, and I commend him for his tenaciousness. The same is true of the truth-in-lending bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in a field in which congressional action is long overdue. Another important measure is the bill to establish a Select Committee on Consumer Problems sponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. That is an excellent measure, which Senators should support, and which ought to be acted upon favorably in the present Congress. I am very happy to be a cosponsor of all three measures.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. When the Senator feels it is appropriate, I hope he will yield to me briefly so that I may make a statement upon the measure to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

All those measures are major legislative steps on behalf of consumers, and it is my hope that each of them, with the addition of the bill I am now introducing, will be enacted in this session of the Congress.

I am now happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague. As is true with respect to so many issues before Congress, when a great reform is considered, there are always many who contribute parts of it who have had an interest for many years in the basic problem. I have chosen a particular role in respect to this problem.

We are all familiar with the role of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We all admire and respect him for the great work he has done in the consumers field, without regard to agreement or disagreement on certain practical phases. He is continuing to carry out, in his statement and the measures which he is putting before the Senate today, the principles in which he believes.

I, too, have tried to draw an analogy between the Small Business Committee and the need for having some consumer representation in the Congress. For some time I have sponsored a measure to provide for a Select Committee on Consumers in the Senate. I have been joined on the bill, Senate Resolution 116, by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. At this time, to make the measure bipartisan, symbolic of the way in which the Senator from Tennessee has presided, I ask unanimous consent to have added as additional cosponsors the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. At the same time I am pleased to join today in the introduction of Senator KEFAUVER's bill, which would establish an Office of Consumers as an independent agency in the executive branch to act as a clearinghouse for consumer information and complaints and to represent consumer interests in cases pending before Federal regulatory agencies and in the Federal courts.

For many years the key symbol in our private enterprise society has been the consumer. Now he is even more crucial, since the focus of the administration's domestic economic policy today is on the need for a tax cut, for the express purpose of stimulating consumer spending. My position is and has been that the tax cut alone is not sufficient, and that action must be taken on a combination of measures as follows: to deal affirmatively with revision of the antitrust laws, with automation's effects on the worker, with profitsharing, with export expansion, and with emergency strike procedures. But the reduction of tax rates for individuals—consumers—is an important part of such a program. Yet the administration, in pressing for the tax cut on the ground of increased consumer spending, has done little or nothing to ascertain, either itself or through the Congress, the underlying reasons which motivate consumers' attitudes toward their personal finances and whether a tax cut as suggested will actually trigger their rate of spending. I believe the Congress in this connection must consider most carefully the factors with relation to the buying habits of 180 million people which have a critically important effect on the economy and, in turn, upon the economic measures with which the Congress must deal.

For these and other reasons I will explain I have introduced Senate Resolution 116, which would establish a Select Committee on Consumers in the Senate, a 17-member bipartisan committee which would study and investigate economic problems of direct concern to U.S. consumers, determine the effectiveness of existing Federal agencies in dealing with consumer problems and recommend what if any additional legislation might be needed to safeguard, protect, and advance consumer interests generally. The committee would be patterned upon the Select Small Business Committee, which serves the same function in relation to the small business community.

I believe Senate Resolution 116 and the bill being introduced today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] together would remedy the very serious gap which now exists in both the Congress and the executive branch. Every committee of the Congress deals almost daily with matters which have an impact upon consumers or, like the tax cut, are based upon predictions of consumer behavior; yet there is no one body in the Congress which is charged with responsibility specifically for studying the factors affecting consumer interests. Similarly, the executive branch, through such agencies as the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, including the Food and Drug Administration, gives systematic consideration to about 28 million Americans—17 million union members, 2.1 million farmowners, 2.3 million wholesale and retail proprietors, and over 6.7 million more private proprietors of businesses and industries—in their capacity as producers. However, there is no systematic representation of consumers' interests in overall economic policy as formulated by the Federal Government.

In July 1962 President Kennedy appointed a Consumers' Advisory Council, a group to advise the President's Council of Economic Advisers. But the pro forma nature of this group has been evident since its establishment. It has only a derivative and part-time role and is wholly without authority. It cannot play the needed meaningful role for consumers even in the executive branch and it can be of little help to the Congress. Senate Resolution 116 and the measure being introduced today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are needed more than ever.

So I express my appreciation to the Senator for his cooperation in this field, and assure him that we welcome his support in this effort, which represents an element of the total structure to which he is addressing himself today and which at long last will be recognized as the critical base of American society and the American economic system.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. I congratulate him upon the continued interest he has shown in the problem and his continued success in bringing Senate Resolution 116, which is the resolution to establish the select committee, toward passage. I note that the bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The names of the cosponsors would seem to indicate that a substantial number of the members of that committee are cosponsors. So I believe the measure would have a good prospect of success. I sincerely hope so.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I do not intend at this point to interrupt the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], but I would feel uncomfortable if I did not at this moment briefly thank him for his kind reference to my efforts in bringing to the Senate a truth-in-packaging bill. However, I rise to make the point that it is the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] who is lending his good offices as well as counsel in that effort, and if the bill does come before the Senate, no Senator will be more responsible for that happy day than the Senator from Tennessee. I intend to speak further on the general subject when the Senator concludes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is unduly generous. The Senator from Michigan originated the idea of a truth-in-packaging bill. He is the chairman of the group that has held very extensive and fair hearings. He has carried the bill toward consideration and enactment. So the success of the hearings, which have already done a great deal of good in alerting the public to the problem, is the result of the work of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and for that work, credit is due to him.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the present consumers' bill establishes an independent agency entitled the Office of Consumers, headed by a Consumers Counsel appointed by the President by and with the advice of the Senate. Its task is to supply effective representation of the economic interests of consumers throughout all branches of the Government. It is empowered to collect and disseminate information, to appear in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies on behalf of consumers. It will act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints. Each year it will conduct a National Consumers Conference, to be attended by experts and representatives of consumer organizations, for the purpose of obtaining information, recommendations and suggestions for the more effective performance of its functions. The present bill differs from those previously introduced in that no provision is made for bringing together many consumer-oriented activities in various Government agencies and departments into the new consumer agency. This was the one provision of the previous bills to which there was considerable objection, although I thought the proposal had merit.

There is great need for an independent government agency specifically representing the interests of consumers. Almost every important special interest group of producers has an agency within the Federal Government which provides official expression of its views. The Department of Commerce, for example, was specifically created to represent the interests of American businessmen; the Department of Agriculture was set up to protect the interests of farmers; the Department of Labor, the interests of workers, and so on. The independent regulatory bodies, originally established to represent the public interest in their domains, have increasingly interpreted their function as one of refereeing disputes between contesting parties in the industry. Nowhere in the Federal Government is there any official voice for the independent expression of the consumer interest.

Today there is a special need for an independent consumer agency. In our present highly industrialized society we are all actively consumers buying most of the necessities and amenities of life in the marketplace. This fact constitutes the outstanding difference between our way of life and that of our grandfathers. A hundred years ago most of our population lived on farms; and many of the family's needs were supplied from this source. The canning of surplus food production was a commonplace practice on the farm; store-bought foods were limited to such items as coffee, tea, salt and similar staples not grown in the area. The fashioning of clothing was then a home activity; some of us here today can recall our first store-bought suit as a significant event which marked the shift from childhood to maturity. Even in the smaller towns and cities, the family constituted a largely self-contained unit able to satisfy much of its material needs. A truly pecuniary economy had not yet come into being; it was just around the corner but at this time it only touched the fringes of people's lives.

Today all this has been changed. As workers, we have attained such a high degree of specialization that most of our material needs must now be supplied by the marketplace. I can remember, for example, when store-bought bread was an exciting novelty in our household; in my youth, bread was made in the home in sufficient quantities to last a week or longer. Today homemade bread is an almost unattainable luxury. We are now all consumers operating in a pecuniary economy; when we need something, we go to the store and buy it.

All of this means a much greater variety in goods and services than was available to our forebears. But there are also serious hazards. None of us can be fully knowledgeable about the multiplicity of items we buy; therefore, we are all gullible consumers. The hearings held by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] showed how easily we are deceived in such an elementary aspect as the packaging of products. The varying weights for an item like soap powder, for example, require the consumer to be a statistical expert if he wishes to find out which soap powder is the best buy in his local supermarket. Similar problems exist with respect to the calculation of real interest rates on consumer loans as contrasted with those advertised by loan companies.

On such matters as this it seems to me only commonsense that the consumer must be accorded protection by legislation. It is idle to think that buyers are going to shop with slide-rules in hand; it is inhuman to think that, unless they do, they proceed at their own peril. Thus, one important function of the Office of Consumers proposed in this bill is to watch out for practices which victimize the consumer in the marketplace; to put the spotlight of publicity on such practices; and, when necessary, to call for corrective action.

But I do not visualize the Office of Consumers as being solely concerned with the housewife with a market basket under her arm. The problem is far more complicated than is represented by the market-basket concept. It is as easy to victimize the consumer behind the front lines—at a point remote from where direct contact is established between buyer and seller. I have in mind the technical, complex, and often tedious proceedings of the independent regulatory agencies established by Congress to protect the public interest. Under this proposed bill the Consumers Counsel has the authority to intervene in these proceedings and present evidence relating to the effect of the agency's action on the consumer interest. Let me cite a few examples.

The need for a Consumers Counsel, a lawyer for the public interest, was never more dramatized than in the proceedings involving railroad merger proposals before the Interstate Commerce Commission. There, decisions affecting directly the economic growth of communities, the adequacy of freight and passenger transit, the national defense and other issues of concern to the consumer, are being made solely on the basis of what evidence may find its way into a court-type record. Wealthy railroad merger petitioners represented by highly paid, skillful lawyers, literally pour into the cases thousands of pages of complicated testimony and exhibits which remain largely untested because other railroads capable of challenging petitioners' cases either fail to appear or give token opposition for fear of upsetting their own merger plans and rocking the industry's boat. Other participants—such as rail labor, States and municipalities, stockholders, and smaller railroads—have struggled to fill the void in these public interest records, but their funds and manpower have been so limited and their efforts so disorganized that their presentation, except on briefs, has not been effective. As a result of this situation, a special staff group from the Interstate Commerce Commission was moved to state in an official report:

> No voice speaks before the Commission for the public as a whole in rail consolidation cases. Thus the question arises as to whether the Commission receives all of the evidence it requires respecting the overall public interest as differentiated from the various private interests. ("Railroad Consolidations and the Public Interest," staff study by Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, ICC, March 1962.)

Faced with collapsing records and virtually no effective public interest presentation, the Commission at the last minute called into a few cases its enforcement lawyers, largely unschooled in economics and merger issues, but these counsel have remained generally silent during cross-examination and have presented little effective evidence to assist the record. This is, indeed, an extraordinary example of the inability of a regulatory body to protect the public interest, and it is a compelling demonstration of why an outside public counsel, armed with his own experts, is vital to the protection of consumers and the public generally in these regulatory matters.

The Federal Communications Commission is empowered by Congress, among other things, to regulate telephone, telegraph, radio, and television communications in this country, the lion's share of which involves the consumer directly. Here, as in the case of the ICC, vital decisions are made upon reports or records developed by private vested interests with no coordinated voice of public concern, except that which might be rendered by Commission Counsel in their efforts to get the laws and regulations clarified and enforced. However, like the ICC, the existence of house counsel built into the establishment and guided by its policy does not assure adequate legal protection for the consumer.

Although the Federal Power Commission—gas and utility rates—and the Civil Aeronautics Board—airline fares and service have special staff members assigned to test petitioners' cases and to take independent views on public interest issues, the closeness of these staff members to their respective Commission policies does not make for any assurance that a full record for the consumer will be made. There is need here for an independent stimulus to raise the issues and spur the development of crucial facts directed to bringing down rates and fares for public use of these services. Certainly in the area of airline travel, there is a great need to preserve the benefits of competition among carriers on as many routes as possible. Such benefits go directly to the consumer in lower rates, better service, and technological innovation, and indeed, should be an immediate area for Consumers Counsel inquiry.

One of the most enlightening statements I have ever seen on the tendency of the regulatory agencies to get bogged down in details and legal technicalities was made by the late Dr. Walton Hamilton, after a lifetime of study of these agencies. It was carried in his last book "The Politics of Business," at page 155. I ask unanimous consent that the brief quotation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The result is that the commission on all its levels becomes busy, in fact overbusy, but largely with detailed problems of the moment, problems which have been raised by complaining parties. It has adequate legal authority to raise questions on its own motion, but amid all the bustle of everyday activity there is very little leisure in which to do it. The larger questions of holding the regulated industry to its function, of improving its capacity to serve the public, of looking to the hazards ahead and guarding against them, and of making of it a more effective instrument of the general welfare are neglected. Matters of policy get immersed in the quagmire of detail. The agency fails to direct the activities of the industry to public objectives, and the industry is left to effect for itself such structure and practices as serve its purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there are other matters of immediate concern to consumers which are not before regulatory bodies but to which the Consumers Council might well address itself. For example, in our society the automobile is an essential element of transportation; consumers are interested in securing as safe a vehicle as possible and the best value for their money. Back in the early fifties, automobile manufacturers engaged in a competitive horsepower race; cars were built to attain speeds both suicidal and destructive of others' lives. Because of public protest, this undesirable form of competitive rivalry was toned down by manufacturers in the late fifties, but once again is being reechoed in advertisements throughout the country.

At the present time there is no agency in our Government empowered even to raise questions about this costly practice—costly not only in terms of human lives but in the expense incurred by the public in purchasing and maintaining these huge powerplants. In this kind of situation the Office of Consumers would perform a useful function by bringing the matter to public attention. The mere fact of publicity often brings solution to a problem by voluntary action of the parties.

Admittedly, it could not issue any orders on such matters, but it could bring the problem into the focus of public opinion.

Under my bill the Office of Consumers would not only have the power to inquire on its own; it would also act as a central clearinghouse in government for consumer complaints of all types. Thus, many important problems would secure airing which currently live in obscurity because there is no place where consumer complaints can be effectively lodged. If an evil can be corrected only by legislative action, the consumers agency can make recommendations to the Congress.

An important function of an independent Office of Consumers would be to serve as public watchdog on industrial pricing developments of particular importance to consumers. Often these go unheeded by the established Government agencies for years. In the field of ethical, or prescription, drugs, for example, public indignation with respect to the high prices prevalent in this industry has existed for years; consumers complained to each other and to Government agencies, but obviously they had no evidence of price collusion or violation of the antitrust laws to bestir the agencies into action. The Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I have the honor to be chairman, decided to look into the matter because of the multiplicity of complaints of high prices, particularly from our older citizens living on limited incomes. The hearings of the subcommittee over the last 3 years fully vindicated the substance of their complaints, and I hope the legislation passed in late 1962, plus other developments which are occurring within the industry, will help in the correction of the structure of high prices in an industry so important to the health of our people. Increased use of generic names instead of companies' private brand names, for example, when doctors write prescriptions, can go far in reducing the prices of many important drugs to consumers.

At one time it was the hope of the Congress that the interests of the public would be represented by the various regulatory agencies being established. Increasingly, however, it has become apparent that in the daily, run-of-the-mill problems faced by these agencies the interest of the public has been virtually obscured and forgotten. Too often these agencies have become arbiters of intraindustry or interindustry disputes; their major concern has been to reach a compromise settlement which will have some acceptability to the parties directly involved. In this kind of procedure, the public interest has been all but obliterated. More often than not the issue of whether a decision accords with the interests of the public is never even raised.

Some of you may ask why it is necessary to have an Office of Consumers in view of the establishment of a Consumers Council in July 1962, upon the recommendation, and by Executive order, of the President.

I think the question answers itself. The Consumers Council is located in the Office of Economic Advisers; it is an advisory group to an advisory group. It meets infrequently; it is composed of busy people with other professional responsibilities and interests; it lacks an adequate staff working consistently day in and day out on consumer problems.

It has no real power or operational authority. In its present environment it also lacks the independence to speak out on issues important to the consumer.

The President is to be congratulated for establishing the Consumers Council but I am sure the members of the Council would testify as to its inadequacy and to the need for a more basic approach based on explicit legislative authority.

These reasons alone, I think, are sufficient to justify an independent agency representing the interests of consumers. For the function of such an agency is daily to be a burr in the hides of government officialdom, to get important consumer issues raised, and to aid in their settlement in such a fashion that consumer interests will be heard and taken account of. The task of making government constantly responsive to the needs of a people is unceasing in a democracy, but, so far as I know, this is the only manner in which our democratic heritage can be preserved.

In conclusion, I recall that when I finished my speech last year on the drug bill, which was subsequently enacted, I pointed out that the bill was a product of the Congress. On that occasion, the Congress had behaved in the manner contemplated by our Founding Fathers. It had investigated a problem. It had tailored a bill to meet that problem. Then it had enacted that bill into law. Now it is up to the executive branch to administer and enforce that law.

Such bills as have been introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] have been conceived of by Members of Congress based upon information that they have obtained. In thus devising and sponsoring legislation on our own, we are carrying out the basic function of the Congress, as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. This makes it doubly important that these measures be enacted by the Congress.

I am happy to yield now to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who, throughout her distinguished legislative career, has fought hard for the interests of the average consumer.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I am particularly interested in commenting on the Senator's reference to the Consumers Advisory Council. I received material from England which discusses a very interesting proposal that is similar to the Consumer Advisory Council.

The English have a theory that perhaps a great many consumers would like to work on a voluntary basis on such a committee, provided that it is headed by a consumer council in the Government. A distinguished member of the Conservative Party in England, Lady Elliot, has been made Chairman of the Consumer Council. It seemed apropos, in line with the Senator's remarks today, that we comment on some of the things that the Consumer Council, working with a citizens' consumers advisory committee, has been charged to do.

One is to inform itself about the consumer's problems and about matters affecting his interests.

Second, to consider, after consultation where necessary with other affected interested, the action to be taken to deal with such problems, or to further or safeguard such interests and to promote such action.

Third, to provide advice and guidance for the consumer, in particular through citizens advice bureaus and other appropriate organizations.

Even further than that—and I believe this is of special interest—it is specifically stated in the proposed legislation that the Advisory Committee or Consumer's Committee shall not do certain things. I believe the Senator will be interested in this point. It is not to take up complaints on behalf of individual consumers.

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that we have never considered such a committee as a sort of complaint department in a department store. We want it to be a guidance committee, an educational committee. Otherwise it would be bogged down with a great many individual complaints. This is the sort of thing that a citizen's voluntary committee can handle, and save a Government consumer council from dealing with these intricacies. I suggest that our committee study the legislation now being enacted in England.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my distinguished colleague from Oregon. I, like others, know Lady Elliot and her excellent efforts on behalf of the consumers of Great Britain. While, of course, we know that a consumer's committee could become bogged down if it were to try to operate as the complaint department of a department store, it should nevertheless act as a clearinghouse for complaints involving matters concerning Government agencies. It should certainly receive complaints concerning matters of general public interest, such as the price of drugs, deceptive packaging, and so forth. I am sure that we will benefit greatly by study of the effort now being made in Great Britain. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska, who has made great efforts, and delivered a number of effective speeches, on behalf of the consumers not only of his own State but also of the Nation as a whole. He is a cosponsor of the consumers bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Obviously I could not do other than to commend him highly for his long, unremitting, able, and conscientious efforts in behalf of the public interest on many fronts.

His reintroduction of his bill for aid to consumers is another striking evidence of that interest and that concern for the welfare of the American people, all of whom are, after all, consumers and represent the broadest public interest in our community.

Many things in the excellent speech the Senator has delivered call for special comment. I find his statement in that presentation particularly commendable, namely, that nowhere in the Federal Government is there any official voice for the independent expression of the consumer's interest. That situation is precisely what Senator KEFAUVER has been trying to rectify and is trying to rectify now. He points out that the bill aims to do more than merely rectify the abuses that afflict the consumer in the marketplace.

The Senator from Tennessee wishes not only to put the spotlight on such abuses, but also to bring about some corrective action.

I am greatly intrigued by the obvious statement—perhaps not so obvious to many others, but certainly obvious to me and to the Senator from Tennessee—that it is just as easy to victimize the consumer behind the frontlines, at a point remote from where direct contact is established between buyer and seller.

The Senator from Tennessee refers, in the next paragraph of his speech, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the abuses which many consumers have suffered from excessive railroad rates. We are particularly conscious of that fact in Alaska, because for 50 years there has been unprecedented discrimination, a unique discrimination, against Alaska in the matter of railroad rates.

It seems hard to believe that an article shipped to Pacific coast ports from key points in the United States, in Ohio or Georgia, for example, to Japan, Hawaii, Hong Kong, the Philippines, or the coast of South America can be shipped at a lower rail freight rate within the United States than that at which the identical article can be shipped to Alaska.

The reason for that is that a half century ago, when the railroads started to establish so-called export-import rates, they discriminated against Alaska, and Alaska almost alone. We consider this practice unconstitutional and as running counter to the provision in the Constitution that there shall be no discrimination as between the ports of the States.

This practice victimizes the consumers, and also the Federal Government itself, because when the Federal Government ships an article, whether it be building material or arms to our military bases in Alaska, the Government pays excess freight rates for everything it ships to Alaska, and pays higher rates than on shipments it makes to almost any other point throughout the Pacific.

I notice the presence in the Chamber of the two able and distinguished Senators from Michigan. I invite their attention to the fact that in shipping an automobile from Pontiac, Mich., to Tokyo, the cost is $7.83 per hundred pounds to send that car to Seattle for transshipment.

However, if the same car is bound for Alaska on the same train at the same time, indeed in the same car, the railroad freight charges to Seattle will be $10 per hundred pounds, or more than $2 more per hundred pounds, or more than $72 more for a shipment of a four-door sedan to Alaska than the cost of shipping the same automobile if it is destined for Tokyo.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. HART. This is a dramatic illustration of some of the inequities in freight rates. Speaking for myself and my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], we believe that the cost should be the same to Seattle, no matter where the car is shipped. Any effort that the Senator can put forth to bring down the cost of shipping automobiles to Seattle, New Orleans, or any other place, will have the active cooperation of the Senators from Michigan.

Mr. GRUENING. More automobiles manufactured in Michigan could be sold in Alaska if the freight rate were made equitable.

This has nothing to do, of course, with the ocean rates. Granted that ocean distances are different, I am speaking about identical services for an identical product over an identical distance. We are confronted with this most frustrating and amazing phenomenon, whether it refers to automobiles from Michigan or refrigerators, or agricultural implements from Indiana or any commodity from any place in the 48 States. I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. The rate to any place in the Pacific is substantially lower than it is to Alaska for the identical service.

The General Services Administration took this matter up several years ago, and long proceedings were held before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Not surprisingly, the Interstate Commerce Commission disregarding the evidence by a divided vote, decided in favor of maintaining the excessive and discriminatory railroads rates.

A similar situation exists in regard to the Alaska Steamship Company, which has had a virtual monopoly ever since the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. It has constantly raised its rates, rates which are almost automatically approved by the Maritime Commission, the so-called regulatory body. It does not matter what the name of the agency is. The name can be changed. It has been changed. It does not matter whether it is called the U.S. Shipping Board, the Federal Maritime Board, or the Federal Maritime Commission; the result is always the same. The public remains low man on the totem pole.

All this runs counter to the declared policy of President Kennedy, which he enunciated when he came into office, with respect to the regulatory agencies. It was hoped—as he hoped—that for the first time in many years these agencies would start serving the public interest. That was a vain hope. The private, vested interest always supersedes the public, the consumer interest.

I notice in the speech of the Senator from Tennessee that he points to the fact that the consumer index rose between 1947 and 1962 about 35 percent.

That could be reduced to a similar figure that I wish to cite with respect to the Alaska steamship rates; namely, from 1950 to 1962, the increase in the consumer index was 31 percent; but the increase in the freight rates was 56.4 percent. Think of that increase in only one decade. That is typical of what is taking place, and which, precisely, it is hoped the proposed legislation which the Senator from Tennessee is introducing would amend.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have spoken with the distinguished Senator from Alaska about the discrimination in freight rates and other discriminations practiced against the people of Alaska. I think they are outrageous. Perhaps one reason why such situations have not been corrected is that they have not, in years past, been forcefully enough brought to the attention of Congress and the Government. The Senator from Alaska is doing that now.

One of the functions of the Office of Consumers would be to put the spotlight of public attention on matters of this kind—such as the discrimination against citizens of Alaska—and to join in building up a record for legislation or for action before the Interstate Commerce Commission or other regulatory bodies to correct the situation. This would certainly be one of the items to which immediate attention would be given.

Along the same line, it is not only Alaska that has been victimized by unfair or uneven freight rates. When the United States ships steel to Europe, American shippers must pay a much higher freight rate than the rate paid by European shippers of steel to the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. That is another evidence of the crass failure and neglect of the Federal Maritime Commission. It is its duty to be vigilant in such cases. The Maritime Commission should see to it that discrimination is not practiced against consumers, or against manufacturers and exporters.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Alaska is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to know whom the Maritime Commission protects.

Mr. KEFAUVER. When Congress enacted shipping legislation, it had an opportunity to correct some of these inequities, but there were not enough votes in the Senate to do so.

Mr. GRUENING. If we continue to expose these conditions, we can arouse public opinion sufficiently so that corrective action will be taken. I serve notice that I shall not cease my efforts until Alaska gets the same treatment in respect to freight rates as do Central and South American countries, Japan, the Philippines, and even Communist China. If we should ever start to have commerce with Communist China, China would get lower rates for rail shipments within the mainland United States than we do to Alaska.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Knowing the ability of the Senator from Alaska, I believe he will be successful.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. During the past month I prepared for mailing to interested persons in Michigan a brief summary of the consumer bill that the Senator from Tennessee has today introduced. I have received a most interesting reply—and there were many who did reply—from Paul Treska, the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen on the Michigan State Legislative Board. As he put it:

> Even if John Q. Public becomes aroused and attends these types of hearings to protect himself, the talk is so technical that he is lost and does not understand what it is all about. Therefore, I believe Senator KEFAUVER's bill to create an Office of Consumers in the Federal Government is essential. I know you will support this legislation.

This man oftentimes attends, participates in, and observes hearings with respect to freight rates. To the suggestion that all one has to do is to become a concerned citizen and attend hearings, and that therefore it is not necessary to have an Office of Consumers, Mr. Treska replies that unless one is a highly skilled and technically qualified person, attendance at the hearing is of no help to him. I am sure that such a statement underscores the desirability of the creation of an Office of Consumers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There should be a central agency or a focal point to help guide and direct consumer activities closely. Even though such situations occur only occasionally they occur with no less effect.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to call attention to one more point. The Senator from Tennessee understands the great value of understatement. It is one of the reasons why he has been so successful. He does not paint things in more vivid colors than they are. But in one instance, I think he has indulged in perhaps too much understatement. In speaking of the operations of regulatory agencies, he said:

> Increasingly, however, it has become apparent that in the daily, run-of-the-mill problems faced by these agencies the interest of the public has been virtually obscured and forgotten. * * * In this kind of procedure, the public interest has been all but obliterated. More often than not the issue of whether a decision accords with the interests of the public is never even raised.

I can cite numerous instances in which the question has been raised but deliberately voted down; instances in which the issue of the consumer interest has been specifically raised before the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Maritime Commission, with unanswerable evidence and facts and figures, and the Maritime Commission or Board has disregarded all of it and voted against the consumer interest. That is why this consumer legislation is so important.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Too often consumer boards have become industry oriented, although that is not true of all such boards.

Mr. GRUENING. No; not all of them. I am hopeful that there will be a Federal regulatory board that will act in the public interest. That will be a great satisfaction to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of all the remarks on this subject a speech I delivered in the Senate on April 27, 1961, entitled "A Strange Discrimination: The Unique Pattern of Railroad Freight Rates to Alaska"; and also a speech I delivered in the Senate on March 23, 1962, entitled "The Failure To Permit Alaska To Enjoy Export-Import Rates Is Both Unjust and Unconstitutional." These speeches discuss in detail the matters on which I have touched briefly today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his contribution to the discussion and for his cosponsorship of the consumer bill. He has always fought for the interest of consumers, not only in Alaska, but in the Nation generally. I compliment him upon his continuing vigorous efforts.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, who tries to protect the consumer on all occasions when his welfare is at issue. I thank him for his cosponsorship of the proposed legislation which has been introduced today.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee for his sponsorship of a bill to establish an Office of Consumers. I am happy to join with him in cosponsorship of this bill, as I feel there is a definite and growing need for a department to provide effective representation within the Federal Government of the American people in their capacity as consumers.

The interest of the consumers in our society is too often overlooked.

Perhaps at times the oversight is not intentional. The competition becomes so severe between the competing interests which are directly concerned with the subject that finally a position of compromise is reached between the competing interests at the manufacturing or producing level, and oftentimes it is believed that in such a compromise the consumer is benefited. So I am not sure that all of the lack of concern for the consumer is intentional at all. Their voice is not heard because they are not organized or represented by powerful lobbies such as represent the producers. The existing Government agencies, with few exceptions, represent American people as producers, not consumers.

The establishment of a department within the Government, specifically designed to represent the consumer interest, is the only prospect for effective representation, since it is unlikely that consumers can be organized. The structure of our Government is such that it is weighted heavily by agencies representing producer interest. There is a compelling need for an influence to balance this by which attention can be brought to top policy officials of the ways in which actions may affect the American people in their capacity as consumers.

Congress would also benefit from this new department, as we tend to hear only the positions of organized business and organized labor. Many times, in considering legislation, we need to have an evaluation of the likely effect upon consumers. Also, after the legislation has been passed, Congress needs to know if the result of the legislation is consistent with its purpose or whether more action needs to be taken.

I am hopeful that this important piece of legislation will be seriously considered and favorably acted upon in the near future.

Again I wish to commend the senior Senator from Tennessee for his great interest and devotion to the cause of securing better protection for the consumers of our country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Indiana for his support and encouragement.

I am aware of his resolution which calls for the establishment of a special committee to investigate the financial condition of certain railroads, particularly as to whether it is necessary for them to abandon some of their lines, and thus throw many persons out of employment, and deprive many communities of railroad service, and, therefore, of the opportunity for economic growth. The study he contemplates is important, and I hope such a special committee will be soon established.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am sure the help of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will be most valuable in this regard.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am most appreciative of the assistance of my colleagues.

CONSUMERS' DAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, has the Senator from Tennessee concluded?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier today I briefly expressed to the Senator from Tennessee my appreciation, on behalf of the consumers of the country.

In colloquy with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I commented on the fact that I had received considerable reaction to a newsletter in which I explained the purpose of the proposed Office of Consumers. Included in those responses were some which were very sharply critical of this proposal. However, I believe the debate we have had today and the speech delivered by the Senator from Tennessee will go a long way in replying to some of the thoughtful questions which have been asked about the proposed Office of Consumers.

Interestingly enough, several of those who replied suggested that Members of Congress should, themselves, do this work. Those who make that suggestion state that Members of Congress are sent to Washington by the people of their States, all of whom are consumers; and the question is asked: "Why do not Members of Congress appear at such hearings and represent the consumers of America or the constituency which sent them to Washington? Why is a special bureau needed for that purpose?"

In that connection, I think it most helpful to have had the Senator's discussion of the problem. The problem is that the matters before these agencies have become so technical that only experts in the particular area involved can make any effective contribution. Moreover, most situations of this sort involve adversary proceedings; and if a Senator were to advocate either one side or other of the issue, he would be charged with intruding on an executive prerogative.

The remarks of the Senator from Tennessee should go a long way toward answering some of the tentative criticisms which have been voiced in regard to this proposal.

I suppose the most frequently expressed criticism is the one that we would only be establishing another bureau, which would cost more money, and that if we simply balanced the budget, the proposed bureau would not be necessary.

A thoughtful reading of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee will demonstrate, first, the necessity of having the consumers' interests represented effectively and expertly; second, that a real dollar saving to the consumer can result; and, third, that regardless of the size of the Federal budget, the welfare of the consumers in our society requires the creation and maintenance of an Office of Consumers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

It is not practical for Members of Congress to appear at every meeting of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Communications Commission; and if they did appear, they would be criticized for doing so.

As for the criticism that this bill would simply create another bureau, I point out, first, that this agency would not be a large one. It would be staffed principally with a limited number of technical experts. Moreover, any price reduction which it achieved for the consumer would reduce the cost of Government purchases and thus result in savings, many times over, to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the comments the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has made, because they relate to the important matter of the adequate protection of the interests of the consumers.

As for the suggestion that Members of Congress should appear before existing agencies, to represent the interest of consumers, I point out that the mere presentation of the consumers' interest in a case in which we might feel the consumers needed representation would require long hours, days, and perhaps months, of preparation. For example, the question of what is the proper charge for the railroad transportation of automobiles, and whether there should be a difference of $72 between the charge for transportation from Detroit and the charge for transportation from Pontiac, Mich., for the same service, requires detailed study of the history, the background, and so forth. Thus, Mr. President, I think Senators can make known to their constituents that although Senators would be glad to appear before such regulatory bodies, and to represent the consumers there, there is not sufficient time in which to do so.

On the other hand, the bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, with the cosponsorship of a number of other Senators, provides a real answer. By means of this proposal, there would be established an agency, with a trained staff, to represent the consumers in all cases in which it is necessary to fight against discriminatory practices or procedures which the agency deems to be unjust on their face.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Alaska. Certainly, there is a great need to eliminate such discriminations.

The doctrine of caveat emptor—"let the buyer beware"—should have been buried many years ago. The courts created it; but the courts have long since abandoned it. Yet the doctrine lingers on, like a persistent ghost who cannot quite become used to the idea that he is dead. Many of the industry trade-association witnesses who testified at the truth-in-packaging hearings, to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] referred, and which I have been conducting for the Senate's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, seem determined to make a saint out of this apparition, which, since the day of its inception, has been regarded by most as an unrepentant sinner.

To suggest that honesty should be the most profitable policy in the marketplace, as well as the best policy at home, and that the Government has a legitimate stake in this problem, somehow has been regarded as un-American by these witnesses.

Yet this is precisely what the resurgence of interest in consumer problems by the American people is all about. Our consumers are simply getting fed up with being taken in the marketplace.

Mr. President, sometimes one wonders whether the consumer, as such, is observant of day-to-day developments. Some Members of Congress tend to judge a question of this sort by the volume of mail they receive. If they do not receive much mail about such a proposal, they assume that all is well and that the consumers are satisfied. However, because of the attention given the truth-in-packaging hearings during the past months, I wish to advise Senators that the consumer is anything but disinterested. He is thoroughly displeased with many matters and he is willing to write letters to his Representatives in Congress when he thinks they are endeavoring to promote specific measures which will be to his advantage.

Until very recently, the mail has overwhelmingly expressed the point of view that the interests of consumers is not given the fullest attention by those who prepare the attractive packages and labels that confront the consumer eventually in the supermarket. No Member of the Congress should assume that there is not considerable unhappiness on the part of consumers over packaging, prices, and so forth.

However, interestingly enough, in the past few days, as the subcommittee has approached a vote on the question, I am beginning to receive a considerable volume of mail from ladies who tell me that they are happy. They like packaging the way it is. They are smart. No one is fooling them. They suggest that the trouble with me is that I underrate their intelligence. Indeed, they go further and say that they like the challenge posed by the supermarket a couple of times a week.

None of us like to have it suggested about ourselves that we are downgrading the intellect of the American woman. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I married a brilliant American woman. She is a licensed helicopter pilot and a licensed multiengine airplane pilot with an instrument rating. I have watched her with a calculator and radio communcations get me from place A to place B through a fog safely—something I could not dream of doing.

My wife tells me that when she goes into the supermarket, she has a great deal more trouble landing right than she does when she lands in a fog.

I would be the last Member of this body to suggest that there is anything inadequate in the capacity of the American shopper, male or female. My bill is simply designed to give them a chance to use their well-known acumen and arrive at an intelligent decision as to which product is the best buy.

Some retail merchants have expressed a point of view that supports the truth-in-packaging bill. It is not easy for them to do so. They are really the ones who take the abuse when the shopper says, "I can't figure this out. It says '7 cents off.' But 7 cents off what?" They are the ones who face the problem of developing the correct answer to the question of which is the better buy—a package containing 13¾ ounces at 39 cents or the package containing 14.6 ounces at 43 cents.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has the Senator received an equally voluminous correspondence from husbands?

Mr. HART. Interestingly enough, in the early months of our hearings we received more mail from men than from women. Perhaps some Senators would be hesitant to admit that they do the shopping either regularly or frequently. But they should take heart. The mail suggests that a great many men in our country perform the shopping chore; and they, too, report extreme difficulty and displeasure. That is not to downgrade the intellect of the American man, either.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know whether it is still applicable, but about a century ago Henry David Thoreau wrote:

> The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation.

Perhaps that is the case of those who do not write.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Alaska can always contribute not only a constructive but also usually a delightful thought as we make the RECORD. He has done so now.

I was commenting on the fact that more retailers slip up in the dark as it were, and whisper to us that "We hope you can place this kind of legislation on the books." But I should like to place in the RECORD a written expression from a courageous retailer in Michigan. Several months ago I sent a mailing to those persons in Michigan who had expressed an interest in receiving such communications. It was captioned, "Ten Ways To Save Money in the Supermarket." The letter described the record we have been making in the subcommittee on the truth-in-packaging bill. The letter stated:

> Enactment of a truth-in-packaging bill would end many of these practices—

That were described to the subcommittee and which were the subjects of some of this critical mail we have been mentioning.

Then I added—

> But, in the meantime, our hearings uncovered a number of ways that housewives can begin right now to save hundreds of dollars a year. Here are 10 of them. I hope they will be helpful.

Back came one of the letters signed by Gordon C. Meldrum, proprietor of the Rainbow Park Food Store, Indian River, Mich. In longhand he commented after each of the paragraphs in my letter. One of the suggested ways a person might save some money was, as I phrased it—

> Watch out for the well-displayed special at the end of the counter or in the checkout area. One grocer who could not sell a certain canned food at 9 cents a can dumped them into a large basket at the end of the aisle and marked it "special, 10 cans for $1." He sold out in 1 day.

Mr. Meldrum, the retail food proprietor, in longhand commented:

> Right every time.

Another suggestion upon which I would like to comment was as follows:

> Be careful of "cents-off" deals. In some cases they are money savers. But often they are merely devices to get your attention or to cover up a price increase when the sale is over. We found some products that have always been "cents-off."

Mr. Meldrum commented:

> A con game if ever there was one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my letter and Mr. Meldrum's comments be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the longhand comments of Mr. Meldrum be shown in brackets.

There being no objection, the letter and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 1963.

SENATOR HART REPORTS—10 WAYS TO SAVE MONEY IN THE SUPERMARKET

(Comment by Rainbow Park Food Store, Indian River, Mich., in brackets)

During the course of hearings on the truth-in-packaging bill, we've learned that the American shopper is the target of a huge corps of motivational researchers, package designers, and merchandising specialists—many of whom display no undue reverence for straightforwardness. [Right as rain.]

As a result, local retailers have less and less control over the way products are packaged and presented, and the supermarket is often a confusing and difficult place to choose the week's purchases. [We have no control, period.]

Enactment of a truth-in-packaging bill would end many of these practices and I am hopeful that it will be passed in this Congress. [By all means.]

But, in the meantime, our hearings uncovered a number of ways that housewives can begin right now to save hundreds of dollars a year. Here are 10 of them. I hope they will be helpful. [Don't build a woman's hopes too high.]

1. When the old package or bottle takes a new shape or size, check the content statement—chances are good that you're now getting less for your money. [Right.]

2. Check the content statement again when you see such words as "new" or "improved" on the old package. These adjectives may shield a drop in amount. [Right.]

3. Always check the bottom shelves. It's a psychologically established fact that products sell best at eye level. Sometimes, retailers take advantage of this to push a higher profit item on eye-level shelves. [We have to in order to stay in business.]

4. Don't assume the largest size in the same product line is the better buy. It may or may not be. The only way to be sure is to figure the cost per ounce. [Right.]

5. Watch out for the well-displayed "special" at the end of the counter or in the checkout area. One grocer who could not sell a certain canned food at 9 cents a can dumped them into a large basket at the end of the aisle and marked it: "Special, 10 cans for $1." He sold out in 1 day. [Right every time.]

6. Don't be influenced by compelling color or package design. What's important is the value of the contents. And beware of the large-looking box. It may actually contain less than its smaller appearing competitor. Check that content. [Right.]

7. Be careful of "cents-off" deals. In some cases they are money savers. But often they are merely devices to get your attention or to cover up a price increase when the "sale" is over. We found some products that have always been "cents-off." [A con game if ever there was one.]

8. Don't be misled by such qualifying adjectives as the "giant half quart." This is merely the old-fashioned pint by a different name. [Another sucker bait.]

9. The phrase "less calories" may actually mean less product. Fluffing up the oleo or slicing the bread thinner might make it less fattening per bite but be careful that it doesn't cost more per ounce. [Only in America.]

10. Use a pocket calculator whenever possible. It's the only practical way to discover your best buy among competing products that sell for 21 cents, 32 cents, and 35 cents and weigh 16½, 22¼, and 26 ounces respectively. [When the manufacturers make

it honest then we can sell it honest. More power to you.]

PHILIP A. HART.
GORDON C. MELDRUM.

Mr. HART. We are being told over and over again by industry that in our free enterprise economy the consumer is king or queen. The consumer is awakening to the fact that he is a king without very many prerogatives. Even a wise and intelligent king certainly cannot make wise and intelligent decisions if he does not have adequate information, or, worse, if he has only distorted information. The subjects in the case of the packaging and labeling hearings are the basic commodities crying out for his attention in the marketplace.

Yet even a bill as basic as the truth-in-packaging bill which many of us have sponsored is branded by witnesses as undue Government interference. The bill merely attempts to insure that the consumer can get from the new salesman in the marketplace—the package—enough basic information to be able to compute the best buy in regard to quantity. It seeks to insure that the package salesman will represent fairly the quantity of the product inside. The bill really seeks to make an honest salesman out of the package.

I submit that if that is interference, it is overdue, not undue.

Government has a responsibilty to all its citizens to do for them what they cannot do for themselves and to insist that competition produce socially useful results, not harmful results.

And Government has this responsibility even though the consumers have no powerful trade associations and lobbies working in their behalf.

That is why this is a historic day in the U.S. Senate. It focuses attention on those representatives who are willing to stand up and be counted in the public interest. And it focuses attention on those consumer problems that are often not attention-getting, not headline material, not dramatic; yet must be solved if our economy is to move forward, if our free-enterprise competitive system is to function without distortion, if the moral tone of our society is to be preserved and our citizens are not to be victimized in the marketplace.

The President of the United States focused attention on the problems facing the American consumer in his equally historic consumer message last year in which he spoke of the right of consumers to be informed.

My truth-in-packaging bill seeks to give substance to this right; the truth-in-lending bill of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is an attempt to do the same thing.

And now the bill of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to establish an Office of Consumers, to be headed by a Consumer Counsel in the executive branch of Government, has been introduced. This legislation is sorely needed and, hopefully, the interest generated by this session today will make it a reality.

The unorganized consumer simply cannot know when bills affecting his vital interests and his pocketbook are introduced in Congress. He simply cannot be effective when the myriad of Government agencies are considering policies and decisions that may directly affect him for years to come.

The interest groups do know when these events take place. They have trade associations to make known their positions and to inaugurate letterwriting campaigns in an attempt to convince legislators that the position of entrenched interest is also a grassroot interest.

This Office of Consumers bill is a necessity to give the consumer a voice in the important decisions of our day which most seriously affect him. And "him" in this context means all of the people.

These bills that we have been discussing, when passed—and the tide of consumer discontent now sweeping the land will insure that they will be passed—once and for all can convince even the most avid skeptics that caveat emptor is truly dead.

And once the last lingering memories of this discredited doctrine have been wiped from the minds of men, we can deal more effectively with the complex problems before us with only one concern: what decision best serves the public interest?

As I close, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need a Truth-in-Packaging Law To Eliminate Deceit and Trickery," which appeared in the Retail Clerks Advocate, an article written by one of the greatest consumer's champion of them all, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING LAW TO ELIMINATE DECEIT AND TRICKERY

(By MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator, Oregon)

Ten years ago, the conscientious supermarket clerk sincerely interested in helping his customers, could advise them as to the relative quality and economy of most items offered by the supermarket. At that time the average supermarket stocked no more than 1,500 items.

Today, you, both as clerks and consumers, are the victims of calculated campaigns to destroy the ability of the shopper to select wisely on the basis of comparative price and quality. Today, the shelves of the average supermarket are lined with 7,500 items. But more significant than the mere number of these items are their deliberately deceptive guises of package shape, size, and label. Suppose that a customer should ask you which bag of potato chips is the best buy? Are you able to tell him? Testimony before a Senate committee disclosed that potato chips are now being marketed in packages of at least 69 different weights. Who but an Einstein could determine the most economical size among them?

The fertile minds of the Madison Avenue motivation researchers and the packaging and labeling geniuses have developed an infinite variety of deceptive and confusing practices.

In packaging, the trick today is to devise the largest possible package without increasing the content. Candymakers, for example, discovered the cardboard tray: take a 4-inch candy bar, center it in a 6-inch cardboard tray, wrap it loosely with paper and mark "giant size." Mint manufacturers discovered spacers—great blocks of cardboard conveniently substituted for mints; cookie manufacturers invented the individually wrapped package. As MAD magazine put it: "You'll find you're buying an awful lot of paper at cookie prices these days."

If you're not going to make your package larger than it need be to hold the ingredients at least you can confuse the shopper by using an odd-sized container. Marketing your product in a weirdly-shaped bottle is an excellent way of preventing the customer from comparing its size with a competing product. If you can flatten out your cereal box, you can make it taller and wider; if you put a narrow neck in a bottle, you can make it taller.

But slack-filled, distorted packages are just the beginning. Science has come to the aid of the producer who wants to enlarge the apparent size of his product without adding any more of its costly ingredients. He injects water into a ham or processed cheese, or markets "balloon" bread, where a 1 pound loaf is baked in a 1½-pound pan.

He offers the customer a shrimp chopsuey dinner in which the principal ingredients are celery, bean sprouts, shrimp broth, and shrimp in descending order of importance. Or he concocts a dinner of frozen fish balls with potatoes, not fish, as the primary ingredient.

Only a shopper with a Ph. D and a slide rule could make a quick choice between a 6⅛-ounce can of crabmeat for 75 cents and a 5½-ounce jar at 69 cents, or choose the best value among the 69 weights of potato chips mentioned above.

If you can't make your product look bigger, you can make it look better. Imaginative pictures on labels can prove a cunning trap for the unwary. You may be surprised to learn that the container of orange juice, decorated with a picture of a fresh orange dripping into a glass, in truth contains little, if any, fresh orange juice. Or that the can of mushroom chow mein, depicting a dinner plate smothered with mushrooms, contained, by actual count, three meager pieces of mushroom. And how often have you wished that the olives inside the can were as large and succulent as the olives picture on the label?

It is true that agencies concerned with consumer protection, such as the Agriculture Department, the FTC, and the Food and Drug Administration require that labels contain certain basic information. But think of the bonus that must have been awarded to the advertising artist who designed a label with the required information written in gold ink on a reflecting background.

When the producer is tired of puffing the size of his product and distorting the label, he resorts to the deceptive use of words to lure the unwary. Have you ever tried to find a small tube of toothpaste which was actually labeled "Small"? The sizes start with "Large" and go up from there. And how much larger than a pint is "Giant Half-Quart"? "Serves four," promises the label. "Four what", queries the housewife, after being once burned. "Four birds?"

Finally, there are the phony bargains. More often than not a promise of "5 cents off" is meaningless. The product is being marketed at the identical price at which it has always been sold. One "Large economy size" instant coffee was proudly marked at 2 cents more per ounce than the smaller regular size.

There is relief in sight, however, both for the consumer and the harried clerk. I am a cosponsor of a bill introduced by Senator HART, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee, which will go a long way towards curbing packaging and labeling abuses. If strong public support is mustered to overcome the special pleading of the affected industries, this legislation may be enacted next year.

We will then, hopefully, return to a market in which products compete on the basis of quality and price, rather than deceit—a market with far fewer headaches and complaints for those engaged in merchandising.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Michigan for the speech he has made. As the Senator knows, I am a strong supporter of his truth-in-packaging bill.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows, I have been a strong supporter of his truth-in-lending bill.

I have a little of what is perhaps facetious regret that the Senator from Michigan did not include in his truth-in-packing bill a section dealing with truth-in-information, which would require all publications to list on their front pages exactly what kinds of journals they are publishing. It seems to me that the time is long past when we should have required Time, which calls itself "the weekly news magazine" to change that to "Time—a journal of plutocratic opinion."

There are similar amendments which I should like to see with regard to a number of our other respected publications. Of course, I realize that certain questions would be raised as to the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, including the right of freedom of speech, which might have inhibited my friend from Michigan, who has such a keen sense of civil liberties, from including such a provision in his bill. I am content that the bill which the Senator has drafted and introduced will, if passed—and I hope it will be passed—make a very substantial contribution to consumer protection and higher standards in connection with retail trade.

I turn briefly to the bill introduced by my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], with a number of cosponsors, to establish an Office of Consumers. I did not cosponsor the bill, but I am in general sympathy with its objectives. The reason why I did not cosponsor the bill was that I feel there is already too great a proliferation of administrative agencies in our Federal Government. What we need is a tightening rather than a loosening of the chains of command within the executive branch of our Government.

I had hoped that we would establish a Department of Urban Affairs, with Cabinet status. I shall continue to press for that badly needed reform. The time will come when there will be too many executive agencies to be adequately coordinated and to be adequately supervised by the chief of the executive branch of our Government, who is, of course, the President of the United States.

I would have preferred a bill to place the consumer agency in the Department of Justice by statutory authority, to be headed by a Consumer Counsel, who would be nominated by the President and whose nomination would be confirmed by the Senate, but who would be administratively under the supervision of the Attorney General. In this way, it seems to me, we could avoid some of the criticism which arises every time we want a Department of Urban Affairs, a Consumer Counsel, a Department of Transportation or a Department of Science. There is no end to the desirable activities in which the Federal Government perhaps should engage in the modern world, but there must be, in my opinion, some sense of orderly administration.

So I say to my friend from Tennessee and to the other distinguished cosponsors who have joined him, that I am completely in accord with the objectives of the bill. I think consumer protection is badly needed at the Federal level. I commend the Senator again for his activities in this regard, which I know have extended over many years. I would hope we could get a little tighter and more orderly administrative setup under which this important function could be performed.

I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HART. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the points made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania. So I agree with him that we should try to avoid a proliferation of Government agencies. Again I wish to stress the fact that the proposed agency would be relatively small in size. But, the most important point is that there is today a compelling need for this agency just as there was a few years ago when Congress established the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Administration was deliberately established as a separate and independent agency so that it would most effectively represent the interests of consumers before other Government agencies. That same logic dictates the establishment of the Office of Consumers as a separate and independent agency.

Mr. HART. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much for, not alone his kind remarks, but, more importantly, his pledge of support. With help such as comes from the Senator from Pennsylvania when he has a deep conviction about the desirability of proposed legislation, my hopes for the adoption of this bill are increased immeasurably.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Two or three points have been brought up on which I would like to comment. The Senator from Tennessee mentioned something we sometimes lose sight of in discussing consumer realtions. One of the things we are interested in is in reducing costs or keeping costs down. I remember, in the great and historic discussion in this Chamber last session about drugs, it was stated that one of the objectives of the drug bill was to see that our people could have useful, lifesaving drugs at a price they could afford. That is one of the objectives we are working on.

I wonder if the Senator from Michigan has not heard, in his committee hearings, some comment that our efforts are going to increase costs to the consumers. Is that correct?

Mr. HART. Yes; we are told that it would cost a fantastic sum to producers of packaged goods if legislation such as this ever was enacted. Indeed, it is suggested that all costs would be increased materially. It is suggested that the result of the truth-in-packaging bill would be to sovietize the American supermarket; that it would be a very drab place, indeed; one to which none of us would want to go. Among other things it might even tend to reduce the sale of slide rules which a small but sophisticated group of buyers is, out of desperation, turning to in order to compare the prices of different brands packaged in different fractional ounces.

The testimony in opposition to the bill, so far as increased cost is concerned, is based, I feel, on an assumption that its objective is to completely standardize packages. As the initiator, and for my cosponsors, let me say that that is not the purpose of the bill. Of course, it might prove to be the ultimate outcome, if packaging becomes even more deceptive, and the unhappy day should ever arrive when every product on the market deceived every consumer in America.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I was interested, because I notice, when I go to the stores, the wording on packages, "new, improved formula." It seems to me when sales are slumping, the producers have to put out a "new, improved formula." If they have to repackage and repackage, it must be very costly.

Mr. HART. Oftentimes the only thing new is the "new" on the box. The cost of packaging is substantial. It is my recollection that the figures produced at the subcommittee hearings show that the packaging business in this country amounts to some $10 to $20 billion a year. The amount of nickels, dimes, and dollars that the American shoppers leave at the cash registers in the supermarkets is in the range of $70 billion a year.

I think that point should be made, because occasionally it is asserted that "you are fussing over nickels and dimes. Why don't you get on with the important business of the Nation?" The nickels and dimes amount to $70 billion a year, and these efforts would really determine which producers would fail or succeed.

It seems to me a bill such as this would serve the long-term interests of all ethical producers.

Indeed, it is conceivable that a larger sum could be saved annually for the average American family as a result of the enactment of the truth-in-packaging bill than through the enactment of a tax cut, about which we hear so much. I suspect such a tax cut, when it is passed, will allocate to the average American family a percentage of reduction which will result in a saving less than the amount which would be saved for the family if

Congress enacted a law which would result in putting on the shelves of the supermarkets packages and information such as this bill seeks.

I yield the floor.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I consider it a great privilege to join with the senior Senator from New York in furthering the cause of consumer representation in the Senate. Each of us in past Congresses has called for the creation of a select committee solely and single mindedly charged with the protection of the Nation's consumers. I think it is entirely appropriate that this be a bipartisan effort—surely the American consumer is neither exclusively a Democrat nor a Republican.

Mr. President, the Senate has designated committees to look after the needs of the farmer and the forester, the soldier and the veteran, the banker and the laborer, the trainman and the seaman, the Indian, the postman. The small businessman is guarded by the sharp eye of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. And the Special Committee on the Aging, on which I am proud to serve, has focused attention upon the particular needs of that underprivileged and neglected segment of our population. As a matter of fact, the Senate Committee on the Aging recently scrutinized the problems of the aged as consumers.

But no organ of this body has had as its sole concern the interest of the ordinary American consumer. Who is this consumer that he or she should be singled out for protection among the thousands of special-interest groups within our population? The significance of the U.S. consumer as an influence upon our economy is evidenced by the fact that two-thirds of our gross national product—nearly $350 billion—is accounted for by the goods and services required to meet consumer needs. Consumer needs are of the most vital concern to our national economic health and growth. This is the function of the consumer as a statistic—an economic phenomena. But the consumer is much more than that. He is a citizen who faces particular problems in our highly developed midtwentieth century economy. President Kennedy in his consumer message recognized the existence of special consumer needs and articulated four basic consumer rights:

1. The right to safety—to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.

2. The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.

3. The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.

4. The right to be heard—to be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals.

Of course, the consumer is not without champions in the Senate. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has waged incessant warfare against the fraud and deceit that rob consumers of their hard-earned dollars in the form of hidden interest charges. This year, hopefully, Senator DOUGLAS' truth-in-lending bill will at long last emerge successfully from the Banking and Currency Committee to become law.

The truth-in-packaging bill authored by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] will, I am confident, run the gamut of special-interest opposition to free the supermarket shopper from the petty deceit and deliberate confusion that are now an ugly blot upon our marketing systems.

And, today the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], whose most recent battle in behalf of the consumer successfully culminated in the passage of last year's historic Drug Act, is calling upon Congress to create an office of consumers.

I am, indeed, grateful for the opportunity to join as a cosponsor of each of these critical bills.

No one can say that the consumer has been neglected by Congress. Why then the need for an additional committee? The truth is that the limited consumer legislation that has successfully emerged from Congress has been solely the result of such herculean individual efforts as those I have just described. In each case one Senator with passion and conviction has been able, if only temporarily, to move a committee normally preoccupied with other interests to recognize a specific consumer need.

But nowhere has there been any systematic, coordinated, continuous legislative scrutiny of consumer needs. For every instance of the successful passage of consumer-oriented legislation, there are a dozen instances of neglect of consumers or the dominance of pressure groups inimical to the consumer. A select committee on consumers would bring the heat of informed public opinion to bear on the standing committees, stimulating them to do a better job in protecting the consumer. A consumer committee would be able to inspect proposed legislation solely from the consumer viewpoint, and would be in a position to articulate that viewpoint to the Congress and the Nation.

Senate Resolution 116 charges the Select Committee on Consumers to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and investigation of:

First. The nature and extent of economic problems of consumers within the United States.

Second. The extent to which authority heretofore conferred by law upon executive, administrative, and regulatory agencies of the United States provides effective means for the solution of consumers' problems.

Third. The nature of any additional legislative or other measures necessary or desirable for the solution of such problems.

Notwithstanding the numerous alphabetical agencies established for this purpose, none contains the word "consumer" as an aid to the public. We in the Congress are familiar with the terms ICC, FPC, FDA, FCC, SEC, and many others which are consumer agencies. The housewife who feels that she has been put upon does not know that those agencies were established for her protection.

I think it worthwhile that a Consumer Committee be established to educate and discuss consumer problems. After all, it is the interest of the consumer that our daily efforts are for and about. The reason for our being, and for conducting this country, who make up the great States, is the interest of the people of this country, who make up the great consuming public.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for his leadership in consumers' affairs. The bill which I am proud to join with him in introducing today has been distilled from years of thought about the weaknesses of distributive marketing and Government regulation of business. I should like to explain why I favor the bill.

THE EVILS OF PRICE INFLATION

The housewife who watches uneasily as the supermarket cash register devours her weekly food budget, all too often regards the price of commodities as an unchangeable fact of life. The small businessman who equips a new production line with ever more expensive machinery rarely thinks about the economic forces that have shaped the figure on the machinery manufacturer's statement. And what with constantly changing products and packaging techniques, it sometimes escapes our attention that real prices are edging ever higher. Price inflation pads the annual growth in gross national product by $6 to $8 billion a year. It depresses consumer demand, which is all-important to employment and economic growth. It prices American goods out of world markets. It jeopardizes the hard-won security of retired persons and discourages savings. But the price of goods and services is not inevitably decreed by forces beyond our control, like the laws of planetary motion. In large measure the price is set by and created within a market in which consumers buy and distributors sell. It is the contest between them that determines how much the seller receives for his wares.

The consumer's interest lies in maximum satisfaction at a minimum price. With expenditures of some $350 billion per year, the ultimate consumer of goods and services creates a market for the vast outpouring of new products and ingenious services that have made the American economy a wonder of the modern world. But the consumer hardly exercises a formative influence in the market. A flood of motivation research, high pressure advertising, and deceptive practices has drowned out the consumer's voice in the marketplace. Only the consumer has the power of the dollar, which can call forth high quality goods and better services. But the consumer's interest is inadequately protected. Supposedly the three-way pull among consumers, labor, and corporate management, should result in lower prices and high quality goods. But labor's interest in higher wages and management's interest in profit are the only forces of any significance. Indeed, about all the consumer can do is delay a purchase until he can afford it. That is not exactly the best way for his interest to be protected.

"But what about competition?" you may ask. The answer is that competition is imperfect and that all too often the price on the package represents a sophisticated judgment as to what the market will bear and not what a product is worth. Resale price maintenance, administered prices, artificial scarcity, planned obsolescence, and other devices of imperfect competition serve to insulate the market from the consumer's power. The need for strengthening the consumer's interest is clear.

The Office of Consumers could report on progress in testing and quality standards. It could assist with the preparation of the Consumer's Price Index and advise on a host of government policies in which the consumer's interest is involved. It could encourage State and local consumer's groups and work for wider public understanding of consumer problems. The Office could cooperate with a Select Committee on Consumers in the U.S. Senate, for which I have also joined in introducing legislation today.

THE CONSUMER'S COUNSEL

Mr. President, there is widespread dissatisfaction over the manner in which administrative agencies have operated in the regulation of business. The resignation of Louis Hector from the CAB in 1959, the loss of William Connole from the FPC in 1960, the Landis report in 1961, and the recent resignation of Howard Morgan from the FPC are all indications that the administrative process does not function as well as might once have been hoped. Louis Hector recommended that the administrative agencies be broken up into functional units. In his book "Regulating Business by Private Commission," Marver Bernstein suggests that any regulatory body has a life of about one generation. In that time it passes from idealism, to practical ideas about implementing the public interest, to eventual decline and impotence. The principal reason for the weakness of the administrative agencies has been the intricate defensive to regulatory aims which has been conducted by the industries regulated by each body.

Hamilton, in his book "The Politics of Industry," described the basic problem very well when he wrote, of a hypothetical commission:

> The commission on all its levels becomes busy, in fact overbusy, but largely with detailed problems of the moment, problems which have been raised by complaining parties. It has adequate legal authority to raise questions on its own motion, but amid all the bustle of everyday activity there is very little leisure in which to do it. The larger questions of holding the regulated industry to its function, of improving its capacity to serve the public, of looking to the hazards ahead and guarding against them, and of making of it a more effective instrument of the general welfare are neglected. The agency fails to direct the activities of the industry to public objectives, and the industry is left to effect for itself such structure and practices as serve its purpose.

And who suffers? The consumer. And who pays? The consumer of our half-regulated natural gas, our virtually unregulated electric power, and our horribly tangled freight and passenger services. When the International Air Transport Association raises its rates, the consumer pays. When the Government fails to control the price of sugar, he pays. The bulk of public-utility regulation at the Federal level has been a dismal failure from the consumer's standpoint.

The Consumer's Counsel could make available to interested consumer's groups the technical services and specialized information they need. That function alone would argue for the creation of the Office. I do not know that I support all of the investigative and intervening powers for the Consumer's Counsel contemplated by this bill, but the advisory capability which the Office could provide would be well worth the expense, so that groups of citizens who come to Washington to petition regulatory bodies might have the benefit of expert counsel and guidance in preparing their submissions.

Mr. President, the first suggestion for a consumer's counsel at the Federal level was made by the late Senator Walter F. George in proposed amendments to what became the Tariff Act of 1930, and in hearing testimony and debates to that act in 1932. Senator George's idea was finally enacted as part of the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act in 1935. Representative JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, wrote that he attempted to make the Consumer's Counsel "the most powerful individual connected with the administration of the act." The Consumer's Counsel was excluded from National Bituminous Coal Commission files, and had to go to court to obtain an injunction before the agency would permit him to view its records. There were consumer's representatives for various other New Deal bodies, but none attained much influence. I do not refer to this history because it weakens the case for the present bill. It provides an ample background from which the features of this bill may be evaluated in committee. And the history also shows that at least some of the strong powers with which this bill would equip the Consumer's Counsel are needed if the Office of Consumers is to perform its job. Senator DOUGLAS was Director of Consumer's Education for the NRA Consumer's Advisory Board, and he, with others who have had similar experience, could advise the committee about these features of the bill.

This bill represents a workable approach to the expression and representation of the consumer's interest. The idea of a Cabinet-level department has been abandoned, in favor of a more modest approach. The proposal makes sense in economic terms; it would rescue the regulatory agencies from policy confusion; and it could profit from our national experience with consumer's counsels at the Federal level. Senator George argued for the idea 33 years ago, and it makes sense today. We should not overlook the wise statement of Adam Smith on the subject of consumers. He wrote, in words that read well today:

> Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production; and the interest of the producer ought to be attended to only so far as may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer. The maxim is so perfectly self-evident, that it would be absurd to attempt to prove it.

It is to recognize the consumer's importance in our economy today, Mr. President, that I join with Senator KEFAUVER in introducing this bill today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The speech of the Senator from New Hampshire is one of the most persuasive that has been made on the necessity for the establishment of an Office of Consumers. Such an agency is to be established not only for the protection of the individual consumer, but also because the Federal Government is the largest consumer, and a more reasonable price—particularly in certain concentrated areas, as the Senator has pointed out—could consequently result in saving the Government very substantial sums.

I am much encouraged by the Senator's cosponsorship of this bill. I know his support will materially aid in its passage.

It has been my pleasure to know the Senator from New Hampshire since he was mayor of Laconia, N.H., in 1952. In all his efforts he has always fought for the interests of the average American, the average consumer. Again I thank him for his support.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to again be associated with the senior Senator from Tennessee in sponsoring legislation to give effective representation to the American consumer in the councils of government. I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee for his unceasing efforts to gain for the consumer a voice in the formulation of governmental policies which affect his economic interests.

The President, in his Consumer Message to the Congress in March of 1962, said of the consumer:

> They are the largest group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But, they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized and whose views are not often heard.

To carry out the Presidential recommendations on representation of consumer interest there was established in July of 1962 a Consumers Council, under the Council of Economic Advisers. The

Consumers Council's function is to advise the Council of Economic Advisers on the various facets of governmental activity which relate to the consumer. The establishment of the Consumers Council was a great step forward in filling the need for consumer representation at the Federal level. Since the appointment of the 12-member Council, under the chairmanship of Dean Helen G. Conoyer, they have been very active in their role as advisers to the Government on issues of broad economic policy, on governmental programs for consumer protection and on needed improvements in the flow of consumer material to the public. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Council members for their unselfish service in advancing consumer interests.

I do not wish to detract from the fine service which has been rendered by the Council, but I believe that their effectiveness is greatly limited—due to the fact that their role is only in an advisory capacity. The bill, being introduced today, goes beyond the advisory role and would establish an Office of Consumers as an independent agency of the executive branch.

The Office would be granted legislative authority to effectively promote and protect the interests of the consumer in his purchase and use of goods and services made available to him by the American economy. This legislation merits the very serious attention of Congress and I would hope it receives long overdue congressional approval.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] in the excellent bills which they have introduced to protect consumers. The Senator from Tennessee has introduced a bill to establish an Office of Consumer Counsel. The Senator from Michigan has introduced a bill to provide "truth in packaging." Both bills are very desirable and are equally in harmony with the consumer protection message which the President of the United States sent to Congress last year .

I should like to speak on a bill which I have introduced, S. 750, or what is popularly known as the truth-in-lending bill.

The truth-in-lending bill is both a simple and modest measure. It requires that all lenders and credit sellers fully disclose to the consumer the cost of using credit in an accurate and uniform manner. Anyone engaged in the business of extending credit at the retail level would have to disclose, in writing, the costs of credit to the borrower before the credit transaction is signed. That written statement would include the total amount of the finance charge expressed in dollars and cents and the percentage which this charge would bear to the total amount to be financed, expressed as a simple annual rate on the unpaid balance.

For example, if the consumer sought from his local bank a 1-year $500 loan, payable in equal monthly installments of $44.06 each, the bank would be required, if such were the facts, to tell the borrower that the finance charge is $30 and the interest rate, therefore, 12 percent.

Let us consider another example. If a consumer wished to finance for 36 months, with a monthly payment of $68.33, the $2,000 due on his new car through an automobile dealer, the dealer would be required, if such were the fact, to tell the customer that the finance charge would be $460, and the interest rate would be 15 percent.

Thus, if the bill were enacted, every borrower would know in advance before signing on the dotted line the two indispensable measures of the price of credit—the dollar cost and the interest or the finance rate. That would enable the consumer to compare accurately the cost of alternative credit plans, and to shop as wisely for credit as for other items in the family budget.

Mr. President, we have held hearings on the bill and its predecessors during at least 2 previous years. Toward the end of the hearings of 1960, we had printed a series of advertisements of various lending firms taken from newspapers all over the country. Those advertisements showed what those who made personal loans, plus those who sold on the installment plan, were charging.

That information is contained on pages 865 through 896 of the 1960 hearings. We have picked out a few of those advertisements at random. I have had my assistant, Mr. Lindley, compute the true annual interest rates charged by these companies. I start by quoting from an advertisement of the Union Trust Co. of the District of Columbia which is contained on page 870 of the hearings to which I have referred. The Union Trust Co. has stated the amount of a note to be signed—$360. The monthly deposit or payment would be $20, payable for 18 months. The amount disbursed to the borrower would be $322.20. Therefore the total amount paid for the credit—the interest charge—would be $37.80.

It is sometimes said that finding the annual rate of interest is difficult. I hold in my hand a circular slide rule which has been devised by the Credit Union National Association Supply Cooperative of Madison, Wis. This device shows the interest rate on this particular loan is 14½ percent.

It is interesting to note that there is an 8-percent usury law in the District of Columbia, which provides that no rate of interest shall be above 8 percent on such loans. I have addressed a letter to the District Commissioners asking whether this practice of the Union Trust Co. charging 14½ percent—which, I may say, seems to be universal among banks in the District—is not in violation of the usury laws. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me it clearly is in violation of the usury laws. Fourteen and one-half percent is greater than 8 percent. The District Commissioners seem to be in some confusion as a result of my inquiry. They have referred the question to the Corporation Counsel of the city. He has not yet rendered an opinion, although he has had these facts before him for many days. I now call upon the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to answer my inquiry and not to delay responding any longer.

The interest rate that the Union Trust Co. is charging is relatively modest, compared to interest rates charged by other lenders. If one goes down the list of credit charges of this bank, one finds interest rates almost uniformly at 14 or 14½ percent, indicating that the monthly payments are set so as to obtain a 14-percent return.

For example, if a man signs a note for $1,440, for which he is to pay $80 a month for 18 months, he will be given only $1,288.80. The interest rate, once again, is 14½ percent.

We could go through the entire list, and each would come out 14½ or 14 percent, indicating that the monthly rates must be set in order to yield a 14- to 14½-percent return to the bank.

Let us consider an advertisement from the Cincinnati Post & Times Star, of a local finance corporation. It says that if a person received $118.07 in cash he would make 24 monthly payments of $7. He would pay a total of $168 in return for a cash loan of $118. He would repay the loan over a period of 24 months. The interest rate would be 36 percent.

Let us consider an advertisement from the Jersey Journal of Jersey City of February 4, 1960. A borrower would pay $18 a month for 24 months. He would get $322.64. They do not tell him what the rate of interest is, but by using the circular slide rule I can tell what the rate of interest is. It is 30 percent.

Let us consider an advertisement from south of the Mason-Dixon line, from the Charlotte Observer of February 8, 1960. The borrower would be credited with $573.15, but he would pay $40 a month for 18 months. He would pay back $720, spread over 18 months, in order to get $573.15. He would pay $146.85 in finance charges. That comes to an interest rate of 30 percent.

No one can quarrel with these figures, because they are in the advertisements and they can be computed with a circular slide rule. It does not take very long for us to do it. The interest rates can be easily computed.

Let us consider an item in the Dallas Times-Herald of Dallas, Tex., February 2, 1960. This is an advertisement by a local Finance & Thrift Corp., in Dallas. The payments would be $11 a month for 24 months. A consumer would have to pay back $264 to get $214 in cash. That is a finance charge of $50. Over the period of 2 years, that represents an interest rate of 21 percent.

We shall submit at a later date for the RECORD some advertisements from all over the country, to show the real interest rates involved in the amounts stated in the advertisements. I merely say at this time that so far as the past record is concerned we found, in the case of secondhand car dealers, that the rate of interest is seldom less than 24 percent, that it is commonly from 26 to 30 percent, that sometimes it is 60 percent, that occasionally it is 100 percent; and we found one case of it being 180 percent.

I wish to make clear that the truth-in-lending bill, S. 750, would not in any way control credit or regulate the terms of credit. Our objective is merely to strip away the disguises which frequently hide or distort the true price of credit. What objection can there be to truth? What legitimate objection can there be to truth?

Mr. President, for the past 3 years the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I happen to be the chairman, held extensive hearings on various truth-in-lending bills. The subcommittee explored current consumer credit practices in depth and in detail. The record of the hearings encompasses thousands of pages. It includes testimony from representatives of almost every segment of the credit industry, from most Government departments, from labor unions, from consumer groups, and from many distinguished experts in the field of consumer credit.

This investigation of current consumer practices has conclusively demonstrated that the average consumer often is either unaware of or badly misinformed about the credit charges and interest rates he pays for various types of credit. For example, Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board—a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and a former president of the New York Stock Exchange—in supporting the proposed legislation to require full disclosure of interest rates, admitted during the public hearings that he was confused by the practices now used by lenders and vendors in stating their interest or finance rates on consumer credit transactions.

If this puzzles the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and a former president of the New York Stock Exchange—what effect would it have on the average housewife, who is not a $100,000-a-year expert, but merely making ends meet on the $90-a-week income of her husband?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Back in 1958 the subcommittee of which I am a member established that high interest rates are frequently charged in connection with sales of new automobiles, a subject which the Senator has been discussing. What justification has been given for such interest rates?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think we have ever heard a real justification.

It has been said that if people knew how much hidden interest they were paying they would not buy, and therefore "the truth" about credit costs would be bad for business. This reminds me of the objection which was made to the Securities & Exchange Commission Act when it was proposed, which was that if the issuing houses were required to tell the truth about the stocks and bonds they sold it would ruin the securities business.

I think this is a grave charge, if true. I do not like to believe it is true. I like to believe the truth is a rock, and that if one founds his life on the truth, he will not founder.

But if a business is founded on falsehood, the rains will descend, the storms will blow, the winds will beat, and that house will fall, because it will not be founded upon a rock.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a matter of fact, while the requirement by the SEC for presenting truthful information still has many shortcomings, it nonetheless has eliminated a great deal of untruth in connection with the sale of bonds and stocks, and generally had a wholesome effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has improved the character of security dealers and has protected the purchasers of stocks and bonds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And they would be the first to say so, I think.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think so, except at election time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Are these interest rates sometimes higher than usury rates prohibited by States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Commonly, they are. I am not campaigning for usury laws, but it is interesting that, for example, in the District of Columbia, the real interest rate seems to be almost twice what the legal maximum is. I think we should decide whether we should repeal the usury laws—which may be justifiable—or enforce the laws. Again I call on the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to give an opinion on the legality of interest rates charged in Washington, D.C.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I remember that some years ago the late Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] initiated legislation for truthful information in connection with the sale of automobiles, including the basic price, cost of extras such as radios, the transportation charge and so on. It, too, was objected to on the grounds that it would cause confusion and hurt sales. Yet, has it not been the Senator's experience that this has proved to be a wholesome measure for the automobile industry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it has been a wholesome thing for the American automobile industry. This principle of truth should be carried into the finance industry. There the door has been slammed in the face of the purchaser, who often does not know what the finance charge is and almost never knows what the rate of interest is.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Some have said such a law would require too much detail about insignificant matters in order to bring out the truth about interest rates. But a personal experience suggests the opposite. Some days ago I signed a small mortgage to buy an interest in my sister's real estate, and a bank issued a mortgage. A list was attached of the cost of the title examination, the registration charge, and the appraiser's fee. All the items were itemized. I felt more confident about having an itemization of all these charges so that I could understand what they were. If all of this itemization can be made on a transaction of this kind, why should it prove to be particularly difficult or complicated to merely show the true interest charges?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would not be complicated at all. The Federal Housing Administration has taken the opportunity to tell buyers of houses with FHA mortgages what the costs would be. Their publications disclose the mortgage interest rate, the time period of payments, the monthly payments, and the total finance charges over the period of the loan.

I ask unanimous consent that the publication of the Federal Housing Administration be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. It also indicates the same information for title I home improvement loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Federal Housing Administration is providing for the consumer a complete and truthful statement of the costs of housing credit.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In making payments on home mortgages, usually information is furnished showing how much of the payment is applied toward interest and how much toward the principal. One knows how much he is paying in interest and how much he is paying on the debt. This is of definite financial value to the taxpayer, since, under present tax laws, the amount paid in interest can be taken as a deduction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The table to which I have referred shows, for example, that the total interest payment on a $10,000 loan for 20 years, at 5½ percent, amounts to $6,507 with an FHA insurance premium of $592. In other words, for a $10,000 loan on a house, the home buyer would pay back $16,507 plus the insurance premium.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield further, for is it not impossible for a taxpayer to ascertain how much he might charge off by way of interest if the interest were lumped together with the rest of the monthly payment? Does that not effectively deprive the taxpayer of the ability to take a legitimate tax deduction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a difficult thing. A bank largely owns the house I occupy. I have great difficulty in ascertaining how much I am paying on the principal and how much for interest.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am in the same situation with respect to a little house I own on Lookout Mountain in Tennessee. I deal with an insurance company which supplies a table indicating how much I pay on interest and how much on principal. If such a breakdown is not made, how can the taxpayer know how much he can deduct as interest?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us consider an automobile. Frequently the purchaser is told his payments will be x dollars a month for so many months on the car, but he is not told how much he is paying for the car and how much for finance charges, and what the charge is in terms of an annual interest rate, on the outstanding balance.

I hold in my hand an advertisement from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, which states:

> You will jump for joy in purchasing a 1963 Falcon, $99 down, $58.99 a month, for 36 months.

But it does not tell how much of the payment will go for the car and how much for the finance charges in order to ascertain what the true interest rate is. The buyer might not jump for joy if he knew the complete truth.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should think that not only would the purchaser be justified in seeing that he is paying a reasonable interest rate, but in having a complete breakdown so he would know how to make a tax deduction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

I may say, in justice to the real estate lending industry, that their skirts are much cleaner than many other lenders. They commonly indicate the real interest rate. Sometimes they do not like to tell what the total amount will be in finance charges over a 15-, 20-, or 25-year period, because it is great. At 5½ percent, on a $10,000 loan for 20 years, the total amount of the finance charge comes to $6,159 on the original indebtedness. On a 35-year loan it becomes $11,151, or the purchaser pays more in interest than the original amount of the obligation.

Those who extend credit for long periods of time do not like to state the total dollar charge. Those who sell for short periods sometimes are willing to state the total dollar charge but do not want to state the true interest rate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has been carrying on a very vigorous effort for favorable consideration of the bill, against considerable obstacles. I am interested in knowing how the matter is coming along.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus far we have had little success so far. We have had little success for the reasons which I have already stated. The interests of the consumers are diffused and scattered, whereas some of the selling interests and the lending interests are concentrated and powerful.

There is the usual battalion opposed to us: the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the automobile dealers, and, I suspect, very soon the American Medical Association will get into the act as well as the American Farm Bureau Federation. This is a contest between a group of unorganized consumers on the one hand, and a small concentrated army of lenders and sellers on the other; and in this contest the consumers go down just as the Indians of Mexico and Peru went down before the Spaniards under Cortez and Pizarro.

Mr. KEFAUVER. When I first came to Congress there was a very fine old man by the name of Ben Marsh, who was a one-man lobby for the people. He has now passed to his reward. Does the Senator think that the Senate needs more Ben Marshes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We need more interest on the part of the consumer, without question. This is an extremely important matter, because we now have between $63 billion and $64 billion outstanding in short- and intermediate-term consumer debt, of which more than $48 billion is in installment debt, and more than $15 billion is in noninstallment debt. In addition, there is about $168 billion in debts on nonfarm homes. That makes a total of about $230 billion in the form of consumer debt.

Moreover, the personal debt of the country is rising more rapidly than is the national debt, and in a few years, at present rates, the personal debt will be much greater than the national debt. A great many people bewail the size of the national debt, but they seem to think that this huge and still rapidly growing consumer debt is a fine thing. All I wish to say is that the borrower and the consumer are entitled to know the truth about what they are paying.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I commend the Senator on his efforts. I certainly hope that as the issue is better known throughout the country, he will receive more and more support.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. The interest charged on the consumer debt is much greater than the interest paid on the national debt.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the Senator does not know what the interest on the consumer debt is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; we do not know what it is exactly. I personally believe that it is well over $20 billion. However, I have very conservative associates who sometimes use a slightly smaller figure. I personally believe it is more than $20 billion a year. If it is more than $20 billion a year, it is more than twice as large as the interest charge on the national debt.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the consumer debt is $230 billion, $20 billion would be only about 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A little less than 10 percent. I believe it is more than $20 billion. Let us take, for example, so-called department store revolving credit, which is very popular and is being more and more used by mail-order stores. The normal interest rate is 1½ percent a month. That is equivalent to 18 percent a year. Therefore, we ask, why not call it 18 percent a year also, instead of just saying that it is only 1½ percent a month?

The formula which we have devised for revolving credit is identical with that which is used for revolving credit on a monthly basis. It is possible to translate the monthly figure into the yearly figure by multiplying it by 12.

I believe we owe a debt to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] for aiding in this cause. I merely say that the charge which is made, that the interest rate is too complicated to compute when one is given the amount of the original indebtedness and the number of months, and the amount of the debt each month is utter nonsense.

In Boston, for instance, there is a company, the Financial Publishing Co., which prepares tables which translate these three variables in the interest rates. We have reprinted that pamphlet in some of the hearings on previous truth-in-lending bills.

The savings banks of New York have a little interest rate slide rule, which costs a few pennies, in which amount borrowed is on one line, and then the monthly payment is on the other line. And then in boxes below it will automatically disclose the rate of interest. A person can learn to use this slide rule in a few seconds. There is a more elaborate circular slide rule, prepared by the Credit Union National Association, with which it is possible to obtain the interest rate, and do it very simply, in a minute or less, as has been demonstrated on the floor.

As a matter of fact, the lending concerns already know what the rate of interest is, because they will fix the interest charges the monthly payments and the total number of months in order to yield a given or predetermined rate of interest. For instance, let us say that the amount to be loaned is a thousand dollars for 12 months at 24 percent yield. The lender then computes the total interest charge to assessed in dollars and cents $130 and the monthly payment $94.17.

Therefore, in the background of every lending transaction there is always a predetermining interest rate. However, it is under the table. It is never brought out and shown to the borrower or buyer. We believe in bringing it out in the open. That is all we ask.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HART. Like other Senators, I have been struck again by the ability of the Senator from Illinois to make understandable a subject which many of us, even when we were in the classroom, found difficult to understand and not very exciting. Perhaps as we grow older, the significance of interest rates and family budgets is heightened, and our interest in the subject increases, but generally our capacity to understand does not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Michigan is altogether too modest. I am sure he understands the subject very well. However, if he does not, he is in the company of 99.999 percent of the American public, including the man regarded as greatest financial expert in the United States, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. HART. I derive comfort from the 99.99 extended figure which the Senator has suggested, because there are days when I recognize I do not feel able to face up to some of the technicians who insist that the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois would somehow overwhelm the major financial institutions and substantial merchandising enterprises. They look me in the eye and say, "We could not live with this. It is impossible at a given time to tell." Now I find a rather inexpensive device, being held in the hand of the Senator from Illinois, which will permit a resolution of the question of what the rate is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hereby extend an invitation to anyone to come to my office, and we will fix a day certain for it, when either I or my assistant, Mr. Lindley, can be asked to translate the figures lenders disclose into true interest rates.

We will offer Coca-Cola and cookies as a bait to try to get some people to come. We invite the whole consumer finance industry to come, and also the banks, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the retail merchants, the automobile dealers and even, if they wish, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the American Medical Association. The AMA can come too, because they will probably be in the act before we finish.

Mr. HART. Coca-Cola stock will skyrocket on the market if it is assumed that such an invitation will be accepted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We will also have true interest rate tables ready for them to read.

Mr. HART. On a serious note, I thank the Senator from Illinois for the continued leadership he offers those of us who would like to see the day arrive when the consumer in America—as he mentioned, that includes most of us—will be enabled readily to ascertain the rate which he is being privileged to pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I serve as a private in his army on truth in packaging, too. Our subcommittee has voted to hold out-of-town hearings on the truth-in-lending bill. We are having a little trouble, which I shall not discuss today; but I expect that in a short time we will hold hearings on the bill. If the Senator from Michigan would wish us to do so, we could hold hearings in Michigan. We hope that hearings may be held in the State of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, either at Pittsburgh or Philadelphia.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Illinois is always welcome in Michigan, officially or unofficially, in a partisan setting or a public business setting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We shall go out as defenders of the truth.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the truth-in-lending bill and as a member of the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is so able a chairman, I congratulate him on the splendid speech he has made this afternoon on the subject of interest rates and truth in lending. I wish him every success in his efforts to have the bill reported to the Senate by the committee. I assure him of my unqualified support.

EXHIBIT 1

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION: MONTHLY PAYMENTS TO FINANCE HOME PURCHASES AND HOME IMPROVEMENTS—A GUIDE FOR HOME BUYERS AND OWNERS

INTRODUCTION

Under the FHA program home loans are obtained from private lending institutions and the homes are built by private contractors. FHA insures the private lender against loss in the event of failure on the part of the borrower to repay the loan in full, and requires that new homes be built in conformance with certain minimum property standards.

Through this system of loan insurance and the development of housing standards, FHA has established a pattern of long-term, low-interest loans and has helped to elevate the standard of housing in the United States.

Lenders, by being insured against loss, are willing to accept smaller down payments and to lend their money over a longer period of time and under circumstances where they might not otherwise be willing to invest.

This works to the benefit of the home buyer and has brought millions of people into the home buying market who might not otherwise have been able to obtain the type of loans they need.

FHA also extends these concepts to home improvements and to rental and cooperative housing projects.

To finance its operations, FHA charges an insurance premium of one-half percent per annum on the average mortgage loan balance outstanding during the year. This charge is included in the borrower's monthly payment. The FHA insurance charge for title I home improvement loans is paid by the lender.

The following information has been prepared by the FHA to serve as a basic explanation of what some typical interest and other financing costs on a home purchased or improved under the FHA system would be. It is hoped that this information will be helpful to prospective borrowers seeking to purchase or improve homes.

HOME MORTGAGE LOANS

When you borrow money to buy a home, you pay interest and other charges for using the borrowed money. These charges add to the cost of buying your home. It is important, then, to make your arrangement for a home loan as carefully as you would arrange for any other large purchase.

Shop around and get the facts from various lending institutions, just as you shopped around and got the facts from various sellers before you selected the home you wanted.

Before entering into a contract for the purchase of a home you should have satisfactory answers to these important questions:

1. How much do I need to borrow to buy the home?
2. How long should I take to repay the loan?
3. How much is the loan going to cost me?

If you're able to make a larger downpayment, you can manage with a smaller mortgage loan; but if you can afford only a small downpayment, you will of course require a larger loan. You will save interest by borrowing as little as you can and repaying the loan in the shortest possible time.

For instance, if you borrow $10,000 at 5¼ percent interest, the monthly payment to principal and interest is $12.10 less if the loan is made for 30 years than if it is made for 20 years; but the total amount of interest you would pay in 30 years would be $3,669.49 more than you would pay in 20 years. In other words, a 30-year loan would cost you about 60 percent more in total interest than a 20-year loan would cost.

Many families are able to own their homes and raise their living standards only by using long-term loans with low monthly payments. But the interest costs on long-term loans can become very high. So you should weigh carefully the relative advantage of a longer or shorter term loan in your particular circumstances.

The following tables show the monthly payments and total cost of interest and mortgage insurance for some typical loans at 5¼ and 5½ percent interest:

MONTHLY PAYMENT TO PRINCIPAL, INTEREST, AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUM, AND TOTAL MONTHLY PAYMENT AT 5¼ PERCENT

Term of loan	$10,000			$15,000			$20,000		
	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment
20 years	$67.40	$4.11	$71.51	$101.10	$6.17	$107.27	$134.80	$8.22	$143.02
25 years	60.00	4.13	64.13	90.00	6.19	96.19	120.00	8.26	128.26
30 years	55.30	4.14	49.44	82.95	6.21	89.16	110.60	8.28	118.88
35 years	52.10	4.15	56.25	78.15	6.22	84.37	104.20	8.29	112.49
40 years [2]	49.90	4.15	54.05	74.85	6.23	81.08	99.80	8.30	108.10

TOTAL COST OF INTEREST AT 5¼ PERCENT AND TOTAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Term of loan	$10,000 loan			$15,000 loan			$20,000 loan		
	Interest	Insurance premium	Total	Interest	Insurance premium	Total	Interest	Insurance premium	Total
20 years	$6,169	$588	$6,757	$9,254	$882	$10,136	$12,339	$1,175	$13,514
25 years	7,954	757	8,711	11,930	1,136	13,066	15,907	1,515	17,422
30 years	9,839	937	10,776	14,758	1,405	16,163	19,678	1,873	21,551
35 years	11,851	1,129	12,980	17,777	1,693	19,470	23,702	2,258	25,960
40 years [2]	13,931	1,327	15,258	20,896	1,990	22,886	27,862	2,653	30,515

See footnotes at end of table.

MONTHLY PAYMENT TO PRINCIPAL, INTEREST, AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUM, AND TOTAL MONTHLY PAYMENT AT 5½ PERCENT

Term of loan	$10,000			$15,000			$20,000		
	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Mortgage insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment
20 years	$68.80	$4.11	$72.91	$103.20	$6.17	$109.37	$137.60	$8.23	$145.83
25 years	61.50	4.13	65.63	92.25	6.20	98.45	123.00	8.26	131.26
30 years	56.80	4.14	60.94	85.20	6.21	91.41	113.60	8.28	121.88
35 years	53.80	4.15	57.95	80.70	6.22	86.92	107.60	8.30	115.90
40 years [2]	51.60	4.15	55.75	77.40	6.23	83.63	103.20	8.31	111.51

TOTAL COST OF INTEREST AT 5½ PERCENT AND TOTAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Term of loan	$10,000 loan			$15,000 loan			$20,000 loan		
	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment
20 years	$6,507	$592	$7,099	$9,761	$887	$10,648	$13,184	$1,014	$14,198
25 years	8,392	763	9,155	12,587	1,145	13,732	16,783	1,526	18,309
30 years	10,429	948	11,377	15,643	1,422	17,065	20,857	1,896	22,753
35 years	12,472	1,134	13,606	18,707	1,701	20,408	24,943	2,268	27,211
40 years [2]	14,728	1,339	16,067	22,092	2,008	24,100	29,456	2,678	32,134

[1] Monthly premium during 1st year of loan at the rate of ½ of 1 percent per annum on average outstanding balance during year.

[2] Maximum mortgage term limited to 35 years except that the term may be increased to not more than 40 years when authorized by the Commissioner.

NOTE.—Taxes and hazard insurance are added to the monthly payments but not shown in these charts.

Mortgage insurance premiums collected by FHA under section 203 (the regular home mortgage insurance program) are paid into the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. Under certain conditions, homeowners may receive dividends from the fund when their mortgages are paid in full.

Discounts

The rate of interest that lenders can charge on mortgages insured by FHA is lower at times than the yield required by lenders in the market. For this reason, lenders sometimes discount FHA mortgages; that is, they charge a certain number of points (a point is a dollar per hundred dollars of mortgage amount) to make up the difference between the FHA interest rate and the yield required on the market. The number of points charged varies in different places at different times, and among different lenders.

Because FHA regulations prohibit the home buyer from paying a discount, the builder of the house or the person selling it may be required to pay the amount. FHA, of course, cannot control the charges that a lender collects from anyone other than the buyer whose mortgage is insured.

FHA regulations do allow the buyer to pay an initial service charge, if the lender requires it. The charge cannot be more than 1 percent of the mortgage amount if the house is already built, or 2½ percent if the house is to be built.

Other costs

Other costs to the borrower include the FHA application fee, recording fees and taxes, title examination, credit report, and other closing costs that vary from one locality to another.

HOME IMPROVEMENT LOANS

FHA offers several insurance programs to aid homeowners in the financing of home improvements. This explanatory sheet does not present the terms for financing improvements which involve refinancing a mortgage or the use of an "open end" device. However, the following tables show the cost to the borrower of financing improvements with a section 203(k) or section 220(h) loan or a title I loan.

Section 203(k) and 220(h) loans have the same terms: 3- to 20-year amortization period, maximum amount of $10,000 per family unit, and a 6-percent maximum interest rate plus the one-half-percent FHA insurance premium. A 220(h) loan is for use in urban renewal areas only.

FHA charges an application fee on these loans. The loan is secured by a recorded lien against the property. The lender may require the borrower to pay a 1-percent closing charge as well as fees and taxes for recording the security, charges for credit report, title examination, and other closing charges that vary from one locality to another.

In general the minimum amount on these loans is $1,000 under section 220(h) and $2,500 under section 203(k).

Below are some typical loan amounts, amortization periods, and payments to principal, interest, and FHA insurance premium under sections 203(k) and 220(h):

Secs. 203(K) and 220(H)—Monthly payment to principal, interest at 6 percent per annum, and insurance premium

Amount of advance	5-year loan			10-year loan			15-year loan			20-year loan		
	Principal and interest	Insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment	Principal and interest	Insurance premium [1]	Total monthly payment
$1,000	$19.34	$0.38	$19.72	$11.11	$0.40	$11.51	$8.44	$0.41	$8.85	$7.17	$0.41	$7.58
$2,500	48.35	.96	49.31	27.78	1.01	28.79	21.10	1.02	22.12	17.93	1.03	18.96
$6,000	116.04	2.30	118.34	66.66	2.41	69.07	50.64	2.45	53.09	43.02	2.47	45.49
$10,000	193.40	3.83	197.23	111.10	4.02	115.12	84.40	4.09	88.49	71.70	4.12	75.82

[1] Monthly premium during 1st year of loan at the rate of ½ of 1 percent per annum on average outstanding balance during the year.

Total cost of interest and insurance premiums

Amount of advance	5-year loan			10-year loan			15-year loan			20-year loan		
	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment	Interest	Insurance premium	Total payment
$1,000	$160	$13	$173	$332	$28	$360	$519	$43	$562	$718	$60	$778
$2,500	400	33	433	830	69	899	1,297	108	1,405	1,795	150	1,945
$6,000	959	80	1,039	1,991	166	2,157	3,113	259	3,372	4,309	359	4,668
$10,000	1,599	133	1,732	3,319	277	3,596	5,188	432	5,620	7,182	598	7,780

Title I provides a limited home improvement program with a maximum loan amount of $3,500 and a maximum term of 60 months. The lender is allowed to charge a discount of not more than $5 per $100 per year on the first $2,500 of the loan and $4 per $100 per year on the amount above $2,500. The $5 or $4 discount should not be interpreted as 5-percent or 4-percent interest. The table below shows some typical loans, payments, and costs under title I and the equivalent interest rate for the amount of discount shown:

Title I property improvement loans with equal monthly payments to principal and interest

Amount of advance	Maximum discount per year per $100	12-month loan		24-month loan		36-month loan		48-month loan		60-month loan		Total cost of interest				
		Monthly payment	Equivalent interest rate (percent)	Monthly payment	Equivalent interest rate (percent)	Monthly payment	Equivalent interest rate (percent)	Monthly payment	Equivalent interest rate (percent)	Monthly payment	Equivalent interest rate (percent)	12-month loan	24-month loan	36-month loan	48-month loan	60-month loan
$500	$5	$43.86	9.58	$22.95	9.43	$15.97	9.30	$12.49	9.18	$10.40	9.05	$26	$51	$75	$99	$123
$1,000	5	87.72	9.58	45.89	9.43	31.94	9.30	24.97	9.18	20.79	9.05	53	101	150	198	247
$2,500	5	219.30	9.58	114.71	9.43	79.85	9.30	62.42	9.18	51.96	9.05	132	253	374	496	617
$3,500	[1] 5	306.11	9.01	159.72	8.89	110.93	8.77	86.53	8.65	71.89	8.54	173	333	493	653	813

[1] And $4.

EXHIBIT 2

A STRANGE DISCRIMINATION—THE UNIQUE PATTERN OF RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES TO ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, to ship an automobile from Pontiac, Mich., to Tokyo will cost $7.83 per hundred pounds to send that car to Seattle for transshipment.

However, if the same car is bound for Alaska on the same train at the same time, the railroad freight charges to Seattle will be $10 per hundred pounds—or more than $2 more per hundred pounds, or more than $72 more for shipment of a four-door Ford sedan to Alaska than the cost of shipment of the same car destined for Tokyo.

I call to the attention of my good friends from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART], that a reduction in the costs of shipments of automobiles for sale in Alaska might make it possible to reduce the number of surplus automobiles, over a million of which are in dealers' warehouses, if these automobiles could be sold in greater quantities in Alaska.

If a manufacturer of agricultural implements in Chicago, Ill., wishes to ship them to Guam, the freight rate to Seattle would be $2.17 per hundred pounds for a 30,000-pound shipment.

However, I am sure the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a distinguished economist, will be concerned that a shipment of the same weight of agricultural implements to Alaska will incur freight charges of $3.28, or more than $1 more per hundred pounds when shipped to Alaska. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] will, I am confident, also be interested in this and in the fact that a smaller shipment to Alaska will increase in transportation cost to as much as $4.48 per hundred pounds.

The Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. McCARTHY] will be interested to know that manufacturers of agricultural implements in Minneapolis can ship their products to Hong Kong for $2.03 per hundred pounds.

If they wish to ship a similar order of implements for use in the Matanuska Valley of Alaska the freight cost to Seattle would range from $3.12 to $4.27 per hundred pounds.

My distinguished colleagues from Indiana, [Mr. BAYH and Mr. HARTKE] will be interested in the fact that a 40,000-pound shipment of electric cable manufactured in Hammond will travel to Seattle for $2.08 per hundred pounds if it is destined for Japan or Hawaii; but the same 40,000-pound shipment to Alaska will require payment of $2.65 per hundred pounds in railroad freight rates to Seattle. Further, the cost of shipment to Alaska will advance to as much as $4.65 per hundred pounds for a smaller shipment of 18,000 pounds.

The same shipment of electric cable from New Orleans, La., to Samoa would cost $1.95 per hundred pounds for shipment from New Orleans to Seattle. But I invite the attention of the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG] to the fact that if this electric cable is to be used in Alaska, the cost of shipment to Seattle would range from $2.06 to $4.52 per hundred pounds.

From the State of Oklahoma shipments of canned or preserved foodstuffs destined for Manila will cost $1.38 for freight charges on a 60,000-pound shipment. However, the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON and Mr. MONRONEY] will find it of interest that the same shipment destined for Alaska will incur freight charges to Seattle of from $1.58 per hundred pounds to $1.83 per hundred pounds.

In the case of shipments of Philip Morris cigarettes from Louisville, Ky., my good friends the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON] will wish to be apprised of the fact that it will cost 28 cents more per hundred pounds for railroad freight charges for those cigarettes to be used in Alaska than if they are finally destined for Hong Kong, Okinawa, or Honolulu.

Likewise, the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JORDAN] may be interested to know that shipments of Lucky Strike cigarettes from Raleigh will require payment of freight charges of 35 cents more per hundred pounds if they are bound for Anchorage than if they are going to other ports in the Pacific Ocean area.

Manufacturers of dry goods, such as sheets, pillowcases, and dress materials originating at Sylacauga, Ala., La Grange, Ga., and Spartanburg, S.C., can ship their products more cheaply to Oceania, Aukland, Tokyo or Okinawa than is the case with shipment of the same items to Alaska.

I invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. THURMOND], to the fact that a reduction in transportation costs of the dry goods manufacturer by their constituents for sale in Alaska would greatly expand the market for these important items.

Also, miscellaneous shipments of freight from Little Rock, Ark.; Chicago, Ill.; Shreveport, La.; Vicksburg, Miss.; Kansas City, Mo.; Columbus, Ohio; or from El Paso and San Antonio, Tex., will cost more for shipment to Alaska via Seattle than if the same cargo is destined to Pacific points other than Alaska.

Even beer from Kansas City, St. Louis, and Milwaukee costs more in railroad freight charges if it is destined for Alaska than if it is going to other ports in the Pacific. I am sure the Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG] and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON and Mr. PROXMIRE], will take full notice of the fact that Alaskans might provide their constituents with an important market for their famous products if a reduction in freight rates could be accomplished, thus reducing retail prices in Alaska.

To recite all the cases in which this disparity exists would be comparable with reading a mail order catalog into the RECORD. Whether the item is structural steel from Birmingham, Ala., or from Hutchinson, Kans., or Youngstown, Ohio, or paper napkins from Minnesota, it costs more to ship it to Alaska than to other parts of the Pacific Ocean area.

Manufacturers of all these, and other products, must wonder why this disparity in rates should exist, a disparity which constitutes an unjustified hindrance to the expansion of sales in Alaska.

They must wonder why and want an end to a situation in which substantially higher freight charges are imposed by the railroads on shipments of commodities bound for Alaska than are charged on shipments of the same items shipped the same day, in the same freight cars, but destined for Tahiti, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Manila, or Hawaii.

It is more than a nuisance—it is a rank discrimination against Alaska and those manufacturers who would supply our consumers.

The cause of this discriminatory rate pattern lies in the fact that, with the sanction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the transcontinental railroads carrying cargo to the port of Seattle, may charge the higher, domestic rates for goods destined for ports in Alaska than the lower import-export rates allowed for shipments to other ports in the Pacific Ocean area.

A look at the area to which the preferential, export-import rates apply reveals immediately the absurdity of this practice of rate determination.

The part of the world which receives favored treatment through application of export-import, rather than domestic rates includes all those locations: First, west of the 170th meridian, west longitude and east of the 30th meridian, east longitude; second, in Oceania on and east of the 170th meridian, west longitude; third, on the west coasts of Mexico, Central America, or South America; and fourth, in certain instances, points in the State of Hawaii. When this arbitrarily demarcated area is located on a chart of the Pacific Ocean it will be seen that virtually all lands touching the Pacific Ocean are included within the low-rate region except Alaska and the west coast of Canada.

It is of interest to note that much of this vast area engages in no commerce with the United States of any significance. For example, no trade now exists between Communist China and the United States. However, if such trade should be resumed, this area would be entitled to a break on transportation costs not allowed the citizens of the State of Alaska. There are thousands of islands in the Pacific Ocean so unimportant to American commerce as to be without significance. Yet the people living there are entitled to lower transportation costs on the goods they receive from the United States—in the isolated cases in which they are customers—than the people of Alaska.

The only portion of Alaska lying within the magic line is the Aleutian Island chain—an area of negligible commercial importance in comparison with the rest of the State. With a population of only a few score people and no ports, the commerce of this part of Alaska is of no consequence in comparison with that of the rest of the State. On a comparison, then, with geographical areas within the preferred area, it would seem there is ample justification for inclusion of Alaska in that area.

Now, if the allowance of export-import rates rather than domestic rates on rail shipments has any relationship to a need for connecting water transportation to port of final destination, then Alaska should certainly qualify for this privilege.

Obviously, the Alaska transportation pattern is in no way analagous to that of other States which bear the domestic rate for railroad freight shipments. Alaska, dependent as it is on water transportation for 90 percent of all its supplies, is, for all practical purposes of transportation, as much of an island as Hawaii, Okinawa, or Guam. It is certainly as dependent on water transportation.

There are many reasons for changing this discriminatory rate pattern. Among the most important are:

First. It is costly to the U.S. Government, in its role as a major shipper to Alaska. For example, in 1959—the year for which latest figures are available—the General Services Administration shipped 16,800 tons of goods to Alaska. In 1960, the Department of Defense shipped nearly 60,000 tons to Alaska. When it is considered that the imposition of domestic railroad rates to Alaska-bound shipments loads Federal budgets with wholly unjustified costs, which must be borne by American taxpayers, there is a clear need to correct the situation.

Second. American manufacturers are limited in the conduct of commerce in Alaska.

The high costs of doing business in Alaska because of the high cost of living there have been demonstrated over and over again. The contribution to the high cost of living of high transportation costs is elementary. Transportation costs to Alaska have been scandalously high—both with respect to rail transportation and water transportation—throughout the history of the State and before that the Territory. It has long been clear that the development of a strong economy based on industrial and commercial enterprise can only take place if we can reduce the cost of living. We can lower the cost of living only if we can lower the cost of transportation. If transportation costs of goods are lowered, the cost of those commodities at retail outlets can be lowered. Hence, if the laws of economies prevail, the quantity of goods sold will increase and so will the profit of the manufacturer.

Third. It is predictable that the railroads, themselves, will benefit by a lowering of freight charges. While, as I have said, Alaska is an island, it may well become less isolated with advances we can foresee in air freight and motor trucking to our State. Lower costs of rail transportation could be counted on to minimize these competitive forces.

Fourth. As for benefits which would accrue to the State of Alaska—this goes almost without saying. Alaska's economy will never develop its potential until we find relief from our abnormally high transportation costs. The reduction of railroad freight rates represents but one step toward achieving this.

The inequities of this discriminatory rate pattern followed by the railroads have been recognized for many years. It was brought sharply to the attention of the predecessor agency of the General Services Administration in 1948 when 3,000 tons of steel moved for export to Alaska. Finding that the charges were nearly double those on similar shipments to Korea and Japan, a rate adjustment was sought and obtained from the railroads. Other adjustments have been subsequently obtained. However, these have not resulted in rates as low as the export rates ordinarily assessed, and they have not been generally applicable.

Recognizing the need for basic relief for this situation, the General Services Administration filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1955 charging the disparity in rates was unlawful and in violation of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The report of the hearing examiner on the case sustained charges of the Government, holding that the application of domestic rates for Alaska bound shipment was, indeed, unlawful. The report point out:

"Here, the service rendered by the defendants under both types of rates is the same. Under the defendant's tariffs it is possible for two cars of like traffic to move from the same origin, in the same train to Seattle, to be unloaded at the same pier and the two cars to be charged a different rate depending on the ultimate destination—Alaska or Hawaii. The defendants render no more service on traffic moving to Alaska than they do on traffic moving to Hawaii or Japan."

Unfortunately for the taxpayers who must pay the costs of Government shipments to Alaska; unfortunately for shippers who would like to sell more goods in Alaska, and most unfortunately for the beleaguered citizens of Alaska the Interstate Commerce Commission rejected the report of the hearing examiner, and with two dissents—those of Chairman Clark and Commissioner Mitchell—ruled that the domestic rates on Alaska shipments were lawful and dismissed the complaint of the General Services Administration.

The Commission refused a petition for reconsideration of its decision filed by the General Services Administration, and the GSA, having no independent authorization for appeal to the courts, was unable to carry the case further. Thus, the situation remains as it was in 1957.

Having failed to obtain a remedy from the agency having jurisdiction over the matter for the inequities in the rate setting pattern I point out today, it appears that a legislative remedy is required. Accordingly, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of my able colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] and myself a bill to establish equitable railroad freight rates which will, I hope, have the early and sympathetic consideration of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be held at the desk for 1 week to enable those Senators who wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the bill, an explanatory statement of the bill and an analysis prepared by the General Services Administration of comparative railroad freight rates for shipment to Alaska and to other destinations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested, and the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1723) to establish equitable railroad freight rates, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The text of the bill, explanatory statement, and analysis presented by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

"S. 1723

"A bill to establish equitable railroad freight rates

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by the insertion of the following subsection after section 3(1a):

"'SEC. 3(1b). It is declared to be the policy of Congress that commodities shipped to and from the State of Alaska shall pay no greater rates and charges for transportation services subject to the Interstate Commerce Act than are applicable to similar commodities, or services rendered on export or import traffic moving to or from any area adjacent to or in the Pacific Ocean. Any greater charges for such services are hereby declared to be undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage to the State of Alaska.'

"EXPLANATION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH EQUITABLE RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES DESTINED FOR ALASKA

"The purpose in introducing this bill is to abolish a discriminatory pattern of railroad freight rates. The rates in question are those charged on commodities moving to Seattle, Wash., by rail, from points of origin in the United States and finally destined for ports in Alaska.

"At present, under a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission, there is an unjustifiable disparity between the charges for railroad freight transportation of commodities destined for Alaska and those applied to shipments to all other ports in the Pacific Ocean area. Thus, it is possible for shipments of the same commodities, from the same point of origin in the United States, traveling on the same day, and, even in the same freight car, to bear different transportation charges, depending upon whether their final destination is in Alaska or some other port on the Pacific Ocean.

"Shipments of goods for consumption in Tokyo, Hong Kong, Manila, Aukland, or New Delhi will travel at low export-import freight rates, while the same shipment to Alaska will bear the heavier, domestic rate.

"The inequities of this pattern of rate discrimination have been apparent for many years. In 1955, the General Services Administration, as a major shipper to Alaska, filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission charging that the imposition of domestic rates on Alaska-bound shipments was unlawful and in violation of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act. Despite a favorable decision by the hearing examiner in the case, the Commission ruled in favor of the existing rates.

"As the General Services Administration is without authority to appeal the ICC decision to the courts, the only recourse for obtaining equitable freight rates is legislation. Hence, the attached bill will be introduced."

Statement showing that rail rates to Seattle, Wash., for movements beyond are higher to Alaska generally than to Hawaii and Japan

[Rates to Seattle, Wash., for Alaska, Hawaii, and Japan as shown apply via the same railroad routes and even in the same trains on the same date]

Rates are in cents per 100 pounds

Item	Description and origins	For movement beyond to—	To Seattle	
			Rate	Minimum weight
			Cents	*Pounds*
1	Agriculture implements, hand or other than hand, from representative points in States of—			
	Illinois: Chicago	Alaska	448	20,000
			393	24,000
			328	30,000
		Hawaii Japan	217	30,000
	Minnesota: Minneapolis	Alaska	427	20,000
			377	24,000
			312	30,000
		Hawaii Japan	203	30,000
2	Cable, electric, from representative points in the States of—			
	Indiana: Hammond	Alaska	465	18,000
			317	30,000
			265	40,000
			206	50,000
		Hawaii Japan	208	36,000
	Louisiana: New Orleans	Alaska	452	18,000
			309	30,000
			257	40,000
			206	50,000
		Hawaii Japan	195	36,000
3	Canned or preserved foodstuffs from representative points in the States of—			
	Delaware: Milford	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
	Florida: Tampa	Alaska	200	40,000
			185	60,000
			175	75,000
		Hawaii	200	40,000
		Japan	186	60,000
	Georgia: Atlanta	Alaska	196	40,000
			181	60,000
			171	75,000
		Hawaii	191	40,000
		Japan	186	60,000
	Maryland: Cambridge	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
	New Jersey: Bridgeton	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
	Oklahoma: Oklahoma City	Alaska	183	40,000
			168	60,000
			158	75,000
		Hawaii	149	40,000
		Japan	138	60,000
	Pennsylvania: Bethlehem	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
	Vermont: Burlington	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
	Virginia: Lynchburg	Alaska	241	40,000
			195	60,000
		Hawaii	235	40,000
		Japan	195	60,000
4	Cigarettes from representative points in the States of—			
	Kentucky: Louisville	Alaska	294	[1] 44,000 [2] 57,200
		Hawaii Japan	266	36,000
	North Carolina: Raleigh	Alaska	294	[1] 44,000 [2] 57,200
		Hawaii Japan	259	36,000
5	Dry goods, including sheets, pillowcases and dress goods, from representative points in the States of—			
	Alabama: Sylacauga	Alaska	398	24,000
			334	40,000
			297	60,000
		Hawaii Japan	362	24,000
	Georgia: La Grange	Alaska	414	24,000
			334	40,000
			297	60,000
		Hawaii Japan	352	24,000
5	Dry goods—Continued			
	North Carolina: Kannapolis	Alaska	449	24,000
			365	40,000
			321	60,000
		Hawaii Japan	352	24,000
	South Carolina: Spartanburg	Alaska	449	24,000
			365	40,000
			321	60,000
		Hawaii Japan	352	24,000
6	Electrical appliances including dishwashers, dryers, and washing machines, from representative points in the States of—			
	Iowa: Des Moines	Alaska	442	[1] 16,000 [2] 20,800
			411	[1] 18,000 [2] 24,000
			371	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			356	26,000
		Hawaii Japan	408	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			398	26,000
	Kentucky: Louisville	Alaska	455	[1] 16,000 [2] 20,800
			432	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			426	[1] 18,000 [2] 24,000
			416	26,000
		Hawaii Japan	373	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			358	26,000
	Maine: Portland	Alaska	534	[1] 16,000 [2] 20,800
			513	[1] 18,000 [2] 24,000
			497	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			478	26,000
		Hawaii Japan	504	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			485	26,000
	New Hampshire: Nashua	Alaska	534	[1] 16,000 [2] 20,800
			513	[1] 18,000 [2] 24,000
			497	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			478	26,000
		Hawaii Japan	504	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			485	26,000
	Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh	Alaska	491	[1] 16,000 [2] 20,800
			471	[1] 18,000 [2] 24,000
			455	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			436	26,000
		Hawaii Japan	462	[1] 18,000 [2] 22,000
			433	26,000
7	Freight, all kinds from representative points in the States of [3]—			
	Arkansas: Little Rock	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	337	30,000
	Illinois: Chicago	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	337	30,000
	Louisiana: Shreveport	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	327	30,000
	Mississippi: Vicksburg	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	320	30,000
	Missouri: Kansas City	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	327	30,000
	New York: Rome	Alaska	631	(4)
		Hawaii Japan	507	(4)
	Ohio: Columbus	Alaska	561	(4)
		Hawaii Japan	437	(4)
	Texas:			
	El Paso	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	327	30,000
	San Antonio	Alaska	461	36,000
		Hawaii Japan	327	30,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Statement showing that rail rates to Seattle, Wash., for movements beyond are higher to Alaska generally than to Hawaii and Japan—Con.

[Rates to Seattle, Wash., for Alaska, Hawaii, and Japan as shown apply via the same railroad routes and even in the same trains on the same date]

Rates are in cents per 100 pounds

Item	Description and origins	For movement beyond to—	To Seattle	
			Rate	Minimum weight
	Internal combustion engines, from representative points in the States of—		Cents	Pounds
8	Connecticut: Hartford	Alaska	512	20,000
		Hawaii Japan	260	30,000
	Michigan: Pontiac	Alaska	445	20,000
		Hawaii Japan	260	30,000
	Iron or steel viz: structural iron and steel articles, from representative points in the States of—			
9	Alabama: Birmingham	Alaska	211	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	150	80,000
	Colorado: Minnequa	Alaska	165	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	98	80,000
	Kansas: Hutchinson	Alaska	185	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	118	80,000
	Ohio: Youngstown	Alaska	229	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	152	80,000
	Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh	Alaska	229	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	152	80,000
	Rhode Island: Providence	Alaka	253	[5] 40,000 [6] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	169	80,000
	Liquor malt, including, ale, beer, porter, and stout, from representative points in the States of—			
10	Missouri: Kansas City	Alaska	256 134 120	30,000 60,000 80,000
		Hawaii Japan	129 114	60,000 80,000
	St. Louis	Alaska	271 135 120	30,000 60,000 80,000
		Hawaii Japan	129 114	60,000 80,000
	Wisconsin: Milwaukee	Alaska	303 135 120	30,000 60,000 80,000
		Hawaii Japan	129 114	60,000 80,000
	Machinery and machines, n.o.i.b.n., from representative points in the States of—			
11	Colorado: Denver	Alaska	321 297	30,000 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	195	36,000
	Louisiana: Shreveport	Alaska	401 371	30,000 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	195	36,000
	Michigan: Detroit	Alaska	421 445	30,000 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	299	36,000
	North Dakota: Grand Forks	Alaska	361 334	30,000 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	195	36,000
	Paper and paper products including napkins, toilet paper, and paper towels, from representative points in the States of—			
12	Minnesota: International Falls	Alaska	248 241	26,000 [7] 30,000 [8] 36,000 [9] 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	219	40,000
	Wisconsin: Menasha	Alaska	296 259	26,000 [7] 30,000 [8] 36,000 [9] 40,000
		Hawaii Japan	238	40,000
	Petroleum products, including fuel oil, gasoline, and lubricating oil, in packages, from representative points in the States of—			
13	Wyoming: Casper or Sinclair	Alaska	248	30,000
		Hawaii Japan	140	50,000
	Plumbers goods, from representative points in the States of—		Cents	Pounds
14	Alabama: Montgomery	Alaska	405	40,000
		Hawaii	340	30,000
		Japan	336	40,000
	Illinois: Chicago	Alaska	325	40,000
		Hawaii	332	30,000
		Japan	243	40,000
	Wisconsin: Kohler	Alaska	325	40,000
		Hawaii	332	30,000
		Japan	243	40,000
	Roofing or building materials, from representative points in the States of—			
15	Nebraska: Omaha	Alaska	236 192 187	40,000 60,000 70,000
		Hawaii Japan	221	40,000
	New Mexico: Albuquerque	Alaska	247 206 187	40,000 60,000 70,000
		Hawaii Japan	172	40,000
	Tennessee: Memphis	Alaska	247 206 187	40,000 60,000 70,000
		Hawaii Japan	255	40,000
	Soap or washing compounds, from representative points in the States of—			
16	Illinois: Chicago	Alaska	295 226 213	30,000 40,000 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	236	40,000
	Nebraska: Omaha	Alaska	268 204 192	30,000 40,000 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	222	40,000
	Ohio: Cincinnati	Alaska	235 224	40,000 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	236	40,000
	Stoves, cooking or heating, from representative points in the States of—			
17	Massachusetts: Boston	Alaska	439 363	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000 [10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
		Hawaii	446	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000
		Japan	370	[10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
	Michigan: Holland	Alaska	384 318	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000 [10] 25,000 [11] 33,600
		Hawaii	391	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000
		Japan	325	[10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
	Tennessee: Chattanooga	Alaska	384 318	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000 [10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
		Hawaii	391	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000
		Japan	325	[10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
	West Virginia: Wheeling	Alaska	403 333	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000 [10] 25,800 [11] 33,600
		Hawaii	410	[10] 18,400 [11] 24,000
		Japan	340	[10] 24,800 [11] 33,600
	Tires, pneumatic, from representative points in the States of—			
18	Ohio: Akron	Alaska	329	35,000
		Hawaii Japan	336	35,000
	Pennsylvania: Conshohocken	Alaska	345	35,000
		Hawaii Japan	352	35,000

See footnotes at end of table.

***Statement showing that rail rates to Seattle, Wash., for movements beyond are higher to Alaska generally than to Hawaii and Japan*—Con.**

[Rates to Seattle, Wash., for Alaska, Hawaii, and Japan as shown apply via the same railroad routes and even in the same trains on the same date]

Rates are in cents per 100 pounds

Item	Description and origins	For movement beyond to—	To Seattle: Rate	To Seattle: Minimum weight
18	Vehicles, motor, freight, or passenger, from representative points in the States of—		*Cents*	*Pounds*
	Michigan: Detroit or Pontiac	Alaska	[12] 1,058	[13] 10,000
				[14] 12,000
				[15] 16,000
			[16] 751	[13] 12,000
				[14] 15,000
				[15] 20,000
		Hawaii	[17] 783	[18] 10,000
				[19] 12,000
		Japan	[17] 552	[20] 16,800
				[21] 18,000
				[22] 19,000
19	Wisconsin: Kenosha	Alaska	[12] 1,000	[13] 10,000
				[14] 12,000
				[15] 16,000
			[16] 714	[13] 12,000
				[14] 15,000
				[15] 20,000
		Hawaii	[17] 783	[18] 10,000
				[19] 12,000
		Japan	[17] 498	[20] 16,800
				[21] 18,000
				[22] 19,000

Rates are in cents per 100 pounds

Item	Description and origins	For movement beyond to—	To Seattle: Rate	To Seattle: Minimum weight
20	Wallboard, from representative points in the States of—		*Cents*	*Pounds*
	New York: Buffalo	Alaska	240	40,000
			165	[23] 50,000
				[24] 60,000
		Hawaii Japan	183	[23] 50,000
				[24] 60,000
	South Carolina: Columbia	Alaska	240	40,000
			186	[23] 50,000
				[24] 60,000
		Hawaii	223	40,000
			200	[23] 50,000
		Japan		[24] 60,000

[1] Cars not over 40 feet 7 inches in length inside measurement.

[2] Cars over 40 feet 7 inches to 50 feet 6 inches in length inside measurement.

[3] Rates do not apply on: (a) Articles which on account of dimensions cannot be loaded through the side door of a 40-foot 7-inch boxcar; (b) class A and B explosives; (c) corrosive liquids.

[4] See par. 3 under "Applications and Authorities for Rates," below.

[5] In closed cars not exceeding 50 feet 6 inches or on open cars not exceeding 53 feet 6 inches.

[6] In closed cars exceeding 50 feet 6 inches or on open cars exceeding 53 feet 6 inches.

[7] Not over 42 feet 6 inches in length inside measurement.

[8] Over 42 feet 6 inches to 50 feet 6 inches in length inside measurement.

[9] Over 50 feet 6 inches in length inside measurement.

[10] Cars less than 40 feet 7 inches in length inside measurement.

[11] Cars 40 feet 7 inches to 50 feet 6 inches in length inside measurement.

[12] Passenger.

[13] Cars in length, inside measurement, not over 41 feet 6 inches.

[14] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 41 feet 6 inches to 51 feet.

[15] Cars in length, inside measurement, 51 feet to 65 feet 6 inches.

[16] Freight.

[17] Freight or passenger.

[18] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 36 feet 7 inches to 41 feet 6 inches.

[19] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 41 feet 6 inches to 51 feet 6 inches.

[20] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 40 feet 7 inches to 42 feet.

[21] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 42 feet to 50 feet 8 inches.

[22] Cars in length, inside measurement, over 50 feet 8 inches.

[23] Not over 40 feet 7 inches in length, inside measurement.

[24] Over 40 feet 7 inches to 50 feet 6 inches in length, inside measurement.

APPLICATIONS AND AUTHORITIES FOR RATES

1. Rates applicable for export to Alaska shown herein are the rates published in Trans-Continental Freight Bureau Tariff No. 1-J, I.C.C. 1627. Rates include all ex parte increases but do not include terminal or port charges. Therefore, the addition of the various terminal charges widens the discriminations as shown.

2. Rates applicable for export to Hawaii and Japan are also applicable on traffic destined to and consigned through to points west of the 170th meridian, west longitude, and east of the 30th meridian, east longitude, also traffic destined to the west coast of Mexico, west coast of Central America or west coast of South America. Rates are published in Trans-Continental Freight Bureau Tariff No. 29-L, I.C.C. 1626, and apply to shipside, including terminal charges. Rates shown include all ex parte increases.

3. Rates on freight generally described as "freight, all kinds" (see item 7 herein), apply in the absence of other specific commodity rates. Through rates are published generally from points west of the Mississippi River and Chicago, Ill. As example, from Columbus, Ohio, and from Rome, N.Y., the rates are constructed on a Chicago, Ill., combination, using New York Central Railroad Tariff No. 3200-I, I.C.C. 1995, to Chicago, Ill. Rates beyond are published in Trans-Continental Freight Bureau Tariff No. 29-L, I.C.C. 1626.

4. Where rates are shown for different minimum weights, the tariffs provide that the lowest charges apply, dependent upon the actual weight of the shipment.

THE FAILURE TO PERMIT ALASKA TO ENJOY EXPORT-IMPORT RATES IS BOTH UNJUST AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. **GRUENING.** Mr. President, almost a year ago on this floor, I called the attention of the Members of the Senate to a rank injustice perpetrated against the State of Alaska in the fixing of railroad freight rates to Alaska.

That injustice still continues.

The matter is not complex.

It is simply that the railroads, beginning half a century ago, established a higher freight rate for the same merchandise moving from any place in the United States to Seattle if its destination is the State of Alaska than if its destination is the State of Hawaii or Tokyo or Guam or Hong Kong or Australia or Chile.

Although I am not a lawyer and certainly not a constitutional expert, this, in my view, is a clear violation of clause 6 of section 9 of the Constitution which provides:

"No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another."

Let us look at a few of the railroad freight rates approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission for various commodities from several different parts of the United States and let us note how those rates change depending on whether the destination is the State of Hawaii or the State of Alaska:

Railroad freight rates to Seattle

[Rates per 100 pounds]

Commodity	From	Ultimate destination: Honolulu, Hawaii	Ultimate destination: Seward, Alaska
Automobiles	Pontiac, Mich	$7.83	$10.00
Agricultural implements	Chicago, Ill	2.17	3.28
Do	Minneapolis, Minn	2.03	3.12–4.27
Canned food	Oklahoma City, Okla	1.38	1.83
Cigarettes	Louisville, Ky	2.66	2.94
Do	Raleigh, N.C	2.59	2.94
Automobiles	Kenosha, Wis	7.83	10.00

Expressed in rates per hundred pounds these figures may not seem to disclose a huge discrimination. But consider that the rail charges to Seattle for a 2,500-pound automobile shipped from Detroit, Mich., and destined for Honolulu, Hawaii, would amount to $195.75, while the rail charges for a similar automobile even if shipped on the same train would be $250 if it were destined for Seward, Alaska. This represents an arbitrary surcharge on Alaska-bound automobiles of $54.25, or approximately 25 percent more than on those bound for Hawaii.

The decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission upholding these discriminatory rates which obviously favor one port over another was rendered in 1957 before Alaska became a State.

I confess, Mr. President, that I can see no longer any logical basis for the decision of the Commission that freight moving to Hawaii is destined for a foreign port but that freight moving to Alaska is destined for a domestic port.

But whatever the underlying reasons for the 1957 decision of the Commission, it is my belief that statehood for Alaska changed the basic situation and that today, for the Commission to use the power to regulate interstate commerce in such a manner as to discriminate against 1 of the 50 States is entirely unconstitutional.

Now I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not begrudge the great State of Hawaii these lower rates. I am happy for the people of Hawaii that, at least in this respect, they enjoy lower freight costs. Being a noncontiguous State—as is Alaska—I know that Hawaii suffers the higher cost of living resulting from high shipping costs.

But my point, Mr. President, is that these lower rates should apply equally to the merchandise shipped to Seattle on American railroads and destined for points in the State of Alaska.

Mr. President, I regret to say, that in the months that have elapsed since that time only a few rates have been reduced in response to my publicizing this discrimination, but the overall situation remains the same. I had hoped that merely by calling this situation to the attention of the railroads involved they would have voluntarily moved long before this to rectify completely this longstanding injustice, which in the half century since these rates were initiated have cost the consumers of Alaska millions of dollars, and seriously retarded Alaska's progress.

The railroads have seen fit not to do so.

This injustice cannot be permitted to continue. It contributes to the high cost of living in Alaska which is one of the greatest obstacles to the progress and development of my State. Every effort should be made to reduce it. The power to regulate commerce granted by the Constitution should not be misused with impunity. We are either a united Nation of equal States or we are not. If the powers granted to the Congress in another clause of the Constitution—article I, section 8, clause 3—"to regulate commerce among the several States" are to be so misused as to impose burdens upon a particular State, who among us can say where this discrimination will end?

It is my intention to use all the power at my disposal to end this discrimination against the State of Alaska by the railroads involved and as of now approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As a beginning, therefore, I have today directed a letter to Mr. M. F. Edbrooke, chairman, Transcontinental Freight Bureau, Chicago, Ill., requesting voluntary action on the part of the railroads in equalizing the freight rates on goods destined for Alaska with those destined for Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Mr. Edbrooke be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is my sincere hope, Mr. President, that the railroads, without further ado on my part, will recognize the justice of Alaska's position in this matter. In my opinion it is manifestly unfair for the railroads to use the exemption given them by the Congress from certain aspects of the antitrust laws to promulgate rates which discriminate against 1 of the 50 States. That is a misuse of this exemption.

It may be, Mr. President, that the time has come when the Congress should take a second look at how the railroads are using or misusing this exemption.

I hope, Mr. President, that this will not become necessary.

EXHIBIT 1

MARCH 23, 1962.

Mr. M. F. EDBROOKE,
Chairman, Transcontinental Freight Bureau, Union Station, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. EDBROOKE: The imperative need for low-cost transportation between the State of Alaska and the mainland States impels me to request that the railroads renew their consideration of reducing rates on traffic to Alaska either by application of present transcontinental export rates, or by publication of transcontinental through rates, which would result in lower total transportation charges than presently assessed through separately charged rail and water rates via Pacific ports.

The high transportation costs on shipments to and from Alaska adversely affect the economy of the State in two ways: (1) High transportation costs are the key to high living costs in Alaska, which increase the costs of doing business in Alaska, thereby impeding development of industry and commerce; and (2) the lack of low carload rates to Alaska provides an impediment to development of wholesale and distribution businesses in the State.

New developments in transportation to Alaska through Prince Rupert should justify the railroads of the United States in giving renewed consideration to their rate structure. Very shortly rail car ferry service will be instituted between Prince Rupert and Whittier, Alaska, for connection between the Canadian railroads and the Alaska Railroad. In a few months, a motor vehicle ferry between Prince Rupert and Haines, Alaska, will enable establishment of new motor carrier and piggyback services.

The fact that railroads already have in effect transcontinental rates for export traffic to and from Hawaii, Guam, Japan and other foreign countries, which are much lower than rates applicable to Alaskan traffic, is evidence of the reasonableness of my request. Heretofore refusal of American railroads to remove this discrimination against Alaskan shipments has been justified by them on the ground of lack of competition. However, the competition is appearing, through development of Prince Rupert as a gateway for through transportation to Alaska; and the continued maintenance of high rates by the American railroads may cause them and the port of Seattle to lose this traffic to the Canadian gateway.

In a speech to the Senate on April 27, 1961, I outlined in detail, and cited specific instances, of the rate discriminations against the State of Alaska. I note with pleasure that some of the high rates about which I complained have been reduced, at least in some degree, for specific commodities. However, the general discriminatory situation remains; and I continue to hope that a means will be found for complete removal.

I am enclosing a copy of my remarks on this subject on April 27, 1961, and of my remarks today.

Please give this matter your attention, and advise at an early date concerning your reconsideration of this important problem.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

SHELTERS—A CRUEL DECEPTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the present time a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee is conducting extremely important hearings on House bill 3516, the civil defense fallout shelter bill. Under the very capable leadership of Chairman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, these hearings have caused a great deal of comment concerning our entire civil defense program.

Mr. President, the fact is that a massive fallout shelter program, if it is to be at all effective—and there is much controversy as to whether there is such a thing as an effective fallout shelter program—will cost the taxpayers anywhere from $20 billion to $200 billion. Herman Kahn, one of the foremost proponents of a fallout shelter program, has stated that the most reasonable one might involve a gradual buildup from about $1 billion annually to somewhere in the neighborhood of under $5 billion annually. Certainly, he is conservative in making that estimate and yet he considers an expenditure of almost $5 billion annually to be the minimum cost of a national fallout shelter program. This is more than we are spending today for either our space or our foreign-assistance program. Is any Member of the Congress willing to embark on a program on this magnitude—especially in view of the fact that there is no guarantee that it will be effective? With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a program would probably be obsolete before its completion. The 100-hundred megaton hydrogen bomb already has made completely useless the civil defense concepts of yesterday. Today's shelters might not be worth the cost of tearing them down tomorrow.

Furthermore, there is always the threat of chemical and biological warfare, against which these shelters are of no use whatever. Once the horror of nuclear war is unleashed, there will be no moral restraint against even more deadly types of warfare. In fact, economically, chemical and biological warfare makes more sense, because they destroy only human beings, not material things.

Even if we assume that some Americans would have shelters that would save their lives in a nuclear war, what sort of world would they come up to? What would happen to the buildings and to the atmosphere? What would they do for food, once their 2-week bomb shelter supply was exhausted? Fallout shelters would likely be only a means of delaying death, if their occupants were not incinerated or suffocated instantly.

Of course, Mr. President, all of us are familiar with the fact that in Hamburg, Germany, in an air raid in which only the medium-size conventional bombs of that day were used, between 60,000 and 70,000 men, women, and children were killed almost instantly in the fire storms which developed when they were hiding in the basements of their homes or in the air-raid shelters.

This is not a pretty picture to paint, but it is the truth—the cold hard facts of survival in a nuclear war.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the silly part of a fallout shelter program is that it is based on the premise that there would be adequate warning of a nuclear attack. At most, there would be only 15 to 18 minutes warning. If the missiles were fired from submarines off our shores, there might be 5 minutes warning. Furthermore, it is not believable that in a moment of terror, wives separated from their husbands, husbands separated from their wives, or children separated from their parents would abandon the rest of their families and would immediately rush into shelters. That is not the way Americans have behaved in times of danger in the past, and certainly it is not the way they would behave in the future. In this regard, former President Eisenhower has said:

> If I was in the finest shelter in the world, all alone, with all my family somewhere else, I just think I'd walk out. I don't want to live in that kind of a world.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this shelter program fosters a defeatist psychology. We have never been a people seeking holes in which to hide in times of danger. The beginning of a fallout shelter program of this magnitude would be just the beginning of a series of humiliating defensive devices, each more expensive than the last, to which Americans could look forward to fleeing and hiding. As the distinguished majority leader stated not long ago, "we owe coming generations a richer heritage than a landscape of fallout shelters."

Mr. President, we are the only major Nation in the world wasting our time, efforts, and resources on a fallout shelter program. In my view, no civil defense shelter program will adequately protect our citizenry should the Soviet Union wage sudden attack against this Nation. The survival of 187 million Americans—indeed, of all mankind—depends not on civil defense but on peace. It depends not on future shelter programs inspired by a caveman complex, but on solid, workable international agreements to stop nuclear testing and to end the armaments race, always providing adequate safeguards for our country. It is interesting to note that many of those who talk the loudest about civil defense talk the least about peace.

The building of fallout shelters represents a psychology of fear in which we Americans should not indulge. Civil defense, as it is conducted today and as it has been conducted, causing a waste of more than $1 billion of the taxpayers' money, is a myth. It has been a billion dollar plus boondoggle. It is based on theories as antiquated as mustache cups, tallow dips, Civil War cannonballs, and flintlock muskets.

In the nuclear age there can be no realistic civil defense program. We should devote our efforts to the utmost toward finding a peaceful solution to world problems. That is our only permanent shelter. In the meantime we must maintain our overwhelming military, air, and missile superiority. Communist dictators respect and fear strength.

Mr. President, we ought to be talking about building homes for our people rather than hoodwinking them with foolish prattle about underground shelters. We should be considering ways to feed the two-thirds of humanity who go to bed hungry every night rather than telling Americans to store away a 2-week supply of food in useless shelters, so called.

Philip W. Kelleher, counsel for Representative HÉBERT's subcommittee, prepared a staff study on the entire fallout shelter concept which is one of the most thorough reviews on this problem prepared to date. In the Washington Evening Star, June 5, 1963, there appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Shelters—A Cruel Deception?" This summarizes briefly but well Mr. Kelleher's study and calls for an end to this shelter nonsense. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHELTERS—A CRUEL DECEPTION?

An index to the kind of world we live in today can be found in the Hamburg firestorm of July 24, 1943.

On that date the British dropped a mere 2,400 tons of conventional explosives on the German port city. But the consequences for Hamburg were catastrophic.

These first bombs knocked out the water mains. On succeeding days tens of thousands of small firebombs were dropped and these were followed by more blockbusters—8,000 tons in all. The chief intelligence officer in our London Embassy, James R. Newman, reported as follows:

"We got a phenomenon that man had never seen before, except perhaps in prehistory. Fires joined together in a radius of 3 miles. Hot gasses rose, while surrounding cool air was pulled in and acted as a bellows. Seventy thousand of Hamburg's 100,000 trees splintered to earth. Two hundred and fifty thousand dwelling units out of 556,000 were completely destroyed. The fire lasted for 7 days. Temperatures flared to 1,400 and 1,800 degrees so that the bricks themselves actually burned. Thousands and thousands of people were in shelters at the time; all but a negligible fraction died anyway. Bodies were still being dug up 6 months later, most of them completely unmarked by fire. They had died of suffocation and carbon monoxide—70,000 in all."

Remember, this disaster was visited upon Hamburg 20 years ago by a trifling 8,000 tons of "conventional" bombs. Has it a meaning for us today when, in an all-out thermonuclear attack, any major American city could expect to be hit, not with 8,000 tons, but with up to the equivalent of 100 billion tons of explosives?

Surely it has. But very few people seem to care. We think the reason is not hard to discover.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Representative HÉBERT has been holding hearings on a Federal civil defense program, with particular reference to fallout shelters. And an Associated Press man reported the other day that the hearing was droning along before an average audience of 35 persons, some of whom were dozing. Obviously, nobody cares very much. And this view is reinforced by the recent decision in Portland, Oreg., to abolish its civil defense program and forget about it—fallout shelters and all.

Why is it that there is so little interest, so little concern? An excellent report to the Hébert subcommittee by its counsel, Philip W. Kelleher, furnishes at least some of the answers—especially with respect to fallout shelters. He quotes Dr. Alexander Langsdorf, Jr., a physicist at the Argonne Laboratories, as saying in a Chicago newspaper interview that the Russians, if they knew we had adequate fallout protection, would explode the bomb in the air rather than on the surface. Dr. Langsdorf added:

"From an airburst you get a massive firestorm which might set all Chicago on fire. Concrete fallout shelters would turn into ovens, cooking the people inside. If they don't burn they would probably suffocate, because all the oxygen would be consumed."

But let's suppose that some people hidden away in fallout shelters in some areas should survive. What of them? Mr. Kelleher quotes Dr. John N. Wolfe, chief, Environmental Sciences Branch of the Biology and Medicine Divisions of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows: "Fallout shelters in many areas seem only a means of delaying death and represent only part of a survival plan. With an environment so completely modified, the question is, where does a man go after his sojourn in shelters? What does he do upon emergence?"

Mr. Kelleher elaborated on Dr. Wolfe's meaning in these words: "The survivor emerges from his shelter only to find that communications and distribution systems are damaged or destroyed. If there is food still undestroyed it may be contaminated, as will be the water supply. It is at least possible that the land which he must stand on is dangerously radioactive. Under these circumstances he may survive, but if so it will be through pure luck."

There is, of course, another side to this debate, and Mr. Kelleher presents it. But as we read his paper, he comes down squarely on the side of the argument which holds that "the currently planned fallout shelter program, or any extension of it, would work a cruel and dangerous deception on the American people."

For our part, we do not think the American people will want to spend up to $7 billion for fallout shelters, much less $100 billion to $200 billion for blast shelters. There is nothing in the American nature that is compatible with the prospect of burrowing into the ground to hide for days and weeks, not knowing what has happened to wives, children or parents. George Kennan, speaking in a somewhat different context some time ago, just about said it all when he asked:

"Are we to flee like haunted creatures from one defensive device to another, each more costly and humiliating than the one before, cowering underground one day, breaking up our cities the next, attempting to surround ourselves with elaborate electric shields on the third, concerned only to prolong the length of our lives while sacrificing all the values for which it might be worth while to live?"

We think not. The only remedy, the only hope, is to prevent nuclear war. Meanwhile, again borrowing from a quotation used by Mr. Kennan: "Let us at least walk like men, with our heads up, so long as we are permitted to walk at all."

INTERRELIGIOUS COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS: AN EXAMPLE FOR AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the clergymen of Washington have united to arouse the conscience of the community against discrimination and racial inequality through the formation of an Interreligious Committee on Race Relations. Under the chairmanship of the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop, Catholic archdiocese of Washington, this committee represents a united campaign by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish spiritual leaders to reawaken the Washington community to the great moral evils of segregation.

This is a development of immense importance, not only to the Washington metropolitan area, but to the entire Nation.

One century after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, the struggle for full civil equality is rapidly gaining momentum across the country, in the North and the South, in the East and the West. This is a struggle that concerns every American. No one can be absolved of responsibility for the racial bias and prejudice that has persisted these past 100 years. No one can be absolved of the responsibility for direct and forthright action now to cleanse America of this bias and prejudice.

Members of Congress have their responsibility to enact whatever additional legislation is needed to guarantee equal protection of the laws to every American citizen, and to provide equal job opportunities, equal educational opportunities, and equal opportunities for political participation. The executive branch has its responsibility to enforce the laws that presently exist and to seek solutions to the many difficult and tragic racial situations that will undoubtedly occur in the coming months in all parts of the country.

I am happy to say that the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, is doing just this. He is giving leadership. I commend him for the many hours of diligent effort that he is now making in an attempt to bring people together, to gain a great national consensus for the vast improvement of racial relationships in the United States.

We have our responsibilities and we must not shirk them at this critical juncture. But so does every American citizen, whatever his color of skin or place of residence. The challenge of full racial equality reaches into every American home and touches every American citizen. That is why the formation of the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations is a development of such significance.

The religious and spiritual leaders in every city and town should immediately establish similar interreligious committees if they do not already exist. Surely the religious leaders face a historic challenge in reawakening the American conscience to the immorality of racial discrimination. Ultimately the only lasting solution to the evils of racial prejudice and bias can be found through national acceptance of the moral obligations involved.

The root of racial injustice is a failure to accept the personal moral obligations that rest upon every human being. There can be no more pressing business before the churches and synagogues of this century than to reaffirm and to reawaken these obligations. In all frankness, organized religion in America has not always accepted these obligations and has not always stood at the forefront of the drive for racial equality. But regardless of the past, we stand today at a historic moment in American history; we must accept fully the obligations of this moment.

Other segments of American society, such as the lawyers, merchants, doctors, teachers, and workers, should move at once to establish similar committees in every local community.

It is not necessary to await the formation of such committees to promote the removal of bias and prejudice, but such committees can help, because ultimately the law, to be effective, must have popular acceptance. Law enforcement requires law observance. Moral observance, or observance of the moral code, is the best way to gain law enforcement.

The evils of race prejudice are not limited merely to the segregation of public facilities such as schools, stores, libraries, parks, beaches, and meeting halls. These represent only the most obvious forms of racial intolerance. Members of the legal profession have a clear responsibility to impart to every citizen a respect for full equality under the law. Doctors have a moral obligation to practice the healing arts in behalf of all our citizens and to open hospital facilities to patients and other doctors without regard to race. Teachers have the moral obligation to instruct their students in the American traditions of freedom and equality. Employers and workers must accept the obligation of providing full equality in job opportunities. No segment of society can consider itself removed from these obligations or above the turmoil of the present struggle.

No section of America can consider itself immune from this turmoil and the great tension which now exists. Every American has the clear responsibility to enlist for the duration of this struggle.

The pattern established by the newly created Interreligious Committee on Race Relations should be duplicated from one end of America to the other. Let all men of good will acknowledge that much remains to be accomplished and that precious little time remains to do it. Let us get on with it today; not tomorrow, but today. Tomorrow will be too late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article published in today's Washington Post reporting on the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations and giving the present membership of the committee; and also an editorial entitled "The Voices of Conscience," that refers to this committee, and published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHURCHMEN UNITE TO AROUSE CAPITAL AGAINST RACIAL INJUSTICES

(By Jean M. White)

Washington clergymen have united to put their preaching into practice by arousing the conscience of the community against discrimination as a moral wrong.

Leaders of the three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—yesterday announced formation of a permanent Interreligious Committee on Race Relations to work for equality of opportunity for Negro citizens in many fields. From the first, yesterday, it was clear this will mean more than sermons from the pulpit, although these, too, will be part of the moral drive.

The call, the spokesmen emphasized, will be for citizens to show by action the beliefs that they profess.

The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic archbishop of Washington, said the 42-member committee was formed to bring greater impact on the community as far as justice and charity are concerned. Area churches and synagogues, he noted, have been individually concerned about racial justice, but there is a need to organize their moral force to fight discrimination.

"Discrimination is primarily a moral issue," the archbishop emphasized. "It goes beyond justice. Justice can be a very cold thing. What is needed is charity and to realize that [we must] love our neighbor."

Archbishop O'Boyle is serving as chairman of the committee. Cochairmen are Bishop William F. Creighton, of the Washington Episcopal diocese; Bishop John Wesley Lord, of the Methodist Conference; Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, of the Bible Way Church Worldwide, and Rabbi Lewis A. Weintraub, president of the Washington Board of Rabbis.

Archbishop O'Boyle emphasized that the seven standing committees will be "working committees" and repeated another member's observation that he didn't want them "to die from paralysis by analysis."

At a press conference, spokesmen showed that the clergymen already are backing up their preaching with action. They reported:

Consideration is being given to an antidiscrimination clause in church-related contracts.

HOUSING ORDER ASKED

Archbishop O'Boyle estimated churches may spend $40 million a year in the Washington area on construction. The Catholic church itself spends $5 to $7 million a year on church and school buildings in the area, he said.

The housing committee already has voted to send an appeal to the District Commissioners to issue an anti-discrimination housing order without delay.

The group's apprentice training committee is cooperating with the Labor Department to develop opportunities for apprentice training and merit promotion for Negroes in the construction trades.

A program of exchange visits betwen white and Negro families will be expanded, and a full-time executive secretary may be hired to carry out the visitation program on an interreligious basis.

The Reverend David G. Colwell, president of the Greater Washington Council of Churches, noted that the issue of housing discrimination is "greater than an ordinance."

"It is also a group of persons that live in a neighborhood," he emphasized. "We need persons in the community to act out their religious professions in their own neighborhood and as they themselves are involved in buying, selling and renting real estate."

STUBBORN PROBLEM

Bishop Williams singled out discrimination in apprentice training as one of the major concerns of the Negro community. It has been "a very stubborn problem," he said, and has contributed to many Negro youths dropping out of schools because they know doors of opportunity are shut to them.

The local committee grew out of a meeting held by Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant leaders in Chicago last January. One of the recommendations of this National Conference on Religion and Race was that communities unite the "local forces of religion" in a struggle to bring about racial justice, charity, and understanding.

The full list follows:

Chairman: The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop, Catholic archdiocese of Washington.

Cochairman: Bishop William F. Creighton, Episcopal diocese of Washington; Bishop John Wesley Lord, Methodist Conference; Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, Bible Way Church Worldwide; and Rabbi Lewis A.

Weintraub, president, Washington Board of Rabbis.

Steering Committee

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, New Bethel Baptist Church; Isaac Franck, executive director, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; Rev. Dr. E. Franklin Jackson, John Wesley AME Zion Church; Dr. Virgil E. Lowder, executive director; Council of Churches of Greater Washington; Aubrey Robinson Jr., Protestant layman; Msgr. John S. Spence, director of education, Catholic Archdiocese.

Standing committees

Person-to-Person Communication

Chairman: Dr. E. Franklin Jackson, the Reverend Dr. E. L. Harrison, Shiloh Baptist Church; Dr. Duncan Howlett, All Souls Unitarian Church; Mrs. John Posey, St. Gabriel's Catholic Church; Capt. Charles Stargel, Protestant layman; the Reverend Wayne Woods, Augustana Lutheran Church.

Legal

Chairman: John Moore, Catholic layman; Henry T. Alexander, Catholic layman; Richard K. Lyon, president, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; Aubrey Robinson, Jr., Msgr. John Roeder, chancellor, Catholic Archdiocese of Washington.

Employment

Chairman: Msgr. George Gingras, Sts. Paul and Augustine Catholic Church; Julian Dugas, Protestant layman; the Reverend Quinland Gordon, Church of the Atonement (Episcopal); Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, Temple Sinai; Robert G. McGuire, Catholic layman; Canon Richard Williams, Episcopal Diocese of Washington.

Housing

Chairman: The Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy; Floyd Agostinelli, Catholic layman; William Calomiris, Greek Orthodox layman; Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, president, Rabbinical Council of Washington; the Reverend Jefferson P. Rogers, Church of the Redeemer (Presbyterian).

Welfare

Chairman: Sterling Tucker, Protestant layman; Msgr. Leo J. Coady, director, Catholic Charities of Washington; the Reverend David G. Colwell, president, Council of Churches of Greater Washington; Dr. Virgil E. Lowder, Mintener Bradshaw, Protestant layman.

Education

Chairman: Harry N. Rosenfield, Jewish layman; Dr. William A. Banner, Protestant layman; the Reverend Theodore Bowen, Calvary Methodist Church; the Reverend Dr. Theodore S. Ledbetter, Plymouth Congregational Church; the Reverend Dr. Russell C. Stroup, Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

Public Relations

Chairman: Edward B. Lyman, Catholic layman; Isaac Franck; George Hartford, Catholic layman; Dr. John H. Satterwhite, Wesley Theological Seminary; Monsignor Spence.

The committee is still in the process of formation. A few additional members will be named shortly.

The Voices of Conscience

The formation of an Interreligious Committee on Race Relations is immensely inspiring and hopeful. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish spiritual leaders in the Capital have joined to undertake what is essentially a religious responsibility—an awakening of the American conscience to the immorality of racial discrimination.

This is really the key to the race problem—a recognition that it is in essence a moral problem, a choice between good and evil. So much has been said about the social and economic consequences of a failure to come to grips with discrimination, so much attention has been given to the niceties of law and politics, that the root of the matter has been largely forgotten. The root of the matter is that denial of rights and opportunities to any man is a denial of justice and of human brotherhood.

To make Americans understand this is a vital office of religion. Once it is understood, the healing influences of conciliation and persuasion can administer their medicine. Once it is understood, political leadership can work out speedy and effective remedies.

It is no overstatement to say that the eradication of racial discrimination is one of the most momentous problems facing America today. If it can point a way to the solution of this problem, religion will point the way to a liberation of the human spirit.

U.S. ENTRY INTO SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT FIELD

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday the President announced that he was committing this Nation to enter the world competition to produce the world's fastest supersonic air transport.

This decision will be accepted by the American people as a necessary one if this Nation is to preserve its position as a major air carrier and as a major producer of civilian aircraft, which, in turn, has contributed substantially to the superiority of our military air capacity.

The President's statement, apparently spontaneous as it was, perhaps came as a surprise to many, both in and out of the administration, who had been associated with the development of the supersonic aircraft concept.

Some time ago the administration requested the Bureau of the Budget, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Federal Aviation Agency to initiate studies concerning the feasibility of developing a supersonic transport. My information at this time indicates that only one report has been completed, namely, that of the Federal Aviation Agency and that the results of this report were indecisive and presented several alternative proposals. Reports from other agencies have not been made and this Presidential decision, coming as it did, on the day following the announcement that a major American airline would purchase supersonic aircraft from British and French firms raises a question as to whether or not the President's decisions represented the product of sound engineering and economic analysis or a tardy response to a need that our airline industry and the governments of other major powers, including the U.S.S.R., have long recognized.

The development of supersonic aircraft undoubtedly will require such a large expenditure of funds and the consolidation of such a tremendous amount of technical and industrial capacity that its development is beyond the capability of private industry alone. Government participation is essential.

This fact raises two interesting points: First, undoubtedly a significant factor in the administration's delay in reaching a decision to go ahead with the Government's participation in the development of this superaircraft has been based upon its tremendous cost and relationship of that great cost to our enormous expenditures for defense and space. Recognizing this fact, a real paradox develops: On the one hand, we recognize the United States carries the major portion of the free world's defense in thermonuclear missile delivery systems, in NATO, and a major share of the cost of policing the peace through the United Nations and in unilateral actions. We also observe, on the other hand, two nations which have committed their resources with their private industries to develop supersonic aircraft, which are in turn sold to an American company. These same two countries, England and France, are as of this month, over $17 million in arrears in their payments to the United Nations and have not fulfilled their commitments to the NATO Alliance.

While this Nation apparently delays its decision to build such a supersonic aircraft because of our enormous defense expenditures, other nations failing to fulfill their defense commitments are placed in a better competitive position with American industry.

Perhaps this inconsistency will chip away at our world prestige, but of greater importance is the adverse effect upon our balance of payments and still more important, the loss of confidence on the part of our people in their national policymakers.

The second factor is that we now launch upon another major technological and industrial race with a delayed start. This undertaking provides us with a new opportunity to insure that this adventure is carried forth with the kind of efficiency and capability which will restore public confidence in the ability of its Government to undertake these bold ventures in cooperation with private enterprise.

At this point, I am compelled to observe that the manner in which this program is now being initiated could well embark us upon the same course of development which has produced the controversy surrounding the procurement of the military all-service fighter known as the TFX.

Until the report is rendered by the Investigating Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I shall not criticize or condemn those involved in the TFX controversy. Yet the Nation has been told that the civilian chiefs in the Pentagon selected an aircraft more expensive to produce and less capable in performance over the unanimous recommendations of military personnel long experienced in this field. I would note that if this is the price we must pay in order to preserve civilian authority over the military then it must be paid—because whatever mistakes and errors of judgment may be made by the civilian heads of the Defense Department, I am persuaded that the fundamental principle of civilian authority over the military is essential.

Let us hope that upon completion of this undertaking the final product will not be the result of the same agonizing procedure to which the TFX has been submitted. Let us hope that the efforts of this country in this instance will produce a safe, supersonic aircraft which is profitable to operate and which will be, without question, superior in performance.

On February 28 of this year, Senator CASE, of New Jersey, introduced two bills, S. 960 and S. 961, which were designed to assure that the awarding of contracts for work such as that involved in the development of this aircraft would be based upon technical competence and would be above reproach for reasons of influence unrelated to competence. These bills would, first, require that a record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder; second, require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provision, or where forbidden by existing law; third, establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to negotiated contracts.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, 1963, page 3214.

It seems to me that this legislation becomes more appropriate as we embark on this new program. I want to congratulate Senator CASE for his diligence in producing the bills which he sponsored. I do have some concern, however, as to whether these two bills will be broad enough to cover the development program involved in producing a supersonic aircraft. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the administration has obviously not secured the recommendations regarding the plane's development from the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Bureau of the Budget. Lacking a clear decision on this point it is not possible to determine whether Senator CASE's bills are at this point adequate to cover this program. At the proper time I will propose amendments to Senator CASE's bills, amendments to which I am sure will agree, which will make certain that the controversies surrounding the TFX are not carried over to the supersonic aircraft.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I have listened intently to the major address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. It is a very informative, very thoughtful, and very important statement. I sincerely hope that the Senators who are not present in the Chamber will read his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I commend him for the statement he has made repeatedly that civilian authority must always be supreme over the military in this country. That is what was provided by the framers of our Constitution. It cannot be reaffirmed too often in the Senate. Personally I feel that there is no penalty that we as Americans should not be prepared to pay in order to preserve civilian authority over the military.

I commend the Senator from Kansas and I congratulate him upon an excellent statement.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a week ago last Monday, a Senate resolution sponsored by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], but cosponsored by a number of other Senators, including myself, was offered on the subject of a test-ban treaty. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. As a cosponsor of the resolution, I hope that hearings will promptly be held and that the resolution will be favorably reported.

The purport of the resolution was to express the sense of the Senate in support of a test-ban treaty confined to testing in the atmosphere and under water, but excluding testing underground, and leaving unmentioned possible testing in outer space. Although I cosponsor the resolution and say again that I hope it will be adopted, I now wish to make some comments and some qualifications.

In the first place, I believe that testing in outer space should be added to the area to be covered by the treaty. I do not believe there is much, if any, responsible scientific opinion which believes that nuclear testing in outer space can be conducted without detection by nations other than the nation conducting the tests. Nor do I believe that there is much, if any, scientific opinion which would hold that the enormous expense of testing in outer space would be justified by any pragmatic or practical results which would be of aid in increasing the nuclear capability of the testing nation.

In the second place, while I support the resolution, hoping that it will be amended in committee as I have just indicated, I feel impelled to point out that this proposal is already before the Geneva Disarmament Conference, having been tabled there by the United States of America last August. Our proposal of last August is substantially similar to the Dodd-Humphrey resolution. Moreover, as long as 5 years ago, we submitted to the Russians comparable proposals.

My recollection is that the first Senator to endorse such a proposal was ALBERT GORE of Tennessee, who made the suggestion on the floor of the Senate several years ago, after returning from a disarmament conference at which a test-ban treaty was under consideration.

Third, I feel impelled to point out that there seems little, if any, chance that the Russians would agree to a treaty along the lines suggested in the Dodd-Humphrey resolution. For the past 5 years, the Russians have consistently said "nyet" to such a suggestion. One can only speculate as to their reasons for that position. Certainly, I have no secret information that would make me capable of fully assessing either Russian capabilities or Russian intentions. But one can speculate that in all probability the Russians are not interested in such a treaty, because they really are not any good at testing underground. I think the information is in the public domain that the Russians have conducted few tests underground so far, and that there is good reason to believe that those tests were not particularly successful. It requires a large amount of know-how to test successfully underground. It takes much expense to prepare an underground testing site, where underground nuclear explosions can be conducted without immediately being detected by opposite number countries. So far, the Russians have indicated very little interest in creating for themselves a capability of underground testing which would prove fruitful of pragmatic results.

On the other hand, the Russians know that we are quite good at underground testing, for we have made public the results of a good many of our tests. We have publicly stated that we intended in due course to continue them, although I am happy to say that the tests which were to have taken place last month were temporarily postponed by the President in the hope of getting a test-ban agreement.

The principal useful results of underground nuclear testing are to develop tactical nuclear weapons. I believe it is the present philosophy of the Russian armed forces that tactical nuclear weapons are not of much use, for the reason that if they are once used, an all-out nuclear war would inevitably develop, a war in which intercontinental ballistic missiles having nuclear warheads would be utilized.

Therefore, there is good ground for believing that the Russians think the expense of further developing tactical nuclear weapons by underground testing is unwarranted, since their use would trigger an all-out nuclear war.

So I am not at all sanguine that much will come from the suggestion embodied in the Dodd-Humphrey resolution. However, it is worth pointing out—and this is the principal reason why I join in sponsoring the resolution—that such a treaty would have a far better change of ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate than would the type of nuclear-test-ban treaty which has been under such vigorous public discussion during the past several months. Such a treaty, which would ban tests in all elements—underground, outer space, underwater, and in the atmosphere—would, in the opinion of the preponderant scientific brains in this country, still require a significant number of onsite inspections and several seismic detection stations constructed on the soil of the opposite number country. The Russians and the Executive arm of our Government are not far apart as regards arriving at an agreement with respect to such a treaty, although there are a number of very important details to be worked out with respect to the nature of the procedures in connection with onsite inspections, and although there remain to be settled a number of important details with respect to the construction of and access to the seismic detection stations to be built on the soil of the opposite number country. Nevertheless, one would would think that if agreement were reached as to the number of such stations and the number of onsite inspections, the details and procedures which I have just mentioned could be speedily agreed upon.

The Russians have offered two or three onsite inspections, and we have offered seven. Therefore, the gap is a very narrow one; and it would seem that this gap could be bridged if the Russians would budge—although they would have to budge a considerable distance—and if our government would budge a little, again—only a very little inasmuch as our government has already made a substantial decrease in the number of inspections upon which it would insist.

It should be pointed out that the reason why our representatives have so decreased the number of inspections our country would require is that during the last few years the art of seismic detection has progressed so substantially that it is now unnecessary to have very many onsite inspections or very many seismic detection stations located on the soil of the opposite number country. This is because national detection stations located on our own soil or on the soil of our allies are competent to detect and to distinguish between suspicious seismic events which might take place on the soil of Soviet Russia—to such an extent that it can readily be determined whether they are earthquakes or whether they are nuclear explosions. With only a limited number of onsite inspections, we could be reasonably well assured that cheating in connection with underground testing was not occurring.

Perhaps it is desirable to add what everyone knows—namely, that testing under water or in the atmosphere and, in the overwhelming number of cases, in outer space can be detected by national detection stations erected on our own soil or on the soil of our allies.

Therefore, I am of the view that there is a far better prospect of negotiating a test-ban treaty which will encompass all four elements—outer space, the atmosphere, under water, and underground—than there is to negotiate the kind of treaty which I am sure would readily be ratified by the Senate, and which is embodied in the Dodd-Humphrey resolution which I join in sponsoring.

The difficulty with the broader treaty is, of course, that there is grave doubt whether such a treaty would be ratified by the Senate, even if it were negotiated by the President. With this situation in mind, I speak today.

Of course we should make every effort to persuade the Russians to accept the kind of treaty embodied in the Dodd-Humphrey resolution. We could hope the Russians would change their minds, and would go along. If they did, we would be reasonably "in the clear," for, as I have said before, such a treaty would, in my opinion, be ratified by the Senate without too much difficulty—assuming, of course, that it had behind it the strong support of the President of the United States.

However, I suggest that if this effort is again made, but again fails, we should nonetheless press forward for a more comprehensive type of treaty. I also suggest that the genie is not out of the bottle, even though the President suggested he is, and that the genie will not be out of the bottle for some time.

It is true that France has acquired a nuclear capability, and that in the near future Communist China probably will acquire a more primitive type of nuclear capability. In all likelihood Russia will again test nuclear bombs in the atmosphere. I think that would be unjustified, and not in the interest of world peace, and uncalled for by any basic situation. Nevertheless, even so, I believe that even if Russia does so we should persist and, in the next few years, might negotiate a satisfactory test-ban treaty—and I believe that our proposal at Geneva is such a treaty—which could be agreed to by both Russia and the United States.

I also believe it would be possible, all things considered, with the support of the United Nations, the other major powers, and the underdeveloped nations, to bring such pressure upon France, and later upon Communist China, that they could be compelled to join in such a test-ban treaty. So I hope this effort will be continued.

Mr. President, I speak today because the real problem is the U.S. Senate, and the real danger is that the military-industrial complex, against which ex-President Eisenhower so explicitly warned us less than a year ago, with its allies in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, will be able to create in the Senate, and to some extent in the country, a climate of opinion which will make it difficult, if not impossible, for this body to ratify such a treaty if it is submitted to us by the President of the United States.

Therefore, I say the first and the highest priority should be given to efforts to assure an open and extensive debate in depth on the merits of such a test-ban treaty, so that as our negotiators at Geneva press forward next month, next fall, next winter, and next spring, in their efforts to obtain such a treaty, they can be assured that the organs of American Government will stand behind them and will support them if they return to us with such a treaty.

Accordingly I suggest that it is time for the President to speak out. It is time for those of us who support the President to continue to speak out.

I am gravely concerned about the secret hearings now being conducted in the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on the Armed Services. Since those hearings are conducted in secret, I do not know what is being said. I have gone out of my way not to find out, because I do not wish to have access to secret information to which my formal duties do not entitle me, and information which, if I had it, I might later be accused of having illegally leaked. But I do know that the service Secretaries—the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, high military officials—have been called before that subcommittee, for that information has been in the press. I am fearful that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and a number of other high ranking advisers of the President who unanimously recommended to him that he should table at Geneva the treaty which he did table covering a test ban will not be given or will not take an adequate opportunity to bring his case before the people of the United States. I have already recommended to the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Foreign Relations Committee that he should hold open hearings on this general subject so that the point of view of the President of the United States might more clearly be laid before the Senate and before the people of the United States.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has assured me that in due course such hearings will be held. I hope that a further and detailed briefing will be given to all Senators who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the position of the administration with respect to the test-ban treaty which we have tabled at Geneva, in order that they may know in intimate detail why the President did present, on behalf of the United States, such a treaty—who advised him to do so, who, if anyone, urged him not to do so, and why he and his principal advisers believe that such a treaty is in the best interests of the United States, and would better protect our national security than an unlimited continuation of the arms race with its nuclear terror, as is the present situation.

Until those things are done, we are in danger that the Russians would shift position, would accept our treaty proposal, that it would be signed, brought back to the Senate and rejected, because we could not summon two-thirds of all Senators present and voting to support the President of the United States, his Secretary of Defense, his Secretary of State, and the Director of his Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I hope that tragedy will not come to pass. For that reason, I speak today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESTRAINT OF THOMAS SOULES, U.S. CITIZEN, IN ECUADOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared relating to Thomas Soules, U.S. citizen, who has not been permitted to leave Ecuador, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THOMAS SOULES, U.S. CITIZEN NOT PERMITTED TO LEAVE ECUADOR

I am greatly concerned over the official restraints placed on the departure from Ecuador of a constituent of my State, Thomas Soules. I have taken up this matter with the Department of State and discussed it on May 31 with our Ambassador to Ecuador who is visiting Washington. The facts revealed by these conversations are as follows:

After serving as port captain of the Port of Guayaquil for more than 4 years Mr. Soules' contract was terminated on March 28, 1963. He was summoned to testify before a congressional committee on the operations of the Port of Guayaquil and did so on May 7. His testimony was controversial and antagonized many people in Ecuador.

He was not permitted to sail with his family from Guayaquil and was placed under arrest on May 11. He was released on May 13 under a writ of habeas corpus and the charges, which have not yet been clearly defined, were at that time dropped. Nevertheless, Mr. Soules was not allowed to leave Ecuador and an order for his detention was again issued. So far as the Embassy has been able to ascertain this action was based on Mr. Soules' alleged failure to return the master key to the port and it has continued in effect despite evidence that the key was, in fact, returned.

The Ambassador has described to me his strong representations to the highest officials in the Government over what he considers to be the lack of justification under Ecuadorean law for Mr. Soules' detention and denial of the right to return to his own country. Although the Ambassador consistently received assurances that this unfortunate matter would be promptly resolved, the detention order against Mr. Soules is still in effect and he is still unable to leave Ecuador.

I am appalled that a citizen of the United States is being subjected to persecution because of testimony given before an Ecuadorean congressional committee and that he is apparently not being given the protection to which he is entitled under Ecuadorean law. I am appalled to learn that this can happen in a friendly country with which we have traditionally maintained close and cordial relations. I am appalled that the most vigorous representations by our Embassy in Ecuador have not been sufficient to effect Mr. Soules' departure despite the lack of adequate charges against him under Ecuadorean law. I would like to express my vigorous protest over this denial of justice to a citizen of my State and to call upon the Department of State to continue in its efforts to bring about his prompt departure from Ecuador.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is on his way to the Chamber. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THREE WORLDS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several weeks ago my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I were invited to speak before the 17th Conference of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., at the Inn at Williamsburg, Va.

The members of this organization are responsible for a far-flung American industrial and scientific complex whose productivity in great part serves the needs of American defense.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my address before that association on May 23, 1963, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the partial text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE WORLDS

This may not be original with me, but it has struck me that it is highly fitting that you, the engineers of so much of our world of tomorrow, are meeting today in this wonderfully preserved world of yesterday.

For there is much we can learn from the past, a distinguished and proud past, in building a better America of tomorrow.

Our heritage of freedom, our institutions of representative government, our traditions of free competitive enterprise are just a few of the historic principles which provide the framework on which to build continually and continuously.

Recently, however, I have been somewhat severe with some of our population who refuse to live in anything but the past. These Americans want to repeal income taxes. They want, in effect, to abolish the Supreme Court by superimposing a so-called Court of the Union. They want to grant even more power to the rural constituencies, which already possess an imbalance of power. They want to return to the isolation of the 1800's and to gunboat diplomacy.

There is, I am afraid, no isolation from intercontinental missiles.

And if we are, indeed, to progress, there can be no isolation, either, from the world of today.

These people live everywhere in America. Some are in Congress. This may be one reason that Congress labors so often under the rules of the past and why progress is often slow. The ancient filibuster, which permits a tiny minority to overrule the majority, is an example.

The man who refuses to face up to the world of today—and consequently makes little or no contribution to the world of tomorrow—has no appreciation in the slightest that one Polaris submarine carries three times the power of all the bombs dropped in World War II.

He has no awareness that nothing is outside our grasp; that our choice is either the most spectacular life we have ever known—or the most spectacular cremation.

He is much like the Congressman, who, at the turn of the century, introduced a bill to shut down the Patent Office. For, he said, everything of consequence had already been invented, hadn't it?

But, in talking to you today, I would like to concentrate instead on some of the problems that you, representing the world of tomorrow, face, not in the future, but right now—today.

In the world of today and tomorrow the first line of American defense is not limited to the jungles of southeast Asia, to the silent sentry on the free world side of the Berlin wall or to the men of our strategic retaliatory forces, above us and at sea. It includes the dynamics of American private industry. It is on industry—its laboratories and the universities whose graduates staff our industrial-scientific complex—that our Nation largely depends for the conception, research, development, and production of the defensive armament and the space systems vital to the preservation of the country.

As you gentlemen well know, the relationship between the national security establishment and private industry—largely unwritten and deeply human—is a changing one, often dependent on personalities involved at various points in time. Both parties—Government and private industry—must always be aware of their responsibilities to each other and to the public at large. For the Government to stifle creative initiative by attempting to detail or to restrict in advance the route American ingenuity is to follow in reaching a given end, is a violation of the tradition of science and ideas. It is also bad business in terms of getting the job done, and achieving those technological breakthroughs which have occurred throughout our history—breakthroughs largely unpredicted and unpredictable until the right combination of brains, materials, and luck come together.

Our national security establishment, and private industry, too, have a responsibility to Congress and to the American people to see that the taxpayer's dollar is spent as wisely and as effectively as possible. But I do not believe that the attempt to bring fiscal responsibility and coordinated planning to national security matters is irreconcilable with the whole tradition of unrestricted science, research, and development. Good will and good judgment can keep it from being so.

Our patent policy is another significant example of the problems we must resolve today if we are to grope effectively with the world of tomorrow. Here we are, in 1963, at a time when anything is possible, yet we still do not have a consistent governmentwide policy with respect to dealing with the inventions underwritten, in whole or in part, by public funds. The controversy over the proper policy for our Government to follow in dealing with the patents which grow out of such inventions has increased in direct proportion to the almost unbelievable growth of Federal research and development programs.

Much emotion has been engaged in by both sides to this controversy. Regrettably, the technical complexities of patent law and practice prevent easy understanding of the issues involved. Suffice it to say, that as a Senator, I do not believe that the correct approach lies either with those who would have the Government take title to any and all inventions, primary and secondary, which arise from a Government research contract, or with those in industry who feel that the Government has no concern in this matter at all.

Of course, the people of the Nation do have a concern—a great concern—where public funds are being spent. And the Government has an obligation to the taxpayers and to industry itself to assure that products developed solely with the taxpayer's funds are not withheld from the market or used to promote monopoly.

But Government also has an obligation to our economy, and to the future of our society, to scrutinize the effects of its policies in terms of the technological and scientific requirements of our time and beyond. I believe a policy can, and should, be developed to encourage, not to discourage, free, private, competitive enterprise in America, in defense and space procurement, as elsewhere. I believe a policy ought to be enunciated which would unleash the constitutional incentives to creativity, devised over a century and three-quarters ago when Congress was authorized "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writing and discoveries."

Such a policy requires, first, governmentwide consistency. I think it is completely untenable for American industry to be faced with one type of patent policy when dealing with NASA—a policy set forth in section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, adopted behind closed House-Senate conference doors, with no hearings and no debate—and another type of patent policy when dealing with the Department of Defense.

At a time when our Nation has made a major national commitment which calls for the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States in the peaceful conquest of space, it is quite unconscionable to hinder the fulfillment of that commitment by a NASA type policy which vests title in the Government with only a possibility of waiver dangled before the successful contractor and his people. Besides consistency, such a policy should be in harmony with the historic practices of a free enterprise system. It should reflect an understanding of the structure of American industry.

The concept of Government ownership of patents is a radical departure from the tradition and the history of the American patent system. In my view, the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, after 3 years of hearings, correctly concluded that "present space patent policies damage small business, cost the taxpayers money, dilute the national effort to be first in space and waste the products of scientific research as a result of the reluctance to market new inventions without the necessary patent protection."

The argument of the zealots of a Government title policy is essentially that the public interest demands that what the Government pays for it should own. This argument, with its superficial appeal, is difficult to combat. But it is seriously misleading. Only in rare instances has the Government borne all or even the major costs of developing inventions. The Government awards research contracts based on the experience, knowledge, and skill of a particular research and development organization. Presumably, the Government takes advantage of an organizational situation in existence, in being. It puts up money in order to translate the know-how and ideas of the contractor into knowledge critically necessary to the Government. That is what the Government bargains for and what the taxpayer pays for.

Given these conditions, I think title should remain with those who create the invention while the Government receives in all such cases a royalty-free license to use the results arising from a Federal research contract, including any patentable inventions. The Government should also be free to make use of those results by utilizing any manufacturer it chooses in accordance with existing law and procurement regulations. But to take title is to impair, most seriously, the incentive to create, and to deny the small contractor his one historic protection against his large competition—a patent.

Besides consistency and harmony with the free enterprise system, such a new approach calls for a procedure to determine the relative equities involved between the Government's interest and the company's and the individual inventor's interest.

Perhaps an independent board of public-spirited citizens who have had experience in scientific research and American industry should be established in each department to determine initially the relative equities involved. Such a determination by either the board or agency administrator should be subject to judicial review in a Federal district court.

In any event, an end should come to the present haphazard approach of legislating behind closed doors as in the case of section 305, and in the more recent vexing attempts to attach Government-title riders to innumerable bills before the Senate, always without benefit of hearings and always when few Senators are on the floor. The proper committee to explore this controversial question thoroughly is Senator McCLELLAN's Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

Senator McCLELLAN has introduced S. 1290 as a basis for discussion and hearings. I commend your attention to this legislation. You might not agree with all of it; neither do I. But it is a start and with good faith this legislation can be fashioned in a constructive manner. Then once again, American industry will be able to use to the fullest extent its skill, its ingenuity, and its experience in developing new and improved machinery and devices so basic to our national security.

A recurring concern to me, and I am sure to you, is the attempt of some legislators and some administrators to undermine the effectiveness of the defense procurement program of this Nation by trying to use it as a social planning tool. While I dislike imputing the motives of some of my colleagues, I am compelled to conclude, based on some of their legislative proposals in the defense procurement area, that jealousy, envy, and the understandably parochial and political concern for the local welfare, rather than for the national security, are uppermost in their minds.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENTS

I believe that the Department of Defense can have only one criterion in defense procurement: How to secure, at the lowest possible cost, the highest quality hardware and systems of defense for America and for the free world. Some of my colleagues, noting that almost a quarter of the Nation's prime defense procurement contracts are awarded to firms headquartered in California, conclude, like Chicken Little, that "the sky is falling." They fail to mention that much of the fabrication takes place in plants located in other States, or that much of it is subcontracted out to other firms. One study shows that 50 percent of the subcontracts are performed outside of California, where the prime contract has been placed within my State.

Early in the present administration, President Kennedy directed the Defense Department to alter its administrative machinery in order to channel defense contracts to firms located in labor surplus areas. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration were instructed to establish set-asides solely for labor surplus areas.

I vigorously protested this directive. The Comptroller General of the United States in a formal, written opinion to me supported my position. This is the position which has consistently been taken by Congress in each annual defense appropriation act since 1954: That no funds shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Following a White House meeting with the President, the directive was withdrawn and I was promised fairplay for California. I do not regard this as just fair play for California but rather it is also fairplay for American industry and for the American taxpayer. If political pressures ever were to determine the allocation of American defense contracts, it would indeed be a national tragedy. In this age of nuclear power, when at any moment, the defensive arrangements of free peoples might face sudden acts of aggression with all the horror of escalating violence, there can be no second best equipment.

The Defense Department and American industry with its far-flung capability, its competent industrial management, its creative scientists, and its skilled workers should have the sole obligation of giving America the very best and most efficient means to deter aggression, or, if aggression came, to beat it down.

I am glad to be a coauthor of S. 961, a bill offered by my colleague from New Jersey, CLIFFORD CASE, which would require that a record be maintained of all ex parte communications, written or oral, made in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone—other than potential bidders—and including Members of Congress or of the executive branch. The record would be open for public inspection. Attempted political pressures—or any pressures—ought to be laid on the table for all to see.

In maintaining an above-the-board atmosphere, you and your colleagues in the aerospace industry can play a vital role. More courage must be displayed when, if ever, it is clear that a competitor received a contract on other than the scientific and economic merits. All too often, I regret to say, the attitude is, if one speaks out and protests, the Government agency involved would retaliate on the next go-around. If you, with access to the information, do not help us correct this type of situation, our procurement program and our national security can only suffer.

Now, I have been talking at some length about just two of the domestic concerns of a U.S. Senator from California—two concerns I thought might be of major interest to you. You may disagree with the substance of my remarks.

Disagreement, indeed, is one of the healthiest signs that democracy and liberty continue to flourish in our land.

In time of gravest peril, such as war, unity is relatively easy to achieve among free people. Nationalistic goals are sublimated to the cause of survival.

We sought to perpetuate the unity of our allies after the Second World War, by helping to create our Atlantic defense alliance, NATO.

We encourage our fellow members to maintain the unity which conflict brought to us by applying other ties to bind free people together: Trade and commerce, cultural exchanges, political discussion to solve common problems.

We welcomed the creation of the Iron and Steel Community, Euratom, OECD, and finally, the Common Market. We looked forward hopefully to the possible establishment of a united states of Europe.

Last July 4, the President of the United States spoke optimistically of an interdependence among the nations of the Atlantic Community.

It is still true that in union there is strength. Our task is to eliminate and to prevent disunity and discord among our allies and ourselves.

In his final volume of The History of World War II, entitled "Triumph and Tragedy," the great Churchill sets forth its theme:

"How the great democracies triumphed, and so were able to resume the follies which had so nearly cost them their life."

So, the follies continue. I sometimes think they proliferate. France refuses to approve the United Kingdom for membership in the Common Market. Our American markets in Western Europe suffer from restrictions, some of which are arbitrary in the extreme. Our trade suffers. So does our balance of payments.

Our recently proposed multilateral nuclear deterrent, the so-called mixed-manned force, faces mountainous difficulties.

Obstacles to freedom and to collective security are growing, many of them created by our own friends—and many of them created by ourselves.

Self-government is surfeited with trouble; witness the violent racial eruptions within the United States, the vexatious disputes within our Defense Establishments, the sometimes bitter controversies on domestic issues.

The handicap of free self-governing peoples is that we cannot always apply the same, unified, single-minded drive available to the totalitarian.

Yet, gentlemen, I would be remiss if I did not tell you, that despite our burdens, I am confident. I am confident as we face the world of today. I am confident as I look back over our accomplishments and achievements of the world of yesterday.

And I am confident of our future in the world of tomorrow.

One of my reasons is you.

Your minds—and the minds of freemen everywhere—grapple for new discoveries to strengthen and preserve our Nation. And you are finding them.

Someone said recently that science is the key to our defense. How true.

Science, indeed, may be the key to our survival. Let us not fetter science, nor place it in chains.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNESCO POLICY ON PUBLICATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on March 4 the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing on the activities and procedures of UNESCO. The subcommittee devoted special attention to the problem of finding effective ways to insure that publications of UNESCO would not be used as a vehicle for Soviet propaganda.

At that time, Assistant Secretary Lucius Battle, representing the State Department, informed the subcommittee of several publications policy directives which were proposed for submission to the UNESCO Executive Board. Secretary Battle has now written to inform me that these proposals have been adopted in substance by the Board. They are intended to insure, and if properly implemented by the Director General and the Secretariat I think they will insure, that Soviet propaganda will be eliminated from UNESCO publications.

The letter also contains assurances that further action will be taken if close observation by our representatives during the next few months develops indications that it is required.

These developments are gratifying to me personally, and I am confident that they will be welcome to other Senators who participated in the hearings, and to all who have been concerned with the problem. In order that the RECORD may show a more complete explanation of the changes in UNESCO policy which have been effected, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Secretary Battle be printed in full following these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 27, 1963.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: You will recall that on March 4 of this year I appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs to discuss the general question of UNESCO publications, and other activities of the Organization.

At that time, you and the other members of the subcommittee expressed considerable interest in what UNESCO is doing to keep its publications free of Soviet propaganda, and I told the subcommittee that we had submitted five recommendations to UNESCO which we felt would accomplish this purpose. These recommendations, which I read into the record of our meeting, were considered, along with recommendations of other member states, by the UNESCO Executive Board at its recent meeting.

I am pleased to inform you that we were successful in having the Board adopt publications policy directives which incorporate in large measure, the substance of our proposals. Two additional U.S. recommendations, one proposing the establishment of a Publications Board within the UNESCO Secretariat and the other suggesting that directives approved by the Board be given immediate effect, were also adopted. A copy of the resolution incorporating the Executive Board directives on the publications policy is enclosed.

I believe the Executive Board resolution represents a real and constructive step toward elimination of Soviet propaganda from the Organization's publications. Perhaps most important, the Executive Board's resolution establishes for the first time certain conditions which must be satisfied by every UNESCO publication, and defines the purposes to be served by the Organization's publishing activities.

The Executive Board's action advances our objectives in several specific ways. First, it states that publications should take the form of comparative studies, wherever possible, rather than monographs. Although it does not prohibit publication of monographs, the resolution requires that any such studies be directly relevant to specific programs approved by the General Conference of UNESCO, and also that they be consonant with specific plans developed by the Secretariat.

Second, it provides that all publications, except those expressing the official views of the Organization, shall include a statement disclaiming responsibility on the part of the Organization for the author's point of view, the facts stated, or the opinions expressed therein.

Third, it sets up specific rules with which authors of publications must comply. These rules provide that statements likely to offend Member States must be avoided, that publications should not be detrimental to international cooperation, and that controversial ideas should be presented constructively, without derogatory inferences about those who disagree.

Fourth, it establishes a Publications Board within the Secretariate to assist the Director General in putting the publications policy directives into effect.

And, finally, it provides that the criteria includes in the resolution be taken into account in the execution of the current UNESCO program; that is, during 1963–64. It was originally planned that no action would be taken on the publications policy until the next General Conference, late in 1964.

As I mentioned when I appeared before your subcommittee, I am convinced that the UNESCO Secretariat, by and large, has been reasonably successful in resisting Soviet attempts to inject propaganda into UNESCO publications. I think we can expect the Secretariat and the Director-General, himself, to continue to do so, to the best of their ability. Consequently, I feel that the most significant effect of the action taken by the Executive Board will be to strengthen the hand of the Secretariat in dealing with Soviet pressures.

While I think the action taken will help insure that future UNESCO publications are objective, I am not completely satisfied with it. We had, as you know, recommended that UNESCO stop publishing monograph studies of purely national situations. Unfortunately, there was no support among the other members of the Executive Board for this proposal, and it was not adopted. Nevertheless, the directives approved may have the same effect, depending on the manner in which they are applied. If the Secretariat executes the Board's directives forcefully and objectively, we expect little difficulty. If, on the other hand, the standards are applied loosely or with bias, further action may be necessary. I intend to watch this problem closely during the next few months, and wish to assure you that I will take additional steps to strengthen the organization's publications policy, if further action appears to be required.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. BATTLE.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Senators will recall the fine speech by the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] delivered last August, demonstrating that military assistance grants to Latin American countries often disserve our foreign policy objectives.

For a number of years, the Committee on Foreign Relations placed in the authorization bill a ceiling on the amount of aid which could be used for this purpose. The practice was discontinued, after 1960, in the belief, apparently ill founded, that it was no longer necessary after the change of administrations.

A recent article in the New Republic by Alex Neish shows that military expenditures, and our own grant military assistance contributions, continue to rise throughout Latin America. The article corroborates the misgivings of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] as to our continued and expanded participation in this activity. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON MILITARY AID

BUENOS AIRES.—Eleven years ago U.S. military aid to Latin America amounted to $200,000. By 1957 it had jumped to over $44 million and for fiscal year 1963 it was about $75 million. Why the rise? In any nuclear war the contribution of these forces to Western security could only be minimal. Their combined strength is about three-quarters of a million men, and their equipment ranges from conventional American weapons to stockpiles of nonstandardized material bought from the Allies after World War II, now in many cases obsolete. Conceivably, they could serve some function in a nonnuclear war, but because of the precarious nature of most Latin American Governments it is difficult to believe that most of them could or would fight outside the continent. In this century only five of the republics have engaged a foreign enemy, and in three instances—World Wars I and II and the Korean war—their participation was more symbolic than substantial. The military's justification must, therefore, lie in its power to stamp out subversion—specifically, Communist subversion.

To certain industrial or oligarchical interests in Latin America, of course, any group is "subversive" if it is committed to nationalizing key sectors of the economy, or to electing a democratic government which inevitably would be either nationalist or leftwing—inevitably because something like 5 percent of the South American population owns over 60 percent of the agricultural land; inevitably because the bulk of industry is owned by foreign companies who, despite their public-relations experts, are more concerned with siphoning off profits than in contributing to internal development.

Despite the propaganda which percolates through the other republics from Havana, the Communist Party is not strong in South

America. Its largest support in the hemisphere comes from Argentina where the Communist Party has 100,000 members—in effect less than half of 1 percent of the total population. The figure is correspondingly less in other republics. The Communists have accommodated to their weakness by forming official or unofficial alliances with other parties, most notably in Chile with the Socialists and in Brazil with the leaders of the Peasant Leagues in the poverty-stricken Northeast. Thus, although the Communists are active, numerically they alone are not sufficiently threatening in Latin America to require the $2 billion plus that has been spent since the end of World War II on armaments "for national defense and against subversion." And indeed that is not why this amount has been spent. The purpose of most of these military establishments has been not so much to check Communists as to check Nationalists and the parties of the Left, ranging from Peru's Haya de la Torre to Argentina's Arturo Frondizi.

If it is doubtful that this considerable outlay is needed to counter Communist subversion, economically the situation is not even open to doubt; not one of the republics can claim to be able to afford its "defense" expenditures. Argentina, to give one example, has a 1962–63 budget which allocates over 37 million pesos for its armed forces—more than double the 17 million allocated for education and about eight times more than the amount marked down for health and social assistance. Nor is this exceptional: Brazil, Chile, and Peru all join her in spending over 20 percent of their annual budgets on defense.

On the other hand, Latin American governments are spending an average of under $22 on each pupil in their schools; or to put it another way, only 2.2 percent of the gross national product is being used to develop the trained workers Latin America needs. Yet if the continent is going to reach even an adequate educational level in the next 10 years or so, says UNESCO, spending on primary education will have to increase by 55 percent; expenditures on secondary education will have to go up by 152 percent.

The situation is similar in housing. Argentina is short a million and a half units and the shortage increases by 10 percent each year. In Chile 86 percent of the working class live in 1 room only, and the 100,000 who drag their lives out in the slum areas around the capital are only a variation on a theme repeated from Mexico City to Rio to Lima.

Life expectancy in South America averages just under 45 years and drops to 32 in General Stroessner's Paraguay. Daily caloric intake in Bolivia is one-third below recognized subsistence levels, and according to the International Labor Organization 27.3 percent of Chile's population suffers from serious malnutrition and another 11 percent from desperate malnutrition. For every doctor in Latin America there are well over 3,000 patients, and in Chile infant mortality is 120 for every 1,000 live births.

Admittedly in some of the republics the Army has been a power for good—Uruguay is an example that comes readily to mind—but it is far from proved that the political benefit of having the armed forces prepared to intervene in public life has outweighed the disadvantages. Knowing that elections are likely to be nullified if the vote runs contrary to the wishes of the generals. Latin Americans tend to become either apathetic or increasingly sympathetic to extremists. The end product is a sense of futility or an endless fragmentation of political parties. As the rector of the University of Montevideo puts it, "You reach a position where everyone knows that in the elections you can vote but you cannot choose."

By picking up the tab for about 10 percent of Latin America's military bill—with, it seems, no firm control over the way the aid is spent, except on allocation to one of the three branches and the general limitation that chosen weapons should be bought in the United States—America becomes guilty by association, held partially responsible for perpetuating the armed forces as a privileged elite. (Over 30,000 retired officers in Argentina are on full pay.) A shadow falls even on the Alliance for Progress which is not uncommonly described by the Latin American Left as "the new American imperialism."

For many the basic question is that posed by a Colombian politician when he asked: "Against whom are we arming the Latin Americans? * * * We're creating armies which carry no weight in the international balance, but which are monstrous destroyers of the internal life of each nation. Each one of our countries is being occupied by its own army."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **HART**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRISIS AT BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. **HART**. Mr. President, in the past several weeks no subject has been more dramatically reported in the press or more seriously considered by thoughtful Americans than the crisis which developed to a climax in Birmingham, Ala.

It is not my thought that tonight, in any remarks I shall make, a new or different version of that story will develop. I should like, however, to sketch—I hope briefly—some of the background which I think should bear materially on proposals which may be made in response to the crisis and the course which the Congress wisely should follow.

Mr. President, there are many lessons which we can and must learn from the recent crisis in Birmingham.

Our immediate reaction to this kind of racial conflict is usually to ask what additional legislation is needed to deal with such breakdowns of law and order and to protect the right of American citizens to demonstrate peacefully in behalf of their civil rights.

But too often, when law and order are restored in these situations and the sense of urgency passes, we tend to put the whole thing behind us and move on to other seemingly more pressing and immediate issues.

Happily, there is every indication now that this will no longer be true; and all of us who are involved will keep on the top of the agenda the question, What shall each of us do?

Mr. President, in my book the time has come when we must look both ways—back beyond these days of crisis to identifying the underlying causes, and forward to formulating legislative executive programs and tools which will strike at these causes.

What are these causes? They are many and complex, but it is possible to point to them in a general way.

First, there is the lack of equal opportunity in basic areas of life, such as employment, education, and housing.

There are denials of basic constitutional rights—the right to vote and the right to peaceably assemble and petition State and local governments.

There is frustration resulting from continuing patterns of discrimination and segregation in the availability and application of public facilities and programs.

And finally—although this is by no means an exhaustive list—there remain across this country pockets of economic deprivation which compound all the other causes, and where all men are equal—at least in their total lack of opportunity and hope.

Mr. President, we must act now on three broad fronts against the causes which produced the disasters of Birmingham.

First, the Congress must not delay longer in enacting a broad civil rights program which will guarantee basic constitutional rights to all Americans and open up employment and education opportunities to all on an equal basis.

Senators on both sides of the aisle have offered such a program to the Senate. When we look at the several bills introduced by Senators on this side of the aisle we see how clearly they relate to the difficulties in Birmingham.

One of the major concerns of the Negro community in Birmingham is the improvement in job opportunities. Unemployment rates among Negroes are consistently double the national unemployment rate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has introduced S. 773, a bill to create in the executive branch a Fair Employment Practice Commission. This bill would provide administrative and court remedies for persons discriminated against as a result of race or color in government and in interstate commerce employment. The Manpower and Labor Subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 773 this summer.

Another concern of Birmingham Negroes is that a start be made in desegregating the public schools. Nine years after the Supreme Court decision, which held that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal, some 2,000 school districts in this country remain completely segregated.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has introduced S. 772, which would require every segregated school district to file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a desegregation plan including plans for first-step compliance within 6 months. The bill would also provide for technical and financial assistance to desegregating school districts, and for court enforcement of the provisions of the act.

One of the chief frustrations in Birmingham and other areas of racial unrest is the unresponsiveness of State and local governments. I do not believe a long discourse on the subject is necessary to establish the proposition that such unresponsiveness would not long survive the enfranchisement of the many Negroes in the South who are now disenfranchised.

The President, in his message to the Congress on civil rights earlier this year, asked for additional legislation to supplement the tools provided by Congress in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. It was my privilege to introduce S. 1283, which embodies the President's recommendations. This bill provides for the appointment of temporary referees to register those who are qualified to vote in areas where voting cases have been brought. The bill would also require uniform application of registration tests and procedures, would make a sixth grade education a sufficient showing of literacy for purposes of qualifying to vote, and would require expedited treatment in the Federal courts for voting rights cases. The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has promised that hearings will be scheduled on this bill.

Another major concern of Negroes in Birmingham has been the jailing of demonstrators. This situation raises the question as to whether or not the Federal Government has adequate tools to protect the rights of Americans to free speech and assembly.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has introduced S. 1389, which is a refinement of that proposal first before the Congress in 1957, which has become known as title III. Under this bill the Attorney General is authorized to institute action for preventive relief wherever there exists a threat that equal protection of the laws, as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, will be denied to any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

One of the most trying of the denials of opportunity and the equality that gave rise to the demonstration in Birmingham, and has elsewhere in this country, is the fact, for example, that a young American on his way to report for service in the Army, could not stop and get a hamburger and a cup of coffee in a restaurant.

It requires no discussion here, I believe, to emphasize the necessity that Negroes in this country be assured that the Federal Government is in a position, and does move, to insure that those facilities and services in the flow of interstate commerce shall be available equally to all.

With the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduced S. 1622, a bill to prevent certain discriminatory practices by persons engaged in businesses affecting commerce.

This bill has been referred to the Committee on Commerce, on which it is my honor to serve. I feel that enactment promptly of legislation of this character can go perhaps further than, and certainly as far as, any single legislative action that we can take to meet the demands—the reasonable demands—and to eliminate a principal pressure for the public demonstrations which all of us know can lead to grave disaster.

Finally, one of the chief problems in Birmingham, as in other racial troublespots, has been the lack of communication between the white and Negro communities.

The President this year asked that the life of the Civil Rights Commission be extended and that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse to provide information, advice, and technical assistance at the request of public or private agencies. S. 1117, which I have introduced, carries out these recommendations of the President. Hearings are now underway on this bill before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

The recent crisis in Birmingham should provide a new sense of urgency for the enactment of this broad civil rights program. But the job will not be easy. Those of us who urged last January that the Senate modernize its rules felt then and feel now that it would be extremely difficult to enact civil rights and related economic legislation under the present rules. But it is a challenge to which we must bend every effort.

Birmingham should, then, remind us of legislation which remains to be enacted. It should also give impetus to a thorough examination of the extent to which Federal funds are underwriting programs and activities in the States which are segregated or administered in a discriminatory manner.

A few weeks ago the Civil Rights Commission recommended the use of economic persuasion by the Federal Government in areas where American citizens are being denied their constitutional rights. Unfortunately, there were misinterpretations of this report.

What the Commission has sought to point out is that in virtually every State in the Union Federal funds go into programs where basic forms of discrimination still exist in the application and operation of the programs.

In my book, the underwriting of racial discrimination with Federal funds is a situation which can no longer be tolerated. I have directed letters to a number of executive departments and agencies with the following question and request:

> If racial discrimination occurs in those operations and activities of any grant or loan program administered by you, do you consider you lack authority to withhold such Federal funds? If so, would you please identify the program and explain the reasons it is thought such authority is not available, together with the nature of the additional authority you would need.

If agencies of the Federal Government, in reply to the question I have directed to them, indicate a lack of authority to withhold funds from programs administered by them, then clearly Congress will have the additional responsibility of providing such authority.

Mr. President, there is a third important front on which we must move. All who observe current history see the impact on our national life of patterns of migration within this country. Millions of those who were born and raised on our farms have gone to the cities to seek employment. Millions of Negroes have moved from the South to the industrial centers of the North. There has also been a great movement of people within metropolitan areas from the city to the suburbs. As a result, the center cities of our large urban areas have become ghettos of the undereducated, unskilled, unemployed, ill-nourished, poorly housed—ghettos of hopelessness and despair.

These conditions are not only self-perpetuating—they also are the breeding ground of many of our major social and economic problems: school dropouts, juvenile delinquency, hard-core unemployment, crime, and inevitably, racial tensions.

Many tools exist today in ongoing national programs that must be brought to bear with new urgency and perspective on the job to be done in these center city areas.

Federal housing programs have financed the white suburbs of the sixties—they must now be redesigned to meet the needs of low income families in our cities.

The beginnings of job retraining have been hampered by restrictions requiring availability of local jobs, lack of personnel, and the absence of courses of study designed for the unskilled. We must accelerate the redirection of our training and vocational education programs.

One shocking example should make the point. The federally assisted school lunch program is being used least in the older downtown schools, where most of our underprivileged children go. It's the new suburban school with the new cafeteria that provides a noon lunch.

In short, many existing Federal and Federal-State programs can and must be redirected to the staggering problems of our center cities. The problems that we face as a Nation in the 1960's will not be solved until they are solved in these urban areas.

Hopefully the legacy of Birmingham will be a resolution to act on these three fronts—a renewed effort to enact into law a broad civil rights program, an examination of the programs of our Federal agencies to insure that they contribute in no way to patterns of racial segregation and discrimination, and a redirection of the resources of the Federal Government to those areas of our urban centers where inequality of opportunity and discrimination are compounded by severe economic deprivation.

I remain confident that this democratic society can mobilize its vital forces and resources for a major attack on those conditions which produced the crisis in Birmingham.

Earlier, I commented on the fact that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is holding hearings on the bills proposing an extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This afternoon the distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Dr. John A. Hannah, testified before the subcommittee. Dr. Hannah is the president of Michigan State University and has filled effectively many roles of importance in the National Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the statement that Dr. Hannah made before the subcommittee today.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, my purpose in giving the summary of where we stand so far as proposed legislation is concerned, and the reason for making my summary at this time, is to provide a means of reviewing those things which have already been proposed. I do so in order that the fact can be underscored that the Senate has had suggestions made to it by some of its Members as to those courses which wisdom and prudence indicate we had better follow, not alone in the light of Birmingham, but also in the light of a reading of history. If it had not been Birmingham, it might well have been some other place. No one is so foolish as to think that there will not be other Birminghams. There will be these pressures until Members of Congress and other officials in position of public responsibility have developed those tools and adopted those policies which remove the sources of irritation which culminate in demonstrations that can produce a disaster, whatever the good intentions of the persons involved may be.

Basically, this problem is one of one's personal conduct and one's moral standards. Legislation alone, all of us know, will not change the attitude of an individual. However, men and women of good will in this country nonetheless will require, in addition to all that good will, specific legislative tools and administrative orders which will enable this country finally to be able honestly to say that we do in fact practice what we preach to the rest of the world on what we stand for. I hope that day will soon be at hand.

Exhibit 1

Testimony of Dr. John A. Hannah, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. 1117 and Other Pending Legislation, Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate your invitation, extended on behalf of Senator Hart, to add to the testimony already presented on behalf of the Commission my own views on legislation which would extend the life of the agency and revise its functions.

The testimony this committee has received from Commissioner Griswold and Mr. Bernhard fully states the reasons for a long-term extension of the Commission on Civil Rights and an amplification of its authority. I would add only a few personal reflections, based in part upon my experience during the past 5 years as Chairman of the Commission.

It is clear to me that we are in the midst of a revolutionary change in race relations in this Nation. When our Commission was established in 1957, the national policy of equal opportunity was already firmly embedded in the law. The principle had been eloquently stated long ago in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment to the Constitution. It had been implemented in a series of judicial decisions, particularly the Supreme Court's opinions in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and the cases following, which said without qualification that segregation in all aspects of public life violated the Constitution.

Yet, as the Commission was to learn in a series of investigations and hearings in all sections of the Nation, there was widespread disregard of these basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The Commission learned, too, in its hearings and investigations that the denial of equal opportunity had inflicted deep wounds upon the Negro community, wounds which were keenly felt by the great majority of its citizens. This last fact was perhaps not very apparent to most of the American public. There were, of course, a number of organizations of standing which had been working over the years to secure equal rights for Negro citizens, employing such traditional methods as litigation, legislation, political and community action. But the deep discontent of the average Negro citizen had not manifested itself in the kind of overt action dramatic enough to compel our attention. Thus, it was possible for some people to conclude that the activities of the NAACP, the Urban League, and other organizations did not reflect any strong dissatisfaction on the part of the Negro community.

The events of recent weeks have shattered any such illusion. It is a measure of the desperation of the Negro people of Birmingham that they were willing to see their children go to jail in the hope that it would contribute to a better future for them. And the deep feelings of Birmingham have been echoed in demonstrations in North Carolina; Philadelphia; Jackson, Miss., and other cities all over the Nation.

These actions and the feelings which prompted them must be understood. Instead of being overly critical of leaders who now demand action, we should be grateful to American Negroes for their patience, forbearance, and tolerance over the long years of slow progress. Violence cannot be condoned, but we should understand why some feel that they are driven to it.

In this connection, I would ask those who plead and argue for a gradual alleviation of the Negro's miserable lot to put himself in the place of a Negro and ask himself how patient he would be if, 9 years after the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, he saw fewer than 8 percent of Negro children in the South attending integrated schools, and in Mississippi, South Carolina, and Alabama none; if he saw equal opportunities for employment denied to him; if he saw himself still without a vote 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation; if he saw good housing denied him even if he could afford it; and if he saw his fellows receive a different kind of treatment by police officers than that accorded whites. Philosophically, a slow tenuous advance toward equality in education, employment, voting, housing, and justice may be best, but the individual Negro cannot afford to be that philosophical. He has but one lifetime; who can blame him for wanting to enjoy his rights within that lifetime?

The turmoil will continue. Out of it, I am sure there will come an end to many of the racial practices that violate our Constitution and our consciences. In just 3 years, the sit-in movement, led by college students, has altered customs in more than 100 communities that had resisted change for more than a half century before. As the pace of the protest movement quickens, these barriers will continue to fall. But the effort to bring an end to overt practices of discrimination is only one part of the problem. If, when the current struggle is over, we have been driven into opposite camps and are left with a legacy of hate, fear, and mistrust, nobody will be the victor.

This, it seems to me, is the real danger. In many places, tensions are now so great and feelings so bitter that it is difficult to see how they can be alleviated. Binding up the Nation's wounds may well be a task almost as difficult as it was when Lincoln spoke of it almost a century ago. It is a job which challenges the resources and imagination of the Federal Government.

Thus, it would be a serious mistake, in my judgment, for the Congress to contemplate the elimination of any part of the civil rights machinery of the Federal Government. A public agency with a continuing responsibility for bringing to light the facts and making recommendations for corrective action is a necessity. By performing these duties responsibly, the agency helps to reduce tensions and to promote calm and reasonable solutions to civil rights problems. Beyond the fact-finding function, there is an even more pressing need for constructive action. As the President said in his civil rights message to Congress, "* * * there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress." Solutions must be found at all levels of society—by State and local governments, by industry and labor unions, by community and religious groups, as well as by the Federal Government.

No single agency or institution can hope to have all the answers. But it would be a contribution of immeasurable importance to vest in some agency of the Federal Government the function of collecting and making information available and of providing assistance and guidance to communities faced with civil rights problems.

I support the legislation introduced by Senator Hart (S. 1117) to accomplish this purpose by revising the authority of the Commission on Civil Rights. If, however, the Commission is to perform these new duties effectively, it should be placed on a more stable basis. The 4-year extension provided in S. 1117 would assure sufficient continuity for the Commission to plan its operations efficiently and effectively. But in my own judgment, a permanent extension of the agency is amply warranted by the facts. No one can foresee the day when the guarantees of our Constitution will be fully secured to all citizens, much less the time when prejudice and mistrust will be replaced by understanding and racial harmony. It would be a significant token of our maturity and resolve if we recognized this fact by establishing a permanent instrumentality for dealing with civil rights problems, rather than attempting to meet them on an ad hoc, crisis-by-crisis basis.

As long as there are still widespread denials of basic rights there will be a need to improve the enforcement procedures available to the Federal Government. But if in the long run we are seeking lasting solutions and better race relations, the constructive resources of Government should also be put to work. S. 1117 would be a significant step toward that goal.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, June 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Federal Communications Commission

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1961.

Department of the Air Force

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

U.S. Army

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara O18062, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Creighton William Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Farnsworth Smoller O19146, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Beverley Evans Powell O20237, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell O21065, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig Gen. Robert Carson Kyser O19535, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut O19077, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock O20609, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin O21980, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor O20699, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward William Sawyer O19918, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Merle Powell O19340, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles Marsden Duke O21753, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Vincent Wilson O23564, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Raymond Bradner Marlin O21899, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Jack Girard O34110, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Cantrell O22682, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Roderick Wetherill O23158, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O34406, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290, U.S. Army.

Col. John Denis Crowley, Jr., O25016, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence Joseph Lang O40705, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Milton Hightower O23531, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Colonel James Arthur Hebbeler O24518, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

U.S. Air Force

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Gen. Samuel E. Anderson 92–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Truman H. Landon 93–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. George W. Mundy 358–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs 356–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. Robert M. Lee 590–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Jacob E. Smart 592–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Joe W. Kelly 612–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway 654–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William O. Senter 648–A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves 1082–A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston 1337–A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade 1582–A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst 1350–A, Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edward H. Underhill 421–A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier generals

William H. Klenke.
Harry N. Lyon.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier general

Sidney S. McMath.

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Robert B. Luckey, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Maj. Gen. James P. Berkeley, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

Lt. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

U.S. Navy

To be vice admirals

Vice Adm. George F. Beardsley, U.S. Navy, to have the grade indicated on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

The following-named officer of the Chaplain Corps of the Regular Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admiral

James W. Kelly

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning Elmond H. Abbott to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Meredith P. Smith to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Michael W. Acker to be first lieutenant, and ending Alvin W. Smith, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Oliver K. Jones to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Leonard P. Zych to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 14, 1963.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning John Z. Fichtner to be major, and ending Jerry S. Walker to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 6, 1963.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Robert O. Beals, Jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade), and ending William Benjamin, Jr., to be permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Louis N. Anclaux to be ensign, and ending Johnnie C. Dennis to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 13, 1963; and

The nominations beginning James R. Moyers to be lieutenant, and ending John T. Watson to be permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 21, 1963.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning William B. Binch to be first lieutenant, and ending Henry G. Williams, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Thomas R. Baisley to be first lieutenant, and ending Michael H. Vidos to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 13, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Robert E. Brengartner, Catholic chaplain at the U.S. Naval Medical Center, offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

We recommend likewise to Thine unbounded mercy all of our brothers and fellow citizens throughout the United States that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law—that they may be preserved in union and in that peace which the world cannot give. We pray that, after enjoying the blessings of this life, they may be admitted to those which are eternal.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1371-63

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms, which was read:

JUNE 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have in my official capacity as Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives been served in a civil action in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (civil action file No. 1371-63). Having in mind that the privileges of the House of Representatives may be involved, I am bringing this matter to your attention.

I did, on June 5, 1963, address a letter to the Honorable David C. Acheson, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, requesting assignment of counsel to represent the Sergeant at Arms as provided for in 2 United States Code 118. A copy of that letter is attached hereto.

Sincerely,
ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Sergeant at Arms.

JUNE 6, 1963.

Hon. DAVID C. ACHESON,
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: I respectfully request that you assign counsel to represent the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., in a civil action in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (civil action file No. 1371-63) pursuant to 2 United States Code 118. I was served in my official capacity, on June 4, 1963, with instructions to answer the complaint within 60 days after service.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the summons which was served on me. I may add that I will be available at any time to confer with any counsel that you may assign to this case.

Very truly yours,
ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Sergeant at Arms.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE EMIL V. PACINI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen sense of grief that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable Emil V. Pacini, a distinguished Chicagoan, the Democratic committeeman of the 10th ward in the district that I have the honor to represent and for many years the alderman from that ward in the City Council of Chicago. As chairman of the council's building and zoning committee for 9 years, he fathered many amendments to the city building code and was responsible for air pollution and electrical codes, and was recognized as the outstanding authority of the Nation in this area of municipal government.

His untimely passing at the age of 64 is a great loss to Chicago, to Illinois, and to the Nation. His death brings deep sadness to all members of the Illinois delegation and, in especially deep measure to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], who served with him for many years in the City Council of Chicago, and to our colleagues, the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] who with Mr. MURPHY, were associated with him in the counsels of the Democratic Party of Cook County as ward committeemen.

Mr. Pacini was a native of Chicago. He served with the Army Air Corps in World War I. As a young man he was an auto race driver and participated in the 500-mile race at Indianapolis. Later, he was secretary to our late beloved colleague, the Honorable William A. Rowan, when the latter was a member of the Chicago City Council, before his election to the 78th Congress from the 2d District of Illinois.

Emil V. Pacini was a great American. His name will long be held in loving memory. To his wife, his son, William, to his two daughters and his six grandchildren, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues from Illinois may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Emil V. Pacini's passing has occasioned a deep personal grief among all our Chicago delegation. I first knew him at the commencement of his political career when he served as secretary to the then Alderman William A. Rowan. On Rowan's election to the 78th Congress as the Representative from the Second District of Illinois, Pacini became the

Democratic ward committeeman and alderman of the 10th ward, which is the center of the steel industry on Chicago's far South Side.

He was a powerful leader in the Democratic Party and his service as alderman won for him national acclaim as one of the country's outstanding zoning authorities. The zoning code that he drafted was adopted in many cities from coast to coast. He was an indefatigable worker, seldom if ever took a vacation, and it was this tireless devotion to his aldermanic and party duties that brought on the heart attack from which he never recovered. His death at the early age of 64 followed by a year or so the passing of our former colleague, Congressman Rowan.

He was my warm friend during all the years of his distinguished public service, and I am deeply saddened by his demise. Chicago has lost a native son whose lifework had contributed immeasurably to the progress and welfare of the city of his birth and of his love. Mrs. O'Brien joins me in deepest sympathy to his fine wife, his son William, and his two daughters.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, with the dean and all the other members of the Chicago delegation I am deeply grieved by the passing of Emil V. Pacini and extend to Mrs. Pacini, his son, William, and his daughters, my deepest sympathy. Our warm friendship and association together in the councils of the Democratic Party of Cook County covered many years. He dedicated his life to the service of the people of his ward and of the city of Chicago. The zoning amendments for which in large measure he was responsible, and which represented months of hard and highly intelligent work, stand as a lasting monument to his memory.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join in eulogizing Emil Pacini, who for many years has been one of the outstanding aldermen of the city of Chicago. During his service on the Chicago City Council, he acquired renown as chairman of the zoning commission, and became a recognized expert in intricate zoning problems of the metropolitan areas of the country. He was a dedicated family man, a hard-working, conscientious public official, the type of man who demonstrated the effectiveness of the principle of home rule.

I join the gentleman from Illinois, Barratt O'Hara, and other Members of Congress from the Chicago metropolitan area, in paying my respects to his memory and extending my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones in his untimely passing.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from the city of Chicago, in expressing my feelings of genuine sorrow on the loss of Hon. Emil V. Pacini who served in the city council for many years.

I have known Alderman Pacini for more than 20 years. He served as chairman of the committee on building and zoning and helped draw up the comprehensive zoning ordinance of 1957 which involved a full review of every parcel of property in Chicago.

He was loved and endeared by the people he represented. He established the reputation as being a champion of the poor and those in need of aid. He was a great public servant and he will be missed by the people of his locality.

To his widow and family, I wish to convey my feelings of genuine sorrow for the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned of the passing of Emil V. Pacini in Chicago.

Mr. Pacini was a very dear friend of mine for many years. He was an outstanding Chicagoan, having been a leader in the civic and political life of Chicago for many years.

Mr. Pacini was the Democratic ward committeeman of the 10th ward of Chicago and represented that ward in the Chicago City Council for over 20 years. His major contribution to the city was the enactment of the legislation of the Chicago Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, and the modernization of the Chicago Building Code.

My association with him in the city council and the County Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Cook County enabled me to become aware of his strong character and devotion to his public duties.

The city of Chicago will experience great loss, especially the people of the South Chicago community. My sympathy to Mrs. Pacini and family in this great hour of grief.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to join with many others who express their sympathy over the passing of Mr. Emil V. Pacini, a former alderman in the city of Chicago, who was serving as ward committeeman of Chicago's 10th ward at the time of his death.

Emil was first elected to the city council by the residents of the 10th ward in 1945 and he served these people until April of this year. Having had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee, I can say he was a sympathetic man and a person who believed in doing everything possible for the welfare of his people. He was a diligent, hardworking public servant.

He will be missed, and his passing is a loss not only to the residents of the 10th ward he so ably represented, but to the city of Chicago. As an expert on building and zoning he achieved a great deal for the benefit of Chicago's citizenry.

I wish to extend condolences to Mrs. Pacini and the family in the loss of this splendid man.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my Chicago colleague in tribute to the memory of Emil V. Pacini and in expression of sympathy to the members of his family. He was held in high and affectionate regard by many in southern Illinois and his reputation as a zoning authority was well established among the municipal officials in the cities down State. His death is a blow not only to Chicago, but to all the State of Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Emil V. Pacini ends the political career of one of the most active aldermen and committeemen of the city of Chicago.

His political activity in the 10th ward of our beloved city won for him recognition as a leader among the officials of the Democratic Party. He entered the city council in 1945, serving on many of its important committees until his political retirement in April 1963.

He was chairman of the powerful committee on building and zoning whose jurisdiction covered the implementation of Chicago's intricate Wacker plan for the beautification of Chicago and modernization of the classification of the use of city property zoned to accomplish this purpose.

In 1957, Chairman Pacini, with his committee, perfected the ordinance passed by council which is the present zoning regulation for the city of Chicago. It was a tremendous undertaking requiring an analytical survey of every property in the city of Chicago. The numerous conferences and public hearings entailed hours of laborious effort and the study of reports by experts in this field. It is felt by many of his associates that the chairman taxed his energy beyond physical endurance in completing this important assignment. His work contributed so much to the great strides in building a new Chicago stimulated by adoption of his ordinance promulgating the great Chicago plan after many years of delay.

He always evinced great interest in sports emanating from his auto-racing days in his youth, and boating experiences in later life. In the latter his enthusiasm carried over into his work as chairman of the Committee on Port of Chicago Wharves and Bridges.

Mr. Pacini was a gentle, soft speaking individual who valued the loyalties of friendship. He was a person independent in his thinking and no one could influence his opinion if he felt in principle that he was right.

In private life he was a building contractor. He reflected even in this employment the high sense of artistry seeking perfection. He was an expert in the lost science of installing, repairing, and making leaded church windows depicting figures and scenes of biblical significance. Piecing together the colored tinted glass fragments that leaded together depict the biblical versions of theological study requires a degree of patience and study that challenges the highest accomplishments of artistry.

We the congressional delegation from Illinois extend to his dear wife, Ethel, his son, William, and daughters, Mrs. Patricia McMahon and Mrs. Anita Bean our heartfelt condolence.

In his passing, Chicago has lost one of its devoted public servants and the State of Illinois, and the Nation one of its loyal and patriotic citizens.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of Alderman and Committeeman Emil V. Pacini. His death was unexpected and everyone will miss him.

His friends and supporters were numerous which can be attributed to his faithful service to the Democratic Party and to the people of his ward. As alderman of the 10th ward of Chicago he worked hard on behalf of his constituents and many of the improvements which have been accomplished in his ward over the past few years were gained through his continued efforts.

He was a man of many talents and abilities and we who knew him are grieved by his loss.

IT'S BROOKLYN DAY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, with crash of brass and blare of trumpets, some 100,000 Sunday schoolteachers and children from all over the borough will begin parading tomorrow at 2 p.m. in honor of Brooklyn Day.

However, it is not, strictly speaking, "Brooklyn Day," says William S. Webb, treasurer of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. It is the celebration of the founding of the union, established in 1816.

The union is made up of Protestant Sunday schools throughout the borough. Schools in Brooklyn and Queens were closed by law in 1860 on Anniversary Day, because it was found that the majority of them took off to celebrate anyway.

There will be 26 separate parades in Brooklyn, with the main one along the long meadow in Prospect Park. The reviewing stand along that line of march will be studied with notables, including Mayor Wagner, Borough President Stark, Parks Commissioner Newbold Morris, and Fire Commissioher Edward Thompson.

The union was founded by Joshua Sands; the first celebration of its inception was in 1829, at the Sands Street Methodist Episcopal Church. The first annual parade was held on June 26, 1838.

Now the celebration is held on the first Thursday in June.

This is the 147th anniversary of the founding. There will be a luncheon at 12:30 p.m. at the Montauk Club, Eighth Avenue and Lincoln Place.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I was quite amused about 2 weeks ago when the Agency for International Development sent me a release announcing that the A. B. Chance Co. of Centralia, Mo., in my district, had been awarded a contract for industrial goods under the foreign-aid program. Mr. Gano Chance, the chairman of the board of the A. B. Chance Co., is the most illustrious member of the John Birch Society in Missouri. Mr. Chance, on May 31, wrote me objecting to this practice of AID. Although I do not agree with Mr. Chance in regard to the John Birch Society—I feel that the Nation would be better off if the John Birch Society did not exist—I do feel that Mr. Chance validly objects to the efforts of the Agency for International Development to sell the foreign-aid program on the basis of what it will do for the economy of this country. I hope no Member of the House will permit his vote to be influenced by the impact which foreign aid has on the economy of his district.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONCERTED DRIVE NEEDED FOR OAS ACTION ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a special OAS committee headed by Ambassador de Lavalle of Peru has just made its recommendations for concerted action against Cuba available to the full OAS Council.

Three of our Latin American friends have requested that action on these recommendations be withheld until at least July 3 of this year. The countries in question are Mexico, Bolivia, and Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, the De Lavalle committee has been working on these recommendations since last October. There is no valid reason to procrastinate OAS consideration of these recommendations.

These three countries have received generous U.S. aid for some time now, yet, they are doing their utmost to stall positive hemsipheric action against Castro.

During fiscal year 1962 alone, Brazil received a total of $242 million in U.S. aid, Mexico received a total of $143 million, and Bolivia received $35.5 million. Yet, these three countries are not doing their utmost to secure speedy hemispheric action against communism in this hemisphere.

It is high time this Nation started directing its aid program more toward nations willing to cooperate with our national goals, and not so much toward those who are unwilling to exert full effort for the cause of freedom.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia on Monday, June 17, instead of Monday, June 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPENDING CUTS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I noted in Robert Albright's column in the Washington Post of May 26, that our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHARLES S. JOELSON has encountered: a "deafening silence" in response of his challenge to Members of Congress to let him know where spending cuts can be made in their own districts. Well, here are three instances in my district—the 13th of California:

Case No. 1—Closing of Camp San Luis: In 1961, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense recommending that this Army base be closed, the military personnel located there be assigned elsewhere, and the several hundred acres involved be returned to the tax rolls.

Case No. 2—Transfer of the Yards and Docks supply office at Port Hueneme Naval Construction Battalion Center to Pennsylvania: Civilian personnel affected: 242 employees. The Navy claimed it could do the job with 68 fewer persons. I requested high-level Navy officials to review their initial decision; this was done, with the result that the potential savings were verified. Upon receiving this verification, I stated:

> I believe that, in line with my pleas for greater efficiency and reduction in Federal spending, I am in no position to enter a protest.

Case No. 3—Channel Islands: I have not introduced a companion House bill to Senator ENGLE's bill authorizing the Federal Government to acquire the Channel Islands in my district. This acquisition would involve a Federal expenditure of at least $20 million.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of months I have taken the floor to call attention to the crime situation in Washington, not having to do with law enforcement, but the prosecution of the law. I am quite sure you are all aware that it is almost a year ago that my secretary was unfortunately attacked in St. Peter's Church, just 2 blocks away, and stabbed 10 times. She was almost to the point of death. She is now fully recovered, I believe. However, the criminal was arrested and pleaded guilty as far back as April of this year. Up to the present time this man has not been sentenced. He has been cleared by St. Elizabeths. Everything has been done, but still he has not been sentenced for that crime and the confession of other crimes.

There is another criminal who murdered a policeman about 3 years ago. To this day he has not been sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia.

I say that if we in the Congress and if we in the District are to show an example to this Nation, I think our committees should get busy and find out what is wrong with justice in Washington, D.C., in trying to make this a safe place for people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71]

Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bell
Buckley
Cederberg
Clausen
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Edmondson
Foreman
Forrester
Gill
Goodell
Gray
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hollifield
Jones, Ala.
Lesinski
McClory
McLoskey
Mailliard
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Rains
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Sibal
Skubitz
Staebler
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Udall
Van Deerlin
Wallhauser
Westland
Whitener
Williams

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6754, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year for all of the activities that are grouped under the Department of Agriculture. As I expressed it in the Committee on Appropriations earlier in the week, when I went on this subcommittee quite a number of years ago I did so with a great deal of pride, knowing how important it was to the farm population of the United States. They were quite numerous and it gave me an opportunity to do much for many of the people who were my constituents as well as those throughout the Nation.

With time the picture has greatly changed. The numbers now on the farm are something like 8 percent of the population. Not only that, but it has gotten to the point where the 92 percent of the American public are in the cities and removed from the farm. However, the challenge that has come to me is just as great today as it was the day I started serving on this committee, because the challenge is to try to look after those things that are done within the Department of Agriculture today, which might well be termed the very basis of the prosperity of the 92 percent of the nonfarmers in this country.

What I am saying to you is that this bill might well be termed the "Basic Security Act for 185 million Americans." And let me tell you why I say that. This Nation is spending 63 percent of the total governmental income on national defense and related activities, and yet we have not seen any reduction in our standard of living. No nation in history ever went through that experience.

Because of the wonderful job that is being done on the farms of the United States of America, a large majority of our total population is free to live in cities, to produce television, radio sets, and the million and one things that make up our high standard of living.

Not only that, but this 8 percent on the farm provides this food, shelter, and clothing at such a reasonable rate that our 185 million Americans pay about 20 percent of their gross income for food, which no nation in the world can match.

When I come to you here today as chairman and spokesman for the Subcommittee on Appropriations I do so with pride, knowing that our subcommittee cannot resolve all differences in that we cannot satisfy the press and those others who naturally are writing for the 92 percent of nonfarmers. They do not have the time to read all our hearings and go into just what is involved here. But in bringing this bill here I will tell you that our subcommittee has done its best to resolve the differences of opinion and to be certain that the funds in this bill go to the things that are essential for the future.

Last year we had 173 million people come into and go out of the United States. That includes those that cross the borders of Canada and Mexico. We had something like 23.5 million pieces of baggage brought into this country. We know that every day there is a tremendous increase in the number of jet planes traveling from where the worst diseases that might prevail in any spot in the world might end up in your part of the country in 5 or 6 hours from the time they leave from abroad.

What does that mean to us? It leaves us with the problem of seeing that these diseases are destroyed and that the possible carriers of diseases are checked thoroughly to see that these diseases do not get in here.

As our population has grown and as the livestock industry has changed and the stockyards have been distributed, we have the problem of inspecting every piece of meat that goes onto your table. Not only that, but if this Department did not have research on wheat, for instance, in 5 years the wheat we now have would be gone and we would be going hungry. We have to stay 5 years ahead to have a strain of wheat that would be immune to diseases, which will continue to attack it.

We read in the press about how expensive the operations of the Department of Agriculture may be. But remember that you cannot deal with agriculture as a thing apart, neither can you afford to take it for granted that food, clothing, and shelter are no longer basic. They are just as basic today as they were in the beginning. Not only that, but as people have left the farms of the country, they have had to be replaced by machinery and other things at a tremendous financial investment. In fact, the amount of money required to operate a farm has grown by 700 percent in a few years. It takes about $47,000 on the average to operate a farm today; in 1940 it took only $6,000. A few years ago a man on a farm could have seven crop failures and still be in business. Today if he loses a crop 1 year he is out of business.

We are here presenting a bill to you that represents the 8 percent who are using the equipment, machinery, and all the other things that go to operate these farms. We are dealing in this bill with that part of our Government that looks after protecting our natural resources for the future. We here present to you the basic thing on which all the rest must depend.

Let me point out one or two facts to you. You have to deal with agriculture in connection with labor and in connection with industry. You are going to have to keep a balance among the three for the benefit of the general population and welfare of each of the segments of our economy. In the bill we present to you, there is only about one-twelfth as much as we are spending for national defense.

In this bill there is only the same amount that we are spending each year on international affairs. Yes, and may I say it is almost exactly the same amount we are spending this year trying to get a man on the moon. Now, we are entitled to make comparisons to see whether we are doing too much and paying too much and looking after and taking care of those basic things upon which all the rest of our economy is built.

I think all of you realize that my experience and my voting record here would indicate that I believe in a balanced budget. I believe in maintaining the stability of our monetary system. But I say candidly to you that if we will look after this country of ours and if we look after our rivers and harbors and our streams, and if we develop our roads and our schools and buildings and all these other material things, then our children and our grandchildren can protect their own financial system if they have to. But if you let the things that are included in this bill go by the board—if you let our trees die out, and if you let our watersheds wash away, and if you let all those things that create our real wealth disappear from the earth, then you can have a budget as black and as wide as from here to the other end of the Capitol; but if you do not have a country behind it, what good would it be?

I want to say we have worked hard on this bill this year trying to hold things in line. We worked hard trying to help the American people and in protecting our sources of food, fiber, and clothing and in trying to protect ourselves against the importation of disease and pestilence, and in trying to see that a fair share of what we produce goes back into the soil so as to protect future generations of Americans. Of course, we cannot say we have been perfect or have been completely successful but we have done the best we can.

We bring to you a bill that is some $389 million below the budget estimate. Frankly, quite a bit of that is due to a reduction in funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, that huge corporation which carries the burden of our price supports. But it is made possible, because they have followed what we have urged them to do in the past, and that is to sell on the market these commodities that they have so to make those funds available, to discharge their responsibilities.

The bill before you is about $28 million less than last year. They came before our committee and showed that we do have this increased need for meat inspection and we have these river survey projects that are tied in with the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture. There are many, many places where we have new laboratories which, in turn, have to have personnel. Of course without the necessary personnel, you would be wasting your money on the laboratories. But I do say to you out of about 1,200 new employees that were requested in the budget, we scaled the number down to a net increase of 180.

I repeat again, in this situation where American farmers numerically are so few—it is a challenge to sell to the Congress and to the American people the fact that it is their business—the business of the entire American people—that we are dealing with and not just the business of a handful of people who still live on the farm. We are dealing with the very basis of the standard of living of all Americans, trying to make it possible for Congress to do the things that we have to do in the name of defense, sending a man to the moon, and all the rest of these things. Yes, this is basically the bill that is before you. I repeat again—we have held things in line.

Mr. Chairman, I would pay tribute here to the hard-working members of our subcommittee. This is our first bill where my colleague, Hon. WALT HORAN, has been ranking minority member. He is a fine Congressman, well versed in agriculture. Though we have missed Congressmen Marshall, Andersen, and others who have helped us in the past, BILL NATCHER, of Kentucky, has rendered real service as usual. The only new member on our subcommittee this year is the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADDABBO. I say candidly that some years ago when the first member from the city of New York, Fred Santangelo, was put on the committee, who was my personal friend and a fine person, the question arose in the minds of some as to why a man from the city of New York would be interested or why he would be chosen to serve on a committee dealing strictly with farm appropriation bills. But, I think you will realize that in this day and time, when 185 million Americans look to agriculture, and all of us must, and where more than 50 percent of the amount carried in this bill is for things not connected solely with farming, but has to do more with protection of public health and with all the many things that are so important to all consumers, then I do not think there is anything more fitting than to have a representative or representatives from the consuming areas of our nation on the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

I do not mean to overlook my friend BOB MICHEL. We differ in viewpoint at times but he is a real and fine gentleman who backs his own viewpoint.

I mean that from the bottom of my heart. I say if that is going to be the situation and recognized—and I am glad to see our leaders do recognize it—we are proud to have our new colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], on the committee because the gentleman does understand the consumer aspect of these matters. I think it is well for us to understand his problems and the problems of his area. I further think it is good for him to have an opportunity to see how closely tied in the operations of this Department are to the welfare of all Americans.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As the gentleman said, of course, a big chunk of this bill is for consumer services including items for poultry inspection and meat inspection. I noticed a reference in the report which indicated the advisability of getting these two types of inspections together in some way. The report mentioned the possibility of placing them under the Marketing Service. I wonder if the gentleman would expand on that a little bit more, as to whether the gentleman was concerned that it would be under the Marketing Service or that those two matters of inspection would be placed under the same service?

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the question of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. SMITH.

The gentleman will doubtless remember that a few years ago when poultry inspection became compulsory—up until that time it had been voluntary—about two-thirds of the processors were using it. This subcommittee brought all funds for inspections out together in one appropriation. There seemed to be a certain understanding with the packing industry that that would not be done. We were not aware of that. We have felt, with the passage of time, that the fears of the poultry processors that they would be taken over by the so-called red meat side of the meat inspection has subsided.

Not only that, but with the high cost of this inspection service, which is for the good of all, there clearly could be a coordination and joint handling of the matter at the supervisory level, from there on up to the top.

I will say to the gentleman that our report is not a directive. It just raises the question, and I would have to say candidly, that many of those who have studied it and have looked at the subject, feel that inspection of the actual carcass is directed to letting it go on into the retail market and is not research. It has been under the research service; yes, but it is not research.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that it is a part of the marketing program. Everyone I know in the research service who has anything to do with meat inspection has the highest regard and opinion for the people who do this.

We are not sticklers for having it done one way or the other. We are not insisting that they bring the two together, but we do think that we see signs that it should be considered. Certainly with meat inspection demands up to the $30 million level, we need to see if it could not be coordinated with poultry inspection, as long as the public health is protected.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Do I understand that this bill does not require the transfer of the Meat Inspection Service from the Research Division to the Marketing Service?

Mr. WHITTEN. Oh, no. It just merely raises the question in the report as to the possibility. We did not even go so far as to insist that it was sound. But, when you get inspections on top of inspections and you have services in the same community, one checking poultry and another checking beef, as well as checking supervisors up above, and another group checking that, it strikes me that it is a subject which should be explored.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further, I am a great believer in exploring any opportunity for consolidating and bringing about efficiency and economy in operation. But I received a telephone call from one of my constituents this morning, who was very much upset, first, because of the reduction that was made in the meat inspection appropriation request, and I told him I thought that was a part of the general economy program.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that all of us have had some wires about the cut from what was requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill carries money for 92 additional inspectors. It carries that much money above what we had last year. So, they have a substantial increase.

There is another thing that makes some of our packer friends put the pressure on us. Under the procedures that the packing industry uses, they pay for overtime. It is to the packer's interest to wait, and in that way they do not have to have any overtime or have to carry any part of the cost at all. You have to take some of these pressures with an understanding that it is to their interest. I have received telegrams too. We are not trying to pass the cost over to them; we are trying to hold it in some degree of balance.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that I am a strong advocate of economy and when I saw from your report the increase over last year's appropriation it struck me that the cut was not unreasonable. I was somewhat apprehensive, however, when I was told that the bill transferred meat inspection from one department to another, and that prompted this inquiry.

Mr. WHITTEN. It does not insist that the Department do that. We just raise the question.

Mr. GARY. That is in the committee report?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is in the report, yes.

Mr. GARY. There is nothing in the bill with reference to the transfer? It is only in the report of the committee?

Mr. WHITTEN. And there we just raised the question.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for this information.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Is there any transfer of funds in this bill from the Meat Inspection Division to the Marketing Division?

Mr. WHITTEN. None whatever.

Mr. HORTON. The gentleman assures us there is no transfer of funds. It is a recommendation that a study be made to consolidate the service in this respect?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. HORTON. I have also received telegrams, and people have talked to me about this matter of reduction of the amount in the budget for meat inspection. Do I understand from the gentleman that this will not reduce the number of inspectors?

Mr. WHITTEN. It will increase by 92 the number of inspectors over this year. It is about 30 percent less than the budget, but it is an increase over this year.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding, and may I commend him for bringing out, as usual, a good agricultural appropriation bill. This is a most difficult assignment as any of us who are associated with agriculture knows. I think the gentleman does an excellent job of doing the best he can.

Since this question of meat inspection has been brought up, I believe the gentleman has answered the question I was going to ask him, as to whether or not he thought the meat inspection service would be harmed. The gentleman has said, "No," and he seems to have a logical argument as to why it is not going to be harmed. There are 91 additional inspectors, there are $1,730,000 of an increase from last year's appropriation for this purpose. It has been suggested that the Meat Inspection Service be transferred from the Agricultural Research Service to the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Inasmuch as the Poultry Inspection Service, as I understand it, is in the Agricultural Marketing Service now, it would seem to me there might be some merit in transferring poultry inspection into Agricultural Research, inasmuch as if we just stopped and thought about it, the Agricultural Research Department has a rather outstanding record in performing this service for the consuming public; that is, of inspecting meat in our processing plants.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that I appreciate what he has said, but we ask merely that the matter be studied. We want to get them to give the same service at the same cost. I feel confident that these people could do it under some reorganization of the services.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I was present in the Appropriations Committee when the chairman made his excellent report to the committee. The gentleman made a most helpful report on this bill. But, I would like to have a statement from the chairman of the subcommittee in regard to the impact of this bill on the various experiment stations throughout the country. Is any sharp change anticipated? I am much interested in the programs of the experiment stations.

Mr. WHITTEN. This bill, for the experiment stations proper, went along with the budget, which carried about a $2 million increase, as I recall it. That, with the constant increase in salaries and costs probably would keep it about where it is.

Now, in our report we went to great lengths trying to show that research was an absolute necessity. You will remember that last year, when this bill went to the other body, they added about $25 or $30 million for research, and for that reason this year we had our staff make a thorough check bringing together all of the research establishments in the United States so that, at least, there should not be any more pyramiding on us again; they would do it with full information. It was something strange to me when I found out how many research facilities we already have.

We had to put some people in here to staff these new laboratories that the Congress has seen fit to build, and we further put a $5 million transfer limitation on the Commodity Credit Corporation to spend money for research in these acute areas, where there are people and where they can contract and get it done, as against setting up a big laboratory and staffing it with permanent civil service employees.

Mr. MAHON. I know the gentleman is familiar with the Great Plains program which is covered in this bill, and he knows of my interest in the program and of the interest of the people I represent.

Does the chairman think that this program is being operated rather efficiently and effectively?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it is being operated efficiently and effectively, and I have become convinced that it is a good program. They do not get all of the funds they want, but it is always hard to please everybody when it comes to appropriating money.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. With reference to the impact on the State experiment stations, the State experiment stations are not on trial in this bill or in this report. What is on trial is the integrity of the Committee on Appropriations, and we want to know what the extent of Federal moneys is that are being expended there. And, I believe the report points that out. A little later on I want to speak on that.

Now, in regard to this meat inspection, when this House passed this gigantic public roads bill and did other things to change the transportation program and pattern of the United States, we just changed the slaughtering of livestock 100 percent. Now we have slaughterhouses that work only 1 or 2 days a week. If they ship interstate, they have to have inspection; it may be away off Route 40 some place, for example, and we have dispersed them from centers where it was easy to inspect meat to any number of slaughterhouses everywhere. Now, I do want to say this, that following the request of this subcommittee as contained in the report of some 2 or 3 years ago, the Department of Agriculture is working with your State departments of agriculture in an effort to recognize State meat inspection where it can be certified. I want to say here and now that no one questions the ability of the State of California to inspect its own meat completely free of the Federal Government and the incidental expense. That is not true of every State, but we are working in that direction, because meat inspection is an important item, and it is growing. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I am probably less knowledgeable on the matter of agricultural activities than anyone in this body, but I am sure you have observed I have been listening very carefully and I certainly want to commend you for a good job on a rather difficult subject.

One thing concerns me in reference to the additional funds that may be going to the Department for research, or inspectors, and so forth. I have the same concern that apparently the committee has, that is, of the funds which go to the Department a sizable percentage of those funds is diverted for support measures or for support of these particular projects. I believe the committee even used the figure of 20 percent and you expressed concern, as I believe you rightly should.

What assurances did you get from the Department that these funds would go for their basic intended purpose, that is, for research and inspectors, rather than being diverted for support programs?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say personally that we heard the Department and we brought our report out. They did not see the report until after it was printed. In the past we have had very good cooperation from the Department concerning the recommendations of the committee. The committee seemed to think the facts were such as to raise a question.

I can realize if they double the load on something that has to be supervised in Washington it might take some more people here, but we doubt that where they get a little extra money in a supplemental they need more people to supervise the work.

We raised the question and we would like to know what they are doing so they do not perpetuate this. We have raised the point now and will study it more thoroughly. And next year we will be able to tell you what we have found out and also how fully they have been cooperating with us.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the gentleman. May I ask the gentleman one further question? I note, and I suppose this would primarily be for support measures, that looking at the Department of Agriculture here in Washington I believe they have some 11,851 employees here. That compares with some 65,457, according to the committee's report, in the entire Department. Did your committee find these 12,000 people justified here to support the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have at my fingertips the exact number, but may I say if the gentleman will read the report fully we have called on them not to increase the number here in Washington. It is a difficult thing to supervise. Some years ago it was the practice to put a limitation that no more than so much money could be spent in Washington and not more than so many people could be in the city of Washington. We learned it was costing us money, because if they had a need for somebody they would call on him to come into Washington and he was here on per diem along with the rest of it. That is one of the things that is hard to trace. We raised that question because we have doubts like the gentleman has. That is all I can tell you.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to thank the chairman for his usual good job and I would like to make reference to the report, and a very good one it is. On page 8 there is a line which starts like this:

> In some instances, figures presented to the committee as to cost of power and other terms of contracts between some cooperatives and private companies differ somewhat. The committee has had no opportunity nor means to determine which may be correct.

The question I would like to ask is this: This deals with the REA program. As I recall it a year ago in your report you made a similar reference with regard to these requests, I believe, for some elbow room. Have you renewed this request and has information been denied to the committee relative to this obviously controversial problem?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman obviously is well acquainted with the fact that this is a controversial program. He is the most aware of this, having worked for the REA on one occasion. But our problem here is this: We heard from the two sides of the controversy. We do not have a large staff and have only a matter of a few weeks, and we do not have the experts at our fingertips.

The differences here are the facts as the REA sees them and the facts as the private companies see them. And unless we had a staff as big as the one you used to have down in the Department, or maybe bigger, we could not be in a position, as a subcommittee, to resolve these differences. But, understand, these were presented by two groups of people who are definitely on different sides of many points in this area.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished Chairman further if he feels that some of these cost studies should be made available to the Committee for examination?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think, as the gentleman read from those two pages, this is the first time he has seen that type of thing in the report.

Mr. NELSEN. I agree.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have always tried, when we take a new stand, to give the Department 12 months to try to come within it. We have never written anything that we did not try to follow up on. This year we will try to follow up, and I believe we will have the cooperation of the Department.

Mr. NELSEN. Further, Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the following paragraph, where a sort of criterion is set up as to the approval of loans, relative to unreasonable rates; and also the suggestions that proper attention be given to an attempt to get a reasonable rate. It provides further in the language that the Administrator should certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that these steps have been taken. It further provides that the contingent fund is under the direction of the Bureau of the Budget. The thing that amuses me is the fact that this great battle that went on on this floor about the Humphrey price bill a couple of years ago, where the Secretary asked for information, and this particular bill, were designed for the purpose of disassociating the REA from the Secretary of Agriculture and even the President. In that year we moved in the direction of giving to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to certify going to the Bureau of the Budget for——

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt to correct the gentleman; we do not say the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify; we say the Administrator.

Mr. NELSEN. That means certify to him?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, which in effect means making a record that should be available to the Congress to see that these steps are taken.

Mr. NELSEN. May I say to the distinguished chairman that I do not quarrel with this because I believe the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are responsible and should have some supervisory authority. But I think we are kind of running in two directions; after the big battle we had a couple or

4 years back, this seems to me to endorse the position that I took originally.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for this report, because I think it does attempt to put this program in proper perspective. The committee is sound and is doing the job that it ought to do.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I should remind him that after all, this is an appropriations committee.

Mr. NELSEN. I understand.

Mr. WHITTEN. And there are certain limitations as to how far we can go. We cannot rewrite the law.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman of the committee for yielding and commend him for the fine job he has done.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. The question I want to ask him is purely for purposes of information. I have read the report. However, I read yesterday that the Committee on Agriculture reported out a bill, H.R. 6196, that would permit domestic textile mills to purchase cotton at the same price now being charged foreign purchasers of cotton; that our domestic mills today are paying about one-third more for this American cotton. My question is, if that bill, H.R. 6196 is reported by the Committee on Agriculture, does that mean then that while we are selling surplus cotton abroad, will this cotton be sold on the domestic market at the same price and be purchased by our mills at the same price at which the foreign purchaser buys it?

Mr. WHITTEN. As I pointed out, this is an appropriations subcommittee. I have some familiarity with this bill, but let me point out to the gentleman that there are a good many things that do not get mentioned in it. In the first place, our domestic mills pay several times as much for labor as our foreign competitors, which is not mentioned in the bill of which the gentleman speaks. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides protection against imports from foreign countries on finished goods. Furthermore, and this is not often pointed out, under present conditions our Government has paid $160 million to our domestic mills to enable them to buy at the world price raw material equivalent to what they export. None of those facts is mentioned in the bill the gentleman mentioned. But if the bill, and we are getting into conjecture now, were to be brought up on the floor and not amended, and if it were sent to the Senate and it was not amended there, we would have a quite different situation than now obtains. In my years here I have never seen a bill follow that course.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman realized I did not intend to raise any question about that, but I am getting to the question of subsidies. Sometimes I wonder when we are going to subsidize the taxpayer so that he might be able to pay for these things and also pay his taxes.

Mr. WHITTEN. My colleague has in mind a still wider range of conjecture. But I say when you pay less than 20 percent of your income for food, which no other nation can do, and when the retail price of the suit you have on carries in its cost the bargaining price of labor, minimum wages, the transportation, the fellow in the spinning mills, and when industry has to sell it at 10 or 20 percent above that so as to stay in business, that is reflected in your retail price. Unfortunately the relatively low price that the farmer gets sticks out like a sore thumb. But do not think all the other that is provided by law does not show, because it has to be paid for.

Mr. BECKER. What we are providing is a subsidization of foreign markets to undersell our domestic markets, and our domestic employment is vitally affected by it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Section 22, under which you could prevent foreign imports from coming in here, is not used. The law provides for that protection if you properly use it. Our domestic mills do have to pay higher for their raw material. They also have to pay many times higher for their labor, transportation, and everything else.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I had intended to ask the gentleman this question when we read the bill, on page 17, but since it coincides so closely with some of the remarks of the gentleman from New York, I would call attention to page 17 of the bill, line 6, calling for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Then I notice the language on page 25 of the report which seeks to explain this. One sentence in that report states:

> An increased domestic consumption of 1 million bales of cotton alone could save the taxpayers some $30 million or more per year.

What are we trying to do by way of giving them the authority to transfer $25 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds? This means that conceivably we are opening up the door for the people downtown to pay cotton mills a subsidy for cotton which they cannot buy at the prevailing price.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is general language and it applies to all commodities. It is not limited. That statement in the report was by way of illustration. I thought it was a worthwhile illustration because of the situation the gentleman from New York mentioned a while ago. Pending before the legislative committee is a bill where the Federal Government would subsidize domestic mills $42.50 per bale if you had this use. It was our opinion that if you had this authority, then the section 32 group could take care of the situation.

You could have the use of this and could use just a part of it to get domestic use. If you could increase domestic use of a million bales more you could save $30 million. But it could apply to numerous commodities in a similar way.

Mr. MICHEL. The point I am trying to make is, it seems to me that by this transfer we are opening up the door for the Appropriations Committee to do that rather than having the Congress itself speak by way of an authorization bill for it. Then I would have to question it because I do not want to see them given the automatic right here to engage in this practice which the gentleman from New York abhors and which I abhor and which any number of the Members of this House think is silly.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will recall, and I am sure he is familiar with section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, 30 percent of the import duties are set aside for certain uses, one of which is to promote the use of surpluses. So that the basic authority for using the import duties for things that are coming in here to compete with our people is already in the law.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman will have to agree we are making a departure from section 32, and we are not talking about perishable commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Section 32 just says that 50 percent or more must go to perishable commodities. So the other 50 percent is free. We are not changing that at all. The change here would be in the use of Commodity Credit Corporation rather than the section 32 group. This is general in nature and retains the right of the Congress to pass on this each and every year. I am convinced that we can save ourselves millions of dollars. If you look at Section 32 and see the provisions of law there and then look and see the inventories that we have in wheat, corn and cotton, and if you can take a few million dollars and reduce that by increased domestic consumption, some of the costs that are being pyramided I think could be saved.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SISK. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the committee for the excellent work they have done on this bill and I am happy to support it. But I do have one question that I would like to ask the gentleman regarding a commodity in my area.

I wonder if you would be good enough to clarify the Appropriations Committee's position on a question which has arisen in connection with proposed research which is most important and essential to the grape industry, much of which is concentrated in the district I represent. This industry is doing a great deal to enlarge and diversify its markets and to thus absorb and make economically useful the surpluses which sometimes occur. There are fields of possible usefulness of grape products which appear most worthy of research exploration, and it is my understanding the Department of Agriculture recognizes this need and would consider a program of research into all current and possible future uses of grapes, together with exploration of cultural, processing, storage, insect, and marketing problems, but there is a feeling that the Appropriations Committee has put some restrictions on this research field. I find this appears to be based on some rather obscure language and discussions in a report of the committee on an agriculture appropriation bill over 20 years ago. As this is a matter of grave importance to many people in my district, I would appreciate your comment.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, in the first place, any comment or discussion in a committeee report of 1936 would have no bearing on the present attitude of the committee or on the use of research funds by the Department. No such restriction is intended on the appropriation we are currently considering. So far as the committee is concerned, the Department could undertake any research it feels is justified, necessary and proper, within its appropriation, for the development of new products and processing techniques of all the present uses of grapes, as it may in any other agricultural field. I hope this will reassure both the Department and the gentleman from California and his constituents.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman. As I understand it, there would be no prohibition against broad research in the field of grapes?

Mr. WHITTEN. None whatsoever.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in southwestern Michigan we are experiencing an outbreak of a new pest called the cereal leaf beetle. I am aware of the fact that the report takes notice of this situation. However, there is a paragraph which appears on page 15 of the report in which there is reference to the fact that the Department of Agriculture has a control program going on along with the States of Michigan and Indiana in order to control this thing.

I would inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], whether it is within the congressional intent under this bill that a research program for eradication of this pest by the Department of Agriculture could be undertaken?

Perhaps as much as $200,000 might be needed on a kind of a crash program in order to attempt to absolutely eradicate this pest before it gets into the grain producing areas of the country.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], that is exactly what the Department plans to do and that is why it has moved in quickly in an effort to control it to the point of eradication before it gets larger.

We carry funds in the bill to do just that.

We have been discussing it with the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and the plans are to do just what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. On page 11 of the report, section (3), there is the following statement:

> To meet the need for additional quality research on peanuts, an additional $200,000 has been provided for use at the New Orleans utilization laboratory. The committee has also provided $400,000 for the establishment of a peanut research laboratory to house peanut shelling work at Dawson and if desirable to bring together peanut research now being conducted at various locations in Georgia.

Are we to understand that the intention of the committee is that the part of the research on peanuts conducted at New Orleans is to be quality research for which $200,000 is provided and that the $400,000 is intended for a laboratory building at Dawson to house the peanut shelling research facilities, with the right to bring to Dawson, if desirable, present research work in Georgia?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is exactly it. As the gentleman well knows, there is quite a difference of opinion between the peanut producers in the various peanut areas. Much of it in our opinion revolves around the research on quality. Since they are highly competitive not only pricewise, qualitywise, and in advertising and all that, and since we now have peanut research going on at the present time in New Orleans, the additional quality research should be done where you have the facilities. So there has been provided $200,000 for the quality work at New Orleans. The work in Georgia would be that which is not controversial and which would in no way displace the type of work to be done in other areas.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for that explanation. I am in accord with what the committee has done.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand it, there is presently $286,445 being spent by the Federal Government on peanut research work in the State of Georgia?

Mr. WHITTEN. The figure I have is $337,240, including the State experiment station.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield further, do I understand it is the intention of the committee that this work shall be concentrated at Dawson, Ga., and shall be carried on in this building for which you are making the appropriations now?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will read the report, we did not insist on that. We did recognize that at Dawson they do not have the buildings for the research work going on there now. But we say, if desirable, the other work in Georgia could be concentrated there. But we do not require that. There might be reasons why they would prefer it and it might be advantageous for them to carry it on where it is now. So, we did not insist on it.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that, but is it intended by this appropriation to authorize any new research work in the State of Georgia?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is not.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for this time to make a very brief comment. In addition, I want the entire subcommittee to know that their efforts in producing this measure is to be commended. Your job is not an easy one. You cannot please all of us any more than any of us can always satisfy and meet the approval of all our constituents. I must say that if I had my unlimited choice I would eliminate some items in this bill and would change others but that is not the situation and the fine art of compromise by respecting the views of others must prevail in this, as in most all other legislation.

I believe it has been made clear by the discussion between my colleagues, Mr. POAGE and Mr. ABBITT, and our esteemed subcommittee chairman, that the peanut research facility at New Orleans shall be the place for peanut quality research and that the $400,000 item heretofore referred to by my colleagues, is to house equipment already located at Dawson, Ga., and that there is absolutely no intent of expanding it into a facility to engage in quality research or as to that matter, to duplicate work presently being performed at other places.

Mr. Chairman, we in the peanut producing areas of the Southwest, feel we are at a disadvantage in numerous respects as related to the Southeast—a competitive disadvantage which we see and feel as time goes on. Research advantages is certainly one of them. We do not feel we can stand silent and permit still further advantages to occur. We call attention to this matter, not to criticize the Committee's action on this particular matter, but to make clear our case for equitable treatment in the future, which I am certain all of you will want to do.

If the circumstances at Dawson, Ga., are such as to constitute an obligation to protect an investment already made, I am not disposed to attempt to eliminate the item provided in this bill but assurances can be given, with certainty, that any future support for the facility will be opposed if it engages in research other than shelling for which it is to be used, as I understand it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. I dislike having to presume upon the gentleman's time further here, but of course the gentleman is the man with the answers. I notice on page 31 of the report we have a new office in the process of being created here, and that is the Office of Rural Area Development.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I correct the gentleman? We are not in the process of creating it. It was created some time ago.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that was in 1961, and the gentleman might correct my impression.

Heretofore the funds have come from other sources, from USDA funds, but this time we are specifically appropriating $120,000 for that particular office.

Mr. WHITTEN. We appropriated some money last year for this.

Mr. WATSON. But not directly as we are doing this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Appropriations were carried under the appropriation for "General administration." In addition, there were transfers from various other agencies.

Mr. WATSON. Here is a question I am trying to get across to the gentleman.

Did your committee really conclude that was a justifiable creation of this Department or a continuation of this Department? As I read the report, we have the rural renewal program under the Farmers Home Administration; we have the ARA program. Why have the creation or continuation of this Rural Areas Department?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has given the reason, in my opinion, for what we have done. We have the Farmers Home Administration, we have the ARA, we have the Department of Commerce, all doing the same type of work. We have the REA doing the same kind of work. If you do not bring them under one proposition, how are you going to keep track of them Further, you have to coordinate work between the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture. You have to have some kind of joint operations between Commerce and Agriculture.

Mr. WATSON. Your committee was not concerned at all as to the present complications and perplexities of the agencies and divisions of the Department of Agriculture. They do not know where to go to participate in these programs, and this is another one somewhere along the line.

Mr. WHITTEN. No; these all have to be brought together.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman does not feel it could be handled by one agency?

Mr. WHITTEN. Whether you give it a separate appropriation, it is constituted. We think they ought to serve as a central coordinating office.

If there are no further questions, I would like to review the various points covered in the committee report and the actions taken on the various items in the bill.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE MOST PRODUCTIVE IN WORLD

American agriculture, 1963, is the most productive in the history of the world. Fortunately, most of our problems in the United States are due to abundance, rather than hunger or famine.

The ability of American farmers to produce food and fiber is apparent at the supermarkets, where city consumers can choose from thousands of safe, wholesome, and delicious foods—products of the farms of our 50 States. Using only about 20 percent of their income, American consumers can select foods with a knowledge of nutrition and balanced diets that makes this a nation of healthy and well-fed people. Most people in the world spend half or more of their available income on food, and in underdeveloped areas people spend most of their time grubbing a living from the earth.

If farmers today used 1940 methods, it would cost an extra $13 billion a year to produce food and fiber for the Nation. This extra cost would be passed on to consumers, adding more than $5 a week to each family's food bill.

American farm productivity, with its decreased manpower and its greatly increased equipment and investment, is borne out at the dinner table where 27 consumers share the bounty of a single farmworker. The average U.S. farmworker produces the food needs for 27 people. Today, only 8 of every 100 American workers are engaged in agriculture. The 92 others provide the goods and services of modern living—manufacturing cars, TV sets, and washing machines, running banks, selling insurance, building homes, fixing telephones, working in hospitals and hotels, and rendering other services, including our national defense.

It all adds up to a standard of living never before equaled in history—at a time when 63 percent of the governmental income goes for national defense and related activities.

FORCED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY CREATES PROBLEMS

To maintain this high standard of living, and with increased costs for what the farmer must buy, increased agricultural productivity has been absolutely necessary. This has come at the cost of much greater investment per farm and a tremendous increase in risk.

The necessity to increase agricultural production to fully utilize machinery and equipment has made it necessary to expand the size of farming units, at high cost to the producer. The small family-size farm is gradually disappearing, largely because it cannot support high-cost machinery, supplies, or labor. The number of farm units has decreased from 6.4 million in 1940 to 3.7 million in 1962. In 22 years, nearly one-half have gone out of production. The American consumer today is almost entirely dependent on the commercial farm for his abundant supply of inexpensive food and fiber.

Larger farming units have made necessary the use of more expensive machinery, seed, fertilizers, and insecticides, with modern farming techniques. This has increased the investment necessary to farm by nearly 700 percent in the past decade, from an average of $6,119 per farm in 1940 to $47,632 in 1962.

This larger investment, together with the vagaries of weather and increased threats to crops and livestock from insects and diseases, has greatly increased the financial risk of the average farmer. The value of investments in terms of current dollars has increased from about $55 billion in 1940 to over $200 billion in 1962. The farm debt during this period has increased from $9.6 to $25.8 billion. Half a century ago a farmer could survive as many as seven crop failures in a row. With the tremendous financial risks involved today, the loss of a single year's crop can result in bankruptcy for many farmers.

Further the price-cost squeeze on the farmer is becoming more acute each year. Farm prices have generally remained constant, but production costs have continued to rise. The small increase in retail food prices in recent years has been added on after the commodities have left the farm by those between the farmer and consumer. In the past 11 years the farmer's share of the retail food dollar has declined from 49 cents in 1951 to 38 cents in 1962. As a matter of fact, if the producers were to receive nothing for their raw materials, it is doubted that the retail price would decline significantly. It should be noted that the farmer receives only 3.1 cents from a 21.2-cent loaf of bread. The farmer's share of a $4.24 cotton shirt is only 28 cents.

These factors make it clear that the agricultural producer must have price protection. This Nation, with laws permitting labor to organize, and guaranteeing minimum wages, with industry having the right and necessity to add markup above cost, must have price support for the producer of the raw material.

EXACT BALANCE IN SUPPLY AND DEMAND UNWISE

Most of the farm problems are due to high cost of what the farmer must buy, leading to increased units and the resulting surplus supplies of agricultural supplies on hand, which depress markets and require large amounts of money to produce and store. However, the worst possible thing that could be done to the 185 million American consumers would be to balance supply and demand, by reducing supply and production to the point of forcing fair prices at the marketplace because there was barely enough to go around.

To cut production down to the point of scarcity would endanger the consuming public. Drought or flood or pestilence could make many go hungry, though in all likelihood it would bring the producer a much larger net income. These facts need to be recognized aside from any defense needs.

Another serious effect would be to encourage foreign countries to increase their agricultural production. The reports and hearings of this committee are full of facts to show that, as the United States has reduced production in recent years, foreign production has been increased to fill the gap, much of it with American financial aid and technical assistance.

Also, in the case of cotton there has been a large competitive growth in the use of synthetic fibers at home and abroad. In foreign countries, this has been due partly to efforts of those countries which do not produce cotton to become self-sufficient in raw materials. But further, this has resulted in part from curtailing U.S. cotton production and holding U.S. cotton off world markets at competitive prices.

At the urging of this committee, the Department has recently reentered world markets on a competitive basis in an effort to keep U.S. production up and to keep American farmers in business. In order to protect our foreign markets, the Department should give further study to producing higher quality commodities. The tendency to stress quantity rather than quality has had a serious effect on the oversea demand for U.S. commodities. A wider range between good and poor quality in level of price supports might improve the situation.

It is to be noted that, unless production levels are maintained, additional farm units will of necessity go out of production, with increased unemployment problems in the cities as more rural people move to town. How to keep adequate reserves to meet all domestic and export needs, plus a reserve for possible defense needs, without depressing market prices is one of the most serious problems facing American agriculture today. It is our belief such reserves should be insulated from the market and charged up to "Consumer security."

THE BUDGET FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

When all is said and done, it requires only 5 to 6 percent of the Federal budget each year to operate all of the programs of the Department of Agriculture—meat inspection, disease and pest control, research and extension, protection of resources, price support, foreign assistance, and all the rest. This is only about one-twelfth of what the Nation is spending each year on defense, about the same as we spend on international affairs, and almost exactly the amount requested each year for research to send a man to the moon.

Only 1.5 percent is required to finance the regular operating programs of the Department, including research, marketing, extension, soil conservation, watershed protection, flood prevention, and other related activities. This averages about $8 per person per year for the production, inspection, and marketing of the finest meats, vegetables, and other foods at the lowest cost to the consumer of any nation in history. Further, it helps to develop and maintain our national resources for unborn generations of the future. It also provides school lunches for our children and food for the needy.

An additional 2 percent is used to finance the various foreign assistance programs operated by the Department, including Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile. The primary benefit of these programs is in the area of international affairs and foreign aid and, therefore, should not be charged to the farmer as a part of the cost of our agricultural programs.

Another 2 to 3 percent is used to finance the price support program needed to protect the Nation's largest market for the goods and services of American industry. It is significant to note that over 50 percent of the funds expended for price support programs go to transportation companies, warehouses, and other activities rather than to the farmer.

As has been pointed out frequently by this committee, agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Agriculture is still our largest industry. It employs 12 times the number of people in the steel industry, 9 times the number in the automobile industry, twice the number in the transportation and public utility industries. In addition, it supports directly another 10 percent of nonfarm population which supplies the farmer with his needs and processes and markets his products.

Agriculture is the major market for the products of industry. It uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery exceeds the assets of the steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Average annual employment in the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Forest Service which is no longer included in this bill) has increased from 47,793 in fiscal year 1954 to an estimated 65,457 in fiscal year 1963. This is a total increase of 17,664 man-years, nearly 37 percent.

It is inevitable that the Department of Agriculture, which serves to some extent every person in the Nation, will have a large number of employees. Recognizing the need to balance the budget and curtail personnel increases wherever possible, however, the committee has held funds for additional employees in this bill to an absolute minimum.

The committee notes that the Secretary has made some progress in the past year in reducing employment in selected areas. A reduction of over 500 employees has been made in the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service as a result of the consolidation of several of the commodity offices and other organizational changes. In addition, several hundred positions have been eliminated as a result of the installation of a centralized data-processing system for the preparation of payrolls and the processing of personnel data.

Funds to meet pay increases authorized last year have been reduced substantially, which will require further personnel reductions by not filling vacancies to absorb the amounts disallowed. Only 80 percent of amounts required for fiscal year 1964 was included in the budget request. Further, for the larger appropriations only 60 percent of the amounts in the budget have been included in the bill. For the agencies which are not large enough to absorb such a large cut, reductions have not been so severe.

The 1964 budget, as amended by House Document 81, would have provided a net increase of 1,201 man-years of employment for the appropriations in this bill. The committee has reduced this by 1,021—85 percent—and has provided funds for a total net increase of only 180 man-years. The increases allowed are primarily for research, meat and poultry inspection, soil and water conservation, REA loan studies, FHA lending activities, and broadening of crop insurance coverage, as follows:

Agricultural Research Service:	
Increases:	
To staff research laboratories recently authorized by Congress and now ready for operation	+89
To extend research to meet increased threats from foot-and-mouth disease and African swine fever	+17
To expand research on peanuts, tobacco, cotton, corn, and wheat—basic storable commodities in surplus supply	+50
To provide additional plant and animal quarantine inspection at ports of entry due to increased traffic from abroad	+22
To increase the program for eradication of hog cholera authorized by Public Law 87-209 approved September 6, 1961	+72
To provide additional meat inspectors to meet expanding inspection workload	+92
Annualization of prior year increases, principally for utilization research	+157
Total increases	+499
Decreases:	
Savings due to installation of centralized data processing system for personnel and payroll data	−76
Reduction in eradication programs for the gypsy moth, screwworm, etc	−182
Total decreases	−258
Net increase, Agricultural Research Service	+241
Federal Extension Service: Savings due to data processing system	−3
Soil Conservation Service:	
Increases:	
To staff 30 new districts to be established during coming fiscal year	+90
To increase soil and water conservation in existing districts	+131
To extend cooperative river basin surveys and investigations	+82
To carry out the new land conservation and utilization program authorized by the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962	+24
Total increases	+327
Decreases:	
Savings due to data-processing system	−44
Completion of projects and reduction in loan activities	−37
Total decreases	−81
Net increase, Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and flood prevention)	+246
Economic Research Service: Research on the European Common Market and other foreign agricultural trade problems	+10
Statistical Reporting Service: To extend the long-range program for improvement of crop and livestock estimates	+83
Agricultural Marketing Service:	
To meet increasing volume of mandatory poultry inspection	+32

Agricultural Marketing Service—Con.	
Annualization of prior year increases for poultry inspection, warehouse inspection, grain grading, and market news service	+52
Savings due to data-processing system	−19
Net increase, Agricultural Marketing Service	+65
Foreign Agricultural Service: To expand market development work and give additional attention to the European Common Market and other international trade relations	+13
Commodity Exchange Authority: Savings due to data-processing system	−1
Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service: Net reduction due to consolidations, organizational changes, and increased employee productivity	−736
Rural Areas Development: To strengthen coordination and administration of rural areas development program	+2
Office of General Counsel: Reduction in staff and savings due to data processing system	−13
Office of Information: Termination of centennial program and savings due to data processing system	−2
Library: To provide more service and information for scientific and research personnel	+20
Rural Electrification Administration: For surveys of REA cooperatives and studies of generation and transmission contracts	+15
Farmers Home Administration:	
For additional workload of regular programs and for new programs assigned to the agency, including rural housing and housing for the elderly	+200
To initiate new rural renewal program	+20
Total	+220
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: To extend the crop insurance program to 100 new counties as contemplated in the long-range crop insurance program	+20
Net total increase, USDA (exclusive of Forest Service)	+180

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

The committee is proud of the record of the Rural Electrification Administration and what it has meant to and means not only to rural America but to all America today. We believe that one of the greatest achievements of the past 30 years has been the bringing of electrical energy to the rural areas. It has been a major factor in enabling the relatively few people on our farms to produce the food and fiber for our 185 million consumers. It has enabled this Nation to support large international and defense costs without reducing our general standard of living.

One of the most remarkable features of the program has been its repayment record. It is one in which everyone in the Nation can take pride. No bank or other lending institution in the country can boast of a better record. Of the $4 billion advanced on REA loans over $1.1 billion has been repaid on principal, some of it in advance of due dates. As of February 28, 1963, only two borrowers were delinquent and they are expected to become solvent in the near future.

The committee is gratified to note that, pursuant to directives in reports of this committee, standards have been established by the Administrator for the control of financial reserves of the REA cooperatives. It is reported that the cooperatives are in full accord with this action and are cooperating to make it effective. This is a healthy and practical realization of the responsibility of these borrowers to the taxpayers of the Nation.

A majority of the members of the committee believe the right to make loans for power generation and transmission purposes, with funds available to implement such right, if necessary, is absolutely essential to enable REA cooperatives to obtain reasonable contracts from private power suppliers with regard to rates, terms, and conditions. However, a study of the REA Act and its history clearly shows it was never intended that this authority be used except for substantial reasons, and not merely to supplant private suppliers.

The committee had testimony from many witnesses on all sides of this issue. With regard to several loans it appears that satisfactory concessions or modifications might have been secured from the private suppliers if real efforts had been made. With regard to others, reasons given for granting loans do not appear too substantial. On the other hand, the requirement of a dual rate by the private supplier, whereby a higher rate is charged for increased quantities of power for the purpose of cutting off prospective customers in areas served by co-ops, appears unjustified and is an invitation for electric cooperatives to seek generation and transmission loans.

In some instances, figures presented to the committee as to cost of power and other terms of contracts between some cooperatives and private companies differ somewhat. The committee has had no opportunity nor means to determine which may be correct. With regard to some contracts, the private suppliers seem to have offered little assurance of providing for increased future power needs of cooperatives on a firm basis or providing delivery points necessary to the economical operation of the cooperatives involved.

Before public funds are loaned for power generation or transmission, a majority of the committee believes the REA Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should make a survey, determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable, advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable and attempt to get such contract modified to make it reasonable. Loans should be made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained.

With regard to any further generation and transmission loan approved, the Administrator should certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier had been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, and had refused or failed to do so.

The committee believes the Administrator has the obligation to make certain that section 5 loans are handled on a sound basis. The REA Act provides that loans under section 5 shall not be made unless the Administrator finds and certifies that in his judgment the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be paid within the time agreed.

It is the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee that the Congress in providing for section 5 loans intended also that they should not be made where local private business can meet the need or where it is determined that the local borrower will provide unnecessary competition. The Administrator should also certify to the Secretary as to the necessity for section 5 loans.

In view of the foregoing facts, the committee has placed $150 million of the electrification loan authorization in the contingency reserve, instead of the $75 million requested. The contingency authorizations can be released only after a further showing to the Bureau of the Budget that the program is being handled on a satisfactory basis and there is a substantial need for the additional funds. This should enable the Administration to meet its obligations, if the recommendations of the committee are followed.

The committee has provided funds for additional employees for the coming year under the REA administrative appropriation to implement the surveys, audits, and supervision called for in these areas.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

As in the past, the committee has had numerous requests for additional appropriations for the various activities of the Department. Some 250 witnesses appeared before the committee this year, many of them requesting additional attention to problems in research. Most of these requests are for work within the present research responsibilities of the Department.

The committee has allowed some increases where the large investments and costs to the Federal Government justify some extra attention. In addition, we have again provided the $1 million special contingency funds to meet needs not specifically appropriated for. The committee, therefore directs the Department to give attention to these additional needs as reflected in these requests in the use of the funds provided in the bill. The usual requests for increases are generally by their nature the type to which present personnel, funds, and facilities should be directed.

It should be noted that the following amounts are being spent for research on certain of the major commodities in fiscal year 1963: $5.2 million for corn; $1.1 million for peanuts; $722,000 for rice; $2.3 million for tobacco; $11.7 million for cotton; and $5.8 million for wheat. In addition, all of the other research work of the Department is of benefit to these commodities in varying degrees.

For years the committee has recognized the absolute necessity for continuing research in agriculture on all of these commodities. The committee has realized that it takes research facilities, personnel, and funds to meet these needs. However, in recent years it has appeared that many requests for increases in funds and facilities have not been based on a thorough knowledge of what the Department already has in the way of facilities and what research is now being done.

The committee believes strongly in agricultural research, the backbone of which is the cooperative programs carried on with the land-grant colleges. The Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges have excellent research organizations, and this committee is proud of their many outstanding accomplishments. The committee has supported the research programs of these agencies as fully as possible through the years. Total research funds for the various agencies of the Department, including the agriculture experiment stations, have increased from approximately $57 million in fiscal year 1949 to over $174 million in fiscal year 1963—an increase of over 200 percent.

The committee recognizes that American agriculture would not be in business today if it were not for the benefits of the Department's research in reducing cost of production, and improving the quality and increasing the efficiency of handling and marketing of agricultural crops. It would be impossible for the economy of the Nation to support large international and defense costs each year, and at the same time maintain our high standard of living, were it not for the remarkable record of agriculture and agricultural research.

When this country was young, 90 percent of the people lived on the farm. Most of them had to produce their own food and fiber with the plow and the hoe. Today, about 10 percent of our people live in rural areas with less than 4 percent working in the fields to feed our entire population. This remarkable accomplishment is due in large part to the fine work of the research agencies of the Department and the land-grant colleges.

It must be recognized, however, that additional funds for expanded research programs each year is not the complete answer to the problems of agriculture. Research must fit into the present system of agriculture and must be held within reasonable fiscal limits. Increased research results must depend on the quality of research rather than the quantity of research. It must be carefully geared to the needs of the agriculture producer and the industrial user.

Agriculture research should be expanded only where present personnel and facilities cannot be shifted to meet the new research needs. Further, it should be expanded gradually on a sound basis and only to the extent that well qualified research scientists are available. The committee is aware of the keen competition for well-trained scientists from all branches of the Government and industry and knows of the difficult problem the Department of Agriculture faces in finding the caliber of people needed to maintain the high quality of research results required of it.

NEW LABORATORY APPROACH, A SLOW PROCESS

It must be realized that a new laboratory approach to pressing research problems means on the average at least 5 years before any valuable results can be obtained, and then usually from experienced personnel transferred from other locations.

The Agricultural Research Service now conducts research at some 228 locations in the United States. In addition the agricultural marketing research program is carried on at 45 locations throughout the United States. These 273 facilities have all made and are making valuable contributions to research. They should be able to meet future research needs by redirecting present personnel and facilities, with expansion where necessary.

Also, it must be kept in mind that the backbone of research is and should be cooperative research carried on with the land-grant colleges. The Federal Government should not weaken this cooperative approach by establishing too many Federal laboratories.

Therefore, it is the belief of this committee that the most urgent needs for additional research in the future should be met as follows:

First. By merging them into present research work at existing locations with existing funds and personnel.

Second. By contract or grant to an established research organization with qualified personnel already available.

Third. By expanding cooperative research programs with the land-grant colleges and other research institutions and organizations, with some arrangement for matching contributions.

Fourth. By enlarging research activities at existing establishments as may be required, but only after the above approaches have been determined to be impracticable.

This should be the formula to guide the Congress and the Department in evaluating future research needs and considering funds for the establishment of additional research facilities. Only in this way can the Federal Government meet the needs of research in a truly expeditious manner within reasonable fiscal limits.

Since the last session of Congress, the committee has conducted a special review of the research programs and facilities of the Department, particularly with regard to certain phases of research. The purpose of this survey is to bring together in one document a detailed description of the research programs now in existence in the Department, to show the many research locations throughout the country where work is now being carried on, and to indicate the amount of money being expended for such research.

From this report it would appear that many demands each year for new research laboratories or new and expanded research projects, most of which would require funds above the budget, could be and should be met with existing facilities, and to a large degree with existing personnel and funds—the committee report will be found in part 4 of this year's hearing, beginning on page 2892.

In order to help meet some of the more immediate and pressing problems of the various segments of agriculture, the committee has taken the following actions with respect to the production and marketing research work of the Department in the accompanying appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964:

First. Funds for marketing research have been consolidated with funds for the research activities of the Agricultural Research Service. It is virtually impossible to conduct the activities of these two areas of research separately. It is believed that more efficient research can be carried on through closer coordination.

Second. Authority has been included in the bill to transfer not to exceed $5 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for contracts and grants to meet acute needs for research to reduce the necessity for the Corporation to invest in and take title to large quantities of agricultural commodities. This approach should enable the Department to move ahead immediately where services of trained and experienced scientists not available for regular Federal employment can be obtained, instead of waiting 5 years under the new laboratory approach with permanent personnel. Such research will be concerned primarily with those commodities in which the Commodity Credit Corporation has a large investment, including cotton, corn, and wheat and should be of real benefit to the operations of the Corporation.

Third. To meet the need for additional quality research on peanuts, an additional $200,000 has been provided for use at the New Orleans Utilization Laboratory. The committee has also provided $400,000 for the establishment of a peanut research laboratory to house peanut shelling work at Dawson and if desirable to bring together peanut research now being conducted at various locations in Georgia.

Fourth. To meet the more pressing problems of tobacco, $400,000 has been included in the bill for additional research at existing facilities on Flue-cured and burley tobaccos. Also, $200,000 each has been provided for additional research at existing facilities on cotton, corn, and wheat—the commodities which now make up the major portion of Commodity Credit Corporation inventories.

Fifth. Authority has been provided to enable the Department to accept funds from the States and private industry to carry out research programs on a cooperative basis. This language will enable agricultural groups to meet their most urgent research needs and to play a part in their solution in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture in line with what now is done in forestry research.

PROGRAM SUPPORT COSTS

The committee has received frequent complaints to the effect that sizable portions of funds provided for specific research projects do not reach the point where the research work is conducted. A preliminary review of this matter indicates that in some cases as much as 20 percent or more of the funds provided by Congress are deducted in Washington or some other administrative level for so-called program support purposes before the balance is finally allocated to the field locations.

The committee expects to make a full study of this matter during the coming year to determine the facts and recommend reasonable standards for such overhead deductions. In the meantime, each agency of the Department is expected to review its practices and make whatever adjustments may be needed. In order to hold program support costs to present levels, the committee directs that none of the additional funds provided in this bill are to be used for administrative or support purposes in Washington or any other location, unless specifically approved in this bill. Further, the committee feels that absorption required to meet pay increases and other expanded needs should come largely from the program support area, rather than from program operations.

CITRUS PURCHASES AND TOBACCO SALES

The committee developed a complete record on the handling of orange juice purchases under section 32 and the sale of tobacco at a fixed price under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Contracts were made to purchase 383,485 cases of concentrated orange juice from five suppliers on November 13, 1962, at a price ranging from $4.57 to $4.74 per case. Immediately thereafter, a severe freeze occurred in the citrus area and the price of citrus products increased substantially. At the request of the suppliers the contracts were canceled and the juice was returned at the original purchase price, despite the fact that the market price in the meantime had increased to around $10 per case. Information from three of the five suppliers indicates that they then sold quantities of this juice at prices ranging from $8.45 per case to $13 per case.

It is to be noted that the juice turned back was from the preceding year's production, was in existence, and final contracts for delivery has been entered into. Therefore, the suppliers were being called on to furnish citrus juice actually in existence and were not dependent on the next year's production to make the deliveries. It should also be noted that the armed services were required to pay $13.50 per case for citrus juice required for their purposes, at this same time. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, this type of transaction is not sound and fails to protect the financial interests of the Government.

On February 11, 1963, the Department announced the sale of Flue-cured tobacco from the 1955 and 1956 crops. This tobacco was offered at a fixed price of around 36 cents per pound, which was considerably under the regular market price of tobacco at that time. An immediate run developed and the Department sold between 60 and 70 million pounds of tobacco during the first few hours of the sale. As a matter of fact some would-be buyers claim that they were unable to participate in the sale program due to demand.

It appears to a majority of the committee that, if tobacco had been sold on a competitive bid basis rather than a fixed price basis, the Government would have benefited greatly. We point out, too, that some serious questions arise as to the effect on new crops of tobacco.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For research, the bill carries a total of $94,445,000 for fiscal year 1964, including $4,950,000 for marketing research. The amount recommended is a net increase of $1,399,775 over fiscal year 1963 and a net reduction of $2,718,675 in the budget request. The net increase includes $1,200,000 to staff new research laboratories which have been authorized in previous years and are now ready for operation, $200,000 for expanded research to develop better protection against the introduction into the United States of foot-and-mouth disease and African swine fever, both of which are becoming increasing threats to the United States as a result of increased foreign travel and the increased speed of transportation, and $1,327,775 to finance 60 percent of the Pay Act increases for 1964. These increases are more than offset by decreases of $2,928,000 due to nonrecurring construction costs and savings resulting from the new data processing system. The amount recommended also includes $1,600,000 to meet the research needs of certain major commodities which have acute production and marketing problems and in which the Commodity Credit Corporation has a large investment.

The 1963 appropriation of $59,505,000 has again been provided for plant and animal disease and pest control. This is a reduction of $5,643,000 in the budget request. Budget reductions of $1,919,000 resulting from savings in the fire ant, gypsy moth, and screw-worm eradication programs, nonrecurring construction requirements, and the new data processing system, have been reallocated for other purposes proposed in the budget. In this connection, attention is directed to the recent outbreak of fire ants along the lower Mississippi River. It is understood that the reduction of funds proposed for the fire ant program is due to a new bait and improved methods of treatment and will permit continued treatment where necessary to prevent further spread of the infestation.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that $2 million for screw-worm eradication work was inadvertently omitted. The committee intended to include this amount for 1964 and will request the other body to reinstate the funds.

The $1,919,000 will be redirected to provide increases of $161,000 for plant quarantine inspection at 30 major ports of entry, $86,500 for animal inspection and quarantine at 14 major ports of entry, $796,000 for expansion of the hog cholera eradication program, and $875,500 to cover 60 percent of the 1964 pay increases.

In fiscal year 1962, a record total of 173 million persons entered the United States by sea, air, and border crossings, bringing with them 23.5 million pieces of baggage. In addition, the number of aircraft arriving from overseas increased by approximately 8,000 over 1961. Many of these are large jet aircraft which make it possible for infested and infected plant materials to reach this country from any part of the world within a few hours. Destructive foreign pests and diseases capable of attacking virtually every major crop grown in the United States are being intercepted regularly at ports of entry. In fiscal year 1962, plant quarantine inspectors made a total of 33,033 pest interceptions—an average of more than 90 each day.

On September 6, 1961, Public Law 87–209 was approved authorizing and directing the Department to initiate a national cooperative hog cholera eradication program. The Secretary appointed an 11-member National Hog Cholera Advisory Committee to assist in the development of a program, and steps were undertaken by the Department to develop plans and procedures necessary for the eradication program. Developmental activities in fiscal year 1962 cost $96,639. For fiscal year 1963, Congress appropriated $2 million for the program. The amount provided in this bill will increase the program to nearly $3 million for the coming year. This is a relatively new program and the Advisory Committee should be fully utilized.

For meat inspection an appropriation of $27,638,000 is recommended for the coming year. This is an increase of $1,730,850 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $864,000 in the budget request. This increase will cover 60 percent of 1964 pay increases and will provide for 92 additional meat inspectors to meet the increased meat inspection workload made necessary by the steady increase in the number of packing plants and increasing dispersion of these plants throughout the country.

The cost of this program has increased from $9 million in 1947 to $27.6 million in this bill, an increase of over 200 percent. This inspection is of primary value to the consumer. Although this activity has grown up under the Agricultural Research Service, the Department should consider moving it to the Agricultural Marketing Service, since it is clearly related to marketing rather than to research. This would lead to closer coordination with poultry inspection and some monetary savings.

COOPERATIVE STATE EXPERIMENT STATION SERVICE

The full budget estimate of $40,383,000 is provided for this program for fiscal year 1964. The increase of $2,120,050 over fiscal year 1963 includes $1 million to meet the increasing costs of research, $1 million to initiate a program of grants for forestry research, pursuant to Public Law 87–788, approved October 10, 1962, and $120,050 to meet increased pay and postal costs. No increase in Federal employment is involved.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Payments to States and Puerto Rico: The committee recommends the full budget request of $64,590,000 for the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of $1,409,200 over funds which will be expended for this purpose in fiscal year 1963.

The committee again recommends that these funds be used primarily to maintain competitive salary levels for county agents and home demonstration workers in order to attract well-trained and highly qualified personnel to this program. No increase in Federal personnel is covered by this appropriation.

Retirement cost for extension agents: The bill carried the full budget estimate of $7,110,000 for fiscal year 1964. The increase of $345,000 over fiscal year 1963 is provided to cover the Federal share of retirement costs for the increased funds allowed under the previous heading for salaries of State and county personnel.

Penalty mail: An appropriation of $3,113,000 is provided for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $311,750 over fiscal year 1963. This item covers penalty mail costs of State extension directors and county extension workers, as authorized by law. The increase is due to the increase in postal rates adopted by Congress last year.

Federal Extension Service: The committee recommends an appropriation of $2,500,000 for the coming fiscal year, a decrease of $97,450 below the 1963 appropriation, and a decrease of $15,000 in the budget estimate. The decrease is due to a small reduction in funds requested to meet pay increases in fiscal year 1964.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The sum of $1,195,000 is provided for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $39,100 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $85,000 in the budget estimate. The increase allowed will finance approximately 90 percent of the pay increase costs required for this organization in the coming year.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1964 includes $452,000 for conducting research relating to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. In the past, this research has been financed by advances from the Agriculture Marketing Service and the Economic Research Service. For the coming year these funds are appropriated directly to this Service and the funds for the other two agencies have been reduced accordingly.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Conservation operations: Soil conservation assistance is being provided for an increasing number of soil conservation districts each year. As of June 30, 1962, 2,929 districts were in existence. This number will increase to an estimated 2,952 by June 30, 1963, and an estimated 2,982 by June 30, 1964.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $97,480,000 for the next fiscal year, an increase of $3,504,500 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $1,973,000 in the budget request. The net increase includes $825,000 for technical assistance to the 30 new districts expected to be organized during the coming fiscal year and $1,072,500 to increase soil conservation work in existing districts. In addition, it provides $40,000 to meet higher postal costs approved last year and $1,849,000 to finance 60 percent of the pay-increase costs required by this program next year. Offsetting savings of $282,000 will be made during the coming year by the installation of the new data processing operations.

Watershed protection: The bill carries a total of $63,222,000 for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $1,845,650 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $770,000 in the budget estimate.

The amount recommended includes an additional $1 million to expand cooperative basin surveys. This will provide a total of $3,042,900 for this purpose for the coming year, which will enable the Department to initiate 8 additional surveys in fiscal year 1964, to continue 10 surveys initiated in fiscal year 1963 on a full-year basis, and to continue 6 surveys initiated prior to fiscal year 1963. Fourteen of the surveys will be carried out in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers and 10 will be in cooperation with State water resource agencies. In this connection, the committee feels that additional efforts should be made by the Soil Conservation Service to coordinate its studies with the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and other interested agencies. Further efforts are required to get agreement on and clearly define the areas of jurisdiction of these various agencies, in order to prevent unnecessary duplication in this work.

In addition to the increase outlined above, an additional $18,000 is recommended to meet increased postage costs, an additional $415,600 is proposed to finance 60 percent of the pay act increases required during the coming year, and $412,050 additional is provided for watershed planning and works of improvement.

A total of 1,702 watershed applications have been received from the inception of the program through June 30, 1962. Of these, no planning has been initiated on 683 which are expected to be suitable and qualified for assistance. It is estimated that an additional 450 applications will be received during fiscal years 1963 and 1964 of which 250 will be approved for planning.

The 1964 budget proposes $5,892,000 for small watershed investigations and planning, the same amount as provided for fiscal year 1963, plus pay act increases. While no specific increase has been provided for this purpose in the bill for 1964, the Department is expected to transfer funds from watershed improvement work in whatever amounts may be necessary to proceed on all applications which are qualified and approved for watershed planning during the coming year.

The 1964 budget states that it is proposed to start 36 new watershed projects during the coming year. The committee does not feel that any numerical restriction of this type should be placed on watershed projects. It recommends that the Department start new projects to the fullest extent possible within funds available.

Flood prevention: An appropriation of $25,465,000 is recommended for the program for the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of $139,150 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $111,000 in the budget estimate. This decrease results from the allowance of only 60 percent of the Pay Act increases required by this program next year.

The progress on most of the 11 major watersheds financed by this appropriation is still far behind the original schedule established in 1944. At that time it was estimated that these projects would be completed in some 15 years. Work on the Buffalo Creek watershed project in New York is now estimated to be completed in 1964. However, the remaining 10 projects will still require many more years to complete, even though it is nearly 20 years since the program was originally established. Now that local sponsors are meeting their responsibilities at increasing rates, the Department is urged to make every effort to speed up the completion of this work. Constantly increasing construction costs and salary increases, and the need for the flood protection these projects will provide, make it essential that these projects be completed at the earliest possible date.

While no increase in permanent personnel has been provided for this program, the Department should use its authority to employ temporary personnel to the fullest extent necessary to speed up the planning and installation work on these projects.

Great Plains conservation program: The bill includes $12,994,000 for fiscal year 1964, a net increase of $640,450 over fiscal year 1964 and a decrease of $1,646,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will provide an additional $586,000 for some 170 additional cost-sharing assistance contracts with the additional farmers and ranchers who wish to come into this program during the coming year. In addition, the increase provides $62,450 for 60 percent of the Pay Act increases required by the program next year. These are partially offset by a decrease of $8,000 due to the new data processing system. No increase in personnel is authorized.

Resources conservation and development: This new program, which was authorized by section 102 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962—Public Law 87-703—provides for technical assistance in planning and carrying out land conservation and land utilization projects in selected areas. Although the Soil Conservation Service is responsible for administering the work of this program, it is carried on cooperatively with other Federal agencies and departments, State and local agencies, and sponsoring organizations. Other agencies of the Department of Agriculture will share in the work of these projects in accordance with their regularly assigned functions. Governing bodies of soil conservation districts, in cooperation with other interested committees or groups, are expected to provide local project sponsorship. These projects will usually be in areas where acceleration of conservation activities is required to provide additional economic opportunities to the residents of a single district, or parts of several adjoining districts, or other geographic planning units within a land resource area.

An appropriation of $1,200,000 is proposed to initiate this program during the coming fiscal year, a decrease of $5,075,000 in the budget request. The amount provided includes $200,000 to assist in formulating local plans and programs, $500,000 for technical assistance in installing works of improvement on approved projects in selected areas, and $500,000 to provide long-term loans to sponsoring organizations where needed to install conservation practices and works of improvement on approved projects. It is estimated that 24 additional man-years of employment will be required to carry out this program at the level approved for the next year.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

An appropriation of $9,832,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year, a net increase of $320,850 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $469,000 in the budget estimate. The increase includes an additional $17,000 to meet increased postal costs, $201,850 to cover 60 percent of the Pay Act increases required for the coming year, and $110,000 for the employment of 10 additional people for research on foreign trade expansion and problems related to the Common Market. These increases are partially offset by a reduction of $8,000 due to the new data processing system.

Foreign supply and demand studies are underway in 19 countries that are important or potential export markets. Studies are needed in additional countries and further analysis is needed of major changes in the demand for U.S. agricultural commodities in all of the areas of the world.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

The committee recommends an appropriation of $11,079,000, a net increase of $1,057,150 over the 1963 appropriation and a decrease of $473,000 in the budget estimate. The increase includes $75,000 to meet increased postal costs, $150,150 to provide 60 percent of the pay increases for the coming year, $80,000 to reimburse Post Office Department for handling of rural mail surveys previously handled on a nonreimbursable basis, and $760,000 to continue the long-range program for improvement of the crop and livestock estimates. These are partially offset by a decrease of $8,000 due to the new data processing system.

The increase of $760,000 is the fourth increment of the long-range improvement program started in fiscal year 1961. It will be used to place the 11 Western States, currently on a pilot basis, on a full operating basis, which will provide a full program of enumerative surveys in 35 States and will permit placing 12 Northeastern States and Florida on a pilot basis. This will give coverage for the first time in the 48 continental States.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Marketing services: The bill for the coming fiscal year includes $37,061,000 for this purpose, a net increase of $1,026,505 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $834,325 in the budget estimate. The increase includes $160,000 for additional postage costs, $733,205 to finance 60 percent of the pay act increases for the coming year, and $250,000 to provide 32 additional poultry inspectors. These increases are partially offset by a reduction of $116,700 due to savings resulting from the new data processing system.

Poultry production has increased steadily in recent years and the number of plants and evisceration lines has reflected this growth. The number of poultry processing plants requiring inspection has increased from 480 in 1959 to an estimated 1,086 in fiscal year 1964.

In the opinion of the members of the committee, a separate unit should be established from present funds for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Also, Department regulations for this program should be modified and revised, recognizing essential differences in areas, as suggested in previous reports of this committee. Further, the officials of this program should immediately discontinue the practice of publicizing any claim or charge against any individual or stockyard company for violation of regulations where no formal hearings have been held or penalties invoked. Hearings or penalties should be for actions in violation of regulations and not for agreements which may have been forced in the first instance.

The committee also feels that free distribution of any commodity through any food donation program should be held to such level as will not interfere with normal commercial sales or destroy the public demand for the product through commercial channels. Recent free distribution of peanut butter through food donation channels appears to seriously threaten normal commercial retail sales of this product, according to witnesses before the committee. The committee does not mean, however, to let these industries run the Department's business. It merely feels that they should have the ear of the Department in working out satisfactory solutions.

Payments to States and possessions: Federal payments, authorized by section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, are made under cooperative agreements between the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State departments of agriculture, bureau of markets, and similar State agencies for the conduct of eligible marketing service activities on a matching fund basis. The States contribute at least half of the cost and perform the work with State personnel.

The full budget estimate of $1,425,000 is recommended for the fiscal year 1964. This is the same amount as was appropriated for the previous fiscal year. No increase in Federal personnel is involved in this appropriation.

Special milk program: The special milk program is aimed primarily at increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children. Nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, all nonprofit summer camps and child-care institutions devoted to the care and training of children, are eligible to participate in the program. From its inception in fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1962, the program was financed through advances from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Agriculture Act of 1961—Public Law 87-128—approved August 8, 1961, changed financing to a direct appropriation beginning June 1, 1962, and extended the authorization through June 30, 1967.

An appropriation of $100 million is proposed for the next fiscal year, a continuation of the amount expended for fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $2 million in the budget estimate.

In 1962, milk consumption under the program, 2.6 billion half pints, was nearly six times the quantity consumed in 1955. The volume amounted to more than 2½ percent of the total nonfarm consumption of fluid milk in the United States. This was in addition to the 2.4 billion half pints used in the school lunch type A meals.

School lunch program: The committee proposes the full budget estimate of $137 million, plus the transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds for the purchase of meats and other foods needed to provide balanced school lunches. This is an increase of $12 million over the appropriation approved for fiscal year 1963. No increase in employment is authorized.

For a number of years the committee has felt that funds for this program should increase as the number of children served increases. To that end the committee this year has set the figure at a fixed reimbursement rate for the number of meals expected to be served next year. The appropriation provided in this bill has been computed on such a basis for the first time, and should continue on such basis hereafter.

In fiscal year 1962 a total of 2.4 billion school lunches were served. This increased to nearly 2.6 billion in fiscal year 1963 and is expected to increase to at least 2.7 billion during the coming fiscal year. At an average reimbursement rate of 5 cents per meal for the coming year, an appropriation of $135 million will be required. In addition, $2 million is provided for the regular administrative expenses of the program.

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities—(section 32): Section 32 funds are used to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural products and to stabilize market prices either through announcements that the Department stands ready to enter the market, or by actual participation in the market. Generally, surpluses are removed from the market through purchases, which are then donated to schools, institutions, and needy persons.

Language is included in the bill this year for the first time to control the use of section 32 funds for purposes other than operation of the commodity programs authorized by basic law and for which the fund was originally provided.

The committee has also included language to permit the use of up to $25 million by the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase domestic consumption of any basic farm commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply. The use of these funds for this purpose appears fully justified, since they come from import duties and the problems facing many of our agricultural commodities at present are due to the failure to use the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to limit the importation of such products.

This action should be a real saving to the taxpayer as a result of increased domestic consumption and decreased costs. For example, an increased domestic consumption of 1 million bales of cotton alone could save the taxpayers some $30 million or more per year. Similar savings for wheat, soybeans, and other large crops can also be made through the use of this authority.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For the coming fiscal year, the committee recommends an appropriation of $18,505,000, a net increase of $1,369,730 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $534,000 in the budget estimate. Based on the total funds available to this service for fiscal year 1963, including $3,994,000 for the special foreign currency program, this is a net reduction of $2,624,270.

The increase recommended includes $239,730 to finance 60 percent of the pay increases for the coming year, $150,000 for 3 additional marketing specialists and 10 other personnel engaged in market development and trade expansion work, and $1 million for market development projects under cooperative agreements with U.S. agricultural producers and trade groups. These are offset by a reduction of $20,000 resulting from the new data processing operation.

The $1 million for market development was provided by transfer from the foreign currency program in fiscal year 1963. Since no funds are being provided for the foreign currency program for the coming fiscal year, the $1 million has been included as a direct appropriation under this heading for the coming year.

The domestic demand for farm products is expected to expand around 1½ percent in the present year, mainly as a result of population growth. Export markets for farm products are now expected to be somewhat below the high level of $5.1 billion attained in 1961–62. One of the important factors in this expected reduction is the imposition of levies by the Common Market countries which became effective on July 30 of last year. Total U.S. agricultural exports to Common Market countries were 13 percent lower during the months of August–November 1962, than a year earlier. Exports of wheat flour were reduced 65 percent and those of poultry products dropped 40 percent.

The additional funds and personnel authorized in this appropriation are to be used for increased market development work abroad in an effort to retain and expand dollar markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The bill carries an appropriation of $1,093,000, an increase of $32,050 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $2,000 in the budget estimate. The entire increase is provided to cover pay act costs for the coming fiscal year.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: An appropriation of $105,737,000 is included in the bill for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $10,314,000 over fiscal year 1963, and a decrease of $9,207,000 in the budget estimate.

The increase includes $4,830,000 to cover 1963 Pay Act costs financed by transfer of funds and 60 percent of the pay act increases required for the coming year. In addition, it includes $195,000 to meet increased postage costs, $5 million for performance checking on the feed grain and wheat stabilization programs, and $500,000 for administration of the land use adjustment program authorized by section 101 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. These increases are partially offset by a reduction of $211,000 due to savings from the installation of the new data processing system.

The increase will provide funds to complete measurement of acreage diverted under the 1963 feed grain and wheat programs and will permit a second check on participating farms to determine ultimate use made of diverted acreage. This increase will also provide funds for acreage measurement in 1964 for wheat farmers who elect to plant within their allotments and qualify for price support, and other measurements as required by present law. No funds are included for administering the 1964 feed grain program.

Section 101, title I, Food and Agricultural Act of 1962, provides for a land use adjustment program under which payments are to be made to producers for making changes in land uses and cropping systems and for conserving and developing soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreational resources. With the $500,000 included in this bill for administrative purposes it is proposed to extend the pilot program initiated in 1963 to other areas of the country first, to cover a portion of the land released from the conservation reserve; and second, to extend conservation practices to other land.

It has come to the attention of the committee that county and community committeemen are being required to sign statements that they will support the programs and policies they will administer. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee this requirement is unwarranted and is not authorized. It has subjected the activities of the Department to severe partisan criticism. The Secretary should discontinue this requirement.

The use of any funds provided in this appropriation bill in an effort to influence the vote of any participant in any referendum on any proposed farm program or pending agricultural legislation is not within the provisions of this act and in the opinion of the committee would be completely unauthorized.

Some years ago, Congress adopted legislation to assure proper security measures for the handling of crop and livestock estimates as the result of instances of premature release of information which caused considerable damage to those engaged in producing and handling agriculture commodities. Apparently the rules and regulations and security measures adopted under this law are working satisfactorily. No further criticisms or complaints have come to this committee's attention.

In view of the large volume of commodities and large amounts of funds involved in the transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation—a $14.5 billion corporation—and in view of their impact on commercial markets, it is the feeling of the committee that protections somewhat similar to those for crop and livestock estimates should be established for the handling of the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Therefore, it is recommended that full and complete minutes be recorded of all meetings of the Corporation and that security measures be instituted relative to actions and decisions on price support levels, purchase programs, announcements of proposed sales programs, and other significant factors. Also, it is recommended that significant actions and decisions affecting the conduct of the business of this Corporation be based on written legal opinions obtained from the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

Sugar Act program: Payments are made to domestic producers of sugar beet and sugarcane who comply with certain special requirements. To finance these payments, a tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds is imposed on all beet and cane sugar processed in or imported into the United States for direct consumption. During the period 1938–62, collections of $1.9 billion from excise taxes and import taxes have exceeded payments by $465.5 million. Estimated collections through fiscal year 1964 of $2.3 billion will exceed estimated payments by $667 million.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $78 million for the next year, an increase of $350,000 over 1963 and a decrease of $2 million in the budget estimate.

Total sugar production from 1963 crops is estimated at 6,275,000 tons, an increase of 304,000 tons over production from 1962 crops. Of this increase, 250,000 tons is expected from the beet area, 50,000 tons from Hawaii, and 4,000 tons from the Virgin Islands. The increase of $350,000 is provided to partially meet this increased production. If estimated production increases are fully realized, some additional funds may be needed at a later date.

Agriculture conservation program: An appropriation of $215 million is recommended for fiscal year 1964 to make payments earned under the program authorized in the 1963 appropriation bill.

This is an increase of $2,100,000 over funds appropriated for fiscal year 1962, due to greater participation in the 1963 program. It is a reduction of $5 million in the budget estimate. Amounts due under this program are legal commitments and funds must be provided to pay all contracts entered into.

The committee has restored the 1964 program authorization contained in this bill to the regular $250 million operating level. In 7 of the past 10 years, Congress has been called upon to restore budget cuts recommended in this program authorization.

In the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee, the funds expended through this program return to the Nation the greatest possible conservation benefits. Further, this program provides the best possible means of meeting local conservation needs in all areas of the country. It is far more effective than many other approaches adopted in recent years.

Conservation practices under this program are developed initially at the local level by ASC State and county committees, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Federal Forest Service. Representatives of the land-grant colleges, the Farmers Home Administration, State conservation committees, and other State and Federal agricultural agencies also participate in these determinations.

The recommendations of these groups are used as the basis to formulate joint recommendations to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in Washington. From these recommendations, the various agencies of the Department in Washington develop and recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture a national program. State and local people then develop their local programs within the structure of the national program approved by the Secretary. No practices are adopted and put into effect in any State or county unless approved by the local conservation groups.

Through the years this program has been the principal stimulus to farmers and ranchers to apply neded conservation measures. It has stimulated twice as much conservation as the amount of Federal funds provided, since the farmer puts up about half the cost of conservation practices installed, plus his labor. The program has over 1 million participants each year, which is nearly 25 percent of all farming units in the United States. In 1962, there were approximately 1.2 million participants.

Since 1936, conservation measures performed under this program have made a major contribution to the total soil and water conservation effort of the Nation. Over 1.7 million dams and reservoirs have been constructed, some 26 million acres of the land have been terraced, over 111 million acres have been protected by stripcropping, about 41 million acres have been placed under proper drainage practices, over 44 million acres of range or pasture and 770 million acres of other lands have been placed under vegetative cover.

Conservation reserve program: An appropriation of $294 million is proposed for fiscal year 1964 to pay off obligations incurred under the conservation reserve contracts still in effect. This is a decrease of $10 million below the funds provided for fiscal year 1963.

Approximately 19,000 contracts covering 1.3 million acres expired as of last December. Additional contracts will expire at the end of 1963 and each year thereafter. Some of the 10-year contracts entered into in 1960 will continue through fiscal year 1970. A few of these contracts for planting of tree seedlings, which were extended 2 years beyond 1960 due to the unavailability of tree seedlings, will extend through fiscal year 1972.

Land-use adjustment program: Title I of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 includes authority for the Secretary to carry out long-range conservation plans with individual farms and ranchers through agreements extending up to 10 years. In additions, for calender year 1963, the act authorizes assistance with respect to land covered by conservation reserve contracts which expired last December.

Pilot projects will be initiated in representative areas throughout the country to determine how land not needed for crop production can best be used for conserving and developing soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreational resources. It is expected that an adjustment payment will be required to compensate the landholder for the adjustment made and also share payments to provide for the establishment of trees, grass, or recreational facilities.

During fiscal year 1963, agreements have been entered into under this pilot program totaling $2,050,437. Further, agreements have been signed to continue conservation on over 700,000 acres of the 1.3 million acres removed from the conservation reserve program last December. It is expected that rental obligations and cost sharing on these acres will total around $7 million.

An appropriation of $2 million was provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1963—Public Law 88-25—to meet fiscal year 1963 costs under these agreements. The bill for 1964 includes a recommended appropriation of $10 million to meet the costs for the coming fiscal year. This is a decrease of $9 million in the budget estimate. Approximately $6 million will be required to meet obligations under the agreements on the former conservation reserve land. The balance is provided to meet 1964 practice payments under 1963 pilot project agreements and to make adjustment and practice payments under agreements to be entered into during fiscal 1964.

OFFICE OF RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Rural areas development program activities are carried out by the Office of Rural Areas Development which was established by the Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum No. 1448 of June 16, 1961. The responsibilities of the Office are to, first, provide leadership and initiative in the formulation of plans for carrying out rural development programs of the Department of Agriculture; second, coordinate and expedite the application of resources of Department agencies in assisting State, local, private, community, and farm organizations and individuals working for the improvement of economic conditions in rural areas; third, maintain liaison with appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch and with officials of public and private organizations to assure coordinated effort in utilization of available resources in support of the rural areas development program. The Office also coordinates work conducted by USDA agencies under the Area Redevelopment Act and the accelerated public works program, acts as liaison between USDA agencies and other Federal agencies. It also advises State and local governments in establishing projects under these programs.

On February 28, 1963, employment in the Office of Rural Areas Development consisted of 24 employees, all of whom were in Washington. This includes employees paid from funds transferred from the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce.

For the coming fiscal year an appropriation of $120,000 is recommended, an increase of $32,150 over funds available for fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $14,000 in the budget estimate. The increase includes $3,220 to meet pay increases during the coming year, plus funds to employ two additional persons to strengthen the coordination and administration of the Department's rural areas development program.

The rural areas development program is expanding rapidly throughout the Federal Government. Additional coordination and direction of this program must be provided if it is to meet its objectives. The additional funds are provided on the assumption that the Secretary of Agriculture will use this Office to provide the necessary coordination and direction. A large number of agencies of the Department are engaged in this program and their work must be fully integrated. Also the work of the Department must be fully coordinated with the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies working on redevelopment, if the rural areas are to realize the benefits of such a program.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

The committee recommends $3,953,000 for the next fiscal year, an increase of $98,400 over 1963 and a decrease of $34,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will cover approximately 80 percent of the pay act increases needed by this Office for the coming year.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

The full budget estimate of $1,684,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $21,780 over funds provided for the previous year. The additional funds recommended are needed to meet increased postage costs and to finance 80 percent of the pay act increases needed for the coming year.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

For salaries and expenses, the committee recommends $1,420,000 for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $234,680 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $275,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will cover approximately 90 percent of the pay act increases required during the coming year and will provide 20 additional man-years of employment to meet the expanding demands upon the library.

Research personnel of the Department continue to make additional demands on the library for more adequate library aid. As the research programs increase, expansion in library facilities and services becomes essential. To assure maximum results from the research dollars invested each year, it is essential that the additional library facilities and research information be available to the research technicians.

The committee has also included an appropriation of $450,000 for the preparation of plans, specifications and drawings for a new library. More than 20 years ago the inadequacy of the present library quarters was recognized. Today the problems are so severe that service is greatly impaired and publications cannot be properly preserved. Many publications necessary for scientific research are not being purchased because of lack of space and staff to store and maintain them.

It is contemplated that new library facilities providing about 240,000 gross square feet of usable space will be needed to provide adequate and efficient arrangements. Based on comparable construction costs, it is estimated that adequate facilities can be constructed for between $6 and $7 million.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For the coming year the committee recommends an appropriation of $3,735,000, an increase of $338,000 over fiscal year 1963 and a decrease of $240,000 in the budget estimate. The increase includes $113,000 to meet 80 percent of the pay act increases for next year, plus $225,000 for the new auditing, inspection, and investigation activities.

This latter amount was provided by transfer from the various agencies of the Department during fiscal year 1963. For the coming year it is proposed to finance this work by direct appropriation under this heading. The appropriations of the other agencies of the Department have been adjusted accordingly.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorization: For electrification loans during fiscal year 1964, the committee recommends the budget estimate of $425 million, an increase of $25 million over 1963. For the telephone loan program the committee recommends the budget estimate of $70 million, a reduction of $10 million below 1963. Of the amount provided for the electrification program, $150 million has been placed in a contingency reserve, in accordance with the practice followed for a number of years.

The committee wishes to again point out that these amounts are not considered as regular appropriations, since they are merely limitations on the amount of funds which the REA may lend during the fiscal year from amounts borrowed from the Treasury and funds are not actually drawn from the Treasury until loans are approved and advance payments are made. Further, the amounts advanced are eventually repaid in full with interest.

Salaries and expenses: An appropriation of $11,162,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $719,800 over 1963 and a decrease of $182,000 in the budget estimate.

The increase will provide $431,800 to cover 80 percent of the pay act increases for the coming year, plus $300,000 for the employment of 15 additional employees to implement the surveys, audits, and supervision necessary to carry out recommendations contained in the earlier discussions of REA loans. These increases are partially offset by a reduction of $12,000 due to savings resulting from the centralized data processing operation.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Direct loan account: Pursuant to the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, a direct loan account was established in fiscal year 1962. Collections of principal and interest on loans outstanding are deposited in the direct loan account and are available for principal and interest payments on borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury and for making additional loans for first, farmownership; second, soil and water conservation; and third, operating purposes. Such loans may be made only in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriation acts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1963, it is estimated that this new account will have a balance on hand of $167,063,969. It is further estimated that collections during next year will total $303,084,000, which will provide total funds available for fiscal year 1964 of $470,147,969 in the revolving fund.

The bill includes authority to use up to $360 million of this total for loans during the coming fiscal year, $60 million for real estate loans and $300 million for operating loans. These represent increases of $10 million over fiscal year 1963 for each category of loan. Of the amount provided for operating loans, $50 million has been placed in a contingency reserve, to be used only to the extent that it becomes necessary to meet the needs of the program during the year.

Rural renewal: The rural renewal program was authorized by section 102 of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962. The program provides technical assistance to locally initiated and sponsored demonstration projects. Loans will be made to local public agencies or groups for rural renewal development projects specifically related to conservation and land utilization. To be eligible for designation as a rural renewal area, the locality must be one of chronic underemployment on farms and unemployment in the surrounding communities and where agriculture or forestry contributes substantially to the economy.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1 million to initiate this program during the coming fiscal year. This is a reduction of $1,350,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will provide funds for approximately 20 additional people to provide the technical assistance. The balance will be available for loans to local public agencies and other sponsoring groups.

Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund: This program was authorized by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, approved September 28, 1962. The act authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $50 million for a revolving fund to finance the program. It also authorizes loans from the revolving fund to private nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide modest rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons—age 62 or over—of low or moderate income in rural areas. These are direct loans, repayable in not more than 50 years. The interest is comparable to housing loans for the elderly in urban areas, which is currently running 3½ percent.

For the coming fiscal year the committee recommends an appropriation of $2 million for this program, a decrease of $3 million in the budget estimate. An appropriation of $1 million is included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963 (H.R. 5517), to get this program underway. However, most of this amount will carry forward into the next fiscal year, which will provide nearly $3 million for this purpose in the coming year.

Salaries and expenses: The bill includes a total of $39,417,000 for the administrative expenses of this agency. Of this amount $38,367,000 is provided by direct appropriation and $1,050,000 is provided as a transfer from the agricultural credit insurance fund. This is an increase of $2,588,100 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $1 million in the budget estimate. The increase includes $850,100 to finance 60 percent of the pay act increases for the coming year, plus $1,835,000 to employ 200 additional employees to meet the heavy workload of this agency. These are partially offset by a reduction of $97,000 due to the data processing system.

The workload of this agency has more than doubled in the past several years. The total volume of lending operations has grown from $309 million in fiscal year 1960 to over $800 million in fiscal year 1963. The number of farmownership loans have increased from 2,502 in 1960 to 10,943 in 1962. Soil and water conservation loans are 50 percent greater in 1963 than in 1962. During the first half of fiscal year 1960, 2,795 rural housing loans were processed; during the first half of fiscal year 1963, 12,720 rural housing loans were approved. Increased farm operating costs and larger farms continue to increase the demand for operating loans.

Also, various new programs have been added to the responsibilities of this agency during the past few years, including the rural renewal program authorized by the 1962 Agricultural Act, rural housing for the elderly authorized by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, farm labor housing and rural housing repair and improvement grants. In addition, this agency handles the loans to local sponsoring organizations under the watershed protection and flood prevention programs.

Despite these heavy increases in volume of work, the personnel strength of the agency has remained about the same since 1955. Additional funds are necessary for the coming year, therefore, to strengthen county and State office staffs in the most critical areas to handle this extra workload and protect the taxpayers' investment.

The Farmers Home Administration should give special attention to the training of new employees. In order to conduct the most efficient and effective programs with a minimum of personnel, it is essential that all FHA employees be well trained and fully informed on all rural credit problems.

In addition, the committee recommends that wherever possible the agency employ temporary personnel to meet temporary or special problems, rather than to increase the number of permanent civil service personnel. In this connection, the committee has included language in the bill to permit the transfer of up to $500,000 from the various programs administered by this agency for temporary employment to meet unusual peakload conditions.

With regard to the rural housing program, the committee is proud of the record made by the Farmers Home Administration. At the insistence of this committee, this program was changed from a farm housing to a rural housing program to meet the needs of far more people. This has meant a great deal to rural people in small towns who were not previously eligible for housing loans under either the Farmers Home Administration or the Federal Housing Administration. It has come to the committee's attention in connection with the administration of this program, however, that there is a lack of uniformity in requirements as to the amount of land required for such housing units. It is recommended, therefore, that standards be established as to the amount of land required for various types of rural housing.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee recommends a total of $10,480,000 for operating and administrative expenses for fiscal year 1964, $6,950,000 by direct appropriation and $3,530,000 from premium income. This is an increase of $415,750 over funds provided for fiscal year 1963 and is a net reduction of $210,000 in the budget estimate. The increase includes $115,750 to cover 60 percent of the pay increases for the coming year and $300,000 for an additional 20 man-years of service to expand the program, as contemplated by the long-range crop insurance program. Since the program is operating on a sound financial basis and has a surplus of premiums over indemnities, the committee feels that it should be extended to as many areas as possible to spread the coverage and reduce the risk.

The program will be available in a total of 1,196 counties in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 100 over 1963. In addition, insurance on additional commodities will be offered in 150 counties previously in the program. This will make a total of 300 new county programs for fiscal year 1964, and will increase participation to 430,000 crops, an increase of 25,000 over the number insured during fiscal year 1963.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Reimbursement for net realized losses: An appropriation of $2,500 million is included in the bill to restore capital impairment of the Corporation for the fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $221,545,000 over fiscal year 1963 appropriations and a decrease of $299,400,000 in the budget estimate.

The Department is urged to continue to increase competitive sales of commodities on hand. Three recent sales of cotton for export resulted in sales of approximately 550,000 bales of cotton worth approximately $70 million. Additional sales of cotton and other commodities should provide additional funds for the operation of the Corporation in amounts equal to or in excess of the reduction in appropriations recommended for the coming year. Also, the inclusion of authority to use $25 million of section 32 funds by the Corporation to increase domestic consumption of commodities determined to be in surplus supply should provide additional income to the Corporation during the coming year by reducing costs.

The major elements of the costs for fiscal year 1962—for which the 1964 budget is proposed—are as follows:

	Thousands
Storage and handling	$393, 257
Transportation	134, 051
Interest expense	290, 651
Administrative and program expenses	91, 044
Commodity export payments	244, 180
Donation programs	481, 268
Nonfarm benefits	1, 634, 451
Price support operations	1, 164, 949
Total costs	2, 799, 400

It will be noted from these figures that nearly 60 percent of the expenditures under this program during fiscal year 1962 went to groups other than farm producers. These nonfarm benefits went to warehousemen, transportation companies, exporters, consumers, and other groups not directly a part of the farming segment of our economy.

Limitation on administrative expenses: The committee recommends the budget request of $41,650,000 for the coming year for administrative expenses of the Corporation. This is a reduction of $1,538,500 in the limitation authorized for fiscal year 1963, due to the closing of three regional commodity offices and increased employee productivity. The total employment for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service including CCC operations will be some 736 man-years less in fiscal year 1964 than in the current year.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The full budget estimates have been provided for sales for foreign currency and emergency famine relief under Public Law 480, and for the bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile program. These amounts are substantially below funds appropriated for fiscal year 1963, including the supplemental funds contained in Public Law 88-1, approved March 6, 1963.

The amount provided for long-term supply contracts under Public Law 480 is a reduction of $26,485,000 in the budget estimate. It will provide the same amount of funds as made available for fiscal year 1963, $40 million, plus $12,515,000 to finance prior year costs not previously covered by appropriated funds.

The amount included in the bill for the international wheat agreement is an increase of $5 million over fiscal year 1963 appropriations and a reduction of $6,138,000 in the budget estimate. This amount will provide $65,562,000 for estimated costs in fiscal year 1964, as compared to $77,549,844 in fiscal year 1963, and $20,656,000 for unreimbursed costs for prior years. The volume of shipments in 1964 is estimated at the same level as 1963. However, a decrease in payment rates is expected which will decrease the amount needed for the coming year's program.

The use of foreign ships for the shipment of a portion of commodities under Public Law 480 and other foreign assistance programs has again been brought to the attention of the committee. In view of the balance-of-payments deficit facing the United States, it is recommended that American vessels be used for the shipment of commodities under this program to a much greater extent than at present.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Limitation on administrative expenses: Since December 4, 1953, the Administration has been an independent agency under the direction of a Federal Farm Credit Board—12 U.S.C. 636. The Administration, originally created by Executive Order No. 6084 on May 27, 1933, was transferred to the Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1939, by Reorganization Plan No. 1.

On December 31, 1962, the Administration had 225 full-time employees of whom 105 were in Washington. The 120 field employees are farm loan registrars, reviewing appraisers, and farm credit examiners.

The full budget request of $2,785,000 is provided for fiscal year 1963, an increase of $153,500 over the previous fiscal year. The increase is required to meet the additional pay costs during the coming year, lump-sum leave payments, and other costs which, due to the small number of employees, cannot be absorbed by a delay in filling vacancies. No additional employees are proposed for next year.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions contained in the accompanying bill for fiscal year 1964 are essentially the same as those included in previous appropriation bills.

Section 601 authorizes the purchase of 515 passenger motor vehicles during the coming year. This will permit the replacement of 498 vehicles which have reached the Government-wide replacement standard of 6 years or 60,000 miles. It will also permit the purchase of 17 additional vehicles for the use of the Agricultural Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee, on the bill they are presenting to the House today. I should like to point out a problem that favors the Extension Service.

I am concerned about the funds for cooperative extension work in the Department of Agriculture's budget.

There never was a time when rural people needed a strong Extension Service more than today. They need these dedicated workers to provide knowledge from our land-grant colleges and the USDA to help them make adjustments in their farm businesses, adopt improved systems of marketing farm products, improve family living, and develop economic opportunities in rural areas. This educational program is essential to making research and other programs to help rural people effective.

We in the Congress, the Department of Agriculture, and farm people have long looked to the cooperative extension agents to do this job. The Department considers them cooperative employees, and looks to them as the educational arm of the Department.

I understand that the average salary of these cooperative extension agents is about $6,800 and I do not believe the State extension directors can continue to employ or hold the kind of agents we must have for that low salary.

State and county governments are recognizing this need. Since 1950 the increase in local support for cooperative extension work has been more than double that provided by Federal Government.

This Congress has laid down a very solid principle of raising salaries of classified Federal service to keep them in line with salaries in business and industry. The administration has been strong for that principle. The 1958 Pay Act made clear that it is the sense of Congress that appropriation for cooperative extension work should include additional amounts to provide increase in the Federal part of cooperative extension salaries corresponding to increase provided classified Federal service employees.

I am disappointed that the proposed Agriculture Department budget this year did not follow that principle and recommend an increase in appropriations to pay the Federal part of salary increases for cooperative extension agents in line with the salary increases in the classified Federal service.

I surely hope that Congress will correct this inequity and provide pay increases for our dedicated Extension Service people in line with the pay increase principles we have already established for other classified Federal service employees.

I enthusiastically support appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service.

The subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, has, I think, performed a great service for soil and water conservation and its friends over the years.

At the time the subcommittee was conducting hearings on items in the Soil Conservation Service program, I, along with many others from both sides of the aisle and many others outside the Congress, testified before the committee in behalf of the budgeted requests.

In my statement at that time I said:

> I sincerely trust that you will see fit to use your able leadership and influence in supporting this program.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years and as a former staff member of the University of Florida, I have intimate knowledge of the value of the great work of soil conservation districts and of the small watershed program. The Soil Conservation Service provides districts with soil surveys, technical assistance in problems of land use, in the proper use of soils, and in the application of soil and water conservation practices. The small watershed program is one of the finest tools provided by Congress in recent years and is accomplishing a great deal of good.

Mr. Chairman, the work that soil conservation districts do, and the small watershed program, benefits all citizens—not just landowners and operators—not just farmers.

Conservation work must stem from local leadership organized to meet local problems. It cannot be handed down by the Federal Government and be successful.

The true role of the Federal Government is one of helping the local people who want to help themselves, and organize and equip themselves to do so.

I know of no finer example of the proper relationship between the people and their government than the local soil conservation district. This partnership, which was created by and has been fostered by the Congress, is now 25 years old. It is respected around the world. It has come to be accepted as the finest mechanism of its kind ever devised for the people and their government to cooperate in an undertaking that is vital to the present and future welfare of our country.

Mr. Chairman, our demands for national defense and the conquest of space are burdensome—and they must be met.

But we have a solemn obligation not to neglect the basic natural resources that have made this Nation great—our soil and water assets—without which there would be no need for, nor any purpose in, national defense and the conquest of space. We must still live within and upon our land and water resources. We must keep them strong, for in them is our real strength.

I am concerned that we are not able to provide more funds now for soil conservation districts and for the construction of watershed projects. I feel confident, however, that we shall continue to make progress in this area that means so much to all America.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, to a man who is hopelessly lost in the hinterlands there are some rules that can help. If there are trees he can roughly observe which way is south or north by the nature of the bark. If he finds a stream, he knows that water runs downhill and usually to inhabited country. If he finds himself in a swamp, and fiscally that is where I think we are, he needs landmarks. That is just commonsense.

I think it well to apply some commonsense to our consideration of money bills. The one we bring to you today could have been cut much more, yet, it is based upon authorizations that this body has passed and when considered in the full light of what the other body may do, I feel it is a measurement of funds with which we can live and which we can defend in conference.

There are some major factors that I think should be kept in mind in the consideration of any money bill.

First. The size of our national debt. It exceeds the national debts of the nations of the entire world by $24 billion, and of the free world, our assumed Allies, by $102 billion.

Trend of increase in gross national product, Federal expenditures, national debt and population, 1948–63

Year	GNP (calendar years)		Administrative budget expenditures (fiscal years)		Administrative budget surplus or deficit (−) (fiscal years)	Cash budget expenditures (fiscal years)		Cash budget expenditures as percent of GNP	Gold reserve U.S. Treasury (calendar years)		National debt (fiscal years)		U.S. population	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number	Percent
	Billions		*Billions*		*Millions*	*Billions*			*Millions*		*Millions*		*Millions*	
1948	$259.4		$33.0		$8,419	$36.5		14.07	$24,244		$252,292		146.6	
1949	258.1		39.5		−1,811	40.0		15.73	24,427		252,770		149.2	
1950	284.6		39.5		−3,122	43.1		15.14	22,705		257,357		151.7	
1951	329.0		44.0		3,510	45.8		13.92	22,695		255,222		154.3	
1952	347.0		65.3		−4,017	68.0		19.59	23,187		259,105		156.9	
1953	365.4		74.1		−9,449	76.8		21.01	22,030		266,071		159.6	
1954	363.1		67.5		−3,117	71.9		19.80	21,713		271,260		162.4	
1955	397.5		64.4		−4,180	70.5		17.73	21,690		274,374		165.3	
1956	419.2		66.2		1,626	72.6		17.31	21,949		272,751		168.2	
1957	442.8		69.0		1,596	80.0		18.06	22,781		270,527		171.3	
1958	444.5		71.4		−2,819	83.4		18.76	20,534		276,343		174.2	
1959	482.8		80.3		−12,427	94.8		19.63	19,456		284,706		177.1	
1960	504.4		76.5		1,224	94.3		18.69	17,767		286,331		180.7	
1961	518.7		81.5		−3,856	99.5		19.18	16,889		288,971		183.7	
1962	553.6		87.8		−6,378	107.7		19.45	15,978		298,201		186.6	
1963 estimated	578.0		94.3		−8,811	116.8		20.20	[1] 15,878		303,494		[2] 188.5	
Cumulative deficit, 1948 through 1963					43,612									
Increase:														
1948–63	318.6	122.0	61.3	186.0		80.3	220.0		−8,366	−34.5	51,202	20.3	41.9	28.6
1950–63	293.4	103.0	54.8	139.0		73.7	171.0		−6,827	−30.1	46,137	17.9	36.8	24.3
1955–63	180.5	45.4	29.9	46.4		46.3	65.7		−5,812	−26.8	29,120	10.6	23.2	14.0
1960–63	73.6	14.6	17.8	23.3		22.5	23.9		−1,889	−10.6	17,163	6.0	7.8	4.3
1961–63	59.3	11.4	12.8	15.7		17.3	17.4		−1,011	−6.0	14,523	5.0	4.8	2.6
1962–63	24.4	4.4	6.5	7.4		9.1	8.4		−100	−.6	5,293	1.8	1.9	1.0

[1] Feb. 28.

[2] Bureau of the Census estimate as of Mar. 12, 1963.

NOTE.—1963 gold reserve data is as of Feb. 28.

Source: Economic Report of the President, January 1963. Budgets of the U.S. Government. Treasury Department bulletins and daily statements.

Second. The enormity of our commitments already made. Just roughly they are:

[In billions of dollars]

Unfunded retired civilian employees of the Government	30
Accrued military pensions	40
Commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (even this is incomplete)	300
Commitments involving housing, maritime shipping, highway program, unfinished public works, unpaid military supplies to be met in the future	150
Existing public debt and, of course, the annual interest of more than $10 billion	300
Total	820

But this is not all. Add $250 billion for actuarial imbalance of obligations under social security. This could add up to $300 billion, as the future unfolds, for a total of $1,070 billion.

These costs lurk in the background as we consider annual costs—and should be on our minds when we authorize new programs.

Third. Add to this the problems of gold and silver in balances of payments, the reported decline in the measurements of our foreign trade, and you will cease to listen to those who say, "Oh, this great country can afford anything, can weather any storm." Inflation, of course, feeds upon itself, and each drop in the purchasing power of the dollar brings the demand for higher retirement pay, welfare money, and for greater costs of everything, including government.

Administrative budget expenditures, 1955 to 1964

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National defense		Veterans		Agriculture		Interest		All other expenditures		Total expenditures	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1955	40,695	63.0	4,522	7.0	4,388	6.8	6,438	10.0	8,346	13.0	64,389	100
1956	40,723	61.2	4,810	7.2	4,868	7.3	6,846	10.3	8,977	13.6	66,224	100
1957	43,360	62.4	4,870	7.0	4,546	6.5	7,307	10.5	8,883	12.9	68,966	100
1958	44,234	61.5	5,184	7.2	4,419	6.1	7,689	10.7	9,843	13.8	71,369	100
1959	46,491	57.6	5,287	6.5	6,590	8.2	7,671	9.5	14,303	17.8	80,342	100
1960	45,691	59.1	5,266	6.8	4,882	6.3	9,266	12.0	11,434	14.9	76,539	100
1961	47,494	57.8	5,414	6.6	5,173	6.3	9,050	11.0	14,384	17.6	81,515	100
1962	51,103	57.8	5,403	6.1	5,895	6.7	9,198	10.4	16,186	18.4	87,787	100
1963 estimated	53,004	55.9	5,545	5.8	6,731	7.1	9,782	10.3	19,250	20.4	94,311	100
1964 estimated	55,433	55.9	5,484	5.5	5,695	5.7	10,103	10.2	22,087	22.4	98,802	100
Including 1955 to 1964	14,738	36.2	962	21.3	1,308	29.8	3,665	56.9	13,741	164.6	34,413	53.4
Including 1960 to 1964	9,742	21.3	218	4.1	814	16.7	837	9.0	10,653	93.2	22,263	29.1
Including 1962 to 1964	4,330	8.5	81	1.5	−199	−3.4	905	9.8	5,901	36.5	11,015	12.5

NOTE.—Details may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Source: The Budget of the U.S. Government, 1964.

There is no logical way to stop this inflation save by living within our income. As our chairman on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has said "Stop spending money we do not have for things we can get along without."

Fourth. In this bill as it came from the Budget we have some interesting items: $212 million just to administer our agriculture stabilization programs; nearly $850 million to fund our free food programs, donations at home and abroad; $463 million for storage; $290 million interest on commodity credit operations; $134 million for transporting commodity credit inventories.

When it is all added up we crowd $200 million for research in 273 locations in this land of ours.

We spend $37 million to administer the farmers home loan program.

I mention these in order to show you that there are costs that we do not always think of when we casually read about this or that Government program in the paper.

We have made friends with Public Law 480 which, in many cases, must be considered as a gift. We have made friends in critical countries with Public Law 480 activities which must be considered as gifts of wheat and other commodity credit stocks. We have done enormous good with our research although it must be admitted that sometimes our research increases the complications of greater production and, to the individual operator, the problem of the cost of what he has to buy in order to utilize research. However, I am for research. But, like all good things, there is a limit to how much we can afford.

I am much in favor of the Farmers Home Administration and consider it to have a great record of sound administration, and the record also shows that it has saved many honest and industrious farmers whose credit ratings had temporarily slipped.

As we go through the bill, almost without exception, I am aware of and appreciate what is being done in our great Department of Agriculture. However, it rests upon the shoulders of those of us who serve as your Committee on Appropriations to attempt to bring some balance into the expenditure of public funds and to inject, if possible, some wise measure by which Government spending can avoid waste, duplication, and obsolescence.

While I have said that I believe this bill before you could have been cut further, I do feel that indirectly we have in many instances provided language in the report which will have the effect of eliminating waste, duplication, obsolescence, and unwise projects.

Usually the language in the report is respected by those who administer appropriated funds. I have informal assurance that if the language in this report is not carried out in spirit and in fact that next year we will write this language in ink instead of water. However, to make doubly sure that this language is properly interpreted, I would like to ask the very able chairman of our subcommittee some questions.

Much has already been said about REA and of the attempts to make them comply with the law and to interpret the law clearly so that we know what we are doing. More questions, I am sure, will be asked. I think a good job is done here in the report to clarify this. I merely want to read one section of this report that I think ought to be clarified still further. This is the paragraph on page 8 in which it stated:

> It is the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee that the Congress in providing for section 5 loans intended also that they should not be made where local private business can meet the need or where it is determined that the local borrower will provide unnecessary competition. The Administrator should also certify to the Secretary as to the necessity for section 5 loans.

Under the act it is very broad and section 5 loans can be made for almost anything. I would like to ask the chairman if this language means exactly what it says.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, it certainly does. We in the subcommittee cannot rewrite the law, as the gentleman knows, but we did feel through this report we could spell out sound business practice and call on the Department to follow it. That is what we do here. In the certification of the Secretary, what it amounts to is that the Secretary will be familiar with what the agency does. In effect it means somebody will check it and you will have a record of what really occurred, on which you can deal with this subject next year.

May I say at this point I had a call this morning from the office of the REA Administrator saying "We mean to carry it out fully, and we hope to have the staff set up and start the first of July doing exactly what your committee asks us to do."

Mr. HORAN. I want to bring to the committee's attention right now the vast unfairness in so many fields of using borrowed Federal money as venture capital. It is not fair to the private investments that exist in any given community. Yet, under some of these programs we make it possible to use Federal money as venture capital at low interest. I have a case here of 2 percent money. This happens to be, if you are interested in it, on page 2521 of part 4 of our hearings. Here is a case of a loan made by the REA to the Jackson Electric Membership Corp. of Gainesville, Ga. I have here two letters from ice companies—refrigerator storage companies—already existing in Gainesville; namely, the City Ice Co. and the Best Ice & Locker Co., Inc.

Gainesville is often called, the broiler center of the world, and a good deal of their refrigeration goes into the quick freezing of broilers, these two companies claim that they are able to meet all of the needs of Gainesville. Despite that fact, a corporation down there could not borrow from SBA, could not borrow from the local banks, went to the REA and got a loan of $137,000. They went outside the city limits of Gainesville—Gainesville is a city in excess of 12,000 people and REA cannot operate in cities bigger than 2,500—built a plant and got started. After that they went to the Small Business Administration and got a loan of some $150,000. As far as I can tell, this is a clear infraction of the very thing that the language of this report is attempting to clear up.

Mr. Chairman, under permission previously granted, I shall put this matter in the RECORD at this point:

BEST ICE & LOCKER CO., INC.,
Gainesville, Ga., May 14, 1963.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
U.S. Representative,
State of Washington,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: Permit me to congratulate you on the enclosed news item from the Atlanta Journal dated May 9, 1963 concerning REA.

Attached you will find copies of correspondence we had with REA in May 1962 concerning the new freezer plant for Gainesville and I might add that since that time the City Ice Co. has enlarged its storage facilities by an additional 17,500 square feet. This loan to a local group was approved in September 1962 and approximately 60 days ago, they began work on the plant.

I believe that you will find that our letter of May 16, 1962, is self explanatory and I just wanted to send this on to you and I might add I have heard nothing further from REA other than their letter of May 24, 1962.

Thanks for your efforts and if there is any additional information you desire, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours very truly,
GERALD GARRARD,
General Manager.

MAY 16, 1962.

DIRECTOR,
The Rural Electrification Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The purpose of this letter concerns the financing and building of a quick freezer and cold storage plant in the area of Gainesville, Hall County, Ga. It is our understanding that a loan application has been made by a group from Gainesville to build this freezer plant for the handling of poultry products.

We would like to acquaint you with the present facilities that are available in Gainesville, Hall County, Ga., and the services being provided by the City Ice Co., and the Best Ice & Locker Co., Inc. Approximately 6 million pounds are available for zero cold storage and 340,000 pounds are available for quickfreezing poultry products every 24 hours. Both of these firms represent a considerable investment of private capital and have been in business here for a number of years; namely, City Ice Co., 35 years and Best Ice & Locker Co., Inc., 11 years.

During 1961, City Ice Co., built a new storage plant from private funds which covers a space of 17,500 square feet which is in addition to their other plant located on Main Street and it is believed that with the facilities (three freezing plants) available through these two firms that it is ample to meet the requirements of the poultry industry. The cold storage business in Gainesville due to its location from a distribution standpoint is 95 percent poultry products and the seasonal trend over a period of years indicates that approximately 6 months of the year is operated at 50 percent or less capacity. With the problems facing the poultry industry, namely, the tariff on the Common Market shipments, it is believed that this will seriously affect the volume of freezing and cold storage of poultry products.

We do not object to competition but we sincerely feel that the present facilities here will be more than ample to meet the requirements of the Gainesville area and both firms have studied the market very closely and are prepared with investment funds to meet any expansion programs necessary in the poultry business.

We would welcome a visit from your representative to inspect our plants and facilities and any other information you desire concerning the needs of the poultry industry in the Gainesville area.

Yours very truly,
BEST ICE & LOCKER CO., INC.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1962.

Mr. GERALD GARRARD,
General Manager, Best Ice & Locker Co., Inc.,
Gainesville, Ga.

DEAR MR. GARRARD: We have your letter of May 16, 1962 in regard to the existing cold storage and freezing facilities in Gainesville, Ga., and the proposal of the Southeastern Freezer Corp., to build additional facilities in this vicinity.

Thank you for your letter and please be assured your comments will be considered before final action is taken on this application.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD A. DELL,
Acting Administrator.

CITY ICE CO.,
Gainesville, Ga., May 25, 1963.

Representative WALT HORAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: I was interested in your comments on the REA type loans and your mention of such a local project. We happen to be an established business which will no doubt suffer because of this Government largesse. We built the first Gainesville freezer in 1943 and we have enlarged our facilities just as fast as demand justified. In 1951 a competitive freezer was built by local men. Both companies have expanded from time to time as we could see the demand ahead. So far as we knew there were no reasonable unsatisfied demands here.

For over 2 years another local group without experience in the cold storage business has wanted to get into this business in competition to the two existing firms. They were unable to get together sufficient finances until they ran across the REA money. I understand that they were granted $137,000 and later also obtained a SBA loan for around $150,000. They have established their business just outside the Gainesville city limits where an REA line had served a home in the past. They are going after the same business which we are serving.

In support of the depressed areas program (which was considered in this instance because some of the surrounding counties are so classified), the officials count up the many jobs which are created. Mr. Clapp states that the local project will create 50 jobs. However, as I have pointed out to Senator RUSSELL, the storage business is thoroughly mechanized and the size storage which they are building can afford to employ only 10 or 12 people when it gets into full occupancy. Unless the volume of business in the community actually grows there will be a loss of employment from existing facilities as a portion of the business is taken over by this new one. Mr. Clapp says, "We are making an effort to call to the attention of local people the desirability of trying to assist existing operations to expand, etc." However, there was no public statement whatsoever from Mr. Clapp, REA, Georgia Agricultural College, or anyone else until the accomplished fact was announced in the granted loan.

The new freezer construction was announced to cost $490,000. This is a misrepresentation nowhere near the truth and is apparently an inflated estimate used to get a big loan. And, as I understand it, a $2,000 cold storage door can be included in an REA loan request because it happens to have a $20 motor to actuate it.

It is, of course, too late for us to have any relief from this new competition made possible by Federal money. However, I wish to speak out against such unfair practices which penalize existing business to promote new schemes and competition.

Your views as recently expressed are much appreciated.

Very truly yours,
C. J. ROMBERG.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the enclosed letter from Mr. C. J. Romberg of the City Ice Co., Gainesville, Ga.

The consumer facility loan to the Jackson Electric Membership Corp. of Jefferson, Ga., was made under authority of section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This section provides that "the Administrator is authorized and empowered * * * to make loans for the purpose of financing the wiring of the premises of persons in rural areas and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment." REA, as you know, has been making this type of loan since adoption of the Rural Electrification Act in 1936.

The $137,000 provided in the loan to Jackson will be reloaned at 4 percent interest to the Southeastern Freezer Corp. of Gainesville to finance the wiring and installation of electrical refrigeration equipment in the company's new freezer, cold storage, and processing plant. Financing for the building has been arranged through private sources. The loan will run for 10 years and the cooperative has assumed full responsibility for its repayment.

This plant will improve the financial position of the cooperative through increased usage of electricity, the basic purpose of section 5 loans.

REA makes section 5 loans only when credit is not available at reasonable rates from local banks or other lending institutions, public or private. This particular loan was approved after careful investigation of the need for another plant of this type in the Gainesville area. The enterprise has support from the Georgia Agricultural College at Athens, from county agents in adjoining counties, and from Department of Agriculture specialists. We were assured that this new enterprise is needed and will prove beneficial to the economy of the area. About 50 local persons will be employed in the plant when it reaches capacity operation. Seven of the adjoining counties have been classified as eligible for rural redevelopment assistance.

We are pleased to provide this information.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD A. DELL,
Acting Administrator.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1962.
Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: We are glad to answer your request for a report on the enclosed letter from Mr. C. J. Romberg, of the City Ice Co., in Gainesville, Ga. As you know, Mr. Romberg's letter of October 26 is in response to our comments on a previous letter which he had written.

Mr. Romberg refers to the Jackson Electric Membership Corp.'s "2-percent rakeoff in interest at the expense of the general public." It is true that REA is lending money to the Jackson Electric Membership Corp. at 2 percent, while Jackson is charging 4 percent. It should be noted, however, that the Jackson Electric Membership Corp. is obligated to repay this money to the Federal Government even if it should fail to collect from the Southeastern Freezer Corp. Despite the most careful feasibility checks, REA borrowers are taking certain risks on such financing for new enterprises, particularly since this financing is available only after refusals from other lending sources.

The question was also raised as to why the needs filled by Southeastern Freezer Corp. were not called to the attention of persons with existing freezer and storage facilities. In REA's work in the development field, we are making an effort to call to the attention of local people the desirability of trying to assist existing operations to expand and point out the various advantages of making this the first part of any development program. We believe that this emphasis will be increased by various local and State groups. Once an application is made, however, it would obviously be improper for REA or any other Government agency to take the proposal of the applicant and try to interest others in doing what the applicant entrepreneur proposes to do.

The project is located in Gainesville rather than in adjoining counties because this location was the one proposed by the applicant corporation. REA section 5 loans are not restricted to the areas designated for assistance by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

There may be differences of opinion as to the number of people who will be employed by the Southeastern Freezer Corp. We should note, however, that the loan was approved by REA under section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 which is not tied to the creation of employment but designed to increase the use of electricity and strengthen rural electric systems so that they can provide electric service at reasonable rates to all rural residents without it. A fortunate side benefit, however, is the stimulation of the local economy.

We hope it will be possible for both the City Ice Co. and the Southeastern Freezer Corp. to prosper in an improving economy in the Gainesville area.

Sincerely yours,
———— ————,
Administrator.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I want to state to the gentleman and to the Chairman of the Committee that I think they have done a good job with what they have to work with. After all, there are obligations that the Congress has passed and sent to the committee and they must do something about them. It is my understanding that this appropriation bill carries $5,979,457,000. Additional authorization obligation, however, in the bill, totals $1,334,379,000. So that in this bill we are fixing to spend $7,313,835,000; or to put it down on a unit basis we are now spending of the taxpayers' money in this program $1,976 for every farm unit in the United States. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. HALEY. And this amount that the Federal Government proposes to spend is approximately 50 percent of the entire income that the farmers of the United States received in 1962; is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman for his observations. For years now, of course, we have had any number of requests for new laboratories throughout the United States, despite the fact that there are already existing 273 locations in the United States, and that does not include land grant colleges. It may include subdivisions of them.

I am reading now from the second paragraph on page 11, I will say to my Chairman:

> From this report it would appear that many demands each year for new research laboratories or new and expanded research projects, most of which would require funds above the budget, could be and should be met with existing facilities, and to a large degree with existing personnel and funds.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he and I have been together through the years and have recognized the need for new facilities. We have been together when we had them forced upon us when we could not see the need for them. I am glad to comment on what the gentleman has said. He and I are in accord on that statement as well as the statement on the preceding page where we list the order in which these things should be done.

I am glad the gentleman has given me the opportunity to point out that he and I, as well as other members of the subcommittee, have taken pride in this. Several years ago we provided $1 million in contingency research funds, in order to meet the type of emergencies that may come up, and so that the Department, every time one of our colleagues goes down there with a problem in his district, will not be able to say to him, "Get us some more money and we will do the work."

The Department has a 7 percent transferability, and has a $1 million special fund with which to meet these problems.

There is no excuse for not being helpful in trying to move in and take care of this. I am glad to join with my colleague and say that whenever a new laboratory is constructed it takes 5 years to get results.

Mr. HORAN. I want to comment here that while there has been some juggling and adjusting done in the Commodity Credit Corporation and stabilization group, it has become apparent to our subcommittee that a couple of our Commodity Credit Corporation problems come from the failure to move what they have in storage. They let it stay there until it stacks up so high it scares them.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the record, the Commodity Credit Corporation is charged by law with doing a number of things. It has several sources of funds to carry out its responsibility. It can increase its domestic foreign sales. That is one way of meeting the obligations placed on it by the Congress. The second is by capital restoration, for which our subcommittee recommends funds to the Congress each year. Either way, the funds are available to carry out their responsibilities.

Mr. HORAN. There is one very interesting thing that I think might point up some of this. Tobacco produced in 1955 had not been sold. The net result was that when they did sell it they suffered a great loss. It represented a loss of $80 million to the American taxpayers.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might also recall that the committee raised serious questions about offering this commodity at a fixed price. I am glad to report that subsequent to our hearings and report, in connection with the latest sale, they are in the process of offering it to the highest bidder, which is a much improved procedure.

Mr. HORAN. I should like to call the attention of the committee and my chairman to the wording two-thirds of the way down page 15 of the report:

> In the opinion of those who testified on this subject before the committee, the Department should consider requiring mandatory dipping of all sheep transported in interstate commerce in order to control scabies.

This should be done, I think, in conjunction with the State departments of agriculture. But I have been assured by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], that this would go a long way toward the eradication of scabies and the prevention of scabies to other States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think we should clear up more here with reference to the amount of dollars spent per farm. I am sure the gentleman will agree that a lot of the money here does not go to the farmer but on the contrary actually reduces farm income. For example, when we have research centers, such as we have in Ames, Iowa, engaging in research to reduce diseases in swine; but every time we reduce diseases, it results in an increase in the supply of pork. Increased supplies of hogs mean cheaper prices for pork and help the consumer. An increase of 1 percent in the supply of pork will result in a reduction of 3 percent in the price of live hogs and less net income for a greater total supply. It is not fair to say this total budget is for the farmers, because a lot of it is for consumer services and some of it actually reduces the total income of the farmers and helps the consumer.

Mr. HORAN. That shows you can argue things both ways.

As to meat inspection, the committee report has this to say:

> Although this activity has grown up under the Agricultural Research Service, the Department should consider moving it to the Agricultural Marketing Service, since it is clearly related to marketing rather than to research. This would lead to closer coordination with poultry inspection and some monetary savings.

I do not doubt but that joining the administration of these two programs would save some money. I would like to have my colleague comment on that, if he would.

Mr. WHITTEN. We suggested a study of the possibilities. I think some coordination or some amalgamation of this inspection work needs clearly to come about. At the outset of poultry inspection the poultry people were afraid that they would be absorbed by the old line red meat inspection group. With time I think those fears have disappeared.

It strikes me that meat inspection is a physical thing and is not research at all. And the suggestion as to the possibility of putting it into marketing is as far as we go. Already we are beginning to hear from vested interests, and by that I mean those who are well acquainted with and accustomed to having it under the Agricultural Research Service. I can understand that they do not want to change. We did not say to change it, but we suggested that the possibilities of it be studied. I think it is a fact that they are just used to it, and it is a fact that motivates them.

Certainly, they will be given a chance to be heard. If we had desired to put them together, the committee could have done so. Of course, I do not know whether they would have stayed together because the Congress might have undone it. At any rate we just recommend for them to do what appears to be appropriate after having heard those who are directly interested.

Mr. HORAN. I hope and trust that the appropriate Committee on Agriculture of the House would hold hearings on the whole field of meat inspection because the people have a right to demand that their meat be inspected.

Right now we are spending out of the common public purse of the American people probably in excess of $50 million just for this service. There is room for argument on both sides of this question.

I received this wire this morning which shows at least what these three packing houses feel about this. This is from three packing houses in St. Louis and I know all of the gentlemen who signed it.

It says:

> ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 5, 1963.*
>
> Hon. WALT HORAN,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The House Committee on Appropriations approved a reduction in the budget request of $864,000 for Federal meat inspection and recommended transferring meat inspection from Agricultural Research Service to Agricultural Marketing Service.
>
> We urgently request that you vote against the reduction and against the transfer.
>
> The reduction in the budget will result in an actual reduction in inspection staff (which we need).
>
> On the jurisdiction question—meat inspection belongs where it is because the primary function of meat inspection is the protection of public health and elimination of animal diseases, under research and not under marketing. If there is a marketing aspect, it is strictly secondary.
>
> ST. LOUIS LOCAL MEAT PACKERS.
> HEIL PACKING.
> HUNTER PACKING.
> KREY PACKING.

Well, it can be argued that marketing comes first and that the disease angle is secondary.

Mr. WHITTEN. Meat inspection does not have anything to do with the elimination of disease. It is for protection of public health. All we suggested was that a study be made.

Mr. HORAN. I have also received this comment from Mr. Blaine Lillienquist of the Western Meat Packers Association:

> The cut is going to hurt. It will increase the cost of slaughtering when there are not enough inspectors to keep the plants operating. Overtime is involved as well. Also, this is a public health service to assure all consumers that the meats they consume are from healthy, disease-free animals. It is essential that we protect the public with the best possible inspection and, actually, this is the best argument for not transferring the meat inspection service from research to marketing. It should remain in research where it serves as a protective measure.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman from the irrigated areas of the great Northwest. In further regard to the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa and the cost involved here, I think we ought to clarify a point. When we look over the list of expenditures here, we have such things as school lunch programs, school milk programs, rural housing, which is nonfarm housing, the contributions to the foreign aid program both through the supplies and technical assistance and so on. These expenditures cannot in fact be charged to the farmers even though this is an agricultural appropriation. Is that not correct?

Mr. HORAN. The only fault with the American farmer is that he is just too efficient, I will say to my colleague from

Iowa, and I am happy to be a Representative of a rather large agricultural area with many fine producers.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, it is rather misleading, if not illogical, to say we are spending X number of dollars in the Department of Agriculture and this means that $1,040 is going to each farm in the United States? This is an illogical conclusion, is it not?

Mr. HORAN. I think so.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I think, added to that, would be the Public Law 480 expenditures which are indirectly foreign aid but which is charged to the farmers and which should not be so charged. I think the record ought to show that.

Mr. HORAN. The record should, and I think it does not when we consider the foreign aid bill. We ought to add those totals to what we appropriate as foreign aid, which totals we do not add now. These amounts—and they run over $1 billion—are not added to the foreign aid program and are not considered as a part of the appropriation.

Mr. REIFEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. REIFEL. The record should show that this amount was figured in the colloquy between the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Florida—that all of this or so much of it is charged to the farmer, which should not be done. It should be clarified that some of this should be charged to the foreign aid program although it is not being done, but appears to be charged to the farmers. That should be cleared up in the record, in my opinion.

Mr. HORAN. It should be.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I note in the bill which calls for an appropriation of approximately $6 billion that approximately 40 percent of this is for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation or some $2.5 billion.

Would the gentleman comment on the large proportion of the appropriation that is set aside for the Commodity Credit Corporation and indicate whether or not he feels there is any chance in the future to reduce this amount?

Mr. HORAN. Well, in the colloquy which I had with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], on the need for stepping up sales of stored inventories under the Commodity Credit Corporation, that is about the only way we can reduce this thing.

We did not have any trouble with the Commodity Credit Corporation, until about 1951, because we were feeding a good share of the world then with the commodities which we produced here. However, this has happened since that time.

As of now I do not see much chance of greatly reducing the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital structure. We have had to repair it from time to time. That is, of course, what this money is designed for.

Mr. HORTON. If the gentleman will yield further, of course a good part of this expenditure by the Corporation is for subsidies on farm prices; is it not?

Mr. HORAN. Well, the Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, places loans on produced crops. So I suppose you could call it that under price supports, or call it whatever you wish.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 6754, we are considering would appropriate approximately $6 billion for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1964.

Other than expenditures for national defense and interest payments on the public debt, this appropriation is the largest single item in the spending of Federal funds.

Within the agriculture budget, we find close to half of the entire amount is intended to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its losses. Specifically, this amounts to $2.5 billion or 42 percent of the total amount recommended in this bill.

What are these losses which the Government reimburses? In a word, the answer is "subsidy." The Commodity Credit Corporation anticipates a "red ink" operation in its price support and other programs of $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1964. This is 10 percent above their deficit spending of the current fiscal year.

Both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have been challenged by the decisive action of the Nation's farmers in defeating the wheat referendum to develop programs promptly that will terminate Government intervention. Policies of forcible equalization through Government controls, price supports, and cash subsidies have seriously upset our agricultural economy.

This welfare policy approach has built a false economic structure. Neither the capital invested by the Government nor farm production are adjusted to and regulated by the total domestic and foreign demand.

The solution lies in restoration of freedom of decision to farmers in the use and management of their land, and to permit agriculture to achieve a balance between its products and its markets. Government control and support will not produce a free market.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations of course is given the responsibility of making these recommendations to the House. I would like to ask my subcommittee chairman a question:

It is our responsibility to see where the expenditure of all Federal funds goes, and what is done with them. Yet in this bill we have $40 million or so recommended for the State experiment stations. We just passed an authorization bill which came out of the Committee on Agriculture which will provide x numbers of dollars in next year's appropriation bill for additional facilities.

Now, we find, without going through the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and without reporting to us that our State experiment stations have been getting—well, in 1962 they got $15.5 million of Federal funds from other departments.

In the current fiscal year, $16½ million. In the committee report it is stated:

> The land grant colleges are the basic agricultural centers and their cooperative agricultural research is highly essential. In addition, they are doing research for the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and others, through grants and contracts totaling $15.5 million in fiscal year 1962 and over $16.5 million in fiscal year 1963. The committee believes that these extra activities should not be allowed to adversely affect their regular agricultural research work. The committee requests that full information showing amounts of such grants and contracts to the State experiment stations and the purposes of the research be presented each year in as much detail as possible as a part of the supporting material for the regular annual Federal appropriation.

I would like to have some comment from my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. This appropriation for State experimental stations has risen from $19 million in 10 years to now it is crowding $60 million. This is another case of an extremely valuable facility, a State experimental station, but where do you stop? That is the question before us. They do good work, and I would like to have some comment on that from my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. We were in accord that at any time, in dealing with this Department or any other, we should know what funds are available to any State group for any particular purpose. We thought it well, however, that all of the activities and all of the funds be brought together where we could see them, so that Congress could see them.

Mr. HORAN. This is one place where we have not completed our work in cataloging all of the research that is done. We have all the facts in several Federal research fields and during our recitation of those facts was actually embarrassing to some of our witnesses who were unaware of all that was being done, as the gentleman may recall.

Mr. WHITTEN. In our hearings we brought together the facilities, the locations, the number of activities, so that we would have a place where you could go and see what we were doing now. May I say to the gentleman, as chairman of this subcommittee for 12 to 14 years, I believe I can truthfully say 99 percent of the people coming to me as chairman, asking for a research funds increase, have not known what we were already doing in that area.

Mr. HORAN. That is right, and we intend to follow through on that and get the answers so that we can properly report to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things I would like to interrogate my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] on, that involves the loyalty oath, that involves other matters that I think should be discussed, but I have used all the time I think it fair for me to take.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, today we are talking about a bill that involves on its face something in the neighborhood of $6 billion. I thought it might be well at this particular juncture to remind my colleagues that the total expenditures for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1960 were $5.4 billion; in 1961 it had risen to $5.929 billion; in 1962 it had risen to $6.668 billion; and in 1963, the fiscal year in which we are today, we will close the books on June 30 with total expenditures for the Department of Agriculture totaling $7.493 billion, an increase on the expenditure side of $2 billion over the period of roughly 3 years. So, when the Secretary of Agriculture tells the country that we are operating the Department of Agriculture and all its activities at a lesser rate than when he took over, these figures will refute those statements, and I would remind my colleagues that these figures have all been checked out with the budget officer of the Department within the last 2 or 3 hours.

Now, may I also say with respect to the personnel of the Department of Agriculture, you have something like 116,000 people working for the Department as of last year, and there is a request for better than 5,000 more this year. The report deals with this subject on page 5, and it indicates that we have had a total increase of 17,664 man-years, nearly 37 percent, since the year 1954.

May I say, too, in this area of the number of employees in the Agricultural Stabilization Service, we made a recent study in Illinois, headed up by Mr. George Theim, formerly with the Chicago Daily News, for the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, which showed that when you add up all the full- and part-time employees for the ASCS in Illinois alone, my home State, we have one of those part-time or full-time employees for every 19 farm operators, I say this is cause for concern for those of us who must fund this bill each year.

I think it also fair to point out, as has been indicated here by several people, that not all of the funds in the agricultural appropriation bill go directly to the farmer. If you look closely at the report, you will see that $1.889 billion of that goes for foreign assistance or other activities abroad. Now, there are two ways of looking at this. You can say "Oh, we should not be so concerned about these surpluses because we are sending most of it abroad, giving it away, in effect, for local currencies, to the tune of about $2 billion a year." On the other side, however, if we did not have those surpluses in this country to the extent that we do, the chances are we would not be selling them abroad for local currencies, which are, in effect, a net loss to the American taxpayer, when we have to come back each year and replenish the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital impairment.

Mr. Chairman, while on paper it looks as though we are cutting this bill some $389 million, I would say in all frankness that it will not stand up through the fiscal year. Mark my word the Department will be up here with supplementals totaling anywhere from a quarter to a half billion dollars more. I am going to insert a table for the fiscal years 1960 through 1963 which shows what has happened in these years when we have made phony cuts in this CCC capital structure account. These are net realized losses which must be met and there is no way to duck them, couch or hide them from public view. The only trouble is it has never been brought to light until a year or so after the fact, but I intend to keep the spotlight on this from time to time.

U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates and appropriations for foreign assistance programs and Commodity Credit Corporation net realized losses, fiscal years 1960–63

	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Act
Fiscal year 1960:				
Reimbursement for CCC net realized losses:				
Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act	$1,535,424,413	$1,435,424,413	$1,435,424,413	$1,435,424,413
2d Supplemental Appropriation Act:				
Unrestored balance of 1958 capital impairment	100,000,000	----------	100,000,000	100,000,000
Partial restoration of 1959 capital impairment	575,000,000	----------	575,000,000	575,000,000
Public Law 480 (titles I and II)	1,072,524,000	1,072,524,000	1,072,524,000	1,072,524,000
Other foreign assistance items	192,875,000	192,875,000	192,875,000	192,875,000
Fiscal year 1961:				
Reimbursement for CCC net realized losses:				
Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act	1,325,000,000	1,226,500,000	1,226,500,000	1,226,500,000
3d Supplemental Appropriation Act	[1] 1,017,610,000	(2)	1,017,610,000	----------
Public Law 480 (titles I and II):				
Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act	996,000,000	988,094,000	988,094,000	988,094,000
3d Supplemental Appropriation Act	[1] 1,608,685,000	(2)	1,608,685,000	----------
Other foreign assistance items:				
Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act	471,992,000	455,522,000	455,522,000	455,522,000
3d Supplemental Appropriation Act	[1] 251,953,000	(2)	251,953,000	----------
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act:				
Fiscal year 1962:				
Reimbursement for CCC net realized losses	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000	1,710,610,000	1,017,610,000
Public Law 480 (titles I, II, and IV):				
1961 costs	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000
1962 costs	251,953,000	251,953,000	251,953,000	251,953,000
Other foreign assistance items:				
1961 costs	1,464,368,000	1,404,319,000	1,404,319,000	1,404,319,000
1962 costs	245,481,000	195,681,000	195,681,000	195,681,000
Fiscal year 1963:				
Reimbursement for CCC net realized losses	2,489,955,000	2,728,455,000	2,066,955,000	2,278,455,000
Public Law 480 (titles I, II, and IV):				
Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act	1,747,000,000	1,370,632,000	939,000,000	1,370,632,000
Supplemental appropriation (title I)	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000
Other foreign assistance items	439,935,000	206,218,000	108,517,000	206,218,000

[1] These items were shifted from the 1962 original budget for consideration as 1961 supplemental appropriations. Since they were not approved by the Congress, they were subsequently appropriated in the 1962 Agricultural Appropriation Act.

[2] Submitted directly to Senate.

In addition, under the school lunch program, which benefits our urban and city centers around the country, there is $137 million in this bill, plus $45 million transferred from section 32 funds.

For the school milk program, that benefits the city children, there is $100 million. For all of the area of research activities, including meat and poultry inspection, there is something in the neighborhood of $175 to $180 million, or in total, something like $2,300 million, or $2,400 million, in which the urban centers share in this agricultural appropriation bill.

This brings me to another point. With 400,000 people a year leaving the farms and coming into the cities and the urban centers which are moving out into the rural areas, we have problems ahead. Some of the areas in which we find the Department of Agriculture engaging, it seems to me, would be a responsibility which would more appropriately lie in the Department of Commerce or in the Department of the Interior. We find under the Watershed Protection Act now that the people of Los Angeles are thinking seriously of a watershed protection program for the city of Los Angeles. In the area of flood control, this does not only benefit the farmers, but a number of the big urban centers.

When you talk about the Rural Electrification Administration, five out of six new customers of the REA lines are urban dwellers. They are getting the benefit of a low interest rate from the Government.

This brings me to the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture when he came before our subcommittee. I had to make the point in the hearings that never before had I heard a Secretary of Agriculture talk about so many things other than agriculture. The Secretary talked about rural area development, which was in effect, slum clearance.

He mentioned specifically: industrialization of our rural areas; recreation, such as golf courses and fishing ponds; the food stamp plan; manpower retraining; nonfarm employment; and housing for the elderly. All of these things took up two-thirds or three-fourths of the Secretary's testimony before our subcommittee in his prepared statement. So we are at that point where we find agriculture blossoming out into all other areas.

You will notice in the report one of the first specific items given treatment was the REA program. I want to skip over this at this point and come back to it because I have some very serious things to say about that, but let me go on in our report in chronological order here. For example, on page 9 of the report on research we find sums are being earmarked for research on corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, cotton, and wheat.

I think it should be pointed out in these areas that much of this money for research is disproportionate to the amount of total dollar volume of the particular commodity. A little later on I hope to give some up-to-date figures other than those which show in the report, bringing for example, corn, cotton, wheat, and the other basic commodities, more realistically in line with what conditions do exist today as against the last figures which were available for insertion in this report.

On page 14 of the report it says specifically that as of February 28, 1963, there were in Commodity Credit Corporation, stocks of corn totaling $1,049 million; cotton—upland—totaling $810 million; and wheat totaling $1,998 million.

As of April 30, a more revised date, we find that there is a considerable improvement on corn. It is now down from better than $1 billion to $779 million. Cotton is at the same level of $810 million. Wheat has increased from $1,998 million to $2,294 million. If I may turn to page 25 of the report and page 17 of the bill, that has to do with the food stamp plan. The administration wanted something in the neighborhood of $51 or $52 million to implement this pilot program.

Mr. HORAN. $51,500,000.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman corrects me, $51.5 million. We, by vote of the committee, reduced that figure to $40 million. Personally, I am opposed to the entire program but in the interest of compromise we have done something in the way of cutting back this figure.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman, with reference to the food stamp plan, would advise the committee what was the original purpose of the food stamp plan. Was it not to get rid of surplus agricultural commodities?

Mr. MICHEL. This is true. But now we see it being used in many areas apparently as a political gimmick, to satisfy large masses of people. I think we disclosed that in the last year, in 26 new areas or congressional districts in which this plan was put into effect, 25 were held by Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHEL. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman emphasized that point because it has now become entirely a welfare program and is no longer concerned with the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. It has gone very far afield.

Mr. MICHEL. There is no question about it. My concern is, if this is broadened further, we never will be able to come back to any normal balance in it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Also I want to remind the gentleman that this entire program apparently is still in the pilot stage. No one knows what the costs and implications of such a program would be if it became nationwide.

Mr. MICHEL. That is so true, Mr. Chairman, and now I would like to turn to page 28. There is one sentence which says that "no funds are included for administering the 1964 feed grains bill." This comes about as a result of the section which was deleted, during the debate on the feed grains bill, through my amendment. I might say, however, that there was some question as to whether or not this involved only administrative expenses or all the funds involved in the 1964 feed grains bill for payments to farmers.

The opinion of the Solicitor, Mr. Bagwell, of the Department, dated April 26, to Secretary Freeman, the day after the bill passed the House, was that it only involved administrative expenses. The other body in their report, dated May 9, specified this and so we are open here in effect to an interpretation by the Department's own Solicitor rather than taking the legislative history as we developed it on the floor of the House.

On page 29 there is discussed the matter of agricultural conservation payments. I understand that there will be an amendment offered to this at a later time by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], so rather than take the time of the House at this point I shall defer on that other than to say that in my committee I reserved on that point.

In years passed I sponsored amendments to cut it because I cannot see any sense in a good measure of it and will support the gentleman's amendment when it is offered.

On page 30 of the report we talk about the conservation reserve program. The committee points out that there are 1.3 million acres of land in the conservation reserve as of December 31, 1962, which has now come out of the reserve. The report does not say that in this year, 1963, there will be 6 million acres additional coming out of the reserve. The question that comes to our mind is this: What do we do with those 6 million acres? Do they go back into production or do we arrive at some payment figure to keep them out of production again for another three, five, or any number of years that we might arbitrarily set? The point is, it is going to cost an additional sum over and above what we are appropriating in this bill to do that job, or the results will bring about increases in production.

On page 31 of the report the matter of rural areas development comes into play. Personally, I am opposed to this program. I think we are just opening up the door here to another real boondoggling operation. Frankly, some of the folks who testified before the committee who are in charge of coordinating the activities here really have no final say as to whether or not a project is good or bad. All they are is a collection agency for information, facts and figures, and the decision as to whether or not a project gets an OK comes topside. I think that ought to be clarified.

Now, if I might turn to this area of rural electrification, may I say this is the first year in which our committee has taken such a strong position in our report. I would like to draw your particular attention to a number of the points that have been made by our chairman, who authors the subcommittee report. May I point out to you page 7 where we talk about these standards that have been established with respect to financial reserves of rural electrification co-ops.

Several years ago we found that these cooperatives were borrowing money at 2 percent and reinvesting it in Government securities bearing interest in excess of 2 percent, sometimes as much as 4 percent or more. These new regulations now provide for investment of reserves of REA co-ops in a special Treasury note bearing an interest rate of 2 percent. REA co-ops have taken advantage of this to the extent of $23 million. What I want to point out is that over and above this there are $289 million of REA co-op funds reinvested in Government securities bearing an interest rate in excess of 2 percent. This is not right, and it ought to be stopped immediately.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Always glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As the gentleman knows, I have for years been fighting to amend this Rural Electrification Act to force REA to pay the going rate of interest, about which the gentleman has just been talking, where the REA has been borrowing at 2 percent and the Government, the taxpayers, have to pay as high as 4 percent, with the REA investing its surplus in Government funds.

On page 8 of the report it is stated:

> With regard to any further generation and transmission loan approved, the Administrator should certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier had been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, and had refused or failed to do so.

This is a weapon over private power. Nor do we know when private power does not comply with the qualification of REA.

Mr. MICHEL. I had an amendment prepared to this bill which I could not get accepted by the committee because it was suggested that a point of order would lie against it. Because of that fact I have today introduced legislation that would call on the Agriculture Committee to take action in this area.

In answer specifically to the gentleman, we found that we never could get anything in writing from REA. You can ask the cooperative and they will say the power companies are lying. I cannot take the position on either side unless I have all the necessary data. When I ask REA and say, "What have you got in writing and what is your offer?" I cannot find anything in writing except in a few instances. To correct this situation, I say that there is an opportunity under the Administrative Procedures Act for a hearing examiner to hear both sides under oath.

Mr. Chairman, the REA program has become the most controversial program confronting the Congress today. It has become controversial because the present Administrator and staff of the Rural Electrification Administration are using this program to build a Federal empire and to advance economic philosophies in a manner never contemplated or intended by the drafters of the 1936 REA Act.

The situation, in my opinion, has reached the point where we must do something to bring this freewheeling Federal agency under control. I think we owe it to our constituents, to the taxpayers of the Nation, to demonstrate in some concrete fashion that our great system of checks and balances can and does function when the need arises.

With these thoughts in mind, as I mentioned, I have today introduced a bill which I think is eminently reasonable and which will, I hope, do something to restore some semblance of rationality in the REA program as well as provide a measure of restraint and control over the REA Administrator.

My bill is directed at two key phases of the REA program. The first phase relates to the granting of generation and transmission loans. The second phase relates to the question of the interest rate on REA loans.

It is in the granting of G. & T. loans where the Administrator has been particularly guilty of deviating from the intent of the law as originally spelled out by Congress. Aided by a cloak of secrecy he has been able to make G. & T. loans during the past 18 months which go completely contrary to the intent of the law. He has made these loans not as an unbiased Administrator with a broad responsibility to the public but as a partisan advocate of an economic philosophy which I believe the American public is opposed to—the philosophy of expanding the role of government in our lives.

I would draw the attention of my colleagues to a bill introduced in the other body earlier this week which is designed to remove the secrecy from the operations of Government agencies. This bill has been sponsored by 14 Senators and in a statement they have issued they point out that "the public is helpless if it cannot obtain the facts about its government." I cannot think of any non-defense agency where this is more true than in the REA today.

I would also point to the comments of the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission as reported in the Star on June 4. Mr. Minow urged the President to divide the FCC's functions between a single Administrator to be responsible for policy decisions and an administrative court to conduct hearings and render judicial decisions on industry controversies. He maintained, and I agree with him, that it is not possible for an Administrator to be a good judge on Monday and Tuesday, a good legislator on Wednesday and Thursday, and a good Administrator on Friday. While REA is not a regulatory agency, it seems evident to me that some separation of functions is called for.

In order to provide the safeguard that events have indicated is now necessary, my bill proposes that any future G. & T. loans cannot be approved until the Secretary of Agriculture has held a public hearing in which all interested parties are given an opportunity to appear and testify. This hearing is to be conducted by hearing examiners appointed pursuant to section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act and it provides for appeal to the courts.

I might point out that the review procedure set forth in my bill is that which was proposed by a special committee appointed by the Judicial Conference set up in 1942. This committee was appointed pursuant to a request by Chief Justice Stone for a study of the review procedure of administrative agency orders. This committee, composed of a distinguished group of judges, after 3 years of careful study and consideration evolved a mode of judicial review designed to provide the most expeditious and satisfactory means of disposing of these cases.

This method fits the present problem perfectly.

Mr. Chairman, I consider that my bill is eminently reasonable. It does not say to the Administrator that he shall not make any such G. & T. loans in future, but it does spell out certain procedures and criteria which he shall follow in making these loans so that at the very least he has to establish a sound justification for his actions. This objective is in keeping with the justification used by Congress in passing this act. It was, perhaps, most clearly stated by an earlier Administrator of the REA, Mr. Claude Wickard, in 1950, when he said:

> The Rural Electrification Administration will make loans to finance the initial construction of generation facilities and transmission facilities only under the following conditions: (a) where no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or (b) where the rates offered by the existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

Some time later, Mr. Wickard wrote an article which also contains a very clear expression of intent of the REA which I would like to quote:

> The Congress, by expressing endorsement of the REA policy, indicates that G. & T. loans shall be used to help the farmers of America get electric power in the most reliable manner at the lowest possible cost. For REA to deviate from this policy—either by refusing to make loans or by making those that do not meet the requirements—would obviously be contrary to the will of the people as expressed through the Congress.

Another section of my bill calls for an amendment to the act to restate the criteria for the granting of G. & T. loans. I think this is extremely important in the light of the fact that the present Administrator has seen fit to modify the criteria as originally spelled out and as quoted by Mr. Wickard above. The present Administrator is using the G. & T. program to build steam plants to augment Federal hydroelectric power. He is using them as a weapon against established electric companies not necessarily to get a lower cost of power—but actually to put electric companies out of business.

The so-called third criterion which the Administrator adopted in 1961, is the kind of device which can be used with far-reaching consequences by any Administrator who so chooses. Congress cannot stand by idly and let this pass. My bill seeks to correct this situation.

Finally, in the very sensitive area of the interest rate on REA loans, my bill proposes a course which I believe solves this difficult problem in a manner that is fair to all. It will insure that the farmer for whom this program was intended will continue to derive the benefit of 2-percent money. What my bill proposes is to leave all distribution loans—and bear in mind that this is primarily the kind of loan REA is supposed to be making—at the 2-percent rate. But under my bill all generation and transmission loans will have to be computed at an interest rate that is comparable to the rate paid by the Treasury on its marketable obligations which bear maturity dates comparable to the 35-year period of REA loans.

As my colleagues are well aware, the interest on long-term Treasury money is somewhere in the area of 4 percent. When Congress set the rate at 2 percent in 1944, it had no intention whatsoever of making this permanent. Nevertheless, we in Congress have allowed ourselves to be mislead into accepting the 2-percent interest rate as something unalterable. The legislative history shows that this is not true. I want to state again, very emphatically, that my bill does not change the rate for distribution loans from the present 2 percent. It changes the rate only for generation and transmission loans which now are being used more and more for purposes that have nothing to do with rural or farm electrification and to benefit nonfarm, nonrural customers and commerce and industry.

One of the problems that has confronted those of us who are genuinely concerned about the direction in which REA is going is that when this question of what to do about REA comes up year after year in connection with the agency's requests for money, we are told that correcting the situation is a matter for the legislative committees and not the appropriations committees. Here is the opportunity in my bill to get this matter before a legislative committee.

Mr. Chairman, a veil of secrecy shrouds this entire agency. We cannot find out the real truth. We find that they avoid putting in the record and the proceedings in which they have these negotiations as to what is a fair and reasonable rate. It is a terrible thing to have cooperatives maligning the private power companies for not coming up with a reasonable rate when they do not specify what they regard as a reasonable rate.

I can cite some examples here where they are completely off base.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman. At this very moment the private utility companies of this Nation are paying hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes to the Federal Government in order that the REA might exist.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true.

Mr. BECKER. I mean that is the tragedy of what is going on.

Mr. MICHEL. I may say that down in Florida an REA co-op bid on power to the Eglin Air Force Base. The Air Force gave a rural electrification cooperative the contract to build lines parallel to a private utility to the Eglin Air Force Base because the Air Force in determining the low bid did not take into account the fact that the co-op got 2-percent money and that it did not pay taxes. If they took that into account, they could not conceivably be competitive with private power companies in distributing power to Eglin Air Force Base. That is one example. Let me cite another one.

In Iowa, where the REA directors and officers have used money to build their own houses at a rate of 4 percent while the commercial banks in the area obviously could not lend money for home mortgages at 4 percent. That is wrong.

I can cite a case in Arkansas where, frankly, the rural electrification was completely off base on the amount of money that would be charged in mills per kilowatt hour as against what the private power company could supply in justification for a generation and transmission loan.

Just yesterday before the Appropriations Committee of the other body in open hearings the chairman of the Southwest Power Administration in testifying was interrogated along these lines by the very able and astute Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. Following are portions of that uncorrected testimony.

The testimony follows:

Colloquy Between Senator Ellender and Douglas Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration Regarding REA Loan to Upshur Cooperative of Gilmer, Tex.

Mr. Wright. Now, gentlemen, mine is not the decision as to whether REA should build a generating plant or not. But I would tell you what those people (Upshur Co-op) could have bought for under this contract that we made available to them. (Mr. Wright is referring here to the Texas-Louisiana contract where SWPA power is wheeled to cooperatives by private companies.) They could have bought it for 6.2 mills and——

Senator Ellender. Well, is that as cheap or cheaper than if they were to generate it?

Mr. Wright. I know of no generation station, no G. & T. in the country who without a great deal of benefit through integration with companies that deliver power cheaper than 8 mills per kilowatt-hour.

COLLOQUY ON PROPOSED $54 MILLION REA LOAN TO LOUISIANA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. Wright. They (the cooperative) have been offered a rate of 6.5 mills a kilowatt-hour on a 10-year contract without fuel adjustment. One of the cooperatives in Louisiana, I believe the largest in the world, has signed such a contract and is receiving its power at that rate. Now, I am told that gas prices are stabilized—and I was rather amazed that that stabilization happened at the time that I was to appear before this Appropriations Committee—but they are stabilized now in the gulf coast area to where even the 6.5 mill rate offer may be changed to a six-and-a-quarter-mill rate offer * * *. Now, answering your question, Mr. Senator, as to whether or not—I think they can generate it and with all the advantages they can secure from us in competition with the 6.5 or 6.4 mill rate—my judgment is that they cannot.

Senator Ellender. Well, what is your opinion as to the cheapest they could manufacture it or produce it?

Mr. Wright. My judgment is that if they do it for 8 or 7.5 to 8 mills a kilowatt-hour, they will be doing mighty well.

Senator Ellender. So if that plan should go through, in order to be able to receive this loan, it will simply mean that the users of the electricity that they serve will have to pay more than they were now paying for obtaining this electricity from privately owned utilities, as has been the case with the Southwestern Louisiana Co-op—would you agree to that?

Mr. Wright. That is correct.

This loan was made under the third criteria which just says, "To protect the integrity or effectiveness and security of the co-op." I think that is wrong.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman I intend to offer an amendment to cut out one part of this bill, on the REA, and I will be able to substantiate it by a statement in the report by the Appropriations Committee. I shall offer the amendment at the proper time.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I want to emphasize that in the bill which I have introduced today, in addition to providing for an open hearing, so that the Congress and the general public can get the facts, we are not eliminating the authorization of moneys or eliminating the generation and transmission program but only requiring that the REA prove their case in the public light.

I also think it is important to point out that in my bill, I provide for the continuation of 2-percent money for distribution lines but loans for generation and transmission will be at the going rate of interest. When the REA Act was first enacted, it was to give electricity to the farmer. Ninety-eight percent of the farms now are electrified and today we see that out of this $400 million that was appropriated last year, 65 percent is going not for distribution but rather for generation and transmission. I say it is wrong, particularly when these loans are granted under the third criteria as against the first and second which I feel are reasonably good grounds upon which to grant loans.

At this point I will be glad to yield to anyone who has any questions.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman referred early during the debate to the language in the bill, near the top of page 17, and also to language in the committee report which appears at about the center of page 25 thereof.

This language in the committee report is particularly intriguing to me, because as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I can report that our committee has recently reported out a cotton bill which would authorize a subsidy to other than the producer, possibly the mill, and in the committee report on page 25 are these words:

> For example, an increased domestic consumption of 1 million bales of cotton alone would save the taxpayers some $30 million or more per year.

It is curious that the language which appears on page 17 of the bill would authorize the transfer of $25 million to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity. But the first farm commodity mentioned in the committee report is cotton. It is also interesting to note that a bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds. A subsidy of 5 cents a pound would figure out at $25 a bale. Using the 1-million bale figure which is used on page 25 of the committee report, multiplied by $25 per bale, it would come out exactly to $25 million.

My question is this: Does it appear to the gentleman possible that this is an example of legislating with an appropriation bill and authorizing a $25 million cotton subsidy program here today, even despite the fact that the Committee on Agriculture has taken action to report out similar legislation on which the House itself has not had the opportunity to work its will on the enabling legislation?

Mr. MICHEL. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois may I say that I raised the question with my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] earlier in the debate. I do not believe I did it nearly as well as the gentleman, who is much more knowledgeable on the cotton facet than I am.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee again to develop this? I would have to say frankly that if we are doing what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] says can conceivably be done by this appropriation bill, then I will have to raise a point of order against this language. And, if we, through failure to say specifically that this does not permit them to do it, then all the more imperative it is to strike this, for it represents an open invitation for them to do exactly what a lot of us do not want to see done.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman, as he well knows, that he is privileged to do that which he feels called upon to do, and this includes my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

However, may I point out that under existing law, section 32 provides for various things. The reason that this was in the report last year was an effort in trying to get some control—we provided this year that they report what they had to us where we could limit what was used and what it was used for.

Section 32 itself provides for the funds and for what they will be used. The other provision has to do with wheat and corn and all the other commodities, but the Commodity Credit Corporation has unlimited authority now to sell those commodities in world markets at whatever loss they care to take.

The bill which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] is talking about would authorize this. They are already authorized under the law to sell in the world market and take just as big a loss as they want to, but we will be taking up the restoration of the capital impairment the following year. The bill which the gentleman talks about would provide for a domestic subsidy of $42.50 a bale on cotton, and I have reference to the use of import duties. Here they are limited. That is what it amounts to other than increasing consumption by 1 million bales, without that $42.50 per bale, or without exporting it at a loss. That is the best investment you could make, and I can prove it. However, that does not prevent the gentleman from moving to strike out that language. But if the gentleman strikes it out, he is then leaving it where the Commodity Credit Corporation has the authority and direction under the law to sell it in world trade for what it will bring and it will cost about four or five times as much.

Mr. MICHEL. But they do not have the power under the law now to pay a subsidy in order to make it competitive?

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. MICHEL. Under this they could get subsidized?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say this, and I do not mean to exclude cotton, it is just one of the basic commodities for which the Commodity Credit Corporation has large amounts. I would not say that section 32 does not permit it now. It is rather broad in the authority that exists now as to how they could go about making use of these funds through increased use. They could make payments to farmers to maintain income. If a point of order is made to this, I will argue the point on several grounds, but that would strike the thing that is most beneficial in this provision.

Mr. MICHEL. If no point of order is raised and it is left as is, conceivably we could have a ridiculous situation. We have shown in the utilization laboratory at Peoria that you cannot convert corn into alcohol and use it as a gasoline or something else for less than 45 cents a gallon. Under this language, the department, could be using some of this money to prove a point which has been proven to be impractical.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, if he has the time, this is the law now.

They can use all of that. If you strike the whole thing out, they still have the section 32 funds. The section is an important one.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to command the chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], and give equal praise to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Horan], the minority member of the committee, as well as all of the members of this committee.

This bill is one of the most difficult appropriation bills to handle because it involves so many facets of things that must be dealt with by this committee in the farflung fields involving feed, food, and price, as the members of the committee have already explained.

You have heard other members explain that only about one-half of $6 billion herein recommended will accrue directly to the benefit of our farmers and why it all in fact accrues to the benefit of all the people.

I am sure if every Member will read the report on the bill which the committee has submitted, they will agree that this committee has done a good job in bringing this bill to the floor There are a few items in this bill which I feel could be less, but as a whole it is as good a bill as any group of Members could devise under present circumstances.

However, I do feel that the requests in this bill for the Soil Conservation Service have been pruned a little too much since this bill provides that the SCS shall absorb 40 percent of the pay raise which Congress passed last year.

They have, however, increased in fiscal year 1964 the funds for small watersheds and for new soil conservation districts which come into being constantly every year. We now have 2,950 soil conservation districts in the United States of America. Each one of those districts generally comprises a county, and more districts are coming in annually. So, it is only right and proper that more funds should be and must be appropriated to man the new offices. The Soil Conservation Service always does a good job with the money appropriated. Some Members may be surprised to know that many of our larger cities have for years called on SCS to show them how to conserve their liquid gold called water, one of our great national problems.

I must say that had every other nation in this world put into effect a program of soil and moisture conservation as we did 37 years ago in the United States, the World Food Conference, which is being held in Washington at this time with delegates here from 100 nations would not be held. As I have looked around the so-called underdeveloped countries of this world I quickly discovered, as everyone has discovered, that in every country that forgot years and years ago that their soil would wear away, wash away, and erode away to the end, that most of their land is now unproductive. There, hunger strife prevails. I only hope that the great powerful land barons in those countries, who own most of the land, will awaken to the fact that they must conserve and build up their soil in such a manner that their land will be more productive and thus hunger will disappear in a very few years. If they will do that even the cold war will just that soon be ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in closing I must give credit to the American farmer who, during the war, was urged to produce, produce, and produce and whose sons, millions of them, went to war. They produced a greater supply of food, feed, and fiber during the war than was ever produced before in the history of this country. Many older farmers, their younger sons, daughters, and wives worked in the field around the clock to feed and clothe all America and about half of the other people of the world, our allies, for which all should be forever grateful. And since then the farmer still produces such quantities of food, feed, and fiber that we have built up this price-depressing surplus of farm commodities, which has for the last decade produced an 80-cent farm dollar.

Mr. Chairman, along with 19 other Members of the House from agricultural districts, I recently introduced a wheat and feed-grain bill.

I explained the provisions of my bill—see page 10087 in the Record of June 4—and, by the way, my good colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell], an Iowa farmowner, joined me in introducing an identical bill. It is more liberal than the other bills introduced at that time. It will in effect pay the farmer, in kind, quite liberally. For each acre of corn that the farmers take out of production, they will be paid on an average in kind of around $78 per acre, and for wheat about $65 per acre.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] such time as he desires.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my chairman in his comments concerning a new member on this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] is one of the great Members of the House and is rendering real service on our committee. He is certainly not only serving his constituents well, but he is serving his whole State and this entire section of the United States in a very capable manner.

This bill contains a recommendation of the sum of $5,979,457,000 for fiscal year 1964. This bill provides the necessary funds for the operation of the Agriculture Department's activities.

Agriculture has advanced more in the past 50 years in this country than in all the prior years of our history. Government and industry have furnished the research that is constantly improving our plants and animals, providing better management of soil and water, discovering new uses for farm products, and devising new and better methods of transporting, storing, marketing, and merchandising farm products. For 6.8 million workers on 3.6 million farms, agriculture is a job and a way of life.

Today 1 farmworker in the United States supplies food and fiber for 27 people; 8 were supplied by 1 worker in 1920.

Population is increasing and per capita food output is still inadequate in many countries. For 3 billion people in the world, American agriculture is an excellent example of abundant production and one proof of our successful democratic system.

One hour of farm labor in this country produces more than four times as much food and other crops as it did in 1920. Today, crop production is 70 percent higher per acre, and output per breeding animal is 90 percent greater. Our total agricultural assets amount to $214 billion, which is equal to nearly two-thirds of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The average farm has grown from 134 acres in 1880 to 325 acres in 1963. We are farming 360 million acres. As farm mechanization grows, farmers are able to handle more land. Each day our farmer is becoming more specialized. Most of our farms are still family units, and a larger proportion of farmers own their farms in whole or in part today than ever before. In our 50 States there are some 2.3 billion acres of land; 80 percent of this land is agricultural—including forests.

Since 1949, retail prices of farm foods have gone up 13 percent and nonfood living costs have gone up 31 percent. We do have a surplus of certain commodities, and we are strong enough to manage and own our surplus.

We all know that we are in a race with the Soviet Union in outer space, but this does not apply to agriculture. Our country today is the strongest, most productive, and wealthiest nation on earth; and in the field of agriculture we have unquestioned superiority.

A battle is being waged by the Soviet Union against agricultural underproduction and food scarcities. The Soviet Union is growing at a rate of 3½ to 4 million a year and it is becoming more urbanized.

It is true that the Russian has to fight more against the climate than our farmer. To overcome this hardship, chemical fertilizer would go a long way, but they are still far behind us in attempting to increase their yield per acre.

They are unable to produce enough food, regardless of the number of people engaged in the process.

The American farmer is a good customer. He spends $26 to $27 billion each year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock. He also spends another $15 billion for appliances, machinery, furniture, and other products.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural products; 60 million acres of our 316 million harvested acres produce for export.

At least half of the total amount appropriated in this bill applies directly to benefits for the consumer. As the result of our research and control programs provided for under this bill, the people of this country can buy food with confidence knowing that it is among the safest, cleanest, and most wholesome food in the world.

This bill contains money both for agriculture and services for consumers. It is true that we have produced a surplus of certain commodities. From our abundance we are sharing with our children and our needy. Funds are provided in this bill for our school lunch, milk, food stamp, and direct distribution of food to the needy programs. The school lunch program now reaches over 14 million children in 64,000 schools. In the year 1961, over 7 million needy persons received food through the direct food distribution program of the Department of Agriculture. Over 200,000 people are receiving supplementary food purchasing power through the pilot food stamp program.

In considering the amount carried in this bill, we must keep in mind the benefits to be received, not only by the farmer but by all of the people in this country.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I first take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], for having assigned me to the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies. Second, I wish to congratulate my chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], for his wonderful presentation on this legislation here today and to say it has been a privilege to serve with him and the other able Members, on both sides, on this subcommittee.

Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi, a subject and Department which would normally hold only limited interest for a Representative from a city district has been clearly explained and I have been brought to a fuller understanding, under his experienced guidance through many weeks of extensive hearings.

I know every Member of this House, after reading through the comprehensive report on this appropriation bill, will better understand the importance and the far-reaching necessity and work of the Department of Agriculture and how this appropriation not only directly affects the farmer but also, just as directly and perhaps more so, the consumer.

True, the consumer pays most of the bill, but this entire program costs each person about $10 per year for which the consumer receives the safest and most wholesome food available anywhere. For this food he pays only about 20 percent of his income, whereas in most other parts of the world most people must spend half or more of their available income on food.

How does the consumer also benefit under this appropriation? Through research we receive better quality and more wholesome foods. Through research, plant and livestock diseases are eradicated, saving the consumer the additional cost that would of necessity have to be added on because of crop or livestock losses resulting from diseased products. Through research, additional local and foreign markets can be found for our products and our surpluses can be better utilized.

Through soil and water conservation, watershed and flood control programs, our future generations will be assured of good lands and water supply.

This appropriation further directly aids the consumer in providing special milk and school lunch programs for our children. It provides for the food stamp program, utilizing our surplus foods for our needy.

Yes, this bill also carries the cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation which deals with our farm surpluses, but this appropriation is for programs passed by the previous Congress and is needed to fulfill previous commitments, and those opposing subsidies must look to oppose future legislation, not this appropriation—for the Government and the Congress must fulfill its previous obligations.

This bill also provides for rural area development, farm housing, and housing for the elderly—programs just as necessary for the farm areas as for the city areas. These programs further aid the city dweller, for if opportunity for decent living is not afforded to the rural area dweller, he then moves to the city and adds to the problems of unemployment, welfare, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, since the defeat of the last wheat referendum, we are fast approaching a serious crisis. We have, on the one hand, the farmers who desire support prices without strict controls, and, on the other hand, consumers who feel there should be no price support programs at all.

I believe the farmers must realize that we live in a dependent society—their existence depends on the consumer and the consumer must realize that his food supply and cost and the actual security of this Nation depends on the farmer.

The facts have proven that, at present, less than 15 percent of our total population produces the necessary food and fiber to supply the balance of our population. Each year this farm population decreases. To remain a strong nation we must be able to produce our own needs. Therefore, we cannot afford to destroy our farming society and must take steps to give it an adequate living standard.

Labor is protected by a minimum wage law—so farmers' income must be, I believe, also so protected. However, the farmer must remember labor receives pay for what it produces and if there is an over amount of production there is unemployment. So, the farmer, I believe, is entitled to a fair and reasonable income and should be protected, but if he wishes this protection, he should only produce what is required for consumption and for storage, only that which is necessary in the event of an emergency.

The alternative of continued overproduction and no price supports would be the destruction of our small farmers and then price fixing by large cooperatives or the complete destruction of our farming society, resulting in our becoming an importing Nation instead of an exporting and self-producing Nation. Also greater unemployment in the cities would result, for the farmer would seek employment there.

The movement from the farm to the cities has continually increased and the farm population, just in the last year, has again gone down several percent.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I am supporting this appropriation now and again repeat that this bill does not carry any price support funds for future programs, but covers only those which have been previously voted by the Congress and obligated and agreed to by the Government and the farmers.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the committee on the adoption of the language on pages 28 and 29 of the committee report dealing with loyalty pledges by county ASC committees and the high pressure tactics by the Department of Agriculture in the recent wheat referendum.

The language to which I refer reads as follows:

> It has come to the attention of the committee that county and community committeemen are being required to sign statements that they will support the programs and policies they will administer. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee this requirement is unwarranted and is not authorized. It has subjected the activities of the Department to severe partisan criticism. The Secretary should discontinue this requirement.
>
> The use of any funds provided in this appropriation bill in an effort to influence the vote of any participant in any referendum on any proposed farm program or pending agricultural legislation is not within the provisions of this act and in the opinion of the committee would be completely unauthorized.

This language very concisely reflects my views on this subject and it is, I feel, indicative of the position of most of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture who introduced legislation to prohibit loyalty pledges by farmer-elected committeemen from taking force and effect. In fact, 34 members of the committee including myself introduced such legislation. These resolutions have been referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and we are urging that prompt hearings be held. We all know that the ASC committeemen are elected by their own neighbors and are not employed by anyone in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. There is ample existing authority to remove them for cause and, moreover, the farmers themselves could oust any county committeeman who is not doing a satisfactory job simply by not reelecting him. It was never intended by the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should seek to intimidate or coerce farmer-elected committeemen to support any specific farm program. On the contrary, the Congress intended that ASC county committeemen should be nonpartisan and independent. Secretary Freeman by his administrative order could now compel these farmer-elected committeemen to become an integral part of the administration's propaganda team by requiring them to support programs which they and their farm neighbors who elected them might flatly oppose.

So I think it is high time for Secretary Freeman, in the light of the committee pronouncement which I again commend, to rescind the insidious regulation he issued on March 1, 1963, and I call on him to do so to conform to the overwhelming expression of congressional opinion shown by the action of at least 35 House Members in introducing rescinding resolutions and the expression of the 50-man membership of the Committee on Appropriations.

There still remains, however, a gray area in law relating to the use of Government funds to influence farmers in national referendums.

In that regard I want to direct the attention of the committee to a recent statement by the majority leader in the other body as reported in a press release under a Lewistown, Mont., heading on June 2, 1963, in which he says, among other things, as follows:

> It appeared there had been some violations of Federal law by Agricultural Department personnel in an attempt to influence the wheat vote of May 21. Some members of his Department apparently have been guilty of certain violations, and if there can be definite proof they should be prosecuted.

The Secretary of Agriculture, regardless of who he may be, should serve only as a referee in the referendums set up by the Department of Agriculture. It was never contemplated that he should use the vast facilities of his Department and the taxpayers' money in trying to influence the results of the referendum votes one way or another.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Now, having said that, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, in view of the pronouncement and statement made in the committee report on pages 28 and 29 thereof, how does the gentleman propose to implement such a statement?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that this situation came up last year, at which time we quoted the code section which has to do with trying to influence Congress. I know of no criminal statute as such against the use of personnel to influence an election or referendum. However, it was the feeling of the committee that any such action is not authorized in law, nor in our appropriation act. Further, the Secretary's order that appeared, I believe, about the 7th of March, requiring the signing of a pledge, we personally could find no authorization for any such requirement and so advised the Department.

I say that we advised the Secretary of Agriculture that we planned to put in our report language along the line which we have placed in it. We did not submit the language, but we certainly submitted the thought to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I have every reason to believe that the Department will cooperate with us in carrying out the intent expressed by the subcommittee on behalf of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will say to the gentleman that I had in mind to introduce an amendment on page 19, line 5 of the bill which would provide that no part of the appropriation provided for administrative expense should be used to pay the salaries or other expenses of any persons who attempted to influence the vote of any participant in any referendum or any proposed farm program or agricultural legislation. In lieu of offering such amendments, will the gentleman assure me or can the gentleman give me any hope that the Secretary will discontinue the requirement for a loyalty oath?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, so far as my vouching for the Department or the Secretary of Agriculture personally, I cannot. I will say to the gentleman that I have every reason to believe that the Secretary and the Department will go along and cooperate with the expressed intention of Congress as has been expressed by subcommittee in its report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi anticipate that some positive action will be taken within the near future?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his assurance.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], and call to the gentleman's attention an article which appeared in the Minneapolis paper entitled "USDA Accused of Pressuring Broadcasters." A memorandum was sent out, signed by Ray Fitzgerald, deputy administrator of State and county operations of ASC, relative to use of free time on the radio and television stations.

This article is well documented with instances, which article I think should be included in the RECORD. If the gentleman would agree, I would like to include this statement with the testimony and the statements which have been made on the floor of the House today.

USDA ACCUSED OF PRESSURING BROADCASTERS

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Agriculture Department ordered its field employees to "act aggressively" in seeking free radio and television time during the recent wheat referendum campaign.

Instructions from Washington to State farm program offices put heavy stress on the "special obligation" of broadcasters to provide "public service" time.

In a number of cases, stations did provide free air time for government officials—from Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman down to State and county farm program employees—to discuss the referendum.

In some instances the stations took the initiative in setting up the programs. But in others government officials sought air time and in some cases attempted to control program format, according to station personnel.

A spot check of radio and television stations serving rural areas, made by the Minneapolis Tribune Washington Bureau, turned up situations like the following:

The Minnesota Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) Committee, which supervises Federal farm programs in the State, appeared on an "Open Mike" program on WCCO radio in Minneapolis.

The station originally proposed a program with only one official appearing, but the committee insisted on having all four members take part.

Jim Bormann, news director of WCCO radio, said the station made the initial suggestion to the Minnesota ASC committee after deciding not to use a Farm Bureau-prepared tape which he characterized as "pretty one sided."

Bormann said, "We offered time to Ewing (C. Urban Ewing, State ASC executive director), and he accepted in writing. Then we got a call from the chairman of the State committee, who said the committee had met and decided that all four members should be on the program. We agreed, and they all took part."

(Members of the Minnesota ASC committee are Milton F. Maxwell, chairman, and Bernard M. Wichterman and Russell A. Johnson.)

After the program, which was aired the week before the vote, Bormann said station officials decided to present their own program on the eve of the referendum.

This was done, he said, with the WCCO farm director "laying out in more or less alphabetical fashion the arguments both for and against the program."

The Tribune's spot check also revealed that:

The Indiana ASC Committee asked for and obtained "prime time" from five television stations to discuss the referendum. Three programs ran for an hour; two were half-hour presentations.

In Louisville, Ky., station WHAS had "several inquiries for program time" from the State ASC committee. Officials of the radio station said they turned some down but did present "some ASC people" in discussions of the referendum.

Another Kentucky radio station, WHOP in Hopkinsville, used some taped material from the Department, including a special statement by Freeman. The station's farm director said he also used another special department tape carrying proreferendum statements from persons identified as farmers in the major wheat-producing States.

The Agriculture Department's information service produced several of these "special" programs on tape or film, with Freeman, ASC Administrator Horace Godfrey and Associate Administrator Edwin Janke appearing on them. One tape went to about 500 stations, Department officials say, while one film was sent to some 300 TV stations.

The Indiana State ASC committee prepared and circulated to county offices prepackaged radio scripts which county officials could take to local stations and read over the air. Some of these were carried, according to local reports.

Underlying the field activities was a memorandum issued April 12 over the signature of Ray Fitzgerald, deputy administrator for State and county operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in Washington.

The memo went to State ASC executive directors and State committeemen. Its purpose, Fitzgerald wrote, "is to encourage you to make full use of radio and television public service time in getting to farmers the facts."

Noting that radio and TV have special advantages because of their timeliness and broad availability to rural people, Fitzgerald added:

"An additional advantage is that broadcasting stations have a special obligation to the public which does not exist in the case of publications."

The memo went on to define this obligation as "the presentation of public service information—especially in the field of agriculture." "This is spelled out in Federal licensing laws," Fitzgerald said, and "these stations must renew their operating licenses every 3 years, and they want to make a good record in public service programing because this is a factor in renewal."

Stations promise to provide such programing, he said, "in return for two special favors granted by the Government": (1) exclusive use of a broadcast frequency and (2) "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially."

The memo said that "this does not, of course, make the stations subject to dictation." "Nevertheless," Fitzgerald said, "a station does have the general obligation to provide its listeners with information on public programs of importance to them. This has been particularly emphasized in the case of farm listeners."

He added: "The program was developed, and the referendum provided, by an act of Congress. This is the same Congress under whose laws commercial radio and TV stations are permitted to operate."

Mr. HOEVEN. I express the hope that the committee statement will be followed up by positive action on the part of the Department of Agriculture. If it is not done, I for one intend to press for legislation that will implement the committee's position in this matter.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if information is available on the total number of dollars spent in connection with that referendum?

Mr. HOEVEN. May I say to the gentleman that for the past several weeks I have tried desperately hard to get that information from both the Comptroller General and the Secretary of Agriculture but have been unable to do so. I got the same old run-around I expected in the first place.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries loan authority for $425 million for the REA. Remember this is loan authority only and not an appropriation. It is in fact simply a limit on the amount which the Treasury may loan to the REA. The money comes back into the Treasury, and I think the repayment record is truly remarkable. During the past fiscal year more money was repaid than was due—$16 million more. These were advance payments. Only two borrowers from REA were delinquent this fiscal year and more than a billion dollars have been repaid. Some of our friends of the minority have indicated that they were unhappy that Congress seems determined to keep the rural electric program functioning.

I would also point out that these REA loans are available to any power company which wants to accept the obligations which the co-ops do accept to serve undeveloped rural areas. Contrary to the generally held notion, the REA offers loans to private power companies on exactly the same terms it offers to cooperatives.

Another important item to remember is that the private power companies have an average density of about 32 connections per mile of line. The REA financed cooperatives and private companies have an average of just less than three connections per mile. This is why the private industry by and large did not want to serve the rural areas. This is why those who do serve these thin areas must be able to either finance their plant at low rates—as the REA borrowers do—or must be able to impose an extra charge on their city customers—as most of the private utilities do. Let no Representative from an urban area assume that were you to deny these low interest rate loans to REA borrowers and turn all rural areas over to privately owned utility companies that your constituents would receive a savings. True, there would be a slight savings in taxes but there would inevitably be a corresponding increase in the rates your people would be forced to pay as consumers of electric power.

The magic number in rural electrification for fiscal 1964 is 97.6. It means that 97.6 percent of all farms in the United States now have lights, and the people who sidestepped the job 27 years ago are jubilant.

"The job is finished," they cry. "Let there be singing and dancing in the streets. Now the Congress, the REA, and the rural electric cooperatives can get out of our business, and let them be quick about it. Now the Congress can quit providing REA loan funds. The great day has come; behold it is here."

Mr. Chairman, I am no less pleased than the power companies with the magic number. It is a magnificent tribute to the job that has been done and is being done by REA and its local borrowers and by their privately owned competitors, all with the help of a wise Congress. But I do not believe the job is finished. The time for singing and dancing in the streets is not yet. And I have no intention of voting for a zero ceiling on REA loan funds in fiscal 1964, or in the foreseeable future, and, of course, the committee makes no such recommendation.

Back in 1936, the year the REA got started, power companies had between $10 and $15 billion invested in their plants. Did anyone hear them say their job was done, even though nearly everybody in urban areas had lights? And Mr. Neff, the then spokesman for the power companies, said that "there are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served." Maybe they said this to justify their refusal to serve rural areas. Anyway they all agreed that they could not make a profit if they took their lines and poles way out into the country. Unfortunately, that is still true unless one has very cheap power to offer to three customers per mile. But the power companies did not feel then and they do not feel now that their job is done.

Now let me tell you what has happened to the power companies in the past 27 years. Their total operating revenues have more than tripled; their total investment in plant has more than tripled, and their earnings on common stock have more than tripled.

In 1960, the earnings on common stock of commercial power companies amounted to $14.1 billion. If you do not think that is a right handsome figure, then consider this: In 1943, just 17 years earlier, the total investment of commercial power companies in their plants was just $14.8 billion. A single year's earnings on common stock just 17 years later almost exactly equaled the total plant investment of 1943. That, my friends, is growth business.

The electric power business is a growth industry. The power companies still are issuing stocks and bonds to finance bigger generating plants and heavier transmission lines. Their job was not finished in 1936 when the urban areas already had lights. If it was finished, what are the power companies doing with all of this money they keep raising with new issues today?

This growth is a fact for the rural electric cooperatives, too. Their loads, even in the thin areas willed to them by the power companies, are doubling every 7 to 10 years. They must have heavier lines, larger and more costly transformers and substations. They must have more power—lots more power—and the ironic fact is that the cooperatives must buy nearly two-fifths of their wholesale power from their biggest, nearest, and in some cases, most competitive neighbors: the commercial power companies.

Now I ask you, if the power companies are not willing to provide an adequate supply of wholesale power at reasonable prices to these cooperatives, what course is open to the cooperatives? They can apply to the REA Administrator for a generation and transmission loan, and some of them have taken this course.

But I submit it is obvious that not every REA-financed distribution cooperative is going to build its own plant; it just will not be feasible. The threat of G. & T. loans is most valuable as a lever upon the bargaining process between cooperatives and power companies. The authority to make such loans is already in the basic REA Act, and it should remain there. The Congress properly looks to the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool.

While I have no intention of raising jurisdictional questions, or of criticizing the Appropriations Committee which, in my opinion, has done a very creditable job, I cannot overlook the fact that on pages 7 and 8 of the report the committee has, I fear, attempted to perform what seems to me to be the functions of the legislative committee—the Committee on Agriculture. Here the Appropriations Committee has sought to write into law their ideas as to proper limitations on the power of the administration. I would respectfully suggest that such limitations can only be placed in the law through the regular legislative process—and, of course, if these views are to have the force of law, they must be put in this bill and if put in this bill, they would be subject to a point of order. The very fact that they were not inserted in a manner where they could be so reached seems to me to indicate that their authors recognized that they were not binding on anyone.

I do not want to be understood as saying that I object to the Administrator giving good reasons for the approval of any loan—distribution or generation. I think that he should lend money only when the need is established, but it should be remembered that he acts as a banker, and I definitely do not agree that the REA Administrator, or any other banker, should give a borrower's financial statement to that borrower's competitor, nor give that supplier of wholesale electricity more than one chance to make an acceptable offer.

No, Mr. Chairman, the job is not finished; not for the power companies, not for the REA, not for the rural electric cooperatives, not for the Congress, but the appropriation bill is not the proper place to amend the basic law and the growth of our rural areas must be encouraged, not placed at the mercy of unsympathetic power companies. We must have adequate financing; we must have an adequate supply of wholesale power; we must continue efficient, reliable electric service throughout our country, and we must not pervert the relation of banker and borrower so as to give the would-be seller of wholesale power an opportunity to know all of the details of his weaker competitor's business. If we are serious about our professed desire to maintain free enterprise, let us start by preserving the basic tenet of free enterprise—the right of even the smallest business to deal at arm's length with its powerful competitors.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I must express to the House my keen disappointment that the bill before us, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, provides no funds whatever for the establishment of a laboratory for research into the quality factors of Flue-cured tobacco.

Members of Congress from the States producing Flue-cured tobacco—this is cigarette tobacco—and spokesmen for the producers themselves—appeared before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and we pleaded the urgency of such a research undertaking.

Producers and the tobacco industry generally respectfully and earnestly petitioned for help in constructing and equipping such a crucial facility, to be located in the heart of the Flue-cured tobacco producing area, at North Carolina State College.

Mr. Chairman, it is our considered judgment that the very existence of Flue-cured tobacco as a major crop, involving the livelihoods of many thousands of families on farms and in factories, depends upon quality research and the application of the findings of such research to the production of this American leaf.

We emphasized to the Appropriations Subcommittee that this research operation is essential to first, assure quality for consumers and to maintain consumer confidence; and second, protect and expand America's dominance in world tobacco markets.

Mr. Chairman, we are well aware of great difficulty and the tremendous responsibility of our good friends on the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I personally commend the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and each member of this subcommittee, for the quality of the job they are performing.

The bill before us does provide some additional funds for general tobacco research, but this does not begin to reach the great problem of quality that confronts the Flue-cured tobacco industry.

The production of Flue-cured tobacco provides all or part of the livelihood of approximately 500,000 farm families in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. Many thousands of other families derive the major portion of their income from the manufacture and sale of Flue-cured tobacco products.

Quality has become a matter of great concern, due to a number of factors, in recent years and months. The Flue-cured tobacco industry is convinced that immediate and major steps must be taken to protect and improve the quality of our tobacco. All elements of the industry, with representatives from all the major Flue-cured producing States met in Raleigh, N.C., on January 28 and resolved to seek the aid of Congress in establishing a laboratory that would provide the essential research and leadership to protect and improve the preferred characteristics of our crop.

Committees were formulated at the Raleigh meeting to draft plans for this laboratory, and these committees, acting upon behalf of the Flue-cured tobacco industry, presented their recommendations to the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a direct interest and obligation in the development of adequate research facilities for tobacco. The Federal Government and the States collect billions of dollars in taxes on tobacco. Moreover, tobacco is one of our greatest export crops, and therefore is important in maintaining our balance of payments with other nations.

Only $1,500,000 of Federal funds now are expended annually on tobacco research in all phases, whereas the Federal Government last year collected $2 billion in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products. The States and local governments collected another $1.1 billion, for a total tobacco tax take of $3.1 billion by Federal and State Governments. In this connection it is interesting to note that Federal taxes on tobacco and tobacco products, since 1932, have more than paid all the costs of farm price supports and income stablization efforts on all crops. Federal and State Governments each year collect more than twice as much in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products as farmers receive for producing the crop.

It would seem to me that the Federal Government would not hesitate for a moment to let our tobacco industry have a return from these taxes of whatever amount is necessary to undertake the essential research in maintaining the quality of Flue-cured tobacco.

Since the first shipment of tobacco from Jamestown 350 years ago, the United States has played a major role in the world tobacco export industry, and today—as for many years past—we are the most important supplier of tobacco in the markets of the world.

The annual value of the American tobacco crop is approximately $1,400 million. In the last marketing year, exports of Flue-cured tobacco amounted to $336 million. Almost 60 percent of these shipments originated in North Carolina. The largest shipments are to European markets.

Now our export business suddenly is threatened by the tariffs being created by the European Common Market, and by increased tobacco production in other areas of the world.

Our greatest weapon to combat this danger is quality. The reputation of our Flue-cured tobacco has enabled us to dominate world markets in the past. We must maintain and improve our tobacco if we are to continue as the dominant world exporter. Quality has been the basis upon which we have achieved our position in world trade and quality is our best hope to perpetuate this position.

I recognize that research is only a part of the quality job that must be done.

Research will be worth very little, if anything, unless such work is coordinated with tobacco program developments and improvements. That is why the laboratory should be located in the very heart of the Flue-cured tobacco producing area. So located, the work of the facility would harmonize with the work of the people directing our tobacco program and with the culture practices of our farmers who produce tobacco.

Mr. Chairman, I take considerable pride in the fact that the work of the House Agriculture Committee's Tobacco Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Abbitt] has played so large a part in building public interest in the needs for adequate and effective research on tobacco quality. The first major development in such research was the resolution of the Tobacco Subcommittee, May 4, 1960, which called upon the Department of Agriculture to—and I quote:

> Immediately undertake a concentrated and comprehensive research program for the purpose of ascertaining definitely and conclusively the effects which the utilization of the chemical MH-30 [maleic hydrazide] in sucker growth control may have upon the tobacco leaf produced for cigarette manufacture.

This research has expanded into a general, though limited, study of the factors affecting quality of Flue-cured tobacco.

It is imperative now that we proceed with the establishment of the laboratory, so that all possible research and study may be brought to bear, not only in the interest of the producers of Flue-cured tobacco but as well for the well-being of users of tobacco, the general economy and for the strength of our Nation in world commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the House that it is my hope that our friends on the Appropriations Committee, later in this session of the Congress, will reconsider all these factors—so urgent in their impact upon so many people—and will provide the funds to get underway the construction of this laboratory for research into the quality factors of Flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would wish to compliment this subcommittee on a very thorough and exhaustive effort but I was distressed to find, upon examining the 1964 agriculture appropriations measure, that the Secretary failed to include requests for funds to meet the pay increases that were authorized by the Congress last year for some 14,000 employees of the Cooperative Extension Service.

In this instance, the administration's sudden shift to economy is, in my opinion, nothing more than a lack of sufficient recognition of the devoted men and women that make up this organization, and I am glad to have this opportunity to express my concern in their behalf.

Since 1914, the Cooperative Extension Service has rendered a most worthwhile and valuable service. Through the coordinated efforts of the U.S. Agriculture Department and the State land-grant colleges in their respective States, the extension agent has played an important role in our Nation's progress—both on and off the farm.

Recent figures show that more than 12½ million American families, without schools or classrooms per se, are being provided with a wonderful opportunity to keep abreast of the latest information on farming and home economics techniques, through the services of this organization.

Mr. Chairman, it is no accident that the families in rural America, as well as urban America, are better fed, better educated, and better clothed than any other nation in the world. The contributions of the extension agent, the home demonstration specialist, and the 4-H supervisor cannot be minimized.

Since the enactment of the Smith-Lever Act, in 1914, the Cooperative Extension Service has been financed jointly by the Federal, State, and county governments. While the figures vary with some States, at present the Federal Government assumes about 40 percent of the cost, with the States and counties sharing the remainder of the costs.

The average annual salary of the extension agent nationwide, is $6,800. This ridiculously low figure is $230 less than a beginning GS-9 employee. Contrary to what some may believe, these men and women are not run-of-the-mill employees. They are college graduates with many years of training and experience, certainly worthy of the salary increases this body voted them last year.

I sincerely believe that the Congress as a partner in this service has a responsibility to finance its fair share of such salary increases and that the States and counties will then carry their share of the burden. The Appropriations Committee is to be commended, generally, for its excellent work on this bill. I am sure that the committee members recognize the importance of this particular need and that this deficiency will be corrected.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the House a very important omission, that is, the members of the Extension Service in their cooperative arrangement with the Federal Government are certainly entitled to some consideration in the regard that he pointed out.

I want to thank the gentleman for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I do want to reiterate my great faith and belief in the service of this organization and feel this oversight should be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman, you and I have a responsibility here today to see that our generation and the future generations continue to have the abundance that we enjoy today. To insure this we need to protect and use our soil, water, and forest resources wisely. That is what conservation means to me and should mean to all of us here today.

The agricultural conservation program is a partnership between Uncle Sam and the farmer to promote conservation practices that provide for wise use of our basic resources.

In 1961, 1,268,000 farmers applied approved practices on farms with 182 million acres of cropland, as well as on 185 million acres of noncrop pasture and range. For these conservation practices the Government paid $239 million; about one-half the cost. The farmer paid the balance. The agricultural conservation program is really getting conservation practices on the land and has been doing this since 1936. For years I have watched the excellent results and that is why I am heartily supporting the appropriation for the program today.

I am proud of the agricultural conservation program record made by the good farmers in my own State of California. For years we have been one of the leading States in participation in this vital land conserving program.

The agricultural conservation program insures future supply of food and fiber—that is what it means to you, to me, and to the future. I urge a "yes" vote on the bill as recommended by both the Agriculture and Appropriations Committees in its present form, without crippling amendments.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, agriculture appropriations is Government in buisness with a vengeance—subsidies, controls, electrification, and telephone in competition with private industry, giving away of food at home and abroad, building up of dietary and food control of schoolchildren—paying farmers and landowners for doing nothing. These and many others show the encroaching role of Government in our lives. A farmer cannot grow what he wants; the Federal Government controls and subsidizes.

Also, we are spending $6 billion of money we do not have, charging it to the future. Worse yet, we camouflage our lack of self-discipline in spending by bragging about the reduction of $389 million from the budgeted amount, yet we end up spending almost $6 billion. Not only is it wrong to spend money we do not have, because we are deficit financing, but this amount of money is entirely too much—by billions.

In brief, these programs, this legislation, this spending is unconstitutional. Therefore, I oppose it.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, there are no better friends of American agriculture than the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee led by our distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN. I want to thank Congressman WHITTEN and the members of the subcommittee for the courtesy and consideration they showed me when I testified before them on the agriculture appropriations bill.

As I said at that time a Soil Conservation Service research laborataory at Pendleton, Oreg., would be of the greatest importance to the economy of the entire Pacific Northwest. The Pendleton lab is now fourth on the Agriculture Department's priority list for research lab construction funds. Secretary Freeman has written me that as soon as funds are approved "the Department of Agriculture will move forward as rapidly as possible in expediting this essential soil and water management program." We cannot afford to wait for the basic research facilities needed to develop the wisest methods of utilizing our country's natural resources. I hope the subcommittee will look with favor on the approval of funds for the Pendleton lab at the earliest possible time.

Mr. LANGEN. Permit me to compliment the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture for the very excellent job they have done in their considerations for the needs and the money requirements in behalf of agriculture throughout the Nation. The committee report, in my humble opinion, is exceptionally well done, and offers explanations and concerns relative to the respective activities in the field of agriculture that are both pertinent and appropriate.

I am particularly enthused about, and want to call to the attention of the entire House, the language on page 25, and particularly the last two paragraphs dealing with the removal of surplus agricultural commodities—section 32. As this House already knows, I have on many previous occasions called attention to the fact that section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, has not been sufficiently used. There have been any number of instances that have come to my attention, and I know to the attention of everyone who is interested in surplus problems and maintaining an adequate market for agricultural commodities, in which imports have seriously affected both items. I hope that the reference that the committee has made here in the report, and the provision further provided for the use of $25 million by the Commodity Credit Corporation may be put to good use.

It is discouraging to farm operators throughout the Nation to be continuously blamed for surplus supplies and overproducing, when in so many instances their markets have actually been reduced for them by virtue of almost unbelievable amounts of imported commodities.

It has always been my contention that section 22 was originally enacted by Congress to prevent, and provide the method whereby attention could be directed and proper steps taken to assure farm producers that they would not be subjected to, these conditions. I presently have legislation pending before the Agriculture Committee dealing with this subject, and have further included a similar provision in a recently introduced bill dealing with the situation that now confronts the wheat farmers by virtue of the outcome of the wheat referendum. It is surely my hope that the future may hold a better response, both on the part of Congress and the Department, relative to this problem.

I note with equal interest on page 28 of the report the last 2 paragraphs relating to the recently publicized fact that community committeemen have been required to sign statements that they will support the programs and policies that they administer. The observation of the committee that this requirement is unwarranted and has not been authorized, is surely, in my judgment, most appropriate. Having had occasion to serve as a community and county committeeman in the administration of the program, I can fully appreciate the significance of such a requirement. Possibly one of the strongest factors in support of the committeeman system is that it provides the opportunity for the local people to have the problems of their respective areas brought into consideration in the administration of and the carrying out of all agricultural programs under their jurisdiction.

Many times this may require that a local committeeman may offer recommendations and suggestions to the State committee as well as the Department of Agriculture which might be contrary to existing programs because they are not applicable to existing conditions on a local basis. To do so, of course, would be somewhat in violation of the statements that they have been required to sign.

It is further to be noted that these men have been elected by the farmers in the local communities and therefore, in response to their selection by the local people, they ought to carry the responsibility of representing the needs and concerns of the communities they serve, and so again, it seems appropriate that I commend the committee for the attention they have given to this matter. Their recommendation could well serve to strengthen the committee system, and freedom of participation by farm people.

Let me further make reference to the attention directed to the cereal leaf beetle on page, 15 of the report. The danger to the production of small grains throughout the entire production area grows more serious by the day. In the best interest of all producers of small grains I hope that adequate funds may be provided for a research program that may completely eradicate the very disturbing threat of the cereal leaf beetle.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have noted the comments in the committee report on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill about meat inspection and the possible value of transferring this program from the Agricultural Research Service to the Agricultural Marketing Service, in which poultry inspection is also placed. I hope that nothing is done to carry out this suggestion without full consideration being given to it from the standpoint of consumer interest. Meat inspection is not primarily a marketing device, such as poultry inspection was originally intended to be. Both services, it seems to me, are now primarily health programs, to protect the consumer, rather than marketing promotion projects.

The President has called for an expansion of meat inspection into intrastate commerce under legislation which would give the Federal Government the necessary authority. The reason the suggestion was made was for consumer protection—not for improvement of the marketing of meat. So, if poultry inspection and meat inspection are to be placed together, I would think that they belong in a branch of the Department which is concerned primarily with consumer research and consumer nutrition and similar activities now carried on as part of the Agricultural Research Service. I would prefer to see all of these functions go into a separate Agriculture Department division set up with definite consumer orientation and given responsibility to coordinate the various activities of the Department of most concern to consumers.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I contend this is legislation on an appropriation bill because it would prohibit the Secretary from carrying out the duties and the authority that he has under legislation that has not been changed. The author of this proposed amendment is attempting to come in here today and prohibit the payment of money to officials of the Government who are authorized, delegated, and responsible for the administration of a program. When you try to put a limitation on the price at which cotton may be supported you are amending the present law affecting the price-support program on cotton; for certainly the gentleman from Illinois does not expect employees in the USDA to work without pay.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The effect of my amendment would be to provide a limitation on the use of funds in this act, and to require that the legislative intent of the 1958 act be carried out and to restrain officers of the Department of Agriculture from entering into price-support levels which were not anticipated nor intended in the legislative act of 1958.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is where I disagree with the gentleman, because it has been under the 1958 act, that the Secretary has acted properly and legally in supporting this price as he has done on all of the commodities. He has not violated the law. When you take away payment of salaries to the people who are enforcing the law, I say you are in effect repealing a law that is on the books.

For that reason, this amendment that the gentleman has offered is legislation on an appropriation bill any way you take it. I do not care what the ruling may be, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman is trying to change basic law. You should go before the Committee on Agriculture. You are coming in here today to take a short circuit to try to use people who are trying to destroy a program without going through the regular legislative processes.

If the Chair should overrule the point of order, he can do so only by looking at the mere form, not the substance of the amendment. The effect of the proposed amendment is to reduce the level of price support on cotton from 32.47 cents per pound to 30 cents per pound. This is clearly a legislative act. To emphasize the point I am attempting to make, the author of the amendment might have set the figure at 10 cents a pound; he might have placed a limitation on the level of price support for corn at 75 cents a bushel; he could have provided that none of the funds provided in this bill could be used for the payment of salaries to officers or employees who administer a price-support program for dairy products at a level of price support in excess of 2 cents per pound. If this kind of amendment is admissible, then it is in order to repeal the whole farm price support program by a simple floor amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I am insisting, as I believe I have pointed out, that this amendment is clearly legislation which should not be admissible, I do not have at hand citations which I believe would conclusively convince you that the point of order should be sustained, I will, in my extension of remarks, include citations which will support my contentions.

Citations: Cannon's Procedures, House Document No. 610, 2d session, 87th Congress, page 64, quoting from Chairman Frederick C. Hicks, on January 8, 1923:

> Does the limitation curtail or extend, modify or alter existing powers or duties, or terminate old or confer new ones? If it does, then it must be conceded that legislation is involved, for without legislation these results could not be accomplished (Cannon's Precedents VII, 1606, 1608, 1628, and other similar citations).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE STATE EXPERIMENT STATION SERVICE

Payments and expenses

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for grants for cooperative forestry research, and for other expenses, including $38,113,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act, approved March 2, 1887, as amended by the Act approved August 11, 1955 (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i), including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture; $500,000 for payments authorized under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623); $1,000,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research under the Act approved October 10, 1962 (76 Stat. 806–807); $310,000 for penalty mail costs of agricultural experiment stations under section 6 of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended; and $460,000 for necessary expenses of the Cooperative State Experiment Station Service, including administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); in all, $40,383,000.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this opportunity by this procedure to express a few comments in connection with this bill because I did not have an opportunity in the general debate as time was already committed. I do wish to express to the chairman and the members of the committee my appreciation of the constructive work done in bringing the bill to the floor. Under provisions relating to the Cooperative State Experiment Station Service, the inclusion of the initial appropriation under Public Law 87–788, which is the forestry research legislation enacted at the last session of Congress. While many of us thought that perhaps this could be implemented by an appropriation in excess of the $1 million, we nevertheless feel that the $1 million which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is an initial appropriation, and this will serve as a vehicle by which this very important portion of the research program in forestry can be initiated. We are embarking one one of the most important forestry research programs that has been enacted by the Congress.

I would also like to ask a question or two of the chairman in connection with the Soil Conservation Service. Might I refer the chairman to page 20 of the report. On page 20, down toward the latter part of the portions in relation to flood prevention I note with interest that there is an authorization, or at least a recommendation on the part of the committee that the Department could employ temporary personnel "to the fullest extent necessary" to speed up planning and installation work in these projects.

My question is not to object to this provision but whether or not this same consideration is applicable to other authorizations of the Soil Conservation Service as Public Law 566 or whether the interpretation the committee puts on this is that temporary personnel is restricted solely to the projects under flood prevention.

Mr. WHITTEN. No; it has reference to the overall operations of the service. We did not repeat it for each item, but the purpose is to cover all programs. Funds are frequently allocated to a particular area for particular projects. Locally they may be delayed by reason of faulty descriptions or lack of rights-of-way or other matters required locally. That concerns funds that are supplied, but which cannot be used. We have learned that planning which is so very important to so many of our colleagues, frequently is retarded by the lack of funds to properly push forward. This just gives them a little latitude to work in the same area, so that a project may be carried forward.

Mr. McINTIRE. This suggestion would apply equally well to the programs under 566.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is so intended.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman very kindly. I also wish to point out, and I assume I am correct in this assumption, that under the language of this report and the bill, funds appropriated for projects under Public Law 566 may be transferred to planning if it is considered wise by the Administrator.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as restrictions are concerned, that is true. We do not expect the projects to be retarded in order to do that. But in the cases that I have described such action may be taken.

Mr. McINTIRE. May I also ask the Chairman if I am correct, that while the Bureau of the Budget recommended 36 projects under Public Law 566, you are saying that this bill carries no numerical limitation and that projects can be started to the extent of funds that are available.

Mr. WHITTEN. We think that is sound.

Mr. McINTIRE. May I congratulate the committee on its bill. I think this does help the Soil Conservation Service materially in the handling of these various programs.

Mr. Chairman, I have personally observed the good works of the Soil Conservation Service for many years as a farmer and for the past 12 years as a Member of the House and of its Committee on Agriculture.

I feel that this is one of the truly worthwhile programs in agriculture. It is deserving of our full support. The benefits of soil and water conservation extend into the towns and cities. Conservation treatment on land reduces erosion and crop damages, prevents floods and subsequent damages to roads, bridges, public and private properties.

Soil and water conservation is carried out primarily through soil conservation districts governed by locally elected supervisors who serve without pay. The Soil Conservation Service furnishes the districts with skilled technical assistance necessary in carrying out their programs of land management.

It would be a disservice to the Nation if this assistance were allowed to lag.

We owe a lot to agriculture. It has been our springboard to greatness. Where other countries have lagged economically, ours has forged ahead. It is true agriculture has its problems here, but our problems—if we must call them that—would be openly acknowledged as blessings in Russia and Red China. As much as we criticize our agriculture, I do not believe we would be too anxious to trade positions with any nation on earth.

We owe much of our present status as a world leader to our rich agricultural resources. We must not forget this. Other nations have been similarly endowed. But many of them have fallen as a result of misusing and eventually destroying their land and water resources.

The soil conservation district movement in the United States is just 25 years old. In that quarter century more has been accomplished in conserving and properly using our natural resources than in any similar period before. It is in the interest of all of us that we encourage this—that we help the farmers and ranchers who own and operate three-fourths of the land in this country in protecting and developing that land for the generations to come after us.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the appropriations report. I am concerned that in this bill there is no increase in the appropriation for the Cooperative Extension Service to sufficiently provide county agents and other extension workers comparable treatment to that given classified civil service workers under the Pay Act of 1962.

I know from personal experience of the work of the Cooperative Extension Service. It serves as the educational arm of the USDA and the State land-grant colleges. Its agents extend the results of research from the laboratory and the experimental field to the grassroots. The people themselves, as well as the Federal and State governments have entrusted them with a task they are fulfilling in a most able fashion.

Cooperative extension agents have helped teach our Nation's farmers to become the world's most efficient producers of food and fiber. They have helped our Nation's families eat better—at a lower real cost—than any country in the world. More and more they are applying their know-how to help citizens' groups, working on broad economic and social problems of their communities in an effort to improve the economy of the area and to help people make the needed adjustments to meet today's demands.

I am sure all of you are aware of the many accomplishments of those in the Cooperative Extension Service. Their work is important and difficult. Their hours of service are long. Most of them have never known a 40-hour week. We have all benefited—directly or indirectly—from the efforts of the Cooperative Extension Service.

But, if we recognize the significant contributions of the Cooperative Extension Service, we should also recognize the obligations of the Federal Government to furnish its proper share of financial support.

Both the administration and the Congress have recently recognized and acted to correct the gap between Federal classified employees' salaries and salaries paid by private industry.

I am therefore concerned that USDA's budget requests did not adequately provide for a similar increase in the Federal portion of Cooperative Extension Service employees' salaries.

If this condition goes uncorrected, I wonder how many able and experienced Cooperative Extension Service employees will look for—and find—more remunerative positions.

I do not plead special treatment for these cooperative employees' salaries. I do strongly believe that there is a sound basis for equity. The fact that extension agents are not included in the Federal classified service does not reduce the obligation of the Federal Government to carry its share of the load in this cooperative program with the States. We must see that the Federal share available for salary increase for cooperative extension workers is adequate to permit salary increases commensurate with salary increases we have already provided Federal classified employees. I sincerely hope and trust that before this appropriation bill is finally enacted, this imbalance is corrected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on May 29 the Subcommittee on Poultry of the Committee on Agriculture held hearings at which it heard testimony from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. Among other things the Secretary explained to the subcommittee in detail the elements of the Common Market's levy against U.S. poultry and poultry products—how, as a result of the new Common Market regulation, the aggregate import charges against U.S. poultry moving into West Germany had been almost trebled—from a reasonable 4½-cents per pound to a virtually prohibitive 13 cents per pound.

The subcommittee is pleased to note the announcement of Governor Herter indicating that the United States will enter into bilateral negotiations with the European Economic Community in response to the shocking additional action which the Council of Ministers recently took in connection with U.S. poultry and poultry products, which had the effect of increasing the already unreasonable levy against U.S. poultry to a staggering 14¼ cents per pound.

In the course of the recent hearings Secretary Freeman told also of the efforts the U.S. Government has been making toward maintaining reasonable access for our poultry for the past 2 years. The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Governor Herter, and the Secretary of Agriculture have all been involved in these efforts. The determined personal efforts made by these high officials have been accompanied by supporting efforts of their staffs at all other appropriate levels of their respective organizations.

Appropriate representations have been made on a continuing basis to the Common Market officials by the U.S. Ambassador to the European Communities, Mr. Tuthill, and his staff. Also, each American Embassy in the Common Market countries has told the story of American poultry time and again to these governments.

Based upon the information available to the subcommittee, it believes the case of U.S. poultry has been effectively and lucidly made, not once but many times to all pertinent Common Market organizational elements. There is no ignorance in Europe of our solidly grounded position. U.S. poultry and poultry products are sold competitively in world trade. They are not subsidized. The market established in Western Europe is a commercial market, which in the past 7 years has grown from virtually nothing to $50 million per year, and has the potential to move much higher if only access to this market can be maintained. And while this increase in U.S. exports has taken place, local production of poultry in Western Europe has also increased dramatically, as has the trade of our competitors. I emphasize that U.S. poultry has not displaced the poultry of others. Rather it has encouraged and shared with others a larger market for all. Poultry has become the symbol of a good product, efficiently produced, meeting the expanding demands of Europe's millions.

The stakes involved, however, are much higher than the value of poultry alone. While the subcommittee limits its interests to poultry, it is fully aware that the example set by the EEC for this commodity runs sharply toward raising the question of the future of the Community itself. When the European Common Market was first proposed and as it began to take shape, we were assured and reassured that here would be a growing, outward-looking, exemplary new affiliation of nations, dedicated to carrying Europe even further down the road toward prosperity and at the same time strengthening its trade ties with the rest of the free world. We believed what we were told. We have looked for and we have expected great things from this new economic union.

If the Common Market's attitude toward trade in such vitally important consumer products as poultry is representative of its future trade attitudes, however, I can only say of the EEC that we are keenly disappointed. We have suffered a letdown. We are left wondering as to the true meaning of the Common Market's expressed ideals which so many of us have supported.

In plain English this means we should erect as formidable trade barriers against exports of products from the Common Market to us as they have to our poultry. After all, they have led the way in this exercise and apparently the only thing they understand is firmness. We should take prompt action, if positive results are not achieved, to raise barriers on those items like hams and wine and cheese and motor vehicles, and so forth, which they send to us and which are important to their farmers. We have been patient long enough. If persuasion does not work, it is time to use a club.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] that I believe we think about the same on this matter. I am very much for foreign trade but I think when it comes down to the matter of sharing our great American market with any other countries we should have the exercise of quotas on imports that will be competitive, such as poultry and other items from these countries.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. My point is simply this, I think we should note that in our negotiations we should feed them out of the same spoon that is feeding us.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with the gentleman. You may recall that the gentleman from Mississippi in general debate raised the point that we had section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act but that we were making mighty sparse use of it. It has been my feeling that if we are to share this great American market, our producers ought to know the amount of that sharing in the whole field of foreign trade. I think we are just like a ship without a rudder now so far as trade expansion is concerned. Our producers are at a loss.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I do not know whether I can altogether agree with the gentleman on that. I think our negotiators up to now have certainly done all they reasonably could and I feel it is just plain obstinacy on the part of those administering the European community. We just ought to get tough and that is my feeling about it.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. I just wanted to have the opportunity to join with the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Washington in this comment in connection with the action of the European Common Market on American poultry and, particularly, with reference to the comment the gentleman from Georgia made in connection with the market that had been developed in the European Common Market area. This development came on the basis of the initiative of the American poultry industry financed in part by some of the counterpart funds developed in our Public Law 480 agreements with some of these countries. But this is a situation where the European Common Market has closed the door to protect markets that the American poultry industry developed in the first place.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The gentleman is very correct.

Mr. McINTIRE. It is a case of their closing the doors on the markets which were developed on the initiative of industry here in this country. I share the gentleman's views that it is high time that those who have the authority meet this challenge and do so very aggressively.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for raising this question. I support the principle that we ought to have quotas of what we import into this country and that our American producers should know exactly how much of this great market they have to share. I have joined with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in requesting quotas for imports of softwood lumber from other countries into the American market. I have joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle in asking that a formula be set up on the importation of zinc and lead and on articles manufactured from zinc and lead. I think our American producers are entitled to know just what they are up against and that the people, as you say, who have the responsibility—or at least we think they have the responsibility—should be doing something in this field.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman. I quite agree that we need a reappraisal of our dealings with these other countries on such matters. I think we certainly need to speak with much greater firmness and in language that they can understand that we are just not going to give everything without receiving something in return.

Mr. HORAN. I could not agree more with what the gentleman from Georgia has just said.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301–1393); Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1101–1161); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(d), 16(e), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590(o), 590p(a), and 590q; 76 Stat. 606–607) as added by section 132 of the Act of August 8, 1961; subtitles B and C of the Soil Bank Act (7 U.S.C. 1831–1837, 1802–1814, and 1816); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, $105,737,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed $94,885,000 may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund (including not to exceed $40,051,000 under the limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expenses): *Provided further*, That other funds made available to Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a question. The chairman will recall, I am sure, that in the Agricultural Act of 1962 there was a provision for the use of $10 million—an authorization for the use of $10 million—in a so-called cropland adjustment program, which was to be designated in certain pilot counties in the country.

This was funded, in part, in a supplemental appropriation bill, but it was funded only in part.

Can the chairman advise me as to whether or not this bill carries adequate or full funding, to the extent of the authorization, in order that the contracts entered into on the part of the Department of Agriculture, contracts which had been entered into principally in the early part of 1963, will be funded either under the supplemental appropriation act, which is already passed, or covered in this appropriation bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman whether he is talking about a land-use adjustment program which is mentioned on page 30 of the committee report?

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes. This is why I raised the question, because I am assuming that that may be correct, but I wanted to be doubly sure.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, the point I was trying to make is that the supplemental appropriation bill provided $2 million for that program. We have gone along with the amount of $10 million to meet the costs for the coming year. This represents a $9 million reduction in the budget estimate. It has been our experience on the subcommittee that with regard to these new programs, some of which are frequently provided for with the support of the individual members of our committee, and sometimes they are not, we have tried to accept our responsibility whether we support them or not.

In this particular instance we can see many benefits. If you have a long-range contract where you can see that things are carried through so much similar to the Great Plains program, it has certain benefits. At the same time, however, we have felt that it was never sound to start a new program full blast, but that we should go along in the same manner, so to speak.

Where we had only $2 million, it was the thought of the committee that $10 million out of $19 million would be ample to meet this problem in the coming year.

Mr. McINTIRE. The contract proposal presented by the Department to those who were interested in this program was for the contract to be paid in one initial payment and the option rested with the interested farmer making the application as to whether this was a 5- or 10-year contract.

Because of the fact that this was set up as an initial complete and full payment type of program my question is raised because if this is the method of funding, then the full amount is needed at this particular time.

Mr. WHITTEN. The words the gentleman uses would be correct, if you ascertain in advance that you have the money for the contracts the Department entered into. It leaves it in the realm of conjecture as to how many contracts were entered into, and we feel with all of the various types of programs in this Department we have provided funds at a rate that will enable them to get this program started.

Mr. McINTIRE. The gentleman's reservation is on the total number of contracts rather than the full funding of each contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not expressed ourselves in any way on putting limitations on the carrying out of the provisions of the law, since we have limited ourselves and it leaves all the provisions in effect. The answer to the gentleman's question would be "Yes."

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 17, line 5, beginning with the word "and" and all that follows through the period on line 11, on the ground it is legislation on a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. KEOGH]. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Illinois that his point of order comes too late. The Clerk has reached page 19.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to make a point of order on the third reading of the bill?

The **CHAIRMAN**. No, it would not.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U.S.C. 1101–1161), $78,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 17 for the purpose of making a point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590(o), 590p(a), and 590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $215,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the programs of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Acts, 1962 and 1963, carried out during the period July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1963, inclusive: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no portion of the funds for the 1964 program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetland Types 3 (III), 4 (IV), and 5 (V) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That necessary amounts shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1964 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices, including related wildlife conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $250,000,000, including administration, except that no participant shall receive more than $2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. **SHORT**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I direct my remarks to the chairman of the subcommittee? In view of the fact that apparently it will not be possible to raise a point of order against the language at the bottom of page 16 and the top of page 17 of the bill in regard to the use of section 32 funds, may I inquire as to the intent and purpose of the language beginning in line 22, page 16, where it says "except for" and it goes on and outlines five different purposes for which section 32 funds may be used.

Is this in effect an amendment to the basic act of August 24, 1935, usually known as section 32?

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Yes, so far as meeting the objectives of section 32 which as the gentleman understands, provides that 30 percent of the import duties are set aside by law. It is a continuing appropriation. It is estimated there will be almost $600 million in the fund. The law says one of the primary purposes of the act is to promote increased uses of those commodities in surplus supply. There are certain limits in that act. One provision was that special attention should be given to perishable commodities which I sponsored some years ago. There is no limit whatsoever in the law on the use of the amount available except that not more than 25 percent of the 30 percent may be used for one commodity and 50 percent or more must be used for perishables.

Last year, in order to give control to Congress, in our conference report we provided on page 8 as follows. I quote:

> The conferees are in general agreement with the intent of the Senate report with reference to the use of section 32 funds, whereby the use of such funds will be justified by project and use each year and made subject to annual approval by the Congress.

We do not change the basic purposes. We do here ask a broadening of the means to reach the end. Since section 32 is complete within itself so far as finances are concerned, and since the primary purpose or one of the primary purposes is to promote the increased use of those commodities in surplus supply, the provision that the gentleman refers to is to an extent a limit on how much funds may be used, but I will say in all candor it broadens the provisions of the act to some degree, not on what section 32 attempts to do but broadens the means as to how. It broadens to a degree how the Department can do what that section provides. It adds additional means.

Mr. **SHORT**. May I say to my friend from Mississippi, are we in effect here, with this language in the bill and perhaps other language that we have already passed, using section 32 funds to finance programs like the food-stamp program that may or may not have received proper financial authority from the Congress?

Mr. **WHITTEN**. According to the opinion of the general counsel of the Department, the food-stamp plan is within the authorization of section 32. The language that we have here in this bill for the food-stamp plan is in effect a limitation, because otherwise there would be no limitation on what part of section 32 could be used for that purpose. In effect, the $25 million and the food-stamp plan dollarwise is a limitation on what otherwise might be done as far as this money is concerned. Candidly, it is my opinion it does not broaden the purposes of section 32 but adds to the authority to reach them. It does give some freedom as to how to carry out the purposes of section 32 as far as promoting those commodities in surplus supply. May I say again, in my opinion, it may be the best money we have ever invested if we can promote use as against sale, with the large discounts you would be forced to take.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. **SHORT**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MICHEL**. Always glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. **SHORT**. I just wanted to ask one more question. Would this authority in regard to the use of section 32 funds perhaps provide the means of utilizing all of the available section 32 funds to the extent that they might not be available for the normal uses that we are accustomed to, such as at times when beef is in oversupply or poultry is in oversupply, that they could be used, or is this actually perhaps tightening down this authority a little more specifically?

Mr. **WHITTEN**. May I say, in my own judgment, that the language proposed here will make more funds available for the purposes that the gentleman describes, because in the absence of a limitation of this sort, larger amounts could be used.

Mr. **SHORT**. They could be used for one single purpose only?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. My recollection is that no more than 25 percent can be used for any one commodity, and there are certain requirements that 50 percent or more must be used primarily for perishable commodities. I repeat again, I started that years ago in this subcommittee, with the support of the subcommittee, and later on it was written into basic law.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MICHEL. Happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand, except for the funds as may be approved by the Congress hereafter, this does permanently change section 32 insofar as these items are concerned.

Mr. WHITTEN. It broadens the way that section 32 funds can reach the objectives set out and for which it is authorized.

Mr. MICHEL. In our several colloquies with one another, Mr. Chairman, you have not yet categorically told me that the Department cannot use this money to subsidize a mill or to get cotton at a competitive price. Can you tell me that this cannot be used for that purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, I cannot tell you.

Mr. MICHEL. Would the gentleman sanction it if the Department used it for that purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would sanction anything that I thought would save money in the long run. It is my belief that section 32, as it now exists, permits the same thing without any limits.

Mr. MICHEL. There is no authorization for the Department to subsidize a mill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I said in my opinion, section 32 as presently written, would authorize that, if in their opinion it would increase domestic consumption of those things in surplus. However, let me repeat again it is not limited to a single commodity. It is those things that are in surplus supply. The gentleman is familiar with how many billions of dollars we have invested in them. This lends itself, in my opinion, to saving many millions of dollars that would otherwise be necessary.

Mr. MICHEL. My understanding is then that the legislative Agriculture Committee has no reason whatever to pass a cotton bill because we are doing here by an appropriation bill, the same thing you propose to do on the legislative side with respect to cotton.

Mr. WHITTEN. The bill before the legislative committee would provide $42.50 a bale domestic subsidy. For those who feel that is essential, certainly there would be every reason to pass the bill. It could be that many Members believe it is essential. There are many things in the cotton bill I do not particularly subscribe to. However, I expect to vote for it in view of many other factors that are involved.

I would like to repeat again, this is not a one-shot provision here. I hope and trust, and I say so here, that the Department will use it wisely in connection with these commodities where they have millions of dollars involved if thereby they could save some money.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORHEAD: On page 20, line 25, strike out "$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deserves the support of the Committee because a vote for it means two things:

First, it is a vote for economy in that it will save the taxpayers of this country at least $100 million—and I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe in reducing Government expenditures wherever possible consistent with the national interest.

And, second, it is a proadministration amendment. It is clearly a pro-Kennedy administration vote because this amendment, if adopted, would reduce the amount of the appropriation to the exact amount requested by the Kennedy administration. I submit, however, that it is also a pro-Eisenhower administration amendment because it reduces the appropriation almost down to the level of the Eisenhower budget request of January 16, 1961.

As I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I do so with the understanding that I have the highest regard for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations who has again accomplished the major task, which he does so well of putting together the agriculture appropriation bill. Outside of the defense appropriation bill, it is one of the five largest of the Federal Government and covers a wide range of programs from foreign and domestic food distribution to meat and poultry inspection. I have always supported the gentleman on these bills since I have served in Congress, and I shall certainly continue to do so. Since I have been elected to Congress, I have voted for agriculture appropriations every time they have been presented; I have consistently voted for tobacco support, wheat support, cotton support, the sugar program and feed grains support, rural housing, and the diversion of unneeded cropland to conservation uses.

I admire the chairman and his subcommittee in their ability to cut $389 million from the proposal by the administration. My amendment is directed to one area where I cannot agree, and where economy should be practiced—this is the $250 million drawing account—or a variation of back-door financing, if you will, for the agricultural conservation program.

The amount appropriated for this program has been a constant source of disagreement between both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations and the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. Consistently, the administration has asked for $150 million and the committee and Congress, by very close vote, have raised this amount to $250 million. Eisenhower asked for $100 million and this was increased to a like amount.

This year the agricultural budget came to the Hill with a request for $150 million again, and again it was raised to $250 million, the only item, Mr. Chairman, which received an increase.

Why there would be such an increase is a mystery to me. The only witness outside of the Department who had testified for such an increase was the limestone industry. Now I do not begrudge their desire to make a little profit but I do not think it should be done at the expense of the Government. The extra limestone would simply go to flatlands where there is no erosion, no need for conservation, and would simply result next year in larger crops per acre in the future for which the American taxpayer would have to pay to store. Thus we are wasting money two ways—a subsidy for soil betterment to produce bigger crops, costing billions of dollars a year to underwrite and store.

This amendment, therefore, calls for proeconomy, pro-Democratic, pro-Republican administration vote. Does it call for an anticonservation vote?

Mr. Chairman, I say emphatically, "No."

Before I came to Congress I was, and I still am, a strong conservationist. Back home, I was a member of the board of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and the Recreation Conservation and Park Council. I could not face my friends if I were proposing an anticonservation amendment.

I have supported and will continue to support the permanent—as opposed to the temporary—conservation programs of the ACP. I favor tree planting, terracing, contour plowing, row stripping, wildlife cover planting programs, and the rest.

But I do oppose the increasingly large part of ACP which has little to do with permanently conserving our soil, but is designed primarily at getting more production per acre.

Without considering the budget of the Interior Department, there is a great deal of money appropriated for conservation in this bill.

The total amount for Soil Conservation Service under this bill is over $200 million; for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, $702 million; and for Agricultural Research, $181 million, or a total of over $1,000 million. Even if we look more narrowly at the bill for strictly conservation purposes, we find $97 million for conservation operations, $63 million for watershed protection, $25 million for flood prevention, $13 million for Great Plains conservation program, over $1 million for resource conservation and development, $294 million for conseration reserve program, $10 million for land-use adjustment program, $59 million for plant and animal disease and pest control.

This is a conservative grand total under this bill of $562 million. If we add the $250 million proposed for ACP, we reach the grand total of $812 million.

Mr. Chairman, we who are conservationists are also taxpayers, and we do not want to spend that extra $100 million out of a total of $1,000 million for programs that masquerade under the banner of conservation but are really production subsidies.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this particular program is, in large measure, a production subsidy program. All our experience tells us that subsidy programs, once started for good purposes, tend to grow on the ship of state like barnacles.

Every subsidy program should be given a good shaking now and then to separate the good and necessary from the bureaucratic and bad. I do not propose to kill the program; on the contrary, I would preserve the good three-fifths of it and merely reduce it to the size that two administrators—one Republican, the other Democratic—thought was sufficient for them to carry out the objectives laid down by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, my father used to refer to a state of beatitude which he described as "the calm confidence of a Presbyterian holding four aces."

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friends, vote for this amendment and you can return to your districts calmly holding four aces—the aces of conservation for our children, economy for our taxpayers, support for our President, and freedom of enterprise for our farmers and industries.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Is there any guarantee that if this amendment is adopted funds which are appropriated will not be used for the purposes about which the gentleman has been speaking?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I cannot make the gentleman a guarantee, but I have been advised by the Department of Agriculture that they will not be so used.

Mr. KYL. This liming of land would be eliminated first? That is the Department of Agriculture program, as I understand it?

Mr. MOORHEAD. That is the program, as I understand it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in order to continue to have a prosperous agriculture in this country we must conserve our soil and water. The program that does more along this line than any other program provided for in this bill is the ACP program. I dislike finding myself in disagreement with my congenial and lovable friend from Pennsylvania, but I say to him quite frankly that on this occasion he is wrong.

If you examine the hearings that appear on the table here you will find that as far as the Department of Agriculture generally is concerned, they are in favor of the ACP program in its entirety. You will find further that the ACP program is the small farmer's program. If there is a program in operation today that takes care of the family farmer it is the ACP program. It is the program where we have cooperation between the small family farmer, the local ACP committee, the extension service, the State office and the Department of Agriculture.

This is not a program where we have an expenditure carried entirely by the Federal Government. Here we have an expenditure that is on a matching basis. Almost every program under ACP is a 50–50 program. There are very few exceptions.

I say to you quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that this is a program that assists not only our farmer but the city dweller as well. I have served for about 9 years on this committee. We made a practice each year of restoring the reductions in the ACP program. I say to you, at no time can you consider this a saving insofar as the future of this country is concerned when you consider our expanding population and the responsibility that is placed upon the American farmer today. We are considering a $250-million authorization under this amendment, not an expenditure of funds but an authorization for the fiscal year 1964. This is a small part of the overall amount contained in this bill of $5,979,457,000. If there is one line in this bill that serves the family farmer and that protects the future of our country, it is the ACP program. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, almost every year when this bill comes before the full committee and before the House we are confronted with those who, I think, are very ill-informed in trying to bring about economy at the expense of those small farmers who utilize this program.

I might say here there is nothing worse in the legislative process than a little information about something. The gentleman from Pennsylvania who offered this amendment certainly has little information because he did not touch on one single element or item which this appropriation is designed to take care of.

In the first place, the use of agricultural limestone in this Government's program has already been cut by 75 percent. The original authorization called for $500 million. By virtue of inflation the purchasing power has been cut to one-half and due to the fact that this bill calls for only $250 million, the farmers will only be permitted to purchase one-fourth of the original quantity of limestone which we found need for when we passed the original act in 1936.

What is the purpose of this limestone? Talking about economy in this program is as phony as the $7 bill. You would be doing much better to go and vote against our good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY's health program or his program for research on heart disease and cancer. There is a lot more to this program than just paying 50 percent of the cost of agricultural limestone for the farmers.

What does this lime do to the soil? There are about three or four points that I would like to make. In the first place nitrogen-fixing bacteria cannot live in sour soil. Limestone sweetens the soil making the climate favorable for nitrogen-fixing bacteria. In sweetened soil the farmer can plant legumes and that includes almost any kind of clover and also includes soybean and so, as I was saying, in sweet soil nitrogen-fixing bacteria will grow and enable the plants through the process of photosynthesis to take the nitrogen out of the air and store it in the soil. If you pull one of those plants up, you will find big nodules on the roots of it, some almost as large as the end of your finger. They have nitrogen which that plant has taken from the air and stored in the soil.

Where does the economy come in? On poor hillsides all over the country you will find foliage as a result of this program. If you have this lime, you immediately get a crop of legumes. You get a heavy crop. I bought under the soil conservation practice and I have been planting it in trees.

Therefore, the use of this lime prevents the clogging up of our streams and prevents the silting of our reservoirs on which we are spending millions of dollars every year. It is costing us millions of dollars to clean these streams up. It is costing us millions of dollars to build these reservoirs and they are becoming silted. Many of them are becoming silted at a much higher rate than was originally anticipated. But that is not the important point. I want you to get this. In the past 9 years the ground content of strontium 90 has increased by 20 times or 2,000 percent. In the Northeastern States there was little strontium 90 in the ground before we started our nuclear tests. Now in areas where there was as much as 4 units, it shows 80 units now or an increase of 20 times. But if calcium is in the soil the soil will not absorb the strontium 90 so readily. It will absorb the strontium 90 less because of the higher chemical affinity of the calcium.

Now you people who live in the Southeast and in the East, do you want to eat those plants and do you want your children to eat plants that are deficient in calcium; calcium being essential to bones, to the skull, the blood, and essential to all the tissues as well as the red blood corpuscles? Do you want them to eat plants which have absorbed strontium 90 instead of calcium, and which also affects the chromosomes and of course, in turn, affects the genes of the chromosomes that have to do with sterility of individuals?

We do not know what the complete effect of strontium 90 is going to be on posterity. We do know it is not going to be good. We do not know how much more strontium 90 we can stand, but we do know if calcium is not found in the soil, the plants will readily absorb the strontium 90 and our children and ourselves and posterity will be eating those plants deficient in the essential elements of calcium and also with a surplus of strontium 90. Posterity will suffer the consequences therefrom.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I think perhaps the gentleman missed the point. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to these lands which he has been buying and on which the taxpayers have been putting this lime does the gentleman feel the taxpayers owe the gentleman the responsibility to do that?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. No, sir, and I will never receive 1 dime from it, but posterity will. We do not own this land. This land belongs to posterity. We are only living on it. We are only passing through. Each and every one of us knows it is our patriotic duty to conserve this soil for posterity. I never expect to get the first dime from the land which I am replanting in pine trees, walnut trees, and conserving through other conservation practices in order to keep the land from eroding. It will never do me any good. Therefore, the Government is merely making a small investment to help me conserve that land for others.

Do not forget what the Chinaman told his son when he gave him a little plot of ground, about one-quarter of an acre. He said "Hang on to this, son, because God will never make any more."

Mr. Chairman, land is precious. Let us conserve it. Let us leave this soil as plentiful as we can for posterity, this soil which we inherited. Let us take care of it and leave it to posterity, or else we will find ourselves in the same situation that the Chinese now find themselves, with soil washed away and gone forever.

Mr. Chairman, it takes 1 million years to make a ton of soil on an acre of ground. Let us preserve it. Let us save it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I have difficulty in understanding how posterity is going to own this land.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman does not think I am going to take it with me, does he?

Mr. SNYDER. No, but I would suspect the gentleman from Indiana would leave it to some individual of his family or others.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. You might take part of your money along with you, or you might give the Government's share to some of our less friendly nations some place, if that is what you wish to do. Then that is all right with me, but I want to take care of my people in the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I suspect that the gentleman is taking care of his people. I suspect this rather than the fact that the land will go to posterity.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I think the gentleman is impugning my motives, Mr. Chairman. I do not think he means that. But if he does, I certainly have all the evidence in the world to prove to him that I certainly am not hoarding a cent, and have not hoarded a cent since I have been in this Congress. I doubt very seriously if I will, based upon our present conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of some of my colleagues here today a few short words from an article which appeared in this past Sunday's magazine section of the New York Times. This is an article entitled "Now the Nonfarmer Asks for Parity." It was written by Prof. Edward Higbee of the University of Rhode Island, and in part reads as follows:

> There is some new thinking on Capitol Hill. The voice of the urban citizen is beginning to be heard. It is he who goes without public services he needs in order to pay for the farm program.
>
> The urban taxpayer naturally gets aroused when he considers his own desperate needs for public services that he cannot have because the money is soaked up by agriculture's $7-billion sponge. If a few billions were transferred from spending on the farms to the congested metropolitan areas, quite a number of public hardships could be relieved without any increase in taxes.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The magazine, Wallaces Farmer, a voice to reckon with in the Corn Belt, sensed the wind of change in January 1962. "We've had farm program fights practically every year," it editorialized. "But they were mostly family spats—differences of opinion among farmers themselves. Now a third party, the city consumer, armed with new voting power, is watching these goings-on in Washington with increasing interest and suspicion. With this new 'partner' abroad, farm legislation must be drawn more carefully. To avoid a violent consumer revolt at the polls, political leaders know that future farm programs must be less costly and more effective."

It seems to me I would be violating my oath of office and my conscience if I were to vote against this amendment and to say that the Bureau of the Budget recommendation of $150 million should be increased to $250 million. All of us have been searching for ways to bring about economy. This is one of the best that has been presented to us since I have been a Member of Congress.

Ever since the Dust Bowl days of the thirties public and private agencies have been encouraging farmers to carry out land management practices that protect soil and water resources.

Incentives have ranged from philosophical exhortations to technical and financial assistance.

Farmers have, the record shows, responded quite well to all of them—and no matter where we live in the United States, we are the better for it.

However, there must come a time in any program of this type when results—in themselves—justify at least a measure of incentive for continued efforts.

Perhaps, for example, the increased productivity and value of land resulting from carrying out conservation practices should carry a little more of the incentive cost, and the taxpayers of the United States a little less.

It could be that the conservation momentum in farming areas is so great that a little reduction in its cash subsidies would not be noticed.

This is worth trying.

A $150 million appropriation for the Agricultural Conservation Program does not spell the end of the program—and certainly does not put the U.S. Government out of the business of subsidizing soil and water conservation or individual farms or in farming communities.

A study of this bill reveals a substantial interest in conservation beyond the agricultural conservation program appropriation.

It provides, for example, for expenditures in excess of $97 million for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to farmers and ranchers in carrying out locally adapted soil and water conservation programs. It provides another $88 million for watershed protection and flood prevention, nearly $13 million for the Great Plains program and better than $1 million for resources conservation and development.

The Farmers Home Administration has authority to make soil and water loans running well into the millions.

A part of the educational funds of the Federal Extension Service have traditionally gone into the reasons for and results from soil and conservation practices.

While acreage diversion payments under current feed grains and wheat programs are primarily for the maintenance of farm income, the removal of acres from soil-depleting crops has impact in the soil conservation field.

The administration which asked an appropriation of $150 million for the agricultural conservation program, and which is responsible for carrying out the program, has made and is making an impressive record in the whole area of protection and rehabilitation of our natural resources.

Accepting its judgment that a satisfactory ACP program can be carried out during the coming year with a hundred million dollars less than this bill provides is not a blow to the conservation movement.

It simply constitutes a reassessment of needs, and is in the public interest. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I came over here to vote in support of this amendment, but I did not realize the gravity of the situation until I heard the remarks of my beloved friend from Indiana, who pointed out that inherent in this amendment is destruction, not just of the American family farm but of untold generations of Americans to come, that we are depriving individuals of calcium to build up their skulls, to build their bones; that we are invariably inflicting vast damage on chromosomes of generations unborn and generations to follow those.

I have a high regard for my dear friend from Indiana, for whom I have the greatest affection, but, you know, we on this side of the aisle get so few opportunities to vote for economy that when the opportunity presents itself we must grab it vigorously by the forelock, because, you see, in years past we on this side have manifested more concern and we have spent money on an abundance of projects. We have spent money on school lunch programs, care for the aged, urban renewal, highways, abatement of pollution, housing, schools, health, research into cancer, communicable diseases, maternal and child health benefits, adequate salaries for our Government employees, hospital construction and upon a thousand and one other projects and programs which we felt were in the public interest, but on which our colleagues on the other side were able to make economy votes.

I say, Mr. Chairman, my good friend has presented to this House a very dangerous picture, and I think anyone who votes for economy under these circumstances should do it with the utmost of care.

I point out to the House today, Mr. Chairman, that my good friend from Indiana in presenting this destruction on untold generations of Americans yet to come overlooks the fact that economy really begins at home. I think here we have a chance to give my beloved friend from Indiana and others who favor economy a chance to strike a real blow for economy in their own backyard. Where the Bureau of the Budget said $150 million is enough, that $150 million for liming fields I am sure will buy a lot of limestone.

I recognize a few generations of Americans may lose a couple of milligrams of calcium, and I am sure they have the sympathy of us all.

The gentleman from Indiana has pointed out to the House that this is important and in the interest of fiscal responsibility. However I am sure that my friend concurs with the need to provide Americans of the future with a balanced budget, with all of the things that my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle say are necessary with regard to meeting and reducing the national debt, eliminating useless and senseless programs. We have an interest in exploring this on the other side of the problem. I think a few of us on this side of the aisle can be excused if we vote to spend only $150 million of the taxpayers' money on liming land rather than the $250 million.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I understand it has been stated that this would be a pro-Kennedy vote if we vote for this. I hope there are going to be some new medals struck here in the interest of economy.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is always voting with me for economy when he does it wisely. I wish my good friend would vote more wisely for economy and more in the public interest on programs to spend money which will help people.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana made a remark a few minutes ago that one should not speak on a subject that he may not be well versed upon. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but I have carefully observed the good results of the conservation program that has gone on in my own congressional district. Now I have heard this talk about economy here today. There has been a lot of talk about economy so far this session by a lot of Members, but the question arises in my mind whether to vote for this amendment is really and truly an economy vote. It has been suggested here by the proponent of this amendment that this amendment is an economy amendment. Its proponent says his amendment is not only pro-Kennedy but somehow is also pro-Eisenhower. I just cannot understand. Then just a while ago you heard the gentleman from Indiana in the well here talk about strontium 90 and how lime applications could offset the danger from strontium 90. But I will not go into that further at this time. However, I suspect that as the years go on there will be much less lighthearted sort of talk about strontium and a lot less fun made of it than was done by the last speaker who just preceded me in the well today. Strontium 90 is a deadly serious thing and if applications of lime can offset its damaging and deadly effects then let us apply lime and lots of it.

But, I want to talk about this question of subsidy and whether we are further subsidizing the farmers by a conservation program. I say we are not. But in a minute or two let us see some of the things that are being done in conservation in some of our congressional districts. Many of us ourselves are in the position that we represent both part of the people in the large cities, and as well have adjoining counties with farm areas also in our districts. I have a district that is about half divided between an agricultural area and an urban or suburban area, and I think I can see both sides of the issue here today. And, I say to you that the great portion of the consumers living in Kansas City, Mo., will be glad to pay this portion of their taxes if it is for conservation purposes because they know something about what conservation means. They know conservation is an investment. But let us see for a moment what we are actually doing in this agricultural conservation program.

Mr. Chairman, by the conservation program we are providing permanent cover for erosion control. We are providing for crop rotation which will lead to erosion control. It is true that the application of liming materials is a substantial part of this program but that is not all of the program by any means. The conservation program includes the improvement of grass land management; it provides for pits, ponds or dams for livestock water and provides for the establishment of sod waterways to dispose of excess runoff. This conservation program means there will be construction of terraces, control of erosion to conserve moisture and it means construction will go forward on terraces or ditches and dikes to control erosion.

The whole watershed program is being affected if this appropriation is cut back to the extent this amendment would provide.

There was a wise gentleman over in Cincinnati a few years ago who was quite a writer, a sage, a philosopher, and he pointed out there was only about 3 or 4 inches of topsoil between the people of these United States and starvation and that if we did not conserve our good soil there would be an inadequate food supply in future years. Oh, I know you will say we can get more out of each acre now, by advanced and improved farming methods but remember also we are taking good fertile acres away from farm use each day by our vast highway building program, with its thousands of cloverleafs and lots of good land is being increasingly consumed by sprawling suburban subdivisions. You just cannot get farm production out of naked rock or sterile deserts. We must conserve our good topsoil. This should not be looked at as a subsidy; instead this is a conservation program, and I urge those of you who represent cities to vote against this amendment, because if it is approved you, in the years ahead, are going to be adversely affected—you and all of your city constituents who are the consumers of agricultural products.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to commend the gentleman for making a very good statement. For some 14 years the ACP appropriation has been $250 million, just as it is in this bill. This amendment would reduce that amount lower than it was up to date and it would ruin what otherwise is a good program. I represent a district of small farmers, and this is more important to my district than any other phase of the agricultural program. And, it represents only 4 percent of the total cost. It is used to fill in gullies, stop erosion, substitute broomsage with alfalfa, and it is used to assist the farmer in helping himself and to preserve the soil for future generations. Now, our topsoil is one of our greatest assets, and once we lose it it is gone forever.

We have seen China and many other countries suffer starvation because they have permitted their topsoil to be ruined. One of the great purposes we should have in mind is to pass on our heritage to our future generations, and if we vote for this amendment, we are voting to refuse to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman agree that to talk about reducing taxes and increasing public works projects in order to spur the economy and at the same time want to reduce this program of small matching fund projects by $100 million would be the height of inconsistency?

Mr. RANDALL. I agree. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by saying that those of you who represent big city districts should remember that if you vote for this amendment to reduce conservation funds your vote can come home to haunt you and affect adversely in future years the people in the cities you represent.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remark that about 4 hours ago the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy completed several days of hearings on the subject of fallout during which a number of Government witnesses testified. The net effect of the testimony was, in my opinion, that insofar as the effect of fallout from all weapons tests to date is concerned, it roughly amounts to radiation exposure less than the difference between living in a wood frame house and a brick house.

This is less than removing one's residence from sea level to 400 or 500 feet above sea level. So, I ask that in good conscience and in good judgment the Members of the House not be swayed by misinformation relative to the matter of fallout.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my good friend from California who makes an impassioned plea now to remedy fallout and the strontium 90 problem, in part by way of this program, may I say frankly, we, as individual farmers, ought to have been doing this all the time for ourselves. This does not mean that you have to have the Government doing it. When I was a kid we took out our own hedgerows behind a team of mules. If there were any stone fences there—and we do not have them out our way although in New England you do—that is your job an an individual farmer, to tear down that thing if you want to be self-reliant. It is not proper to come to the Federal Government for half of the cost of doing this.

That is what you are doing here. There is no rhyme, reason, or sense to pay a farmer for that. I have 80 percent of my farmers getting this money. It is like a raise in congressional salary. Any number of this House, when we get to the point of raising our salary, will vote against it, but these same people will be right there to get it on payday. It is the same thing with the farmers, or with 80 percent of them in my district. "It is there, and I might as well get my share." That does not make it right, however. On these farms where the Government is paying farmers not to grow something on his diverted acres, the Federal Government comes right back and says, on those same acres we will pay 50 percent of the cover for those acres. Then what does the farmer do? Those acres diverted this year go into production next year and a new plot diverted to qualify for these payments.

Most of this stuff is for short-range production stimulants rather than long-range conservation practices. There is just no good rhyme, reason, or sense to it. It is wrong. I support the amendment and hope it will have a good measure of bipartisan support.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Indiana, who does a real good job defending and arguing his point of view.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Just to straighten the record, for the sake of the record, someone might think there was a conflict of interest in my own dealings. I will say for the record, and I will not correct it, that if you will check you will find EARL WILSON received less than $250 for a liming program since the program was initiated. That is the total. It is not $250 per year, but that is the total. It is not a case of conflict of interest, but a case of trying to build up some of this land and pass it on. It is not going to do me any good. I put out 12,000 trees last year. Those trees will be 60 years old before one of those small seedlings will make a tree. I doubt very much if I am here then.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana for making his position clear in the RECORD and I hope he is here with us when those trees mature. He is indeed a most able, diligent, and hard-working member of our Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I believe there needs to be a little correction of the misinformation that has been given us, or the arguments made which tend to lead us to be misinformed, on this amendment. My good friends from the urban areas have talked about the surplus situation and the spending of money that supposedly would create more surpluses. I want to say to you in all frankness that if we were short of food production in this country your consumers would be after you, but fast, to come down here to the Congress and tell the farmers what they had better do to see that they provided us with enough sustenance.

Also the statement was made that we should know what we are talking about. I am just going to say that I believe that the Members of this House in their wisdom are not going to make a judgment on this issue that will curb the ability of the farmers to utilize the technology which they have used in the past that has provided us with the blessing of abundance we have.

I know that you can go back and remember the figures that have been given so many times about the utilization of technology in agriculture that has provided that abundance. I submit to you that if it is your viewpoint that you can stop the flow of funds into the type of conservation purposes that this full appropriation supports, you might be playing on the side of saying that we can leave to chance the conservation practices that will produce the abundance of foodstuffs for the future.

I do not think we can afford to support this amendment which will slow up the technology of agriculture because I submit to you that if you slow it up, about 5 years will be sufficient to produce a deficit of food production in this country, not the surplus that we have today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it has been very popular here today to come up with the idea of economy. I wish some of the Members who are so desirous of economy in this area, would speak as vehemently in other areas as they have in this instance. I happen to represent one of the Nation's biggest congressional districts. Traveling over that district I have to fly a great deal of the time. Flying over that district, I fly over the Palouse area and the Camas Prairie, which is one of the big wheat-producing areas of the country. It is rolling country and it is subject to a great deal of erosion. All you have to do is to look down out of the airplane at gulleys in these cultivated fields that are 6 feet wide and 4 feet deep and that extend from the top of the hills to the bottom. Also when you look at the color of the soil that exists at the top of these hills and at the bottom of these hills it is apparent that much of the good soil has been eroded away.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Sometimes it gets so bad that some of the people out there want to make soil conservation practices mandatory. It has not yet come to pass, but that is how they feel about it.

Mr. WHITE. I would say to my friends from the urban areas who say that this is a boondoggling expenditure of the taxpayers' money that ultimately we are going to need every acre of farm production that we now have. I would also say that we can show that the volume of material that goes down the rivers of the United States and is slowly filling up the reservoirs of our dams is one of the major conditions we are going to have to counteract.

In my area this money is spent for tilling and ditching on these same fields for conservation practices that save the sustenance of this Nation.

I should like to point out one other thing while we are considering this matter. The issue seems to be resolving limestone, calcium sulphate, that is added to the soil. I have checked on this in the time I have had, and I find that the actual limestone expenditure from this appropriation is approximately 10 percent of the $100 million. The remainder of the money is for additional good and adequate soil conservation purposes.

I urge the members of this Committee to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the good intentions of my colleagues. I do not believe in my 22 years here I have really had occasion to question the motives of any of you. I will say for my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] that he came to me and said he was going to offer this amendment. He offered it, I am sure, in perfect sincerity. I appreciate my friendship with him.

As chairman of this subcommittee may I say I got off the farm as early as I could. I did farm some 5 or 6 years after I lost my father. Intentionally I never signed up with any of these farm programs because of my position here. However, the loss is not mine, but the land itself.

I know there have been many disappointments among my colleagues about our wheat referendum. We might give a little thought to those that tried to carry it. You cannot kick one crowd around without hurting others.

In this bill before you, which we will approve, for flood prevention and the other parts of the Soil Conservation Service, you have a couple of hundred million dollars. In the public works appropriation bill, and I made the successful motion a few years ago to override the President's veto on the public works bill, you will have other hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars trying to take care of the resources of this Nation.

With regard to most of these, recognizing the interest we all have in conserving the soil for future generations, the farmer is not called on, or the landowner is not called on, to put up anything of any kind. But the Department is directly tied in this ACP program to the fact that the Federal Government does not say: "This is money you can stick in your pocket." It says: "If you own this land and conform to these practices, for each dollar you put up, and you contribute the labor, we will contribute a third of the cost." For those of you who are interested in the United States, this is one program where the landowner contributes about two-thirds of it, and there are something over 1,300,000 who participate.

I do not know what your experience is in trying to get people to do what they ought to do anywhere. I agree that any landowner ought to take care of the land for his children, and all the rest. But if we have wasted half of our country, it certainly is up to us to devise some means wherein we should encourage people to do what they should do anyway.

In this program, we have talked about this type of practice or that type of practice, but let me explain to you how this works. The farmers put up about two-thirds of the cost. They get together a series of projects which they think will help their community and which will be beneficial to them, knowing it will cost them about two-thirds of the amount spent. That is compiled. Then it is carried to the State offices. From all over the State, the State gets together a group of these practices that have been selected at the local level as being worthwhile to invest their money and our money in.

Then that comes to Washington. Washington determines which ones of these practices or projects are worthwhile. All that information is in a catalog about 2½ inches thick. May I say to you now that any community that chooses a soil project and has elected to spend its own money on a project which has been selected from a catalog that is that big, they must be all good projects.

I say to you while we might not like some people because they work with this fellow or that fellow and we may not like how some of our colleagues vote or something else, bear this in mind: We all like to know that our monetary system will be protected. But as I mentioned earlier in this debate, as important as balanced budgets may be to keep a balance in our economy and to keep a sense of security—money is still money. The wealth of this Nation, I want to remind you, is in our rivers and in our harbors and in our forests. The wealth of this Nation is in the lands and in the fertility of our soil and in material things.

If we want to do a small part of what has to be done and share in this common work where the landowner puts up twice as much as we do to get the job done, then do not hurt the soil conservation by cutting this program which is a very backbone of our soil conservation effort. How can we have a conservation reserve and all the many things that pay folks not to farm—and I do not think that was sound—how we could have those things and then cut out this program, a program where we get $3 invested and the Government has to put only one-third of that, I do not know. I hope you will vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Moorhead) there were—ayes 87, noes 106.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Whitten and Mr. Moorhead.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues a few facts dealing with the administration of the rural electrification program. I believe that they are important enough to be made a matter of record and that Members of the House of Representatives should be advised of the situation as it exists.

As most of you know, I was the Administrator of this program for 3 years under the Eisenhower administration and at that time one of the unpleasant memories was an investigation made of my administration by the Democrat-controlled House, which was costly, time-consuming, disruptive, and unproductive.

In the course of the hearings, charges were made that in my judgment were not based on fact, and among them was the charge that I had violated the law in two instances. First, by appearing at a Republican picnic in Kansas City where I was introduced and made a brief explanation of the REA program, in no way involving myself in any partisan politics or association with candidates for office. A second charge was the fact that I had had breakfast with some friends in Duluth, Minn., who were identified in the paper as Republican officials. This incident occurred on my way to a power-use meeting at Grand Rapids, Minn.

The charges were "laughed out of court" and dismissed and dropped. But in the hearing it was emphasized that the Administrator of the REA program was forbidden by law to participate in partisan politics. Previous to that, legal counsel in the REA administration had advised me not to be involved in the political arena and I, as well as previous Administrators, religiously adhered to this policy, as had other Administrators before me.

During the last campaign I noted in the press a news item that the REA Administrator would appear in Minnesota, in my district. I found it hard to believe. I wired him for confirmation. He responded to the wire and appeared on television and radio with my opponent. I wish to make it very clear that I am not complaining about it, but I do feel that this change of policy should be made a matter of record so that the general public is aware of the fact that a new code of political conduct has been adopted for the head of REA.

During the time that I served as Administrator, the only persons contacted for any political contributions were myself and my deputy. People in the classified service were not disturbed nor did we expect them to make any contributions to political campaigns. This has also been changed and active, open solicitation of funds did occur last winter.

I felt these things were of great import and related them in a letter to the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], since a subcommittee of Government operations had conducted the hearings into my activities when I was Administrator. I include my letter to the chairman in the Record at this point in my remarks.

March 6, 1963.

Hon. William L. Dawson,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Dawson: I feel that it is my duty to call to your attention, as chairman of the Government Operations Committee, some incidents which occurred in the 1962 election campaign involving the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, as well as some practices that have occurred within the REA since election, which in my judgment are in violation of the law.

First, I would like to refer to the Chudoff hearings of the 84th Congress which were conducted under the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee of which you are chairman. You will recall that at that time I was the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration and we went through months of investigation in search of something that the Committee obviously never found. Among other things I was reminded by Mr. Chudoff that under the provisions of section 9 of the Rural Electrification Act I would be in violation if I engaged in political activity. On page 1494 of the hearings appears a statement attributed to you: "Under the law he wasn't supposed to engage in politics" (referring to me, the then Administrator).

The hearings revealed the charges to be ridiculous and I will forever be grateful to you for the observation that you made at the hearings, "I think you are (a) good Administrator" (hearing, p. 1488).

The incident that I would like to bring to your attention concerns the conduct of the present REA Administrator, Mr. Clapp. A newspaper article appeared in the Minnesota papers reporting that Mr. Clapp would be campaigning in the Second District—my district—of Minnesota. We sent a wire to Mr. Clapp stating as follows: "Newspapers announce that you are touring Second District next Monday with my opponent. Please verify by telegram to me." Reply was received, "In answer to your inquiry I have been invited to come to Minnesota to assist in the campaign for the Democratic ticket. Will be in the Second District tomorrow."

Mr. Clapp did appear and toured the district with my opponent. His statements were used in newspaper articles in the district and he appeared on a television show with my opponent.

I am not complaining about the fact that he opposed me, but I am complaining about the disservice to the REA program. He has departed from a long tradition in the administration of that program in which REA Administrators have never involved themselves in partisan campaigns at any time. Obviously my vote majority did not suffer because of the Administrator's activity, so there is no personal complaint as far as I am concerned.

I was advised by counsel and by the staff when I came into REA that I should not involve myself in political activity and we religiously adhered to that policy as had other Administrators before me. This policy now seems to be out the window and a new policy seems to have developed, which in my judgment is detrimental to the program itself. If the Administrator's office is to be used as a partisan political instrument, it certainly follows that bipartisan support for the program would be damaged.

In this context, another practice which has occurred in the Rural Electrification Administration should be brought to your attention. While Republicans as well as Democrats have fund-raising dinners, and properly so, previously, in accordance with regulations, no one in the classified service was contacted for contributions within the agency. To my knowledge, the only persons who contributed from REA when I was there were myself and my deputy.

In the Department of Agriculture, Rural Electrification Administration, there has been the policy as set forth in chapter 70, title 8, section 2, paragraph 2505 of the Administration Regulations and in Staff Instruction 690-3 that:

"Lists of employees shall not be furnished to any person, organization, or firm except on written application showing the purpose for which such lists are to be used, and then only when the furnishing of such lists is in public interest. In determining the public interest involved, attention should be given to the purpose of the request and any interference with proper conduct of the public business which the preparation of the lists may entail. This limitation does not extend to official publications or lists of officials available for public use. Lists of employees may not be furnished for purposes of political solicitation."

It has come to my attention that the Democratic National Committee contacted employees grade 13 and above after having obviously procured a list of REA employees by grade as well as addresses. Many of these were contacted in the agency by high officials, including the Deputy Administrator.

You can certainly understand the implication of this. This had never happened before and such a policy is certainly not conducive to good morale in the agency because of the dissension and financial hardship that might result. The attention of the general public should be focused on such practices on the part of responsible public officials in a Government agency.

I felt you should have this information and I would be interested in your opinions regarding the circumstances that I cite.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN.

Chairman DAWSON very kindly responded to my letter, suggesting that it be referred to the proper legislative committee. This I did, and the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture referred it to the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Freeman replied to Mr. COOLEY by letter dated May 28, 1963, stating as follows:

[SEAL]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. May 28, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Following receipt of your letter with its accompanying letters to you and to Congressman DAWSON from Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, we have given thorough study to the questions raised by Mr. NELSEN.

There has been an exchange of correspondence between Congressman NELSEN and REA Administrator Clapp on the subject of Mr. Clapp's participation in the 1962 election campaign in Minnesota.

Mr. Clapp has been active in the Democratic Party in the midwest for a number of years. As a Presidential appointee, he is not subject to the Hatch Act. He did not travel to Minnesota last November at Government expense.

In his letter to Congressman DAWSON, Mr. NELSEN makes reference to Section 9 of the Rural Electrification Act. This section, insofar as it is pertinent here, is as follows:

"This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualifications shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency."

The activities of the REA Administrator cited by Mr. Nelson do not come within the terms of this provision. In view of the express terms of the Hatch Act, there is no reason why Mr. Clapp should not participate in political campaigns in the same manner as is authorized for other Federal officers similarly employed.

Each year employees of the Department of Agriculture apparently are solicited for contributions by the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee. I have not been able to find any basis for the allegation that employee lists have been provided for any political party organization.

We are returning the correspondence you called to our attention, and appreciate the opportunity to comment on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

I should emphasize at this point that at no time have I made the allegation that Mr. Clapp's political activities in the campaign last fall constituted a violation of the Hatch Act. In my letter to Chairman DAWSON, however, I did question the propriety of Mr. Clapp's political activities in view of the traditional nonpartisan conduct of previous REA Administrators, who, including myself, had been guided by the general nonpartisan tones set forth in section 9 of the Rural Electrification Act.

I feel that this change of policy should be noted and I feel it is a disservice to the REA program and will be damaging to its future stature by permitting its Administrator and its employees to become political implements rather than the devoted servants that they have been to the great program of rural electrification.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the remainder of the bill close in 45 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Messrs. GROSS and COLLIER objected.

The Clerk read as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3(a) of said Act, as follows: Rural electrification program, $425,000,000, of which $150,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program; and rural telephone program, $70,000,000.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKER: On page 26, strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, for many years, in my service in the House and for the past 10 years and this year—and I will certainly give the Members who are interested in economy a chance to vote for economy now—I have for the past 10 years made a very sincere effort that the Rural Electrification Administration borrowing be done at a cost that is paid by the Treasury in its borrowing; in other words, the going rate of interest. Unfortunately, for years the House has voted down this amendment. And then I introduced legislation, but, of course, that has not seen the light of day. Now, what I do under this amendment today is by the language used in the Appropriations Committee report saying that the Rural Electrification Administration has now outlived its original intention; that 98 percent of the farms and rural areas of this country have been serviced by REA; that a good job has been done, and the loan program is no longer needed. All this amendment does is to strike out the $425 million of borrowing authority for REA.

Now, why do I use the Committee on Appropriations report? In granting the requested loan authorizations, the Appropriations Committee gave recognition to a widely expressed criticism of REA for its practice of advancing large volumes of electrical generation and transmission loans for the primary purpose of building new power generating plants.

In granting the $425 million electrification loan authorization, the committee provided that $150 million of the amount should be placed in a contingency reserve—and that the contingency authorizations could be released "only after a further showing to the Bureau of the Budget that the program is being handled on a satisfactory basis and there is a substantial need for the additional funds."

Now, it must have taken considerable testimony to make the Committee on Appropriations write this restriction into the bill. They put a restriction on this for the first time, and I believe from further testimony they had very good reason to do so.

> Under those circumstances there would appear to be a serious question as to whether some substantial part of the loan authorization should not in fact be denied—rather than merely being placed in a contingency reserve from which it might be released by the Bureau of the Budget. Facts bearing on this question include the following: Treasury funds are loaned to the rural electrification associations at a 2-percent interest rate—or approximately one-half of the cost to the Treasury of the borrowed funds. Hence the low-interest rate results in a substantial cost item to the Government and in a substantial subsidy for REA generating plants. Electrical service already has been extended to approximately 98 percent of all farms in the United States. About four of every five new customers being added to the REA system are nonfarm power users today.
>
> Of the $425 million electrification loan authorization in this bill for 1964, $295 million has been earmarked for generation and transmission loans—thus carrying on the trend in recent years of committing the bulk of the loan funds to the construction of power generating plants ($125 million is earmarked for distribution system loans and $5 million for the strengthening of power loads).

Let me quote this, if I may, and just listen to this language:

> In appearing before the Appropriations Subcommittee, REA spokesmen stated that they looked upon the availability of generating and transmission loans, for the construction of new generating plants as a desirable and proper "weapon" to be used by rural electrification associations in their negotiations with private power suppliers over prices to be charged for electrical energy.

Imagine, this is the REA. Our money is being used as a weapon over the private industries from whom we are taking taxes.

> They further agreed that in evaluating the need for a new generating plant for which 2-percent loans of public funds are being sought, they do not take into account measurements of interest and tax subsidies enjoyed by the REA system, as compared with privately owned power facilities.

Without going through all of the rest of it with regard to any further generation and transmission loan approval, I wish you would listen to this language:

> The Administrator should certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier has been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, for refusal or failure to do so.

Nobody has been able to convince the REA of anything at any time, and certainly a private producer of power just cannot convince the REA that they can give the power.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. Briefly, yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making and advise him I have pending a bill which would require the REA to pay the going rate of interest. I solicit his support and that of other Members.

Mr. BECKER. In view of the fact that we cannot get that out I think we ought to knock it all out because we reached the point of no return and we have so many economy-minded Members with us today that this is a good opportunity to do a real job.

As the gentleman pointed out, regarding the true economic cost of power by REA loans, if everything were taken into account, there would be few instances where such loans could be justified on the basis of cost. The economic cost of power by investor-owned utilities includes the cost of interest, operating expenses, depreciation, and taxes, very little of which hits the REA.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution and I think we could not only do a job for our economy but we could do a job for free enterprise in this country, the free enterprise system which is supporting the farm program and for the taxpayers of this country who have to foot the bill, and the private power industry that is paying hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes into our Federal and State treasuries. I think it would be the proper time to strike this type of blow.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 28 years of REA has caused a revolutionary change in American farm life and unless you have witnessed this momentous change you do not have any deep realization of just what REA has meant to the American farmer and to the farm wife.

I say to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York State, that his amendment reminds me of the little boy who caught the fish and he said to it, "Little fish, hold still; all I intend to do is gut you."

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. NATCHER. And he admits that is what he wants to do.

Mr. BECKER. No question about it.

Mr. NATCHER. I say this to you, any bill that is presented to the Congress of the United States pertaining to REA goes either to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These are outstanding committees in the House. They have outstanding members and outstanding chairmen. Why not come in through the front door and try to do what you hope to do, instead of coming in through the back door? Why not let your bill go to the proper committee, have hearings on it, and then have them decide what shall be done?

I say to you that there is not a line in this bill that does more for the American farmer than REA. REA is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government.

An appropriation bill is not the vehicle to ride in this instance. Why not come in through the front door and do it according to House rules?

Mr. Chairman, I ask every Member of this House to carefully consider this amendment, and to understand the intention of the gentleman who has offered it. Let us vote this amendment down.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it might be appropriate for this subject to go to the Government Operations Committee, upon which I happen to serve, because the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power has jurisdiction to investigate the subject of the economy and the efficiency of the agency which we are discussing here today, the Rural Electrification Administration.

There also happens to be at the present time a conflict, an announced, well-known conflict, between the Federal Power Commission and the REA, both of which are under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Committee on Government Operations.

Certainly I think it would be well for the Congress to consider whether or not the intent of Congress is being carried out by REA. We know perfectly well that in 1936 when this agency was created it was for the purpose of delivering electricity to the rural areas, to the farms of America. That function and purpose has been carried out. We know that there are now less than 3 percent of the farms which are not electrified. Most of the funds which are sought to be appropriated here are going to residential, industrial, and commercial areas, which certainly was not the intent of Congress.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman know the rate of interest charged for REA loans at this time?

Mr. McCLORY. The rate of interest is 2 percent. That is what the REA pays to the Government. But as I understand it the Federal Government has to borrow this money at 4 percent in order to lend it to the REA at 2 percent. The REA co-ops then in turn compete with private enterprise. That is one of the subjects with which the Congress is concerned here today.

However, I think the Members are concerned today with the entire function and existence of REA. Whether this is the proper approach, whether this is the time to do it, I do not know. There are various ways of approaching this problem, and perhaps the Committee on Government Operations would be the best place for this to go. I requested the chairman of my subcommittee that we have a review there of the present operations of REA, but I am afraid we are going to wait a year before we get to that. Meanwhile, I suggest that this is a good amendment, this is a good start.

You know, the Congress creates these agencies and it is very hard to abolish them, but this is one whose functions ought to be terminated. Maybe, if REA had to charge interest at a rate equal to that which the Government pays there would not be this competitive advantage which we are giving to the REA, and private enterprise would be able to flourish again. The administration has declared that is the main purpose of the tax bill, as I understand it, is to encourage free enterprise in order to create more revenue. Here is a chance to coordinate REA's activities with the announced intent of the administration and give an assist to free enterprise here today.

My position is borne out well in an editorial which appeared in the January 12, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal to which I am calling the attention of the Members, as follows:

THE DEADLY COMPETITOR

The act of 1936 setting up the Rural Electrification Administration authorized the agency to make loans for furnishing electricity to "persons in rural areas." How is it, then, that in the last few years five out of six new REA co-op customers haven't been truly rural at all, but commercial, industrial and nonrural residential?

For one thing, REA activities reflect the changing character of the Nation; farms are fewer, suburbs have sprawled out from the cities into once-rural lands. And REA Administrator Norman Clapp contends that a territory developed by a co-op "in good faith" when it was rural still is co-op territory even though today it may be a vast suburban or industrial complex.

For another, as Hubert Kay notes in an article in the February Fortune magazine, the REA's co-ops have become increasingly aggressive in going after commercial-industrial business. So much so that whereas it once used only 2.5 percent of its loans to build new generating plants and transmission lines it now uses over 16 percent. The REA system's rapid growth as a power producer has further alarmed already skittish investor-owned power companies which see in REA an ever-expanding power grid with which they cannot forever compete.

For the private utilities pay from 4 to 5 percent for money they need to borrow; the co-ops have the use of Federal funds at 2 percent (which the Government borrows at 4 percent). Utilities pay out about 24 cents in taxes of each dollar received, including 13 cents in Federal income tax; co-ops pay no direct Federal taxes at all and, as co-ops, enjoy preferred State and local tax treatment. And whereas companies are tightly regulated by State and Federal agencies, most co-ops can set their own rates. So the co-ops' competitive advantage is immense.

Now there's one fairly simple way to bring about competition on a more nearly equal basis. And that is to strip the REA co-ops of their protective mantle of subsidies and preferments and thus force them to really compete with private companies. In short, make the REA pay its way in the marketplace.

But as it is, the REA stands as an archetype of a Government agency that not only refuses to die when no longer needed but also uses every unfair means available to kill off its investor-financed competition.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Becker: On page 26, strike out lines 9 through 20, inclusive.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says his committee should look into this matter. I have never opposed any committee looking into these areas. I feel that they should. We have sought to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that any changes in the basic law ought to be made by the legislative committee. What this does is strike out all funds for this great system and the electric cooperatives serving the country. If you want to change it or let the private utilities do it, go to the legislative committee and let them do it, but do not strike anything out of the bill here with regard to the existing situation. With all deference to my colleague from New York, whom I have known a long time, I cannot believe he is serious about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Ford) there were—ayes 53, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Michel: On page 26, line 14, strike out $425 million and insert in lieu thereof $400 million.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, during the course of general debate we touched on this subject. I pointed out the bill that I had introduced today as a result of our being unable to do fully what I would have liked to do legislatively as an amendment to an appropriation bill. I am not going to take the time to go into that. Members will recall last year that we increased the Rural Electrification Administration $100 million. In other words, from $300 million to $400 million. This year the request was for an additional $25 million increase. I submit to you that this is a good point to hold the line at last year's level, at $400 million as just a little warning from the House of Representatives to the administration downtown to take full cognizance of the manner in which the chairman in his report has outlined the deficiencies in this program. It is a strong report offered by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten]. It is a good report. If they follow it to the letter we will have made some constructive progress. But I say that to implement that we could do very well here by holding the line. We are giving them plenty of money. This is not putting any limitation on generation and transmission. I would remind my colleagues that better than 65 percent of the loans today are going for generation and transmission. My reasoning is this: 98 percent of the farms are electrified. They want a $25 million increase. We only have 65 percent of the farms with telephone service, but we cut that down $10 million. This is the area where you ought to be making more progress to get more farms with telephones. One-third of the farms are without telephones. But we cut that back $10 million. I say if we can do it in that area then a little $25 million gig is not going to hurt these folks downtown one bit.

I want to refer to another area. You have the school milk program. With the increase in population, we held that at $100 million this year with no increase. It seems to me, that is good justification for holding the REA administration at $400 million.

May I cite to you just a few of the examples that we touched on earlier of what has been done here. In the REA particularly with respect to the construction of generation and transmission lines, I cited a case in Florida at the Eglin Air Force Base where the Air Force granted a contract to a cooperative to build parallel lines going up to Eglin Air Force Base. Why? Because the cooperative could get 2-percent money and with their taxes foregone could be the low bidder. Their mill rate, of course, is just a fraction under what private industry can deliver it. So the cooperative gets the contract, and we have the American taxpayers subsidizing in effect a cooperative to compete with private industry.

In Gainesville, Ga., we have just been reminded in the last couple of days of a section 5 loan in a town where there are two packing plants run by private industry. Just outside the town we see a section 5 loan for a third packing plant. Then the Small Business Administration comes in with an additional amount to put this third plant constructed with public funds in direct competition with private industry.

I cited earlier examples of home loans made in the State of Iowa from funds from the general revenues of cooperatives by the directors and officers of a co-op at 4 percent, when the co-op is getting money at 2 percent and the local banks obviously are making no other mortgage loans in those communities for as low as 4 percent. The Upshur loan which was made down in Texas was a generation and transmission loan under the third criteria with no justification whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday before the Senate Appropriations Committee in open testimony the Chairman of the Southwest Power Administration disclosed that they could not possibly produce power cheaper than private industry could produce it in that area.

Mr. Chairman, down in Arkansas, I have a letter from the power company down there showing and indicating that the first time they have ever had or could tell for sure what the REA proposed to generate and transmit its power for was by virtue of reading our hearings, because everything else was so secret. The full text of the letter reads as follows and tells a vivid story:

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.,
Little Rock, Ark., May 15, 1963.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITTEN: Upon publication of part IV of the hearings before your Subcommittee on Department of Agri-

> culture Appropriations for 1964, Arkansas Power & Light Co. for the first time learned from information furnished by Mr. Norman Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, as reported on pages 2478–2479 the estimated costs of power which were used as a basis for REA approval of a loan to the Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corp., for a 100,000-kilowatt steamplant and 630 miles of transmission line. The information furnished by Mr. Clapp is that the estimated average cost of power from the REA generation and transmission facilities for the 10-year period 1966–75 delivered to the load centers of the member cooperatives is 7.42 mills per kilowatt-hour. The comparative estimated cost of power from Arkansas Power & Light Co. for the same period is reported as 7.81 mills per kilowatt-hour.
>
> We feel it is our duty to call to the attention of you and your subcommittee members, and the Arkansas congressional delegation, the fact that the estimated cost of power from this company is grossly in error. Our rate schedule under which we already have eight 10-year contracts with rural electric cooperatives in Arkansas is rate schedule 22–B. The basic rate therein provided is 6.67 mills per kilowatt-hour, subject to adjustments for changes in cost of fuel. Taking into account the expected increase in the cost of fuel through 1975, the average cost of power to rural electric cooperatives for the period 1966–75 based on this schedule is 6.92 mills per kilowatt-hour.
>
> The Administrator reported that the justification of the loan was a 10-year saving of $2,900,000 based on the 7.42 mills per kilowatt-hour from the generation and transmission facilities as compared to 7.81 mills per kilowatt-hour from Arkansas Power & Light Co. When the correct figure of 6.92 mills per kilowatt-hour is substituted for the erroneous 7.81 mills per kilowatt-hour, the alleged saving of $2,900,000 becomes a negative saving or an increased cost of $3,700,000.
>
> This should graphically illustrate the crying need for some forum where these matters can be aired prior to approval of loans, so that the overall public interest can be protected. In this case, it is quite obvious that almost $25 million of the taxpayers' money has been approved for a loan on grossly erroneous figures.
>
> In the testimony which was presented to your subcommittee by Mr. H. F. Minnis, vice president of Arkansas Power & Light Co., it was stated that on the basis of the best estimates we were able to work out without information from REA, we believed that the rates available under our schedule 22–B represented a lower cost of power than could be achieved through the proposed generation and transmission facilities. The figures now made public by Administrator Clapp confirm this belief.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> FLOYD W. LEWIS,
> *Vice President.*

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of my amendment as a little token of our affection that we really mean business in the committee report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on this bill we had a number of witnesses who appeared in behalf of the provisions of the bill concerning the REA. We had other witnesses who were critics of this program and they hoped a greater portion of the money would be stricken out of the bill. As the bill came to the Congress and as it was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, $75 million of the authorization amount of $425 million was placed in a contingency fund. This contingency fund was developed and this program of placing a portion in a contingency fund was started by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill reached the Congress, $75 million of the $425 million was in a contingency fund.

Well, after we had heard the witnesses on both sides our subcommittee recommended to the full Committee and the bill now comes to the floor with $150 million of the overall amount of $425 million in a contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, what does that mean? It means when a generation or transmission loan application is filed and is considered, then after the amount has been approved, the Administrator of the REA and the Department of Agriculture, would then make demand upon the Bureau of the Budget for a release of this necessary money.

Mr. Chairman, I am very fond of my able friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I say this to the Members of the Committee, he is one of the able men in the House. He is one of the best members of our committee. But I say to you again, if you want to gut the entire program here is the place to start.

Mr. Chairman, what did we do? We carried that amount up from $75 million, as my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, knows. We carried it up from $75 million to $150 million in the contingency fund.

The REA program has been a successful program. Not one single generation or transmission loan has been made by the REA section of the Department of Agriculture that did not come within the provisions of the law. The REA division and the Department of Agriculture operates the same as it would if it were in a fishbowl from the standpoint of letting everyone know what is going on.

I say to you today, if you want to destroy this program here is the place to start.

Again I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact if you want to change this program, why not introduce a bill and have it go to the proper legislative committee, ask for hearings and justify your position? Why come in here at the time we have an appropriation bill up for consideration and try to make law? That is what you are doing. In this instance you are not doing anything in the world but trying to destroy this program.

If there is one program in this bill that means more to the American farmer than REA, I know nothing about it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to subscribe to what the gentleman says in respect to changing organic law. That is what I have done by virtue of the bill I have introduced. But what my amendment calls for, and I am sure the gentleman will agree, is perfectly within the rules and is done every day on appropriation bills. This would cut back the figure from $425 to $400 million.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman introduced his bill today; is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. NATCHER. I know it will be assigned to the proper committee, and after hearings I hope it comes to the floor of the House and there let the House work its will. But I say again to the House, if you want to destroy this program, all you have to do is to start adopting amendments such as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I would have to differ with the gentleman on that. It is simply a limitation on funds.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, normally I would, as many people from areas such as I represent, be constrained not to speak on an agricultural appropriation bill. However, in the instance of the question involved here, I feel that this is of deep concern not only to those of us who come from urban areas but those of us who believe in the free enterprise system. Today I am speaking for the free enterprise system as it applies to the abuses that the REA has been guilty of in its competitive practices for a long time, practices that are being aided and abetted by Government programs.

I invite the attention of the House, particularly you gentlemen from petroleum-producing areas—I do not happen to be from one—that in the May 1963 issue of the Rural Kentuckian magazine, the Henderson-Union REA Co-op ran this advertisement:

> We offer free electric water heaters to consumers building new homes, to consumers in existing homes that do not have a water heater, and to any consumer now using any type of water heater other than electric and wishes to install an electric water heater.

Again, the Allmakee-Clayton Electric Cooperative, of Postville, Iowa, offers to pay consumers $5 to $50 for the installation of certain appliances. While it might be argued that the funds for these programs come from the co-op's general fund, nevertheless, their general funds are supported by the REA loans and REA lending makes it possible for the cooperative to carry on these programs aimed at the destruction of private tax-paying enterprises.

The REA's are able to borrow 2 percent when the taxpayers of my district and every other district in this country are picking up a tab of 4 percent for the money that the REA's are using.

I think it is high time that we realize what the original purpose of the REA was. For those of you who are not concerned with what happens to the free enterprise system, what I say will probably have little or no effect on you.

But for those of you who are concerned I say that we have reached the point, or we have long passed the point where we should permit the REA to continue to operate with the tremendous advantage it has directly in competition with private industry.

When the gentleman from Kentucky says there is a way to correct this thing, why come through the back door? He knows very well that any of this type of legislation that tried to find its way through the front door would find it locked and barred. Hence the only alternative, the only avenue open to many of us is just the avenue that we seek here today, and I assure the gentleman from Kentucky that legislating on an appropriation bill, if that is what he calls these amendments, is certainly not a new precedent on this floor. And, if that is the way it has to be done, if that is the only way that the voice of free enterprise can be heard, then for goodness sake, let us go in the back door.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is in line with what we do each year. If you read the report on which my name appears, you will see that the committee made every effort to see both sides of this problem and to set out to correct it. I have had assurances from the REA administration that they will abide by the directives of this committee. May I say further, that in connection with the hearings we concluded in our committee, we would put an additional $75 million that was in the budget in the contingency reserve. We did that for this reason. We, too, feel that perhaps they can get by with less money, but in case we are wrong, we fixed it so that they will have sufficient funds which they can release if necessary.

I think we presented this matter where we will know what is going on. And, they will have to go to the private power companies and try to get a contract first before they will be able to go ahead and make loans. I think you should stand by the committee and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MICHEL) there were—ayes 84, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKER: On page 26, line 14, strike out "$425,000,000" and insert "$275,000,000" and strike out all language thereafter on line 14 and all that follows to the word "and" on line 19.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes, but first I would like to say to the gentleman from Kentucky, if he would listen, that in my remarks on my original amendment I stated clearly and concisely that for years I have been trying to amend the authorization bill in reference to the interest rate. I have introduced legislation on that, but that legislation has never seen the light of day. If it is wrong to do this on the floor then I say it is about time that we changed the rules of the House of Representatives and prohibited amendments on the floor. Then we would not have an opportunity to come in the back door, and this being the greatest representative body in the world, would be destroyed. As I say, this is the method we are forced to use today, not because we want to, but we have no alternative. I would like to remind the gentleman from Kentucky of that fact because he used that argument twice, both with respect to my amendment and with respect to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

This amendment is very clear. It is a very simple one. I think it is practically amended by the Committee on Appropriations in its own language, in its own report, in reference to the $150 million, and why they are in a very slight sort of way locking it up with only the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. If the Committee on Appropriations has such reservations as to the proper use of these moneys, I would say this: I do have faith in the Committee on Appropriations and there will be supplemental appropriation bills later on and next year. I say this: If we do what the Appropriations Committee suggests and cut out the $150 million and reduce it to the $275 billion, then if they find in the future or next year that the REA is doing a proper job in their judgment and is living up to the rules and regulations then they can come in with a supplemental appropriation and ask for the funds they might need.

That is the extent of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I sincerely hope this will carry.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from New York that the majority of our subcommittee felt we should spell out how to handle these things as we see them and give them time in which to do it. His amendment would cut it down in advance of correcting these things. Since the House was against the amendment which would have cut $25 million, certainly I hope you will stand by us on this amendment which will give us and the administration a chance to work this out. I hope you will defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL RENEWAL

For necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, in carrying out rural renewal activities under section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $1,000,000.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: On page 27, strike out line 16 through line 20.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike $1 million to initiate the rural renewal program under section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. Chairman, in considering H.R. 6754, the agricultural appropriation bill before us today, the question arises as to just how far the administration is prepared to go in furthering socialization—or, if you prefer what is supposed to be a less obnoxious term—the nationalization of the agricultural industry.

Since the inception of the price support program, the Department of Agriculture has employed every artificial device that socialistic-minded bureaucrats could dream up, in order to manage the Nation's farmers and control their capacity to produce, with a conspicuous lack of success.

Now, a new project is in prospect, to further burden and harass private enterprise. The Department of Agriculture is implementing a so-called rural renewal program designed to convert farmland into recreation land, for the purpose of increasing the income of family-sized farms and take acreage out of production. In this connection, it is looking for farms to use as pilot projects and there is $1 million in this bill to start the program. Under the program, the Government would assist the land-use conversion with a cost-sharing plan. If the pilot program is successful—that is, as far as the Government is concerned—farmers would be eligible to take part in a government cost-sharing program, which would in effect mean that the Government would pay 50 percent of the cost of developing the different types of recreational facilities on farmlands.

On the surface, this sounds pretty good, as do many of these dream programs. However, let us examine this project in practice. One of my constituents, an attorney in Seattle, Wash., represents a small family corporation organized about 4 years ago. The business of the corporation is located on land in Maple Valley, just a few miles south of Seattle. The family, which formerly farmed the land, incorporated and established a business which consists of a semi-dude-ranch operation, including swimming, picnic facilities, barn dance facilities, horseback riding facilities and related outside games and recreational activities, available to groups and others desiring these accommodations.

This purely private enterprise, owned and operated by "old frontiersmen," after some difficult times is at last getting on its feet financially. It is capitalized at $120,000, unsubsidized by any Federal funds and totally owned by members of the family.

Imagine, if you will, the consternation of this corporation when it learned that two of the pilot projects being considered by the Department under the new program are both in the Maple Valley area, and one of these projects involves land immediately contiguous to and adjoining the property upon which the corporation maintains its facilities. This operation would include facilities substantially identical to those of the private corporation, with the addition of an artificial fish lake and fish-rearing pond. It goes without saying that the private corporation is not very enthusiastic at the prospect of a Government-subsidized competitor adjoining its facilities, or anywhere else in the general area.

Mr. Chairman, I have lived in King County all my life and I have never heard of any subsidized agricultural surplus crops being grown in this rural area immediately adjacent to Seattle except perhaps milk. Consequently, if the purpose of this program is to take acreage out of production, it is hard for me to understand why pilot projects are even being considered in this area. Here is a case in point where a privately financed enterprise is faced with ruination by having to compete with a Government-subsidized competitor, financed by the use of funds our Government must obtain from their children and mine and generations yet to come.

In my judgment, it is high time that these pie-in-the-sky schemes are jettisoned and that the Department of Agriculture implement steps for an orderly return to the free enterprise system of our forefathers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was adopted by the Congress. It was enacted into law. It is a new program. The committee has held the funds to a minimum in order to get started on the program.

But when Congress enacts a law we feel we should not exercise the power of veto. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, that is what it would amount to. It is related to kindred programs that have been passed heretofore.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I would say to the Chairman of the subcommittee that the Appropriations Committee rightfully did not exercise the power of veto and I applaud them for it. But I think the House should work its will and, therefore, I hope it will approve the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad the gentleman has made his position clear, as it agrees with mine. I say that the amendment in effect would veto the program that was enacted into law. Our subcommittee did not feel that we should do that. I hope the Committee will support our committee's position and support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PELLY) there were—ayes 87, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 606. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, July 28, 1954, and September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629; 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893), shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 33, immediately after line 12, add the following new section:

"SEC. 607. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the one I offered to H.R. 5888, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, and which was agreed to. It would prohibit the use of funds appropriated in this bill for any activities—including the payment of salaries—of the so-called Domestic Peace Corps study group.

It may seem strange that the Department of Agriculture would have any connection with a domestic peace corps, but I can assure my colleagues that the Department has in fact been involved in this deal.

According to the Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE], employees of the Department of Agriculture have served as members of the so-called study group staff. One, a GS–15, served on a full-time basis for a period of 1½ months.

In addition, the Department transferred to the study group $1,500 to help meet the expenses of the group.

As I have contended in the past, the activities of the study group are being conducted without specific authority from Congress and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to say that I find myself in disagreement with one of my friends. I say to you quite frankly that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is one of the great Members of this House.

There is no provision in this bill containing any funds for this purpose. I say to you quite frankly this amendment should be defeated for this reason. We go right back to the same discussion we have had on several other amendments. If the Department of Agriculture decides at any time in the future to include such language, it should be stricken out, and they should go to the legislative committee.

As I understand the amendment that has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, it provides that no part of the funds appropriated in this bill in its entirety shall be used for the purpose that he expressed. Mr. Chairman, let us let the legislative committees decide these matters. The appropriations bill is not the proper vehicle. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is true, is it not, that there were no funds in last year's bill for this purpose?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Yet funds were used for this purpose without any delegation of authority on the part of the Congress at all. Is that not true?

Mr. NATCHER. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that if any funds were used for this purpose, certainly they were not used with the concurrence of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Still, they were used.

Mr. NATCHER. I will say to the gentleman that I think the legislative committee is the proper place for that to be considered.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the position of my colleague from Kentucky in opposition to this amendment. Certainly the Committee does not have authority to prohibit what is not authorized. There is no authorization in the bill and no money in the bill for such purpose. I would say to my friend who offered the amendment that I do not know that it serves any purpose to prohibit that which is not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 119, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 33, after line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 607. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee who negotiates agreements or contracts or in any other way, directly or indirectly, performs duties or functions incidental to supporting the price of Upland Middling Inch cotton at a level in excess of 30 cents a pound."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the legislative history of the agricultural act of 1958 applied to cotton as well as to feed grains and very clearly indicated a gradual but steady stepdown in the level of price supports for cotton.

Secretary Freeman when taking office immediately raised the level of price supports in direct contradiction of the intent of the legislative act of 1958. He continued the price supports at this excessive level. The purpose of my amendment is simply to withhold funds for payment to any officers or employees of the department who would be entering into contracts or agreements providing for this unrealistic price support of more than 30 cents per pound for upland Middling inch cotton.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment on the basis of that argument. One of the reasons we had the supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation earlier this year was because the price supports for cotton had been set at an unrealistic level. I would also like to mention to those who may not have been in the Chamber earlier today that I had made a unanimous consent request to return to the language on page 17 of this bill. That request was objected to so my point of order was not disposed of by the Chair. I had wished at that time to point out that we are being asked today to legislate a new type cotton subsidy program in the appropriation bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. That is the point I wanted to ask the gentleman about. What effect would the gentleman's amendment have? What effect would the gentleman's amendment have on the Cooley bill which has recently been reported by the Committee on Agriculture in respect to domestic cotton?

Mr. FINDLEY. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The committee, after long consideration and considerable delay in trying to get enough votes to pass it, did pass out the bill. That was some time ago. The bill has not been brought to the floor of the House, I think for the very plain reason that it is of such a controversial character that it proposes a new type cotton subsidy very similar to the action proposed in this language which appears on page 17 of the bill. I do not believe it could pass. I think the Members of this body should know that they are being asked to pass a bill today which includes language which could inaugurate the very same type of unwise subsidy program as embodied in the so-called Cooley bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that in the committee report there was reference to the fact—I will read the exact wording of the report which explained the need for the $25 million which is provided for on page 17 of this bill. It says:

> For example, an increased consumption of 1 million bales of cotton alone could save the taxpayers some $30 million.

Mr. Chairman, it just happens that a bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds. Five cents has been talked about as a compromise mill subsidy to meet this disparity which they have with foreign mills. Five cents times 500 pounds come out at $25 a bale. Then, $25 a bale times 1 million bales, as mentioned in the committee report, comes out precisely at $25 million as provided in the language of the bill on page 17 thereof.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to renew my unanimous-consent request that we return to the language on page 17, line 5, and make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "and", and all that follows to the period on line 11, on the ground that it is legislating on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. In regard to the so-called Cooley bill is it not true that in the Cooley bill there is provision that price supports can be dropped down to 30 cents and a direct payment be made on the first 15 bales of cotton of 10 percent? It does the same thing as the gentleman seeks to do in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. The effect of my amendment would be to require that no salaries be paid to officers or employees who would negotiate contracts or agreements which would support upland Middling inch cotton in excess of 30 cents a pound.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] press his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will not press it for the moment and yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has indicated he desires to be heard on the point of order which has not been made.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the basis that the prohibition that would be set up here would require new duties to be performed in determining who negotiates, whether their actions constitute negotiations, or whether their actions in any of these particulars are in such a manner as to have their salaries not paid, particularly in view of other laws which require that employees of the Federal Government be paid certain specified sums.

Mr. Chairman, it does call for new duties and there is no limitation in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be pleased to hear the gentleman from Missouri on the pending point of order, and then will take up the point of order of the gentleman from Missouri when we dispose of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keogh). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] has offered an amendment which provides for the insertion of a new section, which amendment provides in words that none of the funds provided in the pending bill shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee who does certain things.

In the opinion of the Chair, that constitutes within the rules of the House a limitation on the funds being appropriated and is a proper form of limitation. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the record will show that most of the witnesses who testified before the legislative Committee on Agriculture recommended that price support levels be reduced to the amount that is in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The point I would like to make to the House here at the present time is that the agricultural laws are very complex. If we offhand here try to change those laws, laws which require that the Secretary of Agriculture on or before a certain date announce price support levels, it could hurt many people throughout the United States who have entered into contracts based on those announcements which are a part of the law. This amendment, if adopted, would seriously affect the business relationship of many people throughout the United States who are not farmers.

May I say again, the witnesses who appeared before the committee supported the price support level, so I am told.

Here is the main reason I oppose the amendment. This does not say they shall not go ahead and carry out the law as they have. These employees of the Department are required to carry out the law and the orders of the Secretary of Agriculture, who heretofore has adopted price supports. All this says is "You are not going to get paid."

I respectfully submit that when a man is carrying out the dictates of the law, as he is required to do, you should not deny him his salary. That is what the amendment would do.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first of all that the language of this bill is such that it would require that the Secretary of Agriculture himself could not be paid if he was a party to a contract or agreement which provided for price supports for cotton in excess of 30 cents. So, it seems to me that the point raised by the chairman of the subcommittee just now is completely irrelevant. The important thing is that we get cotton back on the right track. It has clearly been on the wrong track for the past 2 years. On the very day that the Committee on Agriculture was to take final action on a cotton bill earlier this year, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a renewal of the unrealistic level of 32.5 cents a pound. This was in direct contradiction of the legislative intent of the 1950 act. Secretary Freeman's action has gotten cotton into deeper trouble. This amendment is one way of getting the program back on the right track.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Findley) there were—ayes 105, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 79, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—288

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends

Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry

Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik

Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy

Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman

Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rich
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

O'Brien, N.Y.
Osmers
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pool
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
Saylor

Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Sibal
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson

Utt
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—79

Alger
Ashbrook
Becker
Beermann
Bolton,
Frances P.
Broomfield
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Clancy
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis

Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dulski
Fascell
Findley
Ford
Gavin
Gibbons
Goodell
Griffin
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Halpern
Herlong

Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johansen
Keith
King, N.Y.
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Mosher
Norblad

NOT VOTING—65

Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Bell
Bolling
Brock
Buckley
Clausen
Colmer
Dawson
Dent
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Fino
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Gill
Gubser

Hagen, Calif.
Hall
Halleck
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hébert
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, Ill.

Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Skubitz
Staggers
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Udall
Van Deerlin
Westland
Wilson,
Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Foreman against.

Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Elliott for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. McLoskey against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Lindsay against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gill with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Montoya.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Morris.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Scott.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Baring.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THREAT OF VIOLENCE HANGS OVER THE COUNTRY'S RACE RELATIONS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that objection was made to my unanimous consent request that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon, as I wanted to speak at even greater length on a problem that should be of great concern to all of us—the double standard being applied in connection with this country's racial problem.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of violence hangs over the country's race relations—from Washington to Los Angeles and from Florida to Chicago. Those who have attempted to place all blame for the Nation's racial problems on the people of the South now find themselves trying to account for mob-inspired race chaos in their own communities.

To be sure, it was not difficult for purported political and sociological experts to find explanations and to place blame when Birmingham, Ala., and Jackson, Miss., were the only centers for the activity of race agitators. The task has become more difficult, however, since Negro mobs in Philadelphia in recent weeks have defied law-enforcement authorities, and Los Angeles, advertised as a model city for equal treatment of the races, has been pinpointed for mass Negro demonstrations. The truth of the matter is that if the political and sociological experts on race relations were honest in their assessment of the current national crisis, they would necessarily lay a large share of the blame at their own feet.

The country is now beginning to pay for the gross error of seeking answers to problems in human race relations through legislation and court fiat. History and national experience should have warned that legislation and court order is no answer to the racial problem. Yet, spurred on by political opportunists and social theorists, the Nation embarked on a course which has now resulted in a racial crisis of the first magnitude.

Incredibly, the proponents of the legislate-and-regulate school of race relations are now seeking to compound their original mistake. In response to growing racial tensions, we are now being urged to enact more extensive legislation governing national race relations. And our courts are weekly issuing orders, directives, and regulations regarding an ever-increasing area of race problems.

Evidence mounts daily, however, that the Nation's race problems cannot be solved by court order and legislative fiat. The time has therefore come for all Americans—white and Negro alike—to take a fresh and realistic view of the status of our country's race relations.

It should be made clear that the American Negro cannot hope to improve permanently his status or insure a better life for his children by following the leadership of those who urge mob action or violence. What has been described as racism-in-reverse—the preaching of race hatred of whites by Negroes—is certainly one of the underlying elements in the race demonstrations the country has witnessed in recent weeks, from Birmingham to Philadelphia.

NAACP and CORE leaders, by encouraging Negro mob action against community authority, fan the flames of this race hatred. It is but a short step from the violent demonstrations which took place in Nashville and Philadelphia, to the racist doctrine of the Black Muslim leader, Malcolm X, who is quoted as telling a Washington Negro audience:

> We need some Mau Mau and Poqo action here.

The inevitable result of Negro resort to force and violence can only be the setback of America's 16 million Negro citizens in their quest for improved status. For the spread of racial unrest—from city to city and area to area—represents a threat to the security of the Nation in an hour when hostile international forces are poised to take advantage of our every weakness. The present administration invites national tragedy when it moves slowly to recognize this threat, and when its only response to massive civil insurrection on the part of the Negro is to request additional civil rights legislation.

This administration has not hesitated to use troops in Mississippi, and to threaten the use of troops in my native State of Alabama. Yet, to date the actions and statements of the Kennedy administration have encouraged rather than discouraged Negro extremists who seek to disrupt and paralyze national and community life.

A realistic view of race relations in America today finds that while there is growing demand for so-called civil rights among Negro leaders, these same leaders do little to shoulder the weight of civil responsibilities. Those few Negroes who have come forward to point out that their race must assume a greater responsibility toward reducing criminality and social delinquency have been repudiated by the NAACP, CORE, and other extremist race groups.

For example, following the Thanksgiving Day violence at Washington, D.C., Stadium, some Negroes warned that the primary burden for preventing future violence in this city rests upon the shoulder of Negro leadership. Unfortunately, these voices went unheeded, drowned out by NAACP accusations that the blame for racial violence in the Nation's Capital rests with the white community alone. This refusal on the part of Negro groups to assume civil responsibilities—and this blame of the white citizens for every problem of the Negro community—is the essence of racism in reverse.

In the final analysis, there can be no civil rights without civil responsibilities, for any citizen—white or Negro. Negro extremist leadership seeks to maintain its own power by demanding rights while ignoring responsibilities. We find purported leaders among Negroes recently informing a high Government official that, in their opinion, American Negroes would not fight to defend this country from the threat of communism in the hemisphere. And, American Negroes are now being asked by their extremist leaders to identify their own aspirations with those of Negroes of Africa—a pure racist appeal that can hardly be of long-range benefit to American Negroes.

Understand, I am not speaking here of the Black Muslim movement alone, but of so-called authoritative spokesmen for the Negro community. Only last December an American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa was held at Columbia University, at which conference Dr. Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, and James Farmer of CORE and some 50 other American Negroes met to develop and recommend a program for the U.S. Government to follow in our African relations.

Considering the fact that King, Wilkins, Farmer, and others of the group are constantly clamoring for greater attention to the problems of American Negroes on the part of the white community, it is hypocritical that these people, when they met in New York in December, gave their attention to U.S. foreign policy problems concerning Africa. Why Africa? Why not this country's foreign policy problems on southeast Asia or in Latin America, where aggressive communism is on the move? It is difficult to explain this emphasis on African affairs by the NAACP, CORE, and Martin Luther King on any basis other than pure racism. Therefore, we see that American Negro leadership today is operating on a double-standard in many ways.

They demand that certain laws, which serve their purposes, be upheld—while also demanding the right to defy whatever laws displease them. They call for law and order—and for Government repression of those who oppose their aims. But they call for actions leading to violence—and mob rule—whenever it serves their purposes.

Second, we find that extremist Negro leadership operates on a double-standard regarding the emphasis of racism itself. They deplore and protest references to race—to the point of repression of literature, art and music—when these references do not pass the NAACP censorship board. Yet they make a direct, blatant appeal to the American Negroes on purely racist grounds when it serves their objectives.

And what, may we ask, are these objectives? Equality, as they claim—or special privilege? Is it not legitimate to ask whether, if this leadership truly sought the equal rights they purport to seek, some part of their efforts would not go toward helping America's Negroes to help themselves?

The double standard then is the salient feature of American race relations today. It is practiced by Negro leadership—and it is unfortunately reflected in the policies of the Federal Government. Expedient politics today finds the Federal Government moving with armed force into sovereign American States supposedly to preserve law, order, and constitutional rights. But what of law, order, and the constitutional rights of the citizens of Washington, Chicago, Philadelphia, and other communities threatened with mob violence inspired by the racist appeals of Negro extremists? The Federal Government has shown no inclination to assist the forces of law and order in maintaining the constitutional rights of the citizens of these communities. Instead, Federal troops are poised at this very moment to move into Alabama—not to put down lawless mobs—but to throttle the assertion of sovereign State rights by the duly constituted authorities of that State. Perhaps considering this double standard, practiced by American Negro leaders and our own Government, the Prime Minister of Uganda was encouraged to speak out last week on the current racial crisis in this country—in what surely must be the year's prize application of a double standard in considering racial problems. Hear what Prime Minister Obote of Uganda, meeting with other African leaders in Addis Abada, had to say to the President of the United States:

> Mr. President, the ears and eyes of the world are concentrated on events in Alabama, and it is the duty of the free world and more so of the countries that hold themselves up as leaders of that free world to see that all of their citizens, regardless of the color of their skins, are free.

Noble sentiments indeed coming as they do from the Prime Minister of Uganda, a country that, as of December 1962 has refused even to sign the United Nations' Convention on the Abolition of Slavery at a meeting occurring in the capital of another country that also refuses to sign this Convention. Well might the Prime Minister of Uganda direct his attention to concern for human freedom in his own country and those of his African neighbors.

In this regard, I was impressed by a recent article by Dr. Russell Kirk, on the subject of international hypocrisy in the field of race relations. Dr. Kirk takes dead aim at the double standard applied to this field when he writes:

> Nearly all the talk of Africans and Asiatics resenting racial discrimination in America is hypocrisy and nonsense. For nearly every one of the emerging nations or new members of the UN engages in forms of discrimination far more severe than anything encountered in these United States.

Dr. Kirk goes on to say that, considering the treatment of non-Moslems in the Middle East, the existence of serfdom and slavery in Abyssinia and other African nations, and the treatment of racial minorities in Indonesia, "it is improbable that the ruling cliques of Asiatic and African states are seriously concerned over the difficulties of some colored Americans in being served at department store lunch counters."

> When they talk the language of a holier-than-thou attitude in racial relationships—

Writes Dr. Kirk—

> it is only because they resent American power—or hope to extract something more in the way of American aid.

Dr. Kirk, a nonsoutherner, reflects a growing awareness on the part of Americans everywhere that the greatest danger this country faces today in the area of race relations stems from the hypocritical double standard applied to the problem not only in Addis Abada, but unfortunately, among extremist Negro leaders and political opportunists in our own country. We can only hope that the American people—including the mass of American Negroes—recognize and act upon this danger before it culminates in national tragedy.

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that there is more behind the administration current agitation for minorities, than the protection of civil rights. Under the banner of a good cause, certain self-appointed minority group leaders and some officials of the administration are perpetrating civil wrongs and are, in fact, making statements and enforcing action which will create racial tensions where none exist and set back progress already made in guaranteeing the rights of all our people, including minority groups.

I call attention particularly to what has happened in Dallas, Tex., the district I have the honor to represent here in Congress, in the past few days.

Upon direct orders from Washington in keeping with the President's order to advance Negro employees without regard to civil service procedures, three employees of the Dallas Post Office were given supervisory positions. In a letter of protest which I received this morning from the president of the Dallas local of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, it was pointed out that some 400 employees are presently on the supervisors promotion register in Dallas and that the register was completely disregarded in the announced promotions, one man being No. 54 and the other two considerably farther down the list.

This action has created a demoralizing effect among the postal workers in Dallas and has created tensions which heretofore did not exist. It is my sincere belief that Federal employees of all races and religions and national origins should be treated with justice and fairness. For many years every national administration has carefully observed civil service procedures in hiring Federal employees and in making promotions, until the advent of the Kennedy administration. Now, in a direct appeal to racial prejudice and in an effort to submit to threats of violence, the administration has ordered that civil service procedures be ignored and promotions made strictly on the basis of race.

Mr. Speaker, this policy can only bring harm to the Federal service and, in the end, create more injustice for those it is now professing to help. In his zeal to accommodate the demands of Negro leaders the President is implementing the 14th amendment of the Constitution by destroying the 5th amendment, by taking property without due process and by denying through Federal action the right of association, the right to be rewarded on the basis of merit and ability and job performance.

There are several very disturbing developments in the reports of the President's action in the field of race relations these past 2 days. First, although the promotions in the Dallas Post Office were made in accordance with orders from Washington and in keeping with the President's earlier edicts, there is now an attempt to place full responsibility upon the local postmaster. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that supporters of the administration are not so concerned with justice for the Negro as they are with making political capital out of a situation of grave concern dealing with the rights of man.

The political overtones are also apparent in the account in the Washington Evening Star of last night concerning the President's conference with 100 business leaders to bring about integration of all places of business. The news story refers to the Attorney General's list of cities where there is a problem in race relations and then makes this astounding statement: "The only city mentioned as being on the Attorney General's list where there was a problem was Dallas, Tex." I think the statement was aptly dismissed with the disdain it deserved by Mr. Joseph E. Chastain, president of the Lintz Department Stores, Inc., of Dallas, who said, according to the Star, in answering the inclusion of Dallas on the Attorney General's list of problem cities, "I didn't know we had one."

Mr. Speaker, it is a libel upon the city of Dallas and the more than 1 million people. I am privileged to represent, to single out our community as one having problems in its race relations. I defy the Attorney General, the President, or any of those responsible for this libel to compare Dallas' record of harmonious relations between all its people including the Negro and Latin-American minorities with any other city. I challenge them to compare the advancement made by people of all races and nationalities in Dallas and to compare the opportunities Negroes and others enjoy in Dallas with some of the cities of the north in Massachusetts, in New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and other places.

Mr. Speaker, in a telegram to the President yesterday protesting the unwise and dangerous policy of wrecking the civil service merit system, I said:

> To bypass the merit system of civil service and to ignore the work records of several hundred qualified postal employees in order to make promotions strictly on the basis of race or political considerations must, in the long run, mitigate against the best interest of those your administration professes to want to help. This order affecting the Dallas Post Office may seriously jeopardize the harmonious relations among the races which have existed there and undo the good and the progress which a responsible and forward looking community has made through the years. The rights of minorities

can be best assured only through the protection of the rights of all and by maintaining those procedures which recognize the worth of the individual regardless of race or social status.

Mr. President, in the name of the more than one million citizens of Dallas, Tex., black and white, I now urge you to alter the course upon which you have embarked which is designed to promote discrimination in favor of a minority without regard to constitutional guarantees of the right of private property, the right of freedom of association, and the tried and trusted history of the civil service system. Your insistence that all demands of Negro leaders be met under stress of the threat of violence or political reprisal can only result in a complete breakdown in a government of law and in orderly law enforcement which can only mean greater injustice and suffering for the Negro and other minorities.

Your adminstration must bear full responsibility for whatever ill effects upon cordial relations may now ensue between the people of Dallas, and other communities, which have been forced by Executive order to take action contrary to the best interests of all the workers of the Post Office Department. This request is made in behalf of the hard-working and capable Negro workers in the Dallas Post Office, as well as the white workers, all of whom have been victimized by your ill-advised and ill-timed Executive action. By this action you have downgraded meritorious postal service at the expense of all postal workers, those they serve, and the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, if the President insists upon the reckless course he has charted and, in the name of civil rights aborts the constitutional rights of all the people, and in so doing maligns and discredits the people of my city, Dallas, and any other community whose people express political independence and courage, it is time for Congress to remind him to stay within the bounds of the authority given to him under the Constitution. We, as the legislative branch of the Republic can best insure the civil rights of all the people by demanding a return to the constitutional separation of powers and by taking whatever means necessary to prevent encroachment of the Executive on the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress.

SMOKE, FIRE, FURY, AND THE BPA

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 21, Secretary Udall signed an executive order including southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power marketing area. I was present on this occasion and will never forget the Secretary's amazement that all of Idaho had not been included in the Bonneville Power marketing area prior to this time.

We furnish a great deal of the water but heretofore have been receiving none of the power benefits. However, the reaction to the Secretary's executive order was one of controversy in Idaho with the officials of the Idaho Power Co. and the Utah Power & Light Co. and some of their friends predicting dire things for the future and being extremely critical of the Secretary's decision. However, on the other hand, the Snake River Power Association, public officials in Burley and Idaho Falls, many of the representatives of the Rural Electrification Administration, and some of our most prominent State legislators and businessmen commended the Secretary on this long overdue action.

I believe that one of the finest editorials on this subject was written by Sam H. Day in the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune on Tuesday, May 21, entitled "Smoke, Fire, Fury, and the BPA." Sam Day has rendered a real service to Idaho by writing this courageous editorial.

The publishers of the Lewiston Tribune who are noted throughout the northern part of Idaho for their independent and factual approach in matters of controversy have once again presented their readers with a most outstanding analysis of a touchy subject.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the Congress and to all of the people in Idaho who are interested in the ramifications of the inclusion of southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power marketing area:

SMOKE, FIRE, FURY, AND THE BPA

It is one of life's little ironies that the flames of political passion sometimes spring from the least likely fuel. The hottest emotions are not necessarily aroused by emotional topics such as love and religion. The fires of faith and conviction feed more fiercely in such dry and brittle fields as taxation and foreign policy. And nowhere do they burn better than in a field one might suppose to be occupied exclusively by noncombustible facts—the field of hydroelectric power distribution. But the debate over power is a torrid one, and it was no surprise that the flames of passion were kindled instantly last weekend when it was learned that the Bonneville Power Administration plans to extend its marketing area to southern Idaho.

The reaction from the president of Idaho Power Co., Thomas E. Roach, of Boise, was so swift, and so vehement, that the facts of the proposal quickly disappeared in a cloud of smoky oratory. A member of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council, State Senator Carl C. Moore, of Lewiston, succeeded in blowing away some of the smoke. But Roach sounded the call to arms, and reinforcements soon will be pouring into the breach. If the pattern of the past holds true, the lines of ideological conflict will harden and the smoke of battle may long obscure the facts of the BPA plan.

What is this terrible thing that BPA proposes to do?

Effective today, the Department of the Interior has extended the BPA marketing area from Oregon, Washington, western Montana, and northern Idaho into southern Idaho and small adjoining areas in Wyoming, Montana, and Nevada. This means that the marketing area, which formerly covered the lower and middle portions of the Columbia River Basin, will now cover the entire basin.

BPA is a Federal agency which markets at wholesale rates the power produced by Federal projects within its area, chiefly those of the U.S. Reclamation Bureau (like Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (like Ice Harbor on the lower Snake). The extension of the BPA marketing area into the upper Columbia Basin means that BPA will take over the marketing of power produced by five Reclamation Bureau dams in that area.

BPA expects during the first year to sell power in southern Idaho at a rate about 40 percent lower than the rate now offered by the Reclamation Bureau, which is in turn lower than the Idaho Power Co. rate. BPA can do this because of the savings effected by integration of its power supply and demand throughout the basin. The Reclamation Bureau rate, by contrast, was circumscribed by the far smaller output of its five projects in the upper basin. One of the key considerations here is that the lower basin has its peak power demand in the winter because the biggest consumers are cities and industries, while the upper basin has its peak demand in the summer because the biggest consumers are irrigation pumpers. Integration of the two systems will mean more economic use of the available power projects. BPA estimates that the saving from this consideration alone will amount to more than $100 million by 1980, more than enough to build the Lewiston-Soda Springs transmission line which will be necessary for expansion of the system.

Neither BPA nor the Reclamation Bureau sells power on the open retail market, as do the private utility companies. Instead, they sell it at wholesale to certain preference customers, specified by law, such as cooperatives, municipalities, public agencies, some heavy industries, and private utility companies. These in turn sell or provide the power to the individual users, so that, although the direct customers are relatively few in number, the benefits penetrate deeply into the economy.

The significance of this for an economy such as that of southern Idaho, which is severely limited by high freight rates and by distance from the market, should not be overlooked. BPA estimates that the phosphate industry, which is dependent on cheap power if it is to survive, would, with BPA power create 9,000 new jobs in southern Idaho by 1980 in the production of chemical fertilizer.

The ability of BPA to provide a climate for industry through low cost power has been the key to the success and acceptance of BPA in Washington and Oregon. New industries have been attracted to the BPA area by low cost power, and they in turn have attracted population and retail business, stimulating the demand for retail power. This is why the private utility companies, far from being hurt by BPA, have flourished side by side with it.

Why is it that BPA can sell power so much more cheaply than private utility companies can? Its costs are far lower. BPA does not have to pay the bond interest rates which are a major part of the cost of financing private hydroelectric projects. It does not have to satisfy the demands of stockholders. It pays no Federal, State or local taxes. It can take advantage of economies which stem from large scale operations. But, contrary to the claims of some private utility companies, BPA is not directly subsidized by the Federal Government and it does not make a practice of selling power below cost. Its costs are fully met from power revenues.

Do the advantages which BPA enjoys over private utility companies constitute a form of unfair competition? This depends on one's attitude toward ownership of the basic means of production in a society. If one holds that all productive means which can be turned to private profit are properly the field for private ownership, then certainly it is unfair to inject governmental competition into one of those fields. But if one draws a distinction between the productive means which are basic to an economy and other forms of production the rule does not apply. Such a distinction can be drawn between the production and wholesale distribution of hydroelectric power, on the one hand, and such activities as the retail sale of power.

The distinction is an important one because a privately owned company producing power and selling it at wholesale cannot be equated, for example, with a barber shop. One must weigh the impact of governmental competition on the barber and the power company against the impact upon society. The public benefits of government barbershops are few, if any. But publicly owned power systems can, as has been shown many times, have incalculable benefits for society. They have stimulated productive capacity, established taxable wealth, opened vast new fields for the utility companies, among others, and created far more private enterprise than they have destroyed.

No, the BPA won't really hurt the good folks of southern Idaho. But with help from Idaho Power Co. it could come close to scaring them to death.—S.H.D.

JACQUELINE COCHRAN

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay much deserved tribute to one of our great American women, Jacqueline Cochran.

During recent days, flying solo, in one of our country's foremost fighting airplanes, the Lockheed F–104 Starfighter, she established two new international speed records at approximately twice the speed of sound.

These records were not to test the top speed of the airplane which Miss Cochran says she had up to two and a half times the speed of sound for short test periods. They were, instead, to demonstrate what the plane would do by way of sustained precision flying over measured courses in which the powerplant, temperature, and the fuel load aboard would be the limiting factors.

The one record was for the 100-kilometer closed course—which was held by Madam Auriol of France. This was flown at 36,000 feet altitude around an imaginary circle approximately 63 miles in circumference at a speed of 1,203.96 miles per hour. The circle was in fact the duplicate of the same circle on the ground, surveyed and marked by 12 pylons. While the course is being flown, the plane is followed by radar and the actual flight is traced on paper to determine whether any of the pylons are cut and at the entrance and exit of the course there are judges appointed by the National Aeronautic Association. If she cut inside any of these pylons or ended at a lower altitude than at the start, the record would be lost. If she flew more than a half mile outside any of these pylons, the speed which is related to the precise circle would not be sufficient for the record. The plane during this sharp circular flight had its wings in almost a vertical position rather than horizontal as in normal flight. Miss Cochran, due to this flying attitude, was sustaining two and a half times the force of gravity during the flight.

The other record was the average speed of two flights from opposite directions over a 15-kilometer, straightaway course. The course is marked on the ground. The flight was again at about 36,000 feet and flown at 1,273.10 miles per hour. It is called "threading the needle" because of the extremely limited deviations from true course and altitude permitted. The flights both ways are in effect within an imaginary air tunnel 320 feet from top to bottom and a quarter of a mile wide. If the plane touches the top or bottom or either side of that tunnel, there is disqualification. The slightest deviation in a plane going about 22 miles a minute would cause such disqualification. All that was done was recorded by photographic instruments in the plane, by radar on the ground, and by a group of timers and judges on the ground.

That a woman can take an outstanding modern fighter plane and fly it with such precision calls for praise of the highest order.

It should also make us all feel good about the qualities of such a plane especially when it is realized that she had less than 22 hours flying time in it from the start of the program until the end. She told me that she has never flown a plane that was so responsive and so free of tricks. It was as she expressed it, "almost as if pilot and plane could talk together." The Lockheed Starfighter is referred to as the "free world defender" as it is being used by many of the NATO nations.

Miss Cochran has been one of our Nation's foremost pilots for many years. She holds more international air records than any other person. She has received the Harmon International Air Trophy from four different Presidents of the United States. She headed the WASP—Women's Air Force Service Pilots—during World War II and for her war services received the Distinguished Service Medal.

And if that is not enough, let it be added that she is a lieutenant colonel in our Air Force Reserve and several times has been named one of the country's outstanding businesswomen.

And so I salute her for her energy, her leadership, and her accomplishments.

FEDERAL INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my fellow colleagues to legislation which I have introduced today in connection with paying the Federal apportionment of funds for the construction of the Interstate Highway System in the several States.

For some time now, actually dating back to the period of 1959–60 when I was fortunate enough to serve as Governor of Vermont, I have been concerned with the financial burden imposed on the less-populous, lower income States in financing their share of the Federal Interstate Highway System.

It has been apparent that these States with a lower per capita income and fewer people per mile of roadway are necessarily being forced to pay much higher road taxes than say the people in highly populous, high income areas which might well have much less roadway of this nature to construct.

The bill I have introduced seeks to correct this inequity, and I would hope that this Congress would give serious attention to this problem. The Interstate Highway System is basically a national defense highway. While I expect it to be of immense value to the people of Vermont and other rural areas, I do not believe people in such States should be forced to pay higher taxes for this roadway than do those citizens of other areas.

As a result of my experience as Governor of Vermont, and as a result of several months of study on this matter, I have called for changing the ratio under which Federal funds are apportioned. My bill would keep the 90-percent ratio of total costs intact, but would then provide for bonus payments to certain States who qualify.

Without going into the technical details here, the bonus payments would be based on both per capita income of the States in relation to the national average per capita income, and the population of each State per mile of interstate roadway it has to build in relation to the national average population for the entire network.

Under this formula for distributing the Federal apportionment, bonuses ranging from one-tenth of 1 percent to $4\frac{8}{10}$ percent would be paid to 38 States. It would not require additional receipts in the Federal highway trust fund, but would merely change the ratio under which present apportionments are made.

I would be happy to furnish any of my colleagues from other States a breakdown on the amount of bonus payments for the Interstate their State would receive, upon request to my office.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR BILL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention yesterday's article in the Christian Science Monitor by that fine paper's special Mexico City correspondent, Marion Wilhelm, concerning the violent reaction in Mexico to the defeat of the Mexican farm labor bill. I particularly draw their attention to the fact that the leftwingers in Mexico have been "rubbing their hands in glee at such a propaganda coup" brought about by the "slave labor" accusations on the floor of the House. Also, my colleagues will note the serious political repercussions our neighbor to the south may face in next year's presidential election as the Communist and Communist-sympathizing organizations concentrate agitators in the northern farm communities previously aided by Public Law 78.

The article follows:

"No" on Braceros Hit

(By Marion Wilhelm)

Mexico City.—What appears to be the good intentions of a U.S. Congressman have caused a violent reaction in Mexico.

The Congressman is John E. Fogarty, Democrat, of Rhode Island. He joined the majority of the House of Representatives in voting down the extension of the farm labor agreement with Mexico, stating as his reason that "if there was ever a slave labor piece of legislation adopted by the Congress, this is it."

This is exactly what leftwingers have been saying for years south of the border, and they are rubbing their hands in glee at such a propaganda coup in the U.S. Congress.

FIRST VOTED IN 1951

More moderate circles, including the majority of the Mexican press, are taking exception, however, albeit with a few pointed barbs.

The bracero, or migrant-labor, program operates under congressional legislation passed in 1951 which permits American farmers to import Mexican field labor under contracts which specify conditions agreed upon by the Governments of the United States and Mexico. The law will expire December 31 unless Congress extends it.

The fact that the House has recently defeated a 2-year extension does not necessarily mean the end of the program. Under consideration is the possibility of a 1-year extension which is said to have the approval of the U.S. Department of Labor, Immigration Service, and the State Department.

One Mexico City newspaper, La Prensa, commented on the Congressman's remarks this way:

"There is no doubt that we have been insulted, but apart from the insult, they would leave us in the vulnerable position of losing from one day to the next the dollars that the braceros send back to maintain our very precarious balance of payments. And that means that some 300,000 Mexican families will suffer from the unemployment of their family wage earners."

REVERSAL SOUGHT

Ultimas Noticias de Excelsior raised another question:

"Are we to interpret the vote in the House of Representatives as an act against slavery—or as imprudent discrimination (against Mexico)?"

While the Mexican Government has never viewed the migratory labor program as an ideal solution to its own unemployment problems, sharing Mr. Fogarty's concern for higher wage and living conditions, it is hoping that the negative vote in the lower House will be reversed by the U.S. Senate.

The approximately 200,000 Mexicans employed by American farmers last year (fewer than in previous years) sent back to their families about $35 million of their wages.

This money is a vital prop to the Mexican economy as a whole, helping to balance off trade deficits.

AGITATORS ACTIVE

Politically, however, the end of the migratory labor program could have even more serious repercussions at a time when the Mexican Government is preparing for the 1964 presidential elections.

Prolonged drought has broadened the panorama of hunger and misery in the dust bowls. The last 2 years have brought hunger marches, land invasions, and uprisings of peasants.

Communist and Communist-sympathizing organizations are concentrating agitators in northern farm communities.

The Mexican Government has been moving ahead faster than any other Latin American government with land distribution, irrigation works, farm credits, and relocation programs moving peasants from dust bowls to more productive regions.

Meantime, U.S. farm jobs, although declining, have provided an escape valve for economic and political pressures building up in rural Mexico.

ROLE OF PROFITS IN ENERGIZING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us can benefit from a better understanding of the role of profits in energizing the American economy, providing benefits for workers, stockholders, and enabling the Federal Government to receive a most substantial income. I have noted an article in the ADM Archer, an employee magazine of the Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., whose home office is in Minneapolis. This article, I believe, is of great interest to all of us, and I include it in today's Record, as follows:

An Essay on Profits

The profit someone else makes may put money in your pocket. The profit someone else fails to make could cost you your job. And if insufficient profit is earned in America, we may surely expect recessions, unemployment, and sluggish economic growth.

Our whole American economic system is dependent upon profit. Not one American fails to benefit from profits; yet profits are little understood by the general public.

It is important that they be understood, because profits today are under pressure from some influential politicians, from some labor leaders, and from taxation within the country and competitive forces outside the country.

It is worthwhile, therefore, to look into the subject of profits and what they mean to our people and our national strength and progress.

The employee whose employer is earning a profit is secure in his job, if he is performing it properly. He is likely to receive increases in pay and benefits, to have a pleasant and hygienic place in which to work, and good tools for his job.

But obviously, the employee whose employer is not earning a profit cannot be sure how long his job will last. Any increase in wages or benefits granted by a company which is not earning money simply increases the company's losses, which must be borne by the owners, and are likely to lead to layoffs or even to the employer's going out of business.

There can be no job security in a company which is not earning a profit.

New jobs are necessary in great numbers today. Each year, the number of people who desire employment increases as the population increases. Jobs must also be available for persons who become unemployed when old industries retire from business as new industries arise.

New jobs in our economy are created when an investor or a group of investors decides that there is a probability that they can make a profit by starting a new business, or when an existing company decides that expansion may be profitable.

Obviously, more new businesses will be started and more old ones will decide to expand when profit levels are generally good than when they are unsatisfactory. When sufficient profits are being earned so that investors are confident, business grows and hires additional workers and unemployment does not become a problem.

For these new jobs to continue in being, the new enterprises must earn their profit, too, or they will be shut down.

To most people, the word "recession" means a time of unemployment. For many years, economists have observed that unemployment increases a short time after profits have declined. When profits begin to rise again, employment soon increases.

In recent years, unemployment has hovered between 4 and 5 percent of the labor force in the United States. Millions of people who would like to work have been unable to find jobs. It is no coincidence that these years of relatively high unemployment have also been years in which profits have failed to increase in total volume, although wages, salaries, the national income, and the volume of goods and services produced all have increased greatly. Businesses have been producing but their reward for producing has not increased.

Unemployment cannot be greatly reduced by giving more people government jobs or by more government purchases of goods. All government jobs and purchases are paid for by taxes on profits, and on the incomes of persons engaged in profit-making businesses. There is no other source of government revenue.

What government spends is money taken from the incomes of people who otherwise would have spent or invested it themselves. It adds nothing to the nation's income.

More jobs, then, will have to come from private enterprise—which always has created vast numbers of new jobs whenever it was not denied the prospect of soundly profitable operation.

PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a large grower and shipper of farm produce in Arizona—a man who has made extensive use of Mexican farm labor—wrote a very significant letter to the Secretary of Labor expressing his feelings on the House action last week to terminate Public Law 78.

In his letter, Mr. A. W. Bodine, president of the Bodine Produce Co., states emphatically that—

> We are very glad that Public Law 78 is killed and we hope it stays that way. Public Law 78 has served its purpose, but now we definitely do not need this labor.

Mr. Bodine goes on to say:

> I am not the only grower-shipper in Arizona and California that feels this way. There are many of us that want this bill to expire December 31, 1963, and let us get rid of this Mexican national program once and for all. This gives us 7 months to get our houses in order and to lay plans for securing our own help and that is ample time.

Mr. Speaker, the job stabilization bill, which I and several of our colleagues have introduced, would provide an orderly recruitment and transportation program for the benefit of domestic farmworkers and farm employers. It would provide the type of program which would enable us to have sufficient workers to harvest our crops and to make more efficient use of our large supply of unemployed and underemployed farmworkers. I urge its support and enactment at this session of the Congress.

I include Mr. Bodine's telling letter in its entirety for our colleagues' attention:

June 3, 1963.

Hon. Willard Wirtz,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As a large user of Mexican labor I wish to state my position.

We are very glad that Public Law 78 is killed and we hope it stays that way. Public Law 78 has served its purpose, but now we definitely do not need this labor. In Arizona, California and all districts we are terribly overproduced to where many fields of vegetables are plowed under and never harvested and many of them are harvested at less than packing and growing charges. The citrus business is getting in a bad way due to such heavy plantings of trees in all States with the growers and shippers knowing they have labor to harvest these crops, and with the amount of trees now planted in oranges, lemons and grapefruit in Arizona, California, Texas, and Florida, it would be impossible to even get growing cost back if all of this fruit could be harvested.

We might have to pay our American labor more money to do our work but we should do so. Building contractors pay $2.50 per hour to dig a ditch; we should be able to pay an American $1.50 to $2.00 an hour to work in our fields, if we don't have the Mexican labor around.

The reason we can pay more for the labor is that we won't be able to plant so many acres of different items and have depressed markets all the time and our industry will be much better off.

I am not the only grower-shipper in Arizona and California that feels this way. There are many of us that want this bill to expire December 31, 1963, and let us get rid of this Mexican national program once and for all.

This gives us 7 months to get our houses in order and to lay plans for securing our own help, and that is ample time.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

Bodine Produce Co.,
A. W. Bodine,
President.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN BARBITURATES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of extreme urgency that I today introduce a bill to curb the widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, the so-called goofballs, and amphetamines, commonly known as pep pills. The mushrooming use of these drugs by teenagers and young adults is creating a drug problem which will dwarf any juvenile delinquency crisis yet experienced in this country.

We have an American tragedy in the making. Youngsters looking for "kicks" are finding a plentiful supply of these drugs easily available and are turning to their use in far greater numbers than anyone could have anticipated. Goofballs and pep pills are the new marijuana. They are available in every type of neighborhood in large cities and small towns alike. For every pill legally sold on prescription another is sold on the black market. The results are catastrophic.

Once "hooked," normally well behaved youngsters steal from their parents to buy the drugs. Youngsters who are known as shy and retiring are stimulated to commit violent crimes—in one actual case, an unprovoked assault and stabbing of a cab driver. These pills exert tremendous psychotoxic effects on the user and stir up antisocial behavior in normally stable youths.

The goofball and pep pill traffic is destroying families. It is turning well adjusted youths into vicious animals. It is changing thousands of fine young Americans into pitiful debilitated human beings and, worst of all, it is leading the way to narcotic addiction for children who would never normally be exposed to hard narcotics. Police records across the country show that these pills are paving the way to insanity, criminality, prostitution, and death for our unsuspecting young.

I do not overstate the case. This problem was brought out by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1956. It was starkly emphasized by Senator Dodd's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the 87th and the current Congress. It has been eloquently stated by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse and yet today the bootleg and under-the-counter sales of barbiturates and amphetamines is at an alltime high currently estimated by the Food and Drug Administration at about 5 billion pills a year. In actual fact, if the output of the major drug houses were known, this figure would probably exceed 5 billion by a substantial amount.

While the principal problem—and my own primary concern—is the sale of goofballs and pep pills to juveniles, the unauthorized use of these drugs by adults has resulted in great tragedy, particularly in the form of highway deaths. The amphetamine sales from truck stops, restaurants, and bars are a continuing threat to highway safety.

A letter found on a driver killed in a recent crash outside Tucson, Ariz., showed that he had used amphetamine tablets to keep going for 49 hours without rest. His truck crossed a divider on a modern four-lane highway and struck a passenger bus head on. Nine people were killed and 31 others injured.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, in a speech last winter, told of a truckdriver under the influence of pep pills whose tractor-trailer went out of control and struck an auto near the Secretary's hometown of Cleveland, Ohio. The driver had been on the road for 15 hours and, as a result, six schoolteachers were killed in the accident.

The flourishing of this illicit drug traffic is due primarily to inadequate laws. The purpose of my bill is to remedy this situation by providing authorities with the essential tools for effective drug control.

First, the requirement of filing names and business locations of manufacturers with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will enable authorities to locate and close the primary sources of illicit distribution; second, the bill's clear statement of authorized channels for drug distribution will allow officials to sort out and clamp down on illicit distribution through bootleg channels after drugs leave the manufacturer; third, the hard-hitting "pusher" provision regarding sale to minors will emphasize the serious nature of this crime and make it far less appealing. These provisions should go a long way in furnishing Government officials with the necessary equipment with which to crack down on this problem.

The present crisis is unique in that there is, inherent in the misuse of amphetamines and barbiturates, a danger and, unfortunately, a profit comparable to that in hard narcotics while the law governing the goofballs and pep pills is far less stringent—selling drugs without a prescription carries a maximum sentence of 1 year for the first offense.

Now, I do not want to give the impression that I am against any use of these drugs. Their value to the practice of medicine is fully recognized by the medical profession and the Federal Government. Barbiturates are central nervous system depressants which have a wide range of usefulness. Amphetamines and related drugs have a stimulating effect on the central nervous system; they likewise are very useful in legitimate medical practice. However, both types of drugs, in sufficient dose, have the effect of permitting the user to escape from a consciousness of reality.

The prescription or administration of drugs to give relief from tension to a patient who is under the care of a physician is often properly indicated in the course of professional medical practice. When such relief is afforded, however, through unsupervised, unwise use of the drugs, it can and frequently does lead to serious physical and social changes in the user. The widespread abuse of the drugs for nonmedical purposes and the delinquency, crime, and death derived thereform is the target of this bill.

Current remedies are, as I stated previously, inadequate. Large quantities of these drugs continue to be diverted into illicit channels as the result of shipments from manufacturers and wholesalers to unauthorized individuals. These drugs are then sold on street corners, in candy stores, schoolyards, restaurants, service stations, and retail drugstores. The results are obvious. Barbiturate poisoning is now the most common cause of death from a solid poison. It is second only to carbon monoxide as the Nation's No. 1 killer poison.

The goofball and pep pill problem is currently dealt with by 775 Food and Drug Administration inspectors across the country. Because the traffic in these drugs is similar to that in narcotics, these inspectors, in addition to all of their other duties, must engage in the same type of enforcement activity as a Federal narcotics agent. As a result, untrained and poorly equipped men must enter the criminal world to ferret out the peddlers of these drugs. In spite of these handicaps, FDA inspectors have found sufficient grounds for almost 3,000 convictions for nonprescription sale of pep pills and goofballs in the last decade. It is time that they were given adequate tools with which to work.

The importance of adequate enforcement in this area was pointed out by President Kennedy in the 1962 White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse when he said—

> Society's gains will be illusory if we reduce the incidence of one kind of drug dependence, only to have new kinds of drugs substituted. * * * The sooner effective devices for preventing the abuse of these drugs are implemented, the less severe the problem will be.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a most serious problem and it is indeed time that we faced it. While we should recognize that, as Judge John M. Murtagh of New York City's criminal court has said:

> Addiction is a condition of human degradation. It cries out for humane tolerance and Christlike charity.

Those who cause and feed upon the addiction of others should be given no quarter. It is time for us to crack down on the irresponsible, degenerate, and perverted characters who are corrupting the moral, social, and physical health of our youth. I firmly believe that the program embodied in my bill will go a long way in achieving this goal.

NASA CONTRACT AWARDED TO FIRMS LINKED TO FAILURES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is planning to construct an Advanced Saturn Vertical Assembly Building at Cape Canaveral at an estimated cost of about $100 million. This is a major undertaking which would appear to require unusual competence and proficiency on the part of the architects and engineers who design it. It would seem logical for NASA and the Army Corps of Engineers to contract with architects and engineers with a performance record of successes—not failures. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the design contract has been awarded to a joint venture combine of four firms called URSAM. Among the four firms comprising URSAM are one firm, which was concerned with the design of the Texas tower No. 4 which collapsed on January 15, 1961, taking 28 lives, and another firm which was connected with the design of the "big dish" radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va., which Secretary of Defense McNamara canceled in July 1962, after millions had been spent on it.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Kahn, the able and diligent reporter for the New York Post, revealed the background of the firms comprising the combine in an article in the New York Post on April 18, 1963. I include that article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 18, 1963]

LINKED TO FAILURES, THEY GET MOON JOB

(By Joseph Kahn)

Three engineering design firms which played a part in two multi-million-dollar Government project failures have been awarded the contract for the design of the assembly building for the moon rocket, the New York Post learned today.

The building will be designed to provide, for the first time, the facilities and services to assemble the complete launch vehicle in a protected and controlled environment.

The engineering firms chosen for the building design are: Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Ruthledge of 415 Madison Avenue, Max O. Urbahn of 635 Madison Avenue, and Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht of 101 Park Avenue.

A combine of the three companies is called URSAM with offices at 642 Fifth Avenue. A fourth member, Roberts & Schaefer, wholly owned by Thompson-Starrett Co., of 745 Fifth Avenue, was not involved with the two earlier Government projects.

The Moran firm designed the $21 million Air Force Texas radar tower off the New Jersey shore which collapsed in January 1961, taking the lives of 21 men.

A Senate subcommittee investigated the tragedy and found: "Design criteria was clearly inadequate." An expert testified at the hearing that techniques and design came "pretty close to dooming it" from the start.

The Moran firm is party to a $4,775,000 damage suit in Federal court brought by relatives of the drowned men.

PROJECT HALTED

Urbahn and Seelye designed the Navy's super movable radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va. It was hoped it would be the world's largest instrument of its kind for military and civilian purposes. Originally estimated in 1958 at $18,000,000, the final cost projection was $200,000,000.

Last July 18, Defense Secretary McNamara called a halt to the project after the Government had spent $80 million. Construction never got beyond the building of ground control stations and the foundations.

At the time the Defense Department said cancellation of the project was due to mounting costs and advances in science and technology had reduced the potential usefulness of the telescope.

However, a similar telescope, smaller in size, was successfully constructed at Green Bank, W. Va., for less than $100 million.

A National Science Foundation spokesman said problems in design were responsible for the telescope's failure.

"There were two design phases, the base and the antenna," he explained. "It is our understanding after the base was under construction, it was discovered the antenna was too heavy for the base."

Six months after the Senate committee criticized the Moran company in the tower catastrophe and 3 months after McNamara stopped the telescope work, the Corps of Engineers last October 11 gave the Moon rocket assembly building contract to the newly formed combine.

The contract was not open for competitive bids, but let on a negotiated basis.

The initial designing allocation for the building at Merritt Island near Cape Canaveral was $99,500. On December 13, an additional contract for $3,300,000 was awarded.

VOICE FULL CONFIDENCE

A spokesman for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, responsible for the moon project, said selection of URSAM for the design of the assembly building had been made by the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

"We have and still have full confidence in their judgment," said the spokesman.

At Jacksonville, Fla., Col. Harold R. Parfitt, district engineer of the corps, told the Post, URSAM was selected after a screening of 500 to 600 engineering firms over the country.

Parfitt said the corps was fully aware of background of the URSAM firms.

Max O. Urbahn, speaking for URSAM, said when the Sugar Grove telescope was canceled his firm was out of the project.

"We had finished our work a year before," he said, "and the design was continued by another company."

Mr. Speaker, I have called this matter to the attention of the Comptroller General of the United States, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Army Corps of Engineers. I think the American people and the Congress are entitled to know why these firms were chosen.

The Army Corps of Engineers has conceded that the background of the firms was known in a letter to me dated May 15, 1963. It said:

> While the Corps of Engineers was aware of the association of the Moran firm with the Texas tower and Urbahn and Seelye firms with the "big dish" job, it was considered that their preeminent capabilities in their particular specialties made the selection of the joint venture highly desirable.

I think the Corps of Engineers should explain what criteria were used in making this selection. If this combine was selected from among "several hundred architect-engineer firms throughout the United States," as the Corps of Engineers reports, we should know the reasons for rejecting the others. Does the Corps of Engineers contend that it could not find a team with a proven record of performance?

Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration also has a responsibility to answer these questions. So far NASA has failed to assume its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in its report dated June 15, 1961, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services said of Texas tower No. 4—

> The design criteria was clearly inadequate. * * * The structural design engineers miscalculated in believing that the design criteria was reasonable and safe.

In the face of such a finding, with full knowledge of the background of the structural design engineers, the contract for the design of the vertical assembly building at Cape Canaveral was let.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of this contract has come to light through the assiduousness of New York Post reporter Joseph Kahn. In the New York Post of June 5, 1963, Joseph Kahn revealed that the Corps of Engineers has awarded a contract for an independent review of the design of the vertical assembly building to a consulting engineering firm which includes an engineer who was the subject of conflict-of-interest hearings by the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary in 1955. On November 10, 1955, the New York Times, in reporting the resignation of Peter A. Strobel as Commissioner of Public Buildings, said, "A reliable informant said that direct pressure from the White House has brought about the resignation."

Mr. Speaker, I include the article of June 5, 1963, by Joseph Kahn at this point in the Record.

[From the New York Post, June 5, 1963]

Moon Project Engineer Lost U.S. Job in 1955

(By Joseph Kahn)

A consulting engineer who was forced to resign his high Government job over conflict-of-interest charges has been assigned to review the design of the moon rocket assembly building, the New York Post learned today.

The awarding of the design of the rocket building to engineering firms linked to two multimillion-dollar Government project failures is under investigation by several Federal agencies.

Engineer Peter A. Strobel, with offices at 70 West 40th Street, was Federal Commissioner of Public Buildings in 1955, when the House Judiciary Committee investigated charges that he steered alteration contracts to firms that were his clients.

Under pressure from the White House, Strobel resigned in November 1955. He said he had done nothing wrong, but left the service so as not to embarrass the Eisenhower administration.

On April 18, the Post revealed the details of the moon rocket building design award made by the Corps of Engineers for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

The engineering combine chosen without competitive bids is called URSAM, of 642 Fifth Avenue, and includes these firms: Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge; Max O. Urbahn; and Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht.

The Moran firm designed the $21 million Air Force Texas tower that collapsed off New Jersey in January 1961, drowning 21 men.

The Urbahn and Seelye firms designed the Navy's giant radiotelescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va. It was canceled last July by Defense Secretary McNamara after 4 years of work and $80 million had been spent.

Why the firms with a background of failures were selected over 500 to 600 engineering specialists throughout the country is a question raised by Federal agencies and legislators.

The Defense Department has asked the Corps of Engineers for a full report. Senator Case, Republican, of New Jersey, is conducting an independent investigation, Senator Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, is looking into the matter, and Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, has asked the General Accounting Office to review the puzzling award.

Representative Ryan has written for an explanation from the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Comptroller Campbell, and NASA Administrator Webb.

The assignment by the Corps of Engineers of Strobel to review the rocket building design, has raised criticism in some engineering circles. One expert made this observation:

"It seems a waste of money to hire someone to review the design, especially if the corps has confidence in its original selection. Certainly, if a review is needed, someone who has not encountered trouble with the Government could have been chosen."

Mr. Speaker, I think the Corps of Engineers should explain, first, why an outside firm was selected to review the design contract and, secondly, why this firm was chosen. The responsibility for the supervision of the performance of the design contract belongs to the Corps of Engineers and NASA.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised questions which must be answered. The multibillion dollar space program must be supervised and administered in such a way as to have the full confidence of the American people.

THE 1962 EDISON AWARD

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased, today, to have called to my attention in the newspapers and elsewhere that the Edison Electric Institute has selected the Portland (Oregon.) General Electric Co., for its coveted 1962 Edison Award. The reason for the selection is based upon a worthy public service carried on by Portland General Electric in connection with the operation of its franchise. I think that Portland General Electric should be congratulated for its program of developing at its hydroelectric projects nine free recreation facilities. In the Portland General Electric service territory, Portland General Electric reports that there were 400,000 visits made last year to these recreation areas, equipped with electricity and hot water and other recreation, such as camping. The Portland General Electric program has been applauded, I understand, by Mr. Jack Binford of Portland, national president of the Izaak Walton League and by the Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr.

I ask that the text of the citation accompanying the award to Portland General Electric and the acceptance speech by Mr. T. W. Delzell, chairman of the board of directors of Portland General Electric Co., during the ceremony at Denver, Colo., June 5, 1963, be printed in the Record.

Text of 1962 Edison Award Citation to Portland General Electric Co.

To Portland General Electric Co., for its leadership in bringing to fruition a model water resources development program for the State of Oregon combining the preservation of natural beauty, the creation of attractive recreational areas for free public use and providing for conservation, the fishing interests and water utilization for electric power production, thus demonstrating to its customers, the general public, and to the Nation at large, how investor-owned electric light and power companies act in the public interest, thereby enhancing the stature of the free enterprise philosophy.

Remarks by Thomas W. Delzell in Accepting the Edison Award for 1962

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, there are 1,600 men and women in Portland, Oreg., who will be as thrilled as I am to hear news of this award. They are the members of the Portland General Electric Co. organization, and for them I gratefully accept the Edison Award and the honor that goes with it.

The loyalty and dedication these people have shown to their company and to the program which has brought us this honor cannot be overstated. I know that they will feel, as I do, a profound sense of pride and accomplishment—enhanced to a large degree by the outstanding quality of the companies which shared with us the honor of an Edison Award nomination. The Allegheny Power System, American Electric Power Co., Consolidated Edison and General Public Utilities are in the frontline of our industry. Their achievements are of the first order of magnitude, and to them I extend my since congratulations.

The conservation program which made it possible for me to stand at this rostrum is something about which we feel very deeply. In our minds its significance lies not in its application to an immediate problem but in its meaning as an overall concept of business policy; a policy which can best be defined as good corporate citizenship.

Simply stated, this policy means that we have a responsibility to ourselves, our customers, our stockholders and the people of Oregon to provide something more than simple utility service. Developing our water resources for the fullest public good is but one element in the broad spectrum of activities which we have designed to meet that responsibility.

Certainly I do not presume to suggest that my company is ahead of the field in this corporate idea, but I will suggest that our industry is ahead of the field, and that we have a splendid opportunity to provide leadership to the American industrial community.

By all measures our industry is the Nation's largest. Through the mechanism of voluntary investment we have energized this country's climb to the highest point yet achieved by human beings. But that is not enough. Pressures of world growth have given us a new challenge, a challenge to the ability of our economic system to survive in the arena of world competition.

The basic theory of voluntary investment is being contested by the countries behind the Iron Curtain, and the free people of the European Economic Community are driving to beat us at our own game; free competition for the world market.

It seems basic to me that success in this conflict depends to no small degree on our ability to demonstrate to this country and to the world that the economics of a free society and the dynamic concept of a free market can provide—as no other system can—not only the material requirements for living but also the things which go to make living better.

By its example, our industry can create a keener awareness of this need to provide more than simply goods and services. We need to move beyond the area of technical excellence, which we have achieved, and into the field of active day-to-day fulfillment of our responsibility of citizenship.

The only basis on which this country can build its foundation for survival is that there is no interest greater than the public interest. That we have been selected to receive this industry's highest award for a policy which developed from that principle is the thing for which we are truly grateful.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader what the program for the balance of the week may be, and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's request, I am advised we have completed the legislative business for this week.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of June 10 is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

On Tuesday, the legislative branch appropriation bill will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday H.R. 4996, to amend certain provisions of the Area Development Act, under an open rule, with 3 hours' debate.

Thursday and the balance of the week, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963.

This is of course subject to the general reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all legislative business and other special orders previously entered into I may be permitted to address the House for 2 hours today.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 hours at the close of all business on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

IS CRASH RESEARCH TO IMPROVE COTTON PRODUCTION REALLY NEEDED?

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some tables.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has favorably reported H.R. 6196, a bill intended to cure the cotton headache. The bill would authorize, among other things, a so-called crash program of research aimed at reducing the cost of cotton production.

Cotton farmers have had the benefit of extensive research programs through the years, partly through general agricultural appropriations, and partly in the form of specific appropriations. In my opinion, the best and quickest way to cut cotton production costs is to remove the shackles of acreage controls and Government price fixing.

Just so no one will make the mistaken assumption that nothing has been done recently in cotton research, I invite your attention to this data supplied to me by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

You will note that the level of spending for specific direct research for the current year is estimated at $7,884,000, and the budget estimate for next year is $8,140,000, without the research money proposed in H.R. 6196.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the level of spending has risen without exception in each of the 5 fiscal years.

The research listed below is not all inclusive. It consists only of federally financed research which can easily be identified.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Estimated obligations for direct research on cotton, fiscal years 1960–64

[In thousands of dollars]

	1960	1961	1962	1963 estimate	1964 budget estimate
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE					
Production research:					
Crops: Production, breeding, quality, and disease investigations	1,149	1,229	1,311	1,401	1,493
Entomology: Entomological studies of cotton insects	[1] 1,940	1,254	1,489	1,558	1,652
Agricultural engineering: Mechanical harvesting of cotton; cotton ginning research and other engineering studies	748	875	902	944	937
Total, production research	3.837	3,358	3,702	3,903	4,082
Utilization research and development: Development of cotton products of higher quality and new processing machinery to achieve it; and new and improved uses for cotton products	2,459	2,923	2,992	3,914	4,003
Nutrition and consumer use: Clothing and housing; consumer use studies on cotton textiles	102	118	68	67	55
Total, cotton research	6,398	6,399	6,762	7,884	8,140

[1] Includes $1,100,000 provided foi nonrecurring construction of Boll Weevil Laboratory, State College ,Miss.

Increase provided for cotton research, fiscal years 1960–64

[In thousands of dollars]

	1960	1961	1962	1963 estimate	1964 budget estimate [1]
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE					
Program increases:					
For research on cotton mechanization and ginning at the Delta Experiment Station, Stoneville, Miss	+200	--------	--------	--------	--------
Strengthen cotton insect research at Baton Rouge, La. ($32,500); College Station, Tex. ($40,000); and Florence, S.C. ($165,000)	--------	+238	--------	--------	--------
Research on mechanical cotton stripper (Lubbock, Tex. $40,000) and gin stand research with long staple and upland cotton (Mesilla Park, N. Mex., $30,000)	--------	+70	--------	--------	--------
Research on cotton to develop new and improved textiles and processes	--------	+325	--------	--------	--------
Partial staffing and operating costs of new facilities provided in 1960 appropriation for research at State College, Miss. (cotton insects)	--------	--------	+395	--------	--------
For basic research to obtain new knowledge of the composition of farm products: Cotton at Southern Utilization	--------	--------	+100	--------	--------
For staffing and operating new farm research laboratory: Cotton Insects Laboratory, State College, Miss	--------	--------	--------	+85	--------
For an accelerated utilization research program on cotton	--------	--------	--------	+750	--------
Total, program increases	+200	+633	+495	+835	--------
Construction of facilities (nonrecurring): To construct laboratory facilities for research on cotton boll weevil at State College, Miss	+1,100	--------	--------	--------	--------

[1] The 1964 budget estimates now before Congress include a request for $190,000 for staffing Boll Weevil Research Laboratory, State College, Miss.

REMOVING DEPENDENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH UPON THE EXECUTIVE

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill designed to fill what I believe to be a very serious gap in the legislative process. It would remove the present dependence of the legislative branch upon the executive and occasional outside experts for technical advice and counsel.

For a long time, the executive branch has had a near monopoly of scientific talent in Government. Although the President, and the major departments and agencies have scientific staffs which they consult on the tremendous range of highly technical issues concerning the Government, Congress does not. Members of Congress, who are nearly always persons untrained in science, have to rely chiefly on scientists from the executive branch whose task is to defend their programs and seek the funds to run them.

It has become increasingly difficult for Congressmen to question programs sent down from the executive side. This is extremely serious when one considers that it is Congress that must decide whether to vote the money and, if so, how much. Right now, for example, we are weighing the question of whether to authorize billions and billions in the race to reach the moon. We should not have to be so dependent upon the executive for technical advice. This lack of independent scientific resources must be corrected if Congress is to fulfill its responsibilities as direct representatives of the people and is not to become, through lack of proper tools, a mere rubberstamp for the executive.

My bill would establish a permanent source of scientific talent solely responsible to Congress. It would be the duty of these scientists to advise Members and committees, at their request, on technical matters before them. Under the bill, the House and the Senate would each have a permanent staff of three scientists representing the fields of physics, biology, and chemistry.

As conditions warranted, these staffs would be authorized to name temporary scientific personnel to work on specific projects. The top three scientists would have to be under 55 years old to keep an emphasis on youth and creativity. They could serve no more than a total of 6 years, but the terms would be staggered to provide for continuity, as well as fresh outlooks.

The majority party would appoint two of the scientists in each House, designating one of them as director, and the minority party would name the other. Political affiliation of the appointees, however, is ruled out as a consideration. The directors of each staff would be paid $21,500 a year; the associate members would receive $20,000 a year and temporary personnel would be compensated by the day for the period they are employed.

I envision the science staffs as a vital liaison point between the executive and legislative branches, serving as a scientific information exchange between Congress, the executive agencies, and the scientific community at large. Through the science staffs, a Member of Congress would be able to learn what is being done in any field of interest to him whether it is space, insect pests, plant viruses, uses for coal, atomic energy, cancer research, or whatever. He would be able to obtain advice and suggestions on technical matters concerning his district or his committee work. Most important, the science staffs would keep an eye on science spending by the executive branch, seeking to hold down waste and duplication. They would evaluate programs and suggest new or different avenues of research.

There is no reason why scientific matters cannot be made comprehensible to a nonscientist. In the case of Congress, which yearly votes billions of dollars for science, it is essential.

NOW, A HOPE OF FARM SANITY

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the June 7 issue of Life magazine carries an editorial on the status of farm legislation which should be read and digested by all Members who have an interest in a strong, unregimented agricultural economy in this Nation.

The editorial calls attention to a new bill which would take us a long way toward rationality. Permit me to say that I have long supported the approach which is embodied in this bill and have introduced the same legislation myself. I am pleased to see that it has bipartisan support in the Senate. I feel certain that it will gain support in the House.

It is important that the Agriculture Commitees of the House and the Senate take a reading on the prevailing attitude in the farm community which is against regimentation even in the face of high price supports. Hearings should be held on this legislation right away so that wheat can be included in the program with the other feed grains and so that steps can be taken to retire enough land from production to achieve the satisfactory balance between production and consumption.

I commend this editorial from Life magazine to the attention of my colleagues:

> ### Now, a Hope of Farm Sanity
>
> Hurrah for the wheat farmers. When they slapped down Secretary Freeman and President Kennedy by rejecting straitjacket acreage controls, they struck a blow for liberty and reaffirmed individualism as an outstanding characteristic of American life. They also created an opportunity, the like of which we have not known since before World War II, to phase the Federal Government out of the individual's hair.
>
> So what now for the farmer? Absolutely nothing, the administration is saying so far. In effect, Kennedy and Freeman tell the farmers that they have made their bed and they must lie in it: that is, if they really do get $1-a-bushel wheat, they deserve it.
>
> But saner voices are also being heard. Four respected Senators—Vermont's AIKEN, Florida's HOLLAND, Iowa's HICKENLOOPER, and New Mexico's ANDERSON—last week introduced a bipartisan bill aimed at getting some basic crops back into the free marketplace. Their bill incorporates the principal recommendations of the Farm Bureau Federation. Although the details should be thoroughly debated, two elements in the bill would take us a long way toward rationality:
>
> The bill downgrades parity and endorses the principle of so-called rolling supports. These would be based, for wheat, on 3-year world price averages and for feed grains on 90 percent of domestic averages. The bill contains a backstop guarantee of 50 percent of parity, $1.25 a bushel in the case of wheat, if world averages drop below that. The backstop may be necessary now, but we ought eventually to get rid of that too.
>
> The bill attacks the heart of the problem by advocating massive retirement of U.S. cropland. This might run up to 80 million of the 450 million acres now under cultivation. In the past 30 years piecemeal attempts at soil banking largely failed because farmers naturally retired their poor land and grew more food than ever on the rest. Now it is proposed to take entire farms out of production under rental contracts, not just marginal land and scrub.
>
> Naturally this will cost some money. But even if it costs in excess of $1 billion a year, as a study by the Purdue University economist Carroll Bottum estimates, the expenditure would be accompanied by the eventual elimination of at least $4 billion now spent annually on export subsidies, storage costs and other handouts to the farmer.
>
> Congress should match the integrity the farmers showed when they told Kennedy and Freeman to take their $2 wheat and go jump in the lake. We are not going to solve this problem overnight. But no part of our house more needs putting in order, and we must consolidate the opportunity the wheat farmers have given us.

FOR A LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives during their hearings on foreign aid and urged the committee to incorporate in the bill their report on the provisions of my bill, H.R. 6679, to establish a Commission on Foreign Economic Development.

The Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of June 4, 1963, commented favorably on my proposal in an editorial which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

> FOR A LOOK AT FOREIGN AID
>
> Representative GEORGE MEADER, of the Michigan Second (Jackson) District, has a good idea in his suggestion for a permanent, bipartisan commission to study foreign aid and, as he puts it, "take up where the Clay Committee left off."
>
> If created by Congress—and the chances for it seem dubious—the Commission would make a continuing study of foreign aid and specific recommendations for programs and reforms to make the programs more effective.
>
> The Clay Committee did a good over-all job of surveying the foreign aid program and made some recommendations. It did not, however, do the type of job contemplated by Mr. MEADER.
>
> There is no question that the American public is becoming skeptical of—if not actually fed up with—the spending of its foreign aid dollars. It realizes that much of the money is wasted by the recipients and that heavy investments in areas such as Laos often produce no results.
>
> If effective foreign aid is to continue, the American public will have to be shown that the money is being properly spent. Otherwise it may force the Congress to rebel against the ladling out of their dollars.
>
> Representative MEADER speaks from experience when he recommends a continuing study by a bipartisan commission. As a member of congressional committees he has traveled around the world more times than we can count. He can and does give numerous specific examples of the good and the bad he has found in spending abroad. Talking with him provides a quick education on the subject.
>
> But Members of Congress haven't much time to spend studying this subject. They can take a quick look here and there and form broad conclusions. Beyond that they can do little.
>
> Administrative agencies concerned with spending foreign aid money sometimes seem more concerned with building up their own empires and moving the dollars than in cutting out waste.
>
> Thus the justification for a permanent commission, not directly concerned with spending foreign aid cash, becomes apparent.
>
> We hope Representative MEADER finally gets somewhere with this idea that he has been pushing for at least 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman MORGAN, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, called my attention to the fact that a witness appearing before the committee yesterday on behalf of the Americans for Democratic Action expressed that organization's views on foreign aid and urged the establishment of a study commission very much in line with my own recommendations. The two final paragraphs of the ADA's statement are as follows:

> In addition to approving H.R. 5490, we strongly urge the Congress to establish a commission composed of public and congressional members that will reexamine the purposes—successes and failures of foreign aid—from a point of departure that determines its effect on American political interests. Has foreign aid contributed to necessary economic change in the free world? Has it contributed to more efficient and equitable distribution of economic resources and benefits? Has it encouraged the establishment of better administration and better government in developing countries? What machinery can be instituted to more effectively utilize the international agencies and the other industrialized countries?
>
> We suggest that a comprehensive investigation by this commission will teach Americans further, and others, the necessary uses of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that there was no collusion between me and the Americans for Democratic Action in concurring in this proposal. In fact, I have had very little contact with the ADA. It is I think interesting, however, that an identical proposal should come from divergent political philosophies. It would seem to indicate that the idea is a meritorious one and should have universal acceptance from at least a wide band of the political spectrum.

JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURTS IN PENSION AND PAY CASES

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 6538, a bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Subsection (d) of title 28, United States Code, section 1346, provides that the district courts shall not have jurisdiction under section 1346 of any civil action or claim for a pension or any civil action or claim to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of officers or employees of the United States. The purpose of my bill is to repeal this subsection so that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the Court of Claims, of civil actions or claims for a pension or for salary of officers and employees of the United States. But for the subsection which this bill proposes to repeal, the district courts would have jurisdiction of these matters under title 28, United States Code, section 1346(a)(2), which generally authorizes district court jurisdiction of all claims against the United States, not exceeding $10,000, based upon either the Constitution, any act of Congress, any Executive regulation, or any contract with the United States.

This proposed repeal of a narrow limitation upon the jurisdiction of the district courts would not, of course, create any new liabilities or new causes of action against the U.S. Government; substantive law, in other words, is entirely unaffected. Nor would this bill, if enacted, change in any manner the present jurisdiction of the Court of Claims. As before, the Court of Claims would retain its exclusive jurisdiction of Tucker Act cases where the amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, regardless of the precise nature of the individual case. My bill is designed solely to permit the district courts around the country to share in the Court of Claims jurisdiction of pension and pay cases where the amount in controversy does not exceed $10,000.

The chief beneficiaries of the bill would be present and former Government employees and present and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States. Whereas under present law pension and pay cases brought by such persons may be filed only in the Court of Claims, my bill would permit them to bring suit in the district courts. Under the applicable venue statute now on the books, which is title 28, United States Code, section 1402(a), these suits could be brought in the judicial district where the plaintiff resides. This bill is, therefore, in line with modern venue policy in Government litigation, since it offers individual citizens the convenience of litigating against the United States in or near their place of residence. At the same time, no hardship is placed upon the United States as defendant, as under the present organization of the Department of Justice the Government is presumably equipped to defend equally and conveniently in any Federal judicial district.

In my view, this bill dovetails neatly with a measure enacted into law during the 87th Congress, and it is to be regretted that the provisions of this bill were not considered at that time. Public Law 748 of the 87th Congress added to the Judicial Code a new section 1361, which generally confers upon the district courts original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any of its agencies to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff. The principal purpose of this enactment was to rectify the peculiar situation where a person seeking to have a Federal court compel a Federal officer to perform an official duty had to channel his action into the District Court for the District of Columbia. This, in the words of our Committee on the Judiciary—Senate Report No. 1992, 87th Congress, pages 2–3—was certainly "an unfair imposition upon citizens who seek no more than lawful treatment from their Government."

This bill, by removing an artificial limitation on the jurisdiction of the district courts, would enable a wrongfully discharged Government employee to sue to get his job back and to recover his lost back pay all in a single court action so long as the pay claim did not exceed $10,000. And in my judgment, very few back-pay claims would exceed that jurisdictional amount. Because of the doctrine of laches, the plaintiff would be forced to bring suit in most cases before his back pay accrual reached $10,000. In rare cases, a high-salaried official might have accrued more than $10,000 and be forced to go into the Court of Claims, but this is his remedy under present law and my bill would not disturb this arrangement in the slightest.

The Court of Claims calendar today is extremely congested. In the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962, a total of 5,116 back-pay cases were pending in the Court of Claims at the beginning of the period; 832 additional such cases were instituted; 3,131 were disposed of; and, therefore, 2,817 were left pending at the end of the year. To be sure, many of these were class cases, involving identical claims, but still this segment of the Court of Claims workload is truly burdensome.

This bill would result in spreading much of this work around the country.

The sooner we eliminate from the Judicial Code jurisdictional provisions which no longer have a reason for being, the more we shall contribute to the speedy, effective, and just administration of causes in the Federal courts.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 10, following the legislative program, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may address the House for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 647

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced H.R. 647, to amend the National Defense Education Act to provide for college scholarships. The following is a statement I presented to the Special Subcommittee on Education in support of my bill:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 647 BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, JUNE 6, 1963

Madam Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of my bill, H.R. 647, to amend the National Defense Education Act to provide for college scholarships.

We all have been saturated with facts and figures which underscore the importance of higher education in the world today. We have heard and read eloquent statements on this vital national resource. Unfortunately these are not empty words. The serious warnings, the statistics which back them up, must no longer go unheeded.

I submit that favorable action on this legislation under consideration today is a moral obligation to the free world, our Nation, and to our younger generation. The increasing complexity of today's political, social, scientific and economic structure demand that we make maximum use of our available talent.

Since the founding of our country, our great statesmen have stressed the importance of education to the perpetuation of our democratic system and its goals.

George Washington said in 1790, "Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impressions so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours, it is probably essential." Almost 50 years later Abraham Lincoln remarked, "Upon the subject of education, not presuming to dictate any plan or system respecting it, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged in." A century later Franklin Delano Roosevelt voiced his views:

"Education must light the path for social change. The social and economic problems confronting us are growing in complexity. The more complex and difficult these problems become, the more essential it is to provide broad and complete education; that kind of education that will equip us as a nation to decide these problems for the best interest of all concerned. Our ultimate security, to a large extent, is based upon the individual's character, information, skill, and attitude."

If we are to uphold our principles, if we are going to develop our intellectual resources, if we are to erase the loss both in personal and national terms, higher education must be made more accessible to the capable but financially limited student.

Cost is a prime factor in deterring able students from attending college. Each year 60,000 to 100,000 youths of high ability graduating from secondary schools fail to go to college because of the lack of financial assistance. In addition about 60,000 college students leave college each year for this same reason. A definite relationship between socioeconomic status and failure to continue education exists. A 1954 study pointed out that among high school graduates with IQ's of 120 or above, about 40 percent of those from families having incomes of $4,500 or less did not plan to attend college.

Increasing college and university tuitions make the situation totally impossible for many. According to a survey by the American Council on Education, costs to the students have risen at both public and private institutions as much in the last 4 years as in the preceding 8 years or in the 20 years before that. Within the last decade university and college fees increased approximately 86 percent. The family income level has not risen at the same pace, of course.

There can be no doubt the financial barriers keep many out of college. A national program is necessary at this critical time to bridge the financial gap and eradicate the waste of our talented youth.

I would like to make a few remarks about my legislative proposal.

H.R. 647 would amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for a college scholarship program. Individual scholarships of $500 would be provided to students during each academic year for 4 years. An additional amount of up to $500 a year may be paid to those students in special financial need. Persons receiving scholarships would be selected by State commissions in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education a course leading to a bachelor's degree, giving special consideration to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language.

I believe this legislation, while not a panacea for the inducement to and assistance of all our able young people, will effectively increase educational opportuunity in keeping with our present national needs.

There has been some disagreement among those who favor a Federal scholarship program on who should administer the awards. I feel that it is most important that this be done by a State commission. There exists a shocking disparity among our States in the percentage of 18- to 21-year-olds who go to college. The range runs from 50 percent in some States all the way down to 18 percent in others. Administration by State commissions should result in a greater equalization of opportunity as well as the decentralization which is necessary in taking into account the diverse educational and economic patterns of our country.

Many critics argue that the National Defense Education Act loan program is as far as we should go in providing assistance to students for education. To go further reduces individual initiative. The truth is we must go beyond the successful National Defense Education Act program and that initiative is destroyed more by the impossible financial barriers which now exist rather than by a moderate program that would give those deprived by lack of funds the hope and means of obtaining a college education. Obviously, we would not be able to completely erase the financial problems of any needy students. However, we would bring down the economic barrier to the extent that higher education would not be out of the question for the financially limited able young person. Furthermore, to say that individual initiative is destroyed by such assistance is contradicted over and over again by the useful and active citizens for whom college education became a reality under the GI bill.

The National Defense Education Act loan program is adequate and indeed praiseworthy, in what it can and does accomplish. Yet, understandably, the financially disadvantaged student with little or no help from home is often unwilling to incur a long term debt by obtaining a loan to finance his college education. It is true that on-campus and off-campus employment offers a means of meeting college costs. But very often this type of employment is not available nor financially rewarding for the great number who seek it, and unfortunately, a heavy work schedule often makes it impossible for students to devote themselves wholeheartedly to their education.

There are some who would oppose Federal scholarship aid on the grounds of expense. This money would come from taxes and would not be repayable in dollars as are the loans. While this is true, I would like to point out that we are making a sound investment for the Nation and actually there will be a repayment in tax revenues through the increased earning capacity of these individuals. My question is not "How can we afford it" but "How can we not afford to give our young people the education they must have if our Nation's future is to be assured?"

Our society was founded to promote the general welfare of all the people and not just the people who could afford it. As our country has grown and prospered, as it has assumed a position of world leadership, as the complexity of our social, political, and economic systems increases, the concept of the general welfare broadens. In a complicated, scientific-technological age the skills and training required are necessarily greater than for an agricultural society. Higher education for the able is no longer a luxury for the few but a requisite for the general welfare of our country and its citizens.

Other countries such as France provide assistance for the education of their able youth. We as a nation dedicated to the principles of equality of opportunity should do no less. America must rely on the talents and brains of her youth. We do a great disservice to them and to our Nation in failing to expand educational opportunities.

This proposed plan of scholarships would insure that our vast intellectual reservoir will not go untapped. It would provide for a great national talent search. It will assist and supplement other sources of scholarship assistance. It will provide the encouragement, incentive, and funds for a significant number of students who otherwise might not go to college.

I respectfully urge favorable consideration of H.R. 647.

JUSTICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of allegations made in the past I am pleased to insert an article from Justice, which is published by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. This article and the stipulation which I also insert indicates that local 10 does not and has not engaged in discriminatory practices.

New York Body Drops Anti-ILG Case—After 2-Year Delay Finds Local 10 Not Guilty of Job Discrimination

Approximately 200 Spanish-speaking and Negro members of Cutters' Local 10 crowded the hearing room of the New York State Commission for Human Rights on the morning of May 15 ready to testify in behalf of their union, which had been denied until that morning the opportunity to refute in public the charge of racial discrimination.

Within 3 days, by May 17, the case against the ILGWU local had been so thoroughly punctured as to force the man who made the initial charge—Ernest Holmes—and the men who pressed it—the lawyers for the commission—to plead for a settlement.

The case that began on April 4, 1961, was terminated by a joint stipulation made by Holmes, the commission, and local 10. In it, the charges against the ILGWU affiliate were dropped and full acknowledgment was made that Holmes was denied membership in local 10 because he was not a cutter—and not because of his race or color.

The case crumbled under the withering cross-examination of Holmes by union attorney, Emil Schlesinger. Throughout the 3 days, local 10 manager, Moe Falikman, and assistant manager, Abe Dolgen, sat at the counsel table with Schlesinger, consulting frequently on the developing argument.

The hearing was conducted before three commissioners: J. Edward Conway who presided, Francis X. Giaccone, and Lloyd L. Hurst. The commission consists of seven commissioners, three of whom conduct a hearing. At the start of a case, when a complaint has been filed, the commission names one of its own seven as investigating commissioner. In the Holmes case Ruperto Ruiz was so named and conducted the investigations of the ILGWU affiliate.

While the ILGWU local was represented by one attorney, the commission side, acting in behalf of Holmes, was made up of a corps of half a dozen lawyers. On several occasions resumption of the hearings was delayed as attorneys for the parties met in conference. The ILGWU took the position that only complete exoneration could provide the basis of a stipulation ending the proceedings.

The commission's attorneys finally agreed to this condition while Holmes, the first and only witness, was still under cross-examination. They called a halt before questioning by Schlesinger was completed and before the union had had a chance to put on the stand Manager Falikman, other officers or any of the 200 members who had rallied at the hearing on its opening day and were afterwards told that they might be called at any time in the future.

Full Text of Joint Stipulation Ending Anti-ILGWU Case

Whereas complainant on April 4, 1961, filed a complaint against the Union, charging it with discrimination against him because of his race; and

Whereas on June 28, 1961, Commissioner Ruperto Ruiz issued a determination of probable cause which the undersigned concedes does not constitute a final determination of guilt; and

Whereas complainant on March 29, 1963, amended his complaint and in addition to charging the union with discrimination against him because of his race also charged the union with maintaining a policy of limiting the number of Negroes admitted to membership therein; and

Whereas the union duly filed its answer April 10, 1963, to the amended complaint, in which it categorically denied that it ever discriminated against the complainant because of his race, and further categorically denied that it maintained or maintains a policy limiting the number of Negroes to be admitted to membership in the union; and

Whereas on March 29, 1963, a public hearing before three commissioners of the State commission for human rights was ordered for May 15, 1963; and

Whereas the public hearing has proceeded since May 15, 1963, during which time only one witness, the complainant, has been heard but not fully cross-examined; and

Whereas the commission's general counsel has indicated that the commission intends to call at least 3 other witnesses in support of the complaint, and the union by affidavit hereto attached has represented that as of early May 1963 there were more than 250 Negroes and Spanish-speaking cutters who are members in good standing of local 10, and counsel for the union has indicated that he intends to call practically all of these Negro and Puerto Rican members of local 10 to refute and negate the charges that the union maintained and still maintains a policy of limiting their number for admission into the union and some additional 20 witnesses to refute and negate the charges that the union discriminated against complainant in his employment or membership in the union because of his race, most of which witnesses appeared in the hearing room during the first day of the hearing; and

Whereas the undersigned agree that no inference shall be drawn in this case from the number of Negro and Puerto Rican members of the union as compared with the total membership of the union as set forth in the attached affidavit, that there is any practice, policy, or rule of the union to limit the number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans who may be admitted to membership in the union; and

Whereas the results which the undersigned believe the commission desires to achieve through these proceedings are the elimination and prevention of discrimination, if such should exist, and an equal opportunity for the complainant on the same basis as the union extends to all others to learn the cutter's trade and gain admission to membership in the union as and when he becomes a qualified cutter and becomes eligible for membership in the union; and

Whereas the complainant has heretofore on February 7, 1963, voluntarily expressed his desire in writing to withdraw the complaint which he filed herein, and in his letter of withdrawal stated that when he appeared on or about January 21, 1963, at the union office for its aid and help it was offered to him but that he declined the same because he had other and more remunerative employment; and

Whereas the complainant has since lost such other employment and desires to accept whatever assistance that union may be able to afford him:

Now, therefore, the union agrees, in line with its oft-asserted regular and general policy as adopted by conventions of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union from its very inception against discrimination of any person because of his race, creed, color, or national origin, that it will, on the same basis as it applies to all other applicants for admission to membership, exercise its good offices in assisting the complainant to become a qualified cutter and to gain admission to membership in the union as and when he becomes a qualified cutter and becomes eligible for membership in the union.

AN EXAMPLE OF INDIA'S NEUTRALISM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article in the Indian Express published in Bombay, India. It certainly raises some interesting questions about the sincerity of India's professions of neutralism.

The article follows:

An Example of India's Neutralism

It is painfully clear to most educated Indians that Mr. Nehru's foreign policy is not as successful as they would have wished, and nowhere has its irrational feature been revealed so clearly than in India's attitude toward Israel. India's refusal to normalize her political relations with Israel cannot be justified on any account.

Mr. Nehru has said times without number that India's policy is "friendship with all and enmity toward none." How then does he explain his policy toward Israel? When the United Nations Palestine Commission considered the question of the partition of Palestine into Israel and Arab States, Mr. Nehru instructed his representatives on the Commission to vote against the proposal. Nevertheless, the Commission in its collective wisdom, by a majority vote decided to recommend the creation of Israel.

Even after that Mr. Nehru could have asked his representatives to vote for the resolution when it went to the General Assembly. But he did not; instead he again instructed his nominees to vote against the resolution. How then can he justify his statement that his policy is friendship with all? On the contrary it clearly suggests that he has been from the very beginning hostile to the creation of Israel.

GREAT CHAMPION

Mr. Nehru is a great champion of democracy. As such, one would have expected him to accept the majority decision and abide by it. But he did not do so. Mr. Nehru is a stanch supporter of the United Nations and Israel, as everybody knows, was established in accordance with the U.N. resolution. If he is true to his principle, he should have accepted the U.N. decision. If he himself does not accept a U.N. decision, how can he blame other countries for disobeying the U.N.? At least we know that some nations disobeyed the U.N. only when its decisions went against their vital interests. But what does India lose by having diplomatic relations with Israel?

One of the reasons why India has not diplomatically recognized Israel, we are told, is that Muslim countries are hostile to Israel and therefore if India recognized Israel, they will turn hostile to India. This argument is fallacious. India has in the course of time accorded Israel de facto recognition. The Arab nations have not protested to India; nor have they turned hostile to India.

Supposing it is true that the Arab nations will turn hostile to India if she accords Israel diplomatic recognition, does it not follow that India's "independent and impartial" foreign policy is not what it is claimed to be? Is India's foreign policy dictated by the Arab countries? Mr. Nehru will not admit it, but that is what it amounts to.

Mr. Nehru said in Parliament last year—when Mr. H. V. Kamath raised the question—that it was not in India's interest to have diplomatic relations with Israel. What he in fact implied was that if he opened a diplomatic office in Jerusalem and gave reciprocal facilities in New Delhi to Israel, the Arab countries would criticize Mr. Nehru for being friendly with the enemy. If the Arabs are fighting with somebody, it is their business. What has India's policy got to do with it? Further, does it not follow that a great country like India has allowed herself to be held at ransom by the Arab nations in their dispute with Israel?

NEGATIVE POLICY

Mr. Nehru has often said that he was not afraid of any country; and his policy was not based on the fear of anybody. If so, how does he explain his policy towards Israel which is based on nothing but fear of the Arab countries? What can one say of a policy which is so negative in content and purpose?

Mr. Nehru has often preached to the Western countries particularly to the United States that they should not shut their eyes to this reality of the existence of Communist China. Why then is he blind to the reality of the existence of Israel? Further, why is it that he does not give the same advice to President Nasser and company who still entertain the ambition of destroying Israel and throwing the Jews in the Mediterranean? Why this double standard in India's foreign policy?

President Nasser is a cosignatory with Mr. Nehru and Mr. Chou En-lai to (the now much discredited) Nehru's five commandments (Panch Shil) the most important of which is respect for the territorial integrity of other nations. Is not President Nasser's goal of the destruction of Israel a serious violation of the U.N. Charter and of the Nehru doctrine of coexistence?

When China attacked India, Mr. Nehru wrote to Mr. Ben-Gurion also seeking support and sympathy for India. Aggression is aggression, if it is Communist China's or President Nasser's. Why was Mr. Nehru silent when the Arabs attacked the tiny State of Israel soon after the U.N. passed the resolution creating that State? Why was he again vocal when Israel in self-defense tried to scotch Egypt's plan to invade Israel by striking first?

The former Indian Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, Mr. B. F. H. B. Tyabji, is reported to have said after a tour of the Middle East that one of the reasons why India has not exchanged Ambassadors with Israel is that Israel is in occupation of a small area that was not given to her by the U.N. But who is responsible for it? Who asked the Arabs to invade the tiny State of Israel? The original aggression was started by the Arabs with a view to wiping out the new State. Less than 600,000 inhabitants were attacked by well-organized States with a population of more than 45 million from all sides. The fact that the Jewish people not only fought but forced their enemies to sue for peace is one of the greatest heroic deeds in world history. The Arabs agreed to the cease-fire because, if they had continued their fight, they would have been humiliated further and would have lost more territory.

FLIMSY EXCUSES

In any case is it not a strange practice of morality that Egypt and the other Arab countries which first invaded Israel are not only recognized and patronized by Mr. Nehru, while the victim of that aggression has been blamed by him for repulsing that aggression? Is it not strange that India should make flimsy excuses for not according diplomatic recognition to Israel?

Assuming that Israel has occupied a little area of the aggressors, is it a valid reason for India to refuse the friendship of Israel? Has not Pakistan occupied one-third of Kashmir which is Indian territory and China large chunks of Ladakh and the North-East Frontier Agency? Why did not Mr. Nehru break diplomatic relations with both? What can one say of a policy which says that because somebody has occupied somebody else's territory, India will not have diplomatic relations with that somebody, but when its own territory has been occupied it had no inhibition in flirting with the aggressors?

No country has a greater vital economic and strategic interest in the Middle East than the United Kingdom, but it is not afraid to have diplomatic relations with Israel. President Nasser and Arab colleagues could do nothing to prevent other powers from having normal political relations with Israel. Today President Nasser is being wooed by Russia but it was the same Russia which gave steadfast support to Mr. Trygve Lie and the U.N. to implement the partition of Palestine.

President Nasser could not blackmail Russia. Further, oil-rich countries have given concessions to the United Kingdom and the United States of America. They have not withdrawn from them because of their friendship with Israel. Even a Muslim country like Turkey and smaller nations like Nepal and Burma, are more courageous and have diplomatic relations with Israel.

All this clearly shows that the Indian fear is either imaginary or that India is deliberately using this imaginary fear as an excuse for not having diplomatic relations with Israel.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the close of the legislative business on Wednesday, June 19, to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

UNITED STATES MAKES DEAL WITH COMMUNIST CUBA PERMITTING U.S. OVERFLIGHT OF CUBAN PLANES FOR CUBA OVERFLIGHT BY U.S. PLANES

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious now that the State Department made a new deal with the Communists in Cuba that permits U.S. airplanes to overfly Cuba, by withdrawing the previous prohibition of such overflights, in obvious exchange for allowing Cuban aircraft to overfly the United States.

This makes it obvious that the New Frontier policy is resulting in drifting closer and closer to coexistence with communism in Cuba. We are coming closer and closer to giving in on another of Castro's five demands—one of which has already been conceded dealing with preventing exile Cuban raids on Cuba. The second demand was for gradual renewal of commercial relations. Gradually, the American people are being brainwashed into thinking that carrying on some negotiations with Castro—vis-a-vis—the prisoner exchange indemnity deal—permitting a little commerce to overfly each other's countries—giving in to one of Castro's demands—is not so bad because afterall there are many other things we are not doing for the Communists in Cuba. The logical long-range result of chipping away at our professed policy of an economic and political quarantine of Cuba is that eventually we will be coexisting with Communists in this hemisphere. We cannot permit this to happen and that is why calling public attention to each move in that direction I believe is essential.

Two weeks ago I revealed that the FAA is permitting Cuban planes to overfly the United States. I also demanded that this practice be halted.

But, instead of banning these overflights, the New Frontier has worked out a swap with Castro which permits U.S. commercial airplanes to fly over Cuba in exchange for Cuban planes flying over the United States.

It is obvious that the United States is negotiating with Castro and has worked out this deal with his government. Otherwise, how could the administration know such U.S. planes would not be subject to hijacking or attack?

How can we possibly expect other nations to isolate this dictator when in this instance the United States is working with him on a business-as-usual basis. It is becoming more and more obvious that we do not mean what we say when we ask other nations to quarantine Castro and that we do not intend to do so ourselves.

I renew my demand to the State Department that we ban Cuban planes from flying over the United States and that a complete economic and political quarantine of Cuba be our policy.

I also call upon the administration to level with the American people as to what deals are being made with Castro and who the U.S. Ambassador to Cuba without portfolio is.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 hour on Monday next following the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY REGARDING SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this 1 minute to direct a parliamentary inquiry. In view of the fact that one Member of this Congress has taken it upon himself to exercise his rights in objecting to special orders, I would like to inquire whether I am correct in assuming that a Member may introduce a resolution to address the House and let it go through the normal procedures similar to those for any other resolution which does not require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House the gentleman is permitted to introduce any type of resolution at any time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Aspinall, for Thursday, June 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Clausen (at the request of Mr. Arends), for Wednesday and the balance of this week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Horan, his remarks in Committee of the Whole on the agriculture appropriation bill, and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

Mr. Wright and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Michel to include in his remarks in Committee of the Whole extraneous matter including tables and letters.

Mr. Nelsen (at the request of Mr. Nygaard) to follow the remarks of Mr. Hoeven and to include an article.

Mr. McClory, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Osmers.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Nygaard) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Rumsfeld.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Carey.

Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Clark.

Mr. Stratton in two instances.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

901. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting two violations of subsection (h), pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665 (i)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

902. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

903. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

904. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 8), as amended (50 U.S.C., App. sec. 1213(a) and sec. 1213(b)) to extend the provisions of that act to the Federal Aviation Agency"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

905. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

906. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

907. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $46,900,000 for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 6012. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6196. A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 969. An act to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1036. An act to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6868. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6844. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6845. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide judicial review of agency orders concerning biological products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6846. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, and of amphetamine and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6847. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 6848. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain products, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6849. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6850. A bill to prescribe the time for elections of Senators and Representatives in Congress and for choosing the electors of President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6851. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that enlisted members who are retired from the Armed Forces shall be entitled to 10 percent extra retired pay for extraordinary heroism in line of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 6852. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 in order to require hearings with respect to loans for generating plants and electric transmission lines and systems and to change the rate of interest payable on such loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SISK:

H.R. 6853. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6854. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the Federal share payable to certain States on account of Interstate System projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 6855. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 6856. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6857. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6858. A bill to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6859. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the deportation provisions thereof inapplicable to any alien admitted for permanent residence prior to his 14th birthday or to any alien who has continuously resided in the United States for 10 years immediately following his admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6860. A bill to amend section 5(a) chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, for the purpose of assisting States in the cost of construction, modernization, additions and improvements of buildings of State soldiers' homes by providing grants to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6861. A bill to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of $2.50 per diem for each veteran of any war cared for in a State home who requires intermediate hospital or nursing home care in homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6862. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the customs service, and of customs employees killed in enforcing the customs laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6863. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6864. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6865. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 6866. A bill to increase the effectiveness of the Congress in carrying out its functions by establishing a science advisory staff in the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6867. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to payment of Philippine pensioners; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 6868. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 6869. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6870. A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6871. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed if such home has been held for at least 10 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 6872. A bill to continue for the 1964 and 1965 crops of wheat the program in effect for the 1963 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 6873. A bill to permit the Government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6874. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed if such home has been held for at least 10 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 6875. A bill to repeal sections 332 and 333 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 462. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the proposed World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 393. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ two additional employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 6876. A bill for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6877. A bill for the relief of Sophie Yancopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Delores A. Lake and her minor grandson, Oliver Lake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By. Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6879. A bill for the relief of Shelomo Hendel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 6880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 6881. A bill for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 6882. A bill for the relief of the Maloney Brothers Nursery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 6883. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6884. A bill for the relief of Maurice F. Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6885. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nihal Fatma Sarac Reingard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscila Padin Kilgour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6887. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gungor Hikmet Demirezer Spillar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6888. A bill for the relief of Donald and Dee Tjiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 6889. A bill for the relief of Eng Ton Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Inspiration of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Thursday last I had the privilege of giving the Memorial Day address at Victor, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE INSPIRATION OF MEMORIAL DAY

(An address by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia)

"There is a remembrance of the dead, to which we turn even for the charms of the living. This we would not exchange for the song of pleasure, or the burst of revelry."

These words of the American poet, Washington Irving, properly reflect the attitude of our entire Nation on Memorial Day, a day on which we honor our war dead. In the stillness of the spring morning we deliberately turn our thoughts back to our fallen heroes. We relive the anguish of their passing from us, and we know once more the pride of kinship with great men and women.

For all those we honor today were great, in spirit as well as in deed, and we draw close to them once again in order to remind ourselves of the greatness of spirit of our Nation. This is our Memorial Day, a tradition nearly a hundred years old in these United States.

To look back for the origin of Memorial Day is like seeking the source of a mighty river, fed by countless tributaries and rivulets. Many are the States and many are the towns which claim the honor of establishing the custom we are observing today. Of course, the practice of honoring the war dead annually has been carried out, in one form or another, throughout history. But our own custom is unique in that it had its inception in the aftermath of a bloody civil war that all but tore our Nation asunder.

Memorial Day had its beginning in a number of southern towns where groups of women took it upon themselves to keep green the memory of their fallen loved ones by putting flowers on the Confederate soldiers' graves, once the cannons of war were stilled. The women of Columbus, Miss., displayed a generosity of heart by decorating the Union dead as well. This act is said to have inspired the New York State lawyer, Francis Miles Finch, to write his famous poem, "The Blue and the Gray."

Published in the Atlantic Monthly in September 1867, the poem was an immediate popular success, and the sentiment it stirred up across the Nation moved Gen. John A. Logan, first commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, to issue a general order providing for nationwide observance of Decoration Day, as it was originally called, on May 30, 1868. This date was chosen, not as a significant anniversary, but in order that, all over the country, there might be flowers in bloom that could be used in decorating the graves.

So, from this modest beginning, from this spontaneous gathering in a humble churchyard, on the part of a few neighborhood mothers and wives, began our Memorial Day. I wonder if those good folk could possibly have imagined how many times in the future their sons and their sons' sons would hear the roar of cannon again, and know the anguish of battle, the hot grip of pain, the cold hand of death.

Could they foresee San Juan Hill, or Manila Bay? Could they envision the savage battles on the Marne, the shell-rocked forests of Argonne? Could they comprehend Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, Okinawa? Did they, in their imagination, strew flowers on the frosty hillsides of Pusan and Inchon?

Or did they, like most people, imagine that their war would be the last great war, that they and their loved ones had earned peace on earth for all time, for all humanity?

Sadly enough, that is a dream that is still unrealized. For us the cannons have roared loud and often in our lifetime, and they are roaring still, in the jungles of Vietnam today. For us there is yet no peace, nor can there be peace, while the cause of freedom is still unwon.

Let not man say, because the war goes on, that these our heroes of the past died in vain, that theirs was a lost cause. For every flag that marks a soldier's grave is a signpost in the path that leads to human liberty. Let us not grieve that the final peace has not yet been won; let us rejoice, rather, for the opportunity that is ours to bring it about.

Our men in uniform stand at the ready at a hundred outposts halfway around the world; for them there is no peace. In the frozen wastes of the Arctic, in the depths of the sea, in the eerie loneliness of outer space, in foreign lands and in unfriendly climes, our men in uniform are never out of earshot of that final bugle call that may bring them to sacrifice.

However much we grieve for them, and regret the sacrifices they may be called upon to make in defense of their country and its cause, let us be of good cheer.

Happiness is not in length of years, nor in ease of days, but is best found in the service of one's fellowmen. In such service, these men and women we honor here today found their fulfillment.

Philosophers of all time tell us that the greatness of a man is measured, not by his wealth or lands or servants, but by the esteem of his countrymen. Surely we agree. A man who has given nothing of his life to his country, to his city or community, has not lived at all, in the meaningful sense of the word. A man who has perished in the service of his nation, whether in battle with armed foes, or while fighting crime, disease, poverty, ignorance, or any other social enemy, is to be admired and envied, rather than pitied: for such a man has truly lived, and lived well. Those who shrink from the performance of public duty are mere onlookers of life, pale spectators whose character has never been forged in the heat of noble endeavor.

Few of us are perfectly noble human beings. We have our little weaknesses, our self indulgences, our moments of fear and doubt. The virtue that is in us may never come to light, except in such moments when our Nation or our national ideals are challenged and we are called upon to give our all for the cause we believe in.

It has been said that great crises make great men. I do not know whether this is true, but I do believe that when we are absorbed by a cause greater than our own personal ambitions, when the good of others becomes paramount to our own desires, then pettiness and vanity are stripped away from our character and we live in the soul. Look at the honor roll of those who hold the Medal of Honor, our highest decoration. You will find that they were simple, ordinary men, undistinguished from their neighbors, until that momentous day when the crisis of battle caused them to soar to heroic heights of valor.

It is by surmounting crises that we have become a great people, invigorated by the struggle and buoyed by a common hope.

What is our common hope? There was a time when this Nation fought a war in the hope that it would make the world safe for democracy. I know there are some who might sneer at this sentiment, particularly in the light of subsequent events. But I hold that it is a noble thought, and one which animated the bravest hearts in our land: some of these we honor here today.

More recently we fought a war to preserve our freedom, to protect our land from invasion. Millions of brave hearts sprang to the defense of our Nation: and some of these we honor here today.

Still more recently we engaged in a war to protect freedom from being trampled underfoot thousands of miles from our shores, honoring our pledged word, our sacred bond. Some of the brave hearts who sleep today gave their lives in that struggle.

And some of us may ask, why? What have we to do with freedom in Asia, with the jungles of Vietnam, with the walled city of Berlin? The answer to that question is that, freedom being our common hope and desire, the loss of freedom anywhere in the world is our own, our personal loss. No man lives on an island in this day and age. For we have come to live in a shrinking world, where tyranny is no longer insulated by time and space. Fifty years ago, the Czar of Russia was nothing to us, for the crack of his whip and the whine of his bullets could not be heard across a continent and an ocean. But the modern czar of the Russians has his missiles of death trained on our shores, and his dogma of domination aimed at our banners. Every friendly nation that is swallowed up by the foe, every inch of land that it trampled under his iron heel diminishes our bastion of freedom; we have drawn the battle line and we must not retreat. At any moment we may be called upon once again to defend ourselves, our land, our ideals, our beliefs and our heritage of freedom, with all of our strength and courage. On this hallowed soil, remembering our dead, our glorious past, we pledge ourselves to the future.

In the frightening shadow of the atomic bomb; under the threat of a rain of death by inconceivably fiendish devices of war; amidst the hail of propaganda that menaces us daily, we the living are animated by the general hope that human reason will prevail over unreason, that love of our fellow men will prevail over hatred and envy, that free hearts will win over enslaved and soulless men.

This is our hope, and our challenge. We take our example from the men and women whose graves we decorate today. These flowers we strew over them are a symbol of that eternal hope in the human breast: that men can, and will, triumph over adversity.

Our presence here is a pledge that their efforts will not be forgotten, that their courage and determination live on, that their virtues will blossom again in us, in our sons and daughters, and that we will never abandon the fight for peace on earth and freedom among nations.

On this Memorial Day of 1963 we find our country faced with the seemingly impossible task of defending freedom on a cold war battlefront that encircles the globe. If we stop to ask ourselves, How can we do it? Where shall we find the strength, the vigor to maintain our farflung and beleagured outposts?—we have only to cast our eyes and our thoughts on those fallen heroes we honor with this ceremony. For our strength is not merely our own, but the collective and accumulated strength of every American soldier who lived and fought before us, and bequeathed us his unsullied standard.

If in time of peril each of us feels in his arms the strength of 10, that strength issues from the shadowy file of patriots who paraded into battle before us, 10, 20, 50—a hundred years ago and more. Time may dim the memory of their individual faces, but the glory of their deeds will ever brighten our lives and make resolute our purpose.

A thing of beauty, said the poet, is a joy forever. But where in nature or in art will you find a thing of beauty to compare with the act of supreme courage and self-sacrifice that laid these, our honored dead, in the dust at our feet? An act of duty is all they did, but who has ever done more?

Pope John XXIII: Man of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the 6th of June is remembered in history as the day when thousands of Allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy. Today, the 6th of June 1963, is a sad occasion for the world; John XXIII, the Pope of peace, will be laid to rest in the Basilica of St. Peter's. A day, remembered for an act of war, is now marked by the interment of a man of peace.

Guiseppe Angelo Roncalli was born in the small village of Sotte Il Monte in the midst of what he characterized as "serene poverty" and rose to become the "fisher of men," in the full significance of that ancient phrase.

On October 28, 1958, he appeared on the central balcony of St. Peter's Basilica, the new pope, assuming the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church under the name of John. The throng in the huge square of St. Peter's saluted the new pontiff, unaware that this kindly man, called John the good, would emerge as the "Man of the Century."

From the beginning of his reign, Pope John made innovations which energized the church in its mission of salvation. With the gentility of a benevolent prince and the loving heart of a kindly peasant, the Pope looked to other religious leaders of the world and extended a brotherly arm "Ut Unum Sint."

Pope John's greatness became apparent through three events—the calling of the Ecumenical Council and the Encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris." The spirit of brotherhood permeated his encyclicals, stressing the social nature of man and his dignity as an individual to be loved and saved regardless of station.

On another June 6th, in 1940, Pope John warned the world, "Everything serves to demonstrate that in the sense of true world peace there will be the gospel or we will return to bloodshed." Today, those words bear repeating as war continues to threaten mankind with annihilation.

As we recall the beaches of Normandy, long emptied to those infantrymen who gave their lives for freedom, we look to the chair of Peter, now emptied of that great heart which beat with love for all mankind. The holy father was truly, the spiritual father of all humanity. As his children, as he is laid to rest, it remains for us to work in his image and with his spirit—"Ut Unum Sint"—so we may be remembered as men of this century.

Invasion of Normandy Beaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago to the day Allied forces charged ashore on the beaches of Normandy to open the final, bloody act of World War II in Europe.

The decision to launch this massive assault upon Adolph Hitler's "Festung Europe" will go down in history as one of the keys to victory in Europe. The decision, of course, was made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in Europe.

It was not an easy decision. It involved one of history's great risks. For if the invasion failed because of any one of a number of factors—weather, tides, supply difficulties—the war could have been indefinitely extended.

The risks were enormous. Even if success were guaranteed the loss of life and equipment would be staggering. All of these things were among those which had to be considered by General Eisenhower before he could make his decision whether or not to move on occupied France on June 6, 1944.

General Eisenhower faced his problem honestly and met it squarely, fully cognizant of the fact of what failure might mean to his Nation, his men, and to himself.

Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered how the war in Europe would have turned out if the decision to invade on June 6 had been left to the men who today comprise the advisers of the President of the United States. Would the same decisiveness displayed by General Eisenhower have obtained? Would the invasion have taken place at all?

Mr. Speaker, I have given this matter much thought. By applying the reasoning that seems current today in the development of our strategy in the cold war I believe I have found the answers to these questions.

First of all, had the Rostows and the Bundy's and the Schlesingers been responsible for the prosecution of the war in June 1944, the American people would undoubtedly have been told that the German occupation of France offered no threats to the security of the free world. It would have been pointed out that the German forces in occupied France were mainly technicians; that they were being gradually withdrawn—although not in numbers adequate to satisfy our "hopes"; and that they were armed only with "defensive weapons." We would hear that after all, the enemy was still over 30 miles away.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, our State Department officials would be speaking knowledgeably of the great victories the free world could anticipate as the result of the split or rift between Nazi Germany and Italy. This rift, we would have been told, offered our best long-range hope for victory, or rather, for reaching a lasting accommodation with the Axis Powers.

Another line which would be fed to us on the homefront would have been that an invasion of occupied France would only have served to exacerbate the tensions between the United States and the Nazis and could conceivably lead to an escalation into some horrible all-out war. We would have been told that every effort would be made to reach an accommodation through negotiation and that the administration would wait and see what happened, all the while hoping for the best. Finally, it would have been said that Hitler, having achieved so much of what he sought, was now mellowing.

Since all of this kind of talk coming from the officials of the United States would have caused grave doubts about the sincerity of our desire to win the war in Europe among our allies we could have expected General de Gaulle and his Free French forces to have taken matters into their own hands and to have launched surprise exile raids against the coast of occupied France. And I believe that it would not be too much of a stretch of imagination to speculate that the United States would then have imposed a quarantine against such exile raids.

As a result of all of this our allies would have been so disturbed that the alliance would have fallen into a state of disarray. This in turn would have caused us to seek to heal this disarray by offering our allies sort of a limited partnership in a joint military force which, of course, would have remained under our exclusive control lest some rightwing extremist like Winston Churchill among our allies take it into their heads to invade Europe.

At home, a campaign against those extremists who would have the United State invade Europe would have been launched and the administration would have branded the thinking which led to such opinions as unsophisticated.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, June 6 would have come and gone. As a matter of fact, I think it would be fair to say that World War II would still be going on today, except that the argument over the invasion of France would have by now become the argument over whether or not we should do anything to evict the Nazis from New York since it was a well-known fact that they were armed only with defensive weapons.

When I awake from this sort of nightmarish speculation, Mr. Speaker, I fervently thank God that it was Dwight D. Eisenhower who commanded our forces in June 1944 and not the faculty that today directs our destinies. And I whisper to myself in the most impassioned manner, "Oh, how I miss Ike."

Results of 1963 National Issues Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last month, I mailed my 1963 National Issues Poll to many of the residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. The results have now been tabulated. In addition to sending a copy to the President of the United States, so that he will have the benefit of knowing the views of the residents of this great congressional district, I am placing the following tabulation in the RECORD for the interest of the Members of Congress:

RESULTS OF 1963 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

To Residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois:

It is a pleasure to send you the results of the 1963 National Issues Poll. Your cooperation and that of the over 19,000 residents of the 13th Congressional District who gave the time and thought necessary to complete the questionnaire is deeply appreciated. I regret that it has not been possible to acknowledge each questionnaire and the many accompanying comments individually so that you might have my personal word of thanks.

To have effective representative government, I believe that those who are represented must be interested, informed, and vocal. Through the years this has been the trademark of the 13th district. Toward this end, a questionnaire is well worth the time, effort, and money, if it is informative, stimulates discussion and thought, and points up areas where a lack of information possibly exists, and, equally important, encourages comments and individual communications from residents of the district.

I feel strongly that a questionnaire of this type must be objective to accomplish its several purposes. Because of this conviction, I took great care in phrasing the questions in the hope of eliminating any tendency to slant or lead responses. From your comments, it would seem that I was, for the most part, successful.

The response to this questionnaire has indicated to me that it has accomplished its purpose. While the responsibility for my vote, in the final analysis must and should remain my own, I hope and trust that you will continue to write as the Congress proceeds through this session and that you will call upon me if I can be of assistance in my capacity as the link between you and your Federal Government in Washington, D.C. By so doing, you will assist me in providing the kind of representation that the 13th district wants and merits.

With my best regards.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Member of Congress.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The President has submitted a $99,000,000,000 budget for fiscal year 1964 providing for a planned deficit of $11,900,000,000. Should Congress—			
(a) Approve the budget as submitted, accepting the deficit?	6.8	84.2	9.0
(b) Cut the budget, leaving a smaller deficit?	42.8	49.5	7.7
(c) Balance the budget?	58.9	31.6	9.5
2. If the Federal budget is cut, it should be done in the area of—			
(a) Defense, military, and space expenditures?	28.5	41.4	30.1
(b) Foreign aid?	81.0	8.2	10.8
(c) Agriculture?	72.4	9.4	17.2
(d) All new domestic spending proposals such as mass transportation, medicare, Domestic Peace Corps, mental health, etc.?	66.6	18.3	15.1
3. Should Congress enact a tax cut this year—			
(q) Regardless of the size of the deficit it may create?	12.6	76.5	10.9
(b) Only if a relatively small deficit will result?	33.6	55.2	11.2
(c) Only if the budget is balanced?	52.8	37.1	10.1
4. With respect to tax reform, do you favor limiting deductions—			
(a) For the total of such items as State and local taxes, mortgage interest, and charitable contributions to the portion over 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	12.9	67.8	19.3
(b) To only that portion of medical and drug expenses over 4 percent of adjusted gross income?	19.7	52.1	28.2
(c) For medical expenses for persons over 65 and eliminating the 1 percent of adjusted gross income limitation for drug expense deductions?	23.9	49.0	27.1
5. Should the Federal Government continue present agricultural programs (1964 cost $6,400,000,000 against 1963 cost of$5,500,000,000)?	7.2	83.3	9.5
6. With respect to Federal aid to education, do you favor—			
(a) Scholarships for higher education?	50.5	37.7	11.8
(b) Aid for construction of public primary and secondary schools?	31.2	54.8	14.0
(c) Aid for construction of private primary and secondary schools?	11.0	73.2	15.8
(d) Aid for construction of college academic facilities?	30.7	53.2	16.1
(e) Income tax deductions for higher education expenses?	73.5	18.3	8.2
7. Should the Federal Government provide some type of medical expense aid to persons over 65? If "yes," should it be accomplished by—	48.7	25.3	26.0
(a) Expanding Kerr-Mills programs (based on need, administered by States with Federal-State funds—operative in Illinois and 28 States)?	35.9	28.8	35.3
(b) Enacting King-Anderson bill (financed by increased social-security taxes on employers and employees, given regardless of need)?	14.4	53.4	32.2
(c) Enacting Bow bill (permits tax reduction up to $150 per year for costs of purchasing private health insurance)?	42.0	21.5	36.5
8. Should the Civil Rights Commission be made permanent?	34.0	27.3	38.7
9. With respect to labor legislation, do you favor—			
(a) Applying the principle of the antitrust laws to labor unions?	85.6	5.2	9.2
(b) A 35-hour week with time and a half for overtime?	9.4	74.7	15.9
(c) Requiring secret ballot of members before union calls a strike?	88.6	3.1	8.3
10. With respect to commuter transportation, should—			
(a) The Federal Government provide tax concessions and bond guarantees for urban transit carriers (Lausche bill)?	26.0	49.7	24.3
(b) The Federal Government establish a program ($500,000,000 in grants) to improve urban mass transportation facilities?	14.0	64.0	22.0
(c) State and local governments and private enterprise develop and improve urban transportation without Federal aid?	71.9	11.7	16.4
11. Should foreign aid programs for developing nations be—			
(a) Approved as requested by the President (cost $4,500,000,000)?	10.4	80.7	8.9
(b) Continued but reduced substantially?	68.8	22.5	8.7
(c) Discontinued completely?	16.9	71.2	11.9
12. Do you favor U.S. diplomatic recognition of Communist China?	17.7	73.2	9.1
13. With respect to Cuba, do you favor—			
(a) Leaving Cuba communistic if it poses no military threat to the United States?	19.4	59.1	21.5
(b) Requesting multilateral economic restrictions on Cuba?	74.8	7.0	18.2
(c) Denying foreign aid to those nations trading with Cuba?	73.5	11.0	15.5
(d) A complete military blockade of Cuba?	43.2	30.0	26.8
(e) Military action against Cuba?	24.0	47.5	28.5
14. Do you support the use of force by the U.N. in world trouble spots?	64.8	20.3	14.9
15. With respect to the threat of nuclear war, should the United States—			
(a) Take steps unilaterally to discontinue nuclear testing?	21.0	57.7	21.3
(b) Continue to work toward a test ban treaty with Russia?	77.2	12.8	10.0
(c) Prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional nations?	67.3	10.8	21.9

16. Please rank by number these problems by order of importance to the United States:

(1) Maintaining strong military/nuclear deterrents.

(2) Balancing the budget.

(3) Communist subversion in Latin America.

(4) Unemployment.

(5) Stopping nuclear arms race.

(6) Education.

(7) Civil rights enforcement.

(8) Other—Population explosion.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, soon after the sun had set over St. Peter's Square while many thousands watched and the rest of the world waited, the word came that the beloved pontiff, Pope John XXIII had passed to his eternal reward. Many of those assembled—as did others in other parts of the world—unashamedly wept. Now the entire world kneels in abject sorrow to mark the passing of "the Pope of Peace and Good Will," and history will forever record his noble and untiring efforts to create world peace and good will among all men, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, in humble surroundings and of peasant parents who tilled the soil to eke out a bare living in the little known hamlet of Sotto il Monte, he too labored in the fields before he received the call to serve his Church. Despite all the splender of the Papacy in Rome, he will always be remembered for his deep and sincere humility that touched all who were fortunate enough to be in his presence. He was a pastoral Pope—warm, humble, extremely contemporary and always optimistic with a bright outlook for the future. The 260th successor to St. Peter as the spiritual leader of a universal Church exceeding 550 million faithful, this great Vicar of Christ on Earth, was heard to exclaim on the first anniversary of his coronation, "One who is Pope at 78 years does not have a great future." Even then, his great impact on the world was beginning to take shape.

Pope John XXIII was the greatest moral force in modern history. He not only vitalized the Catholic Church, but created a tremendous measure of good will among non-Catholics throughout the world. His convening of the Ecumenical Council last fall in Rome had for one of its principal purposes the beginning of closer relations with the Protestant world. It was the most significant move in that direction taken for several centuries. Time and the continuation of the work of the Ecumenical Council will determine the strength of the foundation that was laid by the late beloved pontiff.

The diplomatic skill Pope John XXIII exhibited during his short reign of 5 years was not an accomplishment acquired in his latest years. Subsequent to his effective work with the Orthodox Church in the Balkans, he was to show skillful and masterful diplomatic and political acumen in those days when Paris was rising from the ashes of humiliation to a new liberation. His brilliant and bold encyclical "Pacem in Terris," or "Peace on Earth," was a historical document that had a forceful impact on the civilized world and endeared this Pope to peoples of all faiths. In this encyclical, Pope John XXIII reappraised the Communist world as a period of troubled transition—a movement in history based upon a false philosophy—that eventually will be subject to profound changes. This message addressed not only to Catholics but to men of good will all over the world gave renewed faith to the oppressed. This, together with his encyclical, "Mater et Magistra," or "Mother and Teacher," which was directed to the more prosperous to help the undeveloped, to share the abundant with those in poverty, hunger, misery, and despair. It was a forthright and historical document that enunciated an ancient philosophy of Jesus Christ that we are all our brothers' keepers, and one that focused attention on the vital social problems of the present day.

The deceased pontiff not only preached the brotherhood of man. He also practiced it throughout his life. Likened to Pope Leo XIII, his predecessor by almost a century who immediately upon his election as pontiff started working for the liberation of German Catholics who were suffering under Bismarck's repressive legislation, Pope John XXIII made history in his efforts to keep alive the spirit of human courage among the oppressed people of the world. As Angelo Cardinal Roncalli, he materially aided in the rescue and survival of thousands of Jews from the mad and sadistic oppression of Hitler and his Fascist cohorts during the World War II period. For these efforts, he earned the undying gratitude of the Jewish people in Israel and the rest of the world.

One of his crowning glories in the practice of brotherhood came when he named the Catholic Church's first African, Japanese, and Philippine cardinals as princes of the church. With the issuance of his two famous encyclicals and his unprecedented move to establish relations between the Catholic Church and the religion removed from the church, Pope John XXIII has left an indelible impression upon all the world—one that surpasses the achievements of any other modern pontiff.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII was a leader of his church and of all mankind. Few people in modern times have contributed more deeply to world understanding and to a recognition of the significance of the common humanity which we share.

Regardless of religion, nation, or philosophic outlook, we pay tribute to him and his great and kindly works.

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, in Presenting Lifesaving Awards During Ceremonies at the U.S. Coast Guard Receiving Center, Cape May, N.J., May 16, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had an opportunity to visit the Cape May Coast Guard Receiving Station at Cape May, N.J., which is in my Second Congressional District, along with the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Admiral Roland, the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and Hon. James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, for the purpose of awarding lifesaving medals to three coastguardsmen for a heroic rescue in the course of their duty.

After witnessing a very fine review of the graduating class, Secretary Dillon made a commendable address in connection with the awarding of the medals, and it is my privilege to insert his address, which points out the value of the U.S. Coast Guard Training Station, and acknowledges the great debt of gratitude which citizens of our Nation have to the U.S. Coast Guard for the performance of its duty during peace and war.

Secretary Dillon's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, IN PRESENTING LIFESAVING AWARDS DURING CEREMONIES AT THE U.S. COAST GUARD RECEIVING CENTER, CAPE MAY, N.J., MAY 16, 1963

Admiral Roland, Commander Waters, distinguished guests, and members of the Coast Guard recruit training class, I have been looking forward to this visit ever since I assumed office as Secretary of the Treasury more than 2 years ago. From this center comes a steady stream of highly trained men who have made the name U.S. Coast Guard known and respected the world over. It is fitting, therefore, that Cape May should be the setting for today's ceremony, in which we are proud to honor three very brave men who displayed the greatest valor in risking their lives to save others. For in recognizing their heroism, we also pay tribute to other brave men who received their training here.

One of the men we honor today, John C. Webb, boatswain's mate, first class, has distinguished himself in the past. Twice previously, in 1961, he was awarded the Coast Guard Commendation Medal for heroic action in the performance of duty. Today, he receives this third award, the Gold Lifesaving Medal, for outstanding heroism in making a most perilous rescue.

His companions, Anthony Duane Lloyd, engineman, third class, and Ray Dwayne Duerre, seaman, are to receive Silver Lifesaving Medals for their heroic parts in the same rescue. All three have brought great credit, not only to themselves and their families, but also to the historic service they so ably represent. They provide you graduates of the training class who are about to take your places in the Coast Guard with an inspiring example.

Today's ceremony is unusual. The Lifesaving Medal is rarely awarded to coastguardsmen, since exposure to great personal risk is considered part of a coast guardsman's assignment. The men who brave angry seas and screaming gales to aid distressed ships and persons expect no special recognition. They are dedicated men who think of themselves as professionals. Only action of the greatest personal daring, involving disregard for personal safety, justifies the award of the Lifesaving Medal to coast guardsmen. These conditions were amply met by the men we honor today.

I shall not attempt to go into the details of the rescue in which these men participated. The citations accompanying the medals will speak for themselves.

While this day has been set aside to honor three brave men, its significance goes far beyond that. In a very real sense, we are paying tribute to this small, but great service of some 30,000 officers and enlisted men in which they were trained to respond so magnificently to the challenge of danger. Courage and humanity lie at the very heart of the Coast Guard's mission. It has been that way from the very beginning, when the first small cutters sailed bravely off to fight Napoleon's numerically superior navy.

In risking their lives to save others, these men exemplify that humanitarian concern for life which motivates the Coast Guard. More than any other service, the Coast Guard gives active meaning to the high ideal of self sacrifice which is at the core of our religious beliefs. In times so given to developing means of mass destruction, the Coast Guard provides an inspiring example to all mankind as it goes about its task of preserving life.

Gentlemen, I congratulate each of you, your families and your officers on this happy occasion. I congratulate also the graduates of this recruit training company. The good wishes of all Americans go with you. May you all have long and fruitful careers in the service of your country.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, May 28, 1963, was the 45th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day. I rise to pay tribute to the heroic deeds of the Armenian people in becoming the first democratic nation in Asia Minor to be allied to the West, and I salute their bravery during World War I.

We are indeed indebted for their efforts in World War I, and for their substantial contribution to Allied victory.

Although an independent nation for only 2 years, the Armenian people were nevertheless able to create an effective government out of chaos. The Armenian nation was recognized by a number of countries and sent a delegation to participate in the Paris Peace Conference.

The history of the Armenian people since ancient times has been filled with amazing courage in their attempts to preserve their rights and freedom. Even in the face of Soviet conquest in 1920, the Armenian people fought valiantly to retain their independence.

In this year's celebration of Armenian Independence Day, we want Armenians in this country and all over the world to know our heartfelt gratitude for their past heroic deeds and our hope that someday they too will once again be a free democratic nation, and will be delivered from under the heel of the Communist conqueror.

Building a Stairway to the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 1 I had the pleasure of speaking before the Alumni of Concord College, at Athens, W. Va. In commenting on the important role the schoolteacher has come to play in our society, I pointed out that the success of our adventures in outer space depends on broadening our educational base.

Mr. President, I believe that in honoring the achievements of our astronauts, such as Major Cooper, we should reserve some additional praise for the colleges and teachers of our Nation who provide the basic academic training that makes our space flights possible.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A STAIRWAY TO THE STARS

(An Address by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia)

It was the American poet-philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said, "The true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops, but the kind of man that the country turns out."

If Emerson had lived in our day, perhaps he would have been moved to say, instead, the "kind of man that our colleges turn out." For our Nation is coming to depend more and more on the college graduate, not merely for leadership in our society, but also as a responsive citizen intelligently aware of the world we are living in and its myriad complicated problems.

There was a time when you young graduates here today would have been part of a small minority of college educated persons in our country. That is no longer true. The ranks of college graduates now number in the millions. This spring some 441,000 more will receive their sheepskins. By 1970 it is expected that some 7 million students will be attending college.

What these figures mean to you, to all of us? They mean that a college degree, by itself, is no longer a mark of special distinction. What counts now is what you have done with your 4 years of college, and what these 4 years have done for you, what kind of man or woman you have become, now that your long years of learning have come to an end—or at least to a pause.

The human being begins to learn something the moment he is born. His parents and his family are his first teachers, his nursery is his first classroom. But very soon these give way to the formal schoolroom, to the professional teacher. For 12 years he labors to master the basic knowledge of his society. In these 12 years he learns what it has taken the human race centuries upon centuries to learn.

Consider the enormous and confusing welter of facts that has accumulated in this time. Consider the task of a student trying to piece this information together for himself, without the aid of a teacher. A dozen lifetimes would not be sufficient for the task. That gives us some idea of the importance of the teacher and the college in our society. The more advanced and complicated our society becomes, the more important will be the role of the teacher in giving shape to the curricula of our colleges. We can see how truly creative the role of the teacher can be. Those who shape history are equally as important as those who make it.

In addition to the 12 years of basic learning, our educational system offers an additional 4 or more years to those students who are capable of going on. The college student has the opportunity to do more than absorb the knowledge of the past; he can equip himself to add to the store of human understanding; he can participate in the advancement of human society.

Ever since human beings found themselves on this earth, they have been faced with the necessity of learning or expiring. Animals adapt by growing heavy fur, long necks, sharp teeth, etc. It is a limited kind of adaptation. Human beings, on the other hand, adapt by extending, not our necks, but our intelligence. We have the power not only to alter our environment, but to change our conception of the world about us.

Education gives us the power to do both of these things. If it is our ambition to alter the face of the earth, to build bridges, erect skyscrapers, we can educate ourselves in that direction. If we want to divert rivers, fly over oceans, level mountains, we can educate ourselves to do that, too. We can learn to deal with things.

We can also learn to deal with ideas. We can learn to examine our beliefs, our concepts, our habits of thought, and we can realine them in such a way as to make for greater human happiness. That is one of the important roles of the teacher.

To survive in this world we need to be capable of earning a living. To be happy, we need to be able to deal successfully with thoughts, as well as things. We need to have healthy, sound, clear-cut beliefs about the world we live in, about our relations with other people, about our work, our community, our town, our Nation. Over the centuries of human history certain basic ideas have been found to be the building blocks of a healthy society. A sound education can build these ideas into our character, can provide us with a bulwark against adversity, a comfort for pain, an antidote for despair. An educated mind, to my way of thinking, is a cheerful mind, a mind that never loses sight of hope. No harm can come to a good man, in this world or the next, said the philosopher Socrates, who died in martyrdom as cheerfully as he had lived. A wealth of sturdy, sustaining ideas such as this is one of the bounties of a good education.

In this respect, it seems to me that the role of the teacher is an especially important one. We are continually improving our school buildings, our laboratories, our books, our technical facilities for teaching, but in the long run the crucial point in education is that point where student contacts teacher. Recent studies have shown us that such media as television, while they broaden the learning audience, are no match for the actual contact between teacher and student that is made in the classroom.

After all, the student is a human being, a living creature; he is not a mechanical robot into whom information is being fed automatically. His rate of learning, his grasp of new material, depends very largely on the kind of person who is presenting this material—on his teacher. If we are to have a better educated citizenry, we must first have teachers who are dedicated to, and inspired by, the historic task of enlarging human mentality.

This task has become especially important in our time, when our whole way of life is being affected by a technological revolution. The sum total of the technological revolution is that everything happens faster. We fly through the air with the speed of sound, we build automobiles in a matter of minutes, we solve incredibly complicated problems in fractions of a second.

To live, to survive in an environment where everything happens so fast requires a greater mental agility than ever before. Our world is becoming something like the instrument panel in the control cabin of a jet airplane. To anyone entering such a cabin for the first time, it seems incredible that the pilots can respond correctly and surely to so many different signals, involving such complicated mechanisms.

The answer, of course, is training—education. Our marvelous technological developments, our flights into outer space, have demonstrated that there is virtually no limit to the development of the human mind. Today the moon is within range, tomorrow the stars—after that, who knows? Human knowledge is a pyramid whose topmost point stretches in infinity.

The moon will be reached in our time, although none of us here may make the flight. But I would be surprised if some of you here who are teachers had no share in making it possible. Scientists and engineers produce the rockets and the capsule that flies into space. But who develops the mind of the astronaut, and his co-workers? That is the job of the teacher, of education. That pyramid of knowledge I spoke of rests upon a base of solid, fundamental learning which makes all of our splendid achievements possible. Cut away that base, and the whole system will topple. The higher we are to soar, the broader that base must be. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the teacher is the Atlas on whose shoulder our world is carried.

There are some who worry about just how big a load this giant can bear, whether we are straining our capacities dangerously by setting our sights on the stars. I see no cause for alarm. There is a limit to how much a man can eat, how many cars he can drive, how many suits he can wear. But there is no limit to what a man can know, and there is no quenching man's thirst for knowledge. Whether or not we build a stairway to the stars depends simply on the kind of educated men and women our schools turn out. Let us not be content with ordinary men. Let us turn out giants.

Death of Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a great force for peace, unity, and good will in the death of Pope John XXIII.

Commencement Address by Senator Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it seems to be customary with each older generation to criticize the younger generation as frivolous, irresponsible, and certain to come to no good. However, I have never been able to associate myself with such thinking.

Every year I try to attend at least one high school commencement in Tennessee. This year I was present when 46 graduates of Seymour High School in Sevier County, Tenn., received their diplomas.

This was one of the finest groups of graduates I have ever seen—eager, enthusiastic, anxious to move out into the world and do their part to make it a better place for themselves and the families they will one day bring up. I was privileged to be the commencement speaker, and I hope that what I said was of some inspiration to these fine young people.

In the further hope that these remarks may be of some benefit to others, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO THE SEYMOUR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS, SEYMOUR, TENN., MAY 31, 1963

If experience is a guide, chances are good that 15 years from tonight, most of you won't remember who gave your commencement address. But no matter whether you remember who spoke, you will never forget this evening. This is fitting. Nothing I or anyone else can say tonight can compare with the achievement each of you recorded in graduating from high school.

For one thing, it is impossible for any of us who have been adults much longer than you to fully appreciate your feelings and your thoughts upon graduating from this fine school. This is something many of us tend to forget. It's something you will probably tend to forget too: Each oncoming generation arrives at adulthood with a totally different background of knowledge and experience.

Personally it seems incredible to me that you graduates never thrilled to the voice of Franklin D. Roosevelt summoning this country to responsibility, summoning it out of its agony of fear.

Or the voice of Winston Churchill summoning the democracies to greatness, summoning them out of the shambles of total demoralization and defeat.

Or saw and took part in the slow, painful, joyful transformation of this great State of ours during the thirties and forties, out of seeming defeat, depression and apathy to the vibrant, optimistic growing economy and society we have today.

Yet it is true. You did not experience these things.

These were the things your parents experienced. These were the things that molded their lives and their philosophies. We have something you cannot quite understand. At the same time, you have things which my generation cannot quite understand.

For one who remembers when there were more horses than horseless carriages, it is difficult to imagine that in your lifetime, daily trips to the moon may become commonplace. And fantastic though this may seem, we all know it is a very real possibility.

It has seemed sometimes that yours is one of the generations Roosevelt meant when he said: "To some generations, much is given." While the generation of your parents is obviously one he spoke of when he added: "From other generations, much is expected."

But this is not quite the case.

You know much is expected of you. Fear and defeat, and responsibility and greatness, are not the property of any generation or any year.

There will be times when you will fear. There will be times when you meet defeat. And there will be calls issued to you to leave fear and defeat behind.

My friends, you are being summoned to responsibility. You are being summoned to greatness. Now, tonight, and from now on through your entire lives.

When you file out of this auditorium, you will be leaving childhood behind. You are walking into the joys of responsibility and of citizenship and—let us hope—of greatness.

It is natural that you are privately worried about leaving this school and the society and friendships you have built within it. The future is dimly seen. The years seem to stretch endlessly ahead.

But those years will go fast. The 17 or 19 years you've so far passed seem a long time, perhaps. The next 10 years, 20 years, 30 years will find each year and each decade becoming shorter and shorter. You will have to seize your chance for greatness promptly.

There is no room nor time for worry. Nor is there any reason to worry. The joys of citizenship, of adulthood, of parenthood—in short, the joys of responsibility—are every bit as sweet as the pleasures of childhood, of youth, and of school. These are to be your joys, your responsibility, from now on.

Part of that responsibility is to prepare yourself for it. Preparation does not end here in high school. This is the age of specialization. I urge every one of you who possibly can to go on to college. If you cannot, try to attend a vocational or trade program which will better equip you to fulfill your responsibilities.

Recently I saw a Census Bureau report that gave a very good reason for going on to college. It showed that while the average annual income for families headed by a high school graduate is $6,300, it is much higher—$9,300—for those whose breadwinner is a college graduate.

Moreover, as we grow up and assume family responsibilities, we realize how much our children's education takes place right in the home. So we want to be as well equipped as we can to help them learn about the world in which they will live and bring up their own families someday.

Besides, education is the gateway to a fuller, richer life all around. It is the one thing that, coupled with experience, generates ideas of the most lasting significance.

A great, great responsibility is that of civic awareness and participation. It is up to you to inform yourselves about what is going on in your community, your State, Nation, and the world. It is up to you to speak out, to vote, and if possible, to offer yourself for community service. "Politics" is not a nasty word so long as good people, like you, are paying attention to it and helping to make it work.

So much for heavy philosophy on this wonderful evening.

It remains to remind you of something about which you surely know: Your parents are mighty proud of you all, both for having successfully reached this milestone and for the determination with which you will go forward to the milestones of the future.

I hope that you are proud of your parents. This community certainly is. It has not been easy, lending you the morale and material assistance to complete 12 years of school.

I hope that you are proud of the faculty of this school system—the teachers you have had. The community is proud of them. A teacher gives a part of himself or herself to his or her students, and acquires back a part of the student in return. This is one reason why teaching is a valued, honored profession. Wherever you may go now, you will take a part of this school and its teachers with you. No matter how far you go, a part of you will stay here.

Finally, I hope you are proud of this community—as proud of it as it is of you.

It has been at considerable expense that your community has provided this education for you—an expense which no one has stinted and which no one regrets. Yet it was an expense and it is up to you to repay it. You will repay it by unstintingly providing the education, or the cost of it, for those who are coming behind you.

Now then: This is your time. These times are your challenge. Responsibility is yours. Wear it well. Wear it proudly.

If you do, greatness will also be yours.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound sorrow on the death of Pope John XXIII. This simple, penetrating, human, and courageous man will surely go down in history, in spite of his brief reign of less than 5 years, as one of the greatest pontiffs in the long and impressive history of the Roman Catholic Church.

Few men in all history have ever captured the love and affection of so many millions of people, many of whom did not share his own religion, and most of whom never had the privilege of seeing or meeting him. This basic ability to communicate with other human beings was truly, as has been said, the miracle of Pope John.

He has breathed new life, new hope, indeed a healthy and youthful new vigor into mankind's age-long quest for peace on earth and good will and mutual understanding among all men.

As we bow in sorrow at the passing of this great man, we can only thank God for having given him and his leadership to the world in such a critical hour, and we can only hope that the great causes of peace and Christian unity for which he fought so tirelessly will be carried forward with equal fervor in the days ahead by all of us who were privileged to live in the age of John XXIII.

The 19th Anniversary of D-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today, June 6, represents the 19th anniversary of D-day, when the Allied forces on June 6, 1944, crossed the English channel and began the invasion of Nazi-held Europe.

It was a day destined to be indelibly written on the pages of history. We have come to know it by many names. Operation Overlord, it was known to the Allied Command. Military analysts speak of the Battle of Normandy. Author Cornelius Ryan, using a quote by German Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, has made it famous as "The Longest Day."

Certainly it is worthy of our looking back and remembering the events of that day.

The English channel was choppy and fog rolled. At 4 a.m. on June 5 at Southwick House near Portsmouth, England, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower had listened to weather briefings and, in the words of British Field Marshal Montgomery "decided to go on June 6. Eisenhower was in good form and made his decision quickly."

A few hours later the man responsible for the defense of Normandy, Rommel, wrote a situation report saying that "invasion is not imminent." The worst storm the English Channel had known in 20 years, plus the lack of Allied activity during 18 perfect-weather days in May, had lulled the Nazi "Desert Fox" into a false sense of security. His report finished, Rommel set off by car to Berchtesgaden to beg Adolph Hitler for more Panzer divisions. His Chief of staff, Gen. Hans Speidel, issued an order relaxing the month-long alert his forces had maintained along the coast of France. Officers moved inland for rest and relaxation.

Even as the Germans relaxed, the world's mightiest armada slipped across the choppy channel toward Normandy's rugged coast: 4,000 ships and thousands of smaller craft, ready to dump onto the beaches the men, machines and equipment committed to freedom's cause. Shortly after midnight, June 6, the first paratroopers of history's largest airborne operation—18,000 men—tumbled through darkened skies. Within 6 hours the main assault forces would hit the beach and the world would for the first time hear the names of places rising to take a place in history: of Utah Beach and bloody Omaha Beach; of Cherbourg and Caen and Bayeux.

What of the giants of the times on this momentous day? And what of the men who then toiled in relative obscurity, but would within an amazingly short time rise to national prominence? What were they doing?

Winston Churchill spoke in the British House of Commons for 10 minutes on the fall of Rome and after, in his own words, "keeping them on tenterhooks for a little" dramatically told his people of "the liberating assault falling upon the coast of France."

Gen. Charles de Gaulle set foot upon his native soil for the first time in 4 years, leading the Free French into battle.

General Eisenhower paced the floor in anxious wonder, fretting as have commanders since the beginning of wars, over the slowness of progress reports.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked the Nation to join him in prayer:

> The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken by the violence of war.

Adolph Hitler slept on, not knowing of the assault until midafternoon of D-day. His now-infamous order to German commanders reveals his failure to grasp the magnitude of the invasion assault: "Clear the beaches by nightfall."

From Moscow, Premier Joseph Stalin wired Churchill:

> The invasion * * * gives joy to us all and hope of future success.

In the U.S. Senate, Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris also prayed:

> Grant that on this D-day of liberation weapons of freedom, forged in fires of faith, may pierce the shields of pagan steel.

Senators recited the 23d psalm together and a few rose to make stirring speeches about the long-awaited invasion.

One Senator who did not speak was a mild, bespectacled man from Missouri. He quietly voted against a proposed technical amendment to a price control bill and left the Senate Chamber. Within 45 days Harry S. Truman would be nominated for Vice President. Within 10 months he would be our Chief Executive. He had no way of knowing what fate held at the ready for him.

The House of Representatives recited the Lord's Prayer. Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas' 10th District, home from the wars with a Silver Star for gallantry in action, made no speeches but went quietly about his work.

At the Chelsea, Mass., Naval Hospital a 26-year-old lieutenant, junior grade, by the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy recuperated from serious wounds received 10 months earlier when his P.T. boat had been cut in half by a Japanese destroyer. No one had the foresight to ask his reaction to this historic day.

On the beaches the Allies fought on. Soon they would sweep into France, capturing Paris on August 23. By September 1 they would reach Belgium and 9 days later fire the first shells into Germany itself.

The Third Reich that Hitler boasted would live "for a thousand years" felt the tremors that meant the beginning of the end.

Thus it has ever been, in the fullness of time, with every such regime founded upon tyranny and terror. And thus may it always be.

Address of Hon. John J. Flynt, Jr., Law Day, University of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, when the senior students of the University of Georgia School of Law planned the annual Law Day exercises for this year, they selected for guest speaker one of the university's most distinguished graduates, Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fourth District of Georgia.

Outstanding Georgia lawyers, supreme court justices, judges of the court of appeals, trial court judges, political leaders, deans, faculty members, and honor students filled the 130-year-old historic and beautiful chapel to hear a profound address by our colleague. It is so noteworthy and significant that I set out its full text for the careful consideration by the House membership. I also wish to commend Law School Dean Alton Hosch and the student leaders of the school of law for affording this opportunity to the legal profession of Georgia.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., OF GEORGIA

Chairman Bloodworth, Senator Russell, Congressman Stephens, President Aderhold, Dean Hosch, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to participate in Law Day at the University of Georgia. For many years I have shared your interest and activity in developing Law Day into the outstanding annual event that it is.

This year you have honored me by asking me to speak on this occasion. It is particularly pleasant for me to return to this historic building, surrounded by many scenes which, for me, hold happy memories of more than a quarter century ago. This is the campus where I was first introduced to both the formal study of law and to formal college education. I owe a debt of gratitude to the University of Georgia and its environs which I can never adequately repay. I look forward to the enrollment of my older son and namesake in the student body of this university in the very near future.

Law Day is set aside as a day of national observance in the United States of America. It is the antithesis of the Communist May Day celebration which is celebrated throughout the Communist world. Law Day stands for a rule of right—not might—and could accurately be described as a day dedicated to the dignity of man. May Day in the world behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains stands for tyranny, oppression and the elevation of the state over the individual.

The expressed purpose of Law Day is to impress upon the citizens of this country the great heritage of Anglo-American law, which protects our rights and freedoms. The solemn recognition and appreciation of our system of law is the perfect counterpart and antithesis of the Communist celebration of May Day, which is loudly celebrated throughout the Communist world with vast parades of troops and displays of armed might. A comparison of these two observances is the most vivid illustration of exactly why the theme for Law Day 1963, "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might," was selected.

In his proclamation designating Law Day 1963, President Kennedy recognizes the important part of our system of laws has played in the development of this country, when he quotes a former Justice of our Supreme Court as stating that: "The history of law is the history of the moral development of the races."

The word "law" has many meanings. We refer to laws of nature, laws of science, laws of economics, and laws of various other fields. In these instances we are confronted with certain facts so frequently or these facts are so inherent in human reasoning that we cannot conceive of any other alternatives, therefore, these facts are referred to as laws.

When we refer to the Golden Rule, we refer to a rule of morals or ethics that is the product of the development of civilization and we tend to regard it as a "law," but there is no compulsion behind the enforcement of ethical rules of conduct, except public opinion and our own conscience.

The word "law" as used in connection with Law Day has a meaning different from any of the aforementioned. When used in this sense we are referring to that set of rules of human conduct that are prescribed by a supreme governmental authority and enforced by the state through its courts. It can be said that "law" is the codified commonsense and good judgment of the ages. It must be that if a government under laws is to survive.

The theme of Law Day for 1963 is "Law; Rule of Right, Not Might." I think we find ourselves in accord that the United States of America would not have achieved its preeminent position of leadership among all nations of the world if this had not been the underlying principle of our system of jurisprudence in this country. We in America have been blessed by the principles of constitutional government and by the Anglo-American system of jurisprudence which has made this constitutional Government a reality.

It is probable that our Nation will survive for more than a millennium against all threats from external sources. Many historians, as well as many contemporary political scientists and philosophers, are of the firm belief that if America ever falls from its towering position of strength and leadership that it will be caused by weakness from within rather than from any external force.

Many believe that the greatest single threat toward the enduring strength and security of the United States of America is the noticeable trend toward absolutism.

As the main topic of my remarks today, I would like to discuss the theory of absolutism and the very real dangers which are inherent in it. Within the past year, the subject of absolutism has become a rather controversial one; and my purpose of discussing it today is not to add fuel to the controversy, but rather to warn of some of its dangers.

Let me emphasize that I do not question the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of those who advocate the principles of absolutism. They have a perfect right to those beliefs. I disagree with the theory of absolutism and with those who advocate it, but I believe that they are honest in their beliefs just as I assume that they attribute to me the honesty of my purpose.

The most dramatic way that I know to express this warning is by recalling your attention to the undisputed facts that the Caesars of Rome, the czars of Russia, Louis XIV and Bonaparte of France, and more recently Mussolini of Italy and Hitler of Germany were each, in their respective times, the foremost advocates of the theory of absolutism.

The devastation and destruction which each brought upon his respective country may not be attributable entirely to his adherence to absolutism, but it is at least a remarkable coincidence that each of these disciples of absolutism either totally or nearly destroyed his own country and his own people.

Several months ago, a colleague and I were discussing this very subject and we had slightly different ideas of the exact meaning. We turned to the lexicon to arbitrate our differences and while neither of us was exactly accurate, the dictionary defined absolutism as follows:

"The doctrine of that which is absolute, or without limitations; specifically, the doctrine or existence of unconditional power vested especially in an autocrat; despotism."

Secondary definitions were given, but I think that the foregoing expresses it best of all. Applied to the Government of the United States, the growing trend toward absolutism manifests itself in court decisions, in grants of power to the executive branch, and oftentimes total disregard of prerogatives of State and local governments by administrative and executive officers of the Federal Government. With regard to the expressions of absolutism by the Court, you are aware that the decision in the school prayer case and its implication to all traces of religion in public activities is an example of what absolutism can lead to. I do not refer to this decision in an effort to be critical of the Court. I refer to it as an example of how far the trend toward absolutism has already gone.

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson invoked divine guidance for all our people describing them in his invocation as—

"Enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of the inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us happy and a prosperous people?

"Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

Following the theory of absolutism, the Court would strike down everything in the above quotation attributed to Thomas Jefferson.

Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, has forcefully expressed his concern about this trend. He, like myself, has been outspoken in his concern about the school prayer case and the application of the prohibitions contained in the first amendment against the States. To the best of my knowledge, prior to 1950, no one even claimed that the restraints laid down in the first five amendments restrained any echelon of government, except the Federal Government.

If the full circle of the trend of absolutism is completed, it will make hollow shells of every State capitol, county courthouse, and city hall in the United States. It will cause every subdivision of government to look to Washington for its solution to all problems. The solutions to most problems do not lie in Washington, but rather the solutions to most problems are close to the people—who are the only source of strength in this or any other country.

The Federal Government derives its strength from the strength of the 50 States and the people of the 50 States. It possesses no strength of its own—it can be no stronger than the source of its strength and power.

No President, however powerful and wise, can transmit his executive strength to the people over whom he presides. He can lead, yes. He can possess great wisdom and personal magnetism. But the strength of the government which he leads can only come from the broad base of the people.

Those who have authored every constitution of the State of Georgia surely had that in mind when, in their wisdom, they wrote article I, section I, paragraph I of our State's constitution which reads:

"ORIGIN AND FOUNDATION OF GOVERNMENT

"All government, of right, originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people, and, at all times, amenable to them."

Upon the belief that ultimate strength is derived from the people and that ultimate sovereignty resides there, our Government has grown from strength to greater strength. It would be tragic if we should deteriorate from strength to weakness because that belief should be changed.

Lest my views be misinterpreted, let me say forthrightly there are certain areas in which the power of the Federal Government must be absolute—among these are the conduct of foreign policy, maintenance of the Defense Establishment, regulations of interstate and foreign commerce, control of coinage and currency, and others clearly enumerated in our basic instrument of government.

When the Federal Government overreaches itself and extends its vast powers into subject matter which can best be done by the State, the counties, the cities, or by the people themselves, then the inevitable result is a deterioration of government in those areas which are exclusively Federal in their very nature.

Our Nation—its people—its Government may truly be the last great hope of earth. Surely the United States is the unquestioned leader of the nations of the free world. It could be that we are the main strength of Western civilization. I believe the best guarantee of a free world is a strong United States of America. An America, strong economically, militarily, industrially, and agriculturally, but most of all possessed of a people strong in purpose, character, and courage.

A strong America can be preserved by a proud and self-reliant people, with strong local governments at each level upon which a strong National Government and a strong Nation must surely rest.

If I have appeared overly critical of the theory of absolutism let me now make some positive and affirmative suggestions. Let me paint a confident and bright picture of the future.

Our people are both proud and self-reliant. Twice within 50 years ambitious rulers of foreign powers have started two world wars, in the belief that America had grown into lethargy and indifference and either could not or would not mobilize its resources in defense of America or America's allies. At a cost of millions of men and uncountable material resources each learned that the courage and strength of America is a very real thing.

The economic strength of the United States is still the strongest of any nation on earth. The private enterprise segment of the American economy is stronger than the private enterprise counterpart of any other country on earth. Research and development in the physical sciences, in the natural sciences, and in medicine bring more real progress in the United States each year than in the rest of the world combined. These advances we gladly share with all people on earth.

Based upon a belief in the accuracy of these statements, I think that the future of our Nation and our Government is brighter than it has ever been in its history. The horizons are unlimited—at least they are limited only by the willingness of the American people to make whatever effort and whatever sacrifice may be necessary to maintain the balance of power between the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government, and at the same time to maintain the balance of governmental powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local governments on the other. Any problems of government capable of local determination including those of financing can best be handled at a local level by officials and administrators who know firsthand what the problem is and also know how to resolve it most quickly and most properly.

Most issues which concern us today are the same issues which have concerned all peoples of all nations since the beginning of recorded history. We have heretofore in this country found the right solutions in the hearts and minds of strong people.

A century ago our country faced some of the identical questions and I quote directly from a speech of the then President of the United States:

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting race and class hatreds.

"You cannot build character or courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."—A. Lincoln.

Each of these admonitions could well be followed by the leaders and the people of the United States today. To these I would add: both the hope and a prayer that this Nation will daily practice the theme of Law Day 1963: "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." As we dedicate this Law Day 1963 to this theme, let us at the same time make it a day of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings which he has given to this our land and our people. Let us make this a day of rededication to those things which have caused our Nation to grow to greatness and proudly reaffirm our faith in a supreme being—the Supreme Judge of the universe.

Partnership for Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1963, I was privileged to attend the dedication of a new wing of the U.S. Plant, Soil, and Nutrition Laboratory at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. The principal speaker on that significant occasion was our colleague HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of the 37th District of New York. His talk, entitled "Partnership for Research," was highly informative and very timely. His remarks are especially significant today as the House is considering the agriculture appropriation bill. He discussed the essential role of Government in certain aspects of research but correctly warned that the proper balance between Government and private research must be maintained if we are to avoid stunting our economic growth. The vast expansion of governmental research can siphon off too large a percentage of our scientific talent if we are not aware of this danger and fail to take appropriate corrective action. I trust we will consider carefully this problem and do all in our power to strengthen research in every field of production activity so that our national economy may be strengthened in all its vital phases.

Although the speech documents a lag in agricultural research it highlights the slowdown in research in many significant areas. I am confident our distinguished colleague's remarks will generate serious thinking and constructive action:

PARTNERSHIP FOR RESEARCH

(By Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG of New York)

It is a great honor and privilege for me to join with you today here at Cornell University on the occasion of the dedication of this important agricultural research facility. Cornell has developed a magnificent and enviable record for progress in agriculture over the years. And, too, Cornell has played a balance and leading role in science and technology as it applies to government, education, and the private sector of our whole national economy and culture. All of us who are familiar with its programs and services are confident that this new wing of the U.S. Plant, Soil and Nutrition Laboratory will produce achievements in keeping with the great traditions and standards developed here in the cooperative programs of Cornell University and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It was a source of real satisfaction to me to join with Congressman John Taber, Congressman Alexander Pirnie, Congressman Howard Robison, and many other friends of this great institution in obtaining the approval in the Congress of the United States of the necessary funds for the construction and operation of this laboratory wing.

This laboratory is being dedicated today to unlock the many remaining secrets, the creative talents, applicable to our soil, plant, and animal resources. These are agriculture programs of a kind which all of us endorse and support, and it is to be regretted that a far greater share of the tremendous budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is not devoted to scientific progress of this nature. In the Department of Agriculture budget of $7 billion now before the Congress, only $185 million has been programed for the Agricultural Research Service. In fact, no funds have been requested in this budget for the establishment of any new agricultural research facilities anywhere in the country. As a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, I am one who believes in economy in government, but I certainly find this to be false economy.

Throughout our history, the Department of Agriculture has been in the forefront of the Federal Government's efforts in support of research. The Department has carried out extensive research within its own facilities, and in support of research elsewhere. It has built up many fine working partnerships with our universities, such as the partnership that exists here at Cornell. The results of these efforts and these partnerships have been dramatic—they have played an important role in reshaping American agriculture—and in making the abundance of American agriculture the envy of the world. We take pride in the knowledge that each American farmer produces food and fiber for an average of 26 other persons, while the Soviet Union farmer's production capability is limited to 6 of his comrades.

I indicated a moment ago that I am not completely satisfied with the consideration given to agricultural research in the pending 1964 budget. In saying that, I should point out to you that in recent years the support for agriculture research has not kept pace with the tremendous surge of Government-sponsored science—research and development. During this period, the strong cooperative system of research developed many years ago as between the Department of Agriculture and that of our colleges and universities—this partnership has provided a sound foundation for expansion, and has measurably benefited the other areas of responsibility on the part of Government in the all-important fields of science and technology.

Although these other areas of governmental endeavor are something of a "Johnny-come-lately" in research pursuits, they have come into being with a tremendous rush. Many of these Federal programs have been increased 50 to 100 percent annually, in recent years. As a result, agriculture research, which was once the chief research interest of the Federal Government, is now in a distant fifth position in the financial tables for research supported on the part of the Federal Government. Topping the list of Federal patrons of research is the Department of Defense, with half of the overall total—followed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Agriculture Department, in that order.

Yes, the Federal Government has entered into research with a tremendous surge. How big is that surge?

Well, in this present fiscal year, the Federal Government intends to spend more than $12 billion in the research and development category; and next year's budget calls for almost $15 billion. The Federal Government's expenditures for research are four times greater than they were 10 years ago, and they have doubled in the last 5 years. The Federal Government is now supporting more than two-thirds of all the research and development work performed in our great country. 10 years ago, the Government supported less than half the total expended for this purpose.

How has this happened?

What is its meaning and its impact?

Let me take a few moments to discuss these developments because I believe they are highly important for our Government, our educational institutions, our private enterprise, our economy, and for our national well being. And, they are now beginning to command reassessment as to application and balance.

The principal reasons for this tremendous growth have been the great expansion of Government responsibility, and the new importance of science and research to the public interests. For example, research in space has become almost totally a program of the Federal Government; health has become a major concern of the Federal Government; promotion of science, itself, has become a major Government responsibility; and, of course, national defense and security have become strongly dependent upon scientific research and technological development, in addition to dependence upon productive capacity and manpower, as in the past. In agriculture, in addition to the continuing goal of seeking to improve quality, and quantity, research has been stimulated also by such factors as rising costs, Government acreage controls, and by price supports. In these latter cases, I am afraid the results have not always been of benefit to agriculture.

Ten years ago the Federal Government accounted for less than 50 percent of the Nation's research and development—it spent about $3 billion in this area. Today, Federal expenditures are $12 billion and comprise more than two-thirds of the national total, both public and private. The Federal role has soared so swiftly and its impact has been so enormous, that we are just beginning to assess these new patterns and their effects.

One thing to be remembered, of course, is that federally supported research is not the same as federally performed research. More than 80 percent of federally sponsored research and development is performed by nongovernment organizations. In other words, $4 out of every $5 invested in research and development by the Federal Government is channeled through industry, colleges and universities, and other nonprofit institutions. Industry receives by far the largest allocation of this—mainly for defense and space projects. But our educational institutions this year will receive about $1.5 billion from the Federal Government in the pursuit of science, research, and technology. In most of the major universities, the Federal Government provides more than one-half of the funds of their research budget. As I understand it, right here at Cornell University the Federal Government supports more than two-thirds of the research activity; and in keeping with the general pattern, the aeronautical laboratory receives by far the largest amount. Agriculture ranks second.

The chief area of research in our educational institutions has always been that of basic research, and I am glad that this has remained true in this period of domination by the Federal Government. While the colleges and universities receive only 12 percent of all Federal funds allotted for research and development, they receive almost one-half of the funds earmarked for basic research. To my mind, this is a very important consideration, because our educational institutions must continue to function as the chief training ground and producer of our new scientists and engineers; and they must continue to play their traditional role in the basic research efforts of the Nation.

May I say that the Congress has given enthusiastic support to the accelerated and varied plans and programs for research and development, and certainly the results have justified our enthusiasm. In space, in medicine, in agriculture, in military technology, in many, many fields progress and achievements have been dramatic and gratifying. Certainly the Nation has benefited greatly. But I must report to you today that there are signs of a second look developing. Why? Because there is a growing concern about the overall effects of the dominant role which the Federal Government has taken in the scientific and research and development effort of the Nation.

What is causing this growing concern? Well, let me discuss a few of the questions being asked.

We are being asked whether it is desirable in our form of democracy to give the Federal Government such a dominant voice in setting the course and the goals of American science and technology.

Is this dominance on the part of Government crowding out many research projects required by the private sector of our society? Is the traditional role of our colleges and universities in the research picture being altered, and is it for better or worse?

Is too much of the scientific manpower of the Nation being diverted to Government purposes? Is there adequate application or "spin off" of Government research to the civilian economy, or are we actually handicapping our economic development by stunting the growth of privately sponsored research?

And then, of course, as Government-sponsored research has mushroomed in all areas, the usual administrative question marks have appeared. For example, are Federal funds justified for research on such programs as religious cults in North Brazil, mother love of the monkey, or bargaining solutions for games?

There have been some difficulties, too, over the diversion of grant funds to other purposes.

I have brought these questions with me from Washington, but I cannot report to you today on the answers. I can tell you that Congress is looking with favor on a new Federal program to aid construction of college facilities, including laboratories. But many of the congressional committees are looking more carefully and critically at Federal research programs and budgets this year. The National Science Foundation is conducting a study of the impact which Federal research funds are having on the research programs of our colleges and universities. We are looking earnestly for the answers to these questions which have developed.

However, I do not consider agriculture research to be affected by this new second look. I believe our problem in that area is to change the uses being made of funds allocated to Agriculture. Research in agriculture requires a far greater share in the national effort: Its value—its merit—its need—are beyond question. These facilities here at Cornell give daily testimony to that. This is the type of Federally supported activity whose benefits permeate our entire society. As Dean Palm has said, agriculture research stretches beyond the production and marketing of the farm to our growing suburban and nonfarm population. It supplies answers to countless problems of homeowners, and yields innumerable results of direct benefit to all mankind.

Research in all fields of endeavor has played an important role in shaping our Nation and our society of today. It has been a strong, workable, realistic partnership with government, industry, our colleges and universities, and other organizations. Even more than in the past, research today will determine the character of tomorrow. It will have a decided bearing on our gross national product, our competitive position in the world, our standard of living, and our pursuit of happiness.

It is a challenge to all of us to see that America's partnership for research remains balanced, diverse, vital and strong, so that our Nation will continue to fulfill its traditional promise of a better tomorrow.

Profile of a Lion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, unless one is an active member, the significance of our international service clubs to our Nation and the world can easily be overlooked.

Lions International is one of these great movements. It binds together public spirited citizens throughout the world. There are today 677,000 Lions in 17,117 clubs located in 121 countries and geographical locations throughout the world. These men have joined together to help, encourage, and extend the personal hand of friendship, to those who for any reason cannot help themselves.

On May 18 it was my privilege to be present and speak briefly to the guests at a testimonial dinner given in honor of my long-time friend and former associate, Michael Orecchio, of Fairview, N.J., on the occasion of the completion of his term as a governor of District 16–A, New Jersey, Lions International.

Governor Orecchio is the owner of the Orecchio Agency, in Fairview, N.J., a well known and highly successful real estate and insurance business. During his entire life, Michael Orecchio has served his community with zeal and devotion. He sponsored and aided in the construction of his town's first playground. He equipped and set up a baseball league for youngsters. He was instrumental in organizing the town's first Boy Scout troop. He served for years on both the board of education and the planning board. For 26 years he was a volunteer fireman, serving also as fire chief. He served as president of the Fairview Chamber of Commerce. Every fund-raising drive has benefited from his help and leadership. He has had a lifelong interest in crime detection and crime prevention, which led to his service as chief of detectives for Bergen County, N.J.

During his years as a member of Lions International, Michael Orecchio has seen a need for some brief credo which would identify a Lion to the community, to the world at large, and last but not least, to himself.

In words that are brief but full of meaning, he has written a "Profile of a Lion." Those who have heard this wonderful description of a Lion have been deeply moved by it.

Lions International was established 46 years ago. Its Lions Club objectives and Lions code of ethics set the standard for Lions conduct. In a sense, this "Profile of a Lion," taken together with the Lions Club objectives and the Lions code of ethics could well form a trinity of lionism.

Mr. Speaker, because the philosophy so well expressed in the "Profile of a Lion" could be followed by all of us, under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD.

PROFILE OF A LION

He is a respected citizen of his community.

He is reverent to his God, loyal to his country and uncompromising in his devotion to both.

He raises his glass in the "Lions toast" and thereby acknowledges the concept of equality of all Lions the world over.

He recognizes authority, accepts responsibility and exercises self-discipline, realizing that only through proper organization can Lionism achieve its greatest goals.

He gives willingly of his time, energy, and substance to assist his community and the needy.

He meets regularly with his fellow Lions and through the common denominator of "friendship" confers, plans and carries out the objectives of his Lions Club.

He is an ordinary guy, enjoys fun and good fellowship, although not perfect he is ever mindful of human concern.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who desirest truth in the inward parts, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning aside from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee.

Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and standing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are—petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own wills and whims, in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we approach Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts, we beseech Thee, from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered within these walls may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion, and from the treason of betraying the eternal principles which are the foundation stones of our national existence.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 28, 1963:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

On May 29, 1963:

S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park;

S. 247. An act to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village in Alaska; and

S. 873. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

On June 4, 1963:

S. 386. An act to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes.

On June 10, 1963:

S. 1409. An act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF LABORATORY BUILDING AT COLORADO UNIVERSITY, BOULDER, COLO.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a laboratory building at Colorado University, Boulder, Colo.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES AT UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of additional research facilities at the University of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of appropriations within that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Amendment of Federal Aviation Act, Relating to Grant of Exclusive Rights at Airports

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Renegotiation Act of 1951, To Extend the Provisions to the Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 8), as amended (50 U.S.C., App. sec. 1213(a) and sec. 1213(b)) to extend the provisions of that act to the Federal Aviation Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Balances of Foreign Currencies Acquired Without Payment of Dollars

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1962

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Memorial 1575

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida

"Whereas the Florida Keys are located but 90 miles from the coast of Cuba which is now a vast fortress under Communist domination where Russian and other Communist satellite nation troops are now massed; and

"Whereas the Key West naval complex has become the hub of United States defense to the mainland of our Nation, and the need for the movement of troops and equipment to and from the Key West naval complex is essential to our national defense system; and

"Whereas Hurricane Donna, in September 1960 destroyed the Tea Table Relief Bridge on Upper Matecumbe Key leaving the Florida Keys without access to the mainland of Florida; and

"Whereas utility service, the most important of which is the flow of fresh water, and the supply of other necessities of life were seriously disrupted; and

"Whereas the Florida Keys continue to remain vulnerable to destruction by natural elements; and

"Whereas the Inland Waterway ends at Cross Bank in the Florida Keys nearly 90 miles north of Key West and all shipping is exposed to the treacherous open waters of the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico and is subject to the dangers of a hostile nation and its allies using proximate shipping lanes; and

"Whereas no alternative route is available to provide for the flow of the necessities of life to the Florida Keys; and

"Whereas the Florida Keys are also completely dependent on the mainland of Florida for their supply of fresh water and the present source is located in proximity to a proposed oil refinery creating a water pollution hazard; and

"Whereas the populace of the Florida Keys and the Key West naval complex are desirous of obtaining an alternative source of fresh water which is readily available in the Everglades National Park; and

"Whereas the construction of a highway would link both coasts of Florida, provide an alternative aqueduct, and open up a new area for recreation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to authorize the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Florida delegation to the Congress of the United States of America."

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

House Concurrent Resolution —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Sec. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"Inez Watson,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

"House Concurrent Resolution —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Article V thereof

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Article —

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"Inez Watson,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

"House Concurrent Resolution —

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'Article —

"'Section 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power of jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

"'Sec. 2. Three-fourths of the Justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire court to reserve a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

"'Sec. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

"'Sec. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

"'Sec. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

"'Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Attest:

"Inez Watson,
"*Clerk of the House*."

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning apportionment of representation in State legislatures.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 149

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constition of the United States concerning apportionment of representation in State legislatures

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Article —

"Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"Sec. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

"Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 148

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this General Assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Article —

"Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION TO PROVIDE FOR A COURT OF THE UNION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide for a Court of the Union.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 147

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide for a Court of the Union

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within two years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a Court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

"SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

"SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

"SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRAYER AND USE OF THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a petition signed by a large number of Iowans requesting active support for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit a nonsectarian prayer to be used in the public schools and to permit the use of the Bible in the classrooms of the various States. I ask that the petition be referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECT OUR HERITAGE

To the honorable Senators from the State of Iowa:

We, the undersigned, registered voters, do hereby petition for your sponsorship, or wholehearted and active support, of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit a nonsectarian prayer to be used in the public schools and to permit the use of the Bible in the classrooms of the various States.

(Signed by Jane Ringland, and 39 other citizens of the State of Iowa.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368) (Rept. No. 236).

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156); which, under the rule was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States", submitted by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to the Committee on the Judiciary; and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1686. A bill to amend section 375 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 1687. A bill to approve the January 1963 reclassification of land of the Big Flat unit of the Missoula Valley project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with the Big Flat Irrigation District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1688. A bill to extend to State public assistance programs approved under titles XIV and XVI of the Social Security Act the special matching provisions presently in force with respect to certain Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1689. A bill to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to preserve domestic peace and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1690. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1691. A bill relating to the occupational training of youth, and the development and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1692. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as "National Public Works Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to bestow a Congressional Medal of National Honor on Carl Sandburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

MAINTENANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF RECORDS RELATING TO APPOINTMENTS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think all of us are aware of a move by the Air Force to transfer from the District of Columbia area, in relatively close proximity to Capitol Hill, the records and other information maintained by the Air Force in regard to appointees and nominees to the U.S. Air Force Academy and to the cadets who are in training there. It is understood that the proposal is to move these records to the Air Force Academy itself. I believe the proposed move would be a mistake, and I have so informed the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MUNDT, CARLSON, HARTKE, MILLER, CURTIS, and METCALF, I now submit a resolution on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk for 3 days, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it. The resolution states that it is the sense of the Senate that these records should remain in the District of Columbia area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The resolution (S. Res. 154) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the Department of the Air Force presently maintains in the Greater Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia certain information relating to appointees and nominees to the United States Air Force Academy; and

Whereas such information is and has been made readily accessible to and has been utilized extensively by Members of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the Department of the Air Force should continue to maintain within the Greater Metropolitan Area of the District of Columbia the master control record relating to (1) all nominees to the United States Air Force Academy, (2) all cadets in training at such Academy, (3) all cadets discharged from such Academy, (4) all Congressional cadet quotas for such Academy, and (5) the status of those persons under consideration for appointment to each entering class of the Academy.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE BEYOND ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule I of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] be, and he is hereby, authorized to perform the duties of the Chair as Acting President pro tempore from today and during the temporary absence from the city of the President pro tempore [Mr. Hayden].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 155) was considered and agreed to.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Eastland, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ANNUITIES OF WIDOWS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1686) to amend section 375 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at times, in the rush of events, those who because of their age or their situation cannot speak out, are passed by. A case of this type has recently been called to my attention. Nine years ago when we were considering the question of annuities for widows of Supreme Court Justices, we passed a law providing that their annuity should be in the same amount as the annuity authorized for the widow of a President of the United States. We did this by incorporating in that law a reference to a statute which had been enacted in 1937 dealing with the annuity of a President's widow.

A few years ago, in 1958, it became apparent to us that an amount of money which might have been adequate for a widow in 1937 was no longer sufficient for her support in 1958, and we, therefore, provided for an increase in the annuity of a widow of a former President. However, because of a quirk in the law providing for annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices, which referred by name to the act passed in 1937, these widows were not caught up in the new law which provided for the increase in the annuities to the widows of Presidents. As a result, those fine ladies have been forced to make do on an amount which was determined in 1937 and there is not a one of us who does not know how inadequate such an amount is today.

I have been informed that there is some urgency about this matter because of the circumstances in which several of the widows of Supreme Court Justices now find themselves in their efforts to live in 1963 upon a stipend which was determined in 1937. Therefore, I have introduced a bill to bring these annuities into line with those we provided in 1958, and I hope that this bill will be accorded a most expeditious treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONCILIATION SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself and for the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to help preserve peace in communities threatened by racial violence and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I offer this bill with the hope that it may be included in the overall legislation program on civil rights which I earnestly hope Congress will enact this year.

While no substitute for many other pressing legislative proposals I firmly believe this bill would represent a moderate and meaningful part of any well rounded legislative program in the civil rights field.

In my judgment, one of the most important lessons of the recent Birmingham crisis is the critical need and tremendous value of timely conciliation to establish lines of communication in our race-torn communities, preferably before intense antagonisms and inflamed passions are aroused.

In Birmingham, this administration scored a major success through widescale mediating efforts, in which Burke Marshall, the head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, played a major role right on the scene.

These efforts were widely hailed, for they truly set the stage for meaningful civil rights gains in that torn city. As Revs. Martin Luther King and Fred L. Shuttesworth said of the Birmingham agreements:

> Birmingham may well offer for 20th century America an example of progressive racial relations; and for all mankind a dawn of a new day, a promise for all men, a day of opportunity, and a new sense of freedom for all America.

This triumph of cooperation triggered by conciliation argues strongly, I believe, for the establishment of a national service with regional offices to work in communities on a regular, continuing basis for the goal of both racial peace and social justice.

Fortunately in Birmingham, when violence erupted, the mediators were rushed out and the flames extinguished. But next time we may not be so fortunate, unless moderating influences are brought into play before the house even starts smoking.

But peace alone is not the goal. There must be both peace and progress toward greater social justice.

The bill I have introduced would not only seek to preserve the peace when violence threatens. It would also seek in every voluntary way possible to insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Working through a national agency and regional offices, the service would provide advice, information, and technical assistance to local communities. It would seek, encourage, and utilize the cooperation of all possible appropriate Government agencies, private institutions, industries, organizations, and individuals. It would be headed, I hope, by the most highly qualified person to be found in the United States.

I would emphasize the catalytic role of the service, for no single man or agency can do the whole job that needs to be done. Civic, business, labor, and especially religious leaders must play a far larger role, and this proposed service could be a tremendous help to the vitally needed broader effort.

In passing, it is worth noting that yesterday at the meeting of the U.S. Conferences of Mayors in Hawaii, the President recommended the establishment of biracial human relations committees in each city. And I think this national service could be of substantial help to local human relations committees in providing advice, guidance, and technical assistance for their efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Monday next for other Senators to join in sponsorship, and I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record together with several articles from the May 10 and 11 issues of the New York Times commenting on the mediating efforts made during the Birmingham crisis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New Jersey, and the bill, together with the articles, will be printed at this point in the Record.

The bill (S. 1689) to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to preserve domestic peace and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Relations and Conciliation Service Act".

DUTIES OF THE SERVICE

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government a Community Relations and Conciliation Service (hereafter referred to as the "Service"). It shall be the duty of the Service, subject to the provisions of this Act, to—

(1) provide conciliation assistance in communities where disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution or interstate commerce of the United States are disrupting, or are threatening to disrupt, peaceful relations among citizens of such communities, and

(2) provide advice, information and technical assistance to local communities, and otherwise seek by voluntary means to insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance under this Act shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and they shall not be obliged to disclose any information acquired in the regular course of performing their duties.

COOPERATION WITH STATE, LOCAL, AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

Sec. 3. The Service shall whenever possible in the course of carrying out the purposes of this Act, seek, encourage, and utilize the cooperation of all appropriate Government agencies, industries, institutions, organizations, and individuals in such communities.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Sec. 4. (a) The Service shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year.

(b) There shall be two Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Assistant Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified. Each Assistant Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $17,500 per annum. Each Assistant Director shall perform such duties and functions as may be assigned to him, or delegated to him, by the Director. The Director is authorized to delegate to the Assistant Directors such of his powers and duties as he deems advisable.

(c) The Director is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as may be necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service under this Act.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; REGIONAL OFFICES

Sec. 5. The principal office of the Service shall be in the metropolitan area of Washington, but the Director may establish such regional offices as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Sec. 6. Subject to the provisions of section 2(b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The articles from the March 10 and 11 issues of the New York Times are as follows:

WASHINGTON

(By James Reston)

Washington.—President Kennedy has adopted a cautious strategy in the Birmingham conflict. He has rejected the provocations of the extremists there and here and bet everything on arousing the moderates in Alabama.

This will not be easy. Ironically, the President is being blamed in the conservative South for saying too much about Birmingham, and in the liberal North for saying too little, but in fact he is presiding over a very delicate attempt to find an effective compromise.

Very quietly in the last few days, literally hundreds of telephone calls have been made from here and elsewhere in the North and South to responsible private citizens and officials in Birmingham.

Officials here, beginning with Attorney General Robert Kennedy, have been on the phone to officials in the South who might have some influence in producing a truce. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has been talking to bankers and other friends in Alabama. Leaders of large national businesses, with branch stores in Birmingham, have been talking to their branch managers there.

All this has had a single purpose: to mobilize the moderate elements in Birmingham and get them to work for peace at the local level, rather than leaving the field to the extremists.

The pressure on President Kennedy to follow a different course has been immense this week. With every story and photograph of violence in Birmingham, he has been pressed either to intervene with Federal troops or at least to issue a sharp public denunciation of the Birmingham police officials.

KENNEDY'S DILEMMA

It has not been easy for him to resist this course, for he has condemned the patient approach to such problems in the past. In 1960, he condemned President Eisenhower obliquely by saying that the American President in the sixties would "demand more than ringing manifestos from the rear of the battle."

"It will demand," he added, "that the President place himself in the very thick of the fight, that he care passionately about the fate of the people he leads, that he be willing to serve them at the risk of incurring their momentary displeasure."

All this has been recalled to him by his liberal friends this week in order to encourage his sharp intervention, but neither the President nor his brother the Attorney General, who is often accused of being the hothead of the administration, analyzed the problem that way.

The Birmingham case, in their view, was not like the University of Mississippi case, where a Federal court order was clearly being defied by refusing to admit James Meredith to the university. Nor was it the same as the Montgomery, Ala., case, where Negroes engaged in interstate commerce were in imminent danger.

ADMINISTRATION SENTIMENT

Accordingly, section 333 of title 10 of the United States Code did not seem to the administration to apply to Birmingham. Nor did it appear to be useful to express the strong feelings genuinely felt here. For while this would undoubtedly make Washington feel better, it might also influence the Alabama Supreme Court, which has been asked to decide whether the present Birmingham city officials be retained in office, or a more moderate group be established.

For all these reasons, a decision was made to reject both troops and manifestos and try quietly to appeal to the conscience, commonsense and self-interest of the moderate citizens of the city.

Burke Marshall, the quiet head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, and Assistant General Louis F. Obderdorfer, an Alabaman, were sent to Birmingham to try to mediate in the dispute.

Meanwhile, the telephones started ringing. Chainstore executives were urged to agree to desegregate their branches in Birmingham when it was legal under local law to do so. Moderate ministers in the North and South called the Birmingham ministers to urge that the efforts at mediation be given time to work. Lawyers called on former classmates in Birmingham to speak out for moderation, and apparently all this has had some effect.

THE NORTH-SOUTH DIALOG

Nobody here is prepared to predict what will happen from hour to hour, but at least moderation is being given a chance. The Attorney General has been trying to open up an honest dialog with the South. He went to Alabama a few days before the riots started. He got nowhere with the Governor, but found others in the administration who, while disagreeing with the administration's views on desegregation, were prepared to support the law.

Thus a discussion of these questions was started before the rocks began to fly and it has been greatly widened ever since. Atlanta mobilized its moderates by itself, and Birmingham is now being urged to do the same. It is a much more difficult problem there, but at least a start has been made.

SANITY IN BIRMINGHAM

A precarious peace prevails in Birmingham, thanks to a unique experiment in collective bargaining between men of enlightenment in the white and Negro community. President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, have played a skillful behind-the-scenes role in averting a racial explosion that could have reached frightful dimensions. Whatever faults extremists on both sides may find with the mode of Federal intervention, the overwhelming national sentiment must be one of relief that the ugly passions of recent days have not found expression in civil war on Birmingham's streets.

The pledge of the city's businessmen to desegregate lunch counters and other store facilities and to abolish discriminatory employment practices represents a significant breakthrough. The foundation has been laid for amicable race relations based on mutual respect and cooperation. It would be delusive, however, to pretend that this cooperation can be made secure without much more display of patience and good will on both sides.

The business leaders who negotiated the accord spoke only for themselves in promising a leveling of the iron bars of segregation. The city's lame-duck mayor denounced them as "a bunch of quisling, gutless traitors." Governor Wallace of Alabama has been almost equally condemnatory. Even the moderate new Birmingham administration, headed by Mayor-elect Boutwell, does not consider itself bound by the agreement. Most shocking of all was the declaration of Safety Commissioner Eugene (Bull) Conner that he was sorry an associate of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., hospitalized after being hit by a jet from a high-pressure fire hose, had not been carried off in a hearse, instead of an ambulance.

The Negro leaders have now succeeded in focusing national attention on the abuses to which Negroes have been subjected in this citadel of repression. The President has put the prestige of his office behind the satisfaction of their justifiable needs. To spread more marches through Alabama at this juncture, as some Negroes have suggested, could only renew the danger of heavy casualties and irrepressible violence. The presence of hundreds of children among the marchers made all these marches especially perilous ventures in brinkmanship. The Nation will hope that the good beginning made in the present peace pact will ripen into a full recognition in Birmingham and the rest of Alabama of the need for equal treatment and equal opportunity, as guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution.

RACIAL PEACEMAKER

(By Burke Marshall)

WASHINGTON.—For the last week the burden of preventing more serious violence in Birmingham and of starting long-term improvement in race relations there has rested largely on the slim shoulders of the Justice Department's civil rights chief, Burke Marshall. By outward appearances, Mr. Marshall is an unlikely figure for such a dramatic role. He is slight of build, unassuming in manner and soft of voice—uncommonly quiet and undramatic.

MAN IN THE NEWS

But it is inner qualities that make the man, or at any rate this man, according to his friends and colleagues. They regard Mr. Marshall as ideal for the peacemaker's role in Birmingham because of his qualities of intellect and style.

His very quietness, his lack of drama, fit him to be a negotiator in situations of great tension. His coolness—courage would be another word for it—inspires confidence. So does his lawyer's way of thinking, analytically and without sentimental confusion.

BEST MAN FOR JOB

Perhaps most of all, to those who know him, Mr. Marshall is the image of the ideal lawyer.

"Burke was the best man for this job," another Justice Department lawyer said, "because he is so clear and so gently persuasive.

"He takes things one at a time, separating out each issue, ones that you didn't even realize were there. By talking in that quiet way he gets people to do the right thing without forcing them.

"It's like the best kind of lawyer with a jury. When the trial's over, they go his way, and they tell you: 'It was not what he said—that was obvious.'"

Mr. Marshall got the job as head of the Justice Department's civil rights division by being a lawyer of exceptional reputation, not a man of experience in civil rights. His chief interest in the Washington firm of Covington & Burling was antitrust law.

There is a legend about Mr. Marshall's first meeting with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who can also be extremely laconic. When Mr. Kennedy first invited him over to be interviewed for the civil rights job, it is said, the two of them sat for minutes without saying a word.

But the Attorney General sensed strength in him and is today one of Mr. Marshall's greatest boosters. That is so although Mr. Marshall wholly lacks the extroverted, football-player qualities said to be admired by the Kennedys.

As Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Marshall has had to learn ways other than those of the litigating lawyer that he was. In this job he has had to deal with passions as intense as those of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ross R. Barnett, Mississippi's Governor.

In Birmingham he has provided an essential line of communication between the protesting Negroes and the white community. Before he arrived there, it is reported, white leaders did not even know what the Negroes wanted.

His role has been the more difficult because he had no ultimate legal power to impose solutions. He could only reason with the two sides, holding back the frustrated Negro groups and trying to persuade the white leaders to accept inevitable change.

Always in Mr. Marshall's mind was the threat that has been with him always in this job—the possibility of racial tensions leading to death.

Mr. Marshall, who is 40 years old, comes from Plainfield, N.J. He went to Phillips Exeter Academy and Yale, then learned Japanese, was an Army linguist, and served in postwar Japan. He still doodles in Japanese characters.

In Tokyo he married Violet Person, who had worked with him as a Japanese linguist for Army intelligence. They have three daughters—Josephine, 11, Catherine, 7, and Jan, 4.

The Marshalls play bridge, and they have a farm at Berkeley Springs, W. Va. But Mr. Marshall has not seen much of it recently.

A DOZEN MEN FORGED ACCORD IN NEGRO'S HOME

(By Hedrick Smith)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—A dozen men hammered out the settlement of Birmingham's racial crisis on the living room floor of a Negro insurance executive's home.

Their meetings were frank, informal, hard-bargaining sessions. The negotiators worked in shirtsleeves, often without ties. Some even took off their shoes.

The sessions lasted until all hours, especially early in the week when the bargaining teams met twice until nearly 4 a.m.

Before dawn Wednesday, after a nightlong session, the negotiators had produced the basic outline of the package announced today.

ACCORD ALMOST WRECKED

But their accord was nearly scrapped several times before they could complete the details.

The worst crisis broke Wednesday afternoon, less than 2 hours after President Kennedy had announced to the Nation that a settlement had been reached in Birmingham.

The difficulty sprang from the jailing of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, the group's secretary-treasurer.

While efforts were being made to raise the $5,000 bond needed to free them, other Negro leaders were threatening to resume mass demonstrations, which had been suspended.

The Reverend Wyatt Tee Walker, Dr. King's executive assistant, charged white leaders with bad faith. The Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, head of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, put on his marching shoes to lead a demonstration.

HEADED OFF BY U.S. AIDS

The crisis was headed off by Justice Department officials, who played an important role in pushing the negotiations to their successful conclusion.

Joseph F. Dolan, a Deputy Assistant U.S. Attorney General, found Mr. Shuttlesworth about to leave his motel room to start a demonstration. He grabbed the Negro leader with one hand and telephoned Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy with the other.

The Attorney General persuaded Mr. Shuttlesworth to hold off further demonstrations until at least the following morning, to give the negotiators more time.

After Dr. King's release later that evening, the negotiations moved with even greater speed than before.

The negotiations this week actually marked the fourth major effort in the past 5 weeks to solve the racial dispute.

The first attempt was made by a number of clergymen early in April. Later, a group of student demonstrators from Miles College, a Negro school here, sought unsuccessfully to work out some agreement with downtown merchants on lunch counter desegregation.

A third effort was made by some of the same white and Negro leaders who helped to produce today's agreement. But their efforts fell through last month, shortly before the massive demonstrations began May 2.

After the major Negro demonstrations started, the Justice Department moved into the picture. Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, arrived last Saturday. Working with three assistants, he sought first to bring the opposing sides together once again, and later to help mediate the dispute.

The first key bargaining sessions were held Monday night at the brick and frame ranch-style home of John J. Drew, the Negro insurance executive.

The white business community was represented by Sidney W. Smyer, a real estate man and former president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, and two young lawyers, David Vann and Erskine Smith.

Local Negroes were represented by Mr. Drew; L. H. Pitts, president of Miles College; Mr. Shuttlesworth; the Reverend Harold Long; Arthur D. Shores, a lawyer; and A. G. Gaston, a businessman.

Dr. King, Mr. Abernathy, and the Reverend Andrew Young participated on behalf of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Justice Department's representatives were Mr. Marshall and Mr. Dolan.

CALLS LEADERS INTO SESSION

The business representatives left the meeting Monday at about 3 a.m., convinced that the Negroes' major demands would have to be met in at least general terms.

The following afternoon Mr. Smyer summoned the Senior Citizens Committee, a group of about 75 Birmingham industrial, commercial, and professional leaders, to an emergency session.

The meeting heard a report from Sheriff Melvin Bailey that the local enforcement agencies had been "strained to the utmost of (their) capacity," Mr. Smyer said. He said the sheriff had reported that unless the demonstrations were stopped and order restored the next step would be the declaration of martial law.

Faced with this alternative, the Senior Citizens Committee empowered a subcommittee composed of the three negotiators and several other business leaders, to come to terms with the Negro leaders.

The most important negotiating session of the week followed that evening, again in Mr. Drew's home.

The session was more friendly and more productive than the one the night before. At Mr. Drew's request, Mr. Smyer opened it with a prayer.

Text of Negro Leaders' Statements

Birmingham, Ala.—Following are the texts of a joint statement by the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Reverend Ralph D. Abernethy announcing terms of an agreement reached with white Birmingham business and civic leaders, and a separate statement by Dr. King:

JOINT STATEMENT

The city of Birmingham has reached an accord with its conscience. The acceptance or responsibility by local white and Negro leadership offers an example of a free people uniting to meet and solve their problems. Birmingham may well offer for 20th century America an example of progressive racial relations; and for all mankind a dawn of a new day, a promise for all men, a day of opportunity, and a new sense of freedom for all America. Thusly, Birmingham may again become a Magic City.

Responsible leaders of both Negro and white communities of Birmingham, being desirous of promoting conditions which will ensure sound moral, economic and political growth of their city, in the interest of all citizens of Birmingham, after mutual consideration and discussion of the issues relating to the recent demonstrations in the city, have agreed to the following:

1. The desegregation of lunch counters, restrooms, fitting rooms and drinking fountains in planned stages within the next 90 days. Cooperative, prayerful planning is necessary to ensure smooth transition.

2. The upgrading and hiring of Negroes on a nondiscriminatory basis throughout the industrial community of Birmingham. This will include the hiring of Negroes as clerks and salesmen within the next 60 days, and the immediate appointment of a committee of business, industrial and professional leaders for the implementation of an area-wide program for acceleration of upgrading and the employment of Negroes in job categories previously denied to Negroes.

8. Our movement has made arrangements for the release of all persons on bond or their personal recognizance. Our legal department is working with further solutions in this problem.

4. Through the Senior Citizens Committee, or the chamber of commerce, communications between Negro and white will be publicly reestablished within the next 2 weeks. We would hope that this channel of communications between the white and Negro communities will prevent the necessity of further protest demonstrations such as have been conducted.

DR. KING'S STATEMENT

I am very happy to be able to announce that we have come today to the climax of a long struggle for justice, freedom, and human dignity in the city of Birmingham. I say the climax, and not the end, for though we have come a long way, there is still a strenuous task before us and some of it is yet uncharted.

Nevertheless, it can now be said that after a great struggle this day is clearly the moment of a great victory. The greatness of the triumph is measured by this one fact: it is a victory that cannot possibly be confined to the limited area of one race. Indeed, the agreements which have been reached over the last few days are signal accomplishments which redound to the credit of all of Birmingham's citizens. As a matter of fact, I believe sincerely that this victory cannot even be confined within the limits of this sprawling metropolis, for Birmingham now stands on the threshold of becoming a great, enlightened symbol, shedding the radiance of its example throughout this entire Nation.

Credit for what has been done must go to many persons. Without question, of course, the name of Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth stands clear as the magic name in this magic city. He has walked a long and often lonesome road to reach this day—and even now his health is impaired—but he has just reason to be thankful and glad for all of his great sacrifices. Moreover, the many men and women who worked with him, by his side and behind the scenes, in the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights must also be praised. And, without a doubt, the world will never forget the thousands of children and adults who gave up their own physical safety and freedom and went to jail to secure the safety and freedom of all men.

PRAISES WHITES

I must say this, too: In these recent days, I have been deeply impressed by the quality of the white persons of the community who worked so diligently for just solutions to our mutual problems. They must also be given real credit. They are men of good will. However, when all is said and done, when this situation is seen in perspective of eternity, ultimate credit and glory and honor must be given to Almighty God, for He has clearly been at work among us. And it is He alone who has finally gained the victory for all His children.

Under His guidance, we now enter into a new day for Birmingham people, a day when men will no longer fear to speak the truth, when citizens will no longer cringe before the threats of misguided men. We look forward now to continued progress toward the establishment of a city in which equal job opportunities, equal access to public facilities, and equal rights and responsibilities for all of its people will be the order of every day.

However, even these needful things are not our final goal. The deepest hope that surges up within our hearts in this: that Birmingham is on its way to the creation of a new kind of community—not simply a new image, but a new reality. We are looking forward to that moment—so nearly upon us—when this metropolis will truly become a magic city again. This time filled with the beautiful magic of a new brotherhood where men are free to know, respect, and love each other. We seek ultimately a magic city where color will no longer be the measure of a man's worth, where character will matter more than pigmentation.

I cannot close without saying the Negro community must accept this achievement in the right spirit. We must not see the present development as a victory for the Negro: It is rather a victory for democracy and the whole citizenry of Birmingham—Negro and white. Our growth in nonviolence has been such that we cannot be satisfied with a "victory" over our white brothers. We must respond to every new development in civil rights with an understanding of those who have opposed us, and with an appreciation of the new adjustments that the new achievements pose for them. We must be able to face up honestly to our own shortcomings.

This is the time that we must evince calm dignity and wise restraint. Emotion must not run wild. Violence must not come from any of us, and if we be victimized with violent acts or intent, the pending daybreak of progress will be transformed into a gloomy midnight of retrogress. As we stand on the verge of using public facilities heretofore closed to us, we must not be overbearing and haughty in spirit. We must be loving enough to turn an enemy into a friend. We must now move from protest to reconciliation. This, too, is our hope for Birmingham. It is a hope that will cause us to look at the signs which say "It is nice to have you in Birmingham," in a new way. Now, we will know that these words are meant for all men, and we will know they are sincere. Then, and only then, will all the citizens of this community be able to say in joyful response: "Thank you. It is great to be in Birmingham—a city of honor, respect, and brotherly love."

Accord Pleases Robert Kennedy—Marshall Calls Ageement Great Gain for South

(By Anthony Lewis)

Washington, May 10.—Justice Department officials hailed the settlement of the Birmingham racial dispute as "a tremendous step forward for Birmingham, for Alabama, and for the South generally."

Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, made that comment at a news conference after returning from a negotiator's role in Birmingham. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was at his side.

Mr. Kennedy said the great lesson of the Birmingham crisis was the importance of whites and Negroes, sitting down together and talking—"the importance of getting a dialog."

"The alternative [to discussion] is going to be great violence," Mr. Kennedy said, "and it is going to be turning these matters over to extremists on both sides."

He said the white extremists were those who "think Negroes should not wear a tie and can't discuss them without using a swear word," and Negro extremists those who "think that white people have mistreated the Negroes for such a long period of time that violence should be used against them."

"All of us in all sections of the country have a great lesson to learn," he continued, "the importance of getting a dialog going between people in the North and the South.

"We really have to start having greater exchanges so that a southern Senator can talk to Burke Marshall or the Attorney General to a southern Governor and not lose votes for him, and a (northern politician) can say something nice about some southern leader and not feel that that is going to lose him the next election.

"That is, in our judgment, what is missing at the present time in the United States."

Mr. Marshall, who played a key part in bringing white and Negro leaders together in Birmingham, also emphasized the importance for the entire South of the fact that there had been biracial discussions in a city with troubled race relations.

"The important thing" Mr. Marshall said, "is that the settlement was reached by the people down there."

"For a city like Birmingham, with a history of difficult race relations, to reach a settlement like this after only a few hours of discussion in a most tense atmosphere is a tremendous step forward for Birmingham, for Alabama and for the South generally."

The Attorney General gave Mr. Marshall high commendation for his efforts in Birmingham in the week that began when the

Assistant Attorney General flew there last Saturday.

Mr. Kennedy said he had talked with the white and the Negro leaders in Birmingham, and it was "the unanimous feeling on both sides that if it hadn't been for his (Mr. Marshall's) efforts and the work that he did the settlement would not have been possible."

"We couldn't have gotten the people to sit down," he said, "couldn't have gotten the people to exchange their views, couldn't have gotten an agreement—and the situation in Birmingham would be far different tonight.

"It thinks he has performed a real function for Alabama, Birmingham and our people."

Those familiar with the tense week in Birmingham said today that lack of communication was one of the major problems. Financial and other leaders in the white community had no idea what the Negro demonstrators really wanted.

At first, it was said, the white leaders took the position that the whole episode was the work of "an outside agitator," the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But gradually, over last weekend, they came to realize that the Negro community felt it was the victim of injustice and wanted change.

"There was a growing recognition," one Birmingham leader said, "by a lot of people when they thought about it, that the Negroes were demanding something that wasn't so unreasonable—to have a cup of coffee at a lunch counter, to get a decent job."

In addition to this greater understanding of the Negro complaints, the financial community began to fear the economic setback that Birmingham would get from a real outbreak of violence or military intervention.

If steps toward a settlement had not been well under way by the middle of this week, the feeling was that violence was inevitable. It was also believed that Gov. George Wallace, an extreme segregationist, was about to take over the city with National Guard troops.

The general feeling at the Justice Department today was one of optimism, although no one thought that Birmingham was entirely out of danger.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which seeks to get at the heart of the problem of our unemployed youth.

Mr. President, this proposal is an effort to assist those young people who find it difficult or impossible to acquire employment today because they do not possess those skills which are required by our more sophisticated, complex labor market. Without exception administration witnesses, and, indeed everyone else who has written or spoken on the subject, have stressed a necessity for training young people in appropriate skills.

This is the second time that I have offered this proposal. When the Senate was considering S. 1, I offered an amendment to strike title I, the so-called "Youth Conservation Corps," and a very large minority of the Senate, 41 to 47, agreed with me. Then, I offered the idea contained in this bill as a substitute. A considerable minority of the Senate agreed with me. I thought that it was eminently to be preferred to the Youth Conservation Corps. Because this substitute was defeated at that time, however, I do not for a minute believe that it is inappropriate for consideration by the Senate now. The President's Committee on Youth Employment, in its report of April 24, has endorsed the substance of this proposal. I am confident that if we do not adopt it this session, it will have to be considered again next year.

The YCC has been approved by the Senate. I do not know what will happen to it in the House. But, if it is passed, I suppose it will be signed. In dollars, we will be $50 million poorer as a nation, but the training of our youth will not have been enhanced one iota as a result.

The watchword which should be our guide in all these matters is training. A bill must train young people if it is to be effective to cope with the problems of ill-trained, unemployed youth on our street corners.

It makes little difference in this day whether a youth genuinely wants to work or not; he cannot do so if he is not trained.

We were unable to do much to advance our training programs when the Senate was considering S. 1. The massive push for something "popular" prevented effective legislation in that instance.

However, my bill would provide an opportunity for the Senate to do something constructive for unemployed youth. The testimony on S. 1 indicated great satisfaction with the Manpower Development and Training Act. That act has, indeed, done good things for our adult populations.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, however, has not done very much for our young people. The reason for this is that only 5 percent of the funds for allowances under that act are available to train young people. The program and its accomplishments, however, have demonstrated their worth. The Manpower Development and Training Act can be of great benefit to our unemployed youth. I submit that the country can ill afford to get along without it.

Mr. President, our Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is now considering S. 580, the administration omnibus bill, containing some seven titles relating to various facets of the Nation's education. Title five of that bill deals with vocational education. It provides some $70 million to be authorized for expenditure on State plans for vocational education.

I have long argued that vocational education has been treated as the stepchild in American education. It has had to take a back seat to academic courses, and the students who sought to pursue vocational courses were regarded as something less than the best students.

Our present labor requirements are rapidly changing that picture. The needs of our economy are crying out for skilled young people to operate our marvelous economic machine.

Last November, the Committee on Vocational Education, appointed by the President, reported on the state of vocational education. It recommended, as a matter of some urgency, that an adequate program of vocational training would necessitate an expenditure of some $400 million.

With everyone in agreement that training in the vocational arts and crafts is one of the most necessary programs with which the Government should concern itself, the administration proposes in title V of S. 580 a paltry $70 million for strengthening vocational education. And out of this, any vocational education facilities to be constructed must be paid for.

Roughly, only one-twelfth of the funds in S. 580 is earmarked for vocational education purposes. This, in face of the testimony of Secretary of Labor Wirtz before the House committee this year that 80 percent of the students now in school will not acquire a college degree, and will thus have to be prepared for vocational training positions in industry which our complex society now require. We are, therefore, providing 80 percent of our young people with only 8 percent of the funds under S. 580.

Mr. President, this present proposal will help to fill the enormous gap between what the President's committee recommended and the amounts contained in S. 580 for use in vocational education.

The proposal which I now offer would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of last year by removing the 5 percent limitation on availability of funds for training allowances for youth. It also would increase the authorization for the Manpower Development and Training Act by $45 million for fiscal 1964, and such sums as Congress may appropriate during the succeeding 4 fiscal years. In addition, this bill will lower the age limit for participation in the Manpower Development and Training Act to include youths from 16 to 22 years of age.

As I said at the outset, I offered this proposal as an amendment to S. 1, the Youth Conservation Corps bill. That was on April 9 of this year. I noticed this morning with some satisfaction that the President's Committee on Youth Employment in its report dated April 24, 1963, has agreed with me. That report endorses my concept of expanding the youth portions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It is my hope that the administration will give full support to the recommendations of its own committee—even if that does mean that it will give support to an idea which originated on this side of the aisle.

It will be nothing short of disastrous for our youth and our Nation if we continue to refuse to regard with the importance they deserve the warnings of educators, labor, management, and, indeed, the Government witnesses themselves on this program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1691) relating to the occupational training of youth, and the development and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF NATIONAL HONOR TO CARL SANDBURG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference—and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record—a joint resolution the purpose of which is to see to it that one of the foremost historians of our time, Carl Sandburg, receives a Congressional Medal of National Honor. This measure is a companion to House Joint Resolution 443, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative Fred Schwengel, of the First Congressional District of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) to bestow a Congressional Medal of National Honor on Carl Sandburg, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas, since 1913, the genius of Carl Sandburg has illumined and celebrated the heart, the mind, and the soul of our people and the spirit of our land through poetry, history, biography, song, and speech; and

Whereas he has placed us before ourselves and the world as we were, as we are, and as our highest aspiration would have us be and thereby added ponderably to our progress at home and imperishably to our repute abroad; and

Whereas he was on February 12, 1959, and March 4, 1961, invited by the Congress to address its Members and all Americans and did deliver before the joint session and before the multitude assembled on the east front two of our most memorable and distinguished addresses about our most American American, Abraham Lincoln: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America bestow upon Carl Sandburg a Congressional Medal of National Honor and therewith the assurance of great admiration and profound respect and the deep affection in which he is held by the Congress, by the people of the United States, and by literary and cultural authorities everywhere for his half century of devotion to letters and his genius for disseminating interest in the American heritage; and be it further

Resolved, That there be an appropriation for $2,500 for the purpose of paying for the medal and incidental expenses in connection with a presentation; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States along with a Cabinet member appointed by him and a bipartisan committee of four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate be appointed by the Speaker and by the President of the Senate, and that the Librarian of the Library of Congress, the Director of the National Gallery of Arts, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution form a committee on presentation of the medal, who, in consultation with the accepted leaders of arts, sciences, and humanities, arrange for an appropriate program of presentation and to make the presentation to Carl Sandburg.

ADJUSTMENT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PRODUCTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 1617, commonly referred to as a bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 23 and May 28, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1590. A bill to protect the right of all qualified persons to attend public schools, and for other purposes: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey; and

S. 1591. A bill to prohibit discrimination against any person on account of race or color in the furnishing of the advantages, privileges, and facilities of any business or business activity affecting the public which is conducted under State license: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS LIMITATIONS ON COMMERCIAL TIME

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters met in Lawrence, Kans., on May 8 and adopted a resolution expressing their views on the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission that the National Association of Broadcasters codes' time limitations on commercial time be adopted as a Government regulation.

As the resolution indicates, Kansas broadcasters feel that the Commission's proposal is unnecessary, unwise, and unfair. It strikes at the very heart of the public's right to censor.

The Kansas broadcasters have led the entire Nation in the voluntary subscription to the National Association of Broadcasters code of good practices, and I am proud of their record of service.

It is my hope that these broadcasters can and will continue to improve their service through individual initiative and enterprise, rather than by directives from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Unanimously Passed by the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters at Annual Meeting May 8, 1963, at Lawrence, Kans.

Whereas the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters feels that voluntary self-regulation is the best regulation; and

Whereas the National Association of Broadcasters has formed the code authority with responsibility to set maximum commercial limitations for the broadcasting industry; and

Whereas the KARB endorses membership by all stations in the NAB code; and

Whereas KARB feels that any station following a policy allowing overcommercialization will ultimately suffer because of listeners' rights of free choice: Therefore be it

Resolved (1) that the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters opposes any Federal regulations concerning the amount of commercial material on broadcasting stations.

PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN AND CONFERENCE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a United Press International dispatch of 10 a.m. which appeared on the news ticker this morning. It reads as follows:

Washington.—President Kennedy announced today that the United States will not hold any further nuclear tests in the atmosphere "so long as other states do not do so."

Mr. President, I think this is a dreadful mistake. I serve on the Preparedness Subcommittee; and the testimony our subcommittee has heard indicates that we have been put back by abandoning testing once. So I do not think it wise that we abandon it again. I do not think we have to be promiscuous in the tests we make, but I think we should make tests—whether the tests are on the ground, under the ground, or in the atmosphere.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the ticker also includes the following item:

Kennedy issued the pledge in announcing that the United States, Russia, and Britain will begin high-level talks in Moscow soon in an effort to rescue a general nuclear test ban treaty.

The President said soberly that "the hopes of all mankind" go with the meetings, which are expected to start in mid-July under an agreement reached by Kennedy, Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and British Prime Minister Macmillan.

The President then said in this connection that the United States will prove "our good faith and solemn convictions" by holding off any further nuclear tests in the atmosphere "so long as other states do not do so."

"We will not be the first to resume," the President declared. "Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty—but I hope it will help us achieve one."

The President revealed the "two important decisions" in a speech prepared for delivery at commencement exercises at American University here.

The Moscow talks also were announced in London and in Moscow. While Kennedy gave no date, these reports said the talks would start in July. Competent sources said they would not involve a summit meeting for sessions at the Foreign Ministers' level.

Instead, these sources said, the discussions will be conducted by representatives of the three countries who have "the highest confidence" of the national leaders. These will not necessarily be persons in official positions.

In announcing the Moscow talks and his decision to refrain from atmospheric tests as long as other nations do so, Kennedy called on all Americans to "reexamine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home."

I think we are again walking on very dangerous ground. We began by calling for approximately 120 on-site inspections as the specific for any treaty to which we might agree. We have now decreased the number to seven, and I understand that the number can go to as low as five. What are we to gain from such high-level talks, Mr. President, except to reduce the number of on-site inspections to zero?

Such talks are not really high level, but are low level, and even that designation is a compliment to the Russians. They have not kept their word to us or to any other country since they began to make promises after World War II; and I believe we should remain at home, and should let the Russians come to us when they are ready to talk about any test ban.

I believe the President is wrong in announcing that there will be no further nuclear tests, and I think he is also wrong in stating that he will discuss this subject—or, for that matter, any other subject—with the Soviets, our announced enemies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Is it not true that Russia began, years ago, to insist on three tests, and has continued, all these years, to insist on only three tests, and still is insisting on only three tests, even though we have now decreased to seven the number we request? It is my personal opinion that even if we were to agree to three tests, the Russians would not sign such a treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Kansas is correct. The testimony presented before the Preparedness Subcommittee indicates that without on-site inspections, the idea of a nuclear test ban is foolish, because despite what some persons think, it is impossible to identify a nuclear blast by some seismic means. Instead, it is necessary to have someone proceed to the site and see whether such a device was actually detonated.

THE BEST JOB IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine section yesterday contained an excellent article by R. Sargent Shriver telling of his challenging and rewarding experiences as Director of the Peace Corps. It has indeed proven to be a most difficult, but satisfying position.

As the chief sponsor of the Peace Corps legislation in the Senate, I take special pride in the success this program has met with and the assistance it is giving to people and governments in all parts of the world. I repeat what I have said so often, that much of the credit for the huge success of the Peace Corps must go to Mr. Shriver for his tireless and outstanding contributions. He and his most able staff richly deserve our commendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I HAVE THE BEST JOB IN WASHINGTON"—THE DEEP SATISFACTION AND SHEER ADVENTURE OF RUNNING THE PEACE CORPS, SAYS ITS DIRECTOR, CANNOT BE MATCHED IN ANY OTHER JOB ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Sargent Shriver)

WASHINGTON.—Carol Byrnes, one of 5,000 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers, wrote from the Philippines: "The important thing we are doing here is not that which can be measured with a camera. People in other projects can photograph a bridge they've designed, a road they've helped to build, or a toilet they constructed. But who can photograph the mind of a child? Our rewards come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned."

A tribal chief in Sierra Leone, in the midst of a ceremony celebrating the construction by the Peace Corps of a road which, for the first time in its thousand-year history linked his village with the outside world told me: "Your Peace Corps has shown us a world we never knew existed. We had never seen a truck, or people from the outside who wanted to help us. We had heard of America, but now we know what it means."

A volunteer from the Midwest said: "For the first time in my life I feel that I'm not just sitting, letting the world go by. I have a chance to do something that is meaningful to people, and when I go back I'll be a better American because of it."

These stories have their counterparts in every continent of the developing world. The Peace Corps has brought learning to tens of thousands of children, opened up new worlds for hundreds of villages, brought new meaning and perspective into the lives of thousands of Americans, showed the face of an America which many never dreamed existed. These are satisfactions surpassed in no department of Government. They are some of the reasons why running the Peace Corps is the best job in Washington.

Of course, other people—some of them even relatives of mine—have more powerful and influential jobs. But somehow I can't help feeling that, once in a while, they, too, wish they were running the Peace Corps. For nowhere in this vast Capital City can be found the combination of excitement, satisfaction and sheer adventure which is the happy prerogative of the Director of the Peace Corps.

One of the greatest of these satisfactions has been the joy of creation—of exploring new problems and unsolved questions—of attempting to do what no one had ever done before.

When we started the Peace Corps 2½ years ago, we had a hotel room, a half-dozen people, the unfaltering support of the President and Vice President of the United States—and a new idea. It was that volunteers, drawn from every segment of American life, could serve their Nation and themselves by serving the welfare of others in every corner of the developing world. It was the idea that Americans mobilized in a national effort, voluntarily making personal sacrifices, undertaking to use their skills in the development of other nations, could make a substantial and important contribution to world understanding—to the cause of peace.

There were, of course, plenty of worrisome questions.

Would Americans respond to this challenge and opportunity? Or were they, as many had said, too cynical, too self-indulgent, too preoccupied with material things? We thought they would respond. We gambled on it, and we found the answer. In 1961 the Peace Corps received 12,000 fully completed applications for service. This year applications are coming in at the rate of 40,000 a year.

Were Americans hardy enough to serve in remote places, lacking many of the conveniences they had always enjoyed? Would they work where malaria, yellow fever, cholera, and dysentery were enemies? We soon learned that our volunteers were more than tough enough, that the complaints about physical hardship were insignificant. Far more important to the volunteers are the day-to-day frustrations, the ambiguous tempo of progress and achievement, the gap between expectations and realization.

Would other countries really want Peace Corps volunteers? Today volunteers are working in 47 countries. Every one of these countries has specifically requested them—and, in fact, has asked for more—often far more than we can ever hope to supply. And almost two dozen countries where we have not yet gone have requested a Peace Corps program.

It is such challenges, and the contact they have brought with almost every aspect of American life, that have made the Peace Corps such an exciting place to work. Take the problems of training. We found that we had to choose men and women of differing backgrounds, occupations and education and in 90 days, equip them to contribute their skills effectively within societies and cultures far different from anything they had ever known. Men ranging from university presidents and professors to labor leaders, mountain climbers and veterans of African safaris streamed into Washington to help us develop radically new and intensive curriculums. We had to teach languages as rapidly and intensively as had ever been attempted. Some of the languages were so exotic that we found ourselves writing our own textbooks and dictionaries, to teach, for example, Somali, Tshi and Pasar Malay.

Soon we found ourselves working with 58 universities from Puerto Rico to Hawaii. The vast range of America's educational resources was brought to bear on the problems of training and preparing volunteers. We trained volunteers for the Himalayas at campsites high in the Rockies. Others worked on Indian reservations in New Mexico before they went to work among the Indians of the Andes. At the New York School of Social Work, volunteers prepared in New York slums for their work among the underprivileged urban dwellers of Bogotá, Colombia.

One of the greatest challenges was the establishment of programs to assist the agricultural development of other nations. Everyone knows that improved agriculture is one of the most critical elements in the growth of developing nations, most of which are 60 to 70 percent rural. We know also that America has evolved the most abundant agriculture in the history of the world. And so we turned to our own farm organizations for the people to transmit some of our knowledge to those who needed it. Here again we met a gratifying response. Organizations such as the National Grange, the National 4-H Club Foundation, and the National Farmers Union "joined" the Peace Corps.

Everywhere we asked for help in American society we got the same kind of answer. Labor unions, technical schools, groups such as CARE, the Experiment in International Living and many others made contributions.

These things have all been part of the job—the challenge of new problems; the richness of contact with the mainstream of ideas, institutions, and people in American society; the satisfaction of making a contribution to the welfare of other countries and to the interests of my own.

The working conditions, even the fringe benefits, also contribute much to making my job the best in Washington. It is the atmosphere, the pace, the people, which make working conditions at the Peace Corps unusual.

A special kind of person is attracted to this kind of operation. They came at the beginning and they continue to come: mountain climbers, ex-boxers, even ex-smugglers, as well as Ph. D.'s and M.D.'s.

Around the table at our daily staff meetings sit former members of State legislatures, union leaders, newspaper editors, farmers, college presidents, lawyers, psychiatrists, psychologists, doctors. I come into daily contact with diplomats, electricians, and all-American athletes, in a continuous dialog concerning how their skills and experiences can be brought to bear on the multifarious problems of developing societies.

There is another side to the job, a side of which my passport is a symbol. Probably that passport has more visas and stamps in it than the passport of any other person who entered Government with the Kennedy administration. And each of those stamps represents experiences and adventures, and a chance to learn about other lands and people that is unique in government.

In the last two years I have traveled more than 500,000 miles visiting Peace Corps volunteers throughout the world. I have gone by plane, ship, Land Rover, jeep, longboat, dugout canoe, helicopter, raft, and horse. I have slept in villages where no official of any national government has ever been. A few weeks ago I was the guest of honor at a state dinner given by the President of Liberia on one night, and participated in tribal dances in Asankagra in western Ghana on the next.

I have had a chance to meet and to talk with most of the leaders of the developing world—men like Nehru and U Nu, Nkrumah and Tubman, Sékou Touré, Lleras Camargo, Betancourt, Azikiwe, Ayub Khan, Tengku Abdul Rahman, Sukarno, Bourguiba, Haile Selassie, Goulart and many others equally distinguished and well known. I have even managed to contract dysentery three times, and during my last appearance before Congress was swallowing pills to counteract an amoebic disease brought home from Africa.

My house, itself, is a trophy chamber of leopard and python skins, ritual dolls, Thai cloaks, and Kenti cloth, plus a live and energetic Managabee monkey named Tom-Tom. And on each of my trips I have had the supreme satisfaction of receiving, on behalf of the United States, the gratitude and appreciation of villagers, slum dwellers, schoolchildren and government ministers for the help and hope which individual volunteers have brought to their lands. I have felt that sense of making a real contribution to human welfare which suffuses our entire organization from volunteer to director.

All of these things have made me believe that this is the best job in Washington. But I also believe that there is something more to it than this; that although we work in foreign lands we are demonstrating something basic about America itself. We are reaffirming a fundamental premise of American democracy—that hard-headed, realistic, practical programs are consistent with the highest ideals and the noblest of motives; that pragmatic problems can be solved without ever yielding firm convictions and high purpose. We are helping to demonstrate that given the chance to dedicate themselves to meaningful work worthy of freemen, Americans are willing, even eager, to give up the deadening comforts of a too easy affluence.

The vitality, the drive, the imagination and the intellect which have been liberated by society are ready today to shape the future as they have so largely shaped the past. And I believe that the Peace Corps symbolizes the fact that, afforded the opportunity, Americans, working in a world community, will show that our first 175 years of history were only the beginning.

This is also part of the reason why the Peace Corps is the best job in Washington. And when my successor takes over, no matter what I may be doing or where, I will always envy him.

RECENT ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the President of the United States addressed the commencement exercises at the American University in Washington, D.C.

The President's speech gave a message of hope and encouragement to people not only in the United States and at the university, but throughout the world.

This is the President's most important statement on world peace since his historic peace race address to the United Nations in September 1961. He has rededicated the Nation to peace as a realistic and imperative goal.

By emphasizing the mutual vulnerability of the Soviet and American peoples in the nuclear age, he has appealed to the most constructive and enlightened elements of Soviet society.

This was a courageous statement. The role of the peacemaker requires as much or more courage as the role of the warrior.

The President will find broad support in the Congress for his decision. This support was indicated on May 15, with the introduction of the Dodd-Humphrey resolution, which was cosponsored by 34 Senators of both parties.

I agree with the President that this ban on atmospheric tests is a first step only. There is no real substitute for a comprehensive test ban treaty. Until one is secured, the danger of nuclear weapons proliferation will remain.

Mr. President, it is once again to the honor of the American people that the leader of the most powerful, most mighty, and richest nation on the face of the earth has declared forthrightly to the peoples of the world that in our strength as well as in our recognition of the dangers that confront the world the President of the United States announces that we shall refrain from nuclear testing in the atmosphere as long as other nations do likewise.

The President's message singled out a few precepts that everyone would do well to recognize. He said:

> Genuine peace must be the product of many nations and the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic and not static, changing to meet the challenge of each generation, for peace is a process and way of solving problems.

It seems to me that the President has laid down the formula for securing a just and enduring peace.

The President's speech, though concise, was comprehensive in its treatment of the issues of peace and nuclear war. He took a fresh approach to problems which have confounded diplomats and embittered journalists down through the years. To President Kennedy, peace is more than an alternative to self-annihilation. Peace, in the President's words, is "the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time." Peace is tangible; it is beneficial; it is a positive goal rather than a pious formula. The President sums it all up in a simple phrase that is earth shaking in its implications:

> Our problems are man made; therefore they can be solved by man.

If we ever needed a reply to some of the fatalistic, deterministic, defeatist doctrine of our day, the President has supplied it.

Let us, as the President urges, try to deal with the world as it is and not "as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different." We have no need to adopt the totalitarian methods of our adversaries in order to defend ourselves.

President Kennedy, in his address at the American University, has spoken words which have long needed saying at the highest levels of our Government. They are bound to be unpopular in certain quarters. There is nothing in them, however, which can be misconstrued as a confession of weakness or as blind acceptance of Soviet good faith. On the contrary, the President's speech of June 10 should go down in history as the attempt of a great world leader to restore sanity to the conduct of international affairs. Whether others will act accordingly is beyond our capacity to know. Whichever way the dice come up, the United States is psychologically and materially prepared.

In the past few days President Kennedy has delivered several memorable addresses. His address before the conference of mayors in Hawaii was a masterpiece and a call to action in the field of human rights and civil rights.

The President indicated how the Federal Government had its responsibility to provide adequate legal tools to secure full civil equality for every American. While fulfilling our obligations in this regard will not be accomplished easily, I have the utmost confidence that Congress will enact civil rights legislation this session. The President went on to say that fundamentally the challenge of civil rights rests with each local community across this land, communities of North and South, East and West. He listed five areas for immediate local action: One, the establishment of a biracial commission to mediate racial problems before they reach the boiling point; two, the necessity for every community to see that local ordinances are in conformity with constitutional law; three, the need for communities to follow nondiscriminatory practices in the employment and promotion of its municipal workers; four, the enactment of equal opportunity ordinances on the local level; and five, a crash program to lessen unemployment among the unskilled of both races by reducing school dropouts.

These are steps totally within the jurisdiction of local community officials. I commend the President for emphasizing the obligation that all governments, Federal, State, and local, and all peoples bear in this crisis. No one segment of society can assume burdens that rest with the entire country.

The President has spoken in a most timely and forceful fashion. I commend the speech to every American.

Mr. President, on Thursday, June 6, President Kennedy also spoke at the commencement exercises of San Diego State College. It was a most noteworthy statement concerning the responsibility of the leaders of this country, present and future, to provide the best education possible for all Americans.

Three basic questions were posed by the President. First, does every American child have an equal chance for a good education? Second, is the quality of American education adequate to our current needs? Third, can our existing educational system meet the demands of tomorrow?

These are questions most worthy of the attention of a college graduating class. They are, moreover, questions to which all members of the 88th Congress should attempt to find meaningful answers through comprehensive legislation in behalf of our educational system. The time has come to stop giving primary attention to areas of disagreement and to direct our energies toward solutions of the basic challenges of education.

Within the past few days, then, the President of the United States has spoken out courageously and wisely upon three of the most important subjects of our time—indeed, of all times. First, he has spoken out on the need of education for everyone, for every American in particular. Second, he has spoken out as to the importance of the protection of those basic constitional and human rights for which this country stands and to which this Nation has been dedicated since its founding.

Finally, he has spoken out in the cause of genuine world peace. He has not talked in terms of platitudes or of panaceas, but rather in terms of the process of peace itself and the meaning of a just and enduring peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's addresses on the subjects that I have mentioned be printed at this point in the RECORD. They are entitled to a part of the great history of this Nation, and all Americans should have access to them through the pages of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH TO MAYORS

I am here to discuss with you a problem which is both national and local—where Federal and municipal governments must act in concert—the problem of race relations.

This is not a southern problem—it is a national problem. And I would ask any mayor who believes there is no problem in his city to talk to those who once believed the same, and then look at his own unemployment, delinquency, housing, and other indicators.

Federal action—including additional Federal legislation—can help to meet this problem. State action can help. But, in the last analysis, what happens in Birmingham or Chicago or Atlanta or Los Angeles depends in large measure on the leadership in those communities. We will back you up—we will work with you in every way we can—but the mayor of every major metropolitan city in every section of America must be aware of the difficult challenge he faces.

I am asking you to be alert, not alarmed. The demonstrations of unrest in Birmingham, Boston, Jackson, Greensboro, Nashville, Philadelphia, and elsewhere can be expected in many other cities in the next few months, North and South. Students will then be out of college and high school. Large numbers of Negroes will still be out of work. The events in Birmingham have stepped up the tempo of the nationwide drive for full equality—and rising summer temperatures are often accompanied by rising human temperatures on all sides.

PEACEFUL REMEDIES

The Federal Government does not control these demonstrations. It neither starts them, directs them, nor stops them. What we can do is to seek, through legislative and Executive action, to provide peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off—to give all Americans a fair chance to a full life.

I would hope that every mayor here would recognize the assistance they would be provided by those legislative proposals which would help move these disputes from the streets to the courts, erase all doubts as to the validity of conflicting legal arguments, require all merchants in all cities to take similar action at the same time, so that none can hang back for fear of being penalized for moving first, and, finally, meet the rising tide of discontent with appropriate nationwide action, without waiting for city-by-city, case-by-case solutions.

Such legislation is, therefore, in your interest—and I hope it will have your support.

But the final responsibility, both now and after such legislation is enacted, will still rest with you at the local level. The problem is growing. The challenge is there. The cause is just.

The question is whether you will do nothing, thereby inviting pressure and tension and possible violence—or whether you will anticipate these problems and move to fulfill the rights of your Negro citizens in a peaceful and constructive manner.

WISDOM AND FORESIGHT

I ask that you act with wisdom and foresight in these matters—not merely for the peace of the country, but for the good of your own community. The financial history of those communities which have been beset with racial disturbances shows that they attract less capital and do less business. As a Birmingham businessman said, after investment in new plant and expansion had declined 80 percent in the last few years: "We've become known as a city of reaction, rebellion and riot—and because of that we're not gaining industry as fast as we should."

It is not enough to say that these are difficult problems in many parts of the country. The Vice President and I have been impressed in the last 2 years—and particularly in the last few weeks—by how much can be done by those determined to get it done. We have met with employers who were pleasantly surprised by how peacefully their hiring practices could be integrated.

We met last week with merchants from all sections of the country who had, without delay or difficulty, desegregated their public accommodations, including lunch counters, hotels, and theaters. We shall be having more meetings—with labor and religious leaders, with Government and business leaders.

It is clear to me that the time for token moves and idle talk is over—that these rights are going to be won—and that our responsibility, yours and mine, is to see that they are won in a peaceful and constructive manner.

ACTION IN FIVE AREAS

I would suggest at least five areas where you can take important action:

First: Every city can and should establish, preferably through official action by the mayor over governing body, a biracial human relations committee—to identify community tensions before they reach the crisis state, to improve cooperation and communication between the races, and to advise local officials, merchants and organizations as to what steps can be taken to insure prompt progress.

Second: Every local government can and should make certain that its own ordinances and practices are in accordance with constitutional law. The Supreme Court has made it clear beyond dispute that no local ordinance requiring segregation is constitutional—whether it applies to schools, zoning, restaurants, or places of amusement, either privately or publicly owned. Nor can segregation be required without ordinance at a municipal golf course, playground, swimming pool, or other city-owned facilities. In short, every instance or institution of segregation sanctioned by local legislation or public action is clearly invalid—and you should move to abolish it.

There will be a difficult period of transition for some. But "the basic guarantees of our Constitution," the Supreme Court said less than 2 weeks ago, "are warrants for the here and now * * * not merely hopes to some future enjoyment."

Third: Every local government can and should follow nondiscriminatory practices in the employment and promotion of its municipal workers. No group of taxpayers or voters should be excluded from the payrolls of your police, fire, school, and other departments. No city government can expect to understand the views of its Negro citizens—and no community can be expected to look favorably on its city government—unless men and women of all races are employed at all levels, supervisory as well as custodial, in all parts of that government.

Fourth: Every local government can and should enact equal opportunity ordinances to spell out the civil rights of all who live in that community; ordinances on equal employment opportunities, equal housing opportunities, and equal access to public accommodations. Such measures are not the exclusive concern of the Federal Government. On the contrary, where local leaders have assumed this responsibility, there has been remarkably little difficulty with racial problems. Where local government has abdicated this responsibility and left it to the Federal Government, there has been too much difficulty.

Fifth: I urge each of you personally to undertake a special campaign this summer in your own community to lessen unemployment among the unskilled of both races by reducing school dropouts. Tell your young people to stay in school. Tell them their chances for steady, gainful employment will be far better for every year of schooling. Tell them that unemployment among 16- and 21-year-olds is already at the million mark, with more on the way for, as the number of young jobseekers grows, the proportion of unskilled jobs has dropped to 1 out of 20.

STEPS ON FEDERAL LEVEL

I have not proposed to you any step that the Federal Government is unwilling to take in its own area of jurisdiction. We have undertaken to eliminate segregation and discrimination in Federal employment, in federally financed housing and construction, in Federal recreation areas, in our cafeterias, and other facilities. The proportion of Negroes holding Federal jobs in many areas is still distressingly low, particularly in the higher grade jobs. But we aim to change this as quickly as possible and, nationwide, have increased the number of Negroes in the higher grades by more than a third.

We have supported equal rights in the courts and the Congress, and will shortly prepare further steps.

Your responsibilities, of course, are more localized—but we are responsible for a city: The District of Columbia. Much has been written about crime and race relations in Washington—much of it untrue—but we are concerned about the District's problems, though they are less than those of some other cities and, more importantly, we are doing something about them.

All places of public accommodation in the Nation's Capital have been opened, with little difficulty, to customers of all races. Equal employment is the policy of the District government as well as the Federal Government. There is no racial bar to any public school in Washington. The District Commissioners have announced their intention to enact a fair housing ordinance unless the Congress itself does so promptly.

We are actively intervening to open up more employment opportunities in the building trades union. And we have urged the Congress to provide home rule for the District in order that all the citizens of Washington may participate more actively and effectively in accomplishing needed improvements.

PROGRESS IN WASHINGTON

Moreover, by striving to improve the quality of life for the residents of the District, Negro and white alike, we are helping to ease the economic and other pressures which would otherwise increase tensions. We are prepared to work with you on similar Federal-local programs—to improve public welfare, to root out juvenile delinquency, to eradicate urban blight, to increase youth employment, to assist urban mass transit, to promote mental health, to provide more recreational and health facilities and to war on organized crime.

These measures—some of which are barely underway—have been effective in the District of Columbia, and I know that, on a nationwide basis, they have, for the most part, been supported by this conference in the Congress. The elevation of all these urban development problems to a higher level of consideration by the creation of a new Cabinet post is already long overdue.

In conclusion, my fellow chief executives, may I say this: Improvement of race relations and the fulfillment of human rights is a continuing problem and challenge. I do not propose to limit our mutual concern to this one brief address. I hope to meet with many of you in the White House in the near future.

But justice cannot wait for too many meetings. It cannot wait for the action of the Congress or even the courts. We face a moment of moral and constitutional crisis—and men of generosity and vision must make themselves heard in every part of the land. I do not say that all men are equal in their ability, character, and motivation. I do say that every American should be given a fair chance to develop in full whatever talents he has and to share equally in the American dream.

On your return from this conference, you can set an example in your communities to which the timid can rally and which those clinging in the past cannot ignore. I ask you to join with me, here and now, in recognizing the rights of all Americans—in guiding along constructive channels the attainment of a peaceful revolution, a peaceful revolution which will not only avoid disaster but fulfill our highest obligations.

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Post, June 7, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

This is a proud moment—proud for me as a recipient of this honorary degree, proud for those of you who have earned your degrees with hard labor, proud for your families and communities who also labored hard for this achievement. Only a small portion of the world's population can share and understand that pride. In fact, only a small portion of our own population have completed four years of college.

You are the fortunate ones. You will be the leaders, the doers, the contributors to our society and progress. You will, on the average, earn nearly twice as much in your lifetime as high school graduates and over three times as much as grade school graduates.

Yes, you are the fortunate ones, the educated, the elite, the only aristocracy our system permits. But I am not here merely to congratulate you, to remind you of your future riches. I am here to remind you of your responsibilities—and particularly your responsibility toward education, toward those who should follow in your footsteps.

THREE BASIC QUESTIONS

However proud we may be, and have a right to be, over the past achievements of our education system, it is time the whole Nation faced up more frankly to the answers to three basic questions: First, whether every American child has an equal chance for a good education; second, whether the quality of American education is adequate to our current needs; and third, whether the educational system we have today can meet the demands of tomorrow.

First, does every American child today have a fair educational opportunity? Let me cite a few facts:

1. In this fortunate State of California, the average current expenditure for a boy or girl in the public schools is $515. But in the State of Mississippi it is $230. The average salary for classroom teachers in California is $7,050, while it is only $3,610 in Mississippi.

2. Nearly three-quarters of the young white population of our Nation have graduated from high school, but only about two-fifths of our nonwhite population have finished. In some States, almost 40 percent of the nonwhite population has completed less than 5 years of school contrasted with 7 percent of the white population.

3. In one American State, over 36 percent of the public school buildings are over 40 years old. In another, only 4 percent are that old.

TWO REASONS CITED

Such facts—and one could prolong this recital indefinitely—make it clear that American children today do not yet enjoy equal educational opportunities, for two primary reasons: one is economic, and the other is racial.

If our Nation is to meet the goal of giving every American child a fair educational break, we must move swiftly ahead in both areas. We must put more resources into the undernourished sectors of our education system. And we must recognize that segregation in education—and I mean the de facto segregation of the North as well as the proclaimed segregation of the South—brings with it serious handicaps to a large percentage of our Nation's population.

Our goal must be an educational system in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence—a system in which all are created equal, a system in which every child, whether born a banker's son in a Long Island mansion or a Negro sharecropper's son in an Alabama cotton field, has every opportunity for an education that his abilities and character deserve.

SECOND QUESTION

The second question relates to the quality of our education. Does our system effectively educate our boys and girls to meet the needs and problems of our contemporary society?

Again let us look at some facts:

1. One out of every three students in the fifth grade will drop out before high school graduation. And only 2 out of every 10 will graduate from college—unless we do something about it. In the meantime, the occupations and professions which require increased education and training continue to grow, while employment in unskilled jobs continues to decline.

2. Of Americans 18 years of age or older, more than 23 million have had less than 8 years of schooling, and over 8 million less than 5 years. As a result, many of these fellow citizens lack the ability to read or write with ease or to do simple arithmetic. They are termed "functional illiterates," and it is no accident that they constitute the hardest "hard core" of our unemployed and those on welfare.

One out of every ten workers who fail to finish elementary school is unemployed today as compared to 1 out of 50 college graduates.

3. Even students who finish elementary school or high school often lack a solid grounding in the humane and classical disciplines which are the heart of our civilization.

NEEDS ARE CITED

In short, our current educational programs do not meet our current needs. We need a major effort to eradicate adult illiteracy, for the man who cannot read a "help wanted" ad or write a letter is beaten before he starts. We need to improve our programs of technical and vocational education, both in school and after school. We need to combat the dropout problem.

Finally, we need to strengthen the freedom of research, inquiry and judgment which is the glory of our civilization. Our schools must present our children with all the facts about their world and their heritage, not just those which support a single viewpoint or party line. For education is the instrument of freedom, and indoctrination the weapon of tyranny—and the difference between education and indoctrination best sums up the difference between ourselves and our adversaries abroad.

The third and final question we must ask is: What of the future? Four million boys and girls are born each year in the United States. Our population is growing each decade by a figure equal to the total population of the country at the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. Is our educational system adequate to meet the needs of an expanding population, and expanding technology and an expanding culture?

Here are some facts:

1. By 1970, the number of students in our public elementary and secondary schools will have increased by 25 percent over that of 1960. Nearly three-quarters of a million new classrooms are needed during this decade, but our present construction rate will not provide them.

2. By 1970, we will have 7 million students in our colleges and universities, nearly 3 million more than we have today. This will require over $2 billion a year for facilities—a billion dollars more than we are devoting today.

3. By 1970, we will need 7,500 Ph. D's. each year in the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering if we are to continue our economic growth and preserve our military security—but in 1960 we graduated only 3,000.

Such facts make it clear how far out present effort falls below our future need. We must take rapid measures to enlarge our educational facilities, to extend our program of fellowships, to improve our teacher training and our libraries and our laboratories, and to work in every way to keep our education abreast of our population growth.

TASK FOR ENTIRE NATION

Education, historically and necessarily, is the responsibility of the State and the local community. Those who are willing to make the necessary investment—in approving bond issues, in building modern facilities, in paying salaries sufficient to attract and retain talented teachers, in encouraging freedom of discussion and dissent—will receive rich dividends on that investment. Their communities will prosper, their horizons will expand.

But this is a task for the entire Nation, for every citizen, and for government at every level. Your own State has shown what a difference forward-looking leadership can make, under Governor Brown, your legislation, and the master plan for education.

But education is also a national responsibility. Not every State can do what California has done. But California has a stake in what every State does—or fails to do. People move freely from one State to another; these are not 50 separate States.

The role of the Federal Government is not to take over the responsibility of the States; it is to give the States the means to fulfill that responsibility, which they owe to themselves and the Nation.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

For this reason, I have recommended to the Congress a comprehensive education improvement program. It is designed to help meet the needs of higher education by assisting the construction of college academic facilities, junior colleges, graduate centers, and technical institutes, and by stepping up existing programs for student loans, graduate fellowships and other student assistance programs.

It is designed to improve educational research and to authorize increased training of teachers of the gifted, the handicapped, and the culturally deprived. It is designed to strengthen public elementary and secondary education through grants to the States for better teacher salaries, to relieve critical classroom shortages, to meet the special educational problems of depressed areas and to continue and expand existing programs for vocational education, guidance, and counseling.

Finally, this program is designed to meet the continuing education needs of our communities by a massive attack on illiteracy, by an expansion of university extension courses and a major effort to improve library services in each community as well as in our schools and colleges.

AWARE OF OBJECTIONS

I am well aware of all the objections which have been raised for more than 50 years to any kind of Federal effort in education—objections involving States rights and civil rights, objections involving race and religion, objections to including this item or not including some other item.

But the time has come for the American people of every party and section to realize the immensity and the necessity of this challenge, to realize that no solution will please everyone, and to mobilize their aroused support behind a program such as the one I have sent to the Congress. And I hope that those of you who have received the blessings of education will be in the forefront of that fight.

This is no novel or subversive idea. "By far the most important bill in our whole code," wrote Jefferson, "is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for preservation of freedom and happiness."

Jefferson truly spoke the American faith. As a nation, we have no deeper concern, no older commitment and no higher interest than a strong, sound, and free system of education for all. In fulfilling this obligation to ourselves and our children, we provide for the future of our Nation—and for the future of freedom.

Remarks of the President at American University, Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university," wrote John Masefield, in his tribute to the English universities—and his words are equally true here. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens, and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace—the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost 10 times the explosive force delivered by all of the Allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and can never create—is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on weary ears. But we have not more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them to do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to help bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First, let us reexamine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics still dream. I do not deny the values of hopes and dreams but we would merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together with mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising shifts in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable—and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly—by making it seem more manageable and less remote—we can help all people to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Second, let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists continually write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on military strategy and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that "American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars * * * that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union * * * (and that) the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalist countries * * * (and) to achieve world domination * * * by means of aggressive wars."

Truly, as it was written long ago: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements—to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning—a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible and communication as nothing more than an exchange of epithets and threats.

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered to be lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two-thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of all this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become primary targets. It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in most danger of devastation. All we have built up, all we have worked for, would be destroyed. And even in the cold war—which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting cast sums to massive weapons that could better be used to combat ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the Soviets' interest as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is the fact that we all inhabit this planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Third, let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war. Let us remember that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

We must, therefore, persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while always defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which present an adversary with a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death-wish for the world.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.

For we can seek a relaxation of tension without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people—but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument of peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can be finally abolished.

At the same time we seek to keep peace inside the non-Communist world, where many nations, all of them our friends, are divided over issues which weaken Western unity, which invite Communist intervention or which threaten to erupt into war. Our efforts in west New Guinea, in the Congo, in the Middle East and in the Indian subcontinent, have been persistent and patient despite criticism from both sides. We have also tried to set an example for others—by seeking to adjust small but significant differences with our own closest neighbors in Mexico and in Canada.

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because their concerns and ours substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge.

Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace. It is our hope—and the purpose of Allied policies—to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others. The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations, could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.

This will require a new effort to achieve world law—a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur in a time of crisis.

We have also been talking in Geneva about other first-step measures of arms control, designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of accidental war. Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's. It has been urgently sought by the last three administrations. And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort—to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament really are.

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight—yet where a fresh start is badly needed—is a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty—so near and yet so far—would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces—the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital safeguards.

I am taking this opportunity, therefore, to announce two important decisions in this regard:

First, Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

Second, to make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on this matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other States do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty—but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament—but I hope it will help us achieve it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us reexamine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives—as many of you who are graduating today will have a unique opportunity to do, by serving without pay in the Peace Corps abroad or in the proposed National Service Corps here at home.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, State, and National—to provide and protect that freedom for all citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared for

> war, if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what does one say about the address made this morning by the President of the United States which is already causing speculation that Mr. Kennedy may eventually go to Moscow.

In June 1960, when the President was still a Member of this body, he stated:

> No President of the United States must ever again be put in the position of traveling across the seas, armed only with vague, speculative hopes in order to provide an occasion for public humiliation.

In October 1960, the President was quoted in Newsweek as saying:

> Any meeting at the summit must be planned carefully with sufficient assurances of good faith at the secondary level to justify a belief that the meeting would contribute materially toward ending world tensions.

In June of 1960, when the President was a Member of this body, he said:

> Our task is to devise a national strategy—based not on the 11th hour responses to Soviet-created crises—but a comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies designed to increase the strength of the non-Communist world.

There are some questions that very readily come to mind in view of these minimal conditions that were set down: Is there anything more than a speculative hope if a high-level conference is contemplated at Moscow? Where, if there be any, are the assurances of good faith, in view of the complete failure to achieve agreement after so many meetings at Geneva?

Will it be another case of concession after concession to Khrushchev to achieve some kind of a test ban treaty?

Then I must add that in view of an entrenched Soviet Communist state in Cuba only 90 miles from our shores, is this the time for a conference with the ever-present hazard of leaving the impression that we are retreating from weakness rather than leading from strength?

And do we now accept another self-imposed moratorium on atmospheric testing particularly after experiencing a Soviet doublecross only a short 2 years ago when a previous moratorium existed?

Are these not the questions which so very naturally arise in contemplating this new move?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us recognize that any negotiation with any country involves certain hazards—or at least, certain unknowns. We recognize that meetings and negotiations with representatives of the Soviet Union have not been very fruitful in the past and are filled with the possibilities of hazard. The President of the United States knows this as well as any man in the world.

We are fully cognizant of the history of our negotiations with and our efforts for negotiation with the Soviets, but the President made it quite clear in his message this morning that the meeting to be held in Moscow is one which has been and is carefully planned and is one about which there is a great deal of information and a clear-cut proposal. I quote from the President's message, as follows:

> Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because their concerns and ours substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests.

The President went on to say:

> The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge.

Following that inclusive and clear-cut statement, the President announced certain decisions. He did this in light of what he considers to be the urgent necessity of slowing down the nuclear arms race. The President said:

> The one major area of these negotiations—

Referring to the negotiations with the Soviet Union—

> where the end is in sight—yet where a fresh start is badly needed—is a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty—so near and yet so far—would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces—the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital safeguards.

Again the President made clear that he knows whereof he speaks and that he recognizes the dangers and hazards involved in negotiations as well as recognizing his responsibility for leadership in these matters.

Then the President said:

> Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

The President and the Prime Minister have agreed to send their representatives to high-level discussions in Moscow. I do not consider this to be in conflict with the statements of Senator Kennedy in 1960 regarding the need for meticulous preparation and caution when dealing with the Soviet Union. I do not interpret it as a circumlocution for a summit conference or necessarily as an effort to lay the groundwork for a summit conference. Moscow is not now on the itinerary of the President's trip this summer. If it were, I can assure Senators that the prestige and security of the United States would be well provided for in advance.

I said earlier that sometimes it takes more courage to be a peacemaker than a warrior. In this instance the President of the United States has clearly told the American people of the hazards, the difficulties, and the dangers; but he has also told them that he is fully aware of history and that vital safeguards must be provided. There will be no yielding to temptation, to give up something which would injure our security; nor would we bargain away the rights of others.

The President of the United States, as the leader of freedom in this world, is demonstrating great personal and political courage by attempting, once again, to lift the terrible burden of the arms race from the backs of the overburdened people not only here in America but also throughout the world. He needs our support. He needs our help. He needs our prayers. He needs our confidence. And he is going to have mine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for what he has said. I hope that the climate in this body with respect to the President's announcement that he and Prime Minister Macmillan have agreed that there shall be very high level discussions in Moscow on a test ban treaty will be one of hope, of joy, of support for the President, who has had the courage to take this step which is so important to the survival of civilization.

I do not want to see what President Eisenhower has referred to as the military-industrial complex and its supporters within and without the Congress cast doubt on the President's action, indicating grave fears that our national security is about to be prejudiced. I hope the climate in this body will be one of strong support for the President in doing something which is badly needed.

I hazard the suggestion that if the President or his emissaries comes back from Moscow with a test ban agreement, that agreement will and should promptly be ratified by this body.

I have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of the President. I have confidence in his principal advisers in the area of a test ban treaty. I know that he, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, would never bring to this body for ratification a treaty which was not in the best interests of our national security.

I hope we shall not find during the remainder of the day or the remainder of this week that Senators will rise to criticize the President for taking this step. I hope there will be unanimity on a bipartisan basis among those who commend him, as the Senator from Minnesota said, for his courage and wisdom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with reference to the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, let me point out that I cited the record and raised some questions. I leave the record and the questions to speak for themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want my comments today to be indicative of criticism of what the minority leader has said. Surely he has a right to raise questions, as anyone has. I merely stated what I considered to be a proper position in respect to the President—the feeling that the President took into consideration the statements which had been made in the past and that he recognizes the hazards of the future.

I think it should also be clear that the possibility of the President himself going to Moscow for high level discussions is, at best, a possibility. The Moscow conference to which the President referred is described in this morning's Associated Press dispatches as follows:

> The Moscow conference could lead to a Foreign Ministers meeting and a summit session, depending on whether it achieves a breakthrough in the stalemate of the past 6 months.

What we see here is the transfer of negotiations to Moscow, possibly with new negotiators; hopefully, a Foreign Ministers meeting; and, if there is something to be achieved worthy of the presence of the President of the United States, he will be there.

At the present moment, it should be emphasized that all talk of a summit meeting is speculation only. The President is fully aware of the need for statesmanship rather than exuberance in matters of such grave import as a test ban treaty. He is well aware of the pitfalls of personal diplomacy. This is precisely why the men he is sending to Moscow will be trained diplomats able to distinguish between serious negotiation and mere gamesmanship. On the basis of their findings the President will decide whether further steps are desirable or necessary. The President, like all great statesmen, is accustomed to crossing bridges when he comes to them. He is also accustomed to testing them beforehand to see whether they will bear his weight.

NIPPON'S OBVIOUS AFFLUENCE HAS DECEPTIVE SIDE

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I would like to draw the Senate's attention to the extraordinary example of national purpose that Japan is setting in the world today. Her own intense efforts to rebuild her war-shattered economy have made American aid more fruitful; no nation in the postwar era has made such a remarkable leap from economic devastation to modern technological achievement.

Many thousands of people visiting Tokyo next year for the Olympic Games will see the results of a whole nation's hard work all around them—in the new industrial plants, new highways, fast express trains, and in the air-conditioned buildings.

In the meantime, perhaps the most convincing picture of current Japanese progress is the 24-page special report entitled "Japan in Today's World," published on May 26 by the Washington Post. It is the second such section that this newspaper has devoted to the Japanese people, and carries personal greetings to American readers from Prime Minister Ikeda, Foreign Minister Ohira, and H. E. The, Japanese Ambassador.

The stories and illustrations of modern Japan and the display of its products and services are a vivid reflection of the country's growing capabilities. On my own last visit I was tremendously impressed by Japan's advance toward its goal of complete self-support, and toward the role that Western leaders hope it will assume—that of the economic leadership of free Asia.

In its lead story by Rafael Steinberg I think the Washington Post gives a particularly good comparison of Japan's obvious affluence and the less obvious areas of instability that she still must strengthen. Mr. Steinberg gives a clear account of the changes that revolutionary ideas and methods are bringing to what some guidebooks picture only as an exotic, backward land of cherry blossoms and geishas; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the story on Japan entitled "Nippon's Obvious Affluence Has Deceptive Side" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIPPON'S OBVIOUS AFFLUENCE HAS DECEPTIVE SIDE—AUTOMATION DISTORTS PICTURE AS MUCH AS THE KIMONOS DO

(By Rafael Steinberg)

TOKYO.—Years ago, in a tiny bay on Japan's Inland Sea, a shipbuilding company used to celebrate a launching by passing out to all the workers ceremonial red and white rice cakes called tori-no-ko mochi, and by giving everyone a day off.

The rice cakes are a thing of the past, but last year the shipyard launched more tonnage than any other yard in the world. Instead of mochi, the company gave the workers a bigger yearend bonus than usual, and there are no extra days off for launchings because there are always new keels to be laid.

Anywhere in Japan, you can send out for home deliveries of sushi (raw fish and rice), and this delicacy has always arrived in graceful lacquered wooden trays which the delivery boy would come around to pick up the next morning.

But now the sushi shops can't find enough delivery boys to afford two trips for every order, so in many places sushi is packed in plain plastic boxes that look as if they belonged in an American supermarket, and the customer can keep them for refrigerator trays.

What's more, this labor shortage—the only one in Asia—has encouraged the development of automatic vending machines, supermarkets and instant soybean soup, while electronic computers are taking the place of abacus operators and a new train will be able to stop and start without an operator.

THE GUIDEBOOK VIEW

First-time visitors to Japan, who arrive with images of geisha girls, tea ceremony and cherry blossoms, are bowled over by these visible signs of modernity and economic progress. It seems to them impossible to believe that this highly industrialized, active nation, with its fast express trains, air-conditioned office buildings and automated factories, is the same exotic backward land the guidebooks still talk about.

From tori-no-ko mochi and exquisite tableware to oil tankers and microwave relays seems too big a jump.

Are Japanese supposed to be polite and old worldly. Watch the rush-hour stampedes in the subways.

Are they dedicated to beauty and symmetry? Look at Tokyo. Are they quaint? See the businessman with his golf clubs.

Do the Japaneses subsist on dried fish and a bowl of rice? Peek at the meat and bread in the housewife's shopping basket.

Are they short, stocky, and bowlegged? Feast your eyes on that long-limbed young beauty strolling down the Ginza in high heels, Paris dress, and Jacqueline Kennedy hairdo.

Are the farmers peasants? Examine the electric water pumps at the wells, the tiny tractors, the TV aerials on the thatch roofs.

Is the Japanese spirit spartan and frugal? Look around at the advertising signs, the purple shirts, the expense accounts, the rising prices that shoppers no longer haggle over.

Is the quiet contemplation of eternal verities a Japanese and Zen Buddhist trait? Listen to the rat-tat of the riveter, the thump of the piledriver, the roar of the dump trucks.

THE INSTABILITY PERSISTS

From these sights and sounds, the visitor could come away with an impression as distorted as the one he arrived with. He is apt to think that Japan has completed the transition from a feudal to a democratic society, from economic backwardness to modern technology, from Asian poverty to a society of affluence.

Such is not quite the case. Despite the 9 percent yearly average growth rate of the Japanese economy that has increased the per capita income from $258 in 1958 to $416 in 1961 (and an estimated $450 last year), so many points of instability and obsolescence remain that the country's politicians and businessmen still hesitate to take the economic leadership of free Asia—a role Western leaders want them to assume.

Commenting on American urging that Japan give more aid to the developing nations, and join more wholeheartedly with the United States in helping to lower world trade barriers, Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohira recently explained that "we in Japan see our role as the establishment in our country of a free, stable, democratic order * * * a Japan that can stand on its own feet, that is self-supporting and does not need to ask for outside assistance. * * * We feel we still have some way to go.

"I wonder if the United States realizes what we consider to be our role," he muses. "We think that the United States believes Japan has already established this orderly and stable government, and therefore expects us to shoulder more responsibilities. * * * But we have to create a healthier and stronger domestic situation first."

To be sure, politics plays a part in this hesitation. Japan's Socialist Party, which can be noisy and disruptive when aroused, automatically opposes whatever it considers to be in the interests of "American imperialism," and Government leaders must go slow.

And much of the reluctance to shoulder responsibilities is merely the application of natural self-interest—an attitude that kept Japan free of foreign domination while other countries in Asia were becoming colonies, and that in large part is responsible for her fortunate position today.

But the Japanese point out several economic facts which they say are unique and which they claim make it impossible for them, despite their surface prosperity, to take what Western leaders consider to be their "rightful place in the economy of the free world."

Without attempting to make any final judgments, it is worth considering the economic problems that Ohira sums up as Japan's attempt "to catch up with the world."

It is not just a question of whether the economy is doing well or badly at the moment. (Actually, it seems to be pulling out of a temporary recession.) The more pertinent question is whether Japan will be able to carry out Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's famous "income doubling" plan in the 1960's, and what will happen to the country in the process.

Specifically, it is a question of the future of that sushi shop delivery boy who no longer comes for the lacquered trays, and his employer, the shop owner. And it is a question of what will happen to the majority of the nation's industrial laborers who work in small shops and factories with inefficient machines, at relatively low wages.

Faced by competition from foreign goods, which Japan has pledged to admit more freely, will they be driven to the wall? And will the big firms, which pay better wages to their own employees but which depend on these small enterprises for component parts and for distribution, also go bankrupt?

To improve productivity, the Government is encouraging more and more workers to abandon the farms and small shops for the more efficient, better-paying, large modern plants, where they will live in company dormitories, eat company food, take vacations together at company resorts. Will this contribute to democracy and individualism, so difficult to take root in Japan anyway, or will it merely pave the way for another form of communal living?

If Japan is to expand her exports, compete in world markets, her industries have to modernize even further, her ports and roads must be expanded and improved. As the labor shortage worsens in the 1970's thanks to birth control and abortion in the 1950's, it will become more imperative than ever that all of Japan's workers attain a high rate of productivity.

But what will happen to the inefficient worker too old to learn a new trade? He is not a fringe minority. He represents a large proportion of the working force, and under the old system he would never be laid off no matter how useless he became. But will his employer be able to live up to this traditional obligation and still compete with the manufacturer in Germany or the United States who pays for work performed?

The Japanese have no confident answers for those questions. Their predictions have not been very accurate in the past, and already there is serious talk of revising Ikeda's 10-year income-doubling plan.

First advanced in 1959, the plan became official Government policy when Ikeda took over as Prime Minister in 1960. It calls for an average annual growth of 7.2 percent in the gross national product for 10 years with an eye to "catching up to Europe's standard of living" by 1980.

But in 1961, the first year, actual growth was 14 percent. This overheated growth also resulted, alarmingly, in such an increase in capital equipment investment that the 1970 figure for investments was attained in the very first year.

This was nearly disastrous. Since much of this investment was in the form of modern machinery imported from abroad—machinery which Japan, of course, sorely needed—Japan suddenly found herself with a balance-of-payments problem, a labor shortage (as people were needed to man the expanded plants) and, shortly thereafter, surplus production of heavy industrial products.

"Technical" measures, such as raising the bank rate, cooled the excessive growth, curbed investment and managed to get international payments back on an even keel.

Growth in 1962 was only about 4 percent.

But this amounted to a recession, from which the country is only now emerging. Because money was tight, businessmen used up stockpiles rather than buy, so the problem of surplus production worsened and there was a scramble for export expansion.

But while the surplus forced down domestic prices of such commodities as steel, consumer prices rose drastically—and are still going up—as farm production fell and urban workers, employed in constructing the new plants or running them, found themselves richer than ever.

The Government had forecast a consumer price rise of 2.8 percent last year, but the actual increase was 6.7 percent. The danger of inflation is the Government's most pressing single economic problem.

The problem is to keep the modern section of the economy from expanding so fast that prices run away, and at the same time to encourage the modernization of the backward sectors and the roads, harbors and utilities that are still far from sufficient to support the kind of technological society that the Japanese dream about.

The problem will be made more difficult by the fact that Japan's huge labor pool, which supplied the muscle for the expansion so far, will reach a peak in the next couple of years and then start to decline. And, ready or not, Japan will have to open her doors to more foreign products or risk losing the chance to expand her exports.

Yet no one doubts the capacity of the highly literate, skilled and ambitious Japanese to solve these problems, and others. For despite all the transformations that have taken place here since the war, most Japanese still retain the single-minded purposefulness, the willingness to submerge individual ambitions and interests for what they consider to be the good of the community and the nation, that enabled them to leap from crumbling feudalism to modern statehood in two generations, and from defeat and devastation to prosperity and prominence in less than one.

It's not rugged individualism, or Jeffersonian democracy, but it works in Japan, and it seems to be what the Japanese want.

Only by following her own path can Japan attain an influential position in the world. "We want to be a bridge between the industrialized nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa," Prime Minister Ikeda has said. "We understand them both."

THE MIGRATORY LABOR BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received expressions of concern from Oregon farmers relative to the migratory labor bills. In my judgment, I owe to these citizens of my State the right of having the Senate consider the points they have raised before the vote is taken on the legislation.

I regret that the materials were not received by me from the Oregon Farm Bureau and the Nyssa-Nampa Beet Growers Association at an earlier date so that the subcommittee could have considered them during the hearings. However, the distinguished junior Senators from New Jersey, with his accustomed fairness, has reviewed the Farm Bureau communication and has provided me with the position of the subcommittee on each of the points raised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter, dated May 14, 1963, signed by Mr. Howard Fujii, director, commodities and farm labor, of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, together with Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' letter to me dated June 4, 1963, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., May 14, 1963.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A conference of representatives from our member county farm bureaus and other agricultural organizations met in Salem, Monday, May 13, to discuss S. 523 and how it would affect farmers and their community. This letter contains a number of their comments on Oregon conditions and recommendations for amendments to the bill.

S. 523, as we understand the bill, would:

1. Prohibit employment in agriculture of local children under 12.

2. Prohibit employment of children of migrant worker families under 14.

3. Prohibits employment of minors below the age of 18 in agriculture "in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age 18 * * *."

In our opinion, Oregon has taken the leadership among States in providing summertime employment opportunities for children and young people. Our farmers, in cooperation with the State employment service, school officials, chambers of commerce and the food processing industry, have developed work programs for young people that are unparalleled anywhere in the Nation.

First, the platoon system was developed as an Oregon program. Farmers employ and transport children for berry and vegetable harvest under the supervision of a platoon leader, who may be a teacher, youth leader, or some other responsible adult. Although farmers have reservations about employing younger children, many of the best workers over 12 are those that have previously worked with their parents or with older brothers and sisters in platoons.

Second, the drive-out program offers supplementary income to families with children. Mothers have a chance to teach children the responsibility of earning their own. The whole family can work together during the weekend to add to their income and make possible purchases of additional consumer goods.

Mothers and others that drive out may not do so if they could not bring their younger children. Work habits developed by young children have proved that they pay off as the youngsters graduate to other types of employment in succeeding years.

Third, migrant families have reported to us that one of the primary reasons they come to Oregon is that the family can work together and children can work and earn money. They say they do not have this opportunity back home.

Restrictions would result in the loss from our labor force of many families that make the annual trip to Oregon so the whole family can work together.

Fourth, the food-processing industry that cans, freezes, or otherwise converts raw farm commodities into consumer products, supplies jobs for a large number of high school and college students, housewives, and others for whom employment opportunities are limited. Reduction in the farm labor force would mean less crop delivered to the processing plants, further restricting job opportunities there.

Fifth, seasonal farm occupations such as irrigation, loading and stacking hay, hauling grain, loading fruit and vegetables on trucks, picking tree fruit, and many short duration jobs are filled by high school boys. In addition, high school youth fill in for regular employees of dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers on many occasions. This is true, particularly of vocational agriculture students that add to their income by helping neighboring farmers.

Almost any occupation has an element of risk involved, and there is concern that such broad authority granted the Secretary of Labor in paragraph (2) could tend to regulate minors out of a job.

Also mentioned in the discussion of S. 523, is the fact that the bill as written, discriminates against the migrant child. He cannot work until he is 14, whereas, a local resident of 12 years of age may work if he "commutes daily from his permanent residence." The "permanent resident" feature also poses a problem at Corvallis and Eugene as families of summer school students could not commute from their "permanent residence." Farmers from Benton and Lane Counties indicate that a number of mothers and children who work in the strawberry harvest are from summer school families. There would also be a hardship on intrastate migrant families that are Oregon residents who move from job to job within our own State.

Following considerable discussion on the minimum age issue, our conference felt that younger children should not be denied the right of job opportunities, but felt that a limit on the time that they may be employed could solve the problem of possible abuses arising from employment of children.

They suggested that the language on page 2, lines 5 and 6, and the word "residents" in line 7, be deleted and this rewritten so there was not discrimination between migrant and local children by substituting the limit of time that a child may be employed in any one day as follows: 9 years of age or younger, not more than 4 hours; 10 and 11 years of age, not more than 5 hours; 12 and 13 years of age, not more than 6 hours.

In addition, they recommended that children below the age of 13 be required to be under supervision of the employer or an authorized supervisor, or under the direct supervision of his parent or person standing in the place of his parent.

The substitute language in line 5 after (C) should read "is under the supervision of the employer or his authorized supervisor, or the direct supervision of his parent or person standing in the place of his parent for not more than 4 hours a day if the child is 9 years of age or younger, not more than 5 hours a day if the child is 10 or 11 years of age, and not more than 6 hours a day if the child is 12 or 13 years of age (then continue with the language on line 7, starting with the word "and").

On page 2, line 11, change "18" to "16" and in line 12, starting with "in" delete the balance of the line through "18" on line 14, and substitute "to operate power driven machinery and handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors under age 16."

At the end of line 17, change the period to a comma and add the following: "or person standing in the place of his parent, provided that for purposes of this Act the term "standing in the place of his parent" shall be construed to include any person with whom a minor is residing."

Paragraph (2) would then read:

(c)(2) No employee below the age of 16 may be employed in agriculture to operate power driven machinery or handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors under age 16, except when such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, or person standing in the place of his parent, provided that for purposes of this Act the term "standing in the place of his parent" shall be construed to include any person with whom a minor is residing.

We would certainly appreciate any effort that you, as a senior and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, can make to gain an understanding of Oregon conditions mentioned in this letter to members of the Committee.

We would certainly appreciate an opportunity for a committee of farmers to meet with you to discuss the problems involved in the proposed legislation. Please advise, if possible, when you will be in Oregon and can reserve some time for such a conference.

Sincerely,

HOWARD FUJII,
Director, Commodities, Farm Labor.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have reviewed the Oregon Farm Bureau position on the child labor bill (S. 523), as presented in their May 14 letter to you, and have these comments to offer:

1. Although the Oregon Farm Bureau views were submitted after hearings on the bill had been completed, and after the bill had been ordered favorably reported to the Senate, you may assure your constituents that their viewpoint was thoroughly considered during our work on the bill. The testimony of the representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation suggested similar amendments to S. 523. These views were considered and rejected during the committee deliberations on the bill.

2. Since initially introduced, efforts have been made to consult with farm employers regarding the effect of this bill on local employment patterns. As a result, the subcommittee has attempted to preserve the beneficial aspects of farm- and youth-work programs that exist in rural communities. Accordingly, S. 523 provides that (a) children of any age can work under any conditions for their parents on a home farm, and (b) a 12- or 13-year-old child can be employed on a farm to which he commutes daily from his home.

The commuting provision, in fact, was developed during the last Congress to accommodate Oregon farm interests in preserving existing employment opportunities in agriculture for children. And although the Oregon views were not expressed until after the child labor bill (S. 1123) had passed the Senate, you will recall that we became involved in the development of the commuter provision in the House. In view of this history of the commuter provision, it appears rather paradoxical for the originators of the commuter provision to assert now that the provision discriminates against migrant children.

3. The proposed Oregon Farm Bureau amendment that would allow a child of any age to work for limited periods under the supervision of an employer or his authorized supervisor, or the direct supervision of his parents—would, in view of the known hazards incident to farm employment, seriously endanger children working in agriculture. Aside from the known hazards of arduous child labor, there are other important considerations. Consider, for example, the recent bus accident in Pahokee, Fla., that took the lives of 27 migrants. About a dozen of the children under the age of 12 were drowned when the bus plunged into a canal alongside the road. One boy was only 4 years old. And while I realize that your State is one of the most progressive in regard to safe transportation, national policy considerations cannot be ignored.

4. To protect children from injuries resulting from hazardous farmwork, S. 523 provides that the Secretary of Labor can find and declare that certain farm occupations are particularly hazardous to children under 18 years of age. Although data is not available on a national scale, the following table from California, showing the high percentage of injuries among children between ages of 16 and 18, indicates that this provision is eminently realistic:

Year	Total under 18 years	Under 16 years	16 to 17 years
1950	485	128	357
1951	523	134	389
1952	525	145	380
1953	464	133	331
1954	440	95	345
1955	501	140	361
1956	499	132	367
1957	512	127	385
1958	434	92	342
1959	565	117	448
1960	539	117	422
1961	426	83	343

Moreover, since modern farming uses many diverse harvest methods, such as high ladders, field packing, and conveyor-belt harvest operations, pesticides, mechanical devices, and power-driven machinery, the bill does not attempt to delineate what constitutes "hazardous employment." Rather, it was considered far more practicable to provide the Secretary of Labor with flexibility in this regard. This flexibility is especially important in view of the great changes that occur almost daily in modern farming operations.

In view of the well-documented need to protect young children from harmful child labor in agriculture, and the fact that S. 523 has adopted some of the specific suggestions of farm employers, it is my judgment that further amendments would not receive support when the bill is considered by the Senate. Moreover, given the limited coverage of S. 523, I am reasonably certain that the farming community in Oregon will be able to adjust existing youth employment programs so that they will be able to operate within the framework of the child labor bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 3, I received a letter from the Nyssa-Nampa District Beet Growers Association commenting upon the migratory labor bills, S. 521 through S. 529. I ask unanimous consent that this communication be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NYSSA-NAMPA DISTRICT BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Nyssa, Oreg., May 13, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our association has reviewed S. 521 through S. 529 and submits the following as our viewpoint on this proposed legislation.

S. 521, educational grants for migrants: The intended goal of this bill is most desirable as the future welfare of the migrant population depends on an education program and the migrant's absorption in the general employment area. While we do not object to this bill we think at present the education program proposed is difficult of accomplishment as summer schools for migrant children, unless compulsory, would not be productive of students since from our experience the migrant family would not permit its children who can work in the field during the summer to attend school during the day. As to night education for children and adults, the migrants, after an exhausting day of work in the field, would not respond with enthusiasm to an evening session at school. On the subject of repayment of cost to local districts for prorated cost of education of migrant children in free public grade and high schools, we believe the local areas should assume this obligation as the taxpayers in such areas are the direct beneficiaries of the efforts of the migrant laborers. In our areas of Oregon and Idaho the migrant children are accepted freely by the various school systems, as soon as they arrive, and they attend the schools until their departure, receiving the same educational opportunities as the local children.

S. 522, day child care: Our position is the same as previously mentioned. As long as the opportunity to work is available most migrant children will be working with their families and the very young are usually cared for by the mother or older daughter. From our experience with labor camps this arrangement seems to work very well.

S. 523, child labor provisions, is objectionable as it imposes restrictions which are unfair to the children for whom the protection is intended. First, children who are ambitious or willing enough to work in the fields should be given the opportunity to do so and migrant children should not be discriminated against with a 14-year restriction while local children are limited only to 12 years. Another reason migrant children should not be restricted is that they usually are part of a family unit where the family is endeavoring to earn sufficient income to sustain it through periods of unemployment and any assistance the children can render maintains the well-being and self-respect of the family. The provisions of this bill would eliminate many local women who go out with their children to pick vegetables and fruit. Several examples brought to mind are the need for this type of labor during pea, bean, and strawberry harvest in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. We believe that minors under 18 years should be fully safeguarded from hazardous employment.

S. 524, farm labor contractor and crew leader registration, will work an unnecessary hardship on crew leaders with the financial burden of the insurance requirement. Most of these men come to work areas as a family unit which consists of their immediate family and close relations. Invariably members of a crew will travel in their own cars and in some instances the crew leader will come to the work area with his family and recruit the remainder of his crew from among migrants already arrived. These crew leaders do not usually earn substantial incomes and in many instances will work with their crews, receiving their supervisory income as the only additional income. Requiring insurance coverage will not serve as a control over crew leaders but will only result in an additional unnecessary expense to them.

S. 525, National Advisory Council, is pointed in the right direction.

S. 526, sanitary facilities, seems to call for an unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds while our Government faces a severe deficit. There appears to be no need for money to be granted to States to provide sanitary facilities for migratory workers. We have numerous camps in our areas which have provided adequate sanitary facilities for their migrant workers with improvements made annually. The cost of these facilities are borne by the farmer. Field facilities should not be provided by the State at the expense of the Federal Government or the taxpayer but should be provided by the individual farmer.

S. 527, Farm Employment Service Act, is a burdensome, unworkable bill, as migrant labor is free labor which comes and goes as it desires. In this area hundreds of migrants travel from place to place at their own expense, without being recruited, and stay so long as work is available or until other pastures look greener. If the restrictions of this bill are forced upon the farmers they will be obliged to resort to complete mechanization, wherever possible, at the expense of migrant labor which will thus be faced with unemployment.

S. 528, Minimum wages: The aim of this bill if attained would have the same results as S. 527, the elimination of employment of many migrants. In this area farm labor, whether local or migrant, is receiving not less than $1 per hour with the range to $1.25 per hour. On piecework in sugarbeet and potato crops some migrants earn $20 or more per day.

S. 529, NLRB coverage: We oppose this bill as farmwork is so different from industrial work that agricultural labor would not be benefited by unionization. In many instances farmers will hire their labor on a yearly basis even though the need for such labor is not entirely necessary during many of the months outside the crop season. This employment is maintained on a compensatory basis since the farmhand is called upon to work long and odd hours during the growing season and he works short hours and light work during the off season. If the farmer is forced to live with unionization he would have to hire his labor only when needed. Furthermore with farmers producing crops which require harvest within limited periods a strike could result in the complete loss of a crop and financial disaster to the nonfarming segment of the economy dependent on the farmers, as well as to the farmer.

We are offering these remarks so you will have the benefit of the local farmers' viewpoint.

We hope you will support the extension of Public Law 78 without amendments.

Thanks for the many courtesies you have extended to me in Washington and your interest in the dirt farmer.

Sincerely yours,

William M. Carson,
President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, farm labor legislation—almost by definition—is controversial. Honest men of sincere conviction can be found on both sides of the issues. Conditions of work may differ in different areas of the country so that what is felt in area A to be a necessity, in area B may have far less importance attached to it. By and large, it is my judgment that Oregon farmers are good and conscientious employers. They are family farmers for the most part. Being fairly small operators, many of them actively engage in their field operations, working alongside their harvest-time help. I suspect that, even as you and I, they dread the thought of legislation which might involve them in more paperwork. But, they are affected in their operations by this legislation, and that being so, they have the right to have their views presented to the Senate, before the legislation is acted upon.

As one of their representatives in the Congress, I feel that I have this obligation to them. When the floor leader for the legislation presents it to the Senate, I am confident that he will do so forcefully and well. He has assured me that the subcommittee has weighed carefully the points, similar to those presented by my constituents, which were presented by other witnesses. It is my judgment that the Senate is ready to work its will in this area, to the end that the public good may be served.

Mr. President, in order that I may not leave an incorrect impression of the mail I have received on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated May 24, 1963, which I have received from the Reverend Kent D. Lawrence, chairman, Department of Migrant Ministry, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Westminster Presbyterian Church,
Portland, Oreg., May 24, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to reaffirm the position I support for legislation relative to migrant farm laborers which the Oregon Council of Churches Department of Migrant Ministry personnel has consistently taken in recent years.

S. 521–9 and S. 981 and H.R. 4516–23 and H.R. 4558 represent a comprehensive program which would greatly help the migrant population. Even in Oregon, where State laws have done much to improve the situation, we find growers saying that the State should not require what the Federal Government does not require.

I want to register disapproval of any outright extension of Public Law 78. The use of bracero labor should be gradually eliminated.

Very truly yours,

Kent D. Lawrence,
Chairman, Department of Migrant Ministry.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT CUBA?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I believe that all of us are agreed that something must be done about Cuba. The question that confronts us is, What can be done, short of military invasion, that will help to restore freedom to the Cuban people and eliminate the menace of Castroite subversion in the hemisphere?

This last April 25 to 27, Freedom House in collaboration with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, brought together a group of experts at Ardsley-on-Hudson, N.Y., in an effort to find an answer to this question. This last Tuesday, Freedom House released to the press a 16-page summary of the discussion which took place at the conference. I consider this to be a document of such significance that I earnestly commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this report printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The report found that, "the freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy." The document takes on all the more significance, in my opinion, because of the extraordinary caliber and balance of the list of participants in the Ardsley-on-Hudson conference. There were conservatives and liberals, Democrats and Republicans in the group. There was not a single member of the group whose name carries an extremist connotation; and the discussion at the conference was gratifyingly free of partisan rhetoric. On certain issues, as was inevitable, there were marked differences between the distinguished participants. What was remarkable, was that despite these differences the debate revealed an extraordinary degree of agreement on fundamentals.

I should like to read the concluding paragraphs of the section of the report entitled, "A Consensus for Action":

Timing is, of course, a crucial factor in assessing risk. The Freedom House conferees tended to the view that the risks later will be more formidable than the risks now. Even on the assumption that time is inevitably on our side, which we do not accept, one cannot be sanguine about a Sovietized Cuba that brings a large portion of the United States and the Western Hemisphere within easy range of Communist missiles and nuclear warheads.

The conference was aware that the major premise of present policy is the assumption that action on Cuba must be delayed because of risks to our position elsewhere in the world. But the conferees were impressed by the fact that the U.S. position in October, far from provoking Communist adventures, forced the Soviet leaders to act with greater caution everywhere. In the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, American toughness justifies Khrushchev's position of restraint, while any evidence that the United States is a "paper tiger" would strengthen Mao's call for aggression.

In any case, if choices must be made as to where we should take bold stands, Cuba is the most logical place. The Soviet Union has overextended itself geographically by reaching into the Caribbean. Of all the fronts on which we face each other, Cuba is militarily Russia's weakest, and our strongest. The only Russian chance for success in such a contest would be to convert the local conflict into a general war—clearly too fearful a price for so small a prize. Moreover, military opinion considers the risk of general war in the near future relatively small because the Kremlin knows that it could not win. The record already shows that the Soviets have almost always backed away from action that might lead to general war when the United States has taken a firm stand, as in Cuba last October and in Berlin since Khrushchev issued his original ultimatum in November 1958.

The risks of inaction, however, must be spelled out also in terms of the impact on the non-Communist world. There is the risk—indeed, almost a certainty—that inaction will encourage neutralism. If the United States can accommodate itself to the indefinite perpetuation of a Communist regime in Cuba, why should not the rest of Latin America? And the consequence will be a steady seepage of communism into the other islands of the Caribbean and the other Latin countries of the hemisphere. At the same time, in Europe and Asia, countries contiguous with the Iron Curtain will have every reason to ask: If the United States dare not uproot Communism from its own doorstep, how can we expect it to risk anything on our behalf?

The freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy, implemented by a practical program of action.

Mr. President, I consider the report of the Ardsley-on-Hudson conference, sponsored by Freedom House and the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, to be an example of the workings of democracy at its best. Here were private citizens with a genuine concern over the course of hemispheric affairs, coming together for the purpose of exploring one of the most critical problems which confronts our Government and attempting to share with their Government the problem of exploring and assessing alternative solutions.

Again I want to say that I hope my colleagues will find the time to read this report in its entirety and to accord it the careful thought which it deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT CUBA?

FOREWORD

In October 1962 the world was shocked by the relevation that the Soviet Union had established a nuclear missile base in Cuba. The American people were virtually unanimous in supporting the President's decision to take prompt and effective action, regardless of the risk, to force the withdrawal of Russian missiles and troops.

The succession of events needs no recounting here. What is significant is that, as of this writing, more than a half year has gone by and the task has not been completed. In the meantime, relations between the U.S. Government and anti-Communist Cuban exiles have deteriorated rapidly, dimming hopes for an early overthrow of the Castro regime. It is urgent, therefore, for the American people to review what has happened and to consider what ought now to be done.

To help in this process, Freedom House invited a group of prominent individuals—seasoned observers and analysts—to meet at Gould House, New York University's conference center at Ardsley-on-Hudson, New York, April 25–27. The sessions were conducted in association with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

This report on the sessions was prepared by Freedom House; nothing in it is binding on any participants. The aim is to present the exchange of opinions among people representing different points of view, the airing of their proposals and the consensus which emerged from the deliberations.

Freedom House expresses its gratitude to the busy men and women who put aside personal interests to attend the conference. The list of participants is as follows:

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive director, Cuban Freedom Committee.

Mr. William E. Barlow, publisher, Vision magazine.

Mr. Murray Baron, labor relations.

Mr. Paul Bethel, editor, "Cuba Research Reports."

Mr. Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America.

Mr. James Daniel, roving editor, Reader's Digest.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, columnist, New York Herald-Tribune.

Mr. Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Mr. George Field, executive director, Freedom House.

Miss Frances R. Grant, secretary general, Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

Mr. Hal Hendrix, Latin America editor, Miami Daily News.

Mr. William vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee.

Mr. Daniel James, secretary, Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

Prof. Harry Kantor, Department of Political Science, University of Florida.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall (retired), military writer and syndicated columnist.

Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, syndicated columnist.

Mr. William Patterson, business executive.

Miss Virginia Prewett, Latin American columnist, Washington News.

Mr. John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee.

Mr. Leo Sauvage, New York correspondent, Le Figaro.

Mr. John Smithies, consultant on Latin American Affairs.

Mr. Gerald Steibel, Research Institute of America.

Dr. Sig Synnestveldt, Latin America specialist, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, School of International Affairs, Columbia University.

Vice Admiral Charles Wellborn, Jr. (retired), Hudson Institute.

Prof. A. Curtis Wilgus, director, School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida.

Mr. Chester S. Williams, associate director, Freedom House.

FOCUS ON A PROBLEM

Americans are agreed that a Soviet Cuba is intolerable to the Western Hemisphere. The reasons bear upon our security and freedom as well as the independence and integrity of the other nations in this hemisphere.

The facts about Castro and Communist Cuba are beyond debate: Six million people who won their freedom from Batista's dictatorship found themselves betrayed into the hands of a new dictatorship. They are denied the right to vote, to speak, to publish—to think. More than 100,000 Cubans have been jailed for refusing to accept communism. Another 250,000 have fled, preferring exile to tyranny at home; 180,000 more are awaiting transportation and countless others dream of escaping from the terror.

Cuba has become an overt Soviet satellite—the only one in the Americas. The Castro regime deliberately handed over the island to the Russian dictator and allowed it to be transformed into a launching pad for potential military aggression against the United States and the other countries of the hemisphere.

Present conditions do not suggest that the evil has been abated, much less eliminated. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba, we would still live in the presence of the 20th century's most efficient offensive weapon—aggressive communism itself. This time bomb is still to be defused.

Fundamental objectives

American policy must rest on three objectives:

1. The elimination of the Soviet political and military base in Cuba;
2. The halting of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin-American peoples; and
3. The liberation of the Cuban nation from Castro's brutal police state.

Americans will unite behind any program that gives hope of achieving these goals. But what would such a program be?

Formulating it presents certain immediate difficulties. Public opinion, while it is clear on the basic objectives, does not have full access to the facts. The reasons are many. Some are founded in the requirements of security, some rest on theories of "strategy" that may or may not be sound. In the last analysis, however, whatever policy is adopted will require, for its success, the understanding of the American people and their wholehearted support. Indeed, it is a function of alert citizenship to participate actively in the formulation of policies, even if it must do so on the basis of incomplete information.

The conference agenda

The mechanics of the conference were designed to facilitate a full exchange of ideas, help clarify differences in approach and substance, and pave the way for the enunciation of areas of common agreement. The agenda was divided into three parts:

1. What we know: The basic facts about the situation inside Cuba and among Cuban exiles, and the views of U.S. Government officials and Congressmen as well as leaders of Latin American Republics.

2. What we do not know and need to know: The difficulties of incomplete information about United States and Latin American

policies and programs. (Where possible, conferees filled in the gaps, clarified ambiguities and defined the areas of uncertainty.)

3. Policy and actions: Judgments on objectives and tactics, consensus on what Government policy should be in the interests of the Nation, Latin America and the free world, alternative courses of action.

The Department of State had been invited to participate but found it necessary to decline because "pressure of problems relating to Cuba preclude attendance of officers of the stature which your seminar would merit." The Department, however, supplied the conference with a statement for its guidance.

In view of the consensus ultimately reached by the participants, the diversity of premises from which they started, is noteworthy. The diversities came out clearly in a formal opinion poll composed of 21 questions formulated in the light of the first day's discussion. At the time the poll was taken, 25 participants were seated at the conference table.

Some sense of the participants' initial attitudes emerges from the rather even division on such questions as these:

Does the administration believe that Russian troops will leave Cuba?

Has Washington reached a decision not to act except as it is presently acting?

Does the administration believe that continued economic pressure will topple Castro?

Does the U.S. Government have a policy for liberation of Cuba?

On the other hand, there was fairly close agreement on the following:

That Castro's regime can be toppled without U.S. military action and without an invasion.

That the hit-and-run raids of the exiles were contributing to Castro's difficulties.

That raids not based on U.S. soil did not endanger the peace.

To ascertain the political bias of the conferees, they were asked to express their attitudes toward the present administration on issues other than Cuba. Of the 25 participants, 14 declared themselves friendly, 7 said they were opposed, and 4 abstained. (For a full appreciation of both the temper and the substance of the conference, the poll is reproduced as Appendix II of this report.) In the judgment of Freedom House, it is worth study not only as a summary of the conferees' views but as a reflection of the way qualified observers see America's current Cuban posture.

IN SEARCH OF A POLICY

An American's confrontation with the Cuban problem must begin with the question: What is our Government's policy?

Since Castro took power in 1959, and especially since the Bay of Pigs disaster in 1961, there have been many conflicts and contrasts between official pronouncement and actual performance. While no one doubts the administration's desire to see Cuba liberated from the grip of communism, there is considerable concern that far less than an all-out effort is being made in the Caribbean to do anything about it.

Troubling questions

From their own specialized vantage points, the experts at the Freedom House conference raised these troubling questions:

1. Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated accord with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba with which the United States could "coexist"? If this is not contemplated, why the reluctance to make public the exchange of messages and letters between the President and the Soviet Premier? The time seems overdue for a full disclosure of the agreements reached and the promises broken.

2. Under present circumstances, is the administration reluctant to increase pressure on the Cuban regime? The east coast longshoremen's union has been boycotting Polish and other satellite lines that use some of their ships in Cuban trade. Washington has been seeking to end the boycott. The question was asked: Why has there been no tough, ironclad ban on the shipment of American goods in any vessel of any line that trades with Cuba? At the present time, a watered-down regulation applies only to the individual ships that deliver goods to Cuban ports, and even violations of this weak measure are reportedly permitted.

3. At a meeting in England, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is said to have described the U.S. position on Cuba in these terms: The first objective is to clean up our own backyard in Central and South America by vigorous implementation of the Alliance for Progress, meanwhile containing Communist Cuba. A second objective is to bring isolated Cuba back into the Organization of American States as a chastened, cooperating member. If this is an accurate reflection of U.S. policy and not just a personal view, how long does Washington think step No. 1 will take before action can begin on step No. 2?

4. Is it possible that the humanitarian mission of James Donovan, the lawyer who negotiated the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, has become something more? Is it also a cover for administration-approved negotiations with Castro, looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba? Castro's conspicuous entertainment of Donovan and his son in early April 1963 suggests that the Cuban dictator may be reaching for some kind of "accommodation" with the United States, since the October events may have convinced him that the Soviets are unwilling to risk much to support him.

(Significantly, a television interview filmed on April 24 just before Castro's departure for Russia, released after the Freedom House Conference had adjourned, lent credence to this assessment of Castro's policy. Aware that he was addressing an American audience, Castro expressed appreciation that the United States has "taken some steps in the way of peace" such as "the stopping of piratical acts against Cuba." He indicated that these steps might be the basis for better relations. "I have looked at such steps with good eyes," he said, adding that the question of Soviet technicians in Cuba—"who would fight with us against any aggressor"—might be the subject of a three-way discussion between Cuba, the United States and the Soviet Union, and not just between the United States and the Soviet Union.)

These uncertainties about the direction of American policy, whether well founded or not, are profoundly disturbing in and of themselves. They suggest that actually there may be no master plan and that we are merely improvising on this crucial cold war front. Certainly, a coherent policy and plan of action would have to begin with an evaluation of a whole series of basic relationships, including the following:

1. The relation of the Cuban problem to the other cold war fronts.
2. Cuba's relation to the other Latin American countries.
3. The relation of the United States to the other Latin American countries.
4. Possible effects on the Sino-Russian conflict.
5. The fear that action on Cuba may escalate into global war.

Specifically, clear-cut U.S. policies are needed in these areas:

1. Exiles' activities.
2. Developments inside Cuba.
3. Post-Castro Cuba.
4. Current Russian presence in Cuba.

Virtually all the discussion on Cuba revolved around these issues. The following pages are an attempt to organize and integrate the observations.

Cuba and the other cold war fronts

Communism's conquest of Cuba must be viewed in the context of the worldwide expansionist drive conducted by the Kremlin, which has already led to totalitarian control over a third of the human race. At this point in history, simple solutions are no longer possible. The problem of resisting Communist expansionism is growing more complex and less manageable all the time. Any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments around the globe. Since we have committed ourselves to the defense of allies in all the continents, our Cuban policy must be consistent with those commitments, or at least must avoid jeopardizing them.

Participants in the Freedom House Conference saw this fact as a major preoccupation in the thinking of those responsible for American policy. In an effort to define Washington's current approach, several conferees used role-playing procedures to present what might be the views of high Government officials. In substance, they said:

"Our policy on Cuba must necessarily fit into the larger U.S. policy of defending the free world against communism while avoiding war. Where certain common interests are shared by the United States and the Soviet Union, we must press for an agreement with the Soviets. In this context, other problems may have priority—such as reconstituting the troika coalition in Laos to prevent a serious collapse that would have dire consequences for Vietnam, Indonesia, and others; the urgent need for concluding a nuclear test ban in Geneva; and preventing the military use of outer space. In such a framework Cuba is not the most pressing issue. We are concerned not only with restoring freedom to Cuba but also with maintaining and enlarging freedom in Berlin. A victory on any given front would hardly be worthwhile if the price turned out to be the loss of Berlin, Iran, Vietnam, or some other sector of the global struggle. What we do about Cuba may precipitate reactions elsewhere that could seriously injure our wider interests.

"Nor can we forget the implications of the rift between Moscow and Peiping. At this juncture it would hardly be wise to increase the pressure on Khrushchev and possibly make him look worse than he did when we forced him to pack up his missiles and go home. The prospect of another such defeat might force him, for example, to move into Iran in order to salvage his already shaky position as leader of the world Communist movement.

"As realists, we know there is no automatic virtue in just doing something; consider the Bay of Pigs and the trouble we're having in Vietnam. And we have to take cognizance of the handicaps imposed by our very strength—the restraints on our freedom of action that flow from our giant size in comparison with the Cuban pigmy. Rough action would alienate world opinion. In any case, even our friends in Latin America are opposed to what they call intervention. Certainly, the reaction during the Bay of Pigs misadventure demonstrates that a program of direct action by U.S. forces would be even less palatable than action by the Cuban freedom fighters—and that would be so despite a quick success and moderate casualties on both sides.

"We are committed to getting Soviet troops out of Cuba as fast as possible. Some Sovietologists tell us we can probably do it more quickly by reducing, rather than increasing, the pressure on Khrushchev. Meanwhile, we are isolating Cuba from the rest of the hemisphere and discrediting its revolutionary image among Latin Americans. We are slowly strengthening our OAS allies and reinforcing their ability to maintain internal security. Over the long haul, we hope to achieve our goals through a successful Alliance for Progress.

"Those who demand a commitment to immediate Cuban liberation are simply ignoring the unacceptable risks that would be involved. After all, we have a commitment to the eventual liberation of Eastern Europe, but those who pledged in campaign speeches to make good on it soon found out that they couldn't fulfill this promise without risking a global war. In 1956, Radio Free Europe and even the official Voice of America were criticized for having encouraged the Hungarians to revolt under the misconception that outside help would be forthcoming.

"The risks of precipitant action cannot be dismissed. To go to the brink and then be forced to retreat rather than accept the dreaded next step, would be disastrous. Even the political opposition which condemns a policy of caution, does not advocate military action in Cuba. Its leaders have been quick to disavow the few who call for blockade and invasion."

Such is the point of view apparently prevailing in Washington, as the conferees reconstructed it. It represents the considerations that seem to trouble the administration as it picks its way across the heavily mined terrain of foreign policy.

Opinion at the conference was predominantly pessimistic that such consideration could get anywhere. As one participant put it: "The United States wants Cuba to be free, but does not want Cuba to become free. We are eager for the result that is sought; but we have no stomach for the actions needed to achieve it." Concededly, there was good reason during the first part of 1962 (before October) for U.S. officials to be apprehensive over the effect on Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam if this country challenged Soviet arms shipments to Cuba. The most significant aspects of the brilliantly executed confrontation in October–November, however, was that it did not trigger Soviet actions in Berlin or in other places where Soviet capability existed.

The lesson of October–November confirms the thesis that action in the Caribbean ripples out to distant shores and sensitive regions. But even more important, it emphasizes dramatically that indecisiveness in the Caribbean can have the most deleterious effects on our alliances, especially NATO and SEATO. Inaction on the Cuban front will only be taken to mean a U.S. unwillingness to run risks in defense of others. If the United States accepts Russian intrusion at its own doorstep, where the Soviet military posture is weakest, how can Europeans expect the United States to risk nuclear devastation to repel a Soviet attack in Europe where Soviet military power is greatest?

Indeed, American resistance to Soviet military penetration in the Caribbean is a prerequisite to restraining the the Soviets from an adventure in West Berlin. Defend our interests close to home, and we reinforce rather than endanger our outposts in more distant places. Blur our purpose and commitment in our own hemisphere, sow confusion between words and deeds about Cuba, and we can only damage American objectives around the world.

CUBA IN CONTEXT: LATIN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Thoughtful observers are by now aware that Cuba is the Western Hemisphere base from which the Communist knife is aimed at the soft underbelly of the hemisphere—Latin America. A long history of economic and political errors has filled Central and South America with internal discontent, thus making it vulnerable to conquest by external forces. How many more Cubas can we sustain?

Time is a vital factor. There are hopeful, prodemocratic forces at work, but they are in a deadly race with the destructive, totalitarian forces. Decisive to the outcome will be the length of time it takes to dislodge not only the Russian troops but communism itself from Cuba. The mere survival of the Castro regime is a factor of great importance. It strengthens the Communists in other Latin American countries and creates an image of Communist invincibility. It encourages the trend toward neutralism, already pronounced in some countries, with increasing numbers of Latin Americans saying, "If the United States is willing to tolerate or coexist with a Communist Cuba, why shouldn't we?" It also encourages an equally dangerous trend toward extreme rightist dictatorship.

The spawning of more neutralist or militarist governments in Latin America, in reaction to the continued existence of the Castro regime in Cuba, can threaten the U.S. objectives of preserving and enlarging freedom. Coexistence, on the one hand, may lead to coalitions which ultimately produce one-party rule, while rightist dictatorship gives the Communists a moral pretext for carrying out their tactics of conspiracy and helps polarize public support in their direction.

History does not operate in smooth unidirectional lines. Developments are the product of a given equilibrium between rival forces. The presence of Castroism, viewed as a temporary phenomenon, has generated some wholesome reactions in Latin America, which should not be dismissed. The delivery of Cuba to Khrushchev as a military base added considerably to the disenchantment of many Latin Americans who had originally considered Castro a genuine patriot fighting foreign economic exploitation. Even before October, Castro had paid some price for his betrayals—ranging from unfulfilled promises to hold elections to the public confession that he had been a Communist all along but had concealed the fact while seeking popular support. But now Soviet domination of Cuba has made it plain that Castroism is not a nationalist liberation movement. Political, labor, and business leaders, editors, intellectuals and students whose hostility to Batista's dictatorship made them sympathetic to Castro, have been disabused. Military officers who might have been tempted to seek a deal with "the wave of the future" have been sobered by the purges and executions that followed Castro's accession to power.

The volatility of the poverty-stricken Latin American masses is another matter. It is difficult to predict the direction in which their pent-up resentments are likely to explode in a period when old institutions are disintegrating and new claimants are demanding power. Army takeovers, like those in Peru and Guatemala, are in the historical Latin American pattern. They are the traditional response when power centers are threatened or when chaos seems imminent. To be sure, in some situations the military play a legitimate role in preventing a minority from seizing power. But U.S. policy must take into account the fact that the Communists often find oppressive rightist regimes more useful than liberal or anti-Communist leftist-governments.

The ultimate success of the Alliance for Progress may hinge on whether Latin America can be persuaded that Castro is not here to stay, and communism will not spread to other Latin republics. Unfortunately, the Communist challenge has not yet convinced a majority of the more conservative Latin Americans to accept the reforms essential to the success of the Alliance. The effect of that challenge has been, rather, to encourage a massive flight of capital from Latin America and to discourage new investment there, thus contributing to further economic deterioration and reducing the Alliance's chances of success.

American policy seems geared to the thesis that we can defeat communism by defeating hunger, poverty and disease in Latin America, and that all we need is time to accomplish the latter. The reality is that the attainment of a higher standard of living does not necessarily preclude communism, as demonstrated by the very case of Cuba, which before Castro was one of the two or three most advanced countries in Latin America. At bottom, we are engaged in a two-front struggle against both communism and poverty, at the same time. If communism remains in control of Cuba indefinitely, it will have proved its permanency in the Western Hemisphere before the reform battle can be won. On the other hand, the mere erasure of communism from Cuba would not, by itself, automatically insure orderly social and economic progress.

U.S. relations with Latin America

These considerations brought the conferees to an examination of American policy vis-a-vis the countries south of the border. Despite the fear of Communist expansion, Latin America still considers U.S. intervention an anathema. The question was whether this factor has not been given undue weight, distorting our relations with Latin America generally. Oversensitivity to the charge of interventionism, based on fear of offending our friends, may now have reached the point where we are alienating support or weakening the hemisphere because of our restraint.

The conference members therefore discussed these questions in the framework of concrete situations. For example:

1. In 1947, the United States and Latin America joined in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, more popularly known as the Rio Treaty, which established a mutual security system, based on the formulation that an aggressive act against one is an aggressive act against all, to be met by economic, political and military sanctions. At Punta del Este in 1962—before the Russian military base in Cuba was revealed—the United States pressed for strong resolutions, which were adopted by the Organization of American States, specifically applying the Rio Treaty to the Sino-Soviet intrusion into the hemisphere. Why did not the United States rest a forthright policy of eliminating the missile bases in Cuba on those OAS resolutions? Can the United States entertain the idea of deals with Khrushchev and/or Castro, involving coexistence with a sovietized Cuba or even a Titoist Cuba, without repudiating the Rio and Punta del Este positions and in effect the whole inter-American system?

2. Since December 1962, according to reliable reports, President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela has wanted to go before the OAS to document the story of Castro-supported sabotage and terror against his country. The immediate objective would be to induce the five OAS members that still maintain relations with Cuba—Mexico, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, and Bolivia—to end their ties. It is reported that the United States has been stalling off the Venezuelan action. If the reports are not true, the question remains whether the United States has been using its full influence to persuade the five to break relations. The issue is a practical one. If the five states permit Cuban embassies to operate in their countries, the subversion will spread throughout Latin America under the shelter of diplomatic immunity, and subversives trained in Cuba and the Soviet bloc will be free to undermine other nations.

The fear of escalation

Undoubtedly, much of American policy is based on genuine fears—not only the fear of consequences in other areas of the cold war, or of the reactions in Latin American countries, but also the fear that decisive action might escalate into a global, nuclear war. This is not an irrational fear, and it cannot lightly be dismissed. But it is precisely because we are living in a world of risks that leadership is necessary. Whoever would give guidance to others must be capable of assessing the risks, and then of acting. In a riskless world there would be no need for leadership.

In his speech of October 22, 1962, President Kennedy said that the greater risk lay in not acting. He concluded that strong action involved the lesser risk.

Whatever happens, the same task will remain: To follow the line of the lesser, more manageable risk. In evaluating the hazards of weak versus strong action, the Freedom House conferees cited the following questions as most relevant:

1. To what extent will the risk of nuclear war increase with the passage of time, in view of the relative increase of Soviet nuclear capabilities?

2. What will be the effect of American vacillation in Cuba on other sensitive fronts of the cold war?

3. What will be the worldwide psychological impact of continued taunting propaganda by Castro and the Soviets?

4. What are the probabilities that the Cuban Communist base will be used against us in the future under unpredictably changed circumstances?

5. What will be the probable effectiveness of the Cuban Communist base in undermining other Latin American governments, with a consequent spread of communism in the hemisphere?

The net effect of examining such factors is to suggest that a simple policy of risk avoidance can lead only to the certainty of a worsening position for the United States. Indeed, it is more likely that an improvement of our position will occur only from a process of intelligent risk taking.

This was demonstrated in the October confrontation. The administration took manageable risks rather than accept the certainty that the nuclear balance would swing in Russia's direction and that Khrushchev's capabilities for blackmail and attack would be increased by the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. Unfortunately, while it was clearly willing to take risks in order to obtain a Soviet pledge of an inspected withdrawal of the missiles, there was no willingness to take the risk of a followthrough. Is there any practical value in running risks to gain a pledge, and running no risks to enforce it?

The fear of escalation, while it might logically deter certain types of all-out action, has distorted the judgment of our decisionmakers on more limited action and narrower sectors of strategy and tactics.

U.S. policy on exile activity

The conferees were especially troubled by the deterioration in the relations between the U.S. Government and the Cuban exiles, whose principal concern is to find ways and means of liberating their country. Does this development foreshadow an ultimate conflict between the freedom fighters' objective of liberation and an American policy of containment? This disturbing question underlays the discussion of American policy toward the Cuban exiles.

Arguing that there has been no consistency of purpose or action in our Government's relations with Cuban activists in exile, conferees cited these specific items:

We can understand the legal and technical reasons for withholding the use of U.S. territory as a base for launching raids against Cuba and against Soviet shipping bound for Havana. But why was it considered necessary to deprecate as "irresponsible, ineffective and dangerous" the raids and supplying missions that originated outside the United States? Is that not inconsistent with our official position that the Cubans themselves must get rid of the Castro dictatorship? Does it mean that the administration disapproves of the rebel action in the mountains and their use of sabotage against Castro? If we favor such action, can we expect the Cubans to proceed without our help and in the face of our public condemnation? In any case, what are anti-Castro Cubans in exile or inside Cuba to conclude?

Miro Cardona and his council had urged Cuban exiles to enlist in the U.S. Army for training. Thousands of young Cuban exiles, including many of the Bay of Pigs veterans, did so. Why? What official representations led them to believe that joining the U.S. Army would offer them the best way of fighting for a free Cuba?

Reports of Central Intelligence Agency collaboration with the exiles seem to suggest a conflict of policies and activities within the administration. Has CIA at times followed an independent line in conflict with that of the State Department?

Attorney General Robert Kennedy appealed to the Cuban exiles to unite in one organization with which the U.S. Government could consult. Does this mean that the administration disapproves of CIA's experiment in favoring certain Cuban factions which has merely increased the disunity? Does the Attorney General's statement look toward the recognition of a government in exile?

The answers to these questions are uncertain, but they sustain the impression that American policy toward the Cuban exiles has lacked consistency and has not contributed toward their unity essential for the fight against Castro.

POLICY ON POST-CASTRO CUBA

American policy should not limit itself to the overthrow of Castro. The attitude of the United States toward the long-range future of Cuba is itself a major strategic element in the right to end the Communist regime.

Discussion among the conferees revealed that little is known about the administration's orientation on this question. To be sure, it would be tactically unwise for the United States to appear to take any action imposing or supporting a specific type of regime. The very concept of democracy held by the United States prohibits such a course of action. Moreover, as a practical matter, any candidate selected by the United States to succeed Castro would be rejected by Cuban public opinion long before he reached Havana.

Nevertheless, intelligent policy, used as a guide for action, must have some orientation on the possible alternatives that will be available, or probable, when Castro is driven from the scene. These possibilities, which American policy must take into account, include:

1. A Titoist Communist state in Cuba: There are indications that this result might be acceptable in certain American quarters. There appear to be some who even believe that a modus vivendi could be worked out with a Communist Castro if, like the early Tito, he breaks all ties with the Soviet Union and ceases to be a tool of its foreign and military policy.

2. A democratic Socialist state: This would be a regime in the tradition of the Western Socialist parties which are anti-Communist but seek to resolve economic problems on the basis of government planning and controls. Pressure for such a form of government might grow inside Cuba after Castro is overthrown, the objective of the people being to retain certain welfare programs and socialized industries rather than restore a free enterprise economy.

3. A liberal democracy: Another choice might be a social, economic, and political system resembling that of Western democracies in its fundamentals, but adapted to Cuban conditions.

It is conceivable that Cuban exiles in the United States could reconcile their differences and join with the resistance forces inside Cuba to form a provisional government. Much would depend upon the composition of the forces which topple Castro.

American policy, of course, must not seek to impose any regime on Cuba as a substitute for the present one. The danger is that its actions in relation to the exiles in the United States will be interpreted as favoring or opposing one or more of the alternatives, when in fact no formal decision has been reached. The effect might then be to produce exactly the opposite of the one we might ultimately find preferable.

THE SOVIET PRESENCE IN CUBA

Despite the political retreat by Khrushchev during the October–November crisis, there is no reason to believe that the Russian dictator has abandoned his hopes of maintaining a Soviet base only 90 miles from U.S. shores, That "fortress Cuba" is a military threat in the Western Hemisphere is beyond question: It is operating as the training ground for guerilla warfare against Latin American Republics and as a center for the spread of subversion, terror, and sabotage.

The latest Soviet aim in Cuba is to use the island as a base for medium-range missiles which could completely circumvent U.S. warning systems and keep a large part of the hemisphere and the United States under the constant threat of nuclear attack. (This subject has most recently been treated in the "Summary of Major Findings" on the Soviet buildup in Cuba by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, May 9, 1963.) In the absence of verified and precise knowledge of the conditions inside Cuba, American policy must be predicated on the assumption that the danger is real and will persist.

Other Soviet aims in Cuba have been achieved:

1. Castro has been supplied with the latest weapons to fend off an invasion from without or an uprising of the people from within. What still remains is for the Russian experts to train Cuban Communists in handling these weapons. According to some military opinion, this will take 4 to 6 years. The Castro regime argues that it has the right, as a sovereign power, to invite military assistance from a foreign country.

2. Cuba has been converted into a Communist West Point for the training of officers intended to lead military attacks on existing regimes. The island will eventually be the arsenal of Latin American revolutions, from which swift military support can be given to the creation of "new Cubas."

3. With its 150 operational jet fighter-bombers, which have a substantial range, Cuba is in a position to control the air over a number of small, nearby countries. (It is reported that some policy makers in Washington find comfort in the fact that all this lethal equipment is under the control of Soviet officers rather than the hard-core Castro Communists who incline toward the more reckless views of the Chinese.)

American policy at the present time is focused, however, on the issue of the missile buildup in Cuba. There is little confidence that Khrushchev has actually carried out his pledge of last October–November. Russian credibility was completely destroyed by the fact that the prelude to the crisis was a direct face-to-face lie by Foreign Secretary Andrei Gromyko to President Kennedy on the very subject of missiles in Cuba. In the absence of on-site inspection, there can be no certainty that all the missiles and nuclear warheads have been removed. Some could have been installed in caves from which they can be fired with perhaps as great precision as missiles from an underwater Polaris. Moreover, the Soviet troops and technical advisers, even if we accept the lowest estimate of their numbers, can accomplish significant secret preparations, partly protected by darkness, cloud formations, and other similar impediments to aerial surveillance. After the Kremlin took such large risks to execute the buildup, one does not have to be of a suspicious nature to wonder what 12,500 to 30,000 Russian military personnel would be doing in Cuba.

Continuance of the status quo—the uncertainty about the missiles and the absolute certainty of the Soviet Army presence—obviously has strong implications about our global position and could lead to even more serious consequences than we have already suffered. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have categorically declared that a Communist base in this hemisphere would never be tolerated. The fact that a Soviet base is now being tolerated can lead the enemy to the kind of miscalculation that might be disastrous. A misreading of our equivocation could induce probing adventures elsewhere. Also, our acceptance of the situation could be taken as some justification for the Chinese view that strong-arm methods do work in dealing with the "degenerate democracies."

But most serious of all, the continued presence of Soviet military forces in Cuba could provide the very spark that ignites a nuclear war. The United States has warned that it will not stand by and allow Soviet forces to quell an uprising in Cuba as they did in Hungary. Any incident—a barroom brawl with Soviet soldiers in Havana, a flareup of tempers over a child run down by a Soviet jeep—could lead to Russian shooting, even in self-defense. As long as Russian troops are in Cuba, peace is endangered by the possibility of an accident. Emotions in this country might well make it impossible for any administration to control the consequences, which could escalate into nuclear war.

Precisely because the situation endangers peace, and because it threatens Khrushchev's policy of coexistence, there is some leverage in persuading the Russians to withdraw. But this can be done only if the United States persists in applying pressure.

A CONSENSUS FOR ACTION

Readers of this report are aware of the diversity of views that were brought to the conference table at Gould House. Early in the proceedings, a formal opinion survey had made the conferees conscious of their differences, the significance of which was explored thoroughly in the ensuing sessions. Ultimately, however, the incisive, and often pointed debate revealed an extraordinary amount of agreement on fundamentals. (A listing of alternatives will be found in appendix I at the end of this report.)

It should be underscored that the following effort to state a consensus is not intended to suggest unanimity on all its components. The task of formulating crucial policy is never really completed, and those who contribute to it render their greatest service by expressing dissents, probing for weaknesses and asserting their own personal insights.

The lack of public information

It was recognized that the implementation of policy may sometimes call for a withholding of information when publication might automatically defeat the objective. But the conferees felt that the effect of current practice was to hinder the formation of American public opinion rather than obstruct the enemy. Many participants indicated their belief that some kind of negotiations were being conducted off-the-record in the effort to balance the interests of one sector of Western defense against the interests of another.

It was acknowledged that the President alone was in possession of the fullest body of information, while others who seek proposed courses of action must do so with less than complete knowledge. In a free society the concerned citizen has no other alternative but to proceed on the basis of the limited information available.

At the same time, it is a legitimate and essential demand on the part of the citizen that his Government clearly expound its policies and thus expose them to the wholesome influence of public debate. Such an exposition, to be constructive, must be conducted in an atmosphere of bipartisanship which has been missing from recent discussions in which both parties have been seeking political advantage. A bipartisan approach, of course, cannot be invoked merely for the convenience of the party in power, any more than the difficulties created by our adversaries abroad may be properly used as ammunition in political campaigns. Nor should national debate be suspended by bipartisanship, the function of which is to nourish discussion by providing conditions favorable to intelligent appraisal. Certainly no political party has a right to utilize a period of great national anxiety and difficulty to further narrow party purposes.

Every American who ventures to suggest a policy on Cuba must recognize that there is an enormous difference between presenting the most intelligent critique of policy and actually carrying the awesome responsibility for the consequences. The effect of such awareness should be to temper forms of expression but it should not reduce the personal responsibility of the citizen to seek and advocate solutions for our national problem.

Definition of the American commitment

Both political parties seem to be united on the objective—freedom for Cuba. To carry out appropriate measures will call for a national unity such as prevailed in the October crisis. But we must be prepared for the fact that future measures will have to be more numerous, more involved, perhaps more onerous and surely less dramatic, requiring a longer period of application than the quarantine during the fall of 1962. Bipartisan consultations are needed now to reach a broad, long-range understanding.

This is possible, however, only if the administration recognizes that it is responsible for providing leadership in a national discussion of the Cuban problem. It must supply the needed facts and it must clearly articulate the country's objectives.

No responsible American doubts the desire of the administration to see Cuba ultimately free and meanwhile to prevent Castro from spreading Communist dictatorship to other parts of the hemisphere. It can certainly be assumed that Washington is committed to eliminating the Soviet political and military base from Cuba eventually and to blocking Sino-Soviet ambitions in Latin America. What is needed is a commitment to urgent and immediate action, unambiguously expressed to the Nation and the world. It is imperative that our people, our allies, and especially our enemies, clearly understand that this Government intends to use all its power to achieve the objective.

All must know that we not only want to free Cuba but we are determined to help it become free—without undue delays. Any doubts on this score must be dispelled—for example, by publication of the correspondence between Khrushchev and the President during and following the October confrontation. So long as the record is withheld, there will be rumors and apprehensions, at home and abroad, about our Cuban commitment. There must be no gap between word and deed.

Providing leadership

Because the Cuban issue deserves high priority and as an evidence of the intention to act decisively, the administration must assign top national leadership to concentrate on this area of national concern. The appointment of an outstanding personality to a Federal post on Cuban or Latin American affairs will symbolize the importance we assign to the problem and should help to improve our performance. Arrangements should be made to call together Department of State personnel, both incumbent and retired, who know the problems and can communicate effectively with our OAS allies to win support for U.S. policies and actions.

The Alliance for Progress

Thoughtful Americans support the Alliance for Progress. Experience demonstrates that the Communists cannot be defeated in their drive for world domination by purely defensive action or negative opposition. The justification of the free world lies in its promise of a better life to the individual. For millions of hungry, illiterate people, living in mud huts and doomed to early death, freedom means, above all, a chance to work and live in dignity. Their yearning for escape from hardship makes them an easy prey for the demagog who holds out glittering prospects under communism.

Every effort must be made, through the Alliance for Progress, to raise the living standards of Central and South America. But the program will succeed only if the people can see and feel the advances. Unfortunately, so long as communism can use Cuba as a base for subversion, economic progress will be sabotaged by the Communists, on the one hand, or strangled by rightists who use the threat of communism to oppose essential reforms. Awareness of these obstacles should lead us to increase, not diminish, our zeal for strengthening the economies of our neighbors to the south. We must be prepared for an uphill struggle against reaction, corruption and communism—all foes of an effective Alliance for Progress.

But there may be an even more serious danger to the Alliance for Progress—our own illusion that it can succeed by itself. The Communists can destroy faster than others can build. The Alliance for Progress must therefore not be considered as a substitute for direct, militant opposition to communism. It is but one of the weapons that must be brought into action. The Marshall plan did not really take hold until NATO provided a shield against the military threat of communism. So too the Alliance for Progress needs an alliance for freedom as a shield against Communist violence and sabotage.

The achievement of progress in Latin America will require the development of local leaders, dedicated to freedom and capable of standing as "a wall of dedicated men" against the inroads of totalitarian tyranny. Theirs will be the task of combating the agents now being trained in Cuba and Russia. Even after the liberation of Cuba, Latin America will be confronted by a formidable disruptive force because of those who have already been taught Communist subversion and guerrilla warfare in Castro's and Khrushchev's schools of revolution. They will be defeated only if the free world is defended by trained men who possess the skills of democratic leadership.

The activities of the Alliance for Progress—such as the labor institutes now underway—must be enlarged. The OAS should be encouraged to set up additional training centers in democratic countries like Costa Rica and Venezuela, with U.S.-supported facilities and teachers. We must fight communism with trained minds as well as good hearts.

This need grows all the more urgent because Communist attacks on the weak spots in Latin America increase the danger of a resort to military dictatorships like the Peralta junta in Guatemala. Such a trend would multiply our difficulties and jeopardize the cause of freedom. We cannot afford to be caught in the crossfire of a battle between the extremists. To escape such a dilemma, we must take timely action in buttressing a system of inter-American democracy. Our need is for knowledgeable leadership in all our embassies and agencies in the field as well as at the top. Only by putting our best men in strategic posts can we hope to handle the explosive situations if and when they occur.

Aid to the Cuban exiles

Cuba's proudest hope is the resistance of its patriots to Communist domination. No act of the American Government should downgrade their courage; every pronouncement should aim to uplift the morale of freedom-loving Cubans everywhere.

We have a considerable responsibility for helping the exiles to achieve unity in their own ranks. We injure such unity if we play favorites among factions. We must encourage all groups to select responsible leaders with whom the U.S. Government can cooperate for the common cause. Through every possible channel, we must assist the organized underground inside Cuba, bringing to bear our extensive resources and experience.

Exile and underground activity has many values. Not the least is the fact that it warns the Soviet interventionists that seizure of other men's countries will bring inevitable retaliatory action. If Communists can promote phony wars of liberation, we can and should support real ones.

The presence of Cuban refugees in the United States, now numbering about 250,000, presents us with a rare opportunity. These men and women are the only major groups of exiles since World War II who have any reasonable prospect of an early return to a liberated homeland.

Cuba's problems will not end with the overthrow of the Communists. If those problems are solved by a future democratic regime, a powerful blow will have been struck for liberation everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. Thus, we contribute to the oppressed people in Cuba and all the satellites when we provide special study opportunities to the refugees now within our shores. By training them in the fields of democratic government, public administration, industrial and agricultural management, defense, public safety and order, public education, we can lay the foundations for a wholesome future.

THE TAKING OF RISKS

Underlying the discussion of policy and action was the question: What risks are Americans willing to take in response to Communist expansionism and which policy is likely to minimize the risks?

We are most in danger of Communist attack, whether from Peking or Moscow, when our indecision suggests fear, weakness, or ineptness. We are safest when our adversary realizes that we are clear about our objectives and determined in pursuing them.

Timing is, of course, a crucial factor in assessing risk. The Freedom House conferees tended to the view that the risks later will be more formidable than the risks now. Even on the assumption that time is inevitably on our side, which we do not accept, one cannot be sanguine about a sovietized Cuba that brings a large portion of the United States and Western Hemisphere within easy range of Communist missiles and nuclear warheads.

The conference was aware that the major premise of present policy is the assumption that action on Cuba must be delayed because of risks to our position elsewhere in the world. But the conferees were impressed by the fact that the U.S. position in October, far from provoking Communist adventures, forced the Soviet leaders to act with greater caution everywhere. In the context of the Sino-Soviet dispute, American toughness justifies Khrushchev's position of restraint, while any evidence that the United States is a "paper tiger" would strengthen Mao's call for aggression.

In any case, if choices must be made as to where we should take bold stands, Cuba is the most logical place. The Soviet Union has overextended itself geographically by reaching into the Caribbean. Of all the fronts on which we face each other, Cuba is militarily Russia's weakest, and our strongest. The only Russian chance for success in such a contest would be to convert the local conflict into a general war—clearly too fearful a price for so small a prize. Moreover, military opinion considers the risk of general war in the near future relatively small because the Kremlin knows that it could not win. The record already shows that the Soviets have almost always backed away from action that might lead to general war when the United States has taken a firm stand, as in Cuba last October and in Berlin since Khrushchev issued his original ultimatum in November 1958.

The risks of inaction, however, must be spelled out also in terms of the impact on the non-Communist world. There is the risk—indeed, almost a certainty—that inaction will encourage neutralism. If the United States can accommodate itself to the indefinite perpetuation of a Communist regime in Cuba, why should not the rest of Latin America? And the consequence will be a steady seepage of communism into the other islands of the Caribbean and the other Latin countries of the hemisphere. At the same time, in Europe and Asia, countries contiguous with the Iron Curtain will have every reason to ask: If the United States dare not uproot communism from its own doorstep, how can we expect it to risk anything on our behalf?

The freeing of Cuba, not ultimately but soon, must be the aim of U.S. policy implemented by a practical program of action.

CONCLUSION: THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESIDENT

The men and women who assembled at the invitation of Freedom House were sympathetic to the heavy burden carried by the President of the United States and his advisers. Theirs is a fearsome responsibility in these days of civilization's great dilemma.

As we were meeting, Haiti became a close second in the Caribbean developments of deep concern to the United States. Southeast Asia is engaging our attention and costing American lives. Berlin is always in the wings. The complexity of these interrelated problems must not be minimized by those who seek to be helpful in the finding of solutions. Our chosen leaders should be able to count on the cooperation of all Americans in the effort to solve the gigantic problems confronting the Nation and the world. And they have a duty to do all in their power to create a spirit of national unity that will prepare us for the crises ahead.

Both the cooperation and the national unity can be achieved only if the people have access to relevant information, study every suggested solution, and develop a consensus for action. Our leaders must keep us informed of the facts and their plans for the future; we must keep our leaders informed of the people's judgment and willingness to sacrifice.

This is the discourse of democracy. Only through such an interchange between the people and their Government can America find the way toward freedom and peace in the difficult days ahead.

APPENDIX I: A PANORAMA OF ALTERNATIVES

From the vantage point of their own contact with the problems of Latin America and the cold war, the conferees attempted to formulate their personal conclusions within the framework of these parameters:

1. Questions of high policy: (a) What do we regard as indispensable? (b) What is intolerable?

2. What costs and risks are acceptable in achieving our objectives?

3. How much action, and what kind, is needed and feasible on the part of (a) the United States; (b) Cuban exiles; (c) the underground in Cuba; (d) the Organization of American States; (e) NATO?

4. What mix of measures would be most effective, including (a) refugee training for service in a liberated Cuba; (b) propaganda and psychological warfare; (c) economic isolation of Cuba; (d) support of sabotage and rebel forces; (e) aid to insurrection; (f) para-military and military actions?

Freedom House commends this formulation to other discussion groups as a helpful tool in studying one of our most urgent problems. Its use in the sessions of this conference proved profitable in laying out at least a partial list of alternative policies and action points. They are listed here, not as points advocated by the conference or even by the individuals who presented them but as evidences of the fact that a frank facing of our position reveals many directions—of varying merit, to be sure—in which we can go. Many of the proposals are contradictory in some respects or even mutually exclusive. They nevertheless help to illuminate the areas in which decisions must be made consciously rather than by default.

TOP-LEVEL DECISIONS

1. Insist as a basic premise that Castro-communism must go or be defeated.

2. Seek to coexist with a Communist Cuba headed by Castro or some other ruler.

HEMISPHERIC POLICY

1. Reassert the Monroe Doctrine, or a modernized version.

2. Announce U.S. support for all dedicated democrats who fight for freedom against dictatorship anywhere in the hemisphere.

3. Proclaim a hemispherewide right of self-determination, accepting any democratic decision on the form of government and social system so long as "human rights and fundamental freedoms" are observed.

4. Help to organize a Latin American Treaty Organization (LATO) outside the OAS, which would welcome all nondictatorial states willing to ally themselves for purposes of military defense after the pattern of NATO. (It is assumed that several of the larger Latin American States would be reluctant to join, and that dictatorships like Haiti, Paraguay, etc., would be barred.)

5. Rally nongovernmental organizations throughout the hemisphere, including business groups and labor unions, for freedom and social justice.

6. Declare that the United States oppose Communist penetration but not revolutionary social change in Latin America.

DIRECT PRESSURE ON CUBA

1. Assert a policy of collective measures against Cuba based on a rigorous implementation of the Rio Treaty, the Bogotá Pact, and the Punta del Este resolutions.

2. Repeal or amend the U.S. Neutrality Acts.

3. Organize a tight OAS embargo against trade, communications, and travel between member states and Cuba; any states rejecting participation to forfeit U.S. aid.

4. In cooperation with Venezuela, exert effective pressure on the five OAS members still maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba to sever their ties.

5. Withdraw U.S. recognition of the Castro government.

6. Propose an OAS study of the steps deemed necessary to achieve the objective of a free Cuba.

7. Impose comprehensive sanctions on shipping to include all vessels of any line that uses as much as one of its ships in the Cuban trade.

8. Use preemptive buying to tighten the noose on Castro's economy.

9. Press OAS to impose the same quarantine on Communist Cuba as it did on Trujillo's Dominican Republic.

10. Citizen groups in this country should cooperate with free Cuba committees in our sister republics.

11. Press NATO countries to curtail the sale of any goods to the Iron Curtain countries of the type being supplied to Cuba by the Communists.

12. Quarantine Cuba against receiving any weapons, whether called offensive or defensive.

13. Quarantine all shipments of petroleum to Cuba.

14. Promote the organization of an OAS task force and prepare an OAS invasion force to be used as a last resort.

AID TO ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

1. Arm and assist Cuban freedom fighters inside and outside of Cuba; encourage sabotage and raids.

2. Help establish bases for Cuban rebels outside U.S. territory.

3. Publicize the extent and character of current Cuban resistance.

4. Launch a major propaganda effort through all media, calling for public support of a Radio Free Cuba.

5. In cooperation with Cuban exiles, start OAS work on "winning the peace" in a free Cuba.

6. Help to organize a Cuban government-in-exile.

POST-CASTRO CUBA

1. Create OAS machinery for governing liberated countries and conducting elections under preplanned rules, to be available for action in Cuba, Haiti, and elsewhere.

2. Provide opportunities for qualified Cuban refugees to receive advanced training in their fields and to conduct studies on problems they will face in a liberated Cuba.

3. Prepare plans for the political, social, and economic future of a free Cuba.

4. Declare that Cubans must and will choose their own form of government.

REMOVING THE RUSSIANS

1. Announce that the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba has first priority in America's agenda.

2. Adopt a formal decision that Soviet troops and technicians must be repatriated within a stated time or face measures of expulsion.

3. Impose an OAS quarantine or blockade if necessary to expel Soviet forces or bring down the Cuban Communist regime—any states rejecting participation to forfeit U.S. aid.

4. Establish OAS teams to inspect all ships bound for Cuba.

APPENDIX II: OPINION SURVEY ON CUBAN POLICY

The following questions were formulated by a subcommittee in the light of the first day's discussion. Participants were requested to indicate their views by choosing among four possible replies: (1) Yes; (2) Qualified yes; (3) No; (4) Qualified no. The qualified replies were intended to indicate the respondent's degree of conviction about his views. During the poll, 25 participants were present.

Tabulation of responses

Questions	Yes	Qualified yes	No	Qualified no	Abstention
1. Has Washington reached an agreement with the U.S.S.R. on Cuba?	0	7	9	2	7
2. Is Washington interested in reaching an agreement with the U.S.S.R. on Cuba?	17	5	0	0	3
3. Is Washington fully committed on a policy to bring down Castro in practical terms?	3	5	11	3	3
4. Does the administration believe that Russian troops will leave Cuba?	5	7	8	1	4
5. Has Washington reached a decision not to act except as it is presently acting?	6	6	9	2	2
6. Does Washington wish an exile Cuban Government?	1	1	20	2	1
7. Does Washington hope to pry Castro loose from the U.S.S.R.?	9	8	3	3	2
8. Does Washington have a plan on Cuba?	1	5	13	4	2
9. Does the administration think it runs a serious risk of losing the 1964 election if Castro remains?	4	2	13	2	4
10. Can Castro's regime be toppled—					
(a) Without U.S. military action?	10	11	3	0	1
(b) Without an invasion by the United States?	21	1	0	0	3
11. Do President Betancourt of Venezuela, former President Figueres of Costa Rica, and others want sterner U.S. action than presently exists?	19	2	0	1	3
12. Would Brazil and Mexico be ready to support such action?	4	13	2	1	5
13. Can Castro-Communist subversion in Latin America be contained without action larger than presently exists?	2	2	19	1	1
14. Is it U.S. policy to oppose widespread and organized internal sabotage against Castro?	0	7	12	2	4
15. Is the United States opposing oil refinery sabotage because former and future U.S. properties are involved?	0	1	11	4	9
16. Were the hit-and-run raids contributing to creating difficulties for Castro?	20	2	1	0	2
17. Did raids not based on U.S. soil endanger the peace?	1	2	18	1	3
18. Does the administration count on or believe it can isolate Cuba?	10	9	0	2	4
19. Does the administration believe that continued economic pressure will topple Castro?	4	6	9	4	2
20. Is Washington's concern with nuclear raids—					
(a) A significant cause of inaction?	5	8	5	2	5
(b) Or is it a rationalization to support its present policy?	8	7	2	2	6
21. Does the U.S. Government have a policy of liberation of Cuba?	4	6	8	4	3

Apart from Cuba, how many in this room are friendly to the administration; or opposed to the administration?

Friendly	14
Opposed	7
Abstention	4

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the foreign aid program for next year is now being presented to the appropriate committees in the Senate and the House, the question of support for the foreign aid program by the American public once again is being raised. Once again a good deal of mythology is being spawned about the unpopularity of the foreign aid program with the American public. And it is being circulated without any prior examination of the facts, the facts about the American public's true views on the program.

In essence, unlike much of the conventional wisdom that has been peddled about the alleged unpopularity of the foreign aid program, there is clear evidence to indicate that foreign aid is now more popular than ever with the American people. In fact, a recent Gallup poll indicated that popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period. However, the poll also indicated that the American public is also gravely misinformed about the facts of foreign aid. These facts relate to such basic matters as percentage of gross national product devoted to foreign aid, percentage of the Federal budget, and actual amounts. It is most important that supporters of foreign aid do a far better job in bringing these facts to the American people.

In a recent speech before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, I have attempted to evaluate some of the salient factors about the American public's stand on foreign aid. I ask that the text of this speech be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

(Speech delivered by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 29, 1963)

Discussion about the foreign aid program this past 2 months has invariably centered around the Clay report. Some of this discussion has been illuminating and helpful; much has been confused and harmful.

One of the most misguided arguments raised in the discussion of the Clay report is that which contends that since the foreign aid program is more unpopular today than ever before, a critical report will only tend to increase the unpopularity of foreign aid among the American public. This argument is based on a fundamentally unsound premise—that foreign aid is unpopular with the American people. On the question of the popularity of foreign aid, I should like to call attention to a recent Gallup poll released which indicated that, contrary to a widespread mythology, foreign aid is more popular with the American public today than ever before.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Despite this evidence of increasing public acceptance of and support for the foreign aid program, the myth is still widely circulated that foreign aid is more unpopular today than ever before.

Indeed, this line appears to have become the "conventional wisdom" for journalists writing on the problem of foreign aid. If the evidence cited from these Gallup polls is reliable, the American public may well be ahead of the Congress in its acceptance of the value of the foreign aid program.

But if the American public is disposed to accept the foreign aid program, it is also clear that the public is very badly informed about it. The same Gallup poll revealed that most Americans believe that our foreign aid appropriation is much higher than $4 billion, is a much larger percentage of the American gross national product than the actual 1 percent. Forty percent of the people polled think that foreign aid appropriations represent over 10 percent of the national budget rather than the actual 5 percent. More than 80 percent of the people did not know the approximate amount appropriated for foreign aid.

What is more important than this ignorance about the statistics of the foreign aid program is a widespread unawareness of what actually has been accomplished by the program—of the thousands of people that have been fed by the Food for Peace program, of the people who have received decent housing and health facilities, of the people who have seen new schools built and teachers trained to educate their children. There is a lack of awareness or the accomplishments of the foreign aid program in creating more viable economies by building dams, roads, and industries; by modernizing agricultural systems and aiding in the training of the public administrators and technicians needed to run a modern government and a modern economy.

Samplings of American public opinion have indicated clearly that support for the foreign aid program increases in direct proportion to knowledge of the foreign aid program. Among those well informed on foreign aid, support for the program was 40 percent higher than among the uninformed. There is therefore a great opportunity and a great responsibility for a group like this to take the lead in informing the American public on the true record of the foreign aid program. A public that is not only receptive to foreign aid by well-informed on it will actively support those members of the Congress who take the lead in assuring adequate appropriations for foreign aid.

In telling the story about foreign aid to the American public, you can draw upon a record of proven success. We have had four foreign aid programs that have achieved unquestionable success. The first was the most successful of all—the Marshall plan. Americans know something about its success—and cannot resist the temptation to judge all later aid programs by the standard of success achieved by the Marshall plan. They fail to remember that this program aided the reconstruction of the war-ravaged economies of highly developed, highly skilled European nations which are radically different from underdeveloped countries of the southern half of the world.

The second success in the field of foreign aid was the point four program which sent trained American technicians to all parts of the world. On two trips to Latin America during the past 2 years most of the people I spoke to referred to American foreign aid as "point four." Point four was the program they remembered.

The third success in the field of foreign aid has been the food-for-peace program. Through this program, millions of persons, both children and adults, have been able to share in America's agricultural miracle. This success continues as the program expands. Today U.S. food is reaching an average of 92 million people a day in more than 100 countries throughout the world.

A fourth success in foreign aid should be mentioned—even though it is only slightly more than a year old. I refer, of course, to the Peace Corps—by any standard a smashing success.

There are at least three striking characteristics which should be noted about the last of these three successful programs (point four, food for peace and the Peace Corps). All three of these involve the outlay of comparatively small amounts of American dollars. All three have an immediate impact upon the recipient country. All three benefit the common people, rather than the elite group. Because they benefit the common people, they have been gratefully received.

Although the record is mixed when we come to the area of long-range economic aid, there have been some notable successes here also. In Greece, Israel, and Taiwan, United States assistance has helped build strong economies that will soon be able to stand on their own. In India and Pakistan, American aid has contributed much to building economies which, despite almost insuperable obstacles, are flourishing, which provide the economic basis for the preservation of democracy on the Asian mainland. Here too is a record of solid success which the American people should know about.

One final program, which is undoubtedly the most important American effort in the foreign aid field today, is also beginning to show signs of success. I refer to the Alliance for Progress program for Latin America. It is not only the most important program as far as American foreign policy is concerned but it is also the program of greatest interest to the American public, the program which has more latent or active support from the public than any other foreign aid program in which the United States is involved. I say that, despite tremendous obstacles and temporary failures, there are indications that some successes are being recorded in Latin America.

I learned something about the progress being made on a trip last fall to the Caribbean area. I visited Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico. I visited gleaming new health centers and was impressed by the simple drugs on hand. I saw hundreds of clean new houses, some of them priced to sell for less than $1,000 with monthly payments of less than $10. The Alianza has moved further in housing than in perhaps any other field; it is beginning to make a dent—but only a dent—in the appalling slums which fester in almost every Latin American city and in much of the countryside. I likewise saw dozens of new schools, many of them built with the donated labor of local residents using materials furnished by the national government and the Alianza. And I learned of an exciting new program which is making simple paperback textbooks available to all elementary schoolchildren at a cost of between 10 and 15 cents per book.

I visited land resettlement and rural housing projects, indicating that agrarian reform is becoming a reality. The cooperative movement both on the farm and in the cities is spreading. I saw foreign private companies flourishing in Venezuela and Mexico. The administrative competence of many governments has improved.

I was favorably impressed with improvements in the work of the U.S. Information Agency: its activities seem to have a better sense of proportion and of priority. Progress has been made in Latin American universities in combating Communist student activity; more effort is still needed in this field. The Voice of America is better, but not yet as good as it ought to be, especially as regards its signal strength. Service to local broadcasters has been effectively strengthened.

This is but a brief summary of some of the progress being made in Latin America today. I have spelled out my own views at length on the progress and problems of the Alliance in a report issued in March to the Senate Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees, and therefore will not expand my views here.

I do not wish to ignore the difficulties we face in Latin America. The problems confronting the Alliance are staggering—and will not be solved in a few years. There will continue to be bad news from Latin America. But I would hope that the American public will hear the good news about Latin America as well as the bad. In the past, the headlines have regularly informed us of all the bad news. The good news, when it has been reported at all, is found on the bottom of page 28. This situation has improved some in the past year, but if the American public is to be fully informed on the successes of the Alliance program, it will require a great deal of hard work by people like yourselves.

I am convinced that the American public has a special interest in the welfare of neighbors in this hemisphere. If they are convinced that our support of the Alliance program is achieving good results, they will continue to make the sacrifices needed to support this program. Quite candidly, it is not easy for a Member of Congress to support the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in southeast Asia. He may acquiesce on expenditures for programs in that area, but he knows full well that there is little active support back home for this program. But when it comes to Latin America, I believe the situation is different. On programs for this area, a Senator or Congressman can count on widespread interest in and active support of the public. I know of few Congressmen who believe there is great political risk in supporting appropriations for the Alliance for Progress. American officials administering the foreign aid program, and groups like this one with a special interest in foreign aid should keep this in mind in their efforts to educate the public. There is not much mileage in talking about Laos when the real interest of the public is—and should be—in Brazil. If this is kept in mind, I am convinced that the Congress and the public will continue to support a foreign aid program commensurate with America's responsibilities as the chief defender of freedom in the world today.

BEAUTIES AND ATTRACTIONS OF WEST VIRGINIA PRAISED AND STATE'S CENTENNIAL ACTIVITY FEATURED IN JUNE ISSUE OF "FORD TIMES"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of West Virginia's entry into the Union, the 35th to achieve statehood. During centennial 1963 citizens of the Mountain State are holding a wide variety of meaningful activities designed not only as a commemoration of the past, but as a reminder of the challenges of the future. Achievement in our rugged and beautiful home has been remarkable, but there yet remain testing problems which must be solved and difficult tasks which must be accomplished.

Blessed with majestic mountains which rise above secluded and scenic valleys, quartered by rushing rivers and chill highland streams, and abounding in wildlife and game of virtually every description, West Virginia has become noted as a tourist haven and vacationland. It is not surprising, therefore, that national magazines and newspaper travel editors have shown lively interest in the activities and attractions available to visitors in West Virginia. This has been especially apparent during the centennial.

The June issue of Ford Times, published by the Ford Motor Co., features West Virginia in a series of three articles, accompanied by colorful illustrations.

The article entitled "100th Birthday Party for West Virginia" gives a brief account of the State's entry into the Union, along with pertinent information on centennial programs. "Wheeling's 1,000 Acres of Fun" is the story of the founding and development of Oglebay Park, the large and inviting municipally owned recreation area at Wheeling, W. Va. Travelers will wish to read "West Virginia's Vertical Vacationland"—extolling the breathtaking beauty of the Allegheny Mountains and the Monongahela National Forest.

Writers Charles Harper and Ned Moore are to be congratulated for the lucid and entertaining manner in which they have described the pleasures and educational experiences which await the visitor in West Virginia. Our citizens are gratified that such great numbers of Americans traveled to West Virginia each year, and we are especially hopeful that tourists will come in 1963 so that they may share our sense of joy and pride in our centennial celebration.

Mr. President, it is my hope that Members of the Congress, and citizens generally, will read the articles "100th Birthday Party for West Virginia," "Wheeling's 1,000 Acres of Fun," and "West Virginia's Vertical Vacationland," in the June 1963 issue of Ford Times.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HOLDING RESERVE COMMISSIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently, the Scripps-Howard newspaper has evidenced an interest in the status of those Members of Congress who hold Reserve commissions in the various services, and having addressed myself to the legal aspect of this interest, I hold the thought that possibly my colleagues might be interested in a brief history and roster of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron.

During September of 1960, considerable interest was expressed by reservists affiliated with the Congress in the establishment of a training activity on the Hill to facilitate their participation in the Air Force Reserve program. After the air staffing of a summary concerning the above subject, concurrence was reached that an Air Reserve squadron should be activated. In December 1960, Continental Air Command was directed to implement the necessary actions to provide the proposed squadron.

Channels of command were from Headquarters, USAF to CONAC with CONAC designating Headquarters Second Air Force Reserve Region, Andrews Air Force Base, as the monitoring agency for the administration, control and training of Hill Squadron. Within a week, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron was established by CONAC General Order No. 127. Prior to the establishment of the 9999th, it had been determined that the congressional reservists were unique inasmuch as they had mobilization day assignments pretty much across the United States so that they were unable to actively train during the period that Congress was in session. The establishment of this squadron was predicated on the fact that these reservists could receive a highly standardized training tailored to the professional levels of the group. Within this standardization there would be opportunity for the Secretary, Chief of Staff, Deputy Chiefs of Staff, major air commanders and others in key positions to present current information on the matters of both Air Force and congressional interest. These presentations were not limited to the Air Force, but invitations were extended to other service chiefs and their deputies to visit and make presentations on the squadron training days. Further, other Government agencies were contacted and have appeared before the squadron.

The training gained by the reservists of the 9999th gives them a greater insight on the Air Force, its activities, concepts, and missions. Further, this insight enables the reservist to return to his mobilization assignment at the conclusion of the congressional session and carry to those organizations information and experience that will immediately enhance the training of the organization.

Actual participation in the weekly reserve meetings has never been limited to the 9999th members but has, additionally, been made available to others on congressional status that have an interest in a specific program, as well as visiting reservists. This, of course, is done only within the limits and bounds of security clearance.

The first meeting was held on Tuesday, January 17, 1961, in the New Senate Office Building and was attended by 23 persons. The squadron now boasts a membership of 85 persons—38 assigned to the 9999th ARS, and 47 attached to the 9999th for training with their mobilization assignment elsewhere.

Membership is confined to people working on the Hill for if it were thrown open we could easily have a membership of over 200. The interest shown in the squadron is attached to the following figures showing percentage of attendance for each of the years: In 1961, total percent attendance was approximately 70; 1962, total percent attendance was approximately 65; 1963, as of June 4, approximately 71 percent attendance.

The 38 members assigned to the 9999th ARS, 2 AFRR, CONAC are listed in accordance with their rank as follows:

Col. G. Ward Hobbs.
Lt. Col. Alphonzo E. Bell, Jr.
Lt. Col. James T. Breen.
Lt. Col. John N. Dinsmore.
Lt. Col. Peter H. Dominick.
Lt. Col. O. Clark Fisher.
Lt. Col. Gordon A. Nease.
Lt. Col. John D. Stringer.
Maj. James F. Battin.
Maj. Orren Beaty, Jr.
Maj. John P. Carlson.
Maj. Geo. L. Milstead, Jr.
Maj. Francis E. O'Gorman.
Maj. Neal E. Smith.
Maj. Stanley R. Tupper.
Maj. Basil L. Whitener.
Capt. Robert C. Cantrell.
Capt. Phillip J. Carlson.
Capt. Geo. F. Cashman.
Capt. Milton Eisenberg.
Capt. Jack Golodner.
Capt. Daniel A. Kavanaugh.
Capt. Jimmy S. Konduros.
Capt. Wiley S. Messick.
Capt. John A. Murphy.
Capt. Fernand J. St Germain.
Capt. John F. Stroud, Jr.
Capt. Paul A. Theis.
Capt. Robert E. Waldron.
Capt. Ira E. Whitlock.
1st. Lt. David L. Batt.
1st. Lt. Wm. O. Billiter, Jr.
1st. Lt. Donald H. Brennan.
1st Lt. Herbert M. Crane, Jr.
1st Lt. John A. Knebel, Jr.
1st Lt. Maurice C. Mackey, Jr.
1st Lt. John B. Simpson, Jr.
2d Lt. George M. Lusk.

The 47 members attached to the 9999th ARS for training purposes are listed in accordance with their rank and mobilization assignment are as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE—LEGISLATIVE LIAISON OFFICE

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Smart.
Col. Walter W. Jenkins.
Col. Joe M. Kilgore.
Col. Frank E. Moss.
Col. Robert R. Poston.
Col. Lyle O. Snader.
Lt. Col. James T. Ashworth.
Lt. Col. K. R. Harding.
Lt. Col. Herbert M. Lineberger.
Lt. Col. James R. Queen.
Lt. Col. Vorley M. Rexroad.
Lt. Col. John H. Simms.
Maj. Cyril T. Bendorf.
Maj. Frank M. Clark.
Maj. Stuart P. French.
Maj. Lewis G. Odom, Jr.
Maj. Harry L. Wingate, Jr.
Maj. James C. Wright, Jr.
Capt. Joe E. Gonzales.
Capt. Harry E. McAdams.
Capt. Earl J. Morgan.
Capt. T. A. Thompson.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S OFFICE

Lt. Col. William P. Cochrane.
Lt. Col. Rabert W. Hemphill.
Lt. Col. Lawrence C. Merthan.
Maj. Thomas L. Hughes.
Capt. Thomas P. Kerester.

HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon.
Capt. William R. Seward.
Capt. William Siegrist.
First Lt. Robert H. Miller, Jr.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/PERSONNEL OFFICE

Maj. Gen. Barry Goldwater.
Maj. Clement J. Zablocki.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—AF CHIEF OF INTELLIGENCE OFFICE

Lt. Col. Eugene M. Emme.
Lt. Col. Robert R. Smyers.
Capt. Donald E. Lukens.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/PLANS AND PROGRAMS OFFICE

Col. Laurie C. Battle.
Col. Hiram L. Fong.
Lt. Col. Franklin J. Schupp.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/MATERIEL OFFICE

Col. Jack R. Miller.

HEADQUARTERS USAF—DCS/OPERATIONS OFFICE

Col. Fred L. McIntyre.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr.

AIR UNIVERSITY, MAXWELL AFB, ALA.

Brig. Gen. John A. Lang, Jr.

4500 AB WING, LANGLEY AFB, VA.

Maj. Robert A. Muldonian.

FOREIGN TECH. DIV., WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO

Capt. Eugene L. Krizek.

1001ST AB WING, ANDREWS AFB, MD.

Capt. Douglas W. Metz.

1405 AB WING, HEADQUARTERS MATS, SCOTT AFB, ILL.

Capt. John R. MacKenzie.

At the weekly meetings an up-to-the-minute intelligence briefing is given by a representative of the Current Intelligence and Indications Center of the Defense Intelligence Agency. The balance of the weekly drills consists of a lecture by outstanding individuals in the services or connected with the services. A list of those people is as follows:

1961

Brig. Gen. Felix L. Vidal, organization of the squadron.

Maj. Gen. Robert Eaton, Maj. Gen. Chester McCarty, and Maj. Gen. Winston Wilson, plans and policies of the Reserves Forces.

Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, role of the Reserve program.

Maj. Gen. Richard M. Montgomery, decisionmaking processes in the Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edward J. Timberlake, Air Force personnel.

Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Air Force logistics financial management improvement program.

Col. H. F. Cruver, integrated military personnel incentive program.

Brig. Gen. Robert C. Richardson spoke on three different occasions: Future concepts and commitments; concepts of general war and deterrence; and U.S. Air Force long-range plans and concepts.

Maj. J. E. Kayhill, airman officer retention.

Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Air Force program.

Maj. Gen. A. M. Minton, missile site construction.

Maj. Gen. C. K. Niess, space medicine.

Maj. Gen. V. R. Haugen, Dyna-Soar spacecraft.

Brig. Gen. Jerry Page, Air Force limited war capabilities.

Gen. Curtis E. LaMay, jobs that confront us in the Air Force.

Gen. Thomas D. White, state of the Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce Holloway, space and national security.

Lt. Gen. T. H. Landon, Maj. Gen. E. S. Ligon, management of Air Force human resources.

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, officer production through Air Force Academy and ROTC.

Maj. Gen. E. S. Ligon, officer grade limitation act II; and on another occasion he spoke on "Personnel programing and retention."

Col. John P. Lisack, changing requirements in the Air Force officer structure.

Maj. Gen. William S. Stone, Air Force Academy.

Maj. Gen. Frank M. Bogart and Col. D. L. Crow, Air Force budget.

Lt. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, Military Air Transport Service.

Mr. Herman Kahn (Rand Corp.), relationships between strategy weapons and choice of targets.

Col. David Miller, Air Force nuclear weapons program.

1962

Gen. Frederic H. Smith, Jr., future of the Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Frank A. Bogart and Col. Duward Crow, program package concept.

Brig. Gen. A. N. Williams, sublimited warfare.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Air Force space program.

Col. David C. Jones, RS–70 employment concept.

Lt. Gen. E. J. Timberlake, Air Force personnel program.

Gen. B. A. Schriever, management trends.

Maj. Gen. A. M. Minton, ballistic missiles construction program.

Maj. Gen. M. C. Demler, advanced technology program.

Col. Jack L. Tueller, Polaris missile.

Brig. Gen. Jerry D. Page, results of Air Force war games, and again on Air Force intercontinental ballistic missiles program.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bergquist, Air Force Communications Service.

Maj. John C. Toomay, satellite detection and tracking.

Col. O. P. Thorne, Air Force nuclear testing program.

Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Hooks, basic research.

Col. G. Ward Hobbs, Washington International Airport program.

Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch, mission of Air Force Flight Test Center.

Brig. Gen. Marion C. Smith, ranges and space.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, Air Force counterinsurgency operations.

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., Tactical Air Command.

Adm. Geo. W. Anderson, Jr., naval operations.

Dr. Knox Milsaps and Col. Robt. Fontana, aerospace research.

Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland and Mr. D.D. Wyatt, manned space flights.

Brig. Gen. J. E. Thomas, Allied Command Europe.

Gen. Geo. H. Decker, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Dr. Theodore Taylor, ORION project.

Lt. Gen. Wm. S. Stone, personnel programs.

1963

Gen. B. A. Schriever and Col. Raymond S. Sleeper, foreign technology.

Col. Walter P. Glover and Col. Theodore S. Coberly, aeronautical systems.

Col. Gene Romig, Air Force space program.

Col. Robert H. Service, command control and communications.

Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, overall Reserve program.

Lt. Gen. E. J. Timberlake, CONAC's role in overall defense.

Col. Leo E. Benade, proposals for military compensation.

Gen. Paul D. Adams, STRICOM.

Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert.

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, current status of Air National Guard.

Gen. David M. Shoup, the Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. H. G. Thorne, Jr., personnel planning.

Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch and Col. Charles E. Yeager, aerospace research pilot training program.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, Federal Aviation Agency.

Maj. Gen. Otto Glasser, electronic systems.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert Pritchard, COIN.

Lt. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, Maj. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, weapons systems.

Col. Thomas W. Wolfe, translation of Marshal Sokolovskii's book, "Soviet Military Strategy."

Maj. Sherman S. Reed, Air Force Reserve records.

In addition to the regularly scheduled weekly Tuesday meetings, interesting and varied field trips, both domestic and foreign, were conducted. In 1961, visits were made to Strategic Air Command Headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.; Tactical Air Command Headquarters, Langley Air Force Base, Va.; Cape Canaveral, Fla., and Fort Bragg, N.C., to observe Operation Swift Strike. Arrangements were made for members to complete their 2-week active duty training on one of four trips abroad: First, Hong Kong, Japan, Philippines, Thailand, and Alaska; second, Newfoundland, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain; third, Newfoundland, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, and Spain; fourth, Newfoundland, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Libya, Spain, and the Azores. All of these trips were made on a space- and aircraft-available basis.

In 1962, the squadron made one field trip where they visited Deputy Chief Air Systems, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and Nellis Air Force Base. Another tour was conducted at NORAD Headquarters and the Air Force Academy. In June, a trip was made to Jacksonville, Fla., where an inspection was made of the aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. The 2-week active duty tour consisted of visits to the following locations: Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.; Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.; Mexico City, Mexico; Albrook Air Force Base, Panama Canal Zone; Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, and Guantánamo.

This year, there have been two field trips; one to view an airborne exercise at Fort Bragg, N.C.; and another to Luke Air Force Base, Ariz. Plans for the 2-week active duty training tour have not been finalized.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently I was appointed along with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to serve on the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Board of Visitors met May 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this year. While this does not constitute the formal report which will be forthcoming from the president of the Board—the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White—I should like to make my colleagues aware of some of the things that transpired during that meeting and make a short report on the Academy itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a list of the members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

Three years effective 1961

Hon. James H. Douglas, former Secretary of the Air Force, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Three years effective 1962

Dr. Fred H. Harrington, president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Dr. Payson S. Wild, dean of faculties, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Three years effective 1963

Mr. John Lawrence, chairman of the board, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Gen. Thomas D. White, former Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

APPOINTED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Senator Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona; Senator Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota.

APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth, Third District of Colorado.

Representative John J. Flynt, Jr., Fourth District of Georgia.

Representative Melvin R. Laird, Seventh District of Wisconsin.

Representative Byron G. Rogers, First District of Colorado.

REPRESENTING THE CHAIRMAN, SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Senator Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada.

REPRESENTING THE CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Representative L. Mendel Rivers, First District of South Carolina.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a fact sheet giving the mission, the cadet strength, the permanent party strength, and other interesting factors.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

General Information

Mission (AFR 23-23, Dec. 4, 1959): The Academy provides instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the U.S. Air Force.

Cadet strength: Full strength July 1, 1962, 2,519 (includes 4 foreign cadets). Current cadet strength, 2,336.

Permanent party strength:

Officers	659
Airmen	839
Civilians	1795
Total (as of April 7)	3,293

Construction cost:

Authorized	$140,986,000
USAFA	139,183,084
Interim Site	1,802,916

Facility occupied: August 29, 1958.

O. & M. Budget, fiscal year 1963: $15,586,000.

Area:	*Acres*
USAFA	17,762
Farish memorial	60
Farish memorial (to be acquired later)	40
Total	17,862

Family quarters:

Indigenous	18
Appropriated	46
Capehart	1,200
Total	1,264

Roads:

Miles paved	75
Miles unpaved	14
Total miles	89

Cadet facilities:

2-Man dormitory rooms	1,320
Classrooms	168
Science labs	45
Lecture halls	5
Seats, Arnold Hall theater	3,000

Airman facilities:

Dormitories	3
Rooms	120
Lounges	3

Prep school data:

Students entered summer 1962	160
Students current strength	138
Graduates, 1962 class	138
Appointments to Academies	99
Dormitories	4

(Prep school students also have joint usage of the airmen dining hall and all community center facilities.)

Stock fund data:

	Fiscal year 1962
Commissary yearly sales	$3,185,522.20
Cadet sales store sales	74,810.64
Clothing sales store sales	1,306,775.00

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, all Members of Congress have the privilege of nominating cadets for the various military academies; and, of course, the Air Force Academy is one of these. How we do this varies from coast to coast. I was interested, during my visit to the Academy, in the results obtained by the various methods.

So that my colleagues may get a better insight into this matter, I asked Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, who is the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy, to address a letter to me giving an analysis of the success of cadets who had been named as principal candidates compared to cadets who had one appointment in a competitive nomination list.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, giving that comparison, be made a part of the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Headquarters,
U.S. Air Force Academy,
Colorado, May 24, 1963.

Hon. Barry M. Goldwater,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Goldwater: During the meeting of the Board of Visitors you asked for an analysis of the success of cadets who had been named as principal candidates compared to cadets who won appointment in a competitive nomination list. The attached table makes several such comparisons.

In the current freshmen, sophomore, and junior classes there were 1,002 cadets who won appointments by competitive congressional nominations, while 555 received appointments as a result of nomination as principals or numbered alternates. In every respect in which we have been able to make comparisons, the competitive appointees as a group have proven superior to the group of named principal and alternate appointees.

The differences in percentages in the attached table are, I believe, of greater practical significance than might appear at first glance. The 5-percent difference in attrition rates means that a cadet class of 800 selected entirely by the principal-alternate system would have 40 fewer graduates than one selected completely by the competitive system. Or, put another way, the attrition rate among competitive appointees has been one-fifth smaller than the attrition rate among principals and principal-alternates.

When it comes to proportions of cadets recognized by my office for excellence in both academics and military performance, difference between the two groups is again only 5 percent. The fact is that the proportion of top-level cadets in the competitive appointee group is nearly twice the proportion of top-level cadets in the principal and principal-alternate appointee group.

There is ample reason to believe that cadet attrition would be less and general cadet quality would increase if more nomination lists were competitive. In 106 principal-alternate lists this year, the candidate offered the appointment had lower score totals than others. That is, in each of 106 lists a different candidate, one who showed evidence of better abilities and preparation, would have been selected had the Member of Congress named his candidates without stating his preference.

Your interest in these comparisons is much appreciated. If there are additional data which would be of concern to you and which we may provide, please ask.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Warren,
Major General, USAF, Superintendent.

Comparison of principal and competitive congressional appointees (classes of 1964, 1965, and 1966)

	Cadets by competitive nomination	*Cadets by principal nomination*
Number admitted	1,002	555
Attrition (percent)	22	27
Dean's list—academic honors (percent)	34	27
Commandant's list—military honors (percent)	20	14
Superintendent's list—overall merit (percent)	11	6

Mr. GOLDWATER. The record will show that the cadets who entered the Academy by competitive nomination do better in this Academy than do those who entered by principal nomination.

This is information which my colleagues can obtain from the Superintendent of the Academy. I assure them that such information would be of great value to them in evaluating the educational opportunities in their own States. It is a comparison of the cadets from each State with the general corps. Of course, this information will not be given to a Senator who comes from another State. I suggest, however, after reading the record made by Arizona candidates, that my colleagues in the Senate might want to get this list from the Air Force Academy.

It is interesting to note that Arizona's cadets have done better than the average, and I am very proud of this fact. It points up to the fact that Arizona's educational opportunities are well above the average.

So that my colleagues may see this as a sample and be guided by it, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be placed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arizona Candidates for the Air Force Academy Class of 1966

During the selection cycle for the Air Force Academy's class of 1966, 33 candidates were nominated by Members of Congress from your State. Of these 33, 23 or 69 percent completed all selection tests; 16 of the 33 or 48 percent were fully qualified. Two of the qualified candidates declined appointments offered them.

In the following table, quartile scores on four selection measures for the 23 candidates from your State who completed all tests are compared with quartile scores for all 4,210 congressional candidates completing all tests and with the scores of the 751 new cadets of the class of 1966.

Selection measures	Group	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
CEEB	Arizona candidates	512	601	653
Verbal	Congressional candidates	474	535	594
Average	AFA cadets	547	600	648
CEEB	Arizona candidates	560	639	708
Mathematics	Congressional candidates	548	611	669
Average	AFA cadets	628	671	717
Academic	Arizona candidates	540	607	645
Selection	Congressional candidates	503	559	611
Average	AFA cadets	584	624	656
Selection	Arizona candidates	534	581	631
Examination	Congressional candidates	501	544	585
Average	AFA cadets	574	606	627

Additional information on all candidates is provided in attachment 2, which also gives a brief description of the nature and utility of these selection measures, and explains the quartile statistics. The middle quartile is usually very close to the mean or average score.

CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES FOR THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY CLASS OF 1966

The Air Force Academy has entered its class of 1966, a class which gives promise of of being the best thus far admitted. That the class is a most promising one is not surprising since it was selected from a very capable group of candidates, probably the best group of candidates to apply for admission to the Academy since it began operation in 1955. Of 751 new cadets, 719, or over 95 percent, had received congressional nominations. The credit for the quality of the candidates as well as the selected cadets must go to the Members of Congress who nominated them.

This year, Members of Congress nominated a total of 5,359 candidates, 24 fewer than were nominated last year. However, of these 5,359 individuals, 2,314, or 43 percent, completed all tests and were fully qualified; this was a definite improvement over the 2,103 (39 percent) who were fully qualified last year. This year, 1,896 other candidates, or 35 percent, took all selection tests but failed to qualify on one or more measures; last year 2,049 congressional candidates (38 percent) completed all tests but were disqualified on one or more. This year 21 percent failed to complete all the required selection tests; last year 23 percent failed to complete these tests.

In discussing the quality of candidates we would like to be able to present information on all candidates. However, the absence of some test scores for many candidates causes us to limit the presentation of selection data to the 4,210 congressional candidates who completed all tests. For comparison purposes, similar score data are presented on the 751 new cadets of the class of 1966. Although many different tests and measures are used in cadet selection, the data are limited to four average scores which include most of the aptitude and achievement information the various tests provide.

The following paragraphs give quartile scores of cadets and candidates on each of the four average scores. Each of these averages has a possible range from 200 to 800. These quartiles are scores which divide the groups into quarters, three-fourths have scores above the bottom quartile and one-fourth fall below it, while half are above and half below the middle quartile. Similarly, one-fourth are above the top quartile and three-fourths are below it.

CEEB verbal average

This score is the average of the nominee's scores on two tests, the college entrance examination board's verbal aptitude and English composition tests. The average thus combines measures of aptitude and achievement, and predicts fairly well achievement at the Air Force Academy in humanities and social sciences.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	474	535	594
Cadets	547	600	648

CEEB mathematics average

This score is also the average of the nominee's scores on two college entrance examination board tests, quantitative aptitude and mathematics achievement. It combines both aptitude and achievement measures and predicts achievement at the Air Force Academy in basic and applied sciences.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	548	611	669
Cadets	628	671	717

Academic selection average

This score is an average of all four college entrance examination board tests, plus score based on the nominee's prior academic achievement—that is, his academic standing in his high school graduating class. The average thus includes not only aptitude and achievement but also gives us some idea as to the nominee's motivation to do well in previous academic situations. It predicts most course grades fairly well and is a good predictor of overall grade point average.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	503	559	611
Cadet	584	624	656

Selection examination average

This is a weighted average of academic aptitude, physical proficiency, and high school leadership activity. It is an overall evaluation of cadet potential, and has a possible range from 200 to 800.

	Bottom quartile	Middle quartile	Top quartile
Candidates	501	544	585
Cadets	574	606	627

Looking at all four averages, one can see that over three-fourths of our new class came from the upper half of the candidate population.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Another interesting table I obtained is that showing the attrition of congressional nominees by States. I have a list of all 50 States, giving the percentage lost by attrition from the classes of 1959 through 1966, as of May 1, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be placed in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to study it. I believe there is a direct relationship between motivation and the education obtained in the cadet's own State and the rate of attrition at the Academy.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Attrition of congressional nominees by State (classes of 1959 through 1966, as of May 1, 1963)

State	*Percent lost*
Utah	7
Iowa	13
New Mexico	13
Delaware	14
Arizona	15
Washington	19
Ohio	20
Massachusetts	21
Indiana	22
New Hampshire	22
Oklahoma	22
California	23
North Dakota	23
Pennsylvania	23
New York	24
Virginia	24
Minnesota	25
Florida	26
Kansas	26
Michigan	26
Wyoming	26
Colorado	27
Texas	27
Wisconsin	27
Arkansas	28
Illinois	28
Louisiana	28
Nebraska	28
New Jersey	28
North Carolina	28
Hawaii	29
Kentucky	29
Missouri	29
Rhode Island	30
West Virginia	31
Georgia	32
South Carolina	32
Alaska	33
Connecticut	33
South Dakota	33
Tennessee	33
Oregon	34
Montana	35
Vermont	35
Maryland	36
Nevada	38
Mississippi	39
Alabama	40
Maine	42
Idaho	43

Mr GOLDWATER. Mr. President, character and motivation play a large part in the success of a cadet at any of the academies. This is a factor that is being studied more and more by each of the Academies in the selection of cadets. For example, in the current cadet classes in the Academy, we find that 18 percent of them had been class presidents of their high schools. Eleven percent had been class vice presidents. Twenty-one percent had been Boys State delegates. Thirty-six percent had received outstanding student awards.

There is a list that continues with this type of accomplishment.

Eighty-five percent had been in the top quarter of their high school graduating class. Zero percent had been in the fourth quarter of the class.

These figures show that we are selecting better and better cadets for the academies.

I ask unanimous consent that this table of the class of 1966 character and accomplishments be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLASS OF 1966

CHARACTER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Participation in high school extracurricular activities

	Percent
Class president	18
Class vice president	11
Boys state delegate	21
Outstanding student award	36
Citizenship award	18
Student government president	16
Yearbook or newspaper, editor or business manager	16
Yearbook or newspaper assistant editor	24
Band or orchestra	17
Debate team	12
Dramatic productions	37
Chorus or glee club	20
Athletic Letter Awards:	
Football	39
Basketball	28
Baseball	17
Track	27

Rank in high school graduating class

Top quarter, 85.3 percent; second quarter, 13.2 percent; third quarter, 1.5 percent; fourth quarter, 0 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask unanimous consent to have a table showing the comparisons, mean score service, academy classes of 1959-62, on college entrance examination board tests and graduate record examination area tests, made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparisons, mean score service academy classes of 1959–62, on college entrance examination board tests and graduate record examination—Area tests

CLASSES OF 1959

	USAFA	USMA	USNA
CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	550	----------	----------
English Comp	542	----------	----------
Quant. Apt	619	----------	----------
Inter. Math	621	----------	----------
Composite	2,332	----------	----------
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	619	574	----------
Social sciences	595	549	----------
Humanities	524	465	----------
Composite	1,738	1,588	----------

CLASSES OF 1960

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	564	552	----------
English Comp	553	551	----------
Quant. Apt	645	626	----------
Inter. Math	645	642	----------
Composite	2,407	2,371	----------
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	603	594	565
Social sciences	584	550	498
Humanities	503	495	460
Composite	1,690	1,639	1,523

Comparisons, etc.—Continued

CLASSES OF 1961

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	559	543	----------
English Comp	543	559	----------
Quant. Apt	631	627	----------
Inter. Math	619	640	----------
Composite	2,352	2,369	----------
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	635	609	604
Social sciences	562	540	503
Humanities	553	510	491
Composite	1,750	1,659	1,598

CLASSES OF 1962

CEEB tests:			
Verb. Apt	563	552	586
English Comp	552	560	580
Quant. Apt	633	632	647
Inter. Math	616	632	652
Composite	2,364	2,376	2,465
GRE area tests:			
Natural sciences	592	575	561
Social sciences	589	553	542
Humanities	515	488	485
Composite	1,696	1,616	1,588

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD a table showing cadet appointment, attrition, and graduation data.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cadet appointment, attrition and graduation data

GRADUATES

	Class of 1959	Class of 1960	Class of 1961	Class of 1962
Appointed initially	306	300	306	453
Admitted as turnbacks	0	17	8	12
Class total	306	317	314	465
Graduated	207	227	217	298
Percent	68	72	69	64
Assignments of graduates:				
Pilot training	186	188	181	253
Navigation training	3	1	16	1
Technical school training	5	0	7	14
Graduate training (AFIT)	6	4	9	17
Medical school training	0	0	0	1
Directed duty	4	25	0	2
Rhodes scholars	1	0	(1)	2
Other services	1	8	4	7
Not commissioned	1	1	0	1
Total graduates	207	227	217	298

CURRENT CLASSES

	Class of 1963		Class of 1964		Class of 1965		Class of 1966	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Appointed initially	748	--------	772	--------	802	--------	755	--------
Admitted as turnbacks	7	--------	28	--------	21	--------	14	--------
Class total	755	100.0	800	100.0	823	100.0	769	100.0
Resignations:								
Motivation	87	11.5	113	14.1	55	6.7	30	3.9
Honor	33	4.4	32	4.0	21	2.5	22	2.9
Other	23	3.0	12	1.5	8	1.0	7	.9
Total resignations	143	18.9	157	19.6	84	10.2	59	7.7
Dismissals:								
Physicals	22	2.9	10	1.2	13	1.6	12	1.6
Conduct and aptitude	3	.4	3	.4	3	.4	15	1.9
Academics	56	7.4	85	10.6	52	6.3	29	3.8
Total dismissals	81	10.7	98	12.2	68	8.3	56	7.3
Turnbacks	27	3.6	19	2.4	14	1.7	5	.6
Total attrition	251	33.2	274	34.2	166	20.2	120	15.6
Present strength	504	66.8	526	65.8	657	79.8	649	84.4
Total	2,336							

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a table of great interest is that of academic curricula of the service academies in semester hours. The Air Force Academy is proud of what are called master's programs. In the master's programs the boy is allowed to take, if he so desires 164 units of classroom work in 4 years. This entitles him to a master's degree. But, unfortunately, one academy has not agreed to this enrichment course. So we in the Congress will not be able to enact legislation which will enable the academies to give master's degrees. Purdue and Georgetown Universities are schools to which cadets can go after graduation and, after 7 months, get their master's degrees. The experiment is very interesting. I feel that it will upgrade colleges all over the United States, because if a boy as busy as a cadet in the Air Force Academy can take this many units in 4 years, I do not think it is expecting too much for others to follow suit. This is something we are all interested in.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the academic curricula of the three service Academies, together with an explanation of the U.S. Air Force Academy's masters' programs be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Academic curricula of the service academies

[In semester hours]

	USMA	USNA	USAFA
Basic sciences	46	39½	35
Applied sciences	54	44¼	33
Humanities	36	27¼	36½
Social sciences	23	12¾	31½
Electives	5	0	7½
Total	164	123¾	143½

Total curriculums of the service academies

[In semester hours]

	USMA	USNA	USAFA
Academic program	164	123¾	143½
Military training program	16	31½	28½
Athletic program	7	4¾	14½
Total	187	160	186½

Prescribed academic curriculum in semester hours

4th class:	
Mathematics	13½
Chemistry	5½
Human physiology	2½
English	5½
History	5½
Geography	4
Total	36½
3d class:	
Mathematics	5½
Physics	5½
History	5½
Foreign language	9
Behavioral sciences	2½
Political science	5½
Economics	3
Mechanical drawing	2
Total	38½
2d class:	
Behavioral sciences	3
Mechanics	6
Electrical engineering	5½
Thermodynamics	5½
Economics	2½
English	2½ or 3
Philosophy	3 or 2½
Law	5½
Lab. option	2
Total	35½
1st class:	
Astronautics	5½
Aeronautics	5½
Electronics	3
Mod. physics	2½
Political science	5½
English	5½
Optional courses	5½
Total	33
Grand total	143½

USAFA MASTER'S PROGRAMS

Two master's-level programs are in operation—in astronautics, and in international affairs. Both are extensions of the Academy's enrichment program and were developed to meet the educational needs of unusually able cadets and those who have prior college. Cadets pursuing the master's program must have completed the 143½ semester-hours prescribed for graduation with a bachelor of science degree, and an undergraduate major. Engineering sciences is the required undergraduate major for the master's program in astronautics; for the program in international affairs it is the undergraduate major with the same name.

The purpose of the international affairs master's is to develop cadet understanding of international relations and foreign policies in the modern world. It is a background for military command and staff responsibilities in operations, intelligence, planning, and programing, foreign representation, politico-military affairs, and joint and combined activities. The master's program in astronautics will contribute to the preparation of future astronauts (for whom the time saved by being able to get a master's degree during their 4 years at the Academy will be an important factor) and will help prepare officers qualified in the sciences to administer the Air Force's vast research program. Both of the Academy's master's programs have been endorsed by the Academic Advisory Committee of eminent professors from a number of the Nation's leading universities.

Although these programs are in operation, master's degrees cannot be granted until there is a change in the legislation governing the Academy. The Air Force has sought the necessary change but has not achieved it to date. Inhibiting factors are the opposition of the other service academies (although only permissive legislation is being requested) and the attitude of the American Council on Education, which opposes degree granting by Federal agencies. There is some reason to believe that the opposition of the ACE was based on a belief that the academies were not fully accredited and on the misapplication to the service academies, which are recognized academic institutions, of a policy designed to prevent Government agencies from entering the academic field at the graduate level only. The academies are fully accredited and have the desired undergraduate base; it is therefore hoped that the council may modify its position. Similarly it is hoped that the other service academies, which at first opposed the enrichment program but later adopted many of its features, may undergo a like change in their attitude toward USAFA's request for master's degree authority. These developments, it is believed, might induce the Department of Defense to approve the Academy's effort to broaden the educational opportunity it offers.

In the meantime, under cooperative arrangements between the Academy and two civilian universities—Purdue and Georgetown—selected cadets may earn master's degrees from these universities within 7 months after their graduation from the Academy. Under these arrangements, 14 cadets will pursue graduate work in astronautics at Purdue, and 15 cadets will complete graduate programs in international relations at Georgetown University. Cadets selected to participate in the cooperative programs will have completed, on their graduation from the Academy, the requirements of the prescribed curriculum, a prerequisite undergraduate major, and the equivalent of one-half year of graduate-level course work. For these cadets, Purdue and Georgetown are waiving their normal 1-year residence requirement for a master's degree. Since these cadets will be able to earn accredited master of science degrees within 7 months after their graduation, headquarters, USAF, has permitted their entry into flying training to be delayed until their graduate work is completed (approximately February 1964). The cooperative programs will result in a great saving of time and money for the Air Force; a similar program in management is being studied.

Mr. GOLDWATER. An important part of the Military Academy's curricula is military training. While one might not think of the Air Force as being interested in basic military training, I watched them "get the works" out there. They come out well trained soldiers as well as airmen.

So that my colleagues may have some understanding of the subject, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the military training program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Military training program

	Semester-hours
4th class year:	
Basic cadet training (summer)	7½
Command training	½
National security and the Armed Forces	1¾
Total	9¾
3d class year:	
Field study of the Armed Forces (summer)	4
Command training	½
Contemporary world forces	¾
Total	5¼
2d class year:	
Field study of oversea areas (summer)	2½
Duty with A.F. unit—3d Lt. (summer)	1½
Instructor training	1
Command training	½
Employment of aerospace power	1½
Total	7
1st class year:	
Duty with underclass (summer)	3
Command training	1
Aerospace systems	½
Navigational indoctrination (optional)	½
Total	5

Mr. GOLDWATER. Contributing to the phenomenal record being made by the Air Force Academy in education is the rather interesting fact that 21 percent of the faculty have Ph. D. degrees.

When we look at the list, we find that 2 in that Academy have bachelor degrees; 86 in the Military Academy have; while there are 180 in the Naval Academy.

As for master's degrees, 276 in the U.S. Air Force Academy have them; 243 in the Military Academy; and 149 in the Naval Academy.

When we come to Ph. D's, there are 72 in the Air Force Academy; 15 in the Military Academy; and 53 in the Naval Academy.

These facts speak very well for the motivation of those who have devoted themselves to teaching the young men who comprise the cadet detachment at the Academy.

Many things have been done at the Academy which are a little different from the historic experience of the other academies. We have known of the hazing and the plight of the fourth-classmen, who go through a rather strenuous period of hazing at the other academies. The Air Force Academy started it, but it was felt that hazing detracted from the Academy, rather than helped it. So an effort has been made to modify the fourth-class system over the past several years. The Board of Visitors thinks so highly of it that we want the effort to be continued. For example, cadets had to sit at the edge of their chairs at mealtime. If an upper classman wanted a glass of water, he threw the glass, and the fourth-classman would have to catch it. They would have to give detailed explanations of the meaning of leather or time. Work was substituted for the beat. The beat was carried on while the lower classman marched around a quadrangle. Now he has to go to work and work off his demerits. This system recognizes the dignity of the cadets, and it has paid off. They go home for Christmas and are given privileges. They are given privileges in the fourth class that are above the privileges given to cadets in the other academies. The dropout in the fourth class is 17 percent, which speaks very highly for the morale of the cadets there.

This morale and motivation, I believe, is best reflected in the activity of the cadets and religious exercises.

I ask unanimous consent that my notes on the Catholic religious activities at the Academy be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection the notes were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Catholic Religious Activities

Despite the fact that Sunday chapel attendance is mandatory for members of the fourth, third, and second classes, it is in the area of voluntary participation in religious activities that the Catholic chapel program shows its strength.

All the following religious activities are on a strictly voluntary basis:

1. Daily mass: Of the 640 Catholic cadets attending the Air Force Academy, about 150 cadets attend daily mass; and during the Advent and Lent this number increases to well over 200 cadets. Attendance at daily mass involves an extra effort on the part of the cadets because they must be physically present at mass before the early morning breakfast assembly.

2. Holy communion: During the academic year, holy communion is distributed to 1,200 cadets weekly, which by ratio compares most favorably with any college or university in America.

3. Novena service: The weekly novena service which is conducted after supper on Monday evenings on voluntary time is well attended throughout the entire year, between 50 and 100 cadets in attendance.

4. Religious retreats: By cadet regulation each cadet may attend a weekend retreat, from after class on Friday until supper on Sunday evening. The Catholic cadets attend retreats conducted at the Sacred Heart Retreat House, 1 hour's drive from the Academy. At their own expense, and giving their own time, about one-third of the Catholic cadets attend these retreats every year.

5. Catholic choir: Under the able direction of Mr. Edward Ladouceur, the Catholic choir of a hundred voices, has made frequent appearances on TV and radio. They have been requested frequently to sing at local churches and cathedrals, and have twice most successfully appeared at St. Patricks Cathedral in New York. Catholic and Protestant choirs are permitted one away-from-the-area trip per year.

6. Guest speakers and lectures: So as not to cut into academic time, cadets are permitted to sign up for early supper on specified days, to attend lectures after supper by guest speakers. These have been enthusiastically attended in numbers ranging from 75 to 200 cadets each lecture. During the past year the following have addressed the Catholic cadets: Rev. John A. O'Brien, author and lecturer, Notre Dame University; Chaplain, Brig. Gen. Edwin R. Chess, Deputy Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force; Rev. Charles Forsyth, O.S.B., Newman chaplain, Colorado University; Rev. Charles F. Taylor, Newman chaplain, Wyoming University; Rev. Henry G. Guyot, professor of scripture, St. Thomas Seminary, Denver; Rev. Paul O'Connor, S.J., Alaskan missionary; Rev. Vincent S. Delavy, C.S.C., Pakistan missionary; and others.

7. Cana conferences: Each year a series of talks are given to the Catholic cadets contemplating marriage after graduation. These talks emphasize the problems and responsibilities of marriage, with special emphasis on the permanency of marriage. The cadets eagerly attend these conferences where open discussion is encouraged, and are most receptive to the suggestions and advice from the expert marriage counselors invited to speak.

In an overall evaluation of the response of the cadets to the entire religious program, I would say it is most encouraging. The cadets are inquisitive about religious matters and want the answers. They ask intelligent questions, and expect intelligent explanations. It is an inspiration and a challenge to work with and for the cadets, and a most rewarding experience.

Chaplain, Col. Stephen J. O'Connor,
Catholic Cadet Chaplain, Command Chaplain, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Protestant record is excellent. Their discussion groups, for example, are limited to 60 cadets per week. Three hundred and eighty-five from the class of 1966 have signed up. Sunday school teachers: They needed 29. One hundred and twenty-seven have signed up from the class of 1966.

Ushers and acolytes: 20 were needed. One hundred and fifteen signed up from the class of 1966.

Choir: They needed 40, and 277 have signed up from the class of 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of Protestant religious activities be made a part of the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cadet Participation in the Religious Program at the U.S. Air Force Academy

PROTESTANT

Discussion groups: Limited to 60 cadets per week; 385 from class of 1966 have signed up.

Retreats: 3 chapel sponsored, 6 church sponsored last year; over 400 cadets signed up.

Sunday school teachers: 29 needed; 127 signed up from class of 1966.

Ushers and acolytes: 20 needed; 115 signed up from class of 1966.

Choir: 40 needed; 277 signed up from class of 1966.

Protestant flight includes 50 different denominational groups.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I said at the outset, this is not a formal report on the Air Force Academy. It is merely the report of one member of the group of observers from the Senate while attending with the Board of Visitors. The two other Members from the Senate were prevented from visiting the Academy because of the activities of the Senate at that particular time. I wished to make this report so that my colleagues in the Senate might have a better idea of what is going on in Colorado Springs. In due course of time, the formal report will be made available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the report he is giving to the Senate today, and, more significantly, for the attention he has given to the Air Force Academy. I consider it a privilege to be one of the members of the Board of Visitors of the Academy with the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Arizona has given a moving and important report to us, with regard to the achievements of the Academy—those who teach at the Academy, and those who are members of the student body, the cadets. I look forward to visiting that fine institution, which I consider to be one of the truly outstanding educational institutions of our country, as well as being exceedingly vital to our national security. I commend the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I know that he was extremely busy at the time of the visit, and I know from discussions that the Senator from Minnesota had planned to be in Colorado Springs. However, in the capacity in which he serves the Senate so well, it is not always possible for him to leave when he desires. I suggest that the Senator visit the Academy at the first opportunity. It is a wonderful institution, and I am sure he will be richly rewarded by a visit to it.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR GRANTED TO CERTAIN STAFF ASSISTANTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the consideration of the migratory labor bills I ask unanimous consent that an unlimited number of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted the privilege of the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the request for unanimous consent is for an unlimited number, I have no objection.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Orrick, Jr., to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey has introduced a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. In commenting on the measure, he notes that it is coauthored by Senators HUMPHREY, MORSE, MCNAMARA, ENGLE, and CLARK. The Senator has made several presentations in support of this repeal measure. In some of the material which he has inserted in the RECORD there are statements that must be challenged and factual inaccuracies that must be brought to the attention of the Senate.

First, however, I should like to comment on my colleague's attack upon right-to-work laws, which now are in force in 20 States. He questions the wisdom of the people of these 20 States for having adopted these laws safeguarding the freedom of American citizens at the places where they work.

The right-to-work law gives the worker freedom to join the union or not join the union at his place of work—without affecting his job and livelihood, without affecting his right to work at his job. In other words, it outlaws compulsory unionism. It does not, of course, restrict voluntary unionism. It preserves the right of collective bargaining for those who wish to have a union do this for them.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey says the general public in the 20 States which have had the right-to-work laws in force for years, some of them for nearly 20 years—that the people of these States have not made a careful enough analysis of these laws. So he proposes that the privilege of such analysis be withdrawn from the population of these 20 States by the Federal Government and that they no longer be permitted to make their own laws safeguarding a vital exercise of individual freedom. The repeal measure would accomplish this withdrawal of permission to legislate.

This would be an affront to the citizens of 20 States, and a political shackling of the citizenry of the other 30 States. As the Senator well knows, my State of Arizona is one of the 20 so-called right-to-work States. Our people enacted a right-to-work amendment to the State constitution safeguarding individual liberty back in 1946, actually prior to the Taft-Hartley Act. We have had a chance to see how the law works for the benefit of all. Two years after its enactment, the very same forces who are today trying to establish the rule of compulsory unionism, sought to repeal our Arizona right-to-work law. Arizona people gave it a much bigger vote, both in numbers and percentage, than it had gotten 2 years previously. Then again in 1952, the compulsory unionism forces sought once more to repeal the law. This time, the people of Arizona gave it still a bigger vote of confidence. The point is that in nearly 20 years of experience with the law, the support for it among the people of Arizona has become stronger and more widespread. It is overwhelmingly favored by our people—after nearly 20 years of service safeguarding individual freedom—Arizona vote: 1946, yes, 61,875—55 percent, no, 49,557; 1948, yes, 86,866—59 percent, no, 60,295; 1952, yes, 115,389—63.2 percent, no, 67,036.

Gov. Paul Fannin, in a radio interview recently, was asked to state the importance of Arizona's right-to-work law. He replied, and I quote from the radio program transcript:

> The right-to-work law protects everybody involved in the free enterprise system—the worker, management, responsible unionism, and the public. This is what makes it a critical factor. By removing the monopoly power which compulsory unionism puts into the hands of union officials, the law protects both management and the public from irresponsible abuses of union power. The right-to-work law states a very simple principle of freedom (Governor Fannin continued). It guarantees that workers can have the free choice of joining the union or not joining. Thus the worker is able to guide his personal destiny in the finest tradition of individual liberty.

Mr. President, I might add that during the years Arizona has had the right-to-work law, our State has progressed economically. In fact, by all but two of the yardsticks of economic progress, Arizona is the Nation's leader in economic growth.

I wish at this point to make note of the fact that I have statements from 24 past and present Governors of right-to-work States endorsing the law that their States have had from 20 years to a few weeks—Wyoming's new right-to-work law became effective on May 18. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, this list of 24 quotations of 24 right-to-work State Governors.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS FOR RIGHT TO WORK: ENDORSEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF STATES

J. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia 1958–62: "The right-to-work law has served a very wholesome purpose in Virginia. Relations between management and labor are on a very high plane."

Ross R. Barnett, Governor of Mississippi, 1960–64: "The people of Mississippi are strongly in favor of the right-to-work law, as evidenced by their vote in 1960 to put the right-to-work law in our State constitution."

Henry Bellmon, Governor-elect of Oklahoma 1963–67: "I believe a right-to-work law is important in stimulating industry and new jobs in Oklahoma. Adjoining States have such legislation and this gives them a competitive advantage over Oklahoma in attracting new industries."

Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida 1961–65: "I am pleased to note * * * that Florida's population growth, its industrial development, its personal income, and its job opportunities have been expanding faster than those of any other State in the Nation, and this has occurred while the State right-to-work law was in effect."

Frank Clement, Governor-elect of Tennessee 1953–55, 1955–59, and 1963–67: "The Tennessee open shop, right-to-work law has been productive of harmony and its repeal is not in the best interest of the people of Tennessee."

George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah 1957–61 and 1961–65: "I feel Utah's right-to-work law has been advantageous to all workers. We have had only a limited number of labor disputes since the law was enacted in 1955."

John A. Connally, Governor of Texas 1963–65: "The right-to-work plank should be in the platform because a majority of the Democrats of Texas want it. To have omitted it from the platform would have been dishonorable."

Price Daniel, Governor of Texas 1957–59, 1959–61, and 1961–63: "The Texas right-to-work law has been important to the industrial development of this State and I feel it is fair to both management and labor. The State Democratic platform calls for preservation of our law."

John E. Davis, Governor of North Dakota 1957–59, 1959–61: "Our right-to-work law is guaranteeing the constitutional rights of all employees in North Dakota. This law does not prevent labor from organizing when they desire voluntarily to do so. It does prevent labor unions from forcing employees to join a union against their will. The State has developed industrially and expanded its job opportunities and wage rates since the right-to-work law has been in effect."

Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee 1959–63: "As I see it, we have had pretty good labor-management relations in this State. We have gained new industries because of our right-to-work law. Industry knows that both management and labor will get fair play."

Norman A. Erbe, Governor of Iowa 1961–63: "The Iowa right-to-work law has been the topic of discussion for many years, during which the interest has varied. I have expressed publicly that to date the people of Iowa have shown no indication that they think the right-to-work law should be changed."

Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona 1959–61, 1961–63, and 1963–65: "The official figures show that in 1958 the AFL–CIO unions had 40,000 members in our State, and in 1960 they had 80,000 members. That's doubling the membership in 3 years—under our right-to-work law."

Archie Gubbrud, Governor of South Dakota 1961–63 and 1963–67: "Union propagandists frequently raise the deceptive cry that right-to-work laws have as their purpose the destruction of unions. Nothing could be more misleading. Statistics establish that in the right-to-work States, since the enactment of their laws, union membership has increased, wages have increased, and the general economy of the State has improved at a higher rate of acceleration than in some of the surrounding non-right-to-work sister States."

Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana 1957–1961: "The right-to-work law has the approval of thousands of union members who maintain that it makes the union leaders more responsive to the wishes of the membership and is a weapon by which corruption and racketeering can be curbed by the members themselves * * * It simply reaffirms and strengthens the traditional position of that pioneer in unionism, Samuel

Gompers, that to be effective, union membership must be voluntary."

A. S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of Virginia 1962–1966: "The principle underlying right-to-work laws is now recognized in Virginia as fundamental. The preservation of the right-to-work law was an important part of my program in the campaign for Governor in 1961. The election results were indicative of the overwhelming sentiment of Virginians for this legislation."

Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina 1959–1963: "We have proven the worth and value of this law. The record shows it has been successful. South Carolina intends to maintain this legislation with confidence. It is a fundamental portion of our progress. We recognize anad respect it as such."

Luther Hodges, Governor of North Carolina, 1957–61: "I am convinced that North Carolina's right-to-work law has attracted business and stabilized employment. I favor the right-to-work laws."

Frank Morrison, Governor of Nebraska, 1961–63, 1963–65: "Right to work is in our State constitution, and as far as I'm concerned, it's there to stay. This provision is basic to our Nebraska philosophy."

Gordon Persons, Governor of Alabama, 1951–55: "In my opinion, all of our labor unions will be far stronger and the members in them will have a far greater interest and respect in the organizations if membership can be shown to be desirable and they are not forced to join."

Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, 1961–65: "The Republicans charge * * * that I have pledged to repeal the right-to-work law. This is absolutely false. I have pledged once a week, and sometimes 40 times a week, throughout the campaign to keep this law on the books."

Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada, 1959–63 and 1963–67: "Nevada has a right-to-work law that works very well."

S. Ernest Vandiver, Governor of Georgia, 1959–63: "We like the right-to-work law in Georgia because it insures freedom to both labor and management, and this freedom of choice is a basic principle upon which our country was founded."

Edward F. Arn, Governor of Kansas, 1951–53, 1953–55: "I would talk long and loud about the right of labor to organize, but I think, too, that the right to work is equally fundamental, and is based upon the concept of the Constitution, just the same as is the right to worship in a church of one's choice—and just the same as the many other rights guaranteed by our Constitution."

Ben T. Laney, Governor of Arkansas, 1945–47 and 1947–49: "Personal freedom and liberty is the priceless pearl sought by all men everywhere. During the 4 years I served as Governor of Arkansas, our State development agencies working with statewide and local groups of civic-minded citizens, secured new industries creating 40,000 new jobs and advancing the economic welfare of all citizens. A major factor in the preservation of freedom, and in the development of our new industrial program in Arkansas, was our Arkansas right-to-work law. Under it, both industry and labor, as well as the citizenry as a whole, have benefited."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the area of compulsory unionism, the Allen case. The Court found that the freedom of American citizens is being violated in so-called union shop contracts. These are the contracts for compulsory union membership which the distinguished Senators who are sponsoring the bill to repeal 14(b) wish, in effect, to force upon the people of the 20 States which have outlawed them. These are the contracts that are now permitted in the other 30 States that do not yet have right-to-work laws. These are the contracts which, every day for millions of Americans, violate the vital political freedom upon which the American Republic was built. Backing me up in this statement is the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court. Union shop contracts permit unions to force American citizens to contribute their money to political activities which they oppose—or be fired from their jobs.

In spotlighting the injustice and the illegality of such political bondage, the Supreme Court has gone halfway toward abolishing compulsory unionism which, in one of its less perceptive moments, Congress permitted in those States which have not erected barriers against such coercion. The Supreme Court's recognition of this chink in the armor of freedom can become a truly historic milestone if we, in Congress today, will but go the other half mile.

My bill (S. 87) would make amends for our myopia of a few years ago. It would, as a national policy and in harmony with the whole constitutional structure, establish freedom of choice at the places where people work for their livelihood, but at the same time would recognize the right of the States to retain their legislative prerogative.

The Senator from New Jersey defines the right-to-work issue in two parts. Part 1 is the question, he says, of whether government should be permitted to interfere with agreements between employer and employees.

Mr. President, it is the primary function of government to protect individual liberty. Many years ago government found that the "yellow dog" contract was interfering with the individual liberty of American working people. Congress outlawed the "yellow dog" contract.

What was the "yellow dog" contract?

It was a contract between the employer and employee. It prohibited an employee from joining a union—under penalty of being fired. Let me repeat that under the "yellow dog" contract a worker would be fired if he joined a union. Therefore he was forced not to join a union—if he wanted to keep his job. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey is as unalterably opposed to such an arrangement as I am. Congress was opposed to it. The Congress of the United States outlawed it. Thus a worker's liberty to join a union was safeguarded. This was government interference in the area of contracts between employer and employee.

Let us make it clear once and for all: Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which the Senator and his five colleagues wish to repeal, merely permits State governments to further safeguard the very liberty that Congress safeguarded in part when it outlawed the "yellow dog" contract. The other half of the liberty I am talking about is the liberty not to join a union. If Government protects a worker's right to join—which is a fundamental function of government—then it must also protect a worker's right not to join.

This is the essence of the debate on the issue of voluntary versus compulsory union membership. It is the essence of any debate that may arise in Congress on this issue. This is government interference on the side of individual liberty; it is government's primary function; and no other agency in our society can fulfill this function.

Another way to approach this aspect of the issue is to pose the question whether State governments should have the right to interfere when an individual's political freedom, and freedom of association, and freedom to work are endangered, or violated. This, I submit again, is at once the primary and the paramount purpose of government—to protect individual freedom, and to interfere with anything that seeks to violate it.

The agreements which the Senator proposes to move beyond the power of intervention by Government are compulsory unionism agreements, the so-called union shop and other forms of such coercion. What do these agreements do? One thing they do, as the Supreme Court noted, is to violate the political freedom of individual Americans. The Supreme Court says that no union should have the right to exact money from an individual by coercion and spend it on political activities objectionable to the individual. The union shop confers this license upon unions, and unfortunately, the Supreme Court, while condemning it, has failed to provide a readily accessible escape for the millions of workers held captive in this bondage. The union shop also forces upon citizens actual membership in an organization to which they may not wish to belong, the alternative is to be fired from the job.

The escape from such bondage is provided in right-to-work laws.

In part 2 of the Senator's discussion of the issue, he seems to imply an uncertain personal support for the premise set forth in part 1. He propounds the idea that unions are different from other nongovernmental organizations. He says the proposition that a person should be free to withdraw from any voluntary association is generally true. But not so with union membership. He holds up the free rider argument as his straw man. He says those who are not members benefit from the union activities and should be forced to pay.

There is only one answer to this: Any man who considers that he benefits from the union's activities certainly ought to pay. Those who do not think so should not be forced to pay. They are not free riders. They are captive passengers. They are captives of a device called exclusive representation. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor in 1935, when the present labor law was being formulated in Congress, threw all of the power of big unionism into the fight for the license of so-called exclusive representation. This provision makes it mandatory that union bargaining units represent nonunion workers as well as union members in the work unit. This created the misnamed free rider who is, in fact, the captive passenger.

Some of the top people in the New Deal fought to preserve the right of bargaining for the minority and the individual, but they were overwhelmed by the power of Mr. Green and other union officials. On February 1, 1934, an Executive order on collective bargaining was issued by the White House and on February 4, the bargaining section was interpreted officially in a press release—No. 3125. The release said:

> 2. This selection of majority representatives (in an election conducted by the National Labor Board) does not restrict or qualify in any way the right of minority groups of employees or of individual employees to deal with their employer.
>
> 3. Section 7(a) affirms the right of the employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; and such concerted activities can be lawfully carried on by either majority or minority groups organizing and selecting such representatives in such manner as they see fit. Also, in affirming this right of collective action, the law lays no limitation upon individual action—Committee on Education and Labor on Senate bill 1958, 74th Congress, 1st session, part I, pages 117–121.

Mr. William Green took note of this interpretation in his testimony at hearings on the proposed Wagner Labor Relations Act. On March 14, 1935, Mr. Green testified:

> We have protested against this interpretation * * * and we hold it is contradictory of the Executive order.

He went on to throw the full weight of his organization against the granting of individual and minority freedom—for reserving to the majority all bargaining prerogatives—exclusive representation.

The sponsors of the repeal measure talk about freedom to contract and majority rule. On these points I should like to read a short editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader and then was picked up and published in other newspapers around the Nation. The editorial says:

> Senator Clair Engle, of California, issued a statement last week, calling for repeal of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act that permits States to adopt right-to-work laws.

The editorial then quotes the Senator as follows:

> "If, through a voluntary and free choice," said the Senator, "the workers in a shop vote to set up a union shop, they have every right to do so. To deny them this choice is to deny them their fundamental right to organize."

That is the end of the quotation attributed to Senator Engle. The editorial continues:

> What a lovely thought. Let us extend it it a little.
>
> Senator Engle's shop consists of 100 workers. Fifty-one of them vote for a union shop, the other 49 don't want to belong to a union. The Senator says the 49 must go. They may have worked at the shop 20 years. Never mind. Out.
>
> Suppose the 51 voted voluntarily and by free choice that no Negroes could work at the place. Obviously, to deny them this choice would be to deny them their fundamental right to organize. Does the Senator not agree?

This is a question, understand, posed by the newspaper. The editorial continues:

> Or suppose that the 51 militant unioneers voted that as a condition of employment, every worker would have to contribute to the National Democratic Party. Do they not have "every right to do so"? And if not, why not? Does the Senator not believe in pure majority rule?

The editorial continues:

> In the Senator's book, all "fundamental rights" belong to the 51 percent; the other 49 have none. He calls this democracy. We offer him another word for it: tyranny.

Mr. President, that is the end of the editorial. I feel that it makes the point on majority rule very well. One of the keystones of our American system is the protection it gives to minority and individual rights, while at the same time operating through the democratic process. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 29, 1963]

THE PURE DEMOCRAT

Senator Clair Engle, of California, issued a statement last week calling for repeal of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act that permits States to adopt right-to-work laws.

The statement was nothing new—Mr. Engle is one of labor's little darlings—but we were fetched by the way he put it.

"If, through a voluntary and free choice,'" said the Senator, "the workers in a shop vote to set up a union shop, they have every right to do so. To deny them this choice is to deny them their fundamental right to organize."

What a lovely thought. Let us extend it a little.

Senator Engle's shop consists of 100 workers. Fifty-one of them vote for a union shop; the other 49 don't want to belong to a union. The Senator says the 49 must go. They may have worked at the shop 20 years. Never mind. Out.

Suppose the 51 voted voluntarily and by free choice that no Negroes could work at the place. Obviously, to deny them this choice would be to deny them their fundamental right to organize. Does the Senator not agree?

Or suppose the 51 militant unioneers voted that as a condition of employment every worker would have to contribute to the National Democratic Party. Do they not have every right to do so? And if not, why not? Does the Senator not believe in pure majority rule?

In the Senator's book, all the fundamental rights belong to the 51 percent; the other 49 have none. He calls this democracy. We offer him another word for it: tyranny.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in California a year ago, Mr. Reuther and Mr. Hayes of the auto and machinists unions attempted to impose compulsory unionism upon all aerospace workers. Tens of thousands of workers had not joined the union, although the UAW and IAM had been the collective bargaining agents for 20 years. They sincerely believed that the union activities did not benefit them. They resisted an agency shop fee because they did not wish to contribute to the union's political and other activities. The union prevailed at Douglas Aircraft Co., and several thousand workers were forced to contribute in order to hold their jobs. Some of the workers refused to contribute. They were fired. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a newspaper article, published in the January 14, 1963, edition of the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, on the firing of one of these workers, a Mr. George Seeley.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Outlook, Jan. 14, 1963]

TWENTY-SEVEN-YEAR MAN AT DOUGLAS FIRED IN AGENCY DISPUTE—IAM ORDER DEFIED BY WORKER

(By Walter L. Scratch)

Friday afternoon, tool and diemaker John Seeley walked across Ocean Park Boulevard and looked back at the plant where he has worked for the past 27 years.

Seeley is one of the Douglas Aircraft Co. employees who have been fired because they won't agree to pay service fees to the International Association of Machinists (IAM) in order to hold their jobs.

He is one of hundreds of Douglas employees who argued that the agency shop contract between Douglas and the IAM is wrong because it forces a worker to join or pay fees to a union against his wishes. They believe in voluntary unionism, but only 25 or 50 of them stood by their guns and accepted final pay checks Friday afternoon. The rest agreed to pay "under protest" to the union.

MOST CAN'T AFFORD INTEGRITY

"Most people," commented Seeley, "can't afford the luxury of integrity."

As we sat on a parking lot guard rail and talked, a claxon horn sounded in the Douglas plant across the street.

"That's the coffee break," chuckled Seeley. "Now we can relax for 10 minutes."

Two days ago, when Seeley was notified he either had to pay $5 a month to the IAM or be fired, he went to call on Donald W. Douglas Jr., president of the company.

"He wasn't in," said Seeley, "so I gave my 25-year pin to his secretary. Mr. Douglas called me later and asked to see me. He wanted to make sure I understood the company's position and my rights under the agency shop contract. I assured him I did. He asked me about turning back my 25-year service pin. I told him I didn't want the pin any longer because I couldn't wear it with pride. Then he asked me to see Mr. Counts before I made my final decision."

J. Curtis Counts is director of employee relations for Douglas.

"Mr. Counts tried to convince me that Douglas had made a good contract for me because I can work there without joining the union. I told him a good many of the employees think the company sold us down the river to the union," said Seeley.

He said Counts got out a copy of the agency shop contract and pointed out that IAM members now are free to withdraw from the union at any time. They can elect to pay the agency fee instead of belonging to the union and paying union dues of the same amount, Counts pointed out. Previously IAM members had to maintain their memberships.

"I was not impressed," said Seeley. "The union can also fire you any time you disagree with the union bosses. They will get their money anyway, because you have to pay service fees in order to keep working."

EXPERT TOOL, DIEMAKER

During his 27 years at the Douglas plant in Santa Monica, Seeley has done every phase of a tool and diemaker's work. He finished his career in department 635, where highly skilled tool and die men build special machinery.

"My superior gave me the highest rating in the plant," said Seeley, pulling his final paycheck and dismissal notice out of his coat pocket. Across the notice was typed

"Failure To Pay Agency Fee," under "Reason for Dismissal."

"Everyone was fair to me," said Seeley. "I feel no resentment against anybody—not even the union. Everybody wanted to make sure I understood my rights. My foreman, George Dobbs, looked real sad when he told me I had to go out at 1 o'clock Friday. I explained to everybody it was just a matter of principle with me."

OLD UNION MAN HIMSELF

Seeley went on to explain that he is an old union man himself. Years ago he helped to organize a union at the Douglas plant. It was called the Aircraft Workers Union. During World War II, he was a member of a CIO union at Douglas, serving it as an assistant shop steward for a time.

These were voluntary unions. Employees were free to join or not join. Seeley believes in that type of unionism. He contends union officials serve the members well when the members don't have to belong to the union in order to hold their jobs.

"I went to union meetings for years," said Seeley, "at which less than 10 percent of the membership showed up. At Douglas a handful of union members had been dictating the affairs of 1,000 workers."

WOMEN IN TEARS

Seeley and George Seay, president of Douglas Employes Right-to-Work Committee, which fought the agency shop contract and still is challenging its legality in a court action, said they saw several women employes in tears in the Douglas plant when they took their final paychecks.

They said they had failed in an effort to learn how many took their dismissals instead of sacrificing their principles. They said, however, the total was between 25 and 50. Hundreds of others who bitterly resent the contract could not afford to quit, they said. One of these is Seay himself, who on Friday paid up his agency shop fees under protest and continued his battle against the contract.

He constantly seeks new members for the right-to-work committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a part of the article, which was written by the newspaper's labor reporter, Walter L. Scratch. It reads in part as follows:

> Friday afternoon, tool and diemaker John Seeley walked across Ocean Park Boulevard and looked back at the plant where he has worked for the past 27 years.
>
> Seeley is one of the Douglas Aircraft Co. employees who have been fired because they won't agree to pay service fees to the International Association of Machinists (IAM) in order to hold their jobs. He is one of hundreds of Douglas employees who argue that the agency shop contract between Douglas and the IAM is wrong because it forces a worker to join or pay fees to a union against his wishes. They believe in voluntary unionism, but only 25 or 50 of them stood by their guns and accepted final paychecks Friday afternoon. The rest agreed to pay under protest to the union.
>
> Seeley and George Seay, president of Douglas employees right-to-work committee, which fought the agency shop contract said they saw several women employees in tears in the Douglas plant when they took their final paychecks.

Mr. President, this is the story of the loss of a man's livelihood, along with that of 49 others. Some union officials might say, "Well, let them get a job elsewhere." But in standing up for what they believed to be their rights, these men and women have become controversial. I am told that this makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for them to secure work elsewhere in the trade in which they have spent their working lifetime.

This is a story of the loss of freedom. I submit to the Senate that this is the only real issue involved in the debate over voluntary versus compulsory unionism.

There is close at hand an even more dramatic illustration of the value of right-to-work laws. I refer to the story of Casey Delatte, a porter on the Reading Railway. He lives in Philadelphia. I have the story here, as it appeared in the May 12 issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin, May 12, 1963]

BROTHERHOOD ENFORCES RULE—CASEY DELATTE: A RAILROADER FACING LOSS OF JOB OVER $8 BILL FOR DUES

(By Douglas H. Bedell)

Casey Delatte, 62, is a man in the grip of a rule.

Delatte is a porter for the Reading Railroad and a former freight tallyman. He looks after the East Falls, Wissahickon and Spring Mill stations.

He's been working on the Reading for 38 years. His record is unblemished.

On February 1 he owed $8 in dues to his union, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, AFL–CIO. Because of his failure to pay the dues on time, the brotherhood says, he must be fired from his job.

Unless an arbitrator waives the rule in Delatte's case—and the case has some complications—he will be dropped from the Reading's payroll sometime this summer.

Three years short of retirement age, he would lose about $30 of the $150 a month, pension he and his wife, Martha, expect to receive. His current takehome pay of $128.17 every 2 weeks would be stopped.

The rule in question is article 6, section 1 of the statutes of the clerks' brotherhood.

It reads, "A member who fails to pay his dues within the time limits specified in this article is automatically suspended at 12 o'clock midnight of the last day of the second month for which he owes dues and no notice of suspension is required."

The rule was adopted by the brotherhood's convention in 1959. It is intended to encourage members to pay their dues on time.

Before it was adopted, brotherhood officials explain, some members let their dues lapse and confused their lodges' books.

In 1960, Delatte's lodge notified its members that it had been directed to comply with article 6 and that:

"In the event of such suspension, we are informed, the provisions of the union-shop agreement will be followed and fully complied with and after an adverse decision the suspended member's seniority and employment * * * shall be terminated.

"Although it seems some leniency has been shown in the past, after January 1, 1961, these rules will be strictly enforced."

Last February 1, the books of lodge 1771 showed that Casey Delatte owed $8, his $4 a month dues for December and January. The rule took hold.

HE WAS SUSPENDED

He was suspended by the lodge's secretary-treasurer, Willie G. Council, and reported to Judson Swan, the brotherhood's general chairman for the Reading Co.

"I got no pleasure out of it," Council said last week. "Before if a man was suspended, he had a chance of being reinstated. Now there is no reinstatement and I don't agree with it.

"I had to do what I saw fit according to the rules and regulations on the books."

Swan asked that Delatte be cited for violating the brotherhood's union-shop agreement with the Reading.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the only offense for which a union can ask that a member be fired is nonpayment of dues.

On March 12, following a hearing the preceding day, Earl T. Hunter, superintendent of the Reading's Philadelphia division, ruled that Delate had failed to pay his dues on time.

The ruling was upheld by Harrison F. Wyatt, the railroad's director of personnel. Delatte's keys and annual pass were to be taken from him on April 24.

STILL ON ACTIVE STATUS

His decision to fight the ruling, however, has kept him on active status until an arbitrator decides the case this summer.

At his hearing, Delatte testified he thought his dues had been paid.

He said he had given them early in December to a friend who had been regularly turning them in for him. The practice, brotherhood officials acknowledge, is a common one, although article 6 says it is a member's responsibility to give his dues to an authorized collector.

Delatte, who lives in Tioga at 2215 Estaugh Street, told a reporter he had been giving his duesbook and money to his friend, James W. Lawrence, while the two of them worked at the freight station in Reading during 1960 and 1961.

He continued the practice when they returned to jobs in Philadelphia. In Reading, Delatte said, Lawrence was an authorized collector.

The two would meet, Delatte said, at the North Broad Street Station. Lawrence, he explained, lived at 2052 Fitzwater Street, near the lodge meeting place at the Citizens Republican Club, 422 South 15th Street.

It was easier for him to pick up Delatte's dues than for Delatte to make the trip downtown.

NINE DAYS LATE

Delatte said he assumed his dues were paid for December and January as they had been for the preceding months.

At Delatte's hearing, however, Swan brought out that Lawrence hadn't offered the money to Council until February 9, 9 days late.

"I trusted Lawrence and he trusted me," Delatte said. "When he told me he paid my dues late, I said, 'Oh, my goodness, why didn't you tell me, why didn't you call?'

"I didn't see why I should lose my job on account of that."

Lawrence, who in December 1961, transferred from the Reading to Acme Fast Freight, Inc., when the trucking company took over operation of Lawrence's station at Willow and Noble Streets, testified at the hearing to the effect that he was sick and couldn't get out to pay Delatte's dues on time.

ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY

"Because of the circumstances," he testified, "I assume responsibility for this very serious affair."

Swan told Delatte that the brotherhood has used "every means possible" to impress on its members the necessity of paying dues on time.

Swan, who is attending a brotherhood convention in Los Angeles this week, said in a telephone conversation that possible mitigating circumstances have "nothing at all to do with the matter."

CAN'T MAKE EXCEPTIONS

"It's a matter of carrying out the requirements of the union-shop agreement. We can't make exceptions in any case."

He noted that Delatte has taken the case to arbitration. "If Mr. Delatte has not been properly treated," Swan said, "it will be handled in the proper procedure."

Speaking for the Reading, Wyatt said he had no alternative but to uphold the ruling against Delatte.

"The railroads don't like the union shop," he said, "but we have agreements with these organizations and we're required to live up to them."

HAS TO GO ALONG

"Morally, I think it is wrong (for Delatte to lose his job)," he added, "but as long as the clerks are applying this rule uniformly, the only alternative I have is to say they're right."

Wyatt said the clerks have the strictest policy on dues of all but one other of the railway brotherhoods.

Delatte himself is a former union steward. He said that at one time he held 100 duesbooks for other men and kept their records straight.

Delatte said that when his friends on the Reading heard of his case, their reaction was:

"Not you, Casey. It was always your preaching, 'If you're working, pay your dues.' "

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I should like to present to the Senate the facts in this case.

Casey Delatte is 62 years old. He has been working for 38 years on the Reading Railroad. His record is unblemished. He has been a union member for more than 20 years. For several years he served as the union shop steward in his union, the AFL–CIO Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

The brotherhood has a compulsory membership contract with the railroad. Only union members can work. In recent years, Mr. Delatte has handed his monthly union dues to a fellow worker who lived close by the union office. The friend would pay both of their dues once a month, on his way home.

Last February 1, Casey Delatte received a terrible shock: The union secretary-treasurer notified him that he was expelled from the union. This meant loss of his job. His dues for December and January had not been paid.

Mr. Delatte explained to everyone concerned that he had, as usual, turned his dues over to his friend James Lawrence, a fellow railroader. Lawrence had in fact paid the dues. He said he had been delayed in paying Casey Delatte's dues for the 2 months in question because he was sick in bed. He had actually been 9 days later than the union rules permit. The records showed this to be the fact.

On March 12, nevertheless, the railroad company, acting upon the provisions of its compulsory unionism contract with the brotherhood, set into action the machinery for Casey Delatte's dismissal. His keys and annual pass were taken from him on April 24.

Mr. Delatte has field a court action. This and the wide publicity in newspapers may move the union to make an exception. However, if the union shop action is upheld by a court-appointed arbitrator, Casey Delatte will be fired officially. He has only 3 years to go before retirement. By being fired he will have lost a substantial portion of his pension.

Judson Swant, the union brotherhood's general chairman for the Reading Railroad employees, said:

> It's a matter of carrying out the requirements of the union shop agreement. We can't make exceptions in any case.

Harrison Wyatt, the railroad's director of personnel, said:

> The railroads do not like the union shop. But we have agreements with these organizations and we're required to live up to them.

Mr. President, this is compulsory unionism in action. This heartless exercise of monopoly control of jobs by a union and its violation of human rights—yes, civil rights—are the heart of the issue of voluntarism versus compulsion in union membership.

However, those who wish to perpetuate the tyranny of the majority over the minority, by prohibiting States from legislating against it, make an argument on economic grounds, too. The staffs of the international unions have long cried out in their propaganda releases that right-to-work laws depress wages and stifle economic progress in the States which have them. To meet the challenge of this attack, the National Right-to-Work Committee recently prepared a brochure based entirely on statistics published in reports of the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Right-to-Work Committee, I am told, did not initiate the debate on the economic effect of right-to-work laws. Their brochure was published as a means of replying to the union's charge that right-to-work laws hold back the economic progress of States which enact them. Since this brochure is the basis for renewed debate on the economics of right-to-work, I ask unanimous consent to have the brochure printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS: NEW JOBS, NEW WEALTH, NEW PROGRESS IN THE RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES DOCUMENTING, WITH U.S. GOVERNMENT STATISTICS, THE RECORD OF POCKETBOOK PROGRESS IN RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

The overriding benefit of right-to-work laws is the specific protection they spell out for individual freedom: declaring that union membership shall be voluntary, that no American shall be forced to join a union in order to hold the job of his choice.

This is but an enunciation of one of the fundamental civil rights guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Why then is it necessary to have such State laws?

Answer: Because, under another form of compulsory unionism—the closed shop (now outlawed)—some unions became so politically and financially powerful[1] that they forced into the Taft-Hartley Act a permission for "contracts" between union and the employer compelling all workers to join and support the union (sec. 7 and 8). The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes, however (sec. 14–b), the right of States to prohibit such contracts and to enforce the principle of voluntary unionism with right-to-work laws.

These right-to-work laws, spreading across the Nation, are destroying the monopoly economic powers of the Big Union hierarchy and, in time, will cut down their political powers and governmental influence to a proper level. For this reason the hierarchy is using its vast resources to prevent new right-to-work laws and repeal all present laws. Knowing the keen interest of all people in bettering their economic welfare—in a greater choice of jobs, more money in the pay envelope, higher per capita incomes, a brighter future—the propagandists for compulsory unionism distort, twist and falsify the economic record of progress under right-to-work laws in 19 States that have had the law in force.

This brochure is an accurate presentation of the true facts of economic progress in the right-to-work States. Its facts came officially from the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Commerce, on January 1, 1963. Confirmation of them can be easily secured by an inquiry to the departments.

These facts hold out a great promise to the people of the States that have not yet enacted a right-to-work law * * * the promise of right-to-work freedom guaranteed by State law, and the promise of a sound, wholesome and continuing betterment of their economic welfare.

Right-to-work States lead the rest of the Nation in the creation of new jobs in business and industry.

Among the 50 States, the leaders in the creation of new jobs: (1) Arizona; (2) Florida; (3) Nevada. All three are right-to-work States.

For the period 1953–61, rate of increase: Other States, 3.8 percent; right-to-work States, 14.6 percent.

Right-to-work States lead the nonright-to-work States in wage rate improvement in industrial jobs.

Among the 10 States in America having the highest percentage increase in hourly wages were 7 right-to-work States: (1) Florida; (2) Iowa; (4) Utah; (6) South Dakota; (7) Alabama; (9) North Dakota; (10) Nevada.[2]

Wage rate improvement, 1953–61: right-to-work States, 37.5 percent; States without right-to-work law, 33.3 percent.

The personal income of the people in right-to-work States is increasing more rapidly than in the other 31 States.

The low income States are showing the greatest strides forward, catching up with the higher income States, with wage rates for skilled workers only pennies apart. For instance, Arkansas has tripled its per capita income during the years it has had a right-to-work law and in the last 8 years has scored the greatest per capita gain in America.

Per capita income improvement, 1953–61: States without right-to-work law, 25.3 percent; right-to-work States, 30.2 percent.

Right-to-work States show a greater gain in capital expenditures for producing new wealth than the other States.

New wealth can come only from production of goods—the processing of raw material into something useful. Such new wealth is dynamic: it creates new manufacturing jobs, new industrial payrolls, new purchasing power, a rising degree of prosperity for all.

The two basic factors necessary to expanding a State's wealth are (1) an increasing capital expenditure, building new factories and new industrial expansions; and (2) expanding production of goods and services through such factories and processing plants. In both of these vital areas of progress, right-to-work States lead the Nation.

---

[1] Income of all unions today is reported by the U.S. Department of Labor to total approximately $1,500,000,000 a year.

[2] Nevada was shown to have the highest industrial wage paid anywhere in America.

Gain in capital expenditures,[3] 1954–59: right-to-work States, 29.7 percent; States without right-to-work law, 8.2 percent.

Value (wealth) added in manufacturing,[3] 1954–59: right-to-work States, 57.6 percent; States without right-to-work law, 34.3 percent.

The bank accounts of people in the right-to-work States are increasing more rapidly than in the nonright-to-work States.

Increase in total bank deposits, 1953–61: right-to-work States, 47.3 percent;[4] other States, 40.6 percent.

The rate of increase in retail sales in right-to-work States is outstripping the non-right-to-work States.

Increase in retail sales, 1954–58: right-to-work States, 20.8 percent;[5] other States, 16.5 percent.

New retail businesses are being established in right-to-work States at nearly three times the rate of the other States.

Increase in number of retail establishments, 1954–58: right-to-work States, 7.4 percent;[6] others, 2.7 percent.

Retail payrolls are growing faster in the 19 right-to-work States than in the 31 non-right-to-work States.

Growth in annual retail payrolls, 1954–58: Right-to-work States, 24.1 percent;[7] other States, 17.3 percent.

Roll call of right-to-work States: Arkansas, 1944; Florida, 1944; Arizona, 1946; Nebraska, 1946; Georgia, 1947; Iowa, 1947; North Carolina, 1947; South Dakota, 1947; Tennessee, 1947; Texas, 1947; Virginia, 1947; North Dakota, 1948; Nevada, 1952; Alabama, 1953; South Carolina, 1954; Mississippi, 1954; Utah, 1955; Indiana, 1957; Kansas, 1958.

Automobile population an indication of progress—is rising more rapidly in right-to-work States than in the other States.

Gain in motor vehicle registration, 1953–60: other States, 29 percent; right-to-work States, 34.8 percent.

The people population goes up in all the right-to-work States.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census reported on January 1, 1963, that populations of all 19 right-to-work States increased, July 1, 1961 to July 1, 1962.

ENRICHING THE WELFARE OF ALL CITIZENS—SAY THE GOVERNORS[8] OF RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

Texas: "The Texas right-to-work law has been important to the industrial development of this State."—Gov. Price Daniel, 1958–62.

"The right-to-work plank should be in the platform because a majority of the Democrats of Texas want it." (Note.—It was in the Republican platform, too.)—Gov. John A. Connally, 1962–64.

Indiana: "In the past 4 years Indiana has enjoyed the greatest industrial expansion in the history of the State. Many industrial firms have openly stated that one of their reasons for moving to Indiana or expanding their existing operations was on account of the right-to-work law."—Lt. Gov. Crawford F. Parker, 1957–61.

"The right-to-work law has the approval of thousands of union members who maintain that it makes the union leaders more responsive to the wishes of the membership and is a weapon by which corruption and racketeering can be curbed by the members themselves."—Gov. Harold W. Handley, 1957–61.

Arizona: "We are convinced that the right-to-work law has been an aid to us in our industrial development activities. In this regard, a great many companies, seeking plant locations in Arizona, have indicated the fact that we have a right-to-work law was materially helpful in allowing them to make a favorable decision."—Gov. Paul Fannin, 1959–65.

Florida: "I am pleased to note * * * that Florida's population growth, its industrial development, its personal income, and its job opportunities have been expanding faster than those of any other State in the Nation, and this has occurred while the State right-to-work law was in effect."—Gov. Farris Bryant, 1961–65.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the honesty of the statistical basis of the brochure can readily be confirmed by publications of the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. The brochure shows that on a percentage basis, the rate of improvement in the right-to-work States, using the accepted yardsticks of economic progress, is outstripping the rate of improvement in the States which have not yet enacted right-to-work laws.

The Senator from New Jersey, in his presentation to the Senate on May 15, gave currency to the charge of the union people that right-to-work laws have a deressing effect on the economy of the States that have them. In fact, the Senator himself made the charge. He stated:

> Georgia is by no means the only victim of the depressing effect of the so-called right-to-work law.

In his remarks on Georgia, the Senator cited an article published last April 30 in the Atlanta Constitution, the lead paragraph of which stated:

> Georgia's so-called right-to-work law may be crippling the State's economic progress.

The writer of the article is Jim Montgomery, of the newspaper's staff. The Senator from New Jersey suggested that in implying that the right-to-work law is hindering economic progress in Georgia, Mr. Montgomery was speaking for the newspaper itself. That may or may not be the case. The Constitution editorially has not, to my knowledge, advocated repeal of the Georgia law.

It is rather ironic, Mr. President, that on the very day when Mr. Montgomery published on page 32 of the Atlanta Constitution, his article bemoaning the depression into which the right-to-work law has projected the State of Georgia, there was published on the front page of the Constitution a news dispatch which the editors considered of high importance. I have the front-page item here. The headline reads as follows:

> Revenue up 5 percent in Georgia.

The lead paragraph of his front page article reads as follows:

> Georgia's economy has grown more than 5 percent during the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, the State revenue department believes.

It would seem, Mr. President, that Mr. Montgomery might well have checked with Mr. John Bearden, of the State Revenue Department of Georgia, who reports that Georgia's economy has progressed more rapidly than the national average—in the last 9-month period of record. The article on the front page of the Atlanta Constitution is a clear refutation of the whole substance of Mr. Montgomery's article printed on page 32. I ask unanimous consent that this front-page article be printed at this point in the Record, inasmuch as the Senator from New Jersey had Mr. Montgomery's page 32 article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Apr. 30, 1963]

REVENUE UP 5 PERCENT IN GEORGIA

Georgia's economy has grown more than 5 percent during the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, the State Revenue Department believes.

Its calculations are based primarily on the collection of motor fuel taxes—which it regards as more of an economic barometer than sales taxes, which fluctuate more.

The tax collections have increased 5.38 percent during the first three quarters of the fiscal year ending June 30.

Motor Fuel Tax Unit Director John Bearden said the increase also is attributable to more driving by the 1.7 million autos and trucks as expressways open up.

The gas tax collections are the steadiest barometer because they do not "fluctuate as rapidly as a result of seasonal buying and economic crises," Bearden said.

The gas taxes have doubled since 1950 as the State experienced its greatest growth. However, there also was an increase in the tax rate during that period.

Total collections for the first 9 months have climbed to $72,434,000, the Revenue Department said.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Montgomery's article makes note of the fact that he drew his conclusions in large part from a magazine article, which the Senator from New Jersey also inserted in the Record. The magazine article was written by Prof. Milton J. Nadworny. He is given a highly useful academic aura by being identified as the Professor of Commerce and Economics at the University of Vermont. Another of Professor Nadworny's connections should be noted, and in my opinion, this connection may to some extent dissipate the academic aura which lends prestige to his article. Dr. Nadworny is the Vermont State chairman for the National Council for Industrial Peace. This is the organization, with a two-man staff, that was set up years ago by the American Federation of Labor to propagandize against right-to-work laws and the right-to-work movement. Mr. John Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, has been its operating chief from its beginning. The Associated Press categorically established the fact that the so-called peace council is in fact a front for the AFL–CIO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record several items dealing with this organization.

---

[3] Indiana and Kansas not included; their right-to-work laws enacted 1957 and 1958 respectively.

[4] All right-to-work States included.

[5] Does not include Indiana and Kansas.

[6] Indiana and Kansas not included.

[7] Indiana and Kansas not included.

[8] These are typical of statements available from 24 Governors.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Star, July 30, 1958]

Right-to-Work Lines Shape Up—Small Business and the Unions Contribute to Respective Committees—Center on Six States—Eleanor Roosevelt Is Active in the Group Fighting on Labor's Side

WASHINGTON, July 30.—Business and labor are putting up the bulk of the money to finance the expensive campaigns for and against State right-to-work laws.

The laws, already in effect in 18 States, will be an issue on the ballot in at least five and probably six States in the November elections.

INTENT OF LAW

Such a law bars employers and labor unions from negotiating any labor contract arrangement requiring compulsory union membership of workers. Voters will ballot on the issue in November in California, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, and Kansas, and probably Ohio.

Heading the opposition to spreading right-to-work laws is the newly formed National Council for Industrial Peace, with Herbert Lehman, former Senator of New York, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as cochairmen. Jack Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, is its operating chief.

The main proponent organization is the National Right-to-Work Committee, with W. H. Harrison as executive secretary. Fred Hartley, former Representative, coauthor of the Taft-Hartley law, served for several years as chairman, but Harrison now says, "We've dropped him off our stationery."

Redding was reluctant to talk about financing of the opposition group.

"We've had contributions from individuals, from some management organizations and, in some instances, from international labor unions," he said. "We're not rich. We have a small staff and a small budget."

Redding operates from the office of Andrew Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL–CIO, which is fighting the right-to-work proposals tooth and nail.

FROM LABOR UNIONS

It is reliably reported that at least half the funds of Redding's organization comes direct from labor unions. The ban in the Taft-Hartley law against use of union dues, money for political purposes applies only to Federal issues and this exempts the State right-to-work fight.

Redding's group reportedly has a budget of $250,000.

Harrison says his right-to-work organization has no budget, but "just spends all the money we get; printing and distributing material.

Harrison says his group gets no money from the two big employer organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Nor does it get money, he said, from such big businesses as United States Steel, General Motors, or Ford.

"We don't have many takers from big business," Harrison said. "We get most of our money from small, family owned firms."

State organizations for and against right-to-work laws are associated with the two national groups, but operate largely on their own funds.

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, Nov. 10, 1959]

New Vermont Council Opposes Laws on Right To Work

Several Vermont political, educational, and church leaders linked to opposition to right to-work legislation Monday with formation of a Vermont Council for Industrial Peace.

Announcement of the council and its opposition to right-to-work laws was made by Dr. Milton J. Nadworny, University of Vermont economist.

Heading the list of signatures on a formal statement were the Most Reverend Robert F. Joyce, bishop of the Burlington Catholic diocese; Bishop Vedder Van Dyck of the Vermont Episcopal Diocese, and Rabbi Max B. Wall of Burlington.

Lt. Gov. Robert S. Babcock, Royce Pitkin, president of Goddard College, Plainfield, and State Senators Mildred Brault and Robert C. Spencer of Jericho also endorsed the statement.

Others associated with the statement included Howard Foster of Salisbury, Edward Peet of Cornwall and Frank Salhman of East Montpelier.

"While the Governor and the house of representatives clearly and emphatically rejected right-to-work legislation, it appears that its proponents intend to continue agitation for it," the group's statement said.

"The Vermont Council for Industrial Peace has been organized to provide a voice for those who would speak out against such legislation."

Formation of the council came less than a week after the Vermont Farm Bureau called for a referendum on the issue at the earliest possible general election.

A referendum proposal to put a "freedom of association" plan before Vermonters at town meeting was killed in the house last spring.

Nadworny said the newly formed committee is composed of citizens who do not purport to represent organizations.

The statement said:

"The major purpose of this committee is to oppose laws which would make the union shop illegal.

"We believe the union shop is beneficial to the process of collective bargaining, to employers and employees.

"However, we do not take the liberty even to recommend that employers and unions negotiate union shop agreements.

"We simply maintain that employers and employees be left free to negotiate on this matter under a free system of collective bargaining in a free society.

"The union shop is a matter for negotiation and comes into being when both the employer and the union agree to establish it.

"Just as we do not believe the union shop should be made mandatory for all employers and unions, so we do not believe it should be prohibited."

Right-to-work legislation is now in effect in 19 States.

It generally makes union shop contracts illegal. These provide that if management and labor agree, a worker is required to join the union within a specified time as a condition of employment.

News Release of the National Council for Industrial Peace, Washington, D.C.

Use of the Kansas right-to-work amendment against the National Farmers Organization was condemned today by the National Council for Industrial Peace.

John M. Redding, executive director of the NCIP, which opposes so-called right-to-work legislation, said:

"We have opposed this type legislation for this very reason. We have repeatedly warned that right to workers would use the law against farmers and that right to work committee members also opposed farmers' cooperatives, REA electric cooperatives, and credit unions through interlocking memberships in other ultraright organizations.

Yesterday, the National Farmer's Organization was threatened with action under the Kansas right-to-work amendment passed in 1958. L. E. Weiss, president of Kansans for the Right to Work, declared in Wichita that the NFO was in violation of the Kansas State constitution by virtue of a maintenance of membership provision in NFO recruiting blanks.

Mr. Weiss said farmers belonging to the NFO were acting like union goons in their efforts to get other farmers to join the farmer's market boycott.

Farm organizations in several States already alarmed by attacks by conservative groups on farm cooperatives were studying the Weiss statement. In Indiana, George Feldman, executive director of the Indiana Council for Industrial Peace in Indianapolis, Ind., said:

"We take a grave view of this development. We are studying the statement by Mr. Weiss and are asking our attorneys to advise us whether the Indiana right-to-work statute also would penalize farmers in this State. We have recognized that the same people who support so-called right-to-work laws also attack farmers' groups, but this is the first time the right-to-work law has been invoked against farmers, as far as we know."

In Vermont, Dr. Milton Nadworny, of the University of Vermont, chairman of the Vermont Council for Industrial Peace, said, "This is a development we have long expected. U.S. Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, warned the Vermont State Labor Council a year or so ago that:

"It (so-called right-to-work laws) would definitely pave the way for abolition of marketing orders for farmers. If labor is denied the right to organize effectively so can farmers be denied the right to organize themselves into farm cooperatives for bargaining purposes."

Leadership of the National Farmers' Union, which opposes the NFO on many issues, including the present boycott, said they were studying Mr. Weiss' statement. They have asked for legal opinion as to whether the Kansas RTW law could, in fact, be used against farmers.

"We are not for the NFO," said a spokesman, "but we certainly are against this type of shotgun utilization of what at best is a bad law."

Several months ago when the John Birch Society was under scrutiny in the Nation's press, leaders of Kansans for Right to Work were identified as members of that ultraright secret society.

Mr. GOLDWATER [reading]:

> Heading the opposition to spreading right-to-work laws is the newly formed National Council for Industrial Peace—

Says the Associated Press—

> with Herbert Lehman, former Senator of New York, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as cochairmen. Jack Redding, former publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, is its operating chief.

The AP continues:

> Redding operates from the office of Andrew Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL–CIO, which is fighting the right-to-work proposals tooth and nail.

I might say that this Associated Press dispatch is several years old. In the meantime, Mr. Redding has moved the office of the anti-right-to-work organization out of the AFL–CIO headquarters building and into the National Press Building. However, its ancestry established and the source of its operating funds has not changed, of course.

In citing these facts I am not challenging the integrity of Professor Nadworny, but it is important that the American public know the source of the magazine article which the Atlanta Constitution and other newspapers have accepted as an objective appraisal of the economics of right-to-work. The implication of the article and the conclusions being drawn from it place right-to-work in a distorted light. In fact, Mr. Montgomery calls Dr. Nadworny's article "The carefully documented indictment of right-to-work laws."

Let us take a careful look at this documented indictment.

In his effort to conceal the true facts about economic progress in right-to-work States, Professor Nadworny has resorted to statistical manipulations which do violence to his position as a university professor of economics. He purports to compare wage differentials between right-to-work States and the U.S. average, for the period from 1950 to 1962. In so doing, he is guilty of:

First. Incorrectly representing the Department of Labor's officially reported average of wage rates in right-to-work States for 1962.

Second. Including in the 1962 national average but not in the 1950 national average the unusually high wage rates of Alaska, thus artificially increasing his particular version of the 1962 wage differential on the side of nonright-to-work States.

Third. Totally ignoring the effect of 12 years of inflation, and erroneously implying that the value of 1962 dollars could be compared directly with the value of 1950 dollars.

Using Professor Nadworny's own selected indicators of 1962, but correcting the errors, the accurate figures would read, according to the U.S. Department of Labor:

Hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing

	U.S. Department of Labor figures, 1962	Professor Nadworny figures, 1962
U.S. average for 48 States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii)	2.32	2.39
Average for 19 right-to-work States	2.16	2.10

This means that the 1962 "differential" between right-to-work States and the U.S. average would actually be 16 cents rather than the 29 cents which is shown by Professor Nadworny's figures. Furthermore, if the 1962 differential is converted to the real value of 1950 dollars, it becomes 12.7 cents, which compares very favorably with the 21 cents differential that Professor Nadworny says was the difference between right-to-work States and the U.S. average in 1950.

Even Professor Nadworny admits, however, that Labor Department reports on State wage rate averages were incomplete prior to 1952. Therefore, rejecting all the contrived comparisons offered by the professor, I believe that the only fair and strictly comparable data are those compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor beginning in 1953 and published annually in what is now called "Employment and Earnings, Annual Supplement Issue."

These reports show that in 1953 wage rates in the 19 right-to-work States averaged $1.52 compared with an average of $1.77 for 29 nonright-to-work States.

Labor Department figures for 1962—not yet published but available to the public—reveal that wage rates in the same 19 right-to-work States had risen to $2.16, compared to $2.42 in the 29 nonright-to-work States excluding Alaska and Hawaii. This means that wage rates in right-to-work States in 1953 were 85.9 percent of wage rates in nonright-to-work States. Figures for 1962 show that right-to-work States had risen to a level of 89.3 percent of the wage rates in nonright-to-work States. The 1962 wage differential, measured in real—noninflated—dollars, was actually far less than the 1953 differential.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD documenting U.S. Department of Labor tables.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gross earnings of production workers in manufacturing, percent increase, 1953–62

State	1953 rate	1958 rate (old base)	1958 rate (new base)	1962 rate	Total gain (hourly)	Percent gain (hourly)	State	1953 rate	1958 rate (old base)	1958 rate (new base)	1962 rate	Total gain (hourly)	Percent gain (hourly)
Alabama[1]	$1.39	$1.81	$1.82	$2.06	$0.66	47.5	Nebraska[1]	$1.57	$1.94	$1.93	$2.20	$0.64	40.8
Arizona[1]	1.88	2.31	2.30	2.57	.70	37.2	Nevada[1]	2.08	2.62	2.60	3.02	.96	46.2
Arkansas[1]	1.21	1.48	1.49	1.66	.44	36.4	New Hampshire	1.42	1.64	1.65	1.88	.45	31.7
California	1.97	2.43	2.44	2.79	.81	41.1	New Jersey	1.82	2.21	2.20	2.51	.70	38.5
Colorado	1.74	2.25	2.24	2.61	.88	50.6	New Mexico	1.80	2.19	2.01	2.20	.58	32.2
Connecticut	1.77	2.16	2.16	2.46	.69	39.0	New York	1.79	2.16	2.16	2.44	.65	36.3
Delaware	1.73	2.15	2.14	2.41	.69	39.9	North Carolina[1]	1.23	1.45	1.45	1.64	.41	33.3
Florida[1]	1.31	1.70	1.70	1.99	.68	51.9	North Dakota[1]	1.48	1.89	1.90	2.14	.65	43.9
Georgia[1]	1.26	1.54	1.55	1.77	.50	39.7	Ohio	1.95	2.40	2.40	2.76	.81	41.5
Idaho	1.87	2.12	2.09	2.34	.50	26.7	Oklahoma	1.69	2.04	2.03	2.19	.51	30.2
Illinois	1.86	2.28	2.28	2.60	.74	39.8	Oregon	2.12	2.40	2.41	2.64	.51	24.1
Indiana[1]	1.89	2.34	2.34	2.65	.76	40.2	Pennsylvania	1.77	2.15	2.15	2.41	.64	36.2
Iowa	1.69	2.17	2.16	2.53	.85	50.3	Rhode Island	1.52	1.76	1.75	2.02	.51	33.6
Kansas[1]	1.79	2.21	2.21	2.52	.73	40.8	South Carolina[1]	1.24	1.45	1.45	1.68	.44	35.5
Kentucky	1.62	1.99	1.98	2.27	.66	40.7	South Dakota[1]	1.47	1.89	1.86	2.17	.73	49.7
Louisiana	1.53	2.02	2.02	2.29	.76	49.7	Tennessee[1]	1.40	1.71	1.71	1.93	.53	37.9
Maine	1.40	1.65	1.65	1.89	.49	35.0	Texas[1]	1.68	2.08	2.09	2.32	.63	37.5
Maryland	1.66	2.13	2.13	2.40	.74	44.6	Utah[1]	1.79	2.30	2.29	2.66	.88	49.2
Massachusetts	1.65	1.95	1.95	2.24	.59	35.8	Vermont	1.46	1.70	1.71	1.96	.49	35.6
Michigan	2.09	2.52	2.52	2.91	.82	39.2	Virginia[1]	1.40	1.65	1.65	1.91	.51	36.4
Minnesota	1.76	2.18	2.19	2.52	.75	42.6	Washington	2.04	2.43	2.43	2.81	.77	37.7
Mississippi[1]	1.14	1.51	1.51	1.64	.50	43.9	West Virginia	1.78	2.24	2.25	2.55	.76	42.7
Missouri	1.69	2.07	2.08	2.38	.68	40.2	Wisconsin	1.78	2.17	2.17	2.51	.73	41.0
Montana	1.93	2.29	2.30	2.58	.64	33.2	Wyoming	1.99	2.39	2.37	2.61	.64	32.2

[1] Right-to-work States.

Average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing, 1953–62

	1953	1958	1958	1962	Total gain	Percent gain
Average, right-to-work States	$1.52	$1.90	$1.90	$2.16	$0.64	42.0
Average, non-right-to-work States	1.77	2.14	2.13	2.42	.66	37.6
National average	1.67	2.05	2.03	2.32	.65	39.4

Source: 1953–58 figures (old base): Employment and Earnings Annual Supplement, May 1959. 1958 figures (new base): Employment and Earnings Annual Supplement, November 1962 figures: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for those who, at this point, may have become totally confused in a sea of statistics, I think the air can best be cleared and the situation summarized by placing in the RECORD the latest report from the Department of Commerce, which gives the average rate of economic progress for persons in each of the 50 States, for the 5-year period ending in 1962. This table shows that income of persons in nonfarm employment has increased at a national average rate of 20 percent. Fifteen of the 19 right-to-work States are shown to have exceeded the national average rate of improvement. The average percentage rate of improvement in right-to-work States was 32 percent, compared with the national average of 20 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two items—the reproduction of the U.S. Department of Commerce report to which I have just referred, and a sheet recapitulating the percentage improvement in each of the right-to-work States.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 3.—*Percent changes in industrial sources of personal income, by States and regions, 1957–62* [1]

[From the Survey of Current Business, April 1963, vol. 43, No. 4, U.S. Department of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, Secretary]

State and region	Broad industrial sources of income						Income received by persons for participation in current production								
	Total personal income	Farm income	Nonfarm income	Government income disbursements			Private nonfarm income	All private nonfarm industries	Mining	Construction	Manufacturing	Wholesale and retail trade	Finance, insurance and real estate	Transportation, communication and public utilities	Services
				Total	Federal	State and local									
United States	25	10	26	46	43	52	21	20	−13	13	16	20	35	12	37
New England	25	−18	26	46	47	45	22	21	4	6	17	21	31	15	43
Maine	20	−13	21	43	36	59	16	15	5	3	15	10	28	10	35
New Hampshire	32	−29	33	51	52	50	29	28	0	26	25	24	29	16	54
Vermont	25	−13	29	45	34	62	25	23	19	27	18	23	28	9	46
Massachusetts	26	−18	26	48	54	39	22	23	−3	9	17	22	31	14	47
Rhode Island	22	−11	22	31	24	46	19	19	17	21	13	18	28	18	38
Connecticut	24	−23	25	49	46	53	22	20	7	−4	18	22	32	18	36
Mideast	22	−8	23	45	43	48	19	17	−31	14	10	18	31	11	35
New York	24	−16	24	43	43	44	21	19	−5	23	11	18	34	10	32
New Jersey	26	−11	27	49	45	55	23	23	−10	16	17	25	26	22	43
Pennsylvania	15	−5	15	43	40	47	10	8	−37	−5	6	10	24	4	30
Delaware	20	29	19	46	40	55	16	16	0	2	13	21	31	13	37
Maryland	33	18	33	58	53	74	27	26	23	18	10	32	42	20	57
District of Columbia	27	0	27	39	38	40	18	15	0	37	3	1	14	−5	30
Great Lakes	18	7	18	48	45	50	14	11	−6	−8	9	13	28	9	27
Michigan	13	−1	14	45	43	46	9	6	−15	−16	5	6	22	6	21
Ohio	15	6	16	46	43	50	11	9	−1	−19	6	12	29	9	28
Indiana	20	18	21	45	44	47	17	15	2	−11	16	12	34	9	31
Illinois	20	8	20	51	49	54	16	14	−7	2	10	16	29	9	27
Wisconsin	24	3	26	51	47	55	22	20	−3	13	19	16	26	17	35
Plains	25	7	28	45	43	47	24	22	−11	25	21	19	34	11	36
Minnesota	26	2	28	50	43	58	23	21	−18	11	25	17	33	9	39
Iowa	20	−17	29	45	43	48	26	22	22	10	24	18	33	11	37
Missouri	24	9	25	43	47	37	22	19	−8	20	18	16	32	12	30
North Dakota	52	104	36	67	76	57	25	23	−9	29	14	16	57	5	53
South Dakota	35	12	45	36	33	41	48	48	6	117	49	29	43	47	45
Nebraska	27	−9	35	43	44	43	33	32	20	67	35	26	35	12	42
Kansas	25	50	23	39	35	47	19	17	−17	28	10	19	33	4	37
Southeast	29	21	29	45	40	54	25	24	−20	12	29	22	43	13	36
Virginia	31	21	31	36	31	56	30	30	−11	31	34	28	39	9	46
West Virginia	5	−29	6	49	52	44	−2	−5	−38	−35	13	1	17	1	18
Kentucky	25	30	25	52	45	66	17	16	−22	36	20	13	29	1	29
Tennessee	25	4	27	41	36	51	23	23	−11	27	27	13	42	11	33
North Carolina	35	29	36	52	44	67	32	33	26	30	34	26	51	27	42
South Carolina	31	9	33	34	32	40	32	33	24	32	36	21	47	17	47
Georgia	29	−1	31	42	39	49	28	27	26	23	26	24	45	24	30
Florida	40	25	41	59	50	77	37	36	13	1	71	34	56	20	39
Alabama	23	4	24	43	44	40	18	16	−24	−10	15	19	31	11	36
Mississippi	36	38	36	50	48	54	31	31	25	41	40	21	54	16	31
Louisiana	17	23	17	39	40	37	11	8	−3	−19	8	12	32	5	26
Arkansas	36	49	34	39	36	46	31	33	−24	52	46	24	47	17	41
Southwest	27	21	28	42	35	53	24	22	−3	20	19	23	42	16	40
Oklahoma	25	30	25	38	39	35	21	18	−4	25	14	18	41	14	33
Texas	24	22	24	41	33	54	20	19	−6	11	16	21	36	15	33
New Mexico	33	11	34	40	31	56	32	30	9	13	39	30	53	18	49
Arizona	55	16	59	62	48	86	59	59	15	80	55	48	85	30	91
Rocky Mountain	30	2	33	46	42	52	29	28	−15	30	44	26	44	11	46
Montana	23	27	22	52	57	45	14	8	−42	44	21	3	29	0	24
Idaho	25	3	30	48	50	47	24	25	−20	37	31	21	37	9	42
Wyoming	22	−6	26	33	20	54	24	22	12	39	−5	32	42	10	31
Colorado	33	−19	36	44	39	53	34	35	−13	21	50	31	51	17	57
Utah	35	−12	38	48	44	58	35	34	−8	33	65	32	44	11	43
Far West	35	5	37	54	47	64	32	33	−1	30	30	31	42	17	51
Washington	27	−3	29	35	31	41	27	27	4	14	32	24	39	12	36
Oregon	27	−1	29	47	44	50	25	23	10	27	22	21	37	10	32
Nevada	65	−18	68	49	37	71	73	77	−8	98	19	56	106	40	117
California	37	7	38	59	51	70	33	34	−1	31	31	33	42	18	52
Alaska	20	0	20	9	−3	110	31	31	14	−39	44	34	81	98	88
Hawaii	45	1	49	34	31	46	60	62	−40	93	58	54	116	29	71

[1] For analytical purposes Alaska and Hawaii included in 1957 totals.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

FACTS OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES AND IN THE NATION AS A WHOLE

(Documentation: Survey of Current Business, vol. 43, No. 4, Apr. 1963, U.S. Department of Commerce)

PERTINENT FACTS

Workers in business and industry in 15 of the 19 right-to-work States are enjoying greater gains in income than the average for the Nation as a whole.

In the 5-year period, 1957–62 the average improvement in personal income (wages) for the 50 States: 20 percent.

Improvement in the right-to-work States individually:

	Percent
Nevada	77
Arizona	59
South Dakota	48
Florida	36
Utah	34
South Carolina	33
North Carolina	33
Arkansas	33
Nebraska	32

Improvement in the right-to-work States individually—Continued

	Percent
Mississippi	31
Virginia	30
Georgia	27
Tennessee	23
North Dakota	23
Iowa	22
Texas	19
Kansas	17
Alabama	16
Indiana	15
Average of 19 right-to-work States	32

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in closing, may I emphasize again that economic progress is not the primary yardstick with which right-to-work supporters all over America wish to measure the issue of voluntary versus compulsory union membership.

Whenever anyone tries to sell the idea of right-to-work or voluntary unionism and attempts to do it on an economic basis, he is invariably defeated. The issue to me is strictly one of individual freedom. It is one based upon constitutional and moral grounds. Therefore I think the most important yardstick is the measurement of individual freedom.

Today under congressional-made law, the individual American citizen has half his freedom at the place where he earns his livelihood. He is free to join a union if he so desires. The other half of his freedom at the place where he works has been denied him in a moment of default by the U.S. Congress. He can be forced to join a union against his will—or be fired from his job. This violates the very essence of human freedom and civil rights. This is where the right-to-work principle is brought to bear—in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations

Act. Under this section, States may safeguard the individual liberty that Congress in 1947 shortsightedly placed in jeopardy. They can do it with right-to-work legislation. Twenty of them have done it; the most recent, Wyoming, just this year. As Gov. Clifford P. Hansen, of Wyoming, said when he signed the right-to-work bill last February:

> The crux of the issue is that the measure is designed to restore full freedom of choice to the working men and women of Wyoming. It guarantees anew one of the most important hallmarks of American liberty and citizenship—the right of individual decisionmaking.

Mr. President, let us here in the Senate of the United States not confuse the issue in the right-to-work debate. Governor Hansen has spoken the issue. It is the simple issue that brought the creation of this legislative body: the right of individual decisionmaking. We are constituted to protect it. Let us count this our primary duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before yielding the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I regret that I had to be in and out of the Chamber during the Senator's analysis of my proposed legislation designed to repeal 14(b), the source of the so-called right-to-work laws that now exist in some States. On the question of individual freedom, I should like to point out that I come from a State which has not elected to enact so-called right-to-work legislation. In my State the government has not injected itself into the freedom of employees to vote for a union and the freedom of employers and employees to agree to a union shop.

I assume that in a State such as Arizona, if there is a union and if the employer and the employees freely elect to adopt a union shop—probably after negotiation and bargaining—they are prohibited from having a union shop by the government; is that not true?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is true. In the nearly 20 years this has existed as a constitutional amendment our whole union picture has improved. There are very few strikes. Labor leaders have become much more responsible, because they recognize that with the right to exercise the power of individual freedom a man can be more outspoken than if he were bound by a union shop contract.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am certain that the Senator dealt with the question of the employee—when there is a union and the union is the bargaining agent—getting the benefits of the union's work in negotiation and collective bargaining but not paying any of the expenses of the union.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We call this the "free rider." It was the Senator's suggestion, I think, that every man should have the right to decide whether he would get a benefit from or be disadvantaged by the union.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator raised the question of "free riders." This has been a shibboleth used by organized labor ever since the beginning of right-to-work laws. This to me is one of the great sources of union power that is sometimes abused. This is exclusive representation, when 49 percent of the workers may not wish to join the union for various personal reasons. They may not like the politics of the union. They may not like the leaders of the union. They may not like the place where the union meets.

Under the right of association, in my opinion, these men have a right not to join the union, even though they might be, as the Senator calls them, "free riders."

This is true all through our society. I believe the Senator is a lawyer. Probably he belongs to the American Bar Association, but he does not have to belong to the association. I happen to have been a merchant in my earlier days. I belonged to the National Retail Merchants' Association. Many of my competitors did not. It used to "burn me up" to have to pay my dues and to see them receive the benefits. But I think this is their right.

It is the right of a workingman not to join a union if he does not wish to join. This is the real "guts" of the debate. It is a matter of individual freedom whether a man has to do something or does not.

I point out that churches, the Red Cross, the YMCA, the YWCA, and other such organizations benefit the whole country, yet many Americans refuse to support these institutions.

I cannot agree with the "free-rider" argument, because it is a freedom of choice that a man is, as called, "a free rider."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The analogy, of course, is not precise when one does not join a voluntary association, one does not receive the benefits of that association, but the nonunion worker does receive the precise benefits of the union. We all have freedom to elect our governing officials in the executive branch. Slightly more than 50 percent of the voters made the decision that we should have as our President for 4 years Mr. Kennedy. Because of the sanctity of the ballot box, I do not know how the Senator from Arizona voted at that election.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has a good idea.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would speculate that the Senator from Arizona did not join the popular choice, but I am sure the Senator is paying taxes along with the winners. The losers, too, pay the cost of this Government, which benefits all citizens.

In our democratic process we accept defeat and pull our oar with the others, even though we do not like the direction given the boat by the coxswain.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The comparison the Senator is using is a rather foolish one, because the only compulsory thing in our lives is service to our country under its laws. Unless we have religious objections we must serve in times of war, and we must pay our taxes. These are compulsory acts which all Americans recognize.

What I am talking about is the extension of compulsion into the field of labor, so that a man may be forced against his will to join a union when a union shop exists after proper bargaining. This is the basis of the whole debate.

I point out to my friend from New Jersey that the United States is one of only four countries in the whole world which have compulsory features in labor laws. We specifically have it. Three others, including England, have the compulsory feature by reason of lack of reference.

It is interesting to note that the countries in which the labor movement has reached its greatest peak—namely, the Scandinavian countries, where 94 percent of the workers belong to unions—prohibit any form of compulsory unionism.

In this country only 31 or 32 percent of the working force belong to unions. The percentage has remained at this figure for many years. I personally do not think it is high enough, but the percentage remains the same in the industrial States without right-to-work laws. It has actually improved somewhat in the States with right-to-work laws.

If I were a workingman, the first thing I would wish to do would be to join a union. On the other hand, if I did not wish to do so I would like to have the right to say "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have only one further observation. We enjoy the liberty of disagreeing on this issue, and we shall continue to disagree. This is not a matter of Democrats believing one thing and Republicans believing another.

I was very much impressed by a news clipping—I do not have the speech—dealing with a speech by a former distinguished Governor of a State which has right-to-work legislation. It was reported in yesterday's Washington Post under the headline "Right-to-Work Laws Are Attacked by Landon."

The article relates to expressions by former Governor of Kansas Alf M. Landon. The news clipping says that he—

> lashed out at so-called right-to-work laws and asked for a better American understanding of the workingman.

He also called the right-to-work laws bad, punitive, and a burden on labor in 20 States.

In addressing himself to the argument as to whether the right-to-work laws would improve labor-management relations and industrial development in a given State, he said:

> Gov. John Anderson in a report to the legislature recently revealed that Kansas has lost nearly 15,000 jobs of production workers in manufacturing in the years since the so-called right-to-work law went into effect.

He also observed that these laws—

> actually bar progress in good labor relations and industrial development.

I wanted to have this in the RECORD, because Governor Landon knows about right-to-work laws in operation. He was the Governor of a State which has such a law. I have never been a Governor of, nor lived in a State with a so-called right-to-work law.

I think that is competent evidence to put in the RECORD and the debate at this point.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I read the article to which the Senator has referred. The 15,000 people who lost their jobs in Kansas lost them because of the shutdown of the B–52 line in Wichita. That involved a union shop, and not a right-to-work law. The 15,000 men—or at least a great number of them—were already organized, and they lost their jobs chiefly because the U.S. Air Force, through the Secretary of Defense, stopped buying this particular airplane.

I would not be surprised in the next year or two to see an increase in right-to-work laws. I have found from my study of this problem that it helps labor-management relations.

My observation has been that it has helped the relations between management and the workers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Again, I hesitate to discuss it with authority, but if there is a disagreement, the Senator's fundamental disagreement is with Governor Landon. Perhaps the Senator should pursue the argument with that gentleman.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He was a Governor a good many years before the right-to-work law was enacted. I do not like the words "right to work." "Voluntary unionism" is a much better term. If we think of the right to work as a civil right, nobody has a right to a job. He has the civil liberty to seek a job. "Right to work" is a misnomer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree with that point. Perhaps a more appropriate name for the State laws would be "compulsory open shop."

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, merely "voluntary unionism." Put it on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We cannot agree on much.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would never vote for a so-called national right-to-work law. I think the States have the fundamental right to pass such laws. We recognize it in 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I find myself in the unusually good company of a former Republican candidate for the Presidency and, of course, the very respected, beloved former Senator Robert Taft, the author of the major bill, who later called the men who were enjoying the benefits of the union, while not joining, "free riders."

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suppose they could be called that. It must be recognized that there are free riders in every branch of our society. We have them in the Senate—for example, those who do not attend committees and let others do the work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are so many committees that it is impossible to attend all of them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not being critical; I am merely saying that we cannot find a segment of our society where someone is not taking a free ride. We do not like it, but we should not force the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment about the discussion which has just taken place about free riders. It is contended that a worker who believes the course followed by the union is not in his general interest or in the general interest of the Nation still must belong to the union if a majority of workers so decide.

The argument is made that, since he gets the benefit of what the union does, he ought to pay a share of the cost of operating the union. But I pose this question: Why should we ascribe to union leaders infallible judgment with respect to what they demand for the benefit of the workers in general or for the benefit of the country? When labor leaders continue to pump up prices, removing the United States from a position of competitive advantage in selling goods throughout the world, is that course helpful to the worker? Is it helpful to the security of the Nation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say——

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will permit me to continue, I should like to do so. I thought he had yielded the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I had. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me finish my thought. The Senator from Arizona made the statement that there may be various reasons why the worker does not want to belong to a union. I agree with that statement. But before we argue the benefits that are derived from compulsory membership, we ought to have a clearly outlined definition of what the benefits are. It may be that what the union is doing will kill the industry, kill the job, place the country in an embarrassing fiscal position, endanger our balance of credits in international trade, and many other things. So when it is argued, prima facie and ipso facto, that what the union does is for the benefit of the worker and the benefit of the country, I cannot agree. I venture to say that there are thousands of clear-minded workers who realize that what is happening will destroy the jobs they hold.

A group of workers belonging to a union in Cincinnati came to me. They had learned that their employer was moving out of the city. The employer said to the union leaders, "We cannot meet your demands and survive." The union said, "We want these demands met with respect to working conditions and wages." The employer said, "I cannot meet them." The union leaders insisted that their proposals be accepted. The employer decided to move out of Cincinnati.

The question comes back: Did the union act for the benefit of the workers?

The workers told me they were never informed by the union leaders that the company said it would move out of the city. The workers did not learn of it until after the decision was made to move from the State. I repeat, it cannot be said that everything the union leader achieves is beneficial to the worker.

Now I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We have had much evidence that some of the decisions of the labor leaders have not benefited the workers. I am thinking of the plight of the coal miners, for example, in West Virginia, who have been put out of work by automation brought on by cheaper fuel in the form of gas and oil which were introduced into the eastern portion of the country as a result of the high hourly wages in the coal-mining industry brought on by bargaining.

This is what bothers me with respect to the word "right." If a group of persons organize and form a union and then select a president, I do not think the Government should intrude itself constantly into every decision made by them officially. I have been preparing legislation to provide that in the matter of contracts or settlement offers, the decision should be by vote of the union membership. I think it would be the better part of judgment for any union leader who was contemplating bargaining to sit down and say, "We are thinking of proposing this kind of increase," and letting the men decide for themselves what it should be and advise the leader. This is done in many unions. Well conducted unions do it. I am thinking of the man in West Virginia who said, "I would rather be working for a dollar and a half an hour than be out of work at $3.50 an hour," when a union drove a steel company out of the State.

The Senator has brought a very important point to the attention of the Senate. Not all decisions made by the heads of unions, or, for that matter, those made by the heads of government or the heads of banks or other organizations, are infallible. That is why we, as elected officials, go back to the people, to find out what they are thinking of. We do not want to propose things that will cause them to be unhappy.

I believe that union leaders should be sensitive to anything in the area of wage increases. I agree that some of the wage increases which have been granted since the war have put us in a disadvantageous position with respect to world trade and competition. It has brought in automation. I have used the argument all the way through, that whenever an unearned wage increase is paid, the price is forced up. Any businessman who has any sense knows that if his workers are earning more money, they should be paid more, without any argument.

I suggest that the Senator from Ohio study the bill I have introduced, which includes a provision that there be a strike vote, and a settlement vote, once a strike has been started.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I believe we are faced with the ugly specter of the Federal Government attempting to procure compulsory union membership. About 3 months ago the administration, by its own statement, said that unless some aircraft companies on the west coast adopted compulsory union membership, they would likely suffer the loss of governmental assignments in the way of business. To me that was frightening. The proposal to enact a Federal law that would prevent the States from adopting provisions against closed shops is another evidence that there are those who believe that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have all the brains and possess perfect judgments; that we ascribe to ourselves the idea that we know all and that State legislators know nothing; and that out of Washington comes all wisdom and all ability to achieve social reforms, and especially government for the people.

I cannot subscribe to that theory. I cannot do so because I know that in Congress we are motivated by the same political objectives that motivate the trustee, the city councilman, and the State legislator.

Each year, before election, programs are sponsored for the protection of voters; and the conspicuous aspects of such proposals is the quest for votes, rather than the objective of trying to serve the country.

This afternoon and tomorrow Senators will be voting on what are known as migratory labor laws. To me this is another effort of the Federal Government, through Congress, to impose its judgment on the States and local communities. The proposals contained in the several bills upon which action will be taken, from the standpoint of dollars expended, are inconsequential and seemingly innocuous. However, they are merely the beginning of a program that will expand each year. We entered this field in a limited way either last year or the year before. I have read the reports dealing with the several migrant labor bills which will be before the Senate for consideration today and tomorrow. Throughout them there appears the foreboding that this is merely the beginning. One of the bills provides for grants to subsidize educational programs in the States for migrant workers.

Another bill provides for grants for day care services for the children of migrant workers.

Still another bill provides for grants for sanitation facilities on the farm for migrant workers. Another bill provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Council to give to Congress and, I suppose, to the President, advice on what course of conduct the Federal Government should follow to help solve the migrant workers' problems.

Primarily, the object is to spend Federal money. My inquiry is this: If these things are to be done, why should we assume that the Federal Government ought to do them, and not the States? Why have not the States done such things? We get back to the argument that the Federal Government knows what ought to be done. If it is argued that the States do not have the money, and the Federal Government does have the money, I point out that this year our deficit will be $8 billion; next year it will be $10 billion; the following year it will be another $10 billion; in 1966 it will be another $10 billion.

Our gold reserves are being withdrawn. The word was current that our position was improving. Figures now show that the dwindling of gold reserves in fiscal year 1963 will be worse than it was in 1962.

I will vote against these bills, except one, and that is the bill that would require agents in the assignment of migrant workers to register in Washington. I will cast my vote against the other bills, because I believe these problems can be handled by the States and should not be handled by the Federal Government. The problems confront the States, and they are best able to handle them.

In the northwestern corner of my State of Ohio, migrant workers are employed. They can handle this problem without Federal aid. We get back to the proposition that the Federal Government wants to put its fingers into everything it can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I need not tell the Senator from Ohio that I am always very much impressed with the position he takes on any issue before the Senate. I do not always join him in his conclusion; but I find myself concerned about the present status of our economy. The Senator from Ohio just finished with what I thought was a very provocative discussion of our gold balance, and has announced his position with respect to the bills which will be under consideration. I wonder if the Senator would join with me in my opposition to a Federal expenditure that far exceeds by many times any of our domestic expenditures; namely, the expenditure for our giveaway foreign aid program, particularly with relation to NATO; and if I could count on the Senator from Ohio joining with me in refusing to vote for any more funds for NATO until our NATO allies decide to assume their reasonable share of the cost of protecting freedom around the world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I welcome the question asked by the Senator from Oregon. I am glad to state that I have adopted clearly defined principles with respect to how I shall approach the foreign aid program. First, I shall oppose the granting of aid to any country having a Communist form of government.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Second, I shall oppose the granting of aid to any country that tells the United States that unless we give it aid, it will move into the Soviet camp.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Third, I shall insist that there be developed a more efficient program in the administration of foreign aid.

Mr. MORSE. I share that view, also.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Those are the three basic principles that will guide me. I have voted for reductions in foreign aid. I agree with the Clay report that was recently made. However, I am somewhat doubtful now because I fear that the attitude of General Clay has become a little softened and that he may abandon his proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Ohio share my view that the Clay report did not go far enough?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall further oppose the granting of aid by way of grants to countries that want to establish government-operated steel plants, aluminum plants, and other manufacturers. I wish the Clay report had gone further.

I cannot say that I will join fully with the Senator from Oregon in the views which he has expressed. I have heard his arguments in the Committee on Foreign Relations. No graver problem confronts us than that of getting our international credits and debits in balance. That is one way to do it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio. At least he has not yet slammed the door in my face. He still gives me some hope that he will support me in voting against the expenditure of a single dollar for the benefit of a single NATO country unless that country starts to cooperate with us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall be glad to hear what the Senator from Oregon will have to say on that subject.

In conclusion, it must be 8 years, perhaps 10 years, since, as Governor of Ohio, I gave recognition to the migrant labor problem. We proceeded to achieve the things that are sought to be done by Congress now. I regret to say that some of the principal proponents of Federal solutions have failed to take action in their own States to try to solve the problem.

My views have been expressed. I shall vote in accordance with the declaration which I have made.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED BY BROADCAST PIONEERS TO REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 6, 1963, at the International Inn, Washington, D.C., a special citation was presented by the Broadcast Pioneers in an elaborate ceremony to Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The Broadcast Pioneers is an organization founded by veteran news commentator, H. V. Kaltenborn. Gen. David Sarnoff is honorary president, Mr. Ward L. Quaal, WGN, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., is president. It is a national organization including a membership of those who have been active in radio broadcasting for 20 years and television for 10 years or longer.

Mr. Frank U. Fletcher, a Washington attorney, is chairman of the District of Columbia chapter of Broadcast Pioneers and presided at the luncheon on the occasion of the award to Mr. HARRIS. Over 300 attended the luncheon, including several Members of Congress and of Mr. HARRIS's committee.

I was privileged to attend the luncheon. I rejoice in the conferral of this honor upon my Representative. It is a recognition which he richly deserves. I applaud Broadcast Pioneers for having made this presentation to him.

The award to Mr. HARRIS in tribute to his contribution to the broadcasting industry was made by Mr. Quaal. The special citation was made by Mr. Paul W. Morency, chairman of the awards committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks made by Mr. Quaal and Mr. Morency, together with the citation presented to Representative Harris and his response thereto.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Mr. Ward L. Quaal, President, Broadcast Pioneers

Stanza I of "The Elephant's Child," by Rudyard Kipling, states: "I keep six honest serving men (they taught me all I knew); Their names are What and Why and When and How and Where and Who."

Mr. Kipling could have been writing about the gentleman to whom we pay tribute today, the Honorable Oren Harris, Member of the Congress from the Fourth District of Arkansas and chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is the committee, as all of us here know (some with poignancy, some with remorse and some with delight) which is responsible for the origination of legislation governing the American system of broadcasting. And this man is the Governor of those Governors.

In the hearing room in the New House Office Building where much of the testimony in this committee's inquiries is taken, there hangs at the back of the room an oil portrait of the Congressman. It was dedicated February 9, 1960. It is so located that if a witness looks over his shoulder to avoid the stern visage of Chairman Harris who is before him, he will be staring at a benign and smiling copy of the original.

When that portrait was dedicated, the principal speaker was Mr. Harris' colleague, Congressman John Bell Williams, of Mississippi. I would like to quote two paragraphs from his speech on that occasion:

"Very few people here, I am sure, have ever heard of Bingen, Ark. If so, it doesn't matter anyway, because Mr. Harris was not born in Bingen; he was born in Belton, a few miles out in the country from Bingen. Bingen, in turn, is about 10 miles out in the country from a place called McCaskill, and McCaskill is out in the country from a town named Nashville, where the nearest railroad station is located.

"Belton, Ark., consists mainly of a general store. Its chief industry is a blacksmith shop and gristmill. It is a thriving little community, with a population of some 15 people, 4 or 5 coon hounds, a couple of milk cows, and innumerable chickens and hogs. Well, Oren wasn't exactly born right in Belton, he was born about 4 miles out in the country from Belton. He was raised so far back in the country he can look at the size of a coon track and tell how much its hide would bring on the market in St. Louis, Mo."

As you can deduce from this, Mr. Harris is indeed an uncommon man. One of his uncommon virtues in these days of intrigue is a fervent devotion to the truth. He is accustomed to the slings and arrows that beset one so engaged. We of the Pioneers feel that he merits the applause and praise of some of those he oversees by reason of the fact that in that search for truth he has always and constantly demonstrated fairness.

He has always besought both sides of the story, and in this process, also, he has been a constant defender of free broadcasting, despite the fact that at times he may have seemed puzzled and querulous about the manner in which some broadcasters belabor this free opportunity.

It is a pleasure today to pay special tribute to the Honorable Oren Harris through some small recognition which we trust he will keep before him as an evidence of our good will and affection, even though he may not have it framed and displayed in the aforementioned hearing room.

Remarks by Paul Morency, Chairman, Awards Committee

Special citation to Hon. Oren Harris, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

For his firm and fair leadership as chairman of the committee of the House of Representatives which develops legislation governing America's system of free broadcasting; for his devotion, often expressed and demonstrated, to the idea that broadcasting in this Nation should be free; and for his constant and unwavering loyalty to the citizens of this Nation who are the arbiters of that freedom and whose interests he upholds and defends.

This special recognition is inscribed, respectfully and with gratitude, by the Broadcast Pioneers on this 24th day of April 1963, on the occasion of the annual Peabody awards.

Remarks by Representative Harris

Mr. Quaal, my colleagues and friends, it is with genuine feeling of appreciation and a deep sense of humility that I accept the honor you so generously extend to me today.

I hasten to say, however, that in accepting your expression of kindness and recognition, I do so with full realization that it is a tribute to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I think is the greatest committee in the House of Representatives. I would also give a large measure of credit to my family and a wonderfully fine, loyal, and efficient staff in both my office and committee.

Personally, I am exceedingly grateful for your friendship manifested by your presence here today. I am fully aware of the fact that it has not been so at all times in the past.

I can recall some experiences in looking down into the glowering expressions of broadcasters.

One of these experiences had something to do with quiz shows; another was in connection with a well-recognized term "payola," a subject of hearings a few years back; then there was, as I remember, the matter of "ex-parte influence" hearings; and more recently the problem of ratings.

Maybe I should not mention these unsavory questions except to say that I like to think that our final judgment thus far has been in the public interest, as well as in the best interest of the broadcasting industry. I am hopeful that most of you share this view.

Even so, I think the industry overall is doing a fine job in performing a public service under our system and concept for the American people. There is always room for improvement, and I encourage you toward this objective.

I want to say to you in all sincerity that the pleasantness and joy of this occasion touches me very deeply. I am indeed grateful, Mr. Quaal, for the honor which the broadcast pioneers has bestowed upon me today and you have my sincere thanks.

I have tried to be firm in my responsibility, but if I have not at all times been tolerant and fair, it is not because I have not tried.

Thank you so much.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The pending business is S. 522, a bill to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

CHILDREN EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after a discussion with the author of Senate bill 523, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the hour of 2:30 p.m. tomorrow one half hour be allocated to Amendment No. 104, in accordance with the usual procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that at the conclusion of that time there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. If I might ask for a revision, the debate could commence at 2 o'clock and a yea-and-nay vote could take place at 2:30. That would be acceptable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I change my request accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana wish to suspend the rule that requires a quorum call before a vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the usual procedure be followed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 2 p.m., during the further consideration of S. 523, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes, with the amendment by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], numbered 104, as the pending question, and that all debate on that amendment and amendments thereto shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. Tower and the majority leader or someone designated by him, following which the Senate will proceed to vote thereon: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to that amendment shall be received.

SURPLUS FOOD FOR NEEDY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News for today, June 10, contains an interesting article entitled "Surplus Food Is Still Hard for Needy To Get." This timely article, written by Sam Stafford, of the Daily News staff, points out that redtape in the District of Columbia Welfare Department is causing many old and disabled people to fail to receive their proper quotas of surplus food, and that the recently disclosed scandal about hustlers making a profit from the delivery of surplus food for the needy is continuing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Surplus Food Is Still Hard for Needy To Get

(By Sam Stafford)

The District Welfare Department is callously ignoring the very people it promised to help following revelations of surplus food irregularities in this newspaper 4 months ago.

Throughout the city, there are still thousands of needy old, sick, crippled, or blind people who have no way of getting the surplus food that is available and that other poor people use to beef up their meager diets. Or they get it only with incredible difficulty.

Commissioner John Duncan has prodded the Welfare Department to come up with a workable food distribution plan using some volunteer help.

PAPER AND TALK

But the welfare bureaucracy, which moves slowly when it moves, has produced a lot of talk and mountains of paper but little action.

"It is hard to see why it should take so long," Mr. Duncan said. "I intend to keep right on pressing for a good plan."

Meanwhile, as a result of the surplus food policies of Acting Welfare Director Donald Brewer and Welfare Controller Alvin Rosin:

Senile old people who should not be on the streets alone board buses for the surplus distribution center on Virginia Avenue SW., get confused, and wind up in the wrong section of town.

Old men and women so crippled they can scarcely move are forced to make the tiring trip to the food center.

Sick or paralyzed old ladies—many without friends or relatives—sit alone in small rooms, fingering surplus food certificates they cannot redeem for food.

A volunteer group that 2 months ago, with Mr. Duncan's backing, offered to carry food to blind and seriously ailing persons at no charge has so far been cold-shouldered by welfare officials.

Some "hustlers" whose profitable food delivery arrangements with some welfare employees were detailed in the News' series, are still running an unlicensed cab service from the distribution center, with aid recipients as a captive clientele.

Under welfare rules, no person may pick up more than two surplus orders a month. So most recipients—presumably including bedridden with no helpful neighbors or relatives—must appear personally at the distribution center to get food.

A private car crammed with recipients—including the ailing who are able to walk—may bring a hustler $8 or $10 at $1 or more a head.

Some sick or disabled persons manage to endure the bus or taxi ride to the center, then return by hustler service since taxis are seldom available at the center. Total cost is sometimes $1.75 or $2.

The system still seems designed to discourage people from getting surplus food.

Under the two-orders-a-month restriction, a man can pick up food for his own family and his sister's family, but not for himself, his sister, and the ailing woman next door.

MOVED

Complicating recipients' problems is the fact the surplus operation early this year moved from Northwest, where many of the needy live, to Southwest, where relatively few live.

The other day, this reporter watched a badly crippled old man approach the food platform at the distribution center.

Face drawn with pain, he inched along in the rain, taking a full minute to walk several feet.

How had he gotten there—by taxi, hustler, or two or three bus transfers? Had he walked far?

He paused for breath, then started up steps leading to the platform. He inched upward, moving each limb with grotesque deliberateness. He seemed the most pathetically crippled man on earth.

The old man struggled upward, reached the platform, presented his food card, then began his painful descent.

It took him 11 minutes by my watch to walk up and down a few steps.

Mr. Edna Frazier, a dignified lady of 70, lives at 732 Morton Street NW. Paralyzed on the left side, she is under doctor's orders not to leave the house.

No one was available to redeem her last month's food card, due May 6, so she and a 76-year-old "forgetful" woman she has taken under her wing had a lean month.

"I mostly could have used the floor," said Mrs. Frazier. "I make a little bread and it lasts a while."

She has lived here 44 years, 26 of them in the same house. When younger, she worked. Her husband, a plumber, died 12 years ago.

When I visited her, she was worried about whether her 76-year-old friend would get lost riding a bus to the surplus center.

"She's lost her way before," Mrs. Frazier said. But the friend eventually returned.

Across the street, Mrs. Fred Mosley, 67, told how she and six other recipients recently had been forced to pay a hustler $1 apiece for a ride home after getting the impression the fee would be lower.

MRS. MOSLEY

Mrs. Mosley, who is partly disabled by arthritis and a bad back, has difficulty boarding and riding a bus. But she recently traveled to the center by bus, walking at transfer points even though this was painful, on the day the hustler took her home.

Mr. Mosley, 69, paralyzed and seldom out of bed, said he wished he could get the food himself, but his wife said she didn't mind.

Elsewhere on the street, I spoke to Mrs. Bessie Gaines, 62, who has glaucoma, and can see only blurred shapes.

She worked in a private home for many years and would be working now "except that I can't get a job because of my eyes. I tried. Even Goodwill turned me down."

Mrs. Gaines cannot see well enough to take a bus to the food center. The other day, she took a cab to the center for 50 cents and gave 75 cents to a hustler to bring her back, although he wanted $1.

Commenting on former harsh treatment of recipients by some welfare employees, brought to light by the News, she said, "They treat us better now, but getting the food is still hard."

ALL ALONE

Others throughout the city also have problems. A crippled woman in Southeast was unable to get to the center or have someone go for her and so lost her month's food. Holed up in musty rooms visited only by landlords and social workers are many other hungry shut-ins.

While some ailing persons have relatives here, the relatives may be unavailable to help on certain days because of work or family duties.

Although Alvin Rosin has taken charge of the surplus reorganization, John Olsavsky, surplus division chief who denied responsibility for the hustlers' profiteering and said he rarely visited the distribution center, still handles the day-to-day operation.

John West, whose Volunteer Transportation Service, a low-cost food delivery service for the needy, was whittled down by surplus officialdom and finally put out of operation when restricted to two orders a month, has offered free food delivery service to shut-ins.

Since nobody has taken him up on the offer made many weeks ago, he figures it must have been buried under Welfare Department redtape—of which there seems to be plenty.

REFORM OF CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Post for June 9 contains an article entitled "Congress Must Seize the Initiative," written by the distinguished columnist Roscoe Drummond. Mr. Drummond makes the point that Congress has not been measuring up to its potential for rendering public service as a viable, progressive, independent branch of the Government.

The article reminds me that it was not very long ago that the Senate passed a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget.

I hope that all Members of the House will read Mr. Drummond's article, and that it will inspire them to take prompt action on the resolution, a resolution which, as I understand, has passed the Senate several times previously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time for Reform—Congress Must Seize the Initiative

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A veteran of the House of Representatives who is retiring undefeated from one of the largest States remarked in private conversation the other day: "In all my 15 years in Congress I have never been able to devote more than one-tenth of my time to doing what I was primarily elected to do—help shape the laws of the land."

The able and respected chairman of one of the Senate's many investigating committees raised his arms in despair the other evening and exclaimed: "The Executive has become so big that we (the Congress) have simply lost control. We can't review it adequately; we can't check it adequately; we just don't know what it is doing."

And this: Congress never gives one look at the massive and mounting Federal budget as a whole. It looks at it piecemeal but never in toto. It appropriates piecemeal without ever putting the parts together to know what it is doing, then it abandons responsibility for continuous, overall review—despite the fact that its own rules call for such review.

What do these facts (and others like them) really mean? They mean that the congressional minutiae so gobble up the time of individual Members of Congress that they can't do their primary work; that even the best congressional investigating committees are no longer able to oversee how the Executive is carrying out the congressional will; that as the Federal budget grows, Congress is steadily losing control, even losing sight, of what is going on.

The need for congressional reorganization to modernize its creaking, Model-T machinery is no longer seriously questioned. The need is to enable the Congress to lay hold of the means and procedures to transact the public business efficiently and responsibly and to capture its eroded authority.

Fortunately, the prospects for such reorganization are looking up. One step is the bipartisan resolution introduced by Senator Clifford Case (Republican of New Jersey) and Senator Joseph Clark (Democrat of Pennsylvania) to create a Commission on Congressional Reorganization to study and propose needed reforms.

Public hearings will be held shortly by a Senate Rules Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Carl Hayden (Democrat of Arizona), aided by a specially appointed staff counsel, former Representative Hugh Alexander, of North Carolina.

Reflecting the almost unanimous endorsement of those in private life who know most about the Congress, the volume of correspondence which Senator Case has had from political scientists is particularly revealing.

Senator Case has received 195 letters from specialists in government. Of these, 160 strongly approve the move for congressional reform, none is opposed, 35 are noncommittal. Eighty-two percent of the letters consider the proposed study very timely and necessary, and hope it will succeed. Some of the specific comments and suggestions are these:

The Commission should focus on this central question: How can Congress remain an independent, productive, efficient, and creative branch of Government?

Many contend that Congress is not measuring up to its potential and to public expectations.

The statement that "congressional reform is long overdue" repeatedly occurs in the letters.

"Congress is in for rough sledding in the coming months and years," one of the political scientists writes. "Unless Congress moves to reform itself, that criticism will grow. Now is the time to begin study of reform so as to bring Congress up to date before even more power passes to the executive branch and before the image of Congress drops further in the minds of our people."

Wouldn't it be well if Congress paused in trying to reform everybody else and took a clear look at its own shortcomings—and did something about them?

FALLOUT SHELTERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Star of June 5 a lead editorial entitled "Shelters—a Cruel Deception?" The editorial presents an interesting and timely analysis of the problem relating to fallout shelters. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHELTERS—A CRUEL DECEPTION?

An index to the kind of world we live in today can be found in the Hamburg firestorm of July 24, 1943.

On that date the British dropped a mere 2,400 tons of conventional explosives on the German port city. But the consequences for Hamburg were catastrophic.

These first bombs knocked out the water mains. On succeeding days tens of thousands of small firebombs were dropped and these were followed by more blockbusters—8,000 tons in all. The chief intelligence officer in our London Embassy, James R. Newman, reported as follows:

"We got a phenomenon that man had never seen before, except perhaps in prehistory. Fires joined together in a radius of three miles. Hot gases rose, while surrounding cool air was pulled in and acted as a bellows. Seventy thousand of Hamburg's 100,000 trees splintered to earth. Two hundred and fifty thousand dwelling units out of 556,000 were completely destroyed. The fire lasted for 7 days. Temperatures flared to 1,400 and 1,800 degrees so that the bricks themselves actually burned. Thousands and thousands of people were in shelters at the time; all but a negligible fraction died anyway. Bodies were still being dug up 6 months later, most of them completely unmarked by fire. They had died of suffocation and carbon monoxide—70,000 in all."

Remember, this disaster was visited upon Hamburg 20 years ago by a trifling 8,000 tons of "conventional" bombs. Has it a meaning for us today when, in an all-out thermonuclear attack, any major American city could expect to be hit, not with 8,000 tons, but with up to the equivalent of 100 million tons of explosives?

Surely it has. But very few people seem to care. We think the reason is not hard to discover.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Representative Hébert has been holding hearings on a Federal civil defense program, with particular reference to fallout shelters. And an Associated Press man reported the other day that the hearing was droning along before an average audience of 35 persons, some of whom were dozing. Obviously, nobody cares very much. And this view is reinforced by the recent decision in Portland, Oreg., to abolish its civil defense program and forget about it—fallout shelters and all.

Why is it that there is so little interest, so little concern? An excellent report to the Hébert subcommittee by its counsel, Philip W. Kelleher, furnishes at least some of the answers—especially with respect to fallout shelters. He quotes Dr. Alexander Langsdorf, Jr., a physicist at the Argonne Laboratories, as saying in a Chicago newspaper interview that the Russians, if they knew we had adequate fallout protection, would explode the bomb in the air rather than on the surface. Dr. Langsdorf added:

"From an airburst you get a massive firestorm which might set all Chicago on fire. Concrete fallout shelters would turn into ovens, cooking the people inside. If they don't burn they would probably suffocate, because all the oxygen would be consumed."

But let's suppose that some people hidden away in fallout shelters in some areas should survive. What of them? Mr. Kelleher quotes Dr. John N. Wolfe, chief, Environmental Sciences Branch of the Biology and Medicine Divisions of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows: "Fallout shelters in many areas seem only a means of delaying death and represent only part of a survival plan. With an environment so completely modified, the question is, where does a man go after his sojourn in shelters? What does he do upon emergence?"

Mr. Kelleher elaborated on Dr. Wolfe's meaning in these words: "The survivor emerges from his shelter only to find that communications and distribution systems are damaged or destroyed. If there is food still undestroyed it may be contaminated, as will be the water supply. It is at least possible that the land which he must stand on is dangerously radioactive. Under these circumstances he may survive, but if so it will be through pure luck."

There is, of course, another side to this debate, and Mr. Kelleher presents it. But as we read his paper, he comes down squarely on the side of the argument which holds that "the currently planned fallout shelter program, or any extension of it, would work a cruel and dangerous deception on the American people."

For our part, we do not think the American people will want to spend up to $7 billion for fallout shelters, much less $100 billion to $200 billion for blast shelters. There is nothing in the American nature that is compatible with the prospect of burrowing into the ground to hide for days and weeks, not knowing what has happened to wives, children, or parents. George Kennan, speaking in a somewhat different context some time ago, just about said it all when he asked:

"Are we to flee like haunted creatures from one defensive device to another, each more costly and humiliating than the one before, cowering underground one day, breaking up our cities the next, attempting to surround ourselves with elaborate electric shields on the third, concerned only to prolong the length of our lives while sacrificing all the values for which it might be worth while to live?"

We think not. The only remedy, the only hope, is to prevent nuclear war. Meanwhile, again borrowing from a quotation used by Mr. Kennan: "Let us at least walk like men, with our heads up, so long as we are permitted to walk at all."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there was published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 7 a lead article entitled "Cloture Seen as Key—Battle Lines Form on Rights Bills." The article points out that the program, which we understand the White House will soon present to Congress, includes several points in the civil rights area. Some of these points will, I am sure, be recognized as being long overdue subjects of legislation. Others perhaps will be highly controversial. The article points out that it is probable that some of these points will be modified or withdrawn.

Mr. President, I hope that when the time comes for presentation of a civil rights bill before the Senate, the proponents will have checked out very carefully the matter with various Members of the Senate, because it appears that the key vote will eventually be on the question of invoking cloture.

I recognize that some Senators are opposed as a matter of principle to invoking cloture; but I suggest that the great majority of Senators are not opposed as a matter of principle to invoking cloture—as was revealed by the cloture vote on the telstar communications satellite bill in the last session of Congress.

I also suggest that the cloture issue will be premised on the nature of the underlying bill on which a filibuster will be waged, and that the degree to which the bill will appeal to two-thirds of the Members of the Senate as being appropriate, needful, and timely legislation will determine the outcome of the cloture vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Christian Science article to which I have referred, and also an article entitled "On D-Day All GI's Were Brothers." The latter article was written by William S. White, and was published in the Washington Star on June 5.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 7, 1963]

CLOTURE SEEN AS KEY—BATTLE LINES FORM ON RIGHTS BILLS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's political advisers in the Senate tell him that to enact his proposed two-part civil rights bill will require cloture.

They feel that they must get between 23 and 25 Republican Senate votes to enact the measure.

Civil rights legislation, they argue, like foreign affairs, now requires bipartisan treatment.

Applying cloture means that an expected southern filibuster must be worn down to a point where a vote is possible.

What seems to be shaping up is one of the big legislative battles of the year; in fact it could blow into a decisive struggle over the will of the majority to prevail.

Delay in presenting the Kennedy civil rights legislative package from this week to next is to allow the administration spokesmen to try to negotiate an agreement with Republicans on a bill that will command bipartisan support.

Republican Senators have promised to support additional civil rights legislation. But they remained mute on whether they would try to crush a southern filibuster. The Republican position was hammered out Wednesday at the second of two conferences promoted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, an ardent supporter of civil rights legislation.

FACTORS INVOLVED

To apply cloture requires a two-thirds majority of the Senate, or 67 affirmative votes.

In presenting civil rights legislation at this time President Kennedy may well be precipitating a decisive battle over the filibuster, which has been going on intermittently for a century or longer.

Three things will help determine the issue:

Whether President Kennedy makes an all-out fight for legislation;

Whether Republicans will cooperate;

Whether Negroes keep up pressure tactics in the South.

Present Senate membership is 67 Democrats and 33 Republicans. Southern Senators number only around 2 dozen, but their strength is increased by conservatives from both parties and by members from smaller States whose bargaining power rests on delaying tactics.

PLAN PREVIEWED

The Kennedy civil rights proposals, according to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, assistant Senate majority leader, are as follows:

1. A "public accommodations" law, to outlaw segregation in private establishments above a certain size, dealing in commodities moving in interstate commerce.
2. A program of aid to school systems that desegregate.
3. Powers by the Attorney General to initiate court actions desegregating private establishments and initiating school desegregating plans on behalf of persons denied constitutional rights.
4. Voting rights legislation including a new literacy test provision establishing a presumption of literacy as a qualification for voting for those with sixth grade education.
5. Extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

SUPPORT SOUGHT

The foregoing proposals will be adjusted to meet Republican support.

For a full scale, frontal assault on the filibuster the Kennedy package almost certainly must be reduced to get the necessary 67 votes.

"As we put foreign policy on a bipartisan basis, we better put racial matters on a bipartisan basis," Senator HUMPHREY told a reporter. He added cheerfully:

"It looks as if we'll spend Thanksgiving in Washington."

[From the Washington Star, June 5, 1963]

ON D-DAY ALL GI'S WERE BROTHERS—COMMON COURAGE AND COMPASSION OF THE 6TH OF JUNE IS RECALLED

(By William S. White)

It is good now to think back to another June day of long ago and so to let memory of the honor and gallantry of the past wash us clean, for a moment, of the little and the sweaty and the ugly contentions of the present.

Now, though directly and mortally we face no enemy shell and flame, we spend our national energy in bitterness and bickering among ourselves about this man's rights and that man's privileges.

Then, 19 years ago, facing unexampled perils while death walked heedlessly among our troops along the coast of France, we knew a timeless and an unforgotten hour of true national union and true national brotherhood. We thought then of man's duty.

Union was based then upon common courage and common compassion and not upon pompous exhortations from self-serving reformers—of whom few were present on D-day. Brotherhood was based then upon a common sacrifice and a common generosity in which no man spoke much of his rights but every man thought long upon his obligations. Brotherhood was not formed by "biracial" committees or white or black citizens councils, however these may be officially named—of which none were present on D-day.

Now, all we have to lose is our national dignity and our national self-control. Then, on the 6th of June, 1944, all we had at stake was the greatest battle in history—and perhaps even the greatest war—and the lives of many who would never see another day in June as the sun rose, for the last time for them, over the already reddening beaches of Normandy.

I remember seeing many men of many races and many religions (and some of no religion at all except the bleak religion of duty) on D-day. There was the redheaded corporal from the Bronx, passing alongside in an LCI (landing craft, infantry), who was fingering his rosary in the leaping light of the small predawn fire forward in the boat. This the platoon commander had lit, obedient to previous instructions, to burn his not-so-secret orders before we reached the touchdown on the other side of the English Channel.

The sergeant just next was a prematurely bald, once black-haired youngster from Philadelphia. He was "a kind of a Jew, I guess," he had mentioned at one point; meaning, I think, that while for whatever reason he had strayed from the ancient faith, the hour had come to seek reassurance from the long yesterdays.

The battalion major, in a larger LCI there, was, as I happened to know, a Presbyterian from a place in the South so small as to be only a mark on a rural free delivery mail route. There were some fellows in other craft thereabouts who were, notwithstanding a stateside saying that there would be none such, undeniably about to become atheists in foxholes, if they survived the first dash through the shallow tides at the beachside.

Now, none of these men had been ordered by higher military authority to love one another, to be fair to one another. Racial "tolerance" had not been legislated, by-the-numbers, by military command, as racial "tolerance" will not now be legislated by administrative, by congressional, or by court, decree.

But, at the risk of seeming sticky, simple truth compels the report that these men did love one another, did respect one another. But they loved and respected not merely the things that were the same in them but also the things that were different, were diverse—were "pluralistic," to use the egghead term—among them.

Here was that union in human diversity, that mutual respect in human divergence, which the great imperatives of adversity and danger can bring to a people in war. Is it too much to hope that—if only the professional minority-group agitators and the professional white-supremacy agitators can somehow be cut down to size by the patient people of all races—we can somehow reach amid peace and plenty what came so readily to us in war and suffering?

TAX-SUPPORTED PROPAGANDA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 26, my able colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] delivered a very important speech at Portland, Oreg. Her speech was entitled "Tax-Supported Propaganda."

In the course of the speech she stated:

> Our tax laws make tax-exempt income contributed to any organization "organized and operated exclusively for religious * * * or educational purposes" as long as "no substantial part of its activities * * * is carrying on propaganda." Propaganda, incidentally, is defined by Webster as "Any organized or concerted group, effort, or movement to spread particular doctrines."
>
> Despite this express exclusion of propaganda organs from tax exemption, there is increasing evidence that dozens of rightwing groups are today masquerading as "educational or religious" organizations, and are flooding the country with the partisan, political propaganda of the far-right, financed by tax-free contributions from businessmen. And, whenever a businessman has tax-exempt income, somebody else is forced to pay more taxes—and that somebody else is you and I.
>
> Who are these organizations and how do they get away with it? One thing is certain: you can't spot them by their titles. Our rightwing extremists may be deficient in their respect for democracy but they certainly are imaginative when it comes to selecting democratic-sounding titles. Let me cite an example. Are you interested in America's future? So am I. Then you may be interested to learn, as I was, what a "nonprofit, educational" tax-exempt institution called "America's Future, Inc.," has to say.

Then my colleague proceeded in her very able speech to point out what really amounts to a tax-exempt racket that is being operated by certain rightwing organizations. By means of this racket, the taxpayers as a whole are, in fact and in effect, paying for such propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent that the very able speech delivered by my colleague be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX SUPPORTED PROPAGANDA

(Speech of Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER at COPE northwest regional conference, Portland, Oreg., on May 26, 1963)

Pollyanna was determined to find some good in everything and everybody—so much so that the term Pollyanna has come to characterize those perpetually cheery souls, we all know them, who profess to find a good side to even the blackest day—like the good people who always insist that though Mussolini was a villain, he did make the railroad trains run on time.

I don't meet many Pollyannas in my daily deliberations. I usually have to listen to the prophets of gloom and despair. But the other day I was discussing the activities of the John Birch Society with a colleague who argued, tongue-in-check, that even the John Birch Society had its good points.

First, he argued, by now, most Americans who spend at least part of the day awake, know the John Birch Society for what it really is: a maniacal sect dedicated to a return to a 19th century economy and repeal of the Bill of Rights. Not that the Society was eager to publicize its malicious wares, but because its founder and patron oracle, Robert Welch, stumbled into the glare of public exposure 2 years ago with his accusation that Eisenhower was a Communist. And that was too much for any rational American, left, right, or center, to stomach. Consequently, the Society's name has become a warning flag to thinking Americans that any message associated with it is tainted by a distorted and perverted view of man, economics, and society. That was one good thing about the John Birch Society.

The second good thing he had to say about the John Birch Society was that at least the Federal Government didn't subsidize it.

I find it hard to dismiss that lightly an insidious cancer that has infected many otherwise well-intentioned Americans. But he did have a point: although the government doesn't contribute to the John Birch Society, you and I unwittingly, and certainly involuntarily, as taxpayers, are indirectly financing millions of dollars of Birch-type propaganda put out by less well-known but equally vicious organizations.

Our tax laws make tax-exempt, income contributed to any organization "organized and operated exclusively for religious * * * or educational purposes" as long as "no substantial part of its activities * * * is carrying on propaganda." Propaganda, incidentally, is defined by Webster's as "Any organized or concerted group, effort, or movement to spread particular doctrines."

Despite this express exclusion of propaganda organs from tax exemption, there is increasing evidence that dozens of right-wing groups are today masquerading as educational or religious organizations, and are flooding the country with the partisan, political propaganda of the far right, financed by tax-free contributions from businessmen. And, whenever a businessman has tax-exempt income, somebody else is forced to pay more taxes—and that somebody else is you and I.

Who are these organizations and how do they get away with it? One thing is certain: you can't spot them by their titles. Our right-wing extremists may be deficient in their respect for democracy but they certainly are imaginative when it comes to selecting democratic-sounding titles. Let me cite an example. Are you interested in America's future? So am I. Then you may be interested to learn, as I was, what a nonprofit, educational tax-exempt institution called "America's Future Inc.," has to say.

"America's Future, Inc.," puts out an eight-page newsletter which it describes as a weekly antidote for the flood of socialistic slanted news and views that assails us and broadcasts a weekly radio program with R. K. Scott as the principal commentator. Recently, Scott's brand of tax-supported education included:

1. Criticism of the Supreme Court decision on school prayers (July 13, September 14.)

2. Repudiation of the Supreme Court decision on school segregation. ("From that decision has flowed most of the racial dissensions and hatred with which we have been plagued ever since. In that decision the Supreme Court did something that it had no right to do under our Constitution") (August 10).

3. Opposition to government control of industry and power to levy taxes on industries (August 24).

4. Attacks on the State Department and the U.S.I.A. (the latter is riddled with hordes of boondogglers, many of whom are soft on communism) (July 27).

5. Criticism of U.S. support of the U.N. actions in Katanga (September 7).

6. Criticism of our participation in the U.N. (the awful mess resulting from our involvement in the United Nations) (August 3).

7. Objections to admitting Russian tourists into the United States where they can spy (July 20).

8. Opposition to the dangerous Labor Union Monopoly which makes a political and economic slave of the union worker and should be equated with labor boss monopoly (July 6, August 31).

America's Future also conducts a thriving business in book-burning called operation textbook. Its textbook evaluation committee, which incidentally contains four men active in the John Birch Society, is now one-third of the way toward its expressed goal of evaluating all 400 social science textbooks currently in use in America's high schools—handing out failing grades to books which give too much attention to freedom of religion, speech, and the press, and which fail to stress the right to acquire and hold property, the right to work, the right to engage in free enterprise, and the right of a free society to protect itself against subversion. And woe betide any text that would "attempt to instill in the student the idea of world mindness or world citizenship, and world government."

We soon discover that "America's Future Inc.," is in reality dedicated to reviving the worst of America's past while burying the very freedoms that have made America great.

Who is it that pumps tax-exempt funds into "America's Future, Inc."? Many old friends of democratic education, led by Gulf Oil, Armco Steel, Cities Service, Consolidated Edison of New York, Dupont, and Socony-Vacuum. Your taxes and my taxes will be higher so that these companies can make tax-exempt donations to "America's Future Inc."

Let's turn to another fine-sounding tax-exempt organization, "The American Good Government Society." Each year the society makes George Washington Day awards at a George Washington Day dinner to Americans who have contributed to good government during the past year. That seems like a worthwhile function—except for the strange fact that between 1953 and 1963, of the awards given to Senators and Representatives, 10 went to Southern Democrats and the rest to conservative Republicans. I was surprised to learn, as I am sure you are, that for the last 10 years no one but Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans has made any contribution to good government.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I don't really object—and I consider that I have no right to object—to any group of American citizens getting together and making George Washington Day awards to anyone they choose (though I sometimes wonder at the woeful miscarriages of justice that are committed in the names of American heroes). What I most certainly do object to is the use of tax-exempt income to promote these essentially political activities. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, thankfully, but it does not guarantee that political propaganda shall be subsidized by tax concessions. There is probably no one who gets more radical rightwing propaganda value for his tax-exempt dollar than Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, whom Time magazine labeled "the big daddy to many a far-right crusade." H. L. Hunt has been rated the second richest man in the United States with a total wealth as high as $3 billion and annual income hovering around $50 million. From his headquarters in Dallas, Tex., Hunt indulges his urge to convince his fellow citizens that the U.S. Government is so thickly infiltrated with Communists that it is practically Communist now, and that any man or woman who favors medicare, foreign aid, and virtually any other social welfare measure which you might care to name, is an enemy of freedom. Hunt also dabbles in anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and even anti-Protestant propaganda (the National Council of Churches) (which doesn't leave him very much room), and damns the Supreme Court as the violator of the Constitution.

You would think that a man with $3 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the Federal Government assume a substantial portion of his political crusades.

Hunt has simply packaged his propaganda network under the head of "The Lifeline Foundation, Inc.," and then had his business corporations—The Hunt Oil Co., and its food processing and canning division, the HLH Parade Co., commercially sponsor Lifeline propaganda throughout the country. Of course, commercial advertising expenditures are treated as a business expense and deducted from the company's income before taxes. Hunt's expressed goal is to see the $11 billion which American business spends on advertising annually, devoted to the sponsoring of right-wing propaganda.

Lifeline's boiling cauldron of trouble includes a five-day-a-week radio program, TV program, a four-page twice-weekly political polemic, a book club: "Lifeline Links," and Lifeline seminars: to "meet the public demand for accelerated enlightenment" on freedom, Communist subversion, and "shelter protection against fallout."

What kind of commercial entertainment does Lifeline put out? Here's a sample: "Support gained from church circles in the U.S. helps them (the Communists) to break down the moral antipathy of a community and gives the infiltrator this respectability which they desperately need."

And again "Everyone in the United States * * * except, apparently, the Supreme Court, knows that communism advocates the overthrow of this Government." To ward off libel suits Hunt's propagandists call the victims of their attacks "mistaken" but it is quite clear to anyone who listens that "mistaken" is a synonym for "enemies of freedom," which is in turn a synonym for Communist.

"As anti-Communist sentiment grows stronger in the United States, the 'mistaken' forces seeking to end freedom feel the damage to their cause. Word has gone out that anticommunism must be stopped. Definite orders for the liquidation of anticommunism have been given in a party manifesto. Since that manifesto, the drive against anticommunism has been growing steadily more intense. If you were the head man of the 'mistaken' forces that are working to end freedom, what orders could you have given that would have produced greater strategic victory than the communization of Cuba?

"The Second World War was but another step in the program of the 'mistaken' to conquer the entire world.

"The entire propaganda line of the 'mistaken,' including doubletalk about disarmament, is designed to make it easier for them to carry out their plot for ending freedom."

To label a group or individual as "mistaken," then, is Hunt's not-so-subtle way of accusing anyone who disagrees with him of being a Communist, without risking a libel suit. But the vicious innuendo is no less vicious because it is put into this kind of transparent code.

Another blatant example of the abuse of tax deductible advertising is the arrangement worked out by General Electric with erstwhile former Movie Star Ronald Reagan. While he was host and occasional star of the television show General Electric Theater, Reagan's contract called for 8 weeks of speaking tours for GE each year. On these tours Reagan had little, if anything, to say about GE toasters or television sets or even anything about his own television program, but at each stop he made the same rigidly conservative speech against social security, the income tax, Federal aid to education, and medicare. It has been suggested that

Reagan is even opposed to a national post office.

I think I have given you enough to convey the flavor of these organizations—and the aroma as well—but I assure you that this is by no means an exhaustive sampling. Just listen to this rollcall of high-sounding titles for low-hitting activities: The American Council of Christian Laymen (How Red is the National Council of Churches?); The American Economic Foundation; the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade; Christian's Echoes Ministry; Christian Freedom Foundation; Church League of America; the Circuit Riders; the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy; Foundation for Economic Education; the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists; the National Education Program.

In 1961, these organizations—plus the ones I have already discussed—took in better than $5½ million in tax-free contributions.

What's in a name? Well, for each of these high-sounding organizations: tax-free income and the shield of respectability that cloaks their rightwing extremist propaganda.

How has this been permitted to happen? It is painfully clear that the tax Service has simply not done the job Congress gave it: to rout out the propagandists from the bona fide educators. It may be that the Service has simply lacked the manpower to investigate exemption applications. It is no doubt true that in a given instance the line between education and political propaganda is a difficult one to draw. Whatever the reasons I think it is incumbent upon the tax Service to terminate, and with more than deliberate speed, the fraudulent use of the "educational" exemption as a tax haven for partisan political propaganda. And I intend to use every resource at my command to see that this is done. Not, let me repeat, for the purpose of silencing political activity, but merely for the purpose of eliminating the tax-exemption subsidy.

If I make a contribution to the Oregon Dunes Committee, my gift is clearly not tax deductible because the Dunes Committee has a political, though non-profit goal: the creation of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. But if I were a member of the DAR and contributed to that crusty old institution, my gift would be tax deductible.

Yet, at its 72d Continental Congress held in Washington last month, the DAR adopted resolutions opposing disarmament and the test ban treaty, deficit spending, foreign aid, liberalization of the Immigration Act of 1952, the United Nations, public housing, urban renewal, Federal aid to mental health care, the domestic Peace Corps and the Youth Conservation Corps (on the grounds that it would "result in endangering the future of private youth organizations and delay the entrance of the youth of this nation into the field of free enterprise"). Here is the dissenting testimony of Mrs. E. King, herself a member of the DAR and a representative of the Chappaqua, N.Y., chapter.

"While the DAR professes no political purpose and claims tax exemption on the strength of it," she reported to the members of her local chapter, "its policy year after dreary year monotonously issued from its rubber-stamped congresses support uniformly the position of a certain segment of American political thought. No resolution contrary to the positions of the far rightwing is adopted."

Would any fair-minded observer say with justice that the Oregon Dunes Committee is more political in its activities than the DAR? I think not.

Let me close by citing to you the strange case of the Inter-Collegiate Society of Individualists, which incidentally draws wide support from private power companies—though not, let me hasten to add, from the State of Oregon. The society is militantly opposed to both the income tax and Federal aid to education. Yet isn't it ironic that its own activities are income tax free and this exemption represents Federal aid—not to "education" in any meaningful sense, but to political propaganda masquerading as education.

THE OAS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The OAS and the Alliance for Progress," which was delivered by William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States. As chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to state that this is an excellent speech, and should be of interest to all who are interested in the Alliance for Progress program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OAS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General, Organization of American States)

It was with pleasure that I accepted the invitation to address this conference on the Alliance for Progress. In saying this I have more in mind than beginning my remarks with the usual words of courtesy that are routine on an occasion of this kind. Let me explain.

The Punta del Este meeting that brought the Alliance into being a year and a half ago declared that: "In order to attain its goals this vast program demands understanding and active cooperation from all the peoples of America." It called upon public opinion of the hemisphere—and in so doing made specific reference to student associations—to acquire an awareness of the social implications of the Alliance and "to take an active part in the dissemination of information on its objectives and in the discussion and execution of its programs." This student conference in Eugene is a fine and timely response to this call for action.

It has seemed to me that I might do well today to present the Alliance from the viewpoint of our regional association, the Organization of American States.

BACKGROUND OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In order that we may have the same frame of reference as I proceed, I should like you to know at the outset that I am making the following assumptions:

Assumption No. 1: That you know what is meant by the term Latin America—that its implications of a homogeneous unity veils a heterogeneous reality of a people of 200 million divided into 20 separate, independent and sovereign states. I am sure that none of you here will ask me, as was the case of an individual with an inquiring turn of mind, who recently asked: What is the capital of Latin America?

Assumption No. 2: That you know that Latin America is classified as an underdeveloped area and that you know what that means—a region characterized economically by a predominantly agricultural economy; by reliance on one or a few agricultural and mineral export commodities for earning foreign exchange; by lack of capital, skilled manpower, and scientific and technological know-how; and socially by inadequate housing, health, and educational facilities; by a small middle class; an inequitably distributed tax burden; and inadequate socio-economic institutions such as trade unions, farm cooperatives, and small business associations; in short, by low productivity, low income, low life expectancy, unequal opportunity, and weak institutions through which the common man can participate more fully in his society. In such a region, the economic and social structures are predominantly those of the prescientific and pretechnological age.

Assumption No. 3: That you know that there is a "population explosion" in Latin America, and that you know that this means that during the next decade there must be an increase of almost 30 percent in food production, transportation, health, housing, and educational facilities, and national income merely to preserve the low standards of living now prevailing in the area; that, by way of comparison, during a period of unparalleled prosperity it took the United States, with all its technical know-how and financial resources, 15 years to raise national income 40 percent.

Assumption No. 4: That you know that extreme poverty, such as that existing in large areas of Latin America, is no longer accepted as a normal order of life, and that this factor exerts social and political pressures that reach the point of explosion; that this situation endangers political and social stability, creating conditions favorable to extreme ideologies of the right and the left, and to organized penetration by international communism.

Assumption No. 5: That you know the structure, the institutions, and the purposes of the OAS; that the OAS is the oldest international organization of its kind, being 72 years of age; that it recently was in the spotlight of public opinion because of the action it took to exclude the Castro regime from participation in the Organization and because of its decision by unanimous vote to establish a quarantine of that regime, designed to force the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of nuclear missiles stationed there by the Soviet Union; and that the Alliance for Progress began as a collective program under the OAS and is being developed within the framework of this regional community of nations.

Concern with the economic and social conditions in the hemisphere has been pressing with a constantly increasing sense of urgency upon the deliberations of the institutions of the inter-American system since its beginnings. One of the objectives of the first International Conference of American States, held in Washington in 1889–90, was to preserve and promote the prosperity [and] the welfare of the hemisphere. The original name of our OAS secretariat, as established by that Conference, was the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics; its primary purpose was the development of trade. The Bureau was to be the central office of an association entitled the International Union of American Republics. It was within the broad concept of union that the inter-American movement developed, in the interval of 72 years since 1890, into the comprehensive regional community of nations of today.

At the time of the general reorganization of the inter-American system in 1948, the charter then adopted created the OAS and incorporated past experiences in cooperative undertakings and a vision of a still stronger unity of purpose and effort. In the field of your interest at this meeting—the economic and social—principles and objectives were agreed upon and institutions established for a greatly expanded community effort. The premise of this effort is that social justice and social security are bases of lasting peace and that economic cooperation is essential to the common welfare and prosperity of the peoples of the Continent.

After the historic 1948 date, 8 years followed characterized by hesitation, vacillation and failure to recognize the magnitude of the problem of poverty and the urgency of its demand for a courageous and creative attack on its solution.

A first important forward step was taken in the years 1956 and 1957, when an Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives met to suggest ways of making the OAS a more effective instrument for cooperation in the economic, financial, social, and technical fields. Some of the measures proposed have proved highly fruitful, such as that instituting direct technical assistance services by the Organization to the Member States, and—perhaps of particular interest to this audience—the one establishing the fellowship program of the OAS. This last-mentioned represents an annual yearly investment of over $1 million, and under its auspices some 2,000 fellows have undertaken advanced training abroad.

In 1958, President Kubitschek of Brazil made a call for prompt, dynamic action of an overall nature under a program termed "Operation Pan America." A special group—the so-called Committee of 21—was appointed by the Council of the Organization to act on this proposal. Meeting over a period of 3 years, the Committee presented, as the result of its final sessions, a series of recommendations known as the Act of Bogotá of 1960, in which social development was recognized as a necessary part of balanced economic development.

During this same period, the long-cherished desire of the Latin Americans for a regional financing agency became a reality, with the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1960. The Bank in its 3 years of operations has had a major impact on Latin America, with one aspect, its Social Progress Trust Fund, playing a particularly important role in socio-economic development such as health and housing.

THE SCOPE OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Culminating previous efforts, and embracing them in an approach that is truly revolutionary, is the now well-known Alliance for Progress, proposed by President Kennedy, and developed at the OAS meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level held at Punta del Este in August 1961.

It should be noted that the Alliance is more complex and far-reaching than that other great international undertaking with which it is frequently compared, the Marshall plan. The latter was primarily concerned with the physical rebuilding of a war-damaged economy in Europe. The Alliance is not a rebuilding; it is a creation of what did not exist: A modern economy, a modern society. The construction of roads, dams, and factories must be accompanied with major social and institutional reforms.

A special feature of the programs of the Alliance is that they are to be undertaken within the framework of overall national plans of economic and social development. An industry will not be set up without considering the manpower that must be trained to run it, the need for transportation facilities to distribute the product, or the social effects of industrialization on a predominantly rural community. National institutions to carry out the planning function on a continuing basis are being established. With national planning proceeding in all of the member states, six countries have presented detailed national plans to the OAS for review and counsel: Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, and Mexico. Colombia's plan, the first submitted to the OAS, has been the basis of consideration for extensive external financial assistance by a large-scale international consultative group.

Emphasis upon international cooperation has perhaps obscured the fact that the Alliance has three basic aspects, unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral, and that the first mentioned, represented by self-help, is in many respects the most important of all. The social and institutional reforms called for can be brought about only by decisions of each individual country, and, even in financing, while due attention was given to possibilities of external assistance, it was recognized at Punta del Este that 80 percent of the annual $10 billion in funds required would have to be raised locally. The credo of the Alliance for Latin America was to be—if I may be permitted a paraphrase of some of the more celebrated words of our day—"Let us ask, not so much what others can do for us, as what we can do for ourselves."

The bilateral aspects of the Alliance lie largely in the areas of financing and technical assistance. Many of the agencies involved here are official. Prominent among them are those of the U.S. Government, in particular the Agency for International Development (AID). It administers a considerable part of the U.S. funds earmarked for the Alliance; it also carries out bilateral technical assistance programs under arrangements with individual Latin American countries. The Export-Import Bank provides credits to make it possible for Latin American businesses to purchase equipment from U.S. private enterprises. The U.S. food-for-peace program has contributed more than a hundred million dollars in food for Latin America, and the Peace Corps now has more than 1,300 volunteers at work in the area, more than on any other continent. Now that their own national economies have been reestablished on a firm basis, European governments are also beginning to participate more fully in Latin American economic development.

An important role is likewise assigned to the private sector—individual banks and industrial concerns. It is expected that funds from these sources will be channeled toward enterprises from which a relatively early return can be expected, whereas the public sector will provide the resources required for the so-called infrastructure undertakings. These are ones for overall social and long-range economic benefit—schools, roads, hospitals, and the like—which are unlikely to attract investments for profit.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AS A COLLECTIVE PROGRAM

I have put in third and last place, for more detailed consideration, the multilateral aspects—the third of the trinity of unilateral, bilateral, and collective components of the Alliance.

I shall start on this topic by indicating the two principal categories of multilateral organizations involved. First and foremost is the OAS, including in particular the Council of the Organization, the Economic and Social Council, the Pan American Union, and such specialized organizations as the Pan American Health Organization, which is also the regional arm of the World Health Organization, and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. Available as needed is the Inter-American Conference, the supreme organ of the OAS. An extremely important member of this regional complex is the Inter-American Development Bank, which, while not technically an OAS agency, is an integral part of the regional system. In addition there are subregional arrangements, specifically the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. These, while not part of the OAS galaxy, are inextricably linked to it in objectives.

In the second category are found the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), the U.N. Specialized Agencies—UNESCO, FAO, and the U.N. Special Fund, and the two vast fiscal institutions, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank.) Their aid to Latin America is vital. For example, the World Bank last year lent $412 million to Latin America out of its total world loans of $882 million.

At the center of this complex of multilateral institutions participating in the Alliance are the Council of the OAS, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and the Pan American Union—the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States. I shall concentrate on these. These three bodies provide the Alliance's institutional framework for policy formulation; for the technical assistance and other services needed in the preparation and evaluation of the plans, projects, and programs of the Alliance; and for appropriate assistance in their execution. I shall attempt to describe the flow of multilateral Alliance activity from policy to execution in terms of the responsibilities and work of these OAS institutions.

THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION

The responsibility of the Council of the Organization, which is the permanent deliberative body of the system, derives from the charter of the OAS. The principal provisions that have to do with the Alliance are those which determine that the Council shall fix the quotas to be paid by each member state for the maintenance of the Pan American Union (and therefore decide the programs it is to undertake); those which assign to it the responsibility for the proper discharge by the Union of its duties; those which give it the direction of the Union's efforts to promote economic, social, juridical, and cultural relations among the member states; those which provide for juridical, economic and social, and cultural councils as dependent organs of the Council of the OAS, enjoying, however, technical autonomy; and those which assign to the Council responsibility for overseeing the functioning of the OAS as a whole. The Council's explicit and direct responsibility for the functioning and for the program and budget of the Pan American Union, the principal operating arm of the OAS, gives the Council a decisive role in determining the pace and the magnitude of the OAS services to be rendered to the member states with respect to the Alliance. Moreover, in a system such as that of the OAS, in which there is technical autonomy in specialized fields, with separate forums for those fields at which special representatives of the governments speak, the Council offers a central locus at which final and unified policy positions can be taken by the individual governments.

THE INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The basic decisions to give the social and economic transformation of Latin America urgent priority in the American community were taken at the meeting in Bogotá in 1960 of the Committee of 21 of the Council of the Organization, set up under Operation Pan America, and at the 1961 meeting in Punta del Este of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, an organ of the Council of the OAS.

At the latter meeting commitments were undertaken establishing the magnitude of the efforts to be made in internal and external assistance. These decisions have the hallmark of their origin in these cooperative and collective deliberations; they possess an essential unity and interrelationship. The tendency to isolate particular aspects of this vast plan from the whole has led to distortions that make the Alliance the target of charges that it is a "giveaway"—of public funds in the United States, and of national sovereignty in Latin America.

There can be little question that the existence of the multilateral institutions of which I have been speaking made possible the acceptance in an international forum of the all-important commitments to undertake reforms in areas intimately related to the reserved domain of the state. As the countries participating in the Punta del Este meeting said, these agreements were made "in the exercise of their sovereignty," that is, by free consent and choice.

As if in anticipation of the Alliance for Progress, provision for high-level policy formulation and decision on matters of economic and social development were made by a thoroughgoing reorganization of the Economic and Social Council. This task was accomplished by the Council of the Organization in the winter of 1960–61.

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council now meets annually, at the ministerial or cabinet level. That is, the participants are the highest officials of the executive branch in the economic area. The same men that arrive at the Council's conclusions are directly responsible in their own countries for putting them into action.

The change in the composition and pattern of meetings was accompanied by equally significant changes in work methods. While the Council, at its annual meeting, can and does take decisions having immediate operational implications, it is apparent that it has assumed as a leading function that of serving as a forum for evaluation and comparison—for confrontation—at the highest level, of advances made in economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The first such annual confrontation of the Alliance achievements realized by the various countries took place at Mexico City last October, and was generally considered of great significance for determining future courses of action. The Council operates primarily on the basis of policy determinations already made at Punta del Este. To a large extent emphasis at the ministerial meetings is on execution of policy rather than on its formulation.

This fact is reflected in preparations for the ministerial evaluation. Immediately before this takes place, the Council meets at a technical level to lay the groundwork for the ministers. At this preliminary meeting the governments are represented by "experts of the highest possible level." While such experts could ill have been spared in many cases for permanent assignment to Washington, the countries can afford to release them briefly for exchanges of views and experiences from which much national benefit may be derived. The experts review at their meeting, from the technical standpoint, the documents and proposals to be submitted to the ministers for consideration in their political aspects. Prominent among the documentation are reports from each country on problems confronted and progress made in their solution, and a survey by the General Secretariat of the situation in Latin America as a whole. These, and other documents prepared by the Secretariat, give the Council a detailed view of action to be taken individually and collectively by the membership and by agencies of the OAS and other international organizations.

The Mexico City meeting created special committees in six areas: planning and project formulation; agricultural development and agrarian reform; fiscal policy and administration; industrial development and financing for the private sector; education and training; and health, housing, and community development. At their meetings, starting early this year, the members of the committees will exchange information regarding the progress of their own programs in the fields involved, on the problems they have encountered, and on solutions that have been found. The evaluation and confrontation process which culminates at the ministerial meeting will thus proceed during the intervals when the Economic and Social Council is not in session.

It will be interesting to see how the special committees perform. Unless properly used, they could represent a costly return to the committee structure of the old Economic and Social Council, calling for attendance at meetings that absorb limited financial resources and the time and energies of a small elite of trained personnel in short supply both in the Secretariat and in the Latin American member states.

With a view to permitting an objective, outside review of national development plans previous to their presentation for financing, the Punta del Este meeting established a new group, known officially as the Panel of Nine, and unofficially as the Nine Wise Men. Appointed by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council upon the nomination of the Secretary General of the OAS, the Executive Secretary of ECLA, and the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, these are experts of the highest level in varying aspects of national development. If it so desires, a nation may submit its overall plan for examination by an ad hoc group drawn from the Panel and from outside sources. While no limitations are placed upon the government's freedom of action, the Charter of Punta del Este declares: "The recommendations of the ad hoc committee will be of great importance in determining the distribution of public funds under the Alliance for Progress."

National plans will normally be of such a magnitude as to preclude obtaining all the required external funds from a single source. A possible channel is indicated by the Punta del Este Charter, which provides that: "A government whose development program has been the object of recommendations by the ad hoc committee with respect to external financing requirements may submit the program to the Inter-American Development Bank so that the Bank may undertake the negotiations required to obtain such financing, including the organization of a consortium of credit institutions and governments disposed to contribute to the continuing and systematic financing, on appropriate terms, of the development program. However, the government will have full freedom to resort through any other channels to all sources of financing, for the purpose of obtaining, in full or in part, the required resources."

THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF THE ORGANIZATION

I come now to the transformations that have taken place in the principal "operating arm" of the OAS, the General Secretariat. Whereas traditionally the Pan American Union was concerned almost exclusively with informational activities, and with the furnishing of organizational, administrative, legal, and technical services at headquarters to deliberative bodies and conferences, today only about 15 percent of its budget goes into such services. The other 85 percent is devoted to operations directed toward promoting the progress of the member states in economic, social, scientific, and training fields.

An important part of this activity takes place in the territories of the individual member states as field services to the governments, such as the OAS regional training centers in a number of countries.

A certain number of functions concerned with the forward march of the Alliance devolve primarily upon the Pan American Union. Important among these functions are those of assistance in planning. Experts in this sector are in short supply everywhere. The OAS, drawing upon its own staff and upon contract personnel, has been able to help several countries in working out their plans and programs. I foresee, moreover, increasing demand for assistance in developing specific projects for financing. Large sums have been earmarked by international agencies for general programs of investment, but detailed plans for individual undertakings must be presented before actual disbursement can take place.

The organization and administration of technical assistance missions, in areas ranging from electoral reform to rural electrification, represent another important feature of Pan American Union participation in the Alliance.

So too do the training programs operated under Pan American Union auspices, in such varied fields as statistics, housing, applied social sciences, rural education, urban planning, and business administration. In addition to its own projects, the Union maintains the fellowship program I mentioned earlier, which permits qualified personnel to pursue advanced study at institutions of recognized standing, in any area that the fellow's government considers of importance to national development.

The Secretariat also has the responsibility of carrying out special studies of importance for understanding the problems impeding development and the means of overcoming them. As in the case of the training and technical assistance programs, the Secretariat had been engaged in activities of this sort prior to the Alliance, but, though not innovations, they are still important for its success. In this connection, the Punta del Este meeting called for the establishment of large-scale task forces to undertake investigations and studies, and drawing on the experience of the member states, to prepare reports and adopt conclusions of a general nature for Latin America in the fields of education, land reform and agricultural development, and public health that may serve as a basis for the member states in preparing their national development programs. The education task force recently completed its work, having produced a series of studies and proposals that should be of great use to the countries of Latin America, the OAS, and other international organizations.

A highly significant function that has been assigned to the chief of the Secretariat, the Secretary General, is that of making representations, on behalf of the member states, to the Commission of the European Economic Community—the so-called Common Market—concerning measures that have had an unfavorable effect upon Latin American basic exports to the countries composing the Community. The Secretary General undertook a mission to this end in Europe last summer, thereby inaugurating a new, and I hope fruitful, era of collective action in international relations.

The geographic frame of reference within which the Pan American Union operates has expanded in other ways. Close collaboration has been established with other international agencies working in the inter-American area and arrangements are being worked out with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and other European-based agencies in addition to the European Economic Community. With the aim of facilitating such relations, offices of the Pan American Union recently were established in Paris and Brussels.

The Old World is stretching out a helping hand to the New. Several European countries, the State of Israel and others, have offered a substantial number of fellowships for training in special fields. In many cases these have been processed and courses are now underway. Moreover, since in various areas the hemisphere does not have sufficient trained manpower to staff our technical assistance and training operations, we have been glad to be able to recruit personnel from other parts of the globe. However, while we welcome this help, and the possibility of financial assistance in the form of extraregional private investments and public funds, these positive factors could be canceled if members of the European community adopt restrictive policies and practices with respect to Latin American export products, the lifeblood of the region's economy.

THE COLLECTIVE PROCESS IN SYNTHESIS

The extent to which the Alliance for Progress depends on collective institutions may be put in perspective by the following summary of what I have said. The OAS furnished the forum within which the nations of America formulated the policies and objectives of the Alliance, and the means by which they can be assisted in carrying those policies and objectives into effect. Included in these means are those through which the nations may supplement their own technical skills through the advice and assistance of foreign technical experts in the formulation of national and sectorial development plans; through which the plans may be reviewed and adjusted so that they can be acceptable for international financing, and through the setting of standards by which projects can be judged as acceptable. International entities and procedures were agreed upon which permit the exchange of experiences and the development of concepts, of both a political and technical nature, which facilitate the resolution of major problems impeding development and the defense of the economies of the members against adverse developments in world markets.

The evaluation and confrontation process to which I have referred previously is of central importance. It marks the various stage of Alliance progression. It is here that we see the close relationship of the unilateral, bilateral and multilateral components of the program and of its planning, technical assistance and financial aspects.

As regards services made available by the OAS Secretariat and other international agencies, the work of the task forces and other special studies provide a basis for economic and social planning by the individual member States. In the course of the planning itself—overall or sectorial, long-term or short—technical assistance may be given, upon request from the governments. Some of this help may be in preparing specific projects for financing, within the general development programs.

The six special committees created by the Mexico City meeting of the Economic and Social Council gather between sessions of that body to exchange experiences in their respective fields, using in particular the information and materials that result from the activities just described.

The findings of the six committees are transmitted to the Economic and Social Council meeting at the expert level, where they are considered together with national reports on economic and social progress, the secretariat survey of the situation in Latin America as a whole, and other information. All this material, revised and coordinated in its technical aspects, is then transferred to the ministerial meeting for review from the policy viewpoint and decision as to possible changes in orientation of the Alliance programs.

The findings of the ministers are, finally, transmitted to the Council of the Organization for consideration in the light of overall policies and responsibilities of the OAS, and, insofar as programs are to be executed by the secretariat, for decision as to the scale on which they are to be carried out as determined by the financial resources made available.

The evaluation and confrontation process that I have outlined is similar to the functions performed under the Marshall plan by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). The confrontation provides the means for a collective examination at different technical and policy levels of the problems encountered, for a review of the progress being made and offers an opportunity to determine the degree of compliance with the commitments undertaken in the charter of Punta del Este.

BASIC PROBLEMS BEFORE THE ALLIANCE

Several times I have referred to problems impeding the progress of the Alliance. They are both many in number and serious in nature. No attempt should be made to minimize them. They must be brought into the open in order that we may cope with them effectively.

It must be recognized, for instance, that the economic and social goals of the Alliance are both competitive and complementary. Resources being limited, shall they be used to build schools or factories? Should profits from industry be paid out in more wages or reinvested to permit plant expansion? The economic and social are interdependent in their sequence. The modern economy requires a modern society, a society in which men possess education, health, and home so that they have the skill, stamina, and stake in society to work well and willingly at the complex tasks of a technological economy. In turn only a modern economy can produce sufficient resources to provide for the social development of a citizenry.

Another factor making for slow advance lies in the fact that the institutional reforms agreed upon in principle at Punta del Este, the general aim of which is greater social justice, often require in practice changes not only in the law but also in entrenched attitudes and habits of work that have their roots in traditions of the past. Changes in the tax structure will touch important sectors of the population in that peculiarly sensitive area of the pocketbook, and it can hardly be expected that they will give up long-held privileges of exemption without struggle.

Moreover, and to single out but one phase, converting systems of the pretechnological and prescientific age into modern institutions and practices is often not merely a matter of importing machinery and know-how, as if it were food and clothing to be distributed wholesale. Technological and scientific experience must be adapted to conditions prevailing in the underdeveloped countries—often adjusted to widely differing situations in different regions of the same country.

Agrarian reform, for example, is not merely a matter of taking land from a few large holders and dividing it among the many, or even of opening up public lands for distribution. It means also conveying modern methods of utilizing the soil to people living and working in what is to us the remote past. Even in so relatively advanced an area as the state of São Paulo in Brazil one can find farms on which the rice crop is cut with sickles, the sheaves beaten by hand against wooden rails, and the grain winnowed from the chaff by tossing it in the air with a shovel. This is a process that might have come out of the Biblical Book of Ruth. Not only must new types of seed, principles of crop rotation, and instruments of cultivation be introduced; but also markets and credit facilities must be developed, roads for the transport of produce built, schools, and training centers provided, and a whole complex program initiated of integrating previously abandoned or new rural communities into the economic and social life of the nation. The urgency of the effort required in this regard will be readily perceived when I remind you that, though Latin America does not today grow all the food its people need, there will be half as many mouths again to feed by the middle of the coming decade.

We see, therefore, that the achieving of agrarian reform means in fact the development of an entire supporting system of changes: political, economic, and social. The achievement of the other great objectives of the Alliance, whether they be housing or economic integration or education, requires this same long-term creation of a web of underlying political, economic and social changes. The implication is that the most meaningful criterion for measuring the progress of the Alliance is not merely the number of acres already redistributed or new homes already built, nor the exact number of dollars expended, but even more importantly the degree to which these essential prerequisite processes have been carried forward.

Another obstacle to a more rapid Alliance pace lies in the fact that, in large areas of Latin America, the climate has not been an inviting one of late for private investment. Social unrest and a strong wave of nationalism have led to threats of expropriation of foreign property, limitations on the conditions under which investments may be made by foreign concerns, and restrictions on the amount of profits that may be remitted abroad. These factors are of course greatly compounded in their adverse effects by the experience of foreign investments in Cuba.

The devising of ways and means to change this unfavorable climate is high on the agenda of the Alliance. And American business is not passively waiting for governmental action. More and more, American and European business sees that it, too, has a responsibility to improve the climate through policies identified with the economic development and social justice objectives of the Alliance.

The Charter of Punta del Este recognized that an important role must be played by private investment if the objectives of the Alliance are to be achieved as scheduled. The charter declared that: "The economic and social development of Latin America will require a large amount of additional public and private financial assistance on the part of capital-exporting countries. It recommended "promotion through appropriate measures * * * of conditions that will encourage the flow of foreign investments and help to increase the capital resources of participating countries in need of capital."

A factor which at times countervails external investment is represented by drops in prices on the world market for a given commodity. It has been estimated that the amount of dollars Latin American countries have lost in recent years as a result of declining prices is comparable, and in some cases superior, to the amount received under the form of loans and grants from the United States. The value of Latin American exports to the United States in 1961 would have been higher by $1.4 billion if prices had remained at the 1953 level. This sum is greater than the combined flow of funds from all sources into Latin America in the same year of 1961.

And this is still not the entire story. It is difficult to estimate the flight of domestic capital, since it often takes place under conditions of well-guarded secrecy. One estimate is that Latin Americans have sent more funds out of the area than external investors have put in—perhaps as much as $600 million more. This phenomenon is unquestionably a problem before the Alliance, but its magnitude and its relationship to the Alliance, in particular the contention that it represents a fear reaction to institutional reforms, needs objective analysis.

Guesses concerning the magnitude of this outflow of "hot money" have been as high as $10 to $25 billion during the past year or 18 months. No doubt, there has been a substantial outflow of short-term funds from Latin America, but not all of it can be classified properly as flight capital. The rise in the value of Latin American trade, particularly imports, means that traders must maintain larger working balances in foreign banks; moreover, medium- and long-term credits extended to Latin American borrowers are usually reflected in an increase in short-term deposits in foreign banks, since the loans are being drawn down and utilized only gradually. A good slice of Latin American funds in the United States, moreover, constitutes balances with security brokers, reflecting the lack of similar investment opportunities at home, rather than a frantic flight of funds for safety. Finally, one must not forget, that capital flight from Latin America, as well as from many other areas, is nothing new. And while there may have occurred some increases in recent years, accounted for principally by two or three countries, there is no reason to believe that the magnitudes are anywhere near the figures commonly cited. I frankly doubt whether Latin American capital flight over the past year has exceeded $500 million. This does not mean that we should take comfort, for even this figure is large and represents a considerable waste of resources. In addition to these outflows, moreover, there are also others which fall into the category of speculative capital, or funds seeking a hedge against currency devaluation and depreciation. While these capital exports have an economic, rather than a political rationale, they are just as undesirable and underline the importance of monetary stability as a prerequisite for the effective harnessing of domestic resources in order to realize the objectives of the Alliance.

The decline of prices for Latin America's commodity exports, and the outflow of funds, both for political and speculative reasons, together threaten to cripple the member states capacity for securing the foreign exchange so essential to industrializing of their economies and improving the productivity of their agriculture. The needed diversification to escape the hazards of the one-crop economy cannot proceed without foreign exchange for new installations and equipment in both factory and field.

These are deep-rooted problems and movements, all simultaneously creating strains on the economies of Latin America: the cost of social development, class privilege, traditional work patterns; the cost of industrialization and agricultural diversification; the decline in export prices, the flight of capital, monetary inflation. To forget these problems is unrealistic; to let them obscure the new socioeconomic foundations being built would be equally unrealistic.

Other sources of difficulty, particularly in organizational and political aspects, are often summed up in facile slogans of glib catchwords which obscure their complexity.

It has been said, for instance, that the Alliance needs to be "Latinized." But just how is this to be done? And, just what does the proposal actually mean?

When the Marshall plan was set in motion, a special institution, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, was set up to coordinate the interests of the countries receiving aid. Some have suggested that a similar agency should be established for the Alliance for Progress. This proposal overlooks the fact that the Americas already have a going regional organization, whereas Europe had none, and that much time and effort had to be expended in preparing the OEEC for operations. A Latin American OEEC-type agency could well introduce a wedge into the inter-American community that would split the unity so laboriously created over the years.

Similar forces of cohesion and division are joined in a historic encounter on the other side of our Atlantic community. There we see a European Economic Community without Britain, at the same time that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation has become the larger Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, via the inclusion of the United States and Canada. If what is intended by proposals for a Latin American OEEC-type commission is to encourage self-help, or to develop a sense of Latin American identification with the Alliance, or to promote Latin American economic integration, all these can be accomplished, I am convinced, without resorting to devices that can do violence to our traditions and practices of inter-American cooperation.

We should take care to maintain the Alliance effort within the unique kind of internation relationship that we have evolved, a relationship in which the demands of independence and interdependence have been reconciled to produce a viable partnership between great and small powers.

There are those who say that the Alliance is a U.S. program, in some way imposed on Latin America. Now to be sure the suggestion which set the Alliance in motion came from President Kennedy, but he was in a very real sense taking up the ideal earlier advanced by President Kubitschek of Brazil for an Operation Pan America, within whose framework the Alliance has specifically been established. President Kubitschek's suggestion, in turn, summed up aspirations that had been voiced in Latin America for at least a decade.

Nevertheless, and despite the fact that the Alliance is multilateral rather than bilateral, champions of the Alliance in Latin America are classed by certain sectors as agents of Yankee imperialism, lackeys of the U.S. State Department, and the like. This is demagoguery and is increasingly recognized as such.

The recent meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Mexico City noted that the problem is primarily one of public education. It called upon "molders of public opinion * * * to collaborate * * * by taking a continuous and active part in * * * a movement directed toward publicizing widely this new concept of modern social democracy." It further recommended that "the member states instill in their peoples the conviction that their own national efforts, both public and private, in the field of economic and social development constitute an essential aspect of the Alliance for Progress." A sense of identification with the aims and programs of the Alliance on the part of the peoples of Latin America would contribute greatly to the success of the efforts being made, but this feeling must be developed within the countries themselves. It cannot be "sold" to them (in the words of another slogan) in a gigantic advertising campaign, sponsored from without.

We also have very much with us the contraposition of the concepts of status quo and change. The magnitude and comprehensiveness of the Alliance, its revolutionary approach, have put partisans of the different sides of this age-old conflict at odds in the inter-American setting. At times the struggle assumes the form of sterile exchange of stereotypes: "You are for the status quo," which means that the accused is against change and progress; and the other side replies: "You are for change for the sake of change," which means that the accused is a radical and perhaps an unthinking "fresh starter." We must avoid the stultifying effects on positive and creative thinking of the slogan approach to this crucial problem of the Alliance in an epoch of great transformations, in which sound judgment calls for a reconciliation of the requirements of change and stability.

Often novelty consists less in an idea, an instrument, or an object in itself than in the context in which it is employed and the use made of it. Because Homer spoke of a wine-dark sea, is that image to be forbidden to all later poets? Was Shakespeare not to write "Hamlet" because the plot was old? Who is to say that his work was not new in the use he made of his material? As August Heckscher, the consultant to the White House on the arts, recently observed: "In a balance between permanence and flux, between what is kept and discarded, what is loved and what is merely used, lies the key to a meaningful civilization." The same applies to a truly living and significant international organization.

A final comment on a problem affecting the OAS as the central agency of the Alliance. Admirable as all the expanded operations of the General Secretariat to which I have referred may be in themselves, and promising as they may be of productive results, they nevertheless pose a serious problem of financing. Quota payments must be made in dollars, and this represents an appreciable drain upon slim stocks of foreign exchange in the case of many countries.

The means must be found to permit the OAS to meet the demands made upon it for aid in the planning and the executing of national programs and for their coordination, and for the development of manpower resources through education and training, so that in economic and social questions, as in ones of a political nature, the OAS may be the instrument of concerted action by the American community.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

A last word on the role of international organization. To focus on international institutions as the primary vehicle for action, whether political or economic and social, is dangerously misleading. Dr. Alberto Lleras, a former President of Colombia and Secretary General of the OAS, now engaged with ex-President Kubitschek of Brazil in reviewing the activities and procedures of the OAS with a view to making the operation of the Alliance more efficient and dynamic, observed upon a memorable occasion that an international organization can be only what the member goverments want it to be, since in essence the organization is the governments.

In the case of the Alliance for Progress, the governments have willed that the OAS be a far more active agency than ever before, but even so its role is primarily that of catalyst. The prime elements for achieving the goals of the Alliance are the governments, upon whose action or inaction success depends. Some will doubtless proceed with greater enthusiasm and dispatch than others, but I have every confidence that those who embarked upon the Alliance at Punta del Este will see that that noble resolve is carried to full fruition, so that a better life is brought to all the peoples of our hemisphere.

PERSPECTIVE ON PROGRESS WITH THE ALLIANCE

In recognizing the array of problems I have touched upon, we would do well to recall that most of them are not new to Latin America or other underdeveloped areas. The new element, the significant element of change, is the existence of this new Alliance with its action programs, which, after only 18 months of existence, are penetrating slowly but steadily into the communities of Latin America.

To grasp the scope of concrete Alliance achievements, you must bear in mind their cumulative and interrelated nature. The Alliance was not conceived in terms of a few spectacular achievements. Aswan dams alone will not do. The action programs are being woven into the entire social and economic fabric of the continent.

I suggest that the most meaningful approach to appraising the progress is to recognize that the Alliance is a process, a movement, not an assemblage of quickly manufactured finished goods.

With these points in mind, what can be said about actual results beyond the vast work of organization to which this study has been primarily devoted?

One can resort to statistics and lists, such as the fact that a large number of member states have increased their budgets for education from 20 to 60 percent since Punta del Este; that the manufacturing output increased by 8 percent in 1961; that the United States has channeled a quarter billion dollars in aid toward better housing, while, for example, Chile's national plan allocates a fourth of its total public expenditures for housing. Tax reform legislation has been passed, and a considerable degree of implementation begun, in most countries. Uruguay enacted its first income tax in 1961; new income tax systems were established in 1962 in the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Nicaragua; major structural changes were made in the tax laws of Colombia, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, and Panama; Guatemala, the only member state without a personal income tax, prepared such a law in late 1962 for presentation to its Congress; and so on for most countries.

Again, as an outstanding but not isolated example of agrarian reform, let me quote President Rómulo Betancourt: "The fact has not been sufficiently publicized that in Venezuela an agrarian revolution is being carried out in the countryside by peaceful and legal means, and that in 4 years more than 3½ million acres of land have been distributed among landless farmers; that more than 57,000 families have been settled on their own land; and more than $100 million have been invested in agrarian reform. This reform was begun before the Alliance for Progress was proclaimed, and in its recent phases it has received aid and cooperation from that progress."

Yet neither the criteria of percentages nor dollar signs nor number of factories or schools built and acres redistributed can provide a full insight into the dynamics of the process of progress in the Alliance.

One can more meaningfully study the dynamics by considering one of the approximately broad areas of activity, such as education, and reflecting on the new social and economic patterns being established by actions such as the following few examples from the complex process encompassed by the word "education":

At this moment, in hundreds of specific communities throughout Latin America, primary grade schools have recently been completed or are under construction. In Pernambuco, one regional state of the northeast area of Brazil, there were 144 schools under construction at one time under the Alliance. Thousands of new teachers are being trained. In, for example, Costa Rica, teacher training ranges from inauguration of newly expanded normal schools to science teaching texts prepared from materials of the National Aeronautic and Space Agency by the Inter-American University in Puerto Rico. New textbooks range from 2¼ million free readers being printed for more than 800,000 first and second grade children in five Central American Republics to advanced scientific texts under preparation for many universities. New techniques are spreading. Guatemala has launched television courses for adult literacy, secondary education, and university level, in broadcasts throughout the republic; Colombia has embarked on mass educational television for schools in five regional departments. University systems are being strengthened. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank has lent Chile $2.3 million to strengthen technological training in five regional universities.

When the balance sheet of the Alliance at its present stage is cast, a surprisingly impressive total, a far ranging panorama of action, becomes evident.

I have talked, I think with considerable frankness, about problems and issues we face in working at the Alliance's objectives. I have referred only to some of the principal difficulties and obstacles. The decade set for the Alliance can only get this great program underway. We face a long, hard road. Your generation will be traveling it, and you will travel it in the good company of your contemporaries of Latin America. This is a task you cannot avoid and cannot escape. The achievement of the Alliance's purposes, whether you call them the Alliance for Progress or by some other name, is a vital part of our world effort to maintain the freedom of man.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today I have joined my distinguished colleague and friend across the aisle, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in providing bipartisan sponsorship for a bill he introduced a few weeks ago, S. 1343. It would authorize moderate Federal financial assistance for public elementary and secondary education throughout the country, meeting undeniable educational needs in appropriate ways.

Both the bill and its bipartisan sponsorship are squarely in the tradition of our late and great Senator Robert A. Taft, a tradition with which I am glad to be associated.

Mr. President, there are honest fears about Federal control of education. To allay these fears the proposed legislation provides that:

First. Federal funds shall be invested in the State aid education system, authorized by the State legislature.

Second. Federal funds shall become State funds upon receipt by the State.

Third. The commingled Federal and State funds would be distributed to local school authorities for public education, in accordance with State law.

Fourth. State and local authorities would determine their most critical educational needs and how they can best be met.

The 4-year bill authorizes State surveys of educational needs and priorities in every local school district during its first year. The total Federal outlay for this year would be $6 million. The survey results would set the general pattern for distribution of commingled State and Federal funds by each State to the local school districts within its borders. Each State would thus pinpoint the various needs of its local districts and direct the merged Federal and State matched funds to these needs. The Federal Government would distribute funds only to the States.

After the survey year, Federal funds would be allocated to the States on a variable matching formula for each of the remaining 3 years. Complete and strict accounting by the States to the Federal Government would be required, but the fiscal procedures prescribed by the law would make Federal interference with local programs of teaching both illegal and administratively impossible.

Allocations to the States would be based on the latest annual total amount of State and local expenditures for public schools in each State. This bill would authorize increases in State and local funds now available for education, ranging from 2 percent of these expenditures in the richest State to more than 8 percent in the poorest State.

We are convinced that these Federal-State and State-local procedures would direct the Federal funds effectivly to the points of genuine priority needs in the thousands of school districts to be served. This bill would strengthen, rather than weaken, State and local autonomy in education.

Mr. President, local property tax resources in thousands of communities are strained. The States have, through great efforts, increased their direct appropriations for elementary and secondary schools to more than $6 billion a year. Enactment of the sort of proposal we make is to insure modest Federal financial cooperation in this most important area of American life. We commend this bipartisan legislation to all Senators, for their thoughtful consideration.

CANCER STAMP URGED

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased and encouraged by the widespread support received by my bill, S. 1517, which directs the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the crusade against cancer. Fifteen distinguished Members of the Senate have joined with me in sponsoring the bill.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has gone on record in support of my bill and Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze has told me in his letter of June 6 that his Department will be pleased to lend its support to my proposal. The Surgeon General of the United States and the Director of the National Institutes of Health are also supporters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letters which I have received from the Secretary, the Surgeon General, and the Director, National Institutes of Health, in support of S. 1517.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 6, 1963.*

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. NEUBERGER: Thank you for your letter of May 14 informing me that you have introduced legislation authorizing and directing the Post Office Department to issue a special U.S. stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer.

This Department will be pleased to lend its support to your proposal.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Luther L. Terry, informs me that the Service, and particularly the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, are aware of your efforts and are writing you in support of your proposal.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Public Health Service,
May 24, 1963.

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Neuberger: I appreciate very much your letter of May 14 informing me that you have introduced in the Senate legislation authorizing and directing the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp honoring the crusade against cancer.

As you know, the Public Health Service, through the National Cancer Institute, has long been active in this field and any effort to create public awareness of this disease and the need to take early precautions against it is always welcomed by the Service.

We take pleasure in lending our support to your effort. If there is any further action we can take please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Price,
Acting Surgeon General.

Department of Health,
Eduction, and Welfare,
Public Health Service,
Bethesda, Md., May 31, 1963.

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: It was very thoughtful of you to bring to my attention, in your letter of May 14, the bill you have introduced to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp commemorating the crusade against cancer. I am indeed happy to express my support of this proposal.

Allow me to express my appreciation, and that of my colleagues in the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health as a whole, of your unfailing interest in the problem of cancer as the second leading cause of death in this country.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Shannon,
Director.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on June 4, 1963, the Securities and Exchange Commission submitted to Congress its legislative program for this session. S. 1642, which embodies the SEC proposals, was introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], and following the introduction of the bill, I announced that hearings on S. 1642 would begin June 18.

On June 5 the New York Times commented in an editorial on the legislative proposals of the SEC. The editorial noted in part that—

> Congress should not delay consideration of the SEC's demands, aimed at establishing a universal code of conduct for the marketplace.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Standards in the Market

The rapidly growing financial community and the army of shareholders across the Nation should welcome the Securities and Exchange Commission's proposals for increased regulation of the securities markets.

Its requests for legislation are not of a nature that would stifle the flow of capital or weaken public confidence in Wall Street. While they fail to touch on many problem areas, which may be covered in another message, they would set up standards to strengthen the free market process and pave the way for even greater public participation.

Most of the SEC's recommendations represent an extension of the tested regulatory principles that have governed operations on Wall Street. Its major demand, for example, is that full disclosure be applied to corporations whose shares are traded in the vast over-the-counter market. Full disclosure, which now covers only securities listed on the exchanges, has proved its usefulness both as a deterrent to unethical practice and a prerequisite for intelligent investing. The double standard that exists on Wall Street, with the activities of one group open to public scrutiny while the other operates in the dark, can be ended by casting the searchlight of disclosure on all publicly held companies.

The SEC breaks new ground in calling for qualifying standards for those entering or practicing in the securities industry. When it was first established as the watchdog over the markets, the SEC deliberately refused to set up any standards, largely because the financial community was then run along the lines of a private club. Now that Wall Street is becoming a mass market, the SEC's wide-open door has been a boon to shoestring promoters and uninformed or unscrupulous salesmen seeking to exploit public ignorance and greed.

Wall Street itself has recognized the need to raise its standards. Despite its original fears that regulation would prove either unworkable or lead to the withering away of the free market, the financial community has grown and prospered under the SEC's surveillance. The responsible members of Wall Street have not been able to enforce on all sectors of the industry a uniform code of ethical practices. This task has become the responsibility of the SEC.

With the markets once again showing signs of a revival of speculative activity, Congress should not delay consideration of the SEC's demands, aimed at establishing a universal code of conduct for the marketplace. Dealing in a free market will always entail risks. But the imposition of standards that foster integrity and more intelligent investing will provide a desirable safeguard that is long overdue.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is a critical need to provide adequate day-care services for children of migratory workers. This legislation (S. 522) establishes a 3-year program to assist States in providing day-care services for children of migratory workers. The bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $750,000 for 3 years beginning with fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to pay part of the costs of establishing and operating badly needed day-care services for migrant children. This measure is similar to the migrant day-care bill (S. 1130) approved by the Senate in the 87th Congress as a floor amendment to another bill.

NEED FOR DAY-CARE FACILITIES FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

There were approximately 415,000 children of migratory farmworkers under age 14 in the United States in 1962. Yet, in the entire Nation today, there are only about 24 licensed day-care centers to serve these children. Thirteen of these 24 day-care centers are located in New York and Pennsylvania. Existing day-care centers would probably accommodate less than 1,000 migratory children.

Of the many children who must accompany their parents on their annual search for agricultural work, the most neglected are the very young children. Too young to work in the fields, they are left at the home camp, and are usually tended by a woman too old or sick to work, or by an older child—perhaps only 9 or 10 years old himself. Even if an older woman is in charge, the care and supervision provided are generally unsuitable and perfunctory. Sometimes infants are taken to the fields with their parents and left for the whole day with little shelter, care, or attention. In short, these children are generally uncared for, and when care is provided it is usually inadequate.

In his statement before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze mentioned some of the unfortunate consequences of this lack of day care for migrant children:

> Such inadequate care has resulted in tragedies to many children through fires, drownings, and other accidents. They have been run over while playing in roadways or injured by farm machines. We are concerned not only about some of these dramatic fatalities but also about the day-to-day neglect of these children, the lack of adequate daily food, and their lack of training and supervision for normal growth and development.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Providing these children with proper care throughout the long working day would give them an experience in their early years which would have a lasting effect on their development into useful adult members of society.

Of the many accidents among young children of migratory farmworkers, a recent bus accident in Florida shows in tragic terms the great need for and value of day-care services. The bus carrying 42 migratory workers plunged into a canal drowning 27 men, women, and children. Among the drowned were about a dozen children under 12 years of age. One young boy was only 4 years of age. The availability of suitable day-care services for children of migratory workers would make it unnecessary for them to take their young children with them in overcrowded vehicles or to leave such children unattended in the fields or along adjacent roadways.

Day-care centers for migratory children would not only safeguard children against serious accidents or fatalities, but would also provide an environment offering adequate supervision and beneficial community activities.

Migrant children, being one of the most educationally deprived groups in the Nation, would benefit from educational programs that could be carried out in day-care centers. The educational programs might consist of health and hygiene training, language training and development, or other skills essential to the growth and development of the migrant child.

In this way, day-care centers could assist existing local efforts to provide continuity in the educational development of the migrant child. This, in turn, will make more effective the subsequent educational experience the child will receive in the regular school system.

Additionally, the day-care measure, S. 522, has important supplementary value to programs provided under another bill reported by the Labor Committee—namely, the bill S. 521, which would provide Federal assistance to States and local communities to help educate the children of migrant farmworkers. Day care, provided under the pending bill, S. 522, would give migrant children the foundation needed for a good start in their regular educational program. The day-care bill would therefore make a major contribution in the overall goal of providing migrant children a more equal opportunity for educational growth and development.

Another value of the day-care measure is highlighted by the child labor bill, S. 523, also reported by the Labor Committee. The child labor bill will increase the present need for day care, in that it will curtail the number of young children who currently accompany their parents to the fields. Moreover, since Public Law 78 may soon terminate—the House just recently voted down a 2-year extension of the law—there may be an additional need factor very shortly. Once Public Law 78 terminates, there will be more domestic migrant families moving about seeking farmwork. This means there will be more migrant children, perhaps in very substantial numbers, in need of day care and in areas where, because of the long use of the bachelor bracero, the very presence of children will constitute a new problem which only a day-care facility can meet.

Day care will also serve as a worthwhile adjunct to the migrant health program—Public Law 87-692—enacted by the previous Congress. To conduct the health program in areas not having day-care facilities, State and county health officials will be burdened with arduous physical and logistical problems in their efforts to provide migrant children with immunizations, examinations, or hospital referrals in cases requiring more extensive medical treatment. Conceivably, to reach as few as 50 migrant children, the health officials would have to travel to a dozen or more different locations, transporting with them necessary medical equipment and supplies. The availability of migrant children in fairly large groups in a day-care center would greatly facilitate this work and lessen the time demands upon State and county officials whose continued acceptance of and participation in the program is essential to the success of the Migrant Health Act.

In short, the day-care measure (S. 522) will perform an exceedingly useful function in the overall attempt to provide migrant children with the educational and health benefits which are available to most children and which are so necessary if the migrant child is to become a contributing member of our society.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare if it is not correct that under the provisions of S. 521, S. 522, and S. 526 all formulas are based on the number of domestic migratory workers and are not intended to count workers not citizens of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. These programs are designed basically for the migrant farm families. These are American citizens who travel south to north in streams to harvest from Florida to Maine, from the great State of Texas—unfortunately, they must leave Texas from time to time to make meager earnings farther north.

Mr. TOWER. But they would prefer to stay in Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure they would. I am sure the Senator would be happy to have them remain in Texas, and particularly happy to have them there in November. Most of them are away in November.

The formulas generally are geared to domestic migrant families.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 522) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of April 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 79), is amended (1) by redesignating section 5 as section 6, and (2) by adding after section 4 the following new section:

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed $750,000 for any year, as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating day-care facilities for children of migrant agricultural workers. No grant under this section shall be made for the establishment or operation of any such facility unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is satisfied that such facility (including private homes) and its mode of operation will meet any standards established for facilities of this type by the State wherein such facility is, or will be, located.

"(b) In no case shall a State receive Federal financial assistance with respect to the same expenditure under this section and the provisions of part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act.

"(c) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'migrant agricultural worker' means an individual (A) whose primary employment is agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis, and (B) who establishes for the purposes of such employment a temporary residence; and

"(2) The term 'child' means a child who makes his home with his parent or the individual who stands in loco parentis to the child.

"(d) No funds appropriated under subsection (a) shall be payable to any entity for the purpose of establishing or operating within any locality any day-care facility if such entity imposes, as a condition of eligibility for day care for children of migrant agricultural workers, any residence requirement which excludes any otherwise eligible child who is physically present in the locality."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADEQUATE SANITATION FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 185, S. 526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 526) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; in line 9, after the word "laborers", to strike out "and"; in line 11, after the word "such", to strike out "facilities." and insert "facilities, and (c) to assist States to develop demonstration projects for field sanitation."; on page 6, line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Surgeon General"; in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Surgeon General"; on page 7, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

DEMONSTRATION GRANTS

SEC. 806. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (or political subdivisions thereof) to pay part of the costs of providing demonstration projects for the purpose of developing improved methods of field sanitation which could be utilized by migratory farm laborers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a sum not to exceed $500,000 which shall remain available until expended.

(b) Demonstration projects for which grants are made under subsection (a) shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which such project is to be carried on.

And, on page 8, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "806" to "807"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—PROGRAM TO ASSIST FARMERS IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE SANITARY FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY FARM LABORERS

"*Findings of fact and declaration of purpose*

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the serious and extensive health problems among our Nation's migratory farm laborers and their families who annually reap our Nation's health-giving harvests are of national importance and concern; (2) inadequate sanitation facilities are directly related to the disease and death rates among such laborers and their families; (3) the interstate movement of such laborers and their families, moreover, poses a serious health hazard for the farming communities which they serve; (4) farmers utilizing the services of such laborers are adversely affected economically because such laborers and their families, when afflicted with disease or sickness, cannot efficiently perform the services for which they are employed; and (5) farmers utilizing the services of such laborers often are unable to defray the construction or renovation costs required to provide adequate sanitation facilities for the use of such laborers. It is therefore the purpose of this title to assist, through a program of grants, in the construction of adequate sanitation facilities to serve the needs of our Nation's migratory farm laborers and their families.

"*Authorization of appropriation*

"SEC. 802. In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000 for any such year, as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (a) to assist in the construction of adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers, (b) to assist States in conducting surveys to determine the need, within the State, for the construction of such facilities, and (c) to assist States to develop demonstration projects for field sanitation. From the amounts so appropriated for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall determine the portion to be made available to carry out the purposes of clause (a) of the preceding sentence and the portion to be made available to carry out the purposes of clause (b) of such sentence.

"*State plans for construction grants*

"SEC. 803. (a) From the funds determined to be available for carrying out the purposes of section 802(a), the Surgeon General shall make grants to States which have submitted and had approved State plans for grants to assist in the construction of sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers. To be approved, such a plan must—

"(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out such purposes;

"(2) contain information satisfactory to the Surgeon General regarding the extent of the need for adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers, and the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in meeting such need;

"(3) provide that such funds shall be used solely to assist persons in constructing adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers;

"(4) provide assurances that any sanitation facility, the construction of which is assisted with funds under this title, shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State and will be available for use by migratory farm laborers for a reasonable time after the facility is constructed;

"(5)(A) provide a schedule of priorities for determining the eligibility of persons to be assisted under this title based on (i) the number of migratory farm laborers who would be served by a proposed sanitation facility, (ii) the degree of inadequacy of the sanitation facilities presently available to serve such laborers, and (iii) the financial need of the person seeking assistance under this title with respect to the construction of such facility;

"(B) provide reasonable standards, consistent with the purposes of this title, for determining the amount of funds any person shall be eligible to receive with respect to the construction of any such facility. Such standards shall be designed to afford the greatest assistance to persons with the greatest financial need, except that no person shall be eligible to receive more than 90 per centum of the cost of the construction of any such facility. In determining the financial need of any person for assistance with respect to the construction of a sanitation facility for purposes of this paragraph, due consideration shall be given to the amount of funds available to such person for the construction of such facility from other sources, and the terms and conditions under which such funds are so available.

"(b) The amount granted to any State under subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount allotted to such State pursuant to subsection (c).

"(c) From the amounts determined by the Surgeon General to be available to carry out the purposes of section 802(a) during any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall (pursuant to regulations issued by him) from time to time make allotments to each State which has submitted and had approved by him a State plan for grants under subsection (a). Such regulations shall provide that the amount to be allotted to any State shall be determined on the basis of (1) the number of migratory farm laborers involved and the length of time they spend in the State, and (2) the extent of the need for the construction of sanitation facilities for such laborers in the State. The amount of any allotment to a State under this subsection for any fiscal year which will not be required for carrying out the provisions of its State plan shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Surgeon General may fix, to other States which the Surgeon General determines (1) have need in carrying out the provisions of their State plan for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under such subsection and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts during such fiscal year in carrying out such plan. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under this subsection.

"*Regulations prescribing standards*

"SEC. 804. (a) The Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations standards as to the type of construction projects which will be eligible for assistance from funds available for carrying out the purposes of section 801.

"(b) Such standards shall provide that a project must (1) be needed for the use of migratory farm laborers, (2) not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and (3) be adequate in size, construction, and design to fulfill the purpose for which constructed.

"*Surveys*

"SEC. 805. (a) From the funds determined by the Surgeon General to be available for carrying out the purposes of section 802(b), the Surgeon General may make grants for surveys to States that do not have adequate data regarding the need in the State for the construction of adequate sanitation facilities for the use of migratory farm laborers.

"(b) The amount of such survey grant to any State shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the cost of the survey, giving due consideration to the number of migratory farm laborers involved, and the length of time they spend in the State.

"*Demonstration grants*

"SEC. 806. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States (or political subdivisions thereof) to pay part of the costs of providing demonstration projects for the purpose of developing improved methods of field sanitation which could be utilized by migratory farm laborers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a sum not to exceed $500,000 which shall remain available until expended.

"(b) Demonstration projects for which grants are made under subsection (a) shall be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which such project is to be carried on.

"*Definitions*

"SEC. 807. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'sanitation facilities' means drainage, water, sewage- and waste-disposal facilities, and includes field-sanitation facilities.

"(b) The term 'construction', when used in reference to sanitation facilities, includes expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing sanitation facilities.

"(c) The term 'person' includes any State (or political subdivision thereof), corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company, as well as any individual.

"(d) The term 'migratory farm laborer' means any individual who receives a substantial portion (as determined by the Surgeon General) of his income as a laborer on farms situated in the United States. Such term includes any member of such individual's family who accompanies him from place to place pursuant to the conduct of his occupation as a migratory farm laborer."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"*Short title*

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

(b) Such Act is further amended by redesignating title VIII thereof (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title IX, and by redesignating sections 801 through 814 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and any references thereto, as sections 901 through 914, respectively.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, grossly inadequate sanitation facilities cause high disease and death rates among migratory farm families whose interstate movement poses a serious health hazard for the entire Nation. This legislation would establish a 5-year program designed to alleviate many serious, extensive health problems among migratory farm families. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $2,500,000 annually for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of 4 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States: first, that have submitted, and had approved, a State plan to provide adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm families; second, for surveys by States that need to determine the extent of the need for such sanitation facilities, and third, for field-sanitation projects.

The funds would be allocated, under the State plans, to individual growers and other eligible entities to improve or build sanitation facilities used by migrant farmworkers and their families.

HEALTH PROBLEMS CAUSED BY INADEQUATE SANITATION FACILITIES

This legislation has evolved from public hearings, research and field trips conducted by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Information developed by the subcommittee, the U.S. Public Health Service, and various State health departments demonstrates the need to improve the sanitation facilities used by migratory farmworkers. This need for proper sanitation facilities extends to sewage disposal, water supply, toilet and washing facilities in or near living quarters, and field toilets and handwashing facilities.

Unhealthy, unsafe sanitation conditions prevail not only where migrants live but also in the fields where they work. Agriculture is a notable exception to the usual practice of providing sanitation facilities at work locations. In other areas of commerce, especially in the food-packaging industries, we insist upon adequate toilets, clean drinking water, and handwashing facilities.

Numerous studies have proved that poor sanitation facilities are a direct cause of diarrheal diseases and seriously undermine the health of migrant farm families. Moreover, a high mortality rate among infants and young children results from diarrheal diseases.

Acute diarrheal disease is a condition that can be easily controlled by the maintenance of a sanitary environment, by adequate sanitation facilities, and by good personal health practices. A single simple precaution, such as making safe water available for family use, is an important factor in reducing the incidence of diarrhea. Yet reports of such diseases among migrant families recur year after year. A 1959 Florida Board of Health report, for example, referred to diarrhea as the most common cause of death and severe illness among migrant children after the first month of life.

In testifying before the subcommittee on April 10, 1963, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze discussed the deplorable environmental conditions in which migrant farm families live and work:

> The inadequacy of sanitation facilities for migratory farmworkers is common knowledge. Dilapidated privies are the most usual means of human waste disposal. Often located close to unprotected water supplies, they provide a source of contamination that leads to frequent outbreaks of diarrhea among young children in migratory farm families.
>
> In the fields where migrants work for long hours, often accompanied by young children, the lack of sanitation facilities is striking. Water for drinking or hand washing is seldom supplied. Men, women, and children alike have no toilets except the end of a long row, or space between rows.
>
> In view of the increase in the field packing of produce such as lettuce and celery, which reaches our dining tables without cooking, the lack of suitable field sanitation facilities is a health concern of consumers of fresh fruits and vegetables as well as the fieldworkers who harvest the crops.

Mr. President, the evidence resulting from research, testimony, and firsthand observations leads to only one conclusion: National assistance is necessary if migratory farmworkers and their children are to be provided adequate sanitation facilities that are so necessary to secure their good health and to protect the communities in which they work and through which they pass.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF FARMERS

The farmer is keenly aware of the sanitation needs of the migrant. In some cases workers might come down with a sickness or disease that temporarily halts the harvest. In farming operations this can be disastrous.

Despite their concern with this problem, farmers are often unable to obtain the money needed to construct a new sanitation facility or to renovate an existing inadequate system. This financial squeeze imposes a particular hardship on small or marginal farmers, usually the farmers with the least adequate sanitation facilities.

This bill meets this problem by allowing States, under their State plans, to allocate funds to individual growers and other eligible groups and persons to improve or build sanitation facilities used by migratory farmworkers and their families. Although a State can provide an eligible person or group up to 90 percent of the cost of constructing a particular sanitation project, it is intended that this maximum percentage be available only in those situations where the economic and health factors clearly indicate that such percentage is both necessary and appropriate.

BILL WILL SUPPLEMENT OTHER EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

By easing the financial burdens that prohibit the farmer from providing improved sanitation facilities for migratory farmworkers, this bill will make three major contributions toward improving the health of migrant farm families.

First, this bill will be a valuable adjunct to the Migrant Health Act passed in the last Congress. This act provides family health clinics for migrants. But without improving the environmental health conditions of the migrant, the medical services provided under the Migrant Health Act will be of limited benefit. By eliminating the environmental causes of poor health, the Federal funds now provided for corrective medical services would be more effectively and economically used.

Second, once financial assistance is available to farmers, State legislatures will be less hesitant to pass adequate sanitation or health codes.

Third, the bill will encourage State health officials to strengthen or amplify their enforcement efforts of existing health codes. Sanitation codes have been enacted by a number of States; too often they have not been adequately enforced. A major reason militating against adequate enforcement of health codes is that State authorities recognize that many farmers do not have the capital necessary to provide adequate sanitation facilities.

The approach of this legislation then is eminently realistic. The assistance to States recommended in this bill is essential and will encourage public and private agencies to improve environmental health conditions of migrant agricultural families.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Based upon a recommendation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill was amended by the committee to include a provision authorizing an appropriation of up to $500,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to pay part of the costs of establishing and operating demonstration projects for developing improved methods of field sanitation. Projects developed under this provision would be maintained and operated in conformity with health standards prescribed by the State in which the project is located.

Mr. President, this bill has not, prior to this time, been considered by the Senate. The other bills being considered today have in substance been before the Senate previously and have been passed. This is a new bill which has been reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consideration by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

The efficacy of this program has been amply demonstrated and is of particular interest to Senators who know of the problem and the serious lack of sanitation facilities in their States. There is broad representation and support of the bill. I am personally very grateful to the many cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as so amended, may be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 526) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 180, S. 521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 521) to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 5, line 10, to strike out "sources." and insert "sources; and"; after line 10, to insert:

(10) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

On page 6, line 17, after the word "and", to strike out "1964 and 50 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965, 1966, and 1967," and insert "1964, 75 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965 and 1966, and 50 per centum with respect to the school year beginning in 1967,"; on page 8, line 13, after the word "employees", to insert "during the normal summer school period"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter" and insert "fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of any such costs and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967"; and on page 11, line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title" and insert "fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Short title

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children Educational Assistance Act of 1963".

Finding and purpose of Act

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over any primarly responsibility for public education. The Congress recognizes, however, that the interstate and large seasonal movement of migrant agricultural employees imposes severe burdens on local educational agencies in discharging their responsibilities with respect to the education of the children of, and in providing adult education for, such employees who temporarily live within their school districts. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees, and to provide for certain planning grants to the States to improve such education, and to provide financial assistance for pilot projects for adult education for such employees.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel, of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary, secondary, and adult education, or if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(2) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(3) The term "child" means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable local educational agency provides free public education;

(4) The term "parent" includes a legal guardian or other person in loco parentis;

(5) The term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual (a) whose primary employment is in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis, and (b) who establishes with his family for the purpose of such employment a temporary residence;

(6) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(7) The term "average daily current expenditures per public school child" means the total current expenditures for a State's public elementary and secondary schools during a particular year divided by the product of the average daily attendance in such schools during such year times the number of schooldays in such year; the term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education in such schools to the extent that such expenditures are made from current revenues, except that such term does not include any such expenditure for the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service; and for the purposes of payments under title I for attendance during any academic year the Commissioner shall determine and use the average daily current expenditures per public school child for the year preceding such academic year;

(8) The term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(9) The term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has five hundred or more such employees in any five or less counties each of which has at least one hundred such employees, and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources; and

(10) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Administration

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EDUCATING CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEE PARENTS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 101. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Payments

SEC. 102. (a) Upon application in accordance with the provisions of this section for the school year beginning in 1963, or for any of the four succeeding school years, by the State educational agency of any migrant agricultural employee State, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency an amount equal to 100 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1963 and 1964, 75 per centum with respect to the school years beginning in 1965 and 1966, and 50 per centum with respect to the school year beginning in 1967, of the average daily current expenditures per public school child, for such State, for each day's attendance during such school year in a free public elementary or secondary school of a local educational agency in such State, by a child who attends any such schools in such State for at least five days during such year and whose parent is a migrant agricultural employee. The amount paid under this section to a State educational agency for each day's attendance in a school of a local educational agency shall be paid by such State agency, in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, to such local educational agency.

(b) Payments by the Commissioner under this section shall be made for attendance during the regular school year beginning in 1963, and the four succeeding school years, and may be made at such intervals as the Commissioner deems appropriate. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(c) An application under the provisions of this section shall be in such form and contain such information as may be required by the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner may require such additional information and reports at such intervals during the school year as he deems necessary.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEE PARENTS

Appropriations

SEC. 201. There is authorized to be appropriated $300,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 202. (a) Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees during the normal summer school period for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under the section shall be available during the year for which made and the succeeding fiscal year for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title for the operating costs of conducting necessary summer school sessions for children who have a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee, except that allotments for the fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of any such costs and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for carrying out the provisions of this title in such State during the period for which such allotment is available, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under this section, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use during such period for carrying out the provisions of this title. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

Application and payments

SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out the State program for summer schools to be conducted in such State by local educational agencies or institutions of higher education, or both, the necessity therefor, the operating costs of such summer schools, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such State agency out of the allotment to such State, the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE III—PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 302. (a) Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title (1) to survey the need for summer school sessions for children who have a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee; (2) to develop plans for such sessions where needed; (3) to develop and carry out programs to encourage such children to attend school during the regular academic year and such summer sessions, and to improve the quality of education offered such children; and (4) to coordinate programs provided for in this Act with similar programs in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children, except that allotments for the fiscal years beginning in 1965 and 1966 shall be available for paying not more than 75 per centum of the costs of any activities for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and allotments for the fiscal year beginning in 1967 shall be available for paying not more than 50 per centum of any such costs. Grants under the provisions of this title shall not be available for the cost of acquisition of any facilities.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for carrying out the provisions of this title in such State during such year, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under this section, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use during such year for carrying out the provisions of this title. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

Application and payments

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out such program in sufficient detail to satisfy the Commissioner that it carries out the purposes of this title; and

(3) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency out of its State allotment the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE IV—ADULT EDUCATION

Appropriations

SEC. 401. There is authorized to be appropriated $200,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Pilot project grants

SEC. 402. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 401 for any fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner for paying the operating costs of pilot projects for adult education for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses in such migrant agricultural employee States as he deems appropriate. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner may approve an application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a State educational agency;

(2) sets out a program of adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses which is to be conducted in such State on a pilot project basis by a local educational agency or an institution of higher education, or both, to provide fundamental education and training for healthful modern living, including the operating costs of such classes, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such State agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request access to the records upon which the information is based.

(b) Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such State agency the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Cooperation with Department of Agriculture

SEC. 404. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Commissioner shall consult and cooperate with officials of the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on S. 521 be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided 15 minutes to each side; the time for the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the time for the opponents to be controlled by the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the bill is designed to provide financial assistance to the States for improving the educational opportunities of migratory farmworkers and their children. The bill provides a 5-year program, under which Federal financial assistance will be available for the following purposes: first, education of migratory children during the regular school term, the assistance to be based on the State's average daily educational cost per child; second, summer school grants for migratory children, $300,000 annually; third, coordinating and planning grants respecting educational programs for migrant children, on a State and interstate basis, $250,000 annually; and fourth, establishing pilot projects for adult education for migratory workers, $200,000 annually.

For the first three of these purposes, all relating to child education, the States will provide matching funds beginning in the third year of the program. During the third and fourth years, the States' contribution will be 25 percent. During the fifth and last year of the act, the States and the Federal Government will share the costs on a 50 to 50 basis.

Respecting the fourth purpose, adult education for migratory workers, Federal assistance would be provided on a pilot project basis, and State contributions for operating costs would not be required.

The bill expressly prohibits any Federal control of education and guarantees that State and local agencies shall have sole responsibility for their educatonal programs.

The bill follows very closely the proven principles of educational assistance to federally impacted areas. By granting aid on the basis of the number of migratory workers in the affected locality, the program provides help where it is most needed.

NEED FOR MIGRANT CHILD EDUCATION

Mr. President, the need for this legislation is serious and widespread. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in his favorable report on the bill, estimated that there are about 200,000 to 250,000 children who accompany their parents each year in the search for agricultural employment. Summarizing the educational problems of these children, the Secretary said:

> Migrant agricultural workers are often described as America's forgotten people and their children are referred to as "the most educationally deprived group of children in our Nation." They enter school late, their attendance is poor, their progress is slow, they drop out early; consequently their illiteracy is high. Studies indicate that most migrant children are far below grade level and that their school achievement is usually under fourth grade.

A primary reason why migrant children fall behind in school and drop out early is that they are on the move for a substantial part of each year and therefore, at best, must enroll in several different schools during a single term. Frequently the migrants are present in a community for such a short period of time that the parents may not consider it worthwhile to enroll the children in school; or they may delay enrolling their children until they have been in the new community for several days or weeks.

Many of the local school districts affected by migrants attempt to provide education to these children, but their efforts are often severely limited by lack of funds. The seasonal influx of large numbers of migrant children creates a need for additional classrooms, additional teachers, transportation, equipment, and supplies. Yet the migrant children come from transient, low-income families who do not contribute to the local tax system or otherwise help to defray the cost of educating their children. The rural school districts on which these educational demands are made, moreover, already have the most serious financial handicaps in our entire educational system.

If funds were available to affected local school districts, migratory children could be offered adequate educational opportunities. The few States that presently operate summer school for migrant children have clearly demonstrated the feasibility of educating the migrant child. In these summer sessions, many pupils have been able to do enough work to complete their school year or to make up one or even two grades of schooling. According to the most recent available figures, however, only 3,855 migrant children were enrolled in these remedial summer schools during 1961—a small fraction of the estimated total of 200,000 migratory farm children.

The Federal assistance provided by S. 521 would make it possible to implement these summer programs on a national basis, as well as enabling local school districts to provide more adequate education during the regular school year. The program of grants for summer schools, by allowing communities to use otherwise idle facilities to offer more education to the children, would markedly reduce the disruptive effects of their frequent travel. Finally, the program of planning and coordinating grants would enable local school districts and State educational agencies to work together, on a State and interstate basis. In this way, continuity in educational programs for migratory children could be developed.

NEED FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Like their children, adult migratory farmworkers are in serious need of educational programs. The Department of Agriculture has found that, of all migrants over the age of 25, one-third are functionally illiterate. An additional 43 percent have no more than an eighth-grade education.

The migratory workers' job opportunities have become increasingly limited because of mechanization on our farms. Most migrants lack the skills to operate complex farm machines, and, still more seriously, they are not now trainable in substantial numbers under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Manpower Development and Training Act because they lack the basic reading and writing skills needed to qualify them for job training.

Additionally, migratory workers in many instances lack practical knowledge of the simplest rules of hygiene and nutrition, or knowledge of the use of ordinary living facilities such as toilets, showers, and garbage cans. The result has often been unnecessary damage to employers' property, as well as needless expense for repairs. Educational efforts are also needed to enable migrants even to take advantage of the limited legal protections and community services which are presently available to them.

Federal assistance would enable the States, through local communities or institutions of higher education, to take the initiative in providing fundamental, practical training for migratory workers. These pilot projects would, in my judgment, reinforce the conclusion that feasible techniques for educating the adult migratory worker can be developed, and, once developed, would benefit the worker, his employer, and the community.

Mr. President, this legislation is supported by both governmental and private groups. The administration has recommended the enactment of this bill; and interested organizations across the Nation have urged that it be adopted.

I urge that the Senate now approve these most needed measures, dealing with one of the fundamentals of the good life; namely, education.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this measure. I do not believe it is necessary. In the estimation of many, it is merely an expansion of Federal aid to education when we do not need such aid.

The total number of migrant children in this country is declining, both absolutely and in relation to the total school population.

This is essentially and primarily a State problem, but is not an unbearable burden on any State. The States in which most migrants are employed are the States of California, Oregon, Washing, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Florida, and Texas. These are among our wealthy States. They are the States that have the resources to take care of their educational needs. In my considered opinion, the impetus for taking care of these educational needs should come from the States.

It is in the wealthiest States that most of the migrant workers are located. This legislation would be an instance of the poor States being taxed to meet the problems of the wealthier States.

Indeed, these migrants are used for the benefit of the economy of the States in which they work. This problem should be regarded primarily as the responsibility of those States. I think they should meet that responsibility.

It is not a question of need, but a question of where the responsibility lies. In this instance, the responsibility clearly lies with the States; and the Congress should not legislate in this field.

The number of migratory workers in the United States is declining. It will decline more and more as the technology of science is applied to the tilling of the soil and the reaping of the harvests. The more machinery and implements that are developed to do the job which previously was done by human hands the fewer the number of migratory workers will be. I view it as a declining problem.

It is my fervent hope that the Senate will not act favorably in the matter of legislation for migrant workers' children at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, first of all, this might be a good time to express my gratitude to the Senator from Texas for his exceptional diligence in the consideration of the bills before the Senate today. He is a most valued member of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. While I have as chairman expressed my gratitude to him frequently, I would like to do so publicly now. It is a pleasure to work with the distinguished Senator from Texas. This is true even though on occasion we find ourselves on opposite sides of a given issue, as we do now in connection with the education bill.

It is probably true that the per capita income is high in many of the States in which great numbers of migratory workers are employed. These are the so-called wealthy States; yet life is not quite that simple. Michigan was listed as one of the wealthy States. Three years ago our subcommittee was in Michigan observing various parts of what we call the migratory farmworker problem. In one community specifically we talked with local leaders in government and farmers about education. It was tragically remarkable that a $15,000 program of summer education, which had proved successful on a pilot project basis was snuffed out because of the budgetary situation in Michigan, which was rather difficult that year. It was only a $15,000 program, and yet it meant much to the community and to the youngsters who, in this one place, were getting the kind of start in life that we all hope for in the case of our own youngsters. But the opportunity for better education was snuffed out for the lack of $15,000.

We have received a communication from Mr. Leland J. Yost, a responsible citizen, a California farmer. His statement, which is quoted in the committee report, gives us an example of the financial burden that migrant children place on local school districts. Mr. Yost said:

> In spite of all we have done, I do not feel that we have been successful in educating even a significant portion of the migrant children who attend our schools for a portion of each year. Our efforts must be redoubled.
>
> Yet school taxes on farmland have reached a point where they cannot be increased. Total taxes for school purposes on the 80-acre farm upon which I live were $1,152 last year.

We have received similar information from another wealthy State, Florida. The wealthy State of New Jersey feels the pinch. We operate basically on a property tax, and the pinch is severe. We do not know when we are going to "unpinch ourselves" in terms of resources. In the meantime these youngsters, who are, in a sense, the victims of interstate commerce, should have the benefits of this national program which meets the needs for regular education and summer education. The program also will include education for adults who were left out when they were young and as a result are poorly equipped to deal with the complexities of life.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had not expected to be present at this time, but I would like to express my satisfaction at the way in which the Senator from New Jersey and I have cooperated from the very inception on the subcommittee dealing with the problem of migratory labor and to pay my tribute to the quality of reasonableness and to the desire to accommodate views to the actualities of the situation which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] has shown.

I am glad that S. 522, providing for day-care services, and S. 526, providing for sanitation facilities, have already been passed; that S. 521 is now being considered by the Senate; and the rest of the bills in this field will also be considered.

I should like to state for the record my support of these measures and my hope that they will be signed into law.

In my State of New York a great effort is made to meet the standards which these bills prescribe. Yet I have found in few other places a greater desire that these bills pass. Aside from very human reasons, one reason is competition—putting it on hard economic grounds.

When migratory labor comes into our State, we wish to feel that a national standard obtains in respect to the treatment of our fellow workers, who in many cases have a sense of competition with our own.

We pride ourselves on the conditions which obtain in New York; yet we feel that national standards are extremely desirable. We do not believe that it will be necessary for us to change our State's practices under the bills if enacted into law. However, if it is necessary to do anything, we will cheerfully do it. That seems to be the general attitude in the State.

I appreciate the problems which some of my colleagues in the Senate have. I join the Senator from New Jersey in understanding the position of the Senator from Texas in respect of farm labor in his own State; secondly, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Jersey for his fine cooperation, and the contribution he has made in his desire to advance the legislation as quickly as possible, consistent with the principles stated by the Senator from Texas. I am glad to be of assistance in this endeavor.

When these bills become a part of the body of the law, I believe they will reflect great credit upon the Nation, the Senate, the Senator from New Jersey, and all those who have participated with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator from New York, my good friend, who is a most valuable member of the subcommittee. I recognize that the work we are doing today is the result of the work of the architects in the subcommittee. We have a subcommittee in which there is no acrimony, but the maximum of cooperation. Having the responsibility of the chairmanship, I can appreciate more than anyone else what a fine little institution our subcommittee is. It does not spend much money on national problems such as this, but it means a great deal to people who have been wholly left out, so to speak, with reference to care and attention and opportunity. I hope no one is surprised to find that the Senator from New York, from one of the most populous States in the Union, and I, from the most densely populated State of the Union, New Jersey, should work on problems of poverty in rural America. I hope it will be recognized that my attitude toward life—and this is true of the Senator from New York—is that the place where action should be taken is where the human need exists. The need does not have to be in the city where the Senator from New York perhaps gets his largest vote, or where I get my largest vote. Where there is a human need, I like to feel that we are together, and that our help is enlisted in behalf of people who need help.

Mr. JAVITS. I know of few subjects on the domestic front, certainly in the agricultural field, which appeal as much to the hearts and minds of our constituents as does this subject, in connection with which so little has been done, considering the deep sympathy which the city dweller has with the migratory workers. Certainly that is true in the case of my State, and I know, also, that it is true of the Senator's State, New Jersey, because I know his State pretty well.

The problem has been chronicled in great books, by Steinbeck, and others, and in motion pictures, based upon this recurrent theme in American life.

The Senator from New Jersey says that we are members of a very small subcommittee. That is true, but it is one that deals with prodigious programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article in the April 1963 issue of Health News, a publication of the New York State Department of Health, entitled "Health Services for Migrant Farm Workers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Health Services for Migrant Farm Workers—New York State

(By Walter C. Levy, M.D., assistant director, Community Health Services, New York State Department of Health)

Each year 20,000 to 25,000 migrant workers enter New York State to help harvest the abundant crops of fruits and vegetables upon which the agricultural economy of this State so firmly rests. Most of these harvesters are residents of Southern States. They begin a trek, after the crop harvest has been completed in Florida, to New York State with one or more work stops in Georgia, North and South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Many of these workers have been sharecroppers, displaced from their permanent homes, and they seek livelihood by following the crops as the ripening season advances northward through these States. They begin to arrive in New York State in May or June for the berry and early vegetable harvest. In late June, July, and August the number of arrivals increases rapidly as the snap beans, tomatoes, and sweet corn ripen. Their number reaches a peak in early September. Thereafter, the total declines rapidly. Substantial numbers of migrants are required for the harvest of the potato and apple crops. Relatively few stay on into November for work in processing plants and fewer still remain for the winter.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SERVICES

The responsibility for providing and coordinating health services for migrant workers belongs to the State health department. The health department is represented on the State Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor. This committee acts as a clearinghouse exchanging information among State agencies with responsibilities in this area. Other State agencies represented on the interdepartmental committee are: State department of agriculture and markets; State department of education; division of State police; State department of labor and its division of employment; State department of motor vehicles; and the State department of social welfare.

Additional State agencies concerned with migrant farmworkers are the Joint Legislative Committee on Migrant Labor and the Governor's Advisory Council on Farm and Food Processing Labor.

REGULATIONS AND INSPECTION

With few exceptions, migrant laborers are recruited for work in New York State by crew leaders. A crew leader recruits workers both in family groups and as individuals. While in New York, most migratory workers live in group quarters commonly referred to as farm labor camps. Since 1956, the public health law has required that properties occupied by five or more migratory farmworkers be operated under a permit in accordance with the State sanitary code regulations.

Significant steps have been taken to insure healthful conditions in the 1,000 migrant camps in the State through regulations and inspections. In 1961, more than 8,000 inspections were made of camp health and housing facilities.

HOUSING AND SANITATION

The State sanitary code establishes requirements on housing, construction and maintenance, fire hazards, bathing and toilet facilities, food handling and food storage facilities, water supply and sewage disposal in camps. To determine compliance with these code requirements, farm labor camps are inspected before permits are issued. Following occupancy, repeated inspections are made to insure that the camp continues to meet sanitary code regulations.

IMPROVEMENTS IN HOUSING

The sanitary code has recently been upgraded to require added improvements in housing facilities at farm labor camps. These requirements call for the provision of hot and cold running water for bathing facilities; heating facilities; fire resistant construction; a fulltime caretaker at the larger camps; increased sleeping quarter space; prohibition of portable kerosene heaters and screening of living quarters.

These requirements are enforced by city, county and district health officers. As a result of efforts to date, housing and sanitation at farm labor camps in New York State are generally recognized as being superior to those of most other States. The Empire State is considered among the leaders in improving living conditions at farm labor camps.

Most camps are brought into compliance through normal administrative procedures. A few hard-core cases require hearing and other legal actions each year. The State police have been helpful in gaining compliance through legal actions in local justice courts. The major problem at farm-labor camps continues to be that of continuing maintenance of the property and damage to facilities by the occupants.

NURSING SERVICES

Since 1945, public health nursing service has been provided by the State and by local health departments for migrants. Many local units feel that more nursing time should be spent among migrants than among the resident population. Nurses who visit camps are usually school nurse-teachers. Recruitment is fairly satisfactory in areas where migrants leave the State by early September. The school nurse-teacher group, of course, is not available for camps occupied during the potato and apple harvest after September.

In many county health departments, the public health nurse working regularly in the geographical area where camps are situated, is responsible for the camp nursing. In such counties, the migrant can be served more often in regularly scheduled local clinics such as tuberculosis, orthopedic and child health conferences. This reduces the need to set up special clinics for them.

In many areas the same nurse has been employed to visit migrants for several years. This gives her the advantage of knowing the owners or growers and many crewleaders. Many migrants return with the same crewleader to the same area each year. Thus the nurse has had previous personal contact with the migrant families. This has two advantages: the migrants are more at ease asking for guidance from someone they know and the nurse gains satisfaction since she can often see progress over the years.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Much emphasis is put on maternal and child health, although visits cover the same disease categories of other staff nurses, including bedside care. Nurses working with migrants must spend a great deal of time with public welfare agencies, the clergy and other community social agencies to obtain desired medical and hospital care.

Crewleaders and farmers may differ in responsibility they assume for injuries and illnesses among migrants. The nurse arranges for first aid equipment and for a responsible adult in each camp to treat minor abrasions or call the nurse. One public health nurse taught a first aid course to migrant ministers; this service is worth repeating.

When surplus foods are available, the nurse helps mothers prepare them. Other activities she teaches include simple sewing, first aid and health habits. Group activities must be conducted at night since most mothers work in the fields. The nurse's activities are not an 8:30-to-5 assignment. To see the owner, crewleaders, or the workers, she must be at camp by 7 a.m. or in the late afternoon and evening.

The public health nurse works closely with day-care centers, usually staffed by teachers from the South. At the beginning of the season, a 1-day institute is given to staff members on formula preparation, simple isolation techniques and review of indications of illnesses in children. The nurse visits the day-care centers regularly, and arranges for physical examinations and immunization of children admitted. The workers call her if an emergency arises.

CLINIC SERVICES

During 1961 and 1962, Dr. William H. Bergstrom, Department of Pediatrics, Upstate Medical Center, conducted a pediatric clinic for migratory farmworkers in two counties with large seasonal agricultural migrant populations. Clinics were held twice weekly during the summer. Well-baby care, immunization and routine physical examinations with tuberculin tests were given, and children with ambulatory illnesses received diagnosis and treatment. The clinics were part of the Upstate Medical Center's clinical teaching program. Nursing services were provided by local health departments. Supplies and drugs were furnished by the State health department, and department reports were used.

The venereal disease section of the department's bureau of adult health and geriatrics has conducted blood serology surveys in farm labor camps. Migrants found to have positive serology are treated promptly unless there is evidence they have been adequately treated before.

Special maternal and child health clinic services are provided by local health departments with State financial support. Prenatal consultation services may also be furnished as well as individual pediatric consultations.

Migrant farmworkers are eligible for any health department supported clinic services, including tuberculosis, orthopedic, venereal disease, and maternity and child health.

PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

For several years, the State health department has employed two senior public health educators to conduct a health education program among the migratory farmworkers in farm labor camps in the Geneva and Utica districts. The educators visit the farm labor camps to acquaint themselves with camp conditions and meet crew leaders. They also meet with local citizen groups, church and civic workers, and others concerned with migrants.

Health education activities are carried out through individual counseling and group activities. The public health educators stimulate and advise local migrant committees and help them with special educational materials. They also report to other health department staff members on sanitation and medical problems at the camps.

Congress enacted the Migrant Health Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–692) to stimulate State and local health agencies to extend health and medical services for migrant farm workers. Under this law, $3 million will be appropriated each year for the next 3 years to pay for family health services clinics and other projects to improve health conditions and services for domestic migratory farmworkers and their families.

The Public Health Service will administer this law. Money will be authorized only as grants for specific projects. All State and local health departments or other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations are eligible to apply for a grant. The State health department will review applications before the expert advisory committee makes its recommendation to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Federal funds have not yet been appropriated, but appropriation is expected early in the 1963 congressional session. Health officials have been urged to develop projects and submit applications.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining; the Senator from Texas has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first I should like to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for his very kind remarks and to say, in reciprocation, that I wish to express my appreciation to him for the great fairness he has displayed in dealing with the opposition. He has given us every opportunity to advance our cause, and has never tried to put anything over on us, so to speak. He has been very fair and has always kept his word, and in every way has been a very fair and fine person to work with on the subcommittee. Therefore I am happy to express my gratitude to him.

In connection with the education problem among the children of migrant workers, we too often assume that if we establish a Federal program we will get rid of some of the vexing problems that confront us.

I do not believe that a Federal program is necessarily the answer to the problem. This problem, as I have pointed out, has two aspects. One is that these are children of people who move about the country a great deal. We cannot expect to give a child a high quality of education when he moves about all the time, even under the most favorable circumstances, as can be given to the child when he is able to remain in one place and obtain his schooling in one place.

I am the son of a Methodist preacher. I grew up in Methodist parsonages throughout the State of Texas. We moved from town to town. Therefore, I am the educational product of that type of growing up; and the result is quite obvious. I am certainly no match in wits for the distinguished Senator from New Jersey who, I believe, received his education all in one place.

That is one aspect of the problem that should not be overlooked. Let us not deceive ourselves and believe that we can resolve this problem by establishing a Federal program, by additional Federal expenditures, and by additional Federal intervention.

There is a second aspect, namely, that a great number of families of migrant workers do not want their children to go to school in the areas where they are employed.

These factors must be taken into consideration. There are many aspects of this problem that make it difficult of solution, regardless of what the program is. I do not believe this is the answer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 521) was passed.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 525.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 525) to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "the," to strike out "farmer;" and insert "farmer, who shall be individuals actively engaged in, and whose livelihoods are dependent upon, agriculture, and who employ migratory labor in connection therewith;"; and at the top of page 3, to strike out:

(d) Service of an individual as a member of the Council or employment of an individual by the Council as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(d) While rendering service as a member of the Council, or as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field employed by the Council on a part-time basis or without compensation, an individual shall be regarded as a special Government employee within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor" (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of fifteen members, appointed by the President without regard to political affiliations as follows:

(1) Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the farmer, who shall be individuals actively engaged in, and whose livelihoods are dependent upon, agriculture, and who employ migratory labor in connection therewith;

(2) Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the migratory agricultural workers;

(3) Two individuals, appointed from private life, who shall have a demonstrated interest in and knowledge of the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor, including the problems of the migratory agricultural workers, his employer, and the community;

(4) Two individuals, appointed from private life, who are or have been actively engaged in activities aimed at determining and solving the health, education, and welfare problems of the migratory agricultural worker and his family; and

(5) Three individuals who have had experience as State officials and who are knowledgeable of the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(b) Members of the Council shall be appointed for the life of the Council. A vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman, and one as Vice Chairman. Eight members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(d) While rendering service as a member of the Council, or as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field employed by the Council on a part-time basis or without compensation, an individual shall be regarded as a special Government employee within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(e) Members of the Council shall each be entitled to receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman or at the call of a majority of the members thereof, but not less often than once each calendar year.

Sec. 2. (a) The Council shall have a staff director who shall be appointed by the Chairman without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall have such duties as may be imposed by the Council, and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed $18,000 per annum.

(b) The Council shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) The Council may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants; individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Council, but not in excess of $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the President and the Congress, with respect to (1) the operation of Federal laws, regulations, programs, and policies relating to any and all aspects of migratory agricultural labor: and (2) any other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(b) It shall also be the duty of the Council to consider, analyze, and evaluate the problems relating to migratory agricultural labor with a view to devising plans and making recommendations for the establishment of policies and programs designed to meet such problems effectively. In carrying out such duty, the Council shall consider, among others, the following matters:

(1) The effect of existing laws, regulations, programs, and policies on the various problems relating to migratory agricultural labor, including the problems of the migratory agricultural worker, his employer, and the local area in which he is employed; and

(2) The means for improved coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies and programs relating to migratory agricultural labor.

(c) The Council shall, on or before March 31 of each calendar year, submit an annual comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Labor for transmission by him to the President and to the Congress.

Sec. 4. The Council shall cease to exist upon the expiration of five years from the date of the initial appointments to the Council made by the President under this Act.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year, to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on S. 525 be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, and that the time for the proponents of the bill be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the time for the opposition be controlled by the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the bill, S. 525, would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. The Council would exist for a period of 5 years and would be composed of 15 members appointed by the President without regard to political affiliations. Appropriations would be limited to $50,000 a year.

The membership of the Council would be as follows:

First. Four individuals, appointed from private life, to represent the farmer, with an express requirement that such individuals shall themselves be active farmers, dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood and employers of migratory farm labor;

Second. Four individuals appointed from private life to represent the migratory agricultural worker;

Third. Two individuals appointed from private life with interest in and knowledge of migratory labor problems generally;

Fourth. Two individuals appointed from private life with experience in health, education, and welfare problems of migratory labor; and

Fifth. Three individuals with experience as State officials and knowledge of migratory labor problems.

It shall be the duty of the Council to study and advise the President and Congress on matters relating to migratory farm labor. In studying migratory labor problems and formulating its recommendations, the Council is specifically charged to take into account not only the problems of the worker but also the problems of the farm employer and the local area on which the migrant worker is employed. The Council is also to give particular consideration to the means for improved coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies and programs relating to migratory agricultural labor.

Mr. President, this is an extremely necessary measure. There are at present a sizable number of organizations and agencies, public and private, concerned with migratory labor problems. Nearly all of these agencies, though, are handicapped by limited jurisdiction either in terms of geography or in terms of subject matter. The numerous State committees on migratory labor, for example, are obviously not in a position to become familiar with or act effectively on these problems, which are truly national and interstate in all major respects. In some cases, it is true, there have been efforts at cooperation among the States, such as that made by the Council of State Governments through its Committee of Officials on Migratory Farm Labor of the Atlantic Seaboard States. Such cooperative efforts have not been wholly satisfactory, however, for, at the hearings on this legislation, this very committee submitted testimony that "it has long been the hope of the committee that a national council with advisory and recommendatory functions would be established."

A National Advisory Council cannot be validly criticized on the ground that it would simply duplicate the functions of the existing President's Committee on Migratory Labor. The fact is that the President's Committee has not fulfilled the functions it was designed to perform, for good and sufficient reasons inherent in its very nature. First of all, it is composed exclusively of Cabinet members, together with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In the best of circumstances, these men who compose the President's Committee, being required to deal with a wide variety of pressing problems, cannot be expected to devote a great deal of time and attention to questions involving migratory labor.

Mr. President, the last meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor was held in January of 1962, nearly a year and a half ago. Moreover, it has been reported to the subcommittee that the administration intends to abolish the President's Committee altogether as soon as the National Advisory Council is established.

That private citizens—not Government officials—will predominate in membership on the advisory council should be kept uppermost in mind. There are 12 members drawn from private life; 3 would be present or former State officials. All members would be drawn from fields in which the problems of the migratory worker, the grower, and the local area involved are of daily and vital concern.

Since none of the council members would be Federal officials, they would be in a position to make a critical, objective evaluation of existing programs. In the words of the Reverend Shirley E. Greene, a widely respected and longstanding authority on migratory labor, at the time of the hearings:

> Although it is not apt to arouse the same degree of humanitarian interest as the other bills, S. 522 may turn out in the long run to be the most important measure before us in these hearings. By providing a national sounding board for the migrant worker and those concerned for his welfare, the proposed National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, if properly manned and staffed, can become the instrument for genuine and lasting solutions to many of the serious problems surrounding the seasonal employment of labor in agriculture.

Mr. President, the administration has recommended enactment of the proposed legislation. Its favorable views have been presented in reports from the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget. The bill is also supported by numerous organizations knowledgeable on migratory labor problems. I urge that the Senate approve the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

A sprawling bureaucracy has been developed in Washington. A Frankenstein monster has been created that threatens to destroy us. The tendency is increasing for Congress to delegate to others responsibilities that legitimately, logically, and rightfully should be ours. We are constantly delegating authority to boards, commissions, councils, advisory groups, agencies, administrators, and others.

I believe we would be creating a redundant agency if we created the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. Let me name the instrumentalities which now exist: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor; a Senate subcommittee; two farm-labor committees in the House; a farm labor advisory committee in the Department of Labor; at least 28 Governors' committees on migratory labor; and numerous religious and private groups operating in the interests of migratory labor.

To establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor would be to create a redundant agency, one more Federal instrumentality added to the sprawling bureaucracy which now exists.

Someday, if we continue to create such agencies, more people will be working for the Federal Government than are working in private enterprise. If additional agencies are created for service in the field of migratory labor, more people will be working for the Federal Government in farm labor affairs than there are farm laborers.

I hope that Congress will not add another Federal agency to an already sprawling bureaucracy. The National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, which is proposed to be established by the bill, would be a redundant agency. It is my hope that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We know that there is a response to the needs of migrant farmworkers. We know that people individually and as members of organizations are working for the solution of the problems of such workers. But as it develops—and as our committee has seen, because we have traveled in many parts of the country—the assistance rendered by such groups is a kind of patchwork quilt of private and public effort.

Some national attention has been focused on the problem. The President has appointed a committee composed of the Secretaries of the respective departments. Their work is merely an appendage activity added to their already immense volume of work and responsibility. As a result, they have been unable to meet often. I am informed that the last meeting was held well over a year ago, on January 17, 1962. That was the date of the last meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. This is not intended as a critical statement; it is merely an acknowledgment of the facts of life.

True, there is a Senate subcommittee. It has been a kind of national committee, and has existed for 3 years. We are doing a part of the work that would be done by a national advisory committee, because we receive requests for information and analyses from church groups and local governments all over the country. I do not believe it is an overstatement to say that we have had to respond, in a national sense, more for the supplying of information, advice, and counsel than to consider legislative business. I am certainly not suggesting that the committee and its staff are not qualified to be helpful; but it seems to me that if there were people from the farming industry, people who were representative of the worker and the farmer and people from State governments, the representation would be from the grassroots, and could more readily be developed in a national council. They would have a more intimate knowledge of the facts of farm life. In my judgment, there would be, an organization which would have an opportunity to weave all the operations into a more national, responsive program—a program which would get away from the patchwork quilt that now exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall resist the temptation to get in the last word; and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time is yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 525) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 182, Senate bill 523, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this is the measure on which the unanimous-consent agreement has been reached, and that, pursuant to the agreement, the bill will be considered at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the debate on my amendment will commence at 2 o'clock, and there will be 30 minutes of controlled time. The vote will come at 2:30.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I understand that then the leadership will call up the final bill of this series, Senate bill 524, which deals with the registration of labor contractors. I believe that can be stated as the program.

Mr. TOWER. I believe there is no agreement on that, but that is understood to be the procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. President, the child labor bill, S. 523, has come a long way since we first introduced it in the Senate over 2 years ago. The viewpoint and the attitude of the farm community have changed during this period from one of almost total rejection and opposition to one of almost total acceptance of the bill as reported by the Labor Committee.

Thoughtful farmers throughout the Nation, as they learned more about this proposed legislation and about the serious extent of harmful child labor, have reappraised their views, and have actively worked with us on this problem.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to cite as a leading example of this informed farmer viewpoint, the statement of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, of Orlando, Fla. This organization's view of the child labor bill, as presented in its statement to the subcommittee, is as follows:

> We support S. 523 as it is written.

I may say that no amendments were added to the bill.

I read further from the association's statement:

> The Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association has continually urged its members to comply with the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as well as the applicable State laws. We do not like to see children in the migrant agricultural labor stream, and we do not like to see children employed on farms in occupations to which they are not suited. We also dislike seeing children employed when school is in session.
>
> We definitely feel that rural youth, 12 years of age and over, should be permitted to work in agriculture under conditions which would be acceptable under S. 523. That is, we believe that rural youth, 12 years of age and over, should be permitted to work on farms within commuting distance of their home with permission of their parents, in those occupations to which they are suited.

Mr. Richard T. O'Connell, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, in testifying, had this to say about the legislation:

> The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has no objection to the apparent intent of S. 523. We believe this legislation is in keeping with the preventing of the exploitation of youth in any industry or occupation where there is danger of the health or physical well-being of the individual. We have no specific amendments to offer, but we do seek assurances that children may continue to work in certain activities in agriculture, particularly where it is both socially and economically desirable.

In like vein, Mr. Fred Burrows, although expressing reservations about the hazardous employment provisions, testified that:

> On the child labor bill, S. 523, in general we are in favor of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Burrows was speaking for the International Apple Association.

Mr. President, this bill amends the existing agricultural child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which presently provides a total exemption for agricultural work when school is not in session. The effect of the current exemption is that a child of any age may be employed in agriculture before and after classes, during vacation periods, or during so-called crop vacations.

This bill (S. 523) narrows the gap in the Fair Labor Standards Act which today permits unlimited child labor in agriculture outside school hours. This bill (S. 523) does not affect existing law in regard to the 16-year-age minimum already applicable to agricultural work during regular school hours.

Specifically, the bill provides that a child may be employed in agricultural work outside of school hours: first, if he is employed by his parents on the home farm, or, second, if he is 14 years of age or over, or third, if he is between 12 and 14 years of age and commutes daily from his permanent residence and has the written consent of his parents or his parents are employed on the same farm.

The bill also contains a provision authorizing the Secretary of Labor to protect children below the age of 18 from working on particularly hazardous farm operations.

A child labor measure (S. 1123) similar to the present bill (S. 523), was the subject of hearing on April 12, 13, 1961, and passed the Senate in the 87th Congress.

UNLIMITED CHILD LABOR ENDANGERS THE SAFETY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE OF LARGE NUMBERS OF CHILDREN

The harmful employment of children in agriculture is one of the most unfortunate aspects of today's migratory farm labor situation. Although this condition has all but disappeared from industry, it is still very much in evidence in some parts of our agricultural economy. The Fair Labor Standards Act, enacted long before farming became a large-scale mechanized operation, desperately needs to be adjusted to the facts of modern agriculture. Today, modern farming operations constitute this Nation's third most dangerous commercial enterprise; only mining and construction are more hazardous. Yet, when school is not in session children of any age can be employed under any conditions and for any duration.

State child labor laws are neither adequate nor extensive enough to protect children employed in agriculture. Twenty States have no minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture, either during or outside of school hours. Fourteen States do not have a minimum age to cover agricultural employment when school is not in session.

The extensive employment of young children in agriculture has persisted despite the fact that the death rate in agriculture is exceeded only by those in the extractive and construction industries. It is estimated that in 1960, nearly 90,000 children aged 14 through 17 did migratory farmwork. An estimated 100,000 to 150,000 additional children under 14 years of age migrated with their parents, many of whom were also employed on farms.

In a statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on April 10, 1963, the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz summarized the hazardous aspect of child labor as follows:

> The time of day or time of year in which young children are employed in agriculture has no bearing upon its suitability for their safety and well-being. All available data point to the comparatively hazardous nature of farm employment. Data available to the National Safety Council indicate that of the 13,500 persons killed in work accidents in 1961, approximately one-fourth, or 3,300, were employed in agriculture. Agriculture is the only major industry which has experienced an increase in the death rate since 1951.

UNLIMITED CHILD LABOR INTERFERES WITH EDUCATIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Agricultural labor is detrimental to children when it interferes with their educational progress. In many States, school attendance laws permit children under 16, or even under 14, to be excused from school to work in agriculture. Additionally, in some States migratory children—not being residents—are not covered by compulsory school attendance laws. These exemptions in many cases create a serious interference with a child's education, and particularly with the education of the migrant child.

Returning tired and worn out to cramped, poorly lighted housing, after spending the afternoon and early evening working in the fields, migrant children find themselves unable to study. Local school officials, moreover, have been discouraged from assigning homework, because of after-school harvesting. These conditions obviously impose severe limitations on the educational development of our rural youth, especially the migrant child who is already burdened by environmental factors, and who seldom attains an education beyond the fourth-grade level.

The present bill (S. 523) is an attempt to break the chain of circumstances that force these migrant children into the unrewarding pattern of life shared by their parents. If these children can be saved from working prematurely in the fields, a large step will have been taken to give them the opportunity for a more worthwhile and productive adult working life.

Strengthening the provisions of the child labor law, moreover, will supplement work currently underway in the area of education and day-care services for migrant children. This committee has reported a bill (S. 521) to increase the educational opportunities available to migrant children and a bill (S. 522) to provide day-care facilities for migrant children. Both of these measures were passed by the Senate in the 87th Congress, and are strongly supported by the administration. Enactment of child-labor legislation will be a valuable adjunct to State, local, and voluntary efforts already providing such necessary facilities.

Considering the increased mechanization in agriculture and the commensurate increase in farm accidents, Senate bill 523 provides a sound, practical means of encouraging more adequate safety standards and more comprehensive protection of children against serious accidents and fatalities. Furthermore, by establishing a national minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture outside of school hours, this legislation (S. 523) will effectively discourage interruptions in the educational process for the migrant child.

THIS LEGISLATION PRESERVES BENEFICIAL FARMWORK

The bill (S. 523) is designed to protect children from harmful child labor and to preserve to the fullest extent possible the beneficial aspects of farmwork. Consequently, the bill does not apply where a child is working for his parent on the family farm. By providing that children 12 years of age or older can, with parental consent, perform agricultural work to which they commute daily from their homes, the bill preserves for local school children the beneficial work programs that exist in many rural areas of the Nation. The 14-year minimum age in the bill conforms to the minimum age adopted by over three-fourths of the States that have enacted agricultural child labor laws.

CHILDREN PROTECTED FROM PARTICULARLY HAZARDOUS WORK

To protect children under 18 years of age from injuries due to hazardous work, the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor can find and declare certain occupations to be particularly hazardous for children under 18. Although data are not available on a national scale, a California study of agricultural injuries in 1961 showed a large number of disabling injuries to farmworkers age 18 years or younger.

Year	Total under 18 years	Under 16 years	16 to 17 years
1950	485	128	357
1951	523	134	389
1952	525	145	380
1953	464	133	331
1954	440	95	345
1955	501	140	361
1956	499	132	367
1957	512	127	385
1958	434	92	342
1959	565	117	448
1960	539	117	422
1961	426	83	343

California had a total of 426 disabling injuries to workers under 18; of this total, 25 children were under 14. Another 58 of the children were between 14 and 15 years of age.

Because of the many diverse techniques used in modern farming, such as the use of high ladders, field packing and conveyor-belt operations, pesticides, mechanical devices, and power-driven machinery, the bill does not delineate what constitutes "particularly hazardous" employment. Rather, the bill follows the far more practical course of providing the Secretary of Labor the flexibility to determine what constitutes hazardous employment on a job-by-job basis and in light of the constantly changing conditions of modern farming.

So, Mr. President, when the vote is taken tomorrow, I hope Senators will realize that this measure is most necessary. A great social gap exists in this area; there is no protection against harmful farmwork for these youngsters during the periods when school is not in session. They work in a form of commerce which is the third most hazardous, and ranks next to mining and construction. Not only is it a dangerous industry, but the work is also debilitating. Many persons picture the child going out in the fields, with his dog, Shep, beside him, to bring in the cows. But youngsters who work in migratory farm labor are not bringing in grandpa's cows. They are working on their knees, picking beans and tomatoes, under a sun which is so hot that the temperature will reach 120 degrees; and from the standpoint of the development of both body and mind, the environment is the worst that young people could have.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to submit my chief argument tomorrow, when I shall submit an amendment to the bill.

I should like to point out some of the salient objections to the bill. It leaves too much to the arbitrary will and discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, in dealing with the work in which young people under 18 years of age may engage. The entire intent and purpose seems to be to narrowly proscribe and restrict the amount of farmwork to be done by young people.

In my opinion, Mr. President, there is no greater character builder in the world than farmwork, and I think young people should be encouraged to work on the farms. I worked on a farm during the summers from the time when I was 11 years of age, and I am glad to have had that experience. I do not wish to return to that work, and I hope the people will not return me to it in 1966. [Laughter.] Nevertheless, I think it is good experience for all people; and I believe this bill is too narrowly restrictive. So I hope the bill will not be passed without at least the adoption of amendments which I believe will improve it.

REGISTRATION OF CONTRACTORS OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in connection with the so-called crew leader registration bill, Senate bill 524, which will be under consideration during the middle of the day tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

BRIEF DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The bill (S. 524) establishes a system of Federal registration for interstate farm labor contractors, or crew leaders, as they are frequently called. These labor contractors are the middlemen in making work arrangements between growers and migratory farmworkers.

As defined in the bill, a crew leader is any person who recruits or transports, at any one time, 10 or more migrant workers for interstate agricultural employment. Every such crew leader must obtain an annual certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor and must display the certificate at proper times as proof that he has complied with obligations specified by the legislation.

Certain entities are exempted from the registration requirements of the bill. The exempted entities are—

First, charitable, educational, or similar nonprofit organizations, and their full-time or regular employees;

Second, farmers, processors, and certain related businesses which recruit migrant workers solely for their own operations—and their full-time or regular employees; and

Third, persons engaged in obtaining foreign workers whose employment is arranged under the supervision of a foreign nation.

A crew leader within the registration requirements may obtain a certificate by submitting to the Secretary of Labor, first, information concerning his conduct and method of operation as a farm-labor contractor, and second, proof of public liability insurance on vehicles used in his business as a farm-labor contractor.

The Labor Department estimates that there are between 5,000 and 8,000 farm-labor contractors in this country, and that about half of all interstate migratory workers are crew members of these contractors. A system of Federal registration is made necessary by the unique role of the crew leader in the farm-labor market. While the employer's contact with migratory farmworkers is often temporary and impersonal, the crew leader has a continuing close relation with the workers, the nature of which makes the worker and also his family almost totally dependent upon the crew leader's honesty and responsibility. The crew leader's functions include recruiting the workers at the beginning of the season, making work arrangements with growers and providing transportation to the work, paying the workers their wages, lending them money if necessary during the season, supervising them on the job, and handling all contacts with the grower.

Many crew leaders perform their functions in a satisfactory and responsible manner, but there is also much evidence that the workers' dependency in this one-sided relationship is violated and abused by some crew leaders. Department of Labor surveys have revealed numerous abuses such as the following: overcharging workers for transportation; abandoning a crew without means of transportation and failure to return workers to their homes; underpayment of wages; and illegal sale of liquor and dope.

Growers as well as workers are exploited. A typical abuse is the crew leader's accepting transportation advances but failing to report for work or reporting with a smaller crew than promised.

The frequency of criminal records among crew leaders has been disclosed as a result of the few State laws providing for crew leader licensing; in New York, for example, 52 crew leaders have been found to have criminal records out of a total group of 401.

The pending legislation deals with the problem of crew leader abuses by providing specific obligations which the crew leader must meet to continue in his business. He must, for example, inform workers at the time of recruitment concerning their prospective employment, to the best of his knowledge and belief; must post written statements of the terms of employment and housing; and, when he pays the workers, must keep proper payroll records.

By providing a means of identifying and locating crew leaders, the bill would also aid in the enforcement of existing laws. The Interstate Commerce Commission has limited authority to regulate the transportation of migrant workers with respect to their safety and comfort, but, as stated in the Commission's favorable report on the bill, the ICC now has no means of identifying the farm labor contractors and communicating the requirements to them unless they are actually found on the highway. Similarly, the crew leader is responsible under the Social Security Act in some cases for withholding and transmitting earnings; but the present difficulties in keeping track of crew leaders have made it almost impossible to check evasions in this area.

Nine States and Puerto Rico have recognized the crew leader problem by enacting registration or issuing regulations on the subject. The commissioners of labor in at least six of these States have said that State action is not enough and that Federal registration of crew leaders is also needed. States which do not now have registration laws have also recognized the need for Federal registration. From the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations of Delaware, a State with no registration law, the subcommittee has received this statement on the need for a Federal crew leader law:

"This is a bill we definitely feel should be passed. Most of the States surrounding Delaware have State laws requiring a registration of such contractors. Many of the contractors who have been unable to secure registration in these States have come into Delaware. We feel that until some such legislation is passed States without crew registration laws will be the dumping grounds of crew leaders with unsatisfactory experience. We also believe that this is the most effective way of curbing crew leaders from practicing unfair or unlawful methods with their workers."

The administration has recommended enactment of this legislation. Its favorable views have been presented by the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by the Bureau of the Budget. I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, although we have not reached the final consideration of all the bills in this group which have been reported—there are six in all. Two bills remain, and have been on the calendar: the child-labor provisions bill (S. 523) and the so-called crew leader registration bill (S. 524). I believe it appropriate at this time to make certain comments in regard to the fine work done by the staff of the subcommittee. They have enabled us to reach this historic occasion in an area in which remedial legislation has been needed so long, but in which so little has been done until this committee, with its very professional and humanitarian staff, has prepared these measures for consideration by the Senate.

I also wish to express sincere gratitude to all of the cosponsors who joined us in the proposed legislation. I received help from so many quarters that if I should attempt to relate the names of all those who assisted, I would surely leave someone out.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

There being no objection, the names of the staff members were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Frederick R. Blackwell, counsel.
Anne O. von der Lieth, associate counsel.
Harry G. Wilkinson, associate counsel.
Woodruff M. Price, research assistant.
Raymond D. Hurley, associate minority council.
Robert Locke, minority research assistant.
George Denison, associate minority counsel.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-DOMINICAN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we know that today Communist- and Marxist-oriented groups in Latin America are attempting to discredit the Alliance for Progress by branding it a tool of "American imperialism." They insist that the Alliance is but another manifestation of the plan to "Americanize" the hemisphere, to force all Latin American societies to pattern their governments and social institutions on the North American model. Social and political diversity, they insist, will not be tolerated.

Unfortunately, some American spokesmen tend to create the impression that these allegations are true—that the United States cannot tolerate political or social movements in Latin America that do not correspond to those in the United States. This is certainly a misrepresentation of our own policy and of our own political tradition. We do not aspire to creating exact replicas of the United States, in Latin America or anywhere else. What we desire are free, independent, prosperous nations whose political and social institutions reflect and embody their own cultural traditions. Unlike the Sino-Soviet bloc, we do not pressure our neighbors to choose between the United States and the Soviet Union. We encourage their commitment to free constitutional government, but we do not attempt to dictate how free constitutional government should be created or operated. That is decided by the individual country.

When the government of one of our neighbors in this hemisphere follows a course which is different from our own, we should not necessarily assume that this course is alien or inimical to U.S. interests. A recent example is the case of the Dominican Republic, which now has a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government after 38 years of dictatorship.

I attended the inauguration of President Bosch, the first Dominican Chief of State to be popularly elected in 38 years. He won his office with a broad popular mandate of 60 percent of the vote in elections which observers sent by the Organization of American States have termed "remarkable for their degree of freedom from fraud and violence." President Bosch scored this significant victory on a platform calling for a program, in his words, of "revolutionary but not radical reforms." After three decades of one of the most brutal dictatorships this hemisphere has known, the Dominican people are indeed in a "revolutionary" fervor to catch up with the rest of the world and to win for themselves the political, social, and economic advances which more fortunate people take for granted. We in this country properly applauded as the Dominican people thus rejoined the ranks of the representative democracies.

Let us look at the record of the Dominican Republic's Government over the past 3 months. As a member of the reform-minded, non-Communist, democratic element in the Caribbean which has produced such leaders and friends as President Betancourt of Venezuela, ex-President Figueres and President Orlich of Costa Rica, and Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, President Bosch's career has been one long, dedicated fight against dictatorship. He has recognized the damages wrought on his nation by the years of dictatorship and has drafted a program of reform within a democratic framework which he regards as a clear-cut alternative to communism. In a speech on March 12, President Bosch denounced communism as meaning "death, war, and destruction."

Like all moderate reformers with a meaningful program, he now finds himself under strong attack from both the extreme left and extreme right as he begins to carry out his program. Some of the unfavorable stories that have recently appeared in the U.S. press may be traced to one or the other of those sources. While Radio Havana strongly attacks him as "a lackey of imperialism," those who oppose his reform program on social, economic, or political grounds thunder from the right. There have been even reports of collusion between the extreme right and extreme left in their opposition to him.

This is the pattern in Venezuela today, where the followers of the former dictator, Jiminez, and the Communists are joining in an attempt to destroy Venezuelan democracy by violence, disorder, and guerrilla warfare tactics. It is a common pattern throughout the world to see the red of the left and the black of the right unite to destroy, if they can, constitutional, established democracy.

Mr. President, President Bosch has publicly charged that the present effort to portray his administration as Communist-oriented is in effect a concerted campaign to topple his government. He reminds those who gratuitously compare his administration with the early days of the Casto regime that Castro, unlike him, was not popularly elected; the opposition in Cuba was being shot in 1959; the Cuban Armed Forces had been destroyed; and there was no voice but Castro's. By contrast, he points out, the Dominican Republic today has a Congress, free elections, a free press, and free commerce. In the brief 3 months he has been in power, he has moved forward with a caution unexpected in a "revolutionary," putting his principal emphasis to date on balancing his budget, paying his government's bills, instituting government austerity—including salary cuts for himself and other top officials and a reduction in government payrolls—conserving the credit worthiness of the Republic by paying off commercial arrearages and preserving the value of its currency. This program already has produced a substantial improvement in the country's exchange and credit positions.

I add, for the critics of the Dominican Republic, that this hardly sounds to me like a Communist-oriented government, particularly when a government seeks to pay off its obligations and to fulfill its responsibilities.

In his efforts to implement his campaign pledges of social and economic reform, President Bosch has demonstrated that he shares the goals and aspirations of the Alliance for Progress, particularly with respect to self-help—a basic and essential foundation for all Alianza efforts in Latin America. I have already referred to his measures to balance the budget and preserve the credit worthiness of the country, demonstrating a high degree of financial responsibility. In the area of social and economic reform, the Dominican Government is not only continuing apace the programs already begun by the predecessor government of the Council of State, but is also initiating a series of reforms and projects of its own. The agrarian reform program of the Dominican Government has been considerably strengthened by private donations of land and funds and by a reorganization of the agrarian reform institute designed to facilitate acceleration and expansion of the program. A law on cooperatives has been prepared and will soon be presented to Congress which will provide technical support to cooperatives by establishing a cooperative institute, and financial support through a cooperatives bank. In accordance with a project agreement in government planning and administration reform with AID, the Dominican Government is planning the establishment of a Presidential commission on administrative reform.

The Bosch administration is making full use of external sources of financing, from both the United States and Europe. The bulk of current U.S. grant assistance for economic and social development has been earmarked for a top priority goal of both AID and the Dominican Government—agricultural development. This would include agricultural credits to small farmers, livestock development, and farm-to-market roads. Project agreements already signed between AID and the Bosch government provide AID funds and technical advisers in the fields of education, public safety, and labor in addition to agriculture and public administration.

Much of the current criticism of the Bosch administration seems to center on the return of certain Communist and pro-Communist exiles to the Dominican Republic and over the degree of freedom permitted to them in their activities there. The return of these subversive elements actually began in January 1963 before President Bosch took office and at a time when all Dominican political parties endorsed repeal of the emergency law under which they had been deported. President Bosch has said that he believes that in principle every Dominican should be allowed to return to his native country. The point at which the national security becomes an overriding consideration is, of course, a decision for President Bosch and the Dominican people. It should be noted, however, that President Bosch firmly refused to tolerate illegal strikes by two unions—a sugar mill union and the government employees' union—led by pro-Communist elements, which resulted in their collapse.

I would not underestimate the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion in the Dominican Republic. Obviously in terms of geography and conditions propitious for its propagation, it is a logical target. I believe that President Bosch and the Dominican people, having endured so much under the Trujillo dictatorship, are determined to frustrate those who would seek to impose another reign of terror, and to deprive them of their recently won liberties. The Department of State describes our policy toward the Dominican Republic as one of helping the Dominican people in all appropriate ways to make the difficult transition from tyranny to a viable democracy, offering a better way of life to the people and thus to fend off the threat from the extreme right and the extreme left. President Bosch and the Dominican people are proud, independent, and sensitive. He has publicly stated that he will get on his knees neither to Washington nor to Moscow. In extending our help and assistance, we do not ask this. We ask only that his objectives coincide with those of the Alliance for Progress and for so long as this is the case, he has and should have our active sympathy, cooperation, and support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post of June 6, 1963, entitled "Attack on Bosch," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACK ON BOSCH

"'Communism means death, destruction, and the loss of our properties,' said President Juan Bosch at a speech delivered at the military academy after he assumed the presidency. However, it seems that these words were not heard by foreign newspapermen." This recent comment on a Dominican radio station reflects the growing sensitivity to a press campaign seemingly designed to prove that the first democratically elected successor to Rafael Trujillo is a Communist.

What lies at the root of charges by some Dominicans is Mr. Bosch's refusal to attack the Communists with the vehemence they deem necessary. The Dominican president is very much his own boss and he can be hypersensitive. From his vantage, he does not want to seem like a puppet of anyone and the kind of anti-Communist position his critics urge, he feels, would make him seem like a supplicant for U.S. favor.

Thus the attacks that some American journalists are pumping up give a weird perspective to Dominican politics. Here is a country that endured three decades of oppression under a dictator who was loudly praised in the United States. Through a miracle, an orderly transition to democratic government has taken place and a regime is now in power that is pledged to the kind of reform program that Washington asserts is necessary elsewhere in Latin America. Against this overwhelming plus, there is the apparent minus of Mr. Bosch's unwillingness to satisfy the hardline standards of some Dominicans and visiting journalists. In this case, is it really Mr. Bosch who is being neurotic?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editorial places the situation in the Dominican Republic in proper perspective. It properly notes a word of caution, because there is an unstable political situation throughout the Caribbean, and particularly in the Dominican Republic, after many years of tyrannical dictatorship in that country.

All one has to do is visit one of the countries that has been ruled by a dictator to learn what terrible things have happened, and how large numbers of people have been destroyed, corrupted by the rule of a dictator. I have seen this in the Argentine. I have seen it in the Dominican Republic. I have seen it in Venezuela.

The most encouraging sign is that the people in those countries, particularly in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, are determined to make democracy work.

It is to our advantage, and it is within our tradition, to attempt to encourage this kind of development.

In today's Washington Post, under the name of that illustrious columnist, Max

Freedman, is an article entitled "Bosch Contrasted With Castro." He states that sympathy and understanding are urged for the Dominican Republic. It is an article written from Santo Domingo. It reads, in part:

> At the end of the first 3 months in office, President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic can present several interesting contrasts with Castro's regime.
>
> Castro seized power by force and became a dictator. Bosch was elected president of the Dominican Republic by a huge majority after the dictator was overthrown. Castro shot his critics or put them in jail without a trial. Bosch has prevented mob rule and police brutality. Castro confiscated bank deposits and repudiated debts. Bosch has avoided all confiscation, is paying all debts and is seeking a stable and convertible currency.
>
> Castro grabbed the land for himself and his party. Bosch has started a genuine program of land reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this revealing and informative article by Mr. Freedman be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOSCH CONTRASTED WITH CASTRO—SYMPATHY, UNDERSTANDING ARE URGED FOR EFFORTS OF DOMINICAN PRESIDENT

(By Max Freedman)

Santo Domingo.—At the end of the first 3 months in office, President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic can present several interesting contrasts with Castro's regime.

Castro seized power by force and became a dictator. Bosch was elected president of the Dominican Republic by a huge majority after the dictator was overthrown. Castro shot his critics or put them in jail without a trial. Bosch has prevented mob rule and police brutality. Castro confiscated bank deposits and repudiated debts. Bosch has avoided all confiscation, is paying all debts and is seeking a stable and convertible currency.

Castro grabbed the land for himself and his party. Bosch has started a genuine program of land reform, with the title to the land belonging to the farmer. Castro made the army the creature and servant of his personal ambition. Bosch has made no changes in the structure of the army, once the agents of Trujillo had fled or been destroyed.

Castro drove thousands of Cubans into exile. Bosch has created conditions which have brought hundreds of exiled Dominicans back to the country. Castro is a Communist and has turned Cuba into a Communist pawn. Bosch, a philosopher of freedom, wants liberty for his people and independence for his country.

Castro forced the Organization of American States to expel Cuba. Bosch wants the Dominican Republic to be a respected member of a stronger inter-American system. Castro is the servant of Russia. Bosch is the friend of America.

President Bosch knows his program will collapse without foreign capital and foreign skill to quicken the economic growth of the Dominican Republic. He also knows that many people are trying to discourage investment by spreading stories of his desire to confiscate profits or subject them to arbitrary taxes.

In reality, he is eager to welcome foreign investment on a large scale. He wants the American dollar to be a good neighbor seeking no special privileges, and respecting Dominican law. While these conditions are met, American investors need fear no confiscation or discrimination or harsh taxation.

Indeed, he is now working on an incentive law to attract capital for new or expanded industries. In many ways, this law will be more generous in its incentives than the law in Puerto Rico, which has been responsible for so much progress. It has to be, since conditions in the Dominican Republic are far worse and demand immediate action.

Always we return to this central point of early results. John Bartlow Martin, the U.S. Ambassador, has said this country has no wish to rule the Dominican Republic from Washington. Nor can the United States tolerate a sequence of events which would allow the Dominican people to be ruled from Havana or Moscow.

America's policy will be fully satisfied if the Dominican Republic remains free and independent. But these are mere words unless we realize that reform is the shield of independence, and social justice is the guardian of freedom.

In the past the United States has often blundered in its relations with the Dominican Republic. It has sometimes talked of annexing the island. It has sent the Marines to occupy the country. It has blustered and bullied. It found excuses during shameful years for the Trujillo dictatorship. These mistakes now belong to a vanished past.

Sensitive and well-informed, Mr. Martin is almost the ideal Ambassador to represent the United States. With his admirable staff at the American Embassy, and with the aid mission headed by Newell Williams, the United States is being excellently served in this important country.

The Ambassador and all these American officials have one message for the American people. Stop this sentimental talk of the showplace of democracy in the Caribbean. Remember the giant problems that still must be mastered. Remember too that President Bosch is not perfect and he will make false starts and take wrong turnings.

Do not be cast down by an ugly failure, nor uplifted by a brief success. Give President Bosch sympathy and understanding—and remember always that the understanding is far more important than the sympathy.

And finally, remember that the Dominican people have waited for long cruel years for a leader like President Bosch. They will not have waited in vain if the United States respects his purposes and supports his policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we should keep a watchful eye on developments in the Dominican Republic. I have taken the time to comment on them today because I have been disturbed by what I believe to be prejudicial news items relating to the Dominican Republic.

I remind Senators that some years ago the Trujillo regime actually hired public relations experts to corrupt the news in this country relating to Trujillo, and to paint a favorable picture of that despotic dictatorship. Time after time news items carried favorable reports of the Republic as a land of law and order and of high living standards—all items bought and paid for. I want to make sure that this time the American people get the facts.

It is my view that when newswriters of the competence of Mr. Freedman visit a country—and there are other competent newspapermen who have done so—we should study their comments. I have visited that country only once, since the election of Mr. Bosch. I found that grave problems existed there. The problems are almost beyond human comprehension. Nevertheless, the Government of the Dominican Republic is determined to do something about conditions there. We are determined to help the country.

As has been said on the floor many times, we ought to try to help the people of the Dominican Republic make their country a democratic showcase. It is within a few miles of Cuba. It should stand as a living contrast to the dictatorship of Castro. As Mr. Freedman said, there are many contrasts. For one, there is an elected government, as compared with the Soviet puppet on the island of Cuba.

I hope the people of the United States will watch very carefully what is going on there.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Jay G. Hitchcock, Auburn, Ala., in place of K. D. Wright, retired.

John S. McGriff, Sr., Dutton, Ala., in place of W. S. Griffin, transferred.

Joyce B. Rodgers, Shorter, Ala., in place of B. F. Screws, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Jimmie R. Harris, Hatfield, Ark., in place of C. C. Smith, retired.

Otto C. Miller, Parkdale, Ark., in place of W. E. Place, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Frank W. Murphy, Chester, Calif., in place of Eunice Kiehl, retired.

Harold L. Hemmingsen, Glendale, Calif., in place of M. L. Green, retired.

Joyce A. Sibley, Nestor, Calif., in place of G. S. Sage, retired.

Royse E. Barnette, San Bernardino, Calif., in place of R. W. Davis, Sr., resigned.

COLORADO

F. Keith Bowhan, Hugo, Colo., in place of L. W. Dillow, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Elizabeth J. Cohen, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.

Donald P. Markham, East Hampton, Conn., in place of F. G. Thatcher, retired.

George F. Beebe, East Lyme, Conn., in place of E. E. Sexton, retired.

Richard E. Venus, Ridgefield, Conn., in place of J. L. Sullivan, deceased.

Joseph R. Kasper, Terryville, Conn., in place of D. P. Hurley, retired.

FLORIDA

Carl R. Garrett, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.

Myrtle I. Finch, Indian River City, Fla., in place of E. W. Shuler, resigned..

Edna M. McDonald, Middleburg, Fla., in place of E. M. McDonald, resigned.

J. Sidney Batten, Penny Farms, Fla., in place of Mabel Fast, retired.

GEORGIA

Sidney M. Hall, Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of R. P. Watson, retired.

IDAHO

Lucille L. Laws, Weippe, Idaho, in place of E. M. Pryor, transferred.

ILLINOIS

John A. Waters, Baylis, Ill., in place of Ralph McLaughlin, retired.

Edward J. Sichta, Clarendon Hills, Ill., in place of George Bigler, retired.

Arnold R. Pedersen, Cuba, Ill., in place of V. E. Burrell, retired.

Edwin G. Mengeling, Hampshire, Ill., in place of E. B. Watrous, deceased.

Norbert L. Gotway, Kampsville, Ill., in place of F. J. Zipprich, deceased.

Harry W. Van Hook, Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of R. J. Horn, transferred.

INDIANA

Charles H. Boswell, Indianapolis, Ind., in place of W. A. Smith, retired.

Chalmers A. King, Muncie, Ind., in place of F. W. Mullin, retired.

Eurvon W. Adkins, New Salisbury, Ind., in place of O. F. Reinhardt, deceased.

Marvin M. Wright, Parker, Ind., in place of L. B. Dickey, retired.

Margery E. Brenner, Whiteland, Ind., in place of M. M. Shinn, retired.

IOWA

Thomas B. Barry, Danbury, Iowa, in place of W. C. Kinney, transferred.

Billy D. Bassett, Drakesvile, Iowa, in place of Bert Kirk, retired.

Kenneth R. Bowers, Essex, Iowa, in place of L. R. Carson, retired.

Wayne E. Exline, Exline, Iowa, in place of C. E. Wood, deceased.

Katherine M. Kennedy, Farley, Iowa, in place of E. P. Kelly, removed.

Loraine F. McLane, Garnavillo, Iowa, in place of E. A. Kregel, retired.

Arthur M. Lundberg, Lake City, Iowa, in place of W. E. Lovett, retired.

Walter D. Dunlop, Moorhead, Iowa, in place of M. E. Johannsen, resigned.

Don M. Wright, Moulton, Iowa, in place of L. R. Horn, retired.

Gerald W. Anderson, Stanton, Iowa, in place of H. O. Anderson, retired.

KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden, Kans., in place of P. T. Welter, transferred.

Arvin J. Mettlen, Lucas, Kans., in place of K. D. Bretz, transferred.

Opal G. Thomas, Mayetta, Kans., in place of N. F. Walsh, retired.

George R. Hess, Towanda, Kans., in place of La Vera Wheeler, retired.

Harold E. Good, Wellsville, Kans., in place of J. R. E. Simmons, retired.

KENTUCKY

Edna L. Peters, Lily, Ky., in place of R. P. Peters, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Beulah R. Amedee, Geismar, La., in place of L. M. Many, deceased.

Lawrence Harrington, Vinton, La., in place of L. J. DeVany, retired.

MAINE

Charles C. Lewis, Fryeburg, Maine, in place of W. R. Jordan, deceased.

MARYLAND

Jerome D. Laffey, Westernport, Md., in place of T. V. McGuire, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John C. Hancock, Lincoln, Mass., in place of A. G. Davis, transferred.

Marion W. Butler, Oakham, Mass., in place of O. O. Butler, deceased.

John H. Higgins, West Wareham, Mass., in place of P. K. Gibbs, retired.

MICHIGAN

Norma L. Beckwith, Jones, Mich., in place of F. E. Kline, resigned.

Kermit R. Moore, Manton, Mich., in place of B. L. O'Brien, retired.

Harry L. Smith, Pickford, Mich., in place of Merrill Hillock, retired.

Gustav E. Leder, Portage, Mich., in place of V. M. Whisler, retired.

MINNESOTA

F. Lowell Johnson, Lake Park, Minn., in place of H. G. Torgerson, retired.

Lester R. Isackson, Leonard, Minn., in place of R. L. TeHennepe, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Robertson, State Line, Miss., in place of E. D. Barkley, retired.

Mary E. Meteer, Union Church, Miss., in place of Annie Saxon, retired.

MISSOURI

Jerry M. Eidson, Camdenton, Mo., in place of O. C. West, retired.

Wayne U. Thomas, Deepwater, Mo., in place of G. E. Sell, transferred.

James Mote, Iberia, Mo., in place of J. E. Karr, retired.

William E. Griffith, Plattsburg, Mo., in place of L. V. Parker, retired.

Christopher C. McLemore, South Greenfield, Mo., in place of D. W. Duffy, retired.

MONTANA

William H. Kempfer, Philipsburg, Mont., in place of A. S. McKenzie, retired.

NEBRASKA

Waldo E. Smith, Arthur, Nebr., in place of L. M. Aufdengarten, resigned.

Victor W. Wendland, Holbrook, Nebr., in place of C. L. Frack, retired.

Kenneth P. Lewis, Lincoln, Nebr., in place of O. E. Jerner, retired.

Carl Tisthammer, Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of G. L. Christensen, transferred.

Gertrude M. Lane, Rulo, Nebr., in place of N. L. Morehouse, retired.

Marvin F. Anderson, Virginia, Nebr., in place of K. C. Swarts, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman E. Vittum, Ossipee, N.H., in place of L. C. Jones, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles P. Rue, Jobstown, N.J., in place of H. C. Cochran, retired.

Matthew J. Sheridan, Northfield, N.J., in place of V. R. Keller, retired.

NEW YORK

Thomas H. Brogan, Auburn, N.Y., in place of C. L. Messer, retired.

Frederick C. Piche, Deferiet, N.Y., in place of M. I. Callahan, retired.

Stanley T. Sokel, Eastport, N.Y., in place of C. A. Pitney, deceased.

Eva R. Weber, Yulan, N.Y., in place of Fred Hensel, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Jarvis, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.

G. Cody Steagall, Draper, N.C., in place of J. L. Cassell, retired.

Milton B. Garner, Goldston, N.C., in place of E. G. Brooks, retired.

James V. Roberson, Lilesville, N.C., in place of R. A. Liles, transferred.

Benjamin T. Aycock, Wake Forest, N.C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Reid A. Hill, Emmet, N. Dak., in place of L. L. Grindy, transferred.

Emerald E. Knodel, Hurdsfield, N. Dak., in place of M. H. Houghton, retired.

Harold E. Nelson, Manvel, N. Dak., in place of O. M. Sproule, retired.

Gwendolyn R. Young, Rutland, N. Dak., in place of J. D. Prindiville, retired.

OHIO

Robert G. Prindle, Orient, Ohio, in place of J. L. Crawford, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Roger S. Wilcox, Selling, Okla., in place of Anna Wilcox, retired.

OREGON

Nellie L. Netter, Aurora, Oreg., in place of H. A. Fleischhauer, retired.

Robert J. Cooper, Wilsonville, Oreg., in place of B. B. Aden, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry J. Minnig, Branch Dale, Pa., in place of H. M. McGovern, deceased.

Dale A. Daugherty, Evans City, Pa., in place of J. E. Sutton, retired.

Wade H. Kinsey, Jr., Ligonier, Pa., in place of C. F. Cairns, retired.

Charles A. Knoll, McKees Rocks, Pa., in place of N. C. McDermott, retired.

F. William Battaglia, Meadville, Pa., in place of F. B. Kunselman, retired.

Ralph W. Whipkey, Jr., Ohiopyle, Pa., in place of R. W. Whipkey, retired.

William J. Shields, Tidioute, Pa., in place of L. B. Atkin, retired.

Elden C. Harris, Torrance, Pa., in place of N. M. Graham, retired.

James L. Roney, Unionville, Pa., in place of E. P. Eastburn, retired.

Clair J. Uber, Volant, Pa., in place of J. N. McConnell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John E. Boulware, Belton, S.C., in place of B. W. Martin, retired.

Gilbert L. Shaw, Longs, S.C., in place of R. B. Whittington, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Duane A. Larson, Chester, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Hausman, retired.

Lyle E. Singrey, Hazel, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Johnston, retired.

Robert E. Iverson, Hudson, S. Dak., in place of E. A. Schlup, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Kenneth E. DePriest, Lobelville, Tenn., in place of N. L. Bates, deceased.

Byerly L. Morgan, Spring City, Tenn., in place of R. B. Gibson, deceased.

TEXAS

Joe H. Childs, Brownwood, Tex., in place of R. F. Stanley, resigned.

James I. Mills, Canton, Tex., in place of T. H. Todd, deceased.

Maxine H. Fuson, Hankamer, Tex., in place of H. R. Speights, retired.

Elva L. Davis, Hedley, Tex., in place of M. E. Jones, retired.

David E. Holster, Jr., Midland, Tex., in place of N. G. Oates, retired.

Willie M. Eubank, Nevada, Tex., in place of P. D. Davis, transferred.

Sidney L. Lockwood, Santo, Tex., in place of M. I. McDonald, retired.

Henry H. Hawley, Jr., Sweetwater, Tex., in place of C. E. Paxton, deceased.

James A. Terrell, Van Horn, Tex., in place of Clyde Wright, resigned.

UTAH

Fannie W. Lowe, Elsinore, Utah, in place of N. J. Barney, resigned.

Howard M. Hardy, Hinckley, Utah, in place of A. H. Reeve, retired.

Glenda L. Green, Wendover, Utah, in place of F. P. Russell, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mamie G. Turner, Carrollton, Va., in place of J. D. Nottingham, resigned.

Burton S. Hamersly, Farmville, Va., in place of D. W. Paulette, retired.

Marvin S. Minter, Providence Forge, Va., in place of J. R. Parker, Jr., resigned.

James W. Stafford, Sr., Radford, Va., in place of H. H. Howard, retired.

WASHINGTON

Samuel M. Howe, Mercer Island, Wash., in place of H. G. Riecks, transferred.

Hubert R. Cartland, Milton, Wash., in place of P. G. Stewart, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

William H. Foster, Freeman, W. Va., in place of J. O. Blanton, retired.

Marguerite L. Hammett, Willow Island, W. Va., in place of H. C. Johnson, retired.

WISCONSIN

George E. Pronold, Genesee Depot, Wisc., in place of F. M. Kuehl, retired.

WYOMING

Charles G. Taylor, Pavillion, Wyo., in place of Ruth Newbrough, retired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 10, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 5: 4: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our lives daily be nourished and strengthened by a greater faith in Thee to overcome the world with all its trials and tribulations.

Deliver us from those paralyzing fears and pygmy anxieties which so often beset us.

May we never be afraid to accept high standards and lofty principles.

Inspire us to live and labor for a social order which will mean health and happiness for all the members of the human family.

Grant that whatever is noble and best may never be suppressed and crowded out during these days when our poor confused world has so many desperate needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 6, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 5207) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE HONORABLE OTTO KRUEGER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest personal regret that I take this opportunity to announce to the Members of the House the death of a former colleague, Otto Krueger, three-term Representative from North Dakota. Otto Krueger, or Otto, as his friends called him, was one of those individuals who had a great faculty for making friends and there are many of his former colleagues and associates here in the Nation's Capital who will be deeply grieved by this news.

Former Congressman Krueger passed away at Lodi, Calif., on last Friday, June 6, in a Lodi hospital. He was 72 years old. He leaves his wife, Ella, and three daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Miss Dorothy Krueger, of Lodi, Calif.

Congressman Krueger was an unusual individual. He was one of not too many Members of Congress born outside of the United States, and of perhaps particular significance at this time, he was born of German parents in Russia, on September 7, 1890. He attended grade and high school in Russian and German schools and immigrated to the United States in 1910 and settled at Fessenden, N. Dak.

Otto Krueger served as a private in the infantry of the U.S. Army during World War I, with oversea service in the 91st Division.

Upon his return from military service in 1919, he ran and was elected county auditor of Wells County, N. Dak. Beginning with 1920, he served 10 consecutive terms as county auditor of his home county. He moved up from county auditor to State treasurer for one term in 1945 and to State insurance commissioner from 1946 to 1951. He was State budget director in 1951 and 1952 and State treasurer of the North Dakota Republican Party from 1948 to 1952. Otto was endorsed to run for Congress by the Republicans of North Dakota in 1952. He was elected and served for three terms during the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses.

Otto Krueger was a good, hard working and popular Congressman. Had he desired to do so he could easily have been reelected, but because of a heart condition, he decided to retire. It was this development in North Dakota politics which was responsible for my becoming a candidate for Congress, and subsequently being elected. I always consider Otto my predecessor and I have found it difficult to live up to the record he established in the Congress. On the Appropriations Committee and on the Agriculture Committee, Otto fought for a sound fiscal policy on the part of the Federal Government and for sound farm legislation that would give the farmer price protection, but not make him a ward of the Federal Government. I can well remember Otto's indignation at what he considered to be unnecessary and politically inspired expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, Otto Krueger was my personal friend as well as my associate in politics. It was with profound sorrow that I learned of his passing on last Friday. Words are always inadequate to properly express our feelings at a time such as this when we suddenly receive a telegram or phone call advising that one more friend has passed on.

My wife Edith and I wish to extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Krueger and her three daughters in this hour of loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to insert their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the death of our former colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD].

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend of former Congressman Krueger, I was very shocked to learn of his death on June 6.

It had been my great pleasure to know Otto Krueger prior to the time that he was elected commissioner of insurance in the State of North Dakota, a position that he held for 5½ years. During his tenure as insurance commissioner and my simultaneous service in the State legislature dealing with problems that confronted his department, Congressman Krueger was always a forthright public official, always willing to do what was right and fitting in the position which he held. I found Congressman Krueger was very well informed with his department and could at any given moment provide in detail any information that was required of him by the legislature or citizens who dealt with his department in their business affairs.

Congressman Krueger later was elected to serve in the Congress, a position which he held with distinction for three successive terms until his failing health caused him to retire.

Through his years of serving the people as an official in local, State, and Federal Governments, he won many friends and will be always remembered as an outstanding citizen and public official.

Mrs. Nygaard joins me in extending our condolences to Mrs. Krueger and his daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Miss Dorothy Krueger, of Lodi, Calif. We know he will be missed by everyone with whom he came in contact.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include an item that appeared in the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., on June 7, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OTTO KRUEGER SERVED STATE, NATION 38 YEARS

Former U.S. Representative Otto G. Krueger, Republican, of North Dakota, formerly of Fessenden, was a Russian immigrant who served 38 years in public office as a North Dakotan.

Representative Krueger, 72, died Thursday in Lodi, Calif., where he had lived since 1959 when he retired from the House of Representatives. He died in a Lodi hospital after a brief illness.

He also leaves a brother, Bernard, and a sister, Martha, in Russia. Another brother, Karl, lives in Fessenden.

Krueger's funeral will take place in Lodi. Lodi's First Baptist Church will direct the services.

Besides his wife, Ella, he leaves three daughters, Mrs. Glen Soule, of Bremerton, Wash.; Mrs. John Ranlett, of Sacramento, Calif.; and Dorothy, of Lodi.

Representative Krueger served nearly 20 years as auditor of Wells County, and served as income tax auditor, treasurer, insurance commissioner, and budget director for the State of North Dakota before serving three 2-year terms as a U.S. Representative from the State.

Representative Krueger said of North Dakota at the time he was elected to Congress. "I came here as a lad from a strange country. You took me into your schools and you gave me work.

"January 25, 1916, was the happiest day of my life, for that is when I swore allegiance to the United States.

"I accept the honor of your electing me to Congress with a humble heart. It can happen only in America and it did happen in Wells County and in North Dakota, where an immigrant was elected to such a high office as a Representative in the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Krueger took off his pants and waded across the Warte River in 1910 to leave Russia. He refused to take an oath of allegiance to the czar, which he would have had to do because he was about to be drafted into a military academy.

He arrived in the United States in 1910, and came to Fessenden, where a friend of his father lived.

In the fall of 1911 he entered grade school, beginning in the sixth grade, to learn the English language. He graduated from high school and attended a Fargo business college.

He acquired U.S. citizenship in the minimum time permissible and, providing he would go to war for that which he believed in, enlisted in the U.S. Army and served overseas in France and Belgium during World War I, including the St.-Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

In 1920, he sought election for the first time as Wells County auditor. He was, in his words, trimmed in the primary.

But by time for the general election women were permitted to vote, and 145 feminine votes put him into office. Votes of men and women were put in separate ballot boxes at the time, and Representative Krueger tied with the men, but had a lead of 145 among women.

He was reelected 10 times, and resigned in 1940 to take the management of an Ellensburg, Wash., hotel.

His time away from public office in North Dakota was short however—he returned in 1941 to become an income tax auditor in the State tax commissioners office, where he worked 2½ years.

In 1944 he was the candidate for State treasurer of the Republican organizing committee, a faction of the North Dakota Republican Party. It was his first try for statewide office.

In the November general election he polled 103,338 votes, more than his three opponents combined.

He served as treasurer only 8 months, however, until Gov. Fred G. Aandahl named him State insurance commissioner to fill out the term of a man who died.

The insurance commissioner's office had been a turbulent one in times prior to Representative Krueger's appointment, and in some respects it continued as he prosecuted the North Dakota Farmers Union insurance companies for its handling of funds.

He lost his case in district court, but was vindicated in State supreme court. He was reelected to the insurance post in 1946 and 1948.

In 1950 he sought the nomination of the Republican organizing committee for the governorship of the State, but the party's nod went to C. Norman Brunsdale, who was subsequently elected. Representative Krueger accepted Brunsdale's appointment to the State budget director's post shortly after he (Brunsdale) took office.

Representative Krueger served until he was elected to the U.S. Congress in November of 1952.

In the June primary, Representative Krueger edged Orris G. Nordhougen of Leeds, N. Dak., for the nomination, 76,866 to 74,959. In the November election, he ran second on the ticket to the late Usher L. Burdick, 181,281, and 156,829.

Representative Krueger faced, and defeated Nordhougen again in 1954. He was reelected again in 1956, and in 1958 announced his retirement from political candidacy when his term officially ended, in the first days of 1959.

Representative Krueger's political conservatism became evident as a Member of the House of Representatives, where he was a particularly active critic of Federal spending programs.

Although he was, as many of his North Dakota congressional colleagues, never a fiery orator, his appointments, during his first term, to the key Agriculture and Appropriations Committees, were evidence that he was an effective Member of the U.S. Congress. He was 68 when he retired.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. I want to join at this time with the Members of the congressional delegation from North Dakota in extending my deepest sympathies and condolences to the family of Otto Krueger. Probably no one in Congress knew Otto Krueger better than I, other than the Members from North Dakota. Because my home is only 8 miles from the North Dakota line and only 90 miles from the capital city of Bismarck. I had known Otto as a State official in the State of North Dakota long before he came to Congress.

The fact that he was an immigrant, the fact that he came to the United States and adopted this country as his own, the fact that he served in every level of government, is one of the things that made Otto an outstanding Member of Congress.

After the apartment known as "Shotts Alley," across the alley from the New Senate Office Building, was constructed, Mr. and Mrs. Otto Krueger moved in and lived in an apartment almost adjoining ours. They were good neighbors. I knew Otto Krueger as a good father and a good husband. I knew him as a good neighbor, and, having served with him for 6 years in the House of Representatives, I knew him as a true statesman in every sense of the word.

Mrs. Berry and I join with the other Members of this House in extending our sincere sympathy and condolences to the Krueger family on this occasion.

THE LATE WARD JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I also have the sad duty of announcing to the House the passing of a former colleague, the Honorable Ward Johnson, of Long Beach, who served so ably in this House during the 77th and 78th Congresses. He was taken last Saturday, June 8, by a heart seizure. Former Congressman Johnson leaves surviving him his widow, his two sons, George and Walter, and, amongst all who knew him, a fond admiration for his achievements, a lasting respect for his humaneness, and a deep gratitude for the inspiration of his exemplary character.

During Congressman Johnson's service in the House of Representatives the U.S. Navy grew from its meager prewar power to the mightiest fleet ever to sail and dominate the oceans of the world. As an active member of the Committee on Naval Affairs during these World War II years, Ward Johnson made more than his full share of contributions toward this magnificent accomplishment. He knew full well the value to our Nation of invincible seapower and strived tirelessly to bring it into being.

He was born in Brighton, Iowa, in 1892, and had early service in the National Guard, careers in business, banking, the publishing of newspapers, and in the law. Aside from his service in the House of Representatives, Ward Johnson found in his practice of the law one of his greatest satisfactions. He was both loved and admired by the members of his profession.

I wish to extend my most sincere condolences to his fine family. Their grief and loss can only be lightened by the knowledge it is shared by so many Members of the Congress and so very many other friends who find in his passing a deep sense of personal loss.

THE RECORD OF BPA AND PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of the Interior signed an Executive order including southern Idaho in the Bonneville power-marketing area. Since that time officials and sponsors of the Idaho Power Co. have been putting on one of the greatest propaganda barrages in the history of the State to confuse the people and to discredit Bonneville Power.

One of their main charges is that Bonneville Power may result in the elimination of the private power companies, and at the least will certainly do irreparable financial damage to them. As a great American once said—"Let's look at the record."

Electrical World, the management newsletter of the utility industry, on April 8, 1963, stated:

> Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies representing roughly 95 percent of

the total electric revenues from the utility industry, net incomes showed a 10.02 percent net gain over 1961 as compared with a 5.4 percent gain in 1961 over 1960.

It is interesting to note that the four major private power companies in the Bonneville power marketing area all showed substantial increases in profit. These four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon showed a total increase of $4,998,000 over their 1961 profits. This represented a gain of 12.3 percent as compared with the 10 percent which the industry averaged nationally. However, the Idaho Power Co. showed a decrease of $812,000 from their 1961 profits or a loss of 8.4 percent. The following table shows the 1961 and 1962 incomes of the private power companies operating in the BPA area as compared with those of the Idaho Power Co.:

Major private power companies in BPA area

	Net income		Gain	
	1962	1961	Amount	Percent
Pacific Power & Light	$20,842,000	$18,076,000	$2,766,000	15.3
Portland General Electric	9,025,000	7,880,000	1,145,000	14.5
Puget Sound Power & Light	8,589,000	7,746,000	843,000	10.9
Washington Water Power	7,063,000	6,819,000	244,000	3.6
Total	45,519,000	40,521,000	4,998,000	12.3
Idaho Power Co	8,856,000	9,668,000	[1] (812,000)	[1] (8.4)

[1] Loss.

These facts easily answer the question: Is Bonneville Power destroying private power companies? Far from it. Through healthy competition and mutual cooperation with BPA the four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon are thriving and what is more important they have achieved this increase in net income while charging the consumers lower power rates than those charged by the Idaho Power Co. A family using a thousand kilowatt-hours of power would have paid the company that served them the following average monthly bill in 1962:

Power company:	*Monthly bill*
Portland General Electric	$10.30
Pacific Power & Light (Yakima)	10.63
Puget Sound Power & Light	10.95
Washington Water Power Co. (Spokane)	12.05
Idaho Power Co	14.15

While there has been increase in rates by the four private power companies serving in the BPA area this year and the rates will be the same as 1962 under the rate increase recently granted Idaho Power Co., their 1963 average rate to a family using a thousand kilowatt-hours would be $15.18.

So the private power companies in the BPA area not only had a 12-percent gain in profits last year as compared with Idaho Power Company's decrease of 8.4 percent but they accomplished this while charging their customers from $2.10 to $3.85 per family less each month.

I, for one, am hopeful that Bonneville Power company will have the same effect on private power companies in Idaho that it has had on them in Washington and Oregon—that is higher profits for the power company and its stockholders and lower rates for the power users.

However, this is not going to be accomplished just by wishing it to be so. Dollars spent for full-page newspaper advertisement attacking BPA are dollars that must be collected from the consumers through higher rates. Power company officials who are spending time traveling the State speaking against BPA are depriving their job of giving the power user the best possible service at the lowest possible cost of their full attention and talents.

I would urge these power company officials to put Idaho ahead of the Idaho Power Co. If they would stop to realize that what is best for Idaho is also best for the Idaho Power Co., then they will take a page from the book of their counterparts in Washington and Oregon who are competing and cooperating with, not attacking BPA. I am convinced that the inclusion of Southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area will then prove to be not only in the best interest of Idaho through a faster growing economy and lower power rates but will also be in the best interest of the Idaho Power Co., through higher profits. That has been the record of BPA—private power company competition and cooperation in Oregon and Washington.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and that Mr. AVERY and others desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a Memorial Day address delivered by an American on British soil. It is as eloquent as it is brief. In 221 words, chosen as flowers from a garden, it epitomizes the spirit of patriotism and the sentiment of living remembrance of America's heroic deed.

The occasion was Memorial Day in the British island of Bermuda and the speaker was Col. Bing Morris, affectionately remembered by many Members of the Congress as a former manager of the Congressional Hotel in Washington. Colonel Morris is now the manager of the beautiful Carlton Beach Hotel in Bermuda, an American-operated unit of Hotel Corp. of America.

Bing Morris is one of many Americans whose work takes them to foreign soil. This fact does not—and as Colonel Morris points out, should not—deter them from remembering that they are Americans, and from observing those ceremonies that are significant and important to Americans.

Thus, on Memorial Day this year, Bermudians—British subjects—were treated to the stirring sight of a special flag lowering ceremony by and for Americans on that British island. The ceremony was conducted jointly with Bermuda's own American Legion post, and the flag was one that had flown over the Capitol in Washington. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the flag for this memorable observation of an American holiday on British soil was sent to Bing Morris by his long-time friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Bing Morris' Memorial Day address follows:

> My friends, when I was a boy, Memorial Day was called Decoration Day and it honored the dead of the War Between the States. There was always a great parade of prancing horses, brass bands, and the legendary 76 trombones. In the town square or on the city hall steps there was the oration by a local political dignitary, who generally referred to the thinning ranks of the boys in Blue and Gray. There are no longer survivors of the Blue and Gray days, and Decoration Day is now Memorial Day. For those of us who are Americans on foreign soil, there are two reasons that make it imperative that we recognize this holiday. One reason is that there is hardly an American anywhere in the world who did not suffer the loss of a loved one or a friend in our last wars. The other reason is that it is not unreasonable to consider that the doctrines of Americanism proudly reside in our hearts wherever in the world we may be, and for whatever reasons take us beyond the borders of the United States. I thank my fellow Americans, our visitors from other nations, and our Bermuda friends for giving us their time and attention, and above all, my thanks to the Bermuda Post of the American Legion for their kind assistance.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, requested by my colleague from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, I want to express my personal appreciation for the fine representation that my good friend is performing for the United States in Bermuda. I am referring, of course, to Bing Morris.

Bing Morris is very well known to many Members of the House, as he was manager of the Congressional Hotel for the Knott Corp. I question whether there is a citizen in the continental limits of the United States who has a greater love for his country and enjoys citizenship privileges as much as does Bing Morris.

Even though his profession presently requires him to be out of the country, his loyalties and thoughts are ever with the United States. It was my privilege to provide a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol to him for a special display in Bermuda on Memorial Day. Not only was this flag properly and prominently displayed, but at each table in the large dining room of the Carlton Beach Hotel a special memorandum was placed to note that the particular flag did fly over the Capitol Building of the United States.

His friendship has long been a source of great satisfaction to me, and his love and affection for the United States and her principles should be an inspiration for every American.

TRIBUTE TO MARSHALL WISE, FORMER DIRECTOR OF CUBAN REFUGEE CENTER

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated and able public servant, Marshall Wise, the director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center in Miami, Fla., since March 9, 1961, has recently resumed his previous position as Director of the Miami Social Security Office.

On March 7, 1961, he was requested to assume the position of director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center with the understanding that it would probably be a 60- to 90-day assignment. This temporary assignment has stretched into a period of more than 2 years.

As director of the Cuban refugee program, he was faced with the difficult task of organizing a program to handle thousands upon thousands of refugees arriving daily, in many cases without family or friends and with little or no knowledge of the English language. He was called upon to provide them with, among other things, food, housing, clothing, medical care, jobs, job retraining, resettlement opportunities, and education for both the children and the adults.

Never before in the history of our country have refugees from oppression arrived upon our shores in such numbers, and never before have so many thousand refugees congregated in one metropolitan area.

The Greater Miami area, with a population of about 1 million, has had to absorb approximately 200,000 Cuban refugees. No community could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 15 to 20 percent increase in population without skillful leadership and Federal assistance. The situation was worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there was a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

There existed no precedent upon which one could predicate a sound program. Therefore, to the newly appointed director and his small staff fell the entire burden of establishing a workable refugee program.

The vast majority of the refugees had to be given a basic course in the English language. Headquarters had to be secured for the various phases of the operation. Food distribution centers had to be established. Unaccompanied children had to be placed. Children had to be located in the public and parochial school systems. Problems of overcrowding, language barriers, and educational cost factors had to be overcome. Medical centers had to be established; cooperation with immigration and security activities had to be set up and maintained; proper and adequate housing facilities secured, medical attention for the ill and aged, and a myriad of other services far too numerous to enumerate were necessary.

He had to immediately set up an effective liaison for many agencies of the Federal Government including HEW, Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization, Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the State Department ,the Justice Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and others. Liaison had to be established with the Florida Department of Public Welfare, with the Dade County Public Health Department, and the Dade County public school system, local and county governments and with citizens' groups. Close cooperation had to be maintained with the University of Miami concerning professional refresher courses.

Close cooperation also was necessary with various chambers of commerce throughout the Nation; with the various trade, professional and civic associations, such as the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, AFL–CIO, American Bar Association, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, junior chamber of commerce, and others.

Close liaison had to be established with the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Services of the National Council of Churches, the Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society, International Rescue Committee, and the American Red Cross.

Tribute should be paid to the close working relationship which Mr. Wise has established with the Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Miami which carried a principal share of the burden during the first year of the refugee exodus from Communist Cuba and still continues to bear an overly large part of the cost.

Close liaison had to be maintained with police and juvenile authorities, though credit should be given to the Cuban people for their actions have caused little, if any, problems in this regard. The refugees are worthy of the highest commendation, and with few notable exceptions the entire Cuban refugee group conducted itself peacefully and orderly as its members sought to find their place in a new community.

Many refugee organizations with varied views and objectives formed. It is a tribute to Mr. Wise's direction that he was able to maintain complete harmony at all times in his dealings and associations with these groups.

Through the efforts of Mr. Wise and his staff in cooperation with the various volunteer groups, over 60,000 Cuban refugees have been resettled throughout the United States. The resettlement program has received many favorable endorsements from communities which have accepted refugee families.

A brief description of how the Cuban Refugee Center operates and the complex nature of its administration as well as its broad area of responsibility will vividly demonstrate the very heavy responsibility laid on Marshall Wise's shoulders.

The Cuban Refugee Center, Freedom Tower, 600 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., is the focal point for Cuban refugee registration, resettlement and relief activities. It also coordinates the Federal Government's program of aid to Cuban refugees under a broad directive from President John F. Kennedy. The Federal program is supervised by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze.

At work in the center are representatives of voluntary agencies experienced in resettling refugees in homes and jobs, in communities across the United States. The national organizations they serve have for many years resettled refugees who have come to the United States from many countries. All these organizations are members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies. Represented at the center are: Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Church World Service, Protestant; United HIAS Service, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; and International Rescue Committee, nonsectarian.

The U.S. Employment Service, Department of Labor, also represented in the center, promotes job opportunities for qualified employable refugees, provides identification of the work experience of refugees, conducts aptitude tests and cooperates with the resettlement agencies in finding employment opportunities.

Cuban refugees, after registration at the center, are interviewed and classified as to job skills, number of employables in the family, friends, or relatives in the United States, and desired voluntary agency assistance. The processing procedure is as follows:

First. Reception and registration.

Second. Interview and classification.

Third. U.S. Employment Service interview for employable persons.

Fourth. Medical examination and X-ray.

Fifth. Voluntary agency interview for relocation and resettlement.

Sixth. Red Cross—for personal articles distribution.

Seventh. Florida State Welfare Department—for financial assistance, if necessary; also child welfare department, if necessary.

Eighth. Surplus food distribution.

Each refugee receives a medical examination following registration and before being interviewed by representatives of the resettlement agencies. The U.S. Public Health Service, working through the Dade County Public Health Department, provides supervision of the dispensary. In addition to a general health examination, each refugee receives a chest X-ray and inoculations prescribed by the attending physician.

Outpatient care for minor needs is provided by the dispensary. Treatment of serious or chronic conditions is available through an outpatient program. Needs that cannot be met by the dispensary are referred to hospitals of their choice, such as Jackson Memorial, St. Francis, Mercy, Mount Sinai, and Gesu Medical Clinic—an arm of Mercy and St. Francis. A minimal fee is paid by the Center for each visit. Eligibility is restricted to those qualifying for cash assistance grants under the program described on a later page.

The American Red Cross has distributed personal kits to newly arrived refugees since the start of the refugee program.

Certification slips for used clothing issued by the voluntary agencies are redeemable at several church depots in the Miami area. Supplies of clothing have been received from New York and other cities serving as collection centers for clothing drives.

Under Federal auspices, broad scale aid for Cuban refugees in the United States began late in 1960 when, after a review of the situation, President Eisenhower inaugurated a program to deal with the most urgent needs.

Subsequently, President Kennedy recognized the Cuban refugee problem as one of national responsibility and beyond the means and scope of the individual States or the combined efforts of voluntary agencies. Accordingly, on January 27, 1961, the President issued a formal instruction to the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, saying, in part:

> I want you to make concrete my concern and sympathy for those who have been forced from their homes in Cuba and to assure them that we shall seek to expedite their voluntary return as soon as conditions there facilitate that.

After a further personal evaluation of the refugee problem in the Miami area, a comprehensive program was formulated by the HEW Secretary, who assigned the Social Security Commissioner to coordinate the efforts of all Federal agencies affected by the President's directive. In January 1963, the Cuban refugee relief program was placed under the newly constituted Welfare Administration—Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of Welfare. Director of the Cuban refugee program, based in Washington, is John Frederick Thomas.

By Presidential authority, $5 million had been allocated to the support of cooperative programs relating to the health, education, and welfare of Cuban refugees in the United States, for the period ending June 30, 1961. These funds were part of the money appropriated by Congress to the Mutual Security Contingency Fund and they represent the first expenditure of such funds within the continental borders of the United States.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the program was carried out with $38.5 million made available under authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On June 28, 1962, Public Law 87-510—Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962—was enacted which provided a legislative base for assistance to Cuban and other refugees from nations of the Western Hemisphere, and authorized appropriations for such assistance. Funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, amounted to $70,110,000.

Besides the Federal, State, and local agencies, support for the refugees has come from private firms and individuals as well as from educational, religious, cultural, and philanthropic agencies. All their efforts symbolize the President's personal concern and attest to his leadership in promoting the welfare of the refugees.

Through agreements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Federal funds are being used to administer a wide variety of programs:

Operation of the Cuban Refugee Center and the maintenance of records.

Resettlement of refugee families in communities offering employment opportunities.

A transitional grant to resettling refugees who receive public assistance in Miami at the time of their resettlement—$100 for a family, $60 for an individual.

Financial assistance to needy families in the Miami area and to resettled families in other areas.

Consultations and advisory services to voluntary agencies with contractual responsibilities.

Hospitalization and medical care for the sick.

The care and protection of unaccompanied children.

Distribution of surplus food commodities to needy refugees.

Emergency welfare services for American nationals repatriated from Cuba.

Educational loans to needy and deserving Cuban students enrolled in American colleges and universities.

An adult education program, as well as an elementary and secondary education program for refugee children.

The retraining of refugee physicians, attorneys, and other professionals.

The establishment and operation of a Cuban refugee research project.

The Florida State Department of Public Welfare is the principal contract agency for administering immediate relief to the refugees in the form of financial assistance, child welfare services, and in the distribution of surplus food commodities. Professional social workers interview and screen the refugees and certify their eligibility to receive monthly financial assistance checks—a maximum of $100 per family and $60 per single case—and inhospital care for acute illness. Child welfare specialists in the Center look after the welfare and education of unaccompanied refugee children.

Through an agreement between the Florida State Department of Public Welfare and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, surplus Federal food commodities are distributed to needy families; this distribution is in addition to other grants-in-aid.

Beside the public and private welfare agencies, aid to the refugees is administered by organizations representing the principal religious faiths of the refugees.

Late in 1959 the Catholic diocese of Miami opened the Centro Hispano Catolico to serve the needs of refugees arriving from Cuba as well as from other Latin American countries. The centro's services include medical outpatient care, food, and used clothing distribution, and home visits for the sick.

The Catholic Welfare Bureau of Miami provides a variety of other services to refugees on referral from the Centro Hispano Catolico or from the Catholic relief offices in the center.

The Protestant Latin Refugee Center was established by the Protestant Latin American Emergency Committee to supplement the assistance given through the Federal program.

Jewish refugees from Cuba receive various forms of assistance from the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, a national organization.

Hardship cases are helped at eight denominational centers.

Refugees with technical skills and professional training receive special consideration. Lawyers, doctors, and engineers are being retrained to fit them for professional service in the United States; most of the retraining work is carried on with Federal aid by the University of Miami.

Cuban college and university students may receive education grants enabling them to resume their studies in the United States. Applications to university registrars are processed through the Office of Education, an agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I have hastily sketched the operations of the Cuban Refugee Center. But even this cursory rundown shows that successful operation under Marshall Wise is solid attestation of his excellent work.

An able administrator, a tireless worker, a dedicated public servant, a great humanitarian, are all words descriptive of Marshall Wise. They bear repeating. His efforts have gained recognition throughout not only the United States and the Western Hemisphere but all of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Wise which were delivered in his speech to the Downtown Rotary Club of Miami, Fla., on May 2, 1963. In it you will find the heart, courage, and talent of an outstanding public officer who deserves credit and recognition for a job well done. Accordingly, I am privileged to deliver his remarks to you:

> A little over 2 years ago—when I first came to this job—people in the community told me we were sitting on a powder keg that might blow up any minute. Eighteen months ago, when I last spoke to this group, I was told the same thing. All during the last 12 months, and once again during the Pepper-Fascell hearings, I heard local labor leaders and other concerned individuals voice the same cry.
>
> However, from where I sit, and from what I see, I've never believed these cries, and right here today I want to say to you, as members of the leading civic organization in this community, that we have not been, and we are not now sitting on a powder keg because of the Cuban refugees living in our midst.
>
> I am really not here to educate you. I bring you information which I hope will enable you to educate yourselves, if that is your desire.

I am not here to plead the special cause of the Cuban refugee, or to defend those who are defenseless. I bring you facts, not fiction, which I hope will enable you to decide whether their cause is a just one, and is deserving of your understanding and active support.

The moment the Cuban crisis erupted recently, Fidel Castro slammed the door through which thousands of Cubans had been fleeing their land since 1959. Planes which had been flying out more than 6,400 Cubans a month, for 19 months, were ordered to halt operations. An estimated 350,000 Cubans—many of whom had already paid for their passage and were waiting only for plane space—were locked in by the ban on emigration.

To be cut off from freedom—especially when freedom lies only a few tantalizing miles away—is a tragic fact of life affecting millions today in many parts of the globe. The tragedy is heightened when families are split—half in freedom, half behind walls. Many Cuban families, both inside and outside their native land, are suffering the agony which is so widespread in the world today.

I'm not going to repeat all the criticisms and complaints about the refugee influx that you've read in our local newspapers, or heard from your well-meaning neighbors and friends, or, may have actually been said by you, yourselves. Most of those I've read or heard, are based on pure fiction and prejudice—not upon hard, cold, facts.

It has been written and said that Cuban refugees are taking jobs away from needy Americans, and lowering the wage rates in Miami and south Florida. I'm sure that some of this has taken place, but the hard cold facts, available to all of you in the reports made by the Florida State Employment Service, the recent special survey on unemployment in Dade County conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, the First Research Corp., and other professional fact-finding bodies, proves conclusively that these inflammatory statements just can't be proved.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees was increasing the crime rate in our communities, yet the official report of the Miami Police Department, released just a few months ago, says that although the crime rate during the past 3 years has increased in Miami—and here I quote from the report—"Cubans were not a problem in the crimes reported on by the department." Lt. Tom Lipe, in making the report, said, "Cubans are good citizens as far as we are concerned."

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would ruin south Florida's tourist industry. Yet industry reports show that 1962 was the best tourist year we ever experienced, and right now the tourist industry tells us that 1963 is going to be better than 1962.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would create slums and depress the real estate market. The most recent reports from the Miami Housing Authority, Area Redevelopment officials, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Real Estate Appraisal Association and the Federal Housing Administration all agree that although there is an overcrowding situation no slums have been created and the real estate market, instead of being depressed, has been greatly helped by the influx of refugees into the area.

It has been written and said that the refugee influx would ruin our school system and slow up the education of our own children. The facts are available to all of you and you can get them by talking to the superintendent of schools, or any of the other responsible officials of the Dade County school system. You'll learn from them that there has been, and still is heavy overcrowding, but that the quality of the Cuban students and the $9 million of Federal funds that has been given to help with the problem has really improved, rather than hurt, the school system.

And finally, it has been written and said that "they are using all our welfare funds to help the Cubans instead of the needy Americans." The truth is that no Dade County or Florida State funds have ever been used for this purpose. More than $80 million of purely Federal funds, contributed in taxes by all the people of the United States including you and me, have been used to give these needy refugees asylum, safety and minimum subsistence in the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

The hard, cold facts, and the real truth of the situation, as stated by competent local officials in recent public hearings is that we in Dade County really don't have assistance programs that are worthy of the name. Although Federal funds have been and are now available on a 3-to-1 matching basis for staff, and equal matching basis for general assistance—this means that for every dollar we are willing to appropriate and spend for general assistance the Federal Government will give us $3 for staff employment and a matching dollar for assistance payments—notwithstanding the fact that such an offer remains open to us we cannot seem to get our own elected representatives to provide the $1 that will automatically bring us matching funds to help the needy Americans in our own communities get back on their feet again.

Let's take a quick, short look at some of the plus factors, at some of the good that has resulted in the exodus of the Cuban refugee fleeing from communism, tyranny, and oppression to asylum, safety, and democracy in the Miami area.

1. I contend that the culture of this area has advanced to a point it would have taken another 10 years to reach without this impact.

2. Miami has been striving for many years to establish its right to the title "Gateway to the Americas," and I can't believe that anyone in North, Central, or South America would now attempt to dispute that claim.

3. All of the people of Latin and South America, and islands of the Caribbean are completely aware of the tolerance, hospitality, understanding, and welcome that the citizens of the Miami area have extended to the Cuban refugee.

4. Just think how our schoolteachers, church people, policemen, government agencies, salespeople, service trades, civic organizations, hotel people, and many of our citizens have learned to speak Spanish in order to deal with, serve, and host our Spanish-speaking exiles and guests. The progress we've made in this area alone will bring us cultural, as well as economic rewards, for all the remaining years of our lives.

5. Our churches and temples have found a rallying point and popular cause, and have greatly strengthened their ties as a result.

6. All our educational and cultural discussion groups have benefited tremendously by their association with the Cuban exiles, and as a result have learned much, in such a short time, about communism and how it works.

7. We're becoming world famous for our "Operation Amigo" project, and the Cuban refugee provided the bridge of understanding and stimulating spark which advanced the program.

Let's just look at the positive aspects of a few highlights you may not have thought about before:

1. Our public school system, although overburdened and badly crowded now, is being assisted by Federal expenditures to accelerate its rate of growth because of this heavy refugee load. When the refugee impact disappears, as it will in the not too distant furture, we'll be just that much further advanced and better able to provide for the future expansion that must come to care for our future normal growth.

2. The success of Interama as a permanent trade fair is a foregone conclusion, because we've proven to all the countries of Latin America that Miami is a host city to the Spanish-speaking world, without a peer to be found anywhere.

3. And last, but by no means least, the tremendous expenditure of Federal funds in this area, more than $36 million last year, and somewhere in the neighborhood of $70 million this year, has bolstered Miami's sagging economy during a time which could have been one of depression and retrogression without such a dollar flow.

Miami, an area whose economic bloodstream is fed and nourished by tourist visitors, has always been happy to welcome the "refugee" from the North who is fleeing from the cold weather.

Up to this time, the great majority of Miamians have also welcomed and tolerated the influx of refugees from Cuba, who are basically fleeing from communism and oppression.

However, we are seeing a small minority begin to resent this influx. We are beginning to hear them say, "America for Americans," and, "Miami for Miamians."

Maybe we should remind them that almost everyone in Miami is from somewhere else, and that America has grown great because of its willingness to provide honest opportunities for immigrants and refugees.

Maybe we should remind them that we welcome the Cuban refugee because the bloodstream philosophy of America is inscribed on our Statue of Liberty, a statue which is known to the rest of the world as; "The Mother of Exiles."

Maybe we should rededicate ourselves to these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
 Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
 The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
 Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. **LONG** of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote on Thusrday on the bill, H.R. 6754, the agricultural appropriation bill, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PAN AMERICAN JET ALL-CARGO CLIPPERS

Mr. **JARMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **JARMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a very interesting hour and a half this morning at Dulles International Airport inspecting the new Pan American all-cargo jet clipper. My purpose in mentioning this matter to Members of the House is that I consider the process of transporting air freight as developed by Pan American Airlines to be of significant value to the commercial and defense interests of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, should a cold war crisis erupt somewhere in the world and America's armed might called into action, men and equipment must be moved at jet speed across continents and oceans. At such a time, the Pan American cargo jet would serve as a frontline reserve element in the free world's defenses. For example, Pan Am's jet freighter fleet—representing a private investment of nearly $60 million—would provide the fastest means of transport for large volumes of military cargo to most of the world's critical areas in times of emergency.

Committed to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, Pan Am's eight freighters on routes between Air Force bases in California and Hawaii could carry nearly 19 million pounds per week of essential military supplies, such as rations, hospital equipment and medicines, military vehicles, and weapon components. Alternately, in all-passenger configurations, they could move 43,780 troops per week on the same routes. In mixed configurations, 109 personnel and nearly 30 tons of freight could be carried on one aircraft.

This important ability to transport quickly men and supplies is due in part to Pan American's palletized preloading system. This system provides a method by which cargo is assembled according to destination, loaded, and secured to pallets immediately upon arrival at the airport cargo terminal. Pallets are completely loaded and placed on a cargo train ready for hoisting into the cargo clipper immediately after it taxis to the cargo terminal.

It is possible, therefore, under this process, for the world's largest air transport to be completely loaded in 1 hour. Or, in other words, 40 tons of freight could cross the Atlantic in a 6½-hour flight—and then be unloaded in another hour ready for the return trip with an additional hour for reloading. This means that time saved in flight is not lost on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, in an equally important area, the Pan American new jet cargo freighter will be a stimulant to American international marketing. Used in connection with Pan Am's worldwide marketing service, the latter having opened new markets abroad to some 3,000 American firms, the jet clipper will be able to serve more businessmen who desire to operate overseas. As a matter of fact, in 16 days one of these new jet freighters could carry between the United States and Europe the entire tonnage of cargo hauled across the Atlantic by Pan American during all of 1952, a year in which the airline led the airfreight industry.

Thus, with a record of operating over 100 million ton-miles of cargo each year and with prospects of increasing Pan American's total freight 25 percent for the coming year, the jet cargo clippers with their new methods of loading will greatly enhance America's commercial and defense interests throughout the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, an invitation has been issued by Pan American to all Members of this body to inspect their new aircraft and its loading system in an effort to demonstrate their tremendous significance to this country. A plane will be at Dulles International Airport all of today and helicopter service is available. If Members will contact my office, arrangements can be made for them to see this most important jet clipper.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following proceedings today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, June 17, following the legislative program of the day, and the disposition of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADMINISTRATION TO DO NOTHING ABOUT BURNING OF MILITARY MISSION OFFICES IN CARACAS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week a Communist mob burned the U.S. military mission offices in Caracas, Venezuela, desecrated the American flag, destroyed valuable documents, and showed the world their contempt for the power and prestige of this Nation.

The report on the incident of the complete takeover of our military mission offices in Caracas is appalling.

Even more appalling is the report that our own State Department does not intend to protest this action to the Venezuelan Government, as they feel Venezuela will take all action necessary. Since when have we left the decision of action to be taken by us to the government of the foreign country? The whole purpose of our guards is to protect our interest and the duty of our State Department is to take immediate action against such attacks when occurring.

If I am correct in my thinking the sole purpose for our retaining guards at our foreign missions is to defend takeover or prevent assaults on the properties and materials maintained in foreign countries. Assuming this to be the purpose let us analyze the Caracas incident. We maintain guards throughout the world at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers—amounting to many millions of dollars a year—to defend our rights at the cost of their lives if necessary. They are aware of their duties and sworn to uphold them upon assignment. They are adequately armed with training to use the weapons at their command. In brief they are the United States of America, not six, eight, or whatever number of soldiers happen to be involved.

They should have been under orders to defend their positions at any cost. This is the price we must pay, if necessary, if we are to uphold the honor of our country and continue to demand the respect of the rest of the world established by our founders and perpetuated throughout our history until recently when our leadership seems to have changed from that of patriotic red-blooded Americans to a lot of international do-gooders more intent on appeasement of those who would destroy us than to stand firm and defend our heritage as passed on by our forefathers.

I am confident our foreign policy, as carried out under the New Frontier, is not what the overwhelming majority of Americans would pursue given a chance to formulate it according to their beliefs. I am further confident it is not a policy any citizen, instilled in good sound Americanism, could look to with pride.

Never in the history of our country have we been so often humiliated both at home and abroad as we have since the New Frontier took command.

There must be an end put to our sacrificing the honor of our country through weak leadership, appeasement, and infiltration of high offices by the "one-worlders" who put the welfare of our Nation secondary.

If the guards we have assigned to protect American interest abroad are in fact not permitted by orders to do so then why should the American taxpayer be saddled with this tremendous extra burden of maintaining them overseas? If they are not to defend our missions when attacked, and this is a clear indication they are not, then why have them there to be humiliated and further humiliate this great United States of America by such incidents? A lock on the door would have given more resistance at a far less expense. I say either give them the authority to defend to their last round or bring them home.

Let me say here this in no way is meant as a reflection on our military men. I feel confident given authority they would have defended to the last man the assault on that or any other mission were they permitted to do so. They are the best soldiers in the world because they believe in America and the Constitution upon which it was founded. Let us act as a nation to uphold this belief and cease selling America down the road to destruction by our so-called internationalists. Now is the time to act, and act forcefully, leaving no question to the rest of the world but what we will defend the rights of America and the principles upon which it was founded wherever challenged.

Weakness by officials of the U.S. Government only invites further attack by those nations who underestimate the courage and patriotism of American citizens.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD STAY HOME

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **YOUNGER**. Mr. Speaker, two articles in the papers over the weekend seem to me to contain very sound advice to our President. Mr. Eldon Griffiths, of London, wrote in the Washington Post on Saturday, June 8, a column entitled "Kennedy Should Stay Home," and the widely read Columnist John M. Hightower's article Saturday in the Washington Evening Star was entitled "Kennedy Trip Seen a Gamble."

Their very cogent and timely arguments coincide with my own views. This certainly does not seem to be an opportune time for the President to go to Europe. Italy has both her religious and political problems at this time; Germany is just in the throes of changing government leadership, and England has an unsavory political mess with the possibility of Prime Minister Macmillan being replaced by his own party. Also, our homefront is not without its complicated and harassing problems which are worthy of the President's obvious and unremitting efforts. So, I hope the alarming and embarrassing situations in the Western Hemisphere and in the United States will persuade the President to remain at home until he can travel abroad without leaving behind more unsolved, pressing situations than now exist.

The two articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1963]

KENNEDY SHOULD STAY HOME

(By Eldon Griffiths)

LONDON.—A noisy debate is under way in Washington over President Kennedy's projected visit to Europe. This is a view from Europe: The President should stay at home.

The original purpose of his trip was to recover the American initiative, seized by French President Charles de Gaulle when he vetoed the New Frontier's grand design for Atlantic partnership. By making public appearances in Italy and Germany, Mr. Kennedy hopes to demonstrate that his Atlantic conception is vastly to be preferred to De Gaulle's narrower conception of a self-sufficient Europe.

He is also expecting to do some discreet lobbying on behalf of U.S. farmers who want a guaranteed share of the European market and for his multilateral NATO deterrent which is running into heavy water. If anyone can sell the Europeans on these projects, Mr. Kennedy thinks he can.

Unfortunately, the political context in which the President's visit was conceived has changed beyond recognition. Mr. Kennedy can still be sure that his welcome would be warm in Italy, tumultuous in Germany and a sensation in Ireland. But there are two decisive reasons why he postpone his trip. The first is that the governments of Europe are in a state of flux. The second is that the racial problem in America requires the President to stay at the helm in Washington.

The European objections to a visit at this time can be seen in every capital. Mr. Kennedy has not been invited to Paris. He has no plans to meet the most important man on the continent. He cannot, therefore, discuss the most vital problem in the Western alliance—the lack of confidence between himself and De Gaulle.

West Germany, by contrast, would entertain him royally. But with whom can the President get down to brass tacks? Konrad Adenauer will be glad to see him—but Adenauer is a lame duck, scheduled to retire in August. Nor can Ludwig Erhardt, his heir-apparent, speak with real authority. As yet, he cannot commit Germany on any issue of capital importance.

A similar climate of uncertainty pervades Italy. The new Pope, if there is one by the time Mr. Kennedy is due to arrive, will not be in any position to exchange anything more than formalities. And the same goes for the Premier-designate Aldo Moro, who is eager to win the leftwing Socialists' forbearance toward a center cabinet. Moro can do little more than shake the President's hand.

In Dublin, of course, it would be different. And Harold Macmillan is sure to be delighted by the change in the President's plans which will permit a 2-day stopover in Britain. But here, too, there is a drawback. The Labor opposition is likely to charge Mr. Kennedy with trying to help the Tories, and in addition, the British Government has not made up its mind on the central issue between the United States and Britain—the mixed-manned deterrent. Whitehall will be embarrassed if the President sought to sell this concept in person.

It is the racial problem in America that is the most compelling reason why the President should call off his trip. The summer months are likely to be a time of mounting tension. Impatience among the extremists on both sides would easily trigger mass rioting in the South. Heat waves in Detroit and Harlem, coupled with the letting-out of schools, could lead to violence in the North.

At such a delicate moment, when the United States is confronting profound domestic emergencies, ordinary Americans are bound to look to the President, and the President alone, for a lead. They are bound to feel that his place is not in Rome or Dublin. It is in Washington, D.C.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 8, 1963]

KENNEDY TRIP SEEN A GAMBLE

(By John M. Hightower)

President Kennedy has committed himself to a personal venture in allied diplomacy this month which holds greater risk of failure than promise of success.

But as high administration officials assess the outlook this weekend, the gamble is one that had to be taken. In their view, cancellation of Mr. Kennedy's plans to visit Italy and Germany would have produced a worse failure than any which the President risks by making the trip.

The decision anounced by Mr. Kennedy to visit Prime Minister Macmillan seems to raise the hazards with the certain prospect that Mr. Kennedy will become directly involved in the British struggle for power between Mr. Macmillan and Labor Party Leader Harold Wilson.

SCANDAL ROCKS BRITAIN

The struggle itself, meanwhile, is being intensified by angry outcries over the sex and security scandal which has rocked the Macmillan government.

The explanation offered in high administration quarters for Mr. Kennedy's offer to see Mr. Macmillan is that the Prime Minister had urged him not to bypass London on his flying tour around the borders of France.

Administration officials are acutely aware that while plans for the President's trip have been buffeted by the winds of adversity, French President Charles de Gaulle has displayed the image of a major European ally standing calm and confident amid a tempest of politics and diplomacy. The contrast is striking.

But administration officials consider the contrast misleading. Many. indeed, regard General de Gaulle's unruffled calm less as a product of strength than as a cover of the semi-isolation into which his plans have been put by his European neighbors.

SEEKS NUCLEAR SUPPORT

Some of Mr. Kennedy's must influential advisers insist that the President does not seek any concrete results from his trip. But the impression is strong that he would certainly welcome agreements with Mr. Macmillan and West German Chancellor Adenauer in support of his proposal for a jointly owned and manned allied navy armed with nuclear missiles.

It seems likely that one of the real reasons Mr. Kennedy decided to visit Mr. Macmillan was to try to get some parallel to the understanding already achieved with West Germany on setting up such a force.

But the nuclear force proposal has several strikes against it. While General de Gaulle cannot veto it as he vetoed Britain's bid for the Common Market last January, he can and has argued that it would be only an extension of U.S. power and not a real European force.

Furthermore, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the plan in Europe, including Britain. Many European military experts have argued it is costly and would be vulnerable to Soviet destruction.

Whether Mr. Kennedy's strong personal popularity, demonstrated when he visited Paris and Vienna and London in 1961, can overcome popular and military antagonism to the nuclear force plan is a serious question. Nevertheless the President clearly intends to make the try.

But the real reason for going through with the trip seems to be that Mr. Kennedy and his advisers felt a cancellation or major postponement would have had bad results throughout Europe and shown weakening allied unity to the Communist world as well.

The President was reluctant to include England because he did not want to be drawn into British politics nor did he wish to appear to be encircling General de Gaulle. In the end, however, Mr. Macmillan's insistence was overriding.

During the past 2 weeks, it was learned, the two men exchanged about a dozen messages on a great range of subjects.

PRESIDENT REENTERS THE TEST BAN UNILATERAL MORATORIUM TRAP

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, the President's promise this morning not to test in the atmosphere unless someone else does, namely the Russians, amounts to no more than giving Premier Khrushchev the power to decide when and under what circumstances the United States will conduct tests.

This is hardly an advantageous situation.

It is most certainly a soft line.

The entire history of negotiation with the Communists shows that nothing is accomplished by soft positions. Only by taking a hard, demanding line can results be expected.

Going hat in hand to Moscow to beg for test ban treaty will prove fruitless.

It could prove dangerous to the national security.

I can conclude only that the President and his speech writers want a test ban treaty, but do not know how to bargain with the Russians to get it. Or, that they do understand Kremlin psychology, do not want a treaty and are taking the steps necessary not to get it.

A far better course would be:

First. Withdraw from negotiation the present draft comprehensive test ban treaty proposal.

Second. Place a definite time limit on our present draft treaty proposal for an atmospheric test ban treaty.

Third. At the end of the time limit, assuming the Soviets still are stalling, issue an invitation to all nuclear nations to sit down and write a simple fallout limitation treaty.

Details regarding a fallout limitation treaty will be found in my remarks of June 5 at page 10209 of the RECORD.

ARA IN THE SUGARBEET BUSINESS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I should suppose that after a number of years of service in this Congress, there would be few things that could amaze me in the field of bureaucratic blundering. There are times when many of us become weary of calling these inconsistencies to the attention of our people. But I have for your consideration today what I consider one of the most glaring lapses of good thinking that has crossed my desk for some time. It concerns an instance where the Area Redevelopment Administration has entered the sugarbeet growing business in an area of the country where there is no history to substantiate the growing of such a crop. And I gather that if ARA and the Department of Agriculture have their way, a substantial amount of our new domestic beet quota may go to that area instead of to areas across the country that already have ideal soil for the growing of beets.

On March 6 of this year, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced that a $25,000 technical assistance study had been granted to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of establishing a sugarbeet refinery in Cayuga County, N.Y. This study was granted because Cayuga County had been designated as eligible to participate in the area redevelopment program due to substantial and persistent unemployment.

On March 20, also this year, ARA tells us that a $93,000 technical assistance study of the feasibility of growing and processing sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., has been approved. That is a total of $118,000 just to find out whether or not sugarbeets can be grown in an area that ARA has admitted is hilly and rocky. There is even some doubt as to whether harvesting machinery can function properly.

They are growing sugarbeets on a test area covering 250 acres of Cayuga County at this very moment, and a news release circulated in that area states that ARA is supplying the contracting farmers with the necessary seed, is furnishing them with the proper planting and harvesting machinery, and will end up by purchasing the crops from them at prevailing market rates.

The same release informs us that the Agriculture Department is reserving a special 50,000-ton sugarbeet allocation for Cayuga County and that ARA is scheduled to underwrite some 65 percent of the cost of the $20 million project. That release says further that the refinery, if finally approved, could not become fully operational until 1966, but that the Department of Agriculture intends to ask Congress to amend last year's law so that, if the tests prove successful, the project can get underway immediately.

Apparently Cayuga County would already have the allocation if it were not for one little technicality: Nobody knows yet whether or not the farmers there can raise sugarbeets on questionable soil. But ARA seems to be taking care of that little detail this summer with taxpayer-financed studies.

The point I want to make is that we have dozens of areas across the Nation, with some of the most suitable soils known for the raising of sugarbeets, who have been literally begging for acreage allotments. These areas, too, such as in my own native Red River Valley, have been declared ARA eligible because of persistent unemployment. The Cayuga project, then, is just another attempt to solve a problem in one area while creating new problems for other areas of the country. This is an outright attempt to ignore the known beet growing areas of the country for an unknown quantity in the dubious name of area redevelopment.

The great Red River Valley of Minnesota and the Dakotas, for instance, are not asking for ARA-financed studies. They are not asking for anything except permission to grow beets on some of the richest and most productive soil in the world. But this Government does not hear them, because we are so busy spending public funds on make-work projects that may never be feasible.

Mr. Speaker, such projects just do not make economic sense, nor do they alleviate the human suffering for which they are intended. The Federal Government simply pours thousands of dollars into areas that then compete directly with worthwhile, organized local effort elsewhere. The sorry part of this mess is that farmers in known sugarbeet areas are being hurt because of efforts to solve problems elsewhere, problems our farmers had no part in creating.

It is time we called a halt to make-work projects that do nothing except waste our money in one section of the country and create new problems elsewhere.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of business and following all other special orders previously granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

UNITED STATES CONCERNED AT RISE IN CUBA SHIP SAILINGS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's speech before the graduating class of American University. If that class was not afraid to meet the challenges of the sixties before the President's address, they must be scared to death now; for the President, reciting the latest New Frontier line, successfully expounded a fear of war psychosis which, if past performance is any indication, is intended to pave the way for further concessions to the Soviets.

The President stated that the people of the United States should reexamine their attitude toward Russia. What does this mean?

Are the American people, after reexamining, to decide that atheistic communism is not so bad? That the Soviet enslavement of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain is all right? That the brutality and slaughter of freedom-seeking people in Hungary should be regarded as a childish prank? That the brick wall separating families and loved ones in Berlin, in spite of treaties to the contrary, is merely an expression of Soviet architecture? Are we to overlook every treaty the Russians have broken which is, in effect, every treaty they have ever made?

I think the answers to these questions are meant to be "yes" if one places any credibility in the President's almost unbelievable statement that the antagonistic, saber-rattling utterances that come from Russia are not really indicative of the thinking of Khrushchev and the Soviets, but of his propagandists.

According to the President, freedom-loving countries can get along with the Soviet system of dictatorship and enslavement if we take the time and effort to increase our understanding of it, if we improve our communications with them.

This statement of New Frontier foreign policy is frightening, and the peddling of the scare of war philosophy by the Kennedy administration makes further concessions to the Russians in order to get along with them inevitable.

This sounds reminiscent, but in far more covert terms, of it is "better to be Red than dead." The American people do not regard these as the only alternatives. They choose to be alive and free, and this can only be accomplished with a strong and determined foreign policy that is not frightened to death of and seeking accommodations with an enemy that has promised to bury us, has promised that our grandchildren will grow up under communism.

This basic expression of New Frontier philosophy is being applied to this hemisphere today, particularly with regard to Cuba. I have been stating for many months that the New Frontier is trying to work out some compromise, some accommodation looking toward a coexistence with communism in Cuba policy. Today the President confirmed my suspicions by expounding the ADA philosophy in foreign affairs.

Perhaps this explains why so little concern has been shown over the 50-percent increase in Russian shipping, including armaments, to Cuba since the quarantine, the continuing and now increased shipping by non-Communist countries to Cuba, Britain, and Canada in particular, and the accommodations between Cuba and even some of the Latin American nations that still recognize and do business with Cuba.

According to official figures of the Maritime Administration, during the first 4 months of this year, 113 known trips by 92 non-Soviet-bloc ships went to Cuba through May 31 of this year. There were 36 trips in April alone, and 16 of these were British. As a matter of fact, 33 of the 92 trips were British ships, 13 of which were tankers carrying precious oil for Castro's war machine.

Twenty-three of the ninety-two ships were under Greek registry.

In addition to the increased shipping by non-Communist-bloc nations, apparently with no effort to prevent it by the New Frontier, I am sure, a further accommodation to Castro and the Kremlin was the reported cessation of low-level surveillance flights over Cuba and the decreasing numbers of high-level surveillance flights.

This accommodation philosophy is further evidenced by the FAA order of 3 weeks ago which permits Cuban commercial planes to overfly the United States enroute from Canada so long as they stop for inspection. This latter condition, incidentally, gives Castro's Communist government use of and access to our airports in the major cities of the Northeast, including Dulles International Airport outside of Washington, D.C.

In exchange for this accommodation, Cuba has apparently agreed not to hijack or shoot at our commercial planes if they cross Cuba and this quid pro quo was accepted by the United States only last week when the prohibition against U.S. commercial flights over Cuba was withdrawn.

Thus, the mood is to be one of accommodation as spelled out by the President today unless the New Frontier awakens to the fact that it is not the mood of the American people. America demands firm leadership in ridding this hemisphere of Communism in Cuba and elsewhere as well.

The only reexamination of our attitude toward Russia should be one looking toward a firmer position, not toward how we can give in without losing too much face to the Communist demands as the price for coexistence.

All these concessions are supposed to be made in the name of peace, but the basic fallacy of this approach is that the Communists have never kept their agreements. It ignores the proven fact that the international Communist conspiracy has as its stated goal—repeated again and again—to bury capitalism and the United States.

To the Communists, conciliation, and concession are signs of weakness. We cannot afford to display weakness on any front or in answer to any challenge hurled at us by the Communists if our freedoms are to be preserved.

SHIPPING TO CUBA SHOWS NEW CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, latest U.S. Government reports show that free world shipping to Cuba is on the increase—enough increase to cause real concern.

During the peak period of June to August 1962, when the Soviets were attempting their crash program military buildup of Cuba, a total of 164 non-Communist ships called in Cuban ports. Since January of this year there have been 89 non-Communist ships calling in Cuba; a figure which represents more than half of last summer's traffic.

What are the Soviets doing in Cuba to require such shipping? What is the reason that free world shipping for this year totals more than it did during the month of July 1962, when such traffic reached its peak? I think these are questions which weigh heavily in the minds of those who recall the events of last October.

I have repeatedly urged that this Government close its ports to ships from allied countries which call in Cuban ports. To date this Government has taken only limited action through a blacklist of such vessels carrying food-for-peace cargoes. Obviously this system has had little effect.

If U.S. ports were closed, as I have suggested, this traffic would come to a screeching halt. No nation would continue its shipping to Cuba if denied access to profitable U.S. cargo runs. Furthermore, such action would discourage the more than 20 allied tankers which have delivered Russian oil to Castro regularly since January, and without oil Castro's island fortress would come to a screeching halt.

Why should our allies shoulder part of the Soviet burden of supplying Castro? Why should we continue to silently approve this practice by allowing these allies access to our ports?

I urge that the United States close its ports immediately to those who value rubles over dollars, and freedom.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia, on the life and service of our late and distinguished colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia:

EMBASSY OF AUSTRALIA,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Australian Government, and of myself, I wish to convey to you and to the House, sincere condolences over the great and sad loss you have sustained as a result of the death of Representative Francis E. Walter.

Australia will remember with gratitude Representative Walter's long and fruitful association with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which made a most valuable contribution to the solution of the refugee problems following World War II; and to the large movements of population from Europe, which have been of great benefit to Australia's economy and have materially enhanced the role which Australia is able to play as a member of the free world.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD BEALE,
Ambassador.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII is deeply and sincerely mourned probably by more people than any other man in recorded history. He was admired and loved equally by the great and the little people of the world, because he himself admired and loved, equally, both the great and the little people of the world. Whatever office he might hold, throughout his career, he never looked upon himself as magnified by that office, but used the office as a means of drawing closer to other people, and of helping them as much as possible. His greatness of soul most appeared in his consistent habit of looking upon himself, most sincerely, as insignificant. Thus belittling himself, Pope John was ready to devote his energies to any task, to risk his reputation in any cause, to hazard his health and his life itself in the service of other men.

Out of this greatness came the instinctive rightness of so many sudden, unexpected words and actions. To a delegation of Jewish rabbis he said, in the words

of Genesis XLV, 4, "I am Joseph your brother"; to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, after he had been carefully briefed in protocol and in the forms of American etiquette, upon seeing her, he forgot all his briefing, opened his arms wide, and called out "Jacqueline"; to prisoners whom he visited, he recalled the imprisonment of his own relatives; to one who had been his superior officer in the Italian Army, he gleefully identified himself as Sergeant Roncalli. Each step he took, as Pope, from his dealings with the Vatican staff and the people of Rome to his major acts such as the appointment of cardinals and the canonization of saints, was an advance in the recognition of the dignity and worth of man. In the crowd—all races, all nations, all faiths—he saw and loved each individual. This was borne out in his two great encyclicals, "Mater et Magis tra"—"Mother and Teacher"—and "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth"—directed to the solution of human problems of ordinary men. Also, the ecumenical council which Pope John convoked was aimed at renewal within the Roman Catholic Church, but also for the unity of all Christians. For this he is loved and mourned and prayed for, and for this he will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an excellent article by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 6, 1963, entitled "The Miracle of Pope John," and an editorial from the Springfield Sunday Republican, June 9, 1963, entitled "Pope John XXIII, the Man of the Century."

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 6, 1963]

THE MIRACLE OF POPE JOHN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reign of Pope John has been a wonder which grows more astounding the more we think how amidst the angry enmities of our time he became so greatly loved. It is a modern miracle that anyone could reach across all the barriers of class, caste, color, and creed to touch the hearts of all kinds of people. There has been nothing like it, certainly not in the modern age. The miracle is a proof which we sorely needed that all the varieties of men do actually belong to one human family. Otherwise, so many could not have heard and understood and responded to Pope John.

That they have responded is proof that the enmities and divisions of mankind are not the whole reality of the human condition. There is in men a capacity, unplumbed and perhaps unmeasurable, to be reached by loving kindness. The miracle of Pope John is that he knew this and believed it and had faith to act upon it, and that he was proved to have been right. So, as he lies dead, he is revered and blessed by all sorts and conditions of men all around the globe.

We know that the miracle of Pope John will not transform the world. The condition of man is a hard one, and his struggle to survive and to prevail will not disappear with the appearance of a saint and the proclamation of a saving truth. We shall not suddenly become new men. But the universal response which Pope John evoked is witness to the truth that there is in the human person, however prone to evil, an aptitude for goodness. That is why we must never despair that the world can be better than the world we live in.

It is evident to anyone who reads the two great encyclical letters, "Mater et Magistra" ("Mother and Teacher") and "Pacem in Terris" ("Peace on Earth"), that Pope John, far from being naive and unworldly, had an encyclopedic and acute knowledge of the complex and stubborn problems of the daylight world. The encyclical letters do not suppose that the world can be cured before the problems that harass it are brought to solution. The encyclical letters are, therefore, directed to the solution of human problems by ordinary men. They are cornerstones of an imposing construction which, as it is carried forward, will become acceptable and increasingly self-evident to men who deal toward each other with respect for the human person and for his reason.

The belief that there are such self-evident concepts and propositions has been denied by many in the modern age. Yet our own American institutions were founded by men who had been taught to think it self-evident that men are capable of reason and that this is a universe which can be lived in rationally. The Founding Fathers inherited this belief. For modern secular men, who have been taught to reject it, an act of faith is needed. When the belief exists, as it did so profoundly in Pope John, it can become the intellectual core of what can be a human doctrine which transcends conflicting diversity.

The movement to bring the teachings of the church to bear upon "the process of radical change" in the modern "economic and political situation" begins, says Pope John, with Pope Leo XIII. The first of the great modernizing social messages is the encyclical "Rerum Novarum" of May 15, 1891, on "The Condition of the Working Classes." Pope John carried forward this movement not only in his two great encyclical letters but by calling together the Ecumenical Council.

What will now come of all this will be of critical importance not only to the Catholic Church but to all churches and to all governments. In any event, the modernizing movement can perhaps be arrested but it cannot for long be turned back. For what Pope John began will have very big consequences, and the history of our world will be different because he lived.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, June 9, 1963]

POPE JOHN XXIII, THE MAN OF THE CENTURY

A few weeks ago a national magazine named Pope John XXIII as the man of the year. Now he is recognized as the man of this century, as Abraham Lincoln was the man of the 19th century.

There are striking similarities between Pope John and Lincoln. Pope John was born of peasant stock; Lincoln was born in a log cabin. Pope John made himself, in a few short years, the man of the 20th century because he strove for peace. Lincoln made himself the man of the 19th century because he strove for peace and, like the Pope, for equal rights for all men.

One is reminded of Punch's famous tribute to Lincoln: "A true born king of men." Once again the similarity persists. Pope John XXIII made himself "a true born king of men" by championing the cause of all men of whatever faith or color.

Lincoln has been described as "the man who forgot himself into immortality." Even in his dying moments, and in great pain, Pope John forgot himself and thought of others.

It is as the apostle of peace in a century already marked by the two greatest wars in history and the threat of even greater wars to come, that Pope John stands out. He followed in the footsteps of the founder of Christianity, Jesus Christ himself.

Pope John was the champion of those whom John Masefield, the English poet laureate, championed in his poem "Consecration"—the oppressed, the underprivileged of whatever race or color.

For all his brilliant intellect and extraordinary understanding of the many complexities of modern times, Pope John was truly a representative of the common people all over the earth; a man of humble origin who came from a large family, toiled in the fields as a boy, served as an ordinary soldier in wartime; a man who never forgot the great anonymous masses of humanity.

Although holding the papacy for only 4½ years, Pope John XXIII accomplished an enormous amount of good. When he became the pontiff, he formulated a program of four main points: internal renewal and reanimation of the Catholic Church, achievement of Christian unity, the promotion of world peace, and the advancement of social justice.

Entering into his task with a vigor that would have done credit to a man half his age, the Pope raised the College of Cardinals to its full strength and enlarged its international character. He spoke out repeatedly against the dangers of nuclear war and enjoined world leaders to strive for peace. He convoked the first world council of bishops to be held since 1870, and issued seven major documents of which two, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," are already recognized as masterpieces of historical significance. They stirred and impressed even those who are indifferent to religion.

The Ecumenical Council, one of the most important to have been held in many centuries, was the highlight of Pope John's career, and showed clearly what he hoped would be the future trend of worldwide Christianity. The council took steps toward liberalization of ceremonies and a larger degree of autonomy by bishops, and laid the foundation for possible future moves through which all of the various separate Christian groups might someday be reunited.

Despite his lofty station, Pope John never lost the common touch; amazingly, he could be the supreme pontiff and yet a common man, at the same time. He tossed aside many old customs of protocol, in order to be closer to all the people. He would not eat alone, but in company with others. On impulse, he would leave his office to visit the poor, call on the sick, or simply talk with whatever ordinary people he happened to meet. He preferred to journey afoot, disliking any mode of conveyance that separated him from the people, or elevated him above them.

Through his own words, to the common people on many such informal occasions, Pope John perhaps best revealed his intensely human side. "You have a Pope," he once said, "who is himself a farmer's son and who has never felt humiliated or embarrassed because of his humble origin."

Again, speaking in reference to his portable throne, known as the sedia gestatoria, he said: "I would be most happy to walk on foot like everyone else. Then I think that if I went on foot, no one would be able to see me, and, therefore, I use it (the sedia) as an exercise of mortification."

And another time, speaking to a captain of the papal gendarmerie, he said: "Captain, you are a bigger noise than I am, because I was only a sergeant."

Such was the pontiff who is mourned now throughout the world; as humble as he was great, as close to the hearts of the common people as he was to God; one of the few really towering figures of our times: Pope John XXIII, a true "servant of the servants," whose name will be listed among those of the greatest in history.

And now we may pray that his great church will be inspired by God himself to choose a new leader who, as "a true born king of men" will reign over all hearts, as Pope John did, in his appeal for peace and good will on earth.

DETERGENT POLLUTION CAN BE STOPPED NOW

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **REUSS**. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of testifying on the problem of detergent pollution before the Subcommittee on Natural Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations. My testimony follows:

I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today on the problem of detergent pollution of the Nation's surface and ground waters.

DETERGENT POLLUTION IS A SERIOUS AND GROWING PROBLEM

Detergent pollution is, of course, only one part of our total water pollution problem. But although it is a relatively new source of contamination of our water, it demands our attention. It will become increasingly severe as more detergents are used each year, as more water is used and reused in populous areas, and as water tables in suburban and rural areas become saturated with undegraded detergents.

Technically, the term "detergent" includes soaps and other cleaning agents. But in recent years, it has come to apply mainly to synthetic detergents, most of which are petroleum derivatives.

These synthetic detergents were among the celebrated "ersatz" products developed in Germany during the First World War. Cut off by the allied blockade from an adequate supply of natural fats, the basis for soap, the Germans turned to their able chemists who produced the first synthetic detergents for widespread use.

Synthetic detergents did not come into general use in this country, however, until after World War II. The availability of automatic washing machines, the spread of commercial self-service laundries, and the obvious superiority of detergents, particularly in hard water, led to a quick conquest of the market by the new products. Today, detergents constitute more than 75 percent of the volume of the entire soap and detergent industry in the United States.

The total sales of detergents last year amounted to about 4 billion pounds and are increasing at an annual rate of about 5 percent. About 75 percent of all detergents sold contain alkyl benzene sulfonate, called ABS for short, as the main cleaning agent. Although ABS is not the only culprit, it has rightly been in the limelight as the principle cause of detergent pollution. For reasons that are not fully understood, ABS is highly resistant to decomposition by natural processes in rivers and streams and ground water and by standard sewage treatment plants.

As much as half of the ABS that housewives send into streams on a given washing Monday will still be in the water system 3 weeks later. In sewage that is passed through usual treatment plants, only about 50 percent of the ABS is removed. In ground water, the problem is particularly severe. Once the water table is saturated, the rate of degradation will be very, very low. In fact, it may be years before our ground water is free of ABS contamination even if we halt additional ABS pollution.

Thus, the detergents that help the American housewife persist in our water supply long after she has finished with them.

DETERGENTS THAT RESIST DECOMPOSITION CAUSE MANY PROBLEMS

But is there any harm in the presence of ABS-based detergents in our water? The answer unfortunately is, "Yes, plenty."

First, they cause foam in drinking water. The committee members will undoubtedly remember the outrage of citizens of a new, expensive subdivision in nearby Mongomery County when they found sudsy water pouring from their faucets last year. A photograph of one of these disgruntled suburban householders is to be seen in the montage that I have had prepared. Water with a sudsy head is surely unappetizing. It scarcely meets the human desire for clean, pure water.

Of course, in some cases the presence of detergents in the water supply is accompanied by the presence of other pollutants, some of which are more injurious than ABS. This has given rise to what may be called the "sudsy detective apology." According to this fantasy, we should be happy to see detergent foam in our drinking glasses because it will indicate the presence of other pollution. The fact is that the detergent molecule travels much farther than other pollutants. It pollutes wells that otherwise would furnish pure, potable water.

The problem of improper well and septic tank installations itself is serious and deserves concern. But it can hardly be a justification for the continued use of "hard" detergents.

Detergents especially affront the natural beauty of our streams and lakes. It is distressing to see ugly mountains of foam in a serene woodland setting. The montage includes a number of photographs of this degradation of our scenic assets in New England, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Virginia, Texas, and New York.

Foaming in surface water used by water purification works has not yet become a problem in this country although Germany, for one, experienced considerable difficulty of this type as far back as 1959. And we may look forward to foam in municipal water unless we take timely preventive action.

Second, detergent pollution interferes with the treatment of sewage and adds considerably to the cost of sewage systems. The sewerage commission of my own city of Milwaukee has recently undertaken a study of this problem. It showed that the annual maintenance cost to deal with detergents amounts to $50,000. The problems caused by the detergents in treatment and plants include:

1. Fats, oils and grease are emulsified by detergents. The emulsified material is not removed in the plant's grease removal facilities, thus reducing the efficiency of the activated sludge process.

2. The efficiency of the aeration process is also reduced, required additional compressed air at added costs.

3. Settling characteristics of the partially treated sewage are reduced. As a result, more pollutants remain in the effluent that is returned to the water.

4. Detergent foam is deposited on walkways, buildings and roadways, forming a slippery slime that represents a hazard for employees. Special efforts must be made to clean off the besmeared surfaces.

The experience of the Milwaukee plant is duplicated throughout the Nation. Cleveland has reported the expenditure of $250,000 on equipment that will reduce but not eliminate the amount of foaming in its plant. On the montage, you will note photographs of foaming at other plants in several States.

In fairness, I note here that not all foaming in rivers and treatment plants is attributable to detergents. They are, however, the principal cause.

Third, detergent pollution represents an unnecessary hazard to human health. Large doses of ABS fed to test animals over a short period of time have not proved harmful. But the effects of continued ingestion of small amounts of ABS over a long period are still under investigation.

Fourth, detergent pollution is harmful to waterlife and wildlife. ABS is toxic to fish in concentrations that are already occurring in our waterways. The toxicity of detergents to shellfish was a factor in the action of the Maryland Water Pollution Control Commission in imposing regulations on the discharge of "hard" detregents into the streams of that State this year.

Fifth, in some instances billows of detergent foam have actualy endangered transport. In Germany, foam interfered with barge traffic and virtualy filled the locks of inland waterways. Motor traffic on neighboring highways has also been endangered.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its May 21 report by Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on my antidetergent pollution bill, said:

"Synthetic detergent wastes are a serious problem in water pollution control. They are markedly resistant to conventional waste treatment processes. Normal waste treatment plant operations are seriously impaired by the presence of detergent wastes, with a resultant decrease in efficiency and increase in cost of ordinary waste treatment. In many cases, use of receiving waters for public water supply and recreation purposes is rendered objectionable through the persistent foaming action characteristic of detergent wastes. The potential health hazard presented by these detergents is still under investigation. Chemical tests have indicated that these wastes are acutely toxic to fish and wildlife when present in water in large accumulations. We do not as yet know the adverse effects, if any, of these wastes on human health when ingested over a long period in the minute quantities in which they may be present in the public water supply. Remedial action is obviously necessary."

WEST GERMANY HAS ADOPTED ANTIDETERGENT POLLUTION MEASURES THAT WE CAN DUPLICATE

In thinking about this problem early last year, the German experience attracted my attention. I visited West Germany last November and talked with scientists and government officials. They told me that when the need for action became clear, a joint committee of industry and local, state, and Federal Government representatives was formed. The committee's studies led to the passage on September 5, 1961, of the detergent law which will ban, after October 1964, detergents that do not meet certain standards of decomposability. German industry is readying production facilities to comply with the law. Several kinds of degradable detergents, which reportedly will clean as well as ABS products and pollute the water far less, are soon to go into production.

The bill that I have proposed, H.R. 4571, adopts much the same approach. It would ban the manufacture or importation after June 30, 1965, of any detergent that did not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The production of a degradable detergent is certainly possible by about that time. The ability of German industry to comply with the similar German detergent law by October 1964 is good evidence that American industry could live up to a similar law effective almost a year later. An industry spokesman has been quoted as promising that a degradable detergent would be on the market by 1965. There is no reason why passage of H.R. 4571 should hurt industry. The technical job of setting standards is left to the official best qualified to do so who can rely upon the advice of the scientists and other technicians of his department.

IS A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION REALLY POSSIBLE?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, however, suggested that before legislation is enacted, voluntary cooperation to eliminate "hard" detergents should be sought.

In his report on H.R. 4571, Secretary Celebrezze wrote:

"We are aware that the synthetic detergents industry is currently engaged in efforts to develop a product that will meet the objectives of this bill. The industry has set the end of the year 1965 as its target date for the production of such detergents. This target date is within 6 months of the deadline set by the bill. We are prepared to consult with and encourage the industry in its efforts and to explore thoroughly with the industry the synthetic detergent problem in all its ramifications (including biodegradability and other aspects) bearing on the prevention and control of water pollution. If reasonable progress toward resolving the problem is not obtained through such voluntary Government-industry cooperation, we would not hesitate to urge enactment of legislation to accomplish the objectives of H.R. 4571. The extent of industry's desire and willingness to proceed in this direction may be further assessed by the committee in the event that hearings are conducted.

"In conclusion, while we support the objectives of H.R. 4571 and would endorse the enactment of legislation along the lines of this bill if the voluntary approach is not productive within a reasonable time, we recommend that final legislative action on the bill be deferred to provide an opportunity for the voluntary solution of this problem."

If an agreement to eliminate detergent pollution can be obtained without legislation, I am all for it. But certain questions present themselves. I hope that the Department and industry representatives will be able to provide satisfactory answers.

1. Is it possible to make an agreement that will eliminate the manufacture or marketing of hard detergents by all companies?

This question is founded in the fact that there are many companies that produce and market ABS or ABS-based detergents. It is true that three companies—Procter & Gamble, Lever Bros., and Colgate-Palmolive-Peet—sold 420 of the 560 million pounds of ABS used by American industries in 1962. This still leaves a considerable amount—140 million pounds—that was disposed of by other companies. Some observers expect that a decision to abandon the use of ABS by one or more large users would cause it to decline in price. Wouldn't this encourage the continued, or even expanded, use of ABS by companies which did not participate in the agreement? Under such circumstances, the responsible companies would find themselves at a disadvantage relative to their irresponsible competitors.

Whatever the agreement made among American companies, foreign producers would be unaffected. How would it be possible to prevent a large importation of hard detergents, especially if there were a price differential between hard detergents and the new degradable detergents being offered by American companies?

2. Does the often-made promise of soap and detergent association spokesmen mean that the companies for which the association speaks are willing to convert completely to marketing of degradable detergents by the end of 1965? The 6 months difference between the effective date of H.R. 4571 and the date fixed by industry for the introduction of mass marketing of degradable detergents does not appear to be of crucial significance if the industry intends a complete switch to a product that will break down in our ground water and streams. But if the industry intends only to begin marketing a degradable detergent at the end of 1965 and to continue selling detergents that will pollute our water supply for a long time to come, we are faced with a very different proposition. Detergent pollution would then continue.

The detergent industry has often trumpeted that it is spending $5 million a year on research on detergents. It fails to mention that its spending to create a better product is an estimated 2 percent of its outlays designed to convince the public to buy the products that are polluting our water system.

3. Is the industry willing to make a binding agreement? It will not serve the public interest or indeed the longrun interests of industry to create the illusion that means of ending detergent pollution have been found and then to discover, in the moment of truth, that "unforeseen difficulties" prevent the conversion to degradable detergents.

4. Will States or localities consider the voluntary agreement of the detergent industry sufficient? If they should not, they could impose their own regulations. Some have done so already. We could end up with a patchwork of local and State ordinances that would impede interstate commerce and hurt the economy by balkanizing the detergent market.

WE CANNOT WAIT LONG TO FIND OUT WHETHER A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION IS POSSIBLE

So far, the attitude of the detergent industry has not been very encouraging. For example, Procter & Gamble spokesmen have contended in recent statements to Wisconsin and national journalists that a U.S. law banning the sale of nondecomposable detergents would be "unwarranted" and unreasonable. Yet P & G has been busily constructing a large new plant at Worms, Germany, where the company will have to comply with a law similar to the one I propose.

Efforts to obtain a voluntary agreement on detergents in Germany foundered when some industries refused to cooperate. It proved necessary to resort to legislation not only to accomplish the national goal of purer water but to protect the cooperative and responsible companies from unfair, unscrupulous competition. Perhaps we will have greater success in this country. I am certainly willing to try, under a time schedule that will leave time to protect the public interest if an effective, voluntary agreement proves impossible. We cannot wait long to find out whether a voluntary approach is feasible if we are not to delay unnecessarily the day when the problems of detergent pollution will begin to decline rather than increase.

If the industry is interested in voluntary steps to eliminate detergent pollution, I challenge it to begin immediate negotiations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work out a timely and effective agreement.

LET THE FEASIBILITY OF A VOLUNTARY SOLUTION BE TESTED IN THE NEXT 2 MONTHS

Chairman Blatnik of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee has indicated that hearings on H.R. 4571 will be held shortly after August 1. I urge the representatives of HEW and the detergent industry to be ready then to present a draft agreement to end detergent pollution, with answers to the questions I have raised. The 2 months between this hearing and that should provide an ample opportunity to work out a voluntary agreement, if one is possible. If one is not possible, I shall expect the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as it states in its May 21 letter, "to urge the enactment of legislation to accomplish the objectives of H.R. 4571."

NET FARM INCOME DOWN DESPITE INCREASE IN GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, official reports show Kennedy supply-management programs have not helped farm income.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has reported a new decline in the farm parity ratio, and has predicted that net farm income this year will be down, despite an increase in Government payments to farmers.

My information is from the Economic Research Service of the USDA.

Net farm income is expected to be $200 to $300 million below the preliminary estimate of $12.9 billion for 1962.

Government payments to farmers in 1962 were estimated at $1,736 million, or 13 percent of the total net farm income for the year. These payments are expected to increase by $150 to $200 million in 1963.

Kennedy farm programs are costing taxpayers a billion dollars more this year than last year. Despite all this increased spending—including a 10-percent jump in Government payments to farmers—net farm income is expected to drop.

The May 15 parity ratio is 77, the lowest May 15 level since 1939. The parity ratio shows the relationship between prices paid and prices received by farmers.

In Illinois, the parity ratio is 71 for the second month in a row; the lowest level on record since 1934.

TO THE HUNGARIANS: ABANDON HOPE

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, recent upsetting developments at the U.N. include surrender on the part of the United States to previous policy toward the admission of the Hungarian Communist delegates to seats in the U.N.

The Chicago Tribune, on Friday, June 7, carried a blistering editorial discussing this latest diplomatic retreat of the Kennedy administration, which I will insert in the Record at this point:

To the Hungarians: Abandon Hope

The Kennedy administration has made the ultimate retreat before the savage Communist tyranny of Janos Kadar in Hungary. Since 1956, when Khrushchev's tanks and Asiatic divisions crushed the anti-Communist rebellion in Budapest, the Hungarian Communist delegation has been denied seats in the United Nations.

The issue has come up year after year in the general assembly's credentials committee. This year, Greece, which had until now voted with the United States against seating the Communists, announced that it would no longer oppose. This appeared to insure that Hungary would regain its place. The United States promptly announced it would not oppose accreditation.

This action is part of a pattern which has been developing. The first move came last December. Upon American initiative, the U.N. Assembly dismissed Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand as its special representative on the Hungarian question. Munro's assignment was to make a continuing assessment of Communist repression of Hungarian liberty. He was no friend of tyranny, and Kadar and Khrushchev kept him from entering their countries. U.N. turned his duties over to U Thant, its secretary general, who is on cordial terms with Communists.

The next step, in May, found the State Department propositioning Congress for support to reopen full diplomatic relations with the Kadar regime. It produced a propaganda paper which suggested that everybody was much happier in Hungary.

On Wednesday, when Hungary regained its seat, the United States did not cast an opposing vote, but merely registered "reservations." Our delegate, Mr. Yost, did vote in turning away Red China, but because of the ideological dispute between Moscow and Peking, that will hardly be offensive to Khrushchev.

Significance can be read into the Greek switch on Hungary. The Greeks are on the American payroll and would be subject, presumably, to Washington's wishes.

As we said before, it all looks like part of a deal between Kennedy and Khrushchev, beginning with the accommodation which leaves communism inviolate in Cuba. After that the American Jupiter missiles in Italy and Turkey which were zeroed in on Russian targets were dismantled and withdrawn. Restraints have been placed on Cuban exile raids against Castro's island, and this is but one of many instances of a drive toward massive accommodations with Soviet power.

Everything is in the pattern of the paper credited a year ago to Walt W. Rostow, the State Department policy planner, who advanced the thesis that the Soviet Union was "mellowing" and "evolving" into a "mature" state with which we could achieve compatability. The insistent calls for "victory" for world communism which are dinned into our ears from Moscow attest that such notions are foolish and suicidal.

Hungary is the latest evidence that the administration's policy is one of surrender on the installment plan.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1963, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States testified on H.R. 5490 containing President Kennedy's fiscal 1964 proposals for the foreign aid program.

We all recognize that the opinion and position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States carries great weight and deserves every consideration. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States represents almost 4 million members. There are 30 thousand business firms which are direct members of the national chamber. In addition there are 33 State chambers of commerce which are organizational members, 3,800 local chambers of commerce, and 800 trade and professional organizations.

The policy positions of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are always thoughtfully and carefully considered, studied, evaluated, and adopted. This makes them all the more meaningful.

This year's testimony on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was presented by Mr. John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, New York City. He did an excellent job as did the staff of the chamber who accompanied him. All members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were very much impressed with the thoroughness, the detail, and the obvious study which Mr. Teeter had given his subject. He answered all questions ably and forthrightly. What was especially gratifying, however, and the principal reason I take this time, is not only to acquaint my colleagues with the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as expressed by Mr. Teeter, but also to demonstrate the extent of the objective criticism and the affirmative recommendations in detail which were made. It was a most thorough presentation, extremely useful, and helpful for our consideration on the committee and I feel it will be extremely useful and helpful for the consideration of my colleagues.

It must be remembered that this policy statement was adopted at a national convention by 3,000 delegates from all parts of the country. This support of the foreign aid program is not new. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce for more than a decade has endorsed the principle of foreign aid. This year the chamber renews its support, noting that the program's objectives "are increasingly urgent to achieve," but also that the present program, despite numerous efforts to make it more effective, "has fallen far short of its objectives."

The chamber, therefore, proposes guidelines and specific measures to redirect the Act for International Development of 1961 in order to accomplish more fully its original objectives and particularly to make it a more effective base for private enterprise without which no U.S. government-to-government assistance program can hope to succeed.

In presenting the policy and recommendations of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, I express my commendation to Mr. John O. Teeter, who represented the chamber, as well as the staff and the committee members of the chamber's foreign policy committee, its joint subcommittee on foreign aid, its advisory committee on foreign aid, and its board of directors, for the diligent work and study on this vital subject. The statement of policy, together with the explanatory matter, are as follows:

Testimony of John O. Teeter, for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on Foreign Aid—Presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, June 6, 1963

I am John Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, New York City. My testimony on H.R. 5490 represents the views of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I serve on the chamber's foreign policy committee, its joint subcommittee on foreign aid, and its newly created advisory committee on foreign aid.

In presenting the position of the national chamber on foreign aid, I want to emphasize four points:

First. There is no single foreign policy issue on which Congress both can and will act this session that is more important to the Government, the people, and the business community of this Nation than foreign aid.

Second. Congress must act this session—wisely and boldly—if the aid program is to be saved, from its enemies, its friends, from itself.

Third. The right answers to the seemingly unsolvable problems of foreign aid already have begun to take shape. A consensus now has begun to emerge—a consensus of what needs to be done to put the program on the road to recovery of its sound but elusive objectives. It remains for Congress to give direction and impetus to this intelligent approach to attainable goals.

Fourth. Until improvements are made in the program it is useless and wasteful to appropriate funds in the increasing magnitude requested by the Government. More money, misspent, can do more harm than good.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN AID

With regard to the significance of this year's foreign aid legislation, the expressions the national chamber is receiving on the subject from its membership probably are as voluminous, as varied, and perhaps as passionate, as the opinions you are getting from home. And with good reason, too.

The most important reason is because an effective U.S. foreign aid program is essential to our national security and our foreign policy objectives. Properly conceived and carried out, foreign aid should, can, and does promote the American system; provide a counterforce to international communism; promote responsible local foreign development, and protect our increasingly important oversea markets and sources of supply, as well as our military security.

Foreign aid aims at fostering the national interest in several ways. It is designed to provide military protection at less cost than the United States could undertake alone. Longer range, in addition to furthering political freedom and democracy abroad, it is intended to help develop strong free world markets in the less developed areas—markets whose strength and growth can expand and strengthen our domestic economy as well. In addition, foreign aid is an expression of deep American moral and spiritual instincts to render humanitarian help to other people in need.

The U.S. business community has a direct interest and stake in the accomplishment of these goals. It is on the free markets of trade and private capital that economic, political and social development and growth depend. The administrators of the aid program recognize this stake of private enterprise. They consistently point out that government-to-government aid cannot, by itself, either afford the costs of the program or accomplish its objectives, and that an increasing share of the task must be undertaken by the private sector.

To stimulate that participation, programs have been established by the U.S. Government to encourage U.S. investment in underdeveloped countries. These include investment guarantees, investment surveys, foreign currency loans, and long-term dollar loans. An overflow of applications for investment guarantees is an example of the response of business to the call for assumption of a major role in the development of less-developed areas. As of March 31, 1963, 1,000 applications for investment guarantees were in process, totaling over $3.5 billion. (The national chamber's position on the investment guarantee program is scheduled for consideration at a meeting of its board of directors later this month.)

Foreign aid contributes to employment in the United Sates of workers supplying goods and services to the recipients of foreign aid. These jobs have been created in part by the expansion of markets stimulated by aid funds.

An estimated 84 percent of all current aid disbursements are now "tied" to purchases of U.S. goods and services, and the Agency for International Development (AID) is seeking ways to increase this percentage to 90 to 95 percent—a step which, incidentally, considerably reduces the balance-of-payments strain of aid on the U.S. economy.

It is a true mark of its importance that foreign aid has so consistently been supported in principle for 15 years by the American people, through both political parties, three Administrations, eight Congresses and countless organizations representing business, labor, churches, and civic groups.

FOREIGN AID IN CRISIS

This year, however, it is apparent that support of the principles of foreign aid is not enough. Criticisms of foreign aid in practice—how programs are conceived and carried out—have been building up over the years to a point where they now threaten to place the entire program in serious jeopardy. As the report of the Clay Committee so well put it:

"There has been a feeling that we are trying to do too much for too many too soon, that we are overextended in resources and undercompensated in results, and that no end of foreign aid is either in sight or in mind."

Even this succinct summary only hints at the misgivings about the program shared by the businessmen who are affected by it, the taxpayers who finance it, the legislators who vote on it. In fact, the misgivings are shared by many of the officials who administer it. Never before have its goals, methods and worth been so seriously and simultaneously challenged. President Kennedy recognized this challenge when he commissioned the Clay Committee as a board of public inquiry to determine whether foreign aid—

(1) "is contributing materially to the security of the United States," and (2) "is directed to specific and attainable goals."

A major and frequent criticism of the foreign aid program, of course, is the cost. The American people have invested $100 billion in foreign aid of one kind or another since the end of World War II.

Public concern over the fiscal affairs of this country—the annual deficits, the mounting national debt, the drain of dollars and gold caused by an unfavorable balance of payments situation—is unquestionably an important element in the controversy.

But to put the troubles of foreign aid entirely on the amount of money involved is both an oversimplification and misleading. It is not only the amount of money, but the results of the expenditures that are at issue.

To people reared in a market-type economy, the question, "Are we getting our money's worth?" is important.

The debate is over not only "How much foreign aid?" but "What kind of foreign aid?" and "To whom?"

SOME ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEMS

Answers to the problems of foreign aid will not come easily, nor will they solve overnight either the program's inherent shortcomings or its inability to meet unreasonable demands upon it for quick, demonstrable payoffs. Nevertheless, a number of recent, responsible reappraisals of foreign aid at least point the way toward some practical, constructive action.

Here is a chart prepared by the chamber in an effort to map out as clearly as possible the policy directions indicated by this emerging consensus. Down the lefthand column we have listed the major parts of the aid program—all the way from its basic policy guidelines through such features as economic development, private participation incentives, the Alliance for Progress, multilateral aid, military aid and supporting assistance, to contingencies and budget account transfers.

Across the top we have delineated, first, the provisions of the present law relating to the categories in the lefthand column. The successive columns summarize the recommended improvements in each category which have been proposed this year by: the National Chamber in its March 15 Policy Statement on Foreign Aid; the Clay Committee; other responsible interested groups, such as the Commerce Department's businessman's Committee on the Alliance for Progress (COMAP), the Business Council for International Understanding (BCIU), the International Economic Policy Association, numerous Congressional subcommittees, study teams, and individual members, and finally, by the President in his message to Congress of April 2.

In the next column, we have compared with these recommendations the actual amendments to the present law which have been submitted by the administration—in other words, the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, H.R. 5490, which is now before this committee.

A careful comparison of present law, suggested improvements, and the administration's proposed amendments is the very least exercise necessary to any meaningful evaluation of the current foreign aid program.

The chamber's evaluation (found in the last two columns)—including a second look at our own aid statement earlier this year—discloses what we in the chamber have now come to call the aid gap—between program and performance. Thus, in the next-to-last column, we have attempted to summarize the most obvious shortcomings of the present foreign aid program, as seen by its responsible critics.

If the identification of the program's most serious gaps is to be of any constructive use, it must be followed by positive corrective action. This we have tried to suggest in the final and most important column in the chart, headed "What's Needed."

Just as the "What's Needed" column is meaningless without the seven columns preceding it, so it could be regarded as presumptuous without a word of explanation about how it was derived and by whom.

For more than a decade, the National Chamber has reflected faithfully the views on foreign aid held by its vast membership. We have consistently supported the principles of foreign aid, testified for or against specific administration legislative proposals, and favored substantial savings in proposed foreign aid budgets. This year we specifically recommend positive, concrete new measures, developed with the assistance of over 300 leading U.S. businessmen and based upon policies approved by our membership.

Starting with our foreign policy committee and its own subcommittee on foreign aid, the chamber recommendations before you were shaped and refined by a joint subcommittee on foreign aid, made up of representatives of five of our standing committees (foreign policy, foreign commerce, national defense, finance, and government operations and expenditures). The product of this exercise then went to the chamber's board of directors, and finally to our new special advisory committee on foreign aid drawn from executives and representatives of companies affected by foreign aid one way or another. Through our staff, we researched all available information and opinion, held extensive and candid discussions with foreign aid specialists in Government, Congress, and the academic community, including a conference of our joint subcommittee with General Clay.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee is more concerned with concrete recommendations than with the history of how we arrived at them, so I shall return to "What's Needed."

PURSE STRINGS FOR IMPROVEMENT

I should like at this point to call the committee's attention to the comparative budget analysis included as part of this statement, which shows the chamber's specific appropriations recommendations for each major budget item in the aid program.

You will note that we urge both specific reductions in the administration's revised requests, and specific support for a number of economic and social development programs. The recommended cuts are as follows: development loans, $160 million; development grants, $57 million; Alliance for Progress, $250 million; supporting assistance, $135 million; contingency fund, $100 million; military assistance, $205 million. Our total recommended reduction is $913,075,000.

It should be noted that of our recommended $913 million reduction in the last official administration figure of $4.5 billion, we suggest paring one-half from military aid, supporting assistance, and the contingency fund. Most of the remainder would be withheld from the Alliance for Progress until it is reorganized along lines suggested in the "What's needed" column of the chamber aid chart.

The programs for which we recommend full budgetary support are: International organizations and programs, $136 million; Inter-American Development Bank and Social Progress Trust Fund, $200 million; surveys of investment opportunities, $1.5 million (which item has now been dropped from the administration's revised requests); The International Development Association, $61.7 million; American schools and hospitals abroad, $22 million; assistance to Cuban refugees, $70 million.

I also want to call your attention to the attached explanation of the reasons for each cut. (This document is based on the administration's original requests, before they were revised downward by $420 million. However, the reasons for the recommended reductions remain the same.) We also explain our reasons for supporting the administration requests we approve in full.

The net effect of these proposals is national chamber support for a $3.6 billion authorization. This is within half a billion dollars of the amount General Clay has said the administration could live with.

To summarize, the national chamber aims at three specific objectives:

1. A return of foreign aid programs to the sound principles of long-range economic development laid out in 1961 in the Act for International Development and in the Foreign Assistance Act.

2. To develop the means for a vastly stepped up inflow of private capital, know-how, and initiative into the aid program. Our own aid planners tell us that such inflow is imperative if foreign aid is ever to reach its foreign policy goals.

3. The curtailment of appropriations in the increasing magnitudes requested by the administration, pending more demonstrable moves toward long-range economic development programs and greater private enterprise participation.

Next, I would like to discuss some of the highlights of the "What's needed" column of our chart.

WHAT'S NEEDED

You will note that the specific recommendations in the "What's needed" column are of three types. One calls for specific amendments to certain sections of the basic act. Another asks for a more precise expression of congressional intent—which can be done through language in the preamble, in the appropriations bill, in committee reports, or in some cases as part of the legislative history in debate on the floor. Finally, we urge the President and the administrators of the aid program to take additional positive action through Executive orders, regulations, and directives which require no additional congressional authorization.

Let me say a word about our view that the purposes, objectives, and priorities of the aid program require much more precise definition. We are aware that AID Director Bell already has taken several steps in the right direction. The Agency's presentation to this committee is one of the best we have seen. We also are aware that AID is preparing a still more detailed interpretation of its basic policy guidelines and criteria to serve as an operations manual in the field as well as at headquarters. We applaud the Agency's new efforts along these lines.

But this committee is aware that these are not the first in a long line of sincerely motivated assurances that measures to promote sounder long-range economic development and greater private enterprise participation are forthcoming. The new administration and Congress said the same thing clearly and convincingly in 1961 in the Act for International Development. As the "Aid gap" column shows, however, progress still is far from staisfactory. We therefore urge action by Congress to bind AID to its most recent promises. This could be done through legislative history, reports to Congress and the public, or appropriations bill controls, or by amendment to the basic act.

For example, the chamber urges specific amendments to the policy section of the law (sec. 102) to make more certain that economic aid funds are not used, as they have been in the past, for bailout aid for supposed financial or military crises. This is a kind of aid which, once begun, has been virtually impossible to stop. There is no better example than bailout aid to demonstrate the program's own violation of its stated objectives of long-range planning assistance.

We acknowledge the need for flexibility in administering the program. We do not propose to repeal the limited authority contained in section 610 to transfer up to 10 percent of the money in any aid fund to another aid fund, nor the authority under section 645 to consolidate unexpended balances. We do propose that this flexibility be restricted to funds authorized for noneconomic aid purposes, and that no funds for economic development—whether financed from the development loan fund, development grant fund, or the economic funds under the Alliance for Progress—be used for other than economic development purposes. We further urge that when transfers and consolidations are made under sections 610 and 645, the funds be used for purposes for which they were authorized.

To encourage long-range economic development planning, we propose that economic aid be directed much more specifically to sound host-country programs, and less toward one-shot projects designed for their political or "showcase" prestige effort. We further urge that economic aid be spent primarily for those programs which place new emphasis on the use and development of the private sectors of the host-country economies, including both domestic and foreign private enterprise. We favor much greater selectivity in choosing from among the countless requests for aid which pour in from over 100 countries. We believe those who show the most progress should receive priority.

To stimulate self-help reforms, we propose that economic aid be made contingent on progress reports from the aid-recipient countries.

To promote vitally important private participation, we propose amendments and administrative steps to improve existing incentives.

To revitalize the Alliance for Progress, we propose legislation to establish an OECD-type institution to act as a central forum and clearinghouse for sound coordination of economic policies among the Western Hemisphere nations—coordination which is essential to the success of the Alliance.

We propose steps to increase the use of multilateral aid, not as a substitute for bilateral aid but as a supplement to it, which in numerous instances is more capable of enforcing sensible conditions than bilateral aid.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I request that the attachments to this statement be made a part of the official record of your hearings.

Thank you.

CHAMBER POLICY ON MUTUAL SECURITY

The chamber supports foreign economic and military assistance as instruments of U.S. foreign policy to strengthen the security of the United States and other nations of the free world through responsible political freedom, social progress, and individual endeavor.

In implementing these programs, particular emphasis must be placed on the role of private enterprise in economic development. To achieve long-term U.S. foreign policy objectives in each area and country, and to engender widespread understanding and support, the concept, scope, and administration of foreign assistance programs must be continually reviewed and improved. Other free world nations should share increasingly in bearing these responsibilities.

Comparison of budget requests and recommendations for the foreign aid program

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Revised administration request, fiscal year 1964	Chamber recommendation, fiscal year 1964	Initial administration request, fiscal year 1964	Congressional appropriation, fiscal year 1963	Chamber recommendation, fiscal year 1963	Administration request, fiscal year 1963
Development loans	[1]1,060,000	900,000	1,248,000	975,000	900,000	1,250,000
Development grants	[1]257,000	200,000	275,000	225,000	235,000	335,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	20,000	20,000				
Investment guarantees				30,000	100,000	100,000
Surveys of investment opportunities		1,500	1,500		3,500	5,000
Alliance for Progress	[1]650,000	400,000	700,000	525,000	400,000	600,000
Social progress trust fund	200,000	200,000	200,000			
International organizations and programs	136,050	136,050	181,250	148,900	148,900	148,900
Supporting assistance	435,000	300,000	397,000	395,000	400,000	481,500
Contingency fund	300,000	200,000	400,000	250,000	200,000	400,000
Military assistance	[1]1,405,000	1,200,000	1,480,000	1,325,000	1,350,000	1,500,000
Administrative expenses, AID	57,250	50,000	57,250	49,500	50,000	55,000
Administrative expenses, State	3,025	2,700	3,025	2,700	3,000	3,100
Hospitals abroad (local currency)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,800		2,800
Total, foreign aid program	[1]4,525,325	3,612,250	4,945,025	3,928,900	3,790,400	4,961,300

---

[1] Additional reductions in these activities subsequently suggested by General Clay would further lower total by $200,000,000 to $500,000,000.

U.S. chamber comparative analysis of aid

	Present law (Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended)	Chamber recommendations (Mar. 15, 1963)	Clay Committee recommendations (Mar. 20, 1963)	Other recommendations [1]
Policy guidelines	Sec. 102 authorizes aid to less-developed friendly countries to promote peace, freedom, and free world security. Sets aid criteria: Sound plans and programs; social as well as economic aspects of development; self-help by recipient countries; long-range development. Urges multilateral participation, burden sharing, and free flow of private investment capital.	Clearly delineate program objectives and priorities relative to U.S. foreign policy. Identify specific aid purposes and finance from controlled separate funds. Emphasize long-range economic development planning; assure full role for private enterprise. Apply greater selectivity in choosing nations and projects to be aided. Apply stricter self-help criteria to point where local reforms are prime factor in qualifying for U.S. aid. Emphasize burden sharing through Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. Reduce short-run emergency aid for financial bailouts, military purposes, and politically inspired projects.	Tighten and sharpen objectives in terms of U.S. national interest. Condition aid on achievement of self-help measures. Apply greater selectivity; carefully examine aid for political as well as economic reasons; determine kind and basis of aid on economic grounds. Emphasize greater burden sharing through specific U.S. representations and OECD Development Assistance Committee; urge allies to apply softer terms.	Direct aid to specific foreign policy goals (Comap [2]). Apply greater selectivity (IEPA, Senator Mansfield, Representative Monagan). Limit extension of aid to countries not now receiving it (Senator Mansfield). Spell out aid conditions (Representative Dawson). Define objectives, establish clear-cut criteria and standards, balance Government and private investment capital (Representative Meader). Stress burden sharing. (IEPA, Senator Mansfield, Representative Monagan).
Economic development	Sec. 201 authorizes dollar loans to promote economic development, emphasizes long-range plans and programs to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities. Sec. 211 authorizes grants and technical assistance, emphasizes development of human resources.	Development loans should receive priority, carry increasingly harder terms, be prohibited from use for other than stated purposes. Speed shift from grants to loans.	Establish harder terms for development loans in some countries. Shift aid from subsidy and gift to loan basis. Specify duration of technical assistance. Land-grant college should contribute.	Channel increasing percentage of development loans through private enterprise; establish separate fund for Government loans for basic infrastructure (IEPA). Speed shift from grants to loans (Senator Mansfield, Representative Monagan). Gear aid to development level of recipient countries; short-term impact projects should evolve into long-range development plans (Senator Humphrey).
Private participation incentives.	Sec. 601 encourages private enterprise participation, requires President to (1) find and draw attention to investment and development opportunities; (2) accelerate negotiation of tax, commerce, and trade treaties facilitating private investment; (3) direct appropriate aid through private channels with practicable local private or governmental participation.	Encourage positive host-country planning for private investment, trade, and initiative—local and foreign; improve and redirect existing incentives for private participation. Employ authority for dollar loans to U.S. firms. Resolve U.S. Government policy confusion over whether to encourage U.S. private production investment abroad.	Stimulate private-sector incentives. Refuse aid to Government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors.	Emphasize private investment (Comap, Representative Meader). Encourage joint ventures between United States and local private enterprise (Senator Humphrey). Grant U.S. investment tax credit (Comap, Representative Meader). Allow tax deductions for commercial risks (Comap, IEPA). Waive U.S. tax liability (tax sparing) on earnings on which host governments forgo local tax (Comap, IEPA). Guarantee 5 percent minimum aftertax return on earnings of private projects approved by Government (Comap). Establish new office of AID Deputy Administrator for Private Enterprise (IEPA). Create new Government-owned corporation to encourage private American investment in developing countries. (BCIU.)
	Investment guarantees: Sec. 221 authorizes guarantees of wholly owned U.S. investment against specific risks of war (insurrection and revolution), currency inconvertibility, and expropriation (confiscatory acts of government). Authorizes extended risk guarantees against any risks other than U.S. management fraud or misconduct. Sec. 224 authorizes similar guarantees of U.S. investment in pilot housing projects in Latin America.			Bring all Latin American countries into program (Comap). Liberalize bilateral guarantee agreements (Comap, IEPA). Broaden war risk to include riots and civil disturbances (Comap, IEPA). Increase authorized dollar volume outstanding; strengthen U.S. obligation (IEPA). Increase housing guarantee (Senator Humphrey). Support multilateral guarantee treaties (IEPA).
	Investment surveys: Sec. 231 authorizes up to 50 percent U.S. Government financing of surveys of investment opportunities.			
	Hickenlooper amendment: Sec. 620 requires suspension of aid to any country which nationalizes, expropriates, seizes, or imposes restrictions of similar effect on any U.S. majority-owned investment without appropriate steps to compensate within 6 months.		Support Hickenlooper amendment.	Encourage compensation for nationalization by host government (Comap [2]). Emphasize congressional disapproval of discriminatory measures; cut aid if host government obligations not met by end of 1963; reduce time requirement for compensatory steps from 6 to 3 months, authorize U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to evaluate expropriated property (IEPA). Compensate expropriation losses through reductions in prior-approved aid loans (Senator Humphrey).
	Foreign currency loans: Sec. 612 authorizes use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies. Sec. 104 of Public Law 480 (Cooley fund) authorizes 25 percent of proceeds from sales of surplus commodities for loans to private U.S. companies abroad or foreign affiliates, and to foreign firms which expand U.S. agricultural exports.		Expand Cooley fund loans.	

See footnotes at end of table.

program and recommended improvements

President's message (Apr. 2, 1963)	Administration amendments (Foreign Assistance Act of 1963)	The aid gap (between program and performance)	What's needed
Apply stricter standard of selectivity and self-help. Reduce and ultimately eliminate aid. Increase role of private investment. Continue aid for defense against external and internal Communist attack. Emphasize burden sharing.		Program objectives and priorities inadequately defined. Various types of aid not clearly identified. Long-range economic development planning frequently sacrificed on altar of quick political payoff. Emergency aid for financial bailouts, military forces, and politically inspired projects overemphasized. Selectivity and self-help criteria too loose. Private incentives inadequate. Burden sharing inequitable.	Congressional action to require definitive statement by administration of aid purposes, objectives, and priorities by geographical area, and to further require categorical commitment by administration to such definition. Amendments to sec. 102 to (1) specifically state intent of Congress that economic development funds be prohibited from use for emergency short-term budgetary, balance of payments, and military aid and other purposes, not essential to long-range economic development of recipient countries; and (2) further state intent of Congress that such emergency aid requirements be met through international institutions, such as International Monetary Fund, equipped to condition such aid on immediate economic and monetary reforms. Amendment to sec. 102 to require progress reports by recipient countries on self-help and reform measures planned and achieved, before economic aid is committed.
Emphasize economic development increasingly through loans. Apply stricter loan terms. Increase lending in countries which permit aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support. Enlarge participation of private enterprise. Encourage land-grant and other university relationships with aid programs.	Amends sec. 631 to authorize President to select U.S. citizen to serve as Chairman of OECD's Development Assistance Committee. Amends sec. 635 to provide payment of reimbursable indirect costs to educational institutions carrying out authorized oversea programs.	Funds subject to misuse for nondevelopmental purposes. Loan repayment terms too loose. Shift from grants to loans too slow.	Amendments to secs. 201 and 211 to require economic development aid to any project to be programed in host country development plan specifically providing for appropriate participation of private enterprise. Amendment to sec. 201 to specifically exempt development loan fund from all contingency, transfer, and consolidation provisions of secs. 451, 610, 614, and 645. Amendment to sec. 201 to fix range of development loan terms. Executive regulation to require consideration of development loan before approving development grant. Support for administration amendment to sec. 231 to authorize appointment of U.S. Chairman of OECD's Development Assistance Committee.
Place initiative on increased role for private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. Amend Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers tax credit for new investments and reinvestments in developing countries.	Proposes to amend Internal Revenue Code to authorize U.S. tax credit for certain investment and reinvestment in less developed countries.	Fail to provide adequate positive incentives to, and protection of climate for, local foreign private initiative.	Coordinated joint representations by U.S. Government and U.S. business to recipient nations, clearly stating necessity and practicality of including measures to stimulate private enterprise participation in economic development plans. Removal of legal ban on AID financing of private projects for which other free world financing is available. Tax-sparing treaties which waive U.S. tax liability on earnings on which host governments forgo local tax. Executive regulation to require use of statutory authority to make dollar loans to selected U.S. firms investing abroad in projects which AID determines as necessary to sound economic development in host country. Executive regulation to require use of statutory authority to subcontract Government-financed oversea projects to U.S. firms. Resolution of Government attitude toward U.S. private productive investment abroad, and substantial Government encouragement and protection of such investment.
Amend investment guarantee provisions to enlarge and clarify program.	Amends sec. 221 to relax 100-percent ownership restriction by defining "wholly owned" as "determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 percent of total issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than parent corporation." Doubles authorized dollar volume of outstanding investment guarantees against specific risks; increases volume of guarantees against extended risks, triples volume of Latin American housing guarantees.	Do not cover decisive risk of riot and civil strife. Do not cover U.S. joint or minority investments otherwise urged upon business by Government. Authority to cover commercial risks virtually unused. Terms too limited as to percentage coverage of equity and loan investment and reinvestment in expansion and modernization.	Consideration of amendments to broaden investment guarantee coverage. Chamber of commerce is studying amendments to sec. 221 to expand guarantees to cover— (1) Risks of riots and civil disturbances. (2) U.S. joint or minority ventures. (3) Higher percentage of loan investment and reinvesment. (4) Working capital loans.
Emphasize investment surveys.		Funds originally requested dropped from revised budget.	Amendment to sec. 231 to restore original budget request.
		Does not cover minority ventures.	Consideration of amendment to sec. 620 to extend protection to U.S. minority-owned joint ventures.
Emphasize Cooley fund loans.		Authority to make Cooley fund loans too restricted.	Amendments to Public Law 480 to increase to 50 percent the authority to lend surplus commodity proceeds to U.S. affiliates abroad, and to authorize local currency loans to foreign firms which expand markets for U.S. industrial (as well as agricultural) exports.

U.S. chamber comparative analysis of aid program

	Present law (Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended)	Chamber recommendations (Mar. 15, 1963)	Clay Committee recommendations (Mar. 20, 1963)	Other recommendations [1]
Alliance for Progress	Sec. 251 and Latin American Development Act authorize aid to Latin America to mobilize resources for economic development and adopt reforms to spread benefits of economic progress. Directs aid to human as well as economic resources.	Coordinate hemispheric aid, trade, and financial policies through institutions similar to OECD. Realistically determine attainable objectives. Encourage creation of more favorable atmosphere for private business. Support Inter-American Development Bank and social progress trust fund loans for development through private as well as public projects.	Condition continued aid on specified self-help and internal reforms on country-by-country basis. Demand achievement of attainable goals. Favor countries which undertake to meet principles of Punta del Este Charter and encourage growth of private enterprise and foreign investment. Insist on recipient country bearing local costs.	Increase Latin American aid; reappraise policies and programs; stress selectivity; increase local contributions; authorize increased local currency financing; establish Alliance for Progress Corporation to promote private investment (Comap). Stress improvement in local business climate (Comap [2]). Concentrate aid on countries demonstrating self-help and reforms (Comap, IEPA, Senator HUMPHREY). Stress regional economic integration; encourage development of rural cooperatives (Senator HUMPHREY).
Multilateral aid	Sec. 301 authorizes grants through international programs. Sec. 205 authorizes U.S.-owned local currency loans for basic development through International Development Association.	Emphasize multilateral aid, making full use of private international consortia. Urge intensive study of problems of countries dependent on single commodities.	Shift aid programs gradually to international administration (e.g., International Development Association).	Increase support of voluntary aid associations (Senator HUMPHREY).
Military aid	Sec. 503 authorizes military aid to any friendly country or international organization to strengthen U.S. security and promote world peace.	Phase out military aid; pare to minimum immediately—particularly in Western Europe. Press efforts to persuade NATO countries to accept larger responsibilities.	Cut military aid substantially over next 3 years, limit to internal security (small arms) in Latin America and other areas. Exclude combat zone aid from program. Reduce aid given in return for U.S. military base rights. Extend aid only extraordinarily to country in conflict with non-Communist neighbor friendly to United States.	Condition on economic self-help (Senator MANSFIELD).
Supporting assistance	Sec. 401 authorizes aid to friendly countries and organizations to promote economic or political stability.	Substantially reduce supporting assistance for supplies and wages for local military forces.	Cut supporting economic aid sharply over 3-year period.	Shift to economic development aid (Senator MANSFIELD). Eliminate in some countries (Representative MONAGAN).
Contingencies	Sec. 451 authorizes special fund for any economic aid in U.S. national interest. Sec. 614 authorizes special funds for any aid important to U.S. security, without regard to requirements of this law (except development lending requirements).	Cut these funds in line with establishment of specific funds for various aid purposes.	Support ample contingency fund.	
Budget account transfers	Sec. 610 authorizes transfer or consolidation of 10 percent of various funds (except Development Loan Fund). Sec. 645 authorizes continued availability and consolidation of unexpended funds.	Prohibit use of various aid funds for purposes other than those specified for each.		Prohibits transfers from new special development loan fund for private enterprise (IEPA).

[1] Recommendations of Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (Comap), International Economic Policy Association (IEPA), Business Council for International Understanding (BCIU), and various Members of Congress.

[2] Separate comments of Comap members David Rockefeller, Henry Wriston, and Emilio Collado.

Recommended changes in the fiscal 1964 budget

[In thousands of dollars]

	Requested	Recommended reduction or saving
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT		
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—MILITARY		
Military assistance U.S. military assistance for equipment and facilities to Western European and other nations is being cut back. The cutbacks can be accelerated to provide considerable savings. Further savings can come from ending the practice of propping up showcase military forces of some countries. In addition, other industrial nations, increasing in wealth, should help bear more of the cost of this military assistance.	1,480,000	280,000
Supporting assistance As military assistance is cut back, supporting assistance for such things as food and wages for the personnel can also be similarly reduced.	397,000	97,000
Development grants Grants (or gifts) of money are charity which even the recipients as a rule don't want. They prefer loans. So does this country, but the shift from grants to loans could be faster.	275,000	75,000
Contingency fund The President is given this money for emergencies not otherwise provided for. A recent example was aid for Chilean earthquake victims. However, $200,000,000 should be enough for this purpose. Specific congressional authority should be required for further expenditures.	400,000	200,000
Development loans—revolving fund The fund was set up by Congress for long-range plans and programs in underdeveloped countries to build up economic resources such as factories, mines, farms, roads, and ports, and to teach men and women necessary skills. In many cases, however, money from the fund has been used to pay off unsound national debts, to prop up shaky currencies, and to bail out government in balance-of-payments crises. Although development loans as originally authorized by Congress are highly desirable, much of the money in the fund is not being used appropriately. The fund should not get as much this year as the $975,000,000 it got last year.	1,248,000	348,000
Alliance for Progress The Alliance for Progress is too disorganized to meet its goals. Aid, trade, and financial policies need to be coordinated throughout the hemisphere, as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development strives to do for its members. Programs of the Alliance need to be reexamined and made more consistent with what is possible to accomplish. Also the Latin American nations should be encouraged to create a much more favorable atmosphere for private business. Until steps are taken toward these ends no more than $400,000,000 can be put to good use.	700,000	300,000
Administrative expenses—AID AID is requesting $7,750,000 more for administrative expenses. Although the chamber is recommending considerable cuts in the AID program, it believes a $500,000 increase can be justified in light of the need for more talented and experienced personnel. So a $7,250,000 cut is recommended in the request.	57,250	7,250
Administrative expenses—State Department This recommendation would hold funds at last year's expenditures in view of no compelling justification for an increase.	3,025	325
Peace Corps This program is regarded as highly successful and useful. But the Corps is having difficulty getting enough specialists of the kinds it needs. So it is doubtful that it could efficiently assimilate a 100-percent increase in funds in its 2nd year. In view of its growth difficulties, the Corps should be held to about 90 percent of its request.	108,000	8,000

and recommended improvements—Continued

President's message (Apr. 2, 1963)	Administration amendments (Foreign Assistance Act of 1963)	The aid gap (between program and performance)	What's needed
Concentrate support on countries adhering to principles established in Charter of Punta del Este; precisely indicate required local policy change, reforms, and other self-help measures. Encourage economic integration.	Amends act to authorize subsequent use of unappropriated funds. Amends Latin American Development Act to increase Alliance for Progress funds.	Inadequate long-range planning, policy coordination, and private participation.	New legislation to establish Organization for Western Hemisphere Economic Cooperation and Development to coordinate aid, trade, and monetary policies of member nations. Realistic determination by administration of attainable objectives. Support for Inter-American Development Bank. Opposition to administration amendments to increase Alliance funds until substantive improvements in program are achieved.
Selectively supplement U.S. contributions to international lending institutions in conjunction with increased contributions from from other industrialized nations.	Amends act to reduce multilateral aid.	Present U.S. Government participation and private international consortia too limited.	Administration encouragement and protection of joint ventures by international consortia recommended by AID Administrator as necessary to host country economic development. Burden sharing made more equitable through OECD's Development Assistance Committee. Study of proposals to stabilize international commodity markets.
Emphasize economic rather than military aid, review both size and purpose of local military forces which receive U.S. aid; but anticipate need for new and expanded military aid.	Amends act to reduce military aid.	Still overemphasized; not adequately geared to recipient nations known capabilities in global defense strategy.	New ways and means to persuade NATO countries to accept additional responsibilities. Support for administration amendment to reduce funds, plus substantial further reductions.
	Amends act to increase supporting assistance.	Overused for questionable support for military forces.	Opposition to administration amendment to increase fund.
Increase contingency fund.	Amends sec. 451 to increase contingency fund.	Excessive commitment of funds for unidentified aid in unforeseen circumstances.	Amendment to sec. 451 (existing contingency fund) to limit to emergencies not provided for by other specific funds. Amendment to sec. 614 (special authority for national security purposes) to prohibit use of any other fund for these purposes. Opposition to administration amendment to increase fund.
	Amends sec. 645 to authorize continued consolidation of unexpended balances with other funds.	Permits funds to be used for other than intended purposes.	Amendments to secs. 610 and 645 to prohibit use of various aid funds for purposes other than those specified for each. Opposition to administration amendment to sec. 645 to authorize continued consolidation of unexpended balances with other funds.

Specific budget requests for which chamber support is approved

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation requested
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT	
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC	
International organizations and programs	136, 250
The national chamber supports in full the administration's revised requests of $136,250,000 for international economic aid programs, on 2 counts: (1) the chamber believes multilateral foreign aid, to which other industralized nations contribute through international lending institutions, should be encouraged and emphasized as a practical alternative to U.S. financing alone; (2) the 13 programs financed under this account represent current commitments which the U.S. Government is obligated to fulfill.	
Social progress trust fund of the Inter-American Development Bank	200, 000
The chamber supports the full $200,000,000 request for the Inter-American Development Bank's social progress trust fund. Its funds are used for loans for low-cost housing, potable water and sanitation, agricultural and technical aid basic to the raising of living standards in Latin America. Each loan must be matched by local financing 4 times its size, or 80 percent of the total cost. The loans are used to help establish private credit institutions and other private enterprise. The chamber also supports the administration's request for a $50,000,000 regular subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank.	
Surveys of investment opportunities	1, 500
The chamber endorses the administration's request for $1,500,000 to help finance feasibility surveys of potential areas for U.S. private investment in the underdeveloped countries as vital to much-needed private business participation in the aid program.	
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Continued	
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC—continued	
Subscription to International Development Association	61, 656
The chamber supports the administration's entire request of $61,700,000 in regular subscription to this international lending institution, which specializes in local currency loans to nations in need of basic development.	
American schools and hospitals abroad	20, 000
The chamber supports the full White House revised request of $20,000,000 for American schools and hospitals abroad as necessary to provide U.S. citizens serving overseas with needed educational and health facilities, and—to the extent American hospital care is provided local foreign nationals—as worthy humanitarian projects which benefit the U.S. image abroad.	
Hospitals abroad (local currency)	2, 000
The chamber supports the full White House request of $2,000,000 for the American-sponsored children's hospital in Poland.	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE	
Assistance to refugees in the United States	70, 000
The chamber supports the administration's full request of $70,000,000 for this necessary humanitarian program for Cuban refugees.	

NATIONAL SECURITY AND MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his budget message to the Congress has recommended a program to meet national goals that depends more heavily for its fulfillment on scientific research and development than any set of recommendations ever placed before this body.

To maintain a vigorous posture of military security, to sustain space exploration second to none, to stimulate domestic economic growth, to continue strides in medical advancement, to meet the problems of a highly urbanized society—for all these purposes we look more than ever before to the fruits of scientific discovery and their prompt conversion to technology.

Research and development appropriations proposed by the President amount to 15 percent of the total budget. These funds reflect a substantial increase since launching of the first sputnik dramatically revealed how intimately our Nation's leadership in the world would depend on a leadership in science and engineering.

We all know, however, that strength of our Nation's research and development is not simply a product of increased expenditures. Limitations on skilled manpower could throttle our effort even more critically than a limitation on budget. For the first time in our history, we may be confronted with a plurality of goals that may well outstrip our supply of scientists and engineers.

The appetite of today's technology for high-level technical manpower is tremendous. The space program furnishes one clear example of the increased sophistication in systems development; the interplay required between different scientific disciplines; the unprecedented demands for reliability. But civilian technology requires similar skills in improvement of our domestic transportation and communications systems, in keeping one technological step ahead of our competitors in world consumer and industrial markets.

In a sense, we stand at a crossroads. We have elected a number of national goals that require world technological leadership. Growth and diversity in research and development effort must be sustained. Yet the slack in the technical manpower system has been almost fully absorbed in our recent rapid expansion.

The dramatic explosion of scientific effort was made possible by a remarkable influx of gifted people in research and development functions from other occupations, by increased production of scientists and engineers through legislation which assisted World War II and Korean veterans to complete studies.

Only a few more people can be appropriately drawn away from nonresearch and development activities, or effectively accommodated in professional ranks without additional training. Moreover, considering the long leadtime for training, the new supply of scientists and engineers for the rest of this decade is already in college and thus fixed by current enrollments; and for the next decade these people are already in junior or senior high school. Growth and strength of our research and development effort will thus be critically limited by productive capacity of our educational system, and by utilization of those already engaged in research and development.

Long-term planning thus becomes essential because we cannot accept the consequences of a random development of our manpower resources to meet present goals. Moreover, the future is difficult to foresee, and we must be prepared to meet the unexpected—to exploit new scientific opportunities as swiftly in the future as we have in the past in atomic energy and in space.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has felt a mounting concern for future manpower requirements, especially in terms of the constantly higher training required of all our technical personnel. Our concern is not unique.

The President, about a year ago—taking note of published reports on deliberate measures by the Soviet Union to develop its technical manpower—requested his Science Advisory Committee to take a careful look at this problem. With release by the White House of the first in a series of reports on manpower, I asked Dr. Jerome Wiesner, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, to comment on specific problem areas, and on programs aimed at their solution. My letter and his reply are submitted for the RECORD following these remarks.

The impending shortage and the most urgent need for action that Dr. Wiesner describes relate to quality, not quantity. Fulfillment of our diverse programs to which we are already committed may be threatened unless strong action is taken to increase the output from our graduate schools, particularly of more engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists who combine high talent and high training.

For example, in 1950 we turned out 2,000 Ph. D.'s in these 3 fields; in 1960, we graduated 3,000, an increase of 50 percent. But in 1970 we need a minimum of 7,500, an increase in the decade of 150 percent. For among other sources of demand for these graduates are the universities themselves; they must accommodate the first wave of the postwar baby boom who become college applicants in 1965.

I do not like to use the Soviet achievements as a yardstick for our own activities, but can we afford to sit back while the Soviets already have three Ph. D. engineers in their ranks to every one of ours, while they train more at an even faster rate?

In this country, only about 4 percent of the B.S. graduates in engineering go on to a doctorate. Out of a group of 10,000 citizens of age 30, only about 4 have a Ph. D. in engineering. This is far too few. The study conducted for the President suggests that the manpower requirements of this decade can be met only if more students studying science and engineering—those already in the college pipeline—are encouraged to continue on to full-time graduate study.

The major barrier to such advanced study is financial. Faced with a choice of a $7,000 starting salary and a very much smaller graduate stipend, many highly qualified college graduates—especially those with family responsibilities and those who incurred debts as undergraduates—decide that they cannot afford graduate education. Others extend their study by combining part-time study with part-time work, often becoming dropouts.

Another barrier is limited graduate facilities and faculty.

To remedy these problems, following recommendations to him by his advisers, the President has placed before the Congress a program of support for graduate students and for facilities that emphasizes the number of new starts.

Both because the Federal Government is a major consumer of scientific talent, and because the problem is urgent, the President proposes a program with Federal leadership, but involving a close relationship with State and local governments, industry, and the universities.

Fellowship and training grant subventions are proposed in budgets especially of the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and extension and expansion of the National Defense Education Act.

These proposals would represent a deliberate first step whereby the Federal Government accepts the Nation's responsibility to assure adequacy of technical manpower resources to meet its commitments. They could provide more and better opportunities for advanced training of our able young people so that none need turn away from graduate study because of financial need, or because training facilities are inadequate or too far away.

The question has often been raised at this point whether an increase in the graduate student population would serve to undermine the quality of a graduate education. It is no doubt true that indiscriminate expansion of facilities without regard to available teaching strength, geographic location, and area of specialization, would very often do more harm than good.

But many outstanding schools would greatly appreciate a larger number of fellowships which would prevent the loss of good graduate students. Many other schools which show promise of becoming centers of excellence are so limited in funds that they cannot retain their best students for teaching and research assignments, or build much-needed laboratories and classrooms.

There are probably more untapped graduate manpower resources in some fields than in others. In the physical sciences, the percentage of students going on to receive Ph. D. degrees is as high as 18 to 20 percent. It may not be possible or desirable to increase output substantially in fields where such a high proportion do attempt graduate work.

But in other fields such as engineering where only 4 percent of those obtaining a B.S. degree go on to receive a Ph. D. it appears certain that a relatively large number of well-qualified students could be attracted toward graduate study.

In a recent survey by the Engineers Joint Council, 136 responding institutions that offer graduate engineering curriculum reported 3,160 students are now on fellowships, that an additional 6,420 fellowships could be used if available. Only 33 current fellowships are unfilled. The normal sources of financial assistance for graduate students and graduate programs just cannot be expected to expand rapidly enough to remove this graduate manpower bottleneck. We should listen to the President's Science Advisory Committee when it recommends that "an immediate, vigorous national effort to increase graduate training in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences" be undertaken.

It is clear from Dr. Wiesner's letter that this area of graduate study is but one deserving attention. There are other serious questions regarding need for technicians, opportunities for women, retraining of those whose skills have become obsolete, and the area of manpower utilization.

In a free democratic society, we do not assign individuals by decree of a centralized manpower board. Rather, we try to maximize the opportunities and the information about these opportunities, so that our young people can exercise an independent and informed choice. But we cannot be nonchalant about this issue in the cold war atmosphere that demands continued U.S. leadership. All elements of our society must study and act—industry, universities, the Executive, and the Congress.

Because of the serious nature of this matter, because of its extreme importance to the future welfare of the Nation, and due to the impact which our present action or inaction will have upon the lives of coming generations, it is my hope and intent to inaugurate a careful and comprehensive inquiry into the status of scientific manpower. This inquiry will require careful staff preparation, which I plan to augment as soon thereafter as feasible with committee hearings to draw testimony from the country's foremost experts in scientific and technical resources.

The main purpose of the inquiry, which the Committee on Science and Astronautics will be undertaking pursuant to its charter from the House, will be to identify the problems of sufficient scientific manpower and to separate the real from the apparent.

We do not kid ourselves that this will be an easy job, and we shall be indebted to many others who have inquired into some of these difficulties from time to time in the past. However, the completed task is an urgent one which can no longer be delayed.

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

Dr. JEROME B. WIESNER,
Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WIESNER: For some time those of us serving on the Committee on Science and Astronautics have felt a mounting concern for the future requirements the Nation faces with regard to its scientific and technical resources. This concern extends not merely to adequate research programs and well distributed facilities, but even more to that most crucial element of our national progress—scientific manpower and the constantly higher degree of training that it must have in these times.

I am aware, of course, that our concern is not unique. The recent report of your own Science Advisory Committee to the President has highlighted some of the growing difficulties in the field of scientific and technological training. Similar recognition of the problem has been evidenced by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, by industry and by the universities. Moreover, this same apprehension was in prominent display during this committee's annual conference last month with its Science Advisory Panel.

In my judgment, it is becoming imperative that the executive and legislative branches of the government join hands in this matter with an eye toward making the Federal effort to bolster research and technological training as effective as possible. While I think that the Nation in general has been doing a commendable job, I doubt if it will suffice in the future. The close association this committee has with the national space program and our recognition of the vast demands which this program alone is making upon our scientific resources leads me to the conclusion that better and more coordinated planning for the development of highly trained scientific talent is an absolute must in the years ahead. And, obviously, the needs of the space program are but a segment of the whole requirement.

With this background in mind, I am addressing you as Director of the Office of Science and Technology, to solicit your aid and suggestions in devising methods to pinpoint specific problem areas and in seeking avenues for their solution. It may be that a broad investigation by this committee of future scientific and technological requirements would be useful—in the course of which facts and information might be obtained from those in and out of government who are most exposed to the exigencies of our national scientific and technological effort.

Your thoughts and comments on this matter will be most welcome.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your recent letter on problems in scientific manpower, and your invitation to pinpoint specific areas deserving immediate attention are sincerely appreciated. Few other issues relate so critically to the successful fulfillment of our national aspirations—to the ability of this Nation to maintain our national security, to stimulate economic growth and to continue the march toward a world free of want and of war—as does the development of our human resources. Many vital commitments have already been made which depend upon contributions of science and technology. Meeting these commitments thus depends heavily on an adequate supply of scientists and engineers—adequate in both quantity and quality. Yet, while the abundance of these resources has been the concern of all sectors of our technological community, the formulation of plans to meet the aggregate needs has been the primary responsibility of none. It is for this reason that the President last year asked for an extensive special study of this area, a matter I shall refer to in detail subsequently.

The manyfold demands for technical manpower draw on the same pool of talent—for defense and space, for innovation of civilian products able to compete in a world market, for meeting such domestic problems as mass transportation and environmental pollution associated with a rapidly urbanized society, for medical advancement, and for the effective management of our resources in such a way that we can help upgrade the way of life of citizens throughout the world without downgrading our own. Superposed on these requirements is the need for science, mathematics and engineering teachers to meet the rapidly growing college enrollment. A sharp competition for manpower has resulted, particularly for the superior individual having advanced training. In that competition, not all sectors of demand have succeeded in meeting their needs, and the future outlook is not encouraging.

For the first time, we are confronted with a plurality of goals that may well outstrip our technical manpower resources.

Most these major goals should not be placed on an either-or basis. Thus, we cannot, in fact we need not, accept the hazards and risks of a random development of our manpower resources to meet present goals. Moreover, the future is difficult to foresee, and we must be prepared to capitalize on the unforeseen; we must be prepared to move as swiftly to exploit new opportunities as we have in space and earlier in atomic energy. Because of the long lead time in training, we cannot do this unless we have a cadre of able, well-trained people.

The Soviet Union's response to this same challenge is well known. They have embarked on a program to improve their capabilities by deliberately training very large numbers of science-oriented professional and semiprofessional personnel. They now graduate, for example, over twice as many baccalaureates in engineering each year as we. Far more significant in my own mind, they already have three times as many Ph. D. engineers in their manpower pool as we—26,000 as compared to our 9,000. The quality of these Soviet resources as measured by talent and high training leaves no room for complacency.

Faced with the same manpower problem as the Soviet Union, how, in a democratic society where each citizen must have a free choice of his or her occupation, do we meet this challenge?

About 1 year ago the President requested that his Science Advisory Committee take stock of our manpower resources and report on measures which should be taken within and without Government to meet our society's complex needs. The Committee's first report, released last December, is one of a series now under preparation, and concentrates on an especially urgent problem of impending shortages of engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists who combine high ability and advanced training. Based on the Committee's recommendations for action, the President has included in his budget for fiscal year 1964 and in legislation now before the Congress a far-reaching program specifically focused on meeting this shortage. By linking Federal, State, and private efforts, this program would help immediately increase the number already in college—who have made this career choice and who are found qualified—to go on to graduate training.

The urgent need for more individuals having advanced training is clear. The variety and complexity of fundamentals that underpin scientific research have grown enormously. Many fields now embrace two or more disciplines, and require a thorough grounding in each.

Similarly, engineers are called upon to use more sophisticated scientific concepts in the design of military and space systems which, in turn, manifest unprecedented demands for reliability, and economy. Civilian industry, which faces tasks such as the development of natural resources and the improvement of transport systems, must also advance by converting new scientific knowledge to technology, and for this purpose requires men who can draw upon understanding in fields of management, economics, law, behavioral sciences and natural sciences, as well as engineering. Research and engineering activities, whether pursued in the office, classroom, or laboratory, today require training well beyond that afforded in the 4-year undergraduate curriculum.

That even 1 year beyond the baccalaureate significantly strengthens the individual's capabilities is revealed by the large number of students now enrolled in part-time graduate study. In fact, over half of the graduate students in engineering are part time. As valuable as this part-time training may be, full-time attendance would be much better.

To keep pace with our national needs, it is the judgment of the President's Science Advisory Committee that we should and could increase the number of Ph. D.'s each year in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences (EMP) to reach 7,500 in 1970, the number of master's or equivalent to 30,000. This annual production of 37,500 advanced degrees by 1970 should be compared with 15,000 in 1960, 11,000 in 1950.

A substantial fraction of these new graduates, incidentally, must be plowed back into the universities for teaching, and soon. The first wave of the postwar baby boom is already in high school and will move into the universities in 1965. Based on census statistics, the number of eligible college applicants will rise in just 1 year by over 20 percent. Faculty will be required to teach college majors in science, engineering, and mathematics. Additional graduates with specialized training will be needed for high quality teaching in colleges and high schools of future citizens who will work in nontechnical fields, but who must be more literate in science if they are to conduct their own affairs and perform public duties intelligently.

At the same time that the college-age population is growing, a larger fraction are entering college. We surely do not want to reverse this trend toward wider educational opportunity. In view of the time required to complete the graduate education necessary for teaching, we are dangerously near the deadline imposed by the unrelenting advance of new college enrollees. It is a little startling to realize that an upper limit to the 1970 crop of technical Ph. D.'s has already been established, since most of these are college juniors.

Parenthetically, the crop for 1980 is also probably limited by quality of math and science courses being taught today to our junior high school students.

It is my view that the baccalaureate base for increased graduate enrollment in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences is ample to meet PSAC's 1970 goals.

In these three fields, roughly 8 percent of those with a bachelor's degree now go on to a doctorate. We believe that many more are both able and motivated. In fact, in physics and chemistry nearly 20 percent continue on to receive a doctorate. But in engineering, it is only 4 percent; in mathematics, 8 percent. To the Committee, enhancing our manpower supply is primarily a matter of quality, not quantity; not a matter of diverting more college students to science and engineering, but of providing for more students who have chosen this career route the opportunity to continue their studies. This means, first, sharply increasing the fraction of full-time students who go on to graduate study in mathematics and engineering; and second, with numerically increasing enrollments in physics and chemistry, assuring continuation of at least the same fraction who complete the doctorate.

Assuming that the proposition of baccalaureates in these three fields continues unchanged in relation to the total number of bachelors degrees (somewhere around 17 percent), the actual number of graduates will approximately double during this decade because of increased total enrollments. With 3,000 doctorates produced in 1960, a potential of 6,000 for 1970 is a minimum expectation. However, we have already noted that the fraction of engineers and mathematicians who now go on to the doctorate is far less than in other fields of science, and could be markedly increased without any drop in academic standards. This explains then, the 7,500 goal for 1970 rather than 6,000. Neither of these, however, will be realized unless significant steps are taken immediately to increase the opportunities for the students and the capacity of the institutions.

With regard to students, the major barrier to continuation of full-time graduate study is financial. Faced with a choice of a starting salary above $7,000, and a very much smaller stipend for graduate study, many highly qualified college graduates—especially those with family responsibilities and those who incurred debts as undergraduates—decide that they cannot afford graduate education. Others extend their study by combining part-time study with part-time work, often becoming a dropout.

Another barrier is inadequate graduate facilities. Increasingly, universities will be obliged to turn away students because of space or faculty limitations.

In addition, there is very convincing evidence that some geographical areas produce a much greater proportion of doctorates than others. In fact, 10 States are producing doctoral graduates at a rate nearly three times that of the remaining 40 States. Relatively few students are prepared to study more than several hundred miles from their homes. It would thus appear that we have a special problem in terms of meeting an unequal geographical distribution of centers of educational excellence.

The present barriers to graduate education—limitations in student support, number of faculty, and educational facilities—must be overcome. It is to that end that the President has proposed that the Federal Government take the initiative and provide the leadership needed to meet these national needs.

To meet goals for graduate education in the three fields of potential shortage—engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences—it is of critical importance that we increase the number of graduate students enrolling in the fall of 1964 from the 22,000 which may be expected on the basis of projected trends to some 30,000. The number of full-time graduate students should also be increased. Therefore, the President has proposed support for 12,000 qualified first year enrollees and for 14,000 graduate students beyond the first year of their training. These numbers should be compared to support for roughly 3,500 first year and 10,000 advanced graduate students in 1962. Emphasis, you will note, is on the number of new starts. Support would be provided within existing legislation, through NSF, AEC, and NASA fellowships, and through new NSF science development and training grant programs. Support would also be provided for research assistantships in accordance with present patterns. The President has also proposed that the NDEA fellowship program, which has been eminently successful, be extended and considerably expanded in H.R. 3000 now before the Congress, especially to accommodate increasing enrollments in these three fields. In virtually all of these cases, assistance to students would be accompanied by a grant directly to the college or university to help meet the true cost of education, and thus would assist the university to maintain an internal balance between fields.

The President also proposes Federal support for new physical facilities, including funds through NSF laboratory and science development grants, through NASA university grants and through a new program proposed in H.R. 3000, of graduate facilities to be operated by the Office of Education. These amounts total some $85 million, as compared to $24 million in 1962. Virtually all of these facilities funds would be on a 50–50 matching basis. Further details are given in an enclosed table.

The proposed program is designed to achieve a substantial and unprecedented acceleration in the rate of production in advanced degrees in these three fields. The proposition that the Federal Government should increase its responsibilities in this area is supported by three arguments: (a) the Federal Government supports almost three-fourths of all research and development conducted in this country, including major expenditures for space and military activities, and it is these programs of Federal origin that have created the shortage; (b) State governments and privately endowed universities face practical difficulties in raising the funds required for expansion in graduate education, especially in competition with funds that will be needed to meet the undergraduate surge; (c) because the demand for specialized manpower is nationwide, neither States nor communities feel it their exclusive responsibility to meet problems or contribute funds which, in the case of graduate education, may primarily benefit the economy of other communities or other States.

There is nothing completely new about Federal assistance for higher education. Past experience with the GI bill and the National Defense Education Act program, Federal agency supported mission-oriented research, and NSF-sponsored basic research, on the whole, has been eminently successful. What is new about the President's program, however, is an acceptance by the Federal Government of a Nation's responsibility to assure the adequacy of technical manpower resources to meet its commitments—by providing more and better opportunities for advanced training.

In this letter, it has been possible to convey only a few highlights of this very complex problem concerned with the supply and demand of specialized manpower. The ills are difficult to diagnose; prescriptions often uncertain in effect. I have wanted to respond to your very kind invitation, however, by bringing to your attention the findings of studies already completed for the President and of the important proposals which are now before the Congress to meet impending shortages in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences. Our studies are continuing incidentally in relation to other problem areas.

The technical fields in which these manpower are engaged relate to the missions of a number of different Federal agencies. Moreover, the support for graduate education and research is involved in the budgets of a number of agencies. The problem, therefore, covers a broad spectrum of interest. I would certainly agree with your suggestion, and I am sure the President would be pleased if your committee would provide a forum to explore full implications of the technical manpower problem, as well as the possible consequences of delay and inattention to this issue.

Sincerely,

JEROME B. WIESNER.

Fiscal year 1964 proposals by the President for Federal assistance to graduate education in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences

NUMBER OF FEDERAL STUDENT AIDS AWARDED

Fiscal year	Fellowships					NSF science development grants	Research assistantships [3]	National Defense Education Act student loans	NSF training grant program	Total administration proposals	PSAC recommendations [4]
	AEC	HEW [1]	NSF	National Defense Education Act	NASA [2]						
1st-year graduate enrollments:											
1962	80	0	770	400	30	0	1,750	380	X	3,410	X
1964 proposed	80	0	1,200	2,820	375	475	2,270	530	4,500	12,250	15,000
Beyond-1st-year graduate enrollments:											
1962	170	250	1,297	802	70	0	7,000	380	X	9,960	X
1964 proposed	170	400	1,990	[5] 1,360	1,775	175	9,100	[8] 530	0	15,550	18,000

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR GRADUATE FACILITIES

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	NSF laboratory matching grants	NSF science development grants	NASA university grants	Office of Education graduate facility grants	Total Federal grants	PSAC national program target [6] [7]
Federal expenditures for construction and equipping graduate facilities:						
1962	17	0	7	X	24	X
1964 proposed	50	8	18	[8] 9	85	250

[1] Primarily chemists.

[2] Division of enrollments between 1st-year and beyond-1st-year categories estimated on the basis of current practices.

[3] Estimate of assistants employed under Government grants and contracts of DOD, AEC, NASA, etc.

[4] Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," Dec. 12, 1962.

[5] Title I of H.R. 3000 (estimated fraction for EMP).

[6] Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," Dec. 12, 1962.

[7] Includes non-Federal matching funds.

[8] Title II of H.R. 3000 (estimated fraction for EMP).

Source: Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) from June 18, 1963, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include the address of the President of the United States at the Air Force Academy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. FASCELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REIFEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

908. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) relative to the estimated cost of facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 87-554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

910. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the fourth semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1962 (pursuant to Public Law 87-195); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

911. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unemployment compensation payments to former Federal civilian employees and exservicemen for more than 1 benefit year based upon only one termination of employment. These payments are financed by Federal appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

912. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the extensive use of first-class air accommodations, District of Columbia government. It is one of a series of reports by this Office showing the unnecessary use of first-class air transportation by various Government agencies and by their contractors at Government expense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

913. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

914. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of April 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

915. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), to provide that distribution system loan repayment contracts may be executed contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

916. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the closing of the roll of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation preparatory to submission of proposed legislation for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Confederated Tribes and their members, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

917. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) (ii) of the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

919. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) (ii) of the act of August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 4, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 7, 1963:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6755. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 5, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 7, 1963:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6791. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 10, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6890. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6891. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6892. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit women to withdraw their applications for reduced old-age or wife's insurance benefits in special cases where they filed such applications because of official misinformation and thereby suffered financial detriment without fault on their part; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6893. A bill to debar evidence obtained through electronic eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6894. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., and St. Petersburg, Fla., through Brandenton, Fla., Sarasota, Fla., Venice, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6895. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6896. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6897. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 10 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6898. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the actuarial status of the trust funds, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to increase the annual earnings includible in determining benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6899. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which may be earned without deductions from benefits in cases where a husband and wife are both beneficiaries but all or most of such outside income is derived by only one of them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6900. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6901. A bill to consent to the Goose Lake Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 6902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of all streams which drain directly to the Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present Interstate and Defense Highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from requiring loyalty pledges of farmer-elected agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAIRD: Memorial of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extension of the service area for the Sacramento Valley Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kiyoshi Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6904. A bill for the relief of Marie Yvette Beaudoin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kn Shill Lim Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andrena A. Whalen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6907. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Megerdichian and his wife, Mary Megerdichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

151. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph A. Zerello, village clerk, village of Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to the Board of Trustees of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson requesting legislation that would empower the Attorney General of the United States to go to court on his own to enjoin those who practice or enforce segregation laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting that there be republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Prof. Edward Higbee of the Uni-

versity of Rhode Island, entitled "Now the Nonfarmer Asks for Parity", appearing in the New York Times magazine section of June 2, 1963; to the Committee on House Administration.

153. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., to take appropriate steps to honor former Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, Kentucky, and Arkansas, the only Member to ever represent three different States at different times; to the Committee on House Administration.

154. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting legislation that would determine the exact, specific name of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., relative to correcting the short title to petition No. 148, appearing on page 9937 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1963, which dealt with the bill H.R. 6160; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New Haven, Conn., requesting that Governors Barnett and Wallace of the Dixiecratic South be "told off", and to neutralize and constitutionalize the power structure in Dixie, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Government Lotteries of Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to acquaint the Members of this House with additional Latin American countries where gambling is respected and treated as recreation and relaxation. Out of a total of 77 foreign countries where Government-run lotteries are legal and proper, none are as foolish as we are in refusing to recognize and capitalize on the human urge to gamble.

Chile operates two national lotteries. Last year, the gross annual receipts came to over $20¼ million of which the Government received over $3 million. Most of the moneys were earmarked and used for support of colleges, public health service, children's welfare program, hospital construction, Red Cross, and other charitable purposes.

Colombia is a small and poor country, yet it realizes the worth of lotteries. The total gross annual receipts in 1962, came to $33,360,000. The total net income to the National Government was almost $11½ million. These funds were earmarked for the blind and deafmutes, for hospitals, homes for the poor, and the aged, and other charitable institutions.

Costa Rica is another country that realizes that the natural gambling spirit of its people should be regulated and controlled for the benefit of its treasury. Last year, the gross annual receipts ran up to almost $10 million. The total net income to the Government was over $3¼ million. These funds were earmarked for the support of mental institutions and other charitable hospitals.

Ecuador, like a number of other Spanish-speaking nations, conducts a Government lottery not for the benefit of the general treasury but rather for the support of numerous charities. In 1962, the gross receipts of the national lottery of Ecuador came to $2,900,000 of which about $906,000 was turned over to various charitable groups and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, we in America could benefit immeasurably if moneys that now flow into the pockets of gangsters and professional gamblers could be diverted into a U.S. lottery and utilized for the benefit of our own people. Why can't we show the same intelligence and sound judgment as our Latin American friends? A national lottery in this country can not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time that we stopped being reckless and careless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery?

Proposed Increase in Taxes on the Domestic Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, recommendations of the administration propose an increase in taxes on the domestic petroleum industry estimated by the Treasury at approximately $280 million annually, or $175 million annually. Both figures have officially been offered.

At the same time, the administration seeks to accelerate industrial activity to provide for an expanding economy

It is difficult for me to see the rationale in these proposals. I can reach no conclusion other than that an increase in taxes paid by oil will retard that industry's growth.

Were taxes on oil and gas production to be increased on the order of $280 million annually, or $175 million, or even $75 million, it would appear evident that the industry's expenditures for a year would be decreased by a like amount. Translating the Treasury's first estimate into capital for drilling operations, it could mean 5,000 fewer well completions. In terms of additions to crude oil reserves, assuming the industry would follow the pattern of the past 5 years, we would fail to develop some half billion barrels of new oil in a single year of reduced drilling activity.

Of course, with a cutback of $280 million in capital realization by the oil industry, not all the reduction in activity would be in the area of oil well drilling. There would be fewer gas wells, service wells, secondary operations, and a general retraction in all phases of drilling-production activity. However, the illustration I have offered serves to bring into focus the magnitude of the proposal to increase oil production taxes.

There is another detrimental aspect to the proposed tax increase. I refer now to exploratory, or wildcat drilling.

In this department, also, there would be a retardation of activity. A large number of exploratory wells, in some indeterminate number, would not be drilled in the search for new oilfields. Yet it is these year-by-year discoveries which provide the industry with its development drilling programs.

In this area the adverse effect would be cumulative.

In my own State of New Mexico—although we are rich in mineral resources—over two-thirds of the total value of all minerals produced is represented by petroleum.

I would be most reluctant to witness a further decline in exploration or development of the petroleum resources of the State of New Mexico. Yet, I am forced to the conclusion that this would be inevitable under the proposed tax program.

Oil, as an industry, enjoys a history of progress since its founding in Pennsylvania in 1859. The unusual hazards it faces in exploration for new reserves has been recognized by realistic tax measures. Since 1926, the depletion factor has been a part of its tax structure. This has served as a needed stimulant to offset the hazards to capital expenditures.

Prior to 1926 discovery depletion was the method used to recognize the peculiar nature of the wasting asset high-risk oil and gas producing industry. However, due to the highly complex nature of this method—percentage depletion was adopted. Now through the back door, the Treasury is seeking to make basic changes in the industry's longstanding tax structure which would be tantamount to a cut in the oil and gas depletion rate of up to one-third. Under the guise of correcting "claimed" defects in the application of existing tax provisions in the natural resources area, the President and the Treasury Department has recommended four specific changes which would—

First. Require a carry forward of intangible deductions for the purpose of reducing the net income from a mineral property in succeeding years upon which the 50-percent limitation is based.

Second. Revoke the taxpayer's option to combine several mineral interests into one property.

Third. Tax gains on sales of mineral properties at ordinary income rates instead of capital-gain rates to the extent of drilling, and depletion deductions (up to cost basis) taken after 1963.

Fourth. Revise the tax treatment of foreign exploration and development costs.

While each of these recommendations would adversely affect oil and gas producers, I particularly wish to point out the harm that would be done to small independent producers if recommendation No. 3—the so-called recoupment provision were enacted. Under present law, any taxable grain realized upon the sale of mineral properties held for more than 6 months is taxed at capital-gains rates. The proposed change would require that gains realized after 1963 be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of deductions taken after 1963 for depletion (up to depletable basis) and drilling costs. In other words, any profit realized from the sale of a mineral property after 1963 would first be considered recovery of prior depletion and drilling deductions which would have to be restored to ordinary taxable income.

Since the vast majority of all sales of mineral properties are made by small independent producers, the full impact of this proposal, which Treasury states will pick up $50 million each year, would fall on those taxpayers least able to absorb this increased tax burden. These smaller companies which discover many, many new oilfields are concerned principally with growth and most always reinvest the bulk of their available cash from the sale of such properties in the further search for and development of new properties. Relatively few independent producers who sell part or all of their properties quit the business; but rather they use the proceeds of the sale to pay their taxes, retire their indebtedness and use what is left over to start in again. The adoption of this particular proposal would severely limit the encouragement of smaller companies and individual operators to remain a vital and effective part of the domestic petroleum industry.

This Nation can ill afford to force out of the oil business these small, yet vitally needed independent producers who find and develop new oilfields and take the money from the sale of such fields to keep on looking for additional new oil reserves.

This proposal as well as all of the other Treasury regulations which adversely affect oil and gas producers should be rejected.

It is my conviction that the industry requires the same tax framework today as it has throughout its history—and for the same reasons—that have provided for progress in the past.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 8, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LAWFUL PROCEDURES

The week's events in the field of race relations indicate political motivation behind much of the agitation. The matter has been brought to a head for the people of Dallas by two events: (1) The ill-advised action of ignoring civil service procedures, and (2) the inclusion of Dallas on the Attorney General's list of cities having race problems. As to (1) the order to promote Negroes strictly on the basis of race and to bypass civil service procedures came from Washington. The local postmaster was forced to take action on instructions from his superiors. In bypassing civil service procedures all the postal workers have been downgraded which is bound to result in lowered morale. The merit system for promotions is the only way to insure justice and equity for all Federal workers. The evils of the spoils system became so bad it resulted in the establishment of the Civil Service Commission and the merit system for Federal employees in 1883. Promotions have been based on (a) ability and performance determined by examinations and rating: (b) seniority; (c) supervisory appraisal. All of these factors are ignored now in orders to make promotions on the basis of race. Also ignored with resulting grave injustice is veterans preference. A breakdown in the civil service system can only hurt all Federal employees including minority groups.

As to (2): Including Dallas on a list of cities having race problems was best appraised and dismissed by a Dallas business man present at the President's meeting who said: "I didn't know we had one." The tragedy of the attempts of the President and the Attorney General to force integration policies without regard to legal procedures is that these efforts are creating racial strife where heretofore it did not exist. The relationship between people must be solved locally by those of good will, and good relations cannot be established, nor justice maintained on any other basis. Every citizen must be guaranteed all the rights outlined in the Constitution which means that in the places where taxpayers' money is used and in areas classed as parks and public utility in nature, of course, there can be no discrimination. However, for the President by government action (and force) to define public utility for the purpose of invading private property is to use the 14th amendment to destroy the 5th amendment which forbids the taking of private property without due process.

As in all our relationships these problems must be solved by the people and for the people. In the Post Office to establish justice for all the postal workers and the people they serve. In other areas to protect the rights of all citizens, the majority as well as the minority groups whatever their race or national origin. If discrimination against Negroes is wrong, and it is, then discrimination in reverse—for the Negro and against the whites—is equally bad. The best guarantee the Negro has to attain justice is within the framework of the Constitution. The fight for equality, the battle to eliminate the injustices that do exist cannot be fought on university campuses or the streets of our cities; it cannot be won through Supreme Court decisions or Executive orders altering the Constitution. It must be won on the floor of Congress through proper legislation, through proper respect for law enforcement, and finally through proper religious motivation in the human heart.

TAX LEGISLATION

A tax bill, the President's No. 1 legislation, is a long way off. There is still no bill, that is, no language. The drafting of language is now beginning. When drafted, the basic tax areas—rate reduction, individual and corporate; and the areas of structural reform—will be considered separately, then collectively, as a package. The economic impact of each, also Federal revenue effect as tax-take of each, must be separately, then collectively, computed. Meanwhile, the Korean taxes consisting of corporate rate reduction, 52 percent to 47 percent; and various excises, must be considered for extension. Otherwise, these wartime, temporary taxes, expire. There is ample reason for letting these taxes, a package producing $4.1 billion revenue, to expire. However, some feel the Korean taxes should be continued and considered as a part of the larger tax reshuffling requested by the President's $10.3 billion package of recommended changes. I favor letting the Korean taxes expire and then reforming what remains. The Ways and Means Committee agreed not to consider further any change in the taxation of natural resources embracing coal, oil, and the approximately 100 extractive minerals.

COMMUNIST GOALS

The Communist Manifesto of November-December 1960 in Moscow laid down a blueprint for the completion of world domination, prime target being the United States.[1] Their goals of muzzling our military and squashing anti-Communists are continuing to meet with success. Greatest impetus in their drive, of course, is their successful open penetration of the Western Hemisphere and discard of the Monroe Doctrine. Cuba can now be called the beginning of the end for American and Western civilization unless something halts final accomplishment of the blueprint. The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee accurately assesses the danger in a recent report and lists the 11 clear and present dangers, as follows:

1. Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.
2. Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.
3. Cuba serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R.
4. The potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba.
5. The vital Panama Canal could be the target for sneak raids originating from Cuba.
6. Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.
7. Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union.
8. Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort.
9. The continued presence of the Soviets in Cuba could require a further reorientation of the U.S. air defenses.
10. Cuba provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.
11. The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable

---

[1] S. Doc. 47, 87th Cong.

to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

A consideration of all these matters serves to emphasize the gravity of the threat to our national security which Cuba now represents.

Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the vote was close yesterday on the question of whether to reduce the agricultural conservation program. Here are some statistics about the accomplishments of the ACP in my district:

Highlights of the Agricultural Conservation Program: Oklahoma—Sixth Congressional District

During the past few years, a high proportion of the farmers and ranchers in the Sixth District have received cost-sharing assistance through the agricultural conservation program for performing conservation practices. These practices have substantially contributed to erosion control, water conservation, soil improvement, crop adjustment through the diversion of cropland to grass and legume cover and trees, protection against wind and water erosion, improvement and establishment of wildlife habitat, and revitalizing small streams by reducing siltation and bank erosion, controlling runoff, and recharging underground water sources.

The 1961 ACP expenditure for the Sixth District was $2,650,000. This amount was paid to farmers as the Government's share of performing ACP practices. Farmers match this by their own contributions, therefore in the Sixth District about $5,300,000 was spent in 1961. This money is spent in towns and cities. Either directly or indirectly, every person in the district benefits from this expenditure.

A wide variety of conservation measures are performed under the ACP. Among the principal practices carried out in the Sixth District under the 1961 ACP are the following:

Conservation practice:	*Extent*
Permanent cover for erosion control or land-use adjustment, acres	33, 000
Increased acreages of cover in crop rotations for erosion control, etc., acres	26, 000
Improvement of established cover for erosion control, acres	6, 000
Improvement of rangeland by deferred grazing to permit natural reseeding, acres	80, 000
Control of competitive shrubs on range or pasture land, acres	31, 000
Wells for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	300
Dams, pits, or ponds for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	800
Establishment of sod waterways to dispose of excess runoff, 1,000 square feet	104, 000
Construction of terraces to control erosion or conserve moisture, acres terraced	54, 000
Construction of diversion terraces or ditches, or dikes, to control erosion, miles	150
Lining irrigation ditches to prevent erosion and conserve water, rods	6, 000
Temporary cover to protect soil from erosion, acres	240, 000
Stubble mulching to control erosion and improve permeability, acres	52, 000
Leaving high-cut stalks or stubble in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	52, 000
Weed control as a step in controlling erosion in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	4, 500
Surfacing clod-forming subsoil to control wind erosion, acres treated	5, 000

Farmer and rancher participation in the Sixth District has been as follows for the past 3 years:

	1959	1960	1961
Farms and ranches	9, 900	10, 800	13, 800
Persons receiving assistance	10, 200	11, 100	14, 300

The total participation over a period of years materially exceeds the number shown for any 1 year since many farmers and ranchers carry out practices only intermittently.

The ACP gives particular attention to the establishment of conservation practices needed on the land on farms in organized watersheds. This helps farmers meet the requirements and schedules for conservation plans and treatment which are prerequisite to planned structural works of improvement.

Under the 1961 ACP in the sixth district, numerous conservation practices were performed in 4 such organized watersheds involving 14 counties and 4,300 participating farms. The ACP cost sharing for these practices was $750,000. The farmers themselves contributed about as much more.

Beginning in 1936, sixth district farmers have been carrying out, under the ACP, many conservation practices which conserve our soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources. They have made good use of these public funds, and indicate a willingness to accelerate the rate of installation of conservation measures if their economic position permits it.

Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson, of Hawaii, Winner of Medal of Merit for Valor, Sets Example for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our daily papers are full of stories of crimes and violence and the part played by the police. Today I would like to call your attention to one policeman out of the 400,000 men in blue who has been awarded the Medal of Merit for Valor by the National Police Officers Association of America in a different kind of a situation.

Hawaii is surrounded by beaches—some perfect for swimming and surfing while others are treacherous with undertow that is not easily discernible to the average surfer who is intrigued with the mountainous waves that look perfect for surfing.

During the past 7 years Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson has saved 100 persons from a watery grave by his constant volunteer patrolling of the west side of the Island of Oahu. To carry on his one-man weekend patrol which he started in December 1958, Sergeant Adolphson has invested over $10,000 out of his own pocket to equip his black sedan with the latest in rescue equipment. He is especially busy during the winter months trying to keep foolhardy surfers out of the giant waves. The sergeant, who will be 47 in November, remains in top physical condition, and dares to take his surfboard into the stormy seas whenever someone is in need of help.

Reporters often have trouble getting him to talk about his rescues, but always find him willing to praise the fire department, the Army Land Rescue Team, and the military and civilian pilots who have participated in rescue missions.

Last December more than 300 persons attended a dinner in Sergeant Adolphson's honor and presented him with gifts and awards from 22 civic and military organizations. Awards included the Merit Award, First Class, the police department's highest award, and the Military Order of Loyal Companions, the highest civilian award that can be made by the Army's Pacific Command. He was praised for his achievements, and the countless hours of overtime work he has contributed without any compensation.

Accounts of his experiences sound like an adventure book, according to "Valor," the association's magazine. A cash award of $250 from the Reader's Digest Foundation will be given to Sergeant Adolphson along with his Medal of Merit.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Hawaii I am proud to add my words of congratulations to Sergeant Adolphson for his work in saving men's lives, and to include in the Congressional Record this account of his humane exploits, brief and inadequate as it may be.

Operation Yorkville, a Major Force in the Battle Against Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me special pleasure to be able to report on some of the activities of a vital group which is leading the way toward community action against obscene literature. Operation Yorkville, organized just a few months ago in the Yorkville section of New York, has sparked enthusiasm far beyond the borders of that area.

Together with the fine work of the citizens-for-decent-literature groups across the country, Operation Yorkville has been effective in mobilizing the local communities to work on their own problems in combating unsavory material on newsstands and other outlets. At the same time Operation Yorkville has encouraged an interest in the national problem and has been a leader in calling for more Federal action on this national problem.

I am pleased that this group has endorsed two bills which I have sponsored concerning obscene literature. These are H.R. 319, which is designed to allow postal patrons to protect their own mail boxes from unwanted and unsolicited obscene mail, and H.R. 470, which calls on the President to establish a Commission on Obscene and Noxious Material. A summary of these two bills will be found at the close of my remarks today.

I call to the attention of the House that hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 319 and related bills before the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski]. These hearings will be June 25, 26, and 27.

It is a pleasure for me, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, to work with the chairman because he is also very interested in doing all possible to control the traffic in obscene literature. Other members of our subcommittee have also been very helpful in our consideration of this problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include some interesting articles which appeared in the recent Bulletin of Operation Yorkville, Bulletin 20, dated May 24, 1963. And I will conclude by including the summary of H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

Fraternal Organizations in 26 States Join Hands With Operation Yorkville

In just 6 months Operation Yorkville has grown into Operation America. Fraternal organizations in 46 States have endorsed and pledged cooperation with Operation Yorkville in its attempts to keep obscene literature out of the hands of children by supporting community standards. Many have already wired and sent letters to the President of the United States, voicing their community standards, and urging him to action. Typical of communications received at Operation Yorkville headquarters: "The Massachusetts State Council does hereby endorse the action of Operation Yorkville * * * in requesting President John F. Kennedy (1) to send a message to Congress calling attention to the danger caused by the nationwide epidemic of obscene material flooding the country, urging a broad and continuous investigation and competent study of the problem and the adoption of appropriate legislation, including, but not limited to, bills now pending; (2) to issue a call to the nation for moral and mental fitness; (3) to alert the press to the evils of pornography and to ask cooperation of the entire Nation in establishing decent community standards as guidlines for elected representatives." "Riverton, Cheyenne, Sheridan, Rock Springs, Cody and Casper * * * Wyoming has been heard from and you can be assured of our continued support." From Virginia: "Operation Yorkville is a courageous and highly commendable campaign and merits active support * * *. We have an obvious obligation to do our utmost to prevent the corruption of an entire generation of American youth through the distribution of filth for the profit of irresponsible publishers." The entire Colorado congressional delegation has been contacted asking for their support of pending legislation.

OBSCENITY IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Wires and letters urging the President to action on the flow of obscene literature are converging on the White House from 46 States. As a voter you have a right and an obligation to request such action. The President has said that the problem of obscenity should be dealt with locally. The dealer around the corner is a matter of local concern, true. But when obscenity is sent through the U.S. mails, it is a matter of national import; when obscenity is brought in from abroad, it is a matter of national import; when the Supreme Court sees fit to review a case (*Roth* v. *U.S.*, 1957) and define obscenity, it most certainly becomes a matter of national import. If the Nation is to be concerned with the physical fitness of our youth, it must first look to the mental and moral fiber of that youth. Mental fitness must precede physical fitness. A generation which is swallowing huge doses of obscene poison, and thus becoming obsessed with sex and perversion, cannot be mentally alert, able, and fit. Obscenity is, therefore, a national problem and must be dealt with nationally as well as locally. It must receive the attention of the most important elected official of the Nation, the President of the United States.

OPERATION YORKVILLE STORIES BRING DEALER PLAINT TO NATIONAL JOURNAL

Two Operation Yorkville articles (Mar. 23 and Apr. 13) in America, a national journal of opinion, brought letters to the editor from Arkansas, Colorado, and Chicago.

From a dealer in Chicago came these remarks: "I have been reading with interest your reports on Operation Yorkville. I should like to present the magazine vendor's side of the problem * * * I had a rule of thumb years ago that I followed. I would not put any magazine on my rack that I would not leave at home in my living room * * *. We had to return 10 to 15 percent of the material that was sent. Today, with the flood of pornographic stuff that we get, we have to return 50 to 60 percent * * *. The magazine business is strictly a push business. We have no control over what is sent to us. We must take it or leave it. We then have to go through every bundle and separate the good from the bad * * *. Why don't we buy from another distributor? Because there isn't any. In the city of Chicago, magazine distribution is a monopoly. So you can see what a problem it is to keep a clean magazine rack."

From a woman in Arkansas: "Cheers for Operation Yorkville and cheers for America for publishing an account of constructive action."

A man in Denver had this to say: "Splendid and considerate. Your wonderfully illuminating remarks about 'prurient interest.' New York is to be envied and Operation Yorkville parents sincerely admired on all three counts: For being rightly concerned about the danger of pornography, for their courage in taking public action, and especially * * * for their use of the Roth versus United States definition."

OPERATION HAWTHORNE GETS UNDERWAY

An Operation Yorkville team traveled to Hawthorne, N.Y., Thursday, May 9, to help Operation Hawthorne get underway. Among the civic, educational, and religious groups represented at the meeting were: The Hawthorne Police Department, the Hawthorne Fire Company, the Hawthorne Elementary School Parent-Teachers Association, the Columbus Avenue PTA, Westlake Junior High and High Schools, the Rotary Club, Lions Club, Board of the Town of Mount Pleasant, Mount Pleasant School District No. 1, leaders of the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, and Girl Scouts, American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, Knights of Columbus, the Trinity Lutheran Church, the Hawthorne Reformed Church, Holy Rosary School, and the Catholic Youth Organization.

Operation Oceanside and Operation Larchmont are successfully at work: Operation Yorkville meetings were held last week in Staten Island, North Plainfield, N.J., and with the New York Rotary. Meetings are scheduled for coming weeks in Brooklyn, Queens Village, and the Bronx.

The Rotary Club of New York at their May 16 meeting at the Hotel Commodore sent the following telegram to the President:

"Letter going forward today expressing our concern about the pornography reaching our children. May we request you as our Chief Executive to protect our children from this grave danger. We promise our complete support."

EXCITING MEETING IN NUTLEY, N.J.

Mr. James P. Foley, chairman of the Nutley Decent Literature Campaign conducted an exciting meeting in the Nutley High School auditorium, May 16. This group was addressed by Dr. William P. Riley, of the New York Citizens for Decent Literature, and by Mrs. Doris Townsend and Mrs. Mildred Cronin of Operation Yorkville. Those attending signed a wire to the President and sent cards urging action.

TWENTY THOUSAND SIGNATURES ON PETITIONS TO COMMISSIONER

To date, 20,000 signatures have been received on "Petitions of Gratitude" to Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy for the recent police raids on obscenity distributors in Queens and dealers in Times Square.

N.Y. LAW WILL BRING OBSCENITY PUBLISHERS INTO THE OPEN

Late in April, Governor Rockefeller signed into law a bill which the District Attorneys Association said will "help considerably in enforcing the laws on obscenity." The law, which goes into effect on September 1, will require the name and address of the publisher to appear in every publication "which is so composed or illustrated as a whole to be devoted to the description or the portrayal of bondage, sadism, masochism, or other sexual perversion, or to the exploitation of sex or nudity." Governor Rockefeller said the purpose of the law is to expose "all those responsible for the publication of materials which are obscene or offensive to public morals." Such exposure, he said, will make it possible for law-enforcement officials to "bring to justice the real culprits responsible for the dissemination of this unwholesome literature." How effective the law will be in stopping the flow of obscenity remains to be seen, but it is a beginning. It will be interesting to see whether publishers of lurid literature will stand up and take credit for their dirt, or will discontinue publication.

Man of the Week—Rev. Robert E. Wiltenburg

Reverend Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, is a member—along with Dr. Julius G. Neumann, Rabbi, Congregation Zichron Moshe and Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., pastor of St. Ignatius Loyola—of the sponsoring committee of Operation Yorkville. Appointed to the post by Dr. Dan M. Potter, executive director of the Protestant Council, Reverend Wiltenburg has been a member of the committee and a guiding spirit of Operation Yorkville since its inception.

The fact that Operation Yorkville has become such a tremendous force in the community is due, in no small part, to Reverend Wiltenburg's clear thinking and eloquence. Operation Yorkville has been told that its phenomenal success has been due to the fact that it has not made the major mistakes (extreme pressure, etc.) that have been made in similar campaigns. This is because one of the hands at the helm has been that of Reverend Wiltenburg. His calm, reasonable approach to the problem of obscenity has helped keep Operation Yorkville on the right path.

Reverend Wiltenburg is an active, energetic member of the New York Rotary. Among other important Operation Yorkville meetings he has arranged, was a New York Rotary luncheon gathering on May 16. The assemblage was addressed by Dr. Bernard Pacella, an eminent psychiatrist, James P. O'Donnell, assistant district attorney of Queens County, and by Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., secretary to Operation Yorkville. Operation Yorkville's Dr. Julius Neumann gave the invocation, and Reverend Wiltenburg was toastmaster.

Ministering to Lutherans in a wide Yorkville geographic area, Reverend Wiltenburg has become prominent for his interest in community affairs. He lives in Queens with his wife and four children. Operation Yorkville is proud to have him as one of its driving forces.

TEENAGERS PETITION PRESIDENT JOIN OPERATION YORKVILLE

The following communication was received this week at Operation Yorkville headquarters from the Teenagers' Decency Campaign, Post Office Box 637, Stamford, Conn.:

"We are joining Operation Yorkville, citizens for decent literature, and other organizations in sending letters and telegrams to President Kennedy asking him to take action on pornography which is undermining the moral character of this Nation, stunting its moral and spiritual growth.

"This is the kind of action which is necessary if we are to rid this Nation of the vile literature which can be found on almost every newsstand across our country. This is the kind of unity which we have been seeking and we urge you to join us in this effort by sending either a letter or telegram to President Kennedy as soon as you can. Please ask your friends to do the same."

SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF H.R. 319 AND H.R. 470—BILLS TO CONTROL OBSCENE MATERIAL, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN CUNNINGHAM, OF NEBRASKA

H.R. 319, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda

This measure is based on the principle in old English law that a man's home is his castle. It assumes that a man has a right to protect his home against the delivery of obscene material and Communist propaganda by the Post Office. Such material is often sent to homes because they are on a list which is sold or rented to various firms by "list brokers" and which falls into the hands of a dealer in obscene material.

Specifically, any person is authorized to return any such matter to the Post Office Department if it is addressed to him or his minor child with a request that the Department notify the sender to remove the name and address of such person from each mailing list owned or used by the sender.

The Department will give appropriate notice to the sender.

Should the sender continue to send mail to the same addressee, the person would return it to the Department. The Postmaster General could immediately cancel or suspend any and all permits issued by the Department to the sender.

In the case of such matter from abroad, the Postmaster General notifies the postal authorities of the country of origin. Continued mailing of such matter from abroad to the person in this country can be followed by withholding of all mail from oversea sender to the person in the United States. In addition, the Postmaster General could refuse to deliver any and all matter within the United States sent by the foreign sender.

The bill also defines "minor child" to mean unmarried persons under 21 years, furnishes several definitions, and provides an exclusion for second-class publications mailed to bona fide subscribers and certain other mail.

H.R. 470, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matter and Materials

This measure provides for the establishment of a 17-member Commission appointed by the President and composed of representatives of Government, clergy, and mass media.

The Commission is charged with investigation of the relationship between noxious matter and antisocial behavior; recommending coordination between the levels of Government for control of obscene matter; informing the public in regard to traffic in obscene matter; enlisting cooperation of leaders in mass media; recommending additional legislation and administrative actions, and taking other steps which would be appropriate.

Authority is granted for advisory committees within States. Cooperation of Federal agencies is specified.

Recommendations are required by January 31, 1964, although this date is subject to confirmation or change by committee action dependent upon progress of the bill through Congress.

Text of the President's Address at the Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the graduation ceremonies of the Air Force Academy. It was an ideal day with a tremendous crowd and the President gave a forceful address. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

It has become trite to say in graduating addresses that commencement signifies a beginning instead of an end. Yet this thought applies with particular force to those of you graduating from your Nation's service academies.

For today you receive not only your degrees, but your commissions—and tomorrow you join with all those in the military service, the foreign service, the civil service and elsewhere who have chosen to serve the great Republic at a turning point in its history.

You will have an opportunity to help make that history—an opportunity for a service career more varied and more demanding than any that has ever been open to the officers of any nation on earth.

There are some who might be skeptical of that assertion. They claim that the future of the Air Force is mortgaged to an obsolete weapons system—the manned aircraft—or that the Air Force officers of the future will be nothing more than so-called "silent silo sitters." But nothing could be further from the truth.

It is this very onrush of technology which demands an expanding role for this Nation's Air Force and Air Force officers, and which guarantees that an Air Force career in the next 40 years will be even more changing and challenging than the Air Force careers of the last 40.

CHANCE TO EXPLORE

For some of you will travel where no man has ever traveled before. Some of you will fly the fastest planes, reach the highest altitudes and lift the heaviest payloads of any aviator in history. Some of you will hold in your hands the most awesome destructive power that man has ever conceived.

Some of you will work with the new leaders of new nations which were not even nations a few years ago. Some of you will support guerrilla and counterguerrilla operations that combine the newest techniques of warfare with the oldest techniques of the jungle.

And some of you will help to develop new planes that spread their wings in flight, detect other planes at unheard of distances, deliver new weapons with unprecedented accuracy, and survey the ground from incredible heights.

In short, the future of the Air Force is no more tied to any particular kind of weapons system than the future of the Navy was tied to the battleship several decades ago. The fact that the greatest value of these new weapons of massive retaliation lies in their ability to deter the very war which would require their use does not diminish their importance.

Nor will national security in the years ahead be achieved simply by piling up bigger stocks of bombs or burying our missiles under bigger piles of concrete. For in an imperfect world—where human failures and follies have too often been the rule instead of the exception—the surest way to bring on "the war that cannot happen" is to sit back and assure ourselves that it cannot happen.

NO MERE STALEMATE

The exisence of mutual nuclear deterrents cannot be shrugged off as a mere stalemate. For our national security, in a period of rapid change, will depend on constant reappraisal of accepted doctrine, on alertness to new developments, on imagination and resourcefulness, and new ideas.

"Stalemate" is a static term—and no one of you would be here today if you believed you were entering an outmoded service requiring only custodial duties in a period of nuclear stalemate.

I am impressed by the unusually fine scholastic achievements of the students and graduates of this Academy, as demonstrated in successful competition with the Nation's best colleges for Rhodes and other selected scholarships, and in the graduate record examination.

I am also impressed by the fact that more than one out of five of your all-military faculty members has a doctor's degree and all the rest have master's degrees. This is good.

For the Air Force officer of today and tomorrow requires this kind of scholarship. He requires a breadth of learning and outlook which was rarely required in earlier days.

NEED BROAD TALENT

You will need to know economics and history and international affairs. You will need an appreciation of other societies and an understanding of our own Nation's purposes and policy.

General Norstad's leadership in NATO—and General Smart's outstanding tour of duty as our senior military representative in Japan—are examples of Air Force officers whose broader talents enabled them to serve their Nation in key positions. Many of you will have similar opportunities—to represent the Government of the United States in some part of the world or some part of an international organization—or to negotiate with both military men and civilians from either Allied or adversary camps.

Your major responsibilities, of course, will relate to the obligations of military command. Yet, as last October's crisis in the Caribbean so aptly demonstrated, military policy and power cannot and must not be separated from political and diplomatic decisions.

Whatever the military motives and implications of that reckless attempt to place offensive missiles on the island of Cuba may have been, the political and psychological motives and implications were equally important.

We needed in October—and we shall need in the future—military commanders who are conscious of the enormous stakes involved in every move they make—who are aware of the fact that there is no point where a purely political problem becomes a purely military problem—who know the difference between vital interests and peripheral interests—who can maneuver military forces with judgment and precision as well as courage and determination—and who can foresee the effects of military moves on the whole fabric of international power.

POLITICAL CHALLENGES

We need men who can cope with the challenge of new political situations as well as new enemy weapons—who can keep their forces flexible as well as reliable, and alert without being trigger happy.

For we live in a world where the principal problems are not susceptible of military solutions alone. The role of our military power today, in essence, is to free ourselves and our allies to pursue the goals of freedom without fear of enemy attack.

But we do not have a separate disarmament policy, and a separate foreign aid policy, all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together. Our goal is a coherent overall national security policy—one that truly serves the best interests of this country, and the interests of all freemen, and the interests of all who aspire to be free.

It is worth noting that among the two military problems most in the news today—the efforts of this country and its European allies to work out the difficult issues involved in a proper sharing of nuclear responsibilities and a proper balance between nuclear and nonnuclear forces—are both problems that cannot possibly be dealt with in narrow military terms alone.

Both require—on the part of military and civilian negotiators alike—great political wisdom and diplomatic skill as well as modern military knowledge.

The Federal Budget and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of all my colleagues in the Congress the very informative speech on "The Federal Budget and the National Economy" by the Director of the Budget, the Honorable Kermit Gordon, to the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16 in San Francisco.

In his lucid and enlightening speech, Mr. Gordon discusses two major questions in any examination of our Federal budgetary policy.

Whether we are using the Federal budget wisely to attain our Nation's goals of continued prosperity and of a satisfactory economic growth rate, and whether the Federal Government is spending too much.

Mr. Gordon's speech was called to my attention by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, and I would like to insert his thoughtful letter into the RECORD as an introduction to the text of Mr. Gordon's speech. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to introduce both Secretary Dillon's letter to me and Mr. Gordon's address into the RECORD.

Mr. Dillon's letter follows:

JUNE 7, 1963.

The Honorable HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HALE: As you requested, I am happy to send you a copy of the very excellent speech Director of the Budget Kermit Gordon made on May 16.

With logical analysis and a wealth of supporting detail he has cogently restated the two most significant facets of the President's overall financial plan. First, he has shown why tax reduction and revision in 1963 is the prime tool in the kit of measures to restore economic vitality and achieve an adequate rate of economic growth. Second, he has reiterated the hardheaded program of expenditure control that embodies the Government's determined commitment to prudent financial management.

I commend his speech to your careful study.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The text of Mr. Gordon's speech follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting, San Francisco, Calif.)

When I took office as Budget Director last December, my predecessor handed over to me the combination to the safe, a $98.8 billion budget for the next fiscal year, and his commitment to address the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16. In the intervening months we have made some changes both in the combination to the safe and to the 1964 budget, but I am pleased to say that the engagement with this society has remained inviolate.

I consider it a stroke of good fortune that my first speaking engagement outside of Washington should be with a distinguished organization of business budget officers. I have heard it said that only a man who has suffered the affliction himself can really understand the ordeal of a friend with a case of shingles. There must be a similar bond of compassionate understanding among budget officers. I can look at you and say to myself, "It's comforting to think that these people have probably lost as many friends as I have in the last 5 months." And you can look at me and say to yourselves, "No matter how many headaches are waiting for me when I get back to my desk, I'll still be lucky compared with this fellow."

With the reassuring knowledge that we are united in the bond of a common burden, let me turn to the subject of my talk. I want to examine the two major questions which people have in mind when they discuss and debate Federal budgetary policy. The first of these is the fiscal policy question: Are we using the Federal budget wisely to help achieve the broad economic goals of sustained prosperity and a satisfactory rate of economic growth? The second is the expenditure policy question: To put it in its bluntest form, is the Federal Government spending too much?

I. FISCAL POLICY

In the heat of public debate about spending, taxes, deficits, and debt, I think we sometimes lose sight of the fact that we have achieved in the United States a rather broad consensus in support of the idea that Federal budget policy should be designed to help compensate for inadequacies or excesses in private demand. Most of us, I think, will accept the idea that if total private and public demand for goods and services presses too hard on total supply, we will have inflation; that if demand falls considerably short of potential supply, we will have idle plants and idle workers; and that it makes sense to try to adjust the relationship between Government spending and taxes to help avoid both of these evils.

Those who doubt the existence of such a consensus should consider whether there would be much support today for the kind of policy we followed in 1932—given the same conditions. In 1932, you remember, the economy lay prostrate under the onslaught of the great depression. Real gross national product was 28 percent below the 1929 level, and nearly one worker in every four was unemployed. Because of the collapse in production and incomes, Federal revenues fell 50 percent from 1929 to 1932, and largely for this reason, the 1929 budget surplus turned into a 1932 deficit.

The Congress considered what it ought to do in the circumstances. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said on the floor of the House:

"Now, my friends, I want you and the country to gird yourselves with stamina, with backbone, and with courage to meet this emergency. All must make tremendous sacrifices. The budget must be balanced. To do it, additional taxes must be levied."

So Congress proceeded, in 1932, to raise income taxes. This action was in accordance with the prevailing doctrine of the period, which held that the only sound rule of fiscal policy was to try to balance the budget each year. Indeed, the conviction of Congress that it was doing the right thing was reinforced when it received a communication bearing the signatures of 62 faculty members of a great university urging an immediate increase in taxes. But the result, almost certainly, was to aggravate and deepen the depression. The fact that few people today would urge the same policy in the same circumstances is evidence that we are not as deeply split on the issues of fiscal policy as the temperature of the debate might suggest.

In saying this, I have no desire to paper over the many major differences of emphasis, attitude, and prescription which do exist; but I think it is useful, as we turn to an examination of our present economic problems, to recognize that we start from the common premise that Federal budgetary decisions should be made in the light of the needs of the economy.

What is the present state of our economy? If we look back only to the beginning of the year, we find reassuring signs of a quickening pace of economic advance, which gives promise of bearing out the more optimistic forecasts of GNP in 1963. If we look back further—to January 1961—we find a 28-month record of uneven, but sustained, economic expansion from a recession trough.

But if we look back as far as 1958, we find a more revealing and sobering picture. We find an economy that has been operating considerably below its potential for 5½ years. Even now, with more than 2 years of expansion behind us, we are producing at a rate $30 to $35 billion a year below our comfortable capacity; the average operating rate in manufacturing is perhaps 10 percent below the preferred rate; and more than 5½ percent of the labor force is unemployed.

Whether we look at total output, employment, or investment, the evidence of slowdown since 1957 is clear. In the postwar decade 1947-57, our total output rose at the brisk rate of about 4 percent a year; since 1957, our progress has slowed to 3 percent. In the postwar decade, unemployment averaged 4.3 percent of the labor force; since 1957 it has averaged 6 percent, and has not in any month fallen below 5 percent. From 1947 to 1957, private fixed investment averaged 11 percent of GNP; since 1957, it has fallen to an average rate of 9 percent.

A persistent gap has opened up between our achievement and our potential, and in many subtle ways we have been paying a high price for our lagging performance. Our growth rate compares unfavorably with that of most other industrialized countries. The overhang of idle capacity has dampened domestic investment incentives and has encouraged the flow of American capital abroad, with consequent strain on our balance of payments. High unemployment rates among our youth have bred discontent and frustration. Our chronically depressed areas have been denied the rejuvenating effects of a strong demand for labor, which would tend both to attract new industry to areas of labor surplus and to draw idle labor into more prosperous regions. Because of the absence of good alternative employment opportunities, many of our agricultural workers continue to earn low incomes and our underlying farm problem persists. In a stubborn effort to save their jobs, workers seek to institute restrictive work rules and to shorten the workweek; and some industries, in a similar effort to insulate themselves from the general economic climate, seek to price their goods so as to earn normal profits on subnormal volume.

The immediate cause of our unsatisfactory economic performance these last 5½ years is, in my opinion, inadequate total demand. We have simply not been able to sustain a rate of climb in demand sufficient to absorb our unemployed and put our idle capacity back to work. The effort to diagnose this condition has led to a search for remedies, and this search has led directly to our Federal tax system.

We are weighed down by the burden of an income tax system which, though modified somewhat, is still essentially the system we adopted to restrain excessive demand in wartime. Its power to extract income from the bank accounts of individuals and corporations is so great that the Federal budget would have shown a string of handsome surpluses rather than deficits in the years since 1957 if the economy had been operating close to full employment. We have been witnessing the paradoxical truth that tax rates set so high as to absorb an excessive proportion of full employment GNP will block the road to the achievement of full employment and will yield disappointingly low revenues. In the six budget documents submitted from January 1957 through 1962, a cumulative budget surplus of $8½ billion was forecast; yet the actual budget outcome was a cumulative deficit of $33 billion. In each year of the past six, revenue estimates were based on an expected resumption or continuation of brisk economic expansion—and in each year the dampening effects of the tax system helped to keep the estimate from being realized.

This, very briefly, is why we believe that the needs of our economy require a substantial further revision of our income tax system in 1963. I stress the need for further revision to remind you that tax changes instituted last year—the liberalization of depreciation rules and the enactment of the 7-percent investment tax credit—had the effect of reducing business tax liabilities by about $2½ billion a year and started us on our way toward the adoption of a growth-inducing tax system. You will remember that these tax changes were greeted skeptically by the business community when they were instituted; but the skepticism has melted in the presence of hard evidence that business investment this year is responding to the stimulus of these tax reforms.

The President's tax program which is now before the Congress has the following main elements:

1. Taxes are to be reduced by $10½ billion, in three stages, during 1963, 1964, and 1965.

2. The $10½ billion net cut is made up of $13½ billion of gross tax reduction offset by $3 billion of revenue-producing reforms. In turn, the $13½ billion gross reduction consists of roughly $11 billion in personal and $2½ billion in corporate taxes.

3. The top bracket rate of the individual income tax to be reduced from 91 to 65 percent and the lowest bracket rate from 20 to 14 percent.

The tax program has two major objectives: First, to provide a sizable increase in market demand by sharply reducing overall tax rates; and second, to provide a tax structure, through sharp cuts in top-bracket rates and reduction in corporate taxes, which will encourage increased risk-taking and a higher tempo of business investment. It is thus a program which will narrow the gap between performance and productive potential, while at the same time stimulating a more rapid growth in that potential itself. The President's tax proposals constitute the most important economic policy issue before the Congress this year, and I am glad to say that the prospects are bright for the enactment of a constructive and invigorating tax program.

But, many people ask, is this the right time to cut taxes? Rather than cutting taxes when we already have a big budget deficit, shouldn't we defer tax reduction until we have a surplus in the budget?

This is an important question, and it deserves a straight answer. The answer, in my opinion, has two parts:

First, I believe we are more likely to reach a balanced budget in the next few years if we cut taxes now than if we do nothing. If we fail to act, we risk a continuation of the experience of the last 5½ years—undercapacity operations and excessive unemployment. An economy operating at undercapacity is unlikely to generate the tax revenues needed to balance the budget. It is instructive to note that we have had budget surpluses six times since the war, and in every case save one the surplus has occurred in the setting of full employment. Our experience lends support to the view that it takes full employment to generate the revenues needed to balance the budget. If we cut taxes now, we will have a somewhat larger immediate deficit, but a better prospect for reducing and eliminating the deficit in the years ahead through the increase in tax revenues returned by an expanding economy.

Second, if we were by some chance to achieve a balanced budget without a tax cut, we would probably find that a tax cut in such circumstances would be badly timed. As we have seen, balanced budgets and full employment tend to go together. Unless a slump is in prospect, to cut taxes in a setting of full employment and high utilization of capacity is to court the danger of excessive demand and inflation.

Another main objection which is raised to tax reduction at this time stems from the fear that the immediate deficit associated with tax reduction will cause inflation. This is a legitimate concern; the American people fear inflation, and properly so. Moreover, there are times when a Government deficit will cause inflation: When demand is pressing against the limits of supply, a reduction in taxes or an increase in Government expenditures will tend to raise prices. But there is no alchemy by which deficits are automatically transmuted into price increases; it is the state of the economy which determines whether deficits will cause inflation. For example, we have deficits in five of the last six years, but our price level has been more stable than that of any other advanced industrial country with the exception of Canada. The reason, of course, is that at no time in this period have we had the pressure of excess demand. Although the President's tax program is designed to stimulate private demand, we do not believe that it will overstimulate demand and cause it to overtax capacity. Even if excess demand pressure should develop—though we think it most unlikely—the tools of monetary policy can be brought quickly into play to damp down the pressure.

Hence, whether one appeals to economic logic or to recent economic history, there is little basis for the fear that the President's tax program is inflationary. The opposite danger is greater—that failure to enact the tax program will leave us with the same set of economic ills which has troubled us for the last 5½ years and will increase our vulnerability to recession.

I do not mean to leave the implication that the President's tax program is the solution to all of our economic problems. I do believe, however, that the enactment of the program will help to create a climate of economic vitality and expansion in which many other problems—ranging from agriculture to automation—will be easier to solve.

II. EXPENDITURE POLICY

Now, I would like to turn to the expenditure policy question: Are we spending too much? Is fiscal responsibility dead in Washington? Is the budget out of control?

These are questions which trouble a good many thoughtful people, and they deserve a considered answer.

We can start by acknowledging the fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year:

"It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

In his 1960 budget message, President Eisenhower made the same point: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years * * *. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and take offs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. By the end of fiscal 1964—the budget for which we are now debating—there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our GNP has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program, which now takes 55 percent of our budget. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of supersonic planes, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent, and in 1963, 9 percent.

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national profit, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of GNP; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of GNP, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952, we had 1.6 Federal civilian Federal employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 1.4. Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every hundred people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5 billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase, indeed, more than the whole of the increase, is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964. In the process of putting together the 1964 budget, $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the assertion that the budget is "out of control." Just a week ago today, President Kennedy explicitly endorsed a statement of the Committee for Economic Development which said: "We believe that Federal expenditures should be made only when they are clearly more valuable than equal expenditures that could be made by individuals and business if equivalent income were left in their hands, or by State and local governments." And the President continued:

"I accept this standard and I am prepared to defend the expenditures proposed in my budget on this basis."

To sum up, I believe that this administration has proposed a fiscal policy which gives promise of restoring to the American economy the confidence and vitality which characterized our first postwar decade. And I believe that we have pursued a prudent expenditure policy which has responded to the urgent needs of national security and domestic well-being, but which has neither indulged in loose spending to give the economy a shot in the arm nor countenanced spending for the sake of spending. I am sure that we have erred in matters of detail, and I know that we can profit from informed and responsible criticism. But I believe that our budget policy is serving faithfully and constructively the interests of our national economy, our national security, and our national well-being.

Unemployment U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Howard K. Smith's TV program "News and Comment" is always a fine one, but I thought the program presented on Sunday, June 2, was particularly timely and of special interest to those of us now giving careful consideration to legislation designed to improve the unemployment situation existing today. I commend this script to my colleagues for their careful perusal in the event they missed the actual presentation:

UNEMPLOYMENT U.S.A.

The United States has the richest standard of living in the world—and it is still rising.

At the same time, the United States has the highest rate of unemployed, idle, unproductive humanity in the Western World—and that, too, may rise.

The eminent American economist, Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. Heilbroner. If all forces stay more or less as they are, including this most important force of a rising number of kids seeking jobs, we could very well have around 10 million unemployed people by 1970.

The man in charge, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz:

Secretary Wirtz. Unemployment is going to get worse and worse and worse. And the projection is quite clear, and what we have got to expect is it will go toward 6 percent and 7 percent within the next 2 or 3 years. That's if nothing is done.

The two biggest new categories of unemployed are young people and Negroes. Edward Washington, who belongs to both categories, admits boys like himself are ripe for trouble.

E. Washington. You would get into trouble with the police if you dropped out of school and can't find a job. These days boys around my age like to have clothes, and money and then that leads up to robbery.

Don Dixon. You mean if they can't get work?

E. Washington. Yes, sir.

Don Dixon. They'd get the money some other way?

E. Washington. Yes, sir.

Tonight, "News and Comment" on the causes—and the possible cures—of the spreading American cancer: unemployment.

Mr. Smith. Good evening. It is notoriously difficult to get the U.S. Congress to act on our national problems until after catastrophe has struck. The great depression of the thirties might have been avoided or mitigated had Congress faced its responsibilities in time. World War II, which killed more humans than any war in history, might have been avoided had Congress acknowledged and faced the problem of stopping Hitler while he was weak.

Today in the face of growing new problems, Congress is almost asleep. As a result there is no doubt that a new catastrophe is abuilding. What form it will take this time is not certain; but very possibly it will be a series of violent social explosions in the midst of our cities. The current rise of crime five times as fast as population—robberies, muggings, rapes—is the merest harbinger of bigger troubles to come.

As suggested in this cartoon by Herbert Block of the Hall Syndicate:

The detonator or fuse will be unemployment, idleness, national neglect of strong young restless Americans entering the work force but finding no jobs.

The way of intelligent behavior is to study a problem before it becomes one. So Reporter Don Dixon went out and interviewed 16-year-old Edward Washington, a polite, well-read young Negro school dropout who cannot find a job. Washington had not fallen victim to the bitterness growing among increasing numbers of idle youth, both Negro and white, but with frustration it can come.

Don Dixon. When did you leave school, Edward?

E. Washington. I left school in February of this year.

Don Dixon. Why?

E. Washington. Because I didn't feel that I had the proper clothes to wear like other boys had, you know, and I thought I would get out—come out of school and get me a job and get the clothes I want to wear to school.

Don Dixon. So, have you been able to get any kind of job at all since you left school?

E. Washington. No sir.

Don Dixon. What sort of work were you looking for?

E. Washington. A busboy. Some kind of domestic work like that.

Don Dixon. Is that what you would like to do? Why did you decide to go look for a busboy's work?

E. Washington. I decided to go look for a busboy job because in looking through the papers that was the only thing I seen in looking in the ads.

Don Dixon. What would you like to do? What sort of job would you like to get?

E. Washington. I would like to be a printer or something like that.

Don Dixon. Is there a demand here for printers do you know?

E. Washington. No, sir.

Don Dixon. Well, if you did get a job as a busboy, what sort of money does it pay?

E. Washington. It pays 25 a week. $25 a week.

Don Dixon. You can't very well live on that.

E. Washington. No, sir.

Mr. Smith. How big is the unemployment problem? Leading officials say when 2 percent are unemployed that, in fact, constitutes full employment and that should be our target.

Some economists say 3 percent is good enough, and we should aim at that less difficult figure of unemployed workers.

President Kennedy's economic advisers think we cannot quickly get down to that figure, and say getting it down to 4 percent unemployed is an interim goal.

In fact, unemployment today hovers around the figure just below 6 percent which everyone agrees is far too high.

And you heard experts predict that if things go on as at present, the figure will soon rise to 7 percent and more—a percentage that can grow to 10 million without work, nearly as many as in the great depression.

Why, in our increasingly rich Nation are increasing numbers condemned to the frustration of joblessness, a prospect that threatens us with social upheavals, with recessions and even with losing the competition with communism.

The simplest statement of why unemployment exists is our increasing productive industry does not distribute enough purchasing power for people to buy up all the increasing output of industry.

Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, once a professor of economics, thinks artificially high prices keep the public from buying enough of industry's output.

Senator Douglas. I think if we had a perfectly competitive economic system, that prices would be reduced to the point where there would be a sufficient quantity of goods and services demanded to employ 6½ or 7 percent who really are unemployed now. But instead of that, we have a high degree of monopoly, price agreements between firms, imperfect competition and cartels. And as a result, prices are kept up on stilts and the sum total of price tags on goods which are produced, or which could be produced is in excess of the sum total of monetary purchasing power in the pockets of people. So I would favor, as an immediate step, building purchasing power up to the level of prices.

Mr. Smith. William F. Butler is vice president of Chase Manhattan Bank. He puts the problem differently: lack of stimulation to the economy has caused growth to lag.

Mr. Butler. It seems to me that the basic cause has been the slowdown on our rate of overall economic growth after 1957. In this period our growth rate has been a little better than 2½ percent per annum and this is not a fast enough rate of growth to provide the number of jobs necessary to deal with the unemployment problem.

Mr. Smith. Leon Keyserling, who was President Truman's chief economic adviser: productivity has risen by automation much faster than purchasing power.

Mr. Keyserling. You have an increase in your productive power and your social prosperity has to increase fast enough to take up that increase in your productive power. What we have had in the past 2 years is a rate of growth that looks good, but only about half as high as the rate of growth needed to absorb the growing size of the labor force in view of the increasing technology in automation.

Mr. Smith. James Callaghan of the British Labor Party being groomed to run the British economy as Chancellor of the Exchequer sums up the causes of unemployment.

Mr. Callaghan. First of all you get changes in traditional industries, where industries decline and leave areas semi-abandoned and derelict. Secondly, you get the failure on the part of the Government to pick up sufficient purchasing power to put it into the hands of the people. I think that's a very important reason. And, thirdly, of course, you can get external problems that can infect your own domestic economy.

Mr. Smith. The cause of unemployment is lagging demand—not enough money to buy up goods at a time when automation is increasing the number of goods being turned out; this happening at a time when the number of people hunting jobs has suddenly leaped upward.

Economist Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. Heilbroner. It's the fact that the big bunchy baby boom has moved up and now bunches and bunches on the labor market, upon the colleges also, by the way. That creates a very special problem, and they are very important problems. There's a real chance that if we do not rev up our growth rate very considerably, that in 5 or 10 years we may face a level of unemployment that can only be called darned serious.

Mr. Smith. Unlike the foregoing speakers who are commentators on the problem, the man who has the problem is Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz. We asked him why unemployment currently is up.

Secretary Wirtz. Because there are so many more of us. Every day. Every year. In the last 12 months we have added over a million jobs—about a million jobs to the economy. So employment goes up and unemployment goes up too. That's the center of the problem. The postwar baby crop which busted out the walls of the schools is now hitting the work force. That, plus the effect of machines on the economy, represents a short answer to your question.

Mr. Smith. Now, why is it that we did so well from the war up to 1957 and relatively much less since 1957?

Secretary Wirtz. Well, when you say so well that the economy is moving along right now at a good rate in terms of gross national product and so on and so forth. But something that people forget is that the impact of automation on the economy came during those fifties, when the work force growth was low because of the war and the postponed effect from it. Now we are getting the confluence of both automation and the increase in the economy, so even though the economy as a whole is doing well in terms of full employment, we are not doing well.

Mr. Smith. How many jobs do we have to create each year?

Secretary Wirtz. We have to create for the next 4 or 5 years a million and a half new jobs each year to take care of new people coming into the work force. It's growing that fast. In addition to that, we have to create jobs to replace every job which a machine takes away. Now, that's a hard figure to arrive at, but it's running right now between 25,000 and 30,000 a week. And in addition to that, we have got to create jobs which will bring our present unemployment down from—oh, about 5½ percent to the figure 4, 3, 2, hopefully. The combination to these means the answer to your question. Something in the neighborhood of 2 million jobs a year for the next 4 or 5 years. It's a big order.

Mr. Smith. Now you have been quoted as saying that even though we don't have enough jobs to go around, the amount of work to be done in this Nation is tremendous and that we could use all the people we have if we would use them sensibly. What about that?

Secretary Wirtz. If we would set out to do the things we want to do in this country—some things in the private sector: pulling up the low incomes to the level they ought to be; some things in the public schools we ought to meet; the hospitals; get rid of the slums; we could have a manpower shortage in this country very easily, if we set out to do the things we can do, want to do, and a good many of them we will do. That's where the answer will come.

Mr. Smith. The problem of getting enough purchasing power to the people to stimulate industry to employ more people is crucial. In America in the depression thirties, unemployment remained high because with all the Government spending, not enough was spent.

In America after World War II the situation was the opposite. War put a stored up purchasing power equal to a hundred and fifty billion dollars in Americans' pockets, and they spent it. Also, rising expenditures of the Marshall plan and the cold war injected more purchasing power. The result was a period of full employment.

The year 1957 is the year the postwar boom is considered to have ended. Surplus purchasing power was used up. Defense spending continued to rise but it went no longer into industries turning out masses of weapons and employing millions of workers; it went into new weapons requiring fewer high-paid workers. Also, to reduce rising labor costs, industries automated at a furious rate, reducing the need for manpower. And now the postwar baby crop is coming of age, demanding more jobs faster.

To illustrate the problem: this is a schematic oversimplified design of how the economy works:

One, the consumer buys goods;

Two, the store then orders more goods from the factory; and

Three, the factory invests in increasing its plant in order to make more goods; this employs more workers and puts money into hands of consumers.

But now, the new plant is automated and employs fewer people, distributing less money. Flow of dollars, once swift, from consumer to store, now slows down too.

The store orders less from the factory.

The plant cuts down on its production, causing unemployment.

The debate about what we should do involves dissension about where we should restimulate the flow. Robert Heilbroner thinks the flow should be stimulated at the investment point:

Mr. Heilbroner. Today if you had to put your finger on the buyer in the economy who is not so much the consumer, it is business. Business buys for capital expansion.

Business is buying new plants, new buildings, new machinery. That's the sector which is, in a sense buoyant enough, but disappointing. It could be higher.

Mr. BUTLER. The problem in our economy for 6 or 7 years has not been a lag in Government spending. Government spending has been going up 6 percent for a year on the average. The lag has been in business investment in new plants and equipment. The investment that provides new and better machinery and thus supports the creation of new jobs. Such investment if not increased in this 7-year period has been steady. Our problem is to provide the incentives, the encouragement to increase investment in new plants and equipment and thus achieve real and lasting prosperity.

Mr. SMITH. Economist Leon Keyserling disagrees. He thinks the stimulus should be aimed directly into the pockets of consumers.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The reason business isn't investing still more is that they do not foresee enough more demand for their products to invest even more rapidly than they are in the building of plants and equipment. Therefore, the whole concentration of stimulatory policy, in my view, should be on the expansion of consumption, demand for other products. That takes two forms: consumption among 180-odd million American people, privately, and consumption by Government—public spending—of the things that a nation needs and can't get privately.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would say that the remedy is to raise purchasing power to the level of prices. This does mean an increase in the national debt, because it would be effected either by cutting taxes without commensurately cutting expenditures or choking off private demand through curtailing credit, or by a public works program. In either case what you do is put an injection of monetary purchasing power into the economy to build up total demand.

Mr. SMITH. The President's plan is aimed to please both those who want him to stimulate investors, and those who want him to stimulate the consumers. His plan is a tax cut and a tax reform that will give both investors and consumers more money to spend. Like many plans aimed to please everybody, it may please none.

We asked the investor's man, William Butler, if the President's plan will solve our problems:

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not believe it will. It seems to me that the President's tax program is spread out over too long a period—3 years or longer in the case of the corporate tax—and this dilutes its impact so that it will not do the necessary job.

Mr. SMITH. Keyserling, who prefers to stimulate the consumer:

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think the tax program itself will do very much to help this problem. First, because it is too small. Second, because I think it isn't distributed in a way that will maximize its effectiveness. And third, because I think many other things besides taxation are even more important than tax reduction to deal with this unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. We have never hesitated taking stands on this program and won't hesitate now. I think Mr. Keyserling is right. The economy is sluggish and doesn't provide enough employment for people because about one-fifth of Americans live in poverty and haven't enough purchasing power to give the economy the stimulation it needs. The logical thing to do would be not to have a feeble tax cut to benefit well-off people who don't need it. The logical thing would be more Government spending to get money to the bottom one-fifth of Americans, spending on their sadly neglected education, on replacing their slums with decent neighborhoods, and so on.

However, even the President's rather weak tax cut is getting nowhere in Congress. What is it that impedes action to cure what the President has called our No. 1 domestic problem—unemployment?

The tendency of unemployment to rise amid our great wealth can only be halted and reversed by vigorous action, especially by Government spending which will no doubt increase our deficit. There is a deep-rooted and wrong American prejudice against Government spending and deficits. Almost every modern American President has deferred to that prejudice with calamitous results.

In the early thirties, President Hoover thought that restricted Government spending would bring prosperity just around the corner. In fact, it deepened depression.

It is easy to forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt's winning campaign in 1932 was that he would balance the budget and restrict Government expenditure. He became famous for doing the opposite, but not enough to end the depression.

In the 1952 campaign, Eisenhower promised one thing—to balance the budget. In office he failed to do that 5 years out of 8, and created the biggest peacetime deficit in our history, but in trying to obey the myth presided over a series of recessions.

Kennedy's key campaign promise was to get the economy moving. He has not notably succeeded, and that is greatly due to not facing the need for much more Government expenditure.

British Politician James Callaghan offers an apt comment on deficit spending.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. We show a deficit you know. But by altering the way which we made up our accounts we could show a profit if we wanted to. And we do confuse, I think, capital items with revenue items. Where's the profit when you put in a sewage scheme or when you build a school? There isn't any but it shows a deficit. And yet these are capital items which are going to yield a return, although not a direct financial return.

We are altering our system of accounts in Britain because we want to make this more clear. We've been held up to the world as running very heavy deficits. By altering the accounts we needn't alter our policy. We will just look better. This is absurd you know, really, and I do think we've got to be very careful not to become the prisoners of words on this question of deficit financing.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think in connection with these programs we propose—the Manpower Development Training Program, a better education program, a youth employment act, ,that kind of thing—we are told that the cost is such that we can't afford it. I wish I could someway get across the idea that it would cost us today—does cost today—just in round figures about a thousand dollars to retrain a man, to salvage a boy or girl who would otherwise go into the slag heap, about a thousand dollars. That boy or girl will represent a cost to this economy of this country of about a thousand dollars a year if we don't train him or her.

The economics someway get out of joint. When I hear about the concern of passing debts on to the next generation, my reaction is that the worst possible debt we could pass on to the next generation is a boy or girl who is untrained and who is going to cost the next generation $1,000 or more a year. That is the debt we can't pass on. The thing that we can't get across, apparently, is that a good many of the things we do as a Government are the kind of things companies do as companies; they invest in the future. And the investment cost should not be charged against our present concept of expenditures.

If we could get across the idea that when we train a person, put $1,000 into the education of a person, it is an investment for the future. When we build a park, when we build a highway, when we build a school, when we build a hospital, those things are investments for the future and shouldn't be charged against the present. It's not just a matter of deficit spending. It's a drawing of the distinction between immediate out-of-pocket costs and the investment thing. I agree, in principle, with what is suggested. I think it would be better if it were put in terms which got away from the idea of deficit spending. That's an oversimplification.

Mr. SMITH. We asked Secretary Wirtz, Will we get full employment back?

Secretary WIRTZ. That's a question the American public will have to answer. My answer to it is that we can get it down there. It takes the decision to do the things we want to do. But I'm talking, not—I'm talking hard business sense. If we do set out to do these things, if we develop a tax program, a manpower program and do these things we want to do, I think it can be moved down past the 4 percent, 3 percent, toward the 2 percent which is probably the ultimate limit because there are always people moving from one job to another and there are always a few who can't be employed. I think it is a practical target to shoot for 3 percent and a 2 percent.

Mr. SMITH. Some friendly advice from British politician Callaghan.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. I think yours is a tough problem. I think you have got to educate. Could I make one general plea: that we shouldn't, any of us, allow ourselves to become the prisoners of words and of old-fashioned ideas no matter what they are. The real test is how are we going to make human beings live and fulfill all their values and all of the qualities of which they are capable? And we ought, if we find our ideas are destroying human beings and their right to survive, then we ought to be willing to put those ideas on one side.

Mr. SMITH. We have nothing to add that will improve on that. Good night.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate amendment to last year's War Claims Act was briefly before the House on May 14, 1963, many Members felt that it should not be brought up as a rider to the supplemental appropriations bill, but should be considered in connection with legislation reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. It will shortly come before the House in that manner as a result of the action of the Senate in adding it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, H.R. 5207. It is now before a conference committee.

The Senate amendment changes last year's act—Public Law 87-616—by providing that any further payments shall go to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants. It was adopted as a result of disclosures before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its investigation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—printed hearing of April 18, 1963.

Supporters of the Senate amendment believe that the disclosures in the Senate investigation compel such a change in the 1962 act. They contend that the Senate investigation disclosed that the activities of lobbyists and others having a personal interest in further payments to private claimants were largely responsible for nurturing and gradually building up an impression both in the Philippines and in the United States that the 1946 act resulted in a moral obligation to pay private claimants the full 75 percent of their approved claims; that there was no such moral obligation; that in this and other ways the lobbyists stirred up a demand for further payment of war damages to private claimants.

They contend that the above activities were much more than ordinary lobbying, and amounted to international blackmail. They contend that but for these and other activities and deceptions, the Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed; that is, with provision for payments to private claimants; that the proper remedy is to adopt the Senate amendment; and that this amendment would be the most effective way of cutting off the payment of further fees to the lobbyists, would prevent windfalls to large private claimants, and would accomplish more nearly the purposes of the original act of 1946, which was to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

The first question is as to what the activities of the lobbyists and their confederates actually were.

ACTIVITIES OF LOBBYISTS

Correspondence between Mr. O'Donnell in the United States and Mr. Delgado in the Philippines reveals the extent of their activities in stirring up a demand for further payments of war damages to private claimants. This correspondence was produced under subpena during investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—hearing April 18, 1963.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado had both been members of the Philippine War Damage Commission which adjudicated claims under the 1946 act. Mr. Delgado was the Filipino member. He was a man of large influence in the Philippines, and close to the Government. He had served as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines in Washington, as justice of the Philippine Court of Appeals, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Philippines Senate, as a Permanent Delegate for the Philippines to the General Assembly of the U.N.

I quote from this correspondence as follows:

January 13, 1952, letter to Francisco A. Delgado: "I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. * * * I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and get the ball rolling."

February 9, 1952, letter to Delgado: "This is in response to your letter of January 22, requesting a copy of a list of about 120,000 claimants which matter you have referred to Mr. Charles. I regret that I have been unsuccessful in procuring these names. In connection with the war damage claimants, I discussed this matter thoroughly with Ambassador Romulo, who feels that if the final 22½ percent is to be realized, it can be accomplished, if at all, from this Congress. I know that the Ambassador will give us unqualified support in such an endeavor. It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

January 18, 1954, letter to Delgado: "Considering Magsaysay's popularity here, it would be my recommendation at this time that you work toward Magsaysay making a request upon our Government for this 22½ percent which has been promised as a matter of law. All of these actions, together with our work here, can keep this proposed legislation in the limelight and ready to move at the appropriate time."

October 31, 1955, letter to Delgado: "Insofar as Mr. Miller is concerned, you and I know that we used his services to keep the war damage legislation alive. He is one of the few who were left who were members of the Insular Affairs Committee that passed the original act and, perforce, he has great standing in the House * * *. I am at a loss to understand the action you report of others in endeavoring to interject other lobbyists into this picture * * *. I have worked for 4 years meeting with Members of the House and Senate on this proposed legislation * * *. Any deviation from this program I believe would be fatal."

May 7, 1957, letter to Delgado: "The climate here has been greatly improved insofar as the Philippines is concerned. Accordingly, I am having Congressman Miller reintroduce the war damage bill, which he will do within the next few days. A copy of his statement is enclosed herewith for your information."

March 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "All in all, I believe that our next effort to obtain the actual passage of a law directing the payment of the balance of the war damage awards has a better chance than at any time during the period of our efforts to keep the subject alive by the introduction of bills in each Congress as it convenes * * *. What concerns me now is our position in the picture * * *. The only chance for legal counsel to be compensated for the efforts resulting in the legislation is through an advance arrangement with the major claimants * * *. I think we should get our ducks in a row at this time * * *. I [shall] proceed after you have made the arrangements aforesaid to adopt a definite plan of action in which I shall outline the part to be played by the claimants and possibly Government officials in promoting the legislation on a vigorous scale in the Congress."

May 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "I am very much interested, indeed, in having the sugar companies which you enumerate as well as any other who might want to join, sign retainer contracts which will assure us of a position in the legislative picture as well as compensation if our efforts should meet with ultimate success."

January 27, 1959, to Jose Romero (Philippine Sugar Association): "As I advised you in my cable, unfortunately Congressman ZABLOCKI left Monday heading a congressional delegation to the funeral of the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman Gordon, of Illinois. As you know, he is most friendly and as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be the natural one to introduce our bill. In this Mr. Miller and Majority Leader MCCORMACK agreed. On the other hand, the Ambassador I know was very anxious to have this bill introduced while he was in the Philippines—thus my cable to you."

February 9, 1959, memorandum to Romero: "As I cabled you, ZABLOCKI wanted to wait until his subcommittee conferred with Bohlen in executive session next week before introducing our bill, but since Congress was adjourning for Lincoln's Birthday, I prevailed upon him to do it today. Miller introduced a bill simultaneously.

"The enclosed editorial from the New York Times of the 8th is very good and very timely. I hurriedly changed ZABLOCKI's introductory speech to accompany the bill, copies of which are enclosed, using the editorial to advantage."

February 10, 1959, letter to Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo: "Enclosed herewith please find a copy of H.R. 4311, introduced by Congressman ZABLOCKI, together with an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9.

"The delay in the introduction of this bill was occasioned by the fact that the Congressman and I had to do much research with respect to the amount and other details of which you are only too familiar before embarking on this program."

February 9, 1960, cable to Don Manolo Elizalde, Philippine Sugar Association: "Interests of members the sugar association and all war damage claimants are greatly impaired by demands for direct payment of balance of $73 million to Philippine Government and reported insistence of Philippine Foreign Secretary on payment of 100 percent, amounting to more than $150 million plus expenses of administration. Members of Congress, who for years have favored appropriation for completing unpaid balances of war damages to claimants, are now vehement in refusal to participate in what appears to be political struggle among factions in your country and with United States * * *. Many Congressmen on the committee hearing our bills have publicly stated that irrespective of reported position of our State Department favoring same they will not vote for legislation to pay war damage funds in any amount to Philippine Government instead of claimants directly as originally intended. I strongly urge you and your association to advise your Government to take immediate realistic stand in support of Zablocki-Miller bills."

November 13, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "The proponent of the bill (ZABLOCKI) with whom the counsel for the Philippine Sugar Association has been and is in constant communication gave complete and conclusive answers to the arguments (before the House Rules Committee), but it was apparent that the congestion of the committee's calendar and the importance of some administration legislation, such as that providing for a Peace Corps, did not permit the members of the Rules Committee to give adequate consideration to these replies."

August 4, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "It is anticipated that the war damage bill will be reported out favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Wednesday.

"In order to speed up its consideration I had today in the Senate introduced a similar bill by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic whip and a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As soon as this bill is printed copies will be forwarded to you. Attached herewith is Mr. HUMPHREY's statement as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1961."

It is clear from this correspondence that the activities of Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado went far beyond ordinary lobbying. As a result of their experience on the Philippine War Damage Commission, they saw the possibilities of earning large legal fees if legislation were passed to provide further payments to private claimants. They embarked on a broad scheme with ramifications in the United States and in the Philippines to bring about such legislation.

It has even been charged that the cancellation by the President of the Philippines of his trip to the United States after the House defeated the Philippine claims bill on May 9, 1962, was part of a contrived scheme intended to point up the Philippine contention that the United States owed the money.

The correspondence quoted above justifies the charge that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the 1962 act was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

MORAL OBLIGATION

The question whether there really was a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants goes to the heart of the Senate amendment, as that amendment cuts off such further payments, and in adopting it the Senate denied any such moral obligation. The adoption by the Senate of that amendment implies that the evidence presented to show that the alleged obligation was a "promise," a "debt," a "legal obligation," was misleading, and based in part on reprehensible activities and undisclosed personal interests.

The question of moral obligation should be reexamined by the House in the light of the recent disclosures. In reexamining that question, the starting point must be the provisions of the 1946 act.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 authorized the appropriation of $400 million, and authorized the Philippine War Damage Commission "to make compensation to the extent hereafter provided on account of physical loss or destruction of or damage to property in the Philippines occurring after December 7, 1941, and before October 1, 1945, as a result of various war activities, including enemy attack, action by the Armed Forces of the United States, and looting and pillage." It then provided—section 102:

> In case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to any one claimant under the foregoing provisions exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of the claims approved in favor of such claimant shall be reduced by 25 per centum of the excess over $500.

The Commission was given discretion to make immediate payment of claims under $500, and the first $500 of larger claims, and a proportion of the remainder, due consideration have been given to total funds available for distribution. The act then provided:

> After the time for filing claims has expired, the Commission shall determine the amount of money available for the further payment of claims. Such funds shall be applied pro rata toward the payment of the unpaid balances of the amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 of this title.

What this somewhat complicated language amounts to was that $400 million was to be disbursed by first paying claims under $500 in full, and the first $500 of other claims, and the balance of the money was then to be used pro rata in payment of larger claims up to 75 percent. The money was sufficient to pay them only up to 52½ percent.

Any fair appraisal of the committee hearings and reports would indicate that the primary intent of the act was to provide for the disbursement of $400 million, and that there was no intention to create an obligation to pay up to 75 percent.

The whole emphasis of the 1946 act was on rehabilitation of the Philippine economy, and the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated:

> The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individual or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the Nation.

Contemporaneous evidence indicates that the 1946 act did not create an obligation to make further payments beyond the original $400 million. The much-respected Bell mission to the Philippines of 1950 felt that the 1946 act imposed no such obligation, as it recommended:

> That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals.

Since then over $1.5 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines, and Philippine people are drawing $80 million a year in benefits from the Veterans' Administration for widows and other beneficiaries.

Other contemporaneous evidence is the failure of the Foreign Affairs Committee to report out a bill on which it conducted hearings in 1950 to authorize further funds in order to bring payment of Philippine war claims up to 75 percent. The committee must have felt that its action only 4 years before had not resulted in any obligation to make these further payments.

Other contemporaneous evidence indicated that there was general appreciation in the Philippines of the payments made under the 1946 act, and that there was little demand for further payments until that demand was stirred up by lobbyists.

Our Government in 1959 concluded that there was no obligation to make further payments to private claimants. Mr. Dillon, then Under Secretary of State, testified to this effect on February 25, 1960, before a Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Part of his testimony was quoted by the subcommittee chairman at page 7041 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 30, 1963, but other parts are also material.

He said that President Garcia on his visit to the United States in June 1958 discussed with him the settlement of 19 Philippine claims against the United States, 1 of which was for "additional war damages." Mr. Dillon testified:

> We do not think that there is any legal obligation to do this. We think that the appropriation of the original $400 million at that time was a complete act.

He went on to explain, however, that the circumstances were such that there could have been misunderstanding about this, and that when the Philippine Government made a series of claims, "we felt this one had certain merits and that we should in all justice ask for appropriation of enough money to take care of it."

In August 1959 the administration agreed upon a settlement with the Philippine Government under which the United States would pay $73 million to the Philippine Government, subject, however, to a setoff of a United States claim against the Philippines of about $20 million. This $20 million was in fact paid April 10, 1961—Foreign Relations Committee hearing June 12, 1962, page 20.

Mr. Dillon wrote to Speaker Rayburn on March 3, 1960, recommending legislation to carry out this settlement, submitting a draft bill, and saying:

> The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippines War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, however, reported in June 1960 a bill—H.R. 12078—providing for further payments to private claimants. That bill was not reported out of the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee in August 1961 reported a similar bill—H.R. 8617. This was defeated in the House on May 9, 1962, but the House subsequently passed another similar bill—H.R. 11721—which became Public Law 87-616.

The above facts, and particularly the contemporaneous evidence, are persuasive in showing that there was no moral obligation to pay approved claims up to the full 75 percent.

The Senate investigation has shown that the claim that there was a moral obligation was largely promoted and contrived by lobbyists and others having a personal interest. These same people spearheaded the testimony before the committees of Congress in support of the alleged moral obligation, without disclosing their personal interest.

It is true that there were some members of the 1946 committee who wanted to provide for payment of the full 75 percent, and much has been made of their statements. But the hearings, reports, and debates of 1946 show that the majority of the committee did not go along with them.

The vote of the Senate on May 1, 1963, of 58-26 to pass the amendment to the 1962 act was in effect a vote that there was no moral obligation. Members should read what was said then, and what was said when the question came up again on May 23, 1963.

THE HOUSE SHOULD ADOPT THE SENATE AMENDMENT

From the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists, and as to the nonexistence of a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, it is clear that if the recently disclosed facts had been known to the House in 1962, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed; that is, with provision for payments to private claimants.

If so, the proper remedy is to amend the act in the manner provided for in the Senate amendment. It will be asked why, in view of all of the above facts, the proper remedy would not be to rescind the 1962 appropriation and not pay the money even to the Philippine Government. A motion was made in the Senate on May 23, 1963, to bring about this result, but was defeated 45-22.

The reason why the $73 million should be paid to the Philippine Government is that our Government agreed with the Philippine Government in 1959 upon such a settlement. Mr. Dillon's testimony on this subject was discussed above in considering the question of moral obligations and the fact that this settlement denied any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants.

It was there pointed out that Mr. Dillon testified that the Philippine claim for additional war damages was brought forward by President Garcia in 1958, that the administration then felt that the 1946 act might have given cause for misunderstanding, and that it was desirable to settle the issue.

It is not relevant to wonder whether, if the facts since disclosed had then been known, this settlement would have been made. However that may be, our relations with the Philippines on this subject have progressed to the point where it would be highly undesirable to rescind the 1962 appropriation entirely.

If the $73 million is paid in a lump sum to the Philippine Government, that Government will receive it without strings, and can use it either for payment to claimants, or for economic rehabilitation, or in such other manner as it deems fit. Such a result will fulfill more closely the purposes of the 1946 act than would the payment of huge windfalls to private claimants, which would result if the Senate amendment is not adopted. And our Government could properly take this $73 million into consideration in making further provision of economic or other aid to the Philippines.

Senator Sparkman has strongly confirmed the statement made above that Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed had the facts since disclosed been known at that time. He presided over the Foreign Relations Committee during practically all of its hearings on the 1962 act. The committee had before it bills for further payments to private claimants and for a payment directly to the Philippine Government. He stated that had he known the facts which have since been disclosed:

> I certainly would not have voted for that bill (the payment to private claimants). I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1963, p. 7581.)

The Senate acceded to this view and passed its amendment providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government on May 1, 1963 by a vote of 58-26. On May 23 it again passed the same amendment, attaching it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, this time on a voice vote.

CONCLUSION

In view of the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists and as to the nonexistence of any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, the House should certainly not approve further payment to private claimants which would confirm the results secured by the reprehensible activities which have been disclosed.

Those disclosures indicate that passage of the 1962 act was secured as a result of a broad scheme, international in scope, pursued by devious methods. There is still time to undo the results so achieved by passing the Senate amendment. Merely cutting off further fees to lobbyists is an insufficient remedy. House Members should not place themselves in the position of confirming the results secured by the lobbyists by the means which have now been disclosed.

The House should accept the Senate amendment.

U.S. Flag Symbolizes National Heritage and Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is June 14. No day is better for an American to pause and reflect on those matters of serious import to him as an individual and as a citizen-member of that great Nation, the United States of America.

With all our national traits of exuberance and enthusiasm, our acceptance of the need for struggle and hard work to accomplish our personal and national goals, we all too seldom take time out to recapitulate all the glories of American citizenship. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Flag Day gives us all an opportunity to pay homage to our great tradition and to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of our highest aspirations and ideals.

No nation's flag is merely a handful of gaily colored bunting. It may seem to be that, but it is much more. As Henry Ward Beecher said:

> A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truth, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficient for all Americans to recognize and celebrate Flag Day with appropriate ceremony. True patriotism demands daily recognition of the continuing symbolic importance of our flag. Do we display the flag on all prescribed occasions? Do we conform to the regulations protecting it? Are we alert to failures to so do? These are some of the many questions we should ask ourselves.

It is one of the basic guarantees of citizenship that a citizen of the United States, acting solely as an individual, has the privilege and duty to exert a responsible role in demanding for the U.S. flag the honor and protection it deserves. That such individual initiative may win desirable community action is best illustrated by a recent incident in Dade County, Fla.

Due to the increasing number of polling places, some of them temporary, there has been somewhat of a problem in always procuring proper display of the flag. We realize, Mr. Speaker, that Public Law 829, 77th Congress, section (f) declares:

> The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near every polling place on election day.

This legislation sets up criteria for the displaying and treatment of our flag and leaves it up to the proper local officials to voluntarily conform.

Many citizens probably made passing note of the absence of the flag, but failed to follow the matter further. It was left to a constituent of the Fourth District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent, to implement his deep feeling that the symbolism of the U.S. flag and the precious freedoms alined to it never can be too often brought to our attention and granted our support and respect.

I am speaking of Mr. Norman R. Kirk, of Miami, Fla. He made it his business to notify the authorities of Dade County and his Congressman of the oversight in displaying of the flag. As a result of his protest and further inquiry by me, I am proud to state that County Manager Irving C. McNayr, of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., has authorized the purchase of flags for every polling place in Dade County, and our Nation's flag should be flying there at the next election.

The simple sincerity of Mr. Kirk's words expresses so well every citizen's feeling about the U.S. flag that I wish to share them with my colleagues. The following vital excerpts from his letter are his plea:

> I am a retired naval officer with 30 years' service. Our flag has been my inspiration for many years, and as my years diminish, I am proud to bask in its security, stature, strength, and prestige.
>
> My letter brings me to this point: when I voted last November the American flag was noticeably missing. I contacted the Miami Herald; a flag was procured for that polling place by midafternoon, through what channels I do not know.
>
> Last month (February 1963), at my voting precinct, again no flag. * * * Again on March 12, 1963, I went to vote, again no flag.
>
> So, I am requesting, if no law presently exists covering this act, that one be enacted making it compulsory to display an American flag at all polling places in Dade County.
>
> I have spent too many of my years assisting in the preservation of our flag to find it missing at the very initial basis of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we may well conclude our remarks with the reminder that the American flag was bought at the price of dedication by generations of citizens, by a lifetime of service by members of our Armed Forces, such as Norman R. Kirk, and by the supreme sacrifice of the lives of many true patriots. Let us then, on Flag Day and all other days, render to it the reverence and homage which it deserves.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, in this valley of decision in which all men stand, endue with Thy wisdom our fallible minds. Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom.

Thou knowest that we desire nothing for ourselves that we do not crave for all mankind—a chance to be freemen. In the midst of deliberations that concern fearful forces—which, if not harnessed by mutual good sense and good will, may utterly destroy—give us powers of discernment great enough that the keys of new power may be used to open doors of plenty and of more abundant life for those in our own land and those in lands under all skies whose lot is meager and hard.

Yet, no matter how fearful the cost, may no awesome threat cause us to shrink from taking our full part in preventing serfdom from dominating the earth.

May a constant sense of the eternal save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR YEAR 1963

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Army National Guard construction program for the year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of April 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXTENSIVE USE OF FIRST-CLASS AIR ACCOMMODATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extensive use of first-class air accommodations, District of Columbia government, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS TO FORMER FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unemployment compensation payments to former Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen for more than 1 benefit year based upon only one termination of employment, Department of Labor, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTION OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM LOAN REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

A letter fom the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), to provide that distribution system loan repayment contracts may be executed contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FURTHER COMPENSATION TO MRS. JOHNSON BRADLEY FOR CERTAIN LAND IN VILLAGE OF ODANAH, WIS.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the Village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PETITIONS TO CLASSIFY STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on petitions to classify the status of certain aliens for first preference under the quota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION (b) OF SECTION 109, TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DESIGN STANDARDS FOR THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (b) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, relating to design standards for the Interstate System (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"Joint resolution relative to Federal in lieu payments

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized that it is the obligation of the Government of the United States to make payments to counties in lieu of taxes for lands administered by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management; and

"Whereas the Forest Service Act of 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) specified that 25 percent of all moneys received from each national forest during any fiscal year should be paid at the end of the year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and the public roads of the county or counties in which the national forest is situated; and

"Whereas several laws specify that a certain percentage of the money received from grazing fees on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management shall be allocated to the counties in which the land is located; and

"Whereas amendment to the laws have allowed the Forest Service and the Bureau of

Land Management to deduct many items from the gross income of the land which they administer, and that particularly in the last 10 years the amount of the deductions has increased at an alarming rate; and

"Whereas the sale price of timber administered by the U.S. Forest Service does not include the cost of access road construction, slash disposal, or Knutson-Vandenberg Act deposits, all of which are part of the actual gross value and income; and

"Whereas this has caused a reduction in the amounts paid in lieu of taxes to the point where now many counties with Federal lands administered by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management are receiving less than one-quarter the amount in lieu of taxes that is received in taxes from private lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the President and the Congress of the United States are requested to amend the present laws so that counties will henceforth receive a statutory percentage of the actual gross rather than a statutory percentage of the net income of the moneys received from lands administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Secretary of Interior."

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to extension of the service area for the Sacramento Valley Canal

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1950 authorized the construction of the Tehama-Colusa Canal and the associated Red Bluff Diversion Dam by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and

"Whereas construction of the Red Bluff Diversion Dam is currently underway and reconstruction financing has been provided for the Tehama-Colusa Canal commencing at the diversion dam and traversing the west side of the Sacramento Valley through Tehama, Glenn, and Colusa Counties and terminating on Bird Creek in the northern portion of Yolo County; and

"Whereas the need for additional water supplies on the west side of the Secramento Valley is acute in many areas and this need is not limited to the presently defined service areas of the Tehama-Colusa Canal and feasible proposals have been made for the extension of this canal system to provide service to Yolo and Solano Counties where a need for supplementary water supplies has been adequately demonstrated to the point that existing sources and all reasonably feasible potential sources are required to meet long-range deficiencies; and

"Whereas the extension of this system to service Yolo and Solano Counties would make possible exchanges of water from other developed projects to furnish supplies to Napa and Lake Counties which are seriously in need of such sources of supplementary water; and

"Whereas the Honorable Clair Engle, U.S. Senator, has introduced S. 785 in the current session of the Congress, and companion bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives, which would extend the service area of this project to include Yolo and Solano Counties and envision the increase in capacity of the currently authorized Tehama-Colusa Canal and its extension to Lake Solano and Putah Creek or beyond as may be determined feasible, and the construction of certain supplementary works, and to redesignate the project as the Sacramento Valley Canal: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Honorable Clair Engle is commended for the leadership which he has shown in seeking solutions to the water problems of the west side of the Sacramento Valley, as well as other parts of this State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact S. 785, or its companion measures in the House of Representatives, introduced at the current session of the Congress, and that the President of the United States is urged to approve such legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF CROTON-ON-HUDSON, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the village of Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y., relating to civil rights.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the inspired words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence assert that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness"; and

Whereas the year 1963 marks the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation; and

Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States dictates that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws"; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 nullified the doctrine of separate but equal facilities; and

Whereas in the past 8 years there has been insufficient progress made in the integration of public facilities; and

Whereas certain States still practice segregation of the white and Negro races and enforce laws providing for such segregation which are repugnant to the equal rights provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the conscience of the American people; and

Whereas the practice of segregation has given and continues to give aid and comfort to the Communist enemies of our American democracy; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that local efforts are underway to collect funds for financing private civil rights actions in those States and while we do not wish to discourage such efforts, we believe that no citizen should be forced to beg, petition, or bring legal action at private expense to enjoy the civil rights that are the birthright of all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the board of trustees of the village of Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y., petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would empower the Attorney General of the United States to go to court on his own to enjoin those who practice or enforce segregation laws; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senators Javits and Keating, and Congressman Barry.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1693. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of Jocelyne Gennevois; and

S. 1695. A bill for the relief of Jennie Gambaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1696. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Hart, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Church, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Javits, Mr. McGee, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Inouye):

S. 1697. A bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1698. A bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1699. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission; and

S. 1700. A bill to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act with respect to the issuance of securities for the construction, acquisition, or operation of pipeline facilities; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Delma S. Pozas; and

S. 1702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. Dominick):

S. 1703. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. Aiken):

S. 1704. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the Federal share payable to certain States on account of Interstate System projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "PACIFICA FOUNDATION"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 157); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, four thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the hearings on "Pacifica Foundation," issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 158); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Civil Defense (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") consisting of five Members of the Senate, of whom three shall be members of the majority party and two shall be members of the minority party. Members and the chairman thereof shall be selected in the same manner as members and chairmen of standing committees of the Senate are selected. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(b) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate. A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(c) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

(d) The committee shall cease to exist on December 31, 1964.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation with respect to—

(1) the nature and extent of the problems involved in the protection of the civilian population of the United States from hazards incident to enemy attack in time of war;

(2) the extent to which effective solutions for such problems have been provided by programs adopted under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 and other existing legislation;

(3) the effectiveness of present organizational structures and operational methods of Federal, State, and local agencies charged with civil defense responsibilities;

(4) the extent to which those structures and methods employ with maximum effectiveness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation for the solution of those problems; and

(5) legislative and other means whereby existing civil defense programs and organizations can be improved to provide more adequate protection for the civilian population of the United States from the hazards resulting from enemy attack in time of war.

(b) On or before December 31, 1964, the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of problems of civil defense.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Supenas may be issued by the committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, TO ELIMINATE STATUTORY REQUIREMENT AFFORDING EQUAL TIME BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office.

There is today no longer any need to impose upon the radio and television broadcasting industry the provision of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, which requires broadcasters to give equal time on their networks and stations to all candidates for any given office.

The provision was suspended during the 1960 election campaign and made possible the great debates between President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon. The President has urged similar suspension of the provision during the election campaign of 1964.

It is time that we recognized the maturity of the radio and television broadcasting industry and, by repealing this provision, give it a vote of confidence. In 1960 the industry used its temporary freedom with a sense of objectivity and fair play in the public interest. And, it makes much more sense to me to repeal the provision than to suspend it election by election.

It should be noted that repeal of the equal time provision does not diminish or affect the Federal Communication Commission's policy or existing law, which holds that a licensee's statutory obligation to serve the public interest still includes the broad encompassing duty of providing a fair cross section of opinion in the station's coverage of public affairs and matters of public controversy.

I ask that the bill lie at the desk for 10 days for additional sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1696) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

COMMISSION ON RURAL LIFE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was just 55 years ago that President Theodore Roosevelt penned a letter to a Prof. Liberty Hyde Bailey, asking if he would be Chairman of President Roosevelt's Commission on Country Life.

President Roosevelt wrote:

> The farmer must first of all grow good crops in order to support himself and his family. But when this has been secured, the effort for better farming should cease to stand alone, and should be accompanied by the effort for better business and better living on the farm.

When the Country Life Commission reported on January 23, 1909, the conscience of the Nation was aroused. Congress passed acts establishing county agents, vocational agricultural teachers, the Federal land banks. Conservation of soil and natural resources, reforestation, farm-to-market roads, balanced farming—all eventually came.

Samuel R. Guard, editor of the national livestock magazine, Breeder's Gazette editorialized in 1958:

> Today watching the efforts to put agriculture on a parity plane, maybe we need another commission—men, such as Bailey, Uncle Henry Wallace (grandfather of former Vice President Henry Wallace); Butterfield,

Pinchot, Page, Beard, and Charlie Barrett—to take evidence at the grassroots, study the contribution of the family farm to the national welfare, outline agricultural policy for the next 50 years.

As I said, Mr. President, that was in 1958, when Senator Flanders, of Vermont, introduced proposed legislation calling for a Commission on Country Life.

The 1958 proposal of Senator Flanders was just one of a series of many since President Roosevelt's first Commission on Country Life.

Numerous editorials, which appeared, over the years, urged Congress to enact legislation calling for such a study. In addition to Senator Flanders, former Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin, introduced proposed legislation to create such a Commission. But Congress never did take any affirmative action.

The time is growing short. The need for such legislation is urgent.

The complexion of our population warrants a Commission on Rural Life, Mr. President, for in 1850, 15 percent of our population was urban; and 100 years later, in 1950, 65 percent of our population lived in our cities. A decade later, in 1960, 69.9 percent of the people lived in our metropolitan areas.

The city folks of our country have a stake in maintaining a healthy agricultural economy; and the passage of this bill establishing a Commission on Rural Life is important to them, for we recognize, of course, that our farmers produce the food and fiber for the Nation—its lifeblood. A great many of our cities are only a few days away from starvation. In addition, we have learned from unhappy experience that economic downtrends in agriculture are soon reflected elsewhere in the economy.

Actually, Mr. President, one of the purposes of this bill is to prevent unhappy experiences, because it will give us an opportunity to learn from the past, observe the present, and look forward to the future of agriculture and its rightful role in our American society.

The Commission's purpose would be to find ways to preserve the values of country living. The Commission would study rapidly changing rural life in America and would determine how its best aspects could be saved or improved.

The Commission would seek to do the following:

First, to preserve, develop, and combine the best in rural and urban cultures.

Second, to encourage leaders of rural people to safeguard the opportunity for full employment of individual and community initiative.

Third, to study the effect on people of trends in food supplies and markets and job opportunities.

Fourth, to develop mutual understanding of rural and urban economy.

Fifth, to provide facts to help rural residents make wise decisions concerning rural living.

Although less than one-third of our people live in rural areas, more than half of the Nation's poverty is found there. Four million U.S. families with annual incomes of less than $2,500 live in rural areas. That is half of the total number of such families in our country. Even those who operate efficient farms often lag behind the rest of the country in income. Many experts believe that because of this low income and unsatisfactory level of living, our country is losing values that have had their roots in country living.

Mr. President, when President Theodore Roosevelt created such a first commission he sent to Congress a special message on the matter. The last paragraph of that message to Congress is as significant today as it was in 1909; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the close of my remarks, for the benefit of my distinguished colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HUMPHREY, HART, MUSKIE, YARBOROUGH, MCGOVERN, CHURCH, BURDICK, BAYH, RANDOLPH, JAVITS, MCGEE, GRUENING, NELSON, and INOUYE, I introduce a bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 10 additional days to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1697) to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve, develop, and combine the best in rural and urban cultures; encourage leaders of rural people to safeguard the opportunity for full employment of individual and community initiative in maintaining and developing community institutions and services; study the effect on people of trends in terms of food supply, costs and markets for farm and manufactured goods, and job opportunities; develop mutual understanding of the economy of both rural and urban groups; and provide the Nation with a body of objective facts to help its people in rural areas make wise decisions in the sphere of rural living, there is hereby created a Commission on Rural Life to develop this approach and advise and recommend probable courses of action, or other appropriate means, which will help the Nation to act wisely in this time of unprecedented change in rural community living.

SECTION 1. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) "Commission" shall mean the Commission on Rural Life.

SEC. 2(a). The Commission hereby authorized and created shall consist of eleven members who shall be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) Vacancies occurring on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members of the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original positions.

(c) Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(d) Each member of the Commission shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member of such Commission, to any such member who is receiving other compensation from the United States, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The President shall appoint a Chairman and Vice Chairman from the membership of the Commission.

SEC. 3(a). The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director, without regard to the Civil Service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe. The compensation paid to such Director under the provisions of this subsection shall not exceed the rate of $20,000 per annum.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, except that any Federal employees subject to the Civil Service laws and regulations who may be assigned to the Commission shall retain Civil Service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege.

(c) The Commission shall establish headquarters in the District of Columbia and shall make such other arrangements as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or each subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(e) The Commission shall request the head of each Federal department or independent agency which includes an agency or agencies with a direct interest and responsibility in any phase of rural life to appoint, and he shall appoint for each such agency, a liaison officer who shall work closely with the Commission and staff. All agencies, departments, and independent instrumentalities of the Government are hereby authorized to cooperate with the Commission, and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish all information as requested by the Commission.

SEC. 4(a). The Commission shall proceed as soon as practicable to set in motion a nationwide inventory and evaluation of factors affecting rural life, directly and through the Federal agencies, the States, and private organizations and groups, utilizing to the fullest extent possible such studies, data, and reports previously prepared or concurrently in process by Federal agencies, States, private organizations, groups, and others.

(b) The Commission shall assemble the facts necessary to give a comprehensive picture with respect to the major economic trends affecting life and work in rural areas; identify major gaps between the economic problems of rural residents and the organized means to handle their problems; evaluate the impact of technological developments on living and ways of making a living in the open country, villages, towns, and small cities of rural America; and assess the impact of the changing composition of the rural population on economic goals.

(c) The Commission shall compile such data and, on the basis of the information it reveals, recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs be initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizens' groups and interests, to meet the problems and challenges of rural life.

(d) The Commission shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a final report, including recommendations for legislative action, upon completion of the study, which shall be not later than three years after the approval of this Act. Copies of reports of the Commission shall be distributed free to interested persons.

(e) The Commission is authorized to conduct public hearings and otherwise to secure data and expressions of opinions.

(f) The Commission is authorized to make direct grants to the States, and to transfer necessary funds to Federal agencies, from sums appropriated pursuant to section 6, to carry out such aspects of the work of the Commission as the Commission may determine can best be carried out by the States, or Federal agencies, under such arrangements and agreements as are determined by the Commission; and may enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public, or private agencies and organizations.

Sec. 5. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 4(d) of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended.

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as "The Commission on Rural Life Act."

Exhibit 1

Excerpt of President Theodore Roosevelt's Special Message to Congress February 9, 1909, From Senate Document No. 705, 60th Congress, 2d Session

I warn my countrymen that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness, as well as the prosperity, of life in the country. The men and women on the farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations; to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brains that can endure the terrific strain of modern life; we need the development of men in the open country, who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war, and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace.

Theodore Roosevelt.

The White House, *February 9, 1909.*

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 511(h) OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, TO EXTEND TIME FOR COMMITMENT OF CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I ask unanimous consent that the letter requesting this bill be printed in the Record, together with a memorandum in support of the proposed legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1698) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and memorandum, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.,
New York, N.Y., June 3, 1963.

Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Magnuson: By application dated November 17, 1961, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. requested that the Secretary of Commerce, Maritime Administration, grant ship mortgage insurance under the provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in connection with the construction of three container ships for operation in the intercoastal trade between U.S. east and west coast ports.

The Maritime Administrator directed that for administrative convenience there be a public hearing (docket S. 137) in connection with the American-Hawaiian application. Hearings commenced August 26, 1962, in San Francisco, Calif., and ended October 25, 1962, in Washington, D.C. For your information, enclosed is copy of initial decision of the hearing examiner, dated April 8, 1963, in which he finds our proposed intercoastal containership operation economically sound and that the impact of the proposed project on other water carriers now in the service does not appear to be so serious as to warrant the denial of the application in light of the probable benefits to domestic commerce.

Exceptions to the hearing examiner's initial decision by competing modes of transportation, and our replies with respect thereto, have now been filed with the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and it is expected that oral argument will be scheduled shortly.

American-Hawaiian has in a construction reserve fund, established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, $11,672,105, and a contingent Federal income tax liability thereon of approximately $2,500,000, if such funds are not invested in new ships. The time within which such funds must be committed under present law expires on December 31, 1963.

We feel it desirable that legislation be introduced that would extend for the brief period of 1 year, the time within which the construction reserve funds could be made available in the building of the new vessels. Moreover, if the final decision is a denial of our application, we wish to consider how the funds might be used in shipping.

You were kind enough on June 11, 1962, to introduce S. 3396, a bill to extend for 1 year to December 31, 1963, the time for commitment of our construction reserve fund. The legislation then sought was enacted on October 10, 1962, Public Law 87-782.

It is respectfully requested that a bill be introduced that would extend for an additional 1 year, from December 31, 1963, the time for commitment of the fund. For your further information, enclosed is copy of our statement of the purpose for the proposed legislation and draft of a bill, similar to S. 3396, which you so kindly introduced last year.

We are requesting Congressman Tollefson to introduce a companion bill in the House.

Thank you for your courtesy and consideration.

Very truly yours,

S. H. Moerman,
Chairman of the Board.

The purpose of the legislation proposed under this bill is to extend until December 31, 1964, the period during which construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, must be expended or committed for new vessel construction.

By an application dated November 17, 1961, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. ("American-Hawaiian") requested that the Secretary of Commerce, Maritime Administration ("Administration") grant ship mortgage insurance under the provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.) ("Act"), in connection with the construction of three container ships for operation in the intercoastal trade between U.S. east and west coast ports.

The Maritime Administrator acting under statutory authority directed that for administrative convenience there be a public hearing in connection with the American-Hawaiian application. Hearings on this matter commenced August 26, 1962, in San Francisco, Calif., and ended October 25, 1962, in Washington, D.C. On April 8, 1963, an initial decision of the chief examiner, Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, found, after extensive hearings, that the projected intercoastal containership service proposed by American-Hawaiian was economically sound and that the impact of the proposed project on other water carriers now in the service did not appear to be so serious as to warrant the denial of the application in light of the probable benefits to domestic commerce.

The company has approximately $11 million in its construction reserve fund which must be committed by December 31, 1963, under present law. The proposed legislation would merely extend briefly the period within which the construction reserve funds could be made available in the building of the new vessels. Moreover, if the final decision is a denial of our application, we wish to consider how the funds might be used in shipping. The Federal income tax that would have to be paid if these funds are not invested in new ships amounts to approximately $2,500,000. Such tax, if paid, would be lost forever for new construction.

American-Hawaiian was formed in 1899 and pioneered in the American building of modern, large steam freighters, the first four of which were placed in intercoastal trade in 1900. In 1902, the first oil-burning equipment used by an American-flag vessel was installed by American-Hawaiian.

American-Hawaiian continued in intercoastal trade until World War I caused the suspension of its service, and in 1917 the Government requisitioned 18 of the company's fleet in the prosecution of the war. At the time, the company had about 25 percent of the deadweight tonnage of large oceangoing freighters under U.S. registry. Aside from its own fleet of 26 ships, the company operated for account of the Government during World War I, a large number of vessels of other owners. At one period American-Hawaiian had 86 vessels in its charge. During the 2½ years of control by the Shipping Board, ending in late 1919, the regular American-Hawaiian fleet carried a million tons of cargo to the allied forces, and at the end of the war brought home 122,361 American soldiers.

After World War I, American-Hawaiian resumed its intercoastal service until 1941 when it was disrupted by World War II, and again the Government requisitioned the vessels. This time American-Hawaiian contributed 32 large oceangoing freighters, fully manned, in first-class condition, immediately available for national defense. Twenty-two vessels of our fleet were lost or requisitioned for title by the Government during the war.

During World War II, traffic formerly moving via intercoastal steamer was diverted to overland modes of transportation. Appreciating that the reorientation of this traffic would be a costly process for the intercoastal lines which had suffered total destruction of their trade during the war, the Government concluded to reestablish the services using Government-owned war-built ships, employing the former intercoastal lines as agents. Such agency operation began in 1945 and, because of the heavy losses, was discontinued in the fall of 1947. American-Hawaiian then chartered Government-owned vessels to continue the service without interruption. This arrangement continued until early 1951, when the Government discontinued the chartering of vessels for use in the intercoastal trade. At this point, American-Hawaiian purchased vessels from the Government and, again without interruption, continued the service. However, in 1953, the company concluded, after long deliberation and careful analyses, that the conventional, break-bulk type of operation was obsolete; that it no longer was capable of rendering a satisfactory service to the public; and that it would not provide a profitable operation. Accordingly, in March of 1953, the company decided to suspend its intercoastal service in order to conserve its assets and to study and consider other forms of transportation.

The present application of American-Hawaiian for vessel mortgage insurance is the result of investigations of new shipping concepts during the past several years, and involves the building of three large 24-knot, 60,000-horsepower container ships for the intercoastal trade.

The ships proposed by American-Hawaiian would be the largest, fastest dry-cargo ships ever built and would be the first new ships developed for the intercoastal trade since World War II.

JUNE 3, 1963.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT TO PROHIBIT ABANDONMENT OF FACILITIES AND SERVICE WITHOUT CONSENT OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1699) to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and services without the consent of the Federal Power Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee of the Senate 20 copies of a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act by adding a new subsection (g) to section 202. This amendment would require Commission approval prior to the abandonment or curtailment of interstate electric facilities or service. After notice and opportunity for hearing, such approval would be given by the Commission upon a finding that the abandonment or curtailment is consistent with the public interest. The Commission recommends this amendment in order to protect parties, served by and dependent upon interstate service or facilities, from arbitrary abandonment.

The proposed amendment is comparable to an existing provision in section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act relating to abandonment of service and facilities by natural gas companies, except that the provision in section 7(b) for compulsory hearing has been modified in the attached draft bill to "notice and opportunity for hearing."

Interstate electric service is becoming increasingly important as the electric industry expands its interconnections to take full advantage of the economies of coordinated operations. While curtailments of needed interstate operations has not been and is not expected to be a frequent occurrence, it is essential that parties relying upon such service, particularly those who may have received such service as a result of action by the Commission under sections 202 or 207 of the act, be protected from unwarranted abandonment or threats thereof.

The Commission believes that it may already possess authority to afford considerable protection to these parties under section 205 of the act, relating to changes in rate schedules. See *Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.* v. *FPC,* 343 U.S. 414, 423–424 (1952). But the amendment, by bringing the Natural Gas Act and the Federal Power Act into line on this matter, should remove any doubts as well as insure that any such abandonment would take place only after a final Commission determination.[1]

The Senate on August 14, 1961, passed a bill (S. 1607) with the exact wording as the one attached hereto.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 12 OF NATURAL GAS ACT RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN SECURITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act with respect to the issuance of securities for the construction, acquisition, or operation of pipeline facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1700) to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act with respect to the issuance of securities for the construction, acquisition, or operation of pipeline facilities, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are submitting herewith a proposed amendment to section 12 of the Natural Gas Act giving the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the issuance and sale of securities by natural-gas companies subject to the Act. Natural gas pipeline company financing is not now subject to Federal regulation, except for a few companies subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. Nor do the States supervise pipeline security issues. Even those States which regulate public utility financing generally do not regulate interstate pipeline companies on the ground that they are not engaged in the retail distribution of gas and are therefore not subject to the States' public service laws. Hence, the great majority of pipeline securities have been and are presently issued and sold without any regulatory approval whatsoever.

The requested legislation would give the Commission the same authority over pipeline company securities that the Congress conferred upon it in section 204 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to interstate electric companies. See Federal Power Act, section 204, 49 Stat. 850 (1935). Indeed, the proposed legislation closely parallels the language of section 204.

The proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act does not give the Commission general authority over the security issues of natural gas producers. Many natural gas producers are engaged in a great variety of activities related to natural gas production but not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction—including the production, refining and distribution of petroleum products both here and abroad. Consequently, the Commission believes that it is not necessary or desirable to attempt to regulate the security issues of gas producers as such; but the proposed amendment would reach any person, including a natural gas producer, seeking to issue any security for the purpose of financing interstate pipeline facilities. The amendment, however, gives the Commission express authority to exempt producers, distributors or other persons whose primary activities are not subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act.

Authority over pipeline security issues would materially assist the Commission in discharging its responsibilities to natural gas consumers. First, the legislation would give the Commission a greater degree of control over pipeline capital structures. A pipeline's capital structure can have a significant impact on its rates to consumers. A pipeline which has insufficient debt and too much equity in its capital structure will end up with higher rates than would otherwise be allowable because the return allowed on equity is invariably higher than the interest rate on debt, and debt has the added advantage that interest is deductible and thus reduces Federal income taxes. On the other hand, where the equity ratio is too thin (i.e., where the company has too much debt) a pipeline's ability to serve its customers might be endangered if revenues fell off or costs increased substantially. The proposed amendment would enable the Commission to assure that the pipelines avoid both extremes.

---

[1] Under section 205(e) a service change could become effective at the end of the 5-month statutory suspension period, even if the Commission had not yet reached a determination of the matter.

The proposed amendment would enable the Commission to prevent a pipeline from raising funds to engage in activities totally unrelated to the business of supplying natural gas to consumers and harmful to its credit standing. The Commission lacks authority to do this at present. The Commission recognizes that many nonjurisdictional activities of pipelines are beneficial to the financial position of the companies and thus help gas consumers. However, it would be in the public interest to protect consumers in the event a pipeline sought to engage in speculative ventures that would not benefit its customers and might impair its ability to serve them.

If the proposed amendment is passed, the Commission would be able to require pipelines to sell securities by competitive bidding rather than by direct placement, which is the usual practice now. Competitive bidding generally results in cheaper financing by virtue of the lower underwriting costs involved. For this reason most electric utility security issues are sold at competitive bidding, and the Commission's rules under the Federal Power Act generally require it. The SEC imposes similar requirements on utilities subject to its jurisdiction under the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Another advantage of competitive bidding is that it prevents a small group of underwriters from monopolizing the business of selling pipeline securities. To a large extent today the underwriting of pipeline securities is in the hands of a relatively small group of investment bankers. Prevention of such monopolies fits within the spirit of our antitrust laws and has been one of the principal reasons for requiring most utility securities to be sold competitively.

If the requested authority were granted, the Commission could also limit the use in bond indentures of some common provisions that may be adverse to the consumer's interests.

For these reasons we urge passage of the proposed amendment to section 12 of the Natural Gas Act.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

FEDERAL SHARE TO STATES ON ACCOUNT OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM PROJECTS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which seeks to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal share payable to States on account of Interstate Highway System projects.

This bill would lessen the financial burden imposed on the less populous, low-income States in financing their share of the Federal Interstate Highway System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1704) to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the Federal share payable to certain States on account of Interstate System projects, introduced by Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and my name be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 1691, the manpower retraining amendments, introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by Senator JAVITS before the annual convention of district 1, B'nai B'rith, Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., on June 4, 1963.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address by Grand Master Charles B. Giller and Senator BYRD of Virginia on his receiving the Grand Master's Award in Virginia.

MAINTENANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF RECORDS RELATING TO APPOINTMENTS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted a Senate resolution, which was referred to the Armed Services Committee, on the issue and decision of the Air Force to move the Air Force Academy office from Washington, D.C., to Colorado Springs. I have discussed this subject with a number of other Senators. I asked that the resolution be held at the desk for 3 days, so that other Senators would have an opportunity to join in sponsoring it.

I rise today to urge other Senators to join in sponsoring the resolution, because they will be rather hard put to obtain information in regard to the Air Force cadets, their grades, and so forth, if they have to make long-distance telephone calls to Colorado Springs in order to obtain this information, whereas up to now we have been able to obtain it from a very efficiently operated office in Washington, D.C.

So I hope a number of Senators will join me in sponsoring the resolution, so that we shall be able to express the sense of the Senate that the office should remain in this city.

NECESSITY TO CURB HUGE OIL TAX BENEFITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate must reverse the oil lobbyists' big victory in the House last week against President Kennedy's mild proposal to curb the huge oil tax benefits.

After this defeat of tax justice by the most politically potent industry in America, any remaining tax reform of significance will be dead unless the Senate acts.

How can the Congress deprive other groups of tax privileges if not even a slight modification in oil's top special advantage is adopted? The oil industry benefits from the most notorious of tax loopholes. This most profitable of American industries pays only about one-third of the taxes on net profits that are paid by other industries.

Such massive tax advantages have been defended almost solely on the ground that they are needed to stimulate more oil exploration. Yet the fact is that we have a great surfeit of oil. The industry is spared a colossal surplus of oil only because of tight regulation. Texas oil fields, for example, are allowed to pump less than one-third of the time.

This rejection by the Ways and Means Committee of the President's three amendments to tighten tax laws governing oil depletion is especially disheartening because the administration worked hard to develop moderate proposals.

These measures would have recovered nearly $250 million for the Federal Treasury, according to Treasury estimates; but since the oil depletion allowance has been estimated by the Treasury to be worth more than $2½ billion to the oil industry, the impact of these Presidential proposals would be relatively gentle. The 27½ percent depletion allowance would remain untouched. Only the proportion of income available for depletion would have been slightly reduced.

FARMERS NOW DOWN TO 37 CENTS OF HOUSEWIFE'S FOOD DOLLAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the farmer continues to be a prime—though badly neglected—source of America's abundant standard of living.

Twenty years ago the farmer received about 50 cents out of every dollar the housewife spent on food. Although he does the lion's share of the work in providing food, makes a huge investment, and takes most of the risk, in the first quarter of this year, the farmer was down to an alltime low of only 37 cents. In fact, the farmer's share in March—the last month of the quarter—was only 36 cents, the lowest for any month on record.

Food marketing costs, including processing, packaging, and shipping, rose 5 percent in the quarter from a year earlier, while prices paid to farmers dropped 3 percent.

In spite of the rise in the cost of handling, processing, and distributing food, thanks to the marvelous efficiency of our farmer, the American family today spends—not the 50 percent of their income on food required of a Russian family or the 35 percent required of a typical English or West German family—only 19 percent, or barely $1 out of $6.

This is a magnificent contribution to the American standard of living. In my judgment it is the greatest of any economic group.

But it is a sad fact that farm income is disgracefully low. In spite of great farm efficiency, parity—the prices farmers receive, compared with the prices they have to pay for what they need—is the lowest it has been in many years. Farmers are squeezing along on less than half the per capita income of nonfarmers.

INTERNATIONAL BANKERS WANT UNITED STATES TO SPEND MORE AND TAX LESS AND ESPECIALLY TO RAISE INTEREST RATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in its annual report, the Bank of International Settlement has denounced U.S. economic policy, because in the judgment of this organization of international bankers the Federal Government has not increased spending enough or cut taxes, so as to create a larger deficit than the one we now have.

The purpose of the deficit is, of course, in the view of these international bankers, to stimulate the growth of our economy. I submit that this astounding criticism coming from international bankers is self-serving. The international bankers recognize that a larger deficit will aggravate our already bad and worsening balance-of-payments situation. But they have a ready remedy for that. What is it? Just what we might expect international bankers to want: higher interest rates. Of course, interest rates represent bank income. The higher the interest rate the greater is bank profits.

Higher interest rates. What a prescription. They would have us increase spending and cut taxes, to expand our economic activity, and then jam the brakes on economic activity by means of higher interest rates, in order to stem the outflow of short-term capital.

This is a prescription for disaster. It will not work. Over and over again we have tried the spend-more, tax-less approach, but it has not worked. And higher interest rates will not work to stem the capital outflow or to help the adverse balance of payments.

The only studies of this matter—by Prof. Philip Bell and Dr. Robert F. Gemmill, of the Federal Reserve System—have shown that a rise in interest rates is not an effective way to improve our balance-of-payments situation. But one thing is certain: higher interest rates will definitely benefit the international bankers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Europe's Bankers Assail U.S. Policy." The article was published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Europe's Bankers Assail U.S. Policy

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Basel, Switzerland.—The United States got poor marks today for its economic policy from one of the world's most renowned judges, the Bank for International Settlements.

The bank's annual report on the world economy devoted major attention to the American economy and concluded: "The economy of the United States during the past year has continued to be afflicted by both a sizable margin of unemployment and a serious balance-of-payments deficit, without significant improvement on either front."

A major reason for the unemployment, the report said, "has been reluctance to call upon fiscal measures on a scale to match the huge size of the economy." By fiscal measures, it was made clear, the report meant tax cuts and increases in Government spending to enlarge the deficit in the Federal budget at least temporarily.

POLICY SEEN HAMPERED

Allowing for the fact that some $4 billion of annual Federal spending is overseas, the report stated, the Federal budget has actually been a "continuing dampening factor" on the domestic economy, despite an apparent deficit in the conventional budget accounts. In economic terms, it said, the Federal Government has shown a "surplus fiscal position."

"For the wider public," the report added, "a consensus of opinion on effective full-employment policy has been hampered by belief in spontaneous private demand and by misunderstanding of fiscal policy."

The Bank for International Settlements, created in 1930 to handle the technical side of German war reparation payments, has become increasingly noted for its annual reports on the world economy.

CONSERVATIVE TINGE NOTED

Its board of directors is made up largely of European central bank officials, and its reputation is essentially conservative. The occasion for today's report was the bank's annual meeting here.

The report recognized that an aggressive budget deficit policy in the United States to restore full employment could make worse another problem—that of the deficit in the international balance-of-payments. But it recommended a solution to the international payments problem in the form of higher interest rates, it argued, would reduce the flow of capital out of the United States without significantly curbing domestic expansion.

"It is evident that the situation calls for more vigorous measures," the report said. "For some time it has seemed unlikely that the international deficit will be resolved mainly by a widening of the trade surplus; in fact the export trend will be quite favorable if it keeps pace with the rise in imports as the economy expands."

The report commended the policy of the Kennedy administration of advocating a tax cut but added. "While the budget program is aimed at accelerating the pace of recovery, it is not designed to lift total demand to a full-employment level over any specified time period."

The bank's underlying conservation attitude came through clearly in the two other main problems discussed in today's annual report.

For Western Europe, the report said, the recent rise in prices has gone far enough, if not too far, and the time has come to call a halt.

WAGE POLICY WEIGHED

"It is clear that the rise in money wages must be moderated," the report said. "This would be accomplished most appropriately by cooperation of all parties in a wages policy designed to secure a continued gain in real earnings without the excess rise in money income that is only dissipated by higher prices. If success is not obtained by this means, the authorities will be obliged to consider more general measures of demand restraint, as some already have."

The second problem was that of the International Monetary System, sometimes called the problem of "international liquidity." In a long argument, the report sharply challenged the view, largely held in Britain that the system needs major reforms in order to assure enough international reserves to finance world trade and other payments.

The real problem, the report argued, is not any lack of international liquidity but the persistence of imbalance in international payments—above all the U.S. deficit.

"Designing schemes to make access to liquidity easier will not solve this problem," it said.

On the immediate business outlook on both sides of the Atlantic, the report was relatively optimistic. In continental Europe, it said, "production is generally expanding in line with the availability of resources and the economy has made a reasonable adjustment to substantial changes in basic demand forces.

It identified these changes as a sluggishness in demand for exports from outside Europe and a slowing down in the demand from business for new plants and equipment, accompanied by a big increase in consumer demand.

LET'S NOT START NOW ON A RACE TO STEP UP SUPERSONIC SUBSIDIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the most rapidly growing area of Federal spending and the least noted is in aid to business.

Since 1957 we have allotted out multimillion dollar gifts to the water transport industry, to nearly $700 million, increased in aid to the aviation industry fourfold to nearly $1 billion, and expanded the subsidies that the budget calls "promotion of business" by fivefold to more than $600 million.

Now the administration is proposing that we get into the supersonic commercial air transport race to the hilt. And this means hundreds of millions of additional subsidies to private industry out of the taxpayer's pocket.

I fully believe in spending what we have to spend to be first in defense. But subsidies to private enterprise are something else.

The justification, of course, is that our country should be first in supersonic jet transport. I hope we are. But if we are not why should the taxpayer bail industry out?

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject in yesterday's Wall Street Journal be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Supersonic Subsidies

"Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permits us to stand still in this area." With that succinct statement, President Kennedy sums up the argument for pressing ahead immediately with development of a supersonic jet commercial airliner.

The argument, however, needs a lot more examination. It needs it particularly in determining whether the development should become another Government crash program or a more careful, and perhaps protracted, search for the best supersonic transport.

For his part, Mr. Kennedy does not as yet seem to be insisting on a crash program. If preliminary study fails to produce a safe, fast, and potentially profitable plane, he says, "we shall not go further." Some millions of

Federal funds have already been spent, and what apparently is now contemplated are design competitions and research.

Several considerations argue for adhering to that approach. The economics of international air competition are not so urgent in this respect that we have to beat the British and French to the punch no matter what the cost. The British-French consortium expects to have a supersonic plane in service well before 1970, and it seems the U.S. industry couldn't beat that anyway.

But it isn't necessarily disastrous if our allies have an initial supersonic lead; no law compels us to be first in everything. In fact, a calm approach could pay bigger dividends later, assuming the studies indicate the United States can eventually develop a faster and generally better plane. That is essentially the history of the subsonic jets, in which the United States lagged at first but came out on top later.

So if the politics of the competition means merely prestige, it doesn't make any more convincing a case for a crash program than the economics of the matter. There is, though, another political aspect to be faced.

It's this whole idea that the Federal Government must subsidize, at perhaps enormous cost, the development of a supersonic transport simply because other governments choose to subsidize their planemakers—and indeed already own their nations' airlines. Competition among governments is pretty remote from the real thing. And it has implications that should be disquieting for the U.S. aircraft industry.

We have little doubt the United States will one day have fine supersonic jetliners, if ingenuity proves them feasible and economical. The objective should be the best plane, however long it takes, with the smallest Government pilot.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished majority leader is able to inform us about the program for the remainder of this week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I announce that, after consultation, it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate adjourn from today until Thursday. It is the intention to call up, very shortly, the measures on the legislative calendar.

As Senators know, there is a unanimous-consent agreement which will go into effect at 2 p.m. today; and at 2:30 p.m. there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

It is our hope—and I believe I speak for the distinguished minority leader—that the committee will continue to work during these periods to the end that necessary legislation will be brought forth as quickly as possible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield further, there have already been some expressions of interest in the Fourth of July holiday period. I wonder if the Senator has given that subject consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must admit that I have not as yet; but the Fourth of July will be on a Thursday. I anticipate that the Senate will go over at least until the following Monday, and perhaps the following Tuesday. I shall consult the distinguished minority leader and see how the program develops. If the Senate does not have before it something of vital importance at that time, it would be my guess as of the moment that the assumption I have just made is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

WE WHO LOVE THE LAW

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, America does not have a citizen better versed in constitutional history and constitutional law than Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., author of "States Rights—The Law of the Land," a treatise which ought to be possessed and read and re-read by every one who reveres the governmental and legal systems established by the Founding Fathers. The Georgia Bar Journal for November 1962, contains an editorial entitled "We Who Love the Law," which was written by Mr. Bloch. He points out in this editorial that the government of laws ordained by the Constitution as it was written and lawfully interpreted is being converted into a government of men by Supreme Court Justices who are unwilling to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process when such process is properly understood and rightly applied, and that in consequence the American people are destined to live under a government of men and not of laws unless those lawyers who love the law have the courage to stand up and protect their right to be governed by the impersonal forces of the law rather than by the caprice of men.

In saying these things, Charles J. Bloch is not a lone voice crying in a constitutional wilderness. Let me cite the actions and words of other men of the highest legal attainments.

One of the ablest men who ever sat on the Supreme Court Bench, the late Justice Robert H. Jackson, had this to say in his concurring opinion in *Brown v. Allen* (344 U.S. 443):

> Rightly or wrongly, the belief is widely held by the practicing profession that this Court no longer respects impersonal rules of law but is guided in these matters by personal impressions which from time to time may be shared by a majority of the Justices. Whatever has been intended, this Court also has generated an impression in much of the judiciary that regard for precedents and authorities is obsolete, that words no longer mean what they have always meant to the profession, that the law knows no fixed principles.

Justice Jackson closed his observations on this score with the sage comment:

> I know of no way we can have equal justice under law except we have some law.

As a general rule, State appellate courts are manned by judges of great legal learning and experience. These judges have been deeply troubled of recent years by the repeated encroachments of the Supreme Court upon the domain reserved to the States by the Constitution.

The gravity of this concern is clearly reflected by the extraordinary action taken by the chief justices of 36 of the States at a meeting held on August 23, 1958, at Pasadena, Calif. These State chief justices adopted a resolution importuning the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to practice the greatest of all judicial powers and virtues, namely, judicial self-restraint, in considering cases involving State affairs or Federal-State relations.

The resolution was accompanied by and based upon an illuminating report which deserves a place among our treasured historical documents. The report analyzes many recent Supreme Court decisions nullifying powers clearly reserved to the States by the Constitution, and asserts that the practice of judicial self-restraint by the Justices of the Supreme Court is essential to constitutional government under a Constitution designed to create "an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

In a brilliant address upon the role of the Supreme Court under the Constitution, John R. Dethmers, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan, made these trenchant observations:

> As you do, mark well what the philosophy of the judicial activists may portend for the liberties of the people and our free institutions. If the Court is to have wide latitude in determining constitutional meaning and, as some suggest, may find it elsewhere than in the language of the Constitution itself or may ascribe a new meaning thereto not intended by the framers; if, as urged, the Court is to exert a political power to achieve the social ends it deems expedient, what will remain of constitutional restraints on government and constitutional guarantees of personal rights and liberties? Shall not these be left, then, to the whim and caprice or, at best, the good intentions of men, be they judges, legislators, or administrators of the law? It was not for this that our forefathers fought nor for this they framed the Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

Thomas Raeburn White, a distinguished member of the Pennsylvania Bar, has put in proper perspective what lack of judicial self-restraint on the part of the Supreme Court Justices is doing to constitutional government in America. He did so in these words in a penetrating article entitled "Construing the Constitution: The New Sociological Approach":

> The serious question which confronts us now is whether constitutional government has broken down. Whether the American theory that tried and true principles of government may be enshrined in a written Constitution and entrusted to the courts for their protection, has proved to be illusory. * * * If it be admitted that the Court may change the Constitution by construction whenever it sees a need therefor, constitutional government as we have known it and as it was visualized by its founders has ceased to exist.

Since Charles J. Bloch's editorial entitled "We Who Love The Law" is concerned with this most serious question, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed as follows:

WE WHO LOVE THE LAW

(Written by Charles J. Bloch)

Not the least interesting of the many interesting and tragic chapters of the Mississippi story was the speech prepared by the Attorney General of the United States for the dedication of Kendrick Hall, new building of the University of San Francisco Law

School, in which he said: "Courage is the most important attribute of a lawyer."

We have not seen the full text of the speech. But with that one sentence of it we agree wholeheartedly.

In so agreeing, we wonder—we wonder when lawyers, singly or organized as bar associations, will have the courage to tell the people of the United States the real causes which underlie such occurrences as those now taking place in Mississippi.

Fundamentally, those causes are, first, the system under which Federal judges are appointed, and, second, the consequent usurpation of power by courts composed of judges so chosen.

With the exception of Chief Justice Warren (and he had been Governor of California) and Justice Brennan, each of the Justices today sitting on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States was holding a position in the Government of the United States at the time of his appointment.

Justice Black was a U.S. Senator from Alabama and had been for 10 years.

Justice Douglas was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Justice Clark had been Attorney General of the United States for 4 years, and for 8 years before that had held one office or another in the Department of Justice.

Justice Harlan was a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Justice Stewart was a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Justice White was an Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

Justice Goldberg was Secretary of Labor.

As we lawyers know, Justices and Federal judges are appointed by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Attorney General. Of course, the Senate must confirm. In recent years, such confirmations have been more or less perfunctory. An Attorney General who is interested in the psychological, philosophical, or political views of a prospective nominee for the Supreme Court of the United States has had ample opportunity to learn of these views during the period of Government service of such prospective nominee. We daresay that, in recent years, at any rate, political, philosophical, and psychological views have counted equally as much as legal ability and integrity, in weighing the scales for or against a prospective nominee. We daresay, too, that these views have been considered to a large degree in the appointment of judges of what the Constitution calls "inferior" Federal courts.

The American Bar Association several years ago appointed a special committee to consider this system. If any accomplishment has ensued from the appointment of the committee, we are not aware of it.

There are lawyers who love the law as it is written in the Constitution of the United States, who have been taught, for more years than some of the Justices and judges now interpreting it have lived, to honor and revere that Constitution as it was written, legally amended and interpreted according to law. We cannot easily endure seeing that law ravished by people seeking power and then being told that we must cherish, nurture, and protect the monster born of the ravishment.

We are told that this is a government of laws and not of men, and we must obey those laws.

If there ever was a time in the history of the United States of America when their people were living under a government of men and not of laws, this is it.

The very first provision in the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 1) is: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The legislative power is judicially defined as the lawmaking power; the department of government whose function is the framing and enactment of laws.

The word law or laws is used in the Constitution of the United States at least 28 times. Each time except perhaps three,[1] the word means a statute duly enacted by the appropriate legislative body and does not mean a decision, opinion, or judgment of a court.[2]

Many, many years ago, Mr. Justice Story said:

"In the ordinary use of language, it will hardly be contended that the decisions of courts constitute laws. They are, at most, only evidence of what the laws are, and are not of themselves laws. They are often reexamined, reversed, and qualified by the courts themselves whenever they are found to be either defective, ill founded, or otherwise incorrect."[3]

Yet, 8 years ago, when the Supreme Court of the United States. using as a basis, not legal principles, not law or laws, but opinions of psychologists, overruled prior decisions of the Supreme Court, and concluded "that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place," we, who love the law and honor the Constitution as it was written, were told that that decision was the "law of the land." According to the views of those it pleased, it became a "law."

During the past 8 years, we have seen that conclusion of the Supreme Court, which was by its own words restricted to public education, extended and applied to every conceivable field.

We have seen the principle applied to golf courses, swimming pools, busses, bathing beaches, eating places, theaters, without a word of explanation by the Supreme Court as to how the principles of the school cases could possibly apply to a case involving the use of a golf course.

We have seen the principle of no discrimination applied to cases involving voting and registration of voters, although the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment cannot possibly apply to such cases, if legal and historical principles are applied in the decision of the cases.

That application was carried to its extreme when the Supreme Court agreed in the Tennessee case to enter the political thicket of legislative apportionment. In so doing, the majority of the Court ignored Justice Frankfurter's solemn warning:

"The Court's authority—possessed neither of the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction. Such feeling must be nourished by the Court's complete detachment, in fact and in appearance, from political entanglements and by abstention from injecting itself into the clash of political forces in political settlements."

The action of the majority of the Court in that case deeply concerned another Justice—Justice Harlan. He dissented vigorously. He concluded his dissent:

"In conclusion, it is appropriate to say that one need not agree, as a citizen, with what Tennessee has done or failed to do, in order to deprecate, as a judge, what the majority is doing today. Those observers of the Court who see it primarily as the last refuge for the correction of all inequality or justice, no matter what its nature or source, will no doubt applaud this decision and its break with the past. Those who consider that continuing national respect for the Court's authority depends in large measure upon its wise exercise of self-restraint and discipline in constitutional adjudication, will view the decision with deep concern."

We, who love the law, were among those who viewed the decision with deep concern. Our concern deepened, when 3 months later, Justice Harlan joined with Justices Black, Douglas, Clark, Brennan, and the Chief Justice in the New York prayer case. In that case, viz-a-viz, were the action of a board of education in New York State in directing a school principal to cause a prayer to be said aloud by each class in the presence of a teacher at the beginning of each school day, and the provisions of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The prayer was—

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

The first amendment is:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Justice Black speaking for the majority of the Court said:

"There can be no doubt that New York's State prayer program officially establishes the religious beliefs embodied in the * * * prayer."

Therefore, the majority said the prayer violated the establishment clause of the first amendment just quoted.

We, who love the law, share the views of dissenting Justice Stewart, who wrote:

"With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an 'official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

We, who love the law, wonder what would be said by the Court if the action of the State board of education should be to direct the principal to cause the following stanza of "America" ("My Country 'Tis of Thee") to be sung aloud by each class in the presence of a teacher at the beginning of each school day:

"Our Father's God to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our Land be bright,
With Freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

We, who love the law, ask all lawyers to bear in mind the admonition of the Attorney General—"Courage is the most important attribute of a lawyer," and bearing it in mind to become convinced that the greatest service they can render to their people is to be sufficiently courageous to warn and teach that Constitutional Government cannot survive unless these judicial encroachments are halted.

We, who love the law, fully recognize the provision of the Constitution of the United States:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land" (art. VI, section 2).

But even so recognizing, we believe that wrongful assumption of power can never be the "law of the land." The assumption, the usurpation, may be enforced by might, but it can never become right.

There are those who say that the Constitution means whatever the Supreme Court says it means, and therefore the quoted paragraph has this meaning:

---

[1] Art. III, sec. 2, par. 1; ibid, par. 2, art. VI par. 2.

[2] *Swift* v. *Tyson*, 41 U.S. 1; also *U.S. Savings & Loan Co.* v. *Harris*, 113 Fed. 27, 35.

[3] Ibid.

"The Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land."

The error of this construction can be readily demonstrated. Article I, section 1, paragraph 1 of the Constitution is—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

Article V, which provides for amendments to the Constitution also provides that no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

In 1790, contemporaneously with the ratification of the Constitution, the most populous State was Virginia, with a population of 747,610; the least populous of the 13 Original States was Delaware with 59,096. The ratio, therefore, was about 12 to 1. In 1960, the most populous was New York with 16,782,304; the least populous Alaska with 226,167. The ratio therefore was, and is, about 83 to 1. Suppose article I, section 1, paragraph 1, and section V were attacked as violative of the 14th amendment (despite the 17th) because of changed conditions having resulted in "invidious discrimination," and the Supreme Court were to hold the provisions requiring equal suffrage in the Senate to be unconstitutional, would that decision be the "law of the land"? If the Chief Executive were willing to call out the troops to enforce it, should citizens who oppose such actions be deemed to be violating the "law of the land"?

In that supposed instance, who would have really violated the "law of the land"?

Some may answer: "Oh, that's ridiculous—that can't happen." It can happen. Who would have dreamed 30 years ago the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* would be rejected by a court on the basis of differences in "psychological knowledge" in 1954 and 1896? Who would have dreamed even 10 years ago that the court would enter the political thicket of legislative reapportionment? Who would have dreamed 30 years ago that the court would set aside an order of a State school official directing the utterance by the children of a simple, nonsectarian acknowledgement of a Supreme Being, and a prayer to Him invoking His blessings upon them, their parents, their teachers, and their country because of a provision in the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion?"

So long as a system exists under which such events can transpire, they will transpire, and the ultimate end lies only in the restraints which men are willing to place upon themselves.

So long as such a system exists, and such events are permitted to transpire, this Government of ours will be one, not of laws, but of men—and the real rulers are those who appoint the members of the judiciary.

We, who love the law, should constantly bear in mind these words of Mr. Justice Harlan, the elder:

"Upon the integrity, learning and courage of the bar largely depends the welfare of the country of which they are citizens; for of all members of society, the lawyers are best qualified by education and training to devise the methods necessary to protect the rights of the people against the aggressions of power. But they are, also, in the best sense, ministers of justice. It is not true, as a famous lawyer once said, that an advocate, in the discharge of his duty, must know only his client. He owes a duty to the court of which he is an officer, and to the community of which he is a member. Above all, he owes a duty to his own conscience. He misconceives his high calling if he fails to recognize the fact that fidelity to the court is not inconsistent with truth and honor, or with a fearless discharge of duty to his client." [4]

HENRY A. BURKHAMMER SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Senate two very fine essays written on the subject "The Contribution of Labor Unions to the Betterment of Our American Way of Life." These essays won the 1963 Henry A. Burkhammer Scholarships Awards program sponsored by Oliver Local No. 1663 of the United Steelworkers of America in Hibbing, Minn.

The authors of these essays are Miss Bette Jo Paripovich and Roger Lake. Both students are members of the 1963 Hibbing High School graduating class and are recipients of $300 scholarships for their work.

I wish to commend both Miss Paripovich and Mr. Lake for the excellent content and style of these papers. They have brought out some of the truly outstanding humanitarian and economic contributions made by labor unions to our society. I wish also to commend local 1663 of the United Steelworkers of America for this fine program through which they assist able and worthy students to continue with their education. The scholarship program is an annual event of Local 1663, and is one of the many fine community affairs in which the union participates. Such a program is another example of "the contribution of labor unions to the betterment of our American way of life."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two winning essays be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF LABOR UNIONS TO THE BETTERMENT OF OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Bette Jo Paripovich)

Carl Sandburg has said, "I like the union and give it praise." Looking at what the union stands for and what it has accomplished, one can better understand why this statement was made.

It can be said that labor unions organize mainly for idealistic reasons—idealistic, because they do not stand to gain in any material way from their efforts. Efforts such as reducing the 12 hour and 7 day work week to an 8 hour and 6 day work week. Along with this change came a change in working conditons. Such practices as 2 hours of preparation for work without pay, unsanitary and unhealthy working conditions, child labor, and mental and physical abuses were stopped when the laborers organized. The outlawing of such practices actually stepped up production, which lead to the raising of our GNP.

Before unions were established, workers were at a disadvantage when they tried to discuss wages with their employers. The employers' economic power and sources of information were much greater than those of the workers. A true competitive value for labor could not be reached because the employer could always understate labor's value and the workers had no means to contradict him; they had no choice but to agree to his terms. After unions were formed, a truly competitive price for the services of workers could be established by means of collective bargaining between approximate equals.

Also through unions the workingman obtained security. Through the seniority rule an elderly man won't live in constant fear of losing his job and not being able to support his family's needs. His children can obtain higher learning, thus producing lawyers, doctors, and scientists, all helping to raise our living standard and to make our country strong. This union family is not likely to listen to any Communist promise for a better way of life when they already have a secure high standard of living.

The equality of all men, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, is accepted by unions unhesitantly. The union organization is actually a model of our governmental system. By this I mean that all can vote for their representatives, who make the rules that all will abide by. The same motto can be used for both, "Together we stand, divided we fall."

The union provides an outlet for the worker to channel and express his complaints and problems without fear of retaliation. When an injustice has been done to a worker he has recourse. Evidence of the importance of a freely voiced opinion and criticism is that of the totalitarian government. Whenever a Communist dictator comes into power one of the first organizations that he liquidates is the union, thereby silencing the voice of the people.

Surely, when an organization contributes to raising the society's living standard, to its people living a more secure life free from unjust abuses and subservience, to racial equality, and to the unity of the people it can be concluded that it is contributing to the American way of life. Therefore, to put it in the words of Carl Sandburg, I too like the union and give it praise.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF LABOR UNIONS TO THE BETTERMENT OF OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Roger Lake)

Labor unions have done much for the American way of life and for society in general. The greatest contribution, I believe, is in the field of working conditions. When industry was first coming into its own, labor was just considered another piece of machinery. Sanitation in factories was abominable, jobs were hazardous, and wages were low. Whole families had to work just to subsist. It is evident that there was need for a change and a change did come. This change did not, however, come without a struggle. Industry hired gunmen to suppress the workers and also used such devices as blacklists, yellow dog contracts, etc., to discourage union membership. Unions did form, though; and after a number of legal as well as physical battles, unions were declared legal representatives for the workers. Once in this position, unions were able to bargain for better working conditions and bargain they did until the present high working standards were obtained.

Unions also have raised the standard of living in America. Before unions came into being, wages were so low that most people couldn't buy luxuries of any kind. With a raise in wages more people were able to buy more things and so the standard of living rose. This also helped industry indirectly by enlarging the market.

---

[4] From the address of Mr. Justice Harlan, in response to the toast, "The Supreme Court of the United States" on the occasion of the centennial celebration of the Organization of the Federal Judiciary held at New York, Feb. 4, 1890. (134 U.S. 711, 751–2.)

> One of the things labor always has been in favor of is better education. It has helped in this field very much through scholarships, grants, etc.
>
> Another important thing unions were instrumental in winning was more leisure time. Families can now take time out for picnics, recreation, and cultural pursuits. This has very much bettered our way of life.
>
> There have been many other benefits obtained by unions such as pensions, severance pay, hospitalization, unemployment compensation, etc.
>
> As anyone can plainly see, unions were necessary in making our life what it is, and of critics I ask where would we be if it weren't for unions?

A FARMERS' LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a 17-year-old girl whose parents are Minnesota farmers. Seldom do I receive a letter which contains so much thought, so much wisdom, so much warmth. Portions of it read as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I sincerely hope you will read this letter personally. My father has been a farmer all his life. At present we farm 240 acres, of which 160 is what we call "our land." It's a very rocky country; if you pick 8 flatrack loads of rock off of 80 acres, you're getting by easy. It's also a country where weeds grow thick and must be pulled out of the beanfields.
>
> Every year since I can remember, we've had to scrape to make ends meet, though some years more than others.
>
> It seems that rules apply unjustly to farmers. Regardless of whether we make a cent, we pay our skin in taxes. Taxes support public privileges. Personal property and land taxes are what hit the farmers right in their empty pockets. City people have some personal property and land, but not nearly as much. Farmers must invest in land and machinery; and they must keep up farm buildings.
>
> Think about this, please. Farmers are practically giving crops and livestock away at these prices. I don't think my own father can honestly say he makes any money to pay taxes on. But, regardless, farmers have to pay land tax. In our case the land isn't even paid for yet. These taxes support public education, etc. Now, who's paying for public education, etc? As near as we can figure, the farmer is, because he must own the land or rent it in order to farm it and gain nothing except the personal satisfaction of seeing the crops grow, the headache of seeing the drought or hail take it, and the inevitable.
>
> Whose son or daughter is most likely to get through college by means of Dad and Mom? You see, the farmer's son or daughter most likely will be helping keep the farm going.
>
> I am 17 and a junior in high school. My ambitions run high. I want to go through college and go into the field of NASA. It's not important whether you think I'll make it. It is important that I think I'll make it. It's just a dream now, but maybe a scholarship.
>
> I started working as a waitress when I was 15 so I could pay for expenses such as school and clothes that my parents would ordinarily have to pay for. I've tried to save most of my money so that, if my parents should need it, I'll have it to give.
>
> If you knew us, you'd probably say at first glance that this farmer isn't bad off. We aren't (on the surface), because we're proud Americans, too, and American standards are high.
>
> We have an unpaid for 1961 Chevrolet Belair because the old car wouldn't run after 8 years. We have reasonably modern furniture because Mom's first set wouldn't hold up any longer. Our farm debt doesn't show because its written on a slip of paper neatly tucked in a bank vault.
>
> I told Dad to write to you because that's what Senators are for. But, he said it wouldn't do any good because, even though you're a real good Senator, and you represent us, farmers are only a minority today and one letter will do no good.
>
> I realize that you are very busy because you are a senior Senator. I realize that one person can do very little, but, please think about my letter whenever you are confronted with the farm question and remember that many people's hearts would break if they should lose their farm. Too few people realize that today's farms are not run by machine alone. A lot of sweat and toil, heartbreak, and sorrow are mixed with the happiness a farm family knows.
>
> Thank you sincerely for being a wonderful Senator.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> —— ——.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 1 minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish every American could read this letter. As I told this young lady in my reply—

> It is very rare indeed that this Senator receives such a moving communication.

I went on to say that—

> Perhaps one day the family farmer will be able to live in dignity, will be able to enjoy the kind of life his city cousins have enjoyed for so long, will receive his reward for providing so many of us for so long with the best and the most food any peoples have ever had, and at the lowest cost yet known to man.

Mr. President, the young lady who wrote me this letter is a credit to her family, her community, her State, and her country. She and the thousands of others like her across the land are the best reasons I can think of for maintaining our traditional family farm system.

I have taken the time to read those excerpts only because I am convinced that these days too little attention is paid to some of the basic economic and social problems confronting our farm producers and our rural families. I am hopeful that the Congress, as it proceeds this year to consider proposed legislation dealing with farm credit, soil conservation, rural electrification, which pertains to the Farmers Home Administration and to the work of the Future Farmers of America, it will give sympathetic consideration to the requests which have been made, and will respond to the plea of this fine young lady who, in her own words, has set forth the basic problems confronting our farm families today.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make the following statement on my own behalf and on behalf of seven other Senators in introducing a bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. In alphabetical order, the Senators concerned are the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], my distinguished and beloved colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

I introduce the bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute or intervene in civil injunction suits in representative cases to safeguard by court order all the rights of U.S. citizens under the 14th amendment to the Constitution. I send it to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1693) to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 123. (a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States because of race, color, religion or national origin, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order.
>
> "(b) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Attorney General in the name of the United States, may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto.
>
> "(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.
>
> "(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law."

Mr. JAVITS. The bill would clearly enable the Attorney General to enforce not only equal protection of the laws, as in the school desegregation cases, but also due process of law, which would include the first amendment right of peaceful assembly and petition for redress of grievances—the right challenged in Birmingham, Ala. This is a broad version of the famous part III of civil rights legislation, and it is updated to meet current conditions.

In that connection I point out that, when this provision originally appeared in the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as passed by the House of Representatives, it referred to certain sections of the law which prohibit conspiracy to interfere with various civil rights, principally equal protection of the laws and the privileges and immunities of U.S. citizens. In effect it was limited in its application to only a part of the 14th amendment as it has been interpreted by a succession of court cases since 1957. Subsequent drafts of the provision have generally referred only to equal protection of the laws.

It is our present intention to deal not only with 14th amendment cases of denial of equal protection of the laws but also with other cases under the 14th amendment, particularly under the due process clause, which would include the 1st amendment right of peaceful assembly to which I have referred. The bill also differs from other drafts of the part III provision by eliminating any prerequisite finding that an individual complainant would be in danger of reprisal if he brought suit.

In short, this is an updating of the whole "Part III" concept to include all of the rights which are guaranteed under the 14th amendment to the Constitution according to the Supreme Court cases decided up to this time.

Our purpose in introducing this bill is to see if the President of the United States might not give it his serious consideration, as he is now considering submitting legislation far more adapted to meeting the national crisis which the country faces in respect of civil rights and equal opportunity than he contemplated before. He has already submitted a very limited package to us, principally on voting rights and including only one rather modest proposal related to public school desegregation. We request that he consider our proposal, which, in our view, is urgently needed as the key item of civil rights legislation in this session.

If the President should come forward with a request which is inadequate by this standard, or should fail to support it adequately, we shall have to press this proposal, which I introduce today on behalf of myself and my colleagues, to a vote in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the drafting of the Senator's bill, has the Senator assured himself that it would not do violence to that part of the first amendment to the Constitution, which refers to the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and so forth?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I am fully satisfied that it would give to the Attorney General authority to protect that right. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, I shall tell the Senator exactly what I have in mind in the presentation.

We have gone to considerable effort to submit this proposed legislation to probably as distinguished a galaxy of law school professors as there is in the country. I am going to put into the Record an original opinion by each of those professors. I think the Senator will find that that will cast very considerable light upon detailed questions as to the application of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to be specific. I will not detain the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all right.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us assume that a man was denied membership in a private club, for any reason. Would that man, under the provisions of the Senator's bill, have access to the powers of the Attorney General?

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all, because the bill would deal only with rights which are civil rights or public rights. It would not deal with private rights.

I have gone to great pains for years to make it crystal clear that I have no desire, notwithstanding my ardent advocacy of this cause, ever to interfere with private rights privately enjoyed.

The Senator refers to what would be a social club, or perhaps a golf club. Perhaps one day our law will mature in that direction, but it certainly has not done so up to this time. As things now stand, a person may invite to dinner, may play golf with, or may play tennis with anyone he chooses, or may ask him to join a club or deny him the right to join a club. That is his business.

As an example, in the case of the Forest Hills Club, involving the son of Ralph Bunche, as the Senator remembers, there was a great public outcry. In that public outcry, at no time did any responsible person raise an issue of law. That case did raise an issue of morality, in view of the fact that Forest Hills, by national consent, was the site of the tennis championships.

I make that point because I do not think that any serious person—I am certainly deeply serious in this regard, as the Senator knows, as is the Senator from Arizona—has ever considered that the ambit of any "part III" would extend to clubs such as the Senator defines.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator is making this very clear in the Record. I shall read the Senator's comments with great interest.

My basic fear concerning title III has always been the possibility of invasion of privacy and the invasion of the rights listed under the 1st amendment, which I think are among our most important rights. If the Senator has satisfied himself and Senators who are joining him on this point, I think he has done a great service. I shall read the Record with interest.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to my colleague, in response, that not only would I have to satisfy myself and my colleagues who have joined me, but the Senate as a whole. I am fully prepared to bear that burden.

I also say to my colleague from Arizona, who is an ardent and most eloquent exponent of the philosophy of our party, that, speaking unilaterally, I know of no single measure more adjusted to Republican philosophy than a measure which leaves complete freedom to everybody, except that it would provide a forum for adjudication, in accordance with the rulings of law, of vexing, detailed, individual problems. I know of nothing which marries our ideas of personal freedom with the need for a forum for adjudication of individual rights more felicitously than this "part III" provision. I say that to my colleague from Arizona because I know he is devoted to refining and developing the philosophy of our party.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend. I shall read the provisions of the bill and the material to which the Senator refers with great interest.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. President, the recent events in Birmingham have demonstrated to us, and we believe to the entire Nation, the vital need for the Congress to enact this legislation, which is a revised version of the so-called Part III provision deleted, after passage by the House of Representatives, from the 1957 Civil Rights Act. The deep demand of Negroes in many parts of the United States to enjoy their constitutional rights now, has achieved the proportions of what might be called a revolt, so far a remarkably peaceful revolt, against the whole social fabric of segregation and discrimination, utilizing as its means of expression the first amendment right of assembly and petition. The effects of this "revolt" are also being felt in explosive situations in the North and elsewhere. These too will be helped by enactment of this measure, coupled with effective enforcement of existing State antidiscrimination laws and by public and private activity in the field of housing, health, education, and employment.

In the Birmingham case the President properly supported informal efforts at mediation and manifested his intention to use his power to call out Federal troops in the event of further violence. But we do not believe that the only alternatives available to the President in these increasingly dangerous situations should be mediation or the use of Federal troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. If the majority leader does not mind, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a remedy in the courts must be provided to avoid resort to other than legal processes by those who are driven to despair by frustration. That is vital in the civil rights field.

This proposal to afford a legal remedy has been reviewed by a distinguished panel of professors of constitutional law at leading law schools throughout the Nation, who have agreed that the measure would be both constitutional and of great assistance in cases like that presented in Birmingham.

The list includes the following: Charles L. Black, professor of law, Yale Law School; Norman Dorsen, associate professor, New York University School of Law; Thomas I. Emerson, professor of law, Yale Law School; Paul A. Freund, professor of law, Harvard Law School; John O. Honnold, professor of law, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Edmond Cahn, professor of law, New York University School of Law; Paul G. Kauper, professor of law, University of Michigan; William B. Lockhart, dean and professor of law, Minnesota Law School; Robert B. McKay, professor of law, New York University Law School; Nathaniel L. Nathanson, professor of law, Northwestern University School of Law; Louis H. Pollak, professor of law, Yale Law School; Charles A. Reich, associate professor, Yale Law School; and Arthur E. Sutherland, Jr., professor of law, Harvard Law School.

Four other professors, although they do not question the constitutionality of the proposal, have certain reservations as to whether they think the legislation is desirable. I shall also list them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinions of all the law professors may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., May 14, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of May 10.

The bill you enclose seems to me constitutional beyond a shadow of a doubt. I cannot conceive what constitutional objection could be addressed to it.

It is my own opinion that the authority to bring such a suit, as to any widespread deprivation of constitutional rights, broad enough in its effects to be analogous to a public nuisance, already resides in the Attorney General. The right not to be discriminated against on the ground of race is at least as important to the national welfare as is the right to engage in interstate commerce. All constitutional rights are bestowed in furtherance of national objectives, and their massive violation is always a public wrong as well as a set of private wrongs. I do not know why the Justice Department will not try this course; the worst that could happen would be that they would lose in court. A cynic might suspect that what they are afraid of is that the Supreme Court would sustain the thesis that a government may invoke the equity process of its own courts to enjoin massive and widespread violations of its fundamental law—and that, having been held to have such power, the administration would then be expected to use it.

Again, I express my gratitude for your vigilance in these matters.

Sincerely,
CHARLES L. BLACK, Jr.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
May 15, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe your proposed bill to amend part 3 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is within the power of Congress as "appropriate legislation" under section 5 of amendment 14 to the Constitution. *United States* v. *Raines,* 362 U.S. 17 (1960), would seem to settle the question with regard to public officials who act to deprive persons of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment. Although the Supreme Court has not ruled on the validity of the 1957 act with respect to private action, I believe that Congress can empower the Attorney General to restrain threatened invasions of constitutional rights. See ex parte Yarborough, 110 U.S. 651, 662–66 (1884); *Logan* v. *United States,* 144 U.S. 263, 282–95 (1892); *United States* v. *McElveen,* 117 F. Supp. 357, 359 E.D. La. 1960). See also the opinions in *United States* v. *Williams,* 341 U.S. 70 (1951).

The efficacy of the bill to assure Negroes their constitutional rights in situations similar to the present one in Birmingham would depend not only on the validity of the application to private action, but on the vigor of enforcement by the Attorney General, the response of Federal district judges in Southern States, and other imponderables. Nevertheless, I believe that, were he armed with the power to prevent invasions of constitutional rights, the Attorney General would be in a position to cope more effectively than he can at present with situations comparable to that in Birmingham.

NORMAN DORSEN,
Associate Professor of Law, New York University School of Law.

YALE LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., May 13, 1963.
Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The proposal to amend part three of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by authorizing the Attorney General to institute civil proceedings to protect 14th amendment rights seems to me clearly constitutional.

Congress has power under section 5 of the 14th amendment to enforce the provisions of that amendment "by appropriate legislation."

The measure would plainly be an exercise of this express power, and I see no other constitutional objection. I believe the proposal would be of significant help in assuring Negroes freedom of speech and assembly, as well as other constitutional rights in situations such as Albany, Ga., Greenwood, Miss., and Birmingham, Ala.

THOMAS I. EMERSON.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
May 14, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your proposed addition to title 3 fully authorized in my opinion by section 5 of the 14th amendment. Since it affects only remedies for existing rights, no problems of vagueness arise.

Best regards,
PAUL FREUND.

UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA LAW SCHOOL,
Philadelphia, May 20, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am delighted to see that you plan to introduce a bill to empower the Attorney General to institute injunctive action against violations of constitutional rights under the 14th amendment. In my opinion, the proposed bill which you enclosed with your letter of May 10 is clearly constitutional and would be very useful.

Since the bill authorizes preventive relief against the denial of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment, this relief could only be directed against persons who are acting under color of State law, or those who are conspiring with persons who are so acting. If the proposed legislation should be modified to make this fact clear, misunderstanding might be avoided and, in my opinion, the effectiveness of the bill would not be impaired.

Very truly yours,
JOHN HONNOLD,
Professor of Law.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 14, 1963.*
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We believe your proposed amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is constitutional. In *United States* v. *Raines,* 362 U.S. 17, similar language from another section of the 1957 act was upheld as applied to State officials. Your proposal then would surely provide valid sanctions for use against public officials in Birmingham or elsewhere who discriminate because of race, color, religion, or national origin. While in the *Raines* case the court did not reach the question of the power of Congress to enjoin private acts of discrimination, we believe that section 5 of the 14th amendment should be read to confer on Congress that power as well.

EDMOND CAHN,
ROBERT B. MCKAY,
Professors of Law, New York University.

CONFIRMATION OF NIGHT LETTER SENT
MAY 13, 1963

THE UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL,
Ann Arbor, May 13, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Although I have not had time for extended study of matter, I believe that proposed bill to authorize Attorney General to institute civil proceeding in Federal district court to enjoin threatened deprivation of 14th amendment rights would be constitutional. This opinion is based to breadth of congressional power to enforce the 14th amendment, the Federal interest in securing to persons the enjoyment of constitutionally protected rights, and the precedent established by the voting rights legislation. Such legislation would serve an effective purpose in helping to meet a situation like that in Birmingham by laying a statutory foundation for intervention by the Justice Department, providing a more adequate and effective civil remedy than now available, and furnishing a means for a prompt judicial decision by a Federal court on the question whether municipal regulations, orders, and police actions restricting the use of streets, parks, and public places for processions and demonstrations are consistent with rights protected under the 1st and 14th amendments.

PAUL G. KAUPER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 14, 1963.
Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Responding to your May 10 letter, I recommend passage of the part III provision authorizing Attorney General to obtain civil injunctions to protect 14th amendment rights. In my opinion such a law would be constitutional and could be useful in many difficult situations.

WILLIAM B. LOCKHART,
Dean, University of Minnesota Law School.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 13, 1963.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I would support both the constitutionality of your proposed amendment to the Civil Rights Act and its applicability to the denial of the rights of assembly and petition in situations such as that presented in Birmingham.

NATHANIEL L. NATHANSON,
Professor of Law, Northwestern University.

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., May 21, 1963.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: My apologies for the delay in replying to your letter enclosing a proposed amendment to part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I have been out of town a good deal—part of the time, as a matter of fact, in Birmingham—and I am only just beginning to catch up with my mail. By now my views on your bill may no longer be timely, but I send them along (brief as they are) for whatever they may be worth.

I have no doubt whatsoever that your bill is constitutional. As I see it, your bill simply widens the statutory base which the Attorney General now has with respect to suits to protect voting rights. Moreover, I think a very good argument can be made for the proposition that even without further statutory authority, the Attorney General has standing to seek injunctive protection of 14th amendment rights generally. See William L. Taylor, "Actions in Equity by the United States to Enforce School Desegregation," 29 George Washington Law Review 593 (March 1961).

To argue that the Attorney General may already have such power is not, of course, to argue that the Attorney General should use this power in all, or even in a great many, instances. When and where such power should be exercised would present very complex issues of policy. But the resolution of such policy issues is the day-to-day business of the Attorney General (cf., e.g., the problems involved in shaping antitrust policy). I make this quite obvious point precisely because I am not at all sure that it would have been desirable for the Department of Justice to rush into court in connection with the recent events in Birmingham. What I saw of events there leads me to conclude that Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall and Assistant Deputy Attorney General Joseph Dolan did a superb job of bringing the parties together to what will, I hope, turn out to be a viable understanding. I would only add that in comparable future situations, the mediating efforts of the Department of Justice might be substantially enhanced if the Department had at its command the leverage implicit in the capability of the Attorney General to go to a Federal court and seek injunctive protection of 14th amendment rights (those of assembly and of fair procedure, as well as those of racial equality before the law) which are being infringed upon in wholesale fashion.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS H. POLLAK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *May 14, 1963.*

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Your bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act is clearly constitutional. In my opinion such legal action might well be of assistance in situations like that at Birmingham.

CHARLES A. REICH,
Associate Professor of Law,
Yale University.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge Mass., May 13, 1963.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Your letter of May 10 reached me a few minutes ago. You ask my opinion about the constitutionality of a modified version of the part III provision which was deleted from the 1957 Civil Rights Act, and of which your letter enclosed a new draft. I have no doubt that your proposed section 123 is within the power of the Congress.

Section 5 of the 14th amendment grants to the Congress power, qualified only by the adjective "appropriate," to insure that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The new section, by its terms, would apply only to "rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment." This clause incorporates by reference the body of doctrine concerning "State action" and modifies what might otherwise be thought to be the overbroad effect of the words "any person" in subsection (a).

Your letter indicates a need for prompt action; I have already telegraphed to you the substance of this letter; and I will not here delay for elaborate citation of authority. The Supreme Court upheld section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 in *U.S.* v. *Raines* 362 U.S. 17 (1960), and the tone of that opinion, which discusses what is "appropriate" legislation under the 15th amendment, is such that it indicates that the Supreme Court would similarly uphold the new section 123 which you propose.

With my good wishes, and my apology for the brevity of this letter, I am

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, those who have dissented on policy grounds are Mark DeWolfe Howe, professor of law, Harvard Law School; Philip B. Kurland, professor of law, University of Chicago Law School; Phil Caldwell Neal, dean of the University of Chicago Law School; and Herbert Wechsler, professor of constitutional law, Columbia Law School.

I ask unanimous consent that these opinions also may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 13, 1963.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This morning I received your letter of May 10 in which you asked me to let you have my views on the suggested amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I have decided not to put my views in the telegraphic form which you proposed, partly because I suspect that the time in which such a response would be useful has passed, and partly because my opinions are somewhat too complex to be compressed into that form. I am taking the liberty, however, of letting you have an expression of my opinions in this more extended form.

My first feeling of discomfort in the bill as drafted springs from the feeling that its constitutional presuppositions are not made clear. Its studied avoidance of any reference to State action may be motivated by a number of considerations. Is nothing said of State action because of the assumption that the reference to 14th amendment rights makes such a reference superfluous? Or is that silence based on the expectation or hope that in the pending sit-in cases the Supreme Court will eliminate State action as an essential element of civil rights legislation? These questions may seem irrelevant to those who urge that what we need is legislation enabling the Attorney General to initiate the suits in question whenever the power of the Nation extends constitutionally to the discriminatory conduct. It seems to me, however, that the bill's failure to indicate its constitutional presuppositions makes it almost hopelessly difficult to ascertain its legislative purposes. It is not clear to me, for instance, against whom this bill contemplates that injunctive relief will be granted. The reference to "conference, conciliation, or persuasion" suggests that relief may be granted against private persons who have failed to negotiate a satisfactory settlement of the demands of Negro leaders for an end to discrimination in restaurants and other private places. It may be, however, that the bill contemplates relief against mayors, police chiefs, and governors if their efforts to negotiate settlements in such controversies have failed. A bill so fuzzy in its constitutional presuppositions and so mysterious in its objectives is likely, I think, to prove a disappointment.

I might add a parenthetical word with respect to another aspect of the bill's clauses bearing on conciliation and conference. These provisions seem to me to be potentially somewhat mischievous. As a practical matter it is evident, I think, that any competent Attorney General will seek injunctive relief against public (or private) discriminations only when local efforts to resolve controversy and disagreement have failed. Situations are, however, imaginable in which promptness of Federal intervention may be essential for strategic or other reasons. I, therefore, consider it inadvisable to include the clauses which would seem, in all circumstances, to make "appropriate efforts" toward conciliation a condition precedent to Federal action.

A somewhat deeper consideration troubles me. Does not this new bill have the fault, in a sense, of trying to do too little? Why should not the power which it proposes to vest in the Attorney General be his whenever rights presently secured by sections 1983 and 1985 of title 42 are infringed? It seems to me that other wrongs than those growing out of racial discrimination need the additional security which this bill proposes to provide. I have the feeling that this high-minded effort to provide an effective response to the tragedy of Birmingham is less useful than it would be if it made a larger purpose manifest. I cannot help wondering whether the progress which you are seeking to encourage might not be more likely to come by the route which was followed in the earlier versions of title III. It may be that political judgment sees some greater likelihood of this new bill being acceptable than that which was offered unsuccessfully on the earlier occasions. I cannot, however, see any advantages in this bill which are absent from the other, and I do see some rather grave ambiguities and confusions in this which were lacking in those. I should much prefer to see a general enactment empowering the Attorney General to initiate injunctive proceedings in any circumstances in which class suits might be brought by aggrieved persons seeking relief under Federal civil rights statutes.

Very sincerely yours,
MARK DEW. HOWE,
Professor of Law.

CHICAGO, ILL.
May 13, 1963.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.:

Proposed section 123 would certainly be sustained as constitutional by Supreme Court. I would regret its passage as an undesirable enhancement of the powers of the Attorney General.

PHILIP KURLAND,
University of Chicago Law School.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., May 20, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry that circumstances did not permit me to reply sooner to your request of May 10 and that it is not possible now to give you more than a very brief reply.

I can see no solid basis for constitutional objection to the principle of giving the Attorney General power to sue for an injunction to enforce the 14th amendment. Also, I have no doubt that there have been and will be occasions where the existence and use of such a power would be appropriate.

I do think there are serious questions as to the wisdom of conferring such a power in the broad terms proposed in your bill. I would hope that before such a measure was enacted there would be careful consideration of ways in which its scope might safely be narrowed. For example, as the bill stands it would apparently permit injunctive interference with the course of State judicial proceedings in which claimed rights of fair trial were about to be denied. The wisdom and necessity of this mode of Federal protection are open to serious doubt. Again, the bill as drawn would be a standing invitation to Federal intervention in manifold aspects of State and local law enforcement. It seems to me that we should want a careful appraisal of the costs this might entail, in terms of undermining the local sense of responsibility, since such costs must be set against the benefits resulting from swifter remedies in particular cases.

On the other hand, I am also doubtful about the desirability of limiting such a remedy by the phrase "because of race, color, religion or national origin." I am not sure what the effect of the clause is intended to be but it introduces what is almost certain to be a troublesome issue of fact and of interpretation. Moreover, the importance of safeguarding rights such as freedom of assembly and freedom of petition is surely not limited to occasions when they are invoked by racial or religious groups or causes.

This is a very inadequate examination of the problems raised by the bill but the importance of the issue seems to me to call for some response to your request. I hope this indication of viewpoint may be of some use. It would be a welcome development if the events at Birmingham were to prompt some further carefully considered measures in this field. It would be unfortunate, on the other hand, if legislation were to be hastily adopted merely to deal with situations like that in Birmingham and as a result saddled us with a new set of problems similar to those which have made the civil rights legislation of the 1870's so unsatisfactory.

Sincerely yours,
PHIL C. NEAL.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N.Y., May 13, 1963.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of May 10 in which you ask my opinion as to the constitutionality and efficacy of a bill which would, in substance, authorize the Attorney General to institute on behalf of the United States a civil action to enjoin conduct which would deprive any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin, of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Replying hastily, as you request, I have the following opinions:

1. I do not doubt the power of Congress under section 5 of the 14th amendment to authorize a civil action in the name of the United States to safeguard rights conferred on individuals by the amendment. The establishment of such a right of action plainly is "appropriate legislation," within the meaning of the enforcement clause of the amendment.

2. How far such a right of action would be effective in any particular situation depends, of course, upon how far the conduct which arouses concern is that of the State or of its agents, within the prohibition of the 14th amendment. Action by one private group which is obstructive of another seeking to protest would not, for example, appear to be attributable to the State and thus forbidden by the Constitution. Action by State officials, on the other hand, involving arbitrary interference or discrimination, normally would fall within the constitutional prohibition. This issue would, therefore, have to be faced in any particular case in determining whether the proposed cause of action lies.

3. I doubt the wisdom of establishing a remedy as broad as that which you envisage, which, in effect, would authorize a suit by the Attorney General in any case where the 14th amendment rights of any person have been threatened. The burden of enforcement this would cast on the Attorney General throughout the country as a whole would seem impossible to bear. A narrower provision, limited to cases where the rights found to be threatened or infringed are those of so large a group that private action cannot afford effective remedies would seem to be more workable in practice as well as more acceptable in theory.

With cordial regards, I am
Faithfully,
HERBERT WECHSLER.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that in my opinion—I have said this many times, and I repeat it now—there is no single more important item of legislation than part III. It would provide an opportunity for relief, as well as a capability for expression of the deep grievances which have brought on this present national crisis. We all know that only an outlet, with relief, will deal with the situation adequately. This kind of provision in my opinion, is critically important because it provides both an outlet and relief. It would enable the majesty of the United States to be interposed in respect to the civil rights of an individual.

We give precisely the same power to Federal officials to sue for wages which are denied to any person who is denied minimum wages. It is at least as important, and I think even more critically important, that we assure each person of his fundamental constitutional rights.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] was unable to be present today. I ask unanimous consent that his statement as a cosponsor of this measure be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND PART III OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1957, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1963

I again join in introducing a bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

When the Civil Rights Act of 1957 was passed, it was welcomed as the first legislation in the civil rights field in three-quarters of a century. In this sense, it was indeed a landmark. But, as a number of us noted at the time, the act as passed failed to include a most important provision—part III of the bill as submitted by the Eisenhower administration.

As originally submitted, this section would have permitted the Attorney General to initiate civil suits in representative cases on behalf of persons deprived of rights to which they are entitled under the Constitution and the laws of the land. The bill which we now introduce would give specific authority to the Attorney General to take such action. Such authority, in the field of education for example, is already embodied in the group of bills some of us introduced earlier this year.

Since 1957 the need for such authority has been demonstrated time and again. With it, affirmative action by the Federal Government to secure justice and equal treatment is possible at the outset. With it, situations like that at Birmingham need never arise. This authority would open another avenue to secure peaceful compliance with the law, a civil and preventive approach rather than one of a criminal and punitive nature.

It is, I believe, an essential tool in meeting the challenge that confronts the Nation. Without it, we in effect continue to ask those most subject to intimidation and brutality, most vulnerable to economic and other kinds of reprisal, to shoulder, largely unaided, the costly and time-consuming burden of individual litigation to secure rights which under the Constitution all our citizens ought to be able to take for granted.

For myself, I do not see how in simple fairness and decency, let alone in the light of our constitutional responsibility, we can justify continuation of this course. Rather, it seems to me the burden is on the Nation to provide an adequate means for redressing longstanding injustice and deprivation.

Only a few days ago the Vice President of the United States, himself a southerner, stated it simply:

"One hundred years ago the slave was freed. One hundred years later the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

"The Negro today asks justice. We do not answer him * * * when we reply to the Negro by asking 'patience'."

The time for palliatives has passed. The time for action to root out the injustices which have given rise to the ugly and degrading events of the last few weeks is here and now.

SENATE ATTITUDE TOWARD SANITATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS MEASURES CONTRASTED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in its simplest terms, this measure, which has been sponsored by a number of Senators, and which has been so eloquently described by my colleague from New York, is modeled after part III of the original 1957 Civil Rights Act and refined. It would permit civil suits to be brought by the Federal Government to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Yesterday, after a few minutes of debate, we passed a bill authorizing the Federal Government to spend up to $2,500,000 each year on sanitation facilities for migratory workers, including toilets, and handwashing facilities.

No one charged that this bill violated States' rights. No ominous threats of a filibuster were voiced. The responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the health of migratory farm laborers by building toilets and washbasins on private farm property was not challenged by a single Member of this body.

The contrast in attitudes toward this type of legislation and the part III bill which we have today introduced is startling. And I will never understand how some Senators who do not blink an eye at Federal legislation for toilet construction can raise such a thunder of protest against Federal legislation to enforce constitutional rights.

I am not critical of any program to relieve the substandard conditions under which our migratory farmworkers work. But certainly, if authority can be found in the Constitution for a sewer, toilet, and washbasin grant-in-aid program, then authority exists for Federal assistance to those seeking equal protection of the law.

There need be no apologies to anyone in any part of our land for this civil rights measure. It is a right and just measure, and it should be a part of any meaningful program of civil rights legislation to be considered and enacted by the Congress.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senate did its part to improve sanitary conditions on the farmlands of America. In the weeks ahead, let us act with comparable dispatch and unanimity to enhance human freedom and justice in America.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, eight Republican Senators have today joined in the introduction of a bill which is a broad version of part III of the Civil Rights Act, updated to present conditions.

I should like to say that those of us who join in introducing the bill, plus a number of other Members of the Senate, have been seeking to secure action on so-called part III, giving the Attorney General the right to intervene in individual cases. Numerous instances of violations of these civil rights have occurred. We have pursued this effort for many years, certainly since 1957. Many of us are of the opinion that without so-called title III, the power presently vested in the Federal Government is inadequate to do justice to an individual whose rights are being trampled upon or abused, because of the present law's requirement, for example, for consent of the Governor of a State to the intervention by Federal forces, or the existence of a situation indicating a breakdown of law and order, or because of other limitations and inadequacies which we were not able to get enacted as a part of the 1957 or 1960 Civil Rights Act.

Ever since the beginning of this year I have been active, along with a number of other Senators, in seeking to persuade the Department of Justice that, unless action were taken along these lines, they would be confronted with continuing outbreaks of violations and by ultimate recognition by a large segment of our people of the inadequacy of the law; that it would lead to frustration, and that frustration would lead to violation of the law; that unless we could get the provisions of the law firmed up, so that an individual may feel he has the full and due protection of the law of the United States, and therefore is justified in working out his rights within the framework of law and within our courts, the individual would resort to means outside the law, and that those means would continue to increase.

It is to avoid this situation that we are very hopeful that action can be had on the enactment of title III.

I may say that some of us spoke to the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, in a meeting some time ago—and I will not attempt to quote what anyone said, but I believe it is proper to speak of the tenor of our remarks—and that the tenor of our remarks was to the same effect that I have repeated today; in other words, we asked that the Attorney General take another look at title III. We again urged him to act favorably, as neither the present Attorney General nor his predecessor had been willing to act, in two administrations, and we pointed out that time was running out, and therefore hoped that the Attorney General would review this subject.

Time has passed. In some cases, as in Birmingham, time ran out; as in Philadelphia, time ran out. We are now confronted by the overt crisis which involves the American people in another great struggle, to the misfortune of all of us; a struggle in which one cannot deny the aspirations of men and women to equality of opportunity and fair treatment and justice. Now we are finally faced with the very confrontation which we have warned against for years, and which we have continually stressed in this session of Congress.

We were finally told before Memorial Day that proposed legislation would be sent to Congress. I suppose the intention was to persuade some people that some kind of civil rights legislation was to be sent up from downtown which would provide either a nostrum, or, as some of us feared, pablum to meet the civil rights problem.

Something happened, and there was delay in the sending up of these measures. Some of us feel we know what happened. Some of us feel that perhaps the administration is anxious to have it both ways. Some of us feel that the administration has been desirous of persuading some of our colleagues it does not really intend to do very much, and to persuade some of our other colleagues and the country that it intended to do a great deal.

I believe the time has come to get off the tightrope. I do not believe anyone is going to be fooled by any attempt in the executive department to talk out of both sides of the mouth at the same time. I believe that the delay in sending legislation to Congress was caused by the action of the Senate Republicans in conference and by the release of a general consensus, indicating that we would support further appropriate legislation on civil rights when presented by the President. As soon as that happened, certain captive commentators, certain suggestible sources which are at all times available to the White House, and certain people who usually can be found to react with almost Pavlovian regularity to administration suggestion came out with statements in the newspapers at the same time. In the course of 72 hours, they all concluded falsely; they all concluded for the purpose of deceiving the American people; they all concluded that the entire onus was on the Republican Party; that the Republican Party, outnumbered 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 1 in the House, should solve the administration's problem, take the administration off the hook, and bring about effective civil rights legislation, if we only wanted to do so.

Mr. President, there are 33 members of the Republican Party in the Senate. They agreed on this consensus by a clear majority. Only one or two have expressed any open disagreement with it. But the magic figure of 25 was used for 72 hours. Obviously beginning with my friend, the distinguished, honorable, and beloved whip of this body, statements were made that 25 Republicans could bail out the Democratic majority. I do not know why the figure was not 22 or 23, or even 27; but when the administration agrees on a party line, believe me, all the loyal captive mouthpieces, and a great many other people, echo that party line with a fidelity superior to the chimes of Westminster.

So for 3 days the administration said "25." But nothing happened.

The administration does not need 25 Republicans. It might get them, but it does not need them. There are 67 Democrats. If 25 Republicans were needed, that would sound as if there were not 38 Democrats supporting civil rights. Perhaps there might be 40 or 42 Democrats. That is a very sorry showing for a party that said it was the "party of performance." That is a very poor showing if that is all they can do, after their magnificent speeches of 1960. It is a very weak showing if the Democrats have to depend on the outnumbered Republicans to have any measure passed by this body.

I must say that I wish we were so strong and effective. I wish we had sufficiently gained the confidence of the American people in that election so that we could, indeed, have made possible the enactment of laws to preserve human dignity, to establish justice and equality, and to overcome the difficulties which have caused the outbreaks of violence in this country. But we are not that powerful or that strong; and I am sorry to say that we are not that numerous.

If the Democratic Party needs troops to secure the two-thirds majority, we will help them. In my judgment, we will give them a higher percentage than they can corral on their side. But if they need troops, they had better get more troops on their side, stop ducking these issues, one by one, in this honorable body, and stop substituting rhetoric for accomplishment.

So I am ready. Eight Republicans have said they are ready. Their numbers will double—and I suspect, triple. We are prepared to support appropriate civil rights legislation, although it has not yet even been introduced. We have had to introduce our own proposals. We do not know what the administration will send to Congress. There are rumors now that the administration will adopt our suggestion and submit a proposed title III. I hope it will. I hope the administration will submit something besides a suggestion for "equality in public accommodations."

But let this administration which was elected on promises of responsibility; let this administration, which was chosen by the people as a government of performance; let this administration which promised in its platform and in its speeches to assure equality of all people under law; let this administration for a change try to perform instead of going to Honolulu and settling for an exchange of "alohas" in lieu of legislation.

I say that the country will judge the administration on this issue. As of now, I suspect that the public judgment is that this administration desires to save the votes of its Southern colleagues, for whom I have the greatest love and respect, and of its Northern colleagues, for whom I have the greatest love and respect, but who are not only schizophrenic legislatively, but at this point schizophrenetic.

I would hope that the administration recognizes that the time is long past for action; and that it will no longer be necessary for some Republicans, time after time, to say, "We want you to keep your promises. We made the same promises, but the people of the United States decided to rely on your promises instead of our promises. Having done so, the solution of this problem lies in the administration's lap. Yes, come to us for help; but provide from the Democratic side a truly responsible and adequate number of representatives who will make possible the enactment of this kind of legislation."

LOCAL PROGRAMS SUPPORTED WITH FEDERAL FUNDS SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED ON A NONDISCRIMINATORY BASIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to have been able to join as a cosponsor of S. 1665, a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds be administered on a nondiscriminatory basis.

In my judgment nothing can justify the contribution of Federal funds to segregated projects or programs. Such practices are unlawful and immoral and cannot possibly be justified by any interpretation of the Constitution. It is incredible at this date in our history that the Federal Government should operate as a silent partner to segregation in any area of activity.

In introducing this bill, the Senator from Oregon said:

> I find it hard to believe that the Administrators of these programs have no choice but to continue extending Federal aid to illegal activities merely because Congress fails in its duty to enact a directive concerning them.

I want to emphasize my emphatic agreement with this sentiment. There is no justification for the "head in the sand" attitude which many Federal agencies take toward this problem. The Constitution is part of every one of our enactments, and no official sworn to uphold the law can continue to ignore Constitutional requirements in carrying out his duties. This duty will persist no matter what action Congress takes on S. 1665.

There is one other point which should be made. This bill represents an attempt to establish a general principle for all programs supported by Federal funds. This approach has obvious merit, and an across-the-board adoption of a uniform policy of nondiscrimination certainly is the most desirable method of dealing with this problem. But the attempt to establish a general policy should not serve as an excuse for not taking whatever action is necessary in the interim to make certain that particular Federal program meet this standard. S. 1665 should serve to define the broad objective we are seeking, but it should not serve as a deterrent to steps which must be taken now to make its principles applicable to individual cases.

The Federal Government collects taxes from every citizen without regard to race, and it has a solemn obligation to insist that these funds be expended without regard to race.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. I hope that the introduction of this measure will serve as an example to the executive branch and put an end to any use of Federal funds for segregation.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROVAL OF LAKE PLACID OLYMPIC SITE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago I was delighted to learn that the Department of State had given its approval to my measure, Senate Joint Resolution 67, joined in by my colleague from New York [Mr. Javits] and by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], to extend an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 Winter Olympic Games in the United States.

Now I also learn that the Department of Commerce has approved the resolution as well. In a vigorous letter of support to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Commerce Department indicates its official endorsement of the effort.

Reports from members of the committee attending oversea meetings are also highly encouraging. The show is nearly on the road, it appears, and with the rousing approval of the two U.S. Government agencies most closely involved, I am very hopeful that favorable action by the committee, by the Senate, by the House, by the President, and ultimately by the International Olympic Committee, will be forthcoming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record the text of the Commerce Department letter on this bill, as well as Senator Fulbright's covering letter to me.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

General Counsel of the
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1963.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department concerning Senate Joint Resolution 67, a resolution "extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States."

The resolution would provide official endorsement by the Government of the United States to an invitation the U.S. Olympic Association will give to the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Lake Placid, N.Y., in 1968.

We would favor such official endorsement for several reasons: The resulting increase in the volume of foreign visitors would provide added impetus to our Visit U.S.A. program, particularly during the off-peak winter season; the foreign currencies spent here by such visitors would provide an additional contribution toward improving the international balance of payments problems; staging the games at an American sports area will assist our winter sports industry by giving it wider recognition among foreign sports enthusiasts; holding the games in this country will represent a great enterprise in international good will.

This Department, therefore, recommends enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 67.

The Bureau of the Budget advised there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Giles.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
May 31, 1963.

Hon. Kenneth Keating,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: A report has been received from the Department of Commerce on Senate Joint Resolution 67, "extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States," which you introduced on March 28, 1963.

A copy of the letter is enclosed for your information. The original of this reply is being held in the committee files for use at such time as the resolution may be considered.

It is requested that the report from the Department of Commerce not be made public without my approval.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN, A GREAT RELIGIOUS LEADER, URGES PRACTICE OF TRUE BROTHERHOOD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in our bereavement over the passing of Pope John XXIII, it is important to remember the great legacy of religious unity he has left the world. In his relatively brief period as pontiff, he pointed the way to greater cooperation among all religious faiths.

One of America's great religious leaders, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Rochester, N.Y., recently emphasized the need for the practice of true brotherhood. In words which we have come to expect from him, Rabbi Bernstein noted the need for all men to work together for the common goals we all share—the building of a better world and the defeat of the evils which beset us.

Mr. President, a splendid editorial in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle of June 3 points up the importance and timeliness of Rabbi Bernstein's message, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON BEING BROTHERLY

In an era in which the zeal for religious unity in some quarters has created fears that it will wipe out creedal differences, it is good to have tempering words from Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein.

Rabbi Bernstein, from the pulpit of the Unitarian Church yesterday, delineated what he called the "Ten Commandments of Brotherhood." We are concerned here with his first, "Accept and respect religious differences."

In the religious unity move so memorably advanced by Pope John XXIII, it should not be overlooked that unity does not mean uniformity. Cooperation, not religious regimentation, is the goal. Catholics will remain Catholics and Protestants will find their own Protestant way to express their convictions. And as Rabbi Bernstein puts it, fundamental religious differences will remain between Christians and Jews.

True brotherhood rests upon acceptance of the right to be different and respect for views other than our own. We are glad the rabbi went further: We must seek out and emphasize what we have in common—one Father and a common humanity. Our objective is identical: to build a better world; our enemies stand before all of us: prejudice, bigotry, discrimination, persecution, injustice, and intolerance. "How foolish, how wasteful, how suicidal, it is to divert our energies to needless dissension," Rabbi Bernstein reminds us, "when together we can and should confront the evils that threaten us all."

A COURAGEOUS SOLDIER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York Daily News of Tuesday, May 14, carried an inspiring article about a remarkable citizen and his determination to make a contribution to national security in the face of handicaps which very few men could surmount.

Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, who is 82 years old, is fighting to rehabilitate himself in order to carry on his career to which he has been devoted for many years. An amputee, partially paralyzed, and stricken with arteriosclerosis, the general refuses to take his handicaps lying down.

General Reilly distinguished himself by becoming the first national president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy in 1904, he has contributed substantially to the Nation's victories, including those areas where national defense policy is formed.

For the past several years, General Reilly has made his home on the 15th floor of the New York Veterans' Administration Hospital at 1st Avenue and 24th Street. Mr. Kermit Jaediker's story in the Daily News describes the general as a "little old man with a wonderful anger in him, and a wild ambition." Those who know General Reilly and know of his dedication—and accomplishments—in the field of national defense, will find this story an impressive one. His courage and determination should be a source of inspiration to the Army and the Reserve Officers Association and to the Nation to which he has dedicated his years of activity of service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks Kermit Jaediker's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD SOLDIER HEARS THE REVEILLE CALL OF LIFE—GENERAL'S FURY CONQUERS PARALYSIS, AMPUTATION

(By Kermit Jaediker)

In a room on the 15th floor of the towering New York Veterans' Administration Hospital at 1st Avenue and 24th Street is a little old man with a wonderful anger in him, and a wild ambition.

He's a general, but he is never going to die in bed, a hospital bed, anyway—not if he can help it.

He is 82 years old and a gravely disabled cripple, but he says, "One of these days I'm going to put on my pants and coat and stand on my own two feet and walk out of here, with crutches maybe, but alone, nobody helping."

He has nursed this ambition, wild as some conqueror's dream of mastering the earth, for six painful, irascible years.

Hospital doctors believe he is fated to wind up in a wheelchair in some nursing home, but as one admitted, "You can never tell about Reilly. The old boy has fooled us before."

The old boy is Brig. Gen. Henry Joseph Reilly, U.S. Army, retired, a onetime military secret service chief in the Pacific, a former history instructor at West Point (Eisenhower and Bradley were among his pupils), a war correspondent and an author.

LEFT LEG GONE, RIGHT LEG FEEBLE

The left side of his body is paralyzed. He hasn't got "my own two feet" because the left leg has been amputated just below the knee and he wears an artificial one. His right leg is so feeble that when he stands he requires a special brace to support it. What's more he has arteriosclerosis.

But counteracting all that, he has a special spirit containing fury, and it is this that sustains him.

He is furious with skeptics who say he'll never walk a street again and he has still another rage reserved for his puny body and for the bed that holds it prisoner most of his day.

"If we could draw his secret out of him with a hypodermic," said Arthur D. Taylor, coordinator of the hospital's physical medicine and rehabilitation service, "we'd shoot it into 50 younger, stronger patients. It would do them a world of good."

The indomitable Reilly, retired from the Army 20 years ago because of age, saw action in most of the principal battles of World War I and also as a foreign correspondent, but nothing will top the gallantry of his hospital years.

FLAT ON HIS BACK AND DETESTING IT

They began in 1957 when, on a writing job, the general did some research at West Point and then came to New York City to confer with his publisher. He was felled by a stroke in his hotel room.

"They brought me here on a stretcher," the general recalls.

Gangrene developed in his paralyzed leg and it was removed by surgery. He was 76 and that, along with the paralysis and a case of acute cardiac failure, made his chances of surviving the operation about nil. But the general, a man of surprises, jolted the hospital staff by recovering.

But recovery meant lying flat on his back, a position Reilly detests.

"They gave me physical therapy—lamps, that sort of thing—to get me over the operation and I got some corrective therapy for my hands and arms," the general said. "But they did nothing about my feet."

Corrective therapy is the use of special exercises to restore action to inactive limbs—even paralyzed limbs. By working pulleys, the general managed to get his paralyzed left arm and hand into motion, bring life back to them. He can now raise his arm shoulder high with scarcely a wince.

TRIES THE WALKER, STANDS IN TRIUMPH

The hand and arm therapy made it possible for Reilly to wheel a wheelchair. He could go to Florida and bake in the sun, assuming he could get someone to take care of him, or he could vegetate at a nursing home.

But that wasn't in the general's credo.

Reilly, who has had three books published, got an idea for a fourth while at the hospital and began writing. There was, however, a lot of research to do. To do the book properly he would have to make several trips to Washington. He would have to interview people at the Pentagon. He would have to talk to Congressmen. In a word, he would have to get around.

This gave him added incentive to learn to walk. He demanded corrective therapy for his legs. But hospital officials thought it would only mean needless pain and an effort beyond his capacity.

"He seemed hopelessly handicapped," said Dr. Bernard Stoll, chief of the Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Service. "His age and condition were against him. It was thoroughly unrealistic of him to expect anything but to be transferred from his bed to a wheelchair and back to bed again."

They told Reilly, as tactfully as they could, to drop the silly notion about walking.

"That," says the general, "infuriated me. I wanted to stand up. God intended you to stand on your feet. The devil intended you to lie on your back."

On the sly, Reilly asked a corrective therapist to let him take a crack at "the walker"—a metal contrivance on wheels in which a crippled man may stand and move, if he has the strength. The therapist braced the walker against a wall and helped Reilly into it. And Reilly stood in shaky triumph on one leg.

HIS NEXT STEP: A TILTING TABLE

He was in the walker only a few minutes, but the sweat stood out on Reilly's face and he had to clamp his teeth tight to surpress a moan.

"But it encouraged me," Reilly said in retrospect, "and it encouraged the hospital people. They knew I could stand up."

The head therapist, David Ser, got into the act. He found a discarded artificial leg and made some adjustments in it so it would fit the general.

The muscles of Reilly's right leg were badly contracted from disuse. So they put that leg in a knee cage with a turnbuckle and straightened the leg "to pain level."

They put Reilly on a tilting table, in horizontal position and bound him to it. He spent 5 to 10 minutes in it daily and each day they tilted the table a degree or so closer to the vertical. When the table came at last to the vertical it was a big moment in Reilly's life. He was standing again.

One day he stood, like a torture victim in a rack, for a full hour.

"Was it very painful?" we asked.

"Damned," Reilly replied.

FOUR MONTHS MAKES A BIG DIFFERENCE

At the start of his course of corrective treatment Reilly, for all his bravura, wasn't very talkative. Therapist Juan Luyanda, who more than any other therapist guided him in the walker, said in his initial report: "The patient has a glassy faraway stare and remains uncommunicative during treatment."

Four months later Luyanda's report went as follows:

"Improvement in ability to sustain activity. He is becoming communicative, talks of friends in military life, especially Gen. Douglas MacArthur." MacArthur was a fellow cadet at the Point.

In 1960 Reilly took his first walk, more or less unaided, in the walker. From then on he has walked in it regularly.

"Would you like to see me walk?" he wistfully asked us. We said of course. The big demonstration was scheduled for the following morning.

NO PICTURES NOW, WAIT TILL I STAND

The general was seated, working the pulleys in a therapy room, when we dropped in. He wore a hospital gown. A news photographer started to take his picture and Reilly made violent objection.

"I don't want my picture sitting down," he cried. "I've been fighting for years to stand up and that's the only way I'm going to be photographed."

Then he yelled for his pants, which were in the supply room. He refused to stand up and pose without them. "By God," he said, "I'll have my pants or there'll be no photograph."

The trousers were put on and Reilly stood up. He no longer wore the makeshift artificial leg; in tribute to his tenacity, the hospital had by this time provided him with a custom-made leg, all his.

He got into the walker in the corridor, Luyanda behind him.

"Give the left leg a little start," Reilly said and Luyanda kicked the artificial leg forward and the general walked in the walker, slowly, with Luyanda's foot kicking the artificial foot almost every other step.

And somewhere ghosts of bugles blew, not "Taps," but a marching song.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Congress now has before it, for its consideration and action, the President's message on National Capital transportation proposals. It is a realistic appraisal of the transportation and commuting problems here in the District of Columbia.

If the recommendations of the message are carried out it will benefit auto traffic, public transit, and preserve the beauty and orderly planning of our Nation's Capital. I hope that hearings can be scheduled at an early date.

The June 3, 1963, issue of the New York Times carries an excellent article on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR THE UNDERGROUND

Every American has an interest in the National Capital, and President Kennedy's proposals for a new transportation system in Washington deserve national support. The President, accepting the recommendations of the National Capital Transportation Agency, has called for a downtown subway with suburban rail connections. He has deferred construction of proposed automobile freeways through the city and asked for a restudy of those projects.

These decisions, if carried out by Congress, will preserve the beauty of Washington and enhance its economy. If there is anything the Capital does not need, esthetically speaking, it is additional great swaths of concrete sweeping across its face and attracting even more automobiles into town. The convenience of rapid transit underground is overdue in Washington.

The President's decision has significance for more cities than Washington. Across the country the battle between rapid transit and the highway builders is being waged. The push for highways, at whatever cost, has behind it powerful automobile, concrete, and other lobbies. In Washington the highway lobbyists were out in full force with the support of the local press. Fortunately, they have lost—at least temporarily. Their setback is a victory for all hard-pressed American cities, and for those trying to save them from strangulation by concrete and the internal combustion engine.

THE CENTURY OF THE EDUCATED MAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Sunday at the commencement exercises of Tufts University in Medford, Mass., the Vice President of the United States delivered an address which is fittingly entitled "The Century of the Educated Man." In these most significant remarks he emphasized the contribution which education and enlightenment must make today in our quest for equal justice and opportunity for all men. The Vice President has thus once more eloquently reaffirmed the responsibility as well as the potentiality of education at this critical point in our history.

Mr. President, I believe that these thoughts should be preserved in the permanent RECORD of this body. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTURY OF THE EDUCATED MAN

When we stood about as far before the midpoint of the century as we now stand beyond that point, the 20th century was popularized as the century of the common man.

Today the year 1999 will soon be nearer to us than the year 1929. We can see our times in a new perspective. At this vantage point, it seems no longer adequate to describe this as the century of the common man.

It is true that during these 63 years, the common man on every continent has covered himself with glory. He has formed more nations, established more self-government, cast more ballots, built more schools, studied more books, cured more disease, ministered to more needy than ever before. The century of the common man has also, as Winston Churchill expressed it, been distinguished by "more common men killing each other with greater facilities than in any other five centuries put together."

The common man has been the focus of great economic and political revolutions. His status as an individual has changed. His institutions have changed. But today a new revolution is running—deeper, broader, more profound and more permanent. It is a revolution of education, a revolution changing the capabilities of the common man—changing what he is, what he can be, and what his children after him will be. In this perspective, I believe we have come to a time when the century in which we live should henceforth be known as the century of the educated man.

On a global basis, no statistics are adequate to suggest the magnitude of today's revolution of education. In our Nation's programs overseas, 30 million people annually use the libraries we provide. We distribute 8 million books abroad each year. The Soviet distributes 20 times more. But together these programs do not begin to meet the world demand.

Mere facts and figures cannot convey the human passion committed to the quest for learning. In our English language teaching programs, small children in Latin America have sold the shoes off their feet to pay their way to classes—which they attend barefoot. In Africa, a tribal chief was turned away from enrolling in a class because there were no more chairs. The next day, he and a contingent of his fellow chiefs were waiting outside the door, each carrying his own chair.

This is not a revolution limited to other continents. Here in our own land, we have more than 50 million students attending more than 135,000 public and private schools at all levels. There are more students today in the United States than there were city residents only 40 years ago.

Our American commitment to education is old and long standing. But the real impact has just begun to come within very recent years.

We have entered an age in which education is not just a luxury permitting some men an advantage over others. It has become a necessity without which a person is defenseless in this complex, industrialized society.

Levels of education which were once regarded with awe, have now become commonplace. And jobs which once could be filled by strength and native intelligence now call for a college degree. We have truly entered the century of the educated man.

It is a mistake, however, to confuse skill with education. A man who has been taught only to hold a job has not been educated—he has been trained. And the man who has merely been trained is not fully qualified to take his place in a free society as a fully participating citizen.

Education, of course, is not something that is acquired just in college. All of life is an education process and when I think of death, I think of it as the moment when the brain ceases to inquire and to expand.

There was a time when some Americans regarded an education just as a passport to a position of luxury in our society. We have come a long way from those days. We have learned that no man can avoid the obligations of citizenship—indeed that these obligations are forced upon him.

This thought is particularly compelling at this time in our history when our country is torn by internal tensions.

People who have been denied basic rights for centuries have reached the explosion point where they are demanding those rights—now. And it is not possible to find logical, moral reasons to say them nay.

In the course of their struggle, Government can—and, I assure you, will—protect them, as it protects all citizens, in the exercise of those right which are guaranteed to them by the Constitution and the laws of the land. But the response to their real—and just—aims must come from the community as a whole.

Government will play its proper role. But our citizens, though they may look to Government for leadership, cannot abdicate their moral obligation to make a total commitment—and carry out that commitment—to the cause of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans, regardless of irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

The days that lie ahead of us will be not only troubled but confusing. The question of equal rights and equal treatment is not a simple one because it is complicated by traditions and patterns of thought that are deeply engrained. The cause of a strong and united America will not be served by promoting misunderstanding and by refusing to understand the legitimate demands of those who are seeking simple justice.

We have too much of a tendency to equate the struggle for equal rights with social prestige and status. The issue is clouded by stating it in terms of who can live in what fashionable section and who can go into what desirable restaurant or who can go into what prestige school.

Frankly, it is difficult for me to see why anyone should deny to another person the right to any prestige to which he is entitled. But even beyond that, we must face up to the fact that individual economic survival in our modern, industrial nation urgently demands equal access to the facilities of our society.

If we deny a man access to the education to which he is entitled by capacity, we also deny him access to his rightful place in our economy. And, I might add, we also deny ourselves his productive skills.

If we deny a man access to adequate housing in an area of his choice, we restrict also his right to live with his family near the place where he can work.

If we restrict the right of a man to enjoy the ordinary comforts of life, we also restrict his right to move from one place to another in search of the best job for which he is qualified. In addition, we restrict the right of the employer to search out the best qualified worker.

Let us be very clear on this matter. If we condemn people to inequality in our society, we also condemn them to inequality in our economy. And we do our conscience a disservice if we dismiss their demands for social justice as a mere desire for social status.

I doubt very much whether those who have been the victims of discrimination have a burning desire to "mingle" with those who have oppressed them. I would think they have accumulated too many resentments. They probably wish that we would just go away and leave them alone.

But we live in a time when our country cannot be divided—not between slave and free or black and white. If we cannot permit each man and women to find the rightful place in a free society to which they are entitled by merit, we cannot preserve a free society itself.

This is the challenge which faces this generation in the century of the educated mind.

One hundred years ago, we settled the question of whether men and women could be property. The answer was "No," an answer that came through blood and agony.

But we did not—despite noble words and noble motives—settle the question of whether men and women would be equal in opportunity. We postponed that issue—simply because it did not force itself upon us in an agrarian society.

We are now learning that no moral issue can be postponed indefinitely. We did not settle the question on the basis of justice and equity when we had time to do so. Now we find we must settle it with turmoil and agony.

The settlement will be one that will try the souls and hearts of all men of all races and religions—North, South, East, and West. This is not a sectional problem because our society is unequal in every section. No part of our country is so without sin that it can cast the first stone.

And somehow we must maintain our compassion—not only for the victims of discrimination but for those who are bewildered and frightened by the changes that are coming at such a fast pace. If we lose our compassion, we will merely substitute one injustice for another—and our agony will be in vain.

This is not a time for retribution but for justice.

The task before us is truly one for the educated mind because the educated mind sees things not only clearly but compassionately. Otherwise, that mind is merely trained. We are dealing with humanity and if we do not treat people as human beings, the educated mind is a sham and a fraud.

This ceremony is quite properly called commencement. In a sense it is the commencement of your education and the commencement of your real problems.

You are stepping out into a world of danger. But where there is danger, there is also opportunity—and the greater the danger the greater the opportunity.

I do not presume to give you advice because my generation cannot tell your generation that we faced up to all problems, solved all issues, and conquered all injustice.

But you are graduating in a time for greatness. I envy you the opportunity and I wish you well.

MEMBERS HOLDING INCOMPATIBLE OFFICES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on May 15 of this year, I introduced S. Res. 142, asking that the Senate Judiciary Committee conduct a complete inquiry into the question of Members of the Senate holding possibly incompatible offices. My colleague, Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, joined me in sponsoring this resolution.

Our purpose in asking for a complete and impartial inquiry into the question is plain. We desire to have all of the pertinent precedents and other information concerning this important constitutional question brought to light. Senator THURMOND and I are Reserve Officers in the Armed Forces of the United States; we are proud to be available for service should that be required. However, we have taken the initiative in this matter in order that the air might be cleared. We have asked for an investigation of the incompatibility question. We are willing to let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, the portion of the U.S. Constitution which is pertinent to this inquiry is found in article I, section 6 and reads as follows: "and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has supplied me with a copy of a comprehensive review of this entire incompatibility question. The study was prepared by Mr. Hugh P. Price of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress and is dated July 2, 1962. I have found the historical background and other information contained in the study to be invaluable and I am certain that it will contribute to a fuller understanding of the incompatibility restriction in our Constitution on the part of each Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the study appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1962.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Holding of incompatible offices by Members of Congress.

This memorandum is in answer to your inquiry of May 24 as to whether the U.S. Supreme Court has ever passed on the constitutionality of simultaneous service by an individual as a Member of Congress and as a commissioned officer in the military service.

The question presented has not been passed upon by the U.S. Supreme Court. Jurisdiction over this matter would appear to be lodged in the appropriate House of the Congress by the Constitution which provides in pertinent part that no Senator or Representative shall during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office (art. 1, sec. 6, clause 2). The Constitution further provides that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members (art. 1, sec. 5, clause 1).

Both Houses have, on several occasions, passed on the question of incompatible offices by Members. An examination of these cases as reported in Cannon's "Precedents of the House of Representatives" discloses that service in the Armed Forces was usually involved. Since there are no pertinent Supreme Court cases we have traced the origin of the constitutional provision; and the material relating thereto is set forth below. Following that is a brief statement on House and Senate decisions, and an opinion by the U.S. Attorney General. Finally there are presented references to relevant works.

I. ORIGIN OF THE PERTINENT PROVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION

(a) *Articles of Confederation*

[The material under this subheading is taken from or based upon "Journals of the Continental Congress," 1774–89, edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by Worthington Chauncey Ford, Chief, Division of Manuscripts, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906. Volume and page references are to this work.]

The constitutional limitation on incompatible offices which is imposed by article 1, section 6, clause 2, is not a new theory respecting public officers. The Constitution's predecessor, the Articles of Confederation, dealt with this principle in article V, clause 2, which read as follows:

"No State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor more than seven Members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than 3 years in any term of 6 years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he or another for his benefit receives any salary, fees, or emoluments of any kind."

This provision as reported to the Continental Congress on Friday, July 12, 1776, from the committee appointed to prepare articles of confederation was in these words:

"No person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than 3 years in any term of 6 years."

"No person holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit, receives any salary, fees, or emolument of any kind, shall be capable of being a delegate [vol. 5, pp. 547, 552].

On Tuesday, August 20, 1776, "Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole to take into their farther consideration the Articles of Confederation; and after some time, the president resumed the chair, and Mr. [John] Morton reported, that the committee having had under consideration the Articles of Confederation, had gone through the same, [and] have agreed to sundry articles, which he was ordered to submit to Congress." Then follows in parallel columns the text of the Articles in their first printed form (as first laid before congress and ordered to be printed), and in their second printed form (showing changes made in text while under consideration in committee of the whole). Changes effected as they pertain to the pertinent section, were limited to the substitution of small letters for the Capitals, with appropriate exceptions (Ibid., pp. 674, 685, 686).

An amendment was effected in the pertinent section on Thursday, October 30, 1777 which is explained by an entry in the Journal of that day reading as follows:

"It was then moved after 'kind' in the 8 1. to strike out "shall be capable of being a delegate,' and in the 6 1. after 'persons' to insert 'being a delegate shall be capable of.'

"On the question put,

"Resolved in the affirmative.

"And the question being put on the several paragraphs as amended, the same were agreed to." (vol. IX, p. 849.)

The foregoing amendment makes the section, in part, read as set out below. New material is italicized. Material that was deleted is inclosed in black brackets.

"No person *being a delegate shall be capable of* holding any office under the United States for which he or another for his benefit, receives any salary, fees, or emoluments of any kind [shall be capable of being a Delegate]."

The Articles of Confederation were agreed to by the Continental Congress on Saturday, November 15, 1777, without further change in the pertinent provisions. The Journal for that day contains this entry:

"A copy of the confederation being made out, and sundry small amendments made in the diction, without altering the sense, the same was agreed to, and is as follows:"

Then follows, in parallel columns, the articles as set forth in the second report, and in their final form (vol. IX, p. 907). The final form of the pertinent section is as first set forth above.

Debate in the Continental Congress on the Articles of Confederation, unfortunately, was not recorded. There are notes of debate by John Adams and Thomas Jefferson which are set out in the Journal (vol. VI, p. 1069, et seq.). However, no reference is found therein to the subject matter here under consideration. The only statement in the Journal to incompatible offices is in the form of a note taken from the writings of John Adams and appearing on pages 125, 126, and 127 of volume IV of the Journal (Feb. 9, 1776). This note indicates that Mr. Adams was to be the Chief Justice of Massachusetts under the new government which was to be formed after independence had been obtained. It seems that there was what might be termed a whispering campaign against Mr. Adams among partisans opposing independence. They alleged that Mr. Adams held an office under the new government of Massachusetts and was afraid of losing it if independence were not declared. Opposition to Mr. Adams was particularly strong among members of the Maryland legislature which instructed its delegates in Congress against listening to the advice of interested persons. A pertinent provision of the instructions to the Maryland delegation reads as follows:

"And we further instruct you to move for, and endeavour to obtain, a resolve of Congress, that no person who holds any military command in the Continental, or any Provincial regular forces, or marine service, nor any person who holds or enjoys any office of profit under the Continental Congress, or any Government assumed since the present controversy with Great Britain began, or which shall hereafter be assumed, or who directly or indirectly receives the profits of such command, or office, shall, during the time of his holding or receiving the same, be eligible to sit in Congress."

With respect to this instruction, Maryland appears to have been inconsistent in that all but two of its delegates were also members of the Maryland Convention which sat from December 7, 1775, to January 18, 1776 (Ibid., p. 127).

(b) *U.S. Constitution*

[The material under this subheading is taken from or based upon "The Journal of the Debates in the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States May–September, 1787," as recorded by James Madison, edited by Gaillard Hunt, in two volumes, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, the Knickerbocker Press, 1908. Volume and page references are to this work.]

On Tuesday, May 29, 1787, after the transaction of routine business, Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, opened the main business of the Constitutional Convention. He expressed his regret, that it should fall to him, rather than those, who were of longer standing in life and political experience, to open the great subject of their mission. But, as the Convention had originated from Virginia, and his colleagues supposed that some proposition was expected from them, they had imposed this task on him. He spoke of the defects of the Confederation, and then proceeded to the remedy. In the course of his remarks he proposed as conformable to his ideas certain resolutions, which he explained one by one. Among such resolutions were these:

"3. Resolved that the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches.

"4. Resolved that the Members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States every ——— for the term ———; to be of the age of ——— years at least, to receive liberal stipends by which they may be compensated for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to any office established by a particular State, or under the authority of the United States, except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the first branch, during the term of service, and for the space of ——— after its expiration; to be incapable of reelection for the space of ——— after the expiration of their term of service, and to be subject to recall.

"5. Resolved that the Members of the second branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by those of the first, and out of a proper number of persons nominated by individual legislatures to be of the age of ——— years at least; to hold their offices for a term sufficient to insure their independency; to receive liberal stipends, by which they may be compensated for the devotion of their time to the public service; and to be ineligible to any office established by a particular State, or under the authority of the United States, except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second branch, during the term of service; and for the space of ——— after the expiration thereof" (vol. 1, pp. 15 and 16).

At the conclusion of Mr. Randolph's address it was resolved—"That the House will tomorrow resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider of the state of the American Union"—and that the propositions moved by Mr. Randolph be referred to the said Committee (vol. 1, p. 19).

On the same day Mr. Charles Pinckney laid before the House the draft of a Federal Government which he had prepared (ibid., p. 19). The same was referred to the Committee of the Whole appointed to consider the state of the American Union (ibid., p. 19). Article 5, clause 3 of this plan was in these words:

"The Members of each House shall not be eligible to or capable of holding any office under the Union during the time for which they have been respectively elected nor the members of the Senate for one year after." (Ibid., p. 25).

On Tuesday, June 12, in Committee of the Whole there were votes on certain pertinent questions:

"1. On a question for striking out the 'ineligibility of members of the National Legislature to State offices'.

"2. On the question for agreeing to the clause as amended.

"3. On a question for making members of the National Legislature ineligible to any office under the National Government for the term of 3 years after ceasing to be members.

"4. On the question of such ineligibility for 1 year (vol. 1, p. 127)."

On June 18, Colonel Hamilton outlined a charter of Government. Under article II, section 8 thereof "The acceptance of an office under the United States by a Representative shall vacate his seat in the Assembly" (vol. 1, p. 166).

On Friday, June 22, in Convention, "Mr. Ghorum moved to strike out the last member of the third resolution concerning ineligibility of members of the first branch to office during the term of their membership and for 1 year after. He considered it unnecessary and injurious. It was true abuses had been displayed in Great Britain but no one could say how far they might have contributed to preserve the due influence of the Government nor what might have ensued in case the contrary theory had been tried."

Mr. Butler opposed it. This precaution against intrigue was necessary. He appealed to the example of Great Britain where men got into Parliament that they might get offices for themselves or their friends. This was the source of the corruption that ruined their Government.

Mr. Wilson was against fettering elections, and discouraging merit. He suggested also the fatal consequences in time of war, of rendering perhaps the best Commanders ineligible; appealing to our situation during the late war, and indirectly leading to a recollection of the appointment of the Commander-in-Chief out of Congress. There were remarks by Mr. King, Colonel Mason, and Colonel Hamilton (vol. 1, pp. 214–217).

Saturday, June 23, in convention, General Pinckney moved to strike out the ineligibility of members of the first branch to offices established "by a particular State." He argued from the inconveniency to which such a restriction would expose both the Members of the first branch, and the States wishing for their services; and from the smallness of the object to be attained by the restriction. It would seem from the ideas of some that we are erecting a kingdom to be divided against itself, he disapproved such a fetter on the Legislature.

Mr. Sherman seconded the motion. It would seem that we are erecting a kingdom at war with itself. The Legislature ought not to be fettered in such a case (vol. 1, p. 217).

Mr. Madison renewed his motion yesterday made and waived to render the Members of the first branch "ineligible during their term of service, and for 1 year after—to such offices only as should be established, or the emoluments thereof augmented, by the Legislature of the United States during the time of their being Members." He supposed that the unnecessary creation of offices, an increase of salaries, were the evils most experienced, and that if the door was shut against them it might properly be left open for the appointment of Members to other offices as an encouragement to the legislative service (vol. 1, p. 218).

There was an expression of views by Mr. Butler, Mr. Rutledge, Mr. Mason, Mr. King, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Gerry, and Mr. Madison (ibid., pp. 218–223).

Mr. Sherman moved to insert the words "and incapable of holding" after the words "eligible to offices" which was agreed to without opposition (ibid., p. 223).

The word "established" and the words "National Government" were struck out of the resolution 3d (ibid., p. 223).

Mr. Spaight called for a division of the question, in consequence of which it was so put, as that it turned in the first member of it, "on the ineligibility of Members during the term for which they were elected"—whereon the vote was yea 8, no 2, divided 1 (ibid., p. 223).

On the second member of the sentence extending ineligibility of Members to 1 year after the term for which they were elected Colonel Mason thought this essential to guard against evasions by resignations, and stipulations for office to be filled at the expiration of the legislative term. Mr. Gerry had known such a case.

Mr. Hamilton: evasions could not be prevented—as by proxies—by friends holding for a year, and then opening the way, etc.

Mr. Rutledge admitted the possibility of evasions, but was for contracting them as far as possible (ibid., p. 223).

June 26, in Convention—Mr. Butler moved to strike out the ineligibility of Senators to State offices. There were remarks by Mr. Wilson and General Pinckney which seemed to support the amendment (vol. 1, p. 247).

Mr. Williamson moved a resolution so penned as to admit of the two following questions: (1) Whether the Members of the Senate should be ineligible to and incapable of holding offices under the United States; and (2) whether, and so forth, under particular States. On the question to postpone in order to consider Mr. Williamson's Resolution, the vote was aye 8, no 3. Mr. Gerry and Mr. Madison moved to add to Mr. Williamson's first question: "and for 1 year thereafter." On this amendment the vote was: aye 7, no 4. Mr. Williamson's first question as amended was agreed to unanimously; on the second question the vote was: yea 3, no 8 (ibid., vol. 1, p. 247).

On Monday, August 6, in Convention, Mr. Rutledge delivered in the Report of the Committee of Detail, the same being a draft of the Constitution. Article VI, section 9 was in these words:

"Sec. 9. The Members of each House shall be ineligible to, and incapable of holding any office under the authority of the United States, during the time for which they shall respectively be elected: and the Members of the Senate shall be ineligible to, and incapable of holding any such office for 1 year afterwards" (vol. II, p. 80).

Tuesday, August 14, in Convention, article VI, section 9 was taken up. Mr. Pinckney argued that making the Members ineligible to office was degrading to them, and the more improper as their election into the Legislature implied that they had the confidence of the people; that it was inconvenient, because the Senate might be supposed to contain the fittest men. He hoped to see that body become a school of public ministers, a nursery of statesmen: that it was impolitic, because the Legislature would cease to be a magnet to the first talents and abilities. He moved to postpone the section in order to take up the following proposition:

"The Members of each House shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States for which they or any others for their benefit receive any salary, fees, or emoluments of any kind—and the acceptance of such office shall vacate their seats respectively."

Colonel Mason ironically proposed to strike out the whole section, as a more effectual expedient for encouraging that exotic corruption which might not otherwise thrive so well in the American soil—for completing that aristocracy which was probably in the contemplation of some among us, and for inviting into the legislative service those generous and benevolent characters who will do justice to each other's merit, by carving out offices and rewards for it. In the present state of American morals and manners, few friends it may be thought will be lost to the plan, by the opportunity of giving premiums to a mercenary and depraved ambition.

Mr. Gerry read a resolution of the Legislature of Massachusetts passed before the act of Congress recommending the Convention, in which her deputies were instructed not to depart from the rotation established in the fifth article of Confederation, nor to agree in any case to give to Members of Congress a capacity to hold offices under the Government. This he said was repealed in consequence of the act of Congress with which the State thought it proper to comply. The sense of the State however was still the same. He moved to render the Members of the House of Representatives as well as of the Senate ineligible not only during, but for 1 year after the expiration of their terms. If it should be thought that this will injure the legislature by keeping out of it men of abilities who are willing to serve in other offices, it may be required as a qualification for other offices that the candidate shall have served a certain time in the legislature.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris: "Exclude the officers of the Army and Navy, and you form a band having a different interest from and opposed to the civil power: you stimulate them to despise and reproach those 'talking Lords who dare not face the foe.' Let this spirit be roused at the end of a war, before your troops shall have laid down their arms, and though the civil authority 'be intrenched in parchment to the teeth' they will cut their way to it."

He was against rendering the members of the legislature ineligible to offices. He was for rendering them ineligible again after having vacated their seats by accepting office. Why should we not avail ourselves of their services if the people choose to give them their confidence. There can be little danger of corruption either among the people or the legislatures who are to be the electors. If they say, we see their merits, we honor the men, we choose to renew our confidence in them, have they not a right to give them a preference; and can they be properly abridged of it.

Mr. Williamson introduced his opposition to the motion by referring to the question concerning "money bills." That clause, he said, was dead. He had swallowed the vote of rejection, with reluctance. He could not digest it. All that was said on the other side was that the restriction was not convenient. We have now got a House of Lords which is to originate money bills. To avoid another inconveniency, we are to have a whole legislature at liberty to cut out offices for one another. He thought a self-denying ordinance for ourselves would be more proper. Bad as the Constitution has been made by expunging the restriction on the Senate concerning money bills, he did not wish to make it worse by expunging the present section. He had scarcely seen a single corrupt measure in the Legislature of North Carolina, which could not be traced up to office hunting.

Mr. Pinckney: "No State has rendered the members of the legislature ineligible to offices. In South Carolina the judges are eligible into the legislature. It cannot be supposed then that the motion will be offensive to the people." If the State constitutions should be revised he believed restrictions of this sort would be rather diminished than multiplied.

Mr. Wilson could not approve of the section as it stood, and could not give up his judgment to any supposed objections that might arise among the people. He would remark in addition to the objections urged against it, that as one branch of the legislature was to be appointed by the legislatures of the States, the other by the people of the States, as both are to be paid by the States, and to be appointable to State offices, nothing seemed to be wanting to prostrate the National Legislature, but to render its members ineligible to national offices, and by that means take away its power of attracting those talents which were necessary to give weight to the Government and to render it useful to the people. He was far from thinking the ambition which aspired to offices of dignity and trust, an ignoble or culpable one. He observed that the State of Pennsylvania which had gone as far as any State into the policy of fettering power, had not rendered the members of the legislature ineligible to offices of Government.

Mr. Ellsworth did not think the mere postponement of the reward would be any material discouragement of merit. Ambitious minds will serve 2 years or 7 years in the legislature for the sake of qualifying themselves for other offices. This he thought a sufficient security for obtaining the services of the ablest men in the legislature, although whilst members they should be ineligible to public offices.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris put the case of a war, and the citizen the most capable of conducting it, happening to be a member of the legislature. What might have been the consequence of such a regulation at the commencement, or even in the course of the late contest for our liberties?

On question for postponing in order to take up Mr. Pinckney's motion, it was lost.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to insert, after "office," except offices in the Army or Navy: but in that case their offices shall be vacated.

Mr. Broom seconded him.

Mr. Randolph had been and should continue uniformly opposed to the striking out of the clause; as opening a door for influence and corruption. No arguments had made any impression on him, but those which related to the case of war, and a coexisting incapacity of the fittest commanders to be employed. He admitted great weight in these, and would agree to the exception proposed by Mr. Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney urged a general postponement of section 9, article VI, until it should be seen what powers would be vested in the Senate, when it would be more easy to judge of the expediency of allowing the officers of State to be chosen out of that body.—A general postponement was agreed to nem. con. (ibid., vol. II, pp. 158-166).

On Monday September 3, in convention—Mr. Pinckney moved to postpone the report of the Committee of Eleven (See Sept. 1.) in order to take up the following:

"The Members of each House shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States for which they or any other for their benefit, receive any salary, fees, or emoluments of any kind, and the acceptance of such office shall vacate their seats respectively."

He was strenuously opposed to an ineligibility of Members to office, and therefore wished to restrain the proposition to a mere incompatibility. He considered the eligibility of members of the Legislature to the honorable offices of Government, as resembling the policy of the Romans, in making the temple of virtue the road to the temple of fame.

On this question the vote was yea 2, nay 8.

Mr. King moved to insert the word "created" before the word "during" in the report of the committee. This he said would exclude the Members of the first Legislature under the Constitution, as most of the offices would then be created.

Mr. Williamson seconded the motion. He did not see why Members of the Legislature should be ineligible to vacancies happening during the term of their election.

Mr. Sherman was for entirely incapacitating Members of the Legislature. He thought their eligibility to offices would give too much influence to the Executive. He said the incapacity ought at least to be extended to cases where salaries should be increased as well as created, during the term of a Member. He mentioned also the expedient by which the restriction could be evaded to wit: An existing officer might be translated to an office created, and a Member of the Legislature be then put into the office vacated.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris contended that the eligibility of Members to office would lessen the influence of the Executive. If they cannot be appointed themselves, the Executive will appoint their relations and friends, retaining the service and votes of the Members for his purposes in the Legislature. Whereas the appointment of the Members deprives him of such an advantage.

Mr. Gerry thought the eligibility of Members would have the effect of opening batteries against good officers, in order to drive them out and make way for Members of the Legislature.

Mr. Gorham was in favor of the amendment. Without it we go further than has been done in any of the States, or indeed than any other country. The experience of the State governments where there was no such ineligibility, proved that it was not necessary; on the contrary, that the eligibility was among the inducements for fit men to enter into the legislative service.

Mr. Randolph was inflexibly fixed against inviting men into the legislature by the prospect of being appointed to offices.

Mr. Baldwin remarked that the example of the States was not applicable. The legislatures there are so numerous that an exclusion of their members would not leave proper men for offices. The case would be otherwise in the General Government.

Colonel Mason: "Instead of excluding merit, the ineligibility will keep out corruption, by excluding office hunters."

Mr. Wilson considered the exclusion of members of the legislature as increasing the influence of the executive as observed by Mr. Gouverneur Morris at the same time that it would diminish the general energy of the Government. He said that the legal disqualification for office would be odious to those who did not wish for office, but did not wish either to be marked by so degrading a distinction.

Mr. Pinkney: "The first legislature will be composed of the ablest men to be found. The States will select such to put the Government into operation. Should the report of the committee or even the amendment be agreed to, the great offices, even those of the judiciary department which are to continue for life, must be filled while those most capable of filling them will be under a disqualification."

On the question on Mr. King's motion the vote was 5 for, 5 against.

The amendment being thus lost by the equal division of the States, Mr. Williamson moved to insert the words "created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased" before the word "during" in the report of the committee.

The last clause rendering a seat in the legislature and an office incompatible was agreed to nem. con.:

The report as amended and agreed to is as follows:

"The Members of each House shall be ineligible to any civil office under the authority of the United States, created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during the time for which they shall respectively be elected. And no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

II. HOUSE AND SENATE CASES

The Constitution (art. I, sec. 6, clause 2) provides that "no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." It further provides (art. I, sec. 5, clause 1) that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members." Under this authority both Houses have upon numerous occasions determined that service with the Armed Forces of the United States is incompatible with membership in the Congress. A study of these cases as set forth in Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, we believe, supports the proposition that Members of the Congress may enter the Armed Forces by enlistment, commission or otherwise; that upon entry into such service the individual ceases to be a Member of the Congress provided the appropriate House chooses to act. There have been cases in which the congressional body affected did not act. The most outstanding example of this, we believe, occurred in 1916 when the House (1) failed to act on the report of its Committee on the Judiciary which found that acceptance of a commission in the National Guard by a Member vacates his seat; and (2) appropriated funds for salary and clerk hire as to such Members. The particulars of that situation are as follows:

"On June 7, 1916, Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, offered the following resolution, which was agreed to by the House:

"*Resolved,* That in order to determine the status of certain Members of this House, with reference to whether there is any disqualification of such Members holding commissions in the National Guard of the various States, the Judiciary Committee is hereby directed to investigate such question and to report its conclusion thereon at such early date as may be convenient to such committee."

In explaining the purpose of the resolution Mr. Mann said:

"There are several Members of the House who hold commissions in the National Guard of the various States. There was no question in reference to that before the enactment of the recent Army reorganization bill. Under that act, there is pay that goes to the officers, and several Members have asked me in reference to their status, whether they could still remain members of the National Guard and of the House. I have a resolution asking the Committee on the Judiciary to make an investigation of the subject so that they may have their standing known."

On June 29, Mr. Edwin Yates Webb, of North Carolina, from that committee, submitted a report in accordance with the resolution of instructions. After quoting section 6, article I, of the Constitution, and referring to the act of June 3, 1916, making provision for the national defense, the report thus analyzes the question submitted:

"The practical question submitted to the committee by the resolution, therefore, is, Does a Representative in Congress cease to be such a Representative upon his acceptance of a commission in the National Guard under the provisions of the act of Congress mentioned?"

As to whether a commission in the National Guard may be considered to be an "office" within the meaning of the Constitution, the report says:

"In the *United States* v. *Hartwell* (6 Wall., 385), the Supreme Court of the United States said that the term 'public office' embodies the ideas of tenure, duration, emoluments, and duties, and that the duties are continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary.

"Accepting this as a correct definition, we must, then, look to the act of Congress above referred to and determine whether a commissioned officer in the National Guard, under the provisions of the said act, is an officer of the United States."

The texts of numerous pertinent provisions are then set forth.

Considering the accepted definition of the term "public offices" in connection with these provisions of the National Defense Act, the report decides:

"From the foregoing provisions it is apparent that a commissioned officer in the National Guard clearly meets the definition in *United States* v. *Hartwell* of an officer of the United States; that is, that his office embraces the idea of tenure, duration, emoluments, and duties, and that his duties are continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary. As such commissioned officer serves under an act of Congress, he takes an oath that he will obey the orders of the President of the United States (see sec. 73, Act June 3, 1916), and will act under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President and Secretary of War, perform the duties prescribed by the President and Secretary of War, and will be entitled to receive such compensation from the Federal Government for his services as may be prescribed and appropriated by Congress."

Having thus determined the status of an office in the National Guard, the committee then takes up the question as to the incompatibility of such office with that of a seat in the House.

The report states the question as follows:

"The only question, then, to be considered is, whether as an officer he is disqualified to fill a seat in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"From the earliest time it has been recognized as a plain principle of public policy that 'where two officers are incompatible they cannot be held by the same person.' Incompatibility exists where the nature and duties of the two offices are such as to render it improper, from consideration of the public policy, for one incumbent to fill both, the rule being that the acceptance of the second office vacates the first. From the further discussion of the duties and requirements of the two offices under consideration it will clearly appear that they are incompatible. The question here presented, however, is not to be determined by any general rule of public policy as promulgated by the courts and dependent upon a finding of incompatibility; but rests upon the plain prohibition contained in the clause of the Constitution already quoted."

The report then goes on to cite the cases of John P. Van Ness, in the 7th Congress, Edward D. Baker, in the 29th Congress, Frank P. Blair, in the 38th Congress, and quotes at length the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the subject in the 55th Congress.

Applying the principles discussed in these cases, the committee concluded:

"No line can be drawn between the large and the small office. The Constitution prohibits a Member of Congress from holding 'any office under the United States while a Member of either House.' If a Member should hold any office under the United States, the prohibition of the Constitution at once intervenes and declares that he shall not 'be a Member of either House.'

"It follows that the seats of those Members of the House of Representatives who shall accept commissions in the National Guard of the various States under the act of Congress of June 3, 1916, will at once become vacant. The only action necessary would be to declare such vacancy by resolution as a matter of convenience and to aid the Speaker and others in discharging their public duties. It would not change the legal effect of accepting such an office in the National Guard."

The committee therefore reported in answer to the resolution that any Member of the House holding a commission in the National Guard under the provisions of the act of Congress of June 3, 1916, would at once be disqualified from acting as a Member of the House.

The report of the committee was not acted on by the House, but on February 28, 1919, during consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, Mr. Mann offered an amendment providing for payment of salary and clerk hire of Members who had accepted such commissions in the military service.

The amendment was agreed to, and Mr. Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, said:

"The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois has been agreed to. As a matter of fact, those gentlemen who left the House of Representatives and accepted commissions in the Army, under all the holdings of the past as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary following an investigation of precedents made in order by a resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois calling upon them for a report, forfeited their seats as Members of the House of Representatives. I say those who accepted commissions. Those who went as privates, of course, occupied a different status.

"Now, there is not any doubt about that. There is not any doubt in the mind of any gentleman here. Here, unfortunately, is what, because of our unwillingness to engage in an ungracious act, we are doing: We are providing an entirely different plane for men who left the House of Representatives and went into the Army from those who left other departments of the Government and went into the Army. I have no doubt, so far as I am personally concerned, of the correctness of the report made by the Committee on the Judiciary. I have no doubt that they were correct under the precedents: I have no doubt they were right under the reasoning. I did not make the point of order. It would have been an ungracious thing to do; it would have been an exceedingly objectionable thing to do to the membership of the House, and yet this opportunity having arisen to express myself, I wish to take advantage of it to say that I did not approve of the amendment."

Mr. Richard Wayne Parker, of New Jersey, added, in substance, that in such a situation, if no notice was taken by Congress or by the States of the fact that the vacancy existed, the membership was only suspended and the Member could come back to his seat again.

Subsequently, Mr. Mann moved to suspend the rules and pass the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms and Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized and directed to immediately pay all arrears of salary and Clerk allowance to Members of the House of Representatives of the 65th Congress who have not received their monthly salary and allowances owing to their absence from the House while in the military service of the United States during the war: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from such amounts for salary, respectively, any money received by any of the above-named as compensation for service in the Army during the present emergency, and the affidavits of the above-named persons shall be accepted as proof as to whether or not such payment has been received by them."

The motion was agreed to.

III. OPINION OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL

There is set forth below the opinion of U.S. Attorney General Francis Biddle made to the President on December 23, 1943, and reported in "40 Opinions Attorney General 301" which has some relevancy to the subject under inquiry.

Members of Congress serving in the Armed Forces

DECEMBER 23, 1943.

The PRESIDENT.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am glad to comply with your request for my opinion concerning the legality of acceptance of commissions in the Armed Forces by Members of the Congress.

The Constitution (art. I, sec. 6, clause 2) provides that "no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." An officer of the Army or the Navy is, in general, a person holding office under the United States. *United States* v. *Mouat*, 124 U.S. 303; *United States* v. *Carter*, 217 U.S. 286; *Hoeppel* v. *United States*, 85 F. (2d) 237. It further provides (art. I, sec. 5, clause 1) that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members." Exercising this authority both the House and the Senate have upon occasions in the past determined that service with the Armed Forces of the United States is incompatible with membership in the Congress. These decisions are cited in the United States Code, Annotated, under article I, section 6, clause 2 of the Constitution, and include the following: House Miscellaneous Documents, 38th Congress, 2d session, volume 3, page 92 (Baker and Yell), page 395 (*Byington* v. *Vandever*); Senate Miscellaneous Documents, 52d Congress, 2d session, volume 6, page 180 (*Stanton* v. *Laine*).

I quote below from the report of the House Committee of Elections in the case of *Byington* v. *Vandever*:

"He has no right as Representative to absent himself from the House without leave; and if he does, is liable to be arrested by the officer of the House, and returned and punished. But he is also bound as an officer of the Army to be with his regiment (perhaps a thousand miles distant) ready to execute the commands of his superior officer; and for his default, is liable to punishment—it may be with death. Or his military superior may take him by force from his seat and duties in the House to his post in the Army.

"That such a physical impossibility as is thus created, to execute the duties of both offices, renders them incompatible, would seem to be beyond a doubt.

"But there is also that in the nature of the powers incident to the two positions which renders them incompatible * * *.

"That no Member of this House shall be allowed to hold, at the same time, an incompatible office, and that no other department of this Government shall be allowed to exercise any influence over its members, by distinctions and emoluments conferred, or any control by virtue of superior authority, are principles that involve the existence, integrity, and rights of the House, and the just distribution of the powers of the Government. They were deemed of such vital importance as to demand a place as an express provision of the Constitution, inserted after the fullest debate and consideration.

"In view of the necessity of maintaining these principles in their full extent, the committee could not allow any extraneous circumstances to influence them. However much they might honor Colonel Vandever for his noble conduct, they must judge his rights by the same law that is applicable to the most undeserving Member of the House. They have therefore felt compelled to report and ask the House to adopt the following resolution."

The House adopted the resolution recommended by the committee, declaring that the Member had not been entitled to his seat since the militia regiment in which he served as an officer was mustered into the service of the United States.

The required conclusion is that under the practice "which appears to have long prevailed and which I see no occasion to disturb" Members of the Congress may enter the Armed Forces by enlistment, commission or otherwise. Upon entry into such service the individual ceases to be a Member of the Congress provided the House or the Senate, as the case may be, chooses to act. There have, of course, been cases in which the congressional body affected did not choose to raise the question. It would be a sound and reasonable policy for the executive department to refrain from commissioning or otherwise utilizing the services of Members of the Congress in the Armed Forces. The Congress has recognized the soundness of this policy by including in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 885, a provision exempting Members of the Congress from induction thereunder.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

IV. RELATED COURT CASES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

We have been unable to find a reference to an article or other work dealing exclusively with the subject of incompatible offices. The Index to Legal Periodicals, the Reader's Guide, the law library catalog, and the main catalog of the library were checked for references to pertinent works with negative results. Mechem on "Public Offices and Officers" has a chapter on incompatible offices (ch. IV, pp. 267–275). American Jurisprudence treats the subject (42 Am. Jur., Public Officers, secs. 58–82). For annotations on incompatibility of offices or positions in military service and civil service see:

26 A.L.R. 142.
132 A.L.R. 254.
147 A.L.R. 1419.
148 A.L.R. 1399.
150 A.L.R. 1444.

The only Supreme Court case we have found touching on incompatible offices is that of *United States* v. *Saunders* (1887) 120 U.S. 126. There a clerk in the office of the President of the United States, who was also appointed to be the clerk of a committee of Congress, and who performed the duties of both positions was entitled to receive the compensation appropriated and allowed by law for each.

HUGH P. PRICE,
Legislative Attorney.

TRIBUTE TO DR. C. WILLARD CAMALIER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on June 30, a man who has long been an outstanding health leader in the Nation, and a good friend of many in this body, is retiring. I am referring to Dr. C. Willard Camalier, who is assistant secretary of the American Dental Association and director of its Washington office.

For nearly 50 years, Mr. President, Dr. Camalier has been a representative of dentistry on the national level. During that half century, his accomplishments have won him high stature not only within his profession but among all those interested in health affairs. I have long enjoyed a most rewarding friendship with Dr. Camalier. It is, therefore, especially pleasing to me to take this opportunity to wish him well and to commend him once more for his fine achievements and his dedicated services to our country and to his fellow man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the statement announcing Dr. Camalier's retirement that was issued by the American Dental Association. The announcement tells of a few of the major achievements of Dr. Camalier and notes some of the many honors those achievements have earned him.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENTAL LEADER IN NATION'S CAPITOL FOR HALF CENTURY RETIRES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. C. Willard Camalier, Sr., 4240 Fordham Road, NW., announced today that he will retire on June 30 from the posts of assistant secretary of the American Dental Association and director of its Washington office. A major figure in American dentistry for nearly 50 years, Dr. Camalier has been one of the profession's prime representatives to the Federal Government since World War I. He is the elder brother of Renah Camalier, former District of Columbia Commissioner.

The recipient of innumerable honors, Dr. Camalier served as president of the American Dental Association in 1937–38, and in 1950 was named the dentist of the half century by the District of Columbia dental society.

Dr. Gerald D. Timmons, of Philadelphia, president of the American Dental Association, said that "all of the Nation's 100,000 dentists will hear this announcement with sadness. Dr. Camalier is almost literally irreplaceable. He has been a major factor in the great progress of American dentistry in the past decades and his accomplishments on behalf of the Nation's health are matched by few men. He has the respect and admiration of all of us."

One of Dr. Camalier's most recent honors came on May 22, when he received the 1963 Award of Merit from the Georgetown University Dental School. The citation accompanying the award read in part: "In conjunction with 40 years of general practice, he served as president of the American Dental Association, as a member of the association's board of trustees and 14 years as a member of the Board of Dental Examiners of the District of Columbia. He is past president of the American Association of Dental Examiners.

"In World War II, he was chairman of the War Service Committee of the (American Dental) Association and the dental member of the national board of procurement and assignment. He has served as chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Selective Service and is a member of the President's Council on Youth Fitness. In 1959, the American College of Dentists bestowed on him its highest award for meritorious service.

During World War I, Dr. Camalier served as secretary of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and as chairman of its committees on registrars and on Liberty Loan drives.

At a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees of the American Dental Association, Dr. Camalier was nominated for honorary membership in the association, an honor rarely accorded a regular member.

A native of Washington, D.C., Dr. Camalier received his dental degree in 1912 from George Washington University. He and Mrs. Camalier, the former Lottie Lillian Pemberton, will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary in November 1964. They have two children living, C. Willard, Jr., who is a general surgeon, and Robert, who is with the Department of Agriculture.

SUSPENSION OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTS REDUCES FALLOUT HAZARDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yesterday in an act of honor, courage, and vision, the President of the United States announced that high representatives of the Government of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States will meet in Moscow in July to attempt once again to construct an atomic test ban treaty.

"To make clear our good faith," the President announced, "our Nation will conduct no more atomic tests in the atmosphere for so long as other nations forgo such tests." The President pledged that should atmospheric testing be resumed "we will not be the first to resume." The cause of peace is served by such a declaration. The hopes of men go with our negotiators to Moscow.

The suspension of atmospheric testing—and the reduction thereby of radioactive contaminants in the air we breathe and the food we eat—is important news for all who are concerned with the health of our children and our children's children.

In recent months, it has appeared to observers that both the Soviets and our own Government were refraining from atmospheric testing and that an unspoken, de facto suspension of tests was being evolved.

By announcing America's willingness to continue this moratorium on atmospheric tests, the President has made it more difficult for the Russians to resume such tests. For if they do it will be very clear to the world that the Russians and not the United States have forced the resumption of atmopheric contamination. If they do resume tests—and we shall know instantly for such tests can be monitored with great precision—the onus for the increasing levels of fallout will not be upon the United States.

Recently 34 Senators—of whom I was pleased to be one—joined with the senior Senator from Connecticut and the senior Senator from Minnesota in offering a resolution calling upon the American Government to again seek a test ban with the Soviet Union on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere and the oceans, and to announce to the world that the United States will conduct no nuclear tests in the atmosphere or under water so long as the Soviets abstain from such tests.

This the President has in substance done.

The people of Alaska have especial reason to be pleased with the President's declaration. In 1962 atmospheric tests conducted by the Soviet Union and the United States doubled the amount of radioactive debris in the world. This will mean that in the present year Americans will have in their diet four times more strontium 90 and other radiocontaminants than last year.

Alaska lies directly in the path of prevailing winds coming from the Siberian northland across the American continent. As a result Alaska receives the full brunt of radiocontamination from Soviet tests. I have pointed out in recent months to the Senate on several occasions that the people of Alaska are experiencing in some cases far more fallout contamination than has been received by citizens of the lower 48 States. I have called for increased measurement and surveillance of contaminant levels in Alaska. I have repeatedly asked Federal officials to prepare and to have ready effective countermeasures, should these become necessary. Radioactive levels in the Arctic have not yet reached the point where such countermeasures are necessary. Levels of contamination in Alaska will increase substantially in the present year because of the radioactive debris already in the atmosphere. I am hopeful, however, that danger levels will not be reached and that extensive countermeasures will not be necessary. I have insisted, I insist now, and I will continue to insist, that the Federal Government keep fully informed and prepared.

Of course, the very best and most effective countermeasure to protect against increasing radioactive fallout contamination is to cease atomic testing in the atmosphere. This, the President has done and this I pray God the Russians will also do.

I did not question the President's sincerity when he reluctantly ordered the resumption of tests in 1961. In his judgment they were necessary for the common defense and it is his responsibility to make such judgments. I know how anxious he is to obtain a nuclear test ban. I stand with him in his determination and I sincerely hope that his actions of yesterday will mean the end of atmospheric contamination with radioactive debris and the beginning of effective negotiations toward a nuclear test ban.

The people of Alaska who stand in the front lines of the cold war have every reason to support the President in his efforts.

THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, delivered a significant address on the Pacific area as a developing community.

He was referring to some 78,000 island people, speaking nine different languages and many different dialects, spread over a 3-million-square-mile ocean area, on 2,100 islands which have but 687 miles of land.

It was these lovely island archipelagos and island groups, set as successive strings of coral necklaces in the blue Pacific basin, that inspired Rodgers and Hammerstein to write of a "Bali Hai" in their classical "South Pacific."

It was at the smallest island of them all, Pitcairn Island, where we recall the famous—or infamous—mutiny on the H.M.S. *Bounty*.

Perhaps vaguely, many Americans will recall the names of some of these island groups—the Marianas, the Marshalls, the Carolines. They will recall that the very success of our Pacific war effort depended on the decisive battles of Truk, Saipan, and Tinian during World War II.

Following that war, this vast Pacific area was entrusted to the care of the United States under the United Nations Charter. Mr. Cleveland's talk reported on the progress that has been made in those islands and the increasing attention we are paying to their importance and development.

Geography has placed Hawaii in mid-Pacific and, as the westernmost State of the Union, has turned our eyes westward to the islands of the west Pacific. More and more, Hawaii has become a hub of activities linking the United States to those islands.

For many years, Hawaii has been playing a vital and creative role in the development of trade and commerce with the emerging Pacific Islands. In addition, the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center, located on the university campus, together have provided a broad liberal arts education as well as technical and professional training for large numbers of students from the Pacific.

The university campus has become a center of Pacific-oriented international scholarly activities. For example, in 1961 the university was host to the 10th Pacific Science Congress, attended by 3,000 scientists from all over the world.

In cooperation with Federal agencies, the State, together with the university and the East-West Center, have participated in technical assistance programs designed to take American know-how directly to the people of the Pacific.

In the development of the Pacific community, Hawaii is expected to assume an ever-expanding role as a center for services and trade in the Pacific hemisphere—a role for which Hawaii is well suited.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Cleveland be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at a banquet of the conference on Educational Investment in the Pacific Community, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Comparative Education Society, cohosted by Stanford University School of Education, and Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, Calif., Friday, March 29, 1963)

I

All of a sudden, it seems, we have begun to talk of a Pacific community. And when we do, we get very close to the heart of U.S. foreign policy. It therefore is worthwhile, I think, to begin by putting that framework around the subject of your conference.

It is easy to forget that the very possibility of any kind of human community at all is a relatively recent phenomenon. For most of man's history to date, he wandered in search of food—a lonely gatherer and hunter of sustenance. No earlier than 10,000 years ago—a mere blinking of history's eye—man first discovered how to domesticate plants and grow his own food. It was an epic technological breakthrough; and its social fallout was the beginning of social complexity—tiny communities of human beings, beginning in the earliest settlements to learn to live together—by living together.

The story of man since then is the emergence of everwidening communities—the clearing, the village, the town, the city, the city-state, the nation. At each stage new technology made possible—and stimulated—the larger community.

Now we already can say with comfortable confidence that when future historians look back on the decades immediately following World War II, they will write it down that our present times were notable for another breakthrough—a matrix of international communities, overlapping and interacting, the most dynamic political force of the 20th century. Suddenly—the historians will exclaim—the world was no longer made of continents and oceans but of communities. And the writers of our history will be bound to note that the Nation with the closest links to most of the new commonwealths was the United States of America.

Behind the new force lies the new technology: the new technology which drives groups of nations together against the threat of thermonuclear war—the new technology which drives nations together in history's first organized war against poverty and disease—the new technology which some day must drive nations to organize international peacekeeping institutions as a substitute for war itself. In the age of jets, great oceans which once served as hostile barriers between nations become friendly inland lakes for communities of nations around its shores. And so we can begin to talk realistically about a Pacific community—for political trends cannot be far behind the technology that makes them possible—and necessary.

II

There is no major area in the whole free world where impulses toward unification, integration, or partnership among new nations are not at work; only in the so-called Communist world is the trend in the opposite direction.

The most spectacular of these regional developments, of course, is in Western Europe where nations that have been at war with each other, off and on, for most of the modern era, are now finding unity. Europe, where these same nations are now putting together the world's second greatest industrial complex to serve a market of over 300 million prospering consumers.

I hope I do not have to stress the point that the recent check to European integration is not a checkmate. Our friends the historians will see it—or so we yet believe—as a bump along a road—a road which has some hazardous passages but leads in a clearly marked direction. Today's biggest headline seems fated, like so many other headlines, to wind up as a quaint footnote in the future's books about the present.

But the new Europe is only the most advanced case of a movement which engulfs all but that reactionary world which is still struggling with the hopeless task of adapting to stubborn reality the theology of Marx and Lenin.

In Latin America aroused peoples are beginning to act as if they had something in common besides a common background—and poverty. The Organization of American States, the Alliance for Progress, the widespread resentment of Soviet intervention in Cuba—all are symbols of a new sense of community still inadequately expressed in workable institutions. There are the beginnings of two customs unions, one in Central America and one, the Latin American Free Trade Association, consisting of the principal South American countries and Mexico. In Latin America there is a new economic momentum, and common institutions for development have just been given another push in the Declaration of Costa Rica.

Elsewhere, similar unity moves are part of the atmosphere.

In North Africa, a Maghrib confederation is being talked about.

In southeast Asia, there are impulses toward regional arrangements and regional programs for economic and social cooperation.

In the Arab world, it is hard to believe that the drive toward unity will not overcome the most bitter of divisions.

Even in tropical Africa, where strident nationalism has been used as a jimmy to pry new nations out of old empires, the first institutions for regional integration are coming into being.

And you meet here in California today to explore the early outlines of a Pacific community.

Several years ago Sir Oliver Franks drew a careful bead on this postwar trend and described regionalism as "a halfway house at a time when single nations are no longer viable and the world is not ready to become one." It would be hard to say it better.

III

The growth of regional communities is of course quite in line with the obligations and opportunities of every member of the United Nations.

The U.N. Charter explicitly recognizes the role of regional organizations in articles 52 and 53 and even foresees their use to help the U.N. keep the peace in emergencies. The U.N. economic commissions are themselves organized on a regional basis, and spawn other regional groupings, like the Mekong River project in southeast Asia.

Regional organizations, in short, can help relieve the United Nations of burdens which otherwise might sink the universal boat we are all in together.

But the point I want to make here is that support for and participation in these overlapping communities of the free is at the doctrinal heart of U.S. foreign policy. Our concept of an emerging new system of world order depends heavily upon the growth and health and strength of the new communities within the broader framework of the U.N. system—for they weave the fabric of order with the strong yarn of consent. They reflect our kind of world of pluralism and color—our open society projected around the globe. They are the exact antithesis of the gray and monolithic world order—the universal closed society—of which the Communists dream.

This is why we—you and I, as Americans—carry around without embarrassment a whole pocketful of memberships and associate memberships in interlocking and mutually reinforcing regional organizations. The last time I counted, which was yesterday, there were 18 of them—8 in our own hemisphere, 10 in Europe and Asia. For any member of this conference who can name all of them without a reference book, the Department of State will offer a modest prize. It will have to be modest; the Congress gives us just enough money to help finance these organizations, and none at all to finance guessing games.

IV

In the Pacific we speak of community—not yet of an organization, hardly even a concept that any two nations on the Pacific rim would define alike. But if we have yet to formulate just what brings us together except the lapping waters of this greatest and least turbulent of oceans, we Americans do share with our neighbors in the near West one very special interest—the bits and pieces of land and small groups of people scattered on that ocean's surface.

They are "dependent territories," most of them. As the great colonies of Asia and Africa wriggle free from their colonial apronstrings, the 50 or 60 enclaves and island groups still regarded as colonial remnants around the world are beginning to show up clearly on the horizon of the emotional debates on colonialism in the U.N. and elsewhere.

More than a dozen of these dependencies are in the Pacific—including the smallest of them all, Pitcairn Island of mutinous memory; 146 people live there on 2 square miles of real estate which has been British for 124 years. The 3 U.N. trust territories that now remain of the original 11 are all in the Pacific: tiny Nauru and huge, primitive New Guinea, both administered in trust by Australia; and the scattering of Micronesians on the old Japanese mandate, now the Trust Territory of the Pacific, which is entrusted to us to govern under arrangements that can only be changed by the Security Council of the United Nations.

As a case study in building a Pacific community, let us consider for a moment the condition and destiny of these 78,000 island people, speaking 9 different languages and unnumbered dialects, spread over an ocean expanse of 3 million square miles, on 2,100 individual islands that aggregate hardly 687 square miles of dry land.

We have left a part of our own history, and a good deal of our lifeblood, in some of those scratches on the map—in Truk, where our aviators neutralized a powerful naval base, and in Saipan and Tinian, where the crucial land battles of the Marianas were won.

I am here to tell you that the administration in Washington is paying very special attention to these people on those islands. And none too soon.

In an era when American power and technical progress is felt in every corner of the free world, when young volunteers and middle-aged technicians are helping every free people to build the institutions of modernity, none of our foreign aid programs are available to the only foreigners who have been specifically entrusted to our care by the world community.

The Voice of America has no program for the islands; the citizens of trust territory are not quite foreign enough to qualify for a rating as an audience. The Soviet radio is not as reticent: Radio Moscow can be clearly heard in Japanese in many islands of the trust territory.

Until the administration and the Congress got busy last year to increase the funds for education in Micronesia, we were spending an average of $33 per child per year for elementary schooling. In a well-meaning but unrealistic attempt to protect the islanders from the shock of 20th century civilization, most education has been in whatever vernacular happened to be the local language—which was nice and comfortable for the parents, but hardly a golden opportunity for the children. In all honesty, we have not been equipping these people for modern living.

The small numbers of people, and the enormous distances involved, make a decent educational system extremely difficult to organize. But we can do lots better, and the U.S. Department of Interior, which administers the islands which the United States holds in trust under the United Nations Charter, is starting out to do just that.

A properly American attitude toward the development of the Pacific islands, is surely plain, if difficult to carry into action all at once. Ignorance is not bliss, we say, not even on lovely islands washed by the bluest of waters and cooled by the gentlest of breezes. Poverty is not picturesque, illiteracy is not Elysian, and backwardness is not the road to happiness.

As our modernization policy gathers momentum, the somehow familiar names of these remote islands—the Marianas, the Marshalls, the Carolines—will lose their recent connotation of war and death and acquire a new meaning as symbols of life, and peace, and the self-determination of peoples.

V

From time to time groups of islanders have expressed an interest in becoming permanently associated with the United States. We are flattered by this interest and perhaps a little embarrassed; we are not quite sure we have entirely merited this admiration. In any event we feel these expressions of interest to be premature. We do want the inhabitants of Micronesia to exercise their inherent and inalienable right of self-determination. We do not think, however, that this choice should be made until these people have acquired a first-hand knowledge of both the benefits and the responsibilities of 20th century civilization.

This is indeed what we have undertaken by treaty to do. The Charter of the United Nations, as ratified by the Senate, describes in these words the aims of the trusteeship system:

"b. To promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement."

Not racy language, that. But the meaning is clear: the islanders themselves will in the end determine their own future, and we shall see to it that they get the chance to learn the issues and exercise the choices.

The winds of change are blowing, still sometimes at zephyr strength, over the other island areas in the central and southern Pacific. What is to become of these bits and pieces of old trading empires: too small and too remote for meaningful nationhood, too much in the spirit of the times to remain old-style dependencies?

How much real estate is necessary to make a nation? How many persons add up to a people?

Can anyone seriously imagine dozens, even hundreds, of sovereign and independent nations fashioned from the multiple island groupings of the Pacific basin, each with its own flag, its currency and national anthem, its independence day celebration and its seat in the United Nations? Must Pitcairn Island, for all its renown, choose a Foreign Minister from its 146 good people?

Wisely the General Assembly of the United Nations, in resolutions designed to hurry the decolonization process, has provided a considerable range of options for the exercise of the right of self-determination. One of the alternatives recognized by the Assembly is for a people to combine with others; another kind of self-determination is to opt for free association, on an agreed basis, with a metropolitan power.

But this constitutional no-man's-land that lies between sovereign independence, which is now so fashionable, and colonial dependency, which is now so rightly out of fashion, needs a great deal more exploration by the lawyers and the political scientists. For if small populations are going to be asked to determine their future, they must be offered something better than a Hobson's choice between permanent dependency and fashionable illusion.

In the Pacific islands, and in each of the major nations around the Pacific rim, a stirring of new thought and new action is more than evident. Things will be on the move, and you in California will have a ringside seat. If we think hard, and act boldly on careful plans, we will surely find ways of assisting the Pacific community in its growing interdependence with the rest of the world. And that's what we mean, isn't it, when we speak here, so late in the evening but so early in history, of a Pacific community?

THE PRESIDENT'S HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAM—REMARKS OF IVAN A. NESTINGEN

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our State of Indiana was honored to have as a guest recently the Honorable Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Speaking before delegates attending the Democratic Women's Convention in Indianapolis, Mr. Nestingen outlined the President's hospital insurance program for older people and attacked the opponents of this measure whose distortion and half-truths have given many people a false picture of the need and of the remedy. In view of the widespread interest in the President's program not only among my colleagues but across the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Nestingen's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY IVAN A. NESTINGEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

It is a pleasure to be with you this afternoon. I appreciate your invitation to be here and to discuss with you one of the most important pieces of legislation now pending before Congress.

There can be little doubt that President Kennedy's hospital insurance program for older people is a necessity both for health and humanitarian reasons. You all know this and have proved your interest by your activity in Indiana to elect Congressmen and Senators who support it. Last year, for example, you defeated a Republican Senator who twice had voted against the program in the Senate. And, you helped to elect Senator BIRCH BAYH who used the program as one of his main campaign planks. Recently I appeared with Senator VANCE HARTKE on a television program to discuss this bill and, as you know, he had been a vigorous proponent of this legislation. Let me say: We, in the administration, are proud to be working shoulder to shoulder with both of Indiana's fine Democratic Senators on this vital issue.

Before going into detail about what the program does or does not do for the Nation's older people, let me comment on the outlook for its passage.

First, in my judgment, the program will become law this year. We will know better about this in a few weeks when the House Ways and Means Committee begins hearings on the legislation. Congressman WILBUR MILLS, who is chairman of the committee, plans to start the hearings in mid-July and to ask for a vote in early August. The timing may be altered somewhat, depending on when the committee finishes up its current work on the tax reduction and reform legislation.

The big question at the moment is: Will the committee approve the program and give the House a chance to vote on it? This is by far the biggest hurdle the program has to face in Congress. For, we know we have the votes in the House and Senate to pass the bill once it gets past the Ways and Means Committee.

The situation within the committee is very tight. The committee has 25 members and, at present, 11 members have openly said they will vote for it. Thus, two more votes are needed for the necessary majority. Whether the additional two votes will be available by the time the hearings are concluded is an open question now.

It is interesting to note that all 11 of the committee members for the legislation are Democrats. All the Republicans on the committee have indicated they intend to try to block it from being voted on in the House.

I'm sure this kind of attitude on the part of the Republicans is no surprise to you. It is no surprise that the Republicans line up with such antipeople groups as the American Medical Association. The AMA violently opposes this legislation. And, like the Republicans, all of them have opposed social security legislation from the beginning.

Why do they oppose the hospital insurance program?

It is for exactly the same reasons the Republican Party opposed social security in 1935 and have continued to oppose it every time it has been extended and improved in the past 28 years. They said President Roosevelt's proposal for retirement payments under social security was socialism and called it a cruel hoax. They are using the same terms now. But, they have never bothered to explain what these labels mean.

Their technique is simple, but it is often hard to combat because it is based on fear. I will go into this in some detail in a moment.

One thing about the Republicans: They are consistent.

Out of the 435 Members of Congress in 1935 there was only 1 Republican who voted for the establishment of social security on the key vote. Again in 1949, when President Truman proposed to increase retirement payments and extend coverage, the Republicans were against it. Out of the 112 votes cast against consideration of the Truman proposals, 111 came from Republicans. Fortunately, there were enough Democrats in Congress to pass it.

In 1956 a Democratic Congress added disability benefits to social security. The key vote on this extension of social security was in the Senate where only 6 out of 38 Republicans voted for it. Last year when the President's health insurance proposal for older people was being considered in the Senate, only 5 Republicans voted for it and 30 were against.

The Republicans are being aided and abetted this year, as they have been in the past, by the leadership of the American Medical Association. In fact, this little group of doctors has deliberately launched a new campaign of fear to defeat the President's plan.

One reliable source said recently they spent more than $7 million last year alone in its propaganda efforts. It is doubtful if a more intensive, or better financed, campaign to defeat a Presidential proposal has ever occurred in the history of the United States.

How is the AMA leadership using fear?

They use it in their speeches, public statements, publications, films, advertising, and every other means of communication they can find. The techniques they use follow a pattern. Usually they start with a completely false statement designed to frighten the people who are listening or reading. They know many people freeze up and oppose change when they are afraid. They hope by using fear they can scare enough people into opposing the President's program so that it won't pass Congress.

Let us take a few examples of this technique used recently by the president-elect of the American Medical Association.

Here are his exact words from a recent Detroit speech:

"It's no secret to you men that social security is already in difficulty * * *. There is nothing in the social securtiy fund but IOU's * * *. The future is bleak indeed. It's going to have enough trouble standing on its own feet * * *. And, if on top of this we add any other scheme of financing, it's merely going to add to the already overburdened social security system."

Yet, the AMA's chief spokesman knows well that the financing of the social security system has been studied again and again by distinguished groups of unbiased citizen experts, and each time it has been given a completely clean bill of health.

One of the real cruelties of this kind of untruth is that it is often heard or read by old people getting social security checks. Then, they begin to worry about whether they will continue to receive their payments. Some even become desperate because they know they cannot live without that monthly check. The Social Security Administration has received thousands of pathetic inquiries resulting from such scare propaganda. It is difficult to dispel these fears and concern of the older citizens.

Another technique frequently used by the AMA's president-elect is to cast doubt on the integrity of those who favor the President's program.

Here's what he said in San Francisco recently:

"Today we have a new type of charlatan in our midst. He is the political charlatan, the political quack, the political fraud who would deliberately misuse his power and mislead the people into accepting medical care through Government control for purely political reasons."

In Concord, N.H., he said:

"These quacks and charlatans are trying to sell their wares to the American people * * *. They want to socialize this country * * *. It is the labor socialists who are the architects and protagonists of the bill."

Again, the good doctor is attempting to frighten people—to scare them into thinking a group of evil plotters are trying to socialize the country.

These charges are ridiculous.

Although these are only two examples of how they use fear to propagate their case, there are many more that have and will be used.

By going into some detail about how the AMA hierarchy is using fear and fakery to fool the public, I hope I have made this simple point. We need your help to get the truth to the public.

We cannot allow the President's program to be smothered by a blanket of propaganda. Nor should we allow it to choke to death on a wad of AMA money.

The opponents of the President's program, including the AMA, know they cannot fool all the people with fear alone. They often use the argument that the program is not needed. They say any health care problems older people have can be solved through public relief, private health insurance, or the Kerr-Mills Act.

The simple fact is: None of these proposed alternatives is satisfactory. The health problems of older people are too deep and too broad. The only practical and logical solution is the one the President has proposed which would add a hospital insurance plan to social security.

Perhaps, by looking at some of the facts regarding the need, it will be clearer to you why the President is urging passage of his program. The facts revolve around the low incomes and other resources of older people and their increased need for medical care as they grow older.

Let's look at their income first. The typical older couple in this country has an income of only about $50 a week—less than half the average income of younger couples. Widows and other aged people living alone have an average of only about $20 a week.

Half of the retired people have almost no income other than their social security payments—averaging $70 a month per person—and they have little in the way of savings. One-third of the aged families has less than $100 in liquid assets.

But still another way, only 3½ million of the 18 million have enough income to even be required to pay income tax. Only 3 out of 100 have an income of $10,000 a year or more.

These figures plainly show that the incomes are not only low, but far below amounts needed for a modest, but adequate, standard of living.

These figures, perhaps more than anything else, spotlight the reason why President Kennedy has proposed that America's older citizens need a basic program of hospital, nursing home, and diagnostic care under our present social security system. They show clearly that most of our elderly just cannot afford to be ill for very long. If they are, they must turn to charity, public welfare or their children.

In addition to the problems older people have with their inadequate income, they are the victims of the skyrocketing costs of medical care.

The Labor Department's cost-of-living index since 1950 has gone up 26 percent, while hospital daily charges have jumped 125 percent.

A third factor which has prompted the President's concern for the health of the Nation's aged is: The elderly usually need hospitalization more frequently than do younger people and, once they go into a hospital, they stay for longer than those under 65. Nine out of ten people 65 or older can expect to be hospitalized at least once during their retirement, two out of three at least twice, and one out of three at least three times.

Furthermore, the aged can expect their hospital stays to be at least twice as long as younger people and their bills to be twice as large. An older person will get an average bill of $700 for his hospital stay.

Faced with these facts, even the American Medical Association admits many of our older citizens need some help—from whatever source—in getting the medical care, particularly hospitalization, they need.

Let's look at the alternates the AMA suggests.

The main bulwark of the AMA's case is that part of the Kerr-Mills Act commonly referred to as Medical Assistance for the Aged or MAA. This is a program under which States which adopt it share the cost of providing the medical assistance with the Federal Government.

The program is designed to provide help to the aged who are considered medically needy.

Here are just a few facts about it:

MAA has only been put into effect in 25 States and 3 territories and, of these, only 3 or 4 States have comprehensive plans. Most States simply do not have the money for a program, even with the Federal Government putting up a big part of the care cost. Thus, half the States have no programs and 20 or 21 have totally inadequate ones.

In fact, five States—New York, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—spent 88 percent of all the money put into MAA last year. In one State, hospital care is limited to 6 days; 12 days in another. Several States provide care only in life-endangering or sight-endangering cases.

Furthermore, the MAA programs are proving to be—in the words of the New York Times—"an administrative monstrosity." This is no wonder. There are 25 different programs—1 for each State. There is the need for annual appropriation of funds by each State and the Federal Government.

It is no wonder that Tennessee is spending more on redtape than on MAA benefits. It is no wonder that in 1961 the cost of administering the MAA program in Kentucky was 124 percent of the amount paid for medical expenses. And it is no wonder that it costs Oregon 38 cents for every dollar of benefits.

And most of all, there is the means test. This test is designed to determine whether an applicant is really "medically needy." In most cases it involves questioning every child of the applicant to see whether the children are able to foot the medical bills of their parents.

As a second line of defense, the AMA leaders claim about half of all Americans over 65 have some form of private health insurance. This figure is, at best, an optical illusion. The question is not how many older people have private insurance, but how good is it. One of the Nation's leading medical economists says that, with all the private insurance, only 10 or 15 cents out of every dollar the aged spend on their medical needs is actually paid by health insurance.

The biggest reason why present health insurance coverage is so poor is that most of the aged cannot afford to pay for really adequate coverage. The cost of broad health insurance coverage for an aged couple, when such insurance is available, is more than $400 a year—about one-sixth of the total income of an average older couple.

This situation is not the fault of the insurance companies. There is simply no way for profitmaking organizations with relatively small numbers of policyholders to cover the aged without charging extravagant fees.

Now let me tell you exactly what President Kennedy is proposing. First, the program is merely a simple extension of the present social security program to cover most hospital, nursing home, diagnostic service, and visiting nurse expenses for nearly everyone now 65 or older or who will reach that age. No payment would be made for surgical fees, the services of personal physicians, and and private-duty nurses or luxury items furnished at the request of the patient.

The program is designed to pay those bills that tend to be the greatest—to help when severe illness or injury threatens the older person's entire economic independence.

The program would provide the following benefits:

1. The costs of up to 90 days of inpatient hospital services, with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days or at least $20, or for those people who so choose the costs of up to 180 days with the patient paying the first 2½ days of average costs; or all costs for up to 45 days of hospital care.
2. All costs of up to 180 days of care in skilled nursing home facilities affiliated with hospitals after transfer of the patient from a hospital.
3. All costs above the first $20 for hospital outpatient diagnostic service.
4. All costs of up to 240 home health-care visits in any one calendar year by community visiting nurses, physical therapists, or other health specialists.

These benefits would be available to all the social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries over 65. In addition, the protection would be extended to all others who are over 65 and have not had the opportunity to participate in the social security program.

In the long run, almost everyone will receive the health insurance on the basis of his participation in the social security program during his working years. The cost of providing the health insurance benefits to those who are not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries would be paid by general tax revenues. The cost of the benefits for those eligible for social security would be paid by an increase in social security contributions. To the average worker it would be 25 cents a week or $13 a year. The maximum it could cost any worker would be $17.68 a year.

Let me assure you we shall be doing everything possible to have Congress pass this legislation this year. I believe it will pass.

GOVERNOR HUGHES ON ELDERLY HEALTH CARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of the Senate to a most thoughtful speech on the subject of health care for the elderly which was delivered recently by Gov. Richard Hughes of New Jersey to the 15th Annual Middle Atlantic Hospital Assembly.

As everyone knows this is a controversial issue, but it is one of the few issues where virtually no one denies that a problem exists or argues that it is being adequately met at the present time. In one of those curious inversions of political life, we find that many of the opponents of the President's program to finance a health care program through social security reserve their strongest opposition to its supposed inadequacies.

Almost the entire argument has degenerated into a controversy over what, in my judgment, should be a decidedly secondary consideration—the method of financing.

It seems to me that if we agree that a problem exists and that the Government must play a larger role in solving it, then surely as reasonable men we can find a solution to the questions of method.

In his talk, Governor Hughes described the commendable efforts of the American Hospital Association to find some sensible solutions to this vital problem, and suggested that this opens up the real possibility of accommodation between the interested parties.

Governor Hughes concluded that it should be possible for those who are truly interested in the establishment of a sound program of hospital insurance to work out their differences for the common good.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope this will be so, and in the hope that other Senators will have a chance to read this thoughtful speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Gov. Richard J. Hughes at 15th Annual Middle Atlantic Hospital Assembly, May 22, 1963

It might seem incredible to a stranger to our shores that the most prosperous Nation in the world is presently engaged in a controversy over whether or not we, as a society, should provide a program to assure adequate hospital care for our elderly citizens. Yet, as the delegates to the Middle Atlantic Hospital Assembly know only too well, there is an intense struggle over the matter of health care for the aged. And the controversy continues, not vociferously now, but we can be sure that it will erupt again when Congress again turns its attention toward this serious social problem.

Although it is possible to pile statistic upon statistic to document the needs of our elderly citizens, it is possible also to state their needs in the simple terms of our common experience. At the very time in life when our elderly citizens require more frequent health care, they are least able to pay for it.

We hear much and read much these days about the "affluent society." But a cursory glance at distribution of income in this country quickly dispels the illusion that most Americans are on "easy street" or soon will be. Certainly, most elderly Americans are in no such position. In 1960, 52.7 percent of those over 65 had an annual income of less than $1,000.

In the language of the insurance industry, these people are "bad risks." Unlike their younger neighbors, they are ill more often and for longer durations. And the plain fact is that they cannot afford to buy the hospital insurance they need because, as you know well, the premiums for bad risks run high.

There has been recognition of the need for a program such as Kerr-Mills designed to provide for these who must depend upon public assistance. But Kerr-Mills in no way provides for the health care needs of the vast majority of elderly Americans. It is estimated that by 1964 Kerr-Mills will provide benefits for some half million persons, this at a time when there will be about 18 million Americans over 65. Thus, only a small percentage of the elderly will receive such benefits. I, for one, would wish that the percentage would grow increasingly smaller because, as President Kennedy has observed "* * * welfare medical assistance helps older people get health care only if they first accept poverty and then accept charity."

The Kerr-Mills approach then is appropriate only for those unfortunate souls in our society who live in a condition of deprivation and poverty. As a society, we have an obligation in charity to provide for these people. But we also have an obligation in social justice to those millions of older Americans who live in modest, but adequate circumstances—adequate only as long as fortunate enough to escape the heavy burden of illness.

When President Kennedy last February addressed a special message to Congress on aiding our senior citizens, he said:

"A proud and resourceful Nation can no longer ask its older people to live in constant fear of a serious illness for which adequate funds are not available. We owe them the right of dignity in sickness as well as in health. We can achieve this by adding health insurance—primarily hospital insurance—to our successful social security system."

Some have suggested that we will embark on an alien course if we adopt a hospital insurance program for the elderly. They see such a program as a radical departure from past practice. In other words, what to many is merely a logical extension of the social security system is to them an unsound scheme designed to undermine free enterprise and free choice by the imposition of a compulsory program from Washington.

I submit that this is merely a replay of the unsuccessful arguments of the 1930's, arguments that sought to forestall the adoption of the social security system itself, now a foundation stone of America's structure of social legislation.

It has long been my conviction that prudent participation of Government in the affairs of men has brought an expansion of freedom for the vast majority of men. Who would deny today that the social security program adds a great dimension of freedom to the lives of millions of Americans? Yet, I recall that when this program was introduced, it was labeled as a "compulsory socialistic tax" and condemned by the same people who are now attempting to pin a similar label on the health insurance program.

We must reject the selective—and often political—application of the principle of free enterprise by some who use—or rather misuse—this vital principle of our society for their own selfish interests. If free enterprise is a basic ordering principle of our society then we must think and act in terms of the expansion of the freedom of personal initiative of each and every individual. And often this can be brought about only by the action of Government responding to the needs of the people, such as was done by the establishment of social security.

Applying this reasoning to the subject under discussion, the leadership of the medical profession, for example, stoutly insists that the extension of social security to hospital insurance would curtail its personal initiative in the practice of medicine and, somehow, eliminate the free choice of physician. Aside from the fact that there is no aspect of the proposed program which fairly can be said to have such effect—it is designed merely as a means of paying hospital bills—this argument reflects facile identification of the medical profession's own interests with the common good.

I do not propose to tell any group how to define its interests and I would hope that all groups concerned with the economics of health care maintain a proper balance between their interests and the common good. We must insist, however, that the common good take into account the extent to which the personal freedom and self-respect of the older American is impaired by both the fear and fact of increased medical expenses and inadequate income. This is a condition of existence for far too many of our elderly citizens. And when the full ramifications of the medical expenses are explored, we find that the burden often must be shared with children trying to raise their own families and whose freedom is narrowed to the terrible choice of dividing limited resources between different sets of loved ones. The millions of people who live in such situations must find it difficult to comprehend the exact nature of unjust compulsion allegedly contained in a hospital insurance program financed through social security.

Thus we see that freedom can be measured by other yardsticks than by that furnished by those who specialize in imaginary fears. In spite of the attempts, first to dismiss the need for a comprehensive health insurance program, then to find that the need is limited to the "medically indigent" who, it is claimed, can be handsomely handled through the Kerr-Mills program, the fact remains that adequate health care for the aged is lacking and will remain so until the passage of President Kennedy's program.

After all is said and done, it remains for this country to decide whether or not the objections to the social security approach are valid. How does the leadership of the American Medical Association, for example, justify its claim to have the determining voice as to the method of payment of hospital costs of the elderly citizen? This attitude is not shared by other associations equally concerned with medical economics, for example, the American Nurses' Association, the American Public Health Association, or the American Hospital Association which has not ruled out the social security approach.

There is much to be said for the position of the American Hospital Association which has a much more direct interest in the proposed hospital insurance plan than the medical profession. Hospital administrators cannot escape the realities of rising costs; they know that the hospital expense per patient day has gone from $16.77 in 1951 to $34.98 in 1961. It appears too that the hospital associations together with the Blue Cross Association recognized their public responsibility when in January 1962 they proposed a special plan to attempt to provide health insurance for all persons over 65. By taking this action, these associations—associations most intimately connected with the problem of hospital costs and care—took notice of the special problem faced by those over 65 in securing adequate health insurance at reasonable rates. For this response to a crucial social problem, these associations are to be commended.

But the most significant development in connection with the offering of the senior citizen plans was the adoption of what might be called a flexible approach to the matter of financing. There is the frank recognition that Government assistance will be necessary if these plans are to be effective and that the tax source for such assistance is of secondary importance. Further, there is the suggestion that the usual means test employed in the public welfare approach be abandoned in favor of an ability-to-pay income approach.

This flexible approach to financing, however, is conditional upon the administration of the proposed plan by the voluntary nonprofit prepayment system. As officially interpreted by the New Jersey Hospital Association, this means that the tax source of assistance is of secondary importance provided that the plan is not administered by the Social Security Administration.

In my view this action opens up the real possibility of accommodation between the interested parties. And I was pleased to note that the President's Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 allows for the use of private organizations in the administration of the program.

In addition, there are other provisions of the President's proposal which further indicate a genuine desire on the part of the Kennedy administration to incorporate reasonable suggestions so as to broaden its acceptability without destruction of the basic concept of the program. I refer to the coverage of these 2.5 million aged not eligible for social security, to be financed through general revenues, and the addition of an option to allow for alternative benefit plans.

May I suggest that it should be possible for those who are truly interested in the establishment of a sound program of hospital insurance to work out their differences for the common good. I personally have noted with pleasure the fact that partisanship has diminished to some extent and that five Republican Senators supported the social security approach in the last Senate vote on this matter.

Let us turn anew to the task before us. The rewards will be many: the same recognition that history has accorded to those who fought the battle for social security in the 1930's; the satisfaction of meeting the needs, not only for our parents, but of our children and their children, and above all, the fulfillment shared by all engaged in building a better America.

OUR MISSED OPPORTUNITIES IN HUNGARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 2 years ago, when the United Nations failed to condemn or take any action on the Indian invasion of Goa, Ambassador Stevenson warned that this abdication of responsibility might undermine and ultimately destroy the United Nations; and to underscore this warning he reminded the General Assembly of the fate of the League of Nations.

Last Thursday the United Nations took another fateful step toward the brink of the precipice. By a unanimous vote, with the United States abstaining, the Credentials Committee voted to accept the credentials of the Hungarian quisling delegation—for the first time since the bloody suppression of the Hungarian revolution by the Soviet Red Army.

I can derive no solace from the fact that the U.S. delegation abstained from voting. Like Pontius Pilate, we gave in to the clamor of the multitude; and, again like Pontius Pilate, we turned our face the other way in the belief that by so doing we could somehow escape responsibility for the consequences of our actions.

Even if every single member of the Credentials Committee voted against us, I believe it was our duty to stand on principle and to vote to reject the credentials of the Hungarian delegation. I will go further. I believe that it was our duty to carry on a vigorous campaign for the rejection of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation; and I believe that if we had carried on such a campaign, the credentials would not have been approved.

With our passive acquiescence, the United Nations has, for all practical purposes, closed the book on Soviet aggression in Hungary. In doing so, it has written a prescription for the successful violation of the United Nations Charter and the successful defiance of United Nations resolutions. It has, in effect, told the Soviet Union and other potential aggressors that, no matter how flagrantly they violate the U.N. Charter, no matter how bloody the aggression of which they are guilty, no matter how many resolutions of condemnation are passed by the General Assembly—all will be forgiven and forgotten at the end of 5 or 6 years if the aggressor nation still remains in control of the victim nation at the end of that time.

Our passivity in this situation is perhaps the inevitable outgrowth of our tragic passivity at the time of the Hungarian revolution.

The Hungarian revolution provided us with an unexampled historic opportunity to restore the frontiers of freedom in Europe. The whole of the Soviet satellite empire was seething with discontent. Poland and East Germany, particularly, stood on the brink of revolt. The Kremlin itself was riven by factional strife and divided over the course to pursue in Hungary—as Khrushchev has since publicly admitted.

I think it not amiss to recall that, in this delicately balanced situation, President Eisenhower explicitly assured the Kremlin that we looked upon Eastern Europe as its legitimate sphere of influence and that we had no intention of intervening. I know that President Eisenhower did not intend it this way, but the fact nevertheless remains that Khrushchev construed this statement as an open invitation to intervene against the Hungarian people.

History has already exacted a high price for our "neutralism" and inaction at the time of the Hungarian revolution—and I am afraid that we shall have to pay a still higher price before the present decade has run its course.

Mr. President, despite the fact that the Credentials Committee has approved the credentials of the Hungarian puppet delegation, we must see to it that the question of Hungary remains inscribed on the United Nations agenda. So long as there are resolutions of the General Assembly which remain unfulfilled, the General Assembly cannot close the book on Hungary without repudiating itself.

I am sure that this position is legally valid. I know that it is morally valid. I hope that our delegation to the U.N., by upholding this position, will endeavor to undo some of the damage that has been done by last week's vote in the Credentials Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point the text of a statement I made in October, 1960, dealing with "Our Missed Opportunities in Hungary."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MISSED OPPORTUNITIES IN HUNGARY [1]

We in the United States, we in the free world, have talked much, but we have done little, about liberation. "Liberation," as we have used the word, has not been a guide to a meaningful course of action in the conflict between freedom and world communism. It has been, on our lips, a political catch-phrase, a hypocritical shibboleth.

To the extent that the concept of liberation has been kept alive, to the extent that it has been given meaning, it is not we of the free world who deserve the credit, Mr. Chairman, but the dedicated representatives in exile of the captive European peoples.

You have kept the concept of liberation alive despite the frequently negative and discouraging attitude of those who should assist you. You have sought to arouse the free world from a lethargy which, if continued longer, points the way to doom. It has, I am afraid, been a thankless and unrewarding and sometimes bitter task. You have been accused, I know, of adventurism and warmongering, of subordinating the interests of the entire free world to your own selfish little national interests. But I say to you and I say to my fellow Americans that the interests of the captive nations and of the free world community are one. I say that the captive nations, even in captivity, protect the free world and protect the peace because they constitute the chief deterrent against Soviet aggression. I say that the free world in its own self-interest must seek the liberation of the captive nations by every peaceful means at its disposal: or else it will pay for its moral and political delinquency by forfeiting its own freedom.

We cannot, we must not seek refuge in the ancient alibi of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" In the world of today we must observe the Biblical injunction to regard our neighbor's welfare as our own, because this basic moral attitude has become the price of our own freedom.

A few days from now we shall be celebrating the fourth anniversary of the great Hungarian revolution. The Hungarian revolution presented the free world with an opportunity—an unparalleled opportunity—to restore the frontiers of freedom to their prewar limits. Our failure to react to this opportunity was, in my opinion, one of our gravest policy failures of the postwar period. It is to this opportunity and this failure that I wish to address my remarks tonight.

If we are to reverse the trend of recent years, if we are to force the Communist world back on the defensive, if we are to set our sights on the victory of freedom over tyranny, we must first of all restudy the strategy and tactics of world communism and we must draw all the hard bitter lessons of the postwar era. We must decide where we have erred and where we have failed and what we might have done to avoid this failure. We must conduct this reappraisal without partisan rancor. We must all be brutally frank with ourselves—nothing less than this will suffice.

In particular, I believe that we must examine the lessons of the Hungarian revolution, that we must try to determine what we did that we should not have done and what we might have done that we did not do. It is imperative that we make this examination because, with or without an active liberation policy, there will be more Hungarian revolutions.

Who can deny this, after East Germany, Poznan, Budapest, and Tibet?

Whether these revolutions culminate in disaster or in the triumphant restoration of freedom to the captive peoples, may very well depend on how well we learn our lesson.

We were all inspired by the heroism of the Hungarian revolution. We suffered with the Hungarian people when the Red Army reinvaded the country and assaulted Budapest. We opened our hearts to assist the scores of thousands of Hungarian refugees who fled across the frontiers to escape from Soviet terror. But at the time of the revolution, how many voices were there in either party who urged a more resolute course of action, who took the stand that compassion and charity were no substitutes for courage and moral conviction?

For the timidity and inaction which characterized our policy at the time, we must all share responsibility.

Before the Hungarian revolution, there were many who scoffed at all talk of liberation. Not very surprisingly, those who had lost all hope were inclined to favor some form of military disengagement, combined with a guarantee of the status quo in Europe.

The chief accomplishment of the Hungarian revolution was that it proved that liberation is possible, given a favorable conjuncture of circumstances. Such a conjuncture occurred in the months preceding the revolution. The Kremlin had been wracked by a series of power struggles; the entire Communist world had been thrown into further disarray by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party; the weakening at the center had resulted in a weakening of control in the satellites; and the growing evidences of discontent in each of the captive nations communicated themselves like electric impulses to the other captive nations. It is not inconceivable that a similarly favorable conjuncture of circumstances will arise within the next several years.

There are those who read a different meaning into the Hungarian revolution: who see in it conclusive proof that liberation is impossible and that the West has no alternative but to accept the status quo. To them I say that the revolution was neither a completely foredoomed undertaking nor a tragic defeat.

The Hungarian revolution might have been successful if the United States and the United Nations had taken a few affirmative measures. It might have been successful if the Western alliance had not been rent asunder by the Suez crisis.

And, even without moral support from the U.N. and the West, it might still have been successful.

At the time of the Hungarian revolution, Poland and East Germany stood on the brink. Had either one gone over the brink, the chances are that the entire satellite empire would have erupted in the flames of a super-revolution. The Soviet Army would not have been able to cope with such a situation.

The Hungarian revolution was a completely spontaneous national uprising. But even if it had been organized and calculated, it would have been a justifiable risk from a military and political standpoint. If we weigh the consequences, the Hungarian revolution, in defeat, ranks as the most significant victory for the forces of freedom since the end of World War II.

From their own history, the Russians know something of the concept of victory in defeat. Napoleon won the Battle of Borodino. But General Kutuzov, as Tolstoy recounts in "War and Peace," insisted that the battle, in terms of its ultimate consequences, was a decisive victory for Russia. The outcome, as every schoolboy knows, was Napoleon's disastrous retreat from Moscow.

Khrushchev was able to crush the Hungarian revolution by massing his armored divisions against the people of Budapest. But the revolution, in defeat, exposed the lie of communism for all peoples to see. Overnight, it converted the Warsaw Pact from a diplomatic asset into a military and diplomatic liability.

The revolution destroyed for all time the myth that Communist regimes can enjoy at least a measure of popular support. Until several months before the revolution, the people of Hungary, like the other peoples in the Soviet empire, gave the impression of passive acceptance of their regime. But underneath this appearance of passive acceptance there lay a smouldering hatred. When the volcano of this hatred erupted, one had to look around and ask: "Where are the Communists?"

Most significant of all, the younger generation, the students and workers who had known no other world and who had been indoctrinated since childhood in Marxist dogma—these were in the forefront of the fight against the regime. The Hungarian revolution has demonstrated, if this needed any further demonstration, that neither 1 generation nor 3 generations nor 10 generations can produce a breed of men who will accept as natural and proper the complete abrogation of human freedom. There is, in short, no such thing as a Communist generation.

---

[1] New York, N.Y., Oct. 19, 1960.

Even in defeat, therefore, the Hungarian revolution was a many-sided victory for the cause of freedom. But the revolution need not have failed. I am convinced that we had it in our power to assure its success. The trouble was that we were completely unprepared. And there was no excuse for this lack of preparation because there had been ample warning.

Throughout the spring and summer of 1956 there had been rumblings in the satellite countries. In August, the Poznan revolt brought radical changes in the Polish Government and resulted in the removal of Marshal Rokosovsky as commander in chief of the Polish forces.

But when the Hungarian revolution erupted 2 months later, we had prepared no policy to deal with such a contingency. In consequence, our response to this historic opportunity was laggard, unimaginative, and timid.

The Eisenhower administration could think of nothing better to do than to assure Khrushchev that we regarded Hungary as part of the Soviet sphere and that he could therefore intervene with impunity.

Let me suggest some of the things that might have been done with just a bit more foresight, a bit more preparation and a bit more courage.

The Hungarian revolution began on October 23, 1956, with a student demonstration in Budapest in front of the statue of the Polish hero, General Bem. When the police opened fire on the crowd, what had been a peaceful demonstration turned into an armed insurrection. Fighting against Soviet tanks with small arms and Molotov cocktails, the freedom fighters, in several days of fierce fighting, forced the withdrawal of Soviet military units from Budapest and other major centers.

On October 27 the formation of a new government, headed by Imre Nagy was announced.

On October 30, Prime Minister Nagy proclaimed the abolition of the one-party system and publicly recalled the Hungarian representative to the U.N., Peter Kos.

On November 1, Prime Minister Nagy announced Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact, proclaimed Hungarian neutrality, and urgently appealed to the United Nations to put the question of Hungary on the agenda.

His message to the United Nations read—and I quote: "Reliable reports have reached the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic that further Soviet units are entering into Hungary * * * therefore, I request your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations the question of Hungary's neutrality and the defense of this neutrality by the four great powers."

Nagy's appeal reached the U.N. at 12:27 p.m., Thursday, November 1. Note this time well. Fifty-eight hours remained between the moment the message arrived and the hour on the early morning of November 4 when the Red army treacherously struck. But so absorbed was the U.N. in the debate on Suez, so unprepared were we, so determined to avoid provocation of the Soviet regime, that no action was taken on Prime Minister Nagy's urgent appeal.

The text of the Nagy cable was circulated to the U.N. delegates at 2:30 p.m. But it was simply one mimeographed document among numerous mimeographed documents, and many delegates did not read it until late that night.

I believe that it was a great misfortune for the free world that John Foster Dulles suffered his first collapse at this critical juncture. In the early morning of November 2, after an all-night session on Suez, Dulles interrupted the debate to say that he hoped the U.N. would "not be preoccupied with the Middle East to the exclusion of assisting the state of Hungary to regain its independence." Hours later, John Foster Dulles was on a surgeon's table, undergoing an emergency operation for cancer.

On the afternoon of Saturday, November 3, the Security Council met again to consider the matter of Hungary. It met, to our eternal shame, not at the request of the United States, but at the urgent insistence of Dr. Emilio Portuondo of Cuba. At this meeting, the Yugoslav delegate, Dr. Brilej, stated that negotiations between the Hungarian and Russian Governments seemed to be proceeding in a satisfactory manner, that it would therefore be unwise to intervene. He moved for adjournment.

Ambassador Lodge supported the proposal. "We believe," he said, "that adjournment for a day or two would give a real opportunity to the Hungarian Government to carry out its announced desire to arrange for an orderly and immediate evacuation of all the Soviet troops."

I shall never be able to understand what motivated Ambassador Lodge to make this statement. For this, let me emphasize, was 48 hours after the receipt of Premier Nagy's appeal in which he made it clear that, far from making progress on the withdrawal of Soviet troops, new Soviet units were pouring into the country.

And so the matter dragged on and on, while the sands of time were running out.

Just before midnight of November 3, the U.N. received the text of Prime Minister Nagy's final dramatic message, informing the world of the Soviet attack on Budapest.

The Security Council approved a U.S. resolution calling upon the Government of the U.S.S.R. to desist forthwith from intervention in Hungary, and affirming the right of the Hungarian people to a government of their choice. This resolution was promptly vetoed by the Soviet Union.

But for the people of Hungary, in any case, the hour was already too late.

This is what happened in the United Nations in the critical days preceding the Red Army's final assault.

Let me suggest some of the things that might have been done and should have been done.

First, without waiting for the formal communication from Prime Minister Nagy, we should have made it demonstratively clear that we recognized the Nagy government as the legitimate Government of Hungary. Among other things, we should have established contract with his government the moment it took office and suggested an immediate appeal to the U.N.

Second, between the time of the establishment of the Nagy government on October 28 and the receipt of Prime Minister Nagy's appeal on November 1, we should have lined up support for a motion urging the immediate dispatch of a corps of U.N. observers to Hungary, and this resolution should have been introduced in the General Assembly within hours of the receipt of Premier Nagy's communication.

Third, until the arrival of these observers, the ambassadors of the U.N. countries in Budapest should have been asked to serve as pro tem observers.

Fourth, Secretary General Hammarskjold should have been notified in advance that any communication received from the Nagy government was to be marked "urgent" and instantaneously transmitted to the members of the Security Council.

Fifth, reacting to the repeated report of Soviet troop movements, we should have let it be known that any attempt by the Red Army to reinvade Hungary and depose the lawfully appointed government of Premier Nagy would be looked upon with the gravest concern by the U.S. Government; that the State Department would immediately respond to such aggression by demanding the imposition of the most stringent economic and diplomatic sanctions; that, beyond this, the consequences, including the military consequences, were completely unpredictable.

Sixth, as a routine defensive precaution at a time of crisis, we should have placed the United States Forces in Europe on alert and asked for an emergency session of the NATO Council.

If we were not prepared to issue the same kind of warning to the Kremlin that the Kremlin has issued to the West over Suez, Berlin, the U-2, Cuba, and the Congo, then we should at least have said nothing and kept them guessing.

How different the world situation would be today if we had pursued the course of courage in Hungary.

The liberation of Hungary would, of course, have made the liberation of the other satellite countries unavoidable. There are many who say that Khrushchev would have risked war rather than accept this prospect.

I challenge this assertion.

The Kremlin has always backed down from a showdown. At the time of Hungary, it would have shunned a general war like the plague. It would have been impossible to conceive of circumstances more disadvantageous from its own point of view.

If war had come over Hungary, the Kremlin would have entered it with its satellite empire in open revolt or on the brink of revolt, and with the Soviet hierarchy still bitterly divided. The Red Army troops in Hungary had shown serious signs of disaffection. In the U.S.S.R. itself, there was manifest unrest among the students of the university, and there had been the great uprising of the Vorkuta slave laborers. Finally, the United States at that time still had an overwhelming proponderance in nuclear weapons, while the Soviet Union had still not tested its first ICBM.

There is clear evidence that, when the Red Army withdrew its forces after the first round of battle in Budapest, the Kremlin was divided and uncertain about the course to be followed. In his speech in Budapest on December 2, 1959, Premier Khrushchev admitted frankly that some of his Kremlin cronies had opposed his decision to use the Red Army to crush the revolution. They opposed it because they feared both Western reaction to intervention and the potential impact of intervention on their own empire. Emboldened by Western assurances, however, Khrushchev and the interventionists won the day in the councils of the Politbureau.

For a period of 4 years, from the death of Stalin until the events in Hungary, the free world had within its grasp an unparalleled opportunity to seize the political offensive, to force communism back with measures short of war, to recreate the political equilibrium in Europe which is essential to a stable peace. But we did nothing. We played the cold war according to the Communist rules.

These rules, as the authors of "Protracted Conflict" have pointed out, demand that the cold war always be fought on the territory of the free world and never on the territory of the Soviet Union or the countries it has annexed through aggression. They demand that we do nothing to exploit Soviet weaknesses, while taking it for granted that the Kremlin will mercilessly exploit each and every weakness it may find in the West's protective armor.

If we continue to fight the cold war according to these rules, it goes without saying that we shall lose it.

If we are ever to extricate ourselves from the fatal paralysis of our defensive posture, it is essential, in my opinion, that we study and restudy the lessons of our lost opportunities in Hungary and in Eastern Europe. Only when we have digested these lessons, will we be able to respond intelligently to the opportunities that will again present themselves in the not too distant future.

I have said there will be more Hungarys. Of this I am certain. In the evolution of the hatred of tyranny, there is a point where it becomes a blind and all-possessing passion. And no regime in history has been so outstandingly successful in fostering this special breed of hatred as has the Communist regime in Russia and its satellite regimes in other countries.

There will be more Hungarys because of this hatred, because of the eternal will to freedom, because totalitarian societies do undergo crises, and also because any crisis in a totalitarian society tends to be a major crisis.

We must ask ourselves "What will we do next time?" But we must ask ourselves another question: "What practical measures can we take to encourage the spirit of resistance among the captive peoples, and to keep alive the hope of liberation and faith in the free world?"

There are some who say that the development of nuclear weapons makes it necessary for the free world, as a matter of self-preservation, to abandon "liberation" as a reckless pipe-dream. The converse is true.

The emergence of a nuclear stalemate means that we do not now possess, or will not possess in the near future, the deterrent of nuclear superiority. Given the massive superiority of the Soviet Union in conventional forces, this creates a highly dangerous situation. In this critical period upon which we are now entering, there is only one serious deterrent available to us: the continuing spirit of resistance of the captive people. It becomes more necessary than ever before, therefore, that we encourage the will to liberation and support it by every practical means.

The crimes of Soviet imperialism must be spread on the record at every appropriate opportunity. Our propaganda must be sharpened. Our diplomacy must seek to raise the issue of the captive nations at every session of the UN, and at every major diplomatic conference. NATO's ground forces in Europe must be strengthened. A Freedom Academy must be created, where representatives of the free world receive concentrated training in the science of counteraction to Soviet aggression. But above all we must persuade the captive peoples of Europe, by our actions, that we shall never reconcile ourselves to their subjugation.

And it would be enormously helpful if we could also persuade them that we have learned the lessons of the Hungarian revolution.

SELF-HELP PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the June 2 issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Sunday Courier is an article entitled "Self-Help Program Aids Underdeveloped Nations," by Jack Hovelson, Courier staff writer. This is another of many articles that are appearing relative to the activities of this excellent philanthropic organization entitled "Self-Help, Inc.," which was organized and has been spearheaded by a dedicated industrialist, Mr. Vern Schield, of Waverly, Iowa.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-HELP PROGRAM AIDS UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

(By Jack Hovelson)

A Waterloo firm last week assembled 55 small metal boxes and became a participant in a most effective form of foreign aid.

The firm is the Waterloo Valve Spring Compressor Co.

The boxes it manufactured were donated to Self-Help, Inc., a nonprofit organization that deals in, among other things, junk.

One of the other things is a diminutive tractor with a nine-horsepower, single cylinder engine that enables the machine to do the work of three draft animals.

Self-Help, Inc., founded 13 years ago by industrialist Vern Schield and located in his home town of Waverly, gets a lot of help itself in the process of assembling its tractor.

The wheels are donated by a Davenport firm. A front counterweight is made at the State Training School for Boys in Eldora. The chassis and motor are purchased for cost.

The newest addition to the tractor, the "Self-Helper," will be the metal tool boxes contributed by Valve Spring. A drafting class at Waverly-Shell Rock High School designed the boxes.

Self-Helper tractors, priced at $675, have been on the market 2 months. Approximately 20 have been sold in underdeveloped foreign countries.

Ray Sulentic, president of Valve Spring, says his firm is ready to produce more tool boxes for Self-Helpers when the initial supply is exhausted.

Schield's unique program operates on the theory that it is better for a foreign aid recipient to pay something for what he receives rather than to be given a handout.

It seems that when people pay for something, they develop a better sense of ownership and responsibility, concludes J. William Baccarini, executive director of Self-Help, Inc.

Prices of the tractors and other Self-Help products are low—as little as one-fifth to one-third their actual value. Self-Help's payment plan is nearly painless—pay what you can when you can, with no interest or carrying charge.

As for Self-Help's other products—the so-called junk—they are reconditioned implements gleaned from scrap piles and salvage warehouses.

A good example is windmills. A few weeks ago, Self-Help put out a call for these now-extinct Midwest landmarks and wound up with a couple hundred of them.

They are being dismantled, repaired, painted, and crated for shipment to countries where they once again will become useful.

Old model John Deere tractor engines are worked over at the Waverly plant and converted into power units that run hammermills, welders, and other machines.

Among other items put on the foreign market by Self-Help are sewing machines, cream separators, woodworking equipment, welders, poultry incubators, threshing machines, wagons, and others.

Future Farmers of America youths are volunteering to collect repairable implements from farms. The Rockefeller brothers fund recently contributed $5,000 to Self-Help, Inc.

Self-Help products are distributed through a variety of agencies—missionary groups, United Nations, Peace Corps, and the Agency for International Development, among others.

"We never deal with the governments of countries," says Baccarini.

Despite this, Self-Help's foreign aid effort has not gone unnoticed in Government circles.

Both the Senate and the House of the 88th Congress have been informed fully of Self-Help's program and accounts of its accomplishments are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE DEATH OF POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the death of Pope John XXIII has not only brought grief to the hearts of many of us as Christians and as individuals, but as members of the human race.

His humbleness, his affection for people of all backgrounds and all faiths, his desire to bring together all mankind under their Creator, which bore fruit in last year's Ecumenical Council, these are the qualities that endear him to us all.

But even more significant from the viewpoint of the very survival of our civilization is the fact that almost alone, Pope John XXIII has made the world "peace" respectable. When the white smoke came forth from the College of Cardinals in the Vatican signaling the election of Pope John XXIII, this was not so—"peace" was not a very respectable word. It had been exploited by the Communists, by the Picasso peace dove, and by Bertrand Russell.

Now 56 months later, peace has once again become a respectable objective for people everywhere. Pope John paved the ground through many months prior to his "Pacem in Terris" which gave us the capstone in this process of rehabilitating the objectives of peace, objectives which should never have been in need of rehabilitation. Having at heart concern for the Christian church and the welfare of his communicants, Pope John more recently embarked on a program of ameliorating the conditions of Catholics, and of all people, behind the Iron Curtain.

Pope John XXIII was a man who will go down in history as one who changed the course of our race. Since he became Pope, we humans, bound like lemmings upon a headlong descent upon self-destruction, have resumed a search for saner, more peaceful paths.

I pray that his successor may follow the same policies and be guided by the same lasting principles as was Pope John XXIII.

REDESIGNING OF 5-CENT GEORGE WASHINGTON STAMP

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently I introduced a companion bill, S. 1571, which was initiated by Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE (H.R. 3992) which will incorporate into the present 5-cent George Washington stamp the quotation "To bigotry no sanction."

Shortly after the introduction of this legislation, Senator NEUBERGER introduced legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, in support of a crusade against cancer commemorative postage stamp. In Senator NEUBERGER's statement she included a recent New York Times editorial which commented on the present design of the 5-cent George Washington postage stamp. The editorial pointed out the necessity for redesigning the George Washington stamp,

and I should like to associate myself with Senator Neuberger's remarks in this regard, for I, too, believe the George Washington 5-cent stamp should be redesigned. And, I am hopeful at this time that the Post Office Department will interject into the design those words which George Washington wrote to the congregation at Touro Synagogue in my home city of Newport, R.I.—"To bigotry no sanction."

NEW POLICY ON CUBA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is mounting dissatisfaction with our policy toward Cuba, and it is being increasingly expressed in calls for clarification and action. A special conference in New York at the end of April, attended by 25 specialists in Latin American affairs and other areas of U.S. foreign policy, discussed this problem at a 3-day session under the auspices of Freedom House, and recommended prompt action to remove Castro and the Soviet troops in Cuba. There are many forms of action to be employed, other than all-out invasion and unilateral force, according to the report issued by the conference—already inserted in the Record by my distinguished colleague Senator Dodd—which was highly critical of our present policy.

The noted political commentator, Roscoe Drummond was a member of the conference; and the conclusions expressed in his syndicated column reflect the discussions in which he participated. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article, by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Kennedy and Cuba: Change in Policy Needed," which appeared in the Washington Post of June 10.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10, 1963]

KENNEDY AND CUBA

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy, I feel sure, will not long condone a passive, timid policy of accepting the Soviet military presence in Cuba with the clear implication that little can be done about it except to try to keep it from spreading further into the Western Hemisphere.

There are two reasons why this policy needs to be changed and, I believe, will be changed.

One reason is that it isn't working; the wall isn't holding. Soviet-supported Castro subversion and sabotage of neighboring Caribbean countries is mounting. Its intensification dates from the Soviet takeover of the Castro regime last fall. Castro has explicitly and openly made Venezuela his first target. Last week Venezuelan Communists successfully raided and burned the U.S. Military Mission in Caracas.

The second reason why administration policy cannot long remain passive is that the American people will not, I think accept it. Unless the do-little Cuba policy is changed in the course of the coming months, it will be a central issue in the presidential election and the country will have the opportunity to register its verdict—yes or no—at the polls.

New evidence that containment is not containing comes from the eight-nation investigating committee of the Council of Organization of American States, whose officials are neither alarmist nor given to overstatement. Their latest findings are:

That Cuban-based subversion in Latin America "has increased considerably during the past year."

That the Communist offensive, with the aid of training, money, and propaganda from the Cuba base, is being steadily "intensified."

That there is "no real awareness on the part of the American countries of the danger to their own security in taking a passive attitude" toward the Communist activity.

This is straight talk—and welcome. It runs counter to the cozy and soporific attitude one encounters in many places in the administration; namely, that if we will only hold our breath—and our tongues—the Soviet forces in Cuba will go away and that, anyway, since they can't attack the United States, there's nothing much that needs to be done.

Is it a valid assumption that the Soviet presence in Cuba is only a negative force, a kind of umbrella against invasion, just a prop to Castro?

The OAS committee repudiates this comforting theory.

It declares that the Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere "results mainly from the intensification of Soviet military power in Cuba."

It reports that "the utilization of the island as a base for promoting subversive activities in other countries" stems largely from the fact that "Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military base."

It deserves to be noted that President Kennedy himself has never said that he intended to acquiesce indefinitely in the presence of Soviet forces in Cuba. But I have listened to very high officials saying that we will have to "live with their presence a long time," that "they may never get out," that the American people have a kind of "neurotic preoccupation with Cuba."

I do not believe that President Kennedy can long live with such a policy. All the American people need to know is that he does not intend to do so. They are prepared to leave with the President the timing and the means of acting once they become certain he intends to act.

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN THE INDIANA DUNES STRUGGLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the Indiana dunes published in the Paddock Publications of Arlington Heights, Ill., on June 6, 1961, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN THE INDIANA DUNES STRUGGLE

(By Tom Edwards)

"The dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity: Once lost, the loss would be irrevocable."—Carl Sandburg.

Today giant machines are clawing away at Indiana's remaining dunes, loading the sand on barges, and finally dumping it into Lake Michigan off Northwestern University's campus in Evanston.

The educational institution wants the sand to create additional acreage to its campus and is paying $6,300,000 to have it created in the lake.

Bethlehem Steel Corp. is leveling the dunes to build a $250 million steel finishing plant, it says.

There has been a battle of national scope for several years between those who wish to save about 6½ miles of the dunes remaining on Indiana's 42-mile shoreline, and those who want industrial development. Apparently the conservationists were gaining ground until the Northwestern University contract for sand exploded on the scene last year.

The dunes weren't always there. Their formation began about 11,000 years ago as a result of a great glacier moving down from the north. Since then the inexorable wind and currents of Lake Michigan have gradually and unceasingly heaved sand into Indiana's dunes.

There are other dunes. They occur from Petoskey, Mich., to the Indiana State line, with the Sleeping Bear dunes of northern Michigan excelling in sheer grandeur.

But for quiet beauty and exotic biology, it is the Indiana dunes that have been extolled by naturalists and botanists for nearly half a century.

It is the only duneland that lies within easy driving range of the 7½ million people in the Chicago metropolitan area (40 miles from the Loop).

Yet its potential as a recreational area has been relatively untapped.

What is classified as duneland once stretched for about 25 miles along the 42-mile Indiana shoreline. Until recent excavation work began, about 6½ miles were left, including about 11,000 acres. At the eastern end of the former 25-mile dune shoreline is the 2,182-acre Indiana Dunes State Park, a 3-mile strip along the shore.

But the heart of and choicest duneland lies just to the west of the park. Much of it is now owned by Bethlehem Steel. It probably isn't fate that the choicest area still survives. It is the most rugged, and posed more development problems. But it is now practically the only portion of the Indiana shoreline that hasn't been consumed by development.

It may well have been the cheapest real estate available and suitable to Bethlehem Steel's purposes when it first bought a chunk in 1956.

Behind the controversial industrial development proposal are morally depressing revelations—February, 1963, issue of the Atlantic Monthly—of an intertwining of political and business interests. Many millions of dollars were at stake in various ways. It seems that any objective analysis by the Indiana State government as to the best use of the remaining duneland would be a practical impossibility.

There are probably few—if any—areas in the United States that fit the general priority considerations contained in the recent report of President Kennedy's Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission more than the Indiana dunes.

They are in a huge population center in critical need of publicly owned land for recreation; they contain an imcomparable fresh water shore and beachline, the widest in North America, it is reported; and they contain natural phenomena and combinations not duplicated anywhere on the continent.

"A beach is the greatest tourist attraction in the world. National parks are runners up," the Rand McNally Vacation Guide states.

The present Indiana Dunes State Park contains about 3 percent of the total park area in the State—but gets about 25 percent of the human traffic to them, the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal reported, while putting to shame Indiana newspapers in exposing the total picture.

Indiana and Illinois are near the bottom of the list of States in the amount of State parks they have supplied their populations. Since 1940 the Federal Government has only increased its national park acreage by about an infinitesimal .005 percent. That is 200 times less than 1 percent. (The Indiana and the Sleeping Bear Dunes are 2 of 29 new national parks the Federal Government is contemplating now.)

Biologically, the dunes contain flora and fauna ranging from desert cactus to Arctic plants. It is a biological island which has long intrigued botanists. More than 1,000 species of plants, including 26 members of the orchid family, grow there, and 255 species of birds have been observed there. One might question if Northwestern University and the proposed steel mills are intrinsically as important.

The first Director of the National Park Service, Stephen T. Mather, visited the Indiana Dunes in 1916 and proposed a 25-mile preserve there. But World War I intervened. In 1925 the State established the present 2,182-acre dunes park.

"In 1929, Midwest Steel Corp. bought 750 acres straddling Burns Ditch, an artificial channel dug 3 years earlier to drain the Little Calumet River," the Courier-Journal reported.

In 1931 and 1935 the Army Engineers recommended against the use of Federal funds for a Burns Ditch harbor proposed by Midwest Steel, the article continues.

In 1944 the Army Engineers again stated that the existing harbor facilities in the area were adequate. But in 1960, Col. J. A. Smedile, the Army district engineer, announced that a port at Burns Ditch could be economically justified. But, according to sundry accounts and a statement by Colonel Smedile, alternative sites have not been studied.

A comparative study of possible Indiana port sites was finally authorized by the U.S. House of Representatives last year.

But Bethlehem Steel wasn't interested in waiting for it. Early last year Bethlehem, a dredging firm, and Northwestern University contracted to take 2,500,000 cubic yards of sand from Bethlehem owned dunes. The dredging firm will pay Bethlehem $20,000 for the sand.

When this was announced, an offer was made to give free to the university for lake fill the material to be dredged from the Cal-Sag Canal. About 10 million cubic yards were to be dredged from the canal, it was reported at that time, and will be otherwise dumped along its banks.

The university board of trustees announced May 2, 1962, that it is their normal obligation to fulfill the contract from which the dredging firm would not release them, according to reports. It has also stated that the Cal-Sag material is not suitable for its purpose.

Until the Northwestern University contract was made, it appeared that the Save-the-Dunes Council, a citizens' group organized in 1952, had a good chance to do just that. Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, had proposed bills in 1958 to create a national park in the dunes.

Senator Douglas has ardently crusaded to preserve the dunes. He presently has a bill in the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on the Interior for a 9,000-acre national park (in addition to the 2,100-acre State park). He got 16 Senators to cosponsor the bill. They are now waiting for a Bureau of the Budget decision on the Burns Ditch harbor before pressing the bill further, Douglas stated May 20.

Last year both Indiana Senators were in favor of the Burns Ditch harbor. But Senator Homer Capehart was defeated for reelection last November, and new Senator Birch Bayh hasn't yet committed himself all the way.

For the proposed harbor, the Federal Government is being asked to put up $25.5 million and the State government, $38 million. The Federal Government has so far refused and the State government has declined to shoulder the burden alone.

It has been stated that 94 percent of the potential tonnage that would be handled in the port would be for the sole benefit of the Midwest and Bethlehem steel mills. Further, it might very well cost the State $3 million a year to maintain the port. The two steel companies would probably be given free access to the port, with other users to pay.

Another point is that employment in steel production is currently off about 30 percent, and automation is growing.

Pollution of the entire Indiana lakeshore is another likelihood in the future if present development proposals are consummated, as anyone who has witnessed ports of the Great Lakes can attest.

Indiana presently has four ports, three serving the steel producing area of Gary, Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, and one in Michigan City. There is reliable evidence that these port facilities should be expanded rather than building a new port at Burns Ditch. Indiana ports already handle more tonnage "than any other State in the area," according to the Martinsville, Ind., newspaper.

If the steel companies decide to go it alone at Burns Ditch, there remains a question of when do public prerogatives supersede private prerogatives.

On the surface, it seems Indiana would do better to develop one fine major port and industrial complex, even if it means public condemnation of property held by real estate speculators, than to foster a string of submajor, or even second-rate ports.

"The creation of virtually every national park has been fought by local groups for one reason or another and, had their views prevailed, we would have had virtually no national parks or, indeed, State parks either," Senator Douglas said.

THE SOUTH'S GREAT VICTORY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our most pressing social problems usually become less pressing when we establish even basic communication among those who are in disagreement. Harry Golden—editor, author, lecturer—is one of those in our Nation today who is trying to increase communication in what he describes as the most important human relations story of the 20th century, the struggle to give full citizenship to all of our citizens.

On June 5, Mr. Golden made a commencement address to Negro graduates at the Morris Brown College in Atlanta, Ga. Once again he made a plea for mutual understanding and for exchange of ideas. He also paid particular attention to the role that education will play in achieving final, full equality. Mr. President, this address was a memorable, timely commentary. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The South's Great Victory

(Commencement address by Harry Golden, Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga., June 5, 1963)

It is customary for the commencement speaker to tell his audience that "commencement" means "beginning," the beginning of a new phase in the life of each of the graduates. But if those graduates are Negroes, and the year is 1963, we must add the highly significant fact that an entire race is participating in this commencement—a beginning so momentous that it is impossible for us to realize its full significance at this moment. In the next generation the grandchildren will envy those of their ancestors who had had some participation in this most important human relations story of the 20th century.

And this is an advantage over those who insist that we maintain a caste system in America. No present-day segregationist will ever gather his grandchildren around him and speak with pride of the good fight he waged against human dignity and against history. Theirs is an impossible task, because the chances of winning a fight against history are even less promising than the chances of winning a fight against the Constitution of the United States.

And since history itself is not an adequate scapegoat the devil needs to be more easily identified and so many of the folks say that the U.S. Supreme Court is Communist inspired, that the Justices have been brainwashed, and presumably this includes all future appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court. If they must have a scapegoat I would suggest that the segregationists put the blame on the early Baptist and Methodist missionaries who converted the Negroes to Christianity. These missionaries failed to tell the Negro that there was a class Christianity. These missionaries failed to tell the Negro that there was a class A Christianity for whites and a class B Christianity for Negroes.

But you will notice that Chief Justice Earl Warren is the more convenient devil and that you rarely hear criticism of the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson, a southerner.

It was Vinson who really struck the first blow against the Dred Scott decision and the later separate but equal idea. In the Sweatt case, Justice Vinson ruled that education involves more than facilities; that first of all it involves a free choice; that most of the Negro students aspiring to become lawyers in Texas would choose the University of Texas Law School at Austin if they had a free choice. The Justice ruled that the education of an individual involves also the reputation of the faculty. of the school, experience of the administration, position, and influence of the alumni, the prestige and tradition of the university, the size of its library, and most important of all, the ability to communicate with other students. Said Justice Vinson: "(The separate but equal law school for Negroes) excludes from its student body 85 percent of the population of the State which includes most of the future lawyers, witnesses, jurors, judges, and other officials with whom the petitioner will inevitably be dealing when he becomes a member of the Texas bar."

Thus Justice Vinson gave us a résumé of the entire human experience. Without such communication, you are educated in a vacuum; without such communication, you live in a vacuum.

This is the crux of the entire matter, you're only half a man unless there is this opportunity to enter the open society and "communicate" with the rest of the culture. The interchange of ideas is the basis of all our intellectual, political, and economic development. Without that, you sit in darkness. This is the selfmutilation program proposed by Nazi-like Muslim movement among the Negroes today; the suicidal back-to-the-ghetto principle. The Parsis lived in peaceful segregation for many centuries, but they lived in darkness. It was only when they achieved locomotion and exchanged ideas with the cultures around them that they rose to their status in the city of Bombay as the mercantile leaders of India today. Locomotion—we contribute to the society within which we can move about as free men, and in return society educates us and moulds our character and our attitudes. You have neither the ambition nor the desire to express a new idea within your own ghetto.

Your individual worth can be assessed only by others, by strangers, if you will; and we know that the drive to prove our individual worth is as strong as the drive to get food and water. Robinson Crusoe learned as much from Man Friday as the primitive man learned from the cultivated European. Indeed there would have been no story at all unless there had been a Man Friday.

Draper and Lecky, competent historians, tell us that in the 10th century every doctor in Europe was a Jew. They brought medical science to western man and they did it under very unfavorable conditions to say the least. The established order was the enemy of the 10th century doctor, because supernaturalism was the order of the day, and illness was treated by prayer, supplication, and on the highly profitable system of sale and rental of relics. But the Jewish doctors had this one great ally—locomotion—and moving about freely in the Middle East the Jews learned much from the new religion, Islam which was deeply concerned with the physical and abstruse sciences. A thousand years earlier Jewish merchants from Antioch had followed Caesar's legions into Britain and to the River Rhine. And after Islam was chased out of Europe by Charles Martel, it was the Jews who kept alive the Arab culture in Europe, mathematics, astronomy, and medicine.

And then the long silence descended upon the Arab civilization, the long silence precisely because there was no longer an interchange of ideas in the open society. And now the great paradox of our times. It is the very presence of the Jewish state in Israel which has given renewed vitality to the Islamic civilization and the Jews whom they consider enemies will have been the very reason for the revival of those Arabic contributions in the sciences which lead to what the Greeks called, the good life.

And because they had this freedom to move about in the open society the Jewish doctors of the 10th and 11th centuries were able to penetrate the prejudices of the old order and soon they established a medical school at Montpelier and then another one at Arles.

But again the curtain came down, the curtain of silence because of segregation. The ghetto. And because of this rigidly enforced segregation, we heard nothing, nothing more until Napoleon opened the gates of the European ghettoes at the beginning of the 19th century. The Jews again had the opportunity of locomotion, the interchange of ideas with the cultures around them and only after they entered western civilization were they able to produce Mendelssohn, Heine, Disraeli, Brandeis, Dr. Salk, and Professor Einstein.

The opportunity to exchange ideas in the open society is the foundation upon which rests all of our intellectual development. There is no way we can pinpoint the process, but we are what we are because of the language we heard, the conversations we had, the people with whom we exchanged visits, the teachers we had in school, the friendships we made, yes, even the greetings we exchanged with casual strangers. Your classmates have a lot more to do with your individual development than you can possibly imagine at this moment. We are the result of the conditions to which we have been exposed.

But here I must come back to the German-Jewish Poet Heine who warned his fellow Jews when the walls of the ghetto came down; "Remember, we must be twice as good to get half as much."

And this will be the formula for our times and a great paradox. The ones who will win the most, when enforced racial segregation is eliminated, will be the white southerners. They will save hundreds of millions of wasted tax dollars with which they tried to maintain two sets of public facilities; they will recover a vast civilization of human resources, because for the past 75 years they have been exporting their brains along with the textiles and tobacco; they will feel a spiritual relief at the lifting of a very great burden; and they will get a bonus too. The southerners will find outside their doors the largest untapped consumer's market left on this continent, a new market which will buy everything from the skin out and like all the newcomers of history, they will buy two of everything they can do without, to prove themselves.

There will be a boom so charismatic that the white southerners will one day wonder what their resistance was all about, and there will be a great turning against the demagogs who led them up the blind alley. As the southern wealth piles higher and higher, the political era will be called the year of the great turning.

But for the Negro it will be something else. The first reaction will be one of disappointment, because entry into the open society as political and economic equals will not automatically bring success or victory. Actually nothing much will happen at the beginning to balance off the long years of struggle for civil rights. And this may come as a shock to many Negroes who had looked forward to this event with such high hopes. The law will be through with you: the law concerns itself only with a public right. No Federal judge will listen to a writ which is intended to change the hearts of men. This is not within the court's jurisdiction. And the hearts of men will not change the day after the Negro can vote, and use all public facilities, and participate in the employment market on a fair and equal basis.

Discrimination, bigotry, and prejudice will not end in your lifetime nor in the lifetime of your children. The Supreme Court of the United States did not attempt to legislate against prejudice. What the Supreme Court legislated against was the violation of the civil rights of American citizens, the right to participate freely in the public facilities of our society. This is guaranteed by Anglo-Saxon law. No man may be deprived of his personal prejudices, but no man has the right to translate his personal prejudices into law.

There are places where I cannot go because I am a Jew. There are thousands of such places in our country, some of them important places at the civic level such as the city luncheon club in every city, the many summer resorts, hotels, and country clubs. In our socially-oriented society where most of the business deals are discussed across the luncheon table, this is not very pleasant; in fact at many levels of our culture it involves the denial of free competition precisely because we are a socially oriented society. Yet because my exclusion is not a matter of State or city ordinance or statute, it has not prevented me or any Jew in America from achieving whatever his character, ambition, and talent will permit him to achieve. But if this exclusion were sanctioned by statute it would be an entirely different situation, a situation of degradation and dehumanization.

Again I will refer to the admonition of the poet Heine that we must be twice as good to get half as much, but for the Negro the odds are much higher. When the ghetto walls broke down and the Jewish people realized that the emancipation itself did not solve the problem of prejudice and discrimination. A great anguish followed, which resulted in mass conversions into the religions of the majority. Indeed, at least one third of the Jewish population of Berlin made this escape, an escape which is obviously impossible for the Negro, impossible even for those victims of self-hatred who would seek such escape.

Therefore, I believe you must be five times as good to get one-half as much, and the only chance you have to reduce the odds is education. The Jews understood this before it was too late. The Negroes of America today must become as ubiquitous in the colleges and universities of America as the Jews tried to be in Europe and in America during the past 100 years. The Jewish immigrant understood this by instinct. He got off the boat and he looked different, his religion was different, and if he did finally learn to speak the language he spoke with an accent all his life. He knew that if he remained as he was he would be forever alien, but that if he had a stethoscope in his ear he could make the hurdle into the open society of America, and actually do it within his own lifetime. His patients would then say, "My doctor has such a cute accent."

May I say to you that there exists in our country today almost a total segregation of Jew and Gentile at the social level. I have called this the 5 o'clock shadow. After the last transaction is closed, the typewriters covered, the blinds drawn, the folks go their separate ways—except among those people who are self-sustaining by career, at which level there is complete communication. And so do not ever resent any of your people who have this complete communication. It means they have achieved excellence in the arts, sciences, sports, and entertainment.

And so you have this added burden of education in addition to all your other burdens which will come with the responsibilities of first-class citizenship. The security of the closely knit society will be no more. Hoffer has said correctly that the homogeneous society of the ghetto was a fortress as much as it was a prison. But a fortress of intellectual stagnation because of the absence of this lifegiving interchange of ideas and locomotion. It will take hard work to make your way on your own. The white man will no longer bail out his favorite Negro; you will take potluck in America and this is good. And it is eminently worthwhile because freedom is worth every sacrifice.

In our American society self-esteem comes with the acquisition of wealth; but you must remember that economic equality for the Negro race, and particularly in the South is still a long way off; so bear in mind that self-esteem and individual worth, come also through education. In fact at this moment in your history there remains only one course of action—there must be nothing short of a stampede of the Negroes of the South into the classroom of America. There is no other way. Only through education will you understand that the Judaic-Christian prophecy and literature speak of the equality of mankind:

"Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? And the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?"

And the echo from the words of a great Anglo-Saxon poet who saw the dream before it became reality:

"It matters not how strait the gate,
  How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
  I am the captain of my soul."

KAMEHAMEHA THE FIRST

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today in Hawaii the statue of a famous Hawaiian warrior king will be laden with garlands of flower leis to commemorate his fearless deeds and his great contributions to the welfare of the people of Hawaii.

Kamehameha the First, who died in 1819, conquered the Hawaiian Islands one by one and welded them into a kingdom that was to last nearly a century.

He was a man ahead of his time for when much of the world was under ruthless autocratic rule, Kamehameha I developed a profound sense of justice and a sense of kindness which touched even the lowest of his people.

Ever faithful to his gods, this great ruler was not above carrying stone to help build temples. He knew well the value of agriculture and became what was perhaps the islands' first conservationist when he issued an order protecting all young trees from wasteful cutting.

Kamehameha recognized the value of friendly relations with other nations and was quick to use the skills and knowledge of men from other lands in the best interests of his people.

Only recently President Kennedy announced that the name of this great Hawaiian monarch will be proudly emblazoned on the hull of one of our new Polaris submarines, now under construction.

I hope that someday the State of Hawaii will honor this great leader by selecting him as the first Hawaiian to be honored in the Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol.

But today all Hawaii pays homage to Kamehameha the First—a fearless king who has left a proud heritage to the Hawaiian people.

THE FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to commend a remarkable book to my colleagues. I speak of "The Federal Investigators," by Miriam Ottenberg, a Washington Evening Star reporter who received a Pulitzer Prize in 1960 for her outstanding reporting.

The book deals with the true, untold stories of the U.S. Federal agents who protect and defend our lives against the gangsters, spies and traitors who would corrupt, cripple or destroy America and its constitutional guarantees.

May I call the particular attention of my colleagues to a chapter about the postal inspection service entitled "Dollars for the Chinese Reds." This chapter relates the story of Postal Inspector R. Frank Ogden, of Honolulu, and how he almost single-handedly exposed a Communist conspiracy funneling millions of dollars a month into Red China to buy American war materials in 1950.

I am privileged to report that Mr. Ogden, whose Hawaiian nickname is "Kalani," is a personal friend and a fellow member of the Kapahulu-Moiliili Lions Club. He is a retired postmaster and lives in Honolulu.

Mr. Ogden is currently executive secretary of the John Howard Association of Hawaii, whose objective is to assist in the rehabilitation and job placement of former convicts.

In these days when we are subjected on all sides to criticism of Federal spending, it is refreshing to note how very much many of our faithful career employees contribute to the national good and well-being, often with resultant great savings to the American taxpayer.

R. Frank Ogden is indeed representative of these career employees and one of whom we should all be very proud.

VICE PRESIDENT'S MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, we were all inspired by the Vice President's Memorial Day address at Gettysburg. His words were a clarion call that the time is late, that we must move immediately to erase bigotry and discrimination from the face of this Nation.

The Vice President's words were received with much enthusiasm nearly everywhere. The Laconia, N.H., Evening Citizen, my hometown newspaper said:

> The Vice President's solemn words demanding the immediate end of racial discrimination will have a place in perpetuity in this country's treasure house of outstanding speeches, sermons, and documentary milestones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials on the Vice President's speech from the Laconia Evening Citizen and the Boston Globe.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Laconia (N.H.) Evening Citizen]

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS

President Lincoln's Gettysburg address will be linked henceforth in historical significance with the message pronounced by Vice President JOHNSON yesterday on the same hallowed ground.

With bigotry, brutality and bloodshed reaching ominous proportions this Nation is confronted with a civil rights test more terrible than anything encountered since slavery was abolished.

The Vice President's solemn words demanding the immediate ending of racial discrimination will have a place in perpetuity in this country's treasure house of outstanding speeches, sermons, and documentary milestones. Under the circumstances it was inevitable that Memorial Day addresses in hundreds of communities would deal with the theme that the color line must disappear. The impact of such an onslaught of oratory should serve to hasten the coming of the day when segregation will be nothing more than an unhappy memory.

As Mayor Bownes so well indicated in his address Thursday noon in Veterans Square, it must be admitted that our democracy has failed if happenings such as have occurred at Birmingham are tolerated.

[From the Boston Globe]

A HAPPY VICE PRESIDENT

LYNDON B. JOHNSON is no ordinary Vice President. He showed this at Gettysburg on Memorial Day when he urged racial cooperation because "in this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake, it is our Nation."

Moreover, the Vice President is described as a happy one, content with his job, holding several top administrative assignments and taking part regularly in executive department policymaking. No Throttlebottom, he.

In this he is perhaps more active than even his predecessor, Richard Nixon. Others before them have been less happy, for they merely presided over the Senate; Calvin Coolidge, under Harding, was no blithe spirit, nor did his own Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, really enjoy the job. Perhaps today the job has grown with the man.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE LIFE OF THE CITIZEN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Federal Government reaches into the life of every citizen of the United States. It does it through the laws it passes and enforces and through the tax money it gathers and spends. It protects the people, pampers and coddles some and infuriates others. It is the biggest business in the world—the largest employer, buyer, and seller in the country and it is growing bigger every day.

If we are to keep America the land of opportunity, we must insist upon the greatest possible degree of individual liberty that is consistent with an organized society.

The citizen, after all, will determine the course and the future of this Government and this Nation of ours.

In the June issue of the Kansas Farm News there appears an excellent editorial, entitled "The U.S. Government," written by Martin J. Byrne, president of the Kansas State Farmers Union. This is a thought-provoking editorial that I would call to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

(By Martin J. Byrne)

We have exercised the well-established practice of criticizing the actions of our Federal Government. We have always supported the right, and defended those who criticized those actions. Such activities, we believe, give direction and strengthen our Government.

It is one thing to blast an action of Government, but another thing to continually chip away at the concept and existence of the Federal Government itself.

We are alarmed by the eroding type of attacks which are being stepped up in number each week.

Our Federal Government has been and is a strong institution, but much of its strength is derived from the confidence people have in that institution, not necessarily in the people or party who happen to be in charge.

It appears to us this continuous anti-Government campaign is designed to weaken the confidence of the people in the institution as a prelude to its destruction.

There is evidence that debate about how far the Federal Government should cross over into the economic system has been abandoned, leaving the impression that government is a filthy thing, that it is sinister, and any suggestion of the use of government is something foreign and dangerous.

We have powerful lobbies for good causes and special interest causes to approach our Government for action, but we have no lobby to promote and defend government itself.

True, an administration, political party, Cabinet officer or Member of Congress, can defend their positions, but the institution cannot fight back and has no organization dedicated to fighting back.

We have watched closely a trend away from criticism of Supreme Court decisions and of the men on the bench, which is good, to criticism of the Court as an institution, which is an entirely different matter.

It appears from here that some of the groups that have always opposed, which is the right, the crossing over of government into the economic field to level out a problem, have become disenchanted with this

American approach and now use the hate-government-itself approach which, in our opinion, is just as dangerous as subversion from within or without.

Subversion of governments becomes easier as confidence, respect, and support decline. We can think of no situation worse than the strength of our Federal Government eroded to the point where it no longer can be the strong hand and final decisionmaker in deadlocks between individuals, State and economic institutions.

We need more and more citizens who are government program "cussers" and critics. We need more people expressing ideas on the way the institution should be run, and translation of part of this interest into activity in one of the political parties which are the doorsways through which citizens become a moving and guiding part of government. We need less of the efforts to discredit the institution, and more citizenry criticism suggestions on government operations, more activity and participation in guiding the institution.

DEATH OF DR. EDITH HAMILTON

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask recognition to regretfully inform the Members of the Senate of the death of Dr. Edith Hamilton, a native of Fort Wayne, Ind., and at the time of her death, a resident of Washington, D.C.

It is improper, however, to classify Dr. Hamilton as to place of residence, as she was truly a citizen of the world. She was born in Dresden, Germany, received her early education in Fort Wayne, Ind., and received higher education at Bryn Mawr College and advanced degrees at the universities of Leipzig and Munich.

Dr. Hamilton was one of the Nation's most distinguished scholars and was a foremost authority on Graeco-Roman civilization. Her books, "The Greek Way" and "The Roman Way," have become classics in this area of study.

Her last book, "The Echo of Greece," was published in 1957, and in that same year, as tribute to her contribution to knowledge in this field, the Greek Government made her an honorary citizen of Athens. Her prolific pen and fertile intellect have left the world with penetrating and widely acclaimed interpretation of Greek literature, philosophy and art.

In 1922, after 25 years of service to Bryn Mawr College as headmistress, Dr. Hamilton resigned, and her real career began. Her numerous books include, "The Prophets of Israel," "Three Greek Plays," "Mythology," and "Witness to the Truth." She also contributed an article to the Saturday Evening Post's "Adventure of the Mind" series. NBC television dedicated a show to her life and writings.

Other members of Dr. Hamilton's family have also made great contributions to the academic world. Her sister and cousin, Norah and Jessie, respectively, were artists and their work appeared in prominent museums. Her sister, Dr. Alice Hamilton, was a pioneer in the field of industrial and occupational medicine. She was the first woman to teach in the medical school at Harvard University.

Dr. Edith Hamilton died May 31 here in Washington in her 95th year. Her perseverance in the pursuit of scholarship and her additions to man's knowledge of early civilizations have left an indelible mark on our world.

I ask the Members of the Senate to join with me in mourning the passing of this great lady.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 523) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand the agreement, the debate on the Tower amendment will begin, under a time limitation basis, at 2 o'clock, and will continue for one-half hour, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that at that time it is the intention of the leadership, in compliance with a promise made yesterday, to ask for the yeas and nays on the Tower amendment.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 186, H.R. 2439; that the consideration of the bills be continued in sequence; and that at the appropriate places I may be empowered to insert explanations and portions of the reports on the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA NATIONAL JAMBOREE, 1964

The bill (H.R. 2439) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 206), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend military equipment and to provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in support of the Sixth National Jamboree to be held at Valley Forge State Park, Pa., in the summer of 1964.

EXPLANATION

It has become traditional for the Government to assist the Boy Scouts of America in connection with their national jamborees by lending equipment needed at the site of the encampment and by providing certain services.

The Sixth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America will be held at Valley Forge State Park, Pa., for a period of approximately 1 week in July–August 1964. Approximately 50,000 Scouts and officials are scheduled to attend the jamboree.

Equipment authorized to be loaned includes tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and similar items.

The services that may be provided are in the fields of communications, medicine, engineering, and logistics.

Only the equipment and services that are available and whose issue would not jeopardize the national defense program could be furnished under the bill.

The Boy Scouts of America would be required to furnish a bond for the safe return of the property to be loaned.

Under authority of the language "other equipment" and "other logistical services as may be necessary or useful," the following types of support have been furnished on a nonreimbursable basis in the past:

1. Specialized equipment for administrative support, and the operation of such equipment;
2. Personnel for security, accounting, and organizational maintenance of the equipment loaned;
3. Administrative support personnel such as supervisors, medical and dental technicians, military police and bandsmen; and
4. Temporary duty and per diem costs of the foregoing support personnel as authorized by law.

REMOVAL OF PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 14, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 357(c) is amended by striking out the words "or any enlisted man so retired whose average marks in conduct during his service in the Coast Guard were not less than 97½ per centum of the maximum, or any enlisted man so retired who shall have been both so cited and shall have received such average marks,".

(2) Section 358 is repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 11 is amended by striking out the following item:

"358. Limitation of retirements."

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by subsection (1) of section 1 of this Act does not apply to any enlisted man who, on the effective date of this Act, has completed four or more years of active service."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 204), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Subsection I(1) of the bill would amend section 357(c) of title 14, United States Code, by striking out the provision that any enlisted man whose average marks in conduct during his service in the Coast Guard were not less than 97½ percent, or any enlisted man who had been both cited for extraordinary heroism in line of duty and had received such average marks in conduct, would upon retirement be entitled to have his retired pay increased by an amount equal to 10 percent of the active duty pay and permanent additions thereto of the grade or rating with which retired. However, those cited for heroism would continue to be eligible for the 10-percent increase in retirement pay.

Subsection I(2) would repeal section 358 of title 14, which provides that the total number of enlisted men who may be retired in any one calendar year by reason of having completed 20 years of service shall not exceed the whole number nearest to 1 percent of the total enlisted force of the Coast Guard on the active list as of January 1 of such year, to be divided in such proportions between voluntary retirements and involuntary retirements as may be determined by the Commandant. Section 358 further provides that in case the number of enlisted men authorized to be retired annually by this section are not retired during a calendar year, the remainder of the authorized number may be retired during any subsequent calendar year providing that the total retired in that year does not exceed 3 percent of the total enlisted force as of January 1 of such calendar year.

Subsection I(3) would amend the analysis of chapter 11 of title 14 by striking out the line:

"358. Limitation of retirements."

Section 2 would provide that the amendment made by subsection (1) of section I would not apply to any enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, would have completed 4 or more years of active service.

REASONS FOR THE BILL

Statutory provisions regarding retirement affecting enlisted men of the Coast Guard differ in two particulars—one favorable, the other unduly restrictive—from those applying to enlisted men of the other uniformed services. On the favorable side is the provision, in section 357(c) of title 14, United States Code, making enlisted men retiring after 20 years of active service eligible for an increase in retired pay amounting to 10 percent of the active duty pay of the grade or rating at which retired if they have maintained a high standard of good conduct throughout their service. Unique to the Coast Guard this provision, according to a study made by the Comptroller General's Office, is applying to 92 percent of Coast Guard enlisted retirees, at an average overall cost of approximately $12,600 per man.

The unfavorable provision affecting only Coast Guard enlisted men limits voluntary retirements after completion of 20 years of service, in any 1 year, to 1 percent of the total enlisted force on the active list as of January 1 of such year. Any involuntary retirements during the year would reduce by so much the number of voluntary retirements permitted.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his letter to the Senate asking introduction of the bill, and the Coast Guard Chief of Staff, in testimony before the subcommittee, urged enactment of the bill—

"From the standpoint of justice to the men who had been advised at the time of enlistment that they could retire after 20 years of service, and whose plans for the future had been made on that basis;

"From the standpoint of the Coast Guard, whose orderly recruitment and promotion routine is being impeded because of inability to grant retirement to all eligibles requesting it. Delayed retirement of leading petty officers, for instance, has an adverse effect on reenlistments of their subordinate associates; and

"From the standpoint of Government financial obligations. Removal of the retirement limitation would result in increased retired pay costs. The Secretary's estimate was that the net additional costs through 1970 would average $1,385,000 per year. Repeal of the extra 10-percent good conduct retirement pay would effect no immediate savings, since it would not affect the rights of persons already retired or those who have at least 4 years of service. However, with a possible 500 to 600 enlisted men retiring annually following enactment, the estimated average saving of $12,600 per man would eventually bring substantial savings far surpassing the net additional cost."

At the present time, according to Rear Adm. James A. Alger's testimony, about 100 men who have requested retirement cannot be accommodated. Because of the large number of men who enlisted during World War II, the number of retirement requests can be expected to increase, he declared, and he estimated that by 1968 the retirement age would be about 26 years, instead of 20, if present limitations are not removed. What would result in such a situation, he pointed out, is that men finishing their first and second enlistments would return to civilian life or transfer to one of the other services where prospects for advancement were better. Thus the Coast Guard could expect to lose many good men with from 8 to 16 years of service, which would be most damaging to efficiency and morale.

No opposition to enactment was received from any source.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 79) to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "after", to strike out "December 31, 1963" and insert "after fiscal year 1964"; in line 8, after the word "enacted", to strike out "after that date" and insert "after December 31, 1963"; and on page 2, after line 14, to strike out:

"(c) The Secretary shall report every six months to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives on the administration of this section."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 205), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Basically, the bill, H.R. 79, would require an annual legislative authorization for major capital construction and procurement programs of the Coast Guard. In this, it would bring the congressional procedures affecting the Coast Guard into harmony with those relating to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, where annual procurement authorizations have been required for a number of years.

Section 1 of the bill, as reported with amendments, would provide that, after appropriations for fiscal year 1964 are completed, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments, or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963.

Section 2 of the bill would amend chapter 17 of title 14 of the code by adding a new section to provide that the Secretary may use any funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for other construction purposes (a) to restore, repair, or replace facilities that have been damaged or destroyed, including acquisition of sites and (b) to acquire, construct, convert, extend, and install at Coast Guard installations and facilities needed permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and the furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, but excluding the construction of family quarters, costing not more than $200,000 for any one project.

The committee amendments (1) would make it clear that separate authorizing legislation would not be required for either regular or supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964 and (2) would eliminate a semiannual reporting requirement which the committee regards as unnecessary in view of the careful annual review contemplated in the legislation.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE BILL

The increasing scope of Coast Guard functioning and responsibilities in many fields and areas, and the obsolete or outmoded condition of much of its facilities and equipment, would seem to call for a more lively interest in the Congress in the planning and programing of Coast Guard operations. By requiring the responsible legislative committees of both Senate and House to review and discuss proposals relevant to such future activities, the bill, if enacted, would serve to require that the Congress have a fuller appreciation of the needs and objectives of the Coast Guard.

Also, to insure a more adequate control of Coast Guard operations by the Congress, it appears necessary that present programing of funds to and for the use of the Coast Guard be more clearly delineated. As the report of the General Counsel of the Treasury made plain, existing provisions of title 14 authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore facilities. Nevertheless, as the report of the Comptroller General points out, the Coast Guard in the past has pursued a policy, when it deemed necessary, of financing from operating expense funds, projects identical or similar to those financed from funds appropriated for acquisition, construction, and improvements. In effect, the Comptroller General's report states:

"This practice affords an alternate or dual source of financing and a means of undertaking capital projects which have not been presented for review by the Bureau of the

Budget or the Congress. As such, it contradicts the logical purpose of the separate appropriations for acquisition, construction, and improvement * * *. We believe the capital expenditures should not be made from operating expenses, except under emergency conditions."

While requiring the Coast Guard to obtain prior authorization for capital expenditures, the bill, in section 2, would permit use of funds appropriated for other construction purposes to be expended for repairs or restoration of facilities damaged or destroyed, and for certain other purposes, provided that costs of any one project not exceed $200,000.

The Treasury Department witness at the hearing, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, did not oppose enactment.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1031) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the Inland Waterways Corporation Act (49 U.S.C. 151–157) is" and insert "(1) the Act entitled 'An Act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes', approved June 3, 1924, as amended (49 U.S.C. 151–157), and (2) section 201 of the Transportation Act, 1920 (49 U.S.C. 141), are"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "law", to strike out "there are transferred to"; in line 6, after the word "Commerce", to insert "shall have"; in line 7, after the word "immunities", to insert "which were"; and in line 9, after the word "Act", to insert "(except requirements relating to service in contracts for sale of facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation which are deemed to be modified by section 1 hereof)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the Act entitled "An Act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes", approved June 3, 1924, as amended (49 U.S.C. 151–157), and (2) section 201 of the Transportation Act, 1920 (49 U.S.C. 141), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) For liquidation of the affairs of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and for this purpose only, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce shall have all functions, powers, duties, authority, rights and immunities which were vested in, or available or applicable to the Corporation on the day before the date of enactment of this Act (except requirements relating to service in contracts for sale of facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation which are deemed to be modified by section 1 hereof) which shall be performed, exercised, and administered by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner and to the same extent as if the same were performed, exercised, and administered by the Corporation. The Secretary of Commerce shall assume and be subject in his official capacity to all rights and benefits, all liabilities and commitments, whether arising out of contract or otherwise, of the Corporation, but he shall pay into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, all future receipts and all remaining funds of the Corporation transferred to, or received by, him. To assist in his liquidation of the Corporation, the books of account, records, documents, assets, and liabilities of every kind and nature, including but not limited to, all funds, notes (and accrued interest thereon), mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts, commitments, claims, and causes of action of Inland Waterways Corporation are transferred to the Secretary of Commerce for liquidation or assignment.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against Inland Waterways Corporation before the date of enactment of this Act shall abate by reason of this Act; but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such dissolution and showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the United States in such court. After the date of enactment of this Act, any suit, action, or other proceeding which, but for this Act, would be commenced by or against the Corporation, shall be commenced by or against the United States in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 207), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Inland Waterways Corporation Act of June 3, 1924 (49 U.S.C. 151–157), was enacted in order to foster the development and use of domestic waterways through Government operation of transportation facilities thereon. That act provided for the continued existence of the Corporation under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce until certain specific criteria, enunciated by the Congress in the act, were fulfilled. Inherent in the act was the desire for navigable channels, joint rail-water tariffs, and private enterprise engaged or ready to engage in common carrier services on the Mississippi and tributaries, except the Ohio River, and on the Warrior River.

These criteria having been generally met, the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to his authority under the act, sold the transportation facilities and operating rights of the Inland Waterways Corporation to the Federal Waterways Corp. under contract of July 24, 1953. The purchaser, whose name was later changed to the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., was required to pay $9 million in installments on or before June 30, 1964. This requirement has been modified by an amendment to the original contract allowing the payments to be extended to June 30, 1969.

In accordance with the terms of the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, the sales contract to Federal Barge Lines required the vendee to provide common carrier services similar to those rendered by the corporation. Of particular significance is the requirement that Federal Barge Lines provide a minimum number of trips per annum between and among the various ports of these rivers, and provide a minimum quantity of less-than-bargeload shipments per annum. In order to secure performance of these services the contract of sale provides that certain penalties would be levied against the vendee, unless excused, for each trip short of the minimum stated in the contract which was omitted or for which service was not made available and for the transportation of less than the required minimum of less-than-bargeload cargo.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 1031, as reported with amendments, would relieve the Federal Barge Lines from the service requirements of the contract of sale, which, it is claimed, are the cause of unprofitable operations by this company. This bill would place the Federal Barge Lines in the same position as to service requirements as other competing bargelines.

S. 1031 was introduced at the request of the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., which claims that the terms of the Inland Waterways Corporation Act and of the contract of sale of July 24, 1953, were obsolete, not required under present conditions, and burdensome upon the bargeline. In a 1-day hearing on March 7, 1963, the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Commerce heard a witness representing the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., and also a witness from the Department of Commerce, both of whom urged passage of this bill. The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation unanimously approved S. 1031 in an executive meeting on May 2, 1963.

The bill is similar to H.R. 10542 which passed the House of Representatives during the 87th Congress, but too late in the session for final action to be taken by the Senate. It should be noted that there was no opposition to this bill either from Government agencies or from competing carriers or shippers. The Department of Commerce did, however, suggest changes in the wording of the bill, in the interest of clarification, and these changes have been effected by the amendment noted below. Further, your committee agrees with the view expressed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in its report that enactment of S. 1031 is not intended to affect the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to require the Federal Barge Lines to comply with the tariff filing provisions of part III of the Interstate Commerce Act effectuating changes in service.

Your committee believes that enactment of S. 1031 will not in any way decrease necessary service, but will place the Federal Barge Lines in a better competitive position while protecting the interests of the Federal Government in both the continuation of common carrier barge service and in achieving full payment under the terms of the contract of sale.

AMENDMENT

The amendments to this bill are all of a technical and clarifying nature. Generally, they were requested by Government agencies reporting on this bill and were found to be acceptable to the Federal Barge Lines, Inc.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The comments of the General Accounting Office, the Department of Commerce, and the Interstate Commerce Commission are set forth below:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 4, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter dated March 8, 1963, requests our comments on S. 1031.

The bill would repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act (49 U.S.C. 151–157). The Corporation was created pursuant to this act in 1924 to continue the operations of the inland waterways transportation and terminal facilities then operated by the U.S. Army on the Mississippi and tributaries, except the Ohio River, and on the Warrior River. This act declared it to be the policy of the Congress to continue the transportation services until such things as (1) navigable channels, (2) terminal facilities, (3) joint rail-water tariffs are provided, and (4) private enterprise is engaged or ready to engage in common carrier services on these rivers.

Another provision of this law appearing in section 153(d), title 49, United States Code, permits the sale of the transportation facilities belonging to the Inland Waterways Corporation when the Secretary of Commerce finds that navigable channels and adequate terminals are available and joint tariffs have been published. This subsection further provides that the purchaser shall give satisfactory assurance and agree as part of the consideration of such sale that the facilities so sold will be continued in the common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the Corporation and give ample security by bond or otherwise to insure the faithful performance of such agreement.

Pursuant to this authority the Secretary of Commerce under contract dated July 24, 1953, sold the transportation facilities and operating rights to the Federal Waterways Corporation in the amount of $9 million. The name of the Federal Waterways Corporation was later changed to the Federal Barge Lines, Inc. Under the contract the purchaser was required to pay the $9 million in installments on or before June 30, 1964. This requirement has been modified by a contract amendment to require full payment by June 30, 1969. Protection to the Government is afforded through the execution of mortgages on the physical assets transferred as security for the performance of the contract and by other protective provisions in the contract.

In order to implement the provisions in the law, 49 U.S.C. 153(d), requiring the purchaser to continue the common carrier services in a manner substantially similar to that rendered by the Corporation, the contract defines "common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service now rendered by the Corporation" as being generally that service furnished by the Corporation and in particular the making of a minimum number of trips per year between the various ports involved and for the transportation annually of certain minimum tonnage of less-than-bargeload cargo.

To secure the performance of this transportation service the contract provides, unless excused, certain penalties, denominated as liquidated damages, for each trip short of the minimum stated in the contract which was omitted or for which service was not made available during the year and for the transportation of less than the minimum tonnage of less-than-bargeload cargo. The obligation to render common carrier service substantially similar to that rendered by the Corporation is mandatory until July 1, 1973, after which the consent of the Secretary of Commerce must be obtained before the discontinuance or modification of common carrier service may be effected.

Another provision of the contract would automatically modify the terms of the contract in accordance with any change later enacted in the law, 49 U.S.C. 153(d), with respect to the obligation for the purchaser to continue its common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the Corporation.

We understand that the bill was introduced on behalf of the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., to permit the modification of the contract as to the common carrier service requirements which are reported to be the cause of unprofitable operations by the bargelines company. It is the position of the Department of Commerce that so long as the provisions in title 49, United States Code, section 153(d), remain in effect modification of the service obligation in the contract is not possible.

Whether the relief sought to be obtained by the enactment of the bill, which would repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act and thus relieve the present common carrier service requirements under the contract of sale with the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., is desirable constitutes a question of policy for determination by the Congress. Consequently, we make no recommendation concerning the merits of the measure.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General
of the United States.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce with respect to S. 1031, a bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act.

The Inland Waterways Corporation, a Federal corporation in the Department of Commerce, pursuant to the statutory language (49 U.S.C. 151–157) which would be repealed by the enactment of S. 1031, operated until 1953 the Federal Barge Lines, a comprehensive barge common carrier service on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, around the gulf, and up the Warrior River in Alabama since this responsibility was assigned to the Secretary of Commerce by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1939. This service, in accordance with the direction of the statute, was developmental in nature, and was inaugurated in an unincorporated form by the Department of War during World War I in an effort to augment other transportation facilities of the Nation in the prosecution of the war.

Section 151 through 153 of title 49 of the United States Code, with their emphasis on common carrier service and the establishment of terminal facilities, make clear the developmental aspects of this operation. Section 153 authorized the Secretary of Commerce, upon the finding that described stages in the development of river transportation were achieved, to dispose of the facilities by lease or sale to private persons. These conditions having been accomplished, the facilities were sold in accordance with the statute on the 24th day of July 1953.

Your attention is invited to the provisions of section 153(d) containing the specific requirement that the purchaser of the facilities was to give satisfactory assurance and agree, as part of the consideration for such sale or lease, that the facilities so sold or leased would be continued in the common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the Corporation, together with ample security by bond or otherwise to insure faithful performance of such an agreement. To carry out this provision, the contract of sale provided standards of performance with penalties in the event of nonperformance. These standards were defined in terms of actual operations by the Federal Barge Lines during a representative period preceding the sale in 1953. There was general agreement that providing a bond as an assurance was not feasible because of the unique and unpredictable nature of the undertaking. Penalty provisions amounting in extreme cases to default and return of the facilities were made a part of the contract of sale to assure performance. This technique was deemed acceptable in light of the alternative "by bond or otherwise" provided by the statute.

In defining the service standards required by the contract to be performed by the purchaser, minimum numbers of trips to be made within all segments of the area served by the system were specifically detailed. These were:

(a) From the port of New Orleans, La., to the port of St. Louis, Mo., and return (designated as the Lower District), 125 trips per annum in each direction.

(b) From the port of St. Louis, Mo., to the ports of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., and including Stillwater, Minn., on the St. Croix River and Port Cargill and Black Dog, Minn., on the Minnesota River, and return (designated as the Upper District), 40 trips per annum in each direction.

(c) From the port of St. Louis, Mo., to the port of Chicago, Ill., and return (designated as the Illinois District), 75 trips per annum in each direction.

(d) From the port of St. Louis, Mo., to the port of Omaha, Nebr., and return (designated as the Missouri District), 16 trips per annum in each direction.

(e) From the port of New Orleans, La., to Port Birmingham, Ala., and return (designated as the Warrior River Division), 18 trips per annum in each direction.

(f) From Port Birmingham, Ala., to the city of Ensley, Ala., and return (designated as the Railroad Division), such trips as may be necessary to transport cargoes in reasonable quantities delivered at or destined to Port Birmingham, Ala., and such online cargo in reasonable quantities as may be offered for transportation.

(g) In the event transportation to Sioux City, Iowa, becomes practical and feasible, the purchaser will extend service to this area to provide such services as are justified in the light of demand therefor and cargo available.

The definition of service performed prior to the sale by Federal Barge and imposed by the contract on the purchaser also included "adequate provision for the transportation of such less-than-bargeload and less-than-carload shipments as can reasonably be anticipated and the active solicitation of these shipments." This service was further defined as "14 percent of the total tonnage per annum, or 375,000 tons per annum, whichever is less, shall be less-than-bargeload cargo."

In addition, the definition also included as a requirement of the contract, the maintenance of joint tariffs with rail carriers and motor carriers and an alertness to make reasonable arrangements for interline traffic with other barge, rail, and truck lines.

Provision is made in the contracts for excuse of the penalty provisions upon a showing by the purchaser, concurred in by the Secretary or his designee, that the penalties should not be enforced because the deficiencies arose from reasons beyond the control of the purchaser; viz, major changes in methods of transportation, or lack of business on the showing of action to obtain such business.

There have been instances of deficiencies. During the first 6 months of operation under the contract in 1953, certain required calls at Port Cargil, Blackdog, Stillwater, and Omaha were not made and the failure to do so was excused because, despite active solicitation, no cargo was available or conditions on the river prevented the calls. In fiscal 1954 five trips on the upper Mississippi district were missed and excused because certain coal and grain traffic did not materialize; a minor shortage during the same period of less-than-bargeload carriage caused by previous shippers of less-than-bargeload expanding to bargeload lots was excused. In calendar 1960, two trips on the upper district were excused because of navigational delays and decline in business. Other performance of services has been good. For example, in the 1961 annual report of the purchaser to the Secretary of Commerce, 885 through tows were reported for all districts in comparison with the required minimum of 584. When intermediate tows were added, the total figure was 1,232 tows with no deficiencies in any district. There has been no imposition of penalties under the contract (1953 to date) because the purchaser has shown the deviations to be excusable under the provisions of the contract and the Secretary or his designee has concurred in these showings.

It has been the position of the purchaser in recent years that the required conditions of this contract of sale relating to service no longer reflect changed conditions prevalent along the inland waterways served by the corporation. With respect to the two major requirements described above, it is contended that the increased size of tows made possible by the more powerful propulsion vessels developed by the purchaser makes the trip requirements out of date. With respect to the less-than-bargeload carriage, a service which was costly and not self-supporting, the purchaser undertook immediately to increase this aspect of the business with the hope of bringing up the volume to the point where it would be profitable or at least self-supporting. Solicitors were hired to bring in this business. This operation was not successful, not, we are convinced, because of a lack of effort or expenditure on the part of the purchaser but rather because the business was simply not there. The less-than-bargeload carriage business has dropped off. The purchaser has, wisely, persuaded most of such shippers who still use the service to increase their use of the lines to the point of shipping in bargeload lots, which is beneficial to the shipper and the carrier.

Concern on the part of the purchaser, based on these changing circumstances and its responsibility to continue services which these changes have outmoded, have caused the purchaser to consider carefully its liabilities under the contract. That contract, as described above, provides that changes in circumstances, on which the required performances set out in the contract are based, will provide an excuse from such performance, but it is perfectly clear that the burden of justifying such nonperformance to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce rests on the purchaser. For these reasons, the purchaser has asked the Secretary to consider amending the contract to reflect the changed circumstances in the areas served.

In view of the precise direction of the Congress regarding service in the statute considered above, the authority to amend the contract in this respect is questionable at best. The purchaser is directed to provide services similar to those provided by Government operation, and the Government operation prior to the sale can be the only basis for such standards of performance.

The contract provides that, if the Congress should, through legislation, grant relief with respect to the present requirement of law that the purchaser shall continue its common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered while under Government ownership, the contract shall be deemed as modified to reflect such change. It is apparently the intention of the purchaser to effect the modification of the contract in this manner.

We concur in the appropriateness of seeking such a determination by the Congress. So long as the view of the Congress is that which is expressed in the present statutes, the requirements of the contract reflecting this view must, in our opinion, remain unchanged. In the unlikely event that the purchaser defaults under the present contract of sale, the responsibility remains under existing law for the Secretary of Commerce to step into the breach and continue the service as directed by the Congress. This possibility should also be taken into account by the Congress in its determination of the need for continuation of this service.

The Federal Government in the developmental work of the Inland Waterways Corporation and its predecessor organizations and the Engineers of the Army, have accomplished much in the establishment of barge service in this area. In 1924, Federal was the only common carrier on the Mississippi River system. In 1962, there were 18 such carriers. We are informed that by 1961 there were over 300 companies operating over 800 towboats of 500 horsepower or more on the Mississippi River and gulf intercoastal waterways systems.

The movement by barge of less-than-bargeload lots is becoming more costly because of increased costs of handling. There is a recognized trend toward the maintenance of smaller inventories of goods such as merchandise and parts by users, with greater reliance on suppliers and distributors as a source of such goods on an expeditiously delivered basis. This type of service is generally provided better by motor carrier and rail. It is our view, based on our knowledge of the development of barge transportation in the area served by Federal, and of the development of competitive modes of transportation, that the service requirements of the statute are no longer needed either to assure that sufficient barge lot transportation is available to those who want to use it or to assure that transportation of quantities in smaller sized lots is available.

In the event of enactment of a bill for the purpose of S. 1031, the present contract of sale would automatically be modified to a contract of sale without the present requirements of service measured by performance by the Government as the operator prior to the sale. The contract would then be directed only to security for the payment of the balance of the purchase price, which at present is $4,375,000 remaining from the original sale price of $9 million.

Payments on the unpaid balance are to be made at the rate of $625,000 per year through June 30, 1969. The facilities acquired at the sale in 1953 were valued on December 31, 1962, at $4,010,922 and subsequently acquired property is valued at $7,605,067. The originally acquired property is pledged as direct security for the payment of the contract debt and the purchaser's equity in subsequently acquired property is pledged for that purpose as well. Based on figures in the annual report for calendar 1961, provided by the purchaser to the Secretary, it appears that as of December 1961 approximately $6.7 million was available as security for payment of the purchase price. We see no reason for concern regarding the purchaser's ability to meet its obligations promptly as has been done in the past.

In the report by the Interstate Commerce Commission filed at the time of the sale, in accordance with the statute authorizing the sale (49 U.S.C. 153), there was included, as required, an evaluation of the properties sold. The commercial value of the waterline assets, taking into account the requirement that the facilities were to be continued in the common carrier service as rendered by Federal, was set at zero. It seems reasonable to conclude that repeal of the required conditions of service would improve to some extent the ability of the purchaser to operate more freely and the strict security aspects of the contract, relating solely to the payment of the balance of the purchase price would be improved.

The provisions to be repealed by S. 1031 would do away with the Corporation which would carry out the more general directions of section 141 of title 49 of the United States Code. Consideration should also be given to the continued utility of this latter provision in light of any decision here reached by this committee on the significance of changes in the area served.

A bill for this same purpose was introduced in the House of Representatives during the 87th Congress (H.R. 10542) and was passed by that House. As introduced, the bill was limited to section 1 of the present bill under consideration. Section 2 of the present bill is identical to the section 2 which was added to the bill during consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House in the last Congress. The purpose of this addition was to assure the continuance of the obligation of the purchaser to pay the balance of the purchase price and to enable the Secretary of Commerce, as liquidator of the Corporation, to carry out any obligations which may remain from the period of Government operation prior to the sale of the facilities.

Further consideration of the language of section 2 gives rise to some concern. The contract provision described above is clearly intended to effect a modification of the contract in the event of a repeal by the Congress of the service requirements of section 153 of title 49 of the United States Code. The first sentence of section 2(a) sets forth the liquidation duties of the Secretary of Commerce as identical to the duties of the Corporation prior to the repeal that would be accomplished by enactment of the bill. This creates the ambiguity that one of the duties could be said to be the enforcement of the service requirements against the purchaser that were imposed by the provisions of section 153. We suggest that this ambiguity may be overcome by insertion of the following parenthetical language after the word "act" in section 2(a): "(except requirements relating to service in contracts for sale of facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation which are deemed to be modified by sec. 1 hereof)."

In conclusion, you are advised that, subject to your consideration of the continued utility of section 141 of title 49, and the clarification of the savings clause, the Department of Commerce has no objection to the proposed legislation repealing sections 151 through 157 of title 49 of the United States Code and the resulting amendment of the service requirements of the contract of sale covering the facilities of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the transmission of this report from the standpoint of administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: Your letter of March 8, 1963, addressed to the Chairman of the Commission and requesting comments on a bill, S. 1031, introduced by you (by request), to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, has been referred to our Committee on Legislation. After consideration by that Committee, I am authorized to submit the following comments in its behalf:

S. 1031 would repeal the act of June 3, 1924 (49 U.S.C. 151–157), under which the Inland Waterways Corporation was created to foster the development and use of domestic waterways through Government operation of transportation facilities thereon, and would charge the Secretary of Commerce with the orderly liquidation of the affairs of the Corporation. In that act, the Congress provided, among other things, for the continued functioning of the Corporation until specified facilities and services were completed and made available to the public, and private persons engaged, or were ready and willing to engage, in common carrier service in the areas which it served. In addition, the Congress laid down certain conditions respecting the eventual sale of the Corporation's facilities, one which required the vendee to provide "common-carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the corporation * * *."

Accordingly, when the Government withdrew from the barge business in 1953, the contract of sale required the purchaser, Federal Barge Lines, Inc., to continue to provide certain services. Included among these were the transportation of a specified minimum quantity of less-than-bargeload and less-than-carload shipments per year and the making annually, of a specified minimum number of trips between certain named points. The contract provided that the purchaser could modify these requirements after June 1, 1973, with the consent of the Secretary of Commerce who under the statute, was authorized to govern and direct the Corporation in the exercise of its functions. Finally, it was further provided in the contract that: "Should Congress through legislation grant relief with respect to the present requirement of said law that the purchaser continue its common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the Corporation, the contract shall be deemed as modified to reflect such change." The terms and conditions of the contract were approved by the Commission, as required by section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act, in *Federal Barge Lines, Inc. Purchase, Etc.*, 285 I.C.C. 439 (Dec. 3, 1953).

It is our understanding that the purpose of the proposed repeal is to relieve the Federal Barge Lines from the service requirements of the contract of sale, which are considered by that carrier too obsolete and burdensome and which action, it believes, will place it in the same position as to service requirements as other competing bargelines.

In our opinion the repeal of the Inland Waterways Corporation Act would be in the public interest. At present, the Commission has no authority to permit the Federal Barge Lines to make any changes in its services which would be contrary to the requirements of that act even though such changes may be desirable and otherwise lawful under the applicable provisions of part III of the Interstate Commerce Act. It should be pointed out in this connection, however, that since repeal of the Waterways Corporation Act would not change any of the statutes administered by this Commission, it is our view that the Federal Barge Lines would still have to make appropriate changes in its published tariffs before it could discontinue any of the services now required by statute and the contract of sale and as reflected in the tariffs. Such changes would, of course, be subject to protest, suspension, and investigation. Nevertheless, in order to avoid any uncertainty as to the intended effect of the bill, if enacted, it is our further view that it be made clear in the committee's report, that such enactment is not intended to affect the authority of this Commission to require Federal Barge Lines to comply with the tariff filing provisions of part III in effectuating changes in service.

We favor the enactment of S. 1031.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION,
LAURENCE K. WALRATH,
Chairman.
RUPERT L. MURPHY.

RINGING OF BELLS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES ON JULY 4

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring observance of July 4 of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "July", to insert "or at such other time on that day as may be determined by local authority"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby (1) declares that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States at the hour of 2 o'clock, eastern daylight time, in the afternoon of the 4th day of July, or at such other time on that day as may be determined by local authority, and (2) calls upon civic and other community leaders to take appropriate steps to encourage public participation in such observance.

The amendments were agreed to. The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 208), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

The purpose of the amendment is to add flexibility to the resolution in order that communities may fix such other time if it would be more convenient for its celebration on that day.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is to provide that the Congress declares that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, at the hour of 2 o'clock on the Fourth of July, and calling upon civic and other community leaders to take appropriate steps and encourage public participation in such observance.

STATEMENT

On July 4, 1776, the Liberty Bell tolling in Philadelphia proclaimed the independence of the Thirteen Colonies from British rule. That infant Nation endured; indeed, in 187 years it has become the leader in man's good fight against tyranny and oppression.

In earlier days, the anniversary of our birth of freedom was actively observed by young and old. While our Nation was growing, while her people were new immigrants, they had fresh memories of tyranny. They were intensely aware that they had something to celebrate on the Fourth of July. It was an occasion to remember and observe.

Lately, unfortunately, this same spirit seems lacking. True, a national holiday is proclaimed; true, speeches are made; but the Fourth of July is not the same.

With this resolution, July 4, 1963, will inaugurate a great new national observance of American independence. Bells will peal across the land from churches, government buildings, and college campuses.

The bells will ring at 2 p.m., or such other time as communities find most convenient, throughout the Nation to remind all citizens that this was the moment when the Liberty Bell tolled in Philadelphia 187 years ago, proclaiming to all who heard it that a new nation had been born. By the ringing of bells on the Fourth of July, our people are reminded by a great chorus of bells of the principle of freedom on which this Nation was founded, and perhaps they will rededicate themselves to preserving those principles not only here at home but also throughout the world.

In the ringing of the bells across the land, we will have every year on our Nation's birthday a fitting reminder of the exalted words and heroic decision that founded America.

The committee is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose, and, accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, as amended.

CONSTITUTION DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as "Constitution Day," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the 17th day of September in each year shall hereafter be known as "Constitution Day", and the President is hereby requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of our Nation to display the flag of the United States on September 17th in each year at their homes and other suitable places, and urging the citizens of the United States to renew and reaffirm their dedication on September 17th in each year to the principles embodied in the Constitution.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein shall be construed as changing or attempting to change, any other designations of September 17th, or the time or mode of observances pursuant to the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as 'Citizenship Day'", approved February 29, 1952 (66 Stat. 9), or the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week", approved August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 932).

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Joint resolution providing that the 17th day of September in each year shall be known as 'Constitution Day', and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 209), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution, as amended, is to designate the 17th day of September in each year as "Constitution Day," and requesting the President of the United States to issue, annually, a proclamation calling upon the people to display the flag of the United States on that day in their homes and other suitable places.

STATEMENT

On the 4th day of July, in the year 1776, the people of the Colonies, in the name of, and by the authority of, the people of the then British Colonies in America, declared, through their representatives in General Congress, the independence of the United States of America, and set forth the causes and reasons which impelled them to do so. Subsequent thereto, and after the War of Independence, the States desired and determined to form a union, and by their representatives did meet in convention, and after long deliberations agreed upon and established a Constitution for the United States of America. That Constitution was signed on the 17th day of September 1787, and is the Constitution under which the United States of America has grown to the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

At the time the Constitution of the United States was signed, there were less than 4 million people to be governed thereunder, and only 13 States. At the present time there are 50 States, and in excess of 186 million people who now live under the protection of that great document. In the 175 years of its being, there have been only 23 amendments to the Constitution, 10 of which are expressed in the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was adopted almost at the same time that the Nation came into being. Since that time, there have been actually only 13 amendments to the Constitution. Under all these circumstances, it would appear that such a document of government would be long and involved, but such is not the case. The Constitution of the United States is exactly 89 sentences long, can be contained on 4 sheets of paper, and can be easily read by anyone in the space of about 15 minutes. The Constitution has seen a continent transformed from a wilderness to the greatest economic power in the world. It is just as elastic and as adaptable to the United States of America as we know it today as it was when it was first adopted. Many great men participated in the formation of that document, including, among others, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gunning Bedford, and Robert Morris. Two of these men were to become Presidents of the United States, 3 Cabinet officers, 15 became U.S. Senators, 8 more became Governors, 1 became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and 3 became Associate Justices.

The 4th day of July, which we celebrate as Independence Day, was the beginning of this great country to be known as the United States of America, but it was not until September 17, 1787, that the real and lasting foundation, upon which this country has grown, was established.

In this world of turmoil and with this constant struggle between freedom and communism, this great document, the Constitution of the United States, becomes more and more significant, not only to us in the United States, but to freedom-loving people everywhere. On the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, not only are we concerned with serious issues in the Far East, the Near East, the captive nations, and at the Berlin wall, but with the ominous threat to free people which has reached the very doorstep of the United States on Soviet Cuba, an island only 90 miles off our coast. This is not only a threat to our people in the United States of America, it is in violation of one of our basic declarations of freedom, the Monroe Doctrine, since it poses a threat by a foreign nation to the whole Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine was enunciated December 2, 1823, when President James Monroe stated to the Senate and to the House, as follows:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Constitution of the United States of America was written with the blood of the brave men, women, and children who suffered and even died to make this great Nation free. There are others who sacrificed and bled and died to extend her from one ocean to the other; and in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The committee is of the opinion that there is no date in history which exceeds September 17, 1787, in its impact on the growth of this country from that date forward. It is a date which is not given its due recognition, and the committee believes that designating this day of each year as "Constitution Day," and requesting the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people to observe this day and urging our citizens to renew and reaffirm their dedication to the principles embodied in the Constitution will make all our peoples, not only here but abroad, aware of the significance of this date in relation to our country. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 48, as amended.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 603) relating to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

M. SGT. BENJAMIN A. CANINI

The bill (S. 192) for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any claims of Master Sergeant Benjamin A. Canini, United States Army, of Tacoma, Washington, against the United States, filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, for compensation for damages and expenses sustained by him arising out of the malfunction of the heating unit of his Government-assigned quarters at Evreaux-Fauville Air Force Base, France, on January 30, 1957, as if such claims had been filed in the time and manner provided in such section, the said Benjamin A. Canini having submitted a timely oral claim but having failed to file a timely written claim as a result of erroneous advice by Government agents. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

LLOYD G. DOUGHERTY

The bill (S. 200) for the relief of Lloyd G. Dougherty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lloyd G. Dougherty may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

AMENDMENT OF PRIVATE LAW 86-354

The bill (S. 380) to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86-354), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86-354), be and is hereby amended by inserting in lieu of the words "the date of the enactment of this Act", the following date: "October 26, 1954".

SISTER LAURA SARANITI

The bill (S. 545) for the relief of Sister Laura Saraniti was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Laura Saraniti shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUISA G. VALDEZ

The bill (S. 551) for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luisa G. Valdez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. MOHAMMED ADHAM

The bill (S. 657) for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Doctor Mohammed Adham has resided in the United States since September 16, 1954, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

MARIJA LOVSIN

The bill (S. 909) for the relief of Marija Lovsin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act of October 24, 1962 (Public Law 87-885), Marija Lovsin shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of that Act.

AMALIA SERESLY

The bill (S. 965) for the relief of Amalia Seresly was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Amalia Seresly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YUKIO ISERI

The bill (S. 966) for the relief of Yukio Iseri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yukio Iseri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. JOYCE MARK BOUVIER

The bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

EDITH ANNIKKI McRAE

The bill (S. 1015) for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Annikki McRae may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of said Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to enactment of this Act.

RAFAEL I. FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Rafael I. Fernandez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rafael I. Fernandez, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404(b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Rafael I. Fernandez shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

BERNARD W. FLYNN, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 219) for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$900" and insert "$797"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard W. Flynn, Junior, of Alexandria, Virginia, the sum of $797, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the expenses of travel and movement of dependents and household goods from Fort Worth, Texas, to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, in September 1961, the said Bernard W. Flynn, Junior, having accepted employment with the Fort Belvoir Research and Development Laboratories, Virginia, in reliance upon the erroneous advice of agents of the United States that he would be reimbursed for such expenses: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DANUSIA RADOCHONSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 312) for the relief of Danusia Radochonski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Danusia Radochonski may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Doctor and Mrs. Stephen P. Radochonski, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Danusia Radochonski pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

YENG BURDICK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 409) for the relief of Yeng Burdick which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yeng Burdick may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Yeng Burdick by Sergeant and Mrs. Roger

Burdick, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MISAKO MORIYA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 697) for the relief of Misako Moriya, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to insert "sections 242 and 243 of"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Misako Moriya, the fiancee of George Snyder, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Misako Moriya is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said George Snyder and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Misako Moriya, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Misako Moriya, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Misako Moriya as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PETER HOPETON MAYLOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 735) for the relief of Peter Hopeton Maylor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "States", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That the natural mother of the said Peter Hopeton Maylor shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Hopeton Maylor shall be held and considered to be the alien child of Wilfred Shirly, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of the said Peter Hopeton Maylor shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARKOS J. JANAVARAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 322) for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Markos J. Janavaras" and insert "Mark John Janavaras"; and at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mark John Janavaras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mark John Janavaras."

LT. CLAUDE V. WELLS

The bill (H.R. 1286) for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MELBORN KEAT

The bill (H.R. 1561) for the relief of Melborn Keat was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RONNIE E. HUNTER

The bill (H.R. 3626) for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT O. NELSON AND HAROLD E. JOHNSON

The bill (H.R. 4349) for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 684) to clarify certain provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act and to place transactions involving identification on acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the provisions of section 5 of the act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF ACT FOR RELIEF OF ESTATE OF GREGORY J. KESSENICH

The bill (S. 1643) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich", approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1968), is hereby amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 2. The estated of the said Gregory J. Kessenich is hereby relieved from all liability for payment to the United States of the amount any income tax imposed under the laws of the United States on the sum referred to in the first section of this Act, and the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is authorized and directed to allow credit or refund to such estate of any amounts paid as income tax imposed on such sum.".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I express my appreciation to Senators for their courtesy and patience in connection with these matters.

DOMESTIC AID

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we have for many years been considering, and acting on foreign aid programs. I have supported many of them. They have contributed significantly to our security and prestige. But, I believe that it is time that we also considered and acted on a domestic aid program.

We have not yet come to grips with the real causes of unemployment and depressed areas. We urgently need a program consisting of more than just stopgap solutions, a broad program which attacks the causes as well as the effects.

First. There should be tighter enforcement of the buy American act as a means of spurring our industrial production and thereby decreasing unemployment. I have long advocated such action and am gratified over increasing signs of progress. Indeed, a recent article in the Washington Post by Mr. Frank C. Porter, pointed out that not only is the White House now considering a new directive in this area, but that the Defense Department has already stiffened its buy American policy on a case-by-case basis.

However, strengthening the buy American act is only one of many ways that we can and must attack this most serious of all of our problems—Americans without work, in too many cases without hope. It is only one aspect of what could be a comprehensive domestic aid program.

Second. We need stronger antidumping legislation and tighter enforcement of laws which deal with foreign cartels. The United States has recently been hit by a wave of dumping—the practice of unloading surplus merchandise at prices below those charged in the producer's own country. It has been happening in steel, copper, brass, cement, chemicals, manmade fibers, and other products.

I have learned that steel producers in Japan and some European countries have secretly agreed to a cartel which would divide up the North American market. My information indicates that the cartel has agreed that the Europeans would sell at fixed prices in the Eastern United States as far west as Chicago and the Gulf region, while the Japanese will sell at fixed prices to the Western United States.

Even though since denied, I believe a continuing investigation of this is warranted. Such a development could influence our whole foreign economic policy. It emphasizes the need for a domestic aid program, because the jobs of many Americans are involved.

Even though we know that dumping practices and secret agreements exist, too often the Government's hands are tied from taking action under existing laws. Such laws need revision.

American industry and American labor ask no special favors in meeting the undeniably stiff challenge of foreign competition. But they certainly have a right to protest clearly recognized fouls, and to have those protests heard. That is why I am a principal sponsor of legislation to tighten the Anti-Dumping Act. This legislation would help eliminate some of the double standards whereby American companies are governed by laws which do not govern their foreign competitors. It would help reduce the unfair jungle warfare which puts so many of our companies out of business, and throws additional thousands of our workers onto the streets.

In this same connection, I have also proposed legislation which would require the marking of metal containers made from imported steel to indicate the country of origin. By enabling buyers to know when foreign steel is used, we would, I believe, promote the use of our own steel, and thereby increase our production needs and get some of our unemployed steelworkers back to work.

Third. We need a positive policy on imports from behind the Iron Curtain. I have introduced a bill which would ban glass imports from Communist countries, not only because they give the Communists dollar claims on our diminishing gold reserves, but because they throw still more Americans out of work.

It is well known that Communist nations utilize economic policy for political purposes. They frequently dump goods in free nations for the sole purpose of damaging domestic industry.

I am for trade. I supported the President's trade bill last year. But first and foremost I am for strengthening our own industry and getting our people back to work. That is why I have been advocating and will continue to advocate domestic aid measures such as these.

We need action, concerted job-creating action, action which will restore the lost birthright of so many Americans. They are the ones who have first claim on our help. Foreign economic and trade policy is only one of the areas in which we can act. It is only part of the domestic aid picture.

A fourth area requiring our attention is Government procurement practices. Ten percent of our gross national product is now purchased by the Government.

I recently proposed a direct legislative attack on unemployment through a bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act—S. 1274—which would give percentage advantages on Government contracts to companies in depressed areas.

This legislation, cosponsored by my distinguished colleagues Mr. BYRD and Mr. RANDOLPH of West Virginia, and Mr. HARTKE of Indiana, would authorize the Secretary of Labor to set up classifications which would depend on an area's rate of unemployment, giving percentage advantages running from 2 to 12 percent.

It would mean, for example, that when the Government wants to buy coal, a company in Scranton, Pa.—where over 13 percent of the people are unemployed—would get a 10- or 12-percent advantage over a company in an area of relative prosperity.

I believe it to be extremely important that we enact this legislation, and will have more to say on it at a future date.

A fifth category requiring our urgent consideration includes measures such as the Manpower Development and Training Act which I supported last year, which I believe should be broadened. Meanwhile, implementation of this act needs to be accelerated.

We need to increase and modernize our vocational and technical training facilities, as part of the program.

It is likewise essential to eliminate racial discrimination in employment.

These problems are all of a piece in that they all relate directly to our persistently high unemployment.

It is time we got down to business; time we stopped just deploring unemployment, and started doing much more about it on every front, time we gave serious and thoughtful consideration to a meaningful domestic aid program which will get our workers working, our country moving ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "White House May Strive Harder To Make 'Buy American' a Reality," written by Frank C. Porter, and published in the Washington Post of May 29, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE MAY STRIVE HARDER TO MAKE "BUY AMERICAN" A REALITY

(By Frank C. Porter)

Despite the protests of free-trade advocates, the White House is considering tighter enforcement of the Buy American Act in a new effort to cut the Nation's chronic deficit of international payments and stanch the flow of American gold overseas.

The move is supported by some businessmen forced to compete against low-priced imports and by some legislators, particularly those from depressed areas, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania, for example, last week urged President Kennedy to issue an Executive order that would virtually end purchases by the Federal Government from foreign suppliers.

Supporters of a more liberal trade policy, however, argue that the current buy American policy is already too restrictive. They say it is giving the United States a protectionist image abroad at the very time the United States is seeking a reduction in trade barriers through general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiations and entry of its goods into the European Common Market.

ACT SIGNED IN 1933

They further insist that the policy is penalizing the American taxpayer by adding to the cost of Government and even slowing some defense programs through the lack of inadequate domestic sources for supplies formerly bought overseas.

The Buy American Act, passed by the lameduck 72d Congress and signed by President Hoover the day before he went out of office in 1933, requires that the Government purchase only domestic goods or materials. It leaves the President some discretion, however, permitting exceptions when domestic purchases are deemed inconsistent with the public interest or the cost unreasonable.

Enforcement of the act was liberalized under President Eisenhower, who in 1954 issued an Executive order still in force. The order provides that foreign bids must be accepted when the lowest domestic bid is at least 6 percent higher, or 12 percent higher if the American firm is in an area of labor surplus.

SCOTT GIVES ARGUMENT

The order also contains a loophole that permits a department head to award contracts to domestic firms no matter how low foreign bids may be if he believes it to be in the public interest. The Defense Department, which has been under strong administration pressure to reduce its foreign buying, has recently invoked that loophole to reduce drastically its purchases from oversea supplies.

Senator SCOTT argued that the Eisenhower order is not geared to a period in which we must simultaneously cope with heavy involvement abroad and large-scale unemployment and lagging industry at home.

He urged Mr. Kennedy to rule that all purchases of $10,000 and less, and all purchases above the figure where the domestic cost over the foreign cost is 50 percent or less should be made from domestic sources. All cases where the domestic cost is more than 50 percent higher would be referred to the agency head for determination.

William J. Barnhard, Washington attorney who represents importing groups, contends that the Defense Department "has been illegally following Senator SCOTT's proposal since July 1962."

A Department spokesman says it is acting legally, invoking the exemption provision of the Eisenhower order on a case-by-case basis. Its only purpose, the spokesman said, is to reduce the payments deficit.

Barnhard claims that the Defense Department is paying 30 percent more for its steel, 35 percent more for its aluminum and at least 70 percent more for drugs and chemcials by ignoring import bids.

But in answer to some searching and critical questions from Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,

> Republican, of New York, the Defense Department estimated that the stiffened buy American policy cost taxpayers an added $1.6 million between last July and February while it saved Uncle Sam about $5.7 million in foreign exchange.
>
> Aside from the dollars-and-cents argument, Barnhard says the buy American policy helps eliminate competition from Government procurement, tends to deny the Defense Establishment some foreign items which are superior to domestic (he mentions aircraft ejection seats and some missile instrumentation), and hurts our foreign trade posture.
>
> "Limiting competition from abroad will make it increasingly difficult for the 'Kennedy Round' of trade negotiations to be achieved on, if achieved, meaningful," says Barnhard. "We set a poor example for removal of nontariff barriers overseas when we adopt an unnecessary and unduly restrictive buy American policy here."
>
> Any new presidential buy American directive is expected to be more restrictive than that issued by President Eisenhower inasmuch as a liberalization of present policy could be carried out under the latter.
>
> No White House decision is expected until completion of a study still underway at the Budget Bureau.

UNJUSTIFIED ATTACK ON SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, an article entitled "Inside Report: The TFX Loser," which bears the byline of Rowland Evans, Jr., and Robert D. Novak, has appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers in various areas of the country.

To put it mildly, I was astounded to read this portion of the article:

> What is new today is a quiet rise of anti-McClellan sentiment within his own subcommittee, like the attitude of Senator Sam Ervin, of North Carolina, once McClellan's faithful sidekick along the investigating trail. Though he surely would back his old friend in any showdown with McNamara, Ervin no longer actively participates in subcommittee work. The little-known truth is that Ervin, a former judge with a well-deserved reputation for judicious behavior, has had a belly full of the injudicious tactics of the investigating staff.
>
> Moreover, the sound of McClellan's tremulous voice excoriating evil in Old Testament style no longer moves Senators—either in the subcommittee or in the Senate itself.
>
> "There's a lot of feeling that old John's just got too big for his britches," says one Southern Democrat who is no special pleader for the Kennedy administration. "Roughing up hoodlums and Communists is one thing, but going after somebody like McNamara is another. It's a little like what happened when McCarthy went after Eisenhower."
>
> Despite all this, the Senate is not about to rebuke McClellan by requiring more orderly procedures for his subcommittee. McClellan is undergoing a more subtle form of punishment.
>
> He has lost the confidence of his peers.

Mr. President, this article constitutes what I conceive to be a wholly unjustified attack upon the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] for his activities as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, in connection with the investigation of the action of the Defense Department in awarding the TFX contract.

This article grossly misrepresents my attitude toward Senator McClellan and the staff of the subcommittee. The writers of the article attempt to justify the misrepresentation of my attitude toward Senator McClellan and the subcommittee staff by citing the irrelevant and insignificant fact that I have not actively participated in the subcommittee's investigation of the TFX matter.

When I first read the article, I was inclined to infer from the juxtaposition of the sentences dealing with my supposed attitude toward Senator McClellan and the subcommittee staff and the derogatory remark concerning Senator McClellan, allegedly made by some unnamed southern Democrat, that the writers of the article intended to imply or engender in the minds of the readers of the article that I was the one who made such derogatory remark.

I thereupon made inquiry of the writers as to this matter, and received from them a telegram reading as follows:

> Have received your telegram. The comment about Senator McClellan attributed to an unnamed southern Democrat was not made by you, we did not say it was made by you, and there was no attempt to imply it was made by you.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Rowland Evans, Jr.,
> Robert D. Novak.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that it was wholly inexcusable for the writers of this article to misrepresent my attitude toward Senator McClellan and the subcommittee staff in order to support their attack upon them. They could have contacted me without the slightest difficulty and could have ascertained that everything they had to say about my attitude toward Senator McClellan and the subcommittee staff was absolutely inconsistent with every thought I have ever entertained. This they did not do.

It is true that I have not actively participated in the TFX investigation conducted by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. My failure to participate in that investigation cannot be justly interpreted to evidence any disapproval on my part of the action taken by Senator McClellan or the subcommittee staff. My failure to participate in the investigation arises out of the fact that I am only one person, with only 24 hours at my disposal each day, and have devolving upon me more tasks than any one human being can possibly perform. I am a member of three standing committees; namely, the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the Senate Committee on Government Operations. In addition, I hold membership upon numerous subcommittees of these three standing committees. For example, I am a member of seven separate subcommittees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I am chairman of two of these subcommittees; namely, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Laws. The job of chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is virtually a full-time job in and of itself. This is particularly true at the present time, when multitudes of so-called civil rights bills are being drafted and referred to the subcommittee.

Two or three of the committees and subcommittees on which I hold membership meet virtually every day of each week, except on Saturdays and Sundays. It is an absolute impossibility for me to attend all of these meetings—much less to actively participate in all the things being done by them. In the very nature of things, I have to devote my energy and time to the activities of these committees and subcommittees which in my judgment are entitled to priority at a given time.

For these reasons, and these reasons alone, I have not participated in the investigation of the TFX matter by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. From my previous labor on this subcommittee, I was satisfied that the subcommittee would conduct the investigation of the TFX matter in the same fine manner which has characterized its previous investigations.

When I first came to the Senate, I was placed upon the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Consequently, I have been associated with Senator McClellan, with Jerry Adlerman, and with other members of the subcommittee staff in many investigations. Moreover, I sat beside Senator McClellan during the 3 years in which he served as chairman of the Select Committee for the Investigation of Improper Practices in the Labor and Management Field. As a result of my experience in investigations directed by Senator McClellan, I can truthfully say that I have the abiding conviction that no man in America is better qualified to conduct investigations than Senator McClellan. Moreover, I have never at any time in my life been privileged to know a more courageous or more just man. In my judgment, he has the character and the capacity to fill the highest office within the gift of the American people.

I wish to add a comment concerning Jerry Adlerman, the chief counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I have participated in many investigations with him. I have never known him to do any injustice to any person. Furthermore, I have not learned of any evidence or charge of an impressive nature that the staff of the subcommittee has been guilty of any "injudicious" tactics in the TFX investigation.

I certainly am not anti-McClellan. On the contrary, there is no man in public life in our country for whom I entertain more admiration or more affection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Washington without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as the ranking Democrat on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I believe I am in a position to tell the Senate that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], during my 11 years of association, has always conducted the affairs of our committee with a high sense of fairness. In my judgment, he has always exemplified the finest traditions of the judiciary in the conduct of the investigations that this committee has been into over the past 11 years during which I have served as a member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

I believe it is well to remind Members of this body that it was only 10 years ago that the Senator from Arkansas, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, caused the rest of us, in agreement, to leave that committee over the procedures that then existed.

The result was that when we returned to the committee, the changes in the rules of the committee as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas were adopted. The existing rules in the committee are the result of the Senator's sense of judicial fairness. The rules of the committee have been highly regarded by all those who have had an opportunity to undertake a careful study of them. In all the time I have served in the Senate, I have never served under a chairman with a keener sense of fairness than the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. Every move that he has made has been steeped in the great traditions of Anglo-Saxon procedure. I have watched him time and time again practice the rule of restraint. When he acts as chairman, he does not act as a special pleader for a conservative group, a liberal group, or a middle-of-the-road group in this body. He acts for all the Senate, adhering to the finest traditions of this body.

I was shocked when I read the article to which the Senator from North Carolina referred, implying that the Senator from Arkansas does not have the confidence of the members of the committee or other Members of the Senate. If there is any Member of this body who says that the Senator has been unfair, he should come forward and state wherein he has done injustice to anyone. I make that statement as one who does not necessarily agree with the Senator on every specific issue. The Senator from Arkansas respects members of the committee who do not necessarily agree with him in voting on specific substantive measures in the Senate. He does not make decisions on the basis of the political philosophy of any Member of this body or any individual who comes before the committee. He is a judge in the finest traditions of our concept of law.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Washington for his very fine and accurate remarks. In the conduct of his investigations, the Senator from Arkansas has exemplified, as to all essential matters, what Edmund Burke so well called "the cold neutrality of the impartial judge."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. What I had to say about the chairman applies also to the staff. The chairman does not have around him, working for him, and acting for him people who do not adhere to the rules that he has laid down. I have worked with the staff for a long period of time. I have always found that the staff members, from Mr. Jerry Adlerman down through the entire staff have endeavored to be fair and just. I desire that the record be clear on that point. Sometimes when people do not have the courage to attack the chairman, they attack the staff.

The staff served under the present Attorney General of the United States. I know that their desire is to see to it that all evidence brought before the committee is fairly and properly prepared for committee presentation.

I commend members of the staff for what they have done and are continuing to do to support the work of the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] for his observations without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina serves the Senate and the country well in calling to the attention of the general public mistakes in the article to which he referred.

I also read the article in the New York Herald Tribune to which the Senator referred, and was somewhat aghast at what I read. I have been a reader of the New York Herald Tribune for many years, and have come to respect its service and its glorious past. I hope for it an equally glorious future. So I was disappointed in finding that it had lent its columns to an article which is so obviously distorted and so full of errors that it indicates that it must have been a planted story, put there for a specific purpose by someone. That is not the kind of reportorial service which I have come to attribute to the New York Herald Tribune, nor have I come to expect that it employs columnists for the purpose of distorting the facts.

Speaking as the ranking Republican member of the full committee and of the investigating subcommittee itself, first of all I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] concerning the fairness and objectivity of the chairman of the committee, John McClellan.

Although I have had some differences of opinion with the chairman concerning the makeup of the staff itself—which is a chronic Republican complaint in the Senate, since we feel we are entitled to greater representation on the staff, and only one member of the staff was selected by the Republicans—the chairman has simply faithfully followed the creed established by the Democratic majority, which is to have the Democrats select the members of the staff. He has been no better nor any worse in that regard than any other committee chairman. I have a high regard for the staff which has been chosen. I thing it is competent. I think it is efficient. I think it is fair.

It is true, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] points out, that many of the staff members were selected and trained by the present Attorney General. While I can think of better references I would like to apply to the staff than that, certainly it is an indication that the staff was not selected arbitrarily by John McClellan to carry out any point of view he might hold.

I hope that we may be able to start a precedent in our committee of giving the minority a right to select more members of the staff, but I have no complaint against the chairman of the committee. My complaint is against Democrats everywhere because they reduce us to such a small voice with respect to selection of staff members. I think the proportions are unfair and unwise. I shall continue to press for reforms.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has called attention to a serious error in the reporting of these 2 newsmen, if we can call it reporting. I think it should be called editorializing. I also wish to call attention to some equally glaring and equally out of context with the truth statements.

For example, it is pointed out in the third paragraph of the article, which shamefully the New York Herald Tribune published without verification as to accuracy on June 7:

> He [McClellan] and the subcommittee staff have been unable to convict McNamara and his bright young men of sinister deeds in giving the TFX contract to General Dynamics instead of Boeing.

I know of no member of the committee who is trying to "convict McNamara and his bright young men of sinister deeds." We have been trying to expose the facts in this situation, which involves the largest Government contract ever let to an individual contractor in the history of the world. It is a contract so large that it will cost the average American family $200 to implement. We are trying to ascertain and to let the country find out whether the contract was in fact let to the contractor who would build the better plane at a lower price. We are concerned with getting the best available weapons system for our country at the lowest available price.

As the evidence to date has indicated that those are not the criteria which were employed—that the low bid and the better plane were not selected—naturally, it has caused us some national concern. Our committee is therefore endeavoring to determine just what were the reasons motivating the contract award.

We are not attributing sinister deeds to the Secretary of Defense, even though the evidence may ultimately show that he made a serious blunder. I do not know that it will show that. The verdict is not yet in. We are studying the problem as we go along. Never, in our objective attitude, has there been any goal whatsoever established of trying "to convict McNamara and his bright young men of sinister deeds." Anybody who has read the hearings faithfully, I am sure, would agree with that.

It is stated in the next paragraph:

> McNamara will not resign from the Cabinet in disgrace, which became the real aim of McCLELLAN.

I know that was not his aim. I know that was not the aim of any individual member of the committee or of the committee collectively. We are not trying to put Mr. McNamara in a condition of disgrace, nor are we trying to force his resignation from the Cabinet; nor was either of those things discussed in committee deliberations. We are merely trying to determine the facts.

The assumption that the committee will issue a noncommittal report on the TFX affair, or no report at all, is equally fictional. We shall issue a report. It will be objective. It will be factual. I have never seen the committee issue a noncommittal report in the past, nor do I expect to see that happen in the future.

The reason why I suspect there is an element of "planting" in this article is not so much because of the attack on the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the liberal use of the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in false context, nor even in connection with the three other errors I pointed out, but instead, because of the degree to which these columnists fight with the record of history. This gives me cause to wonder who really inspired the article in the paper and why.

The writers went on to say:

> McCLELLAN and the investigating staff (then headed by Robert F. Kennedy) conducted a wild-swinging special investigation of labor racketeering. It has lashed out in all directions the last 2 years, including investigations of B-girls and Jimmy Hoffa—with no discernible purpose except newspaper publicity.

Any reporter who is established enough to have been around Capitol Hill for the past 5 years would know that as a result of the McClellan committee investigation of labor racketeering and of Jimmy Hoffa and the rest of the things involved was provided the evidence from which evolved the Landrum-Griffin bill, enacted by both Houses of Congress. Throughout the discussion of the Landrum-Griffin bill, as any diligent student of history or any diligent reporter would have to discover, references were made to the facts produced in that investigation and references were made to our committee report, which was not a noncommittal report, but a hard-hitting report calling for new legislation and spelling out specifically some of the provisions which ultimately were included in the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Somebody, for some reason, is quarreling with history and trying to discredit the Senator from Arkansas and the committee as a whole.

As to whether the Senator from Arkansas has lost the confidence of his peers, I suspect that the roll of American peers of JOHN McCLELLAN is short, and that those who answered the rollcall would be answering a mighty short rollcall. We on the committee do not consider ourselves his peers. He has not lost the confidence of his associates on the committee.

I suppose a chairman of a committee begins to lose confidence first with the members of the minority party, because he disagrees with them so often on so many recommendations made in the committee, such as on appointments of personnel, and so on. Speaking for the Republicans, I assure Senators that the chairman of the committee has not lost the confidence of any Republican member of the committee. There is in no sense a revolt. There is in no sense a desire to discredit him. There is no desire to try to cause him partisan difficulty, because he has been fair, he has been objective, he has been diligent, and above all he has been courageous. He has not permitted anyone inside or outside Government to direct the course of the committee activity. He has followed the inclinations of the evidence and information brought out by a good, able, and diligent committee staff. He is not motivated by narrow partisan considerations.

So that those who read the RECORD may be better informed, I wish to refer to a recognized source of journalistic information, on Capitol Hill, a man who has probably studied the record of the committee more carefully than any other man in Washington, who has been working as a member of the "fourth estate." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a very factual, interesting, challenging and worthwhile discussion of the work of our committee, both as it relates to the TFX hearings and otherwise, as prepared by national prize-winning Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Washington Bureau, Cowles Publications, delivered as an all-university lecture at the Journalism Institute at the great University of Wisconsin on May 10, 1963. Those who are new to this reportorial trade, those who are given to planting stories, those who value facts instead of sensationalism, and editors of reputable newspapers such as the New York Herald Tribune has always been, will do well to study and read carefully this factual review by Clark Mollenhoff, who diligently follows the work of the committee and comments on it objectively.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF NEWS DISTORTION IN THE TFX INVESTIGATION

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff, at the All-University Lecture, Journalism Institute, University of Wisconsin, May 10, 1963)

There are many in the newspaper business who will tell you there is no problem of consequence on access of information about the operations of government in Washington.

Some well-known columnist will tell you that they have never had it so good. They will explain that they cannot remember when it was so easy to get an audience with the Government officials at the highest level for a backgrounding on the greatest policy decision of our time.

There are reporters and editors who will tell you that there is more news being made today than at any time they can remember, and that the administration can be considered excellent on Government information policies because the various officials are so active and so colorful.

There are some Government press agents who will tell you the present administration represents the most open Government in history, and they can prove it. One such press agent cited the number of press releases issued by the Defense Department in a year under the present administration and compared it with a lesser number of press releases issued in a year under the past administration.

On careful examination, I think it should be apparent to nearly everyone that each of these general assertions is based upon a faulty premise.

The fact that a widely distributed syndicated columnist is given frequent access to Cabinet officers does not prove that an administration is frank and open in its operations. This is particularly true if the record shows that the columnist gave his endorsement to the President when he was a candidate, and continues to give general support to that administration policies. It makes no difference how fair and objective that columnist may seek to be, it would not be accurate to say that the accommodations he receives represent a balance picture of information policies.

Likewise, the personal attractiveness of the First Lady, and the resulting news and magazine articles could hardly be used as a standard for judging the information policies. Nor, should we judge by the number of "exclusive" color stories on the extraordinary physical fitness of the Attorney General or the Secretary of Interior, or the amazing mental capacity of the Secretary of Defense. These are interesting insights into the lives and activities of our highest public officials, but they represent no true test on an administration's policies on Government information.

Perhaps the outstanding example of frankness in recent years was the comment of the wife of one prominent New Frontiersman. A United Press reporter asked Joan Kennedy, wife of Senator Teddy Kennedy, if there was anything to reports that she was pregnant, Mrs. Kennedy is reported to have replied: "I'm really not sure yet."

This is perhaps a refreshing frankness, but it would be ludicrous to use this case as an example of open Government information policies. It is equally ludicrous to think of measuring information policies of any administration by weighing the press releases or counting them.

It is an error to judge the openness of any Government agency by the number of press releases it produces, or the number of press agents it hires. All agencies can be counted upon to be cooperative on the release of information that makes the agency seem more important, or makes the head of the agency appear to be heroic in his conduct of public office.

There is no basic quarrel with information policies on routine matters. Most press releases are accurate. Most press officers are truthful. Most public officials are frank and honest on most matters, and strive for a high degree of public responsibility. Cooperation is good on 90 percent of the requests that make up the routine business of most agencies.

The test comes when the agency is asked for information that might be embarrassing to the highest officials in the agency or to the administration. This may constitute less than 1 percent of the total business the agency has with the press, but it is the only real test.

This reminds me of comment attributed to the late Earl Long, former Governor and Congressman from Louisiana. In praising the high degree of integrity of another political figure, Long is reported to have said:

"He is one of the finest, the most truthful men in public life. He won't lie to you unless it is absolutely necessary."

When the test comes, you will find that there are some people in every administration who will make a judgment that a few little lies are absolutely necessary.

This does not mean that these public officials are pathological liars. It does not mean that they believe there is any inherent right to lie about government business. Nor is it an indication that they enjoy making false, inaccurate or misleading statements.

Usually these officials would prefer to make no comment, and have nothing printed about their questionable activities. If it is possible, they try to hide the records that are embarrassing. When truthful answers might prove damaging to political aspirations, few public officials can resist the temptation to distort the record or even make false statements on government operations.

As Earl Long said: "They won't lie to you unless it is absolutely necessary."

There is a well-documented record to prove this tendency to hide or distort the record. The Harding administration hid records and lied about the Teapot Dome scandals.

The Truman administration put out false stories in connection with the tax scandals and tried to hide the facts from the press and the Congress.

The Eisenhower administration had its period of asserting a belief in the most open government. Then the Eisenhower administration used the unlimited secrecy claim of Executive privilege to hide a wide variety of mismanagement and corruption—the conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates case, the scandals in the Federal Communications Commission, the corruption in the foreign aid programs in Peru and Laos.

The Kennedy administration denounced Executive privilege and then found it useful to assert this unlimited secrecy claim to bar the Senate Armed Services Committee from questioning Pentagon censors.

When the Billie Sol Estes case broke in late March 1962, the Kennedy administration at first circulated an inaccurate picture of the relationships with Estes, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman was not generally available to the press. Fortunately, the administration saw the folly of that approach and opened the records.

The McClellan committee investigation of the TFX contract for a fighter plane has demonstrated again that high officials of this administration will distribute inaccurate and misleading information when it finds itself in serious trouble.

It should be clear from these cases that the only true test for the information policies of a Government agency is simply this: How does the agency react when it is in trouble?

It should not be necessary to prove that all public officials are dishonest to demonstrate the need for constant vigilance by the press and the public. Neither should it be necessary to prove that all—or even a substantial number—of public officials make inaccurate and misleading statements to establish the need for increased vigilance in protecting our access to accurate government information.

It should be obvious to everyone that the problem is growing. This does not mean that our Washington officials of today are less interested in democracy and the free press than were the high officials of past administrations. It does not necessarily mean they are more arrogant. It simply means that our Federal Government is bigger and more complex. The annual budget is nearing the $100 billion mark, and the cloud of military security makes it difficult to give a critical examination to more than $50 billion of this annual expenditure. It is easier for reporters and editors to be misled as to the facts involved in complicated multi-billion-dollar decisions where security can be raised as a reason for not making a full disclosure.

I will not try to make an overall comparison of the information policies of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. This would serve no useful purpose, for the problems are different. In many ways it would be as meaningless as comparing apples and oranges. The problems are different.

Certainly there was plenty to complain about in the Eisenhower administration with its extreme use of "Executive privilege" to block investigations into scandals.

I'm not going to rehash the Eisenhower administration's distortions, for I've used the greater part of my book "Washington Cover-up" to document those cases of unjustified secrecy.

While the Kennedy administration has used "Executive privilege" on a few occasions, I do not believe that this has yet become the major problem, although it could be.

There are other grounds for complaint in the Kennedy administration, and I think it is better to be specific than to get into the impossible debate as to whether Kennedy or Eisenhower had the greatest respect or disrespect for the principle of open government. I'll leave it for the professional politicians to do the comparing, and will try to deal with specific cases.

I will deal with the Kennedy administration because it is the administration in power today. I will engage in a case study that is important today, and that will be important when the history of this administration is written.

It is not necessary to deal with a lot of quibbling on information policies that might be considered petty.

To avoid the charge of petty quibbling, let us pick the largest department—the Defense Department with about 4 million employees and annual spending in excess of $50 billion.

Let us discuss the head of that Department, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and his chief spokesman, Arthur Sylvester.

Let us discuss the public pronouncements of that Department on the biggest and most controversial contract—the $6.5 billion program for the TFX fighter plane for the Navy and Air Force.

The documented record shows that the Pentagon has engaged in a broad pattern of false, inaccurate and misleading statements on this major contract investigation. The TFX case demonstrates the ultimate in news distortion on a major matter, and what is troublesome is that up to this moment, Defense Secretary McNamara has been able to get by with this grand deception.

In this case, the Pentagon has been able to get by with news distortion despite the well-documented record established by Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, whose careful work on TFX contradicts McNamara on nearly every major point.

McNamara has been able to do this because the case is complex, involving a major weapons system for the Air Force and Navy, and because the problem of military security made it possible to obscure some aspects of the case in the early stages. However, this grand deception could not have continued if there was more diligence on the part of the press and on the part of most Republicans and Democrats in Congress.

Most members of the press do not know that they have been deceived simply because they have not read the record established by the McClellan committee. This is not a matter of lack of access to information. This is a matter of too many reporters and columnists failing to make use of the full facts that are available. It is easier for some reporters to sit at the Pentagon and read McNamara's handy 32-page explanation of why he should not be investigated than it is to read the 3,000 pages of transcript with expert testimony disputing him on every material point.

In the academic world there is some stressing of the need for going back to primary sources of information, while avoiding the misleading oversimplifications that find their way into summaries. In the newspaper world, as in the academic world, there are too few who are willing to do the careful work to make a solid case on a complex matter.

In reviewing the record, I have concluded that it is quite possible that Secretary McNamara has even deceived his own administration on TFX. I have difficulty believing that the highest officials of this administration would support him so fully if they were aware of the details of the record made by Chairman MCCLELLAN and his committee. I believe that the President and others in his administration are too adept as politicians to have failed to try to correct the record if they were fully aware of the facts. In this respect, it is quite possible that President Kennedy has placed too great a faith—too blind a faith—in Secretary McNamara as the infallible man and in this way has made himself vulnerable. It is even possible that Secretary McNamara has deceived himself by believing the stories written about him by hero worshipers in the press corps.

The officials of the Kennedy administration should be able to remember back as far as the Eisenhower administration when President Eisenhower was unaware of a conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates case, until it was too late to protect himself. The same was true of the problems in the Federal Communications Commission, when President Eisenhower ignored the difficulties and left the job to others until he had a full-blown scandal on his hands.

The TFX case has the potential for doing the same damage to the Kennedy administration, and largely because some of the high officials simply have not read the record. They have accepted the self-serving declaration of Mr. McNamara that he is right, and that his decision will save a billion dollars. They have accepted McNamara's view that those who oppose him are petty politicians trying to disregard the national interest to win the contract for the home State.

Examine what the documented records of the McClellan committee show:

1. McNamara overruled the unanimous recommendation of the top level Source Selection Board favoring the Boeing version of TFX. That recommendation was based on a finding that the Boeing plane had a much higher performance rating, and was cheaper by $100 to $415 million.

2. McNamara had the burden of proof upon him to establish that he was right in overruling his subordinates to award the contract to the General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex. He signed a 5-page memorandum of justification last November 21 that was loaded with errors, according to the record of the McClellan committee. One of the errors was a little slip-up on the entire performance rating of the General Dynamics plane. The performance rating was greatly inflated. Also, McNamara had a little error of $77 million, a little error of $32 million, and a little error of $29 million according to accountants who testified before the McClellan committee.

3. McNamara admits the Boeing performance rating is better, and that it is preferred by Gen. Curtis LeMay and Adm. George Anderson. McNamara admits that the contract

price proposed by Boeing is cheaper. He relies upon a contention that because of greater commonality in the Navy and Air Force versions of the General Dynamics plane there will be greater savings in maintenance, repair, spare parts and training. The experts—civilian and military—testifying on engineering and military matters, have stated that the General Dynamics plane has little or no advantage over the Boeing plane in this area. One experienced aeronautical engineer declared that the idea of any substantial saving because of General Dynamics greater commonality is poppycock.

4. McNamara stated that he could disregard the low bid by the Boeing company because the Boeing cost figures lacked realism. Boeing officials stated that they submitted detailed cost figures to the Defense Department, and had backup material available to demonstrate the realism of the bid. Boeing officials said that the Defense Department never challenged their figures, but had arbitrarily tossed out their low bid. The McClellan committee has proven that Air Force cost figures on Boeing and General Dynamics included errors of dramatic size—$291 million and $340 million. McNamara could not have been right if he relied upon these figures, which he now admits are in error. What figures did McNamara have before him when he decided that Boeing lacked cost realism in making the low bid? When the auditors of the General Accounting Office questioned McNamara about his decision on cost realism he admitted he had no other cost study available. He said he made rough judgments from his experience as an official of the Ford Motor Co.

McNamara told the GAO he got the figures out of his head. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell expressed his surprise that McNamara had no cost figures for such an important decision, and stated that the GAO feels there must be written documents to support such multibillion-dollar decisions.

William Allen, president of the Boeing Co., and his chief financial officers explained the detailed backup figures they had available to support the bid, and expressed the view that even with years of experience in the airplane industry it was not possible to make rough judgments on costs that have any validity.

5. McNamara downgraded the modern braking device—the thrust reverser—in the Boeing plane as being a risky engineering venture. The General Dynamics plane has a conventional dive brake that may make the plane obsolete before it is in production, and the Defense Department is already considering putting the thrust reverser on the General Dynamics plane. Experts have testified it will cost $446 million more to equip the General Dynamics plane with the thrust reverser and that this may result in the necessity for major redesign that will delay that plane for 6 months or more.

6. Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, have expressed their approval of the Boeing plane. They have expressed their reservations about the General Dynamics plane, and have told McNamara it was a wrong decision. Admiral Anderson has stated that we are knowingly taking the plane with the second-best performance at a time when we need to strive for the best performance if we are to maintain the vital edge over the Soviet Union.

In the face of that record of testimony before the McClellan committee, Defense Secretary McNamara appeared before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and made the following statement:

"The really difficult decision (on the TFX) was not the choice of contractors, but the cancellation of the services two-plane program and the substitution of a single aircraft to serve both the Air Force and the Navy. After extended discussions and great controversy, both the civilian and military leaders now agree such a program will meet the military requirements. It will yield a saving of approximately $1 billion. The choice of a contractor for such an aircraft was a subsidiary decision. Both contractors presented acceptable designs, each capable of meeting the military requirements, and with little to choose between them on the basis of performance. The choice of contractor, therefore, could be determined by the civilian authorities who are charged by law with making such decisions, on consideration of ultimate cost and program risk."

The statement by McNamara before the American Society of Newspaper Editors was the ultimate in news distortion. It was inaccurate. It was misleading. It was either an unknowing presentation of error, or a grand deception on the TFX contract.

A high official of the largest Government department has a responsibility to be more accurate. However, it is the responsibility of the press to point up such cases. It is also the responsibility of the Republicans and Democrats in Congress to assure that the facts are kept straight if the press fails to understand, or fails to emphasize the important points on such news distortions.

In recent weeks, Pentagon spokesmen have been contending that McNamara has not been permitted to tell his story before the McClellan committee. I am sure that most newspaper readers have seen this assertion in print in some column, some editorial, or some news analysis. I think that a review of a personal incident in connection with this might be helpful to your understanding of how such things can be distorted.

On April 29, I received a telephone call from a well-known columnist who had been out of the country for several weeks. He said he understood I had been covering the TFX investigation, and wanted me to help him out by giving him some of the background. I said I would be happy to be helpful, and would try to point up some of the important things that he could check in the record.

I started by explaining that I felt it was important that he obtain a copy of the November 21, 1962, memorandum of justification signed by McNamara. I said that testimony showed this memorandum contained some major errors of fact.

My columnist friend stopped me sharply: "Just a moment, Clark. You are charging the Secretary of Defense made an error. That is a serious charge."

I replied that I wasn't charging anything, but was simply reciting what the McClellan committee record showed on an important point. He declared it couldn't be true, and as I insisted that the errors were proven, he snapped: "I wouldn't believe that Bob McNamara could make an error on an important matter like this unless he came to me and told me that he did."

"The McClellan committee record is well documented," I said. "Some of the errors are admitted."

He replied that the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, now headed by McCLELLAN, was once headed by Senator Joseph McCarthy and that it had a shoddy record in the past that made him skeptical. I said I had read the entire record, and that I felt it was a thorough, fair and documented record with depth corroboration.

"McNamara hasn't had a chance to tell his story," my columnist friend replied. "He had to fight to make one brief appearance, and he was humiliated by being kept cooling his heels waiting for the committee. Do you call that fair?"

I said that McNamara had a fair chance to tell his story, and that he would be given another chance when the evidence was completed. I added that McClellan had given McNamara the opportunity to appear as the first witness, but that McNamara had rejected the opportunity and decided not to appear until all the evidence was completed.

"That is not true," my columnist friend replied. "I have it from the best authority that he had to fight to get to testify that once, and they humiliated him by refusing to ask him any questions."

I told my friend that he was misinformed, and reminded him that he was the one who had been overseas for several weeks and that I was the one who had been reading all of McNamara's press releases as well as all of the testimony. I then recited a full list of the opportunities McNamara had had to inform the public of any important aspect of the TFX case:

1. McNamara was informed he could appear first, but had declined. This was established in the record in a statement in the record by McCLELLAN during the questioning of Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester. It was also stated by Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, who said that "it was our mistake, our own misjudgment" if Defense officials were wrong in passing up the opportunity to testify first.

2. Throughout the hearing, Chairman McCLELLAN had periodically asked the representative of McNamara's office if there was any information they wished to submit to the committee to amplify or clarify the record.

3. In mid-March, McNamara asked for the opportunity to submit a statement for the record to put the TFX probe in better perspective. McCLELLAN accepted a 32-page sworn statement from McNamara, and allowed it to be read into the record because McNamara was reported to be too busy to appear that day.

4. McNamara testified on March 21, extending his remarks in the 32-page statement, and apologizing for Defense Department attacks on the McClellan committee. He was given the opportunity to volunteer any information he felt was pertinent, but was not questioned on the TFX decision. His testimony covered another 40 pages in the transcript.

5. McNamara and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy called on McCLELLAN and submitted a lengthy list of questions to be asked of various witnesses. These questions were asked of the witnesses as McNamara requested.

I told my columnist friend that this appeared to me to show that McNamara had been given every opportunity to present any facts to balance the record. The columnist declared that he could not believe my summary of McNamara's opportunities in the light of the information he had been given by the Defense Department. I told him to examine the record for himself, and later called back to leave word with his secretary of the page of the transcript where he could find the statement that McNamara could have been lead-off witness.

I was somewhat surprised to pick up the newspaper 2 days later and read an article by that columnist including the following paragraph:

"The TFX controversy turns upon technicalities which outsiders, conspicuously including Senate investigating committees, are by no means well qualified to weigh. Secretary McNamara, who had to fight hard to get even one brief hearing from the committee, has had no real chance to tell his side of the story."

I do not know whether he wrote that column prior to his conversation with me or after our conversation. I do not know how he could have written it after the conversation if he had read the record. However, it is possible that he has such a blind worship of McNamara as the greatest Secretary of Defense in our history that he finds it impossible to adjust to the facts in a small case involving only $6.5 billion. It is possible that he called his friends in the Defense Department, and they assured him that Mc-

Namara has had no real chance to tell his side of the story.

His error—and I believe it is a provable error—has been repeated by a good many others. Another distinguished columnist has repeated the same basic assertion on at least two occasions. Reporters who are reading the whole transcript are amazed to read how the same inaccuracies have crept into editorial columns and a few news stories. Since they are flat statements without attribution, it is difficult to determine the source.

However, it is possible to trace some of this misleading information to Deputy Secretary Gilpatric.

In writing a letter to complain about a columnist's handling of the TFX story, Gilpatric commented that "Unfortunately, such (a full explanation of TFX) must wait the subcommittee's invitation to Secretaries McNamara, Zuckert, and Korth to testify. Only then can the public be fully informed on the TFX decision. My comments on your article, therefore, must be based on the information available to the public to date."

Gilpatric concluded the letter: "Until the subcommittee gives the Secretaries of Defense, the Air Force, and the Navy the opportunity to testify and to be questioned, all facts and considerations incident to awarding the F-111 (TFX) contract to General Dynamics-Grumman will, unfortunately, continue to be obscured from the public view."

In the light of such comments, it is little wonder that some columnists would assume that McNamara had had no real chance to tell his side of the story.

To me this is news distortion, and I believe that it is time that the press abandon the term "news management" and complain about such distortions. The press will be guilty of a shocking incompetence if it continues to speak loosely of news management while engaging in superficial and amusing comments on the subject that miss the significance of the Government information problem.

The term "news management" means absolutely nothing by itself. There can be proper news management and improper news management.

We should direct our attack on news distortion, and we should direct our attacks on specific cases. We should not be pulled into making a big issue of cases where there is a possibility that genuine military security may be involved in withholding of information. Nor should we make a big thing of petty cases of little consequence.

It is time for newsmen—reporters and editors—to give a little more time to the study of the basic problems of Government information policy. It is time to end the uninformed comments that mix the various information problems, and do a disservice in confusing the press as well as the public.

The confusion is a result of newsmen assuming they know about a subject that they have not studied. They have flailed out in an uninformed way at some news practices without an analysis. In other cases, newsmen have jumped to the defense of an administration for strictly partisan reasons. It has not been a picture of careful and responsible journalism.

At a time when our newspapers should be most responsible, many have been irresponsible on an issue involving press access to information.

On a subject that reporters and editors should treat with respect and the greatest judgment, many have engaged in superficial comments or smart-alecky quips.

At a time when the press should present a unified front in opposition to news distortion, many in the press are still expressing a cynical lack of concern.

There should be agreement that even the best reporters are often powerless to penetrate the bureaucracy of big government, and that they need the full backing of editors, publishers and journalistic groups as the job becomes more complex.

There can be no excuse for reporters and editors failing to learn the details of the laws, regulations, and practices involving major information problems. Information is our business. We would have little time for a lawyer who was not informed on basic courtroom procedure, or the law of evidence. We would have little respect for a doctor who did not have the skill for the simplest problems in anatomy. Yet, there are many in the press—reporters, editorial writers, and editors—who have never taken the trouble to learn the basic information problems of the day.

The use of Executive privilege by the Eisenhower administration represented a basic problem in Washington, and yet only a handful of people took the trouble to learn the law and the facts.

Today there are other problems. It shouldn't be necessary for a mink coat or a deep freeze to be involved to attract the attention of the reporters or editors to the importance of major errors in a $6.5 billion contract.

It shouldn't be necessary for a scandal to develop before we recognize the dangers inherent in the October 27, 1962, Sylvester directive for policing of all press contacts at the Pentagon. The directive provides that every Pentagon official—civilian and military—who has a contact with the press must report the name of the reporter and the substance of the conversation to the Pentagon press office before the end of the working day.

This directive has been characterized by Pentagon reporters as a Gestapo tactic, but efforts to have the directive withdrawn have been unsuccessful. Sylvester says he intends to keep it, and his decision appears to be backed by McNamara.

These are the specific problems of information pending at the present time. They are not small problems. They do not deal with insignificant aspects of government. Yet they are often played down or ignored by persons who want to appear sympathetic and understanding to the administration.

It is not our job to be sympathetic and understanding to those who engage in news distortion or erect barriers to normal news contacts. It is our job to keep the avenues of information open. The best that we do in fighting against that encroachment upon us may not be enough, but this is no time for us to pretend that there is no problem.

The $6.5 billion TFX program alone represents as much money as the whole Government was spending in the depression days of the 1930's. In the last 50 years our budget has jumped from less than a billion dollars—$689,881,000 to be exact—to nearly $100 billion, and the problem of obtaining accurate and balanced information has increased by at least the same proportion. It is a big job, and a difficult job, but it is no time to despair.

This is a time for unity of purpose on the principles of open government. It is no time to let petty feuding or political partisanship divide the press on this issue.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], without losing the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina for directing the attention of the Senate to the article referred to. I suggest that the Senator from Arkansas himself would be the first to say that these reporters had a right to write their stories and any newspaper had a right to print them. I am also proud to be privileged to be counted among those who can disagree.

I speak as a junior Senator in this body, and as one from the minority side, but as one who serves on the Government Operations Committee I wish to recite, from my own short experience, one or two instances which fill me with the persuasion of the conviction of respect I hold for the Senator from Arkansas. Last year when he appeared before the Rules and Administration Committee to seek the means of investigating certain scandals in the agricultural endeavors of this Nation, I said to him that it was a matter of grave concern to the people of Kansas, and that they had confidence in his fairness and ability to make a complete and competent investigation.

Earlier this year, when I was appointed to the Government Operations Committee, but prior to the selection of the Subcommittee on Investigations, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Dakota, knowing of my interest in this particular investigation, extended an invitation to me to join that committee and to listen to the testimony and to make an evaluation of it, knowing the great interest I had in the question on behalf of the people of the State of Kansas.

It is a mark of my own confidence and an expression of it that, after the appointment of the Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I was not a member, I left the hearings there with full confidence, under the direction of the chairman, knowing that we need have no concern about the fairness, completeness, diligence, or ability not only of the Senator from Arkansas but of the Senator from Washington and other Senators on the subcommittee.

I am reminded of an admonition given to me many years ago: The test of a gentleman is not his bearing when the going is smooth and when one encounters kindness on all sides; but the test of a gentleman comes when one is met with unkind and uncomplimentary and difficult situations. I paraphrase that expression only to say that the test of fairness is not when the waters are smooth, but the test of fairness—as has been shown by the Senator from Arkansas—is in difficult times, when one is found investigating a matter of concern to his own party, and at the same time being subjected to unfair tactics, but maintains his own sense of balance.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I hope the words I have expressed have in some small measure indicated the feeling of the people of Kansas.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] without losing the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina and my other colleagues concerning the senior Senator from Arkansas. I consider myself fortunate to be a member of the Government Operations Committee. While I am not a member of the subcommittee referred to, I have had the opportunity to observe the conduct of that committee under the leadership and chairmanship of the senior Senator from Arkansas.

I think a great mistake is made by trying to pit the Secretary of Defense against the chairman of this committee. It was my great privilege to serve in the Cabinet of the President of the United States as a colleague of the Secretary of Defense. I found, and still find, that Secretary McNamara is one of the most able men that I have ever served with in any capacity, a man who works hard, and who is dedicated to his task.

But the fact that the Secretary is able and dedicated to his task and is one of the most able men ever to have served as Secretary of Defense in the Cabinet of any President should not be a reason for slurs and innuendos being cast upon the chairman of this great committee.

As a junior member, I have had an opportunity to observe the chairman of the Government Operations Committee. I have served as a member of the legislative body in a State legislature. I have been a Member of this Congress, a Governor of my State, and a member of the President's Cabinet, and now I am a Member of this body. During these various periods of service I have associated with many men. I have sat, with the highest admiration, through meetings of the committee, public and private or executive sessions, and observed the conduct of the senior Senator from Arkansas.

I have never served with any man, in any capacity, who has ever shown a greater degree of patience, courtesy, understanding, and willingness to be considerate to members of the committee with whom he might disagree, as well as with members of the committee with whom he might be in complete agreement.

The people of the United States have been well served, and the Senate of the United States is well served, by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas as chairman of this committee.

From my observations, his judicial temperament, his courtesy, and his deep intelligence, would lead to carefully considered judgments on any matter coming within his purview.

I consider it a great honor to be a member of his committee. I believe any attack upon his standing in the Senate or on his sense of fairness is ill taken. It is my prediction that this great Senator will always have the support of the members of his committee and the Members of the U.S. Senate who recognize, in their service in this great body, the great contribution which the chairman of the committee has made to the cause of justice and the legislative processes of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I share the very high opinion which the able Senator from Connecticut has expressed with respect to the Secretary of Defense.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] without losing the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no man in the Senate in whom we on this side of the aisle—and of course I speak only for myself when I say this—have more confidence, from the standpoint of his objectiveness, his integrity, and his character, than the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan].

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I am awaiting with interest the report of his subcommittee on the so-called TFX conflict. As one member of the committee, I await that report with the confident feeling that it will be objective, whether we agree with its final conclusions or not, and that it will be honest.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Arkansas, I have listened to many discussions in the committee in which he has participated. While I have not always agreed with him in the conclusions he has reached, I have never in any way believed that they were not, from his point of view, in the best interest of the United States.

I recall that in 1956 or 1957, when the Senate changed in its majority makeup, the question arose with respect to continuing the so-called Labor Rackets Committee. We on this side of the aisle wondered whether it would be in the best interest of the country to do so. We felt it would provided we could be sure who would head the committee. When we found that it would be the Senator from Arkansas who would conduct the hearings and the study, and make whatever report would be made on that very difficult subject, which affected every citizen of the United States, we agreed without exception to the continuation of the committee. I know it to be a fact, because I was one of those on this side of the aisle who had some consultations with regard to the matter at that time.

Therefore, when I hear criticism of him as a person, or as chairman of a committee making a study and investigation, and when I hear the criticism that this study may not be objective and may not bring out the facts as accurately as the chairman and the majority of the committee feel is right, I certainly cannot sit by silently. As one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, who has served on certain committees with the Senator from Arkansas, and who has watched his work on other committees, I merely say that I hope he will continue to carry on as the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. That committee is considering a very difficult subject. It is doing a very difficult job and a very tiring job. We can feel confident that its chairman will do a good job.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield first to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and then to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] without losing the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee presided over by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the Government Operations Committee. However, I was privileged to serve with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in the House of Representatives for several years, and I have served for many years with him in the Senate. I have never served with a fairer or more courageous man in Congress, or one who has been more indefatigable in his pursuit of truth and justice. He has been fair to all sides, giving everyone his day in court, bringing out all the facts, having in mind always, with a singleness of purpose, serving best our country and our people.

He has been a great public servant protecting the interests of our country and of our people. To have a man of his great ability and his high character and integrity and his unceasing labors as the chairman of that committee is a fortunate thing for our country.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I now yield, with the same understanding as previously, to the distinguished and able Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not necessary for any of us to rise in our place to defend Chairman McClellan of the Senate Government Operations Committee. He has a record of integrity and fairness and high standards that will be long remembered after other smear artists take their place with the two little people who have said such disparaging things about him.

As a minority member of the Senator's committee, I have always felt free to express myself, and perhaps to disagree on a detail or two with the chairman. However, I always respect him. No Member of either body in recent times or at any time has had the difficult assignment, not of one investigation but of many investigations, or handled them as superbly as has Senator John McClellan.

Senator McClellan is eminently fair. When he tells us something, we can rely on it. He has worked in the public interest. He has exposed a great deal of wrongdoing. He has gathered facts which are helpful to anyone who wants to use them; and many people have. He has saved the country many millions of dollars by his investigations, and a great deal of legislation has been placed on the books because of McClellan investigations.

For a writer to disagree is one thing. We would all be disappointed if such a thing never occurred. However, there are slurring references in this article which are unbecoming to any newspaper writer.

They not only fail to give the right idea, but some of their statements are deliberately misleading. For example, the article states, speaking of the Secretary of Defense:

> McNamara will not resign from the Cabinet in disgrace, which became the real aim of MCCLELLAN.

I have served with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas long enough to know that he does not run investigations to "get" somebody. His purpose in investigating is to disclose the facts, to let the facts speak for themselves, and to allow all sides to present their facts to the committee members, majority and minority, with absolute freedom to them in the questions that they choose to ask.

Throughout this investigation a number of things have happened. First, some high officials in the Pentagon slandered and smeared the chairman. It makes one wonder why someone complains, unless it is that certain facts are unfolded which could create an uncomfortable feeling.

Mr. President, this is an attack not just upon one individual; it is an attack upon the Senate.

The taxpayers' money is not used by this committee or any other committee that I know of to get people or to destroy them. The committee has as its purpose the gathering of facts, so that those who write the laws and those who administer the laws can be informed as to what is taking place.

Let the RECORD show that the members of the committee—and I am sure I speak for every member of the committee—feel not only that they are not critical, but that it is a privilege to serve under a man so courageous, so fair, and so judicially minded as the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to Senators in the following order, without losing my right to the floor: the able and distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the able and distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the able and distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understand that a unanimous-consent agreement will become effective at 2 o'clock; therefore, I shall be brief.

I have had the privilege of knowing JOHN MCCLELLAN for a great many years; and have had the even greater privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Government Operations for many years. In my opinion, no Member of this body has a higher character, or is more dedicated to the truth, or is in anyway a finer American than is the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. I am sure I speak for all Senators when I say that we are proud to have him as the head of the chief investigating body of the Senate.

It has been a privilege to know him as a devoted friend; it has been a privilege to work with him as a legislator. I am very proud that the people of the United States have a man of the high character and ability of JOHN MCCLELLAN in its Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before saying what I am about to say, I desire the RECORD to show that I have every confidence in Secretary of Defense McNamara. In my opinion, he is the greatest Secretary of Defense the Nation has ever had. However, in reading the article—and this is the first time I have seen it since my return from Montana—I certainly could agree with none of it. It seems to me it contains innuendoes against both the Secretary of Defense and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. For example, referring to the Senator from Arkansas, the article states:

> His maladroit handling of MCCLELLAN has exploded the myth of computer infallability.

I do not believe that Secretary McNamara operates on the basis of computer calculations. He is a human being like the rest of us.

The next sentence reads:

> Congressional respect for McNamara never will be quite what it was before TFX—

I merely ask, Why not? After all, any person handling contracts of the magnitude of those handled by the Secretary of Defense should be called before congressional committees as has been done, to answer questions which have been raised. The article continues:

> but MCCLELLAN's reputation has suffered much more.

In my opinion, the reputation of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas has not suffered. He has always been fair and considerate, and has always tried to ascertain the facts. There is an implication that the distinguished chairman evidently is seeking to procure the resignation of Secretary McNamara, but that Secretary McNamara "will not resign from the Cabinet in disgrace, which became the real aim of MCCLELLAN."

That is an outright falsehood. There is no justification for that statement.

So far as the committee is concerned, it is conducting its activities, so far as it possibly can, in an impartial, unbiased way.

The article further states:

> There are signs that more than a few Senators are fed up with the headline hunting of the Investigations Subcommittee.

I completely disagree with that statement. The subjects under consideration may lend themselves to headlines, but so far as the membership of the committee is concerned, and especially so far as the distinguished chairman of the committee is concerned, they are not seeking headlines, but are seeking facts.

The last paragraph of the article contains a statement to the effect that the distinguished chairman is undergoing a more subtle form of punishment.

> He has lost the confidence of his peers.

That statement also is an outright falsehood. So far as the Senator from Arkansas is concerned, he has our full confidence, he has earned it, and he will retain it.

So far as I am concerned, both as majority leader of this body and as a Senator, JOHN MCCLELLAN is, as always, performing outstanding services. We have every confidence in his ability, his impartiality, and his integrity.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I hail from a neighboring State of that of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am almost a constituent of his, because I have a farm which is situated only a few miles from the Arkansas line.

We in Texas stand to gain much from the award of a defense contract which will mean thousands of jobs and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in my State. The award of such a contract would be a great economic boom to my State.

I hasten to say that we Texans regard any attack on the distinguished Senator from Arkansas as unwarranted and unmerited. No Texan, unless he were blinded by the most narrow self-interest, would ever question the fairness, impartiality, and good judgment of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas; and no Texan would, with any degree of objectivity, ever impute to him improper motives.

I join with other Senators in expressing my confidence in the senior Senator from Arkansas and my belief that the interests of my State will be fairly dealt with under his investigative leadership.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, only a short time ago I was a smalltown practicing lawyer in New Hampshire. Even from that vantage point I sensed the great admiration of the people of this country for Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, and his reputation for integrity.

Since joining this body, it has been my great good fortune to be assigned to the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, where I have participated in some of the defense hearings. During this time I have had the great solace and satisfaction of learning that our chairman is a man of impartiality and judicial temperament. He makes it easy for a freshman Senator like myself to serve. I hope that I may have the opportunity to serve with the senior Senator from Arkansas for many years to come.

Any article that would in any way impugn the character of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas does great disservice to the Senate and to the important committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield first to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], then to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and then to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have just read the article referred to by the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators with respect to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I do not serve on the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I have not served on a committee with the Senator from Arkansas. However, I have known him for almost a score of years. If there is any truth to the statement contained in the article that the Senator from Arkansas has lost the confidence of his colleagues in this body, or any of them, it is the best kept secret that I know of in the Senate. I do not know of any of his colleagues who have lost confidence in him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it appropriate to make a unanimous-consent request at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the limitation of debate begin at 2:15 instead of at 2 o'clock, so that Senators may make their statements with respect to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Montana and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I started to say that instead of a diminution in any way of the confidence and reputation of the Senator from Arkansas, every Senator who has ever expressed himself, either directly or by innuendo, about the senior Senator from Arkansas has, so far as I know, expressed himself in terms of the highest confidence and encouragement; and, so far as my observation goes, his reputation for honor and for vigorous searching for the truth and its disclosures to the American people has never at any time in his career been higher than it is today.

We hear a great deal about freedom of the press. Yes, there is freedom of the press. Apparently there is freedom to malign unjustly and untruthfully, without responsibility. That freedom of the press sometimes is exercised by certain irresponsible writers who take advantage of that particular opportunity and, day by day, engage in distortion of fact.

But, Mr. President, in my opinion, no Member of the U.S. Senate stands higher in the opinion of his colleagues than does the Senator from Arkansas. He has done a fine job for the American people and for decency, fairness, and keeping the public business in the mind and in the eye of the American public; and he should be receiving honors and credit for what he has done and for what he is trying to do. I know of no one who seeks headlines less or who deserves them more than does the Senator from Arkansas.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the circles of the Senate we had not heard a word to the effect that Senator McClellan had lost stature or reputation with his colleagues, until the publication of the article depreciating him was called to my attention. So far as I know, it is the only instance of an allegation in any form that he has lost the respect of his colleagues.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] has just now stated that if there were conversations among Senators in criticism of Senator McClellan for his conduct of the TFX investigation, that was a kept secret, which heretofore was unknown in the Senate.

I first met Senator McClellan 6½ years ago. I have watched his work as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. After observing it carefully, my conclusion is that he has served with unprecedented devotion the interests of the Government and the interests of the taxpayers.

Our Government spends a great deal of money; this year the budget is $100 billion. I assume that probably $45 billion of that amount is expended on the purchase of materials. Even with the exercise of the most meticulous care, things can go wrong. However, sometimes wrong results are brought about deliberately. I do not believe it would be of service to the people of our country to have the committee abandon its studies or to have another Senator put in charge of the committee.

The McClellan committee has rendered an excellent service. Senator McClellan has conducted his assignment with integrity and honor, and he commands the respect of all his colleagues.

Furthermore, if the TFX transaction had not been investigated, in the face of the prima facie statements which were appearing in the press and were being circulated in the country, I would say Senator McClellan would have been widely condemned. I wonder what would have been said if he had remained silent and had done nothing. In that event, there would have been throughout the country a cry, "Why is not this transaction being examined?"

Senator McClellan faithfully fulfilled his obligation. To have done otherwise would have merited condemnation.

I am glad to pay tribute to Senator McClellan for his magnificent, fearless, and courageous work as a U.S. Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues—each of them personally—for their commendatory remarks here today in regard to my services in the Senate, especially as they relate to the performance of my duties as chairman of the Government Operations Committee and as chairman of its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I have heard with humility and deep gratitude their words of confidence and friendship.

I had not expected what has happened in the Senate today. I knew that my good friend and colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] intended to make answer to the charges contained in the article about him, and I had expected to make brief remarks. I shall do that, and no more.

I should like to say to my friend the Senator from North Carolina that I much regret that in their overzealousness, these reporters, Evans and Novak, deliberately resorted to the reprehensible technique of avoiding truth, while maliciously contriving and publishing a falsehood—which I resent, as I am sure all other Senators do. Their premeditated misrepresentation about our esteemed colleague, Senator Ervin, and their imputation to him of an attitude which he has never evidenced, expressed, or entertained, together with the tone and the entire contents of the article, are properly recognized as being characteristics of a pleader who has lost confidence in the merits of his client's cause and of an author who does not believe his own story.

I attach little significance to either the authors of the article or to its consequences. They are not important. That which is important is truth. That is what the committee is diligently seeking to discover in the current investigation.

If the reporters who wrote the article to which reference has been made wish to write an impartial and objective story with the title "The TFX Loser"—if they desire to use that as a subject—they will find ample factual material for it in the record of the testimony that has been received by the subcommittee.

I have not made any public statements about the investigation. I have tried to conduct it and bring it to a conclusion before making a final decision. But from my point of view, the overwhelming question is, Which plane—the design submitted by Boeing or the design offered by General Dynamics—has operational superiority? That is the real issue. Which plane is the best weapon? In other words, which one of the two planes would be the best weapon in a war against the Communists? That is the paramount issue, and it certainly transcends all personalities.

If that battle should come, and if we must fight it with a "second-best" TFX, with the Communists having one of operational superiority, then our American pilots who would lose their lives because they are pitted against such odds, the American people and the people of the entire free world would be the real loser.

Can we, or should we, sacrifice and compromise operational superiority and combat capability for the so-called commonality of parts and for the dubious alleged economics that are now being emphasized? I do not think we can or should. To do so might place in jeopardy our national security and survival. I am not the only one who entertains that view. There is evidence that the press—at least a substantial and important part—does not share the view expressed by those reporters, but rather agrees with what I have just said.

I call to the attention of Senators an editorial published in today's issue of the New York Times, the title of which is "Answers Needed on the TFX." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Answers Needed on the TFX

The manner of awarding defense contracts in the Pentagon is still a major issue in the

> continuing investigation of the now famous TFX experimental tactical fighter.
>
> Senator McClellan's inquiry has stirred a lot of political dust. It has provoked many charges and countercharges. But the fundamental issue is still the same as it was at the beginning of the hearings last February: Are the services getting a second-best plane? Did the insistence of Secretary of Defense McNamara upon commonality—or a plane of basically similar design usable by both the Air Force and Navy—result in technical compromises that reduced the combat effectiveness and performance capabilities desired by each service?
>
> The weight of the testimony, so far, is that the insistence upon commonality did result in performance compromises and reductions. The award to General Dynamics, instead of Boeing, did, in the virtually unanimous opinion of the technical evaluation groups and the responsible senior officers of the two services, represent the choice of a less satisfactory design.
>
> Mr. McNamara has not yet made his final rebuttal. But he has made three major points:
>
> That service requirements often represented gold plating, or unnecessary and sometimes unachievable, performance characteristics.
>
> That the common designs finally evolved by General Dynamics and Boeing were both regarded as acceptable by the services and as a major advance over current tactical fighters.
>
> That in his judgment, the General Dynamics design was preferable because it more closely approximated his ideal of a common plane and because Boeing's cost estimates were unrealistic.
>
> These arguments of the Secretary—particularly the last one—have been challenged by many witnesses. How completely Mr. McNamara can demonstrate the validity of his judgment is important for reasons that transcend politics.
>
> For in the Pentagon, a 10-mile-an-hour speed differential may not appear to be a major factor in evaluating competing designs. But in combat, it can mean the difference between life and death. A second-best aircraft—one that is not fully up to the state of the art, or that sacrifices quality for cheapness—does not belong in the American arsenal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The editorial asked the following question, which it says must be answered:

> Are the services getting a second-best plane?

The editorial continues to state something about the position of the Department of Defense. The concluding paragraph is as follows:

> For in the Pentagon, a 10-mile-an-hour speed differential may not appear to be a major factor in evaluating competing designs. But in combat, it can mean the difference between life and death. A second-best aircraft—one that is not fully up to the "state of the art," or that sacrifices quality for cheapness—does not belong in the American arsenal.

I subscribe to that statement. In conclusion I wish to add that, with the Senate's permission and approval, the subcommittee, as an arm of the Senate, will continue to perform its duties and meet its responsibilities in accordance with its past practices and traditions.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 523) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 2, after the comma after "parent" it is proposed to insert the following: "or any other person related by blood or marriage to such employee,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all debate on the amendment and amendments thereto shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] and the majority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be placed under the control of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the sponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. It is my understanding that the debate is to be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to each side. The time of the proponents is to be controlled by myself, and the time of the opponents is to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that S. 523 is an unnecessary bill. The bill calls for the regulation of the employment of minors in farm labor. The employment of minors is an issue that is very often clouded by semantics.

Such terms as "child labor" and "exploitation" evoke emotional attitudes unrelated to reality. The employment of children in modern-day agriculture is of nominal economic importance. Just as in urban life, the extent to which children can be employed is very rapidly being narrowed by mechanization and local and State regulations.

The growing need in rural areas is for employment opportunities for young people rather than in any further restrictions on such employment.

I seriously question the idea that the remaining employment of children in agriculture is socially undesirable. The most important single type of work in which children are employed is small fruit harvest. In Washington and Oregon, the employment of children in berry harvesting has been carefully developed by employment and school officials, and is considered by the community as providing a healthy and desirable work experience. To the extent that the enactment of S. 523 would interfere with such youth employment programs, the net effect would be undesirable.

The contention that the employment of young people, children, or teenagers in agriculture is socially undesirable is contrary to experience. Perhaps one of the greatest activities in which a teenager can participate which is calculated to build character, to build a sense of industry, and to condition him to hard work, is farm labor.

I remember that when I completed the 10th grade I had flunked plane geometry, so that summer my father took me out to the farm and said, "Son, it's a cinch you will never learn to make a living with your head, so you'd better learn to make one with your hands."

That was a good, refining experience for me, because I learned in that summer of farm labor that I would much rather make my living with my head than with my hands. There are some who will question whether I have learned to make my living with my head, I know, but nonetheless I think it is an excellent experience for all young people. I hope that we will not narrowly proscribe opportunities for teenagers to work on the farms. It is healthful work. It is out of doors. They breathe clean, fresh air. They learn something of the wonders of nature. They come to appreciate the magnificent and phenomenal world God has given us.

In reference to my amendment No. 104, the reason for the amendment is the very common practice of parents seeking to find employment for minors during summer vacations on farms of grandparents, relatives, or friends. Parents do this ordinarily because they consider this work experience to be a very desirable and important part of the education of their children. I agree with this concept. I believe it would be extremely unrealistic to enact legislation which would prevent this practice.

I point out that my proposed amendment would alter the bill only to a minor extent. The bill provides that section 12, relating to child labor, would not apply to employees of agriculture outside of school hours if such employee were employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent. I would add after that, "or any other person related by blood or marriage to such employee." This would merely broaden it to include not only parents but also aunts, uncles, grandparents, and the like. I think it would liberalize the provisions of the act to afford more opportunity for summer farm employment for our youth.

It is my fervent hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. The bill which has been reported, as the Senator has said, provides that children under 14 years of age employed by their parents or by persons standing in the place of parents on a farm owned or operated by a parent or such person shall be exempt from the provisions of the act. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas would not weaken the provision in any large degree. As the Senator has said, he wishes to extend this provision to children who are relatives of the farmer or a tenant.

Anyone who has ever lived in a rural community or in farm country will see the practical sense of this provision, particularly with respect to areas where farms are small in size. The average in my State of Kentucky is about 120 acres.

Often a parent, whether an owner or a tenant of a farm, needs not only his own children, but also children of his relatives on the farm. It results in better operation of a small farm. It provides work for the children of relatives. In effect, the farmer is what we refer to as "in loco parentis," in the place of a parent. I think the same consideration should apply to that farmer as would be applied in the case of his own children or in the case of an adopted child.

As the Senator from Texas has said, this proposal would have great social advantages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes yielded to the Senator from Kentucky have expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky may proceed for 2 more minutes.

Mr. COOPER. This would provide work, usually on a small farm, to children of a farmer's relatives. I cannot see any reason for not accepting the amendment.

Anyone who has ever lived on a farm or in a farm community would feel that this is a practical provision. The number who would come under the terms of the amendment is small.

I am not acting in place of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], but I should say it would be very wise to adopt this practical and useful amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret that the amendment has been offered; and I regret that perhaps we shall not have sufficient time to discuss exactly what might happen under the amendment if it were agreed to.

Let us consider briefly what we seek to accomplish by passage of the bill. First, we know that agricultural work is hazardous. It is the third most hazardous occupation in the country. Only mining and construction are more dangerous than agriculture.

We know that children are not protected by law from employment in this hazardous occupation after or before school hours, or any time school is not in session. Although we have long recoggized that children need protection of law when working in industry, we have not been able to extend the protection to children employed in agriculture.

The folklore of the family farm and its healthful environment must obscure the real problem. As a child, I lived on a dairy farm, and when I was as young as 7 or 8 years of age, I brought in the cows and milked them.

But we are not legislating for the family farm, because under the terms of the bill a youngster of any age could work for his parent. This parental exemption is expressly provided in the bill.

Under this bill a youngster could work for his father on a home farm in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor might consider hazardous if it were not performed on the home farm for his father.

The reason for the exemption is that we know a father will provide adequate attention and care for his youngsters. As Sigmund Freud said:

> I could not point to any need in childhood as strong as that for a father's protection.

We know a father will protect his youngster, but who under the proposed amendment, would qualify as a "blood relative"? Who is a "blood relative"? Is it a second, third, fourth, or fifth cousin, a grand uncle? Is it an uncle who does not like a nephew employee? To exempt such relatives would extend quite far, in terms of exemption, and too far for the adequate protection of the youngsters who would be permitted to work on farms.

This bill permits youngsters 12 and 13 years of age to work on a farm to which they can commute daily if they have their parents' consent. This commuting provision provides an ample opportunity for healthful employment; it is much more liberal than the child labor provisions in industry. In nonfarm employment, the shutoff age is 16. Under this bill (S. 523), any child over 14 can work, and the commuting 12- and 13-year-olds.

We have gone as far as I think we can go in permitting the employment of children in agriculture, being mindful of the fact that we wish to protect youngsters from the terrible physical and educational disadvantages that unlimited hard work in the fields and orchards can, and do, impose upon our migrant farm children.

I would commend to the junior Senator from Texas, the proponent of this amendment, a bill that is now pending before the Governor of his State. This measure deals with child labor, and which has passed both houses of the Legislature in Texas. It provides a parental exemption; it is limited to the employment of members of a family of the farmer, rancher, or dairyman on his own premises, whether owned or leased.

The pending bill recognizes that a parent or a person standing in the place of a parent will take care of his child. I believe we would be doing a great disservice if we extended this exemption any further than that in this legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has New Jersey enacted any law dealing with the subject of child labor on the farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There is no minimum wage, but we do protect women and children working in our State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, in the State of New Jersey the legislature has not seen fit or has not thought it necessary to adopt a law containing the provisions that are in the bill upon which we are to vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. New Jersey has provided protections to children working in agriculture.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will put it a different way. Texas has adopted a law on this subject. It decided something should be done; and the proposed law is now on the Governor's desk. Why should not the Congress leave this question to the States, to New Jersey, Ohio, and the other States of the Nation? I should like to hear the Senator comment on that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. For the precise reason that this work involves interstate commerce, and like other employment in interstate commerce, it is a matter of national concern and importance. Their area of employment is the Nation. Long ago we legislated nationally against industrial child labor. Now we are catching up to the third most hazardous area of work, agriculture, which has too long remained partially exempt from our child labor laws. The justifications for the Industrial Child Labor Act are no more compelling than those for a national law dealing with children in agriculture, when school is not in session.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, much has been said about the hazardous character of farmwork. Many activities that children engage in are hazardous. When they play on the playground swing or trapeze, they are engaging in hazardous activity. When they play football or baseball, that is hazardous. Shall we deny them the opportunity to work merely because what they are doing is hazardous? We do not deny them the opportunity to play.

The proposed legislation is for the most part opposed by farmers, by people from farm States. It is a trifle arrogant for us to assume that farmers are inhumane and that they have no concern for the welfare of their children. I think they are aware of the character of farmwork. They are aware of the provisions of the bill. They are alive to the fact that farmwork is a constructive thing for young people to do. Therefore, not only are they opposed to this legislation, but they suggest that some moderate amendments to the bill be adopted.

I insist that my amendment is a moderate one. It would not permit the exploitation of children. It is a moderate amendment, aimed at providing young people with the opportunity for farm employment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to refresh the Senator's recollection with respect to some of the testimony offered at the hearings. The Senator has suggested that the farm community is opposed to the legislation. Many persons from the farming community favor the legislation. Mr. Ken Moorefield, for example, of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, is on record in support of the bill. Other farm organizations also support S. 523. It is a mistake to feel that members of the agricultural community have not supported the bill. Many of them favor the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I point out that this is a family farm oriented measure. Perhaps some of the growers associations have not opposed the bill, but the Farm Bureau Federation, which is the largest organization of farmers in this country, views this bill as I do, and I believe I reflect its views.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In reply to what the Senator from Texas has said, I would only add that I do not know how much consideration the Farm Bureau Federation gave to this bill. I rather doubt that it was the No. 1 subject on its agenda for consideration, having been so deeply involved, as they were, in lobbying activities against the wheat legislation.

Mr. TOWER. To counteract lobbying activities on the part of the Government in favor of the wheat legislation.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question. Without the adoption of the amendment, would a farmer be allowed to hire his younger brother who was just under 14 to help him on a neighboring farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The language is "except where such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I happen to have been reared on a farm. I was one of the younger members of a family of 11. It was common practice for us children to help our brothers and sisters. If the law were to be retroactive I suspect I would be for it, although the experience I gained in working did not hurt me. It is going a little too far to say that a young boy should not be allowed to help his older brother, sister, or brother-in-law on a neighboring farm unless he is 14 years of age.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I reply? Was the farm within reach? Did the Senator go there each day?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not necessarily. I did part of the time. I could stay sometimes. I happen to come from a family of 11. We had brothers and sisters scattered around. The point is that none of the work hurt us even though at the time we children thought it did.

If this bill is adopted without the Tower amendment, it will be a violation of the law for a farmer to put his own grandchildren to work when they come down from the city unless they are at least 14 years old. Certainly a grandfather can be trusted not to impose on his own grandchildren by giving them work beyond their ability. A few chores around the farm, such as pulling a few weeds in the field, would do the youth good whether he got paid for it or not.

Congress has just passed a law dealing with the juvenile delinquency program. Yet this proposal, prohibiting any young lad under the age of 14 from helping his own grandfather or brother on a farm, will actually create juvenile delinquency. If the grandfather lives close enough whereby the lad can go home each night the age would be reduced to 12, but if he spends the night with the grandfather or brother, the age limit is 14.

Would it be possible for a youngster to help his brother or sister or brother-in-law without the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Not if the child were 12 or 13 and he could go over to the farm each day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, has the time of the Senator from New Jersey expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It must be remembered, of course, that employment, wages, and payment must be involved. Going to "Grandma's" farm and working on it, if the work is not for hire, has nothing to do with the legislation. The employment relationship is the thing.

Is the Senator from Texas willing to yield back his time?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator whether the bill relates only to migratory farmworkers, or to farms throughout the Nation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act. It deals with agriculture generally.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator why this particular bill happens to be included in the package of migratory farm legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bill would mainly reach employment situations involving migratory farm children, because we exempted the family farm. We have limited the bill's application to the neighborhood farm. With this bill we really reach the situation in which the youngster is a part of the migratory stream.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator have any figures on how many farm boys and girls would be affected by the legislation other than the number estimated for migratory farm children as set forth in the committee report?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not have the figures. I suggest that the situations that would be affected are local and few.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

NEW YORK'S LEADERSHIP IN MIGRANT LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, because New York has long been a leader in the field of legislation to protect the migrant farmworker, I am pleased to support the legislation which we consider today, and the bills which the Senate passed yesterday.

Each summer, approximately 30,000 migrant farmworkers enter New York to spend the summer harvesting crops. Because they perform a service vital to the economy of our State, the people of New York have enacted laws to protect them against exploitation, unsanitary and unsafe working conditions, and to provide care and education for their children.

New York State already requires the registration of crew leaders—588 such contractors were registered in 1961. We already supervise through the department of health, the sanitary and safety conditions in worker camps. We already operate 9 summer schools training the children of farmworkers, and 16 day-care centers for younger children. My State does have—and has had for years—minimum age regulations protecting children in agriculture.

I am proud of the record which has been made by New York State, and urge Congress, once again, to follow the progressive and humane example of the Empire State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am prepared to do so.

Mr. TOWER. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington, [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall

Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—53

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Burdick
Case
Clark
Cotton
Hruska
Kefauver
Magnuson
McNamara
Moss
Muskie
Simpson

So Mr. TOWER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am about to call up my next amendment; but first I yield to the Senator from Missouri, without losing my right to the floor.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS AND DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the major problems facing the United States today is the improvement of our international trade situation, as one means of in turn improving our serious balance-of-payments deficit.

After long and exhaustive effort last year, Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The bill was a carefully considered method of meeting the challenging and dynamic competition of a world which obviously is catching up to this country in productive capacity.

Preparations are now going on in our Government agencies for the trade negotiations that are scheduled for May of next year; and as one of the necessary preliminaries, Mr. Christian Herter, the President's representative, has just attended a GATT ministerial meeting. In it was laid the groundwork for full-scale negotiations to come later.

The results of the ministerial meeting have been reported only sketchily in the press. But several of the broad agreements apparently reached between the United States and the Common Market should give Congress and the American people some concern about the results to be expected from any broad tariff cutting under the Trade Expansion Act.

The concession reported to have been made which causes the greatest concern to me is that which may result in the reduction of some of the higher U.S. tariffs by more than the 50 percent provided for in the Trade Expansion Act.

The means by which this would be done are yet to be studied and worked out, but it is already clear that the Common Market, with its lower cost operations, has great expectations of shipping to this country vastly more products on which the higher tariffs now exist.

It is therefore most important that this country and its trade negotiators give careful consideration to making such concessions without fully weighing the result; and the impact on the affected industries, as well as the worth of reciprocal concessions gained from the Common Market, must be known, not just assumed.

One of the industries certain to be affected in the United States is the chemical industry.

This industry is dynamic and highly competitive. It is one which has grown very fast, and now provides about 850,000 jobs to U.S. workers.

Although some chemical tariffs are relatively high, a frequently overlooked fact is that nearly one-half the U.S. chemical imports are duty free. In many other cases, the tariffs are so low that imports are increasing rapidly.

The importance of the contribution of this industry to our balance of payments is clear. The 1962 excess of exports over imports was about $1.4 billion. Since both imports and exports are important in this favorable trade balance, the effect of proposed tariff action on each factor should be carefully considered. If imports expand more than exports, both the United States and the chemical industry will be the losers.

Although the present U.S. chemical exports are well in excess of imports, the Department of Commerce reports that such imports are growing at a faster rate than the exports. In addition, the outlook for increased U.S. chemical exports is not promising. The Department of Commerce has learned that the U.S. chemical industry does not expect its exports to grow appreciably, regardless of the removal of foreign tariff and nontariff barriers. Such exports will be of specialty and short-supply products, because U.S. plants cannot match low foreign costs and selling prices on standard chemicals.

In my opinion, Mr. Herter should not arbitrarily further lower the U.S. tariffs. The shock of even 50 percent reduction of the present level in 5 years will prove to be enough of a problem to those affected.

Recent poultry tariff actions by the Common Market should tell us that national self-interest has not, and will not, disappear from the world trade arena. The United States must be absolutely certain that the Trade Expansion Act is used wisely to accomplish the basic objective—to maintain, if not improve, the U.S. trade position.

We have done our best to bring new life to the free world. Over $100 billion of our over $300 billion national debt represents foreign aid.

President Sukarno, of Indonesia, no great friend of this country, himself volunteered to the Foreign Relations Committee, "the United States will go down in history as the most generous of all countries."

But when we give them the most modern machinery, we cannot expect to compete in the production of shoes with $1.95 labor, with their production of shoes manufactured with 28 cents labor.

And when we rebuild their chemical plants from the ground up, we cannot decide to cut tariffs precipitously over 50 percent without risking an important element of the American economy.

Any apparent prosperity is somewhat theoretical if it is accompanied by increasing unemployment; and we who live in the only country left in the free world capable of resisting totalitarianism should always remember that, in our way of life, any physical strength can come only from our economic strength.

Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Texas for his typical courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for his very fine comments on the subject of international trade and also for his remarks in regard to the necessity of maintaining our free economy as a most important factor in connection with the part we play in the cold war.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield briefly to me, in connection with the matter now under discussion?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been glad to hear the Senator from Missouri comment on what was done at the preliminary GATT negotiations.

Let me ask whether he agrees with me that on the floor of the Senate there are altogether too few Senators who are concerned with the details of tariff and trade negotiations which may very well exercise a decisive influence upon our country's economic policy. Let me also ask whether he will join with me in inviting Senators to study carefully what he and other Senators—on both sides of the aisle—have said; and whether he also agrees that it is most important to maintain continued debate on this subject on the floor of the Senate, so that when the issue comes before the Senate for decision, Senators will not proceed on the basis of so great a lack of orientation—as frequently happens in connection with this field.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, even though the Senator from New York and I sit on opposite sides of the aisle, it is always a privilege to be associated with him in discussions of matters such as this one. I do not believe that the people of the country—either those in the urban areas or those in the rural areas—yet fully recognize the fundamental concept under consideration in the negotiations being conducted by a great American, Christian Herter, a former Secretary of State. In my opinion, nothing could be more important to the future of our economy than the results of these negotiations; and I thank the Senator from New York for what he has said.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that one day very soon a rather comprehensive debate on this subject can be mounted on the floor of the Senate, and that it will be participated in by the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Illinois [Mr.

DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who obviously has a great interest in this matter, and other Senators who have taken a particular interest in it, so that we may present our concepts of this aspect of our trade policy, as an important preliminary to decisive negotiations.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 523) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 106, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in lines 12, 13, and 14, it is proposed to strike the words "in an occupation that the Secretary finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age 18" and insert in lieu thereof "to operate power driven machinery or handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors below age 18."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes—10 minutes to a side—with the time to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, yesterday and today are significant days for the Senate, because during these days the Senate has come to grips with perhaps the worst blight upon our national labor record, the continuing abuses permitted in the field of migrant farm labor.

For decades we have allowed hundreds of thousands of migrant farm laborers to pass among us, toiling in our Nation's fields, harvesting our Nation's crops. These people and their children have been denied virtually all of the protections, safeguards, and minimum standards provided all other groups of Americans. Occasionally some tragedy will briefly bring the situation to national attention—such as the suffocation of several unattended small children of migrant laborers in an abandoned automobile, or the death of 30 or 40 itinerant laborers in a traffic accident. But all the while the grim story of abuse and deprivation has continued to unfold, with its continuing harvest of misery, injustice, degradation, and ruined lives. At last, the American people, acting through the Congress, have taken action.

Yesterday, the Senate passed four important bills. One provided Federal financial assistance for the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant farm workers and their children. A second bill established a Children's Bureau to assist the States in providing day-care services for children of these workers, so that they can be cared for while their parents are laboring in the fields. A third bill established a National Advisory Council of Migratory Labor to advise the President and the Congress on all matters requiring attention in this area. And the fourth bill launched a Federal program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migrant workers.

Today we take up two more bills, measures which some consider more controversial. The first would tighten the law with respect to the employment of children under 14 years of age and to protect all children under 18 years of age from hazardous farm employment.

Present Federal law prevents children from doing farm labor during school hours, but there is no protection for these young children during periods when school is not in session. They toil for long hours on their hands and knees in the broiling sun, in temperatures as high as 120°.

It matters little that they are exempted from this work for a few hours at school during the months when school is in session. After an afternoon and evening of this backbreaking toil, the youthful migrant worker returning exhausted to some crude, poorly lighted shack, is in no condition to pursue his studies, even if he were receiving any encouragement to do so, which is extremely unlikely.

State child-labor laws in many cases are clearly inadequate to protect these children.

Twenty States have no minimum age for agricultural employment, either during or outside of school hours. Fourteen States have no minimum age law for agricultural employment when school is not in session. This is a deplorable situation from any point of view.

The children of migrant farm laborers have many heavy crosses to bear. Homeless, rootless, penniless, poorly fed, poorly clothed, with practically none of the normal advantages of American life, they appear doomed to repeating the cheerless existence of their parents, unless we do something about it.

Surely it is the duty of society, or rather, a small part of that duty, to see to it that these children are provided adequate time for study and rest, so that they will have some reasonable opportunity to escape the dreary cycle of misery which has dominated their early years.

Many of these children are being hurt and maimed in terrible accidents in the fields. As farming has become mechanized, it has also become dangerous—the third most dangerous occupation, ranking behind only mining and construction. Agriculture is the only major industry which has had an increase in the death rate since 1951.

Among the evidence introduced into the record yesterday by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] was the fact that in 1961, in the State of California alone, 426 children were maimed in farm accidents. During that year 3,300 people, many of them mere children, were killed in farm accidents, nationwide.

The pending legislation would empower the Secretary of Labor to protect children under 18 years old from hazardous farm employment, thus extending to them the same protection as those available in other industries.

Surely the Senate will support this necessary and long-overdue protective legislation.

The second bill will set up a licensing system for those who hire and transport migrant farm laborers. These labor contractors, or "crew leaders," as they are frequently called, are responsible for many of the abuses that are involved in migratory farm labor. They are at the heart of the business; and Department of Labor surveys indicate that many of these crew leaders are responsible for overcharging workers for transportation, abandoning crews without means of transportation, failing to return workers to their homes, underpayment of wages, misrepresentation of employment terms, and even the illegal sale of liquor and dope.

The pending legislation would license these labor contractors and would impose upon them proper and reasonable regulations governing the conduct of their business.

The two bills we are considering today, added to the four which were passed yesterday, should go a long way toward bringing to an end conditions which are a national shame.

The American people are well served by their farm laborers. They are willing to pay for this service and to extend to these laborers the benefits and facilities that are available to all others.

The problem in the past has been that too few were willing to plead the case of people who are homeless, voteless, and without influence.

In recent years, many have come to fill this void. Labor organizations, church groups, civic groups, and many in public life have taken up this cause. Among these, one name stands foremost, and that is the name of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. All of the bills we passed yesterday and those we are considering today have been sponsored, fought for, pushed through committee, and brought to the floor of the Senate by the untiring efforts of this great and humane legislator.

These bills provide for an opening attack upon the ignorance, disease, malnutrition, hopelessness, and actual physical danger, which today are the lot of our migrant farmworkers and their families.

This legislation will undo many grievous wrongs. It will help people who are helpless to help themselves. It will give a new chance in life to many thousands of American boys and girls. It will stand as a monument to the humanitarianism, the courage, the energy, and the statesmanship of its author, Senator Williams.

I am grateful to have an opportunity to join with him in this effort and to cast votes that will help to make a reality out of a dream which many of us have pursued for so many years with so little success.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express my deep gratitude to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a fine review and analysis of the New York State migrant labor program, which is one of the most advanced in the country, and a real pilot-plant operation for what we are doing on the bills now being considered by the Senate. This review was prepared by the office of Executive Deputy Industrial Commissioner Robert D. Helsby, of New York State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

May 8, 1962.

New York State Migrant Labor Program

New York is one of the largest agricultural States. It's the largest producer of several fruits and vegetables for processing among the States, and is the third largest in quantity of all vegetables produced for processing. Farm production of such magnitude requires thousands of seasonal workers to supplement individual farmers, their families, and regular employees. Some 70,000 seasonal workers help during the State's annual harvest peak, and about 25,000 are migrants.

Over the years, New York has increasingly recognized its responsibility for the migrant farmworkers who are essential to the production of its agricultural products. New York is one of the first States to show concern for the plight of the migrant worker and to take action in this field. Its program is one of the most effective and comprehensive in the Nation.

Various aspects of the migrant labor program are administered by several State departments, including the departments of health, labor, social welfare, education, motor vehicles, agriculture and markets, and the division of State police.

There is effective coordination of these programs. The Governor's advisory council on migrant labor, composed of representatives of growers, contractors, religious, and other interested groups and associations, and the interdepartmental committee on farm and food processing labor, composed of representatives of the departments administering programs in this field maintain close liaison and frequently hold joint meetings. The joint legislative committee on migrant labor maintains close contact with both groups and operating agencies.

IMPROVEMENTS, 1962

Amendments to the labor law by the 1962 legislature effective October 1, 1962, strengthen the protection of migrant workers through the requirements that crew leaders be fingerprinted as part of the registration process. In addition, the amendments provide that each grower or processor who utilizes the services of a farm labor contractor (crew leader) must countersign the application of the contractor, thus indicating full knowledge of the information in the registration.

For a number of years a series of statewide meetings, under the direction of the Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor, have been held to familiarize growers with their responsibilities under new and existing legislation. This year, as a result of a growing realization that migrant workers were generally unfamiliar with their rights under the law as well as their obligations, the Department of Labor is making the basic attempt to inform migrant workers of their rights and obligations through a concerted educational campaign.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF MIGRANT PROGRAM

1. Prohibition of child labor

Minimum age for farmwork when school is not in session is 14, except that children 12 and 13 may assist in the hand harvest of berries, fruits, and vegetables under restricted conditions. When school is in session the minimum age is 16. Farmwork permits are required for all children under 16. It is interesting to note that in 1948, 54 percent of all farms visited employed illegal child labor in contrast to 3.7 percent of farms inspected in 1960.

2. Child care centers

Child care centers, operated by the Growers' and Processors' Federation are under the supervision of the department of agriculture and markets. For the second consecutive year increased State funds have been provided for this program. In 1961, 16 such centers were operated in comparison with 12 in 1960. The number of children enrolled increased from 935 in 1960 to 1,015 in 1961. This 12-year-old program will be further expanded during 1962. It is interesting to note that in 1960 the New York program accounted for 50 percent of such centers in the United States.

3. Public health services

State or local public health nursing services are available to most migrant labor camps. Serologic, well-child clinics, prenatal clinics or consultations, immunizing innoculations, inspection of campers for evidence of communicable diseases and bedside nursing and demonstration services are available. Public health educators conduct programs of health education in several areas of the State having substantial numbers of migrants.

4. Employer, contractor, and crew leader registration

All farm labor contractors or crew leaders are required to register with the industrial commissioner. Owners or lessees of farms or food processing plants may not use the services of unregistered farm labor contractors or crew leaders. Any person who employs, recruits, transports and brings into New York State or is responsible for bringing into the State five or more migrant farm or food processing workers from other States must register with the industrial commissioner. Prior to January 1, 1962, such registration was required only when 10 or more workers were involved. Such registrants are required to furnish information regarding wages, housing, and working conditions.

Copies of the information submitted by the growers and processors responsible for bringing the migrants into the State are provided to the registrants for posting and distribution to the workers.

The industrial commissioner may revoke suspend or refuse to issue or renew certificates of registration if it is found that the registrant has violated the labor or penal laws; or has been convicted of any crime or offense except traffic violations; or has made misrepresentations or false statements in his application; or has given false or misleading information to his workers.

5. Welfare services and payments

The Department of Social Welfare employs the same standards in regard to migrant workers as are employed in regard to New York State residents. Welfare assistance is available to nonresidents so long as they come into the State seeking employment. Nonresidents, including migrants, are State charges.

6. Regulation of migrant labor camps

Migrant labor camps are subject to the State Sanitary Code which is applicable to camps occupied by five or more persons. Permits from the State or local health department are required to operate camps. Sanitary code standards cover, among other things, drainage and location, structural and fire safety, light and ventilation, water and sewage, and required facilities.

7. Wage payments

Workers must be paid at rates not less than those contained in the application for registration filed with the industrial commissioner. Wages must be paid weekly or in full every 2 weeks. The industrial commissioner may collect unpaid wages from employers.

All contractors or crew leaders must keep payroll records showing for each worker wage rates, wages earned, hours worked or units picked, and all withholdings. They are also required to give each worker with each payment of wages a written statement showing this information. Every grower, processor or other person who is required to obtain a certificate of registration must also keep the payroll records and give statements except where he has a farm labor contractor or crew leader who is required to keep the records and give the statements.

8. Social insurance

The workmen's compensation, disability benefits and unemployment insurance laws do not cover agricultural workers in New York State, except that the workmen's compensation law covers agricultural workers using certain types of machinery under certain conditions. An employer may voluntarily cover workers under workmen's compensation. About 70 percent of migrant workers in New York State are covered by either workmen's compensation or farmer's liability insurance.

9. Education

The education law requires the attendance by children from 7 to 16 years of age when school is in session. Migrant children are included. The education department works with local school districts to insure educational opportunities for migrant children. An annual census of migrant children is conducted. This census serves to make school districts aware of their responsibility to assure school attendance.

The State promotes and pays for summer schools operated by local school districts for migrant children.

In 1961 both the number of schools and the number of children in attendance increased. During 1961 there were 350 children in attendance at such schools compared with 277 in 1960.

10. Transportation of migrants

Migrant workers must have valid driving licenses from their home States and must take New York's vision and highway sign identification test. Under the vehicle and traffic law, trucks carrying passengers more than 5 miles must have firmly attached side racks at least 3 feet high; a securely closed tailboard or endgate; and one person 21 or over on the rear of the truck if more than five persons under 18 are being transported. All vehicles operated in New York must have liability insurance.

11. Commissary registration

The labor law provides that no person shall operate a farm labor camp commissary without a permit from the industrial commissioner. Each permit holder is required to post the permit and the current prices of all goods sold or leased. The prices charged cannot exceed those posted. Most commissary permits are issued to registered contractors.

The commissioner may refuse, revoke or suspend a commissary permit when he finds that the applicant or permit holder has violated the labor or penal laws, or has been convicted of any crime or offense except traffic violations, or is not a person of good character or responsibility, or has made any misrepresentation or false statements in his application for a permit.

12. Recruitment and placement

It is the responsibility of the farm employment service, under the general jurisdiction of the division of employment of the department of labor to facilitate the recruitment of farm labor and to maximize employment opportunities for such workers. Priority in filling job orders is given first to local labor, second to interstate migrants, and third to offshore workers. With respect to interstate recruitment, an attempt is made to ascertain the needs of employers prior to the opening of the season so that the number of workers recruited through the interstate system will not be excessive.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to address two questions to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, if I may. The Senator will recall that in the last Congress the measure now being considered, or one practically identical with it, was drafted and presented by the Senator from New Jersey. The bill was later subjected to informal hearings, at which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and others participated, in an effort to make the measure as unobjectionable as possible to the agricultural interests—at least those represented by the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Florida. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that. Does he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I recall very well the many hours that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] gave to me and to the staff of our subcommittee. They were not only productive hours, but were also pleasant hours. Out of those discussions we arrived at a large measure of agreement. The measures that were considered yesterday, the bill before us now, and the bill to come reflect our conclusions of last year, with one or two exceptions.

In response to the views expressed by growers, individually or through the representatives of their associations, we made minor changes. For example, in the child labor bill, last year we permitted children 12 and 13 years of age to work on farms within 25 miles of home. Grower representatives thought it would be better to state that provision not in terms of miles but in terms of daily commutation. The modification reflects a liberalization of the bill from the standpoint of the growers affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I now should like to ask him the following question: Am I correctly informed that all the changes made last year and reflected in the debate on the matter last year that followed the discussions between the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Virginia, and myself, remain in the bill which is now being considered?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator can be assured that that is the fact. Those provisions remain in the bills that we have considered and are considering.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. While there are those who would not want this particular area covered by Federal legislation, and I am among them, for I would prefer not to have Federal legislation in this area because the conditions in the various States differ so greatly—at the same time I believe this is the best approach to the problem that at least I have been able to devise, and as I understand it, it reflects the deliberation of the three Senators whom I have mentioned. Therefore I desire the record to show that this is the same measure, with very minor change, and no departure in principle, from the measure worked out in a series of conferences last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly. I am sure the people of Florida will express their gratitude to the senior Senator from the great State of Florida for the time, effort, and the humanity that he has shown in these measures that deal with humanity.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I recall also that there were two measures in the migratory labor field which I was happy to join as a cosponsor with the Senator from New Jersey.

I believe that these two measures were among the bills that were passed yesterday—one for Federal support of the day nursery program, which has proved so helpful in my State, and the other for Federal support of the sanitation program for habitations where the migrants live, which again has proved to be so helpful in my State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator will be happy to know that both of the bills passed yesterday unanimously. I am sure the fact that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was one of the sponsors who helped to fashion those bills had a great deal to do with that result.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator compliments me much more than I deserve. But I appreciate his statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the contrary——

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

There is another bill in the migratory labor field relating to housing in which I have had a great interest, as the Senator is aware. Is that measure to come up today or later during the course of the consideration of these measures?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bill of which the Senator is speaking which deals with migratory farm housing, has not been fully considered in committee yet. It is not before us today and is not on the calendar. We hope it will be shortly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his attention. I am sorry that I am not able to join him in his philosophy all the way through, but I recognize his humanitarian approach, and I have joined him insofar as my own observations, my own convictions and my own conscience have permitted me to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Whenever we are together, my position is strengthened immensely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, by my amendment I merely seek to proscribe the broad discretionary power for the Secretary of Labor in determining what is hazardous employment for children below the age of 18. The bill provides that "in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age 18"; in other words, the Secretary would have complete discretionary authority to determine what is hazardous.

By my amendment I intend to proscribe that discretionary authority slightly by merely providing that—

> No employee below the age of 18 may be employed in agriculture to operate power-driven machinery or handle poisonous materials under conditions found by the Secretary to be particularly hazardous for minors below age 18.

In other words, the amendment really would determine that hazardous employment is that around power-driven machinery or poisonous materials, such as fertilizers and insecticides.

I urge the adoption of the amendment because I do not believe the Secretary of Labor is sufficiently experienced in the field of agriculture to exercise broad discretionary authority, and we should more fully define the congressional intent and policy on that question.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I desire to make only one further observation. The amendment would specify extra hazardous employment to include only the operation of power-driven machinery and work around poisonous materials such as insecticides. I feel that the Secretary should have the authority to define other extra hazardous work, such as working on, rather than operating, giant combines and other such equipment. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I am sure the Secretary in his wisdom——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment on that point? I believe giant combines would be classified as power-driven machinery.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The problem is the word "operate." Much of the employment would be on, but not operating, machinery. That is the problem I have with the amendment.

In the area of insecticides, sprays, and dangerous power-driven machinery, we can be confident that the Secretary would very thoughtfully consider those areas and give his careful definitions of extra hazardous work in agriculture.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF TRUE, BASIC CONSERVATISM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, by the tongues of some who seek to incite—and by the actions of a misled few—conservatism, as a philosophy of government, is becoming in the minds of many a barrier to progress. Nothing could be further from the picture actually projected by the philosophy of true, basic conservatism. It is just that, in this age of impatience, progress we find often is defined merely as velocity. Motion, not order, has become obsessive to many. And action, not wisdom, seems to have become a status symbol.

Principled conservatism provokes and promotes progress—sound progress—by taking those changes dictated by time and conditions, mixing them well with the best of the past and coming up with a blend that will allow sound and rational fulfillment of the present-day aims of man.

On June 1, on the editorial page of the Pueblo, Colo., Star Journal-Chieftain, there appeared an editorial on this subject which, in my opinion, points up most forcefully and succinctly the importance of true conservatism to the orderly adoption of the indicated social and economic changes which progress demands. I commend Mr. Frank Hoag and his editorial staff on the Star Journal-Chieftain for this very well done editorial and for the advocacy of progress rather than mere velocity; orderly growth rather than simple motion; and wisdom rather than action for the sake of action alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLCANO OF HUMAN AFFAIRS CONTROLLED BY CONSERVATIVES

Historians and social scientists probably would agree that most adaptations to important social and economic change have been reasonably managed by conservatives—in America and much of the Western world.

The idea that conservatism somehow operates as a bar to progress just does not fit the facts of history.

Through a great part of America's growth, for example, conservative political figures have been in control. Does anyone dare to suggest that this country stood still in that long, long span?

We all know that we did not.

Many years ago some social scientists devoted a hard weekend of thinking to the problem of how change is managed. The consensus was that generally it occurs through a process of "gradualism."

Not only American history, but British was cited in illustration. The celebrated British capacity for "muddling through" was seen as a curious talent for effective management of gradual change.

What this amounts to is the ability to judge when the buildup of particular problems has reached the stage where intelligent action is called for. If that action comes, social tensions are eased, and the society moves ahead without undue strain.

Grave trouble comes, say the historians and social scientists, when men in power try to put a lid on change. Then the result may be not peaceful advance but violent explosion.

The French Revolution was such an instance in history. French monarchs had sought for a century or more to arrest the processes of change. Finally the lid blew off.

The sad facts about the violent outbursts is that they almost inevitably lead to excesses which are avoided by the process of sane gradualism. Thereafter valuable energies can be consumed in correcting the excesses.

Those who try to block all change—and who thereby set the scene for social explosions—are not responsible conservatives at all. They are radicals of a sort, as extreme as the radicals at the leftward end.

The radical "conservatives" no doubt persuade themselves that they are busy "preserving the values of the past." But a course which tries to preserve these at the cost of all change leads only to their ultimate destruction by explosion.

Some who resist change believe sincerely they are not simply keeping the status quo for themselves but handing down a "sound heritage" of unchanging values to their descendants and successors. What they are really handing down is the certainty of an explosion.

The instinct of intelligent conservatives is to keep the processes of change under sensible control, to blend the best of the past with elements of the new, to make sure that escape valves for society's tensions are always at work. A people thus guided moves ahead rationally, if slowly.

But total resistance is like a cap on a volcanic cone. Beneath the cap, great counterforce builds. When the inevitable violent upthrust comes, it may engulf everything around the cone—good and bad.

We in America—and our friends in the free West—must thank our stars that we have most often been led by men who could see the peril of total resistance, and chose instead to keep us moving slowly but surely ahead.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for myself and my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which pertains to one facet of the bill now before the Senate.

A few days ago the other body had before it for consideration a 2-year extension of the bracero program, and at that time defeated the extension by a narrow margin. On that particular day, there were many absences from the other body.

I had considered offering an amendment to the bill, S. 523, now before the Senate, to extend the so-called bracero program for a period of 1 year, but because there had not been an opportunity for hearings I have decided to introduce it as a bill, and therefore have sent it to the desk. It was originally intended to be an amendment to the bill now before the Senate.

As I say, on May 29 the other body considered H.R. 5497, and that bill was defeated. There are many States in this Union which depend to a great extent upon the importation of farm labor into this country. It is not such a simple matter that one could say, "We should not let those from outside the country come in to do this labor." For much of this labor, such as weeding and picking, it is impossible to obtain workers in the Western States.

There are many farmers in my State of Colorado and in many of the other States of the country—including the Midwest, the West, and the South—who are concerned about extension of the bracero program. They need the help which can be rendered by workers in the production and harvesting of crops such as lettuce, carrots, pickles, sugarbeets, tomatoes, cotton, peaches, berries, and other fruits and vegetables.

The House report on H.R. 5497 shows that during 1962 Mexican nationals were employed in 21 States as follows: Arizona, 16,906; Arkansas, 12,410; California, 127,002; Colorado, 10,372; Illinois, 113; Indiana, 587; Iowa, 174; Kansas, 142; Michigan, 13,327; Minnesota, 39; Montana, 1,814; Nebraska, 2,119; Nevada, 66; New Mexico, 2,144; Oregon, 365; South Dakota, 98; Tennessee, 165; Texas, 36,289; Utah, 640; Wisconsin, 778; Wyoming, 1,398.

This has been a very useful law, especially for the small farmers. There are, of course, safeguards in the law which protect domestic workers. We must be concerned about those.

No Mexican nationals can be employed in this country, unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that the following conditions exist: First, domestic workers able, willing, and qualified are not available: second, the employment of Mexican workers "will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed"; and third, reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers at comparable wages.

Nor has Public Law 78 been only a one-sided affair. Our good neighbor to the south, Mexico, has benefited by the operation of the law.

I have personally visited many of the habitations where the braceros are employed in my own State. In my opinion, in most instances they represent at least 100 percent, if not 200 percent, better living conditions than the same people would enjoy in their own country, which they leave to find employment in the United States.

I seriously doubt that many farmers who grow the crops of tomatoes, lettuce, sugarbeets, and the like can continue to operate without the seasonal help which Public Law 78 provides. Under any circumstances, these farmers cannot, overnight, change their farming methods and secure alternate arrangements, such as mechanization. Moreover, there are several crops; namely, pickles and tomatoes, which today require hand labor. These two crops are not amenable to mechanization, insofar as harvesting is concerned. In fact, I am advised that the development of mechanical harvesting equipment for these two crops is presently the subject of major research projects.

Public Law 78 will expire of its own terms at the end of this year, unless an extension is enacted. There is an urgent need to continue the program and we have an opportunity to do so by the proposed legislation I am introducing. This would allow Congress a reasonable time to reexamine its position under Public Law 78 to see where we should go from this point.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD and may be held at the desk through tomorrow for such additional sponsors as may wish to join.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963", and inserting "December 31, 1964".

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 523) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 523, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 523) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, if such employee is—

"(A) employed by his parent, or by a person standing in the place of his parent, on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, or

"(B) is 14 years of age or over, or

"(C) is 12 years of age or over and is employed on a farm to which he commutes daily from his permanent residence, and (i) such employment is with the written consent of his parent or person standing in place of his parent, or (ii) his parent or person standing in place of his parent is also employed on the same farm.

"(2) No employee below the age of 18 may be employed in agriculture in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below age 18, except where such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person.

"(3) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FARM LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 184, Senate bill 524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 524) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 3, line 2, after the word "operator," to strike out "or nurseryman" and insert "nurseryman, freezer, or cold storage operator"; on page 6, line 4, after the word "filed", to insert "or give satisfactory assurance that he will file"; and on page 8, line 19, after the word "Every", to strike out "migrant agricultural" and insert "farm"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce are being used by certain irresponsible contractors for the services of the migrant agricultural laborers who exploit producers of agricultural products, migrant agricultural laborers, and the public generally, and that, as a result of the use of the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce by such irresponsible contractors, the flow of interstate commerce has been impeded, obstructed, and restrained.

(b) It is therefore the policy of this Act to remove the impediments, obstructions, and restraints occasioned to the flow of interstate commerce by the activities of such irresponsible contractors by requiring that all persons engaged in the activity of contracting for the services of workers for interstate agricultural employment comply with the provisions of this Act and all regulations prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Labor.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, joint stock company, trust, or corporation.

(b) The term "farm labor contractor" means any person, who, for a fee, either for himself or on behalf of another person, recruits, solicits, hires, furnishes, or transports ten or more migrant workers (excluding members of his immediate family) at any one time in any calendar year for interstate agricultural employment. Such term shall not include (1) any nonprofit charitable organization, public or nonprofit private educational institution, or similar organization; (2) any farmer, processor, canner, ginner, packing shed operator, nurseryman, freezer, or cold storage operator who engages in any such activity for the purpose of supplying migrant workers solely for his own operation; (3) any full-time or regular employee of any entity referred to in (1) or (2) above; or (4) any person who engages in any such activity for the purpose of obtaining migrant workers of any foreign nation for employment in the United States, if the employment of such workers is subject to (A) an agreement between the United States and such foreign nation, or (B) an arrangement with the government of any foreign nation under which written contracts for the employment of such workers are provided for and the enforcement thereof is provided for in the United States by an instrumentality of such foreign nation.

(c) The term "fee" includes any money or other valuable consideration paid or promised to be paid to a person for services as a farm labor contractor.

(d) The term "interstate agricultural employment" means employment in any service or activity included within the provisions of section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), when such service or activity is performed by an individual worker who has been transported from one State to another or from any place outside of a State to any place within a State.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor or his duly authorized representative.

(f) The term "State" means any of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam.

(g) The term "migrant worker" means an individual whose primary employment is in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or who performs agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION REQUIRED

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall engage in activities as a farm labor contractor unless he first obtains a certificate of registration from the Secretary, and unless such certificate is in full force and effect and is in such person's immediate possession.

(b) A full-time or regular employee of any person holding a valid certificate of registration under the provisions of this Act shall not, for the purpose of engaging in activities as a farm labor contractor solely on behalf of such person, be required to obtain a certificate of registration hereunder in his own name. Any such employee shall be required to have in his immediate personal possession when engaging in such activities such identification as the Secretary may require showing such employee to be an employee of, and duly authorized to engage in activities as a farm labor contractor for, a person holding a valid certificate of registration under the provisions of this Act. Except as provided in the foregoing provisions of this subsection, any such employee shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and regulations prescribed hereunder to the same extent as if he were required to obtain a certificate of registration in his own name.

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall, after appropriate investigation, issue a certificate of registration under this Act to any person who—

(1) has executed and filed with the Secretary a written application subscribed and sworn to by the applicant containing such information (to the best of his knowledge and belief) concerning his conduct and method of operation as a farm labor contractor as the Secretary may require in order effectively to carry out the provisions of this Act; and

(2) has filed, or gives satisfactory assurance that he will file within such time as the Secretary may prescribe, proof satisfactory to the Secretary of the financial responsibility of the applicant or proof satisfactory to the Secretary of the existence of a policy of insurance which insures such applicant against liability for damages to persons or property arising out of the applicant's ownership of, operation of, or his causing to be operated any vehicle for the transportation of migrant workers in connection with his business, activities, or operations as a farm labor contractor. The amount of any such policy of insurance shall be not less than the amount required under the law or regulation of any State in which such applicant operates a vehicle in connection with his business, activities, or operations as a farm labor contractor; but in no event shall the amount of such insurance be less than $5,000 for bodily injuries to or death of one person; $20,000 for bodily injuries to or death of all persons injured or killed in any one accident; $5,000 for the loss or damage in any one accident to property of others.

(b) Upon notice and hearing in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, the Secretary may refuse to issue, and may suspend, revoke, or refuse to renew a certificate of registration to any farm labor contractor if he finds that such contractor—

(1) knowingly has made any misrepresentations or false statements in his application for a certificate of registration or any renewal thereof;

(2) knowingly has given false or misleading information to migrant workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment;

(3) has failed, without justification, to perform agreements entered into or arrangements with farm operators;

(4) has failed, without justification, to comply with the terms of any working arrangements he has made with migrant workers;

(5) has failed to show financial responsibility satisfactory to the Secretary required by subsection (a)(2) of this section or has failed to keep in effect a policy of insurance required by subsection (a)(2) of this section;

(6) has recruited, employed, or utilized the services of a person with knowledge that such person is violating the provisions of the immigration and nationality laws of the United States;

(7) has been convicted of any crime under State or Federal law relating to gambling or prostitution, or to the sale, distribution, or possession of alcoholic liquors or narcotics in connection with or incident to his activities as a farm labor contractor;

(8) has failed to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission that are applicable to his activities and operations in interstate commerce; or

(9) has failed to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued hereunder.

(c) A certificate of registration, once issued, may not be transferred or assigned and shall be effective for the remainder of the calendar year during which it is issued, unless suspended or revoked by the Secretary as provided in this Act. A certificate of registration may be renewed each calendar year upon approval by the Secretary of an application for its renewal.

OBLIGATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 6. Every farm labor contractor shall—

(a) carry his certificate of registration with him at all times while engaging in activities as a farm labor contractor and exhibit the same to all persons with whom he intends to deal in his capacity as a farm labor contractor prior to so dealing;

(b) ascertain and disclose to each worker at the time the worker is recruited the following information to the best of his knowledge and belief: (1) the area of employment, (2) the crops and operations on which he may be employed, (3) the transportation, housing, and insurance to be provided him, and (4) the wage rates to be paid him;

(c) upon arrival at a given place of employment, post in a conspicuous place a written statement of the terms and conditions of that employment;

(d) in the event he manages, supervises, or otherwise controls the housing facilities, post in a conspicuous place the terms and conditions of occupancy; and

(e) in the event he pays migrant workers engaged in interstate agricultural employment, either on his own behalf or on behalf of another person, keep payroll records which shall show for each worker total earnings in each payroll period, all withholdings from wages, and net earnings. In addition, for workers employed on a time basis, the number of units of time employed and the rate per unit of time shall be recorded on the payroll records, and for workers employed on a piece rate basis, the number of units of work performed and the rate per unit shall be recorded on such records. The Secretary may prescribe an appropriate form for recording such information.

AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION

SEC. 7. The Secretary or his designated representative may investigate and gather data with respect to matters which may aid in carrying out the provisions of this Act. In any case in which a complaint has been filed with the Secretary regarding a violation of this Act or with respect to which the Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe that a farm labor contractor has violated any provisions of this Act, the Secretary or his designated representative may investigate and gather data respecting such case, and may, in connection therewith, enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such persons, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as may be necessary or appropriate to determine whether a violation of this Act has been committed.

AGREEMENTS WITH FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies, to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of the agencies, and to delegate to the agencies such authority, other than rulemaking, as he deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this Act, and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or to reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith.

PENALTY PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. Any farm labor contractor or employee thereof who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this Act or any regulation prescribed hereunder shall be fined not more than $500.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 10. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001 and the following) shall apply to all administrative proceedings conducted pursuant to the authority contained in this Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. Any person aggrieved by any order of the Secretary in refusing to issue or renew, or in suspending or revoking, a certificate of registration may obtain a review of any such order by filing in the district court of the United States for the district wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and serving upon the Secretary, within thirty days after the entry of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside in whole or in part. Upon receipt of any such petition, the Secretary shall file in such court a full, true, and correct copy of the transcript of the proceedings upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such petition and receipt of such transcript, such court shall have jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, modify, or enforce such order, in whole or in part. In any such review, the findings of fact of the Secretary shall not be set aside if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as provided in sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28, United States Code.

STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. This Act and the provisions contained herein are intended to supplement State action and compliance with this Act shall not excuse anyone from compliance with appropriate State law and regulation.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 14. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he determines necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 4, 5, 6, and 8 of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1964.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this bill would establish a system of Federal registration for interstate farm labor contractors, or crew leaders, as they are frequently called. Farm labor contractors are the middlemen in making work arrangements between farmworkers and growers and in this capacity often recruit, transport, supervise, handle pay arrangements, and, otherwise act as an intermediary between the migrant worker and the farmer. Although many crew leaders perform their functions in satisfactory and responsible manner, others have exploited both farmers and workers. Migrant workers, because of their dependency on the crew leader, are particularly vulnerable to such exploitation and abuse by irresponsible crew leaders.

For a full statement of the need for this legislation and a summary of the provisions of the bill, I refer Senators to yesterday's Congressional Record, at page 10511.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record my argument against S. 524, which I do not believe should be passed. I do not believe the measure is needed. I ask that my argument in opposition to the measure be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 524—Registration of Farm Labor Contractors

1. There are occasional instances of crew leaders who don't deal fairly with workers or farmers. These are minor and in many cases disputable. Their incidence is exaggerated. There are few crew leaders who make a lot of money in their operations. The picture of venal crew leaders portrayed by some is distorted. A more typical and accurate portrayal of the character and operations of crew leaders is contained in a recent research report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, from which the following is quoted:

"The present system of crews and crew leaders in southern Texas has developed and improved over a period of time. Although leaders of small crews may continue to handle a crew of about the same size for years, the movement into and out of the crew business is rapid. A crew leader who makes some bad job contacts is soon deserted by the crew members. A crew leader who fails to fulfill his job agreements is soon blacklisted by employers and is unable to find work for his crew.

"Twenty-four, or approximately three-fourths, of these 31 crew leaders were migratory workers who had moved up to the crew leader position.

"Most crew leaders maintain close contact with their workers during the winter to make sure that they are not picked up by someone else. When competition for workers becomes intense, crews may be moved out ahead of the season to put them out of reach of 'labor pirates.' If a man's crew deserts him, he may be out of business. But if he has a number of work commitments for the season and cannot obtain the needed workers, he may proceed to the work area and try recruiting workers there. A crew leader who has been able to sign up desirable jobs is not likely to have this trouble.

"A crew leader who can retain the same workers from season to season is proud of his achievement; he attributes it to his honesty and fair dealing.

"Successful crew leaders build up job connections over a period of years. Farmers who find a crew that is efficient and reliable ask it to return year after year. A successful crew leader keeps in touch also with farmers with whom he had had good work relationships. Communication by mail not only assures him of the job but lets him know when to come and how many workers will be needed.

"A study made in Texas in 1939 indicated that 60 percent of the intrastate workers traveled with crew leaders, 20 percent traveled on their own, and the rest used other means of transportation.

"Only 39 percent of the heads of households in the 1957 survey reported that they were members of crews at the time they left their home bases. The rest either went on their own, in their own cars, or in those of friends, or rode in a truck driven by a trucker for a recruitment agency.

"Forty percent of the families migrated in their own cars. Truck transportation is more common for the shorter hauls within the State than for interstate movement. Approximately half of the interstate workers went in their own cars." (Quoted from Production Research Report 41, "Migratory Farm Workers in the Midcontinent Streams," USDA.)

2. It should also be noted that most farm labor contractors are already registered with one or more State employment services. Thus any farm labor contractor who operates in Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Colorado, California, Washington, Oregon, and probably several other States I don't know about must be registered. These are major migratory-farm-labor-employing States.

Most farm labor contractors must be registered in one or more States now. I can see little valid purpose in duplication of Federal regulation in this area.

3. I, therefore, do not believe that the proposal incorporated in S. 524 is of any significant importance, or that it would improve the situation measurably, or that it should be enacted.

4. If the Senate considers otherwise then we would certainly adopt some substantial amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

FINANCING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on May 17, 1963, I introduced by request S. 1562, an administration bill to improve the financing of the Civil Service Retirement System. This measure, which would rectify a weakness of long standing in the civil service retirement and disability fund, provides a reasonable solution to the problem of the fund's ever-growing unfunded liability which currently amounts to $34 billion dollars, and will increase to $35 billion by June 30, 1964. It focuses attention upon a very serious fiscal situation affecting Federal employees and it offers a logical means by which past omissions can be made up. Through S. 1562, the fund's future stability can be assured.

This bill has my wholehearted support, and I am very hopeful that it will be enacted during the 88th Congress.

When the retirement fund was created in 1920, a covenant between the Government and participating employees was established. Under this agreement, a certain percentage of the employee's salary was deducted to cover his share of the cost of his retirement. Whatever additional funds were required to finance the program were to be provided by the Government. Over the years, the Government has failed to make its fully obligated contributions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this failure to meet the contributions really began under the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It started between 1921 and 1928, under a Republican administration, and it was also carried out under the early part of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, in part, they were able to present figures ostensibly showing that they balanced their budget, simply because they failed to make the proper contribution to the civil service retirement fund?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; that ran into billions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was this not an example of fiscal irresponsibility at its worst?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was a fiscal responsibility they failed to fulfill. There is no question about it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. In connection with the allegation of fiscal irresponsibility under the Eisenhower administration, may I ask the Senator who was in control of the Congress at that time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is true that it was a partly Democratic Congress in control, but the Republican executive in Eisenhower's administration made no recommendations. The administration had the right and the obligation to put those funds aside, but it failed to do so until Congress adopted an act and made the Executive do it, in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask my friend from South Carolina if, by any chance, there is a slip-up in the executive branch of the Government it does not behoove the legislative branch of the Government, which makes the laws, to do something about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The legislative branch of the Government did do something about it when the Eisenhower administration failed to do anything. Congress enacted a law which required that the administration must set aside the proper amount each year.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator say the Eisenhower administration was in control of the Congress at that time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was in control of it the first 2 years. After about the fourth year of the administration, Congress acted. The administration had not done anything about this problem, and Congress made it do something, and that law is on the statute books today.

Between 1921 and 1928, for example, the Federal Government did not contribute a cent to the retirement fund. Disbursements of course were small in those days when the plan was in its beginning stages, but significant Federal contributions did not begin until the 1930's under the Roosevelt administrations. The present unsound condition of the fund arises out of such past inadequate contributions. Unless the Congress takes steps to increase the present level of Government contributions, the unfunded liability will grow, and the fund will disappear entirely by the year 1990.

In 1956 in an effort to regularize Government contributions, the Congress enacted Public Law 84-854, under which the fund is currently financed. Each employing agency contributes from its salary appropriation amounts equal to employee contributions at the rate of 6½ percent for employees and 7½ percent for Members of Congress. This assures that annual income approximates normal cost. But these contributions do not fulfill the Government's total obligation because no provision is now being made to meet the unfunded liability—not even the interest on the unfunded liability. In other words, our present method of financing covers only part of retirement benefit costs.

By June 30, 1964, the fund will be liable to the tune of $49 billion for benefits earned by employees and Members for past services. The balance in the fund will be $14 billion.

S. 1562 would require each agency to make supplemental contributions to arrest the growth of this past-service liability and to preserve the fund's integrity. These extra contributions would be spread out to ease their impact upon the Federal budget. They would start at one-half of 1 percent of agency payroll in fiscal year 1965 and increase by one-half of 1 percent annually for 21 years, so that by fiscal year 1986 they would reach 11 percent of payroll where they would level off.

This is to gradually make up our failure to provide for these contributions for many years in the past. These supplemental contributions would be in addition to the 6½ percent of payroll now regularly contributed. The Civil Service Commission estimates that this schedule plus the regular matching contributions would stabilize the growth of the unfunded liability in 1986. After that date, these contributions would permanently finance the system on a normal cost-plus-interest basis, and then go back to the regular matching basis in accordance with the first agreement.

S. 1562 also provides that any new or increased benefits which may be enacted would not become effective until the unfunded liability for past service which would result from the increased benefit had been appropriated. Thus the bill would prevent future increases in the unfunded liability resulting from liberalizations of the retirement system.

In short, this measure would have the following beneficial results:

It would put into operation the normal cost-plus-interest principle approved by the Congress in 1956.

It would slow and then stop the alarming growth of the unfunded liability.

It would keep the fund solvent.

It would achieve its goals without sharp increases in appropriations.

It would assure the availability of sufficient resources to pay benefits promised to, and earned by, our loyal Federal employees.

In my view S. 1562 provides a systematic and conservative means of long-range financing through which the Government can fulfill an obligation which it clearly has neglected in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina for calling attention to this great defect in the past in financing pension benefits for Federal employees. The Republicans of the 1920's and the Eisenhower administration of the 1950's continued to pass on to the future the liabilities incurred by people working for the Government and accumulating claims for their future protection. They refused to provide the resources necessary to meet such liabilities. The result has been, as the Senator from South Carolina has so ably stated, an unfunded obligation, which we will have to make good by future appropriations or else deny benefits to people to whom we have given these guarantees.

I remember that in 1954 I protested this policy of the Eisenhower administration. I remember being outvoted on that issue. It was one of the most slipshod, irresponsible actions that I have ever seen a legislative body carry out.

The irony of it was that it was perpetrated by a group which prides itself on fiscal responsibility and condemns the Democratic Party as being, allegedly, fiscally irresponsible, even though we kept our system, in the main, properly financed, and yet had our very foundations undermined by this policy of the Eisenhower administration and the two great alleged geniuses, Andrew W. Mellon and George Humphrey.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Illinois for calling attention to the fact that this subject was discussed on the floor in 1953 and 1954. As Senators will recall, I brought it to the floor at that time. However, we got no results. During 1953 and 1954 there was a Republican Congress, and the Republicans were in control during all that time. In 1955 I immediately brought the situation to the attention of Congress. During 1955 it was the subject of hearings, and in 1956 the bill was reported to the Senate. A Democratic House and a Democratic Senate passed the law, making the administration then coming into office pay the pro rata share. That is the record that Senators will find written upon the statute books.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, there were 8 years of fiscal irresponsibility under Andrew Mellon and 4 years of fiscal irresponsibility under George Humphrey, and in that period there were accumulated vast sums, which ultimately created the unfunded amount the Senator has stated.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. We must also bear in mind that they borrowed that money that the Government used to balance the budget, and they paid no interest on the money they borrowed during that period.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator from South Carolina trying to tell the Senate that in the 28 years from 1932 to 1960, during which time all but 4 years were under the control of the Democrats in Congress, this problem arose because in 4 years the Republicans had a very small majority in Congress? Is he trying to suggest that that problem arose in that 4-year period?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am giving the facts as the facts appear in the record. These are the facts that appear on the books. They did not pay anything on it from 1921 to 1928. Under the Hoover administration it will be noted that they came back and paid some. The Senator can take the record and read it. The facts are irrefutable.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator says that during 1953 and 1954 the Republicans were in control of Congress, and that this problem existed; that after the Democrats took control, in 1955, his committee held hearings, and started to do something about the situation. Is the Senator suggesting that not enough has been done about it since 1955 to prevent this problem from arising?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The present administration is calling for our attention, in clear and unmistakable words, as I see it, as Members of the House and Members of the Senate, to fulfill our obligation, not only on the part of the Republicans, but also on the part of the Democrats, an obligation that was incurred by both parties when we put 50 percent of the employees, regardless of anything else, on the civil service rolls and gave them credit for their service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, there was a record of Democratic responsibility and a Republican performance of financial irresponsibility.

Mr. MILLER. When did all this happen?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This has been happening all along, ever since the Retirement Act went into effect.

Mr. MILLER. This happened during the years when Congress ought to have done something about it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It ought to do something about it.

Mr. MILLER. Congress has not done something. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am calling on the Senator to vote for the bill when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Last year, when we had before us a proposed increase in the retirement fund, provided for in one of the bills which the Senator's committee recommended for passage by the Senate, I asked my friend from South Carolina about the report that the civil service retirement fund would go bankrupt by 1980. The report emanated from the Civil Service Commission. If I recall correctly, my friend from South Carolina said that he thought the retirement increase provided for in the bill would not add any difficulty to the problem. Apparently today it is adding some difficulty to the problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The amount being paid today cares for today's return, but it does not care for the deficit that was created in past years. That is what I am calling attention to now.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the Senator believe that before we take care of more Federal retirement debt, we ought to take care of some of the previous retirement debt that has not been provided for?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it is our duty to do something along the line of what the administration is calling for. The administration is willing to go along and pay a one-half of 1 percent increase every year until the fund is in proper shape.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be the first to join with the Senator from South Carolina in seeing to it taht something is done to correct the situation. I was not a Member of Congress at the time these activities took place. What prompted my comments and views was the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] about the irresponsibility of the Eisenhower administration, in 6 of whose 8 years Congress was under the control of the Democrats. I think it is about time the people knew upon whose back the responsibility fell. The deficits which occurred during the Eisenhower administration were not the responsibility of the President or the executive branch; they were the responsibility of the Democrats in Congress.

If Democrats are in control of Congress, they are to blame; if Republicans are in control of Congress, and they do not do anything about the situation, then the Republicans are to blame. But let us keep the situation in proper perspective.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the budgets of the Republican administrations from 1921 to 1928 no provision was made for the funding of pensions?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No provision whatsoever was made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, the executive budgets of the President at that time did not make any provision for such funding, but the liabilities were accumulating.

Is it not true also that in 1953 the budget for 1954, in 1954 the budget for 1955, and in 1955 the budget for 1956, contained no provisions for funding?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. The Government borrowed from the retirement fund approximately $5 or $6 billion a year but paid no interest on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So neither the Harding, the Coolidge, nor the Eisenhower budgets made provision for such funding?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. I was casting no reflections upon Republicans or Democrats. Since the situation is as it is, we must face the facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is most important that the facts be known.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Illinois talks about the budgets presented by the executive branch at various times. We now have a budget that has been presented by the executive branch. However, does the Senator suggest that the legislative branch of the Government must sit idly by and swallow everything that is contained in the executive budget, or does he feel that Congress has a responsibility, as well?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Congress has a responsibility.

Mr. MILLER. Congress is quite capable of fulfilling its responsibility concerning the budget, and takes action on it on many occasions when we think such action is needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During the 1920's, the Republicans controlled both Houses of Congress. In each and every one of the years from 1921 to 1930, Republicans had control of Congress, as they did also in 1953 and 1954; and the bipartisan alliance, or unholy alliance, had control in 1955 and 1956.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Illinois explain what he means by the "unholy alliance" and the "bipartisan alliance"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are combinations of Republicans plus Democrats who run on the Democratic platform but always vote with the Republicans. Out of kindness to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], I should say that I do not regard him as being a member of that alliance. I did not give any geographical affiliation.

Mr. MILLER. Should not the Senator from Illinois add to his statement that the so-called alliance consists of Democrats who join with Republicans in stopping proposed legislation or the doing of something he does not agree with; but that when the chips are down and the committees of Congress are organized, those Democrats are most welcome to him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not quite know what the Senator from Iowa is trying to establish.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa seeks merely to point out that when the time comes to organize the committees of Congress, somehow or other the "unholy alliance" collapses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; it still operates.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no; it collapses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Democrats head the committees. The hearts of the Democrats who head many committees are with the Republicans, instead of there being Republican heads of committees. When the Republicans control Congress, we have Republicans wearing Confederate uniforms as chairmen of committees.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Since the Senator has brought that up, I, being from the South——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not mean to include the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have been a Democrat all the way through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I make a great exception of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I merely thought that the Senator from Illinois ought to admit that when the time comes to organize committees, the Democrats speak as one; and that is a pretty important consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our hearts do not beat as one; but unfortunately we sometimes vote as one.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the man who bears the title of Architect of the Capitol is up to his old tricks. He is the gentleman who perpetrated the costly, unesthetic, clumsy, awkward new Senate Office Building, with all its defects, demerits, and weaknesses. He is the gentleman who encouraged and supervised the reconstruction of the east front of the Capitol on the alleged ground that it was necessary to prevent the dome of the Capitol from falling in. That reconstruction, so far as I can tell, cost $24 million including related work and probably was the most expensive real estate construction per square foot in the history of the United States, perhaps in the history of the world.

The Architect of the Capitol is the same gentleman who has taken charge of the third House Office Building, one of the most costly and probably one of the most unesthetic buildings ever to be erected.

As readers of the newspapers will remember, last week it was disclosed that another structural defect had appeared in the third House Office Building; namely, that the suites are so designed that it is impossible to get from the Congressman's private office to the main staff office without passing through the reception room. The desirability of such an arrangement apparently had never occurred to the Architect. He is now willing to cut doors through, displacing the built-in file cabinets, at an estimated cost of approximately $169,000. But I predict that when the work is done, the cost will be much more.

I hold in my hand a transcript of testimony given before the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations. I find that the Architect has other things up his sleeve. He now wants to rebuild the west front of the Capitol, and the reason which he gives is the same reason he gave before; namely, to prevent the dome of the Capitol from falling in. We prevented that from happening once by reconstructing the east front at a cost of $24 million. Now the Architect of the Capitol says we must do it all over again by reconstructing the west front at a cost of $20 million.

But that is not all. Contained in the final pages of the report of the testimony of Mr. Stewart is the very clear implication that he is still planning the construction of a garage under the plaza of the east front of the Capitol. When I exposed this plan last year, the eminent Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and others, I believe, assured me at the time that there was no authorization for such a project. But on page 173 of the typewritten script of the hearings is the implication that Mr. Stewart still plans this construction in addition to the 3,120 underground spaces which he will have on the House side after completion of the Rayburn Office Building and the 1,220 new spaces he is requesting funds for this year. The early estimates show a cost of approximately $22,000 per parking space, which is 7 times the cost of the underground garages at Grant Park in Chicago and the Commons in Boston.

The present Architect of the Capitol is the most expensive, most wasteful, most incompetent Architect whom we possibly could engage. He was appointed during the Eisenhower administration. So far as I know, he has had no architectural training. He was a landscape gardner for a brief period of time. But I am sure he could not pass any architectural examination. He has been continuing for some reason—I know not why—in a whole series of wasteful expenditures.

To paraphrase Cicero, I should like to ask: For how long, O Capitol Architect, wilt thou abuse our patience?

So that the breakdown of the $24 million cost I have cited for the east front project will be clear, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Extension of the Capitol Project, Obligations," which appears on page 170 of the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1964. I also ask unanimous consent that and editorial entitled "Door Prize," published in the Washington Post of June 10, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Extension of the Capitol project

OBLIGATIONS

Obligations by objects	Obligated to Apr. 1, 1963	Estimated obligations, Apr. 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963	Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1964	Total, obligations
Extension, reconstruction, and replacement of east central front of Capitol	$11,382,966			$11,382,966
Alterations to interior of section of building formerly constituting east central front, and related work	1,773,274			1,773,274
Birdproofing entire building, except west central front	81,197			81,197
Cleaning exterior stonework, Senate and House wings	93,824			93,824
Repairs, cleaning, and painting dome, and birdproofing peristyle	1,403,103			1,403,103
Senate subway terminal, including 2 new elevators and escalators to serve traffic from terminal	2,434,000			2,434,000
Improved lighting and rewiring throughout Capitol Bldg., including electronic clocks and legislative call system	2,610,320		$495,000	3,105,320
Architectural, engineering, sculpturing, and consultant services	1,835,035			1,835,035
Topographic survey of Capitol site, test borings and pits, surveys and studies, administration and miscellaneous	1,212,785	$20,658	30,000	1,263,443
Furniture and furnishings, and restaurant equipment for extended portion of building	627,838			627,838
Total	23,454,342	20,658	525,000	24,000,000

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1963]

DOOR PRIZE

In the British Cabinet, they have ministers without portfolio, and in Washington we have architects without diploma. The most celebrated instance is J. George Stewart, a former Congressman from Delaware whose title is Architect of the Capitol. Understandably, Mr. Stewart approaches his task with an amateur zest that is not unimpressive. He is not daunted by cost or criticism, and he could teach the CIA some dazzling new tricks of concealment.

Admirers of Mr. Stewart's work have been wondering what edifice will be his masterpiece. The answer is now evident. The new Senate Office Building was a mere apprentice work, and the remodeled east front of the Capitol only esthetic bagatelle. The crowning effort is to be the new House Office Building, a mountain of marble rising at prodigious cost (more, in fact, than all other Capitol buildings put together) with a style deriving from middle Mussolini, early Rameses, and late Nieman-Marcus.

Touchingly, Mr. Stewart has been furtive about this surprise; for months after the foundation was dug, his office refused to let the public see a sketch of the $70 million or so building. The other day, however, Mr. Stewart did give some prospective tenants a guided tour through the unfinished building where Doric columns, Baroque decorations, and modern glass disclose a splendid versatility of taste. The Congressmen found, however, that their new suites were so designed that it was impossible to get from their private office to the staff quarters, without walking through the reception room.

Why not alter the plan? Well, Mr. Stewart's aids explain, there are file cabinets so ingeniously built in that it may cost $1,000 a suite to make the change—and there are 169 suites. Of course, Mr. Stewart could have been a little less secretive about the whole thing, but that could have created an unfortunate impression. People might have gotten the idea that public money was being spent on Washington's answer to the great ziggurat of Babylon.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the drama, being carried on the news tickers, which is taking place at Tuscaloosa, Ala., in connection with the admission of two Negro students to the University of Alabama.

I think all of us have been watching this drama and its various manifestations, including the proclamations issued by the President of the United States in federalizing the Alabama National Guard and in dealing with what could be another great emergency, in view of the physical interposition of Governor Wallace in an attempt to prevent the registration and admission of these two Negro students to the campus of the University of Alabama.

In the news there is evidence that a confrontation between State police, the federally nationalized Alabama National Guard, and other Federal troops will be avoided. As a result, therefore, all Americans will breathe a sigh of relief.

One thing which seems to be endemic in this entire controversy in the position taken by high officials, including the chief executives of States, such as Governor Wallace, is the absolute refusal to understand that a citizen of Alabama is also a citizen of the United States; that the jurisdiction and authority of the United States to protect and safeguard a citizen of the United States extend into the physical confines of the State of Alabama; and that, just as Alabama is sovereign in regard to its State activities, so is the United States sovereign, right on the soil of Alabama, in regard to all the activities of the United States.

Mr. President, oceans of blood and mountains of treasure were expended during the Civil War, in order to make that fact clear. Yet, 100 years later, State officials high in authority are endangering the peace and security of the Nation and of their own States by refusing to accept what was proven in the course of the expenditure of so much blood and treasure and what the Congress has confirmed time and again.

These officials consider themselves honorable conservatives; but they fail to recognize that the worst thing for honorable conservatives or for any other kind of conservative is destruction of the courts of law. Yet that is precisely what is being attempted.

I mention this matter on the floor of the Senate because often when we debate interesting developments, we miss the main issues before the country—as is occurring now; and, second, because today I had the honor to join with other Senators in introducing a broad so-called part III bill. If any confirmation is needed of the necessity for the enactment of such a measure, it is being evidenced by what Governor Wallace is doing today on the campus of the University of Alabama.

In short, Mr. President, somehow we must bring home to the officials of these States the fact that the United States is superior in regard to protection of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to the individual affected, who is an Alabamian and is in their State. This must be done, because they have not protected him and his rights; but the United States will and must. The only way this can be done in compliance with the requirements of public order is by permitting the courts to have authority to proceed in connection with these matters. When the courts do not have that authority, there is the kind of anarchy that still exists in Prince Edward County, with the schools closed. When the courts have authority—as did the Federal court in Alabama in this case—to cause such students to be admitted to the State university on their own suit, there is a procedure which the President can follow on his own responsibility to enforce the order of the court.

I submit that we who support this course demonstrate that we are conservatives by advocating this course of such soundness in the best tradition of our land; and if there is any danger, it is in the course of grave danger which is being pursued by such State officials.

As I have said of President Eisenhower, no one appreciates better than we the awful moments of decision which come when proclamations have to be signed in order to require the Governors of States to cease activities in violation of laws of the United States and to proceed to function under the laws of the United States, and even to require the calling out of troops, following the federalization of the National Guard.

Mr. President, of course we can engage in all kinds of disputes and debates in regard to what sort of civil-rights legislation the President should request of us. A number of us on this side of the aisle have done what we deeply believe to be the correct thing to do. We know full well that with great satisfaction we will join our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in working for the enactment of such legislation, because such measures cannot be passed unless we join hands and coordinate our efforts.

So, Mr. President, regardless of what may be our individual decisions in connection with such matters, when the President is exercising the highest prerogatives of the presidency, certainly he is entitled to our full support; and in this moment of fire, as it were, the Nation should recognize the real issue, which is whether an Alabamian is also a citizen of the United States and, as such, is entitled to the majesty and protection of the laws of the United States in connection with safeguarding to him his most sacred rights. We say he is. That is the entire issue which presently is before the whole country; and ultimately it will be resolved right here in the Senate by means of the appropriate law which we must pass.

I hope and pray that at this session of Congress, we shall avoid even more dread eventualities, and that we shall pass these measures with the recommendation and the strong backing of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to yield to the Senator from New York.

FARM LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 524) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for several questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask three questions which I believe may be helpful in connection with establishing the legislative history of this very important measure.

First, as I read the bill, growers' associations are exempt from the registration requirements if they employ a crew, making all arrangements for employment of the crew with the crew leader, who in turn deals directly with his own crew. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether that is his interpretation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Of course, the Senator from Iowa has discussed this question with me. In order not to be precise, I should like to include a statement which reflects our feeling in regard to just what this measure will do.

I would have to disagree with that interpretation of the bill, for this reason: One of the major purposes of this legislation is to protect migrant workers against those who deal with them unfairly or dishonestly.

We make an exception for the employer recruiting for his own operations. The farmer or canner, for example, has this exclusion. We do not try to oversee these employers' relationship with the workers. But we cannot go much beyond that.

Where an association recruits workers through a crew leader, there is need for control over such activity, even though the association does not deal with the workers directly.

Section 6(b) of the bill requires a crew leader to disclose the terms and conditions of employment to workers, at the time when they are recruited, to the best of his knowledge and belief. A crew leader recruiting for an association may comply fully with this provision; but at the same time it is entirely possible that the association may have misrepresented the terms of employment to the crew leader. In such a situation the worker would be protected only if the association is also subject to the registration requirements.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question relating to a situation upon which the bill is not too clear, to my way of thinking. Let us consider that an association, which is registered as a crew leader, has an employee who violates the act. The penalty on the agent is clear, under section 4(b), but the effect on the employer is not clear. I assume there would be no penalty upon the employer unless he were a party to the violation which is the basis of the revocation or suspension. Is that a correct interpretation of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct in that respect. Whether the employer was a party to the violation would have to be determined, of course, on the facts of the particular case. I would like to add that something less, on the employer's part, than a specific instruction to commit the violation might cause the employer to be found a party. For instance, the employer might be guilty of gross negligence in selecting the employee or in keeping him on the job. As another possibility, suppose the association's employee commits a serious violation, has his authority to recruit revoked, and is discharged from his job. If there were a succession of such incidents, there might be grounds for an inference here, too, that the employer was in fact a party to the violations and should also be penalized.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask one final question of my colleague from New Jersey. As I understand the bill, growers' associations are exempt from registering in those localities in which they use the gate-hire practice, hiring migratory workers who come to their business offices within a given State seeking employment in the general area. Is this correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to respond by saying first that the practice of gate-hiring alone would not be enough to make the registration requirements inapplicable. The bill defines a farm labor contractor as any person who "recruits, solicits, hires, furnishes, or transports" migrant workers, and gate-hire of course is included within the general term "hires."

In this case, therefore, the need to register as a crew leader depends on whether the workers are hired for interstate agricultural employment and on this question, I would say that the existence of interstate employment is determined from the worker's point of view rather than the employer's. That is, as the term is defined in the bill, "interstate agricultural employment" is present whenever the workers have been transported from one State to another. The association hiring the migrant workers would not necessarily have to transport them to another State in order to be covered by the bill.

Putting it in another way, it boils down to the origin of the worker who presents himself for employment.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have enjoyed the colloquy with my friend from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the questions is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 524) was passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] if he can give the Senate the program for the remainder of the week and for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished acting minority leader will yield to the Senator from New Jersey for the purpose of making a few brief remarks, I shall then be glad to answer his question.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment at this point to comment on the action taken by the Senate within the past 2 days. We have done more than pass six bills; we have made it clear that there is a broad demand for action on these and other legislative proposals that will at long last bring fundamental social justice and some semblance of economic advancement to the migratory farm workers of this Nation.

This demand was not made by the workers themselves; they are disunited and politically voiceless. It has come from individuals who raised their voices because they could not disregard the plight of others once they learned of that plight. It has come from those groups that have worked so long to give some comfort and hope to the migrant. And it has come from my colleagues in the Senate, who have said in the last 2 days that no citizen in our land can be ignored, no matter how quietly he may endure his suffering, hardship, and the death of hope itself.

The favorable action taken by the Senate puts us now in a position to have a reasonable hope of early action and final approval by the Congress of the United States. We have, after all, passed these bills early enough in this session to allow for full discussion and deliberation in the House of Representatives. We are in a far different position than we were in 1962, when the Senate passed five of these bills toward the end of the final session of that Congress. We now have the time, and I think we have a newfound sense of urgency, to expect major progress on programs to help the migrant.

For these reasons and others I am confident that the next few months will bring solid achievement on legislation of direct, daily importance to the men, women, and children who harvest crops that appear on our tables every day. They have waited too long for Congress to act, but the Senate has given new hope and new heart to everyone who has worked to make the victories of the last 2 days possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the acting minority leader yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to take this means, before answering the question raised, to extend to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] my congratulations and commendations for a job well done. In the past 2 days, 6 bills dealing with migrant workers, all under his sponsorship, have passed this body. I think that record, added to what he has done over the years since he has been in the Senate, has marked him as the outstanding individual Senator, and one of the most outstanding authorities in the country in this particular field.

I feel also that I should extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and to his colleague, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the acting minority leader, because what they have done is to make the record clear in relation to the migrant bills so that there will be no misinterpretation.

It has been a great day for the Nation that a man of the caliber of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has been able to accomplish what he has over the past several days in this long-forgotten field. The people who have had little representation in this body should be grateful that a man like the distinguished Senator from New Jersey should take the interest which he has taken, and for the results which he has achieved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader, I wish to state that, after consultation with the leadership in this body, the pending business will be Calendar No. 174, the bill S. 412.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CERTAIN CASES GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 174, S. 412.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further action on that measure today. In other words, there will be no further action on proposed legislation today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 1343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I am pleased to have the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] join me in sponsoring S. 1343 which would authorize the type of aid to education program needed to resolve the several grave controversies involved in this issue. As the able Senator said in his statement yesterday, this bill is in the tradition of the late Senator Taft.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, following consideration of the bill S. 412, which has been laid before the Senate as the pending business, the next bill to be considered will be Calendar No. 175, S. 625, to amend sections of title 38 United States Code with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities."

Following consideration of that measure it is the intention of the leadership to take up Calendar No. 193, Senate bill 603, a bill relating to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Following consideration of that bill, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 189, Senate bill 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriation and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Following consideration of that bill, it is the intention to bring before the Senate Calendar No. 216, Senate bill 684, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], a bill to clarify certain provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act and to place transactions involving unification on acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the provisions of section 5 of the act.

Action on those measures will pretty well clear the calendar, because the only other two items on the calendar not attended to are, first Calendar Order No. 12, Senate bill 812, on which it seems doubtful any action will be taken this year, and Calendar No. 136, Senate bill 102, which is the second item on the calendar, and to which the same statement would apply.

Therefore, in view of the scarcity of items on the calendar under general orders to be considered, I hope that the chairmen of the appropriate committees will see fit to bring out legislation which has been pending in their committees for some time, so that the Senate can get busy and clear measures in as expeditious and as sensible a manner as possible.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that certain Members of the Senate may wish to try to make some plans for the weekend. Would it be the prospect that after conclusion of the business Thursday there would be a session on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the distinguished acting minority leader would not hold me to it too closely, I would say that the prospects for going over from Thursday until Monday are fairly good.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON RURAL LIFE

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] introduced a bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life. It is my privilege to be a cosponsor of the bill. In previous Congresses it was my privilege to be the main sponsor. I am delighted to be associated in this instance with the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and other Senators.

Mr. President, as cosponsor of the bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life, I would like to comment on the changes taking place in rural America and how the proposed Commission will give long-range guidance to this administration's rural areas development program.

The rural areas development program is one of the truly constructive features of the administration's farm program. It is making decided progress, and has an unlimited future in terms of benefits to our rural population and the Nation itself.

I have supported the concept of an overall rural development program, to include nonfarm as well as farm people, ever since the first pilot programs were outlined in 1956. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 enabled us to put this concept into operation, and I am hopeful that additional authority can be obtained soon in order that we might move further in this direction. Present enthusiasm, understanding, and leadership in our Department of Agriculture has broadened the idea of rural development far beyond its beginning stages.

The Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, has given this program his personal leadership and has carried the message of planning and program objectives to all areas of our Nation. The program has had a splendid reception.

Many of the problems of rural people can be solved by bringing employment and other opportunities to the small towns instead of moving rural people to the cities.

Mr. President, when I say "moving rural people to the cities," I mean that this process takes place frequently through what is known as economic attrition, in that rural people are unable to earn sufficient income on their farms and thereby feel compelled to move to the urban areas. It seems to me that it would be much more desirable for the programs of the Federal, State, and local governments to be directed toward bringing employment and other opportunities to the smaller communities or smaller towns which serve the rural areas.

Many of these unemployed are unqualified to fill jobs for which there are openings. Moving the rural unemployed and underemployed to the cities would only add to the relief rolls and the misery. Yet, the needs of our society for goods and services, for outdoor recreation, continue to grow. Rural areas and rural people can help supply these needs—if they have the know-how, the tools, and the place to work.

One of the great needs today in meeting the problems of unemployment in our urban areas is the training—not merely the retraining, but the training—of people who have left the rural areas of our country, the training of them in industrial pursuits, in service industries, in technical skills that modern manufacturing and industrial life requires. This can be accomplished by a substantial expansion of the manpower training program and the vocational education program, as well as the rural development program which we are now discussing.

I shall be offering proposed legislation to expand the vocational education and technical training, and also the manpower retraining programs.

This administration is moving new opportunity to rural America, is helping rural people to help themselves, is coordinating all its resources to encourage complete rural progress.

Mr. President, today only one-third of our rural people are farmers. Most rural people are blue-collar workers. Each farmworker produces enough for twice as many people as he did only a decade ago. So, while fewer farmers do take care of our food and fiber needs, as agriculture becomes more efficient, the complexion of our countryside has changed.

No other people have ever been able to pay for food with less than 20 percent of their income, yet that is what agricultural efficiency has meant to those of us in America. Yet, the paradox of this efficiency is that rural America has more poverty than our urban areas—fewer public facilities per capita, a lower level of educational attainment, and a lack of many of the conveniences of life which city people have come to take for granted. Here are just a few examples of this disparity:

Rural America contains one-third of our population, but half of our poverty.

One thousand four hundred and thirty rural counties lost population between 1950 and 1960.

Unemployment and underemployment in rural America is equivalent to 4.1 million unemployed.

During the 1950's, 70 percent of the migration from rural areas consisted of people in their teens or twenties. As a result, number of births in the farm population is declining.

Only 65 percent of farm homes and 88 percent of rural nonfarm homes had hot and cold running water in 1960, compared with 99 percent in urban areas.

In isolated rural areas, there were only 47 physicians per 100,000 population, compared with 132 in city areas.

Fewer rural people have health insurance coverage than city people.

Rural people have fewer years of schooling than city people.

In the main, rural people have less adequate school facilities.

Mr. President, rural areas development is necessary now. It means more economic opportunities for people and communities, as well as commodity programs. Rural areas development means that under the leadership of local people, new jobs, new plants, and new thinking are being encouraged in 2,500 rural counties. Rural areas development means that the equivalent of 4 million rural unemployed and underemployed will have a better chance to remain in their hometowns, retain their cultural heritage, and still make living wages for their families.

It seems to me this is the kind of program that makes good, solid sense.

It is easy to explain how rural areas development works, if we first understand that it is for all rural people, not only farm people. Typically, a county may see itself going downhill, slowly but steadily; young people moving away; farmhouses and barns unpainted or abandoned; fences along the roads coming down. In town, stores are vacant, and country crossroads and villages are inactive.

I suggest this is all too often the picture one sees in rural America.

An alert young storekeeper may hear about rural areas development. He gets literature from the Department of Agriculture and his State rural areas development committee. Soon he is meeting with the mayor, the co-op manager of a nearby town, the county agricultural agent, the banker at the county seat, other businessmen from all parts of the county and from other counties, too. They realize that theirs is more than a collection of private problems. They see a problem spread through the county, extending through the region.

They formally organize a county rural areas development committee, composed of county businessmen, maybe a farm co-op manager, a church leader, president of a local union, president of a county farm organization, representatives from the rural electric cooperative and the power company, the county road commission, women's groups, and others. They decide their county has many natural assets. It has excellent scenery, it is within a day's drive of a large city, it has many places which could be developed for public and private recreation. It has small streams which could be developed for industrial water supply.

The rural areas development committee calls on the technical action panel, also just organized. This panel is made up largely of U.S. Department of Agriculture field personnel—the county Farmers Home Administration supervisor, Soil Conservation Service technicians, forester, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service representative, and others. This panel gives technical help and counsel to the rural areas development committee. It also can direct the committee to other sources of information, and the committee makes use of the panel's knowledge of the county and its people.

Finally, with the help of the technical action panel, and many others, the rural areas development committee feels that it has pinpointed the county's problems, and its resources of people, land, water, minerals, scenery, and so on. From this comes a development plan, formulated by local people, aimed directly at using all the resources available to solve the county's economic problems.

For example, the county seat town might need a water and sewerage system to help create new industry. If the county is designated for help by the Area Redevelopment Administration, in the Department of Commerce, it might get a loan and grant from ARA. If the town is under 2,500 population, it might get a water supply loan from the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The county has two good streams, but they spill over their banks in major floods every 2 or 3 years. Good land is not safe for farming, or for urban or industrial development. The town is short of a dependable water supply. It could ask the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture for help with a small watershed project, the Farmers Home Administration for a watershed loan, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for ACP cost-sharing help. It might call on State agencies for help in developing one of the watershed lakes into a park or other recreation area. With the extra water supply, the county is better prepared to seek industry.

The local electric cooperative, sensing that more power is needed if the area is to have industry, applies to the Department of Agriculture's Rural Electrification Administration to extend powerlines and improve service. Local appliance dealers visit their bank to arrange loans to modernize their stores and carry larger stocks of merchandise to serve the new customers being brought into the county with industry.

The RAD committee surveys hundreds of small woodlot owners and discovered that their timber output would support a furniture manufacturer. One is invited to inspect the area and agrees to put up a plant employing 100 people, if the community will assure him adequate water and power. He goes to the Small Business Administration for a small loan but gets the greater portion of his financing from a commercial bank in the county.

The Area Redevolpment Administration approves a project to retain local people to operate equipment in the proposed plant. A new furniture factory immediately begins to attract the attention of the transportation industry. The demand grows for better rural housing; loans made by local banks and insured by the Farmers Home Administration would make better housing possible.

Some of the county's commercial farmers decide to cut down on the production of surplus crops and take advantage of the booming interest in recreation. They may ask the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to help them change land use over to grass, or trees, to wildlife production, or to outdoor recreation enterprises. They might apply to the Farmers Home Administration for loans to develop and operate income-producing outdoor recreation projects.

All this—and more—is rural areas development. It begins when local people take over the solution of their own problems in the ways that Americans have always solved their problems. When local people take over the development job, they are prepared to use the many different kinds of help available to them from local sources, and from the State and Federal Governments.

It is not enough today for a rural businessman, no matter how ambitious or how able, to work alone. But what one individual or one businessman or one town might not be able to do alone, all of the people in a trade area, or a market area, or a labor area, might be able to do together, with outside encouragement and help.

Rural areas development does not expect to stop migration from farms and rural areas. It is an attempt to offer young rural people more than just a choice between poverty and moving away. Rural areas development is designed to make the best use of rural land and all other rural resources, so that all people will benefit. Rural areas development does not mean uprooting people, but giving them an opportunity in their own areas; rural areas development does not mean idling land, but using it for the things people want.

Rural areas development is coordinated free enterprise at its finest. It is a way for the various agencies of government to help those communities which want to help themselves.

Rural areas development not only is providing "seed money" and technical aid, but it is encouraging communities to take their own causes to heart. For example, leaders in one county apply for a Farmers Home Administration loan for a water system or an Area Redevelopment Administration loan for new sewers. Then the people of another county seeing that change and progress are possible, strike out on their own to lure an industry or float a bond issue. This is the ultimate rural areas development, with Federal agencies helping to pool ideas, to stimulate the flow of cash and energy. Rural areas development means that small towns and villages will gather enough courage, cooperation, and foresight to promote their own fortunes, with help from many sources.

As these projects move forward, we should remember that rural areas development in its present form, with new and expanded authorizations, began only 6 months ago. Four basic programs in rural areas development—rural renewal, resource conservation and development, cropland conversion, and new programs for small watershed development—have only recently been authorized by the Congress. There is no set date for completion. These projects are intended to meet today's needs and as far into the future as we can see.

In the 1960's we must explore not only outer space, but the open spaces in rural areas, where one-third of our people live, where our soil, water, and forests are. Since 1926, farm population has dropped from 27 percent to 8 percent of our total population. Our population is expected to double by the year 2000. It is entirely possible that our most precious resource in the year 2000 will be elbow room. As our cities continue to expand, as one city bumps up against another, as we begin to appreciate first hand what megalopolis means, as coastlines become continuous shoreline neighborhoods, then we will come to appreciate fully how valuable our rural areas are.

Mr. President, as we move to solve today's rural problems with coordinated Government aid to local people, we must understand that the local people are our greatest resource. Their will, their determination, their energy and their labor will create a new rural America. We must search out what the rural America of the year 2000 will be like; what it should be like.

This should be the role of the Commission on Rural Life. The values and traditions of the open country are important to preserve. As life becomes more complex, as we become more removed from the sources of our food, from open spaces and green living things, as the fast car and good road make rural areas more accessible, we will cherish the living tree, the field of grass, and the open sky more than most of us realize today.

The Commission, in its studies throughout the Nation, also will find many excellent examples of progress in rural areas development and area redevelopment. Not all of these are big, dramatic projects, but if you live in the tiny village of Buyck in northern St. Louis County of my State of Minnesota, you will find that a new wood-using plant, though small, is front page news to our local people.

The new plant, operated by Echo Timber Products, Inc., furnishes peeled posts and poles to a treating plant in Siren, Wis. At Siren the posts and poles are given a preservative treatment and marketed.

Timber for the new plant comes mainly from the Superior National Forest, where the company has 14 to 20 contract loggers cutting timber at the present time. In addition to the company operations, some wood is purchased from independent loggers operating in the same general area.

Six to ten men are employed at the plant, in addition to about 20 woodworkers and the independent loggers. The peeling plant produces about 6,000 cords of peeled posts and poles a year.

This is one example of what can be accomplished through local initiative with the assistance of Area Redevelopment Administration and Rural Areas Development projects.

The $89,000 project was initiated by Echo Timber Products, Inc., on May 8, 1962. Plans were presented to ARA with a request for a loan. Local financing provided $37,000 and an ARA loan made up the balance.

The project provides direct employment for about 30 men in the plant and woods. This brings an annual payroll of about $100,000 to the area. A $100,000 payroll might not arouse much notice in Chicago, Omaha, or Minneapolis, but it brings a welcome boost to the economy of Buyck and other nearby communities in northern St. Louis County, Minn.

A new industry creating 30 new jobs and a $100,000 annual payroll may not look like a spectacular contribution, but let us say that through what we learn from the Rural Life Commission and through stepped-up rural areas development, we are able to create 1,000 new 30-job enterprises in the Nation. We then would be talking about 30,000 new jobs and a $100 million dollar annual payroll. No opportunity, however small, should be overlooked. We need the Rural Life Commission to evaluate what the Nation is doing in its rural areas and to give new direction and spark wherever it is needed.

Mr. President, the agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture carrying responsibility for the interlocking activities that result in the rural areas development program are: Office of Rural Areas Development, Federal Extension Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Farmer Cooperative Service, Forest Service, Cooperative State Experiment Station Service, Agricultural Research Service, Economics Research Service, Office of Information, and Agricultural Marketing Service. These agencies serve on the Department's RAD Board. In addition, the Farm Credit Administration, an independent agency, is a member of the Board. I ask unanimous consent that brief descriptions of the rural area development activities of these agencies—and Farm Credit Administration—be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF AGENCY RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

1. Office of Rural Areas Development: Provides leadership and initiative in the Department of Agriculture for formulating rural areas development policies and programs. Expedites activity and coordinates work in all agencies which can contribute to the rural areas development program, both within and outside the Department of Agriculture. Some 2,000 county rural areas development committees have been organized already and they have over 8,000 projects planned or underway in all 50 States.

2. Federal Extension Service: Provides organization and education leadership to States and counties. Helps organize rural areas development committees to include agriculture, industry, local government, civic, finance, education, labor, religious and other groups. Helps rural areas development committees to study their areas, identify problems and carry out development programs. Some 50,000 local people held 1,400 rural areas development meetings in 1962, and 1,500 overall economic development programs have been planned.

3. Rural Electrification Administration: Makes rural electric and telephone loans. Borrowers (including cooperatives and private companies) may use the loans to extend their electric and telephone services in rural areas, and may finance industrial machinery and other equipment for their electricity customers. In the last 9 months, REA has made $141 million in electric loans and $34 million in telephone loans to stimulate commercial development and reduce unemployment in rural areas.

4. Farmers Home Administration: FHA representatives organize and help head State and county technical action panels, composed of representatives from all local USDA agencies. These panels help local rural areas development committees to use all the information and aid possible and help with development plans, training proposals and other technical assistance.

FHA makes loans to farmers and other rural people who cannot get reasonable loans from private sources. FHA also makes loans to public groups and associations for water and land development. New authority enables FHA to make loans for farm recreation businesses, housing for the elderly, and community water systems. In the first 7 months of fiscal 1963, FHA made the following loans:

Farm operating loans	$175,000,000
Farm ownership loans	127,000,000
Housing loans	136,000,000
Soil and water development loans	5,600,000
Emergency loans	28,500,000
Watershed loans	117,000

FHA is helping farmers and rural communities to help themselves, when they cannot get help elsewhere.

5. Soil Conservation Service: Gives technical help, through soil conservation districts, for soil surveys, in planning and carrying out farm conservation programs, watershed protection and flood prevention work, cropland conversion and income producing outdoor recreation.

SCS representatives help head local technical action panels and help plan for water supplies and land-use adjustment.

6. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Gives financial help for farm and community conservation work, and cropland conversion, through its cost-sharing program. Helps to make agricultural adjustments for both commercial farmers and marginal farmers through loans, price supports, and on-farm storage of crops. Provides information to help local industry and people engaged in rural areas development. Helps head local technical action panels.

7. Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Insures farm crops against unforeseen hazards, spreading the risk throughout many regions and over many crop years. Provides income stability to both the farmer and the community.

8. Farmer Cooperative Service: Provides information on farm co-ops on developing rural communities, helping them to use cooperatives for marketing, buying and other services. Aids cooperatives to do a more efficient job and better serve their members.

9. Forest Service: Manages national forests and national grasslands, often an integral part of developing a rural area. Conducts research in forest recreation, land management and wood processing. Makes feasibility studies in connection with plans for forest products manufacturing.

10. Research support for expanding rural areas development—three agencies support rural areas development with basic and applied research:

Cooperative State Experiment Station Service: State experiment stations, in cooperation with CSESS, conduct research and provide facts on rural population and its problems within the State. Representatives served on rural areas development committees. Research is being carried out, for example, in land and water economics, population analysis, and social economics of rural life.

Agricultural Research Service: Provides technical advice on industrial processing plants which may be under consideration by rural areas development committees.

Economic Research Service: Provides information used in designating rural development areas to the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce.

Performs research in problems of low income rural areas development. A sister agency, the Statistical Reporting Service, helps technical action panels to find facts on production, costs and income, as needed by rural areas development committees.

11. Farm Credit Administration: This is an independent agency of the Federal Government. The FCA system includes: Federal land banks and associations (make farm real estate loans), production credit associations (make production loans to farmers), and banks for cooperatives (make various loans to farmer cooperatives).

12. Office of Information: Rural areas development cuts across agency lines, thus information work must be closely coordinated. This Office produces materials for all mass media, issues a monthly rural areas development newsletter to some 40,000 people, coordinates information efforts of USDA and non-USDA agencies (emphasizing importance of local leadership and initiative), and produces material in connection with the work of the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, in rural areas.

13. Agricultural Marketing Service: This agency provides counsel and advice on the feasibility of and assists in planning market facilities. It also provides current data on the volume and direction of movement and prices of products moving to market.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when we see the array of facilities and agencies which are available to implement the policies and programs which are made possible by rural areas development, it is obvious that this is a valuable opportunity for the improvement of America's rural economic and social life. I am hopeful that Congress will act favorably on this proposal.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment, according to the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, June 13, 1963.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 11, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be medical directors

Alice M. Waterhouse
David Frost
Lynn L. Fulkerson
George N. Wagnon
Walter C. Clowers
John R. McGibony
Charles S. McCammon
Richard A. Malmgren
Roger K. McDonald
Andrew G. Morrow
Robert O. Scow
James H. Baxter
David Brand
Milton Zises
Robert C. Lam
Howard L. McMartin
Charles M. Grace
Dale C. Cameron
Celia W. Tabor
Leon Sokoloff
Wesley W. Wieland

To be directors

Charles E. Smith
James F. Scott
William J. Pennoyer
Oscar B. Tate
Harry J. Kunstadter
Sidney J. Winter
Charles P. White

To be sanitary engineer directors

William A. McQuary
James D. Williams
Aleck Alexander
Clyde F. Fehn
Frederick S. Kent
Charles R. Bowman
Earl H. Arnold
Keith S. Krause
Lloyd W. Gebhard

To be pharmacist directors

Henry L. Verhulst
Reede M. Ames

To be senior pharmacists

Cornelius B. Kelly, Jr.
Milton W. Skolaut
Frank E. Dondero
Allen J. Brands

To be scientist directors

Frederick F. Ferguson
Raymond L. Laird
Floyd O. Atchley
Bernard Brookman
Fay M. Hemphill
Walter L. Newton
Geoffrey M. Jeffery
R. Edward Bellamy
Robert J. Fitzgerald
Paul P. Weinstein
William B. Cherry
Harvey I. Scudder
Joseph H. Schubert
Charles R. Joyce
Morris Goldman
Richard B. Eads

To be senior scientist

Joseph B. Margolin

To be sanitarian directors

Richard F. Clapp
Darold W. Taylor
Louis J. Ogden
Kent S. Littig

To be senior sanitarians

Clarence E. Calbert
Harold E. Thompson, Jr.
George A. Amundson
Charles E. Gerhardt
Samuel M. Rogers

To be nurse directors

Josephine I. O'Connor
Emily M. Smith
M. Estelle Hunt
Esther Kaufman
Apollonia O. Adams
Ann F. Matthews
Jeannette E. Potter
Jane Wilcox
Josephine K. Fitzpatrick
Maria B. Rementeria

To be senior nurse officers

Helen Grosskopf
Walborg S. Wayne
Jean W. Gray
Agnes V. Herrington
Gladys M. Ray
Elizabeth G. Sullivan
Agnes H. Des Marais
Marie D. Grant
Elinor D. Stanford
Anastasia M. Zahler
Florence J. Ullman
Mary F. Luvisi
Elsie K. Y. Ho
Dorine J. Loso
Elizabeth Kuhlman
Faye G. Abdellah
Elizabeth J. Haglund

To be dietitian director

Engla J. Anderson

To be senior dietitians

Margaret V. Vance
Dorothy M. Youland
Jeanne L. Tillotson
Susanne C. Van Leuzen

To be therapist director

Eleanor G. Loomis

To be senior therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be senior health services officers

William H. Redkey
Margaret E. Heap
Stanley I. Hirsch
Evelyn Walker
Heber J. R. Stevenson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*

O Thou blessed and eternal God, inspire us daily with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

Give us a clear vision of our high vocation as coworkers with Thee in building the social order in the principles of righteousness and justice.

Show us how we may safeguard and develop the material resources and interests of our beloved country but above all may we seek to protect and promote its moral and spiritual values.

May we be sensitive and responsive to the many needs of suffering and struggling humanity and be eager to have them enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of God.

In the name of our blessed Lord we offer our prayers of praise and petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 521. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children;

S. 522. An act to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers;

S. 525. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; and

S. 526. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the inclusion in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances, it is my intention, after much reflection, and in the interest of economy, fairness, and commonsense, and in the hope that this action will direct attention to the desirability of adopting rules regulating the insertion and extension of extraneous material, both in the body and in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, to object to unanimous-consent requests for the extension of remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD when such requests exceed more than one such request on any single legislative day.

By way of explanation I would like to point out that up to today the cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the 5 months period the 88th has been in session has exceeded more than $1¼ million.

On one single day, Tuesday of last week, the cost exceeded $27,000. While I am not objecting to the expenditure of funds for any essential service in Congress, I would point out that a large portion of this cost has been occasioned by the printing of speeches, many times including extraneous and in some cases irrelevant matter, and by the extension of remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD by Members who are not even interested sufficiently to appear on the floor of the House, and therefore, have such requests made by a second and even a third party. In such cases the RECORD ceases to be an account of the proceedings or debates in this House. Over the past few years the Appendix has ceased to conform to its original purpose, and has become instead a "catchall" for what I have previously described as "trash, tripe, and trivia," the publication of which cannot be justified by any reasonable standards.

I have long felt, and on occasions have introduced legislation which would have placed reasonable limitations on the use of the Appendix of the daily RECORD, as well as the body of the RECORD, which I believe would save many hundreds of thousands of dollars and possibly millions of dollars each year.

Other Members have also recognized the abuses, but unfortunately, no steps have been taken to correct the abuses which continue to mount. That is why I am proposing today to object to the extension of remarks by any Member who does not confine his unanimous-consent request to one instance on any legislative day, and to object to any such request when it is made by one Member on behalf of another Member who is not interested enough to appear on the floor of the House to make such request in person.

I would also propose to object to the inclusion of extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD when it is in the form of newspaper or periodical articles, editorials or other printed material, other than short excerpts from the same. This objection would also apply to testimony given before committees, speeches made by persons other than Members of Congress; tabulations taken from other Government publications or committee reports which are readily available to anyone who is interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think by this objection there will be reflected, for at least a few days, the saving that can be made if we adopted realistic rules.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] may revise and extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Abernethy
Ayres
Baring
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Cameron
Chelf
Clausen
Cohelan
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Goodell
Gray
Gubser
Halpern
Harris
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Horton
Kastenmeier
Kilburn
McDade
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Nelsen
Ostertag
Pepper
Pillion
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Roybal
St Germain
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Springer
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COAST GUARD CONFIRMS SOVIET TRAWLERS VIOLATED U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS OFF FLORIDA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard advised me late yesterday afternoon that two Soviet trawlers had violated U.S. territorial waters near the southeast Florida coast. According to the Coast Guard, one violation occurred Saturday, one occurred yesterday. The violation which occurred yesterday put the trawler at 2.2 miles off Port Everglades, Fla., and passing through an area of the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Laboratory at the port.

In each case the trawlers were kept under close surveillance as they moved down the coast toward Cuba.

Although I have reported similar violations to the proper authorities in Washington on several previous occasions, this marks the first time such violations have been officially confirmed.

What has been done about them? A check with the Departments of Defense and State this morning gave the answer—nothing.

This is a ridiculous set of conditions for this Government to operate under. A violation of U.S. airspace would be met with blistering protest. These violations are of the same order, and should be met with appropriate action.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to the length of the extraneous material that is to be included with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a relatively short article from the Geneva correspondent of the New York Times on trade matters. I would judge it does not consume more than a column.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would call the gentleman's attention to the statement I made a minute ago on the floor of the House. I will object to that matter appearing in the body of the Record, but I will not object to its appearing in the Appendix of the daily Record.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was nc objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, June 13, 1963, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include therein the remarks of Hon. Edward R. Murrow at East Carolina College yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to remind the gentleman again that I am objecting to the inclusion of remarks in the body of the Record which should appear in the Appendix of the daily Record, where they are readily available to the public. I shall object to including them in the body. I will not object to including them in the Appendix.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to insert his remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and to include extraneous matter.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, June 13, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and all other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my very good friend from Missouri, and he is my very good friend, would give me his reason for objecting to my request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in four instances and to include extraneous matter. The gentleman would not object to my extending my remarks in one instance, but does object to my extending my remarks in more than one instance. What in the reason?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman had heard my remarks made at the opening of the House today he would understand that I am trying to bring some reasonableness into the use of the Appendix of the daily Record. I think the gentleman can accomplish his purpose by asking for one extension. I think if he will read my remarks he will agree with what I am trying to do. I am trying to save a million dollars a year. I think we can do that without unduly harming any Member of this House or restricting him in any reasonable requests he may make.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting for the gentleman to know that I have not inserted any remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record for the past several weeks. I cannot see any reason why the gentleman should not withdraw his objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I announced earlier today that I was going to follow this policy until we can reach some agreement on a reasonable procedure.

NATIONAL REFERENDUM ON A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Public Opinion, better known as the Gallup poll, recently conducted a nationwide poll on the question of State-run lotteries. The results of this survey show that 51 percent of our adult population favors a State-run lottery to help pay the cost of government.

This nationwide poll further shows that while 10 percent of the people interviewed offered no opinion, only 39 percent opposed lotteries run by their State. Another interesting part of the survey shows that Protestants are almost evenly divided—43 percent for a State-run lottery and 46 percent opposed to this type of proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if the American taxpayers were given an opportunity to vote on the question of a national lottery as a means of cutting taxes, the percentage would be much higher in support of a Federal lottery.

In view of the reluctance and the unfounded fear among Members of Congress that a national lottery bill is a hot potato, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to report out my bill, H.R. 4026, which provides for a national referendum on this question. We did it recently for the farmers on the wheat issue; why not for all voters on the lottery question?

I am also certain that, given the chance, a vast majority of the American taxpayers will express full support and approval to a Government-run lottery. Overwhelming support of this proposition will represent a clearcut mandate to the Congress for favorable enactment of a national lottery.

Let us give the American voters a chance to voice their opinion on the question of how to raise additional revenue. Let them decide whether this type of painless and voluntary taxation is not a more palatable substitute for the burdensome taxes they now shoulder. Are we afraid of the results?

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House may once again consider Philippine war damage claims.

This issue has disrupted the normal friendly relations existing between the Government of the Philippines and the Government of the United States—a disruption caused by selfish interests trying to exploit deep feelings of love and respect held by Filipinos and Americans for each other.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues, who apparently were interested in certain news reports prior to the former passage of the bill to read the following five articles that recently appeared in the press.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair state the question.

The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks, and what?

Mr. BARRY. And include five editorials that have appeared in the newspapers with respect to the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to that appearing in the Appendix of the daily Record. I do object to its appearing in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Objection to the latter request is heard.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the five editorials appear in the Appendix of the daily Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF HUNGARY TO UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 I called attention to a telegram sent to me by Mr. Christopher Emmet, one of the officers of the Captive Nations Organization, warning me and Members of the House that the government of Mr. Kadar, of Hungary, was shortly to be admitted to the United Nations with full rights of membership.

At the time I told several of my colleagues in the House that I intended to watch this and follow through on the proceedings. They were a little doubtful. It was their right. They thought probably it was not true, that it was an erroneous report.

I should like to tell the House that last week this became an accomplished fact, and that the delegation of the United States abstained from voting. It would seem almost better to support the Hungarian regime than merely to abstain in a weak-kneed manner and allow them to come into the U.N. This is the same government that slaughtered freedom-loving Hungarians not long ago. This is the same government that has held Cardinal Mindszenty captive in our legation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been very unfortunate, and that our stand in the matter is deplorable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in one instance and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking loud enough to be heard. The Chair did not state the request of the gentleman from Iowa. I think there is a deliberate move to try to avoid objection. I reserve the right to object to this request until it is stated in terms that can be understood.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in one instance and include extraneous matter about legislation which we are going to take up on the floor of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, you know when these new problems of procedure come up, it is often wise for ordinary Members of the House to inquire among friends just what the rules are. The rules seem to have been changed on the insertion of extraneous material either in the body of the Record or in the Appendix of the daily Record.

I would like to inquire of my good friend who has been making some few objections just what the rules are. For example, when our mutual good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Gavin, requested unanimous consent to place his remarks including four inserts into the Appendix of the daily Record and to include extraneous material from newspapers, the objection was made. Then the gentleman from New York, Congressman Barry, likewise a Republican and likewise a good friend of all of us, asked unanimous consent to put his remarks in the body of the Record including extraneous material in four instances. Objection was going to be made, that this could not be done under these new rules, but if the remarks including the four inserts were put into the Appendix of the daily Record there would be no objection. Therefore, under such rules we have the Gavin request ruled one way and the Barry request the other—both good friends and both Republicans, so there was no partisan consideration. How does this result occur? I would appreciate hearing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there has been no change whatever in the rules of the House. When unanimous-consent requests are made, objections may be made by any Member of the House and, of course, that is no change in the rules of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I really was not questioning the majority leader on the change of the written House rules because I know, as you do, there are none since the rules of this Congress were adopted and we have every respect for your leadership. But on the other hand, when we have the fine, self-appointed angels who are making rules by practice from the well of the House, I think we ought to inquire.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD, IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD AND TO INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATTER

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] the distinction between the requests made by the two gentlemen to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] referred, is this:

In part 1, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] asks for permission to extend his remarks in four instances in the Appendix of the daily Record. The other request was to extend remarks in one instance, and to include four articles.

Mr. Speaker, that might represent a fine distinction but there is a limitation on the amount that can be expended on any one extension in the Record.

I would call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] and request that when the Record appears tomorrow the gentleman refer to the statement which I made at the beginning of this session today explaining the reason I was making these objections today.

While I am not setting myself up as a censor, while I am on my feet I think there are others present in the Chamber who can concur in what I am attempting to do. I am now soliciting volunteers to assist me in this effort and thereby save some money in the printing of the Record and bring about some semblance of order and commonsense in the application of the Rules of the House. I will welcome the cooperation of any Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to set myself up as a censor in this regard but I am merely trying to call attention to some of the things that have been going on which I do not think are in the interest of the taxpayers of America.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I ask the gentleman, in all kindness and friendship——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be given 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that at this point such unanimous-consent request is not in order and cannot be entertained by the Chair.

VIOLATIONS OF AIRSPACE OVER THE UNITED STATES BY CUBA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard again that the territorial waters of the United States are being violated by Russian trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called this fact to the attention of the Members of the House as well as to the State Department that the Communists, through Cuba, are also violating the airspace over the United States and have been doing so for some time. The only answer which I have been able to secure from the executive branch of the Government is the fact that the FAA issued a regulation to permit Cuban airlines, nonscheduled, to overfly the United States as long as they landed at one of the major airports, which includes Dulles Airport, located right outside of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of the Government, and objected as well to U.S. citizens going to Cuba through Mexico for training in subversion. The answer to that was that the Mexican Government would not cut off such travel and that, therefore, we could not cut it off since this was outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have communicated with representatives of the executive branch of the Government about this, and the first reply I received was the President's talk yesterday when he said that the United States must, in fact, reexamine its attitude toward Russia; that we must increase our understanding between the United States and Russia. Also, to do this we must increase communications. This evidently means the travel of U.S. citizens to Cuba, the flight of Cuban airplanes over the United States, and even the violation of our territorial waters by Communist trawlers.

OBJECTIONS TO UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] who seems to be acting as minority leader today, the fact that when he says there is some responsibility on the part of the majority leader to protect the rights of the Members of the House with respect to unanimous-consent requests, that that same responsibility devolves upon the minority leader of the House insofar as unanimous-consent requests are concerned.

What caused my objection to the special orders the other day was the fact that for the first time in 15 years I requested a special order, and it was objected to by a Member on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, I am not being partisan about it, but I am objecting to all special orders.

In view of the fact that it is reported frequently in the press that we will be here until November, if we can keep these special orders from being taken which consume several hours a day, perhaps we can get out in October.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] may be permitted the opportunity in one instance to insert his remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and to include therein four newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object on the ground that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] is here I think he can make his own request. I, therefore, object to the request of the other gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman already addressed the House for 1 minute today?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets that the gentleman's request is not in order at this time. The Chair wants to be very liberal, but he must enforce the procedures that exist at this particular period of the day's proceedings.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has been denied through the objection of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], that they be included in one request. What I am trying to say is that there are four different subjects, and they could not possibly fit into one request.

Therefore, I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that I cannot tie them in together.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman speaking on the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the gentleman's observations, of course, will be a part of the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from Ambassador J. H. van Roijen, of the Netherlands, on the death of our late colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador, in reference to the death of our late colleague Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 10, 1963.*

The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Netherlands Minister of Social Affairs has asked me to transmit to you the expression of his deepfelt sympathy on the occasion of the untimely death of Congressman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania. The Minister wishes me to add that the Netherlands emigration authorities, who owe so much to the late Congressman Walter's interest in their problems and in the plight of the refugees in general, will always remember Congressman Walter with sincere gratitude.

I should be most grateful if this message of condolence could be passed on to the family of Congressman Walter through your kind intermediary.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Speaker,
Very sincerely yours,
J. H. VAN ROIJEN,
Netherlands Ambassador.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6868, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we present today the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1964. At the outset I should like to express my appreciation to two new members of the subcommittee who worked directly on the bill with us this year, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN]. Also, of course, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] who have been on this subcommittee for some years.

I am proud to be able to tell the House that they worked hard and faithfully on this bill, and we have tried to bring our annual housekeeping bill to the membership in as good order and in as good form as is practicable for us to do. We have tried to extend the hearings on the affairs of the Congress in the hearings, so that all who desired to know more of the detail of what we do and why we do it might have that information. We have supported the bill this year with a more lengthy report than usual in a further effort to bring to the membership and to the country more detail about our housekeeping affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you totals $140,038,919. This is a reduction of $8,541,326 from the budget estimate but $22,020,509 above the appropriations for the same items in fiscal 1963. I include a table here.

Summary of the bill

Group	Appropriations, 1963 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1964	Committee bill, 1964	Committee bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964
House of Representatives	$49,520,130	$50,772,950	$50,131,550	+$611,420	−$641,400
Joint items	5,380,660	6,297,515	6,271,369	+890,709	−26,146
Architect of the Capitol (excludes Senate items)	16,350,750	31,398,500	30,744,200	+14,393,450	−654,300
Botanic Garden	452,000	483,000	462,000	+10,000	−21,000
Library of Congress	19,905,340	21,252,400	20,487,800	+582,460	−764,600
Government Printing Office	26,409,530	38,375,880	31,942,000	+5,532,470	−6,433,880
Total (excludes all Senate items)	118,018,410	148,580,245	140,038,919	+22,020,509	−8,541,326

NOTE.—Includes all appropriations for 1963 (including the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963) and all budget estimates for 1964 for items covered to date of reporting of this bill. Omits all items pertaining to the Senate.

Part of the reason for the increase in the total amount of money provided for in this bill over 1963 has been brought about by the general pay increases common to all the bills and other increased costs, some of which have been caused by an increase in the volume of work in some of the agencies contained in this bill, and the remainder has been because of the inclusion of a number of nonrecurring capital investment items. As a matter of fact, the new nonrecurring capital items in this bill more than exceed $23 million. The approval of this bill will bring the capital investment program that has been underway on Capitol Hill for the last 15 years much closer to a final windup. The $20 million provided for in this bill for the new House office building and other improvements, the purchase of a great amount of land, and the clearing of that land, the construction of the House office building and its equipment, and other authorized items will make that total investment to date come to $114 million. We can now expect a very sizable decrease in this part of the bill next year, even if some other authorized items are finally decided upon for prosecution.

About the only major item we will have left next year in the way of major construction if this bill is approved, so far as we now know, will be about $4,237,000 to finish up the work around the new House Office Building and the new garage proposed in this bill. Of course, nothing has yet been authorized for a very badly needed new Library Building. And there is the matter of remodeling the two existing buildings.

In addition to the money provided here for carrying on and completing much of the capital investment work, we have in the bill $8,500,000 as a capital item to bring the revolving fund of the Government Printing Office up to needs. This is an operating item needed to handle the ever-increasing volume of work.

We also have in here one capital investment item that will be nonrecurring of $2,225,000 to provide for a new water and sewer system for the main Library of Congress Building. The building is 66 years old and the plumbing has become so badly deteriorated that there is no way it can be successfully repaired; we have included this with some other smaller capital items for that institution. There may be a few other items come along for that old building.

We have deleted a capital item asked for to start a warehouse at the Government Printing Office. That item will probably be back in another year or so. They had to call off the project temporarily until they can bring it into conformity with some of the redevelopment plans currently involved in that area of Washington.

There will probably be a few more items that the Congress will probably be asked to take up in the next few years, having to do with the final completion of the long-range capital investment program that has been undertaken. But that is for the future.

Since the end of World War II, and at the time when this whole program of capital investment will be finished, in probably the next year or so, we will have invested some $280 million in new land, buildings, tunnels, facilities, and replacements, in all the Capitol properties and other institutions supported in this bill.

It might be helpful to present some information on the New House Office Building. There seems to be more misinformation noised around than there is information. In the hope that I might put the record straight, there are a few statistics in connection with that building I would like to give the House at this time. This is a building that will have a final cost of about $71 million-plus, with fixtures and equipment running the total overall cost to about $80,350,000. That includes, besides the building itself, the purchase of the land and building of the sewer under it, the architectural and engineering fees, and the furniture and furnishings. You will recall that earlier this session $3,500,000 was authorized to buy the furniture and furnishings needed for the New House Office Building, or the Rayburn Building, as it will be known. The figures are on page 13 of the committee report and they are in the printed hearings. This building when completed will have a gross square foot area of 2,375,000 square feet. The gross square foot area, excluding the garage in the building, will be 1,373,000 square feet. The net usable space will be 935,000 square feet. The cubic content of the building will be 33,600,000 cubic feet of space.

The cost of the building, if we are successful in keeping the actual cost to the $71.5 million figure that now seems possible, will average approximately $30 per square foot of gross space. The cost per cubic foot of space on this cost figure will be $2.13. The national average for comparative buildings as given by the Engineering News Record, December 1962, which is supposed to be an authority, is $29.13 a square foot and $2.10 a cubic foot. That means that the cost of this building is almost exactly that of the national average for comparable types of buildings.

To give a little better comparison, these are underway in the city of Washington now certain Government buildings that are costing more than $30 a square foot, and there are many privately constructed office buildings going up in this part of the country and other metropolitan areas costing more than the $30 average.

We had cited to us, for instance, one building in New York City where the square foot cost is about $45. While the amount of money involved here is large, this also happens to be a very large building. We have space in this building for the parking of some 1,600 cars. There are three-room suites for 169 Members. There are 9 major committee rooms with the attendant service rooms and conference rooms, telephone rooms, and so forth, as well as staff rooms; 16 subcommittee rooms, 5 dining rooms, a cafeteria seating 700 plus people and considerable space for the various service units, like health rooms, and things of that sort.

We believe that on any basis of comparison this building is in line with what would be considered good practice as to its utility, as to its cost and as to its probable longstanding permanency.

I thought the Members would like to know some of these figures because there has been so much said about the building, and unfortunately not enough of it has been accurate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Turning to page 196 of the hearings, it states that:

> A total of $94 million has been appropriated for the additional House Office Building project to date.

Mr. STEED. As I said, there are a lot of items connected with this investment program other than the third office building itself. My remarks here are confined to one part of the program, the building itself. The cost of land, equipment and furniture, the sewer, and engineering fees, added to the actual building cost will run the total to about $80 million. In addition to that we have over the years purchased other land and have made other constructions, including the proposed garages, the East Front Extension and work for the body on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. How can you put the west front under the language contained here that I have just read, a total of $94 million appropriated for the House Office Building project to date? How do you get the west part of the Capitol in the additional House Office Building project to date?

Mr. STEED. There is no west front money now in the bill, or ever. There is money in the bill for the east front, under a separate appropriation, but the work the gentleman is speaking of; elevators and that sort of thing, is part of the cost of the tunnel connecting the Capitol to the Rayburn Building, and that is included in this $118,237,000 that will have been spent when the whole project, including all items is finished somewhere in the next 2 or 3 years. We have already for all these purposes, under the some appropriation head, which includes the House Office Building itself, appropriated $94 million. We have $20 million more in this bill, which will bring the total to $114 million. Then there still would be estimated obligations outstanding of $4,237,000 as of June 1964 for work done up to that time. The new House Office Building is part of this whole program. The difficulty comes, the confusion often comes, by erroneously assuming or believing that the cost of the whole program, including the cost of land and everything else that has gone on, was all for the third or additional House Office Building itself but as a matter of fact it is not the whole program by some $30 million to date.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying this building is ever going to be completed?

Mr. STEED. It will be; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GROSS. If it is completed it will be at a total cost of approximately $80 million, is that correct, ready to go, $80 million?

Mr. STEED. That is the best figure the Architect of the Capitol can give us at this point. I think it will probably prove to be accurate.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the swimming pool?

Mr. STEED. That does include the swimming pool, the gymnasiums, and everything you have heard about that is in the building.

Mr. GROSS. It is now up to $71 million, and it will be completed for $9 million more. Is that correct?

Mr. STEED. What I have done in trying to make this clear is probably confusing the gentleman. As to the building itself, you had to buy the land, you had to have the architectural and engineering fees and the furniture and furnishings. We have tried to group all that together in a total item, a lump sum of $80 million, approximately. If you do not include that you have a building that costs you $71.5 million. I am trying to make this clear to the House without confusing the issue. The $80 million includes the architectural and engineering fees, the purchase of the land on which the building stands, the purchase of the furniture and equipment, and those items. In addition, we have made other investments by including the east front extension, the purchase of several acres of land, and clearing it, and things like that.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the hearings. I could find only one paragraph in the hearings on the swimming pool. I found nothing in the report on the swimming pool. I note one member of the Building Commission is sitting very close to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Can the gentleman from Georgia, if the gentleman from Oklahoma cannot do it, tell me what this swimming pool is going to cost?

Mr. STEED. That has not been determined yet.

Mr. GROSS. When do you expect it to be determined?

Mr. STEED. Very soon, in negotiations with the contractor. I hope the gentleman does not insist that it be in the record today. That might encourage the contractor to want to charge us more for getting the work done than if we gave him a chance to work it out. I can tell the gentleman the size of the swimming pool is only 20 by 60 feet.

Mr. GROSS. What will be taken out to make room for the swimming pool?

Mr. STEED. Nothing is being taken out.

Mr. GROSS. Why did you have to have a change in the specifications or whatever it was in the plans?

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman wants that sort of detail, I think in fairness to the committee, he ought to go to the field office where the architects and the engineers can show him copies of the contract and blueprints and all those details. I do not have all those things with me and I make no pretense of knowing all the details.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I want to thank the gentleman first for trying to clarify this, but in response to his final statement, there have been individuals who have gone to whom we thought were knowledgeable people on this project and they could not get the information. I call your attention to page 272 of the hearings where Mr. Roberts, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, said:

> Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is the time to bring it up, but talking about the Rayburn Building, as far as economy and service is concerned, I wrote the architect a letter in 1962 about space for a new stationery room, file room, library, and property custodian. I have not received any answer so far. If they are going to provide those quarters, if they would do it now it would result in a big saving to the Government rather than wait until the building is completed and then tear it all up and provide those rooms.

Now the Clerk of the House of Representatives apparently has not been able to get an answer on what is going where in this building or if it, indeed, is going to have any facilities.

Mr. STEED. There again you get into a situation which is not quite as simple as the gentleman might think. The assignment of space on the House side, as the gentleman knows, begins with the Speaker. There have been certain designations of authority. Now what the powers that be are going to do with this space, I do not think anybody is in a position to tell you at this time. I do believe provisions have been made for every foreseeable need, and since there will be for the time being some surplus space, I cannot conceive of anybody or any function or any section having to do with the service of the House of Representatives being unable to get suitable quarters, if they can show the need for it. I do not believe there is going to be any need for modification or repairs or changes that is going to involve any great amount of money.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. When the gentleman cited some figures concerning the comparative costs of buildings by private industry and with this Government building, is the cost figure for the new House Office Building, the Rayburn Building, computed on the basis of all the cubic feet and all the square feet of the garage?

Mr. STEED. We gave each its part. I thought I tried to make that clear as to the gross space and the net usable space.

Mr. KYL. In other words, we are comparing garage space with office space in a private building; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Oh, no, we break that down too. The gross square foot area of the building excluding the garage is 1,373,000 of which there is 935,000 square feet of usable space in that part of the building, which does not include the garage.

Mr. KYL. The Pentagon which is the biggest office building in the world up to this time cost $83 million. In New York the newest and most luxurious skyscraper, the Seagram Building which is a metal and glass structure 38 stories high, cost $41 million. I will bet you they knew what the cost of the Seagram Building was going to be before they had it under construction.

Mr. STEED. I am advised that the Seagram Building cost $45 per square foot as against our $30 per square foot.

Mr. KYL. But it does not have a three story garage in the basement?

Mr. STEED. I personally do not know, but the figures I used were given to me as being comparative costs. I got them from the Architect. I believe them to be correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. On pages 11 and 12 of the report of the committee I notice discussion about the extension of the western face of the Capitol.

I hope that the committee will see to it that Congress is well advised and notified long in advance of any proposal to spend any money for the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

The reason why I make these remarks is because in the language which appears on page 12 of the report there is reference to the necessity of getting it underway because of the monolithic columns which are to be erected.

My feeling about this is illustrated by what happened before the Armed Services Committee. Not long ago that committee, and also Congress, were allowed the privilege of looking at the design for the Air Force Academy Chapel. There were feelings both for and against what ultimately transpired. There are now feelings for and against what may be done to the western face of the Capitol. When it is erected, if it is going to be a new face, we will cover then the last portion of the 18th Century portion of the Capitol now available for public view. The public will no longer be able to view any exterior part of the Capitol which was built prior to 1800 when and if this is done.

I think there are some substantial historical esthetic and financial views which should be considered in any discussion of the extension of the western portion of the Capitol. Of course, there is only one comment in the bill that I can see which has any reference to the extension of the Capitol and that appears on lines 10, 11, and 12 of page 12 of the report.

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to give the gentleman from Florida some information on this subject. The $700,000 which is contained in this bill winds up the east front extension of the Capitol, and here again, the total appropriations covered reach more than the extension per se, as the committee report sets forth on page 11. There is no money in here for the west front. The Committee on Appropriations merely calls the attention of the Congress to a situation which exists, because in our opinion the Congress is either going to have to face that situation or take the responsibility for not doing so. If the Engineers know what they are talking about the building is deteriorating. Nature takes its toll. Since we had this information we felt it was our duty to call it to the attention of the House.

The gentleman might be interested to know that we have been told that the special joint commission which planned for the construction of the east front also has authority in the same law to proceed with the west front.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the Members of Congress knew that when they passed that law.

Mr. STEED. I am trying to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that it is important to know about this and assume if proper notice is given to responsible House Members and Members of the other body that in due time and in their own way they will find the proper answer to it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one further statement. I hope I am one who believes in saving every penny we can. But there are certain responsibilities that just have to be met. In total, however liberal or however tight you make it, I think it is important for us to put it in perspective. This bill in toto—this is one of the three branches of the Government, the legislative branch, and we have to carry the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and some other activities—as compared against the total Federal budget, is in the same relationship that a 5-cent piece is to a $1,000 bill. However, I do not think that just because it is a minute part of the total Federal budget there should be any waste in it. But I do think it is important for the Members to realize its perspective in regard to what the total cost of the Federal operations amounts to and where it lies.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I know the sincerity of my good friend from Oklahoma. We served on the same committee some years ago. I read in the paper the other day that now we find blank walls instead of stone walls, and where there should be a door from the Member's office into the regular business office.

Mr. STEED. Let me tell the gentleman that when the 169 Members occupy the Rayburn building there are some who may like to have an additional door at a particular place as we have discussed. In the building as they are now building it, that spot happens to be a coat closet for the administrative assistant. It will be a very inexpensive matter to have a door put through there, if the Members want it, and if the powers that be will let them do it. It would depend to a great extent on how many Members want to make the change.

Mr. BECKER. As I read it in the paper, this was a mistake.

Mr. STEED. There was no mistake. A door can be put there. It is a matter of personal opinion as to whether that needs to be done. At the time the suggestion was made it was thought it would be nicer to have the extra door. An estimate was made as to what it would cost to put the doors in. That is the figure the gentleman has. So it was decided not to do that. We are not putting the door in. We are putting in a little clothes closet. At some future date, if a Member insisted on having a door there, and if the Speaker and the committee in charge is willing to permit a door to be put there, it could be put there at nominal cost.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman will concede it is a most peculiar situation when a Member or a businessman in a private office must go through the reception room to get to where his employees are working, rather than to go from his office direct. I think that is a rather peculiar architectural design.

Mr. STEED. Has the gentleman been over to see the building?

Mr. BECKER. Not recently, since this has developed.

Mr. STEED. It is pretty hard to describe the physical layout. I think if the gentleman went over to see it he would find it is a matter of interest to some Members to have the extra door, whereas many other Members would not want a door. It is a matter of opinion as to whether or not a door should be there or not.

What I am trying to say is that if the gentleman from New York thinks it is important to have a door there, that door can be made available to him at a nominal cost if he occupies a suite in that building.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing here today a reasonable explanation of some of the things that have been worrying many Members of Congress. What has happened, of course, is past and gone. The gentleman is trying to clear up some of the things in which there has been a great deal of misunderstanding. It is not the fault of the gentleman now presenting the bill or the report.

I think the real cause of this is lack of information that the Members of the Congress have had or less information that you would normally expect on a project so close to the Congress. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] should not be criticized. If anyone should be criticized, it is the Commission who have charge of this program who have not kept Congress informed as to what they were doing. There has been a tremendous amount of expenditures here. Of course, the Congress is spending public money, and I think they should have had an opportunity, and I refer to Members of the Congress, to know what was going on, but that has not been possible heretofore.

Mr. STEED. I may say this, that our committee has had the finest cooperation from everybody that has anything to do with this, and we have tried for the last 3 years, especially the last 2 years, to get on record as many details about what we were doing as we possibly could. And, I think we have put the essential details in the record, and I know that the Members do need to know this. I am sorry that some Members apparently do not read the hearings, or do not read the reports, or do not make inquiry and try to help us get more information. I think we all might be saved a lot of criticism and difficulty if we had a way to get more of the facts truly told to the public. We need these facilities, and I think we are getting a pretty good run for our money. We only have the comparison of what other people have to pay for similar construction, but on the basis of any comparison I know how to make, it seems to me we are pretty much in line with private industry throughout the country.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that coming here and explaining some of these things I think has thrown a good deal of light on some of these things that there has been some misunderstanding on. As far as I am concerned, there should be no criticism of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has done the best he could with the information available. If there has been a lack of information, it must of necessity fall back on the people who developed these things and not the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I will say to the gentleman from Florida we not only had a lot of misinformation about it and misunderstanding, but before we get through I expect there will be more, and with my name being on the bill, I will be the target. But, if the Members have any confidence in our committee, I have nothing to worry about.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether you have taken any notice in the questions that have been asked, about sinks. There has been the matter of doors that I understand has been discussed here today; the door going from the assistants' office to the work office. The only way for the Member to get into the work office is through the reception room. I know you have discussed that. But, I do not know whether you have taken up the matter of putting in the sink pipes but no sinks. The answer I get from the people who are building it is "Those are the orders." Then anybody that has to use the pipes to fit the sinks has to tear it all out again, and that is double work. Why do we have to pay twice?

Mr. STEED. They tell me that the building is so equipped that if at some future date after occupancy a Member or Members wanted a sink, a sink could be installed. I do not know what the cost would be. We have had no estimate on it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I think it would be necessary to have an estimate on it.

Mr. STEED. Personally I do not know whether a Member would need a sink or not. There is one in the bathroom right across the hall.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. That is not a sink; that is a wash basin.

Mr. STEED. There are facilities included in this building that may be brought in at some future date, in the conduits for electric lines, for instance; the anticipation that some day in the future we may need more telephone circuits; the anticipation that some day there may be some sort of electrical signal system for the Members. There might even be closed television some day. They have tried to plan and design the building so that some of these standby features would be included when it was built, to obviate enormous costs to do it later. And, it is my understanding that that is part of the reason the plumbing was arranged so that if at some future date you needed a sink, one could be installed.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Well, I happen to be a Connecticut Yankee, and I like to get my money's worth. But, to pay twice for the same thing is stupid.

Mr. STEED. I am afraid if sinks were put in every suite, you would find many Members not needing them.

If the gentlewoman from Ohio can ever find anything we do around here that pleases all the Members, I would like to know it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I understand that too, but you do not have a woman on the committee, which is most unfortunate.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to put myself on record. I go back home asking my constituents to vote for me. When they come down here to Washington I do not run away from them. I do not understand this feeling of opposition because Members of Congress have to walk from their private office through the public office where their constituents are in order to reach the House. I do not understand this, and I think I am voicing the general sentiment of the House. My door is never closed. I do not have any private office. I do not want to have a lot of doors where I can secrete myself from my constituents. I want their votes and I want to serve them when they come here. They are my boss.

Mr. STEED. The Member does have a direct entrance from the corridor to his private office and if he wants to he can probably escape without anybody catching him.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not want to escape from my constituents, but I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma on the great job he is doing.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I want to congratulate the gentleman greatly. I think he has done a tremendous job along with the other members of the committee in an almost impossible situation. I do not know whether it ever occurred to anyone or not that if they wanted to see someone in the other office they could just push a button and ring a buzzer. I think all of this business about having doors cut through is a little bit ridiculous. I am a little like the gentleman from Illinois. If I live long enough to see that building completed—and I hope to live another 30 years, but I am not betting that I am going to see it completed—I would hope to have a suite there. I will take it the way it is, without cutting a door in it.

There is a question I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, which is this: I read in the paper this morning that the Department of Defense is going to rent all eight floors in a new office building over in Fairfax County. The article went on to say that the caissons were down and the foundations were in and they will start erecting the steel structure next week, and that the building will be occupied in November. If the gentleman can tell me what in the name of common sense has been going on here for the past 6 years, that they have not been able to finish that building. I will guarantee that it is some kind of a new record for the length of time needed to complete a building. Is it because the Architect of the Capitol does not know his business, which I suspect may be the truth?

Mr. STEED. No, I think if the gentleman will read the contracts, it is because of the enormous size of the building, and the conditions encountered, and so on. It has not been an undue length of time. There was a delay occasioned that delayed everybody involving a creek which they ran into and provision had to be made to take care of that. That held it up for many months.

Mr. HAYS. I know about that.

Mr. STEED. But aside from that this building is within 70 percent of completion and they tell me they are on schedule and on time according to the plans.

Mr. HAYS. I understand they are on schedule, but is there anything to the rumor going around here that this building is on a cost-plus basis? Is that correct?

Mr. STEED. No. It is on competitive bid.

Mr. HAYS. I understand. At least it was said here in our committee this morning that this thing is being scheduled and delayed so that the contractor does not get too much income in any one income tax period, and he can spread it out and pay less tax. What about that?

Mr. STEED. I do not know anything about that. That is something I have not heard of before. I will say this, by the time he gets through paying some of the penalties he will have to pay for delay under his contract he may not have any tax problem.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to say that this is a great investigation-minded place around here, and you might start an investigation of the Office of the Architect to see what comes out of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to comment on the more important matters, but I want to compliment the chairman and his committee for some language they have at the top of page 6 of the report, where mention is made of the lack of receptacles for cigarettes. I know that up here, when we bring our guests in, if they want to dispose of their cigarettes, there is not even a receptacle to put them in. I am pleased the committee recognizes that situation.

It is also mentioned that some people feel that the marble on this side of the Capitol is not as well kept as the marble on that side. I do not know if it is a good idea to wax that marble, because just this morning, as I walked over there for early morning breakfast, they just got through waxing the floor on the other side of the Capitol, and it is almost like skating on ice. I think it is quite dangerous. We have so many visitors here, I wonder if it is wise to wax our floors to the high degree of polish as they do over there.

I just offer that as an observation.

Mr. STEED. There could be something to what the gentleman says. We should be glad to look into that, give some thought to it, to see what may be done. The reference to waxing in the committee report was to the tile floor on the gallery floor.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I think it ought to be said here that we have provided some additional jobs, most of which are in agencies that are self-supporting. It may interest the Members to know that of the $140 million in this bill, between $10 and $11 million of it is recaptured in fees collected by three major agencies that are financed in this activity. There is another $4,867,000 in the bill as a payment to the Post Office Department for the use of the frank. That is a bookkeeping transaction. The costs have already been paid to the Post Office Department and all this item does is to shift in the budget the responsibility for that amount from the Post Office Department to the Congress. That, again, is something that serves to make the bill less expensive than might appear on the surface. None of the $8,500,000 added capital for the Printing Office results in additional drain on the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I include selected excerpts from the committee report on this bill so that this RECORD will be more comprehensive in explanation than the time has allowed here this afternoon:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL TOTALS

As shown by this table, the committee is recommending total appropriations of $140,038,919, a reduction of $8,541,326, close to 6 percent below corresponding budget estimates of $148,580,245. The budget for items embraced by the bill was $30,561,835 above corresponding appropriations for 1963. Thus, the bill as reported is $22,020,509 above appropriations for 1963.

The legislative appropriation bill has been fluctuating somewhat from year to year depending significantly on requirements for construction and remodeling projects being initiated, accelerated, or terminated. There is the added factor this year—common to all the appropriation bills—of annualizing in fiscal 1964 the general pay raise which was effective last October. Under the same law classification act employees of the Library and the Architect get an additional increase in January 1964 and provision has been made for that in these appropriations. A few figures will highlight the situation and put the comparative totals in better perspective.

$11,500,000 of the $22,020,509 increase over 1963 is to meet accruing obligations on the Rayburn office building project including two underground garages. Another $8,500,000 increase is to supply the Printing Office with additional working capital attendant upon a significant increase in the volume of business handled; this does not add to total overall expenditure from the Treasury since the operation is on a reimbursable cost basis. $2,225,000 is included for replacement of the badly deteriorated, 66-year-old water and sewer system in the main library building. There are sundry other non-recurring items, but just these three add to $22,225,000. There is a partially off-setting reduction of $6,450,000 from 1963 on account of dropping the item provided last year for a fire-proof annex warehouse for the Printing Office; but as indicated later, that has not been expended and will not be at least until some future year.

There is a $3 million increase for congressional printing and binding; $2,500,000 of it is the overrun in fiscal 1962 costs as compared to the overrun in 1961, the other $500,000 being the Public Printer's judgment—necessarily somewhat of a guess—of the fiscal 1964 obligations as compared to the 1963 estimated obligations for the many classes of printing covered. Wages, materials, and volume enter the calculation. Then there is an increase of $170,000 for the additional telephone and telegraph allowances voted in House Resolution 735 of the 87th Congress. Still another item is an increase of $881,374 for reimbursing the postal revenues for franked mailings during fiscal year 1962. That is a bookkeeping matter; the money was spent in 1962. That cost will very likely be even higher in the next two budgets when the full effect of the general postal pay increases of October 1962 and January 1964 come into the calculation.

The increase of $287,630 over last year for the card distribution service in the Library will be more than recouped to the Treasury through card sales receipts. The same can be said of the appropriation for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents for which an increase of $482,470 is allowed. The increase of $268,000 shown for the special foreign currency program of the Library is not a dollar drain on the Treasury; it represents the proposed use of excess currencies already owned.

What we are saying is that the totals of the bill are far from indicative of the change in the overall level of recurring-type expenditures. There are a few places where the committee felt justified in allowing some modest recurring increases. Only nine additional employees have been allowed under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden and these are in the lower-level mechanical and laborer categories. Small increases have been allowed in the Copyright Office, a partially self-supporting service, and in the Legislative Reference Service to handle rising workloads. The same is true in the catalog card service which, as noted, is more than self-sustaining. Altogether, roughly 65 to 70 additional employees out of a total of 108 net additional requested are allowed throughout the Library. To meet an increasing sales workload and to partially implement the new depository library law, 16 additional positions have been allowed to the Superintendent of Documents; here again, the entire amount is recovered through sales receipts.

Except for a slight increase for electrical energy, the bill does not reflect the impact of maintenance and operations associated with the Rayburn Office Building. That will come in the next budget.

One other detail as to the bill generally. All joint committees are included in the accompanying bill. Heretofore, under a long-standing arrangement, those disbursed by the Senate (Joint Economic Committee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Joint Committee on Printing) have not been included in the bill reported to the House. The new arrangement affords opportunity for equal original review in both Houses.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Items under this heading total $50,131,550, a reduction of $641,400 from the budget estimates and $611,420 above 1963 appropriations. Most of the increases are attributable to annualization of the general pay raise of last fall. A principal addition of $170,000 for 10,000 telephone and telegraph "units" authorized by House Resolution 735 of the 87th Congress.

Otherwise, for many offices and departments the amounts are merely a dollar translation of the statutory roll of authorized employees where the requirements occur, often with little or no change, from year to year. On the other hand, some objects are not subject to precise estimating in advance, being educated guesses of what the dollar demands will be, as, for example, special and select committee expenses incurred pursuant to resolutions of the House; the volume of committee hearings; employment by the standing committees within discretionary limits fixed by law; the number of clerks on Members' office rolls; the needs for additional filing cabinets, office furniture, and the like; this is also true of the printing appropriation, directly dependent on the number of session days; the number of bills and reports; the extensiveness of the body and Appendix of the RECORD. No one can foresee the requirements with precision.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Appropriations to the Architect provide for operation, maintenance, and repair of the physical plant of the Legislative establishment, except the Government Printing Office which does its own, and for major improvement and construction projects specifically authorized from time to time. Following custom, the bill omits provision for items under the Architect pertaining exclusively to the Senate.

Each year, these budgets show a number of changes and the committee generally goes along with some of them in the interest of maintaining the physical plant in reasonably good order. There has been some catching up to be done. In addition, various mandatory cost increases, recurring in character, such as wage-board and within-grade promotions under existing law, repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation work as the physical plan ages, and similar costs have to be met. The Architect is also responsible, and this section of the bill includes the funds, for structural and mechanical care of the Library buildings and for furniture and furnishings for them.

Total appropriations recommended in the bill aggregate $30,744,200, a reduction of $654,300 from the budget requests but $14,393,450 above corresponding 1963 appropriation. The ups and downs are shown by appropriation item in the table of this report; the main items are touched on in the following paragraphs. Every personnel item involves annualization of the general pay raise of last fall, annualization of wage-board increases determined under existing law, and similar mandatory items.

In all items considered, the Architect requested only 13 additional positions under this general heading and the committee has allowed 7 of them—4 laborers for the Capitol Grounds work, a stonemason for the House Office Buildings, and 2 mechanical type employees for the powerplant.

The Rayburn Office Building project and associated items account for $11,500,000 of the $14,393,450 increase over 1963. Another $2,225,000 is to replace the 66-year-old water and sewer systems in the main Library building. There are some other nonrecurring items included; some are noted below and all are listed in the hearings. The 1965 appropriations should total substantially less.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For all items under this heading $20,487,800 is recommended, a reduction in direct appropriations requested for the Library of $764,600 although on a basis comparable to the budget request, only $506,600 because of the inclusion in the bill of a transfer of $258,000 from the National Science Foundation to continue preparation and publication of the valuable monthly index of Russian accessions for which the Library sought a direct appropriation. The total in the bill is a net increase of $582,460 above corresponding 1963 appropriations. The Russian accessions index is a going activity currently financed with an advance of funds from the National Science Foundation. Appropriations for furniture and furnishings and for structural and mechanical care are budgeted under the Architect and are in addition to the figures just cited.

In common with other appropriations involving personnel, a number of increases over 1963 are partially explained by the annualization of the general pay raise of last fall and provision for the further increase scheduled for classification act employees in January 1964. There are, also, the more or less annually recurring increments for such things as within-grade increases under existing law, wage board increases and reallocations of positions.

Not all is an ultimate charge on the Treasury. The $287,630 additional for the catalog card operation, for example, will be recouped through the sale of cards—income now approximates $3 million, more than covering the entire cost. Another $268,000 of the increase over 1963 is under the experimental foreign currency program and goes from one pocket to another in the Treasury. The Copyright Office returns over $1 million annually although it is not completely self-supporting because fees charged have not kept pace with the increased cost.

This is the Nation's largest research library if not in fact the world's largest. In the nature of things, some increase is inevitable. A first-class library either grows or stagnates; it does not stand still and remain first-class. Its collections, the demands upon it, and thus its volume of work will continue to experience steady growth. For example, something like 40 pieces of material come to the library every minute of an 8-hour day. About 8 pieces enter the permanent collection. This is an unceasing day-in and day-out process.

Approximately 664,000 additions of all types were made to the collections in fiscal 1962; in fiscal 1961, the number was 1,810,000 pieces when an unusually large number of manuscripts were added. For many years the Library has experience chronic arrearages in the arranging, cataloging, indexing, shelving, and servicing of the vast, priceless, and ever-increasing collections. The intake is of limited value, unless it is cataloged and readied for use. But the situation is seriously aggravated by lack of space. The buildings are bulging at the seams. Each year, inevitably, the time comes closer when there will be no more room to house the collections or to accommodate the people who service them. Overcrowding and inefficient work arrangements continue to persist—and get worse all the time. Improvising and physical rearranging of the work is a common occurence.

A third building is badly needed—now. Something ought to be done about it. After 3 years of trying to provide some relief, arrangements were finally completed last year for renovation of some space at the Naval Weapons Plant to house some of the activities, principally the moneymaking catalog card service, that do not need to be in proximity to the collections. There has been some further delay; it is now said that occupancy will take place in April 1964. Even so, it will be only a minor and temporary measure of relief for the overcrowding. It does nothing to contribute to the long-range solution.

This is a great cultural and research institution and in the committee's view ought to be brought to a good state of accommodation and efficiency at an early date. Although originally conceived and established as the Library of Congress, it is in fact, by reason of many congressional actions over a long period of years, the national library of the United States and of inestimable value to the Nation's library facilities at all levels. And it is appropriate to again recall that many Federal agencies, not insignificantly including the defense and security agencies, as disclosed by the tabulations at page 47 of the hearings, continue to use the vast resources by allocating several million dollars annually to the Library for specialized and analytical projects.

There have been suggestions over the years, renewed recently, that the Library of Congress ought to be officially designated as the National Library of the United States and its administration shifted to the Executive Branch. There is a considerable reservoir of feeling in the committee against such a proposition of transfer and, very likely, that feeling would be shared by many Members of the Congress. The Library is a unique institution. A good many of its services are intimately and peculiarly adapted, in harmony with the original design, for service to the Congress and its committees. Others are national in character and scope. As to the matter of designation, it has been said that custom and tradition are stronger than the law. There would, likely, be considerable opposition to a change of the name although there would appear to be merit in a formal designation of the Library as the National Library. There are now two specialized libraries so designated formally—one in the field of agriculture and the other in the field of medicine. But even so, it could be said to be a distinction without benefit of the substance of much difference.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

For the operation of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents $5,242,000 is recommended, a reduction of $175,880 from the request and $482,470 above the 1963 appropriation. Roundly, $277,000 of the increase is to finance the old established program including the 12 new low-grade clerical positions requested. Sales of publications continue to increase; $5,770,101 was returned to the Treasury in 1962; $5,800,000 is estimated for 1963 and $6,000,000 for 1964—more than covering the entire cost of both revenue and non-revenue functions. The remaining $206,000 budget increase is associated with the new depository library law (Public Law 87-579) which, briefly, provided for the designation of additional depository libraries, relieved depository libraries of publication mailing costs, and widened the sweep of publications available to the libraries by requiring the Superintendent of Documents to secure selected publications printed by the other Government agencies at their own plants and distribute them to the depository libraries. To begin implementation of the new law, the budget sought a total of $381,000, including 25 additional employees, of which approximately $175,000 and 21 people are directly identified with the acquisition and distribution of non-GPO printed material.

The committee has not allowed the additional money for this non-GPO publications feature. Additional libraries are in the process of being designated; something like 100 either have been or were assumed to be designated for the purpose of making up this budget. The committee has allowed enough funds to extend to these additional libraries the same publications distribution as has obtained over the years for the 600-odd existing depository libraries. All libraries are henceforth relieved of publication postage expense.

As to the non-GPO publications, the Superintendent is beginning to explore with the agencies the ramifications of production, sifting for selection, assembling, and the like. There is some doubt that any significant portion of the material produced in the some 300-plus plants around the world would be of permanent collection value. If that is true it might not be commensurate with the expense. In any event, rather than plunge into this added expense without more finite information at hand the committee would prefer to first have the Superintendent continue his exploratory relationships with the agencies so that he can be in a better position to size up the problem and definitize a budget for it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, with some trepidation I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this for my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED]. He is a diligent worker and he attempts to get all of the answers that are factual and obtainable.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I hope he will remain, because I believe he can help both the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself, and we may need his help.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that I was just trying to get another seat where I could devote my entire time to his presentation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this. This is your bill and you can amend it any way you wish.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a lot of items. It carries the east front of the Capitol Building which was originally planned in 1854 and should have been built when they first estimated for it in 1907, when we could have done it for $2½ million.

We finally procrastinated and paid somewhere around $20-some-odd million. It is in the hearings.

This carries the Rayburn Building. I do not think there is anyone here who has been here any length of time but who realizes that whether we like it or not our files are building up and our need for additional office space is evident to me and I think to other members of the Committee.

It carries the underground garages. I will further comment on those in this short prepared speech I have. It carries other items in it that have been carried in the bill mostly by usage through the years. They are subject to amendment by any of you that want to get your names in the paper.

There are the calendars, the wall calendars that cost about 50 cents. We spend about $27,000 on those a year. They are used to some extent in some of our Civil Service-controlled offices throughout the country where advertising calendars are outlawed by one method or another.

The bill also carries these steamer trunks. We had quite a discussion on that, and an amendment can be offered to knock those out, if you wish. I think you can buy them more cheaply downtown, but they tell me they are well built to rigid specifications. As I have said, this is your bill, brought to the floor under an open rule, and you can work your will upon it.

Our able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM STEED, and other members of our subcommittee, will do our best to explain the issues involved in any questions you may have. To me, there is something about this bill which I think we should all keep in mind. In a very large sense we are appropriating for the very seat of our Government in this measure.

As I came to work this morning, emerging from one of the truly popular, I think, additions to the Capitol here, that of the garage in the Old House Office Building—I know if nobody else appreciates it, the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, thinks it is the finest invention since the wheel—but as I was coming out of there I met a long queue of high school children. Their eyes were filled with awe and wonder. This Capitol with its dome comes as close to being a symbol of the United States as anything across the country. Here we as the representatives of the people of our country do our work. Here in this Capitol the policies which govern this Nation are debated and enacted. Here, in a broad sense, is the beginning, the amending or the repeal of the various statutes which govern the people of this Nation.

The only symbol of authority, and I would call your attention to it, is the mace right over there. When we sit as the House it is atop the column; when we sit as a Committee, as we do now, it is beside the column, on the floor of the dais. That is the only symbol of authority in the Nation. It is as absolute as the scepter of a king, if need be; yet it is not downtown in the White House, it is not enshrined in any of the executive departments, it is not kept over here in the Supreme Court Building. It is not even present in the other body when the Senate sits for deliberation. It is here in the House of Representatives.

Do you realize that this body can under certain circumstances elect a President of the United States? Do you know that in this body lies the sole power of impeachment, from which even the President is not excluded?

When I review these things I can better understand why high school children come to this Capitol to see in awe and I hope for inspiration as Americans.

This appropriation is, of course, the housekeeping bill to maintain and improve the environs in which the Capitol operates. I believe it is our duty to keep these premises in repair and, if proper, embellish them. There is shabbiness enough, as it is, and while each of us may have his own opinions, I must remind you that until a very few years ago, this Capitol was bounded on one side by areas that come very close to the slum category. It is no secret that the original plans for the Capitol not only called for the present Mall, but envisaged a similar Mall on the other side of the Capitol. It is well known that our late great Speaker, Sam Rayburn, deplored the area surrounding the Capitol and the legislative offices. He was hopeful that improvement be had. It is because of this, of course, that at long last, agreement was had to acquire the adjoining property and to landscape it properly. It is for this reason that our present parking facilities long in need of being increased, call for the establishment of underground garages, similar to the so-called legislative garage on the Senate side which, as you know, is landscaped entirely on top with a fountain to enhance the beauty of the grounds. And, it is for this reason, that we have acquired this property, and where necessary facilities are to be added, they will be underground with landscaping on top. So much for the Capitol Building.

Part of our surroundings include the greatest library in the world, containing over 40 million pieces of information, volumes, maps, brochures, and pamphlets, originally established to be of use to the Congress and, through the Congress, to all the people of the Nation. We are also appropriating funds for the Library of Congress in this bill today.

Also, I would like to call to your attention the testimony of our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, which appears on page 360 of the printed hearings. I think you will find that it enlarges in a very interesting way on the original planner's intentions and the growth that have resulted in our present activities to improve our area on Capitol Hill.

As a proud Member of this House of Representatives, I have tried through the years to understand the whyfors of some of our facilities. I think you will find an interesting statement on page 334 of the hearings which deals with the work of the attending physician.

Certainly the cross-currents, the pressures, the burdens, the conflicts, the frustrations and the demands of those of us who sit in the House can and does have an effect on our health. It may be true that we are no different than other people who live in the turmoils of this fast-moving age. But here at the Capitol, it was not always easy to get a doctor in emergency time. You will note that Dr. Calver estimates that once it took from 1 to 3 hours for a physician to administer to a legislator with heart trouble or other ailments. Moreover, when one adds to this the serious attacks that might befall all those who work on the Hill and when one realizes that thousands of people pour through the corridors each day, certainly all of us are agreed that the attending physician's office is more than justified. There is no doubt in my mind that many lives have been saved and extended. We call your attention to the records on page 336 of these hearings to show you that the work achieved by this important office is considerable, and I might add that I have learned that some of these figures are not complete.

So we bring this bill to you and, again, I must remind you that it is your bill, that there is an open rule and that any of you may offer any amendments which you feel are justified.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on what I think is a very excellent job in handling this very difficult bill. I think, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, if he could satisfy half of the people he would be doing an excellent job, because most of us will have the opportunity or the inclination to want to criticize some specific thing which is contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the finest services that the committee has rendered this time has been in the suggestion made in its report. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] commented on the wall calendar item, which is a small item. It involves only 27,000-and-some-odd dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment to strike that item out of the bill, not particularly to save the $27,000, but to try to put this House on record as doing something affirmatively and positively to which Congress can point and say "Yes; we are willing to make some reduction and some savings." I think we need to take that into account.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has also, of course, mentioned the fact that some money could be saved by reverting to the practice of a few years ago when these so-called packing boxes or trunks were furnished only to Members who requested them. I think that was a fine suggestion. I do not intend to offer an amendment, but I hope the Clerk will take that into account.

Mr. Chairman, one of the other things which I want to mention here is the great cost and the growing increase in the cost of operating the Government Printing Office, because of the great amount of printing that is being done on behalf of the House of Representatives. As I pointed out earlier in the day, it is my opinion that through the adoption of a very simple limitation on some of the things that appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or some limitation on what could go in the RECORD, or the amount that could be utilized by the individual Members, we could save $1 million in that one item alone.

We know throughout our hearings on our committees that these hearings are growing all the time. There is also an inclination—and I think it is a growing one—as we have witnesses appear before our various committees and subcommittees, someone will ask unanimous consent for certain things to appear in the printed hearings, without giving any attention to whether that represents a duplication of material which has been printed by some other Government agency and which is available just upon request from the agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a rather detailed study of the printing of the House of Representatives for the last several years. Having grown up in a country printing office and being somewhat familiar with the cost of printing, I think I can detect the opportunity for some savings which will not do damage and which will not take away any of the information that the House and the individual Members need. But if the Members will read here on page 23 of the report they will note that the Public Printer has asked for $11 million to beef up the liquidity of the revolving fund out of which the Printing Office operates. The sum of $6,750,000 was identified with increased business volume.

In other words, I would ask seriously that before Members request to have their extensions printed and include extraneous and many times irrelevant material they should consider is this material or is this information available elsewhere—readily available—and that we can get it without cluttering up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in our hearings the committees too often include in such hearings a duplication of printing which could be avoided and which could save hundreds of thousands of dollars each year.

I hate to stand up here and say I am going to be the guardian of this House. I am not. What I am doing today is to try to point up the importance of this matter. I am hoping we can at some time, maybe not have inflexible rules or very strict rules, but at least have some understanding among the Members of the House as to what is relevant and what should be included in the printing not only of the RECORD but of the reports and other things printed for the use of the House.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I have served on the Printing Committee with the gentleman from Missouri, and on behalf of the gentleman, and in designation of his good faith in this matter, I should like to point out that for the last 3 years the gentleman from Missouri has tried in every conceivable way to get enough interest in the printing of the RECORD, and other matters, to establish proper policies and procedures. If the gentleman has done nothing else but call attention to the fact that we have a very serious situation, he has performed a most noteworthy service to the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to renew my request for other Members to join me in trying to save some money.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in 1950, a contract in the amount of $10,563,000 was awarded the construction firm of McCloskey & Co., for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston, Mass.

Scarcely had the hospital been completed and occupied in 1953 when the Veterans' Administration notified the Army Corps of Engineers that there were serious defects in the construction; that serious damage had already occurred and would get progressively worse unless extensive repairs and corrections were made.

Subsequently, the Corps of Engineers estimated the repairs and corrections would cost $4 million.

On January 3, 1963, I wrote to Attorney General Robert Kennedy stating that faulty construction of such magnitude was an outrage and asserted it would be an even greater outrage to use public funds to correct such defects without action being initiated by the Federal Government to hold to account those responsible for such shoddy construction and recover the funds thus expended.

On January 22, 1963, I received a letter from Acting Assistant Attorney General Joseph D. Guilfoyle stating that the Attorney General's Office was then carrying on conferences with attorneys, engineers, and architects of the Veterans' Administration and the Corps of Engineers to ascertain legal responsibility for this outrageously defective hospital construction.

Assistant Attorney General Guilfoyle informed me that once the full facts could be developed as to liability and damage, the Attorney General's Office would communicate with me.

Remember, this letter was written on January 22, 1963, and Mr. Guilfoyle said then it was expected the full facts would be developed in March of 1963.

It is now near the middle of June, March has long since passed into history, and I have heard absolutely nothing from the Attorney General's Office. Perhaps the Attorney General and his lieutenants have been too busy devising ways and means of stirring up other trouble and spending the taxpayers money to hold to account those who may have brought about the waste of $4 million.

And Ambassador McCloskey, the former finance chairman of the Democrat National Committee, is probably too busy carrying on his arduous diplomatic duties in Ireland to pay much heed either to the proper construction of a hospital for war veterans or completion of the "100-year pyramid"—otherwise known as the New House Office Building. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the contract for construction of the New House Office Building was awarded to McCloskey & Co., long after the shoddy, defective construction of the Boston veterans hospital had become apparent.

Mr. Chairman, I am again writing the Attorney General in an effort to ascertain whether McCloskey & Co., or anyone else is going to be held to account.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], in hoping to live long enough to see that new, New House Office Building completed. For altogether too long streets have been blockaded and traffic has been diverted all over the place. Many of the Members of the House have to drive blocks out of their way in order to get to work in the morning or to their homes in the evening. The time it has taken to build that 100-year pyramid is unconscionable. And, I am surprised that the members of the Building Committee have done nothing to expedite the procedure. With the gentleman from Ohio, I cannot help but suspect that workmen have been pulled off that job in order to take on lucrative contracts elsewhere; in other words, the taxpayers of the country footing the bills and the Congress being made to pay the penalty for this monstrous construction schedule.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McLOSKEY. The gentleman from Iowa has bandied the name of McCloskey around here. I agree with everything you have said with respect to the Ambassador to Ireland, but just so we keep the record straight, I am not related to Mr. McCloskey. I spell my name differently, and I happen to come from the poor side of the family, the one who is interested in saving the taxpayers some money.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for keeping the record straight and assure him that I could not possibly confuse him with this former keeper of the purse for the Democrat Party.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to understand how the contract for this plush House Office Building could have been awarded by the Building Commission of the House of Representatives to a contractor who was under the cloud that McCloskey apparently was in Boston, Mass., with respect to the veterans hospital there. And, I am going to watch, as I am sure others will, how this congressional business turns out across the street.

I should like to say, too, that before the day is over I intend to offer an amendment to stop any further spending of funds for the swimming pool and to stop any spending of funds to cut new doors in the Members' offices. My understanding, according to page 206 of the hearing record, is that the doors that would be put in would only be perhaps 2 feet wide, and if I have not been deceived, there are some Members of the House that would have a hard time getting through a 2-foot door.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. With reference to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that he proposed to offer an amendment denying funds for the construction of a certain 2-foot door in the individual Member's office, it was never designed to be there in the first place. The matter has been before the Commission, and the Commission concluded that for the time being there will be no such door cut. Now, I personally do not think any such door is needed, and I find myself in complete agreement in not appropriating any money for cutting the doors through. Of course, you must recognize this fact, that whenever anyone constructs a building such as this, other people may have and often do have different views as to how it should be constructed. For instance, there were a great many suggestions being made with reference to this or that characteristic, about the number of suites, and so forth. You cannot find everybody in accord. It was designed after the plans had been submitted to the Commission, of which Speaker Rayburn was Chairman, and they tried to make it a most workable place for the Members and their staff, and the committees, I thought then, and I think now, that each suite is so designed for efficiency, for accommodation, and for everything that a Member needs to enable him to properly discharge his duty as a Member of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the support of the gentleman from Georgia for my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. May I say this: I do not think the gentleman should be disturbed about it. I am hoping, in view of such a splendid bill that has been brought here before this Committee, the gentleman does not offer an amendment. I have spent considerable time reading the record on this bill and I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Washington, and the other members of the subcommittee in bringing in such a fine bill as this. I hope the gentleman from Iowa does not offer an amendment. Do not worry about that door. I hope that the gentleman will have a suite in the building and I think he will be satisfied with it.

Mr. GROSS. But I do worry about it, I say to the gentleman because there are so many pure minds around here that are kept pure because they change so often.

Mr. VINSON. I think if the gentleman would stop that argument I would find myself in accord with him, but you need not worry about the doors.

Mr. GROSS. All I wish to do now is thank the gentleman for his support for my amendment. I only hope he does not change his mind when a vote comes on the amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say will probably fall on deaf ears in this Chamber today. The great cry of the American people today is for economy in Government. This is also the cry of many Members of this body. The free spenders should have no trouble today but those, on both sides of the aisle, who espouse economy in Government should do a good deal of soul searching today before voting "aye" on this legislation. The question is—will we today be hypocrites—will we use two standards: one for us and one for the rest?

Some 169 Members of this body will soon be housed in the most expensive office building ever erected on earth. As pointed out in a most revealing article in my hometown newspaper, the Louisville Times, the "squat and unappealing new office building will cost the taxpayers $131,500,000," including land, construction, subway, engineering fees, and so forth. It took quite a bit of checking yesterday before I was able to determine that included in the $20 million today requested for this building is an undisclosed amount for the swimming pool. It is hard enough for me to be on the floor as much as I should with the volume of work in my office resulting primarily from the intervention of the Federal Government into the daily lives of all of the people with its many bureaus and departments. I, personally, have no time for such luxuries and I am confident that those who would take the time would do so at the expense of the work of their respective offices. The question is quite frankly—will we spend our time frolicking in the pool, built with taxpayers' money, while on the taxpayers' payroll? Some of us are concerned about what we often refer to as creeping socialism. Will we today be a party to socialized swimming? Most of the damage has already been done in regard to that monstrosity, but we need not compound the felony today.

While I am on this subject, I might add that I, for one, feel that we should change the sign on the dining room to "Members Socialized Dining Room." It seems a subsidy of $250,000 is needed to make the operations of the various dining rooms break even.

Under this appropriation bill, we will completely furnish the Rayburn Building with new furniture. My question is quite frankly, "Do we have 169 Members with discardable furniture?" I suppose it depends on the station in life to which you are accustomed. There is no numerical increase in Members' staffs—no more desks or desk chairs will be needed. The things that are worn out, we should replace—what extra furniture is needed to accommodate the space, we should, within reason, attempt to furnish. From my own limited experience, I could use any expanded space just for the staff to have "elbowroom." My thinking is that we could well do with a small portion of the $3,500,000 provided for this purpose.

I think it is interesting to note that a figure equal to 5 percent of the structure cost of $71,500,000, or $3,500,000, is needed for "Administration and miscellaneous" on the Rayburn Building. How much of this that has already been appropriated and how much of it that is included in today's bill, I do not know.

We are asked to include $4.625 million toward a total of $8 million for underground garages south of the office buildings—which will be covered with open, sodded parklike areas. This, I am sure, will be attractive and wonderful—but can the taxpayers afford it? Parking space is needed—but for $8 million you can build a lot of building on top of the ground. Not as pretty, I will grant you—but the already overpicked pockets of our taxpayers somewhat overshadows "esthetic view," in my book.

Today represents a real opportunity for self-discipline. Those who would do away with socialized swimming, socialized meals, socialized flowers, socialized haircuts, and many unnecessary expenses too numerous to mention can do it today. The areas for correction in this bill appear to me to be too numerous for a proper job to be done by amendments. Today we can reject the bill and by that action, the committee and the taxpayers will know we mean business and a bill can be reported that evidences that we in Congress are operating on a sensible budget.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it could be said that this is probably as important an appropriation bill as will come before this House as there will be during this year or any other year. This, I think, comes about primarily because it involves two very significant purposes. No. 1, it involves the operation of the Congress itself. Second, it involves to a far larger degree than many of us realize, a service to the public. In light of that I should say, and I say it with great sincerity, that I appreciate the work that has been done in behalf of this bill on the part of the chairman, the ranking member, and each of the other members.

As a new member of the committee let me say to this House that this is a real experience. And I should be bold enough to insinuate that it might be good for every Member of this House to serve at least once on this committee. I am sure it would alert him to a number of items that probably previously had not come to his attention.

Why do I place that emphasis on this bill? I do it for this reason: because, as has already been pointed out, there ought to be funds provided which would permit this House and the Congress to function in response to the problems that come before it in a most effective manner.

By the same token it also behooves every Member of this House to see that those expenditures in turn are used with prudence and with frugality so that they are productive to the greatest possible degree of every dollar expended. This is a matter that certainly is important to every Member of the House.

The unique part of it, and I have heard some criticism here today which no doubt is good, is that I do not recall a single critic coming to the committee during the time of the hearings. As a matter of fact, all during this time I recall only one person who called to make an inquiry about all the moneys that are in this bill. But be that as it may, the moneys that are here have been as carefully pruned as could be by the committee under existing authority, remembering again that there is a major portion of these funds with which the committee could do nothing because the authorizations have previously been enacted which provides these moneys for each individual congressional office, and if it is their desire to expend them, then sufficient moneys must be provided. If they are not here, they will show up again in the deficiency bill or somewhere else. So to that need, again we must be responsive.

By the same token, there are moneys in here that provide a substantial service to the public, even to the matter of parking cars when they come here to visit. Yes, they extend all the way to providing services to the blind people. The wealth of material that is supplied through the Library of Congress or through other Government documents that are pertinent in supplying information to the public in relation to their Government, becomes a public service, if you please. By the same token, this is a necessary service. Again, we should encourage that every prudence be used in their expenditure, but by the same token let us not forget that a democracy will never be any stronger than the extent to which you have an informed populace. Anything we might do to encourage that information if properly used and properly expended is a contribution to the degree in which this Government may function both efficiently and effectively.

So as we look at the problems that may confront us in the area of these expenditures, I would then suggest that we look a little further into the future and as we deal with the legislative matters that provide for these expenditures, that we rather raise the objections when the authorizations are granted, because once those authorities are granted it becomes almost mandatory upon the Appropriations Committee to supply the money.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that there were a good many items in here that I as an individual felt ought to be reduced substantially and could be reduced substantially, but because of the existing authorizations it was mandatory to provide the moneys needed. I realize that in the light of that there are a good many different views on the part of the respective Members, and having so expressed myself, that there would be many others who would object on the same basis.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. If the Congress and the gentleman had known in the original resolution, if there had been a price tag put on this, you would not have had this situation, would you?

Mr. LANGEN. I am sure this is quite true, because a good many of the decisions here have been projected into the future without knowing what the future held, and we are now being faced with the facts of life.

Mr. HALEY. It is just the result of these open-end authorizations. Members of the Congress never know and the people downtown in other parts of the Government do not want you to know.

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad that I have received an additional minute to comment on the excellent observation made by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida. He and I have worked together on the Interior Committee and have had a good many discussions on the matter of open-end appropriations. Of course, here we have been exposed to the full impact of that kind of appropriation and we have seen the folly of leaving an open end which provides the opportunity, as the gentleman has said, for unwarranted expenditures that are not responsive to the original intent of the Congress. So I would recommend that a proper consideration be given to any appropriation bill that is before us in this respect.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I have asked the gentleman to yield briefly just to make a quick observation. The total cost of the square footage in the Rayburn Building, that is, for usable square footage, ought to be cleared up. It seems there are only 935,069 square feet of usable space. If we divide this into $71,500,000, this brings us a figure of approximately $76 per square foot for the usable space in the building. I think that, perhaps, is the figure that the American taxpayers should have instead of the $30 per square foot figure. Much of that building is not usable space and, evidently, is being taken up for parking, garages, and other areas. So I think the taxpayers should have an idea of just exactly what that square footage of office space is going to cost them.

Mr. LANGEN. If I may respond to the gentleman for the worthy observations he has just made, here again let me just suggest a little precaution be used because when it comes to a matter of figures and statistics and talking about the square feet and making comparisons, we need to make sure that all of these comparisons are made on the same basis. I think I raised some of the identical questions as the gentleman just raised, to make sure that if we are comparing the cost of this building with another building, that we are making the same kind of square foot comparison. I had some experience with this in the State legislature at a time when some State buildings were being constructed. The experience there was much the same because of the degree to which we might have evaluated the usable space or the nonusable space, and the gross number of square feet as compared to the net number of square feet. The same thing applies to the cubic feet. But, in that light and being at the point that we now are that if any changes should be made, they should have been made a long time ago and it is too late to do it now after the building is up.

Mr. STINSON. I quite agree with the gentleman. Of course, I was not a Member of the Congress when the idea of this building was conceived. I quite agree with the gentleman, however, that we should use the same measuring stick. But in your experience, do you think it is normal for a building to have a gross of 2,375,000 square feet of space and to have usable space of only 935,000 square feet?

Mr. LANGEN. I would say to the gentleman, I was not here either when the building was started and with regard to the question the gentleman raises, I would suggest that he refer it to the architect who would be in a position to provide him with the answer that he seeks.

Mr. STINSON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

RUSSIANS INCREASE SHIPS TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have received information from various U.S. Government sources which shows that the Russians have increased the number of ships supplying Castro's island in recent weeks.

It may be too early to determine the significance of this increase, but stepped up shipping was an early sign of the Soviet military buildup of Cuba last summer. I strongly urge that U.S. surveillance of Cuba be intensified to insure that our intelligence community can provide reliable and accurate data for U.S. policymakers.

During the month of May, 37 Soviet ships, along with 9 Soviet-bloc ships, called in Cuba. April shipping figures show 27 Soviet vessels, along with 7 Soviet-bloc ships. Total Iron Curtain shipping to Cuba for the first 6 months of 1963 numbers 165 ships, 52 of which were tankers.

Detailed Russian shipping figures for 1963 are as follows:

Month	Total	Soviet-flag ships	Bloc-flag ships	Tankers
January	41	35	6	10
February	38	34	4	10
March	35	32	3	10
April	34	27	7	10
May	46	37	9	12
To date	194	165	29	52

However, the shocking fact is that one out of every three ships supplying Castro's island is from the free world.

Since January 1963, 89 allied ships have made trips to Cuba, and 20 of these vessels were tankers. This shipping would have been considerably reduced if the U.S. Government had implemented my proposal to close U.S. ports to nations which allow their flags to be used in sea trade with Cuba. However, such action is warranted particularly now in view of this new development.

The British are the main offenders. Since January of this year there have been 33 British ships which have called in Cuba. The British would think twice about shipping to Castro if we banned the *Queen Mary* from New York Harbor.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. STEED. Yes, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, last year we passed an amendment relative to patron mail. Now a question has been raised in connection with this legislation, and I see it is referred to on, I believe, page 347 of the subcommittee hearings. The question has been raised as to whether or not we are reinstituting this patron mail as occupant mail and as junk mail by frank in this legislation.

I would like to have that clarified if I could.

Mr. STEED. My understanding of it is that the amendment last year applied to the fiscal 1963 bill only. There is no mention of it in the bill this year and so far as I know that puts the matter back under the previous law which has been in existence all the time which does permit the Postmaster General to make such mail possible if he wants to. It is discretionary with the Postmaster General and whether he will permit it or not I do not know. They did permit it under the old law, that is, prior to last October when the restriction was written into the fiscal 1963 law. What the Postmaster General will do, if the bill passes in this form, the gentleman's guess is as good as mine.

Mr. DEVINE. If the gentleman will yield further, then if we vote for this bill as it now stands, without further amendment, it is the understanding of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the patron mail or so-called junk mail by frank will be reinstituted, or that this operates as a repeal of the amendment?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is that the use of the frank will go back under the previous law enacted by Congress under which we have been operating all these years, and under that law the Postmaster General has the discretion to permit it or deny it. I have no way of knowing what this Postmaster General or the next one may do under it.

Mr. DEVINE. This is very revealing. I thank the gentleman for his frankness.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better complete the record on this matter insofar as the present bill is concerned by inserting the statement from the committee report of June 6—last week. It gives the situation.

FRANKED MAILINGS

The bill includes the amended budget amount of $4,867,374, an increase of $881,374 over the fiscal 1963 appropriation. The figure was supplied by the Post Office Department from data obtained under its cost ascertainment procedure. The amount represents fiscal 1962 mailings since this item is funded on a delayed basis. The cost ascertainment procedure is a statistical calculation using mail volume sampling techniques.

The money has already been spent by the Department in handling the mail and this appropriation does little more than serve to distribute the cost to the legislative bill; the other appropriation bills do a similar thing for mailings by other agencies of Government. Volume is one factor in the determination. Cost is the other.

The Department advises that the figure of $4,867,374 represents 110,944,016 pieces of franked mail during fiscal 1962. The increase in cost—$881,374—over the preceding year is stated to be primarily attributable to volume. The fiscal 1963 appropriation of $3,986,000, for fiscal 1961 mailings, was based on 88,821,000 pieces. Going back another year, the 1962 appropriation of $3,836,000, again according to the Department, covered 113,026,744 pieces mailed during fiscal 1960. Last year the committee was advised that the increase from $3,836,000, representing 1960 mailings, to $3,986,000, representing 1961 mailings, was occasioned by postal salary increases under Public Law 86—568 effective with the beginning of fiscal 1961. While that might have been the net result and explanation, there necessarily had to be some partially offsetting reduction from the fact that the volume of mailings as reported by the Department dropped from 113 million plus in fiscal 1960 to 88 million plus in fiscal 1961. In the absence of any unusual cost factors obtaining during fiscal 1962, it seems reasonable that if the volume reached 110 million plus in 1962 as reported, then the request of $4,867,374 would not appear out of line.

But these figures clearly seem to point up another fact. It is that there is no showing that the availability or use of the simplified address procedure for franked mailings during that part of fiscal 1962 from October of 1961 to June of 1962 had any significant influence, if indeed any at all, on the volume of mail. As noted, the volume in fiscal 1960—when the simplified address procedure was not in effect—exceeded the reported volume for fiscal 1962 when the procedure was in effect for approximately 8 of the 12 months. And as far as costs are concerned, the Department's statement that the per-piece cost of handling franked mail with a simplified form of address is less than the same mail fully addressed has never been challenged.

Considerations of economy—and that extends not only to the handling by the Department but to the addressing in Members' offices—plus the added consideration that under the present prohibition we have the absurd situation whereby Members of Congress using the frank do not even have privileges on a parity with private mailers on either rural, star, or city routes or boxes suggest to a majority of the committee the commonsense of discontinuing the restriction. Private mailers can send rural mail addressed simply "Postal patron, local" and city mail without a specific name. Under the present restriction Members of Congress using the frank can do neither—an absurdity on its face. The simplified addressing procedure obtaining prior to last October was entirely permissive and would remain so under the accompanying bill. Members of Congress could continue to use the more complete address if they so prefer. The choice would be solely theirs.

The language included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, providing that funds available for reimbursing the Post Office for the cost of congressional mailings should also be available for the expenses, as authorized by existing law, of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under the congressional frank was not repeated in the 1963 bill because it was permanent law. Repetition was unnecessary. This provision was temporarily set aside by an amendment in the form of a limitation on the use of funds inserted by the Senate and subsequently agreed to by the House in the 1963 bill, but it only attached to the money in the bill and therefore expires June 30, 1963. The restriction—section 105 of the 1963 law—is not repeated in the accompanying bill. The permanent law would again become controlling.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

FURNITURE

For furniture and materials for repairs of the same, including labor, tools, and machinery for furniture repair shops, and for the purchase of packing boxes, $269,620.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Kyl: After line 12 on page 5, add the following section and renumber following lines accordingly:

"*Provided however,* That no funds appropriated for the Office of the Chaplain, Office of the Clerk, Committee Employees, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, Office of the Doorkeeper, Special and Minority Employees, Office of the Postmaster, Official Reporters of Debates, Official Reporters to Committees, the Committee on Appropriations, Office of the Legislative Council, or Members Clerk Hire, shall be used to pay salaries or other such remuneration to any person who is a relative by blood or marriage of any incumbent Member of the House of Representatives."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have frequently engaged in worrisome studies designed to determine what foreigners think of the United States. In fact, construction of a favorable international image is a compelling passion with many stalwart souls. And maybe this is a good thing.

However, it is this Member's opinion that we might be better concerned in this body with what the American citizen thinks of the U.S. Congress. This is not an academic matter. I hold that the House of Representatives is the most democratic legislative body in the world. It is the bulwark of our entire system of representative goverment. If the people cannot have faith in this institution, their faith in our very foundations is shattered.

It is natural that the House of Representatives should be the subject of much discussion, and in the nature of things, even the object of both humor and criticism. This House is much better than certain reporters and newswriters would picture it. There are, after all, some members of that most worthy profession, who prefer sensational reporting of distorted bits to presentation of honest details and opinions. Without training which could lead to perception, but with practice in touring the sewers in glass-bottom boats, their efforts cannot be considered constructive.

Nor is the House as "sea green incorruptible" or efficient as painted by one of the complacent Congressmen spooning bean soup in the company of his mutual admiration society.

The truth is somewhere in between. The fact remains that there are enough unjustifiable policies, and there are enough individuals doing enough which is subject to criticism to cast a shadow of malfeasance or inefficiency on the entire body of good, devoted men and women. When all the smoke and fury over reform has cleared, I personally do not think there is anything fundamentally wrong with the Congress which a little introspection and a 6-day week would not cure. The Congress must not only refrain from doing wrong, but it must refrain from those unnecessary practices which give the impression of wrongdoing.

High on this category is the matter loosely termed "nepotism." All of us recognize that there are relatives on payrolls who perform their jobs honestly and competently. There is no aspersion in these remarks against any individual or any employee. But the practice is unnecessary. Bad situations have developed because of nepotism and they will continue to happen. While certain areas of the Nation might be tolerant to specific cases, the citizens of the Nation generally object to nepotism.

This amendment simply makes it impossible for nepotism to exist in the House of Representatives in those categories covered by this part of the bill. Another amendment will be offered later today covering the joint committees of the two Houses. Once we have eliminated the practice in the legislative branch, we can in good conscience eliminate it in the executive and judicial branches.

The amendment is offered in good faith for your serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Oklahoma withdrawing his point of order?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the contention of this amendment. I am proud to say that in all my years here I have never practiced what this amendment would prohibit. I am also proud to say that every member of the delegation from Oklahoma can make the same statement as to his own situation.

This is a matter that has caused the Congress some criticism and some embarrassment over many years. It is nothing new. The only reason I oppose the application here is because it is impractical and unwise to try to accomplish this sort of thing in an appropriation bill here on the floor.

We have a House Administration Committee. This is a matter I would suppose to be within their jurisdiction. We have tried to avoid the criticism that has been sometimes justly directed at us in years gone by. We have tried not to usurp or encroach upon other committees. We try to carry out the mandates of the House. I hope the membership, regardless of how they may feel about the merits of this idea, will not impose it on this bill, but if they are that interested in cleaning up this matter, to take it before the proper committee and, having done so, if they can get any type of resolution reported that will change the situation, under those circumstances, it will have my help and support. I just hope we do not make it a practice of trying to correct all of these important policy matters we are criticized about in this bill when we have a more logical and more effective way of doing these things, if we have that much interest in them. This is a policy matter. It ought to come before us in a policy bill, not on this bill. It needs careful committee consideration. I hope the Members will defeat the amendment, and I hope that those who think that it does have merit will take whatever steps can be taken to have it otherwise properly brought before the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask my colleague from Iowa a question or two concerning his amendment. Do I understand that this is purely and simply an antinepotism amendment?

Mr. KYL. That is clear.

Mr. GROSS. It goes no further than to raise the prohibition against nepotism?

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see how anyone could possibly be opposed to this amendment.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I do not know how or where you are going to find out who is practicing nepotism. If what we read in the papers is true, some is going on, and under those circumstances it is going to be quite difficult to apply the mandate of this amendment if it is approved. I do not know whether it will do what shall be done or not. It seems to me that if there are so many Members here that are so interested, why do they not go to the right committee and bring these things out in a proper legislative order. Why try to apply it when an appropriation is in here every time.

Mr. GROSS. Just 1 minute. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this is not the only provision of that nature. There are a number of provisions in this bill that have not gone to the proper committees, and the gentleman well knows it. That argument falls of its own weight, coming from the chairman of the subcommittee, who has written legislation, deliberately written legislative proposals in this bill. Let us not hear any more about that because you have not gone to the proper committee in a number of other instances.

Mr. STEED. We have always tried to keep matters of policy before the proper committees.

Mr. GROSS. Do not let us have any more argument of that kind, because the bill contains other policy and legislative proposals.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not intend to say anything here, but in view of the question raised, I must say I am the only Member that has an antinepotism bill in, and I have not yet been able to get a hearing on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the gentleman has introduced a bill, and I would be most happy to support his bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And I have asked almost every month for a hearing on this bill, and I have not gotten it yet.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say to the gentleman I have no relatives, even down to the 69th cousin, on my payroll or any payroll of the House, but if this is such a good amendment, why do you not come in with a bill prohibiting it all over the country? I read an article in Forbes magazine, regarding one of the big industries in Ohio, that said that one of the reasons it was in such bad shape, that they had the nepotism practice there that if similar nepotism were practiced in Congress, it would cause a scream to go up from coast to coast.

Who are these holier-than-thou people always criticizing Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman, and the gentleman well knows, that an all-inclusive amendment to this bill would go out on a point of order. The gentleman is well aware of that. It is impossible to cover the executive branch of Government in this appropriation bill. The amendment must be limited to the funds contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY, CONSTRUCTION, AND EQUIPMENT, ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the acquisition of property, construction, and equipment of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, and other changes and improvements, authorized by the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41, 42), $20,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 17, line 17, after the figure "$20,000,000," strike the period, insert a colon, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for the construction of a swimming pool, and: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for the installation of additional doors in the Members' offices in the additional House Office Building."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with a Federal debt of $306 billion on the books, and a deficit ranging anywhere from $7 to $12 billion or more, I insist Members of the House can dispense with a swimming pool in the New-New House Office Building. As a matter of fact, they tell me—I have not seen it—that there is an excellent pool across the way operated by the other body. I see no reason why the Members could not tuck their swimming trunks or their bikinis, or whatever they are, under their arm and go over there, if they must swim, until we can get a balanced budget and get this country back on the track financially. They can do their swimming over there. Is that not logical?

I am sure Members of the Senate would not discriminate against Members of the House. I am sure that is an integrated pool; it is bound to be. So why not dispense with a swimming pool in the New-New House Office Building? And anyway, it is one of the last things to be installed in the new. There are no firm plans even now. I doubt that some of you will get to use it anyway, because it is probably 5 or 10 years away at the rate the building is being constructed.

So I hope you will join with me in providing no funds for a plush swimming pool.

The other part of the amendment simply stops the business of cutting additional doors in the Members' offices in the New-New House Office Building. It is my understanding, as previously stated on the House floor, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], a member of the building committee, concurred at that time, and I hope to have his support now. I hope he has not walked through another rose garden and changed his mind.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does not the gentleman realize that there is a rule in the other body that nobody except a Member of that body is privileged to use their pool?

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised there is that kind of discrimination practiced.

Mr. YOUNGER. There is. That is a segregated pool.

Mr. GROSS. Well, let us see if we cannot do something about that. Let us see if Mr. Kennedy, or one of the Kennedys, I do not care which one, but one of them, can get something done about that.

Mr. Chairman, going back to this matter of cutting new doors in this building, I understand this could cost another $160,000, and that the doors might be only 2 feet in width. As I said before, there are some Members who would have difficulty getting through a 2-foot-wide door in order to avoid their constituents.

So, let us save doors and money. I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara]. I see no reason why members cannot walk through their reception rooms to get to their employees or press a button and have their employees come through the reception room to get to them.

We do not need to spend $160,000 or more of the taxpayer's money for another door for each of 169 Members. Let us write my restriction into the bill, just in case somebody does walk through a rose garden and have his mind changed for him.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, this I think indicates that when a Member has the responsibility of handling a bill like this, he can often find himself in a very peculiar position in trying to defend the bill. I am not for wasting money, and I rise in opposition to this amendment for the reason that I think a gymnasium and swimming pool of the types contemplated here, added to this project at the recommendation and with the hearty support of those who are charged with looking after the good health of the Members, is a good thing and needed. I hope that we defeat this amendment and permit these health facilities to be made available to Members of Congress who need exercise and who apparently all too often neglect themselves by not taking it. We might even get my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, to go down there and take some exercise and keep his health as good as it is now, and make it possible for him to serve here for many, many more wonderful and effective years if we had something like this to offer him.

As to the matter of the doors, I am not completely sure that anyone at this point can say what this amendment will do. Some of the doors under the original plan are not yet built. They have some rooms as yet not constructed. I do not know whether this will confuse the situation or not. I think that we might be doing more to the doors than we think we are if we adopt this amendment. In any event, the matter has been exaggerated in the press. I realize it is easy for an unkind press, and that is what the Congress has to live with, to make a great mountain out of this molehill, but I think there comes a time when we ought to be willing to do those things that are desirable.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We went into this and we had frank discussions in our committee. I say to the Committee here and now that I concur with the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. Steed]. I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. STEED. I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I would like to make it plain, too, with some reluctance, that I disagree with my friend from Iowa. I happen to think as one of those who uses the gym as frequently as I can that if more Members would go down there and let off steam we would be a lot happier and more productive on the floor. Furthermore I am not only for swimming pools, I would like to report, too, and I think I can do this in accuracy, that Dr. Calver has made it plain to me, and I hope and expect to our beloved Speaker, about the necessity for keeping the present facilities in addition to the new facilities in the New House Office Building, so we may have additional facilities for those who choose to go there in the future, whether handicapped or not. I do not think going to the gym is just for the handicapped. I know that if I did not go there I would probably be worse to get along with than I am, and possibly that might apply to others.

Mr. STEED. The Congress has approved a lot of other types of exercise. There are some of us here who are getting up in years, to the point where that may be desirable. Daily exercise for short periods is widely recommended and we ought to avail ourselves of it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, particularly that portion of it relating to swimming pools. As one who has been interested in swimming for many years, I have always rather resented the fact that the only kind of exercise we have available to us here in the House is paddle ball. Paddle ball is a fine sport and I know many of my friends have followed it. But, as I am sure the attending physician will attest, swimming is recognized as the best sport of all. We here are all interested in physical fitness. We have a physician to watch over our health. I think a swimming pool would be a great addition to our congressional physical fitness program. Yes, swimming is a great sport. And I might say it is a little less dangerous than bicycling, which I ran afoul of just yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 26, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Kyl: Page 17, preceding the section of the bill titled Capitol Power Plant, add the following new language: "*Provided, however,* That no funds appropriated by this bill shall be used to construct underground parking facilities in the two squares immediately south of the Longworth and Rayburn Buildings, or to pay for planning and design not already completed."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, today we have had some discussion about the desirability of letting the House know what is in these appropriation measures. I want to say I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has done an excellent job in dispelling many of these clouds.

I would like to call attention to what we are doing in regard to providing underground parking space in these lots south of the new Rayburn Office Building and the Longworth Building. We are proposing to spend $8 million to provide 720 parking spaces in addition to what we have. Bear in mind, there are now parking lots above ground in this area. This parking will be removed if this underground facility is constructed. We will have underground facilities providing an additional 720 spaces. If we figure the cost on that basis, each one of these parking spaces will cost around $11,000 unless we include the cost of the land involved.

Now I cannot estimate exactly what this land is worth, but with the dimensions in mind and comparing it with other land that has been purchased in the Capitol Hill area in recent years, it is logical to assume that we will also use about $2 million worth of land for the construction of these garages. If we were building a building on this lot, and we are still talking about annexes for the Library Building and for other facilities here, if we were building a building on this spot and thus making better and wiser use of it, we would not be precluded from building underground parking beneath that building, the same way we are doing with the Rayburn Building. We could still get the parking and use the land with much more benefit. But if we build these parking garages in the two squares or lots, then we will again be faced with the prospect when the need for a new building in the neighborhood of the Capitol arises, we will be faced with the prospect of buying additional land which is now in private hands, and taking more of that property which belongs on the tax rolls of the District of Columbia, and moving people who should not be disturbed. We would be faced with the prospect of finding additional space to build the building that we did not put on top of the ground south of the Rayburn Building. I think the House should be aware of the action we are taking. Certainly, we need parking facilities on the Hill. There is not any question about that. But with the numbers of tourists who visit here, it is unlikely that we will ever catch up with the demand. When you leave the House today, if you will tour the existing facilities, you will find on good days and in god weather, these underground areas are not even used because they are not as handy as the spaces available along the curb. So, in effect, you would not be getting an actual 720 car increase in parking spaces even if we do construct this garage. I do not think there is wisdom in this proposal. I do not think we can justify this kind of expenditure at this time.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have here provided the first year's cost for a project designed on the two squares south of the Longworth Building and the Rayburn Building for the construction of underground garages to provide parking facilities for 1,220 cars, and in addition the construction of some urgently needed facilities to house the carpenter shop and the furniture repair shop and the electrical shop and the paint shop and other service facilities now housed throughout the House Office Building and Capitol Building that are using up space that is needed for other purposes and that are creating noise and may in some instances be termed a nuisance and also in some instances a fire hazard.

Of this estimated $8 million cost that would go into this underground facility, roughly $1 million will be used at the corner where the old George Washington Inn is now situated in order to place these service and shops there. We cannot ever eliminate the eyesore of parking lots now in existence until such a project of this kind is built, because we ought never spoil the beauty and the appeal of the Capitol and its grounds by surface parking lots. We accomplish both the landscaping of the Capitol Grounds and the parking facilities in this project.

The land has already been bought. The core drillings have been done. The architectural and engineering services are in progress.

Mr. Chairman, we can, if we want, put off, but we cannot get rid of the need for this facility. I call attention to the fact that in other needed facilities here on Capitol Hill in the years gone by delays of one sort or another were caused and the ultimate result was that the Congress was denied the use of the facilities for an extra number of years and the cost of the construction went up a great deal. Therefore, all that was accomplished was the loss of time and expenditure in the long run of more money than otherwise would have been necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this would happen in the instance of these garages if the House approves this amendment and further delays this work.

They tell us that by January or February they will be ready to occupy enough of the Rayburn Building parking facilities to move all the cars now parked on these two squares and make room so that the work can begin.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will let this work go ahead to its completion so that within the not too distant future we will have a workable facility here. It will add 1,220 badly needed parking spaces underground but of course it will at the same time displace some 500 existing surface parking spaces.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been estimated that we require well over 3,000 parking spaces for the Members and the employees who work in the House Office Buildings and here at the Capitol. The space we have in the Cannon Office Building plus the space in the Rayburn Building and this underground garage will add up to just 3,120.

In addition to that we hope that this will make available parking spaces on the plaza, now used by employees, for our constituents when they come to visit the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to pay a compliment and tribute to Chief Sullivan of the Capitol Police Force and the members of the Capitol Police Force who have been most courteous in assisting my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, we have a real problem here with all the schoolchildren, and the general public, who come here particularly in the summertime to visit their

Nation's Capitol. There is not nearly enough parking space to accommodate them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out these facts to the members of the Committee. When one makes the adjustments in the cost for these parking spaces to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] referred, one comes out with a figure of about $5,800 per space. It may seem like a large sum, but the cost of a parking space in the Cannon Building, built in 1958, was $4,780. I might say the so-called legislative garage, which is more properly called the Senate garage, built in 1931, cost $4,630.

So I do not think in the per car cost there has been a great deal of inflation, when it is only a small amount over the cost per car of the garage built in 1931.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say this matter has been considered very seriously by the House Office Building Commission when the late Speaker was chairman and the Commission consisted of Speaker Rayburn, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Auchincloss].

It has also been considered by the present House Office Building Commission, of which I am chairman, the other two Members being the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Auchincloss].

The decision in both cases has been unanimous.

We feel that this underground garage is necessary in connection with the Members of the House and their staffs being able to render adequate service to the people of their respective districts and to the people of our country. The observation that has been made by the chairman of the subcommittee is absolutely correct in relation to cost. This garage must be built sooner or later. If it is done later the cost will increase substantially. We know that based upon past experience.

I join with the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Washington in urging that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I would suggest we are going to compound a problem we have already if we start to build these two parking garages, because we are going to have the Rayburn parking facility fully in operation. I think our timing here on building these parking garages is wrong. I think they could easily be delayed for a year until after the Rayburn Building is operative and the 250 parking places in each of these squares are available when they could start parking in the Rayburn Building. If we eliminate these two parking places we are going to have much more of a parking problem than already exists. We cannot have a firm estimate of just exactly when these Rayburn Building facilities are going to be operational.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to observe that we went into this angle. It is expected that the Rayburn Building basement and the parking facilities there will be available in January, so it has already been anticipated.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Even if they may have to give a little bit here and there, it will be in this fiscal year, and the work of the Rayburn Building is far enough along so that we can anticipate using that. So there is no serious question about the availability of substitute parking when these lots are cleared. In any event, the work will not be started until later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The question is, Where are you going to get the money for all these things?

Mr. HORAN. I thought I had gone into that in my prepared speech. I do not think money is being wasted upon the House of Representatives. I am not for Central Government running everything. I am for States rights and local responsibilities, I should like to say to the gentleman, and I want Members of Congress to have the facilities to come here and fight for the home folks as well as to enact wise Federal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Printing and binding

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress; not to exceed $7,500 for printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 182); printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register (including the Code of Federal Regulations) as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 309, 311, 311a); and printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipients; $18,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) : *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Missouri: On page 24, line 6, strike the figure 18,200,000 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "18,173,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the printing or distribution of wall calendars requisitioned and distributed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives;".

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it will not take 5 minutes to explain what I am attempting to do here. The subcommittee on this bill has recommended that a substantially smaller quantity would probably serve the purpose. It also states that this was started some time ago. At the present time they are printing 51,469 of these calendars at a cost of $27,473. I think, in talking with many of the Members, it becomes more of a nuisance than any benefit, and therefore I would move to discontinue this by cutting the appropriation $27,000, providing that this appropriation shall not be available for the printing or distribution of wall calendars.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again I find myself in the position of fighting for something that I have very limited need for. But, the fact that I do not find these calendars to be very attractive is an exception. We find that nearly 400 Members of the House do receive additional copies, and many of them tell me that they would be in some difficulty if this item, now that it has been so long established, were denied to them. The subcommittee went into it thoroughly. We thought the total was getting a little high, and we tried to find every way in this bill that we reasonably could to hold things down, to make it a little tighter, more austere, figuring that was the temper of the House. We thought that a smaller quantity would suffice. We tried to put it in that approach. To just wipe it all out is going to cause as much difficulty, I think, as it will good. I hope that the House will support the committee and let us see what one more year will do about this item. I believe if they will bear with us, that with all the things we have got going, we probably can bring this item down within reason and at the same time still keep available the use of this calendar. Many of our own agencies here are not allowed to have commercial calendars, and obviously we need to have provision made. A calendar is nothing more than an ordinary item of office stationery. Every home, every office in America has calendars.

I would just like for the committee to have a report on this item at least for the coming year to see if we cannot get this thing to where it is more in line and makes more sense.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, from my own experience and observation I do not think that any expenditure of the Federal moneys in comparable amount has contributed more to building the spirit of love of country and respect for its Government among the young people of America. I send these calendars to all of the schools in my district. They hang there and there is no name on them, no advertising of person or product, a symbol of our country, its Congress, and its laws. Just a picture of the Capitol of the United States and the dome. The reaction I get to it is very heartening. I think these calendars perform a great service for our country.

I hope the amendment will be crushingly defeated.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate to me at this time while we are on printing to direct attention to the earlier statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], who is here, relative to the "trash and trivia and tripe" as he described insertions in the Record of the Members of Congress. I personally take exception to that, and I say to my colleagues most respectfully that while I may disagree with many of the statements put in the Record because I do not share that particular philosophy or because I disagree with the gentleman who put in views with which I disagree, I certainly shall not foreclose any Member from expressing his views. When I see any Member of this House, knowing the expenditures we run up in the course of a year, saying that as an economy move we will hamstring or curtail the efforts of the Members of Congress themselves to be heard and speak for their districts, I must object. Indeed, if you want some type of rule, Mr. Chairman, I would say, well enough, let us all have the same number of lines, if that is what you want, if you want to limit the Members of Congress to be heard. However, limiting the freedom of speech on the floor of this House, or the freedom to use the Record and calling Member's views trash and trivia I think is wrong. I do a lot of my work at night in order to have my remarks ready. I can redo these and not use any extraneous material, but we have access to the best brains in the United States who are writing their views, with which we may agree or disagree. When we take that material, editorial or otherwise, and tie in our own thoughts I think we render a service. I say even to those with whom I have disagreed, I have had a tremendous benefit from each of you as I read your views and your extraneous material. I will not accuse any of you of putting trash and trivia in the Record when I may disagree with a commencement speech, or some other editorial or material that you use. Therefore I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Missouri, who is with us now. Can the gentleman give us at this time examples of trash and trivia and tripe placed in the Congressional Record and the Members doing this?

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. I cannot give you any examples of what I would consider to be trash and tripe and trivia that is inserted in the Record. I have made speeches on the floor of the House calling attention to certain local eulogies and writeups of local problems, and recipes for cherry pies, and other remarks made by people who are not prominent, and editorials. The question is not that I disagree with their content, but that they are not of such a literary standard that the Congressional Record should be used to give some status to them. In that respect I think that the Member has an opportunity to use some selectivity in the type of material he puts into the Record. I think if he will exercise some choice we can elevate and improve the standard of the material that has been appearing in the Record. I have made detailed studies of this and I have on occasion printed in the Record some of the material I feel falls into this category. I am not trying to restrict anybody's freedom of speech.

What I have said on the floor here today is not intended to limit any Member in the future in expressing his views to any extent he wishes. But it is intended to cut out editorials and articles merely to fill up the Record and to leave the impression that somebody has made a great study and a great contribution when the contribution is not worth the paper it is printed on.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Chairman, I merely asked the gentleman to make a statement of the Members who have inserted this material and examples of this material. He may have those. I renew that request. I had not intended for him to comment otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege. Whatever we do, let us apply it equally to all Members. I happen to disagree with the gentleman, and I do so respectfully. I happen to think that a Member of Congress may put material in the Record with which I may disagree, but I do not call it trash or trivia. That is his view, not mine. I decry the efforts of the gentleman in trying to censor the rest of us.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to say that I think the entire House will agree with me that this great committee, headed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] has performed a distinct and important service in the fine, well-considered bill which it has reported to this Chamber.

Mr. **STEED**. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. **STEED**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **BOW**. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 122, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—271

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chenoweth
Clark
Cooley
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee

Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—122

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Alger
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Findley
Foreman
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
May
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Watson
Whalley
Wharton
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—39

Abernethy
Ayres
Baring
Boland
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Chelf
Cohelan
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Dorn
Fogarty
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Harris
Hemphill
Kilburn
Kirwan
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Nelsen
Ostertag
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
St Germain
Sheppard
Springer
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Whitten
Williams
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Brock against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Boland.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Willis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain tabulations and other material in connection with the bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND OF CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 396, Rept. No. 379), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a one-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF MASTER CONTROL RECORDS BRANCH OF THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that the Secretary of the Air Force proposes to transfer from the District of Columbia area, all records and information with regard to appointees and nominees to the U.S. Air Force Academy as well as the records of the cadets already in training at the Academy. This proposed move is of great concern to me, as it should be to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have directed a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force protesting this transfer as follows:

JUNE 11, 1963.

Hon. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary, U.S. Air Force, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has recently come to my attention that the Air Force Academy's Master Control Records Branch, presently located here in Washington, is scheduled to be moved to the Air Force Academy in Colorado. Such a move is beyond my comprehension, if efficiency, convenience and expediency are taken into consideration, and, as often as Senators and Congressmen must contact this office for immediate and vital information, it is impossible not to consider these factors.

I cannot see where the transfer of the Master Control Records Branch would be any more economical, or where it would be beneficial to those who use it most frequently, but rather how impractical it would be. Right now the operation is running smoothly, and my office is able to secure information at a moment's notice. Your Cadet Branch has always been ready, willing and able to answer inquiries from my office in a most knowledgeable and courteous manner, and has been largely responsible for my office being able to maintain an efficient and well-organized operation, as well. The cooperation and results we receive from your Academy Cadet Branch are excellent.

I would like to take this opportunity to strongly recommend the retention of this Master Control Records Branch here in Washington, so it can continue to operate as it has in the past under its excellent supervision. Your kind consideration and assistance for gaining a favorable decision to this request will be sincerely and gratefully appreciated.

I would appreciate your early and personal reply to this letter.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress.

I am also introducing a resolution on this subject which states that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that these records should remain in the District of Columbia area. I hope that many of my colleagues, who share these views, will protest this transfer by introducing a companion resolution.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems of the past decade concerns the need to ban nuclear weapons test. The advantages of such a ban are obvious and all nations agree that such an accomplishment would be a crucial and giant step toward what all thinking men pray for—a lasting peace.

For the past 5 years, we have traveled a difficult and sometime tortuous route in our negotiations with the Soviets, but impediments have prevented us from reaching our goal—which in simplest terms is a treaty with adequate safeguards against cheating. Our adversary has been at times intransigent, but I believe that the odds are not insurmountable.

Through the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations almost every type of proposal has been advanced, modified, revised, changed, and resubmitted—but so far a successful treaty has eluded us.

On June 4 I spoke on the floor and mentioned the difficulties and dangers confronting us on the international scene. On that occasion I paid tribute to His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, whose saintly and wise thinking has had a profound effect on me. At that time I said:

> It is not difficult to suggest easy solutions to our domestic problems nor to solve the potential international tinderboxes which are smoldering from Cuba to Plaine des Jarres. The difficulties lie in working out acceptable solutions in the complex middle grounds between absolutes. It is in this area that our democratic society has shown its greatest strength.

Yesterday the President announced two important decisions: First, that he had agreed with Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier Khrushchev that high-level discussions should be held in Moscow on a test-ban treaty; and second, he pledged that the United States would not conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states would not do so. I commend the President on these concrete moves toward peace. These steps are practical and realistic opening wedges. The United States has clearly extended its open hand to our opponents—let us hope that it is received with the same warmth that it was extended.

Following such an important proposal, I would hope that partisan reaction could be kept to a minimum. I stress this because of the impact of the success or failure that such negotiations could have on all of us and because there seems to be an almost reflex action on the part of some to any constructive proposal made by the administration.

I say this again because I have been reading and hearing about one of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle who is proposing a bold move, and to leave the dismal failures of the past behind which superficially appear to be quick and easy ways to achieve a test-ban treaty. My colleague calls for fallout limitation and commented that the U.S. administration should stop tilting windmills and direct its attention to practical steps to deal with whatever future risks may be involved in continued unrestricted atmospheric testing.

Following the President's speech at American University, the automatic reflex again jerked into action and those emotionally charged words such as "a soft line" and "going hat in hand to Moscow to beg" came forth. I can assure any and all that the hand that guided our country through the October 1962 crises was a strong hand which has never and will never go "hat in hand" anywhere.

I would simply like to suggest that work on this vitally important test-ban treaty is not taken casually, but is a deadly serious business. It does not call for a partisan approach, but it does call for a bi-partisan attempt to work out an agreement which we hope will save the world from a nuclear holocaust.

As far as a proposal for a "fall-out limitation," as I mentioned, almost every other approach to this issue, has been tried or mentioned sometime during our past negotiations. Concerning "fall-out limitation," I would like to quote from a speech made by our distinguished colleague, Carl Durham, former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the National Association of Manufacturers in New York on May 21, 1958, on the subject of "Radiation Hazards Facing the State and the Nation." Carl, who was then chairman of the committee, said:

> All of us, quite naturally, would oppose any international agreement on testing which would endanger the national security and weaken the resources of the free world relative to the Communist world. On the other hand, it seems to me that there may be a useful area to explore, namely, agreement on limitation of the amount of fissionable material which is deposited in the atmosphere by nuclear weapons tests. Such agreement would be an important first step toward the ultimate cessation of tests and would serve the vital purpose of cutting down on the amount of radio-active contamination of the world's atmosphere.

In the same vein, Senator ANDERSON, one of our associates from the other body, commented similarly in a speech made in New York on August 5, 1959, entitled "Policies for a Nuclear Future." At that time, he said:

> In 1957 the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee held public hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effects on man. Based on the testimony and the facts brought out during those hearings, I suggested, at the time, that we should seek agreement with other nations on an atmospheric limitation of fission products. I continue to feel that, lacking agreement of cessation of all tests coupled with a reliable inspection and detection system, it is important at least to reach agreement on limitation of fission products put into the atmosphere by testing.

I have just completed 3 days of hearings on fallout radiation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where the subcommittee reviewed all aspects of this crucial problem in what I believe was a dispassionate and objective manner. I hope that the closely related test ban issue can be handled in the same way.

In his encyclical "Pacem in Terris," Pope John XXIII, made a profound observation which I believe bears repeating. The pontiff said:

> Peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed. The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit.

I would like to end my brief comments by making a plea to all of my colleagues who are interested in the field of international negotiations on nuclear weapons, that we work quietly and unsensationally in the cause of peace with honor, and cast aside easy solutions which grab headlines but little else.

JOE H. ADAMS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Miami, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to incorporate a copy of the bill in the RECORD as part of my remarks and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a resolution of the Harvey W. Seeds Post of the American Legion of Miami asking the Congress to designate this hospital to one of its members—one of the outstanding Legionnaires of the country, a national vice commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. PEPPER. I am introducing the bill, but I wanted to incorporate a copy of the bill in the Record.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the reason I reserve the right to object is this—and I think the gentleman will agree with me. By including the resolution, I think the gentleman from Florida is burdening the Record, as well as in printing the bill. If that were put in the Appendix of the daily Record, it would not burden the permanent Record. The bill would speak for itself and the resolution could appear in the Appendix of the daily Record. In view of the statement I made today of what I am trying to accomplish, I would respectfully object to including that material in the body of the Record.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so I may respond?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I made a simple and I thought a proper request to include this memorial in the body of the Record. I am willing to withdraw my request to include the bill and just let the notation of the introduction of it appear in the proper place in the Record. But I have a 1½-page resolution from the American Legion Post of Miami of which this man was a member, memorializing the Congress to enact this bill and I feel it proper that that memorial appear in the body of the Record.

I have not made any similar request today and I do not often make such requests. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, this matter is obviously a matter directly pertinent to the bill which the gentleman is introducing. It is not a matter extraneous to the legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the memorial to which I referred is as follows:

Whereas authorization for the construction of a new hospital by the Veterans' Administration, in Dade County, Fla., has heretofore been authorized by law; and

Whereas Joe H. Adams, now deceased, was a distinguished citizen of the State of Florida, a former national vice commander of the American Legion, a past commander of Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion Department of Florida; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge among veterans of Dade County, and the general public thereof, that Joe H. Adams in life contributed in time, effort, and resources, in the aggregate, more than any other single individual to the authorization, by the Congress, of construction of said new veterans' hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, Department of Florida, on the 45th birthday anniversary of the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, with distinguished guests as follows: National Vice Commander Pat Reese; National Executive Committeeman E. Meade Wilson; alternate National Executive Committeeman Billy Anderson; Department Commander Arthur M. MacCarthy; Southern Area Commander Edwin K. Palmer; 10th District Commander Allan Kelley; and with the concurrence of all posts of the American Legion comprising the 10th District, Department of Florida, in Dade and Monroe Counties, does memorialize the Congress to enact legislation giving to the new veterans' hospital to be erected in Miami, Dade County, Fla., the name: "Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital"; and be it further

Resolved, That this post, in conjunction with all other posts in the said 10th District, be instructed to forward copies of this resolution, duly attested, to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to U.S. Senators Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers, and to U.S. Congressmen Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper.

PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, disturbing elements of change are being experienced in our Government's practices relative to awarding defense contracts. I know this is a subject which is spiced with emotional, economic, and political considerations. I am not unmindful that such reactions are not without rationalization in terms of district and State problems. I would, however, ask that the membership review for a few moments some rather sobering aspects of the shift and change we are presently experiencing and anticipating in growing velocity. In requesting your indulgence may I suggest you do so solely to determine within the framework of our national concern for our national security. Let us ask what we as a Congress can support as policy to obtain for the American taxpayers the best in national defense—in weaponry, in space, for each dollar we spend.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States should be complimented on the advantages it has built into its present bid procedures. These procedures as they have been gradually refined and developed provide for a stage-by-stage development of negotiations with interested industrial firms. The firms are induced to make refined proposals on a projected space craft, missile vehicle, or guidance system.

At each stage, like musical chairs, some bidders are eliminated from the competition. At each of several stages, the Defense Department allows each selected competitor a stated sum of money for a limited period of time to refine and exact their proposal in terms of flexibility of performance, reliability, lowest cost, and highest ultimate level of performance. The real carrot is the final contract award.

In practice this has induced the major competing companies to plow back portions of the past earnings into the greatest of research and development efforts during these negotiation stages. Since the contract goes to only one bidder, there is a real meaning in the word "risk" attached to the "risk capital" of the several contending firms spent in the negotiations.

However, gentlemen, I know from my own constituents that those risks are willingly assumed where there is assurance that the contract in question will ultimately be awarded on the basis of the merit of the final proposals. This is the kind of challenge which has always encouraged the highest performance from our private enterprise system.

Now, sirs, what do you suppose will happen to this incentive and this effort, if it can be demonstrated that the ultimate award is not made on the basis of true merit—not made on the demonstrated, illustrated superiority of the proposal? Will the incentive be as keen? Will the risk capital be so readily advanced if what tips the scale is not the worthiness, the superiority but rather some other extraneous fact, such as comparative employment figures or area percentages of allocation of contract?

May we be reminded that we are here talking about the most important, single activity of our times. The maintenance of the free world leadership and the protection of our Government and the security of our people from a known, aggressive, and resourceful adversary. We are here talking about a new strata of combat—the technological struggle between ourselves and the Russians. A struggle which if decisively won by either side could very well be the single determinant as to which will emerge as victorious and dominant. We are not here talking about a tool for the correction of some of our internal and domestic problems.

Assuming that there was any validity to such a distorted use of the defense program, what results would we expect. May we suggest the following: Out of the careful competitive approach outlined above certain firms have emerged on merit alone as final prime contractors. They employ skilled, well-paid, tax-paying workmen and engineers in their home plants who will work on the part of the contract to be performed in the plant of the successful bidder. Then the successful bidder will subcontract a sizable portion of the total work to other plants throughout the United States all of whom employ skilled, well-payed, tax-paying workmen and engineers and all of whom have been part of the "team" effort to win the contract. This latter represents the "buy" activity of the prime contractor and can involve, as I shall demonstrate, as much as 66 percent of the award money in the prime contract.

May I use a specific illustration, Mr. Speaker? I am sure the Members are aware of the Minuteman missile program. The major contract on this program went on competitive merit to the firm of Autonetics, now operating largely in Orange County. The total award on this contract was $401.5 million. The in-plant manufacturing and development represents 34 percent of the award. Sixty-six percent or $264.6 million represents production bought from other manufacturing plants located in 20 States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I will insert a complete breakdown of not only the States involved but the companies within such States and the amount of subcontract commitment in dollars each company has involved:

List of Minuteman program subcontractors

State	Item	Total amount committed to date
ARIZONA		
Motorola, Inc., 5005 East McDowell Rd., Phoenix.	Transistors	$5,388,954
CALIFORNIA		
Continental Device, 12515 South Chadron Ave., Hawthorne.	Diodes	855,283
Pacific Semiconductors, Inc., 12955 South Chadron Ave., Hawthorne.	do	11,436,671
Ultronix, Inc., 111 East 30th Ave., San Mateo	Resistors	1,414,001
Giannini Controls, 1600 South Mountain Ave., Duarte.	Digital resolvers	236,382
Cannon Electric, 1649 South Central, Glendale	Receptacles	235,020
Airesearch Manufacturing Co., 9851 Sepulveda, Los Angeles.	Blower	290,165
Convair, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego	Body section	697,675
RCA Data Systems Division, 8500 Balboa Blvd., Van Nuys.	N10 chassis, base, and cover.	944,823
	Computers chassis	573,582
	C53	1,548,410
Sperry Rand Corp., Vickers, Inc., Division, 2160 East Imperial Highway, El Segundo.	Auxiliary power supply	8,870,588
Magna Mill-Hydro Mill, H. W. Loud, 969 East 2d St., Pomona; 10533 Sessler, 1707 South Gate, Cloverfield, Santa Monica.	Machined platform	3,367,546
Amphenol Borg, 9201 Independence Ave., Chatsworth.	Cables	3,373,643
Fairchild Semiconductors, 545 Whisman Rd., Mountain View.	Transistors	4,534,680
	Diodes	1,393,987
Raytheon Co., 350 Ellis St., Mount View	Transistors	579,282
Total		40,352,738
CONNECTICUT		
Eastern Industries, Hamden	C24 air conditioners	291,460
Sperry Rand Corp., Wheeler Electronic Division, 150 East Aurora, Waterbury.	Transformers	5,862,159
Total		6,153,619
ILLINOIS		
Cook Electric, 8100 Manticello Rd., Skakie	C24 programer	219,950
	C91 programer	285,315
John E. Fast, 3590 East Elston Ave., Chicago	Capacitors	531,981
Astro Metallic Corp., 7401 West Lawrence Ave., Chicago.	Gyro details	443,827
Total		1,481,073
INDIANA		
Delco Remy, 2401 Columbus Ave., Anderson	Batteries	2,713,297
Delco Radio Division, 700 East Firmin, Kokomo.	Transistors	525,845
Total		3,239,142
KANSAS		
Electra Manufacturing Co., 800 North 21st St., Independence.	Resistors	53,530
MASSACHUSETTS		
Nortronics, Norwood	Gyro compass	4,129,000
Transistron Electronic Corp., 168 Albion St., Wakefield.	Transistors	299,000
	Diodes	2,985,063
Solid State Products, Inc., 1 Pinegree St., Salem	Diodes	82,488
Sprague Electric, North Adams	Capacitors	1,955,710
Total		9,451,291
MICHIGAN		
A-C Spark Plug, Flint	Piga	1,370,421
MINNESOTA		
Minneapolis Honeywell Co., 2600 Rigway Rd., Minneapolis.	Gyro	$5,881,901
	Piga	3,098,200
Total		8,980,101
NEBRASKA		
Dale Electronics, Inc., 1356 28th Ave., Columbus.	Resistors	553,332
NEW JERSEY		
Bendix Corp., Eclipse Pioneer Division, Route 46, Teterboro.	P67 sensing element	1,647,659
	Piga	2,025,233
Mepco, Inc., 35 Abbett Ave., Morristown	Resistors	298,976
Total		3,971,868
NEW YORK		
Sperry Gyroscope Co., Lakeville Rd., Great Neck, Long Island, N.Y.	Platform structure	1,231,000
	Memory unit	2,236,000
	Gyrocompass	91,000
	Resolvers	58,374
General Electric Co., Semiconductor Products Division, Electronic Park, Syracuse.	Transistors	1,296,730
	Diodes	1,287,040
IMC Magnetics, 570 Main St., Westbury, Long Island, N.Y.	Blower	148,863
Reeves Instruments, East Gate Blvd., Roosevelt Field, Garden City.	C96	111,308
Revere Camera, 850 Hudson Ave., Rochester	C92	73,721
Total		6,554,036
NORTH CAROLINA		
Shallcross Manufacturing Co., Preston St., Selma.	Resistors	23,005
OHIO		
Borg Warner, Pesco Division, 24700 North Miles Rd., Bedford.	Auxiliary power supply	7,195,823
PENNSYLVANIA		
Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh.	Diodes	233,437
IRC, 401 North Broad St., Philadelphia	Resistors	2,318,176
Corning Glass Works, 540 High St., Bradford	Capacitors	1,626,407
Total		4,178,020
SOUTH CAROLINA		
General Electric Co., Irmo	Capacitors	2,476,428
TEXAS		
Texas Instruments, 6000 Lemmon Ave., Dallas	Alinement unit	2,402,239
	Integrated circuits	8,072,115
	Transistors	2,313,894
	C21	347,727
	C92	117,584
	Diodes	69,836
Temco Electronics, Post Office Box 1500, Arlington.	Servo cylinders	16,264,877
Total		29,588,272
VIRGINIA		
Melpar, 3000 Arlington Ave., Falls Church	Hi-rel boards	82,816,313
WISCONSIN		
Allen Bradley Co., 136 West Greenfield Ave., Milwaukee.	Resistors	6,461,204

A careful scrutiny of this list is recommended to the Congressmen from the districts in which these plants are located. These subcontracts exhibit a pattern of buying by a firm which has demonstrated with the help of these subcontracts a superior ability in the race for merit. If awards are now to be given on some other basis to other firms then I suggest you only create an unwarranted shift of the unemployment problem. It should be evident that the only jobs involved are in the contract. None are created by the shift. Not only will unwarranted displacement be caused in areas where superior skills and know-how are presently demonstrated as prime contractors' locations, but more significantly there is likely to be disruption in the total buy pattern that exists in the present team configuration and we will have to wait and conjecture as to what new patterns of buy in terms of both the mix and the location will emerge. The quality of our programs will suffer. Established economic balance predicated on sound business relationships will suffer and we will still have our present problem of unemployment with a different spread because of military procurement shift.

Finally, gentlemen, what do I hope to have demonstrated in this presentation—these few points. Defense contracts are intricate matters involving interrelations between the economics of many States. These relationships have arisen out of a partnership of competitiveness which has contributed immeasurably to the sophistications and improvements of the American effort in advanced weaponry and the penetration of space. The evolved practice of awarding contracts has produced a pretesting for merit, before award, that gives our Defense Department the superior effort of our defense industry. If this is not so, then let us have suggestions which will improve these selection methods and avoid practices which erode and destroy both the selection and the incentive for the maximum output our research and development are capable of achieving.

We should emphasize that all parts of our economy and our Nation should enter the lists in these contests of merit. Every procedure to keep the lists open and vigorously competitive should be encouraged. But throughout we should be mindful of the real job the tool we are forging is intended to accomplish and we must sharpen rather than dull the edge of its effectiveness.

For other problems let us turn to other tools. Tools less costly to divert to such use. Tools more capable of achieving the ends we seek. You would not seek a general surgeon for a delicate brain operation. It is not the American way to seek less than the best. We are engaged in a grim contest for the highest of stakes—the award for second place is not pleasant to contemplate. Taking second best is the surest pathway to ultimate second place in the fatal sweepstakes. All that any section of the Nation should seek, all that any representatives can ask, is that our defense effort be the best our scientific and industrial know-how can produce. That is all I ask.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

INCLUDING TABULATION IN REMARKS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my original request to include a tabulation in the remarks I made earlier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ALABAMA TO MINE ITS BILLIONTH TON OF COAL THIS YEAR

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 17-18 the 46th Anniversary Convention of the National Coal Association will take place in Washington. The meeting holds perhaps more interest than any other session, inasmuch as a good portion of the agenda will be devoted to transportation and research.

The incredible advances in the entire concept of coal transportation now taking place offer outstanding opportunities to an industry that for many years has been beset with burdensome costs for moving its product from mine to market. While southern railroads have for some time operated on the principle that greater efficiency and lower costs are possible through trainload movements of a bulk product, other lines are now following suit and in the past several months have slashed freight rates drastically through the introduction of the unit train. The resultant savings to consumers have come about through the close cooperation of mine operators, railroad companies, and electric utilities. The magnitude of the savings can be appreciated when it is realized that a ton of coal, a year ago assessed from $4 to $4.50 for a trip from northern West Virginia or western Pennsylvania to the east coast, can now be delivered for as much as $1.50 less.

The NCA convention transportation panel will include not only a railroad expert, but a representative of a waterways operators association as well as electric company and coal company speakers.

Since America's energy requirements will demand maximum utilization of all fuel resources, the new emphasis on coal research is of national interest. As one of the original supporters of legislation establishing the Office of Coal Research, I look forward to the reports that will be made on June 18 by spokesmen for organizations participating in the OCR program.

Those of us responsible for creating the Office of Coal Research did not, of course, expect a scientific or engineering miracle that would stimulate an immediate sharp upturn in coal demand, yet we were confident that enough progress would be made in the early years of the research program to give us some idea of new development possibilities. NCA President Stephen F. Dunn has arranged for representatives of research organizations handling OCR contracts to participate in the convention panel of June 18. Their report will be of interest to all Members of Congress, particularly those of us from coal States.

As customary, Alabama will be represented at the convention. Nineteen hundred and sixty-three will be a monumental year for our State, in that Alabama's mines will produce their billionth ton of bituminous coal next November or December. A national emergency requiring a tremendous increase in coal could move the date ahead, of course, and by the same token an unexpected decline could conceivably carry over this landmark event into 1964. Citizens of Alabama do not, however, expect the demand curve either to soar upward or jackknife down. We therefore invite America to take special notice when our billionth ton is extracted in the closing weeks of this year.

Mr. Speaker, as early as 1834 coal was shipped from a spot near Tuscaloosa down the Black Warrior River to Mobile. Two years later mining activity got underway in the Birmingham district, where it was loaded on barges and taken down the Coosa River. Coke was made from Alabama coal in 1854. The industry moved slowly, but gradually more and more mining operations got underway—in Tuscaloosa County, in Jefferson County, and in Walker County. We exceeded the million-ton mark for the first time in 1883. By then, coal had become an integral component of Alabama's growing industrial complex, and in the years to follow it has remained one of our major resources.

Alabama's mines had the best year in 1926, when output exceeded 21 million tons. As has been the experience of other mining States, production has declined substantially since the immediate post-World War II years. From 1947, when we sent 19 million tons of bituminous coal to market, production curved downward to slightly less than 13 million tons 2 years later. Since that time Alabama has been more fortunate than most other mining States in that the variations from year to year have been slight. Last year's output amounted to 14,300,000 tons, and we look forward to approximately the same level in this memorable year.

We hope that by marking the production of our billionth ton, we will call to the attention of the Nation's business and industry leaders the potential of Alabama's coal industry. Alabama is in the heart of a geographical area where diversified natural resources equal or excel any other region in the United States. The South has petroleum, natural gas, and water power in addition to coal; we have iron ore, limestone, graphite, phosphate rock, bauxite, and a myriad of other ingredients to attract industry.

Alabama's excellent transportation system includes a network of railroad lines that move about 90 percent of the total output of our coal mines. Our river system includes the Tombigbee and Black Warrior, which join the Alabama, Coosa, and Tallapoosa Rivers to form the great Mobile River Basin.

From Mobile our coal moves into the export market, most of it to South America.

I would hope that the U.S. Department of Commerce will interest itself to the extent that some participation will be planned in observance of Alabama's billionth ton. In taking notice, both government and industry must look upon this event as a landmark along the way to a far greater industrial program. We will have removed but a small portion of the bountiful coal reserves with which nature graciously endowed Alabama. In the 7,000 square miles of our coalfields are another 6,800 million tons of mineable reserves for America's heat and energy requirements of today and tomorrow. This storehouse is sufficient to satisfy the needs of the entire United States, at current rates of consumption, for 175 years.

The upcoming occasion is a special tribute to Alabama's mine operators and mine workers. Their service to our State and our Nation is appreciated. I hope that the economy of the mining industry will improve in succeeding months and years, and I implore my colleagues to stand fast against any inequitable legislative proposals that might react to the disadvantage of this great industry. By the same token we must continue to encourage the coal research program which Congress will have an opportunity to review in detail at next week's meetings of the National Coal Association.

WORLD'S FAIR IN DETROIT IN 1972

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a sizable group of leading citizens of the city of Detroit who represent many segments of the people of Detroit, have joined together in an effort to work and plan to hold an official World's Fair in Detroit in the year 1972.

This citizen group has been incorporated under the title of "Detroit World's Fair, Inc.," and is a nonprofit organization.

This effort to hold a world's fair in Detroit in 1972 has already been endorsed by the Michigan State Legislature. A concurrent resolution was recently approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Michigan, and another resolution has been approved by the common council of the city of Detroit.

The dynamic city of Detroit is located in the heartland of America, and is easily accessible to millions of people in both the United States and Canada, and is located within 1 day's drive for at least 100 million people who would contemplate visiting a World's Fair.

The city of Detroit is nearing the completion of its redevelopment program, including the best freeways to allow for fast moving traffic, a magnificent civic center second to none in the United States, a novel and enchanting international village; and with the expansion of the cultural, medical, and university centers, plus the expansion providing for ample housing and other facilities to provide comfort, beauty, and convenience for all peoples, the city of Detroit will be more than ready to sponsor and hold the World's Fair in 1972.

A resolution was recently introduced in this House by several of the Congressmen from Michigan—including myself—calling attention to the fact that a World's Fair is being planned for Detroit in 1972. Following is the resolution:

Whereas tne Common Council of the city of Detroit and the Michigan State Legislature have unanimously endorsed by resolution the holding of an official World's Fair in 1972 at Detroit, Michigan; and

Whereas the dynamic city of Detroit is located in the heartland of America, and is accessible to millions of people in both the United States and Canada, and is located within one day's drive for at least one hundred million people who would contemplate visiting a World's Fair; and

Whereas with the completion of Detroit's redevelopment program, freeways, international village, civic center, and the inner core of the city, including the medical, cultural and university centers, and the ample addition of housing as well as other facilities, Detroit will be more than ready for the holding of a World's Fair in 1972; and

Whereas Detroit is the oldest city in the United States west of the Alleghenies, having been established as wilderness outpost when all New France contained but a few thousand souls, chiefly crowded along the lower Saint Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec; and

Whereas Detroit's 262 year history has been leavened with the culture of many lands, from its inception as a colony and town of Fort Ponchartrain du Detroit, established by Antoine de Lamothe Cadillac in July 1701, and with its cosmopolitan population, Detroit is today a living symbol of all the cultures of the world; and

Whereas the dynamic city of Detroit, which was known internationally as the "Arsenal of Democracy" during two world wars, has become a metropolis of world renown and its industrial achievements materially influence the daily lives of almost every person on earth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to the citizens of Detroit and of Michigan, and to Detroit World's Fair, Incorporated, a nonprofit organization, for their activities in planning and working for the official World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit in 1972.

SUGARBEET PRODUCTION IN CAYUGA COUNTY, N.Y.—THE REAL FACTS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] made some comments which were inserted in the body of the RECORD at page 10524 and following with respect to a project concerned with the development of a sugarbeet industry in my own congressional district, located at Auburn and in Cayuga County, N.Y. This city, by the way, is also the home of a very distinguished former Member of this body, Mr. John Taber, who also, I might add, supported this project.

I am a little distressed Mr. Speaker, at the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota. They show a failure to understand the meaning of the sugar legislation that was passed last year. The sugar bill of 1962 provided specifically for developing sugarbeet production in new areas which had not been producing sugar. The Department is following that legislation insofar as it is considering the application of Cayuga County. For once we are beginning now to look for the development of sugar production in the areas where the major users are located; namely, in the northeast portion of the country, instead of maintaining that only the western areas of the country can produce sugar, and that those of us who live in the Northeast are automatically and forever to be barred from this kind of production.

But the law provides otherwise, Mr. Speaker, and the very reason the application of Cayuga County is being so seriously considered by the Agriculture Department is precisely because it so amply fills all of the various criteria set up within the law. If the gentleman from Minnesota has an area that he thinks might qualify under the 1962 act, let me suggest that he urge them also to apply to the Department and then let the Department decide just how well they actually do meet the criteria set forth in the law. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that we did once grow sugarbeets in Cayuga County, and the agricultural experts at Cornell University have told us that we can still grow them profitably there today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the assistance of the Area Redevelopment Administration is concerned, let me just point out to my friend from Minnesota that Cayuga County has been a seriously distressed unemployment area for many years. But instead of sitting around doing nothing, they have themselves developed this new idea of relieving their unemployment problem by creating a new sugar industry in the very backyard of some of the major sugar users in the country. So here is a classic example of a community taking steps on its own to deal with its own unemployment problems. And this is the very kind of thing which Congress said the ARA ought to do; namely, help local communities help themselves in solving their own unemployment problems. The funds they have advanced to Cayuga County have been designed to assist that community, and the Department of Agriculture, in getting underway a great new industry which will not only be of value to the community, but which also will go far toward easing the current sugar shortage in America.

Mr. Speaker, lest anyone think that this Cayuga County case is grist for political attacks, let me just point out that the Republican-controlled State government of New York is also solidly behind the project and has already advanced funds to help in the construction of the sugar refinery.

ADMISSION OF HUNGARY TO UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of my colleague from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and express regret that the United States did not offer a resolution at the United Nations questioning the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to the United Nations. It should be pointed out that the matter did not come to a vote, and that the U.S. delegation did not abstain or vote for or against the matter. It is true that this is a reversal of the previous

U.S. position. This new position was adopted because it was known that the seating of the Hungarian delegation would be achieved even if the United States opposed such action. When I learned this reversal was being considered, I protested to the President and urged that the United States continue its opposition to the seating of the Hungarian delegation. It was my feeling that it would be hypocrisy not to take such action when we condemn a similar situation 90 miles from our own shores. Both of these reigns are maintained against the will of the people and should receive similar treatment from the United States.

In response to my protest, the Department of State informed me that the reversal in policy was based upon the action of the Hungarian Government in releasing political prisoners, correction of judicial abuses, easing of passport and visa restrictions, changes in agricultural policy, and the desire of other U.N. members to seat the Hungarian delegation. Not satisfied, I wrote to the Secretary of State and informed him that I was horrified by the U.S. acceptance of a government whose known objective is against all the principles of the dignity of the human being.

I would prefer that the United States offer the resolution and be defeated.

While I agree with my colleague from New York on the present issue, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives that, in 1956 at the time of the Hungarian revolution, your Subcommittee on Europe requested positive action by the then administration to give assistance to the Hungarian freedom fighters. Your Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs sat by in New York, at the United Nations, with Ambassador Lodge, awaiting instructions from the administration for definitive action. This did not occur. I, therefore, say to you that, had positive action been taken on Hungary by the previous administration and we had gone to the aid of the Hungarian people, I am sure that there would be a free government in Hungary today and that the Cuban problem would not exist.

HOW FAR DO WE GO IN DEMONSTRATING OUR GOOD INTENTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy tells the American people it is necessary for us to further demonstrate our good faith in our dealings with the Russians, that we must continue to turn the other cheek so that the world will be sure we want peace.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, abhor war. I, too, have known the horrors of war and have had the soul-searing experience of losing a buddy in combat and have known the pain of sending home to his family the last few possessions of my fallen comrade. I hate war and long for peace among men. My differences with the President is how best to insure that the peace will be maintained.

The President believes, from his public pronouncements, that the world will be at peace only if we refuse to antagonize the Communist government of the Soviet Union. The President's policy has been one of announced accommodation of the Russians.

It is my contention, backed up by recent history, that such a course does not lead to peace, but rather enhances the danger of war. We cannot evaluate within the meaning of the thinking of Americans the reaction of Communist officials. These two nations have entirely opposite objectives. Ours is to remain free and to permit all peoples the freedom of self-determination. The Communist objective, stated time and again by every Russian leader, and repeated constantly by the present dictator, Khrushchev, is Russian control of the world, the destruction of the capitalist system, and the defeat of the United States.

To achieve their objective the Communists honor no agreements, break treaties with regularity, use diplomatic conferences to lie, and resort to slavery and murder when it is convenient. They consider any moves toward the reconciliation of differences as a sign of weakness and immediately move in for the kill. It should be clear to all those in responsible positions in this Government, that the free world and the United States have lost ground since 1945 whenever we have appeared to be weak or indecisive and communism has been stopped only when we have a clear, forthright policy based on strength and determination.

American prestige is at its lowest ebb today and the Soviet Union is riding high because of the lack of policy, the weakness, the indecision of the Kennedy administration in meeting such problems as Russian invasion of the Western Hemisphere through Cuba, the declaration by Khrushchev that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, the attacks upon U.S. missions such as recently seen in Caracas, and the flyover of Russian bombers buzzing American ships on the high seas.

The story by Associated Press this week is terrifying in its implications. In an article entitled, "Six Red Jets Fly Over Carrier," we find this account:

> Six Russian twin-jet medium bombers flew near the U.S. carrier *Ranger* in the Pacific yesterday and one of them swooped low over the 76,000-ton warship, the Navy says. It said the six Badger bombers flew near the U.S.-bound *Ranger* in international waters some 330 miles east of Japan. "One of the Soviet planes made a low pass close to the carrier," the announcement said. There was no indication the Badger made any more threatening move. The Russians were detected by the *Ranger's* radar and they were intercepted 65 to 100 miles away by the carrier's jets, which evidently had no difficulty reaching the slower-than-sound Badgers. Apparently the jets then escorted the Russians, keeping a close watch on them as they approached the carrier. The Badgers apparently came from Siberia or the Kamchatka Peninsula, well within their more than 4,300-mile cruising range. The *Ranger* was the sixth U.S. aircraft carrier to be overflown by long-range Russian planes this year while far at sea in the Atlantic or Pacific. The last such incident occurred March 16. At that time, four long-range, four-jet Bear bombers made a series of flights over the carrier *Constellation* 600 miles southeast of Midway Island in the Pacific.

Six Red jets made a low pass over one of our carriers without protest from us and without interference. Our officials claim the Red jets were followed by our jets who were "keeping them under close watch," but they did not prevent their swooping low over our carrier. Any one of the Russian bombers, bent on a suicide mission, could have destroyed our ship, but the administration does not consider this a provocative act. Nor is this the first time of such provocation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has walked more than the mile necessary to show the world our good intentions, we have turned the other cheek until we are dizzy, and we still have not convinced the Communists. Instead they grow stronger and the world moves closer to war and to slavery. The best guarantee of the peace is to stand firm, serve notice on the Soviet Union we are ready to deal from strength on the problems confronting the world, but that future concessions must come from them, we will back down not an inch farther. If the world is to remain free it must have the leadership of a United States that is respected, not necessarily because of love, but respected because of our strength and our demonstrated will to protect ourselves and others who have the will to be free from further Russian conquests and Communist domination.

AMERICAN WORKERS MUST NOT BE FORCED TO PAY FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF HOLDING A JOB

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the ever-continued battle to preserve the freedom of the American people we must extend the fight to embrace all their freedoms, not only those threatened by a bureaucratic government, but those which are threatened by entrenched groups including labor unions. No man should have to pay for the privilege of holding a job, yet this is exactly what is meant by an agency shop. The latest Supreme Court decision in this area seriously threatens the freedom of a man to earn a living for himself and his family and in that there can be no greater suppression.

The Court decision will no doubt be followed by renewed efforts on the part of powerful labor bosses to wreck State right-to-work laws. The American people and Congress must be prepared to halt further onslaughts by labor on the freedoms of those who toil.

Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the Court decision on the agency shop, I agree with the thinking in an editorial in the Dallas Morning News of June 5:

> For almost a year, labor and management lawyers have anxiously awaited a Supreme Court ruling on the legality of a controversial labor contract gimmick known as the agency shop clause. This gimmick—devised more than 3 years ago—has been used by union officials as a method of making end runs around the right-to-work laws now in force in 20 States—

The editorial declares, and then goes on—

> It is a contract agreement between unions and employers which forces nonunion workers to pay dues and other fees to the unions in order to hold their jobs.
>
> The agency shop clause is unnecessary in States which do not have right-to-work laws—for in these States a union shop clause requiring employees to join a union within 30 to 60 days after they are hired can satisfy labor's goal of compulsory union membership.
>
> But in States where a right-to-work law exists, the union shop clause is illegal. Hence the agency shop clause was conceived as a means of getting around these State laws. Technically, under an agency shop clause, no employee is forced to join a union. But he is forced to pay union dues, and if he refuses, he can be fired.
>
> Thus, the major objectionable ingredient of the union shop clause—compulsion—is still present in the agency shop clause. And this is precisely what State right-to-work laws have been aiming to eliminate.
>
> Many labor bosses, in fact, prefer the agency shop to the union shop clause, because it enables them to collect dues from all workers and to exercise control over their jobs, but does not bring with it the problem of recalcitrant union members who will insist on having a voice in the union's affairs.
>
> If the Supreme Court had declared that agency shop agreements are legal in right-to-work States, the right-to-work laws of those States would have been rendered completely meaningless.
>
> In its decision Monday, the Court did not hand down that opinion. At the same time, however, it did not clearly declare that agency shop agreements are illegal in right-to-work States. The broad principles enunciated by the Court were that Federal labor law does not prohibit agency shop contracts, which is true; and that States are free to ban such agreements, which is reasonable and seems to uphold right-to-work laws.
>
> But the two cases heard by the Court both involved agency shop agreements made in right-to-work States. In one case, the Court held that the agreement violated the State right-to-work law and in the other it held that the agreement did not.
>
> The right-to-work laws of both States are essentially the same, as were the agency shop agreements. How, then, could the Court declare the agency shop legal in one State and illegal in the other?
>
> Apparently, the Court was unwilling to assert its own interpretation of the right-to-work laws in the two States involved. It merely accepted the findings of lower courts.
>
> In Florida, where the Supreme Court declared that the agency shop was illegal, the Florida Supreme Court had made a similar decision. In Indiana, the State courts had held the agency shop clause to be compatible with right-to-work laws, so the Supreme Court took the same view.
>
> Although we may be fortunate that the Supreme Court did not go deeper into the matter, the attitude it has taken amounts to judicial irresponsibility. If the Court is willing to hand down a decision in cases of this sort, it ought to be prepared to deal with the basic issues involved.
>
> Until a clearer interpretation is rendered at a later date, we know little more about the status of the agency shop in right-to-work States than we did before the decision this week.

TRIBUTES TO JAPANESE AMERICAN MILITARY SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in them from time to time some extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, June 2, 1963, the Japanese American Citizens League sponsored commemorative services at Arlington National Cemetery to mark the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

The solemn and impressive program consisted of four separate, yet interrelated, functions—each meaningful and significant in its own way.

The first was the formal rites, originally slated for the grove, in the flagpole area adjacent to the Tomb of the Unknowns, which had to be held indoors in the Fort Myer Chapel because of the all-day rain. Here, spoken tributes were paid to American soldiers of Japanese ancestry, living and dead, who served in World War II to earn for themselves and others of Japanese ancestry the right to be accepted and treated as loyal and worthy citizens.

The second was the presentation by the national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, or the JACL as many of us on the west coast call it, of the floral tribute to all of America's war dead in the Army standard honor wreath ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns. As General Devers remarked in his tribute, the "American soldier known but to God" of World War II might well be an American of Japanese ancestry.

The third was the wreath ceremony at the Masthead of the Battleship *Maine* Monument, where Mrs. Nawa Munemori, a naturalized citizen and the mother of the only Nisei Congressional Medal of Honor winner in World War II, paid floral recognition to the 7 Japanese who are remembered among the 144 officers and men who died when this U.S. battleship was sunk in Havana Harbor, Cuba, in April 1898. These seven Japanese are the first known of their ancestry to have died in the defense of our country's freedom and ideals. And their death more than half a century ago serves to remind us of how long those of the Japanese race have served our Nation well in time of peril and crisis.

It may also be appropriate at this time to recall that Mrs. Munemori and thousands of other Gold Star parents of Japanese ancestry, and others of Japanese nationality lawfully admitted to this country for permanent residence, could not become naturalized citizens of our country until after her son was awarded the nation's highest decoration for valor posthumously, and thousands of other Japanese American GI's fought, and many died, in World War II to prove that good citizenship, like Americanism, is not a matter of race or ancestry but of the mind and the heart. The privilege of becoming naturalized citizens, incidentally, was not extended to those of the Japanese race until 1952, with the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of that year.

The fourth and final event was the visitations to the individual graves of the 21 American soldiers of Japanese ancestry, representative of the more than 600 Japanese Americans who were killed in action in World War II, who lie in hallowed ground in honored glory in the National Cemetery at Arlington. Twenty of those who are interred at Arlington were killed in action with the 442d Regimental Combat Team. The other served in the Pacific, in military intelligence, against the then Japanese enemy.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SERVICES

The significance of these services, not only to the Nisei, or Japanese Americans, but also to all Americans everywhere and to people of good will throughout the world, and the eloquence of the speakers who paid deserved tribute to the Japanese Americans who served in our Armed Forces in World War II, so impressed a number of my colleagues and me from both the House and the Senate that it was decided that we should relate them to the Congress and the citzens of our country, as well as to the peoples of all nations of earth, in order that they may better understand, through living example, what democracy in action truly means.

As a native-born Californian, I number many Americans of Japanese ancestry among my friends and associates, for there are more Nisei in my State of California than in any other except Hawaii. As one who served in the California State Legislature, and subsequently as the executive secretary of the California Division of Fish and Game, I learned of their problems prior to my election to Congress. In the 19 years of my service in the House, I am proud to have participated in the enactment of many corrective and remedial statutes of benefit to those of Japanese ancestry. The JACL and its able Washington representative Mike Masaoka have been the effective advocates of most such legislation.

And, since the primary reason usually advanced for such justified and meritorious legislation was that it would help the Nisei, who had earned on the battlefields of Europe and in the island-hopping invasions of the Pacific Islands and the jungles, mountains, and deserts of the Asia mainland the heartfelt appreciation and respect of their fellow Americans both in and out of uniform, I was very much aware of the deep significance of these services to our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry.

Beyond this, as an American who had not been forced to undergo the indignities, sufferings, and sacrifices that our Japanese American citizens were called upon to bear as a part of their unique and unprecedented burdens of war, I can understand what has happened to these victims of wartime prejudice as an example of democracy in action—able to correct its mistakes and even its abuses.

Finally, as a Member of Congress and of the Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I can appreciate the implications and impact of the status which Nisei enjoy in our country today in terms of both international good will and human relationships.

Perhaps the reasons for these commemorative services can best be summarized in JACL's national slogan and challenge—"For better Americans in a greater America"—for Japanese Americans who served in World War II proved themselves to be better Americans under the most difficult of circumstances and helped to make possible this greater America that may well be mankind's last best hope for peace and freedom in this nuclear, space age into which we have moved.

In this connection, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the editorial entitled "Americans All," which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, June 2, 1963, and which places into historic perspective the meaning of these commemorative services. I ask that this editorial be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

Americans All

> Ceremonies in honor of Americans of Japanese ancestry who fought with valor in World War II will be held today in Arlington National Cemetery under the sponsorship of the Japanese American Citizens League. They will pay tribute in particular to that most decorated military unit in American history, the 442d Regiment, activated just 20 years ago and made up of Nisei who volunteered for war service. And they will recall, inevitably, the tragic exclusion of Japanese Americans from the west coast of the United States and their internment for the war's duration in relocation centers.
>
> No single act of hysteria has placed a greater blot upon the American tradition of respect for civil liberty than the evacuation of all persons of Japanese descent, American citizens included, from California, Oregon, and Washington in the days following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Yet two redeeming developments grew out of that piece of folly. One was the compassionate and considerate administration of the War Relocation Centers by the War Relocation Authority under its wartime director, Dillon S. Myer. The other was the eventual integration of the Japanese Americans into the national community as a consequence of their removal from the coast.
>
> A great many salutary changes have taken place regarding Japanese Americans in the past two decades. They are now trusted and respected members of the American community, welcomed as residents in all parts of the country instead of being confined in large part, as they used to be, to the west coast. Some 500 national, State and local laws once directed against them have been repealed. The Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 has been stricken from the statute books, and naturalization of immigrants from Japan is now permitted. Hawaii, with almost a third of its population of Japanese ancestry, has become one of the States of the Union.
>
> No doubt the heroism of the 442d Regiment contributed much to this transformation. No doubt the patience and the unwavering loyalty of the Nisei was a significant factor. It seems fair to say, however, that the change is also a reflection of basic American devotion to democratic and libertarian principles momentarily forgotten but never really forsaken. There should be room for rejoicing as well as for sorrow in today's observance at Arlington Cemetery.

To my mind, it was most appropriate and remindful that the formal services in the Fort Myer Chapel opened with the invocation by a Protestant and an Army chaplain, Capt. Edward M. Mueller, Jr., post chaplain of Fort McNair, one of the oldest Army posts in the country, having been activated in 1791, just after our Nation had won its independence, and closed with the benediction by a Buddhist minister, the Reverend Shojo Honda.

Although many Buddhist Americans of Japanese ancestry served in World War II, there were only Christian chaplains available to serve their spiritual needs. That a Buddhist minister pronounced the benediction was a forceful reminder that one of the basic tenets on which our country is founded is religious freedom. It also helped to recall that men of all faiths and creeds fought and died to reaffirm that religion does not determine an American's loyalty and patriotism.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

After the invocation and the playing of the National Anthem, a telegram from the President of the United States was read to the more than 300 who were assembled in the chapel in spite of the heavy downpour:

> It is with pleasure that I extend warm greetings to the Japanese American community and their guests. I am delighted to convey these words through Mr. Mike Masaoka.
>
> As Americans of Japanese descent, you may well be proud of your historic heritage and the many contributions made by your countrymen.
>
> This year marks the 20th anniversary of the formation of an organization that history has recorded as one of the most decorated units ever to serve the cause of freedom and our country. Our Nation has cause to be proud of the men who composed the 442d Regimental Combat Team.
>
> At the same time, we must also remember that Japanese Americans too served with equal honor and distinction in the Pacific.
>
> With every good wish for successful commemorative services and for continuing progress in the important work you are doing.

After reading the telegram from the President, Chairman of the Services Mike Masaoka explained that these services were dedicated—

> to Americans of Japanese ancestry who, though questioned as to their loyalty and mistreated in World War II, served with honor and gallantry in every branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, in every major campaign of that farflung war, to prove—beyond all doubt—for all time to come, that Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.
>
> Twenty years ago—

Masaoka declared—

> Americans of Japanese ancestry were suspect citizens of the land of their own birth, even unwanted Americans. And yet, in spite of a mass and arbitrary military evacuation unprecedented in our history, in which 110,000 Americans with Japanese faces were herded into what were described as war relocation camps, thousands of these interned Americans demanded of the Army that had removed them and of the Government that had questioned their loyalty the right to fight, and if necessary to die, for our country.
>
> Two decades ago this year, then President Franklin D. Roosevelt granted them their desire, and later in the same year Selective Service was reopened to all qualified Nisei without restriction.
>
> But the heartwarming memory is that of the hundreds of Americans of Japanese ancestry volunteering for active combat and intelligence duty from out of the war relocation camps into which they had been confined and marching out to join in the battle against the German and Japanese enemies from behind the watchtowers and barbed wire fences, guarded by military police wearing the same uniform for which they had volunteered.
>
> In Hawaii, though Japanese Americans there had not been as badly mistreated as those on the continental mainland, they too had to suffer humiliation, indignity, and discrimination. But, when the call for volunteers came from the President, they were so enthusiastic that more than 10,000 responded in less than a week, thereby forcing the Army to revise upwards its plans for inducting Hawaiian Nisei, from about 1,500 to almost 3,000.
>
> Because these Japanese Americans served so well in every theater of operations, we Americans of Japanese ancestry today are the beneficiaries of their heroic actions and sacrifices. We live as shining examples of democracy in action, as respected and accepted Americans, entitled to all of the privileges, obligations, and opportunities of our way of life.
>
> We are here met in these commemorative services to pay honor and tribute to them, the Japanese Americans who by their service in World War II, made possible this gathering this afternoon.

GOLD STAR PARENTS INTRODUCED

Among the Gold Star parents who were introduced were Mrs. Nawa Munemori, of Los Angeles, whose son, as mentioned previously, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously—for deliberately diving on an unexploded hand grenade and smothering its explosion with his own body, allowing himself to be killed that other Americans might live to fight another day.

Mr. and Mrs. B. Nagato, also of Los Angeles, whose son Private First Class Fumitake was one of the first two heroes of the 442d to be interred in Arlington.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, of Pocatello, Idaho, whose two sons, Private Raito and Sergeant Wataru sleep side by side in Arlington.

Mr. H. Nagano, of Blackfoot, Idaho, whose son Private Hiroshi is also interred here in Arlington; and three Gold Star mothers who came by bus from Seabrook, N.J., to participate in the services—Mrs. Riyo Mukai, Mrs. Mune Minakata, and Mrs. Misaye Fujiki.

Among representatives of the veterans organizations present were Togo Nakagawa, former executive secretary of the 442d Veterans Club of Honolulu, representing the Japanese American veterans of Hawaii; Jun Yamamoto of the Nisei Memorial VFW Post 9938 of Los Angeles;

Harry Takagi, former president of the Seattle Nisei Veterans Association; James Kono of the 442d Association of New York; Joe Kadowaki representing the Nisei veterans of Cleveland; Frank Kelly, representing the National Headquarters of the American Legion; and Norman Jones, representing the National Veterans of Foreign Wars Headquarters.

Among the many honored guests were two who have special knowledge of the Japanese American GI in the Pacific, retired Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence from 1941 to 1951, and former Ambassador William J. Sebald, political adviser to General MacArthur following the surrender of Japan and the Allied occupation of that land.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 75]

Abernethy
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Barry
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clausen
Cohelan
Conte
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dorn
Farbstein
Fogarty
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hemphill
Hoffman
Holifield
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Kilburn
Kirwan
Landrum
Lankford
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
St. George
St Germain
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wharton
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TRIBUTES TO JAPANESE AMERICAN MILITARY SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to join in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so proudly and so well in our Armed Forces in World War II.

Before the 1942 mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific Coast, there were few Japanese Americans in our State of Nebraska. Most of these resided in the western section of our State and were engaged in agriculture.

It is a source of particular pride, therefore, that I may point to S. Sgt. Ben Kuroki, of Hershey, Nebr., who is one of the more famous Japanese American war heroes of World War II. He volunteered for the Air Force the day after Pearl Harbor, and through some quirk in administration was accepted, even though at that time the Army Air Force was supposedly closed to those of Japanese descent. He was the first Japanese American to serve under enemy fire, being a tail gunner on Air Force bombers in raids in North Africa and subsequently in Europe. He flew two full tours in a Liberator bomber, including the famous bomber raid on the Ploesti oilfields in Rumania. After 30 combat missions, though eligible for reassignment to noncombat duty, he insisted upon and received an assignment in the Pacific, where he participated in the B–29 raids over the Japanese home islands. Altogether, he flew 58 combat missions in two theaters, earning thereby three Distinguished Flying Crosses and the coveted Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters. Few Americans regardless of ancestry had a more distinguished record in World War II. Incidentally, four Kuroki brothers in all served in World War II.

After his unprecedented flying record, he returned to the States, where he undertook, in his own words, "a mission against prejudice at home." His activities during and after the war are chronicled in a book called the "Boy From Nebraska," written by Ralph G. Martin, a combat correspondent for the Stars and Stripes, and with a special foreword by famed cartoonist Bill Mauldin.

Among those who participated in the commemorative services on June 2 was K. Patrick Okura, the national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, who is now a resident of Omaha. Pat, as we call him, and his wife Lily, are outstanding citizens of our community. Pat had three brothers who served in World War II—a brother, Private First-Class Susumu was killed while in action with the 442d; another brother, Sergeant Jimmie, served in military intelligence in the Pacific; and still another brother, Technical Sergeant Tsuyoshi served in the Medical Corps.

Pat, who delivered the tribute of his organization and laid the organizational wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns, is the mental health planning executive of the community services division of the Nebraska Psychiatric Institute. Before his present responsibility, he was the chief juvenile probation officer for Douglas County. Prior to that, the late, beloved Father Flanagan at Boys' Town brought him out from Los Angeles after the evacuation to serve as psychologist and casework supervisor, a post which he held for 16 years. Before the evacuation, he was with the Los Angeles County Department of Charities. For 6 years he served on the Governor's Committee for Youth in Nebraska, and among other elected offices, he served as president of the Nebraska Welfare Association.

His wife, Lily, is a personality in her own right, not only among Japanese Americans but also in the general community. She is the administrator of the Meyer Therapy Center for Children in Omaha. She has just been elected and installed as the Nebraska State president of Altrusa, the international professional businesswomen's society. Recently, she was the international vice president of the International Secretaries Association. She has just retired from a post once held by her husband Pat, that of president of the Nebraska Welfare Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute paid to Japanese Americans who served in World War II by K. Patrick Okura, of Omaha, as national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE OF JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

(By K. Patrick Okura, national president)

The Japanese American Citizens League is highly honored to sponsor this commemorative "Services in the Grove" here on the hallowed grounds of the Arlington National Cemetery to honor all of America's war dead and particularly the Unknown Soldier of World War II and more especially all Japanese Americans who served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

Just 20 short years ago, Americans of Japanese ancestry were eyed with suspicion by our fellow Americans. The majority of us were confined in war relocation centers following the mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast.

Today Americans of Japanese ancestry enjoy the respect and full acceptance of our fellow men and are fulfilling the obligations and responsibilities as full fledged citizens of the United States.

The unswerving devotion of the Nisei to their country and their faith in it when our country did not have faith in them has contributed most to the achievement of this goal.

Despite the hate and hysteria and the extreme hostility directed to all individuals of Japanese ancestry, especially on the west coast, thousands of Americans of Japanese ancestry wrote to the President of the United States and the War Department, demanding the right to serve our country against our enemies.

The JACL joined with other organizations in urging the President and the War Department, to authorize such service. Our leaders had the wisdom and foresight to recognize that our loyalty to the United States would continue to be raised unless our loyalty was demonstrated beyond all doubt and question on the battlefields against the enemies of our Nation even though the enemy might be of our own ancestry.

The decision of the War Department in January of 1943, to accept qualified Japanese Americans on a volunteer basis was followed by the organization of a special unit of the Army in which they could share in the fight against the enemy.

The inherent right of every faithful citizen, regardless of ancestry, to bear arms was followed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's statement which I quote, "No loyal citizen of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of ancestry. The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

The war record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, the 100th Infantry Battalion, Military Intelligence Service, and those who served in the Pacific theater is a matter of record of which we are justly and extremely proud. It is a known fact that those who served, not only fought and won over the enemy, but also fought prejudice and bigotry, and won.

It can be truly said that our Nisei war dead did not die in vain. The splendid respect and full acceptance of Americans of Japanese ancestry today can be credited without doubt to the unparalleled record of loyalty and gallantry of our Nisei war heroes. To those heroes who made the supreme sacrifice, and to the thousands of Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so heroically in World War II, we owe our humble thanks and gratitude. The Japanese American Citizens League takes this occasion to pay our tribute and homage by conducting this "Services in the Grove" here at Arlington National Cemetery.

We ask God's help in keeping alive the hope and belief that there was purpose and meaning in the cause for which our Japanese American soldiers died in World War II. If we truly believe this, then their sacrifices were not in vain.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as one who was most impressed by the commemorative services sponsored by the Japanese American Citizens League at Arlington National Cemetery on June 2, 1963, paying honor to Japanese Americans who served in World War II, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join in these tributes today.

As another native Californian, I grew up with and went to school with many Americans of Japanese ancestry. Today, I count among my friends and supporters many Nisei, including Municipal Court Judge Wayne Kanemoto, a decorated Japanese American veteran of World War II.

In Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, which I have the honor to represent here in the House of Representatives, there are many outstanding Nisei in almost every field of human endeavor. For almost the past century, they and their parents have contributed much to their respective communities, particularly in agriculture and horticulture in the prewar days.

When, for reasons which now seem completely unreasonable and unjustified, these Japanese Americans were evacuated from their homes and associations on the west coast in the spring and summer of 1942, it was fortunate not only for the evacuee Japanese Americans but also for our country that there was a Director in charge of the War Relocation Authority who had the understanding, compassion, and humanity of Dillon S. Myer.

As Mike Masaoka, who, as the chairman of the commemorative services and was the national secretary and field executive of the Japanese American Citizens League during the evacuation and early relocation days prior to his volunteering for service with the 442d Regimental Combat Team, perhaps knows better than any other Japanese American what the administration of that wartime agency meant to the evacuee population, declared in introducing Mr. Myer at the Sunday services:

> Had it not been for the democratic, humane, and courageous direction of the War Relocation Authority, I doubt very much that many Japanese American evacuees would have thought enough about America to volunteer for combat duty with the U.S. Army after their experiences with the military.

Mr. Myer was also among the very few high in Government in those days who from the very beginning insisted upon giving the evacuee Nisei the opportunity to serve in our country's Armed Forces. He early realized that only a dramatic record of heroism in battle could turn the tide against the racists and the bigots who had advocated successfully the evacuation and then urged their permanent exclusion from the Pacific coast. He had faith and confidence in the inherent Americanism of the Japanese American. Today, his faith and confidence stand vindicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute to Japanese Americans who served in World War II, by Dillon S. Myer, wartime Director of the War Relocation Authority, be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

Tribute to the Nisei In World War II Military Service

(By Dillon S. Myer, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

I am proud to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the Nisei, who were in the military service in World War II, on this 20th anniversary of their participation in the war.

As most of you know, I felt very deeply about their need and right to participate. First of all they deserved the same opportunity as other Americans to serve their country in the military forces. Secondly, in their situation they had a real need to prove to the rest of the United States and to the world that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart * * * and not a matter of race or ancestry."

There were in this country many unscrupulous or misguided self-styled patriots who would accept no other proof of loyalty and Americanism; other than the kind of brilliant and heroic service that was displayed by the members of the 100th Battalion, the 442d Combat Team, the language school graduates in the Pacific, and others. I speak as one who had the opportunity to learn of the breadth and depth of the fear, hatred, distrust, and economic interest that existed in many areas among thoughtless, ignorant, and misled people who were continually stirred by a few unscrupulous so-called patriotic groups and individuals.

The military service and the records of Nisei heroism, which could be dramatically publicized, was essential to disprove the results of 40 years of the "yellow peril" campaign waged by the Sons of the Golden West, the California Legion, and related groups.

The relocation of the 110,000 evacuees from the west coast might have been accomplished after a fashion without the help of the Nisei in uniform but there is a real doubt about it. In any case the military exploits made the relocation job possible in some areas and made it much easier everywhere. The help of Lieutenant Grandstaff and other officers, who had been associated with the 442d Combat Team, were loaned by the War Department, to go to Placerville, Fresno, and many other places up and down the big valley of California and the west coast, to tell them of the exploits and heroism of the Nisei in uniform, created an atmosphere of friendship and good will on the part of many good people toward evacuee returnees. This could not have been possible otherwise.

The most of you remember how the Hood River American Legion Post was responsible for the removal of the name of Sgt. Frank Hachiya from an honor roll plaque because he was of Japanese ancestry even though he received the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously. At a meeting in the spring of 1945 which I attended, this same group came with 15 or 20 legionnaires who were fathers of boys in the military service. Some of these had lost sons in the Pacific. The leader of this group after introducing them asked for a vote on whether they wanted the Japanese to return to Hood River. When they were reminded that there were many Issei fathers and mothers in relocation centers who had received the same kind of War Department messages as some of them had received, announcing the loss of a son in the service, and that these parents had made even greater sacrifices because of having been evacuated, there was no vote.

These sacrifices of the Issei fathers and mothers and the excellent record of the Nisei in the service in both the Pacific and European theaters made it possible to lick the campaign of the racists and to disprove the propaganda of the "yellow peril" campaign. Thanks to those valiant soldiers being honored here today, discrimination has been largely eliminated by the revision of the immigration statutes and by action of the courts and State legislative bodies.

It took the kind of heroism and dramatic action displayed by the Nisei in uniform to awaken the American conscience and to stir people of good will everywhere into taking the necessary action to erase the results of the racists' campaigns.

Not only the Americans of Japanese ancestry but everyone in the United States owes to the Nisei in uniform in World War II a great debt of gratitude.

I personally wish to express my gratitude to all of them for the sacrifices and the wonderful demonstration of real patriotism and heroism which they have exhibited and which has been so helpful to so many.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to join in paying tribute to Japanese Americans who served with such honor and valor in World War II.

It may come as a surprise to most but my understanding is that probably more Americans of Japanese ancestry volunteered for military duty, for both the 442d Regimental Combat Team and military intelligence in the Pacific, from the so-called Minidoka Relocation Center at Hunt, Idaho, than from any of the nine other relocation camps where the evacuee Japanese Americans had been sent and confined in 1942. Most of these evacuees originally resided in western Washington and Oregon.

Moreover, on a per capita basis, my understanding is that more Japanese Americans who were not restricted to relocation camps volunteered for active combat duty in World War II from Idaho than from any other State, except possibly for the then territory of Hawaii.

Indeed, of the 21 Japanese American war heroes interred here at Arlington National Cemetery, 4 are from Idaho—Private Raito and Sgt. Wataru Nakashima, Pfc. Kiyoshi Murakami, and Pvt. Hiroshi Nagano.

In Emmett, a farming community in my district, they still talk about the quasi-public funeral services held for the Hosoda brothers who were killed in action with the 442d in Europe. The city government, the schools, the banks, and the shops and stores all closed up and the entire citizenry gathered together to honor these two Japanese Americans who had volunteered for combat even though they were eligible for deferment because of their valuable work. The two brothers did not come back, but the community is the richer because of their sacrifices.

As a matter of fact, perhaps the greatest single reason that the voters of my State last November went to the polls and overwhelmingly repealed a constitutional prohibition against naturalized Mongolians "not born in this country," and especially the Japanese parents of our World War II servicemen, voting, serving on juries, or holding public offices, is the outstanding record compiled by the sons of these then ineligible Japanese on overseas battlefields.

Incidentally, Ted Kazuo Yamashita, son of Mr. and Mrs. Masao Yamashita, of Caldwell, Idaho, has just graduated in the upper third of his class at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Now a second lieutenant, he was nominated for West Point by Senator FRANK CHURCH, of my State, and is the first Japanese American in Idaho to be appointed to the Military Academy. Ted has decided to be an infantryman, so he will soon be assigned to Fort Benning, Ga., where we expect that he will continue the outstanding tradition of the Japanese American combat infantryman.

Mr. Speaker, it was most appropriate, to my way of thinking, that retired four-star Gen. Jacob L. Devers, now chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, should have delivered the principal tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II. As one of our top field commanders in the European theater, he was intimately connected with the 442d Regimental Combat Team, and before that with the 100th Infantry Battalion, the first Japanese American unit to engage the enemy in combat that was later integrated into the 442d as its 1st Battalion.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1909, he served in France and Germany with the Field Artillery in World War I. Most of the period between the wars, he served at West Point, first as an instructor in mathematics and later as the graduate manager of athletics. In 1939, he became Chief of Staff of the Panama Canal Department and 2 years later he was promoted to Chief of the Armed Forces. In May 1943, he became commanding general of the U.S. forces in the European theater of operations. It was later as Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean theater of operations that the 100th and later the 442d came under his command. Both had their baptism of fire under General Devers, the 100th at Salerno in September 1943 and the 442d at Suvereto in June 1944, both in Italy as a part of the 34th Infantry Division, 5th Army.

When the 442d joined the 36th Infantry Division, 7th Army, in the eastern drive through France toward the German homeland in the fall of 1944, General Devers was the commanding general of the 6th Army Group, of which the 7th was a part. It was during this autumn push that the 442d won its greatest fame in its rescue of the Lost Texas Battalion, in the Vosges Mountains of northeastern France.

In 1948, when he was Chief of the Army Field Forces, he officiated at the ceremonial rites for Pfc. Saburo Tanamachi and Pfc. Fumitake Nagato, when they were interred at Arlington as the first Japanese Americans to be laid to rest here in this hallowed ground of this great national cemetery. This particular ceremony took place 15 years ago almost to the day, June 4, 1948, that he paid another tribute to Japanese Americans who served under his command in World War II.

In 1949, after some 40 years of service, General Devers retired as the Chief of the Army Field Forces, much decorated by our own and foreign governments for his outstanding military career.

As chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, it is his responsibility to oversee American war monuments and cemeteries overseas, a most appropriate honor for a combat general.

At this point, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Gen. Jacob L. Devers' tribute to Japanese American troops who served in World War II, particularly the 442d.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GEN. JACOB L. DEVERS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, JUNE 2, 1963

Members of the Japanese American Citizens League and friends, I hope Mr Dillon S. Myer and those speakers who follow will forgive me if I trespass just a mite on their territory in this tribute.

I also welcome the opportunity to pay my respects to, and to express my admiration for two distinguished representatives of our American citizens of Japanese ancestry: Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, who was wounded in Italy and brought home a Distinguished Service Cross, and Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, a Purple Heart veteran of European combat and of the Pacific Military Intelligence Service.

What shall we, who are gathered here today, tell those who sleep in this beautiful and hallowed cemetery and in other resting places around the world?

Twenty years ago many of these men and most of us here—Americans all—were facing the hazards of the battlefields of World War II, while our Japanese American population was facing the doubt of their acceptance by their fellow Americans as full-fledged, loyal, citizens.

At that time, a panicky hysteria had brought about the inhuman treatment of 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry—more than two-thirds of whom were American-born citizens—by uprooting them from their west coast homes and forcing them into relocation camps in desolate areas of the interior.

This somber picture has been eclipsed by the brilliant record of the courage, stamina, esprit de corps and devotion to our country exhibited in all theaters of the war by American soldiers of Japanese ancestry.

When the War Department, moved by the pleas of thousands of Japanese Americans, anxious to serve their country in this time of trouble, lifted restrictions against their entering military service, they volunteered by the thousands, anxious to prove on the testing ground of battle their devotion, their loyalty and their eagerness to discharge the responsibilities of their rightful citizenship even unto death.

So, 33,300 American citizens of Japanese ancestry, more than half of whom came from the continental United States, saw service in World War II. They called themselves Nisei; their accomplishments have made this name an honored addition to the American vocabulary.

During the course of the war the only organized combat units composed entirely of Japanese Americans were the 100th Infantry Battalion, and the 442d Regimental Combat Team into which the 100th Battalion was later integrated.

Entering combat in Italy on September 29, 1943, as a unit of the 34th Infantry Division of the 5th Army, the 100th Battalion took part in the bitter battles at the Volturno River, on the upper Rapido River, at Cassino and in the breakout from the Anzio beachhead. Its many casualties brought to the battalion the proud nickname of the Purple Heart Battalion.

Arriving also in Italy on June 2, 1944, the 442d Regimental Combat Team entered combat north of Rome on June 26 as a component of the 34th Infantry Division. It participated in the pursuit to, and the heavily contested crossing of, the Arno River, including the capture of Leghorn. On September 2 this combat team was sent to southern France where it entered combat on October 15 as a unit of the 36th Division, 7th Army, engaging in the assault on Bruyeres which was entered after 3 days of bitter fighting. The 7th U.S Army report on these operations states: "Bruyeres will long be remembered, for it was the most viciously fought-for town we had encountered in our long march against the Germans. The enemy defended it house by house, giving up a yard only when it became so untenable they could no longer hope to hold it."

Perhaps the unit's most well-known exploit was the relief of the "lost" 1st Battalion, 141st Infantry, of the 36th Division which had been cut off by the enemy in the Vosges Mountains. In 3 days of savage fighting, with close combat use of the grenade and bayonet, the Nisei broke through the enemy cordon. In gratitude, the men of the 36th Division launched a drive to have all members of 442d declared "honorary Texans." I personally ordered this unit to the Riviera for rest, recuperation, and to refit, for during the period from October 15 to November 7 this Nisei unit sustained 814 battle casualties.

Returning to Italy early in 1945 the 442d participated in the final campaign of the war as a component of the 92d Infantry Division. Five days of bloody combat in the Massa-Carrara area smashed this western anchor of the formidable Gothic line which had withstood the Allied assaults for 5 long months. The drive continued on to La Spezia, Genoa, and across the Po Valley.

During its 11 months of combat the 442d suffered 9,480 casualties, including 600 killed in action. This was more than 3 times its original infantry strength. Nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts were awarded to its members, including oak leaf clusters, some men earning 3 of these.

Included in the more than 18,000 individual decorations awarded were 1 Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, and 600 Silver Stars. On numerous occasions it has been officially stated that the regiment was "the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service." It had more than justified its motto "Go for Broke."

I think back with pride upon the privilege of having these magnificent troops serve under my command.

Although no combat units of Japanese Americans were organized to fight in the Pacific theaters, nearly as many Nisei served there, in the military intelligence service, as served in the European theater. Their contributions to victory were no less dramatic or important. Attached to American and Allied units, they served as interrogators, interpreters, translators, radio announcers, propaganda writers, and cave flushers. It has been well said that "never before in history did an army know so much concerning its enemy, prior to actual engagement, as did the American Army during most of the Pacific campaigns."

Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Burma, Attu, Munda, Tarawa, Peleliu, Saipan, Guam, Iwo Jima, the Philippines, Okinawa, all were scenes of stubborn, bloody, all-out fighting, but this was made easier by the fruitful efforts of Nisei combat intelligence personnel, for they were there. In their eagerness to do their job well, the Nisei often worked so close to the front lines that, to the danger of being killed, or worse still, being captured, by the Japanese, they added the risk of being shot, through mistaken identity, by friendly troops.

Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell of Burma fame, noted for pithy and often pungent statements, summed it all up: "The Nisei bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood. We cannot allow a single injury to be done them without defeating the purposes for which they fought."

Our Japanese American war heroes proved their devotion to the United States of America and its principles of freedom and democracy. Together with their fellow Nisei in the ranks of civilian America whose steadfast demonstration of patriotism and dedicated discharge of their responsibilities as citizens, they paved the way for those of similar ancestry to enjoy to the full the privileges, opportunities and dignity of the American way of life. Theirs is an experience—a vital lesson here which should be used in solving some of our immediate problems.

It is most fitting that this commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the rescinding of the restrictions on military service by American citizens of Japanese ancestry is being held today in close proximity to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War II, who could, himself, have well been a Nisei.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California, the Honorable EDWARD R. ROYBAL.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was reared in the Boyle Heights area of the city of Los Angeles and had as my childhood playmates, many youngsters of Japanese ancestry. We grew to adulthood together and I remember seeing them in their valley of tears, forced to leave their community, abandon their homes, and sell their possessions for whatever they could get, before being herded to what we call a relocation camp.

Later, the whole Nation became aware of the fact that these same evacuees volunteered to fight for their country, the United States of America, and the subsequent outstanding record established by the now famous 442d Japanese American combat team.

Recently I was impressed with the many speeches given in tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II at the commemorative services held here in Washington. I must confess that some of the information provided by my friend, Judge John F. Aiso, concerning the use of Japanese American soldiers in military intelligence came as a surprise.

Like most Americans, I am rather familiar with the "go for broke" exploits of the 442d Japanese American combat team. But, I knew very little about the extensive use of Japanese American linguists in the Pacific war against the Japanese enemy.

In this connection, it may be appropriate that Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, in his book entitled "MacArthur 1941–1951," had this to say regarding the significance of this service:

> Several FBI-trained operatives of Japanese ancestry, Nisei, had been imported from Hawaii in the prewar months to keep the Japanese population in the Philippines under discreet surveillance. Those men later rendered most important services on Bataan in the interrogation of prisoners of war, in the translation of captured documents, and as counterintelligence agents. Their use called attention to the linguistic potentialities of the American Nisei; this was the modest beginning of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Service.
>
> Fundamental to intelligence, however, was the enormously difficult problem of dealing with the complicated Japanese language. Few Americans could speak it, much less read its forbidding alphabet and script. Early in the war, according to the MacArthur records, "the Japanese had found * * * they could label their minefields, carry personal diaries, use their spoken language freely, and even handle military documents with little regard for security."
>
> But MacArthur, unlike the panicky Californian authorities who insisted on herding second-generation Japanese Americans (the Nisei) into concentration camps, had complete confidence in the Nisei. His G–2 employed hundreds of second-generation Japanese from Hawaii and California in linguist detachments, to be sent into the field with combat forces. ATIS intelligence teams accompanied the troops in all initial landing operations. Captured maps and orders processed by ATIS revealed enemy strength and dispositions and plans of attack. Diaries contained excellent clues to the psychology and the state of morale of the Japanese troops. Other documents indicated the enemy's problems of food and supply, his order of battle, the effect of our air attacks, his relations with natives, the relative effectiveness of Allied and Japanese weapons. Spot interrogations of prisoners taken in battle were at times of such importance that they caused a shift in Allied plans of attack."

As General MacArthur's Chief of Staff for Intelligence from the attack on the Philippines through to the Korean War, General Willoughby probably knows more about the tremendous contributions which they made to victory than any other single person. He reports in an official memorandum:

> We used them even on Bataan. They collected information on the battlefield, they shared death in battle, and when one of them was captured his fate was a terrible one. In all, they handled between 2 and 3 million documents. The information received through their skills proved invaluable to our battle forces.

Col. Sidney F. Mashbir, who commanded ATIS, has this summation to make of the Japanese American contribution to victory in the Pacific:

> Had it not been for the loyalty, fidelity, patriotism, and ability of these American Nisei, that part of the war in the Pacific which was dependent upon intelligence gleaned from captured documents and prisoners of war would have been a far more hazardous, long-drawn-out affair.
>
> At a highly conservative estimate, thousands of American lives were preserved and millions of dollars in material were saved as a result of their contribution to the war effort.

Speaking in tribute to these Japanese Americans who served in the Pacific at the commemorative services was Judge Aiso, of the superior court of Los Angeles. One of our most distinguished jurists, he was the first Japanese American on the continental mainland to be appointed to the bench, being named to the municipal court by the then Governor of California, now the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren. He was later promoted to the superior court by then Gov. Goodwin Knight.

He was drafted into the Army as a private and was relieved from active duty as a lieutenant colonel. He is now a colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the U.S. Army Reserve, with a mobilization designation as chairman of the International Law Division of Judge Advocate General's Corps.

During the war he was the head instructor of the Military Intelligence Service Language School at the Presidio in San Francisco; thereafter, following the mass evacuation of 1942, he was the director of academic training of the Japanese language schools at Camp Savage and at Fort Snelling, both in Minnesota. As an intelligence officer in occupied Japan, he was the assistant section chief of the civil intelligence section of General Headquarters, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, and the executive assistant to Major General Willoughby, Chief of Staff for Intelligence for General MacArthur.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute of Judge Aiso be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TRIBUTE TO NISEI IN G–2

(By Judge John F. Aiso, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

Loyalty and obligation to serve ones' country in time of war and its proper place in the scale of human values, opinions of the learned Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court remind us, are not simple concepts or notions. Moral courage with its sophistication too has its place in times of national crises as President Kennedy so ably depicts in his "Profiles of Courage." Fortunately for me, my assigned mission today is limited to paying tribute to the Nisei of G–2, permitting me to leave the depiction of the total picture of loyalty and courage in time of war to those to whom providence has granted opportunities of the broader perspective and the genius of greater artistry.

These homespun words are meant for all Nisei who participated in military intelligence activities during World War II. Nisei in G-2 includes the living as well as the honored dead. It includes those who served as War Department civilians as well as those in uniform. Deemed too valuable for noncommissioned officer grade, but prohibited by War Department edict from being commissioned only because of racial ancestry until V-J Day was within concrete grasp, civilian status was for convenience of Government. And Nisei WAC's, too, were in G-2.

Nisei participation in G-2 service commenced as early as April 1941. It continues in some form to this date although many military intelligence activities have been transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency.

Linguistic combat intelligence work began on Pearl Harbor Day and at Bataan and Corregidor. The Nisei member of the beach patrol which captured the first Japanese prisoner of war—the sublieutenant that spied on Pearl Harbor from his one-man submarine—participated in his interrogation on the evening of December 7, 1941. And Sgt. Arthur S. Komori, of Hawaii, served as combat linguist for General Wainwright until evacuated to Australia on General MacArthur's personal order.

As fast as graduates could be poured out of the Military Intelligence Service Language School, their activities extended into every major theater of operations, viz.: North American, Asiatic-Pacific, CBI, and ETO. Some stormed the beaches with the second- and third-wave leathernecks and doughboys as they island-hopped across the Pacific from Kwajalein and Tarawa to Okinawa. Although not as large in total numbers or percentage as their compatriots of the 442d Combat Team, a representative cross-section of MIS (Military Intelligence Service) boys were killed in action, starting with Sgt. Frank Hachiya of Hood River, Oreg., on Leyte and terminating with the 12 from Hawaii on the day before V-J Day in Okinawa. One language team attached to GHQ SHAEF intercepted and monitored the communications to and from the High Imperial Headquarters in Tokyo and General Oshima stationed in Berlin. Others worked out of ATIS, Arlington Hall, the Army Map Service, the OWI, and the Military Intelligence Service Language and its satellite on the University of Michigan campus. A vast cross-section took part in transplanting the concepts of democracy and nurturing its growth in occupied Japan.

But whatever their specific mission and wherever they were, their common motivation was a burning desire to prove that a Nisei's belief in and devotion to the ideas of freedom and American institutions were stronger than the fortuitous ties of racial affinity. His self-assigned overall mission was to prove for all time to come that judging one's loyalty even in time of war on the basis of racial affinity and sympathetic affiliation alone was and is wrong, notwithstanding the imprimatur of the Hirabayashi and Korematsu decisions to the contrary. And what better proof could he offer than to actively wage war directly against Japan.

This determination to fight against kith and kin called forth the high qualities of intellectual honesty and moral courage for those best qualified for G-2 service were those whose sentimental heartstrings for relatives and close friends tugged the strongest.

The vast majority of Nisei in G-2, however, had known only their birthplace America. They had never seen Japan. Only 3 percent of those in the Army in 1941 were found to possess a qualified command of the Japanese language.

But fortunately there was a nucleus of Nisei who had in the face of many adversities steeped themselves in the language, history, and culture of both nations. He was the older Nisei who had accepted the challenge of assimilation and Americanization seriously and yet found that assimilation does not mean the abject surrender of pride of racial ancestry. To him the adventure of being a Nisei in 20th-century America was a role and a sacred trust bestowed upon him by decision of his Creator. With over 20 years of close infighting against prejudice and discrimination heaped upon him by chauvinistic elements in both the United States and Japan, he was by 1941 already a mentally and morally battle-conditioned veteran.

Even the intellectual skills and judgments that he proffered to the arsenal of democracy had been wrought in tears and with heartaches. He had been taunted by some misguided American public school authorities that to study the Japanese language was ipso facto, un-American and disloyal. He had found schools in Japan slammed shut against him by petty bureaucrats yelling that Japanese government schools were for loyal subjects of the Emperor only and not for foreign-born sons of emigrants.

But this American of Japanese ancestry had learned his lessons well. His American education had endowed him with the faculty of thinking rationally. He had become imbued with the tradition born of the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War I that Americans don't hesitate to bear arms against blood relatives when freedom and moral principles are at stake. He had "talked to Lincoln" as often as he prayed to his God, because the railsplitter knew what it was like to be born and raised in a rural shack as so many of the older Nisei were. It was Lincoln who assured him that he had a future in America, because our Nation was dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And while not exactly a de Tocqville or a Bryce, he had delved deeper than the average Japanese in Japan for the true meaning of "Bushido." From Dr. Nitobe's writings and from heart-to-heart talks with the truly great characters in civilian and military circles in Japan, he had learned that to a true "bushi" (Japanese knight), blood and sentimental ties were of secondary consideration only when issues of "giri" (duty), "meiyo" (honor), and "on" (gratitude) were laid on the line.

The quiet dedication, therefore, of the Nisei in G-2 to help crush a militaristically conditioned, controlled, and oriented Japan was consistent and consonant with the lofty traditions of both American and Japanese patriots in their finest moments. History will prove as time goes on that their's was a contribution which will transcend narrow national demarcations.

More specifically the Armed Forces Language School, now located at the Presidio of Monterey in California, is their tangible contribution to our national defense. But the reverberations of their intangible contributions will reach even further. In teaching his Caucasian comrades in arms the mastery of the Japanese language, he tore asunder the mythical veil of the inscrutable oriental mind; he demonstrated that east is not east and west is not west when it comes to the longings and aspiration of mankind. In waging a cold war which seeks the capture of men's hearts and minds, knowledge and command of the enemy's language are just as vital as nuclear weapons. And like the atom, language can be employed not only in waging wars, but also in our quest for world peace.

Written words are but signs and symbols of thoughts and the spoken tongue is the medium of exchange in the free commerce of ideas and emotions. Translation and interpretation are arts. They are effective only when there is spontaneous selection and correlation between adherence to dictionary equivalents and the employment of an idiom evoking the precise counterpart idea or emotional reaction. Thus thorough knowledge of the foreigner's psychological makeup, his racial characteristics, and historical background and traditions are not only essential but indispensable. So too is a recondite appreciation of his individual and collective hopes and fears.

When mastery of foreign language command as thus defined becomes a commonplace in every American home, then and then only will the mask of inscrutability be removed from the faces of our potential enemies. Then and then only will international mistrusts be dissolved and international understanding truly achieved.

For showing us the feasibility and significance of this high adventure we say today, "Thank you, Nisei in G-2."

With your foreign language command, you helped crush a militarist Japan, nurture the dignity of the individual in a democratic peace-loving Japan, and make American-Japanese amity a more genuine reality.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as most Members are aware, there are more Americans of Japanese ancestry in the city of Los Angeles than in any other American city except Honolulu. About a third of all Nisei in the U.S. mainland reside in Los Angeles County. It is easy to understand, therefore, why we take such pride in our Japanese Americans who served so valiantly in both Europe and in the Pacific. We are particularly proud that Mrs. Nawa Munemori, of Los Angeles, whose son, Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori, won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously while with the 442d, was able to attend these services and that she was designated to lay a wreath at the monument to the Battleship *Maine*, in Arlington National Cemetery, on behalf of all Japanese Gold Star mothers.

At least 4 of the 21 Japanese American war heroes who lie in honored glory here in Arlington were born in California. They are Pvt. Ben Frank Masaoka, Pfc. Roy T. Morihiro, Pfc. Fumitake Nagato, and Pfc. Lloyd Mitsuru Onoye.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 2, I was privileged to attend memorial services at Arlington Cemetery for our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry who have died in defense of their native America.

I was impressed especially on this occasion by the eloquence of the first Nisei elected to Congress—the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, now representing Hawaii in the U.S. Senate. Mr. INOUYE lost his right arm in action as a member of our celebrated 442d Regimental Combat Team, the all-Nisei fighting unit whose men consummated with their blood the ideals of which Senator INOUYE spoke so movingly at Arlington.

Mr. INOUYE volunteered for the 442d when a youngster of 19, as a private. He received a combat commission in Italy in 1944, eventually being discharged as a captain. His great moment came in the closing stage of the war in the Mediterranean, on April 21, 1945, during the final Allied drive. INOUYE was leading an attack by Company E against the 3d Battalion of the crack 361st Panzer Grenadier Regiment, dug in to defend Mount Mebbione, on the formidable

Gothic line. This was the main part of the Germans' final resistance before Genoa and the Po Valley.

The young lieutenant first led his platoon in a rapid encirclement that resulted in destruction of a German mortar observation post and brought his men to within 40 yards of the main hostile force. The enemy, dug into bunkers and rock crevices, fought back fanatically, halting the advance with crossfire from three machineguns which swept the area clear of cover and concealment. Then INOUYE crawled up the slope to within 5 yards of the enemy and tossed two hand grenades into the machine gun nest. Before the enemy recovered, he stood up and raked the second gun with the fire from his tommygun, killing the crew. He was hit once, but he continued to fire at the other emplacements until his arm was shattered by a grenade. In spite of his pain and his wound, he refused evacuation and directed the final assault which carried the ridge. In the attack, 25 Germans were killed and 8 others captured. For this action, INOUYE received the Distinguished Service Cross. He also earned the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart with two oak leaf clusters, five battle stars, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation with four clusters, among his awards, for his actions with the 442d Combat Team.

Like many another young veteran, DAN INOUYE got his advanced schooling after the war. A BA in government and economics at the University of Hawaii was followed by a doctorate of jurisprudence at George Washington University Law School, in 1952. He served as assistant public prosecutor for the city of Honolulu, and this proved the beginning of a spectacular career in public office. He was elected to the territorial house of representatives in 1954, becoming its majority leader. He went on to the territorial senate in 1958. When Hawaii achieved statehood, he won a seat in Congress by more than 100,000 votes. His record as a first-termer resulted in INOUYE's election to the Senate in 1962.

As a Californian, representing a State which owes much to its citizens of Japanese ancestry, and as a veteran of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations, I proudly ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to inscribe in the RECORD Senator INOUYE's Arlington speech of June 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, JUNE 2, 1963

As we gather together here today to honor our valiant dead, I cannot help but feel that it is only fitting that we stand on this sacred soil almost in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol. For here in Washington are the very institutions which make up the flesh and blood, the heart and soul of what we call democracy.

Here are centered the very ideals our honored dead fought for. One need not look far to know that these ideals are still very much alive and flourishing.

But for these men to whom we pay tribute on this day, our flag might not fly over the White House. But our flag is still there and the White House remains the symbol of the determination and vision which has kept the United States in the forefront of world leadership.

In our Supreme Court honored Justices still zealously guard the rights of freemen in our Nation, regardless of race, creed, or color. Indeed we have come a long way from the battlefields of France and Italy—from those distant shellpocked Pacific islands—in our fight for equal rights for all.

Our Congress still meets in free assembly, freemen freely chosen by a free people.

Our dead have become part of the great history of our country. They have joined those great men of our past—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt who guided us unerringly through the last world holocaust.

These fighting men we honor today are no less great. Each one, in his own way, gave up his life for a greater life—the life of the United States of America.

It is because of them that the torch of freedom still illuminates the dark corners of the world and keeps tyranny at bay.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II, particularly since so many were, and are, from my congressional district in Los Angeles County.

Recently, on May 18, I was honored with a special citation that was presented me at the biennial convention of the Pacific Southwest District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League. This district council embraces all of southern California and Arizona and is one of the eight district councils of the league in the country. The citation expressed the appreciation of the league and others of Japanese ancestry in this country for what they were good enough to call "my leadership" in the Congress in the past 21 years in which I have had the privilege to serve in the House, in securing corrective and remedial legislation for those of Japanese ancestry.

The citation was presented by the league's national president, K. Patrick Okura, now of Omaha, Nebr., but in prewar days a resident of Terminal Island in my district. Pat had three brothers who served in World War II. One was killed in action with the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team of Japanese Americans.

As my colleagues so well know, once the heroic, yet tragic record of wartime loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry became known to us, through the exploits of Japanese American troops in Italy, France, and the Pacific, it was not the difficult and impossible task that it might otherwise have been. Certainly, there is no doubt that these loyal Americans who were forced to give up their homes and businesses when they were evacuated in the spring of 1942 should have been compensated for at least some of their property losses. Certainly, too, the parents of these brave GI's, denied the right to naturalization because of our Federal statutes, deserved to share the citizenship of their children. And, most certainly, the long-deserving Territory of Hawaii should have been admitted to statehood long before 1959.

Though Japanese Americans, in the words of the late Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, "bought an awfully big hunk of America with their blood," in a sense their sacrifices have not been in vain, for today they are respected citizens in every community in the land, relieved of their legal and social discriminations that used to plague them in most Western States, and able to look into a promising future with confidence.

We in our district are pleased to note that Mrs. Nawa Munemori was a participant in the commemorative services which were held on June 2 and that the President paid her special tribute at a meeting the next morning in the White House, for she is the mother of the late Pfc. Sadao S. Munemori, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously in Italy with the 442d. A grateful Nation renamed a U.S. troop transport in her son's memory, the U.S.S. *Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori*, the only American vessel with a Japanese American name.

At a time when our country and our people may tend to forget that patriotism and loyalty are still worthwhile virtues, it may be well to read again the citation that summarizes the single action that earned for a young American who had to volunteer for the Army from a relocation camp, our Nation's highest decoration for valor:

Pfc. Sadao S. Munemori, an assistant squad leader of Company A, 100th Infantry Battalion, 442d Regimental Combat Team, fought with great gallantry and intrepidity on April 5, 1945, near Seravezza, Italy.

When his unit was pinned down by grazing fire from the enemy's strong mountain defense and command of the squad devolved on him with the wounding of its regular leader, he made frontal, one-man attacks through direct fire and knocked out two machineguns with grenades.

Withdrawing under murderous fire and shower of grenades from other enemy emplacements, he had nearly reached a shell crater occupied by two of his men when an unexploded grenade bounced on his helmet and rolled toward his helpless comrades. He arose into the withering fire, dived for the missile, and smothered its blast with his body.

By his swift, supremely heroic action, Private Munemori saved two of his men at the cost of his own life and did much to clear the path for his company's victorious advance.

Among other Japanese Americans who served in the U.S. Army are the nine Nakada brothers, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Ginzo Nakada, who were evacuated from Long Beach in the spring of 1942, along with others of Japanese ancestry. As far as I have been able to ascertain, no other American family, regardless of nationality, has sent so many sons into our Army. Yoshinao served with the Office of Strategic Services; Henry and George with the 442d in Europe; John with military intelligence in Alaska; Saburo, Minoru, James, and Yoshio with military intelligence in the Pacific; and

Stephen, with the Military Intelligence Service Language School. Six of the Nakada brothers still reside in my district.

In closing, may I quote "The Japanese American Creed," which was written before World War II by Mike Masaoka, whom many of us know as the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League. It was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first time in May 1941 by the late Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, then chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Through the travail of evacuation and relocation, our Japanese American citizens lived this creed, which has meaning not only to Americans of Japanese ancestry today but also to all Americans, without reference to race, color, creed, or national origin:

THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CREED

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way: aboveboard, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, as a native of Idaho who grew up with many of the Japanese Americans from southeastern Idaho who served in World War II and who numbers many more among my friends and supporters, I am privileged to join in paying tribute to the Japanese Americans who achieved such a distinguished record in our Armed Forces in World War II.

As has been noted before, five of the Japanese Americans who lie in honored glory in Arlington National Cemetery are from southeastern Idaho. They are Private Raito and Sgt. Wataru Nakashima, of Pocatello; Pfc. Kiyoshi Murakami, also of Pocatello; Pfc. Hiroshi Nagano, of Blackfoot; and Pvt. Roy R. Shiozawa, of Tyhee.

This is not to suggest that these five were the only Japanese Americans from the State of Idaho who died in the defense of our country in World War II, for the number is considerably higher. But, the ratio of 5 of the 21 American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who are interred in Arlington being from my State is indicative of the great number who served from Idaho. Indeed, it is my understanding that on a per capita basis, more Japanese Americans volunteered for duty and served in World War II from Idaho than from any other State, with the possible exception of then Territory of Hawaii.

An estimated 20 from Pocatello served in the 442d Regimental Combat Team alone. From the Idaho Falls area, some 35 to 40 served in both the European and Pacific theaters of operations. And, from the Rexburg-St. Anthony area, some 30 served with the 442d and with military intelligence in the Pacific.

When one considers that there are only about a thousand persons of Japanese ancestry of all ages in the whole area, this is a remarkable percentage, especially when one considers that many, if not most, were not subject to the draft because they were so needed in agriculture and the food for victory program.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima of Pocatello and Mrs. H. Nagano of Blackfoot were able to participate in the commemorative services on June 2. The following afternoon, I was privileged to cohost an informal luncheon for these Gold Star Parents from Idaho and other States in the House dining room along with my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA, himself one of the great Japanese American war heroes of World War II.

As many of my colleagues know, we in the West owe much to our immigrant Japanese, the parents of these brave soldiers who fought so well in Europe and the Pacific. They came more than half a century ago to work on the railroads, to help tie the Nation together with iron rails. They came too to convert the sage brush and the deserts into rich agricultural lands. That Idaho today raises the finest potatoes in the United States is also partly a testament to their skill and hard work.

Perhaps coincidentally, the Nakashimas, the Naganos, and the Shiozawas were among the pioneers who farmed our lands and helped develop the richness of the soil in southeastern Idaho. And, the Murakamis worked on the railroads. Together, these Japanese contributed more than their share to the conquering of the frontier and the development of our region.

Today, the sons of these Japanese pioneers are pioneering again—in the Magic Valley area near Twin Falls, Japanese Americans are showing the way in reclaiming sagebrush lands into fertile potato and wheat farms. Truly, they have accomplished the proverbial miracle of making the desert bloom as a rose.

It is not possible, of course, for me at this time to call the honor roll of Japanese Americans from Idaho who served in our Armed Forces in World War II. But, here are the names of some who come to mind: The Shiozaki brothers of Blackfoot, Hero, Mike, and Jun; Kiyo Morimoto, of Pocatello, now with the Harvard University faculty, who won a Silver Star; and Harvey Yamashita and Kazuo Endo, also of Pocatello, who were wounded in action and earned Purple Hearts. All of these men were with the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team. In addition my neighbors Leo and Paul Hosoda of St. Anthony and my friend Bill Yoden of Blackfoot as well as many other Japanese Idahoans served with honor.

Of interest may be that Togo Hikida won both the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart with the 442d in Italy and France. His brother, Ted Fuji Hikida, is the mayor of Teton City, probably the only Japanese American outside Hawaii and California to be elected mayor of an incorporated city.

No summation of Japanese American soldiery in southeastern Idaho, however, is complete without that of Pvt. Roy Ichiro Miyasaki, for whom the Army Reserve building at Rexburg is named. As far as we know, this is the only public building in the United States officially named in honor of a Japanese American soldier. Miyasaki won the Distinguished Service Cross in Korea, near Tumyong-Dong, on June 12, 1951. As his squad participated in clearing an area between two Communist-held hills, the enemy, behind a well-protected bunker commanding the whole terrain, began to blanket in the entire area with heavy mortar and machinegun fire. When the Browning automatic rifleman in his squad was wounded, Miyasaki took over the heavy weapon and continued to advance in the face of murderous fire, even though he himself was wounded. He finally took the bunker by himself, killing a number of the enemy in the process, and thereby opening up the advance for his entire unit. He defended the bunker against a furious enemy counterattack and held it until Allied units arrived to take it over. While moving to the attack again, he was killed by an exploding mortar shell.

Private Miyasaki has a brother, Tommy, who is a permanently blind veteran of World War II. Two other brothers served during World War II—Akira with the 442d in Italy and France, and Tateshi in military intelligence in the Pacific, where he won the Bronze Star Medal and and oak-leaf cluster. Still another brother, Katsumi, served with him in Korea.

We in southeastern Idaho believe that the Miyasakis of Rexburg, typify the kind of citizenry that represents our Japanese American society.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for taking this time to pay tribute to Americans of Japanese descent who served with our Armed Forces during World War II. Reference was made a moment ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. Roybal] in regard to the operation of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section in the Pacific theater under General MacArthur's command. I just wanted to comment on the fact that as a member of that section it was my privilege and honor to have had several Americans of Japanese ancestry serving with me and under me during a part of the Pacific campaigns. Actually, the Navy had always refused to enlist Nisei, but the Army did enlist them, and we found in the Pacific theater, where General MacArthur unified the services without waiting for any further action, that the only effective translation and interpretation services required the combined services of Americans of Japanese descent and other Americans who had acquired some knowledge of the Japanese language, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] and myself had the opportunity to do. These Americans of Japanese descent served with great distinction. They took, as you can imagine, very serious risks in serving in the Pacific theater had they been captured, and the record indicates that they served with the same high degree of bravery and distinction with which they also performed in the European theater. I want to join with my colleagues in commending these Japanese Americans for the magnificent job that they did then, and for the great role that they are playing in America today, as exemplified by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga], and our former colleague in the House, now serving in the other body, Dan Inouye.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my heart is very close to the Japanese Americans. For a number of years I had, as my constituents, more Japanese Americans than any other Member of the House of Representatives. That, of course, is not true at the present time, but I still have a large Japanese American constituency. They are leaders in many worthy activities, prominent in the professions and in business, a vital part of our cultural and community life.

The first Japanese American congressional secretary was Mary Ono, who has been in my office for 12 years. Her husband is Harry Ono, a veteran of that famous 442d. So, I am much surrounded by sentiment for Japanese Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there is no brighter page in American history than that written by Japanese Americans. Here they were at the commencement of the war with Japan, fine, loyal and educated Americans, born in our beloved America, graduates of colleges, put through these colleges by the sweat and the toil of their fathers and mothers who were not permitted to be citizens. With the war came blind suspicion of anyone of Japanese name or blood. They were taken from their homes and friends, and imprisoned as suspected enemies of the land of their birth and of their love. From all of this cruel misunderstanding and this period of agonizing mistreatment, they emerged with their love of the United States undiminished, undisturbed, their spirit and faith in our warm country unscarred. What they had gone through they accepted as the test of their Americanism, and they met that test with a heroism on the battlefields, never surpassed and a dedication to good citizenry that has been an inspiration to all their fellow Americans.

I do not know of any group in the history of our country who has suffered so much without justification and has come out of it to make such a great contribution with never a scar of resentment or faltering in their love of and loyalty to country. God bless the Japanese Americans.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to join the others here today who pay tribute to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who gave up their lives for their country during the Second World War. It is both proper and encouraging to hear expressions of respect paid to these Americans.

The meaning of this struggle for recognition and dignity was exemplified by the speeches which were delivered at the commemorative services honoring these Americans at Arlington National Cemetery on June 2, 1963. Those of us in attendance were reminded once again of the sacrifices this distinguished group of Americans made in order to be recognized by some as first-class citizens.

One such speech was that delivered by my distinguished colleague and good friend from Hawaii, himself an American of Japanese ancestry and Purple Heart veteran of both the famed 100th Infantry Battalion and of the Military Intelligence Service. So that the Members of this body may have the full benefit of Congressman Matsunaga's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

To Honor Our Dead

(By Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga, Arlington National Cemetery, June 2, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a deep sense of humility and gratitude that I join you in paying tribute to the honored war dead, for had it not been for them, I know I would not be here today to address you as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I like to think that the valiant men in whose memory we gather here today fought and died for me—fought and died so that those of us who survived them, the living, might enjoy freedom with justice. I'd like to point to the distinguished U.S. Senator from Hawaii who spoke before me and to offer myself along with him as living proofs that they whom we honor here today did not die in vain. To paraphrase the statement of President Truman when he presented the seventh Presidential Unit Citation to the men of the 442d Infantry Regiment, "They fought against prejudice and won."

William E. Gladstone, the great English statesman, once said, "Show me the manner in which a nation or a community cares for its dead and I will measure with mathematical exactness the sympathies of its people, their respect for the laws of the land, and their loyalty to high ideas."

There was a time when a gathering such as this would have been looked down upon by some of our fellow Americans as being akin to ancestor worship. We have found, however, that with maturity Americans have begun more and more to pay honors to their dead. And so it is, with honor and with reverence, that we pay tribute to those who lie within these hallowed grounds, at Pohukaina, and other cemeteries throughout the world.

If we the living, the beneficiaries of their sacrifices are truly intent upon showing our gratitude, we must do more than gather together for speechmaking and perfunctory ceremonies. We must undertake to carry on the unfinished work which they so nobly advanced. The fight against prejudice is not confined to the battlefield alone. It is still here and now with us. So long as a single member of our citizenry is denied the use of public facilities and denied the right to earn a decent living because, and solely because of the color of his skin, we who "fought against prejudice and won" ought not sit idly by and tolerate the perpetuation of injustices.

The fight against prejudice is a long and painstaking one. Education is the most formidable weapon against it, but education is a slow and tedious process. The temper of our Nation today is such that we cannot wait any longer for the slow wheels of education to grind out social justice. Patience among the downtrodden is running out and we must look to a more expeditious way. That way, I believe, is the way of the law.

Despite the display of violence over the last few months in certain areas of our country, Americans are undeniably a law-abiding people. Prejudices may drive them to violence, but experience has shown that when confronted with the law, their violence will yield to peaceful compliance. While wiser men will certainly differ, I do believe that the law-abiding nature of our Nation's people will now allow racial prejudice to be outlawed and abolished by legislation and enforcement of the law.

We who have won in our fight against prejudice have a better understanding of the plight of those who continue to be subjected to racial prejudice. In the name of fair play we can serve our fellow Americans by working for elimination of injustices through enactment of appropriate laws at the State and National levels.

In the final analysis, man will best serve himself through law, for as history has repeatedly shown, justice best prevails through the law.

Let us then here resolve in paying tribute to our honored dead, that we shall not rest until through the rule of law, as was so movingly stated by Vice President Johnson at Gettysburg, "justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with men's skins." Thank you.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson], may extend their remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, while New Mexico cannot boast of as many Japanese Americans who served in World War II as many of our neighboring States, we can, however, point with pride to the fact that the only living Japanese American Congressional Medal of Honor winner lives among us, in Gallup, N. Mex.

He is Hiroshi Miyamura, whom most of us call "Hershey," owner and operator of a service station in Gallup.

Although he won the Nation's highest decoration for valor in Korea, he received his baptism of fire with the famed 442d Japanese American Regimental Combat Team, about which we have heard so much this afternoon. He was a replacement for that combat team, just as was Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously in Italy. Both participated in the final Po Valley campaign, which ended in the defeat of the German armies in Italy.

"Hershey" was a sergeant in Korea with the 7th Infantry Regiment. He was captured as a wounded prisoner of war after his heroic actions near Taejon-Ni, late in April 1951. It was not until he was exchanged for Korean prisoners of war after the armistice was signed at Freedom Village in August 1953, after 29 months in enemy hands, that he learned that he had earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. His award had to be kept secret, for there is no telling what his Communist captors would have done to him had they known of his high honor.

Then President Eisenhower personally decorated him with the Medal of Honor at special White House ceremonies in the summer of 1954.

The citation for his Medal of Honor is a remarkable reminder of what patriotic Americans, regardless of their race, color, creed, and ancestry, can do when our Nation's honor is at stake.

The citation reads as follows:

> (Sergeant) Cpl. Hiroshi H. Miyamura (Service No. ER38584192), Infantry, Army of the United States, a member of Company H, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3d Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Taejon-Ni, Korea, on April 24 and 25, 1951.
>
> On the night of April 24, Company H was occupying a defensive position when the enemy fanatically attacked, threatening to overrun the position.
>
> Corporal Miyamura, a machinegun squad leader, aware of the imminent danger to his men, unhesitatingly jumped from his shelter wielding his bayonet in close, hand-to-hand combat, killing approximately 10 of the enemy. Returning to his position, he administered first aid to the wounded and directed their evacuation as another savage assault hit the line. He manned his machinegun and delivered withering fire until his ammunition was expended. He ordered the squad to withdraw, while he remained behind to render the gun inoperative. He then bayoneted his way through infiltrated enemy soldiers to a second gun emplacement and assisted in its operation.
>
> When the intensity of the attack necessitated the withdrawal of the company, Corporal Miyamura ordered his men to fall back while he remained to cover their movement. He killed more than 50 of the enemy before his ammunition was depleted and he was severely wounded. He maintained his magnificent stand despite his painful wounds, continuing to repel the attack until his position was overrun.
>
> When last seen, he was fighting ferociously against an overwhelming number of enemy soldiers.
>
> Corporal Miyamura's indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty reflect the utmost glory on himself and uphold the illustrious traditions of the military service.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in World War II, I note with both sorrow and pride that of the 21 Japanese American war heroes who sleep in the hallowed ground of the Arlington National Cemetery, 4 are from my State of Oregon.

Pfc. Victor K. Hada, Cpl. Jimmie T. Kokubu, Pfc. Thomas T. Kuge, and Pvt. Stanley Oba. All four were killed in action with the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team, the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service. Altogether, more than 9,000 suffered casualties, with more than 600 killed in action. The few who are interred in Arlington are but symbolic of the tremendous toll suffered by Japanese American troops.

The Members of this House know personally of the patriotism of the Japanese Americans who fought in World War II. Members of the two famous Nisei fighting groups in Europe have served as Members of this House. Senator Daniel K. Inouye, our beloved former colleague and my dear friend, served as an officer in the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team. Sparky Matsunaga, the able new Member from Hawaii, was an officer in the 100th Infantry Battalion.

The brave exploits of the Nisei who fought in Europe are well known and a stirring movie was made telling of their dramatic exploits. However, relatively little is known about the important military intelligence activities of the more than 15,000 Japanese American troops that served in the Pacific. As a Navy communications officer in the Pacific during World War II, I heard of their work, but hardly imagined that it was so extensive and impressive. In recognizing their services, one must not forget that when Nisei soldiers were captured by the Japanese forces, their treatment was far more difficult than for other American servicemen.

Perhaps the greatest Japanese American war hero of World War II in the Pacific was Sgt. Frank Hachiya. It gives me great personal pride to tell my colleagues that Frank Hachiya came from Hood River in my own congressional district. His story is probably the most dramatic example of the amazing courage and loyalty of these Americans who had to fight a war under not only desperate and dangerous conditions, but also had to suffer terrible discrimination and prejudice toward their loved ones at home. I have been told that Frank Hachiya's dramatic story would have been portrayed in a movie but it was considered to be just too unbelievable. I would like to summarize briefly his story as reported in the Selective Service System's Report on Special Groups.

The 1942 military evacuation from the west coast of all persons of Japanese ancestry resulted in Frank Hachiya going to the Minidoka Relocation Center in Hunt, Idaho. Not considered acceptable for service in the Army he was therefore ineligible for the draft. Nevertheless he volunteered for combat duty. Because he had some knowledge of Japanese, he was assigned to military intelligence duty in the Pacific.

Several months before the invasion of Leyte, that famous battleground in the Philippines, he volunteered for intelligence work behind the enemy lines. By the time of the invasion, he had mapped out the complete Japanese defenses for Leyte. When the invasion began, he started to crawl out in front of the Japanese lines toward the landing American troops. He was mortally wounded by fire from our own men. Nevertheless, he managed to crawl far enough to lay the maps showing the island's defenses at the feet of an American officer. A grateful Nation posthumously awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross, the highest decoration awarded to a Japanese American in the Pacific theater.

The life of Sergeant Hachiya symbolizes well the story of the Japanese American soldiers of World War II. Unwanted by the Army, he could not be drafted. Suspected by his own Government, he was confined in a relocation camp. He insisted upon serving our country, so he volunteered. Given the most trying of assignments, to fight against those of his own ancestry and culture, he was mistakenly shot and killed by his own comrades. Though he died, his courage resulted in the saving of the lives of thousands of his countrymen.

Surely no other group can surpass the record of the Japanese American soldiers for loyalty and patriotism under arduous conditions while they and their loved ones at home suffered from terrible discrimination and injustice. Their record of outstanding citizenship during wartime is only matched by their records during peacetime. The Japanese Americans in my own district are noted for their industriousness and model citizenship. Most of my Nisei constituents work in farming and related activities in Hood River County, the home area of Sergeant Hachiya, and in Malheur County. The quality of their crops and their general efficiency in both production and marketing is well known.

This country has a great debt of gratitude and restitution to pay both those who suffered at the battlefront and at the homefront. Last year I was pleased to have worked with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Cecil King of California, to insure proper tax treatment for the financial compensation our country made to those who had suffered property losses as a result of the 1942 evacuation.

Many of my own constituents suffered personally in the relocation camps that this Nation so tragically established during the hysteria just after Pearl Harbor.

We are fortunate that the great personal fortitude and deep loyalty of these fellow Americans precluded any lasting feelings of bitterness. Outstanding examples of this deep love of country are Kay and Kitty Hisatomi, who were moved to the relocation camp at Tulelake, Calif., though they were both born and raised in this country. This family has such love of country that their son, John Hisatomi, wants to follow in the footsteps of his two uncles, much decorated veterans of the 442d, and serve in his country's defense. As my colleagues know, my appointments to the military academies are strictly competitive. It, therefore, gave me special pride to announce that John Hisatomi finished first among my nominees and so received my principal appointment this year to West Point.

I take pride today in joining the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, in paying tribute to those of Japanese descent who have lived up to the highest tradition of heroism in the defense of our country. They are indeed great Americans.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to join with my colleagues today to honor those loyal Japanese Americans, who despite harsh treatment by this country, volunteered to defend this Nation against her enemies during World War II. Only one or two generations removed from their homeland, they fought to preserve our American heritage. The Japanese Americans are indeed a living tribute to the foundations and principles of our Nation. They prove that "Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."

We can all remember the treatment accorded to these people during the early years of the war, when, because of so-called "racial affinity," they were torn away from their homes on the west coast and sent to relocation camps in the interior part of the country. There, they lived in almost concentration camp conditions. Our Nation openly doubted their loyalty, integrity, and pride in the American way. If any race living in America should have lost faith in America, it should have been the Japanese Americans. But, they defied that doubt, and finally, in 1943, they were at last given the opportunity to prove their Americanism and join our forces overseas. They had begged and petitioned for this for 2 long bitter years, and when they were at last given this opportunity, the response was overwhelming.

As you know, these volunteers composed the main force of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, and became the most decorated unit in our military history for its size and length of service. The 100th Infantry Battalion, composed mainly of Hawaiian National Guard members, became equally as famous.

The record of individual acts of bravery and patriotism by the Nisei is long indeed, and yet as Ernie Pyle pointed out, most of their personal bravery decorations were awarded for saving the lives of their comrades. Two Japanese Americans from Washington who were killed in action are buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Over 50 are interred in the Washelli Cemetery in Seattle.

We cannot overlook the great contributions made by those Nisei who served in the Pacific in the intelligence branches. Due to their efforts, we knew more about our enemy than ever before in the history of the United States, and it is said that the Nisei intelligence work shortened the war in the Pacific by 2 years. Time and time again throughout the pages of World War II history, the valor and bravery of the Japanese Americans are illustrated. They are indeed the subject of a unique chapter in our history, and the American Nation and the free world is highly indebted to them.

I would also like to point with pride to the record established by the Nisei who came from the Seattle area of Washington State, which I represent. Most of the Japanese Americans from this area were sent to the Minidoka Relocation Center in Idaho. It is generally agreed that the greatest number of mainland volunteers came from this relocation camp. About 1,000 Japanese Americans from the Seattle area served in Europe and in the Pacific during the war. This was one-seventh of the total Japanese population in the Seattle area, which is one of the highest service records of any nationality group in this country.

Let me mention just a few of the many individuals who met the great challenge and who surmounted staggering odds to fight for their country. All are from the Seattle area.

First. The four Sakura brothers of Seattle; all served in the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Second. Shiro Kashino, one of the most decorated soldiers of our area, who is today a successful businessman in Seattle.

Third. Harry Takagi, who also fought with the 442d in all seven major campaigns, who is today one of the highest Japanese Americans in our Government.

Fourth. Henry Gosho, who participated in the combat intelligence in the Pacific and served with the famed Merrill's Maurauders. He won the bronze star medal, among other awards, and was the first Japanese American to be appointed to the Foreign Service.

Fifth. William Marutani, who was a commissioned officer in the Counterintelligence Corps in Japan. Today, he resides in Philadelphia and is a member of one of the country's most distinguished law firms.

Now, I would especially like to pay tribute to Mr. Mike Masaóka, the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League. As some of you already know, Mr. Masaóka was the first Japanese American to volunteer for the Japanese American combat team from the mainland. He was also one of five brothers who served in the Armed Forces, which is more than any other known American family. Mr. Masaóka is the author of the moving and heartwarming Japanese American creed, which expresses the depth of the loyalty and bravery to be found in the hearts of the Nisei. He is an American citizen in the highest sense, and it would be wonderful indeed if every American held our country with the same reverence and high esteem as Mr. Masaóka and his people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the only American of Japanese ancestry in this body, I am sure I speak for all Americans of Japanese ancestry in saying that I am extremely grateful for the kind and gracious remarks of the gentlemen from California, Congressmen MILLER, KING, EDWARDS, ROYBAL, VAN DEERLIN, and LEGGETT; and of the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CUNNINGHAM; of the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman ULLMAN; of the gentlemen from Idaho, Congressmen HARDING and WHITE; of the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman MONTOYA; the gentleman from New York, Congressman STRATTON; the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman O'HARA; and of the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman GILL.

It is true that the Japanese American paid a high price in blood and lives to prove his loyalty to the United States. But it is also true that the Japanese American has no regrets that he paid such a price. He is grateful to the people of the United States for having given him the opportunity to prove his love for his country. He is grateful too for his unqualified acceptance by his fellow Americans into the greatest democratic society the world has ever known.

In demonstration of our gratitude we Americans of Japanese ancestry pledge ourselves to uphold the Federal Constitution, to contribute to our utmost toward the welfare of our great Nation, and to continue to prove to the world that Americanism is a matter of the heart and mind and not one of race or color.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to participate with my colleague from Alameda County in paying my respects to the accomplishments of the Americans of Japanese ancestry.

My State of California is a great melting pot. The gentleman from Alameda [Mr. MILLER] and myself share a common Italian ancestry and we are proud of this ancestry, and no less Americans.

Japanese Americans can be similarly proud of the great things this nationality has accomplished. My fellow Californians and myself remember the great accomplishments of the all-Japanese battalions fighting in Italy and we thank these Japanese Americans for assisting in liberating our homeland. Being men of good will we attempt to forget the aggressive actions of one imperialistic Japanese Empire and likewise to live down the oppressive treatment of Japanese in California and the series of oppressive unconstitutional laws which we have set aside.

The Japanese came to California before the turn of the century over 40,000 strong to respond to the labor needs of California agriculture. Before Japanese came Chinese and after them came Hindus, Italians, Germans, Filipinos, and eventually the Mexican nationals. Where we go from here we do not know. Of this group the Japanese have probably assimilated better than any. They are great producers today of agriculture in the Fourth Congressional District of California. Likewise they are an extremely lawful people who claim a share of public welfare practically never.

I salute the Japanese American Citizens League of the Fourth District for the fine part this organization plays in this wonderful heritage.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who served our Nation during World War II. We owe a debt of gratitude to these men who served their country with such distinction and valor during this period.

I have the honor to represent a district in which we have a large number of Americans of Japanese ancestry. I am happy to recognize their patriotism, and their loyalty to their country during World War II when they were faced with many difficult problems. Some of these persons are numbered among our most substantial citizens in Colorado, and they have made a most valuable contribution to the growth and development of our State, particularly in agriculture. Some of our largest and most successful farmers are Americans of Japanese descent.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in these tributes to those brave Americans of Japanese ancestry who served in our Armed Forces during World War II.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues have now introduced into the record the very eloquent and informative tributes to Japanese Americans who served in World War II.

In addition to these speeches, Dr. Stanley Nagahashi, now of Philadelphia but who was born in Sacramento, Calif., sang "The JACL Hymn," and William Marutani, a national JACL vice president and its legal counsel, also of Philadelphia, read "The Japanese American Creed," both of which are commended to all Americans as expressions of the highest idealism and Americanism. Marutani, a native of Kent, Wash., served in the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Military Intelligence Group as a commissioned officer in Japan. An attorney, he is a partner in the distinguished Philadelphia law firm of MacCoy, Evans and Lewis.

MEETING WITH PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The following morning, June 3, 1963, Mrs. Munemori and her daughters from Los Angeles, Mrs. Thomas Tamura and Miss Kiku Munemori, national JACL president and Mrs. Okura, Judge Aiso, and Washington JACL representative Masaoka, met the President in the White House. There, they also met the Vice President. The meeting was arranged by Senator INOUYE. Congressman MATSUNAGA was also a member of the party.

Mrs. Munemori presented the President with the history of the 442d Combat Team, published by the Infantry Journal and entitled "Americans." Judge Aiso presented the President with a copy of the "MISLS Album," the story of the Military Intelligence Service Language Schools. National JACL president Okura presented a copy of "Beauty Behind Barbed Wire," by the late Allen H. Eaton, which tells about the arts and handicrafts of the evacuees, and explains the inner character and the love of beauty and order of the Japanese American even when confined to desert wastelands.

They were then taken on a special tour of the White House.

That afternoon, Congressman MATSUNAGA hosted a luncheon for the White House party and the other visiting Gold Star parents, Mr. and Mrs. Nagato, Mr. and Mrs. Nakashima, and Mrs. Nagano. Thereafter, he took them on a personally conducted tour of the Capitol.

ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

All of us are most familiar with the endless detail and the tremendous work involved in any type of public program. Accordingly, I feel that in addition to paying tribute to Japanese Americans who served in World War II we should extend our appreciation for a difficult program well executed to the members of the special JACL arrangements committee.

By coincidence, every member of the committee either served in the Armed Forces in World War II or had brothers who did so. And, with few exceptions, all are evacuees from the West Coast. Moreover, all today hold responsible positions in the community.

Honorary cochairmen were Senator DANIEL INOUYE and Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA.

Chairman for both the program and the committee was Mike Masaoka, whom many of us have known over the years as the effective and eloquent spokesman for Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country. As the national secretary and field executive of the JACL at the time of the outbreak of war, he was among those who provided the visionary and statesmanlike leadership that has been the hallmark of the JACL through the years since it was first organized in 1930. He was among those who most vigorously urged the War Department and the President to accept Japanese American volunteers into the Army, and he was the first to volunteer when that proposal was accepted. Four other brothers also volunteered with Mike—Ben Frank, who is interred here in Arlington; Ike, a 100-percent disabled veteran now residing in Los Angeles; Hank, who also lives in Los Angeles; and Tad, who resides near San Francisco.

After his honorable discharge from the 442d in December 1945, Mike came to Washington and it is he who has translated much of the good will achieved by the Japanese American GI into positive and constructive legislation for the benefit of Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country. A leading national magazine once described him as "Washington's most successful lobbyist," while a recent national television broadcast paid tribute to him as the outstanding Japanese American in the past quarter century. As one who has cooperated with him in his legislative efforts for almost two decades, much of the time under difficult circumstances, I believe that it can be said without doubt that most of the public and private legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the postwar years has had the stamp of Mike Masaoka on it. He probably personifies as well as anyone "The Japanese American Creed" he authored more than 20 years ago.

Accordingly, it was most appropriate that he was the chairman for the commemorative services on June 2.

Miss Mary Toda, the secretary to the Washington JACL office, was the secretary of the committee. Formerly from Watsonville, Calif., she had a brother, James, who served with G–2 in the Pacific.

Joseph Ichiuji, now the Assistant Chief of the International Loan Branch, Acting Division Office of Controller, Agency for International Development, is an evacuee from Monterey, Calif. He volunteered and served with the 522d Field Artillery Battalion of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, along with two other brothers, Paul and Harry. Ichiuji served as treasurer of the committee.

Henry Gosho is the first Japanese American to become a Foreign Service officer. A native of Seattle, Wash., he is currently the chief of the East Asia branch of the Voice of America. He won fame and decorations as one of the first Nisei to serve in World War II, being with Merrill's Marauders in the China-India-Burma theater.

Edwin Mitoma is the chairman of the board of the Washington, D.C., JACL chapter. Evacuated out of Oakland, Calif., he served in the Army Signal Corps. He is currently employed as an electronics engineer at the U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratories.

Miss Hisako Sakata is from Cheyenne, Wyo. A brother George served with the 442d in Italy. She is currently the financial management analyst in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Miss Suzy Sakato recently resigned as a captain in the Army Nurse Corps Reserves. She is an anesthetist at the D.C. General Hospital. Born in Idaho, she was raised in Utah.

Mrs. Gladys Onoye Shimasaki has a brother, Lloyd, interred in Arlington. He was killed in action with the 442d. An evacuee from Salinas, Calif., now a housewife, she was the secretary of the

Washington JACL office when it first opened in 1946.

Ira Shimasaki, evacuated from Lindsay, Calif., served with the 310th Infantry Regiment in Germany. Two other evacuee brothers, Fred and Sam, also served in the Armed Forces of our country. The permanent chairman of JACL's Arlington Cemetery committee, since 1948 when the first Nisei were returned to this country for interment at Arlington, he has faithfully made certain that every Memorial Day every individual Nisei grave is decorated with fresh flowers. He is the manager of the paint and body department of Flood Pontiac.

Harry Takagi, another former Seattleite, served in the 442d. A brother, Calvin, also served in the armed services. Takagi is an associate member of the Board of Veterans Appeals of the Veterans' Administration.

Harry Takai, an evacuee from Los Angeles, served in Cannon Company, 442d Regimental Combat Team. Two other brothers, Jimmy and Joe, also served. He is the supervisor of the financial report for the Geological Survey.

John Yoshino, a constituent of mine from Alameda before the evacuation, is the deputy director of field service on the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Now the chairman of the eastern district council of the JACL, he was recently honored by his alma mater, Roosevelt University of Chicago, with the Eleanor Roosevelt Key as the Alumnus of the Year 1962. Last year too, he was one of the five finalists for the outstanding Japanese American of the biennium 1960–62 award and was presented a Distinguished Community Leadership Medallion by the National JACL. He is the national membership chairman for the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, the professional society for social workers.

The committee has asked that we specially acknowledge the outstanding cooperation and help given it by Superintendent John C. Metzler of Arlington National Cemetery and Maj. Robert M. von Schlemmer, ceremony officer, of the Military District of Washington. We are pleased to do this, since we so seldom hear praise for our public servants from those with whom they work in such joint ventures as these.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Japanese American citizens of this country.

As a veteran of the European theater in World War II I know we owe a great debt of gratitude to those members of the Japanese American community that served in the Armed Forces during the late war.

We have, of course, representatives of that gallant body of men here in the Congress. Hon. Daniel K. Inouye—a Member of this House in the 86th and 87th Congress and presently a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate—served in Italy with the 442d Regimental Combat Team. Senator Inouye lost his right arm in the Italian campaign, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery.

Our distinguished colleague from Hawaii in this Congress, Hon. Spark Matsunaga, served in the European theater with the 299th Infantry. He was wounded twice, and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to look beyond the confines of Capitol Hill to see living testimony to the heroism of the Japanese American soldier.

It may be of interest to recall the period of World War II. Our treatment of the Nisei is a shameful chapter in our national history.

On June 17, 1942, the War Department advised the Selective Service System to discontinue Nisei inductions until further notice. Soon afterward all Nisei were reclassified IV–C, not acceptable for service because of ancestry.

This lamentable period extended for several months, until January 1943 when the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team was organized. However, it was not until December 1943 that all barriers to the induction of the Nisei were lifted.

I think we can say with truth that it was the Japanese American fighting men that proved to our Government of that day the loyalty and patriotism of the Nisei.

The 100th Battalion, a Japanese American unit, went overseas to Europe in August 1943. In the first 3 months of service in Italy this unit lost one-third of its members as casualties.

During the first 6 months of service in the Italian campaign this battalion was awarded 900 Purple Hearts, 4 Distinguished Service Crosses, 36 Silver Stars, and 21 Bronze Stars. The 100th became known as the Purple Heart Battalion.

This single battalion by March 1945 had been awarded 1,547 Purple Hearts, 21 Distinguished Service Crosses, 7 Soldier's Medals, 6 Legions of Merit, 73 Silver Stars, 96 Bronze Stars, and 16 Divisional Citations.

Mr. Speaker, that record speaks for itself.

In April 1944 the 442d Regimental Combat Team arrived in Italy and the illustrious 100th Battalion became part of that larger unit. The motto of the 442d was "Go for Broke," and this was certainly destined to be the story of the Nisei soldier.

This gallant body of valiant men became the most decorated unit in U.S. military history. However, the price was high—the 442d suffered a total of 300 percent casualties by the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I think the words of Gen. Mark Clark, addressed to the 442d, say all that can be said to honor these fine men.

"You are always thinking of your country before yourselves. You have never complained through your long periods in the line. You have written a brilliant chapter in the history of the fighting men of America. You are always ready to close with the enemy, and you have always defeated him. The 34th Division is proud of you, the 5th Army is proud of you, and the whole United States is proud of you."

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 at Arlington National Cemetery commemorative services were held marking the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II. Previous commitments precluded me from attending this impressive ceremony but I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all those Americans of Japanese descent both living and dead who served in World War II.

I am very proud to have a large number of Japanese Americans in my congressional district. When in 1942 our Government's policy was to move those Japanese Americans inland, many eventually settled in our great city of Chicago, the center metropolis of the Midwest. They made their new homes around the neighborhoods near the University of Chicago and along the north Lake Shore. In a short time their energetic and loyal natures and their pleasing personalities made them an integral part of the community. They have become very active in civic affairs, mostly through the Japanese American Citizens League which does much to promote and foster a responsible and interested citizenry.

The chairman of the Midwest district council of the Japanese American Citizens League is Dr. Frank F. Sakamoto whom I know to be an able and conscientious worker in behalf of the league's interests. He is aided by such men as Mr. Mark Yoshizumi, chairman of the Chicago chapter, JACL, and Mr. Tomo Kosobayashi, chairman of the legislative committee.

Every 2 years, coinciding with the congressional and many local elections, the Japanese American Citizens League extends invitation to all candidates to appear before them and express their opinions and views. Each candidate is introduced by a different member of JACL, and after speaking for a few minutes then joins the audience to hear the remainder of the speakers. The league makes no recommendations to its members but lets them decide for themselves after having viewed and participated in the forum.

This is in the best American tradition and I am sure that all Nisei who fought for the American way of life under the American flag during World War II can well be proud of the heritage that Japanese Americans are continuing to contribute to our country, truly making the United States the world's greatest democracy.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a most impressive ceremony took place on the 2d of June. It took place in the quiet surroundings of the hallowed grounds of Arlington National Cemetery. It was a tribute to the Nisei, who were in the military service in World War II on the 20th anniversary of their participation.

This ceremony had a special significance for me because I have the honor of representing many Americans of Japanese ancestry in my district. I have walked among them and I have talked to them in the fields and in their shops. Their love of their country is moving and it is an inspiration to talk to them. I had the great pleasure of campaigning with a distinguished citizen of Colorado who was elected to the Colorado House of Representatives last year. He is Seiji Horiuchi, a former national vice president of the junior chamber of commerce, and one of the most promising young legislators in Colorado.

The stories of bravery and courage displayed by the 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry who saw service in World War II are legend. The "Purple Heart Regiment," in 11 months of combat, suffered 9,480 casualties. Six hundred of these valiant men were killed. Nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts were awarded the members of this "Go-for-Broke" group.

It was the late Gen. Joe Stilwell who described them best: "They bought an awfully big hunk of America with their blood," he said.

Over 20 years ago, in 1941, the Japanese American creed was read into the Congressional Record. The first few lines of that creed describe beautifully and succinctly their belief:

> I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future.
>
> Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places.

Mr. Speaker, we are forever in the debt of these great Americans. It is an honor to pay tribute to them.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the accomplishments of the Americans of Japanese ancestry. Cleveland is fortunate in having among its citizens some unusually contributive and constructive Japanese Americans who have won our respect, admiration, and warm regard.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the heroic Japanese Americans who fought so valiantly in Italy and other places in World War II—many of whom gave their lives for the country that we share. They contributed greatly to our final victory. I am very happy to join my colleagues in commending these Japanese Americans for the magnificent job they did then, and for the splendid role they are playing in America today.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with my colleagues in honoring the Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so bravely and valiantly in World War II, particularly since there are more Americans of Japanese ancestry living within the confines of the city of Los Angeles than any other city in America with the exception of our sister city in the Pacific, Honolulu. Nearly one-third of all Americans of Japanese ancestry, known familiarly as Nisei, have their homes in Los Angeles County. It has been my pleasure to have worked with Comdr. Jun Ogimachi of the San Fernando Valley Nisei Memorial Council, District No. 7, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which post is located in Sun Valley, Calif., part of the district which I represent.

The wonderful record that the members of the 442d Japanese American combat team is well known throughout our great Nation, but the use and exploits of these Americans of Japanese ancestry as linguists in the Pacific theater of the war against the Japanese has not been such a well-known fact. Through their actions and sacrifices in this theater of operation the end of the war was brought to an earlier close. In World War II there were more than 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry that served their country valiantly; over half of this number had lived on the mainland of the United States.

The solemn and impressive ceremony that was held on June 2, 1963, in the environs of the hallowed and beautiful Arlington National Cemetery honoring these American men of Japanese ancestry was a sincere gesture from their country to commemorate the memories of those gallant Nisei that had made the supreme sacrifice to further the tenets of our country's long history of freedom and liberty for all mankind. May I add my humble salute to these American Japanese patriots.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] and would like to associate myself with his very thoughtful remarks commending the Japanese Americans who served so valiantly in our country's service during World War II.

These brave men fought a double battle—one against this country's wartime enemies and another against racial prejudice. Though they were placed in relocation camps and otherwise discriminated against, these men chose to fight this discrimination by proving themselves true Americans on the battlefields of the war.

Many Japanese Americans had to fight an uphill battle just to enlist in our Armed Forces. Once they were permitted to join, however, they proved that this trust was not misplaced.

By serving America bravely and valiantly the Japanese Americans showed patriotism and citizenship to be matters of the heart and mind, rather than race or religion. I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in saluting the Japanese American Citizens League on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Sullivan and to include her testimony on the food stamp bill.

Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Gubser.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 521. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 522. An act to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 525. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 526. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members have permission to insert their remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and include extraneous matter:

Mr. Conte in two instances.
Mr. Derwinski in one instance.
Mr. Harsha in one instance.
Mr. Gubser in one instance.
Mr. Lipscomb in one instance.
Mr. Alger in five instances.
Mr. Tupper in one instance.
Mr. Tollefson in one instance.
Mr. Utt in three instances.
Mr. Skubitz in one instance.
Mr. Younger in one instance.
Mr. Osmers in three instances.
Mr. Findley in one instance.
Mr. Berry in one instance.
Mr. Utt in one instance.
Mr. Alger in one instance.
Mr. Michel in one instance.
Mr. Snyder in one instance.
Mr. Burton in one instance.
Mr. Cramer in two instances.
Mr. Wyman in three instances.
Mr. Chamberlain in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object to those extensions in more than one instance. And I might say that after today I will object to extensions in the Appendix of the daily Record by a second party. I object now unless the request is amended to include only one instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from South Dakota amend his requests for permission to include those extensions in only one instance?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request to include one instance for each Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following

Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Morse.

Mr. Burton.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Derounian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the inclusion of remarks in the Record if they include extraneous matter of length exceeding one page.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to the request otherwise?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the request of any Member to extend his own remarks in the body of the Record. If the membership will look at the Record of yesterday, for instance, they will find long speeches, testimony before committees, matter that appeared in hearings and other printed matter which is available elsewhere and has no place in the body of the Record. It clutters up the Record, adds to the expense. For that reason I am going to object to the inclusion of the extraneous material in connection with these remarks. I will not object to the inclusion of any remarks of any Member or short excerpts from any other material, but I do object to these inclusions of long extraneous material.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Would the gentleman consider remarks concerning Pope John XXIII as not worthy of inclusion in the body of the Record?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say that those newspaper articles that were included, the proper place for them, in my opinion—and I am only expressing my own opinion—would be in the Appendix of the daily Record.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the gentleman give, for the edification of those who are listening to him, a definition of extraneous matter?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think extraneous matter is matter that is irrelevant, is extraneous to the extension, matter that is not directly connected with the matter under discussion. If it is a newspaper article or things like that that are available from other sources that take up a lot of space in the permanent Record, which is printed and which might be available in the Appendix of the daily Record, I have no objection to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to know who sets the standards of what is relevant and what is irrelevant. Would the gentleman give me some guidelines of what is relevant?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think if the gentleman had been here and heard my remarks——

Mr. MACDONALD. I heard the remarks at length. I will not say they cluttered up the Record, but I heard the remarks at length.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to say here we are operating in this House without any standards, so to speak. These rules have kind of grown like "Topsy." No one knows exactly what the rules are. I am hoping that we can in the near future bring about some order in the way we are operating here. There is no consistency with which we have operated in the past with reference to the body and the Appendix of the daily Record. I know I am irritating a lot of people here today, and I want to apologize for it, but I think I am pointing up a thing that needs to be corrected. I am hoping that some time in the future I can contribute something to doing that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman given consideration to the introduction of a resolution, and then let the appropriate committee, in this case the Joint Committee on Printing, consider the question, rather than interposing an objection in relation to a custom that has continued for many, many years? It seems to me that the gentleman's position would be completely consistent if he were to announce that he was going to introduce such a resolution and did introduce such a resolution, and then see what the results might be.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say respectfully to the Speaker that I have introduced such resolutions in the past, but, like many other resolutions introduced in the past, there has to be more motivation other than by one person. I am trying to do that, and I think by the encouragement we have had here today we might do that. I spoke to a member of the Joint Committee on Printing and am advised they have not had a meeting this year.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yesterday I introduced into the body of the Record a letter originating with me to the President's science adviser, in which I posed certain questions with respect to this all-important facet of our Government. He answered me with a rather lengthy letter that I believe should be known to all Members of the House. This was not a short statement. His letter was seven pages long and mine was about three pages. Just for my own information and as a guideline, would the gentleman say that this extraneous matter should not have been put into the Record?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say that the Appendix of the daily Record would have been a more appropriate place for it, particularly since such a thing in all probability will appear in the printed hearings of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. It will not appear in the printed hearings of the committee. This information was for me and for the committee and for the House. I respectfully recognize the gentleman's ability to make these judgments, but in my judgment, I felt that the body of the Record, where it would be perpetuated, was a much better place to put them than the Appendix of the daily Record.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say for the benefit of the gentleman and other Members that I am proceeding under the rules of this House. I am calling attention to the fact that there is possibly a need and a desirability for some change in the rules of the House.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was here at the beginning and listened to the gentleman's remarks. I know he has been dedicated to this project for many years. I certainly admire his persistence. I have no argument with the point he tries to put forth here. It did seem to me from the years I have been here, and speaking on just one of the gentleman's points, that there is, it seems to me, a great deal of time wasted when the Members have to stand up in the well to make these unanimous-consent requests. It would be much easier to give the requests to the majority leader and the minority leader and have them make the requests, because I think it saves a great deal of time. That was the only thing that concerned me with respect to the gentleman's position.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say I would agree with the gentleman to this extent. I think over the years a custom has grown up where many Members do not even come to the floor of the House and many Members feel it is not necessary even to make quorum calls, and yet they will have their remarks appear in the Record. I take the position that if a Member is not sufficiently interested to make an appearance on the floor of the House, he is not very interested in getting his remarks in the Record. I have absolutely no objection and I applaud Members who will take the time to prepare their remarks and have them appear in the Record, but frankly, I think it is a sign of laziness for a Member to go through a bunch of periodicals and clip out articles and put two or three sentences with it and put it in the Appendix of the daily Record and try to make it appear that it is his own thinking.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am pleased to have that background from the gentleman and thank him very much for yielding to me.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I sat here and listened to the special order just concluded where the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], along with other gentlemen, discussed the tributes to Japanese Americans for their military service in World War II. I was interested in noting that he submitted a number of unanimous-consent requests to the Speaker, all of which were approved, submitting various speeches, documents, and extraneous material. I am curious to know how you draw the distinction without seeing those documents and without seeing the documents that have been presented by the gentleman from South Dakota, and how you can determine which ones you are going to object to and which ones you are not going to object to. It seems to me this is one of the dangers in censorship.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think you are correct in that respect. I think everyone appreciates the fact that it would be impossible for one person at the beginning of a campaign such as this to get everything in order. I did not object in the instance to which the gentleman referred because it was part of the continuity of the matter that they were speaking on today. I appreciated that fact. But I will say at this time, in similar cases I might object and I am still going to reserve the right to object. The reason I have objected to these requests for extensions at this time and the inclusion of extraneous material is that I do not know what it includes and I think for that reason they should go in the Appendix of the daily Record instead.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. I still think the question that was left unanswered about your objection is that you have no objection to matters that are relevant and, yet, you give no—at least I have not heard the gentleman give any guidelines as to what constitutes relevant matter. To give a concrete example, today I asked permission to put into the Record a study of the Passamaquoddy project in New England. By necessity I have to include within it reports that have been made by people who have compiled these reports on this type of public power. Would you say that those reports would be extraneous and should not be included or would you in your censorship say that that is relevant; and how am I to know when I make the request whether or not you are going to object to it; or how are the people who handle the Journal or the Congressional Record going to know whether it meets your standards, if you set up no standards.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would reply to the gentleman in this way. The report that you are talking about, as I have gathered from your statement, is a report and studies that are available in printed records. I think we are making a mistake in duplicating the printing of such material as that.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the gentleman will permit me to correct him, I would point out that they are available in the State of Massachusetts and in the State of Maine and in New Hampshire, but they are not available here for the Members of Congress. I wish to make them available for all the Members from all 50 States so that they can see the justice of the desire to have this project put forward in New England. I do not believe that the Members of the 50 States are going to be that interested that they will write to the New England states to find out the facts and figures which have to do with this project. And, if you think that they are, you are a greater optimist than you have already shown here today, in my judgment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say you are a greater optimist than I would think you to be if you think that the people are going to read it in the Record, either.

Mr. MACDONALD. What I would like to know from the gentleman is how the gentleman from Missouri became such an expert in all fields that he sets himself up as a censor without going through any committee of this Congress? By what method does he constitute himself a censor to say what shall or shall not be printed in this Congressional Record that belongs to all the Members of the Congress, and not just to the Member from Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would only reply to the gentleman that I am operating under the Rules of the House and you have a remedy if you would care to use it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think this thing goes back—and as a member of the Joint Commitee on Printing and chairman of the House Committee on Printing—to a rule adopted, and the gentleman from Missouri and I have discussed this and do not agree, I believe, about it, but I think it is worthy of putting it before the Members of the House. Some years ago, as the Members of the House know, the Appendix of the daily Record was bound in permanent form. Now the Appendix of the daily Record is not bound in permanent form. Therefore, anything that any Member puts in the Appendix of the daily Record is not bound up. Formerly it was, and every library in the country got a copy of it. It was preserved in permanent form. I said in the Joint Committee in opposing that if we abolished the privilege, which costs relatively little, then the Members were going to resort to putting anything in the body of the Record which really has no relevancy to what happens before and after its appearance in the Record, and it would, therefore, be preserved in permanent form for our libraries.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri to the extent that the Record of the daily happenings here presumably covers remarks which are made on the floor of the House and that a lot of other things should be in the Appendix of the daily Record and such things I would be willing to have placed in the Appendix of the daily Record. Others would be willing to put in the Appendix of the daily Record things they are now putting in the body of the Record in order to insure that it is bound up and preserved in the permanent Record.

Mr. Speaker, I think this was a mistake on the part of the Joint Committee then and I think the evidence of it is coming home to us now.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if we ever have a meeting of the Joint Committee, I could offer a resolution to print and bind up the Appendix of the daily Record in permanent fashion and a lot of this material and practice that the gentleman from Missouri considers an abuse—and this is a debatable question—a lot of the things which are now in the body of the Record could just as well be placed in the Appendix of the daily Record. I would say that if we ever have a meeting of the Joint Committee—if there is ever one called—we might be able to do something, for what it is worth.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Am I correct in stating that there has not been a meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing this session?

Mr. HAYS. As a member of that committee, if there has been a meeting it has escaped my notice and I have not heard of it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, I think the gentleman is very alert and if there had been such a meeting the gentleman would have been there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Reifel] desire to revise his unanimous consent request to state that for those requests in the body of the Record which include extraneous matter they shall not exceed 1 page?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I do, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this puts the gentleman from Missouri in a very difficult position—the requirement of the present law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I have been in difficult positions before.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but how can the gentleman possibly know what an article is going to take by way of space once it is set in type or until it is set in type?

How can he possibly know whether it will take a page, a half page, a quarter page, or what?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The people who prepare the Congressional Record have ways of measuring the typewritten matter and can tell the space it will occupy in the body of the Record.

Mr. GROSS. Then, perhaps, we ought to recess and wait until these articles are gone over and are sent to the Government Printing Office and come back at 11 o'clock or 12 o'clock tonight and pass upon them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If that is the will of the House, I will be agreeable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Missouri have any guidelines that he is willing to give the House—and the very few Members of the House who are here whose prerogatives are now being stepped upon—which the gentleman can set forth as to what is relevant material which can be carried in the body of the Record?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not prepared at this time to do so; no, sir.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MACDONALD. I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand correctly the situation before the House, the gentleman has been asked to amend his original unanimous-consent request to insert material in the Appendix of the daily Record, provided it does not exceed one page; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The body of the Record.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in observing this discussion here today, I shall not quarrel with the desire of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], who has certainly done a great job as a Congressman as long as I have been able to observe his actions, during the past 5 years I have been here. But I think we miss one paramount point in this whole discussion. There appears to be a growing tendency in this Congress to deny the individual Member of the House the right to his own best judgment. The gentleman was urged to amend his request today to say that the material shall not exceed one page. Who is going to draw the line? Who shall decide: Should it be one page, should it be a half page, should it be 1 column, should it be 1 paragraph, should it be 10 pages? If we are going to impose restrictions on the judgment of an individual Congressman, then I believe the entire House should adopt proper rules and limitations instead of leaving this decision to the objection of any single Member. Our present rules permit one Member to set himself up as the censor over the entire House.

I do not think the 434 other Members of this body should be subjected solely to the judgment of the gentleman from Missouri, no matter how good his intentions are. I do not think the gentleman from Missouri would want me or anyone else to be passing judgment on his conduct, and I do not think the other Members of the House should be exposed to that sort of treatment.

For this reason I hope the gentleman will not be pressed to change his unanimous-consent request establishing certain limitations on the material that is being submitted by Members who have asked him as their emissary to obtain unanimous consent for their request. I believe the gentleman from Missouri has made his point. I hope he will now offer his views in the form of a resolution to change the rules of the House and permit the entire membership to work its will on the gentleman's observations.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is on the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel]. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore agreed to, the following may be permitted to address the House:

Mr. Chamberlain, on June 12, for 30 minutes.

Mr. Bromwell, on June 12, for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following other special orders heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Illinois think for one minute that I would not object?

Mr. PRICE. No. I was anticipating.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on June 13, following the legislative business and other special orders heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I objected to that once today and I will object again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record and to include therein extraneous matter: Mr. Slack, Mr. Multer, Mr. McDowell, and Mr. Ryan of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and to include therein extraneous matter:

Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Multer.
Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Ryan of New York.
Mr. Boland.
Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. MacDonald.
Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Morris.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
Mr. Flood.
Mr. O'Neill.
Mr. Rogers of Florida.
Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. McCormack.
Mr. McDowell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. HAYS. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object when the regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 63, noes 47.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a quorum is not required on a motion to adjourn.

The House stands adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

920. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

921. A letter from the executive director, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting the U.S. Olympic Committee financial report for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 805; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

922. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 73. A bill to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay; with amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 75. A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4157. A bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 134. A bill to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 396. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6755, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 6908. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6909. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6910. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6911. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6913. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6914. A bill to grant leave with pay for Government personnel engaged in any international athletic competition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 6915. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which certain military, naval, and air service records may be corrected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 6916. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, to regulate and restrict the printing of certain extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to limit the number of insertions of extraneous matters in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6917. A bill to establish an Office of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to act as a central clearinghouse in Government for consumer complaints; to disseminate information to consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6918. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 6920. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize issuance of total disability income provisions to national service life insurance policies through age 65, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6921. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit a limited waiver of service-incurred disabilities in meeting health requirements for reinstatement of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6922. A bill to amend section 723 of title 38, United States Code, to remove time limitation for exchange or conversion of veterans' special term insurance to qualify for special dividend; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 6923. A bill authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 6924. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities, in order to extend for 3 years certain expiring provisions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6925. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6926. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6927. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway linking the Florida Keys with the Tampa Bay area, Florida, as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6928. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6929. A bill to provide that certain functions with respect to housing loans shall be performed by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 6930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the termination provisions for the Federal excise tax on general telephone service, but to allow the taxpayer a credit against such tax for State and local taxes paid by him which are imposed on general telephone service and earmarked for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 6931. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien sons and daughters of World War I veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 6932. A bill to amend section 104 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6933. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 6934. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fire Island National Seashore, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6935. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Miami, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6936. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fire Island National Seashore in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6937. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 6938. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6939. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6940. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6941. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6942. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 6943. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6944. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6945. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6946. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 6947. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6948. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6949. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 6950. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 6951. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 6952. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 6953. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6954. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6955. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6956. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6957. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6958. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6959. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6960. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6961. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6962. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 6963. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 6964. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6965. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discriminaton; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 6966. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 6967. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 6968. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 6969. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 6970. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 6971. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6972. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6973. A bill to amend the various acts providing Federal assistance for education to insure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6974. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit loans to be made under that act to part-time students in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 468. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 469. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teacher Remembrance Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to certain citizens of Michigan for their activities in planning and working for the World's Fair proposed to be held in Detroit, Mich., in 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Res. 394. Resolution authorizing salary increases for the file clerk and assistant file clerk (minority); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Res. 395. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN: House Joint Memorial No. 26 of the Oregon State Legislature urging the Congress to appropriate funds to construct access roads through and to Bureau of Land Management lands bordering the Deschutes River and to maintain a portion of the area in a relatively wild or wilderness state; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 6975. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Giuseppe, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6976. A bill for the relief of Peter George Klinklavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 6977. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos Kyriakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6978. A bill for the relief of the estate of Melville N. Langford, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6979. A bill for the relief of Dr. Panagis Kokolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6981. A bill for the relief of Elvira Maniscalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6982. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in certain real property in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria, Giuseppe, and Tommaso Santamaria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6984. A bill for the relief of Domenico Fodera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6985. A bill for the relief of Kwang Han Kim, and his wife, Yong Kuk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6986. A bill to provide that Capt. Rupert E. Stivers may be granted a commission in the Regular Army, without regard to the restrictions contained in section 3286 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 6987. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo S. Lastrilla, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Middle East Cauldron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, addressed the 11th Annual Convention of District 1, B'nai B'rith. Senator JAVITS spoke on the difficult situation which exists in the Middle East. As the Senator said in his remarks, the unrest and tension which exists in that area impedes peace not only in the Middle East but in the world. I ask unanimous consent that Senator JAVITS' remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the benefit of his analysis may be available to all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present crisis in the Middle East is deepening and the danger of war with Israel's existence at stake will not disappear as if by magic just because certain words are said and certain statements pronounced.

U.S. policy in the Middle East continues to be one of "quiet diplomacy" and the Middle East is the only part of the world where U.S. policy treats friends of peace and foes of peace alike. This is an untenable and ill-advised posture for our Nation, and it is time we abandoned it.

With new fighting in Yemen; with Iraq teetering on the brink of civil war with the Kurds once more; and with Nasser's propaganda agitation and subversive activity going at full blast, it will take definite acts by the United States—not unilaterally but together with other nations—to halt the war threat in the Middle East and bring about a climate in which our objectives of peace and stability can be fully realized.

One action that we should take as soon as possible is to tighten up on our aid program to Egypt and make it clear to the President that he should suspend or withhold that assistance altogether if President Nasser continues his aggressive and warlike activities in violation of the express aims and objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I have written to the Department of State to this effect and I shall introduce an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which will emphasize the President's authority to cut off aid to Egypt.

The grave concern felt in the Congress over the rampant hostilities in this region found full expression in the series of speeches and colloquies which took place in the House and the Senate. On April 30, I was joined by 15 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in an attack on the Soviet-Egyptian arms buildup and to call for a sharp change in our present policy of dealing even-handedly with friends and foes of peace alike in the Middle East. It is worth noticing that in 2 hours of discussion and debate on the Senate floor by Democrats and Republicans, not one voice was heard in defense of the State Department's policy in this respect.

We were heartened when President Kennedy, on May 8, issued the firmest and strongest statement on the Middle East he has made since he took office. At that time he told a press conference, and I quote:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

Now this should make it quite clear to President Nasser of Egypt where we stand. But President Nasser has a long memory; he knows that the Department of State does not think he is prepared to act the way he talks, and will react to his threats by giving him as before more economic assistance and more private and unpublicized appeals to be nice and not do anything rash.

That economic assistance which the United States is giving Nasser rescued him from the disastrous consequences of his own so-called Arab socialism—which was little more than an excuse to nationalize all private property. Egypt's cotton crop was being sold to the Soviets in return for modern guns, planes, and submarines, and the country was on the verge of starvation when we stepped in with a massive aid program that amounted to over $250 million last year alone, most of it in surplus foods.

We did it because it was said this was an opportunity to get Egypt away from its entanglement with the Soviet Union and back into the Western sphere of influence again. And for a time it seemed to work; President Nasser paid off Great Britain and France for his seizure of the Suez Canal; Egypt's trade with Europe began to pick up again; and some effort was begun to improve the miserable living standards of the Egyptian masses.

Once the panic over the fear of starvation and revolt was gone, President Nasser began his familiar tactics of agitation and subversion, boasting of his new jet bombers that could destroy the oil fields of Saudi Arabia, and his new missiles which could reach, as he put it, south of Syria; and everyone knew that he meant Israel.

That was the beginning of the present crisis, and the next steps followed quickly.

First, came the Nasser-engineered revolt in Yemen last year. He poured 30,000 Egyptian troops, tanks and planes into a war against the new imam, a Western-educated ruler who had just begun to take his nation out of its primitive condition. Nasser's planes, some of them allegedly piloted by Russians, and all of them serviced by Communist ground crews, bombed Saudi Arabian towns and dropped boobytrapped toys and trinkets.

For a time it looked as if the war might spread, and when proroyalist Yemen tribesmen began to beat back the so-called republican forces and their Egyptian allies, the State Department abruptly stepped into the picture. In exchange for a vague promise from Nasser to withdraw his troops, the United States suddenly recognized the new Yemen regime, even though it had no popular support and no chance of survival without the protection of Egyptian troops. The British protested our action as premature and even our own diplomats in some Middle East countries were shocked by this appeasement of Nasser.

Today, 6 months later, Nasser is still in Yemen, vowing to keep his troops there until he wins, and Maj. Gen. Anwar Qadi, his commander in Yemen, is warning that "reactionaries" should not be misled into believing that "we shall pull out before realizing all the objectives of our mission." Meanwhile the Department of State has turned over the hot Yemen problem to the United Nations and is urging speedy implementation of the withdrawal agreement drafted by our special envoy, Ellsworth Bunker.

The second factor contributing to the present crisis was the disclosure that German scientists and technicians, many of them diehard Nazis, were working for Nasser to develop nuclear warhead missiles. Something like a shudder of horror went through the civilized world over the realization that Nazis could still be working for the destruction of Jews 18 years after Hitler Germany had been smashed to the ground. The present German Government of Chancellor Adenauer has ordered its scientists and technicians to return home, and the United States has flatly banned the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Middle East, but Egyptian rockets even with conventional warheads could cause horrible devastation in crowded Tel Aviv and Haifa.

The third action that triggered Israel's alarm was the open declaration in the Cairo charter of April 17 that the avowed object of the new Arab federation of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq was to destroy Israel. At the same time Egypt resumed her propaganda war and subversive agitation in order to stir up revolt in Jordan and possibly Saudi Arabia too. These were followed by riots in Jordan and Egyptian incitement to assassinate King Hussein—an action that could start Israeli armed forces moving toward the west bank of the Jordan. The Government of Israel has formally protested to the Security Council of the United Nations against this new threat to peace.

In a letter to me dated May 20, the Department of State expressed the view that Israel was in no immediate danger and said also that—and I quote—"the aid program in the UAR is tailored as carefully as possible so as not to free resources for arming." But the Department also admits—and again I quote—that "obviously the UAR in its military program absorbs resources which might otherwise contribute to development. But U.S. interests will not be served by ignoring or rejecting the legitimate needs of the people for economic progress or, for that matter, of food itself."

I must take issue, however, with the view that there is no immediate danger to Israel. I feel there is such danger and that it may be imminent.

The unrest and tension imperils not only peace in the Middle East but in the world. The Department of State should not court the criticism that our Government fails to act when there is still time and room to do so. I am convinced that we must take steps now to assure the security of Israel and the entire region not by works alone but by action. And one critical place to act is the massive U.S. aid program to the United Arab Republic.

The contention that we would be ignoring the legitimate needs of the Egyptian people if we conditioned our aid to President Nasser on a cessation of the arms race is not valid. On the contrary, we would be truly helping the people of Egypt by bringing them face to face with the consequences of President Nasser's policies so that they can be changed. As it is, their condition has not been materially improved.

Regarding the security of the Middle East, I am convinced that a mutual defense agreement, joined in by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, with Israel and any other Middle East state willing to assume its obligations, is essential.

B'nai B'rith has a long and honorable history of association with the development of Palestine and the upbuilding of the State of Israel. In Israel, it participates directly and through its membership in a children's home, the Hillel Foundation at Hebrew University, and in other institutions of welfare, health, and education. Through its Israel Committee it contributes substantially by the purchase of Israel bonds and the support of the United Jewish Appeal. Thus, B'nai B'rith, like the United States, has an important stake in the security and independence of Israel, and I would urge you to defend that stake with all your rights as Americans. Congress will take a very searching look at our foreign aid program, especially that part of it which relates to Egypt, and I hope that you will not only let your Congressman know how you feel but also arouse sentiment in your areas about this program.

There is tremendous support in our country for the best relations between ourselves and Israel and for Israel's security so that her mission may be fulfilled. It is critically important, therefore, that this climate of support and Israel's prestige in the United States be kept vital and alive.

Common Market Commission Recommends External Tariff Cuts To Fight Inflation in Europe

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the European Economic Commission, the administrative agency of the Common Market, is now urging the governments of the Six to cut tariffs on imports from nonmember countries in order to dampen inflationary pressures on prices now being felt throughout the Common Market. An increased flow of imports, says the Commission, would provide needed price competition from abroad to hold down prices on locally produced commodities.

I urge the administration to take advantage of this initiative on the part of the Common Market Commission and to work with it to persuade the Common Market to take this most sensible and constructive step. Unilateral or more-than-reciprocal reductions in Common Market tariffs would not only help Europe to fight its inflation, they would also help the United States in a fundamental way to reduce its present payments imbalance with Europe.

I particularly welcome and commend the Commission's recommendation, since it is one which I have made repeatedly and which has been endorsed in numerous reports of the Joint Economic Committee.

In a floor speech on January 25, 1962, I said:

> By greatly increasing imports from the United States, Europe could go far to balance dollar inflows from tourist spending, United States military expenditures, capital investments, and other sources. This would require the abandonment of remaining quotas on dollar imports and substantial tariff reductions by the European countries without asking for compensatory reductions by the United States.

On May 7, 1962, I pointed out that a liberal European import policy would reduce our unemployment and our payments deficit and at the same time strengthen Western Europe.

> Such a policy—

I said—

> would enable European employers—with the blessing of their own governments and of the friendly United States—to grant wage increases without risking inflation, because it would make available the goods needed to sop up the extra purchasing power thus created. And, if the operation were really successful, it could go far toward wiping out the U.S. payments deficit and Western Europe's payments surplus, to the great advantage of the whole free world.

In an article in the May 1963 issue of Harper's magazine, I again called attention to the many advantages of increased imports by the Common Market from the United States:

> This would not merely spur the U.S. economy and create jobs for Americans. It would

> also help the European countries. At present, a wage increase in Europe can cause inflation because higher purchasing power will compete for roughly the same amount of consumer goods. If Europe were to let down her trade barriers, new imports could sop up this excess purchasing power. And these sales of our products abroad would help wipe out the U.S. international payments deficit and Western Europe's payments surplus, to the advantage of the whole free world. Only thus can the dollar—the international currency of Europe and the United States—become stable once again.

The August 1961 report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee recommended that the United States encourage surplus payments countries to rely on liberalized imports and the elimination of payments restrictions for anti-inflationary action. Again, in December 1962, the subcommittee concluded:

> Many countries of Western Europe, and particularly those in the Common Market, need to import more because they face inflationary pressures. The tendency for countries like Germany, France, and Italy to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investment in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a larger part of the free world's payments imbalance. If such surplus payments countries would buy U.S. and other foreign goods more freely, their present fully employed resources of capital and manpower could be devoted to the most productive activities, including further domestic capital investment essential for their future growth.

The March 1963 annual report of the Joint Economic Committee recommended that:

> The United States should promptly and vigorously bargain for a reduction of the Common Market external tariffs, and the Common Market should be requested to make an immediate unilateral reduction in its tariffs on a most-favored-nation basis pending completion of the negotiations.

In arriving at this conclusion, the committee adopted the reasoning set forth in the December 1962 report of its Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments:

> Our best hope to developing a constructive solution to the persistent U.S. payments deficit is the development of policies to deal with the basic sources of the present deficit. The first step in dealing with the basic sources of our payments deficit is the development of policies to expand our overall export surplus.
>
> Fortunately, an expansion in our export surplus can be achieved by the further removal of barriers to international trade. The first step is the removal of the barriers to American exports into the Common Market in Western Europe. These countries are among the most rapidly expanding in the entire world. Over the years ahead these nations will need to import more both because of their rapid growth and because they face inflationary pressures. The tendency for countries like West Germany, France, and other countries to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investments in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a large part of the free world's payments imbalance. If such surplus payments countries would allow goods from the United States and other countries to be sold more freely in their markets, their present fully employed resources of capital and manpower could be devoted to the most productive activities, including further domestic capital investment essential for their future growth.

The text of the New York Times article of June 6, 1963, reporting the recommendation of the Common Market follows:

TRADE BLOC PANEL URGES TARIFF CUTS: COMMISSION ASKS COMMON MARKET TO MAKE MOVE TO SPUR PRICE COMPETITION

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, June 5.—The European Common Market Commission, obviously disturbed by increasing price pressures, is urging the six member states of the trade bloc to invite price competition with nonmember states by cutting tariffs wherever possible.

In its sixth annual report, published today, the commission said any Common Market regulatory measures to control prices "at this time would not be opportune."

But, the commission added, the six nations of the European Economic Community, or Common Market, could each take steps to help dampen price increases. The six members are Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and France.

TRADE WOULD RISE

Tariff cuts with nonmembers, the report said, would increase trade with other countries. An increased flow of goods would mean an increase in price-dampening competition between locally produced goods and those imported from outside the community.

The commission made it plain that this would tend to offset the increasing upward pressures on prices being felt throughout the Common Market.

The commission is the operating management for the six countries of the European Economic Community. It has a responsibility that transcends national interests. Its function is to propose policies that are designed for integrating the six member states into one economic and political unit.

COUNCIL DECIDES

But, although the commission proposes policies, the member states, through their representatives on the Common Market Council of Ministers, actually decide which policies will be followed.

Thus, last week, although the commission proposed a reduction in the tariffs on U.S. poultry exports, the council instead voted to increase the duty.

After reviewing financial developments during the year, the commission urged the member countries to encourage the development of their own money markets. It indicated that this would ameliorate the shortage of investment capital that is being felt within the community.

The commission cautioned against competition with private needs for investment capital.

It also advised the Common Market to avoid undue repatriation of capital held in their countries. It said this could have adverse effects on the liquidity and balance-of-payments positions of nonmember states.

In discussing trade developments within the community, the commission reported that, since the Common Market's inception, imports by the member states from other member states had increased remarkably.

The commission gave these estimates for intracommunity import increases in the past 4 years:

France, a 130-percent increase; Germany and the Netherlands 80 to 90 percent; Italy, 60 percent, and Belgium-Luxembourg, 25 percent.

Masonic Award to Senator Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of May 27, the Grand Masonic Lodge in Virginia held a meeting. On that occasion the grand master presented to our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the Grand Master's Award. At that time the Senator from Virginia made a speech accepting the award. He was presented to the grand lodge by Grand Master Charles B. Gilley. I ask unanimous consent that the presentation speech by the grand master, Mr. Gilley, and the speech by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GRAND MASTER CHARLES B. GILLEY, MAY 27, 1963, GRAND MASTER'S AWARD DINNER, STATLER HOTEL

My brethren, this evening is an example of public devotion of Masonry in action; your very presence here and at all other Masonic gatherings solidifies the fabric that makes our fraternity a strong and useful segment of this great society. Yes, all that we possess is but a token that our Founding Fathers bequeath us.

The most important heritage for us to remember is the many struggles and sacrifices they encountered while molding this great Government and country which we all love and pledge our lives to protect and upgrade. Franklin D. Roosevelt remarked during World War II, "So much to do and so little time to do it," and Thomas J. Watson stated, "The largest room in the world is room for improvement." No words could be more applicable to our present time. Don't break the ties that bind us together; no, don't even bend them because behind every weak or pessimistic American is a sneakthief trying to damage or sink the ship of American freedom and our religious way of life.

Thank God for freedom and the many who are doing their part to ward off the offenders.

This evening we are honored to have among us many outstanding Americans and Masons who have answered the call but we are particularly proud to pay tribtue to one who has displayed his love, devotion, and leadership to his community, State, and his country. A man we are proud to call brother, with family ties which are deep rooted and a strong supporter of our Constitution.

Honorable Brother HARRY FLOOD BYRD, as Grand Master of Masons of the District of Columbia, it is with pride and honor that I have the pleasure in presenting this plaque to such a distinguished Mason who has plowed his way into the hearts of every American by serving them in the high office which you occupy. You are the ideal and personification of an American statesman.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

I am greatly honored and deeply touched by the award bestowed upon me this evening by my brothers of the Masonic fraternity and I am deeply indebted to the grand master. I accept the grand master's award with humility and rededication to the fine teachings of Freemasonry.

Masonry has been good to me in so many ways. It has been good to me in tangible ways such as this occasion and this award—both of which I shall cherish forever, as I do the 33d degree conferred upon me in 1939 by the Supreme Council, Scottish Rite.

And beyond this, Masonry has been good to me in the intangible ways that we here know from its inspiration for exemplary character, good works, good deeds, and good will—and in general, all of the Masonic force for good in human society. It gives us a clear conception of our duty to God and man. It helps us to develop our spiritual faculties, and broaden our lives in fellowship and service—always with respect and appreciation of our brothers. It challenges us to strive for the nobler objectives in life. Its purpose is development of character and culture through fellowship and mutual helpfulness for all who will heed its teachings. It is charitable, benevolent, educational, and religious, and it encourages free association of men together for the achievement of these objectives. It is a fellowship philosophy that translates its principles into terms of daily living.

In my lifetime I have known many people in many walks of life, and in many places. And it has been my observation that Masons invariably are men of good will who merit both respect and confidence. It is the greatest organization of its kind in the world.

During my 30 years in Congress it has been my privilege to have become acquainted with a great many of its Members, in both Houses; and it is very pleasing to note the presence of so many Members of Congress in this great audience tonight.

It is understandable, of course, that my closest associations in Congress have been with Members of the Senate; and I think it is appropriate to say to my brothers here, that I have never known a Member of the U.S. Senate to commit a dishonorable act. This is in the character of Masonry which—in its worldwide fraternity down through the centuries—has embraced millions of men who in their individual capacities—great and small—have contributed so much to advancement of our civilization and society.

Being from Virginia, passing the national memorial in Alexandria so frequently, and working in the Capitol of the United States, George Washington somehow always symbolizes Masonry in the United States to me; and I think Washington was one of the greatest Americans who ever lived.

Moving through the Capitol, and under its great dome, I find myself frequently pausing—mentally at least—in the recollection that Washington, in the company of his Masonic brothers from Maryland and Virginia, laid the cornerstone plate for the Capitol on September 18, 1793.

And Washington was not the only American President who has been active in Masonry. Others were Monroe, Jackson, Polk, Buchanan, Johnson, Garfield, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman.

It has been my great privilege to have been personally acquainted with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Truman, and I suspect many of you have had the same privilege during the past 30 years or so.

President Roosevelt and I took the oath of office, here in Washington, on the same snowy day in March 1933; and, as many of you will recall, the great depression was more turbulent than the weather.

Before his election as President, I had a very cordial friendship with him. We were Governors at the same time. I visited Albany and he visited Richmond. He and my brother Dick were intimate friends and remained so throughout their lives. They had served in the Navy together.

I had been enthusiastically for the 1932 National Democratic platform as a means of strengthening our system of government and bringing us out of the depression. That platform said:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe." And some of the plain words in that platform said:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Government."

There we old New Dealers still stand; admittedly there is not much left to stand on; but then there are not many of us left standing. Just let me quote another passage from that 1932 platform:

"We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced and sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." And to conclude these 1932 platform quotes, it said we stood for:

"The removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and national resources in the common interest."

With that platform, the Virginia delegation at the 1932 convention gave me the privilege of casting its vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt on the promise that he would cut Federal expenditures by 25 percent when he took office.

In his campaign Mr. Roosevelt called President Hoover a spendthrift. Federal expenditures were then $4.6 billion. My first vote in the Senate was for a Roosevelt bill entitled "A bill to preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

It provided for a 15-percent cut in all appropriations, including veterans' pensions. Mr. Roosevelt had promised a 25-percent cut, and as campaign pledges go, I thought a 15-percent cut was pretty fair performance.

The President kept his campaign pledge for economy for 6 months, and then suddenly he abandoned his platform, and the Nation was started on an orgy of deficit spending which has lasted until this day. Mr. Roosevelt changed, but I did not.

I well recall an incident when he called me to the White House. He greeted me cordially. He said, "HARRY, your mother and my mother are two of the grandest persons who ever lived. We should have a reunion of the Byrds and the Roosevelts."

I replied, saying, "Mr. President, my mother and the Byrds would be delighted to attend whenever you name the day." Then he came to the business at hand.

I had been appointed chairman of a committee for reorganization of the Federal Government. The President said: "HARRY, here is a little bill I would like for you to introduce in the Senate."

I said, "Mr. President, I would like to look it over, and if I can sponsor it, I certainly will." He looked me right in the eyes and said, "HARRY, take it or leave it."

And I said, "Mr. President, on that basis, I will have to leave it;" and he took the bill back. I heard nothing more about the reunion.

The bill was introduced by someone else. It would have given him the power to control—among other departments—such quasi-judicial agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The President could have fixed freight rates, passenger rates, etc. But the bill, as he proposed it, was defeated.

My first serious break with Roosevelt came when he proposed to pack the Supreme Court. We then had a Court that knew the law and stuck to it; and the laws he advocated had been declared unconstitutional. He wanted a Court which would give him his laws.

After I opposed his Court-packing proposal, he took away from me appointments usually given a Senator in the same party, and announced that Gov. (brother) Jim Price of Virginia would distribute this Federal patronage. Jim Price, let me say, was one of the outstanding Masons of Virginia.

But this did not hurt me. There were not as many jobs as there were unemployed. When applications were made to me, I simply referred them to the Governor, as the President had indicated.

Pretty soon so many people were calling on poor old Jim down at Richmond, he built a tunnel from the Governor's Mansion to the capitol to avoid the job hunters. The President urged him to oppose me in the next election, but he did not do it.

When President Roosevelt ran for his fourth term, to which I was opposed, the wheels of fortune had made me chairman of the Senate Rules Committee; and by long custom the Rules Committee chairman was chairman of the inaugural ceremonies.

As chairman of the ceremonies, I inquired as to the customary appropriation for defraying inauguration expenses in adequate fashion. I was told it was $25,000 for the stands and other expenses, and I promptly requested this amount.

President Roosevelt then announced that he would have the ceremonies at the White House, and show the economy-minded BYRD how to save this $25,000. And this was done.

I immediately canceled the plans at the Capitol, and withdrew the $25,000 appropriation request, except for an amount sufficient to pay for the invitations.

When the inauguration was over, the White House called and asked me to sign a voucher to pay for a chicken a la king luncheon. I told them to tell the President that, in accordance with his statement, I had canceled the appropriation.

The invitations to the inauguration carried my signature as chairman of the committee. And from some source that I cannot identify, an invitation was sent to Harry Bridges who then was under suspicion of being a Communist.

A San Francisco newspaper got hold of this invitation and published it with the notation that it had always thought well of me, but now that I had invited Bridges to the inauguration, it had changed its mind. Roosevelt made a great war leader and on this I think we can all agree.

President Truman and I were deskmates for 5 years. We were very cordial friends, and I had and still have a high respect and personal affection for him.

But we disagreed when he moved to take over the United States Steel Co., which was being struck, and said he would not only fix the wages but also the dividends, and would take full charge of the operations of the company.

Judge Dave Pine, a Federal District judge, here in Washington, knew and understood the Constitution and declared this action to be in violation of the Constitution.

After I opposed President Truman in this action, he said there were too many Byrds in the Senate. This too helped me in Virginia, and I never held it against the President too much.

I disagreed with President Truman again when he dismissed General MacArthur. But on the other hand I will say that he was always frank and aboveboard in everything he did. He had great courage.

I still have a cordial regard for him. Recently I received a nice letter from him. He started out by saying "Dear Harry," and I replied "Dear Harry" to him.

I also had cordial relations with General Eisenhower. As a member of the Armed

Services Committee, I came in contact with him before he was President. I have great respect for him. He was one of our outstanding military leaders of all time.

I shall never forget meeting with him in Europe, in May 1945, 10 days after peace was declared with Germany. I was one of a delegation of Senators, headed by Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

We had a 3-hour conference with General Eisenhower in Frankfurt, Germany. I was then deeply impressed with his sincerity and his desire for world peace.

President Eisenhower and I agreed on some things and disagreed on others. I was opposed to sending troops to Little Rock.

I deeply regretted the fact that the largest peacetime deficit in history to date occurred during his administration—in 1958–59. I think it could have been avoided; but it may be that he will not enjoy this dubious distinction much longer.

The withdrawal of our gold reserves following that deficit was significant of the effect that deficit spending in this country has on the confidence of other nations in the soundness of the dollar.

It was my privilege also to have very cordial relations with President Kennedy during the years he was a Member of the Senate. His father and I were friends too. We still are. And I hope the President, notwithstanding our differences, has the same cordial regards for me that I have for him.

I have had frequent conferences with President Kennedy and I have supported his proposals whenever I could; and I shall continue to do so on all measures which I think are wise and in the country's best interest.

President Kennedy has a remarkably attractive personality, and he has ability. Late last spring I was called to the White House for a conference of nearly an hour in an effort to resolve differences on the omnibus tax bill.

When I left, the President accompanied me out to the anteroom, and with a grin he said "Senator BYRD and I have agreed on everything." The facts were that he had not changed me, and I had not changed him. As our service together continues, I hope our relations will be cordial.

I have taken the liberty of telling you these anecdotes, because I think Masons appreciate the ability of people to differ sharply on issues without sacrifice of the amenities of civilized discourse, and within the bounds of mutual respect and courtesy.

This is one of the great experiences which are common to Masonry and the Congress of the United States. It has been my great privilege to be a member of both; and for it I am indebted to you and the people of Virginia.

No one could be more pleased than I have been with this meeting of brothers of Masonry—all of whom I am proud to call my friends. I thank you sincerely and very deeply.

Do Members Want the Food Stamp Plan for Their Own Districts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings this week on my bill, H.R. 5733, the administration measure to authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds for a nationwide food stamp program such as is now in effect in about three dozen areas of the country on a pilot plan basis.

I know that many of the Members want to have the food stamp plan adopted in their districts, too—or, if it is now in operation in parts of their district, then have it extended throughout the district. I would like to point out that the only way more Members can have the food stamp plan for their districts is to enact H.R. 5733. In my testimony today, I explained why that is true.

A number of the Members have joined me in testifying in favor of H.R. 5733. However, it is interesting to note that many of us who are testifying already have the plan in operation in our own districts—and can continue having it regardless of whether H.R. 5733 is passed. But we are reporting on our experiences under the program in order to persuade the committee to make it possible to have the program used nationally. I therefore urge those Members who sincerely want the food stamp plan substituted in their districts for the present system of direct distribution of surplus food to get in touch with the Committee on Agriculture and voice their support for this legislation. The hearings are scheduled to conclude tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion at this point, a release on my testimony this morning, as follows:

FOOD STAMP SPONSOR URGES USE OF PLAN NATIONALLY

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, sponsor of the Kennedy administration's bill for expanding the pilot food stamp plans into a nationwide program, testified today that enactment of the bill would bring "good food and needy Americans together at the dinner table, where the rest of us can be found every day in the year."

Appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture as the first congressional witness on her bill, H.R. 5733, following testimony in favor of the legislation yesterday by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Mrs. SULLIVAN said:

"The pilot food stamp programs now in operation in about three dozen areas of the country, including my own city of St. Louis, assure well-rounded diets for families unable to afford even a minimum standard of living at the dinner table. The enthusiasm of the public, of the food industry, and of the needy who are assisted, in areas which have had the plan in operation long enough to iron out administrative redtape, is indeed heartening to all of us who have supported this idea over the years."

The Congresswoman was the author of the first and only food stamp law ever passed by Congress—a bill enacted in 1959 but which was never put into effect by the Eisenhower administration and which subsequently expired. She said new legislation is now necessary to authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds if the pilot plans are to be expanded nationally.

The pilot plans, she explained, are financed by a special fund, consisting of one-third of all annual customs receipts, set aside under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1935 to cover the cost of removal of surplus "nonbasic" agricultural commodities from the market, chiefly meat and dairy products, eggs, poultry, vegetables, fruits and other perishables, and processing them for use in the school lunch program and for donation to the needy.

Only $40 million of section 32 money, however, is earmarked specifically for the food stamp plans in the Agricultural Appropriation bill passed by the House last week, Mrs. SULLIVAN said, whereas about $360 million would be needed to expand the program nationally. She said much of this cost—about $260 million—could be saved through the elimination of the present program in 1,500 counties of direct donation of surplus food packages to the needy, in favor of the food stamp method.

"The question before you is whether the food stamp plan of distribution is preferable to the direct distribution system," she continued. "The experience in the pilot plan areas proves that it is preferable—without any doubt whatsoever.

"The food stamp plan is by no means utopia on a handout card. For those who qualify, and who receive any income at all, a monthly payment must be made to purchase stamps covering the full amount that such a family could reasonably be expected to spend for food. If anything, this regulation has been administered over strictly, and many families previously receiving surplus food donations in the pilot plan areas are not participating."

She said she had investigated numerous complaints in bureaucratic rigidity in setting up the stamp purchase requirements in St. Louis and had found some complaints justified, others not.

"There must be flexibility in administration of any complex program of Government," she added. But, as so many of our colleagues will tell you about the food stamp pilot plans now operating in parts of their districts, the plan does work, and works exceptionally well, to bring decent, American-standard, nutritious enjoyable diets to families long denied such a blessing—people who previously went hungry in a country where we have such abundances of food they cause us all kinds of agricultural woes. Let us use this method to improve the diets of those who cannot afford adequate meals—who are deprived of red meat and fresh eggs and fresh milk and fresh vegetables and who live instead on the cheapest and most filling foods regardless of caloric content and adequacy of nutrition. The food is here; all of us prefer to see it eaten rather than stored or powdered or dehydrated or destroyed."

Under the pilot food stamp plans, eligible participants, mostly families on public assistance receive for the money they normally would spend for food, a value of stamps intended to provide them with a well-rounded and adequate diet. The stamps are usable as money in grocery stores, but only for food items, and only for foods grown or processed in this country.

Teenagers Show Responsible Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during these times when we hear so much about juvenile delinquency and other problems of our young people, it is important that we also recognize the many worthwhile and constructive endeavors in which they are engaged. If one takes the time to notice, it can be seen that teenagers throughout our country have shown responsible citizenship in many ways. Two such incidents which occurred recently in the 10th Congressional District of California are noteworthy because they denote a sincere desire on the part of our young people to help their own country as well as further international understanding.

The first project was initiated by the students of Homestead and Fremont High Schools in Sunnyvale, Calif., and involved a successful effort to financially assist the hospital ship SS *Hope*. As most people know, the *Hope* is a fully equipped medical training vessel, which has recently had two successful voyages, one to southeast Asia and the other to Peru. On both occasions the *Hope* received a hearty welcome by the people of these countries. During a short, 3-year lifetime, this hospital ship has gained an excellent reputation throughout the world, and has certainly improved our relations with other countries. This American good will venture is supported wholly by private donations, and although the American people have been generous, there is always a need for funds.

The students at Homestead and Fremont launched a statewide high school program, inviting other California schools to participate in an effort to raise funds. Not only has this effort brought thousands of dollars to Hope's treasury, but in the words of many of the students, it has helped them learn more about international relations and has given them the satisfaction of actively helping their own country.

Homestead's students have carried out a second project through the American Field Service, and I understand that similar projects are planned by other schools in the district. The American Field Service is responsible for the well-known exchange student program which has done an extraordinary job in creating friendship and understanding between the students of the United States and those of other countries. Looking for an interesting way to raise funds for this program, Homestead students sponsored an International Week, which not only improved their knowledge of other nations, but resulted in raising the money necessary to sponsor a foreign exchange student in this country. Each of the school's language clubs was given 1 day to present a program—to include music, films, dances, customs and traditions of the particular countries—and the proceeds went into a general fund. An international dinner climaxed the week's activities, and over a thousand people attended this event. Food prepared from French, German, Spanish, Russian, and Italian recipes was served, and foreign students from nearby colleges provided interesting entertainment. The event was regarded as a great success, but most of all, both the students and their parents felt it did much to stimulate interest in the ideas and feelings of our neighbors abroad.

With the many national and international problems which face our country today, and will continue to face us in the future, it is very encouraging to see these high school students, and hundreds like them throughout the country, engage in worthwhile efforts which not only help them personally, but their community as well as the entire Nation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 5: 3: *O Lord, in the morning will I direct my prayer unto Thee and will look up.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we are turning our thoughts unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, constrained and compelled by deep longings and instincts which Thou alone canst satisfy.

Show us how we may intensify and cultivate our aspirations and desires for a more intimate fellowship with Thy divine spirit so that our minds may be illumined with wisdom and our hearts be warmed with love.

Grant that in these days of national and international crises we may be fortified against those devastating fears and moods of discouragement which so frequently storm the citadel of our souls.

May our President, our Speaker, and our chosen Representatives be richly blessed with insight and understanding as they strive to bring peace and good will among all the members of the human family, whatever their race, creed, or color.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 192. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army;

S. 200. An act for the relief of Lloyd G. Dougherty;

S. 219. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.;

S. 312. An act for the relief of Danusia Radochonski;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Mark John Janavaras;

S. 380. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354);

S. 409. An act for the relief of Yeng Burdick;

S. 523. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes;

S. 524. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes;

S. 545. An act for the relief of Sister Laura Saraniti;

S. 551. An act for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez;

S. 657. An act for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 735. An act for the relief of Peter Hopeton Maylor;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marija Lovsin;

S. 965. An act for the relief of Amalia Seresly;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Joyce Mark Bouvier;

S. 1015. An act for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae;

S. 1031. An act to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act;

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Rafael I. Fernandez;

S. 1643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368);

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing that the 17th day of September in each year shall be known as Constitution Day, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance of July 4 of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REVISION OF RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, a number of efforts have been made which obliquely but forcibly point to the need for revision of the rules of the House. A complete denial of unanimous consent for continuation of certain practices and the employment and repeated use of quorum calls and motions to adjourn are all efforts which in their application deny wholly or in part a forum to Members of the House. By reason of numbers and the importance of legislative business, unlimited debate is at least a convincing theoretical impossibility, but to make the well of the House useful to the purposes of expression and to increase the finite limits of time through the use of the printed page is to serve an end which the draftsmen of the Constitution of the United States also sought to serve. No one will now know what might have been said in this House or printed in the RECORD during the past few days which was not said or not printed by reason of withholding of unanimous consent, but it is my opinion, earnestly held, that we are not the better off for its exclusion. We have currently before us one of the most volatile social issues of American history in defining the Government's role in racial relations. We have a revolutionary proposition before us in the field of fiscal management. And the overlying problems in foreign policy and defense, which are of concern to the people all but overwhelming in their significance.

Mr. Speaker, the House without delay should take up whatever measures are wise and necessary to reopen this forum and to keep it open.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Abernethy
Ayres
Baring
Bass
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Celler
Chelf
Collier
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Halpern
Healey
Holifield
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Scott
Shelley
Steed
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the bill carrying appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB reserved all points of order on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT PLANS OF EMPLOYEES OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced for appropriate reference a bill designed to permit employees of educational institutions who administer their own retirement plans the same tax advantages as those who participate in programs administered by the Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association.

The bill provides that tax exempt organizations who pay retirement benefits will have them considered as annuity payments. Such annuity payments will be excludable from gross income under section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The measure in no way alters the present structure or contradicts congressional policy in granting this form of tax relief to nonprofit educational institutions. It merely puts those employees under individual plans on the same footing as those under group-sponsored retirement plans.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 361 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4996) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]. Pending that, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I address the House this morning with a sad and heavy heart. Press reports are to the effect that the Negro leader of the NAACP in Mississippi was shot and killed in Jackson, Miss., last night. At this point there is no authentic information as to who fired the fatal shot. However, the assumption is advanced that he was assassinated by some white Mississippian, but regardless of whether he was killed by a white or a Negro person, it was a dastardly act, and the perpetrator should be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

Knowing my people as I do, I can in all sincerity say to you that this thing is not condoned by Mississippians and southerners generally. Moreover, the Governor of Mississippi has assured me that he and all other State and municipal authorities charged with the enforcement of the law are using their best efforts to that end.

Mr. Speaker, while a biased press will no doubt exploit this unfortunate tragedy to the fullest extent and Mississippians will have to suffer thereby, let it be remembered that this latest tragedy, regardless of the race of its author, is the inevitable result of the agitation by the politicians, a biased press, and the do-gooders of this country under the false guise of liberalism.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 provides for consideration of H.R. 4996, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. The resolution provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act was one of the first pieces of major legislation acted on by the Congress and was signed into law by President Kennedy on May 1, 1961. That law established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce and provided authority for industrial loans for both urban and rural areas, public facility loans and grants, technical assistance, and worker retraining benefits in areas of persistently high unemployment. Appropriations to enable the agency to get underway were provided later that year and since then there has been steadily mounting activity under the program.

The widespread interest in the program is shown by the fact that already 836 areas have prepared overall economic development plans which the law requires before any loan or grant assistance can be given under the act. The area redevelopment program is successfully moving toward its goal of creating jobs in areas which have suffered from high and persistent unemployment and underemployment. However, modifications in the basic statute which would be made by H.R. 4996 are needed and increased authorizations for loans and grants must be provided so that the program can achieve its goals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 361.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 will provide an open rule for 3 hours of debate to consider H.R. 4996, entitled "Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963."

Measures to provide Federal aid to depressed areas, such as the Area Redevelopment Act, have been before Congress for a number of years. In the 85th Congress, legislation for this purpose was passed but met with a pocket veto on September 6, 1958. In the 86th Congress, another bill was passed but was also vetoed on May 13, 1960.

The act to which amendments are offered here today, known as the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27, was signed by the President on May 1, 1961. Under the legislation, an Area Redevelopment Administration was created for 4 years to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas. The act authorized loans, grants, and other assistance in "redevelopment areas."

Public Law 87-27 at the time it was passed was referred to as a temporary program to last for 4 years with a total appropriation including loan and grant authority of $394 million. H.R. 4996 will extend the program for an additional 2 years and add $455.5 million additional authorization, broken down as follows:

First. Raise the limit on each of the two industrial loan funds—one for urban areas and one for rural areas—from $100 million to $250 million.

Second. Increase the ceiling on public facility loans from $100 million to $150 million.

Third. Place all ARA loan programs on an appropriations basis and eliminate the authority for direct Treasury financing.

Fourth. Increase the amount which may be appropriated for public facility grants from $75 million to $175 million.

Fifth. Raise the limit on annual appropriations for technical assistance from $4.5 million to $10 million.

Sixth. Permit the 10 percent of the financing of industrial projects which must be met by a local public or semipublic body to be repaid over the same period as the Federal share of financing—existing law requires that this local loan cannot be repaid until the Federal loan is fully retired, which may be as long as 25 years.

Seventh. Require that construction workers on any projects financed under Area Redevelopment Act be paid prevailing wages as required by the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is not any doubt but that unemployment is one of the most serious problems continually facing the United States. Proponents of H.R. 4996 state that this measure is necessary to combat persistently high unemployment. They claim that there is widespread interest in this program as shown by the fact that 836 areas have prepared overall economic development plans which the law requires before any loan or grant assistance can be given under the act. They state that the area redevelopment program is successfully moving toward its goal of creating jobs in areas which have suffered from high and persistent unemployment and underemployment. They argue that ARA has received 638 applications for industrial and commercial loans for new and expanding enterprises which is proof that if individuals and groups are effectively organized and encouraged, and if reasonable amounts of capital, under attractive terms, are made available, the potentials of economic growth in a given area can be made real.

There are rather extensive minority views signed by seven members of the committee as well as individual views of three members set forth in the report. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and others have expressed opposition to this measure.

Let me attempt to explain some of the points of the opposition.

It is claimed that when Congress authorized this program 2 years ago, it gave the agency $394 million for what was described as a temporary 4-year experiment to alleviate the problems of substantial and persistent unemployment in 103 designated areas. That as of April 1, 1963, ARA had given final approval to applications totaling only $84 million. That accordingly there are ample funds remaining to carry out this program for the balance of the 4-year period without adding additional funds at this time. That even if all pending applications, totaling some $245 million, were approved, there would still be unused and uncommitted funds in the original authorization.

Opponents are also concerned with several other programs which tend to overlap or duplicate the purpose of the ARA. Some of these include the Community Facilities Administration within the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is a long-term public loans program for which $600 million has been authorized. Also available from the same agency are urban planning grants for which $23.5 million is proposed to be appropriated for fiscal 1964.

That from the accelerated public works funds that have been appropriated by Congress, approximately $435 million has been, or will be, made available to the Community Facilities Administration for public works construction grants.

Likewise available to urban areas are grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the construction of sewage disposal plants. For this purpose there are available annual appropriations of $90 million, plus approximately $89 million of accelerated public works.

That accordingly in the aggregate, the Area Redevelopment Act and other programs represent Federal lending authority of $1.25 billion and authority for outright grants of $822.5 million—treating annual appropriations on a 1-year basis—or a total of $2.1 billion. If the remainder of the accelerated public works funds not accounted for are added, the total becomes $2.4 billion.

Opponents have cited a number of specific examples stating that in northern California, ARA loaned a company $325,000 to open a plywood mill, although local lumbermen said there was not enough business to keep existing mills open. That while this might temporarily create a few new jobs, in the long run it will create the threat of mill shutdowns and losses of other jobs.

In Maryland, the ARA has under consideration a $1,625,000 loan for a new plant to process soybeans into poultry food although local businessmen say existing plants can handle all the soybeans the area can grow. One local processor stated:

> We could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation, but it just isn't fair to use our own tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business.

One opponent states that ARA made a $418,000 loan to a paper company in Wisconsin to help finance a new plant to make towels, tissue, and napkins, while existing mills in the State are only operating at 85 percent of capacity. That the net effect of using Federal funds to add more capacity such as this is either to waste money on an unsuccessful enterprise or take business away from existing papermills.

That ARA acknowledges that in its first 2 years of operation, it has created only 35,226 new jobs which is less than 1 percent of the Nation's unemployed. That some of these projects have cost as much as $277,000 per new job. That ARA has financed new plants in areas where the particular industry is already in grave danger of suffocation from competition. That it has attempted to place the depressed area label on communities enjoying healthy economies in order to justify make-work loans and grants. That ARA has lured industries from one community to another with the result that people have been put out of work in the first community in order to create new jobs in the second community.

My personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, for what it may be worth, is that we just cannot spend ourself into prosperity. That we cannot create employment and materially reduce our unemployed problem by simply spending Federal money. That to improve our employment situation, we must improve business. That if we have a healthy and expanding business community, then there will be more jobs available. But to do this we should give consideration to a reduction in taxes for business in order to give them the wherewithal to expand and create new jobs. That to continue to spend more money than we are taking in will simply cause us to have further inflation, to further increase the debt, and to thus place a greater burden upon the future of our children and grandchildren.

There are now pending before the Rules Committee a number of new programs which if passed will undoubtedly cost billions of dollars. I refer to the mass transit measure which although it starts out at $500 million will undoubtedly run into billions; the Youth Employment Act is also a new program now pending in Rules Committee which if passed will further add to our fiscal problems. H.R. 12, a new program of loans and grants for medical and dental facilities, has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. Further aid to education in the nature of a higher education bill and a vocational educational bill will start additional new costly programs if passed. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not believe at this time we should add additional funds to existing programs such as ARA, nor should we start further new programs. I think that we should wait until we see what the Ways and Means Committee does in connection with the administration's tax reduction and reform bill, wait and see what our income for fiscal 1964 may be estimated at, and then follow with appropriate study and planning so that we can determine which of these programs should be accelerated or started and what the ultimate cost will be. That is the way that I feel we should act from a standpoint of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried as fairly as possible to briefly explain the support and opposition to H.R. 4996. Personally, I intend to vote against the bill. But from the standpoint of the rule, I know of no opposition to it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California mentioned that under this program it had cost up to $277,000 of the taxpayers' money to create one new job. It might interest the gentleman to know that I called the Congressional Library and I asked them what it cost private industry in the way of capital investment for one new job, and I was told it was $20,000. It seems to me that this indicates that our whole concept of incentive and stimulation for private industry will create a lot more jobs at a lot less cost.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I will take very little time on this rule, as I feel that it has been well covered and thoroughly discussed by both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California. There is only one thing that I would like to direct to the attention of the House because I do not think it is entirely clear.

We have heard a great deal about what this legislation will do as though it was something entirely new; something that was going to revolutionize the country and also solve many of our problems. Of course, this is very far from the truth. The act has been on the books since 1961. It should have shown certain results that we have already been told would happen if we passed this legislation. All we are doing here is adding to something that already exists. The fact of the matter is that the money has not yet been spent; the fact of the matter is that a great many projects have not been approved, and I would like to refer to my own State, with which I am more familiar and in which I have a greater interest than most, namely, the State of New York.

In the State of New York there are applications for projects amounting to $15,230,000. Out of that number, $3,766,000 have been approved. So, you can see that there is a big gap between the $15,230,000 and the $3,766,000 or, let us say, $4 million, giving them the benefit of the doubt. The State of New York is now in the minus column for $36,101,574. This is not the only State that is in this same position. If this was reducing our unemployment problem in the State of New York or in the country, we would say that money is not so important. Our biggest problem today all over is the unemployment problem.

But, according to the figures this May, there are 4,900,000 unemployed in the United States today, which is a slight rise over the month of April. So when we are told of the marvels of this legislation and what it will do for unemployment, I beg to differ. It has not yet proved itself, and the fact that only 25 percent of the money that is in the law at the present time has not been spent, does not augur very well for the future.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. According to the statement of my colleague from New York as to the slow rate at which this has been operating in the past 2 years, which is usually indicative of Government regardless of the times, it would seem to indicate that the unemployed in this country are going to starve to death before this ever gets on the road, and certainly it does not indicate that it will solve any unemployment problem. Would that not be a true picture?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I quite agree it is the true picture, and might I say that it is another case of what we suffer under every day here. We bring in legislation and we pass it. We will probably pass this. It is just a case of buckpassing. We pass the buck but there is no place where the buck ever lands as far as I can make out, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. That would also follow from the statement made by the gentleman from California, that if we were to pass up these vast spending programs and get down to the business of reducing taxes so that the people could spend their own money and so that business could operate with lower taxes and go into expansion programs and more production, we would solve the unemployment problem much better.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I heartily agree with the gentleman from New York and I think the figures that were given showing it would cost $277,000 to create a job through Government as compared to $20,000 to create a job through private industry, which figures were given a few moments ago on the floor by the gentleman from Washington, are highly significant and it would be well to remember them when we consider this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentlewoman agree that this fast-traveling buck, which the gentlewoman says is being passed so freely, finally lands on the backs of the taxpayers?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, but apparently the taxpayers have not had enough of it yet. I do not know how much longer they will be able to stand it. I will say, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the rule and I do hope everyone who can possibly do so will be on the floor and listen to the general debate and give it every consideration. This is a complicated and important matter.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should delineate a little more some of the brief comments I made earlier this afternoon when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] was in the well of the House. I asked for better order so that the Members could hear him explain the bill, because I think it is a very bad bill and I wanted the Members to understand just how very bad it is. In all fairness to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I should repeat I did not say this was the worst bill that has been on the floor of the House this year, but certainly it would compete for that honor. I make that distinction. I might say also I would place this in the same undesirable category as some other bills that have come from this same legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need at this hour here to discuss the detailed provisions of this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California have spoken on these provisions in some detail. The legislative committee, of course, will go into the provisions in some further detail under general debate, but there are two or three points that I would like to bring to the attention of the Members here present.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on May 15 by a very close vote, 213 to 204, we increased the national debt ceiling, again temporarily, to $307 billion. You may inquire what that has to do with this bill? In my opinion, it is directly related to this bill. I would especially direct my comments to my friends on my right, particularly those who fly a conservative flag during their respective campaigns. It was stated on the floor that day, and I think with some justification, that the day and the time when we debate a debt ceiling is not the time or the appropriate day to try to reduce Government spending. From a very practical point of view I think I would have to concur in that observation. In fact, I think I made about that same comment when we had the debt ceiling bill on the floor of the House in 1962. I want to remind the Members what else was said in that connection.

Several Members on this—my right—side of the aisle who consider themselves conservatives repeated that a debt ceiling limitation was not an appropriate procedure to reduce Government spending. It was at the time that an authorization for a new Federal spending program was before the House that Federal spending should be controlled or reduced. I should like to remind those same gentlemen that today is the day of reckoning. If you really believe the time of authorization is the time to reduce or limit Government spending, your vote today is "no." This provides you with an excellent forum to state your views and an ideal time to place yourself on record whether you are for reduction of Government spending, or whether you want to join the parade which will probably end up with an ultimate debt ceiling of $325 billion even before this session adjourns.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the regular order of business on Wednesday next and any special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa received recognition when the gentleman from Kansas yielded to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say to the gentleman that the Chair, as a Member of the House, interposes an objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Abernethy
Anderson
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bass
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clausen
Collier
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Fallon
Findley
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Goodell
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Lankford
Leggett
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Olson, Minn.
Pepper
Powell
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Steed
Talcott
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Wallhauser
Watson
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I have two more points I would like to bring to the attention of the House today in connection with this bill.

The whole concept of our system of free enterprise is being challenged by the operation of this bill. Some Members may ask what similarity exists between a challenge to the free enterprise system and the area redevelopment program. I would like to remind the Members that in the press in the last few months there has been considerable mention of an application for a loan by the Government of India: a multibillion-dollar loan to build a steel mill to compete with free enterprise in that nation.

Mr. Speaker, the application by the Government of India for a billion-dollar-plus loan has been criticized by a number of persons in the Congress and by quite a number of persons from the business segment of our economy. The question is not so much over the billion dollars per se, but upon the theory that the U.S. Government would be a party to establishing a business in a foreign country, under government management, to compete with free enterprise operating in that country. I certainly would concur with this expression of concern by the various persons that have directed their comment to this application.

Mr. Speaker, I see a very direct relationship between the financing of the steel mill in India and the area redevelopment program that we are going to debate here this afternoon. In fact, on my desk I have a letter from an individual in Maryland, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, protesting the application that is now pending for an ARA loan to build a certain facility that will directly compete with a privately owned business in the same community area.

Now, I think there is a little more at stake here than just whether or not we are going to burden the budget with half a billion dollars more of deficit spending. I think there may be a more fundamental issue here; that this is to be one step further in the way of Federal Government control and, even worse than that, it is to be financing private business which will, in turn, compete with taxpaying private industry.

I would not expect the proponents of this program to respond to this at this time, but I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that some justification will be forthcoming, if there is any justification—and I seriously doubt if there is—as to how they could conclude that a program like this was in harmony with our concept of free enterprise as we view it here in the United States of America.

Then, Mr. Speaker, on a matter just a little more delicate than this, there has been much said in the press recently—and I noticed a story on the wire today—whether or not the so-called Powell amendment was going to be offered this afternoon under the reading of the bill and, if it was offered, what would happen to it and what effect it would have on the program if it was adopted. I do not know whether that amendment is going to be offered. Certainly I am not going to offer it. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States has had innumerable conferences with various segments of both the social and the business aspects of our society in trying to induce these segments to adopt nondiscriminatory practices and policies in their businesses and communities. The question then poses itself, if the President of the United States had the authority under Executive order to ban discrimination in housing financed by an FHA guaranteed loan? I am just wondering why that same executive authority could not be utilized and could not be employed for the same Executive order to be issued to all titles of the ARA program. Now, I do not consider this to be a problem in my part of the Middle West, but for those of you who represent metropolitan areas, where you do have a problem, I would like to have you ask this question from the administration, and I would like to have an answer. If there is an honest effort underway to end discriminatory practices, why could it not be employed in all titles of this bill by Executive order.

Now, on a more personal side, to my friend from Massachusetts. A little earlier this afternoon, in a very friendly colloquy, I believe he observed that this bill was completely out of harmony with my philosophy. And, of course, it is. And he reminded me that I had been swimming against the tide for the 10 years that it has been my pleasure to know him.

I would only observe to my friend from Massachusetts, perhaps I had better admonish him to go out and look at another story that is on the wire this afternoon regarding a special election in California for a seat that was won by his party with a 2 to 1 vote. A member of my party won in a special election yesterday by a vote almost as large—not quite, but almost. So I will say that I am not so sure about this tide. I am not so sure just which way this tide is running, and I would say if his party will pass enough bills like this one this afternoon I do not think the direction I am swimming in is going to be against the tide; I think it will be with the tide.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection because the gentleman's philosophy is such that it goes back to the era of the lamplighter, gaslighter, or high button shoe. If he wants to go along with that philosophy, that is all right. However, I say this: The road of the little man is a hard one and anytime when we come in with progressive legislation that is going to help the unemployed, or the little man, the same arguments are trotted out that were trotted out against social security in 1934 and which have been trotted out against every piece of progressive legislation that ever faces this Congress.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's remarks should be very properly answered, and I know he is as sincere in his point of view as I am in mine. This is a philosophical difference between us. In reply I would say only this: If he will refresh his memory as to what the unemployment rate was in January of 1961, he will find that we have burdened the Federal Treasury with approximately $20 billion greater national debt, and just last week the unemployment rate was announced as being within a very small percentage point of the same rate it was in January 1961. So when you talk about what you are doing for the little man, what are you doing for him except burdening him with an additional tax burden for the years ahead?

Mr. O'NEILL. I do not want to get into a colloquy with the gentleman. I think the gentleman from Kansas is one of the finest men I ever met in the Congress. I admire the stand he takes. He follows his philosophy all the way and does not deviate one bit whatever, but I want him to know this: In the past 2 years the labor market has 3 million more people employed than it had when we left off with the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to say one word about that California election. I do not know much about California politics, but I point out to the gentleman in the election which the late Mr. Doyle won, there was one Democrat against one Republican, whereas in the election yesterday, as I understand it, there were five Democrats and three Republicans and a couple of others of different political shades in there. I think you can read just about anything you want into that.

Mr. AVERY. I know the gentleman would not want to leave the impression with the House that he was not completely informed in all of the aspects of this election, so I will say I was honored to observe the official results that were supplied to his side of the aisle, and the vote received by all these other candidates in the total vote happened to be insignificant. So I will repeat you just cannot ignore and sweep under the rug what happened in California yesterday.

Mr. O'NEILL. I would like to say only this to the gentleman, that every once in a while a man rises above the normal strength of his party.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman who has been looking at the California results that he can go back to the last general election and see how they felt in California about the relative merits of the two political parties. I think there are a number of people sitting here in the Congress today who can attest to that feeling.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman. That is what I was pointing out about the change in this tide. I think it might be of interest to him to test that tide just a little bit, too, in California.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hate to interfere with the solution of this problem which seems to be approaching, but I should like to state this. I missed the last quorum call and wish to explain to the House that I was sitting as a guest of the Senate Space Committee, as I am a member of the House Astronautics and Science Committee.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4996) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4996, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is one of the most important bills that this Congress has considered this year, in the interest of helping all the people, in the public interest. It has bipartisan support, as it should have. The vote in the committee to report out this bill was 17 in favor and 6 against.

Our country has achieved the greatest level of economic output of any country in the world. By reason of that great productivity, we have a record that we can point to with pride. In this relatively small country of ours, 180 million people, only 6 percent of the population of the entire world, we have one-third of the world's wealth, we have a per capita income of $2,260 a year. The next highest is Canada with $1,600; then Switzerland, $1,300. Next we have Germany, England, and France with approximately $1,000 per year, and then Soviet Russia with $700. These comparisons are for the lastest year for which we have comparable figures.

We certainly have more of the comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life than all the other 3 billion people in the entire world. No one disputes that. That did not come about just as an accident. It came about by reason of the kind of people we have and the kind of government we have.

Let us be specific about some of the things we have in comparison with the rest of the world.

We have 53 percent of all of the telephones in the world. We have 58 percent of all all the motor vehicles, 35 percent of the crude steel production, 43 percent of the electricity, 38 percent of the petroleum produced, and there are many other outstanding facts that could be brought to your attention. But the main reason I am saying this is to let you know that the people, being in charge and having hold of the purse strings as they have through the election of the House of Representatives every 2 years, have made a success of this Government.

First. But our employment and production of wealth could be a great deal higher. Today almost 6 percent of our labor force is totally unemployed, and almost 20 percent of our productive capacity is idle and unutilized; second, these are the questions we have to face: Are we going to do something to put the idle workers and resources back to work? If we can reduce labor unemployment to only 4 percent, and that is not enough, this will mean an additional $35 to $50 billion of real wealth; gross national product, produced each year. Are we willing to provide just a tiny fraction of the amount of funds for economic development at home as we have; and third, provided for this purpose abroad?

Since the end of World War II American taxpayers have spent some $97 billion to provide for grants and loans to foreign countries.

Last month, we passed a bill to provide an extra $2 billion to the Export-Import Bank for making Bank loans abroad. That bill passed without a dissenting vote, and no one proposed adding a civil rights amendment to it, or proposed complicating that bill with any other extraneous issues not related to the merits of that bill.

That $2 billion will help foreign countries—practically any foreign country in the world, outside the Soviet bloc, in its economic development.

True, loans made by the Export-Import Bank also help American business—particularly the big corporations that enjoy the export business—and indirectly these loans help the whole country.

But it is equally true and even more true that loans to help the underdeveloped areas of this country raise their levels of production and employment will also help the whole country. If we can raise employment and production in the United States, as this bill will surely help to do, then we will all be better off.

Furthermore, I would remind those opponents of the bill who are also sincere advocates of civil rights of these facts. When you defeat efforts to raise the economic and educational levels of our people, you are feeding the fires of bigotry, poverty, ignorance, and superstition—the forces that divide mankind.

When the wolf is at the door, men are at one another's throats. It is when the economic pressures are great that people group themselves according to religious, race, or other arbitrary standards to engage in economic and political rivalries.

I know that the opposition to this bill runs deep and is vigorously felt, but I do hope that the opponents will not insist on any political tricks to complicate the bill with civil rights amendments or any other kind of amendments to inject extraneous considerations into this measure. We should agree or disagree on this bill on its own merits and not be forced to try to agree or disagree simultaneously on a combination of other issues.

As I have indicated, the amount of money we are providing in this bill for economic development in the United States is only a drop in the bucket as compared to the amounts of money we have provided for economic development in foreign countries. Can we not do for our own people just a small fraction of what we do for every other country in the world?

Certainly we do not permit the Export-Import Bank to make development loans to the underdeveloped areas of our own country. The World Bank does not make such loans. Our own people are not eligible for foreign aid.

Here are the amounts of money that we have provided to the various international organizations and to U.S. organizations making loans and grants for economic development abroad up to June 30 a year ago:

Funds committed under Area Redevelopment Act as of June 7, 1963

[In millions]

Program	Current authorization	Funds committed
Industrial loans:		
Urban areas	$100	$26
Rural areas	100	42
Public facility loans	100	28
Public facility grants	75	21
Total	375	117

U.S. foreign aid, including International Financial Institution

[In millions of dollars]

	Cumulative to June 30, 1962	Estimated projection for fiscal 1963–64
World Bank (IBRD)	635	
International Finance Corporation	35	
Inter-American Development Bank	190	
IDA	135	
Export-Import Bank	[1] 7,506	
American foreign aid and related programs	[2] 57,954	
Total foreign aid	66,455	11,000

[1] Long-term loans (over 5 years).

[2] Includes grants and loans of AID; social progress trust fund; food for peace (Public Law 480); other U.S. economic programs excluding U.S. contribution to International Financial Institution listed in tabulation.

Now let me read just a small sample of the countries and projects for which we have lent or granted funds abroad:

Export-Import Bank loans

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Amount	Purpose
Japan Development Bank	20.0	For electrical generating plant.
Toyota Motor Co., Japan	12.0	For motor vehicle manufacturing facilities.
Philippine Islands	20.0	Hydroelectric plant.
Pakistan	4.0	Construction of hotel.
Philippine Islands	1.1	Construction of power facilities.
Do	1.2	Barge construction.
Do	.2	Equipping a yarn mill.
Do	1.3	Equipping a glass factory.
Do	1.3	Spinning and weaving equipment.
Do	5.5	Construction of telephone lines.
Do	1.5	Textile machinery.
Do	14.6	Improvement of port facilities.
Do	5.0	Enlarging Manila Airport.
Do	62.0	Construction of steel mill.
Do	14.0	Construction of thermo powerplant.
Thailand	10.0	Steam powerplant.
Do	2.0	Hotel construction.
Turkey	4.2	Grain storage and handling equipment.
Do	1.7	Copper mine development.
Do	15.0	Expanding iron and steel works.
Argentina	60.0	Steel mill equipment.
Do	6.3	Cement plant expansion.
Do	3.3	Do.
Do	5.6	Steel mill expansion.
Do	9.1	Construction of pulp and paper mill.
Do	1.2	Tractor manufacturing facilities.
Bolivia	28.0	Highway construction project.
Brazil	105.0	Steel mill equipment.
Do	25.0	Equipping of ports.
Do	100.0	Railroad improvement.
Do	10.0	Equipment for construction of Brasília, the new capital.
Do	11.0	Expansion of electric power facilities.
Chile	6.7	Industrial equipment.
Do	58.0	Steel mill equipment.
Chile	31.8	Nitrate production equipment.
Do	15.5	Machinery and equipment for iron mine, rail and port facilities, and steel plant.
Do	42.0	Expansion of thermopower facilities.
Do	20.0	Rehabilitation of railways.
Colombia	3.0	Hotel construction.
Do	5.7	Machinery and equipment for pulp and paper mill.
Do	2.0	Hospital equipment.
Do	1.5	Equipment for a glass manufacturing plant.
Costa Rica	24.0	Highway construction.
Do	4.5	Improvement of water supply system.
Ecuador	16.3	Highway construction.
Do	2.5	Improvement of airports.
El Salvador	2.6	Do.
Guatemala	10.5	Highway construction and improvement.
Mexico	20.0	Electric power projects.
Do	17.5	Canal construction.
Do	56.0	Railway rehabilitation.
Panama	1.5	Hotel.
Paraguay	1.0	Expansion of cotton textile plant.
Peru	20.8	Zinc refinery.
Do	10.0	Iron ore plant.
Do	6.5	Construction of iron ore plant.
Do	6.5	Improvement of water supply and sewer facilities.
Trinidad and Tobago	9.0	Construction of sewage system.
Uruguay	12.0	Hydroelectric development.
Do	1.9	Modern water purification plant.
Venezuela	2.3	Construction of hotel.
Do	3.5	Construction of papermill.
Do	17.7	Expansion of power facilities.
Do	1.4	Structural board plant.
New Zealand	16.0	Equipment for lumber and pulpmill.

ICA grants

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Amount	Purpose	Country	Amount	Purpose
Pakistan	3.8	Ground water exploration.	Iran	1.0	Highway repair shops and equipment.
Do	1.0	Timber extraction.	Do	2.0	Water treatment plant.
Do	2.5	Irrigation.	India	8.0	River valley development.
Do	13.0	Fertilizer factory.	Do	18.4	Irrigation project.
Do	20.0	Multipurpose dam.	Do	6.0	Valley development.
Do	3.6	Power transmission system.	Do	4.0	Thermo powerplant.
Do	6.3	Irrigation dam.	Do	20.0	Railway facilities and iron mine.
Do	4.0	Improvement and expansion of aviation ground facilities.	Turkey	20.0	Coal basin development.
Do	14.6	Rehabilitation of railway.	Do	3.0	Iron ore mining.
Do	5.5	Water supply system.	Do	12.5	Hydroelectric project.
Korea	95.0	Construction and operation of national railroad.	Do	6.5	Aerial transmission lines.
Do	15.6	Highway and bridge construction.	Do	13.7	Grain storage facilities.
Do	5.2	Port harbor improvement.	Do	36.0	Road development.
Do	40.5	Fertilizer plant.	Republic of China	39.8	Powerplants.
Do	6.1	Coal mine.	Do	7.7	Shihman multipurpose dam.
Do	3.0	Rural warehouses.	Do	8.0	Fertilizer plant.
Vietnam	4.9	Telecommunications development.	Thailand	13.0	Telecommunications construction.
Do	6.7	Industrial development center.	Do	3.5	Thermo powerplant.
Do	53.9	Highway and bridge construction.	Do	15.0	East-west highway.
Cambodia	8.1	Highway construction.	Do	3.1	Airfield construction.
Do	23.4	Port highway.	Guatemala	11.2	Atlantic Highway.
Burma	4.0	Inland waterways.	Do	2.8	Self-help housing.
Iran	2.0	Cotton mill.	Indonesia	8.0	Highway construction.
Do	1.5	Dam.	Philippine Islands	2.0	Industrial development center.
Do	1.2	Cement plant.	Do	6.3	Irrigation services.
			Do	12.0	Highway improvement.
			Do	6.6	Port facilities.

Inter-American Development Bank loans [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Amount	Purpose	Country	Amount	Purpose
Venezuela	12.0	To defray part of the cost of a huge rural housing development.	Uruguay	2.5	Sewage facilities projects.
Do	10.0	Large housing development.	Ecuador	3.0	Do.
Costa Rica	3.5	Urban housing.	Brazil	11.0	Do.
Peru	2.8	Do.		13.0	Do.
Colombia	15.0	Do.	El Salvador	2.0	To establish funds for lending to small farmers to develop agricultural livestock.
Do	5.0	Community water project.	Chile	10.0	Supervise agricultural credit.
Chile	3.5	Do.	Argentina	5.0	Teaching, research equipment for 8 national universities.
Brazil	4.0	Do.	Brazil	6.0	Agricultural credit for low-income farmers.
Venezuela	10.0	Water projects for 330 communities of under 5,000 population each.	Mexico	1.0	Improved use of agricultural land.
Do	10.0	For water supply to 55 communities.			

[1] 1961-62 (fiscal year).

WORLD BANK LOANS

Here are just a few of the World Bank loans made within the past 2 years:

Thirty-five million dollars was loaned to the Gabon Republic for a manganese mining project. This enterprise is so deep in the jungle that it is necessary to convey manganese ore to the seacoast via overhead cable for which pilings were set by helicopter.

Sixty-six million dollars was loaned to Mauretania for iron mining.

Forty million dollars was loaned to Italy to develop a nuclear powerplant which is expected to supply electricity to Rome and Naples within a few months.

Uruguay, $18 million, highway construction.

Thailand, $35 million, highway construction.

Singapore, $15 million, powerplant.

Peru, $13 million, highway rehabilitation.

Panama, $4 million, powerplant.

Pakistan, $23 million, railroad improvement.

Nigeria, $13 million, port improvement at Lagos.

Mexico, $12 million, irrigation projects.

Israel, $22 million, highway rehabilitation.

India, $30 million, industrial development.

Finland, $25 million, powerplant.

Cyprus, $21 million, powerplant.

Colombia, $9 million, powerplant.

For all of these agencies, the Export-Import Bank, the I.C.A., the Inter-American Bank, and the World Bank, I have read only a very tiny fraction of the total list of projects and only a tiny fraction of the variety of purposes for which loans and grants have been made abroad.

Now what are our own problems: Why do we have depressed areas? There are several reasons.

Some of the areas of this country we know have been depressed for more than a generation. In some cases a natural resource on which the economy of the area was organized has been exhausted. There have been changes in technology that caused industries to decline and dry up and other industries to relocate. There have been, in the farming areas of the country, constant and tremendous reductions in the need for labor because of changes in farm technology. Mechanization, the use of more fertilizer, new insecticides and herbicides, and new plant hybrids, and new methods of farming have all added tremendously to the productivity of farming, requiring less manpower for output of farm goods. The productivity increases in farming have far outrun those in industry or in any other segment of the economy since the end of World War II.

Since the end of World War II the output per man-hour of employment in agriculture has increased by 140 percent. This compares with an increase of only 48 percent in productivity in nonagricultural business. In other words, the efficiency of agriculture has been increasing at almost three times the rate as in the rest of the economy.

This too has forced tremendous migrations of people from the farms to the cities. In the case of all of the depressed areas there have been tremendous outmigrations of people.

But migrations from the depressed areas do not solve the problem. Many families stay in their communities, notwithstanding the most acute economic pressures. They have close ties to the community which cannot and are not easily broken. To solve the unemployment problem in the Nation we, therefore, must help to solve the unemployment problem in these specific areas by helping to create new kinds of industries in these areas. That is what the area redevelopment program does.

The small towns and the rural areas have made a great contribution to the success of this country. I suspect if you were to evaluate it from the very beginning you would find that the rural areas have been the greatest contributors toward the success of this country. It is true that the last few years, the last decade or two, there has been a transition from the small towns and the country areas to the cities. Today we have a situation which I really deplore; namely, that two-thirds of the people in the United States live in urban areas. I know a city is a great place to live. I do not object to cities. We must have them. They are wonderful. But we need country areas and little towns, too.

During this time the older people have been going to the cities because they can get better hospitalization and more conveniences. It is easier on them. You cannot blame them for it. The middle-aged people with families, with children, have good reason to go to the cities, where they can have better educational opportunities for the members of their family, their children, and at the same time better wages for themselves.

There has been a natural transition from the country to the cities until today we have a deplorable situation. We have a situation where the little towns have practically dried up. Now what are we going to do with these little towns and rural areas? Are we going to say we will do nothing for them and that we will give them no help of any kind whatsoever? That would be a rather cruel way to look at it, because some of their aged people need help. They do not want gifts if they can help it. They would rather work for something. The very people who have furnished the manpower to save this country in time of war and who have built it and preserved it in time of peace are suffering because of circumstances over which they have had absolutely no control. If this Congress can give them just a little aid that is consistent with our private enterprise system and consistent with our form of government; when people who have helped their Government come to a time, later on in life, when the Government could come to their aid and rescue them, it is certainly fitting, appropriate, and proper for the Government to do so—especially in a case where it does not cost the Government anything and where the Government makes money as a result of coming to the aid of its people.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal, the ARA, is to help the people to help themselves. This is to let people have what is known in some areas of the country as seed corn money. It is to let them have money to build a plant and to borrow that money from the Government or from a Government agency. They pay it back with interest. This is seed corn money to private enterprise. I can tell you instances where the Government has made lots of money that way. Let me give you one example that I have almost spent a career on—getting a steel mill constructed in the area of the country that I am from. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the RFC, put up $75 million or a little more than that in order to get that steel mill constructed. The big steel mills did not want it. They said every devastating thing about it that they could think of and tried to discourage people from going into it. But the RFC investigated the matter and said that it was all right. They put up the money and in 11 years time that plant had paid in taxes within $5 million of what the plant actually cost the Government. In addition, the Government got every dollar of its money back with interest.

In addition to that, the Government received an equal amount from the private contractors and others who handled the materials produced by this plant. That can be documented and proven. The Government got 200 percent back for every dollar that it put in. That is what the Government receives from private enterprise. This is not a situation of private enterprise being taken over by the Government. No—this is the Government helping private enterprise. Remember, the Government got 200 percent back for every dollar that it put in. That is seed corn money. It is giving the people money to do something to help their own country. There is an outstanding example of this kind of operation. I could give you many, many others. So we are not trying to interfere with private business. We are trying to help private business.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to legislation being considered by the Congress, I have great faith and confidence in every Member of the U.S. Congress. I feel that we have as fine people as you can get together in a group, in any profession, occupation, or avocation. They are wonderful people, but we naturally have our feelings about things—and some of us believe differently from others. That is understandable. That is the reason we have to have majority rule. That is why we have parliamentary procedure in order to make it possible for us to vote directly on issues and let the majority prevail.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time a bill like this comes up that is in the public interest and helps the poor folk, the low-income people, the workingman and the small businessman, we have all kinds of trouble with it. The first objection is that we do not want back-door financing. We had to take that out, which we did, in this bill. That means that not only will we be required to pass one law to get this money to the deserving people in these underdeveloped areas, but we have got to pass two laws in order to get it to them.

First we have got to pass a bill like this, the authorization bill. It then goes through the committee, for instance, on Banking and Currency, then through the Committee on Rules, and then through the House of Representatives. The same procedure has to be followed in the other body, and then it has to be approved by the President of the United States. They do not receive the money after that is done. No; we have got to start back over again and then we have another bill which comes to the Committee on Appropriations and then it comes to the Committee on Rules if there is any legislation contained in that particular bill. It then comes before the House of Representatives and then goes to the Senate and then to the President again. Thus, we have to pass two laws in order to give these poor people an opportunity to receive this money, to help them help themselves. We are willing to do that, however, but do not add any undue or unnecessary barriers and do not try to do things that will make it almost impossible for these people to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I have known of bills which have gone through this Congress with wings, just flying; almost without objection they move through, providing special benefits for certain people and special groups. We have all seen that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the Committee something upon which I have never made a statement, but it is the truth. Regarding the very, very wealthy, I am not against wealth, I am not against riches, I admire people who can make money; I was a poor boy, and I do not deserve any credit for working hard to get an education, because that is the only way I could do it. The fellows who did not have to do it are entitled to much more credit than I am. So I have no feeling against people of tremendous wealth and big business. That is part of our system. But when we pass laws that permit the people of extreme wealth to escape paying their taxes—that is going a little far.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what I just stated is exactly what has happened. There are so many gimmicks in the tax laws, and so many loopholes, that the money we get out of the big rich is just like passing the hat. If they want to put money in Uncle Sam's hat, they do so. Otherwise they use one of the gimmicks in the tax law to avoid taxes.

Mr. Chairman, here we are dealing with people who are poor or with only low incomes. You know how they pay taxes? They pay them in advance; the taxes are taken out of their pay envelopes, they are not asking for any special treatment; they are asking for an equal opportunity, just an opportunity to make a living for themselves, an honest living in order to educate their children and to continue to be good American citizens, the kind of citizens who made this country wonderful and great.

So, Mr. Chairman, where we have areas of chronically high unemployment or underemployment, let us do something to remove those spots of deterioration, so that all of the country can enjoy the great things that are possible to our people. That is what we are trying to do here in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my friends who are objecting to this bill to keep this in mind. We appropriate money here every year to help some 100 underdeveloped countries in the world. There are five agencies providing loans and grants to other countries.

We really ought to be able to apply to one of these five agencies, three of which we own outright—that is, the United States provides all of the money. But we are not. The laws we passed for the foreign loans and grants do not permit our own people to apply.

Are we going to vote to deny our own people the same kind of assistance that we have given, and are giving to other countries of the world, in billions of dollars? That is the question we should consider.

What about the International Finance Corporation? They are making loans to Mexico, South America, Western Europe, and all over the world. But they will not take an application from the United States.

Then there is the Inter-American Development Company. Same thing.

IDA, same thing, no applications permitted from the United States of America.

What about the Export-Import Bank? No applications allowed from the United States.

So this is our only chance to give our own people just a fair opportunity to get a few crumbs off the rich man's table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas for the splendid speech he is making and for highlighting so effectively the facts which prevail in what we are doing in assisting underdeveloped areas overseas and putting those in perspective alongside of the relatively small sums we are investing in these underdeveloped areas in our own country. I think the gentleman's statistics are graphic proof of the fact that we have been far more generous with our neighbors overseas than we have with our own people in this country who face similar domestic problems, unemployment, and distress. I thank the gentleman and commend him for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Now, we have a fine relationship between the citizens of this country and this Congress. Without the aid of the city Members, we would never have had a farm program. I know lots of farm programs where there was more support from the cities than from the rural areas. Without the support of the cities, we would not have had many of the fine things we have throughout rural America, and we are grateful to the Members for that support.

I am one of the sponsors with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] of the mass transit bill. That is wonderful for the big cities. I am for that bill; I am strong for it; I believe it is in the interest of America, and I believe we ought to put it through this Congress right away. It is needed. What saved the people of Britain except for their rapid transit system?

They say that is what saved the civilians of London. Without it many of them would have perished. We need a rapid transit system in all of our big cities. It is in the interest of America that we have it, and I am for it. While we are helping the cities, do not overlook the little towns that will be helped by this. This is not, however, a rural area bill; and it is not a city bill. It is for both rural and urban communities. It is not just for one against the other, but it is for both, so help us to pass this bill and help us to make it a law.

Now I know there are people who say, "This is not a Federal problem; it is a local problem. Let each locality take care of itself—or let the States handle it."

Well, I am a States rights man myself, but I do not like to have a principle of States rights misused and distorted to create an escape hatch from taxation for the beneficiaries of great wealth.

In the days when Main Street was locally owned—when the grocery merchants, department stores, banks, and service establishments were owned and operated by local people, the States could do their own taxing.

But today, Main Street is absentee-owned. How is the local community or the State going to tax the income of the giant chains operating all across America? Maine, Vermont, Utah, or Pennsylvania cannot collect taxes on the corporate income if the corporation maintains its fictitious home in Delaware. And the 50 States cannot tax the incomes of the big shareholders in the corporations if they live in Connecticut, Florida, Switzerland, and Rio.

The only way the States can tax is through the instrumentality of the Federal Government.

Yes, the program takes taxes. But it is very shortsighted to imagine that those who pay the taxes do not also benefit from this program. We have recognized in the case of foreign countries that poor neighbors make poor customers, and we ought to recognize that at home.

This program is not a Federal handout. It only offers a way for the local communities to help themselves. It does not give anybody a dole. It helps increase the total output of productive wealth in the Nation, and it thus helps the whole Nation.

The ARA program has made a good start. It is getting off the ground. It has taken time, 2 years' time. The act has only 2 years to go. Wait 2 more years and give it a chance. Then if it has not succeeded, we will not extend it, but do not kill the program now, halfway through the 4-year period of its life. Give it a chance.

It is estimated, and I think conservatively so, that this bill would create 247,500 new jobs. These would be distributed as follows:

Distribution of jobs which could be created under increased funds authorization, and jobs anticipated under current funds authorization under ARA

State	Jobs possible under $450,000,000 increase			Jobs anticipated under current authorization		
	Direct	Indirect	Total	Approved	Pending	Total
Alabama	3,060	1,990	5,050	1,301	1,297	2,598
Alaska	510	330	840	1,146	537	1,683
Arizona	315	206	521	------	------	------
Arkansas	3,285	2,135	5,420	2,888	1,013	3,901
California	1,215	791	2,006	121	1,223	1,344
Colorado	375	245	620	------	72	72
Connecticut	660	429	1,089	1,235	310	1,545
Delaware	480	312	792	------	------	------
District of Columbia	------	------	------	------	------	------
Florida	375	245	620	566	354	920
Georgia	3,000	1,950	4,950	1,650	1,625	3,275
Hawaii	210	138	348	336	205	541
Idaho	525	341	866	140	232	372
Illinois	4,385	2,850	7,235	1,570	430	2,000
Indiana	2,730	1,776	4,506	1,671	908	2,579
Iowa	120	78	198	------	------	------
Kansas	195	128	323	5	16	21
Kentucky	8,450	5,494	13,944	1,939	2,853	4,792
Louisiana	2,580	1,677	4,257	66	1,358	1,424
Maine	630	411	1,041	631	353	984
Maryland	1,365	887	2,252	1,627	534	2,161
Massachusetts	2,115	1,376	3,491	730	660	1,390
Michigan	22,360	14,534	36,894	1,460	2,087	3,547
Minnesota	2,220	1,443	3,663	211	650	861
Mississippi	3,830	2,491	6,321	1,135	438	1,573
Missouri	1,365	887	2,252	535	540	1,075
Montana	885	575	1,460	135	38	173
Nebraska	375	245	620	------	------	------
Nevada	15	11	26	5	------	5
New Hampshire	360	234	594	------	89	87
New Jersey	6,035	3,924	9,959	530	285	815
New Mexico	1,125	731	1,856	35	402	437
New York	3,420	2,223	5,643	756	612	1,368
North Carolina	2,880	1,872	4,752	360	1,702	2,062
North Dakota	285	185	470	------	4	4
Ohio	3,300	2,145	5,445	159	1,339	1,498
Oklahoma	2,940	1,911	4,851	1,944	2,957	4,901
Oregon	580	377	957	480	444	924
Pennsylvania	28,875	18,766	47,641	4,620	3,589	8,209
Rhode Island	1,650	1,074	2,724	1,300	154	1,454
South Carolina	2,610	1,698	4,308	1,113	510	1,623
South Dakota	285	185	470	------	161	161
Tennessee	3,075	2,000	5,075	3,181	1,400	4,581
Texas	3,225	2,096	5,321	1,941	2,362	4,303
Utah	285	185	470	516	41	557
Vermont	195	128	323	------	80	80
Virginia	930	606	1,536	175	342	517
Washington	1,935	1,259	3,194	186	1,957	2,143
West Virginia	10,337	6,719	17,056	1,984	4,600	6,584
Wisconsin	1,020	663	1,683	83	1,342	1,425
Wyoming	145	94	239	110	219	329
American Samoa	45	33	78	------	150	150
Guam	165	107	272	------	61	61
Puerto Rico	6,540	4,250	10,790	302	1,360	1,662
Virgin Islands	90	60	150	------	------	------
Total	150,000	97,500	247,500	40,878	43,895	84,773

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman mentioned killing the program at this point. My understanding is there is no effort to be made under this bill to change the original dollar authorization which was designed for the life of the program. Is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I beg to differ with the gentleman. The gentleman's own amendment strikes out the heart of this bill, the provisions affecting the underemployed. It strikes out any assistance for areas of chronically high underemployment. He would discriminate against the country people. Some of the most difficult problems we have in the United States are in rural areas where there are really no employment opportunities, but people can do some work, frequently unneeded work, on the farms and in part-time odd jobs around the towns. They cannot make a real living. They can barely eke out an existence. That is underemployment. That is not a living. It is underemployment that the gentleman's amendment would strike out. There is as much need of helping such areas as there is of helping the unemployed. The unemployed get benefits up to a point, whereas the underemployed get none.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to support the point just made by the gentleman from Texas. The letter which our colleague from Ohio sent to all of the Members of the House, I assume, shows by its own terms that he is going to knock out about 60 percent of the rural ARA counties with his amendment. I think that is certainly a very drastic and substantial cut in the program.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will discuss that at the proper time. I will not take more time at this time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I will be happy to.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this whole program has not worked in the way it was intended. In fact, they have only taken about 25 percent of the money they had available. It has not improved the unemployment situation and it has not done the job. So I think we should vote against this bill and I hope that every Member of the House will read the minority report and not send good money after bad.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILBURN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that the information given to us was that as of April 30 the funds actually committed on the two industrial loan programs was $42.2 million; the gentleman is correct. But I have more up-to-date figures. Within 1 month and 7 days those figures had gone from $42 million to $68 million, or a 150-percent increase in only 1 month and 7 days. You see, this is a new program, and it takes time for it to develop; but the ARA already has on file more applications that have preliminary approval than they have funds to meet.

Mr. KILBURN. I have always found that any Government agency, when it is prodded, can spend the money awfully fast.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that our distinguished chairman of the committee did not choose to discuss the record of the administration of this bill or what is in the bill, but talked about foreign aid and many other things that are absolutely outside of this debate.

I would like to comment on some remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, before I get into my own talk. He evidently has quite an interest, because the largest grant made under this bill consisted of a loan of $8,500,000 and a grant of $983,000 for the Oklahoma Lake Development Authority Tourist Center. In other words, 55 percent of the dollar volume of public facility loans and 13 percent of the public facility grants approved by the agency are for this one project. That is an astounding fact.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, that is quite true, and it is something we are very proud of in Oklahoma. But I think for the sake of the record it should be pointed out that this is not confined to the district of the gentleman from Oklahoma who is speaking. The lake that is served by this project covers portions of three congressional districts. It is in a sense a statewide project and one that will serve the entire Southwest as a recreational area. I do not think it is entirely fair to say that it is this gentleman's district, much as I would like to be able to claim the entire sum and the entire project.

Mr. WIDNALL. I am pleased to have the extent of that project stated for the record. But it certainly was not an attempt to cure hard core unemployment in truly depressed and blighted areas, which was the reason behind passing this legislation originally.

Mr. Chairman, a major problem facing this country today is unemployment. No one can deny that fact. It is also true that there is a role for the Federal Government to play in helping to solve this problem, and lessen the hardships that accompany it. The methods of approach may vary and they certainly include tax relief, built-in stabilizers such as unemployment benefits, and fiscal responsibility, as well as direct help where private or other public sources are clearly unable to handle the task. Unfortunately, this bill before us today does not fall into any conceivable category for solving the unemployment problem.

Two years ago, when this act was first considered by this body, I offered a substitute bill which would have directed the money to be spent and the effort to be made to those areas of chronic unemployment which still plague our economy today. And I am talking about areas such as eastern Pennsylvania and West Virginia that were dramatized so successfully in a political campaign. They seem to have been largely forgotten. This body chose to pass an administration proposal loaded with political implications, and loaded against any solution to the problem. I predicted at that time that the bill that was passed would not be the grand solution its proponents alleged.

A look at the facts clearly indicates that prediction has come true. The unemployment rate for May moved up to 5.9 percent. It has hovered at or above that figure in the 2 years that the Area Redevelopment Administration has been operating. During that period of time the ARA has been able to make use of only 21.6 percent of the authorization available for industrial and commercial loans in urban areas, only 20.6 percent of its existing authorization for industrial and commercial loans in nonurban areas, only 25.1 percent of the available authorization for public facility loans, only 22 percent of the authorization for public facilities, and but 80 percent of the annual authorization for technical assistance.

In short, the ARA has miserably failed to make even a dent in the employment problem. It has been previously stated but I would like to repeat that it claims 35,226 jobs as the result of its activities. That figure fails to take into account the fact that Federal funds accounted for only 47 percent of the funds invested in projects associated with ARA. On a gross basis, only 16,556 jobs can be directly attributed to Federal assistance, which is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total unemployed in this country.

According to the intent of Congress when this act was first passed, the program was to be reviewed at the end of a 4-year period. Now, with over 2 years of operation on the record, the administrators in charge are apparently so aware of their own failures that they believe they can only avoid the wrath of the public and Congress by making a grandstand play for more authorization. The theory, I suppose, is that if they dazzle the public with what they claim they would like to do, no one will see what they have not done.

Among the things that they have not done is to use wisely the money already authorized. This is not merely a matter of quantity but of quality of projects. I personally do not believe that the Federal Government by whatever means can be more than a poor substitute for private initiative in creating jobs. Even when you compare the ARA performance with that of another Federal agency, the Small Business Administration, the difference is striking. The ARA has managed to create its jobs at a cost of $5,098 per new job. The Small Business Administration has created 19,034 jobs as of June 10 at a cost of $2,038 per job, only two-fifths of the ARA cost. I have with me a press release from the Small Business Administration which verifies the figures I have just quoted.

I have been speaking of the gross number of jobs created, for in fact the ARA has simply been transplanting employment and some of its projects may even encourage it. This past February a loan of $1,894,525 was made to a Detroit hotel corporation to build a 432 unit motor hotel in a city with only 54 percent of its hotel capacity occupied. The question arises as to whether anybody can survive competitively under these conditions.

In Minnesota and South Dakota, as our distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] pointed out only this Monday, sugarbeet growers are longing for increased acreage allotments on their farms that are going concerns in rich, fertile territory, but they find that awards are going to other territories. The ARA has started a competing project in Cayuga County, N.Y., on land of doubtful value for sugarbeet production, and the Agriculture Department is trying to guarantee success by promising a 50,000-ton sugarbeet allocation for the county.

Again, in February, the ARA granted a loan to a Wisconsin paper plant to increase capacity in an industry already producing in excess of current consumption.

Even for technical assistance, a program I have no quarrel with, two of the grants last summer went to the Bureau of the Census. This must mark some sort of ultimate in government giving, from one Federal agency to another. I had no idea that the Bureau of the Census was an area of substantial unemployment, or, for that matter, an area of underemployment, considering the 35,000 more jobs requested for the bureaucracy in this year's budget.

I quote from the record of the ARA: On October 22, 1962, two grants to the Bureau of the Census, one for $23,400 to prepare additional statistical profiles and supplements to statistical profiles, and the other $19,000 to prepare U.S. statistical profiles.

While we are talking about some of this technical assistance, here is another: October 20, 1962, northeast Georgia, $22,500 contract to determine economic feasibility of establishing an outdoor recreation and tourism training and demonstration center in a 12-county area of northeast Georgia—a far cry from the original purpose of this legislation.

I have no quarrel either with the idea of a manpower retraining program and I was, in fact, among the first to urge such an approach to the problem of the jobless. In fact, in the substitute bill which I offered, there was provision for $10 million for retraining and the administration bill only contained $4,500,000.

The ARA has a program of retraining; let me give you an example of how it works. On April 13, 1963, on an 11 o'clock evening news program over WTOP, here in Washington, D.C., an examination was made of the progress of one such program in Scranton, Pa. This is an area, so the newscaster reported, of few employment ads, but 13 percent idle. A reporter interviewed one of these unemployed who had spent 18 weeks in a retraining program in electronics.

The trainee, Andrew Anthony, was asked what he learned. The reply, "I wasn't taught a thing." He went on to say that there was no equipment or instruction and no job at the end of the period, which he had been led to believe there would be. Now he exists on $24 a week unemployment compensation.

Should we be worried over this failure? The Labor Department, which works with the ARA on these programs, seemed to be. They asked for a special showing of the newscast 3 days later. It took five people to review the show—which I take as an indication of their concern—at least I hope it is an indication of their concern and not another example of underemployment within the bureaucracy.

In summary then, you are being asked to provide more money for an agency that has not shown it knows how to use the money it already has. I want to say a special word to those of you who represent rural areas. I have three farm counties in my district, and their development is a concern of mine. No doubt the proponents of this amendment will entice you with the thought of more money for your district. You might just ask them why it is that only 25 percent of the authorization of 2 years ago—when the same argument was used—has been put to work and much of that for questionable programs and results.

You might also consider the placement projects and how they can be used. I mentioned that this program when it was first passed was full of political implications. It can be used to harass, cajole or purge. Over the 4½ months prior to last fall's election, 100 projects were approved and announced; 78—or 78 percent—went to Democratic districts. Of the 22 others, 6 were in Pennsylvania, where the President pointed out during the campaign that the Federal Government could work much better with a Democratic Governor, and 4 were in Massachusetts where the slogan "I can do more for Massachusetts" was rather effectively used by another Kennedy. Four more went to districts which were involved in redistricting or where the incumbent had retired, throwing the race open. One represents a case where the notification of the award went to the Democratic candidate running against the incumbent ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The score really stands 78 to 7.

Back in January, the President presented his tax message, and spoke of stimulating employment and the economy. He said:

> The most effective policy is to expand, demand, and unleash incentives through a program of tax reduction and reform, coupled with the most prudent possible policy of public expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, considering the present budgetary position, and the constant rise in the national debt as well as the steady inflationary push on consumer prices, the most prudent possible policy of public expenditures with respect to this $455.5 million proposal is a vote of "no."

I have heard this program called "seed corn" money. We had "seed" money authorized back in 1961 for this program and, frankly, I am getting pretty worried over who is doing the planting and what is coming up as a crop. If we get any more of this "seed" money into the economy, the weeds will choke off the grass.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly oppose the pending bill. I say "reluctantly" because I would very much like to be able to support area redevelopment legislation which promised to be effective in creating jobs for people in areas of serious, long-term unemployment and which did so without hurting already established industrial areas.

The present bill, in my judgment, fails on both these counts. It has not met the needs of truly depressed areas. On the other hand, it has and continues to pose a serious threat to existing industry and employment by the open-handed way in which Federal subsidies have been used to attract industry to redevelopment areas, many of which cannot be considered depressed in the sense Congress originally intended.

For both these reasons, therefore, I cannot conscientiously vote to expand the area redevelopment program until appropriate changes are made in the scope and administration of the program—changes which I believe the Area Redevelopment Administration presently has the necessary authority to institute.

In the committee report on H.R. 4569 of the 87th Congress, I urged that area redevelopment assistance be concentrated in a limited number of chronically distressed areas. This would assure maximum effectiveness of the Federal help. It would eliminate the uneconomic and wasteful competition for the assistance between various areas of the country. It would provide a conclusive test or demonstration of the validity of the economic concepts involved in such a program and the usefulness of the economic tools. Finally, it would make certain that the aid was directed to those areas which need it most and which can use the help most constructively.

I repeated this suggestion in the committee report on the present bill, H.R. 4996, because our experience during the past 2 years with this program confirmed my earlier doubts and convinced me that reshaping the program was more than ever necessary.

We have not had a real area redevelopment program. To my knowledge, no significant attempt has yet been made to initiate and support a comprehensive effort to redevelop the economy of a chronically distressed area. Federal funds have been dispersed to too many areas, for projects with too little economic value, at too high a cost in terms of the jobs or other benefits received.

Of equal concern to me—and, I should think, to other Members who represent industrial areas—is the adverse impact of the program on existing industrial employment, especially in industries operating substantially below their capacity. In several cases, Federal subsidies have encouraged the construction of new plants to manufacture products for which demand is far less than the industry's capacity. The combination of Federal aid, however, and wage levels in the redevelopment area which are often considerably below either union or industry-wide scales, permits the new plant to compete. But I would vigorously contend, Mr. Chairman, that this is unfair competition. The Federal Government has no business underwriting the kind of competition which means the loss of jobs in other companies.

The minority views in the committee report cite some examples of this indefensible use of Federal funds. I hope our colleagues will read them. Here is another one. According to a recent publicity manual prepared for a rural areas development tour of southern Indiana, led by the Secretary of Agriculture, a prominent shoe manufacturer was persuaded to locate a new plant in the area. A substantial part of the lure was an ARA loan of $474,300, a Federal retraining program costing $64,272, and an ARA grant of $130,000 and loan of $105,000 to provide water and sewage facilities for the company. Indeed, a Washington Post reporter who accompanied the tour, said that company officials would not have located a plant in the area without this big Federal subsidy.

But take a closer look at the circumstances of this case. It is common knowledge that the shoe industry in the United States is one of our most seriously depressed industries. The United Shoe Workers of America reports that unemployment in the industry is high and is getting worse. The situation is so bad, in fact, that I understand every Member of Congress from the six New England States has signed a petition calling on the President of the United States to restrict the importation of foreign-made footwear. I suggest to our colleagues, therefore, that they also examine the threat to the existing domestic shoe industry posed by our own Government through unwise subsidy policy.

The ARA-financed plant in Indiana, according to a responsible official of the United Shoe Workers, is competing primarily not against foreign imports but against other domestic manufacturers. This plant, like other company-owned plants, is not organized, and the company has vigorously opposed efforts of the union to enroll its employees. The Indiana plant, the Washington Post reports, is paying wages of $51 a week—substantially below prevailing wages in the industry. Moreover, the company, I am informed by the union, has a policy of refusing to employ Negro workers.

In view of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is reasonable to ask whether the area redevelopment program is functioning—in this and in how many other similar cases—in a manner which contradicts the expressed policy of the Government? In this particular case, which the administration has selected as an outstanding example of the program, what we actually see is the promotion of cutthroat competition, the creation of additional unemployment in a depressed industry, the lowering of industry wage levels, the encouragement of antiunion activity, and the subsidy of racial discrimination in employment.

Understandably, the United Shoe Workers strongly opposed ARA assistance to this company. I find it incredible that this administration refused to listen to their thoroughly justified objections.

The case of Mack Trucks, Inc., illustrates in a somewhat different way how the area redevelopment program, despite antipiracy provisions in the act, can be used to provide both direct and indirect benefits to a relocated plant, and thus make more attractive the prospect of abandoning existing plants for the new facilities, easy financing, lower wages and retrained workers in a Government-subsidized redevelopment area.

In 1961, the year the Area Redevelopment Act was approved, the Mack company closed its plant in Plainfield, N.J., causing a net loss of more than 2,000 production jobs. It relocated in Hagerstown, Md., which was designated a redevelopment area under the act. This was a clear case of a "runaway shop" and was recognized as such by ARA and the Department of Labor which took steps to prohibit assistance to the company. Yet, retraining programs for machine tool operators were approved in the area in full knowledge of the facts that Mack was the largest employer of machine tool operators there, that Mack was actively recruiting such workers, and that any other demand for machine tool operators was created as a result of Mack's policy of hiring workers from other companies at higher wages. Consequently, nearly half of all the workers trained in these ARA programs went to work in the Mack plant, in direct violation of the intent of Congress and of ARA's own regulations. The cost to taxpayers of this Federal subsidy to Mack—including those taxpayers who lost their jobs in Plainfield, N.J.—was approximately $60,000.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that both the facts and my conclusions in this case are conceded by ARA and the Department of Labor.

These are not isolated examples, Mr. Chairman. They are representative of what happens when a program of this kind is not administered with the care and scrupulous regard for congressional intent that it requires, when more attention is devoted to making a record and spreading Federal largesse as widely as it will go than in concentrating on limited but worthwhile objectives.

We have an opportunity here today, Mr. Chairman, to put this program back on its tracks, to make it serve effectively the national interest in helping areas of high and persistent unemployment without endangering those fortunate enough to have jobs. The administration will revise its program if Congress tells them to do it. And Congress can make its message unmistakably clear by eliminating the section 5(b) rural area program and by withholding the requested additional authorizations.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that if we do this we will not be killing the area redevelopment program, nor will we be crippling it. At the rate funds have been expended to date, there is sufficient money in the program to finance it until Congress has an opportunity to review it again next year.

I urge our colleagues to insist that this program be made to serve its primary objective—in justice to our overburdened taxpayers, to our threatened workers in existing industrial areas, and to the hard-core unemployed who deserve more than platitudes and the few crumbs they have been getting from the Federal cake.

As a Member of Congress who represents an urban-industrial district, I have nevertheless tried to follow a policy of supporting programs which will serve our people and strengthen our country, whether or not my own district benefits directly. But there must be limits to such a policy, Mr. Chairman, for no Member can stand idly by while Congress approves program after program giving preferential treatment to selected areas of the country. The time has come, I believe, to insist that the national interest is not served by weakening the economy of one area in order to build up the economy of another. This bill and this program, as presently conceived, will hurt the people of my district and of dozens like it. We ask this House to recognize the danger and give use the measure of protection we have a right to expect.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the opposition of some to this program rests on sounder ground than the grounds which were stated by the gentleman from New Jersey in his remarks just a few minutes ago, because if the facts on which they are proceeding are no more solid than those on which the gentleman relies, they certainly are on shifting sands.

The gentleman cited this lodge project in eastern Oklahoma and stated it was not located in a chronically unemployed area; that it was not serving to meet the problem of unemployment. The gentleman simply has not studied the facts and the supporting data in connection with these projects.

If he will turn to page 66 of the hearings, he will find listed all of the areas, both 5(a) and 5(b), that are located in Oklahoma, and he will find that two of the counties that are served by this project are counties that have 5(a) classified communities within them. The town of McAlester in Pittsburg County is a chronically unemployed area and is clearly identified as such by ARA. Okmulgee-Henryetta is a 5(a) area.

To qualify under 5(a) it must be shown that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least: 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, or 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years, or 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

These two areas, I might say for the information of the gentleman, because I would like for him to be sympathetic to this situation in eastern Oklahoma, are both areas where we once had substantial coal mining production. We had a major source of coal in the Southwest in these communities, and these coal mines are down in both Okmulgee County and also in Pittsburg County, and we have just as much a distressed area from that standpoint as they have in West Virginia or Pennsylvania and have had unemployment for a long period of time. Now, under those two 5(a) counties you add two 5(b) counties, Haskell and McIntosh Counties, and when you add the lake area benefits in the county of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman STEED, Okfuskee, you have five areas in there benefiting directly from the construction of these projects on the Lake Eufaula which is now under construction by the Corps of Army Engineers. So, it is not correct or in accordance with the facts to say that we are not attacking the problem of chronic unemployment and we are not attacking the problem of chronic distressed areas when we are building projects of this type.

A little bit ago the gentleman from Washington, I believe it was, said there is a tremendous cost per job in these projects and that it compared very unfavorably with the $20,000 per job cost in private industry. Well, you can take the figures of the gentleman from New Jersey as to the cost of this lodge project. The estimates of the ARA on the jobs directly produced by this lodge project are that it will produce 500 jobs of direct employment on these two major lodges on this reservoir. But the cost figure, when you project that, is well below the $20,000 per job figure that our colleague has cited in private industry. It runs about $18,000 or $19,000 per job in this project in eastern Oklahoma. But, add to that the benefit which our planning and resources board in Oklahoma estimates, there will be created 1,500 jobs through stepped-up tourist trade as well as the number of people who service these lodges. I say we have a project that can be justified by private industry's own job cost standards.

We have another project in my district, in Adair County, Stilwell, where we provided loans and grants to assist in the production of an improved water supply system for the town of Stilwell. With that improved water supply a cannery is doubling its production capacity and thereby adding 200 jobs in Adair County, and most of them are Indians who face a very severe depressed condition.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. A statement was made that it has cost $277,000 to create a job, which, of course, is ridiculous. Now, I understand that this generalization refers to an illustration to only one project, the Duluth arena-auditorium. And the figure is not correct even for that project, because it counts only the jobs of the janitors and other custodial people, not the other jobs which are indirectly created, and are not counted. All of the projects approved by ARA, in total, have cost an average of $2,763 per job created.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

I know that in Oklahoma where this proposal is one of the most popular programs we have today, we have mayors and city councils all over the State of Oklahoma in communities where there are depressed conditions, participating enthusiastically in it. Maybe that is one of the things creating so much dissatisfaction on the other side, but we have not had a cost per job on any of these projects that comes within 15 percent of the cost per job estimate that was given over on the other side.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about facts. Of course, I do not know what is going on in Oklahoma but I question some of the "facts" presented by the ARA. Here in this report of the hearings before the committee I find a couple of my rural counties in my district classified as 5(b), areas of persistent unemployment. I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that those counties listed as 5(b), Clallam County, for example, today reports a rate of unemployment of 4.1 percent. Skagit, which is also listed 5(b)——

Mr. EDMONDSON. 5(b) is not limited to unemployment.

Mr. WESTLAND. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Oh, no, it is not.

Mr. WESTLAND. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You turn to page 31 where the criteria are listed and you will find low family income and low farm income.

Mr. WESTLAND. 5(b)5 is persistent unemployment. If 4 percent qualifies as persistent unemployment, then I think the ARA has got their thinking twisted. The national figure is 5.9 percent unemployment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am running out of time, and I decline to yield further because I want to read into the RECORD the criteria for 5(b) redevelopment areas.

Mr. WESTLAND. For 5(b)5?

Mr. EDMONDSON. You will find it on page 31.

Mr. WESTLAND. I have it right here—5(b)5 says persistent unemployment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is adding a 5 to what he said a moment ago, because he said 5(b) a moment ago.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MULTER. We should not be misled by this talk about feeding these projects into Republican or Democratic areas and this loose talk about the tremendous cost of some of these jobs, I think we ought to look at the record. The distinguished ranking minority member of our committee placed in our hearing record a reference to a project in his district, a Republican district in upstate New York—and I hope the Republicans from New York will listen to this—where a loan was approved for $844,000.

The project provides directly 150 more jobs. If you will divide it out it comes to exactly $3,620 to provide one job, and there were 150 of them provided. Take that as against the figures that the Republicans put in the RECORD here today that private industry must expend $20,000 to create one job. I would like to know what they are crying about.

When they talk about 75 percent of these jobs going into Democratic areas, I think it is traditional that the wealth of the country is concentrated in the Republican areas, yet 25 percent or more of these projects have gone into these Republican areas. Yet they are crying. Again I say I would like to know what they are crying about.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The main reason they are crying is the fact that they recognize this is a program with very strong support by the people and the mayors and the city councils in these communities where this program is doing a great deal of good. I think this should be added also: A lot of these areas where these jobs are being created are areas where you have a lack of capital and a lack of private money to go into the development of job opportunties. Certainly you are not unwilling to vote money for training individuals to do a job. We have 18 of these training programs going on in Oklahoma now training people to do jobs so as to make constructive use of them.

Mr. PATMAN. May I just point out that the ARA figures show not $20,000 per job, or $277,000 per job, but the exact figure is $2,763 per job, which is quite different from the exceptional figures given by our friends on the other side.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman and I might say by way of conclusion that this is a program which is filling a vital need in the United States—a need, as the chairman of the committee said, which is just as critical and vital in some of these depressed areas of our country as the need is anywhere in Latin America or Africa. We have testimony in the hearings that the rate of unemployment among the Indian tribes in some of these areas which would be charged off by some of the amendments being offered on the other side, is as high as 50 percent among the eligible Indians ready, able, and willing to work if they could get a job. The retraining program under the ARA is making it possible for them to go to work.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Abernethy
Ayres
Baring
Barry
Belcher
Bow

Brown, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Celler
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Forrester
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Jarman
Jensen
King, Calif.
Laird
Lankford
Leggett
McClory
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Norblad
Ostertag
Pelly
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Steed
Talcott
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyman

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4996, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 382 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks with regard to the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963 toward our experience and the actual administration of the law as it was passed 2 years ago. Very frankly, I believe that the administration of this program has not only left a great deal to be desired, but truly has distorted the original intent of Congress in enacting depressed areas legislation.

What was our intent? I thought our intent was to help the truly depressed areas and that is why 2 years ago I supported the Widnall substitute, which limited its help to those truly depressed areas. I was shocked to hear the Secretary of Commerce reveal at our hearings that in actuality, industrial and commercial loans on a cumulative basis of section 5(a) urban areas through fiscal 1964 are estimated to total $107 million, while industrial and commercial loans under 5(b) areas are estimated to total $151 million. In effect, this means that 5(b) rural areas, with 42 percent of the population, are receiving almost 60 percent of the industrial and commercial loan assistance. In other words, out of every $5 that we have authorized, only $2 of assistance has gone into the hard-core industrial depressed areas and $3 has gone into these loosely designated rural areas of lesser need.

You will recall that the bill as passed in the House on March 28, 1961, contained an industrial loan section authorizing the appropriation of $200 million for industrial loans; $100 million was provided for the urban areas, and $100 million for the rural areas. I ask you now to think back to March 28, 1961, and ask yourself, what was our intent as we set up these so-called industrial loans? Let me quote to you the language contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 4, page 5046, where the distinguished gentleman from Texas who now serves as chairman of our committee had this to say:

> To help these communities get their redevelopment programs underway, the bill provides for Federal loans. These loans can be used for the acquisition of land, the construction of plant facilities and, in exceptional cases, for the purchase of machinery.

Mr. Chairman, what actually has been our experience? I have here the activity summary reports through May 20 and 25, 1963. During the hearings held by our committee, these reports only went up to March 25 of fiscal 1963. This report from the Secretary of Commerce tells us that in fiscal 1963, until the date of the report, March 25 of this year, a total of $33,669,952 of so-called industrial and commercial loans had been approved by the Area Redevelopment Administration. The immediate question is, who received this money? Their names are all set forth in this report, but I can tell you this much, that of the total of better than $33 million, 24 percent of this sum, or $7,972,150, went into the financing of new motels and hotels. These are the nationwide statistics, but let me tell you about Michigan particularly, because that is the State from which I come.

Until May 25, 1963, just 2 weeks ago, the Area Redevelopment Administration had made nine of these so-called industrial and commercial loans, supposedly to attract new industry to Michigan. These are the loans, you will recall, that it was said 2 years ago when we were considering this bill that the money "could be used for the acquisition of land, the construction of plant facilities and, in exceptional cases, for the purchase of machinery." They totaled $5,763,150. Do you know what it was used for in Michigan? I can tell you. Better than $9 out of every $10 lent in Michigan, actually 91.2 percent has been lent to finance new motels. Some $5,260,150 was lent in this fashion. They are all listed right here in this report.

I wonder how the people in Detroit and the people in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, who know what it means to live in areas that are truly depressed, feel about this? Last year, in 1962, Detroit had only a 54 percent occupancy rate in the then existing hotels. Having this in mind, you can be pretty certain that the net effect of these new motels, financed by the Federal Government, is going to be to totally destroy some of the existing motels and hotels. I certainly want to make clear that I am not opposed to new motels. I like them. But I do not think that Congress ever intended that in the administration of this program, 91.2 percent of all the money lent, supposedly for industrial loans, should be used to finance the motel industry. I can tell you what a Detroit motel man, Mr. Peter Solomon, who had to finance his own motel through private enterprise, had to say. These were his comments:

> This has the effect of using tax money paid by hostelry owners to subsidize unfair competition. Owners who have their own capital invested in their businesses should not be confronted by competition made possible by Area Redevelopment Act loans. The Area Redevelopment Act program makes it possible for persons to go into the hotel and motel business at no risk of their own capital. It is not right that the Government should be supplying money while other hotel and motel owners arranged their own financing and now have to put up with new competition.

I think that those of you who voted for this Area Redevelopment Act program 2 years ago should also be concerned about the administration of the public facilities section of this bill. You will recall that when the bill was passed in 1961 it contained $100 million for public facility loans and $75 million for public facility grants. When he was explaining this section of the bill at that time, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, now chairman of the full committee, had this to say about this section:

> In addition, the bill recognizes that adequate local public facilities are essential to industrial expansion. Modern industry is highly dependent on adequate sewer and water facilities and other community works. However, many depressed areas cannot afford to expand under present conditions. In fact, they are often hard pressed even to maintain existing facilities. Here they are caught in a vicious circle—adequate public facilities are needed for industrial expansion but the community cannot afford these facilities until the expansion takes place. To overcome this problem, the committee amendment provides for Federal loans and grants.

Again, what has been our actual experience? Well, in fiscal 1962 the Area Redevelopment Administration approved $15,464,000 in loans and $7,428,844 in grants for public facilities. Included in these total loans and grants was a loan for $8,500,000 and a grant for $983,000 for the Oklahoma Lake Development Authority, Tourist Center. In other words, 55 percent of the dollar volume of public facility loans and 13 percent of the public facility grants were used for this one project. Again, I ask you, is this the type of modern industry that is highly dependent upon adequate sewer and water facilities and other community works? This is how the Daily Bond Buyer of June 11, 1962, described this project:

> Clustered around the lake, like jewels in a regal crown, will be deluxe cabins, equipped with the most modern facilities and accoutrements, and two main lodges, the north lodge and the midway lodge, which together boast of 286 units, and appropriate community rooms, all similarly equipped.
>
> Each of the lodges, will nestle like a pearl in its own 2,500 acre park, and each will have its own convention halls, swimming pools, gift shops, tennis courts, golf courses, boat docks and marina—in short, all the necessities so vital and essential to the improvement of the morale of Oklahoma's unemployed.

Now I admit that the Daily Bond Buyer would undoubtedly be prejudiced in connection with a Government loan of this magnitude, and perhaps when they went on to describe this resort as "Senator Robert Kerr's answer to Elizabeth Arden's Main Chance," they were being unfair with regard to the potentiality of the project. Nevertheless, I point out to you that I do not believe Congress ever intended any such project as this in connection with the depressed areas bill, nor that a project of this magnitude would so completely devour the total funds authorized for public facility loans to the truly depressed areas in 1962 as this project did.

Again, I call to your attention that from the activity summary report from the Department of Commerce, the Area Redevelopment Administration approved in fiscal 1963, through March 25, $9,823,200 in public facility loans and $9,145,538 in public facility grants, for a combined total of $18,968,738. But again, of the better than $18 million used for public facility grants and loans, almost 22 percent was approved for a single project; namely, for a convention auditorium in Duluth, Minn. As the Area Redevelopment Administration summed up the purpose of this loan and grant, it is "to supplement convention, entertainment, recreation, and cultural facilities." According to the ARA it would provide 22 permanent jobs, which figures out to be $277,272 per job. Once again let me say that no doubt Duluth will be tremendously proud of the auditorium, but I don't personally feel that expenditures such as this can be justified on the original pretense of attracting industry to depressed areas.

When he so ably testified before the Rules Committee and urged the passage of this bill, our distinguished chairman made the statement and I will quote the words that I wrote down at the time, "I hope that the Rules Committee will promptly report out this bill because I do not know of a bill that will help America more." I hope that this does not reflect the attitude of the entire administration, because very frankly, if you accept the figures claimed by the ARA itself for the number of direct jobs created, and let me say here that I do not accept them. I believe that some of them are grossly exaggerated by the applicants for loans and will be shown in future years to be less than claimed. At any rate, even if you accept their figures, at best there have been only 35,000 direct jobs created. When he was before our committee, I said to Secretary Hodges, and I quote:

> Mr. HARVEY. We are talking about a program of something that involves less than 1 percent of the total unemployed, is that right?
>
> Secretary HODGES. That is right on a percentage basis, that is right.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department now displays on the sides of its trucks in many areas of our country these four-color red, white, blue, and black 22- by 38-inch posters, in order to propagandize this program to the American people.

I called the Government Printing Office this morning and was advised that in all, under the order number listed under the poster, the ARA has ordered some 81,300 posters. I call to your attention that this is at great cost to our Government; for any of you who have campaigned for public office know the cost of this sort of poster. I also point out to you that these 81,300 posters are more than twice the number of jobs even ARA claims to have created.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support a bill to make additional authorizations for loans and grants to this agency with the experience we have had in the last 2 years. I urge my colleagues who supported this bill 2 years ago to closely scrutinize how this agency has administered the bill in their districts. Rather than provide additional authorizations, I think that we should call the officials of this agency before our committee and review carefully the activities of the agency thus far that I have discussed with you, and then express to them the hope that we can get "back on the track" that Congress originally intended.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Oklahoma who preceded me closed his remarks, he stated that "the mayors and members of city councils of America are for this program." I had the honor to serve both as a member of the city council and mayor of Saginaw, Mich., a city of 100,000 people. In my opinion mayors favor programs such as this simply because, once the program has passed, they feel entitled to their share of the Federal funds; and, frankly, it is easier to ask the Federal Government for money than it is to ask the people you represent. It is easier to ask Uncle Sam than for the mayors to ask a tax raise from the people they represent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, because the gentleman recognizes that in these projects there have to be contributions by local communities, and they have to float bond issues and raise taxes to participate in these programs, when these mayors and councilmen participate in public facility loans under the ARA.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. But it does not change the fundamental point that it is easier to get the money from the Federal Government than it is to come to your own people. That is the point.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman made a very fine factual statement, with which I agree. He referred to the expenditure of money in three districts in Oklahoma and the expenditure of money in Minnesota, and mentioned the percentage spent in those places of the total amount spent. He referred to this as maladministration. Would it not be possible also to describe it as political administration?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I think you can draw your own conclusions as to what the motivation was behind it. But the fact remains that as of today more than $10 million was spent on this one resort in Oklahoma.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the situation in Detroit which the gentleman so glibly referred to. He said that the bulk of the money was given in Detroit for the construction of hotels or motels. Detroit recently completed a $38 million conventional hall which is the largest and best in the whole country. We have lost convention after convention because we did not have sufficient room to house the people who would come to a major convention.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Right there I beg to disagree with the gentleman because the occupancy rate in Detroit was 54 percent. I do not know whether we would have been able to house them in the fashion that they wanted, but I heard the chairman say, "Give the poor people of America some of these crumbs off the rich man's table." I will say that this $10 million resort in Oklahoma is a pretty good crumb, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say that Detroit has had no new hotel or motel, a large one, built in the last 40 years. We have not had the conventions in Detroit because we could not house large numbers of people properly. If we want to look backward, we will never get these major conventions to Detroit. But if we go on with this program we will move forward. The largest sum in Michigan given for the construction of one hotel was approximately $1,800,000, which provides 432 additional rooms. It will also provide 450 permanent jobs. Because of these new hotels and motels we are likely to get more large conventions, because good and comfortable accommodations will now be available. It was also because of these new accommodations that our mayor of Detroit was able to invite the major parties to hold their convention in Detroit.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I would still say, with all respect to the gentleman, that it was not the intent of Congress that 91.2 percent of the industrial loan money going into Michigan go into the financing of new hotels. I think this is poor administration. To me it is a shocking thing. I would think it would shock the people of America who live in the truly depressed areas who wanted a depressed areas bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I hope that the remarks of my colleague from Michigan are not correct about the city not being able to hold large conventions, because our great friend, the mayor, was down here and made representations to the Democratic and Republican National Committees asking them to come to Detroit, saying we had all the rooms we needed in Detroit. Certainly I think we have. We can handle those conventions. We can handle the Democratic Convention and we can handle the Republican Convention. I would like to know which conventions in the country are larger than those.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I should like to ask this question, which I think may have some pertinency: Is the Federal Government in the business of supplying hotel accommodations in Detroit so that that city may get a convention which would otherwise go to Chicago?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I think again the facts speak for themselves, because when you get up to 91.2 percent of all the money loaned going into one industry for financing, that is significant to me.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and join with him. I particularly appreciate the views that have been expressed in the minority report. I have been notified that on April 15, 1963, the ARA approved a $68,250 loan to the Farm Ranch Cooperative Association of Wetumka, Okla., to establish a feed and grain mill. I have introduced a bill to place co-ops on an equal-taxation basis along with the rest of business. But my question is this: Is not this using taxpayers' money to set up a tax-exempt business in competition with a tax-paying business?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. That is the subject of a speech in itself. I would prefer not to get into that, but in our hearings and the press there have been cited instance after instance of the ARA being used for the purpose of promoting more competition in a particular field where competition was not needed, as in the case of the hotels in Detroit, where the occupancy rate was only 54 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER].

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in favor of increasing the authorization for the area redevelopment program. This program is one of the most significant pieces of national legislation passed under the present administration. In my home State, Michigan, we have felt the direct impact of this bill. It has benefited us a great deal. In a way, this might seem surprising. Michigan is a relatively prosperous State with an unemployment rate somewhat below the national average. And yet, 57 of Michigan's 83 counties are still faced with chronic unemployment and are eligible for the area redevelopment program.

In the past, attempts at the local and State levels to solve this problem have met with limited success. Since the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act in 1961, however, the change in perspective has been overwhelming. In over 40 of the counties involved, interested citizens have formed local development corporations. And, in the upper peninsula of our State, a regional organization has been established which encompasses 15 counties. In other words, the area redevelopment program has become a tool for self-help.

Since 1961, Michigan has received 10 industrial and commercial loans totaling $6 million, and 7 technical assistance projects totaling $352,000. Currently 26 projects totaling nearly $12,500,000 are being processed and another $66 million in loans is in an advanced stage of preparation.

Let me tell you about just one of these loans:

Iron River is a community in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Formerly, the area was a great iron-mining center. In recent years, however, competition has forced most of the mines to close and the unemployment rate has soared to almost 30 percent. Iron River's economic future looked bleak.

Under the sponsorship of the ARA, however, the people of Iron County formed a development corporation. This committee, working together with research teams from the Michigan College of Mining and Technology—Michigan Tech—developed the idea for a new kind of lumber processing. Traditionally, the problem with Michigan lumbering has been the lack of timber with a material core. Michigan Tech and a small company called Northboard, Inc., developed a process which widens the market for Michigan lumber. Northboard, Inc., together with the Iron County Development Corp. and three of the local banks, managed to raise $170,000. With this money and a $202,800 loan from the ARA, Northboard, Inc., constructed a particle board plant in Iron River.

Next week this new industry will begin production. It will employ 30 men, formerly unemployed miners, who are graduates of an area redevelopment job retraining school. About 10 of these men are between 45 and 55 years old. But more important than the particular individuals involved, this particle board plant will provide a steady source of employment and income to Iron County. The Federal Government will also benefit directly as most of northern Michigan's timberland is public property.

As this one example might serve to illustrate, the area redevelopment program benefits the economy in a number of ways. The initial effect is a stimulation of local groups and organizations to find ways to help themselves. It encourages local initiative.

The area redevelopment program strikes at the heart of the economic problem of areas which traditionally have relied on a single industry or factory. The program is a means of getting fresh capital into economically unhealthy areas. Because the area redevelopment program relies mainly on loans which are repaid with interest, it is economical for the Government and also has the added advantage over public works projects in that it is neither temporary nor self-perpetuating. The benefits from the program do not stop when the loans are repaid nor do communities become dependent on Federal subsidies for their existence. Instead, the result of the program is the development of private industry, which is the only permanent solution to the unemployment problem.

It is for these reasons then, because the program is tailormade for depressed, one-industry communities; because it stimulates local initiative; because it spreads capital into America's underdeveloped areas; and because it helps create new, permanent industries, thereby creating employment and income, that I urge we increase the authorizations for the area redevelopment program.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, on June 4 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some 59 pages of material purporting to show how practically every congressional district in every State has benefited or may benefit from the accelerated public works program and/or the area redevelopment program.

No doubt it is of interest to all Members to know the extent that their own States and counties have obtained financial aid through these programs for projects already approved and the extent to which they may reasonably expect aid for pending projects.

The statistical facts regarding the benefits, however, represent only one-half of the whole picture. The other half is the cost of the benefits. For my own part, I would like to know what the burden of the cost of these benefits is on the people of my State and my district just as much as I appreciated the details of the benefits which were supplied by the gentleman from Texas.

Because of my curiosity in this other half of the benefit-cost picture, I arranged to have an analysis made of the costs. I found that it is practically impossible to allocate the costs of a Federal spending program by congressional districts but that a reasonably accurate allocation can be made by States. A formula for allocation of the Federal tax burden by States was developed several years ago by tax experts of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, and the tax foundation. I have been advised that the tax burden allocations to the States based on this formula are kept up to date by annual adjustments which take into account latest changes in income and other pertinent economic data in the States.

With this tax burden allocation tax formula as a basis, I had an analysis made of the costs to the States of the Area Redevelopment Administration projects already approved and those pending as of May 31, 1963, as well as the distribution of these projects, by States, which appears on page 10094 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4 of this year. The table on page 10094 indicates $113,039,000 had been approved as of May 31. Of that total, $111,439,000 was in 50 States and $1,600,000 was in the island possessions; a total of $311,051,000 was pending as of May 31, and $301,044,000 of that total was in the 50 States.

The costs to the individual States of the projects approved and pending in the 50 States was computed by applying each State's allocation percentage to the total cost of approved and pending projects.

These figures were sent to each office of all of the Members, and I am sure you have them. The results of these figures are quite interesting. For example, take the State of Pennsylvania which has been considered a major example of a chronically depressed area which would be helped by this legislation. If we look at the State of Pennsylvania, we find that for the $15 million worth of aid which they have applied for or have had approved in their State they would pay in taxes to the Federal Government $26 million. On the other hand, if you turn to the State of West Virginia you find that West Virginia comes out some $70 million ahead on this program if all their requests are approved. But look at Ohio, or look at Florida or Illinois or Massachusetts. There is an interesting one. It cost the taxpayers of the State of Massachusetts $11 million more than the projects which they would receive under this program.

Let us take a look at Missouri also, or at Maryland. Obviously the figures do not bear out the position taken by those who put this bill in in 1961. May I suggest therefore that we take a look at the history of this bill. When it was originally presented to the Hill I had the privilege of serving in this body and was on the Banking and Currency Committee in the year in which it was considered. It was originally the concept of the Senator from Illinois. When it was so introduced it was aimed at one particular objective; namely, the giving to those areas of this country which had chronic, long-range unemployment some help. But then, the assistance to the unemployed areas had tagged onto it a completely separate and different program; namely, the provision of benefits for those areas of underemployment. Furthermore, when it came to the Senate floor an amendment was tagged onto the provision for underemployment which in effect required the Administrator to use as many projects as widely and in as many States as could possibly be utilized.

Furthermore, the Administrator was directed to establish the criteria for the decision as to what counties, what areas, would be considered areas of underemployment.

Section 5(a) of the bill is the section which refers to areas of unemployment. Section 5(b) of the original legislation is the section that refers to areas of underemployment.

Pursuant to the description of areas of underemployment and the direction of the bill, the Administrator put together six criteria which may be found on page 31 of the report.

The amendment which I will suggest and which I will at the proper time propose is an amendment that would strike from the provisions of ARA the first four criteria as suggested by the Administrator. It would remove from the bill and from the coverage of ARA those areas of underemployment as contrasted to unemployment.

It has been suggested by some of my good friends in the House that this is an anti-rural amendment. That is not true. If you will refer to the letter which I sent along with the figures I furnished you, I pointed out that after the adoption of my amendment the so-called rural ARA counties would still outnumber the so-called urban ARA counties by 399 to 142.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It would eliminate nearly 450 rural counties from the program, would it not?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I am not going to check the gentleman on his figures, but approximately that number of underemployed, not necessarily rural counties.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would point out if we use the word "rural" as a definition, as of today there are over 4,000 active projects underway in more than 1,800 counties. Under the jurisdiction of ARA? No. Under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, which is the Department most familiar with the problems of those living in rural counties.

I submit further that under the prescribed criteria as set forth by the Administrator, reference is made to income levels, and I would suggest to those of you who have contact with rural areas the fact that the net taxable income of a farmer does not necessarily compare at the same level with an urban dweller. It has no reference to comparison in standard of living because the tax treatment results of the farmer and the farmer-owners is entirely different than the nonfarmworker. The tax treatment of those who earn by the sweat of his brow on the land, if you will, is different. And the fact his net taxable income does not measure up to the level of the urban dweller does not necessarily mean that he is actually underemployed. He may well be, but his level of income does not necessarily prove that.

There will be comment made as to the number of applications which are coming in and which have flooded the office of ADA recently from counties which are 5(b), or underemployment counties. I would suggest to you that these applications are processed and bird dogged by the ASC committees. The number of the ASC committees outnumber the other employees of ARA by many more times than 10 to 1. It is amazing no more programs have been coming in.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On this point of basing it solely on employment, how would you qualify a county where they do not have any industrial employment, they do not have any history for unemployment compensation to be paid, and, therefore, no basis at all in the form of statistics to establish an unemployment level?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I may say to the gentleman it is up to the States to produce certain figures under any of these programs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the unemployment figures depend on the record maintained in districts where you have unemployment compensation programs and pay unemployment compensation, which establishes a basis for unemployment statistics.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I have discussed this with the gentleman. I understand his point.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the House adopt this amendment for two reasons: The Administrator of ARA today is given an impossible task. He is asked under comparable criteria to administer programs for conditions that are entirely differing in their cause and in their effect. Where the program was designed to produce a rifle shot to handle a specific target of chronic unemployment, we have substituted the buckshot of the rabbit hunter and cannot get at the entire program. Secondly, I would say to those who are economy minded that there is no need for any further authorization under this program, provided these counties are removed, because there will be plenty of funds in existence.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very excellent statement on this very important matter. In all the years I have served in this body I have never observed a Federal program so badly and so poorly administered as this one. My experience has been that it is virtually impossible to receive a reply to a direct inquiry made to that agency. I am just wondering whether the gentleman has has the same experience I have had and if the gentleman has looked into the causes of this poor and inefficient administration. Now, the experience of our office has been not only failure to receive replies to letters, failure to receive acknowledgments, failure to receive responsive replies, but irresponsive answers to specific telephone inquiries. It has been the most frustrating experience that I have had in my years of service with any agency of the Federal Government, and I am wondering if your committee has looked into the administrative phase of this program to see whether there is any hope that if it is renewed a better job might be done.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would say to the gentleman that is one of the reasons behind the philosophy of my amendment. It is impossible, in my opinion, for any administration to take off on two completely different contingencies and try to solve two different problems under the same program. I would say to the gentleman that throughout our hearings and during the evidence that was turned up there has been fact after fact after fact, piled one on top of the other, that this program has been engaged in in areas where the projects actually have been covered by other programs, whether they be recreation areas, construction of pools, motels, golf courses, and so forth.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Does the gentleman believe that politics has played any part in the administration of the program?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. This was well brought out in the hearings, as the gentleman, I am sure, is conscious of, and I would prefer not to comment on it at this point. I think the gentleman knows how I feel about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, let us lay this right on the line. This is another of the many programs resisted over the years by the Republican Party as a matter of policy, and now that it is part of the law of the Nation and is beginning to operate they would like to adopt it as their own and tell us again that this is another program in which they can do a better administrative job than the Democrats. That is what all of the opposition boils down to.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I, for one, have been exceedingly careful in my remarks here today not to leave the inference that this is a partisan program on either side, and I would appreciate the same handling of the matter.

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman and I make no accusation and point no finger at him, but I think by and large my statement must stand. I have read most carefully the minority views that have been commended to our attention by the minority. If you will read them as carefully as I have you will find there is plenty of criticism, some of it may be justified, as to the operation of this program, but not in a single one of the minority views, and there are three sets of them, do they say they are opposed to the program. Only one of those who signed the minority views, who has thus far spoken, says that she will now oppose the bill.

Let us get this straight: If you want this program to continue, you must pass this bill and authorize additional funds. There are not enough funds in the program as presently authorized to carry this program on. If you think and you are going to try to tell the people back home that you are for this program because it is good, but because it is badly administered you do not want to authorize any more money, then tell them frankly that you are now voting to wind it up. The record indicates beyond any peradventure of doubt that unless we authorize additional funds there can be no more loans and there can be no more grants for any projects beyond those already committed or applied for. All we are seeking by the bill now—not through the Treasury financing method or what some call back-door financing, but through the appropriation method—we seek now to authorize an additional $200 million in loans and an additional $105 million for technical assistance and for grants.

The reason we are going along with the appropriation method is because we feel on this side, as you have indicated on your side, that the program needs a little closer scrutiny. Only when the administration shows that it can use additional money will the Committee on Appropriations allocate and appropriate some more money for the program.

I would like to change the old adage, or plagiarize it and say with all due deference to those who have used the figures, that figures do not lie, but jugglers do figure. I have yet to witness in my service here, as much juggling with figures as we have had here today. One instance I have already pointed out when one of our colleagues yielded to me, that while private industry, as pointed out earlier, does require a capital investment of $20,000 to create one single job, under this program Government money that is being lent is creating an additional job for each $3,000 or less that is lent. Bear in mind in all of these programs and projects that you have referred to, in each instance the locality—I repeat, the locality—must approve and be willing to go along with the project, and it must be part of their plan. This is not an instance where the Federal Government, or the Federal Administrator walks in and says, "We are going to give you industry here whether you like it or not. We are going to put in here this plant, or golf course, or hotel, whether you like it or not."

It is only when the local people indicate they need it and can prove they need it, and more, only when they are willing to back up their judgment with their own hard-earned cash, that this is done.

You have heard a lot about Duluth, Minn., and the $6,100,000 which is being wasted there. Let me tell you how that came into being. Duluth, Minn., by a referendum asked for it and approved and voted for the project, and they backed up their judgment with $3,100,000 of their own hard cash.

And the ARA only loaned them $3 million. I could go on and point to any number of other projects of the same kind.

Our distinguished colleague from Ohio has circulated this very fine tabulation; it is a good tabulation, the figures are accurate. But let us apply them to the practical logic of the situation. According to this, New York State, my home State, has the largest tax burden for Federal taxes of any State in the Union. The computation says it is 13.39 percent. Under this computation the State of New York will contribute to this program, according to these figures, $36 million. That is much more than any other State in the Union.

If we followed this same kind of computation, I and other Members from New York, ought to start crying and saying, "Look, we are paying 13.39 percent of the defense budget; why should we do it? We are paying 13.39 percent of every other budget that contributes to the welfare and the health and education of our country; why should we do it?"

I ask you not to take that view for the same reason that we in New York do not take it. We are not provincial and we ask you not to be provincial.

This is one grand, big, prosperous country. We want to make it more so. We want to root out the areas of depression and the distressed labor areas. We, in New York, are willing to pay the greatest share in order to do that and we ask every other State in the Union to join us in doing its share within its means. It is only in that way that we can succeed and really practice our preachments about this being the great, prosperous, free country that we want it to be and that we ask the rest of the world to look upon as an example to them.

There has been a lot of talk here about hotels and motels, tourism and luxuries, and that this is not the way to get rid of distressed labor areas. In that connection, let me say to you that even the ARA does not pretend to be perfect. They admit that possibly in some of these programs they did go a little too far in trying to help the local community help itself in accordance with what the community said it needed. But so far as the hotels and motels are concerned they have now revised their procedures and I tell you that in accordance with a letter which I will read in a moment, the administration has set new criteria for the granting of applications for hotels and motels and tourism, even when the locality that needs it and indicates they want it and the people by referendum have voted for it—and have indicated the readiness to put in their own money, the applicant will be required to come up with at least 50 percent of the project cost on its own and at the same time indicate that the total cost will create at least one job for every $6,000 of capital investment—I remind you again that private enterprise requires a $20,000 investment to create a single job—unless they can create at least one job for $6,000, there will be no ARA participation.

The letter is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: In response to your request for information relating to applications for ARA financial assistance for tourism projects, I am glad to give you some of our current thinking on how we intend to modify our present procedures in order to bring the Federal investment on tourism projects under ARA to a more acceptable level.

In evaluating section 6 tourism projects, we will consider whether a project is: (1) one which directly contributes to the fundamental restructuring of an area's economy and where tourism had not been important to the area previously, but is now considered to have a high potential for the future; or (2) one which does not meet the above criterion, but which is designed primarily to attract, or provide accommodations for, additional visitors to an area.

If the project contributed directly to restructuring an area's economy into tourism, it would be treated as are all other projects. However, for projects designed largely to provide accommodations for visitors to an area which is already a tourist area, financial assistance would not be provided unless an impartial study indicates a shortage of suitable accommodations in the area and the unavail-

> ability of sufficient private capital to provide such accommodations.
>
> If such a shortage were found and sufficient private capital not available, such projects could be approved but the investment in the project would be limited to 50 percent of the project cost, or a maximum investment of $6,000 per job, whichever is less.
>
> It is felt that this approach to the evaluation of tourism projects will help to maintain a balanced apportionment of investment of the funds authorized for the purpose of stimulating the economies of distressed areas and creating employment opportunities.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> H. W. Williams,
> *Deputy Administrator.*

Despite the fact that this is a new program, despite the fact that it has had less than 2 years in which to operate, I think on the whole they are doing a rather good job and they can continue to do that good job and improve on it and do a better job only if the Members of this House will go along with them and give them the tools with which they can continue to do the work.

This program demands long intensive and careful planning. It cannot operate on a basis of making loans or grants merely for the asking.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, we have concern, I am sure, all of us, for the depressed areas of our country, for the areas where the economy is declining, for these pockets of unemployment. I am sure that we all see and feel that it is truly a Federal responsibility to attempt to do something about these problems. Whether we can do something about them in the long run through a program such as this one certainly remains to be seen. The operation of this program over a period of 2 years certainly has offered little or no evidence of this fact.

I think it might be well to suggest, perhaps, to the Members of this body that Government fiscal policies and Government spending policies and many other aspects of the activities of our National Government have had a good deal to do with this problem. Certainly providing a mere 35,000 jobs has little to do with the problem we are facing of unemployment in this country.

A good deal has been said about this program, but there are a few more things that might be called to your attention before we move on to voting on amendments to this measure.

First of all, we have discussed the question of administration of this program. I think maybe I might add somewhat to the opinion already expressed here that there has indeed been real maladministration. There was a notable lack of clarity on the program, and I thought a notable lack of candor by the Administrator, when he appeared before our committee. I have had personal experience. I have ascertained that the Administration in examining the question of plant capacity in various industries has not only not paid any attention to the industry figures offered to him, but actually turned down such industry figures. I hope the agency is now revising that practice and beginning to take a look at these figures in one particular area, the tissue-production area, where it has been mentioned the operation in this country is at only 85 percent of capacity. I made inquiry about that. The first answer we were given was that this was not a nationwide problem, that it was an area problem. We said, "Give us the area figures. What are you basing your figures on?" We never have had this information. Indeed, the position has been reversed. The Administration has gone back to saying they are considering industrywide figures.

I think the fact that the Administrator of the program has specified that 33 percent of the counties of the United States are depressed areas in these more or less normal times is in itself an indication of a real lack of clarity as to who are really in trouble and in need. Certainly the operation of the program is 2 years old—it was started in May of 1961—indicating that only 22 percent of the appropriated funds for industrial and commercial loans in urban areas have been used.

Only 25 percent of industrial commercial loans in nonurban areas have been used. Only 25 percent of public facility loans authorization has been used. Only 22 percent of public facility grants have been used.

Over in technical assistance funds 80 percent has been used. We are not making any complaint. Of this, a small amount, $4.5 million, I think probably has been put to good purpose.

But I would point this out, however, and I would like to clarify one point I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] just raised—that this program will die unless this bill is passed. This certainly is not true as to the first three classifications.

Present authorizations for this year, taken in that light, would be renewed. They would continue at present rates. They are $100 million in each case.

It is true that the public facility grant program would expire.

The thing I would like to point out to you in this particular bill, however, and an amendment will be offered in this connection later, is that the authorizations which are included in this bill are grossly in excess of the request made by this administration itself to the Committee on Appropriations of this House.

In addition to this, what we find here then is a request for a blank check for the future. The authorizations being asked here are in most of the instances more than double the present appropriations, less than a quarter of which has been used in most categories.

To say that this kind of administration, this kind of program, should get a blank check for the future, on the kind of authorization that is being provided in this present bill, certainly, is a cruel hoax to many depressed areas and is shifting jobs around in this country rather than coming out with some real answer to the unemployment problem that we have and the depressed areas problem that we have. I think we need to take another look at this program. We need to take another look next year under the threat of cutting off funds unless there is some better administration and some more effective proof of the job being done.

There is one other aspect of this program that I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body. That is the provisions relating to civil rights. I would call to your attention again that this program started in May 1961, and I also call your attention to the fact that you have already heard that during the fiscal year 1963 through April, 24 percent of all commercial and industrial loans, both urban and nonurban programs combined, has been used for financing of hotels and motels—transient facilities. It is true, I think, that certainly many areas that are going to be affected here are concerned with civil rights. It is true many of the depressed areas have many Negro citizens whose employment opportunities and whose economic opportunities have been held back in this country. I think we should have concern and, certainly, this program is one that is tied in with trying to improve the economic status of our minority groups in this country. That, I think, is no justification for us to pass and go ahead with a Federal aid financed program to promote facilities that may compound the discrimination in this country. That is what we may be doing if we pass this present bill.

The program, again I remind you, started in May 1961—18 months later the President issued Executive Order 11063 dealing with equal opportunity in housing. I call your attention to that order, issued only in November, as I say, of last year, provided, that in the case of housing and related facilities, various agencies were directed to take all necessary appropriate action to prevent discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin. Following up under that Executive order, the Administrator issued regulations in part 306, of title 13, of the business credit and assistance regulations in which it provided that roughly the same provisions as the President's order should be related to this program. I read in part from those regulations.

The regulations in this part were issued pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 11063 issued by the President under date of November 20, 1962, and were designed to assure compliance with the established policy of the United States that housing and related facilities financed with the assistance under the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act will be made available for use without discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin.

But, I call your attention also to subsection 306.3 of this section which goes on and specifies:

> As used in this part, the term "residential property" means land and buildings currently intended for use as a place of abode or a place of dwelling, including nursing homes, but excluding transient or hotel

facilities or parts thereof which are intended for occupancy for periods of less than thirty days.

In other words, insofar as the transient facilities are concerned they are out from under the provisions of the President's order relating to nondiscrimination and, in effect, by excluding them, we are justifying and backing up the use of public funds, in a large sector where funds are being used, because we have seen the amount of money going into this kind of financing.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in the committee I offered an amendment to try to correct this situation and to specify that the transient facilities should be covered. I had considered offering such an amendment in the words of this language eliminating the exclusion of transient facilities. However, after giving it consideration I have arrived at a contrary opinion and decided I would not introduce such an amendment here today. The reason, the only reason that I am not going to offer it, is because of the civil rights revolution that is in progress in this country today, and I am sure we all recognize it. By not offering the amendment today, I am sure we can all hope we can move toward an affirmative bipartisan approach for equal rights for all our citizens under this measure and all federally financed measures.

Mr. Chairman, the President asked in a speech yesterday for legislation, and presumably later he is coming up with a request for legislation, specifically outlawing discrimination in hotels, for one thing, and many other facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KILBURN. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be noted well that insofar as this program is concerned the President could and should today seek to eliminate discrimination which is financed with public funds. It is time that we moved in this disgraceful situation, and I think that time is overdue, whether by legislation or by Executive order.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for a very fine statement. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio was here in the House when I pointed out that of all industrial loans made in Michigan some 92 percent of them went into motels. I think he can readily understand why we in Michigan would be very much concerned whether or not the President actually had to date issued any Executive order providing for nondiscrimination with reference to occupancy of these facilities or touching on the matter insofar as it pertains to transient facilities.

Do I understand from the gentleman from Ohio that no such Executive order has yet been issued; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The understanding of the gentleman from Michigan is correct.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Do I further understand that the President does have that authority to issue such an order to eliminate discrimination. So that it would pertain, let me say, to the transients who use these particular motels that we are financing under this particular bill?

Mr. TAFT. It is certainly my understanding that the President has such authority. I think it is the very same authority under which he issued Executive Order No. 11063.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to read briefly from a letter I received, dated June 7, from the Acting Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration in which he condemns Executive Order No. 11063 of the President and finds it deficient in this respect. He said, in part:

> We did not broaden our definitions to include transient facilities since we believe the order is expressly directed toward discrimination in residential property which prevents many Americans from obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary homes.

Mr. Chairman, I imply from that statement, and I think the only implication you can give it from that statement, is that there is no directive which covers transient facilities and it requires some further order and action by the President, which he would be authorized to take, in order to do this.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio upon a very constructive statement and a very constructive approach to this problem, and I particularly express appreciation for the gentleman's decision with reference to the amendment on the question of discrimination. I think it indicates a sense of responsibility on the part of the gentleman which demonstrates that the gentleman is a worthy son of a great father.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the gentleman for that decision here today.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the community which I represent derives no direct benefit from this legislation. However, the indirect benefits have been plausible and merit support.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act and the regulations unemployment and labor surplus is measured by so-called labor market areas. The Cleveland labor market area extends over several countries in the northern Ohio area and includes almost 2 million people. Consequently, the highly concentrated unemployment of the central city of Cleveland is mitigated by the higher employment levels of the suburban and outlying areas.

Although Cleveland labor market area unemployment is currently below standards of eligibility provided by this law, unemployment in my district exceeds 12 percent, with over 30,000 unemployed employables.

The unemployment problem of the central portion of my city is paralleled in many other large cities. The industrial upheaval currently underway in our cities is one in which many industries are abandoning plants in the central city with obsolete buildings, obsolete machinery, and an aging work force. New plant locations are established in the outlying areas, leaving behind in the central city abandoned plants and displaced workers.

My district is as much the victim of persistent unemployment as any in this country which is receiving the benefits of this act. The law must be amended to provide for a redefinition of labor market areas to include central cities or portions of central cities as separate labor market areas. Certainly a city in excess of 500,000 people should be considered as a labor market area by itself so that it can qualify for participation in this program if the level of unemployment meets the criteria established by law.

Page 10 of the report sets forth the views of the committee on this problem and includes a request that the Administrator of ARA make a study to determine how the problem of unemployment in central city area can be solved and report back to the Congress.

In view of the committee request, I will not at this time submit an amendment to qualify cities or portions of cities as labor market areas. However, I do not believe I can permit another year to pass without insisting on such an amendment or a revision of the law to qualify central cities of over 500,000 persons or portions of cities to qualify as labor market areas.

I want to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for his full and complete analysis of the purposes and the aspirations of this bill.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, when the 87th Congress considered the entire problem of establishing the Area Redevelopment Authority the Nation was faced with a severe problem in the decline of the industrial life of many of the formerly prosperous industrial areas of the country. To meet this problem the 87th Congress wrote a law. It was a law designed to assist these centers of industrial decline in their efforts to bring back prosperity by assisting in their search for new industries and assisting also in the growth of industries already located there. We are looking at that act 2 years later—considering today an amendment to the Area Redevelopment Act of the 87th Congress.

At the time the law was written, there were just over 141 industrial areas designated as areas of persistent and substantial unemployment. The program was, I believe, a realistic and well-conceived measure which had written into it safeguards to prevent any area from engaging in the business of pirating industries from any other section of the country. I tell you frankly that we in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania looked upon this act with immense hope and with immense faith.

In my own district, one substantial grant was made and two substantial loans were approved in order to improve the facilities of the Trane Co. and the Eureka Printing Co. Both of these companies are strong and growing stronger. The expansion of each of these companies will continue to provide jobs for our community where many jobs are needed.

In the 10th Congressional District we have invested in a self-help program which we think to be noteworthy. We have an industrial park development which we hope may be used to attract new industries into our area to provide sorely needed employment but we are facing the point where it is impossible to obtain the money sufficient to carry out this program without the continued help of the Federal Government. For this reason it is my hope that the Members of this House will accept the recommendations of the majority report and will pass these amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act. I am particularly hopeful that the amendment included in section 3 of this bill which permits local funds invested in a project to be repaid concurrently with the ARA loan at a rate not exceeding the rate of repayment of such loan will be passed. The 10 percent required by law which must be put up by the local community is a very difficult 10 percent to obtain. If this money must be repaid only after the ARA part of the loan is repaid, then we may have the 10-percent local money tied up for as long as 20 or 25 years before any of it is returned to become available for applications for new projects.

It is my hope, therefore, that the House will see fit to pass this particular amendment to the ARA bill.

Much good has come out of the ARA bill over the past 2 years and much criticism has been leveled at that bill—some of it I believe, justly.

There are two inherent problems in this act. One is legislative, one is administrative. The original designated areas have grown in staggering proportions. The original 141 areas have now grown with the addition of 856 rural areas plus 52 Indian reservations. There is no question but that section 5(b) has added immeasurably to the problem of administering this act. This is the legislative problem.

There is also an administrative problem. The minority report points out that loans and grants have been made to businesses which will provide few new jobs and little industrial growth. This is the administrative problem.

But I ask you all to consider today not only the faults but the virtues. This program is conceptually a loan program. As such it represents an opportunity for the Federal Government not only to obtain a return on the money invested in the loan but two other returns as well. If a Federal loan can provide employment for a substantial number of people, then these people are not only removed from the rolls of those obtaining relief but they are placed once more on the rolls of the taxpayers providing fresh revenue for the Federal Government. There is a second bonus which cannot be measured in cash. I have watched, personally, the ravishing effects of unemployment. It eats the spirit. It destroys the home. It undermines the entire social framework of the community. If this act provides employment to give back to men their self-respect as wage earners in their community, then we in Congress can be proud of the people we have saved from social dereliction.

I would point out to all of you that every penny invested by the ARA in my district was specifically aimed at providing new jobs by means of industrial growth. This was the end of the act. It can be achieved. The number of new jobs provided is only a beginning in the program which we must develop but it is a beginning and I do not want to see it come to an end.

Long before the ARA was passed by the 87th Congress we had already developed a plan for self-help. We had, however, exhausted our resources and we knew that we needed help from outside. That help has come to us. It is my belief that our past experience with such operations as the Scranton-Lackawanna Industrial Building Co. and the Lackawanna Industrial Fund Enterprises prepared us to deal with ARA much more quickly than other communities. Now, however, the experience we had has gone to other communities through their work with ARA. I sincerely hope that the future will show a far wiser pattern of planning than the past 2 years have shown. Experience has given all of us new potential. If there are problems in this act, I cannot believe that the solution is to destroy the act. I am convinced that the solution is to cure the evils. I respectfully urge the adoption of H.R. 4996.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, unemployment is the No. 1 domestic economic problem facing our country today. The present rate of unemployment is 5.6 percent—seasonally adjusted it is 5.9 percent—for all of our population and almost double that, or 10.3 percent for the nonwhite population, and for our young people between the ages of 14 and 19 it is 19.1 percent.

Now, we can attack this problem with temporary quickie programs such as extended unemployment compensation and public relief.

These are aspirin tablets which bring fast, fast, fast relief, but do not effect any cure of the underlying disease. The opponents of this bill seem to complain about this program because it does not bring about fast relief. They fail to understand that ARA is not a quickie aspirin tablet, but an attempt to cure economic ills which have been developing in certain areas over many, many years.

Furthermore, the objection that ARA should have accomplished more comes, it seems to me, with ill grace from Members on the other side of the aisle. We could have had 5 years of ARA accomplishment had it not been for the 1958 pocket veto, and 3 years of ARA accomplishment had it not been for the 1960 veto.

This program really began 1½ years ago in the fall of 1961 when the first dime of money was appropriated. Let us look at the record. Of the total industrial loans of some $67.9 million, only 12 percent were affected in the first 9 months after the first dime of appropriation, and 88 percent in the 11 months of this fiscal year. This program, of necessity, got off to a slow start but it is now accelerating and we should permit it to do the job.

ARA had to establish an organization. Each applying local community had to develop an overall economic plan.

Finally each community had to raise at least 10 percent of the dollar amount of every application, and this amount under law could not be repaid until the full Federal amount had been repaid, in some cases for 25 years. Recognizing the deterrent effect of this provision, on February 4, 1963, I introduced H.R. 3332 to permit concurrent repayment of the local contribution with the Federal contribution. I am happy that the substance of this bill was included as part of section 3 of this bill. One of the witnesses from Wisconsin testified before our committee:

> One of the problems in meeting the 10-percent requirement is that, under present law, none of the industrial development funds provided by local residents can be repaid until the entire balance of loans under the Area Redevelopment Act have been paid. This creates some difficulty, inasmuch as individuals tend to look at funds so invested as contributions which many of them feel will not be returned to them in their lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 4996.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I voted for this legislation when it first came before the House in 1958–59, and each time thereafter. I sponsored one of the first area redevelopment bills introduced in this body because I felt in all sincerity that it would assist distressed areas such as many of the communities in my congressional district and help alleviate some of the persistent high unemployment we have had for many years. I regret to report that such has not been the case. I said a few moments ago that I had never observed a Federal program so poorly administered as this one. In my congressional district three small projects have been approved. There are literally dozens and dozens of projects pending where local contributions are available but ARA approval has not been forthcoming. Out of the three projects one has been funded, two have not, and no one can be certain whether they ever will be.

If this program is to help solve the unemployment problem it must be directed toward areas of hard core unemployment such as the area that I represent. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. As has been pointed out here by the distinguished gentleman from my State, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], about 91 percent of the industrial loans in the State have gone into motels. Nobody can quarrel with the motel business. It is very important in Michigan. But the vast majority of that money went to the city of Detroit and vicinity where there already is an oversupply of hotel and motel rooms at the present time. I simply cannot see in what respect this type of assistance will help relieve the unemployment problem or the economy of our State.

The city of Duluth was mentioned here earlier. There was one project in that city costing approximately $6 million. Duluth is a fine city. It is not far from my district. It is represented by my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNICK], a very able Member of this House. But why should $6 million or nearly 33 percent of the entire appropriation for 1 year be spent in one small city, regardless how good the city or how good the people or how good the Congressman who represents that city? It could be merely a coincidence, but the gentleman from Minnesota happens to be the sponsor of the Public Works Acceleration Act being administered by ARA.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] said that the reason Duluth got its money was because the people there were ready to put up their share. I have dozens of projects in my district where municipalities are ready, willing, and able to put up the money; sewer treatment projects, water projects, and such—but they have not been approved.

Is a water project or a sewer project not equally important as far as employment is concerned, with a public building in the city of Duluth, which at $6 million will provide only 22 permanent jobs.

I merely point out these things, Mr. Chairman, because if I vote for this bill today it will be with tongue in cheek and on the basis of a small crumb being better than no bread. The people of my district thought—because I told them—and had every reason to believe that some benefit would accrue to them and to their communities as a result of this act. But they have been bitterly disillusioned and so have I, by the discriminatory treatment which our area has received.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of H.R. 4996, Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963, as amended and recommended for passage by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I am in thorough agreement with the committee that it should not be necessary to go into great detail concerning the need for the type of positive program provided by the Area Redevelopment Act to assist those communities and areas which today contain millions of people suffering from prolonged unemployment and drastically low family incomes. I do not propose to elaborate on this need. The fact that hundreds of areas have remained in a distressed and economically disadvantaged condition while the Nation as a whole has enjoyed prosperity and relative affluence is well known and beyond debate. In enacting the 1961 Area Redevelopment Act, the Congress clearly recognized that the problems of these pockets of distress are in addition to the Nation's current slackened economic growth, and also clearly repudiated the view that the problems of these distressed areas are solely their own private concern.

I want to emphasize briefly today four points:

First, I would emphasize that it was never the contention of the act's sponsors that the area redevelopment program is the sole answer for the hardcore areas of unemployment, underemployment, and low family income—only that it is one of the answers. In the basic provisions of the act, the Congress created a set of tools designed to be an important and effective part of an attack on many fronts on the problems of these depressed areas. It was highly unfortunate, as the committee has stated in its report, that "some of those who had been working for this type of program expected overnight results once the law was passed and the Area Redevelopment Administration was in being." Such expectations were both unrealistic and unfair. These areas did not become distressed in 2 years. They will not recover in 2 years. It is not difficult to understand why and how many of the long-suffering areas developed the wish that some immediate cure-all, some panacea, some new economic wonder drug could be found which would miraculously end the frightful blight of chronic recession. I ask today for a balanced view of the problems with which hundreds of communities are dealing, and of the program which has been developed as one type of attack upon them. To repeat, these problems did not descend upon these communities overnight, and the job of understanding these problems and of harnessing and focussing the necessary local, State, and national resources—both public and private—to the end of reshaping and redirecting outdated economies and developing new and diversified and growing economic bases cannot be accomplished in a short time. The area redevelopment program is just what it was designed to be—just what it ought to be in a free enterprise system; that is, a battery of weapons which communities can use in their long and arduous struggle toward economic recovery and growth.

This statement brings me to a second matter which I want to emphasize and make clear. It is this. Not one single weapon in this arsenal can be forced upon any individual or any community. No borrower can be coerced or forced into applying for or into accepting a commercial or industrial loan; no community can be forced to apply for a loan or grant to construct, expand, or remodel a public facility; no community can be forced to apply for a technical assistance service or for a program to train or retrain its workers. The entire program operates within the framework of an extensive exercise of local home rule responsibilities. In fact, the provisions of the act are such that in order to make use of the tools of recovery which are provided, communities must put forth more initiative and effort, must exercise greater responsibility and control over their economic destiny than ever before. I believe strongly, and shall always so believe, that it is the primary and inescapable responsibility of the people in an area to develop their own resources. This is precisely what the Area Redevelopment Act requires. It is only when and where the abilities and the resources of localities are no longer sufficient to meet their needs that the act provides for certain helpful types of aid, and even then only on the basis of plans drawn up by authorities widely representative of the community and approved by the State.

The third point I would emphasize is that in the less than 2 years of its operation the area redevelopment program has made impressive strides. New ground has been broken. Many areas suffering from severe economic depression have taken their first organized step toward understanding their problems and toward mobilizing to meet these problems and to capture their opportunities. Under the stimulus of the act, more coordinated planning and acting in behalf of economic rehabilitation and growth is taking place in my State than I have ever observed before. Many scores of economically stranded communities across the country have discovered that they have untapped resources which can be developed for a variety of job-creating purposes.

For example, in my district, with the help of ARA loans, we have created new jobs in the making of kitchen cabinets, in the production of various handicraft items out of native materials, in the operation of basic shelter and feeding facilities required in the promotion of tourism, and in the manufacture of electric equipment.

I want to say a special word about one of these projects. An enterprising craftsman in a small village in one of the hardest hit counties in my district started with two employees a few years ago in the business of making quality kitchen cabinets using native materials. In time he built up his production to where he was employing between 30 and 40 workers. With the help of an ARA loan he has now expanded to an employment of around 120 workers, and today he is the largest employer in his local area. His cabinets are sold by the leading hardware concerns throughout the northeast and central sections of the United States. This local boy has shown what local initiative and a timely helping hand can do.

In addition to these new job-creating enterprises, we are also training nurses aids, automobile mechanics, hospital orderlies, bench workers, and machine operators. Also, through ARA technical assistance we are determining the feasibility of establishing new wood products companies, structural clay products plants, and hardwood pulp and paper mills. Slowly the communities not only in my district but throughout the Nation are realizing that industrial diversification is possible, and that if they have any elements of economic strength in their areas, and particularly if they have determination and ingenuity, the kit of tools provided in the area redevelopment program can be importantly useful to them. The guiding principle of ARA constitutes a challenge to and refutation of economic Darwinism—the notion that if an area is in the slumps, it is a result of natural, unchangeable conditions and that it is wasteful and a folly to attempt to reverse the trend toward further economic decline. I submit that my State and my district are now confirming this refutation.

The area redevelopment program has only just begun. In all parts of the country as people have found out that the program is not a miracle drug but is an honest effort to equip them with some valuable tools which they themselves must use, as they have discovered that the program is not an unlimited, irresponsible handout, that it does not supplant local effort or private banking, and that the more the communities themselves do, the better—as people have found out these things, they have set about to use the tools at their disposal under the act. And as they have used these tools, a new spirit of hope and aggressive determination and a new confidence in themselves has come to life among the people at all levels in an ever-growing number of communities.

Finally, I would emphasize that it would be a cruel and tragic disappointment to hundreds of economically depressed communities, which do not have the necessary funds and resources to reshape and revitalize their declining economies, if the scope and effectiveness of the area redevelopment program are now curtailed just at the time when the organized efforts of these communities are beginning to bear fruit. Now is the time for more intensive and extensive effort, not for less.

It is my unqualified contention that the area redevelopment program has demonstrated its importance and effectiveness, and I, therefore, most heartily support the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963, as amended and recommended for passage by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate the patent absurdity of this so-called distressed area program, I shall take no more time than to call your attention to one of the projects approved by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

You will find the various projects listed on page 18 of the committee hearings. Among those listed is a loan-grant of $6.1 million for the construction of a huge auditorium convention-type complex in Duluth. You will also note in the listing that this project will provide only 22 permanent jobs.

It is ridiculous on its face to have the Federal Government making a grant of $3 million and a loan of $3.1 million to any city to create 22 permanent jobs. Granted, some temporary employment will be provided in the construction of the auditorium, but this is supposed to be a rehabilitation program, not a make-work program, as in the instance of the accelerated public works program.

Twenty-two permanent jobs to be created at a cost of $6.1 million. It is absurd. But that is not the whole story. And it is disturbing to me to find that the ARA itself is not telling the Congress the whole story.

I charge the ARA guilty of either deliberate deception of faulty recordkeeping.

While the ARA tells us that in addition to the grant of $3 million, it is making a loan of $3.1 million to Duluth, I learned that on March 18 the city sold a bond issue in that amount at a net interest cost of 2.8969 percent. When I called the ARA a few days ago for information on its alleged loan, I was simply told it was still being negotiated. It is not unreasonable to assume that the ARA is simply padding its figures to try to justify this additional authorization, deliberately covering up its lack of accomplishment with funds already authorized and still available.

If that is not true in fact, then we can only conclude that the Agency is so inefficiently operated that it does not even know that the city of Duluth has obtained the money on the open market.

The city of Duluth is supposed to be a depressed area. And yet the city obviously has excellent credit standing. It was able to raise $3.1 million at a net interest cost of only 2.8969 percent.

This is substantially less than the Federal Government itself can borrow money. On April 9, just 3 weeks after the city of Duluth made its borrowing, the Federal Government offered a $300 million 31-year bond issue. Mark you that this financing cost the Federal Government a net interest cost of 4.0931 percent. As a matter of fact, only yesterday the Federal Government offered 7-year bonds in the amount of $1.250 billion at 4 percent interest. It does not make sense. Why should the Federal Government be granting $3 million and proposing to loan $3.1 million more to the city of Duluth, or any other city, when the city can borrow the money itself at less interest rate than the Federal Government?

There is much more I should like to say about this fatuous program. But need I say more as to its absurdity than the specifics I have just presented? I have nothing against the city of Duluth. I have nothing against their proposed auditorium. But why should the American people as a whole put several million dollars in a project that will create only 22 permanent jobs in a so-called depressed area that itself can borrow a full 1 percent cheaper than the Federal Government?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the Area Redevelopment Act, which President Kennedy signed into law on May 1, 1961, is unique in that it represents a major effort to bring all of the resources of the Federal, State, and local Governments together on the problems of unemployment and underemployment that today affect so many communities and people across the country.

The area redevelopment program is also unique in that it rests entirely on local initiative and the ability of local people, committees, and development groups to band together to solve the problems of unemployment. ARA's function is to assist local and State governments with their job-generating programs.

In 2 years ARA has made available several forms of financial and technical assistance which will help create an estimated 69,000 direct and indirect jobs and to retrain 20,000 unemployed workers with new job skills. These projects represent a total Federal investment of $135 million, most of which is in the form of loans repayable, with interest, to the U.S. Treasury.

For a moment let us look at the kinds of Federal assistance that can be made available under ARA. They include:

Industrial and commercial loans to help new firms establish or existing firms expand. To date, 186 such projects have been approved at a total Federal investment of nearly $68 million to help create more than 20,000 direct and 13,000 indirect jobs.

Loans and grants for such public facilities as water and sewer systems, railroad sidings, and access roads connected with industrial development. More than 100 such projects have been approved by ARA at a total cost of $48.8 million to help create 22,000 direct new jobs.

Technical assistance studies to help areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment review potential human and natural resources that could lead to new or expanding industry and new jobs. One hundred ninety-four such programs at a cost of $6.5 million have been approved, programs that could lead to thousands of new jobs.

Finally, training and subsistence programs to help retrain unemployed workers for new skills in their areas. More than 400 training programs have been approved at a cost of $11 million to help retrain 20,000 unemployed workers.

In my own State of Rhode Island, ARA activity has been very gratifying. More than 2,000 unemployed workers in the Providence-Pawtucket area will benefit from ARA financial assistance projects. In addition, more than 750 unemployed workers will be retrained with new skills as the result of training programs approved thus far in Rhode Island.

And more projects are in the works—projects that will help create thousands of additional jobs.

As I said at the outset, the ARA program is unique and successful. It has to be in a program that has already done so much for so many through local, State, and Federal efforts.

It is with this in mind that I heartily recommend that the House act favorably on the proposed amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the original cosponsors of this area redevelopment legislation. I was for it then, and I have been fighting for it for years. I am still for it today.

Mr. Chairman, I would agree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] in his statement that what we are deciding today is whether we really believe in this program and want to see it continued or whether we want to see it gradually strangled to death.

Mr. Chairman, four of the five counties I had the honor to represent in the last Congress were eligible for this aid. Three counties in my present district have been eligible for it. One of these has just gone off the unemployment list because the situation is improving there, and the situation in some of the other counties that were originally qualified for help has also been improving. Things are looking up a little bit in New York State, Mr. Chairman, and we in New York are grateful for the help that this program has given to us. Now this is a long-range program, as other speakers have already pointed out. It is not a one-shot deal. It is not an overnight program. It is obviously going to take some time to get the program to end unemployment rolling, because these conditions which it is intended to relieve have been festering for years. We have only been in operation for 2 years. It seems to me we have got to give the program a little longer period of time and some assurance of a continuing ability to extend help if we really intend to see this kind of answer to the unemployment problem pay off.

Mr. Chairman, the debate today has largely taken the form of a case-by-case analysis. We are not seeking apparently, to discuss the basic philosophy of this legislation, but rather we are arguing specific cases of specific loans made to specific communities. Well, I do not know anything about other loans that have been made to communities outside of my own congressional district, of course, but I do believe I know something about the loans that have been made in my own congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] a moment ago made reference to a loan made by the ARA in the 35th Congressional District of New York which I have the honor to represent, a district, incidentally, that was formerly represented by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber, in the last Congress.

Well, if the case to which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] referred is going to be any criterion then I know I can demonstrate to the Members of the committee that this area redevelopment program not only should be continued but it ought to be improved and enlarged.

The story that the gentleman from New Jersey told was this: He said that they have, out in Minnesota, a great sugarbeet producing area in the Red River Valley where the people are dying to produce more sugar. And then he said we have in upstate New York another area where from a barren, rock-covered soil rugged individuals are trying desperately to eke a meager living from this very barren soil. And then we are told that while these New Yorkers are trying to make this living, we have the ARA Administration stepping in with $118,000 and paying these New York citizens to try to help them find out how they can grow beets in this impossible soil at the very time that these people back in Minnesota are just dying for a chance to grow more sugarbeets without any tests or any help from ARA.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a very appealing story. The only trouble is that it happens to be 180 degrees wrong in every single respect. In the first place, the request of Cayuga County, N.Y., for a sugarbeet allotment was made under the provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act which had been specifically designed to encourage new areas to get into sugar producing which had not previously been growing sugar.

Mr. Chairman, if the people of Minnesota have any complaint at all, their complaint has to do with the allocation of existing sugar quotas. It obviously does not have any relevance to the provision of the 1962 Sugar Act which is specifically concerned with stimulating the development of sugar production in new areas which had not previously been growing sugar.

Now the second mistake in this story, Mr. Chairman, is that upstate New York, far from being the kind of rock-bound unproductive soil that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] was trying to suggest, is actually one of the greatest farm areas in the country. We probably grow the greatest crop of dry beans in Cayuga County, N.Y. We have a number of other cash crops grown there. We are a great wheat-producing area. And we also have there a great dairy industry which helps to make New York State the second greatest dairy State in the Nation.

And I might add, Mr. Chairman, that we grew sugarbeets some years ago in Cayuga County, and the agricultural experts at Cornell University have told us that the prospects of growing them profitably again this year are excellent indeed.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the third point made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] against the assistance provided by the Area Redevelopment Administration to the Cayuga County sugarbeet project, let me just say this: The whole purpose of the ARA legislation is to help those communities which are trying to help themselves combat the unemployment problem. Here in the city of Auburn, N.Y., and in Cayuga County, a group of local farmers and businessmen, without regard to party, saw their opportunity to take advantage of the provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act, and saw the chance to revive the sugarbeet industry in upstate New York where cash crops could be grown so successfully, and where the sugar crop could be grown in the very backyard of the major users of sugar. They saw a chance once and for all to prove that sugar was not a crop automatically reserved for one particular geographic section of the country, that it could be grown and should be grown in the northeastern section of our country which uses the greatest percentage of sugar and which has already been losing all too many of our jobs and our industry to the southern and western areas of the Nation.

So here we have, Mr. Chairman, a classic example of precisely the kind of thing the Area Redevelopment Act was created to do—help a community that has enough push and initiative and drive to try to develop its own solution to a persistent local unemployment problem. It was to do this job, Mr. Chairman, that the ARA aid was extended to Cayuga County. It was in the form of technical assistance to help the community develop a new productive capacity that would add greatly to the economic health of the community. The development of this capacity was made available, as I have already pointed out, under the provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act, and therefore could in no way under the law have affected adversely any existing sugar industry in the Red River Valley of Minnesota.

So, Mr. Chairman, this little case, which was supposed to show a mistake on the part of ARA, turns out, when you really know the facts, to be a classic example of this Administration doing precisely what Congress expected it to do. It has been helpful to a country that desperately needs help. It could create a new $20 million industry in Cayuga County, that would pay out some $6.5 million to farmers in the county every year, and maintain an annual payroll of some $1 million. What a boon this would be to upstate New York's economy.

So, on the basis of this case, Mr. Chairman, let us vote to continue the program and expand its battle against unemployment in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, some criticism has been made of the fact that a good deal of the money that went from ARA to Michigan was given to build hotels and motels. The true fact is that the city of Detroit has not had a new major hotel in the last 40 years. The few good hotels we do have in the city of Detroit cannot provide adequate rooms for any given convention. It was only because of the additional space that will be provided by the construction of these hotels with additional rooms that our good mayor, assisted by the Governor, was able to invite both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions to Detroit to hold them in the great Convention Hall that has been recently built in our new, magnificent Civic Center.

Mr. Chairman, now the purpose of this ARA bill rejects the view that problems in local areas should be of concern only to the local areas wherein the problem is situated.

When a flood or tornado devastates an area, the entire national community rallies to its support through governmental and private programs. These actions are considered as Americanism and are long established in our history.

Now, what should be of equal importance and ought to be of major importance to all Americans, is the prevalence of serious poverty caused by sustained high unemployment and a lowered economy in any given area, whether it be rural or urban. These conditions of high unemployment and lower economic standards are injurious and costly to our entire national welfare.

Obviously, it is sometimes difficult for private enterprise to cure the situation, and sometimes the cure needs a push through governmental legislation and means.

These areas should not be dependent on temporary solutions, such as extended unemployment compensation and relief through welfare and other social agencies. Most of the people in these areas want industry to grow and for industry and business to provide jobs available to them.

The basic provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act provides a positive program as one solution to these problems. They do not provide the whole answer, but certainly they offer a very important part of the solution to our national problems of unemployment and slackened economic growth. It stresses the firm belief that opportunities for economic progress can be found within the Nation's presently distressed areas and that these opportunities need nourishing by citizens of the local community, with the cooperation of the State and Federal Governments.

It emphasizes the fact that local planning and initiative involving local individuals and organizations which have a stake in more employment and improved business activity can and will produce results.

This act is a tremendous challenge to people in a distressed area.

This act spurs people onward to organize into a self-help group to attempt to better economic conditions in their area.

Now, criticism is made because more has not been accomplished under the program within the 2 years of its existence. One hundred million dollars was authorized for the purpose of issuing industrial loans, but up to date only approximately $22 million has been approved for projects. I will tell you why. That is because the 10 percent contribution of local groups cannot be repaid until after 25 years.

One great improvement can be made in this bill to get even greater results is to allow the 10 percent portion provided by the community organization to be repaid concurrently over the same period as the other loan is repaid, although at no faster rate than the repayment of the loan advanced by the Federal financing segment.

Under the present law, as I have just mentioned, this 10 percent money advanced by the local redevelopment group cannot be repaid until after the Federal loan has been repaid. Sometimes these groups will have to wait as long as 25 years before they have any thought of getting the money back.

This provision has proven to be the real hardship. It has stymied many projects.

Many promising projects have been delayed or never started, because of the inability of the local organization to meet this 10 percent requirement.

Members of the House, why not look upon this bill as rendering aid through legislation to the distressed areas the same as you would quickly provide assistance for any other kind of serious disaster inflated by nature upon any given area.

I sincerely urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we are being asked today to expand and extend not merely a general loan program, but a program which was initiated to achieve a specific result. Congress was told 2 years ago that there existed across the land certain well-defined regions of chronic unemployment. To improve conditions in these areas, the administration suggested that investment capital in the form of loans be provided. The theory was that the increased activity produced by the expenditure made would serve to put people back to work. As we know, Congress obligingly authorized $375 million and created the Area Redevelopment Administration in an effort to transform this theory into a reality.

After 2 years, however, we can question with some basis of experience whether this program is justifying the optimistic hopes of its original supporters. We are faced with the inescapable fact that jobs are created in our system by private investment, initiative, and imagination. Most of the depressed areas remain depressed, and any general material improvement is difficult to find. There have also been notable instances where funds have been dissipated on projects of dubious value.

When examining the program's administration, we find that rather than applying available funds to limited regions as originally contemplated, ARA officials have designated over one-third of the counties in the United States as depressed areas. This has resulted in spreading the funds too thin and has caused some citizens to actively resist being termed "depressed" by requesting that their county be removed from the list. In any event, it is clear that the program has departed widely from its original purpose.

When reviewing the projects thus far approved, instances have been cited where ARA loans have served not to reduce unemployment, but merely transfer it from one place to another. It has been pointed out that a $2 million loan application now pending for a 22-worker soybean processing plant in Maryland would displace 25 feed establishments; that an approved loan has been made for a motel to be built in Detroit where nearly one out of every two existing hotel rooms stands vacant every night; and that in Wisconsin a mill to make household tissues is to be constructed with ARA funds although America's capacity to produce this product exceeds its capacity to consume it by 16 percent. These projects have not resulted in increased employment, but rather in a situation where soybean dealers in Maryland, motel employees in Detroit, and papermill workers everywhere are faithfully paying in their Federal tax money only to have it used to threaten or abolish their jobs.

Even if I felt differently about the merits of the program, Mr. Chairman, and believed that it had been a success, I would still be forced to oppose the increase in authorization on the ground that it is grossly excessive. After 2 years of the program, there is still available an authorization of almost four times what actually has been used, and it appears that only $98.5 million would be needed to fully meet pending appropriation requests for fiscal 1964. Yet we are asked today to grant $455.5 million in new obligational authority. We cannot know where, or even whether, these funds will be used, and the only basis we have for making a judgment is the certainty that similar funds have been unwisely used in the past.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I believe the most prudent course for the Congress to follow now is to deny this huge request for further authorization until it can be demonstrated that the program will be administered in accordance with its original purposes, and until it is clear that a present and urgent need exists for the funds already authorized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation and I rise to salute the Area Redevelopment Administration for the magnificent effort it has presented in carrying out the intent of Congress under this new law. The Administrator and the various personnel are to be commended for their efforts, their consideration, and their production. I include in this the hope of commendation for the personnel in the Atlanta regional office who have consistently, patiently, and courteously assisted my people in every way they could.

We have used the Area Redevelopment Administration's program to put people to work in my district. I do not know how many jobs we have created or assisted in originating, but I do know that today in my district of South Carolina, people are working who would not be working except for this legislation.

In addition to the jobs produced, we have been able, through the use of this legislation, to improve, almost to guarantee, the attractiveness of certain areas of my district for industrial development. Many cities, towns, and communities have been assisted in the establishment of sanitation facilities, facilities for water, and other media of improvement of the standards of living of the community.

This is one of the best programs we have ever had and I hope it will pass and we can continue to build America with the help of the Administrator and the members of his organization.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to focus attention upon a tax loophole which is often used in conjunction with this area redevelopment program to transplant jobs from one area of the country to another and to transfer unemployment in the process.

It will be recalled by some that the very first project approved by the administration under this program involved the establishment of a shirt factory in Gassville, Ark. As I understand it, a grant of $129,000 and a loan of $31,000 were approved under this act to facilitate the operation of a new plant which was constructed with the proceeds of a tax-free $535,000 municipal bond issue.

On an increasing scale, municipalities in about one-third of the States are using public credit to finance the construction of privately operated industrial facilities through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. In the other two-thirds of our States, tax-exempt municipal bonds are available only for public purposes.

The seriousness of this situation was emphasized in my congressional district when the Borg-Warner Corp. in 1961 moved its Norge Division operations at Muskegon—where 1,800 people were employed—to a new plant in Greenwood, near Fort Smith, Ark.

Under enabling legislation enacted in Arkansas in 1958, Greenwood had issued $7.5 million of municipal revenue bonds to finance the constructon of a huge new modern industrial plant. Under present Federal laws, the interest on municipal bonds is exempt from taxation. As a result of this special tax immunity, municipalities are in a position to issue bonds and borrow money at very low interest rates—rates which are generally lower than that available to the Federal Government itself because the interest on Federal bonds is taxable.

Consider for a moment the tempting proposition which Greenwood, Ark., was able to hold out to lure the Norge plant away from the State of Michigan. After using its public credit to borrow $7.5 million at low interest rates, the municipality of Greenwood proceeded to construct a brandnew plant, holding title to the land and building in its name. Under such an arrangement, the plant is then leased by the municipality to the company, which can deduct its rental payments for income tax purposes as a business expense. Of course, the rental payments under such an arrangement can be very reasonable because the land and building are owned by the municipality—are not on the local property tax rolls.

In some cases, the tax-exempt municipal bonds issued under such circumstances are purchased by the company occupying the plant or by its major stockholders. Such an investment is not a bad one because, for a corporation with annual net earnings exceeding $25,000—placing it in the 52 percent bracket—a tax-exempt municipal yield of 3.5 percent is equivalent to a yield of more than 7 percent on a fully taxable investment.

As long as the Federal tax laws remain as they are, it can be expected that more and more States will move to take advantage of this Federal tax loophole. As the practice grows, there will be a greater and greater loss in Federal tax revenue. Frankly, I believe that the doctrine of reciprocal tax immunity, which is enjoyed between the Federal and State Governments, is abused when a municipality uses its public credit for anything other than a public or governmental purpose. I do not believe that the Federal Government should exempt from taxation the interest on municipal bonds which are used to finance a private industrial enterprise for profit.

For that reason, I have sponsored legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses which would discourage the use of municipal bonds for private purposes.

I refer to H.R. 6368 introduced in the 87th Congress and to H.R. 6772 introduced in the 88th Congress.

Unfortunately, the administration has not seen fit to incorporate the principle of my bill in its current tax reform program now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

I have read with great interest a statement concerning H.R. 4996, made before the Committee on Banking and Currency, by Mr. William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO.

In his statement, which begins at page 144 of the printed hearings, Mr. Schnitzler expressed a similar concern regarding the expanding use of this tax loophole to private industry and transplant jobs.

I am glad to find that Mr. Schnitzler and I agree on this point, and I would welcome the support of the AFL–CIO in securing enactment of H.R. 6772.

In the meantime, surely area redevelopment loans and grants should not be approved to assist in the establishment or operation of industrial facilities which are financed with tax-exempt municipal bonds. I regret very much that a provision to that effect is not a part of this legislation. The absence of such a provision is only one of the objections which I have to the pending bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, some of the older Members here appreciate very well that this is not my first appearance in behalf of this bill. I was the original sponsor of this bill 8 years ago, and I have sat here all afternoon, overwhelmed by these Johnny-come-latelys beating their breasts in behalf of distressed economic areas. Well! Well! Well! I have seen three groups of bright young men sit at that table handling this bill with the same disaster they will meet today. And, did you notice the friends this bill has acquired? Well, as has been said, "I can take care of my enemies, but heaven protect me from my friends," certain friends who want a bill today to help distressed economic areas. Did you see the parade? Did you notice their names? Do you know the States and the districts they are from? I do. Do not turn your backs. If you are in favor of this bill, you will get your brains knocked out—these friends of the bill. The old guard dies, but it does not surrender, does it? The dynasts are still here. The Bourbons do not forget, but they never learn anything, Mr. Chairman; they never learn.

Now let me tell you Democrats, you could never have passed this bill without Republican votes. So, laugh out of the other side of your face. This bill passed the Senate first 7 years ago. I brought it here and tried to take the Republican bill of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Dr. Fenton, and asked him if he would take it. And, they would not take it. Mr. Rayburn, God bless his soul, agreed to recognize me by unanimous consent, and they would not take it. It died by a Republican Presidential pocket veto 2 years ago—2 years later he vetoed it. We passed that bill with over 20 Republican votes three times, and we will pass it today with over 20 Republican votes for the fourth time. Now, put that in your pipe and smoke it.

The distinguished Republican Governor of Pennsylvania came down here 2 years ago as a House Member then and made a fine speech in behalf of the present law, and he is mentioned as a Republican candidate for President. This is the kind of legislation we understand in Pennsylvania. My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], his able successor, is for this bill. He is from an area like Scranton, like mine. We are from distressed economic areas. You amateurs do not know. Well, we know. I speak for this bill because in my heart and blood my people know it is good. It works in my district, in the kind of district it was meant to work in.

A dozen men said today that it did not and it could not. They are uninformed or they do not care what they say. The record will speak for itself. Find out from this office. Administering the bill it is a miracle, with what you did with this bill, from what was intended, that the distinguished Administrator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Batt, could make it work as well as it did. It reminds me of the Irishman at Niagara Falls, where he sat watching the magnificence of the falls for hours, and two tourists asked him, "What's the matter with you? Isn't that magnificent? Isn't that wonderful?" And he said, "What in the world is wonderful about that? Where do you think it would run? Up?"

Two years—now you know, this bill has not been operating for 2 years. Why would you say that? Why would you deliberately make a misstatement like that? You know this did not get appropriations for almost 7 months? You know it was 3 months after that. Two years? This bill has been functioning about a good, round, fat year and 2 months, and you know it.

Section 2 of the Area Redevelopment Act says in part, "under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another"—Public Law 87-27, 75 Stat. 48.

Section 6(a) goes further; it says:

> Such financial assistance shall not be extended (1) for working capital, or (2) to assist establishments relocating from one area to another. The limitation set forth in clause (2) shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area or original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations. (Public Law 87-27, 75 Stat. 50.)

This language was written into the act only after the most careful consideration of testimony and evidence presented by leaders in the field of economic development. Interestingly enough, the language was developed as a result of consideration of testimony presented by both proponents and opponents of the legislation.

The hearings on this act are studded with exchanges between committee members and witnesses which indicate that many people believed the language of the original bill was not strong enough.

For example, the language of H.R. 4569 reads, "and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources 'without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States' "—single quotes supplied, as this is the clause that was strengthened. Strangely enough, the final language is nearly identical with that appearing in H.R. 273—the Van Zandt bill—which says: "opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another."

Nearly all witnesses testified that Federal funds should not and must not be used to finance industrial migration. And that was the attitude of both the majority and minority when the bill was finally passed.

The charge has been made that in the administration of the Area Redevelopment Act, the antipirating provisions have been so vigorously applied that viable projects, which would indeed lead to increased employment opportunities in the redevelopment areas of the country, have not been approved or have not been presented to the Area Redevelopment Administration, and will continue to so limit the scope of the program that it cannot make a significant contribution to area redevelopment.

Charges of this nature are belied by an objective appraisal of the current scope of this agency's financial assistance activity. In the northeast portion of the United States alone, the area with which I am most familiar, ARA already has approved 64 projects leading to the creation of nearly 12,000 jobs. The Federal Government's expenditure has amounted to less than $23 million of which nearly $20 million will be repaid to the taxpayers with interest.

This same section of the country has produced 76 additional project proposals which are now under investigation either by ARA or by its delegate agencies and all of those which are approved will be repaid with interest.

All of these projects, approved or under investigation, involve the establishment of a completely new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of an already operating reputable American industry, employment-producing expansions by industries already located in a redevelopment area, and brand new enterprises launched for the first time.

What I am illustrating here is that the antipirating provisions of the act have not deterred communities in my area of the country in their use of the several tools of the act in promoting economic redevelopment and growth. This is true in all parts of the country. ARA has conscientiously, even rigidly, enforced both the letter and the spirit of the antipirating provisions, and yet after less than 2 years projects totaling $395 million, more than the total authorization in the original act, have been approved or are now in various stages of investigation and processing. I submit, therefore, that the antipirating provisions of the act have not created, nor will they create, any lack of productive economic redevelopment business for the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great diligence to the very eloquent oratory that just preceded me, and I will certainly acknowledge the degree of proficiency with which it was rendered, but somehow or other it loses a bit of its color when we recognize that all afternoon we have heard one instance after the other of the failure of this program, if you will, and the number of projects that have been started in respective areas that have been detrimental and that have created problems that are every bit as serious as the ones they were designed to solve.

Let me add one more to those that have been cited this afternoon. I made reference to this before today and a couple of days ago on this floor. It has been referred to previously today. It is no secret to anyone in this House that we do have an agricultural program all throughout the Nation. It is no secret either that any number of hours of debate have been spent in trying to deal with that problem. We were at it not too long ago. Now then when we come along with another proposition which can do nothing but further aggravate that problem, because we are trying to solve an industrial problem at the expense of agriculture, then I think someone has to raise the objection. Why do I say this? I pointed out the other day that in a particular county in New York $118,000 was presently being expended in order to begin an experimental project for the raising of sugarbeets in an area where it must be determined, because it is not known, whether they can raise beets or not. My area has been referred to, and mine is not alone because there are many of these all throughout the United States, where beets can be raised, and it is known now they can be raised on an economical, commercial basis.

Let me say to you I have people in my area in Minnesota, the same is true in North Dakota, South Dakota, in Texas, and in Washington and others, that literally have been told by Government, if you will, for the last 30 years, that you cannot raise beets. Yes, only a select few of them have been told you can raise beets if you like, but there are a good many more that have been told all these years that you cannot raise them. Now we come along with a program that is designed for the purpose of moving the production of those beets into areas that up until this time have shown no interest whatsoever. I say to you we have these areas that have the potential of going into beet production without 1 penny of expense to the Federal Government, and which have the potential of improving the agricultural economy, and the further potential of improving the tax revenues from those areas without any expense, to the Federal Government. But now we are going to deny them that privilege, if you will, by moving that opportunity into other areas at Government expense.

Yes, I wonder how you are going to explain this; when we are spending billions of dollars in order to try to solve an agricultural program. There has not been a better opportunity anywhere—even in recognition of the foreign sugar lobby and all the other things that are involved—nor a greater potential for the solution of the agricultural problem that faces this Nation than to permit the production of sugarbeets in areas where it can be done without a nickel of expenditure by the Federal Government.

Yes, add that if you will to the rest of the objectionable projects that have been presented here this afternoon, to the number of instances that have been recited of how this program has been misadministered in every form and fashion; and you surely have an undesirable program. Oh, it has been said that some of us do not represent these areas. Let me remind the people before me at this moment that, yes, I have got ARA counties in my district, over half of them, if you will. And what kind of combination does this make. You grant certain privileges to half of that area at the expense of the other half, and add a further tax burden to all of them.

And then, in addition to that, you come along with projects such as this sugarbeet project that will be a detriment to the entire area. And whether they are agricultural people or whether they run a small business in one of the many little rural communities such as I have, all of them are bound to be adversely affected by virtue of the continuation of this kind of program.

I want to make this further point. In addition to that, it has been pointed out so eloquently by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] a few moments ago—of how the Federal Government does not have the money to do this with in the first place, and must pay a higher rate of interest than the money could be gotten for by the individual local community. Does this make economic sense to anyone, I ask you? I think the bill very definitely should be defeated.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in less than 5 minutes we shall commence reading the bill for amendment. May I express the hope that this bill pass by a substantial majority. The ARA bill was made law 2 years ago, with 4 years to run. Two of those years have expired. It has only 2 more years. Mr. Bill Batt is one of the finest administrators I have ever known. He is a good, honest, sincere man. He has made every effort to administer this act without regard to politics. He has not done everything all of us want him to do.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILBURN. I do not think that is an accurate statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is my statement. That is what I believe. I do not know of any organization that is better run or more efficient after being organized and in operation for only about 18 months' time. Now is no time to disband this organization. Give it a fair trial. Give it 2 more years. If this bill passes, as we hope it does, that will not mean that the money is available. We have to pass another law, an appropriation bill, each year. The Appropriations Committee will view the operations of the agency each year, and I think we can be sure that that committee will not appropriate too much.

This is not backdoor financing. The fact that we have two laws to pass in order to get this job done gives us more than ample opportunity to make certain that no more money will be appropriated than should be appropriated.

This helps people, poor people, people of low-income groups. It helps small towns, it helps small business. I do not know of any bill that comes before this Congress that gives more direct and indirect aid to the people who need the help most than this bill. I trust and hope you will look with favor upon it.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I should suppose that after a number of years of service in this Congress, there would be few things that could amaze me in the field of bureaucratic blundering. There are times when many of us become weary of calling these inconsistencies to the attention of our people. But in all good conscience I must rise in protest to some of the most unwise lapses of good thinking that have crossed my desk for some time. It concerns a number of instances where the Area Redevelopment Administration has on the one hand failed to accomplish much of consequence and on the other hand has abused its authority by creating more problems than it has solved.

We will be asked to approve today a record appropriation for the future activities of the Area Redevelopment Administration, so it is appropriate that we take a close look at what has happened during the last 2 years. The committee report's minority views graphically illustrate a number of areas where ARA has used unwise judgment.

You will recall from these views that $418,000 was approved this past February 6 to the Tomahawk Paper Co. of Tomahawk, Wis., to establish a papermill to make household tissues. The present capacity of that industry, without a new plant, is in excess of current U.S. consumption by 16 percent. The 73 new jobs claimed for the new plant would simply mean 73 less jobs elsewhere in the industry.

Over $6 million was approved in loans and grants for a convention auditorium in Duluth, Minn., which would provide 22 permanent jobs. That figures out to expenditure of taxpayers' funds of $277,272 per job, which simply cannot be justified.

The minority report on the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963 also shows where a proposed ARA project in Dorchester County, Md., would throw more than 25 fulltime grain dealers and helpers out of work while a new soybean plant would employ only 22 workers.

We note that during the period ARA has been in existence it has actually utilized only 21.6 percent of the authorization it has available for industrial and commercial loans in urban areas, only 20.6 percent of its existing authorization for industrial and commercial loans in nonurban areas, only 25.1 percent of the available authorization for public facility loans and only 22 percent of the grant authorization for public facilities. This is hardly a way to get our unemployed back to work, but then perhaps the glaring errors already noted would be even greater if the program was in full swing. These figures hardly justify an increase in the authorization of $455.5 million for the ARA.

I also note that 80 percent of the annual authorization for technical assistance has been used, which at least is a somewhat higher figure. However, I would like to cite you an example that indicates the least amount of such assistance done by ARA the better.

This is an instance where the Area Redevelopment Administration has entered the sugarbeet growing business in an area of the country where there is no history to substantiate the growing of such a crop. And I gather that if ARA and the Department of Agriculture have their way, a substantial amount of our new domestic beet quota may go to that area instead of to areas across the country that already have ideal soil for the growing of beets.

On March 6 of this year, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced that a $25,000 technical assistance study had been granted to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of establishing a sugarbeet refinery in Cayuga County, N.Y. This study was granted because Cayuga County had been designated as eligible to participate in the area redevelopment program due to substantial and persistent unemployment.

On March 20, also this year, ARA tells us that a $93,000 technical assistance study of the feasibility of growing and processing sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., had been approved. That is a total of $118,000 just to find out whether or not sugarbeets can be grown in an area that ARA has admitted is hilly and rocky. There are even some doubt as to whether harvesting machinery can function properly.

They are growing sugarbeets on a test area covering 250 acres of Cayuga County at this very moment, and a news release circulated in that area states that ARA is supplying the contracting farmers with the necessary seed, is furnishing them with the proper planting and harvesting machinery, and will end up by purchasing the crops from them at prevailing market rates. The same release informs us that the Agriculture Department is reserving a special 50,000-ton sugarbeet allocation for Cayuga County and that ARA is scheduled to underwrite some 65 percent of the cost of the $20 million project. That release says further that the refinery, if finally approved, could not become fully operational until 1966, but that the Department of Agriculture intends to ask Congress to amend last year's law so that, if the tests prove successful, the project can get under way immediately.

Apparently Cayuga County would already have the allocation if it were not for one little technicality; nobody knows yet whether or not the farmers there can raise sugarbeets on questionable soil. But ARA seems to be taking care of that little detail this summer with taxpayer-financed studies.

The point I want to make is that we have dozens of areas across the Nation, with some of the most suitable soils known for the raising of sugarbeets, who have been literally begging for acreage allotments. These areas, too, such as in my own native Red River Valley, have been declared ARA eligible because of persistent unemployment. The Cayuga project, then, is just another attempt to solve a problem in one area while creating new problems for other areas of the country. This is an outright attempt to ignore the known beet-growing areas of the country for an unknown quantity in the dubious name of Area Redevelopment.

The great Red River Valley of Minnesota and the Dakotas, for instance, is not asking for ARA-financed studies. Our people are not asking for anything except permission to grow beets on some of the richest and most productive soil in the world. But this Government does not hear them, because we are so busy spending public funds on make-work projects that may never be feasible.

Mr. Chairman, such projects just do not make economic sense, nor do they alleviate the human suffering for which they are intended. The Federal Government simply pours thousands of dollars into areas that then compete directly with worthwhile, organized local effort elsewhere. The sorry part of this mess is that farmers in known sugarbeet areas are being hurt because of efforts to solve problems elsewhere; problems our farmers had no part in creating.

It is time we called a halt to makework projects that do nothing except waste our money in one section of the country and create new problems elsewhere.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, the Area Redevelopment Act has been in effect since May 1961, and after 2 years of operation, I see that my original misgivings as to its practicality have proven themselves correct. The House committee in charge of the measure itself reports numerous instances of malfeasance and discontent in areas subjected to its ministrations, which must set something of a record for misplaced bureaucracy.

Notwithstanding the glowing reports which we are presently receiving on the status of the country's economy, Federal aid programs have grown by leaps and bounds to the point that they now overlap one another and have even proved to be confusing to the administrators themselves. Local benefits from the Hill-Burton Act—hospital assistance—the public works acceleration program, the Federal interstate highway program, the libraries assistance program, and others, are obvious, but the Area Redevelopment Act has utterly failed in its announced objectives.

Out of the $395 million initially appropriated, less than 25 percent has, to this date, been obligated. Nonetheless, we are today faced with a decision to give this program permanent status, plus an additional $455 million, without having proven its value to the Nation or to halt the unsavory tendency to "pork barrel" spending.

In monitoring the various programs which assist the 28th District, I am unable to find that the Area Redevelopment Act has taken a single worker off the welfare rolls, even though we have three major areas presently qualified for participation. It has, in my opinion, demonstrated itself to be a colossal waste of the taxpayers' money and I cannot, in good conscience, endorse its continuance much less grant it permanent status.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard no justification during this debate for the increased authorization of nearly one-half billion dollars provided in this bill. As pointed out in minority views in the committee report, the record of this program during its 2-year life has not been such as to indicate its effectiveness. Furthermore, the mismanagement has caused in a number of cases the problems in certain distressed areas to be aggravated. An example of this is the building of a new motor hotel in a community which has an existing vacancy rate of 46 percent in its hotels and motels. The overall picture in that area was aggravated by the building of another motel.

Mr. Chairman, as I said during the consideration of the rule, make-work projects have been initiated at a cost to the taxpayer ranging up to $277,000 per job, whereas, according to the Library of Congress the capital investment per production worker in private industry is only $20,000. Of course, the real and important difference is not the difference between $277,000 and $20,000 per job. The real and important difference, to me, is that when Government spends money in an amount in excess of the Federal Government's revenue it has to be borrowed and the amount is added to the national debt with its annual interest charges. On the other hand when private enterprise makes an investment and expands, the costs are not paid for by the taxpayer or charged to the national debt and interest.

Mr. Chairman, the best way to cure unemployment and economic distress, in my opinion, is through stimulating activity and making it worthwhile for private investors to add new machinery and expand business and jobmaking plants. The better way is to create industrial expansion and create business confidence. I feel Government action should produce a climate of prosperity by encouraging profits and giving incentives to investors. This legislation does not encourage new plants or new machinery—this legislation does not offer private investors a reasonable profit without an undue burden of taxes. Investors should feel that the Government will operate in the black and not go into massive spending programs with huge annual deficits and an ever-increasing national debt.

Unemployment and more jobs are a long-term problem. Business confidence and business expansion over a number of years is the answer. This unnecessary and unwise approach in this area redevelopment bill is wrong. Let the Congress hold the line on new spending and let it cut taxes to the extent possible and thereby bring about increased prosperity and more jobs.

Mr. Chairman, there is a cure for unemployment but the record will show that in many cases this redevelopment program has actually produced the opposite results. Under this program the incentive is to "pirate" industries to move them to new areas making unemployment in some areas in order to create jobs in other areas. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I support the provisions contained in this bill, especially those increasing the fund ceilings for the various projects authorized by the Area Redevelopment Act. We started the whole program in a small way, with minimum limits for each project. Nobody knew how it would work. It has been a success. Thousands of enterprises and projects have been initiated in every part of the Nation. An unexpected quantity of local capital has been made available for projects backed by the enterprise of local citizens. Small business has been stimulated, small pockets of unemployment have been reduced significantly. One-industry areas are offered diversified industries, and additional natural resources opened up. The original bill has done exactly what it was intended to do. To stop the whole program now would be to kill a most promising prospect for general economic expansion. The additional money is needed. It will be used to the advantage of the whole country.

As is usually the case, we may be asked where these appropriations are going to stop. It must be remembered that the major items in the program are loans, not grants. They will be repaid like any other business loan. Business loans are customarily available in any quantity when they can be economically justified. But the small businesses helped by ARA loans have little access to the money market. They will be put on their feet only by Government programs such as provided for in the Area Redevelopment Act. As to the grants for public facility projects, such as water and sewer systems, the total involved is small. They are too serviceable to the general public to justify their abandonment.

Another objection to this bill may be that it would affect adversely the operations of the banks and other financial institutions. There are, it is true, unprecedented accumulations of savings at this time. The institutions which invest those savings are regulated by strict laws. The prime objective of savings and loan institutions is limited. Commercial banks are confined to short-term loans, for the most part. In consequence, funds for long-term capital development are in short supply on the money markets. Looking at the situation from a more realistic standpoint, the growth of business enterprises benefits banks and all financial institutions. New and enlarged businesses provide desirable customers for the banks in their normal and legal operations.

If we want economic growth in this country, as we most earnestly do, every consideration urges support of a program which is succeeding.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN]. As the Members of this body know, I am a strong supporter of our Nation's domestic sugarbeet industry, and if New York State or any other area of the Nation proves to be a sugarbeet-growing area, I am all for it. Certainly our entire Nation is grateful and indebted to the sugarbeet industry which lessens our dependence on foreign nations in supplying our domestic sugar requirements. Certainly the domestic sugarbeet industry has served as a brake in the recent crisis in which sugar prices have gotten out of hand. If it had not been for our domestic sugarbeet production, there is no telling where our sugar prices would be today because the speculators would have had a much bigger field day than they did have.

I have no argument with the people of Cayuga County, N.Y., in exploring the feasibility of growing sugarbeets in their area. It is commendable that they are attempting to determine whether they can economically grow beets. What seems so ridiculous to me is that the Department of Agriculture has agreed to withhold sugarbeet tonnage from other new areas in the Nation which have proven they can grow sugarbeets right now and which have requested the opportunity to do so. The gentleman from Minnesota represents such an area and so do I.

As I stated on the floor of the House last May 27, the Department of Agriculture still has not allocated 95,000 tons to new growers as provided in the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. This is enough to build and operate two additional sugar-processing mills in the United States. The Department informs me it has no plans to allocate these 95,000 tons for some time to come and that these two mills cannot be in production until 1966. In this connection I would like to point out that last October, during the Department of Agriculture's sugar allocation hearings, I appeared before the Department in support of a request by the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. for an allocation to produce an additional 32,000 tons at their Moses Lake, Wash., refinery, through an expansion of their existing facilities.

Had this request been granted, Mr. Chairman, the American sugar consumer would not be forced to rely quite so heavily on the current Department of Agriculture press release stating that in recent days the Department had received new assurances from foreign countries that they will fulfill their quota commitment.

The Moses Lake, Wash., area is located in the northern part of the Columbia Basin project, and is particularly adapted to the production of sugarbeets, with one of the highest per acre tonnage productions in the United States at 24.7 tons per acre. And this is a new grower area which makes it fully eligible for tonnage allocation by the Department of Agriculture.

Why should proven areas such as this be denied sugarbeet allocation because an unproven area wants to find out if it can even grow sugarbeets?

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture should delay no longer in allocating the remaining 95,000 tons to new growers as provided in the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. The Department of Agriculture should immediately schedule hearings, and if there are more proven areas which have put together the necessary arrangements to build new sugar refineries or expand existing ones, then the domestic sugar quota should be raised to allow them to do so. If Cayuga County, N.Y., falls into this category sometime in the future, then that is the time they should be considered, and they will have my unqualified support. But they do not have it now because they have not proven their capability.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 4996—the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963. I do so sadly.

For the original purpose of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 was meritorious. Many areas in this country have undergone years of chronic unemployment, low per capita income and sluggish economic growth. At its best an area redevelopment program imaginatively conceived and properly administered can help stimulate overall economic planning in a number of American communities. But this program has utterly failed to get off the ground and is leaving in its wake a shameful record of mismanagement, stodginess and waste.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told today that a vote against this bill is a vote to kill the area redevelopment program. That is patently untrue. The program will survive; it will continue to operate, but hopefully, it will be a sounder program than it has been thus far in its inglorious history.

Apart from bad management, a further authorization is not needed at this time. The ARA program has been in existence for almost 2 years. It has actually utilized only 22 percent of the authorization it has available for industrial loans in urban communities, 21 percent in nonurban, 25 percent for public facilities. With untouched subjects such as education why, then, do we take this up?

Thus far, the area redevelopment program has fallen so far short of the hopes and expectations of its well-wishers that it can serve as a model of ineptitude for all Government programs—a grim reminder for those who proclaimed "give us this program and we will get America moving again."

Thus far this program has been stodgily and inefficiently administered. It is weighed down with cumbersome redtape that makes the customary bureaucratic snarls look like a bed of roses and has been about as imaginative in execution as a Treasury Department form letter.

The program has transplanted unemployment on a grand scale. When an industry has moved from a nonqualifying area into one which is eligible for area redevelopment assistance, it has left behind in the old community a trail of jobless men.

The ARA has used a disproportionate amount of its available funds for hotels and motels. The figures show that it has engendered an astonishingly small number of jobs. In relation to the vast sums already invested it has failed to produce results of any significance.

The program has twisted and distorted the original congressional conception of what constitutes a depressed area. It is loaded with benefits for rural areas despite the fact that its avowed purpose is to concentrate on alleviating chronic unemployment in areas which have lost their industrial base.

The program has perpetuated discriminatory practices in housing which fly in the face of the President's recent Executive order. There can be no justification to perpetuate these disgraceful practices.

Mr. Chairman, the ARA has come before this Congress to seek a very large outlay of additional funds when the record clearly demonstrates that there are more than ample funds available which can carry this program into the 89th Congress without additional congressional authorizations.

Compounding all of the above is the fact that what funds have been dispersed have been spread far too thinly, rather than being pinpointed to need. The funds have not been utilized for intelligent programing and planning. The agency seems so bent on receiving a congressional vote of confidence that it has gone way out of its way to set in motion at least at one project per county in order to maximize political pressure on as many congressional districts as possible.

Some days ago—June 4 to be exact—the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee spread across some 60-odd pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in large freehanded fashion what he referred to "as an inventory of the Area Redevelopment Act." The only trouble with our distinguished colleague's catalog of names and amounts is that it does not justify a single program in any area of the country. It just lists them. One is led to presume that they are self-justifying.

Mr. Chairman, this program which had such a promise has become a shameful delusion. For by holding out hopes for relief and redevelopment for so many and to have achieved such scattered meager results for so few it has created a climate of despair. And it has created what our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], so eloquently pointed out in her minority views—that this program has encouraged the piracy of industries and has transferred jobs to communities having greater eligibility for ARA funds. In other words, at great expense it has shifted unemployment from one area to another.

Mr. Chairman it should be our task today to compel the Area Redevelopment Administration to set its house in order, not to reward it with a bequest of $455.5 million for one of the shabbiest performances by any government agency in recent memory. Granted it has been faced with a difficult task—all the more reason then why it should not sacrifice its goals and purposes for political expediency.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the establishment of this program in the 87th Congress. I preferred the Widnall substitute because it would have focused attention on the areas of greatest need, our urban industrial communities, which have been more deeply affected by the massive technological upheavals of our age. But when it failed, I supported the creation of the area redevelopment program.

I am one who still believes that there is a need for the Federal Government to cooperate with States, localities, and private enterprise in helping to create new job opportunities and to produce a healthier climate for economic growth in areas which have so long known stagnation and despair. Although I am convinced that the ARA has failed to date to accomplish its original mandate it has had one beneficial indirect effect: It has tended to compel communities to work out long-range comprehensive programs for their economic future. But I see no need for the authorization of additional funds. I see no necessity to give a floundering program a congressional pat on the back to the tune of almost one-half billion dollars. This only adds fuel to the argument which is increasingly being voiced in this country—that the Congress has lost its power to initiate.

If we defeat this bill we will serve notice that the ARA should overhaul its operations, invigorate its leadership, and return to its original purpose which was to aid chronically depressed areas which have lost their industrial and economic base.

Here is the opportunity for the Congress to examine and review this program from top to bottom. Let us withhold increasing the funds for this program until it has used a great deal more of the funds it has and has proved itself worthy of a vote of renewed faith and confidence from the American people. Surely it has not earned that confidence to date.

The program can continue without this bill.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that this Congress ought to start doing something new, bold, and different in the area of hard-core unemployment. We should be working on education, vocational training, manpower retraining, school drop-out legislation, equal job opportunity legislation, housing legislation, and other basic measures. Pork barrel approaches are tired. They are the old approaches of the thirties that unimaginative people are trying to apply to the sixties. Oh, sure, the bill will pass, because there is so much money in it for congressional districts. But I think it is sad that this unnecessary measure should occupy so much of our time. It appears obvious that the Congress is so bogged down over its inability to produce education bills, housing legislation, youth bills, that it does this for the sake of motion above. At least Congress appears to be doing something and this day and age appearance seems to be far more important than substance.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have weighed quite heavily my decision with respect to how I might vote on H.R. 4996.

At the outset, when this legislation was originally advanced and advocated, I was one of its principal sponsors, and as a matter of fact, in my early days of service in the House of Representatives, introduced the original bill, setting up this program, which bill had been suggested by the Department of Commerce under the Eisenhower administration. At the time the House discussed the legislation giving birth to the Area Redevelopment Administration in 1961, I spoke in favor of the bill, indicating to the House that I did not believe it could conceivably answer the problems that existed in the depressed areas of the country; that it had been overplayed by all who were interested in it. At that time, I stated that I would support the legislation, even with misgivings, and I felt that the people of my State and States in like economic situations should have the opportunity to taste the benefits, if any, of this bill rather than to have it offered as an answer to their problem for pure political purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have watched the operation of the Area Redevelopment Administration, and I am not at all satisfied with the record that it has established. In the State of West Virginia where coal mining is so important, the ARA has refused to approve any applications for new mining industries even though several opportunities have been presented to it that would have opened new mining operations and provided a substantial number of jobs for the unemployed coal miners in our State. In addition to that, it has given its blessing to the projects on purely a political basis, the Administrator weighing all of his decisions in such a way as to produce the best political good for his party rather than the best economic well-being for the people of my State. He has refused to respond to correspondence; he has been arrogant in his dealings with Members of the Congress, even though these same individuals cast the votes which gave birth to the program that he administers.

Mr. Chairman, the funds of ARA without question were used in every way possible to bring about my defeat in the 1962 election, even to the extent of my opponent being permitted to announce preliminary approval of a project in my district. And when I countered with a preliminary approval of a project in another part of my district, I was greeted with wide denials in the press by ARA that they never did give preliminary approvals of any project. Every attempt was made by this supposedly qualified public servant to embarrass me, as a result of a preliminary approval announcement on the West Virginia forest products application. When confronted with this announcement of mine by the press, a denial by the Administrator that such was not so was forthcoming. All of this occurred 1 week before the general election in 1962. It had been planned for my opponent to announce it 2 days before the election. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that 10 days following the general election, the preliminary announcement of the project which I made, even though denied by the Administrator as never about to occur, was finally given complete approval. To me this is a display of dishonesty that cannot be tolerated. For that reason, together with others, I intend to oppose with my vote H.R. 4996.

Mr. Chairman, I can enumerate many other instances in which those in positions of responsibility in the ARA have forgotten who their friends were and whose votes were responsible for enacting the legislation that gave birth to this program. This I shall burden the record with.

I believe that this program is entirely inadequate to meet the severe economic conditions that exist in my State and States who have a like economic condition. I, therefore, propose an entirely different concept—one in which the areas looking for strong, vibrant industrial organizations to associate themselves in their areas can be assured that they are not fooling with fly-by-night operations or one hot with an idea that has never manufactured a product or produced an item in their lives.

I am suggesting, and will introduce, a legislative proposal granting a rapid tax writeoff to any manufacturing facility that is located by any solvent industrial corporation in America in any one of the depressed States of this country. This will encourage a diversification of an industrial capacity throughout the United States so that we do not have areas of high prosperity and widespread unemployment. This will assure the depressed areas of honest industrial opportunities rather than wasting time with worthless application to a government agency.

Mr. Chairman, substantially what I am suggesting is this—that if GE or any other company desires to expand a facility of theirs and that it intends to expand, not transfer from one area to another, into a depressed State, it be given favorable tax treatment in order to encourage industrial corporations of like substance to locate in the depressed areas of this Nation. To do otherwise is an operation in futility.

We have individuals working for the ARA not capable of judging the true value and worth of an applicant for an ARA loan. We have States that look to this legislation as an answer to their economic problems being flooded by individuals who have only an idea rather than a solid record of producing any product. I would say, Mr. Chairman, this, more than anything else, prompts me to oppose this legislation, because all of our time in West Virginia has been taken with community after community becoming enthusiastic over a project conceived by some inventor, remaining on the drawing board, and having no acceptance productwise throughout the United States. But, it is said, get a depressed State interested and you will get favorable treatment. They will take anything there. Other than the observations I have made about the administering of this program, I suggest this is the wiser course that we can take.

Therefore, today I am hopeful that the House will visit upon ARA a helpful reminder that in all undertakings in this Nation of ours fundamental honesty and courtesy are demanded. I intend to so emphasize with my negative vote on this legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the dollar authorizations for ARA loans and grants contained in H.R. 4996 are needed to carry the program for the next 2 fiscal years. Anything less would introduce a dangerous element of uncertainty into a program basically designed to restore hope and confidence to communities which have suffered from chronic high unemployment.

Area redevelopment is necessarily a long-term undertaking and the original act recognized this by establishing a 4-year life for the program. The dollar amounts authorized in that act have proven to be enough for almost 2 years. The further authorization now requested and demonstrably needed should be enough to carry ARA for the next 2 years.

Any effort to cut the pending authorization to a point which would barely cover the coming fiscal year would mean that this program would have to go over a double hurdle next spring. First, the authorization bill would have to be reported out, get a rule, pass both Houses and become law and then the appropriation would have to be made. It is generally agreed that next year, an election year, we will have a relatively short session. Communities now planning their own economic redevelopment and attempting to expand employment would be confronted with the serious possibility that vital Federal aid would not be available.

The minority report would only allow authorizations sufficient to cover actual commitments in the coming year. This action would place in jeopardy $100 million or more of applications expected to be pending next June, as well as the future applications which can be expected to come in after next June.

The committee amendments to H.R. 4996 place this program on an appropriations basis, thereby assuring annual congressional review and requiring the agency to come back and justify future requests. The full amount of the authorizations in H.R. 4996 is needed, however, to permit freedom of planning and to assure depressed communities that the Congress is genuinely interested in helping them solve their problems.

To continue on a related subject, Mr. Speaker, the grant and loan approved by the Area Redevelopment Administration for the Duluth Arena-Auditorium have recently become the subject of some controversy. It is my conviction that the ARA can be especially proud of this particular project.

In order to clarify the Record on this point, I would like to read, for the interest of my colleagues, a telegram which I received this morning from Lee Vann, executive vice president of the Northeast Minnesota Organization for Economic Education, in support and justification of the arena-auditorium.

Text of Telegram From Lee Vann

The Federal Area Redevelopment Administration can well be proud of its investment in the Duluth Arena-Auditorium. In addition to the 22 full time jobs and the more than 100 part-time jobs which its construction will create, the arena-auditorium will generate substantial employment opportunities and will further the economic development of Duluth and of northeastern Minnesota. NEMO, the Northeast Minnesota Organization for Economic Education, is proud to have suggested this facility and to have recommended its approval by the Duluth voters in the recent bond issue election.

NEMO views the future of the arena-auditorium with great anticipation of the economic growth it will engender, for it is perhaps the most outstanding industry Duluth and northeastern Minnesota could attract based on the natural resources and the convention activity in the city and the area. Federal ARA can be proud of its participation in this important project.

Lee Vann,
Executive Vice President, NEMO, Inc.

On February 5 of this year the citizens of Duluth voted 2-to-1 in approval of the bond issue to finance the city's share of the arena project. Duluthians thereby vigorously demonstrated their desire to improve the economic status of their city; their emphatic acceptance of the fiscal soundness of this ARA proposal; and their willingness to share, insofar as possible, the attendant financial burdens.

In further clarification of the unfortunate misunderstandings on this issue, I would like to read for the House the following statistics which clearly show the need for the arena-auditorium, the immense economic potential which it holds in store for the inland seaport of Duluth as well as for the whole hinterland of northern Minnesota:

Duluth Arena-Auditorium: The Economic Facts

A. Federal participation: (1) Grant, $3 million; (2) loan, $3,100,000.

B. Jobs to be created: (1) Permanent, 22; (2) part-time, 100; total, 122 jobs.

C. Cost to Federal Government of creating jobs: $24,500 per job.

1. The $3.1 million loan will be repaid to the Federal Government at 3¼ percent interest.

2. Computing the cost of creating 122 jobs in relation to the $3 million grant—the cost per job will be $24,500.

3. Cost of creating jobs in private industry is $25,000 per job.

D. On-site construction jobs created: 147.

E. Additional jobs (engineering, materials purchased) will generate additional payroll expenditures of $250,000.

F. Besides jobs created—and even more important—is additional revenue Duluth will receive annually through hotels, restaurants, gasoline stations, wages, tickets, parking, telephones and telegrams, taxis and buses, utilities, taxes.

G. Increased annual convention income to Duluth, $4 million.

H. Duluth visitor and travel industry (1) has prospects of increasing ten-fold in next 40 years; (2) has greater chance of meeting expectation through arena-auditorium; (3) Department of Commerce estimate, visitor revenue increase: (a) from $32 million in 1958; (b) to $300 million in 1998; (4) increasing revenues by same amount through industrial growth would require: (a) 800 plants; (b) employing 100 workers; (c) at annual salary of $4,000.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, I feel most sincerely that, in creating jobs at a cost lower than that of private industry, in opening up vast perspectives for increased economic growth, and in providing a central facility for our rapidly growing tourist industry, the Area Redevelopment Administration in approving the arena-auditorium, has made a significant contribution of fundamental importance to the depressed economy of northeastern Minnesota.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned with pockets of unemployment, I trust that there will be strong bipartisan support for this bill. When unemployment strikes, it does not single out Republicans or Democrats; it hits everybody. We in the Appalachian area are independent and self-reliant people who do not want doles or handouts. We need jobs.

Over the past 2 years, the Area Redevelopment Administration has provided the seed money necessary to get many communities moving off dead center. I have heard it said by some unkind critics that perhaps the ARA itself occasionally gets on dead center. We must appreciate the fact that when we spend the taxpayers' money, it must be spent prudently. I would point out to some of these unkind critics of the administration of ARA that it would be difficult to be any more prudent than ARA has been in the dispensing of all types of funds, in the processing of applications, and in the extreme thoroughness with which reviews are made.

When any part of the Nation is hard hit by unemployment, it cannot fail to affect the entire economy. The State of West Virginia has benefited greatly by the work of the Area Redevelopment Administration in the past 2 years. It has enabled many worthwhile projects to get off the ground, stimulating industrial development, and providing new jobs and new hope. The amendments now being considered are necessary to beef up the ARA up and down the line.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that Members from all sections of the Nation will vote on this bill from the standpoint of the way it will benefit the Nation. In the past, I have personally supported projects which have not directly benefited the State of West Virginia because I honestly believed that they would strengthen our entire Nation. Now, here we have a chance not only to help West Virginia or the Appalachian region or any economically depressed area, but also to contribute to the overall economic strength of the United States of America. This is one of the strongest weapons we have against communism: the strengthening of our economy. We must show the world anew that freedom and democracy can sustain an economy which will provide more jobs than a slave society.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a number of varied comments on the merits and demerits of the ARA program. I think a significant revelation of fact has been made on the floor of this body during the verbal exchange. Very little reference was made to the basic intent of this legislation—the intent being to help areas help themselves. No one can find fault with this principle. However, the derogatory remarks made have been directed primarily to the administration of the program itself, the politics involved, and the tendency to replace or compete with existing business enterprises in given communities. I believe most of the blame for breakdown of this program lies with the politicians themselves.

In my district I have seen potential benefits of the program. I have seen good administration, but I have also seen complications arise as a result of the program. It appears to me the fundamental problem lies not in the principle involved, not with the dedicated public servants involved, but, more specifically, with the fact that duplications with other programs tend to conflict with one another, improper judgment in approving certain loans have resulted in unfair competition to existing businesses, sometimes resulting in a shift of job opportunity and of tax base, rather than creation of new jobs and new tax base as was initially intended.

I supported Mr. Bolton's amendment because I believe it is designed to rectify existing discrepancies and strengthen the opportunity to help those areas actually in need of industrial and economic development.

I supported Mr. Taft's amendment for the same reason. If these amendments do not pass, the program will continue in jeopardy.

The **CHAIRMAN**. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment. Under the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment recommended by the committee and printed in the bill as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. Experience has shown that certain modifications and increased appropriations are necessary to enable the Area Redevelopment Act to achieve more fully the purposes for which it was designed. It is the purpose of this Act to make these changes in order to insure a continuing and effective program of Federal economic assistance to areas distressed by substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: Page 4, immediately after line 22, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The Secretary shall also designate as "redevelopment areas" those areas (including Indian reservations) within the United States having a labor force of under 15,000 which do not meet the requirements of subsection (a) but in which—

" '(1) the approximate rate of unemployment, on the basis of the best available data, is currently 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in this paragraph, and the approximate annual average rate of unemployment, on the basis of the best available data, has been at least—

" '(A) substantially above the national average for the greater part of the preceding four calendar years, or

" '(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

" '(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years, or

" '(2) disaster, or the removal or the closing of a major source of employment has caused an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment to a level which is at least twice the average rate of unemployment in the United States and the Secretary determines that such unemployment would likely continue at a rate of at least twice the average rate of unemployment in the United States for one year or more if assistance under this Act should be withheld.'

Counties or other areas which qualify as 'redevelopment areas' under the preceding provisions of this subsection may be grouped into appropriate redevelopment areas; and the Secretary in his discretion may include in any redevelopment area designated under this subsection contiguous counties or parts thereof in order to form economic development areas. In making determinations under this subsection, the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations."

(b) The first sentence of section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by inserting "having a labor force of 15,000 or more" immediately after "United States."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I made reference earlier. In substance, what it would do is strike the first four criteria for section 5(b) areas as set forth on page 31 of the hearings. It will remove from the bill those areas which are considered to be areas of underemployment and are judged so on the basis of the income criteria.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was originally conceived, it was designed as a rifle to shoot at the areas of chronic, longtime unemployment. Section 5(c) was added—as the gentleman from Pennsylvania intimated although he did not say—in an effort to cover sufficient areas to get support for this legislation. My amendment would remove those areas of underemployment so as to permit the administrator to concentrate on the job which needs doing. There are over 4,000 active projects underway in more than 1,800 counties, or more than 58 percent of the counties in the United States, under the direction of the rural area development program of the Department of Agriculture. There are over 70 services and programs in existence for rural areas, four of which are under ARA. As my letter to each one of you stated, it is not an amendment which is directed as an antirural amendment because after the adoption of the amendment, the rural counties will still outnumber the urban counties by 399 to 142. But this amendment would return to the administrator the tools which he needs, namely, the rifle instead of the rabbit shot to get the job done.

I would say to this House, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania so well put it earlier, unemployment is our No. 1 domestic issue today. Whether we examine the conditions in this country in the fields of civil rights or of middle age or of juvenile delinquency or of the security of a man and his family, from all standpoints the problem of getting our citizens opportunity for gainful employment is one which is with us today and unless present policies are changed will continue to grow in intensity month after month.

Today our latest national figures indicate that the seasonally adjusted jobless rate has risen to 5.9 percent showing that 4,313,000-plus people in this country are without gainful employment. This is higher than it was last month and shows a serious trend when considered in the light of spring employment and in the light of high level of production and total income in our Nation. This is no time for us to scatter the efforts of this program designed to give aid to the areas of unemployment. The condition of some of those to whom we refer in this act as underemployed may be very bad. In fact, it may be tragic although I would remind the House that the net taxable income figures of a farmer do not necessarily reflect his true standard of living. But no matter how bad we consider the conditions faced by those to whom the bill refers as underemployed, it cannot be compared with the tragedy faced by the breadwinner who is unemployed and who is dependent upon relief and who is caught and enmeshed in an area where employment opportunity is and long has been so bad as to remove all hope for opportunity, and all community pride, and much of the ideas and energy of that community, to say nothing of the man concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment so that we can focus the full attention of the administrator of the ARA upon the problem for which this legislation was created; namely, the chronic long-range unemployment which exists in many areas throughout this country, and I will appreciate all the support that my colleagues can give to this amendment.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is a kindhearted and warmhearted gentleman. But it seems that his sympathy goes only to the man in the cities. The gentleman was not present in the committee nor on the floor of this House when this legislation was written into law or else he would remember that this House determined then that it was just as bad to be unemployed or underemployed in the country as it is in a city. Some people in rural areas have never really had a job at all.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seeks by this amendment to gut section 5(b) and thereby eliminate 400 rural counties in America from any consideration in this bill whatsoever. He says that unless a city has a labor force of 15,000 they are not entitled to be considered. I am sure my distinguished friend will give me credit, if credit is due, for standing in the well of this House and supporting as much legislation for the cities of America, large and small, as any man who has been here in 20 years. To have the gentleman come now and say to the people in Arkansas, in Alabama, in Arizona, across the broad West and the South, "we want your support for the problems of the cities of America but we are not willing to give even a small consideration to the people who never had a job in these counties which you seek to cut out," I do not believe is an equitable approach.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. RAINS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman for a correction.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The language of the amendment specifically provides—and it is in there—for a labor force of under 15,000. I took out the first four provisions but left in the last two criteria.

Mr. RAINS. What about the very small places where underemployment is the major problem rather than outright unemployment? You know, out across this broad expanse we love and call our country there are people who never had a job, and that they are entitled to consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I understand how this House of Representatives feels. I do not believe that the Members of this House want to turn their backs on the poor people of America who never had a job.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama that I have the same concern as he does for the people of our rural areas. I also have concern for the great mass of unskilled workers in our metropolitan areas.

Is there a solution to the problem of unemployed labor pockets in metropolitan areas without the necessity of an amendment which the gentleman from Alabama can suggest to the members of the committee?

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman raised that good question in the committee in which he pointed out—and I say this to the Members of the House—that you might have a large city in which a certain section of that city would have a great number of unemployed and would qualify under the criteria of this bill, but because the entire city added up together might not qualify, that that section of the city would not be able to come under this bill. That is not fair.

Mr. Chairman, as I told the distinguished gentleman from California in the committee, we should ask and direct—and I hope by this statement appearing in the Record as legislative history that we can direct the agency to come up with some kind of definite criteria whereby we can be of assistance in reaching those sections of the larger metropolitan areas that qualify; whereas, the overall picture does not.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. The gentleman from Alabama supports my views in this regard entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of Iowa as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Oliver P. Bolton: Insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out 'six per centum' wherever it appears in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof 'two per centum'; and renumber the following paragraphs accordingly."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would do exactly the opposite to what the gentleman from Ohio intends to do. Instead of reducing the number of areas that are eligible, it would increase them.

I think we are all agreed that a child in a family in an area that has 5-percent unemployment can become just as hungry and his hunger pains can hurt just as much as a child in an area where there is 7-percent unemployment. What we need is more jobs in the United States of America.

Instead of trying to pick out some isolated area and saying to an investor, you have to go there to establish your factory, we should let the investor go anywhere there are unemployed looking for a job. What the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would do would be to more severely restrict the freedom of choice that these entrepreneurs now have in deciding where to establish a factory. What investors want to do is to go where there is favorable transportation and other facilities and ingredients available to permit the most efficient production and distribution. This will be the place where the money we appropriate for risk money will provide the most jobs for the least investment. That is what we want, too.

Wherever there are unemployed people we want someone to establish a factory. We will provide some of the risk money provided it will provide more jobs than other applications on file.

I think we are reducing efficiency and unwisely interfering with the normal economic operation when we say that only people in those areas where 6-percent unemployment exists can expect any help under this kind of a program. Most people agree that where there is a 2-percent unemployment, that represents the normal amount that are just changing jobs, just retired or do not seek employment just then. That is the reason for the 2-percent figure in my amendment. The way this bill is written, it makes second-class citizens of the people in those areas where there is unemployment but less than 6-percent unemployment or where the area they live in does not qualify as an eligible area.

This program uses Federal money that belongs to everybody, but only those who happen to be in a county or area where there is 6-percent unemployment or who can qualify under section 5(b) can get the loan. Over the line into the next county, they may not be eligible although they could establish a factory with less investment per person.

I voted for this bill when it came up before. I do not know how I am going to vote today. But I think the gentleman from Ohio is going in the wrong direction in restricting the areas eligible under this bill instead of making it more flexible and giving investors greater choice in the location of their facility.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa wants to help a maximum number of people. He makes a good argument in favor of reducing the figure to 2½ percent, but the same argument he makes with reference to this 2½ percent would be applicable to even 1 percent. I do not think it is possible to have 100 percent full employment. I do not think we ever had it in any country of the world and not in our country. If we go to the 2½ percent, inasmuch as we are in favor of taking care of everyone that we possibly can, it would take in all areas of the country. It would take in all cities; it would take in all rural areas; it would take in the entire Nation.

So, as well-intentioned as the gentleman is, I believe this is too far reaching. It goes too far and would really ruin the object and intention of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the substitute be defeated.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment for this reason: I appreciate the thinking of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], and I can agree with his understanding of the treatment of various counties and of the fact that if you treat one under the bill now and the county next is not an ARA county, it seems unfair. I submit to the gentleman that this is one of the reasons that some of our colleagues in this House have opposed this program. I would suggest to you, however, that if this program is set at a level of 2 percent and 1 percent, where it has almost universal application in the country and where, to use the gentleman's language, we have the Government assuming the just risk, we are now transforming the entire economic system of our country by asking the taxpayers of the country to assume the risk which traditionally in our country has been one absorbed and assumed by the private investor.

I would say to those who wish to defeat this legislation that this is probably one of the ways to do it. By the adoption of this amendment I fear that you will defeat the entire principle and program of ARA, and I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this committee will reject both of these amendments. I hope that it will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bolton] and I hope it will also defeat the substitute offered by my equally good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] because with all respect in the world for the good intentions of both of these gentlemen and with all the respect in the world for the study which they have given this problem, I earnestly feel that the effect of either of these amendments would be destructive to the overall national objectives of this program.

The program was designed at the outset to go into areas where the problems are most acute, and I recognize that there are limitations upon what the Federal Government can do and upon our resources to meet these problems. We have tried in this bill to set these standards at figures which are realistic and did not put too heavy a financial burden on the Government in trying to help out in these areas.

At the time, as the gentleman from Alabama pointed out very eloquently a few minutes ago, it was recognized by the committee and by this body and by the other body that there are problems in rural areas where they do not even have unemployment records that will qualify them under the standard which is imposed for the 5(a) program; that there are problems in those counties that must in all fairness also be dealt with, and these are counties where these retraining programs have been most effective and most appreciated. And, believe me, we are doing a very constructive thing in these rural counties where we take people who are, in many instances, welfare cases today and continuing year in and year out as a permanent load upon the State and local governments, and train those people and equip them to hold jobs. When we tie in, along with the retraining program, which is conceded by the opponents of this program to be working pretty well—when we tie in with that the program of loans and grants to improve public facilities and make available capital to start new industries to produce new jobs, we are making a long-term investment in America today; we are making taxpaying, productive citizens out of the unemployed or underemployed citizens, either way you want to name it, who are a load upon the Treasury today, many of them welfare cases. I think this is one of the soundest long-term programs and investments in the future of America that we have today.

Let us not try to spread it too thin; but, let us not try to restrict it and deny to any of these rural counties and smaller counties that do not have the unemployment statistics that would be essential under the Bolton amendment, the right to be under this program; and let us not try to exclude and keep from the program counties that are today working constructively on it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Would the gentleman agree that under my amendment—even though you would be against it—we would get more jobs for whatever dollars we appropriate?

Mr. EDMONDSON. No, I do not agree to that because I do not think you will be able to meet the problems in as many cases as you are today under the program with the standards we have. I think you spread the applications out numerically and multiply them many times over and you would be so strapped by the limitation of funds that it would be impossible to meet the basic need anywhere.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we should not be in a position where we create second-class citizens in individual congressional districts. I have a very good case in point. Part of my congressional district is eligible under this particular program, and part is not. During the past year Portage County in Wisconsin worked for a number of months to create the atmosphere and the conditions to attract a food processing plant. The concern was all set to come into the county and loan application had been made, and finally ARA decided that they had made a mistake in designating this particular county as a depressed area.

So this particular plant will now be located in another Wisconsin county. The number of jobs that were to be created in the Portage County area were needed and necessary. This plant had to move over across the county line into another section of our State. This community had worked hard and long in order to build up this particular community's application. It had worked to build the atmosphere to attract this particular plant into the area, and if this program has any merit at all we should place it on the basis of whether it creates jobs or does not create jobs for individuals.

If you are going to be in a position where you say there will be too many applications and the administration of this program is not capable enough to make a determination between one application and another on the basis of the number of jobs created, then we might as well do away with the whole program entirely. It seems to me that the gentleman from Iowa has made a real point here and I hope that this House considers this amendment. The basis for determining eligibility in this bill is not fair or proper. I could cite the problem of Adams County and other areas in our State to show how bad the terms of this bill actually are.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Do I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin to say this is a food processing plant?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The owners of the food processing plant, whether or not they did receive Federal aid, should consider themselves very fortunate. Two weeks ago today this House declined to renew the bracero Mexican national program. If Wisconsin wishes to use her braceros like California, this will be the situation. In California a great many farmers are already planning to move their operations to Mexico and there will be many food processing plants, many truckers, and many packinghouse workers who will not have jobs as a result of our action, and I predict this will also be true in Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman from California that I know of his long and sincere interest in the bracero program. His concern is indeed well founded.

The point I want to make here today is that every Member of this Congress is asking for all kinds of headaches by setting up second-class citizens in most of the congressional districts of this Congress. There are 435 districts. Many of these districts are going to have one area that can qualify and one that cannot. It does not seem to me that this kind of a program makes sense.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee. I asked for time during general debate but circumstances were such that I could not be granted time.

There seems to be some duplication of this agency with some other agencies of the Government. I would like to clarify the answers to about three questions at this time.

In instances where the area redevelopment plan for a community involves construction or expansion of a sewage disposal plant, might not that community be eligible for cash grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for which annual appropriations of $90 million, plus some $89 million of accelerated public works funds, are available?

Mr. PATMAN. If it is incidental and necessary to the creation or expansion of some facility, such as a factory, that is to provide new jobs, it would be eligible under ARA.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could not areas eligible for ARA assistance also be eligible for long-term public works loans under the community facilities program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, for which purposes $600 million has been authorized?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. In the Washington Post an article appeared a few days ago which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, page 10093. The article relates that there was a shoe factory to be built in Salem, Ind. The building was to cost $758,000. The largest part of this facility cost was to come from ARA by a loan of $474,300. In addition to this, retraining money to train personnel was granted to the company, totaling $64,000. The only cost to the company was the cost of the equipment to go into this factory.

There are times when I have a little bit of difficulty agreeing with what the Washington Post has to say. In this particular instance they had this to say, and it is significant:

> Although the company seems fully able to finance its own expansion, of which the Salem plant is a part, and to train its own workers, Federal aid is being given the firm because this is apparently the only way most industry can be lured to depressed areas.

I recognize that Salem, Ind., is quite fortunate that through their own initiative they are going to get this plant. The people there have been working quite hard for it, but I raise this question. How can we, under this ARA program, which is supposed to be a redevelopment program, and not a new construction program for new facilities and for new business, justify, as in this case in Salem, the use of Federal tax funds to subsidize an individual firm in a competitive industry, particularly since those tax funds have been supplied, at least in part, by competitors of the firm being subsidized?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a loan, not a grant, and the loan will be repaid with interest. The only reason it could be obtained was that it was for the purpose of giving employment to unemployed people in sufficient number to justify this action.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I, too, was concerned when I read this article. We have had several meetings around the Capitol here to do something to assist the shoe industry of the United States which is being depressed so much by imports from overseas. When I read this article in the June 4 edition of the RECORD I was very much surprised that the Government would lend money now for a new plant in an industry which is already depressed.

Mr. WAGGONNER. As I understand this particular company operates worldwide, is worldwide in scope, and is making a canvas shoe which is made all over the United States. For the very special reason the gentleman has mentioned, that the shoe industry in the United States is in trouble and we are attempting to do something for them, I find it hard to believe that we are helping, but instead further complicating that problem here.

Mr. BATES. This is the Bata Shoe Co. that gave our shoe people such a great problem prior to World War II. Does the gentleman know whether there are any women's and children's shoes, leather shoes, being made by this company, or whether they will be made?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I understand they will all be canvas.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The reason I raise this question, again, is this: This is not just an area redevelopment program, we are using it for other means.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent a city area. My entire congressional district is a redevelopment area. I believe that if we are opposed to depression and the waste of human resources we must think that it is as deplorable in a farmhouse as it is in a tenement. I think the time has come in this body in these very perilous days to forget our sectionalism and to start thinking about what is good for the country as a whole.

We hear a lot of talk about the administration of the ARA. We have in the ARA a very complex piece of legislation that was made even more difficult by amendments added on the floor. I have worked with this ARA. I do not think I can sit by and hear it criticized the way it has been because I think it has been doing a dedicated job under difficult circumstances. But even if you can say that the Administration leaves something to be desired, this certainly is no reason for scrapping the program. You do not scrap a desirable program because you have some misgivings about the way in which it is being administered. You improve the administration.

I do not say the area redevelopment program has solved all the problems in my district. We have many problems. But the people in my district know that the Government cares. The people in my district know that their Representatives in Congress have not turned their backs on them. We have some hope and we have a feeling that perhaps we are getting back on our feet again and improving our situation.

Being from a redevelopment area, especially do I want to thank those people who are not from redevelopment areas, who are from areas of high prosperity, but who are doing the statesmanlike thing and supporting this program, because we are all Americans. We are not farmers, we are not urban people, we are not from depressed districts or prosperous districts, or from the North or from the South. We are Americans. In that spirit I would urge that this very important piece of legislation be continued, be strengthened, and if possible, be expanded.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the substitute and the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we learn from our great theologians that the walls surrounding the ancient city of Jericho were over 30 feet high, 13 feet wide, and some 40 feet apart. They were great structures that looked very strong. But our theologians tell us further that these walls surrounding Jericho came tumbling down. They came tumbling down because they had a faulty foundation. Yes, they came tumbling down because they did not have a firm foundation.

When you see communities throughout America lose 40 to 50 percent of their prewar population, when you see young children grow up, graduate from school, and say goodby to their loved ones and go out to the farflung places of the United States and the world to find employment, then you are seeing a weak and insecure foundation in these local communities. When you lose the youth in a community today, you have lost the heartbeat and leadership of tomorrow.

My good friend from Ohio wants to water this bill down to where it will not be effective for anyone, then you are, in effect, watering down the effectiveness these local and rural communities want and must have if they are to have a firm and strong foundation. America is like a chain, no stronger than its weakest link.

This ARA program is working. A project in my district was first in the Nation to receive a loan under the industrial section. I have before me a Republican newspaper, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I call it to the attention of my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle. I point out the heading "New Hope for Jobless." A $455,000 loan was made to the Technical Tape Co. and the city to remodel a plant in Carbondale, Ill., that is today providing 300 jobs.

Within 1 year "Tech" tape will provide over 600 jobs, and up to 1,500 jobs in the next 2 years for a $455,000 investment on the part of the Federal Government, meaning that the first year's income tax will more than recoup the entire loan plus principal and interest.

I listened with great interest a while ago to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], when he spent a full 5 minutes knocking a project in the State of Minnesota and nothing good to say about the program anywhere, when in the shadow of his own congressional district, his neighbors to the south of him in southern Illinois, have submitted 31 applications that have been approved by the ARA and 7,455 new jobs have been created in his own home State, the State of Illinois, under this program in 1½ years.

I might also point out to my good friend from Illinois that the Illinois legislature has just appropriated for welfare programs, $700 million which is almost double the amount we are authorizing in this bill for the entire Nation—get this—for welfare programs, for the next biennium, $700 million in Illinois alone is going to the jobless, for unemployment compensation, relief aid to dependent children, and other programs. Does it not make much more sense to give these people a pay check instead of a relief check? Does it not make much more sense to help create a job? That is all they are asking in my district. They are merely saying, "Give me the tools with which to help myself."

So I say in all sincerity, to the great minority whip, if he will come down to the southern part of his own State we will show him where this program is working and it has been so attested to by many, including the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a Republican newspaper. Might I also point out to the committee that the hearings on the Senate side shows testimony by the Illinois Board of Economic Development, a State agency, that over 7,000 new jobs have been created in the State of Illinois alone because of ARA projects and the retraining programs. So I say to you today, it is Christian. Christ said, "what ye do for the least of my brethren, ye do for Me." It is a moral obligation that we should support programs in the Congress that will help build a firm foundation in those communities who have had no hope for years. Let us say to them, "Yes, we want to recognize you on at least a small percentage basis compared to what we give to foreign countries."

That is all they are asking today. This program is working. I have living proof that it does work and I will take the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] by the hand, or anyone else who wants to go into my district and show you people today who have hope, who are earning a livelihood because of the heart that this Congress had a year and a half ago when it passed the Area Redevelopment Act. Many persons have asked where we are going to get the money to pay for the ARA program. The answer is simple. You are paying for it now, in the form of relief and handouts. All we want to do is turn bleak relief days into bright paydays. This program will not solve all the problems, but it will go a long way. Let us defeat these crippling amendments and the substitute. Let us pass the bill today by a great majority vote and let us continue to march up the road of progress and prosperity in America and if you do, these unemployed people will say, Thank you for a job well done. If you do not, unfortunate people will suffer and like the great walls of Jericho, their hopes and future will come tumbling down.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton], and against the whole bill.

Mr. Chairman, we just heard a speech here on the floor about how the foundations of the Jericho wall crumbled. Let me say, my colleagues, the foundation under America is crumbling fast today. After 2½ years of this administration, many Members of the opposite party tell us of the deplorable conditions this country is in, and I agree—we are in a heck of a fix, to express it mildly. With a Federal debt of $304 billion-plus today and a planned New Frontier deficit of $12 billion for fiscal year 1964, how can anyone ask that this Congress spend about a half billion dollars for this unnecessary program where there is no city, county or State in this great Union of ours that is not better fixed financially than is the Treasury of the United States of America? Let us do a little sober, deep thinking. We are rapidly going down the road to national bankruptcy and personal bankruptcy comes in its wake. Look at the past history of every nation in this wide world that traveled the full length of the wasteful reckless spending road on which we have been traveling at breakneck speed for more than three decades. And in those nations across the seven seas you will find misery, strife, revolutions, and currency depreciation which means commodity inflation to the end that it takes a handful of their paper bills just to buy a loaf of bread.

Some say it cannot happen here. It is happening here, right now and make no mistake about that. Just open your eyes and take a good look at our fiscal picture and you will see.

Mr. Chairman, we are transferring a freedom-wrecking debt on our children and their children. Oh, what cowards we be, what cowards we of this generation be when we do not pay our own way. Yes, some Members talk about the present prosperity, and in the same breath those same Members of this House have the audacity to stand on the floor and tell how terrible conditions really are, and insist, in effect, that to bolster up our economy we most mortgage to the hilt generations yet unborn. May God help them.

Mr. Chairman, most of the American people want to do the things themselves that should be done that they can do themselves much better than to have some bureaucrat dictating to them how to do it, which is generally no good.

Oh, my friends, let us think deeply for a change, and may God help us to do the right.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has had his say and now I have had mine.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman asked a question and I would like to answer it for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON) there were—ayes 94, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Page 4, after line 22, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) The second sentence of section 6(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out 'or' before '(2)', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', or (3) for the purpose of adding a production facility in an industry operating below normal capacity while meeting existing demand'.

"(b) Section 6(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The limitation set forth in clause (3) shall not apply in any given case if the Secretary, after receiving the views of interested Federal departments and agencies, certifies that the production facility involved is needed for defense mobilization or other national security purposes, or is necessary to supply a regional or local market disadvantaged because of distance from existing production facilities, or fills an unmet need within the industry for an advancement in production technology.' "

And renumber the succeeding sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would prohibit industrial loans under section 6 to add additional plant capacity to any industry which is already operating below normal capacity while meeting existing demand, except when the Secretary certifies new production facilities are needed for defense purposes, to supply regional or local markets, or to introduce a technological advancement.

The purpose of my amendment is to prevent the Federal Government from using taxpayers' money to shift unemployment from one part of the country to another. This is what happens when a loan is granted to build a plant in a depressed area which will make products that can be sold only by preempting the markets of an industry operating below normal capacity.

If new capacity is added, through an ARA loan, to an industry which is already operating below normal capacity, the successful operation of the new plant can mean only one thing: Loss of business to the existing industry and a loss of jobs to the workers in that industry. The new plant, if successful, may create jobs in the depressed area; it will do so, however, only at the expense of existing jobs. My amendment would prohibit such transfer of jobs.

There may be cases where additional plant capacity can be justified in depressed areas even though an industry is generally operating below normal capacity. There may be defense or national security considerations; there may be the need to supply a local market at a disadvantage because of geography, or there may be a need to innovate, or introduce new production techniques or encourage a new process or invention. My amendment permits the Secretary to certify such exceptions and proceed with the loan.

I would warn the House against the kind of bureaucratic tinkering inherent in the present policy of granting industrial loans without consideration of their effect upon existing industry and existing jobs. I deplore, and would hope to find ways to correct, the pockets of industrial distress in our country, but I submit the wrong way to go about it is to spread the distress more evenly. ARA should be engaged in eliminating the existing distressed areas; it should not be permitted to create new ones.

I cite one example, with which I am familiar. ARA has granted a loan for the construction of a new papermill in Tomahawk, Wis. This mill would make tissue paper—towels, napkins, and toilet tissue. Yet, the tissue industry is now operating at only 85 percent of normal capacity and is making all of the towels, napkins, and toilet tissue that aggressive merchandising and marketing can sell. To the extent that the Tomahawk mill can invade that market and take away business from the existing mills, fewer jobs will be required in those mills. I have every sympathy for the unemployed worker in Tomahawk, but I see little net advantage to this country or its economy when the Government makes possible his employment while putting another worker in another location out of work. This will happen if the Tomahawk mill is successful; if it is not, and several Government agencies have questioned the soundness of the project, the result will only be worse distress in Tomahawk.

I believe the additional criteria proposed in this amendment for industrial loans is vitally necessary, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman's amendment spell out who defines what "normal capacity" is?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Secretary would certify that in his judgment it is below the normal capacity.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman means there would be a determination by the Secretary as to what normal capacity is in every industry in the country?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. And in that case he would have to certify that a need exists for the plant and that production is not under capacity.

The new plant, if successful, may create a job in the defense area, yes, but it will do so, however, only at the expense of existing jobs in some other area. My amendment would prohibit the transfer of those kinds of jobs.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the Committee on Banking and Currency spent two weeks in hearings and went into every facet of this legislation. Now, today, the able members of the minority on that committee, who had every opportunity to appear at the hearings, present this amendment on the floor without the committee having had one chance to study it.

In the first place, it is clear and apparent on its face that it is impossible of administration. What is normal capacity? How would it be determined? The shoe industry might be suffering in

New England, but the shoe industry in Nashville, Tenn., might be thriving. What is existing demand? Who knows, and who would determine it? It is totally impossible, the way the amendment is drawn, for the administrator in any instance to determine normal capacity or to determine existing demand. In other words, is it normal capacity just for one mill or is it normal capacity nationwide? If a mill which sells in nationwide business says that we can furnish everybody in this town, would you assume then that it could furnish its product to everybody in the whole United States? In city after city you have one industry competing with another industry. How would this amendment prevent competition? We are assuming that the industry which is being aided would be engaged in interstate commerce, and many of them, I am sure, would be engaged in interstate commerce, but how then can we fail to locate a new industry in a town that might have another mill of the very same type if it is selling in the national market instead of local business? The amendment should have been given to the committee to consider. It is an effort to tie the hands of administrator to where it would be impossible for him to administer the program, and I do not believe the gentleman wants to do that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I will yield now.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman says that we cannot, or that it is impossible to define what is capacity and what is production. We have the Secretary of Commerce almost daily telling us a certain industry is operating at 85 percent of capacity, or 60 percent, or 70 percent of capacity. Those announcements are made constantly. So there is no new concept here at all. They make those findings in the Department now.

Mr. RAINS. I say to the gentleman it changes every day. Today it may be near capacity, whereas tomorrow it may not be. How in the world can you determine it with the long lead necessary to establish an industry, based on an everchanging market? Also I believe data on production as a percent of capacity is not available for many industries.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman can recognize what will happen when you do not have a criterion like this.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the House that just today, here in Washington, I along with several other Members of Congress, met with a large group of engineers from RCA, and this very problem that is covered by the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin was pointed up very dramatically.

We are finding today in the RCA family that work is being shifted from Camden, N.J., to other areas of the country where the labor market is more desirable, where perhaps the wages are less, and we are finding that the contracts originally awarded and intended to be produced at Camden, N.J., are now going to other areas of the country. This has the result that we are making the engineers and other specialists itinerant workers. Now, these engineers who have established their homes and have their children going to school, and who are an important part of the community, must leave their homes and follow the work. What we are doing is creating unemployment in Camden, N.J., and creating employment somewhere else.

May I respectfully point out to this Committee one of the great weaknesses of this bill is that it will encourage the construction of new plants in areas where labor is cheap. You will find, I think, that the urban communities where the plants are perhaps older and where perhaps wages are higher, are going to be hurt.

Here is the problem. When they go out to these other areas you will find while the contract may be cheaper to the Government in the original instance, when the Government gets done supplying housing, and when the Government gets done putting in other facilities, you will find these defense contracts are costing in the final instance a lot more than they would have cost if they had been awarded to those communities where all the facilities were in being. So I would urge the House to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin because I think it has great merit.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. RAINS. It seems to me the gentleman is discussing an issue which was before the committee, rather than this particular amendment, referred to in the committee by people on all sides as being the antipirating amendment. I would like to point out to the gentleman that there is a strict prohibition in this bill against using any of the money involved in this bill for moving a plant from one section or one place to another.

Mr. CAHILL. I recognize that, but I say this bill places a distinct advantage on a factory moving into an area where the labor costs are low. This is not to mean it is in violation of the antipirating provision, but what is to prevent a company that is in being from going into an area that is depressed and where people are willing to work for lower wages, and constructing a plant and then transferring work into that area? How are you going to prevent this from happening under this bill?

Mr. RAINS. I say again to the gentleman that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin did not touch that issue at all, but the antipirating amendment does. But, of course, the gentleman does not want to exclude the right to bring new plants into these depressed areas because that is the primary purpose of the bill, that is, to try to get these plants where there is an excess of unemployment. However, it should not and does not provide for any plant already located in any other place to use any of the benefits under this program to move that plant, or any part thereof, to any other place.

Mr. CAHILL. I respectfully say to the gentleman that it seems to me that the provision in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, in which the Secretary is given the authority and the power to make this certification certainly would be adequate protection. I urge the House to support the amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief. In the first place I certainly agree that this would be an unenforcible provision. In the second place, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is proposing to give to a Federal administrative agency a power and authority that has never been extended even in time of war, to my knowledge, which is to determine not only the normal capacity of every industry in the United States, but also the market requirement for that industry. I have never heard of a proposal from either side to give Federal power along that line in a bill passed by this House.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. A great deal of criticism from the other side of the aisle has been directed toward the administration of this act. I would like to ask the gentleman if this amendment would not make it more difficult to administer and therefore goes contrary to the arguments of those offering that criticism.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it makes it more difficult to administer. And it is particularly curious that this great grant of authority is proposed to be given to a group of administrators who have been subjected to such a great deal of criticism in this debate on the other side of the aisle. It seems to me it is somewhat inconsistent with the vote of no confidence that has been expressed in the administrators of this act. Certainly it is not consistent to broaden substantially the authority of these administrators with the amendment that has been proposed by my friend from Wisconsin.

I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 95, noes 195.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 6(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$100,000,000" wherever it appears in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000,000"; and

(2) by striking out "only after" in subparagraph (9) (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "in no shorter a period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than", and by striking out "has been repaid in full" and inserting in lieu thereof "is being repaid".

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. May I say that I have two other amendments at the desk, and, since they all relate to amounts, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAFT: Page 4, strike out line 25 and all that follows down through page 5, line 2, and insert the following:

"(1) by striking out '$100,000,000' in paragraph (1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof '$107,000,000,' and by striking out '$100,000,000' in paragraph (1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof '$151,000,000'; and".

Page 5, line 10, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$71,000,000".

Page 5, line 13, strike out "$175,000,000" and insert "$110,000,000".

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, the authorization in this bill goes far beyond any appropriation request made to the Appropriations Committee. The purpose of this amendment is to cut back to the amounts requested before the Appropriations Committee, the various authorizations under the individual categories in this bill.

Specifically what this amendment would do under commercial and industrial loans in urban areas is that it would cut back the authorization asked for, which is an increase to $250 million from the present $100 million, to an authorization of $107 million, which is the total asked for for the fiscal year 1964 before the Appropriations Committee.

Similarly, under the "Commercial and industrial loans, nonurban," the $250 million request for authorizations would be cut back to $151 million, the amount requested before the Appropriations Committee.

Under the "Public facility loans," the requested authorization of $150 million would be cut back to $71 million, the total additional appropriation requested before the Appropriations Committee.

Under "Public facility grants," the amount of $175 million requested to be authorized under this bill would be cut back to $77.5 million, the total additional appropriation requested before the Appropriations Committee.

This would have no effect on the provision of the bill relating to technical assistance.

The total effect of these amendments would be to cut back an obligational authority by some $386 million, and to grant additional authorization under the bill as so amended of $69.5 million.

It seems to me on the basis of the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce and the Area Redevelopment Administrator, and the matter presented to the Appropriations Committee, these amendments would be in order.

I believe further that the cuts in these authorizations, cutting back to their requested budgeted amounts for 1964, are justified and have been justified here today by the many illustrations that have been given of the poor administration of this program and the serious questions that have been raised as to whether or not it will meet the real purposes for which this act is designed.

I request your support for this amendment.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, I should like to point out this amendment was presented in the committee and I believe it was defeated on a rollcall vote by 17 to 8. Actually, this amendment is truly the meat in the coconut. It is aimed at the heart of the program, particularly the rural and small town aspect of the program. What I had to say a moment ago in the argument against the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] is applicable to this particular amendment. The gentleman's amendment would reduce the public facility grant authorization by 65 percent. These grants have been used almost exclusively in small towns, as the larger communities already have adequate facilities. The gentleman's amendment would, in addition, entirely eliminate the new authorization for public facility loans and cut 29 percent of the existing public facility loan authorizations. The reason that the existing authorization has not been fully used up is that in the larger cities, they do not need this program as much. They can borrow money cheaper in the private money market and the smaller communities are slower in getting started. They do not have the expert professional planners and engineers and technicians to get the program underway. The community facilities loan program has always been a smalltown program and it has been in existence for many, many years, long before ARA. It is of no interest to the larger cities with triple A and double A credit ratings. This is a program that is particularly close to the heart of every man who represents a district in which there are small cities and towns. It is a program that brings the water and sewer facilities to the small cities and towns of America.

Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment discriminates against the smaller towns in the South and in the West. The ARA program is designed to help areas with severe unemployment regardless of size. The gentleman's amendment would destroy this noble objective and make it only a big city bill and as such it could not command the votes of people from the rural and small town areas of this country and would kill the bill as dead as the dodo. It is an easy way of trying to get the bill's heart cut out so that it would be of no help to the people at all.

So I urge the Members of the House not to vote for this because this cuts the heart out of the public facilities program. This has been a real good program put out by the Congress and has an operation in almost every congressional district in the country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. I would ask the gentleman first to reflect on the fact that while I am from the city of Cincinnati, I represent all of the small towns and districts and counties in the entire State of Ohio and in the position that I have taken on this bill, I am interested in all the small towns and districts in the State of Ohio.

Mr. RAINS. I represent all the cities and small towns in the State of Alabama too.

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Is it not true that the authorizations which this amendment would authorize would meet all of the need as described in the testimony given by the Secretary of Commerce as it was presented before the Committee on Banking and Currency for the fiscal year 1964?

Mr. RAINS. To those presently pending—yes. But, the gentleman forgets that they must have a long leadtime on the contracts made under this program. For instance, it is on a parallel with the urban renewal program. You cannot cut off an urban renewal program by the end of any given year because of the long leadtime necessary to get these projects underway. A small town does not have the professional technicians and it does not have the engineers and the people to prepare and do all the work that is necessary in connection with the project and, therefore, it needs time to keep the program going and we need this authorization to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the three amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAFT) there were—ayes 119, noes 163.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read—the remainder of the bill—and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PATMAN. And I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman that we vote at a certain time, say, at 5 minutes after 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] makes two unanimous-consent requests; one, that the bill be considered as read, and that we vote at what time?

Mr. PATMAN. Five minutes after six, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes after six?

Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 7(c) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

SEC. 5. Section 8(d) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out "$75,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$175,000,000, to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation Acts,".

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 9 of the Area Redevelopment Act is repealed.

(b) Subsection (b) of section 9 of such Act is redesignated as subsection (a), and the first sentence of such subsection as so redesignated is amended to read as follows: "There shall be in the Treasury of the United States an area redevelopment fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') which shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 6 and 7 and for repayment of all obligations and expenditures arising therefrom."

(c) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 9 of such Act are redesignated as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(d) Section 6(b)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out "paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9(a) of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "currently in effect under the next to last sentence of section 23".

(e) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 9(a) of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "currently in effect under the last sentence of section 23".

SEC. 7. Section 11 of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$4,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000"; and

(2) by inserting before the last sentence the following: "The Secretary, in his discretion, may require repayment of the assistance provided under this section and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment. Receipts from such repayments shall be credited to the appropriation available for assistance under this section which is current at the time of repayment."

SEC. 8. Section 12(10) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out "(not in excess of six months) service" and "allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses", and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "(not in excess of one year) or intermittent services" and "paid actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended from time to time".

SEC. 9. The first sentence of section 21 of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out "and undertaken by public applicants".

SEC. 10. Section 23 of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and when so specified in appropriations Acts such sums shall remain available until expended. Funds appropriated for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 6 and 7 shall be deposited in the area redevelopment fund in the Treasury of the United States. The fund shall pay into the general fund of the Treasury, at least annually, interest on the net amount of the capital so deposited which is used for such assistance, computed in such manner and at such rate as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with this section. The rate for capital used under section 6 shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the time when the money is used. The rate for capital used under section 7 shall not be more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 5, line 18, beginning with the words "and the first sentence of such subsection as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:"

Mr. Chairman, I call the particular attention of the Chair to the language in line 20 which reads as follows:

> There shall be in the Treasury of the United States an area redevelopment fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 6 and 7 and for the repayment of all obligations and expenditures arising therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this constitutes, in fact, an appropriation in a legislative bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this just merely restates existing law. It just creates a fund which already exists, really, and the fund will be supplemented by the amount appropriated through regular channels.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] concluded his presentation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman; it is already in existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not additional appropriations are required for this fund?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; they are required.

The CHAIRMAN. They are required?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; section 10 says:

> Funds appropriated for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 6 and 7 shall be deposited in the Area Redevelopment Fund in the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KARSTEN). Additional legislation would be necessary to appropriate funds. The Chair holds this is an authorization and overrules the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language found on page 6 of the bill, line 23, which reads as follows:

> Receipts from such repayments shall be credited to the appropriation available for assistance under this section which is current at the time of repayment.

I again make the point of order that this constitutes in fact an appropriation in a legislative act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this concerns repayment and disposal of it after it has been repaid from which it was originally appropriated. I do not believe the gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire whether these funds can be reused?

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure they have to be reappropriated. The funds received cannot be reused, they have to be reappropriated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KARSTEN). Relying upon that assurance, the Chair overrules the point of order because additional legislation would be necessary.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee which brings this bill to the floor of the House for the consideration given to several problems relating to my district in the matter of Cuban refugees. There are some 200,000 who have come into this country; 150,000 have not been resettled out of the area I represent, and this constitutes a difficult problem in the employment market. Our area had unemployment problems of its own prior to the arrival of the Cuban refugees. Everyone can readily appreciate that the influx of 150,000 people creates quite an additional employment problem. The unemployment rate now is around 10 percent, having climbed from about 6 percent.

My bill, H.R. 4848, was submitted to the committee on the matter. The committee considered it and found there was sufficient authorization under existing law to deal with this problem. I respect this judgment. Page 11 of the committee report states the committee's interpretation that there is sufficient authority in present law. I express my appreciation to the committee for dealing with this subject in the committee report.

I would like to ask the chairman of the full committee if my understanding is correct that it is the committee's opinion that there is sufficient authority under existing law for the Secretary to make a determination to designate Dade County, Fla., eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act because of severe and substantial unemployment caused by the settlement of 150,000 Cuban refugees in this area?

Mr. PATMAN. The answer is "Yes." We are sympathetic with the gentleman's problem.

Mr. FASCELL. May I ask another question? I understand there will be a full statement of the position of the committee made a part of the legislative history today?

Mr. PATMAN. In the event the bill passes, and it passes the Senate in a different form, and there is a conference, there will be a report of the conferees. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. In my remarks I made today I will put in further information.

Mr. FASCELL. That is what I had reference to. The gentleman's remarks will cover the legislative history on the question I asked clearly reflecting congressional intent that the Secretary has the authority and should be sympathetic to our problem in the Third and Fourth Congressional Districts of Florida.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is correct.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and his colleague from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] who both represent Dade County proposed an amendment to this bill which would require that Dade County be designated an area eligible for financing of part of this project and other projects under the area redevelopment program because the situation there arises from the national policy of accepting Cuban refugees on our shores. The committee rejected this amendment but it made clear in doing so that it was not rejecting Dade County or the projects contemplated there to relieve economic distress. To the contrary, the position of the committee was that the Secretary of Commerce already has discretionary authority under the act to deal with this situation. The committee report took note that in the committee's deliberations on the Area Redevelopment Act when it was first passed, the committee incorporated language requiring that the Secretary, in the exercise of this discretion, should designate areas which may not come within the strict confines of the rigid formula prescribed in the act. For this reason, it did not appear to the committee that further amendment was necessary. Nevertheless, as the committee stated in its report, the situation in Dade County "represents a national responsibility."

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Lipscomb: On page 5, after line 7, insert the following:

"(3) by adding a new subparagraph as follows:

"'(11) No such assistance shall be extended to enable any foreign concern to establish plants or facilities, or establish or expand branch plants or facilities, in the United States.'"

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, during recent hearings before the Subcommittee of Appropriations on Departments of State, Justice, the Judiciary, and Commerce, it was disclosed that the ARA has set up a program to encourage foreign firms to establish branches in the United States. Under this program U.S. taxpayers' money can be and is used to give financial assistance to these foreign firms. The ARA proposes to make loans up to 65 percent of the total aggregate cost for a 25-year period at 4-percent interest. There is no express authority in the law for ARA to do this.

Last year, in August, ARA sent a representative over to Western Europe to encourage foreign firms to come over to this country and establish their branches or their establishments and qualify for ARA assistance. I inquired by letter of ARA on October 6, 1962, as to what authority these firms had to borrow money under the Area Redevelopment Act. This is a portion of their reply to me in a letter dated October 30:

> This is in reply to your letter of October 6, 1962, requesting information as to the authority under the Area Redevelopment Act to expend public funds for assistance to European firms.
>
> The act neither explicitly or implicitly prohibits rendering financial assistance to foreign firms. It is generally recognized that, in the absence of an express or implied prohibition, a statute should be so interpreted as to accomplish its objectives in the most effective manner.

This amendment just makes clear that U.S. taxpayers' money should not be used for financial assistance to foreign firms. Firms which would compete with U.S. firms and at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Lipscomb) there were—ayes 123, noes 163.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Lipscomb and Mr. Patman.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 159, noes 154.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that under the unanimous-consent agreement all time has expired. There is still one amendment pending at the Clerk's desk, which he will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Waggonner: Page 7, after line 9, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Sec. 9. Section 12(12) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended to read as follows: '(12) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act; Provided, However, that notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, no rules or regulation shall be made by the Secretary or any of his deputies in the absence of further legislation by the Congress, to require that facilities constructed under the provisions of this Act be made available for use without discrimination based on race, color, creed or national origin.'"

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this bill; it is not within the scope of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as on Friday, Jan. 4, 1963, Mr. Batt, the Administrator of the ARA, by Executive order——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is on the point of order, I assume?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Louisiana on the point of order rather than the amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as on Friday, Jan. 4, 1963, Mr. Batt, the Administrator of the ARA, by Executive order, did amend the regulations which govern this act, I think this amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

This amendment would give the Secretary the power to establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Waggonner) there were ayes 122, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Karsten, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration for bill R.H. 4996, to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, pursuant to House Resolution 361, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KILBURN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kilburn moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4996 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 209, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—204

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Ichord

Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Price
Pucinski
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Secrest
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—209

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—18

Ayres
Baring
Brown, Ohio
Collier
Conte
Davis, Tenn.
Forrester
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Scott
Shipley
Wallhauser
Wyman

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Wallhauser against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Conte against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Baring with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. STEED changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BURTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] who is in the hospital. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today have permission to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who did not speak on the bill have permission to extend their remarks in the Record on the area redevelopment amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GRASSROOTS OPINION ON CUBA

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter not to exceed one page.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include herewith an editorial from one of my district's outstanding weekly newspapers, the Manhasset Mail, as it appeared in the issue of June 6, 1963.

There is no doubt that not only the people in my congressional district but the overwhelming majority of the American people resent the status quo on Cuba and realize the Communist danger far more than does the President of the United States:

Grassroots Opinion on Cuba

When Congressman Steven Derounian told a Memorial Day audience that America was in grave danger because of the Soviet buildup in Cuba, he wasn't making a political speech, for his warning was based on the alarming reports of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi, and staffed by a bipartisan group of Senators including Stuart Symington, Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Strom Thurmond, South Carolina; Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; Margaret Chase Smith, Maine; and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

We do not have space here to quote the 34-page report in full, but after having read the report, we are in full agreement with Congressman Derounian that America is in great danger. Not only are we in great danger now, but the danger will grow greater as time goes on and as long as Soviet soldiers and weapons remain in Cuba. Before you read further, look at the map, right, and note the strategic importance of Cuba as it straddles the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico.

How many Russians are in Cuba now? The Stennis report says that some sources, primarily exile and refugee groups, estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba. The subcommittee is of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure.

Have all Soviet missiles been withdrawn from Cuba? The report says that refugee and exile reports continue to insist that thousands of caves and underground caverns in Cuba are being utilized to store and conceal strategic missiles and weapons.

Note the reference to "refugee and exile reports."

The failure of American intelligence to conclude that strategic missiles had been introduced into Cuba, prior to the receipt of photographic evidence on October 14, says the report, "was due to the fact that the intelligence analysts were strongly influenced by their judgment as to Soviet policy, and indications that strategic missiles were being installed were not given proper weight by the intelligence community."

Then the report continues: "A contributing factor to this was the tendency on the part of the intelligence people to discredit and downgrade the reports of Cuban refugees and exiles."

Today, Cuban exiles and refugees insist that Cuba is reinforcing caverns, storing weapons in them, and that the Soviets are building a large submarine base in Cuba. There are also reports that Soviet ships are unloading cargo and men at night under conditions of Soviet-imposed security. Further, the Stennis report says "the intelligence community does not believe it has sufficient concrete evidence to estimate any reduction in overall Soviet military capability on the island. There is no evidence that any of the combat troops associated with the four armored groups have been withdrawn."

Far more significant than any comment which we can make is the summary of the subcommittee's report, which follows:

1. Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary and agitational

activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.

2. Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.

3. Cuba serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R.

4. The potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba.

5. The vital Panama Canal could be the target for sneak raids originating from Cuba.

6. Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

7. Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union.

8. Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort.

9. The continued presence of the Soviets in Cuba could require a further reorientation of the U.S. air defenses.

10. Cuba provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

11. The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

"A consideration of all these matters serves to emphasize the gravity of the threat to our national security which Cuba now represents," the report concludes.

The Soviets are in Cuba to stay, and the chance for internal revolt and the overthrow of the Communist regime is virtually nil, according to those who should know. Had the Bay of Pigs invasion been carried out with sufficient force and air power, the threat of Cuba to our security might not exist today; but exist it does, and it will not go away by wishing it away. The Cuban people are not going to overthrow their Communist regime for the simple reason that they are virtually powerless to do so. Therefore, some other action is necessary.

What is to be done?

We hold that the only way to get rid of Castro and communism in Cuba is to throw them out. We are not qualified to say how this can be accomplished, but it has to be done and done soon, or we will find ourselves embroiled in another full-scale war. Should we take action against Cuba, Khrushchev may fight right now, to the last Cuban, but it is doubtful that he will make war on the United States until he thinks he can win; and if his buildup in Cuba and South America is permitted to continue unchecked, then he will be in a strong position, and our position will be vulnerable. The Soviets will make war on us as soon as they are sure they can win. We cannot and must not give them that opportunity.

The time for action is now. The Soviets should be given a time limit to get their men and weapons out of Cuba; a real blockade, with teeth in it, should be set up, and every possible economic sanction should be imposed upon Cuba.

Threats mean nothing to the Soviets. They fear and respect strength and power. We've got both. Let's use them before it's too late.

REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this memorandum is submitted in support of a bill I introduced today—H.R. 6995—an amendment to subchapter M of the code, so as to permit regulated investment companies 45 days, instead of 30 days, after the close of their taxable years to mail to their stockholders the various designations required under subchapter M. The request is prompted by the Securities and Exchange Commission's recent change in its rules to grant these companies 45 days, instead of 30 as previously, for mailing to shareholders their annual reports and financial statements.

Regulated investment companies serve principally to enable investors of moderate means to secure diversification of risk and experienced professional counsel in managing their investments—see Senate Report No. 1021, 86th Congress, 2d session, 1960; House of Representatives Report No. 1080, 86th Congress, 1st session, 1959. A survey conducted by the Investment Company Institute in 1961 and 1962 among the approximately 3 million shareholders of its member companies—the institute's members include 169 regulated investment companies of the open end type, whose assets comprise an estimated 94 percent of the assets of all such companies taxable under subchapter M; it is believed that its members hold over 80 percent of the assets of all regulated investment companies, both open end and closed end, affected by the amendments proposed herein—showed that the median shareholder had a family income of approximately $8,500, while the value of his mutual fund holdings was about $5,000.

Subchapter M provides a special system of taxation for regulated investment companies and their shareholders. Its essential feature is that the company must distribute currently at least 90 percent of its ordinary income, exclusive of capital gains. If it does the amounts distributed, as well as any amounts it distributes out of its realized capital gains, may be deducted in computing the company's taxable income. The shareholder in turn is entitled to treat distributions out of realized capital gains as long-term capital gain on his own return.

As part of this system subchapter M requires the company each year to send a series of notices to its shareholders. These designations indicate the pro rata shares of the various items of corporate income and credit the shareholders are to take into account directly, on their own returns, and conclusively establish the amounts of these items for purposes of the shareholders' tax liability. The code now provides that all of these designations must be mailed within 30 days after the close of the company's taxable year—See sections 852(b)(3)(C), distributed capital gains; 852(b)(3)(D)(i), undistributed capital gains; 853(c), credit for foreign taxes; 854(b)(2), income dividends eligible for credit, exclusion and deduction; 855(c), notice for dividends declared and paid after close of taxable year.

This 30-day time limit for mailing designations was initially adopted in 1942—Revenue Act of 1942, section 170(a). At that time it conformed with the rule the Securities and Exchange Commission had previously adopted, under the Investment Company Act of 1940, requiring a regulated investment company to mail its annual report and financial statements to its shareholders within 30 days after the close of its fiscal year—Rule 30d-1, as adopted in Investment Company Act Release No. 40, effective January 2, 1941, 6 Federal Register 74, 1941. Combining the tax designations and annual reports in a single mailing makes possible obvious savings in mailing expense and paperwork, as well as affording the shareholders the convenience of receiving all of their information at one time. Many regulated investment companies have taken advantage of this possibility; some have even included their income tax designations in the text of their annual reports, as illustrated by the reports attached as exhibits to this memorandum.

Effective December 17, 1962, the SEC has amended its rule 30d-1 to extend to 45 days the time for mailing reports thereunder—Investment Company Act Release No. 3574, 27 Federal Register 11639, 1962. This change was prompted by the Commission's recognition of the desirability of allowing more time for the various companies' independent public accountants to prepare the detailed financial statements which these reports must include, and of the expenses that could be saved if less overtime were required in their preparation and printing.

If the regulated investment companies are to make use of the Commission's extension, and are also to be able to continue the economy and convenience of making their subchapter M designations in or with their annual reports, a corresponding change should be made in the time limits of the code.

Extending the time for mailing subchapter M's notices of designation would in no way inconvenience shareholders in preparing their individual tax returns, nor interfere with the timely filing of such returns. As already noted, the 30-day time limit for designations was first adopted in 1942—Revenue Act of 1942, section 170(a)—at that time individual tax returns were due on March 15 of the following year. Thus for the typical individual who held shares in a regulated investment company on a calendar year, the notice supplying the information he needed for his return reached him on or immediately after January 30, some 45 days before the return's due date. However, since the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the due date for individuals' tax returns has of course been extended to April 15. Hence a change in the notice requirements from 30 to 45 days would mean that in the future the typical individual would receive the information required for his return on or shortly after February 15, some 60 days before the return was due. He would still have 15 days more time than he had prior to 1954.

A precedent for extending the 30-day notice requirements of subchapter M to 45 days is furnished by the newly enacted code provisions governing foreign investment companies. Section 1247(a)(1)(B) allows these companies 45 rather than 30 days for mailing the notice as to capital gains they are required to give their shareholders—see Senate Report No. 1881, 87th Congress, 2d session, 103, 1962.

It should be noted that under the Revenue Act of 1962 regulated investment companies, like all other domestic corporations, will be required on or before January 31 of each year to furnish each shareholder a statement of the amount of dividends paid to him during the previous calendar year. This requirement under newly enacted section 6042(c) of the code is separate and apart from the various special registration notices applicable to regulated investment companies alone under subchapter M. The latter are geared to the close of the company's taxable year, not the calendar year. It is only the various special designation notices under subchapter M which is generally feasible to combine with the annual report, and it is only these designations for which an extension of the time limit to 45 days is sought.

CONCLUSION

A change in subchapter M's provisions to permit regulated investment companies 45 days for making the various designations thereunder would permit the convenience and economy of coordinating these designations with the mailing of the companies' annual reports, with obvious benefit to their several million shareholders. The extension would in no way interfere with the shareholder's receiving the information in ample time for use in the timely preparation of their respective individual returns. Accordingly it is requested that the code be amended by changing the figure "30" preceding "days" to the figure "45" in the sections listed below: Section 852(b)(3)(C), section 852(b)(3)(D)(i), section 853(c), section 854(b)(2), section 855(c).

LABOR DEPARTMENT REQUESTED TO REPORT ON PLANS FOR UTILIZATION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic members of the General Subcommittee on Labor, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, have requested the Labor Department to report on its plans for the full utilization of domestic farm labor following the defeat of the proposed extension of the farm labor importation program.

With the defeat of the proposed extension of Public Law 78, which had allowed for the importation of Mexican agricultural workers, steps must be taken to prevent the development of labor shortages during the periods of peak seasonal employment. Such shortages would not be occasioned by an inadequate labor supply, but rather by unsatisfactory means of procuring available laborers. Domestic labor pools can satisfy national farm labor demands if plans are adopted to develop lines of communication between farmers and agricultural workers. Information as to the areas of employment demand, the whereabouts of agricultural laborers, specific job opportunities, compensation and working conditions, and means of transportation, could greatly facilitate the procurement of farm labor.

The subcommittee has sent a letter to Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz informing him of their concern in this matter and the subcommittee's interest in the development of plans by the Labor Department to prevent any adverse affects upon American farmers or farm laborers, through the elimination of the bracero program.

The Bureau of Employment Security, Farm Labor Service, has been providing agricultural placement services for some time. However, greater efforts are needed to insure against farm labor underemployment or crop losses due to inadequate labor procurement efforts.

The subcommittee's Democratic members are John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, of Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey; Augustus F. Hawkins, of California; and Thomas P. Gill, of Hawaii.

GREAT THREAT POSED BY FEDERALIZATION OF ALABAMA NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much distressed that the executive branch of the Government has cast its lot with the philosophy that might makes right. Yesterday afternoon the President ordered the federalization of the Alabama National Guard. This was done without provocation and without the need for such action. It was done without the request of the Governor of the State, nor was the federalization requested by any other constitutional officer of the State of Alabama, nor were the troops needed under the clear and present danger test. Unless we are to expunge the 10th amendment from the Constitution, then, Mr. Speaker, this action taken by the executive branch of the Federal Government is illegal. It was a dictatorial action and one not in keeping with our democratic and constitutional traditions.

The situation at the University of Alabama and Tuscaloosa yesterday was one of order. The Governor of the State of Alabama was testing in an orderly fashion the laws, rules and judicial fiats that are in conflict with the laws of Alabama. This is a test which needed to be made. The Governor of the State of Alabama had undertaken extensive and adequate preparation for the maintenance of law and order in and around the University of Alabama. There was no violence among our people. There will be no violence unless it is provoked by such unwise actions as have been taken by the Federal Government in threatening and intimidating the people with the force of arms. Yesterday afternoon I wired the President urging that he immediately rescind his Executive order federalizing National Guard troops in Alabama. The federalization of these troops represents an intolerable threat of martial law to the people of Alabama and, I would remind the President, and others who believe that might makes right, who believe that morals can be legislated, who believe that the minds of men can be changed by force of arms, that there are no civil rights where there is martial law. Are the civil rights of any one group more blessed or more dear than the rights of others? Today the people of the South live under the heavy threat of Federal invasion and martial law. Mr. Speaker, irreparable harm is being done to the American system of separation of powers among the various branches of Government. I hope that my words will be heard by the other Members of this body and beyond these halls and that they will be reminded that they may be next.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics may sit during general debate on tomorrow, Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE TIME FOR ACTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS IS NOW

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night the President delivered one of the most significant addresses of his administration. It was an historic speech at an historic moment. Hours after the President's speech calling for a national effort to establish equality for all, Medgar W. Evers, NAACP field secretary, was ruthlessly shot to death in Jackson, Miss. This shocking act of blind hate and insane lawlessness should arouse the conscience of the Nation and underscore the urgency of the President's message.

Mr. Speaker, at long last, after over 100 years of inequality, a President of the United States clearly and unequivocally stated that civil rights was primarily not a legal question but a moral question. The President confronted the Nation with the true nature of this struggle for liberty with these words:

> We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as clear as the American Constitution. The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities; whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated.
>
> We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and a people.

President Kennedy has set the moral tone for the Nation. His recognition of the fundamental nature of the civil rights struggle comes as a turning point in our history.

In the past months we have been witnessing a revolution dedicated to realizing the aims of our first revolution, a revolution which is being fought with determination and dignity to insure liberty and justice for all our citizens. Birmingham, Oxford, Albany, and Tuscaloosa will rank in significance with Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill.

The civil rights revolution is the test of our commitment to democracy. The hour of truth has arrived. The time to act is now.

The Congress has a special responsibility to aid in the struggle. When the President said last night, "Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law," he was challenging Congress to exercise its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, under the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution and the commerce clause of the Constitution, Congress has broad authority to enact legislation eliminating discrimination in housing, employment, voting, financial practices, public accommodations, and in most areas in which American citizens are being deprived of their rights. In addition, the Federal Government has the clear authority to insist that none of the funds appropriated by the Congress be used to support segregated programs. It is also clear that the Congress has the authority to pass legislation to desegregate the schools. The Attorney General can be given the power to institute suits on his own initiative wherever Americans are being denied their constitutional rights.

Congress has the power to legislate. Does it have the will?

The administration is planning next week to propose new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the recommendations will be bold and comprehensive. According to newspaper reports, the proposed legislation will outlaw discrimination in only one area—public accommodations. The President eloquently recognized that the fight for civil rights is more than a fight for the right to eat at the same restaurant as whites. It is a fight for full equality.

I urge that the President declare war on racial discrimination in every field in which the Federal Government has the authority to act. The year to establish the American dream of equality for all is 1963.

LET US HARNESS OUR KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION TO SERVE MANKIND MORE EFFECTIVELY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion going on both in the United States and throughout the world regarding the vast amount of research coming out of the world's universities and scientific laboratories. More and more one hears discussion and debate regarding the underlying question of whether mankind will be capable of harnessing this tremendous flow of knowledge into more useful channels.

It was because of this great need for a more orderly cataloging of research now flowing from our Nation's universities and laboratories that I proposed earlier in this session H.R. 1946, which would authorize the establishment of a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

There is in human nature an element which is drawn by the spirit of evasion, the lure for sacrifice, and the attraction to defer the inevitable.

Man will undergo the most painful medical treatment to overcome an illness which in most instances could have been avoided by some simple preventative measure. He will submit to excruciating operations, sacrifice parts of his body, swallow bitter medicine, lose neglected teeth, and be willing to endure the whole spectrum of human suffering, including prolonged rehabilitation.

The inroads of information are not immune from the same hostile elements.

As early as a century ago, the great American scholar and educator, Thomas R. Lounsbury, warned:

> We must view with profound respect the infinite capacity of the human mind to resist the inroad of useful knowledge.

We are now entering an era in human history where useful knowledge has never been in greater abundance. And yet, the access to this knowledge is like the fruit basket in front of King Tantalus: available in abundance before him, and yet inaccessible.

One of the most important factors responsible for the acute atrophy in our ability to retrieve useful information is the lack of a central system to coordinate the myriads of various activities in information processing which give birth to extraordinary waste and duplication.

It is comparable to the existence of several census bureaus, each recording the same data in different form. For example, one census bureau would record the number of married women, and another would record the number of married men. Such senseless duplication, ridiculous as it may sound, does in fact exist today.

For example, the other day I was shown an article on the subject of statistics first presented in English at Columbia University, then translated by the Russians into Russian, and finally translated back from the Russian into English. There is obviously no limit to the number of times the same article could be translated back and forth.

This is but another item from the first page of the first chapter from an endless catalog on waste.

In contrast, I would like to point to a company whose various operating divisions under central coordination have made it the pillar of our country's strength.

Almost a half century ago, the brilliant manager, the man responsible for the miracle of General Motors, Alfred P. Sloan, realized the importance and implemented the policy of a central coordinating system. A half century of monumental success in General Motors speaks for itself.

My proposal, H.R. 1946, calling for the establishment of a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center is based on the philosophy of Alfred P. Sloan.

The task before us is comparable in scope and complexity to the early stages of General Motors. But it is our duty and responsibility to carry out and meet this great challenge. In the words of the late Reverend Phillips Brooks from the great city of Boston, we can find inspiration for our tasks:

> Do not pray for easy lives. Pray to be stronger men. Do not pray for tasks equal to your powers. Pray for powers equal to your tasks.

It would be unfortunate, however, if history should repeat the grandiloquent blather of some unwitting, unfortunate prophets of doom.

Some years ago, Professor Goddard was described as "moon-mad Goddard." However, last July this honorable House passed a bill to establish March 16 as National Goddard Day.

Dr. Hugh Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, has this to say in a recent article:

> One day in April last year (1961), a distinguished group of medical men called on me to argue that men still do not have the basic research needed to risk launching Astronaut Alan Shepperd. Manned space flight, they claimed, was just not feasible yet. When I tried to explain that we had to learn by doing, they threatened to go over NASA's head to the President. The next day, Cosmonaut Yuri Gargarin went into orbit.

At the time the atomic bomb was being developed, Adm. William D. Leahy, then Chief of Staff to the President, made the following comment about the atomic bomb:

> That is the biggest fool thing we've ever done. The bomb will never go off, and I speak as an expert in explosives.

At this moment as I speak to you, the Russians and other countries from behind the Iron Curtain, meeting in Bucharest since May 21, continue their cooperative efforts for improving their central master plan in data processing and information retrieval.

Clearly, then, we can no longer evade the challenge confronting us, nor continue to sacrifice precious scientific talent for duplicating research, nor defer the inevitable establishment of a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

I am encouraged that the administration has taken a very significant step which in my judgment will help develop a more orderly collection and dissemination of research data produced under the auspices of the U.S. Government.

Last Friday, Dr. Jerome Wiesner from the Office of Science nad Technology, announced the establishment of a national standard reference data system, which will integrate to a single point of responsibility the present data-compiling activities of the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and several other agencies.

The fact that the administration is trying to achieve this proposed standardization of techniques and technology in data processing indicates the first significant step toward what I hope will be the ultimate establishment of a National Research Data-Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

Dr. Wiesner quite properly acknowledges the magnitude of the job ahead when he stated in his news release: "Only a national system is able to cope with this information flow."

It is most encouraging to me to note that Dr. Wiesner is taking this forward-looking step, and I am sure it is a source of comfort to my entire subcommittee who 2 weeks ago began hearings on the establishment of a National Research Data-Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

I am confident that with this type of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of Government, America can indeed become the most dominant force in the world's scientific pursuits.

The United States is faced with a crisis in information retrieval carrying the seeds of destructive power which must be tamed in order to insure our competitive position in the world.

Last year, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges stated:

> The speed with which other nations adopt scientific advance to practical use often exceeds ours, which explains, in part, why they are able to compete against us today in both price and quality.

One of the most important factors which determines the speed, price, and quality of new products is efficient data processing and information retrieval.

Dr. Anthony J. Barrett, who is head of the Technical Department Royal Aeronautical Society, supports this view in a recent paper by stating:

> Products that rely extensively on technical information can only compete if the data utilized are comparable in extent and quality with those utilized by the competitor. The proportion of his resources each competitor extends on research is almost totally irrelevant * * * product will be competitive if it is competent in finding large quantities of research information in addition to those data generated by its own efforts.

My proposed bill, H.R. 1946, for the establishment of a National Research Data-Processing and Information Retrieval Center, would greatly enhance our ability to compete in foreign markets. In addition, the Center would eliminate the enormous waste and duplication pointed out in my opening statement, which I made at the opening of my committee's hearings.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that some of the functions of the center would be to coordinate and augment the present existing facilities for data processing and information retrieval and would in no way infringe or curtail the various information services now available. On the contrary, it is my fervent hope the various information services can be strengthened and improved wherever it is feasible.

I cannot think of anything that would hurt scientific progress more than to attempt all research under one roof. It is a physical impossibility. Likewise, it is physically impossible to attempt to place all of the activities associated with research data processing and information retrieval under one roof. I firmly believe that the related activities in data storage and retrieval, such as translating, abstracting, digesting, codifying, and so forth, must be carried on very much as it is today by the many scientific societies, abstracting societies, and universities. But the finished product of this widely dispersed effort must ultimately find its way to a central center if we are to recapture the full contribution of the world's technological explosion.

Another of the most pressing needs in data processing and information retrieval is the lack of trained information scientists. Accordingly, I propose that one of the primary and immediate aims of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center be the establishment of a facility for training information scientists, comparable in scope to any other college level discipline. But even before such a center becomes a reality, the National Defense Education Act should be amended to provide special funds for establishment of information science courses in our universities and loans for students to attend such courses.

Another important area for taming the pervasive chaos in data processing and information retrieval is to enter the joint efforts with all nations of the world, including the Soviet Union, to provide a cooperative basis for solving some of the existing problems in data processing and information retrieval.

Several nations already are actually engaged in scientific research data processing and information retrieval: France, England, Poland, Italy, Belgium, and the Soviet Union, to name a few.

It is difficult to name anything which would speed the way for greater world understanding more than having all nations work out a universal plan for exchange of scientific nondefense knowledge. I suggest that since there are many serious obstacles still standing in the way of complete scientific exchange, we use the interim period for a free exchange of knowledge about scientific data processing and information retrieval. This is an area which offers the nucleus for eventual complete exchange of knowledge.

In addition, I would like to propose the establishment of an annual award of $50,000 for the most important contribution to research data processing and information retrieval.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, who during the last war directed our scientific defense effort and whose distinguished career in science and record of service to his country are surpassed by few, is also one of the great pioneers in data processing and information retrieval. It seems fitting, therefore, that the gratitude of this Nation bestow upon him the honor by christening the award as the "Vannevar Bush Award."

This award is long overdue in an industry which next year will supply $350 million of information retrieval equipment, according to a joint research project in marketing sponsored by Mosler and General Precision Equipment.

The logarithmic rate of growth of this giant new industry already overshadows the atomic energy industry, which has a similar award: the Enrico Fermi Award.

We should keep in mind that development of retrieval equipment could help bring about a more efficient distribution of the $15 billion this Nation spends annually for research. This annual Vannevar Bush Award would more than pay for itself manyfold every year in savings by helping eliminate duplication in research.

We must exercise sapient judgment, recognize the rapid pace of new technology, and provide the necessary tools to insure successful progress. Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in a recent article emphasizes the new challenge confronting us:

> New national policies in the United States are required to insure the effective use of technology in industry. Vigorous support for the development of new technology by industry is needed for our free enterprise system to thrive, to meet the competitive pressure in the growing world market, and to withstand the challenge from the Soviet Union. The effective use of technology is a key to a vigorous free economy.

The establishment of a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center proposed in my bill, H.R. 1946, is a most important tool for moving this Nation to a vigorous and free economy.

Our Nation's progress in science and technology can no longer be paced by the initiatives the Russians make in space or any other area in science and technology.

I am therefore confident that in the annals of human progress, the initiative we take for resolving the crisis in data processing and information retrieval will evolve as one of the everlasting milestones delivered by this august assmbly.

It is my hope that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval which I head will be able to develop the need for greater coordination in our research activities.

This ad hoc subcommittee was appointed by Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman of the full House Committee on Education and Labor, in order to ascertain whether the National Defense Education Act should be amended to permit the Office of Science Information Service to establish a national research data processing and information retrieval center.

The Office of Science Information Service was established in 1958 after Congress adopted enabling legislation as part of the National Defense Education Act in order to help close the scientific information gap which, it was believed at the time, placed the United States behind the Soviet Union in technological development. Many of you will recall that the National Defense Education Act was approved by Congress shortly after the Soviet Union plunged its first sputnik into space.

Public Law 85-864 established the National Defense Education Act of 1958. title IX, section 901, titled "Functions of the Service," reads as follows:

> The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service; shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

There has been considerable discussion about the effectiveness of the Office of Science Information Service. I have read the annual report of this very important Agency, and it is my hope that as the hearings proceed, we will learn more about the functions of this Agency.

On January 17 of this year, I introduced H.R. 1946, which calls for the establishment within the structure of the Office of Science and Information Service of a national research data processing and information retrieval center. This proposal is designed to help eliminate costly duplication of research and provide a centrally coordinated effort for the dissemination of scientific and technical information.

The tremendous amount of written material pouring from over 100,000 technical journals is but one of many sources which makes it physically impossible for scientists to keep current in their field. This results in wasteful duplication of research estimated to be up to 50 percent of our current $15 billion effort in research and development.

The House Committee on Education and Labor has a particular interest in how the resources of the many universities and other institutions of higher learning are utilizing their scientific facilities for their contribution toward this Nation's technological progress.

The members of this committee are generously giving of their time in order to ascertain whether the spirit of the National Defense Education Act, which established the Office of Science Information Service, is indeed being fully carried out or whether this important agency needs additional legislation to make its work even more effective.

I am convinced that the work of this subcommittee can make a most significant contribution toward a better understanding of the problem which confronts America in midtwentieth century.

The members of this subcommittee who, despite assignments on other important committees, have agreed to undertake this very important study include the Honorable John BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana; who, in addition to many other outstanding educational achievements, holds a degree of doctor of philosophy from Oxford University; the Honorable HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat from New York, eminent member of the bar, a Member of Congress who has shown intense interest in the technological capabilities of this Nation's institutions of higher learning; the Honorable ALPHONZO BELL, Republican, of California, who brings to this subcommittee the rich knowledge and experience he gains every day as a member of the very important House Committee on Science and Astronautics; and the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Illinois College who has shown an intense interest in research retrieval.

This subcommittee is also fortunate to have as technical advisers two gentlemen who have outstanding records in data retrieval: Mr. Allan Kiron, head of advanced research in the Office of Research and Development in the U.S. Patent Office, and Dr. Karl F. Heumann, Director of the Office of Documentation, National Academy of Sciences.

The subcommittee is also most grateful to Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences, who has agreed to assemble a panel of outstanding scholars who will serve as an advisory task force to this subcommittee.

As you can see, while the five members of this committee, including myself as chairman, are extremely interested in this entire subject of research data processing and information retrieval, we have surrounded ourselves with professional men who are highly respected in the American educational community to guide us along the way in this very complicated field.

It is my firm conviction that before this decade is over, research data processing and information retrieval will be one of the biggest industries in America and the world. The tremendous knowledge explosion which is sweeping the world makes it imperative that this civilization develop more efficient ways of grasping the full meaning of man's intellectual discoveries.

I am fully convinced that just as this Nation spent the 1940's in nuclear development and the 1950's in space exploration, the generation of the 1960's will see the advent of a tremendous emphasis on data processing and information retrieval.

I dare predict that before this decade is over, a vast part of both the Federal budget and expenditures in the private sector of American industry will be spent on storing and retrieving this tremendous amount of research data that scholars throughout the world are producing.

Since the beginning of recorded history, man's capability to accumulate and retrieve information has paced his progress. Today we are witnessing a grave threat to this progress.

This threat has been eloquently described by the eminent neurologist, Dr. Grey-Walter:

> During the last two generations the rate of accumulation of knowledge has been so colossally accelerated that not even the most noble and most tranquil brain can now store and consider even a thousandth part of it. Humanity is in a critical state compared with which the constitution of the Dinosaur and the community of the Tower of Babel were triumphant.
>
> The root of this evil is that facts accumulate at a far higher rate than does the understanding of them. Rational thought depends literally on ratio, on the portions and and relations between things. As facts are collected, the number of possible relations between them increases at an enormous rate.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, the great American scientist, characterized the urgency of the problem with the following grim note:

> Science may become bogged down in its own products, inhibited like a colony of bacteria by its own exudations."

The staggering statistics amply testify to this pejorative state of affairs.

During the last 33 years, there has been a tenfold increase in the number of scientists and engineers; from 50,000 in 1930 to over a half million today. Indeed, one authority estimates that the number of scientists now living is greater than the number of all scientists who ever lived before.

The prodigious output flowing from this ocean of creative activity is overwhelming. Over 130,000 R. & D. projects per year are of Government origin, representing two-thirds of the $15 billion our country now spends on research.

We have over 120,000 technical journals in the world. Our Patent Office has over 7 million patents in its files. There are over 500 specialized science information services.

Indeed we have reached a stage in the accumulation of knowledge where manual searching for information is quickly becoming an impossible and extremely costly task.

For example, we now have bibliographies of bibliographies. The last issue of the "World Bibliography of Bibliographies" contains more than 100,000 separately collated volumes of bibliographies.

And yet it is painfully apparent that the human capacity to absorb knowledge is almost minuscule in comparison with the fantastic amount of information available.

For example, the average person reading 12 hours a day, for 50 years, can at most read about 16,000 to 18,000 technical books in his lifetime. We have about 30 million books in the world today.

The enormous gap in our capacity to store and retrieve information and at the same time meet the demands and responsibilities in our society has created the most costly and wasteful drain on our resources, which is without parallel in the entire history of mankind.

The appalling figures speak for themselves. One major U.S. company spent over $250,000 and 5 years of research in an attempt to solve an electronic switching problem important to military communications. The team of topnotch mathematicians doing the research found the solution. However, they also discovered the solution was available in a manuscript 6 months before the research program started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after the completion of the experiment, it was discovered that the same experiment was performed at an earlier date, costing only $256,000.

In one of our ballistic-missile programs, a special valve was needed to solve a tricky fluid handling problem. After several months of research, the solution was realized. In addition, it was discovered the information on this valve existed before research was started. In the meantime, missile firings were held up for several months.

Recently the General Accounting Office reported two Government agencies were working on the same type of missile for over a year before the duplication was discovered. The cost of duplication involving NASA's Atlas-Agena B and the Air Force Atlas Vega was $18 million.

A leading manufacturing firm paid over $8 million for the invention of one of its products before it realized someone else had developed the same product.

One Air Force project for storing and retrieving research reports rediscovered 3,000 reports worth $36 million.

In fact, the situation of retrieving information has reached such an abysmal state of affairs that industries find it more economical to duplicate research projects costing less than $100,000 rather than spend the time and effort in finding out if in fact the desired information is available in the literature.

This catalog of waste is by no means exhaustive. It is, however, sufficiently dramatic to make us responsive to meet the greatest challenge of our time, a challenge fraught with power to either suffocate our progress or enoble the aspirations and welfare of mankind.

Indeed, the harnessing of power from scientific knowledge through data processing and information retrieval will surely surpass the rich rewards derived from harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Another challenge with which we must concern ourselves is the Soviet Union. Reports of past and recent activities in the Soviet Union indicate a concerted Government effort toward the solution of problems in data processing and information retrieval.

Probably the best known institute in Russia devoted to data processing and information retrieval is Viniti, located in Moscow. It is by no means the only one. However, it is the biggest, most centralized institute in the Soviet Union. Viniti employs thousands of scientists and abstractors, processing mountains of information which becomes available wherever it is needed.

There has been a great deal of speculation as to the important role Viniti may have played in advancing the Soviet space effort. The American Air Force Journal, as early as 1957, wrote this about Viniti:

> No one will ever know how many billions of rubles and how many tens of thousands of man-years of valuable scientific research time this system has saved Russia.

The following facts reported recently in the Soviet literature may offer some hint:

In 1 year, a plant in Maslenikov saved $1,400,000 dollars.

An industrial complex in Leningrad saved $27 million; in Gorkiy, $25 million; in Udmurtskiy, $14 million.

All this saving was achieved as a result of information provided from Viniti.

The Russians seem to be so efficient that Dr. Finley Carter, director of the Stanford Research Institute, was prompted to state:

> In order to better know what American scientists are doing, one must read Soviet journals of abstracts.

John Gunther, the well known American reporter, writes:

> Russian abstracting services are so complete and so well developed that it has come to the point where American scientists learn about new accomplishments by Americans in their field from Russian abstract journals.

The importance of centralizing information has been attested to as one of the key factors in the success the Soviets have had so far. As pointed out by Dr. Michailov, director of the Institute of Scientific Information of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences:

> Nine years of operational service of the Institute of Scientific Information under U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences justify completely the establishment of a centralized documentation agency, since it is only within a centralized documentation service that the world's overall output of scientific publications can be processed and knowledge scattered through various sources can be cumulated and synthesized. Besides, the centralized system of information provides a fair base for effective mechanization and automation development.

The above is supported by Prof. Boris M. Tareev, also from Viniti who states:

> Experience gained from information work in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries indicates that the complex and important task of providing complete, i.e., "total" information on all recent scientific and technical developments throughout the world can be accomplished by a central scientific information institute which has at its disposal many highly qualified specialists, suitable technical equipment, and sufficient funds for acquisition of current literature from many different countries. The Institute of Scientific Information is such a center in Russia.

In my bill, H.R. 1946, introduced January 17, 1963, I proposed the establishment of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center to ameliorate some of the abysmal shortcomings, and dangers to which facts and figures above bear witness. For it is readily apparent that the lack of a central organ, amidst hundreds of abstracting devices and countless specializing information services, lacking efficiency and control over duplication of research projects costing billions of dollars is a deadly danger to the survival of our country.

It is like a gigantic octopus with an excised nervous system, aimlessly flopping its tentacles in response to the assault of waves, only to subside from the overwhelming force bearing upon its inability to coordinate and control its survival and thus sink to the bottom, and extinction.

The timing and need for the Center which I have proposed have never been more urgent and necessary. The responsibilities of our Government to our citizens and the scientific community must be met at once with energy, dedication and leadership worthy of our heritage.

The cries for help from our scientists are desperate and justly demanding. The distinguished vice president of Tulane University, Dr. F. R. Cagle, only a few months ago succinctly captured today's mood of our scientists by saying:

> I speak as a scientist complainant—as a biologist frustrated by the difficulties of obtaining articles essential to my research—as a bewildered administrator participating in decisionmaking—as a frightened observer of the literature problems of my biologist colleagues—as an angry critic of our Government for failing to have concern about technical information programs * * *.

It is therefore of little surprise that my proposal has received such gratifying response and support.

The distinguished soldier-scientist, former Chief of Research and Development in the Department of the Army, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, recently pointed out:

> I believe you of industry, our academic allies, and the agencies of Government need to get together and back what I think is needed here—let's call it SATIC—a Scientific and Technological Information Center—a national clearinghouse for the most complete and comprehensive acquisition, translation, and exchange of information that we can get from all segments of our Nation and from the rest of the free world.

A Washington University editorial writes:

> Above all, in this country we need a central agency to coordinate the overall information effort; winnow the total production; and pick up the loose ends like foreign publications, research bulletins, graduate theses, Government reports and papers delivered at conferences. Organizing and operating such an institution would be an effort no bigger than others we have made, no more ponderous than others the Government has shouldered and carried home. It would deserve to be called investment rather than extravagance.

One of the most distinguished foreign critics on information retrieval, whose expert advice and services have been solicited by various Government agencies for many years, including the National Science Foundation, whose record of objective scientific analysis is unassailable, professor of mathematical logic and linguistics, Y. Bar-Hillel, has recently stated:

> There could, for instance, hardly be any doubt that the establishment of an institution corresponding to the Russian All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information could greatly improve the existing situation in the information field in the United States and could most probably be an overall improvement.

Needless to say, there are many others who voice similar views. Clearly, the establishment of a national center is the most urgent need and merits the highest consideration and priority.

The benefits to be derived from the establishment of a national center are too numerous and too obvious to need further elaboration here. However, there is one outstanding bonus which can be had. It is less obvious and, therefore, I shall detail some of the hidden rich rewards awaiting the realization of a national center.

We are all too familiar with the current shortages of scientists, the costly expense involved in obtaining a technical education and the difficulty of attracting students to pursue degrees in science. And yet, notwithstanding these obstacles, the establishment of a national center could double the number of scientists by cutting wasteful duplication and mountainous literature searches which consume as much as 70 percent of our scientists' time.

Never before in history have we faced such a titantic challenge. The hour is fast approaching when we must act or be left behind, adrift in a fog of technological confusion. The rewards in accepting this great challenge are boundless. The decision is ours.

EXTENSION OF THE BRACERO LAW

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a reappraisal of the vote on the extension of the bracero law is in order. The people who buy vegetables and fruits will want their voices to be heard. They feel that food prices at this time are high enough and should not be increased. The House of Representatives on May 29 by a 16 vote margin defeated a simple extension of 2 years of the Public Law 78 legislation, which was originally enacted in 1951.

Victor Riesel, in an article appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on the date of June 7, writes on the question of "Ban on Braceros Poses Problem." Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the full text of Mr. Riesel's article:

BAN ON BRACEROS POSES PROBLEM

(By Victor Riesel)

In the West the other day I ran into ranchers who raise cantaloups and vegetables, not cattle, who warned it will cost us "back East" lots more to eat because they are paying some of the itinerant fruit workers $800, $900, and even $1,000 a week during the season.

These fruit workers are skilled packers, loaders, and lidders. They move with the sun. They follow the melons, the tomatoes, the lettuce.

Their season is short as they move up from the Mexican border into Texas—Rio Grande City, and Laredo. Then on to Yuma, Ariz., over into El Centro and Blythe, Calif., and then to Bakersfield and up to Los Banos farther north.

I have some average weekly wages for a season of some 7 weeks. The ranchers who supply this payroll data are quite bitter over the spectacular rates forced by labor scarcity at the height of the crops' ripening.

But this bitterness is a soft sigh in a tornado, compared with their anger over congressional refusal to permit scores of thousands of Mexican nationals to come across the river after December 31 to help pick the fruits and vegetables for the packing and loading sheds. The ranchers say the cost of hand picking now will rocket just as did the cost of packing, loading, lidding, and trucking, over the years as men were needed all at once for intense and speedy work.

From a California rancher comes the startling news that during the 1962 cantaloup season the average weekly wage came to $337.02 for loaders. For the packers the average came to $242.75 a week. And for the truckers, $228.11.

I repeat, this is for the short season, for the so-called "fruit tramps." So high is this seasonal pay that at least one rancher knows of a chiropractor who has shut his office for a month to work as a melon packer in Yuma during the past 10 years. There are students, too. Some schoolteachers move into the packing sheds to raise extra money.

The outsiders go back to their professions and pursuits. But what of the men—and their families—whose only work is handling the produce?

Now, say the ranchers to the folks back East, there will be increased costs because the Government will not permit some 60,000 to 80,000 braceros to come in from Mexico to work in the fields. Those in the House who pushed through the antibracero vote believed the Mexicans were being exploited and forced into undignified "stoop labor."

The ranchers now ask where the field help will come from. They were thousands short last year. If no domestic farm labor turns up, who will harvest the lettuce, the tomatoes and other vegetables for the tables of the land.

What happens now? Some U.S. growers already are operating in Mexico. Our first cantaloupes of the season come from across the border. Soon there will be "runaway ranchers." Below the border, a rancher finds many takers for stoop labor at a dollar a day. At this rate the grower can pack his produce, pay the U.S. tariff and still make money.

But what of those who want to continue ranching in their own country? Some of them simply go out of business. In the northern San Joaquin Valley, there now are only five packing shed operations. Three years ago, there were over 20 fresh tomato packing houses in this same valley. The five remaining houses have abandoned the hand-wrap packing system.

Now special machines are being developed. For fruit there are tree shakers. For lettuce, there is a mechanism which has a feeler to test the firmness of the lettuce head. Special robots are harvesting tomatoes. Since no human hands are involved the entire crop must ripen all at once, or the green ones will be cut along with the ready-to-eat produce. So there is experimentation in breeding special tomatoes, or special long vines for grapes.

In a decade these machines will displace considerable hand labor—a process which is being speeded by the difficulty of obtaining field hands. There must be dignity for labor and a decent wage.

Perhaps a committee of Congressmen should go out into the western sun for a while and talk to all sides right amid those fields which feed a land.

COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, last week James E. Powers, national commander of the American Legion, traveling through Europe, sent a message to President Kennedy from Berlin, lauding the important announcement made by the President regarding the determination of the U.S. Government to develop as quickly as possible a commercial supersonic transport. The message read as follows:

> BY RELAY FROM BERLIN, VIA NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C.—On behalf of your nearly 3 million fellow American Legionnaires may I congratulate you on your decision that the United States should forge ahead immediately to develop the fastest supersonic transport in the world. At its last national convention (the 44th) October 9–11, 1962, the American Legion National Security Commission passed resolution No. 647 reaffirming support of a high priority for a U.S. supersonic transport program, similar resolutions were adopted during the 42d and 43d conventions.
>
> The Legion heartily endorses also your statement "That this Government should immediately commence a new program in partnership with private industry to develop at the earliest practical date a commercial supersonic transport."
>
> We feel that to permit any lag in the U.S.-flag air carriers keeping apace with their competitors would be most detrimental to the prestige and strength of the country.
>
> JAMES E. POWERS,
> *National Commander, the American Legion.*

Commander Powers is in Berlin where he is personally inspecting the current Berlin situation, under the guidance of military and Government officials. He is also visiting the Legion departments of France and Italy.

The position as expressed by Commander Powers in his telegram and of the membership of the American Legion, as expressed by their resolutions passed in the national conventions of this great and patriotic organization of Americans dedicated to keeping this country strong in times of peace as well as war, should be appreciated by all Americans. In time of peace the possession of the fastest fleet of supersonic jets of transport aircraft keeps strong the country's prestige and economy. In time of war the possession of such a fleet of supersonic jet transports could mean the difference between victory and defeat. I would like to add my voice to that of President Kennedy and all others in urging a speedy development of such a program to bring into reality adequate supersonic commercial jet transports.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the people of Alabama and the students at the University of Alabama faced a critical moment in our State's history with courage and dignity. As an Alabamian and as a graduate of the University, I have been especially aware of the ordeal which my State and school are undergoing.

Alabamians are a proud people with a proud history. Nothing which occurred in Tuscaloosa yesterday diminished that pride. Alabamians and all those who love the University of Alabama hold their heads up today still proud of their past and confident of their future.

Alabama's ordeal is by no means over, but an even greater ordeal lies ahead for those who have not reckoned with the consequences of making a political issue of the Nation's race relations.

Yesterday, Tuscaloosa was the scene of law and order as our Governor and people had pledged. But already the violent whirlwinds of racial disharmony are moving through every section of the Nation.

These are winds spawned by irresponsible manipulators of the country's race relations. Alabama before acceding to Federal force has raised a warning to all the people of the United States. Alabamians have maintained law and order in Tuscaloosa, but those who have played a part in forcing integration at the University of Alabama and elsewhere throughout the South must also face the grim responsibility of maintaining law and order in their own communities.

TRIBUTE TO HON. A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have good reason to believe the voices of young Americans are becoming more discerning in public affairs. All of us have read or heard opinions to the effect that our present generation of youth take little or no interest in public affairs and that many of the few who do take such an interest have difficulty distinguishing the kernel from the corn. That opinion is challenged by a guest editorial appearing in the Leesburg Commercial of Florida, written by Bill McBride, Jr., a young man who just graduated from Leesburg High School.

Bill McBride visited Washington recently and it was his good fortune to come to know his Congressman and to observe him in action. Upon his return to Leesburg he wrote a report of his impressions, which became the guest editorial to which I refer. That editorial provides an excellent example of discernment by an American youth who knows the difference between the kernel and the corn. The title of the editorial is "Tribute to SYD." It refers to our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, SYD HERLONG, who is indeed worthy of the tribute paid to him.

The guest editorial to which I referred, written by Bill McBride, Jr., follows:

TRIBUTE TO SYD

This is to express appreciation and tribute to a great man in Government, the Honorable A. SYDNEY HERLONG, of Leesburg. I am writing because I had occasion to view this man while he was representing and serving us in Washington. To a young person such as myself, who hasn't had much chance to be acquainted with men in Government, Congressman HERLONG is a great source of inspiration. I would like to explain the reasons why I came to believe in this man.

I was honored to be selected for a visit to our Nation's Capital. While there I had some free time and decided to call Congressman HERLONG's office. Knowing how busy he was, I expected only to get a few moments to talk to him. Instead, he not only talked to me for a while, but invited me over to his office the next day. I wondered then how he could find time to fit me into his tight and exhausting schedule.

Next day I went to Congressman HERLONG's office and accompanied him to the National Chamber of Commerce Convention, where he was to speak concerning the Kerr-Mills bill before Congress.

All this time he treated me as an honored guest and made me feel very special. Before his speech, while we were visiting with the members of the convention, I was amazed at the influence and prestige that the Governors and senators of various States across our country accorded my Congressman. A great many made it a point to seek out Congressman HERLONG and visit with him.

Just as Congressman HERLONG was about to ascend to the speaker's stand (I was in audience of the hall and he at the head table up front), I leaned over and asked the gentleman next to me if he knew who Congressman HERLONG was. He did not know who I was or where I was from. He was from Utah, and I don't know whether he was a Government official or not. He replied: "Yes, he is quite an influential and able man in the House." This again made me proud.

Congressman HERLONG gave a captivating speech, explaining his stand on medicare. He received thundering applause on two occasions. He ended his speech amidst great applause, and then answered questions. In reply to the question, "Do you or will you have any qualms about voting against the King-Anderson bill when it is brought before Congress again?" he answered, "I will never have any qualms about voting as an American." After the Congressman left the hall a man stood up and yelled out to the audience, "I recommend we get more men in Congress like that man."

On riding back to his office, I witnessed an incident that I will never forget. The address to the convention and such were outstanding, but this is the thing that I think sets our Congressman out in front of his colleagues. From our conversation the taxicab driver surmised that Congressman HERLONG must be a man in Congress. The driver then explained to him about a ticket he had received the previous day which seemed very unfair to him. Instead of agreeing with him and letting the matter pass, Congressman HERLONG started discussing the matter with him. Right in the midst of a very busy schedule and on the way back to his office where a thousand things awaited his attention he started examining the cabdriver's problem. He decided that the ticket was indeed unfair. He took down the data on the incident and told the driver to call his office in 1 hour. In his office Mr. HERLONG made phone calls and straightened the matter out. He would probably never see the driver again, but he helped him. This showed me that we don't have in office a politician, but a humane statesman.

Back in his office, I noticed his concern over whether or not he had made a good impression on some elementary school pupils he had shown around the House earlier that morning. Yes, he is like I believe all Congressman should be; we have a very warm and wonderful man in Congress.

LEFTWING EXTREMISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat of a rare privilege in this day and age to be able to speak under a special order and, I assure you, it is not going to be on a controversial subject—it is going to be on leftwing extremism in this country. I want to make it clear I will speak about the non-Communist left in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more apparent each day that many so-called liberals are mounting a massive assault on the forces of conservatism and patriotism in this country. Any form of conservatism is fashionably designated as "rightwing extremism" by these liberals and Democrats. In this city, for example, an organization is conducting extensive research for the express purpose of attacking conservative organizations, conservative spokesmen and conservative principles. A few weeks ago, several Democratic members of this body attacked the Americans for Constitutional Action. These attacks were ably answered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] and I do not feel we need to amplify on his fine remarks.

It is with the idea in mind of going to the very heart of the attacks on the American right that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] and myself have taken this time today to present these views. We believe America is indeed endangered by extremism but the danger is almost completely one from the left rather than the right. The danger comes from extremist policies which are weakening our posture abroad in the struggle with world communism and domestically are destroying our free enterprise system, the value of our currency and the independence of our people.

It is obvious that certain types of extremism are completely allowable. Leftwing extremism which deals with one worldism and undercutting American sovereignty, unilateral disarmament, appeasement of world communism and domestic socialism seem to receive a whitewashing from the liberal establishment.

If one looks with concern upon the income tax and sees it as the heart of socializing our country by the backdoor, he is an extremist. If one observes the steady erosion of our ideals by the all-consuming Federal Government, he is a radical extremist. If one looks with chagrin upon the steady course of appeasement which this administration has followed regarding world communism, he is an extremist. If one looks at the 17-year history on the United Nations and is critical of its activities which have been dominated to a great extent by the Communist world rather than the free world, then he, too, is an extremist. Let us examine some of those charges and see wherein the true extremism lies.

President Kennedy would now accuse Congressman John F. Kennedy of extremism for the statements he made in a 1949 speech. This speech appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, page A993, and contained this attack on the policies of the day, and I quote directly from former Congressman John F. Kennedy:

> Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government. * * * There were those who claimed, and still claim, that Chinese communism was not really communism at all but merely an advanced agrarian movement which did not take directions from Moscow. * * * This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

I suggest you just contemplate for a moment on the thought of what would happen were someone to say that today on this floor of the Congress. I imagine he would be labeled as an extremist.

As a matter of fact, President Kennedy once had some very good words to say for extremists. In his Pulitzer prizewinning book, "Profiles of Courage," he wrote that the great men "spoke and voted their convictions irrespective of the temper of the times." You are not supposed to do this in these times, the era of the New Frontier.

Now, of course, men who speak their piece, men who criticize many of the activities of Government or, indeed, the United Nations, are extremists. Anyone who would utter remarks of the type which President Kennedy made in 1949 on this floor today would be branded either an unsophisticated fool or an extremist. It is sad that the President on November 16, 1961, reversed his field almost completely and would address an audience in Seattle, Wash., warning of the dangers of the type of statements he used to make. At that, he certainly should be an expert on extremism because he has surrounded himself with some of the Nation's leading leftwing extremists, Professors Heller, Surrey, and Schlesinger, to name but a few. Let us look at some of their extremism.

Those who would abolish the income tax are, of course, in the lingo of the left, extremists. What about Walter Heller who has advocated that the income tax policy be changed to include the imputed income on owner-occupied homes—think of that, imputed income. We have not taxed enough real income. Bureaucrats would assess a value to your house, say $100 per month, and you would include $1,200 as income on your income tax and pay at your regular rate. What could be more extreme than that? Professors Heller and Surrey have further recommended that income tax be applied to proceeds from insurance policies, that deductions for interest paid on home mortgages be abolished, as would the deduction for State and local income and property taxes. And their statements are available in the printed documents of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Even the elderly are to face this liberal extremist policy. Professor Surrey said that the elderly are receiving too much preference under our tax laws and this should be changed. He noted that when you consider social security retirement payments, the additional $600 old-age exemption and the increased medical expense allowance for the aged:

> Persons over 65 become a distinctly favored class under the income tax. * * * It is basically wrong to exclude social security pensions from income or to grant a retirement income credit.

This is Mr. Heller's brand of extremism.

Where is the American left when it comes to extremist proposals such as those advanced by the fuzzyminded New Frontier extremists? Why turn the gun on Americans who are concerned about the income tax? Why not direct some of your concern at those who would impose reactionary tax provisions on our elderly? Yes, this is real extremism—in the true style of the American left.

I suggest that it is very dangerous to impute the policies of certain groups and say "Well, you are a John Birch member or you are very close to John Birch thinking." This is the thesis of so many on the left. It is more than a clever diversionary tactic. It is dishonest and fraught with danger.

Let us take a look at what Gus Hall said in the Political Affairs magazine, an organ of the Communist Party, in February of 1961 at page 43 thereof:

> We have a general approach that is basically sound. It includes such demands as: a 30-hour week; a much higher minimum wage; Government controls to transfer some of the superprofits from automation to the workers and the public in the form of price cuts and wage increases; higher unemployment compensation to be paid as long as one is unemployed; reduced taxes on workers and higher taxes on the big corporations; a large public works program of housing, roads, hospitals, schools, etc.; reduction of armaments, opening up trade with the Socialist world and other similar demands.

This is directly from Gus Hall, Communist Party, U.S.A.

Those of us on the conservative right do not want to impute the motives of those on the left. If we were to use the tactics used by the gentlemen on the other side in their recent attack on the ACA, we would of course say that Gus Hall has said this, and this is the Communist Party position, and look how close you are to communism. This is not done. It should not be done.

I only point this out because it shows what a dangerous matter this would be to try to impute conservative motives and liken the conservative line to what they call the radical right, because the radical left is the true extremist wing of our country. Those who are on the liberal side of the political spectrum should be very careful lest they open themselves up to the same attacks they are bringing to us. Retaliation of like type is not in order but we serve notice that this sword can cut both ways.

It is not supposed to offend your finer sensibilities when the American taxpayer is forced to provide the money for the State Department to assist Communist countries as a part of their appeasing foreign policy. If this brings you to a boil or the point of outrage, be careful, because you are very close to the line of becoming an extremist. If things are not going right for about 17 years out of 17 in the United Nations and it begins to look like we are being taken for a sucker, be careful, do not speak out because you will be labeled as an extremist. Indeed, you can be a patriot anywhere in the world except the good old U.S.A. Here patriots are called isolationist or extremist.

The United Nations and its bevy of satellite organizations can do no wrong according to this leftwing cult. Extremism in the cause of one-worldism is strictly A-OK. Take several examples which never make the hit parade of the peddlers of extremist mania. In their series directed at teaching proper history and internationalism, entitled "Toward World Understanding," the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—put the following into print:

> The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. * * * Not only can it correct the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership * * * in the world society (p. 9). It is sufficient to note that it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism by hearing what is national extolled and what is foreign disparaged. * * * The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes. * * * As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results (pp. 54–58).

Further, Americans are not supposed to be offended by recent outrages from UNESCO. To do so would be extremism. UNESCO published a Communist tirade against the West and gave it a forum for its lies and deceit in the form of a booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." The preface boasted:

> The purpose of this publication is to acquaint the public with one of the major social triumphs of our day; namely, the way in which the problem of nationalities has been solved in the Soviet Union. It is, in

> fact, the story of the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

One lie after another was presented. Note these excerpts:

> Thus in czarist Russia, the inequalities between national elements, and the oppression of national minorities and colonial peoples, were consequences of a reactionary social system based on czarist absolutism, capitalism, and landlordism.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Only the revolution of October 1917, which overthrew this regime and instituted the Soviet system, enabled the peoples of Russia to achieve genuine equality of rights and freedom of development. * * * It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

Oh, yes, this type of extremism is all right. Only those who criticize in even the most constructive manner the operation of the United Nations are wrong. They are the extremists.

Where were these people when one of the largest pressure groups in the country, the National Education Association, distributed a highly inflammatory pamphlet which likened the fight over Federal aid to education to the wornout Marxist class struggle of rich against poor. This NEA publication, entitled "The Root of Opposition to Federal Aid to Education," comes up with some really choice extremist statements: Consider just a few:

> The fight over Federal aid to education is, on the surface, a political fight, with spicy dashes of racial prejudice and religious bitterness thrown in. But under the surface, in reality, it is an economic battle—one of the oldest and hardest fought in this country. It falls in the classic pattern of historic battles between the haves and the have-nots, between those who control the wealth of the land and those who make up its masses.
>
> * * * * *
>
> So the fight has developed and grown * * * a fight between the people with the wealth and the people with the kids.
>
> * * * * *
>
> This year, the traditional foes of Federal aid, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and national chamber of commerce, have been helped by such strange bedfellows as J. Strom Thurmond who is afraid the Negroes will get in and Cardinal Spellman who is afraid the Catholics will be left out.
>
> * * * * *
>
> More than ever of the Nation's wealth will be taken from those who possess it and spent on the education of the Nation's children. That harsh, impolite economic truth is at the root of the opposition to Federal aid to schools.

Where were the critics when Carl T. Rowan, then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and now Ambassador to Finland on December 27, 1961, told a Philadelphia audience:

> It is an extremely revealing thing to look at the sources of support for Tshombe and his policy of secession. In the United States we have a conglomeration of arch-conservatives; people who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation; opponents of fluoridation of water; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation, and so forth.

Further, Ambassador Rowan has said:

> Nationalism is as outmoded as David's slingshot. True loyalty to either State or an ideal requires a worldwide perspective today, for the great opportunities and threats that come to both nations and individuals may have their genesis in places and events that are thousands of miles away.

Extremism? You, the American people, be the judge.

These are but a few extreme statements of the liberal proponents. Where are the critics, where are the protests against this type of extremism in the country?

Take, for example, the AFL–CIO in reference to extremism. They are among the loudest to decry the American right. Look at the Allied Industrial Worker, January 1962, page 3. In its column called the "Washington Letter," it refers to a Member of the other body, the Senator from Arizona, as follows:

> Herblock's latest peeve is Senator Barry Goldwater who is currently straddling the fence between the John Birch Society and the rightwing of the Republican Party, if that's possible. Goldwater is not as bright as Taft, not as crude as McCarthy, and not as oily as Dirksen. Nobody has punctured his inconsistencies better than Herblock who savagely takes off on the dapper man with horned rim glasses in a manner which is most upsetting to people accustomed to the social graces. Since Herblock couldn't care less about cocktail parties—he lets fly with cartoons which have shown up Goldwater for what he is—a sanctimonious mossback who, if he had his way, would hurl this country into utter social chaos, deprive orphans of their milk, and cast the helpless into the street.

Is this extremism? I suggest it is extremism of the most deplorable type.

In the February 1962 lead editorial in the Federationist, monthly magazine of the AFL–CIO, George Meany attacked those who do not make what he terms a necessary distinction between Communists and democratic Socialists. Even though both ideologies are closely associated and based on the same compulsion of the individual, he said:

> Everyone devoted to democracy and human dignity must draw a sharp line of distinction between the democratic Socialists and the totalitarian Communists. * * * We trade unionists have learned from life to distinguish clearly between Communists as deadly enemies of democracy and social democrats as loyal supporters of democracy. To be genuine and effective, liberals must welcome the cooperation of the democratic Socialists, the Socialist trade unionists and all other truly democratic forces in the struggle against communism as the mortal foe of human dignity, freedom, and world peace.

Yes; were we to make this association, all liberals would yell "foul" and yet Mr. Meany does it with impunity. I personally happen to believe that it is an example of extremism to promote the cause of the Socialists and try vainly to disassociate them from the totalitarian doctrines which they so readily expostulate. Further, Mr. Meany tried to walk the same tight rope in another Federationist editorial which appeared in the April 1962 edition. Rationalizing the direct assistance to the Communist regime which American distribution of surplus foods would bring, Mr. Meany asserted:

> Our country has always shown great generosity and capacity in helping save people from starvation. The American people would rather give away free some of their rice, wheat, butter, textiles, and medicines to the needy people in Communist China, Cuba, and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain than to sell these goods for gold mined by slave labor.

I doubt if many Americans want to aid a Communist regime whether it take the form of an aid to the people rather than the government. This is a ruse. What helps them hurts us and it is a fantastic scheme to propose. Extremism? You be the judge.

Let us look back into history a little bit.

This piece of Democratic extremism of a bygone era caused one illustrious Democrat, former U.S. Senator James Reed, of Missouri, to speak out in protest. The Democratic Digest, official publication of the other party, on page 28 of its March 1936 edition, took a pot shot at the U.S. Supreme Court which was striking down some of the New Deal legislative enactments of the day. This is the way they put it:

> AMERICAN GUILLOTINE
>
> The original guillotine which decapitated King Louis XVI, loyal friend of the American colonies when they needed a friend, was sold in France on St. Valentine's day for $167.
>
> With American liberties at stake, it might not be inappropriate to buy that guillotine and set it up in front of the new judicial temple which frowns across the park that separates it from the Capitol.

It is unfortunate that so many of our national magazines and newspapers follow this same line of posing the threat from the right while remaining silent on the threat from the left. Newsweek on December 4, 1961, had a front page banner "Thunder on the Right: The Conservatives, the Radicals, the Fanatic Fringe." I am still looking for an article about the "Thunder from the Left." The New York Times and the Washington Post consistently talk about "rightwingers" and "rightists" but prefers to call their counterparts "liberals." The Saturday Evening Post did run companion articles on the dangers of the left and right which was indeed fairer than most other publications.

Yet, even the Saturday Evening Post did a disservice to the English language and political philosophy in its advance advertisements about the January 13, 1961, article on the American right. Note the following:

> America's Nazis: Are they really a threat? The American Nazi Party is a nest of hatemongers. And it's only one of 1,000 radical rightwing groups. In this week's Post, a U.S. Senator speaks out in "Voice of Dissent." He rips into homegrown Fascists. And tells why he thinks they're even more dangerous than Reds.

What a farce. By what stretch of the imagination can a knowledgeable periodical place the Nazi Party—whether the German or American variety—on the right or the conservative side of the ledger? The Nazis always were and still are a Socialist Party—an extreme of the left. Pick up your dictionary and look at the definition of Nazi. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines "Nazi" as follows:

> Nazi (G. abbr. representing pron. of first two syllables of Nationalsozialistische Partei) 1. A member of the former National Socialist German Workers' Party, founded on fascist principles in 1919, headed by Hitler from 1921. 2 (also not cap.) An adherent of nazism in another country.

The same dictionary defines nazism as follows:

> Nazism: The body of political and economic doctrines held and put into effect by the National Socialist German Workers' Party in the Third German Reich, including the totalitarian principle of government, state control of all industry, predominance of groups assumed to be radically superior, and supremacy of the fuhrer; German fascism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who can be politically naive enough to equate Nazi principles with conservatism. It is the liberal not the conservative who promotes the totalitarian principle of government, state control of all industry and state centralization. Nazism, like socialism and communism, its totalitarian cousins, comes from the left not the right. Yet this fallacious principle is promoted in the college classroom and so extensively by the liberal school of thought that even the staid Saturday Evening Post has become brainwashed into following this semantic error.

Assertions of "ban the bomb" or "I'd rather be Red than dead" extremists go unnoticed by those who are supposedly monitoring the dangers of extremism in America.

While I do not object to the right of various people and groups to say what they think, it is interesting to see how statements are extreme if they are made by conservatives but fine if uttered by the "rather Red than dead set." Where are the people who worry about extremism when statements appear such as those which appeared in the December 1961 issue of Motive, published by the Methodist Student Movement. The cover of this Christian issue was a somber and depressive picture, described inside as follows:

> Bob, who is an artist with the Mennonite magazine, says of his cover: "It is prophetic, calling out the doom ahead. It shows our complete helplessness and futility. There is no material destruction but we are caught in a trap of death, waiting for the end, robbed even of our hope."

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. On the other hand, if any one were to talk about victory over communism or firm and fair policies, they would be called an extremist, superpatriot or crackpot. What has happened to our sense of values?

Dean John Coleman Bennett, of the Union Theological Seminary, can be quoted in one of our leading national magazines, Time, in its November 10, 1961, issue as saying those who talk of complete victory in the cold war are really talking about complete defeat:

> To all such people I must say that one element in the moral life is the kind of prudence that seeks to prevent the greater evil and that their view of the cold war will almost certainly lead to hot war and to the nuclear catastrophe which will add to the victims of tyranny scores and perhaps hundreds of millions of new victims of war. Also, I say to them that the institutions of freedom in which they claim to believe so fervently are not likely to survive such a war. Whenever people say to me, "Give me liberty or give me death" and from these noble words deduce a cold war policy that is likely to lead to a nuclear catastrophe, I say, "If such a war should come, liberty will probably not survive, and as for death, it is not only your death that is involved but the death of countless people who never made this choice."

Further, he said:

> The utterly self-defeating character of the intransigent forms of conservative anticommunism in this country is amazing to contemplate.

Again, is this not extremism of the type so loudly decried by those on the other side of our political lineup?

Mr. Speaker, I have many more statements I could make, but since the hour is late, I will close for now. Suffice it to say that I have not touched the broad area of our foreign policy. When one contemplates the soft and shameful way that we have slackened our guard against world communism it is no wonder that we have many Americans who are pointing the finger, possibly uttering extremist statements. Why shouldn't they, I ask, when you view the 2½ years of the Kennedy administration? Outer Mongolia was recognized and the State Department is preparing to resume normal diplomatic relations with the tyrants in Hungary who so mercilessly crushed the Hungarian freedom fiighters. This administration has opened up the trade channels with the Communists. One of the first things they did in 1961 was to remove restrictions on export licenses to the Communists which had theretofore prevented the flow of many strategic commodities to the Iron Curtain. This administration next removed the ban against the free dissemination in this country of Communist junk mail. The President hesitated to issue a captive nations proclamation and then made an appeasing one which did not even mention "communism." The military was muzzled so that it no longer could talk in terms of victory or the Communist enemy. We retreated from the Cuban declaration of October 22, 1962, and then held back the Cuban freedom fighters, in effect giving Castro a privileged sanctuary. These are but a few of the things which concern American people and yet we wonder why people then express doubt—serious doubt—about our conduct of foreign policy. Yes, these are policies which are based on the extreme foolishness of believing you can do business with the Communists, that they are maturing, that we can trust them if they sign a nuclear test ban and so forth. These are examples of real extremism about which we should worry because it jeopardizes our security. This is liberal extremism. There are many more examples but I will close for now. Suffice it to say that what extremism there may be on the American right has a legitimate birth in the policies of appeasement in this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

He wants to bring to the attention of this House other forms of extremism which we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me at this time. One of the problems which has been to a degree correctly stated by some is that there is a great frustration among a large segment of the American people. I certainly would say that I would find myself in agreement with that analysis. Unfortunately many who sense the existence of this frustration attack their fellow men with a broad brush of smear, guilt by association, and vicious innuendo. I believe there is a sense of frustration on the part of many people and I believe this sense of frustration has on occasion led a few isolated people to go off on tangents which were probably not wise and which perhaps could be honestly granted as extremism. I would say, however, as a danger to our society by comparison they pale into insignificance compared to the illustrations of in-power leftwing extremism given by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

When I acknowledge the existence of a sense of frustration, I also must recognize that there is a reason for this. I would suggest the reason for it is at the national level in the executive branch of the Government where there is a great deal of confusion of definition on the difference between what is called security and secrecy. I suggest if the American people are let in on some of the things going on a little more openly than they are at the present time, a great deal of the frustration that is described will disappear most rapidly. For example, I would suggest that the President of the United States instantly release to the American public what are known as the Rostow papers. I suggest that the American people have heard so much rumor about the Rostow papers that they should have the privilege of examining them themselves to see whether the rumors they heard are given with accuracy, or whether they are in error.

I suggest if they lift this mantle off papers and correspondence that have taken place at the highest level, this sense of frustration of a large segment of the American people will have no reason for existence because then the broad sunshine of knowledge will be available so that honest exaluation can be made.

What is in the Rostow papers that they should be hidden away from the scrutiny of Joe Doe? For is it not indeed John Doe who is master of this Government? Have we reached a point in America where a few people who call themselves in the words of one high official, "the seeing-eye dogs of our society," actually believe that the mass of the American people, the John and Jane Does, if you please, are blind, where they must be led along as though behind a seeing-eye dog? This is the cause of what may be termed a frustration in the hearts and minds of the American people. I would suggest further this may be the reason why we do see groups spring up across the country, groups with which perhaps the gentleman from Ohio and myself would not be in complete agreement on all conclusions reached. We would find ourselves perhaps in strong disagreement with some of their conclusions, but I think we need to understand the reason for the growth of new organizations and place it in proper perspective. If indeed there is a frustration and there are movements in America to try to do something about what they sense is wrong, whether correctly or in error, the way to correct this is to correct the policy of confusing security and secrecy at the national level.

I suggest that there is indeed a sense of frustration in America, which is described by the left in our society—the non-Communist left—as extremism. It deals with obvious economic irresponsibility in the New Frontier. This could be summed up in a magnificent letter that was sent to every Member of this House by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Appropriations Committee, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. It was one of the most outstanding pieces of work and effort on the part of an individual Congressman this year. He pointed out the economic situation in which we find ourselves this fiscal year. What did his letter say as he was begging his colleagues to join him in helping to bring the light of day to the entire economic situation which we face? His letter said this:

> Since the adoption of the Constitution 174 years ago, the Federal Government has collected in revenues $1,312,508,000,000. In addition to the collection and expenditure of this astronomical sum, the Federal Government has also borrowed $305 billion, and spent that, too. Furthermore, it has created 108 statutes calling for future expenditures for services previously rendered in the amount of $746 billion. The statutory obligations are just as binding as borrowed-money obligations. Therefore, the two obligations, borrowed money and statutory combined, make the true Federal public debt $1,051,000,000,000.
>
> Since the adoption of the Constitution, for each $1 the Federal Government has collected, it has created an obligation of $1.81. We have mortgaged future generations in the amount of $1,051 billion. Much of this staggering obligation has been created in recent years and during the most prosperous ones in American history.

The letter from the Democrat chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. PASSMAN], continues:

> These startling facts invite the sober consideration of all Members of Congress as well as all other Americans. Do you agree? If so, then we should work together to get off this treadmill before it is too late.

That is the end of the letter signed by OTTO PASSMAN.

I congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee for his excellent piece of work and for his call for help. But I notice that when other Americans around the country point to the tremendous debt that is on our shoulders, and when they raise their voice in opposition to welfare-State programs that further increase this debt, or programs that merely transfer unemployment, or programs that create a greater centralization of power, they are attacked as being extremists or irresponsible. I say this is the height of responsibility. This placing of labels does not answer a thing. It is a neat diversion, a beautiful diversion.

I was interested in reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attack that was launched on alleged rightwing extremism the other week, when some of those who participated referred to the constituents who wrote to them as members of this or that group. All of this was determined just by reading the letters.

What clairvoyant perception does any Member of this House have which, when they receive a letter, though it might sound slightly hysterical, they can say, "This person belongs here, and that person belongs there."

What kind of supernatural inspiration has been given to these Members that they can read their letters and say, "We know that this letter represents a group." Nonsense. There is no way of knowing this unless you know the person individually and in a very personal way.

We have all kinds of programs in America that have failed. We have an agricultural program which the wheat farmers of America just repudiated rather soundly, when given a referendum. You might say it was extremist action when they rose up and by an overwhelming margin voted down the welfare state-regimented proposal of the executive branch; when they chose freedom over Freeman, if you please.

I think it was summed up in a national publication; the total idiocy of some of the proposals that are taking place; the chain reaction; how you start out with one violation of economic freedom, find it does not work, and then you have to come in with another and compound error upon error.

In respect to the cotton program, that was summed up beautifully in one paragraph. This is a classic example of interference with a free economy. This paragraph is from the publication National Review and I suppose there are those who do not understand and who would classify it as an extremist magazine, because it takes a contrary position to what is the "seeing-eye dog" philosophy of our day. They have this paragraph:

> First the Government gave subsidies to cotton farmers by buying cotton to keep the price up. Then it gave foreign aid subsidies to a host of countries to encourage cotton production. Stunned by the cotton surplus, the Government began to subsidize farmers for not growing cotton. Alarmed by the drop in world prices and lack of U.S. exports, the Government paid subsidies to exporters to sell subsidized cotton. That drove prices down further, and the puzzled Government increased the subsidies. The Japanese bought U.S. cotton at one-third below domestic prices and sold finished cotton goods in the United States. Worried by the damage to local manufacturers, the Government put on tariffs and stringent quotas.
>
> Now the Japanese are hurdling these barriers. So the President plans to pay a subsidy to U.S. manufacturers to make up for the subsidy paid to U.S. exporters, which is to make up for the subsidy paid to U.S. farmers to grow cotton, as distinct from the subsidy paid farmers not to grow cotton.

This, in one paragraph, sums up the error and the compounding of error as the Government comes in with a kind of Keynesian economics and tries to impose it as an answer for all the ills that affect American society.

I suppose this summary of the cotton program is an extremist position. To be in opposition these days, no matter how articulate you try to be, no matter how thoroughly you try to study from the many authors who range from the left to the right, if you challenge the collectivist you hear the cry "extremist." The minute you raise your voice or try to make a more positive approach, the charge is made that you are irresponsible.

Why is this lack of direction present in our policy, both foreign and domestic; this lack of discernible direction in attempting to solve problems? How can a gentleman in the other body, for example, supposedly a very responsible gentleman, rise as he did the other day decrying those of us who say we should have a clearcut call for victory in the cold war? He decries our irresponsibility by saying, "What would we do with victory once we achieved it?" But let us not be extreme. Let us not call for victory because we would not know what to do with it if by some chance we did happen to win the cold war and communism was eliminated from the face of the earth. "What would we do with victory once we achieved it?" says the gentleman from Arkansas in the other body. Of course, that is not extremism, that is not irresponsibility. That is the statement of a "distinguished statesman" who is revered by all of those who have as their goal some kind of willy-nilly foreign policy aimed at accommodation with Khrushchev. Is it not clear that they are afraid of victory? Is it any wonder that millions of Americans feel a sense of frustration with such a policy?

Should we have the right, perhaps, to question the reason for the failure of policy when those in high places make statements which should shock every American right down to the soles of their feet? I have here the verbatim transcript of an address delivered on WRC-TV on December 2, 1962, at 6 o'clock by the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Mr. Harlan Cleveland. I simply ask you to evaluate what he says and see if this is one of the ills, not necessarily evil motivation but by lack of sense and balance, that causes us to fail time and again in these critical days. What did Mr. Cleveland have to say? Let me give you a quote and I assure you it is not out of context. I quote:

> We are called upon to decide something very difficult, and we find that in trying to figure out what to do next in the general code of ethics, prescriptions, shall we say, that have been written down by somebody else, by our church or our parents or the books we read or the Scriptures, that these general prescriptions really are not awfully useful in deciding what to do next.

Oh, really? The Scriptures are no longer useful in helping to reach decisions? The ethics and the principles that have been taught throughout the generations in our history are no longer useful in making decisions? The books, our parents, the church, no longer are very useful in trying to determine an approach upon which the fate of the world may well depend? Is it any wonder we wander around in a vacuum and come up with patchwork programs, as I call them, that are supposed to have some general noble purpose but none of which achieve any common aim? Is it any wonder that there is a sense of frustration in large segments of our society when they read this kind of statement by men in high places? I, for one, say there is no problem we are facing, be it domestic or foreign, wherein the lessons and principles we learn from the Scriptures and the ethics we learn from our parents and the church would not be most useful in trying to determine what to do next.

Now we can go at great length into other areas. I have here a pamphlet. Now I know there is a great concern, and perhaps rightly so, about quoting statements made by men 10 years ago or 15 years ago because of the obvious possibility that they might have changed in their philosophy. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] the other day and other men in the past have cited the writing of a man who is administrative assistant to the President of the United States, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. They cited his article back in the late forties in a publication called "Partisan Review," where he said socialism could, indeed, be brought about piecemeal by what he called a series of New Deals. This many have dismissed as not being fair. After all, that was written in 1947 or 1949 and that is quite a while ago. I simply draw to the attention of my colleagues that we can bring this up to date. I have in my hand a pamphlet which was written in 1960 and published in 1960. It is entitled "Private Indulgence or National Power." The author is Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. I am intrigued by the printing on the bottom of what I refer to as the little red book because of the red binding around it. Printed across the bottom of the cover are the words "for private circulation." How fascinating—how intriguing that the man who is assistant to the President of the United States would write this little pamphlet and want it for private circulation only. But then as I read this pamphlet—as I read this little document, I began to understand quite clearly why one would want this to be used for private circulation. Frankly, if I had the means of personal finances, I would have several thousand of these reprinted, because there is no copyright on it—reprinted and sent around wholesale across the country so that John Doe and Jane Doe could read it for themselves in its complete form. In this he goes into details of private indulgence or national power. What is private indulgence? I will not go into all of it verbatim because of the time involved. But, in effect, what he is saying is that private indulgence is the right of consumer free choice. I think I can give you one quote that makes it rather clear. Of course, it was a political document. Let us face it—he was attacking President Eisenhower and the then candidate Nixon. He says there that the thesis is definite and explicit, "It is that the allocation of our resources should be determined by the way the consumer chooses to spend his moneys."

This says Mr. Schlesinger is what is wrong in our society—it is that evil in our economic system which has to be changed—the right of the consumer to make up his mind how he wants to spend his resources and spend his money. And as you go on in this, you begin to realize that what he is talking about as private indulgence is the choice of the individual to purchase, let us say, a second television set. But you do not need a second television set according to the theory of Mr. Schlesinger. One is sufficient. You do not need a second television set. You might decide that you would like to have a second car. But you do not need a second car. His position is simply this: It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to siphon away from the individual that share of his income which he uses for private indulgence because they—this nebulous "they"—the elite—can provide facilities for spending it so much more wisely than can the individual. Private indulgence—the right of choice of the consumer to spend his income as he decides. Now what are we talking about here? Maybe Mr. Schlesinger, although possessing a fine educational background, should go back and take a basic course in economics. Maybe this again is one of the reasons for this sense of frustration on the part of many, many people across the country because they feel themselves being moved and pulled and tugged at by forces that they just cannot see but which they feel, but they cannot identify them and so, perhaps, occasionally they do lash out and sometimes miss the target. We cannot blame them.

Does not Mr. Schlesinger understand that when you buy a product you buy something that has to be manufactured? In order to manufacture it you have to have employees. When you have employees you provide jobs, and when you have jobs you provide a payroll. When you provide a payroll you provide taxes which provides more funds to the Federal Government. When you provide a profit you are paying, for instance, an advertising agency, and you have reinvestment of those profits all the way down the line.

"Private Indulgence or National Power." I wonder if Mr. Schlesinger has really sized up the philosophical argument in which we find ourselves?

Mr. Speaker, in the climate of a relatively free economy, the Government has the role of protecting the inherent rights of man, rather than controlling and distributing material things. When you get into this field where there is an elite group which seems to believe they have some divine authority under which they can decide what is good for everybody, tyranny is the inevitable result.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to page 13 of this pamphlet in order to see how Mr. Schlesinger goes into other areas when he extends his false understanding of economics and individual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we get to foreign policy. Now I am not, I stress, challenging the motivation of Mr. Schlesinger. I am challenging his logic and conclusions. These are his conclusions which appear on page 13 under the heading——

> IV. AN INTELLIGENT NATIONAL POLICY
>
> The answer to Soviet success is as plain as day. It lies in the power of the Soviet Union to focus its national energies. The visitor to Soviet Russia finds it frightening to see what energy a great nation can generate when it allocates its talents and resources according to an intelligent system of priorities.

Oh, now, Mr. Schlesinger—"an intelligent system of priorities" in the Soviet Union? An intelligent system?

Mr. Speaker, if the goal of America is national power for power's sake alone, then perhaps Mr. Schlesinger is right. If it is to ignore the rights of individuals, if it is to ride over their rights because of some goal of national power, then perhaps the system could be interpreted as intelligent. But I suggest that such rights do not exist under national socialism. It did not work under Hitler. Hitler tried to make national socialism work. The Jews had to be liquidated because they could not conform. The children had to join the Nazi Youth League and goosestep to command. The people had to work where they were told. Is it extremism to analyze national socialism and perhaps lift a flag of warning? If this is extremism I am proud to wear the banner. I believe in individual freedom and responsibility. If this be extremism, then let it be. As for me I will take on those who challenge liberty, any time and with pleasure.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his contribution.

I would say to those Members who have been good enough to stay that the gentleman from Indiana and myself have scores of different examples of quotes from articles and speeches that we had intended to present in the 2-hour period. When we got this special order we had no idea it would run this late in the evening.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to impose much further on the generosity of the Members of the House and keep you here tonight. But we will at a later date present more—if necessary, even under the 1-minute rule—because we believe the examples of the extremists which are coming from the so-called liberal community should be presented to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly are not willing to preclude the right of the other side to debate this question, but we will say for ourselves that we are going to round out our presentation, even though we have a great deal more to bring to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to thank our colleagues for their patience tonight in bearing with us, and I would like to thank the majority also for allowing us to go uninterrupted. At this time, in view of that fact, we are giving up the additional hour for which we have a special order.

Mr. ASHBROOK. As I said, we have no intention to close off debate, but we will yield back the balance of our time at the conclusion of this intitial presentation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana for the purpose of answering a question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am under the impression that I am wrong, and I hope the gentleman will correct me, that among other things the Rostov papers include a review of the 8 years of the Eisenhower foreign policy, including the steps that led to the occupation by the Communists of Cuba, is this correct?

Mr. BRUCE. I would have to answer the gentleman in this way: Since the Rostov papers have not been released, perhaps he has been given preferential information as to what is in them. We can only guess.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am relying on what I read in the press, and I assume the gentleman read the same information I did in the same press. That was a review of foreign policy under various administrations during the last 20 years, including 8 years under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I also understand that there are recommendations in there as to our future foreign policy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact of the matter is that perhaps I agree with the gentleman they should be made public. I think the Members ought to see it, and I suspect one reason they are not made public is because they might possibly embarrass a previous administration.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not think we on the Republican side are afraid of that. What happened in the past is past. I was most critical of the administration policy on Cuba, but I think it ill behooves those today when they want to get off the hook, to constantly go back to something that happened in the last 8 years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman. The thing I believe in is to move forward.

Mr. ASHBROOK. To alleviate some of the apprehensions of the people, the Rostov papers, and I think the correspondence of the President of the United States with Premier Khrushchev ought to be released to the American people so they can see exactly what is in that correspondence.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am very interested and intrigued by the flow of oratory that has been going on. I share the gentleman's views about extremism. I would like to ask a direct question, both of the gentleman from Ohio and also of the gentleman from Indiana, if under the extremism that you both abhor would you accept any help from the extreme right, say the John Birch Society?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Whether or not we would accept any help?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am asking the gentleman directly.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Do you mean from the society or from individuals? I do not happen to know much about the society and I will say I am not a member. I know many good patriotic people who have told me at one time or another that they were a member. I will say I accept help whether it be by people who want to assist in ringing doorbells or in making contributions on the basis of what the individual himself is. I do not shun people because they may happen to belong to an organization.

Mr. MACDONALD. You would accept help from the John Birch Society in a campaign for the U.S. Congress?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would not accept help from the society as such. I am happy to receive the support of the Republican Party organization.

Mr. BRUCE. My answer is that to my knowledge I have not accepted help from any organization outside the Republican Party and what we call the Bruce committee back home.

May I say that I happen to be a student of the Communist publication, The Worker. I find it most interesting. If you are going to use logic, the Communist Party endorses the King-Anderson bill. You must accept the onus of supporting the Communist Party then, because they are putting it out all across the country.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am asking you a direct question that has nothing to do with the Communist Party or the King-Anderson bill, which personally I am not for. I am asking you, have you accepted help from the Birch Society?

Mr. BRUCE. I have not knowingly. I might accept help from people without knowing who they are. How do you know who helps you?

Mr. MACDONALD. Because I make a report as to who helps me.

Mr. BRUCE. On votes? Do you know everybody who votes?

Mr. MACDONALD. Do you accept financial help from that society?

Mr. BRUCE. I never have.

Mr. MACDONALD. If it were offered to you by the Communist Party or the Birch Society would you accept it?

Mr. BRUCE. Do you accept help from the CIO?

Mr. MACDONALD. I certainly do.

Mr. BRUCE. That is not an extremism?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am asking you a question.

Mr. BRUCE. It has not been offered.

Mr. MACDONALD. You have had no help from the Birch Society?

Mr. BRUCE. I have never received help from the John Birch Society.

Mr. MACDONALD. If help were offered to you by the John Birch Society, you would refuse it?

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while a great deal of attention has been focused on the so-called "Thunder on the Right," the Nation has received very little information regarding the "Lightning on the Left."

Consider the publication of a book by Doubleday entitled "The Liberal Papers." Written by 12 Democrat Congressmen, here are a few of the foreign policy recommendations advanced by its authors:

Recognition of Red China and her admission to the U.N. Recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and the Pescadores. Financial aid for Red China. Expulsion of West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO. Shutdown of American missile bases in Europe. Invitation to Russia to plug in on a bidirectional DEW line (our radar warning network against nuclear attack).

The Communists, in their wildest dreams, never hoped for such concessions.

Still another quote from "The Liberal Papers":

> As the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist.

The sponsors of these incredible views include Chester Bowles, Presidential foreign policy adviser; Mr. Wolf and Mr. Johnson, who are officials of AID—Agency for International Development; and Marcus Raskin, an employee of the National Security Council, our highest level strategic planning agency.

Still another example of "Lightning on the left" can be found in the recent policy position by the Americans for Democratic Action:

> The administration should press forward with its proposed agreement banning atmospheric tests without inspection. Inspection at this time should not be made a condition of agreement.

It seems the ADA has forgotten that we did participate in such an agreement with Russia, and that they brazenly broke this agreement October 1961, with over 40 nuclear blasts including a 58-megaton superbomb.

The ADA policy is far to the left of the instructions given to the disarmament negotiating team now representing this administration at Geneva. These instructions make "inspection" an absolute essential for any further nuclear test bans, and are basically sound.

Some of the other ADA policies call for: recognition of Communist China and its admission to the U.N.; shipment of surplus foods to Red China and a removal of trade barriers with that country; and a hands-off policy toward Cuba, which we as a Nation, we seem to have embraced.

ADA has vigorously opposed all aid to Spain while in the same policy statement it has supported aid, including military equipment, to Tito's Yugoslavia.

ADA has condemned what it called the imperialist policies of the Netherlands and called for a cutoff of aid to the Dutch, but it has remained strangely silent about Indian aggression against Goa, Communist aggression against South Vietnam and Indonesia.

None of the persons associated with "Thunder on the Right" hold any positions of executive responsibility in Government, and those in the "irresponsible fringe" are hardly in a position to affect national policy.

On the other hand, the 35 ADA'ers in key administrative positions include Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Presidential administrative assistant and a former national ADA chairman; Chester Bowles, special adviser to the President on foreign policy; G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs; Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council; J. Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India; James Loeb, U.S. Ambassador to Peru; Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Theodore C. Sorenson, special counsel to the President; and Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

The policies advocated by the ADA and "The Liberal Papers" are reflected daily in important administration decisions.

Consider for example our virtual withdrawal from Laos, our 7-month delay in resumption of nuclear tests following the Russian test series of last October, sharply increased trade with the Communist bloc during the past year, continued foreign aid to such countries as Poland and Yugoslavia, our failure to act decisively following Brazil's confiscation of American property a month ago, the action of the President last April lifting regulations to curtail free mail delivery of Communist propaganda, substantial American contributions to various U.N. agencies which furnish direct financial and technical assistance to Communist countries including Cuba, our U.N. vote against Portugal with the possible repercussions against our use of the vital airbase in the Azores, and so on, ad infinitum.

Certainly rightists are not always right and should exercise more responsibility than has been evidenced on some occasions in the past, but they are not in power or in position to damage good government. Has the time not come when the press corps should awaken to the "lightning on the left"? It kills.

The differences that divide Members of Congress on most major issues today are based on much more than mere party affiliation.

Senators and Representatives tend to become identified either as "conservatives" or as "liberals" but over the years these labels have meant different things to different people.

The root word or derivative of "liberal" is the same as "liberty." A few decades ago, those called liberal fought to take the power away from the kings and emperors and to give it to the parliaments; now it is the "liberals" who are anxious to give more and more power to the executive at the expense of the legislative branch.

Jenkins Lloyd Jones, in a recent syndicated column, took note of the change that has taken place in liberal philosophy, saying that they are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. The attempt to solve a problem with a study group which inevitably recommends the problem be solved by burying it with money.

Every time the liberal sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually, and with the best intentions, he weaves a web of do's and don'ts that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible or alleged injustice you arrive eventually at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he cannot cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation.

When taxpayers occasionally balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual, the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. It is easy to appear before the city council, but how many taxpayers can afford to go to Washington?

The argument: "If Missouri does not take the money, Maine will," is a potent one. Even those who oppose the idea can be excused for their efforts to get some of their hard earned tax dollars spent back home.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite illogically at his advocacy of centralized power and bureaucracy. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his desires. It outflanks our traditional system of checks and balances, and often negates patriotism.

Federal aid to all schools, the liberal believes, will provide more funds without raising school taxes. Never mind that every school board in the country is far more solvent today than the Federal Treasury in terms of indebtedness.

Ninety percent Federal highway money means, the liberal says, that he will not have to pay for a bond issue. Federal welfare, he thinks, means that local responsibility can be shirked. A good way to avoid a nagging conscience when the Community Chest drive falls short of its goals.

Under this same philosophy, no one pays for his own medical care, but everyone pays for everybody else's.

One problem with the liberal is that he is getting way behind the times. He cannot adjust his dogmas to new forces. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing powers of the United States Steel workers. He is unable to be responsibly progressive.

He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But he pleads that the criminal in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who would not have gone wrong, if there had been enough social legislation.

In his effort to cure injustice, he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of big government.

The liberal, with minor interruptions, has been in power in America for 30 years. He will not admit error. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy, but he is loving us to death.

The mass of laws and expenditures proposed by the New Frontier makes Jenkins Lloyd Jones look like a prophet. We have been regimented too long. We have subjected an entire generation to "credit card" living.

Bills have been introduced in Congress to solve every problem as though we could ever legislate our way to happiness.

It is so easy to spend at the Federal level where there are no worries about whether income equals outgo. And so we have a $308 billion national debt, an increasing outflow of gold, and a growing demand by everyone to get some of that "free" money said to be available in Washington. The Santa Claus complex has stifled self-help. It is still not too late to wake up—but the time is getting shorter.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Thornberry). The question is on the motion that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bruce) there were—ayes 23, noes 34.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. SNYDER. The point of order has been made that there was no quorum present and the gentleman from Indiana moved a call of the House. Since the motion to adjourn was defeated, is not his motion in order?

Mr. BRUCE. I withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair state that the motion to adjourn was made in the meantime, and no point of order has been made since.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Findley.
Mr. Barry.
Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Laird.
Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Utt in two instances.
Mr. Widnall in two instances.
Mr. Alger.
Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Moore in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. Clausen during debate on H.R. 4996, immediately following Mr. Bolton of Ohio and Mr. Moore, during the debate on H.R. 4996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered into, the following be permitted to address the House: Mr. Bromwell, on June 13, for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the body of the Record during debate on the bill H.R. 4996, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman object in connection with debate on the bill?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am objecting to anyone having these requests made by a second party when the House is not in regular session, and I do not consider it is in regular session at this time.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roybal] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] may address the House for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker, for the third time.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record: Mr. Celler, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Abbitt, Mr. Rooney, Mr. Nix, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Rivers of Alaska, and to include extraneous matter, in one instance each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Burton.
Mr. Hall.
Mr. Macdonald and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Tollefson and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. Multer and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Vanik and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Gonzalez and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Alger.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 192. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 200. An act for the relief of Lloyd G. Dougherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 219. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 312. An act for the relief of Danusia Radochonski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 322. An act for the relief of Mark John Janavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 380. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 409. An act for the relief of Yeng Burdick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 523. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 524. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 545. An act for the relief of Sister Laura Saraniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 551. An act for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 657. An act for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 735. An act for the relief of Peter Hopeton Maylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marija Lovsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 965. An act for the relief of Amalia Seresly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Joyce Mark Bouvier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1015. An act for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Rafael I. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing that the 17th day of September in each year shall be known as "Constitution Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance of July Fourth of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 13, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

923. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 16th Semiannual Report of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the period ending June 30, 1962, pursuant to the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; U.S.C. App. 2001–2016), as amended, and the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U.S.C. 1621–1627), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

924. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

925. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties-Installations) relative to the estimated cost of certain facilities projects for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to Public Law 87–554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

926. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on medical services furnished without charge to individuals financially able to pay and inadequate rents for employee housing, Indian health program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

927. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayment of rentals for automatic data processing machines by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

928. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the law with respect to trade with the Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

929. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report relative to proceedings relating to *C. H. Baldwin* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 9–56, pursuant to House Resolution 438 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5932. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 401. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 101. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 402. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 247, a joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for offices of President and Vice President; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 403. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 4347, a bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 6988. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on lands in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6989. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6990. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 6991. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6992. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6993. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 6994. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 6995. A bill to amend subchapter M of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to regulated investment companies), to change the periods relating to year-end shareholder notices from 30 days to 45 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 6996. A bill to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6997. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6998. A bill to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 6999. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 7000. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McINTIRE.

H.R. 7001. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7002. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 7003. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7004. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 7005. A bill to provide that the representation in the House of Representatives of each of the several States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7006. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transportation, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 7007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 7008. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7009. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall provide convalescent and nursing home care in facilities provided at Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 7010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer who is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 7011. A bill to amend section 2 of the Social Security Act to provide that a means test shall not be applied in determining eligibility for medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period during which an individual citizen of the United States must be present in a foreign country or countries in order to exclude his earned income for such period from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7013. A bill to provide for the tariff classification of certain particle board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7014. A bill to provide for the reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7015. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 7016. A bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the cost of all medicine and drugs for the taxpayer and his spouse, rather than only the excess over 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, may be included in computing the medical expense deduction where such taxpayer or spouse is 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 7018. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide certain credit for service performed in the military forces of a foreign country allied with the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 470. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim the first Sunday in June in each year as Teacher Remembrance Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of $25,000 for the George Washington Carver Centennial Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 472. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as "National Public Works Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 473. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 474. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution to express the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 397. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Res. 398. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 399. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the retention in the District of Columbia of a master control record in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 400. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 7019. A bill to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H.R. 7020. A bill for the relief of Theodora Manafis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Rodney R. Blissett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7023. A bill for the relief of Dr. Damianos Evangelos Karandreas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7024. A bill for the relief of Leonora Guevara Villanueva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7025. A bill for the relief of Luciana Zannoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

157. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William E. Walsh, secretary-treasurer, Massachusetts State Council of Machinists, Hyde Park, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting full support for the granting of a permanent certificate for Northeast Airlines on its Florida route and to exert every possible effort toward that objective, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Annual Lobster Dinner of the Maine State Society of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, once again the Maine State Society of Washington, D.C., has scored a hit in the promotion of Maine products. Its annual lobster dinner was held this year on Friday, May 24, in the Department of the Interior Cafeteria. A record-breaking total of between 500 and 600 people were in attendance at the dinner which featured a menu of Maine food products, including apple juice, clam chowder, boiled fresh Maine lobster, potato chips, blueberry pie, and the fixings.

Mementos of the occasion included a 5-pound bag of Maine potatoes for each person and Maine-made products donated by their manufacturers were distributed as door prizes.

The Society's President, Federal Maritime Commissioner, James V. Day, presented certificates to leading seafood restaurants in Washington which have featured Maine lobster. Also, he presented on this occasion, on behalf of the Society, a prefabricated cabin to the Pineland Hospital and Training Center of Pownal, Maine, for use of retarded and emotionally disturbed children at the planned George Freedman Memorial Camp.

The mighty "homarus americanus" remained king of the evening, however, as the Maine lobster, unchallenged monarch of the seafood family, reigned supreme. Temporarily displaced Maine citizens and their guests paid homage to this delightful crustacean and the experienced, along with the uninitiated, dined amid words of praise.

On August 2, 3, 4, 1963, the Maine Seafoods Festival will be held in Rockland, Maine, where each year people from all over the country join in praise of this same succulent "King Lobster." It is a memorable annual occasion where good people enjoy Maine's beautiful coastal area and delight in the warm hospitality of Maine and its good food.

Dr. C. Willard Camalier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. C. Willard Camalier, D.D.S., assistant secretary of the American Dental Association and director of its Washington office, has announced that he will retire on June 30.

Both as a legislator and as a physician, I have long had the greatest respect for Dr. Camalier and the deepest admiration for his valuable contributions to this Nation's health. Since World War

I, Dr. Camalier has been representing his profession to Congress and to other branches of the Federal Government. No profession, business, or Government could ask for a finer or more devoted representative. His achievements are many and have rightly brought him a long list of honors.

I am happy to say that Dr. Camalier is a good friend of mine, as he is of many other Members of Congress. I first met him during the days of World War II when he served on the Procurement and Assignment Board for Physicians and Dentists, and I served as personnel officer for the Surgeon General of the Army. Our friendship has been a rewarding one and I know I speak for all of his many friends in wishing Dr. Camalier well and congratulating him on his long and notable career of service to his profession, his country, and his personable and fine family.

Army Times Guide to Army Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are guidebooks on every State in the Union and every country in the world. But until now no one has had the patience to put together a much-needed guidebook on Army posts. Such a reference book has now been published and it is an excellent piece of work. I refer to the Army Times Guide to Army Posts, published by Army Times Publishing Co., and edited by Tom Scanlan, a veteran member of the Times staff.

This book will certainly prove of great value to our Army families throughout the world, families who must move from post to post while protecting the vital interests of the United States. There is a great deal of factual information on more than 300 Army installations in the book, including posts overseas; and the emphasis is on current housing, transportation, schools, and other facilities at or near the posts. This is the sort of information Army families need to know, that has never been conveniently collected in one volume before, and Members of Congress should find the book of great help in answering queries from constituents in the service.

But there is also a great deal of factual and fascinating historical data in the book about some of the older Army posts. In this regard, Editor Scanlan's comment in the preface seems worthy of attention:

> It is suggested that anyone interested in American history and how the United States came into being can discover something of value from a study of old Army posts. Even a passing knowledge of old Army posts will again prove that the United States was not created by a people intent upon playing it safe, waiting for a base on balls, and letting some other guy fight the wilderness, the prairie, pestilence, the original Americans we called savages, and the innumerable other fears and facts of the unknown that had to be met before this Nation could be united ocean to ocean.

Editor Scanlan, who has been writing about the Army for over 10 years, combines the concise, sharp writing of a good newspaperman with the accuracy of a historian. He has made a reference book interesting reading. I am sure the book will prove of value to all Members of the House.

Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD certain remarks and speeches of our Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It occurs to me that it is particularly appropriate that this be done, for the Vice President has never limited himself to the customary or traditional functions of his office.

He has far exceeded these by endeavoring to use his office to help lead, instruct, and revitalize the thinking of Americans. He has acted in the conviction that as a leader of this Nation he must not be content to preside over his office but must also use his office to help lead the America people through troublesome situations and to help them aspire to their highest capacities as a people and as a nation.

The Vice President was doing this on Memorial Day when he made such a moving speech at Gettysburg. His remarks on that occasion were widely reprinted and commended.

However, a few days before the Gettysburg speech, Vice President JOHNSON spelled out his thoughts on "Equality of Opportunity" with even greater particularity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address as given at the Capital Press Club on May 18, 1963, in the RECORD:

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Prepared for Delivery Upon Acceptance of Distinguished Service Award, Capital Press Club, Washington, D.C., May 18, 1963)

I can respond to your generosity tonight in two ways—and two ways only. First, I can express my deep and heartfelt thanks; and, second, I can pray that I shall always conduct myself in such a way as to justify and merit your confidence.

It is only through the second response that I can—in any manner—approach levels of adequacy. Of this, I am deeply conscious. The purpose of this meeting tonight is not to touch off a round of mutual, back scratching, congratulations. It is, instead, to review what has been done by some people in the hope that we can inspire ourselves and others to do even more.

I am very proud—and I do not apologize for my pride—that you have included me in the company of those who are being honored tonight. At the same time, however, I am aware that this dinner does not represent the last chapter in a book or even the last page of a chapter. When we are involved in the field of human rights, we cannot consider the volume closed until those rights are so secure that no one even thinks of challenging them.

ROLL OF ACHIEVEMENT

At this moment in the history of our country, it is possible to call a roll of successful achievements in the struggle for equality of opportunity and human understanding. That roll can and should be called frequently, because it is essential in times of strife and turmoil to remind ourselves that progress is possible and our goals some day will be achieved if we have sufficient dedication.

But we would be doing ourselves and our country a disservice if we assumed that those successes meant that full and complete justice has been achieved. Quite the contrary. Justice is not a partial thing which can be measured in terms of percentages. Any degree of injustice is complete injustice. And until we achieve complete justice, we can regard progress only as a series of steps toward the goal. Each step should hearten us, but should not lull us into self-satisfaction that the job has been done.

Some months ago, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which I have the honor to head, released some statistics on minority group employment. They were good statistics in that they demonstrated a substantial improvement in the hiring practices of some of the firms that come under one of the Committee's programs. It was a report of solid, substantial progress.

A Negro editor wrote an editorial for his newspaper the following week. Commenting on the figures, he said something like this:

"When somebody points out how far I have come, I am the ungrateful kind of SOB who points out how far he has got to go."

Some people considered the comment to be ungracious—and perhaps it was. But that point did not bother me. The thought that loomed largest in my mind was that the comment was valid—and that the editor was absolutely right.

A SOBERING THOUGHT

A massive Federal effort, backed by all the prestige of the executive agencies of the Government, had succeeded only in bringing the editor (speaking figuratively) part way along the road to a goal where he had a right, as a human being, to be without any Federal effort at all.

This is a sobering thought which I commend to those of my fellow Americans who sometimes feel that efforts at progress should be abandoned because the presumed beneficiaries of these efforts do not express deep gratitude.

The truth of the matter is that there is nothing to be grateful for except, perhaps, the discovery that decades of inequality have not succeeded in quenching the flame of conscience in the breast of our fellow man.

We are not trying to do something for a group of people that will give them an extra edge in life. All we are trying to do is to eliminate deprivation so this group will have an opportunity to compete with their fellow Americans on terms of equality. And should we succeed, I am confident that they will take care of themselves—as they want to anyway.

But the sands of time are running out. The hours are short and we have no moral justification in asking for an extension or a continuance.

As a prudent—at least, I hope I am prudent—man, I know that frequently in life I have had to settle for progress short of perfection. I have done so because—despite cynics—I believe that half a loaf is better than none. But my acceptance has always been conditioned upon the premise that the half loaf is a step toward the full loaf, and that if I go on working, the day of the full loaf will come.

It seems to me that in the field of human rights, we are well past the stage where half a loaf will do. No one in this audience is so unrealistic as to expect to awake tomorrow morning in a perfect world. But, nevertheless, progress must come faster and I believe it will come faster as sensible men and women realize that they cannot afford—morally or economically—to abandon the field to the forces of unreason.

PROGRESS MUST BE FASTER

Progress must come faster because otherwise there are millions of individuals—human beings entitled to their rights—who will never receive justice even though some day justice may come to their group.

Progress must come faster because otherwise the tragic headlines which speak of the breakdown of law and order will increase rather than diminish. (And I hope we relearn the lesson that issues which are not settled by justice and fairplay will sooner or later be settled by force and violence.)

Progress must come faster because otherwise we will not achieve the unity which we must have if freedom—freedom for all of us—is to survive.

And, finally, progress must come faster simply because it is right, and has been too long delayed.

UNDERSTANDING EAR

I think that one of the greatest barriers to progress is the fact that we don't talk to each other enough or, rather, that we don't listen to each other enough with an understanding ear. We leap to conclusions too rapidly, we seize upon half truths without looking at the full picture; we accept slogans without looking behind those slogans to the essential reality.

For example, it is said repeatedly that no law can enforce human understanding or implant reasonable attitudes among human beings. With this statement, I agree. It is valid. It is also beside the point and totally irrelevant to the issues that divide our country today.

The law cannot bring reasonable men and women together to work out their differences. But it can restrain unreasonable men and women from imposing their will on a community; and then the reasonable people can, and will, get together and work out their problems themselves.

The law cannot inject goodness and brotherhood into those who are determined to reject both qualities. But it can prevent the extremists from trampling over the rights of others.

The law cannot make men equal and does not pretend to do so. But it can open the doors of equal opportunity which have been slammed shut by those who fear that when men and women can compete on an equal basis and are equal before the law, they will turn out to be rather equal after all.

And I want to make one point clear—very clear. This administration is determined to enforce the law.

TO ENFORCE THE LAW

We are fully aware of the fact that the ultimate solutions must spring from the people themselves. But that is not—and will not be—an excuse for sitting idly by while minorities obstruct the efforts of just and reasonable men and women to find solutions.

I am not here tonight to make a speech. I am here to share this evening with you—to say thanks for your courtesy and to extend in return my best wishes.

I only wish to leave you with one thought. These are difficult, emotion-ridden times. We face strife, and it is idle to pretend that it will go away. It is going to be difficult to maintain our perspective—at times virtually impossible. Yet, this we must do.

We must remember that we are all Americans—Americans with a difficult problem. We must work it out together. We must not be satisfied just with progress but neither can we afford to despair and reject progress.

I have faith that the day will come when it is not necessary nor remarkable to give or receive human rights awards—not necessary or remarkable simply because justice will be colorblind and all men and women will be judged on their merits and not on irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

Thank you.

A Bill To Provide for Federal Payments to Counties Where National Forest Lands Are Located

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for Federal payments to counties where national forest lands are located. My bill provides for an annual payment in lieu of taxes to each such county at a rate of 10 cents for each acre of national forest lands in the county. This payment would be in addition to the revenue-sharing payments currently made to States for distribution to counties for roads and schools.

Under the act of May 23, 1908, and subsequent legislation, a payment amounting to 25 percent of gross receipts from each national forest, mostly from the sale of timber, is made at the end of the fiscal year to the State in which the forest is located. This money is spent as the Legislature may direct for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the national forest is located. The money may not be used by the county for any other public purpose.

In the 12th Congressional District, in which the Ottawa and Marquette National Forests are located, the funds annually made available from revenue-sharing payments are neither an adequate nor a dependable source of revenue upon which local governments may rely in budgeting for the needs of their communities.

The revenue-sharing payments in my district fall far short of making up for the tax losses on property added to the national forests in recent years. I am sure that this is true in other parts of the country. One of the inequities in the present payment system, however, results from the wide variance in the payments because some forests are more productive than others.

One of the greatest defects of the present system is the way the revenue-sharing payments fluctuate from year to year in accordance with the supply and demand situation in the wood-based industries. The Forest Service informs me that the reduced revenue-sharing payments from the Ottawa National Forest in recent years have resulted from lower demand for stumpage and reduced stumpage prices. During the period from 1953 through 1957 these payments averaged 10.7 cents an acre, declining to 7.9 cents in the years 1958 through 1962. The Forest Service estimates that the payment for the current fiscal year will approximate 6.5 cents an acre.

This decline in revenues under the present system has had a serious impact on the counties in my district at a time when expenses for schools, roads, and other public facilities and services have steadily increased. In Gogebic County, for example, 38 percent of the land is in the Ottawa National Forest. In some school districts the proportion of Forest Service land is much higher. One of the larger geographic units in Gogebic County is the Marenisco School District, comprising 200,000 acres, of which 122,000 acres, or 61 percent of the total, are owned by the Forest Service. The largest part of this acreage has been added to the Ottawa National Forest in the last 15 years. Before 1938, 50,800 acres in the Marenisco School District were part of the national forest. Since then, 71,200 acres have been added to the national forest by withdrawal from private ownership. Local authorities estimate that the tax revenues on the additional acreage that went off the local tax rolls since 1938 would now amount to $19,000 annually and perhaps as much as $29,000, depending on certain variable factors in the assessment procedure. At the estimated average of 6.5 cents an acre the revenue-sharing payment on these 71,200 acres will amount to $4,628 during the current fiscal year.

In 1948 the Congress approved a special payment arrangement for 500,000 acres of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of the Superior National Forest in Minnesota. Timber cutting in this area had been drastically curtailed in order to preserve its scenic beauty, and the counties in that area were thus deprived of funds they otherwise would have received as their share of the forest revenues. To make up for this loss, Congress passed a law requiring an annual payment of an amount equal to three-fourths of 1 percent of the appraised value of the forest lands as determined at 10-year intervals by the Secretary of Agriculture. This payment is made to the State of Minnesota for distribution to the counties concerned.

Since this area lies across Lake Superior from the Ottawa National Forest in my district, I thought it would be interesting to know how the Minnesota counties have fared under the special arrangement. I learned that they are much better off than the counties in my district and will do even better when the next appraisal reflects the enhanced recreational value of the wilderness area. Even under the last appraisal made in 1958 the payments averaged 17.1 cents an acre in 1962, about 10 cents an acre more than revenue-sharing payments have been averaging in my district. It is also significant that revenue-sharing payments to counties in the Superior National Forest of Minnesota outside the canoe area averaged only 5.6 cents an acre in 1962.

It is obvious, therefore, that the present revenue-sharing system is an inequitable method of reimbursing counties for the loss of national forest lands from the local tax rolls.

Basing payments in lieu of taxes on the assessed value of the forest lands might be the fairest method of assuring the counties stable revenues of which they could rely in their long-range planning. I am mindful, however, of the great expense that would be incurred in making the regular appraisals that would be required for putting payments on a valuation basis. For this reason I believe that the simplest solution to the problem is to retain the present system, based on forest revenues, and make an additional payment at the flat rate of 10 cents an acre.

My bill provides for this payment to be made directly to each eligible county, which could then apportion the funds among its townships, school districts, and other units of local government.

It is also unwise, in my opinion, to restrict such funds, as those from the revenue-sharing payments are restricted, to educational and road construction purposes. The money that would be available under my bill could be used to build and maintain roads and schools, but also could be used for other essential purposes of local government.

This legislation is vitally needed by the counties in which our national forests are located and I urge its enactment.

Canyonlands National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Utah is endowed with some of the most spectacular and exciting natural scenic attractions in the world. The area located in the southeast portion of the State is one of the most colorful in the world. It has long been the desire of those acquainted with this scenic wonderland to conserve and preserve the scenery, the natural and historic objects for the enjoyment of future generations.

Consistent with this desire, a Canyonlands bill was introduced in the House in the 87th Congress. Testimony was heard and recorded and the committee report was made with the recommendation that the measure be passed. Even the minority view of the report stated, "There can be no question but that much of this area is of a true national park stature, possessing outstanding scenic grandeur unsurpassed anywhere else in the Nation." Exception was taken to the bill, however, because of threats to private interests and unresolved questions of multiple use.

Since that time, the members of the Utah delegation, the Governor of the State of Utah and other persons and organizations involved have worked diligently to resolve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that these problems have now been quite largely resolved and we are ready to create the Canyonlands National Park. The bill I introduced yesterday is, I think, a reasonable compromise and I sincerely hope that we can now move forward with the creation of the park.

Statement Supporting H.R. 5625

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I submitted to the Special Subcommittee on Labor on June 11, 1963, in support of a National Service Corps:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5625, BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, JUNE 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy stated very explicitly in his Youth Message on February 14, 1963, that "the logic and value of a National Service Corps has been demonstrated by the work and success of our Peace Corps overseas. * * * While admiring the work of these volunteers in carrying their skills and ideals to assist the needy in other lands, it is equally clear that the opportunities for service are also large here at home. Although the United States is the wealthiest Nation the world has ever known, the poverty of millions of our people, and the need for training, assistance, and encouragement in numerous corners of our country, from teeming slum areas to those depressed rural areas virtually bypassed by technological and economic progress, provide fertile fields for those citizens with the desire and ability to be of assistance."

I agree with the President. I think, however, the justification for a domestic corps—aside from the tremendous need—should not be sought so much in the success of its foreign predecessor as in the inherent rightness of the idea it represents. That is: it is time for the Federal Government to give a boost of a very particular kind to the American volunteer social work tradition.

Why boost the American volunteer social work movement? Because the only reasons for not doing so are either that no need exists or that there is a better alternative. I would challenge anyone to assert that no such need for more workers in the social work fields exists. The need is blatant, and the question of its existence is simply not the issue. The issue is: who is going to provide such workers? One small pamphlet recently published on the National Service Corps put it this way:

"Whether or not it is properly the business of the Federal Government to supply volunteers for local social service projects, few persons question the value of work of this kind or doubt that more volunteers for it are needed." ("Domestic Peace Corps," Editorial Research Reports, No. 13, April 3, 1963, p. 255.)

The figures from the Fact Sheet on Social Work Manpower and Social Work Education for 1962–63 describe just how severe this need is. In June 1962, 2,318 students in the United States completed their social work education and received their master's degree in social work. Yet, the most careful estimates available indicate that upward of 15,000 persons would have to be recruited annually to replace those leaving the field, to staff necessary expansion of existing services, and to man newly developing services. Moreover, this estimate does not take account of the full expansion of services that would be required by the recent rapid growth in population.

In addition, right now there are 10,000 current social work vacancies for which funds are available but for which qualified staff cannot be found.

There are no figures on how well volunteers are currently working to fill this gap. But when the President's Study Group for National Voluntary Service consulted State, county, and local officials and hundreds of organizations around the country, as well as the professional fields that would be most concerned with the use of volunteer workers, they not only got a response that expressed great interest but some organizations also submitted concrete proposals outlining projects where volunteers could be used.

For example, back in November, when the domestic Peace Corps idea was first gaining ground, the Mobilization for Youth project on the lower East Side of Manhattan was asked for recommendations on whether and how they could use such volunteers. The directors replied that they could easily use as many as 30 Peace Corps volunteers and said: "Almost any place you touch on our program you can find a use for peace corpsmen."

I think that it should be emphasized that the volunteers provided by the National Service Corps would be full-time volunteers. Most persons currently doing volunteer work are not full-time but part-time volunteers. This certainly is understandable in that for most volunteers, their volunteer work is only one item on a crowded schedule. But it also makes more attractive the idea of a corps that would supply volunteers who could do what they do in the spirit of total commitment.

A director of Mobilization for Youth, once again, showed how this kind of commitment could be valuable. It would mean that these full-time volunteer workers could live with the people they were helping. He added:

"This way they would establish their own contacts and attachments—each within a different pocket of the neighborhood. We would want them to root themselves in the community, to understand and become part of its culture and climate."

He even concluded that this advantage of a peace corpsman gives him a value in and of his own that is different from the professional worker who would not be willing to live in this manner.

I think another way to really appreciate the possible potential and value of a home corps to this country is to examine the alternatives. It has been generally admitted during the past few years by public welfare personnel that payments alone to the poorer part of our population are not enough. These people need rehabilitation to make a payment meaningful. We, as a nation, are coming to the point where our national conscience will not tolerate the mere transfer of money as an adequate method of improving the lot of the poor. We must provide the right social services to help people climb from the confusion and despair into which poverty has sunk them.

This could be done either by expanding our public welfare programs at a very high price to provide such services, or it can be done by enacting an idea like the National Service Corps, which would achieve many of the same goals, at a minimal cost. The special kind of commitment that characterizes such an effort is something that cannot be bought at any price, and yet, is a tremendously valuable factor in the makeup of a program that aims at rehabilitation.

A most important consideration, of course, is how the potential volunteers and how the social work profession, in general, feel about the establishment of such a corps. By now enough spokesmen have been heard from and enough surveys tabulated to make it possible to draw a fairly clear picture.

A recent publication of the President's Study Group, "Facts on the Proposed National Service Program," reports the following on a survey they conducted:

"More than 10,000 students at 65 colleges and universities replied to the questionnaires; 88 percent felt a national service program is desirable; 70 percent said they would join, or consider joining, such a program.

"Responses from over 4,000 senior citizens showed that 82 percent think the program desirable, and 57 percent said they would join or consider joining."

Not too long ago, the Social Welfare Assembly, speaking for the many groups that are its members, took a stand on the idea of a national peace corps. Cautious as they were in their statement, they explicitly and unquestionably endorsed the corps. Their published position statement reads:

"The National Social Welfare Assembly believes that a National Service Corps under certain conditions can make significant contributions to the welfare, health and education services of the Nation.

"We believe the National Service Corps should set forth sound goals which can be achieved. Under positive conditions the program will have significant value and merit."

Such support is valuable and should not be ignored.

I think we should be most encouraged and spurred to establishing such a corps by the words of one of our fellow representative's daughters, Barbara Boggs, when she said the following in trying to capture the current mood of youth, and especially of those individuals in the organization she was discussing—the National Student Association. She described: "a growing willingness to act on social issues." And mentioned: "The Good Joe idea, even the ivory tower idea, is disappearing rapidly. There is a desire on the part of many college students to channel their new awareness into some type of socially worthy activity after graduating."

This bill, H.R. 5625, would authorize $5 million for the coming fiscal year. Although it is not specified in the bill, I understand that the goal is to get 1,000 persons at work by the end of fiscal year 1964, and perhaps, 5,000 by the end of 3 years. I agree with those who would keep the corps small. It is highly desirable to use it as a catalytic agent rather than developing an army of workers upon which the whole Nation might ultimately depend. This latter development might also stunt the very kind of growth that it is trying to stimulate.

The provisions for the volunteers seem advisable, and the $75 per month allowance, which had initially been considered at a figure less than $75, seems fair. I understand that many have both speculated on and, then, argued about the contemplated length of the training period for these volunteers. In fact, the National Student Association representatives favored a 3-month training period like the foreign corps volunteers rather than the 1 month suggested by the President's Study Group. It seems to me that although the on-the-job difficulties of the foreign and domestic assignments will be equal, the preparation needed does not necessarily have to be. After all, this is America and the question of a new culture and a new language plus all the other general background information that can be helpful in this work will not need to be covered to the same degree as in a totally foreign land. Much that is known by any citizen will carry over although, naturally, particulars on different minority groups will have to be filled in.

I definitely favor also keeping the stipulation that no project be undertaken unless the local community has initiated the action and invited the Federal Government to come in. There is plenty of potential in this home corps and there is no point in stifling it by having it continually embroiled in disputes with localities claiming the Federal Government will try to impose its will on them. Also, to have the Federal Government force the issue is to deny the initial purpose of the legislation, which was to supplement, not coerce, local action.

I would like to conclude by saying that the time to pass this bill is now. The potential for social gains inherent in it is great, and the expenditure is small. I urge the early enactment of H.R. 5625.

President Kennedy's Grab for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are in danger of losing their freedoms because of the unmatched grab for power by President Kennedy. Not even Franklin Roosevelt, in his bald attempt to pack the Supreme Court, could match the demands made by the present occupant of the White House. And the real danger is that the President's plans to downgrade Congress and seize additional power for the Executive are applauded by some Members of Congress.

The dangers inherent in Executive excesses were eloquently exposed by Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, who took the affirmative side of the question, "Is President Kennedy Attempting a Grab for Power?" in this week's issue of the Washington World. Senator MORTON's article follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S GRAB FOR POWER

(By Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky)

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

The Budget Director told Congress its Members couldn't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will, there was an outcry that rocked the country.

There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of government are subordinated.

DANGEROUS EXCESSES

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy—negotiations based upon Executive decisions.

Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removal of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich.

But suddenly, without consultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously, by the Executive alone.

Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present.

When, if ever, a disarmament is finally reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for the Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

"Planning" is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

DISTRUST OF PEOPLE

I think these excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

MUST GOVERNMENT DO ALL?

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry; the Federal Government alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it—mistrust of the people.

Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while we have been occupied of late with other issues of paramount concern, the national debate over methods to provide hospital insurance for the aged continues. I happen to believe that the best method is a program financed through and operated under social security. Those interested in the issue have advanced alternate methods. One such method was recently brought to my attention by a physician who resides and practices in Princeton, N.J. The method he suggests is set forth in a recent issue of Medical Economics. It is outlined in an article entitled "Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?" With your permission I should like to place before you this article and my reply thereto which was in the form of a letter. The article and my letter are as follows:

Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?—That's What Blue Cross and the A.H.A. Propose as an Alternative to the Administration's Health Care Plan—Here's Why They Say the Government Must Pay for Hospital Insurance for the Aged, but Blue Cross Should Run the Program

Practically all the aged need help in paying for hospital insurance policies. It's got to be Government help, and "the tax source of the funds is of secondary importance to us." The important thing is for the insurance to be purchased and administered through the voluntary nonprofit prepayment system.

That's the gist of two public statements made last year by Blue Cross and the American Hospital Association. They did not attract much attention then; President Kennedy's aged-care plan took the play away from them. But after the Kennedy plan was compromised and defeated in the Senate, some Congressmen took a second look at the Blue Cross-A.H.A. proposal. Its combination of Government money and private initiative may turn out to be a popular political mix in 1963.

Can you pocket the Government's money without winding up in the Government's pocket? A good many doctors have wondered if that's where the Blue Cross-A.H.A. proposal might lead. So Medical Economics Associate Editor Carlton Smith recently put some pointed questions to Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association. Here are the highlights that emerged from their discussion:

"Question. Mr. McNerney, doesn't your proposal call for a kind of Government subsidy of Blue Cross?

"Answer. No. What we've proposed is Government subsidy of the 65-and-over age group to help them buy the hospital care protection they need but can't afford.

"Question. Do you mean that assistance would be given directly to the aged to help them pay for Blue Cross coverage?

"Answer. We haven't specified Blue Cross. Our proposal was that the administrative machinery of the entire voluntary prepayment system be used. There's already a shortage of skills on the administrative side of health care. So to create a parallel organization as a Government agency would only heighten the shortage and make for unnecessary duplication.

"We propose to make use of the experience that the voluntary system has acquired in enrolling millions of subscribers. Blue Cross, for example, has developed a high degree of sophistication in working with doctors, hospitals, and subscribers. As a result, quality of care isn't subordinated to purely quantitative considerations. For quality hospital care, the U.S. public needs that kind of experience—and it can't be acquired overnight.

"Question. Why, then, have Blue Cross and the hospitals proposed using Government money to subsidize the over-65 group?

"Answer. Because Blue Cross can't provide the money, particularly for people reaching retirement age who never had Blue Cross during their working years. They never participated in creating the plan's reserves. Blue Cross can't undertake to subsidize a special group and at the same time continue to be competitive.

"Question. What about the hospitals? Couldn't they give aged patients a discount?

"Answer. That might have been possible back in the days when a hospital was a 'house of mercy' with mostly volunteer labor. Today's hospital doesn't have the financial cushion to absorb such a loss. So if you eliminate the prepayment system and the hospitals as a subsidy source, the only practicable alternative is Government money.

"Question. How much money? A good many doctors aren't convinced that the over-65 are in quite the dire straits that are publicized. How much assistance do you think is actually needed?

"Answer. Blue Cross has made a thorough study of that question. On the average, the aged's hospital expenses are roughly double those of people under 65. Their incomes, on average, are of course considerably less than those of the younger group. And our study tells us that there will always be an aged group in need of some help.

"Granted, not all the aged need help. Some of today's aged are fairly high on the scale in terms of assets and income. Yet what makes the aged unique as a group is the disproportionate number with low incomes and high health care expenses. And because of their fixed incomes, they're usually not protected against inflation.

"Question. If the need for assistance varies within the aged group, how will you determine who gets how much help?

"Answer. Blue Cross and the hospitals have suggested a scaled-income system—more help to those with low incomes, less help to those with higher incomes. An aged person at the bottom of the scale might be subsidized to the extent of 100 percent of the cost of his hospital insurance. Someone at the top of the scale might get a 25-percent assist. And there would be gradations in between.

"Question. Would every aged person get some help, whether he needed it or not?

"Answer. Yes. On the scaled-income system, everybody would receive some help. We feel that the relatively few aged with substantial resources have been overplayed as a reason for not simplifying the subsidy system.

"Question. How would you determine where an aged person belonged on the subsidy scale?

"Answer. Probably by a special report he'd make to the Internal Revenue Service or to some other Government agency.

"Question. Then each person receiving assistance would get his money directly from the Government—as a monthly check, for example?

"Answer. The amount could be added to a Government retirement check, or it could be a separate check. Each recipient would have to supply evidence that he was insured for hospital care—possibly through certification by the carrier.

"Question. Let's take a bank president who retires with a net worth of $1 million-plus and an income of around $75,000 a year. Would he be eligible for assistance?

"Answer. It's conceivable that he'd get a minimal subsidy if he carried health insurance. Whether he'd need it or not isn't really the issue, as far as Congress is concerned. There are strong forces in the country—including people in industry management itself—who feel that after all the taxes they've paid to the Government, they and their employees and dependents should get something in return. If such power groups developed enough weight, Congress would have to see that everybody got something. That's a matter of cold political reasoning.

"Question. Mr. McNerney, wouldn't your proposed system bring the Government into medicine on a large scale?

"Answer. The Government would certainly develop some standards—some controls. But the extent to which it would try to manipulate the controls—to take over—would be an indication of how well or poorly Blue Cross performed. We think our standards and performance are so good that, if we were involved, there'd be no need for excessive Government controls.

"Question. But if you opened the door to the Government this way, wouldn't it soon want to take over?

"Answer. I think not. Blue Cross is covering many retired Federal employees throughout the country, and our underwriting relationship with the Government is working well. The State of Texas is buying Blue Cross for its indigent aged patients, and our experience there is good.

"The administration and Congress might welcome our voluntary prepayment plan as a buffer against the many complex issues that arise in the course of covering a sizable part of the population. Besides, there's a growing bipartisan sentiment that the indigent in this country deserve to get good quality health care. This feeling isn't necessarily prompted by a desire to have the Government take over medicine.

"Question. Granting the good intentions, isn't there a danger that, once you started a plan such as you propose for the aged, pretty soon everybody would want the Government to pay for his hospital care?

"Answer. Some people may be aiming for that. But right now the bipartisan middle group in Congress doesn't seem to be. The essential question is this: Would acknowledging the need for more Government help to the aged strengthen the voluntary health insurance system or weaken it? I'm convinced that what Blue Cross and the hospitals are proposing would strengthen the voluntary system."

Dear Doctor: I want to thank you for forwarding the article entitled "Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?" which appeared in the May 6 issue of Medical Economics. I read that article with great interest. As I promised in my letter of last week, my views respecting the article follow:

Blue Cross, it would appear, is again jockeying for position as Congress heads toward renewed consideration of a hospital insurance program for the elderly.

The Blue Cross Association proposes that a Federal program for the elderly consist of subsidization of the cost of acceptable private hospitalization coverage (i.e., Blue Cross). The Government's contributions are to be made on a sliding scale based upon individual income.

I think the proposal is deficient on several counts:

1. Subsidization of Blue Cross contracts would involve considerably more cost to the program than if the underwriting function were assumed by a social security fund. Additional expenses involved would include: (a) risk charges; (b) unnecessary or unreasonable charges for overhead such as might be involved in the payment of salaries, advertising, promotion, and lobbying expenses; (c) payments to hospitals in excess of reasonable costs—a reimbursement practice of a number of Blue Cross plans; (d) the cost of Blue Cross establishment and operation of a national apparatus. Blue Cross, as you know, is not really a functioning national entity, but is, essentially, a loose confederation of more than 70 different organizations. Coordinating all these local plans would represent a costly and complex operation and the national headquarters has not had any comparable task in the past, so that it cannot be demonstrated that the capacity exists. On the contrary, the Blue Cross Association has on several occasions been unable to obtain compliance among member plans with its announced national policy because the authority of local member plans has been dominant.

2. Blue Cross claims that it now has 5 million subscribers who are aged 65 and over. A large proportion of those enrolled pay premiums based upon community rating—that is, rates representing an average cost of all subscribers, both young and old. Blue Cross says that it pays out far more than it takes in from its older members. A program involving Government subsidy would encourage Blue Cross to raise its premium levels to a point covering the actual claims experience of these older persons, eliminating the community rating factor; a factor, incidentally, which had been included in the premiums charged these older people during their younger and more claims-free working years. The Government would thus conveniently relieve Blue Cross of a major obligation by its payment of substantially higher premiums for the same coverage previously provided by Blue Cross at lower cost. This would be a unique beneficial gesture toward Blue Cross and would not affect commercial insurance companies in the same fashion. The commercial carriers, as you know, have been making a substantial profit on the limited coverage offered to older people.

3. There is no question that a social security underwritten and administered program would hold the interests of those insured paramount. There are serious questions raised, however, as to whether many Blue Cross plans have an equal overriding commitment to their subscribers. I think it fair to state that Blue Cross boards of directors are, in the main, dominated by persons directly or indirectly connected with the providers of health services—hospitals, doctors, etc. State regulatory agencies have exhibited increasing concern over this imbalance in representation, and what even borders on conflict of interest. What we want is a program with an unqualified, unhedged, and unlimited dedication to the beneficiaries of that program. I know social security can make that commitment; Blue Cross, at least at present, cannot.

4. No one has, as yet, been able to devise an equitable and satisfactory income test—and Blue Cross is no exception. Such a test would greatly complicate any program and would result in inequities to many beneficiaries. The requirement that millions of people copay premium costs would mean that many might not be able to pay initially or maintain their share of the cost. Indeed, as premium costs went up the burden would become ever greater. But, my principal objection to this feature is that we are talking about a social insurance program, not a public assistance plan with a means test. All beneficiaries should be able to secure the protection on an equal basis; employment of an income test works against this vital principle.

I am not so sure that all of the Blue Cross plans want to participate in a social security financed program. The American Hospital Association statement of January 1962, quoted in the Medical Economics article, says, "The tax source of the funds is of secondary importance to us." The Blue Cross plans, meeting concurrently with the A.H.A. omitted that phrase from their statement. I understand that this omission was deliberate and reflects the substantial opposition of a number of Blue Cross plans to the essential principle of social security financing. Related to this is the fact that the Blue Cross plans do not speak with "one voice." The 75 or 76 plans are, basically, locally and not nationally oriented. Their policies vary, reflecting local biases, prejudices, and methods of operation—many of which would be unacceptable in a national program.

Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of the degree of disorder and lack of agreement among the various plans occurred last fall. The Blue Cross Association, at that time, announced in full-page advertisements that all Blue Cross plans were prepared to offer new plans of hospital protection for the elderly during the fall of 1962. Millions of older Americans were tragically misled by that advertising campaign. Many Blue Cross plans—including the two largest ones—did not offer new programs. The Blue Cross Association could not force its reluctant or recalcitrant member plans to implement a national program. Blue Cross, definitely, does not speak with a single voice. It is, rather, an unled, dissonant chorus.

I realize that the position I have outlined above is somewhat strong. I should point out that I am familiar with a number of outstanding Blue Cross plans which do a fine job of serving the public interest. Unfortunately, too many other Blue Cross plans do not meet the high standards established and maintained by the best plans. I should also indicate that while I firmly oppose subsidies to Blue Cross, I have an open mind on the possibility of making use of Blue Cross in certain aspects of administration of a social security-financed program.

National Lotteries of Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, all of the 77 foreign countries that operate Government lotteries have found that restraining rather than prohibitive measures are best not only in coping with the gambling problem but in raising additional revenue. Today I would like to go back to South America and point out four other countries that utilize Government-run lotteries as the best, painless revenues producers.

Mr. Speaker, all of these countries make the normal gambling urge of their people work for the benefit of health and social welfare.

Paraguay is a small and impoverished nation of about 2 million people. Revenue sources are few and far between, but public needs are great. Luckily, Paraguay is smart enough to take advantage of a national lottery. The total gross receipts for 1962 came to $900,000, of which almost $187,000 went to the Government. The net revenues were used by the department of maternal and child care for the mother-child care program.

Peru is another country that takes advantage of and capitalizes on the gambling spirit of its people. The gross annual receipts for 1962 were $2,506,000. The net income was $406,000, which was used to increase the charity funds of the public benevolent organizations operating the lotteries. These funds were earmarked for hospital and medical services.

Uruguay is also a small country of some 3 million people, but it also has the sense to realize that great benefits may be derived from a national lottery. The gross receipts for the year 1962 came to over $18 million, an increase of $3 million over last year. The total net income to the Government came close to $5 million.

Venezuela is another country where the wheels of fortune spin on behalf of the public welfare. This small nation took in over $28 million in 1962. After payment of prizes, about $2¼ million went to the Government treasury. All of the income was set aside for the support of charities.

Mr. Speaker, with our taxes rapidly rising and with the need for new sources of revenue to meet our public demands becoming more pressing, is there a more painless or sensible way of raising Government revenue than a national lottery? None of these countries think so.

It is hard to understand our stubbornness and reluctance in not having our own Government-run lottery in the United States. If we took advantage of a national lottery in this country, we could raise over $10 billion a year in added income which could be used for tax relief and reduction of our national debt. What a lift this would be to Mr. and Mrs. American taxpayer.

New Climate for Feighan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary is a well-known and articulate authority in this important and highly specialized field of congressional work. He brings to his new responsibilities 20 years of intensive experience with the problems of people made homeless by war, tyranny, and revolution. His keen knowledge of law, world affairs, and the crisis of the cold war qualifies him as a natural for the chairmanship of this subcommittee.

A news story appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 12 reflects the thoughtful views of our colleague, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, as he assumes his new chairmanship. This report of a personal interview by Alvin Silverman is a warm and well-deserved tribute to a distinguished American.

By unanimous consent, obtained June 12, I insert this item in the RECORD:

NEW CLIMATE FOR FEIGHAN

WASHINGTON.—MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, brandnew chairman of the House group that handles immigration matters, leaned back in his chair and looked over the top of his rimless glasses at the ceiling.

The head man of a most important committee in the congressional scheme of things, FEIGHAN was pondering a question about his views on immigration.

It was an unusual experience for him.

For 20 of his 21 years as a House Member, he had served on the Judiciary Committee. Now, with the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, he was its ranking Democratic member. For 14 of those years he had been a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. Now, with Walter gone, he was its chairman.

It was an extraordinary occurrence because, even though FEIGHAN had been articulate and, at times, verbose about immigration policies, few persons had sought out his views or listened very attentively to his expressions.

People talk of "the leadership" and of "majorities" but the individuals who run the show in the Congress are the committee chairmen. They can block legislation or they can report it out. If you want to get national publicity, you make a speech on Capitol Hill. If you want to get a particular measure enacted into law, you make friends with the chairmen of the committees.

FEIGHAN may or may not have been reflecting on the turn of events. When he answered, though, it was apparent he had been reflecting on immigration laws.

The handsome Clevelander, whose rippling silver hair usually causes more gallery comment than many of his colleagues' declamations, leaned forward suddenly and said:

"Our immigration laws should be pointed at three major objectives."

The first of these, said FEIGHAN, was to reunite families, with citizens of the United States receiving priority.

Second, he went on, we should seek to acquire special skills and aptitudes needed by our national economy, cultural interests and, in fact, our security. This, he explained, could best be done through a selective immigration process geared to our established needs.

And third, said FEIGHAN, our immigration laws should provide the President of the United States with a reasonable flexibility of action so he may move quickly in international emergencies growing out of wars, tyranny, and human upsets.

"The world looks to the United States for leadership in these circumstances," FEIGHAN explained, referring especially to his third point. "A rapid response could spell the difference between peace and war."

Above all, in the Clevelander's opinion, our immigration policy, as all U.S. policy, must serve the common good of our people. It must reflect what is best for the interests of the United States, domestically and internationally.

"Our immigration laws, through which policy is put into practice, must be consistent with the traditions and history of our Nation," FEIGHAN asserted.

"We are a Nation made great by the toils, the hopes, the sacrifices, and the creative genius of people whose origins go back to many other countries of the world.

"We have been a safe haven for oppressed people, people who have suffered religious and political persecution, people made homeless by war, aggression, terror, and tyranny.

"In my opinion," FEIGHAN continued, "our immigration laws must be flexible, completely in tune with the changing times and consistent with our responsibilities as the leader of freedom's cause."

Cleveland, for many years, has been the great melting pot of the United States. Nearly two-thirds of its population is either foreign-born or second-generation American. Its Hungarian community, to pick out only 1 of the 14 principal nationalities, is said to be the largest in the world outside Budapest.

Now a Clevelander has much to say about American immigration policy.

Macdonald Praises Passamaquoddy Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, New England, which has long had the unenviable distinction of paying the highest electric rates in the continental United States, may soon be getting ready to do something about it.

I await the report of the Interior Department on its restudy of the Passamaquoddy project and St. John River. It is my understanding that the report will be completed by July 1 of this year. I certainly hope it will be a favorable report—a report which will mark the beginning of comprehensive development of New England's water resources.

I have in the past supported water resource development programs throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope those of you from other areas will view this proposal with favor when it is brought before the Congress for action.

I want to outline some of the recent developments which are putting the problem of power costs in New England—and the possible solutions—into clearer focus than ever before.

First, it is an unfortunate and distressing fact that power rates in New England are too high.

William D. Shipman documented this statement in his 1962 book, "An Inquiry Into the High Cost of Electricity in New England." He found that rates in New England were 12 to 15 percent higher than comparable rates of private utilities outside of our area. He found that on a cost per kilowatt-hour basis, the difference was even greater—46 percent higher in New England.

Federal Power Commission Chairman Joseph Swidler documented the fact that New England power rates are too high in a speech in Boston in October 1962. Mr. Swidler observed: "New England still has far to go in taking advantage of its opportunities to reduce the cost of producing and selling electric power."

In 1961, Mr. Swidler noted, the average residential consumer in New England used 3,113 kilowatt-hours of electricity. But, he added, that was 23 percent below the national average of 4,019 kilowatt-hours. These figures raise sharply the question whether consumers in New England are achieving the full benefits of electrical living.

The latest available figures from the Federal Power Commission—as of January 1, 1962—show that New England residential consumers are paying from 4.8 percent to 20.5 percent more—highest in the continental United States—for 250 kilowatt-hours of electricity than the average U.S. residential consumers.

Manufacturing industries in New England fare much worse. A recent study by the Electric Consumers Information Committee reveals, for example, that manufacturing industries in the United States paid an average of 0.832 cents per kilowatt-hour for purchased power in 1960. But New England manufacturing industries paid an average of 1.452 cents per kilowatt-hour for the power they purchased in 1960. That was highest in the Nation, 65 percent more than the national average, and 181 percent more than in the east south-central region.

Consider this: If power purchased by the New England manufacturing industries had been just one-tenth of a cent cheaper—in 1960, our industries would have saved $11.4 million. And even a 1 million decrease in the cost of power would have still kept New England's cost of power highest in the Nation.

Now I want to point out that New England is beginning to speak out on this issue. We are concerned and we want to do something about it. The Boston Herald noted in an editorial on November 15, 1962:

> Here is another opportunity for useful leadership by the Governor of Massachusetts in 1963-64 * * *. It is to bring about a reduction in the cost of power.

I want to add that all of us from New England have an opportunity for useful leadership on this issue.

The same Boston Herald observed so accurately in another editorial on November 23, 1962:

> Electricity is not only costlier in New England than elsewhere in the country, but to make it cheaper would give tremendous impetus to the whole economy of New England.

Another Massachusetts newspaper added its voice to the call for action a few months ago. In an editorial February 26, 1963, the Haverhill Journal declared in sharp language:

> The cost of power in this region is outrageous. It is a definite factor deterring our future industrial growth and must be brought into line with reason if we are to achieve any genuine progress.

The Journal added:

> If we are being overcharged for electricity, let's find out why and put a stop to it. If we are not being overcharged by our electric utilities, let's find out why their rates have

to be so much higher than private owned utility companies in other regions.

Our good friends and neighbors in nearby New York are also voicing their concern about high power rates. In words that apply so aptly to New England, a group of industrial leaders in New York City said recently that high power rates are "building an economic wall around our city that may halt any future plant expansion and keep vital new industry out."

There is the issue. There are some of the recent expressions of concern. Now, what can we do about it?

Mr. Swidler, the FPC Chairman, offered several concrete suggestions in his Boston speech. He urged greater integration of facilities and operations, and coordinated planning. He urged development of the region's hydroelectric potential. We in New England have 2.8 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydropower capacity, according to the latest conservative figures. That total does not include an estimated 1 million kilowatts of peaking capacity at the Passamaquoddy project.

Mr. Swidler also urged the construction of large, more economical generating-plants, as well as greater use of power, with rate reductions to stimulate increased use.

Mr. Shipman, in his book on New England power rates, suggested that a regional power policy for New England would be desirable. He also suggested consolidation of many of the small power companies into two of three large integrated systems.

The distinguished junior Senator from the State of Maine [Mr. Muskie] observed in an address in Cleveland, Ohio, early this month that our New England "hydropower can, and should, be developed now." Unlike atomic energy, he said, "the technology is already perfected and feasible sites have been surveyed. The major cost of a hydro project is in building the dam to form the reservoir. This expense is subject to escalation as price levels rise; thus, the sooner these projects are constructed, the lower the anticipated price tag."

The point is clear: much can be done to make more power available to Massachusetts at lower rates. I hope our New England region will band together as never before to accomplish this goal. We need to modernize and improve our power system. We need multipurpose development of our water resources and integration of our now disjointed small power systems. Large steam generating units, conventional and atomic, should be constructed.

We might well consider creation of a Northeastern Power Administration to bring to New England and the entire Northeast the benefits which other regions have enjoyed under similar arrangements. Massachusetts can surge forward on a tide of low cost energy if proper vision and imagination are used in power resource development.

All of us in New England—local and State officials, business and labor and farm and civic groups, all consumers, and those of us who represent our great region in the Congress—all of us must work together, on our own and in cooperation with the appropriate Federal departments and agencies, to achieve the goal of abundant electricity at lower rates in our region. The people, businesses and industries of New England will benefit. So, too, will our entire Nation.

Polar Explorer, Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S. Naval Reserve (Retired)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Polar Explorer Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, who has a remarkable record in geographic and scientific exploration of the Antarctic, was honored recently by the Explorers Club of New York at their annual banquet of the Washington group.

The Certificate of Merit, of which Captain Ronne is the second worldwide recipient, was presented him by Dr. Serge Korff, president of the Explorers Club of New York. In presenting the citation, Dr. Korff stated "that the board of directors of the Explorers Club awarded him this honor, recognizing his achievements in his geographic and scientific contribution to polar knowledge over 30 years of service in exploration."

Captain Ronne in accepting this honor expressed his appreciation with the hope that Dr. Korff would convey his heartfelt thanks for the club's recognition. "It was very thoughtful and gracious of them to remember me at this time," he concluded.

The record of my friend, Capt. Finn Ronne, upon which this citation of merit is based is unparalleled in the annals of arctic and antarctic exploration. To date, Captain Ronne's distinguished career encompasses six journeys to the Antarctic; four of at least 15 months' duration, including one he personally organized and led in 1946–48, as well as four summers to the arctic regions.

Norwegian born and the son of Martin Ronne, who was with Roald Amundsen for 20 years, Finn Ronne's enviable record of geographical exploration of the Antarctic was accomplished as an American citizen. Trained as an engineer, he emigrated to the United States in 1923 and joined the engineering staff of Westinghouse Electric Corp., at Pittsburgh, Pa. He became a citizen in 1929. On leave, he served with Admiral Byrd's 1933–35 expedition as ski expert and dog driver and sledged for months in Antarctica's interior doing geographical exploration and survey.

Back with Westinghouse in 1935 he made plans for his own small expedition which suddenly snowballed into U.S. Antarctic Service Expedition when his plans were taken over and conducted by the Department of Interior. As second-in-command at East Base on Palmer Peninsula, he led the main southern sledge party that completed a 1,264-mile sledge trip in 84 days, exploring and delineating 450 miles of new coastline in the Pacific quadrant, and claimed newly discovered land for the United States. On the mountainous Palmer Peninsula he accurately surveyed more than 300 geographical features, photographed them from 12 main control centers and completed a survey map that forms the basis for control of trimetrogon photographs he took on his later exploratory flights over the same area 7 years later. Commissioned a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy in May, 1941, he served in World War II with the Navy's Bureau of Ships in charge of tenders and repair ships for which he received Navy's commendation. In summer of 1946 he was on Navy task force staff surveying Canadian Arctic and northwest Greenland to set up weather stations and construct airstrips at now famous Thule Air Force Base.

Without funds of his own and against great odds, his sheer determination launched the Ronne Antarctic Research Expedition 1946–48. With congressional approval for loan of a Navy ship, he solicited funds and equipment from universities and scientific organizations. The Air Force lent him airplanes for exploration and aerial photography and the Office of Naval Research outlined a scientific plan to follow. The 23 people, including his wife, Edith Ronne, the 183-foot wooden ship *Port of Beaumont* was manned and sailed beyond Cape Horn, to Marguerite Bay, off Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica, where his ship was frozen in. Based on shore, his party spent the long, dark, and cold winter night preparing to tackle geographical problems on the sun's return. His party of aviation people, himself the aerial navigator, made numerous flights and mapped known and previously unknown land to the south and southwest of the treacherous Weddell Sea. Here the last unknown coastline in the world was delineated; it stretches from Palmer Peninsula southernmost in the Weddell Sea to Coats Land, a distance of about 450 miles. Scientists at base and out in the field with dog teams conducted investigations in 11 branches of science. Mountain ranges with huge glaciers were discovered in the newly explored Edith Ronne Land which is more than twice the size of Texas—all of which he claimed in the name of the United States.

The 100 new features discovered includes Isaiah Bowman Peninsula, Gould Bay, Mount Merle Tuvé, LeMay Mountain Range, Sweeney and Lowell Thomas Mountains, and many others. The correlation and location of all of the newly discovered features he located on sketchmaps sent to the American Geographical Society from Valparaiso, Chile. Complete maps were made by the society even before the expedition ship reached New York. This also proved to be a "first" in the history of exploration. A full description of the geographical and scientific accomplishments of the expedition were published in the June 1948 issue of Geographic Review of the American Geographical Society of New York.

The results obtained by Captain Ronne's expedition are found in 15 scientific publications by the Office of Naval Research. Other publications as a result of his expedition were presented the Air Force, the Army, Scientific Monthly, Explorers Journal, et cetera, and the popular account of the expedition in "Antarctic Conquest," Captain Ronne's own story, by G. P. Putnam's, New York. The expedition, which cost a total of only $50,000, was financed on a shoestring, but the accomplishments of its 23 members, as indicated in the foreword of "Antarctic Conquest" by Dr. Isaiah Bowman, were much greater than any much larger and costlier expedition of the time. Captain Ronne's work has been recognized in the scientific and geographical polar field. In 1946 he became the first American postmaster ever to set up a post office in the Antarctic and thus gave him official backing to an otherwise privately financed and operated polar expedition.

Promoted to captain in the Naval Reserve in 1953, he served as military commander and scientific leader of Ellsworth Station, southernmost in the Weddell Sea in Edith Ronne Land from 1956 to 1958 with 38 men in his expedition to collect scientific data under the International Geophysical Year program. In addition to a thorough scientific study made by the nine civilians in the party, Captain Ronne discovered new mountains and glaciers in the Edith Ronne Land sector on many airplane flights and these also were claimed for the United States.

During the 1958–59 season, Captain Ronne accepted an invitation from the Argentine Navy to accompany their expedition to their many bases on the Palmer Peninsula and their two bases, deep in the Weddell Sea. Again, in November-December 1961 he flew to McMurdo Sound in the Ross Sea from New Zealand and farther on to land at the South Pole. This visit was in connection with the 50th anniversary of Roald Amundsen's sledge expedition when they first reached the South Pole on the 14th of December 1911. In the summer of 1962 Captain Ronne spent some time on Spitsbergen, north of Norway in a small 97-foot long sealing ship cruising along the western fiords of the archipelago studying this little-known island group in the far north.

Thus through four yearlong winterings and seven summer tours in the cause of science and geographical exploration, Captain Ronne has covered more terrain in the Antarctic by dog-team travel and airplane flights than any other Antarctic explorer. All of this newly discovered land he has claimed in favor of his adopted country, the United States of America, in the never-ending direction of energies toward the accumulation of knowledge for the benefit of all mankind.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, and in the earth, and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name. Give us, we beseech Thee, the lowly and humble heart emptied of presumptuous pride which is the only shrine where any altar pleasing to Thee can be raised.

Lead us to the still waters, to the elixir of the springs by the wayside which alone can save us from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine, from cynicism and bitterness of spirit. Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals in this free forum, may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous times be higher than our own—

Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to set men free;
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 122)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Annual Report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1963.*

REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 121)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Under the provisions of title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the seventh annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 79) to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 national jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon the request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REVISED ESTIMATED COST OF CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the revised estimated cost of certain facilities for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN INTERSTATE SALES OF NATURAL GAS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, as of June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON OVERPAYMENT OF RENTALS FOR AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING MACHINES, GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpayment of rentals for automatic data processing machines, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON MEDICAL SERVICES FURNISHED WITHOUT CHARGE TO INDIVIDUALS FINANCIALLY ABLE TO PAY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on medical services furnished without charge to individuals financially able to pay and inadequate rents for employee housing, Indian health program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO TRADE WITH THE INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law with respect to trade with the Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 131, TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ALONG NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 131 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the control of outdoor advertising along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

ROBERT S. KERR—RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma State Legislature, on the 20th day of May 1963, paying tribute to the life and activities of the Honorable Robert S. Kerr; memorializing the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Oklahoma congressional delegation to designate the Water Pollution Laboratory at Ada, Okla., as the "Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center"; and directing distribution of copies of this resolution.

Senator Kerr, as the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, was largely responsible for the favorable action taken on Public Law 660 to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. This has come to be the "Magna Carta" in the Federal Government's activities in connection with its efforts to render usable the water resources of this country, which we all know will soon be in short supply if we cannot, through pollution abatement and control, provide for the reuse of the stream flows of this Nation.

After the adoption of Public Law 660 in 1956, Senator Kerr continued his efforts to increase the effectiveness of the basic legislation which the Congress had adopted. On July 20, 1961, Public Law 87 was adopted to amend the Federal Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, and for other purposes. It was in this amendment to Public Law 660 that the Congress authorized the construction of pollution control laboratories to be manned by highly skilled and technical personnel to attack the pollution problems on regional levels in order that greater speed might be accomplished than was indicated under the original act. Also under this amendment was provision for increasing the Federal participation with cities and towns for the construction of sewage treatment works, as was a section to provide for water quality control through the impoundment of water in Federal reservoirs for release at critical times in order that a quality of water might be maintained in our stream systems.

This is only a part of the great work that the late Senator Kerr did in connection with the matter of clearing up our streams and making available for use limited water supplies throughout the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems altogether fitting that the Public Health Laboratory which will be constructed on a site within view of the birthplace of Robert S. Kerr might bear his name as a continuing reminder that this man, from his humble beginning to a place of exalted influence, was ever using his energies for the benefit of generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 546

Resolution paying tribute to the life and activities of the Honorable Robert S. Kerr; memorializing the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Oklahoma congressional delegation to designate the water pollution laboratory at Ada, Okla., as the "Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center"; and directing distribution of copies of this resolution

Whereas the life and activities of the Honorable Robert S. Kerr from the fireside of an Indian territory log cabin to the council tables of the most exalted and influential leaders of men, reflects and epitomizes the great dream and image instilled into the heart of every American who breathes the perfumed air of liberty and swells with pride at the melody of freedom in action; and

Whereas the Honorable Robert S. Kerr fully represented all the people of the State of Oklahoma with courage, conviction and tenacity; and through boundless energy, commonsense, intelligence, and decisive debate, he established a position as one of the most revered and influential personalities of our time; and

Whereas it was the great dream of such an admirable man that this State would be one of the most active water ports in the Central United States, which resulted in the devotion of his every activity to the accomplishment of such a dream; and

Whereas the birthplace of Robert S. Kerr, and the old Kerr homestead, was 3 miles south of Ada; the people of the State of Oklahoma, through their elected representatives, wish to create a perpetual memorial in memory of their most beloved citizen and leader; and

Whereas it is the desire of the 29th session of the Oklahoma Legislature that action be taken to name the Water Pollution Laboratory at Ada, Okla., the "Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 29th session of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein).

SECTION 1. That we respectfully request the Oklahoma delegation of the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to act promptly in support of legislation necessary for such a designation

SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Oklahoma congressional delegation and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 2d day of May 1963.

J. W. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the house of representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 20th day of May 1963.

——— ———,
President of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 131. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 238).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co. (Rept. No. 240);

H.R. 3120 An act to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766) (Rept. No. 241); and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766) (Rept. No. 239).

By Mr. ALLOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 243); and

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date (Rept. No. 242).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 220. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan (Rept. No. 247).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 152. Resolution to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II" (Rept. No. 244);

S. Res. 156. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States" (Rept. No. 245); and

S. Res. 157. Resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Pacifica Foundation" (Rept. No. 246).

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 250)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the supplemental views of Senators BENNETT, TOWER, and DOMINICK, the individual views of Senator ROBERTSON, and the individual views of Senator SIMPSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT EXCERPTS ON THE 1963-64 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE SUBJECT OF MEDICARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 248)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare, and submitted a report thereon, which concurrent resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate proposition: "What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care to the Citizens of the United States," compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

PRINTING OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 249)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 159) authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, and submitted a report thereon; which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the 65th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1962, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Two hundred and eighty-three postmaster nominations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 1705. A bill to supplement existing provisions of law prescribing the extent to which the antitrust laws are applicable to the business of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1706. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1707. A bill to amend section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1708. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1709. A bill to establish an outdoor recreation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1710. A bill to amend sections 9 and 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1711. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1712. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1960, as amended, so as to authorize packages of grapes and plums exported to destinations on the continent of North America to be exempted from the requirements of grade marking; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1713. A bill to remove a cloud on the title of certain property owned by Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers, both of Malin, Oreg.; and

S. 1714. A bill for the relief of Andres Mendoza (also known as Andres Molostvow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Lupeni A. Fonua, Lavenita Fonua, and Siosiua Teiko Fonua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1717. A bill for the relief of Marie Jane Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 1718. A bill to amend the law with respect to trade with the Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1719. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1720. A bill to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s), in order to authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of National Honor to Carl Sandburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT SELECTED EXCERPTS ON 1963-64 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF NATIONAL INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. EDMONDSON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) favoring a study with a view to increasing the mileage of the National Interstate and Defense Highway System, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. EDMONDSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 159) authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 160) creating a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. EDMONDSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORT RELATING TO OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 161); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging, United States Senate, two thousand additional copies each of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the hearings on Frauds and Quackery Affecting the Older Citizens, held by that committee during the current session; and two thousand additional copies of Senate Report No. 8, Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, entitled, "Developments in Aging, 1959-1963".

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF S. REPT. NO. 8, 88TH CONGRESS, ON "DEVELOPMENTS IN AGING, 1959-63"

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 162); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging an additional two thousand copies of Senate Report No. 8, "Developments in Aging, 1959-1963," of the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. THURMOND submitted a resolution (S. Res. 163) to express the sense of the Senate that the United States resume nuclear testing and suspend temporarily test ban negotiations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. THURMOND, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL ACTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal surplus property disposal acts in regard to purchase by governmental bodies of surplus real property for use for educational, health, or public park purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1707) to amend section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to deal with the situation which has arisen in the Committee on Government Operations in regard to the disposal as surplus property of Mitchel Field in Nassau County, N.Y. I believe that case, on which the committee ruled today, demonstrated that there is presently a possibility that the Administrator of the General Services Administration may act arbitrarily in denying public benefit discounts allowed by law to governmental purchasers.

In effect it was ruled, in the case of Mitchel Field, that, where real property is declared surplus the General Services Administrator may himself determine in advance how much of it is needed for public purposes such as schools, hospitals, libraries, recreational areas and parks, for which the law provides discounts ranging from 50 to 100 percent. The committee ruled that the Administrator, before making his decision, does not have to get the expert recommendations of the affected departments, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior, as to how much of the property is needed for those purposes.

It is my deep conviction that such expert recommendations are required by the law now; and that unless we have such recommendations before us when a proposed disposal is referred to the Committee on Government Operations for consideration, as it must be under the law and the practice which has developed, we shall not have an adequate record upon which to consider whether the General Services Administrator has exercised his discretion reasonably and properly.

The answer of the Administrator that he would decide the matter in the same way, even if he had those expert recommendations in hand, is not an adequate answer. That is true of every case in the courts of law in which a judgment is reversed because admissible evidence has not been admitted by the judge, even though the judge might not have changed his decision because of that evidence.

Mr. President, I am introducing this bill to make it crystal clear that it must be the practice to obtain the expert recommendations. I have been assured of prompt hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. I hope very much that serious consideration will be given to this matter, since it can have a very wide effect in the field of surplus property, affecting every Member of this body.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended in 1962. The bill puts in legislative language stated objectives of AID under the Kennedy administration; and embodies basic recommendations in recent reports by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by General Clay, and the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress, headed by J. Peter Grace.

In his foreign aid message to Congress a month ago, President Kennedy emphasized:

> The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries.

The ultimate success of the Alliance for Progress, as well as all other economic assistance programs around the world, depends upon the effectiveness of our efforts in carrying out the vital and central objective so clearly expressed by the President.

President Kennedy particularly said he was grateful to General Clay, and was pleased with the report; and his foreign aid message stated:

> My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay committee.

The main recommendations of the Clay committee were as follows:

First, to increase the participation of private enterprise in the aid program and I quote:

> Our aid should help create economic units which mobilize the great potential and range of private, individual efforts required for economic vitality and rapid growth. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition, and knowledge of economic organization and consequences. Our conviction is based not on doctrine but on the practical realization that it is the private sector, operating with the cooperation of a vital democratic labor movement and enlightened management * * * which will make the greatest contribution to rapid economic growth and overall development.

Second, to review and reduce U.S. aid commitments, as follows:

> We believe that we are indeed attempting too much for too many and that a higher quality and reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more. Substantial tightening up and sharpened objectives in terms of our national interest are necessary.

Third, to help eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit through our aid procurement policies, the report states:

> The harmful effect on our international accounts * * * has been mitigated by tying U.S. economic aid to procurement in this country.

Fourth, to institute self-help criteria under the Alliance for Progress. These should be specific measures on a country-by-country basis. Such aims as "monetary stability, sound financial and social budgeting, reductions and eventual elimination of subsidies to Government enterprises, tax systems, and administration which contemplate * * * stimulating private local and foreign investment" should be our goal.

Fifth, to insist on an equitable sharing of aid by the other developed countries of the free world. This burden is carried disproportionately by the United States. The other industrialized nations can and should do more than they are at present.

Sixth, to support the Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, requiring suspension of aid to countries expropriating the property of American investors without full compensation in convertible foreign exchange. The Clay Report emphasized that expropriation and nationalization undermine sound economic progress in the mobilization of private local and foreign capital investment, by stating:

> Countries which would take this route should realize that while the United States will not intervene in their affairs to impose its own economic system, they too lack the right to intervene in our national pocketbook for aid to enterprises which only increase their cost of government and the foreign assistance burden they are asking us to carry.

Seventh, to expand our investment guarantee program, and suspend aid to countries which refuse to enter into investment guarantee agreements.

AID Administrator David E. Bell has also supported the Clay Report, in the following statement:

> I was privileged to sit with the Clay Committee through their * * * hearings and discussions. I was very much impressed by the seriousness and care with which they went into these matters. My own feeling is that the judgments on policy and the attitudes that they expressed are sound and appropriate and proper * * * we do not have any substantial difference of judgment on the main lines of recommendation which the Clay Committee made.

The Commerce Committees for the Alliance for Progress—COMAP—headed by Peter Grace, president of the W. R. Grace Co., also has made a study and evaluation of our aid programs, specifically to the Alliance for Progress countries. COMAP's main recommendations, like those in the Clay Report, emphasized the role of private investment, and added detailed suggestions to protect and encourage private enterprise through tax incentives, investment guarantees, and various financing aids.

We must not hesitate to take the proper steps to fulfill the aims of the Alliance for Progress. The Council of Finance Ministers of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in Mexico City late last year, warned the governments of Latin America:

> The flow of foreign private capital to Latin America has diminished and there is strong evidence of substantial capital flight from Latin America. Taking into account the limitations to the availability of public funds, it is clear that the objectives of the Alliance cannot be achieved without the full participation of the private sector and adequate measures must be taken to assure maximum contribution to growth by the private sector.

Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, recently reiterated the administration's position that:

> The Alliance for Progress is a radical break with the past. It is not another U.S. aid program. It is a vast cooperative effort whose success depends primarily on the initiative of Latin America. The United States supports all efforts designed to breathe a dynamism and a spirit of complete individual and national commitment into the programs of material development proceeding under the banner of the Alliance.

The bill I am introducing will effectuate these objectives, strengthen our AID program, and revive the faith of the American people in the continuing soundness and ultimate goals of AID.

The bill would create a new officer in AID known as Assistant Administrator, Private Enterprise, with centralized responsibility and authority—under the Administrator and Deputy Administrator—to achieve maximum participation of private enterprise at all stages of AID planing and administration. The bill also specifies that not less than 50 percent of the dollar loans shall be earmarked for economic development through private enterprise—on a worldwide average basis under AID and on an overall basis under the Alliance for Progress.

In our investment guarantee program, covering specific risks of expropriation, inconvertibility and war, the bill increases the maximum ceiling from $1.3 to $2.5 billion; it adds coverage of riot or civil disturbance; it reduces from 1.5 to 1 percent the fees for covering all three specific risks; and it puts the full faith and credit of the United States squarely behind all guarantees. Moreover, the bill provides for cutting off the flow of aid to a government which persists in refusing to sign the necessary bilateral agreement initiating the guarantee program in each country.

Finally, the bill confirms the sound interpretations of the Hickenlooper amendment already made by AID, requiring full compensation for expropriated property, and protecting against all actions in the nature of creeping expropriations. The bill also enables the President to utilize the experienced services of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States in evaluating expropriated property.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1708) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PART I

SECTION 1. Title I of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 202(a), strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided further,* That in order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 201(b), 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section 202(a) for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise."

(b) Strike out section 205.

Sec. 2. Title III of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In the proviso to section 221(b)(1), strike out "$1,300,000,000" and substitute "$2,500,000,000".

(b) In section 221(b)(1)(C), strike out the period at the end thereof, insert a comma, and add "or riot or civil disturbance."

(c) At the end of section 222(a), add the following: "The maximum combined fee for covering all three specific risks listed in section 221(b)(1) concerning any project or investment shall not exceed one per centum per annum."

(d) In section 222(e), amend the first sentence to read as follows: "All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America."

(e) In section 222(f), strike out the period at the end thereof, insert a comma, and add the following: "including all payments required to discharge all liabilities on guaranty contracts under any provision of subsection (d) of this section."

Sec. 3. Section 252 of title VI of chapter 2 of the Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and adding the following: "*Provided,* That in order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 251, 601 and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the loan funds appropriated pursuant to this section 252 shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise."

PART II

Sec. 4. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 601(b), which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

(1) At the end of paragraph (3), strike out "and".

(2) In paragraph (4), strike out "wherever appropriate" and insert in lieu thereof "to the maximum extent practicable".

(3) At the end of paragraph (4), strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add "and".

(4) Add the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(5) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries."

(b) Amend section 620 as follows:

(1) Section 620(e) is amended as follows:

(A) In the clause commencing with "(2) has imposed or enforced", after "operational conditions", insert: ", or has taken other actions,".

(B) In the concluding clauses commencing with "and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails":

(i) strike out the parenthetical clause and substitute the following: "(not more than three months after such action, or, in the event of referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States as provided hereinafter, not more than six months after such action)".

(ii) strike out "equitable and"; and strike out the comma after "foreign exchange" and insert: "equivalent to the full value thereof,".

(C) Add the following at the end thereof: "For purposes of this subsection, upon request of the President, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to determine the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subjected to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, and to exercise for such purposes the powers conferred upon it by section 4, title I, of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection."

(2) Add the following new subsection at the end of section 620:

"(i) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1963, to the government of any country which has failed to enter into suitable arrangements with the President to effectuate the program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing guaranties concerning all three specific risks of (A) inconvertibility, (B) expropriation or confiscation, and (C) war, revolution, or insurrection, riot, or civil disturbance."

Sec. 5. Section 624 of chapter 2 of part III is amended by inserting the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) One of the nine statutory officers provided for under subsection (a)(3) of this section shall have the title of 'Assistant Administrator, Private Enterprise,' and shall have authority and responsibility, under the Administrator for International Development and the Deputy Administrator for International Development, for all funds and programs under this act concerning economic development through private enterprise, including but not limited to development loans payable in U.S. dollars under sections 201–202 and 251–252, investment guaranties under section 221, housing projects under section 224, surveys of investment opportunities under section 231, research and evaluation of economic development under section 241, all other programs (not otherwise delegated by the President) to effectuate the provisions of sections 601 and 602 of this act, and local currency loans under section 104(e) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(e))."

Sec. 6. Section 2 of the Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86–735; 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "*Provided further,* That the funds hereafter made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the provisions of sections 604 and 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended (22 U.S.C. 2354, 2370)."

OUTDOOR RECREATION FUND

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as Senators will recall, S. 20 was passed by the Senate and the other body and signed into law by the President early in this session. This law gives the Secretary of the Interior several inventory, planning, research, and technical assistance functions to perform in the field of outdoor recreation through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I think it is wise that we have recognized, by the enactment of this legislation, that the development of outdoor recreation facilities on the public lands will be a great benefit to the people of this Nation. The demands for such facilities have increased tremendously in the past decade, particularly in the Western States where the Federal Government owns from 30 to 90 percent of the land.

The Senate Interior Committee, on March 7 and 8, held hearings on S. 859, entitled "A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes." Hearings were recently conducted by the National Parks Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on an identical House bill. The principles embodied in the titles of these bills are indeed laudatory. However, many of us who participated in the Senate hearings were somewhat concerned about the provisions of S. 859. It is for that reason that I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a new bill to establish an outdoor recreation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1709) to establish an outdoor recreation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Dominick, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) This Act may be cited as the "Outdoor Recreation Fund Act of 1963".

(b) Purpose.—The purposes of this Act are to strengthen the health and vitality of the Nation by assuring the availability and accessibility of land and water based outdoor recreation opportunities.

CERTAIN REVENUES PLACED IN SEPARATE ACCOUNT

Sec. 2. There shall be set aside in a separate account in the Treasury of the United States, as prescribed in section 3 of this Act, all proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or recreation charges collected or received by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico), notwithstanding any provision of law that such proceeds shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall affect any rights or authority of the States with respect to fish and wildlife, nor shall this Act repeal any provision of law that permits States or political subdivisions to share in the revenues from Federal lands or any provision of law that provides that any fees or charges collected at particular Federal areas shall be used for or credited to specific purposes or special funds as authorized by that provision of law; but the proceeds from recreation fees or charges established pursuant to this section for entrance or admission to, or for recreation use of, Federal areas shall be used solely for the purposes of this Act.

The President is authorized to provide for the establishment, revision, or amendment of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and recreation charges at any developed land or water area administered by or under the authority of the Federal agencies listed in the preceding paragraph, except that this section shall not authorize (1) Federal hunting or fishing licenses, (2) fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation, (3) admission fees in national forests other than for developed outdoor recreation areas therein, (4) admission or use fees for areas classified by the Department of Agriculture as wilderness, wild, or primitive, or (5) admission or use fees for travel by canoe through the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Any fees established shall be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, benefits to the recipient, public policy or interest served, the extent of development of recreational facilities, and other pertinent factors.

Any such fee or charge at any such area shall be reduced at the end of any calendar year in which public use of such area, as compared with the preceding year, declined by five or more per centum. Such reduction shall be in such amount as is determined to be necessary to encourage increased public use of such area.

There is hereby repealed the third paragraph from the end of the division entitled "National Park Service" of section 1 of the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 238) and the second paragraph from the end of the division entitled "National Park Service" of section 1 of the Act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1602; 16 U.S.C. 14). Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 24, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 460d), as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1195) is further amended by deleting, "without charge", in the third sentence from the end thereof. All other provisions of law that prohibit the collection of entrance, admission or other recreation user fees or recreation charges established pursuant to this section for areas under their administration.

OUTDOOR RECREATION FUND

Sec. 3. After deducting all necessary Federal administrative expenses incurred in implementing this Act, there shall be transferred to an outdoor recreation fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which is hereby established, such moneys as are derived under this Act in order to assist the States and Federal agencies as hereafter prescribed. Moneys placed in the fund shall be available for expenditure for purposes of this Act only when appropriated, and such appropriations may be made without fiscal year limitation. The Secretary of the Interior shall keep such accounts as are necessary for these purposes.

ALLOCATION OF FUND FOR STATE AND FEDERAL PURPOSES

Sec. 4. Appropriations from the outdoor recreation fund shall be available for both State and Federal purposes as provided in this Act in percentage of 60 per centum for State purposes and 40 per centum for Federal purposes.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES

Sec. 5. General Authority; Purposes.—(a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to provide financial assistance to the States from moneys available for State purposes. Payments may be made to the States by the Secretary as hereafter provided, subject to such terms and conditions as he considers appropriate and in the public interest to carry out the purposes of this Act, for outdoor recreation: (1) planning, (2) acquisition of land, waters, or interests in land or waters, or (3) development.

(b) Apportionment Among States; Notification.—Sums appropriated and available for State purposes for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final, in accordance with the following formula:

(1) two-fifths shall be apportioned equally among the several States;

(2) three-fifths shall be apportioned in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States.

The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionments and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter for payment to such State for planning, acquisition, or development projects as hereafter prescribed. Any amounts apportioned under this subsection for any fiscal year which have not been used or obligated for use by any States prior to the end of two fiscal years following such fiscal year for which apportioned shall be reapportioned by the Secretary among the other States in accordance with the formula used for the original apportionment.

The District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall be treated as States for the purposes of this Act, except for the purpose of paragraph (1) of this subsection. Their population also shall be included as a part of the total population in computing the apportionment under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(c) Matching Requirements.—Payments to any State shall cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of planning projects, and not more than 50 per centum of the cost of acquisition or development projects, that are undertaken by the State. The remaining share of the cost shall be borne by the State in a manner and with such funds or services as shall be satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) Comprehensive State Plan Required; Planning Projects.—A comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan shall be required prior to the consideration by the Secretary of financial assistance for acquisition or development projects. The plan shall be adequate if, in the judgment of the Secretary, it encompasses and will promote the purposes of this Act. The plan shall contain—

(1) the name of the State agency that will have authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary for purposes of this Act;

(2) an evaluation of the demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the State;

(3) a program for the implementation of the plan; and

(4) other necessary information, as may be determined by the Secretary.

The plan shall take into account relevant Federal resources and programs and shall be correlated so far as practicable with other State, regional, and local plans. Where there exists or is in preparation for any particular State a comprehensive plan financed in part with funds supplied by the Housing and Home Finance Agency; any statewide outdoor recreation plan prepared for purposes of this Act shall be based upon the same population, growth, and other pertinent factors as are used in formulating the Housing and Home Finance Agency financed plans.

(e) Projects for Land and Water Acquisition; Development.—In addition to assistance for planning projects, the Secretary may provide financial assistance to any State for the following types of projects or combinations thereof if they are in accordance with the State comprehensive plan:

(1) Acquisition of land and waters.—For the acquisition of land, waters, or interests in land or waters, but not including incidental costs relating to acquisition.

(2) Development.—For development, including but not limited to site planning and development of Federal lands under lease to States for terms of twenty-five years or more.

(f) Requirements for Project Approval; Condition.—Payments may be made to States by the Secretary only for those planning, acquisition, or development projects that are approved by him. The Secretary may make payments from time to time in keeping with the rate of progress toward the satisfactory completion of individual projects: *Provided*, That the approval of all projects and all payments, or any commitments relating thereto, shall be withheld until the Secretary receives appropriate written assurance from the State that the State, political subdivision, or other appropriate public agency has the ability and intention to finance its share of the cost of the particular project, and to operate and maintain by acceptable standards, at State or local expense, the particular properties or facilities acquired or developed for public outdoor recreation use.

Payments for all projects shall be made by the Secretary to the Governor of the State or to a State official or agency designated by the Governor or by State law having authority and responsibility to accept and to administer funds paid hereunder for approved projects. If consistent with an approved project, funds may be transferred by the State to a political subdivision or other appropriate public agency.

No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary, be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the then existing comprehensive outdoor recreation plan for the area involved and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location.

No payment shall be made to any State until the State has agreed to (1) provide such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his duties under this Act, and (2) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this Act.

(g) Coordination With Federal Agencies.—In order to assure consistency in policies and actions under this Act, with other related Federal programs and activities (including those conducted pursuant to title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 and section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954) and to assure coordination of the planning, acquisition, and development assistance to States under this section with other related Federal programs and activities, the President may, prior to the exercise of any authority under this section, issue such regulations with respect thereto as he deems desirable and such assistance may be provided only in accordance with such regulations.

ALLOCATION OF MONEYS FOR FEDERAL PURPOSES

Sec. 6. (a) Moneys appropriated from the fund for Federal purposes shall be allocated by the President, on the basis of a determination of relative needs, for the development of outdoor recreational facilities, as follows:

(1) National park system; recreational areas.—Within the exterior boundaries of areas of the national park system now or hereafter authorized or established and of areas now or hereafter authorized to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for outdoor recreation purposes.

(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—Within existing or authorized areas of the national forest system, including areas now or hereafter authorized to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for outdoor recreation purposes.

(3) THREATENED SPECIES.—For the purposes of any national area that may be authorized for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife that are threatened with extinction.

(4) RECREATION AT REFUGES.—For the incidental recreation purposes of section 2 of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653).

(b) None of the money appropriated from the fund for Federal purposes shall be available for the acquisition of any land.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have given much thought and consideration to the drafting of this bill, and I have conferred with many of the persons, groups, and organizations who testified on the administration's bill both in the Senate and in the House. I believe that it is more responsive to the public needs and I commend it to my colleagues for their study and analysis.

I shall give a brief analysis of this bill and, for the sake of comparison, draw some contrasts between it and S. 859.

Section 1 provides that the name of the act is the Outdoor Recreation Fund Act of 1963. Since the avowed purpose of S. 859 is to create a fund for outdoor recreational facilities, I think it is most appropriate to mention it in the title of the act.

Section 2 sets aside a separate account in the Treasury for the outdoor recreation fund. However, this fund is to be financed solely by user fees to be collected at developed outdoor recreational facilities on the public lands. It eliminates the provisions found in S. 859 for the inclusion in the fund of motorboat fuels tax and surplus property sales proceeds.

Section 3 simply provides that after deducting all necessary Federal administrative expenses incurred in implementing the act, that the balance of the proceeds shall be transferred to an outdoor recreation fund, a separate fund in the Treasury. I have eliminated the provisions in S. 859 which would allow the President discretion to allocate such sums as he sees fit to go to miscellaneous receipts before any money goes into the fund.

Section 4 simply provides that the Outdoor Recreation Fund shall be allocated 60 percent for State purposes and 40 percent for Federal purposes. I have eliminated the discretion vested in the President, found in S. 859, to change these allocations by as much as 15 percent. I have also eliminated the provision for a $60 million advance appropriation over a period of 8 years.

Section 5 provides that the 60 percent available for State purposes shall be apportioned as follows: two-fifths equally among the several States, and three-fifths apportioned in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States. I have eliminated the provision in S. 859 which would give the Secretary the authority to apportion one-fifth according to his judgment of the needs of the individual States and I have added this one-fifth to the portion allocated equally among the several States.

The matching requirements for the States are on a 50-50 basis for the planning, acquisition, or development of outdoor recreation projects. This also gives a more favorable matching provision to the States for acquisition and development than does S. 859.

My bill does not put any limit on the amount of its funds that a State may use for development projects, whereas S. 859 would place a 10-percent limitation upon this phase.

Section 6 provides that money from the fund allocated for Federal purposes shall be used by the President for the development of outdoor recreational facilities in the national park system, the national forestry system, and the areas for threatened species and refuges.

There is no authority contained in this section for Federal acquisition of any land. S. 859, on the other hand, contains almost unlimited Federal acquisition authority.

In the preparation of this bill, I have encompassed several of the key recommendations of the President's Citizens Committee for Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. One of the primary points made in the report of this Commission is contained at page 95:

> The States should play the pivotal role in providing outdoor recreation opportunities for their citizens. They are the most logical unities to provide the flexible approach required to see varying needs. States can assess their own needs and take actions accordingly.

I believe that my bill most effectively carries out this objective by providing a 50-50 matching basis for outdoor recreation projects and by allowing the States themselves to determine what portion of their allocations are to be used for planning, development, and acquisition. This also conforms to the specific ORRRC recommendation pertaining to the section dealing with State allocations.

Many of us who participated in the hearings were also concerned about the vast new Federal acquisition program envisioned by S. 859. I believe that the Federal Government should first provide and develop adequate outdoor recreational facilities on the public lands it now owns before proceeding on a new large scale acquisition program. Secretary Freeman and Secretary Udall made it clear when questioned in the Senate hearings that they intend to utilize this fund primarily to acquire new holdings of Federal lands. It was difficult to even engage them in a discussion of what they intended to do by way of developing outdoor recreational facilities on the present public lands. On March 29, Secretary Udall sent lengthy correspondence to the Committee indicating that over a 10-year period it was intended to acquire some 1,373,000 acres of national park land, 1,899,000 acres of endangered species areas, and 3,973,000 acres of Forest Service land, estimated to cost over one-half billion dollars.

I think my colleagues will agree with me that if these acres are actually needed over the next 10 years for national parks, endangered species areas, and Forest Service areas, then the appropriate Secretary should come to Congress with specific requests and not blanket in vast areas under the guise of outdoor recreation. This is especially true considering that the Federal Government presently owns 770 million acres of land which constitutes about 34 percent of all the land in the United States.

Many Senators also expressed their disagreement with an all-purpose, nationwide conservation sticker or user fee. In the public land States, one can hardly turn around without crossing Federal lands. Many of our major State, Federal, and interstate highways cross these public lands. It is neither fair nor equitable to charge people for this. My bill contemplates a user fee at developed outdoor recreational facilities such as campground, trailer camps, and swimming and boating facilities. At these developed areas the public enjoys special benefits not enjoyed by those merely driving or walking across the public lands. I believe that a fee for the use of such special facilities is reasonable and practicable and would equitably assess the user who receives these special benefits. I understand that the Forest Service has been charging fees for some of these special areas with no difficulty in administration and with generally favorable public acceptance.

I do not believe that we should earmark the funds realized from the sale of surplus Federal real and personal property as provided in S. 859. As my colleague, Senator ALLOTT, pointed out in the hearings, these are the capital assets of the Federal Government and should go back into the general account of the Federal Treasury.

Nor can I agree with the wisdom of transferring the proceeds of the motorboat fuel tax from the interstate highway fund to such a fund contemplated by S. 859. This will simply mean that the interstate highway fund will have to seek other revenues to replace these moneys.

In my opinion, the authorization of $480 million in advance appropriations under S. 859, to be repaid without interest, is uncalled for and poor fiscal policy. It is just another method of deficit financing. It was freely admitted by all of the proponents of the administration's bill that the special fund was being created, subject to appropriation, because they were fearful that Congress would refuse to appropriate general revenues for such a gigantic acquisition program.

In conclusion, Mr. President, this bill can be a workable and practicable solution to our outdoor recreation problems. It is financed by those who use special facilities and would still allow the States to play the pivotal role recommended by the ORRRC report. The States would still have to submit and gain approval of a comprehensive plan before receiving any funds. Forty percent of the fund would be available to the Federal Government to develop outdoor recreation facilities on the lands it already owns.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 1 week so that other interested Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF CLOUD ON TITLE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNED BY WILMER ALLERS AND JANE B. ALLERS, OF MALIN, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove a cloud on the title of certain property owned by Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers, both of Malin, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1713) to remove a cloud on the title of certain property owned by Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers, both of Malin, Oreg., introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to release to Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (husband and wife), both of Malin, Oregon, and their heirs and assigns, that interest reserved by the United States in lots 4, 5, 6, and 7 of block 29, supplemental plat of Malin (Klamath County), Oregon, pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371), which interest relates to the right of the United States to construct ditches and canals upon and through such lots.

Sec. 2. Upon payment within six months following the date of enactment of this Act by the said Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (or their heirs or assigns) to the Secretary of the Interior of an amount equal to the current fair market value of the interest authorized to be released under the first section as determined by the Secretary after appraisal, the Secretary shall execute and deliver to Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers (or their heirs or assigns) an appropriate written instrument which will effect the release so authorized.

ANDRES MENDOZA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Andres Mendoza—also known as Andres Molostvow. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1714) for the relief of Andres Mendoza (also known as Andres Molostvow), introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andres Mendoza (also known as Andres Molostvow) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER AND DEVELOPMENT TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Clark, McNamara, Pell, Kennedy, and McIntyre, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Manpower and Development Training Act of 1962.

The proposed measure would provide 100 percent Federal funds to the States for retraining allowances for the unemployed after June 30, 1964, under the provisions of the act, and would also support with 100-percent Federal participation the State agreements for vocational retraining of the unemployed after the same date. It would leave unaltered the provisions for on-the-job training and vocational upgrading of employed persons, and in effect, would provide for the continuation of the Manpower and Development Training Act program in fiscal 1965 on the same basis that it has been effectively administered in fiscal 1963, and as it will be administered in fiscal 1964.

This bill, Mr. President, has grown out of our experience of administering the Manpower and Development Training Act during the past year. It is supported by the administration and by evidence gathered by the Department of Labor, and its need is substantiated by abundant testimony presented in recent hearings to the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I am privileged to serve.

According to the Department of Labor, some 40 States have made no plans to provide their 50-percent matching funds after June 30, 1964, as stipulated under the relevant provisions of the original act, and are without funds to do so. This condition was further demonstrated in testimony presented last week to the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment by five State commissioners of employment security who appeared before our committee. It is for this reason that the authorization for fiscal 1965 must be increased to provide for full Federal participation in the amount that was originally established as the responsibility of the States.

Without the enactment of the proposed measure the Federal Government will not be able to negotiate agreements with the States this fall for training programs that will be initiated next January and which will extend into fiscal 1965.

For this reason it is important that the Congress act with dispatch on the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, introduced by Mr. Randolph (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING FOR TAX PURPOSES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence.

In essence the bill provides that wages of certain interstate airline and motor carrier employees shall only be subject to withholding for State or local income tax purposes in the States of their respective residences. The proposed legislation is limited in scope to airline and motor carrier employees actually engaged in operating aircraft or vehicles in interstate commerce.

Both the individuals and the conveyances which they operate are, in a very real sense, actual instrumentalities by which transportation is conducted in interstate commerce and this legislation is designed to protect those instrumentalities and that commerce from unduly burdensome and duplicating tax compliance procedures by States and their local subdivisions.

It should be emphasized that the proposal will not impair the general taxing authority of the States in any way, nor will it relieve the affected employees of their liability to pay taxes properly due. It will prevent the application of collection procedures which create difficulties for the taxed persons and their employers involving expense to them out of all proportion to the benefits which might accrue to the States thereunder.

Serious problems of administration and equity are involved in attempts by States and their subdivisions to tax individuals wherever they may happen to be, even for brief periods of time, and to impose responsibility for collection of such imposts upon their carrier employers.

Contrary to popular conception, the activities of airline pilots and interstate truck drivers do not fall into set patterns of designated routes customarily traveled. Their employment in interstate service is governed, among other things, by diverse operating requirements of carriers and by union work rules. The result is that many of these individuals will be assigned to a succession of operations, each of which may involve different States. Exposure to multiple taxation by a large number of States and municipalities is obvious. It would be impossible for them to handle these tax compliance problems without employing professional help.

Similarly, the accounting detail which multiple withholding will require of employers would create an expense which, in many cases, would exceed the actual amounts to be withheld for local governments.

The magnitude of the problem is apparent when it is realized that of 37 States imposing income taxes, 35 impose net income taxes on individuals. All of them require withholding on the full amount earned by residents and 31 require withholding on amounts earned by residents and nonresidents within their borders. The four States which do not require withholding from their own residents do require it as to earnings by nonresidents. In addition, 27 cities impose income taxes and 26 of these require withholding as to both residents and nonresidents.

Although a number of jurisdictions have been reluctant to proceed with this type of withholding even though authorized to do so under present laws, the problem upon which congressional action is requested can be expected to multiply in the future, with consequently greater hardships on the parties concerned. For this reason it is imperative that action be taken now to simplify the burdens of these instrumentalities of interstate commerce at a time when it can be done with minimal effect upon State fiscal policies and with clarification as to State tax procedures in the future.

In the final analysis, State and local income tax withholding requirements upon these employees create a very real burden on interstate commerce which the Congress is empowered to, and should, prevent.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1719) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence, introduced by Mr. Monroney, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after section 226 a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"Sec. 226A. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any motor carrier to an employee of such motor carrier engaged in the operation of a motor vehicle in interstate commerce in two or more States shall be withheld for tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such salary or wages with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means any possession of the United States or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

Sec. 2. Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 1111 the following new section:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"Sec. 1112. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any air carrier to an employee of such air carrier engaged as a flight crew member or flight attendant (including a flight steward or stewardess) aboard aircraft operated in air transportation shall be withheld for tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such salary or wages with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means the District of Columbia and any of the possessions of the United States."

Sec. 3. That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Title XI—Miscellaneous" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1112. Exemption of certain wages and salary of employees from withholding by other than residence State."

INCREASING PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I introduce proposed legislation which would authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated. This bill is identical to S. 3201, which was introduced by Senator McCarthy and me last year.

Experience in the management and operation of wildlife refuges over the last two decades has shown the need, and an urgency has developed, for an early revision upward of the formula for making payments to counties having wildlife refuges or wetland areas containing federally owned land.

With the ever-increasing cost of government on all levels, the local subdivisions are in a tighter squeeze than ever before. This situation will tend to intensify in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota during the next 6 or 7 years as the wetlands acquisition program under Public Law 87–383 gets into full operation.

Mr. President, the Department of the Interior, in its letter of June 20, 1962, to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. Magnuson], strongly recommended enactment of legislation providing for increased payments. It did not go as far as recommending that the payments be 1 percent of the adjusted true value of the federally owned land, as is proposed in my bill, but modestly recommended that the payments to the particular counties be three-fourths of 1 percent of such value. This recommendation is helpful, even though it did not go as far as I had hoped and would have liked.

Under a 1935 act, the formula for the present payment to counties for federally owned land in wildlife or wetland areas is an amount equal to 25 percent of the net proceeds from the refuges therein. Receipts of refuges are derived from the sale of surplus wildlife, timber, hay, grass, or other spontaneous products of the soil, shell, sand, gravel, and from other privileges on wildlife refuges.

In many instances a wildlife refuge yields very little or no returns. Consequently, even if all receipts therefrom were turned over to the county, the amount would be extremely small. The Department's letter report on the proposed legislation states that the smallest payment to a county in 1961 was $1.

The remaining 75 percent of the net refuge receipts remain available to the Department of the Interior, pursuant to a permanent indefinite appropriation provision in the act of September 6, 1950, for the management of the national wildlife refuge system and the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Almost all counties derive their sole income, or at any rate their principal income, from taxation of property within the county. Any loss of taxable acreage is a blow to the county's financial structure. This is even more serious when in addition to the tax loss the county may become obligated to make additional expenditures due to the use and development of the land taken off the tax rolls.

The loss of tax revenue through Federal acquisition is one of the measurements which should be applied in evaluating proposals for the most equitable payments to losing counties. Other components of such payments might well be compensation in part for increased costs of policing by peace officers necessitated by the wildlife development and accompanying recreational facilities; necessary and unexpected construction and rerouting of local roads to and around the refuge and other impacts on the finances of the local governmental units.

Mr. President, I do not intend that this bill is, nor should it be construed to be, legislation for reimbursement in lieu of taxes. Counties in which wildlife refuges are located are at present receiving a Federal payment. This legislation merely would put the formula under which that payment is made on a more equitable basis.

I do not want to be understood as saying there are no positive benefits from wildlife refuges, wetland areas, or other migratory waterfowl habitat development. There are many. Most of these, however, are more statewide and national than local.

The very reason for the wetlands acquisition program is to preserve for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl, at the earliest possible time, the most important and valuable duck and geese nesting and producing areas in the United States. These are located in the three States I have mentioned.

Despite the many tangible and intangible benefits from wildlife refuges and their development, local governmental officials view such projects with the feeling that the net benefits are negative.

Mr. President, in order to lessen local opposition to the wetlands acquisition program; reduce the impact of land withdrawal from county tax rolls; and as far as possible protect and preserve the financial structure of affected counties, I urge the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate itself to approve and recommend that payments to counties be on the basis of 1 percent on the adjusted true value of the federally owned lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a U.S. Department of the Interior press release, dated June 13, 1963, which states that the Department of the Interior strongly supports a change in formula for payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1720) to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s), in order to authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay at the end of each fiscal year to each county of any State in which any refuge established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, or under any other law, proclamation, or Executive order administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, is situated an amount equal to 1 per centum of the adjusted true value (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) of the lands of the county included within such refuge, which amount shall be expended for the benefit of the public schools and roads in such county. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) All money received during each fiscal year from the sale or other disposition of surplus wildlife, or of timber, hay, grass, or other spontaneous products of the soil, shell, sand, or gravel, and from other privileges on refuges established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, or under any other law, proclamation, or Executive order administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided,* That except as otherwise provided by section 204 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, the disposition or sale of surplus animals, and products, and the grant of privileges on said wildlife refuges may be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be for the best interests of Government or for the advancement of knowledge and the dissemination of information regarding the conservation of wildlife, including sale in the open market, exchange for animals of the same or other kinds, and gifts or loans to public or private institutions for exhibition or propagation: *Provided further,* That except as otherwise provided by section 204 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, out of any moneys received from the grant, sale, or disposition of such animals, products, or privileges, or as a bonus upon exchange of such animals the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay any necessary expenses incurred in connection with and for the purpose of effecting the removal, grant, disposition, sale, or exchange of such animals, products, or privileges; and such expenditures shall be deducted from the gross receipts collected each fiscal year before such moneys are paid by the Secretary of the Interior into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

The release presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

INTERIOR FAVORS INCREASED SHARED REVENUES FOR COUNTIES HAVING NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

The Department of the Interior said today it strongly supports a plan now before Congress to increase shared-revenue payments to counties where national wildlife refuges are located.

The Department said proposed legislation, if modified, could remove one of the serious stumbling blocks for waterfowl habitat preservation by setting up a new formula for distributing revenue payments on a more equitable basis. The revenues come from sales of hay, grass, timber, and other products of the refuges.

The Federal Government's wetlands development program received impetus in 1961 by congressional authorization of $105 million for a 7-year accelerated plan, the money to be repaid to the Treasury from future duck stamp sales. The program has been stymied for the past 2 years by State and local opposition to Federal land purchases which take property off local tax rolls.

Under the administration's revenue-sharing proposal, the Department of the Interior estimates that the total payments to the counties would be nearly equal to or exceed what the counties would have received if the lands were in private ownership. A few counties would receive less than they now get, but most counties would receive more.

Details of the Department's proposal were given in a letter from John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER of the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Carver noted that the 1961 Wetlands Act requires that the purchase of lands for waterfowl habitat from the migratory bird conservation fund must first be approved by the respective Governors or appropriate State agency. Considerable acreage of key waterfowl habitat is involved in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota since these States contain the major duck nesting grounds within the United States outside Alaska.

Under a 1935 law, 25 percent of the net receipts from wildlife refuge lands (timber, minerals, oil, grass, and so forth) is paid each year to the counties where the refuges are located. The money benefits public schools and roads.

The 1935 formula has resulted in inequitable distribution of receipts, Mr. Carver said, because some refuge lands have little or no revenue-producing activities and other counties receive a great deal more revenue than if the lands were in private ownership. The new formula would remedy the situation by putting all revenues into a single fund and distributing them under a formula tied to local real estate values.

Assistant Secretary Carver said that in fiscal year 1961 net receipts from 120 national wildlife refuges, game ranges, and waterfowl production areas were about $2 million. Of this, $496,840 was returned to the 188 counties where these areas are located. The largest payment to any county was some $277,000 and the smallest, $1.

Under the new formula, 203 counties would have received about $620,000, nearly $123,000 more than the actual payment in 1961. A similar calculation for 1962 showed that 218 counties and the State of Alaska would have received about $658,000, or $75,000 more than was actually paid in 1962. This would have included 33 more counties than the 185 receiving payments last year.

"Every county, wherein lands have been acquired as part of the national wildlife refuge system, would share more equitably under our proposal in the total net receipts from the system whether the refuge lands are revenue producing or not," Assistant Secretary Carver added.

The new formula would continue to require use of the fund for the benefit of public schools and roads.

Assistant Secretary Carver said several provisions in pending bills do not relate to the revenue-sharing principle. Accordingly, the Department urges that such sections be excluded.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF NATIONAL HONOR TO CARL SANDBURG

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of National Honor to Carl Sandburg.

A similar joint resolution has been introduced in the House by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, and the joint resolution I introduce today is intended as a companion measure. I have, however, taken the liberty of asking the legislative counsel of the Senate to make several revisions in form and procedure which appeared to be desirable so this joint resolution, therefore, is not identical to the one introduced in the House.

Carl Sandburg and his contributions to our culture are so well known and appreciated that it is unnecessary for me to attempt to justify this proposal. I hope that this joint resolution will be speedily considered by the committees so that action can be taken during this session to properly honor this famous son of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of National Honor to Carl Sandburg, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, one of the principal reasons which impelled me to aspire to and become Governor of the State of Oklahoma was an inherent interest in the building of roads in the State. Immediately after becoming Governor over 4 years ago, I initiated my roadbuilding program, and my efforts and success during the following 4 years are a matter of record and are known to the citizens of my State, all organizations sponsoring better roads in the Nation, the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce, and the users of highways. My efforts in this program covered the needs of my State not only from the standpoint of the State highways, but also the Interstate System and all intermediate levels of roadbuilding, including, of course, the farm-to-market roads.

As you know, Mr. President, Rome was not built in a day, nor are our highway construction programs completed in a few months or even years, and as I learned during my 4 years as Governor, my successors in that office must devote their initiative and energies to the continuation of this work. I found myself unwilling to withdraw from active participation and leadership in this most vital responsibility of the States and the Nation. As was my feeling relative to the governorship, I knew that one of the principal reasons for my desire to come to the U.S. Senate was the opportunity that it would give me to continue active work in the highway building program.

The monumental effort of my colleagues in both the Senate and the House of Representatives which resulted in the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was undoubtedly the greatest accomplishment in this field in the history of the Congress of the United States. I have supported this legislation and the administration of the act, and I recognize the successful and economical administration which had as of December 31, 1962, put into actual passenger and commercial vehicle use 14,336 miles of the Interstate System. The routes of the present Interstate System are limited to 41,000 miles in total extent, which routes have been designated.

This entire program under existing legislation is scheduled for completion in 1972 and already it has been definitely determined that in order to meet the constantly increasing population and expansion of the national economy, the increase in motor vehicle use and highway transportation needs resulting therefrom, together with the needs of the national and civil defense make it advisable that the Congress consider immediately the need for and feasibility of an expansion of the Interstate System. This is to assure that there will be no lag between the completion of the presently authorized 41,000 miles of highways and a higher total mileage authorization.

We must face this requirement and planning must be completed at an early date to utilize the engineering talent that will soon complete their phase of the currently authorized program as well as the construction personnel and management. This Nation is indeed fortunate in having in position and functioning the very excellent and capable Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce under the brilliant, capable, and responsible leadership of the Honorable Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator. I am sure that it is not necessary for me to tell you, my colleagues, of the high quality of services rendered to our Nation by Mr. Rex Whitton.

Pursuant to the foregoing remarks and in my continuing efforts to serve the people of my State and of the entire Nation by providing this necessary commodity of American life—improved highways—I introduce for the consideration of this body and the House of Representatives a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a study should be made with respect to increasing the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

This concurrent resolution provides that the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, should undertake a comprehensive study and investigation concerning the desirability and feasibility of designating additional mileage for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and that the Secretary should submit a final report on his findings with recommendations to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 1966.

Finally, but most important of all considerations, is the known savings of human lives resulting from the Interstate System. Much of the research and design improvement work conducted under this program by the Bureau of Public Roads is directly or indirectly concerned with highway safety. The improvement of roads and streets, through this program, has done much to make travel safer and completion of the system will save more than 5,000 lives a year.

I would hope that this concurrent resolution would receive unanimous support of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Whereas the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and, to the greatest extent possible, to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico, as provided in section 103(d) of title 23, United States Code; and

Whereas the completed portions of the Interstate System, constructed in accordance with modern design and safety standards, are producing untold benefits to the public, including preservation of lives and substantial savings in time and money; and

Whereas the routes of the Interstate System are presently limited to 41,000 miles in total extent, which routes have been designated; and

Whereas the constantly increasing population and expansion of the national economy, the increase in motor vehicle use and highway transportation needs resulting therefrom, together with the needs for the national and civil defense, make it advisable that the Congress have sufficient data as a sound basis for determining the need for an increase in the mileage of the presently designated Interstate System: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, should undertake a comprehensive study and investigation concerning the desirability and feasibility of designating additional mileage for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in order to accomplish its objectives as heretofore prescribed by law, and that the Secretary should submit a final report of his findings, with recommendations, to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 1966.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to amend Senate rule XXV, to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, Senators are aware of the numerous efforts that have been made to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs since the introduction of the Reorganization Act of 1946. In the few months I have been privileged to be a Member of this great legislative body I have come increasingly to understand and appreciate the needs which have prompted the efforts to create such a committee.

I have also grown aware, during my brief tenure in the Senate, of the outstanding job done by the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, both of which now have jurisdiction over matters affecting veterans. The resolution I offer today is not intended as a criticism of those committees, nor is it intended to reflect adversely on their outstanding efforts in the field of veterans' legislation. Rather, Mr. President, the resolution now offered recognizes the manifold duties and responsibilities of these two committees and seeks to relieve them of some of that burden.

The need for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs seems manifest. Today, over 22 million Americans are veterans. The 1964 budget proposes an expenditure in excess of $6 billion to finance and administer programs affecting this substantial portion of our populace. To carry out existing programs and to effectively fulfill its responsibilities toward this group, the Veterans' Administration requires a staff of approximately 175,000. An operation of this magnitude requires the guidance of a separate Senate committee.

A number of measures concerning veterans have already been introduced, and many more may reasonably be expected during this session. Legislation directly affecting such a vast number of people and involving the expenditure of such huge sums of money is deserving of our best efforts. American veterans are deserving of the services of a committee whose members and staff are not burdened with equally important and complex legislation in other fields. In view of the obvious need for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the expressed desire of many veterans and veterans' groups for such a committee I urge the Senate to give this measure its full support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 160) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (m) of section 1; and

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out in the second sentence thereof "and the Committee on Rules and Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Committee on Rules and Administration; and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs".

Sec. 3. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, respectively, during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 6868, the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. The purpose of this amendment is to continue the prohibition of the use by Members of Congress of the franking privilege to send out junk mail—unaddressed mail.

Last year the Senate, in its approval of the Legislative Appropriation Act for fiscal 1963, accepted my amendment, the purpose of which was to repeal the junk mailing privileges of Members of Congress.

Prior thereto Members of Congress could send, under the franking privilege, unaddressed mail to postal patrons in the cities or in the rural areas, a privilege denied to businessmen.

This meant that candidates for reelection could use their franking privilege to circulate the voters of an entire State with the taxpayers paying the postage. In fact, under the old arrangement there was nothing to prohibit a congressional Member who was running for the Presidency from using his franking privilege to circulate the entire United States with political propaganda and letting the taxpayers pay the postage merely by putting his speeches in the Congressional Record and having them reprinted.

As evidence of how important that amendment was, I cite certain statistics which were obtained from the Post Office Department:

The volume of mail for the Congress for fiscal year 1961 was 88,821,000 pieces, and the cost was $3,986,000. Then there was added to the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1962 a provision liberalizing the franking privilege to extend to all so-called junk mail—unaddressed mail. Significantly, the volume for Congress that year jumped to 110,944,016 pieces at an estimated cost of $4,867,374. This was an increase of $881,374.

Then last year Congress approved my amendment to the Legislative Appropriation Act which repealed this junk mailing privilege for Congress, and while I do not have the statistics for this year, it is estimated that a similar savings resulted.

With this background I was very much disappointed that on Tuesday of this week the House passed the Legislative Appropriation Act for fiscal 1964 and again repealed this amendment by eliminating all reference to it from the appropriation act itself and including in their report language which specifically states that the old law shall prevail. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Record the two paragraphs dealing with this subject as appearing on page 9 of the House report.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Considerations of economy—and that extends not only to the handling by the department but to the addressing in Members offices—plus the added consideration that under the present prohibition we have the absurd situation whereby Members of Congress using the frank do not even have privileges on a parity with private mailers on either rural, star, or city routes or boxes suggest to a majority of the committee the commonsense of discontinuing the restriction. Private mailers can send rural mail addressed simply "Postal patron, local" and city mail without a specific name. Under the present restriction Members of Congress using the frank can do neither—an absurdity on its face. The simplified addressing procedure obtaining prior to last October was entirely permissive and would remain so under the accompanying bill. Members of Congress could continue to use the more complete address if they so prefer. The choice would be solely theirs.

The language included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, providing that funds available for reimbursing the Post Office for the cost of congressional mailings should also be available for the expenses, as authorized by existing law, of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under the congressional frank was not repeated in the 1963 bill because it was permanent law. Repetition was unnecessary. This provision was temporarily set aside by an amendment in the form of a limitation on the use of funds inserted by the Senate and subsequently agreed to by the House in the 1963 bill, but it only attached to the money in the bill and therefore expires June 30, 1963. The restriction—section 105 of the 1963 law—is not repeated in the accompanying bill. The permanent law would again become controlling.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I am offering today which will override the House action and reinstate the law as approved last year be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following new section:

"FORM OF ADDRESS ON FRANKED MAIL

"Sec. — (a) Chapter 57 of title 39 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" '§ 4169. Form of address on franked mail.

" 'Mail matter shall not be sent through the mails as franked mail under section 4161, 4162, or 4163 unless it bears the name of an addressee or is addressed to a specific street number.'

"(b) The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof a new item as follows:

" '4169. Form of address on franked mail.' "

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH JAPAN—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, Executive I, 88th Congress, 1st session, being a consular convention between the United States of America and Japan, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on March 22, 1963. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention and protocol, that the message from the President, the convention and protocol be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and Japan, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on March 22, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the convention and protocol submitted herewith and give its advice and consent to their ratification.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1963.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) consular convention with Japan, with protocol, signed at Tokyo, March 22, 1963.)

HEARINGS ON NONDIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, early last year the Committee on Foreign Relations began a study of nondiplomatic activities of representatives of foreign governments.

With one exception, the O'Donnell case, our study has been confined to staff investigations and executive sessions of the committee. On Friday of this week, we shall begin public sessions, to a large degree consisting of disclosure of the information developed in closed meetings.

Before the public hearings begin, I think it is desirable to attempt to put the study in proper perspective, in the hope that judgments may be made by Congress, the press and the public—not upon the basis of the individuals involved, or their deeds or misdeeds—but rather upon how their activities relate to our foreign policy and our national stature.

If this is to be done, I think it is important that certain background distinctions be made.

One distinction is between the employment of U.S. citizens for purely technical or legal guidance. It is one thing, for example, for a U.S. citizen to represent a foreign interest or government in a highly technical proceeding before the Tariff Commission, and quite another to attempt to influence the public, the press, or the Government on foreign policy issues.

The most important distinction, I think, is that which is involved in the term "foreign agent." There has been confusion among many newspapers, commentators, and I think in the Congress itself, between "foreign agents" and domestic "lobbyists" and their proper roles. There has been too great a tendency to regard some of the activities which have been disclosed as merely examples of lobbying, without regard to the difference betwen a domestic lobbyist petitioning Congress or the Executive, by the various techniques of the trade, contributing, politicking, propagandizing, et cetera, and the foreign agent using the same techniques in behalf of his principal—the foreign government or other interest.

The very use, by the foreign agent, of the techniques developed by the domestic lobbyist or propagandist, has tended to obscure the vital distinctions of right and propriety, which depend upon the question of whom the agent is acting for. The reaction has often been, on the one hand, to condemn the activity as typical of our society, or to excuse it for the same reason.

The failure to make these distinctions, I think, may explain, to a large degree, the rather lax administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act over many years, the lack of compliance with it, the general toleration of this fact, and the lack of interest in the act and its administration by the Congress heretofore. This is the first investigation of the operation of the act since its passage.

The first amendment to the Constitution guarantees the people the right of petition—and this right, of course, is applicable to both domestic and foreign affairs. The right of petition is so fundamental that it is connected in the first amendment with the rights of freedom of speech, the press, religion, and assembly. Lobbying has been held by the courts to be an important expression of the right of petition—"the healthy essence of the democratic process," as a Federal court has said.

Those foreign agents who use the modern techniques deriving from the right of petition, or lobbying, are regarded by many, and many of them probably regard themselves, as merely exercising that constitutional right, with no greater obligations than those who represent American interests and American citizens.

But this is not correct—or ought not to be. A foreign government or interest does not have the same right of petition under our Constitution. Should it be permitted to acquire such a right by hiring and directing a U.S. agent? There is, in other words, a vital judgment to be based upon who the principal is, rather than entirely upon what the agent does.

Custom and tradition have it that the political and public affairs of a foreign government be performed by regularly accredited diplomatic personnel—whom, in fact, our Government may accredit or not as it chooses, and whom our Government may declare persona non grata if and when they overstep the bounds of propriety.

There are legitimate questions about the regulation of lobbying—and the whole field of propaganda—which have little validity when that lobbying or propagandizing is done on behalf of foreign interests. In the domestic field, we are accustomed to and can identify, evaluate, and discount much of these activities. To a large extent, they are canceled out by conflicting and competing efforts. Furthermore, the right of petition, by our own people, and the freedom of speech and press, being so highly valued, we hesitate to go even so far as we could legitimately, in the fear of impinging, ever so slightly, upon that which is fundamental.

These inhibitions should not concern us to the same degree in dealing with activities of a foreign agent done under the direction or control of a foreign principal.

When these activities coincide with the interests of U.S. citizens or residents and their own foreign policy, it is only incidental. The primary motive, while not necessarily inimical, is at least divergent. Nevertheless, no one is suggesting, nor does the Foreign Agents Registration Act provide, that these activities be forbidden. The obligation is for full disclosure of the activities on the assumption that impropriety will thus be inhibited by publicity.

When an agent or lobbyist deceives an American client into believing that because of his "contacts," "influence," or "connections," he can get our Government to do something, when he cannot—that is a problem between people. If he does the same with a foreign principal, it can become a problem of governments—and one in which our Government has a legitimate interest.

When a politician receives a campaign contribution from an American, he has the right to assume that it comes from an American source. Custom and experience have taught him what it means, if anything, and how to deal with it. He has the right to assume that the American source of the contribution knows, or should know, the contribution does not mean he is bought and paid for. When the contribution actually is from a foreign source, the candidate has no means of evaluating the effect of his acceptance upon the attitude or expectancy of the actual contributor, and the latter may receive an entirely wrong impression.

If a domestic lobbyist represents to a domestic interest that he can influence the appointment of an official who will be concerned with that interest's governmental relations, the domestic interest has full means and opportunity to evaluate such a representation. When a foreign agent represents to his principal that he can influence the appointment of an Ambassador, the foreign principal may or may not be able to evaluate the representation. If the foreign principal believes it, it does not reflect credit upon the United States.

If a public relations concern represents to a domestic company that it can control the news about that company throughout the United States, the company ought to be able to evaluate that representation. If the same public relations firm makes the same representation to a foreign and new country, for example, the latter may or may not believe it. Impressive "brochures" and "documentation" may deceive the uninformed.

Efforts to influence news media by domestic interests are almost certain to be met and counter-balanced by similar efforts of competing domestic interests. Our people usually have the facilities for evaluating news about domestic matters, through experience and observation. To the extent they do not, there is no constitutional cure. Similar efforts by foreign interests neither have the same constitutional sanctity, nor the same safeguards of competition and diversity.

When a group of American citizens band themselves together for political or propaganda action on an issue of foreign policy, no one has the right to question the propriety or the organization, acting on its own. But if they should be financed or controlled by a foreign principal, those whom they seek to influence have the right to know this.

In short, there are ample grounds for distinguishing between what is, or should be, proper activity on behalf of a domestic interest and the same activity on behalf of a foreign principal, and the fact that representatives of one may use the same techniques as representatives of the other should not obscure these grounds for distinction.

I hope that as our public hearings progress these distinctions will be kept in mind.

Again, I should like to repeat, we do not seek to prohibit activities of foreign agents. I believe the American people should not be deprived of political information, even when it comes from, or is controlled or financed by foreign principals. Our purpose is the same as that which Justice Black set forth when he summarized the purpose of the original Foreign Agents Registration Act:

> Resting on the fundamental constitutional principle that our people, adequately informed, may be trusted to distinguish between the true and the false, the bill is intended to label information of foreign origin so that hearers and readers may not be deceived by the belief that the information comes from a disinterested source.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will conclude its current series of hearings on Presidential inability with a final hearing on Tuesday, June 18, 1963. The hearing will be at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At that time, we will hear testimony from Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, among others.

HEARINGS ON S. 1561

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Health Benefits and Life Insurance Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that public hearings on S. 1561 have been scheduled for 10 a.m. on Monday, June 24, 1963, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building. S. 1561 would amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 by removing certain unforeseen technical problems which have arisen in connection with the application of the act and would simplify its administration. First to testify will be representatives of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that public hearings have been scheduled to begin on Wednesday, June 26, 1963, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building on the bill S. 747 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Anyone desiring to testify or submit a statement for the record should notify the office of the subcommittee, room 2306, New Senate Office Building, phone extension 2347, as soon as possible so that a schedule of witnesses may be prepared.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING BY BUREAU OF WATER RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced the bill (S. 1610) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital parks system in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes, which has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be allowed to be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of June 4, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 1650. A bill to provide an elected Mayor, City Council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes: Mr. Brewster, Mr. Case, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Hart.

S. 1665. A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries; Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Keating, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 1666. A bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes; Mr. Boggs, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Smathers.

SENATOR RUSSELL ADDRESSES UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA GRADUATES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, Senator Richard B. Russell, the senior Senator from Georgia, has an abiding interest in higher education, and in 30 years of outstanding senatorial service he has dedicated himself to its furtherance. His contributions in this regard have been great and they have been many.

Senator Russell is especially devoted to the University of Georgia, where he was graduated in 1918 with a bachelor of laws degree. Therefore, it was a distinct pleasure for Senator Russell on June 1 to return to his alma mater to address the 1963 graduating class.

Senator Russell spoke to the graduates of the challenges of the future and the opportunities it holds for young people, as well as the pitfalls that await the unwary. He reminded them of the timeless truth that dangers of the present day should not be feared or avoided, but, rather, should be faced squarely, for they present in themselves opportunities to make this a better world in which to live.

And in the context of current events which astound and appall the law-abiding citizens of this Nation, Senator Russell correctly noted that self-restraint is essential to self-government, that local law is entitled to the same measure of obedience that the Federal Government expects for its laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Russell's address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Russell at 160th Commencement Exercises at the University of Georgia, June 1, 1963

For me this is an honor that I cherish and an occasion I have anticipated with great pleasure.

Athens and the university have a special place in my affections. Perhaps this is a syndrome that occurs in other graduates of this institution and in graduates of other institutions, but whenever I approach Athens my heartbeat quickens and the sweet sadness of nostalgia suffuses me.

In my own case I am confident this reaction is only a manifestation of my being at heart a perennial undergraduate. I suspect, though, that this feeling is widely shared and that for each of us it is largely the result of recalling some of the pleasures of our undergraduate days. Perhaps it goes back to moments we spent in pausing, or refreshing, or both, at Costa's, or Moon-Winn's, or Cody David's, or the Varsity, or the favorite gathering spot of our era here. For others, it may be caused by a kaleidoscope of football flashbacks, and the finest hours of the Bob McWhorter, the Herdis McCrary, the "Catfish" Smith, the Frank Sinkwich, the Charlie Trippi, or the Francis Tarkenton of our day. For still others, the onrushing thoughts may be chiefly of sorority or fraternity life, or the lasting friendships of days in a dormitory.

I hope, however, that for most of us the memories are heavily sprinkled with thoughts of the principal reason for our having been here—the pursuit of learning—and the faculty members who with varying degrees of success contributed to our quest.

To the graduates of 1963 I extend congratulations and best wishes. You have every reason to feel a sense of accomplishment. Despite commendable progress in broadening education opportunity in this country, only a relatively small part of our population has successfully completed 4 years of college.

The achievements that are commemorated today represent much determination and hard work.

The formal education and the training you have received in this school are assets you will never lose and never regret.

The parents of this year's graduates are also entitled to congratulations and a major part of the credit for the achievement that is noted today. Your graduation is for many of them a culmination of planning, saving, and sacrifice since your birth.

Fortunately, the state of our national economy at this time is such that you do not have to wonder whether you can find a job. Instead, for most of you the decision probably is which job to take.

Although monetary gain should not be the principal objective of education, it must be pleasant for you to realize that information from the 1960 census supports a conclusion that, on the average, 4 years in college result in lifetime earnings of $178,000 more than the earnings of a high school graduate.

Many members of this class will be entering on a period of active duty with the Armed Forces. Graduates of earlier days have brought honor to our university, our State and Nation by devoted and heroic service in the uniform of our country. I would like to think that you regard military service as an opportunity to be cheerfully entered upon instead of a burden to be grudgingly borne.

To me the most important conclusion to be drawn from today's state of world affairs is that we must be militarily strong. The values of an education, the blessing of governing ourselves, the enjoyment of the products of our immense industrial capacity, and life itself, are dependent on our ability to defend ourselves successfully.

Some of you may be surprised if today you do not hear an oversimplified formula for success in life or an exhortation to join the battle against a multiplicity of dangers. Even if I had the inclination to do so, I would not be so presumptuous as to think that I could specify for you the objectives you should seek or the route by which you should pursue them. I know enough of this institution to be confident that each of you has acquired the information and the discriminating judgment that contribute to sound choices of goals.

Neither shall I remind you of the dangers of the present day. These dangers exist, certainly, and many of them seem immediate and formidable. Each generation of humanity has had its troubles though, and to each generation the problems it knew probably seemed as pressing as ours do to us today. However, momentous events and great dangers usually bring universal opportunities. Again I have every confidence that the training you have received here enables you to recognize these dangers and gives you the courage to take up arms against them.

Instead, I should like to talk with you briefly about a subject I hope is dear to all of us, and that is the University of Georgia itself.

As a result of our friendly competition with North Carolina as to which is the oldest State university, many of us have boasted that Georgia is the oldest chartered State university. While we are thus charter conscious, I suspect many of us tend to forget what the charter itself contains. I recently came upon its text again while reading "A Historical Sketch of the University of Georgia" by A. L. Hull. With your indulgence I should like to quote the beginning of the charter now:

"As it is the distinguishing happiness of free governments that civil order should be the result of choice and not necessity, and the common wishes of the people become the law of the land, their public prosperity and even existence, very much depends upon suitably forming the minds and morals of their citizens. When the minds of the people in general are viciously disposed and unprincipled, and their conduct disorderly, a free government will be attended with greater confusions and evils more horrid than the wild uncultivated state of nature: it can only be happy where the public principles and opinions are properly directed and their manners regulated. This is an influence beyond the stretch of laws and punishments, and can be claimed only by religion and education. It should, therefore, be among the first objects of those who wish well to the national prosperity to encourage and support the principles of religion and morality, and early to place the youth under the forming hand of society, that by instruction, they may be molded to the love of virtues and good order. Sending them abroad to other communities for their education will not answer these purposes, is too humiliating an acknowledgment of the ignorance or inferiority of our own, and will always be the cause of so great foreign attachments, that upon principles of policy, it is inadmissible.

"This country in the times of our common danger, and distress, found such security in the principles and abilities which wise regulations had before established in the minds of our countrymen, that our present happiness, joined to the pleasing prospects, should conspire to make us feel ourselves under the strongest obligation to form the youth, the rising hope of our land, to render the like glorious and essential services to our country."

Dr. Bocock, one of the all-time great faculty members of this institution, has been quoted as saying that the first sentence of this charter is one among the five or six great sentences in the English language.

In writing of our charter the late universally beloved Chancellor David Crenshaw Barrow stressed, in connection with our having the distinguishing happiness of living in a land where civil order is the result of choice and not necessity that choice calls for selection and selection demands responsibility. In developing this thought he said: "So in our civil government there are very many who do not meet the requirements of good citizenship. This is brought out in times of excitement, in times of stress, and in times of temptation. It is the greatest human achievement to meet the requirements of freedom, to be worthy to be free. There are very few of us, of older years, who do not find the exercise of freedom of choice, at times, a test of manhood."

Another important part of the charter is that referring to the common wishes of the people becoming the law of the land. Much of the stability of our Government has come from our respecting the choice of the majority and our abiding by this choice, even when we have to accept the verdict of an adverse majority.

Contemporary events in our Nation remind us forcefully that self-restraint is essential to self-government. Neither can a free government long endure unless our highest officials accord the same respect to local ordinances that is expected from all of our people for Federal law. In our system of dual government and divided powers, the majesty of local law, legally enacted, is as supreme in its sphere as the enactment of the national Congress throughout the Nation.

Having the charter as a precept, I think we may say with some satisfaction that the university of today is carrying out its reason for existence with high fidelity. We certainly have passed the stage referred to in the charter of being humiliated by having to send our sons and daughters elsewhere to seek an education. The quality of instruction here needs no defense; graduates of this institution can compete without a handicap and on equal terms with those of any institution in the world.

This does not mean that we have achieved perfection, or that there are no challenges yet to be met. The size of the student body is increasing yearly and this condition will continue for many years to come. A visitor to Athens sees abundant evidence that the physical facilities are being expanded in anticipation of this increase. We should rejoice that this is true, and that more and more of our young people are being exposed to the blessings of a college education. But we should also be careful not to dilute the power or quality of that exposure by spreading it too thin.

This brings us to the question of how one measures the quality of education. Since my experience has been in government rather than in education my views are those of only a profoundly interested observer, and not of an expert.

I think we would all agree that the number or splendor of the buildings, the size of the student body, the faculty-student ratio, the number of volumes in the library, or success in intercollegiate sports competition are not in themselves, either singly or collectively, the things that determine the worthwhile reputation of an institution of learning. This is not to say that each of these factors does not contribute to a school's reputation, some obviously contributing in more important ways than others.

Yet it seems to me that a school's relative position, as reflected by the demeanor and the accomplishments of its graduates, is more influenced by the ability of its administrators and its faculty to inspire intellectual curiosity and discipline in the student body.

It would be impossible for me to draw a specification for a great teacher. They fall into many different patterns, and the reasons some are outstanding are elusive to define. I am convinced, however, that the incidence of their appearance determines the comparative merits of schools and the more fruitful eras within a single school. At Georgia we have been blessed with some faculty members of profound learning and an uncommon ability to inspire. I feel sure we are still so blessed and that we will continue to be in the future.

Kahlil Gibran, in "The Prophet," deals interestingly and wisely with the science of teaching.

"Then said a teacher, speak to us of teaching.

"And he said:

"No man can reveal to you aught but that which already lies half asleep in the dawning of your knowledge.

"The teacher who walks in the shadow of the temple, among his followers, gives not of his wisdom but rather of his faith and his lovingness.

"If he is indeed wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind.

"The astronomer may speak to you of his understanding of space, but he cannot give you his understanding.

"The musician may sing to you of the rhythm which is in all space, but he cannot give you the ear which arrests the rhythm nor the voice that echoes it.

"And he who is versed in the science of numbers can tell of the regions of weight and measure, but he cannot conduct you thither.

"For the vision of one man lends not its wings to another man.

"And even as each one of you stands alone in God's knowledge, so must each one of you be alone in his knowledge of God and in his understanding of the earth."

I know that your families and the wise teachers of this great university who have "given of their faith and their lovingness" and who have "led you to the threshold of you own mind," to repeat these words from "The Prophet," would like to find their reward and their satisfaction in your contributions to society. Nothing could be more pleasing to them than for you to build on the education they have made possible. With this start, with God's help, and with a liberal application of hard work you have almost unlimited opportunities to solve the problems of our day and to make this a better world for your having lived in it.

In conclusion let me bespeak your continuing interest in and devotion to this school. If each acknowledges our debt to alma mater we will assure even greater contributions to our State and our Nation in the years to come.

I congratulate you again. You have my every good wish for a useful life and happiness.

EROSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Mr. President, on Wednesday the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made an eloquent and sincere plea for the preservation of the Constitution, which is repeatedly being undermined by decisions of the Supreme Court, edicts by the executive branch of Government, and what amounts virtually to indifference by the Congress.

The Supreme Court, in one decision after another, is chipping away at the rights of the sovereign States and the liberties of individuals. Indeed, the Court seems bent, not on interpreting and following the law, but on making new law, amending the Constitution, and distorting the intent of our Founding Fathers. Unwarranted and unconstitutional decrees by the Executive in the areas of public housing, employment, public schools, and private enterprise are usurpations of legislative authority, and do great damage to our republican form of government.

In an address before the Minnesota State Bankers Association, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Virginia, Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, urged that this dangerous trend be reversed, and that the Constitution be protected and preserved as the bedrock of our Government, as intended by the great men who were the architects of what has become the greatest government of all time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROBERTSON's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE MINNESOTA STATE BANKERS ASSOCIATION, JUNE 12, 1963, AT ST. PAUL, MINN., ON CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY

It is a great honor to be here in the Twin Cities with the officers, members, and distinguished guests of the Minnesota State Bankers Association. As a hunter and a fisherman from the foothills of Virginia's Blue Ridge Mountains, I am pleased to visit your beautiful and richly endowed State. When some nations are dying for lack of water and many areas of our own country are threatened with deficiencies in this precious natural resource, Minnesota has the largest supply of fresh water in the United States. Since steel is the most important basic material of our industrial age, the location in Minnesota of 2 billion or more tons of taconite, which when processed in pellet form is superior to the ore of the Mesabi Range, makes your State a great contributor to our national wealth. And, since the tourist dollar is encompassed about with fewer problems than dollars earned in nearly any other way, the people of Minnesota can take great pride in the value to others of their beloved land of the sky-blue waters.

The year 1963, as you know, is an important anniversary in banking—the 100th anniversary of the National Bank Act, and the 50th anniversary of the Federal Reserve System and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which I have the honor to chair. We look ahead this year to a remarkable prospect for growth in population and income for our competitive enterprise economy. It is a good time to pause for awhile and consider the importance to banking and to the economy of a healthy legislative environment and a sound fiscal policy. Without the constitutional liberties that make for political stability, and without the fiscal disciplines that make for economic stability, we cannot release the creative forces of enterprise that have made our Nation the marvel of the modern world.

In the area of business developments, the uncertainty of the winter has given way before continued signs of economic strength. The current expansion has now been underway since February 1961—well over 2 years. The brisk and encouraging advance of that year slowed down and reached a plateau as 1962 moved into its winter of discontent. Now, with spring almost behind us, many business signs are pointing up, and the prospects for the rest of this year are good to excellent in many lines. During the first quarter, the gross national product rose an encouraging $8.5 billion at a seasonally adjusted annual rate. Industrial production in March and April was upward for nearly all industries. In automobiles, the first 5 months of this year topped the pace in record year 1955. New orders of factories rose in April and are 14 percent above a year ago in durable goods. With a record 69 million civilians working, personal incomes are continuing their rise, even though unemployment is still a problem at an average rate of 5.7 percent of the labor force. So, all in all, this anniversary year for banking seems likely to exceed its earlier promise on the business scene.

On this occasion, I shall not comment on legislative proposals that have been or may be considered during this session by the Banking and Currency Committee. We are engaged in studying the meaning and importance to our future of numerous studies recently completed.

Beginning with my Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which did not pass the House but still has had a great deal of influence on subsequent banking legislation, we have seen the results of the $1.3 million study by the National Monetary Commission of the private Committee for Economic Development. After that, we have received the reports this year of the President's Committees on Financial Institutions and on Federal Credit Programs. We have also received the report of the Comptroller's Advisory Committee on the National Banking System. And we have received the report of the comprehensive study by the Securities and Exchange Commission of our securities markets.

The reasons for the interest in our financial institutions do not lie in any concern about their security and soundness during the current prosperity and stability in our economy. Rather, it is the great changes we have experienced since the depression thirties that have called for the new look at banking.

While we are still studying these reports, so far the new look has revealed, in my opinion, no serious flaws. The main conclusion emerging from the reports is that there is no need, to use the Committee for Economic Development's words, for "wholesale overhaul of our financial system." And, the President's Financial Institutions Committee said, "Many of the needed revisions of law and policy * * * are not so urgent as to command the highest priority."

As a result of these studies and current discussion, a number of proposals have been made that deal with banking legislation. I need not take time here to go into them in any detail, but they include increases in FDIC and FSLIC insurance limits, increased supervision of savings and loan associations, Federal Reserve cash requirements for State nonmember banks, Federal charters for mutual savings banks, changes in portfolio regulations, a Federal Banking Commission, and several others.

Recently, the SEC presented to the Congress and our committee three major proposed statutory changes of interest to bankers. These involve establishment of minimum qualifications for individuals and concerns entering the securities business, changes in disciplinary procedures and penalties, and the imposition of basic disclosure and other requirements in companies whose stock is traded over-the-counter.

In general, the legislative proposals relating to financial institutions fall into two categories: proposals to change the governmental framework of regulation, and proposals to change the powers and activities of the various financial institutions themselves.

In my opinion, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will want to consider all these proposals with great care and attention, with full consideration for the views of all interested parties, and with particular attention to the public interest. It will want to make sure that a given proposal has real merit. It will not vote for change simply for the sake of change.

Of course, bankers are interested in and affected by legislation throughout the broad range of fiscal policy. Bankers may not need much legislation under current conditions. But bankers do need confidence in the future. And this depends upon sound fiscal policy as well as sound banking legislation.

The best legislation for banks in 1963 will be no legislation to continue after July 1 the corporate tax rate of 52 percent. The automatic 5-percent cut when the Korean war rate expires at that time would produce more jobs than a similar cut in the lowest bracket of personal income and would reduce anticipated revenues by a far smaller sum. Cutting the corporate rate to 47 percent reduces revenue by only $2.375 billion, while a 5-percent cut in the bottom personal income bracket reduces revenue by $6.5 billion. What we need in this country today is more economic opportunity for our growing labor force, about to be swollen by record numbers of young people. I would be glad to see all Federal tax rates reduced but as a safeguard against inflationary deficit financing, I think tax cuts should be accompanied by spending cuts.

If we let the corporate rate drop back to 47 percent, I recommend that the revenue loss from such a productive tax reduction be offset by a $1 billion cut in the budget item for a shot to the moon. And a $1½ billion cut in foreign aid.

In the opinion of experts the shot to the moon has no military value, and in the opinion of many eminent scientists it has less than $20 billions of scientific value.

As for the foreign aid program, I have long recognized the vital stake that America has in the sound economic development of our allies and friends. Like others, I am heartened by the reports of some accomplishments for the Alliance for Progress. But since World War II our total foreign aid will have topped the $100 billion mark by the end of this year. We have now given military or economic aid to 111 countries and foreign groups. The Clay Commission itself, in its report on foreign aid, has told us that, "We are trying to do too much for too many too soon, that we are overextended in resources and undercompensated in results, and that no end of foreign aid is either in sight or in mind." And a cut of the size I propose only moves the program back to its level in fiscal 1962 or thereabouts. Surely it is time for our European allies to increase their share of the real foreign aid burden and for us to give Mr. Bell a chance to make some sense out of a confused and scattered effort. Nor can we safely ignore the fact that foreign recipients of our indiscriminate bounty are storing up one-fourth of the dollars we so generously distribute as a future claim against our depleted gold supply.

We hear much today from learned doctors about national priorities. I, for one, cannot see the national priorities served by a tax-tomorrow-but-spend-today philosophy. I am convinced that it leads to an era of perpetual deficits. I ask, must we rush so fast to shoot a man to the moon and billions of dollars over the face of the globe on a free ride, while hobbling investment in jobs with war-level tax rates?

It does seem that there are some extreme economic planners in Washington who would like to influence America to follow the mood of the Persian poet, Omar Khayyam, who wrote:

> "Ah love! could you and I with him conspire
> To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire
> Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
> Remould it nearer to the heart's desire!"

As a Virginian, I cherish the thought that my colonial ancestors helped to cradle and defend the infancy of a nation dedicated to the principles of private enterprise and constitutional liberty. I would be the last to repudiate the philosophy of Patrick Henry, who said that "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

Many nations have older and more famous institutions of learning than we. Many nations have produced great scholars, great artists, great scientists, but no nation has rivaled our rapid accumulation of national wealth and our standard of living. Why then, hasn't experience taught us that our system of private enterprise is the best of all economic systems and our system of American constitutional liberty the best environment for "pursuit of happiness" in its fullest sense?

May I close my remarks to the descendants of freedom-loving pioneers of the great northwest area, ceded to the Nation by Virginia as its contribution to the formation of a more perfect Union, by urging the preservation of the Constitution of the United States. Repeatedly, the Supreme Court has usurped authority by amending the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it. Repeatedly, the President of the United States has usurped authority with respect to the use of Federal troops and White House edicts in lieu of legislation with respect to fair employment on public projects, desegregation of FHA-financed mortgages, etc. Repeatedly, has the Congress taken refuge behind a Supreme Court decision that no taxpayer will be heard to challenge congressional spending to appropriate for projects clearly of a welfare state character not authorized by the Constitution. That type of constitutional erosion was mentioned by James Madison, the principal architect of the Constitution when he said: "I believe there are more abuses of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by the gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation."

It was with that thought in mind that the immortal George Washington in his Farewell Address urged that the Constitution be preserved and if changed then by the processes provided in the Constitution for that purpose.

Extolling that advice on the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Washington and pleading for the preservation intact of the Constitution, Daniel Webster said: "Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

LATTER-DAY SAINTS (MORMON) YOUTH PROGRAM, 64TH ANNUAL JUNE CONFERENCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on June 14 through 16 there will convene in Salt Lake City the 64th annual June Conference of the Mutual Improvement Association of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormons. There will be present at this conference over 25,000 youth leaders, who will gather together to receive inspiration, instruction, and on-the-spot help in a program designed to better the lives of youth, and thus develop better citizens of this great United States of America. In addition, a similar number of young people will participate in special programs of the conference—making an estimated total attendance of from 50,000 to 60,000 persons.

We hear a great deal about the increasing problems of juvenile delinquency in this country, and many and varied theories are offered in the attempt to combat and reverse this trend. The constructive program of the MIA is one of the Mormon Church's answers to this problem, and in its long history it has achieved amazing results.

I should like to take a few moments to highlight some of the features of June conference and to relate some of the programs and activities which combine to make the MIA organization one of the outstanding youth programs ever devised, an organization from which other religious and civic groups frequently borrow ideas for incorporation into their own programs.

The program at June conference will cover cultural, recreational, and character-building spiritual instructions to leaders of youth. These leaders, in turn, are then better fitted to give guidance and direction to approximately 300,000 young people enrolled in the MIA in the United States. Through general sessions, departmental workshops, demonstrations, and special events, the youth leaders will gain new ideas and enthusiasm and instruction to aid them in their important task.

The 1963 conference will stress the importance to youth of moral and physical fitness, talent and cultural development and spiritual growth. This is the goal and purpose of the Mutual Improvement Association, which it has been diligently striving to carry out since its formal organization in 1869 by Brigham Young.

A Mormon youngster enters MIA at the age of 12, and progresses through well-organized departmental groups, each comprising lessons and activities designed for the interests of his particular age, as well as participating with the entire organization in special programs and planned recreation and outings.

Let me highlight briefly some of the activities carried out by the MIA:

Speech: To the MIA has been given the great responsibility for speech training and developing in the young people confidence to stand before men and express themselves orally. The speech program seeks to develop the ability and desire for self-expression. A speech competition will be one of the events of the June conference.

Music: The MIA music program is designed to provide top-quality musical activity among the youth. It seeks to uncover and develop musical talent, and to provide youth opportunity for musical experience and expression in choruses, quartets, trios, recreational singing, special class lessons, and instrumental ensembles.

Drama: Another program designed to encourage self-expression and develop talent is drama. The drama department has a twofold assignment: to help the participants enjoy this stimulating activity; and to produce plays for the enjoyment of the entire MIA.

Young women's sports-camp program: An activity which has great appeal is the young women's sports-camp program. In some localities, mountain retreats are owned and maintained for the purpose of providing camping facilities for the surrounding MIA groups. Here and in public campgrounds throughout the United States, organized groups may camp for a day or a week or longer, and participate in outdoor activities and sports, as well as in handicrafts, first-aid instruction, nature walks, and so forth, all under the supervision of their own class leaders.

Young men's athletic program: The young men's organization carries out an extensive athletic program, which consists of basketball, volleyball, softball, golf, and horseshoes. The Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association sponsors the largest basketball league in the world. Some 3,500 teams from the various wards—the equivalent of a parish in other churches—first compete to win their stake—diocese—championships, and a division playoff between the winners of several stakes is then held to determine the teams which will represent the division in the finals. Then the 75 to 100 winning teams from all over the United States assemble each year in Salt Lake City, during the latter part of February, for the finale of this massive all-church tournament. If one were to select the one most outstanding feature of the tournament, I believe it would surely be the extraordinarily high quality of sportsmanship and good fellowship which is constantly displayed at these games and throughout the athletic program.

Dance: Dancing has always been an integral part of the recreational and social life of the Mormons, from the earliest days of the church. While crossing the plains, the pioneers occasionally paused at the end of their hard day's trek to sing songs around the campfire and to join in a square dance to brighten and restore their tired spirits. The MIA strives to teach the art of dancing, so it may be enjoyed by everyone, and to provide clean, wholesome dancing parties. I quote president David O. McKay, of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, on the worth of the dance program:

> Our people deserve, yes, merit, the opportunity to mingle in dance under the most favorable circumstances and under the influence of righteousness. By holding our standards high in personal conduct, dress, dancing positions, social graces, and performance of fundamental dance techniques, we learn to respect and appreciate each other while enjoying this outstanding social activity.

During this June conference the great biennial dance festival, held in the University of Utah stadium on two separate evenings, will be enjoyed by approximately 50,000 spectators. This event, which will culminate several months of preparation by indivdual wards and stakes, will involve over 6,000 costumed youthful dancers from all over the United States.

Scouting: This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scout program in the MIA, an event which will be commemorated at the conference with a pageant, "The Golden Years of Scouting." The Mormon Church was the first religious body in the United States to sponsor the Boy Scout program. All boys who join the MIA at the age of 12 participate in the Scout program, and as MIA members they have the opportunity to advance through all its levels and receive its highest awards. The president of the Boy Scouts of America and the chief Scout executive will be among guests attending and participating in this year's jubilee. The National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, at its recent convention in New York City, adopted a resolution commending the Mormon Church for its role in the scouting program. In this connection, I ask that an article appearing in the Deseret News of May 25, 1963, be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News of May 25, 1963]

CHURCH GAINS U.S. PRAISE FOR SCOUTING

NEW YORK CITY.—Commendation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on its 50th anniversary of scouting was passed here Friday in a resolution at the annual convention, Boy Scouts of America.

Also during the convention, Elder Harold B. Lee, of the Council of the Twelve of the Church, was presented the Silver Beaver Award for noteworthy service to boyhood.

The 2,500 scout leaders of the Nation unanimously adopted the commendation to the church which said:

OPTIMISTIC FUTURE

"*Resolved,* That the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, sincerely recognizes and deeply commends the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on this the 50th anniversary of scouting in the Church and looks forward to another 50 years of wonderful, happy experiences together."

The church's response to the resolution was made at the special awards banquet Friday evening by Elder Ezra Taft Benson of the Council of Twelve. Elder Benson, chairman of Region 12, is also a member of the national committee.

PRESENTS PLAQUE

Elder Benson made a statement of the position of the scout and explorer programs in the church and then presented the national council with a silver plaque commemorating the 50 years of scouting in the church.

The church official explained that scouting and exploring are an integral part of the church's program for boys and not an optional program. He quoted from a letter of the first presidency issued in December 1960 expressing the desire that all boys of the church affiliate with the Boy Scout program. He said the "50 years of the full scouting program in the church has been a happy, productive and fruitful experience. Some 90 percent of all eligible boys are enrolled in scouting."

SCOUTING HISTORY

Elder Benson traced the history in the church which began with the MIA Scouts in early 1911, and followed by affiliation with the national program on May 21, 1913—50 years ago this week.

Elder Benson also told the council meeting that in a telephone conversation Friday with president David O. McKay, the church leader asked that his warm personal wishes be conveyed to the Boy Scouts of America.

The silver plaque presented by Elder Benson on behalf of the church read:

"Presented to the Boy Scouts of America by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

CORDIAL RELATIONSHIP

"In appreciation for the cordial relationship and the bonds of brotherhood that have existed through 50 years of partnership in the great Scout movement; and for the supplemental support of scouting in the citizenship, physical fitness, character and spiritual uplift that have been part of the lives of thousands of Mormon boys who have participated in this wonderful program."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, another of the activities of the MIA is the Beehive program: The MIA provides a companion program for early teenage girls, called the Beehive program. The first 50 years of this organization will also be celebrated this year with a "Golden Bee Jubilee." The beehive, taking its symbolism from the industry of the bee, is the State symbol of Utah.

To sum up, Mr. President, we in Utah are proud of the MIA and its outstanding youth program. We believe, with Marion D. Hanks, a Latter-day Saints member of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, who has said, "Anyone who is working with and for youth is battling on the front lines of the century."

BANQUET IN HONOR OF SENATOR AND MRS. ANDERSON

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be one of some 3 dozen Members of the Senate to attend the banquet at which a dozen national conservation organizations honored our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and also Mrs. Anderson.

This was the national conservation testimonial dinner for Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON. It was sponsored by the American Conservation Association, American Forestry Association, Conservation Foundation, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

With C. R. Gutermuth as toastmaster, the dinner program included an invocation by the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick B. Harris; introductions of the many distinguished guests; tributes to Senator ANDERSON by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; presentation of the award to Senator ANDERSON by the National Wildlife Federation's executive director, Thomas L. Kimball; an address by Senator ANDERSON; and presentation of the award to Mrs. Anderson by Howard C. Zahniser, executive director and editor of the Wilderness Society. The evening closed with musical presentations by Jack Morton Productions.

RECEIVED BY THE PRESIDENT

Earlier in the day, at noon, the President of the United States had received at the White House, Senator ANDERSON and his family and conservation leaders from the organizations sponsoring the testimonial dinner. The President commended Senator ANDERSON's conservation record and spoke particularly of the importance of the wilderness bill, now the Senate's Wilderness Act—S. 4—of which Senator ANDERSON is the outstanding champion. The President also spoke of the importance of our pending outdoor recreation programs, and urged the importance of conservation.

GUTERMUTH—A SKILLFUL TOASTMASTER

Toastmaster Gutermuth, who is vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, presented for due recognition Mrs. Wanda Johnson, of the Institute's secretarial staff, and Daniel Poole, editor of the Outdoor News Bulletin, who, with Mr. Gutermuth, had been responsible for many of the arrangements for the evening.

Mr. Gutermuth conducted the evening with his usual skill and good taste, and it was indeed a pleasure to listen to the tributes and presentations of awards—not only because of the enjoyment in hearing Senator ANDERSON commended, as he so well deserves, but also because of the sentiments so well expressed. There was fun in "Pink" Gutermuth's revelation that the "C" in his "C.R." initials stands for "Clinton" and his puckish introduction of Howard Zahniser as Howard Clinton Zahniser, the program having been arranged to include Zahniser's seldom-used middle initial. It was clearly an honor on this occasion to be named Clinton.

SENATOR ANDERSON'S REMARKS NOTABLE

Most notable during the evening were the remarks that Senator ANDERSON himself made after receiving his award.

The award was a plaque carrying the following citation:

> The National Conservation Award presented to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON in appreciation of his dynamic leadership and vigorous participation in the conservation of America's natural heritage by the American Conservation Association, American Forestry Association, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, the Conservation Foundation, the Wilderness Society, and Wildlife Management Institute (1963).

SENATOR ANDERSON COMMENTS ON LOYALTY

Senator ANDERSON'S remarks included an especially inspiring comment on loyalty.

Referring to Henry James' book entitled "The Philosophy of Loyalty," and its definition of loyalty as "constant unswerving devotion to a cause—a cause greater than ourselves, to which we commit ourselves," Senator ANDERSON said:

> Very largely the story of our life is the story of our loyalties—the things to which we have given our time and energy with no holding back of a part of the price: the causes to which we have given our determined assistance.

MRS. ANDERSON HONORED

It was a particular pleasure to see Mrs. Anderson honored also and presented a plaque that includes a reproduction of the one presented to the Senator and, in addition, the citation:

> Presented to Henrietta McCartney Anderson for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband.
>
> Of Senator ANDERSON'S years of accomplishment that we now honor—

Said Howard Zahniser in presenting this plaque—

> 1 score and 10, by his own estimate, we can well appreciate as an extension of his years that we owe to Mrs. Anderson. They are a measure of the gratitude and appreciation we have for her. She has conserved a great conservationist.

TEXTS OF REMARKS ASSEMBLED

So important has this occasion seemed to me that I have been interested in assembling the texts or reconstructions or representations of the remarks made by the various speakers. This effort has been successful to a gratifying extent, and these papers have now been assembled—along with the printed program; a news report from the New York Times of May 21, 1963; an editorial from the Washington Post on the following Sunday, May 26, 1963; and a news release from the May 31, 1963, issue of the Wildlife Management Institutes' Outdoor News Bulletin.

These are as follows:

Exhibit A: "Anderson Testimonial Dinner Rated Outstanding," a news report from the Outdoor News Bulletin for May 31, 1963.

Exhibit B: The printed program, entitled "Conservation Testimonial Dinner for the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senator of New Mexico, Presidential Room, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1963."

Exhibit C: Remarks by the Secretary of Agriculture, **Orville L. Freeman**, at the dinner honoring Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, on May 20, 1963.

Exhibit D: Excerpts from remarks by the Secretary of the Interior at a dinner honoring Senator ANDERSON.

Exhibit E: Remarks by Thomas L. Kimball in presenting the award to Senator ANDERSON at the testimonial dinner.

Exhibit F: The citation on the plaque presented at the memorial dinner, May 20, 1963, to Senator ANDERSON.

Exhibit G: Remarks by Senator ANDERSON.

Exhibit H: "She Has Conserved a Great Conservationist," remarks by Howard C. Zahniser, in presenting an award to Mrs. Anderson.

Exhibit I: "President To Visit Wilderness Areas," a news report from the New York Times of Tuesday, May 21, 1963.

Exhibit J: "True Conservative," an editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday 26, 1963.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that these items be printed in the CONGRSSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the program, addresses, and other documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

[From the Outdoor News Bulletin, May 31, 1963]

ANDERSON TESTIMONIAL DINNER RATED OUTSTANDING

The national conservation testimonial dinner for Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, held Monday evening, May 20, at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., was attended by a capacity audience of more than 600 persons from all levels of public and private life and natural resources backgrounds and interests, according to the Wildlife Management Institute.

Taking part in honoring the popular New Mexican, who earlier this year stepped down as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that handles much of the Nation's natural resources legislation, were three members of the President's Cabinet—Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; and Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce—more than 30 Senators, many Congressmen, the Governor of New Mexico, heads and key personnel of Federal agencies, and officers and staff personnel of national conservation groups.

The sponsoring groups presented Senator ANDERSON with a plaque that cited his long service to the cause of conservation and improved resources management. A replica of the plaque also was given to Mrs. Anderson. Earlier in the day the members of the Anderson family, accompanied by a group of conservation leaders, visited with the President at the White House.

The testimonial dinner was sponsored by the American Conservation Association, American Forestry Association, Conservation Foundation, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

EXHIBIT B

CONSERVATION TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR THE HONORABLE CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. SENATOR, NEW MEXICO, PRESIDENTIAL ROOM, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 20, 1963

PROGRAM

Invocation: The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate.

Toastmaster: C. R. Gutermuth.

Introduction of distinguished guests

Tribute by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

Presentation of awards by Thomas L. Kimball and Howard C. Zahniser.

Music presentation by Jack Morton Productions.

Sponsors: American Conservation Association, American Forestry Association, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, the Conservation Foundation, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

EXHIBIT C

REMARKS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT A DINNER HONORING SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, STATLER HOTEL, MAY 20, 1963

We are gathered here to honor a man who can rightly be called Mr. Conservation. In his long years of public service, first as a Congressman, then as my predecessor in the Department of Agriculture, and now as a Senator, he has been an advocate of conservation of the public's soil and water resources. As a farmer and rancher, he has practiced in private what he has preached in public.

Thus, as an individual, he epitomizes the emerging concept of conservation not as a cold abstraction but in its truest sense as a policy of using land and water to meet human needs now and in the future.

Our progress in the development of this dynamic sense of conservation has not been as rapid as many of us would like. In fact, we are not now making the best and wisest use of our land and water to serve our national well-being. This is true of public as well as privately owned resources.

But, with the leadership of a man like Senator ANDERSON, we are moving in the right direction.

I need not remind you that he was the sponsor of the legislation creating the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and now, as a member of the Commission, is the driving force behind this effort to preserve and make available the resources of land and water for outdoor recreation.

As a Minnesotan I am grateful for the actions which the Senator took as Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman. We have in northern Minnesota one of the great wilderness areas of this country. It is a place were man can go only by canoe, and it is being managed today under the plan initiated by Senator ANDERSON when he served as my predecessor.

The wilderness system, which provides that all of us may use forest, soil, and water resources in their natural state, owes a great deal to the Senator. He helped to expand it as Secretary of Agriculture, and he has helped to guard it as a Senator.

But his interests in conservation—in recognizing that using soil and water resources does not impoverish them, but misusing them does—is not reserved for public lands. As Secretary, he expanded the technical and financial help provided landowners through programs to encourage local soil conservation districts. During his 3 years as Secretary, more than 500 new districts were organized. And he, himself, is a member of his local soil conservation district.

In many ways, the emergence of the Department of Agriculture as a great conservation agency can be traced back to the actions of Senator Anderson.

It is on these foundations that we are today proceeding to encourage programs and policies which will insure the conservation—the proper land and water use to satisfy human needs now and in the future—of not only public lands but also private lands.

We have reached the point in our national development where we are able to satisfy easily the needs of people for food and fiber, but we are just beginning to learn how we should use our land and water resources to satisfy human needs for outdoor recreation, for green areas around cities and towns, for open space to look at * * * to climb on * * * to walk through * * * or to meditate in.

When we look around for the land that is available, the majority of it we find is privately owned. As true conservationists, our challenge is clear. We must seek alternative land and water uses that will serve people in worthwhile ways * * * that will preserve local enterprise and the rural economy * * * and which will avoid the idling of vast tracts of land.

We look forward to this challenge with the idealism which Senator Anderson, Mr. Conservation, brings to the task of making wise use of our soil and water resources.

Exhibit D

Excerpts From Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Udall at Dinner Honoring Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Monday, May 20, 1963

We honor here tonight a man who, by any standards, is one of the foremost conservation leaders of his generation. "Clint" has earned the admiration of this distinguished company through his sensitivity and his fairness in dealing with a wide range of conservation problems over many years.

The record we are speaking of tonight is his conservation record, but the richness of Senator Anderson's service extends to many other aspects of our national lives. Permit me, for just a minute, to illustrate the magnitude of this man's accomplishments. Senator Anderson has served the people of this country in the House of Representatives, in the Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture, and in the Senate of the United States.

His competence and the great range of his interests are reflected in his Senate activities; he has been a tireless leader for the wise and careful development of atomic energy; he has fought the good fight for civil rights and for a system of equitable taxation; only last summer he endangered his health by the vigor of his efforts for adequate medical care for our senior citizens; and he is now the chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Committee. If conservation is the first love of Senator Anderson, these other fields in which he contributes so significantly indicate his versatility, his wholeness as a man.

As a conservationist, "Clint" has that attribute which another great conservationist, Teddy Roosevelt, 50 years ago singled out for commendation—he has "distance in his eyes." Since his boyhood days on a South Dakota farm, and through long familiarity with the conservation problems of the West, he has demonstrated that we can have a fresh and inspiring land, and at the same time sustain its productivity.

However, nothing I might tell you about Clinton P. Anderson reveals more about the inner man, his convictions, his conception of the worth of individuality, his ideas as to the duties we owe the generations which are to inherit our land, than his own words.

In a university commencement address 2 years ago, the Senator threw out a challenge that mirrors his own outlook on the duties and responsibilities of freemen:

"The methods of the past will be of little help in coping with the exigencies ahead. We must recognize the new fashion in global combat and harden ourselves to the harsh likelihood that the struggle will not end in our lifetimes. But in the words of the late French patriot and author, Albert Camus: 'Let us rejoice at being faced with cruel truths * * *. Let us seek the respite where it is—in the very thick of the battle.'"

Senator Anderson has spent his public lifetime on the firing line of making great decisions, sane decisions. A conservationist to the core, he has conserved his own equanimity and inspiring peace of mind, while giving firm counsel to his country.

Not long ago, Senator Anderson was asked by an organization to submit a statement of his philosophy on conservation. The highly personal statement he provided is so eloquent—and so expressive of the man so many of us know, that I want to read parts of it to you:

"In my boyhood on a South Dakota farm I learned from my father the true meaning of conservation. This philosophy was instilled in me daily by him as he sought to 'make land' on the Dakota prairies, and the philosophy I hold today reflects those early formative years in a family that loved the soil and all of nature's wonders.

"Conservation is to a democratic government of freemen as the roots of a tree are to its leaves * * *.

"For as we have and hold dear to our practices of conservation, we say to the other peoples of the world that ours is not an exploitive society—solely materialistic in outlook. We take a positive position—conservation means we have the faith that our way of life will go on and we are surely building for those who we know will follow.

"There is a spiritual side to conservation, and wilderness typifies this. Wilderness is a demonstration by our people that we can put aside a portion of this which we have as a tribute to the Maker and say—this we will leave as we found it.

"Wilderness is an anchor to windward. Knowing it is there, we can also know that we are still a rich Nation, tending to our resources as we should—not a people in despair searching every last nook and cranny of our land for a board of lumber, a barrel of oil, a blade of grass, or a tank of water.

"I believe we must carefully harvest our renewable resources so that the amount we remove over any period balances the growth. The timber, the grass, and the wildlife are rich examples.

"I believe we must do more than just balance growth and harvest. We must replace what we take with a new crop high in quality and utility to mankind.

"Over a century ago there crossed the American scene a man from Massachusetts. He was an educator who achieved a national stature based upon the work he did in his native State. His name was Horace Mann. The admonition he passed on was: 'Be ashamed to die until you have done something for humanity.'"

Clinton P. Anderson augments his legacy to humanity by daily deeds in behalf of wilderness, water, parks, and forests—all enhanced by an outlook which Albert Schweitzer has called, "a reverence for life."

In his early years in New Mexico, Clint had the privilege of friendship with a wise forester and outdoorsman whose name needs no introduction to this audience. I would like to conclude these remarks with a quotation from the late Aldo Leopold, because they summarize what Clinton Anderson stands for and why the rest of us are here:

"We abuse the land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."

Exhibit E

Remarks by Thomas L. Kimball in Presenting the Award to Senator Clinton P. Anderson at a Testimonial Dinner, May 20, 1963

A Missouri resident of some fame, who also served in the Senate of the United States before moving on to higher office, has been credited with some notworthy expressions. One of these is to the effect that persons who cannot stand the heat should stay out of the kitchen.

By such a definition, our guest of honor certainly qualifies as a foremost "cook" because he long has been in the midst of controversial national conservation issues. From a varied background as journalist and insurance businessman, he has been exceptionally active since moving into public service 30 years ago. Many of his major accomplishments have been in the field of natural resources. He served as Secretary of Agriculture and contributed efforts to agencies of the New Mexico State government in addition to his work in both Houses of the Congress.

Those of us here tonight are well aware of the leadership that Senator Clinton P. Anderson has given to passage this year of the wilderness bill (S. 4), the program for outdoor recreation (S. 20), and the Water Resources Research Act (S. 2). We all applaud his sponsorship of the Water Resources Planning Act (S. 1111) and of the proposal to preserve shoreline areas (S. 42).

To refresh our memories on his many other noteworthy accomplishments, I invite your attention to:

First. Outdoor recreation and his sponsorship in the 85th Congress of the measure establishing the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, followed by his outstanding service as a member. The study prepared by the Commission is regarded as a landmark in outdoor recreation and it will continue to pay dividends for many years. The Senator has also been a leader in securing appropriations for national forest recreation programs.

Second. Water conservation, wherein he has served with distinction on the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources and many of his legislative proposals have been designed to implement recommendations of this important group. As early as the 82d Congress, Senator Anderson authored a law to study weather modification in an effort to increase the amounts of precipitation in arid areas of the West. In 1958 he coauthored a bill for the creation of a saline water conversion demonstration program, and in the 84th Congress he cosponsored the Colorado River Storage Project Act. The stamp of his work also may be found on compacts relating to waters of the Canadian and Pecos Rivers, to projects in the Arkansas—Red and White River Basins, and to the Navajo-San Juan-Chama project.

Third. Soil conservation and Public Law 566, enacted in the 83d Congress, became an agricultural landmark. This was the Small Watershed Protection Act which Senator Anderson joined in sponsoring. In 1954 he was a leader in securing appropriations for emergency wind erosion control.

Fourth. Forestry—the Anderson-Mansfield Act, enacted by the 81st Congress, established an accelerated and continuing program for reforestation and revegetation of national forests and grazing lands. In the 84th Congress he joined in protecting national forest lands from unnecessary mining operations. His sustained-yield, multiple-use philosophy won national attention in settlement of the Klamath Indian timber problem in 1958.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could go on to enumerate other of Senator Anderson's accomplishments in the broad field of natural resources. I could list legislation to protect scenic values in several forests, parks, and monuments. I could set out his work on Indian areas; and I could detail his efforts at phreatophyte control.

These additional citations, however, seem unnecessary. From the foregoing, I am sure all of us recognize the many and varied contributions of Senator Anderson to conservation. It is an honor and a pleasure for me to have this opportunity of paying tribute to a truly remarkable gentleman and his equally remarkable career.

Most certainly, he has flourished in the hottest sort of kitchens, and most certainly generations of Americans yet unborn will profit from Senator Anderson's public service in providing for the conservation and wise use of our Nation's great wealth of renewable resources.

Exhibit F

Citation on Plaque Presented at Memorial Dinner May 20, 1963, to Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

The National Conservation Award presented to Senator Clinton P. Anderson in appreciation of his dynamic leadership and vigorous participation in the conservation of America's natural heritage by the American Conservation Association, American Forestry Association, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, the Conservation Foundation, the Wilderness Society, and Wildlife Management Institute (1963).

Exhibit G

Remarks of Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Conservation Testimonial Dinner, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1963

For more than 20 years I have enjoyed the bewhiskered story of the hod carrier who died just after a new attorney was hired by his union. The new mouthpiece claimed the privilege of saying a few words at the funeral, and while he carefully researched the history of membership of the deceased in the union, he added a great many flowery touches as to his private life and personal accomplishments. At the end, the mother asked one of the children to please tiptoe up to the coffin and see if it was their father in the casket.

I have watched my own children look about incredulously tonight wondering what happened to that other father of theirs who has been wanting to quit Washington and come home to a few flat, irrigated acres where a dozen western cow ponies nibble in a nearby pasture. There is no splendid solitude in that piece of irrigated ground; no rush of mountain streams, not even a problem of silt accumulation or soil erosion.

Who is this fellow who is being so graciously commended this evening? Well, I know him better than most, and I can tell you.

Henry James has a book which I have had in my library for the past 40 years. It is called "The Philosophy of Loyalty," and is a series of lectures which he delivered at Harvard. I have used that volume to crib material for talks many times in the past. But both my notes and the volume are in New Mexico which is normal: when I want something for a talk in New Mexico, my notes are in Washington. These notes that I wanted tonight are in New Mexico.

But the book defines "loyalty" as the constant unswerving devotion to a cause—a cause greater than ourselves to which we commit ourselves.

Very largely the story of our life is a story of our loyalties—the things to which we have given our time and energy with no holding back of a part of the price—the causes to which we have given our determined assistance. I wonder if we always know how we become involved in these causes. During the past few weeks I have been looking back over the trail of the half century since I left high school to see what brought me to this dinner tonight.

Forty-five years ago as a reporter, I met Aldo Leopold, who had taken a position with my hometown chamber of commerce. He was an excellent source of news, but truly his heart was in the Gila wilderness and its establishment.

A year or two later, I joined forces with Ward Shepard, then of the regional forester's office at Albuquerque, to select in the Cibola National Forest a site for a Boy Scout camp. We went into a country that then had few trails and no roads. We carved out a little empire with a running stream and a hundred acres of fine trees. Today, the trees are gone and the stream dried up. The Boy Scouts long since have sold the property—first to ranchers and they to subdividers. But the memory remains of how Ward Shepard could find his way in and out by the trees and types of vegetation in the same fashion that you and I follow street numbers and highway maps.

These two men first interested me in the out-of-doors.

Then after a long breathing spell, I came into the Department of Agriculture and under the influence of Lyle Watts, then head of the Forest Service and Hugh Bennett, the father of soil conservation. Here were men who, once having laid their hands on you, never let you go. I owe them a great deal.

But those who educated me were not confined to the Department of Agriculture. In the Cabinet, I never got on a basis of intimate friendship with the old curmudgeon, Harold Ickes. I could never be sure where "Honest Harold" would lead me. But I was always certain that when a helping hand needed to be stretched out to pull me away from trouble, the hand of Oscar Chapman would be there. And there were many others in the Park Service—men like Horace Albright who once had headed it.

If time permitted, I would enjoy nothing more than to be privileged to call the roll of helpful people in a host of other circumstances. But I must mention one more. There have been probably many eras of good feeling between the White House and the Congress, but there was one period during the 80th Congress when the feeling was not so good. The man who handled the Department of Agriculture appropriation was Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois who had served with me in the House of Representatives and had permitted me to be drawn into the circle of his friendship. With the change in control of Congress, he had a dominant position in appropriations for Agriculture. He came to my office to say that he was ready to trust me more than some of the testimony he was likely to get and that if the occasion arose where I knew his committee was wrong in its final judgment, he wanted me to bring the facts straight to him so that he might correct it. How many times, since we both have been serving in the Senate, have I remembered that day.

All of which leads me to say that I know considerably more about the conservation worker who has been so graciously discussed here this evening than any of those who have spoken. I happen to know that he has had a lot of help both on and off the Senate floor, just as he had help from within and without his office when he was in the executive department.

I happen to know that, probably more often than not, when he was alone in his office after taking on a chore, he has leaned back and wondered, "Why in the devil did I let them push me into this one."

My difficulty, in accepting all that has been said this evening, is in having a too intimate knowledge of the details of some of these efforts to keep the country abreast of conservation needs. I have been able to sit up here and identify—sitting around with every appearance of complete innocence—a large number of people who have repeatedly taken advantage of the inability of the subject of the evening to say "No," and to stick to it.

No one would suspect from anything he has said this evening that the chairman of this meeting, Mr. Gutermuth, ever instigated any of these conservation efforts. He has. If the law in some States in regard to repeated offenses were effective, he would be serving at least five life terms as an habitual criminal. And I would be proud to be jailed with him.

But he wouldn't be in solitary confinement. He would have in the cell with him his whole delegation of arm-twisters and leg-pullers.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Montana, who can keep the straightest face of anyone I ever saw, would be somewhere nearby.

Mike attempted to start this affair off early on the Senate floor the other day when we had a water resources research bill up for debate.

He extolled the author of the bill for his diligence and leadership on conservation matters without even hinting he had himself started the water running five years ago in Senate Resolution 48, which established the Senate Select Committee on National Water Problems. I had to point out that he turned on the faucet and the rest of us are just manning the pumps.

Mike's cell would be well filled too. He keeps a considerable squad with him, I am glad to say.

On the occasion I mentioned, when the water research bill was up, there were 61 by actual count in his retinue, including many delightful strays from Everett Dirksen's flock.

On an occasion two or three weeks before, there were 73. I would love to call the roll of those because the cause of conservation is not now and never has been a political issue.

Of course, I am deeply honored by the three Cabinet officers who are here tonight. I have known Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges since 1926. As Secretary of Agriculture I needed to try to make some sort of sense out of the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its wartime purchases, sales and shipments. I asked Luther to leave his New York responsibility, forget his high salary and come to Washington at $10 a day to straighten out the account. I have never seen a finer example of shrewd business judgment, tied to unending devotion, to bring about such an inspiring result.

I am delighted that the able and upright Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, is here tonight. I have known every Secretary of Agriculture since the days of Mr. Jardine. I know how delicate their relationships must be with the Department of the Interior because of bureaucratic zeal. And I have never known a man to display a greater willingness to work with the Secretary of the Interior for the advancement of the cause of conservation and the ultimate good of the Nation than Orville Freeman.

What can I say of my buoyant and devoted friend who, I am sure, must have been the instigator of this occasion, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall? I wrote down hundreds of words that I would have liked to use to pledge my loyal support to him but as Kate Smith was singing on the "Ed Sullivan Show," Sunday night, I found in two lines of one of her songs all I need to say and all he needs to know. These are the words: "As long as he needs me, I know where I will be."

I could also include here two or three pages about Ben Stong, but I know Ben wouldn't like that, and so I shall simply say he is one of those for whom I also say special thanks.

It just isn't possible to stand here and tell you how much I appreciate this occasion and everything about it—those who sponsored it—the fact of the presence of each of you—the kind things that you have said. I accept your kindness not as a proper recipient but on behalf of my colleagues in the Senate and the House whose servant I have been in the execution of their legislative desires.

I appreciate it all very, very deeply, but it is more attention than any one man deserves—certainly more than I deserve—and what I have been trying to say is that the effort to make wise provision for our resources is moving forward because a great many people—a host of them—develop a loyalty to that cause and push it ever forward.

From beginning to end—if there ever were to be an end to conservation policymaking—there are invariably dozens, hundreds, and often a good many thousands of leaders involved, from those people with ideas, through those who write letters and send telegrams, to those who cast votes in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

I wish I were somehow able to reapportion out to each of you your proper share of the kindness so generously bestowed on me this evening, for you deserve it.

And it is you—all of you combined—who will carry forward the continuing effort to meet man's needs for resources of every kind—whether the need be for water in our lakes and rivers, for forests of oak and pine and redwood, for minerals that may carry man on spaceships to faraway planets—or whether it be merely for quiet places of solitude where God dwells and where man may rest his soul in that companionship.

On behalf of my family—both personal and official—those who tolerate me during the day and those who await my return at night—I thank you deeply and sincerely for this occasion.

Exhibit H

"She Has Conserved a Great Conservationist"—Remarks by Howard C. Zahniser in Presenting an Award to Mrs. Clinton P. Anderson

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to express at this time our special appreciation to Mrs. Anderson, and, if I may so add, an appreciation thus to all the ladies who are with us and to all those others, too, who do so much for conservation but are so seldom recognized.

Those of us who have worked in conservation fields have realized especially well that without the support and cooperation, the tolerance and charity, of a good and sweet wife—who may also be strict and stern on occasion—it is difficult indeed to continue long or maintain an effectiveness.

When we began, with this occasion in mind, to consider the innumerable accomplishments of Senator Anderson, remembering the many times we have seen his gallant effectiveness, we soon surmised that he must be accustomed to setting forth from home with the blessing of someone with patience and charm, perhaps some authority too, and certainly a contagious assurance.

What we had surmised, investigation readily confirmed. Mrs. Anderson's services, like those of the Senator himself, have been far greater than ordinary, although like those of most wives, they have been little known.

Henrietta McCartney knew when she became the bride of Clinton Anderson that she was undertaking more than ordinary wifely responsibilities.

Her husband's repeated health problems, his impatience with inactivity, his refusal to excuse himself from responsibilities, his consequent almost continuous lavish expenditure of energies—which in his case are unusually precious—have through the years tested her resources and have in truth proved her conservation of this great man to be truly phenomenal.

Of Senator Anderson's years of accomplishment that we now honor, 1 score and 10, by his own estimate, we can well appreciate as an extension of his years that we owe to Mrs. Anderson. They are a measure of the gratitude and appreciation we have for her. She has conserved a great conservationist.

So we have learned what our hearts had led us to expect, and we have been pleased to prepare a plaque for Mrs. Anderson, also, for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband.

"Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land." (Proverbs 31:23). In his eminence, as the writer of Proverbs long ago led us to expect, we see her virtues and with him we honor her too.

Mrs. Anderson, it is my pleasure, a privilege indeed, to present to you, with our compliments and appreciation, this plaque, which includes a reproduction of that presented to the great man with whom you live, and, in addition, reads as follows: "Presented to Henrietta McCartney Anderson for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband."

Exhibit I

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1963]

President To Visit Wilderness Areas

Washington.—President Kennedy said today he hoped to see some of the Nation's resources, natural wonders and wilderness areas, which he hopes to preserve.

The President said he planned a trip to the Midwest, the Rocky Mountains and the Southwest. He said it would be a good idea for "all of us in Washington" to do this and for the people of the country generally.

Mr. Kennedy spoke about his travel hopes to representatives of a dozen private organizations interested in conservation and particularly to Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat of New Mexico. They gathered in the White House rose garden.

The President praised Senator Anderson today as a man who had worked hard all his life to preserve the heritage of natural resources.

Mr. Kennedy has recommended legislation to preserve wilderness areas, promote outdoor recreation spots and guard natural resources. He said he appreciated Senator Anderson's work for the wilderness bill and other legislation in recent years and his long record of accomplishment.

Mr. Anderson told the President that conservationists "would like to see you get out with this group of men and see what they are doing."

Exhibit J

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1963]

True Conservative

Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico is the kind of conservative who wants to save as much as possible of America's natural wonders before the country is paved over, coast to coast. He eminently deserves the testimonial he received this week from a dozen conservationist organizations. The most fitting salute came from President Kennedy, who said he planned to visit wilderness areas that one of Mr. Anderson's bills proposes to save. It would do all of us in Washington good, Mr. Kennedy remarked, if we got out and saw more of the country. And it would do the Nation good if Congress enacted the wilderness bill in order to assure future generations that there will be something left to see. The Senate, paced by Mr. Anderson, has approved the bill; when will the House begin to move?

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] introduced an excellent bill termed the freedom of information bill, which I am very proud to cosponsor and support. In connection with that bill I hope the Congress will follow the lead of Wisconsin in bringing the cleansing light of public scrutiny into government's action and activity. This government business is the taxpayer's business. He pays for it. What right have public officials to shut him out?

In 1959 the State of Wisconsin enacted a law requiring open meetings of governmental bodies and agencies.

Wisconsin has been the only State in the Union in which every citizen is assured access to information regarding governmental affairs. The Wisconsin law declared that:

> No formal action of any kind shall be introduced, deliberated upon or adopted at any closed executive session or closed meeting.

The difficulty of gaining similar access to information held by the executive branch of the Federal Government is recognized by newsmen, legislators, and other interested parties, yet as the years go by little seems to be done in a substantive way to correct this situation.

A Federal Government which daily makes decisions affecting not only the lives of its citizens but the virtual existence of all men cannot afford to withhold capriciously the facts on which these judgments are based.

Among other things, the freedom of information bill recently introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] would require each agency to publish in the Federal Register—

First, descriptions of its organization and places where the public may obtain information;

Second, statements of the general course and procedure by which its functions are performed; and

Third, substantive rules and statements of general policy.

In this way, the Long bill, which I am cosponsoring, sets the door of public scrutiny ajar, although the Wisconsin law opens it wide.

With the passage of this legislation, the Federal Government will begin to follow Wisconsin's lead in guaranteeing the prerequisites of communication between the people and their Government without which no popular democracy can survive.

We all recognize that some military, diplomatic, and personnel information must and should remain classified and secret. At the same time, the overwhelming amount of information which is classified should not be classified. By classifying, the Government prevents the public, which has the best right of all

to know what is going on, from knowing. I feel that the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] deserves support in the Congress. I hope that it will pass this year.

I yield the floor.

PROPOSED DEMONSTRATION AT THE CAPITOL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in a thoughtful editorial in his June 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report, the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, said:

> The Supreme Court of the United States in a group of six cases recently reversed the convictions of several Negroes arrested for breaches of the peace in restaurants, lunch counters in stores, and recreation grounds in parks in the South.
>
> The laws of "trespass" have been imbedded in our system of government for many decades. The Louisiana Legislature, for example, passed a law which wiped out all segregation ordinances and defined disturbance of the peace as including "the commission of any act as would foreseeably disturb or alarm the public."
>
> The Supreme Court now has held, in effect, however, that the ordinances covering disorders were too broad and that the "mental urges" of the police were designed to maintain segregated service, while the "mental urges" of the demonstrators were merely motivated by the pursuance of a constitutional objective. The High Court declared: "It is said that failure to obey the command of a police officer constitutes a traditional form of breach of the peace. Obviously, however, one cannot be punished for failing to obey the command of an officer if that command is itself violative of the Constitution. And the possibility of disorder by others cannot justify exclusion of persons from a place if they otherwise have a constitutional right—founded upon the equal protection clause—to be present."
>
> This is an invitation to mass violence in America and virtually blocks preventive action by the local police as mobs gather. The officers must wait until persons and property have been injured. They cannot thwart a riot or a foreseeable disorder because, conceivably, some constitutional objective is in the minds of the demonstrators.

In view of the fact that there have been in recent weeks proposals made by Negro leaders for a mass demonstration at the Capitol of the United States, which Martin Luther King said would include 50,000 from Harlem alone, it may be well for me to remind all Government officials of the fact that we have for the protection of the Capitol and the entire seat of Government in the District of Columbia an act of Congress similar to city ordinances relating to unauthorized parades, processions, and assemblages which have been openly violated in the South and for which the violators have been granted immunity by the Highest Court in the land.

The law in question is to be found in title 40, United States Code 193(g) and reads as follows:

> **It is forbidden to parade, stand or move in processions or assemblages in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 193(j) and 193(k) of this title.**

Before the demonstrators being whipped into a frenzy by Martin Luther King reach our Capital City, I think someone in authority should publicly announce whether or not the law against illegal parades and assemblages is going to be enforced.

LET US NOT HAVE KING-SIZE FEDERAL SALARIES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a committee, which has been considering fixing a proper and adequate scale of pay for officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, headed by Clarence Randall, a retired Chicago steel executive, finally made its report and recommendations to the President yesterday. It has not as yet been made public.

It is evident that the members of this Committee are no strangers to king sized executive salaries in industry. It is anticipated that the Committee will propose really colossal salaries for officials in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government. Clarence Randall is himself a former president of the Inland Steel Co. The steel industry, from whence he retired, is noted for paying princely salaries to its executives. President Kennedy appointed this Committee, whose function was to make a study of salaries paid to Members of Congress, Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, administrative heads of Federal agencies, and other top Federal officials. Then, having studied the salaries paid to all Federal officials and employees, to make its report and recommendations.

If these advance notices are correct, apparently our Chief Executive made a mistake in not placing some average individuals or ordinary citizens on this Committee. Perhaps a more equitable recommendation would have come forth had he selected for this public service a few men like myself, whose way of life has been to work hard all their adult life and in the past have been very hard pressed financially for some years, and who have acquired a habit of living conservatively. Furthermore, a sprinkling of university professors and instructors, whose salaries are far from being princely, might have leavened the expected final report somewhat. It appears that this Committee was well larded with executives and former executives in private industry, known for profitable operations and high salaries to executives.

The facts are that private industry bases its pay scales on profits, and where the profits are great the salaries in many instances are super colossal. I make no complaint regarding such policies. No such factors govern the Federal Government's payroll. Our Government's only source of income for paying salaries is the taxpayer. There is already a heavy burden upon our taxpayers. I think citizens generally wish public officials to be paid adequately. I am certain it would be foreign to our American way of life were Congressmen, for example, to be denied adequate compensation. It would be unfortunate were only men and women born to great wealth, or who had acquired great wealth, able to afford to occupy public office, elective or appointive. No one wants that. On the other hand, it is reported that this Committee has come forth with overly generous and, in fact, outrageously high salary recommendations. If so, I believe that the recommendations of this Committee should be denied.

It would be well for a joint congressional committee, instead of retired steel executives and other wealthy men, to make recommendations as to what are and are not appropriate salaries. Do we want Washington bureaucrats to become America's new economic royalty? It is true that in order to attract outstanding men and women into Government service, salaries should not be miserly. They should probably be somewhat comparable to those offered in private industry. However, this Committee reputedly proposes a fantastic raid upon the Public Treasury. Long ago it was written:

> Enter ye the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it.

The gate to the Public Treasury is wide and broad is the way. Far too many there be which go in thereat. Let us guard this gate and protect to the utmost against raids upon the Public Treasury.

The Committee report is expected to recommend that salaries of Supreme Court Justices be increased to $60,000 a year, salaries of Cabinet officers to $50,000, and now we come to the heads of independent agencies, assistant secretaries, and commissioners. The minimum for these officials—and there are a multiplicity of them—is an increase to $30,000 with increases ranging from that sum of $50,000 a year. Can Senators imagine the chaos that would follow such increases? Other deputy commissioners, administrative assistants, executive assistants, and right down the line would very properly demand that their salaries be doubled or nearly doubled when they observe, for example, that a Supreme Court Justice has his salary hiked from $35,000 to $60,000 per year.

Furthermore, the vast body of our public employees, when they reach retirement age, feel they are fortunate, indeed—and they are—that as long as they live an adequate retirement annuity will be paid to them. Supreme Court Justices and other Federal judges, upon retirement at the age of 70, or for disability before that age following 15 years in office, receive their full salary as long as they live.

Mr. President, it is well known that whenever there is a vacancy on the Federal bench, Members of Congress, and in particular Senators, are importuned by a large number of lawyers ambitious to serve as U.S. district judge or appellate judge. There are probably only a few hundred lawyers in our Nation who, if offered today an appointment to the Federal bench, would not accept. I suspect if the salary of Members of the Congress were to be increased to $35,000 a year, approximately the same number who now seek election from our citizens, would be asking for election to Congress.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may be given an additional 3 minutes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, no doubt the same men and women would be returned to Congress. I will continue to speak out against, and I shall vote against such salary increases for elected and appointed Federal offices. Furthermore, it seems to me outrageous to propose that the administrator of some independent agency should receive the same salary or a salary in excess of that of a U.S. Senator. Senators seek election, often at great personal expense, and following election we necessarily maintain two residences, report constantly to our constituents, and incur considerable travel and entertainment expense. We make no complaint about this. It goes along with our job. Apparently many citizens consider that a Senator has an expense account in addition to his salary. We do not. Facts are that at this time without any pay raise whatever, very few men and women of high achievement in private life would refuse appointment or certain election to the U.S. Senate or to the House of Representatives. Most Americans are eager to serve their country.

If preliminary reports are correct, I assert that the recommendations of this Committee are really somewhat frightening. Were they to be carried out salaries all along the line would be increased and taxpayers would sweat on and on. A further reason, if it should be necessary to give any further reasons why such proposals should be disregarded, is that they would result in outrageous increases in the cost of all Federal programs. The entire situation would be unrealistic.

Perhaps our President would be well advised to thank the Committee members for their services and then terminate their services and dissolve the Committee.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the tragic assassination of Medgar W. Evers, 37-year-old field secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in a sneaky and dastardly attack is yet another reminder of the grim seriousness of the civil rights struggle. This is an offense against our Nation as well as a tragic crime involving an American and his family. The crime appears to be an effort to intimidate the NAACP in working for constitutional rights of Americans in Mississippi. It underscores the emergency nature of the current crisis, which demands action now at all levels of Government, especially by the Congress, which has lagged behind the other branches of the Federal Government on civil rights. I am sure the Attorney General of the United States will invoke the full resources of the FBI as well as the full power and authority of the executive department under existing law to track down the guilty; and I know he will insist upon the State of Mississippi exercising all its authority toward the same end.

So, too, the fatal shooting, this time of a white mechanic at Lexington, N.C., and rioting in Danville, Va., and Cambridge, Md., a day or two ago, all are apparently attributable to racial tensions. All of these events underline the seriousness of what is going on and the earnestness with which the Congress must perform its responsibility for safeguarding the civil rights of U.S. citizens in this national crisis according to the call of the President at long last for meaningful congressional action, proportioned to the size and intensity of both the constitutional and moral issues.

Under the dreadful pall of such events and while we dedicate every facility of law enforcement to finding and punishing the guilty, it is at the same time of critical importance to examine our own historic responsibility and to enable these events to sharpen our judgment and deepen our determination to do our part in giving our country the structure and means to avert these, the dread and unreasoning dangers of racial violence which beset us.

The crusade for human dignity to which the President summoned the Nation Tuesday evening must be fought on every level of our society. One of the major struggles will be here in the Senate of the United States, and I would like to address myself to that.

The basic issue in the Senate struggle will be cloture. If there was any doubt about that, our colleague the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] acknowledged leader of the Southern Senators on this issue—made that clear yesterday when he pledged to oppose civil rights bills with every means and resource at his command.

Although the showdown may be a couple of months away, it is time to begin the national debate on the issue of cloture—so that the public will understand it fully and will be enabled to get their views to have a real impact on the proceedings here in the Senate.

The fight for cloture is a case of simple arithmetic. The Nation is aware of the division within the Democratic Party on this issue. It is said that of the 67 members on the Democratic side, we can expect no fewer than 40 votes and no more than 45 votes for cloture. It is thus clear that the Republican Party holds the key to cloture, for we will need at least 22 votes on this side—and an optimum of 25 assured votes—to win this epochal struggle.

It will take the maximum to beat a filibuster; and a filibuster has been promised us by none other than the leader of the southern Senators, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as recently as yesterday.

It is important for my party to understand that as the fateful vote for cloture approaches, the spotlight will be on Republicans in the Senate as never before. Our party's great heritage, our fidelity to Lincolnian principles, our responsibility for national leadership at time of crisis—all these will be tested by this struggle.

The Nation will understand these issues—and I hope my party will, too. It may appear to be a battle of U.S. Senators alone. But it is much more than that. I hope every Governor, every national leader, every party official will stand up and be counted before the vote on cloture takes place.

I also would like to express the hope that the Senate leadership will make the necessary move to ensure that when the time comes, it will not be a so-called gentleman's filibuster. The issues are too grave to permit such niceties, for as we have found in the past, the "gentleman's filibuster" has simply been an aid to the small group of Senators seeking to block a vote in the Senate on civil rights. Use of the rules to the fullest extent possible, in the same way the minority uses those rules in a filibuster to prevent a vote, will be needed, and consideration will have to be given at some stage to round-the-clock sessions, if necessary, as again this issue is likely to be fought out late in the session. Anything less will reflect a lack of determination which the Nation will not understand in the present crisis on civil rights.

The attention of the country is focused now upon the fact that cloture will be the critical civil rights vote. There can be all the meaningful legislation in the basket anyone can think of, but if we cannot get cloture, there will never be civil rights legislation. Without cloture, no effort to make our contribution and to exercise our responsibility can head off these dread dangers to the national tranquility to which I have referred.

Those of us who are interested must fix the attention of the people of the country upon that fact now. The people must make it known to their Senators that they understand it is the vote on cloture which is important if we are to get civil rights legislation.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I intend to reiterate this proposition time and time again on this floor in the coming weeks, until we come to a decisive vote, in order to let the country understand that there is no substitute for a vote on cloture if we really want to meet our responsibility to head off the dread dangers which are facing the country.

THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I hesitate to make a statement on the floor of the Senate in this vein, but in view of statements by former President Eisenhower, wherein he again was quite critical of the space program of this Government, I feel compelled as a member of the Senate Aeronautical and

Space Sciences Committee to rise and express my complete confidence in this vital national effort and in those administering it.

Mr. Eisenhower is a distinguished American, indeed, one of our Nation's great leaders, but I must call to your attention the tremendous success we have begun to enjoy in the conquest of outer space and remind you of the surge of national pride which we all have felt as a result of the triumphant flight of *Faith 7*.

We stand in the position of leader for the free world as we battle for superiority in this challenging field. We cannot afford to do less than we are now doing.

The national goals set by the President of the United States and ably administered by the distinguished James E. Webb deserve the united support of Americans, for it is this program which assures this country preeminence in space.

RATIFICATION BY NEW HAMPSHIRE OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the State of New Hampshire yesterday ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment to the U.S. Constitution when the senate of that State's legislature adopted the resolution of ratification approving the amendment, by a voice vote. The house on May 16 had previously approved the resolution ratifying the amendment, likewise by a voice vote.

Thus, Mr. President, New Hampshire—the Granite State—becomes the 35th State to ratify this important amendment to the Constitution, leaving only 3 States needed to achieve the 38 required. I am indeed indebted to my two distinguished colleagues from New Hampshire—Senator COTTON, who cosponsored, stanchly supported, and voted for my resolution in the 87th Congress proposing this amendment, and who, with Senator MCINTYRE, has worked valiantly to achieve ratification by their great State. I am indeed indebted to both Senators for their splendid efforts, and I am especially grateful to Senator MCINTYRE for advising me this morning of the final action taken by the legislature of his State.

Again, Mr. President, this is another example of the complete bipartisanship with which Members of the Congress, the Governors of the respective States, and the State legislatures have approached this matter. I, indeed, salute all those in New Hampshire for the splendid bipartisanship they have shown in accomplishing the ratification by their great State.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, speaking for myself—and I am sure that my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire will voice the same thought—I am grateful indeed for the kind words of the Senator from Florida. It has been my privilege and pleasure, as it has been my colleague's, to do my best to speed this action by our legislature. I must add, however, that one reason that I have been diligent is that the distinguished Senator from Florida has not allowed me to be otherwise. He has frequently reminded me that New Hampshire should act, and I agreed with him.

It is highly fitting—and I say this somewhat facetiously—that just before the Senate is apparently about to be plunged into a situation which may resemble a reenactment of the Civil War, it has been demonstrated what influence a great southern Senator has over the two Yankee Senators from New Hampshire.

In all seriousness, I am gratified by this action of the New Hampshire Legislature. This constitutional amendment, of which I was a cosponsor in the Senate, is thoroughly deserving of ratification by the requisite number of States. It is a source of pride to me that New Hampshire, consistent with its history of responsibility, has met and discharged this important obligation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is more than kind in his comment. I am particularly happy that New Hampshire has taken this action, because as he knows that State finally made possible the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, by casting the deciding vote in 1788.

I am glad now to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed and able colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, for his kind remarks and congratulate him for his continued efforts in behalf of the proposed 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Through the good work of the Senator from Florida, and with the cooperation of various Governors and State legislators, 35 of the needed 38 States now have ratified the amendment.

It is, I feel, and I know that my senior colleague, Senator COTTON joins in this thought, most fitting that New Hampshire—which 175 years ago this month became the ninth and deciding State to ratify the Constitution—should, through its general court, approve this amendment, aimed at the protection of a fundamental right of all our citizens.

The poll tax bears no reasonable relation to the rights and privileges of citizenship. The protection of the fundamental liberties of the citizen is a legitimate function of government and one intimately related to the role our Nation has come to play in a world where human rights are a matter of increasing concern.

Mr. President, I trust that the legislatures of some of our other great States recognize this fact, and will see fit in the near future to join New Hampshire and the 34 other States in approving the proposed 24th amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the kind comments of my distinguished friends from New Hampshire. It would have been impossible to reach this stage if we had not had their determined and indefatigable efforts, for which I thank them.

THE CURRENT CRISIS AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the eyes and ears of the world have turned with increasing concern in recent days toward the United Nations in New York, where the Communists have again mounted a determined effort to undermine the effectiveness of the world body. The Soviet bloc, in fact, has been trying to bring on the worst crisis in the U.N.'s history.

The severity of the Communist challenge cannot be minimized. It seeks particularly to subvert the peacekeeping mechanisms the U.N. has painfully evolved over recent years—functions which hold great promise for calming potential conflicts in the future.

If the U.N. cannot come up with means to strengthen—and finance—its peacekeeping efforts, it may disintegrate into a meaningless, ineffective international debating society instead of the responsible, effective instrument for peace it could be.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind about the fact that the U.N. does have ways and means to help keep the peace. On more than one occasion in the past it has helped divert potentially explosive disputes into nonviolent channels. This has come about by providing a forum for airing differences between nations, by serving as a center for negotiations, and by mounting economic, administrative, and policing actions to meet situations which might lead to open conflict.

It is for the very reason that the U.N. has been able to help maintain peace—and contain Communist aims—that the Soviet bloc is so anxious to sabotage it.

The current Communist attack in the special session of the General Assembly has taken three courses.

First, the Soviets have continued their refusal to pay their share of the peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo.

Second, they have added five other items in the budget to which they object and which they therefore refuse to help finance. These range from service on U.N. bonds to upkeep of the U.N. cemetery in Korea.

Finally, the Communists reportedly tried to force Secretary General U Thant to bring the issue of sending observers to Yemen before the Security Council. This would set a precedent that the dispatch of all peacekeeping missions must be authorized by the Security Council—where the Soviet Union can exercise its veto—and would strip the General Assembly of this vital function.

Mr. President, if the Soviet bloc gets away with these moves, they could hamstring the U.N. and be well on their way to reducing the organization to the status of a talking society. It will take firm, decisive leadership by the American delegation to rally opposition to the Communist campaign of sabotage and obstructionism.

The moves made thus far by the Russians in the special session of the General Assembly may be just the beginning of a sustained campaign to interfere with the progress of the U.N. Although, as I have indicated, this is actually a tribute to the effectiveness of the world body in thwarting the Communist goal of global conquest, the Soviet moves will be seized upon by some critics as an excuse for urging American withdrawal from the organization.

I think those people who say that because the U.N. has not been a complete success it is therefore a failure and worthless are missing the mark completely. Certainly the U.N. is not a perfect instrument and many improvements must be made.

But, just because everything does not go exactly as we might wish is no reason to throw up our hands and quit. Rather than turning our backs on this great opportunity for strengthening the organization in the cause of peace, we should roll up our sleeves and get to work to bring about needed changes.

This is a task which will require all the ingenuity, patience, energy, faith, and determination at our command. Solutions will not be easily found—nor implemented.

But the stake—world peace—is high. We must not quit just because the going is rough.

I am hopeful the current session of the General Assembly will come up with some answers to the problems confronting it. I am not optimistic about the outcome, but I shall not be discouraged by the results.

It is vitally important for all Americans who are concerned about peace to keep themselves informed about what is going on at the United Nations and about the problems which confront the organization. That is why I have always been so vitally interested in and have supported so strongly the fine programs of the American Association for the United Nations.

This organization has done a splendid job of informing the American people about the U.N. and its work. In so doing, it has strengthened the hand of our Government and our delegates to the U.N. in carrying out their vital work.

The AAUN, perhaps more than any other nongovernmental organization, has helped create a climate of thought in this country in which strong American support for the U.N. has been able to grow and prosper. My hat is off to those in this organization who are responsible for the excellent record it has compiled and will continue to compile in the days ahead.

My home city of Rochester, N.Y., is extremely proud of the enlightened and vigorous activities of its chapter of the AAUN. This group has done much to stimulate constructive thought about the U.N. and to educate people about the world body's work.

Recently, Joseph Sisco of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, addressed the Rochester Association for the United Nations. Although not everyone will agree with all he said, he did deliver a provocative and important address on the present and future of the U.N. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sisco's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. JOSEPH SISCO, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, OFFICE OF UNITED NATIONS POLITICAL AFFAIRS, TO THE ROCHESTER ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS ON MAY 21, 1963

Secretary Rusk said recently, "We tend to forget so much and so fast. Nowadays there are those who seem to think that * * * the United Nations is a fanciful exercise for those who wish to talk somewhat idly about a world which has not and cannot come into existence. In truth, a central issue of the cold war is the United Nations itself, its charter, its concept of a decent world order, its commitment to peaceful settlement of disputes, its concern for human rights, the expansion of trade, economic and social progress, and our deepest aspirations toward a disarmed and peaceful world."

Moreover, because world community does not exist at a time when world interdependence has become a reality, the United Nations is not a fanciful exercise but an indispensable necessity.

All of us, I believe, accept the fact that there are no absolute answers to the agonies and searchings of our time. The process of giving flesh to the bones of the United Nations Charter has been going on for 17 years, and the millenium is obviously not just around the corner. This is scarcely a matter for surprise or discouragement. No more arduous task, no more necessary task, has ever been undertaken by mankind in recorded history. For as President Kennedy has said: "Arms alone are not enough to keep the peace. It must be kept by men. Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations. * * * We may not always agree with every detailed action by every officer of the United Nations, nor with every voting majority, but as an institution it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America."

Regrettably, an assessment of the United Nations in terms of U.S. national interests has been obscured or distorted by both ardent friends and implacable foes, by those who feel the United Nations does too little and those who feel it does too much.

What I say here today is not intended to provide ammunition for either enthusiastic friend or hard-bitten foe. My hope is that you will find in my words a dispassionate summing up of both the capacities and limitations of the United Nations, for, above all, the United Nations is a human institution reflecting both the strengths and weaknesses of mankind.

SCOPE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The scope of the United Nations today is impressive.

In the Middle East the United Nations Relief and Works Agency continues to feed and clothe over a million refugees. The United Nations Emergency Force patrols daily the armistice demarcation lines. The United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization copes with touchy incidents which could spark into broader conflagrations. A U.N. observer group is expected to go to Yemen soon to help verify disengagement undertakings assumed by the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.

In the Far East the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority is helping to assure peaceful transfer of West New Guinea from the Dutch to Indonesian administration, prior to arrangements being made by Indonesia and the United Nations for the exercise of self-determination. A ceremony is being held today in West New Guinea at which the U.N. is formally turning over administration to Indonesia. A representative of the Secretary-General is actively engaged in easing relations between Thailand and Cambodia. U.N. observers in Kashmir continue to police the cease-fire lines.

In Africa, United Nations' "presences" are important elements of stability, in addition to the Organization's key role in the Congo.

The United Nations has an economic commission in Europe, in Latin America, in the Far East and in Africa. There are 53 resident representatives, primarily in underdeveloped areas, providing essential technical and administrative guidance.

PURSUING U.S. NATIONAL INTERESTS THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is not a substitute for policy. It is an Organization in which the United States pursues its national interests through peaceful means.

Let us use this measuring rod to determine how well the United States came out in three ways: first, at the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly which concluded this past winter; secondly, during the Cuban crisis; and thirdly, in connection with the United Nations operation in the Congo.

THE RESTRAINED AND REASONABLE 17TH ASSEMBLY

Restraint and reason, for the most part, prevailed in the 17th General Assembly of the United Nations. A recently completed tabulation of the voting on 29 key issues before the Assembly shows that the majority coincided with the U.S. position 22 times.

For those who fear that the United States is being submerged within the huge voting blocs of the present 110-nation U.N., a brief look at some of the key results of the 17th Assembly is worthwhile.

The Assembly elected U Thant Secretary-General for a full term. The troika never got out of the barn, and the Soviets were forced to rein in their attempt to get a veto over the U.N. Secretariat.

The World Court's opinion was accepted by an overwhelming majority, thereby making payment of the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping expenses obligatory for member states. But we must guard against optimism. This was an important action but only a preliminary bout won; the main decision will have to come at the special Assembly session on finances. Collective financial responsibility—or lack of it—can mean the difference between an effective and ineffective United Nations. It can mean the difference between a conference-type United Nations and one with real executive and peacekeeping capacities. The U.S. position on any possible future contributions above our regular scale assessment for peace-keeping operations will be decisively influenced in the months ahead by the financial support which other members of the United Nations actually provide.

The Chinese representation vote came out even better than last year. Once again we succeeded in preventing Red China from getting a seat in the United Nations.

A resolution reaffirming the United States position on Korean unification was again adopted.

The Assembly asked the Secretary-General to establish a U.N. presence in South-West Africa.

The Assembly once again endorsed our position on Hungary; it has called upon the Secretary-General to take a hand in the matter.

Under the general umbrella of the decade of development, the Assembly asked for a study of a proposed U.N. institute for training and research in U.N. operations, called a United Nations conference to study problems of international trade and development, affirmed the importance and the legal rights of private investment in developing countries, and passed a resolution on population which was at once historic in its recognition of the problem and moderate in its proposals for dealing with it.

These results are on the plus side of the ledger. But we must face frankly that on colonial issues we frequently favored more moderate recommendations than some adopted by the Assembly. The preoccupation of the United Nations with colonialism, understandable as it may be, is of course also exploited by the Soviet Union.

But it must be recognized that the basic problems arising from the breakup of old colonial patterns are, for the most part, ones which the United States would have to face whether or not there were a United Nations. The United States launched and has long been committed to the principle of self-determination. As a leader of the free world, it has a legitimate interest in orderly progress toward self-government. The fact that this progress is faster and less orderly in some cases than we would desire is perhaps inherent in the present irresistible drive for independence. This drive does not originate in the United Nations. While the existence of the United Nations probably helps intensify the drive for self-determination, it also has provided a valuable safety valve as well as a restraining brake. And the existence of United Nations machinery has eased the painful shift from old established patterns with a minimum of disturbance and disorder in most cases.

The end of traditional colonialism is in sight. But among the problems which remain are some of the toughest ones. Nevertheless, the impact of the colonial issue can be expected to diminish before too long.

Where the West is able to take a position that is responsive to the basic objectives that the Africans and the Asians deem important, we can influence them toward moderation.

THE CUBAN CRISIS

Let me turn to the Cuban crisis of last fall.

The Cuban crisis demonstrated the utility of the various diplomatic instruments available to the United States in a crisis. Coordination of national action, bilateral diplomacy, regional arrangements, and the United Nations system marked the handling of the crisis throughout.

The United Nations was important in three ways: as a forum for exposing Soviet duplicity and enlisting diplomatic support; as an effective instrumentality for international conciliation and a defuser of the crisis; and as an institution willing and able on short notice to serve as inspector to verify the removal of the offensive weapons and to guard against their reintroduction.

Ambassador Stevenson's speeches in the Security Council, together with the photographs and explanations to the delegations, presented convincing evidence of the presence of Soviet offensive weapons in a dramatic and effective way. In addition, the United Nations provided a forum in which the American Republics could impress on the world and on the Secretary General their solidarity on this issue. This public exposure in the United Nations was one factor—and I do not contend it was the most important factor—for what followed. Shortly thereafter, Chairman Khrushchev admitted the presence of offensive weapons in Cuba and agreed to withdraw them.

The Secretary General was an effective go-between, especially during the early days. His intervention on the second day of the Security Council debate, at the request of a large number of United Nations representatives, helped defuse the crisis and led to the cooling-off formula under which Soviet ships stayed away from the interception area. This was a classic example of the use of the United Nations as a third-party instrumentality.

The readiness of the U.N. to provide on-site inspection in rapid order, after Khrushchev had agreed, attests further to its utility in this crisis. This did not succeed, of course, because Castro would not permit U.N. inspection on Cuban soil, but the rejection helped to underscore that the dispute was not only one between Cuba and the Organization of American States, but also one between Cuba and the United Nations.

In short, the United Nations proved useful in a big power dispute—in an issue of peace and war.

THE CONGO CRISIS

Now I turn to the third test, the Congo. Today, after 2½ years of difficulties and frustrations, reasonable quiet has returned to the Congo.

I believe the conclusion is inescapable. The United Nations operation in the Congo has served the national interest of the United States.

It has helped to maintain a free, moderate government for the Congo as a whole.

It has warded off dangers of civil war.

It has helped avoid direct great-power intervention which could have resulted in American forces fighting in the Congo.

It has ended secession from the left and from the right and has spiked the ambitions of the Communists to establish a base in the heart of central Africa.

I believe history will prove that the decision made by the Eisenhower administration in the summer of 1960 and reaffirmed by President Kennedy subsequently to support a U.N. peacekeeping operation was the correct one. Surely those who are critical of the decision to support the United Nations in the Congo would not have preferred the direct use of American military force.

Most Americans recognize the merit in these arguments, yet a number of specific questions about the Congo are still raised.

First, as to its legality. The U.N. operation is and was a legal operation. The United Nations was asked to come in by the Government of the Congo. Moreover, the military actions taken by the United Nations force were pursuant to the mandate laid down by the Security Council. The fighting which occurred this past December was initiated by the Katangese; the actions taken by the United Nations were in self-defense and in the exercise of freedom of movement throughout the Katanga.

Moreover, the United Nations action did not constitute intervention in the internal affairs of the Congo. The situation there was clearly a threat to international peace and security because of the actual or potential involvement of outside powers. It was in this kind of a situation that the Government of the Congo asked for United Nations help.

There are those who have felt in the Congo we somehow turned our back on the traditional U.S. support for the principle of self-determination. This is certainly not the case. Too few people realize that Tshombe could not pretend to speak for all of the Katanga. As leader of the Lunda Tribe, his main support resided in south Katanga. In the north he has been strongly opposed by the Baluba Tribe. Tshombe's party gained only 25 in a 60-seat assembly in the only popular election ever held in the Katanga. He received less than a majority in the Katanga Parliament. Support which he has received during the past 2½ years has been from a rump parliament lacking full Baluba representation.

And it is worth repeating that Tshombe himself agreed to the concept of a single Congolese state at the Brussels roundtable conference of January 1960. At the Kitona conference, he did so again. In accepting the Thant conciliation plan, he once more opted for a unified Congo.

All of these are important facts since they relate to questions which are being asked frequently by Americans.

LOOKING AHEAD IN THE CONGO

But now we must look ahead to the important task of reconstruction and reconciliation. The Congo remains a paradox—staggering problems in the present and impressive prospects in the future.

As it enters the reconstruction phase of its young life, the Republic of the Congo faces three key obstacles to progress.

First, regrettably it still has an underdeveloped political system which is not yet able to take vigorous, executive action which will make itself felt throughout the territorial confines of the Congo.

Second, it is maintaining an expensive military establishment which needs more training before it can assume a progressively greater share of the problem of maintaining law and order in all the provinces of the Congo. In the absence of U.N. forces, an internal security vacuum could result inviting outside meddling.

Third, the Congo has a financial administration which collects much less revenue than it needs and than it could.

More than external aid, success in the reconstruction effort in the Congo depends on developing the administrative fiber, to train the national army, get the fiscal system under control, and construct a political system featuring a strong executive. If these prerequisites can be met, the Congo should not be a burden on its friends for long because its resources are great.

What is needed now is an agenda for reconstruction in the Congo, including as one part the tying up of the loose ends of the Katanga's reintegration. The U Thant plan for peaceful reintegration of Katanga has been partly bypassed by the events of last December and this past January.

A de facto federalism is actually developing in the Congo.

The integration of the currency, as envisaged in the U Thant plan, is well underway.

The Katanga gendarmerie are being slowly integrated into the National Congolese Army, but much more needs to be done.

Katanga's foreign affairs establishment remains to be eliminated.

The executive amnesty already announced for Tshombe and his colleagues is in effect.

We hope a training program for the Congolese armed forces can get started at a reasonably early date. It should be possible to reduce the United Nations force level rather quickly so that the financial drain on the United Nations can be reduced.

Inflation is a serious problem in the Congo largely because governmental expenditures exceed revenues despite the growing production and rising exports. For every franc taken in by the Central Government last year, the Government spent nearly five. Nothing less than a well-financed, well-coordinated, and well-staffed stabilization program, pursued with resolution and resourcefulness, will avoid the runaway inflation which could bring serious political trouble to the Congo.

IMPACT OF CONGO CRISIS

This is the United Nations story in the Congo, past and future. The situation is better, but risks and uncertainties remain. And I like to think, too, that the 31-month Congo crisis may well have brought Africa of age.

In July 1960, Africa was hurtling toward national independence, colonialism evoked deep stirrings. In some quarters, the Soviet Union was regarded as a friend of Africa, or at least a force that could be safely used to one's advantage. Leftist politicians like

Patrice Lumumba were able to secure wide followings.

The Congo's grim ordeal has helped to change some of this. It has impressed upon the Africans some valuable and lasting lessons which they are the first to acknowledge.

The fact that unprepared independence is not in anyone's best interest was perhaps the most vivid, single lesson of the Congo. Evidence that this lesson was learned, at least by some leaders in Africa, came midway in the Congo experience when Rwanda and Burundi achieved independence in circumstances quite different than the Congo. A U.N. presence there helped ease the birth pangs.

More and more African nations are learning to make the distinction between colonialism, on the one hand, and legitimate foreign investment on the other.

Efforts to proclaim a rigid U.N. deadline for total independence everywhere could not muster majority support in the last Assembly.

There are also some signs at the United Nations of a new appreciation of the neocolonialism which the Soviet imperialist system and doctrinaire dogma represent. More and more Soviet colonialism is being denounced at the United Nations.

Moreover, it is significant that the United States emerged from the Congo with solid African support. The U.S. key role in unifying the Congo has by no means been overlooked by the Africans. Soviet refusal to support the United Nations effort by contrast has also been an eyeopener.

None of this is true without exception everywhere in Africa. Communism has not thrown in the sponge, nor have all Africans shaken off the effects of past mistreatment.

However, a decade of growth has been concentrated, admittedly painfully, into 2½ tumultuous years.

REPORT TO SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS AND APPROPRIATION COMMITTEES

I wish to bring to your attention a few observations made in a report submitted recently to the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriation Committees by Senators GORE and ALLOTT after their participation at the 17th General Assembly as members of the U.S. delegation. The report includes three significant points regarding U.S. participation in the United Nations.

"In the first place, our view of the world makes it inescapable that we should maintain the position that 'the first principle of a free system is an untramelled flow of words in an open forum.' This tedium and palaver, which characterizes U.N. procedures, is at once its most exasperating aspect and its most saving grace.

"Secondly, the United States regards the United Nations as at least potentially the best available multilateral instrument for preserving the peace, not only between the great powers, but also in superficially less important areas, especially where the great powers might feel impelled to intervene. In keeping with this aim, our country also labors at the United Nations in an effort to damp down explosive forces which might easily involve free world members in open conflict with one another. Unfortunately, this policy often has the byproduct of making it seem that the United States is heavily absorbed in essentially negative tasks no matter how desirable their outcome.

"Thirdly, the United States regards the United Nations as an educational device of great value * * * the mere act of participating in the deliberations at the United Nations tends to educate the delegates from non-Western societies in concepts favoring our view of the world community."

The report goes on to say that "it is easy to assess the U.S. position as being far more defensive and static than is really the case. This is partciularly true at times when the Communist states, which by definition can accept only a totalitarian world community, step up their troublemaking and their attacks on the procedures and organization of the United Nations. Rather than seeing these attacks as a measure of the success of U.S. policy in influencing the United Nations to reflect our concepts, some of our citizens appear to believe that the United Nations is wide open to Communist influence.

"With full recognition of the problems involved * * * it is nevertheless clear that there could be diminishing public approval for the United Nations in this country unless these factors are made more comprehensible to our citizens. This continues to be especially true with respect to the United Nations operation in the Congo."

These observations are of direct interest to your association.

U.N. GOALS: OUR GOAL

I have one final thought. It might be well to recall that the Founding Fathers of our great Nation took upon themselves the responsibility for the creation of a new and independent state on American soil. They did so with firm trust in the future and with firm belief in the basic decency of man. In that spirit, they managed to weld together in one nation people from many nations. In its belief for freedom and in its hope for world unity, the Charter of the United Nations expresses an approach to the political problems of man which would have been well understood by men like Jefferson and Lincoln.

Aristotle said that the end of politics must be the good of man. Man's greatest good and greatest present need is to establish world peace. Without it, the democratic enterprise—one might even say the human enterprise—will be utterly, fatally doomed. The United Nations is striving to achieve such a peace.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES ASSOCIATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, May was Senior Citizens Month, and the attention of the Nation was focused on the problems and potentials of our older citizens. As a member of the Senate Special Committee on the Aging, I take a personal interest in the welfare of these citizens, and am particularly pleased to learn of programs which will make use of their talents and put to profitable use, their golden years.

The Oliver Wendell Holmes Association in New York City has proposed such a program. They hope to make opportunities available to persons who have retired from business life or other active occupations, to continue a life of culture and learning under the guidance of emeriti professors. The organization is aptly named after the great Chief Justice who proved that the life of the mind, and the learning experience should continue as long as man lives. The organization hopes to make this possible, not only for senior students, but for retired academicians whose experience and ability we cannot afford to retire.

In order that my colleagues may be more fully informed as to the aims and purposes of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a short pamphlet outlining their plan be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES ASSOCIATION

A number of outstanding educators and other leaders in public affairs have joined in the formation of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association, under a charter of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York.

Its purpose is to set up, in cooperation with communities, and wherever possible in association with colleges in various parts of the United States, institutes "of, by, and for emeriti," offering an opportunity to persons of mature age, who have retired fully or partially, to continue a life of learning under the guidance of emeriti professors and other instructors.

The association is based on the faith of its founders in the values to the individual citizen and to society of bringing together, in an organized way, the inadequately deployed or as yet largely untapped human resources of men and women who have reached the period of retirement, with the invaluable human resources of emeriti professors of our Nation's universities, colleges and schools who possess a sustained intellectual vigor and pedagogical skill.

Science, engineering and machines are in these days releasing Americans for longer leisure time and permitting freedom from routine jobs earlier in life than ever before in history. At the same time, science and applied medicine are enabling Americans to live longer and to continue the development of their intellectual, social and spiritual potentials beyond the Biblical age of three score years and ten.

Adult education during on-the-job years is increasingly important. Equally imperative is the need to provide opportunity for those whose business and professional careers are largely behind them to continue learning for learning's sake and to make education a lifelong experience.

The program of the association is intended to make this possible in a distinctive way; to provide for continued interaction between the worlds of intellect, culture and public affairs; and to demonstrate the extensive range of socially responsive intellectual vitality as long as people live and are, or can be, stimulated by association with other informed active minds.

There is in this, the prospect of implementing the thought of the late Mr. Justice Holmes who wrote of: "the subtile rapture of a postponed power."

The association's program is sufficiently advanced so that it can promptly be put into effect. The planned fields of study include the following:

1. The physical world: The world in which we now live; how we acquired our knowledge of it; the vast as yet inadequately explored or totally unexplored reaches at whose rim we now stand.

With such subjects as: "The Geography of History"; "The Universe of Space"; "New Knowledge of the Nature of Matter and Energy"; "The New World of Potential Abundance and Inescapable Interdependence."

Consulting professor: Dr. Kirtley F. Mather.

2. The human world: The anthropological record; old and new societies; the psychological and sociological forces and trends that have shaped and are shaping our lives.

With such subjects as: "Human Origins"; "Societies of Yesterday"; "Psychology; Sociology"; "The Rational, the Emotional, and the Unknown."

Consulting professor: Dr. Margaret Mead.

3. The historical political world: The historical developments and forces that have appeared down the corridors of time; their ebbs and flows; their meaning to our national and international destinies.

With such subjects as: "The Ancient World"; "The Roots of Western Civilization"; "The History of Modern Nationalism"; "The American Experiment"; "Today's Asia"; "Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere."

Consulting professor: Dr. Hans Kohn.

4. The cultural world: Our heritage in creative expression from classical times and onward to our own days; in song and story; in theater and dance; in music; art; sculpture and architecture; in all that is revealing of human expression and creativeness.

With such subjects as: "Our English Heritage"; "The Heritage of Greece and Rome"; "The Hebraic Influence"; "The Story Teller"; "Poetry and Drama"; "The Visual Arts"; "Music."

Consulting professor: Dr. Walter Muir Whitehill.

5. The reflective world: With such subjects as: "The Philosophies of Man"; "The Religions by Which We Have Lived"; "Moral and Ethical Concepts."

Consulting professor: Dr. Cornelius Krusé.

6. Today's creative world: Contemporary developments; the search for dependable economic, political and social guideposts to a better world and to the good life.

With such subjects as: "Today's Communications"; "Contemporary Political Tensions"; "Current Events and Philosophies."

Consulting professor: Dr. Everett R. Clinchy.

The faculty and the courses for these institutes will be under the guidance of the consultants.

The proposed institutes will not require funds for permanent campuses. Nor, in light of the planned use of emeriti already receiving pensions, will they involve heavy faculty costs. The locations will be in communities in various parts of the United States that attract older citizens as residents or as long-term seasonal vacationists—men and women who have fully or partially retired and who have a continuing intellectual vitality and willingness to cultivate these interests; who have, in brief, "a love of learning."

The plan envisages that each community will provide the meeting facilities, and the transportation, maintenance and fees for the faculty, during sessions of from 5 to 14 weeks such as each community may find most suitable.

The association will also work with industrial companies, business and labor organizations in refresher programs for their executives who have been away from college and university life for a generation or more and who want to be updated concerning the newest developments in our scientific and cultural life.

It is the hope of those who have founded the Oliver Wendell Holmes Association that this will initiate a major educational development that can spread throughout the United States and the world, and create a body of mature men and women who can have a profound influence in directing the forces for peaceful social change in this revolutionary age.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the following two resolutions were adopted by the American Jewish Committee at their annual national meeting in New York City. It is my opinion that these resolutions present a clear and comprehensive picture of the problems of Israel's existence in a threatening environment. In addition, both statements propose concrete suggestions for the amelioration of the present conflict between Arab countries and Israel.

The American Jewish Committee emphasizes the contribution of foreign scientists to the development of a Middle Eastern arms race which could easily lead to the greater possibility of war in this area.

The American Jewish Committee also points out the importance of the American position in connection with the balance of power between the Arab countries and Israel. The statement points out the problems involved in the present attitudes of our Government, and presents several useful suggestions for the clarification and implementation of U.S. policy in the Middle Eastern States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the texts of these two resolutions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON GERMAN SCIENTISTS IN EGYPT OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, 56TH ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 16–19, 1963

The recent disclosures of the contributions being made by citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Arab Republic's program toward the development of advanced armaments, whose primary objective is the domination of the Middle East, have aroused great concern throughout the Western World.

The American Jewish Committee feels that the efforts of Western scientists and technicians to create a more powerful war machine has exacerbated tensions in the Middle East. These activities have increased the danger of an accelerated Middle East arms race which may lead to war.

There is evidence that some of the Germans employed by the UAR are pro-Nazi and have expressed strong antidemocratic and anti-Semitic attitudes. The UAR has made warfare and aggression a foundation of its foreign policy. It has publicly proclaimed, in violation of international agreements, its intention to destroy the State of Israel whose population consists largely of survivors of the Nazi holocaust. In view of the history of the Nazi era, we are sure that the German Government and a large sector of German public opinion are particularly sensitive to the participation of German nationals in activities which increase the possibility of war.

The German Government has condemned such activities and declared that it is eager "to cause the return to Germany of German scientists whose activities abroad could contribute to an increase in political tensions." Many outstanding figures in political, religious, and academic life are trying to put this decision into effect.

We therefore urge the Federal Republic of Germany to utilize existing legal and administrative means to prevent her citizens from contributing to the war potential of the United Arab Republic. In addition, we hope the Federal Republic of Germany will seek new means, if necessary, to control such activities. In this connection the present efforts in the Bundestag to seek amendments to the basic law are encouraging.

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, 56TH ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 19, 1963

Current developments in the Middle East confirm that this strategic area continues to be a center of violence and political instability. The threat to international peace has now substantially increased.

Arab animosity toward Israel continues without abatement. The joint declaration, signed in Cairo on April 17, 1963, establishing a federation among the United Arab Republic (Egypt), the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq, incorporates for the first time in a constitutional document the "liberation of Palestine" as a basic objective. Unless effective action is taken now, there is real danger of armed conflict in the area.

The United States, as leader of the free world, must assume a primary and continuing responsibility, both directly and through the United Nations, for the maintenance of peace and security in this turbulent region.

The American Jewish Committee welcomes President Kennedy's statement, at his press conference of May 8, 1963, that our Government's policy supports "the security of both Israel and her neighbors," seeks "to limit the Near East arms race," and is "strongly opposed to the use of force, or the threat of force, in the Near East." We are also gratified by the President's reaffirmation that:

"In the event of aggression, or the preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

The President thus confirms fundamental and longstanding tenets of our foreign policy. We believe his statement should be supplemented and clarified to preclude any possibility of miscalculation as to the firm determination of the United States to employ its full resources to meet any threat to peace in the Middle East. Our Government should make clear—as it did during the Lebanese and Jordanian crises of 1958—that covert acts designed to provoke internal upheaval can constitute aggression as much as direct military action.

The continuation of indirect aggression today may precipitate an even more explosive situation than 5 years ago. Our official recognition of the Nasser-backed rebel regime in Yemen—whose power is maintained only through the continued presence of one-third of Egypt's Regular Army—has created doubts about our determination to oppose subversion and military aggression in the area.

The United States should vigorously pursue all avenues of negotiation, particularly with the Soviet Union, to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena. But as long as the Soviet bloc continues to supply Arab countries with ultramodern weapons—including jet fighters, bombers, submarines, and missiles—effective limitation of armaments is virtually impossible. The United States and other Western powers should take immediate and sustained action to maintain the balance of arms between the Arab countries and Israel.

The swift destructiveness of modern weapons, particularly when used against small and vulnerable nations, makes prior assurances of U.S. assistance crucial. A formal U.S. guarantee of the independence and integrity of any state in the Middle East which requests such a guarantee would have a significant deterrent effect. It would discourage open military aggression. It would also reduce the likelihood that a peaceful nation which considered its security threatened might undertake defensive counteraction, on its own, to stem indirect aggression by others wishing to upset the present tenuous balance in the area.

We further urge our Government to press for the elimination of inflammatory Arab propaganda and hate campaigns, which are a major obstacle to peace in the Middle East.

Our Government's policy of impartiality toward all nations in the Middle East cannot succeed unless they are willing, in all good faith, to coexist. In the absence of good faith, our policy of equal treatment seems to condone, if not actively support, the aggressive designs of the Arab States against the very existence of Israel. Our present policy has not succeeded in convincing President Nasser to fulfill his promise to withdraw Egyptian military forces from Yemen. Nor has it deterred him from seeking arms in increasing quantities from the Soviet bloc, thereby furthering Communist penetration.

Finally, a peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the creation of a stable and secure Middle East. We urge our Government steadfastly to continue its efforts toward this prime objective.

The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to: (1) Clearly define what it would consider aggression; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab States; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

FEDERAL AID IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, the inequities of the Federal aid program are clearly demonstrated by the example of New York State. New York State contributes 20 percent of all Federal tax revenue yet we only receive a very modest sum of Federal aid in return. More specifically, it costs New Yorkers an initial sum of $2.07 for every dollar we receive in the form of Federal aid. These figures—recently released by the Tax Foundation—show that New York State suffers the greatest loss of any State in the Union.

I do not question the value of many Federal aid programs. There is no doubt that they can be very beneficial to those States which are in most need of financial assistance. But I do dispute the gross difference between what New Yorkers contribute to the Federal fund and what they get back in return.

An editorial which appeared in the May 5 edition of the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle points up some of these inequities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the text of the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Costly Dollars

New York State every year receives in Federal aid a modest bundle of the most precious dollars dispensed by Uncle Sam. Why precious? Because every dollar sent to this State costs this State $2.07.

Figures released by the Tax Foundation show that in comparison to $965.5 million computed as New York State's burden for Federal aid, the State got back $467.2 million in 1961, the latest year for which such a study has been made. This was the biggest loss suffered by any State.

In the allocation of more than $7 billion in Federal grants 14 States took losses and 36 were gainers over the amounts of their contributions in taxes. The losers, of course, were many of the wealthier States. This would indicate the richer States get poorer. An exception was California, a luscious $107 million gainer.

The theory, of course, is that the States most able should help the less fortunate ones, which include every Southern State except Maryland and Florida and every State west of the Mississippi.

It can be argued that the well being of the Nation as a whole is the real stake in the Federal aid program. A perusal of the sagging economies of some States lends some support to the view. What of the other side of the coin? New York State is experiencing severe budget pains. In Monroe County and Rochester officials are hard pressed to provide ample funds for the quality schools the community demands and expects. With the funds which leave this State to assist other States, better educational facilities would be possible.

We do not dispute the value of the Federal aid program but it is occasionally worth remembering there are inequities as well as advantages.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTIONS OF ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. Mr. President, the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, a fine and public-spirited group, recently held its annual convention in Chicago. One of the many important matters in which this group has taken an active and leading interest is Indian affairs. I ask unanimous consent that resolutions passed by the convention on this subject be printed in the Congressional Record for the information of the Congress.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Indian Affairs

Whereas the Termination Act of 1955 for American Indians which encouraged them to leave the reservations has been misinterpreted, poorly administered, and has created great hardships for our American Indians, and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has called for a repeal of this law: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs support the General Federation in its attempt to secure the repeal of the Termination Act.

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has asked the Congress of the United States to develop programs which will train Indians for economic opportunities similar to those provided by the point 4 technical assistance program to underdeveloped countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs support the General Federation in its efforts to secure this type of program for our American Indians.

LIBERALIZED IMMIGRATION

Mr. **DODD**. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] was the principal speaker at the third annual national symposium dinner of the American Committee on Italian Migration, which was held Monday night, June 10, at the Mayflower Hotel.

Senator Hart made a very compelling case in support of a liberalized immigration policy.

The concluding sentence in his speech is:

> We seek an immigration policy for America which speaks a welcome to all peoples in the spirit of brotherhood and justice.

Because this is precisely what Senator Hart's immigration bill seeks to do, 35 of us, from both parties, have joined with him in sponsoring S. 747.

There is agreement among many people, in Congress, and throughout the country, that our immigration laws are in need of extensive revision. And no one has worked harder and more ably, to accomplish this goal than my good friend and colleague from Michigan.

So that many others will have an opportunity to read his fine address, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Philip A. Hart at the Third Annual National Symposium Dinner of the American Committee on Italian Migration, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963

You are kind to have me at your symposium. You meet in truly historic times. The barriers to equality for all Americans are crumbling. There is a surge for justice in American attitudes and actions. We are in an era when the core of our democratic credo—the dignity of the individual—is making daily headlines from one end of the country to the other.

We're making progress in removing a grotesque blemish from the face of America. And this is as it should be—for the good of America's Negro citizens, the Nation as a whole, and the forces of freedom the world over.

Less dramatic, but an equally intolerable blemish, is the nationally discriminatory and racially biased quota system of our basic immigration statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The act's well-known restrictive provisions against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, its token quotas for Asian countries, and the racist implications of its Asia-Pacific triangle clauses should have no place in our public policy of the mid-sixties.

Enactment of S. 747, the reform bill I introduced on behalf of myself and 35 other Senators from both national parties, would remove these purely arbitrary racial and nationality barriers to immigration. The bill substitutes a new formula based on equality and fairplay for people of all races and nations.

The impressive support for S. 747—in the Congress and throughout the country—evidences, I believe, a growing public awareness of the need for reform, and a fast evolving consensus as to the kind of reform that is needed.

I commend all of you here for your vigorous role in producing this consensus. The American Committee on Italian Migration has broadcast far and wide the need for reform. You have helped mightily in alerting us to still another area where we must see that our American creed shapes our national policy.

I am confident that your efforts, and those of like-minded Americans, will produce results in the coming months.

President Kennedy, during his service in the Senate, was a leader in the effort to liberalize our immigration laws. His recent statements that his administration is working on legislative proposals to change the quota system are most welcome. We must have the President's full and active support.

With such support we will win a major victory. The basic principles of S. 747 will be enacted into law. Discrimination in our immigration policy will once and for all be left for the study of historians.

The discrimination built in the act of 1952 is reason enough for reform legislation. But in effecting an equitable admissions policy, this bill also accomplishes other important changes.

Parents of American citizens would be admitted to the United States on a nonquota basis.

There would be a flexible provision for the admission of a reasonable number of refugees without the necessity of enacting emergency bills.

Priority would be given to the admission of those with special skills needed in this country.

The lack of these provisions in the act of 1952 has necessitated many special, temporary, legislative enactments. The list is a long one—from the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, through the act passed in the closing days of the last Congress to allow several thousand skilled persons and relatives of Americans to enter this country.

The latter act cleared the way for a number of distinguished scientists whose special talents are vital to the performance of important defense work. Nearly 50 hospitals, universities and research organizations in all parts of the Nation are benefiting by this special law. Under the quota system of the act of 1952 these exceptional persons, as well as many relatives of Americans, were inadmissible to our country. S. 747 corrects this situation and brings our basic statute into a a creative relation with the needs of the sixties.

Enactment of S. 747 would not flood this country with immigrants, a charge I have heard made. It does not substantially alter the present rate of immigration. Nor does it eliminate the health, literacy, security and financial screening that each prospective immigrant must pass.

It is simply a reasonable and factual approach to the problem and need of determining an equitable and useful immigration policy for America.

Opposition comes from many quarters. Some oppose reform—and immigration generally—because of prejudice, intolerance and a strange belief in long-discredited racial and nationality myths. But the spirit of this age is against them.

Others look upon the immigrant as an economic liability—as a competitor for jobs. This is a legitimate concern—even for those of us favorably disposed toward reform.

The economic aspects of immigration of course are complex—I would be the first to say it. But as I pointed out recently in the Senate, S. 747 was introduced only after thoughtful consideration by its sponsors of the economic impact on our complex technological economy. We do believe our bill has economic value. We firmly believe its enactment will stimulate national economic growth. The best data available confirms this.

President Kennedy's words at Yale University over a year ago have a real relevance to the economics of immigration. "Mythology distracts us everywhere," he said. "We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new difficult essential confrontation with reality."

The presence of racial, economic, social, and political myths—in any segment of public policy—can only stifle America's growth and keep us from a broad area of potential achievement.

No responsible citizen will deny that our immigration policies do, indeed, have an impact on our economy. But let's not deal in mythology. Let's be honest with ourselves.

That we continue to need the economic stimulus of immigration, is outlined graphically in recent studies by the Department of Labor. Officials point out that the favorable prognosis for job opportunities over the next decade would not be upset if the current level of immigration is maintained. They even suggest a slight increase in admissions during this period would be a boon—in terms of economic growth—if the skill level and occupational composition of added immigration fell in categories of need. I remind you—this is one of the priorities of S. 747.

Under our present immigration policy we add through immigration—including quota immigration and nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere—about 125,000 workers a year to our national labor force. The best estimates are that under the terms of S. 747 this figure would be increased by about 75,000.

When we compare these 75,000 new workers with the number of new workers which will be added to our labor force through population growth each year, then we see the impact of immigration on employment in its proper perspective.

It is estimated that approximately 2.6 million young people will be added to our labor force in each of the next 10 years as our population grows. The addition of workers which might come under a revised immigration program is only 2.9 percent of that figure—and it is only 0.1 percent of our total national labor force today.

We must attack the problem of unemployment and underemployment in this Nation.

This is a high priority in President Kennedy's program. The solutions lie—at least in part—in training the unskilled, in removing racial bars to equal employment opportunities, and in expanding the economy through sound tax reform and fiscal policies designed to stimulate economic growth.

It is in these ways that we must attack this situation where far too many Americans cannot fully use their talents and contribute to their own and the Nation's well being.

It serves no useful purpose to make immigration the scapegoat for the problem of unemployment. Such reasoning only generates confusion, perpetuates our problems, creates a false issue, gives cause for doubt among our friends, and ammunition to our enemies on the claimed vitality of our democratic society.

We have a great cause in reforming the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. We seek a law free from injustice, and from offense to those races and peoples who under the policy of existing law have been declared less desirable members of the human family. This is a good cause and a practical one—consistent with our democratic ideals and our efforts to build a stronger America. All of you here can be proud of what you are doing to help.

If we are to achieve our goals you, the friends and supporters of basic immigration reform, must continue to stand together as we proceed along the difficult legislative road ahead.

There will be times when it will seem easier to settle for half a loaf—when it may seem practical to have again only a temporary bill to admit a few thousand from the backlogged quota of a particular nation.

It is my sincere hope that the united support which has so successfully developed in the drafting of S. 747 will stand together as we work in the Congress for acceptance of this bill.

We have here the framework within which significant and fundamental changes can be made in our immigration policy. We can compromise and adjust within this framework. But the eyes of all of us must remain together on the goal—a goal each of us believes is right.

We seek an immigration policy for America which speaks a welcome to all peoples in the spirit of brotherhood and justice.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America and a statement prepared by the Izaak Walton League on a joint Interior Department-Izaak Walton League summer employment program, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. As Mr. Penfold points out, both the Izaak Walton League and the National Wildlife Federation choose 13 boys for summer employment with the Department of the Interior.

This is an excellent program and one which I am pleased that the Secretary of the Interior has encouraged. In order to qualify as a candidate the young man must have an interest in conservation and a desire to study the natural resource field. This program is one which I hope will be expanded further for it provides an excellent basis for developing the natural resource managers which our Nation will need both for public and private conservation.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF
AMERICA, INC.,
Glenview, Ill., May 9, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will be interested to learn that Mr. Robert D. Fallow, Jr., of 203 B Avenue, La Grande, Oreg., is among the 13 winners of a nationwide program sponsored jointly by the Izaak Walton League of America and the U.S. Department of the Interior to reserve a few of Interior's summer jobs for highly qualified young men planning careers in natural resources conservation. The 13 winners were selected from top candidates picked by the league's State divisions.

Thus, Mr. Fallow competed first at the State level, then at the National level. He is an outstanding young man.

Enclosed is a detailed description of the program.

Sincerely,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director IWLA.

JOINT INTERIOR DEPARTMENT-IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The Izaak Walton League of America cooperated this spring with the Department of the Interior in a program of reserving a few of the Department's summer jobs for highly qualified young men planning careers in conservation. The league, a national conservation organization, selected 13 outstanding high school senior boys for fieldwork with the Department this summer.

In similar fashion, the National Wildlife Federation also chose 13 boys for employment with the Department.

When first discussing the program with the league, Secretary Udall wrote:

"I have long been concerned with what appears to be the limited opportunities available to high-caliber young men interested in the field of conservation to gain practical experience by working in the outdoors on a conservation project under experienced and qualified supervision. It is my hope that with the cooperation of your organization and that of the National Wildlife Federation a few summer jobs in the Department of the Interior can be set aside for selected young men who demonstrate an interest in natural resources conservation and a need for practical experience.

"Because of the difficulty involved in a Federal agency handling such a program, I hope to gain the assistance of the league and the federation in publicizing the program and processing and selecting the applicants. The Department is not so organized nor so distributed nationally as to handle these functions effectively and fairly."

The Department of the Interior each summer employs a limited number of seasonal personnel to do needed conservation work in the national parks, national wildlife refuges, and public forest and rangelands other than those in the National Forest System, and to help furnish public services to tourists and sportsmen. Under this year's pilot program, a few of these jobs were reserved for high school graduates who are planning careers in some aspect of natural resources management and who want field experience before entering college. The work experience which these young men receive will help them to solidify career plans and provide them with invaluable practical backgrounds for later studies. They will also earn money with which to begin college. Wages will be commensurate with Federal salary standards and local wage scales.

Every effort will be made to locate the selected employees as close to their homes as possible, since each employee will be expected to pay his own travel expenses to and from the area of his work.

To qualify for one of these jobs, a young man was required to be a high school senior expecting to graduate this spring, to be 18 years of age by June 15, 1963, and to have definite plans to enter a college or university for ultimate study in a natural resource field—including, but not limited to, forestry, soil and range conservation, land management, fish and wildlife, outdoor recreation, or geology. He was required to have an above average scholastic record, to possess leadership qualities, and to have shown a continuing interest in natural resources conservation.

Program publicity in the various States included press, radio, and TV announcements, as well as information given to high schools and youth organizations.

The 13 winners named by the league were selected under a competitive system which began at the State level. The president of each league State division appointed a selection committee to process all applications from his State. These committees, chaired by league representatives, were largely made up of university professors, ministers, conservation agency personnel, and others of similar position in order to assure impartial evaluation of applicants. Nominees chosen by the divisions were judged at the national level by a committee composed of Dr. William A. Wallace of the league's executive board, Mr. Victor Gauzza of Secretary Udall's office, and Dr. Henry Clepper of the Society of American Foresters.

All selections were made on the basis of the following materials submitted by each applicant: (1) A completed U.S. Government form No. 57 employment application; (2) a transcript of his high school record to date; (3) a written recommendation from some adult, other than family, who knows the applicant and his qualifications for the program; (4) a letter from him indicating his college and career plans, describing his extracurricular activities in high school and any conservation work he has done, and discussing his reasons for seeking summer employment with the Department of Interior.

The 13 winners were unanimous choices of the national selection committee. They are: Patrick M. Navolanic, 411 Scholl Drive, Glendale, Calif.; Alexander D. Neighbors, 1823 13th Street, Greeley, Colo.; Robert T. Schwarzkopf, Jr., 9 Golfview Lane, Carpentersville, Ill.; Lester C. Ehrsam, Jr., 4325 North Clinton St., Fort Wayne, Ind.; Jerry Wayne Cook, 70 Dixon Avenue, Aberdeen, Md.; Guy Rodger Stafford, 1535 Glastonbury, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Vernon Roy Riddle, Wheaton, Minn.; Eric Lloyd Kindig, R.D. 1, Box 7, Lodi, Ohio; Robert D. Fallow, Jr., 203 B. Avenue, La Grande, Oreg.; Grant W. Hagadorn, 120 Sullivan Road, Wayne, Pa.; William R. Butler, 122 Kingsley Road SE., Vienna, Va.; John L. Keller, Route No. 2, Stratford, Marathon County, Wis.; John Nelson Cundy, 643 Wood Street, Powell, Wyo.

JAPAN IN TODAY'S WORLD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in recent weeks several noteworthy studies which mirror the excitement of modern Japan's pace of progress, economically, socially, and politically, have been published.

I would like to mention particularly the report of the distinguished Committee for Economic Development, entitled "Japan in the Free World Economy"; a special supplement of the Washington Post, dated May 26, 1963, entitled "Japan in Today's World"; and a report on "Japan's Democracy" appearing in the Wall Street Journal of June 11, 1963.

As an editorial appearing in the Honolulu Advertiser on May 6, 1963, pointed out, since World War II "few developments have been more amazing than the rapid expansion of the Japanese economy, which is, indeed, the fastest growing economy in the world."

Overall, having visited Japan several times and after reading these articles, I am reassured of the rapid and continuing growth of that great nation.

I am tremendously impressed by the figures which illustrate its remarkable economic recovery. For example, a sampling of available statistics and facts show that the country's average yearly growth rate has been about 9 percent; per capita income has risen from $258 in 1958 to $416 in 1961, to an estimated $450 last year.

Japan is the only Asian nation whose economy is characterized by a labor shortage. This has given impetus to the development of automated factories and vending machines, supermarkets and instant miso soup, and electronic computers.

The popular notion that Japan is a land of paradoxes is beautifully etched out by the Washington Post Supplement:

> There are the polite, gentle Japanese people, but there are also rush-hour subway stampedes; there is quiet beauty and quaint architectural symmetry, but also the huge bustling metropolis of Tokyo; there are peasant farmers, but also electric water pumps at the wells, tractors, and TV aerials on thatched roofs; there are quiet, contemplative philosophies of Zen Buddhism and those of other spiritual commitments, but also advertising signs, expense accounts, and the continuously loud sounds of thousands of automobiles and construction in the cities.

It is a nation in which democratic practices have, according to the Wall Street Journal, "taken firm root," not only in the national government, but also on the small-town level.

It is a highly industrialized economy that is moving ahead rapidly.

Separated both by geography and history, Japan is the only major free world industrial country outside the North Atlantic community. While the nation plays a significant role in world trade and in the defense of the free world, Japan does not yet occupy its proper place in international councils. Although its aid to underdeveloped countries is eagerly sought in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, it is not a member of the OECD.

Because Japan has not been included in world trade councils, she has not been in a position to participate fully in the joint economic planning of the Atlantic community—even though she has much to contribute by way of example and experience.

If Japan were more fully integrated within the councils of this community, it would constitute a valuable link between the advanced industrial countries of the North Atlantic and the developing countries of Asia and Africa, struggling to lift their standards of living without abridging individual freedom.

As an outstanding example of successful economic development and rapid growth within the framework of individual enterprise, Japan has much significant practical knowledge to offer the developing countries.

Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda has aptly pointed out that Japan is, after all, admirably suited to be, and, indeed, wants to be "a bridge between the industrialized nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa. We understand them both," he said.

Japan's application for membership is now pending before the OECD. She should, it seems to me, be admitted without the slightest hesitation. I am in hearty accord with one of the Committee for Economic Development's conclusions: it is vital that Japan "pursue its economic aspirations in close association with the United States and the rest of the free world."

America's policies should continue to be those of encouragement and promotion of closer ties binding Japan to the United States and the rest of the free world in a community of nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following texts be printed at this point in the Record: the conclusions and recommendations of the CED report on "Japan in the Free World Economy"; the lead article, "Nippon's Obvious Affluence Has Deceptive Side," from the Washington Post supplement; and the Wall Street Journal article, "Japan's Democracy."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Japan in the Free World Economy

It is our general view, underlying our proposals here, that there is nothing in Japan's situation that makes it unduly hard for her to accept the responsibilities of full partnership with the other major industrial powers. At the same time, we see no reason why Japan's industrial trading partners should not extend to her the benefits of full partnership in the free world economic system.

In a recent policy statement, this committee aid: "We consider it of the utmost importance that Japan should take its place as an equal partner in free world trade. The present position of Japan is highly irregular. Many European countries have declined to extend to Japan the tariff concessions extended to other members of the General

Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Japan voluntarily limits its exports of some products to the United States. Japan restricts its own imports by high tariffs and exchange controls. All of this not only depresses the efficiency of the free world economy but also strains free world political solidarity."[1]

Our proposals are designed to help fit Japan into an international economic policy system whose major policy is aimed at securing to the whole free world its maximum strength by permitting each nation to use its particular comparative advantages as supplier of goods, services, and capital.

Special reservations against full Japanese participation in the making and functioning of free world international economic policy should be removed. Japan is not a full member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, although she participates in its Committee for Coordinating Development Assistance. The OECD was formed in 1960 to take the place of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European agency through which Western Europe planned for and made use of Marshall plan assistance from the United States. OECD broadened the cooperative functions beyond Europe by the addition of the United States and Canada as members.

Japan, the leading free industrial nation not now included, should be given full membership in OECD. We welcome the strong support given Japanese membership in OECD by the United States, Belgium, and Great Britain.

We recommend seven additional steps toward full partnership for Japan in a competitive free world economic system.

1. AN END TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JAPAN

Nondiscrimination is a basic principle of international trade in the free world. This principle is concretely embodied in the most-favored-nation rule, by which a country undertakes to extend to all other countries (subject to limited exceptions) the terms of trade extended to its most favored trade partner. This rule has a long history. It is now incorporated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to which Japan, the United States, the Western European countries, and most other free world countries are parties.

Nevertheless, Japan is denied most-favored-nation treatment in her trade with many other parties to GATT, principally those in Western Europe, and Japan is the only party to GATT so treated on a substantial scale.

In most cases this discrimination has been carried out by the application against Japan of article 35 of the general agreement. Article 35 permits parties to the GATT to withhold most-favored-nation treatment from new signatories if they wish to do so. Nations that are already parties to the GATT may invoke article 35 against countries newly coming into the agreement, and nations coming in may invoke it against countries already in the GATT. The article permits nations invoking it to apply special trade restraints against exports of a particular nation, without being considered in violation of the basic GATT trade principle of nondiscriminatory trade.

Nineteen countries have at some time invoked article 35 against Japan and 13 still do. They are Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Haiti, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nigeria, Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, and Tanganyika. Great Britain, Belgium, and France have indicated that they will soon give up the application of article 35 against Japan.

Some countries, including Italy, maintain discriminatory provisions against Japanese trade without using article 35.

Most countries discriminating against Japan have been easing their restrictions in recent years. But it is clear that in the case of Japan free world trade is being conducted under a very widespread exception to the rule that there should be no discrimination among nations:

Present discrimination against Japan, whether or not based on article 35 of the GATT, should be abolished and most-favored-nation treatment should be granted to her.

A certain gradualness may be justified in the removal of these discriminations, to avoid hardship in some cases. But the discriminations are so offensive to the basic principles of the free economy that they should be removed as promptly as possible and the countries now practicing discrimination should accept responsibility for the domestic measures needed to assist adjustment of the resulting imports.

2. RELAXATION AND REMOVAL OF VOLUNTARY QUOTAS

The United States does not directly deny Japan most-favored-nation treatment. But the United States has been a prime mover in the use of the second major form of discrimination against Japanese trade.

This is the voluntary quota, by which Japan keeps its export sales of particular goods lower than they would otherwise be.

The use of voluntary quotas grew out of rapid increases—concentrated in a few products—in Japanese exports to the United States of cotton textiles in the early 1950's. The Japanese were trying to recapture their prewar share of the American cotton textile market, which had been about 2 percent of U.S. consumption. Although this overall goal was small, the drive concentrated during 1950–55 in a few lines of cotton textile products; chiefly, gingham, velveteen fabrics, pillow cases, blouses and shirts. By 1955 imports from Japan accounted for one-half of sales in the U.S. velveteen market, and for about one-fifth of the U.S. market for blouses. By 1956, Japanese imports accounted for over a quarter of the U.S. gingham market.

These imports raised demands for protection. Complaints to the U.S. Tariff Commission resulted in a ruling that Japanese sales of velveteens were causing serious injury to U.S. producers.

The first use of a voluntary quota soon followed, in 1955. It limited the sales of Japanese cotton blouses in the United States. Since then, the two Governments have been in almost continuous consultation on voluntary quota arrangements. At the end of 1961, the Japanese had adopted voluntary export quotas on their sales of 25 products in the U.S. market. These quotas affected 25 to 35 percent of Japan's exports to the United States. A few of the quotas were adopted as a means of limiting competition among Japanese exporters in the United States and thus of sustaining prices and profits of Japanese producers.

The use of voluntary quotas has now spread to a part of Japan's trade with Canada and Europe. Some of the European countries that are no longer invoking article 35 have asked the Japanese to limit sales in their markets by applying voluntary quotas.

The voluntariness of voluntary quotas does not change their basic character as quantitative restrictions on imports of particular goods from particular countries. In fact, their voluntary nature carries with it certain disadvantages of its own, one of which is that the standards by which the quotas are applied are not publicly known and discussible.

We recognize that some producers and workers in the United States and Europe are now enjoying the protection of these quotas. Termination of the quotas should be phased out over a sufficient period to avoid serious hardship to these protected interests. Affected firms and workers should be eligible for adjustment assistance of the kind now provided in the United States and other countries. Voluntary quotas and other quantitative restrictions on exports to the United States and Europe should be relaxed and removed together, so that the immediate impact of freer imports will not be concentrated on one country. But the basic objective should be to eliminate voluntary quotas on an orderly schedule over a reasonable period of time.

The special case of cotton textiles

Early in 1962 a new multilateral arrangement for controlling international trade in cotton textiles was adopted by the main exporting and importing countries. To a considerable extent the new arrangement was inspired by inequities that arose in the use of voluntary quotas on Japanese sales of cotton textiles in the United States.

Sales in the United States of cotton textiles imported from all sources rose from 2 percent of the U.S. market in the early 1950's to 6 percent in 1960. But Japan's share of the U.S. market remained unchanged, at 2 percent, while sales of cotton imports from India, Hong Kong, Pakistan, Spain and Portugal increased substantially. This convinced Japanese producers that the voluntary quota system holding down their sales in the United States was inequitable. Meanwhile, very tight import restraints in Europe kept cotton imports from any source from increasing significantly. This convinced U.S. cotton textile producers that they were bearing an unfair share of the burden of adjustment to increased production of cotton textiles in the low-wage countries.

The new Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement is to remain in force for 5 years from October 1, 1962. The importing members of the agreement are Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, United States, Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. They agree to enlarge their quotas on importation of cotton textiles by at least three 5-percent steps during this period. At the same time an importing country is entitled to ask exporting countries to restrain increases in exports when necessary to avoid disruption in the importing country's markets. If the exporting members—India, Japan, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain and Hong Kong—do not voluntarily restrict their sales the importing country may limit imports to the desired degree by use of import quotas.

As a transitional device to escape from the difficulties arising under the Japanese voluntary quota on cotton textile imports to the United States, the new arrangement has merit. It may result in a more even sharing of the burden of export restraint between Japan and other exporters and a more even sharing of the burden of adjustment to imports between the United States and other importers. It is also intended to bring about a gradual enlargement of imports.

There may be other cases in which this mechanism may serve a similar purpose, although it is noteworthy that the parties to the Cotton Textile Arrangement declared that the measures incorporated in it "are not to be considered as lending themselves to application in other fields." However we wish to emphasize our belief that such arrangements are acceptable only as steps toward freedom from quota restrictions and not as substitutes for that freedom.

One other subject should be mentioned with respect to the special problem of cotton textiles. This is the two-price U.S. cotton system. It is an example of Government intervention in the competitive system leading to redoubled Government intervention: the two-price system came about because Government support of U.S. raw cotton prices made U.S. cotton too high priced to sell in world markets. To make U.S. raw cotton competitive, the Government paid a subsidy on its export. This allowed foreign cotton textiles makers to get U.S. raw cotton more cheaply than could U.S. makers of cotton cloth. This, in turn, intensified the feeling of U.S. cotton textiles producers that they deserve more tariff, or quota, protection.

---

[1] "A New Trade Policy for the United States," a statement on national policy by the research and policy committee of CED (April 1962).

We made recommendations[2] recently for adaptation of American agriculture over a 5-year period to competitive market conditions. These recommendations included the immediate reduction of the domestic price of cotton to this world level. Adoption of such a program would, in addition to correcting a misuse of our resources in agriculture, release the United States from the above policy dilemma, and permit both cotton growers and cotton textiles makers in the United States to get back into world trade on a sound footing.

3. JAPANESE ELIMINATION OF QUANTITATIVE RESTRAINTS ON IMPORTS

Japan alone among the industrial countries of the free world still uses a system of exchange licensing to control the amount of her imports. Under this system, a license must be obtained from the government to import any items on a list of imports subject to license control. Japan justifies continued use of this policy on the ground that she feels herself to be peculiarly exposed to balance-of-payments difficulties.

In 1959 Japan adopted a policy to remove these restrictions. By October 1962 commodities which had accounted for 88 percent of Japanese imports in 1959 were free of exchange license control and it has been announced that this figure will be raised to 90 percent by April 1963. This will not mean that the items still under control would account for only 10 percent of Japanese imports if there were no control. It will mean that the items still under control composed only 10 percent of Japanese imports in 1960, and this number is low in part because imports of these items were limited by controls.

Controls have tended to be retained on the items that were most competitive, imports of which would rise the most if controls were eliminated. Presumably the still-controlled items would account for much more than 10 percent of Japanese imports if all controls were abolished. Moreover, some items freed of exchange licensing controls are still subject to quantitative quotas. The importation of petroleum is subject to quantitative limits based essentially on refinery runs. At the same time it should be pointed out that the volume of licenses given for items still under control has been enlarged.

Japan does not have persistent large balance-of-payments deficits that justify use of exchange controls. Her tendency to cyclical balance-of-payments deficits can be managed, as it largely has been, by domestic financial policy. We believe that Japan should eliminate her exchange controls and other quantitative restrictions on imports. In this case, as in others where we recommend trade liberalization, we recognize the need for orderly timing. But we believe that Japan can proceed more rapidly in this direction than it has been doing.

4. GENERAL TARIFF REDUCTIONS

The voluntary quotas, quantitative restrictions, discrimination and exchange controls that hamper trade in both directions with Japan are inconsistent with the principles of the free world economy. They should be eliminated in an orderly manner, but in a reasonable time and thoroughly. Every country imposing such restraints has an obligation to move in this direction without expecting compensation from others for thus coming into line with the basic requirements of the international economic system.

Aside from these special restrictions, high tariffs imposed by Japan and by other countries impede trade between Japan and the rest of the world. We believe that these tariffs should be substantially reduced in a process of bargaining in which at least the United States, Western Europe, Canada, Australia, and Japan, would participate.[3] The reasons for this are, we hope, clear from what has been said above about the principles of the free world economy (section 2). We have explained them more explicity with reference to tariff policy in the near future in "A New Trade Policy for the United States" (April 1962).[4]

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 embodies the belief that the United States will gain from substantial, mutual tariff reduction between us and our chief trading partners. In motivation and form this act was primarily directed to reduction of tariffs between the United States and the European Common Market. It authorizes complete elimination of tariffs on items of which the United States and the Common Market supply 80 percent or more of world exports. But it also authorizes reductions of up to 50 percent on U.S. tariffs that do not fall within this category. We hope that this authority will be used in bargaining for a reduction of Japanese tariffs and of United States and European tariffs on items of which Japan is a major exporter.[5]

Western tariffs of particular interest to Japan will be substantially reduced only if Japan is prepared to reduce tariffs of special interest to the West. Participation of Japan in this process may be impeded by the traditional Japanese view of her foreign trade as essentially a means of obtaining raw materials that she doesn't produce at all and only as a last resort certain highly special manufactures. However the benefits to Japan of being both an importer and exporter of manufactures, as other industrial countries are, would be large and we hope that they will be recognized.

In all countries, fear of hardship to domestic industry is an obstacle to reduction of tariffs. In the West this fear is likely to be intensified with respect to Japan by a misunderstanding of the significance of low Japanese wage rates. As we have explained earlier (pp. 24–25) low Japanese wage rates are not a source of danger or injury to her actual or potential customers. A sudden expansion of imports from any source may cause hardship to domestic producers, but such a sudden expansion is not more likely to come from a low wage country than from a higher wage country. What is important for the possibility of a great upsurge of imports is the total supply and cost situation of the potential exporter, not just the wage level.

The possibility of hardship to domestic industries does call for a timing of tariff reductions that is adapted to the situations of particular industries. We believe that it will almost always be possible to achieve some tariff reduction without real hardship if a reasonable period is allowed. Moreover the pace of tariff reduction that is possible without hardship can be speeded up by use of the machinery for adjustment assistance that exists in the United States and many other nations.

We note a concern, in Japan and elsewhere, that the value of tariff concessions granted by the United States may be seriously impaired by the U.S. escape clause machinery. There is fear that if U.S. tariff concessions, received in exchange for concessions made by others, lead to substantial increase of U.S. imports of particular goods the concessions will be withdrawn. We have recommended in the past, and we repeat the recommendation here, that the escape clause should be used sparingly, only in serious cases, and even then only for a temporary withdrawal of concessions.

While we understand the concern of our trading partners, we believe that the concern has been exaggerated. The United States is committed to grant compensation when it withdraws concessions under the escape clause. Moreover, the escape clause was used only 15 times in the 15 years from 1948 through 1962. In five of these cases Japanese products were involved to an important extent. The five cases together involve Japanese sales in the United States of $30 million a year, compared with total Japanese exports to the United States of over $1 billion a year.

We strongly urge that the advanced countries of the free world seize the opportunity lying before them to increase their efficiency, growth, and solidarity by substantially reducing their tariffs. Japan's participation in giving and receiving tariff concessions is essential to the idea that there is a free world.

5. U.S. GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT IN JAPAN

Before 1961 the U.S. Government made substantial purchases of goods in Japan to be used in the U.S. economic and military aid programs, particularly in Asia. In general these purchases were made in Japan because Japan was the cheapest source of supply. Beginning in 1961 the United States reduced such purchases, in Japan as elsewhere abroad, as one step to control the U.S. balance of payments deficit by reducing the outflow of dollars. This had an adverse effect upon some industries in Japan, such as fertilizer production, and also in some degree upon the Japanese balance of payments.

Reduction of offshore procurement is an acceptable method of dealing with the U.S. balance of payments only if it is regarded as a purely temporary measure. But in general the principle that we, and others, will be best off if we buy from the cheapest source of supply is no less valid for the U.S. Government than for U.S. private citizens. We recommend that the United States should resume worldwide procurement as soon as its balance of payments position permits.

6. JAPAN'S TRADE WITH THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

Before World War II, a fifth of Japan's trade was with countries that are now members of the Sino-Soviet bloc. Japan's alinement with the West in the cold war has prevented her from making a full effort to recover this formerly big market.

---

[2] "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture," a statement on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of CED (July 1962).

[3] Memoranda of comment, reservation, or dissent by Alvin R. Jennings: "Certainly net benefits to all parties are implicit in freer trade between Japan and the other free nations. And, in my opinion, the reciprocal actions that are recommended (pp. 36–53) contain the necessary cautions, safeguards, and caveats to avoid undue damage to any of the parties from suddenness in removing existing bars, restrictions, and discriminations (e.g., 'gradualness' in removing discriminations under GATT, p. 40); phasing out of quantitative quotas over a sufficient period to avoid hardship (p. 41); orderly timing in eliminating exchange controls and quantitative restrictions on imports (p. 44); etc."

[4] A statement on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED (April 1962).

[5] Memoranda of comment, reservation, or dissent by Frederick R. Kappel: "It seems unrealistic to recommend that our tariff reduction authority under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 be used on behalf of Japanese exports. Since the Japanese have made greater use of tariff and quota protection, more emphasis should be placed on the possibility of trade concessions on their part as an instrument in bargaining for the lowering of restrictions on Japanese exports."

However, Japan has in recent years been exchanging trade missions with Russia, the East European Communist countries, and with Red China. Japanese trade with bloc countries is still very small, but it is growing. In theory, at least, Japan can see in the need of the Communist countries for capital goods, and in the possible supplies from Communist countries of raw materials that Japan needs, a basis for large scale Japanese-bloc trade.

The practical outlook, however, is not for any large increase in the near future. In 1961, in the first year of a 3-year trade agreement with the U.S.S.R., and on the basis of new trade contracts with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Communist China, Japan exported $103 million worth of commodities to bloc countries, and imported commodities valued at $217 million. This was about 2.6 percent of Japan's world exports in 1961, and 3.7 percent of her imports, around a tenth of Japan's prewar trade with countries now in the Sino-Soviet bloc.

According to what has become known of bloc offers to the Japanese, the bloc countries have been able to promise Japan only limited additional amounts of raw materials. Japan has no strong interest in making substantial exports to the Communist countries on credit. These two conditions appear to limit the possibilities of Japanese-bloc trade, under present conditions, to fairly small amounts. However, Japan appears to be anxious to exploit fully the present possibilities of trade with the bloc, and to widen them if feasible.

Japan embargoes the shipment of military and strategic goods to bloc countries, in line with general free world policy.

The free world needs a new set of principles that will be followed by all members in trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. In the absence of such principles there are two important things to say about Japan's position.

First, Japan's trade with the bloc is now much smaller than that of several West European countries. Thus, the problem of trade with the bloc is not primarily a Japanese problem.

Second, the tendency of Japan to seek Sino-Soviet bloc trade will be influenced by the terms of her economic relations with the West. The importance of avoiding the possibility of Japanese dependence on trade with the bloc is another reason, in addition to those discussed earlier, for liberalizing trade relations between Japan and the West.

7. JAPANESE REMOVAL OF BARRIERS TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Japanese protectionism has come to include major restraints upon foreign investment in Japan. This has deprived Japan of some useful foreign exchange. More importantly, however, it has tended to protect Japanese businesses from the competition of foreign ideas and business practices, and has limited the direct benefit to the Japanese economy that would come from introduction of specialized managerial and technical know-how.

As a result of Japanese policy, foreign investment since World War II has increased only slightly in Japan, while it has grown greatly elsewhere. It has been restrained in Japan because Japan has effectively restricted the permissible variety of investments. Those foreign investors who felt justified in risking their knowledge and their funds only on the basis of direct investments in businesses that they would manage themselves have found themselves largely barred from Japan.

The Japanese have sought, instead, foreign loans, secured through the sale abroad of Japanese Government and other bonds. The foreign investor who was interested in a simple portfolio or equity investment in Japanese shares has been discouraged by restrictions on his right to sell the shares and repatriate his investment. The waiting period for withdrawal of capital invested in shares has recently been reduced from 2 years to 6 months.

A more important problem, however, relates to direct investment by foreign firms. Such firms can invest in Japan with or without advance assurance that they will be able to repatriate their capital. The governmental authorities have been extremely reluctant to give advance assurance. Advance permission to repatriate capital has apparently been granted chiefly where the investment involved advanced technology the Japanese authorities regarded as highly desirable and where the technology could not be otherwise obtained. Generally, the Japanese have preferred to obtain technology through licensing or management contract arrangements.

But the matter of repatriation of capital is in practice less important than the right to enter, to say, and to grow with the Japanese economy without undue restriction. To an excessive extent, Japanese Government approvals required by an enterprise have been subject to the condition that the foreign firm enter into partnership with a Japanese firm in setting up a jointly-owned subsidiary. In arrangements of this type the foreign firm has not been allowed more than 50 percent ownership in the Japanese subsidiary.

Japan adopted restraints upon foreign investment on the grounds that the foreign funds might be recalled from Japan in sudden movements large enough to plunge her into balance of payments crises. However, the provisions have come to be a shelter for Japanese business from foreign competition. We regard this as having the same damaging effect upon efficiency and growth as do other kinds of limitations upon the freedom of new business competition to set up and operate. Not only is the flow of the latest and best technology to Japan reduced, but Japan is also deprived of the abilities of foreign management trained in the use of the technology that the investment brings with it. We do not deprive ourselves of these benefits: foreign investors are privileged to establish wholly owned and managed firms in the United States.

As to the effects of foreign equity investment on Japan's balance of payments position, it seems to us that, under normal conditions, a more liberal welcome for investment would add significantly to the foreign exchange available to Japan. Japan's balance of payments position would normally, therefore, be eased. In practice private investors do not often repatriate their invested capital. They take home a portion of the new income they have created, as reflected in their earnings, but a substantial portion of their earnings is normally reinvested to expand their original investment stake.

In some cases the difficulty encountered by foreign enterprises in establishing themselves in Japan has caused them to invest in other nearby places, such as Hong Kong or Formosa. Thus Japanese businesses have not escaped the competition of foreign enterprise but Japan has missed the advantage of having the investment in its own country.

There seems to be fear in some quarters in Japan that the increase of direct foreign investment would compromise the independence of Japan. This fear is groundless. On the contrary, it is the foreign investor who gives hostages and subjects himself to the control of the government of the country he enters. The assurance the foreign investor has of fair treatment—an assurance now inadequate in much of the world—comes not from the power of the investor or of his native country but from the host country's awareness of the benefits it derives from foreign investment.

We regard Japan's hesitancy to permit entry of foreign enterprise in its economy as a major deficiency of Japanese foreign economic policy, and as a major obstacle to the full inclusion of Japan as a partner in the free world economic system.

We recommend that Japan dismantle its barriers to equity investment in Japan by foreign firms, and that it permit foreign investors freedom to establish wholly owned and managed branches in Japan comparable to the freedom which Japanese investors enjoy in the United States.

"The free world is in motion, as a result of external pressure and internal dynamism. We must act to give this motion the direction we prefer, before ideas and institutions are set on some other course." This observation, from a statement of this Committee cited earlier,[6] applies with particular strength to Japan. Certainly no part of the free world exceeds Japan in internal dynamism, affecting not only her economic size but also her social structure. Already a great force in the world, she will surely become a greater one.

Incorporated as an equal partner in the free world, Japan has much to contribute and much to gain, not only in economic efficiency but also in movement toward a less divided, less fearful, and freer world. If she is shut off from that status by Western neglect and insularism at home, no one can tell in what direction Japan's dynamism may move the course of history.

There now exists, in the fluid state of international economic policy, an unusual opportunity to develop much closer economic ties between Japan and the West based on the principle of reciprocal advantages. By taking this opportunity while it is available, the trading partners will not only serve mutual interests but at the same time will contribute to the political and economic strength of the entire free world community.[7]

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1963]

Nippon's Obvious Affluence Has Deceptive Side—Automation Distorts Picture as Much as the Kimonos Do

(By Rafael Steinberg)

Tokyo.—Years ago, in a tiny bay on Japan's Inland Sea, a shipbuilding company used to celebrate a launching by passing out to all the workers ceremonial red and white rice cakes called tori-no-ko mochi, and by giving everyone a day off.

---

[6] "A New Trade Policy of the United States" (April 1962).

[7] Memorandum of comment, reservation, or dissent, by Thomas Roy Jones: "This footnote is by way of an obiter dictum which in no way subtracts from or adds to the recommendations of this report in the preparation of which the writer had an active part. The writer believes that multilateral free trade amongst free nations, attained in an orderly and just fashion, is both desirable and inevitable. However, if our present course of rising costs is continued, he foresees certain dangers for the United States. If labor costs of this country continue to rise and tax and other burdens imposed by Government on business combine to keep this country at a disadvantage in the cost of those products with high labor content, the United States may find itself in the position of being an exporter of products with a low labor content and an importer of products with a high labor content. The consequent effect on unemployment is obvious. Even if a high rate of employment could be maintained under these conditions, the Nation would be exporting irreplaceable resources or resources difficult or slow of replacement for the freely replaceable labor content of other countries."

The rice cakes are a thing of the past, but last year the shipyard launched more tonnage than any other yard in the world. Instead of mochi, the company gave the workers a bigger year-end bonus than usual, and there are no extra days off for launchings because there are always new keels to be laid.

Anywhere in Japan, you can send out for home deliveries of sushi (raw fish and rice), and this delicacy has always arrived in graceful lacquered wooden trays which the delivery boy would come around to pick up the next morning.

But now the sushi shops can't find enough delivery boys to afford two trips for every order, so in many places sushi is packed in plain plastic boxes that look as if they belonged in an American supermarket, and the customer can keep them for refrigerator trays.

What's more, this labor shortage—the only one in Asia—has encouraged the development of automatic vending machines, supermarkets, and instant soy bean soup, while electronic computers are taking the place of abacus operators and a new train will be able to stop and start without an operator.

THE GUIDEBOOK VIEW

First-time visitors to Japan, who arrive with images of geisha girls, tea ceremony, and cherry blossoms, are bowled over by these visible signs of modernity and economic progress. It seems to them impossible to believe that this highly industrialized, active nation, with its fast express trains, air-conditioned office buildings, and automated factories, is the same exotic, backward land the guidebooks still talk about.

From tori-no-ko mochi and exquisite tableware to oil tankers and microwave relays seems too big a jump.

Are Japanese supposed to be polite and old-worldly? Watch the rush-hour stampedes in the subways.

Are they dedicated to beauty and symmetry? Look at Tokyo. Are they quaint? See the businessman with his golf clubs.

Do the Japaneses subsist on dried fish and a bowl of rice? Peek at the meat and bread in the housewife's shopping basket.

Are they short, stocky, and bowlegged? Feast your eyes on that long-limbed young beauty strolling down the Ginza in high heels, Paris dress, and Jacqueline Kennedy hairdo.

Are the farmers peasants? Examine the electric water pumps at the wells, the tiny tractors, the TV aerials on the thatch roofs.

Is the Japanese spirit spartan and frugal? Look around at the advertising signs, the purple shirts, the expense accounts, the rising prices that shoppers no longer haggle over.

Is the quiet contemplation of eternal verities a Japanese and Zen Buddhist trait? Listen to the rat-tat of the riveter, the thump of the piledriver, the roar of the dump trucks.

THE INABILITY PERSISTS

From these sights and sounds, the visitor could come away with an impression as distorted as the one he arrived with. He is apt to think that Japan has completed the transition from a feudal to a democratic society, from economic backwardness to modern technology, from Asian poverty to a society of affluence.

Such is not quite the case. Despite the 9 percent yearly average growth rate of the Japanese economy that has increased the per capita income from $258 in 1958 to $416 in 1961 (and an estimated $450 last year), so many points of instability and obsolescence remain that the country's politicians and businessmen still hesitate to take the economic leadership of free Asia—a role Western leaders want them to assume.

Commenting on American urging that Japan give more aid to the developing nations, and join more wholeheartedly with the United States in helping to lower world trade barriers, Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohira recently explained that "we in Japan see our role as the establishment in our country of a free, stable, democratic order * * * a Japan that can stand on its own feet, that is self-supporting and does not need to ask for outside assistance. * * * We feel we still have some way to go."

"I wonder if the United States realizes what we consider to be our role," he muses. "We think that the United States believes Japan has already established this orderly and stable government, and therefore expects us to shoulder more responsibilities. * * * But we have to create a healthier and stronger domestic situation first."

To be sure, politics plays a part in this hesitation. Japan's Socialist Party, which can be noisy and disruptive when aroused, automatically opposes whatever it considers to be in the interests of "American imperialism" and government leaders must go slow.

And much of the reluctance to shoulder responsibilities is merely the application of natural self-interest—an attitude that kept Japan free of foreign domination while other countries in Asia were becoming colonies, and that in large part is responsible for her fortunate position today.

But the Japanese point out several economic facts which they say are unique and which they claim make it impossible for them, despite their surface prosperity, to take what Western leaders consider to be their "rightful place in the economy of the free world."

Without attempting to make any final judgments, it is worth considering the economic problems that Ohira sums up as Japan's attempt "to catch up with the world."

It is not just a question of whether the economy is doing well or badly at the moment. (Actually, it seems to be pulling out of a temporary recession.) The more pertinent question is whether Japan will be able to carry out Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's famous "income-doubling" plan in the 1960s, and what will happen to the country in the process.

Specifically, it is a question of the future of that sushi shop delivery boy who no longer comes for the lacquered trays, and his employer, the shop owner. And it is a question of what will happen to the majority of the Nation's industrial laborers who work in small shops and factories with inefficient machines, at relatively low wages.

Faced by competition from foreign goods, which Japan has pledged to admit more freely, will they be driven to the wall? And will the big firms, which pay better wages to their own employes but which depend on these small enterprises for component parts and for distribution, also go bankrupt?

To improve productivity, the government is encouraging more and more workers to abandon the farms and small shops for the more efficient, better-paying, large modern plants, where they will live in company dormitories, eat company food, take vacations together at company resorts. Will this contribute to democracy and individualism, so difficult to take root in Japan anyway, or will it merely pave the way for another form of communal living?

If Japan is to expand her exports, compete in world markets, her industries have to modernize even further, her ports and roads must be expanded and improved. As the labor shortage worsens in the 1970s thanks to birth control and abortion in the fifties, it will become more imperative than ever that all of Japan's workers attain a high rate of productivity.

But what will happen to the inefficient worker too old to learn a new trade? He is not a fringe minority. He represents a large proportion of the working force, and under the old system he would never be laid off no matter how useless he became. But will his employer be able to live up to this traditional obligation and still compete with the manufacturer in Germany or the United States who pays for work performed?

The Japanese have no confident answers for those questions. Their predictions have not been very accurate in the past, and already there is serious talk of revising Ikeda's 10-year income-doubling plan.

First advanced in 1959, the plan became official government policy when Ikeda took over as Prime Minister in 1960. It calls for an average annual growth of 7.2 percent in the gross national project for 10 years with an eye to "catching up to Europe's standard of living" by 1980.

But in 1961, the first year, actual growth was 14 percent. This "overheated" growth also resulted, alarmingly, in such an increase in capital equipment investment that the 1970 figure for investments was attained in the very first year.

This was nearly disastrous. Since much of this investment was in the form of modern machinery imported from abroad—machinery which Japan, of course, sorely needed—Japan suddenly found herself with a balance-of-payments problem, a labor shortage (as people were needed to man the expanded plants) and, shortly thereafter, surplus production of heavy industrial products.

Technical measures such as raising the bank rate, cooled the excessive growth, curbed investment, and managed to get international payments back on an even keel. Growth in 1962 was only about 4 percent.

But this amounted to a recession, from which the country is only now emerging. Because money was tight, businessmen used up stockpiles rather than buy, so the problem of surplus production worsened and there was a scramble for export expansion.

But while the surplus forced down domestic prices of such commodities as steel, consumer prices rose drastically—and are still going up—as farm production fell and urban workers, employed in constructing the new plants or running them, found themselves richer than ever.

The government had forecast a consumer price rise of 2.8 percent last year, but the actual increase was 6.7 percent. The danger of inflation is the government's most pressing single economic problem.

The problem is to keep the modern section of the economy from expanding so fast that prices run away, and at the same time to encourage the modernization of the backward sectors and the roads, harbors, and utilities that are still far from sufficient to support the kind of technological society that the Japanese dream about.

The problem will be made more difficult by the fact that Japan's huge labor pool, which supplied the muscle for the expansion so far, will reach a peak in the next couple of years and then start to decline. And, ready or not, Japan will have to open her doors to more foreign products or risk losing the chance to expand her exports.

Yet no one doubts the capacity of the highly literate, skilled and ambitious Japanese to solve these problems, and others. For despite all the transformations that have taken place here since the war, most Japanese still retain the single-minded purposefulness, the willingness to submerge individual ambitions and interests for what they consider to be the good of the community and the nation, that enabled them to leap from crumbling feudalism to modern statehood in two generations, and from defeat and devastation to prosperity and prominence in less than one.

It's not rugged individualism, or Jeffersonian democracy, but it works in Japan, and it seems to be what the Japanese want.

Only by following her own path can Japan attain an influential position in the world. "We want to be a bridge between the industrialized nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa," Prime Minister Ikeda has said. "We understand them both."

PRIME MINISTER SENDS GREETINGS

"The promotion of true understanding between Japan and the United States is, in my view, a task of prime importance, for upon such understanding rests the effective cooperation between the free peoples of our two nations in the common pursuit of the ideals of peace and progress.

"In expressing my appreciation to the Washington Post for its many contributions to the strengthening and deepening of this understanding, I wish to take advantage of this special supplement to extend greetings to the people of the United States and to reaffirm our dedication to the goal we share: that truth, justice, and freedom shall prevail among all peoples of this world.

"HAYATO IKEDA,
"Prime Minister of Japan."

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 11, 1963]

JAPAN'S DEMOCRACY: A WESTERN INSTITUTION IS RESHAPED IN SMALL TOWNS

(By Igor Oganesoff)

MISHIMA, JAPAN.—Half a dozen years ago, the elder citizens of this bustling town decided to find a sister city in the United States for cultural exchange and hit upon Pasadena, Calif., as the most suitable choice. Culturally, of course, there isn't much similarity between the two communities. But a visitor here quickly notes that democratic practices, as imposed by the American occupation after the war, have taken firm root in small-town Japan, though they've been reshaped by traditional mores.

Mishima, with its 68,000 inhabitants, nestles at the foot of the Hakone Mountains about 70 miles southwest of Tokyo. Traditionally, it is one of the 53 stopping places for weary travelers on horseback or foot on the historic Tokaido route between Tokyo and the commercial center of Osaka. Decorative pink and blue neon lights are strung along the paved main thoroughfare, which is the Tokaido, lending a permanently festive air to the town.

The mammoth wooden arch of the Shinto Grand Shrine of Mishima, 300 years old, today contrasts with the clean modernity of Tokyo Rayon Co.'s nylon plant, one of several industries in the town. In the farmlands of the township, rice is the main crop but farmers also grow carrots, radishes and cabbage in the nearby hills, along with big, juicy strawberries.

HARDLY ANY PROBLEMS

Off the highway near the edge of town stands Mishima's modernistic, white brick city hall, completed in late 1960. Here, in a spacious conference room, tastefully decorated in Western style, stocky 40-year-old Mayor Taizo Hasegawa discourses on Japanese municipal politics and administration. He made his first trip to Pasadena last December and his conference room is stacked with abstract paintings by Pasadena artists, soon to be put on exhibition as part of the cultural exchange program.

Mayor Hasegawa cheerfully observes that his prospering town has hardly any problems at all, save a nagging but not critical water shortage. Paradoxically, he also complains that he has barely enough time on a weekend to read a few pages of a Japanese best seller, much less indulge in other recreation. And it quickly develops that his honor's crammed schedule is far less the product of actual chores than social obligations imposed by Japanese custom.

Thus, three or four times a week he attends meetings of various citizens' groups: Housewives, shopkeepers, factory workers, religious organizations, and the like. He makes frequent speeches in Mishima's nine elementary and nine high schools, as well as in the local branch of the national Nihon University, a private institution. Here, of course, citizens get an opportunity to air any gripes they have such as the current water problem. But Mishima's busy, contented populace really haven't enough things to discuss to warrant such imposition on the mayor's time. And, like most Japanese, they are inclined to take life, ungrudgingly, pretty much as it comes.

"Actually, in Japanese custom now, this kind of contact is simply expected of him," one of the mayor's aids explains. "He must get to know the people so he can serve them." However, this official admits that, while such practice admirably serves democratic ends, here it is more a matter of form than substance. This form is ingrained in the paternalism of the traditional Japanese feudal system, though today it can certainly help the mayor to get reelected.

STRIVE FOR UNANIMITY

A bit different are Mayor Hasegawa's activities in currying the favor of the city council, an elected, 30-member body which passes ordinances and approves city projects. Never once, in his 30-month tenure, has the city council denied any proposal of the mayor. But this encouraging record isn't enough in Japan.

What the mayor strives for is complete unanimity within the council, a penchant common on all levels of national and local government in Japan. No politician is content simply with passage of his proposals by a strong majority; he feels compelled to bring opponents into line, and to make sure that everyone is satisfied at least to the point of withdrawing open opposition.

Mayor Hasegawa describes himself as an independent and declines to be drawn into discussion of broader issues. "The mayor of a small town should not have party affiliations," he says, sipping from a cup of green tea. "I am interested only in the welfare of Mishima town." He is, by standards of Mishima, a highly successful businessman, which serves to orient his political views toward the conservative side. Mr. Hasegawa owned a furniture factory and store, which he had to turn over legally to his wife when he was elected mayor. The couple and their three young children live in a rambling, straw-matted house, containing a modern, Western-style living room, behind the furniture store.

CAMPAIGN OUTLAY LIMITED

The mayor started his political career on the part-time city council where he served a term and a half, or 6 years, for which he was paid the equivalent of $70 a month. Though he claims he had no support from other members of the council, Mr. Hasegawa received enough encouragement from other influential citizens to run for mayor against the incumbent, a member of Japan's ruling conservative Liberal-Democratic Party, who was criticized for his aloofness to Mishima's citizens. Because Japanese law forbids a majority candidate in a town the size of Mishima to spend more than $1,400, Mr. Hasegawa was able to finance the campaign from his own savings.

Once in office, by a handsome majority, the Japanese system made his job simpler in one way: There is virtually no patronage system in smaller cities. City employees up through the top rank are almost invariably civil service and firing any administrator is almost taboo. So, other than bringing in a couple of supporters as personal assistants, Mr. Hasegawa made no political appointments and his election supporters merely went back to their regular occupations after the election.

The spectacled mayor proudly points out that, thanks to the construction of the nylon plant and branch factories of a national drug firm and a confectionery concern, Mishima has boosted its wage levels and eliminated unemployment. Average family income of salaried employees runs about $117 monthly, with savings averaging $16, significantly above national average. Drop in at Hiroshi Yamato's tiny fish restaurant and he tells you he owns a station wagon for his business and a sedan, also of Japanese make, for personal use. Television antennas sprout from nearly every roof and the town's 10 small movie theaters and 15 old-fashioned inns are doing brisk business.

FACTORIES SUPPLY HOUSING

The new factories, as is Japanese custom, provide their own housing for workers so Mishima has been spared overcrowding from the influx of technical and administrative employees. But Mayor Hasegawa is putting through a scheme to build city-owned private houses to rent to local people who want to improve their dwelling place and to attract newcomers.

The industrialization of Mishima in the last few years, however, has also brought the town its only major problem. The plants have diverted much of the city's water supply, so that faucets sometimes produce little more than a trickle and farmers aren't getting quite enough for their crops. Mr. Hasegawa's office is now conducting surveys on new water sources and studying plans for a small dam for irrigation purposes.

Mishima's total city budget this year runs around $1.2 million, of which a local residence tax, based on income and applied uniformly all over Japan, provides two-thirds. The National Government kicked in $150,000 and the rest came from city real estate and utilities taxes. One-quarter of Mishima's municipal expenditure, the biggest chunk, goes into education.

In addition to his monthly salary of $280, the mayor has a personal expense fund of $230 each month. He makes weekly trips to Shizuoka, the prefectural capital, and to Tokyo on occasion for official business. He also regularly entertains some of Mishima's influential townsmen at a local bar or restaurant, sometimes calling in a couple of the city's 40 geisha girls to pour sake or chant folksongs. And he seems to find this blend of Western democracy and Japanese custom as rewarding as the rest of Mishima's citizenry does.

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 1693 ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, according to an editorial in a recent edition of the Sunday Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, "the racial issue is the greatest single unfinished piece of domestic business in the United States."

Recent events in Birmingham, Philadelphia, and other parts of the Nation seem to underline this fact increasingly.

One of the key issues at stake in these areas of strife is the denial to American citizens first amendment freedoms to assemble and petition for redress of their grievances.

Yet, there exists at the present time no Federal law enabling the Attorney General to go into court and secure these rights for Americans.

The Attorney General himself has said that he has no authority to bring such suits because Congress did not pass any legislation giving him the authority to protect the constitutional rights to equal opportunity.

He pointed out that the Federal courts, for example, have ruled in recent cases that the Justice Department does not have the right to sue for desegregation of schools in the absence of congressional action.

To protect these rights effectively, I am cosponsoring a bill, numbered S. 1693, which would empower the Attorney General to institute civil proceedings for injunctive and other relief to redress all deprivations of constitutional rights.

This measure was proposed originally by President Eisenhower, and it deserves renewed consideration today.

I believe that this proposal would be a significant step forward in the present racial crisis.

THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE SHOULD CONDUCT A FAIR TEST OF KREBIOZEN NOW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, now that Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic have filed a plan with the Food and Drug Administration for Krebiozen, there is no excuse for the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration to delay further a fair test of Krebiozen.

Obstacles to a fair test for Krebiozen have been erected and maintained for years due to the obstinate and often irrational opposition to a fair test by organized medicine and especially the American Medical Association. Their influence has dominated both the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration which should act in the public interest and as objective governmental agencies and not as pawns for organized medicine.

REASONS FOR A FAIR TEST

There are two general reasons and three specific reasons why a fair test for Krebiozen by the National Cancer Institute should proceed immediately.

The two general reasons are:

NONTOXIC DRUG

First. The drug is nontoxic, and no responsible source even among its opponents has claimed otherwise. It has been used on thousands of patients without harmful side effects. This is admitted by proponents and opponents alike.

HUNDREDS OF SUBSTANCES TESTED

Second. The National Cancer Institute has tested, literally, hundreds of substances for possible use in the management of cancer. Some of these have had toxic side effects. Few of them have had anything like the objective evidence to justify testing that is available on Krebiozen.

The three specific reasons why a test is justified are:

THE STANDING OF DR. IVY

First. The generally acknowledged ability and standing of its chief sponsor, Dr. Andrew Ivy.

Dr. Ivy set up the Naval Medical Research Institute at Bethesda and served as its director for nearly a year.

Dr. Ivy was president of the American Physiological Society from 1939 to 1941.

Dr. Ivy was selected by the American Medical Association's board of trustees to represent the allied governments at the trials of the German medical men after World War II.

Dr. Ivy was vice president of the University of Illinois and was in charge of its medical schools.

Dr. Ivy has contributed a dozen or more papers on cancer research, either alone or with others, to the leading medical journals.

Dr. Ivy has discovered a number of the hormones of the human body.

Dr. Ivy was named executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council—1947–51—and advised the U.S. Public Health Service on cancer research because of his wide knowledge and background.

Dr. Ivy was a director of the American Cancer Society.

Dr. Ivy is one of the foremost pathologists and medical and cancer research experts in the country today.

STATISTICAL AND OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE

Second. The drug should be tested because of the vast statistical and objective evidence submitted by Dr. Ivy to the National Cancer Institute. The statistical information was for 4,200 cases and for 35 tumor types treated with Krebiozen. It indicated that the tumor was decreased on the average in 35 percent of the cases, varying with the kind of tumor. The tumor was arrested in 51 percent of the cases. In 14 percent of the cases the tumor was unaffected or increased.

In addition, the clinical records on several hundred cases are now actually in the hands of the Food and Drug Administration. Most of these have been collected by the Food and Drug Administration.

These latter records, which include biopsy reports which prove the patients had cancer, and the physicians' reports of the actual regression of the tumors in some cases, and the relief of pain in many others, are far more adequate, factual, and scientific evidence than the records and information which have led to the testing of literally hundreds of other substances.

THE PATIENTS THEMSELVES

Third. I personally have talked with and heard the stories of over 100 patients. They have not merely said that Krebiozen was helpful to them in the sense that it created a general sense of euphoria or eased pain, but many of them have come with medical records and biopsy reports from reputable physicians that they had cancer.

Many of them believe they are alive today because of this drug. Some of their records indicate they must have Krebiozen to survive. They believe that Krebiozen, like insulin for the diabetic, is a matter of life and death for them.

Since a natural regression of a malignant tumor occurs only very rarely—estimates are only one in tens of thousands, and I am told that many physicians practice for life without seeing such a case—the physical presence of these patients is extremely persuasive evidence of the drug's beneficial effects.

EVIDENCE MORE THAN ADEQUATE FOR A FAIR TEST

These reasons and this evidence does not lead me to take the position that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer. I would not be so unscientific. Dr. Ivy does not take such a position.

The position I take is that these facts are more than adequate to justify a fair test for Krebiozen and a fair test now. And a fair test means one by those who are not hostile to the drug or one set up and carried out by hostile and prejudiced persons.

What do the opponents of Krebiozen and the AMA have to fear? If the substance is worthless, a truly fair test will show that. If they are so certain it is worthless, why do they continue to object to a fair test?

The National Cancer Institute now has enough objective evidence before it to start to test now. Dr. Endicott of the National Cancer Institute indicated to me in a private conversation that there is no need for further animal tests because the drug is admittedly nontoxic and thousands of human patients have already used the drug without toxic effects.

I think there should be a test now. While I cannot speak officially for others in the Congress, I do know that dozens of others share my view that there should now be a fair test of the drug.

I hope the Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration will get on with the test and not carry out delaying tactics intended to keep the program in perpetual limbo.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, some time ago, I introduced S. 1093, which was also sponsored by Senators McClellan, Mundt, Byrd, Williams of Delaware, Thurmond, Tower, Miller, and Dirksen.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a policy leading to the gradual elimination, insofar as possible, of Federal Government competition with the free enterprise system, whose taxes pay in great part for the Federal competitive activities. Early action on the bill is urgently needed, particularly as we see the Federal Government initiating more and more activities which could just as well be carried out by the private sector of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Iron Age magazine for June 13 on this topic be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Must We Relearn Hard-Learned Truth From Others?

Getting Government out of competition with private industry has long been a rallying cry of businessmen.

So far, it has had little effect. Maybe people are tired of hearing about it. Or they figure Government has been in private business areas so long there's no use fighting it.

Then, too, there are those who see nothing wrong in all of this. They believe Government-operated businesses are more efficient or offer better value for the money. We are not talking about Government operations necessary for national security.

There has been some nibbling at the problem over the years. Studies upon studies have been made. Invariably, they turn up cases of inefficiency and waste. And with them strong recommendations urging less Government competition with business.

Based on these reports, some of this has been done. The Government no longer operates a barge line in Mississippi. Synthetic rubber and some World War II defense plants have been sold off at a small percent on the dollar. They became taxpayers.

However, there's still a long way to go.

For example, the Government still operates shipyards built for the World War II peak. This is in face of expert opinion which claims Navy vessels can be built in private yards for 15 to 25 percent less. This would save millions of dollars.

If anything, the battle to keep Government out of competition is losing ground. The Government has entered new areas in recent years. Activities are operated that should have been dropped long ago. Some estimates put the increase in Government activities under this administration at $2 billion.

The fact is, no one can say accurately how much the Government has invested in business operations. The low figure often used is $30 billion. Some say it may run five times that figure—or more.

This is too big an amount for most people to contemplate—perhaps too big to jar them out of their complacency. If so, then we might take a tip from one of our hard-hitting allies and competitors—West Germany.

This government has had plenty of past experience with governmental control of business. Yet, in recent times it has gone about shucking off businesses such as shipyards, steel mills, iron ore mines, and power stations. It has put almost none under government control.

So it seems that others are now teaching us the hard-learned lessons of free enterprise.

Fortunately, all have not given up the fight to get Government out of business. There are now five bills before Congress, all pretty much directed to the same end.

If any of them get through, they will go a long way to setting things to rights again. Freed businesses would lessen the tax burden and add to tax revenues.

This is one way to get this country moving.

EUGENE C. BEAUDET, *Editor*.

CONGRESS, TOO, HAS CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have been grateful this year, as in the past to cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. Case] measures designed to subject Congress to the same ethical standards as we demand from the executive and judiciary. Senator Case's devotion to the cause of ethics in Government is unparalleled and his craftsmanship in formulating an articulate and legislative scheme for achieving these ends must surely commend itself to the conscience of this body.

S. 1261, which we have proposed, is based upon the premise that full disclosure of financial interests offers the most effective protection against the misuse of public position for private gain. We believe that a requirement of full disclosure of the facts is a far more workable approach than an attempt by law to draw a precise line between proper and improper interests, relationships, and conduct.

In an article published in the New York Times magazine on May 19, 1963, Senator Case forcibly stated the need for public disclosure by Members of Congress and top staff of the legislative branch, of their financial interests and their dealings with executive agencies at the behest of a party in interest.

Senator Case writes:

> Public disclosure is not a new principle. Preventive rather than punitive in approach, it already applies, in part, to the field of campaign contributions and expenditures. It is particularly appropriate in an area where flat prohibition might raise questions of infringement upon the right of the people to elect the representative of their choice, be he rogue or shining knight. Certainly, it would help to give the electorate a better basis on which to judge their representatives' actions.

I ask unanimous consent that this admirable article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress, Too, Has Conflicts of Interests

(By Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey)

The Congress is taking a beating. But I am afraid that, at least to some extent, it has had it coming. For too long Congress has followed a double standard of conduct, preaching one thing and often permitting its Members to practice another.

In recent weeks the press has highlighted accounts of high living abroad on committee expense accounts, no-show relatives on congressional payrolls, millions of dollars for new congressional offices, allegations of personal profiteering from inside knowledge of congressional plans, suggestions of improper influence in behalf of certain would-be Government contractors.

Taken all together, they add up to a most unattractive picture. No matter that it is distorted, that for the misdeeds of a few the whole Congress is maligned. Many an average citizen finds in such accounts confirmation of a cynical view of politicians toward which he is already disposed.

The extent to which the double standard prevails in Washington shows up sharply in the way Congress deals with conflict-of-interest problems of members of the executive branch and the way it handles, or does not handle, those of its own Members and staff.

I remember, for example, a meeting a few years ago of the Senate Commerce Committee, of which I was then a member, on a Presidential nomination for a vacancy on the Federal Communications Commission. The nominee, a lawyer by profession, had previously served the Government with distinction. His qualifications were not questioned. Nonetheless, he was there to withdraw his nomination. The explanation helps to highlight the double standard that today prevails in Washington:

The Federal Communications Act forbids any member or employee of the Commission to have any financial interest in the manufacture or sale of communications equipment. Indeed, the prohibiton is so stringent that it extends to an interest in a company owning stock in a manufacturing or sales company in the communications field.

As it happened, the nominee had a prudent father. Some years before he had established a small, irrevocable trust fund for his two sons, to be managed by trustees outside the family. Soon after its establishment the trustees invested a portion of the funds in stock of a well-known electrical firm which manufactures communications equipment. Over the years the stock had greatly increased in value and at the time of the hearing the trustees could not justify its sale, in the light of their fiduciary duty. Since neither beneficiary had any control over the investments made by the trust and the trust itself was irrevocable, there was no way in which the nominee could divest himself of this involuntary financial interest.

The committee agreed that it came within the proscription of the act. The provisions of the act are clear, and I do not question them or the rightness of the decision to withdraw. But I could not help thinking of the contrast between the stringent restrictions on membership on the Federal Communications Commission and the complete absence of any restriction on membership on the Senate committee that oversees the FCC and passes on legislation in the communications field.

Another hearing on a Presidential nomination comes to mind. The nominee, from private industry, had worked for his firm through the first 6 months of the year in which he was nominated. He had relinquished all financial interest in the firm, which did some work for the Government, but was hopeful that he might be permitted to take half of the year's share in the profit-sharing plan of the company.

With some reluctance, I felt obliged to point out that this seemed inconsistent with the clear intent of the law, since the company's profits were calculated on a yearly basis and the value of a 6-month's share would be determined partly by the profits realized in the second half of the year. The committee agreed.

Again our action highlighted the difference between standards applied to executive appointees and the Members of Congress. For Members of Congress may, and do, sit on committees which act on measures that, directly or indirectly, affect their personal financial interests. And, on occasion, Members of Congress have attempted to influence the actions or decisions of an executive agency from which they stood to benefit personally.

Certain provisions of our conflict-of-interest statute do apply to the Members of Congress. It is a crime, for example, under one section of the United States Code for a Member of Congress, as well as any officer or employee of the United States, directly or indirectly to receive compensation for any service rendered either by himself or by another in a matter in which the United States is a party. And Members of Congress have been convicted for violating this ban.

But other provisions omit mention of Members of Congress. One of them is the provision that led to the invalidation of the Dixon-Yates contract because one of the participants had acted for the Government in a matter in which his own firm had an interest.

Of the overall public policy embodied in this statute, Chief Justice Warren wrote in the Dixon-Yates case: "The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Bibical admonition that no man may serve two masters, Matthew vi: 24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms."

If this is good public policy for Congress to prescribe for the Government generally, is it any less good for Congress itself?

To put it another way: If a Member of Congress who is a stockholder acts in his congressional capacity to apply pressure on an executive agency to maintain or expand a program which will benefit the company in which he holds stock, is this any less reprehensible than if he were acting as a paid representative of the company? Does the fact that he is a Member of Congress dispel that possibility of suspicion which the statute seeks to avoid? If the doctrine, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country," is considered at best naive when expressed by a member of the executive branch, is it less so when proclaimed by a member of the legislative branch?

Perhaps it would be unrealistic to suggest that Members of Congress should be required to divest themselves of all financial interests which might conceivably be affected by legislation or by the action of executive agencies under the purview of a committee on which a Member serves. But should a Member of Congress, whose law firm represents a common carrier, act as a committee member, or vote on the floor, on measures affecting common carriers? Or should one with business associations in the mining industry pass on such measures as depletion allowances?

We expect a member of the judicial branch to disqualify himself from sitting in a case where his personal interests or associations might be thought to color his view. The same holds true for the executive branch. And the same practice should be followed in Congress.

It would, I think, be impossible to frame statutory provisions adequately dealing with this problem in the infinitely broad and varied situations with which Congress, and Members of Congress, have to deal. Yet there is, I believe, a way in which Congress can provide better protection than now exists for the public interest, and in a manner consonant with its elective status. That is by applying the principle of public disclosure to the financial interests of members and top staffs of the legislative branch and to their dealings with executive agencies at the behest of a party in interest.

Accordingly, first with Senator **RICHARD NEUBERGER** and later with his widow, Senator **MAURINE NEUBERGER**, I have proposed in this and three preceding Congresses legislation that would require that all top officials in the legislative, as well as the executive, branch report annually their sources of income, including gifts worth $100 or more, and their financial assets and liabilities. The reports would also include a statement of all dealings in securities or commodities and all purchases and sales of real property. They would be filed with the Comptroller General as public records available to both press and public.

A second part of our bill, in which Senator **JOSEPH S. CLARK** has now joined as cosponsor, would also apply the principle of disclosure to all oral or written communications to regulatory agencies, concerning particular cases, including communications from Members of Congress or members of the executive branch outside the agency involved. For example, all communications, routine or otherwise, from Members of Congress in behalf of a particular application for a broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission would be made a part of the public record of the proceeding.

Public disclosure is not a new principle. Preventive rather than punitive in approach, it already applies, in part, to the field of campaign contributions and expenditures. It is particularly appropriate in an area where flat prohibition might raise questions of infringement upon the right of the people to elect the representative of their choice, be he rogue or shining knight. Certainly, it would help to give the electorate a better basis on which to judge their representatives' actions.

To the Congress as a whole, and to individual Members of it, a requirement for disclosure of financial interests would be of benefit in helping to dispel the cynicism and disdain with which so many citizens view the political practitioner. This attitude is, I am convinced, for the most part unfair. In my experience, the great majority of Members of Congress are honest, conscientious men, trying to do the best job they can in the interests of the Nation and their State or district. Nonetheless, there is no denying the low estate in which politics is held by all too many of our citizens, as public-opinion polls have repeatedly shown.

For officials in the executive branch and particularly in regulatory and semijudicial agencies, the obligation to file regular financial reports would be both preventive and salutary. The maintenance of public confidence in the integrity of administrative processes is essential. With them rest determinations that may vitally affect the well-being of particular enterprises or industries and the communities of which these are part.

The necessity of making such a report would serve at least as a stop-and-think warning. At the same time, in conjunction with the requirement for disclosure of communications, it would tend to check the all too prevalent inclination to ascribe, without tangible ground, any particular decision to influence or a fix. Contrary to common supposition, these factors are, I believe, the exception rather than the rule.

Support for the principle of disclosure is growing. Other bills similar to ours have been introduced in the House and the Senate. Several candidates for high office have made public in one form or another their financial worth. Some Members of the Senate have publicly disclosed major investments. Not long ago the Secretary of Defense released a statement of his financial situation and holdings.

To accomplish the objective, however, disclosure should apply equally to all—and to the same extent. And it should include income from all sources and gifts.

Admittedly, Congress is historically loath to discipline itself, even in enlightened self-interest. But at the same time, the Members are generally sensitive to public opinion. With enough prodding, by both the public and the press, we will yet take, I believe, affirmative action to merit greater confidence and respect.

The simplest, most feasible, and, in the long run, most effective method of achieving that end is to assure the public and press continuous, ready access to all the facts relevant to the conduct of the Nation's legislative business.

PACIFIC TELEPHONE PLAYS ESSENTIAL ROLE IN ATTRACTING BUSINESSES TO CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read an informative and well-written pamphlet published by the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. for its employees. It deals principally with the job needs that have been created by California's population explosion—and the important part that advanced communications systems play in meeting this challenge.

I commend the pamphlet to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URGENT NEED IN CALIFORNIA, 1,750,000 NEW JOBS IN 7 YEARS—WHERE WILL THEY COME FROM?

In 1860, California had 379,994 people, New York State had 3,880,735. One hundred years later, California had 15,717,204 people, and New York had 16,782,304. Early in 1963, California passed New York as the most populous State of all.

This kind of growth results in tremendous new wealth and many other benefits. But it brings problems, too—and sometimes the problems seem to overshadow the bonanza. From border to border, communities must bear the burdens imposed by the need for new schools, roads, hospitals, water, and waste disposal systems, while utility companies must work at forced draft to supply the growing population with such essentials as gas, electricity, and communication services.

But perhaps the most important need of all is a steady supply of new jobs and work opportunities for payrolls to support the increasing population. Thousands of new jobs are needed every single month, and will be, so long as growth continues at or near the present rate. It is estimated that 1,750,000 new jobs will have to be created in California to support its growth between now and 1970.

Where will these jobs come from? Naturally, growth and expansion of businesses already here will provide many of them. But most of them can only come from new businesses, new factories, and other new enterprises that will be attracted to serve the vast, booming western markets, or to take advantage of special, favorable conditions. What is needed to attract these new enterprises to California? What factors are important to a prospective industrial newcomer?

With few exceptions, the Golden State offers the common essentials: water, transportation, fuels and electricity, manpower, raw materials, building sites, housing, educational and cultural advantages, climate, recreational facilities, and many other things.

Even more important, California offers potential manufacturers one of the world's largest and most promising markets for goods and services of every description. Markets, of course, are a basic requirement.

A favorable business climate is of great importance to industrial newcomers. The California State Legislature recognized this need in passing an assembly resolution. Its purpose is to caution against actions by the legislative or executive branches of the State government that might deter the investment of capital or the creation of needed payrolls.

Another factor of major importance to industrial growth is superior telephone service, and the growing range of advanced communication systems which spring from technical developments in this field. Communication is no longer simply telephones and teletypes. Being able to provide the complex systems offered by Pacific Telephone plays an essential role in attracting businesses to California.

Among these services are electronic data handling systems used in conjunction with regular telephones, closed circuit TV channels, facsimile transmission, nationwide dial teletypewriter networks, and many other modern innovations in service and equipment. These make it faster, easier and less costly for modern businesses and industries to meet their essential needs.

Steady improvement and expansion of telephone services in California has required enormous efforts, and expenditures by Pacific Telephone of more than $2¾ billion in the last 10 years. And this expansion must continue.

California already profits from this expansion in scores of important ways—in addition to improved telephone services. Thousands of new jobs have been created, and thousands more are supported by our huge construction program. The effect of these jobs is far-reaching. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, every 100 new factory workers bring to a community an average total of $710,000 more each year in personal income. This supports 65 more people in nonmanufacturing jobs. It buys 97 more cars. It supports 100 more households, 3 more retail establishments, and results in $331,000 more in retail sales per year.

But important as jobs are, our primary task at Pacific Telephone is to be sure that adequate modern communications will be available to meet the needs of California's growth. This requires an investment of well over $1 million every day for construction and facilities. The total for this year will be $412 million, and next year's needs will probably be similarly high.

Capital outlays of this magnitude are essential for our forward-looking program—a program which in itself will help to provide many of the needed 1,750,000 new jobs. But it takes a financially healthy company to make such huge expenditures, and this, of course, depends heavily on our earnings. For only through our ability to maintain adequate profits can we support the investment program needed to build ahead for California's future growth.

THE "CITY OF NEW ORLEANS" IS SUNK

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, regarding the bill S. 534, to authorize admittance of the vessel *City of New Orleans* to American registry. This bill was voted down by the Senate Committee on Commerce today. Senator GRUENING's testimony was a crucial factor in the defeat of this legislation which I have opposed. His statement before the committee is not only an eloquent argument against this legislation—it is a definitive outline of the transportation problems of Alaska. It deserves to be made a part of the permanent RECORD of this body.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, DEMOCRAT, OF ALASKA, ON S. 534, TO AUTHORIZE ADMITTANCE OF THE VESSEL "CITY OF NEW ORLEANS" TO AMERICAN REGISTRY, BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify on the bill, S. 534, which would permit the Alaska Steamship Co. to operate, in the domestic trade of the United States, a vessel built in Japan and now registered under the laws of the Republic of Liberia. I might say, parenthetically, that my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, who is now ably presiding, and I find ourselves in disagreement on this legislation, and it is the first time that we have differed on a piece of Alaska legislation. During the 4½ years we have served in the Senate we have thought and voted alike on matters dealing with our State, and pretty generally, though not invariably, on other matters. Perhaps this is the exception that proves the rule.

I intend to present reasons in opposition to this legislation in some detail. I will, first, demonstrate the serious threat this bill represents to the domestic economy and then examine the reasons it is particularly harmful to Alaska.

First, I would point out that a literal reading of the language of the bill does not describe its real purpose or give any hint of the gravity of its potential impact on the economy of the United States.

While S. 534 is a special privilege bill for the exclusive benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co., it is impossible to contend that, if this bill is passed, there will be any possibility of denying the same benefits to other carriers who prefer to buy cheap foreign ships to building new ships in American shipyards.

THERE ARE NO PRECEDENTS FOR THIS LEGISLATION

The proponents of this legislation have inferred there are a number of precedents for S. 534. In fact, there has never been legislation permitting use in the domestic trade of a large oceangoing ship of the size of the *City of New Orleans*, for the purpose for which it would be used by the Alaska Steamship Co. It is absurd to attempt a comparison of minor bills which have been enacted at previous sessions of Congress with this legislation, which is of major significance to the domestic shipping industry. Let us analyze other legislation to which the proponent has referred as exceptions to the cabotage laws and precedent for S. 534.

One of the precedents cited concerns a series of statutes that authorized Canadian vessels to service the Alaska port of Hyder, a small mining town located on a fjord which separates British Columbia from Alaska at its southern extremity. A look at a map of this area will immediately demonstrate the absurdity of comparison of this legislation with S. 534. Hyder, a community of 34 individuals, obviously would have very little freight delivered or exported. It lies on the Portland Canal, which separates British Columbia from Alaska at this point, and is approximately 100 miles long. This canal is traversed only by Canadian vessels, and it is not possible that an American-flag operator would be willing to service this town under any circumstances.

A second example concerns Public Law 217, 87th Congress, which authorized a 31-foot fishing boat *Acadia*, that was built in Nova Scotia, to be operated out of Portland, Maine, because the owner, in good faith, did not know that these laws existed.

A third example, Public Law 380, 76th Congress, admitted the American-owned barges *Prari* and *Palpa* to American registry, but these were small barges of no consequence.

A fourth example was Private Law 87–512, 87th Congress, permitting transfer of a 38-foot yacht, *Bar-Ho-Iv* from Canadian registry to American registry, but the vessel was built in the United States in the first place in 1950.

A fifth example, Public Law 119, 80th Congress, admitted the ferry *Crosline* to American registry, but she had been built in Seattle, Wash., in 1929 and transferred to Canadian registry and was being brought back by the State of Washington. This vessel was only 142 feet long.

A sixth example, Public Law 86–666, 80th Congress, permitted admission of the hydrofoil vessel *Flying Fish* to be used among points in Puerto Rico. There was no such type vessel available in American shipyards at this time and the vessel did not prove to be satisfactory and was withdrawn. She was 68 feet long.

A seventh example, Public Law 134, 77th Congress, permitted a Canadian passenger ship to travel between Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., for an American Legion convention in September 1941. This was a specialized use as hotel facilities for 3 days.

An eighth example, Public Law 261, 77th Congress, permitted two whaling tugs, the *Port Saunders* and *Hawk* to be used to attempt a revival of the whaling industry on the Pacific coast. The tugs were 120 feet long, built in 1904 in Norway, and were scrapped soon after.

A ninth example, Private Law 87–516, 87th Congress, admitted four tugs and four barges originally built in the United States back to American registry, but only for use in dredging operations while they are owned by the Standard Dredging Corp.

A 10th example, Private Law 87–513, 87th Congress, permitted transfer from Canadian registry of the tugs *John Roen, Jr.* and *Steve W.* in connection with dredging operations only. These tugs are under 100 feet in length and were originally built in the United States anyway.

An 11th example, Private Law 87–515, 87th Congress, was for a 29-foot boat to come back to American registry.

A 12th example, Public Law 1019, 84th Congress, authorized transportation of iron ore between Great Lakes ports by vessels of Canadian registry for approximately 6 months in 1952. This was because of an absence of American vessels for the service.

A 13th example, Public Law 409, 82d Congress, authorized transportation of grain on the Great Lakes for a short period of time due to lack of American tonnage.

A 14th example, Public Law 877, 87th Congress, authorized transportation of lumber to Puerto Rico by foreign-flag vessels for a period of 1 year. This law specifically provides that if American vessels are available and offer their services at a fair rate, they will have first refusal.

Certainly, no one can seriously contend there is any similarity between the laws and the bill now proposed which would provide for purchase by a single American carrier of a large vessel over 300 feet in length, less than 5 years old, built in a foreign shipyard, for use in the coastwise trade.

The Alaska Steamship Co. has, for 67 years, been nourished, cared for, and protected by the very legislation—the cabotage laws—it now seeks to ignore where its own interests are concerned.

During the 86th Congress, the Alaska Steamship Co. felt quite different about exemptions to the cabotage laws than now is the case. Its position on legislation considered during that Congress, as compared with its yearning for this bill which would, to all intents and purposes, negate the objectives of the Jones Act, demonstrates Alaska Steam's consistent demand for special and favored treatment without regard to the effect of this on others who may be concerned.

In 1960 there was introduced a bill, S. 3188, which had as its purpose to eliminate a provision long sought by Alaskans to apply the third proviso of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (the Jones Act) to permit the use of foreign shipping to Alaska where such shipping occurs over Canadian railroad lines, where merchandise is transported between points in the United States and where the routes used are recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission and operate on the basis of tariffs filed with the Commission.

When the Jones Act was passed in 1920, this legislation, which bore the name of Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington (whose desire was to help his Seattle constituents), the single exception of the Jones Act to which I refer deliberately excluded the State of Alaska from such benefits as might have been realized by its application.

From the time the act was passed until the time of statehood, the Territory of Alaska constantly sought to amend the law to allow the possible introduction of low-cost foreign shipping into the Alaska trade. It was not until passage of the Statehood Act in 1958 that this became possible. Only then were Alaskans able to change the words "excluding Alaska" to "including Alaska."

The potential threat that this would somehow injure the Alaska Steamship Co. evidently bothered the company out of all proportion to its actual effect.

Accordingly, when S. 3188 was introduced in the 86th Congress to repeal the third proviso of section 27 of the Jones Act, the Alaska Steamship Co. was quick to signify its support of the legislation. By a letter from Mr. Henry W. Clark, vice president of the company, filed in the record of the hearings, the position of the company was stated as being in support of the bill. It is noted that, in supporting the legislation, the Alaska Steamship Co. said:

"We are not saying that certain situations may warrant exemptions but do feel that when such exemptions are given that American steamship lines should be able to present their position before allowing foreign-flag vessels to operate to our detriment and possible demise."

In light of these remarks, the support of S. 3188 by the Alaska Steamship Co. truly shows its position that while others should not be allowed exemptions from the cabotage laws, the outrageous exemption it now claims for itself can be justified. The illogical argument of the carrier that it is somehow good for the domestic shipping industry to allow the purchase of the *City of New Orleans* but that foreign competition beneficial to others is to be condemned is reminiscent of the mad queen of "Alice in Wonderland" who changed the rules of the croquet game to suit herself and maintained a consistent policy toward those who incurred her displeasure of "off with their heads."

If this bill is passed, there is no reason to expect any more construction of ships in American shipyards. If you make this unprecedented exception for one steamship company, there will be no justification for denying it to any other. The others will not unnaturally seek the great financial advantage of acquiring a ship built by cheap foreign labor and costing half as much as it would cost at home. The precedent will have been established.

As has been repeatedly pointed out to this subcommittee, this legislation represents a truly unprecedented breach in the traditional policy of the United States that the domestic trades will be reserved entirely for vessels built in the United States and operated by U.S. carriers.

In considering S. 534, it is important to review the purpose of the cabotage laws. Since 1898, when Congress enacted legislation making the principal law, the coastwise trade of the United States has been, traditionally, reserved for domestic shipping. The purpose of this is to insure the existence of a healthy domestic merchant marine for the United States. While the future of carriers in the domestic trades, as well as the foreign trades, has been in jeopardy for many years, the theory that domestic water transportation must be reserved for domestic vessels remains valid in terms of its objectives.

Of course, it is recognized that a most important reason for protecting the domestic ship building industry is that in the event of war we must have domestic vessel capacity available and we must have our domestic shipyards in operation to produce the vessels that war requires.

Recognition of the importance of the merchant marine to national defense has been repeatedly expressed. Recently, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Fred Korth, declared, in a speech made on National Maritime Day that it is incredible that the Nation's merchant marine, with a proud tradition, should be faced with "relegation to second-rate status and possible extinction."

Citing the alarming rate at which Russian shipping has been increasing over the capacity of this country, Mr. Korth was quoted in the New York Times on June 2, 1963, as follows:

"The United States is and always has been a great maritime Nation. We owe our birth, succor, and survival to seapower. Without it we would have failed in our bid for freedom and could not have endured the tribulations of early independence.

"Lacking seapower, we could not have preserved the Union, nor successfully defended ourselves in two great wars which threatened our national existence.

"As a second-rate maritime Nation, this country would not have achieved the status as the strongest, richest Nation on earth. If we become a second-rate maritime power, we will not long maintain that status nor insure our freedom.

"Our seapower is not measured in naval terms alone. Our merchant marine is an equally essential element of our maritime strength. The present state of our shipping industry gravely affects that strength."

The Secretary of the Navy, referring to the fact Russia has 1,168 operational ships as compared with 985 belonging to the United States and to the rate of increase of the Soviet fleet of 1 million deadweight tons annually, called for action which would "assure Mr. Khrushchev and his kind that our system will survive and that, most certainly, its demise shall not be a burial at sea."

Now, in this context, let us analyze the effect of this particular bill on the strength of the American shipbuilding industry and its impact on our domestic economy.

Assuming this kind of ship were to be built at all, it has been estimated by the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Donald W. Alexander, that it would cost approximately $8 million to construct the U.S. yards. Thus, with respect to this ship alone, there is a loss of income, loss of jobs, loss of opportunity and loss of capability of shipyards in the United States that would otherwise perform this work. As an aside, expert opinion has been expressed that the design and construction of the *City of New Orleans*, is inefficient and outmoded, by American standards, in any case. At the very least you are, if this bill should be enacted, depriving American shipyards and their workers of $8 million.

Beyond the detriment to the shipyard industry from the loss of this particular shipbuilding contract, S. 534, as a precedent for an inevitable flow of future cries for special privilege legislation, represents a dagger at the throat of entire shipbuilding industry now and in the future.

Throughout the United States there are 143,000 individuals whose jobs directly depend on shipbuilding and repairing of ships and boats in private shipyards. It is my belief that each one of these individuals would find his or her job in jeopardy if this legislation is passed.

In Alabama the city of Mobile could find itself most seriously depressed if such firms as Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co., Harrison Bros. Drydock & Repair Yards, Inc., the Mobile Shipbuilding Co., the Mobile Steel Co., and the Mobile Drydock & Repair Co., should be forced to close for lack of work. In Birmingham, the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., represents an important segment of the city's economy, with shipyards at Pascagoula, Miss.; and at Decatur, Ala.

In California the shipbuilding industry is one of its most important sources of wealth. Such companies as the A-1 Boat Works of Alameda, the Alling Iron Works & Shipbuilding Co. of West Sacramento, the Campbell Machine Co. of San Diego, the Colberg Boat Works at Stockton, Craig Shipbuilding Co. of Long Beach, Fellow's & Stewart Inc. of Wilmington, the Foster Shipbuilding Co. of Terminal Island, the Kaiser Steel Co. of Napa, Kyle & Co. of Fresno, the McDonough Steel Co. of Oakland, the Sausalito Co. of Sausalito, Todd Shipyards of San Pedro and San Francisco, the Wilmington Boat Works of Wilmington, and many, many others would be seriously threatened with depression if there is a change of our laws governing the use of domestic shipping equipment in the domestic trades.

In the State of Florida, Jacksonville, Miami, and Tampa would find themselves in most serious difficulties if foreign ship construction eliminated the Aetna Steel Co. in Jacksonville, the Auchter Co. in Jacksonville, Bellinger & Son in Jacksonville, or the Gibbs Corp. in Jacksonville. In Miami there are numerous shipyards including the Day Dry Dock Corp., the Florida Machinery Corp., the Merrill-Stevens Drydock Co., the Miami Shipbuilding Corp., and U.S. Foundry & Manufacturing Corp. In Tampa the Tampa Marine Co., and the River Heights Boat Yard, Inc., would feel the effect of foreign competition if S. 534 is enacted.

In the State of Florida there are 21 shipbuilding yards and repairing companies and nearly 200 boat-building establishments which will be in danger if this mischievous bill is passed.

In the State of Louisiana, New Orleans could become a severely depressed area if the ship construction and repair work on which this city depends should be closed down. Affected would be the Algiers Iron Works & Dry Docks Co., Inc., the American Marine Corp., Canal Marine Repairs, Inc., Champion Machine Works, Inc., Halter Marine Service, Higgins, Inc., Hooley & Sons, Inc., the Mississippi Valley Electric Co., Inc., Orleans Materials & Equipment Co., and many others. In New Orleans, also Todd Shipyards would be severely affected if there is a serious depression in the shipbuilding industry. In Louisiana there are 27 shipbuilding yards and 69 boatbuilding and repair yards, all of which would feel the pinch if S. 534 is enacted.

The city of Baltimore, Md., would find a substantial part of its economy wrecked by a depression in the shipbuilding industry. In Maryland there are 11 shipbuilding and repair facilities, 3 of which employ more than 1,000 people and all of which would be badly damaged by enactment of S. 534. Firms in Baltimore that would be affected include the Baltimore Marine Repair Shops, Inc., Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Booz Bros., Inc., and Frank & Ethel's Boat Yard.

The State of Massachusetts also would feel a serious depression, which would boost its already high rate of unemployment, if shipbuilding and repair work is diminished by enactment of S. 534. Plants in Massachusetts which would be affected would include the Bethlehem Steel Co., with yards at Boston and Quincy; the Bromfield Manufacturing Co., in Boston; the Cape Cod Shipbuilding Co., of Wareham; the General Ship & Engine Works, Inc., of Boston; the Gibbons Engineering & Machine Co., Inc., of Charlestown; the Gladding-Hearn Shipbuilding Corp., at Somerset; the Gloucester Marine Railway Corp., at Gloucester; Graves, Inc., at Marblehead; the Hodge Boiler Works, at Boston; Kingman Marine Construction, Inc., at Cataumet; the Manchester Marine Construction Co., at Manchester; and many, many others.

The great State of New Jersey would find itself in serious difficulty with closing or diminishing of work at Hoboken's yards of Bethlehem Steel; the General Ship Contracting Corp., of Hoboken; the Jefferson Electric Corp., and the Hudson Engineering Co. The Quaker Shipyard, Inc., at Camden, N.J.; the Rodermond Industries, Inc., of Jersey City, N.J.; the Stowman Shipbuilding Corp, at Port Norris; the Swenson Drydocks & Shipyard, Inc., of Jersey City, N.J.; Todd Shipyards, at Hoboken; and Welin Davit & Boat Division of Continental Copper & Steel Industries, Inc., of Perth Amboy. Zobel's Sea Skiff & Yacht Works, at Sea Bright, N.J., would also suffer if S. 534 is passed.

In North Carolina the great city of Wilmington would be seriously hurt by loss of business at Hamme Marine Railway, Inc., the Maritime North Carolina Shipyard, the Stone Marine Railway & Drydock Co., the Wilmington Iron Works, and the Wilmington Shipyard, Inc. Also in North Carolina, the cities of New Bern and Manteo would be badly hurt if S. 534 was passed.

South Carolina would not be the same if the shipyards of Charleston were to be diminished in their importance for ship construction and repair service by enactment of S. 534. The Charleston Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., the Charleston Drydock Co., Hernandez & Owen Boat Works at Folly Beach, the Mount Pleasant Boat Building Co., would all be depressed.

In the State of Washington, the shipbuilding industry is of exceptional importance. According to the Marine Engineering Log of 1963, in the State of Washington, 84 plants in the State engage in marine construction and repair work. They include the Bellingham Shipyards Co. at Seattle; the Burchcraft Boat Co., Inc., at Aberdeen; Chilman Shipyard at Hoquiam; the Colby Steel & Manufacturing Co., Inc., at Seattle; the Commercial Ship Repair Co. at Seattle; the Duwamish Shipyard, Inc. at Seattle; the Friday Harbor Shipyards, Inc. at Friday Harbor; the Lake Union Drydock Co. at Seattle; the Lockhaven Marina, Inc. at Seattle; and Marine Construction & Design Co. at Seattle. Also, the Pointer-Willamette Co., Inc., the Puget Sound Boat Building Corp., the Seattle Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp., the Tacoma Boatbuilding Co., Inc. and Todd Shipyards at Seattle.

Shipyards of Bethlehem Steel Co., alone, employ more than 17,000 people in the construction of ships for the American merchant marine.

In Baltimore, Md., Bethlehem Steel employs 2,160 people; in Quincy, Mass., 4,375; in Boston, Mass., 550; in Staten Island, N.Y., 190; in Brooklyn, N.Y., 1,350; in Hoboken, N.J., 1,050; in Sparrows Point, Md., 4,425; in San Francisco, Calif., 1,600; in San Pedro, Calif., 600; and in Beaumont, Tex., 950 workers.

The following is a list of 76 shipyards throughout the United States whose existence would be threatened with passage of S. 534. I suggest Senators from the States and Congressmen from the districts where these are located take note:

NAME OF SHIPYARD, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, LOCATION, AND CONGRESSMEN

Atlantic Repair Co., 20.

Bath Iron Works Corp., 2,450; Bath, Maine; Stanley R. Tupper.

Bethlehem Steel Co., 1,000; Baltimore, Md.; Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, Richard E. Lankford, Samuel N. Friedel.

Bethlehem Steel Co., 170; Boston, Mass.; Thomas P. O'Neill, John W. McCormack, James A. Burke.

Bethlehem Steel Co., 1,325; Brooklyn, N.Y.; Emanuel Celler, Eugene J. Keogh, Edna F. Kelly, Abraham J. Multer, John J. Rooney, Hugh L. Carey, John M. Murphy.

Bethlehem Steel Co., 900; Hoboken, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Bethlehem Steel Co., 3,950; Quincy, Mass.; James A. Burke.

Bethelehem Steel Co., 3,100; Sparrows Point, Md.; Clarence D. Long.

Baltimore Marine Repair, 30; Baltimore, Md.; Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, Richard E. Lankford, Samuel N. Friedel.

Brady Marine Repair, 60; Hoboken, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Brewer Drydock Co., 300; Staten Island, N.J.; John M. Murphy.

Bushey, Ira S., 160; Brooklyn, N.Y.; Emanuel Celler, Eugene J. Keogh, Edna F. Kelly, Abraham J. Multer, John J. Rooney, Hugh L. Carey, John M. Murphy.

Charleston Drydock Co., 225; Charleston, S.C.; L. Mendel Rivers.

Colonna's Shipyard, Inc., 175; Norfolk, Va.; Porter Hardy, Jr.

General Ship & Engine Works, 40.

General Ship Repair, 40; Baltimore, Md.; Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, Richard E. Lankford, Samuel N. Friedel.

General Dynamics Corp., 7,000; Groton, Conn.; William L. St. Onge.

Gibbs Shipyard, Inc., 500; Jacksonville, Fla.; Charles E. Bennett.

Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., 1,750; Baltimore, Md.; Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, Richard E. Lankford, Samuel N. Friedel.

Mathis, John H. Co., 30; Camden, N.J.; William T. Cahill.

Moon Engineering, Inc., 60; Norfolk, Va.; Porter Hardy, Jr.

Morris Basin Dry Dock, 40.

Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., 18,400; Newport News, Va.; Thomas N. Downing.

New York Shipbuilding, 6,200; Camden, N.J.; William T. Cahill.

Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp, 1,500; Norfolk, Va.; Porter Hardy, Jr.

O'Brien Bros. Shipyard Corp., 65; Staten Island, N.Y.; John M. Murphy.

O'Kane Marine Repair Co., 65; Hoboken, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Old Dominion Marine Railway, 100; Norfolk, Va.; Porter Hardy, Jr.

Perth Amboy Dry Dock, 75; Perth Amboy, N.J.; Edward J. Patten.

Rawls Bros. Shipyard, 750; Jacksonville, Fla.; Charles E. Bennett.

Rodermond Industries, Inc., 130; Jersey City, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Savannah Machine & Foundry, 225; Savannah, Ga.; G. Elliott Hagan.

Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock, 2,050; Chester, Pa.; William H. Milliken, Jr.

Todd Shipyards, 500; Brooklyn, N.Y.; Emanuel Celler, Eugene J. Keogh, Edna F. Kelly, Abraham J. Multer, John J. Rooney, Hugh L. Carey, John M. Murphy.

Todd Shipyards, 825; Hoboken, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Union Dry Dock & Repair Co., 100; Weehawken, N.J.; Cornelius E. Gallagher.

Albina Engine & Machine, 450; Portland, Oreg.; Edith S. Green.

Astoria Marine Construction, 20; Astoria, Oreg.; Walter Norblad.

Bethlehem Steel, 700; San Francisco, Calif.; John Francis Shelley, William S. Mailliard.

Bethlehem Steel, 500; San Pedro, Calif.; Cecil King.

Craig Shipbuilding Co., 80; Long Beach, Calif.; Craig Hosmer.

Lake Union Drydock, 70; Seattle, Wash.; Thomas M. Pelly.

National Steel & Shipbuilding, 1,600; San Diego, Calif.; James B. Utt, Lionel Van Deerlin, Bob Wilson.

Northwest Marine Iron Works, 125; Portland, Oreg.; Edith S. Green.

Pacific Coast Engineering, 25; Alameda, Calif.; George P. Miller, Jeffrey Cohelan.

Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock, 1,600; Seattle, Wash.; Thomas M. Pelly.

Todd Shipyards, 375; Alameda, Calif.; George P. Miller, Jeffrey Cohelan.

Todd Shipyards, 1,000; San Pedro, Calif.

Todd Shipyards, 800; Seattle, Wash.; Thomas M. Pelly.

West Winds, Inc., 200; San Francisco, Calif.; John Francis Shelley, Wm. S. Mailliard.

Willamette Iron & Steel, 400; Portland, Oreg., Edith S. Green.

American Ship Building, 100; Chicago, Ill.; William L. Dawson, Barratt O'Hara, William T. Murphy, Edward J. Derwinski, John C. Kluczynski, Thomas J. O'Brien, Roland V. Libonati, Dan Rostenkowski, Edward R. Finnegan, Harold R. Collier, Roman C. Pucinski, Donald Rumsfeld.

American Ship Building, 250; Lorain, Ohio, Charles A. Mosher.

American Ship Building, 160; Toledo, Ohio; Thomas L. Ashley.

Christy Corporation, 160; Manitowoc, Wis.; John W. Byrne.

Defoe Shipbuilding, 300; Bay City, Mich.; Elford A. Cederberg.

Ingalls Iron Works Co., 150; Decatur, Ala.[1]

Manitowoc Shipbuilding, 150; Manitowoc, Wis.; John W. Byrnes.

Alabama Dry Dock, 650; Mobile, Ala.[1]

Avondale Shipyard, Inc., 1,200; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Bethlehem Steel, 300; Beaumont, Tex.; Jack Brooks.

Boland Machine & Manufacturing Co., 120; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Dixie Machine Welding, 120; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Equitable Equipment Co. 450; Madisonville, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Farmers Marine Cooper Works, 60; Galveston, Tex.; Clark W. Thompson.

Gulfport Shipbuilding Corp., 250; Port Arthur, Tex.; Jack Brooks.

Higgins, Inc., 300; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Hooley & Sons, Thos. W., 30; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., 5,800; Pascagoula, Miss.; William M. Colmer.

McDonough Iron Works, 25; Galveston, Tex.; Clark W. Thompson.

Mobile Ship Repair, 175; Mobile, Ala.; [1]

Southern Shipbuilding Corp,, 400; Slidell, La.; James H. Morrison.

Tampa Ship Repair & Drydock, 500; Tampa, Fla.; Sam Gibbons.

Todd Shipyards, 300; Galveston, Tex.; Clark W. Thompson.

Todd Shipyards, 175; Houston, Tex.; Albert Thomas.

Todd Shipyards, 250; New Orleans, La.; F. Edward Hébert, Hale Boggs.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

The rate of unemployment in the United States today is recognized to be one of our most serious domestic problems. During the year 1962 over 4 million Americans were without work, approximately 5½ percent of the civilian labor force. As a result of this there is an immense amount of wasted manpower, and a tragic loss of potential production of goods and services. The result is that living standards fall into a depression, the community is burdened and deprived, and families suffer loss of human dignity as workers endure repeated and prolonged joblessness. But the individuals are not the sole sufferers, for in the eyes of foreign nations, America, as a country, is measured for its free and democratic ways. As the world sees us, unemployment is a measure of our Government's concern for its least fortunate people and its ability to provide them with a genuine opportunity to participate in the country's well-being.

In the past decade the country's unemployment rate has remained consistently high, unlike anything since the era of the thirties. The 1962 unemployment rate of 5½ percent is particularly disturbing because the rate has held tenaciously to this level many months after a substantial recovery from the 1960–61 business recession. Furthermore, during the latter months of 1962 there were definite signs of a repeated lag in employment.

Of course, unemployment is never evenly distributed geographically. However, there are three States which have had a consistently high unemployment level—notably West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts—the latter two having important shipbuilding industries.

Although a national industry, shipbuilding is concentrated in 10 States—California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. It should be noted that each of these States has an unusually high unemployment rate, the average being 5.79 percent. A precipitate decline of the shipbuilding industry, which could well occur with passage of S. 534, would cause these States to suffer even greater unemployment.

There is a national feeling that the economy of the United States has been operating well below its potential utilization of manpower since 1957. Looking ahead, one may surmise that the welfare of the United States in the years to come depends largely upon our ability to achieve a more satisfactory rate of economic growth and to meet the added pressures of an expanding labor force.

---

[1] All Alabama Congressmen elected at large.

[1] All Alabama Congressmen elected at large.

Enactment of S. 534, by plunging the domestic shipbuilding industry into formidable uncertainty, would inevitably increase unemployment rates and stifle economic growth.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE DOMESTIC SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

On January 1, 1962, 66 merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over were under construction in private shipyards of the United States, including 7 tankers, 26 cargo ships, 3 passenger-cargo, and 3 ferries. Thirty-seven vessels were launched during 1962. The 27 vessels delivered had a dollar value of $335,700,000. Of these 27, 17 were built on the east coast, 3 on the gulf coast, and 7 on the Pacific coast. From 1958–62 an average of 28 commercial ships have been delivered per year with an average dollar value per year of $320 million.

Of the merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over contracted for with private shipyards during 1962, 13 were cargo ships, one passenger-cargo ship, and one tanker, as compared with a total of 34 vessels contracted for during 1961 in private shipyards.

The number of merchant ships engaged in coastwise trade as of January 1, 1963, was 307, representing a melancholy decline from the 427 vessels trading as of January 1, 1954.

In 1962, the gross national product of the United States was $571.8 billion. Of this, 0.3 percent or $1,617 million represented ship construction for which contracts were let during the year.

The total number of employees in U.S. shipyards and repair yards as of December 1962, was 209,600, of whom 92,200 were employed by Navy yards and 117,400 by private yards. By geographic regions, they were distributed as follows: North Atlantic, 93,600; South Atlantic, 38,900; gulf, 23,200; Pacific coast, 47,500; Great Lakes, 2,899; and inland, 3,600. Another 25,600 individuals were employed in the allied field of boat building and repairing.

Shipbuilding workers, compared to workers on other durable goods, average a slightly lower hourly workweek, but the average hourly earnings per employee, in comparison, are slightly higher. Average weekly earnings per employee, in comparison, are also higher.

As of December 1962, shipbuilders averaged 41.4 average weekly hours; $3.07 in average hourly earnings; and $127.10 in average weekly earnings. This last figure has gone up from $107.80 in January 1960.

On the Pacific coast as of December 1962, the average hourly earnings of a shipyard employee had gone up 57.5 percent above that wage received in 1951. The average hourly earnings for all U.S. regions, however, had gone up 64.7 percent, the Pacific coast region having the lowest percent raise of the four regions. From June 1962, to December 1962, the average total hourly earnings have gone up 1.7 percent.

There is no doubt the domestic shipbuilding industry represents an enormously important segment of the economy of the country, and, for the sake of this industry, itself, must not be put in grave jeopardy by legislation such as S. 534.

In considering the impact of S. 534 on the domestic shipbuilding industry we must also take into account the implications of this legislation to all allied industries that are suppliers of components of ships and boats.

The steel industry, which is facing increasingly serious competition from new foreign plants (substantially financed with the help of the United States), contributes approximately 1.1 percent of its capacity to shipbuilding. In wartime this percentage has risen to as much as 19 percent. The proportionate number of employees of the steel industry whose productivity is applied to steel used in shipbuilding is approximately equal to the steel plant capacity devoted to this.

In addition to the steel industry, producers of turbines, gears, radio equipment, lumber manufacturers, rope makers, producers of electronic equipment of every variety, diesel engines, heating equipment, in fact, all manner of manufacturers of large and small equipment needed in the construction of ships must shudder to consider the loss of markets which will occur if S. 534 is allowed to be enacted. It is estimated there are approximately 4,100 industries now supplying equipment and parts for the construction of ships in the United States.

This large complex of industrial organizations cannot be allowed to suffer depression and decline because the selfish motives of one water carrier leads the domestic shipbuilding industry to destruction.

THE "CITY OF NEW ORLEANS" IS NOT NEEDED TO MEET ANY THREAT OF FOREIGN COMPETITION, BUT ITS PURCHASE WOULD WIPE OUT AMERICAN SHIPBUILDING AS A RESULT OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

It has been contended this legislation is required to meet the threat of foreign competition, meaning Canadian competition, in the Alaska trade.

I would submit, in answer to this argument, that the deliberate policy of the U.S. Government has been, since the inception of the Marshall plan in 1948, positively to encourage and indeed promote the development of industries abroad which are in competition with our domestic plants in almost every field of endeavor. There is almost no kind of manufacturing enterprise carried on in the United States that does not have foreign competitors whose competition is serious only because this Government has invested the dollars of American taxpayers in overseas programs. That does not mean that I agree with this policy. But why consider it now as a justification for supporting this foreign competition to our shipyards and steel industry and piously deploring the possible competition in maintaining transportation against an oppressive operator whose service has been disastrous for Alaska? Foreign aid which produces competition with our own industries is widespread.

It is true in the field of mining and minerals exploration and fabrication.

It is true with respect to the textile industry.

It is true with respect to the fishing industry.

It is true with respect to agricultural industries.

It is true with respect to industries dependent on forest resources.

And so, through the whole gamut of classifications of American industry we find foreign competitors giving domestic plants trouble because they can produce goods cheaper—and they are in existence at all simply because the U.S. taxpayers furnished the money for them to go into operation.

As for the shipbuilding industry, it is of interest to note the Development Loan Fund of the Agency for International Development has made loans of $5 million to Finland for ship construction, and to the Republic of China has made a loan of $900,000 for the expansion of a shipyard.

In addition, nearly $8 million has been loaned the Republic of China and Thailand for the construction of cargo vessels by the Export-Import Bank.

The American steel industry, and our aluminum plants, which depend heavily upon the shipbuilding industry as a market for their products, find themselves in tough competition with foreign steel and aluminum plants which have been financed by the following dispensations of funds by the various agencies of the Government and by international agencies:

Loans made by the Agency for International Development for steel mills

Country, project, and amount:	
European Coal and Steel Community, production of raw materials	$100,000,000
Ghana, construction of smelter project	55,000,000
Lebanon, aluminum plant	400,000
Turkey, steel mill, Eregil Iron & Steel Works	129,600,000
Republic of China, production of aluminum	1,350,000
Total	292,250,000

Loans extended by the Export-Import Bank for steel mill construction

Country	Project	Date	Amount
Ghana	Establishment of aluminum smelter	Jan. 4, 1962	$55,000,000
India	Aluminum reduction plant	Jan. 7, 1960	13,650,000
Japan	Expansion of steel mill (Fuji Iron & Steel Co.)	Aug. 1, 1957	9,335,238
Do	Expansion of steel mill (Yawata Iron & Steel Co.)	Dec. 13, 1957	24,136,004
Do	Toyo Kohan Co., expansion of steel mill	May 29, 1958	7,100,000
Do	do	Jan. 28, 1960	3,000,000
Do	Sumitomo Metal Industries, expansion of iron and steel production facilities	Jan. 4, 1962	8,100,000
Lebanon	Aluminum extrusion press	June 30, 1960	124,300
Philippines	Construction of steel mill	May 17, 1961	62,300,000
Turkey	Expansion of Karabuk Iron & Steel Works	Nov. 25, 1959	15,000,000
Austria	Equipment for aluminum foil plant (Brueder Teich, Oesterreichisches Credit-Institut, A.G.)	Mar. 15, 1956	1,000,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Oesterreichisch-Alpine Montangesellschaft)	Apr. 25, 1957	26,085,549
France	Steel-mill equipment (Union Siderurgique du Nord de la France)	Feb. 11, 1690	913,792
Do	do	do	519,625
Do	Hot strip mill and related engineering services (Union Siderurgique du Nord de la France)	Oct. 6, 1960	2,828,827
Do	Rolling mill mechanical equipment (Union Siderurgique du Nord de la France)	Oct. 5, 1961	691,454
Germany	Steel-mill equipment (August Thyssen-Hutte)	June 28, 1956	9,090,000
Italy	Equipment for steel mill (Government of Italy)	June 30, 1955	2,000,000
Do	do	do	5,000,000
Do	do	Mar. 27, 1958	5,946,331
Do	Equipment for blast furnace and rolling mill (Government of Italy)	Oct. 23, 1958	4,875,000

Loans extended by the Export-Import Bank for steel mill construction—Continued

Country	Project	Date	Amount
Spain	Expansion of steel-mill facilities (Union de Siderurgicas Asturianas, S.A.)	Apr. 1, 1958	$6,800,000
Do	Equipment for steel mill (Government of Spain)	Jan. 15, 1959	3,850,000
Do	Rolling mill rolls (Government of Spain)	Sept. 8, 1960	2,300,000
Do	Cold rolling mill with equipment for expansion of iron and steel plant (Government of Spain)	Mar. 9, 1961	13,000,000
Do	Hot sheet and strip mill and related accessories and services (Altos Hornos de Vizcaya, S.A., and Sociedad Anonima Basconia) (Banco de Vizcaya, et al.).	May 4, 1961	18,000,000
Argentina	Steel-mill equipment (Central Bank of Argentina)	Mar. 10, 1955	5,500,000
Do	Expansion of iron foundry (Acinfer, S.A., Banco Ind. de la Republic Argentina)	Mar. 12, 1959	700,000
Do	Expansion of steel mill (Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros, S A)	May 5, 1960	5,645,000
Do	Facilities for cold-drawn seamless steel tubing (Dalmine, S.A.F.T.A., Banco Ind. de la Republic Argentina).	June 9, 1960	1,842,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Sociedad Mixta Siderurgia, S.A.) (Central Bank of Argentina)	Nov. 10, 1960	12,000,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Acinfer Industria Argentina de Acero, S.A.)	Dec. 30, 1960	170,500
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Establecimientos Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, S.A.)	Aug. 22, 1961	241,600
Do	Steel-mill equipment, 5 loans (Establecimientos Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, S.A.) (Banco Ind. de la Republic Argentina).	Feb. 21, 1962	444,400
Brazil	Steel-mill equipment (Cia. Siderurgica Nacional, Banco do Brasil) (Republic of Brazil)	June 19, 1940	45,000,000
Do	do	July 20, 1950	25,000,000
Do	do	Feb. 1, 1956	35,000,000
Do	Expansion of steel foundry (Acos Villares, S.A.) (B.N.D.E.)	Aug. 22, 1957	2,320,000
Chile	Steel-mill equipment (Corporacion de Fomento do la Produccion) (Republic of Chile)	Aug. 9, 1951	58,000,000
Do	Strip rolling equipment and open hearth facilities (Cia. de Acero del Pacifico, S.A.)	Feb. 28, 1957	16,000,000
Mexico	Steel-mill equipment, Altos Hornos de Mexico (United Mexican States)	May 3, 1951	5,000,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment, Hojalata y Lamina (United Mexican States)	Dec. 18, 1952	3,600,000
Do	Rolling mill equipment (Acero de Chiluahua S.A., Cia. Fundidora de Chihuahua, S.A.)	Aug. 11, 1955	720,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Altos Hornos de Mexico) (United Mexican States)	Feb. 7, 1957	16,000,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A.)	Dec. 29, 1960	120,000
Do	Steel fabricating equipment (Manufacturas Metalicas Monterrey, S.A.)	May 5, 1961	113,500
Do	Processing equipment for steel mill (Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A.)	Oct. 12, 1961	174,000
Do	Steel-mill equipment (Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A.)	Nov. 28, 1961	345,000
Peru	Iron ore beneficiation plant (Marcona Mining Co.)	Nov. 14, 1957	10,000,000
Do	Machinery, equipment and services for metallurgical plant (Metalurgica Peruana, S.A.)	Apr. 26, 1962	1,950,000
Total loans			546,532,120

Loans made by the World Bank for steel mill construction

[In millions of dollars]

Country, project, and amount:	
India:	
Indian Iron and Steel Co., steel mill ($12 million of this loan was for development of coal and coke)	70
Tata Steel Co., expansion of steel production facilities	107
Japan:	
Yawata Iron & Steel Co	20
Kawasaki Iron & Steel Co., 3 loans	34
Sumitomo Metal Industries, 2 loans	40
Kobe Iron & Steel Co	10
Nippon Kohan	22
Fuji Iron & Steel Co	24
Total	327

It is noted that Japan, the country which produced the *City of New Orleans* has been the chief beneficiary of loans for steel mill construction of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and has also received a total of $51,671,242 for this purpose from the Export-Import Bank. It is ironical to contemplate the use of iron and steel by the Kure Shipbuilding Co. of Japan, produced as a result of American financial assistance, now being a component of the vessel which is the subject of this legislation and of genuine alarm in the U.S. shipbuilding industry.

India has received generous loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and from the Export-Import Bank. And, now, serious consideration is being given to even more assistance to India for the construction of a very large steel mill under the auspices of the foreign aid program. Presumably, with additional steel capacity, India could become an important manufacturer of ships and, if S. 534 is allowed to pass, there will be inevitable pressures for allowing American water carriers to buy Indian ships, along with those constructed in Japan and other foreign countries.

As for the necessity of this legislation to meet competition now, happily, existing, as a result of the sea-train service from Prince Rupert to Seward inaugurated last season by Canadian National Railways this argument will not bear analysis. Alaskans welcome gladly the entry of the Canadians into our transportation system, since it brings, finally, at long last, promise of lower transportation costs against ever increasing maritime freight rates which have reached astronomical and intolerable levels.

The fact is the Canadian National Railway Service operates entirely with American-built tug and barge equipment. Further, as to the volume of its cargo, in the 12 months ending May 11, 1963, Canadian National moved 10,933 tons of freight from Prince Rupert to Whittier—less than 3 percent of the total freight moving to the rail belt of Alaska in that time.

There is, then, no real competition to worry about insofar as American-owned water transportation is concerned. Such competition as is of significance would arise between the Canadian and American railroads vying for traffic to the west coast. Alaskans have no reason for hesitation in encouraging Canadian transportation service, either by rail or by water so long as it is cheaper than Alaska Steam. As a corollary, there is no reason for Alaskans to protect American railroads from such competition as they may encounter as a result of the Canadian sea train service.

For the American railroads, also, have exercised a rank discrimination against Alaska in setting their rates.

Let me call your attention to this flagrant and unique discrimination with specific examples of what these railroads have done, are doing, and apparently propose to continue to do to Alaska.

To ship an automobile from Pontiac, Mich., to Tokyo, it will cost $7.83 per hundred pounds to send that car to Seattle for transshipment.

However, if the same car is bound for Alaska on the same train at the same time, the railroad freight charges to Seattle will be $10 per hundred pounds—or more than $2 more per hundred pounds, or more than $72 more for shipment of a four-door Ford sedan to Alaska than the cost of shipment of the same car destined for Tokyo.

I call to the attention of my good friends from Michigan, Senator **HART** and Senator **MCNAMARA**, that a reduction in the costs of shipments of automobiles for sale in Alaska might make it possible to reduce the number of surplus automobiles, over a million of which are in dealers' warehouses, if these automobiles could be sold in greater quantities in Alaska.

If a manufacturer of agricultural implements in Chicago, Ill., wishes to ship them to Guam, the freight rate to Seattle would be $2.17 per hundred pounds for a 30,000-pound shipment.

However, I am sure Senator **DOUGLAS**, of Illinois, who is a distinguished economist will be concerned that a shipment of the same weight of agricultural implements to Alaska will incur freight charges of $3.28, or more than $1 more per hundred pounds when shipped to Alaska. Senator **DIRKSEN**, the distinguished minority leader, will, I am confident, also be interested in this and in the fact that a smaller shipment to Alaska will increase in transportation cost to as much as $4.48 per hundred pounds.

Senator **HUMPHREY** and Senator **MCCARTHY**, of Minnesota, will be interested to know that manufacturers of agricultural implements in Minneapolis can ship their products to Hong Kong for $2.03 per hundred pounds.

If they wish to ship a similar order of implements for use in the Matanuska Valley of Alaska the freight cost to Seattle would range from $3.12 to $4.27 per hundred pounds.

My distinguished colleagues from Indiana, Senator **BAYH** and Senator **HARTKE**, will be interested in the fact that a 40,000-pound shipment of electric cable manufactured in Hammond will travel to Seattle for $2.08 per hundred pounds if it is destined for Japan or Hawaii; but the same 40,000-pound shipment to Alaska will require payment of $2.65 per hundred pounds in railroad freight rates to Seattle. Further, the cost of shipment to Alaska will advance to as much as $4.65 per hundred pounds for a smaller shipment of 18,000 pounds.

The same shipment of electric cable from New Orleans, La., to Samoa would cost $1.95 per hundred pounds for shipment from New Orleans to Seattle. But I call the attention of Senator **ELLENDER** and Senator **LONG**, of the great State of Louisiana, to the fact that if this electric cable is to be used in Alaska, the cost of shipment to Seattle would range from $2.06 to $4.52 per hundred pounds.

From the State of Oklahoma shipments of canned or preserved foodstuffs destined for Manila will cost $1.38 for freight charges on a 60,000-pound shipment. However, Senator **EDMONDSON** and Senator **MONRONEY** will find it of interest that the same shipment destined for Alaska will incur freight charges to Seattle of from $1.58 per hundred pounds to $1.83 per hundred pounds.

In the case of shipment of Phillip Morris cigarettes from Louisville, Ky., my good friends, Senator **COOPER** and Senator **MORTON**, will wish to be apprised of the fact that it will cost 28 cents more per hundred pounds for railroad freight charges for those cigarettes to be used in Alaska than if they are finally destined for Hong Kong, Okinawa, or Honolulu.

Likewise, Senator ERVIN and Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, may be interested to know that shipments of Lucky Strike cigarettes from Raleigh will require payment of freight charges of 35 cents more per hundred pounds if they are bound for Anchorage than if they are going to other ports in the Pacific Ocean area.

Manufacturers of dry goods, such as sheets, pillowcases, and dress materials originating at Sylacauga, Ala., La Grange, Ga., and Spartanburg, S.C., can ship their products more cheaply to Oceania, Auckland, Tokyo, or Okinawa than is the case with shipment of the same items to Alaska.

I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues, Senator SPARKMAN and Senator HILL, of Alabama, and Senator RUSSELL and Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, and Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND, of South Carolina, to the fact that a reduction in transportation costs of the dry goods manufactured by their constituents for sale in Alaska would greatly expand the market for these important items.

Also, miscellaneous shipments of freight from Little Rock, Ark., Chicago, Ill., Shreveport, La., Vicksburg, Miss., Kansas City, Mo., Columbus, Ohio, or from El Paso and San Antonio, Tex., will cost more for shipment to Alaska via Seattle than if the same cargo is destined to Pacific points other than Alaska.

Even beer from Kansas City, St. Louis, and Milwaukee costs more in railroad freight charges if it is destined for Alaska than if it is going to other ports in the Pacific. I am sure Senator SYMINGTON and Senator LONG, of Missouri, and Senator NELSON and Senator PROXMIRE will take full notice of the fact that Alaska might provide their constituents with an important market for their famous products if a reduction in freight rates could be accomplished, thus reducing retail prices in Alaska.

To recite all the cases in which this disparity exists would be comparable with reading a mail order catalog into the RECORD. Whether the item is structural steel from Birmingham, Ala., or from Hutchinson, Kans., or Youngstown, Ohio, or paper napkins from Minnesota, it costs more to ship it to Alaska than to other parts of the Pacific Ocean area.

Manufacturers of all these, and other products, must wonder why this disparity in rates should exist—a disparity which constitutes an unjustified hindrance to the expansion of sales in Alaska.

They must wonder why and want an end to a situation in which substantially higher freight charges are imposed by the railroads on shipments of commodities bound for Alaska than are charged on shipments of the same items shipped the same day, in the same freight cars, but destined for Tahiti, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Manila, or Hawaii.

It is more than a nuisance—it is a rank discrimination against Alaska and those manufacturers who would supply our consumers.

The cause of this discriminatory rate pattern lies in the fact that, with the sanction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the transcontinental railroads carrying cargo to the port of Seattle, may charge the higher, domestic rates for goods destined for ports in Alaska than the lower import-export rates allowed for shipments to other ports in the Pacific Ocean area.

A look at the area to which the preferential export-import rates apply reveals immediately the absurdity of this practice of rate discrimination.

The part of the world which receives favored treatment through application of export-import, rather than domestic rates includes all those locations (1) west of the 170th meridian, west longitude and east of the 30th meridian, east longitude, (2) in Oceania on and east of the 170th meridian, west longitude, (3) on the west coast of Mexico, Central America, or South America, and (4) in certain instances points in the State of Hawaii. When this arbitrarily demarcated area is located on a chart of the Pacific Ocean it will be seen that virtually all lands touching the Pacific Ocean are included within the low-rate region except Alaska and the west coast of Canada.

It is of interest to note that much of this vast area engages in no commerce with the United States of any significance. For example, no trade now exists between Communist China and the United States. However, if such trade should be resumed this area would be entitled to a break on transportation costs not allowed the citizens of the State of Alaska. There are thousands of islands in the Pacific Ocean so unimportant to American commerce as to be without significance. Yet the people living there are entitled to lower transportation costs on the goods they receive from the United States (in the isolated cases in which they are customers) than the people of Alaska.

The only portion of Alaska lying within the magic line is the Aleutian Island chain—an area of negligible commercial importance in comparison with the rest of the State. With a population of only a few score people and no ports, the commerce of this part of Alaska is of no consequence in comparison with that of the rest of the State. On a comparison, then, with geographical areas within the preferred area, it would seem there is ample justification for inclusion of Alaska in that area.

Now, if the allowance of export-import rates rather than domestic rates on rail shipments has any relationship to a need for connecting water transportation to port of final destination, then Alaska should certainly qualify for this privilege.

Obviously, the Alaska transportation pattern is in no way analagous to that of other States which bear the domestic rate for railroad freight shipments. Alaska, dependent as it is on water transportation for 90 percent of all its supplies, is, for all practical purposes of transportation, as much of an island as Hawaii, Okinawa, or Guam. It is certainly as dependent on water transportation.

There are many reasons for changing this discriminatory rate pattern. Among the most important are:

1. It is costly to the U.S. Government, in its role as a major shipper to Alaska. For example, in 1959 the General Services Administration shipped 16,800 tons of goods to Alaska. In 1960, the Department of Defense shipped nearly 60,000 tons to Alaska. When it is considered that the imposition of domestic railroad rates to Alaska-bound shipments loads Federal budgets with wholly unjustified costs, which must be borne by American taxpayers, there is a clear need to correct the situation.

2. American manufacturers are limited in the conduct of commerce in Alaska.

The high costs of doing business in Alaska because of the high cost of living there have been demonstrated over and over again. The contribution to the high cost of living of high transportation costs is elementary. Transportation costs to Alaska have been scandalously high—both with respect to rail transportation and water transportation—throughout the history of the State and before that the Territory. It has long been clear that the development of a strong economy based on industrial and commercial enterprise can only take place if we can reduce the cost of living. We can lower the cost of living only if we can lower the cost of transportation. If transportation costs of goods are lowered, the cost of those commodities at retail outlets can be lowered. Hence, if the laws of economics prevail, the quantity of goods sold will increase and so will the profit of the manufacturer.

3. It is predictable that the railroads, themselves, will benefit by a lowering of freight charges. While, as I have said, Alaska is an island, it may well become less isolated with advances we can foresee in air freight and motor trucking to our State. Lower costs of rail transportation could be counted on to minimize these competitive forces.

4. As for benefits which would accrue to the State of Alaska—this goes without saying—Alaska's economy will never develop its potential until we find relief from our abnormally high transportation costs. The reduction of railroad freight rates represents but one step toward achieving this.

The inequities of this discriminatory rate pattern followed by the railroads have been recognized for many years. It was brought sharply to the attention of the predecessor agency of the General Services Administration in 1948 when 3,000 tons of steel moved for export to Alaska. Finding that the charges were nearly double those on similar shipments to Korea and Japan, a rate adjustment was sought and obtained from the railroads. Other adjustments have been subsequently obtained. However, these have not resulted in rates as low as the export rates ordinarily assessed, and they have not been generally applicable.

Recognizing the need for basic relief for this situation, the General Services Administration filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1955 charging the disparity in rates was unlawful and in violation of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The report of the hearing examiner on the case sustained charges of the Government, holding that the application of domestic rates for Alaska-bound shipments was, indeed, unlawful. The report pointed out that "here, the service rendered by the defendants under both types of rates is the same. Under the defendants' tariffs it is possible for two cars of like traffic to move from the same origin, in the same train to Seattle, to be unloaded at the same pier and the two cars to be charged a different rate depending on the ultimate destination—Alaska or Hawaii. The defendants render no more service on traffic moving to Alaska than they do on traffic moving to Hawaii or Japan."

Unfortunately for the taxpayers who must pay the costs of Government shipments to Alaska; unfortunately for shippers who would like to sell more goods in Alaska; and most unfortunately for the beleaguered citizens of Alaska, the Interstate Commerce Commission rejected the report of the hearing examiner, and with three dissents (those of Chairman Clark and Commissioners Mitchell and Walrath) ruled that the domestic rates on Alaska shipments were lawful and dismissed the complaint of the General Services Administration.

The Commission refused a petition for reconsideration of its decision filed by the General Services Administration, and the GSA, having no independent authorization for appeal to the courts, was unable to carry the case further. Thus, the situation remains as it was in 1957.

Finally, with respect to the desirability of encouraging additional competition in the Alaska trade, which its proponents advance as a reason for enacting S. 534, the pious plea for more competition from Alaska Steam—to be induced by enactment of S. 534—comes strangely from an organization that has fought competition so bitterly that the Department of Justice once filed civil and criminal charges of violation of the antitrust laws against it. The complaint and indictment were dismissed solely on grounds the Federal Maritime Board had jurisdiction in the matter—jurisdiction never exercised by that agency nor likely to be by its successor—the present Federal Maritime Commission.

In taking its stand in behalf of the virtues of competition, Alaska Steam might well be reminded of the charges found in the complaint filed by the Department of Justice in the suit to which reference is made.

Alleging that the Alaska Steamship Co. has engaged in an unlawful combination and conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce, the Department of Justice charged, specifically, that the defendants had agreed to obtain a monopoly of water transportation to Alaska by the following means, as quoted from the civil complaint of the Department of Justice:

"1. By acquiring control of, eliminating competition with, and merging the operations of Northland Transportation Co. and the Alaska Steamship Co., the two largest water carriers in the Alaska trade;

"2. By hindering, obstructing, and preventing others from chartering vessels for the purpose of entering the Alaska trade in competition with them;

"3. By attempting to acquire control of, eliminate competition with, and merge their operations with the operations of the Alaska Transportation Co., their largest remaining competitor in the Alaska trade;

"4. By entering into agreements with shippers by the terms of which such shippers are required to deal exclusively with them and to refrain from doing business with competing water carriers;

"5. By utilizing their position as the only carrier serving the whole of Alaska as well as their position as the only carrier offering a full line of shipping service to coerce shippers to ship exclusively with them.

"(a) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw the service of carrying supplies north to canneries and fisheries and other industrial users in Alaska unless such shippers patronize them exclusively in the transportation of fish, fish oil, and other products south from Alaska;

"(b) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw the service of transporting perishables under refrigeration unless shippers desiring or requiring this service patronize them exclusively in the transportation of nonperishable freight;

"(c) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw the service of transporting passengers, unless shippers desiring or requiring such service patronize them exclusively in the transportation of freight;

"(d) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw the service of transporting dry cargo, unless shippers desiring or requiring such service patronize them exclusively in the transportation of fish oil or other bulk liquids;

"(e) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw service to shippers patronizing any other water carriers;

"(f) By threatening to limit, delay, or withdraw service to shippers to, from, or between points in Alaska, which only defendants serve, if shippers requiring or desiring such service patronize any other water carrier to, from, or between any other Alaska points;

"(g) By threatening to increase freight rates on particular commodities unless shippers of such commodities deal exclusively with them and refrain from dealing with any other water carrier;

"(h) By offering to reduce and reducing freight rates on particular commodities if shippers deal with them and refrain from dealing with other water carriers;

"(i) By inducing and compelling shippers to breach existing contracts and agreements to ship freight with other water carriers by the several means alleged in subparagraphs (a) through (h) of this subparagraph;

"(j) By causing field representatives and agents of defendants to determine the identity of shippers who patronize other water carriers by maintaining a systematic surveillance of docks and terminals, by obtaining access to competitors' freight manifests, and by other means and by thereafter causing said field representatives and agents of defendants to call upon shippers who have patronized another water carrier, and inform said shippers of defendants' awareness that the shippers have patronized another water carrier, demand an explanation of the shippers' conduct, threaten said shipper in the manner alleged in subparagraphs (a) through (h) of this subparagraph if said shipper again patronized another carrier, and by other means intimidate, harass, and annoy said shipper;

"6. By scheduling or diverting their ships so as to split and reduce cargo available to other water carriers;

"7. By denying other water carriers reasonable access to dock and terminal facilities at Alaskan ports;

"(a) By diverting or scheduling defendants' ships to arrive before the arrival of competitors' ships and by unreasonably delaying the departure of defendants' ships for the purpose of blocking the dock or terminal facilities;

"(b) By threatening to delay or to misroute freight destined to a particular Alaska port unless the ships of other water carriers are required to move from dock and terminal facilities granting defendants' ships immediate access thereto."

Further, the complaint alleged that the Alaska Steamship Co. had also undertaken to eliminate competition by land carriers to Alaska:

"1. By hindering, obstructing, and preventing the movement of freight from Canada and the continental United States to interior Alaska points by rail and motor carrier by inducing and persuading railroads to refrain from establishing rail rates requested by motortruck carriers;

"2. By hindering, obstructing, and preventing the movement of freight by motortruck carrier from Alaskan ports to interior points by limiting, withdrawing, or refusing to furnish water-carrier service necessary to such movement."

ENACTMENT OF S. 534 WOULD MEAN HIGHER TRANSPORTATION RATES TO ALASKA

Although I find nothing in the record to indicate what the Alaska Steamship Co. expects the purchase of the *City of New Orleans* to mean in terms of freight rates to Alaska, there is an implication throughout the testimony of the proponent, that, somehow this will be beneficial to the State of Alaska.

Any notion that enactment of S. 534 would bring lower water freight rates to Alaska is pure poppycock. It can be predicted that, as certainly as night follows day, the acquisition of the *City of New Orleans* by the Alaska Steamship Co. will result in yet another rate increase to be paid by the people of Alaska. Further, the evidence is that this is an expensive, high cost ship to operate, and, if allowed in the trade, would saddle the State with even higher costs than now exist for another quarter of a century.

In the first place the Alaska Steamship Co. does not need more vessel capacity. Even now, Alaska Steam operates more voyages to the rail belt than can be justified. Obviously, the *City of New Orleans*, being a train ship, could operate only to the Port of Whittier the terminus of the Alaska Railroad, thus adding still more capacity where partially loaded ships are now going, at unjustified expense.

This was amply demonstrated in a recent rate case in which the Federal Maritime Commission unfortunately decided, on May 6, the company was entitled to another in the long series of rate increases which this agency and its predecessors have automatically allowed over the years.

In that case, in which the hearing examiner's decision, (subsequently overruled by the Commission), was against a rate increase, the examiner disallowed expenditures of the company in 1960 in excess of $500,000 for the provision of extra voyages in the carrier's service "in the face of evidence here that a substantially greater amount of traffic was transported by Alaska Steam in prior years with substantially fewer voyages."

The examiner's conclusions were that "it would appear unreasonable to permit the carrier to force upon the trade a de luxe service when declining traffic trends under prudent and economical management would dictate retrenchment and the adoption of austerity measures."

The words of the hearing examiner, unhappily disregarded by the Maritime Commission, are even more aptly applied to the case of the contemplated purchase by Alaska Steamship Co. of the luxury vessel *City of New Orleans*.

If the management of the Alaska Steamship Co. had been such over the years it could be relied upon to reduce costs and operate efficiently, there might be some reason for confidence in its predictions of a better day in ocean transportation for Alaska.

Unfortunately, the record is replete with examples of inefficient management which has caused vessels owned by the company to be laid up for long periods of time, at great expense to the people of Alaska, and used to justify increase after increase in rates.

During 1958 and 1959, abnormal costs of over $30,000 were incurred because the MV *Palisana* was entirely inactive for a continuous period of approximately 14 months. The MV *Coastal Monarch* was continually inactive from September 17, 1958, to May 31, 1960—at a cost to Alaskan rate payers of more than $30,000.

Including preinaugural expenditures, which are really investments in capital, and should not be charged as expense, as has been allowed, the Alaska Steamship Co. spent nearly $20,000 in 1958 and, in 1959, a total of $173,464 in inactive vessel expense.

This is not much of a record for efficiency for a company that claims it is now going to operate for the benefit of the State of Alaska.

While I would defer to none in championing the needs of Alaskans for adequate transportation service, it is my belief our primary concern at this time is achieving lower freight rates without lowering standards of service.

Within the last month, on May 21, I spoke on the floor of the Senate on the unfortunate May 6 decision of the Federal Maritime Commission allowing the Alaska Steamship Co. yet another rate increase.

And, now, the situation has been made even worse by another decision of a hearing examiner of the Commission in yet another rate increase case for Alaska Steam. On June 3, the decision was reached in a case involving rates for the seasonal trade of Alaska Steam, that it is entitled to an increase which will yield a rate of return in this service of 12 percent. The damage done here, in addition to, once again, raising the costs of water transportation, is that, if the decision is affirmed by the Commission, there will be permanently frozen into the precedents of the Commission a rule that this company is automatically entitled to an unjustifiably high rate of return, regardless of arguments to the contrary.

From the days of the U.S. Shipping Board, Alaskans have suffered the consequences of ineffective rate regulation. They have been and are dependent on water transportation for nearly everything they eat, wear, use, and need for any purpose. Ninety percent of all commodities sold in Alaska have been transported by water.

And, through the years there has been one consistent pattern in the cost of living in Alaska—that is up—always increasing and increasing at a rate faster than other living cost increases. That Alaska's rising costs follow the cost of transportation is undeniable because the pattern of transportation cost has been the same—inexorably increasing, year by year, and the cost of living in Alaska has been roughly proportional to the transportation rates.

Prior to statehood, a constant preoccupation of the Territorial legislature, beginning with the first one in 1913, was with means of prevailing upon the Federal Government to bring down the cost of shipping—an area of legislation in which the Territory was completely helpless.

In 1939, shortly before I became Governor, the legislature adopted a memorial requesting the investigation of maritime freight rates. "Freight tariffs," said the legislators, "have been increased to a point where they are now excessive and beyond the value of the service rendered." With much effort, following this expression, an investigation was secured from a reluctant Maritime Commission, and its investigators indeed found the rates to be excessive. They so reported, and calling attention to discriminatory rates, called for rate reduction.

But, the result was the same as it has been repeatedly. In fact, in May 1940, while the investigation of the excessiveness of the rates against which the Alaska legislators, had protested had been ordered but had not yet gotten underway, the carriers obtained from the Commission a further 15-percent increase on passenger and freight rates.

Since 1950, water borne freight rates to Alaska have increased 56.4 percent. In the same period the cost of living in the United States had increased 26.7 percent. Thus, the raise in prices the Alaska Steamship Co. has obtained, with the connivance of the Maritime Commission, and its predecessor has been of a magnitude of 100 percent greater than the rise in the cost of living, reflecting costs of all commodities used in the United States.

And now, the new Maritime Commission appointed by President Kennedy has awarded another 10 percent increase to the Alaska Steamship Co. and there is danger it will now proceed to guarantee that company a wholly excessive profit, regardless of justification or lack thereof.

Let us analyze the predictable result of acquisition of the *City of New Orleans* by Alaska Steamship Co.

The cost of the vessel is estimated as approximately $4 million, not including such additional expenses as would be required to outfit it for service to Alaska. This is a very expensive purchase for a company that, within the last decade has demanded and obtained raises in freight rates of 56.4 percent on grounds it is in dire financial need. In this same period the price index has risen only 31 percent. Thus, it is an extravagant purchase for a pauper to justify.

Including charges for refitting, the *City of New Orleans* would nearly double that part of its rate base attributable to vessel cost on which Alaska Steam can now depend for support of its habitual pleas for more money. In the Federal Maritime Commission decision on the rate increase allowed May 6 in docket 881 the rate base of the company attributable to vessel cost, as estimated by the Commission, as of the end of 1959 was $3,815,579. Since 1959 this value has steadily diminished the net book value of its vessels being estimated by Alaska Steam, as of December 31, 1961, at $2,390,419. What better way to bolster a steadily decreasing rate base, at the expense of the State of Alaska, than by acquiring an undesirable, unneeded and expensive vessel?

There is, also, expert testimony the *City of New Orleans* is an exceedingly expensive ship to operate, providing another excuse for grabbing more money from Alaskans.

It would be shocking, indeed, to reward Alaska Steam with the favor of this particular special privilege legislation in light of the fact that, for 25 years Alaska Steam has built no ships for its own account, relying on purchase and charter of low cost vessels built by the Federal Maritime Administration, representing an already substantial subsidy to the company.

Cynically, Alaska Steamship Co., protected for 67 years by the Jones Act it would now invalidate for its own purposes, has, through the years, taken full advantage of regulatory policies which have given it extremely generous rate base and depreciation allowances for ships it did not build, and, even for ships it has not owned. The resulting profits from increased rates were not reinvested for replacement of existing vessels. Indeed not. True to form, Alaska Steamship stockholders have pocketed for themselves substantial sums a conscientious carrier, interested in public service, might otherwise invest in better equipment for the service of its customers.

Despite the misleading impression given by Alaska Steam export witness, Mr. Rudy, to the effect depreciation allowances have been hard to come by, the company was the beneficiary, for many years, of very generous treatment. Prior to December 31, 1957, depreciation charges on ships recognized to have a 30-year life were allowed on the basis of a 20-year life, thus allowing the carrier to accumulate, by that date, $1,878,072 in vessel depreciation charges, of which less than 19 percent was used for capital improvements, in the form of refitting and repair of vessels—and none for new construction.

In a 2-year period (1958 and 1959), examined in connection with a recent Alaska rate case, Alaska Steam accumulated total depreciation charges of $954,784, of which only 55 percent was used for all capital improvements during that period in which vessels were refitted for the cargo unitization program of which the company is so proud.

Prior to 1960, when even the Federal Maritime Board in a sudden fit of sanity, was forced to come to a sensible decision in the *Atlantic Gulf/Puerto Rico General Rate Increases* case, the rate base for Alaska Steam was computed on an odd formula which allowed an average of book and reproduction costs depreciated for owned and chartered vessels. Under this arrangement Alaska Steam profited even more—certainly to an extent sufficient to have allowed investment in new vessel construction for the benefit of the trade.

Let us be under no illusion Alaska Steam is interested in improving service to the public by acquiring the *City of New Orleans*. If this legislation is passed the Alaska Steamship Co. can be depended upon to come back, within a year after it gets its hands on the *City of New Orleans*, and request a rate increase to pay for equipment it does not need and cannot possibly operate economically.

Thus, Alaska Steam would, if successful (as the past record demonstrates it would be), be the beneficiary of (1) a preferential subsidy from the U.S. Government, in the form of this legislation, at the expense of other carriers in the trade; and (2) increased profits, in addition.

There is no possible logic in allowing the people of Alaska to suffer from still higher water transportation costs while Alaska Steamship reaps benefits deliberately bestowed by the Congress if this bill is passed.

The threat posed by S. 534 to the domestic shipping industry is well expressed in articles appearing in March issues of two maritime trade magazines—the Pacific Work Boat of March 1963, and the March 15 edition of the Maritime Reporter and Engineering News, which I now ask to have included in the record of these hearings.

It is interesting to note that the article in the Pacific Work Boat, the theme of which is "Don't Scuttle the Jones Act," is followed immediately by an article describing the new Alaska ferry system for southeastern Alaska. The three ferries constructed for the State of Alaska by Puget Sound Bridge and Dry Dock Co. are now providing passenger and freight service, originating at Prince Rupert, British Columbia, for the southeastern Alaska ports of Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Juneau, Skagway, and Haines. The success the State is meeting in operating this service demonstrates Alaska can obtain the kind of water transportation it needs with wholly American-constructed vessels.

This, then, is an added demonstration that *City of New Orleans* is not needed to provide water transportation for Alaska.

I urge each member of this committee to review with utmost care the arguments presented in opposition to this legislation. It is my belief that, having studied them and having read the record, you will be compelled to vote against S. 534.

[From the Pacific Work Boat, March 1963]

DON'T SCUTTLE THE JONES ACT

In the accompanying article we have tried to be as objective as possible in reporting the pros and cons of the *City of New Orleans* case.

In its preparation we read hundreds of pages of testimony presented before congressional hearings. We personally interviewed representatives of the Alaska Steamship Co., Puget Sound Tug & Barge Co., the Pacific American Steamship Association, the Western Shipbuilding Association, and others who have a specific interest in this case.

Because of the importance of the issues involved and to give a balanced report on all points of view we have devoted considerable space to the article. We believe it to be the most complete summary of the *City of New Orleans* case yet available.

Our own view, after considering all arguments in the case, is that Congress should not weaken the Jones Act by admitting the foreign-built *City of New Orleans* to American registry. We strongly oppose passage of Senate bill 534.

EDITOR.

MARITIME FIGHT ROCKS PACIFIC COAST

(By Donald E. Oman, editor and publisher)

(Note.—Entire marine industry now involved in decision on use of foreign built vessel in the Alaska trade. Alaska Steamship and railroads again try for congressional OK on ferry for Alaska run. Maritime Administration reverses stand and joins opponents of change in historic marine law.)

What was shrugged off by many last year as a private fight between Ned Skinner, president of Alaska Steamship Co., and Tom Crowley, coast tug and barge tycoon, over Alaska freight business, has turned into a congressional struggle of national and international importance.

On the surface the issue looks very simple. Alaska Steamship Co. merely wants congressional permission to buy a Japanese built rail car ferry—SS *City of New Orleans*—to run between Seattle and Alaska. Because foreign built ships are prohibited in the U.S. coastal trade under the historic Jones Act, a special exception for Alaska Steamship would have to be granted by Congress. Senate bill 534 has been introduced for this purpose.

Opponents of the bill see it as a dangerous precedent which would scuttle the Jones Act. They see in this a real threat to the U.S. merchant marine, to U.S. shipyards, to U.S. labor and capital.

Crowley and his supporters in the industry fought similar legislation before congressional committees last year. No conclusive action was taken by Congress. New hearings were resumed late last month by the Senate's Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Committee of Commerce.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS

Three major developments at these hearings may effect the final outcome:

1. The U.S. Maritime Commission reversed its earlier stand and went on record opposing Senate bill 534 which would grant the special exception that Alaska Steamship seeks.

2. Tom Crowley announced that he has a new rail car barge under construction which will begin Seattle-Whittier, Alaska service June 1. This rail car service was not available last year when the first hearings were held.

3. Phil Spaulding, Seattle naval architect, submitted a 40-page study including figures supporting his contention that tug and rail barge service on the Alaskan run would cost substantially less than Alaska Steamship's proposed rail car ferry service.

CANADIAN COMPETITION

Now let's take a look at what got this *City of New Orleans* thing going in the first place. Then the opinions pro and con on this matter will have greater meaning.

In May 1962 the Canadian National Railways established a rail car-barge service between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and Whittier, Alaska, to provide through rail-car service from midwest, eastern and southern U.S. points of origin to the Alaska rail belt. Since Prince Rupert is about 600 miles closer to Whittier than is Seattle, this held the threat to the 4 U.S. railroads with Seattle terminals of a diversion of traffic away from Seattle and onto the Canadian National Railways, lines terminating at Prince Rupert. This rail barge service is provided under the American flag by ABC Transportation Co. in which a Crowley company owns half interest.

The U.S. railways began negotiations to set up a Seattle-Whittier rail car water service to compete with the Canadians. Whittier is northeast of Seward and south of Anchorage, Alaska. Of the negotiations which have been made public, the proposed deal with Alaska Steamship is the latest. Thus they are backing the acquisition of the *City of New Orleans* by Alaska Steamship to provide the Seattle-Whittier rail service. Various testimonials during the hearings in Washington last year included statements that the Japanese-built car ferry was the only available means of getting the roll-on-roll-off cars to Alaska from Seattle.

Subsequent developments have tended to change this picture somewhat. By early summer of this year, alternative rail car barge service from Seattle is expected to be available.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR

Arguments supporting Alaska Steamship's desire to get an OK from Congress on purchase of the rail car ferry can be summarized somewhat as follows:

1. The four U.S. railroads need such rail car ferry service from Seattle to Whittier, Alaska, in order for them to be able to compete with the Canadian National Railways' rail car barge service from Prince Rupert to Whittier.

2. Alaska needs and wants the best, most economical freight costs she can get for the development of this new State and the rail car ferry service would help provide it.

3. Coincidental with the above circumstances, a used foreign-built rail car ferry is available for purchase for this service by Alaska Steamship Co. if Congress approves. It is economically feasible since the cost would be much less than building a new specialized ferry for the purpose.

4. Approval of the purchase would insure that Seattle would retain its preeminence as the major supply point for Alaska, thus the deal has an important bearing on the economic welfare of Seattle as well as Alaska.

5. If Congress does not approve the deal, danger exists that the U.S. railroads might bypass Seattle to a rail terminal in British Columbia with Alaska-bound freight originating elsewhere in the United States.

6. Certain exceptions have been made in Jones Act provisions in the past so that these establish a precedent which makes reasonable the present request for another exception to the Jones Act in the case. (Leslie M. Rudy, consultant for Alaska Steamship Co., cites 14 exceptions which he says set precedents for the present case.)

These and supplemental arguments were sufficient last year to win the majority approval of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce. By press time no decision had been announced on last month's hearings. House committee hearings are expected to be held after the Senate committee decision is announced. If either committee OK's the bill, then a major fight is likely to take place in the House and Senate.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

A major part of the U.S. maritime and shipbuilding industry has marshaled its big guns against the Alaska Steamship position.

The opposition arguments seem to boil down to these:

1. If an exception to existing law is made in the present Alaska Steamship matter, then this individual company is being granted an unfair competitive advantage over other carriers on the Alaska run.

2. Granting of this exception could lead to a breakdown of the entire historical concept requiring U.S. coastal trade to be carried in U.S. built and operated vessels. It would set a precedent which would endanger the millions of dollars that U.S. carriers have invested in American built vessels. It would threaten not only the U.S. merchant marine but the U.S. shipbuilding industry.

3. Congressional approval of the foreign-built car ferry would not remove the threat of competition between United States and Canadian railroads, which is one of the primary reasons given for its passage.

4. Alternative means of moving rail cars from Seattle to Alaska by water are available for the 1963 season on an economically feasible basis with American built carriers so that it is unnecessary to break down existing law by admitting a foreign-built ship to U.S. registry.

LINEUP PRO AND CON

Lines have been formed for the forthcoming political battle. There are those who fear that the decision will be purely political rather than being based upon an objective appraisal of all the facts in the case.

In the lineup of supporters for Alaska Steamship Co.'s acquisition of the Japanese built *City of New Orleans* (including those who have voiced "no objection") are:

Four transcontinental railroads with terminals in Seattle: St. Paul & Pacific, Great Northern, Northern Pacific and Union Pacific; Port of Seattle; American Mail Line, Ltd.; Foss Launch & Tug Co.; States Steamship Co.; Metal Trades Council of Seattle and Vicinity; Tacoma Chamber of Commerce; Alaska Chamber of Commerce; Puget Sound Shipbuilders Association; Spokane Chamber of Commerce; Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Western Railroad Traffic Association.

In opposition to congressional authorization of the acquisition of the foreign built car ferry are included the following:

Puget Sound Tug & Barge Co. and its Puget Sound-Alaska Van Lines Division (a Crowley enterprise); Pacific American Steamship Association; Western Shipbuilding Association; American Waterways Operators, Inc.; Committee of American Tank Owners; Shipbuilders Council of America; American Maritime Association; Propeller Club Port of New York; the Common Carrier Conference of Domestic Water Carriers; Harbor Carriers of the Port of New York; The New York Tow Boat Exchange; American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.; Gulf Atlantic Towing Corp.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

The names of the players are subject to revision of course as the economic and political factors change. But the above are all officially on record as indicated.

COMMISSION REVERSAL

During the Senate committee hearings last month the Maritime Commission, completely reversing its stand on the issue, now strongly opposes the admission of the *City of New Orleans* to the U.S. merchant marine.

Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, testified against Senate bill 534 February 21 on behalf of the Maritime Administration and the Department of Commerce, before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

"Last year we testified in favor of a substantially similar bill to admit this vessel to the Alaska trade," he said. "The reasons we gave last year were (1) that it would provide improved and more efficient service between Alaska and the rest of the continental United States, (2) that it would provide assistance to this segment of our offshore domestic trade at no expense to the Government, (3) that the vessel is especially adapted to meet the announced competition of Canadian rail lines, and (4) that the vessel is immediately available to meet this competition.

"We have given further consideration to this matter. The arguments on the other side of this question, we think, are (1) that admission of this vessel to the trade between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington might lead to the enactment of other bills to admit modern foreign-built vessels to the domestic trade, and thus undermine the Jones Act, (2) that enactment of the bill may deprive U.S. yards of prospective work, and (3) that the vessel would operate in competition with American-built vessels.

"We believe that, on balance, the latter arguments are the stronger, and we therefore recommend against favorable consideration of the bill. * * *

"We feel the proposal to permit foreign-built vessels in the domestic trades requires a great deal more consideration than can be afforded in this particular case. If this is a good solution for one operator, it will be contended that it should be good for all or at least all those in the domestic trade to noncontiguous territories. In other words, the use of low-cost foreign-built shipping should not be the prerogative of a single operator in the trade. We are not convinced, however, that foreign-built ships represent the best answer. * * *

"The issue raised by the bill goes far beyond the treatment to be accorded a single ship. In our view it would be a mistake for the United States to act in this case without considering the more fundamental question of the continued application of the coastwise laws to our noncontiguous territories. * * *

"For these reasons, and on balance, we have reluctantly concluded that we cannot recommend favorable consideration of the bill."

CROWLEY TESTIFIES

Tom Crowley, testifying for the second year in opposition to the *City of New Orleans*, told the committee that he was inaugurating a roll-on-roll-off 30-car-rail-barge service from Seattle to Whittier, Alaska, on June 1.

"This new system," he said, "is an ingenious and effective method of transporting rail cars to and from the 49th State on a far more economical basis than could have been accomplished by the Japanese-built *City of New Orleans* had she been admitted to the trade. This American-flag car barge will not deviate from the principles of the Jones

Act, will require no special legislation, and will not be financed by government funds.

"The barges in this new car-float system will be towed in tandem with the existing new container barges that our company operates, thereby reducing the towing costs to a minimum. The service will not be as fast as the service proposed by the Japanese-built, 18-knot vessel, but it will be at much lower cost. The shippers in Alaska have overwhelmingly indicated that for the vast majority of their freight, lower cost is paramount and if high-speed transportation is required, this can be accomplished by air freight or highway truck."

Crowley minimized the importance of the volume of freight represented by the rail cars hauled to date on the Prince Rupert-Whittier rail barge run. (A total of 206 rail cars containing a total of 7,961 short tons between May 11, 1962, and January 18, 1963.)

Crowley also testified that whereas he knew of no new vessel that Alaska Steamship Co. ever built, that his companies had spent about $14 million during the past 15 years on new construction in American yards under the provisions of the Jones Act. This does not include repair and conversion.

"All of these vessels could have been built in foreign shipyards at about half these costs," Crowley continued. "Mr. D. E. Skinner, head of Alaska Steamship Co., has indicated that the Jones Act causes the domestic water carrier to subsidize the American shipyards.

"If this is so, we have paid about $7 million worth of subsidy with our own money, but we are glad to do it because our country needs shipyards and we are protected by the Jones Act from foreign competition in the domestic trades. * * *

"If the Alaska Steamship Co. is privileged to purchase this Japanese-built ship at the bargain price of $4,500,000, you are, in effect, giving a construction differential subsidy to the Alaska Steamship Co.

"We are carriers in the same trade and although we hesitate to ask to build foreign for patriotic reasons, you must admit it would seem reasonable that we be allowed to build $4,500.000 worth of new equipment in foreign shipyards for the domestic trade if the Alaska Steamship Co. is allowed to buy $4,500,000 worth of Japanese-built vessel. Our other common carrier competitor in the Alaska trade should also have the same privilege.

"We have invested over $5 million in the last 4 years in new floating equipment, containers, terminal facilities, etc., in the Alaska trade, but only after the Alaska Steamship Co. abandoned all plans some years ago, to build a rail car ferry in American shipyards. We went into the game with the idea that the 'rules of the game' would remain the same. We ask you not to change the 'rules of the game' 4 years after we have started to play.

"This legislation (S. 534) would lay the foundation for the destruction of the principles of the Jones Act which reserve the domestic trade to vessels built in American shipyards and manned by American seamen. Both are so necessary for our national defense that Congress substantially subsidizes an offshore American merchant marine," he continued.

In further testimony, he maintained that the proposed bill is special interest legislation not compatible with the principle of equal treatment for all. He claimed further that the maritime industry, both labor and capital, are almost wholeheartedly in opposition to this bill. He predicted that erosion of the principles of the Jones Act can hurt the transcontinental railroads very seriously (presumably in the event that foreign ships were permitted in coastal and intercoastal operations). He also asked, "If an exception is made ostensibly for the benefit of the people of Alaska, what about the people of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the States served by the intercoastal coastwise and great lakes trade?

Finally, he maintained that the Japanese built ship is not needed any more because an American built car float will go into service on this run on June 1.

COST STUDY DATA

Tug and rail barge transportation costs from Seattle to Alaska would be 12 to 20 percent less than costs of operating the rail car ferry *City of New Orleans*.

This is the conclusion of a 40-page economic study prepared by Philip F. Spaulding & Associates, naval architects, Seattle, and presented at the committee hearing.

This study shows that train-ship operation would cost about $7.22 per measurement ton transported, as compared with about $6.30 per ton for a single tug-barge operation and $5.75 per ton for a tandem tug-barge operation.

The single tug-barge operation figures were based upon use of a hypothetical 165-foot tug and a special 408-foot barge as yet unbuilt. The tandem tug-barge operation is based upon use of an existing tug of the *Sea Witch* type and a new 272-foot barge (with rails on deck), a sister barge to the barge *Seward*. The new 272-foot barge is currently under construction and is scheduled for operations beginning about June 1.

Two key witnesses in favor of the bill forcefully argued the major points summarized earlier. They were Leslie M. Rudy, transportation consultant for Alaska Steamship Co.; and T. H. Maguire, chairman and counsel, executive committee—Western Railroad Traffic Association.

STEAMSHIP CASE

Rudy maintained that the proposed *City of New Orleans* train-ship service is vital to strengthening Alaska's economy since Alaska is dependent upon outside areas for 95 percent of its material and consumable supply requirements.

He described the *City of New Orleans* as "the only vessel of the type, capacity, and speed adaptable to the Alaska trade in existence anywhere."

The Japanese-built vessel is owned by West India Fruit & Steamship Co., Inc., who used it on the Florida-Havana run until the Cuban crisis erupted about 2 years ago.

Rudy testified that it would cost about $7.9 million to duplicate the vessel if built in American yards and that a trainship vessel specifically designed for the trade would cost considerably more.

"These are capital sums which the highly seasonal one-way Alaska trade cannot support," he said. He explained further that the nature of the Alaska trade is such that it cannot support capital investment in other than old low-cost vessels nor to finance the replacement of such vessels with more efficient new vessels. He quoted earlier congressional testimony supporting these unique aspects of the Alaska trade.

Competition of the Canadian National Railways and the Prince Rupert-Whittier rail barge service, he said, "can be effectively met only by a superior American service capable of being promptly established and conducted within the limits of economic feasibility. Because of prompt availability, and adaptable capacity, speed, and cost factors, the *City of New Orleans* represents the only economically feasible means of accomplishing this objective.

"This vessel would make a weekly turnaround, operating between Seattle and the Alaska Railbelt, carrying 56 rail cars in each direction, with overall transit time from 1 to 2 weeks faster than the Canadian service via Prince Rupert," he stated.

Rudy also emphasized the point that the Alaska trade is distinctly different from all other domestic trades in one key factor:

"It is the only domestic trade either contiguous or noncontiguous, that is subject to foreign competition for American interstate commerce," he explained.

(A minor provision of the Alaskan statehood bill makes this possible.)

Rudy discounted any possible threat to U.S. shipyards as a result of admitting the car ferry to American registry.

"Neither the survival nor the welfare of American shipyards has resulted from new construction for the coastwise common carrier trades for the past 25 years," he claimed. "Indeed, insofar as new construction is concerned, the shipyards have been supported almost entirely by military and other Government construction, commercial construction dependent upon Government subsidy, and proprietary or directly related tanker construction, none of which bear any relation to the *City of New Orleans* or the unsubsidized Alaska common carrier trade in which she would be employed."

He also maintained that the carrier groups opposing the bill are, for the most part, unrelated to the use of the car ferry in the Alaska trade, nor would she be in competition with them.

RAILROADS ARGUE

In his testimony on behalf of the railroads, Maguire took several swings at Crowley by name. He claimed, for instance, that in earlier negotiations between the railroads and Crowley on Seattle-Alaska rail car transportation, Crowley apparently lost interest when the railroads would neither guarantee earnings nor minimum volume to Crowley.

(Maguire made no mention of any railroad negotiations with Foss Launch & Tug Co., who bid on rail barge service too but is now "not opposed" to the Alaska Steamship car ferry plan.)

"I am authorized to state emphatically and unequivocally," said Maguire, "that no railroad has contributed or will contribute a cent toward the acquisition or financing of the purchase of the *City of New Orleans*.

"No guarantee of any volume of traffic or of minimum revenues has been or will be given. The Alaska Steamship Co. will be in precisely the same position as any other connecting carrier. Under the division sheets or agreements, it will receive the agreed division of the charges on each through shipment actually handled by it, and no more."

He stated further that the railroads had reviewed all water transportation facilities available and that "a self-propelled trainship represents the most desirable means of providing the service and that this will best meet the specifications for speed and efficiency.

"Another desirable feature of the proposed trainship operation," he said, "is that cars and contents will be protected from weather in transit by storage below decks on the trainship, whereas by barge they would be more or less open to the elements."

OTHER OPPONENTS

Other opponents of the measure who testified included:

Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, said his membership unanimously oppose the bill. Enactment of the bill, he said, "could set in motion a chain reaction which could have serious, destructive effects on the private shipbuilding industry, as well as on the domestic shipping industry."

John N. Thurman, vice president, Pacific American Steamship Association, said the basic issue is "whether or not Congress intends to set an important precedent in the matter of removing the requirement for American construction of vessels operated in the domestic commerce." He said that his association is vigorously opposed to any such legislation.

Testifying on behalf of the Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., Stanley O. Sher claimed that enactment of legislation of this kind, changing long-established merchant marine policy, would threaten the future not only of the American tanker owners, but also of American shipyards and American dry-cargo ships engaged in the coastwise trades.

Similar opposition was voiced by Harry J. Donohue, assistant to the president, American Waterways Operators, Inc., who called the bill "a violation of a basic principle having great economic consequence. The principle is simply stated—the coastwise trade shall be reserved to American-built vessels operating under the U.S. flag."

FIRST ALASKA SUPER FERRY DELIVERED—READY FOR TOURISTS, TRUCKS, FREIGHT

The *Malaspina*, first of three new superferries for the State of Alaska, has been delivered to her owners after thoroughly satisfactory trials on Puget Sound.

The three ships will connect seven of Alaska's major ports with all points in Canada and the United States, and provide a 561-mile short cut over the all-highway route to western Alaska.

The *Malaspina's* sister ships, *Taku* and *Matanuska*, have been launched by the fleet's builder, Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., and also are scheduled for delivery this year.

Constructed to meet the highest standards of the American Bureau of Ships and the U.S. Coast Guard, the 352-foot vessel has a 73 foot beam and 15 foot draft.

Main engines are twin Enterprise V–12 diesels rated at 4,062 horsepower each, driving through Western Sea-Master marine gears at a 1.88:1 ratio. The propellers, European designed but American made by Avondale, are controllable pitch, four blade, 10½-foot diameter. They are controlled from stations both in the wheelhouse and engine room.

Designed for an average 16 knot speed, the engines were opened up to 20 knots on the final leg of her inaugural run from Seattle to Juneau, with no discernible strain. The engines use diesel oil only for docking and maneuvering, and cruise on residual fuel.

Navigation equipment includes twin Raytheon radar units and a fathometer; a Northwest Instrument radio telephone, monitor-receiver, and other monitoring equipment.

Safety equipment includes 4 lifeboats, 2 with 59 person capacity plus two motorboats for 52 each. Fourteen Elliot liferafts, 12 of 25 person capacity and 2 for 20 each are stowed on each side of the boat deck. On the main deck, the anchor windlass is an electric drive Markey, fitted with 1¾-inch stud link chain.

Staterooms, lounges and sitting rooms can accommodate a total of 500 passengers over the full run of 30 hours. The car deck has a capacity for 109 cars or 51 trailers 27 feet long, loaded through doors forward to port and starboard, and at the stern. The *Malaspina* can accommodate all sizes of vehicles legally permitted on public highways. The ship's complement is 32 in the crew, with 8 officers.

FIFTEEN MILLION DOLLARS

The three ships, with terminal and other facilities in Alaska, will represent more than $15 million when the service is fully established. Basic contracts for the ferries are $3.3 million each.

Their southern terminal is Prince Rupert, British Columbia, where the Canadian Government has built facilities for Alaskan use on a lease basis. From Prince Rupert the ferries will call at Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Juneau, Skagway, and Haines—the northern terminal. Alternating calls will be made at Sitka, also.

Besides the stimulus the new system will provide Alaska's commercial and industrial growth, the new ferries should be a key factor in boosting the State's tourist activity—now its fourth largest industry.

[From Maritime Reporter/Engineering]

CAN WE AFFORD THIS LEGISLATION?

The 88th Congress had barely convened in January before special interest bills began dropping into the legislative hopper. Two of these deserve special notice, for their passage would seriously breach the Nation's traditional policy of protecting domestic shipping.

A bill to grant American-flag registry to the car ferry *City of New Orleans* is similar to one that failed in the last Congress after going through hearings in the House and Senate committees. The *City of New Orleans* was built in Japan for trade, under the Liberian flag, between southern ports in the United States and Cuba. Its owners would like to unload it for obvious reasons.

The proposed bill would grant American-flag registry so the ship could be sold to the Alaska Steamship Co. and be used between Seattle and Alaska. Proponents argue that this is a special case and that such a ship could not be built in an American shipyard at a cost that would make it economically feasible.

But is this sufficient? Can we grant one ship operator the privilege of purchasing a foreign-built ship constructed at low foreign wages and force other domestic ship operators to replace their tonnage in American yards where higher wages prevail? Can we afford to drop our policy of protecting the American shipbuilding industry?

The other proposed legislation would make it possible for Oregon and Washington lumber companies to ship their product to east coast ports on foreign-flag vessels. The proposals are patterned after legislation which slipped through last fall granting the same lumber producers the privilege of using foreign-flag ships to send lumber from Pacific coast ports to Puerto Rico.

Since passage of that act, four Japanese-built and operated ships have been chartered to carry lumber to the commonwealth. Many more charters are expected to follow—to the detriment of American-flag operators and, ultimately, to U.S. shipyards. Our ships, required to be manned by American seamen, cannot compete with Japanese or other foreign ships because of high labor costs.

Proponents are offering the same arguments used last fall by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, who sponsored the Puerto Rico lumber exemptions. They contend that American lumber companies cannot compete with Canadian lumber in east coast markets because Canadian lumber companies can ship in low-cost foreign vessels.

But lumber is a mainstay of intercoastal ship traffic from the west coast. If this traffic is diverted to foreign ships through special interest legislation, most of the intercoastal ships will go out of business.

Furthermore, one breach in the Jones Act restrictions must almost certainly be followed by further exemptions—canned goods, chemicals, steel and iron products, for example. Thus, any intercoastal shipping which might survive the loss of lumber traffic would be sure to succumb eventually.

The railroads which carry lumber and other products across the continent also would suffer. Losses of this revenue would certainly have to be made up in higher rates on other products carried by rail—higher rates that must be paid by the public. No crystal ball is needed to see how almost everyone in this country would be affected—loss of intercoastal ships needed for national defense and higher rates—while foreign ships are profiting handsomely.

If we are to allow Japanese-built ships to ply our domestic ocean routes, why not Japanese-built tugs, barges, and towboats for our harbors and inland waterways? Why not unrestricted imports of German locomotives, English aircraft, French trucks? If we are going to permit foreign ship companies to carry lumber from west to east coast ports, why should they not also carry chemicals between ports on the Mississippi or in the gulf; coal between ports on the Ohio, or iron ore between U.S. ports on the Great Lakes?

There are other ways to protect our lumber industry from the inroads of Canadian lumber. Why kill a vital shipping industry and endanger our railroads for the benefit of a few lumber producers?

COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN URBAN PLANNING

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, President Kennedy, on his recent visit to San Diego, Calif., hailed the first official instance of the United States-Mexican cooperation in urban planning when he announced the approval of two urban planning grants to San Diego and Calexico.

The grants, I believe, will open the door to a great resurgence of cooperative planning and work between Mexico and the United States in making our border cities more vital and attractive. I would like, therefore, to spell out the aims of these two grants and discuss them in some detail.

The grants will be made to the California State Department of Finance, amounting to $100,406 for San Diego and $11,900 for Calexico. They will be supplemented by $50,203 in local contributions from San Diego and $6,064 from Calexico.

President Kennedy remarked in San Diego:

> We welcome this opportunity to congratulate California on initiating cooperation with the ambitious national border program of our sister Republic to revitalize her cities.
>
> I hope that these grants are only the first in a series of actions to help all our border cities collaborate effectively with their Mexican neighbors.
>
> The grants will be used to do our share in stimulating sound community improvement, planning, and action in the cities on our side so that the end result will be a rejuvenation and beautification of the entire border from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico.

I heartily second the President's remarks. I also offer my congratulations and support to the Mexican Government for its efforts on its side of the border.

Under its program nacional fronterizo—national border program—the Mexican Government has become involved in comprehensive planning and community improvement undertakings in many of its cities.

The Mexican program was established in 1960 and has two basic purposes. They are:

First. To raise the standard of living in the Mexican border zones.

Second. To develop the physical environment of the gateway cities so that tourism and other economic activities will be increased.

About $100 million is scheduled to be spent in this program by the Mexican Government by 1965 with further expenditures to follow in the succeeding years.

The urban planning that will be undertaken with the recent Federal grants will not involve a legal agreement between the United States and Mexico but officials and community leaders on both sides of the border will cooperate and consult freely on mutual plans, problems, and actions.

Here are details on the work to be done in San Diego and Calexico.

SAN DIEGO

Special emphasis will be given to coordination of planning the San Diego region with Mexican Government planning in the Tijuana area. Special studies have been designed to find solutions to the broad and basic problems on both sides of the border. The studies will cover:

Channelization of the Tijuana River: Since about 5,200 acres on the U.S. side of the border lie idle or are limited to agricultural use because of flooding by the Tijuana River, studies will be undertaken in cooperation with the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the International Boundary and Water Commission to determine the best alinement for the Tijuana River Channel on the U.S. side. Similarly, appropriate development of lands on the Mexican side will require comprehensive control work.

Harbor development: Potential development of a second entrance to the San Diego Harbor together with facilities for small craft and recreation is also dependent upon development of adequate control of the overflow from the Tijuana River at flood stage.

Reclamation: Studies will be begun for draining another 5,000 acres—in addition to those inundated by floodwaters—which could be developed for new residential, industrial, and recreational uses but are currently unusable because of marsh conditions and a high water table.

Circulation and transportation: Border crossings and general areawide development consideration have created highway problems. In addition to studies for highways and expressways, an analysis will be made of existing and deactivated air terminals for determining how special transportation needs of future development can be met.

Economy: Studies will be made to determine economic relationships in the San Diego-Baja California region and to indicate the appropriate public and private actions required to realize the maximum recreation and tourism potentials of the area.

Urban designs: Planning will be aimed at creating the physical environment portrayed in the goals and development plans of the San Diego general plan, the California State development plans, and the Tijuana plans of the Mexican national border program.

CALEXICO

Special consideration is to be given to the coordination of planning in Calexico with that underway in Mexicali by the Mexican Government as part of the national border program. Included are the following special studies:

Airports: Because of the strategic location of Calexico in relation to nonscheduled aircraft travel between the United States and Mexico, an air trade and market study will be prepared to determine the type and size of airport facilities required.

Border crossing: Planning will be initiated regarding increased border crossing by pedestrians, automobiles, and trucks at this point of entry between the United States and Mexico, in consultation with the State division of highways, the State planning agency, and other interested agencies and authorities.

Sewer problems: Studies of area sewer problems with State and local agencies will be carried on. One particular problem is sewage deposited on the Mexican side of the New River which flows into Calexico.

Mr. President, this summary of the purposes of these urban planning grants indicates that, first, officials and community leaders along the border are well aware of the problems which confront them; and, secondly, that they have much hard work ahead of them in solving these problems.

But, more important, it indicates that there is on both sides of the border a willingness to get at the hard work, to improve and beautify the border cities.

I am very encouraged to see that the Federal Government now is participating in this most important enterprise.

SCIENTISTS ARE NOT ROMANS: THE LABORATORY IS NOT THE COLOSSEUM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there are many ways, of course, to measure the level of civilization attained by a nation: Citizens of a highly developed civilization treat each other with respect and the less fortunate among them with sympathy and concern. Citizens of such a society also treat the members of the animal kingdom with care and consideration.

A good man would no more kick his dog than he would beat his child.

We have read recently—and with concern—of vanishing numbers of songbirds on the eastern coast eradicated along with the Japanese beetle and crab grass by the overuse of pesticides. There will soon be a silent spring in the East.

We have read recently of the declining number of African game animals and of the danger that such as the hippopotamus and the rhinoceros will soon be extinct. The earth would be a lesser place without these remarkable creatures.

Money has been collected, organizations formed, hearings held, and action taken to solve these problems. They are not yet solved but we are working on them.

There is, however, a problem shocking in its extent and appalling in its depth which exists across the whole country and which is supported in many ways by Government funds.

I refer to the inhumane treatment of laboratory animals. For far too long we in the Senate and in the Congress have failed to act so as to ensure the sensible, adequate, and reasonable treatment of animals subjected to scientific experimentation. Too often in the past this matter has been obscured by the antivivisectionists who by seeking the whole loaf have received none. I am not arguing the antivivisection cause: I am disassociating myself from this cause.

Three points are clear:

First. Vivisection is necesssary for modern science. Without vivisection we would not have the polio serum, antibiotics and many of the most modern surgical techniques. Our hope for a control or cure for cancer is in part dependent upon experimentation with laboratory animals. This is perhaps regrettable but it is true.

Second. The Federal Government is investing billions of dollars a year in medical and biological research. This is money well spent. Literally millions of animals are being used in this research. This, too, is worthwhile.

Third. Most unfortunately, however, in a few of the laboratories supported by Government funds these animals receive cruel and inhumane treatment:

Cages are too small to allow the animal room to stand.

There are no regular water or feeding facilities for the animals.

Inadequate sanitation facilities have caused infestations of vermin and disease.

Surgical operations are performed without anesthetics, leading to severe pain and shock.

No postoperative care is provided once the experiment operation is completed.

A single animal used as a training ground for a crew of surgical students operating upon it in a series of operations, one immediately following the other.

Experimental animals are clamped into observation forms which hold them immovable for many weeks.

Such practices as these are unnecessary and cruel. They should be stopped; they must be stopped. No one, no one can say that the progress of modern science would be hindered or slowed in any way by the elimination of such practices.

We must recognize that scientists need experimental animals. Scientists in turn must recognize that unnecessarily cruel and inhumane treatment of these animals will not be tolerated.

The Society for Animal Protective Legislation of New York City has prepared a short list of six points for the protection of laboratory animals. These points outline the essential features which legislation in this field must have. I ask unanimous consent that these may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

If you are for a law to prevent needless suffering to animals in laboratories without hampering responsible research, here are the basic requirements:

A good bill must include these provisions:

1. Unannounced inspection by qualified, full-time inspectors with access to animal quarters, laboratories, and records of animal use.

2. Individual licensing by governmental authority of all scientists desiring to use live, vertebrate animals, with the right to remove said licenses from persons responsible for inhumane treatment.

3. Pain-curbing provision that animals suffering severe, enduring pain must be painlessly killed instead of being allowed to

linger in agony or being used over again. Failure to comply with the above automatically gives the inspector the right to destroy the animal painlessly himself.

4. Humane care and housing, including normal exercise, comfortable resting places, and adequate food and water for all animals.

5. Student work, as distinct from research conducted by qualified scientists, must be painless.

Any bill which does not have these provisions cannot prevent abuses in laboratories and therefore should not be enacted.

A good law should further require:

6. Records that include a brief statement of what is to be done to the animals and why, identification of animals and eventual disposition, and a brief annual report.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the British have had a humane treatment law such as this since 1876. The law is carefully enforced. It is not recorded that it has in any way restricted the growth of science or medicine in the United Kingdom.

Civilization has come a long way from the Roman games held in the Colosseum where lions and tigers and elephants and bulls and gladiators would fight to the death for the amusement of the crowds.

What we no longer allow in the Colosseum we should now stop in the laboratory.

BELLRINGING ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, historically bells have played a significant part in the celebrations of the American people. With Senate passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, declaring that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells, the effort to revive this American custom was given new impetus. Once again across the land Fourth of July celebrations will proclaim this Nation's dedication to the cause of liberty by the ringing of bells.

Nebraskans have added their voices to the many who are urging nationwide participation in this worthwhile program. Mrs. Chester Paxton, of Thedford, Nebr., a national vice president of the Cow Belles, the auxiliary of the National Stock Growers Association, reports notable success in that organization's effort to encourage similar groups to cooperate with the program.

In Nebraska, the American Legion has been designated the official coordinator of this effort. Under the leadership of Mr. Warren E. Baker, the department adjutant, Legionnaires will head up the publicity program and arrange the times in the communities for the school bells, church bells, and others to ring at one time.

Mr. President, it is important that everything possible be done to instill in the hearts of Americans the same feelings of pride and patriotism felt by our Founding Fathers when the first Independence Day was celebrated. While it is simple in nature, the proposal contained in Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 is one of the best suggestions for bolstering the pride we all feel in our Nation.

I refer to the kind of pride expressed by Col. John Glenn when he stood before a joint session of Congress not so long ago and said he hoped that there would be more of the simple and sincere patriotism expressed in Americans' daily lives. He told us that when he sees a parade with the American flag and a marching band, his heart beats just a little more quickly and he feels tremendously proud of being an American and a member of a nation that is so strong and so prosperous.

It was with this thought in mind that I became a cosponsor of the resolution and that I am so gratified that the Senate has acted favorably on the resolution.

KEEP LIVESTOCK PROGRAM VOLUNTARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in these days of widely divergent views on farm legislation, it is refreshing to find measures which seem to have the unanimous support of producers, marketers, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Such legislation is H.R. 5860 which has already been passed by the House and companion bills, S. 1482 and S. 1490, which are pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

These bills would amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to free from possible Federal regulation the voluntary programs for promotion, research, and education relating to livestock, meat, and other products.

For some 40 years the livestock industry has employed a system under which a few cents have been deducted from each head of livestock sold. This money is matched by the packers and goes into a fund to be used by the National Livestock and Meat Board for research, education, and sales promotion of livestock. It has been an eminently satisfactory system which has been of great benefit to the livestock industry.

This is especially important to my State of Nebraska, Mr. President, because over 60 percent of Nebraska's cash income from farm marketing comes from livestock.

This system is now threatened by the fact that the Department of Agriculture now proposes to issue regulations which would establish Federal controls over what up till now has been a voluntary system.

In the House the legislation is reported to be one of the very few matters to have had the unanimous support of the Agriculture Committee. The House report refers to the committee's being impressed with "the unanimity of support for this measure which was manifested by testimony, written statements, letters and telegrams from all the major farm organizations and from national, regional, and State livestock organizations." The measure was also supported by the three different packer organizations whose members cooperate in the financing of the program, and "not a single witness or organization appeared in opposition."

Even the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. President, who is not noted for his enthusiasm for voluntary programs, has indicated that he has no objection to these bills. It may even be that his attitude was affected by a strong letter objecting to Federal control which I was pleased to sign, along with other members of the Nebraska congressional delegation.

There is, however, the problem of prompt Senate action. The Secretary has proposed to issue regulations asserting Federal control over this so-called check-off system. These regulations are to become effective July 1.

While it is to be hoped—and expected—that the Secretary would defer implementation of the regulations in view of the pending bills, it would be far better, Mr. President, if the Senate could complete its action and have the bill signed into law before July 1.

Many Nebraskans have written me about this matter evidencing serious concern. In view of the general agreement on keeping the promotion and education activities of the meat industry on a voluntary basis, it is my hope that timely action can be taken.

NEEDED WORDS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on June 2, 1963, the Baltimore American published an editorial entitled "Needed Words." This article requires no introductory remarks; it speaks for itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Needed Words

It may be predicted that extremists of both sides, white and Negro, will disparage the words Vice President Lyndon Johnson spoke at Gettysburg on Memorial Day.

They were words addressed to men and women of reason on both sides, an appeal to work within the law and not outside it by violence and hatred. And they were words above partisanship, above empty rhetoric, and, since Vice President Johnson is a Texan, above personal political consideration.

We are not going to enfeeble what Mr. Johnson said by paraphrase. Here are some direct quotes:

"One hundred years ago the slave was freed. One hundred years later the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin. In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake. It is our Nation. It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands.

"Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge that now confronts us.

"Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

"The law cannot save those who deny it, but neither can the law serve those who do not use it."

DEMANDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST BICYCLE IMPORTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in 1960 the U.S. Tariff Commission determined that "an industry in the United States is being injured, and is likely to continue to be injured, by reason of the importation of bicycles from Czechoslovakia at less than fair value within the meaning of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended." As a result of the sale of bicycles by the Czechoslovak exporting organization at less than fair value, the importer has been able to sell bicycles in the United States at prices below the prices at which American producers were able to sell comparable products. The volume of Czechoslovak imports was sufficient to displace a significant part of the domestic market for low-priced bicycles.

The ruling of the Tariff Commission authorized the imposition of an antidumping duty on Czechoslovak bicycles. A table compiled by the U.S. Tariff Commission from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce indicates that in 1959, before this antidumping duty went into effect, 51,539 bicycles, or 5.1 percent of the total number imported into the United States, were of Czechoslovak origin. In 1962, with the antidumping duty in effect, imports from Czechoslovakia were down to 11,156 bicycles, or nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total number imported.

Further reference to the Department of Commerce statistics, however, shows that the problem has not yet been eliminated. In 1959 the United States imported from Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary a total of only 1,014 bicycles; but by 1962 the bicycle imports from these 3 countries had risen to 96,820, or 7.6 percent of total bicycle imports. The increase in imports from these other eastern European countries has more than replaced the decrease in Czechoslovak imports which followed the ruling of the Tariff Commission. This evidence leads me to believe that the Communist bloc may still be dumping bicycles on the U.S. market at less than fair value, possibly by transshipment of Czechoslovak bicycles to Poland and the other eastern European countries for export to the United States.

Mr. President, I am writing a letter to the Commissioner of Customs, Mr. Philip Nichols, Jr., asking that the customs officials at each U.S. port of entry take special notice of the situation to determine whether any Czechoslovak bicycles are being imported to the United States from Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary with a false specification of the country of origin, and whether it would be advisable to seek an extension of the antidumping duty to all countries in the Communist bloc.

REA COOPERATIVES AND THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—SPEECH BY FPC CHAIRMAN SWIDLER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 8 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, delivered an address in Minneapolis on the rural electric cooperatives and the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Swidler spoke before the North Central Area G. & T. Management Conference, which includes 19 of the rural electric generation and transmission systems in the area. I congratulate the distinguished FPC Chairman for a fine, informative address.

Mr. Swidler stated in his Minneapolis address that his objective in undertaking a national power survey is to bring to all consumers—including the members of the rural electric cooperatives—the benefits of the latest technology in the electric power field. Mr. Swidler emphasized the enormous part that electric energy is playing and will continue to play in the future of America and of the world, especially the underdeveloped and emerging nations.

In his speech, Mr. Swidler also said that the generation and transmission movement itself is a manifestation of the efforts by cooperatives to pool their markets and their resources in an effort to take advantage of larger and more efficient generating capacity and higher voltage transmission lines.

Mr. President, I agree with the Federal Power Commission Chairman on this point. And I might add that the rural electric cooperatives must continue to take advantage of these opportunities in their efforts to make available more abundant power at lower cost. These consumer-owned systems are going to play their part in helping to supply the electricity demanded in rapidly growing amounts every day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that FPC Chairman Swidler's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REA COOPERATIVES AND THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(Address by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, before the North Central Area G. & T. Management Conference, Minneapolis, Minn., May 8, 1963)

It was a constructive public service for the Southwestern Federated Power Cooperative to arrange this occasion for a full-dress discussion of the relationship between the Federal Power Commission's National Power Survey and the power supply problems of the rural electric cooperatives. I hope that before the program of the day is over and you have heard from the FPC representatives and the members of our advisory committees who are on the program, you will have a better idea of what the Commission is trying to do and that your questions as to our programs and their possible impacts on your work will have been answered.

Some of you may know that I am no stranger to the problems of the electric cooperatives. I helped to organize the first of the modern rural electric cooperatives in this country, the Alcorn County Electric Power Association of Corinth, Miss., even before REA had settled upon cooperatives as its primary instrument for bringing the blessings of electric power supply to the farmers of this country, and before REA had been established as a permanent agency. This was in the spring of 1934 when I was power attorney for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I had the pleasure of reporting on the cooperative type of organization to a forum in Washington called by Morris Lewellyn Cooke to explore various organizational devices when REA was still groping for the best medium through which to carry on its program. In the period in the late 1930's when TVA was building up its power marketing area and working with the local distributors in the purchase of facilities from private power companies, I shared responsibility for the recommendations which led to selling the existing distribution systems in many small communities to the rural electric cooperatives. The loads—including industrial loads—of these small urban communities served by the cooperatives have greatly improved the average line density of the cooperatives in the TVA area and have helped to make them strong and prosperous.

The cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area where I labored for so many years are an exceptionally thrifty lot. In 1961 the 50 cooperatives in this area sold over a fifth as much power as was sold by the other 950 electric cooperatives in the United States. Several have peak demands well over 100,000 kilowatts each. Over a dozen have peaks of more than 50,000 kilowatts. I believe every one of the 50 cooperatives is thriving and the success of these co-ops and the important role they play in the power economy of the Tennessee Valley area will always be a source of pride to me.

I also have some familiarity with the problems of the cooperatives inside and outside the Tennessee Valley from the point of view of co-op management. After I left TVA I represented a number of cooperative and municipal electric systems as well as two statewide cooperative associations.

Sometimes in Washington I look back with nostalgia to the time when I worked for TVA and to the years when I was practicing law on behalf of public and cooperative power systems. The impulsions of advocacy have a wonderfully simplifying effect on complex problems. A lawyer may have only a fair record in court but never lose a case in arguing with himself. After almost 2 years on the Federal Power Commission I can assure you that in the power field it is much easier to be an advocate than a judge, and a great deal more fun. I might also add that advocacy pays better. At any rate, as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, I have a responsibility to the whole industry and to all the consumers of the country. This certainly includes the REA cooperatives and their members. It also includes the other segments of the industry and their consumers.

This is a particularly exhilarating time in the history of the electric power business. The mounting pace of technological development is changing the face of the industry faster than ever before. Breakthroughs in extra-high-voltage transmission have greatly increased the economic attractiveness of transmitting huge blocks of power over long distance and have given a major impetus to power pooling. Generating unit sizes are also in a period of rapid increase. In 1950 a 100-megawatt unit was considered large. Today, 650-megawatt units are installed and 1,000 megawatt units are on order. The huge new generating units can produce power much more cheaply than the largest units of a decade ago. Nuclear technology, which is also advancing rapidly, promises even more dramatic economies of scale. Conventional and nuclear plants of 5,000 megawatts are probable within the next 20 years; and from responsible sources one hears proposals for study of the possibilities of 8,000-megawatt electric power plants that will also be used to desalinate water. The large capacity pump-turbine plant for peaking is another new development which can reduce the cost of power supply when used in combination with economical base-load plants in large integrated power pools. The pump-turbine in effect converts cheap off-peak thermal energy into high-value hydro peaking energy.

The technological progress of cooperative systems has paralleled that of the industry, but of course started from a much more modest base. The G. & T. movement itself is a manifestation of the efforts by cooperatives to pool their markets and their resources in an effort to take advantage of the obvious economies of larger and more efficient generating capacity and higher voltage transmission lines. Generating units of 200 megawatts are being installed by at least one G. & T. system. There has been great progress although there is a limit of the extent to which G. & T. systems in isolation can take advantage of the vast array of our new technology.

What I have said concerning economies of larger capacity generation and transmission equipment for the mass production and bulk transportation of power has an altogether different application in the distribution of electricity. In distribution the economies that came with greater use of electricity are measured in terms of greater use by individual consumers and they can be realized by distributors of every size. This is a fact of enormous importance to cooperatives. When the job to be done is to distribute power from a central point to individual homes and farms and business establishments, the evidence indicates that the way to reduce unit costs is to build up high average use per consumer and high density per mile of line. The cooperatives and many municipal systems and small private power companies have demonstrated that low unit distribution costs can be achieved in small systems as well as in large.

Cooperatives are thus in a position to continue their performance in their vital role of supplying low cost power to rural America in the future if on the one hand they can achieve the economies of growing use by their individual members and if on the other hand they can have access to the benefits of integrated regional power pools for generation and transmission. The cooperatives' opportunities in this respect are no different than the opportunities and challenges facing the industry generally in the years ahead which we are spotlighting in our national power survey. It is the goal of the survey to bring to all the consumers of America—including the members of the electric cooperatives—the benefits of the latest technology in the electric power field.

The survey is the Commission's effort to carry out responsibilities assigned to it in section 202(a) of the Federal Power Act to encourage the voluntary interconnection of the Nation's power systems to assure "* * * an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and with regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources."

The survey is filling a longfelt need by supplying a framework in which the Nation's interest in the effective use of its electric power resources can be expressed in a positive way. Many thinking people inside and outside the industry have recognized the need for developing such a framework to reflect the national interest in the planning of the electric power industry. I believe this explains the cooperation which the Commission has received from all segments of the industry in carrying on the survey, despite the fact that the various segments are in frequent disagreement on policy matters.

The survey is not intended as a basis for dictating to the various elements in the industry—and I include the cooperatives—what kind of generating units they should buy, where they should be located, or how they should be integrated for service to the region and Nation. Rather, the purpose is to suggest in general the kinds of developments in generating plants and intertie and integration arrangements which the operating systems can follow up on their own, with such variations as more particular investigations and changing circumstances may disclose to be necessary. Already the survey has served to focus attention on the national interest which is involved in every industry decision on building additional generating and transmission facilities, and into every study of interconnection and integration possibilities. More and more, the question is being asked, How would each of the various alternatives serve the Nation's interests?

The Commission is working closely with the entire electric power industry in carrying on the survey. Several score of the Nation's leading experts in the electric power field are actively at work on the special technical committees, the regional committees, the general technical advisory committee and the executive advisory committee. The committees are drawn from every segment of the industry and every part of the country, and include many of the leaders in the Nation's cooperatives, most of whom are here with us today. As you know John Hyde is now in our executive advisory committee. In addition to Mr. Hyde, committee members include Hugh Spurlock, of Kentucky RECC, on the general technical advisory committee; John K. Taylor, of Western Farmer Electric Cooperative, on the transmission and interconnection committee; Frank Linder, of Dairyland Power Cooperative, on the power requirements committee; John Bugas, of Colorado Ute Electric Association, Inc., on the generating stations committee; J. E. Smith of Mecklenburg Electric Cooperative, on the distribution committee; and Virgil Hanlon, of the East River Electric Power Co-op, and Neil Adams, of Associated Electric Cooperative, on the regional advisory committees. We also have a legal advisory committee on which Lawrence Potamkin is an active member.

The industry as a whole has a long way to go to take full advantage of present-day technology and the technology of the future. As of January 1, 1962, the latest date for which figures are available, FPC statistics reveal that approximately 25 percent of the total steam generating capacity of the industry was in units of 50 megawatts or less, practically all of them low pressure, low temperature units. The best of these small units used approximately a pound of 12,000 British thermal units coal per kilowatt-hour or about a third more coal than a 500-megawatt unit of high temperature and pressure. Power from a 50-megawatt unit, even a modern one, costs 30 percent more than from a 500-megawatt unit.

It is the intention of the power survey to help the industry to shape the Nation's power supply systems so as to enable them to meet the growing needs for electricity in the coming decades with the greatest possible efficiency and at the lowest possible cost. As I said in a speech before the American Power Conference in March, we should be satisfied with nothing less than the maximum efficiency from each input of fuel and equipment and site resources, no matter who puts up the money for a plant or where title may lie.

I know the primary interest of those gathered here today is in the possible bearing of the power survey on the power supply planning of the G. & T. cooperatives. I believe the implications are clear and should provide both encouragement and a challenge to the managements of G. & T. systems throughout the country. The cost advantages of large generating units and of large integrated power systems makes it imperative for G. & T. cooperatives to take steps to obtain the benefits of the best in industry technology.

G. & T. cooperatives have a great opportunity to reduce their power supply costs by obtaining their power from larger and more efficient units. Some cooperatives now participate in regional power pools and share in such savings, but there are many others which for one reason or another do not. The G. & T. cooperatives and the neighboring power systems, public and private, should pool their power requirements and work together as partners in joint ventures to build large, efficient units and coordinated high voltage grids. Today there are moves in this direction underway in various parts of the country. I think this trend should be accelerated.

There are a variety of ways in which cooperatives can share in the savings inherent in the economies of scale in the generation and transmission of electricity. One of the best, where it is feasible, is to buy your power from large pools of publicly owned low-cost capacity, such as TVA and Bonneville. Another way is to create your own G. & T. sources and to integrate them with the power supply network of the region for maximum economy. The purchase of power at wholesale from investor-owned power companies is another alternative and it is one in which the Federal Power Commission has a special role to play.

The Federal Power Commission has a statutory obligation to assure that power from the privately owned interstate grids will be available to distributors on fair terms, and the Commission intends to assert its authority to provide this assurance. As I told the American Power Conference, this means that wholesale customers should have access to power from interstate pools "* * * on fair terms which insure that the purchase of power from a neighboring company or system will not be used by the seller as a club to destroy the buyer. The small distributor must not only be able but willing to buy, and its preference for purchased power rather than for producing its own will not be dependent on price alone. As a part of the bargain for power supply, the small distributor has the right to expect that the seller will recognize the buyer's right to exist, will not compete for retail customers by invading the buyer's own territory, will share fairly the economies of low-cost power sources, and will provide security for meeting growth in loads over the long term."

Cooperatives should not be compelled either to create their own G. & T. sources, or to agree to forego creating such sources of supply, in order to secure the benefits of low-cost power from integrated grids. The Commission emphasized this point in a recent decision involving a rate reduction to cooperatives in Delaware.

This was a case in which three cooperatives as a part of a power supply agreement with a private company agreed that they would not seek G. & T. loans for a stipulated period. The Commission approved the reduced rates but made clear that it was not approving this commitment of the co-ops. The Commission said that it stood ready to enforce the provisions of the Federal Power Act to protect wholesale purchasers, and that cooperatives could not be required to forgo building their own generating facilities as the price for receiving just and reasonable wholesale rates from private companies.

The regulation of wholesale rates in interstate commerce is the core activity of the Federal Power Commission and it is an activity which is of growing importance as the power systems of the country increasingly integrate their operations. In the past decade the industry has moved rapidly toward a single interconnected grid, and such a grid already exists from the Rocky Mountains to the east coast, and from Maine to Florida. Even though many of the interconnections are weak, and the interconnection arrangements for the most part are far from true integration agreements, there has resulted a tremendous increase in the wholesale transactions in interstate commerce. Yet, in the period that the need for the rate regulation of wholesale sales has increased greatly, for all practical purposes the rate regulation activity ceased to be an effective function of the FPC.

When the present members of the Commission took office in 1961 we found the electric rate staff—which consisted of a total of four people—submerged in the natural gas organization. The situation had so deteriorated that many of the interstate electric power companies subject to FPC jurisdiction had not even filed their wholesale rates with the Commission, as required by the Federal Power Act.

We began promptly to invigorate our electric rate work within the limits of existing manpower. The group was transferred to the Bureau of Power and given the prominent place it deserves in our power organization. We have built up our rate staff to the extent possible within existing appropriations. It now consists of 26 people and we are seeking funds to further enlarge this staff.

We have required the public utilities to file their wholesale rates in interstate commerce with the Commission and these rate filings are now pouring in. We have proposed rules—that is, we have initiated formal rulemaking proceedings—to require the companies to support these rate filings with cost information in order to facilitate meaningful Commission review. We are making a comprehensive study of all of the rate schedules on file to identify those which are out of line and warrant formal investigation. Our electric rate work has been greatly expanded and it will soon be on a footing which can assure prompt protection of wholesale power purchasers in interstate commerce.

We have found that the Commission's jurisdiction had fallen into such disuse that many municipalities and co-ops bargained with their wholesale suppliers without being aware that Congress had provided a forum in which their interests could be protected. I hope that the FPC's rate jurisdiction is no longer a secret. Certainly the REA cooperatives, which purchase 38 percent of their aggregate power needs from private companies, should be aware of their rights to protection under the Federal Power Act.

In emphasizing the FPC's role as the arbiter of wholesale rate disputes I want to make clear that the primary responsibility for reaching accommodations on territorial problems and construction programs is local, and that cooperatives and other wholesale purchasers should make every effort to work out satisfactory agreements with their suppliers. Rather, we believe awareness of our jurisdiction will be a factor that should encourage realistic discussions and result in more sound wholesale contracts with the private companies. On a relative basis such purchases have been declining. Power purchased from private power companies represented one-half of all the power generated and purchased by REA co-ops as recently as 1952. The proportion has dropped by a quarter to 38 percent. If distributors are aware that the law gives them the right to buy power at fair and reasonable rates determined by the FPC and that they are not at the mercy of the sellers, they would be encouraged to place greater reliance on wholesale contracts for their power supply. Such access should prove of growing importance to cooperatives in the future, because the advancing technology of the industry, and the economies which will result from the accelerated trend toward power pooling, I believe, will bring about substantial reductions in wholesale rate schedules.

The problem of working out equitable arrangements by which cooperatives and municipalities can tap low-cost power sources is complicated by the bitterness which has developed in the relations between the public and private segments of the industry. I believe that every segment of the industry could benefit if it reexamined its basic approach to relationships with other segments. The citizens of this country would benefit, both as taxpayers and as consumers, if peaceful negotiations, supplemented by the firm and impartial exercise of regulatory authority, were to take the place of the guerrilla warfare which is now the all-too-common way of carrying on relationships among the industry factions.

We should start by accepting the continued existence, and I might add also the patriotism, of all segments of the industry. I have said, and I repeat my view, that the private power systems which now constitute approximately 80 percent of the industry will continue to be the backbone of this country's power supply, and I have every reason to believe that they will constantly improve their standard of service. But TVA, Bonneville and other Federal systems are also here to stay and to share in the growth of the regions which they have helped to develop. The municipal and cooperative systems are living up to their responsibilities in a way which meets with the approval of the areas which they serve, both urban and rural. They, too, are here to stay.

In the highly sensitive relationships among the segments of the industry, there is a tendency to regard every dispute as a call to arms and every skirmish as a climactic battle in a war between ideologies. If we can once accept the fact that each of the segments of the industry has a place, that this country is founded on economic pluralism and has always offered and should continue to offer a choice of economic instruments in public service activities, the industry can isolate the areas of disagreement, agree to disagree on those points, and then move along together on the main job of reducing costs and expanding supply.

The lack of mutual confidence between the public and private segments of the industry is not the only form of mistrust which is inhibiting arrangements to obtain the economies of scale in the generation and transmission of electric power. I know that many public and cooperative systems distrust the effectiveness of the regulatory agencies upon whom they must rely if obtaining power from the large regional pools is to be a fair alternative for their own isolated sources of generation. I should be the first to agree that the record of inaction by the Federal Power Commission has done much to contribute to this lack of confidence.

I have no illusion that the distrust of regulatory agencies which has been built up over many years can be dissipated overnight. But all of us who have responsibilities as leaders should exercise our responsibilities to build rather than to destroy, to bridge rather than to enlarge the differences among the various industry groups, and to find common goals and programs behind which all segments can unite for the benefit of consumers everywhere.

I have already told you of the Federal Power Commission's program to make its rate and service jurisdiction for wholesale customers an aggressive and effective activity in the public interest. We have made large progress toward that goal. We are determined to do our part to dispel your mistrust of the regulatory agencies by exercising our responsibilties with such firmness and impartiality that all parties will have confidence that their just interests may be entrusted to the administrative process.

The Commission's primary goal on the power side of its jurisdiction—I suppose you all know that we have some natural gas responsibilities as well—is to build our staff organization and our procedures so that the Commission may contribute to the health and growth of the industry and to the far-reaching cost and rate reductions which our new technology is making available. The building up of an organization, including a regulatory Commission, is a matter of bricks and mortar, and of building up one brick at a time, an undramatic process which does not attract headlines or even the attention of many who follow the Commission's work, but over the long run it is just as important to consumers as the development of a sound body of policies and principles. The two are integrally related, because the one flows from the other.

Our responsibilities are not limited to formal cases involving rates and service but include the obligation to take positive action to lower the cost of power supply to consumers throughout the country. To pare the cost claims of individual companies in formal rate cases is a long-drawn-out and tedious process, and even when successful helps only to reduce rates for the consumers of one company and for a limited period. I say this not to disparage the rate regulation function which is the backbone of public utility regulation in the public interest, but only to point out how much greater dividends we can expect from nationwide and concerted action of the whole industry to reduce costs by seizing the benefits of integration and present-day technology. To win a rate battle against strong company opposition may be truly a victory for the consumer interests involved in the case, but to achieve industrywide cost and rate reductions with the help of the industry results in benefits multiplied manyfold. The national power survey represents action by the Commission to discharge the duty of helping the industry to reduce costs—not fractionally, but sharply and drastically over the period of the next decade.

The rural electric cooperatives have a great record of achievement. When I came to the Tennessee Valley in 1933 only 3 percent of its farms were electrified and these were almost entirely near the urban centers on distribution lines radiating out from the towns and cities. A true rural electrification program did not exist. In the Nation only about 10 percent of the farms of the country had central station service when REA was created. The leaders of the cooperative movement in this audience and throughout country can take satisfaction and pride in the fact that—largely through their efforts—we are now approaching 100 percent rural electrification.

The Federal Power Commission does not expect quite the same degree of success in striving toward its own goal of effective discharge of the full range of its responsibilities in the public interest, but with your cooperation and support, and with the cooperation and support of all segments of the industry, we expect to show a great deal of progress in the months and years ahead.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Mr. William H. Ewing is the editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, the largest daily newspaper in the State of Hawaii. Mr. Ewing is not only a leading editor but an outstanding reporter who won a national award for his reporting of the Tokyo student riots a few years ago.

Mr. Ewing recently delivered an address on American foreign policy before the Rotary Club of Honolulu. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent enunciation of our foreign policy printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By William H. Ewing)

What is foreign policy and how is it made? Foreign policy is a program of action intended to maintain the physical security of our country and the institutions of our Nation in a changing world. I emphasize the final phrase, "in a changing world."

Today's great debate over foreign policy really centers in this last phrase. The administration and its supporters in both parties recognize it as being not only essential but of utmost importance. Others, though admitting its importance, would relegate it to a secondary position.

These latter are principally preoccupied with maintaining the physical security of our country and our fundamental political and social institutions. They are not too much concerned with whether the world is changing or not.

I think this is an extremely shortsighted view because it is based on isolationism and our isolation ended the day the first World War began. Today, in maintaining the physical security of our country and its basic institutions we must reckon with the fact that the world is not the same world that existed when the United States came into being.

We call ours a democratic government and the Communists call theirs democratic, so in order to avoid any conflict over semantics I will depend on the terms "expansionist" and "nonexpansionist." I believe nobody could claim successfully that the United States is expansionist. On the other hand the Kremlin's aim of world communism is admittedly expansionist. Mr. Khrushchev would say this is only a means of spreading the virtues of communism, but the fact remains that he has always done it with a gun, and he has been able to do it only with a gun.

The difference between expansionism and nonexpansionism makes a profound difference in the shaping of foreign policy. In an expansionist country, under communism, foreign policy is simplicity itself. Whatever is calculated to advance the cause of communism is essential to and a logical part of foreign policy.

Because Soviet foreign policy is thus by its nature dynamic and expansionist, whereas the American attitude toward the world at large is one of live and let live, the makers of our foreign policy must of necessity remain constantly on the defensive. This is unfortunate but it is inescapable.

The placing of Soviet missiles in Cuba last fall was an apt example of the aggressive nature of Soviet foreign policy. It was an apt example also of the dangers inherent in a defensive policy which must always react to the opposition, dangerous in that it is by no means certain that the reaction can always be handled in such a way as to avoid war without surrender.

Having had to give ground in the October confrontation, Soviet reaction has been to win back all that was lost and perhaps more but by different methods. The result is that a new crisis in Cuba is likely in making. But Cuba, dangerous though it is, is only the temporary focal point of the test of strength between the United States and Russia.

The big prize, the fulcrum on which the weight of the world may be moved one way or the other, is still Berlin. Should the Soviets win Berlin they would win Europe, and if they should win Europe, I do not see how we could win in the rest of the world.

There is an important addendum to our foreign policy of maintaining ourselves in a changing world, and this is our policy toward the path to be followed by other nations, particularly those nations only recently created. The word here is self-determination; it is a significant word because it has given rise to a bitter controversy among ourselves.

The administration's policy throughout the world is one of self-determination and this has resulted in criticism of our foreign policy on the ground that it is not sufficiently anti-Communist. But what other position, logically, morally and historically, could we because they impose their system by force possibly take?

We denounce the Communist countries and allow none of their victims to say whether they will or will not maintain the Communist order. How can we then be anti-Communist to the point of telling any nation that it must be anti-Communist?

To do so would belie our own belief in the system to which we adhere. Instead, we proceed on the firm conviction that our two great documents, the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, are correct when they say all men want to be free, and that they will be free if allowed to choose.

A familiar instance of what I am talking about is the Congo. Belgium retired from the Congo, the Republic of the Congo was established and was admitted to the United Nations. Almost at once the Province of Katanga seceded and the new nation applied for military aid from the United Nations to maintain its unity.

In extending such aid the United Nations did no more than live up to the requirements of its Charter and we ourselves had a large part in making United Nations intervention effective. Yet a powerful body of criticism arose in Congress, in the press, in military circles and around the country generally because the leadership of the Congo rebellion appeared to be more pro-Western than the government in the Congo capital.

The basic idea seemed to be that friends are where you find them and the devil with principle. Happily, in my opinion, no such view prevailed. Katanga has surrendered and, though the Congo's troubles are probably by no means over, the country has been restored to order and is in position to go about its development as a united people.

Morality in government is often derided these days, particularly by those impressed by the successes of cynical and ruthless men, but in my opinion the United States has no choice but to follow a course morally in accord with its traditions and institutions on any great national or international issue.

I believe we would not be half so far along, half so strong as we are today in world opinion, had we based our foreign policy strictly on the thesis of anti-communism instead of on self-determination.

Despite our many problems, and despite the mistakes that are inevitable, I think we can be proud of the record of our country during this post-war period when the world has been in ferment and in many places has been locked in revolution.

At a time when our opponent was fomenting disorder as the first step toward imposing an order of its own, we supplied the help that enabled people to make their own order.

At a cost beyond anything remotely resembling it in history, even on a proper basis of comparison, we underwrote stability in the countries ravaged by war including our former enemies.

Though the world lives today in a balance of terror, so long as the balance remains we can still extend and support the principle of self-determination.

We ought to remember, too, and be proud that the principles of our two great documents, the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, today influence the actions of governments throughout the non-Communist world.

The Charter of the United Nations is largely an enunciation of the principles of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution; and anyone who thinks the Soviets are winning the cold war should stop to consider that every nation acceptable for membership has subscribed to these principles, some, of course, with reservations, such as the Soviet Union.

The fact remains that the principle of self-determination, of freedom for men and nations to decide for themselves what kind of government they shall have, a principle most clearly enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, is today spread throughout the world because it has been made the keystone of American foreign policy.

A MEMO TO THE JUNE GRADUATES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, each June, graduates of high schools and colleges throughout the country are showered with millions of words of advice. Most of the well-meaning speakers tell their young listeners that the free world is counting upon them for final victory.

But George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, took a different view recently in an editorial entitled "A Memo to the June Graduates." Mr. Chaplin is a distinguished editor, a great southerner, and a former Nieman fellow at Harvard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Chaplin's editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEMO TO THE JUNE GRADUATES—AMERICA'S UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(By George Chaplin)

A friendly memo to the June graduating classes:

Some years ago a Senator from Massachusetts—I believe the name was Kennedy—addressed a class reunion at Harvard University.

He quoted Prince Bismarck as saying that one-third of the students of German schools broke down from overwork; another third broke down from dissipation; and the remaining third ruled the country.

Ideally, the quality and the scope and the thrust of our educational process should be such as to produce only rulers—if by a "ruler" one means every enlightened citizen capable of evaluating the issues, problems and opportunities, making intelligent decisions about them, and then acting on those decisions.

Such citizens will largely determine the course of our Nation and, in so doing, will significantly influence the future of the world. For while in the years ahead, sophisticated computers will replace much of routine thinking, the fundamental and crucial decisions will always be made by human beings.

It is fashionable to observe, at graduation time that the older generation can hardly wait until the younger generation—meaning you—emerges from the high school and college campus so that the conduct of the world can happily be turned over to you.

This is a base canard, completely devoid of any semblance of truth. No one is impatiently waiting for you to take over. On Broadway these days there's a show titled, "Stop The World, I Want To Get Off." It does not apply to the older generation.

The only way you will ever dispossess that generation—my generation—of any power or position or anything else—except possibly on occasion the family car—is to take them away from us by main force and haul us screaming out the back door. The older generation simply has no intention of giving up.

This is by way of observing that it's a rugged world and you'll need all your knowledge and your nerve and your love of your fellow man to make your way in it. You'll need your faith and a certain quantity of fear, too. For fear need not paralyze; it often can be a constructive prod to intelligent action.

The world bristles with clear and present dangers and dilemmas. It always has, although our margin for error was never so narrow. Welcome the fact—for what challenge is there without risk? How dull things would be if the world's business were neat and orderly.

Remember, the Declaration of Independence does not guarantee you happiness—but only the right to pursue it. It guarantees you liberty only if you are prepared to make whatever effort, whatever sacrifice is required to preserve that liberty.

In seeking the good life, never let it out of your mind and your heart that the basic strength of the free society is freedom. Encourage freedom of the pursuit of knowledge, freedom of inquiry.

As the late Judge Learned Hand suggested, "Place brave reliance upon free discussion." In a democracy, we need more colloquies, not more soliloquies, more competition of ideas in the marketplace, not less.

The same Judge Hand told the board of regents of the State of New York that "we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas."

And Elmer Davis said this Nation is dedicated to the principle—among others—that honest men may honestly disagree.

So beware of thoughtless conformity for the sake of easy popularity and be grateful for intelligent dissent. We can improve our society only by thoughtfully questioning it. That is implicit in the educational process.

Six years ago sputnik, by blasting us out of our apathy and smugness, helped restore American scholarship to the esteem it enjoyed in the early days—when scholars led the Revolution and then for a while occupied the White House.

Sputnik may have fortified in some the lopsided view that science is everything, but it at least gave respectability to the egghead and taught the needed lesson that knowledge, intelligently applied, is the key to our survival and the high road—indeed, the only road—to greatness.

Education, of course, has its pitfalls. One can fall into intellectual arrogance—the kind that prompted Lord Melbourne to say of the young historian Macauley, that he wished he was as sure of anything as Macauley was of everything.

The best way to avoid such arrogance is by being an activist, by being a participant rather than a parasite in this exciting human adventure of our workaday world.

In this world, we of America face three basic challenges—to make democracy more meaningful here at home; to successfully resist the global threat of the Communist bloc to our free society; and to meet, with our allies, the desperate yearning of two-thirds of mankind in the underdeveloped areas to break out from the poverty and the disease and the illiteracy which imprison them—and to thus achieve a dignity which we, in this blessed land, take too much for granted.

The struggle between freedom and tyranny is not new. Athens, the birthplace of democracy, and Sparta, probably history's first police state, were locked in battle more than 400 years before Christ.

Athens and Sparta were, in many respects, miniatures of today's free world and Communist world. Liberty did not come cheap then; it does not come cheap today.

In between the Greek city-states and the nations of today's world, history records the rise and fall of Rome, followed by a thousand years of darkness in the West, then the Renaissance and the Reformation, the sweep of the American and the other political revolutions and of the industrial revolution and, more recently, the death of colonialism and the inexorable force of militant nationalism.

We are now well embarked upon what has been called the scientific revolution.

Certainly no one can doubt that the horizons of science are fabulous. But I would suggest that the real values of science will depend on how science relates to the concepts and values of our free society.

There is some fear that science is becoming the master, rather than the servant, of society. Certainly, there seems to be a widening gap between scientists and humanists.

Sir Charles Snow says the Western World is divided into two cultures—the literary culture and the scientific culture. He says neither understands the other and that each is intolerant of the other, with the result being dangerous for all.

It is a problem which will increasingly be with us. For what profit to conquer outer space if the net is to exalt the machine rather than the human spirit. Science must help build a society that is abundant not only in the material, but is even more durable in the realm of human liberty and dignity.

And if science is to truly prove a boon to mankind, it must be directed to that challenge posed by the two-thirds of the world's people who live in poverty and political instability.

Thus far, science, by creating more and more for the one-third of the world's people who live in modern industrial societies, is actually widening rather than closing the chasm between the haves and the have-nots. It has been said, that as we concern ourselves with a second car or a second TV set, "families in backward societies wonder whether they can afford a second meal."

Their problem is accentuated by the crisis of overpopulation. Consider these figures. At the birth of Christ, there were 250 million people on earth. By the time the English settled our Atlantic coast this total was doubled, to 500 million.

Today the world's population is 3 billion and by the year 2000—37 years from now—it is expected to double again—to 6 billion.

Science is keeping people alive longer—but has not yet been able to adequately feed them. Our crowded world is getting closer to the point when it will have to put out a "Standing room only" sign. If we are unable to resolve this problem, the implications for the future are those of enormous peril.

Meanwhile, there is the continuing need, and thus the continuing struggle, to make democracy work at home.

True, we need physical strength and imaginative diplomacy to resist the Communist threat abroad, but our greatest power still lies in the magic of freedom, in our deep belief in our own capacity to sustain a society in which liberty is paramount, a society in which man has his best chance for happiness. The President has correctly said, "We shall be judged more by what we do at home than by what we preach abroad."

A few weeks ago while on the mainland I made a brief historical pilgrimage. In Washington, I visited the Jefferson Memorial. In Charleston, S.C., I went to the tomb of John C. Calhoun. And in New York I spent an afternoon at the United Nations.

At the Jefferson Memorial, as you walk up the steps just south of the Tidal Basin, you see above the entrance way a sculptured view of Jefferson and others of the committee which the Continental Congress named to write the Declaration of Independence—Franklin and John Adams, Robert Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston.

Inside the memorial, with its 19-foot statue of Jefferson, you see in bronze letters on the walls four selections from his writings, dealing with independence, religious freedom, public education, and the abolition of slavery—which he favored.

Here was a man of whom, at 32, a friend could say, Jefferson is "a gentleman who can calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance a minuet and play the violin."

He was a remarkable man, this author of the Declaration, this first Secretary of State, this third President, this founder of the University of Virginia—and he lives today in the American ideal toward which we all must strive.

Some hundreds of miles to the South, in the city of Charleston, where the first shot of the Civil War was fired, I visited the tomb of Calhoun. It is a large and dignified tomb. Around it leaves from a magnolia tree had fallen. And, as if in a stage set, a mockingbird was singing.

On the tomb was inscribed the offices which Calhoun had held—Congressman, Senator, Secretary of War, Vice President of the United States. But he was more, of course. He was the high priest of nullification. He was the parliamentary giant who believed and argued that there was virtue and justice in the principle of slavery.

Calhoun's fellow southerner, Jefferson, also believed in States rights, but with a view to sustaining the Union; Calhoun's brand of States rights was designed to break the Union.

It all came to a test in a great and terrible war, which pitted American against American, but which saved the Union. And as I stood by that tomb, with an occasional brown leaf fluttering down from the magnolia, I could not escape the thought that for some Americans Calhoun still lives and the Civil War, which came 11 years after his death, was never fought.

These people are still trying to secede, not so much from the Union as from reality and morality and constitutional authority. It is so sadly evident in the news dispatches of recent days and months from Birmingham and Oxford and many another city and town.

The race conflict, in the South and wherever else it flares in all its ugliness, is a moral conflict. Most southerners, like most other Americans, are basically what Gunnar Myrdal calls "moral-conscious"; most are respecters of the law, and it is these qualities which, in time, with broad leadership will overcome the countervailing social, economic and political pressures, and enable a solution.

Here in Hawaii, we are blessed in our human relations, not because we are instinctively better people, not because our genes and chromosomes are superior to those of others, but because of geography and history.

If we had only two races in Hawaii, one probably would have battled to a dominant role, leaving the other in second place. Our good fortune is that we are a society of minorities; no ethnic group in Hawaii has 51 percent of the population and the result is that reality, rather than inherent virtue, creates or requires mutual respect and tolerance.

Even so, we are not without blemish. There are still enclaves of discrimination and we all would do well to forgo smugness when we read the news of racial upset elsewhere.

There is some discrimination against the relative handful of Negroes who are here; suffice it to say that if there were a sudden heavy influx of Negroes into Hawaii, our luminous shield might quickly be tarnished by overt intolerance. The ideal of racial and religious equality requires constant vigilance, constant nourishment.

From Calhoun's tomb, I went to New York and while there to the United Nations. Looked at in one way, the U.N. headquarters is an impressive mass of marble and green glass dominating the East River skyline.

Viewed in another way, it is, in President Kennedy's words, "man's last best hope for peace,"—or as Ralph Bunche said of it as a world organization, "It's not only the best we have; it's all we have."

The Security Council was out of session and I had the chance to walk down onto the floor of the council chamber and up to the desks labeled with the names of the 11 member nations—5 permanent, 6 rotating. I came away feeling that as long as men will gather about a table and talk there is always a basis for optimism.

I suddenly realized, on leaving the U.N., that without really planning it that way, I had visited in Jefferson's memorial a symbol of the spirit which founded this Republic; in Calhoun's tomb a symbol of the dispute which brought the most severe testing of the Republic; and in the corridors of the 40-floor U.N. building a symbol of the path that may yet lead this Republic and the other 109 member-nations of the U.N. to a workable peace.

In ways that one cannot accurately predict, all of you being graduated this June will play a part of your own in that quest for peace.

I recently wrote to the three living ex-Presidents of the United States to ask for a sentence or two of wisdom that I might pass on to you in closing.

General Eisenhower, it turned out, was not in Gettysburg at the time.

From New York Mr. Herbert Hoover sent these words to you: "In my long life I have lived and worked in countries of freemen, of tyrannies, of Socialists, and of Communists. I have seen liberty die and tyranny rise. I have seen slavery again on the march.

"Every one of my homecomings was for me a reaffirmation of the glory of America.

"Each time, my soul was washed by relief from the grinding poverty of many nations, by the greater kindliness and frankness which came from acceptance of equality and wide-open opportunity to all who want a chance. I was inspired by the self-respect born alone of freemen. There is no place on the whole earth, except here in America, where every youth can have such a chance."

And from Independence, Mo., Mr. Harry Truman responded. I should note that he has lost none of his instinct for getting right to the point.

He wrote this: "My suggestion to you, in reply to yours of May 6, is to tell the young people to do their duty and carry out their understanding of what is right and they won't have any trouble. Sincerely, Harry Truman." How could anyone possibly improve on that?

Good luck.

FLAG DAY—ARMY BIRTHDAY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, tomorrow Americans everywhere will celebrate the 186th birthday of our national flag. By Executive proclamation, this day commemorates the adoption of a resolution by the Second Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, approving the design of the original Stars and Stripes.

As we honor this occasion, let us not forget that this date also marks the anniversary of another notable resolution by that historic Congress. Mr. President, I speak of the creation of the U.S. Army, the organization which for 188 years has served the flag as this country's buttress of strength, as the stanch defender of our land and our institutions.

The flag which we honor is the emblem of our unity as a Nation. And when we unfurl the flag we unfold the story of the Army's dedication to our Nation. It is fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute on this day to the men and women of the Army, whose early struggle against tyranny made possible the very existence of this country, and whose sustaining force has long safeguarded the flag's bright constellation of stars—from the 13 Colonies to the 50 States. Let us pause for a moment to recall the Army's bright record of distinguished service to the Nation.

In mid-June of 1775, the Continental Congress was convened in the old State House in Philadelphia. Skirmishes with the Redcoats had already been fought at Lexington and Concord, and the colonial militia faced the British siege of Boston.

Our historic predecessors, recognizing that the success of the patriots depended upon unity of strength and purpose, voted to adopt the small band of fighting men already bearing arms as a single Continental Army. Further, they determined to enlarge the force and on June 14 of that fateful year resolved "that six companies of expert riflemen be immediately raised in Pennsylvania, two in Maryland and two in Virginia."

On the following day, the new Army was given a leader—Gen. George Washington.

Thus, over a year before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, our yet unborn Nation, supported by a regular force, stood at the threshold of the long struggle for freedom and self-determination.

The Revolution marked only the beginning of the Army's service to the Nation. There would be much to do. Independence had to be secured and a vast continent opened and developed. The Union would have to be preserved, no matter how great the cost. The Army, growing in strength with our country, helped achieve these objectives. All the Nation asked, the Army did. I need not remind you of Harrison at Tippecanoe, of Scott at Chippewa, of Taylor at Monterrey, and of Teddy Roosevelt at San Juan Hill.

The United States entered the 20th century as a world power. And three times within as many decades, our fighting men paid the high price of freedom. American soldiers marched across the ancient battlegrounds of war-weary Europe; tramped through the dense jungles of isolated Pacific islands; fought over the rugged terrain of embattled Korea. The names of Pershing, MacArthur, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, and many others were added to the long list of this country's great captains.

And at this very moment, as we are well aware, the Army is positioned strategically around the world, poised as a powerful deterrent to Communist aggression.

During the past 188 years, the strength, organization, weapons, and uniform of our country's senior service have undergone distinctive changes. Continual research and planning have increased the ability of the Army to perform in its basic mission—the defense of our land and our institutions. At the same time, moreover, the Army has made outstanding contributions to the general welfare of all our citizens—humanitarian contributions unmatched by any army in history.

William Clark, Zebulon Pike, John Charles Fremont—military men—charted and blazed trails through the American wilderness. Army Engineers were harnessing waterways and dredging harbors as early as 1824. The Panama Canal and the Alaskan Highway are shining examples of the hundreds of projects built by the Army to make the United States and the world a better place in which to live.

Through the years, important advances in medicine have matched the vital achievements in exploration and engineering. Yellow fever, typhoid, and beriberi fell before the insistent research of Army doctors. And I might point out that this tradition of dedicated research is very much in evidence today. Not long ago Army medical personnel isolated and identified the virus causing Asian flu, thus paving the way for development of an effective vaccine.

Other contributions stemming from Army research and development include modern aircraft, weather prediction techniques, automatic transmissions, flameproof fabrics, and modern methods of processing and packaging foodstuffs.

This varied list could be continued to encompass many other benefits to our society, but suffice it to say that, as liberator and inventor, defender and healer, the U.S. Army is a strong and versatile force, both in safeguarding our national ideals and in creating a richer and fuller life for all our citizens.

It is therefore with great personal pleasure, Mr. President, that I recount these impressive achievements of the Army. On the special occasion of its birthday, we remember with gratitude the invaluable service faithfully rendered by this honored organization to the Nation—and to the flag. I know that my distinguished colleagues join me in an expression of appreciation and good will.

NORTH CAROLINA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the many institutions in which North Carolina justly takes great pride is the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Durham. North Carolina Mutual is the world's largest Negro owned and operated insurance company, with branch offices in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia.

Only recently, North Carolina Mutual held ground-breaking ceremonies for its new multimillion-dollar home office building which is being constructed on land which once comprised Four Acres, the homestead of the late James B. Duke who established the Duke Endowment.

North Carolina Mutual's founder and first president, James Merrick, was the personal barber of Washington Duke, organizer of the American Tobacco Co., and father of James B. and Benjamin N. Duke. At the instigation of the Dukes, Merrick associated himself with Dr. A. M. Moore to establish North Carolina Mutual which today has grown into an organization having assets of more than $76 million.

The company is obviously outstanding by professional standards; but it is, I believe, particularly deserving of our commendation because of the exemplary leadership it provides in the American tradition of free enterprise.

North Carolina Mutual's influence is not, however, limited to the boundaries of the United States. This institution has its own foreign aid program. In 1960, the company employed Victor Maafo, of Ghana, as an intern for a 2-year period. Mr. Maafo, who has studied at Wesley College, the University of London, and the Ghana School of Social Welfare, plans to establish a life insurance company in Ghana after completing his assignment with North Carolina Mutual. Undoubtedly, Mr. Maafo's internship with the company will assist not only in the economic development of his native country, but also in fostering better relations between this country and Ghana.

Our appreciation for North Carolina Mutual's contribution is best expressed in our deep and sincere admiration and our best wishes for continued progress in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article and editorial be printed at this point in the Record: "Ground-Breaking Ceremony Held by North Carolina Mutual," an article by Charles Barbour, appearing in the Durham Morning Herald of May 18, 1963; and "Memorable Ground Breaking Friday," an editorial from the Durham Morning Herald, of May 19, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, May 18, 1963]

Ground-Breaking Ceremony Held by North Carolina Mutual

(By Charles Barbour)

North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., the country's largest Negro-managed life concern, began construction of its new multimillion-dollar home office building here Friday with a groundbreaking ceremony.

Figures of international, national, State, and local prominence gathered with some 300 to 500 townfolks to witness the turning of the first layer of dirt. The 12-story structure will be erected on the site of the former homestead of the late B. N. Duke, brother of J. B. Duke, tobacco millionaire who endowed Duke University.

Asa T. Spaulding, president of the firm, told those attending the ceremonies, "As our new building rises from its foundation floor by floor, we believe the pride of our whole community will rise with it, and that it and what it represents and signifies will not only improve Durham's skyline, but will also help hasten the day when the city will stand out unquestionably as an example worthy of emulation and most deserving of 'The American City Award.' "

Among the distinguished guests scheduled to speak was S. Edward Peal, Ambassador of the Republic of Liberia, West Africa. He could not attend, but sent a long letter which referred to the project as the "Spaulding Dream," and noted that the Negro people, Durham, and the Nation could point with pride toward this undertaking.

Senator B. Everett Jordan told the group that the State was very much interested in luring new industry to the area. "But," he added, "we are more interested and happy to see one of our own businesses grow," and added that he hoped other firms in the area would follow the example being set by North Carolina Mutual.

State Commissioner of Insurance Edwin Lanier reminded the group that North Carolina Mutual is 64 years old. He then pointed out that the department of insurance is likewise 64 years old. "We grew up together," he said, "and 64 years from now, in the year A.D. 2027, North Carolina Mutual might be breaking ground for a branch office on the moon."

George Kirkland, chairman of the Durham County Board of Commissioners, termed the insurance firm one of the "strong pillars in the building of Durham," and said the concern had set a good example for others to follow.

Mayor E. J. Evans praised the undertaking, and then took time to award President Spaulding a gold key to the city in token of his work with the organization.

Others speaking briefly included Dr. Charles A. Ray, representing the Durham Business and Professional Chain; J. Wesley Lewis, president of the Durham Chamber of Commerce; J. H. Wheeler, president of Mechanics and Farmers Bank, and chairman of the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs; Dr. Alfonso Elder, president of North Carolina College; and Dr. Herbert J. Herring, vice president of Duke University.

Home Security Life Insurance Co., another life concern who recently built a new office building in the same general area, was host to distinguished guests and North Carolina Mutual officials at a luncheon following the ceremony, and Home Security President Watts Hill, Jr., spoke briefly to those attending.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, May 19, 1963]

Memorable Ground Breaking Friday

Groundbreaking Friday for the new skyscraper home of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. was a memorable event for Durham. Not only does it herald a new and imposing office building to enhance the city's attractiveness; also in its promise of much expanded facilities for the company it forecasts still greater growth for the company and in a stronger company added prestige for Durham in the financial and insurance world.

North Carolina Mutual has for more than threescore years been one of Durham's notable assets. Its steady and substantial growth has been a source of economic strength and business pride to the city and to the entire State.

A particular fitness attends the building of the company's new offices at Four Acres. The new building replaces the mansion of one the early builders of Durham whose advice and encouragement inspired the founding of North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. The Dukes, Mr. Washington Duke and his sons James B. and Benjamin N., took as much, possibly more, pride in their ability to pick men for responsibilities as they did in their own ability to build great businesses and to acquire great wealth. Impressed with the native ability of John Merrick, their barber, they encouraged him to go into business. He did, in association with Dr. A. M. Moore, and the North Carolina Mutual is the result. If he could see the skyscraper office building of this company rise on the site of his old home, the late Mr. Ben Duke would see in it his judgment of Mr. Merrick's ability abundantly vindicated.

North Carolina Mutual will soon join as neighbor Durham's other life insurance company, Home Security, whose home office is situated just across Duke Street. Their adjacent locations will probably soon bring to the commanding eminence the name "insurance hill." More important though, is the distinction the two growing companies will continue to bring to Durham, which, to its gratification, both call home.

THE ISLAND OF CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently my friend and colleague the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] made an interesting proposal to convince Mr. Khrushchev of the folly of trying to maintain a base for his operations on the island of Cuba.

In order that this proposal get the widest possible hearing, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing it, by the Hearst reporter, David Sentner, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jackson, Wyo.—Senator Gale W. McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming, today called for the United States to "pull the lid" on Khrushchev behind the Iron Curtain if Soviet troops are not withdrawn from Cuba.

McGee asserted there could be no more propitious time for the United States to negotiate for removal of Soviet military forces from Cuba through the threat of aiding underground groups in Soviet satellite nations.

He declared there was currently a rising tide of nationalism and discontent apparent throughout the Soviet slave territory.

Senator McGee, a professor of history, revealed his blueprint for ridding Cuba of Soviet troops while attending the western premiere of "Spencer's Mountain." Maureen O'Hara and Henry Fonda star in the Warner Brothers film which deals with the adventures and problems of the rugged Spencer family.

Senator McGee plans to transmit his blueprint for solution of the Cuban crisis to the Secretary of State or President Kennedy.

He made it clear he was not advocating any direct military assistance to Iron Curtain resistance groups which might induce a world conflict but would provide merely financial and moral aid.

"While such limited assistance to anti-Communist movements inside the Iron Curtain is less than the Kremlin is providing an anti-American and pro-Communist government 90 miles off our shores, a 'pull the lid' program would prove a powerful diplomatic weapon," said McGee.

"Khrushchev knows he has an achilles heel in the matter of retaining Soviet enslavement of his satellite nations.

"In Czechoslovakia today there is a political and economic restlessness reflected in suppressed demonstrations among the students and workers. This is partly due to reduction in economic supports from Moscow and dissension inside the Communist Party.

"There is a possibility that disorders may build up to another Hungary type of uprising."

McGee said that crop failures and lack of distribution of goods were adding to tensions in Poland, Rumania, and other Soviet satellite countries.

Globe-traveling Maureen O'Hara, beautiful star of "Spencer's Mountain," contributed her suggestion toward winning the cold war.

She urged that more emphasis be placed on beaming the story of America to the women of Russia. She said Russian women have great influence in the Soviet Union aside from the Communist Party, pointing out, for example, that 77 percent of Soviet doctors were women.

"If the women of America could tune in on the women of Russia perhaps something could be done to improve the international situation," said Maureen.

PEACE CORPS SUCCEEDS IN BOLIVIA AND IN NEPAL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, initial discouragement often faces our Peace

Corps volunteers, and courage, patience, and determination are necessary to overcome barriers to understanding. Fortunately, these qualities abound among our Peace Corpsmen. Their presence, combined with the experience of living and working with the people overseas, helps them to feel the actual texture of the culture and offers great promise of improving international relations.

Two fine articles in the May 1963 Peace Corps Volunteer explain the problems and activities of Peace Corpsmen in Bolivia and in Nepal. I am proud that two young North Dakotans—Pat Vessel of Fargo and Ken Van Sickle of Ellendale—are participating in these projects.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Peace Corps Volunteer, May 1963]

BOLIVIA VOLUNTEERS MAKE A GO OF URBAN JOBS

Has an urban assignment got you down? Do you crave the boondocks?

Early last fall there were in Sucre, Bolivia, five public-health volunteers whose prospects seemed most unpromising. One of them, a nurse, had an unpleasant dispute with a Bolivian doctor largely because of a language difficulty. She and the other Peace Corps nurses all felt resented by their Bolivian coworkers.

Gerry Marr, Lismore, Minn., Frances Valdez, Trinidad, Colo., Pat Vessel, Fargo, N. Dak., and Judy Worms, New Munich, Minn., all shared a suspicion that it might not be easy to establish real rapport with the people of Sucre, a small city dominated by its old and honored university. Instead of requesting a transfer to a rural assignment, however, they decided to stick it out.

Within 6 months they had made contact with hundreds of poor families through a milk-distribution program. They had established four model wards in the local hospital to help in training nurses. They had helped to set up and teach a credit course in English-language medical terminology at the university medical school. They had put into operation two free dispensaries and were training young Bolivians to assist in staffing them. They were broadcasting regular public-health and nutrition talks in Spanish and English over a local radio station.

A campaign to mobilize young people to renovate an orphanage had resulted not only in the rehabilitation of the institution but also in a remarkable outpouring of public spirit and the beginnings of what may become a Bolivian voluntary service corps.

The enthusiasm of the young Bolivians, led by a law student from the University of Sucre, was too strong and too articulate to be dismissed as a passing fad. These Bolivians had been moved by the sight of Peace Corps volunteers working for their community, and they sought ways to express their own sense of civic responsibility.

Jim McTigue, Braintree, Mass., a pharmacist and volunteer leader in Sucre in those early, difficult months, was largely responsible for organizing the Peace Corps breakthrough. To accomplish his ends, Jim found out what made Sucre work, who the leaders were, what the city needed and wanted.

THE GIFT FOR PEOPLE

He has what the Latins call the don de gente, the gift for people. The local prefect agreed to contribute from public funds the equivalent of $18 toward the orphanage rehabilitation. Through a clerical error he gave Jim a check for 10 times that amount. By the time the error came to light, the money had been spent, thus denting the prefect's budget. But Jim and the prefect are still the best of friends.

What made the Peace Corps work in Sucre is difficult to say. Part of the secret, certainly, was Jim McTigue's effort to develop contacts with people who were sympathetic and who could give sound advice. An hour or so of patient listening was far better than a hastily organized project.

Patience pays off in other ways, too. Watching Jim McTigue take several hours off to act as godfather to the 12th child of an unemployed laborer was to see what the don de gente can really accomplish.

SUITABLE PROJECTS

The Peace Corps projects in Sucre were sound because they posed no sharp threat to the established scheme of things and because, in general, they led naturally into other ways to achieve Peace Corps goals.

The milk-distribution program was an entré into the lives of thousands of persons who could then be persuaded to seek the medical attention that was available only if they asked for it. It was an opportunity to introduce concepts of public health and of nutrition which these people were not aware of.

Teaching a course at the university led to wider contacts with a variety of students eager to sit up half the night discussing politics and world affairs. The orphanage renovation brought a fresh awareness to the people of Sucre of what community effort can achieve.

None of the Sucre volunteer nurses was working in quite the way she expected. But out of initial discouragement in an urban assignment came a usefulness and effectiveness that fulfilled their hopes.

LEARNING FROM PASHUPATI

Shortly after arriving in the hill village of Dhulikhel, volunteers Jerry Young, Reading, Mich.; and Ken Van Sickle, Ellendale, N. Dak.; began building behind their house the first latrine in the history of the town. It was not elaborate but it was original, and Pashupati, a teacher from the volunteer's school, was impressed. A structure like this, he said, would be just the thing for the high school, and the volunteer saw an ideal community project coming up.

Winter vacation began, and so did work on the school latrine. Three other volunteers and I went out to help. But progress, unhappily, was patterned roughly as follows: the hole was dug (by volunteers), bricks were carried and laid (by volunteers), wood flooring was sawed and laid (by volunteers).

The students came by—to watch with an air of faint amusement all the goings-on. So did Pashupati. How strange to see teachers, and American ones at that, doing menial labor, soiling their hands. Meanwhile, we were becoming aware of the workings of the Hindu caste system.

PATIENCE TRIED

As the walls grew higher, our irritation increased. Occasionally a student would carry a brick or two, at our request, but usually our modest pleas for help were met with the excuses from the students that they weren't strong enough to carry bricks, that they did "not know how" to do the work. Pashupati wasn't much more enthusiastic, though he would occasionally tote a brick or two. I slapped the last brick in place just as the last stores of my patience were depleted.

Later, in calmer reflection, I realized two things. First, we had made mistakes in conceiving and organizing the project. We had failed to make the students see that the latrine, and its relation to health and sanitation, was something of immense importance to them. Enthusiasm for any project arises only if the project relates to the experience of the people involved. Furthermore, we had followed the old American way of doing things: see what needs to be done, then pitch in and do it.

SUPPORT NECESSARY

This Pashupati told us afterward, is not the Nepali way. Nepalis like to make great plans, organize committees, have meetings. This we did not do, and we consequently failed to obtain positive community support from the beginning. Lacking that support, we did not achieve the personal ties we might have.

Second, our own example had brought definite, though at times barely perceptible, changes in the attitudes of our "helpers." Pashupati's attitude changed from skeptical bewilderment to outright cooperation. What he observed was an accomplishment of initiative and hard work, and as the building neared completion, more labor and less looking came forth. It was satisfying to see a few students voluntarily beginning to get their hands dirty.

The experience was certainly invaluable as a guide for the future on how to accomplish in this culture, which is in some ways so different from our own.

Our little structure, which now firmly rests on the side of a hill commanding the vast panorama from Annapurna to Mount Everest, was built under trying conditions, but I believe it offers promise for the future.

LOCAL SERVICE CARRIERS HAVE STRENGTHENED AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES—CONGRESS HAS CLEARLY AFFIRMED ITS SUPPORT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in this 25th year since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, now the Federal Aviation Act, it is well to reaffirm congressional interest in securing and strengthening scheduled air services to the smaller as well as the larger cities of the Nation.

The action of the Congress of the United States in establishing, through the Civil Aeronautics Board, a group of airlines dedicated to serving small and intermediate size municipalities and their trading areas, has proved to be a productive investment.

These carriers, known as local service airlines, provide direct and daily flights to 577 communities in this country. Three hundred and forty-four of these urban and suburban sections of small and intermediate size are dependent solely on the local service operators for their scheduled air transportation.

With these services supplementing the larger trunk airline systems, there are few points in the Nation more than a day's travel away from any part of the country.

Air transportation is therefore meeting the growing needs cited in the act, namely, those of "commerce of the United States, of the postal services, and of the national defense."

The importance of the local service airline today to the economic and social development of our intermediate and smaller communities is generally recognized. It indicates the appropriateness of reviewing the trend of air transportation in the 1940's and the occasion for establishing these carriers.

It was apparent at that time that the trunk airlines, for sound economic reasons, were concentrating on the larger metropolitan markets. Flights to smaller cities were limited and subject to the needs of the terminal-to-terminal passengers. In many cases, intermediate trunk flights were down to one flight daily. Had this situation been permitted to continue, industries in our smaller and intermediate size cities would have been at a serious competitive disadvantage.

Recognizing this problem, the Congress urged the Civil Aeronautics Board to develop a program which ultimately led to the "two level" air transport system we now have. The trunk airlines were assigned the major markets and the local service airlines were certificated on a regional basis to meet local air service requirements.

The Congress has consistently provided the subsidies required by this investment in the economic and social development of smaller communities.

In West Virginia, three of the local service airlines—Allegheny, Lake Central and Piedmont—serve all 10 of the State's airports where there is scheduled carrier service. Eight of these airports, and scores of communities are solely dependent on these local service carriers for air transportation. Through the services of the local airlines, numerous West Virginia industries not in air trunkline cities, are accessible to the commerce of the Nation. They also are in better national defense status and more advantageously benefit from the movement of the mails and cargo by air. And, of course, the markets of the other States are more readily available to West Virginia.

In addition to being a primary requisite for the conduct of business of existing industries, air service is an important and, at time, a determining factor in the location of new industry. This was borne out in North American Aviation's decision to establish a plant employing 325 persons at Princeton, W. Va., last year. The same is true with respect to a number of new industries in other parts of our State, including the central counties, the Ohio Valley and the eastern panhandle.

It is vital, both from the standpoint of West Virginia and the United States, that local air services be continued and further developed.

West Virginia has not always been as dependent on local service airlines as at this time. Less than 4 years ago, the trunk airlines served seven of the State's certificated airports. Those carriers asked to be relieved of their operational obligation at five of these so-called loss points on the premise they could be served better by subsidized local service airlines. Following a series of hearings, the Civil Aeronautics Board suspended the services of the trunkline carriers. The local service airlines accepted their newly added responsibilities and the communities acquiesced in the belief that an adequate air pattern—hopefully better schedules—would be provided. This was the situation when American Airlines was replaced at Elkins and Parkersburg, Trans-World Airlines at Wheeling, and United Air Lines—Capital—at Clarksburg-Fairmont, Morgantown and Wheeling. American, Eastern, and United continue to provide excellent interstate service to our people from Charleston and Huntington.

In authorizing discontinuation of considerable trunkline services in West Virginia and at many other points in the Nation, the Civil Aeronautics Board is obliged to provide the replacing local service airline with the necessary support and flexibility to operate a meaningful and productive service.

The local oriented airlines carried more than 7 million passengers in 1962. This was a 130-percent growth over the previous 5 years. These lines, Mr. President, appear to have turned the corner on subsidy requirements.

While this is commendable, the Civil Aeronautics Board must recognize there is much to be done to stabilize and strengthen the local service carriers and thus assure the continuation and permanence of effective air service to smaller and intermediate size communities.

The intent of Congress has been clear in this area.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and its predecessor legislation, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which I cosponsored, are expressions of congressional policy. Section 401 of the current act provides for the airline certification, including those flights operated by the local air carriers. The Board consistently refused to accord permanent and stable status to the local service carriers. In 1955 the Congress responded by amending section 401 of the 1938 act to make permanent the then outstanding route authority of the local airlines. Section 406 of the act provides for the payment of subsidy by the Board to the air carriers in amounts sufficient to meet the needs of such carriers and to yield to them a fair return in their investments.

The clear intent of Congress is to be found in the official reports and actions of the various committees of the Congress. Mine has been a longtime and very real personal and official concern for civil aviation, both as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the Senate.

The reduction of the subsidy required to sustain their expansion and development is of interest to all of us—the passenger, the shipper, and the user.

Such reduction should not, however, be accomplished through the emasculation of the program nor should arbitrary limits be placed on the carriers. These actions have the effect of forcing reduced intermediate services and arresting the dramatic traffic growth—over 100 percent in the last 5 years—of the local service airline industry. Certainly, there must be ways and means of strengthening the operators, once called feeder carriers, thereby realizing the same objective in a more constructive way.

Mr. President, the Board should recognize that Congress has a continuing interest in the development of air services in the smaller and intermediate size communities. And the companies providing such services must be economically sound if our air transport system is to fulfill the intent of Congress as defined in the Federal Aviation Act.

A GREAT MILESTONE IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN CULTURE—THE PRESIDENT'S ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday, June 12, 1963, will be regarded as a great milestone in the history of American artistic activities. On that day, the 35th President of the United States established within the Executive Office, for the first time in American history, an Advisory Council on the Arts.

The Council is to be composed of heads of departments and agencies concerned with the arts, together with 30 private citizens, active in American cultural affairs.

This is, I should like to point out, no mere pro forma organization. It is geared to help assist toward a dynamic program. Such a program can advance American cultural ideals through recommendations for practical long-range action.

The President anticipates, therefore, not only continued survey of the arts but receipt of specific, useful suggestions. The President is, of course, keenly familiar with the urgent needs of the arts. His statement refers, for example, very frankly, to the financial needs of many artistic organizations and professional artists.

ATTAINING NATIONAL CONSENSUS

I may say that those of us in the Congress who have been privileged to work for the arts see the advisory council as an admirable instrument for the attainment of a national consensus.

Consensus toward what, it may be asked? Toward action—action, as the President envisages, for encouraging more gifted youngsters to enter and to remain in the arts, action to stimulate and work with grass-roots and State art councils, action in specific fields such as "tax laws, copyright laws, disposition of surplus property, public works and community development, public buildings, housing and urban renewal."

An advisory group is, by definition, advisory, but the advice is the means toward ends. And the ends are actions.

The responsibility for actions is, of course, shared by the legislative branch.

ACTION NEEDED ON NATIONAL ART FOUNDATION

I believe, therefore, that we of the Congress should lose no opportunity to proceed on necessary art legislation.

I hope that action will be taken, for example, toward enactment of S. 1316, the bill which would not only establish the advisory council on a permanent statutory basis, but, far more important, would establish a U.S. National Art Foundation, including a grant-in-aid program to the States. This legislation, popularly known as the Javits-Pell-Humphrey bill, has been further improved since its enactment in an earlier form by the Senate in the closing days of the second session of the 87th Congress.

I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] will be giving this matter his most careful attention as chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee which is expert in this field, aided by the active Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

TRIBUTE TO SUPPORTERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

Let it be noted that the President's issuance of the executive order represents the culmination of many years of patient, devoted effort by a great many public officials and private citizens. Most worthy of commendation is one particular citizen, Mr. August Heckscher. He has served with great distinction as the President's Special Consultant on the Arts. Mr. Heckscher brought to this post the same qualities of great learning, great understanding, and great ideals, which have characterized his efforts in a broad number of civic fields down through the years.

It would not be feasible to "call the roll" of the many other individuals in public and private life, who helped achieve the landmark of June 12, 1963.

I personally have been happy to offer bills for an Advisory Council for a number of years.

On April 18, 1962, I had written to Mr. Heckscher, suggesting that, in view of setbacks to legislation of this nature, the President might wish to exercise his prerogative to set up the Council administratively.

A week later, April 25, Mr. Heckscher wrote back, indicating deep interest in this concept. Our exchange of letters appears on pages 267–268 of the Senate hearings on my bill, S. 741, 87th Congress and on related bills.

BOTH PARTIES HAVE WORKED FOR THE GOAL

In the House of Representatives, several distinguished Members have worked hard for this goal. I believe that it would be universally conceded that no Member of the House has been more active in this effort than Congressman Frank Thompson of New Jersey. I should like, too, to commend the role of Congressman John Lindsay of New York, among others of both parties.

In this connection, let it be noted that the first suggestion by the Executive office on this subject was made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, 8 years ago. At that time, he urged enactment of a bill to establish an Advisory Council, but suggested that it be set up as an aid to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and within that particular Department.

By contrast, the present order, like the provision in S. 1316, sets up the Council close to the Chief Executive where it can rightly serve and to some extent speak for the entire executive branch.

REPORT BY MR. HECKSCHER

Now looking forward, may I mention these points:

First. Next Monday morning, a report will be released by the President's Special Consultant on the Arts, Mr. Heckscher. I believe that this report will represent an extremely important statement and will be very well received here and throughout the Nation.

Second. We are all, of course, awaiting with interest announcement of the names of the 30 private citizens who are being selected by the President to serve on the Advisory Council. I am informed by the White House that the selections have been completed. However, in view of the usual procedures of final clearance, and so forth, it will probably be a month and a half or so before the Executive office is in a position to announce the list.

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATION BY REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Third. I expect that, shortly thereafter, we will release a committee print, entitled: "Activities of the U.S. Government Related to the Arts." This print will be published by the Committee on Government Operations through its Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman.

The print brings together, for the first time, the text of all Federal laws on the arts, as well as a brief description of Federal organization and expenditures in the arts. It lists all the advisory commissions, boards, panels, and other groups assisting Federal organizations in the arts. Advance copies of this print were circulated last year to Mr. Heckscher's office and to other sources. In doing so, I had pointed out this paradox: Many individual departments and agencies have had advisory art groups, but there has been no one group to serve the executive branch, as a whole. Fortunately, this particular situation has now been corrected.

WORK OF THE COUNCIL

With respect to the Council, itself, two points might be made:

First. The Advisory Council will aid the President's Special Consultant on the Arts and the latter will be in a position to aid the Council.

Second. The Council is fairly large—a maximum of 43 members. Even so large a group can function without being unwieldy. The fact is that there is a vast array of artistic areas and needs. And they require a broad, representative basis from which to draw specialized knowledge and skills.

The Council will function in large part through subcommittees and additional panels. Membership on these groups, in turn, will consist of the highest level individuals in the professions and artistic disciplines.

ART AND THE SPACE-NUCLEAR AGE

Finally, may I observe that formation of an Advisory Council on the Arts is ideally suited to these times when the soul of man is so tested on every front.

The Council symbolizes the nature of man—striving for the good, the excellent, and the beautiful, while meeting the fundamental challenges of security and survival.

A cultural renaissance is not an anachronism in the space-nuclear age—it is a necessity for this age, for it is an expression of the whole of man's interests. It is the proof that we will continue to pursue man's esthetic interests in order, among other reasons, to strengthen our inner lives against outer perils.

But mostly, we seek the highest in artistic creation, because the profound impulse to art exists in man and must find its fullest outlet.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the text of the President's statement and of his Executive order.

There being no objection, the statement and Executive order were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the President Establishing the President's Advisory Council on the Arts

Establishment of an Advisory Council on the Arts has long seemed a natural step in fulfilling the Government's responsibility to the arts. I acknowledge the support of Members of the Congress in both Houses for this measure. I am hopeful that the Congress will give the Council a statutory base, but meanwhile, the setting up of the Council by Executive action seems timely and advisable.

Accordingly, I am establishing the President's Advisory Council on the Arts within the Executive office, to be composed of heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned with the arts and 30 private citizens who have played a prominent part in the arts. Private members will be drawn from civic and cultural leaders and others who are engaged professionally in some phase of the arts such as practicing artists, museum directors, producers, managers, and union leaders. An Executive order is being issued today defining the scope and structure of the Council and I shall shortly announce the names of those private citizens I am asking to serve.

The creation of this Council means that for the first time the arts will have some formal Government body which will be specifically concerned with all aspects of the arts and to which the artist and the arts institutions can present their views and bring their problems.

It is my hope that the Advisory Council will keep the state of the arts in this country under survey, and will make recommendations in regard to programs both public and private which can encourage their development. I trust that the Council will recommend such permanent procedures and programs as they consider necessary in this field.

I should like to summarize briefly my reasons for believing that the establishment of such a Council by the Federal Government is both appropriate and urgent.

Widespread public interest in the arts has not always been accompanied by adequate concern for the basic institutions of our cultural life. Increased attendance at museums, for example, has not eased long-standing financial problems but has actually increased the strains on these institutions as new services have been expected by the public. Of the thousand and more symphony orchestras of which we are justly proud as a nation, only a comparatively few have serious professional status and offer a season of sufficient length to provide a living wage to performers. The same is even more true of opera and dance groups. For some years American singers have been going in large numbers to find in Europe opportunities for employment which institutions at home cannot provide. The professional theater—despite the development of amateur groups—reaches only a limited part of the population. Indeed children are growing up who have never seen a professionally acted play.

A recent estimate by the Department of Labor presents a gloomy forecast of employment opportunities for the next decade. Although the demand for concerts and performances is bound to grow, there is no evidence that employment opportunities for the professional artist will increase. This is a situation which deprives Americans of the cultural opportunities they deserve and want, and discourages the development of creative talent.

I emphasize the importance of the professional artist because there is danger we may tend to accept the rich range of amateur activities which abound in our country as a substitute for the professional. Without the professional performer and the creative artist, the amateur spirit declines and the vast audience is only partially served.

Art is no exception to the rule in human affairs—that of needing a stable and ample financial and institutional base. As education needs schools, so art needs museums, actors and playwrights need theaters, and composers and musicians need opera companies and orchestras.

The Government has a responsibility to see that this important aspect of our lives is not neglected. The concept of the public welfare should reflect cultural as well as physical values, esthetic as well as economic considerations. We have agencies of the Government which are concerned with the welfare and advancement of science and technology, of education, recreation, and health. We should now begin to give similar attention to the arts.

Specific problems and areas which I hope the Council will look into include the following:

I am particularly interested in the opportunities for young people to develop their gifts in the field of the arts and also to participate in an active cultural life. The Council will, I hope, examine the degree to which we are now meeting our responsibilities to young people in this area.

The Council should evaluate the many new forms and institutions which are developing. For example, the growth of State arts councils is significant, as is also the planning of community cultural centers in many cities and regions of the country.

The impact of various general governmental policies and programs on the arts is an area to which I hope the Council will give special attention. This includes such specific fields as tax laws, copyright laws, disposition of surplus property, public works, and community development, public buildings, housing and urban renewal, and others.

Public recognition of excellence in the arts is one effective way of giving encouragement. I am sure that the Council will want to give consideration to various possibilities in this field, including such forms of recognition as prizes, competitions, festivals, traveling tours, and exhibitions.

Although the international cultural exchange program will not be a responsibility of the Council, the link between the vitality of our national cultural life and institutions and the success of our international programs is obvious. Our international programs are a direct reflection of our cultural achievements at home. I hope that the Council as it looks at the national cultural scene will consider its implications for our exchange programs.

The cultural life of the United States has at its best been varied, lively, and decentralized. It has been supported—often with great generosity—by private patrons. I hope these characteristics will not change, but it seems well to assess how far the traditional sources of support meet the needs of the present and the near future. In giving form to this reassessment the President's Advisory Council on the Arts will be making a most important contribution to the national life.

ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Establishment of the Council: (a) There is hereby established the President's Advisory Council on the Arts (hereinafter referred to as the Council).

(b) The Council shall be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, the Administrator of General Services, the President's Special Consultant on the Arts, and no more than 30 members appointed by the President from among persons in private life who are widely recognized for their role in the arts, including practicing artists, civic and cultural leaders, and others professionally engaged in the arts. Members from private life shall serve for terms of 2 years, except that the terms of members initially appointed shall be for 1 or 2 years as specified by the President. The Chairman shall also invite the Librarian of Congress to be a member of the Council.

(c) The President shall designate the Chairman of the Council.

(d) Federal members of the Council shall receive no compensation for such service. Members appointed from private life shall receive compensation for each day engaged on business of the Council and travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 55a; 5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

Section 2. Functions and Responsibilities of the Council: (a) The Council shall—

(1) Survey and assess the needs and prospects of the various arts throughout the United States, the means used to encourage creative activity and to afford opportunity for participation in and appreciation and enjoyment of the arts, and the relative roles of governmental and nongovernmental institutions in relation to the arts;

(2) Identify existing Federal legislation, policies and programs which directly or indirectly affect the arts, and evaluate their current and potential effects on the development of cultural opportunities and institutions and, except to the extent that responsibility may be vested by statute in other Federal advisory bodies, the character and quality of Federal activities in the field of the arts;

(3) Submit reports and recommendations to the President on its own initiative or at the request of the President or the President's Special Consultant on the Arts;

(4) Encourage and facilitate the most effective use of resources available for support and development of the arts by advising and consulting with Federal, State, and local agencies, civic and community organizations, educational institutions, foundations, and other interested organizations and institutions; and

(5) Promote and stimulate public understanding and recognition of the importance of the arts and cultural institutions to our national welfare and our international interests.

(b) In carrying out its functions the Council shall, insofar as practicable, provide interested Government and nongovernmental agencies and organizations and private citizens, including practicing artists and others professionally engaged in the arts, an opportunity to present their views and recommendations to the Council for its consideration.

(c) For the purposes of this section the arts are defined to include music, drama, opera, dance, painting, sculpture, literature, architecture and such allied fields as urban and landscape design, photography, graphic arts, crafts, motion pictures, radio, and television.

Section 3. Federal agencies: (a) As deemed necessary to facilitate the work of the Council, the Chairman may request the head of any executive department or agency whose activities have significant implications for the arts to designate a liaison officer to consult with and advise the Council on matters of common concern.

(b) Upon request of the Chairman each executive department and agency is authorized and directed, consistent with law, to furnish the Council available information which the Council may require in the performance of its functions.

(c) Each Federal agency represented on the Council shall furnish such necessary assistance to the Council as may be authorized by section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691).

(d) The General Services Administration is hereby designated as the agency which shall provide administrative services for the Council on a reimbursable basis.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 12, 1963.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CERTAIN CASES GUARANTEED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration. Minority views filed.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, June 10, the President of the United States made the most significant and far-reaching speech he has made since taking office almost 2½ years ago. In this speech, the President set forth in detail the foreign policy of the United States.

There have been many calls in the Congress for the administration to make known to the Congress and to the public exactly what is the foreign policy of the United States. We have heard demands that the infamous and illusive Rostow policy paper be released to the public.

Well, Mr. President, now we have it; for, in his speech, the President has set forth the U.S. foreign policy, and, for all intents and purposes, he has consistently and articulately pronounced as official the tenets of the Rostow policy paper.

Mr. President, in October 1962, in individual views filed with the report of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on Military Cold War Education and Speech Review Policies, I summarized U.S. foreign policy as follows:

> The U.S. foreign policy objective is containment of direct foreign military aggression. It does not seek victory over communism, but only to deter aggression while seeking grounds for accommodation, so that the Communist dominated territories will have the necessary time in which to evolve into nonagressive, socialist states.

The President confirmed beyond any doubt in his speech at American University that this characterization of U.S. foreign policy was, and is, completely accurate.

In the first place, the President made it clear that it is the U.S. policy to accept the status quo between the Communists and the free world, and that if we hold on to the status quo, the Soviets will evolve or change. The President stated that we should live together with mutual tolerance, which is nothing more than formalizing the status quo. He stated:

> We must deal with the world as it is, not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

The President stated that we should focus our efforts on peace "based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions."

He assured his listeners:

> The tide of time and events will often bring surprising shifts in the relations between nations and neighbors.

Again, he stated:

> We must, therefore, persevere in the hope for peace that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach, solutions which now seem beyond us.

Mr. President, one would think that after the Soviet forays into Cuba, sensible and practical people would have put aside the notion that the Soviets have given up their drive for world conquest and their willingness to gamble the lives of all mankind to fulfill their quest for power. It appears, however, that the President tenaciously clings, despite all the evidence to the contrary, to the hope that the leopard really is changing its spots.

Perhaps the Cuban affair did affect the President's belief that the Soviets were evolving to a slight extent, for apparently he recognized the outside possibility that the Soviets might not mellow. This did not change the basic approach of his foreign policy, however, for with reference to this contingency, he stated:

> And if we cannot end our differences, at least we can help to make the world safe for diversity.

Mr. President, I, for one, am not interested in making the world safe for a diversity from freedom. Communist rule and Communist terror are a diversity which should never be safe, and it is indeed tragic that our foreign policy would be directed toward making safe the conquests and dominations by Communist dictators.

The President urged his listeners not to see "accommodation as impossible." Quite obviously, the President does see accommodation, not only as possible, but as the best course to follow. As a basis for his conclusion, he has outlined a very dubious interpretation of history and existing circumstances.

The President stated, in speaking of the United States and the Soviet Union:

> Almost unique among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other.

To the extent that the Government of the Soviet Union has never formally declared war on the United States, the President is correct. It is a technicality without comfort, however, for the Soviet Union never formally declared war on such nations as Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia; yet all of these countries and others are now dominated by the Communists. Putting aside such meaningless technicalities, it is an obvious fact that the international Communist movement, which rules the Soviet Union, long ago declared war on the United States and all other free peoples. We can predict with relative certainty that the Government of the Soviet Union will never make a formal declaration of war on the United States, but this gives us absolutely no assurance against a surprise nuclear attack nor any other level of belligerency with the Communists think is in their best interests.

The President charged his listeners:

> Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union.

As one basis for his re-examination, the President stated:

> We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counter weapons.

From this statement by the President, one can only conclude that the President expects the American people to revise their attitude toward the Soviet Union and conclude that in the cold war the Communists and the Americans have been equally guilty of creating suspicion by their acts. Facts do not bear out this conclusion. It is the Soviet Union and its Communist apparatus throughout the world that has sought to undermine free governments everywhere or to take them over by force of arms. It is the Communists who have proclaimed their plan and program for overthrowing all non-Communist governments in the world. It is the Communists who have demonstrated their desire and capacity for terror and suppression, which surpass in evil any force in history. There is no basis in fact for concluding that the differences between the free world and Communists result from mutual suspicion. Any policy based on such a fallacious conclusion is doomed to failure.

The President also alleged that "both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace."

Mr. President, there is no historical fact, or action by the Soviet Union, to indicate that it has any interest in a just and genuine peace, as we understand the word. What does the President find in the Soviet actions to indicate any interest in peace? Has he forgotten the atrocities and slaughter committed by the butcher of Budapest in 1956? Has he forgotten so soon the introduction of Soviet ballistic missiles into Cuba? Does he prefer to overlook Soviet intransigencies on the Lao question? These hardly seem the actions of a peacemonger.

The President also explained what his policy of accommodation has required, is requiring, and will require of the United States. He pointed out:

> To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint.

One can only hope, with less than full faith, that this does not mean that we have resigned ourselves to a strategic military parity with the Soviet Union in order not to provoke the Soviets. With reference to this point, I ask unanimous consent that my weekly report to the people, entitled "Strategic Superiority or Strategic Parity" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY OR STRATEGIC PARITY?

The opening battle in the Senate on what promises to be one of the most controversial subjects before the Congress this session begins in the Senate this week. The forum for this battle will be the defense posture hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the issue is the strategic defense policy of the Nation.

At least until June 1962, the officially announced defense policy of the United States was based on the concept of strategic superiority. Under this policy, nuclear deterrence was achieved by maintaining a clear superiority in quality and quantity of strategic weapons. This required heavy investments in research and development, with emphasis on multiple types of weaponry. It provided a mixed system of delivery for our nuclear punch, including medium, intermediate, and intercontinental missiles, manned air and carrier based bombers, and Polaris missiles, as well as a host of other weapons and conventional power. The essence of this policy was that it recognized that there is no ultimate weapon.

A new policy—nuclear stalemate—has been adopted by the Secretary of Defense and is well into the process of implementation. Under this policy, we would accept a nuclear standoff by relying on a very few types of missiles—Titan and Minuteman in hardened sites, and Polaris under the sea—to deter nuclear attacks by the Soviets. Research and development would diminish and no meaningful effort would be made to develop advanced space weaponry. Under this policy, the United States would strive only for nuclear parity, not nuclear superiority.

It was Secretary McNamara's pronouncement of the new policy in Paris, Bermuda, and Canada that really brought the matter into the open. France would not trust her national security to an allied power who was willing to settle for nuclear parity. So far, neither will Canada.

Traditionally, Congress is more interested in hardware, and its cost, than in strategic policy. The nuclear stalemate policy does permit lower costs, and is explained by the Secretary of Defense in this framework. The abandonment of the Skybolt missile and the B-70 program, the impending cutback in the Dyna-Soar weapon system, and the dismal outlook for development of the TFX variable-sweep fighter are all elements of the new policy. Members of Congress are disturbed by the report in Air Force/Space Digest that "the heads of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force do not approve of the change in strategy. They are unanimous in their support of a doctrine of strategic superiority."

Implications of strategic stalemate in terms of disarmament become immediately apparent. The United States is now estimated to hold about a 3-to-1 superiority in strategic forces, which makes a percentage reduction of arms unacceptable to the Soviets. The disarmament studies conclude that strategic parity would increase chances for disarmament.

The Soviets will not accept a nuclear stalemate. They are continuing to work on development of new weapon systems, including space weapon systems. While the United States has stretched out the development of our anti-missile missile until 1969, the Soviets are working full speed on a defense against ballistic missiles. The Soviets have never been able to achieve strategic parity with the United States, but if we give them parity, their all-out efforts may give them the margin that will spell superiority.

Strategic superiority or strategic parity? The final round will begin in the Congress this week.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President also spoke of "halting the arms race." There has been no arms race in recent years, for the simple reason that the United States has not been racing. Nuclear tests are often cited as the prime example of the arms race. Mr. President, in the last 2 years, the Soviets have tested many times more shots, and many, many times higher yield detonations than has the United States. We have intentionally restrained our level of testing in order not to antagonize the Soviets and not to jeopardize the possibility of obtaining what would be, at best, a dubious, and probably disastrous, agreement with the Soviets on nuclear testing.

The President also stated:

> Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants.

Even the Soviets will interpret this as appeasement, for they themselves have stated repeatedly that they will not be provoked, but will act at times and at places of their own choosing.

If Americans wonder why a Communist military bastion has been permitted in Cuba, and under U.S. policy will continue to be tolerated in Cuba, they have only to refer to the President's statement:

> Above all, while always defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which present an adversary with a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war.

The President is contemplating a one-way street. This is precisely the choice the Soviets sought to present to the United States by introducing nuclear ballistic missiles into Cuba.

In the Cuban crisis last October, the Soviets demonstrated that when faced with a firm resolve and superior power, they would withdraw rather than risk a war. To withdraw, however, would involve a "humiliating retreat" for the Soviets, and, this the President tells us, we must not inflict upon them. So long as the United States follows a policy that it must not cause the Communists to make a "humiliating retreat," we can, of course, never take any step to cause the withdrawal of the Soviet military might from Cuba. Nor for that matter, under this policy, could the United States tolerate an uprising in any of the captive nations, for that too would involve a "humiliating retreat," or possible defeat, of the Communists. The conditions in Cuba constitute a diversity from the principles of self-determination and liberty, which the Monroe Doctrine decreed for the Western Hemisphere, and, according to the President, "we can make the world safe for diversity." Since the United States is the major source of power against the Communist nations, we can "make the world safe for diversity" by mere inaction; and we can make the Red brand of diversity even safer by his policy of accommodation.

The President's efforts to reassure our free world allies, and to offset their growing lack of confidence in the United States resolve to resist Communist imperialism, will reassure none of them; it will only confirm their suspicion that the United States will negotiate, and will never defend them.

The President stated:

> Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for example, stands undiminished.

He went further to state:

> The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge.

This statement brings to mind a similar statement, made by a high Government official a few years ago, to the effect that "What's good for General Motors, is good for the country." What the President has said in effect is that what's good for the United States is good for our allies.

The President also pointed out, however:

> Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become primary targets. It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in most danger of devastation. All we have built up, all we have worked for would be destroyed.

Mr. President, in view of these statements, together with our unwillingness to present the Soviets with "a choice of either a humiliating retreat or nuclear war" in Cuba and elsewhere, our allies in Western Europe can have little confidence that the makers of this foreign policy would defend them against Communist forays into Western Europe.

The President stated:

> Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace.

Mr. President, this is a far cry from the President's speech to a joint session of Congress on May 25, 1961, in which he spoke of "the expansion of freedom," and stated:

> We would support a revolution seeking an end to injustice, tyranny, and exploitation.

The American University speech also tells us something about the manner in which this policy is to be implemented.

The President stated that a new context for world discussions is required. He said:

> This will require a new effort to achieve world law—a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur in a time of crisis.

This "direct communication" is in direct implementation of the Rostow paper, which is quoted in the press as follows:

> We should seek, however, to develop further informal contacts and exchanges between the President and the top Soviet leadership which would—unlike more formal summit meetings—be received more as a forum for communication than negotiations.

We are now confronted with an agreement between the President, Prime Minister Macmillan, and Chairman Khrushchev, which is a result of the new, informal summitry, disguised as "communication." The so-called hot line between the White House and the Kremlin can be expected to produce more secret, informal summitry. This new channel of secret negotiations, camouflaged as communications, was designed to deceive, not the Soviet people, but the American people.

Quite obviously, this is just as dangerous a procedure as diplomacy by "tacit agreement," which has prevailed in the past year or so, and through which understandings which are never reduced to writing or made known to the public are reached.

I ask unanimous consent that a syndicated column entitled "Summitry a la Kennedy," written by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, which describes in some detail the genesis of this constant high-level negotiation procedure, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no bjection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMITRY A LA KENNEDY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The increasingly frequent exchange of secret letters between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev is a new form of summitry.

While outwardly the two national chiefs are not conducting direct firsthand negotiations, actually that is exactly what they are doing.

A specific instance of this backstage summitry is Cuba, on which Kennedy and Khrushchev have been carrying on an extensive correspondence.

The same is true on the vital issues of disarmament, a nuclear test ban, South Vietnam, and Berlin—in each instance involving letters whose existence has never been revealed.

This highly significant development of secret U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiations is spelled out in detail in a National Security Council policy paper that is being circulated among top officials and ambassadors for their information and guidance.

Prepared under the direct supervision of McGeorge Bundy, special foreign policy adviser of the President, and Dr. Walt Rostow, head of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, this key document states:

"We should welcome temporary and partial accommodations or detentes with the U.S.S.R. We should seek to develop the basis for these agreements by further expanded contracts and exchanges between President Kennedy and the top Soviet leadership which would—unlike formal summit meetings—be viewed by the public as a form of communications while actually involving negotiations."

In defining negotiating guidelines, the Bundy-Rostow paper points out, "There may be (and it is in our interest that there should be) agreement on specific problems, Cuba, Berlin, disarmament, nuclear test ban, and arrangements for periods of relative tranquillity.

"To the extent possible in the existing climate, the United States should grant the U.S.S.R. the position its status as a great power warrants. We should also hold out by word and deed the prospect of fuller Soviet participation and influence in the community of free nations if and as the Soviet leaders show a genuine interest and will for such constructive participation."

Crisis management—In addition to negotiating an informal detente with Russia, the President's secret exchanges with Khrushchev have several other major objectives.

As discussed in the top-level policy paper, they are as follows:

"Convey to Moscow a clearer understanding of our intentions * * * so as to avoid or minimize future crises promoted or exploited by the Soviet Union.

"Work out over the longer run tacit understandings with the Soviets as to the ground rules governing our competition throughout the world.

"Close out any crises as quickly as possible with as little violence as consistent with avoiding any net loss for U.S. interests."

Warning U.S. policymakers to expect and prepare for other crises similar to last fall's missile showdown in Cuba, the Bundy-Rostow paper presents a "grand design" for the cautious handling of such war-threatening confrontations, stating:

"Since we must expect a series of crises which the Communists will systematically seek to exploit, it is essential that we not reward this Communist technique by diverting attention and energies from the long-term policies and enterprise on which ultimately, the success of the free community depends.

"We must, therefore, try to meet these threats in ways which, if possible, reinforce the long-term direction of our policy and minimize the diversionary consequences of our reactions.

"Thus, the Cuban crises should be used to push and expand the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America; the Berlin crisis to help resolve the debate on the role of conventional and nuclear forces in NATO; and the Vietnamese crisis to increase the degree of mutual involvement and support among non-Communist nations in the area."

It is "against this background" that the Bundy-Rostow document asserts that President Kennedy is using his secret exchanges with Khrushchev "to work out over the longer run tacit understandings with the Soviets as to the ground rules governing our competition throughout the world."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President stated that the United States was, in effect, declaring a moratorium on nuclear testing, in order "to make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter."

Mr. President, we have had experience with a test moratorium with the Soviet Union; and, in view of that experience and the Soviet duplicity which resulted, the United States has no reason—nor is it the proper party—to engage in an act to demonstrate "good faith." Indeed, a unilateral moratorium at this point does not demonstrate good faith; it demonstrates gross gullibility.

The United States needs to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere now, to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles; to provide our Nation with a certain capability to penetrate a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads; to assure the immunity of our second strike missile systems to a surprise enemy nuclear attack; and to develop specialized nuclear warheads to defend our Nation against satellite bombs and other terror weapons with which the free world has been threatened.

Real peace can be maintained only if the United States succeeds in keeping a strategic military superiority to the Soviets.

This superiority we are in danger of losing; and under the U.S. foreign policy pronounced on Monday, we will surely lose strategic superiority.

Dr. Edward Teller, one of the most outstanding nuclear scientists of our day, and father of the hydrogen bomb, has stated that the proposed test ban treaty "would endanger our security and help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world."

Mr. President, all of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are on record as being opposed to the current proposal of the United States for a test-ban treaty.

It was reported in the press yesterday that the service chiefs are also opposed to the moratorium on tests in the atmosphere, which the President announced on Monday. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Service Chiefs Oppose Air-Test Moratorium" written by Richard Fryklund, and published in the Washington Evening Star for June 12, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE CHIEFS OPPOSE AIR-TEST MORATORIUM

(By Richard Fryklund)

The chiefs of staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.

They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.

If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

NO PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The service chiefs have no plans to speak out publicly, but if asked by a congressional committee, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, reportedly are ready to say it is vital to American security to continue testing.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is reported to have stood with the service chiefs in past private protests against moratorium proposals, but it is not known how he would testify specifically on the Kennedy plan.

Civilian leaders in the Pentagon will be split if they are asked to testify, these informed sources said.

Defense Secretary McNamara will support a moratorium as he has in the past. But at least one and perhaps all of the service Secretaries are reported ready to oppose a moratorium.

Up until this week the position of Pentagon leaders on testing had been almost academic because the Russians had been showing no signs of signing any agreement.

THREE-NATION TALKS

On Monday, however, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States, Britain and Russia will hold high-level discussions in Moscow in July on a test ban, and he said that meanwhile the United States would not test in the atmosphere if other countries refrain.

His plan would permit underground, undersea and space testing.

A similar moratorium was tried by President Eisenhower, starting in the fall of 1958. He gave up all testing, as did the Russians.

In September 1961 however, the Russians suddenly resumed testing with the biggest explosions ever set off. The United States then started a long series of tests.

Both sides are now in a testing lull.

Tests in the air give off the most radioactivity and therefore have been the particular target of persons concerned about fallout. At the same time, such tests are the most useful in the development of weapons.

The service chiefs do not want to stop them, largely because they believe there is a good chance that the Russians now know more than we do about the possible vulnerability of our ICBM's to enemy near misses.

Military men point out that since the last moratorium was ended the Russians have set off three times the number of explosions as we have. Many of these explosions were monsters—up to 58 megatons, more than twice as large as any the United States has tested.

Apparently some of the explosions were in war game situations where they were used against simulated American weapons.

These military men fear the Russians may have found weaknesses in American ICBM installations or in the communications and support networks.

American tests have pitted A-bombs against some of the components of the American ICBM underground "silos," but never against a whole silo and its supporting equipment.

It is known, however, that nuclear explosions create electromagnetic waves which under some circumstances can disrupt electrical equipment from a considerable distance. If American ICBM's are vulnerable, the American chiefs do not want the Russians to be the only ones to know it.

SEEK "CLEAN" BOMBS

The service chiefs are also interested in perfecting "clean" weapons—that is, bombs that would not create radioactive fallout in time of war, anti-ICBM weapons and bigger weapons.

The Russians say they can orbit a 100-megaton weapon, and their tests have indicated that this may be an understatement.

The Chiefs do not believe these would be economical weapons, but they fear they could have great psychological effect whizzing over American and foreign cities. The chiefs want to be able to match the stunt.

All of these weapons advances would require additional testing in the atmosphere.

REDS GOT JUMP

Some of the Chiefs believe the last moratorium was disastrous to American interests. It is argued that the Russians prepared important tests during the ban and may even have tested underground in secret.

After the Russians broke the moratorium with a series of important tests, the United States had to build slowly toward major tests. Therefore, some military men say, the Russians may have been given a chance to catch up or move ahead in some weapons categories.

The basic argument for a moratorium or complete test ban is that the United States is now ahead and the ban would freeze that lead. Secretary of Defense McNamara took this position during hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee in February.

At that time, the three service chiefs and service secretaries, under questioning by Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said continued atmospheric testing "is necessary for the security of the United States * * * under the present circumstances."

The public record of the closed-session testimony indicates they were not asked their reasons.

Mr. THURMOND. The President said:

> And is not peace in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence.

The President is correct in his analysis of the tragic effects which a nuclear war would bring upon mankind. The destructive power of nuclear weapons must be realistically assessed and taken into account, which fact must and does increase the weight of responsibility of those charged with averting a nuclear conflict.

In assessing the terrors of nuclear war, however, the President would do well to recall the words of President Roosevelt, "All we have to fear is fear itself." We must not become so obsessed by the fear of the results of war that we lose perspective on the best methods for preventing those results. War cannot be prevented by repeating the tragic errors of Munich and Yalta.

The genesis of the no-win foreign policy of the United States goes back several years. Just last month the distinguished columnist, Holmes Alexander, wrote a series of articles on U.S. foreign policy and, somewhere, found evidence that, and from the first of this series—

> It may be that the age of accommodation ended last May 8 when the President told us he was "not at all hopeful" about getting a nuclear test ban treaty with Russia.

Mr. Alexander's hopeful conclusion that the policy of accommodation was at an end has proved incorrect, but his analysis of the policy itself is very enlightening. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three articles by Mr. Alexander be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S EARLIER VIEW ON TEST BAN DISAPPEARING

WASHINGTON.—It may be that the age of accommodation ended last May 8 when the President told us he was "not at all hopeful" about getting a nuclear test ban treaty with Russia.

This is a good time to assess the dangerous and deceptive optimism which Mr. Kennedy, as candidate and later as President, dangled like an eye-pleasing bauble before the American people.

In a way, Mr. Kennedy's "hopefulness" was a much more perilous and unsubstantial promise than the one by Candidate Eisenhower in 1952 when he said that, if elected, "I will go to Korea." Ike's implication was that he would find a way to stop the bloodletting of that inconclusive war which he had chosen not to win. Ike was not wrong in the hopefulness he spread. The Korean situation did have a solution, although not a glorious one, and Ike found it in the ceasefire that still continues.

Mr. Kennedy's nuclear policy statement was made October 9, 1960, in a letter to former Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas Murray. As to the Geneva disarmament talks, then already 2 years old, Candidate Kennedy said that, if elected, "I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit within which to determine whether significant progress is being made." The implication was, and Mr. Kennedy often verified and repeated it, that talks would stop when there was no further hope of getting a treaty. The talks have dragged on till now, continuing the delusion that an agreement with Russia is a possible and desirable thing.

Where did Mr. Kennedy come by this delusion? Well, shortly after the 1960 election, his close advisers, Profs. Jerome Wiesner and W. W. Rostow, headed for Moscow to attend the sixth renewal of the notorious Pugwash conference. Inspired by Bertrand Russell, originally financed by Cyrus Eaton, attended by such abject accommodationists as Linus Pauling, the Pugwash get-together of peace-mongering scientists is like the famous appeasement conference at Munich raised to the *n*th power.

Ranged against Rostow and Wiesner, and some other American volunteers, from November 27–December 5, 1960, was a phalanx of 21 Russian scientists, economists, historians, and militarists. Among them were Topchiev and Federov, Kapitza, and Emrlyanov, top figures in what amounts to the Soviet Ministry of Science. General Talenski and Admiral Isakov were there as leading military strategists. All the Russian delegates, along with representatives from Red China, were disciplined servants of the world Communist state. Rostow and Wiesner, though representing a President-to-be, had no authority or instructions from any branch of the American Nation. All confrontations of Americans and their enemies are contests of sorts. In this one, our side was untrained and overmatched to say the least.

Back from this strange conclave, Rostow and Wiesner entered the Kennedy administration as intimate policy advisers to the President. They had brought home, as was subsequently learned, the fragile, all but inexpressible belief that Russia would welcome a ban on nuclear testing—if only she could trust the United States, and if only we could understand the U.S.S.R.

For nearly 3 years, Mr. Kennedy has pursued the will-o'-the-wisp that came from Moscow with his unofficial emissaries. Was it loosed in their brains by the Kremlin's sorcerers? Was it hatched in visions of world peace or in nightmares of world war? In any event, Mr. Kennedy has tried mightily to coax Russia into loving and trusting us, so that communism and democracy can lie down together in green pastures of disarmament.

A likely thought. We'd better be glad that President Kennedy is finished with it.

[From the Holmes Alexander Gazette, May 22, 1963]

PUBLIC ISN'T INFORMED ON SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—American policy on the Sino-Soviet split is well understood in administration circles and is occasionally imparted to congressional leaders—for their acceptance rather than for their approval.

The result is a great gap of ignorance in the minds of the American people, who are not as informed as they might be if the policy were openly debated. Perhaps the only way to inform the people is through the paraphrasing of certain ideas which, if put together, would spell out the policy on which this phase of the cold war is being conducted.

The administration is tiptoeing around the perimeter of the Sino-Soviet split, careful not to frighten either the Russians or the Chinese, but trying to give credence to Khrushchev's plan for nibbling the free world to death and trying to divert Mao's outspoken plan for a warlike crash.

For example, our military support of the South Vietnam regime does give credibility to Khrushchev's contention that "wars of liberation" are a substitute for a big war between the free world and world communism. As long as we are willing to fight in the bush, and not to use heavy bombardment by the Air Force or Navy, we strengthen Khrushchev's argument against Mao's argument. But do we dare win in South Vietnam any more than we dared to win in Korea? At best, we are playing for a stalemate which will establish in southeast Asia much the same situation we have in the Florida Strait, the Formosa Strait, at the demilitarized zone in Korea and at the Berlin wall. We are playing for surcease of aggression, but not for victory.

There is within the administration, though I hope not at the top, the idea of a negotiated withdrawal from the off-China islands of Quemoy and Matsu. As a candidate, Mr. Kennedy listened to his advisers in appeasement and spoke of shucking off our responsibility for these strategic positions. As President, he married himself to the Eisenhower policy of defending these islands. But today there are nervous glances toward Red China's future as a military power, and there is talk of abandonment of Quemoy-Matsu before Red China can brandish a massive threat.

Going in lock step with this counsel of retreat is advice coming to the President that we should foster trade and cultural exchange between Red China and allies and neutrals, although the climate is not right for our own participation. And, of course, we must never say "Never" to Red China's aspirations for UN membership. There is, however, no intention of deserting Nationalist China, which has succeeded beyond expectations.

Another phase of the policy for making Khrushchev look good as a relative peacemonger lies in our attitude toward East Europe. Although the peoples of these ancient countries are involuntarily immured behind the Iron Curtain, the idea is to make their satellite governments seem respectable. To this end, American officials are forbidden to denounce the fake "people's democracies" of East Europe, Congress is asked to aid Poland and Yugoslavia, and Western Europe is encouraged to trade with East Germany, which might otherwise collapse.

in detail in a National Security Council policy paper that is being circulated among top officials and ambassadors for their information and guidance.

Prepared under the direct supervision of McGeorge Bundy, special foreign policy adviser of the President, and Dr. Walt Rostow, head of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, this key document states:

"We should welcome temporary and partial accommodations or detentes with the U.S.S.R. We should seek to develop the basis for these agreements by further expanded contracts and exchanges between President Kennedy and the top Soviet leadership which would—unlike formal summit meetings—be viewed by the public as a form of communications while actually involving negotiations."

In defining negotiating guidelines, the Bundy-Rostow paper points out, "There may be (and it is in our interest that there should be) agreement on specific problems, Cuba, Berlin, disarmament, nuclear test ban, and arrangements for periods of relative tranquillity.

"To the extent possible in the existing climate, the United States should grant the U.S.S.R. the position its status as a great power warrants. We should also hold out by word and deed the prospect of fuller Soviet participation and influence in the community of free nations if and as the Soviet leaders show a genuine interest and will for such constructive participation."

Crisis management—In addition to negotiating an informal detente with Russia, the President's secret exchanges with Khrushchev have several other major objectives.

As discussed in the top-level policy paper, they are as follows:

"Convey to Moscow a clearer understanding of our intentions * * * so as to avoid or minimize future crises promoted or exploited by the Soviet Union.

"Work out over the longer run tacit understandings with the Soviets as to the ground rules governing our competition throughout the world.

"Close out any crises as quickly as possible with as little violence as consistent with avoiding any net loss for U.S. interests."

Warning U.S. policymakers to expect and prepare for other crises similar to last fall's missile showdown in Cuba, the Bundy-Rostow paper presents a "grand design" for the cautious handling of such war-threatening confrontations, stating:

"Since we must expect a series of crises which the Communists will systematically seek to exploit, it is essential that we not reward this Communist technique by diverting attention and energies from the long-term policies and enterprise on which ultimately, the success of the free community depends.

"We must, therefore, try to meet these threats in ways which, if possible, reinforce the long-term direction of our policy and minimize the diversionary consequences of our reactions.

"Thus, the Cuban crises should be used to push and expand the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America; the Berlin crisis to help resolve the debate on the role of conventional and nuclear forces in NATO; and the Vietnamese crisis to increase the degree of mutual involvement and support among non-Communist nations in the area."

It is "against this background" that the Bundy-Rostow document asserts that President Kennedy is using his secret exchanges with Khrushchev "to work out over the longer run tacit understandings with the Soviets as to the ground rules governing our competition throughout the world."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President stated that the United States was, in effect, declaring a moratorium on nuclear testing, in order "to make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter."

Mr. President, we have had experience with a test moratorium with the Soviet Union; and, in view of that experience and the Soviet duplicity which resulted, the United States has no reason—nor is it the proper party—to engage in an act to demonstrate "good faith." Indeed, a unilateral moratorium at this point does not demonstrate good faith; it demonstrates gross gullibility.

The United States needs to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere now, to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles; to provide our Nation with a certain capability to penetrate a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads; to assure the immunity of our second strike missile systems to a surprise enemy nuclear attack; and to develop specialized nuclear warheads to defend our Nation against satellite bombs and other terror weapons with which the free world has been threatened.

Real peace can be maintained only if the United States succeeds in keeping a strategic military superiority to the Soviets.

This superiority we are in danger of losing; and under the U.S. foreign policy pronounced on Monday, we will surely lose strategic superiority.

Dr. Edward Teller, one of the most outstanding nuclear scientists of our day, and father of the hydrogen bomb, has stated that the proposed test ban treaty "would endanger our security and help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world."

Mr. President, all of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are on record as being opposed to the current proposal of the United States for a test-ban treaty.

It was reported in the press yesterday that the service chiefs are also opposed to the moratorium on tests in the atmosphere, which the President announced on Monday. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Service Chiefs Oppose Air-Test Moratorium" written by Richard Fryklund, and published in the Washington Evening Star for June 12, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE CHIEFS OPPOSE AIR-TEST MORATORIUM

(By Richard Fryklund)

The chiefs of staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.

They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.

If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

NO PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The service chiefs have no plans to speak out publicly, but if asked by a congressional committee, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, reportedly are ready to say it is vital to American security to continue testing.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is reported to have stood with the service chiefs in past private protests against moratorium proposals, but it is not known how he would testify specifically on the Kennedy plan.

Civilian leaders in the Pentagon will be split if they are asked to testify, these informed sources said.

Defense Secretary McNamara will support a moratorium as he has in the past. But at least one and perhaps all of the service Secretaries are reported ready to oppose a moratorium.

Up until this week the position of Pentagon leaders on testing had been almost academic because the Russians had been showing no signs of signing any agreement.

THREE-NATION TALKS

On Monday, however, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States, Britain and Russia will hold high-level discussions in Moscow in July on a test ban, and he said that meanwhile the United States would not test in the atmosphere if other countries refrain.

His plan would permit underground, undersea and space testing.

A similar moratorium was tried by President Eisenhower, starting in the fall of 1958. He gave up all testing, as did the Russians.

In September 1961 however, the Russians suddenly resumed testing with the biggest explosions ever set off. The United States then started a long series of tests.

Both sides are now in a testing lull.

Tests in the air give off the most radioactivity and therefore have been the particular target of persons concerned about fallout. At the same time, such tests are the most useful in the development of weapons.

The service chiefs do not want to stop them, largely because they believe there is a good chance that the Russians now know more than we do about the possible vulnerability of our ICBM's to enemy near misses.

Military men point out that since the last moratorium was ended the Russians have set off three times the number of explosions as we have. Many of these explosions were monsters—up to 58 megatons, more than twice as large as any the United States has tested.

Apparently some of the explosions were in war game situations where they were used against simulated American weapons.

These military men fear the Russians may have found weaknesses in American ICBM installations or in the communications and support networks.

American tests have pitted A-bombs against some of the components of the American ICBM underground "silos," but never against a whole silo and its supporting equipment.

It is known, however, that nuclear explosions create electromagnetic waves which under some circumstances can disrupt electrical equipment from a considerable distance. If American ICBM's are vulnerable, the American chiefs do not want the Russians to be the only ones to know it.

SEEK "CLEAN" BOMBS

The service chiefs are also interested in perfecting "clean" weapons—that is, bombs that would not create radioactive fallout in time of war, anti-ICBM weapons and bigger weapons.

The Russians say they can orbit a 100-megaton weapon, and their tests have indicated that this may be an understatement.

The Chiefs do not believe these would be economical weapons, but they fear they could have great psychological effect whizzing over American and foreign cities. The chiefs want to be able to match the stunt.

All of these weapons advances would require additional testing in the atmosphere.

REDS GOT JUMP

Some of the Chiefs believe the last moratorium was disastrous to American interests. It is argued that the Russians prepared important tests during the ban and may even have tested underground in secret.

After the Russians broke the moratorium with a series of important tests, the United States had to build slowly toward major tests. Therefore, some military men say, the Russians may have been given a chance to catch up or move ahead in some weapons categories.

The basic argument for a moratorium or complete test ban is that the United States is now ahead and the ban would freeze that lead. Secretary of Defense McNamara took this position during hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee in February.

At that time, the three service chiefs and service secretaries, under questioning by Senator Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, said continued atmospheric testing "is necessary for the security of the United States * * * under the present circumstances."

The public record of the closed-session testimony indicates they were not asked their reasons.

Mr. THURMOND. The President said:

> And is not peace in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence.

The President is correct in his analysis of the tragic effects which a nuclear war would bring upon mankind. The destructive power of nuclear weapons must be realistically assessed and taken into account, which fact must and does increase the weight of responsibility of those charged with averting a nuclear conflict.

In assessing the terrors of nuclear war, however, the President would do well to recall the words of President Roosevelt, that "All we have to fear is fear itself." We must not become so obsessed by the fear of the results of war that we lose perspective on the best methods for preventing those results. War cannot be prevented by repeating the tragic errors of Munich and Yalta.

The genesis of the no-win foreign policy of the United States goes back several years. Just last month the distinguished columnist, Holmes Alexander, wrote a series of articles on U.S. foreign policy and, somewhere, found evidence that, and from the first of this series—

> It may be that the age of accommodation ended last May 8 when the President told us he was "not at all hopeful" about getting a nuclear test ban treaty with Russia.

Mr. Alexander's hopeful conclusion that the policy of accommodation was at an end has proved incorrect, but his analysis of the policy itself is very enlightening. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three articles by Mr. Alexander be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KENNEDY'S EARLIER VIEW ON TEST BAN DISAPPEARING

Washington.—It may be that the age of accommodation ended last May 8 when the President told us he was "not at all hopeful" about getting a nuclear test ban treaty with Russia.

This is a good time to assess the dangerous and deceptive optimism which Mr. Kennedy, as candidate and later as President, dangled like an eye-pleasing bauble before the American people.

In a way, Mr. Kennedy's "hopefulness" was a much more perilous and unsubstantial promise than the one by Candidate Eisenhower in 1952 when he said that, if elected, "I will go to Korea." Ike's implication was that he would find a way to stop the bloodletting of that inconclusive war which he had chosen not to win. Ike was not wrong in the hopefulness he spread. The Korean situation did have a solution, although not a glorious one, and Ike found it in the cease-fire that still continues.

Mr. Kennedy's nuclear policy statement was made October 9, 1960, in a letter to former Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas Murray. As to the Geneva disarmament talks, then already 2 years old, Candidate Kennedy said that, if elected, "I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit within which to determine whether significant progress is being made." The implication was, and Mr. Kennedy often verified and repeated it, that talks would stop when there was no further hope of getting a treaty. The talks have dragged on till now, continuing the delusion that an agreement with Russia is a possible and desirable thing.

Where did Mr. Kennedy come by this delusion? Well, shortly after the 1960 election, his close advisers, Profs. Jerome Wiesner and W. W. Rostow, headed for Moscow to attend the sixth renewal of the notorious Pugwash conference. Inspired by Bertrand Russell, originally financed by Cyrus Eaton, attended by such abject accommodationists as Linus Pauling, the Pugwash get-together of peace-mongering scientists is like the famous appeasement conference at Munich raised to the *n*th power.

Ranged against Rostow and Wiesner, and some other American volunteers, from November 27–December 5, 1960, was a phalanx of 21 Russian scientists, economists, historians, and militarists. Among them were Topchiev and Federov, Kapitza, and Emrlyanov, top figures in what amounts to the Soviet Ministry of Science. General Talenski and Admiral Isakov were there as leading military strategists. All the Russian delegates, along with representatives from Red China, were disciplined servants of the world Communist state. Rostow and Wiesner, though representing a President-to-be, had no authority or instructions from any branch of the American Nation. All confrontations of Americans and their enemies are contests of sorts. In this one, our side was untrained and overmatched to say the least.

Back from this strange conclave, Rostow and Wiesner entered the Kennedy administration as intimate policy advisers to the President. They had brought home, as was subsequently learned, the fragile, all but inexpressible belief that Russia would welcome a ban on nuclear testing—if only she could trust the United States, and if only we could understand the U.S.S.R.

For nearly 3 years, Mr. Kennedy has pursued the will-o'-the-wisp that came from Moscow with his unofficial emissaries. Was it loosed in their brains by the Kremlin's sorcerers? Was it hatched in visions of world peace or in nightmares of world war? In any event, Mr. Kennedy has tried mightily to coax Russia into loving and trusting us, so that communism and democracy can lie down together in green pastures of disarmament.

A likely thought. We'd better be glad that President Kennedy is finished with it.

[From the Holmes Alexander Gazette, May 22, 1963]

PUBLIC ISN'T INFORMED ON SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington.—American policy on the Sino-Soviet split is well understood in administration circles and is occasionally imparted to congressional leaders—for their acceptance rather than for their approval.

The result is a great gap of ignorance in the minds of the American people, who are not as informed as they might be if the policy were openly debated. Perhaps the only way to inform the people is through the paraphrasing of certain ideas which, if put together, would spell out the policy on which this phase of the cold war is being conducted.

The administration is tiptoeing around the perimeter of the Sino-Soviet split, careful not to frighten either the Russians or the Chinese, but trying to give credence to Khrushchev's plan for nibbling the free world to death and trying to divert Mao's outspoken plan for a warlike crash.

For example, our military support of the South Vietnam regime does give credibility to Khrushchev's contention that "wars of liberation" are a substitute for a big war between the free world and world communism. As long as we are willing to fight in the bush, and not to use heavy bombardment by the Air Force or Navy, we strengthen Khrushchev's argument against Mao's argument. But do we dare win in South Vietnam any more than we dared to win in Korea? At best, we are playing for a stalemate which will establish in southeast Asia much the same situation we have in the Florida Strait, the Formosa Strait, at the demilitarized zone in Korea and at the Berlin wall. We are playing for surcease of aggression, but not for victory.

There is within the administration, though I hope not at the top, the idea of a negotiated withdrawal from the off-China islands of Quemoy and Matsu. As a candidate, Mr. Kennedy listened to his advisers in appeasement and spoke of shucking off our responsibility for these strategic positions. As President, he married himself to the Eisenhower policy of defending these islands. But today there are nervous glances toward Red China's future as a military power, and there is talk of abandonment of Quemoy-Matsu before Red China can brandish a massive threat.

Going in lock step with this counsel of retreat is advice coming to the President that we should foster trade and cultural exchange between Red China and allies and neutrals, although the climate is not right for our own participation. And, of course, we must never say "Never" to Red China's aspirations for UN membership. There is, however, no intention of deserting Nationalist China, which has succeeded beyond expectations.

Another phase of the policy for making Khrushchev look good as a relative peacemonger lies in our attitude toward East Europe. Although the peoples of these ancient countries are involuntarily immured behind the Iron Curtain, the idea is to make their satellite governments seem respectable. To this end, American officials are forbidden to denounce the fake "people's democracies" of East Europe, Congress is asked to aid Poland and Yugoslavia, and Western Europe is encouraged to trade with East Germany, which might otherwise collapse.

American policy, then, is aimed to coexist with both Russia and Red China, although favoring the former. The hope is for a stretchout of peace, but not for economic, diplomatic or military victory.

Would the American people approve such a policy if they knew about it? One way to find out, perhaps the only way, would be in an historic debate. This could happen if some bold Senator, such as Dodd, Keating or Goldwater, took the matter to the Senate floor. Or it could happen next year (which might be very late indeed) if the Republicans make the policy a central issue of the Presidential election.

Diplomacy in the Dark Is New Policy of the United States

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington.—One big difference begins to emerge between American peaceseeking in the fifties and in the sixties. It is the difference between the cellar and the summit.

President Kennedy as Senator and presidential candidate saw his predecessor mousetrapped into meeting with Bulganin and Khrushchev at Geneva and saw him humiliated by Khrushchev's crude snub in Paris. Mr. Kennedy's one meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna confirmed his skepticism of top-level conferences with the enemy. It is now the administration's firm policy to avoid both confrontation and camaraderie with enemy potentates. Any personal meeting between the President and the Russian Premier would now be an act of last resort.

But the President does have a peace plan. It goes forward partly in the open, partly under diplomatic cover. That part which the American people see is the unhappy attempt to find a disarmament formula. The part usually hidden from public view, and therefore capable of producing welcome and unwelcome surprises, takes the form of official but unannounced policy attitudes toward Soviet Russia.

One such attitude has a certain 19th century structure in that it recognizes Russia's right as a major power to spheres of influence. It is the opposite of Secretary Dulles' liberation doctrine for East Europe. It concedes Communist occupation of that area as a means to peace. There is no longer even the theoretical threat that we would intervene to support the kind of uprisings in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary which rocked Khrushchev's early regime in the mid-fifties. By the same token no hope is held forth to the captive peoples.

The thinking on East Europe, and elsewhere, is that passivity on our part is the way to exploit Russia's mellowing as a successful industrial and political nation. This is how we show approval of the Kremlin's milder treatment of the satellites, and is the way we work toward relaxation of international tensions. But in the cellar we make concessions to communism that would be unthinkable at the summit. Public opinion remains muted because it is not informed.

In an atmosphere of relaxed tensions, if it ever comes, the policy calls for increased cooperative activities between the United States and U.S.S.R. Public health is a field already marked for joint operations between America and Russia. The administration hopes for peaceful and atomic energy, as well as in stepped-up cultural exchanges.

The hot line communication system between the White House and the Kremlin is another substitute for summitry. It avoids publicity and pageantry, but permits sotto voce diplomacy. It carries the implication that we are always ready to make a concession in order to quiet a crisis. With France out on the edge of the Western Alliance, and Britain heading toward neutralism under a Labor government, it is anticipated that there must be many more direct dealings between this country and Russia. Should a fire-eater such as Willy Brandt succeed Adenauer as West German Chancellor, precautions will be taken, by direct but medium-level methods, to assure that we are not dragged into war. But, again, the wheeling and dealing is for the cellar, not for the summit.

No President could do otherwise than be a peace seeker. Cellar diplomacy is not in itself a disgraceful thing. But there seems to be no reciprocity in the peace-seeking policy. If sphere of influence is a workable arrangement, it should work both ways. Russia should be as hands off in Cuba as we are in Hungary. If the cold war can be liquidated by concessions, there should be a fair exchange of these.

Nobody would want a repetition of our prestige losses at the summit meetings, but these mistakes were made in the open. They were subject to public judgment. They may be one reason why the American people defeated Mr. Eisenhower's chosen successor. The danger of secret covenants, secretly arrived at, does not seem the lesser of evils. The real change that we need is a switchover from defensive to offensive diplomacy. And this is nowhere in sight.

Mr. THURMOND. For over a year, the executive branch has refused to reveal the contents of the Rostow policy paper to either the Congress or the public. I am convinced that the President has now revealed a major portion of the fundamental positions of the Rostow paper in his speech at American University. Some comments concerning the Rostow policy paper have been printed in the press, of course, and, in my opinion, two of the most accurate of these articles were written by Mr. Willard Edwards and published in June 1962. For convenience in comparing the President's speech with reports on the Rostow paper, I ask unanimous consent that the articles written by Mr. Edwards on June 17 and 18, 1962, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 17, 1962]

Draft Foreign Policy Revision Bowing to Reds: Based on Theory, Soviet Union Is "Mellowing"

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington.—A master plan for historic changes in U.S. foreign policy has been readied for President Kennedy's consideration.

It embraces the theme that the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policies are mellowing and the way is open for meaningful agreement between the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

This proposed guide for future decisions by the President and the National Security Council, the Nation's highest strategy group, advances these theories:

Russia's leaders are beginning to realize that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can defeat the other in the world of the future.

FIND NO BASIS FOR IT

Both the United States and Russia are losing power and authority in their respective areas and an area of "overlapping interests" is developing in which mutually profitable agreements may be negotiated.

Envisioning, as it does, Communist abandonment of the goal of world conquest, this blueprint for future strategy has aroused heated dispute from military leaders and intelligence agencies who can detect no evidence to support its assumptions.

They quarrel with the contention that conciliation can be as important as a strong defense in future relations with the Kremlin.

Leading sponsor of the plan, which has been more than a year in preparation, is Walt W. Rostow, State Department counselor and Chairman of its Policy Planning Board. He acknowledges that a strong "educational" campaign will be needed to sell Congress and the public if the proposals are given official sanction.

SHAPED CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

Compiled under Rostow's supervision, the strategy plan represents the work of many officials in the White House, State, Treasury, and Defense Departments. It has been steadily revised and edited down from an original volume of 285 pages to a shorter draft.

Despite a host of contributors, the plan bears the Rostow stamp. A former member of the faculty of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rostow, 45, is the President's top foreign policy adviser. He played a major role in shaping Kennedy's foreign policy speeches in the Presidential campaign and was deputy special assistant to the President until he took over his present State Department post last December 6.

Rostow's brand of philosophy, not concealed in books, articles, theses, and speeches in recent years, has always envisioned the evolution of Soviet Russia into a mature state which will come to realize the outdating of the Marxian theory of the class struggle as the moving force in history.

FOR A NEW YOUNG PRESIDENT

As long ago as 1956, he voiced confidence that Communist leaders in the next decade would mend their ways and in 1958 he was depicting Russia as about ready to enter the age of high mass consumption reached by the United States a quarter century earlier.

He has now translated this optimistic conviction into a blueprint for basic national security policy, designed to govern future decisions at the highest levels.

It is a conception calculated to stimulate and enthuse a new, young President who could insure a secure place in history as the American leader who brought peace to the world, ending not only the dread potentialities of nuclear conflict, but the harassments of cold war conflicts which drain the economy.

NOT A SHRED OF PROOF

It is also a theory which has stirred many in the Government's intelligence agencies to alarm. They report not a scrap of hard data to support the roseate assumptions of the State Department planner.

They note no lessening of Communist intransigence nor of grim determination to "bury" the free world. They see in the Rostow recommendations a total misconception of the nature of the Communist conspiracy; a naive brushing off of its treachery as evidenced in a long history of broken treaties and agreements while steadily pursuing the goal of world conquest.

Rostow believes that Premier Nikita Khrushchev of Russia and his associates do not want a major war. He concedes their desire for a total victory for communism but he glimpses changes beneath the surface of old Communist objectives and a willingness among some in Russia to modify old ideological formulas in the light of changing reality.

UNITED STATES ON WANE, HE SAYS

Neither Russia nor the United States is going to dominate this century, he contends. To those who speak of a victory or win policy in the cold war, he retorts that neither of the great leading nations will win over the other. Capitalism will not triumph over socialism. Rather, the victory will be one of men and nations voluntarily cooperating under the principles of the United Nations Charter.

"And we deeply believe this victory will come—on both sides of the Iron Curtain," he concludes.

The policy outline pictures the United States and Russia as two aging combatants, both showing signs of waning prestige and power. There is a diffusion of power away from Moscow within the Communist bloc, it asserts, and away from the United States within the free world.

In lesser degree, the evolution theory is also applied to Red China and the same conciliatory tactics are advocated. The Chinese Communists can be encouraged to evolution into a peaceful state by showing them we have no aggressive intentions.

Possibilities should be explored for expanding contacts with Red China, placing it, according to one objector, in the same position as Yugoslavia and Poland.

CANNOT PROMOTE A SPLIT

There is no final bar to entrance of Communist China into more normal relations with the United States if they are prepared to modify present policies, the policy paper asserts. In the meantime, unnecessary provocations should be avoided and informal negotiations pursued.

There is little that the United States can do to promote a Sino-Soviet split, the paper contends.

The proposed foreign policy guidebook does not suggest any weakening of national defense and includes recommendations for a greater buildup of the Nation's capacity to wage conventional warfare.

It estimates Soviet policy as designed to avoid any actions which would bring about a nuclear war, ruling out the belief of many military leaders that the Communists will strike whenever they think they can destroy us.

WE WILL WAIT TO BE HIT

Any idea of the United States contemplating a "first strike" is ruled out. Planning in that direction is not relevant since the United States does not plan to initiate a nuclear attack on Communist nations. Military men assail this section as against all sound principles of war for which planning against all contingencies is essential.

Despite all rebuffs to date, strenuous efforts should be continued to get an agreement on limited arms control, the policy paper recommends. It is suggested that the United States might advance a program not requiring formal negotiations.

Again, objectors to this recommendation argued, the proposal totally disregards the nature of the Communist enemy. Any information furnished to Communists will be used against us and any such action will never change their basic aims.

REDS GOING PEACEFUL

Since both arms control planning and research and military planning are directed toward national security, the strategy outline asserts, they should be integrated. General and complete disarmament is a goal which must never be obscured.

There was objection from military men to inclusion of this section. They argued that the nature of communism is disregarded in a process of reasoning which contends that the United States will be secure in a disarmed world.

In seeming answer to these contentions, the proposed policy emphasizes the assumption that the Soviet policy will evolve into a peaceful state.

Even if Communist leaders are unwilling to share the United States image of the world's future in the degree necessary to negotiate major arms reduction programs, they may come to realize the dangers of accident, miscalculation, and failure of communications and thus be willing to join the United States in limited measures to reduce those dangers.

MORE POWER FOR KENNEDY

In the field of Presidential control of the strategic forces, the recommendation is for a wider range of plans, involving increased control, under centralized military command, in accordance with Presidential decisions.

Detailed plans are advocated for initial use of nuclear weapons in periods of great tension in order that they may be responsive to political decisions by the President.

The problem of executive authority, in case of the President's incapacity, is also discussed.

This disturbed former President Eisenhower but Congress ignored his request for a legislative solution.

The danger has been noted of the possibility that appointed officials could assume the powers of the President instead of officials responsible to the electorate.

AWAITS OFFICIAL STATUS

The Rostow document awaits official status. When Undersecretary of State George W. Ball was before a special Senate armed services subcommittee last week, a demand was made upon him for production of the strategy outline.

Ball protested that the papers were "a working draft," not representing "settled views" and not approved by either the President or Secretary of State Dean Rusk. In their present incomplete form, he said, they should not be inspected by a congressional group.

Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, noted several leaks to the press in the last 3 months which hinted at some of the provisions in the document. Senator Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, lamented that Congress was always "the last to know" about some Government policies.

The reason for these leaks was disclosed in the policy document itself. This and additional details of the proposed guide to foreign policy will be disclosed in a following article.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 18, 1962]

Soft Red Line Must Be Sold—Rostow

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington, June 17.—A systematic publicity campaign will be necessary to sell Congress and the American people on the merits of a bold new foreign policy advocating conciliation of Russia, a state department planner has advised.

The problem of this "gap" between government and popular thinking is tackled with candor by Walt W. Rostow, chairman of the State Department's policy planning board in his draft of a master plan which awaits President Kennedy's consideration.

The new policy, the work of a number of experts in government under Rostow's supervision, is based upon the theory that Russian domestic and foreign policies have mellowed during the post-Stalin period. It holds the way has been opened for cooperation between the Communist and noncommunist worlds.

EDUCATION IS NEEDED

Since the evidence, in the form of deeds and words by Soviet leaders, runs directly contrary to this assumption, Congress and the people, the Rostow outline confesses, must be educated to acceptance of a fresh approach.

In typical State Department parlance, this can be accomplished by "systematic exposition in forms appropriate for public presentation." The term "indoctrination" is avoided.

One of the appropriate methods of public enlightenment, favored highly by the Kennedy administration, is the newspaper leak. This involves funneling of selected information to favored reporters.

CITE OUTMODED POLICIES

Although the Rostow document is presumed to be confidential and described by a State Department spokesman as a working draft, hints of its contents have been leaked in the last 3 months to three newspapers, a news magazine, and a syndicated column. The resulting articles, in the main, feature it as a precise, balanced, and complete master plan of global objectives and strategies which would replace old policies, manufactured under crisis conditions.

These inspired stories lacked detail, in most instances, but stressed the need for replacement of policies left over from the Eisenhower administration. The existence of ambiguities had permitted dispute between partisans of different concepts and contributed to varying interpretations of policy, they noted.

HINT ON A-STRATEGY

One "leak" was definite, however, in reporting a provision that the United States would never strike the first nuclear blow unless it were faced with a massive conventional assault, such as a full-scale invasion of Western Europe.

Another revealed proposed new policies for dealing with the problem of the two Chinas on the mainland and Formosa.

Speeches and statements by administration spokesmen to condition Congress and the public to the new policy are also suggested in the Rostow document. Rostow has set a good example in this respect. In a number of addresses, he has stated his conviction that neither the United States nor Russia can win the cold war, that capitalism will not triumph over communism, and that the fate of the world will be settled by forces now at work on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

SEES NEW LINEUP

In a speech June 3 at Minneapolis, Rostow said:

"It is sometimes asked if our policy is a no-win policy. Our answer is this—we do not expect this planet to be forever split between a Communist bloc and a free world. We expect this planet to organize itself in time on the principles of voluntary cooperation among independent nation states dedicated to human freedom. We expect the principle that 'governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed' to triumph on both sides of the iron curtain.

"It will not be a victory of the United States over Russia. It will be a victory of men and nations over the forces that wish to entrap and to exploit their revolutionary aspirations."

In another speech to the special warfare school at Fort Bragg, N.C., he voiced the same sentiments and added: "It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism."

Two years ago, in a California speech, he outlined Russia's fears that other nations would get the nuclear bomb, calling the prospect of nuclear weapons in Chinese hands "a latent nightmare" for the Kremlin.

RUSSIA OUR ALLY

He saw in this a possibility that Russia might find "the only logical course is to make a common cause with the United States to establish a minimum framework of order."

Thus, Rostow's policy draft contains few surprises to students of his record. He is aware of the initial lack of popular acceptance which will greet its unfolding. Suggested in the draft is a shifting of emphasis, particularly in the public consciousness, from the problem of opposing Communist aggression to exploiting opportunities in building and extending "a community of free nations."

These "opportunities" are described in the document as growing from a gathering historical trend toward fragmentation in the Communist bloc and some relaxation of internal controls in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Thus, Communist regimes and peoples are to be dealt with in terms of "overlapping interest," a phrase which is also popular with Rostow in public statements.

The U.S. information agency must be used abroad to define and dramatize the "limited but real areas of overlapping interests" between the United States and other governments and peoples, the paper asserts.

Students of Communist policy eye this alleged intertwining of interests with strong doubt, noting that Communists have never admitted any interest which lies outside world domination.

One theme is consistent in the proposed strategy plan—continuing communication with Russia, informal and formal, direct and indirect, must be maintained in order to dispel its fears of the United States and give it a clear understanding of our peaceful intentions.

Rising tensions or the pleas of our allies or of the American public must be ignored in any crisis with Russia. The temptation must be avoided to prolong or expand any crisis in an effort to degrade or embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world.

The Soviet Union, the paper advises, must be granted its status as a great power and induced, by word and deed, to fuller participation and influence in the community of free nations if its leaders show a genuine interest and will for such constructive consideration.

EASY ON SATELLITES

Gentle treatment of the satellite nations is advocated. No official attacks should be made against their regimes, whatever the provocation, and even criticism should be softened. Western Europe, at the same time, must be encouraged to closer relationship with the satellites and urged to furnish aid to them.

East Germany, the policy draft says, cannot be forever insulated from dealings with the United States and business must be transacted with them.

Above all, no encouragement or support must be given to armed uprisings in eastern Europe. This is a continuance of policy in existence for several years.

These proposals, one critic noted, will in effect recognize the satellites, including East Germany, as legitimate regimes, disregard the principle of self-determination, and cause the captive peoples to lose all hope of freeing themselves from communist rule.

A POPULAR WORD

The plan is concerned with the promotion of rapid industrial growth and full employment in the United States. Unless there is great prosperity here, it noted, it will be extremely difficult to obtain congressional and popular consent for allocation of resources to international purposes or liberal trade adjustments.

The word "modernization" appears frequently in the plan in relation to the development of nations. The strength of international communism, it states, can best be sapped by strengthening the performance of the free community through "modernization." Opponents of the policy draft have suggested that "modernization" may be a synonym for "Democratic socialization."

The United States must expand its participation in institutions and organizations "which transcend the independent powers of the nation-state," the outline proposes.

It seeks progressive moves toward a legal order which lays down and enforces essential rules of conduct in interstate relations which will "provide sure and equitable means for the settlement of international disputes."

Again, in arguments over this proposal, it was noted that it presupposes Communist submission to the law. One expert recalled the sardonic comment made by the late Andrei Y. Vishinsky, chief delegate to the United Nations. He once told the U.N.: "What laws? We make our own. We do not abide by bourgeoisie laws."

SEEKS MODERN ALLIES

On balance, the draft asserts, American interests will be better served by leaning toward nations with modern ideas rather than sticking to old allies with outmoded notions. The paper identifies neither the modern states nor the old friends, conceding no general rule can cover this situation.

As a final touch, the policy paper suggests that denial of foreign aid can be as useful as supplying it. In Laos, where aid was withdrawn to force a coalition with Communists, this policy has already been implemented, it was noted.

Mr. THURMOND. The foreign policy of the United States, pronounced by the President of the United States Monday at American University, is doomed to failure, for the simple reason that it ignores the nature and the purposes of the Communist beast. It is based on an assessment of the Communists derived from a mirror image—that is, the intentions and motivations of the Communists are assessed by trying to determine what non-Communists, such as we, would do under similar circumstances. Whatever else we may say about them, and however much we may reexamine our attitude toward the Soviets, we should certainly realize that the Communists are a breed apart. They seek not only to rule the world, and to change the existing world order, but they also seek to remake mankind into a mold of their own choosing. By their own words and acts, they seek to improve on the handiwork of God.

Any policy which is based on the fallacious concept that we can judge the Communists by what we would do under similar circumstances, and by the motivations by which a non-Communist would act and react to circumstances, is doomed to utter and miserable failure.

Mr. President, the Senate does not have legislative power to prevent the President from negotiating with foreign nations on the subject of a nuclear test ban. By virtue of the constitutional provision that no treaty shall be binding on the United States in the absence of the advice and consent of the Senate, however, the Senate does have legitimate and official responsibility in this matter. The Senate has a repsonsibility to the American people to insure, among other things, that their security and rights are not impaired by a treaty.

This responsibility cannot always be completely fulfilled by waiting until a treaty is signed by the executive branch and formally sent to the Senate for consideration. If a nuclear test ban treaty is actually signed, the Senate will be told that regardless of how badly it would affect the interests of country, a rejection of the treaty by the Senate would give the Soviets fuel for a major propaganda campaign.

It would be far better for the Senate to nonconcur in advance of the negotiations, making it clear that the Senate would not under any circumstances ratify a treaty which would jeopardize the security of the Nation or endanger peace. An appropriate resolution to accomplish such a nonconcurrence might well be worded as follows:

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1961 unilaterally breached the moratorium on nuclear testing, having made secret preparations for nuclear testing while pretending to negotiate in good faith with the United States and other nations to end nuclear testing; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, by its duplicity, succeeded in making substantial progress in nuclear weaponry; and

Whereas because of the progress made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the field of nuclear weaponry, it is vital to the security of the United States and the free world that the United States engage in nuclear testing in the atmosphere and other mediums in order:

(1) to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles,

(2) to provide our Nation with a certain capability to penetrate a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads,

(3) to assure the immunity of our second strike missile systems to a surprise enemy nuclear attack, and

(4) to develop specialized nuclear warheads to defend our Nation against satellite bombs and other terror weapons with which the free world has been threatened; and

Whereas in the absence of further nuclear testing in the atmosphere and other mediums by the United States, the United States cannot be assured with any degree of confidence that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has not achieved a level of knowledge of nuclear science from their recent nuclear tests which, without further testing by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would permit them to develop and deploy a new generation of nuclear weapons which would give them a clear nuclear superiority over the United States and the free world; and

Whereas the present and foreseeable state of the art of detection of clandestine nuclear tests underground, in the atmosphere and in space is such that it is scientifically impossible to detect and identify clandestine nuclear tests of certain magnitudes; and

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that the United States will not conduct any further nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other nations do not, and

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that he has agreed with the Prime Minister of the Government of Great Britain and the Chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to engage in high level negotiations for a ban on nuclear weapons testing, despite the proven duplicity and demonstrations of bad faith in this and other fields by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; it is

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the United States should resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere and in all other mediums at the earliest date at which preparations for such tests can be completed, and that negotiations with other nations seeking an end to nuclear testing be immediately suspended until a new series of nuclear tests have been completed by the United States, and negotiations not be resumed until and unless the United States is assured beyond a reasonable doubt that in the absence of further nuclear testing by any nation, the United States can maintain a clear nuclear superiority and an invulnerable second strike capability, and until the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has demonstrated that it has renounced its goal of world domination and its attempts to achieve a superiority in nuclear weaponry with which to implement that goal.

Mr. President, I send to the desk this resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 163) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening the President of the United States made an important speech on the necessity of obtaining civil rights legislation. In addition, he made a proper appeal to the conscience of the people of the United States and to the Congress.

His speech was needed, because it must be said that it represents a change in the position of the administration with repect to civil rights legislation. For, despite the growing tensions, the administration has contended during its tenure in office, even until 3 weeks ago, that one enactment of civil rights legislation by the Congress, which would empower the Federal Government to take decisive enforcement action, was not required. This attitude persisted in spite of the fact that legislation, familiarly known as title III legislation, which deals with enforcement, was introduced in 1961, 1962, and 1963 by a bipartisan group of Senators.

I should also like to say that several weeks ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and I introduced legislation dealing precisely with the three areas to which the President has directed his attention—voting rights, desegragation of schools, and the prohibition of segregations in "public accommodations."

The bills relating to desegregation of schools and public accommodations have been cosponsored by over 30 Republican and Democratic members of the Senate. And I know that many Senators—both Republicans and Democrats—have held for years that civil rights legislation is necessary.

I do not underemphasize the efforts of the administration, and of many officials and organizations and citizens, to secure acceptance of the fact that the equal rights of all our citizens are constitutional and moral rights. But these rights cannot be conferred or negotiated by anyone. They derive from the law. Legislation is required to define the means by which rights guaranteed by the Constitution can be enforced; it will provide also the necessary background for moral persuasion.

I make these comments today because I believe they bear upon the question which now faces the administration and Congress, and indeed the country.

That question is: Will the administration press for and will the Congress enact needed civil rights legislation? I know that enactment of legislation will not settle every question, or even secure these rights immediately, but legislation will provide the legal framework for enforcement and persuasion. It is the immediate responsibility of the administration and of Congress.

I point out again that civil rights legislation has been before Congress for more than 2 years, has been introduced this year, will be offered by the administration. But after the administration has offered its bills, the vital question then will be, can it be enacted?

There is a dual responsibility. The first responsibility is that of the administration. Will the administration recognize the fact that the issue of equal rights is the most important question before our country, subordinate only to the question of maintaining the security, the freedom, and the existence of our country? If the administration will recognize this fact, and subordinate other legislation, however important it may be, then the first step will be taken toward enactment of civil rights legislation this year. If the administration will then marshal the support of its own leadership in the House and in the Senate, and its vast majority; and if, when legislation is brought before the Senate—whether it be by report of a committee or by amendment of another bill—the administration will not then abandon the fight until a vote is finally taken even if we must remain here until the next session of Congress is required to convene, then I believe civil rights legislation will be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my friend from Kentucky that I share the observation he has made with respect to the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government and the responsibility of Congress with respect to placing on the statute books legislation necessary to make possible the implementation of the Constitution of the United States.

As I said the other day, we have never delivered the Constitution to the Negroes of this country, and it will not be delivered to the Negroes of the country until Congress enacts the necessary legislation to make it possible to enforce, procedurally, the constitutional guarantees.

I want the Senator from Kentucky to know that I stand shoulder to shoulder with him in the observations he has made.

When the Senator from Kentucky speaks about the Democratic majority in Congress, I believe he knows, as well as the senior Senator from Oregon knows, that it is necessary to qualify the word "majority," because there is a historic division in Congress which very often results in failure to muster a majority of the Democratic Party on the civil rights issue. I regret that that is so. I regret also to say that the record clearly shows that too often there has been an interesting coalition between southern Democrats and certain Republicans, which has made it very difficult for us to do things in the Senate that are necessary to be done in order to end debate.

Although in this connection I have no concern about the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], whom I see on his feet, I wish to say in a nonpartisan way that Senators on the Senator's side of the aisle have the same responsibility as Senators on this side of the aisle, to see to it that the votes which are necessary to impose cloture are obtained. We can take judicial notice, I believe, that there will be a filibuster as soon as civil rights legislation comes before the Senate. In that connection, I say to the leadership of my party that I am not interested in any leadership talk about not holding the Senate in round-the-clock sessions. I am willing to eat my Christmas dinner here. We may have to eat our Christmas dinner here, but we will not get this job done unless the Republicans and the Democrats, in order to guarantee to the Negroes of this country their constitutional rights, are willing to stay here, 24 hours a day, day after day, and week after week, in order to break the filibuster. The filibuster will be broken by American public opinion. It will be broken by American public opinion only after we do the job of getting across to the public the necessity for breaking the filibuster.

Mr. COOPER. I intend to address myself later to the responsibility of Congress and the responsibility of both parties. But I do insist upon what I have said in order to emphasize the first responsibility of the administration: To see that legislation is brought before the Senate.

When a civil rights bill does come to the floor, another decision must be made by the President and the Democratic leadership. It is that the fight will not be abandoned, by some procedural vote, until a final vote can be had upon the merits of the legislation.

What I say is not partisan. It is a fact that the decisions I have outlined are the responsibility of the President and the Democratic majority. Again and again I have been asked in recent days, "What are Republicans going to do to assist the passage of civil rights legislation?" We want to help, but cannot help greatly unless the Democratic leadership provides the Senate the opportunity to consider legislation.

I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, very few who speak upon this issue are given closer attention than the Senator from Kentucky, for many reasons, involving his prestige, character, and great reputation. The Senator from Kentucky has a very well deserved reputation in this Chamber for integrity.

In addition there is the unique position of his State, dating back to the days even before the Civil War, when Kentucky was a border State, in which the conflict raged and when it had, as it were, relatives in both camps, as it does to this day—people within the State having divergent points of view. It is much more risky for the Senator from Kentucky to take these positions than it is for me, not that that fact in any way detracts from the depth of conviction which I feel on this subject. Nonetheless, it is a political fact. The views of the Senator from Kentucky have always been very important and helpful to me.

It seems to me there are three things which the Senator from Kentucky is emphasizing which I thoroughly agree with the Senator must have emphasis: First, there has not been, since President Kennedy took office, a determined drive by the President for civil rights legislation. The fact that President Eisenhower may not have pressed for such legislation either is no excuse. That was said even when he was President, so we have a right to say it now. Similarly, when something good happens in one's administration, one is entitled to claim credit for it. The only two civil rights bills that have been passed since the Civil War period were passed in 1957 and 1960, when Eisenhower was President.

So I join fully with the Senator from Kentucky and with my dear friend the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the belief that the President must feel that the statement which he made to the American people in his speech must last. It must last—by reason of the speech, the publicity, and the very words. The President has already had a reverse in the other body; he may have one here. So he must have visceral determination.

I am not stating these things in the order in which I think they must occur.

Second, there cannot be the remotest implication that this is a Democratic Party show, because such an implication would lose the few votes that are indispensable. The Administration has my vote, the vote of the Senator from Kentucky, and other votes on this side of the aisle. We know there are a good many. But there are still a few who will make the outcome uncertain. They are very likely to be heavily influenced by whether it is a bipartisan or a party show. I think the President must make up his mind that he might lose on this issue; but he cannot expect to win on it: he should expect to do it for the country in a truly bipartisan spirit.

Third, I think it is not too early today to start—and I am deeply grateful that the Senator from Kentucky speaks in this field with such prestige—to focus the attention of the country on the fact that the vote of every Senator on cloture will count. The speeches we make when we introduce bills—and there are many bills on the desk—will not count as much as our votes on cloture.

When the proposal to amend rule XXII was before the Senate, the vote fell short of the mark. There were 18 votes from this side of the aisle and 36 from the other side. That showing is inadequate.

The public has a job to do, just as we and the President have. It seems to me that those are three broad conditions for action in this field.

I again express gratitude to the Senator from Kentucky. He knows that I need not reassure him that it is a great privilege to join him in any of the efforts which I know he will make.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the senior Senator from New York for his statement. I do not wish to stray from the central purpose of my speech to state the conditions which I believe are required for the enactment of civil rights legislation. But, for a moment I will digress, as the Senator from New York has been very kind in his remarks about my State, Kentucky. I see in the Chamber my colleague and friend from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. I am very proud, as I know he is, of the record of our State in respect to civil rights. We are very conscious of the fact that the situation in Kentucky is not as difficult as it is in many other Southern States. Yet it is correct to say, and I am proud to say, that since the Civil War, a war which divided our State, the people of Kentucky and their officials of both parties have accepted and supported equal rights as issues have developed. They have accepted the rulings of the courts, including the Brown case, relating to schools. Only a few weeks ago, the city of Louisville enacted an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations.

I return to my chief thesis. It is to emphasize that the first essential for the enactment of civil rights legislation is that the Democratic leadership bring before the Senate for actual consideration a bill, and not abandon it until there is a final vote upon its merits. I do not believe it can be successfully contradicted that this is the first essential.

Second, the Congress has its own responsibility, and I now address myself to its elements.

The position which Senators take upon civil rights issues is determined by their convictions, and is affected, I have no doubt, by the sentiment of the people whom they represent. But our country has come to a point of crisis. Whether one wants to deny it or not, or say they do not exist, there are equal rights which have been given to every citizen, Negro or white, all races, all beliefs, by the Constitution of the United States. Some of the rights have been spelled out in the Constitution. Among these are the right of citizenship in the Union, and in the States, and the voting right. Some of the rights have been defined by the courts; and once defined by the courts, they are rights which must be recognized. The law must be obeyed. It must be enforced.

The right to vote, the right of equal use of interstate facilities, the equal right to enter desegregated schools, and the right of equal access to facilities under the control of the Federal Government or of a State or subdivision, have been determined.

It is correct that the right to the equal use of public accommodations has not been determined by the Courts since it was denied in the civil rights case of 1883. But in that case Justice Harlan, from my State of Kentucky, and a Confederate veteran, wrote a dissenting opinion which I believe is as sound and as applicable today as it was then—and that it will become the law of the land. In his dissent, Justice Harlan held that the right to the equal use of accommodations affected with a public interest—such as hotels, theaters, and restaurants—was a legal right—not a social privilege, and as a legal right should be accorded to all citizens.

I believe the recent decisions of the Supreme Court holding that the States, their subdivisions, or their officials, could not enforce discrimination in public accommodations can only rest upon a premise which will eventually be determined by the Court. It is that those seeking the use of public accommodations had the legal right to be there; because if they had no legal right, the Court could not have held logically that the private individual or the State could not enforce discrimination and prohibit their use of the public accommodation.

Be that as it may, I now return to the province of this body. If proposed legislation comes before the Senate, we cannot longer avoid acting upon it. We cannot avoid voting upon it, by a procedural motion to table the proposed legislation. It would not be right, and the country will not long accept such procedural devices. The Senate must finally come to a vote on this issue.

If a filibuster develops, the first test in the Senate will come upon cloture.

I do not know what will occur. I cannot predict the outcome of any vote. I can only state what I think should obtain; namely, that after a reasonable time for debate—and by that, I do not mean a filibuster—if the debate still continues and becomes a filibuster, cloture should be voted.

This morning I was asked a question on the television program "Today"—and I say this because I see my dear friend and colleague [Mr. MORTON] in the Chamber—attributing to him a statement to the effect that he doubted ther would be sufficient votes on the Republican side of the aisle to order cloture, even if a number of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle voted in favor of ordering cloture. I agree with him that it would be difficult to obtain cloture; but I believe that if the issue is debated and the opinion and conscience of the people of the country assert themselves, there are enough Members on the Republican side, with full knowledge of their responsibilities, to join with a sufficient number on the Democratic side to assure cloture.

But if cloture cannot be obtained, then—in view of the importance of this issue—I repeat that I believe we should stay here until a vote on the bill is obtained.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to his colleague?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I thank my senior colleague.

Mr. President, in reference to the mathematics of this matter, let me say that when I was stopped in the hall the day before yesterday, and was asked about cloture, my reply was that cloture requires 67 votes, and we are only 33. So obviously the obtaining of cloture will depend entirely on the number of votes cast by Senators on the Democratic side who agree with us.

If the last vote on cloture can be regarded as an accurate barometer—and, as I recall, on that occasion 38 Senators on the Democratic side voted for cloture—29 votes from our side would be required; and 29 out of 33 is a rather high percentage. But certainly I did not mean to imply that there would be any difference between this vote and those in the past. I was merely pointing out what seems to me to be a mathematical reality and the statement of a fact—namely, that we simply do not know what the outcome will be.

But I thoroughly agree with my colleague that if we cannot obtain cloture, let us continue our sessions around the clock, until this question is settled.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my colleague. I raised the question because I believe that his statement was misunderstood.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in my judgment the only way to obtain cloture is to have 'round-the-clock sessions; in my judgment we shall never obtain cloture in any other way. Those of us on both sides of the aisle who feel as strongly in favor of obtaining cloture must act with the same determination as those who are opposed to cloture. We must have the same fortitude, the same organization, the same diligence as the opposition and be prepared to meet this problem head on. We will not succeed with halfhearted efforts. Our cause is just, and it deserves every ounce of our energy.

The vote on cloture will be crucial. If we have to move in the cots and remain in session indefinitely, then let us do so and obtain the action needed in this field.

It will be a great demonstration to the country and will tend to be helpful since Congress has to cope with our civil rights problems. If Members of the U.S. Senate make clear our determination to put through needed legislation, I believe it will have a helpful result all through the country, at this time of great strife. To date, all that has been displayed is a determination on the part of those who are opposed to cloture and who are opposed to civil rights legislation. That is where the determination has been—at least, insofar as it has been evident. Those of us who believe in civil rights legislation and who feel that in these times its enactment is essential, must stand up and show our strength, even at some inconvenience and, if necessary, some physical discomfort. Others are undergoing severe trials in their efforts to obtain their rights; and I believe many Senators on both sides of the aisle must be prepared to show their support for the magnificent struggle being waged for freedom throughout our land.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been waiting a long time to speak; so I shall conclude my remarks after commenting briefly on the statement the Senator from New York has made.

I think action by Congress would have a helpful influence in restraining violence. I am interested in having these issues brought into the realm of law. It is right to have these matters decided by legislation and in the courts, rather than by violence. Our system of orderly government, of consent to law, does not comprehend or desire the determinations of governmental and legal issues by violence, and such a tradition should not develop. But if legislative bodies will not act at all to protect fundamental rights, the conditions for violence are created.

In conclusion, let me say that I do not know what kind of public accommodations bill the President will send to the Congress. I hope it will not be tied to the commerce clause of the Constitution. For to do so would result in only partial relief; it would declare legislatively that the equal rights of all citizens are applicable only to certain businesses, which would be designated ultimately by regulation of the Federal Government. It would legislate inequality among the owners of businesses, and would provoke interminable litigation.

But above all, the equal right to use public accommodations, as it will be determined by the courts, derives from the equal rights declared to all citizens, of all races, colors, and faiths, under the 14th amendment. So such legislation should not be based on the commerce clause, in connection with the question of how segregation affects interstate commerce or is a burden upon commerce. The political rights established under the Constitution go to the equality of the individual, and his inherent integrity and dignity; they should not be placed upon a lesser ground, such as the commerce clause.

I hope the President will consider carefully this distinction, and will examine the public accommodations bill introduced in the Senate by Senator DODD and myself, joined by many other Senators and by Congressman LINDSAY and others in the House, which bases the right to use public accommodations upon the 14th amendment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon; and I yield the floor.

DO DOCTORS DESIRE SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Michigan Medical Society recently conducted a referendum vote of its membership to determine whether the doctors of medicine in the State wanted the protection of Social Security for themselves and their families.

The results of this opinion poll, by secret ballot vote, are now in, and I am pleased to report that an overwhelming majority of those doctors who responded to the questionaire said that they wanted social security coverage.

A report on the results of this referendum was published in the May 9, 1963, editions of the Detroit News. And now I ask unanimous consent that this Detroit News article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. The News article points out that nearly three-fourths of the Michigan Medical Society members took part in the referendum. The vote was 3,099 in favor of Social Security for doctors, with 1,845 opposed and 20 expressing no opinion.

This is the second statewide referendum conducted on this issue by the Michigan Medical Society. The ratio of approval is similar to the earlier poll, by the State society, and to two additional polls of the members of the Wayne County Medical Society.

Despite these repeated expressions in favor of social security by a clear majority of Michigan doctors, they find themselves today, along with their fellow physicians throughout the country, ineligible for the program.

I think it is important to note that doctors of medicine are the only self-employed group in the United States today who are denied the protection of social security for themselves and their families.

The reason for this is very simple. The hierarchy of the American Medical Association is opposed to social security for doctors, and we here in the Congress have been listening to the AMA leadership lobby instead of to the physicians themselves.

Nearly all of the available evidence points to the conclusion that a considerable majority of doctors favor Social Security coverage.

It will be recalled that in 1960, the House of Representatives voted to extend social security to self-employed physicians. But the provision was deleted by the Senate Committee on Finance which stated in its report:

> The provision of the House bill extending coverage to physicians has been deleted because of lack of definitive information on whether a majority of doctors wish to come under the program (S. Rept. 1856, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 15).

At that time, on June 30, 1960, the then-president of the AMA, Dr. Leonard W. Larson, filed a letter with the Senate Finance Committee in which he pointed out that the AMA had been opposed to social security for doctors since 1949—on the grounds that the program "does not fit the economic pattern of the practicing physician."

While conceding that "several State medical societies have endorsed coverage of physicians," Dr. Larson said, "it can be concluded from the results that a majority of the profession is still opposed to compulsory coverage."

This dubious conclusion of the AMA, unsupported by any documentation, was forcefully challenged that same day before the committee by another group of doctors. Dr. I. L. Schamberg, speaking for the committee for social security for physicians, flatly contradicted Dr. Larson's claim.

Dr. Schamberg submitted a statement on behalf of Dr. Harold Aaron, chairman of the committee on social security for physicians, asserting that a "substantial majority" of doctors want to be covered by social security.

More important, the claim was backed up by the results of 27 statewide polls of doctors on this issue.

Taken by State, the polls showed that a majority of doctors in 19 States, representing 126,462 physicians, or 64 percent of the Nation's total, were in favor of doctor coverage, while 6 States, representing 18,266 physicians, or 9 percent of the Nation's totals were opposed.

Two States, representing 4,351 physicians, or 2 percent of the total, voted for voluntary coverage only—which, of course, as we know, is not possible.

A summary of 18 polls showed 62.5 percent of the doctors favoring social security coverage, while 37.5 percent were opposed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Dr. Aaron, along with a summary and tabulation of the various State polls on physician coverage be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Dr. Schamberg made another point, conveniently ignored by the AMA hierarchy, and that is the need and desire of younger doctors to have the protection of social security for themselves and their families.

Dr. Schamberg told of a doctor—with a wife and three small children—who died of leukemia at the age of 41.

Speaking of the doctor's widow, he said:

> She is one of the few widows in the country who is denied social security protection when her husband dies at the age of 41.

I believe, Mr. President, that a substantial majority of the doctors of medicine of this country are involuntary holdouts from social security.

The House of Delegates of the American Medical Association meets in annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J., starting this Sunday, June 16.

No doubt this question of social security protection for doctors will come before the convention again, as it has in the past several years.

I would strongly hope that the AMA convention would take steps to obtain an accurate, definitive, and nationwide expression of physician opinion on this important matter.

Ideally, this would be in the nature of a nationwide referendum, conducted by some outside, objective organization, and covering not only the 200,000 members of the AMA but also the 60,000 doctors of medicine who do not belong to the AMA.

The several statewide polls taken thus far clearly point to the prospect of a prosocial security vote in such a referendum.

I think it is important that the doctors of this country be given an opportunity to express their choice—by secret ballot—on the important issue of social security coverage.

I would hope that the AMA, in convention next week, would allow such a choice to be made. In the event they do not do so, the Congress might well consider other methods of obtaining an accurate expression of doctor sentiment on this matter.

EXHIBIT 1

PHYSICIANS BACK SOCIAL SECURITY BID

(By Merle Oliver)

Michigan physicians in a secret ballot have voted by a wide margin in favor of being included under social security.

An opinion poll, the second in 2 years taken by the Michigan State Medical Society (MSMS) asked the single question: "Do you favor inclusion of physicians under social security?"

Nearly three-quarters of the 6,790 members of the society responded. The vote was: Yes, 3,099; no, 1845; and no opinion, 20.

SAME RESULTS HERE

The result was substantially the same as when Wayne County Medical Society members were polled on two occasions.

The statewide vote was ordered last fall by the MSMS house of delegates at its annual meeting. The house, policymaking body of the society, refused to accept results of a 1961 poll.

A resolution passed by the delegates said that the 1961 questionnaire was "faulty and subject to misrepresentation," and was misrepresented to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association (AMA).

The poll 2 years ago asked two questions: "Are you in favor of permitting doctors of medicine in private practice to have the opportunity to participate in social security if they so desire?" There were 4,658 yes and 591 no votes.

HIT COMPULSORY IDEA

"Do you favor making participation of all doctors of medicine in social security compulsory?" The result here was 1,035 yes and 3,964 no.

The AMA house of delegates last June voted down social security. The results of the new Michigan poll will be submitted to the AMA at its annual meeting next month in Atlantic City.

Physicians were informed before they voted that, under social security, when members of an occupation are admitted by act of Congress it becomes compulsory.

OTHERS COVERED

Physicians represent the only self-employed group not covered, according to Samuel F. Test, assistant district manager of the Social Security Administration. Dentists and lawyers are covered.

Approximately 30 percent of physicians are included because they work for salaries in research institutions, hospitals, in industrial medicine, or educational institutions.

Some have social security because they are self-employed part time as partners in businesses, Test explained.

EXHIBIT 2

STATEMENT OF DR. HAROLD AARON, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY FOR PHYSICIANS

We are glad to have this opportunity to present up-to-date evidence to prove that a substantial majority of the Nation's self-employed physicians want to be included under social security.

A tally of the 27 statewide polls on social security held in the past 2 years shows: 19 States, representing 126,462 physicians, or 64 percent of the Nation's total, are in favor of physician coverage; 6 States, representing 18,266 physicians, or 9 percent of the Nation's total, are opposed to coverage; 2 States, representing 4,531 physicians, or 2 percent of the Nation's total, are in favor of voluntary coverage only.

We have enclosed a tabulated breakdown of these various polls for the examination of members of the committee.

There are several significant factors about these polls to which we would like to call your attention:

1. Twenty-four of these polls were official surveys conducted by State medical societies, most of whose delegates to AMA conventions had consistently opposed social security coverage for physicians.

2. Two independent polls among Illinois and California physicians, conducted by the Honest Ballot Association as recently as May and June of this year, show majorities of 67 percent and 62 percent, respectively, in favor of social security coverage. These polls included not only physicians affiliated with the AMA but all physicians.

3. You will note that substantial majorities, ranging from 57 percent to as high as 77 percent, were piled up in States which favored coverage.

4. All of these latest figures confirm the trend observed in the nationwide independent poll conducted by the authoritative publication, Medical Economics, which showed a nearly 2-to-1 majority in favor of coverage.

For years now physicians have been virtually the only self-employed group to be denied the benefits and protection of social security coverage. On the basis of the evidence we have presented, we sincerely hope that Congress will remedy this injustice to members of the medical profession and their families.

In conclusion, we would like to state our approval of the provision passed by the House, which would indicate not only self-employed physicians but also interns under the social security law.

Results of 18 State polls of physicians on the issue of social security coverage

State	For coverage	Against coverage	Total voting	Number of physicians in the State
Arkansas	167	596	763	1,533
California [1]	635	372	1,007	[1] 2,104
Connecticut	1,391	504	1,895	3,782
Delaware	135	85	220	522
District of Columbia	550	192	742	2,252
Florida	957	714	1,671	4,61
Georgia	496	539	1,035	3,2
Illinois	3,964	1,962	5,926	11,624
Maine	369	210	579	888
Massachusetts	3,253	988	4,241	8,274
Michigan	1,781	1,048	2,820	7,823
Minnesota	817	1,030	1,847	4,080
New Jersey	2,174	916	3,090	6,694
Ohio	4,095	2,737	6,832	10,616
Oklahoma	446	761	1,207	1,999
Pennsylvania	5,605	3,335	8,940	13,821
South Dakota	155	104	259	456
West Virginia	436	237	673	1,582
Total	27,426	16,330	43,756	95,951

[1] The California poll is a 1-in-10 poll of the State's 21,045 physicians, conducted by the Honest Ballot Association.

SUMMARY OF 18 POLLS

27,426 physicians favor coverage; 62.5 percent of all physicians voting.

16,330 physicians oppose coverage; 37.5 percent of all physicians voting.

The 43,756 physicians who cast "yes" or "no" votes represent 46 percent of all physicians in these States.

In two State society polls—Maryland and Montana—the vote was mixed and inconclusive. In Maryland, physicians opposed compulsory coverage 853 to 368, but favored voluntary coverage for themselves by a vote of 741 to 571. In Montana, the physicians opposed compulsory coverage 256 to 65, but approved voluntary coverage 195 to 133.

In the case of four State medical societies, only percentage figures were available: Rhode Island, 70 percent for, 30 percent against; Utah, 60 percent for, 40 percent against; Vermont, 65 percent for, 35 percent against; Washington State, 60 percent for, 40 percent against.

In two States—Virginia and Wisconsin—no figures or percentages have as yet been released, although the State medical societies have informed our committee that a majority of the physicians voted against social security coverage. The two States have been listed accordingly in our tabulation.

We have also leaned backward, Mr. Chairman, in estimating the ratio of physicians who returned yes or no ballots as against the total number of physicians in these States. Our figure of slightly more than 46 percent is obviously conservative as it does not take into account the following categories: physicians who cast blank or "undecided" ballots; those who are not members of the AMA; those who did not receive ballots because of change of address; those who sent in ballots after the poll was closed; and so forth.

To conclude this point, Mr. Chairman, we sincerely believe that these figures, in addition to the data we have already presented at these hearings, provide clear-cut evidence that a substantial majority of the Nation's self-employed physicians want social security coverage.

SENATE COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee is now conducting hearings on the foreign aid bill.

These are historic hearings and, in my judgment, of great importance to the American people. It is extremely important that the American people be apprised of the facts in great detail relative to foreign aid as the hearings progress. I wish it were true that all we would need would be public hearings in order to insure the American people of knowledge of the facts about legislation as important as the measure now before the committee. But that does not happen to be the case.

There is an aspect to these hearings that troubles me no little. The Secretary of State appeared before the committee the other morning and testified for 45 minutes to an hour. The next day Mr. Bell appeared and testified a corresponding period of time from a prepared statement. The committee went into executive session, and about that I shall comment momentarily.

This morning the Secretary of Defense appeared before the committee. He was accompanied by General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They presented a formal statement.

But the committee necessarily, because of the time limitations for that particular individual session of the committee, finds it necessary to adopt a procedural policy of limiting each Senator to 5 minutes for questioning in rotation. The result is that under that procedure the American people really are denied a full examination of the witnesses on the statements that they have made. Under our legislative process, the purpose of public hearings is to present publicly points of view of the representatives of the administration on a given subject countered by such question as members of the committee feel important to ask the witnesses, and discussions between the witnesses and members of the committee, so that a complete and full record may be made on the pros and cons of the issue raised by the witnesses.

In the last 10 years or so, I have been greatly concerned and increasingly disturbed about what is happening to public hearings in the Senate. They have become pretty much pro-forma.

Do not forget that the most powerful legislative representative groups in our country are the various departments of the administration at any time. I speak respectfully when I say that there is no lobby in the United States as powerful as the State Department, the Defense Department, or any other department that seeks to put through the Congress legislation with which it is directly concerned, such as the foreign aid measure. They have large staffs, paid for at public expense, to prepare and present their material, no small amount of which is in special pleading form.

I pay no disrespect to the Secretary of State or to Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, or to the great Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, when I point out that their testimony is the testimony of special pleaders. They have a bill of goods to sell. They have behind them the power of the press and the media of public information. When they take the witness stand and present formal statements, their formal statements receive wide circulation in the media of information—as they should. But I am concerned about the increasing tendency on the part of Senate committees to close out too quickly public examination of the statements made by special pleaders from the executive departments, especially in fields of foreign policy.

I would have my colleagues in the Senate look back into the history of this great parliamentary body 25, 35, 50, or 75 years.

They will find that committee examination of a witness presenting a major legislative proposal desired by the administration which he represented frequently was kept on the witness chair for days, until there was an examination in minutiae of claims of evidence in the representations made by that witness.

Theoretically, Mr. President, it will be said that such procedure is still available; but it is available only in theory, and not in fact.

The other day there was a rather long session with the Secretary of State. I do not think it is fair or reasonable or right for us to hold a Cabinet officer before the Senate committee for more than two and a half hours. Common decency should cause us to dismiss him at the end of 2 hours, for that particular examination.

But I wish to speak out against what I think is a general notion in the precincts of the Senate that such witnesses should not be called back repeatedly, as many times as is necessary for a Senator to fulfill what he considers to be his trust as a Member of this body. The Senator must be perfectly willing, when he makes such a request, to withstand some evidences of displeasure on the part of any member of the committee who wants to go on to the next witness.

But I happen to think that the foreign aid bill is vital to the protection of our greatest security, namely, our economy. The Senator from Oregon serves notice on the floor of the Senate today, as he has done already in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he will not be satisfied with only one or two appearances of a witness—be he the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or the Director of AID.

The Senator from Oregon would fight to guarantee this procedure to any other Senator. So long as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations wants a witness recalled for examination on the foreign aid bill, or on any other bill, I shall insist that the Senator be guaranteed that right.

I am not implying that we are not guaranteed that right at the present time, although I do not have to be hit on the head with a baseball bat to know what the sentiment within the committee is. It has been accepted that the plan this year is to have short hearings on foreign aid. I am against short hearings on foreign aid this year.

I do not know of another time in my 19 years in the Senate when it was more important to have a detailed examination of witnesses on a foreign policy bill than in this year of 1963 in connection with this bill.

So, when the Secretary of State had been on the witness stand for more than 2 hours the other day it was only fair and reasonable and proper that he be excused for the day. I announced that I wanted to have him called back, for I had been able to examine him only a maximum of 15 minutes—and I am not sure that I had the third round of questions.

Because of what was really a taking-it-for-granted position concerning the second hearing, that of Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, the committee went into executive session for the hearing; and I assumed that there was some good reason for going into executive session. I assumed that probably there was to be some truly top secret material which Mr. Bell was to disclose to the committee which, from the standpoint of the security of our country, needed to be delivered to us in executive session.

The witness started with the suggestion that he file his statement and summarize it or condense it by oral remarks, which I found completely unacceptable. I objected to such procedure, for I think it very important that we hear these witnesses through on the basis of their prepared statements, which we see for the first time when they take the witness chair. So I objected to the filing of any statement, and requested that Mr. Bell be required to read his statement, which was perfectly agreeable to him. I wish to make that very clear.

I listened to Mr. Bell. For the life of me, I could not find one single bit of information in that statement which should not have been told to the American people in public hearings. He was perfectly agreeable to appearing in a public hearing. I do not criticize my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee for the fact that we were not having a public hearing.

But I made the point—and I was joined by other members of the committee—that I felt all the hearings on the foreign aid bill should be public hearings, with the press and the public invited; and, if any department or any witness felt there was some top secret material which should be given to the committee in executive session, he could omit it from his formal public statement, and make the request of the committee—and it would be automatically granted—to meet with the committee in executive session to present material which he thought should be given in secret.

Of course, the committee reserves the right to pass judgment on whether it is in fact secret material and whether the Department's request that it be kept secret should be granted.

The senior Senator from Oregon serves notice now that on any such occasion the material had better be secret and not merely bear the label of "top secret," because much of the material that has been presented to us bearing the label of "top secret" is not top secret at all, and should never have been so labeled.

Such materials belong to the American people. The final judgment on the foreign aid bill will be made by the American people, at the polls, if necessary. It is my view that the foreign aid bill raises certain issues of legislative public policy so vital to the welfare of the American people that if the facts are presented to them, the American people will demand drastic downward revisions of the bill.

So I notified the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that I reserved the right to speak each day, starting next week, on foreign aid issues, from the floor of the Senate, supplementing the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee. I did so because the procedure being followed in Senate committees makes it almost certain that Senators will not be able to use the time in committee to call the attention of the American people to what I consider to be some of the very unsound parts of the testimony already heard before the committee.

I have stepped up my schedule. I was in Detroit last night, and I discussed some of these problems with certain prominent businessmen who told me things about the administration of foreign aid of which I was not aware. I came back to Washington in the wee hours of the morning satisfied that I should start talking about foreign aid right away. They will all be relatively short speeches for me, for I intend to make these speeches issue by issue.

I intend to have my hearing in the Senate, and to cooperate with my majority leader, as I always have done, to the fullest extent possible; but I have written my majority leader to notify him that, while the foreign aid bill is pending in the Senate, I will not accede to any unanimous-consent request for limiting debate in the Senate or for fixing a time for debate in the Senate, which operations would thereby prevent a discussion on the floor of the Senate of other matters, such as the foreign-aid bill.

I know I can take judicial notice as to what the position of my majority leader will be, for he would be the last Member of this body to in any way deny to the senior Senator from Oregon necessary time each day, if he desires to use that time each day, to engage in these discussions. I have cooperated for years in talking after 5 o'clock in the afternoon, with the result that in some places I am referred to as the "5 o'clock shadow." But on this subject matter I will not relegate this discussion to the period after 5 o'clock, for the issue of foreign aid is so important that it needs to be the subject of discussion at earlier hours in the day on most occasions.

When it comes to unanimous-consent requests, we probably shall be able to arrive at an understanding that a certain period of time during the day shall be set aside for the discussion of subject matters other than the subject matter to which the unanimous-consent agreement pertains.

I do not know how the American people can be made to understand the foreign aid bill unless Senators discuss it, as I propose to discuss it, and answer here on the floor of the Senate, as the administration's case for foreign aid is developed in committee, the positions taken by the administration in respect to certain parts of the bill which I think are completely unsound.

TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY M'NAMARA

Before I turn to the particular phase of foreign aid which I am about to discuss from the manuscript, I wish to refer to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. As I told him at that hearing, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to his leadership as Secretary of Defense. In my judgment, he has had no peer in that position during my service in the Senate. I have great admiration for him.

Many other things could be mentioned, but I mentioned three things in his record that I think will cause him to go down in the history of the Pentagon as one of the great Secretaries of Defense of all time.

First, he has done a magnificent job in making it perfectly clear to the American military that, under our Constitution, the American military is subject at all times to civilian command; and that the policies of this Government in the field of defense, as well as in all other fields, are to be civilian-determined, with the advice of professional assistants and the experts of the military. But the decisions are to be the decisions of a civilian government, and based upon the recommendations of a civilian Secretary of Defense.

In my opinion, Secretary McNamara has performed a great service in making that clear both to the American people and to the Military Establishment.

In the second place, I think Secretary McNamara is a great Secretary of Defense because of his objectivity, because of his insistence on getting the answer to the question, "What are the facts about this problem?"

As is true of each of us, he may come to a mistaken conclusion in his interpretation of the facts and his application of the facts to a particular problem; but it is an honest mistake.

As I did more briefly this morning in committee hearing, I want to pay my respects to Secretary McNamara for his objectivity. He owes that objectivity to the President of the United States. The President of the United States is fortunate to have such an objective man as his Secretary of Defense.

Third, as I said in the hearing this morning, I pay my great respects to him because of his courage, his forthrightness, and his determination to stand up against pressures, whether those pressures come from the Congress, from the military within the Pentagon, or from great industrial powers.

I told him I had great respect and high regard for the position he took, for example, after he had made an analysis of the facts and reached a conclusion in connection with the controversy raging over the building of a great military plane. Certain economic forces in my section of the country sought to have me disagree with the Secretary of Defense and seek to apply pressure to bring about a change in his decision. Of course, they were all wrong if they thought such a procedure would be successful, because Secretary McNamara is not that kind of public servant. They should have known they were all wrong if they thought I would apply pressure in any case, for I have never asked for an economic advantage for my section of the country if the facts did not warrant it.

On the basis of what I have learned to date, I believe the Secretary of Defense is right in that controversy. I pay homage to him for standing up against all the pressures to which he has been subjected on that issue.

Having paid that tribute to him this morning, I must still find myself in disagreement with him on certain aspects of his prepared statement concerning the administration's program for military aid.

The examination was started this morning. I have formally requested on the record, that he be called back. I shall continue to press for a further hearing with the Secretary of Defense, because I believe the statement he made needs to be discussed in public. I do not believe it is in keeping with the purpose of public hearings of committees merely to call a witness in, have him make a statement, have a few questions asked him for a period of an hour or an hour and a half, and then dismiss him. The testimony which the Secretary of Defense gave this morning raises so many important and vital questions, as the examination already shows, that in my judgment the Secretary of Defense also should be called back for as many more sessions as are necessary to satisfy every member of that committee.

That raises the final procedural point I wish to raise. It may be that a Senate committee can decide by vote that no Cabinet officer or administration witness or any other witness should be called back for further examination. Technically, a committee might do that. I hope no committee will do so. Each of us represents the people of a sovereign State. Those people are entitled to ask whatever questions their representatives believe should be asked of any witness, no matter how many sessions may be required to ask such questions, provided—and that is easy to determine—the requests made by a Senator are good-faith requests, and provided the examination itself shows that it is a good-faith examination.

The American people cannot be informed about the facts of the foreign aid bill unless the administration spokesmen are subjected to thorough examination, involving every minutia, to which a Senator wishes to subject them.

I quite agree that it is necessary to have a rule such as is being followed in the Foreign Relations Committee, of rotation on a 5-minute basis. However, it does not take very long, under such a rule, to put a Senator in the position where he could not examine a witness for more than 10 or 15 minutes.

I shall abide by the majority opinion of the Foreign Relations Committee on this subject. However, I raise the question here because I believe that a procedural problem faces the Senate. The trend toward quick hearings and short periods of examination of witnesses is a trend of recent development in the history of the Senate. It is a trend that should be reversed.

In addition to cross-examination in the committee, it is important that Senators start now making a case on the foreign aid bill on the part of those of us who believe it should be drastically reduced. I would have Senators keep in mind that the foreign aid bill for fiscal year 1964, as proposed by the administration, is $4½ billion; that the military aid section is $1.4 billion; that the economic aid section is $3.1 billion. I am not favorably impressed with the argument made by the Secretary of State the other day, and again this morning by the Secretary of Defense, that the $1.4 billion bill for military aid is only 3 percent of the national defense budget. My question is: So what? I do not intend to permit them, by such a nonsequitur approach to this subject, to seem to establish the justification of a $55 billion national defense budget in round figures. It is entirely too high. It needs to be drastically reduced. When we discussed this point with the Secretary of Defense this morning, in replying to a question put to him by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and subsequently elaborated upon by the senior Senator from Oregon, he took the position that the $1.4 billion for military aid could not be reduced, and indicated that if any reduction had to occur—and he does not favor any—it should be made elsewhere in the defense budget.

There is nothing sacred about these figures, although I expected the Secretary of Defense to take exactly the position he took when I pointed that out, for in a sense, the Secretary is a special pleader. The Pentagon is not going to topple, and the security of this country is not going to be endangered if there is a reduction in both these figures. I suspect that the most surprised people in Washington will be those in the Pentagon if the figures are not reduced. I did not have an opportunity to ask the Secretary this morning, because of the limitation of time, how much unexpended funds there are from last year's appropriation. I will ask him the next time. I serve notice on him now that I shall ask him.

I suggested to him this morning in public hearing that in my opinion the total budget could easily be reduced by 15 percent. I asked him what his position was. I received exactly the answer that I expected from him. One does not go through these hearings as many times as I have, without being able almost to give the witness's answer for the question. Of course, he told me that he thought such action would endanger the security of our country. I will give him an opportunity to show me in what way. I am not interested in the generalities that the administration witnesses have given to date as the chief characterization of their testimony; and that goes for the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; for Br. Bell, the Director of Foreign Aid; and for Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense.

I want a breakdown of the figures; and I also want to have presented clear proof as to why a reduction here or there would do serious damage to the security of the country. One gets a kind of generality from page 16 of the testimony of the Secretary of Defense this morning. As I recall, he pointed out that in the past couple of years, NATO countries have increased their contributions to the expenses of NATO.

I asked, "In what way? Prepare for me a memorandum that shows exactly what every dollar they have contributed has been spent for."

It is very important to have such a memorandum, because merely to say that the NATO countries are increasing their contributions is completely meaningless, unless it can be shown that the increases they are making really are to the benefit of NATO as a totality.

I was very much interested in the testimony of the Secretary of Defense this morning, when I asked him if it were not true that De Gaulle has failed to assign French forces to the NATO command in any such numbers as France is supposed to furnish.

In effect, the response was that, of course, it was thought De Gaulle should assign French troops to NATO, but it was also true that in case of war every Frenchman would be available.

I asked the Secretary of Defense if he did not think every American would be available, too. Under article V of the NATO treaty, all the participants pledged themselves to the doctrine of one-for-all and all-for-one. But as I made clear to the Secretary of Defense, it is no answer, by way of a rationalization of De Gaulle's failure to carry out the obligations of France under NATO, to say that although it is true that De Gaulle has not been providing France's share of NATO troops, still all Frenchmen will be available if we should become involved in a war. On that basis, we could bring all our boys home, for we would all be available, too. The fact is that De Gaulle has not kept the commitments of France.

That leads me to the issue which I wish to discuss in this first of a series of many speeches I propose to make in the Senate in the weeks immediately ahead with respect to foreign aid.

I wish to address myself to the future of U.S. relations with Western Europe, especially as they have been affected by the issue of a NATO nuclear force. It is of great regret to me that my comments in the Senate on this issue have, except for the remarkable speeches by my friend from Idaho [Mr. Church], been the only public comments among Senators on one of the greatest foreign policy issues of this decade. It is of no credit to Congress, and especially to the Senate, that we have abandoned the matter of America's relations with Europe to the executive branch. When the time comes for a large new American contribution to a NATO nuclear force, or for an amendment to the McMahon Act, then Congress will find itself confronted with a fait accompli, and we will be told that we had better simply ratify what the administration has done for us in our name, and as a result of our delinquency.

I do not intend to be caught in that predicament. I do intend to discuss this issue, whether anyone else in Congress is interested in it or not, because I have the feeling that what is being put forward, both at Ottawa and in the multilateral Polaris fleet, is only that small part of the iceberg that shows above the surface.

One reason I shall discuss it is that I was so active in 1949 in getting the North Atlantic Treaty ratified by the Senate. I know that NATO was created for a certain reason and because of a certain circumstance. The current generation of policymakers seems to have forgotten entirely what it was created for.

These original purposes have been achieved, and every partner except the United States is now operating on that assumption.

I have alluded previously to the objectives of European economic recovery, the economic integration of Europe, and the drawing of Germany back into the community of Western nations as constituting the primary purposes of the treaty. The current issue of the NATO nuclear force has brought into sharp relief the achievement of these objectives and the many other fundamental changes that have taken place since 1949.

ADVENT OF NUCLEAR AGE

The principle one is the advent of the nuclear age, and the missile age. This technological revolution has alone made NATO obsolete, in my opinion. It is now the United States, not Western Europe, that is most likely to take the brunt of any aggression from the Soviet Union. The doubts expressed among Europeans that the United States will fire its nuclear missiles in the event of an attack on Europe are nothing compared to my doubts that our NATO allies will move a muscle if the United States is attacked by the Soviet Union.

EXPANSION OF U.S. COMMITMENTS

A second major change since 1949 is the vast increase in U.S. commitments elsewhere in the world. Whenever any question is raised in Washington about the value of NATO, one can be certain of hearing the old refrain "the security of Western Europe is vital to the security of the United States," played like an old phonograph record.

The people who say it have usually been saying it for most of their diplomatic or political careers, and would not know how to say anything else, much less think anything else. Even if true, it is not very relevant to the question.

But since 1949 there is hardly a spot in the world that we have not tabbed as vital to our security. In 1950, 14 nations in the world received U.S. military aid—all of it in grants. In 1964 we will be giving grants of military aid, not to 14 nations, but to 70 nations, and will be furnishing military aid through loan or purchase to 13 more countries.

As with Western Europe, this military aid to 83 countries is also extended on the finding that they are vital to the security of the United States. Aside from the financial expense, we have indicated by our military assistance that we have a commitment to their general interests and security. That commitment now includes almost every nation in the world outside the Communist bloc and Africa.

Mention South Vietnam, Taiwan, Iran, South Korea, India, Pakistan, and anyone in Washington will swear that each is vital to the security of the United States to the tune of billions of dollars. This may not prove anything except the stupidity of the United States, but it is nonetheless costing us billions of dollars and spreads our general defense commitment from one end of the globe to the other.

Western European countries have no such commitments. In fact, some of those we have acquired have been commitments abandoned by our allies. In south Asia, France has bowed out; we have tried to pick up the pieces. We are deeply involved in South Vietnam and in Laos, areas which Americans felt were vital to our security, but which France decided were not vital to hers at all. Much the same is true in the Middle East, where we also send huge amounts of military and economic aid in order to build what we think will be a bulwark against communism in an area called vital to our security. These areas were formerly dependencies of Western Europe; today they are dependencies of the United States.

India is one of the principal members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

It is my understanding that the President of India is now in London. I am happy to know that. I hope that while he is in London he will take up with the British Government the question: "How much are you willing to help to contribute or to lend for the defense of freedom in India?" Although India is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the sad fact is that to date the United States has been the country to which India has turned, primarily, for military assistance and economic assistance. In my judgment, any aid we give to India should be given in relationship to the amount of aid India receives from the other free nations of the world, for the American taxpayers must be protected more than they have been protected for some years in regard to being called upon to "shell out" billions and billions of dollars for the protection of freedom elsewhere in the world, whereas other free nations are not carrying their fair share of the burden; and that goes for England vis-a-vis India. I hope the President of India, who now is in London, will be successful in getting that point across, if he is interested in pressing that point. Let me say to the President of India that if he is not interested in pressing that point, I am not going to be enthusiastic about voting for apropriations of American taxpayers' funds to be used to come to the rescue of India. But I think India knows perfectly well that only in the United States does she stand to get consideration of the amounts of military aid and economic aid she needs in order to be able to defend herself against Red China.

I was very much interested in a response made this morning by the Secretary of Defense when I was pressing the point that our greatest defense weapon—namely, our economy—needs a little more protection than it has been receiving. The Secretary thought we could aid all these countries, because our gross national product is $600 billion a year. Again I ask, so what? Let us apply this point to a very homey problem which each one of us meets in his own private financing. I operate a few farms. The gross product of those farms has been increasing; but the only thing that really counts is the net return, and it has not been increasing. So we must consider what the American people have left, their net return from the gross national product. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, cannot escape the fact that today the U.S. economy is lagging in comparison with the economies of most of the countries of Western Europe. Our production rate is not rising as rapidly as the production rates of the prosperous countries of Western Europe. One of the reasons for that situation is that we have rebuilt their economies. We should have done that, and I voted for it, for we had a moral obligation and a national self-interest obligation to rebuild Western Europe. But Western Europe too frequently impresses me with the feeling that it has overlooked the fact that we rebuilt it. So we are being subjected by Western Europe to one discriminatory practice after another in the field of foreign trade. We find France failing to carry out her obligations under NATO; we find the other countries of Western Europe, save and except West Germany—and her record in the field of foreign trade vis-a-vis the United States is not good—taking advantage of the American taxpayers by failing to assume their fair share of the cost of protecting freedom, not only in Europe, but also elsewhere in the world.

This morning, when I questioned the Secretary of Defense about what England and other NATO countries, including Australia and New Zealand, are doing in South Vietnam, he replied, as the record shows, that they are doing something. However, when we press for details, we find that the aid being given is only token aid. I am not interested in form; I am interested in substance. The other nations of the free world are not paying their fair share of the support of freedom in the areas of the world where freedom is threatened.

In view of the many billions of dollars that the American taxpayers have poured out to build up the nuclear power of the United States—with the understanding that it is for the defense of the free world—is it any wonder that our economy is dragging? This morning I was astounded to hear the Secretary of Defense argue that he thinks the pouring of these billions of dollars into nonproductive military expenditures does not have a serious effect on our country's economy. When he next appears before the committee, I shall discuss that point with him at greater length; but at this time I wish to file this caveat, by saying that I could not disagree more with him on a matter of economics, for expenditures for military defense are not productive expenditures. Expenditures for military defense did not expand our economy; they do not create new wealth. We need to begin pouring into our economy huge sums of money which will expand the economy at the civilian level, for today our country does not have a civilian economy and a free economy. Today, the economy of the United States is a defense economy, and it is very lopsided. We have a right—and we must insist on it—to have the other free nations of the world increase their contributions to the military aid costs and the economic aid costs for the underdeveloped areas of the world; and the time to do that is now, in connection with the foreign aid bill.

If we reduce the foreign aid bill a minimum of 25 percent, we shall begin to hear talk in international conferences in regard to what other nations will do. But so long as Uncle Sam is willing to "pay through the nose," he will be permitted to continue to do so.

So, Mr. President, I will continue to take the position that until the Secretary of State, Mr. Bell, and Mr. McNamara, submit to the Foreign Relations Committee proof that other nations in the world are substantially increasing their contributions, I will not support a foreign-aid bill. Last year I voted against the measure for the first time in all my years in the Senate. If that is what I shall again be called upon to vote for this year, I shall vote against it, and I have made that point very clear to the White House. I could not think of voting for a bill which, in my judgment, would do injustice to the American people and weaken the strongest defense of our country; namely, our economy. I could not think of voting for a bill in terms of the present administration bill.

So it is no longer a question of whether Western Europe is vital to the interests of the United States, because it is. But I do not think Russia is going to swoop down on Europe, whether we are there or not. It is the one place where our friends are wealthy enough and strong enough to take care of their security without us.

EUROPEAN PARTNERS NO LONGER SATISFIED WITH NATO

They know that, even if we do not. They are acting on it, and have been acting on it. Both the rising right in France, and the rising left in Britain and Italy are espousing doctrines of independence from the United States. I think they are doing so because the first and foremost objective of NATO has already been achieved, and that is the economic recovery of Europe. These nations are no longer scared to death of communism. They are no longer fearful of a takeover by their internal Communist parties, nor are they fearful of military aggression from the Soviet Union.

Economic self-confidence is bringing political self-confidence to Europe. If these nations were still truly fearful of Russia, they would be helping us to subsidize the poorer members. Britain, France, and the Benelux countries are not only continuing to receive military aid from this country which they do not need, but they are doing nothing to take over a proportionate share of the subsidy to Greece and Turkey, without which these two nations probably could not furnish the some 24 divisions they now furnish to NATO.

I digress to say that the American people need to learn about these figures. I wish the administration would make clear to the American people what it is costing them, for I believe that the American people are entitled to know these facts. I am satisfied that if the individual taxpayers of our country come to understand what we are doing on the question of foreign aid to NATO countries, their answer will be, "Cut it drastically."

Military aid alone for fiscal 1963 to NATO members shows Belgium receiving $28 million; Denmark $22 million; France $14 million; Germany less than a quarter million; Greece $62 million; Italy $70 million; The Netherlands $16 million; Norway $38.7 million; Portugal $11 million; Turkey $135.7 million; Britain $11 million. To this should be added the some $150 million in various kinds of economic aid which we also send to Greece and Turkey, and the $32 million in military and the roughly equivalent amount of economic aid we make available to Spain, because one need only look at the Summary Presentation to Congress of the current foreign aid bill to know that our aid to both Spain and Portugal is in payment for U.S. bases used in the defense of Europe.

If the European partners truly thought that Spain, Greece, and Turkey were vital to their own defenses, they would be helping us pay these costs.

I asked the Secretary of Defense about the aid that we give to Portugal and Spain for our bases in Portugal and Spain. I said, "Mr. Secretary, is it your position that the bases are vital to the defense of the United States?"

He said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had gone into that subject. It was their opinion—and he shared the opinion—that the bases are essential to the defense of the United States.

I raised the question as to whether they were considered essential to the defense of Europe. Of course, the answer was that they were so considered.

My next question was as follows: "That being true, why does not Europe pay a part of the cost of the bases?"

To that question I did not receive a satisfactory answer. I was told that the per capita income of Portugal and Spain is much lower than that of the United States.

Again I asked the question—"So what?" I am not suggesting that Spain and Portugal pay us. I am only asking why we must pay them for the privilege of defending them.

We cannot pay the bill for the world. We have helped Portugal and Spain to the point where they have attained economic rehabilitation and a degree of prosperity that they have not known for many decades.

Why should not the other free nations of Europe pay a part of the cost of maintaining bases in Spain and Portugal, assuming that they are important to the security of our country? A general statement in committee this morning to that effect does not convince me. The Department must have an opportunity to prove to the committee not only that the bases are vital to the security of the United States, but why we must pay for them and why no other country should help us.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish this point, and then I shall be happy to yield.

Spain and Portugal remind me of a good many chambers of commerce in the United States. They are anxious to obtain certain installations for their cities. They are willing to do almost anything to obtain the installations. The desired installations are brought in, and not very long after that the cities start seeking to obtain further benefits for the maintenance of the installations—quite in contradiction to the assurances of local support that were made in the effort to obtain the installations.

We did not have to force these bases on Spain and Portugal. If they are vital to the defense of the United States, they are equally vital to the defense of Portugal, Spain, and other countries of Europe; and those countries should pay a part of the cost.

I yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has spoken courageously. But beyond his courage, which is characteristic of his service in the Senate, we see the clear intent of the case he is making. What he has said is significant not only because he has made the statement, and made it well, but because, at deeper levels than we acknowledge or understand, he reflects the reasoning of a considerable segment of the American people.

The facts which the Senator expounds in this forum are sobering. I am conscious of this since I have knowledge, as does my colleague, that there are perhaps only six or seven countries on earth which have not received either direct aid or indirect assistance from the United States of America. We ponder the truism that more than 100 countries have been participating in the largesse of this Nation, resulting from the productivity of our people. There is no desire, Mr. President, on my part to think in narrow terms. We both believe, as I understand, that we have a covenant and commitment with the needy peoples of the world. This is a time not only for appraisal, but also for reappraisal of our personal, national, and international goals.

I compliment my colleague the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it means a great deal to me to have these words from the Senator from West Virginia, who serves with me on the Subcommittee on Education of this body. A good many of the economic factors I am discussing in connection with this issue are involved also in our educational problem. We know what is happening to the economy of our country because so much of our money has been going into the noncivilian production of defense and foreign aid.

When I think of the great pockets of unemployment in this country—the Senator's State is one, and my State is another—and when I think of the great need to correct undeveloped areas in our own country, I say it is about time that, as Senators, we start directing our attention to some of the economic needs of our own domestic economy, and let France, England, Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Norway, Belgium, and other countries, into which we have been pouring our largesse since 1946, start paying their share.

I do not buy the argument of this administration, "If you follow that course of action you may alienate some of our friends; you may drive some of them into the arms of the Communists; you may create a serious international problem."

If our relationship with our allies is dependent upon our paying more than our fair share, the sooner we find out who are our friends the better. We cannot continue to support 83 nations, which we are now doing—never dropping any, but taking on more—and maintain the strength of our economy.

I say to the American people, "Rise up! Rise up! Make clear that you think the time has come for this Congress to start protecting the domestic economy of our country. We cannot do it by pouring out these billions of dollars being called for in the foreign aid and defense programs."

EUROPEAN DRIVE FOR NUCLEAR INEPENDENCE

One good which I do see coming out of the whole discussion of a NATO nuclear force is that it will finally compel the United States to face reality and make some basic and long overdue decisions about NATO.

The meaningless cut-and-paste job that came out of the Ottawa Conference is one more stalling device designed to protect our Defense and State Department policymakers from facing the inevitable while they work on something else. But it will not save them for long.

It will not save them, because they are refusing to recognize that now, and for several years past, NATO has been largely a United States-German alliance maintained primarily for the defense of Berlin.

The monumental disinterest of France and Britain in this endeavor is being made more clear than ever in the debate over the NATO nuclear force. Like Germany, they see no need whatever to subsidize Greece, Turkey, Spain, Norway, Denmark, and Italy in order to keep the Russians from rolling through West Berlin. That is a folly all the members have all been happy to leave to the United States.

But unlike Germany, none of our other NATO partners has much interest in a nuclear force, even under NATO command and with mixed units that cannot be withdrawn, over which the United States will maintain a veto and which will add little but a new expense to the NATO defenses.

Why do we not face up to the fact that the only purpose in the proposed NATO nuclear force is to give Germany a hand in nuclear weaponry which she is not allowed to have on her own? That is what this is all about. West Germany is forbidden by treaty to manufacture nuclear warheads and missiles. Now that France has decided that NATO no longer serves her primary national interest and is embarking on her own military buildup, including the nuclear one, it is alleged that Germany will soon come to feel that she, too, must have her own such force.

One alternative would be to free Germany from her 1954 pledge. But that is supposed to arouse raging fires of apprehension on the part of the Russians, and among some of Germany's neighbors as well.

FALLACY OF FEAR OF GERMANY

I do not think that there is much to be said for the notion that the former victims of German aggression within the Atlantic Alliance fear nuclear weapons in the hands of Germany. If they truly did, they would be anxious to participate in a NATO force in which Germany was only one of many members, and over which the United States had a veto.

But no. France does not allow any nuclear warheads on her soil because they are under American control.

That is the De Gaulle position. I ask, Is that the position of an ally?

Considering this position of de Gaulle, and the position of de Gaulle on manpower assignments to NATO, on foreign trade, on the Common Market, and on the discrimination against the United States vis-a-vis GATT, we would have a hard time bringing him under the definition of "ally."

I am at a loss to understand why this administration is proposing more concessions to France until we determine the question as to whether de Gaulle is to be an ally again. If he is not, let him "go it alone." We should not support his nationalistic program, or his plan for a French nuclear force, with a single dollar of American taxpayers' money.

Norway and Denmark do not allow nuclear warheads on their soil at all. The Italian Government was recently forced to promise its people that no bases would be made available in Italy for our Polaris submarines. So much for their fear of the possibility of a German hand on a nuclear capacity in which there was no American participation.

While Germany is anxious to have American participation in nuclear force even with an American veto, France is only anxious to have a European nuclear force in which there will be no American participation at all. The rest of the partners, including Britain, are too disinterested or too poor to concern themselves with any appreciable share in it.

AMERICAN PROPOSALS

I do not see anything in either the rearrangement on paper that was put together at Ottawa, or the proposed surface fleet of Polaris vessels, that will bridge this gap, that is really a gap among the Europeans. I do not see any good purpose whatever in putting more American money into a venture that is only a facade to cover up the dissolved foundation of NATO.

At Ottawa, a nuclear command under General Lemnitzer was set up, having at its disposal three U.S. Polaris subs, 180 British Vulcan bombers, and national fighter-bomber forces from 8 other members, many of which are already equipped for U.S. controlled nuclear warheads. A NATO liaison staff will go to Strategic Air Command headquarters at Omaha to take part in planning and targeting operations. However, all warheads assigned to NATO will still be under American control, and any of the assigned forces can be withdrawn at the discretion of the donor country.

The French were right in accepting this arrangement as being nothing new, different, or constructive.

The Secretary of State did not bring out of Ottawa the slightest change in French posture from what it was when the French delegates first sat around the table at Ottawa. Ottawa did not produce any significant commitment on the part of France. The French delegates went back to France, and De Gaulle remains free to travel down his nationalistic road. I say he should be allowed to go, but we should not pay his travel expenses. He should pay them, himself.

The force is proposed to be under NATO command, but not under NATO control. It retains the same objection that the French and many others in Europe regard as the fatal defect, and that is an American veto.

PROPOSED FLEET NOT MULTILATERAL AT ALL

But our proposed nuclear surface fleet maintains the same defect. It also has the added defect of being very costly to ourselves and the Germans, because under this arrangement, we and the Germans would each pay 40 percent, leaving 10 percent to Britain, and 10 percent to any of the other members who might want to participate. France will undoubtedly remain out of it entirely. For its mere 10 percent Britain will also have a veto over its use.

The total cost of this force has not been indicated, but estimates I have heard run from $2.5 to $6 billion. Forty percent of $2.5 billion would put the U.S. share at $1 billion. Forty percent of $6 billion would be $2.4 billion. Even the lower figure is much too high a price to pay for political peace within NATO. That this is a purely political device is generally understood. The force would add nothing to the existing destructive power of the nuclear forces already in the hands of the West.

I do not see how anyone who thinks we and Germany should finance 80 percent of a new nuclear force can consider that force to be a multilateral, NATO force. With Britain financing only 10 percent, it is idle to maintain the fiction that she would be a real partner in the surface fleet venture.

And without France, there simply is no NATO any more, no matter how much we may pretend otherwise. France is too key a country to permit NATO to continue to function without her. It does not matter whether France's reasons for picking up her marbles and leaving the game were sound or not. It is not an issue of wisdom, but an issue of fact. We are all in NATO together, making equal financial and manpower contributions, or NATO is finished. When a major participant declines to fulfill those contributions, that is the end of the organization.

Yet here we are, pushing for a new branch to the organization, this time without France, with only 10-percent participation from Britain, and with insignificant and reluctant contributions, if any are forthcoming at all, from 10 of the other members.

DOES NOT MEET EUROPEAN OBJECTIONS TO PRESENT SETUP

Neither do I see anything in this force that would do anything to overcome European objections to the present arrangement of having all nuclear warheads in NATO under American command. The U.S. veto would remain, and I would be very strongly opposed to any subsequent effort to eliminate that U.S. veto.

What concerns me is that this surface fleet may be only the preliminary step to the creation of a NATO nuclear force in which there will be no veto. Only the doctrine of use of the force by majority vote would overcome the European objection to the present system. Any system that retains a veto in the hands of the United States can hardly remove those objections. So I see little in the surface fleet that will meet the objections to the status quo, unless this is but an opening wedge to a future move to put it under majority vote.

It is quite possible that the military and diplomatic planners who are obsessed with the idea that the United States must be permanently joined with Europe politically, economically, and militarily, think they can advance faster by taking a step at a time than by revealing their true objective at the outset. Perhaps they mistakenly think that once the surface fleet is a reality, and we have sunk a billion dollars into it, Congress will then be more easily persuaded to keep it going by giving up our veto over its use.

UNITED STATES MUST MAINTAIN ABSOLUTE VETO

There are already reports that some kind of weighted vote is being dangled before France as a means of assuaging her objections to a full American veto. Why American officials are so anxious to court France, I am never able to understand. In my opinion, there is nothing to be said to France at all on the subject of the nuclear force, until she has met her full manpower obligation for NATO's conventional forces.

Our spokesmen are making a grave mistake if they are discussing a weighted command of the surface fleet with the understanding that they can get quick congressional approval, once the force is in being.

They should be disabused of that notion right now. I do not intend to support a billion dollar outlay for NATO at all, when it constitutes 40 percent of the whole cost, much less vote for it and then be told later that this was only the first installment and the next installment will be a modification or a relinquishment of a U.S. veto.

I would not be in favor of giving up any part of our veto because I do not believe the United States should ever be in a position where Western Europe could make us a target for nuclear attack against our own judgment. If it were possible to limit our liability to those nuclear forces that were actually under NATO command, that might be different. But I do not see how that could be done. I do not see how a nuclear war in which Western participation was commenced by a majority vote in NATO and against American objections, could be restricted to those forces actually under NATO command.

So long as nuclear arsenals exist, we will best serve the cause of peace if we continue to take an adamant stand in regard to the control of any nuclear forces to which we make a contribution.

U.S. ALTERNATIVES

It seems to me we have two possible alternatives. One is to come to grips with the reality that NATO is really a United States-German organization, and confine ourselves to a bilateral arrangement with Germany alone so long as the Berlin issue remains unsettled. At least this would enable us to rid ourselves of all the excess baggage of subsidizing peripheral members. It would save us from the stupidity of begging for French support. And it would remove the issue of the veto, at least as long as the Germans themselves do not raise it.

Or we might make it clear to France, Britain, and Germany that they are on their own, free to do whatever they like about creating a European defense force of their own, including a nuclear deterrent, free from all American financing, participation, and veto.

I believe we must "lay it on the line," so to speak. If they want to go it alone, it must be with the understanding that they pay their own way. That is why I believe the foreign aid bill should be discussed at the crossroads of America for weeks to come, because it is part and parcel of the whole NATO issue. That is why I am not at all interested in a rush act on the foreign aid bill. I am not at all interested in quick hearings. I am not at all interested in closed hearings. I am interested in a sufficient passage of time, so that the American people will know that Congress is being asked, and will be asked in the future, to give away hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars for a purpose which I seriously question has a good ending.

A British-French-German pool of nuclear technology could lead to a European deterrent that would obviate the issue of their reliance upon America. It would obviate the issue of the American veto over a NATO nuclear force.

That something of this nature is in the wind seems evident to me. Newsweek magazine has recently published a comment to this effect by the prospective Defense Minister in a Labor government in Britain, Mr. Patrick Gordon-Walker. Mr. Gordon-Walker is quoted as saying that the Labor government will abandon the independent British deterrent, in exchange for which it will ask Washington for a veto over the entire American nuclear policy. And if Washington refused, he was asked. "Then we should have no alternative but to throw in with Europe."

I understand that Mr. Gordon-Walker is coming to Washington in the near future. If he is coming to sound out the prospects for the British Labor government having a veto over American nuclear policy, he should plan to throw in with Europe right now, and save himself the cost of the trip over.

Moreover, a purely European defense would also make it possible for us to begin withdrawing a good part of our 400,000 troops in Europe. They would no longer be needed as the hostage of our good intentions.

Mr. President, that rankles me, when I think of what we have poured into Europe, in blood, materiel, and money, and when I recognize that France has not been able to defend herself for half a century.

France has continued to exist, not because of any capability of defending herself, but because for half a century the free world has come to her defense. Mr. De Gaulle needs to reread French history, not distort it, and to be told, as we have been told—and this includes the Germans too—what the truth is. They suspect that the United States would not really come to their defense. They seem to have taken the position that we must have 400,000 American boys in Europe, figuratively as hostages, to demonstrate our good intentions. What assurances have we from Europe, correspondingly, that give us any assurance that Europe will come to our defense?

It would probably be true—and I suspect that many of the European allied leaders are taking this into account, which may somewhat explain their intransigence—that if we should get into a nuclear war, it would be a quick one between two great powers, the United States and Russia, and would be fought over the heads of the Europeans; and the European countries, conceivably, might not be touched. So I ask, What assurance have we that in such event the Europeans would not stand on the side lines?

That is what I mean when I say I rankle at the repeated challenges to the good faith of the United States that have broken out from time to time throughout Europe. We have too many boys over there. A large number of them should be brought home now. I have been heard to say before that we have more boys over there under NATO command than France, Great Britain, and Canada combined. De Gaulle leaves a long gap in the NATO defense, without any French manpower.

However, the Secretary of Defense told me from the witness stand that while this is true, he is satisfied that in case of war all French soldiers would be available. I do not "buy" that argument. That is not my idea of keeping faith with an alliance. If De Gaulle does not want to keep faith with the alliance, all of us must reappraise our participation in it.

I repeat that we should consider seriously turning over the defense of Europe to Europe. If these nations believe large numbers of conventional forces are needed in Europe, they will be willing to furnish them themselves. And if they believe subsidies are needed for Spain, Greece, Turkey, Italy, and other members, they will see that they are paid.

My suspicion is that it is almost true that only the United States seems to think these subsidies are necessary. If Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and the other countries really thought that the subsidies were necessary for NATO countries which cannot afford to maintain their military forces, and if they really thought they were necessary to the defense of Europe, they would help to pay for them.

Let us find out. The best way to find out is to cut the bill drastically with respect to the whole matter of NATO allowances. We should cut it, and then we will find out whether England and France and Belgium and Italy think that the heavy support that we are giving to these other countries is important to the defense of Europe.

My suspicion is they do not think it is. That is why they are so reluctant to contribute any money. That is why we have not gotten anywhere in all the past negotiations on this subject. I do not "buy" the argument of the Secretary of Defense, which in effect is that we should go ahead, because we are proceeding on the assumption that if we get into trouble over there, those countries will rally around the NATO standard. The time for rallying is now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator from Oregon will recall that several years ago the two of us had occasion to take a look at the arrangements that were being made for building military bases in various countries.

As an example, it was found that the United States had rushed into England to build some new airfields and to convert some old airfields in accordance with modern standards. We operated on a 60 to 40 arrangement, whereby, as I recall, the British would pay 40 percent of the expense ratio. Then the British rushed ahead to build more airbases without any agreement, on the theory that we would negotiate about them later.

From the point of view of the hardheaded British businessman, the British would have been absolutely idiotic to have paid us more than about 10 percent for the construction of the additional bases, because while originally they went into the program as a matter of mutual defense, since the airfields meant as much to them as they did to us, once they saw that America was willing to go ahead, even if we had to pay for the whole business, from the point of view of a nation that was hard pressed for finances anyway, it would have been ridiculous and not in the public interest of Britain to have made any contribution to the construction of the bases.

Mr. MORSE. What we said in our confidential report in 1952 can be said publicly now, namely, that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon filed with the Committee on Armed Services a report that pointed out what a very unwise course of action the United States was following even then.

Since the Senator has raised the question—and I am glad he has raised it—we found one waste after another in NATO as we went across Europe. The Senator from Louisiana and I stood on air fields in France on which not a single jet fighter had been landed, nor could be landed.

It was possible for us to kick out—and we did kick out with the toes of our shoes on those airfields—stones and gravel which in some instances were half again as big as our closed fists.

Those bases had to be built by French contractors and under French supervision. Their construction involved the waste of millions of dollars. The American taxpayers had to pay through the nose again for the rebuilding of those air bases. Does the Senator from Louisiana recall that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do. In some cases, we had been charged heavy taxes and tariffs to import material into those countries for their own benefit. We were virtually giving it to them for their own defense.

Mr. MORSE. Listen to that, Mr. President. It came out also this morning in the testimony with respect to our present policy. The Secretary of Defense denied that such a situation exists, but I have asked him to submit a memorandum in support of his statement.

The Senator from Louisiana is correct. Let the American taxpayers know that in some of the countries we have been aiding, we pay the taxes and tariff duties on American military supplies which are destined for the building of air bases for the defense of those countries. France is one of the worst offenders. The record against France is a sordid record so far as her economic treatment of the United States is concerned. The senior Senator from Oregon does not propose to vote for a single sou for the French, because the French do not have it coming to them.

Let me say to my administration: "You had better do some negotiating with France first. You had better try to rectify the situation before you come to the Hill and ask Congress to continue this shocking waste of the American taxpayers' money by way of aid for the defense of France through NATO."

France is not the only country. I say to my administration: "You had better have a new conference on NATO before you seek a vote on the foreign aid bill, because Ottowa did not solve anything."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First, I congratulate the Senator from Oregon on the excellent speech he has made. I was unable to be present while the Senator delivered it, but I have read his speech in full. I think he has rendered a very real service in pointing up the way that conditions have changed since the NATO Alliance was first formed, though our policies toward the alliance have not. The Senator from Oregon knows that I share many of his views in this regard. I commend him for alerting the American people and the administration to the need for a change in our policy toward Western Europe.

The Senator will recall that yesterday or the day before, when the Secretary of State appeared before our committee to testify on behalf of this year's foreign aid bill, both the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Idaho questioned him with respect to the spread of the foreign aid program.

I believe I observed that in 1962 we were giving American aid in some form to 107 countries. If we exclude the Sino-Soviet bloc, that means that only eight countries are left in the whole world that are not getting some form of American subsidy.

Mr. MORSE. They must not give up hope.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know what accounts for the fact that these eight countries have not yet climbed aboard. Perhaps it has been pure oversight. But every year the list grows longer. Once the spigots are turned on, they are never turned off. That is what gives some of us who have been supporters of the foreign aid program reason to pause. It does not matter whether the administration is Republican or Democratic. It does not matter who is administering the program. It does not matter how much is given, or for how long. The administration of the program never changes. Although the form of aid may change, although, in some cases, the amount of aid may be decreased, once the spigots are turned on, they never stop dripping.

I am hopeful that this year, with the help of the senior Senator from Oregon, who has always stood with me in this cause, we can have written into the foreign aid bill an amendment to shut off the spigots to those countries which have become so affluent that no one seriously contends they cannot afford to pay their own way. That is all I ask. No spokesman for foreign aid has ever contended that it was meant to subsidize the rich. It is about time for us to begin to write the law in such a way as to take the rich countries off the dole.

I hope that with the help of the senior Senator from Oregon and such other Members of the Senate as the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] the bill can be amended so that it will begin to make more sense to the American people and to the Government. If that can be done, we can all continue to support foreign aid in good conscience. But if it cannot be done, the time may have come to reappraise our position with respect to the whole program.

I again commend the Senator from Oregon and thank him for his speech.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I cannot begin to tell the Senator from Idaho how much I appreciate his contribution to the discussion this afternoon. For several years he has been one of the leaders in raising these danger signs. He has rendered a magnificent service. For several years I have supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho on this subject.

I want to support foreign aid. I have supported it until last year. When we started this fight 5 years ago, 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar was grant money. Merely for giving aid away we provided 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar. In the early days of the program, it was necessary to provide a large share of grant money, although I never thought it should be that much. Some of us kept struggling to have the amount reduced. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], on amendment after amendment offered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, supported us and also uttered words of caution about where the program was leading. But we did not make progress fast enough to suit me. Sometimes I would vote against the bill in committee, hoping that thereby we could get a better bill on the floor. Sometimes I voted against the bill both in committee and on the floor, hoping that thereby we could get a better bill from the conference. But last year I was fed up; I voted against the bill at each of the three critical voting points—in the committee, on the floor, and when we were dealing with the conference report. I shall do the same this year if the bill comes anywhere near resembling the one we now have under committee hearing.

We changed the proportion until 65 cents of every Federal-aid dollar was for grants and 35 cents was for repayable loans. But it has remained static at those proportions for some time.

It is most difficult to specify a definite rule and say that when it is applied, we will vote for the bill. But I will state my goal—namely, that when the foreign aid bill is changed to such an extent that 75 cents of each dollar is for repayable loans and 25 percent is for grants, and when—as the Senator from Idaho has said—no funds are provided for nations which no longer are entitled to our foreign aid, I will vote again for foreign aid.

I say to the administration that when the American people understand these facts, I have no doubt what their position will be. But as of now they, too, have had their fill of the foreign aid program. This administration will make one of the most serious mistakes it could make from the standpoint of sound public policy if it tries to ram this bill through merely because it may think it has the power to do so. If it follows that course of action, it will get its answer in 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for his excellent statement. Let me point out that when he refers to a goal of having 75 percent of the foreign-aid program be in terms of repayable loans, I hope he is speaking of their repaying us, rather than repaying themselves.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I am speaking of.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon well knows that the loan fund under the development loan program began, and has for a long time been pursued, on the theory that we would loan them the money, and they would repay it to themselves, with the result that if they used the commodities or other things of value which we sent them under our foreign aid program and sold them for their own local currencies, and left the proceeds in the bank, it was as if they had never repaid anyone—either themselves or anyone else. So the loans turned out to be gifts.

The Senator from Oregon will recall that when Mr. Dillon was Secretary of State, he recommended to us that the loan funds we had made available to Turkey and Greece be struck off the books—in other words, to cancel the indebtedness of those countries to us; not only to immobilize approximately $100 million of local currencies, as of that time, but also to strike that indebtedness completely off the books, and forget about it. It seems that some persons have been somewhat misled, under the theory that some of the development loans would be repaid, whereas the only obligation was to repay it to themselves.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has raised that point.

The other day, in the course of questioning the Secretary of State, we brought out the point that a very high proportion of the so-called repayable loans—that is to say, repayable in hard dollars, not in the soft currency of the country concerned—is loaned at three-fourths of 1 percent interest, with 10 years of grace during which no interest whatever is charged. So I said to the Secretary of State that this is another hidden subsidy to those countries, because three-fourths of 1 percent interest does not begin to pay the cost of the use of that money of the American taxpayers, in view of the fact that when our Government goes into the market to borrow money for the American taxpayers—and that is done every day by the Treasury Department—it does not get money at three-fourths of 1 percent interest. Instead, the last figure I saw was more than 3 percent.

So we are giving these countries another handout. Yet some persons would give the impression that the gifts are repayable loans, with interest and at no cost to the United States. However, in this debate and in the hearings we must be sure to set forth in the record every cent of the cost of the bill to the American people.

As for soft loans, the Senator from Louisiana said he hoped I was talking about loans repayable in American dollars. Let us not forget that many of the loans are not repaid to the United States. They are paid in terms of the soft currency of the country concerned, and the "repayment" is deposited in a bank in that country, for whatever expenditures the United States may wish to make there. But we know that in that situation, many countries build up huge deposits of their soft currencies which are of practically no value to us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon said "for whatever expenditures the United States may wish to make there." I believe many of them are for such use as the United States wishes to make of the money, provided the foreign country agrees.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that is the other "gimmick"—that even with the so-called loans repayable in soft currency, we cannot use that currency in that country at our discretion. Instead, we must go hat in hand to the government of that country, and ask it, "Can we use some of this money to build an American embassy" or "to buy American supplies for our various service agencies here?" Frequently they deny our request—on the ground that such expenditures might be disruptive of their economy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So long as the foreign country does not agree to use the money or does not permit us to use the money in the way we want to have it used, insofar as that money is concerned, it is about the same as if the funds did not exist at all, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Furthermore, when the program was begun, General Bradley, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that those funds would not reduce by one dollar the cost of our defense requirements, and that we could not thereby reduce by one dollar the cost of our necessary defense expenditures. That was his opinion of the value of the foreign-aid program.

I feel that subsequently, under the Eisenhower administration, the witnesses were more or less required to testify or to infer that the foreign aid program reduced the cost of our national defense.

It is well for us to keep this point in mind. Any good defense planner realizes that if our country were forced to fight a war with some great power, such as the Soviet Union, we could not be sure that any of our allies would help us. It is entirely possible that we might find ourselves at war over a situation such as a blockade of Cuba, and that no other country would fight by our side. As a result, we might find ourselves fighting it entirely with American men, dollars, and equipment. That being the case, even our dispositions of troops in various countries in the world would actually reduce, rather than increase, our ability to defend our homeland. In other words, if the nations of Europe were not at war, I would certainly hope that in a war between our country and some other great power, we would undertake to remove our troops from other countries, so they would be available to fight for the defense of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Thus they would contribute to the defense of this country, and thereby our defense costs would be decreased.

So while it is well that we spend funds in ways that will help keep countries from falling under Communist domination, it is also well to realize that not one of the dollars spent on such a program actually contributes to the defense of our own country.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. I thank him very much for strengthening the record of my speech by his comments.

Mr. President, I close with my last paragraph.

I am convinced that the impasse over the nuclear force will eventually force some such choice upon us, as I have outlined. It is unfortunate that we did not face up to the choice before we squandered hundreds of millions of dollars on defenses for Europe that the Western Europeans have not considered worthwhile. They have been more cognizant of changed conditions since 1949 than we have. They have acted on their new self-confidence and we have pretended that things were still the same. The Ottawa agreement was one more stalling device, but it did not settle anything. In the end, we are going to have to disengage ourselves from Europe, and I only hope it will be sooner rather than later.

As the debate continues in the weeks ahead, I hope that the administration will reevaluate its position on the bill and make some suggestions for amendments that will once again unite our forces. But our forces will never be united, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, if the administration continues to press for this bill, which, in my judgment, involves an expenditure that cannot be justified from the standpoint of the reasons that I have enumerated today, and the many more that I shall enumerate in the days to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon, and I can assure him and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] that they will have substantial support on this side of the aisle in achieving their objectives.

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, Cuba is the most urgent of the many problems on the agenda of American foreign policy. Its urgency results from a number of factors, not the least significant of which is the special and traditional relationship that Cuba has had with the United States. Also, the presence of a sizable body of troops from our main adversary in world politics underscores the importance of Cuba as a problem for American foreign policy.

Since Cuba is the most pressing problem confronting the United States in its foreign relations today, it behooves all citizens concerned with the safety of this Republic to study the Cuban question in order to understand all of its ramifications and, hopefully, to carry on a dialogue about it with the aim of strengthening the hand of those charged with the responsibility of formulating and executing American policy on Cuba.

The Senate has an especially important role to play in the developing dialog on Cuba. Although its constitutional power to "advise and consent" encompasses nominations and treaties only, its role in the treaty process enhances its importance in the foreign policymaking process. I, for one, welcome the responsibility charged to the Senate with respect to American foreign policy. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, nevertheless, I am an interested and concerned observer of American foreign policy.

I have been following closely the development of our policy with respect to the Cuban situation. Today I want to discuss it, for the purpose primarily of attempting to clarify our present policy and to point out what I feel are its shortcomings and inadequacies. I do this in the spirit of patriotism, not partisanship, for I want the President and his administration to succeed in carrying out whatever policy options they select.

What is the objective of our Cuban policy? The objective as well as the broad outlines of the present policy have been spelled out on a number of occasions in recent weeks by the distinguished and able Secretary of State: "It is the unanimous view of the governments of this hemisphere," Secretary Rusk declared some weeks ago before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, "that the present Marxist-Leninist regime on that island is incompatible with the inter-American system, and that our object must be to welcome a free Cuban people back into the inter-American community." Included within the scope of our objective Secretary Rusk said, is the fact that "a Soviet military presence in this hemisphere is not to be accepted as a normal state of affairs."

What measures are being taken to achieve this objective? Secretary Rusk divides them into three categories:

> The first involves the commitment of our Armed Forces to insure that Cuba does not pose a threat to the security of the hemisphere. This means a prohibition of the return of offensive weapons to Cuba, a maintenance of surveillance to assure ourselves and others that such an offensive capability is not present, enforcement of the free use of international air space and waters in the Caribbean, interdiction of arms and shipments and other forays aimed at other countries, and insurance that there not be a Hungarian-type episode in this hemisphere.
>
> A second group of actions aimed at demonstrating that there is no future for Cuba under the present regime, and that the Cuban people cannot achieve success at home or normal relations with their traditional friends of the free world under a regime committed to implacable hostility toward free institutions.
>
> This is why trade and fiscal relations with the free world have been rapidly shrinking, and why free world ships are being steadily withdrawn from the Cuban trade.
>
> A third group of measures has to do with the rest of the hemisphere. They include a strong effort within the Alliance for Progress to demonstrate that rapid economic and social development can best be achieved through free institutions. They include measures such as those discussed by President Kennedy with the Presidents of Central America and Panama to interrupt the clandestine flow of funds and personnel between Cuba and other countries of the hemisphere.
>
> They include close cooperation among the armed forces and security agencies of the Caribbean in the interest of public safety. They include a fourfold increase in our own broadcasting to Latin America since 1960, and the vigorous engagement of Latin Americans themselves in the political and propaganda battle.

Secretary Rusk contends that the present policy on Cuba, viewed in its entirety, constitutes "a serious, sustained, and effective effort to deal with the threat of Marxist-Leninism in this hemisphere."

This, then in broad outlines is our present policy on Cuba. I might comment here that review of various declarations by administration spokesmen, including most notably the President and the Secretary of State, discloses that with the exception of some modifications resulting from our experience during the October missile crisis our policy has been pretty consistent for many months. In fact, one might say that the policy has been constant since the debacle at the Bay of Pigs over 2 years ago.

The policy can be summarized in the phrase "isolation of Cuba." All the measures outlined by Secretary Rusk, the President, and other administration spokesmen are designed to bring about the complete isolation of the Castro Communist regime within the confines of the island of Cuba, with the aim thereby of bringing about the end of that regime and welcoming the reentry of a free Cuba into the inter-American community. Isolation, then, is the working aim of the present policy.

Secretary Rusk's statements of the ultimate objective of our Cuban policy have been vague in that he does not specify just what will take place in Cuba in order to assure its return to the inter-American family of states. Other administration spokesmen, however, have indicated that we advocate the overthrow of the Castro regime. The Vice President, in remarks before the first graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College, declared:

> Our mutual objective is to end that Communist regime in Cuba. We cannot be really content until communism is gone from Cuba and gone from this hemisphere.

The Secretary of Defense was more specific in testimony last February before the Committee on Armed Services. He stated that an objective of our policy with respect to Cuba was:

> The eventual change in government. The President has expressed it in various ways at various times, but I think it is quite clear that we continue to work for the overthrow of the Castro government and the elimination of the Communist control of Cuba.

I doubt that any thoughtful American will quarrel with that aim as expressed by Secretary McNamara, although I note that neither the President nor the Secretary of State have been that specific.

When it comes to the question of how the downfall of Castro will be brought about, however, the matter becomes fuzzy. When asked about this at his press conference on February 7, the President said:

> I am quite obviously hopeful that it (the Castro regime) can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens.

The President commented further:

> There is no obviously easy solution as to how the Communist movement will be removed. One way, of course, would be by the Cubans themselves, though that is very difficult, given the police setup.

Other administration spokesmen apparently contradict themselves. The Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Edwin M. Martin, implied in a television interview on April 27 that the most likely way to eliminate the Castro regime would be an internal uprising. Mr. Martin pointed out that for more than a year the administration had constantly maintained that—

> Castro would have to be deposed whether from within Cuba or by a massive U.S. invasion.

Rejecting an invasion under present circumstances, Mr. Martin said:

> That leaves us primarily looking to action from within Cuba, for the Cuban people to repudiate Castro, which we thought and think still is the most likely and from its overall impact in Latin America and Cuba in the future, is the best way for him to go down.

The State Department's Coordinator of Cuban Affairs, Sterling J. Cottrell, seemingly contradicted Mr. Martin 2 days later when he said that the administration does not expect a popular revolt against the Castro Communist regime. According to an Associated Press dispatch:

> "Military control is too restrictive for that" Cottrell told a news conference on his arrival here (Kansas City) for a Rockhurst College banquet address tonight. Also, he added, "We note a considerable amount of apathy on the part of the Cuban peasants."

I leave it to my colleagues in the Senate and the American people to make sense out of these apparent contradictions.

One thing seems clear about our present Cuba policy. Although recognizing that Cuba is presently a Soviet garrison and a forward base for Communist subversive activity throughout this hemisphere, the administration does not regard Cuba as a grave danger to the security of the Americas. The seemingly serene confidence in present measures to build, in President Kennedy's words, "a wall of dedicated men" around Cuba—most notably the Alliance for Progress—is evidence of a lack of urgency within the administration about Cuba.

Such serenity certainly is not shared at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. In its recent and outstanding report on the Cuban military buildup, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services asserted that—

> Cuba as a source of weapons and small bands of provocateurs, saboteurs, agents of revolution and chaos * * * is a distinct and present threat to all of the Latin American nations with shores on the Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean Sea.

And the subcommittee warned of the longer range threat:

> The paramount danger at this time is that the nations of this hemisphere may be subverted one by one and be exploited, in turn, for subversive and revolutionary activities. By this process of erosion our neighbors to the south may fall, nation by nation, until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

What is wrong with the present policy on Cuba as I have just outlined it? I contend that it fails to come to grips with the central problem confronting this Nation and its hemispheric allies: the continued presence in this hemisphere of a regime controlled by a hostile alien power whose object is to destroy the various societies existing in this hemisphere and building in their place its tyrannical Communist society. Let me be more specific in what I regard as the inadequacies and shortcomings of the policy.

I think there is a broad consensus throughout the hemisphere, certainly in the United States and the Caribbean region, that the Communist base and regime in Cuba must be eliminated. Whether this objective is expressed in the vague and polite diplomatic language of the Secretary of State or the more straightforward language of his colleague in the Pentagon is immaterial, provided that this is the aim of our policy. Given this objective, the question is whether or not the various measures instituted by the administration and outlined on various occasions by its spokesmen will do the job.

Prediction is hazardous, of course, but I am inclined to be pessimistic for several reasons.

First, the task of policing the Caribbean to prevent clandestine shipments of arms, propaganda, and personnel to countries on its periphery seems wellnigh impossible. Unless the administration can present positive and conclusive evidence to the contrary, I shall continue to be skeptical of the effectiveness of this seemingly overwhelming task that has been assigned to our Armed Forces in the Caribbean.

Second, the unwillingness of several important Latin American countries to go along with the United States in the effort to control the traffic of men between their countries and Cuba and between their countries and, through Cuba, the countries of the Communist bloc, raises doubts in my mind as to the effectiveness of isolation no matter what we do under the present policy. Perhaps our attempt to gain assent for such control measures would be more effective if we advised these recalcitrant governments that we might suspend all aid programs we have in their respective countries until they become more cooperative.

Third, I wonder how effective our embargo on Cuba will be, especially since the bulk of Cuba's commercial intercourse is with the Communist bloc, whose ships are permitted uninterrupted ingress and egress to the Caribbean. We are told that the embargo is making this intercourse steadily more expensive for the Soviet Union, but I wonder if this seriously bothers the Soviets in view of their obvious satisfaction that they have a forward base from which they can wage their "wars of national liberation" throughout Latin America.

I most strenuously dissent from one argument that is repeatedly voiced by administration spokesmen. I refer to the contention that, in the words of the Vice President:

> Cuba is clearly proving to be for the Communists a showcase of failure—not a show window of success.

Several facts are usually offered to sustain this contention, including the fact that food consumption under Castro has declined by 15 percent and the fact that nearly a quarter of a million people have fled from Cuba since Castro came to power 4½ years ago.

I feel that we are most seriously mistaken indeed to pin our hopes on such ideas as, first, Cuba will be a showcase of economic failure manifested by suppression of food consumption there, and second Cuba will be a showcase for social and political failure manifested by the massive exodus of middle-class Cubans. Let me point out that such phenomena have never yet brought about the overthrow of a Communist regime. To the contrary, Cuba may demonstrate the efficacy of Communist methods in permitting a totalitarian cadre actually to retain its grip on power in the face of suppressing consumption, partly by combining hunger with a monopoly of food supplies as an instrument of control and order. Communist China over the past several years provides a vivid example. As we know, the regime there has survived gravely serious famines in 3 successive years without crumbling. I might note parenthetically that the Chinese have not been as fortunate as Castro's Cuba in obtaining Soviet assistance. As for the flight of Cubans from their homeland, the regime has been enabled thereby to enrich itself by seizing the wealth and goods of those who depart. Moreover, potential opposition to the regime thereby leaves Cuban soil. In this sense, the exodus of Cubans performs what the Chinese Communists accomplished by their mass executions in the winter of 1950.

Actually, I believe, a case could be made, in the eyes of some people at least, for the contention that Castro's Cuba is a showcase for success. Think of the groups of highly dedicated and disciplined men throughout Latin America who are striving and indeed plotting for the overthrow of the regimes presently in power. Certainly they must be heartened by the continued existence of a Communist forward base in Cuba. Not only does it continue to exist, but, if I may use a figure of speech, it is nestled securely under the arm of the colossus to the north, Uncle Sam. Surely this emboldens these determined insurrectionists who are ready and willing to advance the cause of Marxist-Leninism.

We had an example of that the other day when the U.S. military mission in Venezuela was destroyed and burned. We all know that those who engineered that mission certainly have had close contacts with, if not actual training in, Cuba itself.

No, I cannot go along with those who are serenely, even supremely confident that our present policy with respect to Cuba will effectively achieve its objective. Certainly rapid economic and social development envisioned under the Alliance for Progress cannot cope with this most immediate and urgent challenge. I know of no case in history where rapid economic and social development has ever taken place. I credit the administration with trying to achieve its objectives. I concede that there is a policy on Cuba. But this policy, I submit, is a policy of procrastination, a policy that fails to grasp the central issue, a policy that postpones decisions that will have to be made sooner or later relating to the presence in this hemisphere of a Communist regime pledged to the extension of Communist rule throughout this hemisphere.

Having already outlined what I believe are some of the inadequacies of the present policy, let me say a word about its consequences. With respect to Latin America, as the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee eloquently pointed out, we risk permitting a process of erosion to occur that could lead to the isolation within this hemisphere of the United States.

But there is another consequence involving the United States only, and it is one that deeply concerns me. That is: a policy of procrastination on Cuba risks the likelihood that Cuba might become on a grand scale a political football on the domestic scene in the months ahead. Naturally, I am a partisan, but I am an American first, and this prospect distresses me because it can only hinder the efforts to achieve the objective we seek with respects to Cuba. With the approach of another presidential campaign, rising temperatures will not be conducive to the thoughtful and introspective study of our Cuban policy, especially if through the coming months we continue to drift with the present policy. Procrastination now renders more likely and risky, I might add, the possibility of some dramatic grandstand play later on.

I have limited myself today deliberately to a review and analysis of the present policy for the purpose of clarifying it and criticizing it. I realize, however, that criticism by itself can serve no useful purpose, although I hasten to add that we must recognize our shortcomings and errors before we can develop more satisfactory alternatives.

I expressed the hope at the beginning of my remarks that a dialogue on Cuba will begin with the aim of developing these alternatives. And I noted the important role that the Senate can play in this connection. I shall continue to study the Cuban situation as closely and conscientiously as I can, and perhaps some time in the future I can contribute more to what I hope will be a developing dialogue. I invite my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do likewise.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has placed his finger this afternoon on one of the more sensitive areas of our foreign relations, and he has contributed greatly to an understanding of the problem by his objective analysis of it.

Many of us who have studied this question over a period of time might disagree with some of his conclusions, or support all of them, because each of us have varying points of view.

My own feeling is that while, in a sense, the present policy toward Cuba could be called a policy, it is if anything an ineffective policy of containment.

It seems to me the situation at the present time is deteriorating. I am concerned, as the Senator from Kentucky is, that anything as vital to America as the Cuban situation should, as a Presidential campaign develops in the months ahead, enter the arena of politics, the Senator has so very well pointed out. If it does come into the arena of politics, it is extremely doubtful that we shall be able to obtain, from the State Department, the executive branch, or the Congress, any objective solution of this problem.

We all have an interest in this subject. The interest of every Democrat in the Senate is the same as the interest of every Republican in the Senate, and our interest is as Americans. Our interest as Americans is the implementation of the President's policy which will hopefully forge ahead in the Cuban area and produce results.

From a reading of the report of the Preparedness Committee, the brilliant report which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi delivered on this floor some time ago, and upon which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] commented, I believe everyone is concerned about this question. Today no one can successfully contend that the situation in South America, with respect to the strengthening of the free countries of the world, is improving. Except for one or two small areas, the situation is showing a decided and steady deterioration.

My mail from friends I have known for many years, and my contacts with persons who have visited Latin America, bear out that statement.

I hope the Senate will continue this discussion of Cuban affairs. We must get the United States out of a position where we are reeling on our heels like a punch-drunk fighter; and get in a position where we can steadily exert pressure, in one manner or another, and produce a free government in Cuba.

Those poor, misled people, who suffered so long under Batista, now are suffering even more under Castro. We must do something to give them an opportunity to return to a free way of life, and prosperity, under a form of government similar to that which the Constitution of 1940 guaranteed.

I have been giving this problem much thought. Within the next few days I hope to make some proposals on the floor of the Senate with respect to the Cuban question which I hope will be discussed and examined most critically, and which can perhaps form the basis of a future policy toward Cuba. A policy not only with respect to Cuba itself, but with respect to stopping the infiltration of poisonous communism into every country in Latin America, which is going on this very minute, and which has been going on every minute for the past year and a half.

My distinguished friend from Kentucky has made a very great contribution. The mild, moderate, and objective manner in which he has made his critical analysis of the Cuban situation should appeal to all Members of the Senate. I am certain it will appeal to a great majority of the American people. I hope it will stimulate not merely one discussion, but a series of discussions, in the Senate, and serve to provide impetus and direction to our Cuban policy, which, I feel, does not exist today.

Next week I hope to continue this discussion with some concrete proposals.

I thank the Senator very much for yielding, and particularly for the contribution he has made this afternoon.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I look forward to hearing his suggestions next week.

What I am trying to do is to avoid being critical in a negative sense, but to show that I am in sympathy with the objectives of our policy; but our policy is not attaining those objectives. It is incumbent upon all Americans to try to develop something that will get us moving. I cannot conceive that, in the reverse of the present situation, the Russians would allow a similar situation to exist if Cuba were in either the Baltic or Black Sea.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very happy that the Senator from Kentucky has spoken as he has today. The Senator has a wide knowledge, not only as a legislator, but from having served in an important post in the State Department. He has expressed today a universal concern of all Americans. When it is our privilege to visit with someone of military competence, in terms of the Cuban situation, it is said to be a tragedy that we do nothing about it.

When it is our opportunity to talk with those competent in diplomatic affairs, they express the same concern that has been expressed today. I have such a profound respect for the knowledge and intuition and commonsense and patriotism of the rank and file of Americans that I believe our Government should always take cognizance of the feeling of patriotic Americans all over the country.

I believe that the Senator from Kentucky has been giving voice to the feelings of patriotic Americans in all political parties.

I hope this will not be his last speech on this subject. What he has said needs to be said over and over again until something is done. I shall look forward to hearing what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will have to say, because I know that his remarks also will be worth listening to, and will make a great contribution.

It seems to me that because of the attention that is given from day to day to other problems of varying degrees of importance, this most important problem, the survival of the United States and of liberty in the Western Hemisphere is continually brushed aside. The Senator has called our attention to many important things. I am glad that he repeated the summary from the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Those Senators have spent a great deal of time on this subject. They are experts in their field. As the Senator from Kentucky has reminded us, they state in their report that Cuba "as a source of weapons and small bands of provocateurs, saboteurs, agents of revolution and chaos—is a distinct and present threat to all of the Latin American nations with shores on the Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean Sea."

The subcommittee also warned:

> The paramount danger at this time is that the nations of this hemisphere may be subverted one by one and be exploited, in turn, for subversive and revolutionary activities. By this process of erosion our neighbors to the south may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

That is not political oratory. That is the finding of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. In all the attention that has been turned to domestic matters and matters of foreign policy far removed from our hemisphere, this grave warning is lost sight of and pushed aside.

I apologize to the Senator from Kentucky for taking so much time. He has been on his feet for a long time. However, as an American I am very much pleased that he has taken this stand today. There is nothing more important, even though there are many issues in which Americans are interested, and even though there are wrongs that ought to be righted and problems that must be solved. However, lest we lose the battle with the Communists, and collapse internally and financially, what we think about this subject is significant. The Senator has made a great contribution in his speech. I hope he will make more speeches of the same character. I look forward, also, to what the Senator from Colorado will have to say on the subject.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator very much. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, other Senators have commented on the contribution made by the Senator from Kentucky to the Senate and to the Nation. He has also made a contribution to the junior Senator from Kansas. Perhaps now I can answer in better form the questions that come to me from the plains of Kansas as to just exactly what our policy is in Cuba. I am not sure that it will satisfy my constituents, but the effort to define this particular policy will serve me very well in that effort.

There is one point the Senator made which has especially attracted my attention, in seeking to evaluate the real meaning of the existence of a Communist power in Cuba, supported by the Soviet Union. I hear this fact mentioned in relationship to Berlin. I ask the Senator what our real position is in Berlin today.

We stand there, in a part of a city, surrounded by the Soviet sector, facing a wall, which was erected, if I am correct, in violation of five separate treaties and agreements signed since World War II. We stand there on a tiny bit of land. I suggest that the real meaning of our existence there is to say to our allies in Western Europe and all over the world: Here we stand in fulfillment of our commitments to the free world, and here we are going to honor those commitments. That is why we are here.

That is why Chairman Khrushchev may very well describe the Berlin situation as a bone in the Russian throat. Is this not exactly what the Communist influence in Cuba is today, in the same sense that our presence in Berlin is a bone in the Russian throat on the other side of the ocean?

Mr. MORTON. I believe that is true. We often hear it said that we cannot do anything more rapidly, or under a policy that is in any way aggressive, because of Berlin, because of Vietnam, because of Laos, or because of something else. If we are to look at the solution of every problem in relation to the whole global concept and what it might result in bringing about somewhere else, we will never do anything. If the Communists took over five other countries in Latin America, we would still hear that argument made—that we cannot do anything about it because of Berlin, because of Vietnam, because of Laos, or because the pot is boiling in Indonesia, or because the Chinese Communists may go back into India, or because the Shah of Iran is having some difficulties. If we are to restrain ourselves and hesitate to take action that we should take because of what is going on in the rest of the world, we will not take any action at all. That is what concerns me.

The Senator from Nebraska made some reference to the Department of State. It was my high privilege to serve in the Department of State under Secretary Dulles. History will have to judge him as a Secretary of State. In my opinion, he stands very high. He understood that prestige is built on respect, not on popularity. I talked with many Latin American acquaintances after the firm stand our country took last fall, which we all applauded. However, we have let our sword become dull; we have backed down on four or five conditions that we set. We have not seen a withdrawal of troops. We have not seen a U.N. inspection team in Cuba. We have not seen a great many things take place that we said would have to take place. If we keep relating this problem to Vietnam, Berlin, or any other place, we will never solve the problem, or any other problem that may arise from time to time in this hemisphere. If we continue to relate the problem to the difficulties that we and our friends and allies face around the globe, whether it be in Congo or anywhere else, we cannot solve the problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is well known that the present situation in Venezuela is very difficult. The Communists have been hard at work for a long time. If there should be a Communist overthrow in Venezuela, which I hope will never occur, unless we acted decisively, would we not face the same situation that we face with respect to Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, Quemoy, or somewhere else, and now face with respect to Cuba? The argument has been used that we cannot do this because it would disrupt the world. Would such a continuing policy not mean that we might gradually see the world attritioned away from us while we did nothing at all for it, because if we did, we might upset the apple cart somewhere else?

Mr. MORTON. Exactly; our hands would be forever tied.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. In his speech, the Senator quoted the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Martin, to the effect that Castro would have to be deposed, whether within Cuba or by massive U.S. invasion.

Can the Senator from Kentucky foresee at any time any factors progressing from an active U.S. policy that would actually put pressure on the Castro regime?

Mr. MORTON. In fairness to the administration, I must say that the leadership of this country has cut off trade with Cuba by most of the other free nations of the world. There is still some trade. But I think the cutting off of most of the trade has been the result of U.S. leadership and persuasion. However, I do not think it is doing the job. As Assistant Secretary of State Martin pointed out, we are not now talking about massive invasion. This leaves as the only alternative a rising of the people of Cuba from within; and that would require more encouragement than they are getting now.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is well acquainted with current opinion about the Communist threat and the Communist regime in Cuba. When people speak about a rising from within, does the Senator from Kentucky see any prospect of that happening without substantial outside aid, support, organization, and leadership?

Mr. MORTON. Not under the police state methods that have been employed. We have seen what happened in the Balkan States, in Eastern Europe, and in China itself. History proves that when there is policy authority, the catalyst for an overthrow of such regime, the source of supply, the communication with the underground, must come from without.

Mr. ALLOTT. So if Mr. Martin's supposition is correct, such an incentive must come from either of two sources—a massive invasion or a rising from within. The elements which must be supplied are not on the horizon today.

Mr. MORTON. From what I can learn, they are not on the horizon; they are not even on order; and in fact, such efforts as have been made have been discouraged.

Mr. ALLOTT. In addition, we see an increasing fragmentation of the exiles from Cuba, because of U.S. policy over the past several months.

Mr. MORTON. That is correct. The fragmentation of Cuban exiles is worse today than it has been at any time in the last 3 months, and it is getting worse every month.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my voice to the colloquy that has been taking place and to congratulate the Senator for bringing up the subject. A little more than 2 weeks ago, or perhaps a little less than 2 weeks ago, I had an opportunity to meet with a Cuban national who was formerly one of the supporters of Castro, and who is now active in South America. The very first question he asked me was, "Why does not the United States use the determination it showed in October 1962 in order to again give to the people who want to get control of their own government encouragement to go ahead in some way with the very activities which the Senator has mentioned in connection with the policy of isolation?" He has indicated rather clearly to me that what has happened with respect to the isolation factor in South America will not work with the Cubans at this time. But trained Communists are active in South America; they are creating revolutions; they are moving. So the isolation policy does not seem to be working.

Would the Senator say that in a real sense our policy has been constant?

Mr. MORTON. Yes; I should say our policy has been constant except for the firm stand we took during the missile situation, a period of 3 weeks when missiles were supposed to have been withdrawn from the island.

Mr. DOMINICK. That policy having been shown to be at least inadequate over that period of time, it seems to me we ought to be developing a new policy. I shall listen with great interest to the remarks of my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT], which I hope he will make next week, and to those of other Senators. This is really an important problem. I hope that before we are through, with the Senator's assistance and leadership, there will be a broad debate so that there may be a consensus of the Senate about what should be done.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I yield the floor.

THE SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED YOUNG ADULT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate performed a noble service in behalf of humanity last week when it accorded overwhelming approval to President Kennedy's comprehensive program to combat mental illness and retardation. I am hopeful that the House approval will be forthcoming promptly. We should implement these historic proposals as soon as possible.

While mental illness and retardation is a problem that we have only begun to face, there are many existing mental health facilities that are performing outstanding and enlightened service in our local communities. One such institution in Minneapolis, the School for Social Development of the Mentally Retarded Young Adult, is demonstrating how much can now be done to prepare the mentally underdeveloped members of our society for a useful, purposeful, and productive life. Individual handicaps are closely studied, and a variety of teaching methods are used to establish for each retarded person an immediate relationship between learning and doing. By skillfully combining the professional services of physicians, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, speech therapists, elementary teachers, social workers, and vocational counselors, the school has been able to develop untrained potential to such an extent that mentally retarded people have become assets to their families and their community. This is indeed an exciting accomplishment. For it means that we can offer these people something far more precious than pity—the chance to assume a place of dignity and responsibility in the larger world about them.

Mr. President, I believe that there is a lesson to be learned from the record of this school. Given sufficient will and imagination, a significant step can be made in leading the mentally retarded away from the shadows of an aimless and narrowly bounded existence. It is through such institutions that we must hope to give reality to President Kennedy's program for combating the effects of mental retardation. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the following description of the work of the School for Social Develpment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEMONSTRATION IN HUMANITY—SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The School for Social Development is a continuation, and expansion, of a demonstration project which was supported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and sponsored by the Minneapolis Association for Retarded Children, from April 1, 1958, to March 31, 1960.

PURPOSE

1. To promote the mentally underdeveloped individual, within his own specific limitations—who would otherwise be a financial and moral burden to himself, his family, his local community, and his State—to a useful, purposeful, and productive life.

2. To demonstrate through use of a combination of professional services—provided by the physician, psychiatrist, clinical psychologist, speech therapist, elementary teacher, social worker, and vocational counselor—it is possible to meet individual needs and to develop untrained potential to such an extent that the mentally underdeveloped person can be an asset to his family, and can assume his rightful place of responsibility in home and community.

CONCEPTS IN PRACTICE

School for Social Development subscribes to and practices the following concepts:

1. The mentally underdeveloped young adult can learn when an obvious relationship exists between learning and doing.

2. The mentally underdeveloped individual can be trained to use good judgment and to assume responsibility for making decisions which affect his personal preference for social, recreational, and vocational activities.

3. If a variety of teaching methods are used, it is always possible to find one which will meet the needs of a particular individual, thereby permitting him to develop in areas previously believed inconceivable.

4. Regardless of mental or physical development, individuals are different and no two will achieve optimum success with precisely the same training, care, and treatment. At School for Social Development the individual is first—all else, however important, is secondary.

As of August 1, 1960, School for Social Development is the only such project in the United States. This is a demonstration which will habilitate many young adults and can become a pattern for the establishment of similar schools throughout the country.

STATISTICS

There are 20,000 plus mentally retarded persons in Hennepin and Ramsey Counties (the Twin City area generally served by School for Social Development).

There are 6,045 in Minnesota State institutions for the retarded, as of July 1, 1960. About 2,300 of those institutionalized are from Hennepin and Ramsey Counties.

More than 10,000 mentally retarded are wards of the State; of this number 10 percent are awaiting institutional placement from the Twin City area.

A total of 4,353 mentally retarded were receiving special education in the public schools in Hennepin County as of January 1, 1959. County School Superintendent Nelson estimated this to be "one-sixth of the number who could use such special services."

Approximately 1,500 retarded persons of varying ages are served by private agencies in the Twin City area, including those enrolled in parochial schools, sheltered workshops, vocational workshops.

Each of the 6,045 residents in our State institutions cost $2,600 per person for care and treatment at Owatonna, and $1,400 per person at Faribault and Cambridge. This does not include the cost for providing each bed, which varies from $9,000 to $12,000.

PROFESSIONAL TEAM

Directress: Mrs. Doris Kuehnle McGregor; 18 years related experience; certificated special class teacher. B.A., Augsburg College & Seminary; M.A., Arizona State University; additional graduate work, Los Angeles State College, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Southern California, and University of Minnesota, major fields are educational psychology, vocational guidance.

Music therapist: Mrs. Mamie Brant, 50 years related experience; a certificated music teacher, she received her training at Augustana College, Rock Island, and Minnesota College, Minneapolis; experience includes superintendent, Lutheran Girls Home, Minneapolis, welfare worker, Minneapolis Lutheran Welfare; Mrs. Brant is administrative assistant at School for Social Development.

Speech therapist: Mrs. Ann Seymour, 3 years related experience; B.A., Stanford University; licensed speech therapist and audiologist; certificated teacher with additional training in reading and art.

Physician: David V. Sharp, M.D., University of Minnesota; served 7 years as medical consultant to Minnesota institutions for the retarded; is presently on the staff of Deaconess, Mt. Sinai, and Methodist Hospitals.

Clinical psychologist: Mr. Jerome S. Gray, B.A., M.A., University of Minnesota; consultant in clinical psychology, Cambridge State School and Hospital; also serves as consultant to Glenlake Sanatorium and the Department of Surgery, University of Minnesota.

Psychiatrist: Robert E. Meller, M.D., University of Minnesota; psychiatrist and neurologist on the staff of Glenwood Hills, Homewood, Fairview, and St. Mary's Hospitals; certified by the American board in both psychiatry and neurology; is a fellow of both the American Academy of Neurology and the American Association of Psychiatry.

THE 1961–62 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Theodore Hidding, president (Twin City Tile & Marble Co.).

S. A. Dillon, vice president (president, Springfield Milling Corp.).

James N. Scott, secretary-treasurer (brokerage manager, Lincoln National Insurance Co.).

Sister Anna Marie (Christ Child School for Exceptional Children, St. Paul).

Harold J. Alford (University of Minnesota, head, general extension division, St. Paul).

St. Clair Beeman (International Union of Electrical Workers).

Dr. R. J. Capobianco (clinical psychologist).

Miss Dagny Johnson (School of Social Work, University of Minnesota).

Mrs. E. A. Kellerman (District No. 5, American Legion Auxiliary).

Donald J. McGlynn (Beamish-McGlynn Properties, Inc.).

Mrs. Doris K. McGregor (directress, School for Social Development).

Dr. John Schwarzwalder (general manager, KTCA, educational TV channel 2).

Dr. David V. Sharp (physician).

Robert S. Silvers (Frederick-Sherry Office Supply Co.).

Oren Steinfeldt (personnel director, Thermo-King Corp.).

Richard J. Yearneau (personnel director, Northwestern Hospital).

(It is anticipated that maximum board membership—23—will be accomplished during the present year.)

ELIGIBILITY FOR ENROLLMENT

Age limits: 17 through 35.

Qualifications: After screening, applicants who show promise, regardless of previous IQ rating, are accepted subject to limitations of the school itself.

Enrollment: Limited, during first year of operation, to 25 mentally underdeveloped young adults. (See Planned Program Expansion.)

A 3-month probationary period provides time for the professional team to evaluate each student's potential capabilities and to plan a program for maximum growth and development.

PRESENT FACILITIES

Total of 4,130 square feet of floor space, third floor, Lewis Building, 603 Second Avenue South, presently being donated by owner Stanford Clinton, Jr.

The area is divided into a large combination room, a recreation and music room (one end of which is used for classroom activities) and an office. One wall of the combination room has a modern kitchen, designed and equipped by the Minneapolis Gas Co.

PRESENT PROGRAM

Emphasizes socializing, educational, and developmental activities, to provide one of the following—according to individual potential—as evaluated by the professional team:

(a) Background for prevocational training and eventual job placement.

(b) Training toward more independent home living.

(c) Training towara assumption of personal responsibility.

Planned program expansion

	Maximum enrollment	*Annual cost*
1960	25	$31, 437. 50
1961	35	44, 013. 00
1962	45	56, 588. 00
1963	55	68, 688. 00
1964	65	81, 738. 00

YOU SHOULD KNOW

School for Social Development is not eligible to participate in United Fund Campaign, since two years of successful operation is one of the requirements (this project began April 4, 1960).

School for Social Development is a nonprofit corporation, falling within the category of tax deductible agencies.

Not one penny is being spent to solicit your contribution—even this brochure, including artwork, pictures and printing, have been donated. Your contributions will be spent, specifically, as detailed in our budget.

The staff of School for Social Development is supplemented by regular volunteers—many over age 65 (providing a new interest for the retired person).

School for Social Development needs furnishings and equipment to effectively carry on its many activities. Perhaps you have a much needed item—now taking up space in your garage, basement or attic—call FEderal 6-4204 and find out if it can be put to good use.

School for Social Development is open Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Visitors are always welcome, and help to provide socializing experiences.

The professional team—composed of physician, psychiatrist, clinical psychologist, speech therapist, music therapist, teacher, sociologist and counselor—believe:

(1) The mentally underdeveloped individual is entitled to the dignity of adulthood;

(2) He can become a contributing member of society; and,

(3) In terms of human worth, merits every possible effort toward his habilitation.

The only vacancy on the professional team is you.

JOIN THE TEAM—LET YOUR CONTRIBUTION WIN—HELP DEVELOP USEFUL CITIZENS

As a teammate, you personally, will be responsible for helping a fellow citizen make maximum use of potential capabilities, to become a productive, acceptable member of your mutual society.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of this body a very eloquent and interesting column which was published in the Sunday Star of June 9, 1963. The column, a regular feature in the Sunday Star and a number of other newspapers around the country, was written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the distinguished and beloved Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. Entitled "Spires of the Spirit: D-Day Then—And Now," Dr. Harris' outstanding column contains a moving appeal to Americans to recapture the spirit of patriotism which motivated our troops on D-day, June 6, 1944, and this same spirit of love of God and country which has made America the greatest nation the world has ever known.

In the column, Dr. Harris makes reference to a recent meeting of the board of directors of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, which meeting was presided over by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary president of this great American institution. Mr. President, I was privileged to be present at this meeting in my capacity as a member of the board of directors on which I have the honor of serving with several other Members of the Senate—the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

While attending this meeting, I was again impressed with the great work which this organization is doing to promote the principles of Americanism and freedom. Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., under the dynamic able leadership of its president, Dr. Kenneth Wells, is the most effective organization in this country dedicated to providing Americans with much needed information on patriotism, freedom, and the other basic principles which have enabled our Nation to reach such heights of greatness in the world by providing both freedom and a broad distribution of prosperity for our people through our vibrant free enterprise system.

Mr. President, Freedoms Foundation was founded in 1949 to undergird our constitutional Republic and combat the increasing threat of socialistic communism to the American way of life.

Nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical, the foundation's sole purpose is to encourage all Americans to understand and defend the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities they enjoy as Americans under our constitutional democratic form of government.

Using the free enterprise principle of incentive and reward, Freedoms Foundation conducts an annual national awards program based on the American credo which reaches into Main Street, U.S.A., encouraging and stimulating citizens of every age level to think, write, speak, and act in behalf of the American way of life.

Since the inception of the national awards program in 1949, over 1 million entries have been received from students, teachers, businessmen, ministers, members of the Armed Forces, writers, broadcasters, actors, civic leaders, communities, schools, colleges, companies—from Americans in all walks of life. During this period over 12,000 individuals, companies, organizations, and communities have received Freedoms Foundation awards which are in the form of cash awards of $50 to $5,000, George Washington Honor Medals, plaques, teachers medals, freedom libraries, and student-teacher pilgrimages to Valley Forge and other historic sites.

During the past 14 years, Freedoms Foundation has proven itself to be one of the most effective means of rededicating our youth to pride and understanding of the American heritage and in stimulating adults to reaffirm and perpetuate their beliefs in the American way of life.

More and more educators, editorial writers, clergymen, movie and TV producers, cartoonists, lecturers, and other opinion-molders are asking the foundation for material, research work, and assistance to help them retell the freedom story.

To help meet these requests, the foundation has increased its facilities by erecting new buildings and adding libraries and research and study facilities. It is offering new printed material and plans to expand its national award program, recognizing and encouraging outstanding accomplishments by proponents of freedom.

Mr. President, I have never read a better description of the American way of life than that enunciated by Freedoms Foundation in the emblem by which it has become so well known. This is the way that Freedoms Foundation describes the American way of life:

Political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual, these being—right to worship God in one's own way; right to free speech and press; right to assemble; right to petition for grievances; right to privacy in our homes; right of habeas corpus—no excessive bail; right to trial by jury—innocent till proved guilty; right to move about freely at home and abroad; right to own private property; right to free elections and personal secret ballot; right to work in callings and localities of our choice; right to bargain with our employers and employees; right to go into business, compete, make a profit; right to bargain for goods and services in a free market; right to contract about our affairs; right to the service of government as a protector and referee; and right to freedom from arbitrary government regulation and control. All this, Mr. President, is pictured as being based on constitutional government designed to serve the people and a fundamental belief in God.

I am proud, Mr. President, to display a copy of this emblematic chart on my office wall, and commend it to my colleagues, in the hope that they may do likewise.

I am glad, Mr. President, that our respected Chaplain, who is also the national chaplain of Freedoms Foundation, at Valley Forge, has given appropriate recognition to Freedoms Foundation in his column, which points up in such great literary style the importance of promoting and preserving the vital principles of the American way of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Spires of the Spirit: D-Day Then—And Now

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Forever, in American history, June 6 is recorded as D-day. On that day in 1944 our boys and their English colleagues in valor were storming the shores of Normandy as gallantly they went into the jaws of dire danger and lurking death. They were joined by battalions of airborne fighting men dropped from the skies to liberate the enslaved land which had come to America's help in the Revolution of 1776. Any nation that would forget that June invasion would deserve the worst that history might bring. Because of all that hinged on that heroic D-day the designation might well stand for "Destiny."

With vivid remembrances do I recall the alarm in the night announcing that by boat and plane our boys were at last invading the shore bristling with all the deadly traps and murderous fire the entrenched enemy could muster. With the news that the attack was on there came from the Capital press the inquiry—"When morning comes will the churches be open for prayer for the stalwart knights of this flaming crusade?" Of course when dark turned to dawn intercession was lifted from church altars, from home altars, and from millions of individual hearts. At noon that stressful day came a memorable scene in the U.S. Senate when the chaplain, knowing that his own son-in-law was that day parachuting to the soil of France, ended the opening prayer with the ancient prophecy: "Your covenant with death shall be annulled, your agreement with hell shall not stand, your refuge of lies shall be swept away." What a moment it was in that historic Chamber when the Senators solemnly repeated the 23d Psalm, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death," as somehow the familiar words shone with a new incandescence. All that is a moving memory of D-day then.

As the 19th anniversary approached of that day which will live in history, I found myself gazing at a picture of the allied leader, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, upon whose mind and heart was the awful decision when and where to attack. It is one of the most striking photographs of World War II. In the picture General Ike is surrounded by paratroopers with blackened features and camouflaged helmets.

As in 1963 the anniversary of that D-day drew near, it was mine to join a company of dedicated citizens of the Republic as they surrounded that same great American, now a former President of the United States. It was a council of campaign composed of outstanding Americans who from sea to shining sea had come to that hallowed spot, Valley Forge. They represented the leadership from all phases of our national life. As General Eisenhower presided at the head of the table, his intense concern for the present state of the Union, and of the troubled world, brought vividly to mind the photograph of almost a score of years ago, just before he turned on the green light—go—on that epochal day.

The men and women surrounding General Eisenhower in 1963 composed the general staff of Freedoms Foundation planning for D-day now. For everything that was won on D-day in 1944 is threatened as the Nation then defended prepared to meet the challenge of D-day now and in the days ahead.

Freedoms Foundation is mobilizing all America with a new realization of the heinous things it is against, and of the precious things it is for. From its headquarters in Valley Forge, facing a new D-day, it is registering a vow made in heaven that the American dream must be preserved whatever the cost. Conscious of democracy's faults and failings, praying daily for the dear land of our hope and care—"God mend thine every flaw"—the credo of Freedoms Foundation is that America has come to the Kingdom for such a time as this. It declares proudly that of every fallen defender of the faith, from Lexington to Vietnam, it can be said, "He gave his life for a grand country."

The exultant patriotism of Astronauts Glenn and Cooper, and the others, is justly warranted. The faith we are sworn to defend—"Freedom under God"—was conceived at Plymouth Rock, born at Philadelphia, nurtured at Valley Forge, baptized at Gettysburg, consecrated in the First and Second World Wars, challenged in Korea, and is now standing valiantly against unnumbered foes in Vietnam. That faith is saying to those who would bury us, as they crucify our freedoms, "You shall not pass."

Peace-loving America is willing to go the limit in jubilantly banning the bomb when the tyrants, who so lately planted their rockets on our doorstep, are coerced into ceasing their awful threat to enslave the whole world. Those who keep America strong for the new D-day now upon us are the real peacemakers of whom a rescued world will one day say, "Blessed are they." Those who cry "peace, peace" when there is no peace would have us lower our shield even when poisoned arrows of subversive tyranny are being aimed at the heart of freedom. How strange that those who would insure by essential armament the improbability of war, are so often dubbed by the blind, "warmongers," and that those whose deadly sophistries would lead directly either to war, or surrender, are called "peacemakers." What a prostitution of words and of the truth.

And so, Freedoms Foundation's defenders of our birthright at Valley Forge in 1963, surrounding General Eisenhower who on D-day in 1944 gave the fateful word to the waiting crusaders, is reminding the Nation that it is a time to put into operation Washington's order in that other Revolutionary D-day—"Put no one but Americans on guard this day."

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 193, Senate bill 603.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 603) relating to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, effective as of the day following the date on which the present incumbent in the office of Director ceases to serve as such, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is a very short and simple bill. It provides that following the service of the incumbent in the office of Director of the FBI, the rate of compensation shall be $22,000 per annum.

There is no particular need for me to recite the achievements of the FBI, because they are well set forth in the report which accompanies the bill. So, Mr. President, in lieu of any statement which I might make, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks, all the material included on pages 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the report and also the observations of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 210) and the statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENT

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That effective as of the day following the date of which the present incumbent in the office of Director ceases to serve as such, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

PURPOSE

The purpose of this proposed legislation, as amended, is to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, immediately following the time when the present incumbent in the office ceases to serve, and to fix the rate of his compensation.

STATEMENT

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a Bureau within the Department of Justice and under the general control and supervision of the Attorney General of the United States. With 14,055 employees in 1962, and a budget appropriation of $130,700,000, its gross personnel and appropriated dollars amount to almost 50 percent of the entire personnel and appropriated funds for the Department of Justice as a whole. The work and services performed by this Bureau are vital to the welfare and security, not only of the people of the United States, but to the people of the entire free world.

J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of this Bureau, is a man whose name and accomplishments are as well known and universally applauded as are those of any Presidents and generals, heads of state, or leaders in industry, educators, scientists, or judges who have been active in public life from the mid-1920's to the present time. The services he has rendered and the contribution he has made to this country, both in time of peace and that of war, are of value beyond human ingenuity to assess. This committee is proud and privileged at this time to pay its tribute to this great American. It commends him for a job well done and wishes for him many additional years of fruitful service.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation as it is presently constituted is a living monument to this man, who, on May 10, 1924, accepted the job of Acting Director of the then small and obscure Bureau of Investigation within the Department of Justice on the condition that the Bureau must be divorced from politics and not be a catchall for political hacks—that appointment must be based on merit—and that promotions would be made on proved ability and that the Bureau would be responsible only to the Attorney General. These conditions, first accepted by Harlan Fiske Stone, have been scrupulously observed by every subsequent Attorney General, regardless of political affiliation.

Present statutes do not provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. While it is earnestly desired and hoped that J. Edgar Hoover continue as long as he desires in his position, this committee feels that on this 39th anniversary of his tenure in office, it is appropriate now to provide that his successor be subject to Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation. This act of Congress will in itself be an accolade to the monumental achievements of this great American. It is, therefore, recommended that S. 603, as amended, be favorably considered.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is a release of the FBI, dated December 27, 1962, covering the year 1962, which graphically illustrates the present scope of activities and the achievements of the Bureau.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
December 27, 1962.

In a year end report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy concerning the operations of the FBI during 1962, Director J. Edgar Hoover has disclosed that marked increases were recorded in all major categories of FBI accomplishment in the past year.

According to Mr. Hoover, final tabulations for 1962 will show:

More than 12,700 convictions in FBI cases, compared with 12,418 in 1961;

The apprehension of some 11,400 FBI fugitives, compared with 10,688 last year; and

Fines, savings, and recoveries totaling well over $200 million compared with $148,421,690 in 1961. This figure far exceeds the amount of funds spent to operate the FBI during 1962, he stated.

Among other achievements noted by the FBI Director were the location of some 19,000 stolen automobiles in investigations under the interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles, statute, and the apprehension of nearly 2,500 offenders who were being sought at the request of State and local authorities for fleeing across State lines in violation of the Fugitive Felon Act.

In citing individual crime problems confronting his Bureau, Mr. Hoover called attention to a sharp increase in violations of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute. "An average of 100 robberies, burglaries, and larcenies of banks and other financial institutions covered by this statute have been reported to the FBI each month this year," he stated. "This represents an increase of approximately 25 percent over the number committed in 1961."

The FBI Director also commented upon his Bureau's extensive activities in the field of civil rights, calling particular attention to investigations of a series of church burnings in Georgia last August and September. "Based upon indications that the purpose of these acts was to discourage Negroes from voting, the FBI instituted intensive investigation which led to the prompt solution of the September 17 burning of a church in Terrell County, Ga., and to the arrests of two persons for a church burning near Leesburg, Ga., on August 15," he stated.

Highlights of FBI accomplishments in combating organized crime and racketeering included the solution of the murder last year of Chicago union official John Kilpatrick by two Detroit hoodlums. The evidence gathered by the FBI was turned over to Illinois authorities for trial of the two men in local court. One pleaded guilty; the other stood trial and, upon conviction, was sentenced to serve up to 150 years imprisonment.

Other information gathered and disseminated by the FBI led to the smashing of an international narcotics ring during 1962 and the seizure of illicit drugs valued at well over $20 million.

"Data regarding matters such as these were among the more than 100,000 items of criminal intelligence information which we furnished to other law enforcement agencies during the past year," Mr. Hoover reported. Included were items received from FBI confidential informants which, when passed along to the authorities concerned, resulted in the arrests of more than 2,400 persons and the recovery of stolen and contraband valuables totaling nearly $32,500,000 by other agencies.

In his report to the Attorney General, Mr. Hoover emphasized the continuing threat posed by the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other subversive organizations within the United States. "During even the most critical moments of the Cuban crisis, the party openly proved its loyalty to the International Communist cause. Its members stood unwaveringly opposed to our country's efforts to stop the Soviet Union's buildup of offensive military equipment in Cuba and to assure the removal of such weapons already there," he said.

Highlighting the FBI's accomplishments in the domestic intelligence field were the seizure of a cache of explosives equipment and the arrests of three pro-Castro Cubans on sabotage conspiracy charges last month. One of the arrested men was a newly arrived attaché of the Cuban mission to the United Nations. Two other members of the Cuban mission to the United Nations, both protected by diplomatic immunity, were also named as members of this plot.

Other domestic intelligence accomplishments during 1962 cited by the FBI Director include the arrest of Nelson C. Drummond, a Navy enlisted man, in the act of passing classified military information to the Russians; the conviction of Mark Zborowski on perjury charges arising from his denial before a Federal grand jury that he knew self-admitted Soviet spy Jack Soble; and the dissemination of intelligence information which resulted in persona non grata declarations and related action against several official representatives of Communist-bloc nations.

Mr. Hoover also called attention to the prosecution action instituted by the Justice Department against the Communist Party and individual party leaders. "Based upon witnesses and information located by the FBI, the Communist Party, as an organization, was convicted on December 17 and fined $120,000 for failure to register with the Attorney General under the Internal Security Act of 1950. Two of the party's top officials, Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., have also been indicted and are awaiting trial for violating this Federal statute.

"In addition, Artie Brown, San Francisco area member of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, was convicted under the provision of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act which prohibits Communists or persons who have been party members within a period of 5 years from holding union office," he reported.

Expressing appreciation for the assistance which the FBI receives from other law enforcement agencies, Mr. Hoover said that 1962 witnessed a further strengthening of the bonds of mutual cooperation throughout the entire law enforcement profession. "Our Bureau has come to rely heavily upon the help which it receives from other authorities. We deem it a privilege to reciprocate whenever possible," he stated.

Among the cooperative services which the FBI renders other agencies are cost-free examinations of evidence, comparisons and identification of fingerprints, and assistance in police training schools.

During 1962, the FBI laboratory conducted nearly 236,000 scientific examinations of evidence at the request of authorities in all 50 States. As in the past, many of these examinations assisted local police in identifying wrongdoers. Others helped to establish the innocence of falsely accused persons.

The Identification Division, which serves as the national repository for fingerprint identifying data, received an average of more than 23,000 fingerprint cards for processing every working day throughout this 12-month period. As the year ended, its files contained nearly 165,600,000 sets of fingerprints representing an estimated 77 million persons.

During 1962, the FBI Disaster Squad, a group of fingerprint experts who are available to assist in identifying bodies of disaster victims, was dispatched to the scenes of several major tragedies, including air crashes in Montana, New York, Missouri, Ohio, and Maryland, as well as in France.

The FBI also assisted, upon request, in more than 3,600 local and regional police schools. Additionally, two sessions of the FBI National Academy were held. Including the 165 men who attended these two sessions, 4,258 officers have completed the National Academy's 12-week course of advanced training since its founding in 1935.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

That effective as of the day following the date on which the present incumbent in the office of Director ceases to serve as such, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

I count it a privilege to support S. 603, which as the report of the Judiciary Committee so appropriately notes, is an accolade to the monumental achievements of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I commend the sponsors of the bill, the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from Wyoming. I am pleased to have been a member of the Judiciary Committee which considered the bill and reported it to the Senate.

All of us share the hope that Mr. Hoover will continue to serve his country for as many more years as possible in the same magnificent way he has for the past 39 years as the Director of the FBI.

And yet we all know that the time will come when he must relinquish the leadership of the splendid organization he heads.

Because of his performance in his job, he has made it one of the most important in this or any government. It is so important, going to the very security of our Nation, that there can be little doubt that Mr. Hoover's successor should be appointed subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, as are other major officials in the Government.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, as the committee report observes, makes up nearly half of the Department of Justice both in terms of its 14,055 employees and its annual appropriation of $130,700,000. It is a major agency of Government and the people, through the Senate, should have a voice in the selection of its Director.

I must observe, parenthetically, that the FBI differs sharply from other major agencies in one important regard: For every dollar appropriated for its operation, it returns $1.37.

It is well that we act on this measure now while Mr. Hoover is still in good health and looking forward to many more years of service. I am told by one of his senior assistants that the Director still walks a brisk mile for exercise each day and that many of the younger men on his staff are hard put to keep up with the rapid pace he sets in his work day.

I know we all rejoice that this is so; and, as we act on this bill today, we sincerely hope that it will be many, many years before it is called into use.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say that this bill came from the Judiciary Committee by a unanimous vote; and I think it is high time that we provide for Senate confirmation of the head of an agency which spends $130 million a year. The FBI has a most distinguished record, as everyone knows.

So I shall be content to let the material in the report speak for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 189, Senate bill 777.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "striking out 'not to exceed $10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such sums as may be necessary and appropriate,'." and insert "adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act.' "; on page 2, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "that" and insert "than"; after line 24, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by striking out the words "this or any other law" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "this Act".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

And, on page 3, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.

"(d) None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 49(a) of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 639), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 2. Section 45 of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 637), is amended by redesignating subsection 45(b) as subsection 45(c) and by inserting after subsection 45(a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In the case of contractors or subcontractors and their officers or employees, actual or prospective, the Director may accept, in lieu of the investigation prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a report of an investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, when it is determined by the Director that the completed investigation meets the standards established in subsection (a) hereof: *Provided,* That security clearance had been granted to the individual concerned by another Government agency based upon such investigation and report. The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than 'confidential' to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees, actual or prospective, on the basis of reports on less than full-field investigations: *Provided,* That such investigations shall each include a current national agency check."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by striking out the words "this or any other law" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "this Act".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

SEC. 4. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.

"(d) None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee was unanimous in ordering the bill reported. It authorizes, for a 2-year period, an additional appropriation of $20 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report on the bill, including the amendments to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. Let me say that the bill has been cleared by the Democratic steering committee and by the distinguished Republican leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 215) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

As reported, S. 777 authorizes the appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, to remain available until expended. In addition it permits the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) to grant a security clearance to contractors, subcontractors, and their employees on the basis of an investigation made by a Government agency other than the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Several other changes in existing law are also made by S. 777. All of these are discussed in detail in other sections of this report.

BACKGROUND

The Arms Control and Disarmament Act became law on September 26, 1961. As recommended by the President, it established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal broadly with the whole range of disarmament matters, including research, policies, and programs.

The act charges the Agency with these primary functions:

(a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation;

(b) The preparation for and management of U.S. participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;

(c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and

(d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, the direction of U.S. participation in such control systems as may become part of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities.

The first research contract was awarded by the Agency on February 26, 1962. A full list of contracts let to date, together with those contemplated in fiscal year 1964, follows:

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

STATUS OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS AND GRANTS, FISCAL YEAR 1963

A. Contracts, amendments, and grants signed:	
1. Techniques for monitoring production of strategic delivery vehicles, contract ACDA-1 (Bendix) (fiscal year 1962)	----------
Same. Amendment No. 3 to describe U.S. strategic missile technology	$19,000
2. Design and evaluation of inspection systems for a ban on weapons of mass destruction in space and for restrictions on missile flight tests, contract ACDA/ST-12 (Sylvania)	354,000
Same. Amendment No. 1 provided for special report on techniques of verification for a Latin American nuclear-free zone	5,726
Amendment No. 2 to provide for special report on arms reduction and the use of potsdam-type military liaison missions	2,632
3. Implications and inspection of restrictions on missile and military space system research development test and evaluation (R.D.T. & E.) activity, contract ACDA/ST-13 (Aerospace)	217,700
Amendment No. 1 to analyze the technical problems involved in converting sounding rockets to surface-to surface missiles	4,418
4. Progressive zonal disarmament, contract ACDA/WEC-2 (Raytheon) (fiscal year 1962)	----------
Same. Amendment No. 1 provided for extension of work to "develop planning principles for field tests of inspection techniques"	78,120
5. Evaluation of combined techniques for monitoring levels and production of strategic vehicles, contract ACDA/ST-16 (Bendix)	218,500
6. Problems of subversion and peaceful change, ACDA/GC-11 (Richard A. Falk) (fiscal year 1962)	----------
Same. Amendment No. 1 to provide for historical and documentary appendixes	1,000
7. European view of European security and the present general and complete disarmament proposals, grant ACDA/WEC-14 (Institute for Strategic Studies)	21,064
8. Responses to violations of arms control and disarmament agreements, contract ACDA/GC-17 (Historical Evaluation and Research Organization)	$162,000
9. Peacekeeping Panel study, contract ACDA/GC-19 (Johns Hopkins University; Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research)	87,308
10. Development of a field test plan regarding production of strategic delivery vehicles, ACDA/WEC-18 (Bendix Corp.)	158,500
11. Verification for retained levels of ground forces, armaments and tactical nuclear delivery vehicles, ACDA/WEC-22 (Sylvania)	202,000
12. Studies on arms control and international communism, ACDA/IR-15 (MIT)	65,000
13. Regional arms control arrangements for developing areas, ACDA/IR-24 (MIT)	145,000
14. Arms control and disarmament concepts and the military environment in the European area, ACDA/WEC-23 (Stanford Research Institute)	267,688
15. Interaction of arms control and disarmament measures with capabilities of ground forces, ACDA/WEC-21 (Research Analysis Corp.)	177,300
16. Reciprocal influences of weapons and political systems, grant ACDA/IR-20 (Eagleton Institute-Rutgers University)	40,000
17. The nonmilitary aspects of CENTO, grant ACDA/IR-26 (Dr. Richard H. Pfaff)	1,500
18. Psychological factors in Soviet disarmament positions (Institute for the Study of National Behavior, Inc., Princeton, N.J.)	10,704
Subtotal	2,239,160
B. Contracts, amendments, and grants under negotiation	740,300
1. Interaction of arms control and disarmament measures with capabilities of strategic nuclear forces (RAND).	
2. Summer study on Soviet attitudes (Columbia University).	
3. Ground inspectable features of Soviet armament production technology (Arthur D. Little).	
4. Analysis of requirements for automation of data processing for inspection field tests (RFP No. 16).	
5. Survey of sensors and techniques applicable to arms control inspection and verification (RFP No. 17).	
C. Requests for proposals	$295,000
In selection board process:	
(a) Computation laboratory (RFP No. 18).	
(b) Arms control concepts and the European political environment (RFP No. 19).	
(c) Future character and role of peace. Observation arrangements under the United Nations (RFP No. 20).	
D. Reimbursement agreements with other agencies:	
1. Soviet fiscal system—allocated to Department of Commerce	10,000
2. CW-BW study (DOD)	75,000
3. Technical analysis and planning for field tests (DOD)	425,000
4. Preparation of new digest of international law (Department of State) (contribution for arms control and disarmament section)	14,500
Subtotal	524,500
E. Action documents in process (approved by Research Council)	16,000
1. Soviet military expenditures.	
2. Responding to apparent disarmament violations.	
Total committed to contracts, grants, and agreements	3,814,960

FISCAL YEAR 1964 CONTRACT AND GRANT RESEARCH PROGRAM

I. CONCEPT STUDIES

A. Regional security and arms control and disarmament	$480,000
1. Analysis of specified A.C. & D. proposals for the European area.	
2. Political aspects and impact of arms control in developing areas.	
B. Preliminary measures for general arms control and disarmament	610,000
1. Technical aspects of command and control as arms control measures.	
2. Studies of steps to improve the international environment for A.C. & D. (grants).	
3. Economic impact of specific arms control and disarmament measures in the U.S.S.R.	
4. Political potentialities and barriers to limited arms control arrangements.	
C. Substantial measures for general arms control and disarmament	800,000
1. Interaction of specified A.C. & D. measures with strategic military capabilities, including analysis of verification requirements.	
2. Interaction of specified A.C. & D. measures with capabilities of naval forces.	

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—Continued

C. Substantial measures for general arms control and disarmament—Continued	
3. Interaction of specified A.C. & D. measures with capabilities of ground forces.	
4. Exploratory studies of new A.C. & D. concepts (grants).	
D. International security arrangements for disarmament and the preconditions for disarmament	$350,000
1. Role of alliance systems in a disarming and disarmed world.	
2. The legal structure and financial support of an international disarmament organization and its relationships to the United Nations.	
Subtotal	2,240,000
II. SUPPORTING STUDIES	
1. Inspection system studies	750,000
(a) Development and evaluation of alternative graduated access inspection concepts.	
(b) Inspection theory and concept studies (grants).	
(c) Operational organization of an international inspection organization and the role of intelligence.	
2. Studies of elements in an inspection system	1,000,000
(a) The role of electromagnetic and mechanical sensors in inspection.	
(b) The use of economic data as a part of the verification process.	
(c) Analysis of nonphysical inspection techniques (grants).	
(d) Preliminary design and feasibility studies for special-purpose inspection equipment.	
3. Verification of specific armament and activities	1,300,000
(a) Inspection for clandestine military activities.	
(b) CW/BW verification and control problems.	
(c) Study of methods of limiting military manpower compatible with inspection.	
(d) Verification and control of nuclear weapons production and stockpile.	
(e) The structure of Soviet industry with reference to the production of specified weapons.	
(f) Feasibility of control of R.D.T. & D.	
(g) Fiscal systems of the Soviet bloc with reference to military expenditures.	
4. Legal and political aspects of inspection, violations, and response	450,000
(a) Studies of the legal and political implications of the inspection of industry.	
(b) Response to indirect aggression and subversion.	
(c) Gaming of violations and responses.	
(d) The development of rules of international law.	
5. Research for inspection field test program	2,400,000
(a) Field test design study.	
(b) Field test data processing.	
(c) Field test research.	
6. Strategy of negotiations	$200,000
(a) Political factors bearing on abrogating, renegotiating, or arms control agreements.	
(b) Tactics and techniques of negotiating arms control and disarmament agreements.	
7. The relationship between national political environments and arms control	250,000
(a) Soviet political environment in relation to arms control and disarmament.	
(b) Arms control and disarmament arrangements and national expectations.	
(c) Soviet atitudes toward A.C. & D.	
8. Historical studies of arms control and disarmament experiences	410,000
(a) Analyses of international disputes.	
(b) Interaction of the post-World War II arms race with political tensions.	
(c) Historical analysis of issues in disarmament negotiations under the League of Nations.	
(d) Analysis of past A.C. & D. agreements (organizations, control, compliance, violations, and response).	
(e) Origin and operations of the armistice organization in Korea.	
9. Technical and economic dislocations resulting from arms control and disarmament	350,000
(a) Effect of arms control and disarmament in the electronics industry (United States).	
(b) Methods for analyzing defense employment (a feasibility study).	
(c) Regional case study (economic impact).	
10. Analyses of nongovernmental arms control and disarmament efforts	100,000
(a) Study and full description of nongovernmental organizations in the United States concerned with problems of arms control and disarmament.	
11. Arms control implication of technical development	400,000
(a) Arms control implications of technical developments in the U.S.S.R.	
(b) Arms control implications of AICBM and other technical developments in the United States.	
12. Computer services and methodological studies	1,000,000
(a) Computation laboratory.	
(b) Development of a general purpose military-political arms control and disarmament game to test arms control concepts.	
(c) Basic research on methodology for analysis of arms control problems (grants).	
13. Bibliographic studies	$150,000
(a) Maintenance of bibliographic and abstracting services on unclassified literature and research relating to arms control and disarmament.	
Subtotal	8,760,000
Grand total, contract research program	11,000,000

As this table shows, the Agency planned an expanded research program in fiscal year 1964 and contemplated requesting an appropriation of $15 million of which $11 million was to be spent for research and $4 million for Agency operations.

The Agency has also had the responsibility for U.S. representation at lengthy disarmament and test ban negotiations at Geneva. The Agency estimates that since its establishment American negotiators have participated in formal meetings on arms control and disarmament matters in Geneva on more than 205 days. These included meetings of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference (ENDC) plenary sessions, meetings of ENDC Test Ban Subcommittee and meetings of the ENDC Committee of the Whole.

Although no substantial progress has been made at either conference, preparation for them and participating in them has consumed a great deal of the Agency's energies. Reviewing these negotiations is outside the scope of this report. They have been subject of separate hearings by this committee from time to time and the Committee on Foreign Relations will continue to follow the development in this area closely.

To carry out its function of disseminating and coordinating public information concerning arms control and disarmament, the Agency reported that Agency officials did participate in over 100 meetings, panel discussions, and study groups in 1962. In addition, such informational materials as articles for commercial journals, scripts for educational television programs, network and local TV and radio programs were prepared, and briefings and interviews were arranged with Agency officials for correspondents of public information media.

This and related activities are further discussed in another portion of this report.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The legislation contained in S. 777 was requested by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on January 31 and introduced by Senator HUMPHREY (for himself and Senators CLARK, RANDOLPH, and JAVITS) on February 11, 1963. Two months later, on April 10, 1963, the committee held a public hearing at which all persons who asked to testify up to that time were heard. The record was held open for over another month for such additional statements as individuals and organizations wished to submit.

On May 28, after some further testimony in executive session, the committee voted to report S. 777 favorably to the Senate with amendments. Inasmuch as some question arose as to the committee's intent regarding one of the amendments, the committee met on June 4 to modify this amendment and voted without objection to report the bill, as amended, to the Senate.

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS (SECS. 1 AND 4)

Authorization of appropriations: Public Law 87-297 authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $10 million to remain available until expended for the work of the Agency. Having virtually exhausted this authorization over the period of 2 years, the ACDA requested the authorization of "such sums as may be necessary and appropriate." The committee carefully considered this request and agreed to recommend to the Senate that there be authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 the sum of $20 million, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this act. It should be clear that this sum is to be available for appropriations over a 2-year span. The language of the bill is not to be construed as meaning $20 million is to be available each year. The following table shows past and recommended authorizations and appropriations:

Authorization, executive branch request, and appropriations

Fiscal year	Authorization	Executive branch appropriation request	Appropriation
1962	[1] $10,000,000	$2,900,000	[2] $831,000 1,000,000
1963	(3)	6,500,000	[4] 6,500,000
Total			8,331,000
Authorized and not appropriated			1,669,000
1964	20,000,000	15,000,000	
1965			

[1] No year specified.

[2] Pursuant to sec. 47(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, the State Department, on Oct. 30, 1961, authorized this transfer of funds. The actual amount indicated on the transfer authorization was $840,500, but the figure was rounded out to $840,000 for budget purposes. As a result of later adjustments by the State Department in funds it had obligated but not deducted for disarmament administration activities, the Department, on Apr. 20, 1962, authorized $9,400 of the above amount to be transferred back, leaving a net transfer balance of $831,100, which was rounded out to $831,000 for budget purposes. This is the figure that the Bureau of the Budget directed be shown in the 1962 column of the Agency's budget for fiscal year 1964 instead of the $840,000 figure shown last year before the adjustment was made.

[3] No change.

[4] As of May 28, 1963, the Agency had obligated $4,962,340.90 of this amount.

In deciding on the amount, the committee weighed these facts: (1) The Agency received in appropriations $1,831,000 in fiscal year 1962, $6,500,000 in fiscal year 1963, and proposed to request $15 million for fiscal year 1964; (2) during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963, the ACDA had obligated less than half of the funds available to it; and (3) the ACDA is still very new, as Government agencies go. The committee believes the amount proposed in S. 777 is reasonable and sufficient to finance the Agency's program for the next 2 years.

The committee proposed this authorization of appropriations as a means of assuring a continued review by the Congress over the growth and direction of the ACDA—a review which it believes the Agency should welcome.

In connection with the authorization the question of permanency of the Agency was raised in the committee. This committee points out that the enabling legislation does not anywhere provide that the Agency should cease to exist on any certain date. It is the view of the committee that the ACDA is as permanent as such statutory agencies as the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development (AID) which have thus far been required to seek annual authorizations for appropriations. In fact, in arriving at the formula proposed in S. 777, the committee was influenced by the fact that in the case of the Peace Corps and the AID annual authorizations are required. In any event, the method selected by Congress for providing funds for the operations of an agency is totally unrelated to its permanency.

Before leaving the question of the authorization of appropriations, the committee notes that there remains an authorized but unappropriated balance of $1,669,000. (See table above.) Under the language approved by the committee, this authorization remains available for use without fiscal year limitation.

Rate of obligation: A second committee amendment concerns the rate of the obligation of funds. The ACDA furnished the committee a table showing the monthly obligation of funds for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, which is printed on pages 80 and 81 of the hearings. To the end of March 1963, out of the $6.5 million appropriated, the ACDA had obligated $2,964,862.79—less than one-half of the amount available. A little less than one-third of this amount alone was obligated in March 1963. According to ACDA figures, as of May 28, $4,962,340.90 has been obligated in fiscal year 1963, indicating that during April and May the rate of obligations has been in the neighborhood of $1 million a month. In contrast, during the first 3 months of this fiscal year, the average rate of obligations was less than $80,000.

The committee is fully aware that this change in the monthly rate of obligations during fiscal year 1963 reflects the fact that the beginning phase of the organization of the ACDA is over and that the Agency is now launching its research program in earnest. Before this curve in the monthly rate of obligations becomes an established pattern in ACDA operations, the committee decided to recommend to the Senate this amendment as guidance to the ACDA:

"Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to the act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year."

This language is adapted almost verbatim from that contained in the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1963, applying to foreign aid funds, except the contingency and development loan funds. The committee was so concerned lest the fiscal yearend rush to obligate funds might become a regular procedure of the ACDA that it considered language prohibiting the Agency from obligating more than 20 percent of its available funds during the last 2 months of their availability. Even though the committee agreed to the less restrictive language, it hopes that the Agency's rate of obligations during the next 2 years will show that far less than 20 percent of its funds were obligated in the last month of the fiscal year.

SECURITY PROVISIONS

One of the two amendments relating to the security provisions, set forth in S. 777, would change the requirements for security investigations for actual or prospective contractors and subcontractors and their personnel. Such persons may not now have access to any classified information until they have received full-field background loyalty and security investigations by the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The proposed amendment would authorize the Director to accept, in lieu of such an investigation, a report of an investigation conducted by another Government agency, such as the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, etc. In fact, the latter two agencies were consulted in the drafting of this amendment. In discussing the proposed amendment, Mr. Foster testified:

"The proposed procedure would be on a parity with practices followed by our most highly sensitive agencies. Indeed, the language of our amendment is based largely upon a similar amendment to the Atomic Energy Act which Congress passed in 1961."

Mr. Foster further assured the committee that "if the investigative report of the other agency did not, in our opinion, fulfill our normal requirement with respect to thoroughness and completeness, we would obtain additional information as required on matters not adequately covered."

Under the proposed change an investigation of a contractor made within the preceding 5 years would be accepted and brought up to date by the ACDA, the FBI or the Civil Service Commission through a name check rather than a full-field examination, unless something derogatory were disclosed, in which case a full-field investigation would be conducted. If the previous clearance is older than 5 years, a new full-field examination would be carried out as if the previous clearance did not exist.

The Agency cited two persuasive reasons for requesting this change in the act: (1) The delay occasioned by having to conduct new full-field examinations of each contractor, which normally takes 60 days but can take as much as twice as long when the load is heavy; and (2) the cost involved in these examinations, which is estimated to run between $350 and $400 per person.

The other change of a minor nature provides that the Director may grant access for information classified no higher than "confidential" to contractors, subcontractors, their officers and employees, on the basis of a name check only, rather than a full-field investigation. The intent is to use this procedure mainly for persons invited by the Agency to bidders' conferences. According to the ACDA, this practice is commonly utilized by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies.

Two years ago, when the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was considered by the committee, it devoted particular attention to the security requirements. In fact, the committee redrafted this provision so as to satisfy itself that "the standards and procedures * * * are among the most thorough that appear in any Federal legislation." The committee believes that the changes recommended in S. 777 will not result in any dilution of the standards established in 1961.

AMENDMENTS TO THE POLICY FORMULATION PROVISION (SEC. 3 (a) AND (b))

The committee recommends two amendments to section 33, which pertains to policy formulation. The first relates to the proviso which states "that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

The committee voted to recommend deletion of the italicized words and the insertion in lieu thereof "this Act". The committee believes that limitations contained in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act should apply only to actions taken pursuant to that act and should not by inadvertence venture into constitutional questions beyond the subject matter scope of this act. It should be stressed that the substance of the proviso, which the committee regards as an essential safeguard, remains completely unchanged. Its applicability, however, is now being solely limited to actions taken pursuant to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

The second amendment to section 33 consists of the addition of a new sentence reading as follows:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

The amendment is self-explanatory. It is the committee's view that nothing in the original act would have authorized the Agency to deal with the question of individual ownership and possession of firearms. Since some concern seems to exist, nevertheless, in the minds of sportsmen and others, the committee recommends this amendment to the Senate to make the congressional intent entirely clear.

LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR DISSEMINATION OF PROPAGANDA

The last amendment recommended by the committee is the following limitation on the use of funds:

"None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

This language reflects the committee's concern over the organized pressures brought to bear during consideration of S. 777. The committee is fully aware of the constitutional right of citizens to petition their Government. It is concerned, however, that tax funds gathered from all the citizens not be used, directly or indirectly, to encourage expressions of particular groups of citizens simply because those groups support positions taken by the Government agency. Mr. Foster testified that he personally did not promote these exertions on behalf of the bill and that he did not know who did. The provision recommended by the committee would therefore merely insure that the Agency will not participate in a public campaign on behalf of its own legislation. The committee does not intend by this language to restrict Agency officials from addressing public affairs groups and others on the general subject of arms control and disarmament or to undertake similar activities.

CONCLUSION

The committee believes that S. 777 with the committee amendments deserves the approval of the Senate. The amendments are designed to assure that the ACDA's growth proceeds cautiously and under necessary safeguards. The authorization insures another thorough review by the Foreign Relations Committee of Agency operations in 2 years. In this connection, the committee bore in mind that the annual appropriation process also serves as a review. In fact, the committee did not request a detailed justification of the proposed fiscal year 1964 contracts, believing this to be a matter for thorough examination by the Appropriations Committees.

The committee hopes that the Senate will give its prompt endorsement to S. 777 together with the committee amendments.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 33 OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

"POLICY FORMULATION

"SEC. 33. The Director is authorized and directed to prepare for the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies, as the President may determine, recommendations concerning United States arms control and disarmament policy: *Provided, however,* That no action shall be taken under this **[**or any other law**]** *Act* that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States. *Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."*

SECTION 45 OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

"SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 45. (a) The Director shall establish such security and loyalty requirements, restrictions, and safeguards as he deems necessary in the interest of the national security and to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Director shall arrange with the Civil Service Commission for the conduct of full-field background security and loyalty investigations of all the Agency's officers, employees, consultants, persons detailed from other Government agencies, members of its General Advisory Committee, advisory boards, contractors and subcontractors, and their officers and employees, actual or prospective. In the event the investigation discloses information indicating that the person investigated may be or may become a security risk, or may be of doubtful loyalty, the report of the investigation shall be turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full-field investigation. The final results of all such investigations shall be turned over to the Director for final determination. No person shall be permitted to enter on duty as such an officer, employee, consultant, or member of advisory committee or board, or pursuant to any such detail, and no contractor or subcontractor, or officer or employee thereof shall be permitted to have access to any classified information, until he shall have been investigated in accordance with this subsection and the report of such investigations made to the Director, and the Director shall have determined that such person is not a security risk or of doubtful loyalty. Standards applicable with respect to the security clearance of persons within any category referred to in this subsection shall not be less stringent, and the investigation of such persons for such purposes shall not be less intensive or complete, than in the case of such clearance of persons in a corresponding category under the security procedures of the Government agency or agencies having the highest security restrictions with respect to persons in such category.

"*(b) In the case of contractors or subcontractors and their officers or employees, actual or prospective, the Director may accept, in lieu of the investigation prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a report of investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, when it is determined by the Director that the completed investigation meets the standards established in subsection (a) hereof: Provided, That security clearance had been granted to the individual concerned by another Government agency based upon such investigation and report. The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than "confidential" to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees, actual or prospective, on the basis of reports on less than full field investigations: Provided, That such investigations shall each include a current national agency check.*

"**[**(b)**]** *(c)* The Atomic Energy Commission may authorize any of its employees, or employees of any contractor, prospective contractor, licensee, or prospective licensee of the Atomic Energy Commission or any other person authorized to have access to Restricted Data by the Atomic Energy Commission under section 2165 of title 42, to permit the Director or any officer, employee, consultant, person detailed from other Government agencies, member of the General Advisory Committee or of an advisory board established pursuant to section 41(f), contractor, subcontractor, prospective contractor, or prospective subcontractor, or officer or employee of such contractor, subcontractor, prospective contractor, or prospective subcontractor, to have access to Restricted Data which is required in the performance of his duties and so certified by the Director, but only if (1) the Atomic Energy Commission has determined, in accordance with the established personnel security procedures and standards of the Commission, that permitting such individual to have access to such Restricted Data will not endanger the common defense and security, and (2) the Atomic Energy Commission finds that the established personnel and other security procedures and standards of the Agency are adequate and in reasonable conformity to the standards established by the Atomic Energy Commission under section 2165 of title 42, including those for interim clearance in subsection (b) thereof. Any individual granted access to such Restricted Data pursuant to this subsection may exchange such data with any individual who (A) is an officer or employee of the Department of Defense, or any department or agency thereof, or a member of the Armed Forces, or an officer or employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or a contractor or subcontractor of any such department, agency, or armed force, or an officer or employee of any such contractor or subcontractor, and (B) has been authorized to have access to Restricted Data under the provisions of sections 2163 or 2455 of title 42."

SECTION 49 OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 49. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act. *In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act.*

"(b) Funds appropriated pursuant to this section may be allocated or transferred to any agency for carrying out the purposes of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with authority granted in this Act, or under authority governing the activities of the agencies to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

"*(c) Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act* *shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.*

"(d) None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish for the RECORD to show my opposition to the passage of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. I am unalterably opposed to the operation of any Arms Control and Disarmament Agency so long as the Communists continue to demonstrate by words and acts that they have not changed their goal of dominating and enslaving the peoples of the world. To entertain such a foolish notion that the United States, the principal guardian of freedom in the world, can afford to lay down its arms in a disarmament arrangement with the forces of world communism which have proved over and over again that they cannot be trusted to keep their word, reflects the height of asininity and absurd reasoning. We should enter into no disarmament negotiations with the Communists until they have proved by words and acts of good faith that their goal to dominate the world has been abandoned.

Mr. President, I opposed the establishment of this Agency in 1961, and I cannot give my assent to this legislation which would provide increased spending for an agency which has not proved its worth and which could, through naive and foolish negotiations, render our Nation impotent in the cold-war struggle with communism.

There have come to my attention, Mr. President, several examples of study projects, or what have been referred to as "think factory" contracts, which have been entered into by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The two studies which I will cite on the floor today cause me concern not only from the standpoint of the money expended but even more so because of the nature of the studies.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a contract entered into between the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Institute of Defense Analyses in Washington, D.C. The author of the "think factory" contract is Mr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. I have been unable to obtain the cost of this contract. The contract study is entitled "A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations," and was completed on March 10, 1962.

Here, Mr. President, is a brief description of the content of this study:

> This paper is an attempt to sketch out the possible contours of a world effectively controlled by the United Nations, followed by a discussion of the difficulties attending an enterprise of this nature. The question of feasibility seems so overwhelming in today's world, and the common answer on the part of politically sophisticated people so invariably negative, that it may be wondered why the exercise is undertaken at all. It has three justifications. On policy grounds, it would be well to spell out with greater precision that to which this country has committed itself. On heuristic grounds, it may be worthwhile to apply analytical methods to a problem commonly approached on the basis of hunch alone. Finally there is always the possibility that sophisticated people will turn out to have been wrong.

Mr. President, I also call to the attention of my colleagues a "think factory" contract entered into between the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Peace Research Institute in Washington, D.C., in the amount of $20,000. It is entitled "Study of Factors Pertinent to Political Control of an International Police Force," and was initiated on June 19, 1963. This is what the study showed:

> The study will explore the political arrangements such as (1) the relative merits of and means for sustaining in personnel priority of allegiance to the International Police Force (IPF) compared to national allegiances, (2) what should be the characteristics of the institution which has the power over decisions regarding the use of the IPF, (3) type and extent of command structure for decisionmaking in the field compared to decisionmaking at political-institutional headquarters, during a mission and between missions, (4) the organization and operation of IPF when not on active missions, and (5) the style of and processes for introducing IPF into practice and into the world areas. Special attention will be given in all cases to political procedures for minimizing the possibility that the IPF could be used for partisan purposes disadvantageous to other nations.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the reasons why I desire to be recorded against passage of S. 777, despite the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did make some needed improvements in this bill during its consideration in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE CLEVELAND AT DINNER IN HONOR OF 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to quote briefly, for the information of the Senate, from an article written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times:

> This administration has been more assiduous in attempts to suppress unwelcome news than any other this correspondent has observed in action.
>
> The President's notion of a free press is quite different from our own. We talk of freedom of information, really, whereas he talks of how to get his point across. His interest is in how a free press can best be used.

This opinion was expressed by Mr. Krock in the Times of April 4, 1943. It was quoted, as an example of "timeless opinions" from the "ancient history of 20 years ago" by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, in a delightful speech commemorating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

The speech abounds, Mr. President, with witty and refreshing allusions to the events and personalities of these 20 years, which serve to season wise and compassionate comments on the problems of feeding a hungry world, and on the related problem of building an enduring peace. Its author is one of the ablest public officials now serving his country in Washington. I ask that the full text of the speech to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOASTED BREADCRUMBS OF THE FUTURE

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs)

I

Tonight each of us consumed at these tables as much nourishment as is eaten in a day-and-a-half by more than 50 percent of the people of the world. If we were suddenly to join that less-fortunate half of the human race, our next meal would be a late lunch on Wednesday. And our menu on that occasion would be one small bowl of cooked rice and perhaps a piece of fish about 1-inch square.

You and I wouldn't stand for such treatment. Neither will the world's hungry people—at least not for long. And that is why, 20 years ago today, men and women from 44 countries, exhausted but exhilarated, met in their final plenary session at a mineral water spa in Hot Springs, Va., to approve the final act of an historic meeting.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt had set the tone for their labors in his message to the Conference:

"We know * * * that each freedom is dependent upon the others; that freedom from fear, for example, cannot be secured without freedom from want.

"[The nations] must see to it that no hindrances * * * be allowed to prevent any nation or group of citizens within a nation from obtaining the food necessary for health.

"In this and other U.N. conferences we shall be extending our collaboration. Only by working together can we learn to work together, and work together we must and will."

The short history of how we started to work together, in the midst of a great war, is worth this moment of commemoration. Each nation represented at Hot Springs has its own story of how it got there. Let me tell you the story as it looked from Washington at the time.

II

Franklin Roosevelt was mindful of the strictures of John Maynard Keynes that the failure of Versailles and the League of Nations was due to the lack of concrete "ideas * * * for clothing with the flesh of life the commandments which [Woodrow Wilson] had thundered from the White House." So a group of planners under Leo Pasvolsky, a special adviser to the Secretary of State, actually began postwar planning as early as the autumn of 1939.

But President Roosevelt early developed the principle—which he practiced but never preached—that an ultimate pattern of peace must be put together over a period of time out of its major fragments. It was too much, he seemed to feel, to build a peace all at once, in a single stroke of diplomacy, from such a ruin as the Second World War might make of the world.

So in the early months of postwar planning the planning was in bits and pieces, reaching into every specialized corner of the Government. The dynamics of specialist enthusiasm would be used to provide motive power for building the peace—out of building blocks which would take the form of international organizations for special as well as general purposes—for technical as well as political functions.

Thus, over in the Treasury Department, the first planning papers that were to lead to the Bretton Woods Conference, and later the World Bank and Monetary Fund, were drafted early in the war.

Across town in the Public Health Service, doctors dreamed of a world health organization.

Elsewhere, university people began talking about a world education agency; the labor movement worked hard to preserve the International Labor Organization, temporarily exiled from Geneva to Montreal; and the forecasters of weather, already organized for almost 70 years in an international organization began the rethinking that found expression in the World Meteorological Organization.

And, as a neophyte in Government, employed in the Department of Agriculture, I remember working on postwar food planning in 1941, several months before the United States was actually engaged in fighting the war we assumed from the first would be won.

But the idea that food would have to play a central part in the building of the peace, and that in a peaceful world every citizen should have enough of it was not confined to Washington.

In wartime London was Stanley Bruce, a former Prime Minister of Australia and Australia's representative in the War Cabinet. With him was F. L. McDougall, son of a one-time Lord Mayor of London, who had gone to Australia, experienced a hard time as a farmer, joined Bruce in the League of Nations, and developed a crusading zeal for a global attack on hunger.

In the midthirties, when the League of Nations as a political organization was already on its last legs, Bruce and McDougall were hobnobbing with John Boyd Orr of Scotland and others, promoting an international marriage between health and agriculture—and borrowing words from the 16th century heretic Hugh Latimer to describe their efforts. After one eloquent outburst in the League Assembly, Bruce wrote to Orr that "we have this day lighted such a candle by God's grace, in Geneva as we trust shall never be put out."

John Winant was in wartime London also as American Ambassador, his shy manner and curiously formal handshake obscuring a passion for people—and a hatred of poverty.

Shuttling back and forth across the ocean was Paul Appleby, newspaper editor and Under Secretary of Agriculture, later to become a philosopher of public administration—and our guest tonight.

Earlier talks in London about an international wheat agreement led to further talk of a broader food organization; and in the cold of wartime London the Hot Springs Conference was conceived.

The scene shifts now to Washington where Winant, according to one story, had sold the idea to President Roosevelt. Another version, that of Gove Hambidge in "The Story of FAO," is that McDougall sold it to Mrs. Roosevelt who in turn sold it to Mr. Roosevelt. (That there should be conflicting claims to the parentage of a successful idea is not surprising. I personally know 5 people who invented the Marshall plan and 17 people who first thought of point 4.) In any event, if Mrs. Roosevelt was the effective courier, it was not the first—or the last—time that she put a bee in the President's bonnet.

But whoever sold him the idea of a World Food Conference, the President bought it as the first fragment of a still obscure pattern of peace. And on March 20, 1943, the President announced in a press conference that the United States would host a meeting to "deal with long-range problems of the nutritional standards of all countries."

III

It is worth remembering that in 1943 it was a much more exotic idea to have a world conference than it is today. During the 19th century our own Nation participated in an average of hardly more than one international conference per year. Our career as a nation of conference-goers started in 1826 when a youthful United States, preoccupied with its own internal development, took a wary look at its first invitation—from Simon Bolivar—to attend the Panama Congress of American States. This meeting is generally counted as the beginning of our international conference program—but in fact the U.S. delegates were not confirmed by a suspicious Senate in time to take part in the session.

Nowadays, Congress and the rest of us take international conferences as part of a familiar landscape. We are attending about 450 of them this year on almost every imaginable subject from atomic energy to zinc. In the last 26 months, the U.S. Government has participated in as many international conferences as we attended in our entire history from the founding of the Republic in 1789 to the Hot Springs Conference in 1943. Few had been more important than that one and I am confident that few will be more important than the World Food Congress that starts here tomorrow morning.

In any case, when President Roosevelt announced at a press conference on March 19th that we would host a World Food Conference, it was big news. It was especially newsworthy that day in the State Department, which had not previously known that it was planning a World Food Conference.

Certainly the 1943 Food Conference was regarded as news by the newsmen gathered round the President that day, and the resulting questions and answers produced one of those hilarious occasions which President Roosevelt always seemed to enjoy so much. Asked if the Conference would be in Washington, the President said he hoped not because it would be dreadful to subject the delegates to Washington. He thought it should be held in some small town, to encourage the delegates to get to know each other.

Asked if newsmen would be permitted to cover the Food Conference, the President said he hoped not, and laughed. We are seeking efficiency in the food discussions, he said. Then, of course, he was asked whether reporters were not efficient. Sometimes, said the President, they were too efficient and this slowed down the discussions.

If all this sounds rather up-to-date, so does the furor which developed from the President's announcement that he would not permit reporting at the Hot Springs Conference. Under Roosevelt's guidance, said Arthur Krock in the New York Times of April 4, 1943, "this administration has been more assiduous in attempts to suppress unwelcome news than any other this correspondent has observed in action." Quoting a colleague, he went on: "The President's notion of a free press is quite different from our own. We talk of freedom of information, really, whereas he talks of how to get his point across. His interest is in how a free press can best be used." I remind you that these timeless opinions are from the ancient history of 20 years ago.

But the most eloquent protest came from an army wife who complained to the President in a letter to the Kansas City Star that, "You don't seem to want us housewives, via the newspapers, peeking over your shoulders while you measure in the baking powder and the toasted bread crumbs of the future. We've got to eat the stuff."

IV

Whether by design or by accident, the fact that the Hot Springs Conference was surrounded with soldiers resulted in far more publicity than the organizers of a conference generally manage to procure for it by the more normal means of piquing the curiosity of journalists.

Newspaper readers and radio listeners were privileged in those weeks to learn something about the postwar food problem because the press corps, outraged at its exclusion from the proceedings, descended on Hot Springs, determined to report every scrap of information it could get.

Once the Conference got going, the American delegation persuaded the White House to loosen up on security arrangements and let reporters mingle with the delegates in the hotel grounds—though not to attend the Conference sessions. But no one ever found out—because no one ever asked—whether President Roosevelt's press conference remarks about excluding reporters were made to keep them out or to excite their interest. My own guess is that the purpose was to get more coverage rather than less.

The State Department may or may not have learned about the Hot Springs Conference first in the newspapers, but it certainly lost no time in getting on with the job. Nowadays, we plan a gathering like tomorrow's World Food Congress more than a year in advance. But President Roosevelt's first announcement was in March and the Conference was in full swing 2 months later, in May. Judge Marvin Jones, soon to be U.S. War Food Administrator, lent his distinction and his political experience to the exacting task of chairing the Conference. And buried deep among the technicians in the Canadian delegation was a bright young career diplomat named Lester Pearson.

In the midst of the uproar about news reporting, the Hot Springs Conference got down to business in framing proposals that were news indeed. An Interim Commission, chaired by Lester Pearson, was set up to produce a specific plan for a permanent organization in the field of food and agriculture. Three months after the war was over, the labors of Mr. Pearson and his colleagues had produced, at a meeting in Quebec, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The story of the infancy and the adaptation and maturation of the FAO; the gradual shift from emphasis collection and exchange of information to emphasis on executive direction of operational programs over the past 18 years—is too well known to this audience to bear repetition here.

V

I think we can agree it is a good thing that the pattern of peace was allowed to develop in a fragmented way. In the first place, it is much easier to reach international agreement in the relatively safe, relatively nonpolitical subjects with which the specialized agencies deal. In the second place, the world of the 1940's and 1950's was far from ready for an enforceable peace system; and progress in one field of endeavor could not be made to depend on simultaneous progress in all the others.

In the third place, the excuse for creating another international organization—adding another fragment to a world pattern for peace—is the very progress of science and technology. Each scientific breakthrough produces international cramp and tension until it is matched by an institutional breakthrough in the same field.

Thus, nobody thought of starting a malaria eradication program until, less than 20 years ago, the scientists demonstrated in Sardinia and Egypt and elsewhere that malaria could in fact be stamped out. Then it suddenly seemed ridiculous not to eliminate it from our planet altogether.

Before the invention of the radio there was no need for an international body to divide up the spectrum of radio frequencies. Now, so many new uses are elbowing each other in that narrow spectrum that we are to have a big conference in Geneva this autumn, to reserve a bloc of frequencies for experimentation in outer space.

Until very recently, all the weather bureaus could do in the way of international cooperation was to exchange the information each collected with its own national facilities. But now we can take big strides in combining three new kinds of technology—picture-taking meteorological satellites, communications satellites, and high-speed computers to collect weather information from all over the world, to interpret it, and draw a world weather map fast enough to stay ahead of the quick changes in the weather itself. For the first time a world weather watch becomes a feasible proposition. And thus does new technology set new tasks for international organization.

Civilization does progress by stages. It is good that within the frontiers of specialties like agriculture, health, and the physical sciences, we are beginning to demonstrate that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of friction and confusion—just as we are beginning to demonstrate within the frontiers of nations that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of bloodshed.

It is good that scientists can "speak the same language" even through an interpreter; that physicians can cooperate with each other in a global war on disease; that farmers can teach each other how to get higher yields without politics getting too much in the way.

So we salute the growth of the FAO and its sister agencies, and we shall continue to press for steady improvement in their operations.

VI

All this is good but it is not enough. The spawning of new technologies is not all beneficent. The technology of atomic fission and fusion can provide electric power for national development; it can also incinerate all life in the Northern Hemisphere.

The parochialism of each major field of knowledge is not necessarily an improvement on the more familiar parochialism of nation-states, unless the demonstration that experts working with each other on food and health leads in fact to nations working with each other to keep the general peace.

A civilization which guarantees people enough to eat and longer life—and then exposes them to lethal radioactivity—is not moving onward and upward. It is moving sidewise toward a precipice. So the ultimate worth of every specialized or functional body must be measured partly by whether it helps develop the general or political bodies charged with peaceful solution of international conflicts. Every step to strengthen the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations must in conscience be matched with steps to control arms and develop the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations organization itself. For if a workable pattern of peace must be constructed patiently by building first its component parts, the parts in the end must fit a pattern that makes enough sense to keep us not only healthy but also alive.

VII

All this was foreseen by the wise men at Hot Springs 20 years ago when they provided that the international food organization aborning there should become a part of the yet-unborn United Nations family of agencies.

And it was foreseen explicitly by the founders of the United Nations when they wrote in the preamble to the charter that "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" we must "promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." Enough food for all, available in fact to all, is the first elemental breadcrumb of a future in larger freedom.

Indeed, the role of the FAO as part of a pattern for peace, including the political agencies, was forecast by the story that Judge Jones told when he came back to his former colleagues of the House Committee on Agriculture to report on the Hot Springs Conference—and it applies just as well to rivalries among the international agencies as it does to quarrels among the nations.

"In one of McGuffey's Readers," said Judge Jones, "was the story of a man with six sons who were always quarreling. One day he called them together, showed them a bundle of sticks bound together and offered a prize to any one of them who would break the bundle. They all tried and reported that it could not be done. 'That is easy,' said the old man, who then unbound the sticks and broke them one by one. 'Anyone could do it that way,' the boys replied. 'So it is with you, my sons,' declared the father, 'if you stick together no one can hurt you, but if you continually quarrel and fight among yourselves you can be broken separately.' "

In a fundamental sense, then, the FAO is more than a food and agriculture organization: it is part of a pattern for peace which is far from completed. Yet we know that when we improve the political machinery for keeping the peace we strengthen the functional agencies—and when we improve the functional agencies we strengthen the prospects for peace. And that brings us back to the business at hand: the FAO's goal of a world free from hunger.

Can we do it? Can we feed 6 billion people by the year 2000? Can we double total farm production and triple the output of milk, meat, eggs, and fish? On the record—the record of miraculous technology—we surely can.

If Ceylonese motorboats can multiply by 10 the fish brought in by boats propelled by oar; if a general use of hybrid corn would double the world's supply of corn; if a dairy cow in one part of Asia can produce 25 times the milk of her counterpart in other parts of Asia; if the Japanese can produce more rice per square inch than anybody else; if only 1 acre of land is now cultivated for each person in the world and another 2½ acres is probably tillable; if the world's most densely populated nation can earn foreign exchange as a net exporter of food; if in this country 1 farmer can feed his own family and 26 others; then surely our work is cut out for us, surely there is still plenty of room for the human race on this compacted globe; and surely the vision of a world free from hunger is a realistic goal and not a pipedream.

After 20 years of working at it, the members and staff of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the U.N. system have only just begun on what Lester Pearson, in his report of the first FAO Conference, called "so bold an aim as that of helping nations to achieve freedom from want." Watching the World Food Congress over the next 2 weeks some observers may say, as one historian of the U.N. Charter said of Hot Springs: "Its immediate results consist largely of fairly obvious generalizations and recommendations."

Obvious? Yes, it long has been an obvious generalization that too many people are hungry. But 20 years ago it was not so obvious to many that much could be done about it. Now it is. And I predict that it soon will be just as obvious that we who have inherited the vision and the work begun at Hot Springs are going to do more and more about it—and with such will that another generation will know a world for the first time free from hunger.

DR. ALGA MARIE FERRER

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives with amendments to Senate bill 74.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BAYH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer, which were, after line 8, insert:

> SEC. 2. Section 2 of Private Law 87-673 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of that section of the said Act."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, on April 4, 1963, the Senate passed S. 74, to grant the beneficiary permanent residence in the United States as of the date of her first admission to this country as a visitor.

On May 7, 1963, the House of Representatives passed S. 74, with an amendment to add the beneficiary of a House bill. Under the provisions of S. 74, as amended, both beneficiaries would be placed in a position to file petitions for naturalization.

An additional case, that has now been approved by the Judiciary Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, has been considered. The beneficiary, the subject of S. 574, would be granted the status of permanent residence in the United States.

I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 74, with a further amendment to add the additional case; and I send to the desk the further amendment, as follows:

> After section 2, add the following new section 3:
>
> "SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered

to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CERTAIN CASES GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that there will be a clear understanding of this matter, let me state that before the Senate adjourns today it is my intention to notify Senators that on Monday the pending business will be Calendar No. 174, Senate bill 412.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of that bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill will be the pending business when the Senate resumes its work next week.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT CONTINUES TO RISE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, once again I regret the necessity of calling to the attention of the Senate another alarming rise in youth unemployment. This has become somewhat of a monthly ritual for me. I do not enjoy it. I wish the statistics proved otherwise. But it is also essential that Members of Congress face up to the critical situation regarding unemployment among the youth of this Nation.

The harsh facts are these: In May the Department of Labor disclosed the highest rate of unemployment among young people that has existed since the Department began keeping separate figures for teenagers in 1949. Unemployment in this age group rose from 13 percent in April to 18 percent in May.

There are currently 1,200,000 unemployed young people actively seeking work, 25 percent of the total jobless force.

I think that figure reveals why there are certain problems in delinquency and certain problems among our young people of social unrest. We cannot have 1,200,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 22 unemployed and not have troubles.

Secretary Wirtz has already commented that this situation could develop into "one of the most explosive social problems in the Nation's history."

I commend the Secretary of Labor for this assessment of the situation but, if anything, it is far too restrained. This Senator is one who believes that the danger level was passed many months, perhaps years, ago. But today the issue is beyond question. If 1,200,000 young people—out of work, out of school, out of hope—do not constitute an explosive situation, then I cannot imagine what would be considered explosive.

Mr. President, the urgency of the situation is apparent. Anyone who takes only a moment to consider the magnitude of the problem—1,200,000 unemployed young people—will see that procrastination and delay is no longer an acceptable substitute for action.

It is for that reason, among others, that I deeply regret what took place in the other body yesterday when the area redevelopment proposal was defeated. However inadequate the proposed legislation might be—and it surely has some inadequacies—it provided some employment, and it provided opportunities in the distressed areas for jobs for young people.

Moreover, I fear that the employment figures for June will disclose an even greater percentage of unemployment among young people as thousands of graduates enter the labor market. Surely the time for prompt action on the Youth Employment Act has arrived.

I recently commented that support for the youth bill continues at a high level throughout the Nation. I have never seen a public opinion poll where a large majority of persons questioned did not enthusiastically endorse the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps. I have never alleged that this bill will provide the total answer to this gigantic social and economic problem. But it does provide a beginning, a first step, toward meeting this extremely critical problem. It is a beginning that has received the support of the professional organizations concerned with social welfare, youth employment, education, and conservation. It is a beginning that will enable thousands of our young people to become responsible and self-sustaining members of society.

Ultimately, the solution to youth unemployment must be found in a combination of factors: First, a more rapidly expanding economy that provides more jobs for all. That in itself tells of the urgent need for the proposed tax legislation that is before the Congress, and as we now consider and are worried about what we call civil rights, I suggest that one right which would make civil rights truly meaningful is the right of a job and the opportunity to have a job. We need to have the kind of tax legislation proposed which would give greater impetus to our economy, so that in the months ahead we could see an expanding economy which would provide opportunities for youth as well as for others.

We also need a more adequate educational system that discourages school dropouts, a more enlightened program of social welfare that keeps families together rather than separates children from parents, a vastly expanded program of vocational and technical education, and an enlarged and broadened program of manpower training. But no realistic American expects all these solutions to be reached during this session of Congress.

Of all the great needs today, in the light of the great number of people who have left our rural areas and have come to the large cities, the vocational and technical education program is at the top of the list of priorities. I believe that program is needed, together with the so-called civil rights package which will be coming to us very shortly from the administration. I have so expressed myself to the President and to the leaders of the Congress. It is my view that there are hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions of people—who have left the farms through no fault of their own. Some of them are sharecroppers, white and colored alike, who have little or no experience with urban living, and absolutely no experience in modern industry, manufacturing, or even in the service industries.

What those people need is a vocational education. They need work experience that only technical and vocational training and on-the-job experience in a technical and vocational school can give them. As a Congress we have an obligation, in cooperation with local institutions of government, to see that that opportunity is provided.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator predicting that the President will submit to Congress a civil rights bill which will contain material not directly concerned with the immediate civil rights problem?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say that. I said that I hoped he would.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator did not say that the President will do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say that he would.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope he will not, because if he should submit a bill containing extraneous matter and requests for authority not directly related to the civil rights problem, I am fearful that we might not get any civil rights legislation at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that the Senator's wish will be fulfilled. At least I feel so. But I say most respectfully that I have a high regard for the Senator from Vermont; but I can think of no right that is more important today than the right of an education and, I might add, among the young people who are suffering because of unemployment—and the figures are manifestly clear—the rate of unemployment of Negro young people is four times what it is among whites. That rate of unemployment is related directly to the level of vocational education.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows that I have the greatest respect for him. I consider him one of the best hearted men in the Senate. But I hope that the civil rights problem will be kept separate from the other questions in which he is interested and in which I am interested, because I feel the civil rights bill would be almost the worst bill we could select upon which to attach riders.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respectfully suggest that I am not proposing that it be a rider. I am asking that this kind of measure come to us as a part of the backup, the fortification of what I call job opportunities which need to be made available and cannot be made available without work experience and educational experience. The Senator and I would not disagree about the fact that a comprehensive civil rights bill ought to be left to itself. But I would hope that, along with that proposal, Congress would introduce upon its own initiative, or the executive branch would present us with, some recommendations which would vastly expand our job training program—our vocational and technical education program—which, by the way, has been recommended not only by the Senator from Minnesota, but by many Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. AIKEN. I also share the Senator's desire for more opportunities for employment, not only for young people but for older people. But I hope that, in our efforts to provide greater employment, we do not indulge in any programs which will put a stamp of relief or possibly second-rate citizenship on any of our people.

I learned in the early 1930's to dislike exceedingly the great signs which were put up at the end of WPA projects which, in effect, said, "The people employed on these projects are failures. They are being taken care of by the Government."

I hope we can avoid anything of that nature, because there is enough legitimate work to be done to warrant the payment of full-scale wages so that we should not have to revert to that relief-type program in this day. At least, I do not think we have to revert to that WPA-type of work.

Although I think that work in the forests is good for boys from the city, it is not a permanent solution to the problem. When boys work in the forests they should work as full-scale wage laborers, and not as $50-a-month "reliefers."

So I will go along with the Senator from Minnesota in trying to plan something along that line, but I cannot go along with anything which smacks of the old WPA relief days, unless it turns out to be absolutely necessary, which I do not think it is at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could not agree more with the Senator from Vermont. It is my view that we have suffered from a lack of educational opportunities. My interest is in seeing that the group of people who had to experience such misfortune will have an opportunity to catch up, not on the basis of relief, but on the basis of utilization of technical and vocational skills, in the fine public and private school systems, with a broadened program of technical and vocational education.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is speaking correctly on that subject. One reason why there is such a high degree of unemployment as exists today is that technology is getting ahead of us. We suffer from unemployment because the nature of jobs changes so rapidly that one must necessarily spend considerable time training to take on a new type of job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, technology compounds itself. It goes ahead faster than our means of riding with it.

The Senator from Minnesota is correct when he says that we must pay more attention to education, particularly to vocational training and preparing people to shift from one type of job to another faster than they have ever done before.

There was a time, if a man learned a job as he finished school—and many finished school at very young ages in those days—the training he got at that time would last through his life, or at least perhaps through a generation. That is not the case anymore.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. A man may be trained for a job, only to find, 5 years later, that the training needs to be at least refurbished or done over in order that he may take on the next type of work.

I know I do not differ with the Senator from Minnesota as to objectives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. The Senator is being most helpful.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to have our young people put to work which makes them appear to be "reliefers."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

What the Senator from Minnesota was hoping to say—and perhaps it was stated inadequately—was that our educational programs need to be kept abreast of the technological changes which are occurring.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The migration from the farm has been no fault of the farmer himself. Many people in many parts of the country—not only in the South—have had little opportunity to find work in industry, and, therefore, have found themselves less able to take on jobs when there is not an ample supply of labor.

Mr. AIKEN. This very necessity for retraining is the reason why we must expect a slightly higher percentage of unemployment than we would otherwise expect if the retraining were not necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, we can, however, pass the Youth Employment Act now. We can take the first steps down this long road. We can assist thousands upon thousands of disadvantaged young people to know the security and self-satisfaction of steady and productive employment. This is the opportunity before the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Let us seize this opportunity without further delay.

It is vital, in the area of which we speak, that Negroes and depressed whites be given hope.

For the Negroes, civil rights legislation is necessary for human dignity, without which there can be no hope.

But for the Negro and white, either together or alone, education and job opportunities are equally crucial for hope.

What we speak of is a crisis at least as severe as that demonstrated by sputnik, which we well remember, in 1957. We responded then with the National Defense Education Act. It is my view that we now ought to respond, in terms of what we have had as an experience in education and training, with a massive education and training program, with a tax cut for new investment, along with other measures, to produce jobs and to equip people to fill those jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by John D. Pomfret that appeared in the New York Times of June 9, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS YOUTH MAJOR PROBLEM—DECLINE OF WORK FOR THE UNSKILLED INCREASES TEEN UNEMPLOYMENT

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The evidence is mounting that the United States is faced with a long-range unemployment situation of serious dimensions.

The underlying difficulty is that the economy is not growing fast enough to create the new jobs that would provide work for those who want it.

This strikes hardest at the young people who are looking for their first permanent jobs and the burden of unemployment is falling on them with ever greater severity.

The employment figures for May, issued last week by the Labor Department, gave striking evidence of this and prompted Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz to say that teenage unemployment could develop into "one of the most explosive social problems in the Nation's history."

The figures showed that the unemployment rate among teenagers was nearly 18 percent—the highest since the Department began keeping a separate figure for teenagers in 1949.

CRITICAL SITUATION

Mr. Wirtz thinks the situation is critical and called for broad action to improve the educational system, eliminate racial discrimination, train jobless youths and reduce the number of students who drop out of high school.

President Kennedy recently emphasized the gravity of the general manpower situation in a message to Congress that was accompanied by a Labor Department analysis that is the most thorough to date.

Between 1947 and 1962 the number of jobs rose by 17 percent, but the labor force went up by 21 percent. The obvious result of this discrepancy was that unemployment rose from an average of below 4 percent of the labor force in the immediate postwar period to more than 5 percent in more recent years.

As unsatisfactory as this situation is, it may very well get worse.

FLOOD OF JOBSEEKERS

An unusual flood of new jobseekers is about to hit the economy. The experts' estimates are that the country's labor force will grow by 13 million during the sixties and by another 7 million between 1970 and 1975, reaching 93 million.

But these are net changes. Within the figures will be even larger shifts.

Thus, 26 million young persons under the age of 25 are expected to enter the labor force in the sixties—a far greater number than the country ever has had to train and absorb before in a 10-year period.

Success would mean a new level of prosperity as the young people get jobs, marry and begin to rear families and contribute to the economy's output and demand.

But the experts do not believe that success will come easily or automatically.

Further, two statistics in the manpower report indicate that the economy will have to run faster and faster just to stay even.

Research and development expenditures rose from slightly over $5 billion in 1953–54 to $14,750 million in 1961–62. The impact of this so far has not been reflected by a rise in the rate at which output per man-hour is increasing, but it is inconceivable to the experts that it will not be soon.

Secondly, even without any rise in the rate at which productivity is increasing, the real output of the private economy in this country grew 59 percent between 1947 and 1961 with an increase in total man-hours of just 3 percent. The fact that private employment increased by 10 percent in this period was due to the very large rise in the number of part-time workers.

In the first place, the economy's performance at creating jobs has been lackluster in recent years. The slowdown has been centered in the private sector. This, between 1947 and 1957, grew at a rate of 700,000 jobs a year. But between 1957 and 1962 the gain was 175,000 annually.

Growth in the public sector—mostly State and local government—has absorbed some on this slack. Total civilian Government employment has been rising in the post-war period at a rate more than two and a half times that of total nonfarm employment. State and local governments have been creating 285,000 jobs a year on the average since 1957, compared with 185,000 before then.

MORE IDLENESS FEARED

But the experts estimate that if the economy does not begin to grow faster, unemployment which now is about 4,500,000 will grow by 1967 to beyond 5,500,000, or more than 7 percent of the labor force.

If the challenge is large in the aggregate, it gets even bigger when looked at up close.

Technological change is demanding an ever higher level of skill. An underlying shift in employment from goods-producing to service-producing industries is leaving many stranded. Drastic shifts in demand, depletion of natural resources or relocation of industries have left large groups of persons and sizable areas in the backwash of the general prosperity.

Thus, unemployment last year among unskilled nonfarm laborers was 12 percent—higher than any other occupational group. Semiskilled workers had a jobless rate of 8 percent; the skilled, 5 percent, and professional people, 2 percent.

The jobless rate among construction workers ran 12 percent and among manufacturing employees, 5.8 percent. In the service industries, it was 4.3 percent and in public administration, just under 2 percent.

Negroes, often deprived of training as well as job opportunities by discrimination, have an unemployment rate of twice the national average.

SKILLS NEEDED

Unemployment among teenage boys, many of whom had not finished high school, was more than twice as high as the average rate last year. And although older workers are not as often out of work as their juniors, they have a much harder time finding a job when they are.

West Virginia, hard hit by the decline of coal mining, had a jobless rate of 10.9 percent last year. Pennsylvania, with the mining and steel industries both contributing to joblessness, had a rate of 7.9 percent.

To meet the unemployment challenge, the administration has proposed a $10,300,000,000 tax cut to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 13, 1963:

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353.

Pope, Derwin B.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Charles E. Diviney, V.F., St. Charles Borromeo, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Bless, O Lord, these distinguished Representatives of our people. Today they are faced with awesome problems and burdened by heavy responsibilities. Their concerns—local, international, and interplanetary—include the threat of war abroad, seething unrest at home, and the mysteries of space exploration and control.

Grant them the wisdom to recognize the need for divine guidance in a world whose dimensions seem to be outstripping the range of human reason.

Make them great souled enough to rise above appeals to self-interest; courageous enough to resist the pressures of frantic emotion and uncontrolled passion; prudent enough to direct all their thoughts and actions toward the common good.

Finally, give them the insight to understand that in our human condition and with the urgency of our times, God needs men. Therefore, if they continue to be devoted to duty, dedicated to their ideals—with Your help they cannot fail. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 15, 1963:

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

On May 17, 1963:

H.R. 5517. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

On May 20, 1963:

H.R. 4997. An act to extend the feed grain program.

On May 23, 1963:

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

On May 29, 1963:

H.R. 6009. An act to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act;

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation; and

H.R. 4655. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes.

On June 4, 1963:

H.R. 5389. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LIMITATIONS ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there seems to have been some misunderstanding about some of the objections that I have made to unanimous-consent requests. I want to call attention to the various limitations that are placed upon Members of Congress; in their salaries, in their trips home, in travel expense, in the number of clerks that may be employed, in the clerks' salaries, in the amount allowed for telegraph and telephone expenses, stationery allowance, stamp allowance, number of free envelopes, and the limitation on space in the RECORD, which may not be exceeded except by unanimous consent.

We are limited in almost every activity except in the amount that we may incur in the printing of the RECORD.

It might be news to some—even the Member involved—to know that one Member of this House in the period between January 9 and June 12, 1963, made 192 insertions in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, and 23 extensions of extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD, which measured 4,130 inches or the equivalent of 153 pages. The Public Printer estimates the cost of printing the RECORD at $90 a page. The cost of the extensions of one Member therefore cost the taxpayers $13,770 in a little more than 5 months. I leave it up to my colleagues whether or not this is an abuse which would warrant some kind of limitation. This particular Member does not top the crop in his expenditures, for last session he was not at the head of his class, and there were several close contenders whose extensions cost the taxpayers far more than their salaries.

I have been going over this and analyzing it for some time, and some of the Members I have talked to have been rather surprised when I said that the extension of extraneous remarks by some Members in the last session exceeded their total salary. At $90 a page, I think if we were to try to curtail some of this we would bring about a saving which would be in the neighborhood of $1 million a year. I am hopeful we can arrive at some limitation on the insertions both in the body and Appendix of the daily RECORD.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech on civil rights is a bitter pill for the South and for much of the Nation to swallow. While his proposal has not been spelled out in bill form, it is certain that any civil rights bill of far-reaching nature will have rough sledding in the Congress. There is a growing feeling that the whole picture of civil rights is being overplayed and that undue emphasis is being placed on it. Unfortuately, a wave of hysteria fanned by sensational news stories is sweeping the Nation. Much harm has been done to the cause of race relations and it is regrettable that the President has taken his present action without calm and deliberate discussion and evaluation with leaders at all levels.

American morale at home and prestige abroad and, in fact, the whole cause for democracy, has suffered. Voluntary cooperation between the races will accomplish much more than legislation or force. This is clear from what has happened in Birmingham and elsewhere.

MEDICAL EXPENSES SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM OUTSIDE EARNINGS OF SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide that the amount of an individual's medical, dental, and related expenses shall be subtracted from his outside earnings before determining the reduction of any social security benefits because of such outside earnings.

Under existing law, if a social security recipient earns over $1,200 of annual earnings, his benefits are decreased. There is no allowance for medical expenses in computing outside earnings.

We all know that medical expenses constitute a very large part of the budget of our senior citizens. Medical expenses in many instances wipe out both outside earnings and benefits for persons on social security. Heavy medical expenses result in depriving many senior citizens of the support originally intended by the passage of social security.

Since medical expenses are involuntary, it is unlikely that anyone would be able to take unfair advantage of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is no solution to the tremendous problem of medical care for the elderly, who have one-half the income and more than twice the medical bills of the rest of the population. I am a strong supporter of medical care for the elderly through the social security system, and I have signed the discharge petition to bring the King-Anderson bill to the floor of the House for a vote.

However, this bill would encourage our senior citizens, who constitute an invaluable national asset, to continue to contribute to our society. Passage of the amendment would help the elderly meet medical expenses which now may wipe out income from social security.

I urge early consideration of the bill.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1963, I introduced H.R. 3311, to authorize an additional $900 million to finance the accelerated public works program through the fiscal year 1964.

Yesterday the House in its wisdom, or lack of it, voted against certain strengthening amendments and increased authorizations for the Area Redevelopment Administration. The effect of yesterday's vote is to place a critical burden on those communities with a high percentage of unemployment. To stimulate employment in these areas, we cannot depend on military and space expenditures. I have pointed out in recent weeks the way in which certain States like West Virginia have been shortchanged in military installations and space contracts.

Therefore, I believe it is even more vital that the accelerated public works program be extended. This program has already brought vast benefits to areas with high unemployment, and the investment in permanent public improvements will pay rich dividends.

Mr. Speaker, in view of yesterday's action by the House, unless we take this action to extend the accelerated public works authorization, the entire economy might be dragged down by the critical unemployment situation in certain areas.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; one on water pollution and one on equal pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object, except for one instance.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD today and also on Monday next.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object to that. I have made it clear that I think such requests should be made on the day the extension is to be made.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. Does the gentlewoman from Missouri seek further recognition?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include a very short item on equal pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NASA AND THE MOON

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed by the arguments that have been generated over the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program to land an American on the moon.

Surely the critics of this program do not wish our country to be left behind in the space race?

For military reasons alone it is imperative that the Soviet Union not be permitted to gain this valuable advantage over us. A base for military purposes on the surface of the moon would, if it were controlled by an unfriendly power, hold a veto power over our Nation's strike force capability.

Rockets and other missiles could be launched from the moon to strike any part of the territory of the United States. It would be tremendously difficult for us to combat such a threat and for these reasons alone the NASA program should be pushed forward with all possible speed.

A moon base under our control, on the other hand, would give us this vital military and psychological advantage and, with our other defense capabilities, it would strengthen the hand of the free world forces in the struggle for peace.

I am bewildered by General Eisenhower's remarks recently on the subject. It is plain that General Eisenhower has never really understood the concepts of the nuclear-rocket age. The blow to our prestige by the launching of the first Soviet sputnik has still not been fully repaired, despite the great strides we have made in recent years.

In the battle for men's minds that we find ourselves engaged in it is vitally important that we show the world we have the skill and know-how to justify our leadership position.

When Columbus left the Old World in 1492 in search of new lands it was fashionable in certain quarters to criticize the expense and purpose of his voyage into the unknown. I think we can safely say that his journey was well justified and that the expense has been repaid many times over.

In our own day and age, brave men are still exploring unchartered oceans. I have no doubt that these journeys, too, will be well justified and that once again in time the expense will be repaid many times over.

I suggest we study history a little more fully to prepare ourselves for the future. I regret that General Eisenhower will be pictured to our great grandchildren in future textbooks as being shortsighted and narrowminded.

We can be thankful that our space program in recent years has been under the control of President Kennedy and the able administrators of NASA. They have been doing well and our Nation can be assured America will take first place in the space race.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman indicate what the extraneous matter is and the extent of it, please?

Mr. REID of New York. It consists of two brief newspaper articles in this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would object to that because I feel these newspaper articles should be inserted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and not clutter up the body of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE LATE MEDGAR W. EVERS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the entire Nation is deeply concerned and shocked over the dastardly shot in the back that occurred in Jackson, Miss., with the murder of Medgar W. Evers, the NAACP field secretary.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King in New York yesterday referred to a conversation that he had with Mr. Evers late Tuesday. Dr. King quoted Mr. Evers' last words to him: "We're going on. We're determined to carry on until the problem is solved."

Mr. Speaker, I would only like to say to the family of Mr. Evers that there are many of us in the Congress who will do all in our power to carry on—to see that the Congress make a moral commitment and enacts necessary bipartisan legislation to insure that Mr. Evers did not die in vain; to insure that we will indeed have equality of opportunity for all Americans now.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, knowing of the real heartfelt appreciation of my colleagues and the sincere affection which they held for "Tad" Walter, I was very much moved by a letter written by a friend of mine, Marcus Daly, to a newspaper in Monmouth County, N.J., the Red Bank Register, which reads as follows:

LINCROFT, N.J.

To the EDITOR:

On May 31, U.S. Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, died after a long illness. Many persons know his name from his chairmanship of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Here he did outstanding work in vigorously opposing all those forces determined to undermine the American way of life. For this work alone he did deserve the thanks of all of us.

However, there was an area that he worked in that was little known about. Here he showed a true stature of being a great humanitarian. This was in the field of international refugee relief. For over 3 years, I saw the deep interest he had in this truly charitable work of helping the refugees. Many thousands of refugees now in Australia, Latin America, Israel, Canada, and the United States owe their present peace of life to this man. He did everything legally possible in the interpretation of laws and regulations so that these unfortunate victims of communism could once again live with their heads held high as free men.

To enumerate the untold instances of his interest would cover many pages of newsprint. Suffice it to say he looked to all men as his brothers' keeper.

I know that, in many thousands of hearts, prayers have been and are being said for this man—"Tad" Walter—their unknown benefactor.

His ways may have irritated many and pleased others, but he saw what he thought was right for the refugee and did it.

Sincerely yours,

MARCUS DALY,
Former Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 122)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with illustrations, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1963.*

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 121)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Under the provisions of title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Seventh Annual Report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *June 13, 1963.*

SUBCOMMITTEES NOS. 3 AND 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittees Nos. 3 and 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Abernethy
Alger
Ayres
Baring
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Cederberg
Celler
Chenoweth
Clark
Collier
Conte
Cunningham
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Gavin
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Holifield
Jones, Ala.
Karth
King, Calif.
Kirwan
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Norblad
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Ryan, Mich.
Schwengel
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Trimble
Vanik
Van Pelt
Whitener
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COAST GUARD

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 79) to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "December 31, 1963," and insert "after fiscal year 1964,".

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "after that date" and insert "after December 31, 1963".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "project." and insert "project'."

Page 2, strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISABILITY BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to reduce to 1 year the amount of covered working time required to be eligible for social security disability insurance benefits. My proposal will enable young, disabled workers to receive disability insurance benefits if they are disabled early in their working life.

This bill liberalizes present social security requirements. Disabled workers now receive disability benefits only after 5 years of covered work during the 10-year period immediately preceding the onset of disability.

Mr. Speaker, there is a decided need for this legislation. Under present law, a young disabled worker who has had social security for less than 5 years is denied disability benefits. My bill corrects an inequity to younger workers, many of whom have inadequate means to provide for their growing families in the event of an unexpected and tragic disability.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth] in introducing this needed legislation.

This is the fourth major amendment to the Social Security Act that I have proposed so far this session of Congress. The other social security bills I introduced would increase minimum social security benefits from $40 to $50 per month, lower age requirements for full social security benefits to 60 years for both men and women, and increase to $1,800 the annual amount of earned income a person may receive without having his social security benefits reduced.

These bills, if enacted, would strengthen our economy at the base. They would put needed purchasing power into the hands of those who need it most. They would bring a measure of social justice to individuals and families and those 35 million of our fellow citizens—including many in the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent—who are denied the opportunity of a decent livelihood in the midst of great national surpluses and prosperity.

OBSERVANCE OF VICIOUS TAKEOVER BY SOVIETS OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, June 16, the Baltic States Freedom Committee of New York is commemorating the vicious takeover by the Soviet Union of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940, and the mass deportations which occurred in 1941. While my schedule of official duties prevents my personal attendance to this commemoration, I have sent the following message to be read at this observance. Because it expresses my firm convictions on the responsibilities I feel we in the United States have to those trapped behind the Iron Curtain, I would like to share this message with my colleagues:

June 16, 1963.

I deeply regret not being able to participate personally in the observance being conducted by the Baltic States Freedom Committee of New York. However, my absence in no respect lessens my strong sympathy for the cause of your commemoration.

The forcible occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet tyrants and their subsequent deportations are a tragic blot on world history. These evil events must not be forgotten. They are an ignoble example of Communist oppression.

We who legislate in behalf of freemen are summoned to speak clearly and act forthrightly to banish forever the bondage of communism. Our mission must be to eradicate this awful scourge from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and wherever else it enslaves freedom-loving people.

Please extend my best wishes to all who will join in this important commemoration. Their activities are living proof of the strong desire in America to restore human dignity to the brave people of the Baltic States.

Frank Horton,
House of Representatives.

PROCLAIMING DECEMBER 7, 1966, AS "PEARL HARBOR DAY"

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as "Pearl Harbor Day" in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

This day should always be one to remember; not one of comfort, but one to keep before us so that it will never again happen.

December 7, 1941, was a black day in American history. On that day, many men serving their country gave their all for a common cause. Since that time there have been various tributes, memorials, and other efforts to sustain the history so that this shall not be repeated.

Because the heroism of American forces before the unforeseen onslaught was an inspiration throughout the grim and terrible struggle that followed and because the bright beacon of courage then ignited will burn forever in the hearts of free men, I believe that it is only proper that the 25th anniversary of this occasion be proclaimed as a special date of remembrance and be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

WITHHOLDING FEDERAL FUNDS FROM EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS PRACTICING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6971, to withhold Federal funds from any educational institutions which practice racial discrimination.

The bill applies to funds under acts for national defense education, vocational education, federally impacted areas, library services, and land-grant colleges.

It would amend each to limit funds to schools which are on a racially nondiscriminatory basis or are carrying out plans which will achieve a nondiscriminatory basis by June 30, 1964.

The explosive racial situation calls for effective but moderate Federal leadership. My bill would involve most public and private educational institutions, and would provide a strong financial incentive for these institutions to end any racial discrimination. It would be a peaceful noncompulsory way to promote equal opportunity for Negroes.

The President has said he cannot withhold Federal funds because of racial segregation unless Congress includes such authority in the law. I am doing my best to give him that authority.

The spending of Federal money for education is unwise; but if the forces of spending cannot be stopped, the least we should require is that the money be spent fairly. Everyone pays taxes, and no citizen should be deliberately deprived of some benefit from his own taxes—small as it might be.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 396) providing for the consideration of (H.R. 6755) a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a one-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 396 provides for consideration of H.R. 6755, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates. The resolution provides a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 3 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6755 is to continue the present corporate tax rate and certain existing excise tax rates for 1 year.

The existing tax rates which this bill continues for 1 year are the present combined 52-percent corporate income tax rate, which would otherwise revert to 47 percent, and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and the transportation of persons by air. All of the taxes affected by this bill, except those relating to general telephone service and transportation of persons by air, are taxes which were increased at the time of the Korean war. The Tax Rate Extension Act of 1959 added the latter two taxes to the list of taxes subject to automatic reduction.

If this bill were not enacted, it is estimated that there would be a revenue loss of $4.1 to $4.2 billion in a full year of operation and a loss of revenue in the fiscal year 1964 of $2.8 to $2.9 billion.

The rate extensions contained in the bill conform with the recommendations made to the Ways and Means Committee by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 396 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6755 to provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and all points of order against the bill shall hereby be waived. The general debate will last 3 hours, and there will be only one motion besides those amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means—there will be only one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, of course we are told that it is a perfectly normal thing that this money is needed. Well, we need a great deal more money than this because we are running on borrowed money right straight along. This bill actually would provide a very small amount compared to what we need. It will also provide a very small amount compared to the deficit we are prepared to face at the end of the fiscal year which has been minimized at $10 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the only quarrel I have with the bill is the fact that we do not seem to be willing, in this House, any more in this bill than we did on the debt limit, to face facts. Why not admit that these taxes are going to continue on? There is nothing temporary about them, nothing temporary at all. They are just about as temporary as eternity. So why come in here year after year, which we will do, and go through the same operation? Why do we not just admit that the taxes have gone up, that they will go up some more, that we will have deficits, and that we will have to live with deficits?

That is my one great quarrel with this bill.

Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection I know of to the rule, although I do not see how we can consume 3 hours of debate on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session of Congress I introduced H.R. 45, to repeal the excise tax on telephone service. In their consideration of H.R. 6755, the bill before us today, I regret the Committee on Ways and Means did not give this matter consideration. This tax on telephone service has been collected for some 20 years now, though it was imposed during World War II as a "temporary" measure, as the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. St. George, has stated.

The telephone is the only household utility subject to Federal excise tax. It should not be included with the excise tax on luxury items because the telephone is a very essential service. More than 80 percent of our Nation's homes have telephones and it is quite impossible for business to operate without it.

Without the tax, it is reasonable to expect that there would be a still greater use of the telephone which would contribute to the stimulation of the economy. More telephone use would require more construction of telephone equipment, lines, and so forth. This would contribute to the creation of more jobs both in the telephone industry and in the economy at large.

For several years now there has been general agreement in the Congress that the tax on general telephone service should be repealed. But when? Each time we have said—next year, perhaps. It seems to me that we should delay no longer.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio upon the introduction of the bill to which she refers and to inform her that when this matter was heard in the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] offered an amendment to repeal the telephone tax over a period of years. That was defeated by a vote of 16 to 9. I favor the gentlewoman's bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, more particularly that portion which extends the Federal excise tax of 10 percent on general telephone service.

Originally, the Federal excise tax of 10 percent on telephone calls was imposed not only to raise revenue but to discourage use of the telephone at a time when metals and war materials were scarce. It was intended as an emergency, temporary wartime levy.

Today, 18 years after the war, it still remains in our statute books. Although, in 1959, we voted to end the tax effective the following year, the 86th Congress in 1960 restored it.

Mr. Speaker, to continue this tax would be to place telephone service in a luxury class comparable to the tax on jewelry, perfumes, and furs. Telephone service is a business and household necessity—it is an essential utility service like gas, water, and electricity.

This is an unfair, burdensome, and discriminatory tax and it should be repealed.

I regret the action taken by the Ways and Means Committee in further extending this tax.

The people are fed up with the high taxes they have to pay, not only to our Federal Government, but to our State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, when taxes are high and still going higher and we are faced with a desperate need for expenditures of unparalleled proportions, we must consider other means of raising revenue which in ordinary times might not be considered suitable.

Neither this Congress, nor the Ways and Means Committee, has the right to ignore or be careless of possible tax and revenue advantages offered by a Government-run lottery which could easily pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery which would be a painless and voluntary form of taxation, would certainly be a more palatable way of raising revenue for this Government.

If the Ways and Means Committee and if this Congress is really sincere and concerned with the plight of the American taxpayers and wishes to alleviate the heavy burdens of taxation, then it should have the courage to seriously consider a Government-run lottery as the only sensible, realistic, and logical alternative to this type of legislation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would, in principle, object to the rule except that understanding the procedures we normally follow, I realize with a sense of frustration that it is not the intention of the House at this time to depart from recent practices, but I would hope that some day we will under a rule on a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means have the opportunity to present amendments, so that not just the overburdened members of the committee itself but the entire House could work its will in these deliberations. Incidentally, as I look at the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I see the distinguished chairman [Mr. MILLS] and the ranking minority member [Mr. BYRNES], both much grayer now than they were 6 months ago when they started their deliberations on the President's tax proposal. And, I look at this proposal to extend the excise taxes for a year with some apprehension. I say the simplest painless procedure possible would be to abolish these temporary taxes. It would save the wear and tear on the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and remove the entire subject of tax revision from the political arena, and I believe it would probably be the most welcome changes that the House could take. But, realizing that we seem to thrive on confusion, realizing that we thrive on temporary means I bow to the inevitable.

I realize the rule will be granted and realize that the temporary taxes become permanent. But, I do hope that some day we will get a rule on the tax bill, an open rule, so that we can work our way on amendments and that we can eliminate the temporary wartime-imposed taxes.

Since Federal revenues from these sources now reach $7 billion, we would, in effect, be giving consumers of products and telephone users across the country a tax reduction effective July 1, which would immediately reach an overwhelming proportion of our population. The sum involved could effectively be balanced by economy moves now clearly apparent in the Congress. We will then have presented the public with a tax reduction based on corresponding reduction in expenditures. The arguments for a tax reduction could be validly applied here; to stimulate the economy, reduce the burden on individual citizens, businesses, and so forth, to eliminate record keeping, redtape, and paperwork, that are impediments to American businesses and, last but not least, the restoration of faith in Government promises that were made regarding the temporary nature of these excise taxes.

Perhaps this proposal does not have the political magic of an across-the-board slash in income tax rates, but it would reach as many people and have an immediate sound effect. Furthermore, the principle of eliminating the wartime imposed excise taxes is a valid one, and this action would not create a great inflationary spiral and an increase in our national debt that are inherent in the complex and controversial proposals presented to this committee by administration spokesmen.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6755, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, each year, beginning in 1954, the Congress has been requested by the person then President of the United States to provide a 1-year extension in certain tax rates that would otherwise revert to lower rates generally on June 30 of that year. This started, Mr. Chairman, during the administration of President Eisenhower in 1954. It was repeated by President Eisenhower through a request to the Congress in each of the years that he served in that high office and into President Kennedy's administration.

Once again we have the President of the United States requesting the Congress to enact legislation to continue for one additional year certain rates of taxation that would otherwise expire or drop to a lower rate without this action on June 30 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, let me here summarize the specific taxes involved, and the Treasury revenue estimates of the full year effect.

H.R. 6755 continues for 1 year—until July 1, 1964—the present combined 52-percent corporate income tax rate which would otherwise revert to 47 percent—the 5-percentage point reduction would occur in the 30-percent normal tax. The Treasury revenue estimate for a full year is $2.5 billion. The bill also continues the following excise tax rates until July 1, 1964:

First. Distilled spirits, which would be continued at $10.50 rather than $9 per proof gallon—$193 million.

Second. Beer, which would be continued at $9 rather than $8 per barrel—$84 million.

Third. Wines, which are continued at various tax rates rather than being reduced by approximately 11 percent—$9 million.

Fourth. Cigarettes, which would be continued at 8 cents rather than 7 cents a pack—$246 million.

Fifth. Passenger cars, which would be continued at 10 percent rather than 7 percent of the manufacturers' price—$460 million.

Sixth. Auto parts and accessories, which would be continued at 8 percent rather than 5 percent of the manufacturers' price—$82 million.

Seventh. General telephone service, which would be continued at 10 percent of the amount paid rather than reduced to zero—$570 million.

Eighth. Transportation of persons by air, which would be continued at 5 percent of the amount paid rather than reduced to zero—$105 million.

If this bill were not enacted, it is estimated that there would be a total revenue loss of $4.1 to $4.2 billion in a full year of operation and a loss of revenue in the fiscal year 1964 of $2.8 to $2.9 billion—taking into account floor stock refunds.

During the course of the time that we have been extending certain of these higher rates of taxation there have been added to this list, by action of the Congress, two taxes that were not initially levied in the period of the Korean war. One of those—the telephone tax—has been discussed already under the rule today, Mr. Chairman. I think it is interesting in this connection to look back a little bit to see how long this tax on telephone service has been in existence. In the year 1914 Congress levied an excise tax on long distance telephone service. In 1916 the Congress saw fit to repeal that excise tax. In 1917, the Congress reenacted an excise tax on long distance telephone service, which was again repealed in 1924. It was again reenacted in 1932 and has remained in existence in some degree ever since, either upward or downward. In 1941, it is true that for the first time Congress levied an excise tax on local telephone service.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, this matter that is included in this bill dealing with the taxation of telephone service is not something that was started basically as a temporary matter during the Korean war. It became a temporary matter in 1960, as I remember, as the result of the adoption of an amendment by the other body that came to us in conference. Rather than permit the tax to lapse at that time the conferees decided that it should be extended for 1 year, and we have been extending it since that time, and you are asked to extend it again this year.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to this particular tax, one suggestion has been made to the committee that the committee reduce the rate of the tax—not repeal it, but reduce the rate of the tax—over a period of years, for the reason that under the telephone tax the revenue is rapidly approaching $1 billion, and there is fear on the part of the industry that if the amount of the revenue to be developed from any particular tax ever reaches the level of a billion dollars it may be much more difficult to get the Congress to repeal that tax. We are assured, in conversation with the industry, that if we drop this tax from 10 to 9 percent, let us say, and then subsequently down to 8 percent, and subsequently to 7 percent, and on down to 6 percent, and then leave it at 5 percent, that the use of telephone service is increasing at such a rate that by the time we would reach a 5-percent rate sometime in the future we would in all probability be developing as much revenue then from that rate of tax as we are developing today from a 10-percent rate.

I have reviewed this for the information of the Members. However, I should here point out that I have not been able to reach the conclusion that this excise tax serves to depress the industry that is collecting the tax. It is, of course, a tax upon the consuming public—those who use the telephone service. Naturally they would like to have this tax, as I am sure they would like to have many other taxes that they pay, repealed, so that they would no longer have to pay them. For example, there are other excise taxes in this bill they would like to have repealed or reduced. But I am sure the information I have given the House indicates that the committee has not yet been able to conclude that the reason for a repeal of this tax is the onerous load placed upon the industry itself, or that it serves to defeat growth within the industry itself. I can understand the industry's point of view. I hope that sometime in the future it may be possible for the committee to give attention to the proposal of the industry of graduating the rate of this tax downward over a period of time.

If one would vote against this bill because of his dislike of the telephone tax, for example, one would have to bear in mind also that he would be voting to reduce certain other rates of taxation; that he would be voting against revenue amounting in a full year to more than $4 billion presently coming into the Treasury of the United States.

But again, Mr. Chairman, let us look at what is involved here in the bill in addition to the tax on local telephone service. As I indicated earlier there is a 5-percentage point normal tax paid by corporations involved here. The tax would revert from the 30-percent normal tax rate to the tax we had before the Korean war, which was a 25-percent normal tax. There was at that time and still is a 22-percent surtax on corporate income above $25,000. As I also indicated, in addition to this particular 5 percentage points, which amounts to about $500 million per point—a little bit more than $2½ billion of revenue—there is involved a reduction, if this were not passed, in the tax on distilled spirits from $10.50 per proof gallon to $9; on beer, a drop in the tax from $9 to $8 per barrel; on wines an average of about 11-percent reduction in the varying rates applicable to various kinds of wine; on cigarettes a drop in the tax from 8 cents per package to 7 cents per package. On passenger cars a manufacturer's excise tax of 10 percent is being levied at the present time. If this legislation is not passed that manufacturer's excise tax would revert to 7 percentage points on June 30 of this year. The automobile industry itself has asked, of course, that we not make this 10 percentage points permanent, because they look forward to the day when this tax may be brought down not to just 7 percent but down, perhaps, to as little as 5 percentage points. But at the moment, at this time and in this particular year the automobile industry is enjoying a high level of sales, just as it did last year.

Mr. Chairman, we could not feel that this particular situation justified separate and distinct treatment that we were not according other industries that are also involved in these excise taxes, that are not Korean taxes, that were levied long before the Korean war.

We did not feel justified, therefore, in picking this particular tax out for special treatment.

Automobile parts and accessories are also involved. The tax under existing law is 8 percent. Without this legislation that tax would drop to 5 percent.

In addition, there is involved in this bill the question of a 5 percent excise tax on the amount paid by those using airline services. It will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, that last year we worked out some changes with respect to the tax on travel by passengers. In that year we dropped this tax altogether for travel over railroads, water, and on buses and reduced it from 10 percentage points to 5 percentage points with respect to travel on airlines. At the time we did that we selected this method of continuing a type of user tax on airline service in lieu of then considering all the recommendations which had been handed to the Congress by the President for a tax on jet fuel and perhaps even other things that would be used by the airlines that would serve as a use tax to partly compensate the Government for some of the expenditures incurred in connection with airline transportation safety and matters of that sort. The airline people themselves would much prefer that we continue this 5 percentage points on the amount paid by passengers of airlines than to impose upon them some other or additional type of user tax. There is no question in the minds of the industry about that particular point.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that here we have without the passage of this legislation a revenue loss for the fiscal year 1964 of approximately $2,900 million and a revenue loss for a full year of about $4,200 million.

I think it is quite evident to all that we consider this proposition at this time in a somewhat different atmosphere and under different circumstances altogether than was the case in some of the years in the past. We have before the committee this year, contrary to the situation last year or in the year before, a request from the President of the United States that we make certain adjustments with respect to the rates of taxation affecting individuals as well as corporations. No decisions have been made other than with respect to some substantive parts of the President's proposals other than rates, on a tentative basis, by the Committee on Ways and Means. No definite, final, decisions have been made even with respect to those matters that have been announced by the committee as tentative decisions. But certainly the committee has made no decision with respect to what it will recommend in the way of rate reductions either for corporations or for individuals.

I would think that the more appropriate procedure for the House to follow would be to go along with the recommendation of the committee in this instance. Let us continue these expiring rates for such period of time as we suggest here, to give the House and the other body the opportunity of working their will with respect to the recommendations that the President has placed before the Congress.

Let us leave some leeway so that we can say that the Congress does desire to do something about the corporate rate of taxation, that the Congress thinks that the time has come to get the Government out of the position of being a majority stockholder in the profits of corporations.

Let us say that the Congress has decided the time has come to do something about these very high individual rates of taxation, ranging from 20 percent to 91 percent. If the Congress wants to do that, certainly, the Congress should have that opportunity but if we do not continue these rates of taxation involved here, certainly, the Congress will not have the same opportunity of looking at the overall picture because we are talking here about almost $3 billion of revenues that were anticipated actually in the development of revenues for the purposes of the budget of 1964. If these revenues are not to be continued, in my opinion, we do not have the opportunity, certainly the same opportunity, to pass judgment even on what the Congress will want to do in the overall situation facing the American taxpayer.

I believe it is much better for us to proceed in this manner, to look at the situation with respect to the overall picture and a little later on in this session reach conclusions about reductions of rates in that connection, rather than here today prevent, or tend to prevent, a proper application of such action as we might want to take in reducing rates.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Of course, I must preface my question by saying I am one who would like to see a reduction in taxes, and particularly in these taxes. But may I ask the gentleman this question: With the budget we have now and the expenditures that we are having, am I correct in the assumption that if we should vote against this bill and take these taxes off, that with the expenditures we are facing, it would require the Government to borrow this money and pay interest on it.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. Let me say further in reference to that, because it has its application elsewhere, any time we do not collect within the course of a particular fiscal year through taxation the amount of money that we spend, then we have to borrow it and we have to pay interest on the amount that we borrowed, in order to pay the expenses of Government.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand if we had to borrow this money that that might again occasion the necessity for an increase in the debt limitation?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, there is no doubt about that. If we were to increase the prospective deficit, whatever it is, by such a reduction as this contemplates in this fiscal year, it would add to the size of the debt limit.

Mr. BOW. Then am I correct in assuming that if we are intent upon cuts of this kind in taxation, then to be responsible about it, we have to find some way also to cut budgets and to cut the spending of the Government.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Ohio is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations and I know he diligently applies himself daily to the proposition of trying to find ways and means—if I may use that term—of bringing about reductions in the rate of spending by the Federal Government. To the extent that the gentleman and his committee are successful in that accomplishment, they make it possible in my opinion for the Congress, beginning with the Committee on Ways and Means, to have more room within which to accomplish objectives that have been submitted to the Congress for tax reduction. Certainly, I would feel better about any tax rate reduction being accompanied by a tighter rein on Federal spending.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Had the area redevelopment bill which was considered by the House yesterday been passed, that would have called for nearly a half billion dollars of additional spending; would it not?

Mr. MILLS. May I say to my colleague, I find my time has been so taken up with consideration of methods and ways to try to figure out how to relieve the taxpayers of some of these rates of taxation, I am going to have to rely upon my friend's opinion as to the total amount involved. Yes it is around $450 million.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I say close to a half billion dollars.

Mr. MILLS. All right.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, we will not quarrel in this case over $5 million or so, or $50 million or so.

Mr. MILLS. My friend and I never quarrel over anything; never.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means indicated a little earlier that the 5 percent tax on telephone service was not desirable from the standpoint of the telephone industry.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I indicated the industry would prefer that it be reduced.

Mr. FINDLEY. And has now proved to be an onerous burden upon the industry.

Mr. MILLS. No; I used—pardon me, but I used the suggestion and recommendation that that had come about from certain people within the industry for a gradual reduction in the rate. Their statement to me about the amount of revenue we would get under these lower rates, at least to me, has indicated that the industry was growing and extending more telephone service daily and that we could not point to this particular industry as one that was depressed necessarily as a result of this tax.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, in view of that and in view of the further need for additional revenue did the committee in its consideration of this bill give any serious thought to increasing the rate on telephone services?

Mr. MILLS. No; the committee did not. The committee gave consideration to the possibility of gradually reducing this rate, as the gentleman from Tennessee observed during consideration of the rule, but we did not give any consideration in connection with this bill to any further increase in any of these taxes. We did not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the House will agree with the Committee on Ways and Means and approve H.R. 6755.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I supported the rule. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this matter is ready for the consideration of the House. However, I would like to point out what I feel to be the function of a member of a committee and, indeed, the function of a committee of the House of Representatives, and that is to try to elucidate, to try to bring out the factors and the views that pertain to an issue so that the House can make its decision.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is important to dwell a little bit upon that function, because I find that many committees are going along the road of feeling that their purpose is to make the decisions for the House and, therefore, to try to gather together the various viewpoints within the committee so that they can come onto the floor of the House with a unanimous approach. Then, the technique of debate on the floor becomes one really of concealing information rather than bringing it out, and concealing honest differences of opinion rather than bringing them out.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the Committee on Ways and Means has done an adequate job of studying this matter and bringing the issue to the House in the majority report. I might say also that our chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], in his usual excellent fashion, has presented the situation. However, I want to call attention to the minority views which are signed by six Members, the object of which not being one of trying to necessarily defeat this bill, although it is our recommendation that it should be. We try to spell out the reasons and to bring out some of the basic points that are involved.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we have a practical matter to consider. The executive department has already decided that we should have a tax cut. The Committee on Ways and Means is already in the process of considering this tax cut. If we are practical men and women—and I know we are—with the majority of the committee being 15 to 10 Democrats against Republicans, and the Democrats naturally wanting to support their administration—in this climate where the executive is the one which does the suggesting rather than legislation being initiated here in the Congress, the decision has been largely made for us that there is going to be a tax cut bill.

All of this talk about having to have expenditure reform before you have a tax cut is out of the window, so far as the administration is concerned. I adhere to that position as strong as I know how. I think it is a dangerous thing to pursue a course of having tax cuts anywhere without some knowledge of expenditure reform coming about. It certainly does not behoove the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means or this administration to advance any argument along the line of not cutting taxes before expenditures are cut.

I refer to the minority viewpoint that speaks about the morality involved in this matter. There is a moral obligation at issue here. When a decision has been made to cut taxes, obviously the taxes that must be cut first or eliminated are those that were imposed on a temporary basis to meet a specific need. These taxes we have before us today we imposed on a 2-year basis to meet the needs of the Korean war. They have been continued on an annual basis 10 times by this Congress on the theory that we needed the revenue. I might say I have supported that proposition each time, because indeed we did need the revenue if we were not going to exercise expenditure reform.

I think I have always been a member of the so-called economy bloc doing my best with my votes and with my voice to persuade the Congress that we need to exercise expenditure reform, and yet I have gone ahead and said, yes, we must raise these taxes, and as the chairman of the committee pointed out, if we do not raise the money in the form of taxes, then we have to borrow the money.

Does morality mean anything to us in the Congress these days? I wonder. Here we are talking about cutting taxes and the administration says we must do so for the benefit of our economy although we do not have expenditure reform. They come in and say, cut the permanent taxes and extend the temporary cuts. How can the people of the country believe us if we in the future say we are only going to impose a tax on a temporary basis?

I happen to think morals are important. That is one thing, if anything, that bothers me about the future of our country. I refer to the seeming lack of understanding of this point. We in politics know what a pledge means or is supposed to mean. Has it reached the point where we openly and avowedly renege on our pledges? Mind you, this is in the terms of a tax cut. The administration says we must cut taxes.

Let me point out another inconsistency of the administration's position on this bill. As set out in the minority views, there is the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of this extension of the Korean excise and the corporate tax increase.

This becomes perhaps a little bit complicated, but it is a very important thing because the President's tax message on tax cuts emphasizes the need for a balance between the investment dollar and the consumer dollar. Indeed, the President's Council of Economic Advisers has emphasized heavily the importance of releasing money into the consumer purchasing power area by releasing consumer taxation, taxation on the consumer dollar, and has gone to a very refined and, I might say, questionable economic theory of the multiplier effect on the economy that the release of a tax on the consumer presumably will have on our economy. Now, whatever balance we work out in a tax cut bill which may come out of the Committee on Ways and Means, there is going to be some balance. There is going to be a cut on the investment dollar and there is going to be a cut on the consumer dollar, and there must be some balance. I know no one disagrees that there should be a balance. The argument is, where you balance up; how much to the consumer dollar; how much to the investment dollar.

Now, read Secretary Dillon's testimony when he said:

> The automatic excise tax reductions are particularly inconsistent with the decision of the President that tax revision to stimulate economic growth and increase taxpayer equity first requires removal of the strong check on initiative and investment inherent in present income tax rates.

These taxes that we have before us happen to be consumer taxes, and the Secretary of the Treasury is now telling the Congress—and I assume he speaks with authority for the administration—that any reduction in taxes on the consumer side is inconsistent with the decision that the President has made. Let me say that the excise taxes of $1.7 billion in here are consumer taxes and the impact falls on the low-income consumer in the same proportion that it hits any other income bracket consumer in our country. But, in theory, take any Federal income tax, it does not hit the lowest income bracket, because those people are not taxpayers. And, here we have the political party that has professed to be the party of the little man coming out and saying that a tax cut on the consumer level, that will really get to the lowest income group, is inconsistent with the theory that the President has decided to pursue.

One other point was made insofar as the initial imposition of transportation and communication taxes; part of the Korean war taxes. The point relates to the theory of allocating our resources; it was not entirely just to raise revenue. It was to deter the use of some of these economic facilities, communications and transportation in particular. Now, here is a tax reduction proposal that the President has given to the Congress seeking primarily to stimulate the economy, to stimulate economic activity. Well, by any logical sequence, the very first taxes we should remove would be those we set in to impede. So, not only do we have a moral problem of removing these taxes that went on for commitment reasons but also for good economic reasons.

Now I come to another point and the one that disturbs me most, and I think it disturbs the people on my side of the aisle and those on the Democratic side of the aisle who are concerned about expenditures. In our report we say:

> Congress can force a modicum of expenditure reform by not passing this tax increase bill.

Then I want to read what we say:

> Many people have argued that the only way to bring about expenditure reform is to first reduce the revenues—cut the taxes.

Now, I have not agreed with that point of view. The report goes on to say:

> There is merit to this statement but only when control is being exercised over the authority of the Federal Government to issue more Federal bonds in lieu of the lost tax revenues.

Now, is there this discipline over the executive department to sell the bonds, I say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. Bow]?

The answer is "Yes." Even though we did not follow the Republican recommendation in the House and in Congress to hold the debt ceiling to $305 billion, to exercise real discipline, the $307 billion and the $309 billion which it goes onto August 31, as the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], of course, told the House, was not a loose ceiling. Indeed, it was tight, and there was no question about it. If this House saw fit to turn this bill down, this tax increase bill, here is what would happen. Expenditure reform would come. Mind you, this is another point. Oh, you can turn semantics around and say that this bill is simply extending taxes, but let us face it, this is a tax increase bill over our permanent tax base. Only by affirmative action do these taxes go up. This is a tax increase bill. If we fail to increase these taxes here today, the executive department is going to have to exercise expenditure reform because the executive department under the debt ceiling cannot sell more bonds.

Secretary Dillon said this to me in answer to my interrogation in the Committee on Ways and Means on this particular matter. He said with a smile, "Oh, Congressman, if you do this we are not going to have to do anything about expenditure reform until late in August. This is not going to put the bite on us."

I said, "No, Mr. Secretary, you are right and I am very pleased you make the point because it does take planning to exercise good expenditure cutting." If we force it on overnight we would create some real economic damage, but if this House should take this action today and if the administration came before us, as it must anyway, whatever we do, in August, and told this House it has not exercised expenditure reform and had not set up planning so that expenditure cutbacks could be made, the President of the United States would be guilty of the grossest sort of fiscal irresponsibility.

So I say this is a technique—we do not have many and it is not the best, but it is a technique—for exercising expenditure reform.

Just as I tried to point out in the debt ceiling legislation that was before us, the President does have considerable leeway in his expenditure rate. He has requested $108 billion in new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, and he has a carryover amount from previous authorizations of $87 billion, giving him a total authority to spend $195 billion. He has told us his expenditure rate for fiscal year 1964 will be $99 billion roughly. In other words, he has some leeway, not as great as those gross figures sound, but nevertheless some leeway in cutting the expenditure rate back. All this cutback here today would mean would be an insistence on an expenditure rate for fiscal 1964 back to the 1963 expenditure level of $94 billion. This is entirely within reason.

Then the final point is this: Of course, the way to go about this expenditure reform is through our appropriation techniques, and as the Congress did yesterday on authorization bills. But we have found over a period of time in the Congress, and knowing the will of the majority party, which does not desire to exercise expenditure reform, we must do certain things. The President himself said he does not intend to exercise expenditure reform, and in good faith, because he believes according to his economic theory that the expenditures cannot be cut. This is a basic difference of economic philosophy which the administration and the majority party in the House are espousing, but I know there are many people on the Democratic side of the aisle who disagree.

And yet we find it difficult to cut back on these individual appropriation bills in an adequate fashion. We are always going to have this problem, that the programs are desirable, most of them are, and the big problem of expenditure reform is deciding priorities among desirable programs, and recognizing that you cannot do it or all of them at the same time. We have no machinery in the Congress—we should develop it, but we do not have it—for establishing program priorities, through the proper way, the best way, through the appropriation techniques, so that we can keep our authorization and expenditure levels to a certain figure.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. As the gentleman in the well knows, for the past 10 years, under the previous administration and this administration I have gone along and voted for this legislation on the ground that each administration has promised they will make an honest attempt to balance the budget. Our present President so indicated in many campaign speeches in 1960, that he would balance the budget. However, in view of the statements the gentleman has just made in the well of the House, and the fact that the administration has reversed itself and is directing itself toward planned deficit spending, I cannot see on the ground of morality, which the gentleman mentioned a minute ago, how I can vote to continue these taxes; that is, in the face of a planned deficit and with no attempt being made to balance the budget.

I think the will of the American people and the desire of the American people have been indicated that we do balance the budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I think his observations are exactly correct. This is a proper technique for those of us who believe that expenditure reform is necessary for us to bring about this kind of discipline. It is an opportunity for those of us who disagree with the theory of planned deficits, not just for the fiscal year 1964—the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, has made it clear that his theory of planned deficits will go on at least into the fiscal year 1967. So here is the time for the Congress, for this House, if they disagree with this economic theory, to express themselves by a negative vote.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend both the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] for their articulate presentation of the contents of this bill. It is my observation that both of these gentlemen are after similar objectives. There appears to be a simple difference of opinion as to how, when, and where to cut taxes. I am certain that each has a logical reason for his position because each of them is among the most knowledgeable and respected Members of this House. Thank God for their presence.

In view of my previous experience at a lower level of government, I have listened intently to the presentations and conclude that both gentlemen recognize the need for a revision of our tax structure; both gentlemen agree on the prudence of a balanced budget; both gentlemen are concerned about the threat of bankruptcy with the continuing deficit spending concept; both gentlemen agree, as I do, that the way to continued growth and prosperity is to "pull the bit out of the mouth of private enterprise" by releasing tax sources back to poor old John Q. Taxpayer and in so doing give him a raise for his labors.

In conclusion, a paramount factor blossoms forth after hearing this presentation—it is simply a matter of timing. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] wants to cut taxes now—when the opportunity is presented to the Members of the House, and the very able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], having the responsibility of defending the administration even though I am convinced he does not agree with the economic theory of the President's advisers, has asked for more time to prepare a broader tax reform. I somehow get the feeling that the time is also required to convince the administration's economic theorists that their philosophy has been in error, as stated in a recent editorial of Life magazine.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, I see on the ticker that the President has stated that he is going to give the Congress another chance to act on the extension of the area redevelopment program. That is another reason why we should take the kind of action to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the President have the right to move to reconsider the vote that we had yesterday?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. He says he is going to give the Congress another chance.

Mr. CURTIS. No Member has the right to move to reconsider. But I suppose the President, under his concept of Executive authority, believes he has that right.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take this opportunity to compliment him for the very excellent statement that he has made to the House today.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. The wisdom he has shown with reference to this problem, I am sure, warrants the consideration of his views by every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today reminds me of those "who-done-its" we see on television, with the little statement at the end of the program proclaiming that "this story is true, only the names have been changed to protect the innocent." But in this case, only the dates have been changed to protect the innocent Members of Congress who refuse to face the issues involved on a permanent basis.

The Tax Rate Extension Act before us is the same as we have seen before. In fact, every year for some time now we enact this so-called temporary extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. Always for 1 year. Always evading the decision we some day must make.

I am particularly concerned this year, because this is a year when we have heard much about the desirability of cutting taxes to give the American people increased spending power. It just does not make sense to even consider the problems of taxation while we continue to extend emergency wartime taxes that should have been allowed to expire long ago or made permanent features of our tax program. The tax levies in the bill today will expire July 1 of this year, unless we take action before that time. So what we are actually doing is voting on a bill to increase taxes, which is strange behavior at a time when the administration advocates tax reduction.

We are told that it would be desirable to lower corporate tax rates this year. But this bill increases the corporate tax rate from 47 percent to 52 percent. This hardly appears consistent.

Turning to the list of products or services in this bill that would have their excise tax rates increased, I am a bit at a loss to explain the relationship or similarity of the items. I find it difficult to consider passenger cars and essential telephone services along with liquor and cigarettes. It seems to me that we have lumped essential services and luxuries under one great heading, perhaps for the purpose of making the bill easier to pass, since it is difficult to get anyone, including myself, to vote against an excise tax on such things as liquor and cigarettes.

The minority report on this bill, however, makes a good point in this respect. The State and local governments have long depended on liquor and cigarettes as items to be taxed to raise revenues. The Federal Government, through such emergency and temporary tax programs as this, have usurped many of the areas normally held to be available for local use. Many States would benefit from this added source if the Federal Government released its grip. In my native Minnesota, for instance, the price of cigarettes was raised this year by an additional cent a pack, and would undoubtedly welcome Federal removal from the scene.

From the standpoint of stimulating business, the auto manufacturers certainly would benefit if we allowed the 10 percent tax to fall to its normal 7 percent.

Perhaps the greatest injustice is in the excise taxes on telephone, telegraph, and related communications services. This 10-percent tax was imposed in 1941 to discourage the use of these essential services in time of war and to produce revenue for the emergency effort. But the effect now is to place these companies at a disadvantage in competing for business and capital by discouraging the public from using their facilities. It should not be necessary to point out that telephone service is a necessity, not a luxury like some of the other items in this bill. In fact, it is the only household utility subject to a Federal excise tax. To lump it together with cigarettes and alcoholic beverages is a gross injustice.

The tax on a household telephone bill in 1 year amounts to more than a whole month's average bill. This money could be put into circulation to spur the economy, and would enable the communications companies to expand and create jobs by encouraging the public to use their services.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take another look at this bill before us today and not to pass it out of yearly habit, but to give it long and proper consideration. If every item in this bill is absolutely necessary, then it should be incorporated into permanent tax revision. It makes no sense to talk tax reduction on the one hand and tax increase on the other without an overall plan.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the pending legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], and his most illuminating discourse on H.R. 6755.

In the hope that I am a responsible Member of this House and with a full understanding that if this Congress continues to vote increased appropriations then necessary revenues must be provided, it is most difficult to arrive at a proper decision as to how to cast a vote on this measure.

At the outset I wish to point out that from the very beginning of this session, I for one have consistently voted against excessive Government spending.

It is then with a clear conscience that I feel justified in voting against this bill. I agree with my colleague from Missouri that a yes vote for this bill in essence is voting for a tax increase.

The administration has been talking about a need for tax reductions; well, I feel this is an opportunity to assist the administration.

Furthermore, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] there is a most critical moral obligation involved in this issue. These tax measures we are discussing today are tax rates which were sold to the American people as temporary measures.

I should like to ask when does a temporary measure become a permanent measure? How much longer are we going to continue to kid the American people?

If we are to reduce taxes then let us first reduce some of these so-called temporary taxes. Why vote to cut permanent taxes later in this session and at the same time vote today to extend temporary taxes.

This just does not make sense to me—it seems we are placing the cart before the horse. I agree the proposed budget for fiscal 1964 is already seriously out of balance and I suppose there will be those who will say if you vote against this bill you will throw the balance further out of balance.

In answer to this I should like to say if we cannot defeat appropriation bills then perhaps if we defeat this bill we can slow down spending by shutting off revenues.

Because, I believe the defeat of this measure will help the small taxpayer.

Because, I believe the defeat of this bill will help release money for the expansion of business and industry, and last but not least the moral issues involved in the matter I feel compelled to vote no.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, last February 25, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the 16th amendment, I made some remarks which in retrospect have some bearing on H.R. 6755 which provides a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and also of certain excise tax rates.

I said this:

> When, Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, the deterrent to business and industrial expansion and growth by killing profit incentive began. I suggest that if the current movement to repeal the 16th amendment should prevail, the machinery of business in this country would start to hum and employment would increase as never before in the lifetime of any of us.

This statement which I have quoted along with some other similar remarks were interpreted, Mr. Chairman, by a possibly not too attentive representative of the press to mean I had announced myself for the repeal of the income tax. In fact, since then I frequently see myself listed as such. The trouble is no one has read the text of that speech carefully. But be that as it may, I did mean and I do clearly state that a substantial cut in the corporation tax would stimulate business.

President Kennedy has stressed the need for immediate tax reduction, yet he only proposes a cut in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 50 percent for the calendar year 1964 and a further cut to 47 percent for the calendar year 1965.

As to this latter proposal in my judgment it would take effect too late and would be far too little. But since the administration is unwilling to reduce Government expenditures so as to justify a tax cut I can see why it would follow a too little and too late policy.

Congress, I certainly hope, will take a different view and substantially reduce the President's budget of expenses. Already the House has made some major cuts and there seems to be a reasonable basis to hope that a net cut of several billions of dollars will result.

As I understand the full year effect of disallowing the extension of the tax rates in this bill is $4.1 billion of which $2.3 billion revenue loss would result from the corporate income tax. If this bill passes there would be little or no prospect of any immediate corporation tax cut. If the bill is defeated, on the other hand, any loss in Government revenue due to failure to extend present excise tax rates could be incorporated in a subsequent bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, so what I am talking about and what I favor is a $2.3 billion corporate tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, when similar legislation to extend the Korean war temporary normal tax rate has been considered in the past I have raised the point that when business is taxed in excess of 50 percent, business in effect is more than 50 percent socialized. I have strongly opposed the continuation of this temporary emergency rate and accordingly I shall vote against the bill. I hope the bill will be defeated.

The Committee on Ways and Means is making a study of the entire tax picture and considering tax reforms and other complicated tax problems. I favor allowing the Korean war corporation taxes to expire as they were supposed to expire years ago. Defeat of this bill will give business a big boost and then next let us consider all angles to the tax picture in one omnibus tax reduction and reform bill. The 52 percent rate for a corporation is too high. I hope, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6755 does not pass.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we are here once more to perform our annual function of extending the taxes which were imposed to raise funds to help liquidate expenses incurred by the Korean war. This matter has been brought up for the last 10 sessions of Congress.

I know a lot of people want taxes reduced; all of us do. I also would like to see taxes reduced.

President Kennedy in his special message on tax reduction and reform stated:

> Our economy is checkreined today by a war-born tax system at a time when it is far more in need of the spur than the bit.

In order that we may follow this line of reasoning I believe that the first step of Congress would be to remove the excise taxes which are due to expire on July 1, 1963. This is one means of placing additional money into hands of the ordinary taxpayer. The removal of these wartime excise taxes would enable the people of our country to purchase certain goods and services without the additional tax rates imposed on them by the present excise tax legislation.

It is my belief that tax reductions result in increased business profits which gives us more tax revenue. This is due to the fact that the elimination of taxes, no matter what they may be, gives the people of our country additional purchasing power and which in turn stimulates all phases of our economy.

Coming from the State of Michigan, particularly from an area which produces the largest number of automobiles, I am greatly concerned with the manufacturer's excise tax on the sales price of passenger cars, trucks, parts and accessories. If this Congress permits, and I hope it does, to have the automobile taxes revert to their previous levels, I am sure that the automotive industry will continue to have the high production which it presently enjoys.

I rise to record my protest against the extension of the 10-percent automobile manufacturer's excise tax. As you know, this discriminatory tax was increased from 7 to 10 percent in November 1951 and was added only as a temporary measure. On July 1, 1963, it will revert to 7 percent unless the House takes affirmative action to again extend it for the 10th time.

To be sure, the need for revenue still exists, but I believe that there are other ways which are more equitable to raise revenue than through penalizing the Nation's No. 1 industry. With its related industries, the automotive industry employs one out of every seven workers in the United States. One of every six businesses is in the automotive field and approximately 22 percent of all retail sales are automotive.

The automobile, in our present state of economy, is no longer a luxury but a necessity, and it is shown by statistics that in many cases, one-car families of yesteryear are now two- and three-car families. The only justification that I can see for the continuance of taxes on automobiles is the cry "that we need the money."

Many other luxury items which are not required as a daily necessity to life are not taxed at the maximum rates. However, we are asked to extend the 10-percent automotive excise tax for another year.

For that matter, it is a well-known fact that price plays a leading role in an individual's decision whether he should buy an automobile or any other item. A high price may discourage a man who wishes to buy a new car but a lower price may be an incentive to him to purchase one.

It has been shown, in recent reports, that the average annual income of a new car buyer was in the neighborhood of $7,500 to $8,000. These persons bear the extra burden of taxation because they find it necessary to use their cars going to and from work, and for other essential purposes in their daily life, which is reflected in the additional tax which they must pay through the purchase of additional gasoline.

I think it is high time that we, as Members of Congress, take a long and closer scrutiny at the continued extension of these nuisance taxes. These taxes are a source of irritation as well as a burden to our businessmen. Taxes of this nature affect the taxpayers in all income brackets. I know that the taxpaying public is willing to withstand almost anything; however, I feel that their patience has reached the limit.

It is my belief that the automobile excise tax is not in the national interest, and I urge its prompt repeal.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, of course, none of us really enjoys asking the Congress to reenact these excise taxes, but the fiscal state of the country at this time demands that we take this action. There are some of these taxes that the committee should take another look at, at the earliest practicable moment.

The excise tax on communications which was originally designed to discourage the use of an essential service during wartime as well as to help raise revenues for the war effort is one of the taxes that should command our attention. This is one tax which if it is taken off will redound directly to the benefit of the customer. There is no way that a regulated company can raise its rates and get the benefit of a tax reduction in this area.

In my judgment, the time has long passed when there should be any discouragement of the use of communications services, particularly now when the effort of Government and industry is to increase the overall economic growth of the country.

The committee has from time to time considered the repeal of these taxes, but in every instance has acceded to the request of the Treasury officials to continue the tax unchanged because of the unfavorable effect of reducing revenues upon the Federal budget. Obviously, there will never be a time when any reduction of revenues will be acceptable to everyone. I shall, therefore, propose in connection with next year's bill, and I believe and trust the proposal will meet the approval of the members of the committee and of the Treasury, that beginning next year we reduce the 10-percent tax on communications 1 percent and that proportionate reductions be made each year thereafter until the tax is entirely removed. By adopting this method, the impact on Federal revenues will be minimal, as our natural growth will increase the Government's take enough to offset a 1-percent reduction in the tax.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 6755 for a number of reasons.

This legislation extends taxes that were originally passed during the Korean conflict and have been extended on a year by year basis since the termination of that conflict; in keeping with the promises made during the Congress which imposed these taxes we should abolish the taxes because they were excise taxes and not supposed to extend beyond the Korean war.

If we have to depend on this sort of tax for revenue, and apparently we would, we should face the issue and either make the tax permanent or abolish it. In any event, we should meet the issue head on.

For many years now I have tried to accomplish the abolition of the tax on telephone service. This is the only public service which we do tax and the American people are entitled to have this tax on service exempted.

This tax bill came in under closed rule. All tax bills have been coming in under closed rule and it is my opinion that the American people are denied the right of full discussion by the use of the closed rule.

For these reasons I intend to vote against the tax as proposed.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill for two reasons:

First. The legislative history of this legislation is that H.R. 6755 involves taxes which were increased at the time of the Korean war for the specific purpose of raising the money to prosecute that war. The Korean war has been over for a decade.

Page 1 of the committee report No. 370, which accompanies H.R. 6755, makes substantially this statement.

Second. If it is necessary to retain the present high rates of these taxes for the operation of the General Government, it then would seem preferable to present legislation to make such taxes permanent or to let such taxes revert to pre-Korean war rates.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I join in commending the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his excellent economic remarks. He is a student of economics, and has been a valuable member of the committee for the past 10½ years. I have the highest regard for TOM CURTIS. However, I shall vote contrary to him today. I will vote for this bill, as much as I would like to vote against it.

I will tell you why I am going to vote for it and why I urge you to do likewise.

No. 1, we are facing an $11 billion deficit in fiscal 1964. If we do not pass this bill, you add $3 billion to that. That is the first reason. As far as I am concerned, that is sufficient reason.

Our committee is in the process of reporting to this House a tax bill. Regardless of what many people are saying, you are going to have a tax bill. We will report it to you. I can speak only for myself, but I think I know something about it. We will report a tax bill to you I would say in the next 3 weeks. If it goes on as it is now it will be a good tax bill and I shall support it. I reserve the right to oppose it if a lot of things are put into it I think should not be put into it. So far we are getting along well with the tax bill. So my No. 1 reason for voting for the bill and recommending that you vote for it is that we cannot afford another $4.2 billion deficit superimposed on that deficit.

The second reason is, if we do not pass this bill today, in my opinion you will not have any tax bill. There are two reasons. I say the second reason is that I do not believe the Committee on Ways and Means will report a bill to you or a general tax cut if this bill is defeated. I do not intend to, the way I feel about it. If I had my way, and we were not going to report to you a tax cut bill—which I am confident we will—and as I say, I am speaking only for myself, but I have been on the committee now 10½ years and I think I know a little something about it, what I would do in this bill; I would let the corporate rate drop from 52 to 47 percent. I would leave the distilled spirits at $10.50 a gallon. I would leave beer at $9 a barrel. I would leave the wines at the present rate of 11 percent. I would leave cigarettes at 8 cents a pack instead of reducing that, and I smoke them. I would reduce passenger cars from 10 to 5 percent. I would reduce automobile parts and accessories from 8 to 5 percent. I would cut out the telephone tax entirely, take the tax off entirely. And I would take off the tax on transportation of persons by air.

You may say I have certainly torn up the bill. Well, I have, but I am going to vote for the bill exactly as it is for the two reasons I gave.

As an individual member of the committee, may I say that we have worked for weeks and weeks and weeks on these tax matters. I think we started hearings the second week in January. We have heard two or three hundred witnesses in public hearings, the best economists and business people in America. We have been in executive session morning and afternoon for 8 or 10 weeks, something of the kind, and we have 3 more weeks of it. I say we are going to have a good tax bill. I am going to make this prediction, still speaking personally, that we may bring you a tax bill here that will not cost you a dime.

We may bring you a tax bill here that will not cost a bit of revenue. In fact, I rather think we will, if we adopt the right kind of rate schedule and the right kind of phasing and timing, and some additional revenue measures that you will hear about later. We can well bring you a tax bill in the nature of a substantial tax cut with a new rate schedule for individuals and corporations that will not entail any revenue loss. Then over a period of 2 or 3 years, in my opinion, it would result in a gain of revenue of billions and billions of dollars. That is the history of it. When Canada cut their individual and corporate rates, in the very first year they collected more money than they did under the old rates. That happened just a few years ago.

With that, my colleagues, I will conclude, stating again that I shall vote for this bill and I hope you will do likewise.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. In order to make certain that the record is complete with reference to the observation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] with regard to the question of the President's statement and how he was going to have his way of getting another vote up on the Area Redevelopment Act, which was before the House yesterday, to me it is rather obvious how that can be done. Probably, what he is talking about are those bills that have already been introduced both in the House and in the other body which would increase the authorization for accelerated public works from $900 million, in some bills, to $1,400 million, a portion of which is Area Redevelopment Act and, therefore, would not require increased use of authorization. So I do not think there is any question about how it is going to be done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply wanted to pick up the one point you made, that if this were defeated, this would be the end of another tax bill. It may be. But I do not think so because the bulk of the losses in this bill, is $2.4 billion, which is a 5-percent corporate tax cut, which, of course, would be part of the other bill. So I think we would be talking about the $1.7 billion of excise losses which would be an alternate bill, I think. But I think there would be other reasons, if I might make that observation to the gentleman.

Mr. BAKER. I will agree with the gentleman except that we will unquestionably cut corporate rates if we cut individual rates.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he would not agree with me, with those who see the possibility of some degree of expenditure control, or greater control through the vehicle of reducing revenues, that probably the better place to exercise that doctrine is with respect to a proposal that might come from the Committee on Ways and Means, making adjustments not only in the corporate rates but adjustments in individual rates as well rather than to do it here where we have a few selected excise taxes plus the 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Mr. BAKER. I certainly do. With reference to the excise tax on cosmetics, for example—and I will get a plug in for the ladies here—that is a necessity of life and I would not want to repeal the tax on liquor and let the ladies still have to pay the tax on cosmetics. That would be unfair, discriminatory and highly unpopular.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I know that my colleague does not want to put me in the position of being against the ladies, but let me say to my chairman, that the difference is that these corporate taxes that we are talking about now were imposed temporarily. We have this moral issue and, certainly, from the economic standpoint we should cut off all excises. I agree. But these were considered together because they were put on temporarily for specific purposes.

Mr. BAKER. I think the cosmetics tax involves a moral issue too.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield again to me?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLS. I would like the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I am sure my friend from Missouri would agree with me that if we are reducing taxes for economic reasons there might be some that are not in this package.

Mr. CURTIS. Very much so.

Mr. MILLS. Some which would attract us more than those that are presently here; not all of them, but some.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree, but we have got the moral issue involved in this particular package.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, once again I rise to protest against that portion of this bill which extends for yet another year the automotive excise taxes on passenger cars, parts, and accessories and to voice my deep concern about our tax policies that are perpetuating inequity and, in my judgment, hold back economic growth and greater employment.

The extension of the temporary Korean war taxes has become an annual exercise to which we devote a day and then forget for another year. Our action reminds me of the hole in the roof: it cannot be patched while it is raining, and when the sun is shining there is no need to fix it. We cannot let go of the money when we need it so badly to finance the Federal Government and when business and production are good, it is said there is no need to reduce taxes.

As usual, as part of this annual routine, we have another closed rule prohibiting any amendment which would permit the House to work its will with respect to the application of the individual taxes that this bill is extending on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. And also, as in past years, we find tobacco, corporations, automobiles, travel, liquor, beer, and wine all in the same tax barrel.

But if, over the years, extending these temporary taxes has become a routine matter, the climate in which we are considering the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 is a bit different from what it was when we passed the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962. This year, the legislative environment is even more clouded with inconsistencies than before. There is more concern today about stimulating the economy, about tax reduction; yes, and about tax reform. You will recall that in his state of the Union message the President said:

> It is increasingly clear that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits, and employment [and] now checks growth.

You will also remember that in his message he called for tax cuts of \$13½ billion to stimulate economic growth. But just 3 days later, in sending the budget to Congress, the administration asked that the discriminatory 10-percent temporary wartime excise tax on automobiles be extended for another year. Thus the administration is asking for tax cuts to spur the economy and simultaneously requesting the extension of a tax specifically designed to curtail production. This reasoning is beyond my comprehension. It is inconsistent for us to talk on one hand of our support of economic growth while on the other hand we continue repressive taxation through the annual extension of the automobile excise tax. To translate such an inconsistency into our jargon today I would say that we are in the middle of the countdown in a concerted effort to send our economy soaring—and now just before blast off—we are giving the signal to fire the retrorockets while we are still on the pad. How can we go forward and backward at the same time? If we are asked to cut taxes to perk up economic growth, how can we in reason, respond by extending and increasing selective taxes on our most important manufacturing community?

As you perhaps know, this tax was increased to 10 percent in November 1951 as a temporary measure and has been extended annually since 1954. If we do not extend it again today, it will, under present law, revert to 7 percent on June 30. As the minority views so logically point out on page 15 of the report:

> Expiration of tax rate increases imposed temporarily for 2 years to meet a specific crisis cannot be properly referred to as tax reduction. Quite the contrary, any bill to continue these temporary rate increases can only be regarded as bills to increase taxes. If Congress does nothing the temporary increases expire as they were planned and promised, and the regular tax rates go into effect again. Any action the Congress takes is action to increase the normal tax rates. So the bill before the House is a tax increase bill, make no mistake about it, just as the 10 bills which preceded it to continue the Korean wartime rates for just another year were tax increase bills.

May I remind those who are looking for congressional action to stimulate our economy, that the original purpose in increasing the automotive tax from 7 to 10 percent in 1951 was to divert our industrial capacity from the production of passenger automobiles to the needs of our war effort. It was the express intent to discourage demand and depress sales by increasing excise taxes.

I would like to outline briefly for the record the history of the Federal tax rates on new passenger automobiles from 1917 to date:

Excise tax rate on manufacturer's selling price

Effective date:	*Percent*
Oct. 4, 1917	3
Feb. 25, 1919	5
Mar. 28, 1926	3
May 29, 1928	--
June 21, 1932	3
July 1, 1940	3½
Oct. 1, 1941	7
Nov. 1, 1951, to date	10

But while the 10 percent auto excise tax has remained unchanged since the Korean war, Congress has since that time reduced or repealed numerous other so-called temporary taxes. In 1954, we reduced excise taxes on refrigerators, electric gas and oil appliances, jewelry, cameras, sporting goods, local telephone service, and many other items including general admission taxes. In 1958, we repealed the excise taxes on transportation of freight and the movement of oil by pipeline.

Last year, we repealed the 10-percent tax on rail and bus fares and reduced the 10-percent tax on air travel to 5 percent. The automobile is the principal consumer durable which is still subject to tax at its wartime rates. Twelve years will soon have elapsed since the current 10-percent rate was first imposed and 22 years have elapsed since the rate was increased from 3½ to 7 percent to meet the needs of World War II. The time is long overdue for a reduction in the wartime automotive excise taxes and rather than extending these rates for yet another year, today we should be reducing them. As the minority views of the report point out:

> There is a moral obligation to remove tax rates which were sold to the people and to the Congress as temporary tax rates before the Congress can justifiably consider reducing rates which are part of our permanent tax laws.

Let me turn briefly to one of the most frequent arguments I hear against the reduction or repeal of this tax and that is what I call the good year argument. After all, some say, aren't automobile sales breaking records this year? I would like to meet this head on. Yes, it is true, and we should all be glad it is, automobiles are having a splendid year. In fact, this year is better than last and that was the best year since the alltime record of 1955. But let us look just a little beyond gross sales and see what this has meant to our economy, for the Congress is deeply concerned with unemployment and its economic and social consequences. Yes, automobiles have had a good year, and you should know what this has done to eliminate unemployment. I asked the Secretary of Labor to designate the largest automobile producing centers in the Nation and compare unemployment today with unemployment 2 years ago. Here are the statistical facts the Secretary furnished.

Total unemployment rate for major automobile manufacturing areas, March 1961 and March 1963

	Unemployment rate		Percent drop
	March 1961	March 1963	
Trenton, N.J	8.2	6.5	1.7
Chicago, Ill	6.8	5.0	1.8
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa	8.6	6.8	1.8
Indianapolis, Ind	6.3	4.3	2.0
Pittsburgh, Pa	12.7	9.4	3.3
Birmingham, Ala	8.7	5.4	3.3
Canton, Ohio	11.6	7.8	3.8
Toledo, Ohio	9.9	6.0	3.9
Akron, Ohio	9.3	5.3	4.0
Youngstown, Ohio	11.8	7.8	4.0
Cleveland, Ohio	9.6	5.5	4.1
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky	15.0	10.8	4.2
Kenosha, Wis	8.7	3.5	5.2
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	12.0	6.0	6.0
Detroit, Mich	15.2	6.0	9.2
Lansing, Mich	14.8	3.7	11.1
Flint, Mich	23.3	2.9	20.4
U.S. average	7.7	6.3	1.4

Here we have a definite example of how automobile sales and production have spurred activity for the Nation's greatest economic community. Where I come from everyone is happy to have smoke coming from our factory chimneys. Our people want to work. They are glad to work. Last year was a good year. This is a good year. But what about next year? Can next year always be better than last? Will production fall off? And if it does, what will it mean to our national economy? The question is whether we are willing to surrender a relatively small amount of tax revenue in an effort to insure a high sales level and permit our economy to operate more freely or whether we are going to insist on keeping this emergency brake on, and then appropriate more funds to help mitigate the misery caused by our insistence to continue a depressive discriminatory tax. And when I speak of this tax as an emergency brake that is exactly what this tax is, a brake that Congress applied for a specific emergency. Sure it might mean the loss of some revenue; the committee report estimates the loss to be about \$450 million if we refuse to extend this tax. But think of the hundreds of millions we have authorized for unemployment compensation, job retraining, pump priming public work projects, for area redevelopment projects, and now we are talking about another CCC program, to help relieve unemployment? What is wrong with encouraging jobs? Is it not time we try to find and treat the cause of unemployment rather than to wait to deal with the effects of unemployment? It is fundamental that if prices are reduced, demand will be increased. Any page of any newspaper in the country will tell you this. If cars are cheaper more will be sold and more will be made. This will have a ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

I would like to remind you again of the vital relationship of the automobile to the rest of our economy.

Automobile production utilizes 19 percent of all steel, 61 percent of all rubber, 32 percent of all zinc, 13 percent of all aluminum, 49 percent of all lead, and 58 percent of all upholstery leather sold in the United States.

One business in every six is automotive.

One of every five retail dollars is spent for automotive products.

That 11,600,000 people—1 of every 7 workers—are employed in highway transport industries.

That 74 percent of U.S. families own automobiles.

That 41 million persons rely daily on automobiles to get to work.

Before concluding may I direct attention to just how much it would cost to let this temporary tax expire. The Secretary of the Treasury states that we would lose $430 million in revenue. The estimate in the committee report is a little higher—about $450 million. But this would not all be lost. This amount would be freed for other purposes and flow in the channels of our economy rather than be siphoned off and sent to the Treasury. The chairman of the Joint Economic Committee recently pointed out that the best estimates presented to that committee were to the effect that the gross national product would be increased from three to four times the amount of any tax cut. This is called the multiplier effect. Applying this principle, if we did not extend the auto excise tax, the resultant increase in the gross national product would be from $1.35 to $1.8 billion. With taxes on this increase estimated at $270 to $360 million, it means that the estimated real loss of revenue to the Treasury would be from $90 to $180 million. To me this is a small price to correct a longstanding tax inequity and at the same time stimulate business by taking the emergency brake off the largest manufacturing operation in our country.

For years I have voted against the extension of the taxes contained in this bill, but with the qualification that my opposition did not apply to the taxes imposed on corporations, tobacco, beer, wine, and liquor. However, in view of the urgings of the President for tax relief to promote economic growth, I submit that we have now an opportunity to provide the impetus needed to trigger economic growth and expansion. In addition, we should have no reservations about relinquishing the tax on tobacco and liquor, for, as the minority views so well point out, these tax sources could promptly be used by the States to finance a great variety of State and local governmental activities—aid to education, for example. In my judgment there is no justification for extending any of the temporary taxes contained in this bill.

Being realistic, and mindful of the action of the Congress in extending these taxes in prior years, I say to my colleagues if we are to insist on retaining our excise taxes in their present form, it is time we have the courage to treat all manufacturing equally by enacting a general manufacturing excise tax which would fairly and equitably distribute the tax burden on all manufactured products rather than singling out the automobile to pull the bulk of the excise tax load. This would broaden the tax base beyond automotive products, permit a much lower tax rate, and provide greater stability in annual revenues. It is my hope that my colleagues of the Ways and Means Committee who are now considering tax reforms will give this their thoughtful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot reconcile the extension of this tax with the President's urgings for tax reduction. If tax reduction is to be a tool to spur our economy, to create jobs, to encourage investment, then here is a chance today for us to give the President what he has been asking for.

I urge you to join me in opposing the extension of all of these taxes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the debates on H.R. 6755 to extend various excise taxes demonstrate the need for increased budgetary responsibility on the part of the Congress. These haphazard efforts to manage the great fiscal business of the United States without any correlation of expenditures with revenues and without balancing outgo with anticipated income result in reducing the authority of the Congress under our system.

Legislation to create a Joint Legislative Budget Committee such as in H.R. 3964 would provide useful machinery for a return to the Congress of its constitutional authority and responsibility over governmental fiscal policy.

This proposed legislation would enable the Congress to review and revise fully the executive budget and to gage priorities in proposed expenditures. In addition, the Congress would be enabled by this legislation to establish a maximum figure above which executive spending would not be permitted.

The existing practice of considering appropriation bills independently of each other and without regard to revenues is disastrous to our Federal economy and solvency.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI].

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, on June 12, I introduced a bill—H.R. 7007—to amend section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the personal income tax exemption allowed for those who have attained age 65 or are blind.

Under existing law, an additional $600 personal exemption is provided for a taxpayer, or his spouse, who is age 65 or is blind. However, the taxpayer who provides full support for a parent age 65, or a blind parent, is not allowed the additional exemption. This is manifestly inequitable.

Under my bill, an additional exemption will be allowed for those over age 65, or blind, both in the case of their own returns if they have taxable income, and in the case of the returns of other taxpayers where they do not have taxable income and are dependent upon those taxpayers for support.

In providing for an additional exemption for those taxpayers and their spouses who are over 65, or blind, the Congress recognized the additional financial needs of the aged and the blind. Those needs must be fulfilled regardless of whether the elderly person has a separate income or whether the support must be provided by others.

The taxpayer who supports an elderly parent must provide for such support from a single source of earnings. Where the elderly person, or the blind, has his own separate income, the burden on the family will not fall as heavily as in the case of a taxpayer who might be providing the income for the sole support of an elderly or blind parent. Therefore, it would seem that justice would require granting the additional $600 exemption where the elderly or blind are dependents of a taxpayer who does not happen to be their spouse. My bill will accomplish this.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion lately about the need to improve the economic growth rate of our country. We have also been hearing much from spokesmen of the administration promising a tax reduction. In this legislation before the Committee today this same administration is seeking to raise taxes; and even more confusing and discouraging is the fact we are asked to raise taxes in an area that is certain to have a direct adverse effect on the economy and its growth potential.

Proponents of this measure would obscure the tax increasing aspects of the bill by terming it a mere extension of tax rates. In truth, it is a bill to raise taxes, for if we take no action these taxes would be reduced automatically. Thus, if we pass this bill, we will be adding a tax burden to our citizens through higher taxes than would otherwise apply.

Proponents of this measure have also indicated that these taxes are for just 1 more year and may even be reduced when and if the major tax package now in the Committee on Ways and Means takes effect. If this prospect exists, why create the confusion and uncertainty of this tax rate increase? This is not only bad tax policy, but it is a clear breach of faith with the American people. Year after year we have continued these so-called temporary wartime taxes by misleading our constituents into believing they would be removed after just 1 more year. On both this measure and the debt ceiling legislation we continue to apply the label of "temporary" and yet give virtually permanent effect to high taxes and high debt. By now I would think the American people must feel like the loyal fans of a losing ball club who are told by its coaches, "Wait till next year," and next year never seems to come. And now, after putting up with this for so long, these same patient people are seeing the ball club being moved away through the administration promises for tax cuts in other areas. It seems to me much as it would to the long-suffering fans of a losing ball club that we ought to consider carefully our promises in this area before giving tax relief elsewhere.

The fact that we are being asked to raise these taxes instead of letting them lapse as we promised is bad enough. It is much worse when, as is the fact here, the taxes in question were designed for and have had the proven effect of acting as a depressant on our economy. These taxes when effected during the Korean war, were planned not only to raise revenue, but also to discourage mass consumer buying of many products. And they have had precisely that effect. This was not fully realized until the late 1950's when our economic growth rate began to slow up, but it has had a direct effect in retarding this Nation's growth in recent years. Yet this administration, while nominally pledged to get this country moving again comes here today and asks us to enact a measure that will impede if not actually reverse the current upward trend of the level of economic activity—hesitant though it may be. This to me, and I am sure to many others, appears inconsistent and illogical. Here we have a chance, by not increasing these taxes to give a great shot in the arm to our economy. This boost would not involve economic gimmickery. It would have immediate effect of substantial benefit. It would spur both consumer spending and corporate investment and expansion, and it would give tax relief to virtually all segments of our economy. Yet we are being asked by this administration, at a time when our economy may be reaching a make-or-break point in its upward turn, to take the deliberate step of putting on the brakes and feeding a proven depressant back into the economic mainstream for 1 more year. We have heard much talk of this being a do-nothing Congress to date. Yet here we have a chance to accomplish something by doing nothing and we are suddenly asked to get moving. If we pass this bill we will be moving all right—backward and downhill.

Mr. Chairman, let us now examine some of the specific provisions of this tax increase bill. We are once again being asked to raise the corporate normal tax rate from 25 to 30 percent, and thus the maximum rate on corporate income would be 52 percent instead of 47 percent. It has long been argued by many Members of this body, myself included, and it is now conceded by the administration and others, that this high rate of corporate taxation has been one of the greatest, if not the greatest, contributing factor to the retardation in economic expansion. It has forced many corporations to cut back employment, limit expansion, and continue to operate obsolete equipment leading to lack of ability to compete in the marketplace. A great deal of the unused plant capacity and high permanent unemployment in this country can be traced directly to this high corporate tax rate which discourages and inhibits expansion of job creating and job maintaining investment on the part of this Nation's business.

Further, this normal tax burden falls on all corporations, unlike the surtax burden which applies only to larger ones. Thus this tax rate, if we let it lapse, would have a maximum breadth and depth of economic effect and could doubtless do a great deal to cure the high unemployment rate and the unsatisfactory growth rate of the country. Instead we are told to wait until some future unspecified date when a major tax package may be brought forth before doing anything about the corporate tax rate. If we follow this counsel we are making the opportunity to boost this Nation's economy wait upon the uncertainties of politics, when by simply doing nothing, we could effectuate a great spur to the economy. It just does not make sense. If this cut in corporate tax rates is needed, as we have been told by the administration, why not effectuate it now?

We have seen a somewhat encouraging upturn in our economy recently. Yet, and this is vitally important, we are rapidly approaching a critical point. Either the economy will move upward, or it will falter and perhaps slide back. We have an opportunity now to virtually guarantee a strong upsurge by doing nothing by just letting the presently scheduled tax reduction occur. By the time we get around to taking any positive action, it could well be too late. Don't misunderstand me, I am not crying gloom and doom. All I am saying is that we do have an opportunity at this time to follow a positive policy to strengthen and continue the upward move of our economy, and I am opposed to action that would miss this chance and depend on the uncertainties of actions that may or may not be taken later.

Of particular concern to the people of my district and the State of Michigan is the proposed increase once again of the excise taxes on passenger cars and automotive parts. This is perhaps the most odious and nonsensical part of this bill. I speak as a representative of the people of Michigan, and what I have to say applies on a nationwide basis. The automotive industry is a bellweather of our economy. This has been shown time and time again. When the car business is hurting, the Nation's economy hurts, too. And when, as is now the case, the automobile business is staging a recovery it has nationwide effect.

I am sure that all of you are aware that the current upswing in the automotive industry has had a great deal to do with the current rise in the Nation's economy. This is a natural result when you consider some of the following facts. This industry provides over 6 million jobs in the production, distribution, and service of its products and constitutes some 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. It consumes over 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 47 percent of all lead, and 35 percent of all zinc used in this country. It consumes vast amounts of textiles and electrical products. One business in every six in the country is dependent on this industry. The automobile today is a virtual necessity to the American family. Much of the growth of this country, economically and in many other ways, can be traced directly and indirectly to advances in the automobile industry. Thus the adverse effects of the automotive excise taxes are widespread and of major importance. Yet this is the only major consumer durable that still remains subject to the special wartime rates we are concerned with here today. This special tax amounts to over a half billion dollars a year. And its effect is born by the little man, by the consumer, and is felt directly and indirectly on a huge scale nationwide.

The time has long since passed when this tax should have been allowed to die and be buried. We have witnessed recently a heartening recovery in the automobile industry. Think for a moment what this means to your hometown. Even if, as is likely the case, cars may not be manufactured in your district, think of how many businesses are dependent on the use and service of automobiles. Think of how many jobs are directly involved in these businesses. And then think of how many more are in turn dependent on the health of those businesses for their own economic survival and health. Yet, today you are asked to once again increase this excise tax on passenger cars and automotive parts. You are asked to discourage and blunt this recent upswing in the automotive industry. You are asked to take this action when by doing nothing you could contribute this economic benefit to all those businesses and jobholders to which I just referred. Viewed in this light, H.R. 6755 does not make much sense, does it? We have heard so often the argument that consumer spending must be given priority in tax policies aimed at economic growth. Yet, here we have a chance to bolster the purchasing power of the consumer in a vital industry and you are asked to extend once again this illogical, so-called temporary wartime tax depressant.

There are doubtless, as the minority report points out, many Members who would hesitate to vote against this bill because of the alcohol and cigarette taxes involved. Nonetheless, may I again emphasize that on the State level, taxation of these products provides a great deal of revenue used for essential government functions. Undoubtedly, were these taxes allowed to lapse, many States would fill the gap in order to gain needed revenue for their school systems and other services. For these reasons I shall not hesitate to vote against raising these taxes again.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, it seems to me that this bill clearly points out the inconsistencies in the current position of the administration. Indeed, as I pointed out earlier, it almost seems to prove that the administration is suffering from some strange economic and fiscal schizophrenia. Here we have an opportunity, with minimal revenue loss and no economic gimmickery, to give a badly needed shot in the arm to our economy. It would apply both to consumer spending and business investment and would have a maximum nationwide effect of great significance. And we can achieve these results by doing nothing; by simply letting these taxes die as we have long promised. I think it is incumbent on us to do just that, not only for the vastly beneficial economic results, but as a matter of keeping faith with our constituents. I invite each Member to exercise good sense and good faith by voting against H.R. 6755.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us today principally because of the fundamental things that are involved. A short time ago the Congress was informed by the administration that they were going to present, which they did, a proposal providing a tax cut for the taxpayers of this Nation. Today we are becoming involved with not a tax cut but a tax increase.

Mr. Chairman, many people may passionately disagree with me in my philosophy as far as the tax cut is concerned, but this is an extension of taxes that has an expiration date. That expiration date is June 30, 1963. Over the years we have constantly, from the days of the Korean war, extended these excise taxes that amount to $4.1 billion.

These are taxes upon the people of this Nation. I cannot conceive how an administration can inform the people of this Nation with their left hand that they are going to give them a tax cut, and the next day with their right hand they are going to tell the people we must increase and extend the taxes which were imposed as a deterrent to spending, and also in order to finance the Korean conflict.

I was a Member of Congress back in 1953 at the time that the Korean conflict was at least temporarily halted and agreements were reached, and through all of these 10 or 11 years since then we have continually extended taxes that were levied for a specific purpose. That was because of the high cost of the Korean conflict and to discourage people from spending money in certain fields. I do not believe that the people of this Nation should be continually obligated to pay taxes that were levied for a specific purpose that no longer exists. I do hope in all good conscience that when the House votes today they will adhere to the recommendation of the President of the United States that their constituents are entitled to a tax cut, and this is the place where the tax cut should take place.

This is not just favoring a special few, but it favors all of the people who are in the market today making purchases of all of the commodities that are affected by the excise taxes. One of the great problems I have, and I think we all have, is with the tax that is levied today on the automotive industry. This is a tax that is levied at the rate of 10 percent, and 3 percent of that was extended because of the Korean conflict. This 3 percent tax on passenger automobiles alone amounts to almost a half a billion dollars. In fact it amounts to about $460 million.

This is a direct tax savings that would go to the consumer because the consumer is the individual who has to pay the tax. I did my utmost in the committee to try to get this 3-percent tax eliminated and not extended. Unfortunately for the people of the Nation I was not successful in my attempt, but today I am going to vote my convictions and vote against this tax in order that the people of this Nation may have their tax burden reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLS. We have no more requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, pursuant to House Resolution 396, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6755 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 91, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—283

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—91

Abele
Adair
Ashbrook
Barry
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Berry
Bray

Bromwell
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Curtis
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Harrison
Hemphill
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horton
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Calif.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Moore
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—58

Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ayres
Baring
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Collier
Conte
Cunningham
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Elliott
Forrester
Gavin
Gibbons
Grant
Hansen
Harsha
Hébert
Holifield
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kirwan
Lindsay
Martin, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Monagan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Norblad
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Staebler
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tupper
Vanik
Van Pelt
Whitener

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ryan of Michigan against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Alger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Andrews with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Selden.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. LATTA and **Mr. OSTERTAG** changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] recorded?

The TALLY CLERK. He voted "aye."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] is unavoidably detained elsewhere on official business. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 17, 1963

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week and what the plans are for the balance of this week.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. We have completed the legislative business for this week and, if we get leave of the House, we will adjourn over until Monday after announcing the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called.

There are five bills to be considered under suspension on Monday, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 467, to amend section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the authority of the Federal Housing Administration.

H.R. 3517, administrative expenses of retired Federal employees health benefits.

H.R. 5377, to provide coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the Architect of the Capitol and his employees.

H.R. 5932, to extend Federal employees' health and group life insurance benefits to certain teachers of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4638, Presidential Transition Act of 1963.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

Also, on Tuesday, we will take up the 1964 appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, there will be considered House Joint Resolution 247, suspension of equal-time provisions of the Communications Act for the 1964 presidential campaign. This is under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate. There will also be taken up H.R. 4347, construction of Veterans' Administration hospitals. This is also under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

Of course, this is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Will the gentleman yield further for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but that last bill on suspensions, did the gentleman say "Presidential transition" there?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Presidential Transition Act of 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Is this in preparation for an outgoing President in 1964?

Mr. ALBERT. This has nothing to do with any outgoing President. This is a 1963 act.

Mr. GROSS. Then we really do not need this legislation if you are not planning to change Presidents.

Mr. ALBERT. We are making no plans of that kind. The gentleman is 4 years off in his arithmetic.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in introducing three bills in the field of mental health and mental retardation. I hold, as he does, that this approach dealing effectively with separable areas of legislation serves to smoothly and swiftly advance toward a common goal in the service of a pressing need.

The first of these three bills relates to a greatly increased maternal and child health and crippled children's program. The second concerns the construction of clinical and service centers for the mentally retarded in the community, and the construction of research centers and mental retardation facilities that are affiliated with university and medical school programs. The third contains provisions for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and for research and demonstration projects relating to the education of mentally retarded children.

The bills being detailed in the Record by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty]—I shall not dwell at length on context—however, Mr. Speaker, I must earnestly commend to the membership of the cognizant committees the need for early consideration and approval of these individual bills. I would also call the attention of my colleagues to my remarks in the Record on March 19, 1963, which is a comprehensive analysis of this field of legislation.

Certainly the gentleman from Rhode Island is to be commended on his long history of dedication. It is only fair to state that there is no other Member of this House whose contribution has been so vast and unique.

In these areas of critical national impact, one might even say tragic neglect, there is a demonstrated requirement for action programs.

President Kennedy in a special message clearly enunciated the crucial need. I believe this legislation will focus the Nation's resources on the problem and begin to solve the medical, social, and economic burdens caused by mental retardation. The keynote is action and the time is now.

REQUEST TO EXTEND AT THIS POINT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FREEDOM SEASON CELEBRATION

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again this year the citizens of Woodland Hills, Calif., are conducting a freedom season celebration, from June 14, Flag Day, through July 4, Independence Day. During this period the people of the community rededicate themselves to the principles on which our country is founded and the institutions which are the bases of our democracy.

There will be many public and private events to carry out the theme, "I Am Glad To Be an American." On June 15, the San Fernando Valley Male Chorus will present a program "Let Freedom Sing." The Kiwanis Club is sponsoring a home decoration contest. There will be a children's parade on June 29, and the festivities will be climaxed by an old fashioned Fourth parade and fireworks on July 4.

Mr. Speaker, there are some persons and groups which have twisted the patriotism of their fellow citizens to their own selfish and destructive ends. I deplore the actions of these super patriots who in reality are subverting the ideals of our Nation. Such efforts are markedly different from the genuine pride and joy in our heritage shown by the citizens of Woodland Hills. I heartily endorse the freedom season and congratulate Richard Tisch, William Tyson, Walter Carlson, and those who have joined with them in organizing and conducting this celebration. These events demonstrate to all that the true brand of American patriotism is a force for social justice and economic progress.

HANFORD ELECTRIC POWER GIVEN PREFERENCE OVER CIVIL RIGHTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in my speech in this House on May 7, 1963, and again on May 20, 1963, I charged that for political expediency the Kennedy administration had deliberately provided for violation of or noncompliance with a specific requirement of law relative to the equal-employment-opportunity portion of its civil rights program, in some 78 Federal contracts relating to the new production reactor powerplant at Hanford, Wash. This charge still stands and the facts of record fully substantiate it.

I also said that in my opinion the Hanford power contracts were illegal in that they provided for a violation—or noncompliance—with existing law. Certainly, this conclusion is elementary, as no Federal agency can legally execute a contract that specifically provides for evasion of or non-compliance with a provision of existing law.

DOUBLE STANDARD FOR CIVIL RIGHTS ADMINISTRATION

With the press full of Kennedy administration expressions of concern for civil rights and the need for additional legislation on the matter, on one hand, and a deliberate failure to enforce the law in the Hanford power contracts, on the other hand, there is raised a serious question of a double standard of administration.

In delving into this matter, I came across another phase of the Hanford deal that is even more serious than the provision for noncompliance with a civil rights law, and that is the apparent neglect of the national defense posture of this Nation in deference to promotion of the Hanford powerplant. I shall discuss this at some length further on in my speech.

After I delivered my May 7, 1963, speech, I was told that a prominent protagonist of the Hanford power deal would attempt to answer my charges. I then prepared my May 20, 1963, speech, setting forth a number of points that must be considered by anyone foolish enough to attempt to deny my charges.

On May 23, 1963, a futile attempt was made on pages 9224–9225 of the Congressional Record, to refute my charge and to explain away the deliberate actions to nullify a provision of existing law when the extension of the bureaucratic power empire was threatened. In this diatribe, my charges were referred to as "specious" and "wild and completely false."

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

My answer to this is, "Let's look at the record" to see who is guilty and who has been guilty over the years of using specious reasoning, half-truths, and wild and completely false statements, in the promotion of this Hanford powerplant deal.

In my May 20, 1963, speech I listed nine points I felt must be referred to in any attempt to refute my charges of a conspiracy to evade an existing law.

First point: The proposed Hanford contracts as presented to the Congress prior to the passage of the authorizing act included a nondiscrimination section exactly as required by law, as embodied in Executive Order No. 10925 relative to equal employment opportunity. These contract drafts thus became a part of the legislative history of the AEC Authorization Act of fiscal year 1963.

The Hanford protagonist admits this to be true but claims that the addition of a subsection which provides for noncompliance with a specific requirement of existing law is not a material departure from the contract originally submitted.

I believe every honest person would agree that an addition to any contract which provides for noncompliance with existing law is a material departure from a contract that provides for strict compliance with the law. Headlines in the Portland Oregonian early this year indicated there was material concern in the matter as follows:

> Race Issue Snags Sale of Power—Contract Clause Would Cancel Buyer's Pacts
>
> Peaceful harnessing of the power output of the Hanford Atomic Works has been snagged on an antidiscrimination question.
>
> A spokesman for the U.S. Department of Interior in Washington Thursday night confirmed by phone what the Oregonian has been hearing for several days:
>
> That there can be no contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and a developing-operating agency for Hanford power until an antidiscrimination penalty clause is modified.
>
> At stake is the estimated 800,000-kilowatt production of the Hanford pile. Customers are to be 5 investor-owned utilities and some 60 municipal and publicly owned power companies.

> Under the arrangements, authorized by Congress, the atomic power will be developed by a corporation set up by public power agencies in the State of Washington known as Washington Public Power Supply System. WPPSS will finance the project with revenue bonds, and the security for the bonds would be contracts for sale of power.

EXEMPTION—YES; MODIFICATION—NO

Second point: A complete reading of Executive Order No. 10925 discloses that while exemption from application of the order can be granted under specified conditions, no provision is made for any modification of the requirements of the order. Exemption, yes; modification, no.

The Hanford protagonist's answer to this was:

> The charge that the order permits only an exemption and not a modification is hardly worthy of comment. A grant of authority to exempt a contract from all the provisions of the order obviously includes authority to make a partial exemption.

I am sure the Hanford protagonist would like to be able to dismiss the matter with a hardly-worthy-of-comment phrase. His comment that "A grant of authority to exempt a contract from all the provisions of the order obviously includes authority to make a partial exemption" is specious reasoning in the extreme. The law in question is very specific. It says:

> SEC. 303. The Committee may, when it deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of section 301 of this order in any specific contract, subcontract, or purchase order.

Certainly, there is no grant of authority here to provide for partial compliance. If such were intended or desired, the first sentence of section 303 would have read:

> The Committee may, when it deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions, or any portion thereof, of section 301 of this order in any specific contract, subcontract, or purchase order.

But no such modification provision is in the law. Chaos would certainly result if every law of the land were permitted such loose interpretation. I realize, of course, that loose interpretation of the laws to suit its political expediencies is a stock in trade of the New Frontier.

BANKERS OPPOSE NON-DISCRIMINATION SECTION OF HANFORD POWER CONTRACTS

Third point: The bankers advised Washington Public Power Supply System and/or Bonneville, that inclusion of the nondiscrimination section of the equal employment opportunity law in the contracts as proposed would result in failure to sell the bonds or, if sold, only at high discount rates.

The Hanford protagonist freely admits this to be true.

Fourth point: After receiving the bankers' advice as noted in my third point, discussions were had with and a request was made of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for an outright exemption of the Hanford contracts from the application of the equal employment opportunity law as prescribed by Executive Order No. 10925. This requested exemption was denied.

The Hanford protagonist made no direct reference to this point.

CIVIL RIGHTS PENALTY PROVISION SACRIFICED FOR POWER

Fifth point: Faced with failure to finance the Hanford power project as a result of the denial for exemption from the equal employment opportunity law, the Hanford power project proponents had to come up with some other scheme. The result, as the record shows, was the decision to insert an additional subsection in the nondiscrimination section of the contracts, that provided for noncompliance with a penalty provision of the law under which the contracts could be canceled

The Hanford protagonist admits the truth of this fifth point. He erroneously says that the action to provide for noncompliance with the cancellation provision of the law was made pursuant to a procedure which the Executive order itself provides. As indicated earlier, the language of the Executive Order No. 10925 does not make provisions for such a partial exemption from section 301. It is an attempt to read into the law something not therein provided.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE NOT CONVENED

Sixth point: Did the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which is charged with the administration and enforcement of the law under Executive Order No. 10925, approve this decision to add the noncompliance-with-the-law subsection of the Hanford contracts? I understand that the Committee did not approve this action.

The truth of this sixth point is confirmed by a letter from Dr. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, advising that they had asked Mr. Taylor, Executive Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity whether the President's Committee was convened to consider the addition to the contract that provided for the non-compliance-with-the-cancellation provision of the law. Dr. Seaborg's letter said:

> Mr. Taylor stated that the Committee was not convened to discuss the question.

Of course, it was obvious to Dr. Seaborg that there had been no such convening of the Committee, as Dr. Seaborg is a member of that Committee.

NONCOMPLIANCE A NEW ROLE FOR AEC

A reading of Dr. Seaborg's letter of January 9, 1963, to Mr. Taylor gives me the impression that Dr. Seaborg was not too happy about having to endorse Secretary Udall's request for noncompliance with a portion of Executive Order 10925. Here is one quotation from his letter:

> The Atomic Energy Commission, throughout all of its operations, has assiduously pursued the objectives of Executive Order No. 10925. We have believed that the AEC had an important responsibility in carrying out the policies of the Federal Government directed toward equal employment opportunity, since its activities extend into every part of the United States and because its contracts with a wide variety of organizations run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Notwithstanding the broad impact upon the AEC program, no exception to the policy set forth in the Executive order or to the rules and regulations of the President's committee has heretofore been sought.

EXECUTIVE VICE CHAIRMAN TAYLOR ACTED UNDER PRESSURE

A perusal of copies of the letters referred to in the Hanford protagonist's statement indicates that the Executive Vice Chairman's acquiescence to the importuning of the Secretary of the Interior and a member of Interior's legal staff for fast action was based on a naive reliance on the representations of the Federal agencies involved as to what constituted special consideration in the national interest.

Seventh point: No contract, whether Federal or non-Federal, that provides for evasion of or noncompliance with the law is a valid contract.

Ninth point: Any bond issue based on illegal or invalid contracts would also be invalid.

The Hanford protagonist does not and cannot deny the evident truth of these two points.

Eighth point: The actions taken with regard to the Hanford power contracts and the nondiscrimination section of the equal employment opportunity law all add up to a conspiracy to evade the law.

The Hanford protagonist takes the position that the actions taken by various public officials were in accordance with the law. With this we cannot agree.

CONSPIRACY TO EVADE LAW

I think it now time to discuss some of the fallacious reasoning of our Hanford protagonist and of the various administration officials who took part in what I claim was a conspiracy to evade the law when faced with a possible inability to finance the Hanford power project. Our Hanford protagonist tells us the decision to provide for noncompliance with law as contained in Executive Order No. 10925 was based on special circumstances in the national interest and listed five items that were to be included under this heading, as follows:

> 1. The timing of the project is of great importance and cannot be delayed. The Pacific Northwest will be short of firm power in 1965–66 under critical water conditions. The two generators of the project are scheduled for completion on October 1 and December 1, 1965. In addition, it is estimated that the reactor will be operated for both the production of plutonium and the generation of power for a period of 7 years. Thereafter, the cost of operating the project only for the generation of power will increase substantially. Any delay which will shorten the 7-year dual-purpose period will have an adverse effect on the financial feasibility of the project.
>
> 2. Continuous use of the reactor for power generation will assure its constant availability for rapid conversion to plutonium production should such production be necessary for defense purposes. It is my understanding that many Russian reactors are dual purpose and are capable of rapid conversion to plutonium production. This will be the only dual-purpose reactor in the United States.
>
> 3. The completion of the project will result in steam payments to AEC—payments which may amount to as much as $155 million or more. These will help defray the

cost of the reactor and plutonium production to the taxpayers of the country.

4. Two presently unused products, waste steam from the reactor and unsalable hydroelectric secondary energy, will be combined to make a usable product—firm electric power.

5. The generating facilities will have a capacity of approximately 800,000 kilowatts. It will be the largest nuclear powerplant in the world.

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN NATIONAL INTEREST ARE PHONY

In my estimation, all of these five items which our Hanford protagonist wants us to believe are special circumstances in the national interest, are as phony as a $3 bill. Let us keep in mind, in all this discussion, that the project with any national defense aspect at all would be the new production reactor at Hanford, which is supposed to be going forward to early completion regardless of whether the Hanford powerplant is constructed or not. The project which our Hanford protagonist is referring to is the Hanford powerplant, not the production reactor itself. With this in mind, I shall proceed to discuss these five items that are falsely claimed to be of special importance to the national interest.

First item:

The timing of the project is of great importance and cannot be delayed.

Our Hanford protagonist tells us the Hanford powerplant cannot be delayed, as the Pacific Northwest will be short of firm power in 1965–66 under adverse water conditions. Actually this is not a true statement if all available resources are taken into consideration and interruptible or nonfirm loads are eliminated. In addition, he fails to tell us that under normal or median water conditions all loads can be carried with a surplus to spare. This surplus in an average or median water year holds true each year through 1970–71. In fact, the power surpluses without Hanford, in 1967–68, for instance, will range from 1 million continuous kilowatts to over 6 million continuous kilowatts. These facts are set out in the latest report of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee dated January 15, 1963. This conference committee includes technical representatives from all major utilities of the Pacific Northwest including Bonneville and all leading non-Federal public power systems. The possibility of an occurrence of the most adverse water conditions in 1965–66 is highly remote. Bonneville and the Washington Public Power Supply System cannot be too concerned about a power shortage in the region, as the Interior Department and the Washington Public Power Supply System, over the past several years, have been doing all in their power to prevent private electric utility systems of the Pacific Northwest from providing additional electric generating capacity of their own for the future. Proposals have been made for the construction of a new coal-burning steam-electric plant in the Pacific Northwest, which would provide 500,000 kilowatts of firm power. In contrast, the Hanford powerplant would produce only nonfirm power. The power from the coal-burning steamplant could have been provided much sooner than the Hanford power, if it had been started at the same time the Hanford new production reactor was started.

Bonneville refused to consider this coal-burning plant ahead of Hanford power.

Our Hanford protagonist also should correlate his statement with the Interior Department spokesman who just last week—May 20, 1963—told the Federal Power Commission, with regard to the Pacific Northwest, that we have a present surplus of power in that region and have had for several years, and that there would be a surplus of power through 1971–72. The Interior Department asked FPC not to approve an FPC examiner's recommendation that private utilities be permitted to build an 875,000-kilowatt hydroelectric plant on the Snake River.

Another phase of timing that I am sure our Hanford protagonist would like to forget is the extremely long and costly delay in the construction of the new production reactor. All or nearly all of these delays are chargeable to the conversion or power phase of the new production reactor. A year ago, the new production reactor cost had risen to a total of $195 million; or $75 million above the estimated cost for a plutonium-only reactor, and the completion date had been put back at least a year. We are now told the cost has increased to $200 million and the completion date set back another year. All this $30 million increase in cost and the 2 years' or more delay in the production of plutonium is directly chargeable to those members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—which included our Hanford protagonist—who insisted on the construction of a convertible reactor instead of the plutonium-only reactor as recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission.

NATIONAL SECURITY SACRIFICED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

This 2 years actual loss in plutonium production for defense could be catastrophic, as it might well represent the margin of firepower needed to overcome our enemies in the future. I would not want it on my conscience, if this should ever be the case.

It seems to me that in this regard there has been a complete lack of consideration for the national interest in the action of the Hanford power proponents. The real concern of these Hanford power proponents is fully evident on the record. It is the financial feasibility of this "1910 model-T" Hanford powerplant. How anyone can in clear conscience say that this financial feasibility is a special circumstance in the national interest is beyond me, and I am sure, beyond every other clear-thinking American.

Our Hanford protagonist has not, to my knowledge, disclosed any real concern over early completion of Hanford for plutonium production for national defense. If he has, I would like him to point out chapter and verse.

HOPE FOR VALID RUSSIAN AGREEMENT A DELUSION

Second item:

Continuous use of the reactor for power generation will assure its constant availability for rapid conversion to plutonium production should such production become necessary for defense purposes.

Actually, the new production reactor at Hanford is estimated to be operated for producing plutonium for 7 years after startup, so that any reference to operating for power would be after that time, or earlier only if an agreement were reached with Russia to stop producing plutonium.

Here is what one member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said in 1961 about the national defense aspects of the Hanford plant under power-only operation:

They tell us if you have an agreement with the Soviets to stop producing plutonium, and if it falls through, and if the reactor is running for power, it can quickly be reconverted to producing plutonium again. The fallacy of the argument is that if ever the time comes under such circumstance we need plutonium, it would be whatever we had on hand at that moment that would save the Nation, not what you could produce thereafter. No matter how much you are able to produce afterward, it would not stop our enemies at that moment, thus the argument is fallacious.

This early startup argument can be put into proper perspective when we realize that the plant is estimated to be operated for plutonium production for 7 years. With 7 years of added production from the NPR, we might well ask if we will not have plutonium coming out of our ears. On the other hand, if plutonium production is even now a matter of national interest, the AEC and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should be saying, "Let's go ahead full steam on the new production reactor, so as to achieve plutonium production at the earliest possible date, and not provide for a shutdown to permit connection of the powerplant as long as plutonium production is needed." Any other course would be sacrificing the national defense on the altar of financial feasibility for the Hanford powerplant and could result in national suicide.

If the time ever comes when we can cut back on plutonium production, consideration can then be given to constructing the Hanford powerplant and to shutting down the new production reactor to connect up the powerplant and to make the necessary changes for more efficient power production. I can well understand the desire to improve the "1910 Model-T" type of powerplant. Certainly, it is not of special importance to the national interest to hold up plutonium production to achieve such a result; in fact it is just the opposite.

The reference to an agreement with Russia that would have any meaning, must be viewed in light of the negative results of atomic test ban negotiations to date and the failure to get an onsite inspection in Cuba to see if nuclear weapons and offensive Russian Army units have been removed from that nearby island.

HANFORD PAYMENTS MAY BE LESS THAN $210,000

Third item:

> The completion of the project will result in steam payments to AEC—payments which may amount to as much as $155 million or more. These will help to defray the cost of the reactor and plutonium production to the taxpayers of the country.

This, without a doubt, is the most fallacious argument of all. Actually, the maximum total payment could be less than $210,000.

The two signed copies of the two contracts between AEC and Washington Public Power Supply System show what payments are to be made to the Treasury. Contract AT(45-1) 1357 covers the lease of Federal land to Washington Public Power Supply System on which to construct the Hanford powerplant. Payments to AEC under this lease are $1,000 for the first year and $10 a year thereafter.

The other contract is AT(45-1) 1355 called the operating and construction contract. Attached to this contract is another lease agreement covering the lease of the new production reactor to Washington Public Power Supply System when power only is to be produced. The payments under this lease agreement are the same as those under contract AT(45-1) 1357, that is, $1,000 for the first year's rent and $10 a year thereafter. Incidentally, how would you like to rent a $200 million Federal plant for $10 a year?

The operating and construction contract provides for various payments to be made by Washington Public Power Supply System to AEC during the operation of the new production reactor for the dual purpose of plutonium production and steam for power. The payments provided start very low, then increase, then later go down again. The length of operation of the new production reactor for dual-purposes has a very material effect on the total amount to be paid by Washington Public Power Supply System to the Federal Government.

No one knows just how long the new production reactor will be operated for plutonium production and how long it might be operated for power only. In addition, it is always possible that incidents could occur that would preclude further operation for either.

I shall give a few examples of payments the taxpayers would get under the contracts as signed, assuming a total operating period of 30 years and various periods of dual-purpose operation.

First example: 2 years, dual-purpose operation—plutonium and power, 28 years—power only.

1st year	$101,000
2d year	100,010
3d year	1,010
4th year	20
Remaining 26 years	520
Total	$202,560

In other words, if agreements were reached at the end of 2 years to stop plutonium production for defense purposes, the total payments over a 25-year period would be $202,560, or about one-fifteenth of the interest cost for 1 year on the power conversion cost to the taxpayers. This is a far cry from the up to $155 million payment our Hanford protagonist holds up before our eyes.

Originally, the Hanford powerplant was analyzed on the basis that we would have enough plutonium by 1972 and operations thereafter would be for power only. Here are the payments that would be forthcoming under such a schedule:

1st year	$101,000
2d year	100,010
3d year	200,010
4th year	200,010
5th year	600,010
6th year	800,010
7th year	1,000,010
8th year	1,010
Remaining 22 years	440
Total	3,002,510

In other words, under the terms of the contract, $3,002,510 would be the amount of repayment to the taxpayers for the use of steam for 7 years and the lease of a $200 million plant for 23 years.

You may ask, if the above figures are true—which they are—where does our Hanford protagonist get his "up to" $155 million figure? It is on the basis of operating the new production reactor for dual purpose for 30 years with no power-only operation. I am sure that those who know our present plutonium production capacity would say that continued plutonium production, at our present rate, plus the Hanford new production reactor for the next 30 years, would give us enough plutonium to bomb every square foot of earth on this planet.

ALL HANFORD STEAM WILL NOT BE USED

Fourth item:

> Two presently unused products, waste steam from the reactor and unsalable hydroelectric secondary energy, will be combined to make a usable product—firm electric power.

This statement is not as complete and true as it apears on first glance. I am sure most readers would assume that all the waste steam from the new production reactor would be utilized to generate electric power which could be combined with unsalable hydroelectric power to make usable firm power. This will not be the case.

In a letter dated June 15, 1962, the Federal Power Commission presented information on the potential utilization of power from the Hanford powerplant. This data showed the following estimated plant factor at which the Hanford powerplant could be operated:

	Percent
1966-67	21.2
1969-70	34.4
1974-75	53.9
1985 and after	85.0

The plant factor is a measure of the plant output in comparison to the potential output operating 100 percent of the time at full load. These FPC figures mean that because of existing surplus hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest, only certain portions of the NPR steam can be utilized for power production. Based on these FPC figures, nearly 80 percent of the Hanford steam would have to be wasted up through the years 1966-67, with 65 percent wasted through 1969-70 and 46 percent wasted through 1974-75. Actually, under a better than average water year, the surplus hydropower available would result in no need to generate any power at Hanford.

LABOR FORCE SACRIFICED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

In addition to only a partial use of the Hanford steam, the Hanford power proposal does not provide for the use of a far more important resource of the area not now being fully utilized. That is the labor force. Thirteen counties of Washington contain areas of "substantial and persistent unemployment," as reported by the Department of Labor. The proposed coal-burning steam-electric powerplant at Cle Elum, Wash., would have provided work for a goodly number of the presently unemployed miners and other workers in the area. Not only would such a coal-burning steamplant be infinitely more reliable than the Hanford powerplant, but ultimately would provide added firm power on its own, something that Hanford can never do. Here, again, the true national interest has been sacrificed on a false pagan altar of financial feasibility for an antiquated "1910 model-T" powerplant. Even this so-called financial feasibility has to be predicated on completely erroneous methods of financial analysis and writeoff of proper costs. It all adds up to a fraud and a delusion on the American taxpayers.

ANTIQUATED POWERPLANT IS LUDICROUS

Fifth item:

> The generating facilities will have a capacity of appropximately 860,000 kilowatts. It will be the largest nuclear powerplant in the world.

No one can deny the reference to size, but without a doubt, this is the most ludicrous item of all—to classify as of special consideration in the national interest. In fact, its runs the entire gamut of the definition of ludicrous, as given in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary:

> Adapted to excite laughter, especially from incongruity or exaggeration; ridiculous; absurd, broadly comical.

Do not take my word alone, but look at what other Members of Congress have said about this elephantine "1910 model-T" powerplant.

A member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

> Next they argue that this 800,000 kilowatts of so-called nuclear power will be a great thing for the international prestige of the United States. This is equally specious; 154 years ago a man named Robert Fulton invented the steamboat, and he ran his steamboat, the *Claremont*, up the Hudson River. It had a boiler in it that made steam which ran the engine which turned the paddle wheel. The fact of the matter is that the steam that would be produced out at Hanford is so low in temperature, so wet and of such a low pressure that it is more like the steam Robert Fulton used 154 years ago than it is to the steam used in modern day production of electricity.
>
> If we are going to "move ahead," as the popular phrase goes, instead of retrogress, this certainly is the opposite from the way to do it. How much international prestige are you going to get by going back almost a century and a half in technology? None at all. The people overseas are going to look at such foolishness and laugh at us. We

> would not gain prestige; we would lose it by foolishness like this.

Here are some excerpts from other statements on the House floor relating to the Hanford powerplant:

> It is like building an 1880 vintage woodburning locomotive to compete with today's modern diesel electric locomotives and claiming it would help the art.

> What possible technical experience and benefit can be gained through the construction of 1910 model-T vintage electric generation plant with steam pressures of one-tenth that of modern day electric units?

> It's like building a 1910 model steam engine driven threshing machine to compete with a modern-day grain combine.

I could go on and on, but this should be sufficient to make it amply clear that, far from being a special circumstance in the national interest, the Hanford powerplant must be classed as antiquated and adverse to the national interest. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

> The people overseas are going to look at such foolishness and laugh at us. We would not gain prestige; we would lose it by foolishness like this.

DELIBERATE DECEPTION ATTEMPTS

Here is a good place to point out a prime example of the half truths and deliberate attempts to deceive that fill the record on the promotion of the Hanford powerplant. Faced with the undeniable fact that the Hanford powerplant would be of the 1910 model-T type, which major utilities had stopped building many, many years ago, the Hanford protagonist attempted to hoodwink the Members of Congress into believing such low temperature generating units were still being manufactured and installed. Here are his words as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> My colleague has raised the argument that this is an obsolete type of electricity generation and he makes that point on the basis that this involves approximately 135 pounds of steam pressure as against some of the new modern machines which use up to 1,000 pounds of pressure.
>
> I hold in my hand a list of low-pressure turbines that have been built by the General Electric Co. alone, and there are plenty of others that have been built by other companies. I hold in my hand a list of 30 turbines—turbines of this type utilizing pressure from steam of from 96 to 150 pounds per square inch in parts of the machine. These are all used by well-known power companies like Commonwealth Edison; Consolidated Edison; Detroit Edison; Indiana, Kentucky & Ohio Electric Co.; and all these other companies. So there is a place for both kinds.

When we delve into the matter, we find every one of the units listed is a highly modern unit placed in operation since 1955. They are among the most efficient in the country and for the most part operate at steam pressure around 2,000 to 2,400 pounds per square inch and temperatures of 1,000° or more. Here was a deliberate attempt to deceive those within sound of his voice, and those who later might read his words. In another instance the Hanford protagonist, in trying to downgrade the public power aspects of Bonneville and the Hanford power project, said that over 50 percent of the Bonneville Power Administration power was sold to the private utilities. This in the face of Bonneville's own statistics which showed only 18.8 percent of the Bonneville power went to the private utilities.

IS 50 PEOPLE THE CUTOFF POINT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

The Hanford protagonist, in trying to belittle the extent of noncompliance with the cancellation provision of Executive Order No. 10925, says:

> The actual construction of the Hanford power facilities will be undertaken by contractors. They will be subject to all remedies for the enforcement of the nondiscrimination clause, including cancellation.
>
> The contractor operating the power facilities for the supply system will also be subject to the full enforcement provisions, including cancellation.
>
> The supply system, the only organization against which the remedy of cancellation would not be available, will employ less than 50 people.

These statements raise several very interesting questions. I cannot agree that only 50 employees would be affected by the provision for noncompliance with the law. However, this raises an interesting point. Is 50 persons the cutoff point on noncompliance with the nondiscrimination law? What about 51 people, or just where do you start requiring strict compliance with the law?

Also, why is there no mention of the 76 Washington Public Power Supply System contracts which all provide for noncancellation? The employees of the 5 private utility companies and the 71 non-Federal public utilities number in the thousands. Is this a deliberate attempt to create a false impression as to the number of employees involved?

HANFORD CONTRACTS STILL SUBJECT TO CANCELLATION

If, as indicated by the Hanford protagonist, all the construction contracts are to be subject to cancellation, it will be possible to have a cancellation of one or more major construction contracts that could delay the construction of the Hanford powerplant indefinitely. This certainly would jeopardize the financial feasibility of the power project.

There are other cancellation provisions in both the AEC-Washington Public Power Supply System contracts and in the Bonneville-Washington Public Power Supply System contracts. As I pointed out in my May 7, 1963, speech, cancellation under these provisions would not affect the financial feasibility of the bond issue, as the taxpayer through Bonneville would have to pick up the check. In fact, as I read the contracts, the new production reactor could blow up shortly after initial operation and the taxpayer would have to pick up the check for the Hanford powerplant. A possible blowup might not be too farfetched, as a large part of the increased cost of the new production reactor was related to the construction of thick-wall pipe of a pressure and temperature not previously manufactured. After a large part of the pipe had been shipped to the Hanford site, it was found to be full of tiny cracks not disclosed at the time of factory inspection and acceptance. We are told this pipe has been reworked and is now considered safe, but is it? I hope for the sake of the national defense aspect that this is true.

PLAGIARISM OR TWIN GHOSTWRITER

After reading the Hanford protagonist's diatribe on pages 9224 and 9225 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1963, I glanced further through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and came to the utterances of another Hanford proponent on pages 9244 and 9245. As I read further, there came to me a feeling that I had read part of this before, and sure enough, on comparing the Hanford proponent's words with those of the Hanford protagonist, I found sentence after sentence and paragraph after paragraph were identical. At first I thought plagiarism was involved; then I realized both articles were placed in the RECORD the same day. I am sure nearly every Congressman makes use of a ghostwriter at one time or another, but I certainly would fire a ghostwriter who was so enthralled with his own rhetoric that he would use it intact for more than one client.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION NOT LAW

The Hanford proponent took a little different approach in trying to claim that a specific provision for total exemption from a law can be interpreted to also provide for partial exemption. She says that Attorney General Rogers, in the prior administration advised that power to grant exemption under a prior equal employment opportunity executive order included the power to grant partial exemption with conditions or modifications. I am sure the Hanford proponent knows that the advice of any Attorney General is just that, and carries no more weight in law than does the advice of a country lawyer. I am sure the record will show many opinions of Attorneys General have been held invalid by the courts.

The Hanford proponent infers that the legality for partial noncompliance has been concurred in by attorneys for some 70 or 80 participants in the Hanford deal. I would like to bet $10 to a dime that there has been no more than three or four, if that many, typewritten statements expressing any conclusions as to the legality of this modification of the civil rights law.

FULL INVESTIGATION TO CONTINUE

On the question as to whether there was any discussion or consideration given to total exemption from section 301 of Executive Order No. 10925, I relied on sources that have been extremely reliable in the past. I am making my own investigation into this whole affair. So far, the response to some of my inquiries has been less than prompt or cooperative. Nevertheless, I shall continue and, in due time, I expect to be able to report the entire sordid aspects of this evident Kennedy administration double standard for administration of the equal employment opportunity law as set forth in Executive Order No. 10925.

ARE PRIVATE UTILITIES UNHAPPY?

With regard to the Hanford proponent's reference to the Portland General Electric Co., I would like to report that

I have had no contacts on this matter with that company or any other of the five private utilities who are participants in these contracts of questionable validity. If any of these companies are at all unhappy about the matter, perhaps they should have considered that old Chinese proverb:

He who lay down with dogs shall arise with fleas.

Actually, the use of the Portland General Electric Co.'s name was a happenstance, in that it was on the authenticated copy of the Bonneville-Washington Public Power Supply System contract supplied by Bonneville, under a request from the office of another Congressman who is interested in this Hanford deal. It could just as well have been the name of 1 of the other 76 participants.

DUPLICATION IN STATEMENTS MAKE ANSWERING EASIER

In replying to the Hanford protagonist, I have also covered most of the Hanford proponent's statements, in which she attempts to explain away my charge of deliberate noncompliance with a portion of Executive Order No. 10925 regarding equal employment opportunity. Of course, when whole paragraphs of their statements are identical, it makes the job easier.

NATIONAL SECURITY NEGLECTED

In closing, I want to emphasize that this is not all I shall have to say about this matter. I intend to continue digging until I get to the bottom of this Hanford power deal that indicates it has resulted in serious adverse effects on the national defense posture of our Nation. It is no longer just a question of the evasion of a civil rights law, but can well encompass the question of national survival. If plutonium production is now critically needed in the national interest, then the completion of the new production reactor should be pressed at maximum speed without reference to power. If plutonium is not now in urgent need and the 2 years' loss in plutonium production from the new production reactor at Hanford is not a serious development of critical national importance, then the Congress and the taxpayers of the Nation have been the victims of a gigantic and costly hoax. We might well ask if we have been hoodwinked into providing an additional subsidized electric power source to an area now enjoying the lowest power rates in the Nation which were made possible at a cost to date to the taxpayers of the Nation of over $2 billion.

HAS PREFERENCE LAW BEEN VIOLATED

The reference to the dire effects of the loss of approximately 80,000 kilowatts of firm power to each of the private utilities raises some interesting questions. As I have noted earlier, there are still other contract cancellation provisions remaining in the Hanford power contracts. In addition, there is another question of Hanford power contract validity with respect to the five private utilities.

The Bonneville Administrator recently testified before a congressional committee that the entire output of Hanford was to be turned over to Bonneville and Bonneville would, in turn, deliver firm Federal hydroelectric power to each of these five private utilities who are participants in the Hanford power contracts covering a 30-year period. Under the present preference laws, Bonneville cannot make firm power contracts with private utilities for 30 years without recall provisions if a preference customer needs the power. Conditions could well occur under which the preference customers would sue to force Bonneville to recall the Federal hydropower committed to private utilities under these contracts. Here, again, it appears Bonneville is attempting to evade another law in connection with this Hanford power deal. Furthermore, not satisfied with the present preference law, Bonneville wants Congress to give them a special preferential preference law to permit them to keep strings on all the Federal power in the Pacific Northwest. Thus, the taxpayers of other regions of the country who have contributed over $2 billion for Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest would be excluded from reaping any of the benefits of their investment.

All in all this whole thing smells. Let me summarize it:

First. Double standard for administration of civil rights law in provision for noncompliance.

Second. Serious adverse national defense aspects.

Third. Evasion of existing power preference law.

Fourth. Promotion of a preferential preference bill to exclude other parts of the country from enjoying some of the fruits of the multibillion-dollar tax payer investment in Federal power projects in the Pacific Northwest.

LAW DAY, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, my friend and distinguished colleague from New York, Robert R. Barry, addressed the Lions Club of Bronxville, N.Y., on May 7 in connection with "Law Day, 1963."

His speech reflects a deep understanding of the importance of the law in maintaining freedom and good government. Because my colleagues as legislators are keenly interested in the rule of law, I insert Congressman Barry's excellent speech at this point.

Law Day, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be with you today as a participant in these Law Day observances.

Until May 1, 1958, the first of May was the occasion for the Communists in this country and throughout the world to stage parades, one major purpose of which was to disparage America and the heritage of freedom.

But in that year, President Eisenhower endorsed the idea of the then president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Charles Rhyne, and proclaimed May 1, as Law Day.

It was a day in which Americans could meet together and reflect upon their great heritage of individual liberty under law. Its purpose was and is to foster a deeper respect for law, encourage responsible citizenship, and promote national unity and strength by reaffirming faith in the "rule of law," as the foundation stone of American life and government and as an example to the world of what reliance upon the rule of law can mean to peoples of all nations as the only sure road to peace and order.

Since that first auspicious beginning, Law Day has been celebrated annually by ever-growing numbers of groups and organizations throughout the country. In 1961, its significance was heightened by the passage by Congress of a law designating May 1 of each year as Law Day.

Law Day on May 1, perhaps comes as close as any other day in the year to being that special time when we search for and express at least part of the meaning of America. It offers us not only an opportunity to refresh ourselves once more in the wellsprings of liberty and to reinvigorate an awareness of the eternal tie between law and freedom, but also to demonstrate to others the strengths and the riches of a system founded upon the rule of law.

The weapons that we marshal in our demonstration are our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our laws and our liberties in contrast to the tanks and steel-gray guns that rumble through the streets of the Communist capitals.

We proclaim law as the end of our civilization; they parade force. We commemorate the blessings of freedom; they, coercion and the bleakness of fear. We demonstrate that government is the servant of the people and its purpose the good of all; they demonstrate that government is the master of the people and that its good is the purpose of all.

It is in times of national crisis that we are most inclined to reexamine the foundations of our society. It is altogether fitting then that we pause to consider the rule of law and its relevancy to our history and to ourselves.

Law Day is really a day of massive American introspection with its end purpose a national rededication to those mighty ideals and principles which forged our freedom initially and which have preserved it throughout the critical periods of our development. It is not only a day for lawyers, it is a day for all those who respect and live by and for the concept of law as the basis of our civilization.

Sometimes the significance of the law in our country is overshadowed by jokes about law and the legal profession. Former Attorney General Rogers used to tell the story about the letter a woman wrote to her attorney as follows:

"I want to thank you for winning my case. I especially liked the way every time that other lawyer asked me those unfair questions, you jumped up and objected. I'm recommending you to all my friends as a real objectionable lawyer."

But despite a certain flippancy at times about the law, the American people have always understood its real meaning to freedom and the American way of life. As nothing else in our development, the "rule of law" has had an overwhelming importance to us. It directly affects almost every face tof our daily lives—our families, our business, our property, our safety, our peace, our freedom.

Perhaps no one described the meaning of law more concisely than did William Pitt during a speech to Parliament in 1770 when he said, "Where law ends, tyranny begins."

It was because the Founding Fathers were so deeply cognizant of the sacrifices and struggles that men had suffered and undergone in order to gain freedom, that they were determined to establish a system where the concept of the rule of law would be forever enshrined, inviolate from the passions of those seeking total power. They knew, as the late Justice Jackson stated a few years ago, "The choice is not between order and liberty, it is between liberty with order and anarchy without either."

This concept of law, that is, of affording liberty in an ethically ordered society, was expressed by the philosopher, Immanuel Kent in this fashion when he described law as "the sum total of the conditions under which the personal wishes of one man can be reconciled with the personal wishes of another man, in accordance with a general law of freedom."

The result is the greatest freedom for each man consonant with the well-being of his neighbor. This is the blessing of the rule of law.

Thus, the instrument by which the Founding Fathers created this system of free government was the Constitution. The means they looked to for the preservation of such a system, was the law.

In his "Constitutional Government in the United States," Woodrow Wilson phrased this concept in these words, "Constitutional government," he said, "is par excellence a government of law."

The bases of our system of the rule of law are the Constitution with its provisions for limited government, the Declaration of Independence with its thrilling, eternal passages of the right of the individual, the Bill of Rights which sealed so many of these principles into the heart of our civilization, representative and responsible government subject to the decisions of its sovereign, the people, at stated times through elections, and an impartial judiciary for the settlement of disputes.

The result is a society where the rights of people are governed by established rules and where the freedom and dignity of the individual are assured.

The standard is the equality of all before the law. Each man is then free to make as much of his life as he wishes so long as he accords the same privilege to his fellows.

The rule of law is perhaps the finest moral and political concept yet developed by man. Under the principle of equal justice for all, progress and order are nourished and sustained, and conflicts are resolved by law rather than force. This paramount underlying concept has been the major reason for the attainment by America of its place of world leadership and for the continued expansion of our strength and our "good society."

At the bottom of our system of law are we the people, exercising individual and moral responsibility and demonstrating our respect for the rule of law in our every daily action. Without this virtuous citizenry not even the Constitution could make our system work. In the words of the late Chief Justice Hughes, "Unless you have sound public opinion * * * the Constitution (would be) * * * nothing but a piece of paper."

Our system under law works because we the people want it to work; because we believe in it; because we know that it has preserved freedom and peace in our country in the past and that the rule of law offers the best promise for achieving permanent world peace in the future.

But to keep our responsibility and awareness at their finest pitch, we celebrate Law Day each year and rededicate ourselves to these magnificent principles.

As former President Eisenhower said, "It isn't enough merely to say, 'I love America' and to salute the flag. And to take off your hat as it goes by, and to help sing 'The Star Spangled Banner.'"

If we are to promote and preserve our great system of legal order and freedom we must work at it day in and day out, year after year. Our record thus far has been indeed, superb, but we are fully conscious that our system here at home is far from perfect, that it has many dark and gray areas where the warm light of freedom and equality has yet to shine.

We count our blessings on Law Day, but it can be more, it can be an inspiration to us to strive even harder to perfect equal justice under law for all.

And beyond its significance to us here at home is its promise for world peace. One of the primary purposes initially announced for Law Day was to awaken and educate the legal profession and the public to the promise and potential of a world ruled by law. One way in which our celebrations of Law Day helps is the demonstration to the rest of the world that when millions upon millions of individuals voluntarily accept the demands of responsibility and individual restraint, peace and freedom are fostered and preserved.

We can also resolve to support actively, by letting our representatives know of such support, the programs and policies of our Government aimed at furthering the solution of world problems through the processes of law and persuasion. Such programs include not only our efforts in the United Nations and our attempts to negotiate disarmament agreements, but our assistance to underdeveloped lands where our objective is to aid the growth of responsible, independent countries cooperating with restraint and maturity in deliberations concerning world problems and in relations with their neighbors.

No one, of course, envisions an utopian situation where all conflict will be forever vanished from the world. But we can work, both inside and outside the United Nations, for the slow acceptance of ways and means of peaceful absorption or resolution of conflict.

Considerable experience in procedures and types of machinery has been gained since World War II in this area. The successful experience, for instance, of the European Court of Justice has led to the examination by bar groups of the possibility of creating similar regional and specialized courts for the Americas, for Asia, and for Africa.

Another development has been the growth of the use of arbitration agreements particularly in the areas of commerce and trade, and economic development.

A third has been international conferences of lawyers seeking to develop areas of mutual agreement such as a general codification of existing principles of international law.

Ideas for a World Law Day and World Law Year as well as the creation of a permanent World Peace Through Law Institute have been proposed and are being worked upon. A World Law Day would help to focus attention everywhere upon the promise and potential of law in the world community. A World Law Year (similar to the International Geophysical Year which accomplished so much for science) would involve cooperative endeavors upon a whole series of projects for the drafting of new treaties and conventions to update world law.

But you ask What can I as a nonlawyer do to help further this process of a step-by-step building of a world of law and justice?

Religious and civic groups, as well as governments, are taking an increasing interest in the development of these programs. While the legal profession will do the legal spadework, the dissemination of results and the stimulation of interest in such programs constitute ways by which nonlawyer groups are participating and can participate significantly in the process of building toward world law.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention and your interest in these remarks on the origin and meaning of Law Day. As I have attempted to point out, Law Day has essentially four purposes: (1) Examining the meaning of law in our own history and development, (2) fostering a deeper understanding of the rule of law and its relationship to freedom, and of a deeper respect for law, (3) encouraging the continuance of the practice of responsible citizenship, and (4) awakening and educating Americans to the promise and the potential of a world ruled by law.

We know the full meaning of the rule of law to ourselves and to our country. It is the greatest blessing with which we and mankind everywhere can be endowed.

The great opportunities for the development of law in the future are both here at home and among the nations of the world. In the words of Charles Rhyne, the "father of law day": "If we work as hard to build this world of law as we do on other tremendous programs like that of concentrating enough brainpower and manpower—and money—to do such hitherto impossible things as putting a man into space or on the moon, we will succeed. And that success will be much more meaningful because when a world of law is achieved man can then walk anywhere on the face of the earth, or travel in outer space, in freedom, in dignity, and in peace."

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the Chair would indulge me for a minute I think I can explain why I am making this reservation and why I intend to object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered into the following be permitted to address the House:

Mr. BROMWELL, on June 18, for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYS. There is, Mr. Speaker. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record and to include therein extraneous matter: Mr. Celler, Mr. Rooney, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Morris, Mr. Flood, Mr. Vanik, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Multer, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. McDowell, and Mr. Rogers of Florida, each in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMERICAN MIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to be among those who successfully opposed any extension of the Bracero Act—Public Law 78.

One of the reasons for my opposition to the 2-year extension—or any other extension—of this act was aptly stated by the Christian Science Monitor in an article of March 9, 1962, which states in part "braceros occupy in the agricultural economy of the Southwest a place roughly comparable to that of slaves in the onetime cotton empire of the Old South."

This is a manifestly true statement, for the braceros were then and are now nothing much above the status of slaves.

What effect did this importation of cheap foreign labor have on American farmworkers?

The answer is that wages were depressed. In a typical situation in Texas not so long ago, the father of a family could make $6.15 in a day if he picked 300 pounds of cotton. Anybody who knows will tell you that picking 300 pounds of cotton in a day is something not easy to do. Who can support his family on $6.15 a day even when housing is furnished?

The answer is, of course, that nobody can. In order to survive, the domestic laborer had to press his wife and children into service. They might be able to average about 175 pounds apiece in a day of about 12 hours. Their contribution would enable the family to survive. But at what price?

The children could not work and go to school at the same time, and so they received no education to speak of. Result? In later life they, too, would become migrant agricultural workers.

The working conditions of migrant Americans are far below the standards of other American workers. In Texas, there is no protective legislation for these workers. There is no minimum wage, there is no workmen's compensation, there is no safety code, there are no housing safeguards, there are no health regulations, and there are no other laws to protect these workers. While many employers are honest and fair, there are some who are not, and the lack of State regulations invites these few to take full advantage of the vacuum.

I have seen enough to know that the working conditions of American migrant workers hang somewhere between civilization and medievalism. I would hope that this House will not make things worse by any extension of Public Law 78.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 5795.

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE PRICE OF PEACE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, peace has always been an aspiration of a strong America, but we have never sought "peace at any price or at any cost," for the price of peace can frequently be counted in the forfeiture of freedoms, the loss of liberties, and the negation of national prestige. Surely we have led the world in independence, freedom, and establishing our "colonies" as independent nations.

Perhaps while our President is seeking a so-called peace which, growing through a series of stages is to permit "parallel political developments that would take the place of arms," it would prove profitable to examine and assess the price that Americans are being forced to pay for peace at the present time.

Only last week the administration's policy, or would it be more correct to say lack of policy, provided a clear and striking example of the loss of liberty, freedom, and dignity which every American citizen has had to pay in order that the so-called peace be maintained. On June 5 under the dictates of eight armed Venezuelan pro-Communist terrorists, six unarmed Americans of the U.S. military mission to Caracas were forced to disrobe publicly in that capital city. Unsatisfied with disgracing American representatives, the "red" raiders—admittedly Communist conspirators and most likely Castro-trained and Cuba-based—impudently burned a U.S. flag and a portrait of George Washington before setting the entire mission ablaze and fleeing with the clothing and valuables of the American citizens involved. They had the gall and audacity to tell our GI's that they would not be so lucky as to escape with their lives the next time.

Certainly, no legislator of this House will recognize this outrage as any part of peace, yet many will not hesitate to assert the specious and fallacious conclusion that any sort of retaliation would act as a detriment to peace. However, one has only to look to the real source of the difficulty in order to find a point at which a strong, uncompromising stance in foreign policy would have precluded the possibility of this and other outrages to America.

The editors of a leading news magazine went straight to the heart of the matter in diagnosing the cancerous Communist terror as being initiated by subversives trained in Castro's Communist Cuba. A firm policy in regard to Cuba, its trade and its emigrant flow could and would have prevented this outrage against our Nation and other subversive activities in Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, and other Latin American republics.

What kind of action did the public humiliation of our citizenry and the degradation of our flag evoke from our State Department? Did it add starch to the soft approach of the administration? No, the button-down collar of the intellectual has seemingly evolved into the buttoned-lip policy of our State Department. In fact, no action whatsoever in regard to these disgraces has been taken. More important still, is the continued lack of a policy of strength regarding Castro's exportation of subversives to our South American neighbors.

My distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. Cramer and Mr. Rogers], only last Monday, June 10, brought to the attention of this body the startling facts concerning the soft policy of the administration toward the continued buildup of Castro's Cuba. They were careful to point out that the buildup was taking place through the unrestricted trade of the island dictatorship with many countries of the free world whom we are assisting with considerable economic and military aid and with whom we still engage in an active trade. The inconsistency of American policy at this point is too glaring to ignore. This price of peace is too great to pay, especially when one realizes that peace cannot be purchased in this manner; while maintaining any semblance of dignity and honor—individual or national.

Do Americans across this great Nation share with our President the frightful feeling, the policy which deals from fear, that a soft line in foreign policy is justified and necessitated, because "it is discouraging to think that their leaders—the Communists—may actually believe what their propagandists continually write"? Certainly, the general public cannot join the Chief Executive in this sophisticated "whistling in the dark" when the facts of subversion stare us in the face and the Berlin wall prevents freedom-loving individuals from true liberty and equality.

The supposedly new policy statement of the administration on Monday was merely the overt declaration of a pacifistic policy of verbal internationalism intended to hide a fearful isolation in the realm of useful policy implementation. In recent times so-called peace has been purchased at the price of principle and prestige. Without serious protest Russian fishing vessels have approached our scant 3-mile limit, American fisherman have been ordered out of several fertile parts of conceded international waters of the oceans, Turkish confidence in America has been seriously undermined, and wherever possible we have crept away from conflict with Cuba—in fact, there again we snatched defeat from the jaws of victory when the entire free world was on our side and the Communists were admittedly deceitful and overextended.

It is foolish to lull ourselves into the false security procured by thoughtful inaction. Experience regarding appeasement and tolerance toward Hitler in the 1930's should have taught us that such a policy merely builds the confidence of the warmonger, suggesting to him the possibly of ultimate success. Like it or not, chauvinistic as it may be—nonresponsible nations understand only firm action and a "big-stick" policy, no matter how softly we speak. Our recent actions as a Nation has not borne this out. Peace must not be bargained for at the price of principle. History tells us that it cannot be. If Americans are now so dominated by anxiety over nuclear capabilities, the price of peace may well again involve a Pearl Harbor, only this time recovery will be all the more precarious.

What does it take to awaken the will of the people of the United States of America, who bravely sent the U.S. Marines—as a fledgling Nation—to the shores of Tripoli in order to correct injustices far less serious than we now accept without protest in Cuba, Venezuela, and even Ecuador—which we feed.

MIA JUNE CONFERENCE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very significant event occurring this weekend in my home State of Utah.

Beginning Thursday, June 13, youth leaders from all sections of the United States and many foreign countries will arrive in Salt Lake City for the 64th Annual June Conference of the Mutual Improvement Association of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The Mutual Improvement Association is an organization within the Mormon Church which has as a specific aim, the promotion of wholesome activity for young people. The two divisions of the association, Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association and Young Women's Mutual Improvement Association are under the direction of G. Carlos Smith and Florence S. Jacobson, respectively.

From the very beginning of the church, the importance of young people as the leaders of the future has been recognized. Great stress has always been placed upon the necessity of helping youth become responsible adults—individuals in whose daily lives, religious conviction, moral integrity, and honesty are constantly applied.

The key has been activity—activity which diverts the energy and enthusiasm of youth into character building endeavors of lasting worth. Religious values and spiritual development serve as the underlying influence which provide the activity with proper meaning and orientation.

The simple maxim "Be honest with yourself," becomes an integral personality trait through participation, for example, in sports where sportsmanship is placed above winning. Camping, handiwork, and service projects incorporate high regard for honest effort into the daily actions of young people. Development of the ability to communicate and think maturely is a reality through public speaking and drama fostered by this organization. Other talents find expression through the association-sponsored music and dance programs.

Thus the Mutual Improvement Association supplements the efforts of the home and community in building capable future leadership.

The attendance of the local leaders at all sessions of the conference is expected to exceed 100,000. This is indicative of the activity of this organization of the church in reaching the lives of young people all over the world.

The conference itself will take place June 14 and 15. Stress will focus upon increasing leadership ability and devotion to the service of youth on the part of the association workers.

In this day when the problems of juvenile and adult crime are increasing, it is refreshing to cast our attention upon the efforts of an organization in which a program to combat these problems on the level of their genesis is active, applicable, and effective.

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICIAL CALLS ST. LOUIS WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAM "MODEL FOR NATION"

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to read into the RECORD the high praise by U.S. Public Health Service officials to MSD and St. Louis communities, with reference to the pollution abatement program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we in St. Louis are very proud of the steps being taken by our communities to help solve the urgent national problem of water pollution, and to provide our area with the facilities necessary to prevent further pollution—and thus help to clean up our great Mississippi River.

The agency assigned this responsibility is the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, the executive director of which is Mr. Peter F. Mattei. From every indication this agency is doing a good job. I was pleased, therefore, to find in the May newsletter of this agency a report on a recent conference with U.S. Public Health Service officials at which the MSD program was described as becoming "a model for the rest of the Nation."

According to this account, Mr. Murray Stein, of Washington, D.C., Chief Enforcement Officer of the Water Supply Pollution Control Section of USPHS, said that no other metropolitan area in the country had approached its water pollution problems "with such foresight, orderliness, and cooperation." This is indeed good news for those of us from the St. Louis area who have supported effective measures to combat water pollution, because this proves we are trying our best on the local level to solve a national problem which can be solved only with the utmost local cooperation and much sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion as part of my remarks the item which caught my eye in the May newsletter published by the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, as follows:

U.S. OFFICIAL PRAISES MSD

High praise was given this month by U.S. Public Health Service officials to MSD and the St. Louis communities for their outstanding manner in which the pollution abatement program here has been handled. "In the years to come, the St. Louis area will serve as a model for the rest of the Nation," said Murray Stein of Washington, D.C., Chief Enforcement Officer of the Water Supply Pollution Control Section, USPHS.

Stein said that no other metropolitan area in the country had approached its water pollution problems with such foresight, orderliness, and cooperation. He praised the officials of the many communities involved in this area, various other public officials, and singled out MSD for particular tribute on the manner in which we have moved ahead on a very complex problem.

Stein's remarks came at a progress meeting here on Friday, May 10, at which he and other USPHS officials from Washington, Chicago, and Kansas City heard reports on pollution abatement measures being taken in the Greater St. Louis area.

The meeting was the seventh such semiannual review session of Federal officials with Missouri, Illinois and local authorities. The regular progress meetings were recommended by the March 1958 conferences conducted here by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This was the conference that set in motion the area-wide pollution abatement program, which for the MSD area reached a high point last November in vote-approval of the huge Mississippi River project.

After reviewing reports of progress both in the MSD area and on the East Side, Stein and his fellow Federal officials characterized the MSD program as moving ahead "in excellent fashion." They expressed "pleasant surprise" at the strides made by East Side communities since the last semiannual progress meeting, and mildly cautioned Illinois authorities that only three small areas "could bear watching."

HOSPITAL INSURANCE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, representatives of senior citizens clubs from many States have come to the Capitol today to urge upon us early and favorable consideration of amendment of the Social Security Act to extend some measure of hospital and nursing home insurance protection to those eligible for retirement benefits.

Over the years the Social Security Act has been expanded and revised many times and each amendment has been accompanied by the woeful cries of those who oppose any Federal assistance in the field of social welfare. However, each and every time, their dire predictions of increases in unemployment, decline in purchasing power, tremendous increases in taxes, prohibitive administrative costs, and so forth, have failed to come true. Indeed, the social security system, since its inception has proved to be a sound, economic, and humane way to aid our citizens, many of whom are still not eligible for private pensions or annuities.

Months ago, Mr. Speaker, the President sent Congress his recommendations with respect to aid for our elderly citizens. His message proposed, among other things, that a hospitalization insurance program be instituted under the social security system to assist our senior citizens in meeting the hospital and nursing home costs that so many of them must face. The President is calling for another progressive step forward by requesting that hospitalization insurance protection be added to the retirement and disability benefits now available through the social security system. With reduced incomes, facing more frequent illnesses or breakdowns, remaining hospitalized or under the care of a physician for longer periods of time, our older people must be provided with adequate protection and care. They are entitled to it, and we must see that they get it.

It is unfortunate that private insurance programs have not been able to solve the problem, but the reason for this failure is simple and basic—people on retirement incomes are greater risks insofar as insurance is concerned, and therefore the premiums for coverage are extremely high. Low-cost group insurance is generally not available to them, and buying on an individual basis is necessarily very expensive and, in many cases, virtually impossible.

Because I believe that the administration's proposal will be an effective method of providing care and treatment for our older citizens, I am today introducing a companion bill to the measure introduced by the gentleman from California, Congressman Cecil R. King, during the current Congress. I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means will be in a position to take action on this bill in the very near future, and I trust that this House will see fit to pass such legislation when it reaches the floor for consideration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, some newspaper columnists who purport to tell their readers the inside story, are claiming that a move is afoot to compromise this issue by amending the King bill to permit the Social Security Administration to delegate the administration of the program to the Blue Cross or other organizations. In my opinion this is an unwise proposal despite its superficial plausibility and despite the worthy congressional sponsorship it is said to enjoy.

Although incorporated as a nonprofit organization and, broadly speaking, operated in the interest of the community at large, in actuality the Blue Cross is dominated and controlled by the purveyors of hospital service—the so-called voluntary hospitals. Neither Blue Cross nor the American Hospital Assoication has announced support or endorsement of the bills to add hospitalization to the present package of social security benefits. Now, however, as enactment of the bill becomes more certain, the hospitals and the physicians who largely dominate their governing boards wish to capture the hospitalization insurance program.

I am opposed completely to this maneuver. I will not vote to place administration of a public program in the hands of its private opponents. I will not vote to place administration of a public program in the hands of the private vendors it would reimburse. I will not vote to place administration of a public program in the hands of a private organization that cannot possibly do the job at a lower cost than the Social Security Administration. I will not vote to place the administration of a public program in the hands of a private organization that is not subject to the equitable rules of merit employment that apply to public agencies.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the newspaper reports to which I refer are in error and that the efforts to effect this shoddy compromise will come to naught. I call upon any of my colleagues who may be approached with this proposition to stop, look and listen. The fact that such schemes are even proposed is clear evidence that victory is near at hand for the President's plan for hospital insurance for older people under social security. Now is the time for all friends of the President's bill to stand fast and reject unworthy compromises.

RIGHTWING EXTREMISM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a statement.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week my able friend and colleague, Morris K. Udall, devoted his newsletter to the subject of rightwing extremism in this country. This gentleman from Arizona is known for his thorough work, and I commend his words to you.

FRIGHT FOR SALE

For 2 years now, on every working day, the postman has left on my doorstep 150 or more pieces of mail. Some are newspapers, press releases, and routine communications from Government agencies. Many are letters from constituents asking for help. Some are thoughtful, constructive comments on great issues of the day. But nearly every morning I find 10 or 15 letters which defy description—letters filled with fear, suspicion, and distrust, not of enemies and potential enemies, but of our own Government and the leaders we ourselves have elected to office. For 24 months I have thought this strange, irrational mark of our times would pass. Instead, it persists, defying fact, reason, and the lessons of history.

Nearly every week I am told that there is a Liberal-Socialist-Communist plot to turn our Government into a dictatorship. Earl Warren, our Nation's Chief Justice, is a "fellow traveler" who should be impeached. President Kennedy, a usurper of power, is preparing to turn our Armed Forces over to the United Nations; as a first step he has removed the words "In God We Trust" from our dollar bills. In the minds of these Americans most of the men and women who serve in Congress, most Supreme Court Justices, and nearly all of our executive department officials are left-leaning, Socialist, ultraliberal, neo-Communist dupes—if not worse.

Everyone likes to receive mail, but imagine starting your day—every day—with messages like the following:

"It seems that the Constitution is a cloak only to be used when the little Kennedy brothers and their kosher friends need to show their might by invading the State of Mississippi."

"Has any foreign person not a Communist or a cannibal approved our foreign policy?"

"It is regrettable that you liberal-socialists are bent on throwing away for mysterious international reasons everything Americans have had to fight for."

"I am mad clear through * * * about what you and our other representatives are doing to us, our country and our heritage down there in Washington."

"Why do you believe Christian-American taxpayers should support an anti-Christian, pro-Communist, and alien Jew rabbi?"

"Many of us * * * are ashamed of your lying tactics."

"Of all the rats and snakes elected to office in Washington to represent the people and carry out their wishes, you rank head and shoulders beneath the lowest."

The people who write these letters aren't foreigners, or New Yorkers, or Californians. They are Arizonans who live in Bisbee, Phoenix, Casa Grande, and Tucson. Some of them may be neighbors of yours.

OVERTONES OF PREJUDICE

To me the most alarming feature of these letters and the pamphlets which so often accompany them is their thinly disguised or even blatant overtone of racial and religious prejudice. I always shudder in this year of 1963, in a supposedly enlightened and tolerant Nation, to find people accepting statements like the following:

"Just last month I was sent the current Gerald L. K. Smith publication, The Cross and the Flag, which declared: "Observers * * * have known for many years that international Jewry plotted the complete liquidation of the German race." This is history turned topsy-turvy, for the Germans systematically put to death 6 million Jews. Yet an Arizona lady writes: "There never was any execution of 6 million Jews as they would have us believe."

I'm also served almost daily with the words of another "authority," Myron C. Fagan, who with Smith is a prime mover in the current hysteria over disarmament. Fagan tells his readers—and many believe him—that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, working with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has a plot to get control of our communications media—"you know what for"—along with other "treasonous activities."

Another "authority" is the Reverend Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N.J., whose daily radio program is heard in our State. In the name of Jesus Christ—the greatest exponent of charity and brotherly love—he regularly preaches hatred of Pope John (for his final encyclical "Peace on Earth"), the Roman Catholic Church ("the harlot church and the bride of the anti-Christ"), the National Council of Churches ("apostate, Communist and modernist"), the United Presbyterian Church and Evangelist Billy Graham ("a compromiser"). McIntire attacks the peaceful demonstrations of Negroes in Birmingham, implying they are "Communist-organized" and "Communist-controlled."

A REPUBLICAN SPEAKS OUT

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL the able, moderate California Republican often mentioned as a possible presidential candidate, has become so concerned about the volume and virulence of this kind of mail that he recently made a remarkable speech of conscience detailing the common experience of all of us who have the honor to serve in the greatest legislative body in the world.

In a systematic way Senator KUCHEL went down the line of charges currently being made by what he termed the "fright peddlers." He inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reproduction of some of the stupid, inflammatory and fraudulent pamphlets distributed by the John Birch Society, Smith, Fagan and various self-styled "patriotic" organizations. He told the Senate:

"Do these people really believe, I ask myself—and now I ask them—that a gigantic and incredible and unprecedented conspiracy has occurred in America in which the President and his Cabinet, 99 percent of the Congress, 99 percent of the Nation's journalists, and even the U.S. Army have all taken part to sell out our country? * * *. If they do, the only reasonable reply I can give to them which they will understand is the honorable, 100 percent red, white, and blue expression: 'Nuts.'"

This speech by Senator KUCHEL is so important that I have obtained several hundred copies and will make them available to those readers who wish to pursue the matter further.

AGREE WITH ME OR YOU'RE A TRAITOR

My staff and I have spent many hundreds of hours compiling patient and reasonable answers to the people who write these letters, but there can really be no intellectual exchange or respect for honest differences of view. You either agree 100 percent with them or you become, at best, a well-meaning dupe or coward and, at worst, a traitor.

Even conservative Republicans are not immune to such wild charges. My able colleague, Congressman JOHN RHODES of Phoenix, was attacked as a "coward" when he refused the request of a member of the Arizona house of representatives to sponsor impeachment of President Kennedy for sending troops to maintain order in Alabama. The attack was so intemperate that it prompted the Phoenix Gazette to comment, "To vilify a public official personally because he disagrees with an extreme suggestion * * * is piling extreme upon extreme."

America has always had its hate peddlers and other fright-purveyors, such as the German-American Bund and Father Coughlin of the 1930's and the "barn burners" and "know nothings" of Lincoln's time. Yet I doubt that we have ever had such a consistent, sustained, well-financed, long-lived outpouring as the kind we are observing today.

THE VESTED INTERESTS

Most of the people who write me are sincere, law-abiding citizens who are honestly concerned. Many are whipped into the frenzy of suspicion and fear by a whole battery of well-financed organizations which pour out a steady stream of pamphlets, newsletters, and radio broadcasts. Behind many of these organizations are devious people who have a stake in frightening their fellow Americans.

Some of the authors of this vicious literature undoubtedly are disturbed people—paranoid personalities of one type or another. Others are in it for a more obvious reason; they have a vested interest in frightening the American people.

If Americans believe that the cold war is going well despite problems in some places, that we are succeeding in some places and holding our own in others, that we are maintaining a majority of the United Nations on our side, these purveyors won't sell many pamphlets or lecture tickets. But if they can make Americans believe that we are losing everywhere and the Reds are winning everywhere, that we can do nothing right and the Reds can do nothing wrong, that every country that isn't 100 percent pro-American is 100 percent pro-Russian, then they can sell their pamphlets and lectures, and they can get "sacrificial pledges" from radio listeners throughout the country.

Thus, these people constantly repeat and embellish every rumor, however absurd it may be, to serve their purposes. An example was the widely reported rumor that 16,000 African soldiers "with nose and ear rings" were to participate in a United Nations exercise in Georgia, real purpose of which was "a war to invade America." The truth was that 124 foreign military officers from various allied nations observed a U.S. Army exercise in guerrilla warfare called Operation Water Moccasin.

"Vested" too is the term for the interest of certain persons of extreme wealth in these campaigns of frenzy. H. L. Hunt, the Texas billionaire, is the founder and principal financial supporter of "Facts Forum" and the "Life Line" radio broadcasts and bulletins. While scaring Americans is their stock in trade, these activities also advance the views of Mr. Hunt, who wrote a book proposing that "if you accept State aid because you are poor or sick, you cannot vote at all, and you're denied an old-age pension." Mr. Hunt's "democracy" would also provide that "the more taxes you pay, the more votes you get."

SOME FACTS THAT WON'T SELL PAMPHLETS

It shouldn't be necessary to assure Americans or Arizonians in the year 1963 of some of the following things, and I am a little ashamed to have to do it. But let's get a few facts straight, even if they won't sell any pamphlets or tracts:

The President, his Cabinet and Members of Congress are patriotic Americans. There isn't a Socialist or a Communist in the lot. The vast majority of them are overworked, underpaid, sincere and effective public servants.

The State Department is not filled with Communists, Socialists or One Worlders. Ninety-five percent of these employees served under President Eisenhower. The backgrounds and loyalty of every State Department official have been checked and rechecked by the FBI.

There isn't going to be any unilateral disarmament on the part of our country, and there is no plot to surrender our sovereignty to the United Nations or anyone else.

Dwight Eisenhower, Earl Warren, and John F. Kennedy are sincere, dedicated, and loyal Americans working for the best interests of our country. No one of them is a party in any way to any scheme to deprive us of our liberties, transform our way of life, or turn our country over to some foreign power.

The U.S. Army is not training cannibals in Georgia to invade our country and enforce integration and intermarriage.

A PRODUCT OF OUR TIMES?

I don't know what a psychiatrist would say (the prophets of fear, appropriately, are opposed to "mental health"), but I think much of this fear and distrust is a product of the dangerous times in which we live.

Prior to 1941 America went its own way. Attack or invasion by a foreign power were out of the question. There were several great powers in the world. Today we are the leader of the free world. The United States and the Soviet Union are the only great powers left, and they are engaged in a great economic and political struggle. In foreign affairs we can't always have our way, but we are deeply involved in most world events. Whether Eisenhower, Kennedy, Goldwater, Romney, or Rockefeller is President, we will have some successes, some failures, and some mistakes in our foreign policy.

At home we have domestic problems of a staggering magnitude. Our country grows by 3 million people every year. Since 1946 we have experienced an industrial and technological revolution that rivals in quality and quantity the mechanical changes between 1850 and 1917. An engineer or scientist who graduated in the 1940's would find his training inadequate if he were to step abruptly into the technological world of 1963.

Failure to understand and adjust to this changed world is, I think, a major factor in the fear psychology we are observing in our country today.

FEAR AND SUSPICION—OR TRUST AND RESPECT?

The greatest need in America today is not fear or suspicion. The greatest need is trust. We need to trust and respect and support the leaders our people have elected. Democracy finds a ready mechanism for changing its leaders whenever the majority of the people desire a change.

Americans have been notoriously poor judges of their contemporary leaders. Those who arrogantly and with complete certainty cast doubt about the patriotism of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy would do well to read with humility what their counterparts of 1863 said about President Lincoln.

Ask any American today to name our two greatest President, and he will surely name Lincoln as one. Yet Lincoln was bitterly denounced in his own era by many intelligent leaders of the day as ignorant, prejudiced, corrupt, utterly incompetent, atheistic, and insane. In 1863 Richard Dana, a respected writer and political figure, concluded a typical attack by declaring:

"The President has no admirers, no enthusiastic supporters * * * he is an unutterable calamity to us where he is."

Ask any American to name the greatest pronouncement of an American leader, and he is likely to name the Gettysburg Address. Yet the correspondent who covered that speech for the influential Chicago Times sent a description of the speech which ended on this note:

"The cheek of every American must tingle with shame as he reads the silly, flat, and dish-watery utterances of the man who has to be pointed out to intelligent foreigners as the President of the United States."

THE JUST END TO PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include relevant material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call our colleagues' attention to two newspaper articles and a letter which bear directly on the affirmative action taken by the House to terminate the Mexican farm labor importation program.

Contrary to the arguments raised by its supporters, the ending of Public Law 78 will not cause great damage to Mexico's economy. Rather, as the Mexican Agronomy Society stated in an article appearing in the New Mexican:

> The Government had been anticipating the eventual end of the program and the men who had been working as braceros could be placed in other jobs.

At the same time, domestic farmworkers to harvest our crops are available. As Arthur Ross, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California, stated in an interview appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette:

> We must remember there are 500,000 unemployed workers in California alone. Many of them are members of minority groups whom farmers are accustomed to employing in particular crops. Many are young men with limited education but strong physiques. Thus there is no shortage of a potential labor supply. What is needed is to recruit and utilize it more effectively.

Such a recruitment and utilization program is possible; it has been incorporated in H.R. 4518 and similar bills. And this legislation has the support of such farm organizations as the National Farmers Union. As its president, James Patton, stated in his letter of June 10:

> I feel this is the time, already too long delayed, for raising our own domestic farmworkers and family farmers out of poverty, at the same time giving many of our unemployed youth job opportunities. To this end I strongly urge you to give all-out support to quick passage of the domestic farm labor recruitment bill, H.R. 4518.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the two newspaper articles and the National Farmers Union letter in their entirety for they speak directly and constructively to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I join in urging early and favorable consideration of this legislation.

[From the New Mexican, Sante Fe, (N. Mex.), June 3, 1963]

Program End Won't Hurt

Mexico City.—Mexico's economy would not be greatly damaged if the United States ended the bracero program, a spokesman for the Mexican Agronomy Society said Sunday.

The U.S. House last week voted down a measure to extend the program under which Mexican workers can be hired by U.S. farmers.

A society spokesman said the Government had been anticipating the eventual end of the program and that the men who had been working as braceros could be placed in other jobs.

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Daily Gazette]

Bracero Program Halt May Aid Unemployed

Berkeley.—The halt to importing Mexican contract farmworkers was halted today as a measure of hope for the growing number of California unemployed.

Arthur M. Ross, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California, noted that there now are a half million unemployed Californians, many of them only able to do farmwork.

The U.S. House of Representatives last week decided against extension of the bracero program, with the California congressional delegation splitting 19–13 in favor of continuation.

California growers employed almost 80,000 Mexican workers at the height of the 1962 harvest. The State administration is now seeking Federal aid for housing and transportation of domestic farmworkers, to fill the gap.

Ross admitted that elimination of the braceros would create major problems of adjustment involving such crops as tomatoes, strawberries, lettuce, lemons, and asparagus, which had been harvested by the Mexicans.

"A large part of the answer will be to provide steadier work for domestic farmworkers," Ross said.

"A recent study of farmworkers in Kern County showed that heads of households were obtaining an average of 138 days of work in 1961, little more than half time. Experience shows that with careful attention to scheduling and sharing of crews, at least 250 days of work could be provided annually. If this were done for a substantial proportion of the domestic seasonal workers, the loss of braceros would be compensated."

Ross added that "we must remember there are 500,000 unemployed workers in California alone. Many of them are members of minority groups whom farmers are accustomed to employing in particular crops. Many are young men with limited education but strong physiques.

"Thus there is no shortage of a potential labor supply. What is needed is to recruit and ultilize it more effectively. This will call for close collaboration between agriculture and labor groups and the employment service, so as to provide the steadiest possible work. Undoubtedly, it will also require substantial improvements in housing, sanitation, and wage levels."

National Farmers Union,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963.

Dear Congressman: I wish to thank you for your recent vote opposing extension of the Mexican labor importation program. Our organization supports you in this stand and urges you to also oppose a 1-year extension of the program.

Instead, I feel this is the time, already too long delayed for raising our own domestic farm workers and family farmers out of poverty at the same time giving many of our unemployed youth job opportunities.

To this end I strongly urge you to give all-out support to quick passage of the domestic farm labor recruitment bill, H.R. 4518, now in the House Education and Labor Committee. A companion bill, S. 527 will be the subject of hearings starting June 10 before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, headed by Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey.

We wish to make clear our position.

First, we in Farmers Union have always felt that low-income (sometimes subsidized) agricultural workers are unfair competition to family farmers and their wives and older children.

Second, we feel that farmers who are required to pay fair wages and maintain good working and living conditions should have their income from farming protected sufficiently so that they can well afford to pay good wages and maintain adequate working and living conditions.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

James G. Patton,
President.

THE TIME HAS COME TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS WITH LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the Record and to include additional pertinent information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the reason I reserve the right to object, and I have no objection to a reasonable amount of matter, but I think the Member asking for unanimous consent to include certain additional matter should indicate what it is and indicate its approximate length. There is a limitation on the amount of material to be inserted in the Appendix of the daily Record, but that limitation does not apply to the body of the Record. One day last week, one of these extensions in the body of the Record cost $5,400 just for one extension of extraneous material. That is what I am objecting to. I am not going to object in this particular case because the gentleman from Iowa has indicated to me before making the request that it is rather short. So I am not going to object and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to establish a permanent Committee on Small Business with legislative authority to develop and recommend to the House of Representatives germane amendments to the following acts of the Congress:

First. The Small Business Act, which established the Small Business Administration.

Second. The Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Third. The Robinson-Patman Act.

The Small Business Act—Public Law 536, 85th Congress—provides, in section 10(b) that—

> (b) The Administration shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, and to the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, on December 31 of each year, showing as accurately as possible for each such period the amount of funds appropriated to it that it has expended in the conduct of each of its principal activities such as lending, procurement, contracting, and providing technical and managerial aids.

Again, in section 10(e) the Small Business Act provides the following:

> (e) The Administration shall retain all correspondence, records of inquiries, memorandums, reports, books, and records, including memorandums as to all investigations conducted by or for the Administration, for a period of at least one year from the date of each thereof, and shall at all times keep the same available for inspection and examination by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, and the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, or their duly authorized representatives.

Pursuant to these sections which I have quoted, the Small Business Administration presents its annual report to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, and to the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business and makes all correspondence, records, reports, and books open and available to them. This covers, of course, the Small Business Investment Division of the Small Business Administration which was established by the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The protections for business provided in the Robinson-Patman Act are more important to small business than are many other aspects of the antitrust laws, and the Robinson-Patman Act is in a very real sense a "Magna Carta" for the protection of the vital interests of small business, and is so regarded by small businessmen, as is shown by a letter I have received from George Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 370 WOULD ESTABLISH A PERMANENT SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE WITH LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 370 which would establish a permanent Committee on Small Business with legislative authority to develop and recommend to the House of Representatives germane amendments to the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is my confident belief that this measure implements the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and the Robinson-Patman Act.

In addition, House Resolution 370 provides that the permanent Committee on Small Business which it would create would have authority to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business existing, arising, or that may arise with particular reference to (a) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (b) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business; and (c) whether Federal departments and agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business.

I introduced House Resolution 370 because I am convinced that small business, along with farming, is the backbone of the American economy. Our history shows that as small business prospers so our Nation prospers and is strong, steady, and self-reliant, and able to meet all emergencies during both war and peace.

In addition, I was moved to develop and introduce House Resolution 370 because it has become increasingly clear to everyone concerned that the House Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business is terribly hampered in its efforts to serve the needs of the Nation's 4½ million small businessmen. This select committee of the House is prevented from making the full contribution it should to small businessmen because, as a study committee, it cannot legislate but can only refer its studies to other committees of the House of Representatives.

These committees generally take these studies, file them, and then make their own studies of the problems.

This process results in unnecessary delays, frustration, duplication, and waste.

Furthermore, it is obvious that the other committees of the House, which are not directly charged with the problems of small business, and which do not, for instance, have the Small Business Administration reporting directly to them, cannot possibly be as well informed regarding the difficulties which small businessmen must cope with to stay in business as the House Small Business Committee is.

As a member of the House Committee on House Administration, I have had to listen many times over the past several years to chairmen of the standing committees of the House relate their need for funds in order to carry on their constantly growing workload, a large share of which is concerned with small business and simply duplicates, or overlaps, the work which the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business has already done but cannot, in the present situation, legislate on.

House Resolution 370 would cut out the waste and redtape that for so long have cluttered up the machinery established by the Congress to serve the needs of business.

It would help assure our country's small businessmen that they would get a dollar's worth of service for each dollar they paid to support the work of the Congress.

My measure would save money, end confusion, improve the processes of government, and, in addition, would add to the confidence which the taxpaying small businessmen of our country have in themselves and in the great destiny of this free people.

I include as part of my remarks a letter from George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, endorsing my House Resolution 370 and its objective which is the full recognition which small business deserves of the Federal Government.

Mr. Burger wrote in part:

> To the everlasting credit of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, carrying out their mandate instruction in our appearances before both the Democratic and Republican platform committees in convention in 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960, we have repeatedly urged this recognition to small business.
>
> It is our hope that the rules committee will give early consideration in this Congress and report the resolution out as there are similar resolutions also pending sponsored by Congressmen GROSS, WIDNALL, and MOORE.

I include also a letter from Mr. Burger in which the Robinson-Patman Act is described as the "Magna Carta" of small business; and the text of my House Resolution 370.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., May 28, 1963.

Hon. JOHN KYL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KYL: I noted with considerable interest your splendid action of the 27th in introducing a measure that would provide for the present House Small Business Committee to be a permanent committee of the House and giving it full legislative authority.

This is a very constructive action on your part and should be welcome news not alone to small business in your own congressional district but even more important to all small business in your State of Iowa and finally, of tremendous interest to small business throughout the Nation which includes more than 191,000 federation members, all individual members comprising all types of small business in the 50 States.

What is more important in your action is that it was spontaneous on your part.

Furthermore, you are to be congratulated for the detailed statement that you made as to the need for this action by the House.

With over a quarter of a century background on Capitol Hill in behalf of small business, plus a 54-year background in small business itself, you present a constructive statement of the need which I honestly believe is not debatable.

To the everlasting credit of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, carrying out their mandate instruction in our appearances before both the Democratic and Republican platform committees in convention in 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960, we have repeatedly urged this recognition to small business.

It is our hope that the Rules Committee will give early consideration in this Congress and report the resolution out as there are similar resolutions also pending sponsored by Congressmen GROSS, WIDNALL, and MOORE.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., June 11, 1963.

Hon. JOHN KYL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KYL: In your release of May 27 at the time you introduced a resolution that would provide for a permanent Small Business Committee in the House, with full legislative authority, I noted that the third recommendation you made for the need for this action by the House was relating to the field of the Robinson-Patman Act, which, in our opinion should be the No. 1 action in the Small Business Committees of both branches of the Congress.

It will be found from the record of the proposed agendas of the respective Small Business Committees at the start of any congressional year, on behalf of the membership of the federation, carrying out their mandate urging fullest enforcement of the antitrust laws, which includes the Robinson-Patman Act, we have repeatedly urged such action by the committees—that is as to the enforcement of the act, and as to whether there is any deficiency in the present law, and if so, corrective amendments to be made.

The truth of the matter is, with over half a century background in small business, I have come to the conclusion that the increasing problems facing small business nationwide originate in the production end of our economy and then in the distribution end. Let me follow this thought a little further in an attempt to justify our action.

Due to the strong opposition from large corporate interests, including large merchandising chains when the Robinson-Patman Act was under consideration before the Congress, when finally the act became a law in 1936 it was our opinion, and we have so stated publicly, that small business looked upon this constructive action of the Congress in their behalf as their "Magna Carta."

In the early part of 1936—to be exact, on or about March 4—a large gathering of independent businessmen took place in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C. About 1,500 or more were present that day. The gathering was addressed by the sponsors of the legislation, the late Senator Joe Robinson of Arkansas and the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. I was also privileged to address that group in my official capacity at that time as secretary-general manager of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers.

A day or two later we were honored to meet with the then President of the United States at the White House, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt. We urged the President, in behalf of small business, that if the legislation was finally approved by the Congress, that he would affix his signature—which he did.

It is to be noted that shortly after the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act the views that we held as to the "Magna Carta" for small business were confirmed in the action taken in the first instance by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. in canceling its contract relationship with Sears, Roebuck & Co. in the manufacture of Sears tires by the Goodyear Co.

This was due to a cease and desist order by the Federal Trade Commission issued March 5, 1936, FTC docket No. 2116. It goes without saying that that contract relationship would not have been canceled except due to the action of the Robinson-Patman Act under which the producer apparently believed and which he so stated in canceling, that they couldn't justify the price under the new law.

It is significant to note that this was one of the first "cost-plus" contracts of its kind in all industry.

Bear in mind the Commission's findings in that contract were that the quality of tires furnished to Sears was equal in every way to Goodyear's trademarked tire—first line.

Within a month or two later the B. F. Goodrich Co., having similar contract relationship with the Atlas Supply Co. (Standard Oil of New Jersey)—Atlas tires, canceled their portion of the contract with the Atlas Co., the statement coming from the president of the Goodrich Co., stating they couldn't justify the price under the new law.

Shortly after the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act certain store managers in the employ of tire companies owning and operating retail stores stated to me: "Burger, find me a job as under the Robinson-Patman Act our company cannot keep these stores operating."

Shortly after the cancellation of the Goodrich contract with the Atlas Supply the Goodrich portion of that contract was taken up by the U.S. Rubber Co. (1936). U.S. Rubber Co. at that time in a published statement announced a new national sales policy in keeping with the full provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is to be noted a few years later, to be exact 1939, the FTC issued a cease and desist order against the U.S. Rubber Co. on this new sales plan, charging violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. It is to be noted, in my private and official capacity we have questioned if and when that order was ever vigorously enforced by the FTC. (Refer to United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly—staff report to the House Small Business Subcommittee, then headed by the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER).

As it applies to that major industry, rubber tires, in recent published statements appearing in the press as late as May of 1963 it is stated that there are now 110 or more private label tires on the market. In 1936, for practical purposes there was possibly less than a dozen.

Now what we are leading up to—the action prevailing in that particular industry apparently was noted by other factors in industry who have shaped their overall national sales policy accordingly—all tending to destroy efficient independent business at the production and distribution level.

Therefore, Congressman KYL, for these Small Business Committees to extensively check into the operations of the Robinson-Patman Act, and have the legislative authority to act when needed—this in itself would be a major obligation upon the part of the Small Business Committees; and Congress should recognize this and give them the authority to act in the same official capacity as any other standing committee which in the long run will preserve at least 4½ million small business institutions and, without a question of doubt, in preserving those institutions would ease the employment situation nationwide.

Finally, it is our opinion the Robinson-Patman Act was honestly conceived to bring about fair competition, particularly as it relates to the distribution of equal quality merchandise. That was its principal purpose and apparently something happened along the wayside to nullify the importance of the act in our economy.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

H. RES. 370

Resolved, That (a) clause 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting immediately after subparagraph (q) the following new subparagraph:

"(r) Committee on Small Business, to consist of thirteen members."

(b) Clause 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is further amended by redesignating subparagraphs (r), (s), and (t) (relating to the Committees on Un-American Activities, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means) as subparagraphs (s), (t), and (u), respectively.

SEC. 2. (a) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by redesignating clauses 18 through 30 as clauses 19 through 31, respectively, and by inserting immediately after clause 17 the following new clause:

"18. Committee on Small Business.

"(a) Germane amendments to the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and the Robinson-Patman Act.

"(b) The Committee on Small Business, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized from time to time to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; and (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business.

"The Committee on Small Business shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the result of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Small Business, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

(b) Clause 26 (j) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "paragraph 26" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph 27".

(c) Clause 2 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "clause 21 of rule XI" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause 22 of rule XI".

PHILADELPHIA NEGRO MINISTERS

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in this time of racial crisis in our country which arises because some of our citizens deny the constitutional guarantees to the Negro, pervert the Christian precepts they profess to hold, disregard the legal mandates of our courts, invoke fanciful concepts of law to justify illegal acts and cynically appeal to the ignorance and prejudice of their fellow citizens for political advantage, it is of the utmost importance to pay the highest tribute to a different breed of men—I refer to the Negro ministers of Philadelphia who, without hornblowing or name calling, but with a deep sense of responsibility, have set a standard for racial progress in that city. These men have made 22 demands for the employment of Negroes in specified numbers and categories upon 22 separate business establishments and in every instance their demands have been met.

Mr. Speaker, these men of good will have the respect and the confidence of the people of Philadelphia. Every one of these men has shown courage and a high degree of intellect. Each one of them has borne the burden of the fight for Negro equality through the years, and they stand collectively and individually for equal rights now, not tomorrow.

I bring this sane, and outstanding approach to racial problems to the attention of the country because it stands out as a directive to all fighters for Negro equality that methods necessary in Alabama and Mississippi may not be required in other cities.

Mr. Speaker, the Negro has fought for equal rights and human dignity; he has hoped that his fellow citizens and his elected officials would include him in the democratic circle; he has lived on hope and believed in promises; but I say to this House with utter finality that the Negroes of the United States of America know hope to be an illusion and a snare, and after 95 years that promises are worthless. The time is now.

Mr. Speaker, the only other ray of light in our dark night of racial conflict is the stand and the speech by President Kennedy, but even this noble effort has been answered by the murder of an innocent Negro freedom fighter in Jackson, Miss. I assure this House that no force on earth can defeat the Negroes' fight for full freedom now.

In furtherance of our fight, I am today introducing legislation "to provide that the representation in the House of Representatives of each of the several States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged."

Mr. Speaker, by introducing this legislation, I focus attention directly on section 2 of the 14th amendment, about which nothing has been done by the Congress of the United States during the 90-odd years since its enactment:

> SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crimes, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

FLAG DAY/ARMY BIRTHDAY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to re-remind my distinguished colleagues that this day has a twofold historical significance. On this date 186 years ago, the Second Continental Congress resolved:

> That the flag of the United States shall be 13 stripes of red and white, with a union of 13 stars in a blue field, representing the new constellation.

Today—by proclamation of the President—Americans everywhere are paying special tribute to our national colors.

Approximately enough, Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is also the official anniversary of the organization which has insured that the American constellation could rise to its present apogee of unparalleled radiance, and could shine in the eyes of the world as the symbol of hope and of strength. Today is the birthday of the U.S. Army, for 188 years the bulwark of the Republic, the defender of the Star-Spangled Banner.

It is fitting that the Members of the House should pause to note this occasion, and to recall for a moment the proud history of our flag and our Army.

In mid-April 1775, the embattled farmer-patriots of Massachusetts met the British regulars at Lexington Green. I need not remind you that here was fired "the shot heard round the world." From Concord to Boston, the British were engaged by the brave but poorly organized New England militiamen. Boston lay beseiged. These inital hostilities marked the beginning of the long struggle for independence. Our historic predecessors in the Continental Congress had convened in the old State House in Philadelphia under the influence of an aroused populace. On June 14, 1775, the Congress determined to establish a regular Army that would later prove superior to the well-trained Redcoats. It resolved:

> That six companies of expert riflemen be immediately raised in Pennsylvania, two in Maryland, and two in Virginia.

On the following day the Congress designated a Commander in Chief, the incomparable Washington, for the Regular Army and the volunteer militia.

Thus, over a year before the Declaration of Independence and exactly 2 years before the creation of our national flag, the U.S. Army was established.

On June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress adopted Old Glory, Washington himself is said to have described the symbolism of the newly created flag: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from the mother country, separating it by while stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

The Continental Army embodied the spirit of the Revolution. And, for 188 years the basic mission of the Army has remained the same—the preservation of our ideals and the defense of our homeland. Indeed, the U.S. Army, born to give strength to the people's desire for independence, baptized in its own red blood of devotion to America, has demonstrated to every generation its strength of being and purpose.

That bleak winter Washington and his men suffered at Valley Forge was the first of many trials for the American soldier. I need only remind you of Anthony Wayne at Fallen Timbers, of Jackson at New Orleans, of Scott at Chapultepec. Or of Old Glory flying throughout the land, symbolic of a nation indivisible.

Throughout the last century, the Army served as the Nation's arm of authority in the untamed West. Torturous frontier fighting and unbelievable hardships were the soldier's lot, as new stars were added to the field of blue bunting. A veteran of Monterrey and Veracruz, he again fought on foreign soil, crossing the waters to Cuba and the Far East in support of national ideals and policies.

In the First World War, names only vaguely familiar to many Americans took on new and fearful meanings: Argonne Forest, Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel—all became synonymous with the roar of gunfire and the struggles of men. The world saw the Stars and Stripes raised victoriously alongside the British Union Jack and the French Tricolor.

Then World War II came, and the American soldier carried our flag over four continents. He fought in sun-baked deserts, humid jungles, and frozen fields. At Normandy and at Okinawa he died so that the ideals of Old Glory might be preserved.

And Korea—where Heartbreak Ridge, Pork Chop Hill, and the 38th parallel became new landmarks on our soldier's map. This time the Stars and Stripes joined the blue and white banner of the United Nations whose wreath and globe symbolize our Nation's determined quest for the grail of universal freedom and eternal peace. And here again, our soldiers displayed the same indomitable will that has always been the hallmark of our Army.

At this very hour American fighting men are serving in the cause of freedom throughout the world, opposing the Communist aggression that threatens the self-determination of our friends and, ultimately, our own security. Acutely conscious of its foundation in the enduring and patriotic spirit of Washington's Continental force, of its own birth in freedom, the U.S. Army stands today—as it has for 188 years—squarely astride the tyrant's path.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, in a ceremony here at the Capitol, the new Army flag was unfurled. This flag bears 145 battle streamers, commemorating campaigns fought in defense of our freedom, our homes, and the freedom and homelands of others dedicated to the principle of self-determination.

On this occasion, then, as Americans salute their national flag, let us honor also the Army flag, and express the appreciation of a grateful nation for the bright record of unfailing service that this distinguished organization has so long rendered our country. The Army has guarded the American constellation as it grew from 13 Colonies to 50 States. And its emblem's motto, "This We'll Defend," carries us with confidence and security into the future.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY NEEDS STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A 10-YEAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM COMMENCING WITH FISCAL YEAR 1972 WHEN THE PRESENT INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAY PROGRAM ENDS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 464, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting in cooperation with all other interested Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and with the States—acting through their highway departments—to make a comprehensive investigation and study of the types and volumes of estimated highway traffic projected for 20 years after completion of the current Federal-aid highway program, which is scheduled to terminate in 1972. As ranking minority member on the Roads Subcommittee of Public Works, I believe attention must be focused on this problem now. This investigation and study would include, among other things, any changes—including the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways—which may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems to accommodate traffic forecast for 20 years or 1992, the cost of such changes, the extent of Federal participation in such costs, methods for financing such Federal costs, methods of apportioning Federal-aid highway funds among the States, examination of the possible creation of a new Federal-aid highway system or systems, examination of possible extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, examination of toll road problems including the extent to which toll facilities have been or may be established on existing Federal-aid highway systems and whether or not other toll facilities should be established on these systems. This joint resolution would require the Secretary of Commerce to submit to Congress within 10 days after January 2, 1966, the results of the investigation and study, together with a recommended Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the 9 succeeding fiscal years, including recommendations as to the financing of such program.

The current accelerated highway program was launched by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and provides for completion of the 41,000-mile Interstate System with appropriations authorized through fiscal year 1971. The Congress is also carrying out the intent expressed in connection with enactment of the 1956 act to add $25 million annual incremental increases to the authorizations for the Federal-aid primary highway system and the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and extension of these systems in urban areas—known as the A-B-C program—until it reaches a $1 billion total yearly authorization. The financing of this current program has been provided for by enactment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended, which created the Highway Trust Fund and appropriated to such Fund amounts equal to certain highway user taxes and fees to be collected prior to October 1, 1972.

Federal-aid highway funds have been apportioned to the States for the fiscal years through 1964, and the States are utilizing their apportionments of both Interstate and A-B-C funds at an acceptable rate. The highway trust fund is in sound condition to support the current program. Twelve thousand two hundred miles of the 41,000-mile Interstate system have been improved and are opened to traffic, in addition to the 2,368 miles of toll facilities incorporated into the system. The improved nontoll mileage includes over 9,000 miles completed to acceptable standards for 1975 traffic, in accordance with the present requirements of law; 5,000 more miles are under construction, and engineering or right-of-way acquisition is underway on 11,300 miles of the system. The goal of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments is the completion of the total 41,000-mile system by October 1, 1972.

To meet this goal, the Federal Highway Administrator recently pointed out that the final construction contracts under the present program should be awarded in 1970, that the final design work and right-of-way acquisition should be underway no later than 1968, and that right now the last of the studies on route locations should be winding up.

On that basis, the necessary and orderly continuation of the highway program after fiscal year 1971 requires that construction planning, traffic surveys, and route location studies be commenced in the near future, so that there will be a firm program for continuation of highway improvement to take up where the present program leaves off.

The undertaking of such construction planning, surveys, and studies is dependent, to a great degree, upon prior determination by the Congress of the nature and extent of a program for continuing improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems and the authorization of appropriations therefor. To avoid the adverse impact upon the Nation's economy which would result from an abrupt substantial reduction in the amounts expended annually for the improvement of Federal-aid highways; to avoid the slow and costly replacement of staffs and equipment inventories again to accelerate the Federal-aid highway program at a later time; and to continue the effort commenced by enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to meet the growing transportation requirements of the Nation, it is essential that a study be made of the needs for further improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems after completion of the current program to enable the Congress to make timely provision for continuation, to the extent and as determined necessary, of the Federal-aid highway program after fiscal year 1971.

The American Association of State Highway Officials has recognized the necessity for an early reappraisal by the Congress of the Nation's highway needs to determine whether it is in the national interest to extend the Interstate System and, if so, to what extent, and to further evaluate the size of the A-B-C program, and the justification for Federal aid to these highway systems. Such expressions were included in the 1963 policy statement of AASHO, adopted at its annual meeting at Bal Harbour, Fla., in December 1962. Mr. John C. Mackie, State highway commissioner for the State of Michigan, and president of AASHO, in testifying before the House Roads Subcommittee on May 28, 1963, pointed out that it is the considered opinion of AASHO that the currently authorized interstate and A-B-C programs have progressed to where the Congress should direct the Secretary, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to study the continuing and future highway needs and report back to the Congress in January 1967. Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association, in testifying before the Roads Subcommittee on May 29, 1963, advised that his association considered it imperative that comprehensive studies be commenced in the near future to consider the highway construction needs of our Nation in the decade beginning in 1971.

The Kennedy administration has not submitted any recommendation to the Congress for the making of a highway needs study, and for the formulation of a program for highway improvement during the 1970's although it is understood that the Bureau of Public Roads has been planning such an undertaking for sometime. It may be more than coincidental that at the same time the President is recommending that essential interstate highway projects in the District of Columbia be deferred, pending a careful reexamination of the highway program in the District of Columbia in connection with the transit development program, the administration is making no effort to recommend to the Congress that a study be undertaken and a program developed for orderly continuation of needed highway improvement. There is growing concern that the New Frontier is following a carefully conceived plan to delay or stop needed highway construction in urban areas, so as to force people to use mass transit facilities and thereby making the construction of rapid transit appear more economically feasible. I sincerely hope that this is not the attitude of the administration, but since it has taken no action to request authority to make a highway needs study and to recommend a continuing highway improvement program nationally, it is up to the Congress to see that timely action is taken which is the purpose of House Joint Resolution 464.

A corrected copy of House Joint Resolution 464 follows:

H.J. RES. 464

Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for ten years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon twenty-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a ten-year highway program commencing June 30, 1971, to Congress

Whereas, by the provisions of section 101 (b) of title 23, United States Code, it is declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, hereinafter called the "Interstate System", and the Congress expressed its intent that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over the period of availability of the appropriations authorized for its construction, reconstruction, or improvement, and that the Interstate System in all States be brought to simultaneous completion; and

Whereas appropriations have been authorized through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System; and

Whereas, to carry out the intent of Congress, final contracts for construction of the Interstate System should be awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and final design work and right-of-way acquisition should be underway no later than the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and

Whereas, for the necessary and orderly continuation of needed improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, construction planning, traffic surveys, and new route location studies should be commenced not later than the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and

Whereas the undertaking of such construction planning, surveys, and studies is dependent upon prior determination by the Congress of the nature and extent of a program for continuing the improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems and the authorization of appropriations therefor; and

Whereas to avoid the adverse impact upon the Nation's economy which would result from an abrupt substantial reduction in the amounts expended annually for the improvement of Federal-aid highways; to avoid the slow and costly replacement of staffs and equipment inventories again to accelerate the Federal-aid highway program at a later time; and to continue the effort commenced by enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to meet the growing transportation requirements of the Nation, it is essential that a study be made of the needs for further improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems after completion of the current program to enable the Congress to make timely provision for continuation to the extent and as determined necessary of the Federal-aid highway program after the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1971: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Commerce, acting in cooperation with all other interested Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities and with the States (acting through their highway departments) shall make a comprehensive investigation and study of—

(1) types and volumes of estimated highway traffic as projected for twenty years;

(2) any changes (including the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways) which may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems needed to accommodate such traffic;

(3) the cost of such changes;

(4) the extent of Federal participation in the cost of such changes;

(5) methods for financing such Federal costs; and

(6) methods of apportioning Federal-aid highway funds among the States.

(b) The investigation and study authorized by this section shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) the estimated traffic and the required changes in each existing Federal-aid highway system on a State-by-State basis, as well as on a national basis;

(2) an examination of the present system of highway classification for the purpose of determining whether such highway classification should be continued or should be placed on a functional basis;

(3) an examination of the possible creation of a new Federal-aid highway system or systems;

(4) an examination of the possible extension of the Interstate System with particular reference to—

(i) additional mileage.

(ii) the use of such additional mileage to include in the System those highway links which should be supplied to more fully complete the System, and

(iii) revision of methods and standards for allocation of mileage and funds for such System; and

(5) an examination of toll road problems, the traditional policy that highways constructed with Federal funds should be toll free, the extent to which toll facilities have been or may be established on existing Federal-aid highway systems, and whether or not other toll facilities should be established on existing or future Federal-aid highway systems.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress within ten days after January 2, 1966, the results of the investigation and study authorized by this joint resolution. This report shall include his findings and recommendations on each specific item referred to in the first section of this joint resolution and shall contain a recommended Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years, including recommendations with respect to the financing of such program.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS INTRODUCED

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill to amend title 2 of the Social Security Act to permit both men and women to retire with full benefits at age 62.

The purpose of this measure, of course, is to help meet the plague of persistent unemployment. All of us are aware of the technological revolution that is sweeping the world—a revolution which is both challenging and terrifying. The terror can be traced in part to the fact that we now have at our fingertips the means of destroying every vestige of civilization. But there is another terror connected with today's technology—the terror of being without work, of wanting to provide for one's self and one's family but being unable to find employment opportunity.

It is estimated that unemployment will increase during the next 19 months to more than 7 percent of the work force or more than 5 million people. Efforts of this administration, including tax reduction to pump new purchasing power into the economy, retraining, area redevelopment, and accelerated public works, to mention only a few, seek to bring about a full economy so that unemployment will decrease significantly after the early months of 1965.

I am sure all of us are aware that after each of the last four recessions the economy snapped back but employment did not. Each recovery found a higher rate of unemployment than following the previous recession. Economists advance many reasons for this but it is generally accepted that automation is an important factor and will become more so in the months ahead.

We also know that our economy must create somewhere in the neighborhood of 30,000 to 50,000 new jobs every week during the next decade for millions of new workers and millions of others whose jobs will be affected by technological change.

The question is whether these jobs can be manufactured fast enough to approach full employment, using the present definition of jobs and the present means of providing them.

I am afraid the answer is "no." Unemployment today cannot be regarded as a temporary situation that will be eliminated by the next turn of the business cycle or by the simple expedient of tax cuts. Involved in today's unemployment is a major national problem which the country has only begun to face up to. Between now and 1970, about half of the new openings in the labor force will go to those in the age bracket between 14 and 24. But as technology advances, it will be harder and harder for people in this age group to find jobs, so that between 1970 and 1975 only about a quarter of new additions to the labor force will be between 14 and 24, while the 25- to 44-year age bracket will expand rapidly to about 50 percent.

There is one other aspect to this problem that more people must understand in connection with automation and technology, and that is that the growth rate of new jobs just is not holding up. During the 10 years from 1947 to 1597 jobs increased at the rate of 1.9 percent a year, but since 1957 the rate has fallen by half, to less than 1 percent. And this has happened, as we all know, at a time of population explosion when the demand for more jobs for newcomers to the labor market has reached an all-time high.

All of these facts seem to me to point to one conclusion. If, in the face of changing technology and other factors of mid-20th century life, there simply are not enough jobs for our burgeoning population, then through a process of selectivity we must determine who works and who does not. There are those who say that everyone can work if he or she really wants to. This is patent nonsense. There are those who say that unemployment can be eliminated if we go to a shorter workweek. To my mind that represents the least efficient and most expensive alternative open to us.

Ideally the answer to unemployment is to improve our process of distribution and to meet hitherto unmet demands. Our goal should be to eliminate the poverty which cripples nearly 10 million American families so that these people can become productive citizens and consumers of the great variety of goods and services available. But this is a slow process. The hard fact we face is that steps must be taken now to limit our labor force to something close to the number of available jobs if unemployment is to be curbed, even if this means eliminating from the labor force those who are willing and able to work.

We know that voluntary retirement takes a long step in this direction. In 1956 the retirement age for women was reduced from 65 to 62 on a reduced benefits basis and as a direct result, 650,000 women retired from the labor market within a year's time. Similarly, when retirement at age 62 was made optional for men, again on a reduced benefits basis, 525,000 men retired from the labor force within a year.

These were useful first steps, Mr. Speaker, but we know it simply has not been possible for substantial numbers of working people to retire at 62 on reduced benefits. By taking the step proposed in the bill I have introduced, I am confident that between 2 and 3 million men and women between the ages of 62 and 65 will choose to retire rather than remain on the job. I can think of no quicker way of creating this number of job opportunities. The cost, let me say, is anything but prohibitive. The Social Security Administration advised me that the benefits under my bill will call for an increase of 0.82 percent of current payroll—which of course would be divided equally between employer and employee. This is not a welcome expense, to be sure, but it is minimal compared to the staggering and persistent costs of unemployment.

POLICY FOR EXPENDITURE CONTROL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter written by the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee pertaining to an expenditure policy which has been recommended to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the 1963 Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee, the minority members, in their separate views, urged that a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures be appointed to undertake a thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination of Federal expenditure policy. It was our belief that thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures—far from impairing the national interest—would increase our security and stimulate our economic growth.

The recent fiscal record of the Federal Government makes abundantly clear that the budget will not be balanced within the foreseeable future unless more hard thought and attention is given to controlling rapidly rising levels of Federal spending. From fiscal 1961 through the estimates for fiscal 1964, for example, the Kennedy administration will have increased Federal spending at an average annual rate of 7 percent, contrasted to an average annual increase of 2.2 percent from 1954 to 1960. Budget deficits from fiscal 1961 through the estimates for fiscal 1964 will total about $30 billion, or more than the net deficits of the previous 8 fiscal years combined.

Looking to the future, Dr. Arthur Burns told the Joint Economic Committee recently that his estimates showed that, if the Administration's tax program is approved and if expenditures continue to increase at the recent rate, the budget would not be in balance before 1972 and the public debt would rise about $75 billion above the level at the close of fiscal 1963.

In order to underscore our concern about the need for expenditure reform, the Joint Economic Committee minority members also wrote to the President, making the suggestion for an Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures and specifically listing the tasks which such a Commission might usefully undertake. Because the President himself has made numerous statements about the importance of expenditure reform, it was felt that our suggestion would be welcomed by the administration both as a means to initiate a responsible and nonpartisan review of expenditure policy and, additionally, as a way to demonstrate its desire to make genuine progress in this area.

Regrettably, the administration has rejected the suggestion. Under unanimous consent I include a copy of the letter of the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee to the President and the reply by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Kermit Gordon, in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Essentially, the administration gives three reasons for rejecting the suggestion. First, the claim is made that the administration already is exercising "expenditure discipline." It is said—and we have heard this many times before—that expenditures for other than defense, space, and interest will decline slightly from 1963 to 1964. The fact is that this illusory decline in civilian spending would be achieved by selling off assets of the Government to conceal increases in spending.

Senator William Proxmire, in individual views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Majority Report, makes clear that domestic spending will increase by $2 billion from 1963 to 1964. Senator Proxmire said:

> This year's budget by various bookkeeping transactions conceals the real increase in spending in the domestic sector.
>
> The reason the $2 billion increase doesn't show up is because the administration plans to sell $700 million of the cotton surplus, $423 million of Export-Import Bank holdings, $315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages, $300 million in Commodity Credit Corporation loans, $150 million in farm housing loans, and $150 million in college housing loans. This total of $2 billion of liquidated assets will be used to offset increased spending in almost every department of Government.

Senator Proxmire added that the surest index of expanded spending is the increase in Government employees planned for the coming fiscal year—36,492 in all. As Senator Proxmire said, every department of Government, except Defense, will increase its employees in the coming budget year.

If this is an example of the "rigorous expenditure control" claimed by the administration, then there is little hope—if any—of ever eliminating budget deficits short of taking bold and imaginative action along the lines which we have recommended to the administration.

The second reason given for the rejection of the Commission idea is that the President believes that the established procedure, with the administration submitting its budget estimates and legislative program for review and decision by Congress, is the most satisfactory approach for determination of sound and effective expenditure policies. As a matter of fact, it should be quite clear that our suggestion would not supplant the established budget procedure. Rather it would improve upon it.

When asked about the suggestion for a Commission on Federal Expenditures at his press conference on April 4, the President himself expressed his satisfaction with present procedures and professed to see no merit in suggestions to improve upon those procedures. The sanctity with which the bold thinkers of the New Frontier regard "established procedures" that have led to a steadily mounting series of large budget deficits is curious to behold.

Emerson P. Schmidt, a distinguished economist and the director of economic research of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, told a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on April 30 that the President apparently was not fully aware of the nature of the Republican proposal when he brushed it off so lightly at his press conference. As Mr. Schmidt said, the President clearly ignored the significant proposals in his response. Certainly, said Mr. Schmidt, many other individuals are not entirely satisfied with the budget system, or lack of system. He added that "such traditional thinking" as was represented by the President's reply—as well as by the Budget Bureau's recent letter—is not good enough with an annual budget of over $120 billion.

Finally, the suggestion for the organization of a Commission on Federal Expenditures was rejected because, in Mr. Gordon's words:

> We are not able to see how it could make a direct or significant contribution to the resolution of those issues of public policy which constitutionally and properly rest with the President and the Congress.

Mr. Gordon's letter goes on to say that such a Commission might have the opposite result by obscuring the public understanding of the "locus of responsibility for resolving such issues."

This statement totally ignores the highly useful service performed for the Nation by a large number of presidential advisory commissions through the years, including those set up by the present administration. While there are many such special commissions, I need mention only a few to make clear the contribution which such bodies can make to the development of sound public policy.

Most recently, the Commission to Strengthen the Security of the Free World—Clay Commission—was created by the President to make recommendations on our foreign-aid program. The President has also created an Advisory Commission on Labor-Management Policy, which has performed and is continuing to perform an important public service. We all know the vital contribution to improvements in the organization of the executive branch which was made by the two Hoover Commissions. In the field of foreign trade, the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy—Randall Commission — performed outstanding service. Clearly, rejection of the commission approach for the reasons stated by the Bureau of the Budget is a lame excuse, indeed, to cover up the administration's apparent indifference to genuine and nonpartisan expenditure reform.

It is my hope and the hope of the other minority members of the Joint Economic Committee that the administration will not close the door on efforts to examine expenditure policy along the lines we have suggested. While the administration may not consider it appropriate to study all seven areas outlined in our letter at this time, a start should be made somewhere. We earnestly implore the President and his advisers to review our suggestion again in order that a beginning may be made in undertaking some of the urgent tasks which we outlined and which are in addition to those steps which the administration says it intends to pursue in order to realize budgetary savings.

The economic importance of expenditure policies has been forcefully emphasized by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee in its unanimous report of January 23, 1958. In that report, the subcommittee, with Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS as chairman, said:

> Increasing emphasis on economic growth necessarily focuses attention on Federal expenditure policies. The Federal Government is the largest industry in the United States. Its direct purchases of goods and services account for a substantial share of the economy's total output; its effects on the amount and character of economic activity are even greater than can be indicated by any such statistic.
>
> In part, these influences stem from the means by which the Federal Government's activities are financed. This subject was extensively investigated in 1955 by the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Economic Committee in its study of Federal tax policy for economic growth and stability. The character and extent of the Federal Government's spending activities, however, may be of even greater consequence.

With the growth of Government increasing steadily, the advice of the subcommittee is even more valid today than it was 5 years ago. It would be a serious misfortune, indeed, if the administration failed to grasp the opportunity to begin now the serious and wide-ranging examination of the Government's spending policies which is so urgently needed.

U.S. CONGRESS,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In response to your recent invitation for a continuing dialog on the major economic issues before the Nation, we should like to set forth some of our observations on your proposed 1963 tax program and to offer a suggestion for expenditure control which we believe would contribute to sound and stable long-term economic growth.

While we recognize that knowledge of the sources of economic growth and the means of accelerating it are limited, it seems clear that well-conceived incentive tax reduction and reform is a major and necessary step toward improving upon our Nation's rate of economic growth. We have long supported tax reductions and reform as a high priority objective of our economic policy. However, it is also clear that such a program will involve costs as well as benefits. These costs must be weighed and, if possible, offset.

One cost will be budget deficits higher than those which would have been incurred without the tax cut. These would follow 3 years of steadily mounting deficits which have totaled more than $19 billion, or more than the net deficits of the previous 7 fiscal years combined. Some opinion holds that budget deficits need not concern us. We do not share this view.

The experience of the past suggests that it would be reckless to ignore the inflationary dangers posed by persistent and increasing deficits. The state of economic learning is neither so advanced nor so precise as to safely admit any other conclusion as a guide to policymaking. Sound long-term economic growth cannot be based upon a foundation of budget deficits. Furthermore, we cannot ignore the adverse effects such deficits could have on our continuing balance-of-payment problem and on the entire free world trade and payments system.

Recognition of the potential dangers of chronic budget deficits is implicit in your proposed tax program. As one of its objectives, the program seeks to bring the budget into balance by stimulating economic activity and thus increasing revenues.

We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures.

We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth.

In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

In our separate minority and additional views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, we made several specific suggestions which we believe offer a sound basis for a reform of Federal expenditure policy. At this time, we wish to call one of these recommendations to your attention and ask that you give it your serious consideration.

As an essential step to a reform of Federal expenditure policy, we suggest that you appoint a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures, composed of private citizens from business, labor, education, the professions and Members of Congress equally from both parties. The work of this Commission, assisted by a staff, should parallel the 3-year period over which your tax program is scheduled to take effect. During this period, the Commission should conduct studies and periodically make public its recommendations in the following areas:

(a) Establishment of spending priorities among Federal programs, separating the desirable from those that are essential, in order to serve as a guide to the administration in drawing up the budget, particularly in years of expected deficits.

(b) Appraisal of Federal activities in order to identify those programs which tend to retard economic growth and for which expenditures should be reduced or eliminated.

(c) Improvement of the Federal budgeting and appropriations process in order to increase the effective control of expenditures.

(d) Examination of responsibilities and functions which are now assumed by the Federal Government, but which could be better performed and with superior effectiveness by the private economy.

(e) Review of Federal responsibility and functions in order to determine which could be better performed at the State and local levels.

(f) Improvement of Government organization and procedures in order to increase efficiency and promote savings, including a review of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in order to determine how those already implemented have worked out in practice and whether those not yet implemented should be given further consideration.

(g) Determination of policies with regard to the level of user charges and fees to be made for special services furnished to members of the public by the Government.

The recommendations of an objective and nonpartisan Commission of the kind described should command widespread support among the public and within the Congress. Its proposals would offer a sound basis upon which to begin the reform of Federal expenditure policy.

In view of the relevance which expenditure control has for the success of a tax reduction and reform program, we earnestly hope you will give this recommendation your early and favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS B. CURTIS.
CLARENCE E. KILBURN.
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.
JACOB K. JAVITS.
JACK MILLER.
LEN B. JORDAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The President has asked me to convey to you and your minority colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee his thanks for your thoughtful letter of March 19, concerning Federal tax and expenditure policies and the goal of a prosperous and growing economy.

We welcome your support for the view that a wisely-conceived program of tax reduction and reform will contribute to improving the rate of growth of our economy. We are pleased, also, to note that you dismiss an across-the-board cut in Federal spending as self-defeating—a view in which we fully concur. Finally, let me say that we welcome and appreciate your recognition that the President's fiscal program seeks to eliminate budget deficits by the method which we regard as most constructive and most promising—an expansion in economic activity and in Federal revenues stimulated by the realinement of our tax system.

The continued exercise of expenditure discipline is a vital part of the President's fiscal program. As you know, the President's administrative budget recommendations called for the total of all expenditures other than defense, space and interest to decline slightly from 1963 to 1964. Since the 1964 budget was submitted to the Congress in January, this continuing search for economies has enabled the President to reduce his appropriation requests by $615 million for fiscal 1964 and an additional $235 million for fiscal 1963.

Rigorous expenditure control will characterize future budgets as well. In his 1964 budget message, the President said:

"As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit."

This means that the transitional deficit is to be reduced by holding any necessary increase in expenditures to an amount substantially below the accompanying increase in revenues. To help in achieving this objective, we intend to pursue budgetary savings through (1) the further substitution of private for public credit; (2) the search for opportunities to reduce expenditures in existing programs whose relative urgency may have diminished with changing times and circumstances; (3) the further extension of the user charge principle; and (4) intensified emphasis on efficiency and cost reduction throughout the Government. In other words, we expect to intensify our efforts to include in the budget only those expenditures which meet strong criteria of fulfilling important national needs and to insure that those needs are met at the lowest possible cost.

Taking all of this into account, we believe that the established procedure, under which the President presents his budget estimates and legislative program for review and decision by the Congress, is the most satisfactory approach to determining sound Federal expenditure policies. While an advisory commission such as you suggest might perform a constructive collateral service through stimulating informed discussion of fiscal policy and program objectives, we are not able to see how it could make a direct or significant contribution to the resolution of those issues of public policy which constitutionally and properly rest with the President and the Congress. In fact, by obscuring public understanding as to the locus of responsibility for resolving such issues, its efforts might well lead to an opposite result. For these reasons, the President is unable to join you in recommending that such a body be established. We very much appreciate, however, the constructive and cooperative spirit in which your proposal was made.

Sincerely yours,

Kermit Gordon,
Director.

BRACEROS NEEDED TO HARVEST PERISHABLE CROPS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] has just addressed the House with regard to the bracero program. He quoted one small part of an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas to quote the full article from the Monitor as it portrays both sides of the issue. I have that article in my office. I wish I had it here now to read it. But he picked out one part of it out of context. Now I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that his colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Joe Kilgore, sent me a file a day or two ago that was sent to him by Mr. Will Wallace, a constituent from Edinburg, Tex. Mr. Wallace had 500 acres of cantaloups that badly need to be harvested. He went to see a labor leader, Mr. Bob Sanchez, an attorney in the county seat where Edinburg is located. This labor attorney represented the Spanish-speaking people in that vicinity who did agriculture work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. All business being disposed of, if there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. After the two men had arrived at an understanding Mr. Wallace asked the labor leader to work up a contract to suit himself so that he could harvest the 500 acres of cantaloups. A contract was executed and agreed to. Here is what happened. Instead of 70 cents an hour which was the prevailing wage in the community, the contract called for 75 cents an hour with an additional 25 cents an hour if they stayed until the harvest was completed. He said in this letter to Joe, it just "could not miss," it was bound to work, "but miss we did." The result was it did not work. He did not get sufficient labor, although he bought 200 spot announcements in Spanish over the radio and distributed hand bills in quantity.

On the first day, May 15, 1963, only 34 turned out to work. On the next day it was 41. On May 17, 30 worked. On May 18 only 15 workers came to work. He needed about 200 or more workers to harvest the cantaloups. Starting on May 25 the school officials sent football players and they did well in the harvest. Our people do not like to do this backbreaking field work. Those who have opposed this Mexican program over the years have said constantly, "If you pay enough you will get the labor." Here is what happened in Edinburg, Tex. Thirty cents an hour in excess of the prevailing local rate was offered and the workers in sufficient number could not be found. Bracero labor is the only dependable source and there will be no law on the statute books authorizing a supplemental supply of labor from the Republic of Mexico unless the law is extended. Crops that cannot be cultivated and harvested by mechanical means will deteriorate and rot in the fields. Food prices will soar.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings] may proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair is permitting this request although the Chair does not consider this is to be the 1-minute period such as we have before proceeding with the regular business of the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the Speaker and I am grateful to him. I also appreciate so much the gentleman from Louisiana asking for this additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue this little story and I want also to extend my remarks and to include the file that Joe Kilgore sent to me.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, perhaps it ought to go into the Appendix of the daily Record or anyplace else. How big is this article? Would the gentleman withdraw his request at this time and continue with his talk at this time?

Mr. GATHINGS. I will withdraw the request and wait until I do have the article so that I can show it to the gentleman from Ohio.

But suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, cantaloups need harvesting when they are ripe and ready to harvest. That is the same situation that exists with reference to strawberries and citrus fruits and various vegetables. You have to have the labor to harvest these crops at the right time. I wish more of our folks would work at farm jobs but they are on relief and they are getting unemployment and other checks and commodities and they do not want to do this kind of work. That is understandable as it is hard work. We do need this law extended. It was only by a 16 vote margin that this House turned down the proposed extension for 2 years of the bracero law. When the facts are known, the legislation will pass as it benefits the farmer, consumer, the worker, and the economy of Mexico.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include bills pertinent thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the administration bill to combat mental retardation and improve mental health will not adequately do the job intended. The omnibus approach to this type of legislation has been found to be ineffective and subject to considerable objection and delay.

Because of this and after much study and consultation, I am today introducing for appropriate reference three separate bills confined solely to the area of mental retardation. These three bills, taken together, comprise the essential components of a unified and effective program to combat the problem.

The first of these three bills relates to a greatly increased maternal and child health and crippled children's program. The second concerns the construction of clinical and service centers for the mentally retarded in the community, and the construction of research centers and mental retardation facilities that are affiliated with university and medical school programs. The third contains provisions for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and for research and demonstration projects relating to the education of mentally retarded children. I am including the bills and a summary of them at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, these bills contain many of the provisions in the bills previously introduced, to carry out President Kennedy's mental retardation program.

The first of these three bills is, in fact, identical with the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning bill, H.R. 3386. My motive for introducing an identical bill is this: I wish to leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to where I stand in relation to the provisions of these bills. I am for these provisions, and I consider their adoption by this House to be of critical importance.

However, despite the similarities between the other two bills I am introducing today and the bills that were previously introduced, I consider the differences between these bills to be essential to the successful enactment of the President's general proposals and the implementation of his goals.

The essential differences are these:

Unlike H.R. 3689, entitled "The Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963," my bill contains a separate title to provide grants for the construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. These grants are to be made whenever or wherever a university or medical school is ready to develop a suitable facility, quite apart from the readiness—or lack of readiness—of the State to develop community mental retardation facilities under the State formula mechanism described in H.R. 3689.

H.R. 3000, entitled "The National Education Improvement Act of 1963," is the administration's omnibus education bill. It consists of six titles, and contains provisions for such educational matters as modern foreign language training and research, student work-study programs, public community libraries, and adult basic education. Of the 182 pages of the printed bill, less than 4 pages relate exclusively to the educational problems of the mentally retarded.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the educational problems of the mentally retarded are too important a matter to be buried in the center of an omnibus bill.

I would like, too, to reaffirm the fact that my interest in providing for appropriate educational opportunities for the mentally retarded has not decreased since I introduced in this House the bill which later became the act of September 6, 1958—Public Law 85-926—and which H.R. 3000 seeks to amend.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this a suitable occasion on which to refocus the attention of this House upon the goals of the President's proposals relative to mental retardation.

As stated in his message of February 5, these include, first, the prevention of the occurrence of mental retardation; second, the providing of facilities and programs for research and for early diagnosis and continuous and comprehensive care, in the community, of those suffering from mental retardation; third, the restoration and revitalization of the lives of the mentally retarded in the community through better health programs and strengthened educational services; and fourth, the reinforcing of the will and capacity of our communities to meet the problems of mental retardation, in order that the communities, in turn, can reinforce the will and capacity of individuals and individual families to meet these problems.

The President emphasized in this message that if our Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower, we must, as a Nation, seek to bestow the full benefits of our society on those who suffer from mental retardation.

Mr. Speaker, though the Congress and the executive branch have done much, in the past decade and a half, to help the mentally retarded, they have remained victims of the ancient but persistent belief that mental retardation is a hopeless, incurable affliction.

As a result of the persistence of this belief and the negative attitudes that accompanied it, this Nation has never launched a full-scale attack on the problems of mental retardation.

Consequently, mental retardation continues as a major national health, social, and economic problem. Over 5 million persons are thus afflicted—twice as many as blindness, polio, cerebral palsy, and rheumatic heart disease combined.

Because, under our present system of care, many of our mentally retarded are not properly trained and educated to achieve their maximum productivity, the losses to our economy are great. In addition, States and localities spend over $500 million for care and services for the mentally retarded—for the 200,000 who are cared for in residential institutions, most at public expense, and for others of the 400,000 of the mentally retarded who require constant care or supervision.

Yet it may be said that for the 5 million Americans who suffer from some degree of mental retardation, our present system of care could better be called our system of "don't care."

In our public institutions for the mentally retarded, conditions are no better—they are sometimes worse—than they are in our State mental hospitals. But it is among the millions of retarded who remain in our communities that our "don't care" system has been most vicious.

Time and time again our dedicated scientists and professional workers have found these relationships functioning in our society: Where people are impoverished, there is poor health; where there is poor health, mental illness and mental retardation are prevalent. Where families are weak, community ties tenuous, educational and employment opportunities lacking, there you will find the mentally retarded clustered. Among expectant mothers who do not receive prenatal care—a disproportionate number of whom reside in city tenements and rural slums—premature births occur two or three times as frequently as they do among women who receive adequate prenatal care; further, among premature infants, the incidence of birth defects and mental retardation is high.

In city tenements and rural slums, the intellectual blight that characterizes these neighborhoods is associated with the higher incidence of mental retardation found among schoolchildren coming from these neighborhoods.

Yet in our communities, rich or poor, urban or rural, we have done little to help the mentally retarded. Less than 30,000 mentally retarded individuals were served by our psychiatric outpatient clinics in 1959, and only 20,000 received clinical services in programs supported by the Children's Bureau in 1961.

Out of five mentally retarded school-age children, one is enrolled in special education programs in public schools. We need 75,000 specially prepared teachers to instruct the mentally retarded—we have less than one-third that number now.

These findings—and many others reported by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation—are the facts that undergird current proposals in this field. They indicate that if we are to prevent the occurrence of preventable mental retardation, we must allocate more resources for health, for education, and training.

Furthermore, if we are to bestow the benefits of our society upon those who are already retarded, they must receive special services, in the community, that will actively foster the development of each individual's maximum capacity, and his maintenance in the community at the highest level of social responsibility of which he is capable.

If, as is apparent, providing adequate medical care to expectant mothers and their infants prevents mental retardation, then adequate medical care must be made available to each mother, and to each child.

If the mentally retarded need special educational opportunities, then we must make special efforts to insure that there are enough classroom teachers to instruct each mentally retarded child. For the retarded child does not differ from the normal child in his need to be properly educated for adult responsibilities.

If, as we know, many of the retarded will require special services over a long period of time, and that some of the more severely retarded will require a sheltering environment for an indefinite period of time, then provisions for these must be made in the community.

Mr. Speaker, time does not stand still for the mentally retarded while those who control his destiny quibble about what proportion of his total needs they are going to provide: whether he will get 10 percent of the services he needs, or 25 percent, or 50 percent. The passage of time will make only more desperate the needs of the retarded that are not being met today. For it is now that the infant's mother needs care. It is now that the toddler needs a careful diagnostic workup. It is now that the child needs special education. And it is now that millions of the retarded need special facilities in their communities, near their own homes.

For a long time, I have known that the needs of the mentally retarded were great and complex. I have consistently brought these needs to the attention of this House. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that annually considers the administration's budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have, year after year, urged that adequate funds be appropriated to mount truly effective programs in this field.

The Appropriations Committee was pleased that the President gave this problem the recognition he did when he appointed the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. While that Panel made an excellent report, there are certain aspects of the problem that could have been given attention if the Panel had had a little more time. The following are a few exciting possibilities for new programs that appear to have been overlooked.

PERINATAL RESEARCH

The report of the Panel makes references to some of the early findings of the collaborative perinatal project of this Institute. It points to some of its results as "illustrative of research findings which have led to prevention of a significant number of cases of mental retardation." However, the Panel makes no recommendation for continuation or extension of this important undertaking—an undertaking which has mobilized vast resources in 15 university centers, and has created a national resource with continuing capability for an organized and concerted drive against the causes of retardation, cerebral palsy, and other neurological and sensory disorders. The potential of this resource is largely unexplored, but numerous requests from many agencies indicate that this unique program is in a position to make broad contributions to many facets of the problem of mental retardation.

At the present time, a wealth of research information is already assembled in the collaborative project. The Institute is now exploring with other agencies the most profitable directions for the further extension of this program and should be in a position to present such a broad plan for fiscal year 1965.

ROLE OF VIRUSES IN PREGNANCY

The Panel points out that a "number of viruses and other infectious agents have already been identified or are strongly suspected of producing damage to the fetal brain when the mother is infected during pregnancy." No specific recommendation for an attack on this problem is made, however.

Within the institute's collaborative perinatal project, every woman is receiving serological examinations for the detection of viral infection. Preliminary studies show that about 7 percent of these women experience infection by a known virus during pregnancy. Within this program, the virus of German measles—an agent known to produce mental retardation—has been isolated. The human disease has been produced experimentally for the first time. The effectiveness of a vaccine has been demonstrated, and its usefulness in preventing fetal injury is under investigation in monkeys.

These studies should be extended to other viruses. The place to search for such viruses is in abortions or premature births because those agents which in mild instance cause mental retardation, lead to death and miscarriage of the fetus in severe cases.

The methods for culturing such viruses have now become routine, but they are laborious and time consuming. Such work does not provide challenge for the university-based scientist whose interest lies in the search for new approaches. It would be possible, however, through industrial contracts, to establish a large screening program to search for viruses among a number of specimens. Within such a program it is almost certain that additional viruses responsible for fetal injury would be found.

A NATIONAL NEUROSENSORY INSTRUMENTATION CENTER

Because of the complexity of the nervous system, the development of precise instruments is an essential aid to investigation. For example, a statement frequently quoted is that "in 75 percent of instances of mental retardation no structural abnormality of the brain has been demonstrated." A thorough review of the literature suggests one probable explanation for this impression: brains of retarded individuals after death have not been studied with the precise methods required to demonstrate detailed and deep-lying deformities.

The studies of Dr. Windle and his associates in Puerto Rico indicate that asphyxiated newborn monkeys undergo extensive cell loss in the brain. Such loss, however, is demonstrable in later life only as a reduction in the number of cellular elements present. One cannot see what is absent, and without the use of precise cell-counting techniques, up to 25 percent of the neural elements of a nucleus of the brain may be lost without this being evident to the neuropathologist.

Studies in the Institute's Laboratory of Perinatal Physiology also indicate that the effects of such deleterious agents as asphyxia and kernicterus are highly selective, leading to serious impairment of some parts of the brain while sparing others. Exact quantitation of cell loss in various nuclei of the brain is thus essential if we are to understand the structural basis of the varied forms of intellectual impairment in mental retardation. However, the brain comprises several billions of nerve cells. It has been the lifework of a few dedicated scientists to attempt such quantitative studies of even one or two specimens. However, technology has now reached the stage where much of this arduous task could be accomplished automatically by the use of instruments. The development of an automatic cell-counting microscope is now well within the realm of attainment. The specific technological problems which must be overcome in the production of such an instrument have been defined.

A central planning group, empowered to use grants or contracts to recruit the technical and industrial resources required, is needed to make this possibility a reality. The availability of a cell-counting instrument to scan the brains of mentally retarded individuals dying of intercurrent diseases, and of animals with comparable experimentally induced neurosensory defects, would constitute a major contribution in our efforts to define with accuracy the organic abnormalities responsible for mental retardation.

Particular concern has been expressed regarding the complex problem presented by the blind and the deaf retarded. Especially where multiple handicaps are present, the mobilization of the individual's intellectual resources may be completely blocked by failure of communication. Fundamental investigations, well underway, are exploring the use of patterned sensory stimuli, applied to the skin by electronic devices, as a means of establishing a meaningful communication. In a similar way, Helen Keller learned the meaning of sound through feeling with her fingertips the vibrations of the larynx of her teacher. The time is ripe for an all-out investigation of the various alternative sensory pathways through which visual and auditory information may be made available and meaningful to those whose normal channels are destroyed.

An even greater challenge exists in explorations directed toward the substitution of electronic devices for the eye and the ear—devices which might be keyed into the human nervous system directly in such a fashion as to provide substitute stimuli within the visual and auditory systems. The problems to be overcome are awesome but not insurmountable.

In vision, for example, one first must have precise knowledge of the coding process of the eye whereby the light impulse falling on the retina—composed of some 100 million computer cells—is converted into patterns of nerve impulses. When this knowledge is available, it will be necessary to develop computers and other instruments capable of interpreting the impulses. Finally, means must be found to key the coded messages into the nervous system in a way which will not destroy the delicate nerve fibers to be stimulated.

A committee of competent scientists is actively engaged in the consideration of this entire problem of substitutions for vision. The financial and logistical resources required to transform into reality the ideas of this committee, and of other related groups, should be established within a national neurosensory service center.

A COOPERATIVE HEAD INJURY STUDY

The most common single cause of hospitalization of children is accident and injury. Of a group of injured hospitalized children, 30 percent were found to be suffering from injuries of the head and brain. Head injury is not ordinarily thought of as a cause of mental retardation. However, in approximately 10 percent of institutionalized retarded, a postnatal condition is held responsible for the retardation. Among these, a significant number result from head injury. Automobile accidents account for a large portion of such accidents, but sports, various play activities, and home accidents are also causes. As pointed out by the President's Panel, the obvious solution is prevention. However, as is the case with asphyxia, many of the serious permanent residuals of head injury appear to develop after the event during a postconcussion reactive phase. Therefore, effective management of this delayed reaction could materially reduce the severity of the permanent neurological damage in many instances of head injury.

A cooperative head injury program should investigate many problems: the logistical problems of providing prompt, definitive surgical management of accident victims from cities and highways; the fundamental characteristics of the reaction of the brain to injury; the classification and evaluation of the injured; and the evaluation of the therapeutic measures now being carried out on a largely empirical basis.

CENTERS TO STUDY DISEASES OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM IN INFANCY AND CHILDHOOD

The problem of mental retardation is one of broad scope to which a diversity of skills and talents must be addressed. The Chairman of the President's Panel has made it clear that it has been the intent of that Panel to mobilize, for the attack on this problem, individuals having the widest possible variety of skills. Important among these is the scientist whose life is devoted to the study of the brain. The mobilization of the field of neurology to attack this vast problem requires a clear definition of the role and responsibility of clinical neurologists, neuropathologists, neurophysiologists, neurochemists, and neuroanatomists. The importance of this aspect of the problem of retardation requires that it receive specific focus. The development of centers specifically to study diseases of the nervous system in infancy and childhood, is essential if such people are to be drawn into active participation in research in this field.

It is believed that the above-mentioned special activities are in line with the thinking and objectives of the President's Panel and could appropriately have been included within their report.

This year we face an unprecedented opportunity. First, as a result of the work of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, the facts regarding mental retardation have been clarified as never before. Second, the President of the United States, in a historic message to Congress, has used the weight of his great Office to lead the Nation into better ways of dealing with the medical, social, and econmic burdens caused by mental retardation. Third, the people have indicated by their response to the President's message, that it is their will, as well as their desire, that the mentally retarded be given appropriate care, treatment, and education in their home communities.

I therefore urge that this great legislative body act on the opportunities currently available to us, and enact an effective mental retardation program.

I am submitting for the RECORD a summary of the three bills I now introduce:

SUMMARY OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Increase in maternal and child health and crippled children's services: Sections 2 and 3 of this bill would increase the authorizations for existing programs for maternal and child health and crippled children's services under title V of the Social Security Act from the present $25 million each, by steps of $5 million, to $50 million each by the fiscal year 1970. For each program the present matching requirements and basis for apportioning funds would be continued.

Special project grants for maternity and infant care: Section 4 of the bill would establish as a part of title V of the Social Security Act, a 5-year program of project grants to assist in meeting the costs of maternity and infant care for high risk groups. The appropriations authorized would be $5 million for fiscal year 1964, $15 million for fiscal year 1965 and $30 million for the next 3 fiscal years. Grants would be available to State health agencies or, with their consent, to local health agencies, to pay up to 75 percent of the cost of projects for the provision of all necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, after childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and who are from low-income families or are otherwise unlikely to receive all necessary health care.

Research projects relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services: Section 4 would also authorize under a new part 4 of title V of the Social Security Act, appropriations for grants or jointly financed cooperative arrangements or contracts for research projects relating to services for maternal and child health and crippled children which show promise of making a substantial contribution to the advancement of knowledge relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. With respect to this provision, the Congress would be authorized to appropriate such sums as it may determine to be necessary beginning with the fiscal year 1964.

Grants for planning comprehensive action to combat mental retardation: Section 5 of the bill would add a new title, title XVII, to the Social Security Act to authorize the appropriation of $2.2 million for project grants to be used by the States to: (1) determine the action necessary to combat mental retardation and the resources available for this purpose; (2) develop public awareness of the problem of mental retardation; (3) coordinate State and local activities relative to the various aspects of mental retardation; and (4) to plan other activities leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

SUMMARY OF MENTAL RETARDATION CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Grants for construction of centers for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development: Title I of this bill authorizes a 5-year program of Federal grants to assist in the construction of centers for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development; this program would be contained in a new part B to be added to the health research facilities title (title VII) of the Public Health Services Act. The total appropriation for the period July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1968, is $30 million.

In acting on applications for grants, the Surgeon General would be required to take into consideration relative effectiveness of the proposed facility in expanding the Nation's capacity for research and related purposes in the field of mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

The Federal share of the project could be up to 75 percent of necessary costs of construction.

Grants for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded: Title II of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to States for the construction of facilities especially designed for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training, or custodial care of the mentally retarded, including facilities for training specialists, and including sheltered workshops for the mentally retarded, if such workshops are part of facilities which provide comprehensive services for the mentally retarded.

Appropriations of such sums as Congress may determine would be authorized during the period July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1969. The funds appropriated would be allotted among the States on the basis of population, extent of need for facilities for the mentally retarded, and the financial need of the States, with a minimum of $100,000 for any State. States would be given the alternative of varying the Federal share of the cost of construction of projects, on the basis of standards set by the State, between 45 percent and 75 percent or of choosing a uniform Federal share—which would not be less than 45 percent and could go as high as 75 percent for some States—for all projects in the State.

Applications would be submitted to the Secretary after approval by the State agency designated by the State to administer the State plan.

A State advisory council, composed of representatives of State agencies concerned with planning, operation, or utilization of facilities for the mentally retarded and of non-Government organizations or groups concerned with education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, and health, as well as representatives of consumers of the services involved, would consult with the State agency in carrying out the State plan. The plan would have to set forth a construction program based on a survey of need for facilities and provide for construction in accordance with relative need for facilities insofar as permitted by available financial resources. The plan would also have to meet several other requirements set forth in the bill, including provision for methods of administration necessary for proper and efficient operation of the plan, hearings for unsuccessful applicants, and standards of maintenance and operation of facilities constructed.

Priority of projects to be approved under the State plan would be based on relative need of the different areas in the State, with special consideration for those facilities which will provide comprehensive services for a particular community or communities.

Project grants for the construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded: Title III of the bill authorizes appropriation of such sums as Congress may determine for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1964, for the purpose of assisting in the construction of clinical facilities providing, as nearly as practicable, a full range of inpatient and outpatient services for the mentally retarded and facilities which will aid in demonstrating provision of specialized services for the diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded or in the clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel needed for research, diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded.

The sums so appropriated would be used for project grants for construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded which are associated with a college or university.

In the development of this aspect of the program for the mentally retarded, special provision will be made for the construction of the service facilities described in this title in association with the grant program covered in title I, which provides for the construction of research centers. The association of research centers with the full range of inpatient and outpatient services would provide for the maximum exchange amongst the research, training, and service functions of these centers. In this manner the very best standards of care can be achieved. Research will proceed in the context of the teaching and care problems and the quality of training will be of the highest.

The maximum Federal share of the cost of construction of these facilities would be 75 percent.

SUMMARY OF MENTAL RETARDATION EDUCATION RESEARCH ACT OF 1963

The bill would amend the act of September 6, 1958 (Public Law 85-926), which authorizes grants to institutions of higher learning for training personnel who can, in turn, train teachers of mentally retarded children, and grants to State educational agencies to assist them in providing training of teachers of mentally retarded children and supervisors of such teachers.

The grants to the institutions would be expanded to include grants for training teachers of mentally retarded children and supervisors of such teachers, and for training other specialists and research personnel for work in this area.

The present limitation of $1 million per year for payments under the law would be replaced by an authorization of appropriations of $5 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as Congress may determine for the next 4 fiscal years.

This bill also authorizes $1 million annually for fiscal 1964 and the next 4 years for grants to States, State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher learning, and other public or nonprofit private educational or research organizations for research and demonstration projects relating to education of mentally retarded children. Grants under this authority would be made after securing the advice of panels of experts.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 366 OF THE IRC

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Groman* v. *Commissioner* (302 U.S. 82 (1937)) and *Helvering* v. *Bashford* (302 U.S. 454 (1937)), and in a number of subsequent decisions in lower courts, it was held that the reorganization provisions of the Revenue Act of 1928 and their successor provisions in subsequent revenue acts did not apply where a corporation acquired the assets or stock of another corporation, and, pursuant to the plan, transferred such assets or stock to a wholly owned subsidiary. Also, the reorganization provisions were held inapplicable where the stock or assets were acquired directly by a subsidiary, and stock of its parent corporation was issued in exchange therefor.

In enacting the 1954 code, the Congress sought to overturn the results of those decisions. However, this was actually accomplished only with respect to statutory mergers and consolidations under section 368(a)(1)(A) and stock for asset acquisitions under section 368 (a)(1)(C). The Congress failed to give consideration to the need for also extending the rule to cover stock-for-stock acquisitions under section 368(a)(1)(B), which were also affected by the Groman and Bashford cases. The proposed amendment to code section 368 would correct this oversight. This would be accomplished by amending the definition of a so-called "B" reorganization to permit the use of a parent corporation's stock in making the acquisition of the stock of the other corporation; by amending section 368(a)(2)(C) to permit the parent corporation to transfer acquired stock to its subsidiary without destroying the reorganization; and by amending the definition of a party to a reorganization to make clear that the shareholders and corporations making the exchange will qualify for tax-free treatment under sections 354(a) and 361(a), respectively. The substance of these proposed amendments was included among the recommendations of the subchapter C advisory group submitted to the Ways and Means Committee in December 1958.

As contemplated, the proposed amendment also would permit the corporation acquiring the assets of another corporation in exchange for the stock of a corporation in control of the acquiring corporation to transfer such acquired assets to a corporation controlled by such acquiring corporation without disqualifying the transaction as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(C). This result, however, would be obtained only where both the acquiring corporation and its controlled subsidiary, to which are transferred the acquired assets, are members of the affiliated group and file a consolidated tax return for the taxable year in which the acquisition occurs. Thus, where corporation B acquired the assets of corporation X in exchange for the stock of corporation A, which is in control of corporation B, corporation B could transfer the acquired assets to its controlled subsidiary, corporation C, without disqualifying the transaction as a reorganization under paragraph (1) (C), provided corporations B and C are members of the same affiliated group and file a consolidated return for the taxable year in which the acquisition and transfer occur.

The amendment would be made effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, in order to avoid problems of administration that might otherwise be incurred.

The proposed amendment to code section 368 would ease the unduly restrictive distinctions under existing law which defeat acquisitions of the type described above. Such acquisitions encourage business diversification and expansion, stimulating greater economic activity which is presently needed and being sought by the President. The proposed amendments should not cause any loss of Government revenues and most likely would result in increased revenues since economic activity would be stimulated, resulting in greater profits and the payment of more income tax.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. YOUNGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) on the subject "Inquest of Freedom: The Enslaved Peoples of the Baltic States."

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

930. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief

of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 15, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Sturgeon Creek, Middlesex County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

931. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 1, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Back Bay of Biloxi and Bayou Bernard, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

932. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 131 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the control of outdoor advertising along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2838. A bill to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2985. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5795. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7027. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H.R. 7028. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 7029. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where a substantial part of an estate consists of a contract right to receive annual payments over a period of years, the Federal estate tax attributable to such contract may be paid in annual installments over such period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7031. A bill to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7032. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7033. A bill to assist in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers, grants to States for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded, and grants for construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7034. A bill to assist in providing training of teachers of mentally retarded children, to authorize grants for research relating to education of such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 7035. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7036. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7037. A bill to amend section 368 (relating to corporate reorganization definitions) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the use of the stock of a corporation in control of the acquiring corporation in a section 368(a)(1)(B) reorganization and to allow the acquiring corporation acquiring assets in a section 368(a)(1)(C) reorganization solely for voting stock of a corporation in control of the acquiring corporation to transfer such assets to a corporation controlled by the acquiring corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 7038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period during which an individual citizen of the United States must be present in a foreign country or countries in order to exclude his earned income for such period from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7039. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with only four quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7040. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7041. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 7042. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of an individual's medical, dental, and related expenses shall be subtracted from his outside earnings before determining under such section the amount of any reduction in his benefits by reason of such earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 7043. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain surplus property of the United States shall be offered for sale to the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 7046. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 7047. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7048. A bill to authorize assistance to the States for surveying the needs of elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7049. A bill to authorize assistance to the States for surveying the needs of elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Br. Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7050. A bill to amend section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit contributions and other payments by the United States to programs and activities of the United Nations to 33.33 percent of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Br. Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7051. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit both men and women to retire thereunder with full benefits at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7053. A bill to place the position of Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia in an appropriate grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 7054. A bill to amend section 104 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7055. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7056. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.J. Res. 476. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 477. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 178. Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination against U.S. citizens by foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. FASCELL presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida to the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a highway from the Florida Keys through the Everglades National Park to the west coast of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7057. A bill for the relief of Eduardo J. Whitehouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 7058. A bill for the relief of Alisa Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 7059. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki Tsitsou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7060. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isabelo Remedio Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7061. A bill for the relief of Joanna Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 7062. A bill for the relief of Murray Moritz Jacobson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

158. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Anthony Maurovich and others, San Francisco, Calif., requesting preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mass Deportations From the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Baltic States Freedom Committee in commemorating the 22d anniversary of criminal deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which were conducted by the Soviet Union. The martyrdom of thousands of citizens of the Baltic States in 1941 remains on the consciences of all who believe in the ideals of freedom and independence. The anniversary of this event should be noted by every American who believes in the ultimate victory of the free world.

The Soviet Union has imposed the harsh rule of an alien dictatorship on the Baltic peoples since June 1940, when Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia were forcibly and cruelly incorporated into the Soviet Union. The peoples of the Baltic States have resisted the efforts of the Soviet Union to impose a foreign way of life and prevent the continued practice of traditional Baltic customs. Those who resisted these efforts were subjected to exile, deportation, imprisonment, and even execution. When they found difficulty in imposing dictatorial rule on these ancient peoples, the Soviets made plans to transplant all the people of the Baltic States to Russia.

The fact that these plans were not carried out is surely due in part to the resistance of the Baltic peoples. The Russian answer to Baltic opposition was deportation. The outrages which I would like to commemorate today reached their peaks on June 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1941. During these few days thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were expelled from their homelands under the most primitive conditions.

As we join in commemorating the mass deportations from the Baltic States in June 1941, we reaffirm our dedication to the cause of freedom for the Baltic peoples.

Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia: Their Freedom Must Be Returned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago the troops of Red Russia marched into three independent and self-governing nations with but one intent, to occupy and control. This invasion was made in spite of the fact that each country had a treaty of friendship and nonintervention with the Russian Government.

The rest of Europe, already embroiled with Hitler's grasping for political hegemony for Germany over the entire area could do little as those three brave nations went under—when their freedom was destroyed. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, small nations along the Baltic Sea were absorbed by force into the Soviet Union.

Born out of the hopes and dreams at the end of the First World War, all three had obtained independence as a result of the Allied victory, and for 20 years enjoyed the fruits of this independence within the world community of nations. Twenty years is short in the average lifetime of any nation, yet it is a sad fact of recent years, though that such a life expectancy seems about average for those nations and peoples bordering the Soviet Union.

Stalin's Russia—nor for that matter Khrushchev's either—could not allow a nation representing a political doctrine of liberty and freedom for its citizenry to taint its border areas. Such a "revolutionary" philosophy spreads quickly, especially amongst people who know nothing but the extreme opposite. So, crying subversion against his state, the Communist master of the Kremlin gave the order to move forward. His troops marched in, and that was the end of freedom.

It took more than military control to defeat these people—their countries may have been small in size, but their peoples were not small in bravery or spirit. The Russians intended to establish puppet governments, but in order to do so all possible opposition had to be done away with. This really presented no problem, as the wasteland of Siberia had long been a Russian dumping ground for political elements not taking kindly to Moscow domination. This was again the policy followed. In the week subsequent to June 13, 1941, alone, some 60,000 men, women, and children were deported to Siberia and, for most, almost certain death.

This number represented but one period in the deportation schedules that were interrupted only by the arrival of another invader—Nazi Germany.

Yet not even the victory of the democracies after the Second World War could bring succor to the citizens of these countries. For included amongst the victors was imperialistic Russia, still determined upon her policies of domination and conquest. The Baltic States slipped easily back under Communist control, and there was a new series of deportations, with political control from Moscow ever stricter.

Today, 22 years after the first great deportations the situation remains the same. It is therefore our just and rightful duty to give recognition to the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in their dedication to overcome all opposition and to again see freedom in their respective homelands.

Baltic Freedom Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the ironies of modern times is the "progress" which mankind has made in developing weapons of mass terror and conquest. The barbaric practices of antiquity have given way to the more efficient methods of the gas chamber, slave labor camp, and cattlecar deportation. It is the last technique in particular which the observance of Baltic Freedom Days on June 14–16 brings to mind, for it was 22 years ago this week that the Soviets ruthlessly executed a mass deportation in the three conquered Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The goal of these mass deportations, along with mass arrests and exterminations, was the complete physical and spiritual destruction of these three small nations. The figures are staggering. During one night alone—June 14—about 10,000 Estonian men, women, and children were arrested and shipped in cattle cars to Siberia and northern Russia. From Latvia, 15,600 were transported to Siberia on June 13–14. During the week of June 14–21, Lithuania lost 34,260 souls to the remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic. The week's total for the Baltic area was 59,860 deportees.

What happened to these ill-fated people. Most of them died or went insane as a result of Soviet brutalities and inhuman living conditions. There were few survivors, but the testimony of some of these has documented one of history's most heinous crimes.

It would be wrong to assume that these deportations are a thing of the past, to regard them as simply an excess of Stalinism. The mass deportation has continued throughout the postwar era to be an instrument of sovietization and coercion. The specific techniques have shifted from mass arrests and cattle-car shipments to the more subtle one of job and housing controls which force segments of the population to move from one area to another. These methods may be less offensive, but the hardship and disruption which they cause the Baltic peoples have not been lessened. Thus it is an illusion to believe that these peoples have any more freedom under Khrushchev's so-called liberalized regime. It is well to be reminded of these hard facts of the cold war, lest we forget the human misery and suffering caused by Soviet imperialism. It is our fervent hope that the Baltic peoples will again be able to observe an occasion such as Baltic Freedom Days in their native land.

A Peaceful, Prosperous Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Middle East have again given rise to fears of aggressive action in this extremely important and highly volatile area.

There are so many conflicting interests at work and so much internal instability evident that no one can predict with certainty what may happen next.

But it should be borne in mind by all leaders of the nations located in that cradle of civilization that the interest of all demands the maintenance of peace. Wars and threats of war disturb the tranquility of the area and prevent it from developing its resources for the benefit of all its inhabitants.

As one of the leaders of the free peoples of the world, the United States has a strong and vital interest in keeping the peace among all the countries of the Middle East.

This continuing interest was sharply emphasized in 1958, when President Eisenhower, at the request of the local government, sent American troops into Lebanon to assist the constituted authority in maintaining its democratic heritage and tradition in a stable atmosphere.

In view of this past history, it is well to note the statement made recently by President Kennedy in answer to a question at one of his press conferences. I believe Mr. Kennedy's statement should be taken at face value by those contemplating aggression in this area, now or at any time in the future—for it certainly has the support of all Americans, and it certainly will serve as the basis for any American action, should such action become necessary.

The President's statement follows:

> The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor, and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security.
>
> We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East, and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Middle East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people. This Government has been and remains as strongly opposed to the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression, which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time."

In short, the President has expressed the traditional U.S. position favoring a peaceful and prosperous Middle East, but, at the same time, he has reiterated our firm determination to support with all our strength the forces of peace in that strategic region.

The Massive Youth Program of the Latter-day Saints Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of our entire country could profitably take note of an occasion soon to transpire during the lovely spring evenings in Salt Lake City, Utah. Some 50,000 spectators will gather in the stadium on the University of Utah campus to witness a dance festival unduplicated anywhere in the world. Six thousand young dancers assembled from all parts of the United States will apppear in costumed dances to climax a conference to which 25,000 youth leaders will be gathered. These leaders will return to give continued guidance, inspiration, and encouragement to more than 300,000 people enrolled in the Mutual Improvement Association, an auxiliary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It was 50 years ago that the Latter-day Saints Church became the first religious body in the United States to sponsor the Boy Scout program. It simultaneously established a corresponding Beehive program for the girls of comparable age, which has matched in success the wonderful results of the scouting program.

As the name of this auxiliary suggests, it is geared to personal improvement through mutual participation in activities designed to build character, develop each participant's talents, and provide wholesome entertainment for youthful energies. In a day when we are plagued with increasing juvenile delinquency, charges of a corrupted youth, and are urged to enact massive Federal programs to occupy the time and energies of our young people, it is indeed refreshing to note the great success of such a youth program in our Nation.

Its success is accomplished voluntarily as a service of love and appreciation, being carried out enthusiastically by those who have benefited from the program during their growing years. Hundreds of thousands of our youth have been reached by this activity, and at absolutely no cost to the Federal or State Governments.

I am sure my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in offering sincere congratulations to the dedicated leaders and teachers in the MIA program on the forthcoming annual conference, and in expressing the hope that their continued efforts will provide healthy and constructive achievement for many thousands more of our Nation's youth.

Baltic Freedom Day; Our Duty To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we remember today the people of three small nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. They were cruelly overrun by Communist Russia 22 years ago, yet the people of these countries have not forgotten, even today, the joys of the freedom they once knew. They still work and hope for the day when they will know it again.

We can best understand the plight of these Baltic peoples by realizing the blessings that we in the United States of America often take too much for granted. Perhaps one of the greatest benefits which we have had was well over a hundred years of relative isolation from the rest of the world. In this position of isolation, after our Declaration of Independence, we were able to work out our destiny within the confines of our national interest and a national unity, with relatively few outside influences with which to contend. We also had vast unsettled lands into which our expanding population could move. In spite of a Civil War, we were able to maintain a detachment from the divisive influences of foreign involvements which allowed a great degree of our attention to be directed toward national problems during our most formative stages. Thus, when the full force of outside struggles for power was introduced into our country with the coming of the First World War, we were strong and united internally, with a dedication to self-preservation and great faith in the ideals upon which this Nation was founded and governed. By these unifying strengths we have been able to stand up and defeat those who would pull us down.

Not so with too many of those small nations on continental Europe, surrounding its large central land mass. Though the peoples of these areas are ethnically separate and have at various times in history been able to form themselves into self-governing States, a continuance of this state of existence was in direct relationship to the centralization of power in the land mass center controlled from Moscow, and Moscow's relationship within the European balance of power. The independence of smaller States surrounding Russia depended too much on the particular pressures of the moment within the stronger States bordering them. We have then, as with Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, brave, strong, and hardworking peoples of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, formed into viable democracies of their own choosing, yet unable to stand up to more powerful outside influences, both of fascism and communism, that would do them ill. It is a sad mark of our times that many nations, from the Balkans to the Baltic, have found themselves in a like position, too close to a power-mad nation that would adopt any means to subvert adjoining nations to their particular brand of government and political control.

It is for us in the Western World, especially in this country of ours, continually to call attention to the plight of so many millions of people not so fortunate as to enjoy the fruits of political freedom and independence with which, due in many ways to our geographical position, we have been blessed.

Twenty-two years ago the Soviets, from Moscow, set about the consolidation of their conquest of the three free Baltic States through a policy of mass deportations to slave-labor camps in faraway Siberia of so-called antisocial elements within each nation. It was the Soviet intention to subject the remaining population to their own imperialistic control, and to allow them the most minimal degree of self-government and autonomy within the monolithic Soviet state.

But in following this course of action the Soviets forgot one extremely important factor: people have an inborn urge for freedom to live within societies of their own making, and to determine their own future under leadership of their own choosing. This spirit cannot be killed in slave-labor camps, by brainwashing, and by harsh political control through threat and use of force.

The peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, in spite of the persecutions of the Soviet Union, have not given up their thirst for freedom. Their spokesmen in the free world, and clandestinely from within the countries themselves, remind us constantly of the plight of their fellow citizens. They look to this country, the United States, as the absolute antithesis of what is represented by Soviet dictatorship, and to the action taken by us in bringing about a return of freedom to these unfortunate nations. On this 22d anniversary of the first cruel Soviet deportations of free peoples from the Baltic States, let us rededicate ourselves to the task and goal of seeing their freedom returned.

Baltic Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, June 14 marks the 22d anniversary of the mass deportations by the Communists from three Baltic States: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

For 20 years these nations and their leadership knew the fruits of a hard-earned independence that came after the First World War. During this period each of these countries exhibited to the world at large the abilities of their leaders and peoples to assume with dignity and correctness the obligations of independent national status. These three Baltic States, giving to their peoples a democratic rule in cooperation with the Western World, knew economic, political, and social stability remarkable for the time and surrounding conditions.

Most unfortunately for the hopes of these nations, they had a powerful neighbor with urgent designs on the territory of each; not only could imperialist Soviet Russia not allow a nation knowing political freedom to contaminate her borders, but Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia controlled a major portion of the Baltic Sea, a vital trade and shipping route the Russians felt they must have.

How to gain control of these countries, each of which had a treaty of friendship and a guarantee of sovereignty with Russia, was an easy problem for the masters of the Kremlin. Quickly overpowering each weakened government, the Russians established Soviets in each country, and began a campaign of mass deportations of all antisocial elements that was halted only by the subsequent German invasion of Russia in 1941, with eventual conquest of the three Baltic States.

First the Russian conquest, then the Nazi conquest—still the spirit of freedom was not killed among these brave peoples. With the confusion following the breakup of the Nazi war machine in 1945, resistance leaders in the Baltic area sought to reestablish their national independence. They were in for a sorry disappointment. As victory against Germany was assured, the Russians quickly moved against Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, snuffing out any move toward independence, and reestablishing their strict prewar control.

Again the deportations began. All enemies of the State—that meant all who aspired after some sort of freedom from outside political control—were packed off to Siberia, and almost certain death. Thus during a 5-year period, through two mass deportation moves, untold thousands of free people were driven from their homelands. National independence was no more, it died through Russian power, that began with brute force 22 years ago this month, and is still going on today.

I would like to discuss in this connection a measure I have introduced in the House, House Concurrent Resolution 43, which calls on Congress to request the President to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and ask the U.N. to request the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and return Baltic exiles, and that the U.N. conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision. In my view it is important not only to the Baltic people but to the free world to work diligently to bring about freedom for the Baltic people and

I would urge that this resolution be approved by the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by an organization known as "Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States" discussing the struggle for freedom by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and commenting on the resolutions introduced in the House and Senate designed to help bring this about.

The memorandum follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 12, 1963.

LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

The period following World War II was notable for the emergence of certain newly independent nations. It also saw other free nations drawn behind the Iron Curtain by the cruelest colonialism of this modern day.

Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have inhabited the lands along the shores of the Baltic Sea for many centuries. They had rejoiced in their freedom and independence.

In June of 1940 Soviet armed forces invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Moscow-appointed emissaries set up puppet governments; the parliaments were dissolved; heads and higher officers of governmental agencies were dismissed and replaced by Soviet agents; civil liberties were suspended. The Soviet puppet governments took over all newspapers, printing establishments, and broadcasting systems.

The desire for freedom has not been crushed

These are outright annexations of territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia whose people are as enamored of freedom and as fully entitled to their rights as are the people of Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Even more shocking was the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets following their ruthless subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In June of 1941, more than 200,000 persons were deported from the Baltic States, and the total now approaches 1,500,000.

The people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are today a silenced people, unable to speak their mind, practice their religion. Despite their long enslavement, we know that their desire for freedom has not been crushed. They may be waiting silently and grimly, but also hopefully for the future.

We must help the Baltic people to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Since June of 1940, when the Communists took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83d Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, the committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to the committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration by the Congress which stated that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

Thirty-two Senate and House concurrent resolutions pending before Senate and House committees

Thirty-five Members of the U.S. Congress have taken concrete steps in seizing the offensive from the Soviet Union and the Communist world. These Senators and Congressmen have introduced 32 concurrent resolutions in the Senate and the House since January 9, 1963, when the 88th Congress convened for its 1st session, that call for freedom for the captive peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Following are the resolutions and their authors:

In the U.S. Senate

1. Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, introduced by Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa.
2. Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, introduced by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, Democrat, of New Hampshire, and Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
3. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey.
4. Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, introduced by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York.
5. Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, introduced by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska.
6. Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, introduced by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio.

In the House of Representatives

1. House Concurrent Resolution 15, introduced by Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, of Iowa.
2. House Concurrent Resolution 38, introduced by Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.
3. House Concurrent Resolution 43, introduced by Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California.
4. House Concurrent Resolution 54, introduced by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California.
5. House Concurrent Resolution 55, introduced by Representative ABNER W. SIBAL, Republican, of Connecticut.
6. House Concurrent Resolution 59, introduced by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska.
7. House Concurrent Resolution 62, introduced by Representative WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Democrat, of Illinois.
8. House Concurrent Resolution 63, introduced by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York.
9. House Concurrent Resolution 66, introduced by Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, of Arizona.
10. House Concurrent Resolution 80, introduced by Representative ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR., Republican, of California.
11. House Concurrent Resolution 96, introduced by Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey.
12. House Concurrent Resolution 97, introduced by Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut.
13. House Concurrent Resolution 103, introduced by Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., Republican, of Ohio.
14. House Concurrent Resolution 106, introduced by Representative CARLETON J. KING, Republican, of New York.
15. House Concurrent Resolution 126, introduced by Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland.
16. House Concurrent Resolution 127, introduced by Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts.
17. House Concurrent Resolution 128, introduced by Representative JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
18. House Concurrent Resolution 130, introduced by Representative CLARENCE D. LONG, Democrat, of Maryland.
19. House Concurrent Resolution 132, introduced by Representative STANLEY R. TUPPER, Republican, of Maine.
20. House Concurrent Resolution 133, introduced by Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER, Republican, of Illinois.
21. House Concurrent Resolution 135, introduced by Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.
22. House Concurrent Resolution 138, introduced by Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Democrat, of Maryland.
23. House Concurrent Resolution 139, introduced by Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.
24. House Concurrent Resolution 140, introduced by Representative CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Republican, of Maine.
25. House Concurrent Resolution 151, introduced by Representative AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Democrat, of California.
26. House Concurrent Resolution 153, introduced by Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan.

The aforesaid resolutions request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States' question before the United Nations and to ask that the United Nations should request the Soviets:

1. To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;
2. To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave labor camps; and
3. To conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia under the United Nations direct supervision.

All these resolutions have been referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs respectively.

Our Government must act now without a further delay

At a time when the Western nations have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extend freedom and independence to peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

A. This organization, the Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States, embracing thousands of freedom-loving Americans throughout our Nation, states:

(1) The liberation of the Baltic nations is no political gambit. It is a proposition that all Americans should embrace if they are to be true to the ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

(2) The Baltic question must not become an object of international compromise. The plight of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia must be brought to the attention of the world. The United Nations must act to restore the rights of the Baltic peoples, and it is an obligation of the United States to initiate such action.

B. This organization respectfully urges the Congress of the United States:

(1) To request the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to act favorably and without any further delay on the aforesaid resolutions;

(2) To act on these resolutions, when reported out of the committees, promptly and overwhelmingly.

The sufferings and subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other captive nations must, if we are to survive in liberty, spur free peoples to the preservation of man's inalienable rights. By maintaining the rights of others to be free, we confirm our own unyielding will to survive in freedom and in peace.

LEONARD VALIUKAS,
President, Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States.

Who Are the Real Fright Peddlers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 7, my colleague from California, JAMES B. UTT, delivered a speech at the Indiana War Memorial Auditorium under the sponsorship of "We the People."

The address was entitled "Who Are the Real Fright Peddlers?" and the text follows:

WHO ARE THE REAL FRIGHT PEDDLERS?

(By Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, it is a privilege and an honor to be invited to participate in this important and historic occasion. Meetings and discussions such as this can have an important bearing on the future of this Republic. I am, as you all know, a controversial figure. I have been called an "alarmist" by those who want America to sleep. To that I will plead guilty, even as Paul Revere was an alarmist in his day, and traveled the countryside to warn the sleeping villagers that the British were coming. I have been called "inflammatory" because I will not subscribe to the slogan of "Better Red Than Dead." More recently I have been referred to by a few of my colleagues in the House and the Senate as a "fright peddler." It is apparent that we who have a patriotic devotion to this Republic are supposed to lie down and play dead while the pseudoliberals not only permit but assist in the extension of communism in every part of the globe; and those who wish to resist the appeasement in Laos, the surrender in Cuba, and the abandonment of freedom fighters throughout the world, as well as the suicidal unilateral disarmament program, are termed "fright peddlers." The truth is, I am frightened, and I would be a coward if I did not raise my voice in protest, and to tell the American people the truth about the International Communist Conspiracy and its interwoven relationship to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

As J. Edgar Hoover said in an address to law enforcement officials on March 1, 1960: "It is indeed appalling that some members of our society continue to deplore and criticize those who stress the Communist danger. What these misguided 'authorities' fail to realize is that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an integral part of international communism * * * Public indifference to this threat is tantamount to national suicide. Lethargy leads only to disaster."

Our Founding Fathers were well aware that man's eternal enemy was government, whether that government was a dictatorship, a benevolent monarchy, a democracy, or a republic. Usurpation of power is the natural trend of every government. George Washington expressed it in these words: "Government is like a fire, which if it is properly controlled, will light your homes and cook your food and run your factories, but if it is not controlled, it will destroy you."

A hundred years ago, a great Civil War was being fought to test whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. Today, we are engaged in another civil war testing the same premise. It is not a hot war, but a cold war, which can be just as deadly. During that hundred years, the poles of the compass have swung in a 180° arc. At that time it was a question of whether or not the sovereignty of a State or a group of States transcended the sovereignty of the Union. That conflict was resolved in favor of the Union. The conflict today is whether or not the sovereignty of the Union transcends the sovereignty of the States which created the Union. That conflict has yet to be resolved.

Free enterprise and capitalism have long been the American way of life. One hundred years ago, Karl Marx completed his blueprint for the destruction of the capitalistic society and his proposal to establish a universal Socialist-Communist society. We have been following this blueprint for many years, and the pseudoliberals embrace that doctrine 100 percent. It is well known that the seeds of death are implanted in every human being before he draws his first breath. So also are the seeds of destruction implanted in the body politic of every nation at birth. Just as the life of an individual can be extended beyond its three score years and ten, by proper care, attention and prudent living, so also can the life of a nation be prolonged beyond the normal cycle; but as wanton and careless living will cut down the span of a human life, so also may our national life be cut down. If this Republic, which was conceived in liberty, is to survive, the American people must demand that we return to the basic concepts of our forefathers and declare again that we are a nation under God.

It was not until dozens of patriotic organizations throughout this Nation began to alert the American people to the dangers of the Socialist-Communist ascendency to power in this country, that the hierarchy of the Communist international conspiracy decided that it was high time to destroy the anti-Communists. To this end, they called a meeting in Moscow, which was attended by 80 Communist organizations from all parts of the world. The delegates to this meeting were instructed to return to their respective countries and begin a massive program to destroy all anti-Communists. Gus Hall, president of the Communist Party, U.S.A., returned from Moscow and inaugurated that program of destruction. The first to feel the ax was General Walker, who was indoctrinating his troops so that they would recognize the dangers of communism as a conspiracy and so that they would not be brainwashed as they were in Korea. For this bit of patriotism he was dismissed, degraded, demoted, and deprived of his rights under the Constitution.

This served only to accelerate and intensify the work of patriotic anti-Communist organizations. The administration was frantic because the New Frontier was being equated with socialism and socialism with communism, and something had to be done. Who was to do it? None other than Walter and Victor Reuther, who came to Washington in the fall of 1961 and had a strategy conference. At this conference Walter Reuther promised to write a memorandum for Attorney General Robert Kennedy. That memo was a 24-page blueprint for the destruction of the anti-Communists. The memo was actually written by Victor Reuther, whom you remember as being the Soviet devotee, who in his earlier days spent some time in Russia writing glowing reports on the Soviet socialist program, and in a moment of reverie wrote a letter to his colleagues in America urging them to "keep up the fight for a Soviet America." This man, then became the chief adviser to the administration on how to deal with the anti-Communists. In his note, which accompanied the memo, he said, "We are hopeful that this memorandum may have some value to you in focusing attention upon possible administration policies and programs to combat the radical right."

Now it must be understood that the "radical right" refers to any and all patriotic organizations which stand opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine as set forth in the Communist manifesto of 1848 and restated by the Moscow Communist Convention in 1960. That, of course, means you as well as me.

"Liberty cannot exist where government takes care of the people, but it can only thrive where the people take care of the government." Woodrow Wilson said that many years ago. He might just as well have spelled it out more clearly by saying that liberty and socialism cannot coexist, that they are incompatible and only one can survive. In 1937, Pope Pius XI asked a searching question: "How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?" If Pope Pius XI was shocked in 1937, what would he say today after seeing an additional 750 million human beings swept behind the Iron Curtain? Pope Pius XI also said in 1931 that the Socialist state cannot exist without an obviously excessive use of force. We are seeing that excessive use of force not only in the Communist countries, such as East Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, but also in our own country.

Now let us examine the recommendations of the Reuther brothers to be used for your own destruction. The first recommendation was that "The radical right inside the Armed Forces poses an immediate and special problem requiring immediate and special measures." Under this heading, he recommended that Secretary McNamara investigate the extent of the radical right in the military. The memorandum claimed that it was widespread pressure from rightwing generals and admirals in the Pentagon which brought about the recall of Gen. James Van Fleet to active duty. What was wrong with General Van Fleet? Simply this, he was a member of the board of For America, he endorsed the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and he was on the board of advisers of H. L. Hunt's Life Lines. The memorandum complained that all that Van Fleet accomplished was to embarrass Adlai Stevenson by saying that Stevenson was to blame for the U.S. failure to provide air support in the Bay of Pigs invasion and that General Van Fleet would have fired Stevenson. Had I been President, I would not have fired Adlai Stevenson for the simple reason that I would never have hired him in the first place.

The No. 2 complaint in the Reuther memorandum was that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations is lending aid and comfort to the radical right. (That's you.) The memo goes on to state, "Although the radical right poses a far greater danger to the success of this country in its battle against international communism than does the domestic Communist movement, the latter has been branded subversive by the Government, and the former (radical right) has not." The memo goes on to state, "The list today is almost like a Good Housekeeping seal for the radical right and as long as it exists" (indicating it should be abolished) "it should not remain one sided and permitted to work in favor of the radical right." It is interesting to note that the adjective "radical" precedes any mention of "right." You see, radicalism has always been an offensive word to the American people, and, if the brothers Reuther can implant the word "radical" in connection with conservatism or rightwing movements, it would prove destructive.

The memo continues that "It might be advisable for the Attorney General to announce at this time that he is going to investigate one or more of these organizations with a view of determining whether charges will be filed and hearings held on the question of listing one or more of these organizations. The mere act of indicating that an investigation will be made will certainly bring home to many people something they have never considered—the subversive character of these organizations and the similarity to listed groups on the left."

Now that is really something. Many of these organizations to which Reuther refers have requested an investigation, and I can assure you that if one is held there will be no witness who will take the fifth amendment.

One specific proposal in the memo was that FBI agents infiltrate ultraconservative organizations to determine whether they should be classified as subversive or not. My dear friends, the FBI does not have to infiltrate these organizations. They have an open invitation to join with any of them.

The third suggestion was "The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible." You should note that the word "dammed" is spelled with two m's although their direct intent was to spell it the other way. The proposal further stated "As funds are a source of power to the radical right, action to dam up these funds may be the quickest way to turn the tide now running in their favor." At least that is an admission never before heard, that the tide is running in our favor. The memo suggested that tax exemptions be carefully checked and that the list of major donors to the far right be made public and that the Federal Communications Commission check radio and television stations carrying far-right propaganda, but listing their programs as religious, news analysis, or public service, and that the program, "Know Your Enemy," emanating from Washington, would be a good place to start.

Incidentally, immediately after the memo was circulated, the income tax reports of Walter Knott of Knott's Berry Farm, one of the greatest exponents of free enterprise, and a true patriot, were examined and he was found liable for deductions which he had taken on contributions to support the California Free Enterprise Association. It is amazing how easy it is to deduct money for contributions to the Fund for the Republic and other leftwing organizations which support the socialistic Communist ideology, but when you attempt to educate people on the free enterprise capitalistic system, you are then dispensing political propaganda. When you consider the massive political propaganda spewed forth by the National Education Association, the Rural Electrification outfit, and even the National Council of Churches, the double standard becomes so apparent that a schoolchild would recognize it.

Skipping one recommendation, I go to the fifth, which was that "The domestic Communist problems should be put into proper perspective for the American people, thus exposing the basic fallacy of the radical right." What we are doing here tonight is putting the domestic Communist problem in its proper perspective for the American people, and in so doing we are not exposing any basic fallacy of the conservative right.

Now we come to the real "meat and potatoes" of what seems to be bothering the liberals, and that is that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, "exaggerates the domestic Communist menace at every turn, and contributes to the public's frame of mind upon which the radical right feeds." The memo further charges that Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, who continues in charge of internal security matters, has always maximized the domestic Communist menace. "There is no need," the memo continues, "of a further effort to dramatize the Communist issue, the need now is to rein in those who have created the unreasoned fear of the domestic Communist movement in the minds of American people and to slowly develop a more rational attitude toward the strength of this movement." In other words, the rational attitude which the pseudoliberals want is that we should appease and even embrace the international Communist menace. The memo suggests that it would not be well to forbid dissenting officials from expressing a contrary view for fear of the charge that the administration was attempting to muzzle J. Edgar Hoover, but that "any effort to take a more realistic view by the leaders of this administration would probably cause most of the administration officials to fall in line, and even some legislators might be affected thereby."

This, then, is the key to the recent attacks upon our patriotic conservatism by some Members of the U.S. Senate and some Members of the House, and, if you will read these attacks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will be amazed to see how closely they have followed the substance and the language used in the 24-page memo of Victor Reuther.

The authors of the book, "The Far Right," Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, state that, "No formal action was taken on the suggestions, although the document was read by key members of the administration and circulated to sympathetic Congressmen." With that statement I completely disagree, for sympathetic Congressmen and Senators have been following the directions of this memorandum, and many TV and radio station licenses are being withheld. These charges by sympathetic Congressmen are replete with the charge of guilt by association and similar techniques, and anyone who disagrees with these so-called sympathetic Congressmen becomes anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and is charged with being a greater menace to American security than is the domestic Communist establishment.

I, as a dedicated conservative patriot, resent being charged with radicalism and as a member of the "lunatic fringe." However, these charges will not alter my course nor the course of you patriots, who intend to continue exposing communism wherever it rears its ugly head. As Daniel Webster said, "I was born an American, I expect to die as an American, and in between I intend to live as an American."

We have been in a steady retreat from Moscow, which is more humiliating to me than Napoleon's retreat from Moscow 150 years ago. The difference is that Napoleon was forced to retreat, while we retreat by reason of weakness, fear, and design. We have the greatest military force in the world, but its Commander in Chief does not know when to use it, where to use it, or how to use it. High military decisions, including the selection of armaments, are made by the "whiz kids" in the Pentagon over the objections of the Joint Military Chiefs of Staff.

Paul Nitze, one of the planners in the Pentagon, and now the leading candidate to be Under Secretary of Defense, stated years ago that our military power should be divided among the nations of the world, and we are proposing to do just that. How can we have a win policy with such men directing our defenses? Why should not the American people be frightened over our steady retreat because of a threatening bully in Moscow? Why should we not be concerned over the establishment of a Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere? Why should we not be concerned over the suggestion that we give up Guantanamo Bay? In spite of the President's denial of this, it was the administration that asked for money to acquire land in Puerto Rico and money to build additions to the naval base at Roosevelt Roads. The only thing that stopped it was the Committee on Armed Services. There was ample opportunity to set up a representative government in Cuba when Batista offered to resign, warning our Ambassador in Havana of the Castro threat, but there were people in the State Department who were bound and determined to set up a Communist government in Cuba, with full knowledge that Castro was a dedicated Communist. The two men responsible for this were William Wieland and Roy Rubottom, and the Senate report is replete with their treachery. These two men were not even reprimanded by the administration, but were advanced to higher positions of security, just as Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White were moved upward into places of greater authority after their treachery was common knowledge.

It is only human that some mistakes should be made, but when none of them is in favor of America, I cannot help but recognize a design for surrender. The Bay of Pigs fiasco is a good example of this, along the route of our retreat. Following that, the Soviet military buildup was well known by the administration, but denied by them until a national election seemed certain to swamp the New Frontier. Then dramatic action was taken which lasted less than 48 hours during which time this administration made concessions to Khrushchev, all of which have not yet come to light. These concessions played into the hands of the Communists, for they actually accomplished exactly what they set out to accomplish, and that was a Communist satellite within the Western Hemisphere, protected by the force and might of the U.S. Navy.

In exchange for the removal of a few offensive missiles from Cuba, we would dismantle our foreign bases in the Mediterranean and other places. At this point, I would like to say that I have seen a lot of missiles, and I have yet to see one designated as offensive and another designated as defensive. It depends on which way the gun is pointed. Khrushchev promised to remove an undisclosed number of troops from Cuba, with March 15 of this year as a deadline. According to the count, nearly 3,000 troops were removed, but no count was made of the troops on the incoming ships. As of last month, the Senate Committee on Military Preparedness disclosed that there are now a minimum of 17,500 Russian troops in Cuba. But for the token removal of troops in March, our President hailed Mr. Khrushchev as a statesman for keeping his word. How silly can you get?

Castro is exporting communism by propaganda, as well as military equipment and men, to several Latin American countries. From this we will reap a whirlwind, and not in the too far distant future. What happened to our demand for on-site inspection of Russian military might in Cuba? The answer is, nothing. We even go so far as to summarily dismiss a marine captain who caught a Communist spy redhanded on our naval base at Guantanamo and had to shoot him in self-defense. This same captain has been told that he will be fined $10,000 and imprisoned if he even talks about the incident. What has happened to our first amendment of free speech? The same pattern by which we lost Cuba to the Communists is being followed with regard to the Republic of Haiti.

I would like to submit just two examples of misstatement of facts by the administration with reference to the Cuban situation, and compare them with the interim report of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee. On February 6, 1963, on page 47 of the special Cuba briefing, R. S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, said, "I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously." Now this is what the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee said on page 7 of the interim report: "The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas."

At his press conference on August 29, 1962, President Kennedy said, "We have no evidence of troops * * * we do not have information that troops have come into Cuba." And this is what the Interim Report said on pages 10 and 11 (speaking of the July-August period, 1962): "Human source reports also alleged that the nature and character of the arriving Soviet personnel had changed significantly. It was reported that some of the arriving personnel during this period were primarily young, trim, physically fit, suntanned and disciplined, and that they formed in ranks of fours on the docks and moved out in truck convoys. Refugee, exile, and other human source reports suggested that, in contrast to the earlier arrivals, the new arrivals were Soviet combat troops. However, the intelligence community adhered to the view that they were military instructors, advisers, and trainers, plus a number of civilian technicians and advisers associated with improving the Cuban economy."

These are just two examples of the inconsistencies between statements of the administration and the actual facts.

Walt Rostow went to Moscow to ask Mr. Khrushchev what we could do to lessen tensions. Mr. Khrushchev's reply was that we should eliminate our first-strike capabilities, and Mr. Rostow returned to Washington to implement that suggestion. That is why the Skybolt was canceled and the RS–70 program is at a standstill. It is the Strategic Air Command, with its capabilities of striking first, that has prevented Khrushchev from attacking us, and, while we phase out our first-strike capabilities, the Soviets continue to build the counterpart of the RS–70, capable of carrying warheads on a 25,000-mile mission at speeds up to 2,000 miles an hour, at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet.

The fuzzy-minded planners surrounding the President have the idea that if we disarm unilaterally the Russians will do so, as a gesture of good will. That is just like hoping that if you let a ball player steal second base, he will be a good boy and not try to steal third. It is just as foolish, but far more deadly. We can no more unilaterally disarm and have peace, than you can disarm the police force of a big city, in hopes that the underworld will respond by abandoning their criminal careers. There is nothing but force or the threat of force that will deter the Communists from destroying us.

There has recently been some discussion of a memorandum by Walt Rostow and McGeorge Bundy (political advisers to the President) which stated in part that it should be the policy of the administration to refuse aid to freedom fighters in any part of the world and that, if a Communist government took over, the United States should do all within its power, short of war, to see that such a government should survive. This is shocking, but when inquiry was made to the State Department regarding this memorandum, the State Department replied that there was such a memo, part of which was leaked to the press, but that it had been taken out of context and was misquoted. The only possible answer to that is, "Let's look at a copy of that memorandum to see what it really said." Upon requesting a copy of this memo from the State Department in order that the matter might be clarified, the reply came that the memorandum was prepared for the Security Council and was "classified and top secret." So the public will never know the truth. However, to give credence to the Rostow-Bundy memo, it should be noted that, when a resolution was introduced to provide for a Captive Nations Week and thereby hold out some hope to the enslaved peoples in the captive nations, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, filed an objection with the Rules Committee against the passage of this resolution on the grounds that it would create tensions and displease Mr. Khrushchev. All I can say is that it is about time we began to offend Mr. Khrushchev.

Because your organization and others like it, as well as individuals, including me, are attempting to alert and warn the public of the serious consequences of these successive retreats, compromises, and accommodations, we are called "fright peddlers." Let's see who are really the fright peddlers. President Kennedy threatened this nation with a depression if Congress failed to pass his tax program "in toto." Nothing can be more frightening than a depression. Secretary Freeman threatened the farmers (and when I say threatened I mean threatened) with a farm depression if they refused to buy his farm program of rigid controls. He even indicated that he would go so far as to dump our grain surplus on the market and ruin the farmer. To many, that is fright peddling.

Why is it that those, who make eloquent outbursts on the floor of the House and Senate, ignore the fright peddlers such as Khrushchev who says that he will bury us? Recently, Khrushchev said he would pulverize us if we interfere with Castro's Cuba. Why do they ignore Castro's frightening demands and threats to our security?

Why, also, do they ignore the frightening requests of the State Department that American department stores should display in their show cases goods made by Communist countries?

Those who ignore these threats are the real fright peddlers by their very silence in this area. This is a sin of omission which is as great as the sin of commission.

President Kennedy continues to ignore the bilateral agreements with Latin American countries, calling for the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine; which, by the way, has recently been adopted by Mr. Khrushchev, in reverse, by demanding that America stay out of Western Hemisphere affairs, and, moreover, the President has promised Mr. Khrushchev that our Navy will protect the sovereignty of Fidel Castro. To me, that is truly frightening. The President agreed to remove our missile bases and to call home many of our Army personnel, now located in strategic points around the world, with the exception, of course, of Oxford, Miss.

It is high time that the American people stop looking for fallout shelters and begin looking for "sell out" shelters. If this administration, as suggested by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Paul Nitze, turns over our Strategic Air Command to NATO and the United Nations, there must be an accounting by men in high places. The creation of an international "peace force," under the control and direction of an organization controlled by the Afro-Asian bloc in concert with the Russian satellites, would certainly be giving aid and comfort to the enemy and should be dealt with accordingly.

The administration's effort, to promote civil rights by riot, strife, and revolution, is doing much to implement the Communist manifesto of 1848, wherein Karl Marx declared that capitalism and all property rights must be abolished. No one can deny that people are entitled to their civil rights, but what they fail to comprehend is that with each civil right there is an equal and corresponding civil responsibility. And that responsibility is that the civil rights of others cannot be destroyed by illegal application of the civil right in point. Civil rights must be a two-way street. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court are leading us down the road to the complete destruction of property rights and the law of trespass held sacred since the Magna Carta.

The high emotional stress to place human rights above property rights is a false concept. Let me say here and now, and most emphatically, that the highest human right of man is the right of private property and its protection against trespass and confiscation as provided in the Fifth Amendment. In fact, all human rights are based on property rights, and, if you question this statement, I suggest that you examine the situation in all Communist countries which have destroyed property rights, and you will find that human rights followed them down the drain. In this emotional atmosphere, it is apparently easy to convince the people that we should carry out the Communist Manifesto and destroy the right of private property. Of course, much of this is being done under a highly graduated personal income tax and inheritance tax, as recommended so clearly by Karl Marx, as the main weapon in the arsenal of socialism.

People are good not because they are white or black or yellow or red. They are good because they accept the moral and spiritual laws, and apply them in their daily lives. They simply want to be good people. And people are bad not because of their race, creed or color, but because they refuse to accept and apply the moral and spiritual laws.

Men, as well as governments, do good things in order to entice others and to then perform their evil deeds. The child molester always entices a child with candy or some other gift before he performs his evil deed. Likewise, governments promise something for nothing in order to extend their control and dominion over the people whom they are supposed to govern by the consent of the governed. I have seen a lot of free cheese in a mouse trap, but I have never yet seen a happy mouse that ate the cheese. Likewise, our liberties are contracted with each extension of dominion and control. This is the short road to slavery.

Beyond the constant attacks of the anti-anti-Communists, there is a concurrent and massive attack against religion which is the foundation upon which this Nation was built. This attack comes not only from the atheists, but from other people and organizations, including the U.S. Supreme Court, under the guise of sophistication. We are attempting not only to maintain a separation of church and state, but a separation of state from God.

If this Nation ever turns its back on the God who created us and made us free, we will be destroyed as surely as God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. You will find these words in Second Chronicles, chapter 7, verse 14: "If my people who call me by my name, will humble themselves and pray, and forsake their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sins and will heal their land."

Ladies and gentlemen, if there was ever a land that needed healing, it is this glorious America of ours. Let us then unite in that high purpose, that the design of liberty etched upon the fabric of our American life shall continue to shine brightly upon us, our children and our children's children for generations to come. "To Him all majesty ascribe and crown Him Lord of all."

The 1963 Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, early in the year when I began preparations for polling my constituents with my annual questionnaire I determined that I would use a new and fresh approach in obtaining their views, giving them an opportunity to express their opinions with more than just a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Therefore, at the request of the entire seven-member Washington State congressional delegation the Political Science Department of the University of Washington prepared a questionnaire which would give the respondent the choice of expressing himself in varying degrees as to his feelings.

I was pleased to accept the assistance of the University in preparing this opinion poll and consequently in early April I mailed it to approximately 45,000 registered voters in the First Congressional District.

The response to this poll was gratifying in that the return was roughly the same percentage as last year—to wit, about 22 percent. Many different conclusions can and probably will be drawn from the tabulation of this questionnaire, which I believe will be of interest. Inasmuch as the language used was totally prepared by a disinterested group of political science professors there is no question of bias.

Mr. Speaker, believing that the Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD will be interested in the views of the residents of the First Congressional District of Washington I include hereafter the tabulation as prepared by IBM:

THE 1963 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

I. MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

The six most frequently indicated important issues before the country today were named in the following order of importance with all other issues being tabulated as miscellaneous:

	Percent
National Economy and Unemployment	32
Foreign Affairs and Cuba	30
Big Government	14
Communism	11
Education	5
Peace and Disarmament	3
Miscellaneous	5

II. YOUR OVERALL VIEWS

1. In your opinion, how good a job is the President doing now? (1) 8.7 percent excellent, (2) 19.0 percent good (3) 28.9 percent fair, (4) 36.1 percent poor, (5) 4.3 percent I just don't know.

How strongly do you hold this view? (1) 62.6 percent very strongly, (2) 33.9 percent fairly strongly, (3) 1.0 percent don't care too much.

2. In your opinion, how good a job is the Congress doing now? (1) 1.7 excellent, (2) 21.5 percent good, (3) 45.1 percent fair, (4) 24.0 percent poor, (5) 4.3 percent I just don't know.

How strongly do you hold this view? (1) 46.0 percent very strongly, (2) 49.3 percent fairly strongly, (3) .7 percent don't care too much.

III. ISSUES BEFORE THE CONGRESS

These questions give you a chance to express your general feeling about certain issues. You should answer the question about the tax cut, for example, on the basis of your general feeling about the desirability of a tax cut. Do not answer on the basis of your view about some specific kind of tax cut, such as a tax cut combined with a reduction in spending. Of course different things are important to different people, so we don't expect everyone to have an opinion on all these issues.

[In percent]

	No opinion (1)	Very much in favor (2)	Somewhat in favor (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat opposed (5)	Very much opposed (6)	Total in favor (7)	Total opposed (8)
1. One issue before Congress is the question of a tax cut. Supporters argue that an immediate tax cut is a "must" to stimulate a lagging economy. Opponents argue that a tax cut will lead to deficits if spending isn't cut at the same time. How do you feel about a tax cut?	0.6	35.1	18.0	3.5	16.1	23.2	53.1	39.3
2. Another question is Federal aid to education. Supporters argue that the funds would help relieve crowded classrooms and that we must educate our children now if we are to remain strong in the long run. Opponents argue that such a program would lead to Federal control of education and raise difficult questions about aid to parochial schools. How do you feel about Federal aid to education?	.5	21.6	10.1	2.7	13.9	49.1	31.7	63.0
3. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs has been proposed. Supporters argue that cities need help to deal with such problems as housing, transportation, and delinquency. Opponents argue that an Urban Affairs Department would lead to more Federal involvement in local affairs. How do you feel about a Department of Urban Affairs?	1.8	12.1	7.8	6.2	13.5	56.8	19.9	70.3
4. The medicare program is before Congress again. Supporters argue that retired persons need help to meet high medical costs, and that the program would use the reliable social security system. Opponents argue that the needy aged already have some help, and that the social security deduction is too high now. How do you feel about the medicare program?	.5	26.7	11.5	3.4	10.3	46.8	38.2	56.1
5. The foreign aid program is an important foreign policy issue. Supporters argue that new nations need help to avoid falling to communism, and that military aid is important to U.S. security. Opponents argue that the program has been badly administered and that we have been throwing money down "ratholes." How do you feel about foreign aid?	0.4	15.0	20.6	3.5	24.8	31.8	35.6	46.6
6. Some people say Congress needs to be reorganized. Supporters argue that the present system gives too much power to a few old men. Opponents argue that the present system prevents "railroading" a bill through without necessary debate. How do you feel about congressional reorganization?	6.9	24.4	17.6	13.2	14.2	20.0	42.0	34.2

IV. OPTIONAL FACTUAL INFORMATION

It is helpful to have some background information for tabulation: Sex, (1) 72.6 percent male, (2) 21.6 percent female. Age (1) 6.5 percent under 30, (2) 47.1 percent 30 to 50, (3) 44.9 percent over 50. Marital status, (1) 5.8 percent single, (2) 84.1 percent married, (3) 2.4 percent divorced, (4) 6.3 percent widowed. Political preference, (1) 14.9 percent Democrat, (2) 51.8 percent Republican, (3) 27.5 percent independent.

Note: Each column does not necessarily add up to 100 percent inasmuch as some persons did not answer all questions.

Inquest of Freedom: The Enslaved Peoples of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago this month saw the enforced deportation to Siberian slave labor camps of thousands of free and innocent peoples, being slowly crushed under the heel of Soviet Russian imperialism. We speak today in memory of this sad occasion, yet call attention to the heroism of the peoples and nations involved—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Here we have three small countries that grew into respectable and ably administered independence after the horrors of the First World War—an independence guaranteed by the Allied

Powers and confirmed by treaty with a powerful neighbor, Soviet Russia.

These between-the-war years were well used by the governments and peoples of the Baltic States to develop economically and politically within the range of their domestic interests and within the confines of their own nationality. Yet at the same time the three countries made able and appreciated contributions to the world at large and fulfilled with all proper qualifications the obligations of nationhood. Liberal, advanced and economically able, the contributions made by each to the period between 1920 and 1940 were well conceived and well accepted.

Yet, as an immediate neighbor to these nations there grew in strength and power the Soviet imperialist military machine. To have a nation of political liberty hard against the borders of a state dedicated to political dictatorship was intolerable—that three such states existed hard against Soviet Russia could not be allowed to continue.

It was not difficult for the masters of Kremlin strategy to figure out a method of gaining control over those three small bastions of liberty in what was becoming a dark area as far as political and personal freedoms were concerned.

Though secretly negotiating with the Nazi Germans, the Russians used as an excuse that there were pro-German elements within the governments of the three States working against the interests of Soviet policy. In spite of a declaration of neutrality by each of the governments concerned, and a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union itself, the Russians marched against each nation in turn, using the excuse that the security of Russia herself was endangered by the continued presence of anti-social elements within the nations in question.

With the rest of Europe already plunged into Hitler's war, there was nowhere to turn or no way out for the unfortunate victims of the latest in Soviet expansion—and all three countries capitulated to the force of Communist armies. Liberty was at an end.

To insure that there would be nothing left of some of the social elements within each country possibly demanding or working toward freedom and against the interests of the Russians, a policy of mass deportations was instigated that saw a swelling of the populations in the Siberian slave labor camps; this was only halted with the German invasion of Russia and the Baltic, and the passing of control over these countries from Russian to German hands.

For a brief moment after the fall of Hitler, Germany hoped there might be a chance for a return of freedom to the Baltic States, but that hope was nipped quickly in the bud by an immediate return of Soviet troops to the Baltic area, and an immediate reinforcement of the Communist rule of terror to keep the people under.

Yet the people have not stayed under—they, if not in fact, in spirit and mind are fighting back. We must, on our part, continue to give fuel to that spirit burning so brightly for a return of the dignity of freedom and independence. We will keep that spirit high for peace will not come to this world until all conquered peoples are liberated, and it is the greatest desire of this Nation to know peace.

Promise or Performance—Tax Cut Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the new tax proposals can help close the gap between promise and performance in the field of economic growth. Some recent remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon before the National Coal Association Convention stress the importance of an overall tax cut.

His remarks follow:

There comes an hour in the life of every nation when the gap between promise and performance must be closed. Such an hour is striking now in the field of economic growth.

Several months ago, the gap between our economic performance and our potential was more readily apparent than it is today, when we see the pace of business activity picking up, and the business outlook seemingly bright. But we cannot let present prospects blind us to the fact that the current upturn in our economy holds out little hope of giving us the momentum we need to achieve our goal of full employment.

Last month, more than four million Americans actively seeking work could not find it. Even more disturbing, unemployment among teenagers climbed from 16 percent in April to 18 percent in May. That was the highest jobless figure for teenagers since the Labor Department began recording its figures on a seasonal basis in 1949. The young people born in 1946—the first year of the postwar baby boom—have begun to enter the labor force. They will continue to enter it in increasingly large numbers. During the midsixties, our labor force will have to absorb an inflow of nearly three million young people each year, compared to less than two million during the midfifties—an increase of 50 percent.

This prospect alone presents us with a formidable problem. And it will be compounded as automation and modernization displace greater numbers of workers and lessen the demand for unskilled and semiskilled labor.

As measured by output per man-hours, the productivity of American business has risen by more than 10 percent over the past 2 years. Like other industries, the coal industry has been helped considerably by the two tax measures of last year—the investment credit, and the liberalized guidelines for depreciation. Those tax changes—and even more, the new tax proposals made by President Kennedy—will give added impetus to the striking advances in productivity that have made the U.S. coal industry one of the most competitive in the world. It has been estimated, for example, that American mines which produce coal for export average about 12 tons per man per day—as compared with 1½ tons per man per day for West German mines. And some of the newer U.S. mines produce as much as 40 to 50 tons per man per day.

Unfortunately, the pace-setting productivity increases that have long been a hallmark of the American coal industry have not been consistently reflected in rising coal exports. Last year, those exports increased for the first time since 1957. I hope last year's rise may be a portent of things to come—not only because of the benefits higher exports would bring to you, but because increased coal exports would be of considerable help in easing the imbalance in our international payments.

It is essential that we continue to encourage in every American business the kind of progress that has placed the coal industry in the forefront of our march toward great productivity. But even as we do so, we cannot forget that productivity increases can also be accompanied by less welcome increases in unemployment.

As a nation, therefore, we face the difficult and double challenge of not only sustaining and encouraging the upswing in productivity, but at the same time providing the millions of new jobs we will need to replace obsolete ones and to absorb our new workers. If our economy is to provide those jobs, it will have to grow at a considerably faster pace than has been the case during the present upturn. Our total output will have to increase by far more than the $25 to $30 billion that appears in sight for 1963.

Look, for example, at what has happened over the past 12 months: One year ago, we had a gross national product of $552 billion and an unemployment rate of 5½ percent. Yet, while today GNP has risen to $580 billion—$28 billion higher than a year ago—unemployment is verging on 6 percent. To put it another way, we would need an average rise in GNP of $14 billion a quarter—beginning now—to close the gap between output and employment by the end of 1964. Yet, since last fall, our economy has been growing by only a little more than $8 billion a quarter. At that rate, and assuming that our potential output grows at its present pace, it would take us 10 long years to reach our interim full employment target of 4 percent unemployment.

We simply cannot tolerate that kind of delay—and that is why the President has submitted tax proposals designed to achieve the more rapid, sustained, and balanced growth we must have. Let us consider them briefly.

The proposed reduction from 52 to 47 percent in the corporate tax rate—combined with last year's investment credit and depreciation reform—would cut business taxes by a total of $5 billion. That total would give business 40 percent of the overall tax reduction, provide a strong and continuing stimulus toward accelerated economic growth, and increase the profitability of new business investment by almost 30 percent.

Anyone who is skeptical about the effect of corporate rate cuts should take a hard look at the results of last year's tax changes. A recent survey of capital spending by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission estimates that expenditures for plant and equipment in 1963 will rise to more than $39 billion from a level of some $37 billion for 1962. And, as an earlier McGraw-Hill survey pointed out, businessmen gave credit to last year's tax reforms for at least 43 percent of their increased capital expenditures.

Reducing business taxes alone, however, cannot do the whole job. For we need not only to increase business productivity, but to expand—and expand dramatically—the overall markets for business output. No company will produce more goods, or new goods, without markets to absorb them. The best way to assure those markets is to assure that consumer purchasing power expands as our capacity to produce expands. The President's tax proposals would accomplish this by reducing personal income tax rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. Such a cut in individual rates, combined with the proposed corporate rate reduction, would total $13.6 billion. The rate cuts may, of course, be somewhat revised in the bill that emerges from the House Ways and Means Committee. But I am confident that the net tax reduction will not be far from the proposed $10.3 billion.

The impact of that overall tax cut will be felt throughout the economy far faster than most people realize. If the President's program were to receive final approval by October 1st, the entire $10 billion in tax relief would be released into the economy within the following 15 months. The ultimate effect would be several times $10 billion—as evidenced by the report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which estimated that it would eventually increase our annual Gross National Product by as much as $40 billion.

It would be a mistake, however, to measure the effectiveness of the overall tax program in dollar terms alone. For in the final analysis, what it will mean is more and better job and educational opportunities for millions of our citizens, greater profitability, productivity, and incentives for business and business investment, and increased Government revenues to provide for our growing national needs without risking large deficits.

The question of Federal expenditures and deficits has loomed large in public discussion of the President's tax proposals. I would like to devote some time to it today, for it is a question that has too often been beclouded with misunderstanding.

First of all, let me say that the reason we have had large deficits in recent years—either in this or in preceding administrations—is not because of excessive or unnecessary spending by the Federal Government. The real reason is simply that our economy has not been operating at levels high enough to produce the revenues we need to meet the demands of our rapidly growing population and the increased costs of defense and space.

Let us look at some of the facts involved in the issue of expenditure control: One very elementary point—which too many choose to ignore—was made by President Eisenhower in his 1960 budget message, and I quote:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

The Director of the Budget, Kermit Gordon has provided some very telling examples of this population rise and of its impact on Federal services: By the end of fiscal 1964, the budget year on which we are now working, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. Between fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the volume of mail will rise by more than 6 percent, the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions by 10 percent, beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program by 16 percent. Those are by no means all the figures one could cite, but they are enough to make the simple point that we are a growing nation which requires growing national services to meet the needs of its people and of its business and its industry.

President Kennedy, without neglecting essential national needs, has exercised, is exercising, and will continue to exercise a firm control over expenditures. Our budget has increased rapidly over the past 3 years, but fully 70 percent of the total increase from 1961 through 1964 has been in the areas of defense, space, and the inescapable interest on the public debt. When you include the 1964 Budget as submitted by the President, then—apart from defense and space—the total increase in all expenditures during the first 3 years of his administration will be $800 million less than the similar increase during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961.

The facts are there for those who are willing to recognize them. I have no quarrel with those who do scrutinize the facts and who, after intelligent examination, pinpoint where they think cuts can be made. But seldom has any single issue generated so much loose and spend-thrift oratory as this matter of Government expenditures. It is hardly responsible, fiscally or otherwise, to pluck from the blue air—or from the nostalgic past—some arbitrary figure and proclaim it as the magic limit expenditures must never exceed, or as the exact amount expenditures must be cut.

Some who are seriously and honestly concerned with fiscal integrity are currently suggesting that fiscal 1964 expenditures should not exceed the fiscal 1963 level. That suggestion, I am afraid, is completely out of touch with the realities of fiscal life and national needs. The truth is that the entire $4.5 billion budget increase from 1963 to 1964 can be accounted for by increases in only three areas; defense, space, and interest on the public debt. The total of all other expenditures is being held below 1963 levels.

To reduce the total fiscal 1964 budget to the 1963 level would call for cutting defense and space expenditures by $4.5 billion, or cutting a similar amount from all other programs—which have already been held below their 1963 level—or some combination of the two.

The impracticality of such an arbitrary cut becomes apparent when one realizes that while the administration presents the budget and Congress considers it on an annual basis, the programs whose cost is expressed in the budget are in large part continuing programs which involve not only plans but commitments for years ahead. For example, over 40 percent of the fiscal 1964 expenditure budget involves payments from unspent authorizations enacted in previous years, most of which are already obligated. And there are other items—such as veterans pensions—which, while they are in a somewhat different category, are inherently contractual in nature.

Let us look at specifics: Where would you cut the budget to reduce fiscal 1964 expenditures by $4.5 billion?

The $4.5 billion increase was in space, defense, and interest on the public debt. Suppose you tried to cut the defense budget by $4.5 billion, where would you look first? Research and development costs $7.1 billion, so you would have to cut that more than in half. Procurement costs $16.4 billion, most of which represents payments on contracts already far along and funded out of earlier appropriations. Therefore, budget cuts here would have little effect in 1964, but rather in 1965 or even later. To reduce procurement expenditures in fiscal 1964 we would have to severely stretch our programs already underway and funded by appropriations which have already been made.

Expenditures for maintaining our standing defense forces at home and abroad total $25.9 billion. This amount is funded from the current budget, so it is here that we must cut if we wish to hold 1964 expenditures to 1963 levels. A cut of one-sixth in this area would provide almost $4.5 billion. But it would mean reducing the Army by more than two divisions—more than twice the total increase in manpower since this administration took office, reducing the Navy by more than 140 ships, reducing the Air Force by 14 combat wings, and so on right down the line. I doubt if there are many Americans who would favor such a course.

The same thing applies to the space budget. Here, the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested a cut of $1.4 billion in the $5.7 billion of new spending authority requested by the President. But even if such a drastic cut were made, it would only reduce actual 1964 expenditures by a little over $500 million.

My point is not that the budget cannot be cut, but simply that it cannot be cut arbitrarily or fitted into a fixed mold such as the 1963 expenditure total. We must not forget either that the fiscal 1964 budget is an extremely tight budget—one of the tightest ever proposed. It has already been cut—and hugely—by the administration itself. Since January, the President has reduced his fiscal 1964 requests by some $615 million. Before that, a full $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

In the final analysis, the only real solution for our recent large budget deficits is to increase our economic growth to the point where it will produce enough revenues to finance, within the context of a balanced budget, the minimum programs required to meet our national needs at home and abroad. Not only will substantial tax reduction in 1963 help generate that growth, but—as the President has repeatedly pledged—a large portion of the increased revenues that result will be applied toward eliminating the current deficit.

This is the positive approach to the budget issue—the approach that can help us to achieve our potential as a Nation, both in economic and human terms. Prompt and substantial tax reduction will, of course, greatly increase the potential for American business. Even more important, it will greatly increase opportunity for all Americans. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, by strengthening our economy, it will increase the ability of our entire Nation to provide a better and more secure life for this generation and the generations to come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 11: 28: ***Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.***

Almighty God, how gracious are Thy words of welcome, inviting us to come unto Thee and how precious are Thy promises unto all who call upon Thee in the fellowship of prayer.

In penitence we confess our sins and seek Thy pardoning grace; in heartfelt gratitude we praise Thee for our many blessings; in humility we renew our vows to serve Thee in love and loyalty.

Grant that in these strange and strenuous days the mind and heart of mankind may be redeemed from pride and prejudice and be restored to compassion and charity, to good will, and mutual trust.

Inspire and constrain us to look upon bruised and broken humanity with insight and sympathy and show us how we may give help and healing to all who are carrying heavy burdens and wandering in ways that are dark and lonely.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the text of the bill (S. 74) entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer" with an amendment.

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and to include a letter from the President, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in two instances.

In fairness to the gentleman from Missouri, I will not submit those immediately, inasmuch as I have to be away for 2 weeks. I am asking this permission in order that I might submit them during my time of absence from the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the two extensions, in view of what I have previously stated.

DR. OLGA MARIE FERRER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the private bill of the Senate, S. 74, for the relief of certain aliens, and concur with the amendment of the Senate to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I inquire of the gentleman if the Senate amendment is germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment of the Senate is germane to the House amendment and to the original bill.

On May 7, 1963, the House passed S. 74 with an amendment adding to the bill the provisions of a bill previously passed by the House. Under the bill, S. 74, as amended, both beneficiaries of this legislation would be placed in a position to file petitions for naturalization. Both beneficiaries are physicians, doctors of medicine, who desire to practice their profession in the States of Florida and West Virginia, respectively. For licensing purposes they need the status of U.S. citizens. Both have been admitted lawfully for permanent residence.

The Senate added to the bill one more case approved by the committee. The beneficiary is being granted, under the amendment, the status of permanent residence, thus making him eligible for naturalization as the case is in the matter of two other beneficiaries of S. 74.

Mr. POFF. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING DISTRIBUTION OF LITERATURE BY CONGRESS CAN SAVE MONEY FOR TAXPAYERS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I made the same request last week and it was objected to on the Republican side, as was my first request in 15 years for a special order. It was my purpose to object to all 1-minute speeches, but I shall not, pending my next request for a 1-minute speech. But, if it is objected to on the Republican side, I shall object to every request for a 1-minute speech from then on from that side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving money for the taxpayers, and there is not a Member here who is not so interested, I am sure, Congress could bring about an immediate saving of more than $1 million if we eliminated the distribution of so-called free literature such as Agricultural Yearbooks, Farmers Bulletins, Infant Care, and other publications.

Of course, we all know this literature is not free and the Members who distribute it do not pay for it. It is paid for by the taxpayers. I am confident that such a demonstration of good faith on our part, by eliminating these publications, would meet with the approval of the majority of our constituents.

I made just a rough check on the cost of some of the literature and find it costs approximately $213,000 to $220,000 a year just to print the Agricultural Yearbook. The Department informs me there is probably another $100,000 for complete financial analysis. Now, add to that the intangible costs of wrapping and mailing the Yearbooks from the House folding room and the cost of postage and you will see that the printing and distribution of the Yearbook alone would approximate a million dollars a year.

The Agricultural Bulletins, according to my information from the Department, come close to costing $275,000 a year.

Infant Care is just one of the booklets issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and a gross round number figure on the cost comes close to $119,000.

We can admit these are fine publications, but can we justify them as legitimate costs to the taxpayers? It seems to me we would be better to follow the example of an earlier Congress which eliminated the sending of free seeds to constituents, by eliminating free literature and permitting those who desire to purchase textbooks, library books, reference books and "how to" pamphlets to do so with their own money.

Even with the wide distribution given this literature, only a very small proportion of the people can get it, so free distribution through the offices of Members is discriminatory and unfair to those who must help pay the bill, but cannot get their share of the books and pamphlets being given away.

I invite others who are interested in saving money to join me in introducing legislation which will put an end to the practice.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include extraneous matter in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after all legislative business and other special orders heretofore granted, I be allowed to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing editorials are supposed to go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. For that reason I would object to the inclusion of the editorials in connection with the gentleman's remarks in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include the material attached.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

HOOD COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to attend the 70th commencement exercises of Hood College in Frederick, Md., on June 9. During the conferring of degrees by President Elliott, of Hood College, honorary diplomas were given to Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, the researcher with the Food and Drug Administration, who was responsible for the public warnings about the dangers of thalidomide and to Dr. Muriel Meyers, an alumna of Hood College and now the associate director of the University of Michigan Simpson Memorial Institute for medical research.

A distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, spoke to the graduates and their guests on "The Meaning of Time." In his very insightful and learned remarks, Senator LAUSCHE reminded the academic convocation that although threats to the peace of the world seem insurmountable today, the problem of man's survival is as old as history itself. Senator LAUSCHE told the graduates that "the marvelous present period is ours to do with it as we will. Many will do great things tomorrow, but tomorrow never comes. Delay is a tragic human failing and a failing of nations." The Senator concluded by urging each of the graduates to be aware of the opportunities which exist for public service and to seize the day, making the most of such opportunities.

I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to all 102 new alumnae of Hood College and in particular I would like to congratulate the honor graduates, R. Louise Fisher Waynant, summa cum laude, Helen Carol Joice, magna cum laude, and Lorraine Clara Gorrell, cum laude.

Hood College, of Frederick, Md., represents a unique experiment in the education of young women. The administration and faculty deserve the highest praise for the standards of excellence which they maintain in this all-important work of preparing these young women for the future.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, June 18, after the completion of the legislative business and all other special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALUTE TO BOY SCOUTS AND SCOUTMASTER W. W. COULSON OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, local, State, and National authorities today are concerned about the problems of juvenile delinquency. There also is discussion of establishing new agencies, financed by the Federal Government, to create outlets of activity for young people in metropolitan areas.

I would like to take a moment, however, to pay tribute to just one of the youth organizations in the United States which has done a monumental job in the development of good citizens. I speak of the Boy Scouts of America.

It was my privilege this morning to host 30 Eagle Scouts, all members of Troop 410, Fairview Christian Church, of Wichita, Kans. They are in Washington for a 4-day educational and sightseeing tour. They have worked hard for 2 years to earn this trip.

I also want to salute Mr. W. W. Coulson, the scoutmaster of this troop, who has provided inspirational guidance and leadership to Boy Scouts for 33 years in Wichita. He is dedicated to Scouting and to his boys. He possesses a commendable record in volunteer Scout work. Mr. Coulson, who will be 77 years old next month, has guided 175 boys to Scouting's highest rank of Eagle Scout. He has worked with them from the time they entered scouting as Tenderfoots until they attain the Eagle badge.

The city of Wichita, the State of Kansas, and these United States have benefited from the dedication and devotion of Mr. Coulson to his boys. He is representative of the thousands of men and women who volunteer their time toward building young men who are thoroughly prepared—educationally, morally, and spiritually—to assume the responsibilities of good citizenship.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

U.S. SHOULD CUT DIPLOMATIC TIES WITH HAITI

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Haiti's anti-American President Francois Duvalier has demanded that the United States recall its Ambassador to Haiti, and has already recalled his own Ambassador to underscore his demands.

Coupled with Duvalier's recent harassment of U.S. citizens, this new turn in U.S. relations with Haiti points up one hard fact—that the United States should suspend its diplomatic ties with the Duvalier regime.

Furthermore, the American people have had the impression that U.S. aid to Haiti has been suspended. I am informed that this is not so. Under the U.S. food-for-peace program, Haiti last year received some $1.3 million in U.S. surplus foodstuffs subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer. Haiti also received last year some $1.3 million from the United States as part of a grant to finance a malaria control project.

And at present Haiti is free to market over 40,000 tons of sugar in the United States, and at the present prevailing price of sugar in New York last Friday, which was $152 per ton, Haiti could expect an income of $6,166,488 this year if its U.S. sales continued.

This aid should be cut as well. Positive actions, such as these, would do much to strengthen our position in the Caribbean and the rest of the hemisphere as well.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1963

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4837) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to observe I intend to object to all of the procedures under unanimous consent as they come along. I have been denied the right to have a special order and I have been denied the right to place information in the RECORD which I believe is of importance. I think until such time as the watchdogs of the House agree to some type of ruling that the procedures of the House are going to have to be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INCREASING PER DIEM AND SUBSISTENCE, AND LIMIT MILEAGE ALLOWANCES OF GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5905) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEASE OF TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5930) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE 1963 TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASES

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 403) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPAND AUTHORITY OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3050) to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3999) to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2876) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from California if the gentleman's unanimous-consent request is made on the basis of his announcement of a moment ago and not because he objects to some provision of the proposed bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my sole purpose is directed to the fact that we have degenerated into a juvenile children's hour of denying the various Members to run their own household and place documents and other matters in the RECORD which they feel they should place in the RECORD, and to have special orders.

Mr. Speaker, I object to it on that ground only and not on the merits of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6012) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INLAND AND WESTERN RIVER RULES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and for signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LIMIT PRIORITY OF TAXES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO DUTIES OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4818) to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MERGING OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 73) to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULES OF NAVIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 75) to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may permit vessels desiring to navigate or operate under bridges constructed over navigable waters of the United States to temporarily lower any lights, day signals, or other navigational means and appliances prescribed or required pursuant to law, rule, or regulation, and, if necessary, may authorize vessels so navigating or operating to depart from the rules to prevent collisions as prescribed by law, rule, or regulation. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may also prescribe such special regulations to be observed by vessels so navigating or operating as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

(b) Notice of the regulations to accomplish the purposes of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register and in the Notice to Mariners, and after the effective date specified in such notices, such regulations shall have the force of law.

(c) Any person who navigates or operates a vessel in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $500. In addition, any vessel navigated or operated in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty of $500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against, by way of libel, in the district court of the United States for any district within which such vessel may be found.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PART II, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the only purpose I reserve the right here is to ask if there is not some way by which we can dispense with the printing of the bill. It would cost quite a lot of money to print the bill. I am asking for that permission to waive its printing.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, we plan to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, § 11-505(b) (7), fourth line, strike out "Court" and insert "Courts".

Page 6, § 11-506(a), first line, strike out "Court" and insert "court".

Page 30, § 11-1557(1), first line, strike out "sction" and insert "section".

Page 130, § 16-1314(b), fourth line, strike out "for" and insert "fee".

Page 163, Analysis of Chapter 29:

In heading of section 16-2922, after "widow" insert "or widower".

In heading of section 16-2924, after "widow's" insert "or widower's".

Strike out heading of section 16-2926.

Page 164, § 16-2921:

Second and third lines, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Fifth line, strike out "widow's".

Seventh line, strike out "commissoners" and insert "commissioners".

Tenth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Twelfth line, insert "or man" after "woman".

Thirteenth line, strike out "bonds" and insert "bounds".

Page 164, § 16-2922:

First line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Second and third lines, insert "or her" after "his".

Page 164, § 16-2923, fourth line, strike out "wife's".

Page 164, § 16-2924, second line, insert "or widower" after "widow" and "or he" after "she".

Page 165, § 16-2924:

First and second lines, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Third line, insert "or he" after "she".

Fourth line, strike out "from her" and insert "of the".

Fifth line, strike out "her dower, and shall allow her," and insert "the dower, and shall allow her or him,".

Sixth line, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Eighth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Page 165, § 16-2925, fifth line, strike out "by the wife".

Page 165, § 16-2926, strike out the entire section.

Page 168, § 16-3111, first line, insert before the first word "With respect to the trial of issues in the Probate Court, including the taking and use of testimony of nonresident widowers, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, unless otherwise provided by law, are applicable thereto.".

Page 178, § 16-3902, ninth line, insert "not" before "available".

Page 186, § 17-303(b), first line, strike out "be" and insert "by".

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought there was a request to be made that would estop the printing of this bill and save the taxpayers some $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. **TUCK**. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Iowa, and I ask unanimous consent that the printing of this bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER**. That concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF SECTION 221 MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.J. Res. 467) amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fifth sentence of section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 467 is a very simple measure which would keep one of FHA's programs going for another 2 years. In the Housing Act of 1954 we established section 221 to provide liberal mortgage financing under FHA insurance for families displaced by urban renewal or other Government activity. This program applies to both homeownership and rental housing. In the Housing Act of 1961 we broadened section 221 to make the benefits available to low- and moderate-income families generally. In the same act we put a 1965 cutoff date on most FHA programs, but this broadened authority under section 221 was made for only 2 years. Under existing law it would go back to being available only for displaced families after June 30 of this year. This resolution would extend this broadened eligibility to 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard no opposition whatsoever to this extension. In the committee report—House Report No. 386—we included letters of endorsement from the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In addition, of course, it has the endorsement of the Federal Housing Administration. The committee has received a great number of letters from builders urging the extension of this program, and I know many of my colleagues have received similar letters. This resolution was reported out of the Subcommittee on Housing without a dissenting vote and was also reported unanimously by the full Banking Committee.

There are just two subsections of the FHA law which would be affected by this resolution. Section 221(d)(2) authorizes FHA mortgage insurance on both new and existing single-family homes in amounts up to $11,000. There is the further provision that in the high-cost areas this may go up to $15,000.

The maximum term is 35 years, except that where necessary to enable the home-buying family to qualify on the basis of monthly payments the FHA Commissioner may extend the maximum maturity to 40 years. The minimum downpayment under the law is 3 percent. The other subsection is 221(d)(4) which provides for the insurance of mortgages on rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups.

In the 7 years prior to 1961, FHA insured 25,000 home mortgages under section 221(d)(2). Since the effective date of the 1961 Housing Act, it has insured an additional 36,000 units, making a total of nearly 61,000 homes. Under section 221(d)(4) a total of 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured, including 12 projects with 924 units insured since the 1961 act became law. These figures include units provided for displaced families as well as for low- and moderate-income families generally.

While the volume of activity has been relatively small, this program has great potential and fills an important need in our efforts to encourage private financing for housing in the low price and rent ranges. House Joint Resolution 467 would continue the program in its present form until June 30, 1965. I urge the passage of the resolution today so that the Senate can act and it can reach the President's desk for signature prior to the June 30 expiration date.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to affirm what the distinguished chairman has said. This resolution was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The change that would be made would bring into line two sections, 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) to section 221(d)(3), which presently has an expiration date 2 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of the resolution.

Mr. **MINISH**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 467 to extend sections 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act for 2 more years.

Section 221 was made a part of the National Housing Act in 1954 to assist the housing industry to provide relocation housing for families displaced by urban renewal or governmental action. Although the act did not so specify, the intention was to help families of limited income, since most displaced families are in this category and those with higher incomes have no trouble relocating themselves.

Section 221(d)(2) authorized FHA mortgage insurance for home properties, and section 211(d)(3) mortgage insurance on multifamily rental housing sponsored by nonprofit organizations or public bodies. Section 221(d)(4), permitting mortgage insurance on rental housing with profit-motivated sponsorship, was added in 1959.

The Housing Act of 1961 made some sweeping revisions in section 221 in recognition of its suitability as a vehicle to provide housing for moderate income families in general as well as displaced families. The 1961 act removed the previous limitation, on mortgage insurance under the section, to relocation housing, and also removed the requirement for certification by the HHFA Administrator of need for the housing.

These new provisions of the section were intended for families with incomes too high for public housing but not high enough to enable them to compete for adequate housing in the private market. So that Congress might have an opportunity to assess the value of the new provisions in practical application, termination dates were provided except for relocation housing. The cutoff dates are July 1, 1962, for section 221(d)(2)—homes—and 221(d)(4)—multifamily rental and cooperative housing with profit-motivated sponsorship—and July 1, 1965, for section 221(d)(3)—multifamily housing with nonprofit sponsorship.

I feel very strongly that the (d)(2) and (d)(4) programs are needed and that the 2-year period in which they have operated in their present form has not been adequate to demonstrate their value. In the middle and higher income market, housing supply and demand have reached a state of balance in which there is no longer an acute shortage; but special financing terms are still needed to bring homeownership within the reach of families with lower incomes and to make good rental and cooperative housing available to other families for whom homeownership is not at present feasible.

In my own part of the country we are constantly made aware of the necessity for programs that will provide decent housing at the lowest possible cost. I recently had the pleasure of having FHA Commissioner Brownstein visit my district and review the housing problems of the area, and (d)(4) in particular was suggested as one of the possible answers to providing good rental housing for moderate-income families. We could probably make good use of (d)(2) also.

Figures on a national basis indicate how the industry has accepted the 1961 provisions of the latter section. In the first half of 1961, the FHA received 3,674 applications under the old provisions.

In the second half of the year, following passage of the 1961 Housing Act, more than 11,000 applications were received. Altogether, from the passage of the 1961 act through May 1963 there were 69,200 (d)(2) applications, compared with 39,300 for the nearly 7 preceding years during which it was in effect. From August 1954 through June 1961, 25,400 mortgages totaling $232.9 million were insured, and from July 1961 through May 1963, 38,000 mortgages totaling $395 million have been insured.

Although section 211(d)(4) has been slower in starting under the 1961 provisions, builders are gradually becoming aware of its advantages in providing low-cost multifamily housing. No mortgages were insured under this section before the 1961 Housing Act became law. Since July 1961, the FHA has insured mortgages totaling $8.9 million on 14 (d)(4) projects with 1,117 units. Thirteen applications on projects with 1,477 units are in process at the present time.

One advantage of (d)(4) financing is that the mortgage represents a percentage of estimated replacement cost rather than of appraised value as under the regular section 207 rental housing program of FHA. Generally speaking, basing the mortgage on replacement cost rather than on appraised value permits a higher mortgage amount. If there are disadvantages of location, for example, appraised value will fall below replacement cost and the mortgage amount will be correspondingly restricted. Housing financing under (d)(4) does not have to meet the location requirements of section 207. It must be located in a marketable area but not necessarily in an exceptionally desirable area. A workable program for the community is not a requirement, nor is a finding of economic soundness required; however, cost certification provisions apply. The housing can be built in an urban renewal area or elsewhere. The provisions of the section are especially suitable for financing rehabilitation of multifamily properties.

This section fills a gap between urban renewal housing and the higher rent housing built under section 207. The mortgage limits are less than under section 207 or 220, but are higher than those established for nonprofit or limited-dividend sponsorship under 221(d)(3).

Because of the special incentives section 221(d)(4) offers and because of the growing interest in it, I recommend that it be continued for another 2 years as provided in House Joint Resolution 467.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an issue is presently before the House that demands the support of every Representative from every district in the Nation. House Joint Resolution 467, a bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Housing Administration 221 housing program until 1965, is absolutely necessary if we are to continue to provide housing for our low and middle income citizens.

For many years the "package of tools" offered by Congress through the Federal Housing Administration has been among the most popular programs offered by the Federal Government. FHA has established itself as an efficient administrative agency and has good relations with both the public and the business community. Its programs have helped homeownership in the United States to reach an unprecedented level of 62.5 percent in 1961.

All FHA programs have been designed, in one way or another, to encourage homeownership by citizens who would otherwise be forced to remain renters all their lives. Section 221(d)(2) and section 221(d)(4) are exceptionally good examples.

Section 221 became a part of the Nation Housing Act in 1954 when Congress became concerned with the relocation of families from urban renewal projects. These families were largely renters and, for the most part, low on the income ladder. Their chances of homeownership were dim and the prospect of having to move to another slum area was ever present. Section 221 offered a chance for many of those unfortunate people to leave their old environment and reside in a suitable neighborhood either as renters or homeowners.

In 1961 sweeping revisions were made in the 221 program when it was recognized that it could be employed to meet the growing, and unmet, need for low and middle income housing other than relocation housing. Section 221(d)(2) differs from other FHA programs in that it requires a lower downpayment, in some cases has a longer mortgage term, and enjoys less restrictive minimum standards. Section 221(d)(4) offers encouragement to the construction of low and middle income apartments for those who need time to save for future homeownership.

Since enactment of these revisions in the 221 program in 1961 things have moved at a brisk pace. Under the (d)(2) program 36,000 units have been insured and 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured under the (d)(4) program.

It pleases me to lend my support to such a worthy program. The growing need for adequate housing in this country is a recognized fact. This is especially true in the area of low and middle income housing. These two FHA programs, the extension of which was reported favorably by both the House Subcommittee on Housing and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, deserve to be extended for another 2 years. House Joint Resolution 467 will legalize the continued benefits of these two vital FHA programs. This measure has received my enthusiastic support and I will continue to be a friend of such needed legislation. I trust that my fellow Congressmen will rally to the need in sufficient numbers so that this measure can pass without further hesitation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 467.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the housing resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4(b) and 6(c) of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850 and 851; 5 U.S.C. 3053(b) and 3055(c)) are hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. Section 8(a) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "In addition, the Government shall contribute annually and there shall be deposited in the Fund amounts for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

Sec. 3. Section 8(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057 (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of the health benefits plan negotiated under section 3 of this Act, for payment of the Government's contribution provided for by section 6(a) of this Act to agencies of the Government which administer a retirement system for civilian employees of the Government, and for payment of expenses, within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation Acts, incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. Udall].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3517, will probably not affect the destiny of the Nation, but it is an important bill to 415,000 retired Federal employees. Since objection was made when this bill was placed on the Consent Calendar, I think perhaps it is important that we take 3 or 4 minutes to explain what the bill is and what it would do.

This bill is based on a recommendation by the Civil Service Commission. A similar proposal was passed out of the committee in the 87th Congress. It was not acted upon by the House because we ran out of time in the closing days of the session.

For several years we have had a health benefits program for active Federal employees, including those in the legislative and executive branches. These employees customarily have deducted from their pay an amount which is matched by the Government, and they receive certain health and medical benefits. At the time this legislation was enacted there was no provision for those who had already retired. Today there are some 415,000 former Federal employees.

Congress passed an act in September 1960 which gave medical and health benefits to employees who had retired after July of 1960. These people received a Federal annuity and from their pay is taken each month $3 if they are single, or $6 for a family. This is matched by contributions from the U.S. Treasury, and for this they receive these benefits.

In this little bill we are talking only about the 415,000 retired Federal employees. We are not talking about those who hereafter retire. They are covered under their present plan and will continue to have coverage.

The purpose of this bill and all it would accomplish is this: It would remove from the existing law a provision which limits the portion of the Government's contribution which the Civil Service Commission may use for administrative expenses for this act. This amount is now limited to 2 percent. This 2-percent limit would be eliminated by this bill. I should say that this legislation was reported unanimously from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of no Member of the House who is here today to object to it.

The 2-percent limitation formula was first applied during the fiscal year 1963. Our committee report indicates that the amount available on the basis of 2 percent of the Government's contribution for fiscal 1963 would be $282,000. This was based on 2 percent of the estimated Federal contribution of $14,118,000. However, the actual amount appropriated for Government contributions during fiscal 1963 was only $12,807,000, rather than the $14 million requested. This resulted in an amount being available for the administration of this important act of only $256,000. This $256,000 was not sufficient for proper administration. The actual costs in the last 3 or 4 years have been as follows: In 1961, $412,000; in 1962, $474,000; in fiscal 1963, estimated, $393,000. Thus it has become readily apparent in the administration of this act that the 2-percent formula does not give enough room and does not provide the necessary funds.

Thus, the Civil Service Commission has a serious budgetary problem in trying to carry out the responsibilities we have given them. A way was found out of it, a temporary way, during the current fiscal year. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act actually authorized $375,000 and appropriated that amount rather than the $256,000 which would have been available under the 2-percent limitation. The budget proposal for fiscal year 1964 calls for $392,000. Thus we have provided temporary relief in the appropriation acts while the legislative provisions governing the administration of this Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act has a 2-percent limitation.

The question might be asked, Why have the costs of administration exceeded the 2-percent formula that the Congress thought would be adequate when the act was passed? Basically there are three reasons.

The first is that participation by the annuitants has been substantially less than was expected. The House and the Congress thought that perhaps 95 percent of the retired Federal employees would take advantage of this fine program. Actually about 60 percent have applied and are participating. Lower participation, of course, means a correspondingly smaller Government contribution and a correspondingly smaller amount available for administrative purposes.

Secondly, dealing with these older retired people, many of whom are unfamiliar with this law, are unfamiliar with the benefits, has proven to be more costly than was expected; especially in dealing with thousands of elderly people on a subject that is new to them, and that is somewhat complex, has required a great deal of correspondence and additional staff that was not anticipated. It is really difficult for the Civil Service Commission to communicate as effectively with these people as with active Federal employees. This was not fully anticipated.

The third reason is that the program involves a closed group which can only decrease with the passage of time. This group will never grow. It covers just those who retired prior to September 1960, and as deaths occur this group will gradually be reduced until the whole program is closed out. Yet the natural decrease in the size of the group will mean a gradual reduction in both the Government contribution and the administrative costs. But the characteristic of this group, they being elderly people, is such that it will decrease at a more rapid rate than the administrative cost. Thus the committee has come to the conclusion that there is no real possibility of the administrative costs being retained within the 2-percent limitation. We had a patchwork kind of correction for this situation last year, but the only permanent relief is to pass this bill.

You might ask what will happen if we defeat this bill and the law is not changed? I should anticipate some kind of temporary relief would be asked for from the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. They have been very cooperative. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] has helped to work out a plan for this difficult period. But this is a program that has been authorized by the Congress and we should not put the Civil Service Commission or the Appropriations Committee in a position of having to adjust a patchwork formula to make sure that these 415,000 people receive the benefits that Congress has authorized.

I think it would be shortsighted economy to defeat this bill. It would only cost $100,000 for this year and it is anticipated that the extra cost above the 2-percent limitation would not go much beyond that in the years to come.

I would emphasize again that the bill has bipartisan support, that it came out of a subcommittee of which the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill]. It was approved in the full committee. I know of no one who is opposed to it today.

Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this bill will receive the prompt and favorable attention of the House today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], this legislation was approved by our committee unanimously. It certainly is not controversial. This bill, H.R. 3517, was on the Consent Calendar for several weeks but an objection to it made it necessary to call it up under suspension of the rules.

Actually, the only thing that the bill does, in the final analysis, is to eliminate an awkward administrative procedure. It will permit the Committee on Appropriations to exercise some discretion in appropriating necessary funds to administer the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. Back in 1960, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made, I believe, a major contribution by encouraging business and private industry generally to do something to help solve the problem of medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens. In 1960 we provided that all retired Federal employees could come under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act which was similar to a measure Congress approved for active Federal employees in 1959. When we enacted this law in 1959, we provided that Federal employees who retired in the future could continue their medical and hospitalization benefits. But we did not provide for those who had retired in previous years. So we came back in 1960, as I said, and enacted a new law that did provide for all retired Federal employees to have medical and hospitalization protection. We hope, or at least this Member hopes, that this will encourage all business and industry to provide a similar type of program for all of their retired employees so that no blanket Federal aid for medical care would be necessary to take care of our senior citizens.

When we enacted this program in 1960, we estimated that the administrative expenses would be approximately 2 percent of the Government's contribution. That was a reasonable estimate and an accurate estimate provided as large a number of retired employees participated in the program as we estimated. As was pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona, there were 415,000 retired Federal employees who would be eligible to participate in this program. On the basis of a 90 percent participation by retired Federal employees in the program, the

Federal annual contribution was estimated to be approximately $21 million. Certainly, 2 percent of that contribution would amount to approximately $420,000 annually which was the cost of administering the program as estimated by the Civil Service Commission and by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, we were mistaken in our estimate because we found that only approximately 60 percent of those retired employees exercised the option of participating in the program. So the purpose of this legislation is to remove this 2 percent administrative limitation from the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and to permit the Committee on Appropriations, as I said earlier in my remarks, some latitude and discretion in appropriating funds for this purpose. At the present time, it is necessary to include a corrective provision in the appropriation bill each time. It is really an awkward situation. In a sense we are invalidating an act of Congress in doing what we are doing now. In this legislation we are asking the Congress to amend this particular provision of the original act so that we can have a much more orderly administrative procedure. This is not going to cost a nickel more in the final analysis. In fact, the actual cost of administering the program is going to diminish over a period of years because this act only applies to those who retired in former years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will overwhelmingly approve this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out that the two gentlemen who have spoken in support of this bill have properly explained it. This is nothing but a matter of bringing administrative procedures into harmony with the actual facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman in urging that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arizona that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3517.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

RETIREMENT INEQUITY—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(c)), is amended by inserting "the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol," immediately following "official duties,".

(b) Section 2(c) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22(d)), is amended by inserting "(other than the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol)" immediately following "congressional employee".

(c) Section 2(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(d)), is amended by inserting ", except as provided under subsection (f)," immediately following "temporary congressional employee".

(d) Section 5(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2255(d)), is amended by striking out "to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol,".

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall not apply in the case of employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5377 was reported unanimously by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and should be enacted to correct an inequity in the law which adversely affects the civil service retirement rights of employees of the Architect of the Capitol.

The employees covered by the bill are in every sense congressional employees. The Architect of the Capitol has been defined by the Comptroller General of the United States, in several decisions, to be an officer of the Congress, and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol likewise has been defined to be a part of the legislative establishment. All of the duties and responsibilities of the Architect and of employees of his Office are devoted to the service of the Congress.

The Congress in 1954, recognizing the unique conditions of congressional employment, enacted legislation to provide a carefully planned and practical retirement program for congressional employees. The same unique conditions apply to employment in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Like other congressional employees, neither the Architect has nor do his employees have civil service or other protective status. Yet neither the Architect was nor his employees were included in the congressional employees' retirement program enacted in 1954.

As a result, although they are truly congressional employees and direct all of their working time and energy to serving the Congress, their retirement benefits are considerably inferior to those of their fellow congressional employees. The omission of these congressional employees from the congressional employees' retirement program apparently was due to an oversight. There is no record of any consideration being given to them when the 1954 legislation was being developed and approved. Possibly a contributing circumstance to their omission from the program is the fact that their salaries are the same as those under the Classification Act of 1949, an act which applies generally to executive branch employees. However, that is merely a matter of administrative convenience and in no way alters the status of the Architect and his employees as congressional employees.

This legislation extends no civil service retirement rights to anyone not already entitled to retirement rights. It simply alters such rights for the employees covered to make them equal to rights now available to other congressional employees. The bill can affect no more than 1,175 individuals. In fact, since the retirement act already provides for the Architect to exclude employees whose tenure is temporary or of uncertain duration, and also requires a minimum of 5 years of congressional service to qualify for any benefits under the congressional employees' program, it is very probable that the number of individuals covered will be substantially less than 1,175. Over two-thirds of the 1,175 employees are specifically subject by statute to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law.

Mr. Speaker, this is very worthy legislation and I hope it will receive the prompt approval of the House.

Positions under the Architect of the Capitol

Appropriations	Wage board positions	Unclassified positions	Classification Act positions	Statutory positions	Total positions
Salaries, Architect of the Capitol	1	3	26	3	33
Capitol Buildings and Grounds	96	44	16		156
Capitol Grounds	49		6		55
Senate office buildings	286	54	21	8	369
Legislative garage	7				7
House office buildings	284	76	21		381
Capitol Power Plant	78		4		82
Library buildings and grounds	57		2		59
Subtotal	858	177	96	11	1,142
Care of the building and grounds, Supreme Court	31		2		33
Total	**889**	**177**	**98**	**11**	1,175

Hearings of 1964—Breakdown of regular force under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol engaged in structural and mechanical care of the Capitol Building and Grounds, Senate and House Office buildings, Capitol Power Plant, Library of Congress buildings, U.S. Supreme Court building, and legislative garage

Capitol Power Plant: Engineers, mechanics, helpers, and laborers	82
Electrical substations and transformer stations (located in Capitol, Senate Office buildings, House Office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and U.S. Supreme Court building): Operators, mechanics, helpers	12
Air conditioning—operation and maintenance: Engineers and mechanics	62
Structural care of buildings and operation of miscellaneous equipment: Maintenance mechanics and helpers (plumbers, electricians, carpenters, painters, sheet-metal workers, heating room attendants, public address system operators, subway operators)	170
Elevators—maintenance and repair: Mechanics and helpers	29
Elevators—Operation: Elevator operators	143
General domestic care of buildings:	
Laborers, full-time	201
Charwomen, part-time	300
Capitol Grounds—Care and Maintenance: Gardeners and laborers	49
Legislative garage—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	7
House garage (old building)—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	10
Professional, administrative, and office force: Architect, engineers, administrative and clerical assistants, and miscellaneous	110
March 1963, total employees	1,175

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth], in support of this legislation, H.R. 5377. As he pointed out, this was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee.

In substance the bill brings all of the employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol under the same retirement system that all other employees of the legislative branch of the Government now enjoy. In fact, two-thirds of the employees of the Architect of the Capitol already are subject to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law and, therefore, they should be treated the same as all other legislative employees.

There are approximately 1,175 employees who would be brought under the congressional employees retirement system as a result of this act. The Comptroller General has ruled that the Architect of the Capitol and all of its employees are employees of the legislative branch of the Government. They have no connection whatsoever with civil service insofar as civil service status and job security protection is concerned. I believe the reason the employees of the Architect of the Capitol were not included in the present act when it was approved by the Congress in 1954 was the result of an oversight. No one suggested that they be included, and no one had any opportunity to object to their being included.

Interestingly enough, some employees of the Architect of the Capitol are already under this legislative retirement system.

As a result of the ruling of the Comptroller General, employees of the restaurants of the House and Senate are already included. Perhaps the reason why all employees of the Architect of the Capitol have not been included is the result of confusion, since they are paid under civil service Classification Act salary scales.

There is a chart on page 5 of the report which shows the difference between the present retirement benefits of employees of the Architect of the Capitol, which is the same as those in the regular civil service and the proposed benefits which are identical to the retirement benefits now enjoyed by other legislative employees.

We are preventing any windfall under this act. Those working part-time or more or less temporarily will not receive the benefits proposed by this legislation because we require that they be employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for 5 years before they can come under the provisions of the bill.

This legislation merely seeks to eliminate an inequity where one group of employees was treated one way and another group another way. The cost is estimated to be approximately $315,000, which is a moderate cost to take care of this inequity, the very serious inequity that has existed over the years. This legislation would correct the inequity and I hope my colleagues will join in overwhelmingly supporting the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wallhauser].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee appointed to consider this legislation, I join with my colleagues in support of it. It has been thoroughly explained, and, therefore, further explanation is unnecessary.

The full committee agreed that this bill would correct an inequity.

I hope the House will pass it overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5377.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5932) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3002(a)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31–1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091(a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and in no event shall any teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31–1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins not later than the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5932 is the result of an official administration request that was submitted to the Congress by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I was privileged to serve on the subcommittee which held hearings on the measure at which favorable testimony was received from the government of the District of Columbia and from representatives of the District of Columbia Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. There was no adverse testimony received from any source and the bill was reported by a unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

This legislation will correct a very inequitable situation that now exists with regard to schoolteachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who are serving under so-called temporary appointments. Enactment of this legislation will permit these temporary teachers, if their service aggregates 2 or more school years, to elect coverage under the Federal employees health benefits program and the Federal employees group life insurance program. They are now excluded from both of these programs by reason of their so-called temporary status.

Of the nearly 5,000 full-time schoolteachers employed in the District of Columbia public school system, approximately 1,700 have temporary status. These temporary teachers are employed on a yearly basis—their appointments by law cannot extend beyond June 30 of the fiscal year in which appointed—and the appointments are renewable each year and they may also be terminated at any time with or without reason. Generally these teachers are serving in a so-called temporary status either because they may fail to meet one or more of the detailed technical requirements and, therefore, have not taken the necessary qualifying examinations, or because they do not expect to remain long in service and so do not wish to attain permanent status. In addition, there are a number of teachers who must be employed on a temporary basis to fill temporary positions and to replace permanent teachers whose job rights must be protected while they are on leaves of absence.

I would like to emphasize that all temporary teachers must meet certain minimum qualifications such as possessing a bachelor's degree from a recognized college or university; being a citizen of the United States; and being of good moral character. However, some of these teachers may lack a technical requirement for appointment on a permanent basis such as not possessing credit in college work closely related to the subject field in which they teach, not possessing the master's degree that is required for teaching in senior high school, or not meeting the age requirements. For example, many fine teachers are employed in a temporary status because they are above the 50-year age limit for appointment on a permanent basis. These, generally, are the teachers who have returned to the profession in later years, after having raised families.

The temporary schoolteacher is most definitely an important part of the District of Columbia school system. Of the approximately 1,700 temporary teachers now employed, 700 have served for 2 or more years, 270 have more than 5 years of service, and some have taught for 15 and 20 years. Under the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits and Group Life Insurance Acts and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission issued pursuant thereto, employees serving under appointments limited to 1 year or less are excluded from participating in these two programs. Temporary schoolteachers of the District of Columbia, therefore, because of the nature of their yearly appointments and even though many have served and dedicated a number of years of their lives to the public school system are precluded from enjoying these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 5932 will correct this most inequitable situation. It amends both the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide that no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia serving under a temporary appointment shall be excluded if such teacher has been so employed for a period or periods totaling not less than 2 school years.

The cost of this legislation is very nominal. It is estimated that the additional cost of the District of Columbia Government would be approximately $39,000 a year which would be absorbed from regular appropriations in the normal course of operations.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fairness and equity, I urge the adoption of this most worthwhile legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, again I am happy to state that I am supporting legislation which was approved unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It certainly indicates we have a very harmonious committee. Unfortunately we do have some legislation which is considered by that committee that is not quite as noncontroversial as the legislation we have here under a suspension of the rules today.

This bill, H.R. 5932, Mr. Speaker, provides an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide health and life insurance benefits for certain teachers in Washington, D.C. At the time the Congress approved and passed those acts we provided that the benefits would extend only to those Federal employees who had appointments of a year or more. We found that this excluded approximately one-third of the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia from the benefits of either the life insurance or health insurance acts. There are 1,700 of these 5,000 schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who fall into the classification of temporary appointees. They can only be appointed on a school year to school year basis. I think they are appointed for the term to start in September and end in June of each year and, because of certain technical reasons they cannot obtain a permanent appointment. Those technical reasons fall into many categories. In the first place, they have to have a master's degree to teach in senior high schools. They may lack certain college credits along the lines of the subject that they are teaching. They might be over 50 years of age. They might not be able to pass an examination, but yet they are good, sound, qualified teachers and have been teaching in the school system for a number of years. As pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, over 700 of these teachers have been teaching in the District of Columbia school system for more than 2 years.

They must have a bachelor's degree in order to teach. They must be of good moral character. They must be citizens of the United States. So these are good teachers. But because of certain technical reasons they are not able to receive an appointment on a permanent basis and must be appointed on a year-to-year basis.

All this legislation does is to amend the acts of 1954 and 1959 to permit teachers in the District of Columbia School System whose service aggregates more than 2 school years to qualify for health benefits and life insurance benefits.

The cost is very nominal. It is estimated to cost approximately $38,000 a year. It has the support of all segments of the District of Columbia Government. Again, as pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, there was no opposition whatsoever to the legislation when we conducted hearings on the bill a few weeks ago. This will not affect the part-time employees, the so-called substitute teachers. We will still carry out the act as originally intended, that persons must be on a somewhat permanent basis before they can qualify for the health and life insurance benefits.

I hope the Members will approve this legislation overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5932?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to apologize to those Members who feel that they have been unduly inconvenienced by my actions of the past few days, in objecting to certain unanimous-consent requests in connection with extensions of their remarks in the body and Appendix of the daily Record where such extensions involved the inclusion of extraneous material.

I want to reemphasize at this point, however, that nothing that I have done has had the effect of limiting any Member in the extension of his own remarks in any manner whatsoever, and there has been neither any intention nor the effect of limiting debate or limiting the space in the Record which might be utilized for the expression of the personal opinions of any Member. Particularly would I emphasize the fact that this action in objecting to the extension of remarks in the Appendix to include extraneous material, in more than one instance on any single legislative day, and in objecting to the inclusion of extraneous material in the body of the Record, was not motivated by any vindictiveness on my part. Inasmuch as no other person was responsible, either directly or indirectly, for my action, I want it understood that I, and I alone, accept any and all responsibility for any inconvenience that was occasioned by this action.

I hope that I have pointed up not only what I consider to be an abuse of a privilege that is available to all Members, only through unanimous consent, but that I have called attention to an extravagant practice that is costing the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, and have also pointed out how a lax interpretation and enforcement of the rules of the House can result in an unnecessarily large expenditure of funds. In the extension of these remarks I will point out how I believe the laws and rules for publication of the Congressional Record are not being enforced. Because reprints of these laws and rules are readily available from the Joint Committee on Printing, I will not ask for permission to have them printed at this point in the Record, though from time to time excerpts from them are printed as filler material in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this time that it is not my intention to continue with this solo crusade to bring some semblance of reasonableness in the printing of the Congressional Record, which, as I understand it, is supposed to be as far as practicable a verbatim account of the proceedings in the two Chambers of the Congress. I recognize that the rules of the House supersede the course of conduct in the allowances now taken to depart from this original design, and for that reason I believe that there should be rules in the form of guidelines to assist Members in conforming to a reasonable practice. At this time we do not have such rules, and while in the past Speakers of the House have enunciated certain practices which would be observed and which have been observed in the absence of unwritten rules, it has been some time since this House has had the benefit of such guidelines.

It will be recalled that at the outset of this short campaign I issued a call for volunteers to assist me. I have received encouragement from many Members who have stated privately, and I might add rather quietly, that they consider that I have been performing a meritorious service; many say they believe there should be limitations, and I have found no one who is willing to defend the practice of permitting unrestricted use of either the body or the Appendix of the daily Record for the inclusion of extraneous material, when such use by any one Member exceeds more than $25,000 for any one session, more than the salary of any Member. But, I must admit that my call for volunteers who were willing to stick their neck out, fell on deaf ears. In this instance, at least, no one seems willing to give even lipservice to economy. While I am not promising to completely abandon my efforts to bring about some semblance of reasonableness, which would result in the savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars, let us say for the time being, I have accepted a self-imposed suspend fire, which I reserve the right to reimpose if and when the abuses appear to reach the proportions that have been indicated in the past. I will continue to endeavor to seek relief through committees of this House, the Joint Committee on Printing, and continue to seek the cooperation of the Speaker and individual Members of this body.

By studying the changes that have occurred in practices in conection with the granting of unanimous consent requests for extensions both in the body and in the Appendix of the daily Record, there has developed a tendency to approve unanimous consent requests, the exact nature of which are not revealed to other Members of the House, or even to the Speaker. The use of the word "extraneous" material can cover a wide variety of material. For instance, the practice has grown up whereas it has become an accepted procedure for a Member to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks to include extraneous material, and when there is no objection and the request is approved, the Member then yields back the balance of his time without making any statement on the floor, and without indicating either the subject that he proposes to discuss in his 1 minute speech, or the nature of the extraneous material that is to be offered. On the following day other Members read in the Record a long dissertation, often on a controversial subject, accompanied by newspaper articles, editorials, or sometimes even speeches by controversial figures who are not Members of Congress, yet whose remarks have been given the same status as if they were uttered by responsible Members of this body. I say that this is contrary to the spirit and letter of the law. It would seem to me that when a Member requests permission to address the House he should at least indicate the subject on which he proposes to speak even if he elects to remain silent. Also, I would think that other Members are entitled to know the nature of the extraneous material that he seeks to include. Some years ago when a Member made such a request, he indicated that he desired to include an article from a specific publication dealing with a specific subject; or that he wished to include a resolution from a specified organization, supporting or opposing a specific issue that was being considered in the Congress. Many Members with whom I have talked think it might be well to reestablish these customs of the past. Certainly, there should be a little argument against requiring that a Member be on the floor and make his own requests, rather than have them all lumped in one wholesale package at the end of the day, when no one has any idea about what subject any Member wishes to extend his remarks. It is possible that some other Member might want to respond at the time an original statement is made rather than to wait over a weekend.

I would like to quote from the law which gives the Joint Committee on Printing control over the Congressional Record:

> Title 44, section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, content, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

As stated earlier, I will not burden the Record with printing the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, but would recommend to all Members a reading of the same. I would point out, however, one rule that appears to have been violated on many occasions:

> 10(a). Appendix to Daily Record.—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Providing*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

We all are familiar, I believe, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that there are certain space limitations, in connection with rule 11, which states that:

> No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, etc.

During the time I have been a Member of this House, I cannot recall a single instance when objection was made to such a request, notwithstanding the cost, which quite frankly, in many instances, has exceeded what I would interpret as a reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a limitation on the use of the Record for the extension of extraneous material, which while it might appear to be more generous than some Members might feel would be justifiable under the terms of a rule or reasonableness, nevertheless, would in my opinion, result in great savings to the taxpayers. I would propose that each individual Member be limited to an average of not more than 2 pages of extraneous material during each week that Congress is in session, but not require that this limitation be imposed on a weekly basis, but over the entire session. Figuring a session of 42 weeks, this would amount to a total of 84 pages that could be used during the session, which would limit the cost to be incurred by any one Member to not more than $7,560. I doubt if more than 10 percent of the Members would use this entire amount, for the Record indicates that the large percentage of the Members use this privilege only on rare occasions, and use some discretion and selectivity in requesting the publication of extraneous material. I believe such a rule would not impose an undue or unreasonable hardship or inconvenience on many Members, and would certainly result in the savings of a great amount of money, not to mention the fact that it would serve to make the Record more nearly an accurate recording of the proceedings.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I express the hope that the Members will realize that I have attempted to be objective in my thinking, rather than merely acting in the role of an objector, who seeks to impose his personal views, under the rules of the House which do permit the action which I have taken. I have not relished this role. It has not been easy. Again may I say there has been no spirit of vindictiveness on my part. I have attempted to be both fair and consistent. I am constrained to believe that a majority are sympathetic to the purpose I have been attempting to attain, although I realize there are many who resent the manner in which I have proceeded. I have pointed out the problem; I have suggested one of many solutions; I am ready to abide by the decision of the majority.

TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity."

Among the declared objectives of the Constitution of the United States these two stand together in its preamble—in this sequence.

In the current racial controversy in our country these two goals now appear to be arrayed against each other in open conflict.

It is made to seem that we cannot have either one without the sacrifice of the other.

Insofar as they are so arrayed in opposition it is an unnatural conflict.

Justice and tranquillity belong together. Each urgently needs the other.

There can be no true or lasting domestic tranquillity without justice.

And tranquillity is the climate required for justice to flourish.

How, then, has this tragic conflict and dilemma come to pass?

Perhaps because the denials of justice to some of our Negro citizens are greater and graver than some of his white fellow citizens have recognized or been willing to acknowledge.

Perhaps because some white citizens have mistaken domestic tranquillity for preservation of an unjust status quo or a comfortable escape from vexatious problems—meanwhile forgetting that tranquillity cannot be maintained indefinitely if injustice is indefinitely tolerated.

Perhaps, also, because some of our Negro fellow citizens have, in rash impatience or in their own intolerance, discounted gains already made, ignored opportunities for added gains, and sought to impose still other gains which can only be earned and cannot be enforced.

Perhaps because some of our citizens, both Negro and white, forget that protracted disruption or domestic tranquillity—even in a supposed quest for justice—does not and cannot provide a solid and permanent foundation for justice. And that such disruption instead ultimately insures only complete chaos for everyone.

Perhaps it is all of these things—and more.

In the pursuit of explanations, and of answers and solutions, let us consult each other—and our own consciences—on these matters.

But let us not make these explanations, however valid or warranted, the basis for mutual recriminations. "Let us judge not, that we be not judged."

And how is the conflict to be resolved and the rightful partnership of justice and domestic tranquillity restored in our land?

By more laws, more apparatus and power of government?

Perhaps—though all of us can be losers to an all-powerful government.

More likely, I suspect, it can be accomplished by more vigorous and effective leadership, Negro and white, in and out of government, nationally and locally—and within both races.

Are we to rely for decision of the issue on more "in the streets" mass demonstrations, more boycotts, or additional pressure tactics and coercive measures?

I very much doubt it even though I see little prospect of early acceptance of what to me seems the wiser counsel against these methods. The fever is upon us.

But when this troubled and turbulent phase does finally pass—as it surely will after needless casualties to justice and domestic tranquillity alike—I firmly believe that it will be mutually tolerant and generous negotiations and meaningful communication that bring us to our true goal.

And that goal is cordial, sensible, voluntary acceptance of each other in mutual good will, with an understanding that justice is for all—and that responsibility is for all as well.

And then justice and domestic tranquillity will once again stand together in genuine partnership—not only in our Constitution's preamble but in the life and affairs of our beloved country.

BILL NUNLEY NAMED DRIVER OF THE YEAR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding individual who has recently been selected as the American Trucking Association's "National Driver of the Year."

I am speaking of William C. Nunley whose outstanding record of driving safety, courtesy, and heroism and community and company service has overwhelmingly earned him the title of "Driver of the Year."

This Thursday, the Oklahoma congressional delegation will have a breakfast to honor Mr. Nunley and Mr. Fisher Muldrow, the executive vice president of the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma—the organization which nominated Bill Nunley for the national award. We are looking forward to meeting this outstanding person.

But Nunley's career as a truckdriver stretches over the past 30 years. In that time, he has driven more than 2,225,000 miles without a single accident.

For the past 26 years, he has been an employee of the Yellow Transit Lines out of that firm's Oklahoma City, Okla., office. During this period of more than a quarter of a century, Bill Nunley has hauled an estimated 328 million pounds of valuable freight without incurring as much as a scratched fender.

His outstanding record has been rewarded with many honors. In 1962, he was named the "Driver of the Year" by the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma and on two previous occasions he was selected as the "State Driver of the Month."

His record of driving safety speaks for itself. In addition, Mr. Nunley has been cited for his efforts in assisting many motorists in trouble.

For example, when a crippling ice storm had highway traffic tied up all over the State, Mr. Nunley encountered an Army officer whose car had broken down near Adair, Okla., while he was taking his seriously ill wife to a hospital. Realizing the hazards an ambulance would face on the icy roads and the importance of time, Bill Nunley assumed the risk himself and towed the couple in their vehicle to Pryor, Okla., where the woman was able to receive medical attention.

Bill Nunley has also taken an active part in company safety activities. His work in the research and development of safety devices was instrumental in the installation of safety belts in Yellow Transit's extensive truck fleet. Mr. Nunley has also been a driver-trainer for the past 10 years and his students have amassed a cumulative safety record running into hundreds of thousands of miles.

Mr. Nunley also actively participates in community affairs. In addition to his busy schedule on the job, he finds time to work with young people as a youth baseball and basketball coach. He has also made frequent radio and television appearances for safety causes in the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas region.

This native of Tennessee, resident of Kansas, and truckdriver in Oklahoma and Texas is indeed a credit and an outstanding example of the men and women in the trucking industry. My sincere congratulations go to Bill Nunley on his most recent honor of being named "Driver of the Year."

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last weekend marked the 22d anniversary of the first mass deportations from the Baltic States which took place on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941.

Generation after generation of the Baltic people have withstood the influence of their adversaries even though they were physically overcome. The people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have never lost their identity and have preserved their cultural heritage and their individuality throughout centuries of vicissitudes despite superimposed regimes.

It is ironic that the latest effort to overcome the Baltic people and to destroy their nationality and their long-preserved identity should have come from Russia within the generation of those who in establishing the Soviet Government proclaimed "the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to and including separation and formation of independents states."—International Conciliation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 1963, page 11n.

How long will the Soviet Union continue this denial of a cardinal principle upon which it was founded? How long will the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia remain in bondage or in exile? The suffering of those who were deported cannot be expunged. But the principles for which they stood, the heritage which they preserved will live on as reminders that for people who truly believe in independence of spirit there can be no denial of the right of self-determination. The spirit of liberty is alive in the hearts of the Baltic peoples and will not be extinglished by totalitarian oppression.

THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is designed to improve the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration by clarifying much of the present ambiguous language of the act, insuring uniformity of implementation among the various Federal agencies concerned, and establishing an independent administrative review procedure.

The bill is a result of and largely based on the findings and recommendations of the recently published subcommittee report on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act. The report points up the needed improvements to the act, among which are first, legislative clarity for proper administration; second, language to insure uniformity in interpretation, application, and enforcement by various Government agencies; and, third, a formal review procedure which would afford an appeal from a decision of the Secretary of Labor as a matter of right.

The bill would clarify some of the language found to be ambiguous: "Laborers and mechanics," "city, town, village, or other civil subdivisions of a State," "projects of a character similar to the contract work," "employed directly upon the site of the work." The bill would remove the present uncertainty and lack of uniformity in the interpretation and enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act among the various Federal agencies by centralizing enforcement functions in the Department of Labor. A Davis-Bacon Appeals Board would be established to provide impartial review to interested parties on determinations made by the Secretary of Labor. The Board would be composed of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members would serve for terms of 3 years. Other changes made in the Davis-Bacon Act by the bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to impose debarments for a discretionary rather than an absolute period of time as is now required under the Davis-Bacon Act and would allow a contractor to be removed from the debarred bidders list upon a showing by the contractor of present responsibility.

Enactment of the amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, as proposed in my bill, should solve many of the problems that have arisen in the implementation and interpretation of the act. The subcommittee will hold hearings on the bill later in the session.

ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 by providing for its more effective operation. I have been concerned for some time about the need to plug loopholes and to improve procedures with regard to its administration.

As we know, the purpose of the Antidumping Act is to prevent a foreign manufacturer from disposing of merchandise in the United States at prices bearing little relation to its true costs of production. Dumping takes place when merchandise is sold in this country at prices below those charged in the exporting country; in other words, as the law specifies, when it is sold "at less than fair value."

Our Antidumping Act and those of other major trading countries are specifically authorized by the International General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and are in consonance with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Historically, the threat of dumping and its destructive effects has existed for many years. An unfair international trade practice which followed closely upon the industrial revolution, it is pertinent to note that dumping was complained about by Alexander Hamilton in 1791 in his "Report on the Subject of Manufacturers" and the threat of dumping has continued to plague legitimate competition to the present day.

It is high time that this unfair international trade practice be stopped. To do so, however, several serious inadequacies which militate against this objective must be overcome. Procedural and technical overhaul is vitally needed and administrative interpretations, which at times have frustrated the purpose of the act, have tended to contravene the intent of Congress.

Clearly, remedial action to curb injurious price discrimination in world trade is not a partisan matter. It is, on the other hand, a significant issue on which groups with widely divergent interests can and, in fact, have joined in efforts to stamp out its cancerous effects. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, capital and labor, domestic manufacturers and importers—in fact, all Americans devoted to the perpetuation of the private enterprise system upon which our economy has flourished—should press for consideration of this amendment by the Committee on Ways and Means and, I would hope, for its enactment by the House and Senate at this session.

It should be stressed that an identical bill to the one which, after careful consideration, I am introducing today was introduced prior to his recent and untimely death by our colleague, the respected and distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, and it is most heartening to note that, included among the 23 Republicans and Democrats who have sponsored the amendment in the House as of this date, six are members of the Committee on Ways and Means. The bipartisan nature of the proposed amendment is further exemplified and the substantive worth of its provisions is given added weight by the fact that a similar bill has been cosponsored by 27 Senators, seven of whom are members of the Senate Committee on Finance.

It is my understanding that one of Mr. Walter's last official acts was to direct a request to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], in which Mr. Walter reaffirmed his long-standing conviction as to the need to amend the Antidumping Act without further delay. In urging Chairman MILLS to introduce an identical bill, Mr. Walter expressed his firm hope that the proposed amendment be given early consideration and endorsement by the committee in order to permit sufficient time for necessary action to be taken by both Houses of Congress.

In view of the overriding importance of this legislation to the fair and equitable conduct of international trade, in view of the intensive review and deliberation which have characterized the development of the proposed bill, and in view of honoring the resonant and oft-repeated request of a great American who served this body with such distinction for 30 years, I am introducing this amendment to the Antidumping Act today. In so doing, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in introducing and supporting similar bills in order that adequate consideration may be given its provisions by the Committee on Ways and Means in the near future. I know that many of you share Mr. Walter's fervent wish that we enact a sound and workable measure of this type which will improve the effective operation of the Antidumping Act. It was his hope and it is mine that this laudatory objective may be achieved before the close of this session of the Congress.

SUPERSONIC COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the President has sent up a communication in which he is requesting Congress to provide a program to initiate the development and construction of supersonic commercial transport aircraft. There has been a lot said about this program for the last several weeks. Consideration has been given to the advisability of this type of aircraft for the last 5 or 6 years.

I think this is a most important program in view of the fact that a joint undertaking by the British and the French is in process of developing such a commercial aircraft. Our committee will hold hearings on this request and we will develop the authority and to just what extent there is present authority under the law.

We will initiate these hearings Thursday afternoon at which time we will go fully into this program with a view as to what we should do and how we should do it in the best interest of our country and continued leadership in the aviation community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the executive communication may be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 14, 1963.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Congress has laid down national aviation objectives in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These include the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense. These objectives, when viewed in the light of today's aviation challenges, clearly require the commencement of a national program to support the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft which is safe for the passenger, economically sound for the world's airlines, and whose operating performance is superior to that of any comparable aircraft.

Our determination that the national interest requires such a program is based on a number of factors of varying weight and importance:

A successful supersonic transport can be an efficient, productive commercial vehicle which provides swift travel for the passenger and shows promise of developing a market which will prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator.

It will advance the frontiers of technical knowledge—not as a byproduct of military procurement, but in the pursuit of commercial objectives.

It will maintain the historic U.S. leadership in aircraft development.

It will enable this country to demonstrate the technological accomplishments which can be achieved under a democratic, free enterprise system.

Its manufacture and operation will expand our international trade.

It will strengthen the U.S. aircraft manufacturing industry—a valuable national asset—and provide employment to thousands of Americans.

The cost of such a program is large—it could be as great as $1 billion for a development program of about 6 years. This is beyond the financial capability of our aircraft manufacturers. We cannot, however, permit this high cost, nor the difficulties and risks of such an ambitious program to preclude this country from participating in the logical next development of a commercial aircraft. In order to permit this participation, the United States, through the Federal Aviation Agency, must proceed at once with a program of assistance to industry to develop an aircraft.

The proposed program, though it will yield much technological knowledge, is principally a commercial venture. Its aim is to serve, in competition with others, a substantial segment of the world market for such an aircraft. While the magnitude of the development task requires substantial Government financial participation, it is unwise and unnecessary for the Government to bear all of the costs and risks. Consequently, I propose a program in which (1) manufacturers of the aircraft will be expected to pay a minimum of 25 percent of the development costs, and, in addition, (2) airlines that purchase the aircraft will be expected to pay a further portion of the Government's development costs through royalty payments.

The requirement for cost sharing by the manufacturers will assure that the cost of the program will be held to the absolute minimum. In no event will the Government investment be permitted to exceed $750 million. Moreover, the Government does not intend to pay any production, purchase, or operating subsidies to manufacturers or airlines. On the other hand, this will not exclude consideration by the Government of credit assistance to manufacturers during the production process.

Although the Government will initially bear the principal financial burden in the development phase, participation by industry as a risk-taking partner is an essential of this undertaking. First, the development of civil aircraft should be a private enterprise effort, a product of the interaction of aircraft manufacturers and their prospective customers. We wish to change this relationship as little as possible, and then only temporarily. If the Government were the full risk-taker, the degree of control and direction which it would have to give to the program, to the expenditure of funds, to the selection of designs, to the making of technical decisions, would of necessity be too great. If however, private industry bears a substantial portion of the risk, the degree of Government control and the size of the Government staff required to monitor the program can be held to a minimum.

Second, our objective is to build a commercially sound aircraft, as well as one with superior performance characteristics. This will require, at a relatively early stage, a determination whether the aircraft's cost and characteristics are such that it will find a commercial market. This is a difficult task, and our decision that we have succeeded in developing such a commercially sound aircraft will, in large measure, be attested to by industry's willingness to participate in the risk taking.

If at any point in the development program, it appears that the aircraft will not be economically sound, or if there is not adequate financial participation by industry in this venture, we must be prepared to postpone, terminate, or substantially redirect this program.

Our first concern, however, must be to get the program launched. I am convinced that our national interest requires that we move ahead in this vital area with a sound program which will develop this aircraft in an efficient manner. For that reason I commend this proposal to your early attention.

I will shortly submit to the Congress a request for funds to meet the immediate requirements of this program, such as the detailed design competition. Then we will be started on the task of marshaling the funds of Government and the ingenuity and management skills, as well as funds, of American industry to usher in a new era of commercial flight.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPORT ON PARIS AIRSHOW AND MEETING WITH BRITISH/FRENCH OFFICIALS

Mr. HARRIS. Last week I had the privilege of traveling with three members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and two members of the Appropriations Committee to Paris, France. We made the trip aboard one of the FAA's C–135 flying laboratories. The purpose of our trip was to observe the inflight procedures of this aircraft as it checked the accuracy of the navigation aids used to guide our commercial and military aircraft on their flights along the airways of the world.

It also gave us the opportunity to visit the Paris International Air Show. Here, where most of the latest aircraft produced in the world were on display, we had an opportunity to observe firsthand the spectacular advances made by European aircraft manufacturers during the past few years.

We also held a meeting with the principal executives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., to discuss their plans for the joint production of the British/French supersonic Concorde commercial transport aircraft. This airplane, which is being financed jointly by the French and British Governments, developed and built jointly by the French SUD Aviation Co., and the British Aircraft Corp., will probably fly twice the speed of sound, have a range of some 3,250 nautical miles, carry approximately 104 passengers, and have the capability of flying nonstop between London or Paris and New York in approximately 3 hours.

This is no paper airplane. Tooling has already begun and the first prototype is scheduled to fly in 1966.

I will discuss our meeting with the representatives of these two companies, and describe in some detail the information we were able to gather. But first, I should like to remark briefly on the operations of the FAA C-135 jet aircraft in which we made our trip. The FAA operates two of these large four-engine jets which are a version of the 707. They are packed with highly complex electronic equipment which is able to check the accuracy of the radio navigation stations which guide planes by signals from the ground. The tasks they perform are truly prodigious. As an example, in our 7-hour, 15-minute flight between Washington, D.C., and Le Bourget Airport in Paris, France, we checked the accuracy of the ground navigation aids, in a band 300 miles wide, along the path of our flight while over the American Continent. When flying over the air routes of the North Atlantic, we checked the accuracy and strength of the communications and radar facilities on Ocean Ship Charlie and Ocean Ship Juliet.

Although the FAA has only two of these aircraft, they have a schedule which requires the flight checking once every 6 months of the ground navigation aids used for guiding our civil and military jet aircraft along the air routes throughout the United States and the areas of the free world into which our aircraft fly. While we remained in Paris to meet with the representatives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., this aircraft flew on to Germany where it flight checked the navigation facilities at three major U.S. Air Force Bases.

The SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp. had gathered representatives of their top management for our meeting. Our discussions were wide-ranging, candid, and frank. It soon became entirely apparent that in spite of any problems the British and French may be having about the admittance of Britain to the European Common Market there was no discord between the two nations or these two companies in their cooperative efforts to produce the Concorde supersonic civil transport airplane.

We found that a great deal of work has been accomplished already. The program has been underway for over 18 months. Most of the basic engineering has been completed. An engine capable of producing the speed range at which the Concorde has been designed to fly is an actuality. Certain long-lead items such as castings for the main landing gear are now being fabricated. The complete details as to which company will fabricate each part and where it will be assembled into complete airplanes has been determined. The companies have embarked on an intensive sales campaign. Our indications are that cooperative efforts between the two nations to pool technical and economic resources to capture 30 years of U.S. preeminence in aviation will continue and intensify.

Projects of such magnitude as Concorde by necessity require Government support. No manufacturer or combination of manufacturers in any country could finance the total research and development costs of a supersonic transport airplane.

We learned that the development cost for Concorde is now estimated to be approximately $425 million. This would give them two flying prototype models, one to be assembled in Britain, and one to be assembled in France. They were quite candid, however, in admitting that this sum was an estimate and that research and the developmental costs of any aircraft, particularly one entering areas yet unknown, had an alarming habit of rising beyond predicted levels.

At this time there is no reason to believe that if we begin our supersonic program with all due haste that the Concorde will be seen more on our domestic airways than aircraft which bear the label "Made in U.S.A.," but the threat is there, it is real, and it will grow more real with every delay on our part.

Our airlines will and must buy the best product they can get at the lowest possible price consistent with safety requirements when it makes economic sense to do so. This is true whether that product be of United States or foreign manufacture. So far as the economics of airline operation is concerned, it matters very little in what country the airplane is manufactured. The airlines will buy airplanes, regardless of who builds them, which are designed to make fare levels both acceptable to the traveler or the shipper and profitable to them.

The challenge to the U.S. aviation industry is not solely confined to the area of supersonic aircraft. At Le Bourget—first ground that Lindbergh touched after his historic 33½-hour flight from Long Island in 1927—we saw assembled a stunning display of tangible evidence of the tremendous strides the nations of the world have made in the technology of flight. After an inspection of these exhibits, it is obvious that no one nation can claim preeminence in creativity. Many foreign manufacturers and Governments, including Poland and Czechoslovakia, participated in the show. The products they had on display were of excellent or superior design and workmanship.

It was also obvious that the efforts of the Europeans to capture potential markets was not confined to the British/French Concorde supersonic transport effort. For example, the one aircraft in the world now flying and ready for the market which appears to come closest to meeting our requirements for a replacement for the DC-3 is French built.

At the Paris Air Show we saw evidence on every hand that the U.S. aviation industry must redouble its efforts to retain its preeminence in the aviation field. A part of the European effort to topple us from our lead position is the pooling of resources, both financial and technical. The first major example of this is, of course, the agreement between the British/French to jointly build the Concorde supersonic transport. There were a number of other cooperative projects. I found particularly revealing the cooperation of the British, French, German, and in some instances, U.S. companies, in funding and developing certain military aircraft and components. This was undoubtedly the result of the long and vast U.S. effort to promote the maximum effectiveness of the NATO nations for the benefit of the free world.

This Nation can be very proud of the U.S. products and aircraft displayed at the airshow. The United States leads in number of aircraft on exhibit with a total of 55. However, the number of foreign aircraft on exhibit this year is much larger and more varied than it was 2 years ago. Those of us who had the opportunity to view the products and aircraft on display and discuss with SUD Aviation and the British Aircraft Corp. representatives the Concorde program have been made forcefully aware that in the past decade Europe has produced a new era of prosperity and a vastly increased technical competence and capability. This prosperity and capability has now become a major and ever-present challenge to our position and stature in world aviation. We must face up squarely to this fact and take the measures necessary to retain our 30-year preeminence.

If we delay or are indecisive we may well find that the United States has become a follower rather than the leader in world aviation.

We must not allow this to happen.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may be interested, I include a summary of the action in the appropriation bills down to date in the current session and an approximation of the portions of the President's obligational authority budget yet to come before the House for consideration. It is a revision of similar information presented earlier in the session.

Summary of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of June 15, 1963

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations. And does not include any "backdoor" appropriations.]

Fiscal year and bill	Budget estimates to House	House action		Budget estimates to Senate	Passed by Senate	Enacted	Bills at latest stage compared to budget request
		Reported by committee	Passed				
FISCAL 1963							
Supplemental, Agriculture (shifted from original 1964 budget request)	[1] $508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	
Supplemental, 1963	1,641,507,106	988,756,506	1,438,691,506	1,652,300,456	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491	-$184,869,965
Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)	(..............)	(450,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
All other	(1,141,507,106)	(988,756,506)	(988,691,506)	(1,152,300,456)	(1,038,683,841)	(1,017,430,491)	(-134,869,965)
Total, 1963	[2] 2,149,679,106	1,496,928,506	1,946,863,506	2,160,472,456	1,996,855,841	1,975,602,491	-184,869,965
FISCAL YEAR 1964							
Interior and related:							
Appropriations	998,009,000	929,690,200	922,625,200	998,009,000	979,693,400		-18,315,600
Borrowing authority	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	6,000,000		-7,000,000
Contract authority	17,500,000			17,500,000			-17,500,000
Total, Interior	1,028,509,000	935,690,200	928,625,200	1,028,509,000	985,693,400		-42,815,600
Treasury-Post Office and related	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	5,997,026,000	6,146,842,000	6,069,466,250	6,045,466,000	-101,376,000
Labor-HEW and related	5,759,489,000	5,449,988,000	5,449,981,000				-309,508,000
Agriculture and related:							
Appropriation	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	5,979,457,000				-389,298,000
Borrowing authority	855,000,000	855,000,000	855,000,000				
Total Agriculture	7,223,755,000	6,834,457,000	6,834,457,000				-389,298,000
Legislative (excludes Senate items)	148,580,245	140,038,919	140,038,919				-8,541,326
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related	2,159,891,900	1,851,269,900					-308,622,000
Grand total reductions to date on portions of budget processed through the regular appropriation bills (based on latest action on each bill)	24,616,746,251						-1,345,030,801

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964 (which was reduced accordingly).

[2] This accounts for virtually all the supplementals for 1963 specifically projected in the January 1963 budget except the $2,000,000,000 borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank submitted as a "backdoor" proposition and now pending.

Mr. Speaker, we will report the defense bill this week. Hearings on the other bills are either completeu or well advanced. Some bills are delayed pending consideration of the related annual authorization bills which under the rules must precede the appropriation bills.

There are no further supplemental bills for fiscal 1963. There is pending, however, a $2,000,000,000 back-door appropriation in the bill for the Export-Import Bank. As may be noted from the table included, the House has considered $24,616,746,251 of the new appropriation budget requests for fiscal 1964 in the six regular bills reported to date.

AMOUNTS YET TO BE CONSIDERED

The President's January budget proposed $107,927,000,000 in new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which $11,781,000,000 is for permanent appropriations recurring under prior law, principally interest on the debt, thus leaving in round figures, $96,146,000,000 proposed for consideration in the present session applicable to fiscal 1964. The President has subsequently submitted several revisions to the January budget for fiscal 1964 totaling approximately $1,123,000,000 in reductions, principally the $508,172,000 agriculture item switched over to fiscal 1963 and the $419,700,000 downward revision in foreign aid; there are approximately $195,000,000 in other downward adjustments. Thus the current total new obligational authority proposed by the President for 1964 for action in the current session is, again approximately, $95,023,000,000. And the January budget identifies about $2,727,000,000 of that—the figure has not since materially changed—with propositions of legislation for new programs initially for consideration in legislative rather than appropriation bills; therefore it remains uncertain how much of that will eventuate in formal budget requests for actual appropriation. And some portion of the remaining $92,296,000,000 will probably also be affected as the Congress processes the annual legislative authorization bills for such major items as space, military construction, and foreign aid; any change will presumably also affect the budget request for actual appropriation.

So that, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot, even at this date, give the precise budget amounts yet to come before the House in the appropriation bills, on the basis of what is now pending before the committee the magnitude and character is approximately this: Defense bill $49,014,000,000; independent offices bill, $14,560,000,000; public works bill, $4,558,000,000; military construction, $1,978,000,000; foreign aid bill, $4,840,000,000; District of Columbia bill, $34,000,000; and, as usual, a closing supplemental bill, amounts now unknown.

Mr. Speaker, a precautionary word for anyone who may take the time to balance out these figures with the budget totals. The budget concept of new obligational authority is slightly different from the traditional appropriation concept—for instance, an appropriation to liquidate prior contract authority is counted as an appropriation but it is not new obligational authority. And whereas in the foregoing tabulation the Post Office appropriations are counted, as heretofore, on a gross basis, in the budget only the estimated postal deficit, chargeable to the General Treasury, and being the excess of the appropriations over the estimated postal revenues, is reflected as new obligational authority.

REVISED SUMMARY OF NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT

For the fiscal year 1963, ending this month, the President's January budget estimated total new obligational authority, including supplementals to be submitted to the present session, aggregating $103,192,000,000. Subsequent revisions from the President thus far increase that figure by the net amount of approximately $272,000,000—to a new total of $103,464,000,000; there have been formal downward revisions of $236,495,000, more than offset by the $508,172,000 switch to fiscal 1963 from the 1964 budget for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A few small increases submitted by the President and not specifically identified in the January budget for fiscal 1963 are chargeable to the contingency allowance within the overall total.

For the fiscal year 1964, the revised total new obligational authority request, after adjustments as noted, is approximately $106,804,000,000; that is, the original January budget of $107,927,000,000 reduced by the adjustments of $1,123,000,000.

Comparatively, then, the President's adjusted recommendations for new authority to obligate the Government for fiscal 1964 are as follows:

1964 total budget request exceeds currently adjusted 1963 total by	+$3,340,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1961 by	+20,129,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1954 by	+44,039,000,000

And as previously documented, using official budget and Treasury figures, approximately 53 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1963, is for "Other than national defense"; approximately 49 percent of the recommended increase, 1954 over 1961, is for "Other than national defense"; and approximately 60 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1954, is for "Other than national defense."

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, we have said this before but when reciting these fantastic amounts it is well to repeat that a source of much confusion is the matter of just what set of figures correctly measures the size of the budget on which the Congress acts. Contrary to widespread impression, the House does not act directly on the more generally familiar $98,802,000,000 January spending budget for fiscal 1964 which, incidentally, is now slightly outdated though it is the last official estimate from the President. The House acts on the new obligational authority budget of $107,927,000,000 for 1964—that is the 1964 total of the propositions submitted, and currently revised to about $106,804,000,000. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the appropriation process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligation necessarily follows in due course of time. If you do not appropriate, no obligation can be created. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The $98.8 billion spending budget is the checking account budget—it represents the checks drawn to pay the bills. The new obligational authority budget represents the authority to create the obligation. That is the key figure to keep in mind. An increasingly higher obligational authority budget and appropriation signifies, inevitably, a higher disbursement or expenditure budget.

Members of the House, the press, and others from time to time during the year, and especially in the closing weeks and days of the session, inquire as to what Congress has done to the spending budget. Unfortunately, we cannot tell them because the figures are not available. And they cannot be precisely and authoritatively compiled here. The House will have opportunity to vote on only approximately $44,668,000,000 of the $98,802,000,000 spending budget figure for fiscal 1964—principally for two reasons. And even this diminished total will be fragmented among some 14 or 15 appropriation bills and numerous legislative bills, handled on a piecemeal basis throughout the session. About $42,353,000,000 of the spending in 1964 will be from obligational authority already voted in past years by previous Congresses. Then, roughly $11,781,000,000 will ensue from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. These total $54,134,000,000, or over 54 percent of the 1964 spending budget of $98.8 billion not directly before the House this session.

As to the remainder, a portion is related to propositions of new legislation first for consideration in sundry bills in the legislative committees, or, on the other hand, if such be the decision, to be cut from the budget by failure to report or enact the new proposals. The separately identifiable January budget total for these new propositions of legislation, within the $107.9 billion total new obligational authority request is $2,727,000,000 of new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which, according to the budget, $1,202,000,000 would be expended in 1964 and therefore included in the $98.8 billion bill spending figure for 1964.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Scott (at the request of Mr. Lennon), for 15 days, on account of illness.

Mr. O'Brien of New York (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Carey (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Dulski (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Jensen and to include a message by him to the World Food Conference.

Mr. Goodling to insert the Memorial Day exercises which took place on the national cemetery at Gettysburg on Memorial Day, and include the remarks of the Vice President of the United States.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 13, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily Record in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I want to point out that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] made a speech earlier today in which he objected to the printing of certain agricultural bulletins and yearbooks, and said that the Congress could save a lot of money if we refused to send them out. He is asking permission to extend his remarks in five instances. Already this year he has included enough material in the Record to total $13,000 plus. It seems to me that if he really wanted to save money he ought to cut down that way and not try to cut down on useful publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. What happened to this bill that was under suspension, H.R. 4638?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the bill was not called up.

Mr. GROSS. I submit that it is an unusual procedure, in light of the fact that it is 1:20 o'clock in the afternoon, to abandon the last bill scheduled for consideration under suspension. This bill was put on the whip notice on both sides of the aisle to be called up this afternoon. Moreover, I have been hearing the last few days that it was in the nature of an emergency to get the bill under consideration on the floor. I do not understand why this bill, H.R. 4638, is being shelved when an afternoon remains in which to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been withdrawn and there is nothing unusual about that. It is not an unusual situation.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr.

SHORT] that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I revise the request to one instance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The gentleman from Texas was on the floor this morning and could have made his request at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object to all of these second-hand requests.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these requests for permission to insert remarks and material in the Appendix of the daily RECORD will all be objected to, I will not mention any more of the requests.

REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may address the House for 30 minutes on June 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

POINT OF ORDER OF NO QUORUM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

933. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the April 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

934. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense, which includes the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

936. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

938. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 14, 1963:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes: without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 17, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2827. A bill to extend until June 30, 1966, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2651. A bill to extend for 1 year the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6246. A bill relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 392. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was introduced on June 14, 1963:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred June 17, 1963*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7064. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7065. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, in computing annual income for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain pensions, certain payments received on account of disability shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 7066. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to permit civil actions for damages in the case of water pollution affecting fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 7068. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7069. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7070. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received, and to put the National Cultural Center on a sound, businesslike basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend section 3012 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment to those survivors not entitled to death compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or death pension, compensation and pension accrued to a veteran at the time of his death and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7072. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to assure fairness in editorializing by radio and television station licensees in support of or in opposition to candidates for public office by making the equal opportunities provisions of section 315 applicable thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend paragraph 1537 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7076. A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 7077. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7078. A bill to amend section 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the exclusion from annual income in entitlement determinations to dependency and indemnity compensation of those amounts paid by a dependent parent for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 7079. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans in existence and to authorize the loan of a naval vessel to a friendly foreign country and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7080. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7082. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution congratulating the American Veterinary Medical Association on its centennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 404. Resolution extending greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives to the people of Millbury, Mass., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of their community; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing thanks for courtesies extended to Chaplain Alphonso Jordan on his recent visit to the Nation's Capital, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Elsie Anita Jardim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liliana A. Barsoum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Ciccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Esber, Sabahat, and Sumru Koprucu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haia Cervonogura Wolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7091. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioannis Tsakiris (husband), Thomae Dimitrios Tsakiris (wife); and two children, Ioannis and Athina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Renato Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Alfred Stewart McCorkle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Reginaldo Salvatore Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. D. Brownell, president, National Association of Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Contractors, Washington, D.C., relative to requesting that the utmost be done toward opposing the enactment of Senate bill 757 and House bill 2029, and that continued support be given the Small Business Administration programs which have done so much to aid the small businessman in the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

160. Also, petition of Joseph Scaramella, chairman, Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County, Calif., relative to expressing support for Senate bill 1275, relating to Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. C. S. Mueller, pastor, the Lutheran Church of St. Andrew, Wheaton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Into your hands, most blessed Lord, we once more place, in prayer, our Nation, our leaders, and our people, asking for your continued care.

We this day give thanks for the abundance of your many blessings, especially those of freedom, plenty, and opportunity. Undeserving as we are of these gifts, You have graciously given into our hands all that is necessary, that we might truly "have life and have it more abundantly." May we use, and never abuse, these gifts.

In this spirit of thanksgiving and humble acknowledgment, we make bold to ask that today and every day these mercies be renewed and placed at the disposal of this Nation, her people, and her leaders, with the matching grace of wisdom, courage, understanding, and true sympathy. May what You have given to us touch the lives of all men, for good, through us.

Upon this Senate and all who work that decisions here made be just, beneficial, and effective, let your spirit of guidance rest. May the men and women who deal so intimately and directly with the destiny of our Nation and our world know the peace of calling You Father and the assurance of being your child.

These things we ask in the name of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, through whom we have the privilege, in prayer, of calling on You for more and more, and yet more. Hear us, we humbly pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 79) to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proprosed Amendment to the Budget, 1964, for Department of Labor (S. Doc. No. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1964, involving a proposed provision for the Department of Labor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Development of a Commercial Supersonic Transport Aircraft

A communication from the President of the United States, relating to the proposed development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Virginia and West Virginia

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Johns Creek, Va., and Upper Deckers Creek, W. Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations, and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the month of April 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Provision of Quarters and Equipment to Certain Officers and Employees of the United States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Selected Right-of-Way Activities of Federal-Aid Highway Program in State of Virginia

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Virginia, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618)

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Sections 3288 and 3289 of Title 18, United States Code, Relating to Reindictment After Dismissal of a Defective Indictment

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Fees Payable to the Patent Office

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Plans for Work of Improvement in Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Tennessee

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Cheaha Creek, Ala., Poteau River, Ark., and Okla., and Middle Fork-Obion River, Tenn. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Resolution —

"Resolution thanking the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and the members of the North Carolina congressional delegation for courtesies extended to Chaplain Alphonso Jordan on his recent visit to the Nation's Capital

"Whereas the Reverend Alphonso Jordan, chaplain of the house of representatives of the North Carolina General Assembly visited the Congress of the United States on Thursday, May 23, 1963; and

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and in particular the Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation to the U.S. Congress, extended many courtesies to Chaplain Jordan during his visit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives:

"Section 1. The house of representatives expresses its appreciation to the Congress of the United States, and particularly to the Members of the North Carolina delegation to the Congress of the United States, for the many kind courtesies extended to Chaplain Jordan.

"Sec. 2. The secretary of state shall send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the North Carolina delegation to the U.S. Congress, and to Chaplain Jordan.

"Sec. 3. This resolution shall be effective upon adoption.

"Adopted June 6, 1963."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fish products. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

"Joint Resolution —

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fish products, and for other purposes

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas it has been recognized that the agricultural economy of the country requires the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities at the lowest possible rates consistent with the financial status of the carriers; and

"Whereas the Nation's railroad carriers have heretofore been hampered in the setting of minimum rates for the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities by reason of time consuming and arbitrary standards imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

"Whereas it is absolutely essential for the continued development of agricultural production in the State of Maine that the producers of agricultural products be able to reduce transportation costs on feed and other ingredients; and

"Whereas other agricultural areas of the country are now the recipients of greatly reduced transportation costs of such ingredients to the detriment of and discrimination against Maine agricultural producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that the document entitled 88th Congress, 1st session, H.R. 4700, a bill to obtain the aforesaid objectives, be passed by the Congress in order to accomplish the aforesaid objectives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately submitted by the secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"Read and adopted in senate chamber, June 7, 1963.

"Chester T. Winslow,
"*Secretary*.

"Read and adopted in house of representatives, June 10, 1963.

"Harvey R. Pease,
"*Clerk*."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 1819. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 622. A bill to improve and encourage collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and to permit to the extent practicable the adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart (Rept. No. 252).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1326. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., and Karlson Development Corp. (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for recreation purposes at Cochiti Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 851. A bill to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes (Rept. No. 258); and

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1185. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 260).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated June 6, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S. 1721. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit certain discriminatory practices by business enterprises receiving assistance under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1722. A bill to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to insure fair and equitable treatment under collective-bargaining agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 1723. A bill to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to certain licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1724. A bill to amend section 368 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definitions of the terms "reorganization" and "a party to a reorganization"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1725. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. McGovern):

S. 1726. A bill to consent to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact between the States of Nebraska and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1727. A bill to permit donation of surplus agricultural commodities to State and county penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Max Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1729. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1730. A bill to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of National Honor to Carl Sandburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES BY BUSINESS ENTERPRISES RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stop the Small Business Administration from making loans to firms that discriminate because of race, creed, or color, by refusing either service or employment to certain persons. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, almost all Americans recognize that discrimination is based on bigotry and hate.

We only disagree on how far the Federal Government should go to eliminate it.

This body will predictably be divided on the question of whether the President's civil rights bill to use Federal sanctions to prohibit discrimination in various business establishments that are in interstate commerce is wise public policy. I think the President is right. I will support him. But some Senators will argue that this should be left to the States or to private determination; that it is none of the Federal Government's business. I disagree. But I understand the basis for these objections—based, as they are, on States rights doctrine.

But, Mr. President, when it comes to discrimination financed by Federal funds, that is something else again.

A firm that borrows from the Small Business Administration is asking all Federal taxpayers to finance its operation. The Federal taxpayer's money—the money of the white man, of the Negro, of all taxpayers—is involved. The use of these funds by such a firm, to enable it to expand its discriminatory policies, is wrong; and there is no moral, political or financial justification for it.

Mr. President, Small Business Administration loans are helpful to small business. Often they determine whether, in fact, a small business will be able to grow and develop. This is a good program that is warmly supported by the American people.

But no one can argue that small business loans are as necessary as aid to dependent children, to the blind, or to the mentally and physically ill.

On the other hand, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has introduced, and I am cosponsoring, a bill to stop Federal participation in the various welfare programs if the programs practice discrimination. This bill is sound, although it may indeed cause heartrending hardships among dependent children and persons who suffer painfully from lack of food, clothing, or shelter.

The bill I have introduced, however, will simply prevent the businessman from obtaining such a loan from the Government until he has discontinued any discriminatory practice he may be following. If he needs the money badly enough, he will have to discontinue denying persons their rights as Americans. If he chooses not to do so, why should the Federal taxpayer finance his defiance of basic American rights?

The Civil Rights Commission—composed of prominent men, southerners as well as northerners, who for many years have studied the race problem in our country—has proposed that the Federal Government stop all payments to a State that practices discrimination. My bill, which confines its effect to a Federal agency, does not go nearly that far.

My bill also has the virtue of assuring a firm which discontinues discrimination—often at considerable sacrifice—that at least its competition will not be able to take its business away, through using Federal tax money. Unless this bill is enacted, tax money paid by an employer or a firm which, at great sacrifice, has ceased discrimination, may be loaned, through the Small Business Administration, to a firm which may use the money to expand its facilities, so that it can take business away from the firm which has ceased discrimination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1721) to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit certain discriminatory practices by business enterprises receiving assistance under such act, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMBERSHIP IN LABOR ORGANIZATION AS CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act. My amendment would nullify those provisions of any collective bargaining agreement which require membership in a union as a condition of employment in any case where the contracting union maintains an exclusionary policy with respect to membership based on race, creed, color, or national origin.

For the past 30 years, labor unions have been the recipients of many special privileges, rights, and immunities enjoyed by no other form of private organization in our society, and conferred on them by Federal law. Among the most substantial of these union advantages is the power to contract with the employer to compel membership in the union as a condition of employment.

In 1935, Congress adopted the Wagner Act which the trade union movement refers to as its Magna Carta. A fundamental principle of the Wagner Act was that no employer could lawfully discriminate against an employee because of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union. This basic principle was embodied in section 8(3) of the Wagner Act which made it an unfair labor practice for an employer "by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization."

If section 8(3) had stopped right there, every form of compulsory union membership agreement would have been rendered unlawful. To avoid this, the Congress conferred a special immunity on labor unions by including a proviso to section 8(3) which permitted unions and employers to enter into compulsory union membership agreements without violating the law.

It was clearly recognized that this exception was in direct contradiction to the act's fundamental principle that an employee's job status was to remain completely unaffected by reason of his membership or nonmembership in a union.

In 1947, Congress recognized the need to narrow this broad and powerful immunity it had granted to labor unions 12 years earlier. Although in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, it continued to permit employers and unions to enter into compulsory union membership agreements, it narrowed the permissible scope of such agreements. Moreover, it also made explicit by writing into the new statute a principle which had previously been part of the unwritten law, to wit, the so-called right-to-work principle. Section 14(b) of the amended National Labor Relations Act specifically authorized the states to prohibit all forms of compulsory union membership. To date 20 States have enacted such right-to-work laws.

Nevertheless, in the remaining 30 States, unions continue to enjoy the special privilege of lawfully being able to compel employees to join the union if they wish to hold on to their jobs. It is my firm conviction that this special privilege should be withdrawn from any labor union which denies fair and equitable treatment to qualified employees and applicants for employment.

For that reason I am introducing this bill which, simply stated, merely renders null and void any provision in a collective bargaining agreement requiring union membership as a condition of employment, if the union which is a party to such an agreement, discriminates with respect to membership therein because of race, creed, color, or national origin. If a union wishes to assert the prerogatives of a private organization to pick and choose its own members in any way it sees fit, it is inequitable for the Federal Government to grant it the special privilege of contracting for compulsory membership where the union exercises its prerogative unjustly and arbitrarily.

In closing I would like to point out that my bill would not apply in any way in those States which have or enact right-to-work laws. Inasmuch as the bill merely nullifies compulsory union membership contract provisions under certain conditions, it can obviously have no application in any State where such provisions are already prohibited by State law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and also that the bill be permitted to remain at the table for 3 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Texas, and will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1722) to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to insure fair and equitable treatment under collective bargaining agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection:

(g) Any agreement, as authorized in subsection (a)(3), requiring membership in a labor organization as condition of employment, shall to that extent be unenforcible and void if such labor organization, because of race, creed, color or national origin, denies membership therein to any individual on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all members of such labor organization.

CONFORMATION TO CERTAIN LICENSING LAWS OF STATES BY CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Bureau of Reclamation of the U.S. Department of the Interior spends vast amounts of the taxpayers' money on a variety of projects each year. The work of the Reclamation Bureau in constructing irrigation, drainage, waterpower and other projects is well known and requires no review at this time.

In a construction operation as massive as that carried out by the Bureau numerous problems are bound to arise. Among the difficulties that accompany the building of a large dam or irrigation project are those connected with the complex contracts between the Bureau and the contractors and between the various contractors and subcontractors themselves. At each Reclamation Bureau project a number of individuals and companies are involved in supplying or paying for material and labor. Disputes about the work to be done or the amount of payment to be made naturally arise from time to time.

Unfortunately, some of the individuals and firms working on reclamation jobs sometimes fail to meet their obligations. In cases where a contractor or a subcontractor cannot or will not pay his debts complicated legal procedures must be resorted to by the creditor. In many instances, the law and the courts of the State in which the dispute arose may not be utilized by the local supplier or other party who is forced to sue to recover what he has lost. However, the wronged party does have an alternative remedy under the Federal law.

The Miller Act was enacted to provide a substitute for mechanics' liens which are not recognizable by the Federal Government for the settlement of obligations between contractors and those furnishing labor or material to prime and subcontractors. Under the act all Government construction contracts exceeding $2,000 require that the prime contractors furnish the Government with performance and payment bonds. The amounts of the payment bonds vary from one-half the amount of the contract in cases where the contract amount is less than $1 million to $2,500,000 for contracts in excess of $5 million.

Many of the claims which arise from reclamation projects are adequately handled through the processes of the Miller Act. However, on large Federal contracts there are many second, third, fourth, or even more tier subcontractors. The present law does not adequately protect those who furnish equipment or labor to these subcontractors. For, it is the general contractor, not his subcontractors who must post the performance and payment bonds.

A further complication to this problem is the fact that contractors engaged in Federal construction are not required to be licensed under the laws of the States where the construction projects are located. The result of this situation is that a number of contractors who have no licenses to operate within a State are nevertheless able to work on construction projects sponsored by the Federal Government and located in that State. This vacuum in the law has resulted in abuses.

Mr. President, some contractors who have earned poor reputations within certain States and have had their licenses removed by the local authorities have been permitted to work on Reclamation Bureau projects within the same States. The registrar of contractors of the State of Arizona, for example, may find a certain contractor unfit to do business in Arizona for reasons dealing with his reliability or his credit rating. Nevertheless, the registrar must sit back and watch this same contractor awarded a portion of a Federal contract located in our State. When this contractor fails to pay his Arizona suppliers and the suppliers seek redress of their grievances, the State of Arizona is powerless to help them.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and I believe that this condition must be corrected. As a means of closing this loophole in the law we are introducing a bill to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to the licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located. The requirement set forth in the bill would provide all persons dealing with such contractors with a direct remedy for the abuses that I have discussed.

I do not contend, Mr. President, that this proposed legislation will solve all of the problems in this area. Nevertheless, this is a step in the direction of seeing that financial responsibility is insured on all matters related to projects of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask permission that it appear at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1723) to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to certain licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any contract entered into by the Secretary of the Interior after the date of the enactment of this Act with any contractor for the construction of any project under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (including the Act of June 17, 1902, and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) shall provide that such contractor (including any subcontractor working on such project) shall, as a condition to the performance of such contract, conform to all applicable provisions of law of the State in which such project or part thereof is to be constructed requiring the licensing of contractors within that State whose principal contracting business is in connection with (1) fixed works for irrigation, drainage, water power, water supply, or flood control, or (2) the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines. The requirements of this Act shall apply only to the performance of any such contract and shall not apply to the submission of bids with respect to any such contract or to the entering into of any such contract.

LOWER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1961 the two great sister States of Nebraska and Wyoming concluded a compact pursuant to consent granted by the Congress of the United States as provided in the act of August 5, 1953—Public Law 191, 83d Congress, first session, chapter 324, 67 Statutes 365—and the act of May 29, 1958—Public Law 85-427, 85th Congress, S. 2557, 72 Statutes 147.

This compact undertakes to apportion the waters of Ponca Creek and the tributaries of the Niobrara River common to the two States. It is designated as the "Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact."

It has been ratified by the legislatures of both States and has been approved by the Governor of South Dakota and the Governor of Nebraska.

In 1961, I introduced a bill which sought the consent of Congress to this compact. Unfortunately, the departmental reports were not received in time to enable the committee to act on the bill.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as well as the two Senators from the State of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MCGOVERN], I introduce a bill for this purpose and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1726) to consent to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact between the States of Nebraska and South Dakota, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNIQUES LEADING TO IMPROVED METHODS OF EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH EPILEPSY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning.

Epilepsy affects an estimated 1,800,000 citizens, yet it remains one of the least understood of human ailments. Discrimination against those who suffer from it is still common. This is reflected in unnecessary obstacles to their employment and to their educational opportunities and in State legislation which in some cases prohibits or restricts their right to marry. In 13 States the law permits administrators of State institutions to sterilize inmates with epilepsy, although in practice it appears this is not widely imposed on those who suffer only from epilepsy.

More serious in some ways is the general misunderstanding by the public about the nature and effects of epilepsy and, consequently, the stigma placed on the persons afflicted.

Epilepsy is a disorder of the nervous system. In many cases the cause is unknown but in some instances it arises from injury to the brain and from infections such as encephalitis which damage the brain. It is not contagious. It is not usually disabling. It does not cause mental deficiency, and those suffering from epilepsy have about the same range of IQ as the whole population.

Great progress has been made in medical research for the treatment and control of epileptic seizures. It is estimated that 50 percent of all afflicted persons become seizure-free, while another 30 percent have substantial reduction of seizures as a result of modern medical and surgical techniques.

One of the principal needs today is to provide better educational opportunities for children afflicted with epilepsy and to help them develop their talents so they can lead constructive lives. There is a need to overcome false fears and misunderstanding and to approach this problem in the same sympathetic way that we have learned with respect to other afflictions. In some areas children with epilepsy are automatically barred from schools and in other instances they suffer discrimination and do not properly develop academically because of the lack of knowledge of methods and techniques. Training programs to assist school personnel in the use of appropriate methods would enable many children with epilepsy to fit into regular school classes and carry normal schoolwork without any special school facilities.

The bill which I am introducing today authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for projects and demonstrations for training school personnel in techniques for educating students with epilepsy. Persons employed or preparing for employment as teachers, school nurses, school administrators, school psychologists and counselors would be eligible for training projects, as determined by the Secretary. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance programs in cooperation with appropriate groups in a joint effort to meet this educational problem. Finally, the bill provides for the establishment of the President's Committee on Epilepsy to serve as an advisory group to assist the Secretary in carrying out the terms of the act.

The authorization is for a 3-year program. Private groups, particularly the Epilepsy Foundation, have done excellent work, but this is an example where Federal grants can be used to develop training programs with great beneficial effects. It will do much to improve the educational opportunity of handicapped children. The effort to meet this specific problem will also help the public understand the disorder and to remove the false fears and misunderstanding which for so long have limited the development of those afflicted with epilepsy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1729) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PREVENTION OF USE OF CERTAIN MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service.

I do not believe that industrial work measurement systems and the philosophy behind them can properly and effectively be applied to the Federal service. The guidelines system, inaugurated under the previous administration, has had ample time to prove its worth. In actual fact it has proved itself cumbersome, costly, and destructive of good personnel relations and employee morale. I do not believe that there is any place for an arbitrary and unrealistic "speedup" system in the postal service nor do I believe that the expenditure of $11 to $12 million annually in an attempt to enforce such a system is in the public interest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1730) to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CHURCH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1276) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. Church, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that public witnesses will testify in open session on Friday, June 21, beginning at 10 a.m., on the bill (S. 1276), the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building. Those who have not already evidenced their wish to appear may do so by getting in touch with my committee staff.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of June 4, 1963:

S. 1651. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products: Mr. Hartke, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Smathers.

Authority of June 4, 1963:

S. 1676. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising on rights-of-way adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Flag Day speech delivered by Senator Morton before the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Milwaukee.

OPPOSITION TO POLICY PERMITTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO MAKE FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALL DEFENSE CONTRACTS AWARDED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week I wrote the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, calling his attention to the danger of the present policy of the Defense Department wherein Members of Congress are allowed to make the first announcement of all defense contracts awarded within their respective States.

For the information of the Senate, I shall read the letter into the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you in connection with a serious problem which concerns both your Department and Congress; and that is, the policy under which the Defense Department permits Members of Congress to make the first announcement of all defense contracts that are being awarded to companies in their respective States. I appreciate that this policy did not originate with your administration, although it is becoming evident that the policy is now being implemented to a far greater extent than ever before. Unless this political farce is checked, however, I am afraid it will develop into the greatest era of influence peddling we have ever seen.

My concern over this situation is the misunderstanding which is rapidly developing on the part of many contractors and the American people in general that the way to get a Government contract is to see their Members of Congress. Defense contractors in some States are now being openly told that the easiest way to get Government contracts is to elect as their Representatives in Congress men who have the closest ties or relationships with the administration. Allegedly, Government contracts will be obtained for their States on the basis of the influence of the Member of Congress rather than on the contractors' ability to underbid their competitors.

One dangerous aspect of this policy is the tendency of National or State political organizations to capitalize on the influence their candidates will have in Washington as an excuse to collect larger political contributions from these defense contractors. Of course, the inevitable result would be for these contributions to be added to the cost of the next Government contract, and again the taxpayers will pay.

We both fully recognize that when Members of Congress use their political influence to obtain Government contracts for their States or for their favored constituents it is wrong. Likewise, should your Department award a contract to a particular contractor solely on the basis that an influential Member of Congress from his State had interceded, rather than on the basis that the company was the lowest responsible bidder, that too would be highly improper if not actually illegal.

At the present time high ranking officers are being detailed as messenger boys to hand deliver advance notices of these contracts to Members of the congressional delegations. In my opinion, it is an insult to these officers, most of whom earned their ranks on the battlefield in the service of their country, to now delegate them to the status of messenger boys.

A glaring example of just how far this policy is getting out of hand was called to my attention sometime ago. In that particular case, a sizable contract was being awarded in a State where both U.S. Senators and the Congressman of the affected district were all very friendly with the administration, and apparently the Defense Department wanted to be sure not to show partiality. Therefore, three high-ranking officers were dispatched to the Capitol with a notification for each of the three Members. To make sure that there was no partiality shown, the officers even synchronized their watches and by prearranged plan, entered the offices of their designated congressional Member on the exact minute.

All of these precautions and the utilization of the services of these three officers were being taken to allow some Members of Congress to claim credit for something with which they had nothing to do; in fact, in this instance not one of them even knew that the company in question was bidding on the contract. And had it been true that some Member of the delegation had been interceding or using his influence to get this contract for his State it would have been improper.

Actually, under this system the laziest Member of the congressional delegation is the one who will be able to get out the first announcement of the contract to the constituents of his State. This is true because that Member of Congress who neglects his committee work, neglects his duties on the House or Senate floor, and just sits back in his office with his feet propped on his desk will always be on hand to take the message and thereby be able to relay it back home before the working Members of the delegation return to their offices. To make matters even worse the telephone calls to relay these messages back to the State papers and radios are ofttimes charged as official business, which means that the taxpayers are paying for this political farce.

But in addition to creating a false impression as to how contracts are awarded and burdening the taxpayers with unnecessary costs, there is another bad result that can develop from the continuation of this farce in that it would make it possible for the administration in power to use this "advance notice method" as an inducement, bribe, or club to keep a Member of Congress in line and to make him take orders from the White House as to how he should vote on certain legislative requests under the threat that the advance notice could be withheld from his office should he refuse to cooperate.

I am sure that we are both in complete agreement that Government contracts should always be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder and that under no circumstances should they ever be awarded to any State or any congressional district on the basis of political intervention or on the basis of how that State voted in the general election.

This problem is being called to your attention in the hope that you too recognize the serious danger of allowing this policy to continue, and in the hope that you will establish a new policy wherein the Defense Department itself will in the future make direct to the press its own announcements of the awarding of all defense contracts.

In calling this to your attention I again emphasize that I am not placing all the responsibility for the present policy upon you or upon any other administration. Like Topsy, the policy started and has been allowed to grow, and I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent mink-coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic.

Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous.

In order that you may get not only my opinion on this problem but the reaction of the other Members of Congress as well, I am writing this as an open letter, and next week I will place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read.

I shall await your reply with interest.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Thursday the Senate passed S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. At the time the bill was considered the leadership was unaware that any Senator desired to debate the proposal. Subsequently the interest of two Senators was brought to the attention of the leadership. In order to accommodate those Senators and others who may be interested, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in passing S. 777 and in tabling a motion to reconsider that action be now reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendments to the bill be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the Calendar in the status it occupied prior to its passage last Thursday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request at this time which may be a little unusual. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 777.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the Senators most vitally interested in the proposal, I ask unanimous consent that on the basis of two amendments which will be offered, the time be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment, 15 minutes to each side, and that, in addition, one-half hour of debate be allotted on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Montana correctly understand that, on the basis of the unanimous-consent agreement recently agreed to by the Senate, at the conclusion of the 1½ hour debate on the bill, there will be a vote on the bill; or, if the time is yielded back and less time is needed, there will be a vote at that time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct; the vote will occur at the conclusion of the time allocated.

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME, KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is a pleasure today for me to call the attention of Senators to the progress being made in my State of Kansas to construct the Agricultural Hall of Fame. This is to be a national institution.

The idea for this hall of fame was first discussed in 1957, but it was not until 1959 that an active national effort was made to determine a suitable location for the project.

After much spirited competition among many of our agricultural cities, a 275-acre site was chosen near Bonner Springs in the rolling, scenic hills of northeastern Kansas.

This location is within easy driving distance by new superhighway to the Eisenhower Library and Museum at Abilene, Kans., and is only a few minutes from the Truman Library at Independence, Mo. Also within an easily traveled radius of the hall of fame site are the two Kansas universities at Lawrence and Manhattan. In addition, the hall of fame will be near the proposed Prairie National Park, adjacent to the recently dedicated $80 million Tuttle Creek Reservoir. It is easy to visualize many thousands of visitors annually to this area when the hall of fame is completed.

I am most happy today to be able to report that actual construction will begin on the Agricultural Hall of Fame within the next 2 months.

I congratulate those farsighted men who have devoted their time and money to this idea during the past 5 years. It is a tribute to their desire to guarantee this Nation a centrally located Museum of Agricultural History.

The future of this project has the devoted and active support of all surrounding communities, which is evidenced by the acquisition of an adjacent 350 acres by Wyandotte County for establishment of an attractive park for visitors. The State of Kansas will add another 70 acres to the area, insuring easy and convenient access to the hall of fame grounds from the Kansas Turnpike.

Mr. President, I would note again at this time that the Agricultural Hall of Fame is a national project and will by no means be a local shrine. I mention this point specifically because the composition of the hall of fame's board of directors comprises 36 men from varied business fields and locales across the Nation.

Further, this initial construction is being undertaken with donated funds and all future additions will be built with private financing.

The first building to be erected will include a museum, library, meeting room, and offices. Eventually, the site will have a model farm community, and an Indian village. For the city youngsters, a full-scale children's farm complete with farm animals on display. As the project grows, display halls for agricultural products from each State are planned, as well as exhibit areas to show the relationship between agriculture and industry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, as this program moves forward to completion, it will offer a resting place for historical documents and equipment related to the development of our great agricultural system in this country. Many irreplaceable relics will be on display for visitors to the hall of fame, and these exhibits will contribute a public preservatory for those books, documents, and machines relating to American agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for bringing to the attention of Senators the commencement of construction on this important project, the Agricultural Hall of Fame. Once this program gets underway and construction begins, not only will it result in greater interest in agriculture, but also it will be a great addition to preserving many memories of agriculture, which has been so important in the Nation's history.

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH DOES NOT SUPPORT TAX CUT AS WISE POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a careful analysis of economic growth in recent years by Mr. George Shea in this morning's Wall Street Journal calls into serious question the administration's proposal to increase long-term economic growth with a tax cut, including a deliberate deficit.

Mr. Shea analyzes precisely what has happened, and why, in economic growth in this country since 1947. This analysis, in my judgment, devastatingly repudiates the administration's case for a tax cut.

Mr. Shea's careful and balanced discussion makes this interesting conclusion:

> All of this raises a very critical question about the administration's claim that a one-shot tax cut within 2 years would so stimulate business that the growth thereafter would be on a lastingly higher rate. And it raises the further question whether growth rates are wholly or even largely matters of Federal fiscal policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Outlook: Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

The current debate over Federal economic policies, including whether to cut taxes, centers around two claims. One is that economic growth has slowed down sharply since 1957; the other that Federal measures can give the growth rate a lasting acceleration. Both claims are questionable.

Walter W. Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in a speech late last week referred, as he has many times before, to changes in growth rates. He said that from 1947 to 1956 the rate averaged 4 percent a year, whereas since then it has fallen to 3 percent. His figures, of course, are correct, but they need to be read in the light of fluctuations in growth rates within those periods.

This has become especially easy through a study by the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit group. The study presents the growth rates of U.S. gross production, adjusted for price changes, from any quarter-year in the whole period 1947–62 to any other quarter in those years. For instance, it shows a growth from the second to the third quarters of 1950, when the Korean war started, at the huge annual rate of 18.6 percent. And it shows a decline in gross national product between the third and fourth quarters of 1953, in the 1953–54 business recession, at the disheartening rate of 7 percent.

More important, the study makes possible the examination of growth rates in such a way as to eliminate almost completely distortions from recessions and recoveries. The ideal way to do this is to look at growth between tops of booms—or, alternatively, between the bottoms of recessions.

When the figures are looked at in this manner, they show in the first place that there was rapid growth in the late 1940's and early 1950's because Korean wartime spending was superimposed on a strong business expansion. In the second place they show that the growth slowed down sharply from 1953 to 1957 because a decline in defense spending partially offset another strong business expansion. And in the third place they show that since 1957 the growth rate has improved again.

This pattern is wholly different from the one arrived at by comparing only 1947–56 and the years since then. The first of those two segments is a period in which the growth figure is pushed up by starting with 1947, a year before the 1948 end of the first postwar boom, as well as by Korean wartime spending.

In contrast, the true fluctuations in growth rates are revealed by examining what's happened in each of the last four down-and-up business cycles. In the first of these, from the top quarter of 1948 to the top quarter of 1953, the growth rate was 5.2 percent annually. In the next, to the top quarter of 1957, the rate fell to 2.3 percent. But from then to the 1960 top it improved again to 2.7 percent. And from 1960 to the end of 1962 (which as shown in the chart (chart not printed in Record) was not yet the top of the latest recovery) the rate improved further to 3.1 percent.

The influence on these growth rates of Government defense spending was critical. Such spending rose enormously in the first of the foregoing four cycles, from $12 billion in fiscal 1948 to $50 billion in fiscal 1953. In the second cycle defense spending fell back, to as low as $40 billion in 1956, with a recovery to $43 billion in 1957. Since then it has risen gradually to $53 billion this year.

These facts suggest that, while it is true a sharp increase in Federal spending can bring a higher rate of economic growth, the influence of the spending tends to diminish unless the spending itself continues to expand. Such spending in the latest 1960–62 cycle has been somewhat higher than the highest defense spending rate reached in 1948–53, and total Government spending has also been higher, but the growth rate of the economy has been considerably lower.

All of this raises a very critical question about the administration's claim that a one-shot tax cut within 2 years would so stimulate business that the growth thereafter would be on a lastingly higher rate. And it raises the further question whether growth rates are wholly or even largely matters of Federal fiscal policy.

Greatly varying governmental policies mark nations such as Japan, Germany, France, and Russia, which in recent years have grown much faster than we have. But they have had one advantage in common. That has been the opportunity to copy what we have done, because their economic systems have been less advanced than ours. They started much lower and they are still considerably lower.

The reason that has been such an advantage for them is that growth is not merely a matter of steel and other metals, nor even of autos, toasters, and other products that are already known. Today's growth would be impossible if we had only the scientific and productive knowledge of the horse-and-buggy days. Growth is a matter of new ideas.

Nor are the ideas needed only in the realm of production and manufacturing. The supermarket and the shopping center have also been ideas that have contributed to U.S. growth, and which are only now beginning to be copied abroad.

A nation which can copy ideas from elsewhere can surely grow faster than the nation which is at the head of the parade and thus must generate most of the new ideas for its own growth. And there is also another factor, which is that in periods of rapid growth such a nation uses up in part its stock of ideas accumulated during a previous fallow period, such as the depression 1930's and the World War I years.

None of the foregoing is intended as an argument that a tax cut would not be beneficial. Such a cut doubtless would make usable some new ideas barred by present tax rates. What is questionable is the double claim that the United States has been stagnating, and that acceptance of the Government's proposals would automatically push the growth rate up to a much ligher level on a lasting basis.

George Shea.

UNFAIR COMPETITION FROM OIL TAX GIVEAWAY FOR OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the best and most neglected arguments in favor of the administration's plea for modifying, moderately, the oil depletion giveaway was revealed in the Wall Street Journal this morning. The Wall Street Journal, in a front-page article, pointed out how some oil firms are entering the real estate field, and how the tax credit boosts profits.

The article states, in part:

> Oil companies can deduct from taxable profits up to 27.5 percent of gross income from producing wells, to cover depletion of oil reserves. They also can subtract capital spent on drilling for new wells. If these credits exceed total profit from oil operations they can be charged against income from other activities—such as land developments.

The article also says, about Sunset International, a real estate-oil firm:

> Mainly because of land development revenues sheltered by oil tax credits, Sunset's profits rose to $3.2 million last year from $500,000 in 1959. Last year Sunset garnered 72 percent of its $16 million in operating revenues from sales of houses and homesites. But while it's now emphasizing land development, Sunset will remain active in the oil business, says its president, Morton A. Sterling, because of the tax advantages.

The Wall Street Journal points out that this is not an exceptional practice. It is very common among oil companies.

What does this kind of competition do to normal real estate operations which cannot rely on the oil tax bonanza? How can an ordinary business compete under such circumstances?

In the debate which I anticipate will occur in the Senate on the administration oil depletion reform proposal—which I shall, of course, support—this unfair impact on other businessmen should be considered.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some Oil Firms Enter Real Estate Field—Tax Credits Boost Profits—Humble Teams With Del Webb To Develop Space-Age City—Trees Camouflage Old Wells

(By Lawrence Lynch)

Los Angeles.—For years oil companies have been searching for wealth under the surface of the earth. Now some of them are taking advantage of their special tax status to bid for profits above ground, in real estate development.

Sunset International Petroleum Corp. is developing planned communities at Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, and Sacramento. Christiana Oil Corp., Los Angeles, is investing millions in ocean-front homesites in southern California. And Humble Oil & Refining Co. is helping finance a new city near the U.S. Manned Space Craft Center at Houston, Tex.

Like many other real estate developments, such ventures by oil companies have been prompted by rapid population growth in some areas. But unlike most other land developers, oil companies often can shelter profits from their real estate operations with tax credits that might otherwise be lost.

Oil companies can deduct from taxable profits up to 27.5 percent of gross income from producing wells, to cover depletion of oil reserves. They also can subtract capital spent on drilling for new wells. If these credits exceed total profit from oil operations they can be charged against income from other activities—such as land developments. Although President Kennedy has recommended tightening depletion allowance provisions, oilmen believe that any changes will be minor, and probably won't come during this congressional session.

COMMUNITY CORE

Oil companies turned developers usually begin in building a community core—a number of homes and commercial structures. Then, while they continue construction themselves, they also try to sell much of the surrounding land to other builders at a profit.

Thus Sunset International sold 391 homes and 360 homesites in its 1960 fiscal year, its first year of development activities. In 1962 Sunset sold only 245 houses but the number of homesite sales jumped to 605.

Mainly because of land development revenues sheltered by oil tax credits, Sunset's profits rose to $3.2 million last year from $500,000 in 1959. Last year Sunset garnered 72 percent of its $16 million in operating revenues from sales of houses and homesites. But while it's now emphasizing land development, Sunset will remain active in the oil business, says its president, Morton A. Sterling, because of the tax advantages.

Christiana Oil has formed Huntington Harbour Corp. to develop its ocean-front land in southern California. Christiana owns 80 percent of Huntington; outside investors own the rest. L. W. Douglas, Jr., president of Christiana, says development costs and other expenses will total about $35 million. He predicts that over the next 6 years the 877-acre development will yield gross revenues of $102 million. About 140 homes ranging in price from $50,000 to $100,000 will be completed by July, he says.

Sunset and Christiana both acquired the land for surface development since 1960. Some other oil companies are breaking ground for homes on land that was purchased long ago, when oil companies could buy clear title to vast acreages at relatively low prices.

TEAMING UP

Humble Oil, a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), is building its community near Houston on 30,875 acres it purchased in 1938 to get at oil discovered there. Last year the Government decided to build the Space Craft Center on a 1,700-acre tract of Humble property. Humble then brought in a construction firm, Del E. Webb Corp., to help fashion what it envisages as a city of 180,000 persons.

Humble, which retains a majority interest in the venture, and Webb have invested $9 million in the first section of their Texas community, due to open in August. It includes 12 model homes, 44 apartments, a shopping center, a community center, golf course, motor hotel and industrial building. Next year they expect to begin pumping $25 million a year into the development.

The involvement of oil companies in real estate development often means now homes are going up near eyesores presented by old oil wells. In such cases, surface pumps generally can be concealed behind foilage.

Huntington Beach Co. in Los Angeles, 64 percent owned by Standard Oil Co. of California, holds title to 1,500 acres south of Los Angeles encompassing 850 producing wells and 2.5 miles of beach. The company is negotiating with a developer and hopes to begin homebuilding next year. Oil wells near residences would be landscaped out of sight says William E. Foster, engineering supervisor for Huntington Beach.

SENIOR CITIZENS?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent days there has been a conference in Washington of so-called senior citizens.

Who is a senior citizen? A report issued by the President's Council on Aging is a refreshing exception to the tendency to refer to older people as a special group, as senior citizens.

In 1870, nearly 100 years ago, Otto Von Bismarck proposed a social security law in Germany and at that time fixed the age for retirement at 65 years. Nearly 100 years have elapsed since that time. The life span has been greatly extended by the advance of science. Life expectancy has become much greater now than it was even 20 years ago. Insurance companies, which are still basing their rates on old longevity tables, have prospered unduly because of that fact.

Yet some industries in this country still are so unrealistic as to fix the age of arbitrary retirement at 65, whereas all of us know some men of 55 are older in appearance and in action than are other men who are 65 years of age.

Frankly, it seems to me that the name "senior citizens" should be discarded. It

should certainly be discarded as applying to those between the ages of 65 and 75.

There are 18 million elderly men and women in this country. Each is an individual. Their circumstances, abilities, and wealth vary widely. Included in this number—these so-called senior citizens, an appellation which the junior Senator from Ohio very definitely does not like—are three ex-Presidents, nearly 10 percent of the population of the United States, nearly 1½ million men and women living on farms, more than 1 out of 4 U.S. Senators, almost 2 million people working full time, and 2 of 9 U.S. Supreme Court Justices.

Also, there are more than 10,000 people in the United States who are more than 100 years of age. There are over 12½ million people receiving social security benefits—men and women who paid premiums into the social security insurance fund and now are receiving retirement benefits based upon what they had paid in. There are more than 2,300,000 war veterans over 65 years of age. There are more than 3 million people, men and women, who migrated from the old countries to this country who are over 65 years of age.

Therefore, it seems to me, if we are going to term these various individuals in any one class or category, it is high time to discard the appellation "senior citizens."

REGULATION OF SMOKING PRODUCTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, earlier this month I introduced a bill to put smoking products under the authority of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. My bill (S. 1682) which is cosponsored by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] would give to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the same authority to promulgate rules and regulations in labeling smoking products as he now exercises regarding food, drugs, and cosmetics.

Since my bill was introduced, the American Heart Association has announced that, on the basis of a study made since 1960 on the effect of cigarette smoking on heart disease, the association has adopted a stand to discourage smoking, particularly among teenagers.

In a study completed before 1960, the association called attention to the statistical relationship between smoking and illness or death from coronary heart disease, but it was not until the new evidence came to light that the association determined to try to dissuade young people from acquiring the smoking habit.

I ask unanimous consent that two news accounts of the association's stand and findings be carried in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 9, 1963]

Cigarette Link to Heart Disease Is Reported in Scientific Study

New York, June 8.—The American Heart Association said today a scientific study conducted since 1960 strongly suggests there is a relationship between cigarette smoking and heart disease.

The association for the first time adopted a stand to discourage smoking, particularly among teenagers and adults with a high risk of coronary disease, as harmful to health.

The organization's board of directors adopted the report on smoking and cardiovascular diseases prepared by a committee of physicians and scientists.

The association's latest report reviews scientific evidence collected since 1960, when a previous study called attention to the statistical relationship between smoking and death or illness from coronary heart disease.

"This statistical association does not prove that heavy cigarette smoking causes coronary heart disease," the report said, "but the data strongly suggest that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary heart disease or its complications."

The latest survey said that "no information has become available which contradicts or invalidates the 1960 report * * * (the) committee * * * expresses the feeling that interval developments since the 1960 report not only confirm but supplement the 1960 report."

It was recommended that the assoication join with other agencies "in educational programs for teenagers relative to cigarette smoking."

The committee said that strong encouragement to stop smoking be given "people who have a high risk of death and illness from coronary artery disease."

It said a high risk case was one with a family history of heart disease or stroke in middle age "and/or high blood pressure, high levels of fatty substances in the blood and other factors associated with greater proneness to atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries)."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 9, 1963]

Heart Society Maps Drive on Cigarettes

(By Alfred E. Clark)

The American Heart Association is starting a drive to discourage cigarette smoking, with emphasis on teenagers.

The association's 120-member board of directors adopted a resolution yesterday calling for "joint educational efforts with other voluntary and official health groups." The association's action was taken at its semiannual meeting at the Summit Hotel.

The move marks the first time the association, a volunteer public health agency, has decided to wage a public campaign on smoking.

A spokesman said that the first phase of the campaign would be devoted to educational work.

The Tobacco Industry Research Committee could not be reached for comment yesterday on the heart group's action.

In 1960, the association issued a report indicating that evidence was strong that heavy cigarette smoking contributed to or accelerated the development of coronary heart disease, the leading cause of death in the United States.

The report adopted by the board yesterday reviews the scientific evidence that has become available since 1960.

STATISTICS ARE CITED

"No evidence has become available since 1960 to contradict or invalidate the 1960 statement," the board said. "Moreover, the additional evidence now at hand not only confirms but supplements the earlier findings.

"The harmful effect of cigarette smoking is in the statistical relationship between smoking and mortality from coronary artery disease. A number of ancillary features also are recognized, including emphysema, lung changes that makes breathing difficult, diseases of the blood vessels in the arms and legs and of course lung cancer."

The committee recommended that "strong encouragement to stop smoking, under physician supervision be given people who have a high risk of death and illness from coronary artery disease and myocardial infarction."

Included in the latter category were persons with high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, oversigns of hardening of the arteries, a family history of heart attacks and strokes in middle age, or a combination of any of these.

An ad hoc committee of four physicians and a layman compiled the report on which the board issued its recommendations.

The board urged that expanded biological and medical research be conducted in the following areas:

More and larger longitudinal epidemiologic studies of cigarette smoking in relation to coronary artery and other cardiovascular diseases;

Possible correlations of smoking in various population groups with diet, physical activity, heredity, emotions, blood clotting, blood fats, and other factors that may be or are known to be causally related to such manifestations of atherosclerosis as myocardial infarction and strokes.

Effects of duration and intensity of smoking on the risk of developing coronary artery disease;

Relationship of preclinical atherosclerotic lesions to smoking habits in individuals under 45 years of age;

Effects of tobacco and the constituents of tobacco smoke on the heart and blood vessels of animals and humans and on such disease processes as experimental atherosclerosis.

Studies of patients to determine the influence of smoking on known coronary artery disease and on intravascular clotting, thrombosis, including the effect of cessation of smoking on longevity and health in patients with established coronary artery disease.

Studies of the differences between the effects of cigarette and pipe or cigar smoking. The latter two presumably do not have a statistically significant association with cardiovascular diseases.

John Brundage of Montclair, N.J., an insurance executive, is chairman of the board of directors. The committee report was prepared by Dr. A. Carlton Ernstene of Cleveland; Dr. Frank W. Davis of Baltimore; Dr. Joseph T. Doyle of Albany and Dr. Henry C. McGill of New Orleans. The lay member was Felix E. Moore, Jr., of Ann Arbor, Mich.

U.S.S. "UTAH"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I continue my campaign to have the American flag raised over the U.S.S. *Utah* and the brave men entombed in her at Pearl Harbor by asking unanimous consent to have the most recent article on this matter published by the Navy Times included in the Congressional Record.

I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee [Mr. Russell] to schedule hearings on my bill as soon as the committee schedule, and his own schedule, permit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Memorial Day: A Cemetery Without a Flag

Fifty-four Navy men went unhonored this week as the Nation paused to pay homage to its war dead.

They've been unhonored and all but forgotten, except in the memories of their families and friends, for 21 years.

The flag they died for does not fly over their grave.

They're the crewmen entombed within the blackened hulk of the U.S.S. *Utah,* as she lies today exposed in shallow water north of Ford Island where she was sunk by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor Day.

She lies less than a mile from the U.S.S. *Arizona's* splendid memorial, but too far away to be definitely associated with *Arizona's* glory. The small plate which adorns the *Utah's* hull does not even list the names of the 54 officers and men who lie entombed within the ship. Nor are they listed within the *Arizona* Memorial.

One of the men—CWT. Peter Tomich—was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for heroism during the Japanese attack.

This may be the last year that the *Utah's* men go unhonored.

Last December, Navy Times and Parade magazine sparked a campaign to have a simple flagpole erected over the *Utah's* hulk to honor the men within her. Senator FRANK Moss, Democrat, of Utah, is spearheading the drive and has introduced S. 703 to provide for flying the colors over the half-sunken ship. Thirty-seven other Senators have added their names as cosponsors. The bill now awaits hearings by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Here, in response to requests received since Navy Times started publicizing the neglected *Utah* men, are the names of those entombed within her hulk, as furnished by the Navy:

Lt. Comdr. Rudolph P. Bielka, Lt. (jg.) John E. Black, Lt. (jg.) Herold A. Harveson, Lt. (jg.) John G. Little III, Lt. Comdr. Charles O. Michael, S2c. William D. Arbuckle, F3c. Joseph Barta, S1c. Virgil C. Bicham, F1c. John T. Blackburn, F3c. William F. Brunner, OC2 Feliciano T. Bugarin, S2c. George Chestnutt, Jr., S2c. Lloyd D. Clippard.

F1c. Joseph U. Connor, F1c. John R. Crain, S1c. Billy R. Davis, S2c. Leroy Dennis, S2c. William H. Dosser, S1c. Vernon J. Eidsvig, QM1c. Melvyn A. Gandre, BM2c. Kenneth M. Gift, S2c. Charles N. Gregoire, S2c. Clifford D. Hill, Bkr1c. Emery L. Houde, S1c. Leroy H. Jones, SC2c. William A. Juedas.

Y3c. John L. Kaelin, GM3c. Eric T. Kampmeyer, F1c. Joseph N. Karabon, S1c. William H. Kent, GM3c. George W. La Rue, S2c. Kenneth L. Lynch, S2c. William E. Marshall, Jr., EM3c. Rudolph M. Martinez, S2c. Marvin E. Miller, S2c. Donald C. Norman, F2c. Orris N. Norman, EM2c. Edwin N. Odgaard, CSK(PA) Elmer A. Parkey.

SC3c. Forrest H. Perry, S1c. James W. Phillips, MM1c. Walter H. Ponder, SF3c. Frank E. Reed, S1c. Ralph E. Scott, F1c. Henson T. Shouse, S2c. Robert D. Smith, S2c. Joseph B. Sousley, F3c. Gerald V. Strinz, CWT. Peter Tomich, F3c. Elmer H. Ulrich, F3c. Michael W. Villa, FC1c. Vernard O. Wetrick, F1c. Glenn Albert White.

WILLIAM C. NUNLEY NAMED "DRIVER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. William C. Nunley, a Kansan from Baxter Springs, has just been awarded the coveted title of "Driver of the Year" for 1963 by the American Trucking Associations.

Mr. Nunley's outstanding professional career as a truck driver spans 30 years and 2,225,000 miles without an accident. He received this award from the American Trucking Associations as a representative of the trucking industry's model of safety and courtesy—and occasional heroism.

During this period of an unblemished driving record, the affable, energetic Nunley was cited by company officials for assisting "hundreds of motorists" in trouble and for "acting heroically on occasions."

For instance, in March of last year, authorities credited Nunley with saving an ambulance driver from death or severe injury at the hands of a berserk mental patient. The man, who had been sedated and secured for a hospital transfer, slipped his bonds near Wagoner, Okla., and struck the driver on the head with a metal cane, causing the ambulance to go into a ditch. The driver was able to hail the passing Nunley who helped him subdue his attacker.

In another instance, when a crippling ice storm had highway traffic tied up all over the State, Nunley encountered an Army officer whose car had broken down near Adair, Okla., while he was taking his seriously ill wife to a hospital. Realizing the hazards an ambulance would face on the icy roads and the importance of time, Nunley assumed the risk himself and towed the couple in their vehicle to Pryor, Okla., where the woman was able to receive medical attention.

To exemplify the care that Nunley, a nonsmoking teetotaler, takes in his everyday operations, company spokesmen stated he has safely hauled an estimated 328 million pounds of valuable freight without incurring as much as a scratched fender in his 26 years with Yellow Transit. During that entire period, and the 4 previous years with two other Oklahoma-based companies, Nunley has never been charged with a moving traffic violation, nor arrested for a traffic offense.

A tall man with a ready smile, Nunley and his wife are members of the First Christian Church of Baxter Springs. Hunting and fishing are his hobbies, but Nunley also finds time to work with youth organizations as a baseball and basketball coach, as well as making radio and television appearances for safety causes in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma region.

It is my pleasure to call this outstanding record to the attention of the Senate, as I feel that Mr. Nunley deserves the commendation of all of us.

AMISH BLACKSMITH IMPRISONED FOR RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS AGAINST BEARING ARMS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my attention was called today, by a letter from a prominent clubwoman of Ashland County, Ohio, Mrs. Robert L. Davis, whom I know personally and respect highly, to a very sad situation in her county. She writes:

> A young Amish blacksmith has been sentenced to serve 2 years, probably on a prison farm, not because he has committed a crime, but because his religious convictions prohibit him from bearing arms against his fellow men.
>
> He went to Cleveland under the impression that it was only for a hearing of his case. And in this busy farm season it must have been a hardship for him to close his shop for even 1 day. It is my understanding that an FBI investigator from Mansfield had visited the shop and stated that, in his opinion, this man should never be drafted into the peacetime Army. But Johnny Keim of R.F.D. No. 5, Ashland, is now behind bars.
>
> For the next 2 years, he will be prevented from using his talent and strength as an independent member of society. Instead, he will be supported by the State; a crushing indignity for a member of the Amish sect.

Mr. President, I know that is a fact. The Amish people in Ohio and our neighboring State of Pennsylvania are fine, law-abiding, God-fearing people, who work hard and never knowingly disobey the law.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and I have introduced a legislative proposal to exempt those of the Amish faith from the operation of our social security insurance system, because Amish families have always taken care of their aged and incapacitated. They are hard-working people, men, women, and children, and they never ask for charity or help from their Government, nor for any special privileges. They have asked for no Government support and have strong religious scruples against receiving any insurance benefits, including social security benefits. Although I am a fervent advocate of our social security system, I do not believe that the U.S. Government should remain in the position of having to enforce social security laws against Amish citizens in violation of their religion.

Mrs. Davis writes:

> These people ask nothing more than to be allowed to live according to their faith. They set an example that few of us would have the courage to follow. Surely it is time for legislation to make it legally possible for them to pursue their own way of life.
>
> The Keims have not asked for assistance. It is being sought because those of us who know them value their friendship and respect them.

Then she adds—and I wholeheartedly agree with her:

> Americans have no right, in my opinion, to speak smugly of religious freedom and still tolerate this injustice.

Mr. President, I shall do thorough research on this subject, and will strongly urge that justice be rendered in this case.

VALENTINA VLADIMIROVNA TERESHKOVA, FIRST RUSSIAN WOMAN ASTRONAUT IN ORBIT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova has made this a great day for women as well as her nation. Her achievement is a very significant indication of the place that women are being given in Russia. It is a further indication of the physical capabilities of Russian women.

Russian women have long been bringing honor and credit to their country. They won the Olympics for Russia with their excellence in gymnastics.

Back on January 19 of this year, I made a speech in which I spoke of the Russians putting a woman astronaut in space orbit in the near future. Shortly thereafter, an unidentified Air Force spokesman in the Pentagon made a statement to the press disputing and discrediting my statement. I wonder how he feels now and I wonder what the press thinks of his authoritativeness in current intelligence and accuracy.

Today's Washington Post has an excellent editorial on the first woman astronaut. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Valentina

We salute Miss Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova in becoming the first woman to enter space. Regardless of what further feats she accomplishes with the Soviet cosmonaut she joined in orbit, she has brought great honor upon herself and her country and particularly upon her sex. Indeed, her achievement is so warmly numbing that it almost displaces concern for her well-being and safe return. May she land on earth with the same ease and aplomb as that with which she left it.

To be frank, pride of sex wars with incontrovertible fact in assessing the immediate impact of Miss Tereshkova's flight. If she has done irremediable damage to the male ego everywhere, she has also demonstrated the often underexploited talents of the female sex. If she has made space flight look easy ("even a woman * * *"), she has also made space technology—especially Soviet space technology—look excellent.

After all, unlike other space travelers, Miss Tereshkova is not an experienced pilot honed to a sharp edge by extending space training. She is, by Moscow's word, a nice single girl who fairly recently shifted from a cotton factory and a hobby of parachuting into the complexities and challenges of space. She is also a woman of impeccably proletarian origins and Communist upbringing. And she is said to be pretty, too.

The mission which she and Colonel Bykovsky are now conducting offers further evidence, of course, of the relative lag at the moment in the American manned-flight program. But such gray thoughts are for another day. Today belongs to Valentina. It is hers and, anxious for her comfort and safety, we cheer her on.

WASTE AND DUPLICATION IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the June 3, 1963, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This editorial pinpoints the herculean task being performed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, to remove the costly waste and duplication in defense procurement.

Whenever an attack on waste in Government spending is announced, the public lends its moral support and hopes the attack will be successful. But when the person in charge begins making specific cuts, he runs into determined opposition from the people being affected by the cut.

This process discourages many such campaigns, and they falter and fall by the roadside. But Secretary McNamara has not faltered from his goal of saving $3.5 billion in defense procurement annually, despite what many writers have described as overwhelming opposition from the defense industry and legislators who serve the industry's interests.

Mr. President, I have the greatest of faith in Secretary McNamara, and I believe his goal will be reached. But I will not let him fight this battle alone. The recent hearing by the Joint Economic Committee entitled "Impact of Military Supply and Service Activities on the Economy" confirms the success of Secretary McNamara's program, which already has resulted in a saving of more than $1 billion in the fiscal 1964 budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 3, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Power Struggle Over Defense: II—Civilian Control, Profits of Military Contractors at Issue in McNamara Fight

(By Richard Harwood)

Washington.—Defense Secretary McNamara's felicitous relations with Congress and the military lobbies have been badly damaged in the past 12 months.

The source of the disenchantment is a series of decisions that has eliminated billions of dollars in defense contracts throughout the country and has forced the military services to bow to the practice as well as the principle of civilian supremacy in the Pentagon.

These decisions have affected the profit-and-loss ledgers of big military contractors. They have affected the economies of areas represented by powerful politicians in and out of Congress. They have curtailed the power of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to embark on billion-dollar weapons projects that have proven in the past to be impractical or duplicative.

As the knowledge has sunk in that McNamara intends to stand by these decisions, despite intense political pressures, he has become the target of a concerted counterattack.

One clash was with Representative Carl Vinson, of Georgia, the powerful chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Vinson has been described by the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal as the "acknowledged backstage boss of the Pentagon. Top military leaders have always courted his favor with unabashed ardor."

Vinson for several years has been insisting that the Defense Department proceed with the development and production of the RS–70 airplane. It would be a supersonic platform for launching air-to-ground missiles, and would cost, ultimately, several billion dollars.

McNamara doubted the practicality of this weapon. It would do nothing, he said, that a Minuteman or Polaris missile can't do better and cheaper. Therefore, he decided last year to proceed very slowly with the RS–70 project.

Vinson, however, was adamant. His committee voted $320 million more for the project than McNamara requested and this year, again at Vinson's insistence, Congress has approved $363,700,000 more for the RS–70 than McNamara wants.

This incident did more than ruffle Vinson's feelings. It profoundly disturbed the Air Force and the aircraft industry. They charged that McNamara was intent on abandoning manned aircraft. The Air Force Association equated the decision to "unilateral disarmament." Senator Barry Goldwater, a reserve Air Force general, said the decision was insupportable.

The prime contractor for the RS–70 is North American Aviation, a California-based firm. But substantial subcontracts for the plane were earmarked for more than 30 States.

Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric stated in an interview recently that, in his opinion, the selection of the subcontractors for the RS–70 was "skillfully contrived to enlist maximum congressional support. It could have just happened that way, but I have enough of a jaundiced eye to think it was planned that way."

Last year the Defense Department phased out the production of fighter planes at the Republic Aircraft plant on Long Island, N.Y. More than 13,000 jobs were to be eliminated.

One of the most concerted political efforts of its kind ever seen in Washington was begun to prevent this job loss. The White House was bombarded with thousands of petitions from Long Island. The entire New York congressional delegation, plus Governor Nelson Rockefeller, put extreme pressure on both the White House and the Defense Department.

Finally, New York Representative Emanuel Celler was able to announce: "The extraordinary congressional, State and local effort to prevent a 13,000-plus employment cutback at Republic has resulted in an overall $80 million subcontracting program to Republic in the F–4–H (fighter plane) production."

Today, aircraft employment on Long Island is greater than ever.

The newest struggle for a defense contract far overshadows the Republic affair. Involved is a contract for between $6 and $7 billion for the development and production of 1,700 supersonic fighter planes for the Navy and Air Force.

The plane is called the TFX (tactical fighter experimental).

The Defense Department after 2 years of study and over the objections of both the Navy and Air Force, awarded the prime contract to General Dynamics Corp. instead of its competitor, Boeing Aircraft.

This decision brought down upon Secretary McNamara the concerted wrath of the military, the aircraft industry and powerful Members of Congress. The Air Force and Navy were outraged—especially the Navy—because McNamara insisted that the TFX be designed for use of both services. Each wanted a separate plane, tailored to its own specifications.

McNamara and Gilpatric regard the TFX case as the supreme test thus far of civilian authority in the Pentagon and of the power of the military-industrial complex.

Close working relationships between particular services and particular companies were explored 3 years ago by the Hébert investigating committee in the House.

The committee discovered that high-ranking Pentagon officers were flocking into the offices of defense contractors immediately after retirement. General Dynamics Corp., the successful TFX bidder, had 27 generals and admirals and 186 officers of lesser rank on its payroll at the time of the inquiry.

Lockheed Aircraft had also hired 27 generals and admirals and 171 field-grade officers. Fifteen general officers had been employed by Radio Corp. of America, 14 by International Telephone & Telegraph, 11 by General Tire & Rubber.

The committee concluded, "the coincidence of contracts and personal contacts with firms represented by retired military officers and retired civilian officials sometimes raises serious doubts as to the complete objectivity of some of these decisions."

The Hébert committee found instances of expensive entertainment of active-duty officers by major contractors, including a trip to the Bahamas for 26 officers who were guests of the Martin Co., an aircraft producer.

Senator Case, of New Jersey, has introduced legislation to require that public records be kept of every communication between Congressmen and the Defense Department in regard to contracts. Case also favors a permanent Senate watchdog committee to oversee defense-contract awards.

So long as the defense program involves big money and vitally affects the economy of every State and virtually every congressional district, it will, in McNamara's words, inevitably generate political pressures on Defense officials.

If the TFX investigation or some other development should cast a political shadow on the decisionmakers their public support would quickly evaporate.

That is the great problem facing Secretary McNamara today. And he is being tested in a congressional climate already infected with cynicism toward politics and defense.

PRESIDENT'S EQUAL RIGHTS SPEECH OF JUNE 1, 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the President's speech appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded reason, human experience, and true equality under the Constitution.

The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of Federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept those of a different race as guests creates a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

The outstanding distinction between a government of free men and a socialistic or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas statism denies property rights.

The phrase "from each according to his ability and to each according to his need" may have greater emotional appeal than "work hard to acquire property and the law will protect you in its enjoyment." However, Marxism has not worked and can never work because it does not take human nature into account. To rebut the emotional appeal, we have the hard, undeniable fact that in our free enterprise system we have plenty, whereas the Marxists—though they have never been able to apply literally their avowed creed—all suffer from scarcity and privation.

Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by process of agitation, demonstration, intimidation, law defiance, and civil disobedience.

I do not believe that the American people will be easily frightened into discarding our system for adventures into socialism that have been discredited wherever tried.

The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for law, whether it be legally enacted ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national charter—the Constitution.

I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law whose only offense was undertaking to maintain order and protect private property.

The South has its shortcomings as well as other areas. But a calculated campaign waged by the metropolitan press, television and radio, has magnified the unfortunate occurrences in the South while crimes of violence in other areas have been minimized. This has generated bitterness and hatred against the white people of the Southern States almost amounting to a national disease. It is also encouraging a condition bordering on anarchy in many communities. These terrible conditions are sure to further deteriorate with increasing disorder unless the President of the United States desists from using threats of mass violence to rush his social equality legislation through the Congress.

No American citizen has the right to select the laws he will obey and those he will disobey.

The President of the United States has a higher call to leadership than to use threats of mass violence and disregard of reasonable local laws as a means of securing action in the courts and Congress, however desirable he may regard it to be.

The Congress of the United States, by an enactment of March 1, 1875, declared that all persons were entitled "to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement." The Supreme Court of the United States on October 15, 1883, declared this Federal restriction upon the use and control of private property to be unconstitutional.

When white citizens protest against the Supreme Court decision in the school cases, they are immediately told that those decisions are the "law of the land" and that, if they protest too vigorously or violently, the armed might of the United States will be summoned to subdue them. Our Negro citizens, who are conducting daily demonstrations against the "law of the land" as established by the Supreme Court in the civil rights cases in 1883, are encouraged to increase the velocity of their demonstrations by the belief that the Attorney General, the FBI, the hundreds of U.S. marshals, and the Armed Forces of the United States will protect them in their demonstrations. The President of the United States cites these demonstrations are reasons for a legislative stampede to change this "law of the land." All this in the name of American equality and justice.

The President and the Attorney General now say that they will predicate this new thrust for race mixing on the already tortured commerce clause of the Constitution. If the commerce clause will sustain an act to compel the white owner of a dining hall to accept a Negro against his wishes, it can be used to sustain the validity of legislation that will compel his admittance into the living room or bedroom of any citizen.

I believe in equality before the law for every American. In equal measure, I reject the idea that Federal power may be invoked to compel the mingling of the races in social activities to achieve the nebulous aim of social equality.

Every Negro citizen possesses every legal right that is possessed by any white citizen, but there is nothing in either the Constitution or Judaeo-Christian principles or commonsense and reason which would compel one citizen to share his rights with one of another race at the same place and at the same time. Such compulsion would amount to a complete denial of the inalienable rights of the individual to choose or select his associates.

I hope that the American people will not be swept further down the road to socialism by the present unprecedented wave of propaganda. To me, the President's legislative proposals are clearly destructive of the American system and the constitutional rights of American citizens. I shall oppose them with every means and resource at my command. I do not believe a majority of the Congress will be frightened by thinly veiled threats of violence.

NEED FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS STUDY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, one of the leading citizens of Kansas, the Honorable Alf M. Landon, continues not only to study serious domestic and international issues of the day, but seeks to give voice to his experience and continuing interest by speaking out in deserving praise or constructive criticism.

That the subject of his analysis, or his opinion upon an issue, may be controversial, never deterred either his willingness or his desire to speak out.

On June 8, 1963, in Wichita, Kans., Mr. Landon addressed himself to the need for an industrial relations study. I ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted in the RECORD, so that the students of the same may understand his viewpoints and the reasons thereof.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS STUDY

(Address by Alf M. Landon, Midwest States Conference of Machinists, Wichita, Kans., June 8, 1963)

Today we are facing explosive conflicts in the world at large—and the Western Hemisphere in particular. At home, explosive racial conflict—and a rigid punitive attack on organized labor through miscalled right-to-work legislation.

It is a time for all good Americans to start thinking and seeking the answers for our complex and perplexing labor-industry problems.

Since the days little girls in pigtails worked in sweatshops in the East—and little boys in knee britches worked on the breakers in the coal mines—I have believed that labor had the right to organize and bargain collectively to protect its own rights and the rights of its women and children. I have had no reason to change my mind.

The problems of the past have grown out of all proportion in the last few years. Automation—the pace of our modern civilization—have so changed all of our old concepts that we need a fresh beginning. The impact of the machine has affected not only production methods but it has changed the accompanying problems of man's relations with each other.

Now we have all of the old labor-management problems—time, wages, working conditions—and we also have an entirely new set of problems that outmode present practice in many areas of cooperation and controversy.

These new problems are not going to be solved by attempting to weaken labor organizations by laws such as the miscalled right-to-work proposals. Equity in labor relations can only be delayed by such attempts to impose hobbles by law.

You men and women are here today to plan the union course for the next year. That is your way—the American way—to handle the collective-bargaining technique. By such methods, you make it simple for management to respond. If management knows what labor wants—and the precise position of the rank and file—it simplifies management's problem of isolating what it is they can give.

Labor needs to know what it is that management will and can give. With this information available to both sides, sensible bargaining can proceed with a minimum of friction in the interests of both industry and labor—and the public.

There is a crying need for more such practical commonsense approaches to these problems. I am favorably impressed by the proposal in steel and autos to open negotiations a year in advance of contract termination to define problems and areas of conflict in an atmosphere free of tensions and emotionalism of round-the-clock discussions and a midnight deadline.

That is thoughtful and responsible industry and union leadership at its best. That is the way in which to achieve lasting good relations with the public.

I have been impressed by several of the actions taken by the Machinists Union and its leadership. Under the wise guidance of Al Hayes, your president, and Ray Siemiller, your ranking vice president—there has been a whole new concept of labor-management techniques set up in the aerospace industry.

The aerospace conference—consisting of all of your machinists lodges concerned in this new industry—studies the problem—defines the issue. That parallels action by the Aerospace Industries Association, so that both labor and management are ready to meet on a prepared agenda when the time for new negotiation arrives.

I am also much interested in the recently concluded meeting of your automation foundation, which organized jointly with U.S. industries, to deal with this basic labor problem. I have no doubt that, if we could find a solution for the problem of automation, we would solve most of the present difficulties bedeviling our industrial age.

The solution will not come easily. But it certainly cannot come if no attempt is made to find it.

I congratulate the Machinists Union—its leaders and its counterparts on the side of management—for a reasonable and reasoning approach to this fundamental problem.

I congratulate also the leaders of industry and unions on the way they are working together to combat the spread of communism in the great countries to the south of us.

That is a responsible approach based on intelligent self-interest—and public interest.

That is the way of true industrial peace.

But there are those on the side of management who do not see eye to eye with such methods. There are—on the side of labor organizations—a few selfish misguided leaders who see labor organization as a means to personal power. Both do great harm to our wonderful country.

I would like to address myself to the public in these areas for just a moment.

There are some 17 million men and women in the ranks of organized labor in this country. That is a tremendous cross-section of our population. Here are the men who labor with their hands—the women who use needles—the workers who tap the resources of our mines and oil wells. In fact, everything which is produced, shipped or serviced goes through the hands of these Americans.

These Americans may have a little less money—a little less leisure—than others. But they put on their pants one leg at a time and they are not 9 feet tall. In short, they are human beings with all the strengths and frailties of human beings.

The point I am making is that, by and large, union members and their leaders are responsible members of society. They are entitled to the same respect, the same protections, that other citizens of our great country receive. They should not be the object of punitive legislation. They should be governed no differently than other citizens.

The Wagner Act begat the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act begat the Landrum-Griffith Act. These were regulatory acts. Their administration is another matter. They are not punitive in nature. But we have in the country today a philosophy which seeks to impose a compulsory open shop on labor. It is punitive legislation—bad legislation. These are the so-called right-to-work laws which now burden labor in some 20 States.

That is legislation which hits at the right to contract. That is legislation that strikes at the basis of union security, which is, in turn, the foundation of strong, dedicated, responsible labor leadership. That's what we need. That's the kind of thing I was talking about earlier in this speech.

The so-called right-to-work laws ban progress in good labor relations and industrial development in our great State and, in the long run, they benefit no one.

The proponents of this legislation—when campaigning in Kansas—said such a law would solve all of our problems of industrial growth and would attract new industry to our State. That has not proved out. Governor John Anderson, in a report to the legislature recently, revealed that Kansas has lost nearly 15,000 jobs of production workers in manufacturing in the years since so-called right-to-work went into effect. Four thousand Kansans lost their jobs in industry in just 1 year. Of course there were other factors involved.

But it is evident that the right-to-work law has not attracted new industry to Kansas. It was more emotional than realistic. It should be repealed.

Many responsible newspapers and leaders in the State also consider that the law should be repealed.

That is not an easy step. For the right-to-work amendment in Kansas was frozen into our constitution. That hampers efforts in seeking better ways to establish workable and equitable industrial relations of great and vital public interest. It does not make economic sense, or political sense, to short-circuit democratic processes by taking away from a State legislature its responsibility to enact legislation that fits changing conditions of an expanding complex industrial economy.

Only recently the President of the United States appointed a Committee under authority of the Taft-Hartley Act to study labor-management problems and suggest solutions. The workings of right-to-work laws in actual practice certainly should be studied and reported by that Committee.

Last February, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said, "Neither the traditional collective-bargaining procedures nor the present labor-dispute laws are working to the public's satisfaction, at least as far as major labor controversies are concerned. It doesn't matter any more, really, how much the hurt has been real, or has been exaggerated. A decision has been made, and that decision is that if collective bargaining can't produce peaceable settlements of these controversies, the public will. I agree with that decision." And I will add that I agree with the Secretary, also.

But right-to-work legislation settles nothing. It is stagnation in a rapidly changing industrial era. Disillusionment is growing among those who thought Government could be it all.

I call upon the President's Labor Affairs Committee, created under the Taft-Hartley Act, to take our bewildering maze of Federal regulations—right-to-work laws—court decisions—under study, and come up with an informing, comprehensive, factual report covering the best way—or at least alternative ways—for settlement of industrial disputes in the interest of the rank and file of labor, management, and the general public that will forge a stronger connecting link in the interminable fight against communism's tyrannical dictators.

ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC DEPORTATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year marks the 22d anniversary of one of the most inhuman actions perpetrated by the Soviet Union during its long history of oppression and slavery. On June 14, 15, and 16, 1941, thousands of men, women, and children were forcibly deported from their homelands to unknown parts of Siberia. This barbaric act took place in the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which the Soviet Union had occupied in clear violation of nonaggression pacts with all three.

The Baltic States gained their independence during the years immediately following the First World War. Each nation based its sovereignty on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. All three eventually joined the League of Nations in order to better cooperate with other European nations in building a just and secure political and economic order. The League of Nations foundered, thus intensifying the trends leading to the Second World War. In the European power politics of this era, the destinies of smaller nations were determined by the expansionary dreams of ruthless dictators.

In 1940, the Baltic nations lost their independence and were absorbed into the Soviet Union. The human cost of Communist land hunger was enormous: 60,000 Estonians, 34,000 Latvians, and 45,000 Lithuanians were either murdered or deported on the charge of political unreliability. Among these unfortunates there were hundreds of children aged less than 1 year.

We, the citizens of the free world, should pause and remember the tragic history of the Baltic people. Above all, we should recognize that the perpetrator of these crimes—the Soviet Union—has not ceased to be a threat to our lives and liberties.

THE ARTS AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as chairman of the temporary Subcommittee on the Arts of the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare in the 87th Congress, I should like to direct our attention to the report released today and submitted to President Kennedy by Mr. August Heckscher, the President's special consultant on the arts.

Mr. Heckscher has completed his special assignment, entailing more than a year's highly constructive labor, and will be returning to the Twentieth Century Fund to resume his duties there. President Kennedy has accepted Mr. Heckscher's resignation with deep regret, and has extolled his report as opening up a "new and fruitful relationship between government and the arts."

I heartily applaud the results of Mr. Heckscher's most comprehensive study. He has contributed significantly to our understanding as we move ahead in the Congress to implement vitally needed legislation in promoting, inspiring, and assisting artistic achievement.

Senator HUMPHREY's bill, the National Arts and Cultural Development Act, which I have had the privilege of cosponsoring, gives us all immense impetus as we strive toward our goals. I hope we may be able to hold hearings on this bill soon.

Mr. Heckscher states:

> There has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization.

I would like to emphasize the truth inherent in these words, as well as the benefits which will accrue to our Nation in proportion as we incorporate our talents and abilities into an imaginative and forward-looking program for all forms of artistic accomplishment.

Mr. President, in paying tribute to Mr. Heckscher's work, I ask unanimous consent that his valuable report, entitled "The Arts and the National Government," be printed in the RECORD, together with the White House correspondence pertaining to Mr. Heckscher's resignation.

There being no objection, the report and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 10, 1963.

Mr. AUGUST HECKSCHER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AUGIE: I accept your resignation with great regret. As special consultant for the arts, you have initiated a new function in the Executive Office of the President. The best tribute to the success of your work is the decision to establish this function on a full-time and, I hope, permanent basis. I am sorry that you cannot take on the continuing assignment yourself; but I know your desire to return to your duties at the Twentieth Century Fund, and I am grateful for your willingness to stay until a successor has been named.

I have long believed, as you know, that the quality of America's cultural life is an element of immense importance in the scales by which our worth will ultimately be weighed. Your report on "The Arts and the National Government" opens up what I am confident will be a new and fruitful relationship between Government and the arts. Government can never take over the role of patronage and support filled by private individuals and groups in our society. But Government surely has a significant part to play in helping establish the conditions under which art can flourish—in encouraging the arts as it encourages science and learning.

We have much to learn in this complex and delicate area. Your report will guide your successor and the President's Advisory Council on the Arts in their study of these problems. I am glad to have your assurance that you will serve on the Council when it is appointed, and I have no question that your work in these past months will be regarded as a milestone in the process by which our Government has begun to fulfill its responsibilities to our culture.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MAY 28, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to submit the attached report covering my activities as special consultant on the arts since my appointment in March 1962. The report describes briefly the functioning of an office new to the Government, evaluates the impact of existing Government programs and policies upon the arts, and makes recommendations for action in various areas.

In submitting this report, I submit my resignation, having already served a good deal longer than the 6 months which we originally envisaged.

The major part of the report deals, as was suggested in your letter to me of December 5, 1961, with activities of the Federal departments and agencies as they relate to the arts; also with general policies, such as taxation, as they impinge upon this field. It has seemed wise, in addition, to consider ways in which the relationship of the Government to the private institutions of the arts and to the whole cultural life of the Nation could be made more explicit and helpful.

In the course of the work it became evident that Government policies and programs affecting the arts are far more varied and extensive than is generally supposed. It is not enough to look at labels or to judge by declared objectives. Many Government policies ostensibly having nothing to do with the arts affect them in a substantial way—often adversely. Conversely, many agencies which seem removed from this field have responsibilities which they have been endeavoring to carry out, frequently with little recognition and inadequate support. This report casts its net widely and groups activities related to the arts under functional, rather than departmental, categories.

In many of the areas surveyed the major need is for greater awareness of the possibilities for esthetic improvement and of a more sharply definied responsibility to the arts. Increased expenditures are secondary. Elsewhere new programs and additional funds should be authorized, if Government's concern with the arts is to be effectively expressed. Even these sums are comparatively small—yet a relatively small amount of money may make all the difference between mediocrity and excellence.

The period during which I have served as special consultant has been immensely challenging, the more so because of the widespread popular support evoked by your interest in this aspect of our national life. To have been able to help within your administration in shaping a new approach to the arts has been an opportunity for which I shall always be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST HECKSCHER.

THE ARTS AND THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

(Report to the President submitted by August Heckscher, special consultant on the arts, May 28, 1963)

(NOTE.—In the writing of this report, as in all the work of the office of the special consultant on the arts, I am immensely indebted to my assistant, Miss Barbara Donald. Without her constant and effective help it would have been impossible to fulfill even a part of the assignment. Mrs. Nancy Newhouse also deserves my thanks for her valuable assistance.—A. H.)

INTRODUCTION

Growth of the arts

Recent years have witnessed in the United States a rapidly developing interest in the arts. Attendance at museums and concerts has increased dramatically. Symphony orchestras, community theaters, opera groups, and other cultural institutions exist in numbers which would have been thought impossible a generation ago. The artist, the writer, and the performer hold new positions of respect in our society. Good books are bought in large quantities, as are recordings of good music and reproductions of the great art of all ages. The crafts are developing new standards of creativity.

The causes of this widespread popular interest lie, it appears, deep within the nature of our society. What might be taken at first glance as a fad, a passing enthusiasm, is actually related to some of the basic currents of the sixties in America. An increasing amount of free time, not only in the working week but in the life cycle as a whole; a new sense of the importance of cities; a recognition that life is more than the acquisition of material goods—these have contributed to the search for a new dimension of experience and enjoyment.

At the same time there has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization. The evident desirability of sending the best examples of America's artistic achievements abroad has led to our looking within, to asking whether we have in fact cultivated deeply enough the fields of creativity. We have come to feel as a people not only that we should be stronger but that we should have a higher degree of national well-being in proportion as the arts come into their own.

Despite this new enthusiasm, despite favorable social and political tendencies, the condition of the professional arts in the United States is not in all regards satisfactory. The very demands which changing public tastes have made upon established artistic institutions have strained the financial resources available to them. Older forms of patronage have not in all cases been adequately replaced. A longstanding weakness in what might be called the cultural infrastructure has led to institutions inadequately supported and managed and, as in the theater, to a lack of the stability and continuity which provide the grounds where talent can develop and mature. Often inadvertently, government has imposed obstacles to the growth of the arts and to the well-being of the individual artist.

The role of government

Government in the United States has not in the past showed consistent concern for the state of the arts. There have been moments, particularly the formative period of the Republic, when statesmen possessed the clear realization that the forms of art reflected the inner ideals of the social order. The planning of cities and the construction of public buildings were expected to match the concepts of order and human dignity inherent in the country's laws and institutions. This awareness was dimmed during most of the period of westward expansion and industrial progress. But in the 20th century American Presidents again began to sense a relationship between government and the health of the cultural life. Before Franklin Roosevelt inaugurated immensely fertile experiments in this field, Theodore Roosevelt had brought to the White House artists, scholars and poets; William Howard Taft had established the Commission of Fine Arts.

Since the Second World War the role of government in the arts has been repeatedly stressed. In 1958 Congress passed legislation establishing the National Cultural Center. A report on "Art and Government" requested of the Fine Arts Commission by President Harry S. Truman surveyed the field methodically and formed a starting point for much of the work done by the special consultant in recent months. Significantly, too, when President Eisenhower established a Commission on National Goals, the cultural life of the United States was one of the areas subjected to inquiry.

A new phase

These two trends—mounting popular enthusiasm for the arts and a growing concern on the part of the Government—came together at the start of the present administration. Attendance at the inaugural ceremonies of outstanding artists, writers, and scholars was understandably hailed as signaling a new partnership in the national life. Reconstitution of the White House as a dramatic symbol of America's cultural heritage, and the hospitality provided to outstanding representatives of the intellectual and artistic community, carried further the idea that government and art have a basic relationship.

Against this background the first special consultant on the arts was named. It was understood that he would be concerned with the progress of the arts primarily as they affect, not our international posture, but the well-being, the happiness and the personal fulfillment of the citizens of our democracy. In this sense the appointment, modest in scope and tentative in form though it was, marked the beginning of a new phase in the history of art and government.

I. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL CONSULTANT

Named in March 1962, with the understanding that he would serve part time, approximately 2 days a week, and for approximately 6 months, the special consultant has had a small White House office with one full-time assistant. During this period work has been carried forward in the following major areas.

Collecting information on the arts

A major concern of the office has been to gather so far as possible within its time and resources information about the needs, programs and activities of individuals and organizations within the general field of the arts. This has been a field rapidly developing, with new undertakings in the communities, in the educational system, and among the more traditional forms of cultural institutions. Municipal, county, and State governments have been rexamining, and in many cases extending, their role in relation to the arts.

Legislative activities

During the last session at least 40 bills before Congress concerned the arts in some measure or other, and several major pieces of art legislation were under discussion. The office has, within its means, kept in touch with this situation.

Survey of Federal programs

A specific charge given to the special consultant was to make a survey of policies and programs within the executive departments and agencies affecting the arts, and to make recommendations for raising standards and encouraging the fullest use of the opportunities available. In this work the office secured the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget, working with it upon a questionnaire for the Bureau's examiners which might reveal unexpected facets and supplementing its leads with personal contacts.

Advisory activities

In addition to normal duties relating to White House concern with the arts, including liaison with the U.S. Commission for the New York World's Fair and the National Cultural Center, the office has had to deal with a considerable day-to-day correspondence, with interviews and discussions, and a variety of informational and counseling activities with private organizations and individuals. This part of the work was augmented by the unexpectedly large public response evoked by announcement of the post.

Attendance at cultural functions, visits to communities engaged in significant enterprises in the field of the arts, addresses and articles have been expected of the special consultant and have seemed important as a means both of gathering information and of formulating new approaches and concepts. These activities are summarized in appendix I.

In considering the future White House role in relation to the arts these four areas should, it is suggested, be kept in view. Together they add up to a body of work which serves a significant public interest and requires sustained and continuous attention. Recommendations as to means for carrying forward activities in these areas are made in section V ("Administrative Machinery Relating to the Arts").

II. THE ARTS AND THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

The Federal Government touches the arts at many points. By its programs and activities it can affect the cultural life of the country in important ways. If all is done well, much will have been accomplished, not only in making the Government a setter of standards but in giving support to creative talent.

In this section existing Government programs and policies are reviewed and broad objectives stated. Governmental activities have been grouped not according to departmental and agency lines but in terms of broad functions. Thus, Government acquires art; it creates objects which are marked by quality and good design; it shapes the cultural environment, etc. It has seemed most useful in dealing with this wide variety of material to concentrate on general policies and objectives and avoid administrative or operating detail.

1. The acquisition of art

Government in the normal course of its operations acquires by purchase or commission a considerable number of works of art. In this way, Government is a patron of the arts. It creates a market for the work of artists; it sets an example to others, including public and private bodies, which may have an important effect on the general cultural climate. Memorials, statues, murals, fountains, historic and decorative paintings, as well as works of art for public museums, are among the objects which Government in some degree or other makes its own.

The role of Government as a patron of the arts in this sense could well be increased. Its support of the artist could be exemplified more directly than heretofore; and the resulting acquisitions could more effectively serve to make its buildings, its open spaces, its collections of art, representative of the values of a great people.[1] If the Federal Government is niggardly in this regard, can we expect any better of our States and municipalities? An important recommendation of this report, therefore, is that the Federal Government make it an objective to increase substantially the number and worth of the works of art which it acquires.

Art is now acquired in a variety of ways and through a variety of agencies. Three areas offer particular possibilities.

Government Collections of Art

The Federal institutions chiefly concerned with the acquisition of art do a splendid job within their resources and their authority of preservation, display, and research. But the National Gallery, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress have virtually no funds, except more or less accidental private bequests, for adding to their collections. As a result, these collections cannot be truly representative either of our artistic heritage or of contemporary American art.

The Commission of Fine Arts in 1953 recommended funds for the purchase annually of American art by the National Collection of Fine Arts. This could become the one Federal collection of traditional and contemporary American art and urgently requires attention and review, not only in regard to funds but staff and space.

A National Government seriously concerned with cultural values would also find ways of making funds available to the Library of Congress and other Government museums for the purpose of adding to their collections.

Public Buildings

A current list (see appendix II) of works of art commissioned in the last 2 years in connection with public buildings suggests that the harvest has been meager, though the General Services Administration is now attempting to practice a policy of using for fine arts one-half of 1 percent of the cost of buildings over $250,000. It is well known that whenever building budgets must be cut, art is the first amenity to go. A bill before the Congress has specified that up to 1 percent of the cost of Federal buildings in the National Capital area be set aside for the commissioning of fine arts decoration. This would be a highly desirable step, and the principle should be extended to Federal buildings throughout the country and abroad. Such a policy was in effect as a depression measure during the prewar Roosevelt administration and has been recently adopted by some of our cities, notably Philadelphia. It is certainly to be hoped that in planning the new Pennsylvania Avenue, for example, sculpture will have a prominent place.

American Embassies

American Embassies are important cultural outposts. The purchase by the Government of American art, supplemented by private gifts, could lead to a collection administered by the National Gallery or some other bureau of the Smithsonian Institution and displayed, perhaps on a revolving basis, in U.S. Embassies. These works should not be considered interior decoration, but as art representing the finest of American creative expression. (They should be supplemented by special exhibitions, stressing contemporary works, loaned for short periods through such private patrons as the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art and the Woodward Foundation.

In addition, in a number of often unrecognized ways the Government is constantly acquiring art—by purchase, commission, or creation by its own designers and producers. Examples of such activities are the commissioning of official portraits, the photographic and film projects of a number of Federal agencies (for example, Department of Agriculture, USIA, and the departments of the armed services), and the continuing art projects of the Air Force and the Navy. (It is interesting in this connection that during the Cuban crisis the Navy sent an artist to Guantanamo, and an artist also was commissioned by NASA to document the landing of astronaut Major Cooper.)

---

[1] Funds from two private trust funds administered by the Library of Congress have been used for the commissioning of new musical compositions. The Federal Government could well consider whether the commissioning of music as well as the visual arts is not a legitimate objective. Could not, for example, a major work be commissioned for the dedication of an important Federal building?

Too often, unfortunately, the criteria observed are solely documentary or functional. There is every reason why the Government should also provide for high standards of artistic excellence. The distinguished quality of the Farm Security Administration photographic programs during the depression years is widely recognized as an artistic achievement of which the Nation is proud. In the selection of artists for public portraits or historic events we should as a matter of course wish to be represented by the best American talent, as we do in all other fields of endeavor, whether it be weapons, scientific developments or public buildings. Clear recognition of this principle is hardly less important than the provision of adequate funds.

2. Raising design standards

Many of Government's activities are related to the arts indirectly in that they consist of a normal part of its operations which may be done with a sense of beauty and fitness, or may be done tastelessly. Government is a printer and coiner; it strikes medals and makes stamps. It is also a builder on a grand scale. Should it not consistently promote—as Pericles said in his funeral oration to the Athenians—a "beauty in our public buildings to cheer the heart and to delight the eye day by day"?

The task throughout this area is to inject into the process of planning and execution a concern for esthetic standards, for the quality of good design and good workmanship. Different problems exist in a field so broad and varied, but across them all lie certain common approaches to excellence.

GOVERNMENT POSTERS—AN EXAMPLE

Government posters may be cited as an example of the way in which a seemingly utilitarian process—in this case the communication of simple facts or ideas—can be raised to the level of art. A group of Government posters collected for this survey by the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress shows how frequently inferior American work is to European in this field; it also reveals the difference of quality which exists between different initiating agencies. The USIA has issued some striking posters for its exhibitions abroad; the Department of Commerce, in encouraging foreign travel to the United States, has used photographs to good effect, combined with excellent typography. The Armed Forces recruiting and training services have done consistently good work. Elsewhere, too often, the Government communicates with its citizens on a banal and commonplace level.[2]

Does it matter that the level of posters be raised to the level of the best now being produced by private enterprise and by governments abroad? It is a basic assumption of this report that it does matter. Everything done by the Government bears either the marks of excellence which we like to think characteristic of a free and great people, or else in some measure it betrays the Government and degrades the citizen.

ADMINISTRATORS ALERT TO THE IMPORTANCE OF GOOD DESIGN

The first requisite for improving design is that men in responsible positions be encouraged to concern themselves with more than practical utility in their respective fields. They may not themselves be knowledgeable in art and design, but they must have an awareness of the need for the highest quality in all that the Federal Government produces or sponsors. They must be ready to take advantage of expert advice wherever it is available. At present in Washington are numerous examples of individuals who have transformed what might have been routine and undistinguished operations. But too often public agencies seem content with the production of governmental objects which fall below the standards set by private enterprise or by European states.

RECRUITING AND ENCOURAGING TALENT

The recruiting and encouragement of talented individuals in those areas where design is carried out has not been sufficiently recognized as a policy objective. There are small incentives at present for men of ability in the arts to think of the Federal Government as a place where they can do good work. Rewards tend to go to the conventional and the mediocre.

At the same time there is slight disposition among Government agencies to make use of outside talent. Younger artists, designers, architects, etc., are rarely brought into the service of the Government for specific tasks or commissions. Competitions which might appeal to such talent are the exception rather than the rule.

The Use of Advisory Committees on the Arts

In a number of departments special committees have been created to advise on matters of art and design. (See appendix III). Such committees can play a highly useful role, depending upon their composition, their quality, and the weight attached to their recommendations. Outstanding representatives from the world of fine arts and architecture have shown themselves ready to give generously of their time when called on for these purposes.

The most notable example of such a committee has been that which advises the State Department on the design of its embassies and consulates. Composed of a small rotating group of gifted architects, ready to take advantage of talented young men as well as famous names, this committee has been responsilbe in the postwar years for buildings abroad in every way worthy of America's role in the world. In the last several years, the value of this achievement has not been fully recognized. The foreign building program of the State Department has received inadequate support and has been cut back.

The recently appointed committee advising the Post Office Department on the design and subject matter of its stamps has been less successful, judged in terms of esthetic results. This committee has not had adequate representation from among graphic artists and designers. Nevertheless, the Department has for the first time initiated competitions in stamp design.

An agency which might not have been thought to have need of an advisory art committee is the Federal Aviation Agency; yet here, under Mr. Najeeb Halaby a significant innovation has been created. A small committee composed of highly qualified individuals has worked most effectively in advising on the completion of the Dulles Airport, as well as on other airport construction and on general problems of landscaping, graphics, and decoration. A fine arts committee originally appointed to screen works of art submitted to the National Air Force Academy is now extending its jurisdiction in an attempt to save that magnificent complex of buildings from being cheapened by inadequate future planning and by inferior new construction.

Public Buildings—A Major Area of Concern

In areas where design factors are involved, the advisory committee should be adapted to special needs; thus graphic artists should advise on postage stamps, sculptors on medals, etc. These committees, perhaps under some system of loose coordination, should continue to work within separate departments and agencies. In the case of public buildings, however, a more centralized structure might well be explored.

The most striking and most enduring objects created by Government are buildings. Construction is carried on through many agencies—principally by the General Services Administration, but also by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Space Administration, the Post Office Department, etc. Here the possibility arises of an overall panel which would oversee, from the point of view of design, all Government building. It could determine occasions where competitions are appropriate and keep open ways to the use of fresh talent and novel concepts.

There are vast opportunities for an imaginative approach to architecture in military installations and in construction connected with space exploration. Philip Johnson's atomic powerplant for the Israeli Government is an example of what can be done when science and art are brought fruitfully together. In many communities the post office is the only concrete symbol of the Federal Government. As a symbol, it should be a dignified and pleasing building in which the citizen can take pride. Although most post offices are acquired on a lease construction or rental basis, the Department has both the authority and the responsibility to approve the design. Here, as in all other Government programs, the criteria should include appropriate esthetic standards as well as purely functional needs. If there are opportunities, there are also dangers that mediocrity will cover ever larger areas of the earth's surface.

An overall panel on architectural policy might help assure that the standards achieved in our best Federal buildings, such as those hitherto constructed abroad, could be made to prevail in what is built at home for all the various purposes which Government serves. Such a panel would leave to the Fine Arts Commission the authority over building in Washington which it now possesses; it would not preclude advisory committees on the arts in agencies where special problems of design and construction arise.

The implementation of the President's directive of May 23, 1962, on "Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture" is of first importance.

This directive recommended a three-point architectural policy for the Federal Government. It restated in affirmative and contemporary terms the conviction held by Washington, Jefferson, and other early American statesmen that public buildings should set an example for public taste and in the words of the directive "provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government." It recommended (1) the selection of distinguished designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought; (2) the avoidance of an official style and the encouragement of professional creativity through competitions and other means; and (3) the special importance of landscaping and site development in relation to the surrounding area.

Positive steps should be taken to incorporate these principles in the policies and criteria governing all Federal programs concerned with construction and building. Periodic reports to measure how well we are doing in achieving these objectives might be required and could appropriately be the responsibility of the overall panel suggested above.

A basic assumption of this report is that good design is not an added embellishment or an unnecessary extravagance. In fact, the position is taken that good design is economical. It strongly endorses that section of the directive on "Guiding Principles" which says: "The committee takes it to be a matter of general understanding that the economy and suitability of Federal office space derive directly from the architectural design. The belief that good design is optional, or in some way separate from the question of the provision of office space itself, does not bear scrutiny, and in fact invites the least efficient use of public money."

---

[2] The following generalizations can be made in regard to Government posters: the best work is intended for audiences overseas (like our best Government buildings); the availability of displace space, as with the Armed Forces, tends to make for more effective design; the best posters are those neither designed nor executed by Government personnel but done on outside contract. Obviously the posters used by a department would come within the concern of such advisory art committees as are discussed below, p. 20.

3. Impact on the cultural environment

We have been speaking of government's responsibility in the design of specific objects—from postage stamps to buildings. But government's responsibility does not stop there. Not always is it recognized how large a role government plays in preserving cultural assets and creating an environment within which cultural values can be realized. Public buildings, if they are to be genuinely significant, must not only be well designed but must be part of a setting in which life can be lived with some sense of spaciousness, dignity and esthetic delight. Again, roads are not only per se susceptible of being improved in appearance and in the esthetic experience they provide; what is even more important, they must be so conceived and carried out as not to dehumanize the landscape or run roughshod over the living community.

The scale upon which modern government acts makes it vital that this responsibility to the total environment be acknowledged. The constant tendency is to think only of the immediate task, forgetting the wider implications of governmental action. The economics of roadbuilding too often threaten to run highways across historic towns, park lands, or even across a college campus. The urgency of slum clearance often means that a wrecking crew destroys in the process a humanly scaled and intricately woven community life.

Preservation of the Cultural Heritage

The Historic Sites Act, passed nearly 30 years ago, established the Government's concern with the preservation of historic sites and buildings. Under this act a program of identifying, recording and promoting preservation, by acquisition where appropriate, has been carried out.

The problem is broader, however, than can be met by such an approach. Government policies and programs directed toward legitimate and accepted ends have had the secondary results of destroying sites and buildings which ought to be preserved. It is important that in all Federal policy governing construction, highways and community development the interest of the Nation in historic preservation be given weight. This is an area where the vigilance of a consultant on the arts can make sure that such an interest is heard and adequately represented.

The phrase "historic preservation" does not fully cover the interest which is at stake. Today a single building of outstanding architectural interest (particularly if it derives from our Colonial past) may be saved from the wrecking crew; the occurrence of some outstanding event in former times may make a site immune. But the cultural heritage is more inclusive than these. It comprises areas within cities which taken as a whole express the values of a still valid past, including much anonymous and vernacular architecture. Even more broadly, it comprises a total landscape in which men have found the possibilities for balanced and fruitful lives.

Preservation in this sense requires prudence and sensitivity in administering Federal projects. It requires a willingness to give weight to views in the community which may not always be very loudly expressed but which speak for the long-range national interest. A constant preoccupation with this problem, expressed at key points in the Federal Government, can provide the guidelines for policy now too often lacking.

Shaping the Environment

To shape an environment which meets the needs of men and women for a civilized existence is a long-range Federal interest going beyond mere preservation. The national parks should be seen in this light: they are important for recreation, but also, more broadly, as a means to fulfilling the characteristic American concept of the good life. In addition the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (created in April 1962) should be a means for expressing the Government's interest in the environment and its influence upon the citizen.

Within the urban context, as well, Government policies to enhance the environment and to assist in the achievement of this objective by the private as well as the public sector should be encouraged. Through the varied programs providing financial and technical assistance to private and public housing and to community development the Federal Government has many such opportunities and responsibilities.

The Government's responsibility for good housing was clearly stated in the Housing Act of 1949 which established a national housing objective. This act declared that the goal of a national housing policy was "a decent home and and a suitable living environment for every American."

In the 14 years since that act was passed, the Government has continued and initiated many programs to carry out this aim. With this experience has come increasing recognition of the importance of environmental factors, especially the use of space. Thus the Housing Act of 1961 authorized a program of grants to help States and metropolitan areas create and preserve open space.

Urban renewal has shown itself in many instances to be the only effective and practical means of saving and redeveloping urban areas. The recognition by the Urban Renewal Administration that plans should be concerned with historic preservation, with the provision of such public services and amenities as theaters, libraries, and cultural centers, and with standards of good architectural design, is important. A recent URA policy statement makes the point that "urban renewal provides an unprecedented opportunity to rebuild major parts of our cities. Well designed, these can become great assets—functionally and esthetically. But if these areas are poorly designed, rebuilt in uninteresting and unproductive patterns, a basic purpose for the expenditure of public funds and public effort will be lost."

From an economic and investment point of view the importance of good design and the availability of amenities and public services responsive to the needs and desires of the inhabitants should not be underestimated. It may be a critical factor in preventing rapid obsolescence from lowering market values, producing vacancies and overtaking mortgage servicing. It is for this reason that the Federal Housing Administration believes that good design is important in a sound mortgage insurance program, and takes it into consideration in approving the eligibility of projects for Federal insurance.

As one means of bringing about an improvement in design, the FHA has taken steps to increase the use of professional architectural services and insure adequate architects' fees. It is giving increasing attention to research and advisory services relating to community and land-use planning and to the role of amenities and public services. It is sponsoring an experimental program of insuring mortgages on properties that include new and untried materials and methods likely to improve neighborhood design. Through design seminars for mortgage bankers, planners, architects, and FHA officials and through other methods of identifying the importance of design and environment, it is working to raise standards and formulate criteria. It should be noted that FHA criteria for sound mortgage evaluation are widely used by private industry and are thus very influential.

Public housing is an area in which the Federal Government has even greater and more direct responsibility and opportunity.

Unfortunately public housing has too often been the victim of indifference, suspicion, and even hostility on the part of officials and politicians, private builders, the general public and even the architectural profession. There is a widely held view that public housing should by its very nature be drab, standardized and functional and that materials and appurtenances should be held to the minimum type and quality necessary to build what the law describes as a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling.

The law further prescribes that such housing be developed and administered to promote serviceability, efficiency, economy and stability, that no elaborate or extravagant design or materials be used, and that economy of construction and administration be promoted. These criteria have often been unnecessarily interpreted to mean that public housing units under the law cannot be well and imaginatively designed and that essential amenities and services cannot be provided.

The Public Housing Administration should be encouraged and supported in its new efforts to improve the design of public housing and to make its projects more responsive to the needs of its tenants. It is actively working with the American Institute of Architects on improving architects' fees (which have generally been too low) and revising standard contracts. It has asked the AIA also for recommendations on ways to improve design, development and review procedures, the desirability of competitions, design award programs, exhibitions, and methods of increasing public and professional appreciation of design and environmental factors.

A consultant program has been established to aid local housing authorities and their technicians on design problems. The program includes architects, landscape architects and planners, and their function will be to consult with and advise on specific plans and designs, land use, site development and assist in the conduct of seminars. A National Panel of Design and Planning Consultants, composed of 30 or more leading architects and planners, has been set up.

Notwithstanding such steps, a distinguished U.S. Senator has recently asserted that "the Federal Government, directly and indirectly, through the laws it writes, the programs it enacts and the regulations it issues, has contributed more than its share to the ugliness of the landscape. In countless ways the Federal Government has fettered its own and the efforts of others to improve the appearance and vitality of our communities." Such an indictment indicates the scope of the work to be done by those who concern themselves seriously with the relation between the ideals of the Government and the outward forms in which these ideals are expressed.

The Renaissance state has been referred to as "a work of art." Today the whole environment, the landscape and the cityscape should be looked on as potentially a work of art—perhaps man's largest and most noble work. The power to destroy provided by modern organization and machinery is also, if it is widely used, an unprecedented power to create. To create humanely in the service of man's highest needs is a supreme task of modern statesmanship.

4. Presentation and display of art

Government responsibility is not discharged in acquiring and conserving works of art and other objects of historic and artistic merit. To be enjoyed and appreciated by the people and to make the contribution they should to our cultural life they must be made available and accessible in a much more extensive and varied manner than they have been to date.

The Visual Arts

A large number of Federal agencies are involved in one way or another with the display and presentation of the visual and graphic arts. Chief of these, of course, are the great galleries in Washington and the Congressional Library. Some individual departments and agencies operate specialized museums and exhibit programs, for example, activities of the armed services, historic sites and buildings administered by the National Park Service, national memorials of various kinds, etc.

The quality of existing activities and the competence and dedication of the staff responsible for them was found in the cases which this office was able to study to be unusually good. On the other hand, the casual and unimportant role accorded such programs as far as policy and financial support was concerned has meant that as a practical matter they are generally inadequate and haphazard. Lack of funds, limited exhibit space, duplication and ineffective coordination and liaison between the different Government agencies involved, and above all the absence of any positive policy and program to make our national collections more available to the public have all contributed to this state of neglect.

In general, activities are restricted to the city of Washington. There are some programs which reach out to a broader audience by means of traveling and loan exhibitions; the sale and circulation of slides, reproductions, lecture outlines; the preparation and distribution of catalogs and other publications. These are generally speaking very limited in relation to both the potentialities of the Government's resources and the needs of the public. Furthermore, they are in most cases dependent on private financing.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the lack of any central system of exercising overall coordinating, recording and policy functions has probably contributed to the greatly varying character of professional care, preservation, accessibility and even knowledge of the art treasures belonging to the Government. This should be a matter of some concern.

A great improvement in facilities and space will no doubt be brought about with the opening of the new Museum of History and Technology and the renovation of the historic Patent Office Building to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Portrait Gallery.

The large museums in Washington, however, are not the only means through which the visual and graphic arts may be presented. As noted above, many agencies and departments sponsor exhibits and administer specialized museums. The provision of accessible and appropriate exhibit and gallery space should be a consideration in drawing up plans for new Federal buildings, not only in Washington but especially throughout the country.

The National Collections

A positive program should be adopted to expand the educational and presentation activities of the national collections. The many excellent recommendations in this regard of the report to the President submitted by the Fine Arts Commission in 1953 should be carried out. In this report the Commission urged that in addition to providing authority and funds to the national collection to make this a truly representative museum of American art, a greatly expanded program of traveling exhibitions, catalogs and publications and reproductions should be initiated.

Much more attention should be given to the production of publications of distinction and high esthetic standards.

Consideration should be given to organizing some central clearing system to coordinate such activities and to publicize their availability.

The much more extensive and imaginative use of public buildings, such as post-offices and regional office buildings, for poster and exhibit displays and even the distribution of Government publications, should be encouraged. A small pilot project to promote the sale of Government publications has just been instituted by the Post Office Department.

The basic objective is the use of the great resources of our national collections for the benefit and enjoyment of all the people throughout the country.

Presentation of the Performing Arts

The Federal Government should fulfill its responsibility for the performing as well as the visual arts. Government auditoriums have generally been built with little or no concern for this important function. The sponsorship of concerts and theatrical performances has been very limited, primarily restricted to the city of Washington, and in most instances entirely dependent on private gifts to the Government.

The programs of chamber music, literary readings, and dramatic performances taking place in the Library of Congress, the National Gallery Symphony Orchestra concerts, and the few programs, including experiments with "Son et Lumiere," sponsored by the National Park Service, are the main examples. Tours and performances sponsored by the armed services provide an opportunity for presenting the performing arts to an audience which is in a position greatly to influence the future cultural life of American communities.

The National Cultural Center

Creation of the National Cultural Center will enhance the Federal Government's role in presenting American cultural achievements and in stimulating and supporting the performing arts throughout the country. To fulfill its aim, the Center must be more than a group of splendid stages for the benefit of Washington audiences.

The general policy of the Cultural Center is outside the scope of this report; but it may be stressed here that if it is to fulfill its role of presenting the performing arts to a broad national audience it must from the start conceive a program keyed to diverse and wide-ranging interests. Not only must it be expected to present the best of orchestras, repertory theater, opera, choral and dance groups from this country and overseas; it must also reach out through competitions, festivals, youth programs, and commissioned works into the heart of the Nation's cultural life. The motion picture, that most characteristic and indigenous of American art forms, should have an important place in the program. The organization of the motion picture industry tends to emphasize the expensive commercial feature picture. The Center can provide a means to encourage both the production and the opportunity for public viewing as well as a way of recognizing the best of our documentary and shorter fine arts films.

The Cultural Center must use all means to make its presentations extend beyond the area of its halls. A program of education and dissemination activities must be central in its planning. Plans must be made for bringing the programs to the country at large through full use of television.

Promoting New Facilities

A major obstacle hindering the development of the performing arts throughout the country is the lack of proper facilities. There are a number of ways in which the Government can contribute with little or no increased expenditure of Federal funds. In many of the construction programs in which the Government exercises a financial or advisory role, auditoriums are built or could be built—and at little relative additional cost—with adequate facilities for the performing arts. It is strongly urged that the Government not overlook this opportunity.

Specifically it is suggested that the provision of facilities for the performing arts be considered in (1) plans for new Federal centers and buildings throughout the country as well as Washington; (2) urban renewal and community development programs; (3) public works programs; (4) the National Park Service; (5) business and building financial and service assistance; and (6) the school construction program and advisory service on school facilities administered by the Office of Education.

The Urban Renewal Administration has already taken steps to suggest that the provision of auditoriums and civic and cultural centers be considered eligible and desirable objectives in renewal plans. This policy should be encouraged and extended to other appropriate programs.

Although the Federal Government has no direct responsibility for the design of schools and colleges, except under the special construction program in federally impacted areas, it can exert important influence. The opportunity afforded by the enormous amount of school building forecast during the next decade should not be lost. Unless its use for the performing arts is taken into account, school auditoriums, which will be built in most schools as conventional educational facilities, may not be suitable or adequate for such performances. An increasing number of school systems are recognizing the great educational potential of including performances by professional artists in their curricula.

School auditoriums should also be increasingly conceived of as serving the needs of the community as a whole. Communities which can only afford one auditorium should at least make sure that this is suitable for the presentation of various forms of the performing arts.

It is strongly urged that the Office of Education emphasize in its advisory and counseling service on school facilities the desirability of auditoriums which can serve the performing arts.

Presentation in the International Sphere

Cultural exchange is one of the most important means by which government fulfills its role of presenting and displaying American arts. The foreign policy aspects of this program are not considered here. It must be stressed, however, that the cultural life at home is stimulated and benefited by the effectiveness with which this responsibility is carried out. The recognition American artists receive through the exhibition of their works abroad is an important element in their development. Those who have the experience of working abroad and coming to know the artists of other countries bring back fresh skills and new sources of inspiration. (It is significant, for example, that the Jerome Robbins ballet, which played at the White House in 1962, was an American group tempered by three seasons at the Spoleto Festival.)

For these reasons it is urged that an active exchange program be furthered by all Government agencies directly or indirectly involved. Despite the proven value of these international programs and the great increase in the number of new countries we are trying to reach, there has been no increase in the relatively small amount of money allocated to the circulation of art exhibitions and the touring of performing arts groups. The average cost of a symphony orchestra tour runs to 25 percent of the budget, and the tour of the American Repertory Theatre, a company created to meet the demand for a professional American theater tour, was so costly that its repetition cannot be reasonably contemplated within present budgets. Funds for traveling art exhibitions are totally inadequate. If these programs are to fulfill their purpose in demonstrating abroad the vitality and quality of the arts in the United States, adequate funds must be made available.

International Fairs and Conferences

The Commerce Department, responsible for trade fairs and exhibitions, can also play a role in presenting before foreign publics the best work of American architects, graphic artists and designers.

Such a Federal exhibition as that at the New York World's Fair—the building, displays, landscaping, graphics, etc.—should be significant indication to our people and to foreign visitors of the kind of excellence which the Federal Government seeks to express in all its works.

The Department of Justice should make every effort to put into effect simpler and more realistic entry requirements, thus encouraging the holding in this country of international conferences, competitions and festivals. It must be hoped that ways will be found for providing the funds which other countries authorize for hospitality to foreign visitors at such gatherings. At present, due largely to legislative obstacles and stringencies, international groups rarely meet within the United States.

This failure of the United States to provide the hospitality and the funds necessary to the successful putting on of such conferences is having unfavorable repercussions on just that group of young leaders and professionals whose understanding and knowledge of this country is of critical importance to our long-range interests. This is one of the best means of assuring other countries of our commitment to a common effort in scientific, cultural and technical development. If funds to hold 5 or at most 10 such conferences a year were available the rewards would be fare greater than the relatively small cost.

5. Education, training, and research

The Federal Government affects the arts through what it does, or fails to do, in the related fields of education, training, and research. In developing these potentialities there is opportunity for much positive and useful support. Programs in these areas are well established and recognized as a natural governmental operation. But at present, the arts are given a low priority, or are even excluded in most educational and training programs; and basic research information in this field is scarcely pursued at all. These programs could easily express toward the arts a greater interest and concern without substantial additions to their funds or personnel.

The National Defense Education Act

The major program of Federal assistance (aside from aid to special construction, vocational and minority groups) is that authorized by the National Defense Education Act. Assistance is limited to those fields of education which contribute to the national defense—specifically science, mathematics, and modern languages. Initially the act was interpreted to permit a limited program of fellowship awards in the arts, but this was later terminated as being contrary to congressional intent.

The Office of Education

The Office of Education, the chief agency of the Government concerned with education, has until recently given little attention to the arts. Recommendations for increasing the art programs of the Office of Education have been submitted after a study by a consultant who reviewed for HEW its activities in this area. A new division has been established to deal with educational needs beyond formal school programs. This division will be responsible for the library services and adult education programs and through a new Cultural Affairs Branch will give increased attention to the arts. Specialists in various fields will be added to the permanent staff. There is need, for example, for a program to strengthen and improve the educational role of museums and the training of curators and museum personnel.

It is recommended that further consideration be given to increasing the share of the Federal Government's support to education which is concerned with the arts and the humanities. This should include the same type of across-the-board assistance now given to modern languages, mathematics, and science: for example, facilities and equipment, teacher training, teaching techniques and materials, scholarship and fellowship programs. The predominant emphasis given to science and engineering implies a distortion of resources and values which is disturbing the academic profession throughout the country.

Other Federal Institutions

The activities of the Library of Congress and the several museums comprising the Smithsonian Institution are often classified as educational in nature. Those agencies do carry on a variety of educational services, but they are to a large extent dependent on private funds and volunteer staff, necessarily limited in nature and primarily restricted to Washington. A major recommendation of the Fine Arts Commission Report of 1953 was the allocation of funds to make color reproductions, photographs, slides and motion pictures available to schools and colleges on a national basis. This recommendation should be put into effect.

Research in Art Education

Encouraged by its success in stimulating the preparation of new teaching materials in science and mathematics, the Panel on Educational Research and Development (a committee sponsored by the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and the President's Science Advisory Committee) has initiated a project on the teaching of art and music in elementary and secondary schools. One of the research studies in new educational media financed under the National Defense Education Act is to examine the potential role and function of such media in the future program of the National Cultural Center.

Generally speaking, however, no more attention has been given to research on and in the arts than to training and education in the arts. Since 1956 for example, the Office of Education has administered a cooperative research program in collaboration with state and private educational institutions. Although appropriations in 1963 were approximately $7 million and requested funds for 1964 are more than $17 million, only a handful of the approved projects have been concerned with the arts.

It is suggested that the teaching of the arts is particularly susceptible to improvement through the use of new techniques, visual and audio aids and materials, and such mass media as television and radio. It is recommended that funds and attention be directed to new research and application, especially pilot experiments.

Gathering Statistical Information

A major obstacle to the assessment of the problems and needs of the arts and the formulation of sound and realistic public policies is the lack of adequate up-to-date factual and statistical information. Professional organizations or associations of the arts have not had the resources to collect such information as is commonly collected by business, labor or other professions. None of the fact-collecting agencies of the Federal Government collect comprehensive or consistent data on any detailed or meaningful basis.

This problem is not easy, as much of the data relating to the arts is not available through standard methods of collecting information on economic and social activities. At the same time, the growing social and economic role played by the arts makes the collection of such information increasingly necessary. For example, Department of Commerce figures on recreation and entertainment show that in 1961 expenditures on admissions to legitimate theater, opera and entertainments of nonprofit institutions amounted to $400 million which is substantially more than total admissions to spectator sports. The importance of the performing arts in the employment picture has been recognized by the Department of Labor in including data in the annual Occupational Outlook Handbook of 1961 for the first time. But there is little reliable information on such elementary facts as numbers of performing groups, character of facilities, types of services, sources of financial support including State and municipal subsidies, etc. To be of value this information must be collected on a continuing, systematic and detailed basis.

It is recommended that funds be made available to both the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce so that the arts be covered adequately in both the regular census and periodic surveys.

6. Government recognition of the artist

Most of the great countries of the world have traditionally given national recognition not only to outstanding military and government service but also to individuals for distinguished accomplishment in science, the arts and the humanities. Britain has an Honors List; France the Legion of Honor and the Academy; the Soviet Union a variety of awards. Japan gives recognition by designating her artists as "living cultural assets."

In recent years there has been growing support in the United States for a system of national recognition of achievement in the arts and the humanities. Presidential recognition has been given in several different ways through special dinners, individual invitations to the White House, and occasional performances by leading professional artists or youth groups. This method, however, is necessarily irregular and personal and can scarcely answer the requirements of a formal and continuing system, though a more official system does not, of course, exclude the continuation of the various forms of personal Presidential recognition noted above, which have important values of their own.

A number of bills to establish a system of medals or awards in various fields of civilian endeavor have been introduced in Congress in recent years but have never been passed. An occasional individual, such as Robert Frost, has been honored by a medal authorized by special legislation.

Until very recently, however, there has been no system of regularly honoring accomplishment or contribution in all fields of human endeavor. As a result of legislation passed in 1959, a National Medal of Science was established and the first award made in February 1963. Also in the scientific field are the Fermi and Lawrence Awards, which include cash prizes, and are granted by the Atomic Energy Commission, as authorized in its basic legislation, for meritorious contributions to the development of atomic energy.

The highest civil honor of the United States has been the Medal of Freedom originally established by President Truman as an award for meritorious service in connection with the war. Its scope and purpose has recently been broadened, and from now on it will be awarded on a systematic annual basis to a limited but unspecified number of persons who have made especially meritorious contributions to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural, or other significant public or private endeavors.

There still seems a need, however, for an additional system of awards in specific art fields. The schemes adopted should be chosen carefully after thorough consideration of various atlernative proposals, criteria, and means of selection and consultation with the intellectual and artistic community. It is the recommendation of this report that the consideration of all proposals should be specifically assigned to the President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

The basic objective of a system of recognition should be to stimulate interest in and respect for intellectual and artistic effort and achievement.

Very careful thought should be given to the scope of the awards, the nature of the awards (should they include cash prizes or be purely honorary?), and the type of awards (should they recognize young talent, a specific achievement, accomplishments over a period of years, the winner of a specially held competition, or include several types, and perhaps on a graduated scale of prestige?). The procedures, criteria, and membership of the selection system should be weighed especially carefully. The question of whether recognition should be restricted to American citizens or in some instances extended to foreigners should be discussed.

III. THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

The city of Washington has an importance far outweighing its relatively small population of less than 800,000 people. As the National Capital of the country, it is the center of a metropolitan population of 2 million (over half of whom live not only beyond its municipal borders but in other States), it plays host to more than 15 million tourists a year (estimated to rise to 24 million in the next decade), and as a political and diplomatic capital is visited by hundreds of thousands of business and professional men, public officials, and foreigners.

It should be an example to the rest of the country, a symbol of the finest in our architecture, city planning and cultural amenities and achievements—a symbol in fact of what the environment of democracy ought to be.

A new era for Washington

For more than 150 years Washington's chief problem has been growing up to the dimensions of the L'Enfant plan. The original conception of the city was in every sense magnificent; but for long periods Washington was allowed to grow without order, design, or a true appreciation of its esthetic potentialities. Federal architecture has been largely second-rate, with the new State Department Building standing as a particular monument to false functionalism and false grandeur.

In the past decade Washington has suddenly outgrown not only the original plan but also the political and administrative system which has been relied on to date to guide its development and maintain its distinction.

In any discussion of Washington, or of the relationship of government and the arts, the responsibility of the Federal Government for Washington should be stressed. It is the Federal Government—through the executive branch and the Congress—which makes the ultimate decisions and authorizes the funds which determine the quality and character of the city.

Much of the problem is due to overlapping, conflicting or inadequate policies, agencies, and interests. In the esthetic field, we have the General Services Administration, the Fine Arts Commission, the National Park Service, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (Congress has complete authority over buildings and grounds in the 135 acres comprising the Capitol area), the National Capital Planning Commission and, if we include the metropolitan area and the Potomac River, the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the States of Virginia and Maryland.

What is needed is an imaginative new approach which will realize the concept of a Capital City fully expressing the standards and values of the Nation.

A beginning has been made in the new policy on Federal architecture contained in the President's memorandum of May 23, 1962, in the establishment of the Pennsylvania Avenue Advisory Council charged with drawing up plans for the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue as the great thoroughfare it was originally intended to be, and in the President's memorandum of November 27, 1962, establishing guidelines for the development of the National Capital region. These policies and projects should be vigorously pursued and implemented.

This report also strongly endorses the establishment of a National Capital Parks Memorial Board as proposed by the Secretary of the Interior. The passage of the necessary legislation is essential to protect the pleasing and dignified development of the Capital's park lands and open spaces and protect them from being overrun by a hodgepodge of poorly placed and ill-designed statues and memorials.

Federal policies applicable to cities should be applied with special care and imagination to Washington itself. This it is fortunate and fitting that what is potentially the country's best urban renewal project in terms of planning and design is situated within a stone's throw of the Capitol. In the same way mass transportation, arterial highways, and other public improvements should be constructed so as not only to enhance the life of Washington but to be a model to other communities.

The Fine Arts Commission

It is vitally important that the Fine Arts Commission be made capable of carrying out its mission of helping to insure that the architecture and environment of Federal buildings in the Capital be worthy of the best of our times. It should take a positive attitude toward achieving good design in the Capital. To this end it should be equipped with a full-time Director and adequate staff.

Planning the Capital region

A more difficult but equally urgent task is to create some means to eliminate the present piecemeal approach to the planning and development of the National Capital region. A plan worthy of L'Enfant, for example, would provide for the preservation and enhancement of the Potomac River as a natural resource offering amenities to our citizens as well as assuring the Capital the beautiful setting it deserves.

Cultural opportunities

The Capital should, however, be more than a collection of buildings, monuments, museums, and parks. It should also offer both opportunity and recognition to the best dramatic and musical talent, both from here and abroad, as expressed in performances of composers, playwrights, and choreographers new and old.

It has never had a stage appropriate to this role, and this is what in essence the National Cultural Center will be. It is, therefore, of utmost importance that the efforts now under way to bring to reality the Center with its several halls and stages should be given every possible encouragement.

In addition, Washington should be an example to other cities in seeing that the artistic institutions and programs needed to provide the city with a broad range of cultural opportunities are flourishing and responsive to new needs as they develop. The Federal Government's role in most communities can never be more than marginal and indirect. The real stimulus and support must come from the community itself, but in an increasing number of cases it is being found that this requires both public and private funds and closer collaboration between public and private agencies. States and cities are establishing arts councils and even executive offices solely devoted to cultural affairs. Washington could well be a laboratory for the working out of effective relationships between public agencies and private institutions.

IV. GENERAL POLICIES AFFECTING THE ARTS

There is a broad range of general Government policies which are designed to accomplish objectives not primarily or specifically related to the arts, but which do affect and concern the state of the arts and the position of the individual artist, often adversely and mainly through inadvertence. These are in such fields as taxation, copyright laws, postal rates, disposition of surplus Government property, public works, and general assistance programs.

1. Taxation

Of these, the impact of the tax laws is undoubtedly the most important, mainly because the earning and income pattern of the writer and artist differs strikingly from that of most other professions and occupations.

Our tax laws have traditionally been more concerned with providing relief and incentive to the inventor than to the artist. The argument has been that tax relief to the inventor is necessary to encourage the inventive genius essential to economic growth. It is time that the contribution of the artist and writer to the cultural growth of society be given at last equal consideration. Nor need the artist be accorded special privileges. Revisions in tax laws and administrative interpretations which would recognize the distinctive character of his income pattern would of themselves go a long distance to remedy the artist's precarious economic plight.

Income Tax

It has been widely recognized that the progressive tax rate principle affects individuals whose incomes fluctuate from one year to the next much more harshly than it does those with steady annual earnings. This result violates a basic principle of equity providing that equal incomes should bear equal tax liabilities. Existing tax laws make some provision for averaging income over a period of years but for narrowly prescribed and limited situations. For example, although the writer can qualify for a 3-year spread of income (even if his book takes 10 years to write), it appears that the performing artist cannot. Frequently the writer's earning pattern does not permit any real relief because it does not fit the specific requirements of the law. Existing law is quite restrictive and limits the benefits of averaging to a particular invention or artistic work the completion of which took 2 years or more, and requires the 80 percent of the income from the work be received in a single taxable year. The economics of book publishing and selling are such that few writers can qualify under the law.

Revision of the tax laws to create a fair-income-averaging provision which will provide realistic and equitable tax relief to the artist is of first importance to the growth of the arts.

Tax Deductibility for Contributions to the Arts

The President's new tax proposals contain a number of recommendations which affect the tax deductibility of contributions. This report welcomes the proposed extension of the 30-percent ceiling to such nonprofit organizations as symphony orchestras, museums, libraries, and other cultural institutions. Under existing law contributions to these types of organizations are limited to 20 percent. It is strongly urged that the higher limit be applicable to all recognized cultural institutions. The proposed revision should embody this principle very clearly in its final wording.

The tax message also urges the repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction provision on the grounds that no group of taxpayers, no matter how small nor how beneficial their contributions, should be permitted to escape income tax entirely. Under present law some taxpayers need give little more than the otherwise allowable 30 percent in order to escape from the payment of any tax. Although the $10 million involved is small, relative to total philanthropic giving, repeal could seriously affect specific institutions and organizations, especially in the cultural field.

The major proposal which may adversely affect the level of private support of nonprofit cultural institutions and programs is the recommendation for a 5-percent floor on itemized deductions.

Under existing law voluntary contributions are wholly deductible and it has been frequently argued that this is the American way of providing public support and encouraging private giving to philanthropic and cultural institutions. Treasury officials have estimated for the purposes of this report that such tax concessions result now in an average tax benefit to individual and business donors to the arts of about 50 percent. With total voluntary giving estimated at approximately $8 billion annually, this 50 percent tax benefit is clearly substantial. But the amount given to the arts is very small in comparison to that given to religion, education and general philanthropy. (Indeed, an estimate of annual giving to the arts, based necessarily on inadequate data, puts the figure at probably not more than $50 million.)

In any case the tax benefit is considered of crucial importance by those responsible for the managing and financing of our cultural institutions. They state with virtual unanimity that a 5-percent floor would seriously affect contributions. To the argument of Treasury officials and other tax experts that over the years the level of voluntary giving has been unaffected by tax changes, they answer that the psychological effect of such a change introduced at this point would be severe, and that individual contributors would definitely decrease their giving.

This report strongly urges that contributions to nonprofit organizations and institutions be considered a quite separate category of personal expenditure entirely different in nature and purpose from other deductible items of personal expenditure, such as taxes, interest, employment and investment expenses. Complete tax deductibility for contributions is a method, deeply imbedded in American tradition, of support for philanthropic and nonprofit enterprise. In many ways it is a substitute for the direct public subsidy these organizations would need in the absence of private contributions. The eligible organizations and institutions are providing important services, are not run for profit, and can by their nature never be self-supporting. Government policy should be to provide the maximum positive encouragement and contributions should be wholly and not partially exempt from taxation as a matter of principle.

Admissions Tax

Other countries give positive support to their theaters; the United States by contrast penalizes the theater by imposing a 10-percent admissions tax. Such a tax has been considered a legitimate excise tax traditionally levied on luxuries. It has been defended on the ground that its remission would not necessarily have the effect of lowering ticket prices or benefiting the actor or playwright. But the theater is not a mere luxury. And it is quite possible, as the recent agreement between Actors Equity and the New York producers has shown, to insure that a tax saving will be used in ways which advance the true interests of the theater and of the acting profession.

The repeal of the Federal admissions tax on the legitimate theater, especially if combined with other acts aimed at promoting the American stage, would give a vital stimulus to this basic and enduring art form.

Professional Tax Deductions

Artists and writers often find themselves penalized by not being permitted to deduct what they consider legitimate professional expenses under existing tax laws. The issues are basically technical and frequently a matter of regulation and administrative interpretation. They relate generally to the fact that the practicing artist must often earn his living through other employment, notably teaching, and is often unable to earn any money from his creative output for years at a time.

The tax laws and their administration should be consistently responsive to these characteristics of the creative artist's profession, both as a matter of equity and of the Nation's interest in the encouragement of the arts.

Tax Treatment of Copyrights

The creator of a work of art is denied the rights available to holders of patents and other property under the capital assets tax provisions. The result of this is, for example, that while inventors and others may benefit from the lower capital gains tax, the writer and artist is subject to the higher income tax rates on income derived from copyright transactions.

This issue is controversial and it is argued that it is difficult to justify treating the value of copyrights as a capital asset. It is urged, however, that the merits of this issue be given new and serious consideration.

2. Other policies

Postal Rates

Existing special rates for organizations and educational and library materials are important to the maintenance of communications within the cultural community. The postal regulations limit eligibility for special rates to specified organizations and types of material, and the definitions sometimes exclude or are interpreted to exclude materials of cultural institutions and organizations, e.g., museums. It is important that rates for all legitimate cultural materials be kept as low as possible as a matter of principle.

Copyright Laws

The Register of Copyrights is preparing legislative proposals for the first general revision of the U.S. copyright laws since 1909. This step is long overdue. Technological developments entirely unknown in 1909 have rendered the existing laws in many respects uncertain, inconsistent, inequitable and inadequate.

It is not possible in the space of this report to go into the innumerable factors involved. It is sufficient to say that the equitable protection of fundamental rights as well as the recognition of the contribution of the creative writer, artist, composer and playwright are at stake. The outcome will be of major significance in determining the degree of encouragement or discouragement this Nation offers the creative arts.

Major issues involved include: (1) Duration of copyright whether 56 years as at present or longer (most other countries have adopted a life-plus basis); (2) proof and evidence of copyright protection; (3) extent and character of rights; and (4) existing limitations and exceptions (for example, jukebox operators) from payment of royalties. There are a number of others.

In addition, there might well be expressed a concern for the performing artist similar to that shown the composer and playwright.

A more radical proposal, the merit and feasibility of which should be seriously studied, is the suggestion that royalties on works in the public domain should be paid to the Government to be used to support and advance the arts. Care should be taken in working out a formula which would be equitable and sound in its effect on both living authors and musicians and on the cost of performing and publishing classical works now in the public domain. The suggestion has sometimes been made that such a policy be applied on a limited basis, both as to years and amounts, only on works which will fall into the public domain in the future. It could perhaps be tied in with an extension of the period of copyright protection.

Government Surplus Property

Many millions of dollars worth of surplus real and personal Federal property becomes available annually for free disposal or sale. Under present law such non-Federal and nonprofit use as schools, libraries, health, recreation, and wildlife conservation programs, etc., are eligible to acquire this property on a free or low-cost basis.

It is suggested that the importance to the public interest of such institutions as museums, theaters, orchestras, cultural and art centers, etc., all of which are educational in its truest sense, could well be recognized.

At the very least, it is urged that the President's recommendation to the Congress of May 16, 1962, to amend existing statutes to permit the sale of real property to public bodies at 75 percent of fair market value—rather than full value as at present—be approved. This recommendation has been resubmitted to the 88th Congress.

Public Works and Community Development

Although such cultural facilities and institutions as auditoriums, museums, theaters, and cultural centers are not specifically excluded from Federal public works and community development programs, very few projects of this type have been aided.

In a few instances assistance has been given to libraries, civic auditoriums and zoos. In general, however, such projects are given low priority as not meeting essential public needs or contributing to either economic growth or the reduction of unemployment.

It is suggested here that the existence of adequate cultural facilities in a community is often an important factor in plant location and therefore economic development. In any case, the concept of the public interest should be interpreted to include cultural opportunities as well as basic material needs.

Special Assistance and Service Programs

Federal programs of service and assistance have not usually taken into account environmental factors or considerations of good design. The Small Business Administration and the Community Facilities Administration could well include these considerations in their advisory services and in their planning and research assistance. Better design is not only to be desired on esthetic grounds but, as manufacturers are increasingly aware, can be important to efficiency, public relations, and sales, particularly exports. Similarly, plant location could be subjected more effectively to considerations of environmental planning, including cultural factors.

Media of Mass Communication

Government has long been recognized as having responsibility to insure that radio and television are operated in the public interest. Within the scope of this authority, through exhortation and encouragement, the Federal Communications Commission has recently been able to raise in some degree the level of programing, with the result that the arts and cultural activities in general have received a better hearing. But this indirect method has definite limits. The Federal Communications Commission is a quasi-judicial body, not a watchdog on behalf of the great community of listeners. The commercial broadcasters, though not infrequently surprised at the broad appeal which programs of a high cultural level achieve, can scarcely be convinced that this appeal is numerically greater than that of popular entertainment.

The Federal Communications Commission cannot be expected to carry the burden of determining the cultural level of programs. But through other machinery it should be possible to report periodically upon the advance or decline of current programing insofar as it relates to the specific field of the arts and cultural activities. It is recommended that a panel of the President's Advisory Council regularly issue such reports based upon a review of actual developments. In this way a series of benchmarks might at least be provided, in place of the scattered and unsystematic impressions on which judgment is now formed.

A second area of general government policy related to the quality and the cultural content of programing is through the ability to increase the number and effectiveness of educational television stations. Here, as in other fields, government's long established concern with education can be properly used as a means of stimulating the arts. Educational television as it has developed in the United States is only partially geared in with the educational system narrowly defined; it is also—and not least importantly—a means of bringing to the broad public a high level of programing, with stress upon literature and the other arts. Educational television may become the kind of yardstick—testing new ideas and audience response—which many have urged be established by one means or another.

For this reason the encouragement of educational television becomes a major means by which the Government, through its regular activities, can affect the arts. Particularly to be noticed is the precedent of recent legislation authorizing Federal assistance on a matching basis to facilitate the creation of educational television facilities. Funds should be appropriated to carry out this program. There are valid grounds for similar assistance for program and network development.

Tariff Policy

It is most important that the necessary legislation be passed to implement the Florence Agreement to establish duty-free status for educational, scientific and cultural materials. This agreement is one of several international conventions drawn up under the auspices of UNESCO to promote the free flow of cultural materials. It was adopted in 1950 and has since been ratified by approximately 40 countries, including the United States.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY RELATING TO THE ARTS

Experience during recent months suggests the need for setting up continuing administrative means for dealing with issues of the arts. The public has come to anticipate that the expressed concern of the Government will be formalized in some way. It is important that nothing pretentious or heavyhanded be created, and equally important that recent initiatives not be allowed to expire. The following suggestions build upon what has already been done, and look ahead to what seems a natural development in the light of increased and deep-lying national interest in the arts.[3]

These suggested steps presuppose a constant concern with the enhancing and development of the arts through normal activities of the Federal Government. They also look forward to a more direct involvement of government through a new institutional body with operating funds. They do not envisage any effort to direct or influence the work of artists; their purpose is to keep the arts free, not to organize or regiment them.

1. Special adviser

A major recommendation of this report is that the post of special consultant on the arts be continued after the present trial period. Consideration should be given to its being full time and having the status of special adviser. Detailed day-by-day attention is necessary if governmental operations, often seemingly unrelated to the arts, are to be brought to the standards advocated by this report.

Principal areas of work for which the special adviser would be responsible have been described in the first chapter of this report. Besides the policy-planning and review functions which formed the major part of the original assignment, he should be available for advice on all matters pertaining to the arts which arise in the course of the administration's work. He should be the President's liaison with the National Cultural Center, should sit in on panels and meetings where matters of Federal architecture, design, graphics, etc., are being discussed.

In addition, the special adviser should have, as described below, a close relationship with the President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

2. The Advisory Council

Detailed recommendations relating to the establishment and functions of an Advisory Council within the Executive Office of the President have been separately submitted. This Council provides an essential part in an orderly and representative structure dealing with the arts. Its basic function is to continue and fill out the work of study and gathering information begun with the limited resources of the special consultant; to review Federal policies and make recommendations for improving design; to recommend long-range programs; and to assure the active participation of the artistic community in the Government effort.

The special adviser can call upon the Council and its specialized committees for assistance. The Advisory Council will thus become part of the machinery through which advice is provided to the various agencies of Government as they endeavor to set up art committees of their own, to organize competitions, or otherwise to raise the level of design.

The President will appoint the Chairman of the Council, who presumably will be the special adviser. Following experience in the science field, the Advisory Council should achieve effectiveness and stature through being related to the President's adviser and having its recommendations go through him directly to the President.

3. A National Arts Foundation

An Arts Foundation, on the model of the existing foundations in science and health and as already proposed in legislation before the Congress, would appear to be the logical crowning step in a national cultural policy. Such a Foundation would be a means of administering grants-in-aid, generally on a matching basis, to States and institutions of the arts. It might thus administer matching grants to States setting up arts councils. It might make available grants for demonstration projects proposed by particular cultural institutions. Thus it could consider helping support experiments designed to increase attendance, to foster creativity and introduce contemporary works to new audiences, or to offer services on an experimental basis. The Foundation would not provide subsidies to carry the deficits of such institutions, but would aim at promoting cultural diversity, innovation and excellence.

Such an Arts Foundation should be thought of as supplementing the goals of the National Cultural Center, for it would help develop and stimulate the cultural activities and institutions of the country. And these, in turn, would have for their ultimate showcase the stages of the National Cultural Center in Washington.

What is sketched here represents the beginning of what could become a permanent policy giving form to the relationship between Government and the arts. It is a limited policy; for Government's role in this area must always be marginal. It is a policy not copied after European models, but keyed to the particular conditions of diversity and decentralization prevailing in the United States.

There will always remain those who feel that art and Government should exist in different spheres, having nothing to do with each other. But in fact the Government of the United States comes up constantly against choices and decisions where aesthetic considerations are involved. In today's world, moreover, artistic talent and creativity are resources vitally important to the Nation, and the well-being of the people is related to progress in the arts as surely as to progress in fields such as recreation and education where Government's responsibility is fully recognized.

Although Government's role in the arts must always remain peripheral, with individual creativity and private support being central, that is no reason why the things which the Government can properly do in this field should not be done confidently and expertly.

APPENDIX I

MAJOR SPEECHES BY THE SPECIAL CONSULTANT ARTICLES AND OFFICIAL PARTICIPATION AT CULTURAL EVENTS, APRIL 1962 TO MAY 1963

1. Major addresses during this period include 1962: American Institute of Architects Conference on Aesthetic Responsibility, New York City, April 3; annual convocation, Yale Arts Association, New Haven, April 14; annual meeting, Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra Association, Milwaukee, May 14; Boston College Seminar, Boston, May 15; commencement address, Manhattan School of Music, New York City, May 29; annual meeting, American Association of Museums, Williamsburg, Va., June 6; Phi Beta Kappa oration, Hunter College, New York City, June 6; commencement address, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, N.J., June 9; annual convention, American Library Association, Miami, June 17; annual convention, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C., June 28; annual dinner, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, Washington, D.C., September 13; founder's day address, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, October 2; Binghamton Fine Arts Society, Binghamton, N.Y., October 15; 22d American Assembly on Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations, Arden House, N.Y., October 18; convocation, Board of Regents of

---

[3] One of the institutional steps often proposed has been the calling of a White House Conference on the Arts to assist in the formulation of a national arts policy. It is recommended that such a conference should be held only after a frame of reference has been worked out in some detail. The advisability and timing of such a conference should be a concern of the President's Advisory Council.

New York State, Albany, October 26; annual meeting, American Society of Industrial Designers, New York City, November 2; annual meeting, Association of Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., November 14; Association of College and University Concert Managers, New York City, December 17; general meeting, National Music Council, New York City, December 20.

In 1963: Cultural affairs officers of Washington embassies, Washington, D.C., January 8; symposium, University of Pennsylvania architecture students, Philadelphia, January 11; American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., January 17; Foreign Service Institute oversea assignment course for wives, Washington, D.C., January 25; annual dinner, Society of Architectural Historians and College Art Association of America, Baltimore, January 25; Detroit Adventure Conversations in the Arts, Detroit, January 28; Pittsburgh cultural groups, Pittsburgh, January 31; Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, Minneapolis, February 6; Yale and Vassar Clubs of Washington, Washington, D.C., February 12; Philadelphia Museum College of Art, Philadelphia, February 19; Pomona College 75th anniversary symposium, Claremont, Calif., February 21; New York Academy of Public Education, New York City, February 27; Conference of Association of Womens' Committees for Symphony Orchestras, San Antonio, Tex., March 5; P.E.N., New York City, March 11; 1963 American National Theater and Academy Assembly, Washington, D.C., March 12; Flint Institute of Arts, Flint, Mich., March 14; Allen R. Hite Memorial Lecture, University of Louisville, Louisville, March 21; Coe College Fine Arts Festival, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, March 27; AFL–CIO conference on community services, New York City, April 3; State Conference on the Cultural Arts in California, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles, April 5; Fifty Books of the Year Exhibition, American Institute of Graphic Arts, New York City, April 16; Festival of the Arts in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, April 17; Princeton University symposium on the arts, Princeton University, April 20; American Federation of Arts annual convention, Dallas, Tex., May 23.

2. Official participation and remarks at cultural events (1962): World Theater Day, New York City, March 27; luncheon for the National Symphony Orchestra, Washington, D.C., April 4; Seattle World's Fair, Seattle, May 10; Friday Morning Music Club Foundation competition awards, Washington, D.C., May 11; annual meeting, American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York City, May 24; Lotos Club State Dinner honoring Robert Frost, New York City, May 24; luncheon honoring Arena Stage, Washington, D.C., June 5; presentation of first Carnegie Hall Award to Pablo Casals, Casals Festival, New York City, June 21; Richard Rodgers 60th birthday luncheon, New York City, June 28; Robin Hood Dell Outdoor Concert, Philadelphia, July 9; New York State Arts Council meeting, Tarrytown, N.Y., August 26; dedication of Martha Graham Dance Studio, New School for Social Research, New York City, September 20; annual dinner, Morgan Library, New York City, October 1; National Poetry Festival, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., October 17; dedication, Washington Gallery of Modern Art, Washington, D.C., October 20; dedication, Spaulding Auditorium of Hopkins Arts Center, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., November 12; luncheon for National Cultural Center, Washington, D.C., November 26; Long Island dinner and closed-circuit television show for the National Cultural Center, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., November 29.

In 1963: 85th birthday dinner honoring Carl Sandburg, New York City, January 6; Dimitri Mitropolous International Music Competition Concert, New York City, April 7; citation to Leopold Stokowski and the American Symphony Orchestra, Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 15; opening of National Music Week, Manhattan School of Music, New York City, May 6.

3. Articles: Challenge, "Government and the Arts," June 1962; House and Garden, "The Two Cities That Are Washington," July 1962; Saturday Review, "Public Works and the Public Happiness," August 4, 1962; Environment, "Environment and the Citizen," Autumn 1962; New York Times Sunday magazine, "The Nation's Culture: New Age for the Arts," Sept. 23, 1962; Art in America, "The Role of Government," winter 1962; Artists' Equity Newsletter, "Government and the Artist's Role," December 1962; Show, "Ordering a Cultural Explosion," December 1962; New York Herald-Tribune, "Subsidy of the Arts?" December 1962; Lincoln Center program, "Government and the Arts," winter 1962; The Critic, "Should the U.S. Government Subsidize the Arts?" December 1962; Arts in Society, "Higher Education and the Arts," spring 1963; Equity Magazine golden anniversary issue, "The Theater Tomorrow," May 1963.

APPENDIX II

LIST OF FINE ARTS (SCULPTURE, PAINTING, MOSAICS, ETC.) COMMISSIONED OR INSTALLED ON NEW FEDERAL PROJECTS FROM 1959 TO PRESENT

1. Ceramic mural frieze 5 feet high by 57 feet square, abstract high relief sculpture by Franz Wildenhain, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md.

2. Low-relief medallion portraits of three famous doctors (Billings, Garrison, and Fletcher) by C. Paul Jennewein, at National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md.

3. Murals (oil on canvas) representing early Milledgeville architecture located in lobby of new post office, Milledgeville, Ga., by Frank Herring.

4. Fountain sculpture in bronze—an abstract composition suggesting the Mississippi's source and flow—by Robert Cronbach, in the lobby of the new Federal Office Building in St. Louis, Mo.

5. Wall and ceiling mural decorations painted direct to plaster representing musical instruments by Allyn Cox, in the musical instrument room of the new History and Technology Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

6. Heroic bronze sculpture fountain "Man and the Expanding Universe," by Marshall Fredericks, for the south courtyard of the new State Department Building, Washington, D.C.

7. Two heroic relief sculptures over end entrance doors to be carved in limestone blocks, by Bernard Frazier, at the new Oklahoma City Courthouse and Federal Office Building.

8. Great U.S. seals, modeled by Mr. Kiselewski for entrance doorway at the new courthouse and Federal office building in Brooklyn, N.Y.

9. Fountain sculpture in metal, by Russell Forrester, for Federal office building in Salt Lake City, Utah.

10. Ceramic tile mosaic mural in lobby, by Charles Harper, for Cincinnati, Ohio, Federal office building (under construction). Cast architectural sculpture (aluminum) to be modeled by Marshall Fredericks.

11. Artists have been selected for bas-relief stone carving bronze column at entrance and panels for interior of the U.S. courts and Federal office building (under construction) Denver, Colo.

12. Murals, a series of vignettes representing history and growth of industry at Ocala, Fla. Studies now in preparation by Professor Hollis, of University of Florida, Gainesville, for the lobby of the new post office in Ocala. (This project will be financed entirely by private funds.)

APPENDIX III

LIST OF EXISTING FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES RELATED TO THE ARTS

1. The White House: The Fine Arts Committee of the White House; Advisory Committee to the Fine Arts Committee; Special Committee for White House Paintings.

2. Commission of Fine Arts (itself an advisory body): Board of Architectural Consultants for the Old Georgetown Act; Advisory Panel on the Performing Arts (inactive).

3. Smithsonian Institution: Smithsonian Art Commission; Advisory Committee on the Arts to the National Cultural Center.

4. Department of the Interior: Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; Consulting Committee for the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings.

5. Department of Defense: Air Force Academy Fine Arts Panel; National Music Council Overseas Touring Committee (Department of the Army); American Educational Theater Association, Overseas Touring Committee; Navy Art Cooperation and Liaison Committee.

6. Department of the Post Office: Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

7. Department of State: U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; Advisory Committee on the Arts; U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; Advisory Panel on Buildings Overseas; Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs.

8. U.S. Information Agency: Advisory Committee on Cultural Information; Music Advisory Panel.

9. Federal Aviation Agency: The Design Advisory Committee.

10. Library of Congress: Committee to Select Prints for Purchase Under the Pennell Fund; Advisory Committee to the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation; Advisory Board to the Serge Koussevitsky Music Foundation; individual consultants and advisers.

COMMEMORATION OF THE MASS DEPORTATIONS FROM THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941, the Soviet Union forcibly deported close to 40,000 persons—young and old, men, women, and children—from their homes and loved ones in Lithuania and shipped them off to slave labor camps in the remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic. On the anniversary of these inhuman crimes, it is only fitting that we in the Senate should pay tribute to the brave Lithuanian people who have endured so much.

In the interval between World War I and World War II the Republic of Lithuania made an admirable record. Its constitution guaranteed to all citizens the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, and communications, and economic and social progress was made. With the outbreak of World War II, the Lithuanian people bravely resisted the aggressions of both Hitler and the Soviet Union; however, they were gradually engulfed. In 1939 the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty upon the country; on June 15, 1940, the Soviet demanded immediate formation of a friendly government and occupied the country; on August of that year the Baltic States were deprived of their independence and incorporated into the

U.S.S.R. by means of force and fraudulent elections; and on June 14, 1941, the Soviet police began the deportations. Thousands of persons were executed when the Soviet forces retreated in haste under German attack, and when the Soviets retook the country in 1944 new waves of mass deportations followed.

The United States have never recognized the forceful incorporation of Lithuania and her neighbors by the U.S.S.R. We have denounced this crime of aggression and consistently refused to recognize the Communist claims to these people and their territories. This policy of nonrecognition originally affirmed by President Roosevelt was reaffirmed by the Senate when it approved the Douglas resolution in 1954 and by the Congress when it passed the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959.

Americans of Lithuanian descent have made real contributions to our country in industry, labor, music, and the arts. They are good citizens and the Chicago Lithuanian-Americans have been among the best. Let us hope and pray that the day will soon come when freedom and democracy will be restored once more to Lithuania.

LET US HAVE FAITH

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my great fortune and deep honor to be a participant in the 91st commencement program of Doane College in Crete, Nebr., on June 3.

Doane's alumni rolls list many distinguished names. Of especial interest to my colleagues is that of my illustrious predecessor, the late Senator Hugh Butler. He was always proud to refer to his graduation from Doane in what he termed "the class of double-aught."

In his lifetime and at its close he was most generous in his financial support of this fine Congregational college which he loved so well.

Doane is now in its 92d year. It is preparing to celebrate its centennial in 1972. The college administration and faculty, together with its board of trustees, have made long-range plans which include both the construction of buildings and significant expansions in the academic program and the faculty. These plans are based on a splendid tradition. We can rejoice in the success of this outstanding educational effort by men and women of vision and courage who lead that march of faith which means so much in the future of our country.

The president of Doane, Dr. Donald Typer, invited me to address the graduating class, at the conclusion of which honorary degrees were conferred upon the Reverend Robert W. Inglis, superintendent of the Colorado Congregational Conference, and me.

For the honor thus paid me by Doane College, I am deeply appreciative and most grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my commencement address, "Let Us Have Faith," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let Us Have Faith

(Address of Senator Roman L. Hruska, 91st annual commencement, Doane College, June 3, 1963)

Dr. Typer, members of the faculty, parents, friends, and members of the student body: I am honored to share the pleasure of this day with you. The service of Doane College to the fundamental task of education has been long and illustrious. You can take just pride in recognition of the fact that Nebraska, the Nation and, indeed, wherever Doane's graduates have gone are the beneficiaries of the discipline and devotion to learning that lie behind its degrees.

To become one of Doane's alumni is, therefore, a distinction which, I assure you, the passing years will bring an increasing awareness. Let me say that to be entrusted with the responsibility of addressing the graduating class of 1963 is a privilege the memory of which I will always cherish.

My gratification at being with you today is greatly increased by the fact that this was Hugh Butler's college.

As a young man and especially during my years as a freshman Congressman I turned often to Senator Butler for counsel and guidance—and sometimes for consolation. I will never forget, and always will be grateful for, the talks we had in his office or home at the end or on the eve of a long legislative day.

Hugh Butler loved the Senate of the United States. Anyone who serves there does. But he loved Doane College more. It was not just that he was a graduate of what he called the class of double-aught or that he was appreciative of what Doane had done for him. It was something deeper than that. It amounted to a complete faith in Doane, in its past and its future.

So I consider it a personal privilege to stand today on the campus of the college which 63 years ago this week handed a diploma to Hugh Butler and sent him on to a distinguished career in business and government.

Although it may be traditional, it was never more true to observe that your generation is living in the midst of the richest, most dramatic and awesome epoch in all history. The statement is not intended to be an appeal to your ego. It is offered as a challenge to your convictions and sense of responsibility. This moment, inescapably, is pivotal for the fate of mankind. Never before in history has so much depended on the cool calculations of so few.

Even with decisions seemingly dictated by the data processing machines which fill the nerve centers of our Nation, the problems of our age have not been reduced to manageable proportions.

This period of history of mankind is unmatched for sheer quantity of power to be disposed, for issues of momentous significance not to one nation alone but to all of the nations on earth, for the possibilities either of achieving a just and lasting peace or precipitating a war that truly will end all wars—and civilization along with it.

With the suddenness by which such an era has come, it is not surprising to find opposing opinions and contradictory forecasts regarding the future. At the same time we are told that the future has a rosy glow and that it will soon climax in a mushroom cloud. In the same manner we are told that we are a nation of conforming sheep and likewise that we have no standards; that we are too liberal and too conservative; that we have cut ourselves off too much from the past and that we are too tradition-bound for a modern age.

I suppose any number of other antinomies have occurred to you. They define a condition of a very complex society and I would not try, if it were even possible, to reconcile them. Rather I make the judgment that with faith the problems of our age can be successfully met. Certainly without it, they will not.

Knowing the capabilities of this and similar graduating classes to do tremendous good for mankind, I propose simply to challenge and possibly to reinforce your own confidence. In short, I plead the case, "let us have faith."

My text is drawn from the address of Abraham Lincoln at Cooper Institute in New York in February 1860. In the final sentence of that great speech he proclaimed: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

The times were fateful then, too, both for Lincoln as a possible candidate for the Presidency and for the Nation. Whatever his ambition, the man had one thought in that hour. That was for the issues which were casting lengthening shadows over the Union, threatening its dissolution. Narrowly, those issues applied only to those times. Yet they had overtones that are relevant to many of our problems today. The terms of Lincoln's approach also apply today. Let us recall the situation briefly.

Lincoln had debated Stephen Douglas across the State of Illinois on the issue of extending slavery in the national territories. Douglas would appease the South by submitting the issue to popular sovereignty in the territories. Lincoln, while leaving slavery where it was, would prevent its extension where it was not. Leaders of the young Republican Party, looking for its first candidate for the Presidency, had been impressed by the cogency and vigor of Lincoln in these debates. He was invited East for a major address on the subject so others could look him over.

Senator Seward, a major contender and one who, as Lincoln had acknowledged, had preeminent claims upon the party in terms of service to it, had just delivered his major address on the issue in Congress. Yet it was Lincoln on the evening of February 27 who said what men of deepest concern were waiting to hear.

Lincoln stated the case of the South with complete honesty and refuted it with sobriety. As the historical Allan Nevins puts it: "Unlike Seward, he did not treat the disunionist threats as so unnatural that no hand would execute them; he implied that the peril was real. He did not gloss over the great divisive issue but explicitly defined it; and instead of appealing to expedient patriotism which would ignore issues, he appealed to a patriotism of principle that would face them."

Throughout the address morality was not blurred. It was held clearly before all. The appeal to faith in the final sentence was made in the teeth of a most direct confrontation of issues, and by looking squarely at the possibility of the most adverse developments.

The faith of which Lincoln spoke was shaped by a consciousness of realities. As such, it required courage as much as anything. It was not without a trust to justify that courage, however. Hence the belief that right makes might. Such faith requires more than firm convictions. It must be followed by action. It is this what Lincoln meant when he said: "And in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Let me suggest today two things in which we can have faith; what is right for us.

I

The first is a faith in the creative possibilities of our human powers.

It is beyond our needs here to cite even a small portion of the major discoveries of your lifetime. It would be difficult even to say what the most important one has been. Developments which have not yet become known may turn out to be more revolutionary than those discoveries that have.

Consider, for example, the potential for harnessing the power of the atom itself, which less than a week ago opened a new era for Nebraska in the plant at Hallam.

In the field of medicine, the antibiotics and mycins have vastly affected us. Through chemistry and genetics the land has been made to bring forth in an abundance surpassing the Biblical milk and honey.

Major Cooper's successful flight of 3 weeks ago reduced the earth in size, to only 88 minutes around now. Television is intercontinental today; tomorrow we expect to see live pictures of the planets.

With the frontiers of knowledge of the processes of life and the nature of the universe continuously receding, is it so rash to say that we can do whatever we decide and are willing to put our efforts to?

We can have faith that such discoveries will bring to mankind a new freedom. Rid of the age-old scourges of sickness and scarcity, unrestrained by the physical barriers of ocean and air, and in touch with one another by new systems of sight and sound, we are at the threshold of achieving even greater human freedom and dignity.

Of course these accomplishments of what once were the wildest of dreams will not come easy. The tasks of tapping the potential defy comprehension. They stagger the imagination.

My purpose, however, is not to remind you of the hazards involved or even to advise you as to how to avoid them. I am content that with the keen discipline developed in your years at Doane you are well equipped to think and act for yourselves. My purpose rather is to emphasize that, whatever field you now shall enter, the future beckons. In responding, it is imperative that you utilize the creative possibilities which lie within your power.

Faith in the individual is no panacea. It is, however, the primary factor if the potential and promises of the future are to be realized.

II

At the outset I suggested that there were two things in which we should have faith. The creative possibilities of the individual is the first of these. The other is a faith in the instruments and institutions of self-government.

As you leave this lovely campus to become doctors, lawyers, clergymen, teachers, scientists, engineers, businessmen, farmers, housewives, or whatever it may be, you will be equally conscious of your role as a citizen. I hope that your sense of responsibilities as a citizen will neither be dulled nor subordinated by the preoccupations of your chosen profession or calling.

There is nothing in your future more important than active participation in self-government. I say this in all earnestness and for compelling reasons.

There are vast and vexatious concerns with which this Republic is faced and which require your most urgent attention.

The problem of peace is one. The annual expenditure of over $50 billion for military purposes is in itself burdensome enough, precluding as it does, needed constructive, nondefense activities. But the fiscal burden is not all. As a nation, we are torn between hysterical peace demonstrations and slogans like "Better Red Then Dead" on the one hand and those who would plunge us into nuclear war on the other.

The threat to peace is heightened by the ill-considered actions of those who profess to see a mellowing in the Kremlin. No greater mistake could be made. The goal of international communism remains what it has always been: world domination.

A similarly serious mistake is being made by those who favor a change in our policy toward Hungary because there have been some minor relaxations in the cruel and harsh oppressions of the Kadar regime. We had before our Senate Internal Security Subcommittee some of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters who survived the bloody and ruthless suppression of the 1956 revolt. It is unfortunate that those who now espouse a softening of our attitude toward Hungary did not hear those anguished, desperate stories.

Another problem concerns the new and emerging nations which compound our difficulties in foreign relations. Claiming their inalienable right to self-government while sometimes exploiting their own people, these governments can raise hard questions regarding their acceptance in the family of nations. And by flirting with communism as they look to the free world for support and protection, these same nations create difficult decisions as to the proper policy to follow.

Another problem is that of human rights. Not overseas, but right at home. The knowledge that the color of a man's skin may determine the extent to which he can exercise his civil rights arouses acute pangs of conscience. Mammoth protests, mass arrests, multiple lawsuits, and the movements of troops all coalesce into a discouraging picture which distorts and minimizes the progress which the last 100 years has witnessed in the field of race relations. A policy of too much talk and not enough action seems to have led us to the point where we are desperately and awkwardly searching out something—almost anything—to throw into the breached wall of our national dignity and effectiveness with our own citizens.

A fourth area of trouble is clearly indicated in the apparent obsession of some persons to enhance the public sector of the national scene at the expense of the private sector, local government, the individual and of the national well-being. This they seek to do by a large scale increase in the size, scope, and cost of our Federal activities.

With a new annual spending base of some $108 billion—33⅓ percent increase over 2½ years ago—and a host of new and expensive social programs, the course is being mapped, not only for a serious deterioration of our fiscal position, but also for a change in our methods of government.

Fortunately, awareness of these dangers is on the increase. More and more, earnest, concerned citizens are applying this test to public officials and their proposals: Do they advocate that this Federal Republic belongs to the Government? Or does it belong to the people?

We know the right answer. It is to be found in our Federal Constitution and in the thrilling progress made by the United States in making available to so many the benefits of democracy. It is these millions to whom this country belongs, and not to its Government, and certainly not to those individuals temporarily in charge of its affairs.

It is in these areas that I urge your concern—peace, emerging nations, human rights at home, fiscal responsibility, and our philosophy of government.

In the wake of tensions and crises thus generated, far too many people lose their nerve, their principles and convictions, their power to act. They lose their faith. They evidence this by yielding to the temptations to downgrade our instruments and institutions of self-government. Regrettably many go so far as to write them off as inadequate to cope with "the felt necessities of the times."

So it is that we witness again—as we did in the thirties—vitriolic attacks on the judicial system. Some call for curbs upon its powers. Others would impose upon it a super supreme court of one kind or another.

Today we observe repeated assaults on the legislative branch, both from within and without the Congress. With increasing frequency we hear cries to abolish or pack certain committees, to revise procedures or rules, to abandon or radically change well-tested, long-accepted practices.

It is popular to disparage our operations of government. It is considered fashionable to refer to Congress as the symbol or cause for the so-called deadlock of democracy.

Why these destructive outbursts? And what deadlock?

Simply this: The complainants are unable to secure acceptance and approval of their solution of the Nation's problems. Their pet programs are rejected—or what is worse—totally ignored after being subjected to such inspection and analysis long considered imperative before any new plan, program, or law is launched to apply to 50 States containing 185 millions of human beings. Hence the frustration, bewilderment, and disappointment are converted into a reckless condemnation of the system of government and its procedures which have brought so much in the way of improvement and advancement in the material and spiritual lot of Americans as well as in the freedom and dignity accorded them. And with a potential and goal of even greater progress virtually assured if only we refuse to be stampeded.

At the risk of destroying or seriously impairing a well-principled, delicately balanced, and highly beneficial arrangement of self-government, the impatience and ego of self-adjudged benefactors leads them to ill-advised excesses to gain their goals of salvation. Thus the long-range values are thrown into discard for immediate political expediency.

III

These problem areas are many and they are serious.

But let us well note that they are overbalanced many times by entries on the credit side of the ledger.

Ours is the oldest government on earth functioning continuously under a written Constitution. We are approaching the conclusion of our second century. Under that document there has been brought more liberty, dignity, material wealth, and spiritual freedom and richness than have ever been visited upon any nation before.

Ours is an open society in which we can engage in self-criticism without fear. As long as we do it respectfully we can and often do differ vigorously with our public officials—our President, our Members of Congress, our Governors, and State legislators.

All of this is healthy.

Moreover, it is to be expected in a dynamic society such as ours. We are not and have not been static. We have grown, developed, progressed; Congress has been reorganized in recent years; procedures have undergone change; old customs have yielded to new conditions.

This process is in rapid movement right now. It will continue. For some, the movement is too slow. For others it is too fast.

For the bulk of us, it is acceptable in rate, and understandable in quality.

We are still the best in the world as a nation—and getting better.

I ask that you maintain and strengthen your faith in our concept of government and the institutions which it has established for law, order, and advancement.

I ask that you reaffirm in your thinking the real source of America's greatness and strength. It is not to be found in our Nation's Capitol, nor in the halls or officials of formal government. America's greatness and strength are to be found in its people, in their diligence, productivity, imagination, creativity. In their vision and in their faith—a faith attached firmly to a conviction to act.

The officials you elect to conduct the affairs of the Nation, and those they appoint to help them in that task, are not the only ones who incur the obligation to support and defend the Constitution.

In a larger sense, the obligation to support the most profound system of self-government yet devised by man rests squarely on each citizen's shoulders—and each of you is such a citizen.

My message this morning is thus for a renewal of faith in the individual based on the belief that man was meant to be free.

The essence of my appeal is found in the words of Judge Learned Hand written 19 years ago:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it. * * * (In) that spirit of an America which has never been, and which may never be; nay, which never will be except as the conscience and courage of Americans create it; yet in the spirit of that America which lies hidden in some form in the aspirations of us all * * * in that spirit of liberty and of America I ask you to * * * pledge our faith in the glorious destiny of our beloved country."

In the spirit invoked by Judge Hand, I express congratulations and gratitude to the faculty, administration, staff, and board of this college—and to you, Dr. Typer, as its distinguished president—for your 1963 contribution to a better Republic. It is another year of work well done.

To the graduates and their justifiably proud families, I extend congratulations and best wishes as you conclude another and very meaningful step toward a full and vital citizenship.

DENVER, IND., IS LINKED TO FARAWAY COMMUNITY IN KOREA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in an age when international cooperation is a prerequisite to the survival of all nations in the free world, it is indeed a pleasure to see the growth in friendship between the peoples of Denver, Ind., and Sonyu-ri, Korea. These people have found in their relationship the time-honored principles which underlie successful friendships throughout the world—that is, a sincere desire to learn about the cultures of other nationalities and the ability to mutually respect each other's way of life.

I, along with the people of Denver and Sonyu-ri, hope that more opportunities will arise for other experiments of this nature to take place. It has not only been a fulfilling experience for the people involved, but a step toward peace and international understanding. At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Peru, Ind., Tribune of June 6, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Denver, Ind., Is Linked to Faraway Community in Korea

(Editor's Note.—There is an interesting sidelight that has developed since Mrs. Lewis Dice, Tribune correspondent in Denver, wrote this story. The Korean girl who is mentioned in the story by Lt. Col. A. John Golden completed the scroll and planned to send it to Mrs. Edgar Lewis, project chairman of the Denver Woman's Study Club. When the mayor and other towns-people heard that the girl was going to mail it and pay for the cost of mailing herself, they persuaded her to let them pay for the cost of sending the scroll airmail to Mrs. Lewis.)

(By Mrs. Lewis Dice)

The sign post reads: Denver, Ind., 7,439.9 miles." It stands at the gates of Camp Pelham in the Republic of Korea. erected by the men in the outfit of Lt. Col. A. John Golden, commanding officer of the camp after they found that Denver is his hometown.

Lieutenant Colonel Golden sent a plea across those miles. It came in a letter to Mrs. Edgar Lewis whose interest in missions and work in church and civic affairs he had known from his youth here as the son of Rev. and Mrs. C. F. Golden. Since going to Korea in November he has become concerned about the people of Sonyu-ri, a village of some 3,000 persons crowded onto about 10 acres adjoining the camp.

In the first letter he wrote: "Sonyu-ri is extremely poor but there are a lot of fine people who are struggling to rid the town of its corruption. This in turn helps me. They have established a police force and help patrol the post to prevent thievery which was so rampant."

He was trying to help them start some small industries so that they may become self-supporting, something of their own which will continue after the military has left. He wrote:

WANT TO TRUST US

"I find the local people desperately want to trust us and to believe that we really are interested in them. They have a high regard for family life. If some way I can tie in my own community back home I feel it will accomplish something of mutual benefit." He stressed that while much was needed, most of all he wished that the people of Denver and vicinity might in some way show their friendship for the people of the village.

Mrs. Lewis presented the letter at a meeting of the Woman's Study Club of Denver and the club voted to sponsor aid to him in his efforts, and Mrs. Lewis was named chairman. Since then there has been an extensive exchange of correspondence between the two, including taped messages to Mrs. Lewis and to the club.

To start the ball rolling, Mrs. Lewis sent Golden a check for $10. Writing to tell her what a morale builder it was, he said: "The people got so excited when I told them my hometown wanted to exchange ideas, culture and friendship. You have no idea what that check will do. First I will show it to them. It means 5 meals of rice (a meal is about a peck) and about 1½ weeks' work. Ten dollars will pay a man for 9 days or 9 men for a day. Seven dollars and fifty cents will buy food for a man for a month."

PLANTING TREES

"Right now," he wrote in one of his letters, "the town people are helping us plant trees, grass, gardens and flowers. In turn we have helped build a levee and provided machinery and other help for their roads and streets and drainage.

"Tree planting is a national project for Koreans and they take great pride in it. (The Republic of Korea Government gives the people pine and locust trees but fruit trees must be purchased and are expensive.) I have received 500 trees to plant on the post and the town is planting them for us. I am buying a peach tree and presenting it to the town with a plaque indicating it is from the officers and men of Camp Pelham to the town in honor of their arbor day. I am convinced that trees know no country nor hatred of men but somehow provide a faith that there is a God who created all things and that man must strive to help his fellow man regardless of nationality.

"I am astounded at the response these people have given me to make this a better place for my men to perform duty and a better country for them as a result of our being here. I am convinced that some worthwhile evidence that my community back home is interested in their welfare will be all the more beneficial to the soldiers who perform duty here."

CLUB SENDS $80

Inspired by the letters and pictures he sent, the Study Club members have contributed about $80 which has been forwarded to Golden. A Korean food package and five school kits have been sent through CARE, to explore possibilities of aid.

Colonel Golden and men in the camp are promoting four self-help projects with citizens of the village: A school and playground, a town hall, self-sustaining projects for employment and the planting of trees.

Plans for the school have been submitted to authorities and it is believed this will be accomplished through joint United States and Korean Government effort. Some swings and teeter-totters have been built for the playground and Golden writes it is a sight to see some 500 children standing in line to take turns playing on them.

The men of Camp Pelham are cooperating to raise a fund to start the town hall which is calculated to cost about $300. The village has no public meeting place except as the town council rents a tavern. When the town hall is started the playground will be set up on a plot of ground adjoining it so that the equipment can be protected from thieves. Mothers will supervise the playground.

Golden says: "The money you have sent will go to support the No. 3 project (employment) right now, but in the minds of the people you are supporting all four. We must make every dollar count in a way to help good people stand up tall and the thieves, beggars, loafers, prostitutes, etc., unpopular."

REPAIR ARTIST SHOP

He sent a clipping from "Stars and Stripes" showing a picture of a Korean girl who has a little art shop in Sonyu-ri where she makes color portraits from black and white snapshots. She also does charcoal sketches from live models at two service clubs each week. He wrote:

"She has a tiny shop with broken windows and the most beautiful smile you ever saw. Just like you read in missionary articles of people with extreme faith to do something constructive." He gave her funds to repair her shop and buy paints and brushes. In appreciation she is making a scroll to be sent to the Denver club.

"One reason that I do not want to spend any more dollars than necessary," he writes, "is that the national policy is to conserve dollars spent overseas and second we don't have it to spend. Also the Korean Government has a responsibility to help their own people. By encouraging to spend money for them, i.e., the school. Also the people support their own community organization when they know it is helping them."

"The mayor brought over 50 people to help us put in a 6-inch sewer line. There were several women with babies strapped on their backs. We fed them dinner and supper. The men gave them different times also. One day people came from a town 10 miles away to help dig ditches and do other work that had us whipped for a while. No one talks much about it but there is a real bond between these people and the men now."

MAKE STRAW ROPES

In one of the latest letters he reports that several Koreans had been employed by the camp to make straw ropes for camouflage for maneuvers. Then the children were treated with candy, soft drinks, and milk by the men of Camp Pelham. He stated that material for the ropes and treats for the children had cost about $28.

Quoting from other letters:

"The more I learn about these people the more ashamed I am. They are really hungry but they never complain. In fact, the mayor said they have been living like this for 1,000 years and they feel sorry that we make life so complicated. Quite frankly, I often envy them. They love their little farms and are meticulous in their work. Everything is so precise and exact in their fields. The troublemakers are the same as at home—the people who make a living off people rather than work.

"The mayor of the town reminds me of my Grandfather Cunningham. He works hard day after day. He tries to help people get on their feet. He hates drifters and lazy ones, with a passion. Everyone who has trouble blames it on him. They have backed him pretty well since we got the meal for them. (150 hundred-pound bags of flour procured through the aid of the Catholic chaplain.)

He goes around collecting from the ones who have steady jobs and buys rice and flour for the really destitute. He makes the lazy ones work or they can't eat. At one time they brought pressure on him to get gasoline and material from the army but he has convinced them that those days are over and everything must be accounted for. The amazing thing is he gets no pay at all. He is selected by 15 councilmen and is actually the 16th. If they don't like him he gets fired by the simple fact that they take a vote and elect another one. He has an amazing desire to help his people but it is the same the world over, they jump all over him.

"The little town is in a battle for its life against the syndicate, Communist sympathizers, criminals and petty thieves. I had to have something to give them the courage to stay with it. That something is faith in America. When I prove to them that the civilian community that raised me is concerned with their problems—that's the missing element here. They don't understand the cars and machinery, nor do they need to. They understand life and the terrible problem it is to sustain it. Regardless of race and creed it is the same. The well person must always help the sick and helpless. The community back home is not wealthy nor perhaps even well-to-do by some American standards but it is strong and healthy. It's not enough for these people just to survive. Over here we must first earn their respect and then give them a helping hand until they get on their feet."

This his friends hope to help him do to whatever extent they are able. Pupils in the vacation Bible school at Chili where Golden's wife, Helen, and daughter, Janelle, reside are collecting used clothing to send to the Korean children. Although the club season is closed members will be on the job all summer to receive gifts for the Korean project and channel them through Colonel Golden to the village of Sonyu-ri 7,439.9 miles away.

POVERTY AND THE LAW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum entitled "Poverty and the Law—The Constitutional Rights of Assistance Recipients," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This memorandum, which was prepared by Elizabeth Wickenden, technical consultant on public social policy of the National Social Welfare Assembly, has stirred a great deal of interest in this matter and I know Members of Congress will find it of value.

The memorandum was prepared in order to further discussion, research, and possible legal action on a problem which seems to be increasingly evident in many parts of the country, namely, actions which have the effect of depriving recipients of public assistance of their basic rights.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY AND THE LAW—THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Many critics of the contemporary social scene, including lawyers and others dedicated to the role of law in the democratic process, have recently expressed their concern over the mounting evidence that poverty itself constitutes a barrier to equal treatment under law. For example, in a recent interview on "The Law" published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Mr. Edward Bennett Williams in reply to the question, "What do you consider to be the most urgent problem in the administration of the law?" answered: "The most urgent one centers around the defense of the indigent." In a brief before the Supreme Court challenging the constitutionality of the situation created for indigent defendants in States which do not provide defense counsel in such cases,[1] Mr. Abe Fortas argues: "To convict the poor without counsel while we guarantee a right to counsel to those who can afford it is also a denial of equal protection of the laws." There are many other areas where lack of resources precludes an adequate defense, freedom from incarceration under bail, the ability to appeal an adverse decision, or access to the facilities of the law as in civil proceedings.

Recently, however, a new concern has arisen among lawyers, social workers, and others interested in protecting the constitutional rights of all Americans regardless of their economic or social status. This is the growing disposition in some States and localities to apply a different standard of law enforcement to persons because of their poverty, especially if that poverty is reflected in dependence upon tax-supported benefits such as public assistance. Examples of this trend may be seen in the following kinds of specific cases:

In three New Jersey counties mothers of illegitimate children have been subject to prosecution under otherwise rarely enforced adultery and fornication laws upon applying for public assistance. Newspaper articles have made it clear that this type of action is restricted to applicants for, or recipients of, welfare aid.

In Connecticut a mother of an illegitimate child receiving public assistance, who had recently come to Connecticut from a Southern State, was subject to deportation action by the State. Court action brought by the Legal Aid Society on a question of constitutionality (under the Supreme Court decision in the *Edwards* case) resulted in a withdrawal of this particular action but the policy is said to persist.

In many jurisdictions night raids upon assistance recipients to determine the presence of a man in the house are common practice. (This is based on the assumption that such a man is either the father of the children, who should therefore be legally responsible for their support, or his very presence presumes a moral responsibility to support the mother's children.) Recently in Alameda County, Calif., for example, a widely publicized night raid was conducted in a single night on 500 mothers receiving assistance for the support of their needy children.[2] It is maintained that no search warrant is required in these cases on the ground that these investigations are solely concerned with eligibility for a benefit conditioned by specified eligibility criteria, some of which can only be checked in this manner. Failure to cooperate by admitting such night raid investigators typically results in the discontinuance of public assistance. The constitutional limits upon the investigative process involved in determining eligibility for assistance has never been clearly established.

In each of these situations a constitutional guarantee (equal treatment under the law, freedom of movement among the States, and rights to privacy) would seem to have been denied to persons primarily distinguished by their poverty.

Dependency on public aid may also invite two other types of penalty deriving from an inequitable application of the concept of child neglect. Since the protection of children (together with their responsible parents) from destitution and their protection from neglect on the part of those same parents are both typically public welfare functions, the relationship between the two presents more complex problems which are discussed separately below. However, for purposes of identification, these two types of penalizing actions which might raise constitutional issues of inequitable treatment are—

Referral or threatened referral of mothers of children in receipt of public assistance (most commonly illegitimate children) to courts on neglect charges on a different basis from that applied to children in similar circumstances who are not receiving public assistance.

Application of criminal or civil penalties to mothers in receipt of assistance for alleged mismanagement of their assistance grants in the absence of alleged fraud or child neglect (with its concomitant obligation of protective action toward the child).

THE LEGAL BASIS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

Public welfare agencies of the States and their political subdivisions are responsible for the administration of State laws which establish eligibility for welfare benefits and hence determine the limits of possible fraud or misrepresentation in seeking or accepting such benefits. Under these State laws fraud actions are brought in State courts, typically on the basis of an initial referral from the public welfare agency with a subsequent development of evidence by the prosecutor's office.

However, in order to qualify for Federal financial participation in a State public assistance program (and the Federal share may exceed 80 percent in some cases) State law and practice must comply with a number of requirements of the Federal Social Security Act which affect individual eligibility and entitlements. The Federal law requires that eligibility for assistance be based on an individual determination of needs and resources in each case but that the standards governing such eligibility determinations be equally applicable to all persons in similar circumstances in all parts of the State. Similar requirements govern the level of assistance given to persons in similar circumstances in all parts of the State. The Federal law also requires that the administering public welfare agency receive and act promptly upon all applications and that the applicant or recipient be given the right to appeal any decision.

---

[1] Declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a 9 to 0 decision on March 18, 1963.

[2] Subsequently the constitutionality of this action has been challenged in two different proceedings. At a hearing called by the California State Board of Social Welfare the use of mass night raids was questioned as contravening both the Federal Constitution and existing State regulations. A social worker, Benny Parrish, who was discharged by the Alameda County Welfare Department for insubordination because of his refusal to participate in the night raid initiated reinstatement action on the grounds that the raid was itself unconstitutional and otherwise illegal and therefore his refusal could not be considered insubordination. If in this administrative proceeding his reinstatement is denied, this case may be reviewed in the courts.

All of these Federal requirements have the effect of circumscribing the limitations States are able to impose on eligibility for federally aided assistance, especially with respect to particular groups. This has proved especially significant with respect to needy persons whose behavior patterns, race, or newcomer status make them subject to community attitudes which might otherwise restrict their access to assistance.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Nowhere is the role of the Federal law in assuring equal access to federally aided benefits in accordance with established principles under the equal protection and due process clauses of the Federal Constitution more important than in the category of "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (AFDC) authorized by title IV of the Social Security Act. This has become increasingly evident in recent years when the availability of social insurance benefits both for surviving widows and orphans and for insured workers suffering permanent disability, has served to accentuate the social problem character of welfare dependency. The growing proportion of children in need of assistance because of desertion, illegitimacy and divorce (without adequate provision for their support) has been further aggravated by the fact that until 1961 this federally aided assistance could be given only to children deprived of parental support by reasons of death, disability, or absence from the home. Thus children in a two-parent family in need because of unemployment were less privileged than those in need because of illegitimacy or desertion. While States are gradually moving to take advantage of the new authority to extend federally aided assistance to families in need because of unemployment, community resentment toward families in need because of socially disapproved behavior persists. This resentment is aggravated by the fact that this group typically includes a disproportionate number of persons of minority status. Poverty, discriminatory employment practices, inadequate education, traditional cultural patterns, social isolation, and lack of access to such legal processes as divorce make disproportionate numbers of Negroes on assistance rolls an inevitable consequence of discrimination as "An American Dilemma" predicted in 1944.

Many efforts have been made by State legislatures to circumvent Federal requirements for equal access to these benefits. Federal interpretations have developed somewhat greater precision as a consequence. The following situations illustrate this development:

Georgia and Louisiana laws: A law passed by the Georgia legislature in 1951 provided for the denial of assistance to more than one illegitimate child of a mother. The Social Security Administration advised that a formal hearing under the Social Security Act with respect to the legal and constitutional issues involved would be required if this law was implemented. No such hearing occurred because the law was subsequently repealed. The Social Security Administration subsequently issued similar advice with respect to a virtually identical law enacted by the Louisiana legislature. These determinations by the Social Security Administration were based on the proposition that denial of assistance to a child who met all of the State's other eligibility requirements, solely because of the legal circumstances surrounding his birth, was discriminatory and constituted an unreasonable classification in the light of the purposes of the Federal program.

Substitute approaches: Subsequent to the above Federal interpretations with respect to the Georgia and Louisiana laws, a number of devices have since been used or proposed for the purpose of excluding illegitimate children or others in families with unacceptable behavior patterns. These devices are equally arbitrary but less direct. Many of these are clearly discriminatory in their effect and, therefore, may well raise the same questions of equitable treatment under both Federal and State law and administrative practice. Under its authority to determine whether States receiving Federal grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act are conforming with the plan requirements conditioning such aid (and the principles inherent in our Federal constitutional guarantees) the Social Security Administration has moved gradually to clarify its own position on some but not all of these indirect approaches.

Louisiana "suitable home" controversy: One of these precipitated the regulation resulting from the so-called Flemming ruling of 1961, subsequently incorporated in the Social Security Act in a somewhat modified form. The Flemming ruling resulted from the passage of a second Louisiana law which provided that assistance could be given only to a child living in a "suitable home."[3] This law provides that any home must be deemed "unsuitable" if an illegitimate child was born to the mother subsequent to her receipt of assistance. As a result of the retroactive application of this law, 26,000 needy children were dropped from the public assistance rolls in Louisiana.

At the hearing called by the Social Security Commissioner to determine whether this action was in conformity with Federal law and protections of the Constitution, two questions of law were argued by counsel for the Federal and State governments and by five lawyers presenting amicus curiae briefs on behalf of interested voluntary agencies: (1) Did the action of Louisiana contravene Federal law as currently interpreted by the Social Security Administration and (2) did the Social Security Commissioner under the Social Security Act have the authority to rule such State policy and action "out of conformity" with Federal requirements. The ruling of HEW Secretary Arthur Flemming held that, while the answer to the first question was negative, the answer to the second was affirmative and the Social Security Act did contain such authority. The ensuing ruling required that as of a future effective date federally aided assistance could not be denied to an otherwise eligible child on the grounds that his home was "unsuitable" so long as the child remained in the home. This was subsequently modified in the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to provide that a child who was otherwise eligible could not be denied federally aided assistance because of an unsuitable home unless other provisions were made for his care. Such provisions might include voluntary placement with other relatives eligible to receive public assistance payments in his behalf, removal of the child from the home on neglect charges by court order, or transfer to nonfederally aided general assistance. These decisions reflect the interaction of State responsibility to protect children against neglect and to extend assistance in time of need.

Richmond, Va.: The emphasis on this relationship has encouraged States to explore, and in some cases, to use the threat of actual institution of neglect proceedings as a means of eliminating certain kinds of cases from the assistance rolls. For example, the Richmond, Va., Times Dispatch of January 30, 1963, carries a story under the caption "City Welfare Office Acts Against Unwed Mothers" which begins as follows:

"Twenty-three women on city relief have given birth to second or subsequent illegitimate children since July 1, Welfare Director Raleigh C. Hobson said yesterday.

"And, under a new welfare department policy, court action has been taken or begun against all 23, he told members of district V, Virginia Council on Social Welfare.

"The women are taken to juvenile and domestic relations court on warrants for a court decision on whether they are suitable mothers."

The story indicates that in no case did the judge actually remove the children in question from their mothers' custody. (Such action would be extremely unlikely in most jurisdictions because of the almost total absence of substitute care arrangements for Negro children). This, however, in no way changes the basic fact that these women were subject to legal action solely because of their receipt of public assistance. It is reasonably safe to assume that family situations involving the same facts but no applications for or receipt of assistance were not so referred.

Intimidating effect: The basically significant effect of such policies is, however, one of intimidation. For many women in this situation, especially among Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans, the unforgivable sin is to give up their children to public authorities. If this becomes the actual or threatened price of public assistance, they will withdraw from or fail to apply for assistance no matter what their need or what the ultimate deprivation to their children. This is most clearly evidenced in the experience under a plan used in Florida and recently adopted by Louisiana to replace its outlawed suitable home policy.

Florida plan: In Florida, a mother of illegitimate children applying for assistance is granted aid if otherwise eligible but told that her situation must be studied by a special review team in order to determine whether court referral on neglect charges is not necessary. While relatively few referrals are actually made and virtually no children have been removed by court order, the effect on a group of mothers whose loyalty to their children is a dominant characteristic has been dramatic: that is, 45 percent voluntarily withdrew from the assistance rolls.

Maryland and Pennsylvania proposals: In a pair of bills currently pending before the Maryland Legislature the inequitable use of the neglect concept is even more pointed: (1) "Neglect" is redefined to include the occurrence of an illegitimate pregnancy in any family with one or more children and (2) the welfare agency is required to refer all such cases appearing among families in receipt of assistance to the courts after a 1-month grace period. A similar bill pending in the Pennsylvania Legislature provides comparable mandatory court referral of AFDC families under similar circumstances such as illegitimate pregnancy. The Florida experience indicates that such laws will produce a wholesale voluntary withdrawal from the exposure of public assistance to the relative safety of anonymous, if unaided, destitution.

---

[3] For a more detailed discussion of the suitable home concept in relationship to public assistance, see a forthcoming report by Winifred Bell entitled "Rejected Families: A Study of the 'Suitable Home' Concept in Aid to Dependent Children."

These proposals not only raise questions regarding inequitable treatment of persons under similar circumstances but also completely contravene the traditional concept of neglect in which each case is judged in terms of its individual circumstances and not on the basis of some sweeping categorical definitions which may or may not be damaging the particular child in question. Moreover, both these proposed bills and the Florida practice distort the concept of child neglect in a way that would appear to damage rather than safeguard the child's interests. If the mother withdraws from assistance in order to be sure of keeping her child, the child has neither the source of income to which it was legally entitled nor a court review of the adequacy of its home situation. On both counts, is not such a child denied the equality of protection under the law which our Constitution requires?

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FUND MISMANAGEMENT

The Federal Social Security Act was recently amended to modify the unrestricted money payment requirement by permitting States to impose criminal or civil penalties on mothers of dependent children for mismanagement of assistance funds following an official warning. Though still too recent to afford any useful experience, this provision would seem likewise to penalize a child for the alleged misdeeds of his parents without assuring to him the protective concern of a neglect proceeding. Moreover, it could well impose a different standard of civil liability on assistance recipients than is applicable to others in the population. Its potentialities as a punitive measure for socially unacceptable behavior on the part of those dependent on public aid are obvious.

USE OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO TEST ASSISTANCE POLICIES

Welfare policies have rarely been challenged in the courts by individuals or groups who feel that their rights have been abridged. The very poverty of those who depend upon assistance makes this impractical and organizations have not interested themselves in this area to the same extent as in questions of racial or religious discrimination. Organizations interested in welfare policy have typically sought to exert their influence at the point of legislative or administrative decision rather than seeking court review of questionable laws or administrative practices.

Nevertheless, the possibilities for legal remedies do exist in the appeals procedure and in the courts, both State and Federal. This memorandum has been written to encourage lawyers and others interested in assuring the protections of the Constitution to all groups in the population to consider these possibilities.

REVERSE FREEDOM RIDER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, about 1 year ago the first reverse freedom rider was sent to Jersey City from New Orleans amidst international publicity.

Recently, the Jersey Journal carried a report about Mr. Louis Ernest Boyd and his family of eight children and the results of his residency thus far in Jersey City.

Mr. Boyd and his family now live in an apartment in the A. Harry Moore development at Lincoln Park, a public housing project. I am informed by the director of tenant relations, Mr. Conrad J. Vuocolo, that the family is getting along well from the standpoint of employment, schooling and community relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Jersey Journal be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Jersey City Journal, May 22, 1963]

Ernest Boyd: Solid J.C. Resident—First Reverse Freedom Rider Overcomes White Citizens' Bigotry

(By Judson Hand)

Louis Ernest Boyd scored against bigotry by becoming a solid Jersey City citizen.

A year ago, Boyd was internationally known as the first reverse freedom rider.

The White Citizens Council of New Orleans had sent him north with a one-way bus ticket and $50 pocket money.

A council representative, on hand at the New Orleans bus depot, explained why:

"We hope to show the Negroes who their real friends are," he said. "We'll see what those persons up north who have been maligning the South do for them."

The 42-year-old Boyd had worked for 20 years as a New Orleans longshoreman. In 1959 he contracted pneumonia and, when he left the hospital, he found that automation had wiped out his old job.

With no work open to him and few skills to offer, Boyd went on relief. He was hard pressed to feed his wife and eight children.

A little over a year ago, Louisiana cut off his relief payments, saying he was fit to work. Boyd said his doctor had told him he could perform only light duties.

Suddenly, by way of television, an opportunity came. The White Citizens Council offered to provide free bus trips north to any Negro who was unhappy in the South. Boyd jumped at the chance—and into a national spotlight.

Roy Wilkins, president of the NAACP, described the freedom trip as "a pretty cheap stunt." Senator Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York, called it "shameful." Bigots everywhere believed Boyd could not make a new life.

First Louis Ernest Boyd found a $100 a week job as a truckdriver and handyman in Jersey City. This job fell through and he was crushed for a time.

Boyd's courage did not falter. Jersey City ministers, businessmen, the NAACP, the Urban League and others rallied behind him. Louis Ernest Boyd found another job, this one with a rolling steel mill in Jersey City.

Some months ago he moved to a modern five-bedroom apartment in the A. Harry Moore housing project, just across the street from Lincoln Park. His neighbors represent many ethnic groups.

"Believe me, they are a fine family. It's a privilege to serve them," says Conrad Vuocolo, head of tenant relations for Jersey City housing.

Boyd's eight children are doing well at School 39. The family are parishioners at St. John's Episcopal Church on Summit Avenue, where it is reported the children are among the best behaved at the Sunday School.

Not that Louis Ernest Boyd has an easy life supporting a family of 10, but he once told a Jersey Journal reporter, "All I want is to settle down and work like any other man."

And that's exactly what he has done in Jersey City. He is doing very well on his own in the North now.

The Citizens Council apparently did him a favor.

KAMEHAMEHA AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii is justly proud of her reputation as a showplace of racial harmony, where peoples of many races and cultures live and work closely together.

Her outstanding record in race relations had its beginnings in the ancient monarchy of Hawaii and, indeed, coincides with Hawaii's emergence as a unified kingdom in 1795 during the reign of Kamehameha I.

It was this great king who established the first civil rights in Hawaii, when in 1797 he promulgated the "law of the splintered paddle."

The story behind this first Hawaii civil rights law is recounted in a Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial appearing on June 11, 1963, a day the State annually sets aside to honor Kamehameha's memory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Kamehameha and Civil Rights

Kamehameha, the founder of the dynasty which bears his name, was born into a society in which there were no civil rights.

Each chief was the absolute ruler of his people and maintained his ascendancy with a cruel tabu system, and the death penalty.

The first recognition that government had a responsibility to protect its people, a rudimentary recognition of civil rights, probably was Kamehameha's famous "law of the splintered paddle."

The story is told that during the years when he was consolidating his rule on the Island of Hawaii, Kamehameha engaged in raiding expeditions along the Puna coast.

During one of these, the warrior was set upon by Puna fishermen who resisted his efforts to plunder their village.

One fisherman, bolder and stronger than the rest, brought his canoe paddle down heavily on Kamehameha, splintering the weapon. Kamehameha barely escaped with his life.

Later, when Kamehameha was undisputed ruler of the island, the fisherman was brought before him for sentence. Kamehameha, acknowledging that he, not the fisherman, was in the wrong, forgave the man and propounded the historic law of the splintered paddle.

He, Kamehameha, would guarantee to all his people their physical security from robbers and brigands. Indeed, they might lie beside the highway and not be molested, on pain of death to any who might violate the edict.

In thus recognizing both the right of his people to be secure in their homes and their belongings, and government's responsibility to protect this right, Kamehameha established the first civil rights in Hawaii.

And it is on this, as much as upon his prowess as a warrior and his ability as an administrator, that the merited fame of the first king of all Hawaii rests.

His memory is honored today because he was as great in the ways of peace as he was great in the ways of war.

CALIFORNIA ELECTS ANOTHER NEW REPUBLICAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to the gratification of many and to the surprise of more the resurging and reinvigorated Republican Party in California has come up with another Republican victory in a congressional district long represented by a Democrat. This second such success within a few short months in which a sitting Democratic Congressman representing a long-time Democratic district has been succeeded by a Republican Congressman elected in a special election has important national significance.

These two election upsets in our country's largest State indicate Americans are getting tired of an administration which persistently substitutes attractive adjectives for appropriate action.

Yes, Mr. President, Americans are getting tired of continuing deficits; of programs which would institute a new WPA program in the midst of plenty; of the steady proliferation of one new agency or bureau upon another with the inevitable substantial increase in the overstaffing of Government payrolls; of an administration of foreign policies which are vague, defensive, and apologetic; of indecision in high places and of intemperate exercise of great authority by lesser officials. Americans are looking forward to an opportunity to change these and other similar ineptitudes and inadequacies in 1964. North, south, east, and west, Republicanism is on the march. It is a pleasure to see Californians in the vanguard of the parade for progress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks a George Todt column commenting on the factors leading to the election of Republican Congressman Del Clauson, former mayor of Compton, Calif., in the recent byelection in that great State.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

George Todt's Opinion: What Makes Politics?

What makes a political candidate become a man to be reckoned with? How does he cause us to like him? Who does he really impress by his actions?

Recently I heard a southlander running for Congress say something so different from anything I can remember before that it shook me.

In response to a direct question by a lady in the audience, in which I was seated, the aspirant said publicly: "No, I shall not attempt to gain favor with any minority group by promising special considerations. I shall be absolutely fair and impartial."

The man was Del Clauson, mayor of Compton for the past 10 years, and presently running tomorrow for the congressional seat in the 23d District vacated by the death of the late Hon. Clyde Doyle.

THE BUNK

He had preceded me on the lecture platform before the alert Downey Republican Women's Club last May 27—and the ladies cheered him to the rafters for his bold statement of fact. He really meant it.

This is the kind of politician for you and me. Favoritism and partiality are the bunk. What we want is the kind of man who is willing to give us a fair deal—and let the chips fall thereafter.

One of the banes of American political life in these modern times we live in today is the unholy pressure put on men running for office by numerous self-serving minorities. Each wants a special edge on everybody else.

TOO MANY PROMISES

Actually, we all are members of various minorities of some kind or other. When everybody demands his unfair cut, if the politican has made too many easy promises, some are bound to be left out and disappointed.

It would be much better if all politicians followed the example of Clauson and refused to make improper deals with anyone.

I would have the greatest respect for the honest man who merely said he would be guided by his best judgment under any given circumstance while in office—and would do his best to be fair at all times.

That would be good enough for me. How about you?

No way to know in advance if Clauson is going to win his seat Tuesday but I will always admire his exemplary stand on minorities. No deals!

WHICH COURSE?

We had good officers and bad officers in the Army during World War II—as I recall—just as there were good and bad GIs, too.

But I remember reading on one occasion in the officer's guide about two distinct ways to be a successful member of the corps. You had a choice between letting a selfish clique run the show and keep you out of trouble in return for backing them up to the limit—or rely on absolute fairness and impartiality.

Actually, you could make it either way. Which would you take?

I know in advance the choice Del Clauson would have made.

"SHE HAS CONSERVED A GREAT CONSERVATIONIST"

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] in appreciation of the testimonial dinner in which the great national organizations concerned with conservation paid tribute to "Mr. Conservation," the beloved Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

It was an exciting event with a surprise ending. Mr. Howard Zahniser, director of the Wilderness Society, called Mrs. Anderson to the dais and presented her with a special award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zahniser's remarks entitled "She Has Conserved a Great Conservationist" be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to express at this time our special appreciation to Mrs. Anderson, and, if I may so add, an appreciation thus to all the ladies who are with us and to all those others, too, who do so much for conservation but are so seldom recognized.

Those of us who have worked in conservation fields have realized especially well that it is difficult indeed to continue long or maintain an effectiveness without the support and cooperation, the tolerance and charity, of a good and sweet wife (who also must be strict and stern on occasion).

When we began, with this occasion in mind, to consider the innumerable accomplishments of Senator Anderson, remembering the many times we have seen his gallant effectiveness, we soon surmised that he must be accustomed to setting forth from home with the blessing of someone with patience and charm, a contagious assurance, and perhaps some authority too.

What we had surmised, investigation readily confirmed. Mrs. Anderson's services, like those of the Senator himself, have been far greater than ordinary, although like those of most wives, they have been little known.

Henrietta McCartney knew when she became the bride of Clinton Anderson that she was undertaking more than ordinary wifely responsibilities.

Her husband's repeated health problems, his impatience with inactivity, his refusal to excuse himself from responsibilities, his consequent almost continuous lavish expenditure of energies, which in his case are unusually precious, have through the years tested her resources and have in truth proved her conservation of this great man to be truly phenomenal.

Of his years of accomplishment that we now honor, one score and ten, by his own estimate, we can well appreciate as an extension of his years that we owe to Mrs. Anderson. They are a measure of the gratitude and appreciation we have for her. She has conserved a great conservationist.

So we have learned what our hearts had led us to expect, and we have been pleased to prepare a plaque for Mrs. Anderson, also, for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband.

"Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land." (Proverbs 31:23) In his eminence, as the writer of Proverbs long ago led us to expect, we see also her virtues, and with him we honor her too.

Mrs. Anderson, it is my pleasure, a privilege indeed, to present to you, with our compliments and appreciation, this plaque, which includes a reproduction of that presented to the great man with whom you live, and in addition, it reads as follows: "Presented to Henrietta McCartney Anderson for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband."

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if we are to surmount the crisis in race relations which now faces us, men of conscience must speak out forcefully on the moral issues and obligations which are involved. It is particularly encouraging to see a distinguished leader of the South—the area in which the direct confrontation is taking place between the Constitution and right on the one hand and unjust social and legal practices on the other—taking such a strong public stand.

Former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, in a recent commencement address at the St. Petersburg, Fla., Junior College, issued an impressive challenge to Southern leadership to declare for justice in the present crisis despite the unpopularity with some of such a stand. I think Mr. Collins' speech is thoroughly in keeping with his fine public position on this and other issues, and that it deserves wide attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commencement Address by LeRoy Collins, President, National Association of Broadcasters, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Fla., June 7, 1963

I consider it a great honor to take part in this ceremony, to be present at this very important event in your lives, graduates, and to be visiting again one of the finest junior colleges in America.

It is also a great thrill to be home again. Florida will always be home to all of our family, and I will never cease to be grateful for the privilege of serving as your Governor.

I know this day brings to the members of this graduating class mixed emotions. Doubtless you like the idea of getting out, and yet leaving has its pains, too.

Perhaps you feel like the little boy whose grandmother gave him a pin cushion for Christmas. His "thank you" note went like this: "Dear Granny, I thank you for the pincushion. This is something I have always wanted—but not very much."

If your education thus far has served you well, from this day forward you have the responsibility to continue your learning, to draw your own conclusions, to explore life in your own way. Education has given you new knowledge and has helped free your mind from the darkness, the narrowness, the groundless fears and self-defeating passions of ignorance.

In a troubled, anxious world I think we tend to look for some person, some philosophy, that will furnish us with the right answers to our problems. We assume, to begin with, that every problem has a pat answer. But getting answers this way is like using the old arithmetic book that had the answers in the back.

The temptation is to start with the answer and try to make it fit the problem. It didn't work very well then, and time hasn't improved the process.

The world, of course, is full of answers and people who are willing to furnish them at a moment's notice. Ready-made answers, however, are sometimes contradictory, often biased, and because of the great growth of knowledge, frequently irrelevant. Thus, a culture that is "answer" dominated—in which the question becomes secondary, the answer primary, is misdirected.

We should start with questions and the paramount one for each of us is: What is the chief end of man? Or, what am I here for?

Wise men have suggested that we are here to find fulfillment as individual human beings, to grow in our ability to live and work harmoniously with others. That is the challenge more than the answer. The task of the individual is to help set conditions for growth—growth of the individual and of the culture of which he is a member. It is the individual's task to find out how his growth is being hindered, and to discover new ways to release his best energies.

Answers come in countless ways and take many forms. The germ of each is in the spirit. Their development is greatly influenced by chance as well as by choice. They are likely to find maturity—to have their testing and proving-out—in conflict. The responsibility for all this is yours.

We know that the world was not made the way it is today—complete with transistors. Man's good fortune is to be born in one world, grow up in another, and grow old in a third.

The physical truth of this was impressed upon me the other day by a friend who had just taken a trip from the east coast to the west coast by nonstop jet flight. He said his seat neighbor turned out to be a lady in her late eighties who told him, as they were cruising at 35,000 feet, that this was her second trip West and that on the first, when she was only 7 years of age, she rode in a covered wagon, and in an attack by Indians her sister was scalped.

Now I was a little skeptical about this tale, but I later checked some history, and whether it happened to this old lady or not, some people were riding West that way, and Indians were scalping some little girls at about the time to which she referred. What a change in a single lifetime.

Each generation has had its men and women of questing spirit whose creative and inquiring minds have been determined to reach out beyond the known.

You men and women of this St. Petersburg Junior College graduating class have the opportunity to be among this number. The wealth of knowledge, discovery and accomplishment is spread before you.

Behind you are the wellsprings of history which offer you understanding, stability, and inspiration. Their eternal truth was so well expressed by Santayana when he advised: "Those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

William Faulkner once made this observation: "What's wrong with the world," he said, "is it's not finished yet. It is not completed to the point where man can put his final signature to the job and say, 'It is finished. We made it and it works.'"

This is one of the joys of being young and living in our country today. You know that you will never see Faulkner's finished world in your generation or in the generation of your children. It is this awareness that makes it possible for you to participate in a society that is dynamic, changing; one that stands in need of what you can offer with your mind, your heart, and your body.

If I could leave with you today a single thought which might linger on in your contemplation, I would like it to be simply this: It is important that people believe—that they have beliefs that they hold to strongly and strive to live by. For in this fragile existence we share, in this tenuous world in which we live, it is beliefs that can provide the human ship with a strong and true keel adequate for life's voyage.

Now it is not for me, or any other, to write the prescription for the forms your beliefs should take. This is everyone's life quest. It is the individual's inviolate responsibility to fashion beliefs for himself.

But of this I am sure: A man needs to believe deeply and strive for something beyond purely selfish purposes. His primary aims must be beyond physical survival—beyond the satisfactions of material comforts.

Nor is it enough to limit one's perspective to his own personal horizons. What happens in the great "out there" must be one of every man's grave inner concerns. For war and disorder anywhere, and the human conflict which nourishes such, now shake the foundations of all houses everywhere.

We often hear that the world is becoming smaller and smaller, and indeed from a physical point of view this is true. Instantaneous communication and fast transportation are seeing to that.

But thus far our skill and aptitudes for human relationships have failed miserably to keep pace with our technological progress. We are experiencing physical closeness without the compatibility that comes from understanding and mutual interest, and that doesn't work for nations any better than it does for individuals. Such a circumstance, if not improved, is far more likely to produce disunity than accord, to foment war more surely than peace.

We have allowed the potential brilliance of our age to be overcast by the threat of nuclear disaster; and with the presence of starvation haunting the lives of half the world's population, we face neither day nor night, but a new twilight of our own making.

To write off all the political, economic, and social restlessness throughout the world as Communist-inspired is to deny our intelligence. Much of it is inspired by the very basic desire for simple human dignity, to have room to live and breathe, to eat and vote, even to read and write.

To misunderstand the real issues involved almost surely means to misjudge the policies which should be applied for coping with them.

The answers to seemingly insoluble world problems, regardless of the form they may take, or the forum in which they are debated, must be bottomed upon a very broad belief in the universal brotherhood of man.

And a belief like this is grounded not just in the mind, but deeply in the heart and the will. It must be more than an intellectual conviction. It must be a feeling that takes hold and will not let one go.

Our Founding Fathers held this kind of belief in the brotherhood of man when they spelled out in the Declaration of Independence the philosophy of our Government. They reached out to all humanity with the words: "All men are created equal." This was the ark and covenant by which they felt Americans should be guided.

Continually we must call upon ourselves to rekindle the splendor of this bold dream. Custom and human frailty have dimmed it for us. For too many, it is little more than Fourth of July rhetoric. We indulge and take for granted tragic examples of man's inhumanity to man, which should shock us.

The spirit of 1776 that fostered our democratic government was one of broad vision despite limited material means. Too often today, with our booming production lines, we sit back blinded, fat and inert, feeling that so long as things go smoothly for us, all must be right with the world. In an affluent age, are we not thus in danger of producing a poverty-stricken spirit?

Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life—to win a full measure of freedom.

It is said by many that our whole Nation may be on the brink of violent racial conflict. We hear appeals for moderation and order based upon each citizen's duty to support the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions, whether he personally approves them or not. Certainly there is logic in this position else there could be no order or stability in our society.

But by no means will this matter be settled on the basis of abstract legal obligations. Efforts for adjustments here must be anchored to something firmer, to feelings that reach out from the heart and soul.

If nondiscrimination in any form is to triumph, such must be supported by the simple belief of men that it is wrong—fundamentally, inherently, morally wrong—to deny to one person a right or privilege solely because he differs in race or color from another person to whom the same right or privilege is allowed.

Graduates, you cannot afford to close your eyes to any of the deep problems below the surface of society. If you do, the concept of a liberal arts education in the American college simply is not working as it should.

Across the country there is a growing feeling, now more loudly articulated, that something is wrong if we are increasingly unable to relate our Nation's problems to the educational experience.

If the college graduate is blind, prejudiced, provincial, he finds himself at cross-purposes to the historically proclaimed aims of education.

It is you who now possess a liberal arts education who must believe with Terence: "Nothing human is alien to me; no human knowledge, no human anguish, no human value, no human hunger. Anything less than this leads to a truncated or sterile life, a life without fullest meaning and direction and depth."

It is meaningless, therefore, to labor for better technical communications without being concerned about what is being communicated, to lay away an abundance of food for storage in one corner of the world while countless millions go hungry elsewhere, to speed up transportation without asking yourselves, "Why am I here, and where am I going?" Any person who does not seek wise answers to these broader human questions is unfit for significant leadership. And all of these questions and answers relate to the beliefs a person holds.

Whatever your beliefs are, they must be firmly held and firmly expressed.

It is one thing to stand up and speak out clearly on some cause when there is no longer any uncertainty about its triumph.

It is something else to stick your neck out when the cause is unpopular, and to keep it there while even your friends may be disapproving and others jeering.

There is a price which has to be paid for leadership, for standing up for what you believe at a time when it may be unpopular. That price—the price of integrity—can come pretty high at times.

Beliefs require a willingness to make sacrifices. When the sacrifice comes, one may wonder if it is the prelude to even more suffering or the presage of new hope. It may be both. The important thing is a willingness to accept either.

For the Governor's inner office in the State Capitol, I sought and bought for the State a good painting of Andrew Jackson. He richly deserves to be there; he was our first Governor. But there were other reasons why I wanted "Old Hickory" peering down at everything which went on there. Jackson was a leader of great will who over and over again, with little or no regard for popular praise, stood firmly for what he regarded to be best for the country. It was Jackson who, against much popular will, insisted upon pushing the Nation's boundaries to the Pacific, making possible the broader physical base upon which to build our national greatness.

One of Jackson's "boys" was a soldier-politician named Sam Houston, of Tennessee. With extraordinary valor he fought Indians and, later, Mexicans. He served as Congressman from Tennessee, Governor of Tennessee, President of Texas, Senator from Texas, and Governor of Texas. He was a man of strong principle and very great courage in political as well as military battles.

As he approached the sundown of life, Houston was the elected Governor of Texas. The Civil War came, and he stoutly, but unsuccessfully, resisted secession by his State—unremittingly loyal to the Union, as all Jackson followers were. Secession was voted by his State, however, and the day came when all elected officials were called upon in public ceremony to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. Houston was there, all right. Four times they called his name—"Sam Houston, Governor"—but he would not step forward. Then the name of the elected lieutenant governor was called. A young man, he eagerly stepped forward and was sworn in as Governor in Houston's place.

And that night a bent old man went home ready to die—faithful to his trust, but deeply wearied by the fight his principles had demanded of him. From the crowd in town there no longer came the acclaim which he had heard so loud and so often during his lifetime of service—only the thick, sticky silence of disappointment and regret.

But every schoolboy in America knows Sam Houston. A great city bears his name. There are monuments and memorials of all kinds fashioned for him by grateful people. And higher than any of these, of course, stands his record of loyalty to his beliefs.

Do any of you know the name of the young Lieutenant Governor who took his place? I doubt it and, what's more, who cares?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 777, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the time limitation now in effect, the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of No. 643-4P-32, Richard R. Conley, of Rome City, Ind., on page 2 of the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Public Health Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Michael Canelis, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service;

Alfred S. Nelson, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Alice M. Waterhouse, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration, en bloc, of the nominations on the Executive Calendar with the exception of the nomination of Mr. Richard R. Conley, of Rome City, Ind., identified as Calendar No. 643, Message No. 4P-32.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, with the exception noted, the nominations on the Executive Calendar are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 777), to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again exclusive of the time limitation, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time be not charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be allocated by the majority leader be, instead, allocated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments—which, without objection, with the exception of the amendment inserting section 3, will be agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. One portion, the committee amendment, inserting section 3, on page 2, line 25, is open to amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the organic act, not to the committee amendment. When is my amendment eligible for consideration?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment has precedence, but, without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the amendment of the Senator from Iowa; and his amendment will be stated.

There was no objection.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

> Sec. 5. In section 31(2), before the word "private", insert the words "United States".

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield to himself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Five minutes, or as much thereof as I shall need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last Thursday, the day when this bill was passed originally, I found that the Disarmament Agency had made at least one contract with a foreign institute—in England—in the amount of $21,064, to support a 6-month study of "The Effect of Disarmament on European Security."

I feel that this Agency is not yet ready to go into the business of making contracts with foreign principals, firms or agencies in other parts of the world.

The net effect of my amendment to the organic act is that the Disarmament Agency, although allowed to make contracts and agreements, for studies in the field of arms control and disarmament, with private or public institutions or persons, would be restricted, if this amendment is adopted, by the following language in section 31(2): "and other studies in the field of arms control and disarmament, by United States private or public institutions" thus at this time limiting the contracts to U.S. private or public institutions.

In connection with my remarks, Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a June 7, 1963 release by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, setting forth some of these contracts which have been made. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Grants Awarded for Studies Related to Arms Control and Disarmament

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency today announced that three grants have been awarded since the first of the year to nongovernmental research organizations and individuals in support of various unclassified studies pertinent to the field of arms control and disarmament.

The first of these was awarded to the Institute of Strategic Studies of London, England, in the amount of $21,064 for support of a 6-months study on "The Effect of Disarmament on European Security." Under terms of the grant awarded on February 20 the institute is examining the effect upon European security and the balance of military power within Europe of the execution of stage I of both the U.S. disarmament proposals and those of the Soviet Union, as introduced in current disarmament negotiations.

"Arms and Democracy: The Reciprocal Influences of Weapons and Political Systems," is the subject of a 2-year study by the Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., which was awarded a grant of $40,000 on May 3. The focus of this study will be on the relation of changes in weapon technology to political institutions.

The most recent award was made on May 14 to Dr. Richard H. Pfaff, assistant professor of political science of the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., for a study entitled "The Nonmilitary Aspects of CENTO." In examining the Central Treaty Organization in its economic and social influences, Dr. Pfaff will consider such subjects as the effect of increasing economic functions in CENTO in relation to regional arms control problems and the economic development of regional members in the context of regional disarmament possibilities. The study which will cost $1,500, is scheduled for completion in 3 months.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not care to argue this matter at any length. I merely suggest—although I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of the committee—that the effect of the amendment is to limit the contracts providing for studies to either public or private agencies in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see nothing wrong with the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and a new paragraph (b), as follows:

> In the proviso, strike out the balance of the sentence after the word "except," and insert in lieu thereof the following "in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States."

And renumber the subsequent sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, there appears a provision authorizing the Director of the Agency to prepare recommendations, for the present, concerning U.S. arms control and disarmament policy. As now amended by the Foreign Relations Committee, the pending bill contains a proviso which I should like to read in full to the Senate, as follows:

> No action shall be taken under this act that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President, under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

My amendment is directed to the phrase "or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

In particular, I call attention to the part of this proviso which states, in effect, that action can be taken looking toward disarmament or reduction of the Armed Forces, pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President or if authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress. With regard to that aspect of this proviso—which states that the disarmament shall be achieved by treaty pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President—I have no quarrel; that is in strict conformity with the Constitution.

However, it is my intention that the complete language has the effect of putting the Congress on record as authorizing the President to make treaties relating to disarmament subjects, through approval by means of further affirmative legislation by Congress. In my opinion, that would be a first step in circumventing the treaty-making process of the United States, and it should not be done.

My amendment does not attempt to make any new law; it merely states that no action shall be taken to obligate the U.S. Government to reduce its Armed Forces, except in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States. In other words, Mr. President, I believe that in this bill we should make absolutely clear that we are not by means of this measure attempting, in the field of arms control and disarmament, to upset or cast any doubt whatsoever upon the constitutional processes of this Nation.

My fear is that the language now in the bill creates a fuzzy situation which might be interpreted as meaning that the President, instead of proceeding by way of treaty, may proceed by way of agreement, and thus require only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress, instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, as the Constitution requires in connection with the making of treaties.

There are instances in which certain types of international commitments have gone into effect after approval of proposed legislation by both Houses of Congress. That practice ought not to be encouraged. We ought to give full faith and credit to the thinking of the men who wrote the Constitution when they said that a treaty must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

I suppose I should be willing to trust the executive branch of the Government and have confidence that no disarmament treaty would be concluded without the approval of such an agreement in accordance with the treaty-making processes prescribed by the Constitution. I understand that the present administration definitely contemplates that if an agreement is reached by it, the agreement will be in the form of a treaty. That is how it should be done. But the language of the act is "Or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Through the existence of such language I suggest that we might enter into a most dangerous field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to call to the attention of Senators the questions which I addressed to Mr. Fisher, who is the legal expert in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. One question was as follows:

> Let me put this question. Let's assume that the Agreement deals with disarmament. Would the executive branch, in its discretion under this language, have the right to ask that it be disposed of by congressional action rather than the manner directed by the Constitution, that is, under treaty?

In his answer Mr. Fisher said:

> If it was considered to be under the general constitutional practices that have developed they would have the right.
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. Let's assume it provides for disarmament, and the matter, that is definitely the substance of what has been asked, that we disarm in a limited degree. Would it be under the existing language within the power of the administration to ask that it be disposed of by an agreement, by the Congress?"

Mr. Fisher gave the following answer:

> I would say that it would, sir——

In other words, in the opinion of Mr. Fisher, an agreement could be made to disarm, and the language of the agreement might require only a majority vote of each House of Congress. My amendment contemplates merely that whatever agreement is made, it shall be subject to the approval provided in the Constitution. If the agreement were one that may be approved by a majority vote of both Houses, it would not conform with the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the Senator's amendment. The proposed legislation is bad enough, regardless of how much it is improved. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to whose arms are about to be controlled. What country is it proposed to disarm?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No specific agreement has yet been reached. The bill would only provide the machinery by which an agreement subsequently made could be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. What country is it that the American people are told would disarm? Is it the United States?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would have to be both countries.

Mr. CURTIS. In the face of history, are we to go on record as saying that an agreement with a Communist country to disarm will be carried out by that country?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what the agreement would envision. If we made an agreement with Red Russia to disarm, and we believed that it was made in good faith and Russia would keep it, that agreement would, of course, come before the Senate for ratification. If it should come before the Senate in the form of an agreement, the language of the bill would seem to imply that it would be subject to the approval of a majority. I contend that an agreement to disarm should be in the form of a treaty and would have to be approved by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator, but I do not agree that the Commission should continue to talk, make commitments, and negotiate in the manner in which they do when they admit they cannot rely upon the parties with whom they are negotiating.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to that aspect, I look with considerable doubt upon the good faith of Red Russia to keep its agreements when I know that 50 out of the last 53 important ones made by that country have been broken when to break the agreement was thought to be expedient for Russia's own interest.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I point out that if small nations would do what we are doing, we would censor their action. If they were setting up machinery to negotiate with the Communists, in the face of recent history showing that 50 commitments have been broken, I do not believe it would help the cause of peace or liberty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

So far as I know, no agreement is now in existence. So the bill would merely deal with machinery relating to agreements in the event they come into existence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that I have no objection to the amendment. I believe it covers the situation quite well. I can imagine very minor agreements which would have nothing to do with disarmament—such things as a "hot line" or something of that kind of a relatively minor nature which might come up, and which the Senate would not wish to have covered as a treaty or legislation, because it would not be important enough to warrant such action.

But in respect to any measure of importance, as the Senator has mentioned, which would entail disarmament in a meaningful way, a treaty would be the proper way to handle the agreement. We must recognize the fact that the distinction in our constitutional history between an executive agreement and a treaty has not always been clear.

There are many distinctions. I believe that any agreement involving disarmament or dealing with defense clearly comes within the concept of the treatymaking power of the Constitution. The way in which the Senator from Ohio has stated his amendment, in accordance with the constitutional processes, is quite adequate. I am satisfied with the amendment and, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while I have the floor, and in order to complete the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short statement in regard to the bill. There has been some misunderstanding on the part of the public with regard to what has been done. At least I have had a few letters indicating that. I only emphasize that the bill does provide a 100-percent increase in the authorization for this Agency for the next 2 years, together with one or two other minor matters which I have treated in the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

(Statement by Mr. FULBRIGHT)

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I present to the Senate S. 777, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. The bill is quite simple. (1) It authorizes the appropriation of $20 million for a 2-year period covering fiscal years 1964 and 1965; (2) It makes two procedural changes in the provisions dealing with security clearances; (3) it spells out clearly the fact that nothing in the act authorizes the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the question of the right of individuals to possess firearms for their own use; (4) it prohibits the Agency from spending its funds for promoting its legislation before Congress; (5) it limits the applicability of the proviso in section 33 to actions taken under the authority of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; and (6) it prohibits the Agency from obligating more than 20 percent of its funds in the last month of a fiscal year.

Most of these amendments are of a minor nature and are fully explained in the committee's report. I intend, therefore, to limit my remarks to the amendments that consumed the greater part of the committee's time.

The first of these, quite naturally, was the authorization of funds. The Agency requested an open end authorization, as it did 2 years ago. Then, as now, the committee believed that this was a premature proposal. The Agency is not yet 2 years old. Its organizational phase is barely over and its research program is just getting underway. Under these circumstances, the committee sees a real advantage in a 2-year authorization of funds which will require the Agency to review its program and achievements with us in another 2 years. I think there is really nothing so terrible in having to go through the authorizing process from time to time. Lots of agencies do this, and there is no overriding reason why the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should not. In fact, the Foreign Relations Committee is extremely interested in the development of this Agency and intends to follow its various activities closely, particularly the negotiations at Geneva.

With respect to the amount authorized, the committee recommends the figure of $20 million for the 2-year period. This is a 100 percent increase over the $10 million authorized 2 years ago, and now virtually exhausted. Incidentally, under the committee's language, the unappropriated balance of $1,669,000 remains available to the Agency. The Agency proposed to request an appropriation of $15 million for fiscal year 1964, of which $11 million was earmarked for research contracts. This is a substantial increase in research activities for which the Agency has obligated $3,814,960 as of May 31, 1963.

I wish to mention one other amendment relating to funds which prohibits the Agency from obligating more than 20 percent of its funds in the last month of a fiscal year. This language is not very restrictive and is intended primarily to serve as a warning to the Agency to watch its monthly rate of obligations. As might be expected of a new agency, the monthly rate has risen steeply. The committee does not wish to see this become an established pattern in Agency operations.

Now, a brief word about the security provisions on which the committee spent some time in order to assure itself that they will not result in any dilution of the standards established 2 years ago. The committee sees no disadvantages to the two proposed changes. On the other hand, there are real advantages in terms of time and money saved. The committee also was informed that highly sensitive agencies such as Defense, the Atomic Energy Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency have the authority that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is now seeking.

The last amendment that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate is the limitation on the use of funds for propaganda relating to pending legislation affecting the Agency. Members of the committee were subjected to what appeared to be a highly organized campaign to approve S. 777 without any amendments. I realize that this is not unusual in the annals of Congress, but it is unusual in the affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. No other legislation or treaty handled by the committee has provoked quite such activity. The right of American citizens to petition Congress is not being questioned by the amendment which is directed solely at the Agency and designed to ensure that the Agency not use any of its appropriated funds to promote its own legislation.

I believe that the committee amendments serve to encourage the Agency's orderly growth. This committee has always regarded the Agency as a highly sensitive one, one that should proceed with its tasks carefully and cautiously. This is made possible by S. 777 as amended by the committee and I urge the Senate to give its favorable consideration.

JUNE 17, 1963.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer a 1-word amendment. On page 3, line 19, in the committee amendment, I propose to strike out the word "general" and insert in lieu thereof the word "any".

The paragraph presently reads:

> None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The word "general" seems to be a little too general. I have not been able to get a good definition of the word "general" as applied to this particular bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont is speaking under controlled time. Does the Senator yield any time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think this situation came about because of the fact that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were solicited to support the bill before there was any bill, apparently the result of a leak somewhere, probably from the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me that if we are to prevent the use of funds for propaganda purposes it should be for "any propaganda" and not for "general propaganda," when nobody appears to know exactly what that means. Therefore, I offer the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment. Either "any propaganda" would be all right, or we could leave out the adjective altogether. Both would serve the purpose. Either would suit me.

The point of particular interest to us is that this propaganda should not be directed to any pending legislation. A general statement about the virtues of disarmament is not objectionable, but in this case the campaign was directed to this particular bill.

I agree with the Senator. I think "general" is an equivocal word which should be either removed or changed to "any."

I am willing to do either.

Has the Senator from Vermont offered an amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I offered an amendment to strike out "general" and to insert "any."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to that, if the Senator prefers that to deleting the word "general."

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the word "any" more than I understand the word "general."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do also. Would the Senator prefer to delete the word "general" altogether? I think that would have the same effect.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be perfectly satisfactory with me to delete the word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps that would be better.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I change my amendment to one of deleting the word "general."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. I shall not object, but before the amendment is put to a vote I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am a little concerned about what is meant by the word "propaganda." I have no objection to prohibiting the use of taxpayers' money for propaganda in support of legislation, but I hope it will be clearly understood that the Agency is entitled to make available to the people of the United States full and free information with respect to all the activities of the Agency in connection with negotiations, proposed agreements, and treaties which it may bring to the President or to the Senate for consideration. I agree that the taxpayers' funds should not be used for "propaganda," but I do not wish to see the flow of information cut off by reason of any legislative construction of the provision in the act or in the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that problem was dealt with satisfactorily in the committee report, on page 10. The key sentence is:

> The committee does not intend by this language to restrict Agency officials from addressing public affairs groups and others on the general subject of arms control and disarmament or to undertake similar activities.

What we were trying to reach was the nuisance of the very extensive campaign for this specific bill. Some of it came in before we even considered the bill. That is why we have said "pending legislation." We did not intend to restrict discussion of the general subject of disarmament.

That sentence is in the report.

Mr. CLARK. I see that sentence. I think it is a useful and helpful sentence.

I assume the chairman of the committee would not intend that the language should be construed to prevent the dissemination of pamphlets such as those which have already been disseminated by the Agency, explaining the proposals both with respect to a test ban and with respect to general and complete disarmament, which have been tabled by the President and his advisers at Geneva, so that the country can be fully advised as to what we are advocating and why.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it would cover that situation. Propaganda in support of pending legislation, by the Agency would seem to me to be all that would be covered. The general explanation of the work of the Agency and the various considerations involved in arms control would be perfectly proper subjects on which to inform the public.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska withhold his point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to inquire if it is the purpose to deny the yeas and nays.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is not the purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. I withhold my point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona asked for the yeas and nays. I believe a sufficient number of Senators are now present. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains one-half hour of debate on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has the bill been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 10 minutes from the time on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending bill. In my opinion, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been doing a magnificent job in the cause of peace since its existence was authorized in the late summer of 1961.

It will be recalled that this bill was brought to the Senate, and later to the House, in August of 1961, shortly before the President made his historic address at the United Nations advocating general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law.

That speech was followed, a day or two later, by the Zorin-McCloy agreement, under which the United States and the U.S.S.R. agreed to 18 principles for a treaty of general and complete disarmament.

This Agency, which we are about to approve, whose finances we are about to refurbish, has been engaged ever since then in an earnest effort to reconcile the differences between the Soviet Union and ourselves with respect not only to a treaty of general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law, but also with respect to a test ban treaty.

It is true that we do not as yet have what the President wanted, and what I believe every intelligent and sensible citizen of the United States wants, namely, an end to the arms race and a cessation of nuclear testing. But cynics to the contrary, I contend that substantial and discernible progress has been made toward both of those objectives in the past year and a half. I believe there is good reason to hope that, in the years ahead, those objectives will finally be reached, so that we can take off the backs of the taxpayers of the world the frightening cost of the arms race; so that we can eliminate the delicate balance of terror under which we all live; and so that we can bring to an end nuclear testing, which is the outward and visible sign of the physical poison of radioactivity, and the poison in the hearts and minds of men which the arms race engenders.

I was dissuaded earlier today from proposing an amendment to the bill which would have restored the full $30 million of authorization, for a 2-year period, which the Agency requested. I think they were entitled to that money. I think the committee should have given it to them. I think the Senate should have given it to them. I hope the House will give the full $30 million; that the bill will go to conference and come back here, and that the Senate will be more generous than it is going to be today, and vote the whole amount.

Mr. President, how many Senators know the dramatic fact that between now and tomorrow we will spend for war, or for the preparation for war, over $100 million. This in a space of less than 24 hours; and yet we hesitate to give this Agency, for 1 whole year, $15 million, not for war, but for peace, for research into peace, for maintenance of a payroll which will work for peace, for the negotiations and issuance of contracts which will show us the way to make disarmament a reality, not merely a hope.

I commend the able Director of the Agency, Mr. William Foster, an outstanding American citizen, for the excellent work which he has done in his unceasing search for peace, utilizing the fine commonsense which has made him such a successful businessman.

I commend his able assistant, Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Agency, a skilled lawyer, and an imaginative and resourceful negotiator.

I commend the General Counsel of the Agency, George Bunn, for the fine work which he has done.

Finally, I congratulate Mr. Foster on having brought out of private life Archibald Alexander, a distinguished and able lawyer, a former candidate for public office in New Jersey, who has taken over the economic aspects of the search for peace which the Disarmament Agency is conducting.

As one Senator I resent the criticisms which have been made against this Agency. It seems to me it has been improperly held up to criticism, and sometimes to scorn. Its activities should not be denigrated. We should be proud of this Agency. It is doing a magnificent job.

I noticed, for example, an article in the New York Times for the 17th of June, entitled "Experts Quit Jobs on Arms Control," under the byline of that ordinarily accurate reporter, Mr. E. W. Kenworthy.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERTS QUIT JOBS ON ARMS CONTROL—U.S. AGENCY IS LOSING TOP AIDS OVER ITS POLICIES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, June 10.—At the time when President Kennedy has called for a new initiative for a nuclear test ban, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is losing virtually all its most experienced experts and negotiators.

According to informed sources, these men are transferring because they have become increasingly unhappy and frustrated over the operations of the Agency.

Ronald I. Spears, former Chief of the Political Affairs Office, who for years has done most of the policy planning on the nuclear test ban issue, has already left for a high position in the State Department's Bureau of European Affairs.

Charles C. Stelle, who has been in charge of the day-to-day test ban negotiations in Geneva, plans to leave in a few months.

RELIED UPON BY DULLES

Other experienced disarmament officials who will soon transfer to other areas of the State Department are Vincent Baker, James E. Goodby, David E. Mark, and Robert E. Sturgill.

These men comprise a tight little group who, even before the Agency was set up, were relied upon by Secretaries of State John Foster Dulles and Christian A. Herter for planning and the execution of policy.

William C. Foster, Director of the Agency, has been reluctant to lose them and has delayed their departure as long as he could.

It is also understood that two key officers, Jacob D. Beam, former Ambassador to Poland, and Henry A. Byroade, former Ambassador to Egypt, South Africa, and Afghanistan, are hoping that they will be assigned to new ambassadorships.

The Agency was created as a quasi-independent organization within the State Department in September 1961, in fulfillment of a campaign pledge by President Kennedy.

Repeatedly in the election campaign of 1960 he accused the Eisenhower administration of giving "this problem no attention." At nearly every whistlestop he said, in support of this charge, that "fewer than 100 people" scattered through four or five agencies were working on disarmament.

WANTS MORE PERSONNEL

Now the Agency has about 187 persons, of whom roughly 75 are officers. This is 10 times the number that dealt with disarmament in the State Department in 1960. Mr. Foster would like to increase the number of personnel to 277 in the next fiscal year.

Testifying on May 1 before a House appropriations subcommittee, Mr. Foster said that he needed the increase to take care of the larger research program and the continuing active negotiating responsibilities.

However, according to informed sources, the principal grievance of those who have left or are leaving is what they consider overstaffing in the Agency.

One official said both the President and Mr. Foster had assumed that a tenfold increase in personnel would automatically achieve a tenfold increase in quality and breadth of planning.

This is not necessarily so, he said.

Another official said that the principal effect of the expansion had been "more meetings, more committees, more memorandums."

Another criticism concerns the size and volume of the research program. So far the Agency has made contracts and grants for studies totaling $4,500,000. Next year Mr. Foster wants to spend $11 million more.

The critics concede that formerly the political officers and negotiators were at a disadvantage because the disarmament section did not have its own scientific staff to come up quickly with needed studies. A few such scientists and technicians were needed, they say.

They also concede that some of the medium-range and long-range studies contracted to research organizations can be useful.

However, they contend that many of the studies are "completely irrelevant to any of the real problems" the Agency is likely to face in the foreseeable future.

Examples cited are studies on world law and reorganizing the United Nations.

One official said that officers were so busy "dreaming up" new studies that they often did not read the ones that were delivered.

COMPLAIN ABOUT RUSK

A third complaint involves relations with the Secretary of State. Formerly, officials point out, the small group worked daily with Mr. Dulles and Mr. Herter. Now Secretary Dean Rusk, it was said, largely divorces himself from day-to-day consideration of disarmament matters, possibly because he regards this area as the responsibility of Mr. Foster.

The trouble with this arrangement, it is argued, is that disarmament and a nuclear test ban are political problems in which the State Department is deeply involved.

Considerable doubt about the growth and direction of the agency exists on Capitol Hill. This is evident from the recent cut in the agency's spending authorization made by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Two years ago the agency received $10 million, to be available until spent. With this almost gone, Mr. Foster sought an authorization to spend as much money "as may be necessary and appropriate," and an actual authorization of $15 million for the next fiscal year.

RECONSIDERS FUND CUT

The committee at first authorized $15 million for 2 years. On the reported urging of the agency, the committee reconsidered and the amount was raised $20 million.

To prevent hasty contracting of studies toward the end of the year, in an effort to use up unexpended funds, the committee declared that no more than 20 percent of an appropriation could be obligated in the last month of the fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this article, quite inaccurately, states that many of the important experts in the Agency are quitting, that it has been under increasing criticism.

The fact of the matter is that certain eminent, honest, honorable, permanent Foreign Service officers who have been assigned to this agency are now about to leave. I do not want to say anything in derogation of the public career of those fine gentlemen, but I will say that they will not be missed. The hearts of very few of them have been in the real work of the agency. They went over there to finish their careers after honorable service in the Foreign Service, waiting for retirement. Not too much reliance has been placed on their vision and imagination in the agency.

The men whom I earlier commended are the ones who are carrying the load and the men to whom the country should look for accomplishments. I completely disagree with Mr. Kenworthy in his criticism of the agency. It is rendering an outstanding service. It needs more money than the Senate is willing to give it. I hope that money will be forthcoming before the bill goes to the President for his signature. I hope, since the yeas and nays have been ordered, that the bill will be passed by an overwhelming majority of Senators who are willing to cast one vote for peace negotiations and commonsense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 or 4 minutes to me?

Mr. AIKEN. If I have control of the time, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when this legislation was first proposed, I voted against it—not that I am opposed to disarmament. Like all reasoning men, I believe that disarmament is a very desirable thing; but I like to see the other fellow disarming at the same time.

I voted against the creation of the extra committee of the State Department because I was not convinced that our enemies were in a mood to talk disarmament. Neither am I convinced that they are in the mood today.

The very first act of this Agency was to propose a disarmament treaty at Geneva that was never discussed, so far as I have been able to determine, with any Members of the House or the Senate. It came as a complete surprise to me, months after it had been offered, through the Associated Press and the UPI. It came on the morning debate began on the moneys that were advanced to the United Nations last year.

After exhaustive questioning on this floor of Senators who should know, and who one would reasonably expect to know, due to their connection with the various committees of the Senate dealing with this subject, I found that none of them was aware of this proposal.

Anyone reading the proposal can see in it efforts made toward unilateral disarmament. I do not charge the Agency with being engaged in that, but I do suggest any proposal such as the one which was offered at Geneva is a dangerous one to be sponsored by the United States. It is one that, had I been Mr. Khrushchev, I would have accepted the day it was offered.

I did not like the idea a newly created agency of our Government not wanting to discuss with interested Members of the Congress a proposal that could well change the entire course of our freedom.

Another point that disturbs me is that at first we asked for 120 on-site inspections in Russia, to help bring to an end nuclear testing. We have continually yielded and compromised until we are now down to seven, and I understand the figure might get down to five, or even to three. I have expressed my interest in disarmament. I also express my interest in people who talk about disarmament having stiff backs and not giving in to the enemy every time they are asked to give in.

We are told, for example that underground nuclear testing by the Soviets can be detected by seismic means. I deny that. For an agency of Government even to suggest to the American people that such detection can be made would be cause enough, in my opinion, to vote against passage of the authorization and appropriation.

I do not wish to detain my colleagues in the Senate any longer. We are using a very unrealistic approach to the whole subject of disarmament. I do not want at some future day to be connected with an agency in which my confidence does not rest. Therefore I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will take a very short time, to correct the record. I should like to state that the agreement which was submitted at Geneva, to which my friend the Senator from Arizona has referred, was first called to the attention of the country by the President of the United States at the time he made his historic speech before the United Nations, on September 21, 1961. The agreement was drafted, not by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which was not in existence at that time, but under the supervision of Mr. John McCloy, a prominent Republican, and then the President's principal adviser on disarmament affairs.

If there is any criticism of the treaty—and I personally do not think there is—the criticism should not be directed against Mr. Foster and his agency, which played very little, if any, part in connection with it, but against the President of the United States and his adviser, Mr. McCloy.

I thought then, and I think now, that it is an excellent treaty, of which all Americans can be proud.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has misunderstood my point. I should probably have mentioned the fact that the President outlined the agreement in his speech before the United Nations. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the original draft was dated the day after the legislation was passed by Congress. I was merely referring to this fact—and it is an interesting fact, and the Senator can verify it by reading my questions propounded to various Senators when the debate opened last year on the United Nations funds—that not one responsible member of the Foreign Relations Committee or of the Armed Services Committee, who should have known about this proposal, knew anything about it. I should think that a treaty like this would have been discussed by them, or at least they should have shown evidence of having some familiarity with it. The chairman of the House committee knew nothing about it. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield to me on my time so that I may propound a question to him?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was on the floor of the Senate on the day when the Senator from Arizona made that comment. I well remember that he queried two prominent members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Both of them said they did not know anything about the proposal. If they had read the President's speech, which he made before the United Nations the preceding September, they would have known about it. They could have learned about it from the pamphlet, which was issued to all the American people, and which I saw in Moscow on September 25. In that way they would have found out about the proposal, which the Senator from Arizona, I am sure in all sincerity, has said he had never heard of.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator saw it in Moscow on September 25, he saw it before it was published in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I took it to Moscow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the bill. I believe that the same motivation which caused me to vote for the original bill compels me to vote for the pending bill.

We have a national conscience to satisfy that we are doing all we can on our side to achieve some kind of arms treaty and disarmament program. However, I wish to sound a note of warning. I share the concern of many of my colleagues in the Senate, that we have been giving the impression, at least, that we are making too many concessions in Geneva. I believe we have had the proclivity of trying to tell the Soviets what is good for them, without realizing that they probably know in their minds what is to their best interest, whether or not we do.

I believe that we have also given the impression that we are a little too eager. If a person is on one side of the bargaining table, over-anxiety or over-concession on his part does not help his bargaining position.

Therefore I suggest that our negotiators, particularly those who issue press releases, not be in such a big hurry to give the impression that the United States has any less time in this matter than the Soviets; that the people of the United States are any more susceptible to nuclear fallout than are the people of the Soviet Union: The United States negotiators must make clear that we recognize that the people we are dealing with have an ideology which does not inspire trust and confidence, and which holds that the end justifies the means, that lying, cheating, stealing, and anything else is permissible.

In such a situation it behooves us to keep our powder dry. I do not want to suggest that we must have a completely foolproof treaty. However, I suggest that if there are to be any errors, they had better be on the side of the security of the United States and of the free world.

I hope that our negotiators will continue to negotiate, recognizing that they cannot get a treaty through the Senate, ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, if such treaty jeopardizes the security of the United States.

With that in mind, I hope the Senate will pass the bill, and that our negotiators will continue to negotiate and will be successful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill, because in my judgment it not only goes in the direction of exploring ways in which disarmament could be effectively brought about on a mutual basis, with the Soviet bloc disarming parallel to disarmament in this country, but also because the proposed legislation and the basic legislation which it amends provide that any disarmament agreement must be implemented either by treaty—in which event two-thirds of the Members of the Senate would have to concur in the ratification of the treaty—or by statute passed by both Houses of Congress by a majority vote.

That being the case, I do not share the fear of those who believe that some very imprudent and unwise agreement will be brought before us.

If that were the case, under the proposed legislation Congress would have to approve it. In the absence of such an approach, it is possible that a disarmament agreement could be put into effect by Executive agreement. That is something I very much fear, because I believe Congress should be very careful in determining precisely what was to be agreed to, in the event any agreement were arrived at in the field of disarmament.

As one who served on a committee studying the problems of disarmament over a period of years, I know it is oftentimes a difficult and frustrating task. But this Nation should, so far as it can, seek to bring about a limitation of arms and a certain amount of arms control. While nothing has happened along this line with regard to our effort for the past 16 years or more, I am hopeful that someday something will happen along that line. Therefore, I shall vote for the proposed legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has asked me to make a statement in his behalf. The Senator is fulfilling a prior engagement in Connecticut, not having known that the measure under consideration would be brought up today.

The senior Senator from Connecticut has asked me to state to the Senate his deep interest in the bill; that he voted for the creation of the Disarmament Agency when the issue was initially before the Senate; and that he subscribes to the policy of our country in attempting to negotiate a ban on nuclear tests and disarmament consistent with the security and the maintenance of the honor of our country. If he were present, the senior Senator from Connecticut would vote for the measure.

I shall vote for the bill. In my judgment, the danger of nuclear war is of such a specialized nature that a special agency of government is necessary to deal with the problem. I have expressed my views in the past, and I shall do so again, namely, that those who are in charge of negotiation should not abandon the thought of protecting the security of our country merely for the purpose of reaching an agreement. An agreement may be reached; but the agreement reached may be most dangerous to our country unless it contains adequate provisions to insure the Nation's security.

I think the record ought to show that our country has constantly yielded. From the beginning Red Russia has said that there should be not more than 3 on-site inspections. We initially asked, I believe, for 20; we then reduced the number to 7. Russia's proposal still remains at not more than three.

I hope that those in charge of negotiations will try to reach an understanding that will be honorable and in accordance with the security of our country.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I think we are engaged in the purest sort of folly to be considering disarmament at a time when the militant arm of communism is seeking to encircle the world. Can we in all honesty expect a dictatorship that holds suzerainty over captive people to disarm? I think not. I believe we are engaging in the sheerest sort of folly to pass a bill which entails a program of disarmament.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I intend to support the bill; but I shall do so with a clear reservation in my mind and with the expression of the hope that the bill will not be used to extend the executive authority beyond the powers vested in the Congress of the United States. I should not like to see our Nation confronted with a fait accompli in the framing of a treaty when it will be too late to bring the attention of such a proposal to the attention of Congress for its opinion. Therefore, I believe the rights of Congress should be carefully observed in this and in all other instances.

With that personal reservation, I shall support the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING ON ARMS CONTROL AGENCY BILL

As strong supporters of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—of which Senator JAVITS was a cosponsor—we deeply believe there is continuing need for intensive study and development of the whole range of disarmament matters. Peace is the objective of our time and an end to nuclear testing, which is injurious to the welfare of all mankind, must be pursued by negotiations. We strongly support this authorization for $20 million to carry on the work of this important agency in helping to formulate policies and programs for arms control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time in opposition to the bill has expired. The Senator from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The bill before the Senate is the product of much discussion, debate, and deliberation by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has been amended. In the main, I believe the amendments are constructive. The bill provides the agency with the authority to continue in the work in which it is now engaged. The purpose of the agency is to act as a coordinating arm of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, in matters relating to the policy of arms control and disarmament.

No one believes that we will be immediately successful in these endeavors; but every thoughtful person knows that the arms race, constantly spiraling upward, leads to continuing problems, economic as well as political, and perhaps even problems of survival.

I submit that every proposal involves a risk. There is a risk in the arms race. History tells us that an arms race has never resulted in peace. History also tells us that there has been little or no success in disarmament. Therefore, the risk is present; and anyone who would pretend to the contrary would be deceiving himself and others.

But I believe the agency fulfills a useful purpose. It gives to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who speaks for the Nation, counsel, advice, and a coordination of policy, which is highly essential. We shall be negotiating, and we shall be compelled to negotiate, because of the demand of humanity to seek a way out of this impasse. The negotiating must be done carefully and prudently and with the constant objective of protecting the security of the United States.

I cannot believe that President Kennedy or his predecessor, President Eisenhower, both of whom have engaged in the subject of disarmament, would ever do anything that would prejudice the security of the United States.

Remember that any proposal for negotiation will be presented on behalf of the President of the United States after most careful counsel and advice from his advisers, including those who are informed about such matters. Therefore, I am hopeful that we will give the President the authority and the machinery that he needs to conduct our disarmament policy safely and prudently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The bill having been read the third time, the question is Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If the Senator from South Carolina were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If the Senator from Connecticut were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirkson
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kefauver
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Mechem
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower

NOT VOTING—27

Bartlett
Bible
Cooper
Dodd
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Thurmond
Williams. N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 777) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to announce that, on the rollcall just taken, my colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, could not be present. He is at this moment delivering an address at the National Coal Association's annual luncheon which is being held at the Mayflower Hotel. I have just left the luncheon to answer to my name on this rollcall, but, obviously, Senator RANDOLPH could not do this, as everyone here will readily understand.

TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCAST BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on the evening of June 11, President Kennedy commented on the events occurring as a result of the enrollment of two young Alabama residents at the University of Alabama. The only thing that made this a special occasion was the fact that these two students were Negro.

President Kennedy's eloquent and moving message to the American people poses a problem that is broader than Alabama or any region of the United States. He spoke to all Americans. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the text of the television and radio broadcast be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the television and radio broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON NATIONWIDE RADIO AND TELEVISION

Good evening my fellow citizens. This afternoon, following a series of threats and defiant statements, the presence of Alabama National Guardsmen was required on the University of Alabama to carry out the final and unequivocal order of the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of Alabama. That order called for the admission of two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born Negro.

That they were admitted peacefully on the campus is due in good measure to the conduct of the students of the University of Alabama, who met their responsibilities in a constructive way.

I hope that every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents. This Nation was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds. It was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened.

Today we are committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free, and when Americans are sent to Vietnam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It ought to be possible, therefore, for American students of any color to attend any public institution they select without having to be backed up by troops.

It ought to be possible for American consumers of any color to receive equal service in places of public accommodation, such as hotels and restaurants and theaters and retail stores, without being forced to resort to demonstrations in the street, and it ought to be possible for American citizens of any color to register and to vote in a free election without interference or fear of reprisal.

It ought to be possible, in short, for every American to enjoy the privileges of being American without regard to his race or his color. In short, every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated. But this is not the case.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the Nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 a year, a life expectancy which is 7 years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This is not a sectional issue. Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety. Nor is this a partisan issue in a time of domestic crisis. Men of good will and generosity should be able to unite regardless of party or politics. This is not even a legal or legislative issue alone. It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right.

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution.

The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities, whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated. If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him, if, in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression, and this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free.

We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is a land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or caste system, no ghettoes, no master race except with respect to Negroes?

Now the time has come for this Nation to fulfill its promise. The events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives.

We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives.

It is not enough to pin the blame on others, to say this is a problem of one section of the country or another, or deplore the fact that we face. A great change is at hand, and our task, our obligation, is to make that revolution, that change, peaceful and constructive for all.

Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality.

Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. The Federal judiciary has upheld that proposition in a series of forthright cases. The executive branch has adopted that proposition in the conduct of its affairs, including the employment of Federal personnel, the use of Federal facilities, and the sale of federally financed housing.

But there are other necessary measures which only the Congress can provide, and they must be provided at this session. The old code of equity law under which we live commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens as there are no remedies at law. Unless the Congress acts, their only remedy is in the street.

I am therefore asking the Congress to enact legislation giving all Americans the right to be served in facilities which are open to the public—hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure, but many do.

I have recently met with scores of business leaders urging them to take voluntary action to end this discrimination and I have been encouraged by their response, and in the last 2 weeks over 75 cities have seen progress made in desegregating these kinds of facilities. But many are unwilling to act alone, and for this reason, nationwide legislation is needed if we are to move this problem from the streets to the courts.

I am also asking Congress to authorize the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to end segregation in public education. We have succeeded in persuading many districts to desegregate voluntarily. Dozens have admitted Negroes without violence. Today a Negro is attending a State-supported institution in every one of our 50 States, but the pace is very slow.

Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court's decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall, having suffered a loss which can never be restored. The lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job.

The orderly implementation of the Supreme Court decision, therefore, cannot be left solely to those who may not have the economic resources to carry the legal action or who may be subject to harassment.

Other features will be also requested, including greater protection for the right to vote. But legislation, I repeat, cannot solve this problem alone. It must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country.

In this respect, I want to pay tribute to those citizens North and South who have been working in their communities to make life better for all. They are acting not out of a sense of legal duty, but out of a sense of human decency.

Like our soldiers and sailors in all parts of the world, they are meeting freedom's challenge on the firing line, and I salute them for their honor and their courage.

My fellow Americans, this is a problem which faces us all—in every city of the North as well as the South. Today there are

Negroes unemployed two or three times as many compared to whites, inadequate in education, moving into the large cities, unable to find work, young people particularly out of work without hope, denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified. It seems to me that these are matters which concern us all, not merely Presidents or Congressmen or Governors, but every citizen of the United States.

This is one country. It has become one country because all of us and all the people who came here had an equal chance to develop their talents.

We cannot say to 10 percent of the population that you can't have that right; that your children can't have the chance to develop whatever talents they have; that the only way that they are going to get their rights is to go into the streets and demonstrate. I think we owe them and we owe ourselves a better country than that.

Therefore, I am asking for your help in making it easier for us to move ahead and to provide the kind of equality of treatment which we would want ourselves; to give a chance for every child to be educated to the limit of his talents.

As I have said before, not every child has an equal talent or an equal ability or an equal motivation, but they should have the equal right to develop their talent and their ability and their motivation to make something of themselves.

We have a right to expect that the Negro community will be responsible, will uphold the law, but they have a right to expect that the law will be fair; that the Constitution will be color blind. as Justice Harlan said at the turn of the century.

This is what we are talking about and this is a matter which concerns this country and what it stands for, and in meeting it I ask the support of all of our citizens.

Thank you very much.

WAIVER IN CERTAIN CASES OF INDEBTEDNESS GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may ask the Senate to consider items on the calendar to which there is no objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING MODIFICATION OF THE REPAYMENT CONTRACT WITH THE GRAND VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 218, House bill 2821.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2821) to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 237), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2821, introduced as the result of an executive communication, is to authorize certain modifications of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, Colorado. The repayment obligation of the association would be modified by (1) deducting from such obligation the unaccrued construction charges in the amount of $109,158.19 against 1,366.2 acres of public land originally classified as productive and now classified as permanently unproductive, and (2) crediting to the next annual installment from the association the sum of $4,531.93, which represents construction charges paid by the association on 123.6 acres of land in canceled farm units included in the above acreage.

COSTS

The enactment of this legislation would not involve any additional cost to the Federal Government.

DISCUSSION

The Grand Valley project in west-central Colorado is one of the older Federal reclamation projects. Construction was authorized in 1912 and the first water was delivered in 1915. The initial project works, including the main canal, were constructed with capacity considered adequate to serve 53,000 acres. However, over 50 percent of this acreage was never entered. On the basis of classification of the project's 53,000 acres under the Omnibus Adjustment Act of May 25, 1926, and reclassifications, pursuant to that act, in 1953, 1954, and 1955, 24,783 acres were determined to be productive and 28,217 acres were classified as permanently unproductive.

On December 18, 1954, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association advised that it considered certain lands included in the 24,783 acres to be unproductive and requested an additional reclassification. This request was based upon its belief that the area classified as irrigable on many of the vacant tracts so greatly exceeded the usable area that the construction charge payments discouraged entry, purchase, or other disposition of the lands. The association agreed to pay one-half of the expense of the reclassification.

The field and report work pertaining to the reclassification was completed in 1955. The total area reclassified was 1,533.3 acres. Of that total, 1,366.2 acres were found to be permanently unproductive and 167.1 acres were found to be productive. The 1,366.2 acres found to be permanently unproductive included 123.6 acres which had been entered and on which the association has paid certain construction charges.

As a result of the reclassification, the 1,366.2 acres were recommended for exclusion from the irrigable project area with the 167.1 acres to remain subject to repayment charges. H.R. 2821 would implement these recommendations. The unaccrued construction charge obligation for the 1,366.2 acres found to be permanently unproductive was determined to be $109,158.19 and the legislation provides that this amount be written off as a loss to the reclamation fund. In addition, the legislation provides that the association be given credit in the amount of $4,531.93 which represents construction charges paid on the 123.6 acres of entered land which have been found to be permanently unproductive.

The enactment of this legislation would not only permit a realistic adjustment of the irrigable acreages and construction charges heretofore applicable to these lands but would assist the Bureau of Reclamation in making this public land available and useful to resident farmowners and resident entrymen through sale or by amending existing farm units.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H.R. 2821 be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

E.L.K. OIL CO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 221, Senate bill 1066.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1066) for the relief of the E.L.K. Oil Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 240), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 1066 is to authorize the Secretary to do equity, if he finds the facts and circumstances warrant such action, by reinstating a Federal lease on oil lands in Wyoming which has been terminated automatically under the provisions of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (found in 30 U.S.C. 188). The subject lease was that of the E.L.K. Oil Co., a small independent corporation of Cheyenne, Wyo., which has been conducting wildcatting operations in the Mountain States. By dint of investment of time and money, and with good luck, the company found oil on a part of the acreage covered by the lease. Thus, if this acreage were now to be offered for lease, it would have to be disposed of by competitive bidding with the chances being that the E.L.K. Co. would lose out to a major corporation which probably would outbid it.

FACTUAL SITUATION

The E.L.K. lease covers a tract of 240 acres. Payment of advance annual rental for 1963 was due on February 1, 1963. This was a Friday. The rental check for $120, dated January 31, was not received in the office of the Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne until the following Monday, February 4. Since, under the law, the lease had terminated as of the close of business the preceding Friday, February 1, the check was returned to the E.L.K. Oil Co. on February 6.

At the subcommittee hearing, the president of the E.L.K. Oil Co., Mr. Robert Klicker, testified that he had come in from a field trip on Thursday, the 31st, discovered that the rental had not been paid, and that he himself wrote the check for $120, placed it in an envelope addressed to the Bureau of Land Management office and mailed it at the Cheyenne post office in person.

This testimony was not contradicted, and no evidence casting any doubt upon it offered from any quarter.

At the subcommittee's specific request, the Bureau of Land Management made a search of its files for the postmarked envelope in which the check had been mailed. Results of this search were negative; the envelope was not found. Bureau of Land Management officials explained that except in rare instances, such as in an appeals case, letters received in BLM field offices are opened, the contents time stamped, and the envelope discarded. The volume of mail is quite large.

The committee wishes to emphasize the fact that S. 1066 does not reinstate the E.L.K. oil lease. Rather it authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to "receive, consider, and act upon" any petition by the company that may be filed within 180 days after enactment. That is, the Secretary will conduct a full and complete investigation of the facts and circumstances, and then determine whether the lease should be reinstated upon payment of the year's rental.

APPLICABLE LAW

Although S. 1066 makes no changes in existing law, the applicable section of the Mineral Leasing Act, section 31, as amended by Public Law 87–822, which added subsections (c) and (d), is as follows:

"Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 450) as Amended

"SEC. 31. (a) Except as otherwise herein provided, any lease issued under the provisions of this Act may be forfeited and canceled by an appropriate proceeding in the United States district court for the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located whenever the lessee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act, of the lease, or of the general regulations promulgated under this Act and in force at the date of the lease; and the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

"(b) Any lease issued after August 21, 1935, under the provisions of section 17 of this Act shall be subject to cancellation by the Secretary of the Interior after thirty days' notice upon the failure of the lessee to comply with any of the provisions of the lease, unless, or until, the land covered by any such lease is known to contain valuable deposits of oil or gas. Such notice in advance of cancellation shall be sent the lease owner by registered letter directed to the lease owner's record post office address, and in case such letter shall be returned as undelivered, such notice shall also be posted for a period of thirty days in the United States land office for the district in which the land covered by such lease is situated, or in the event that there is no district land office for such district, then in the post office nearest such land. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, however, upon failure of a lessee to pay rental on or before the anniversary date of the lease, for any lease on which there is no well capable of producing oil or gas in paying quantities, the lease shall automatically terminate by operation of law: *Provided, however,* That when the time for payment falls upon any day in which the proper office for payment is not open, payment may be received the next official working day and shall be considered as timely made.

"(c) Where any lease has been terminated automatically by operation of law under this section for failure to pay rental timely and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the failure to pay timely the lease rental was justifiable or not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, he in his judgment may reinstate the lease subject to the following conditions:

"(1) A petition for reinstatement, together with the required rental, for any lease (a) terminated prior to the effective date of this act must be filed with the Secretary of the Interior within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this Act;

"(2) No valid lease has been issued affecting any of the lands in the terminated lease prior to the filing of the petition for reinstatement.

"(d) Where, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, drilling operations were being diligently conducted on the last day of the primary term of the lease, and, except for nonpayment of rental, the lessee would have been entitled to extension of his lease, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 790), the Secretary of the Interior may reinstate such lease notwithstanding the failure of the lessee to have made payment of the next year's rental, provided the conditions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) of section (c) are satisfied."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any petition of the E. L. K. Oil Company, of Cheyenne, Wyoming, filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease "Wyoming 046887(C)", as if such petition had been filed within the time provided in such section and such section had been applicable thereto.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE TAXATION BY STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, H.R. 6441.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6441) to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 242), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would extend from July 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, the time within which the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and/or the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall file the reports required by Public Law 86–272.

STATEMENT

Public Law 86–272, as amended, requires the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate, acting separately or jointly, or both, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, to "make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States" and report to their respective Houses the results of such studies, together with their proposals for legislation on or before July 1, 1963.

The Committee on Judiciary, acting through a special subcommittee, has undertaken such a study, which is both broad and thorough. In the course of its work, the subcommittee has gathered a large amount of useful information. It is now engaged in analyzing this data and preparing recommendations based upon it.

Although the subcommittee has proceeded with diligence, the issues involved are numerous and complex. The time remaining for completing the report will be insufficient for the continued careful consideration which these issues demand. The House Committee on the Judiciary believes that an extension to March 31, 1964, should provide enough time for it to complete its work.

The Senate Committee on Finance is of the view that this extension is necessary and desirable and commends this bill to the Senate for its favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6441) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 225 through 229, in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF EXCERPTS ON THE 1963–64 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963–64 national high school debate subject of medicare, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document selected excerpts on the 1963–1964 national high school debate proposition: "What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care to the Citizens of the United States", compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 159) authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the sixty-fifth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1962, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF STUDY ENTITLED "PROBLEMS AND TRENDS IN ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP—II"

The resolution (S. Res. 152) to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a staff study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II", prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that six thousand additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

The resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States", submitted by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

PRINTING FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ITS HEARINGS ON "PACIFICA FOUNDATION"

The resolution (S. Res. 157) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Pacifica Foundation," was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary four thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the hearings on "Pacifica Foundation", issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of measures on the calendar. There will be no further pieces of proposed legislation taken up at this time. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his forebearance and courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

CUBAN LIBERATION: A PROPOSAL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there is a time in the policy councils of a free nation for measured deliberation and even for conscious delay. Until all of the facts are in hand, until they are confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt, and until the public mind and the national will have coalesced into an overwhelming consensus—that is the time for deliberate indecision.

But there is also a time for decision—and for decisive action. And then, soaring rhetoric must give way to purposeful deeds.

We have arrived at such a time—in sober fact, at the moment of truth—in this Nation's confrontation with world Communist imperialism.

Still more, we are face to face with the moral imperatives of our national honor. The weight of our words, and the value of our most solemn pledges, are now hanging in the balance. And it will be a dark day indeed for the cause of freedom, everywhere in the world, if they are found wanting.

My subject is Cuba. My concern is Cuba. My concern is the liberation of that terribly oppressed people; and the removal of a leprous sore gnawing away at the very life of this hemisphere.

I speak today to my peers in this coequal branch of the National Government—and thus also to and for the American people—in the name of our blemished national honor and with the mandate of a collective judgment that can no longer go unrepresented. We must take up the burden of responsible leadership that has so long been defaulted by our executive officials. It is time, at long last, to make good their own pledge of Cuban liberation. It is time, to put the matter most bluntly, to fulfill the same mission begun at the Bay of Pigs—to establish a beachhead of freedom on Cuban soil. Only this time we must get the job done, as I shall propose.

It is right and proper that the Congress should be the forum for such critical public debate—leading first to unequivocal decision and then to bold action. What better place, indeed, than the representative assembly of the whole American community to bring to a focus the mounting tide of public anger and public frustration over a Cuba policy of planned procrastination? If the executive will not lead—will not represent what I am convinced is the hardened will of the American people—then where but here can responsible action originate?

This action began a few days ago, in my judgment, when the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] subjected to careful scrutiny the Cuban policy of this administration. His analysis was dispassionate; but not the implications that so indisputably emerge from this sorry record of delay and deceit, of empty rhetoric, and of bold promises timidly deferred.

The political and security considerations are grave enough—and to these I will direct attention in the remainder of my remarks. But equally grave, and more shocking still, are the moral implications of our Cuban policy. Or, to call them by their true name, the moral failures.

We failed at the Bay of Pigs—through flaccid reasoning at the critical moment. And we compounded our failure by attempting, months later, to hide behind some legalistic distinction between "air cover" and "air support," in a manner wholly unworthy of a great and powerful nation. What was at stake there was not formal niceties but rather the lives of brave men. And these we callously sacrificed.

We failed again last October when, with every winning card in our hand, with overwhelming popular support in this Nation and throughout the free world, we stopped short of our avowed goal. And the Soviet presence remains in Cuba—if, indeed, it does not grow.

We have failed, repeatedly, to mobilize the vast anti-Castro ferment inside Cuba and to unify with it the self-exiled refugees from Communist tyranny in this country and throughout the hemisphere. In crude terms of strategy, this has meant a shameful waste of valuable resources; and in the more significant terms of moral commitment, we have played cruel games with the hopes and aspirations of all these people—endlessly proclaiming our desire to see them once more free but failing to follow through with effective action.

We thus cheapen the concept of freedom—and irreparably undercut both the material strength and the moral stamina of the forces of freedom, worldwide.

And we contribute to the disarray among the forces of free Cuba, that, time and again, administration spokesmen point to as an excuse for our failure to mobilize the full resources of the hemispheric community in support of a provisional free Cuban Government.

This Nation, in honor and good conscience, can no longer have it both ways. If we are not prepared to do more than talk the Castro regime out of existence, then let us at least muster up the candor to confess our timidity and our helplessness. But I do not for one moment believe that this would properly represent the hardened will of the American people; and in their name, I utterly reject any such counsel of despair. Instead, I urge upon this body a clear and purposeful reaffirmation of our commitment to Cuban liberation. It is a matter, equally, of our national interest and our national honor. Now, let us get on with the task.

Can there be any remaining doubt about the urgency of the problem? A Communist Cuba is no mere annoyance. It is not some minor blemish in a community of nations otherwise healthy. It is, rather, an ugly and a potentially fatal cancer within the vitals of the free world.

In the measured words of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee's "Interim Report on the Cuban Military Buildup:"

> Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition and propaganda throughout Latin America. It serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R. It provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

The report goes on:

> Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.
>
> This evil threat—

The report concludes—

> must be "eliminated at an early date."

Let me simply underscore those final words. The Communist presence must be removed—not endlessly discussed, not reduced, not redeployed, but removed. And Cuba must once more be free.

When the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], in effect, challenged this administration to supplant its eloquent words with positive deeds, I rose to observe that I, too, had been engaged in a critical analysis of our Cuban policy. I then applauded, and now underscore, his argument that the time is long overdue for this body to come to the aid of the executive: if they will not spell out the details of a policy aimed at Cuban liberation, if they will not make good their own pledges, then let us provide the impetus. I promised to come forward with a proposal, more to promote and provoke debate than a full-blown operational plan, which would be devoted to one overriding purpose: the restoration of a free Cuba.

And so today, in no spirit of competition or partisanship, but simply as one profoundly disturbed American whose official responsibility it is to help hammer out the guidelines of national policy—in this spirit I rise to offer such a proposal. I ask only that it be considered in the same spirit—seriously, soberly, impartially. I ask that it be thoroughly debated, on its merits. If it helps move us forward, from dissonant oratory to a national harmony of decisive purpose, then I will be content. I ask that you hear me out, and then put my proposal to the hard test of full and free debate and to the ultimate standard of this Nation's best interest.

It is in this affirmative spirit that I offer a proposal for Cuban liberation.

The goal has already been stated: the liberation of Cuba, by and for the Cuban people themselves.

What unique resources, what readily available strengths does it call upon?

Chiefly two: First of all, the Cuban people throughout the hemisphere, and within Cuba itself. This is the manpower ultimately required for Cuban liberation—dedicated, ready, and willing to spearhead the operation. They must have U.S. encouragement and support. And they must have a home for their government.

That home, too, exists—right on Cuban soil. The U.S.-leased naval station at Guantanamo Bay is perfectly located to become a free Cuban outpost upon the very island of Cuba. It is there. It is fully equipped. It can serve as a moral rallying point for all Cuban patriots, on their own land. It is, in fact, exactly what the Bay of Pigs operation was meant to secure: a territorial beachhead on Cuban soil, a place for a seat-of-government for provisional officials upon the very sands of their homeland, and a focus for eventual liberation operations.

These are the unique resources that would form the basis of an operation committed inflexibly to Cuban liberation—the manpower and the territorial beachhead itself. But something more is needed—indeed, it must be the first order of business—and that is a free Cuban Government, as widely representative as possible of all Cuban democratic groups and parties. Up to now, we have treated a free Cuban Government as a stumbling block to liberation; and we have greatly contributed, by our own indecision and our own failure of nerve, to the confusion of competing and sometimes conflicting forces, each claiming to speak with the voice of free Cuba.

No one, and certainly not this Nation, can say for sure just who does represent a free Cuba. Only the Cuban people themselves, in free elections, can ultimately give the answer—and even then, only after the full restoration of freedom and the gradual rebuilding of the basic institutions of Cuban society. But what we can do—and do now, with a candor to match our bold purpose—is to call on the Cuban patriots to compose their own differences and to unite behind the one supreme goal of liberation. Let us issue our call—our challenge, in fact—in these terms:

We pledge our full support to a unified interim government and then prepare the way for free elections, within the framework of the 1940 constitution.

We will help this government establish itself on Cuban soil, at our Guantanamo base and, at the earliest appropriate moment, accord it full recognition as the legal instrument of Cuban sovereignty—at the same time branding, once and for all, the Castro regime as foreign-dominated usurpers. We will thus make use of our Guantanamo base to complete the mission we so shamefully muddled at the Bay of Pigs—the establishment of a free Cuban Government on Cuban soil. And we will do so without firing a shot, without risking lives or spilling blood.

We will insist on the provisional nature of this interim government—and request its executive officials to deposit with the Secretary-General of the OAS their undated resignations, to become effective when the Cuban people, by free elections, reassert their own ultimate sovereignty. We offer the use of Guantanamo, while retaining our full treaty rights and our perpetual leasehold. And thus we utterly reject the notion of offering this key base as a pawn in some future negotiations—with any Cuban government. That form of appeasement has no part in our liberation policy.

We will, at the same time, continue the policy of training free Cubans in our own Armed Forces. These men, in increasing numbers, will provide a reservoir of military skills upon which the provisional government may wish to draw as it charts its own course toward ultimate liberation. Without such an objective, without such a government to rally these forces and to lead them, our present training program has no real meaning. It is an illusion of action with no clear objective.

We will, at every step in this process, seek the fullest possible collaboration and support of the OAS community—in recognizing an interim government, in branding the Castro Communists a regime of usurpers, and in training the nucleus of a free Cuban army. But with or without such collaboration, this Nation will honor its pledge with every necessary resource.

I am suggesting that we thus challenge all Cuban patriots to units in the name of liberation. And toward the accomplishment of this goal, we must pledge our unequivocal purpose and the resolute use of our power.

Having proclaimed Cuban liberation as the core of our policy, we must do one thing more: we must warn away any and all outside powers that we will tolerate no interference, in Cuba or elsewhere in this hemisphere—no arms, no strategic supplies, no technicians, no training missions. And if the interval between the proclamation of our liberation policy and its effective implementation is used for the withdrawal of all foreign presence from the OAS community, so much the better. But let every foreign power be on notice, clear and unmistakable, that the United States means business about Cuban liberation. Let no one doubt that this Nation is prepared to meet its commitments—wherever in the world the challenge may come. We will not be diverted. Neither will we be deterred.

There we have the bare outline of a proposal for Cuban liberation. Let me stress once more that I offer this proposal as one possible course of action—consistent with our own avowed goals and with a high potential for accomplishing these goals. I offer it mainly as a spur to purposeful debate. I hope and expect to have it subjected to close and careful questions. Indeed, nothing less than this will fulfill my own purpose of moving our present Cuban policy out of the doldrums of defeatism and into the range of effective action. And in spelling out all the details, there will be problems. There will be legalistic forms to be either observed or overcome. There will be accusations, internally and externally, of warmongering. And there will surely be dire threats about escalating the crisis and blustering warnings about rocking the boat.

I submit that this is precisely the time when the boat needs rocking—right on out of the shoals of procrastination and of indecision. And I submit, too, that the form of escalation we can least afford is to permit this advance base of Communist imperialism to harden into a permanent enemy outpost barely beyond our own mainland. These are the realities of an intolerable situation. Our purposes are entirely honorable. And with a resolute will, we can achieve these purposes—to assist an oppressed people to liberate themselves from a foreign tyranny, and thus to advance the cause of freedom everywhere in the world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I rise to pay my compliment to the distinguished Senator from Colorado for the statement which he has just made. In it he is suggesting positive action, which in this day and age, in this city, is rather unusual, in view of the constant negative approaches of our administration.

The Senator has said that we need effective measures today. I suggest that we need an effective measure somewhere in this world, because whether we like it or not, we must admit that we are not being too successful around the world. We are faced with disaster in South Vietnam and in Laos. The Lord only knows what Berlin will bring up. Cuba is the one place close to our hearts and close to our heartland where we can do something.

I believe that what the Senator has suggested is worthy of discussion and consideration.

Frankly, as an American, I am a little ashamed of letting other people down. We have let the Hungarians down. We are beginning to let the people of southeast Asia down. We are not certain about what we will do in Berlin. We have certainly let the Cubans down.

It has been historic in this country that we keep our promises. So far the administration's hallmark, in addition to being indecision, has been failure to keep its word to our friends and allies.

Before I close I should like to ask the Senator a question, to make it perfectly clear in my mind and in the minds of my colleagues in the Senate, what he means with respect to one point in his speech.

When the Senator suggests that Guantanamo, on which we have perpetual lease, be used for the establishment of a free Cuban government, he is not suggesting that we give up our naval base. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I am merely suggesting that in Guantanamo we offer the Cubans a place, on their own homeland, where they can form a home for their provisional government.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend from Colorado. There will be those who will immediately charge that the Senator from Colorado is suggesting that we give up Guantanamo. I know that his suggestion does not contemplate that. I believe that at the outset we should make this point clear, so that those who tremble and quake at every word from the Kremlin will not throw at him and the people who back him the charge that he is following the example of constant appeasement.

Whether we like it or not, and whether the newspapers have covered this subject up with other headlines, the fact remains that Cuba is still the most important issue to our people and the most important issue for peace anywhere in the world. We had better get on with the problem that confronts not only the freedom of America but also the freedom of the entire Western Hemisphere, and the freedom of the entire world.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Colorado. I thank him for having made this historic and courageous speech.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona very much, particularly for pointing out one thing which I think should be made perfectly clear; namely, that we have no intention—and I have no such purpose in mind—of giving up Guantanamo either to the Castro regime or to a new regime which we would recognize after it was formed in Guantanamo, or to any other regime, until that time, not now in the foreseeable future, when Guantanamo would not be of any service to us whatever. I cannot foresee such a time at the moment. The Senator's question has given me an opportunity, which I appreciate, to make this point perfectly clear.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator, from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I am greatly impressed and very much intrigued with the idea the Senator from Colorado has presented. We have been going along for several years, being told that there is no practical step that we can take, and that there is nothing whatever that we must do. Now, for the benefit of the American people, the Senator from Colorado has presented a very practical proposal. It seems to me that this is a challenge to the executive department, either to adopt the proposal or to come forth with one that is better. It cannot be wiped off the record merely by saying, "We must still wait to see what happens."

I have this question to ask: If a provisional government were set up in Guantanamo, would all activities of that government be confined to Guantanamo?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not think so. If we permitted the establishment of a provisional government in Guantanamo, we would recognize that government. One of the paradoxical and anomalous situations in this country today is that we have never severed our connections with Cuba. We have only withdrawn our diplomatic representation from Cuba. Therefore, at the time that we would recognize the provisional government, we would sever diplomatic connections with Cuba.

Mr. BENNETT. If we recognized the new provisional government, would it not be perfectly proper for the people of the new Cuban government to establish embassies and other representations, particularly on our own soil?

Mr. ALLOTT. I assume that they would set up representation in many places where they thought the need existed. They undoubtedly would do so somewhere on our own soil.

Mr. BENNETT. Therefore, there would be an opportunity for that government to have free contact with the Cuban refugees who are located within the borders of the United States, and with anyone else or with any other government that might be interested in the success of the new provisional government thus established. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. The situation as it exists now—and even the administration's spokesmen have said so over and over—is that our dealings with Cuba have so fragmented the exiled patriots that they are now broken into many groups.

It is my hope that such a proposal as this, offering exiled Cubans a home on their own soil, with all the national honor and dignity that would come with it, would create an impetus, a drive, a motivation among them to establish a provisional government, a government which, of course, we would recognize when we were satisfied that it was a truly representative government.

Mr. BENNETT. If such a provisional government were recognized by the United States, would it not be possible also to have it recognized by the other states which are members of the Organization of American States, so that Cuba could again be represented in that important body?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is a possibility. Of course, no one knows what the first reaction would be; but I am sure that the South American countries themselves are as critical of our policy toward Cuba as are the Cuban exiles themselves. I know they wonder why we, with all our power, with all our might, with all our prestige, are unable to assist the little country of Cuba, while at the same time we are talking about keeping the peace of the world. The South Americans simply cannot understand a powerful, strong nation, which acts in such an utterly flaccid, vacillating, unpurposeful manner.

There has been a whole series of such actions by this administration. If we would not continue to act in this way, if we acted with all our force behind us, we might convince those people, and we might find, as we did last fall, when the President made his ringing declaration, that we would pull all the support of the Organization of American States behind us at once.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is much impressed with the idea proposed by the Senator from Colorado. Until another one that seems even better and more practical comes along, I shall do everything I can to support and hasten the fruition of this interesting and intriguing plan. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on the idea which he has brought before the Senate today.

Mr. ALLOTT. I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Utah. He himself made an outstanding speech on the Cuban situation a few weeks ago. I hope that he also will continue the discussion of this subject in the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado. He, like the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, has made an outstanding contribution to our national welfare. The suggestion that a provisional government be recognized and be given a home on Cuban soil, on the Guantanamo base, without in any way relinquishing any of our rights there, is one of great promise. Frankly, I do not believe it should be rejected unless a better proposal is offered. It is one of the most important steps that could be taken. Some of us may have something else to offer; but I believe the Senator from Colorado is talking in the long-range interest of the peace and security of the United States as well as the liberty of the Cuban people.

Recent history proves that whenever the West has acted with determination and strength in the defense of great principles, the Communists have backed down. Likewise, recently history shows that whenever the West has acted with vacillation and compromise, communism has advanced. Instead of being called warmongers, those who advocate specific, purposeful action in connection with the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere are actually serving the long-range cause of peace with justice and honor. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to make two points. First, I go back to my prefatory remarks; namely, that I offer this proposal as one positive plan.

Second, I do not know whether the administration has a policy or not. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] brought this point out very well the other day. If the administration has a policy, the best description that can be given of it is that it is a policy of containment. At best, it is a negative policy. I believe it is time for Americans to get our whole international policy off its heels and forward on its toes, where it can punch, and punch hard. I do not believe we can steer a true course of world leadership, to which we are definitely committed and which we cannot avoid, until and unless we are willing to take strong moral positions and support them.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I, too, salute the Senator from Colorado for making a most compelling, courageous suggestion of a constructive nature, one which would put an end to the retreat from freedom, which the United States has been leading in the Western Hemisphere. What the Senator from Colorado proposes is on all fours with the hallowed concepts, principles, and programs embraced in the Monroe Doctrine.

We have reached a stage in our relationships with the Western World where to do nothing, as we have been doing for so long, is much more dangerous than to do something and to take some constructive action. His call for action should produce results either along the line of his proposals or in conformity with some other plan of action.

I liked what the Senator said about the dangers of escalation. It seems to me that the dangers of escalation in this area are much greater from the standpoint of a continuation of a do-nothing program than they would be if some constructive leadership were exerted.

Over the weekend I was visiting with a friend from a Latin American republic. We were discussing the excellent speech made by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], in the Senate on Thursday, in which the Senator from Kentucky reviewed the catastrophic consequences of our Cuban policy to date. I was discussing with this important Latin American citizen the feeling I have that the Latin American republics should be as much concerned about Cuba as we are; and that they should join with us in some kind of concerted effort to eliminate the Communist cancer from the Western Hemisphere. The rejoinder of my friend was that the Latin American people are far ahead of the North Americans—or at least ahead of the U.S. Government. He said:

> We are looking for some leadership. We are waiting for someone to give us marching orders. We are willing and eager to cooperate; but we are unable to cooperate in a do-nothing atmosphere. While you sit on your hands, we sit on our hands.

I like the double-edged suggestion that a provisional Cuban Government be established. The Senator from Colorado has in mind, as I have, the creation of incentives by which the Cubans themselves would become eager to select their provisional government and to settle their personal or political differences.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I wish to make certain that my own purpose in this respect is understood. It is not that the United States would create a provisional Cuban Government, but that the Cubans themselves would create it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I think we should create some incentives. One reason why the Cubans have had so much difficulty in getting together is that they have had not much incentive to get together. They have not had a chance to do things which would bring them together. I think a provisional government which would have nothing to do would be unpopular in Cuba and among the refguees. To establish a provisional government and then to tell it that it could not recruit freedom fighters, could not train its forces, could not have contact with the people in Cuba who are anti-Castro and anti-Communist, would be to give the kiss of death to a provisional government before it was created. So we ought to provide a provisional Cuban Government work to do and an opportunity to house itself on Cuban soil.

If there are those who may oppose such a program—I hope there will be no opposition—I suggest that there are perhaps islands adjacent to Cuba, aside from Guantanamo, on which a provisional government could be established. It seems to me that the important thing is to give a provision government an opportunity to locate itself on Cuban soil, where it can begin to undertake plans for what will happen after Castro. The suggestion of the Senator from Colorado point to that direction.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes the program which he has discussed would be in conflict with the suggestion I have made from time to time, in various speeches and in reports to the State Department and the White House; namely, that the first essential step that we could take to indicate that we mean business about getting rid of communism in Cuba would be to intensify our economic boycott, which at least would tend to keep the Castro government in Cuba from fattening itself on the fruits of the free world. Would there be anything contradictory between such a policy and the suggestions made by the Senator from Colorado in the course of his speech?

Mr. ALLOTT. I see no conflict between those two courses of action. In one respect they are quite similar; namely, the proposal that we cease doing nothing; that, instead, we start upon definite planned courses of action which will exert upon Castro every kind of pressure for the fall of Castro which we can exert, and which will exert every kind of pressure upon Cuba and Khrushchev—instead of permitting Khrushchev to exert pressure upon us—to get his own people out of Cuba before, because of certain developments, it might be too late to get them out.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to hear the Senator from Colorado make that statement, because in my opinion one of the most dismal aspects of our present policy toward Cuba is the fainthearted effort we have made to establish the first essential step in setting up and supporting an economic boycott in the Western Hemisphere against Cuba. The U.S. policy has been completely satisfactory from the standpoint of our own nationals, for they are not allowed to trade with Cuba or to send to Cuba anything except essential medical supplies. But in the implementation of that policy we have not taken even a half-sized step in the direction of persuading others to adopt a similar policy. For example, we say that ships which engage in Communist trade with Cuba will not be welcome in U.S. ports, for commercial purposes. But if we meant business, if that policy were designed to do something other than to deceive the public, and if we really meant to establish an economic boycott, the least we could do would be to insist that shipping companies which permit their ships to trade with Cuba will not be permitted to have any of their ships engage in commerce in American ports. Such a policy would have some meaning, some validity, and some effect.

However, when we say to a shipping company, "All we require of you is that your ships A, B, and C, which trade with Cuban ports, shall not enter our ports; but you may bring into our ports any other ships you operate," in my opinion that is an exercise in futility, for it is designed to do nothing.

So we should take the first step in making our economic-boycott policy effective. We should have taken it long before now. However, after October 22, after the Bay of Pigs fiasco, and after retreating down hill ever since then, we still have not taken that first step in endeavoring to apply economic sanctions against Cuba.

So I am happy that as the Senator from Colorado has discussed our studies, he has pointed out that there is nothing to prevent us from taking action tomorrow to apply economic sanctions against Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct, and I thank him for contributing this point to the debate.

The main point is that we must begin placing pressure upon them, for there is no reason why our country should be the constant recipient of pressure from Khrushchev and the Communists in Europe. Instead, we should be exerting some sort of pressure ourselves, not only in this one spot, but also in spots throughout the world. If we did what the Senator from South Dakota has suggested, that would be at least one positive step toward exerting some pressure on them, instead of backing away from it, as we have constantly done.

Mr. MUNDT. If we took the simple, logical, and completely understandable step I have just discussed, and then moved in the direction the Senator from Colorado has proposed, I am sure—as my Latin American friends said over the weekend—that the countries of Latin America which are looking to us for leadership would finally realize that we are serious; and they would take steps of their own, and steps in cooperation with us, to implement this policy. Furthermore, I believe that some of the NATO countries and some of our supposed friends across the seas who are constantly fattening their economic coffers by trading with the enemy, while insisting that we continue to give them large handouts in order to make them safe against communism, should stop that counter-productive practice. Thus we would not find NATO countries and other countries we are supporting knifing us in the back by making profits for themselves by trading with the enemy.

I salute the Senator from Colorado for his persuasive and challenging suggestions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I have been testifying before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, so I did not have the advantage of hearing the first part of the speech of the Senator from Colorado. As I understand from the latter part of his speech and the subsequent colloquy, he proposes that the Cubans who are now in our country establish a government-in-exile, and that we offer them a place of domicile at Guantanamo Bay.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. And that thus we would help the Cubans who are now in exile return to their own country.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; their return would have to be planned. First, we would have to determine how many of the Cubans now in exile would be offered a domicile at Guantanamo Bay.

This suggestion is based upon the historical fact that in the past 2 years the body of Cubans in exile has been fragmentized. My purpose is to offer them motives for setting aside their differences and forming a provisional government as representative as possible—and, of course, we would not recognize it until it was as representative as possible—and then to offer that government a place of domicile and a home on their own soil. That government would then have the recognition of many countries which otherwise would not recognize it.

This development would provide a great upsurge in the effort for liberation of the Cuban people. Today, most Americans have forgotten that we have had many years of wonderful relationships with the Cuban people and that in many instances we really owe them a great deal.

All in all, I feel that this proposal would give a strong push to the movement of obtaining liberation for Cuba. We would be starting that movement, instead of merely talking about it.

Mr. GRUENING. I can understand how this proposal, if accepted and carried through, would have a definite psychological value. However, I do not clearly understand—and perhaps the Senator can assist me in this connection—what would happen then? How would that help overthrow Castro?

Let us assume that a government-in-exile were organized, established, and recognized on Guantanamo Bay. What then?

Mr. ALLOTT. Then I think we must provide assistance for every organized effort which the government would make in relation to exiled Cubans and Cubans within Cuba in order to help them gain recognition for themselves. We are now training Cubans in our military forces. Such training is an empty gesture unless we really mean to use those people, or permit them to implement their efforts to gain a beachhead in their oun country and overthrow Castro.

Mr. GRUENING. Any constructive suggestions are desirable at this time. I should be interested to see what the reaction outside of this small group who endorse the idea would be. I should like to see what reaction we get from the administration or from the public. I confess that I feel we must do something more definite and tangible than we have been doing in the past. I suppose other Senators were as shocked as I was to read that a Castro group had invaded the residence of a U.S. Embassy official in Caracas, seizing his wife, tying her up, and painting their slogans on the walls. It was a plain defiance of the dignity and authority of the United States. It is shocking to think that that sort of thing can happen, with no apparent redress sought.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is shocking to think that our country has changed so much in 50 years. That invasion could not possibly have happened 50 years ago. No one would have dared to insult the integrity of the United States in such a manner.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I commend the Senator from Colorado for his positive approach to the problem. A few days ago when he discussed his suggestion with me informally, I tried to take a negative view. I was a little skeptical. But the more I have thought about his proposal, the more impressed I have been that he has suggested a practical approach to a very difficult problem.

I should like to comment on three items of his proposal. First, I commend the Senator for bringing out the point that it was U.S. action or lack of action which contributed toward the fragmentation of the various groups that are interested.

They have one common interest—the liberation of Cuba from communism. But they are divided among themselves as to how best to approach a solution to the problem. The U.S. Government has used that fact as an excuse for its position of doing nothing. I believe that action such as the Senator has proposed—or if not that approach, something parallel—would get us out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves today as a country and as the leader of our hemisphere.

As I understand the proposal of the Senator from Colorado, he is trying to accomplish the original concept of the so-called Bay of Pigs undertaking. Is that not correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I was not in any way privy to what went on in the planning of that unfortunate undertaking after January 20, 1961, but I was somewhat privy to what went on before then. In the first place, the locale was not to be the Bay of Pigs, but another point. However, that is immaterial one way or the other. The idea was not that we should land a force of Cubans on Cuban soil and suddenly see Castro overthrown and the Communists out. The idea was much more sophisticated than that. It was based upon the premise that if we could establish a provisional government on Cuban soil—a government such as the Senator has described in his careful and well-chosen words—it would become a rallying point. Contact could be made with the anti-Castro forces which were in the very mountains in which Castro himself got his start, and ultimately communism could be thrown out.

It was anticipated that either there would be protection against air attack, or that Castro's airpower would have been liquidated completely. That was the basic concept behind the training program which started in March of 1960 for those who took part in the invasion

13 months before it actually was put into effect.

I believe that no one questions the fact that the plan was not implemented during the previous administration because we had not been able to obtain the proper leadership among the various groups that were tainted by the brush of Batista or even the brush of communism.

So the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado would accomplish the particular purpose of setting up a provisional government on Cuban soil.

The Senator from Alaska has asked the question as to whether we would train a force at Guantanamo which would go farther into Cuba. That question brings up many problems. Of course, I doubt that such action would be practical. But the proposed government on Cuban soil could, as the Senator has pointed out in previous colloquy, have an embassy in Washington and a consulate in Miami, in the keys, or somewhere else. Through that consulate or through some of the South American countries, the government would be in communication with the Cuban underground and keep active. It could encourage and give guidance to the Cuban revolutionaries who are in the mountains.

The suggestion of the Senator from Colorado has great merit and should be carefully considered by the Congress, and by the administration.

A final point is that the Senator will be criticized for some possible treaty violation which might come about as a result of his proposal. We have a base in Guantanamo under what might be called an executive arrangement between President Theodore Roosevelt and the early Cuban Government formed after Cuba achieved its independence. That arrangement was formalized into a treaty in 1934, which was ratified by the Senate. The treaty is very simple. I do not profess to be an expert in the field of international law. I recently examined the treaty. Frankly, I can see nothing in the treaty that would prevent such an arrangement. But should it be argued that the treaty would prevent such action, if we should recognize a provisional government in Cuba for Cuba, would we not then be at liberty, with that government, to make any amendment of any treaty obligation? As the Senator has pointed out, if we should completely sever diplomatic recognition of any Castro regime or the de facto regime in Cuba today, it seems to me we would be free to negotiate treaty amendments or any treaties we might wish with the Government of Cuba which we in fact recognize, and which I hope others will recognize.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I should like to point out that at the present time Castro himself does not recognize the treaty of 1934, which was based chiefly upon two executive agreements dated in 1903. Castro refuses to recognize that treaty. So far he has refused to cash any of the checks, in the amount of $2,000 annually, paid for the leasehold under the treaty. Perhaps in the amount in which Castro is now stowing away funds, $2,000 does not mean too much to him. I have no doubt of that. So we are in the anomalous position that Castro does not recognize the treaty anyway. We are dealing with a man who does not recognize a right which we say is valid and which exists. So if we should recognize a provisional government in Cuba we would, of course, expect that provisional government to recognize our treaty and our leasehold.

Mr. MORTON. The fact that Castro will not cash a check for $2,000 for the leasehold of Guantanamo might show his attitude toward a very modest amount, but he does not hesitate to shake us down for approximately $55 million in tribute.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. I have previously pointed out on the Senate floor that when the Senate attempted to revise the sugar bill, those of us who were very interested in that bill waited until the very last day—the night of June 30—before action was taken. We should have acted upon the measure many months before that. By failing to act previously, we financed the Cuban revolution and Castro that year to the extent of about $155 million. Therefore, it is not too soon for us to shake our heads and start coming to grips with reality.

Mr. MORTON. Again I commend the Senator. I hope this question will be fully debated not only in the Senate, but also throughout the country.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has been a great help to me on the floor and also in our private conversations, in developing these facts.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to join my voice with the voices of those who have commended my senior colleague for a positive, forward-looking, and progressive program. I have stated on numerous occasions, both publicly and on the Senate floor, that it has seemed to me the present administration has taken two basic positions as its fundamental foreign policy.

The first is that communism will evolve if we do not enter into a head-on confrontation with it, and that sooner or later it will be agreeable enough to live with peaceably. I do not believe this, but it seems to me that it is a part of our so-called isolation program.

Second, there seems to be a belief that Mr. Khrushchev is the most moderate of the Russian Communist leaders, and therefore should not be embarrassed by the creation of a crisis for him, whereby he might be overthrown. This has even been publicly stated by our representative at the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, who said that we might possibly be able to get Soviet troops out of Cuba provided we did not embarrass Khrushchev too much. How he comes to that conclusion I do not have the faintest idea; but it seems to me that by taking such an attitude we would do nothing except strengthen the armed base in Cuba, now so well established for the infiltration of Central and South American countries.

I stated, as a part of my comments in a conversation with the Senator from Kentucky a few days ago, that I had recently had a meeting with a distinguished Cuban who had been originally a Castro supporter, who is now living in South America. I asked him what he thought we should do, to get his viewpoint. He replied that the first thing we ought to do would be to provide incentives for the creation of a provisional government-in-exile. He stated that we should recognize that government, that we should give it all the assistance we can, and that we should stimulate aid to the guerrillas and freedom fighters in Cuba.

It seems to me that my colleague has pinpointed in his remarks the ideas and comments which were expressed to me, as well as adding to them by proposing an actual base on Cuban soil, which is quite important if we are to recognize a provisional government under our present Neutrality Act, as I understand it.

I should like to ask my colleague one question. In addition to the problems discussed by my colleague and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, are there any other legal complications which might occur by virtue of establishing a provisional government on Guantanamo Bay?

Mr. ALLOTT. I answer the Senator's question by saying, first, that later I propose to discuss this subject more fully.

We know we would not be recognizing an exile government on U.S. soil. It is therefore my belief that we would not be violating the neutrality laws of the United States.

In my study of this question the question of the legality of such action was raised again and again. I have consulted many people about it, and the question has been studied thoroughly. Though I do not wish to go into a full discussion of it at this time, I merely say that the soil involved is, in an international sense, still the soil of Cuba, which would make the proposed action very desirable. Such a proposal would stir the hearts and move the blood of the Cubans themselves.

We hope that this would stimulate a desire to do away with the fragmentation.

I have examined the two original executive agreements, and the treaty. I find nothing in those agreements—and others I have asked to examine them have found nothing in them—to violate the neutrality laws. I have found no express prohibition. Only by reading something into the treaty consciously could this be declared unlawful or against the terms of the treaty.

I am not concerned about that problem, although the question which the Senator asked is one of the first questions which crossed my own mind.

Mr. DOMINICK. Again I commend the Senator for his positive program. Mr. Castro himself started with about 62 people in the Sierra Maestri Mountains. When he started with 62 against the forces of Batista, he looked pretty silly, but he continued to grow in strength, with support from a great many people who were tired of the Batista government, who, without realizing the problems they were creating, nurtured this creature in their own breasts.

It seems to me that if we could create a government chosen by the Cubans themselves—not one of the "Kennedy favorites," as expressed by the Cuban to whom I talked a few days ago—with someone chosen by the Cubans themselves to be placed in temporary power, pending free elections, as the Senator has so carefully spelled out, we would be creating a fountainhead which would be the source of inspiration for continued guerrilla activity designed to free Cuba from this Communist menace.

I think it is a wonderful idea.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my colleague very much. I should like to go back to one of the first points he made, because I do not think it should be dropped completely. I refer to the indecisiveness, and the flaccidity of our Government in its attitude toward this situation. It is one which creates a feeling of hope along with a miasma of despair. It is bound to cause that, in addition to fragmentation.

This is the sort of thing which creates a climate Khrushchev himself wants, in order to promote his form of imperialism in this world. It is this coexistence policy which has come out so prominently in the past few days, particularly since Castro returned from his little tete-a-tete with Khrushchev, which creates the ideal situation and climate in which to confound the world, and permit Khrushchev to make further gains. I am reminded of something which was said to me by a Member of the Swiss Parliament. I believe it is worth repeating now. He said that anyone who believes in coexistence believes that the lion can lie down with the lamb and that the lion will become a vegetarian.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to pay my compliments to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for his excellent statement of a program.

I also wish to observe that for a long time we have been on dead center so far as Cuba is concerned. Certain speeches and statements to the contrary notwithstanding, I think the American people are very much aware of the fact that we are on dead center. It seems that every time a spokesman from this side of the aisle makes a proposal one of two things happens. Either we are met by the retort that it is warmongering or advocating a measure leading to war; or, secondly, the proposals we make are completely ignored, and in press conferences and other forums the administration spokesmen say, "If those on the other side do not agree with what we propose, what do they propose?"

All they have to do, Mr. President, is to read the newspapers and take a look at the Congressional Record. There they will find that for a long time Members on this side of the aisle—such as my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], both Senators from New York [Mr. Javits and Mr. Keating], myself, and many other Senators—have made proposals. They are not proposals to invade Cuba or to attack Cuba, but are concrete proposals which are not warmongering and which would, if carried out, probably get the job done.

They relate more to the area of economic and political activities than the area of military activities, although I suggested that the quarantine or blockade the President of the United States established last October should be reimposed until such time as Mr. Khrushchev and his puppet, Mr. Castro, carried out the commitment that there would be onsite inspection in Cuba.

I suggest to the Senator that, beneficial and helpful and instructive as his comments are, we may expect to find in the future the old "abracadabra,"—"Are they suggesting war measures, or what do they propose?" They will say that merely because they do not care to read in the newspapers what we have been proposing.

I congratulate the Senator from Colorado. I hope, somewhere along the line, that those who have eyes will see, and that those who have ears not only will listen, but will act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very appreciative of my friend's help.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article by David Lawrence may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my comments in my colloquy with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Policy of Inaction Against Cuba

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built MIG's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government

> to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrranical dictatorship?

Mr. ALLOTT. I add, in conclusion, that I know one of the first questions that will be asked is, "Are you advocating that we invade Cuba?"

I am not advocating such action. That would be one of the greatest mistakes this country could make at this time. There was a time for us to act. I think it was Shakespeare who said:

> There is a tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

We had our "time of fortune." We did not take it up. What I am advocating is that we increase the amount of pressure on Cuba, using every facility and advantage at the disposal of this great country, until we have succeeded in giving to those wonderful people the liberty they thought they had won when they welcomed Castro down from the mountains.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I join with Senators who have spoken to congratulate the senior Senator from Colorado, because what he has recognized is that where we are is not as important as where we are going.

I was impressed by the observation made by the Senator from South Dakota that to offer some leadership now would certainly fill the minds and the hearts of people all over Latin America with hope. I recall, as the Senator from Colorado will recall, that not so very long ago there was a situation in Guatemala in which an anti-Communist government overthrew an anti-Communist government.

How does this happen? As I privately thought about it, I observed the fact that not too long before that, in a South American conference in which this Nation was represented by no less than our Chief Executive, at a time when the people were concerned about their freedoms, we began to talk about social reforms that would come about through our inter-nation efforts and cooperation. Of course, that was important, but the people who went back to Guatemala said, "We alone must stand firm."

I think the Senator from Colorado is urging that our Nation stand firm, and show it in this forum and otherwise, so that those who looked to the North for leadership and who for so long found it lacking may find it here again.

I salute the Senator. I think he has made a great contribution. I think from here on we may expand the dialog around this subject. The Senator from Kentucky suggested that we do so, and the Senator from Colorado has done so today.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, before I submit the amendment I propose to introduce to the foreign aid bill, I should like to say that I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Colorado and the discussion which followed. I do not want to be included among those who have been charged with accusing the members of the Republican Party with warmongering. I know the Senator from Colorado is not a warmongerer. I respect his good intentions in making the suggestions he has made.

Doubtless we share a common purpose in wanting to see the Castro regime brought down, and doubtless this ought to be accomplished by the Cuban people themselves, for, after all, it is their Government, not ours, and it is their country, not ours.

I must say to the Senator from Colorado, however, that I cannot see how the proposal he makes would advance that objective. The problems we have had with the Cuban exile movement stem in part from the fact that many of the leaders now in this country come from the few families which owned or controlled nearly all of the land and wealth of Cuba. These men are not likely to be greeted on the shores of Cuba as liberators, but, rather, as those who would reinstate the plantation-and-peon economy that existed in Cuba under the Batista regime.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he goes on?

Mr. CHURCH. Not at the moment. I want to make my point first.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well.

Mr. CHURCH. I say this because I think there is a need to find leadership that is not identified with the old order, which, as the Senator knows, was not freedom, but tyranny of a very vicious sort, in its way, as bad as the tyranny that now has been imposed on the Cuban people, which all of us find so objectionable.

Second, I point out that, from what I know of the feeling and the attitude of the Cuban people, there has long been considerable resentment in Cuba itself over Guantanamo, whether it is well or ill founded. It would seem to me not to augur well for any provisional government, that we hope one day would win general support of the Cuban people, to headquarter it in Guantanamo.

Psychologically, I think it would seriously set back whatever hopes we might have that the Cuban people would give this government the general support necessary to overthrow the Castro tyranny.

For these reasons, it seems to me I would have to part company with the distinguished Senator from Colorado in the proposal he has made, even though I honor his motivation and share the end objective of seeing the Castro regime overthrown and a genuine democratic government established in Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I invited comments when I started my speech, and I am very happy to have the comments of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Even though we part company, it would not be the first time, and I am sure it will not be the last, although I respect him for his own motivations and his own sincerity.

A provisional government does not necessarily have to be made up of the people he has mentioned. I suggest that, before the Castro regime, bad as the Batista regime was, the people of Cuba then had by far the highest standard of living of any country in Latin America. No country in Latin America has yet approached it.

As for the second point, this plan has also been suggested to Cubans. We have not had the reaction that the Senator suggests.

I know that the Senator from Idaho has waited a long time to make his statement. I had not anticipated this long a discussion, so I will not prolong it now.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. It is true, as the Senator has said, that the per capita income in Cuba under Batista was higher than that of most other countries of Latin America, but that is based upon dividing the gross national product by the population, and makes no allowance for the exceedingly inequitable distribution of wealth which was placed lavishly in the hands of a few, while the many were exposed to fearful poverty.

I am sure that had it not been for the dissatisfaction of the peons in Cuba, who worked on the great sugar plantations, it would never have been possible for Castro to have achieved the popular support—the grassroots support—that enabled him to overthrow Batista and his 35,000-man army, which we helped to arm and equip. The very success of this grassroots revolt indicates the deep dissatisfaction the average Cuban in the countryside felt toward the Batista regime. We must face this fact if we are to fashion a realistic policy that can win the support of the great majority of the Cuban people, because in their support alone rests the opportunity to see Castro overthrown and a genuine democratic government established.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. It had not been my purpose to discuss Cuba at this time. I have an amendment to the foreign aid bill that I wish to discuss and present. However, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been informed by native Cubans that in the early days Castro was supported by the intelligentsia and people with a high standard of living, and that those people supported Castro almost unanimously, because they wanted to get out from under Batista, whose regime we agree was tyrannical. It was not until after Batista had been ousted that they found that they had something worse than what they had been fighting against. In many cases those people are the ones who have now left and who are most active in the exile groups, trying to find some mechanism or government with which they can pull together the various fragmented sections. Not only are the peons active; a great number of highly intelligent and highly educated people, and some formerly wealthy people are active in this movement. They want to go back and create a democratic form of government.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not disagree in the least with the Senator in that regard. There are some very fine potential leaders, I am sure, who could head up an exile government which would have the potential for success in Cuba. However, those leaders must be people who are convincingly for the establishment of a government based upon liberal democratic principles, and who are not so identified with the old regime as to lack popular appeal. That is the challenge that faces us. It faced the last administration also. It is a difficult problem. I am sure that both the Senator from Colorado and I share a common interest in finding that kind of leadership for the people of Cuba.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN AID ACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to this year's foreign aid bill (S. 1276), and ask that it be appropriately referred. As I believe it to be genuinely bipartisan in character, I am hopeful it will win widespread bipartisan support. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may lie on the desk for 1 week, in order that other Members who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the need for this amendment can be expressed in a few words. In fiscal 1962, the latest year for which the figures are available, the United States gave foreign aid to 107 countries. Apart from the Sino-Soviet bloc, there were only eight countries left in the world which did not receive some form of foreign aid from the United States.

Unless one is to believe that there are only eight countries in the whole of the free world that can make do without some kind of American subsidy, something must be seriously wrong with the administration of our foreign aid program.

What is wrong should be obvious to Congress. Foreign aid has become thoroughly institutionalized. The bureaucracy charged with its administration has a vested interest in extending and perpetuating the program. Each year the list of recipients has grown longer. In nearly every case, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, the administrators have shown an inability to end foreign aid in any country, once the spigot has been turned on, regardless of how much has flowed out, or how rich the recipient country has since become. The nature of the subsidy may change, the flow may even be reduced, but the spigot never stops dripping.

The purpose of this amendment is to turn off a few of the spigots by simply prohibiting further grants of aid to rich countries.

The amendment is so drawn as to give adequate direction and discretion to the President. Under it, all existing unfulfilled commitments would be fully honored; only new pledges of additional gifts would be barred. The amendment would not affect loans or credit sales.

The operative language of the amendment is as follows:

> No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under any provision of this act to any country, except to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, unless the President shall have determined that it would be an undue economic burden upon such country to purchase or provide the supplies, equipment, or services proposed to be furnished.

The principle embraced by this amendment can be plainly put: Countries that can readily pay their own way ought to be taken off our dole.

Since it cannot be argued that the purpose of foreign aid is to subsidize rich countries, the administrators are disposed to say that it is their policy to reduce, and eventually to terminate, further aid to such affluent countries as the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Italy, and Japan, all of which were still receiving American grants in 1962, in the total sum of nearly $400 million.

The very size of our subsidy to these rich countries in fiscal 1962 is argument enough for the amendment. They should have been dropped from the list long ago, but they are still on it. All of these countries will continue to receive further subsidies under this year's foreign aid bill.

If it is the purpose of the administrators to stop giving aid to rich countries, then they ought not to object to this amendment. For it will put some legislative bite into their declared policy, and give them a statutory basis for sooner achieving their acknowledged goal. Indeed, they should welcome the amendment, as it would make their future dealings with these affluent nations much easier, enabling them to explain the need for finally shutting off further gifts by citing the requirement of our law. Congress, I am sure, would be willing to shoulder the blame.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, my efforts, over the past 3 years, to get an amendment of this kind adopted, have been given no support by the administrators of the program. I have been unable to overcome the combined opposition of the State Department and the Pentagon, despite the fact that the arguments raised against the admendment are demonstrably without factual basis. Most of the aid we continue to give these rich nations takes the form of military assistance; that is, American grants of military equipment and supplies. When aid can be wrapped in a uniform, Congress is reluctant to open the package and look inside. This accounts, I think, for the willingness of Congress, in the past, to accept the excuses for these continued subsidies, without giving critical appraisal.

We should stop behaving this way. It should be incumbent upon us—especially those of us who have supported the foreign aid program—to insist that all parts of it make sense. The excuses often given for continued subsidies to the rich are lacking in reasonable basis, as the following answers should demonstrate:

First. The amendment will not "handcuff" the President. The argument that Congress should delegate to the President full discretion over the spending of foreign aid money has become an artful way of dodging the question of why, on the merits, a given program is being perpetuated. Certainly an emergency might arise, or special circumstances might cause the President to conclude that further grants of aid should be made to a particular country, even though it can afford to pay, but, in such cases, the bill provides an ample contingency fund for the President's unfettered use. The amendment I propose would restrict only the normal programing of our foreign aid, which is really the function of the bureaucracy, not the President.

Second. The amendment will not affect our obligation to the NATO alliance, nor will it weaken or disrupt the alliance in any way. The amendment does not touch our contribution to the NATO infrastructure, or any other treaty commitment of the United States to any multinational organization. It merely cuts off further grants to individual countries, in NATO or elsewhere, which are able to get along very well on their own.

Since all existing commitments would be honored, the amendment would cause no disruption or disorder within NATO. Moreover, the language permits the President the latitude to continue giving aid to our poorer NATO partners, such as Turkey, wherever he finds that economic conditions warrant it.

In the long run, the amendment could actually strengthen the alliance by making it clear to each member that, as we intend to do our part, so we expect them to do theirs. The continuation of our needless subsidy to rich countries, fully capable of paying their own way, can lead only, as history has often shown, to a corruption of the alliance which will weaken it internally through the erosion of the mutual respect that comes from each member doing its share.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that I have offered much more strongly worded amendments than he has offered, in an endeavor to achieve the same purpose. I cannot for the life of me understand why the United States should still be continuing to supply economic aid to the United Kingdom, West Germany, France, the Benelux countries, or other countries, which are today enjoying a degree of prosperity greater than those countries ever enjoyed before. In fact, if one could conceive of the United States not being a part of this planet, those countries would be the most progressive, prosperous nations on the earth; they would be the leaders and the hope of the free world.

I am happy to see the Senator again offering an amendment to achieve the same objectives. I only hope that if his amendment is successful, the administrators will not abuse the purpose of it, as I have seen them do in years gone by, by seizing upon any escape language available to them to reach a conclusion that is not justified by the facts.

The Senator from Idaho well knows that economic or military aid to those countries can no longer be justified. Those countries should have their own foreign aid programs to help less fortunate nations. I believe some of them actually do. There is no reason whatever why the United States should continue to aid those countries this long after the war.

We undertook a very heavy burden after the war, beginning in 1946; but 17 years after the war, those nations should be able to pick up and carry some of the burden, rather than asking us to do it.

I believe that one thing that has been driven home and made demonstrably clear is that so long as any nation can be certain that Uncle Sam will carry the burden if that nation defaults on it, the burden will be passed off on to Uncle Sam.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct. I can see no reason why the prosperous countries of Western Europe should continue to be on the American subsidy. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, we are calling upon these countries, recognizing their unprecedented level of prosperity, to help us shoulder the burden of foreign aid for the underdeveloped nations of the world. At the same time that we ask them to give us their help, we are doling out hundreds of millions of dollars to these very countries in subsidies to help them maintain their own armed forces. This does not make sense. I think it is the administrative momentum within the program, and the vested interest that the bureaucracy has in extending it, that accounts for the fact that this many years after the full recovery of Western Europe, the American subsidy still continues. That is why I think that if we are finally to turn off the spigots, Congress will have to take action by writing into the law some requirements the administrators will have to respect.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also true—perhaps the Senator has already covered this in the earlier part of his speech, before I entered the Chamber—that the nations of Western Europe, and for that matter, almost all the nations with whom we are allied, are contributing less than 5 percent of their gross national product, or about that figure, as their part of the defense of Western Europe, while the United States is contributing almost 10 percent of its gross national product to the defense of the entire area, plus the United States?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. We are making approximately twice the effort in proportion to our own wealth to maintaining our Armed Forces, as our prosperous NATO allies are making in proportion to theirs.

I intend to place in the Record some previous statements that give these facts in detail, in support of the amendment. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will have the opportunity to read the Record tomorrow, where the whole case will be brought together and these facts will be set out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also true that the contribution that this Nation would propose to make, in the event the NATO nations were attacked, would be almost as great as we would expect the sum total of those nations together to be?

Mr. CHURCH. Everyone who has studied the question at all knows that the defense of Western Europe today rests upon American nuclear power. The NATO alliance has succeeded because we have tied our nuclear striking force to the trip wire of American troops in West Germany. Were it not for our presence in Europe, and the availability of our nuclear striking power, Europe would have no effective defense today. So we are not only providing Europe with the elements that constitute its effective defense; we are also subsidizing the individual countries to maintain their own conventional forces. And we are doing so, despite the fact that they are making only half the effort, in proportion to their own wealth, to provide for their own defense, as we are making in proportion to ours. This does not make sense. We ought to put a stop to it. The least we should do is to stop furnishing subsidies to countries which have become rich. We should say: "We rejoice in your wealth. We are happy that the objectives of the Marshall plan have proved out, and that prosperity, profits, and productivity have been established at unparalleled levels. We commend you on these accomplishments. And now the time has come to take you off our dole."

This is the purpose of my amendment. I believe it would help the NATO alliance and strengthen it. I believe the countries of Western Europe would fully understand why it became necessary to write this provision into the law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If there is any error in the Senator's amendment, it might be in the degree of flexibility with which the program would be administered. I am sure that he permits flexibility to such a degree in hopes that the administrators would go along with it.

It has been my impression, almost since the day I came to the Senate, that one of the great difficulties in the program is that the administrators, having a responsibility for the defense of this country and its conduct of foreign affairs, have become so spoiled, so soft in the job they do, in the years they have played Santa Claus, that it would be difficult for them to turn around and start a drive in this Nation's interest in dealing with equals around the world. But that will take time to accomplish.

However, certainly what the Senator from Idaho is proposing is the most reasonable thing we could ask.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Four years ago, when I first became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I asked the spokesmen for the foreign aid program whether they could point to some countries which were soon to be taken off the list, as examples of success, countries to which we had given large amounts of our aid over a long period of time to build up their economies and make them self-sustaining Of course, this is the basic rationale of the foreign aid program. So I asked, "After all these years, where has success been achieved? What countries are about to be taken off this evergrowing list?"

The Senator from Louisiana will be interested to know that the reply listed the same four or five countries, which it was then said would "soon" be dropped, as were listed this year by the Secretary of State, in making his response to the same question. Those countries are still on the list, although we are still being told that in due course, perhaps in another 4 or 5 years, these countries will yet be taken off. I think this situation is indicative of the reluctance of the administrators finally to close the spigots, even in the case of countries which, after having received enormous amounts of aid from the United States, over a long period of time, have become rich and fully self-supporting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I am more optimistic than he is, for my suspicion is that his speech will result, after we adopt the amendment, in removing from the list these four or five countries.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the Senator from Oregon is right.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program because I believe it vital to the security interests of our country. But unless all parts of the program make sense, unless we cut off our aid from all countries which no longer have any reason to be on the list, and unless we can show the American people reasonable progress, we face the day when popular support of the program will crumble and it will collapse like a house of cards. It is for this reason that I offer the amendment. I wish the administration would get behind the amendment, because I believe it would serve the longterm interests of the foreign aid program itself. I think it is particularly necessary that the amendment be adopted at this time, when we are still failing to correct our own adverse balance of payments, despite the fact that our gold supply has fallen dangerously low. As the Senate knows, this problem is far from being solved; and one of the reasons why our balance of payments continues to be adverse is our continued spending of large amounts of money in the foreign aid field.

So, Mr. President, Congress should at least begin to close the door on further

American subsidies to those self-supporting countries that have no need whatever for any more American aid.

The continuing American subsidy has not been successful as an inducement to the rich countries to make a greater defense effort on their own. To persist in this notion is to keep throwing good money after bad.

After 15 years of "inducements" on our part, approximating 15 billions of dollars, our prosperous allies in Western Europe were spending 5.4 percent of their gross national products on defense in 1962, while we were spending 9.8 percent of ours. Moreover, the average yearly military expenditure of our NATO allies had fallen off from 7.1 percent, in 1953, to 5.4 percent, in 1962. The trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

To demonstrate beyond argument the level of wealth that has now been achieved by most of our NATO partners in Western Europe, their resultant capacity to maintain their own armed forces without American subsidy, and the lesser effort they are actually making, compared with our own, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an appropriate chart containing these figures for last year, 1962.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Selected economic and defense expenditure data on European NATO countries, calendar year 1962

	Population, mid-1962	GNP in current market prices		Private per capita consumption	Defense expenditures	
		Total	Per capita		Total	Percent of GNP
	Thousands	*Millions*			*Millions*	
Belgium-Luxembourg	9,579	$13,876	$1,449	973	$417	3.0
Denmark	4,707	7,130	1,515	1,058	215	3.0
France	46,710	68,580	1,468	967	4,435	6.5
Germany	54,766	84,275	1,539	884	4,308	5.1
Greece	8,480	3,775	445	317	170	4.5
Iceland	183	160	874	601		
Italy	49,821	38,400	771	464	1,360	3.5
Netherlands	11,797	13,100	1,110	630	590	4.5
Norway	3,645	5,186	1,423	842	192	3.7
Portugal	9,268	2,800	302	227	200	7.1
Turkey	29,200	6,090	209	154	330	5.4
United Kingdom	53,242	79,115	1,486	977	5,081	6.4
Total, European NATO	281,398	322,487	1,146	721	17,298	5.4
United States	186,591	553,600	2,967	1,912	54,400	9.8

Source: Statistics and Reports Division, Agency for International Development, June 14, 1963.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, that which is true in Western Europe is also true in Japan. Japanese defense expenditures, as a percentage of her gross national product, have gone down from 2.2 percent, in 1953, to 1.1 percent, in 1962. In short, 10 years after our military subsidies to Japan began, the Japanese were making only half as much effort to maintain their own armed forces as they had made to start with. The inducement argument is obviously unsupported by the record.

Mr. President, on several earlier occasions during this session, I have taken the floor to argue in greater detail the case for this amendment. I have also made insertions in the Record in support of the objective this amendment seeks to serve. In order that the whole statement of the case may appear at one place, I now ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record, Feb. 21, 1963]

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. Church. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article appearing in the U.S. News & World Report. The article compares the present defense burden of the United States with that of the countries of Western Europe. The analysis very cogently demonstrates the disproportionately heavy burden the United States carries in providing an adequate defense for ourselves and for our Allies in Western Europe. The article shows that the American taxpayers are bearing far more than their fair share of this cost, while at the same time the NATO countries are assuming military expenses in an amount much less than their national wealth would allow.

For example, as the article points out, the United States is spending 11.3 percent of its total national income for defense purposes, while Western Europe spends 4.9 percent. The average American taxpayer pays $277 a year for defense purposes, while the average European is paying only $53 yearly for defense purposes. In addition, the United States has some 2.7 million men under arms, which is only slightly less than the total men under arms in all of the NATO countries put together. While we operate under a rigorous 24-month compulsory draft, all of the NATO countries have shorter draft requirements—except Turkey and Greece—and Great Britain has no compulsory draft at all.

In short, Mr. President, the article shows that the prosperous countries in Western Europe are not making as much an effort, in proportion to their own resources, to maintain their armed forces, as we have been making in proportion to ours. Indeed, we are making over twice the effort for defense in relation to our own wealth as the average of our European Allies in NATO. I think the American people are of the opinion that the time has come for many of these prosperous nations in Western Europe to assume their obligations by contributing their share of these vast defense costs.

The inequitable situation becomes more apparent when the military assistance program of the United States, as it is applied to the countries of Western Europe, is considered. Only last year, over $314 million was allocated for military assistance grants to Western Europe. This is a perpetuation of the military subsidies we continue to give these countries, which have totaled more than $14½ billion since 1950, despite the fact that the majority of the countries involved have long since recovered economic capabilities sufficient to sustain their own military forces without external aid.

There is clearly no economic basis upon which to justify our continuing subsidies, in the form of military grants, to these countries in Western Europe. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries nearly 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting. The time is long overdue for us to take a similar stand on military aid.

My colleagues may recall my efforts in 1961 to have the Congress amend the Foreign Aid Asistance Act to provide that further military assistance on a grant basis to the countries of Western Europe, except to fulfill prior firm commitments, should terminate, unless the President declared an emergency or determined that such termination would create an undue economic burden on the particular country for which the proposed grants were intended. At that time storm clouds were gathering over Berlin, and my amendment failed to carry in the Senate. Last year, in hopes of getting some kind of congressional action, I proposed a less stringent amendment to the Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1961, and it was adopted. This amendment provided:

"The President shall regularly reduce, and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevant considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate, all further grants of military equipment and supplies to any country having sufficient wealth to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy."

History has shown, Mr. President, that once these military assistance programs are underway, those administering the program become increasingly reluctant to end the program. Their oft-stated policy that the United States must furnish follow-on support in order to assure full effectiveness of previously furnished materiel simply means that once this military aid has begun it can never stop. If we accept this principle, the United States will have to continue its grants-in-aid indefinitely, even when the recipient countries can afford to purchase the follow-on support, as is now the case for most countries in Western Europe.

At a time when we are struggling to correct our adverse balance of payments, and when too many of our citizens are unemployed, the American taxpayer has a right to expect our NATO Allies to assume a greater share of their own defense burden. Through the adoption of my amendment last year, the Congress has made a start to close the door on further American subsidies to those self-supporting countries that have no need whatever for more American aid. It is my intention to urge the Congress, at the appropriate time, to strengthen its expressed position by writing stronger limitations into this year's foreign aid bill.

I believe this article is most timely, Mr. President, and I am hopeful that those of my colleagues who have not had the opportunity to read it can find time to do so. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the article appearing in the January 21, 1963, edition of the U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DEFENSE BURDEN: WILL EUROPE PAY ITS SHARE?

"The White House now is giving signs of being more and more impressed by a set of facts often glossed over in the past.

"The facts, in essence, are these:

"A Western Europe that was heavily damaged by war not many years ago is actually moving ahead faster today than the United States. Americans over the years contributed importantly, of money and direction, to produce these good times for Europe.

"Around the world, colonial empires that European nations are turning loose, or have turned loose, are being bolstered with American aid.

"American youths, American weapons, American leadership, and American taxpayers, at this time, are bearing the bulk of the burden of defending the rich nations of Europe, with combined populations greater than that of the United States.

"Time for a change?

"The idea is dawning that maybe the time has come when other nations can take over more of the task of defending themselves and of helping underdeveloped nations.

"President Kennedy has suggested that. Robert McNamara, U.S. Defense Secretary, repeated it rather bluntly to a meeting of U.S. allies in Europe.

"Charts and tables on the two following pages help to give you an understanding of what is on official minds. The figures indicate that Americans are carrying a disproportionate share of the load involved in defending the political freedom and economic well-being of big European nations.

"It is this burden, officials point out, that is weighing heavily on American taxpayers and leaving an unbalanced American budget.

"The suggestion that part of this load be shifted to shoulders of Europe's taxpayers and Europe's young manhood is not meeting with an enthusiastic reception in Europe.

"A look at Europe shows this:

"The British, as an example, insist that they cannot afford the burden they already are carrying. Britain has no draft. Its contribution to the defense of the European Continent is three badly understrength divisions, instead of the four full divisions to which the British are committed. Britain, in addition, was counting on the United States to develop, and to help supply, missiles with which to arm its bombers. There was a loud outcry when President Kennedy decided to cut off that program.

"The Germans and French, meanwhile [illegible] that the latest American ideas about what is needed to defend Europe are wrong. Americans are placing stress upon the need for more ground forces, armed with modern weapons of conventional nature. They discount the chances of unlimited, nuclear war, pointing to a growing stalemate in nuclear arms between United States and Russia.

"The big need, in the U.S. view, is primarily for more French and German divisions, to supply the troops for a mobile defense. As the Germans and French see it, however, any future war in Europe will be nuclear war, with only the United States and Russia possessing those weapons in quantity. If Europe is to do more, nuclear arms must be shared in some way, they say. So a standoff in basic policy results here.

"Italy and the smaller nations in Western Europe are reacting to the American suggestion by insisting individually that they are not as rich as they may appear to be on the surface. They plead inability to supply more manpower, or to provide more weapons or funds for their defense.

"Despite this resistance to increasing Europe's share of the defense burden, a serious effort now is to be made by the Kennedy administration to work out a more equitable arrangement for paying for Western defenses.

"The arguments to be used by the United States boil down to these:

"America, with a third fewer people than Western Europe, is now supporting about the same number of men under arms—including 425,000 American standing guard in Europe in 5 U.S. divisions, a major U.S. fleet in the Mediterranean, and a big network of U.S. air bases over Europe and nearby areas.

"The United States, at this time, also is paying out far more than are its allies in Europe for defense, even after discounting the differences in national incomes. This contrast in defense costs is what bothers hard-pressed U.S. officials the most, now that Europe has achieved record prosperity. The important measure of defense costs, as they see it, is this: The United States is spending 11.3 percent of its whole national income for defense, while Western Europe spends only 4.9 percent.

"In terms of money actually spent by allies on each side of the Atlantic, the contrast is even more pronounced. The United States now is spending for defense at a rate of $52 billion a year. That compares with only $14.9 billion a year spent for defense by all 12 of its European Allies combined.

"When these outlays are averaged out to find the cost to each taxpayer, the burden appears more one sided than ever. It works out to this: The average American is now paying $277 a year toward the cost of defending the West. But the average European is paying only $53 a year for defense.

"Americans, it turns out, are paying on the average about five times as much toward the burden of defense as do Europeans in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"A comment from London

"This disparity is recognized by many informed people in Europe as well as in the United States. The London Economist reported the growing restlessness over the one-sided defense costs in this way in its January 5 issue:

" 'The United States regards the defense of Western Europe as utterly necessary to its own defense and does not visualize a time when this will not be so. But Americans feel that the burden of this defense is very great and should be shared more equitably; the United States provides the nuclear deterrent power, at fabulous cost, and an unduly large proportion of the fully trained and equipped manpower for the frontlines as well.'

"The whole issue is coming to a head at the time of a change in the top military command of the NATO forces, with Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer replacing Gen. Lauris Norstad as supreme commander of the NATO forces in Paris.

"The new commander, like the retiring one, is known to feel strongly that more military forces are needed—and in a hurry—in Western Europe if any real defense is to be insured.

"The lineup

"Right now, under the NATO command in the crucial zone across central and northern Europe is a total of 24 divisions. Top military planners at NATO headquarters in Paris believe they need 30, at a minimum.

"Of the present 24 divisions, the United States contributes the 5 best equipped, most combat-ready units. Britain furnishes three divisions—all under strength. France contributes two, West Germany nine, Belgium two, the Netherlands two, and Canada one brigade.

"The additional required divisions have been promised for years by NATO nations, but not supplied. They include two more French divisions, three more German, and one more British.

"There are other NATO divisions on hand now, on Europe's southern flank. Turkey is supporting 14, Greece 8, and Italy 7. But all of these units are needed to defend that flank, could not readily be shifted to the central front if a Soviet attack should begin to sweep across Western Europe.

"As a result, NATO planners see a major need now for more conventional troop units in central Europe. In addition, they say, tactical nuclear weapons soon will be needed as part of the basic equipment for most NATO divisions if defense is to be effective.

"Together, these needed improvements could increase the cost of Europe's defense by billions.

"Tougher drafts?

"More military manpower is involved, too, as well as more money. At present, none of the allied nations in Europe comes anywhere close to the United States in the proportion of its young men serving in the Armed Forces. Where the United States has 5.4 percent of its available manpower now in military uniform, Britain has only 2.5 percent, West Germany 2.2 percent, Denmark 3.2 percent.

"Draft provisions, United States believes, need tightening all over Europe if this manpower burden is to be equalized.

"At present, for instance, Britain has no draft at all. Denmark drafts its youths for a minimum of only 16 months. France has just reduced its draft service from 27 to 18 months. Germany has 18 months as a basic draft period. Italy's minimum is 18. Norway has 16 to 18 months, Portugal 18 to 24 months. Only Turkey and Greece, in fact, equal the United States requirement of a basic 2 years of service for all draftees.

"Special cases, all

"Why is a prosperous Western Europe reluctant now to contribute more toward its own defense? Each nation, when queried by the United States, comes up with a different reason.

"Some, like West Germany, point to an acute manpower shortage in a period of full employment, plus a lack of training facilities for more military units.

"Others, like the British, say politics keeps the Government from going back to drafting men for the armed forces, or draining off funds needed elsewhere for use in stepping up defense outlays.

"Then there are special cases. Italy's inadequately equipped force is financed by the lowest percentage of national income devoted to defense of any big European country. Yet Italy insists no funds can be spared from the job of rebuilding depressed southern Italy. And the French, with nearly a million men under arms, are contributing only two divisions to NATO—the same number as Belgium—because of continued nervousness about North Africa.

"Americans, as a result, are finding that their share of the defense burden continues to run to many times that of Europe, when Europe's growth rate surpasses that of the United States.

"To some Members of Congress, it raises the question, 'Is America being played for a sucker, when it comes to paying the bill for defense?' ".

The arms load, country by country

IN MONEY

	Yearly defense budget	Defense spending's share of national income
	Millions of dollars	*Percent*
United States	52,000	11.3
Britain	4,180	6.7
France	3,786	7.2
West Germany	3,750	5.9
Italy	1,255	4.4
Netherlands	555	5.0
Belgium	364	3.8
Turkey	287	4.3
Norway	191	5.0
Denmark	180	3.2
Greece	170	5.8
Portugal	158	6.9
Luxembourg	7	1.7

IN MANPOWER

	Size of Armed Forces	Armed Forces' share of manpower
		Percent
United States	2,700,000	5.4
Britain	415,000	2.5
France	705,000	5.3
West Germany	353,000	2.2
Italy	470,000	2.8
Netherlands	141,000	4.2
Belgium	110,000	4.3
Turkey	455,000	5.1
Norway	34,000	2.9
Denmark	46,500	3.2
Greece	160,000	6.2
Portugal	80,000	2.9
Luxembourg	5,500	5.0

IN LENGTH OF MILITARY DRAFT

	Compulsory military-service term
	Months
United States	24
Britain	(1)
France	18
West Germany	18
Italy	18
Netherlands	20
Belgium	18
Turkey	24
Norway	16
Denmark	16
Greece	24
Portugal	18
Luxembourg	9

---

[1] No draft.

MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yes, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching $15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of $314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States that in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends $277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only $53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO Allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO Allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the Alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

"Something of an 'agonizing reappraisal' of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

"The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

"That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

"Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

"In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated $1 billion cost.

"At the same time the United States is challenging all its European Allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the Allies in Europe.

"And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

"The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

"The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

"The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. U.S. defense spending currently is at the rate of $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

"With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

"This relationship must be, and it is being reappraised.

"As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

"But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

"Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Apr. 22, 1963]

AMERICAN FOREIGN AID—ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, no American who has visited Japan in recent years can fail to be impressed with the astonishing pace of her burgeoning economy. Today Japan enjoys the fastest rate of economic growth of any of the great industrial powers, while the United States continues to suffer from a lingering affliction of stunted growth.

Last December, as I walked the streets of Tokyo, I was amazed at the evidence of economic vitality to be seen at every corner. Hundreds of modern business buildings—factories, hotels, department stores—were under construction. The din of riveting filled the air, and the steel skeletons of high-rising new construction could be seen in all directions across the skyline of the city.

Broad boulevards were being pounded out to make way for the clogged traffic, a vast new subway system was being dug, and expanded terminals were being built to meet the need for rapid transit. Never have I seen an American city more alive with activity than today's Tokyo. Never have I seen a city anywhere experience so surging a boom.

And what is true of Tokyo is true also of Japan itself. Her current production of goods and services dwarfs her prewar yield. Not only has Japan become self-sustaining, she has achieved an unprecedented level of prosperity, far beyond anything her people have ever known before. Alone among the nations of the Orient, Japan is rapidly approaching living standards which are comparable to those that now exist in some countries of Western Europe. If present trends continue, Japan will outdistance most of her rivals, and many of us who now serve in this Senate will live to see the day when Japan is listed in the forefront rank, among the richest nations of the world.

I say this, not in criticism, but in praise of the Japanese. They exult in hard work; they are an efficient and competitive people; they have the good sense to understand the superiority of the incentive system of free enterprise, and they are making it work for them, with startling success, in the marketplaces of the world. They are practicing popular, free government, in an area of the world where one must search for it with the patience and persistence of a Diogenes, and, though recently our enemy, they have forsworn the course of neutralism to ally themselves formally with the United States. For all this, we can rejoice and raise our voices in praise of Japan.

We would also do well to remember—for if we forget, no one else is likely to remind us—the central and controlling role of the United States in the working of the miracle of modern Japan. From the day the war ended, we have treated the Japanese, not as the victor has historically administered to the vanquished, but as a doctor administers to a sick patient. We have nursed Japan back to health and vigor. The economic and political reforms decreed by MacArthur during the period of American occupation, which were unashamedly patterned after our own national experience, furnished Japan the framework of her remarkable recovery. Instead of extracting reparations from Japan for her attack upon us, as other attacked countries in southeast Asia and the western Pacific have done; instead of making Japan repay us for the heavy toll she took in American lives and property when she seized Guam, Midway, and the Philippines, possessions we had to forcibly recover at so dear a price to ourselves; instead of taking any act of retribution or demanding any part of the ransom customarily due a conqueror, we were soon offering our own money to Japan to help her bind up her wounds, repair her wreckage, and regather her strength. From July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1962, the United States has given Japan some $3.3 billion in grant aid.

Again, let me say, I recall these facts, not to deride the policy of the United States, but to praise it. For it matters not whether we were motivated by the fear of communism, as our critics charge, or inspired to act in conformity with the Scriptural injunction, "love thine enemy;" in either case the policy was a sound and statesmanlike response to the needs of the postwar era. With it we helped to rejuvenate Japan, and she, in turn, willingly allied herself with us, as the northernmost anchor in the chain of island defenses on which we rely in the far Pacific.

But policies once wisely begun often outlive their usefulness. The respect of a beaten people for a conqueror so strong that he generously extends his own help to put them back on their feet again, can quickly turn to contempt, if, when robust and healthy once more, they discover that the conqueror has somehow turned so weak that he cannot stop the subsidy. This has come to be the hard truth concerning our continuing grants of military equipment and supplies to the Japanese Government, whatever other arguments maye be offered to justify the perpetuation of this aid program.

The plans for a demilitarized Japan were punctured by the Korean war. The fear of potential aggression, revived by the Communist invasion of South Korea, led the Japanese Government to reestablish a home defense force, comprising army, navy, and air units. This was done, notwithstanding the prohibition in the Japanese constitution against the maintenance of armed forces, though the legality of the action still remains a troublesome issue in the politics of the country.

We approved the rearming of Japan. Indeed, we consented to help finance it. From July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1962, we have given Japan over $737 million in grants for military supplies and equipment. This represents approximately 18.5 percent of the total cost, during the 9-year period, to the Japanese Government for maintaining her defense forces.

Mr. President, in order to detail the amount of military aid we have furnished Japan over the years in question, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a chart which sets forth these figures, giving the totals for the full period, as well as the breakdown for each fiscal year since 1958.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART NO. 1.—*Japan-United States MAP deliveries, defense expenditures, and defense expenditures as percent of GNP, by fiscal year*

[Dollars in millions]

Country	Total, 1953-62			1962			1961			1960			1959			1958		
	MAP[1] deliveries	Defense[2] expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures	
		Amount[3]	Percent of GNP[4]		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP
United States	--------	$453,500	10.1	------	$53,400	9.6	------	$49,000	9.4	------	$45,700	9.1	--------	$46,200	9.6	--------	$44,800	10.1
Japan	$737.8	4,424	1.4	$74	572	1.1	$66.9	503	1.1	$85.8	454	1.2	$131.5	436	1.3	$130.9	421	1.5

[1] Figures were furnished by the Department of Defense, and the amounts include only the price of the chargeable program in grant form. The amounts do not include acquisition price of excess material delivered to Japan, which totaled $169,900,000 during the same period of time. MAP to Japan did not commence until fiscal year 1954, so this total is 1954 to 1962, inclusive.

[2] As indicated on charts Nos. 2 and 3, the United States totals are in calendar years, totals for Japan are in fiscal years commencing April 1 of each year.

[3] The amounts shown for United States were rounded from figures given in chart No. 3. Amounts shown for Japan were taken from chart No. 2.

[4] The percentages shown for the 10-year period were computed from data contained in charts Nos. 2 and 3. The percentages shown for the individual years were taken from charts Nos. 2 and 3.

Mr. CHURCH. It will be noted that this chart also gives the comparative figures, from fiscal year 1958 forward, of the dollar equivalents spent each year by the United States and Japan, respectively, for defense purposes, together with the percentage these amounts bear to the gross national product of each country. These figures give us an accurate comparison of the proportionate effort each country is making to provide for its own defense. The chart also shows the total amounts for the entire period since American military subsidies to Japan began, fiscal years 1953 through 1962, inclusive. These totals are most revealing. They show we spent the grand sum of $453.5 billion on our own Armed Forces, which was 10.1 percent of our gross national product, while Japan spent $4.4 billion, which was 1.4 percent of her gross national product.

I cite these figures not because I think it realistic to expect Japan to make anywhere near as much an effort, in proportion to her resources, to provide for her own defense, as we make in proportion to ours. Why on earth should she? Under the terms of our mutual defense treaty with Japan, we guarantee to defend her, with our own forces, against attack, and the umbrella of our protection has enabled Japan to escape the stifling burden of armaments. Indeed, this has been one of the primary reasons why Japan has been freed to pour her energies into peaceful, consumer production, and thus to lift her standard of living to an all-time high.

No, Mr. President, I cite these figures merely to show how little Japan is doing in her own behalf. Yet, this very fact is often used as a basis for justifying continued grants on our part, by those ingenious men who think up arguments for perpetuating aid programs. They say we must continue to offer the aid as an encouragement to the Japanese to do more on their own. I have frequently heard such arguments made on behalf of further extensions of military assistance to wholly self-supporting nations, by sober-faced spokesmen appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is not easy to understand how such contentions go unchallenged, when, year after year, the facts are precisely the contrary. How long are we to permit ourselves to be fooled? We have now given the Japanese Government nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in military aid. We have been at it for 10 years. Has it induced the Japanese Government to increase their own defense effort, as their capacity to do so has grown with their burgeoning wealth?

It has not. In fact, the very opposite is the case. Just to prove the point, and to demonstrate how the Japanese have slackened their own rate of expenditure for defense, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD at this point tables giving the exact data, both for Japan and for the United States.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART NO. 2.—*Selected data on Japan*

[Calendar years, unless indicated otherwise]

Year	Population [1]	GNP current prices	Per capita GNP	Per capita personal consumption expenditures	Defense expenditures [2]	Percent of GNP spent for defense
	Thousands	*Millions*			*Millions*	
1953	87,000	$19,039	$219	$135	$431	2.2
1954	88,200	20,498	232	147	430	2.1
1955	89,276	22,696	254	156	378	1.7
1956	90,170	24,990	277	167	374	1.5
1957	90,920	28,119	309	180	425	1.5
1958	91,760	27,703	302	188	421	1.5
1959	92,630	33,441	361	201	436	1.3
1960	93,419	38,845	417	223	454	1.2
1961	94,280	47,584	505	253	503	1.1
1962	95,180	[3] 51,700	[4] 543	[4] 295	572	1.1

[1] As of Oct. 1.

[2] Budgeted totals for fiscal years beginning Apr. 1 of year indicated.

[3] Fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1963.

[4] Estimate.

Source: "Economic Statistics of Japan," 1961, the Bank of Japan.
Prepared by Far Eastern Division, OIRE, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce.

CHART NO. 3.—*Selected economic measures, United States, 1953–62*

[Calendar years]

Year	Population	Gross national product	Per capita GNP	Personal consumption expenditures	Personal consumption expenditures per capita	Defense expenditures	Defense expenditures as percent of GNP
	Thousands	*Billions*		*Billions*		*Billions*	
1953	159,559	$365.4	$2,290	$232.6	$1,458	$49.3	13.5
1954	162,388	363.1	2,236	238.0	1,466	41.2	11.3
1955	165,276	397.5	2,405	256.9	1,555	39.1	9.8
1956	168,225	419.2	2,492	269.9	1,604	40.4	9.6
1957	171,278	442.8	2,585	285.2	1,665	44.4	10.0
1958	174,154	444.5	2,553	293.2	1,684	44.8	10.1
1959	177,080	482.7	2,726	313.5	1,771	46.2	9.6
1960	180,676	503.4	2,786	328.5	1,818	45.7	9.1
1961	183,742	518.7	2,823	338.1	1,840	49.0	9.4
1962	186,591	553.9	2,969	356.7	1,912	53.4	9.6

NOTE.—Per capita figures computed from unrounded data.

Sources: Population figures from the Bureau of the Census; all other data from the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce.
Prepared by U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a quick glance at these tables will suffice to give the picture. Between 1953 and 1962, the gross national product of Japan nearly tripled, difficult as this is to believe. It jumped from $19 billion to over $51 billion; the per capita income went up from $219 to $543. But Japanese defense expenditures, as a percent of the GNP, went down from 2.2 percent in 1953 to 1.1 percent in 1962. In short, 10 years after our military subsidies to Japan commenced, the Japanese were making only half as much effort to maintain their own armed forces as they had made to start with. The inducement argument obviously lacks any factual basis.

Is it the purpose of the foreign-aid program to subsidize wholly self-supporting countries? If it is, then Congress had better speedily execute the monster once and for all. We have our own solvency to protect, a stubbornly persistent adverse balance-of-payments problem to correct, a deficit to reduce, chronic unemployment to eliminate, and many other urgent problems at home that the money we are spending abroad could help to cure.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of foreign aid is to help poor, undeveloped nations resist communism by arming themselves against it, and by raising the living standards of their people, which I have always understood the purpose of the program to be, then why do we continue to dole out money to Japan?

Groping for an answer to this question, the Pentagon has come up with a new and different argument. By offering money to assist the Japanese in the procurement of certain types of weapons, it is argued, we can influence the kind of forces they maintain, fitting them into our overall strategic plan for the defense of the western Pacific.

Well, perhaps this argument is all that is needed to perpetuate our subsidy to Japan indefinitely. To accept it as valid is to concede that there cannot be an end to our handouts, ever. It is the perfect solution for those who administer the program; it can be applied to any country, rich or poor or in-between; and it has no limits whatever in time.

Mr. President, if Congress will use a little commonsense, it will become at once apparent that the size of Japan's defense force doesn't even begin to be sufficient to successfully defend her against a full-scale attack. For defense, she relies upon us. We are formally committed to protect her under the terms of the treaty of mutual defense between the two governments. Japan maintains hardly more than token forces, as a semblance of good faith. If they are to be of any use to her in an emergency, they necessarily must fit into the overall strategic plan for the general defense of the area. We do not have to pay Japan to make these forces fit the bigger scheme of things; it is in Japan's own national interest to see to it that they do.

Mr. President, twice before during this session I have taken the floor of the Senate to speak in support of an amendment I propose to offer to this year's foreign-aid bill. This amendment will bar further grants of aid, whether economic or military in form, to self-supporting countries, excepting only that which may be required to fulfill prior commitments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted that the Senator from Idaho will offer his amendment. I understood him to say that he will offer it. If so, he would honor the senior Senator from Oregon if he permitted him to be one of the cosponsors of the amendment again this year, as he was privileged to be when the Senator from Idaho offered the amendment previously.

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to welcome the senior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the amendment. I wish publicly to thank him on the floor for the very effective help he gives cosponsoring the amendment. I hope Congress will adopt it. If we are to make the kind of sense that we need to make in our foreign-aid program, we must start here. If we cannot stop the subsidies to prosperous, flourishing nations, how on earth can we expect to reform the program elsewhere where we face great difficulties in the underdeveloped areas of the world?

The amendment will, of course, apply to Japan. It will apply also to a number of flourishing countries in Western Europe. I believe it conforms with both the letter and spirit of the Clay report on our foreign-aid program, and so I hope the Congress will approve it. If we do, we will have taken one important step toward making more sense out of foreign aid—a course we must pursue if we expect the American people to continue to accept and sustain this program.

I want to make it clear that my sponsorship of this amendment is in no sense a reflection upon the leadership of the President, or the direction he has given our foreign-aid program. He himself has often urged our prosperous allies, in Europe and in the Pacific, to assume a larger part of the aid burden that we have carried so long. It must be very difficult for him to make them believe he means it, when we continue to pour subsidies into the very countries to which he appeals for help.

No, the fault lies with the legacy that Kennedy has inherited. Alone, he has not been able to force an end to programs which are carried along by their own momentum. He needs the help of Congress, and so, too, do the taxpayers of this country.

But we will never accomplish even so sane and sensible an objective as that embraced by the amendment I have mentioned, without hearing the outcry of the easily intimidated: "We dare not change the law to exclude Japan," they will plead, "for this will offend the Japanese."

Mr. President, I shall conclude these remarks as I commenced them—with a personal reference. Twenty years ago, I sat in the great hall at Nanking and witnessed the formal surrender of Okamura Jasugi, commanding general of the Japanese occupational forces, to the Republic of China. That day we thought the Japanese had lost the war. Now we know it was Tojo who lost. As for the Japanese people, they have turned out to be the winners, perhaps more so than any other people involved in the Second War, including ourselves.

Only their total defeat on the war fronts, followed by the surrender and occupation of their country, could have destroyed so completely the military tyranny which had so long dominated their affairs. It was then that we reformed their institutions, and with our own money helped repair the damage they sustained in the war that they themselves had thrust upon us. If now, when Japan has emerged as the fourth greatest industrial power of the world, protected by American might, and free not only to occupy herself with the profitable pursuits of peaceful commerce, but to heap ceaseless criticism upon us in the process—if, in this situation, we cannot even muster the gumption to stop subsidizing the token defense forces Japan does maintain, for fear of offending the Japanese Government, then God pity the United States of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I were to interrupt the Senator every time I find myself in agreement wtih him, I would be constantly interrupting him. He is so right in the observations he has made with respect to the position of Japan vis-a-vis the United States.

As the Senator knows, I hold the same point of view in regard to the aid that we are giving to many NATO countries. These countries are simply not carrying their burden of the price of freedom. I see no reason why the American taxpayers should continue to pay through the nose, to pour into Great Britain and France and Portugal and other NATO countries the huge sums of money that we are pouring into them, including, I may say, West Germany, when, first, they are well able to pay their own way with regard to this subject and, second, I am greatly disturbed about the attitude that certain NATO countries have taken with regard to the United States concerning economic relations.

I see no reason why we should continue to pour money into West Germany, while West Germany prepares to take the discriminatory attitudes she is preparing to take against the United States in regard to agricultural products. That is true also of France and of the Low Countries. Once again I call the attention of the State Department to the fact that of the $3 billion-plus of U.S. exports, more than $1 billion worth in the past has been American agricultural products. Yet when we talk with the officials of the State Department, we continue to be given the old line that we still are selling more to Europe than we are buying from Europe. That does not change the fact that negotiators for the State Department have been for some time selling American agriculture short in our relationships with the NATO countries.

I repeat my notice: I do not intend to vote for this administration's foreign aid policies vis-a-vis the United States and Europe until the State Department proceeds to do a better job of protecting American agriculture.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. He and I have supported the foreign aid program in the past because we have recognized it to be an essential instrument of American foreign policy in dealing with a world in ferment, and in coping with the Communist menace. This very fact makes it clear that our efforts are not directed toward opposing foreign aid, as such. We have been friends of foreign aid; we have recognized its necessity. What we are striving to do is to reform the program, so that it will make better sense.

I have observed on the floor of the Senate in the past, that if Congress fails to effect such reforms, the day may come when the pendulum of reaction will fill the Halls of Congress and the White House itself with men who would return this country to a last lingering isolation. Foreign aid can be sustained only so long as the American people are willing to sustain it. Their good sense tells them that much is wrong with the foreign aid program; much that must be reformed.

I appreciate the support of the distinguished Senator from Oregon of the amendment I intend to offer. I think it will provide for us, with respect to the NATO countries, Japan, or any other self-sufficient foreign country, the basis upon which we can improve and strengthen our relationships. I believe the NATO alliance today is weakened because we cannot summon the resolution to stop subsidies to our prosperous NATO Allies, for these governments know that they are fully capable of maintaining their own armed forces without further help from the United States.

If we desire to strengthen the NATO alliance let us insist that each member with the capability do its share. Ending our subsidies will make it so much easier for the President to say to them that we expect more help from NATO, and more help from Japan, in carrying the heavy burden of foreign aid in the underdeveloped parts of the world which, up until this time, has so largely been borne by the United States alone.

How can we expect them to believe our plea if, on the one hand, we exhort them to greater effort while, on the other hand we continue to dole out subsidies to the very countries whose help we are asking?

I have made my address today in the spirit of constructive criticism of the foreign aid program and in the hope that my argument may lead to the kind of reform that will strengthen the program, and thus assure it the continued support of the American people. Before closing, I want to say that I have just received a written message from the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], advising me that he, too, wishes to be a cosponsor of the amendment I propose to offer. I am grateful to him for his expression of support.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his splendid presentation, and I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment he has submitted today.

I agree with him wholeheartedly that the American taxpayer should not be asked to dig down again into his pocket to give further aid to countries which are already firmly back on their feet, and which, in some cases, are doing almost better than we are.

There can be no question about continuing economic assistance to the poor, underdeveloped countries as long as these countries are undertaking strong measures of self-help, nor can there be any question about providing military assistance to underdeveloped areas when the strategic situation makes it in the interest of the United States and the free world to do so. But the time has definitely come when we must cut off grants to the rich, free countries which are able to take care of themselves.

It is not enough for those of us who are Democrats to point out that the foreign aid program, which was established under a Democratic administration, was simply expanded and carried on, almost without change, by the Eisenhower administration. The fact that the previous administration did not have the wisdom to keep the program abreast of the surging changes in our fast-moving world does not relieve this administration of the responsibility of making adjustments in that program now.

I regret having to say this; but I believe there may be some truth in the charge, made by the Senator from Idaho, that the foreign-aid agency—under any of its recent names—and some of the career servants in it—dedicated though they may be—have for some years now proceeded on the theory that this is not a temporary, emergency agency, but is a permanent one, which for many years to come will be formulating annual budget requests and will be asking Congress for huge appropriations. The time has come to call a halt to this type of thinking and planning. I feel that we should make clear to the foreign-aid planners that Congress will support them only when we are convinced that they are examining every program, not to see what other projects we can now undertake with the dollars of American taxpayers, but to see whether the Americans have already done enough, so that we can call a halt and can pull out.

Last fall, I had the privilege of fulfilling a Senate mission to southeast Asia, along with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. It was a very worthwhile trip. It took us into nine countries, where we met both American officials and the leaders of the governments involved. We were treated with the utmost courtesy, and our questions were answered freely. But we came away with the firm conviction that the aid program had become a fully entrenched program—and was rapidly becoming ingrown with surplus personnel. We agreed that not only could the program stand considerable tightening up, but also that substantial cuts could be made in personnel without any risk to the effectiveness of the program. I cite these points merely to emphasize the one which both the Senator from Idaho and I are trying to make—namely, that foreign aid has become an institution. But it is not a sacred one, by any means; and we should examine it carefully before we appropriate money for any phase of it.

I am of the frank opinion that there are a number of countries in which foreign aid can, and should, be phased out in the next few years; but I have no doubt that there are some in which we can stop grant aid here and now. These are the rich and affluent countries of Western Europe—the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, and Italy—and also Japan in the Far East. It is incredible to think that in 1962 these countries received nearly $400 million in grants from the United States. All of them will receive additional grants, under the terms of this year's foreign aid requests.

These countries are well able to meet their own economic and military needs. Their economies are booming in most instances. They have been able to contribute substantially to the assistance of the underdeveloped countries, and this has cut down our own aid efforts in this respect. For this we are grateful. But they are well able to shoulder their own responsibilities—particularly their military responsibilities—and they should do so.

Take Japan, for example, which has had the world's fastest-growing economy in recent years.

Since the end of World War II, when Japan was totally defeated and her economy in a state of collapse, the United States has given her more than $3 billion in foreign aid.

Thanks to this aid, thanks to the hard work of the Japanese people, and thanks to Japan's free political and economic institutions, Japan has become one of the world's foremost industrial nations.

For example, Japan's economy has been growing for the past decade at an average annual rate of 9 percent—the highest rate of any country in the world, higher than what Khrushchev boasts for the Soviet Union, higher than the fabulous growth rate of West Germany, and three times as high as the growth rate of the United States during the past decade. Japan's shipbuilding industry leads the world; she is first in her fishing industry, fourth in steel production, and the generation of electricity, and one of the top five in cement production. The Japanese people have the highest standard of living of any people in Asia, and it will not be long before Japan will rank among the richest nations of the world.

And, I repeat, our aid to Japan has contributed to this miraculous economic recovery and growth. The bulk of our aid to Japan has been good, wise, and necessary, and we have ample reason to be proud of what we have done. Apart from the moral aspects of helping a defeated and bankrupt nation to her feet again, consider the tremendous political significance of Japan's being so prosperous and so stable that international communism has no chance of making inroads in that country, either by infiltration or subversion or propaganda. Consider, also, the military significance of Japan's remaining in the free world, which her economic strength, her political stability, and her friendly relations with the United States have enabled her to do. Yes, the bulk of our aid to Japan for the past 17 years has been in our best interests.

But, Mr. President, Japan has for some time reached the stage where she no longer needs our aid in order for her to play her part in the free world. She is fully able to stand on her own feet. The $70 million of military aid which we have given her annually for the past few years could have been put to better use in other areas. If Japan needed that extra amount in her military budget, she could well have afforded to provide the extra money herself.

And, Mr. President, in view of the economic prosperity and continued growth of the European continent, it is equally as difficult to justify use of American grant aid. The Executive Commission of the European Common Market reported only last month that "many of the indicators available show that the pace of economic expansion (of the six Common Market nations) has been strong enough for the rates of increase forecast for 1963 still to seem attainable" despite the unusually severe winter which Europeans experienced this year. This means that the Common Market as a whole may again show an overall growth of more than 4 percent. French officials are reported concerned because they now expect a rise in the gross national product for 1963 of only 4.7 percent, compared with 6.3 percent last year. The rate of economic growth in the United States presently hovers between 2 and 3 percent.

During the late 1950's and the first 2 years of the present decade, the rate of economic growth in Europe was spectacular. Europe not only recovered from the holocaust of the Second World War, greatly aided by the Marshall plan, but continued to register a general economic expansion year after year. Holland, which is receiving $16 million in military aid for fiscal 1963, registered a striking 8 percent rise in the gross national product as recently as 1960. According to the London Economist (Aug. 11, 1962, p. 551), manufacturing production in the six members of the Common Market has increased faster than in other industrial countries of the world—including the United States—both before the Common Market came into being and afterwards. These calculations are for the years 1955–61, excluding the year 1958, which was a year of diminished growth for the six and of recession in the United States and elsewhere.

To be sure, the phenomenal European boom of the late 1950's is slackening out, and there are some sections of Europe which have not shared the general prosperity. But the economic situation in Europe remains one of self-confidence and prosperity, and our European allies are fully capable of paying for military and economic projects which they believe vital. According to an economic correspondent of the New York Times:

> While the rate of business investment in plant and equipment—a key to present prosperity and future growth—continues to give some concern, it is now evident that investment will not decline this year and, in most countries will show some further growth (in the OECD). (Edwin L. Dale, Jr., New York Times, May 30, 1963, p. 23.).

Germany, the country in which fears of an economic decline were strongest, now expects continued expansion. The Federal Economics Ministry in West Germany recently reported that "the most recent statistics indicate a definite improvement in the economic situation." The Federation of German Industries, the leading spokesman of the German business community, also expects further expansion. Private and official reports on Italy, which is receiving $70 million in U.S. military aid in fiscal 1963, also register hopes for a major expansion in general economic activities this year.

Why should the United States pick up the check for military and economic costs of the European Continent, when Europe is enjoying unprecedented prosperity? By 1960—

> "The more than 300 million people of Western Europe enjoy average incomes with purchasing power more than one-third higher than the per capita incomes of the 260 million who lived in the same region on the eve of the * * * war * * *. Industrial production * * * has more than doubled over the past two decades. Agricultural output—with few men on the farm—is over a third larger than in the immediate prewar years." Moreover, while this advance was uneven and left some of the backward areas almost unaffected, "the rates of growth of nearly all European countries for the 1950's alone surpassed those of the United States and Canada." Between 1950 and 1959, the combined gross national product of the 18-member countries of the OEEC * * * increased by 46 percent * * *. This was equal to an annual compound rate of over 4.3 percent—enough to bring about a 100 percent increase over 1950 by 1967. These are figures for total output. Industrial production rose a good deal faster. (George Lichtheim, "The New Europe" (New York, Paeger, 1963), pp. 88–89. Internal quotations and statistics are from J. Frederick Dewhurst, et al., "Europe's Needs and Resources" (New York, 1961).)

As the Senator from Idaho has made clear, the amendment would not in any way affect the U.S. contribution to the NATO infrastructure, nor would it affect any other multilateral commitment of the United States. It would relate only to the individual grants to individual countries. It would be our way of insisting that these countries maintain their own armed forces without American subsidy.

Nor would the amendment, as I see it, hamstring the President in any way in his great and continuing fight to keep the world free. The type of programing to which the amendment refers is the routine programing of an established Federal agency. The Congress will always listen with an open mind should events dictate that we must give additional help to any country where we have halted grants, and the President would always have the authority to continue assistance already allocated should there be an "undue economic burden." So this is not an amendment without a "fire escape," but it is intended to end American foreign aid to countries which no longer need it, and put the program on a firmer basis by removing from it elements for which it is severely criticized, and rightly so.

I concur with the Senator from Idaho. His proposal would render a service in the field of foreign aid by making the program acceptable and stronger. If it continues to grow, ultimately the whole structure will collapse and come down of its own weight.

I have been a firm supporter of the principle of foreign aid in underdeveloped countries and all new nations trying to establish freedom and which are willing to set up democratic processes of government. In some instances I am willing to gamble in relation to countries which are of questionable allegiance. I refer to countries such as Ghana in Africa. At one time it appeared that that nation might have gone over to the Soviet side, but with the establishment of a sound and stable government and an indication being given of their willingness to adopt reasonable government control, it seems that that nation can now be independent and stand on its own feet and become a sound member of the community of nations.

That is the principal purpose of foreign aid. The purpose is not to continue subsidies forever to countries that have recovered. So I commend the Senator from Idaho for his continued leadership in that field. I have listened to him before on the floor of the Senate. I have dicussed the problem with him many times. Today he brings to the Senate and to the people of the United States a principle that must be adopted in the interest of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I very much appreciate the persuasive case which the Senator from Utah has made for the amendment. He and I share common views on the foreign-aid program. We have both supported it in the past. We merely wish to see that excesses in the program are eliminated.

The Senator will be interested in knowing that when I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, some weeks ago, calling for an end to further aid to Japan, though the speech was not given much publicity in this country, it received very considerable notice in Japan.

As a consequence, I received a good deal of mail from Japan. The interesting thing about the mail was that I did not receive a single letter, either from Americans in Japan or from the Japanese themselves, which was adverse to my recommendation that the program now be ended. Both the Japanese and the Americans living in Japan recognized that we had accomplished its objective, that we had given aid when aid was needed, that Japan had fully recovered and was now one of the fastest growing industrial countries of the world, and that it would serve the interests of our common partnership to end the subsidy, both from the standpoint of the United States and Japan.

Not a letter took issue with my recommendation. This makes me feel even more strongly that the end result of such an amendment would not be to weaken our relationship with these rich countries, but instead to strengthen it.

Mr. MOSS. That is indeed remarkable. It underscores the desire to have freedom and independence as between countries, rather than a continuing subsidy.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the foreign aid amendment by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], to bring an end to foreign aid to affluent countries.

Among the countries which have grown in wealth and which have ceased to be in need of outright foreign aid from America, are some that are in the European Common Market, which has become so protectionist that their unreasonably high tariffs are squeezing the poultry export industry in Texas and the rest of the United States out of Europe.

With our national goal of providing tax relief for our citizens, with our national security demanding constant heavy spending, these proposed cuts in foreign aid to countries no longer needing help should be given urgent attention by this Congress. We should cut off this $400 million in aid to the affluent countries, which we now give outright.

Cutting off handouts to the prosperous countries with high standards of living would set a much-needed precedent—a precedent for saying to affluent foreign nations:

"We have helped you in time of need. If the need arises, the American people stand ready to help again. But we have completed the historic chapter on 'Help to Friends in Need,' and are ready to write a new chapter called Do-It-Yourself Economics."

I commend the Senator again for his contribution to the subject, not only now but also in the past, and for his distinguished service on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Texas. I am grateful for his support.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. Perhaps they have already been covered in the Senator's comments. I thought, however, that some questions might clarify certain points with respect to my own position.

It seems to me that our theory that economic aid is the thing which stops communism has been pretty well blown up by the recent election in Italy, as well as those in other countries, in which the Communist Party increased strength despite the fact that the country was well off.

Particularly I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether, if the Senate should agree to the amendment to cut off aid from European countries and Japan, this would mean cutting off loans as well as grants?

Mr. CHURCH. The amendment is limited to grants only. It would not affect either loans or credit sales.

Mr. DOMINICK. Secondly, would the Senator's proposal cut down the amount of the foreign aid appropriation bill by the amount so eliminated?

Mr. CHURCH. I see no reason for not cutting it down. That is one of the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. On the question of Japan, I noticed the Senator said that in the past 10 years Japan's percentage of gross national product devoted to defense needs had been halved, despite the fact that the gross national product was increasing. Does the Senator know either the actual or equivalent dollar figures in that connection?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not have those figures readily available. I could supply them to the Senator. The only figures I have available, at this time, is the percentage of the Japanese gross national product spent for defense, which fell from 2.2 percent to 1.1 percent.

Mr. DOMINICK. In terms of dollars, has the amount gone up?

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot give the Senator an answer in dollar amounts. However, in terms of the growing economic capacity of Japan and of the Government's budget, the proportion of effort directed toward defense has gone steadily down, while we have continued grants-in-aid upon the argument that they induced the Japanese to do more. This argument is not borne out by the percentage figures.

Mr. DOMINICK. I say to my colleague the Senator from Idaho that we need to review and revise in some ways our foreign aid program. It seems to me this would be one step which might be very fruitful along that line. We are spending money now as though it came from a drain pipe. I do not see any purpose in doing so if we can find some method of changing our foreign aid program without damaging effects in countries which really need our assistance.

Mr. CHURCH. This is my objective. If we cannot discipline this program sufficiently to stop subsidizing the rich, how can we possibly expect to do the things necessary to make the program more effective in areas of the world toward which it is supposed to be pointed, the underdeveloped countries?

I believe the amendment has a genuinely bipartisan character. I hope it will have widespread bipartisan support.

In that connection, since I sent the amendment to the desk, I have been asked by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to have their names added as cosponsors of the amendment; and I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names of the four Senators will be added as cosponsors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in my own time briefly to comment on the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I am pleased to be one of its cosponsors.

I have supported the Senator from Idaho on the principle of this amendment for the past several years. The Senator from Idaho has taken the lead in the Senate on this particular proposal for improvement in our foreign aid program.

I hope the administration is taking note of the increase in the number of voices speaking out against its foreign aid bill this year. I speak as a Democrat in opposition to the foreign aid bill.

If the administration took a nose count in this country it would find that a substantial majority of the taxpayers want a drastic reduction in the foreign aid bill and some major changes in the policy inherent in the foreign aid bill.

The Church amendment is only one of many amendments which will be offered to the bill. The Church amendment goes beyond the question of amount, and in final summation goes also to the proposal for some basic changes in foreign aid policy.

I have listened to the major witnesses for the administration: The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; the director of AID, Mr. Bell; and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. In my judgment, they are three of the most dedicated public servants of our generation. I have great admiration and high respect for them. They have presented the administration's point of view.

I have told them, in our Foreign Relations Committee hearings, that, although I have great respect for their position, I disagree with them in some very major aspects of the foreign aid bill.

Last week I said that from now until the end of the consideration of the foreign aid bill, until the final vote of the conference report on the foreign aid bill, I propose to speak with great frequency on the floor of the Senate on this subject matter.

I repeat my reason for following the policy. In my judgment, our foreign policy belongs to the American people, not to this administration. If the American people are to have an enlightened attitude about what our foreign policy should be, they must have the facts about it. I respectfully say they are never going to get the facts if they limit themselves to the press releases issued by the various agencies of the Government in connection with this bill. They will not get the facts if they limit themselves to what necessarily must be rather limited articles appearing in the press.

Therefore, I consider it my obligation to focus attention on some of the weaknesses of the bill. If it results in only a few people reading my remarks it may cause some of them to make it a matter of discussion at the precinct levels of America. In my judgment, if the great mistakes in foreign aid that we are making are going to be corrected, that decision will have to be determined at the precinct levels of America. I use the phrase "precinct levels" because this is a political issue. It should be, and necessarily is, in a political democracy. I say to Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike that they have a responsibility as citizens to see that they inform themselves in regard to the foreign aid program and make known their wishes to their representatives in the Congress and to the President of the United States.

Since 1946 the foreign aid bill has cost the American taxpayer $100 billion. That is a tremendous sum of money. It should be enough to cause any citizen to stop, look, and listen, and ask this administration a few pertinent questions about this year's bill. We cannot continue to spend at the rate this administration is asking us to spend, which is a continuation of the rate of spending under 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, and keep a strong domestic economy. Our domestic economy is not strong.

Do not be fooled by the kind of testimony we received from the Secretary of the Treasury the other day that we have a gross national product of some $600 billion. Mr. President, the gross national product means very little unless there is a substantial net for the American taxpayer, for it is the net, and not the gross, which determines whether you and I are solvent.

The time has come, as the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, when we ought to stop grants to countries that can afford to pay their own way. That is what this bill deals with, as the Senator from Idaho said in answer to a question put to him by the Senator from Colorado.

But this is only a part of the reform that is needed, because great reform is also needed in the field of loans. To the American taxpayer I say, "Watch out for the propaganda issued by the State Department and by the AID organization concerning loans." Five years ago, 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar was an out-and-out grant. In the early years of foreign aid, it was necessary to give away a substantial volume of dollars to rehabilitate war-stricken areas among the free nations of the world, principally Europe.

As I said this morning in the Foreign Relations Committee hearing, when Dean Rusk was before us, I do not agree with the views that have been expressed, by way of hindsight, that the Marshall Plan from the very beginning should have been a loan program. I do not believe it should have been a loan program from the very beginning. It should have become a loan program after a few years as Europe became economically rehabilitated and began to possess the earning power with which to repay loans.

But we must analyze very carefully the propaganda of the State Department and the Defense Department and AID and the White House on the matter of loans.

I have pointed out that 5 years ago, 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar was grant money. For the last few years, it has been down to 65 cents. In my judgment the percentage of grants is still entirely too high. A tentative analysis that I have seen in the proposals of the administration this year is that it would get grants down to about 60 percent, leaving about 40 percent in loans. But that percentage is a breakdown of economic aid only. It ignores military aid, which is really all grant aid. It certainly is not good enough for the vote of the senior Senator from Oregon.

When the administration gets the foreign aid program down to a ratio of about 75 cents out of every dollar in repayable loans—and I will have something to say about what I mean by repayable loans in a moment—and 25 cents out of every foreign aid dollar for grants, I will be more interested in returning to the fold of supporting foreign aid.

By such a change, we could bring about a reform that would make it possible to continue a foreign aid program that will strengthen freedom around the world and maintain the strength of our greatest defense weapon, which is our own domestic economy.

Sixty percent in grants and forty percent in loans, I understand, is a fair estimate of the figure for this year. That is not good enough. When the administration talks about loans, we had better take a look at what is meant by loans. Senators will find that an exceedingly large percentage of the so-called loans are interest free, with only a service charge of three-quarters of 1 percent. There is usually a grace period of 10 years, which means that for 10 years those countries do not have to repay a dollar on the loans. I do not call that a loan program at all. The real danger is that such loans will never be repaid. If we do not mean business enough in connection with loans to charge a rate of interest that will repay the American taxpayer the cost of the use of the money, we do not meet the definition of a loan program.

For the Secretary of State and the Director of AID to continue to say, in answer to questions about this subject in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, that they consider it a loan program because it calls for repayment, causes us in rebuttal to call the attention of these dedicated public servants to what the history has been in regard to repaying loans of this type. Such loans usually end by being repudiated or usually end in diplomatic negotiated understandings that forgive many of the loans.

When I talk about repayable loans, I mean loans that are made at interest rates that will repay the American taxpayers at least the cost of the use of the money. I mean loans to be repaid in hard American dollars, not in the soft currency of some country, when we very well know that very little value will be collected, so far as the American taxpayers are concerned, through soft currency channels. Some loans are repaid, I admit, but not many. It is a small percentage of the supposed dollar value of the loan.

Whenever there is a loan that is spelled out in terms of the soft currency of some foreign country, it means, of course, that we cannot exchange the face of the loan for hard American dollars. Such a loan does not mean too much, because only a small fraction of the value of the loan, if anything, will ever be collected, for the benefit of the American taxpayers.

So when I say I am a "loan man," and not a "grant man," in order to characterize my position on foreign aid, I am urging, in the case of loans, that they be repaid in American hard dollars, the operation to be carried out on the basis of an interest rate charge that will at least repay the American taxpayer interest equal to the cost of the use of the money.

Many people do not stop to realize that we do not have a quantity of American money that we can make available to some foreign country on loan. When we make a loan, in most instances the Treasury, in the first instance, must borrow the money it expects to loan. So the U.S. Treasury borrows the money it will lend to country X, Y, or Z, and pays the going market price for the cost of the money at the time it makes the loan.

Then it turns around and lends the money with only a charge of three-quarters of 1 percent.

So, as I said to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Bell, when they were on the witness stand the other day, "what you should tell the American people, what you have a duty to tell the American people, is that you are granting a subsidy over and above all the other subsidies. You are granting a subsidy to a foreign country that is a recipient of such a favorable loan to the tune of thousands, and in some instances over the years of the life of the loan millions of dollars, in an interest giveaway."

What I am pleading for is that we get the foreign aid program, in relation to its lending aspects, down to a sound financial basis, and that we make clear to the countries of the world that Uncle Sam is no longer in the giveaway business; that his whiskers do not really constitute a Santa Claus mask; that we are in the business of protecting the financial interests of the taxpayers and, through them, the economy of the country.

When the people of the country read press releases, as they will be reading them, and the news stories based upon the press releases of the State Department and AID, I want them to remember that when these press releases discuss loans, they do not mean loans of the kind that the average taxpayer is faced with when he goes to his bank to borrow money to refinance his home, or to buy a washing machine, or to meet the other family or business obligations.

The bill is honeycombed with a whole series of such undisclosed subsidies, not clear to the reader at the first reading of the bill. From time to time, I shall discuss some of the other subsidies as the debate progresses.

But I do believe the Marshall plan had to be a grant program for a considerable length of time.

There is no question about the fact that the European countries fought our war for us before we got into it. I have always held to the point of view that World War II was our war for quite some time before we got in it.

Mr. President, you and I know that there are still areas of resentment in Europe because we were as long delayed in getting into it as we were. They were our partners. They were doing the economic and physical bleeding in the protection of freedom against imperialist Germany and Mussolini's Italy. We had a great obligation to help rehabilitate Europe in part at our cost. It was in our self-interest, too. There is no doubt about that fact, in my judgment.

How well I remember the day—for I was sitting on the other side of the aisle in those days—when one of the most courageous and able Presidents in our history, President Truman, delivered his historic message at a joint session of the Congress, which came to be known as the message on the Truman Doctrine, and which proposed that the United States go to the assistance of Greece and Turkey.

The Congressional Record will show that on that day where was only one speech made on the floor of the Senate following the joint session in which the President of the United States addressed Congress. The senior Senator from Oregon will always be pleased to leave that Congressional Record to his descendants, for I walked from the House of Representatives to this floor and, as a Republican, pledged my support to a Democratic President. I pointed out that no power in the world except the United States of America could stop Russia from trampling across Europe. We had a great obligation, not only to those countries, but also to ourselves, to come to the defense of freedom.

My position was the same in connection with the support of the Marshall plan. I have supported a foreign aid program in vote after vote in my many years in the Senate. I should like to return to supporting foreign aid, but I will not do so until foreign aid is so rewritten as to justify support. Therefore, last year, for the first time, I left the support of foreign aid completely. At every step of the proceedings I voted against the conference report. I have already announced that I shall vote against it again this year, unless foreign aid is drastically reformed.

Mr. President, it is not easy to take this position. I well know that there are two extreme groups in this country on this issue. There is the extreme right, which takes the position that we ought to get out of NATO completely, that we ought to get out of the United Nations completely, that we ought to cut ourselves off from international intercourse, and that we ought to go isolationist. Of course, there is always the temptation for one's critics, when one takes the position that I take, to charge one with being a neoisolationist. If one makes a suggestion for a modification of the foreign policy of the United States in respect to foreign aid or in respect to a good many other issues involved in the foreign policy, one must expect to be smeared as being a neoisolationist.

However, labels do not bother me. They never have, and never will. I am interested only in facts. I am satisfied that the people will see through labels and weigh the facts, and recognize that when one fights for a reform of the bad policies in the existing foreign aid program and tries to make it a good program, that that is good internationalism and sound Americanism, too.

Then there are the extremists, on the international front, who apparently have permitted themselves to be victimized by a dogma. I direct my remarks to those liberal groups in the country which seem to be very perplexed because the senior Senator from Oregon is not following them blindly in their so-called internationalism dogma, and I want to say to those liberal groups: "Stop calling names. Stop thinking in terms of labels, and stop analyzing the facts about this administration's foreign aid bill. If you analyzed the facts about this administration's foreign aid, in my judgment you will not support it either, but will ask drastic amendments and modifications in it."

I do not intend to be deterred in my determination to carry out my trust in respect to this piece of legislation by either the rightists or the so-called dogmatic internationalists, who are apparently perfectly willing to give away anything we have in the name of internationalism, because it seems to fit into the foreign policy dogma that has come to create so much myopia, particularly among liberals.

On June 12, following a speech I made in Portland, Oreg., to the Portland City Club, in which I called for drastic changes in the NATO program, the Portland Oregonian, not noted for its support of the senior Senator from Oregon, wrote an editorial that pleases me very much. I say to the editors of the Oregonian that I am human enough to appreciate an editorial such as they wrote on June 12 entitled "Morse Right on NATO."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Oregonian be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks. To the editors of the Oregonian I say, "Thank you very much."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MORSE RIGHT ON NATO

Senator Wayne L. Morse, of Oregon, is right in questioning the present value of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the methods now being promoted by the Kennedy administration to keep it alive in the face of allied resistance. NATO served a timely purpose—or, more properly, the presence of American arms in West Germany did—in discouraging Soviet bloc aggression against war-weakened Western Europe. It continues to guard threatened Berlin. But its broadscale function has been served. Conditions have changed.

We would not go as far as Senator Morse if he advocates the immediate dissolution of NATO, or America's withdrawal from it, as he seemed to do in his City Club talk in Portland last Friday. But even that might be preferable to the United States' being a party to its dissolution by attrition of purpose and diversion of interests.

This newspaper suggested, when Germany and France entered into their recent military and political alliance, that it may be time for the United States to consider withdrawal of its troops. The problem, of course, is not to leave a vacuum into which Communist power will flow. Or to leave untended a situation in which the Western European nations may retrograde into their old enmities which offer so fruitful a field for war cliques to cultivate. If NATO is to be killed, it must be replaced.

We have little liking for the administration's desperate efforts to appease the British and French by multination manning of nuclear-armed ships and other vehicles of war. If a practical reason is needed, it is that

> Congress is not going to turn over U.S. nuclear weapons to General de Gaulle, and the French are not going to accept the U.S. veto on use of nuclear weapons in another guise.
>
> The time is running out when any nation—Canada included—will accept the U.S. veto of decision in the use of nuclear arms stationed on that nation's soil for free-world defense. We may consider this silly of other nations, but there it is. Nationalism is not exclusive to Africa. And the nuclear lodge is no longer exclusive, either.
>
> The European Common Market has hardened the economies of its member countries. It has also strengthened them militarily and is bringing them much closer together politically. It is reasonably plain that the continued dominance of NATO by the United States will become intolerable, in time. It may be well to prepare our own exit while there remains some semblance of good feeling.
>
> In this era of nuclear stalemate between the Soviet Union and the United States, the danger of Communist invasion of Western Europe, which was acute about the time of the Korean war, is no longer a major hazard. Certainly defensive forces are needed in Western Europe, if only to prevent the Soviets and their satellites from seeking a haven from U.S. missiles and war planes while they level U.S. bases at long range and receive payment-in-kind. But is that America's role? We doubt it. Germany is strong again. France wants to go its own way. The smaller NATO nations appreciate our aid, but more on economic grounds than military. We would be obliged to make some separate alliances, as with Turkey, but these would only confirm what we are doing now under the NATO name.
>
> Senator MORSE is speaking responsibly in raising the question of perpetuating NATO beyond its usefulness. A thorough reexamination of the question is overdue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that the Oregonian will continue to present to the people of my State—and that other newspapers across the country will do likewise—the facts that are developed in this historic debate which is now underway in Congress on the foreign aid program.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that the executive branch is being entirely candid about this year's foreign aid bill. This burst of candor comes in the foreward by AID Administrator David Bell to the summary presentation of the foreign assistance programs to Congress. There, in black and white, the foreward asserts:

> The proposals for 1964 include no major innovations.

They are candid about it. They are truthful about it. But that is the point for an attack. The question is, Why do they not attack?

The Mansfield amendment of 1959 served notice on the executive branch of the Government that Congress wanted the number of countries receiving aid reduced. We wanted a report from the administration each year showing what countries were being eliminated from the program of supporting assistance.

I discussed this subject with the Secretary of State when he was on the witness stand this morning. I asked for a detailed memorandum from the State Department on this subject. I want to know to what extent the executive branch of the Government has kept faith with the Mansfield amendment; for, in my judgment, the Mansfield amendment has been largely disregarded. I do not intend to permit that fact to go unnoticed. Also, in a future speech, I shall discuss the Morse amendment in respect to military aid to Latin American countries in connection with internal security problems. It is my opinion, as I indicated to the Secretary of Defense the other day, that that amendment, too, has become a dead letter. Under the system of checks that it is our duty to impose upon the executive branch of the Government, I do not believe we can permit the executive branch to conduct an end run play around the policy position of Congress set forth in provisions such as the Mansfield and Morse amendments. To all intents and purposes, that has been the end result. Those amendments have been turned into dead-letter provisions of the foreign aid law; and no one is more responsible for permitting that situation to develop than Congress itself.

Mr. President in regard to the statements by Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, that the proposals for 1964 do not include any major innovation, there is no basic change, despite evidence on every side that the American taxpayer is increasingly fed up with the albatross of foreign aid which has been hung around his neck each year for a decade and one-half.

What in the world was the Clay Committee convened for, if it was not in recognition of the fact that there was a pressing and long overdue need for fundamental changes in the aid program.

In order that there may be no doubt, I think the Clay Committee report is, on the whole, a sound one. As the debate progresses I shall point out that, so far as I am concerned, I do not think the Clay Committee report goes nearly far enough in regard to the proposed reductions in the foreign-aid program. It appears that we have borrowed and cherished the classic French statement that the more things change, the more they remain the same. I may add that that phrase is about all that France has given us in recent times.

We are still playing the old guessing game which the American taxpayer has lost annually over the years. Under the rules of this contest, the gentlemen downtown work out their astonishingly complicated program, doubtless in ways which would give even the stoutest computer a nervous breakdown as spectacular as the Comiskey Park scoreboard after a home run. They then try to guess how deeply the Congress will cut their mystical masterpiece, and apparently they add to the original request the amount of the envisaged cut. For their part, many tortured gentlemen on the Hill feel compelled to guess at the guess made by the executive officials, and then to cut the program more than the executive officials anticipated.

Good playing form at this Mad Hatter's tea party demands that—along with the call "move down, clean cups"—there be anguished cries from both sides about intolerable damage to the fabric of our Nation. I scarcely need point out that the taxpayer—in the form of Alice—has gotten the dirty cup each time. Now the very curious thing is that, once the party is over, the gamesmen seem able to accept the decision with relative tranquillity, and the Nation's fabric is still there, to be theoretically rent at the next annual installment of the contest.

Also from Mr. Bell's foreword we learn that:

> After a searching review of the foreign aid program for 1964 * * * the President now finds it possible to reduce his original budget request by more than $400 million.

To some, this may seem encouraging; after all, the request as it stands is only—and I stress the word "only"—some $600 million more than the amount approved by the Congress last year. But to me this is really not very impressive. I remember that, in 1960, the Bureau of the Budget cut about $750 million from the departmental requests before the program came to the Congress. There is no new policy here.

Then Mr. Bell—for whom I personally have a very high regard, as I have said before—unwittingly makes a bad matter worse by writing:

> The intention is * * * to put into more effective practice the concepts established by the Congress in 1961.

The fact is that we in Congress have never been able to make more than modest adjustments in the bills presented by the executive branch.

Everyone should know that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have labored mightily each year to promote major changes in the foreign aid program. But each time we have been stymied by our inability to get at the philosophic concepts on which the executive branch requests rest. We do not have the resources or the time completely to revise the whole program. Therefore, we have been forced to use a paring knife, when a meat cleaver is required.

I have worked hard in the past to cut down on the aspects which I find most unnecessary and distasteful, such as wasteful military aid and "supporting assistance," and to improve the administration of the useful and needed instruments of technical assistance and developments loans. Year after year I have consoled myself with the marginal improvements we have effected, and with the hope for a new deal. But last year my hope and my patience became exhausted, and I voted against the program. I am not too sure that Congress will be able to override the entrenched interests, here and abroad, that support the foreign-aid program as it has stood for these many years.

One of the most powerful lobbies in the United States today is composed of the vested business interests which are dependent, in their operations, on huge military expenditures and on a defense economy, rather than a free economy, and who find to their profit the continued building up of our extremely large foreign-aid program. Already this year, when the administration's witnesses presented their interesting testimony, which they repeat again and again, we have learned how large a percentage of our foreign-aid funds provided for the manufacture of supplies is spent in the United States. But, Mr. President, when we analyze that argument, its implications do not make us very happy. We ought to be asking whether the policy is sound and whether in the long run we are helping the economy of our country by subsidizing great business concerns in our country, through a very large foreign-aid military defense program. We are asked to continue to vote for the program, in part because American businesses make money out of it. But that is a rather sordid situation, and really is a shocking one, when we stop to analyze the ethics involved.

I have voted, and will continue to vote for every dollar necessary for the defense of our country; but I say to the great defense industrialists in this country, "Do not think that I am going to vote for a continuation of foreign aid on the basis of the argument that you keep men at work and keep your plants busy in connection with the manufacture of tanks and other weapons of war."

That argument is given as justification for a continuation of the foreign-aid program. However, it is very important that we separate these two concepts. In my judgment, we cannot justify a foreign-aid program merely on the ground that it results in the expenditure within the United States of public funds for the construction of nonproductive goods which are necessary for defense. We can justify spending whatever amounts are necessary for defense; but we cannot justify continuation of a military aid program merely because its continuation keeps a certain number of people at work and results in profits for the owners of those defense establishments. After all, Mr. President, a tank is not a good device for peacetime transportation; a jet fighter plane does not make a good commercial air transport plane. No economically productive good results from the use of a missile or a machinegun or a bullet. Yet in whatever amount they are necessary to protect our security, we must have them.

The point I am seeking to make is that there are those who lobby heavily for a huge foreign aid program on the ground that it serves a selfish interest of a relatively few in the United States. I say to some of the labor leaders in our country, "My criticism goes to you, too."

There are too many shortsighted labor leaders. If a tapering off of a defense plant or a cutback in military expenditures is suggested, we see lobbyists in uniform from the Pentagon Building, industrial lobbyists from industry, and labor spokesmen as lobbyists. There is a triumvirate of powerful political lobbyists. But we must stand up against them. The lobbyists for foreign aid, on the basis of the fallacious argument that I have heard from the Secretary of State, from Mr. Bell, and from the Secretary of Defense, must be pinned to the mat.

The mere fact that a large percentage of the money is spent in the United States is no justification whatsoever for the appropriation of the money in the first instance. The question is whether or not the expenditure of that money for the purposes set forth in the foreign aid bill is in the longtime national interest of our republic. That is the issue. In my judgment, it is not. It becomes a matter of degree, I admit. It becomes a problem of tapering off as rapidly as we can taper off with safety to the security of our country. But the tapering off should bear no relationship whatsoever to the profits of industry or to the jobs of workers. I make that statement to the union halls of America. I say, "You are entitled to full employment. No one will fight harder, and no one can present a record that shows he has fought harder, than the senior Senator from Oregon, during his many years in the Senate, for full employment for those in our country who are ready, willing, and able to work."

But, Mr. President, American labor is not entitled as a matter of right to continue to work in a defense plant the moment that the defense plant is no longer needed or ought to be reduced in the quantity of goods it produces.

Such action calls for some planning. There has been little of it since 1946, when I was one of the cosponsors of the Murray full employment bill, which was also a part of the law of this land, and has gathered dust and cobwebs almost from the day the bill was signed into law.

I am fed up with the argument of industrialists, military lobbyists, and labor leaders that we must not touch the foreign aid bill, because if we should touch the foreign aid bill, we would reduce profits, throw men out of work, and close plants. Whole communities would be up in arms. In the past few years we have had examples of what happens when we start to reduce and taper off huge foreign aid expenditures as they affect military aid.

The responsibility of the Government is to proceed with a transition plan which would transfer the expenditures from nonproductive military foreign aid expenditures into great expenditures that would help to expand the economy of our country, so that we would not get statistics such as those cited by the Senator from Idaho to the Senate today showing how we are lagging behind one nation after another in production. He has shown that we are lagging behind Japan, France, Italy, West Germany, and England. One of the reasons why our production is lagging is that much of our production is going into nonproductive production, so far as the civilian economy is concerned, for war plants do not create wealth. I desire to repeat that statement. It is an elementary principle of economics. I am told that a great many people are working in a war plant. I suggest that those who make the argument that it is expanding the economy get the argument out of their heads. We must put people to work in industry and in occupations that expand the civilian economy. We would create new wealth out of which new jobs would result. We have not yet scratched the surface of the expansion possibilities of a civilian economy in the United States.

I do not intend to let the spokesmen of America use the argument of bribery—for that is what it amounts to—that, "You ought to vote with us, because if you do not vote with us, some men are going to be put out of work and plants will close."

I say to the administration, "You have no right to a single dollar of foreign aid, except that minimum amount, whatever it is—and that is what the debate is all about—which will best serve our national interest and carry out our obligations to the free world with reciprocity on their part of service to freedom. Then come forward with your plan or plans for expanding the civilian economy of this country so that men now at work in tank factories will be at work in tractor factories and in factories manufacturing goods which will create new wealth for an ever-increasing expansion of the economy of our country."

Mr. President, we need not scratch our imagination very deeply to see what a great economic crusade that would be and how much human happiness such action would produce. But, of course, the barrier in the way of all of us is the constant threat of Communist Russia and Communist China to supplant the kind of civilian economic freedom for which I am raising my voice in plea this afternoon with the economy of enslavement by communism. That is why we are in the paradoxical situation in which we must try to figure out where the balance is. I shall resolve doubts in favor of more for defense than may be needed and more for foreign aid than may be needed, but we do not have to go to the extreme of a defense budget this year of more than $52 billion, and a foreign aid program, military, and economic, of $4.5 billion, in round numbers. They have gone too far again. The taxpayer cannot stand it any longer. The American taxpayer, with increasing vigor, is trying to get across to the administration that he will not stand it any longer.

In a responsible government the reasoned judgment of a substantial majority should be followed. They have a right to that reaction from any administration, whether it be Democratic or Republican.

It is my view that very rapidly there is developing in our body politic a reasoned judgment on the part of a substantial majority of our people calling for a change in our foreign aid program.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has been willing to lead with his chin on this issue, so to speak, which is very unpopular in some quarters. In my judgment, the popularity of my position will increase more and more as the American taxpayer becomes more and more enlightened.

We as Senators have an obligation to take the facts to the American people and not to let this administration, after cursory hearings and with very little public attention being given to the matter by the administration or by the Members of Congress, slip this program through the Congress again without full debate.

So, unpopular as my position may be in some quarters, I intend to do my share, at least, in stirring up debate over the subject matter so that the American people may understand it better and make their wishes known to this administration.

I have such confidence in the judgment of the American people, once they have the facts, and such confidence in the analysis of the foreign aid bill that I have been making over the past several years, that I am perfectly willing to run all the risks that may be involved in standing up and being counted in opposition to my party's proposal for a foreign aid bill as it has been submitted to this Congress in the form of the bill now being considered in hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

We have a clear duty as a Congress to try to create the kind of aid program which would truly reflect American interests and benefit the international community. And I yield to no one in my continuing concern for those objectives. However, those objectives are not met by the present foreign-aid bill which is but a repetition of the traditional program tossed up to us again this year.

Mr. President, I reiterate my position to allow for no chance of misinterpretation. Like Alice, I have become disgusted with the mad tea party. No longer will I join my committee colleagues in the despairing annual effort to push the shoddy and overstuffed doormouse into the teapot.

My duty to my constituents and the dictates of my conscience will force me to register a protest vote against the foreign aid bill when it comes before this body if it resembles its present form.

I shall offer and support with evidence and argument a series of amendments which, if adopted, will reduce the foreign aid expenditures by at least 25 percent. I joined in cosponsoring one of those amendments this afternoon, when I joined in cosponsoring the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

I close by saying that it is my judgment, after long and detailed study of the bill, that the bill can be reduced in total amount by 25 percent without in the slightest weakening the security of this country. To the contrary, in my judgment it would strengthen the sesecurity of this country, because it would strengthen the domestic economy, which is crying out for strengthening.

I shall not propose an across-the-board 25-percent cut. The total amount of cut which result from adoption of the amendments I shall offer or support would, at a minimum, be 25 percent. In some instances I shall propose the striking of an entire amount. That goes along with the proposal I shall make later, to supplement the proposal of the Senator from Idaho, to eliminate certain countries entirely from receiving a single dollar of grant money in fiscal year 1964.

In some instances we could safely reduce the amount involved by 50 percent; in some instances by 40 percent; and in some instances by 10 percent. In a few instances I shall support an increase in the amount, where the facts warrant an increase.

But the total amount, in my judgment, should be reduced not 1 cent less than 25 percent.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Medford Mail Tribune in my State, under date of May 16, 1963, published an editorial which was called to my attention yesterday. It is called A Reply to a Letter. It is one of the most devastating answers, in my judgment, to a non sequitur we have heard in this country on civil rights for many years. I have heard it stated in one form or another over the years on the floor of the Senate. It is a common non sequitur used by southern editors in their editorial writings. It is a non sequitur which is supposed to cause those who live in the North to surrender, to give up on the matter of civil rights.

The editor in Medford, Oreg., Eric Allen, has written a reply to this fallacious argument.

I shall read the editorial in part, and later I shall ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in full in the RECORD.

The editor says:

> We received the following letter the other day:
>
> "To the EDITOR:
>
> "A correspondent of ours in Oregon tells us that you have shown an interest in the South's racial problems on your editorial page.
>
> "We southerners are delighted to see that other parts of the Nation are becoming interested in the race problem and welcome the sincere desire to help.
>
> "Would you on behalf of your subscribers welcome into your community several hundred Negro families from the South? If you will write such a welcome in the form of an editorial we will give it wide publicity throughout the South and will help raise the necessary transportation cost for these Negro migrants.
>
> "Perhaps you would print this letter in your letters-to-the-editor column.
>
> "We believe that the most nearly Christian solution to the race problem is migration and dispersion throughout our Nation. I am mailing you under separate cover statistics on this subject which may interest you.
>
> "Sincerely,
>
> "ROBERT B. PATTERSON,
> *"Secretary, Citizens' Council.*
>
> "GREENWOOD, MISS."

I am sure no one is surprised that such a letter came out of Greenwood, Miss.; but, of course, there are many other communities south of the Mason-Dixon line in which that bigoted organization known as the White Citizens' Council reigns, along with its hooded copatriots, the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. Patterson got his answer from this Oregon editor. Listen to a part of it:

> No, Mr. Patterson. We would not welcome "several hundred Negro families from the South" here—not so long as they are shipped off like a bunch of diseased cattle just to get them out of your way.
>
> You, Mr. Patterson, and your colleagues and your and their forebears, held Negroes as slaves until 100 years ago. Since then you have exploited them, refused them adequate education, refused them even a chance to improve themselves. You have prevented them from learning skills which would have made it possible for them to rise on the economic ladder.
>
> You, Mr. Patterson, and your fellows, for generations have treated these fellow human beings like subhumans, subject to lynchings, beatings, intimidation, night-riding.

I digress from the editorial long enough to say that all one has to do is look at the photographic evidence in Life magazine and the newspapers of the country in recent days to see how right Mr. Allen is. What a shocking betrayal of the ideals of constitutional government—policemen in one community after another in the South, including Cambridge, Md., have been subjecting Negroes to a shameful disgrace, to the great loss of our prestige around the world.

These photographs are front page in the newspapers of the world, free and Communist.

As Senators know, for years I have stood up against police brutality within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. I have carried on the fight against the proposal to change the Mallory rule, although there are bills pending in the Congress to surrender to the police of the District of Columbia the great, precious constitutional protections of the Mallory rule. If we surrender it here, we shall have surrendered the principle nationwide.

If anyone had any doubt about any of the many speeches the senior Senator from Oregon has made on this floor over the years, calling upon the Senate always to be on guard against unchecked police power, he only has to look at the shocking pictures of cruelty and brutality practiced by various southern police departments in recent weeks against Negroes. Humane principles cry out against it.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in continuity.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, Mar. 16, 1963]

A REPLY TO A LETTER

We received the following letter the other day:

"To the EDITOR:

"A correspondent of ours in Oregon tells us that you have shown an interest in the South's racial problems on your editorial page.

"We southerners are delighted to see that other parts of the Nation are becoming interested in the race problem and welcome the sincere desire to help.

"Would you on behalf of your subscribers welcome into your community several hundred Negro families from the South? If you will write such a welcome in the form of an editorial we will give it wide publicity throughout the South and will help raise the necessary transportation cost for these Negro migrants.

"Perhaps you would print this letter in your letters-to-the-editor column.

"We believe that the most nearly Christian solution to the race problem is migration and dispersion throughout our Nation. I am mailing you under separate cover statistics on this subject which may interest you.

"Sincerely,

"ROBERT B. PATTERSON,
"Secretary, Citizens' Council.

"GREENWOOD, MISS."

No, Mr. Patterson. We would not welcome "several hundred Negro families from the South" here—not so long as they are shipped off like a bunch of diseased cattle just to get them out of your way.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your colleagues and your and their forebears, held Negroes as slaves until 100 years ago. Since then you have exploited them, refused them adequate education, refused them even a chance to improve themselves. You have prevented them from learning skills which would have made it possible for them to rise on the economic ladder.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your fellows, for generations have treated these fellow human beings like subhumans, subject to lynchings, beatings, intimidation, nightriding.

You and your ilk, Mr. Patterson, under the guise of States right, have made and kept an entire group of people second-class citizens—when, indeed, you permitted them any of the dignities and privileges of citizenship at all.

You and your ilk, by collusion, subterfuge, and even more overt methods—including, most recently, dogs, hoses and bombs—have prevented them from voting, from serving on juries, from attending your schools, even from using common lunch counters or restrooms.

You say they are ignorant, irresponsible, lazy, unclean, diseased. In many cases this is true. And you are to blame; you and your determination to maintain your privileged status by holding others down, by depriving them of the dignity and opportunity to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to which each American—regardless of color—is entitled.

No, Mr. Patterson, we would not accept your offer, because it is a brutalizing, evil, hypocritical offer; nearly as evil and brutalizing and hypocritical as the slave trade itself.

We do know that, inevitably in times to come, Americans whose skins are black will come here to live and seek livelihood. And we know that it will bring problems—difficult and serious problems, just as it has in Detroit and Chicago and Los Angeles and San Francisco, and Portland, and in other smaller communities.

We will not welcome these problems, because we have so far been without them, and no one likes to borrow trouble.

Still, when the time comes, we are convinced that men of good will—and they are legion—will do their utmost to see that the problems are settled with fairness, justice and honor.

One-sixth of the nation's population has dark skin. And these people, as never before in history, are demanding the right to be treated simply as Americans, and not as inferiors, as people set aside from the stream of life.

They are demanding the right to make their own choices, and not to be shoved around, or to be shipped off like a group of slaves just to satisfy the malevolence of racist citizens' councils.

We must, if we are to live up to the ideals which made America great, learn to live side-by-side with each other, and to deny equal opportunities to none.

This will not be easy for anyone—white or Negro. There are agonizing times ahead. But the challenge is one of the greatest Americans have ever faced.

They can meet it if—and only if—they can bring themselves to do unto others, all others, as they would have others do unto them.

E.A.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am proud that there is an editor in my State with the courage, foresight, and enlightenment of Mr. Allen, who called a spade as it should be called in his reply to the racist, Mr. Patterson, who wrote this letter thinking that the non sequitur of the letter would leave Mr. Allen and others without reply.

SPEECH BY JOHN M. THORNTON TO BENNING RIDGE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point—and it is a particularly fitting speech in view of the remarks I have just made on the civil rights issue—a speech delivered by John M. Thornton, chairman of the National Capital Voters Association, to the Benning Ridge Civic Association.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I wish to announce to you the recent birth of an organization whose broad and meaningful program is destined to become a rallying cause for the leaderless people of the District of Columbia. It was conceived of by a group of enlightened residents here who envision a glorious future soon to unfold for the disfranchised citizens of this the capital of the Western World—citizens who are convinced that even while we await that opportunity there is much we can do to prepare ourselves for a meaningful use of the ballot—that we could act now to combat the forces which have made our community a breeding ground for crime and delinquency, that we must act immediately to stem the tide of rising illiteracy and dropout through insisting upon quality education for the public's children.

Perhaps you have already heard or read something of the National Capital Voters Association, Inc., which last August received from the recorder of deeds its official charter for operation in the District of Columbia. In compliance with the purpose and objectives as stated our charter sets forth the following and I quote:

"The purpose of this organization shall be to organize and guide the citizenry of the District of Columbia in an effort to persuade it to exercise its franchise in a manner that will be more advantageous to the community.

"To educate and stimulate interest and to disseminate information in relation to political candidates, measures, or vital questions and to strive for the goal of 'Every Citizen—A Voter.' "

The principles and ideals set forth in this charter are based upon the premise that an enlightened citizenry can secure good government and guarantee personal security through full participation of all in the political and social life of the city such as self-government and free access to the ballot offers. This concept goes further * * * it is based on a conviction that the right to the franchise bestows collective pride upon a community, inspires common concern, and protects the individual dignity of its people. From this sense of concern for the community's welfare there will ultimately derive a more wholesome society with improved patterns of behavior and a feeling of well-being which can only come from a sense of participation. What is happening to the Negro now under the present arrangement is that he feels outside looking in just as has traditionally been his lot—with his leaders selected and imposed upon him.

Since 1874, residents of the District of Columbia in the Nation's Capital have been completely disfranchised without the fundamental right to the ballot for almost a century in this Capital of the free world—this city the citadel of the freedom and democracy which we seek so hard to export. Is it any wonder then that the population in Washington does not assume the seriousness and responsibilities of first-class citizenship or that the masses of us are so lacking in political sophistication and the community spirit?

Citizens of the District granted the right to vote in their respective Democratic and Republican party primaries, only for President and Vice President 8 years ago will in addition for the first time in their lives be permitted to vote in the general election for the President and Vice President next year. To qualify as intelligent voters and thus, to make their individual and collective votes count, each and every voter must have summary knowledge of issues affecting their lives politically, socially, economically, and will need training in the procedures and political tactics to get the most out of the vote cast. Voters must be provided with certain basic facts in order to fully weight these issues and to question their impact upon their individual lives and the general well-being of the entire community. A candidate's past record must be reviewed in this light and a study of his proposed platform thoroughly studied in order to estimate what can be expected from the selection of their choice.

The national average of eligible voters actually going to the polls on election day throughout the United States is only about 60 percent. Some States which have been voting since 1789 have not at times been able to do this well. This sad story is compounded by the fact that it is well known that the percentage of Negro voters is much lower than 60 percent. This is the tragic story of one of democracy's failures. To muster even a 60 percent voting average in the District of Columbia instruction of citizens will be of prime necessity among its Negro majority and that we who have undertaken this job face a Herculean task.

Recognizing the enormity of this job—of what will be necessary to overcome the political lethargy of the majority population, the Capital Voters Association has set for itself the task of preparing ourselves and others for the most effective use of the ballot while mobilizing our people for an assault upon the forces of immediate destruction of our youth and the undermining of our common lives. There is much that the majority Negro population can do now to raise the quality of public education, to stem the rising tide of dropouts and to stabilize our community against the routing procedures of the housing agents and blockbusters adopted in the last few years. Do not forget that we constitute 54 percent of this city's population and our children count more than 84 percent of the total in the public schools of the District.

Our organization has a program conceived and dedicated to the welfare of the vast majority and is determined to reach citizens in every section of the District of Columbia—at the grassroots level where we think political action and citizen responsibility must begin—down under among the multitude too long forgotten and persistently "spoken for."

This is where we propose to direct our attention. While our program is still largely in the formative stage, we can announce a successful workshop on leadership which though small drew the attention of the delegates to the immensity of the issues vitally affecting the majority population. Together with instructors to be trained and prepared at a coming seminar to be held at Howard University, March 30, we plan to reach every corner of this city. We have already acquired a listing of some 50 churches, community centers, halls, etc., where these local meetings will be held. We intend to expand this listing until we have reached and scheduled meetings throughout this city. With the cooperation of various fraternal, religious, labor and civic leaders of every educational, social, and economic level we anticipate distributing thousands of pieces of literature explaining the purpose and objectives of our organization and concentrating on mobilizing the majority populace in the city's broadest and most unique program of arousing the people to their citizenship responsibility. We trust the communication media, the newspapers and radio of the District will assist us in keeping you further informed of our program and work. A major cost will of course be the printing and distribution of materials with other services donated by genuinely concerned volunteer workers.

Therefore, we call upon you singularly and collectively, organizations and institutions to join us in this great effort to:

1. Educate the local residents on responsibility and requirements of good citizenship.
2. Stimulate interest in community, civic, and political affairs such as improvement in the quality of education in our public schools and the prevention of dropouts and delinquency.
3. Encourage a thirst for political know-how and a determination to improve the city and the lot of all its people.
4. Cultivate interest in political issues, the records of political figures whether nominated, appointed, or elected.
5. Guide citizens in an effort to persuade them to use the ballot in a manner that will most benefit the community as a whole.
6. Help provide and support the political and social machinery necessary for developing native leadership through the ranks that may be trusted to genuinely represent the cause of the majority.

Our aim is to make every citizen a good citizen, a responsible citizen, and a voting citizen into one who understands, respects, and defends the sacred right and the power of the ballot.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—RECONSIDERATION OF ACTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action taken on Order No. 226, Senate Resolution 159, authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, be set aside, and that Senate Resolution 159 be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 412, Calendar No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is open to amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a request that the absence of a quorum be suggested at this time. Another Senator made the request that the absence of a quorum be suggested, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an identical bill (H.R. 242) has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 242, and that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill would authorize the Veterans' Administration to waive certain indebtedness owed the United States by the veterans or their spouses on account of defaults on guaranteed or direct loans. The new authority permits waiver under certain circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, waiver would be permitted where there is a determination that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that the collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

Although existing law provides some authority for waiver, the Veterans' Administration believes that administrative action granting total forgiveness of indebtedness on the basis of hardship would be very questionable in the absence of specific authorization. Consequently, the Veterans' Administration has officially requested the enactment of the proposed legislation to clarify the law and to effect more equitable settlements in hardship cases.

The new authority applies to hardship cases only. It would not authorize the Veterans' Administration to grant complete waiver where the veteran's financial situation is such that he could arrange to pay all or a substantial portion of the indebtedness without severe hardship on himself or his family.

The Veterans' Administration believes that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

The minority views on this subject point out that other Federal Government programs do not have the waiver provisions in some similar cases of default. I must remind the Senate that the original purpose of the legislation for veterans' housing was a special program intended to help the veteran obtain decent housing for himself and his family. The percentage of default has been amazingly low. Mr. Gleason stated that it was 0.02 percent over the life of the various programs—one-fifth of 1 percent.

Therefore, we should not try to compare this program with those of the Farmers Home Administration or the Federal Housing Administration. This is a special veterans' program and, I might add, one of the most successful housing programs Congress has enacted.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than December 31 of each year, a written report concerning each case in which a waiver of indebtedness has been made under the authority of the amendment made by the first section of this Act. Such report shall include, together with such other information as the Administrator deems appropriate, the name and address of each person with respect to which a waiver of indebtedness has been made and the total amount of such waiver.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this amendment would require the Administrator to submit an annual report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives showing each case in which he has exercised the authority granted by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Texas whether the amendment relates to the concern expressed in the majority policy committee with respect to the bill when it was cleared for Senate action.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The majority policy committee read the minority views that were expressed in the report, and this amendment was requested by the majority policy committee. The amendment provides for an annual report so that both the House and the Senate may review such actions as might be taken under the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the amendment provides that the Veterans' Administration shall report to the House and the Senate each year all the cases in which the Veterans' Administration has taken action under the special discretionary power.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is quite correct. Each body would be enabled to see how the power was exercised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the report be made to committees or to the Houses of Congress?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The report would be made to the committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Which committees?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Of course, the reports would be available to all Senators; they would not be the private documents of the committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, whenever such discretion is exercised, the Administrator must give the cases his consideration and make certain that, in his opinion, they are true hardship cases, and that information will be reported to the Senate and House, together with the amounts of money involved.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is quite correct. The amendment relates to each case in which the authority is exercised—not only the totality, but each case, so that each House of Congress will have before it annually the information as to how the power has been exercised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the report dated February 15, 1963, from J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to Hon. Lister Hill, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the bill S. 412; and the Administrator's supplemental report dated April 8, 1963, to Chairman Lister Hill, pointing out that H.R. 242, which is now before the Senate, and S. 412 are identical in terms.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 15, 1963.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The following comments are furnished in response to your request for a report on S. 412, 88th Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for waiver of recovery from veterans of indebtedness to the United States resulting from the payment of loan guaranty claims or from default on direct loans, under circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, the bill would provide that where there has been a default and loss of the property the Administrator may waive recovery if he determines "that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran."

The law now provides (38 U.S.C. 1820) that the Administrator may "pay, compromise, waive or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption" with respect to matters arising under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, which deals with the loan guaranty and direct loan programs of the Veterans' Administration. For many years this general authority with respect to waiver has been implemented by regulations which establish standards authorizing waiver (1) when the veteran was not at fault in the creation of the indebtedness and (2) where recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience.

These regulatory standards are like those payments or overpayments of benefits under our programs as specifically set forth in provisions of the code dealing with benefits generally (38 U.S.C. 3102). However, it has not been considered that general waiver of debts due the United States by reason of default on guaranteed or direct loans should be granted out of compassion or because of such factors as existing hardship and present or near future inability to pay an indebtedness.

This has not prevented appropriate compromises which, in some instances, involve a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. Moreover, these standards permit waiver of the right to offset the amount of the inedebtedness against benefits otherwise payable to the veteran where it is found he was without fault and that the circumstances show that the offset would work such a hardship on him as to defeat the purpose for which such benefits are payable.

We recognize that the authority of the Administrator to waive or release claims in connection with the loan assistance programs is cast in broad terms. However, we have felt that without a specific legislative indication that total forgiveness of the indebtedness could be granted on the basis of financial hardship, it would be very questionable whether it would be proper to interpret and apply the waiver authority to that extent.

In this area we are dealing with an indebtedness incurred by the veteran as a result of his original voluntary act of negotiating a loan guaranteed or made by the Government and the obligation he concurrently assumed to pay the Government in the event it was required to fulfill its obligation on the guaranty. The matter has been considered as materially different from overpayment of gratuitous benefits, such as compensation and pensions, which involves a mistake on the part of the Government. In the latter circumstances, a full waiver of recovery is sometimes granted pursuant to statutory authority.

In the light of experience, we believe that the law respecting waiver of loan indebtedness should be clarified to provide in specific terms for general waiver under conditions provided in the proposed legislation. The enactment of the bill would not, however, permit general waiver of the indebtedness where such action would be contrary to the purpose of the loan program. It is not intended, therefore, to be used for granting complete waiver of the veteran's liability where his financial situation is such that he can arrange to pay all or a substantial part of the indebtedness without severe hardship on himself or family.

Liberalization of the waiver authority as contemplated in the proposed legislation would involve some reduction in the amounts which are now recovered from veterans. However, it is believed that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative costs would not be significant.

For the foregoing reasons, we recommend favorable action by your committee on S. 412.

We were advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there was no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to presentation of a similar report to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on H.R. 242, a bill which is identical in substance with S. 412.

Sincerely,

J. S. Gleason, Jr.,
Administrator.

April 8, 1963.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Chairman, Committe on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This refers to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 242, 88th Congress, which was passed by the House of Representatives on March 18, 1963.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill is identical, in substance, with S. 412, 88th Congress, on which we submitted a favorable report to your committee on February 15, 1963, a copy of which is enclosed. The Administrator's views expressed in that report are equally applicable to H.R. 242.

Sincerely yours,

Robert C. Fable, Jr.,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators who signed the minority views, I ask unanimous consent to have the minority views on S. 412 printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the minority views (Report No. 189) were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATORS GOLDWATER, PROUTY, TOWER, AND JORDAN (IDAHO)

We are opposed to the enactment of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that where there has been a default and loss of property by a veteran the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may waive recovery if he determines that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

The Administrator now has the authority by law (title 38, ch. 37, United States Code) to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption with respect to the loan guaranty and direct loan programs of the Veterans' Administration. According to the testimony of the Veterans' Administration at the hearings, the authority to waive has not been exercised where default arose out of a hardship or present or near future inability to pay an indebtedness. However, the waiver authority has been used in cases where the default arose not because of fault on the part of the veteran but of fault on the part of the Federal Government.

In the majority of hardship cases, compromise settlements have been reached between the Veterans' Administration and the veteran, involving a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. Several cases were cited during the hearings by officials of the Veterans' Administration in response to a request for an illustration of the term "compelling reasons" which would be considered for waiver under the proposed bill. One involved a blind veteran against whom an indebtedness had been established without any fault on his part; another concerned a veteran whose home was washed away by a flood. A compromise was reached with the blind veteran whereas the record indicates no compromise was reached in the case of the veteran who suffered the loss of his home by flood. Thus, in the only cases cited by the Veterans' Administration to support their request for additional waiver authority, one was settled by a satisfactory compromise payment and, while a compromise was not reached in the other, we are unable to understand why, inasmuch as the two cases appear to be indistinguishable as to indebtedness, both veterans being clearly without fault. For example, in a case where a flood caused a change in a river channel which destroyed some 20 acres of the most productive part of the borrower's farm, the Farmers Home Administration reduced the claim on the basic earning capacity of the remaining part of the farm.

It should be noted that two other agencies of the Federal Government, which operate loan guarantee and direct loan programs, Farmers Home Administration and Federal Housing Administration, may compromise, adjust, or reduce claims but neither have the authority to waive or forgive an indebtedness.

We believe that the present authority is sufficient for the Administrator to effect satisfactory settlement and therefore the additional authority proposed by this legislation in the light of the hearing record is not advisable.

Barry Goldwater.
Winston Prouty.
John G. Tower.
Len B. Jordan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 242) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill, S. 412, will be indefinitely postponed.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 175, S. 625, and that it be made the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAUDI ARABIA ACCEPTS AMERICANS OF JEWISH FAITH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this body shares my satisfaction that one instance of gross discrimination against American personnel overseas has been ended. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post of June 12, entitled "One Ignominy Less," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I request the same privilege for an article from the New York Times of June 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the "ignominy" referred to in both items was the refusal of the Royal Government of Saudi Arabia to permit American citizens of Jewish faith to serve in our military installations and other government missions on Saudi territory. Throughout much of the postwar period the United States enjoyed important base rights in Saudi Arabia, notably at the SAC base near Dharan. Americans of Jewish faith, however, could not be stationed there.

I could never understand why a single airbase was worth the price of agreeing, even under protest, to make arbitrary distinctions among the American personnel whom we assigned there. The record reveals that I protested such official recognition and maintenance of discrimination; and I submitted amendments, which were adopted by the Senate, protesting such discrimination and asking that it be ended, even at the expense of the withdrawal of our forces from that base. Obviously the Saudi Arabian Government felt strongly about the question. Clearly, Saudi Arabia was bitterly hostile toward Israel. But our laws, Mr. President, made no valid distintion among Americans, whatever their race, religion, or national origin; and our laws should not make any such discrimination. The people being discriminated against were Americans, not Israelis. The policies of the Saudi Arabian Government were wrong. In fact, I think they were invidious and reactionary. I am ashamed that we knuckled under to them so long. Indeed, as I have said, I did everything in my power, as did several of our distinguished colleagues, to end the discriminatory practices. Senator Lehman, of New York, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and other Senators led the fight against such practices.

In 1956, for example, the Senate declared that any attempt by a foreign power to discriminate among Americans on religious grounds was "inconsistent with our principles." Two more recent statements by the Congress acquired the force of law. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 states:

> The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion.

Even more relevant to the Saudi Arabian case was section 108 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1962, which states:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

I am proud to have had something to do, together with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], in putting the Congress on record in favor of equal treatment for all Americans overseas. In fact, I believe in equal treatment for all Americans, wherever they may be.

In the case of Saudi Arabia, this particular section has evidently been implemented at long last. I am gratified that the Royal Government of Saudi Arabia has seen fit to permit the stationing of American citizens, regardless of their religion, on its territory. Without drawing farfetched conclusions as to the motives for this concession, let me second the concluding words of the Post editorial:

> All Americans will be glad that Saudi Arabia has taken a step closer to modern times and that the United States no longer feels it necessary to practice discrimination on its own citizens in order to appease a foreign ruler.

The editorial puts it very well; the fault was clearly on both sides: on the Saudi side, for trying to impose warped national prejudices on a sovereign foreign power; and on the United States, for putting up with this indignity for reasons of expediency.

Laws may not be able to change the hearts of men, but circumstances can change the actions of men. We are seeing the truth of this axiom in the United States. The vast majority of Americans agree with President Kennedy that our dedication to freedom rings hollow so long as millions of American Negroes are denied the substance of freedom. This is more than a question of domestic politics; it is a principle which should guide the conduct of Americans abroad, as well as at home. In every segment of our national and international life it is incumbent upon us to behave like the free men we are. If we are intolerant of anything, it should be of intolerance itself. I trust, therefore, that the ignominy of our previous relations with Saudi Arabia will never be repeated anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, the dropping of this restriction is one bit of good news which certainly merits reporting and consideration.

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 12, 1963]

One Ignominy Less

Sometimes, in the pursuit of national interest, a country must swallow its pride and its principles. This is what the United States did when it acceded to a Saudi Arabian demand that no Jewish personnel be permitted among the American missions in King Saud's country. The airbase at Dhahran was adjudged as a major strategic asset and thus the United States reluctantly went along with the Saudi Arabian attempt to impose national prejudice arbitrarily on American citizens.

But possibly as a byproduct of Saudi Arabia's concern with Washington's attitude on the civil war in Yemen, the restriction has been quietly dropped. In a letter to Congressman Celler, the Defense Department has noted that Americans of the Jewish faith are among the units stationed in Saudi Arabia. (The lease on the airbase expired last year, but there is still a training mission in the country.)

Saudi Arabia is to be commended for ending its distinction as the most fanatic of the Arab countries in applying religious tests to all who set foot on its soil. The acceptance of King Saud's Diktat on this matter was an ignominous surrender of principle by the United States that was rightly criticized no matter how persuasive the arguments of expediency may have seemed. All Americans will be glad that Saudi Arabia has taken a step closer to modern times and that the United States no longer feels it necessary to practice discrimination on its own citizens in order to appease a foreign ruler.

Exhibit 2

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1963]

Saudi Arabia Lets Jews in U.S. Units Serve on Her Soil

Washington, June 9.—U.S. servicemen of Jewish faith have been serving in Saudi Arabia for several weeks, despite strong objections in the past by the Saudi Government to their presence there.

A Defense Department spokesman said today that their presence had been approved by the Saudi Government.

This reversal of the long-standing Saudi policy that no persons of Jewish faith be among the U.S. troops assigned to Saudi Arabia was understood to have been a result of recent international developments and not of negotiations.

One such development might have been the U.S. attitude toward the recent involvement of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic in the civil war in Yemen.

The United States has supported United Nations efforts to get Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic to withdraw their forces from Yemen.

Washington has also recognized the republican government of Yemen. Saudi Arabia has backed the royalist forces in trying to regain control of the Government.

The U.S. lease agreement with Saudi Arabia for use of the Dhahran air base expired more than a year ago.

The lease agreement bound the United States not to send to Saudi Arabia any person objectionable to the Saudi Government. In practice that came to mean that no persons of Jewish faith were sent among troops or civilians involved in construction or operation of the air base.

This lease clause was the cause of repeated complaints by Jewish organizations protesting Washington's concurrence.

TROOPS WERE REDUCED

While the dropping by the United States of Dhahran as a base has caused a reduction of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, there is still a training mission there and Air Force units occasionally take part in maneuvers with Saudi troops.

Details on numbers of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia were not available tonight.

In the Yemen civil war, Egyptian troops, supporting the republican regime, launched attacks on Saudi territory.

These were denounced by the United States, which warned President Gamal Abdel Nasser that his country was jeopardizing its relations with the United States.

Subsequently, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic agreed to end their support of the opposing Yemen factions. However, this agreement does not yet appear to be fully effective.

The first word that persons of Jewish faith were among U.S. units in Saudi Arabia came from Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of Brooklyn.

Mr. Celler said in a radio interview in New York last night that the new policy had been disclosed in a letter from Roswell L. Gilpatric, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Longstanding Ban Eased

The refusal of Saudi Arabia to admit Jewish visitors put the U.S. Government in an anomalous position for many years.

Not only servicemen but American diplomats, Congressmen, businessmen, and tourists have been affected. Washington was involved because of the importance it accorded Saudi Arabia in two areas: the cold war and oil.

Saudi Arabia accounts for about a fourth of the oil production of the Middle East. The concession is held by the Arabian American Oil Co., which is owned jointly by the Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Texaco, and Socony Mobil.

As early as 1950, the State Department defended the refusal of Aramco to employ Jews as a matter of national interest. It did this in a statement to the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, which thereupon upheld the employment questionnaires used at Aramco's New York headquarters.

This ruling was challenged by the American Jewish Congress. After a long battle, the State agency, now called the Commission on Human Rights, reversed itself last fall, and ordered Aramco to stop asking job applicants about their religion.

The company said it would appeal to the courts, but a settlement was reached in which the company promised to withdraw the protested questions.

Nobody available last night could say whether the company had sent any Jewish employees to Saudi Arabia.

AN IMPORTANT BASE

The Dhahran airfield was established in World War II. Later it became an important civilian transport base, serving Trans World Airlines among others.

Early in 1956, during negotiations for a renewal of the agreement for use of the base, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles confirmed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that American Jews were not sent to military or diplomatic posts in Saudi Arabia.

"We don't like to acquiesce," he said, "but we have to recognize that Saudi Arabia is an ally."

In response, on July 26, the Senate adopted a resolution declaring that any attempt by a foreign country to discriminate among Americans on religious grounds was "inconsistent with our principles."

This appeared to have no effect. In January 1957, on the eve of the arrival of King Ibn Saud on a state visit, Mayor Wagner announced that there would be no official welcome for him.

Secretary Dulles commented that the snub had only stiffened the monarch's position when the question of the ban on Jews was discussed with him in Washington.

TWO MESSAGES OF HOPE AND CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first 15 days of June have been the occasion for an uncommonly high level of oratory. On June 1, my good friend, Lady Jackson, or Barbara Ward, as she is best known in this country, delivered a truly remarkable address in Williamsburg, Va., in commemoration of the 50 days in 1776 when the Virginia Declaration of Rights was framed.

Mr. President, as I recall, the able and distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] placed in the Record the full text of that address, and made appropriate comments in regard to it. Subsequently, the President of the United States has made three major pronouncements on the challenges our Nation must confront.

We are indeed fortunate to have as President of the United States one who so well understands and can so well express the aspirations and ideals of the American people. In his remarks on education and on civil rights, and, above all, in his commencement day address at American University, where his subject was our foreign policy and peace in this thermonuclear age, he rose to the highest traditions of his office. He has made every American proud of him. All of us should be grateful to the President for doing this, because he speaks with eloquent and moving persuasion in voicing the conscience of the Nation.

Mr. President, it is a curious irony of our history that many of the eloquent statements of American ideals have been made by foreign observers of this Nation. No one has surpassed de Tocqueville's description of the excitingly unique and radical character of American democracy. Earlier there were the declamations of Lafayette; later, the inspired passages of Lord Bryce.

Miss Ward, too, shows a sympathetic understanding of American ideals that any American might envy. The framers of the Virginia Declaration assume their full stature in the words of this gifted Englishwoman. Looking back to a period when our now mighty Nation was "13 separate colonies, not yet certain whether neighbors would be ready to share sovereignty, even less certain whether the power of Britain could be successfully withstood," when "to seawards lay uncertainty and hostility; inland, a vast unknown where French pretensions and Indian enmity had still to be reckoned with," she recalls the "magnificence of their audacity" in speaking "not as beleaguered citizens, but as heirs and perpetuators of human freedom itself." This was a period in which the inhabitants of so wild and remote a land might have been expected to be obsessed by parochial concerns and all too tangible fears. Under these circumstances, their affirmation of human rights and liberties was an event that, as Miss Ward rightly says, "should still leave us speechless with surprise."

Miss Ward is too much of a humanitarian and too much of an activist to allow us to indulge for long in flattering memories of the past. She perceives that the true significance of the declaration of rights lies in the universal terms in which it is formulated. At the very moment when Edmund Burke, the great English philosopher and statesman, was speaking of the "rights of Englishmen," these Virginia burghers were asserting that "all men are equally free and independent," "all have certain inherent rights."

This was a commitment to which, as Miss Ward observes, we have not always been true. Though we have overcome the barriers to transportation and communication that made the universalism of this declaration seem visionary, we have not always shown equal concern about the rights of other men. Though we have created wealth and power beyond the wildest speculations of those early settlers, we have appeared hesitant about investing in the future welfare and liberty of the less developed nations.

Paradoxically, Mr. President, we have both overestimated and underestimated the difficulties of aiding other countries in their quest for development. Despite showings to the contrary in public opinion polls, many politicians believe that American taxpayers have found the burden of foreign aid too heavy to sustain. At the same time, there are frequent expressions of disappointment at the length of time it has taken our relatively small investment abroad to show results.

Mr. President, I find myself in disagreement with some of my colleagues about foreign aid. I happen to believe that it is a wise investment for the future of our Nation and the future of the world. I find that most Americans agree with me. The most recent public opinion poll, and I believe I inserted the text of that poll in the RECORD several days ago, shows that in the period of the last 5 years approximately 58 percent of all Americans polled support actively foreign aid, 12 percent were uncertain, and some 30 percent were opposed. So if we were to take the 12 percent that were uncertain and divide it proportionately, we would find that approximately 65 percent of the American public supports foreign aid.

I have been a practical politician, I trust. I find that if we can gain the support of 65 percent of the public on any issue, we have a most amazing record. If we can get 50 percent plus one, we are doing well.

In our State, after some months of recount of the 1,300,000 votes cast, we found that a majority of only 91 votes was enough to elect a Governor for 4 years. So the significance of the public opinion poll which has been cited here should not be underestimated.

I do not believe that foreign aid has been a failure. I do not believe it has been maladministered. However, I believe that there have been times when our investments in foreign aid have not produced the results we would like.

I believe that is true of practically every investment one could make. Slightly more than a year ago investments in the stock market took a tumble. But that does not make me opposed to American stocks, nor make me think that the stock market is an evil institution. Investments require a degree of risk.

But critics of foreign aid apparently feel that when we put money into an oversea program, it should automatically yield political and economic dividends.

I know of no investor of the United States who really feels that when he invests his money, there is an absolute guarantee of a profit, a dividend, or a reward on the investment. The American investor is willing to take a risk. But the risk is a contemplated and calculated one. He feels that the risk of loss is less than the risk of gain. We must have somewhat the same attitude in terms of foreign aid. We must be willing to venture. We must be willing to try. We must be willing to run the risk of defeat and loss as well as to search for the exhilaration and the glory of victory and gain.

So today, as in other days, I find myself in opposition, or at least with a different point of view than some of the more outspoken critics of our foreign aid program.

The program deals with people in many lands and affects lives of people that have different cultures and traditions. It ought to be clearly understood that this kind of program has some limitations. It is extremely difficult to administer, particularly because the administration must take place a long way away from home base.

So let us be a bit tolerant and understanding of the program, and at the same time keep a watchful eye on it.

The greatest difficulties of foreign aid today are the limitations that have been built into it by the Congress. It is literally impossible to administer the program in a businesslike manner, particularly when the Administrator is shackled and tied down so that he has very little room for movement.

We in the Congress have our responsibility. I have advised and counseled the Administrator of foreign aid to speak forthrightly to Congress. If we desire to hold the Administrator accountable for foreign aid administration, he should administer it.

I should like to see Mr. Bell, the new Administrator of AID, demonstrate the courage which I think he has by frankly telling the Congress that he would like at least a year or two to administer the program without being tied down, and without being limited in his discretionary and administrative powers. If he will tell the Congress that and ask for that kind of program, he will be in a much better position to be able to respond to his critics a year from now.

We make it very difficult for any administrator. I believe that the time is at hand for administrators to say so. I think they should say:

"Give me the opportunity to administer the program, and if I cannot do a good job, recommended that I be dismissed. But if you want to administer it and have me only as titular head or as the front man, I want you to know that I am not going to take the responsibility for all the problems. You are going to share in them, too."

As I see it, the foreign aid program has built into it many provisions which limit the administrative capacity of any good administrator. If that is the nature of Government, I ask that it be minimized. I ask that we be somewhat understanding of those who are responsible for the program.

Barbara Ward called to our attention, for example, the problems that we face in foreign aid administration. That is why I have commented upon them. She also called to our attention another area in which we are now seeking to make some progress. I refer to arms control and disarmament, because today we extended the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as we well should. Here again there are many criticisms of the Director and of the Administrator. I desire to say only that that Director and Administrator has a fine record of public service. Mr. William Foster has served under three administrations, the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and now the Kennedy administration. He has proved himself to be a faithful, loyal, dedicated, and competent public servant. I do not think anyone needs to worry about this distinguished American doing anything that would weaken the security of our Nation.

I believe the time is at hand for Members of Congress to recognize that there are other patriots besides those who are elected. There are patriots in the executive branch of the Government, just as there are here in the legislative branch. I see no reason to feel that we have a monopoly upon the desire to protect the security of our country. I cannot but believe that the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Administrator and Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of whom make disarmament policy, are equally concerned about the security of the United States. As compared to any Senator, I do not think they are more concerned, but I do not think they are less concerned. I do not believe for one minute that those men whom I have mentioned—the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the men who ultimately formulate our arms control and disarmament policy—would ever make a recommendation that would in any way threaten the security of our country. I challenge those who say to the contrary. That is why the Senator from Minnesota has taken an active interest in supporting the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It puts together that machinery that makes possible a better formulation of our policy relating to the critical and complex subjects of disarmament.

The quest for disarmament is another area in which, as President Kennedy points out, we have sometimes too easily yielded to discouragement. Admittedly, there are sound reasons for feeling pessimistic about the prospects for peace. We have been engaged in a thermonuclear arms race with the Soviet Union for a good many years now, and the race has only increased in intensity with time.

Too many of us have come to contemplate calmly the possibility of a war that would destroy the world.

As I said earlier today, there is no action which can be taken today without risk. The risks of the arms race need to be contemplated, as well as the risks of disarmament. I challenge those who say that the arms buildup is the sure way to peace to show me any evidence from history.

I said, with equal candor, that a sad tale of frustration and defeat has characterized the efforts of man to find a way to curb the arms race and to bring about any meaningful and effective kind of disarmament. Nevertheless, Mr. President, we must seek it. We must try to find a way to preserve the peace.

Against this corrosive fatalism—this sitting back and contemplating the possibility of a war which could destroy the world—we can and must set the President's courageous affirmation:

> No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable, and we believe they can do it again.

Until we shake off the lethargy of despair, until we become convinced that this manmade problem can be solved by man, and devote the best of our thought and energy to solving it, we shall make little progress toward a lasting peace. In calling on us to examine our attitude toward the possibility of attaining peace at home and abroad, President Kennedy has correctly identified a major element of the problem.

Neither the conditional suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere nor the agreement to revive negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty is a substitute for disarmament. They are small though significant steps toward a vastly more important objective. What matters is that they are seen in this light. They express the hope that men of good will can break through the distrust and inertia that prevent both sides from dealing with the basic problem. They represent the concrete initiatives of a man whose vision of a world at peace transcends the fears and rivalries of our time.

In her Williamsburg address, Miss Ward exhorts Americans to regain the daring and perseverance, the firmness of conviction and universality of concern, that she finds in the men of 1776. It seems to me, Mr. President, that these are the preeminent qualities of President Kennedy's recent speech at American University; and, indeed, the other speeches to which I have referred.

The past 2 weeks have been a very bright and challenging period not only for Americans but also for the world. I believe the President of the United States has been serving at his best, giving this Nation the leadership he promised. He has been giving leadership in the field of education, knowing full well that a nation is no better than an enlightened people. He has called for equal opportunity for every citizen of this country, so that all may share the benefits of education.

The President has spoken out on the whole issue of human rights, of civil rights, placing this in proper context and proper perspective, as a moral issue and not merely a political issue.

I submit that no American true to his faith, religious or political, can rest easily or can be comfortable so long as he knows there is discrimination and social injustice in a part of the pattern of American life. Thank goodness it is not the pattern. It is only a part of the pattern. It is a spot upon our countenance, and it needs to be cleansed, and it will be.

I predict that this year of 1963 will be a year known in the annals of history, in the days to come, every bit as memorable and great as the year 1863.

In January 1863 there was the Emancipation Proclamation, a promise.

In the summer of 1963 the Emancipation Proclamation will be realized and fulfilled. It is 100 years later, but the time has arrived.

Members of Congress serving in the 88th Congress can be proud of the fact that by an accident of history they are serving at a time every bit as memorable and as great as the time when Abraham Lincoln served in January 1863, when the great Emancipator gave to the world the Emancipation Proclamation.

This is an exciting period in which to live. Of course, it is challenging and demanding. At times it is very worrisome. But only periods such as this can qualify for the words "exciting" and "challenging."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 15, in conjunction with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I submitted S. Con. Res. 42, a concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that the functions of the proposed committee are intended to be construed broadly; that when we refer to "all matters pertaining to national defense, foreign policy, and national security," we intend this to include the whole spectrum of policies and programs dealing with these subjects.

The Congress in 1947 established certain principles concerning our national defense which basically were designed to codify the lessons of World War II and project them into the future. It was far more than a mere Unification Act, for all recognized the need to correct the inadequacies of the plans and preparations that existed prior to and early in World War II for the mobilization of our economy and resources to meet wartime requirements. Foreign policy considerations and the military structure to support such policies had long been recognized as a part of the national security problem, but too little attention had been paid to plans that would assure our mobilization base and our economy being prepared to support efforts to meet these two basic problems.

It was these experiences and the growing complexity of modern war that led to the plan for corrective legislation exemplified in the National Security Act of 1947. The Congress in that act established a National Security Council to provide the President with a mechanism to constantly study the broad security problems facing the Nation. It also established an agency called the National Security Resources Board, which was to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. The responsibilities of this Board have passed through several successor agencies until now they are vested in the Executive Office of the President, where they are assigned to the Office of Emergency Planning. The head of the National Security Resources Board was a statutory member of the National Security Council and his successors have continued to serve in this capacity.

Many studies of national security problems have tended to overlook the fact that without plans for a sound mobilization base and without a mechanism to provide the President a sound and realistic basis upon which to evaluate the objectives, commitments, and risks that must be considered in connection with our domestic, military, and foreign policies, our entire national security planning might fail. Therefore, in the functioning of the Joint Committee which our concurrent resolution is designed to bring into being, I wish to assure all the Members of the Senate that these important nonmilitary security problems will be a continuing part of the congressional evaluation of our national security matters.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 175, S. 625; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there is other Senate business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, June 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1963:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Department of Defense

Eugene G. Fubini, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice John H. Rubel, resigned.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Christopher L. Gholston, Jr., Laverne, Ala., in place of D. L. Capps, transferred.

Herbert Allen, Newton, Ala., in place of A. M. King, retired.

ALASKA

Margaret E. Watson, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of N. I. King, resigned.

ARIZONA

Mary M. McCarrell, Chambers, Ariz., in place of Peter Balcomb, resigned.

William E. Wood, Douglas, Ariz., in place of C. O. Rice, deceased.

Edward I. Kacer, Palo Verde, Ariz., in place of J. J. Fuhrman, Jr., resigned.

Charles F. Adams, San Carlos, Ariz., in place of C. H. Higgins, resigned.

Ara O. Sparks, Whiteriver, Ariz., in place of D. S. LeBaron, deceased.

William R. Rowley, Yarnell, Ariz., in place of A. E. Loudermilk, retired.

ARKANSAS

Lewis E. Pruitt, Gurdon, Ark., in place of Claxton Steed, deceased.

Austin A. Stovall, Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.

Franklin L. Brown, Marianna, Ark., in place of J. E. Hunt, deceased.

Donald E. Eddington, Tyronza, Ark., in place of L. W. Freeman, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Irene V. Hunter, Buttonwillow, Calif., in place of W. D. Tracy, retired.

Lena M. Butler, Byron, Calif., in place of M. B. Chaim, retired.

Evelyn E. Kuraisa, Camp Richardson, Calif., in place of L. M. Latta, retired.

Fae S. Freude, Frazier Park, Calif., in place of J. M. Rautenbush, deceased.

Betty J. Laskey, Johannesburg, Calif., in place of M. B. Hord, deceased.

Eugene T. White, Laguna Beach, Calif., in place of W. E. Parke, retired.

Ray A. Crettol, Lathrop, Calif., in place of E. F. Schobert, retired.

Loren A. Kibby, Mount Hermon, Calif., in place of A. E. Lacy, retired.

Murrel C. Jensen, Murrieta, Calif., in place of R. C. Tarwater, retired.

Kathryn S. Wilson, Pasadena, Calif., in place of R. R. Holmquist, transferred.

Marshall C. Kelley, Rialto, Calif., in place of W. P. Martin, resigned.

Eric Lundquist, Sanitarium, Calif., in place of J. H. Reavis, retired.

Mila M. Waltz, Santa Margarita, Calif., in place of M. L. Cogan, retired.

James R. Chapman, Winters, Calif., in place of E. V. Roseberry, retired.

COLORADO

Kermit R. Hurst, Palisade, Colo., in place of M. C. Huber, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Robert V. Laws, Canterbury, Conn., in place of W. F. Newton, retired.

DELAWARE

James C. Bowdle, Dover, Del., in place of H. K. Heite, retired.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Raulerson, Pierson, Fla., in place of N. S. Jackson, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Herring, Barney, Ga., in place of M. B. Folsom, transferred.

Francis E. Allen, Cairo, Ga., in place of R. P. Wight, retired.

GUAM

Alejandro P. Cruz, Agana, Guam, in place of T. R. Santos, resigned.

IDAHO

William E. Farley, Kellogg, Idaho, in place of A. E. McKinley, retired.

Calvin J. Whittaker, Leadore, Idaho, in place of N. G. Andrews, retired.

ILLINOIS

Charles H. Parker, Ashmore, Ill., in place of L. H. Watson, transferred.

Joseph E. Powell, Chenoa, Ill., in place of C. G. Missal, retired.

Anne G. Barker, Frankfort Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Russell, resigned.

Delmar R. Haun, Nashville, Ill., in place of W. H. Weihe, resigned.

Robert C. Johnson, Richton Park, Ill., in place of Veronica Scheidt, retired.

Lelan D. Graham, West York, Ill., in place of R. L. Ryerson, retired.

INDIANA

Gayle A. Smith, Boston, Ind., in place of S. E. Howard, retired.

David F. McGuire, Solsberry, Ind., in place of C. W. Hudson, resigned.

IOWA

William J. Walrod, Belmond, Iowa, in place of G. E. Jenison, transferred.

Harold L. Leazer, Corydon, Iowa, in place of B. H. Swegle, deceased.

Robert E. Lynott, Jr., Hawarden, Iowa, in place of G. R. Sawyer, retired.

Marjorie G. Rogers, Lucas, Iowa, in place of I. D. McCauley, retired.

W. Cecil Coleman, Mount Auburn, Iowa, in place of H. J. Greenwalt, retired.

Joseph J. Mazur, Rowley, Iowa, in place of W. H. Rehberg, deceased.

KANSAS

Donald C. Ratcliff, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of W. L. Hartley, deceased.

Edgar L. Tressler, Colony, Kans., in place of A. I. Cox, retired.

John P. Lenahan, Eudora, Kans., in place of J. M. Grimes, retired.

Donald G. Sands, Holton, Kans., in place of R. H. Moore, deceased.

Larry K. Harris, Moscow, Kans., in place of J. E. Wright, transferred.

Ellen M. Mohney, Ozawkie, Kans., in place of Guy Baker, deceased.

Anna J. Mills, Russell, Kans., in place of R. K. Artas, retired.

LOUISIANA

Jacob E. Foil, Bogalusa, La., in place of D. W. Graves, retired.

Frank E. Walters, McDade, La., in place of N. V. Baker, retired.

MAINE

Gordon L. Stitham, Mars Hill, Maine, in place of L. V. Keenan, retired.

Allan G. Pinkham, Moody, Maine, in place of D. L. Moody, retired.

William D. Duhamel, Old Orchard Beach, Maine, in place of R. H. Morse, deceased.

MARYLAND

William F. McNutt, Fallston, Md., in place of R. C. McNutt, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Margaret C. Hahn, North Hadley, Mass., in place of R. F. Hahn, retired.

MICHIGAN

Everett E. Underwood, Brethren, Mich., in place of E. G. McNamara, retired.

August W. Delgoffe, Menominee, Mich., in place of C. S. Duby, deceased.

Barbara J. Tryban, Mullett Lake, Mich., in place of V. E. Roberts, deceased.

Clarke D. Gordon, Saline, Mich., in place of M. C. O'Neill, retired.

John P. Grynwich, Sawyer, Mich., in place of E. A. Westhauser, resigned.

Frederick W. Rawsthorne, Jr., Trenton, Mich., in place of P. E. Teifer, retired.

William Salerno, Yale, Mich., in place of R. H. Peacock, retired.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Melbye, Hitterdal, Minn., in place of Clifford Hitterdal, retired.

Clarence J. Schaber, Rogers, Minn., in place of Otto J. Scharber, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Eupal G. Byram, Golden, Miss., in place of Lela Epps, retired.

Fred A. Jackson, Sturgis, Miss., in place of T. A. Hamill, retired.

Ann G. Wise, Washington, Miss., in place of Aileen Rawlings, retired.

MISSOURI

Dorothy A. McDaniel, Gray Summit, Mo., in place of V. R. Thornhill, retired.

Poly B. Sims, Koshkonong, Mo., in place of H. M. Swain, retired.

William C. Brandenburg, Wellsville, Mo., in place of R. G. Smith, deceased.

MONTANA

Herbert Oster, Melstone, Mont., in place of L. N. Field, retired.

NEBRASKA

John I. McKelvey, Falls City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Elam, retired.

Nellie L. Lockard, Stella, Nebr., in place of R. C. Briggs, transferred.

NEVADA

Vivian A. Crammer, Pahrump, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Agnes P. Pascoe, West Ossipee, N.H., in place of W. H. Pascoe, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Mateas P. Serna, Magdalena, N. Mex., in place of Hezekiah Hall, retired.

NEW YORK

John J. Murray, Albany, N.Y., in place of H. A. Goetz, retired.

William J. Hopkins, Jamesville, N.Y., in place of F. D. McClenon, retired.

Wilfred F. Smith, Livingston Manor, N.Y., in place of E. K. Homer, retired.

William J. Barber, Nyack, N.Y., in place of H. E. Wadsworth, retired.

Sister Mary Dominic Scheg, Stella Niagara, N.Y., in place of Sister Mary Leontine, retired.

Thomas J. Byrne, Suffern, N.Y., in place of A. J. Kennedy, retired.

Helene R. Scharett, Union Hill, N.Y., in place of G. G. Batchelor, retired.

James E. Hawes, Valois, N.Y., in place of D. S. Sutphen, deceased.

Roy E Laine, Wading River, N.Y., in place of C. G. Kemp, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn W. Jarvis, Engelhard, N.C., in place of T. M. Matthews, retired.

Thomas F. Trivette, Lewisville, N.C., in place of M. M. Stimson, retired.

Oliver C. Tew, McLeansville, N.C., in place of R. D. Mullis, resigned.

William M. Young, Walkertown, N.C., in place of Eva Walker, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Olson, Kindred, N. Dak., in place of L. D. Larsen, deceased.

Fred H. Tufte, Northwood, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Halverson, retired.

Donald Smith, Souris, N. Dak., in place of F. V. Frykman, resigned.

OHIO

Charles W. Perry, Holland, Ohio, in place of R. H. Benton, resigned.

Charles E. Wellman, New Knoxville, Ohio, in place of E. H. Katterheinrich, retired.

Grover J. Neikirk, Republic, Ohio, in place of H. D. Anderson, transferred.

Janet M. Lesher, Spring Valley, Ohio, in place of A. M. Krug, retired.

Ralph H. Gibson, Wharton, Ohio, in place of H. W. Baker, Jr., transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Harold W. Thomason, Boynton, Okla., in place of L. K. Hawkins, transferred.

Alan N. Case, Marland, Okla., in place of J. B. Carson, retired.

Margaret B. Moody, Ratliff City, Okla. Office established January 1, 1953.

OREGON

Bettejane B. Cass, La Pine, Oreg., in place of M. G. Miltenberger, deceased.

Robert L. Snider, Roseburg, Oreg., in place of C. W. Carstens, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ward Johns, Adrian, Pa., in place of N. F. Skinner, retired.

Donald P. Fischer, Bethlehem, Pa., in place of J. W. Dawley, retired.

Wayne H. Winton, Centerville, Pa., in place of E. A. McBride, retired.

Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.

Theresa A. Catale, Hillsville, Pa., in place of W. W. Gilmore, retired.

Alvin R. Marshall, Hollsopple, Pa., in place of C. R. Baker, retired.

Russell R. Weaver, Jackson Center, Pa., in place of J. H. McConnell, retired..

Victor N. Deane, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.

Russell J. Greenawalt, Kempton, Pa., in place of E. M. Albright, retired.

Herman O. Todd, Lake Como, Pa., in place of A. E. Vouaux, retired.

Harold R. Hockman, Mingoville, Pa., in place of Harry Walizer, resigned.

Ned M. Hartsell, Oil City, Pa., in place of L. J. English, retired.

Jerome A. Frank, Saint Marys, Pa., in place of D. A. Phelan, retired.

Roger G. Eshelman, Terre Hill, Pa., in place of B. E. Weaver, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John P. Sullivan, Jr., Jackson, S.C., in place of J. C. Greene, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Richard V. Bell, Hecla, S. Dak., in place of R. C. Bonzer, retired.

Daniel C. Wiest, Newell, S. Dak., in place of P. A. Wiest, retired.

TENNESSEE

Millard M. Brown, Livingston, Tenn., in place of C. C. Gore, retired.

Billy V. Taylor, Mercer, Tenn., in place of C. G. McCauley, retired.

Bobby L. Price, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.

Horace M. Hughett, Robbins, Tenn., in place of Berbin Ellis, retired.

TEXAS

Shirley R. Clark, Cleburne, Tex., in place of H. G. Littlefair, deceased.

Ladislav L. Zbranek, Hardin, Tex., in place of Elizabeth Davis, retired.

Talmage E. Gilbreath, Iowa Park, Tex., in place of F. S. May, resigned.

Ollie T. Bullock, Milano, Tex., in place of J. D. Yoakum, transferred.

Ann M. Postlethwait, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of C. J. Woerner, resigned.

Oleta B. Coleman, Splendora, Tex., in place of P. W. Davis, retired.

UTAH

Kay F. Probst, Midway, Utah, in place of N. A. Burgener, retired.

VERMONT

Justin M. Lanou, Irasburg, Vt., in place of N. H. Pike, retired.

Dwight H. Cooley, Passumpsic, Vt., in place of E. J. Filgate, transferred.

VIRGINIA

William E. Scheid, Falls Church, Va., in place of W. H. Sealock, deceased.

E. Brown Porter, Max Meadows, Va., in place of T. E. Simmerman, Jr., retired.

WASHINGTON

William H. Boyes, Monroe, Wash., in place of C. H. Currie, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick T. Newbraugh, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., in place of A. S. Henry, retired.

Floyd F. Edmunds, Bramwell, W. Va., in place of S. M. Gordon, retired.

Virginia L. Eddy, Friendly, W. Va., in place of Lula Griffin, retired.

Martin M. Strganac, McMechen, W. Va., in place of P. J. Burke, retired.

Howard E. Shamblen, Mammoth, W. Va., in place of E. C. Bess, resigned.

WISCONSIN

James W. Hankerson, Fair Water, Wis., in place of E. G. Zellmer, retired.

Jon D. Lysdahl, Grantsburg, Wis., in place of H. R. Olson, retired

Orien E. Heldt, Merrill, Wis., in place of W. C. McLaughlin, retired.

Neil E. Schell, Norwalk, Wis., in place of A. G. Willgrubs, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John H. Cook, Dozier.
Carrie M. Mann, Pleasant Grove.
James T. Carroll, Stevenson.

ARIZONA

Marion L. Massey, Jr., Claypool.
Hettie M. Black, Hereford.
R. Odie Shipp, Miami.
Merle W. Heap, St. Johns.

ARKANSAS

Henry W. Allen, Jr., Brinkley.
Harry L. Smith, Elm Springs.
Harry L. Bealer, Helena.

CALIFORNIA

Richard L. Byington, Boron.
Irving A. Cleek, Chico.
John B. Klugiewicz, Costa Mesa.
Mary L. Johnson, Keyes.
Rosalie L. Rhodes, Lakehead.
Ruth A. Winters, Loleta.
Edward F. Austin, Moffett Field.
Beverly J. Clark, Occidental.
Dessa L. Pinkham, Pescadero.
Irvin J. Burt, Roseville.
Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana.
Paul Medows, Woodland Hills.

COLORADO

Marie P. Burg, Hideaway Park.
Laurence Montano, Leadville.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph A. Rajcula, Brookfield.
Lolita C. Splaine, East Granby.
Charles E. Hatheway, Ellington.
Charles W. Latimer, Pleasant Valley.
William F. Csere, Portland.
Leopold A. Szczygiel, Uncasville.

FLORIDA

Carl P. Geiger, Cocoa.
Ralph D. Marshall, Estero.
Luther W. Reel, Winter Haven.

GEORGIA

Joseph R. Bowers, Fayetteville.
Gladys A. Walker, Marshallville.
C. Lawrence Mize, Toccoa.

HAWAII

Steven K. Kaneda, Wailuku.

IDAHO

Donald W. Heath, Winchester.

ILLINOIS

John R. Frymire, Enfield.
Theodore C. Geocaris, Mount Prospect.
Kenneth Cole, Norris City.

INDIANA

Robert H. Wilson, Albion.
Melville A. Mix, Jr., Brownsburg.
Virginia E. Ross, Brownsville.
Charles J. Murray, Jamestown.
James E. Rainford, Lake Village.
Glendon R. Hinshaw, Mooresville.
Maurice G. Whitaker, Paragon.
Robert H. Meier, Westphalia.

IOWA

Ronald L. Grant, Bondurant.
James A. Anderson, Casey.
Kenneth A. Madigan, Council Bluffs.
Clifford S. Heng, Cylinder.
Vernon M. Hill, Davis City.
Leonard R. Brasel, Dow City.
Helen A. Bellmann, Durango.
Frederick W. Neumann, Fairfield.
Iva M. Mauck, Garwin.
Myrtle M. Hawbaker, Hillsboro.
Don H. Richards, Hinton.
Arthur G. Meyer, Holstein.
Leland J. Gorshe, Hornick.
Daniel J. Gibbs, La Motte.
Clarence E. Pittman, Morning Sun.
Leon L. Wilson, Nevada.
Marjorie I. Trusty, Oakdale.
Derrel D. Waring, Reasnor.
Florence K. Hamilton, Riverside.
Irvin F. Husmann, Scotch Grove.
Rex V. Ritz, Selma.
Gordon L. Elwood, Silver City.
Alwin M. Zwanziger, Strawberry Point.
Cecil C. Ramsdell, Toledo.
Glenn W. Fleck, Vinton.

KANSAS

Willis J. Ross, La Harpe.

KENTUCKY

M. Aileen Hall, Betsy Layne.
Lee R. McNeely, Jr., Burlington.
Walter E. Burkhart, Cawood.
Lester G. Nanny, Murray.
Matthews Fletcher, Pewee Valley.
William E. Amyx, Jr., Shelbyville.
Jean P. Crouch, Verona.
Kenneth E. Brock, Worthville.

LOUISIANA

Edward W. Cruse, Alexandria.
Leslie C. Sutton, Baker.
William J. Broussard, Carencro.
Edward J. Hymel, Destrehan.
Irene T. Nash, Gibson.
Roma H. Williams, Many.
Norman C. Terherst, Newllano.

MAINE

Thomas W. Adell, Readfield.
David H. Hackett, South Harpswell.
Robert B. Kessell, South Paris.
Fernald K. Linscott, Springfield.
John R. McLean, Vassalboro.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis J. Mooney, Andover.
Howard M. Hayden, Athol.
John F. Keefe, Dracut.
Charles P. Aspesi, Fayville.
Harry W. Vozella, Franklin.
Edward F. O'Leary, Holliston.
Marion O. Lantagne, Linwood.
Lydia J. Hartnett, Millville.
William A. Latraverse, Northbridge.
John G. Barry, South Hadley.
George E. Owens, Jr., Wayland.
John D. Foley, West Acton.
Joseph M. Steinmann, West Concord.

MICHIGAN

Donald G. Bachman, Sr., Ann Arbor.
Kathryn E. Warner, Bridgeport.

Noble G. Haver, Jr., Durand.
John J. Cheney, Elmira.
John P. Funkey, Hancock.
Thomas E. Wilhelm, Petoskey.
Leola A. Rugg, Shaftsburg.
Glenna A. Brooks, Somerset Center.

MINNESOTA

Gordon W. Van Den Einde, Blomkest.
LeRoy H. Grundei, Carlos.
Grant D. Vagle, Lake Bronson.
John E. Murphy, Marshall.
Eugene C. Howe, Palisade.
Wilfred F. Greenheck, Pillager.
James L. Harlan, Plainview.
Darold J. Osterloh, St. Francis.
Albert L. Gutzke, Waverly.
John E. Patterson, Westbrook.
Francis R. Tangen, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Samuel L. Westmoreland, Houlka.
Felix L. Sweatt, Shaw.

MISSOURI

Erwin H. Schmidt, Barnhart.
Bernetta L. Faulkner, Centerville.
J. Warren Campbell, Edwards.
Allen E. Buetzer, Forest City.
Lawrence O. Kinyon, Forsyth.
Elmer C. Smith, Frohna.
Marcella F. Boyer, Herculaneum.
Amherst W. Maphies, Jericho Springs.
Robert A. Woodward, Lamar.
Lucille D. Howerton, Leonard.
Harold C. Jacobs, Palmyra.
Leland S. Reid, Point Lookout.
Marvin L. Steele, Unionville.

MONTANA

Robert J. Williamson, Belt.
Una V. Hopkins, Custer.
Alberta E. Harrington, Garrison.

NEBRASKA

Richard L. Hart, Bridgeport.
Eldon W. Marsh, Brunswick.
John C. Bounds, Grant.
Ferol G. Carney, Lisco.
John P. Munnelly, Omaha.
Keith R. Carson, Pilger.
Charles F. Obrist, Steinauer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George A. Clement, Chester.
Royce C. Morse, Lebanon.

NEW JERSEY

John Cook, Florence.
Rita M. Kosminsky, Liberty Corner.
Robert G. Reeves, Sr., Mauricetown.
Herbert J. Jackson, North Bergen.

NEW YORK

Laurence M. Sucher, Alton.
Frances W. Flynn, Burke.
Everett H. Enstine, Calverton.
Clyde W. Barber, Castile.
James J. Connolly, Catskill.
Joseph A. Peckovitch, Cementon.
Walter A. Glynn, Craryville.
John J. Powers, Jr., Eagle Bridge.
Clifford J. Vincent, Jr., East Berne.
Marian C. Laing, East Otto.
Dominick D. Formisano, Gardiner.
Olga A. Mihanowich, Glenham.
Mildred H. Burd, Greenwood.
Alexander G. D'Imperio, Harrison.
Carl J. Barry, Kent.
William J. Holahan, Middleport.
Edwin D. Jennison, Sr., Milton.
Michael J. Vickio, Montour Falls.
Fraser Bushey, Mooers Forks.
Samuel R. McKernan, Olcott.
George W. Voorhis, Jr., Piermont.
Margaret M. Vaughan, Rush.
John G. Davis, Stone Ridge.
Clarence M. Pulling, West Lebanon.
Leo F. King, Woodbourne.
Raymond A. DuFour, Wynantskill.

NORTH CAROLINA

Isabel H. Glover, Bailey.
Thomas E. Dixon, Benson.
Marvin N. Farmer, Blanch.
Charlie O. Williams, Central Falls.
Louise N. Blankenship, Fairview.
Louise C. Pittman, Gates.
Robert W. Phillips, Hudson.
Albert F. Waller, Kinston.
James Napier, New London.
R. Wayne Ward, Staley.
Charles R. Isgett, Winston-Salem.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph R. Walter, Devils Lake.
Ronald E. Monson, Edinburg.
Clements H. Weigum, Hazen.
Gilbert W. Kessler, Martin.
Donald B. Tweten, Reynolds.
William J. Gust, Jr., St. Thomas.

OHIO

Frank I. Miller, Ada.
Thomas F. Fenton, Chandlersville.
Robert J. Healea, Dennison.
William A. Beard, Eaton.
Robert L. Lowry, Green Camp.
Frank L. Biggs, Pataskala.
John Karalius, Rock Creek.
Beatrice A. Shoemaker, Sedalia.
Jack A. Pancher, Uhrichsville.
Marlin F. Gehres, Wren.

OKLAHOMA

Don A. Neumeyer, Council Hill.
Jack E. Clement, Fairfax.
Finis Ward, Foyil.
Ernest E. Buffington, Westville.
John H. Tynon, Wyandotte.

OREGON

Richard J. Halverson, Garibaldi.
Susan H. Wick, Keno.
Halford A. Dudley, Rhododendron.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Gough, Ashland.
Bernard F. Cooney, Jr., Austin.
Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield.
Patrick J. Moran, Gladwyne.
Emily T. McDaniel, Groveton.
Stephen W. Ochs, Lucinda.
Roland E. Dunkelberger, New Bloomfield.
Dorothy M. Sherbondy, Ruffs Dale.
Henry J. Schwalm, Valley View.

PUERTO RICO

Emilio A. Hernandez, Aguada.

RHODE ISLAND

Katherine M. Purnell, Clayville.
Francis M. Burns, Pawtucket.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Phillip C. Seigler, Batesburg.
Robert A. Jolley, Jr., Greenville.
David B. Brockman, Greer.
James C. Riley, Piedmont.
Margaret H. Leary, Troy.
Thomas W. Suber, Whitmire.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyle R. Haug, Brandt.
Kathryn A. Hight, Deadwood.
Hugen M. Kelsey, Fedora.
Christian B. Jordan, Fort Meade.
Elmer T. Fitzgerald, Rapid City.

TENNESSEE

Harvey G. Fitzgerald, Humboldt.
Walter F. Church, Roan Mountain.
Betty S. Watkins, Talbott.
Jeff J. Blanks, Jr., Trezevant.
Joseph W. Gore, Wartrace.

TEXAS

Erwin O. Dallmeyer, Burton.
Harry C. Rathjen, Canadian.
Michael M. McCully, Clarendon.
S. Reese Upshaw, De Leon.
Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose.
Douglas L. Garrett, Hempstead.
John L. Boyd, Lake Dallas.
Carlos I. Palacios, Laredo.
John R. Cullers, Shamrock.
Preston R. Wheeler, Slaton.
Leopoldo Martinez, Jr., Zapata.

UTAH

Harold P. Green, Grantsville.
Robert D. Nevin, Riverton.

VERMONT

Helen A. Howrigan, Fairfield.
Robert W. Swann, Roxbury.
Robert H. Lawrence, South Hero.
Collise A. Brown, Waterville.

VIRGINIA

Charles H. Mason, Alexandria.
John H. Glass, Dewitt.
Herman L. Bundick, Painter.
Joseph C. Rucker, Shenandoah.
Archibald E. Sutton, Tappahannock.

WASHINGTON

Arvith M. Christiansen, Belfair.
Paul B. Coffey, Chewelah.

WEST VIRGINIA

Norman Armstrong, Pickens.
Carl R. Shaffer, Tunnelton.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Weinhold, Adell.
John F. Rochon, Florence.
Mathew E. Lang, Gillett.
Echo I. Fisk, Holcombe.
James G. Omachinski, Menasha.
Russell J. Myers, Monroe.
Cora D. Manthei, Pleasant Prairie.
Mary E. Suihkonen, Sheldon.
Arden A. Johnson, Trempealeau.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Memorial Day at Gettysburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year, as always, the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee conducted appropriate and impressive ceremonies at the National Cemetery in that historic Pennsylvania community. An outline of these ceremonies follows, as well as the principal address of the day which was delivered by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States:

CHESTER S. SHRIVER. On behalf of the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee, the citizens of this community and our Commonwealth, we extend to you a most cordial welcome to the 96th annual service as we commemorate Memorial Day here in the National Cemetery in Gettysburg.

We are highly honored to have present for this service today, one of our own citizens from Gettysburg and Adams County, a man who has served this community in a dedicated spirit, for many years in business, education, and public service to this State and our Nation and at present on an international level. It is my honor and pleasure to introduce to you, His Excellency, the Honorable

John S. Rice, U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN S. RICE, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE NETHERLANDS

Ambassador RICE. It is fitting that we have another illustrious personage address us at this national shrine. Our speaker is not only a distinguished citizen of the United States but one of the world's great statesmen.

During his career as leader of the U.S. Senate, he particularly distinguished himself as a great unifier. He has the canny ability to bring people together to work for responsible government. His great leadership was recognized by the people when they elected him to the second highest office of our country.

It is a privilege and honor to present the Vice President of the United States.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Vice President JOHNSON. On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it, but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen if the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the Proclamation of Emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Mr. SCHRIVER. Thank you very much Mr. Vice President for this most inspiring message and tribute that you have rendered here upon this occasion. We deeply appreciate the fact that you have taken your time from your busy schedule, to lead our Nation and the world upon this observance of Memorial Day.

And as a special gesture of high esteem for your dedicated service to the peoples of the world, may I present you with this citation of merit from the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, the only organization, chartered by Congress, to represent the Grand Army of the Republic, and who by their General Order No. II in 1886, proclaimed May 30 annually as Memorial Day. As their commander in chief, may I present this special citation to you.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 15, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas)

HOUSE KILLS NEW AREA REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS

A major victory in the fight to slow down Federal spending was achieved by the House of Representatives this week with the defeat of President Kennedy's request for an additional $455 million to continue the Area Redevelopment Act, 209 to 204; 152 Republicans and 57 Democrats voted against the spending bill; 189 Democrats and 15 Republicans were in favor of it. The bill would have provided additional authorization for loans and grants to carry the area redevelopment program for the next 2 years. The House vote will not end the program, but will slow it down and should result in additional savings of the taxpayers money. Chief arguments against appropriation of new funds were based on the minority report of the Banking and Currency Committee which pointed out the lack of accomplishment of the program in its first 2 years of operation and the record of using Federal funds to transplant unemployment and to create new businesses and jobs at the expense of those already existing.

Some examples from the minority report: (1) The Area Redevelopment Agency approved a loan to the Ponchartrain Hotel Co., Detroit, Mich., in the amount of $1,894,525 to assist financing a 432-unit motor hotel with the claim it would add 450 jobs. Since the hotel occupancy rate for Detroit in 1962 was only 54 percent, it is clear the new motor hotel will not add even one hotel job on a net basis to the economy of Detroit. At best, employment at the new facility will result in a corresponding decrease in employment at existing hotel facilities. As a matter of fact, a net decrease in hotel employment for Detroit might easily be the result if the new facility forces existing hotel facilities, already suffering from excessive capacity, into bankruptcy. (2) The Agency approved a $418,000 loan to the Tomahawk Paper Co., of Tomahawk, Wis., to establish a papermill to make household tissues. Present capacity of that industry, without addition of this new plant, as of January 1, 1963, is in excess of current consumption in the United States by more than 400,000 tons. The 73 new jobs claimed for this new facility simply means that corresponding unemployment will be transplanted to existing plants which are only operating at 84 percent of capacity. (3) In Dorchester County, Md., an application has been made for a loan to build a $2 million plant to process soybeans into poultry feed. The plant would be in the heart of the Delmarva Peninsula, made up of parts of Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of U.S. poultry production just after World War II, but now represents less than 10 percent. Since Delmarva's share of the poultry business has shown little inclination toward growth, other feed companies in the area claim a new plant would cost more jobs than it would create. Typical of the reaction of the citizens: "This ARA is supposed to be creating new jobs, but they're just about ready to take mine away"—"We could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation, but it just isn't fair to use our tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business."

In my remarks during debate I pointed out: The ARA on April 15, 1963, approved a $68,250 loan to the Farm Ranch Cooperative Association of Wetumka, Okla., to establish a feed and grain mill. I have introduced a bill to place co-ops on an equal taxation basis along with the rest of business. But my question is this: Is not this using taxpayers' money to set up a tax-exempt business in competition with a tax-paying business? In answering my question, Congressman HARVEY, of Michigan, said in part: "In our hearings and the press there have been cited instance after instance of the ARA being used for the purpose of promoting more competition in a particular field where competition was not needed."

My principal objection to the area redevelopment program is the use of it to establish Federal criteria for designating distressed areas and this is just not possible. More than one-third of all the counties of the country have been declared eligible areas—depressed areas. Common sense tells us that in this period of reasonably good prosperity, that just is not true. With the House action this week we have taken at least a short step toward the return to the encouragement of private business, the only real way to increased economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

MUZZLING CONGRESS

A subtle move seems to be underway to muzzle Congress. For the past week one Member has objected to all special orders, that is requests of Members for time to speak on the floor on subjects not directly related to the legislation of the day. Later in the week a second Member decided that the other Members would be limited to only one insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would not be permitted to use extraneous material in connection with floor speeches. He effectively used this form of censorship by objecting when unanimous consent was required to put such remarks in the RECORD. I strongly objected to this abridgement of the rights of all Members of Congress, those with whom I disagree as well as those whose views I find compatible. The House as a forum for debate and the expression of views must not be subject to the censorship of an individual Member or group of Members. If the President is making mistakes, one of the best ways to cover up is to stop criticism by Members of Congress and this is the real danger in the actions now taking place in the House. As I stated on the floor, "I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege." I will certainly not be silenced in presenting views I think are important to the people of my district and the Nation, or in criticizing the President when, in my opinion, his actions threaten the freedoms of our people and the security of the Nation.

KOREAN TAXES AGAIN EXTENDED

The Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 extended for another year excise taxes and Korean war taxes. I opposed the extension and joined in the minority report to point out: (1) This is a tax increase bill. Expiration of tax rate increases imposed temporarily for 2 years to meet a specific crisis cannot be properly referred to as tax reduction. On the contrary any bill to continue these temporary rate increases can only be regarded as bills to increase taxes. (2) There is a moral obligation to remove tax rates which were sold to the people as temporary taxes. (3) A basic solution to removing these taxes and enacting an overall tax cut in all brackets is to cut Federal spending. (4) Excise taxes hit those of lowest income hardest of all.

ARCHITECT OF FAILURE TO HEAD DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

The man the President is sending to deal with Khrushchev, to reach an agreement which could result in total disarmament of the United States, is Averell Harriman, the architect of failure in our policies of combating the Communist conspiracy. Appalling as the President's announcement that we were suspending nuclear testing in the atmosphere and were entering into top level negotiations with the Soviets in Moscow, was to the American people, the naming of Harriman as the top negotiator is simply beyond belief. It was Harriman who arranged the coalition government of Laos at the Geneva Conference which is now resulting in the complete takeover of Laos by the Communists. In fact, Mr. Harriman has been involved in many of the disastrous agreements, particularly regarding Rumania. If the President insists on continuing to send the Nation on a suicidal course in international affairs, the least he can do is to put an engineer at the throttle who will recognize danger signals when they are flashing.

American Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 some of my colleagues attacked American liberalism by way of equating the platform of Americans for Democratic Action with that of the Socialist Party and the publicly stated position of the Communist Party. This linkage is frankly false because it attempts to directly associate liberalism with socialism and socialism with communism. This tortured logic, if extended, as was done on the floor, allows no difference in principle, philosophy, and methodology between liberalism and communism and democratic socialism and communism.

Mr. Speaker, such reckless charges violate the American tradition because they neither deal with the merits of any issue nor bear any resemblance to the truth. These allegations attempt to relegate to the ash heap those practices which are traditional, appropriate, and proper in American political life. I would hope that my conservative colleagues would call liberals to task if they ever link conservatism with reaction and reaction with fascism.

A cursory knowledge of American politics should clearly demonstrate that liberals are not Socialists and Socialists are not liberals and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Communist. By the same token, conservatives are not reactionaries and reactionaries are not conservatives and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Fascist. The test we must apply is how well do the liberals and conservatives meet today's challenge through use of democratic processes.

In this time of continual crisis, which we have faced since the beginning of the cold war, we need liberals and conservatives who participate fully, vigorously, and effectively in the dialogue on the great issues affecting Americans today—how to enhance the freedom of all Americans, abolish poverty and regain full employment, protect our security by encouraging independent nations elsewhere, and maintain peace.

Ours is an open, strong society. Its strength rests on a vigorous clash of ideas competing in the open. It is in this context that liberals and conservatives must battle. The subverters of our Constitution—the Communist Party, the White Citizens Councils, the John Birch Society and their fellow travelers—shun the marketplace of ideas and instead pursue conspiratorial avenues of political influence that inject fear and falsehood into American politics.

I propose to discuss only two items: the meaning of the ADA platform and the application of the liberal and conservative ideologies.

The ADA platform covers many items. This is so because ADA is a multiinterest national political organization. Its members are interested in domestic and foreign policy and so ADA takes a stand on a whole host of issues from the problems our aging face through making the United Nations a better instrument for freedom and peace. The ADA stand is not always correct. As a member of its national board, I do not agree with every policy ADA supports. And I dare say no member in ADA agrees with each and every ADA position. That is always the case in a democratic organization which arrives at its positions after discussion and debate, where ideas clash and one policy prevails over another.

Liberalism and ADA will be judged by their purposes and goals, their past achievements and future accomplishments. ADA has stood the test of time, for as President Kennedy told the 16th annual ADA convention, held in May of this year—a convention I had the honor to address and, yes, even criticize ADA in a serious but friendly vein—"you have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics and looking back you can take satisfaction that on the whole, time has confirmed the rightness of your judgments."

Mr. Speaker, I request that President Kennedy's message to ADA's 16th annual convention be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Liberalism and ADA stand for affirmative goals. The fulfillment of the individual in a just and responsible world is our goal. ADA believes that its goals can be achieved in only one way: through the democratic process. ADA practices democracy by participating in election campaigns, generating ideas, stimulating thought. Its performance is always in public for all to judge, evaluate, accept or reject.

ADA welcomes to its ranks only those whose devotion to political freedom is unqualified. Those who apologize for segregation have no place in ADA. Those who apologize for Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Spain, the Dominican Republic under Trujillo, Venezuela under Jiminez, have no place in ADA.

But let us examine what the conclusions of two recognized scholars are about ADA. Prof. David Shannon of Columbia University in his book, "The Decline of American Communism," concludes that ADA was one of the most important factors after World War II, in converting the non-Communist left into the anti-Communist left at home and abroad. ADA fought the Communist issue on preservation of principle without violating democratic procedure. We did not engage in the recklessness of false accusation and scare tactics as so many who use the issue of communism solely for political profit.

Prof. Max Lerner of Brandeis University in his preface to "Americans for Democratic Action"—a book incidentally sympathetic with ADA's philosophy but not uncritical of ADA—says:

> There can be no doubt that without the ADA American political thought and action would have become more extremist at both ends, left and right.

The ADA record in support of expanding democracy is clear. We believe in more freedom at home—a vigorous defense of the Bill of Rights and immediate implementation of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Today as in past years we oppose imperial expansion and internal dictatorship. To those who resist dictatorship, Communist or otherwise, and support democracy, we lend our support. We look toward a world where all people may share our freedom—a world without aggression, a disarmed world subject to effective inspection and control.

We are disappointed, however, that too many conservatives too often have not upheld their acknowledged belief in constitutional process and the rule of law. For the greatest contribution of conservatives to American democracy would be to rid their organizations, such as Americans for Constitutional Action, of undemocratic John Birch Society members and its equally undemocratic fellow travelers and at the same time join American liberals in supporting comprehensive civil rights legislation, that is real and not a sham, to fulfill the constitutional mandate of the 14th and 15th amendments. The conservatives' failure to meet this responsibility will mean that the American people are the losers, for it is the American ideal that will remain unfulfilled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have not gone into the subject which fascinates ADA and administration critics: namely, that ADA'ers run this country. Judging by ADA's criticisms of the administration, one could never imagine that ADA is running the country. Furthermore, glaring inaccuracies in statements made by my conservative colleagues lead me, for one, to wonder how much credence can be given to their arguments on substantive issues. I refer specifically to Mr. HALL's remarks appearing on page 10739 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. HALL said that "the 35 ADA'ers in key administrative positions include" ABRAHAM RIBICOFF as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Arthur Goldberg as Secretary of Labor. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, I believe, has been elected to the U.S. Senate from Connecticut, and Arthur Goldberg, of course, is the newest member of the Supreme Court. This is but one example of how out of date are many of the thoughts of my conservative friends.

J.F.K. TO ADA

I am happy to send my greetings to the 16th annual convention of ADA. During these years, you have striven valiantly for social progress and civil freedom at home and for liberty and peace in the world. You have done this in the face of clamor and criticism, and you have seen the causes for which you have fought move steadily ahead toward fulfillment. You have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics. Looking back, you can take satisfaction that time has on the whole confirmed the rightness of your judgments.

Now again we look to the future. This strong country of ours faces all of the problems that come with a complex and changing economy in a revolutionary world. This administration—in the field of economic and monetary policy, in education, in the care for the sick, retarded, and the aged—has put forward programs to provide a greater participation in the American life for all of our citizens. This country cannot turn its back on the urgent problems of the day: four and a half million unemployed, an inadequate educational system, a growing tangle of urban blight, pockets of poverty that reproach our affluence, a large segment of our citizens still denied their civil rights, the massive problems of the developing nations and, above all, the overwhelming need to turn the world's momentum toward destruction into an equivalent momentum for production and peace.

I may not always agree with ADA on how these goals should be pursued, or they with me; but I salute the role you have played—and will continue to play—in supporting new initiatives and new ideas, in freshening our political dialog, and in countering those who reject the future, doubt the present and labor to keep us mired forever in the past.

Message by Congressman Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, to the Delegates to the World Feed Conference From 100 Foreign Nations on This Side of the Iron Curtain Now Being Held in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MESSAGE BY CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, TO THE DELEGATES TO THE WORLD FEED CONFERENCE FROM 100 FOREIGN NATIONS ON THIS SIDE OF THE IRON CURTAIN NOW BEING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, being a member of the congressional delegation to this conference to devise ways and means to help feed the hungry people of this troubled world, I am impelled to make the following remarks which I hope you will all take in the spirit in which this statement is made.

We welcome you here in the United States of America, land where God has been good to us, by giving us such a plentiful supply of sunshine and rain, and rich productive soil which our farmers keep productive by good soil and moisture conservation practices which was started here only 27 years ago, to the end that, we have a surplus of feed, food, and fiber and which we want to share with you folks across the seven seas, but we want to be sure it reaches the people we want to help, which we know it has not to a marked degree up to this time. So I say without fear or favor that unless you leaders, here representing your respective countries, see to it henceforth that, the right people do receive these commodities, then your time and money attending this conference has to a marked degree been wasted.

Your time and money will also have been wasted in coming here unless on your return home you do not start a crusade to establish a land reform program in your respective countries if such a program has not already been established in your homeland.

It has been my good fortune to visit some 40 foreign nations and to observe the problems of the people there, and it was crystal clear to me that most of those problems were found in the nations where most of the land was owned by the great powerful land barons, who had for past centuries permitted their once-productive soil to wash away, blow away, and erode away and thus become unproductive to the end that hunger, strife, and internal unrest is now and has been for centuries past, the order of the day as all of you well know who come from such countries as I have just described.

I will refrain from naming those countries, but I will name some of the countries abroad who have since World War II established a land reform program: Pakistan, India, Japan, Formosa, and Thailand just to name a few. We are all glad and relieved to know that, in all those nations, hunger and internal unrest and strife is gradually disappearing, and as a consequence, the Communist conspiracy to rule them and the entire world is being effectively blocked.

Land reform programs were established in all those nations by peaceful means. The government took little to great blocks of land paying a reasonable price to the owners, divided it up in small economic acreages which were sold at a reasonable price to the former peasant farmworkers on a long-term payment basis, at a low interest rate, and also made necessary farm machinery available to the new owners with irrigation where needed, along with technical farm advice by people experienced in the art of good farming, many of them former U.S. farm boy graduates of the State Agriculture College at Ames, Iowa.

It is noteworthy that the only ineffective land reform program that has recently been established is in Cuba, where Castro by armed force, and by rolling heads in typical Communist style, took complete control of every farm and every segment of the Cuban people, their industries, churches, and schools. All of which is doomed to failure, and must be eliminated from the Western Hemisphere and soon and by force if necessary as the last resort. Now even though that is another story, nonetheless if not soon brought to heel, the peace of the entire world will be in jeopardy.

Thus my friends I pray and plead and admonish every one of you to unite with us in cutting away this cancerous growth from our body politic before it engulfs all of us in another world war more destructive to life and property than all the wars that have been fought on this earth.

In closing I beg of all to remember always that, Uncle Sam covets nothing that does not belong to the people of the United States of America. We seek only peace and freedom for ourselves and for you. Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain.

Flag Day Address by Senator Morton, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address given by my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], at the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Milwaukee on June 14, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON, OF KENTUCKY

Do you agree that the legislative branch of Government is indispensable? Or do you prefer rule by Executive rather than rule by representative? The keystone of our representative form of government has recently been challenged, and to this new issue, which traverses all American tradition and crosses all party lines, may we address ourselves tonight.

In this country, Government, like the flag, stands for the people.

The flag was a dear subject to an uncle of mine, R. C. Ballard Thruston, and he wrote a history of it which was adopted and printed by the 69th Congress in 1926. Reading his treatise, I noted that the flag evolved from the personal flags of the English and Scottish kings. Take note, not the flags of the English and Scottish peoples, but the kings. The flag was the king's.

This difference between a king's flag and a people's flag symbolizes the challenge to American representative government.

Not long ago, self-government, implemented by the representative system, would never have been questioned in this Nation. For by self-government, and that alone, Americans have been free, are free, and shall be free. But there is a new doctrine. This scheme has sprung up inside this Nation. Its spokesmen are our fellow citizens—free men kept free by the institution their doctrine subverts.

The doctrine has no name, but it is the doctrine of the master planner. Its sponsors consider themselves the elite, the ruling class.

What precisely do they have in mind? I shall read you a statement of this doctrine. One of our richest and most prestigious scholarly foundations issued it. Its author, having raised the question of how are we doing with respect to the processes of democratic self-government, concludes this way:

"It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down—the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

To rectify conditions as he sees them, the author would amend the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives to 4 years, to decrease the terms of Senators to 4 years, and to hold all congressional elections in presidential election years.

The author of this is a Senator. Had he been from another branch of the Government, his opinion would not have been so shocking. It could have been written off as another typical example of the new party line.

And this line separates not Republicans from Democrats but rather the arrogant, self-appointed omniscients of rule by the few from us old-fashioned types who continue to believe in the virtues of limited government and balanced power, the twin bulwarks of free society. But, as I said, he is a Senator and the former mayor of a great eastern city. I have unwavering faith in Joe Clark's sincerity. His reasoning I question.

He is correct in every count if:

(1) If the measure of our democratic representation is its speed in bowing unthinking to every decree from the Executive.

(2) If legislative productivity be judged by the amount of debt piled on the living as well as the unrepresented generations to come.

(3) If he would reduce the legislative, the powerful right arm of the people, to a spineless bunch of yes men who hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil.

Let's look more deeply into this doctrine. Let's put our finger on its basic assumptions. Besides taking for granted that the people are not receiving true representation from those they elect and, in most cases, re-elect, its says that a tiny handful of willful minor deities can do the job. Can they? I doubt it.

They have tried and failed. Irving Kristol, editor of "Basic Books," writing in the New Leader, has this to say about such a regime.

"The basic fault * * * is that it suffers from delusions of managerial omnicompetence. Its vaunted (philosophy of government) too often seems to amount to nothing more than a ruthless opportunism in small matters of politicking and administration, combined with a self-righteous and doctrinaire obstinacy on large matters of policy."

And what is the end result of rule by this elite? Mr. Kristol expresses it thus:

"In sum, that very sophistication and wide-ranging thoughtfulness which makes (the elite) so intellectually attractive also seems to make it so practically ineffectual. In politics intelligence and imagination are qualities to be desired, but it is a misfortune when they are not subordinated to a readiness to look reality in the face, to recognize its plain features, and to act with a simple decisiveness. It requires strength of character to act upon one's ideas; it requires no less strength of character to resist being seduced by them."

In other words, this ruling elite thinks it can make no mistake, but it does.

The doctrine of the ruling class would remove our only protection from the Executive's poor judgment. The legislative branch embodies that protection. But if every Member of Congress, was elected with the President, don't you see that the majority would be a pack of coattail riders, rubber stamping every proposal from the White House regardless of its value.

That is not the function of Congress, nor is it anything but the abdication of reason to vest so much power in the Executive. The United States has thrived on the system of checks and balances, the limitation of power.

Walter Lippmann, the columnist, once wrote:

"The genius of the American system is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea.

"For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce. It is necessary to postpone the decision, to respect the opposition, and then accept the burden of trying to persuade it."

We respect the opposition. That is important. We respect it because we recognize our own limitations. We are aware that we can be wrong, and we take that into account in our affairs.

The ruling class, however, would not allow for that. In essence, they are right. If you disagree with them, you are wrong, and they would bury you.

Delusions of managerial omnicompetence are part of the false underpinning of the ruling class doctrine. The other part, I said, was disbelief that representatives truly represent.

If you take a quick look at the 88th Congress, you'll see that few bills have passed, that for a long time none were, and that the Senate almost as soon as it convened got tied up in a filibuster over one of its rules of procedure. I can understand how someone develops reservations about the legislative process.

But if you take a long look at Congress, you will see much more. It is, in fact, the meeting ground for the countless and contradictory needs and interests that arise from this gigantic and very complex Nation.

Its task, with respect to all sides, is to reconcile the contradictions, to determine priorities and find and reflect the national will. The difficulties become gargantuan because Congress is the voice of the people in a Nation of some 180-odd millions.

The national will, how can it emerge from the diversities and inner confines of this country? The considered judgment of the whole people can only come—never easily and never perfectly—from the sober deliberations of responsive and responsible legislative assemblies.

And each one of these assemblies is composed of thoughtful and hardworking men and women—responsive to the ballot box but, more basically, responsible to certain enduring standards of right and justice that tradition has deposited, experience has tempered, and time has tested .

I do not think I either exaggerate or glorify when I say that the Congress, at the apex of our representative system, has always been the national forum in which this painstaking process has gone forward.

"Process" is the key word. Senator Clark uses this same word, but he seems not to understand its real meaning. The political process which produces the national will is, of necessity, disorderly and often disorganized; it is inherently slow and deliberate; it refuses to conform neatly to any textbook of rules and procedures; it defies perfectly logical analysis.

For one reason, no political process accurately mirroring the scope of our society and purporting to serve it could possibly be other than complex—filled with competition and conflict.

The second reason is more important still. The focus of all of America's institutions, their dependence and their ultimate strength is people: individual citizens, free men and women. In times of greatest crisis we are most acutely aware of this fact. Then, the slick flow charts and the scientific procedures go out the window and what we have left are dedicated citizens who discharge their duty not because the rules say they must but, quite simply, because it is the duty that they freely assumed.

The Congress, too, is preeminently a human institution. And as I have already noted, it is indispensably the deliberative forum which echoes the multitude of America's competing and conflicting interests—echoes and then refines them. Its purpose is not just to respond but to represent. Its typical mode of operation to weigh and to balance—and only then to decide, in about equal parts by acting, by not acting, or by acting in ways that could not possibly have been predicted at the outset of the process. The ballot box and its own best apprehension of the national good are, equally, its benchmarks.

The difficulties of Congress and other legislative bodies boil down to the fact that they represent the people. The legislative is the epitome of the democratic system. No President of the United States shall ever be as close to the citizens of Milwaukee as Representatives Zablocki and Reuss. Consequently, no President shall ever protect the interests peculiar to this city as will its elected representatives. If the incumbents don't, the people will trade them in on a new model. What holds for Milwaukee in this respect also holds for every other community of the Nation.

Yes, I think the legislative branch is indispensable. It is the single limb of American Government that is close enough to you to be called, in a real sense, yours—whether you live in Maine or California, Minnesota or Mississippi.

Earlier, I mentioned the flag. Do you know that whenever either House of Congress is in session the flag flies above its Chamber? This is appropriate because the flag stands for us.

But if you strip the powers of Congress and give them to the Executive you may as well haul down that remarkable standard and trample it in the dust.

For when Americans release their individual freedom and make a king, they will have desecrated the flag.

I hope such will never occur. I believe it never shall, because so long as we know from what our freedom comes, we shall see to it that that billowing, bright-colored cloth we unashamedly call Old Glory floats above the great Houses of self-government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 145: 3: *Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and His greatness is unsearchable.*

Eternal God, our Father, by Thy wise and gracious providence, we live and move and have our being.

Grant that in these days of national crises we may be the uncompromising champion of righteousness and justice.

We humbly confess that we are often so timid and hesitant in applying these principles.

Penitently we acknowledge that we are frequently disobedient to our noblest moral instincts and impulses.

Show us how urgently we need to be delivered from the blight of spiritual blindness and the servitude to the mammon of materialism.

May we always seek to help humanity cultivate and develop its capacities to attain unto a greater splendor of character and conduct.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; and

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees;

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963–64 national high school debate subject of "Medicare."

PRINTING OF EULOGIES IN HONOR OF THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES PATRICK McGRANERY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the eulogies presented on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 7, 1963, in honor of the late Honorable James Patrick McGranery, together with other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In lieu of the number of copies of House documents to be printed and their distribution prescribed by section 54 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U.S.C. 131), there shall be printed two hundred copies of the House document referred to in the first section of this resolution which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct and which shall be distributed under the direction of the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania, to members of the family of the said James Patrick McGranery and other interested persons.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF EULOGIES AS A TRIBUTE TO MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 343 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the eulogies delivered in the House of Representatives in the first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress as a tribute to the life and ideals of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, together with any other relevant material, be printed as a House document; and that thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and two thousand five hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] if the gentleman will not assure the House that all of these resolutions were unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on Printing and by the full Committee on House Administration, and that this list includes some 15 printing bills, 5 of which are Senate concurrent resolutions with which the House generally concurs?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I would be very happy to assure the Members of the House that what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] says is true. These resolutions did come from the subcommittee unanimously and unanimously from the full committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 119, ENTITLED "PATTERN OF COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 357.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 119, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "COMMUNIST YOUTH ACTIVITIES (EIGHTH WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL, HELSINKI, FINLAND, 1962)"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 358.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Youth Activities (Eighth World Youth Festival, Helsinki, Finland, 1962)", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "COMMUNIST AND TROTSKYIST ACTIVITY WITHIN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES CHAPTER OF THE FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 359.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities seven thousand additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist and Trotskyist Activity Within the Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—AND THE TRUTH—ABOUT CONDITIONS IN SOVIET RUSSIA"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 360.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Propaganda—And the Truth—About Conditions in Soviet Russia (Testimony of David P. Johnson)", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 336, ENTITLED "FACTS ON COMMUNISM—VOLUME I, THE COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 161.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities twenty thousand additional copies each of House Document Numbered 336, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, The Communist Ideology"; and House Document Numbered 139, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev".

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NUMBERED 2559

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 162.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 2559, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1961."

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "COMMUNIST OUTLETS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF SOVIET PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES, PARTS 1 AND 2"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 163.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies each of the publications entitled "Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States, Parts 1 and 2", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS (MEDICAL AID TO CUBA COMMITTEE AND FRIENDS OF BRITISH GUIANA), PARTS 1 AND 2"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 164.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies each of the publications entitled "U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments (Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and Friends of British Guiana), Parts 1 and 2," Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINT COPIES OF THE COMMITTEE PRINT, EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios of Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR USE OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF ITS HEARING OF THE 87TH CONGRESS ON "SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand additional copies of its hearings of August 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11, 1961, Eighty-seventh Congress, entitled "Space Satellite Communications."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF THE HEARINGS OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 35.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee fifteen hundred additional copies of part 1 of its hearings on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, current Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF A REPORT AND HEARINGS ON STATE DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY ISSUED BY ITS INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 37.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary eight thousand additional copies of the report (committee print) of its Internal Security Subcomimttee of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State Department Security"; five thousand copies each of part 1 (the William Wieland case), part 2 (the Office of Security), part 3 (the new passport regulations), part 4 (testimony of Elmer Hipsley, Otto Otepka, John Leahy, Roger Jones, Scott McLeod, Andreas Lowenfeld), and part 5 (testimony of William Wieland), of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on State Department security; and five thousand additional copies of part 13 of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS 1 AND 2 OF THE 1963 HEARINGS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy one thousand additional copies each of part 1 and part 2 of its 1963 hearings on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we should be somewhat fair in this matter of being unfair, and if there is going to be objection lodged to unanimous-consent requests for 1 minute on our side, I only wish to state that that is going to be done on this side, also. I will not object at this time, but I certainly will give notice that it will be done in the future.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that a Member is entitled to make 1-minute speeches, and I would trust that maybe we could let bygones be bygones and from now on recognize that right that has been established here for quite some time.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is why I said I will not object at this time, but if they are going to object to requests on this side, I will object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust that our friends will not object to 1-minute speeches on either side of the aisle hereafter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STOP FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SEGREGATION

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have filed with the Clerk of the House a discharge petition for H.R. 5741. This bill provides that no Federal financial or other assistance may be furnished in connection with any program or activity in the United States in which any individual is discriminated against on the ground of his race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.

The President in his civil rights speech on June 11 reminded the Nation that Congress has not yet fully made a commitment "to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law." The time to begin is now. H.R. 5741 would outlaw in one measure the spending of Federal funds for segregated programs. There is absolutely no defense for the continuation of this practice. The Federal Government cannot on one hand urge all citizens to end discrimination and on the other hand underwrite segregation. The use of Federal funds for segregated programs is an outrage to our fundamental principles and a violation of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, in the past antidiscrimination amendments have been offered to appropriation and authorization bills. As recently as April 30, when the 1964 Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill was before the House, I proposed amendments to eliminate segregation in the impacted areas program and the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. These amendments were defeated. During the 88th and 87th Congresses antidiscrimination amendments have been defeated some 8 times in the House and rejected some 14 times in the other body.

When an antidiscrimination amendment is offered, the argument is made invariably that its adoption would insure the defeat of the principal, underlying legislation. And when it is offered by a Member on the other side of the aisle, it is assumed that it is a political device designed to kill the bill. There are Members who argue that such an amendment should be defeated in order to save the main bill.

I have consistently supported these amendments, even when I was the only member of my political party to do so.

On April 24, 1963, an antidiscrimination amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] to H.R. 12, the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963, was defeated by a teller vote with 146 ayes and 186 noes. I supported the Sibal amendment and so did 145 other Members. I hope that those who voted for it will join now in signing this discharge petition. That will make it clear that the Members on the other side of the aisle acted in good faith and not out of a desire to kill or gut H.R. 12.

By bringing this measure to the floor and passing it, the House will at last make it clear that the Federal Government will contribute no longer to segregated programs. At the same time this kind of amendment will be removed as a political issue.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot remain silent while our Supreme Court continues to exclude from our public schools appropriate voluntary references to the existence of Almighty God. To me, the pattern of the Court's decisions in relation to an acknowledgment of Divinity and encouragement to young minds to recognize an Infinite Being is tragically unnecessary. There is no need to interpret the first amendment so strictly when these affairs have been upon the basis of voluntary alternatives.

We are a Christian nation under God, conceived as such, spawned as such, dedicated to religious freedom and to belief in God. The Court's action literally invites from an omnipotent and omniscient being the assignment of this country to the purge list of infinity. Shades of the Roman Empire and its materialism. In the name of legal verbosity and intellectual technicality the Court reflects a new cynicism that, in substance, before the great dispenser of infinite justice seems to me to be asking for trouble.

It has been said so pointedly that the real question in determining the eventual success or failure of democracy in the world is not whether God is on our side but whether we are on God's side. The pattern of these decisions of the Supreme Court does not help us to be on God's side. I simply cannot understand what the Court is trying to do.

BALTIC DEPORTATIONS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 22 years have passed since that anguish-filled week in June 1941 when the Soviet occupation forces rounded up some 60,000 men, women, and children in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and shipped them to slave labor camps in Siberia. There is no reliable way of determining the fate of these unfortunate souls, but we do know that a great many of them died.

This was only the beginning, too, for the mass deportations resumed when the Red army reoccupied the Baltic in 1944 behind the retreating German troops. A total of at least 500,000 persons from the three former republics are known to have been deported. Among these torture, disease, starvation, and insanity took a heavy toll.

The passage of time tends to deaden the memory of these horrible events, but for many people they retain their searing immediacy. I refer, of course, to the survivors of these deportations and to the relatives and friends of those who were never heard of again. In a more general way, all Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians remember these Soviet atrocities, whether they have continued to live in their homeland or have sought freedom in the West.

These memories, however painful, have strengthened the Baltic people's determination to resist continuing efforts to extinguish all traces of their national character and spirit. Totalitarian systems can brook no diversity and the Soviets are impelled to suppress the national minorities of the U.S.S.R. and to force the Baltic peoples to conform to the Soviet pattern. But these gallant, independent-minded folk have withstood many threats to their existence, most notably the mass deportations and exterminations of the wartime occupation and immediate postwar period. This is a heartening fact, for it inspires confidence that their continuing struggle for freedom and happiness will be crowned with success.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF VOTE FRAUDS, IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THE VOTING CIVIL RIGHTS OF EVERYONE, IS DEMANDED IN CLEAN ELECTIONS BILL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for a thorough investigation of vote fraud cases in those instances where American citizens are being unlawfully accorded or denied the right to vote or to have the votes properly counted in any election of presidential electors, Members of the U.S. Senate, or of the House of Representatives as the result of any pattern or practice of fraud in the conduct of such election. In order to get such a study properly underway, my bill includes these additional areas of investigation within the scope of an agency already considering matters regarding voting, and that is the Civil Rights Commission. Thus the Commission would be studying ways of protecting not only the voting rights of the minority, but of the majority as well.

Today, the average citizen may feel complacent in his belief that revolutionary methods of communication and the increased sophistication of the electorate have all but done away with fraud at the polls. The fact is, though, that the political and social developments of modern times have not made extinct the vote thief. In fact, one recent estimate has indicated that at least 1 million votes are stolen during a presidential election. Of course, open violence is not as prevalent today as it was in 1926, for example, when Don Mellett, editor and publisher of the Canton (Ohio) Daily News, was shot and killed for exposing ballot-box stuffing, police graft, and political fraud. But, the more refined tactics continue to be plied with astonishing success.

Some methods are time tested, such as chain balloting, "ghost" election boards, false canvasses, vote buying, multiple voting, voting of transients, graveyard voting, disqualification of valid voters, qualification of invalid voters, and falsification of voter's affidavits. But, modern variations are also being employed, such as rigged election machines and tampering with absentee ballots which have become more important, with millions of Americans residing overseas.

About one-third of the country still votes by paper ballot. This situation affords a choice field for plying the old vote stealing trade, as may be seen by some recent reports on the subject.

The Chicago Election Board, for example, opened 906 ballot boxes after the 1960 election in order to count the vote for President, as well as for some local offices. In at least 200 precincts, the vote had been counted wrong. In the same election, an individual, appointed to investigate fraud charges in Cook County, found that, in 42 precincts, election judges had indulged in "complimentary" miscounting—that is, overcounting votes for one candidate and undercounting approximately the same number for his opponent. Of even greater concern was the Chicago precinct captain and two henchmen who were sent to jail for altering ballots after the polls closed.

While on the subject of ballot alteration, by the way, I believe I should briefly describe what a fine art this has become. A much-admired practice is for an election official to conceal a small piece of lead in his hand—preferably in his fingernail or within a bandaged finger. By this means, he is able to mark a ballot, which was deposited unmarked, for a desired candidate. The same device is also used to invalidate a ballot which has already been marked by the voter. Similarly, invalidation may be accomplished by the individual tearing of an otherwise valid ballot with a sharpened ring that he wears on a finger. Through these means, and many more, qualified voters are disenfranchised and honest citizens are denied civil rights, as surely as if they had not been granted the rights.

Continuing on, in Texas, during the 1960 election, evidence was produced that in some counties large numbers of ballots were thrown out for technical errors, while in many other counties ballots were accepted which bore the same errors. Similarly, the Houston Chronicle conducted a spot check of the 1960 vote in 11 counties and found that the Texas law had not been complied with to account for the paper ballots which were thrown out for alleged improper markings. Since the ballots, regarded as invalid, were not properly kept for canvassing by higher authorities, no one will ever know how many voted for whom and whether valid votes were uncounted.

In Philadelphia, where the committee of 70 has performed admirably as a public watchdog, leads have been supplied in a recent election to convict a political worker who had pulled the handle of a voting machine 327 times. In nearby Chester, Pa., in 1961, a committeeman was sentenced to 6 months in jail for voting 43 times in 2 elections—impersonating a different voter in each case.

The introduction of voting machines has reduced the opportunities for election chicanery. Yet, even here, cases of thieving and fraud are regularly found. One means for practicing this art, it is stated, is to wedge a nail, hairpin, or small piece of wood under a voting lever to keep it from registering. A less imaginative scheme came to light in early 1962, when five men and women were convicted of inducing impersonation in the 1958 Philadelphia election. These individuals had gone into the street and had rounded up teenage girls to impersonate registered voters. After the girls had falsely registered, they entered the polling booth, where they found a man who pulled the appropriate levers for them. They each received a dollar or two for their brief task. In Chicago, meanwhile, voting machines were checked after the 1960 election. There it was discovered that some election officials could not even transcribe the totals on the counting devices to their tally sheets correctly. These were not merely instances of figures being transposed. The totals on the machines sometimes bore no resemblance to those on the tally sheets.

Many other examples of illicit practices could be cited which would reveal the ways citizens can and have been denied their voting rights. But, I have presented enough, I believe, to demonstrate my firm conviction that it is as equally important to provide for honest elections as it is to provide the opportunity to vote.

Raymond Moley has stated:

> There have been laws and proposals to protect the voting rights of Negroes and to control the activities of corporations and labor organizations. There seems to be no reason why Federal power with new legislation should not protect the accuracy and honesty of voting generally.

Mr. Moley was addressing himself to the enactment of Federal legislation to supervise Federal elections. I agree with him in this sentiment, but before we can act intelligently we need thorough, up-to-date information which can be professionally obtained if the Civil Rights Commission is granted the additional authority to probe the cancerous growth of voting fraud which exists in many elections today. Similarly, the Commission, through spotlighting the evil practices that take place in many polling stations, will spur local communities to shoulder their own responsibility for correcting abuses. Through these combined forces, I am convinced that a giant step forward will have been taken in protecting an individual's right to vote and to have his vote fairly counted.

Thus, I have today introduced an amendment which would extend the jurisdiction of the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate voting irregularities wherever and to whomever they may occur.

At present, the Commission is limited to investigating voting irregularities only when a minority group is involved.

But, the right to vote is everybody's right, not just the right of the few; and, Congress has the duty to protect the voting rights of the majority as well as the minority in Federal elections.

My bill would broaden the jurisdiction of the Commission to include all vote fraud cases, voting being the civil right protected.

In the first session of the last Congress, I introduced this amendment to the Civil Rights Commission extension bill. The Judiciary Committee favorably reported my amendment and, in its report, said:

EXPLANATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT

The right to vote is the cornerstone of representative self-government in America. As such, it is imperative that the franchise of every qualified citizen be adequately and effectively safeguarded and protected.

Congress, in 1957, concerned with extensive allegations that certain qualified citizens were being arbitrarily denied the right to vote, or to have their vote properly counted, established the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate charges that the franchise of minorities was being abused. This duty of the Commission was set forth in section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c(a)):

"The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain persons are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based."

In 1956, Mr. Herbert Brownell, then the Attorney General, described the proposed operation of the Commission in an executive communication to the Speaker (see p. 14, H. Rept. 291, 85th Cong., 1st sess.):

"Where there are charges that by one means or another the vote is being denied, we must find out all of the facts—the extent, the methods, the results."

* * * * *

"The need for a full scale public study as requested by the President is manifest. The executive branch of the Federal Government has no general investigative power of the scope required to undertake such a study. The study should be objective and free from partisanship. It should be broad and at the same time thorough."

Although the amendment was favorably reported, the Members of the House never had an opportunity to vote on it because, according to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, in debate before the House on September 12, 1961, no application was ever made to his committee for a rule to bring the bill to a vote.

Bottling up this amendment in 1961 was a most revealing feat of legislative chicanery. It indicated very strongly that the so-called champions of civil rights, the self-proclaimed liberals, are the very ones who fear legislation for civil rights for the majority as well as the minority.

For, it was the liberals, not the more conservative members, who fought this bill in committee and prevented it from coming before the House for a vote.

And, it was the then Deputy Attorney General, Byron R. White, who opposed this legislation on behalf of the administration.

It appeared that those who most vigorously attacked civil rights in the South, were the very ones who feared most an investigation of everyone's civil right to have his vote counted and not watered down with fraudulent voting in the North as well as the South.

For further background information on this legislation, I am inserting the remarks concerning this bill that appeared in the Record on September 12, 1961:

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the House just a few minutes ago discussed but did not take a vote on the conference report on the Justice Department and other agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 7371.

Included in the conference report was a very important piece of substantive legislation, the extension of the Civil Rights Commission, which was added by the other body as a rider to this appropriation bill.

The manner in which this has been handled, the lack of opportunity on the part of this body to have the chance to consider the merits with regard to the Civil Rights Commission bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of this body on August 18, clearly indicates that there is something wrong, at least in my opinion, with the manner in which substantive riders are added by the other body to matters that are not related thereto, and in this instance amounts to legislation on an appropriation which would be subject to a point of order if contained in H.R. 7371 in the House—but it is not as a part of the conference report.

Here is what has happened. The Committee on the Judiciary on August 18 reported out an extension of the Civil Rights Commission and included an amendment that is of vital importance so far as the jurisdiction of that Commission is concerned. This amendment was considered on its merits by the committee. The amendment would give the Civil Rights Commission the authority to investigate all vote fraud cases generally, vote fraud cases among the majority as well as the minority. That amendment which I offered in committee was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill was reported as amended by the Committee on the Judiciary on August 18, but no rule has ever been granted. Therefore, the House has been denied absolutely and completely the opportunity of considering that amendment on its merits. The committee report itself indicates the importance of the amendment, a substantive amendment as proposed and voted out by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater right that a human being has, if you talk about civil rights in America, a free society, a representative form of government, than the right to vote by either the majority or minority. This amendment was for the purpose of giving to the people in America the assurance, so far as the Civil Rights Commission could do it, that they would enjoy the right to vote and to have the voted counted. In other words, give somebody the authority to investigate flagrant voting fraud cases, of which I have evidence in substantial quantity in my files and which has been carried in the press. This matter of vote frauds has been discussed all over the country in the past.

The result of adding this substantive rider limiting it to extension of the Commission in the other body and bringing it in, in the form of a part of a conference report, denies the House any opportunity of working its will on the substantive legislation itself, and of greater importance, on the important clean elections amendment that was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary. It does not give the House the opportunity of considering it.

I discussed with the Parliamentarian how this amendment approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary might be considered under the circumstances, with a motion pending to recede and concur or to recede and concur with an amendment offered by the other body, and I was informed that is a priority motion, therefore no parliamentary procedure could be had except to vote that motion down, which in the makeup of the House at the present time is an impossibility. No motion to consider this clean elections amendment would be in order.

This indicates the shortcomings of the procedures of this body that permits such a rider added to an appropriation bill in the Senate to be included in a conference report with no opportunity for this body to work its will on the substantive matter itself.

Mr. Poff. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Cramer. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Poff. May I ask the gentleman if the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has asked the Rules Committee to grant a rule?

Mr. Cramer. Well, whether he has asked or not, I could not say definitely. But he certainly has not been successful. The distinguished chairman of our Judiciary Committee is quite persuasive in other matters with respect to acquiring a rule and a rule would be forthcoming if the leadership wanted it, especially with the stacked Rules Committee. It is inconceivable to me that he would not have been able to acquire a rule had he pressed for it or if the leadership wanted it and that we would have had the Civil Rights Commission extension legislation as a substantive matter on the floor of this House to be considered on its merits, as well as the amendment that was enacted rather than as a rider in a conference report on an unrelated appropriation bill.

Mr. Poff. It is my understanding that the Commission is authorized under the parent legislation to investigate charges of the denial of the right to vote on account of race, creed or color. The amendment adopted in the Judiciary Committee expanded the authority of the Commission to authorize investigations of charges of deprivation of the right to vote by means of fraud or any illegal act; is that correct?

Mr. Cramer. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In effect, it protects for everyone the basic constitutional right to vote and to have that vote counted; that is, the civil rights being protected. It protects those rights for all Americans, not only for the minority members. That was the objective involved.

The Speaker pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Andersen of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object to Mr. Cramer having 3 additional minutes, but I do want to vote on this other bill before we forget what the matter is all about.

Mr. Cramer. I appreciate the statement by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Andersen of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will share my concern about my clean elections amendment which was offered in the Judiciary Committee and approved by the Judiciary Committee in the Civil Rights Extension bill. The committee instructed the chairman to request a rule on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission with the vote fraud amendment. Such a rule was not forthcoming. Here we get in the dying days of the session this substantive piece of legislation—the extension of the

Civil Rights Commission as a rider to an appropriation bill, with no opportunity whatsoever to work the will of the House on an amendment offered by this body.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield further the fact that my good friend from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is arguing the matter as he is, is conducive toward my feeling that I should support his position.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I just wish there were a parliamentary procedure whereby we were able to get in this substantive clean elections provision at this time. The only recourse now is to vote down the motion to recede and concur in the Senate rider, amendment No. 25.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reported favorably on this amendment, and in that report said as follows:

> "If it is true that the denial of freedom to any American is a diminution of freedom to all Americans, then we cannot tolerate restrictions on the franchise from any quarter—for any cause. If the constitutional right to vote is worth protecting through a Federal agency for any Americans, it is worth protecting through such agency for all Americans."

Can anyone argue with that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. With reference to the question as to whether an application was made to the Committee on Rules for a rule to bring out the judiciary bill, I want to say as chairman of the Rules Committee that to my knowledge no request was ever made for a rule. I did not know the bill had been reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Based upon the way the Rules Committee is now constituted, there certainly would have been no question about your having had an opportunity to get a rule and have the matter debated fully on the floor of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. Does the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee feel that the manner in which this legislation has been considered by tacking on a substantive rider to an appropriations bill for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission and not permitting the House to consider it or my clean elections amendment is the way to legislate?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think not only in this instance, but in other instances it is an outrageous abuse of the parliamentary procedures, and the House should not stand for it.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree and I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say that the purpose for which it was done was to avoid the vote fraud amendment which was adopted by the Judiciary Committee and avoid the House having the opportunity to work its will on the question. There is no doubt but what the House would have approved this amendment.

It will be my objective in the future to press for the passage of this obviously necessary amendment protecting the civil right of everyone to vote when the civil rights matter is up for further consideration or in the next session when we have an opportunity to work our will on the merits.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were: ayes 61, noes 18.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of September 7, further consideration of the pending motion and the remaining amendments reported in disagreement will be postponed until tomorrow.

I also include the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [TOM CURTIS], on this amendment now introduced as a bill, and including an interesting but misguided letter from the Attorney General's office wherein excuses for opposing this clean elections approach are dreamed up.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the basic civil right, the right of franchise has two parts. If either part is missing the right does not exist. These two parts are: First, the right to vote; and second, the right to have that vote counted honestly.

The National Democratic Party, a three-headed coalition, consisting of the northern city machine Democrat, the southern Democrat, and the American for Democratic Action Democrat stands charged of violating one part of the right of franchise, the right to vote, through its southern head, and the other right of franchise, the right to have the vote counted honestly through its northern city machine head. The ADA Democrat though ideologically in support of civil rights, looks the other way when attempts are made to enforce the full right of franchise in our country.

In the 1961 session of the Congress, the gentleman from Florida [Congressman CRAMER], offered an amendment to the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission to enlarge its jurisdiction to include vote fraud, the right to have the vote counted honestly. This amendment was adopted by the House Judiciary Committee, but it seemed important to the northern city machine Democrat that this amendment die. Yet the northern city machine Democrat and the ADA Democrat dared not affront their constituency to whom they appeal for votes as great civil rights supporters by failing to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

What to do? The leaders of the Democratic National Party in the House and the Senate with the approval and guidance of the President tied the legislation up in the reformed House Rules Committee so that the House could not work its will, went over to the Senate and tacked on a nongermane amendment to a House-passed appropriation bill which extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission without jurisdiction over vote fraud.

The extension to the life of the Civil Rights Commission accordingly is part of a 1961 appropriation act.

I have just received a copy of a letter the then Deputy Attorney General, now Supreme Court Justice Byron R. White, wrote to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman CRAMER, on March 22, 1962, setting forth what is the Kennedy administration and the National Democratic Party's reasoning on why it is unconcerned about having the Civil Rights Commission look into vote fraud.

I am setting out the letter in its entirety so all may read the cynical casuistry it reveals:

The letter states: "In the absence of similar showing of inability of State and Federal law-enforcement agencies to deal with election frauds, an extension of the Commission's mandate to this area, would seem unwarranted."

The basic point made by the southern Democrats in resisting looking into denial of the right to vote has been that there had been no showing of inability of State and Federal laws to enforce the right to vote. Years of effort was necessary to overcome this opposition. Indeed the very purpose of establishing the Civil Rights Commission was to pin this point down. The southerners fought this matter tooth and toenail just as the city machine Democrats have fought successfully up to date, the looking into the deprivation of our people's right to have their vote counted honestly.

The letter states about the right to vote: "However, the investigation of such violations has been merely a part of a broad study of discrimination against minority groups."

According to this warped logic discrimination against majority groups has no part in a study of discrimination against minority groups. Be that as it may, the facts are that the deprivation of having the vote counted honestly is also largely directed to minority groups. This is true both in the rural South where it sometimes takes a strange twist of having Negroes vote not once but many times over—as directed—and in the big city areas where the constituencies are made up largely of minority groups, including Negroes.

I am hopeful that our citizens will see through the hypocrisy of the National Democratic Party as exemplified by the position it has taken in respect to the right of franchise. The Democratic Party looks three ways on many other important issues of the day, thus contributing to the confusion of the voter in determining what the two major parties stand for.

The letter from Deputy Attorney General Byron R. White to the gentleman from Florida, Congressman CRAMER, follows:

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: This is further in reply to your letter of August 8, 1961, proposing that the duties of the Civil Rights Commission be enlarged.

As you know, the life of the Civil Rights Commission was extended to September 1963 in the Department of Justice appropriation bill (Public Law 87–264). Under your proposal the Commission would be directed to "investigate allegations in writing, under oath, or affirmation, that certain citizens of the United States are being unlawfully accorded or denied the right to vote, or to have that vote counted, for presidential electors, Members of the U.S. Senate, or the House of Representatives, as a result of any pattern or practice of fraud or discrimination relating to the conduct of such election." This proposal would extend the Commission's investigatory mandate from denials of the right to vote on grounds of color, race, religion, or national origin to any pattern or practice of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of elections to Federal office.

While there is no legal impediment to the expansion of the Commission's duties as suggested, it would seem doubtful whether such an expansion of its duties would be desirable. Although fraud and discrimination on grounds other than color, race, religion, or national origin in the conduct of Federal elections are no less reprehensible than the deprivations of the right to vote presently within the jurisdiction of the Commission, there is no reason to believe that the ordinary law enforcement agencies are unable to cope with them. Fraud and discrimination in Federal elections are punishable under 18 U.S.C. 241 and 242, *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299 (1941)); *United States* *v. Saylor* (322 U.S. 385 (1944)); *United States v. Fontana* (231 F. 2d 807 (C.A. 3-1956)). In addition they are crimes under the laws of the several States. The Commission would therefore be operating in an area which is primarily and appropriately the responsibility of Federal and State grand juries and other existing investigatory agencies.

Of course, deprivation of the right to vote on grounds of color, race, religion, or national origin is likewise a crime under both Federal and State law. However, in the congressional hearings on the Civil Rights Act of 1957, there was a substantial showing that prevailing community attitudes in some areas made protection of the political rights of Negroes peculiarly difficult notwithstanding the laws already on the books. (See, e.g., hearings before Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 85th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 237-243, 291-307, 488-526, 815-830, 863-870.) In delimiting the Commission's scope of investigation as set forth in 42 U.S.C. 1975(a)(1), Congress recognized that the political rights of members of minority groups require special protection. In the absence of similar showing of inability of State and Federal law enforcement agencies to deal with election frauds, an extension of the Commission's mandate to this area, would seem unwarranted.

The problem of election frauds is essentially one of law enforcement and the Commission is not a law enforcement agency. Its primary purpose is to collect and accumulate data so that a more intelligent study of the civil rights problem may be made (H. Rept. No. 291, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8). It is true that the subject matter of its investigations has often involved law violations, particularly in the field of voting. However, the investigation of such violations has been merely a part of a broad study of discrimination against minority groups. In its 3 years' existence the Commission has acquired an expertise in this field. Accordingly, it is not believed that the Commission should be diverted to an essentially dissimilar area of investigation from that in which it has been operating.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Alger
Ayres
Barry
Bolling
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Colmer
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dulski
Ellsworth
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Horan
Hosmer
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Madden
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Monagan
Norblad
Osmers
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Roosevelt
Roush
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Smith, Va.
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Ullman
Wallhauser
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 393.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective July 1, 1963, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional employees at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "two additional employees at rates" and insert "one additional employee at a rate."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this resolution have the approval of the minority?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It does. I just called the gentleman from Ohio, and he is on his way up. It passed the committee by unanimous vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read "Authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ one additional employee."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the meeting of the Subcommittee on Accounts on June 11, 1963, was attended by eight members. The following resolutions were approved:

1. House Resolution 393 (Mr. VINSON), authorizing two additional employees for the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment: Line 3, strike out "two additional employees at rates" and insert "one additional employee at a rate".

Chairman VINSON appeared before the subcommittee and suggested the amendment. He informed the subcommittee that in the recent Defense Department bill, $7.2 billion was earmarked for research and development. Of this amount, $3½ billion is for aircraft, missiles, and ships, for fiscal 1964. Since jurisdiction of this expenditure is to be under the Committee on Armed Services, Chairman VINSON explained his need for one additional professional staff member for this purpose.

This resolution, in addition to one approved in the 82d Congress for two additional clerical assistants, will give the Armed Services Committee authorization to employ five professional staff members and eight clerical assistants.

2. House Resolution 291 (Mr. BENNETT of Michigan), authorizing the payment of death gratuities in the case of certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who are assigned to duty in the House of Representatives.

Both the Senate and the House pay gratuities in connection with the death of their employees, and the Senate pays more limited gratuities to employees of the Architect's office who are employed on the Senate side of the Capitol and in the two Senate Office Buildings. House Resolution 291 would authorize similar payment of gratuities in the case of employees on the House side of the Capitol and in the two House Office Buildings.

In previous Congresses the subcommittee has held hearings on individual resolutions but took no action pending adoption of an overall policy applicable to all cases. This resolution, House Resolution 291, would accomplish this purpose. The resolution provides for similar payments to those now being paid by the Senate to employees of the Architect; no employee would receive more than 6 months' pay, and an employee would have to work 6 consecutive years before being eligible for a gratuity.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 291.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, a gratuity to the widow, widower, or heirs-at-law, of each deceased employee under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who was assigned to duty in the House of Representatives at the time of his death. The payment of each such gratuity shall be in accordance with uniform rules and regulations adopted by the Committee on House Administration except that no such gratuity shall be in excess of that payable to the widow, widower, or heirs-at-law of any deceased employee under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol having a comparable length of service, who was assigned to similar duties in the Senate at the time of his death.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has a rather good report on both of these two measures which have just been brought up, and I trust the gentleman from Maryland will ask unanimous consent to include those reports on the bill in the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland make that request?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The report referred to follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE RESOLUTION 291

The Committee on House Administration, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 291) having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do pass.

Prior to July 2, 1954, the House of Representatives approved individual resolutions authorizing payment of gratuities plus a certain amount toward the defrayment of funeral expenses of deceased employees of the House, including those employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who were assigned to duty in the House.

This procedure was changed by the enactment of legislation (2 U.S.C., 125) effective July 2, 1954, authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay gratuities from the contingent fund to beneficiaries of deceased House employees. It will be noted, however, that this legislation (quoted below) did not include personnel of the Architect's office whose duties were performed in the House of Representatives.

2 U.S.C., 125: "The Clerk of the House is on and after July 2, 1954, authorized to pay, from the contingent fund of the House, a gratuity to the widow, widower, or heirs-at-law, of each deceased employee of the House an amount equal to one month's salary for each year or part of year of the first six years' service of such employee plus one-half of one month's salary for each year or part of year of such service in excess of six years to and including the eighteenth year of such service. Service computed hereunder shall include all Federal civilian employment, and military service where such service interrupted Federal civilian employment".

In the U.S. Senate a resolution was approved by the Rules and Administration Committee on June 11, 1952 (which is still in effect) authorizing gratuities to be paid to beneficiaries of Senate employees, including employees of the Architect's office assigned to duty in the Senate. That part of the committee resolution pertaining to the personnel of the Architect's office assigned to duty in the Senate is as follows:

"*Ordered,* That the Architect of the Capitol, in cases of employees of his office dying while in service, shall make recommendations to the Committee on Rules and Administration for the approval of gratuity payments to the estates or next of kin of such employees having served six consecutive years with him at the time of their death.

"*Ordered,* That for Senate employees no compensation greater than one year's salary shall be paid out at any time and that the gratuity for any deceased employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall not be greater than six months."

The Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration considered legislation in both the 86th and 87th Congresses which would have provided a gratuity payable to the widow of a deceased employee of the Architect's office who had been assigned to duty in the House of Representatives. No action was taken on the resolution in either Congress pending the adoption by the committee of a definite policy governing all such cases.

It is the consensus of the Committee on House Administration that employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, assigned to duty in the House of Representatives, should have the same rights and privileges granted House employees and accorded their fellow employees assigned to duty in the U.S. Senate.

House Resolution 291 provides that payment of each such gratuity shall be in accordance with uniform rules and regulations adopted by the Committee on House Administration except that no such gratuity shall be in excess of that payable to the widow, widower, or heirs-at-law of any deceased employee under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol having a comparable length of service, who was assigned to similar duties in the Senate at the time of his death.

Therefore, the following rules and regulations shall be followed in the administration of the provisions of House Resolution 291 when agreed to by the House of Representatives:

1. The Architect of the Capitol is directed to inform the Committee on House Administration of the death of any employee under his jurisdiction who was assigned to duty in the House of Representatives at the time of his death, giving the name of such deceased employee, the name of the widow, widower, or heirs-at-law, and a statement of the employee's gross salary and total period of service.

2. The Committee on House Administration reserves the right to withhold any of these benefits or modify them as the circumstances of a person's employment may merit.

3. Gratuities shall be paid only in cases of deceased employees of the Architect's office who have served 6 consecutive years in his employment.

4. The total gratuity to be paid to any such employee shall not be greater than 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death.

5. The gratuity shall be based on 1 month's salary for each year's service not to exceed 6 years.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that I did not object today to special orders and I shall not object in the future, at least for the time being, but in lieu of that, as chairman of the House Committee on Printing I shall have the staff measure up the amount of space used, exclusive of debate on bills, by the various Members. Those who use more than a couple of thousand dollars worth between now and the end of the session, I will publish the amount that they use in the RECORD, and if they can justify using $15,000 or $20,000, and some people have used as much as $25,000 worth of space in half a session, that will be up to them and their constituents. I hope this will cut down on the unnecessary use and abuse of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7063 with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as was indicated at the time of the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the pending bill makes appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, the judiciary, and a number of related agencies. I shall subsequently endeavor to obtain consent, when we go back into the House, to insert at this point the following table which appears toward the top of page 2 of the committee report, which is a summary of the action of the committee on this bill:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1963	Estimates, 1964	Recommended in bill for 1964	Bill compared with—	
				1963 appropriations	1964 estimates
Department of State	$404,948,000	$359,721,000	$305,051,000	−$99,897,000	−$54,670,000
Department of justice	318,593,400	355,506,000	343,799,000	+25,205,600	−11,707,000
Department of Commerce	805,850,750	996,572,000	833,818,000	+27,967,250	−162,754,000
Bureau of Public Roads (trust fund)	(3,251,200,000)	(3,250,500,000)	(3,249,650,000)	(−1,550,000)	(−850,000)
The Judiciary	62,916,441	67,140,900	65,927,900	+3,011,459	−1,213,000
Related agencies	551,118,250	380,952,000	302,674,000	−248,444,250	−78,278,000
Total	2,143,426,841	2,159,891,900	1,851,269,900	−292,156,941	−308,622,000

The following are the related agencies included in this bill:

American Battle Monuments Commission, Commission on Civil Rights, Federal Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Small Business Administration, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Subversive Activities Control Board, Tariff Commission, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency.

The total amount recommended by the committee for all these agencies is $1,851,269,900 in direct appropriations. Please note that this is a decrease of $292,156,941 below the total appropriations for the current fiscal year. The appropriations recommended are $308,622,000 below the total of the budget estimates, a reduction of 14.3 percent.

The bill also includes appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund for the Bureau of Public Roads in the amount of $3,249,650,000.

First, with regard to the Department of State: The amount requested was $359,721,000. The committee has included in this bill for the Department of State the amount of $305,051,000, which is a reduction of $54,670,000 from the total requested, and $99,897,000 below the total appropriated for the current fiscal year. I must in fairness, however, point out that included in the current year's figures was the amount $100 million for "Loans to the United Nations." This is not a recurring item in fiscal year 1964.

With regard to the item "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," the committee has included $153 million, which is $9,800,000 below the amount of the budget estimate, and an increase of $5,451,500 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The Department of State requested 570 additional permanent positions. All of these additional 570 positions have been denied. This action will still leave 13,930 permanent positions in the Department of State. The additional funds over the current year appropriations allowed by the committee will provide for such things as pay increase costs, which are mandatory; within grade promotions, which are mandatory; overseas wage and price increases, which are necessary; pay in excess of the 52-week base, which is mandatory; and certain other mandatory costs. It would also include funds for the opening of new posts.

The additional funds requested for the training of Foreign Service dependents have been denied. I should also point out that no funds are provided to pay hardship differentials when an employee is away from his hardship post. As most of us know, there are certain posts over the world designated as hardship posts. These may be 10 percent, 15 percent, 20 percent, 25 percent pay differential posts. We were amazed to find out that a man getting an extra dollar for every four, serving in a 25-percent hardship post, let us say in Africa, and brought back to attend a course in the Foreign Service Institute over here in the Arlington Towers across the river, gets a 25-percent addition to his pay for 6 weeks after he has left his hardships.

I must say that the position of the Department was against this sort of thing. We believe that it now has been cured, and that no Foreign Service officer will receive hardship differential pay unless it is for the time he is actually serving at his post.

In connection with new employment in this bill and the denial of these 570 additional permanent positions in the State Department, I should like to point out that the committee was requested in this bill for about 4,800 additional positions. The action of the committee now brought to you today for approval, and we trust you will approve the committee's judgment not only in this regard but with regard to all of the items in this bill, because we think it is a good bill, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will agree with this when he takes the floor, means that we denied about 66⅔ of these requested new positions. In these instances to which I am about to refer and a few more we have allowed additional employment over the number they have in the current fiscal year.

We have allowed 550 additional positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation because of the Attorney General's drive against organized crime. Of these, 200 are agents and 350 are clerks.

We have allowed approximately 200 additional positions in the Bureau of Prisons, mainly due to the fact that a new maximum security institution at Marion, Ill., is presently being activated.

We have allowed about 200 additional positions in the Bureau of Public Roads. We have allowed some in the Census Bureau, and we have allowed some additional technical jobs in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman wishes to conclude his statement, I will defer until he does.

Mr. ROONEY. If the distinguished gentleman will presently withhold his questions, I would like to proceed further at the moment, if I may.

In view of the modest action of the committee with regard to representation allowances, a favorite subject of my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I shall not at this point refer to the subject, because the action of the committee is what might be termed minimal.

As to the request for $27 million for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad, the committee has deleted entirely the amount requested, for the reason that there is no authority for such an appropriation in law and the bill which would authorize this money has been hung up between the other body and this body in conference.

The committee also had before it a request for $3.9 million in foreign currencies for a similar program in certain foreign countries. The committee cut this to $2.75 million, and denied any funds whatever for the construction of a new USIA building in New Delhi, India, where we have a spate of new buildings.

Insofar as contributions to international organizations are concerned, the committee has approved the entire amount requested, to-wit, $81,305,000. I should like to point out that this amount, unfortunately, is $12,078,000 greater than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. There was a reduction of $516,000 advanced to the committee during the hearings in connection with these contributions. However, the committee feels that this reduction is still not enough, but necessarily takes the position that if we are going to belong to the United Nations we must pay our dues. If we are to be taken out of the United Nations it is not within the functions of this subcommittee to do so. We take it that it is our responsibility to furnish the funds requested by the executive branch of the Government so that our membership may continue in the United Nations, particularly at such a hazardous time as this, and particularly when the financial structure of the United Nations is so precarious as it is.

I might point out in passing that the volumes of the printed hearings on this bill, and the hearings began in January and were concluded in May, total 4,990 printed pages. I doubt if many Members of the House have had a chance to read all of these pages, but I would guess that the most avid reader in the House, my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is fairly well acquainted with the testimony presented during the course of these committee hearings.

With reference to the item entitled "Missions to International Organizations," the committee has included $2,500,000 which would be $245,000 below the amount of the budget estimate, but $178,200 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Continuing to the item entitled "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities," the sum of $42,250,000 is included in the bill for this item. This amount together with prior year balances which can be utilized in the program will provide for an overall program of approximately $50 million for the fiscal year 1964. The majority of the committee feel that this amount is ample for this program.

As to the Department of Justice, the budget estimates amounted to $355,000,000. The committee has recommended the amount of $343,799,000 which is a reduction of $11,707,000 in the total requested and an increase of $25,205,600 over the total amount appropriated for this Department in the current fiscal year.

Proceeding to "Legal activities and general administration," and specifically with regard to general administration, no new personnel are included. In "General legal activities" which include the expenses of the various offices of the Attorney General such as the Office of the Solicitor General, the Tax Division, the Civil Division, the Criminal Division, the Lands Division, the Office of the Legal Counsel, the Internal Security Division and the Civil Rights Division, the amount allowed is $600,000 below the amount of the budget estimates but is an increase of $1,477,350 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

With regard to U.S. attorneys and marshals, a total of $29,230,000 is contained in the bill to provide for the necessary expenses of the offices of U.S. attorneys and marshals in each of the 92 judicial districts in the coming year. This is a decrease of $350,000 in the budget estimate but is an increase of $1,063,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

You may wonder why in the last number of items to which I have made reference, there are increases over the current fiscal year. Generally speaking, these increases are due to the fact that we have to provide for the pay raise which was granted by the Congress last year. We have to provide for mandatory within-grade promotions. In the coming fiscal year there are 2 extra compensatory days. All these required and mandatory items add up to substantial amounts and justify the increases over the amounts allowed in the current fiscal year.

In connection with this item for U.S. attorneys and marshals, there is a new judicial district in the State of Florida and there has been included in this item sufficient funds to staff that office.

As to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to which I previously made reference, the committee has allowed the full amount requested which would entail the addition of 200 new agents and 350 new clerks.

As to the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, the committee recommends $69,011,000 which is a decrease of $989,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, but is $2,738,950 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

I should like to point out, the Immigration and Naturalization Service voluntarily decreased the number of their permanent positions requested by 122 positions below the number they have in the current fiscal year.

As to the Federal Prison System, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons, the committee has included the amount of $53 million to provide for the custody and care of prisoners, the maintenance and operation of the Federal prison institutions, and the central office.

This amount is $1.1 million below the amount of the budget estimate but is an increase of $2,758,150 over the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, this increase is primarily to provide for increased pay costs, for maintenance of 1963 employment, improved institution maintenance and the activation of the Marion, Ill., maximum custody institution.

Funds are also included for additional staffing at institutions to which Alcatraz prisoners were distributed.

As to "Buildings and facilities," there is recommended in the bill the amount of $7.15 million to continue the work on the new psychiatric institution at Butner, N.C. The testimony of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons was that this was all that would be obligated in connection with the construction of this institution at Butner, N.C., in the coming fiscal year, the amount of $7.15 million.

Mr. Chairman, also included in this bill is a half-million dollars for preliminary planning work in connection with a new national training school which is to be located in the State of West Virginia, and $275,000 for an activities building at the prison at Sandstone, Minn.

Mr. Chairman, as to the Department of Commerce, the amounts recommended in the bill total $833,818,000. This amount represents an increase of $27,967,250 over the total appropriation for this Department in the current fiscal year, but a reduction of $162,754,000 below the total amount of the budget estimates.

As to "General administration, salaries and expenses," the sum of $4 million is included in the bill, which is $520,000 below the amount of the budget estimate, but an increase of $48,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. In this particular instance 49 additional positions were requested and only 1 additional position has been allowed. That one additional position is so that there may be at least one person in the Department of Commerce, which includes the Maritime Administration, to see that American-flag ships of our merchant marine fleet obtain a fair share, the share to which they are entitled of what? Cargoes, generally? No; of Government cargoes principally from the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 480. That is the only position allowed, and we do trust that the Secretary of Commerce and his associates will do something about increasing cargoes for the American merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, as to the Area Redevelopment Administration, there is included in the bill $145,500,000 for this agency; $13.5 million of this is for necessary expenses in the direction of the program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically affected areas. Of the total amount provided, $4.5 million is made available for "Technical assistance," as authorized by section 11 of the act.

The committee has deleted the entire amount requested, to wit, $35 million, for grants for public facilities inasmuch as there is presently no authority in law for making such an appropriation.

As to the Area Redevelopment Fund, there is included in the bill the sum of $132 million for loans as authorized by sections 6 and 7 of the Area Redevelopment Act. The amount allowed is an increase of $16,950,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, and is a decrease in the amount of $58 million in the budget estimate. The amount allowed in the bill is the total amount of that requested which is presently authorized, based on the figures furnished to the committee as to the estimated loans outstanding on June 30 next.

Mr. Chairman, we were surprised to find that in this area they were proposing to send personnel overseas to encourage foreign firms to come to this country to establish factories on funds loaned to them by the Area Redevelopment Administration, when such firms would be in competition with established American management and labor. Accordingly, the committee has recommended that no funds shall be used for such purpose.

Now, as to the Business and Defense Services Administration, the budget estimate was in the amount of $6,250,000, a requested increase of $2,248,250 over the amount available during the current fiscal year when comparative transfers are taken into consideration.

The committee has included in the bill the sum of $4,600,000 for this agency, which is a reduction of $1,650,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. Included in this item was a request for travel and transportation of persons for the Business and Defense Services Administration, an increase from $85,000 in the current fiscal year to $714,000 in the coming year, and included in this request was the highly unusual proposal to pay the travel costs and hotel bills of foreign buyers. This committee has denied all funds for such a program.

There is included in the bill a total of $364,900,000 in the six separate appropriation items for the Maritime Administration. The action in each item is as follows:

Ship construction: The full amount of the budget estimate, $112,500,000, is recommended in the bill for the constructional-differential subsidy and national defense allowances for the construction of 17 ships, and the acquisition of 21 replaced ships.

Operating-differential subsidies—liquidation of contract authorization: The bill includes $225 million for the payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidies. These subsidies are provided in order to maintain a U.S.-flag merchant marine in support of

U.S. foreign commerce and capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in time of national emergency. To be eligible for subsidy, an operator must provide regular berth services on an essential trade route, show that Government aid is necessary to place the operation on a parity with its foreign competition, and employ vessels constructed in the United States and manned by U.S. citizens.

Research and development: The sum of $7 million is provided for "Research and development." This amount is $1,250,000 less than the budget request and is $3,450,000 above the appropriation for the current fiscal year. However, during fiscal year 1963, an unobligated balance of $6,377,000 from prior year appropriations was available for expenditure.

The basic objective of this program is to secure significant technological advantages in U.S. water transportation systems as a primary means for improving the competitive position of the U.S. shipping industry and thus decrease the need for Government subsidy.

Salaries and expenses: For "Salaries and expenses," there is included in the bill $15,500,000 which is a decrease of $252,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $250,750 over the current year's appropriation. Of the amount provided, $8,854,000 is for administration; $696,000 is for maintenance of shipyard facilities and operation of warehouses; and $5,950,000 is for reserve fleet expenses.

Maritime training: The full amount of the budget estimate, $3,495,000, is provided to cover the cost of maintaining and operating the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., the cost of a cadet training liaison office in Washington, D.C., and for training representatives in the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coast districts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill is so long, and I have only so far made reference to 19 pages of a 45-page report, it seems that the expeditious way to handle it would be to ask those who have read the report if they have any questions at this time.

I first yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question or two about the U.S. Travel Service or Tourist Service.

Mr. ROONEY. Please do not mention it.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand they have bought an insignia, and perhaps produce for themselves a flag to fly in connection with this thing? Can the gentleman enlighten us briefly on this?

Mr. ROONEY. They did so many unusual things with which the committee was completely confounded that we came to the conclusion nothing like this had ever happened in the history of the U.S. Government.

With regard to the insignia the gentleman mentions, they expended $14,773 of the taxpayers' money for the development of this insignia. I am going to show you this insignia for which they paid $14,000 plus of the taxpayers' money. I suggest that one could get a class in any high school in the United States, a senior class, have a little contest, and would come up with something just as attractive or more attractive than this thing they paid $14,773 for. After having it imprinted on all of their literature and paraphernalia in the six offices overseas, finally one of their employees said, "You cannot tell what this insignia means." They paid $14,773 but about the only thing you can make out of it is an American flag.

So, after having this brought to the attention of these great promoters, and after they had spent the $14,773, they then had to write "U.S. Travel Service" around the insignia.

If this is good judgment of the way to spend $14,773 of the American taxpayers' money, then I do not know anything.

Mr. GROSS. This in face of the fact the Congress has not seen fit to authorize a flag for itself.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not anti-insignia, I am anti-$14,773 of an insignia.

Mr. GROSS. For what they got there, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it was a needless waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Let me say that I think this is one of the best bills he has ever brought out in my time in Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. I always have a good bill, fair to everybody, I will say to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not exactly impressed with the fact, and the gentleman has not said that there is $292 million of a saving over the expenditures for last year. That is what always interests me in an appropriation bill—that is, how much has been saved by comparison of the spending of the previous year with the nonrecurring items.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to be fair with my distinguished friend. He must take into consideration the nonrecurring items, nonrecurring from 1963 to 1964.

To be perfectly fair about it, I could just as well say nothing, and let people think we saved every cent of that money. But, I would not be honest, for the reason that last year we had $100 million in United Nations bonds, and also have allowed just sufficient construction money in a number of instances to furnish the funds which will be obligated in the coming fiscal year and have delayed the appropriation of further funds necessary to complete some of these projects. I am referring to high-power Voice of America radio transmitters abroad; I am referring to this prison institution in North Carolina and other such items. I would not want the gentleman to think we actually saved all this money, because we may very likely and probably will be confronted with requests for money to finish these construction projects.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman, on the face of the bill, has come closer to the figure of last year, on the face of the report and the contents of the bill, and I want to compliment the committee and the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for at least making a valiant attempt to put a stop to some of this spending.

Mr. ROONEY. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that as the result of making an official trip to Bonn in West Germany last December we have saved the taxpayers $119,000 a year, which is the cost of operating a private train for the American Ambassador to West Germany. After we confronted the folks in the State Department with the facts of life in regard to this train—when we got there we grabbed the log and learned where the train had been and when, and found that most of its use was down to the recreation areas in the Bavarian Alps, where the skiing is very nice, Garmisch, Oberammergau and Berchtesgaden—they protested that it was necessary for the prestige of the United States, although it was a hangover from the occupation days when the French had a similar train and the British had a similar train. But, the French realized their train was costing them money and that they did not need it, and that the prestige gained from it did not amount to a dime. The result was that 3 days after the hearing, they advised the committee in writing that the train was being discontinued as of this June 30.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think it might be well to point out that the discovery of this train was made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], when he was in Germany, and had he not been on that inspection trip, the train would probably still be operating. And, I think this should be pointed out: There is the advantage in many areas of on-site and on-scene inspection by Members of the Congress. This would never have come up had the distinguished gentleman from New York not been on the ground and found this situation to exist, and the train would still be operating. I think the gentleman is to be congratulated, for on this one item he saved over $100,000 a year and perhaps millions in the future, and he is to be congratulated for the very fine work he did.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. On page 879 of the hearings I was somewhat amazed to read about a carpet that was purchased over in Hong Kong for the Tokyo office. I am wondering if the committee inquired as to whether carpeting was unavailable in this country.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman's remarks prompt me to say the same thing to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], as he did about me, for at the time he was in Tokyo I was in West Germany, and it was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who disclosed the facts about this carpet costing—what was it—$17 or $18 a square yard in dollars when the purpose of the opening of the office was to help the balance-of-payments situation.

So instead of spending dollars here in the United States for American carpet the U.S. Travel Agency had to go to Hong Kong.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I note in the hearings on page 879 that the carpet was purchased from the Taiping Carpet Salon in Hong Kong for $1,860.70. According to the testimony this carpet was estimated to be about 30 feet by 30 feet, and probably cost around $18.75 a square yard. Those of us who have been concerned about the textile industry situation—and the carpet phase of it is also involved—are quite concerned that the folks in the Travel Agency did this. Incidentally, the head of the Agency is one of the dearest friends I have and I am sure had he been traveling a little around North Carolina he could have found a carpet just as fine, and perhaps at a cheaper price.

Mr. ROONEY. An unfortunate part of the situation is that the gentleman who spent the taxpayers' money in this fashion, if my memory serves me right, is from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I just said that, and he is a very close friend of mine, but even my friends sometimes make mistakes.

Mr. ROONEY. Would you be surprised to know in connection with setting up six offices in six oversea capitals for the U.S. Travel Service he spent $415,072 of the taxpayers' money, and of this amount $192,690 was spent for planning and supervision paid to an interior decorating firm, $155,185 for alterations and decorations, and $67,197 for furnishings and equipment. In other words, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina spent $192,690 to plan and supervise the expenditure of $222,382. Is that the way they run a business in North Carolina? I do not think so.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say from reading the testimony in the hearings it appears that most of that money was spent with New York organizations.

Mr. ROONEY. Does that reflect well on this gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WHITENER. No, but I say it would indicate that the sharpies took the country boys again.

Mr. ROONEY. I will rest on that.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I note that on page 6 of the report it mentions the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. I am just a little bit curious as to what this Commission does. I notice it was created in 1889. The item here is for over $10 million, $8 million of which is for construction.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall say to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota that this is a well-known, well-functioning, and very substantial operation. The International Boundary and Water Commission operates between the United States and Mexico. This is the Government agency which built the Falcon Dam across the Rio Grande, which subsequently 2 or 3 years later saved over $100 million when we had serious floods on the Rio Grande. This organization is presently building another dam, Amistad Dam, also across the Rio Grande River. This is one of the easiest items in the bill to justify, I will say to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. This is very interesting. I am not questioning the merit of the appropriation. I was just curious to know, is this an international agency, so to speak?

Mr. ROONEY. It is. It is between the U.S. Government and the Government of Mexico rather than between the State of Texas or the State of California and Mexico, just across the border.

Mr. SHORT. With reference to the construction of these dams across the Rio Grande River——

Mr. ROONEY. They are joint projects.

Mr. SHORT. They are joint projects?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. Jointly financed?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. And this $8 million construction item is for what this year?

Mr. ROONEY. Approximately $7 million is for the Amistad Dam; $350,000 for Rio Grande gaging stations; $90,000 for the Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project, $500,000 for the Nogales sanitation project, and $66,000 to the State of New Mexico for the loss of a bridge due to some negligence, as I recall.

Mr. SHORT. Is the dam the gentleman mentions a new dam, a new project?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, Amistad Dam is.

Mr. SHORT. And this is being jointly financed?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not want the distinguished gentleman to misunderstand me. The initial construction of the dam is not being started with money in this bill. The construction and planning for it started a number of fiscal years ago.

Mr. SHORT. It has already been authorized?

Mr. ROONEY. This is the amount of money required in the coming year to proceed with the construction of the Amistad Dam, which, as the gentleman knows, means "peace dam" in Spanish.

Mr. SHORT. May I ask the gentleman this question? What is the matching formula between Mexico and the United States?

Mr. ROONEY. It is the result of an agreement made by our diplomats and the Mexican diplomats.

Mr. SHORT. Can the gentleman give us the matching formula?

Mr. ROONEY. All of this information, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, is in the printed committee hearings.

Mr. SHORT. What I am trying to get at is, What is the proportionate cost of sharing between the United States and Mexico?

Mr. ROONEY. If my memory serves me correctly, with regard to Amistad Dam, the estimated U.S. cost will be 56.2 percent. And, if my memory further serves me correctly, that was approximately the percentage in connection with the Falcon Dam construction which was completed some years ago and which was dedicated by President Eisenhower when he was President, although it was built in the Truman administration. The estimated cost for Amistad Dam will come to $55,289,000 as shown at page 1306 of the printed hearings for the Department of State.

Mr. SHORT. May I ask the gentleman one further question? What is the purpose of these dams? Are they irrigation projects?

Mr. ROONEY. They are primarily flood control projects. There are some irrigation benefits. And in connection with the Falcon Dam there is a powerplant and there are some revenues which have never satisfied this subcommittee—that is, the amount of these revenues. But I must admit that during the floods on the Rio Grande some years ago the dam paid for itself more than three or four times, so far as the taxpayers of the United States were concerned.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to this North Carolinian who was so free with the taxpayers' money, the serious question is, is he still on the Federal payroll, does the gentleman know?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe he is still Director of the U.S. Travel Service.

Mr. GROSS. This is one individual that ought to be removed, or certainly ought to have his knuckles rapped.

Mr. ROONEY. In this connection, may I say that this same gentleman from North Carolina bought 200 sets of men's cuff links and 24 bracelets at a cost of $2,141. When he went on the trips to visit his six costly offices abroad, he distributed some of them as gifts.

Mr. GROSS. Do not tell me any more. You already have me convinced.

Mr. ROONEY. We asked him where his authority in law was to use the taxpayers' money to buy $10 sets of cuff links to give away, and these bracelets. It turned out that they had no authority in law. We have a communication from the General Accounting Office that there is no authority in law, and we believe that this $2,241 will be repaid to the taxpayers' Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand from your hearings that the Federal Government underwrote the cost of that Governors' conference in Tokyo, Japan, at least to some extent? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. ROONEY. That seems vaguely familiar. They held a very successful conference. They went up Mount Fujiyama.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know where they went, but they went to Tokyo, at least. I was under the impression that the States were taking care of these trips for these Governors.

Mr. ROONEY. If my memory serves me correctly, and I have an idea that the gentleman from Iowa could find the page faster than I could, I was amazed to discover that Federal funds were used in connection with this Governor's conference in Tokyo. The committee naively thought it should be paid for by the various States that were represented.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I might say in connection with the request of the gentleman from Tennessee about the agreement between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Iowa that the distinguished gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Iowa always come up with something new.

Can the gentleman tell us if in the record of the committee hearings or elsewhere there is something to show that countries with embassies here or agencies such as our Travel Service purchase their supplies directly in the United States?

Mr. ROONEY. The testimony with regard to the Travel Service indicated that a great deal of the funds, although they were supposed to be primarily interested in the balance-of-payment situation, were spent for foreign-manufactured goods, in dollars.

For instance, in Tokyo all the furniture and furnishings, the Sony electrical machines mentioned in the testimony, were all bought for dollars. The same applies to other locations.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The reason I ask the question is—I understand there are about 40 nations which have travel agencies in the United States, and I was wondering if those located in New York City and elsewhere purchased some of their supplies and equipment and furnishings from American firms.

Mr. ROONEY. I would not know that.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I might ask the gentleman one other question. He has painted the picture of the Travel Service here, which is somewhat startling, but is it not a fact that since this service was established a year and a half ago, there has been a substantial increase in the number of persons visiting the United States from foreign countries, particularly those in which the Service has agents?

Mr. ROONEY. It is also the fact that there is more travel going out of this country. I believe the taxpayer has wasted money in connection with this travel service. If the gentleman will look at the figures, he will find there has been an increase over all the years since World War II.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions, I will reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 46 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking minority member, for their able leadership in preparing this bill. The chairman displayed his usual ability, energy, and consideration for the other members of the subcommittee throughout the lengthy hearings and preparation of this appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies.

The chairman has already discussed many of the details of H.R. 7063.

During the extensive hearings and during the markup of the bill, item after item was discussed at length. There were differences of opinion, as there always are when a group of men gather around a table to discuss the various items in an appropriation bill. A consensus was finally achieved which represents the judgment of the subcommittee as to what funds will be required to operate these many agencies during fiscal year 1964.

No appropriation bill satisfies everyone. Nor does this bill represent the exact thoughts of everyone on the subcommittee. I personally would have liked to have seen deeper cuts in certain areas. There may be members who would have liked to have seen different results. The bill, as must be the case, is a compromise. The committee has brought the bill to the floor in agreement, with the exception of one or two reservations. Later I will go into one of these reservations, with regard to the United Nations.

At this point I would like to bring to the attention of the House what was stated to be administration budget policy when the budget was presented earlier this year, and to weigh the committee's action against this policy.

President Kennedy in his budget message said:

> I have felt obliged to limit severely my 1964 expenditure proposals. In national defense and space programs—where false economy would seriously jeopardize our national interest or even our national survival—I have proposed expenditure increases. Fixed interest charges on the debt will also rise. But total 1964 expenditures for all other programs in the administrative budget, taken together, have been held to this year's level, and even reduced somewhat. Within this total, increases have been confined to those areas most important to the Nation's current welfare and future growth, and these will be offset—indeed, slightly more than offset—by the reductions I am recommending in expenditures under other programs.

The President also said:

> Requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible.

Despite these fine statements, unfortunately the original budget estimates for this bill certainly did not follow these criteria. The President's original request for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies contained in this budget was considerably over 1963 appropriations, and included requests for approximately 4,800 new employees. Later the President reduced this increase somewhat during the course of our hearings by amendments to his own original requests to a net increase over 1963.

The committee made further reductions. I believe the reductions by the Appropriations Committee in good measure follow the goals set forth by the President. If the President's budget criteria were sincerely established there should be no objection to cuts the committee made.

It seems to me the committee in this bill has attempted to—

First, limit personnel additions in 1964 to requirements of nondeferrable workload increases, law enforcement, protection of property, or high priority objectives;

Second, postpone new nonemergency construction, and reduced expenditures for construction which could not be obligated in 1964;

Third, place a moratorium on initiation of new programs not fully essential for the national welfare and security; and

Fourth, reappraise on-going programs and services, with the hope the agencies would apply budget reductions to programs and services with a low priority and leveling out those programs which have enlarged substantially in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, time does not permit going into each instance of inefficiency and poor judgment which has taken place in some of the agencies' operations. If the committee hearings and the committee report are carefully read and noted by the Administrators of the programs included in this bill, it will be realized that changes and improvements must be made.

The constructive criticisms and the reductions in budget requests should serve to reemphasize to those administering these programs how far-reaching and significant their responsibilities are in connection with spending taxpayers' money.

It is high time that Government agencies conduct searching self-examinations to improve their manpower controls, eliminate low priority and nonessential programs, adopt more efficient practices, increase productivity, decrease the effort toward thinking up new nonessential programs and ways to increase the size of Government, and find ways to economize instead.

Mr. Chairman, one of the items carried in this bill which deserves great attention by the Congress and the committees of Congress is the item entitled "Contributions to International Organizations." The total amount is $83,354,480, less $2,049,480, which is the credit due the United States as the initial repayment of principal and interest on U.S. loans to the United Nations made in accordance with Public Law 87-731. This makes a net total "Contributions to international organizations" of $81,305,000.

The total provided in this bill for this item is actually $14,127,480 greater than the amount provided in the current fiscal year. It is about $42 million more than it was as recently as 1959. In terms of money and the total budget this may seem small. But to look at the total involvement of the United States in international organizations is another story. Total U.S. expenditures for "Contributions to international organizations and programs," which includes appropriations not included under this bill such as under the AID program, Public Law 480, and others, are estimated for the present fiscal year, 1963, at $388 million. In 1959 they were $123 million, so there has been an increase of $264.5 million in 5 years. This rapid and seemingly uncontrollable situation led the committee to once again express its deep concern.

In its report for fiscal year 1963—Report No. 1996—the committee stated:

> Although the committee has repeatedly expressed concern over the costs of our membership in these international organizations, this appropriation has nearly doubled in the last 5 years. Testimony presented by Department of State witnesses does not reflect sufficient efforts being exerted to hold the annual budgets of these organizations to a minimum. The committee is appalled at the witnesses' lack of knowledge concerning pay scales and allowances even though this is the stated reason for much of the increase being requested.

In the report on this bill for fiscal year 1964 the committee states:

> The committee has repeatedly expressed its concern over the increased costs of our membership in these organizations and has admonished Department of State officials time after time to exert a greater effort toward holding the annual budgets of these organizations to a minimum. A reading of the testimony appearing on pages 1016 and 1244 of the printed hearings for the Department of State would indicate that such efforts have not been put forth in every instance and that the results achieved are disappointing. Unless better results are obtained in holding down these costs, restrictive limitations will be required in order to control the expenses of this item.

A good example of what the committee is talking about is the fact that there are 40 officials of international organizations whose income from salary, post adjustment, representation allowance, and housing allowance is higher than the salary of the U.S. Secretary of State.

It would seem that the Department of State officials would begin to take heed. Certainly in the interest of U.S. taxpayers, attention must be given to problems such as this. It is time the Department of State made it clear to international organization members they could lose their "sugar daddy." Our patience and our money are running dry.

Of great concern is the United Nations Organization which goes merrily along increasing its budget year after year. For calendar year 1959 their operating regular budget was $60,802,120; for calendar year 1963 it is an estimated $93,911,050, an increase of $33,108,830. The increase in this bill for the United Nations over last year is $9,645,383, a $4.8 million increase in the regular assessment budget, and $4.8 assessment for the working capital fund. Increases of the budgets of the specialized agencies are of the same magnitude.

Salaries and wages, common staff costs, for example, have increased at a fantastic rate. Since 1960 they have increased approximately $15 million.

The United Nations' financial position as of December 31, 1962, showed estimated total unpaid obligations in the amount of $160.4 million, made up of U.N., $34.5 million; U.N. emergency force, $17.7 million; U.N. operation in the Congo, $108.2 million. The net cash resources as of December 31, 1962, amounted to $8 million for the U.N. and $12.3 million for U.N. emergency force, and $67.7 million for U.N. operation in the Congo, or a total of $88 million. The net cash resources for U.N. emergency force and U.N. operation in the Congo, represent the unexpended balance received from the sale of $121 million of United Nations bonds at that time.

This is only a part of the picture. It is a sorry state of affairs.

Mr. Chairman, included in the unpaid obligations of the United Nations operations in the Congo is a substantial amount owing to the United States for services rendered by the Department of Defense.

The U.S. Department of Defense over a period of years has supplied the United Nations Congo operation with supplies, material, equipment, airlift and sealift, and other services. The Department of Defense is continuing to supply the Congo operation to the present time.

As of April 30, 1963, the United Nations owed the U.S. Department of Defense for expenditures incurred in behalf of the United Nations on the Congo operation, $19,491,004.77.

When this bill is read I intend to offer an amendment to reduce the $81,305,000 in the bill for "Contributions to international organizations" to $61,814,000, a reduction of $19,491,000.

The sum of $31,330,445 of the $81,305,000 for international organizations included in the bill is for contributions to the United Nations. This amount under the amendment would in effect be reduced to $11,839,445.

In essence, however, the appropriation to the United Nations would not be reduced, for in addition to the $11,839,445 appropriated, a United Nations indebtedness of $19,491,000 due the United States for Department of Defense expenditures for the Congo operation as of April 30, 1963, would be settled. These two items, the appropriation and the settlement of the indebtedness, amount to $31,330,445, the amount now included in the bill for contributions to the United Nations.

The funds which would be recouped from the United Nations pursuant to the amendment represent, in part, longstanding debts.

This would be a start toward squaring accounts.

In closing, I think we have a fair bill in which the subcommittee is in accord, with the exception of the item on the United Nations. If the reductions are maintained by the other body and accepted by the President, we will have prescribed a slower buildup than was requested by the administration; we could have stronger and more effective organization in the departments and agencies concerned; and we will have saved taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds in this bill to provide voluntary contributions for United Nations operation in the Congo or the Near East—voluntary contributions, that is?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There are no voluntary contributions to the United Nations or specialized agencies contained in this bill this year.

Mr. GROSS. Nor is it the intention of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that any funds provided under this bill be used in the nature of voluntary contributions? Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The funds in this bill are for contributions to the United Nations and specialized agencies. The only way that funds could be used for the Congo would be to come out of the U.N. working capital fund, which is being increased up to $40 million. The U.N. working capital fund has been tapped for the Congo operation before. It is in debt $25 million because of Congo operation loans and that is the reason the fund is being increased to $40 million.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may have his attention, this question: Do I understand there was some kind of a beauty contest held down at the State Department not long ago?

Mr. ROONEY. No, not a beauty contest. It appeared that the Director of the Passport Office, Mrs. Knight, put on a glamor show. She invited at that time her friend Miss or Mrs. Jacqueline Cochran, who has a line of cosmetics, to tell the girls how they should primp themselves. And, this was done during business hours. It took an hour and a half of the time of 100 or 150 girls working in the Passport Office right at the time of the Cuban crisis. Is that what the gentleman had in mind?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what it was, but I have been given the impression of some kind of a beauty contest at the State Department, and I wondered what the story could be. I was not aware that the State Department was in that business. But, of course, this might be construed in some other quarters in the New Frontier as being physical fitness. You know, they do have sweaty lunch hours around here that last for an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and applaud the fine presentation the gentleman from California has made. In his opening remarks, he made reference to the criteria set up by President Kennedy as far as the 1964 budget was concerned. This criteria sounded very good when it was released throughout the country by our press, radio, and television. It seems to me, however, that the criteria sounded pretty good, but as far as putting the budget together, the criteria was not used.

A news ticker report on the speech that is to be given by Secretary Dillon has just been called to my attention. The Treasury Secretary is quoted as saying:

> Anyone that advocates slicing this budget by as much as $4.5 billion for fiscal 1964 is certainly out of touch with reality.

The Secretary goes on to say in his speech prepared for the convention of the National Coal Association as follows:

> Dillon, in a speech prepared for a convention of the National Coal Association, said that such a budget reduction would force unwise curtailments in the Nation's military forces.
>
> The Secretary said he welcomed suggestions of cuts from persons who, "after intelligent examination, pinpoint where they think cuts can be made."
>
> "But seldom has any single issue generated so much loose and spendthrift oratory as this matter of Government expenditures," the Secretary added.
>
> He directed most of his criticism at groups advocating keeping fiscal 1964 expenditures at the same level as the current fiscal year budget.
>
> "The truth is that the entire $4.5 billion budget increase from 1963 to 1964 can be accounted for by increases in only three areas—defense, space, and interest on the public debt," Dillon added.
>
> He said to implement a $4.5 billion reduction in the present budget, the administration would have to remove two divisions from the Army, reduce the Navy by more than 140 ships and drop 14 combat wings from the Air Force.
>
> "I doubt if there are many Americans who would favor such a course," the Secretary said.

Now, I would like to compliment this subcommittee for pinpointing specifically and definitely over $300 million worth of cuts. Secretary Dillion says this cannot be done and then goes on to use old-fashioned scare tactics to cover up waste and inefficiency in Government. We will have had 6 appropriation bills on the floor of the House of Representatives by July 1 for consideration. I would predict that of the appropriation bills reported from the House Committee on Appropriations by the 1st of July, from our committee, with bipartisan support, will have made reductions of $3.5 billion in this so-called President Kennedy tight budget for fiscal 1964. It seems to me that with 5 more appropriation bills yet to be reported from our appropriations committee in this session of the Congress the House will show budget reductions well in excess of the $4.5 billion Secretary Dillon is using in his prepared speech. And, I do not believe that these budget reductions are irresponsible at all. These budget reductions have been brought about because the House on both sides of the aisle in the Committee on Appropriations realizes the danger of approving the President's budget as submitted to this Congress, and I believe that the statement that has been made by Secretary Dillon in criticism of this House and its appropriation committee is certainly irresponsibility at its most. As Secretary of the Treasury he should be applauding budget reductions instead of dragging scare red herrings across his speaking platform today.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I commend the gentleman on his excellent statement. I believe this appropriation bill for State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies is dramatic proof that the President did not follow the criteria that he set forth in his budget message submitted to the Congress.

It is due to the leadership of such men as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and a committee such as this. That pinpoints the reductions that should be made and gives us a chance really to do our job in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill—H.R. 7063—we are considering would provide nearly $1.9 billion in fiscal year 1964 to the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and 10 related agencies.

There is one portion of this spending measure to which I would draw my colleagues' particular attention. That is the amount in the State Department budget for the U.S. share of the expenses of the United Nations and its eight specialized agencies. This amounts to more than $57 million, or close to 20 percent of the entire $305 million which this bill recommends for the Department of State.

I believe we are all aware of the current refusal of the Soviet Union to properly share in the peace-keeping costs of the United Nations. Certainly, it would seem essential to the continuing functions of this worldwide Organization that there be collective financial responsibility.

It cannot be considered in the best interests of the United States to continue our prompt payments for the maintenance of the United Nations in the face of this Soviet stubbornness.

Therefore, I feel Congress should urge our United Nations mission to press firmly for the speedy resolution of this financing question. The clear language of this United Nations Charter should be applied.

If the Soviet Union persists in flouting the charter's requirements in this regard and does not live up to its financial commitments, then we must seek the denial of their right to vote in the General Assembly.

Just as the United States assumes its responsibilities in sharing the costs of the United Nations—almost one third of the total United Nations budget—other member nations are under equal obligation to fulfill their responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] for the statement he has just made regarding the item which he read from the wires of the Associated Press concerning the statement by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon. I think it is a very proper statement and a very timely statement to have been made.

Mr. Chairman, so far as the bill before us now is concerned, may I say that I am in support of this legislation. I think the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] as chairman of the subcommittee, has brought us a bill that has had substantial cuts made in it. There are undoubtedly other areas where some of us would have cut further, but, as is usual in appropriation bills of this kind, there is the question of compromise. I am sure the gentleman from New York went along with some areas where perhaps he would have liked to have done a little differently, because of our feelings in the matter, and we have done the same with him.

I think it is a good bill and should be supported by both sides of the aisle because when you have a reduction of over $308 million in a bill of this size I think you have really gotten out a lot of the fat. I am particularly interested in the fact that we were able to reduce the number of new employees. This is the area which has caused us so much trouble in the past, that is, constantly increasing the numbers of bureaus and numbers of Federal employees. The gentleman from New York told you we have reduced these figures. In the State Department, with 570-some employees they requested, they received none. In the Department of Commerce, office of the Secretary, in the area of the Maritime Commission, they received one. These reductions have been made throughout the bill on new employees, and I think this is important.

On the question of representation allowances I would like to call your attention to page 153 of the Commerce hearings to show you just what will happen if you let these agencies run away completely and do not check them in what they are doing. Here is the Commerce Department representation allowance, the tools of the trade, as my distinguished chairman says. You all know what the tools of the trade are. There are some flowers, there are some wreaths, but most of them are dinners and cocktail hours and receptions, and situations of that kind. Listen to this, though, from Commerce. In the year 1961 for representation allowances in the Commerce Department they were getting $4,875. In the fiscal year 1962 that jumped up to $26,475. In 1963 it was reduced to $21,375. But what was their estimate for this coming fiscal year? What did they request for 1964? In this connection where they had a $4,875 expenditure in 1961, this year they asked for $62,875. Imagine, an increase from $4,875 to $62,875. I did not know we had gotten into the situation where we needed that many more cocktails or that many more dinners to carry on the work of the Commerce Department. It is rather typical of what we saw happen down in the Travel Bureau. It is one of these things where the budget goes up and you do not know just what it is being used for, or why.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman will tell us where that increase was to go, what was the use of it?

Mr. BOW. It was an increase throughout the Commerce bill for representation allowances in various departments of the Commerce Department, where they had not had them before.

Mr. ASHLEY. Was part of it to encourage travel from foreign countries to the United States?

Mr. BOW. Oh, sure; they had a beautiful champagne party over in Tokyo—that is, Japanese champagne with our dollars. But in the Travel Bureau alone they asked in 1962 for $9,600, in the fiscal year they had $5,000 and this year they asked for $15,000.

Mr. ASHLEY. The point that I am trying to make is this. I am curious about whether this could be assessed as an investment to encourage travel to the United States?

Mr. BOW. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that that is not the fact. In the hearings last year it was shown that some of these travel people went up to Brighton, England, for a meeting of travel agents and they bought some tea on the veranda of one of the hotels for some of the natives over there. But it is not necessary for them to spend this kind of money to get people to travel to the United States. If we have to bribe them with booze to travel to the United States, then I am against it. There is an increase here of $10,000. If $10,000 for representation allowance is going to make or break them, then they had better go out of business.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. Not on a trivial matter of this kind, where the gentleman is trying to convince me that they need more allowances of this kind to get people to travel to the United States; I do not yield further on this item.

Mr. Chairman, I might say to the committee that the largest item of the increase, up to $62,875 is for international activities. Where they had $10,000 this year, they want $40,000 for next year. When you take an increase from $4,875 to $62,875 I submit that is inexcusable.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I might say that the distinguished gentleman's reference to Department of Commerce international activities and their requested increase in representation allowances reminds me of the fact that in connection with this item there was a very innocuous sounding bill passed by both Houses, signed by the President, setting up mobile trade fairs. The testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as will be attested by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] shows that there was a program ready to move and authorized, of $500,000. Lo and behold, they come before this subcommittee this year, not with an operating program with a ceiling of $500,000, but with a request for $200,000 to study how they should spend the other $300,000. If this makes sense then I do not know anything.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

With reference to the Department of Justice, we approved all that the FBI requested. In the present situation of the country, with an increase in crime, there was an excellent presentation by the Director of the FBI, such as he always makes. I should like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to pay tribute again to J. Edgar Hoover who has done such a magnificent job over the years in the operation of the FBI and to say to you that I believe it is the consensus of our entire committee that no one ever comes in and lays the cards on the table to justify a budget as well as does Mr. Hoover. His presentation is excellent and he accounts for every dime that is given to him.

The people of this Nation owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Hoover.

Also in Justice I should like to pay tribute to the Department of Immigration and Naturalization and Ray Farrell and his very competent staff.

I think this is a proper increase in the Justice budget.

Now, we have talked some about Commerce. I have not much more to say about it except to say that it was hard to understand some of the increases they were asking for. In the establishment of new agencies they wanted $1.2 million or $1.5 million to study firefighting. This has been a project that has been going on for years and years by the colleges, the big cities, the insurance companies, and private enterprise in other areas, but they want to start a new bureau over there to fight fire. We cut that all out. That was an unnecessary expenditure.

I should like to get into this question of glamour shows. My chairman, I know, is interested in this subject of the glamour portion. I think we had better set the record straight, because Abba Schwartz was quite upset about this situation of what Mrs. Knight had done in the Passport Office. Unfortunately, the morning she appeared before the committee I had to be before another committee and I could not be there but I have studied the record. I wish I had been, for as far as I am concerned what Mrs. Knight did, in my opinion, and I know my chairman and I differ on this question, was proper. What she has down there is a secretarial training course. She had invited those in her office to go to the auditorium, which Mr. Schwartz objected about so violently, for a lecture on grooming—let me tell you just what it was—a lecture on the appropriate, comfortable attire of businesswomen, and their taking exercises to keep them trim—I should say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]; as part of the New Frontier exercise program, I suppose—how to dress comfortably, and down through the various items which would help in meeting the public, such as their posture, their clothing, and the manner in which they met the public.

I would like to point out a letter to Miss Jacqueline Cochran, signed "Frances G. Knight, Director, Passport Office," dated October 31, 1961.

> Our audience will be mixed and many of the women work at the lower grades. Others are adjudicators, lawyers, researchers, and so forth. The ages vary from youngsters out of high school to women about to retire.
>
> What I would like to have brought out in the talk on the subject of personal appearance is as follows:
>
> (1) Appropriate and comfortable attire for the businesswoman.
>
> (2) Facial and body exercises to keep in trim.
>
> (3) Clean, attractive and comfortable shoes.
>
> (4) Use of deodorants.
>
> (5) Use of perfume and/or toilet water during business hours and social hours.
>
> (6) Care of the hair and practical hair styles.
>
> (7) Care of the skin.
>
> (8) Everyday use of cosmetics.
>
> (9) Evening use of cosmetics.
>
> (10) Posture and poise and their effect on glamour.
>
> I believe that a basic lecture on these items will provide guidance for all—colored and white alike. All of us need to be reminded now and then about our appearance—to see ourselves as others see us.
>
> One more thing—we are not permitted to do or say anything which could be interpreted as pushing or selling or giving publicity to any line of merchandise. We have to be very careful about this since competitors could lodge complaints that we were using Government time and property on which to give one person an advantage. You know and I know that this is ridiculous, but there are always potential troublemakers. This would preclude your distribution of any literature, advertising your cosmetics, but it would not preclude your samples to illustrate your lecture.
>
> If you still want to go through with this idea, I would like to take a tape recording of your talk for future use. Next time I will give the lecture based on what I learn from you and your expert demonstrators.

In other words, they had cosmetics in the lecture. At the conclusion of this school, Miss Cochran did hand out cards that people could send in and get some face powder. This probably technically violated the rule, but I am more concerned, I might say, not about the examination of Mrs. Knight by the gentleman from New York—he was at his best, when I read the record, and he is good at it. I appeared one time before him as a witness when I was a counsel to a committee here in the House back in the 80th Congress. I was counsel of the Harness committee. Some of you will recall that distinguished committee. I was called before the Appropriations Committee of which my distinguished chairman was a member. I shall never forget being a witness before my distinguished chairman. It is quite an experience. If any of you want to try that sometime, come in on a good, controversial question. He is an expert.

I have heard my chairman talk at times about the abracadabra of things. This is the abracadabra of Abba.

Abba Schwartz is the new head of the Security and Consular Affairs Agency and he raises this question, I think, about the school after Mr. ROONEY had gotten into it. The chairman asked some questions about it and Mr. Schwartz said:

> Mr. Chairman, if I might interrupt and with your permission on the subject of the article which you have brought to our attention here, I would like to state for the record that neither I nor my superiors were aware of the functions in the State Department auditorium. We feel that it is not very good judgment for this function to have been held, particularly at the time which we now are informed that it was held, which was during the Cuban crisis.

There was a crisis in Cuba and these employees should not have been gotten together to give them some instructions in their meeting with the public. If I am correct, it took place on November 15.

Then on the next page of the hearings, page 684, Mr. Schwartz again interrupts. Here he is an eager beaver and he is interrupting the chairman, to again protest. He says:

> Mr. Chairman, I would not have approved it. This was at the very time when we and other offices and bureaus were lending personnel to the Secretary's office, to Mr. Orrick's office, and other offices * * *. My own immediate office was depleted of, I believe, at least two secretaries and other personnel who were loaned for special projects on an emergency basis.

Now we will find this emergency project in just a minute.

Then we go on and here is poor Mr. Schwartz still bleeding:

> Mr. Chairman, may I for a moment make a statement for the record in regard to the use of the auditorium for the purposes for which you indicated. I would like to state for the record that neither I nor my superiors would give approval for the use of the auditorium for such a purpose, and we are taking measures to see that—it will not be done.

Now, Mr. Schwartz had interrupted. He was not asked but he interrupted at three different times to talk about this terrible thing that was going on during the Cuban crisis when these people were taken for an hour and given instructions on how to better meet the public.

Now let me call your attention to the dates of the Cuban crisis. The Cuban desk, or the foreign desk tells us that the Cuban crisis extended from October 22, 1962, when the President made his Cuban speech until the day the blockade was lifted on November 20, 1962.

Now here is a memorandum from the Executive Director of Security and Consular Affairs, that is Mr. Abba Schwartz's office, and this his executive director, on the date of November 8 during the Cuban crisis, this terrible crisis when they have taken these people out for an hour out of this Passport Office, and he comes along with this memorandum from Seymour Levenson, Executive Director, to all security officers and directors:

> NOVEMBER 8, 1962.
>
> To: All SCA office directors.
> From: SCA/EX—Seymour Levenson.
> Subject: Selection of a candidate for the Princess Ball.
>
> The recreation association is sponsoring the Princess Ball, December 8, 1962, from 9 p.m. to 1 a.m., to be held in the Grand Ballroom of the Presidential Arms. Each major element of State, USIA, AID, Peace Corps, and Disarmament will select a princess to participate as its representative for the occasion.
>
> In order to be eligible for princess, a young lady must be:
>
> (1) Between the age of 18 and 30.
> (2) A full-time employee.
>
> It has been determined that four candidates be nominated from PPT, two from VO, one from SCS, and one from ORM, from which a princess can be selected to represent the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. These names should be submitted to this office: SCA/EX, room 6328, extension 5318 or 3145, no later than November 15 so a SCA committee may choose a representative from this bureau.

This is all during the Cuban crisis. These girls are to go up to an office to be interviewed to find out who is going to be the beauty princess in Mr. "Abracadabra" Schwartz's office.

Now let me read you another memorandum. This is from Mr. McCubbin to Mr. Corcoran.

And, this is November 20, still during the Cuban crisis. This is what he said:

> Yesterday, at the request of SCA—

That is Mr. Abba Schwartz' division—

> I served as a judge to select a candidate from SCA for the Princess Ball. Four candidates (one from each division) were selected from the Passport Office and were considered along with four other candidates from other areas, SCAVO, SCS, ORM, BCA. Each of the eight girls were told to report to Mr. Seymour Levenson, the Executive Director of this agency.

In other words, they were told to report to Mr. Seymour Levenson's office at one-half-hour intervals beginning in the morning for interview by the judges. This, during the Cuban crisis that had depleted Mr. Abba Schwartz' office. But his Executive Director was able to hold a judging of a beauty contest in his office that whole day.

> The interviews were conducted almost entirely by Mr. Levenson, the Executive Director, and such questions as "would you like to be selected, and why?"

Not "are there missiles in Cuba?", and "are they going to remove the Cuban missiles?" but "would you like to be the princess, and why?"

Then they also say "What are your hobbies?" Shades of other investigations going on in other countries. Mr. Chairman, these were questions put to each of these girls.

> After all the girls were interviewed, the judges voted for the winner. Later in the day the judges and the candidates were told to report to Mr. Mace's office so that photographs could be taken.

Mind you, this was during the Cuban crisis that had depleted Mr. Schwartz' office. He was calling them all back up from their offices, all of them back up to the State Department to get their pictures taken at taxpayers' expense with some of these officials. I have a copy of the picture here if the members of the committee would like to see it. They are very attractive people.

> Miss Bratberg in the Foreign Operations Division of the Passport Office was declared the winner—

During the Cuban crisis. The memo further said:

> Although the task was interesting it was rather unproductive as far as our work is concerned. Between the notifications to the divisions to select candidates, the forwarding of information to SCA regarding the candidates, the interviews and posing for pictures, I lost the better part of a day. However, I plan to stay a little late and also to take a few items home with me.

Now, it seems to me that when Mr. Abba Schwartz took the time to interrupt the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], three or four times to protest against what Miss Knight had done, that this was during the Cuban crisis, that his office had been depleted because of the Cuban crisis, it does not sound very good now to have him heading up, with his Executive Director, a beauty contest at the same time he is trying to put the Passport Office in a bad light.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee that in my dealings with Government agencies I find that the Passport Office is the most cooperative. I find we can get services from that office with more courtesy and more dispatch than any of the other offices with which we deal. But I for one resent the tactics of Mr. Schwartz in his attempt to smear that office, when he himself should have been subject to this severe cross-examination on the beauty contest that was operated during the Cuban crisis.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman now yield?

Mr. BOW. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROONEY], and I am sure the gentleman will give us some pearls of wisdom.

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly do want to compliment my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. I have always said that he is one of the ablest Members of this House.

Mr. BOW. Look out, now. It is coming.

Mr. ROONEY. He is one of the finest lawyers we have in this House, and I should commend him on his attempt to make something out of a very, very poor case.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio has said he was not there the day that Mrs. Knight testified. He would not be familiar with the fact that she deliberately attempted to deceive the committee into thinking that this glamor show took place in February 1963, when it took place on November 15, 1962.

I should like to call my distinguished friend's attention to this. Mrs. Knight was asked this question:

> Mr. ROONEY. Did she not demonstrate various cosmetics from her own firm and

at the end of the lecture did she not pass out cards to those attending entitling them to a box of facial powder, compliments of the Cochran firm? Is that true?

Mrs. Knight. That is right.

Mr. BOW. That is what I said in my opening statement. Probably the passing out of the cards may have been a violation, although I do not think so. Maybe it should have been, but Mrs. Knight in her letter was very specific in saying that this should not be done.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. This is an interesting story. It almost appears that we are telling Mr. Schwartz, "You have done a good job," by keeping him on the payroll if he is still in his present job, or in the job he was in when he testified. Is he still there?

Mr. BOW. The last time I heard of him he was there.

Mr. FOREMAN. Under this bill he will be getting a raise in salary?

Mr. BOW. Maybe an ingrade increase. I cannot answer whether that is right or wrong. Ingrade or other increase.

Mr. FOREMAN. In other words, we call this a good bill. It continues to condone this kind of activity, and yet we keep these people on the payroll and give them a raise in salary.

Mr. BOW. I would not do it, but it is a good bill, taking it over the four corners.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The report of Mr. Schwartz' activities here personifies exactly what is wrong with our foreign policy in this country today. We pay them to engage in beauty contests. We do not pay them for foreign policy and condone this kind of matter. Mr. Schwartz personifies what is wrong with the State Department.

Mr. FOREMAN. There are a good many things about this that concern me. We can talk about these things that are going on, yet we say this is a good bill and we give them more money to continue these things. There are the beauty contests. I am sure they may possibly be contained in the activities of the U.N. We have $57 million for the United Nations and specialized agencies, the UNESCO for $5,500,000. I am wondering whether the Members of this body are familiar with that.

Mr. BOW. Before the gentleman goes on, let me say this: To correct anything in that way, so far as the United Nations is concerned, lies in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This is authorized. There are many things that go on in the United Nations I do not like, but this is authorized and this is an obligation of our Government under the treaties we have. Until there is a change in that, then I feel we have got to appropriate the money to pay these bills. I would like to reduce some of these items, and I may say the day will come if the men at the United Nations and the budget committees do not tighten the lid the House will have to do it. I think that should be a very extreme emergency. When you have an obligation, it is an obligation of my Government, and I want to see my Government pay its bills and meet its obligations. If we want to change the situation, let us go to the legislative committee and have it changed. It seems to me we cannot be criticized in this bill for paying the obligations of the Government of the United States, to keep our word. To me the word of the United States is a precious thing. Inasmuch as I dislike much of the money that is in here, I will say to the gentlemen, I for one am going to see that the obligation and the faith of my country is maintained, even though the other countries do not do it. We have to stop here sometime. We cannot continue it, but this is not the place to do it.

Mr. FOREMAN. I think that was very well stated. You say we are going to stop it. When are we going to stop it? Let us get away from the United Nations and go to the inter-American organizations, the Pan-American Health Organization, $3,887,000. We know that in the last year the United States contributed to one department of the Pan-American Health Organization some $50,000 that was supposed to be used for fighting malaria in South America. We know that a goodly portion of this money bought Russian jeeps going to Cuba. Now, is there any more money going to them for that purpose?

Mr. BOW. May I say this to the gentleman, if you look in the record and study the hearings, you will find where we raised the question. We are making contributions through these agencies which go to the benefit of Cuba. We are picking up part of Cuba's contribution, and this is wrong, but it has to be corrected in other areas.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is familiar with every facet of this bill, and I wonder if he could enlighten me as to the source in the Justice Department from which the postage on a certain letter I received under date of June 3 was paid. The President's study group of the National Service Group sent me the testimony of a gentleman from California by the name of Clemens before the House Labor Committee in favor of the so-called domestic Peace Corps or the National Service Corps. Oddly enough, he advocates the cutting down of the number of migratory laborers in California, when just a few weeks ago we defeated a bill on the ground that sufficient migratory labor could be developed locally.

Mr. BOW. I think with what you have in your hand, if I were you, I would look at section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code. The gentleman who said that undoubtedly has violated that law.

Mr. GUBSER. In other words, the postage fees were paid by the U.S. Department of Justice. Is that a proper use of appropriated funds?

Mr. BOW. No I do not think it is, and I would suggest the gentleman look at section 1913 of title 18 of the Criminal Code.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I shall find it necessary to vote against this bill. This, to me, presents a difficult situation because my committee reported the bill. I realize that it covers many agencies of Government, most of which are doing satisfactory work. It may appear inconsistent to vote against a bill which contains funds for many necessary functions of Government, but I vote against it to protest a situation which I consider intolerable. I refer in particular to the Supreme Court decision outlawing Bible reading and recital of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Apparently this is in keeping with the Court's preoccupation with the new fetish for minority rights. In recent years the Court has plunged headlong into a morass of social experiments, wholly without precedent, which in substance say that any so-called rights demanded by a vocal minority must prevail over the views of the majority. In its zeal to give the militant minority whatever it chooses to demand in the name of "rights," the Court perforce has ridden roughshod over the rights of the majority. The net effect of the Court's new strained interpretations of its constitutional responsibilities is to undermine all human rights. No individual henceforth can consider himself secure in any rights and protections heretofore commonly understood and assumed.

In its most recent ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court has struck a body blow at our Constitution. It has placed an interpretation of the wording of the Constitution that was never intended by the Founding Fathers. They were deeply religious men. All they sought to do was to prevent the establishment of a state church. They could not have dreamed that their wording would be used as an argument against religion itself. To take religion out of the public schools is to take a long step toward the adoption of an atheistic doctrine. This is another blow at the bright symbolism which made this country the hope of the world for so many years. The decision has cheapened America and weakened its moral strength. I sincerely hope the Congress will rebel against the things that are happening to our country and its people and reassert the principles which made us a great nation. As a first step, the Supreme Court must be curbed. My vote against this bill is a vote against the Supreme Court for which funds are carried in the bill. The situation brought on by the Court is so grave that I consider a protest vote is necessary.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out here that if American countries are going to control malaria in Central America, it cannot be effective if we just control the mosquitoes in some of the countries and leave Cuba without any control. This is the reason the United Nations has spent some of this money in Cuba. They cannot control malaria effectively if any country in the mosquito breeding area is left out.

The chairman has explained the details of this large bill as well as can be done in the time available. We sat in hearings from January to May for several hours per day taking testimony, hearing justifications and on cross-examination. Obviously all the details gathered and examined in that length of time cannot be thoroughly discussed here and obviously there could not be unanimous agreement on all items; but, the bill is a compromise bill which was at least accepted by all the members of the committee with a couple of exceptions.

I would have reduced some items more than they were reduced and increased a few but the general objective of preventing across-the-board increases was agreed upon by all. I am in favor of increased investigators to prevent waste in the interstate road program and for effective increased efforts to arrest the balance-of-payments problem, but at the time felt there were abuses in the use of funds to pay expert witnesses in Indian claims cases, excess requests for some research funds, and evidence of more employees than needed in some of the agencies. Some agencies were claiming credit for the same accomplishments some other agency claimed credit for in order to justify the request. I am just as critical as others of the unwise expenditures by the Travel Bureau; however, I do feel they have helped increase travel to the United States. I think the operation was more expensive than necessary but that the evidence did indicate some results.

I am convinced that all budgets can be reduced in specific places without reducing their effectiveness. Congress reduced all eight of President Eisenhower's budgets and I assume we will reduce all eight of President Kennedy's budgets. When it takes each subcommittee months to find places where budgets can be reduced, obviously a President cannot find time to discover every place that a budget can be reduced before submitting it to the Congress.

Although there may be some items with which I disagree at least moderately in this bill, all appropriations bills represent compromise, this one will probably be compromised some more in conference with the Senate and I urge adoption of this as a compromise bill worthy of your support.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the President of the United States, like all his predecessors, submits a budget to the Congress, the Congress having control of the purse strings, and whether it is President Kennedy or President Eisenhower or President Truman, or President Roosevelt, in my time, he expects that the committees on appropriations of the House and Senate will carefully scrutinize his budget. I do not believe any President at any time has ever sent up a budget that he has personally inspected down to the last cent. This is the function of the Congress, and I am sure that President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, President Truman, and President Roosevelt expect and expected that their budgets would be cut when it was found there were funds contained in them which were not required or justified.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman], is disturbed about how we can cut down on these international organizations. With him I, too, am disturbed. That is one of the reasons why I have no intention of voting for this bill, for I see no evidence on the part of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to cut down on the contributions on the part of the U.S. Government to these various international organizations. That leaves some of us only one thing to do, namely, to vote against the appropriations in lieu of cuts that ought to be made.

I want to call attention to some information to be found in the State Department hearings accompanying this bill which show, for instance, that in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization Russia has 24 employees, yet it makes not one dime of contribution to the organization. I ask you, why U.S. taxpayers should contribute a heavy percentage, some $4 million to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization to support 24 Russians?

I would also call your attention to the list of consultants to be found in the State Department hearings. They cover a number of pages. It is unbelievable the number of consultants who are employed not only by the State Department but by the Commerce Department as well. I call your attention to one of those consultants employed by the State Department, Warren M. Christopher, a member of a law firm in Los Angeles, Calif. He has a bachelor of science degree and an LL.B. from Stanford University. He was a law clerk to one of the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court; was vice president of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education; and, he was special counsel to Governor Brown, whatever that means.

Then we turn to page 106 of the hearings and we find that this gentleman has been hired as a consultant. He has gone from Los Angeles to Paris to Geneva to New York to Washington, D.C. and returned to Los Angeles after attending the OEECD meeting in Paris for a total expenditure of $1,400. I do not know what qualified him for the OEECD meeting.

Then he went from Los Angeles to Washington, D.C. and return four times for a total of per diem and transportation amounting to $1,436.69 for consultation with the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. I do not know what qualified him for this mission.

He went from Los Angeles to Tokyo and return to head the U.S. delegation to the bilateral discussions on textiles conducted with Japan and Hong Kong, which cost the taxpayers $1,800, and I see nothing in his biography which indicates he was qualified for half a second to represent the United States in dealing with these countries concerning tariffs and textiles. The report says he has a bachelor of science degree and a law degree. This is the type of stuff which is costing the U.S. taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. I am talking about these consultants and the contract firms providing so-called expert advice.

I noticed in the hearings that we now have an Ambassador in Libreville and he is in a country as I understand it from the hearings—and I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will correct me if I am wrong—having a total of 23,000 population. There are reported to be 86 Americans there. I do not know how many nationals are employed, but this Ambassador reportedly has 86 Americans under his dominion. How in the world can we justify this kind of expenditure?

I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if this is approximately correct, that we have an Ambassador with 86 Americans in Libreville representing the U.S. Government, and dealing with a population of 23,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman advise me of the page to which he is referring?

Mr. GROSS. Page 220 of the State Department hearings.

Mr. ROONEY. It seems to me offhand that that figure includes many, many people outside of American diplomats. I am quite sure that in these hearings we have set forth exactly who they were.

Mr. GROSS. In the hearings you say, "I would imagine these 86 American employees must make quite an impact."

That would be in an area with only 23,000 population.

Mr. ROONEY. That is exactly what I was proving there, at page 220 of the committee print, that the population was only 23,000 and that they had 86 American employees. I inquired if that would not make quite an impact and they said, "There are 86 Americans."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 additional minute.

Apparently this figure includes 49 people from the Peace Corps, if I read my own hearings correctly.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see any reference to the Peace Corps.

Mr. ROONEY. That is on the previous page, page 219. Yes, I believe that is so.

> Mr. Rooney. The total Peace Corps complement would be 49?
>
> Mr. Williams. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Rooney. The total number for the country, I believe you said previously, was 66.
>
> Mr. Williams. That is correct.
>
> Mr. Rooney. That would be 27 of whom 12 are State Department people.

Mr. GROSS. And to house them, $60,000 a year.

Mr. ROONEY. I think we have entirely too many people in many of these small capitals. You can go into a town in Africa with a population of about 30,000 and find that it takes 8 or 9 or 10 or a dozen houses in the small town to house our American personnel. I do not subscribe to this sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has again expired.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman again 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Then it seems to me that the only way to teach these people downtown that Congress means business is to cut their appropriations right down to their hip pockets.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that out of the 86 people to which he referred only 12 are paid out of the item "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," the pending appropriation?

Mr. GROSS. If you can shake it down that far; and I am not sure that you can from reading this record, to 12 Americans, paid by the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. In the last administration—I am referring to the State Department administration, when Mr. Loy Henderson was Under Secretary of State, it was proposed to set up 16 Americans at every post in Africa, no matter how small. At least we cut that half in two.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that I did not defend that record, either.

Mr. ROONEY. I think we are in agreement on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has again expired.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to take up too much time. This matter has been amply covered by the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York, and by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this legislation, although there are areas where I believe we could make further reductions. But with the idea of coming up with some kind of reasonable compromise I think the bill presented to us today is wise and goes a long way, in my opinion, in cutting down and in stopping the advance of bureaucracy as much as we possibly can.

There is one thing I would like to say very briefly. That is in the area of civilian industrial technology where $1 million has been allowed for textiles only. It was to complete research in textiles which was started by a $600,000 appropriation in the supplemental.

If we had opened the door as requested by the administration in this particular field, I think it is the general consensus of every member of the committee on both sides of the aisle that we would not know what the limits would be, because they would probably in a few years go into $50 to $100 million and duplicate much research that is now being carried on in the private sector and other areas of Government.

Again I say I support this legislation. I think this is one of the best bills we have brought out of this subcommittee in the few years I have had an opportunity to be a member of it.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I had earlier considered proposing an amendment to H.R. 7063, which would have added an additional $250,000 to the appropriation for financing cultural exchanges through participation in international arts festivals held in the District of Columbia and in selected cities in the United States during 1964.

On second thought, I decided not to propose this amendment today, since I did not appear before the committee considering this bill, and the committee had no chance for a consideration of the amendment on its merits. I deeply regret, however, that the lack of funds has caused such notable programs as the Inter-American Music Festival to be canceled this year.

Mr. Chairman, in offering this critique I do not pretend to any special knowledge about cultural matters. The arts, as all of us recognize, are areas of specialization. Some of our colleagues, however, have some expertise in these fields and have developed a considerable national following as a result.

What I am concerned about here is how to win friends around the world for the United States and this is a matter which has engaged a growing amount of our time and thought in this House and elsewhere. In fact, we have been spending tremendous sums of money to construct a favorable international image of our country and its citizens.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower began in 1954 the practice of the participation of the Federal Government in international trade fairs, and at the same time he began sending our cultural groups overseas to demonstrate to other peoples that we are not the dollar chasers and barbarians which the propaganda of the Soviet Union pictures us to be, propaganda which, at the same time, and in the same breath, pictures the Soviet Union as the cradle of culture.

Under the program initiated by President Eisenhower, and during the time he was in the White House, we participated in the Brussels World's Fair, and the Moscow Fair, and in many other fairs and cultural events, and have won many friends.

Make no mistake, however. The Soviet Union's concentration on cultural matters is a mighty weapon, a weapon, moreover, which speaks as significantly as its sputniks to the uncommitted peoples, spreading the story of so-called peaceful intentions of that country.

Some time ago Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University, made a suggestion which could be the basis for a successful counter strategy.

Dr. Goheen said:

> We need to learn to know and to respect the culture of others—their history, their religion, their art, the things they value as their own. Only in this way can we hope for enlarged rapport with the peoples of other lands—or expect them to join with us gladly in the quest for a peaceable world order, built upon mutual advantage and mutual respect.

Americans spend between $2 billion to $3 billion in traveling abroad each year to learn about other peoples, to see at first hand the history, religion, the art of other peoples. Indeed, many Members of Congress travel abroad to learn at first hand about other peoples to find out about the things which other peoples value as their own.

However, only a small fraction of Americans can afford to make such trips.

I would like to see it possible for millions of our fellow Americans to learn at first hand about what other peoples value as their own.

This would be one of the best ways to establish an enlarged rapport with the peoples of other lands, indeed, it might well turn out to be the very best way to encourage them, in the moving words of President Goheen, "to join with us gladly in the quest for a peaceful world order, built upon mutual advantages and mutual respect."

This could indeed give hope and substance to this quest, a search which has engaged the world's greatest minds, and which must, of necessity, continue to engage everyone if the world as we know it is to survive and not be blown to smithereens.

It would then be possible for the young people in our Nation's colleges and universities, the leaders of tomorrow's world, to obtain a firsthand knowledge of the culture of other peoples—something which is an "absolute must" as Dr. Goheen and other educators, as well as all who are concerned with the quality of leadership we give the world and our own people recognize.

Mr. Chairman, the Latin American nations are extremely important to us, and we are concerned with the spread of Castro's influence and the response he has gotten from individuals and groups in those countries.

This administration went all out to court France in bringing the Mona Lisa to Washington. About all we have gotten for our efforts to court that country is the hotfoot.

The Latin American countries are willing and eager to cooperate with us, yet all they get for their efforts in this direction was the cancellation of the Inter-American Music Festival this year for lack of funds.

This festival was supported by the Inter-American Cultural Council, a council which was given a major role by the Charter of the Organization of American States which we signed.

A White House news release of May 12, 1962, announced that the President and Mrs. Kennedy had accepted an invitation to serve as honorary sponsors of this festival.

This festival was postponed at a time when the National Cultural Council of Cuba has embarked on a major cultural offensive throughout Latin America, an offensive which was launched with a cultural festival in Havana between October 7 and November 10, 1962.

If Cuba can, with the backing of the Soviet Union, conduct a cultural offensive in Latin American countries, then the need is obvious, and I urge that it be explored further on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point to express my keen disappointment that only $1 million of the $7.4 million requested by the Department of Commerce for advancing civilian industrial technology has been approved by the committee and included in this bill. Not only is the figure far from adequate to accomplish the important objectives of the program, but it has been limited to the single field of textiles.

During the last few years, as we know, there has been a dramatic increase in total expenditures for research and development, an increase which reliable sources estimate has accounted for nearly one-half of our annual growth in gross national product. During the last 20 years, as a matter of fact, our dollar input for research and development has risen from half a billion dollars to approximately $17 billion.

The great majority of this effort, however, nearly three-fourths, has gone for national security and for the exploration of space. No more than $30 million—about the cost of launching a single space vehicle—is being spent for the support of civilian technology.

The defense and space efforts, furthermore, tend to support, as would be expected, firms, industries, and geographic areas already competent in science and technology; a selection which serves to further unbalance the technical resources of our country.

For example, 300 manufacturing firms perform 90 percent of the research and development work done in manufacturing industries, and 300 firms do 80 percent of the privately supported manufacturing research and development.

Of particular importance, it seems to me, is the fact that this civilian industrial technology program is designed to help small firms—those with less than 5,000 employees. And let me emphasize that because of the expense involved in research and development today, these firms have been able to conduct very little of this work which is so vital to progress and growth, nor do they have sufficient trained technical manpower to take advantage of the research and development done by others.

Mr. Chairman, the urgent requirement for us to compete successfully on the world scene in defense and space is now matched by the need to compete successfully in the economic arena—to insure the maximum possible utilization of our resources, both human and material. As the Council of Economic Advisors stated in their annual report for 1963:

> Our economy would be strengthened significantly over the long run if our civilian research and development resources were expanded to meet better the wide range of private and public needs.

The $7.4 million requested for the advancement of civilian industrial technology is a relatively small amount, but it is an amount which can encourage significant and urgently needed advances in an important area of our economy. I am very hopeful that the full amount requested can be restored and that the House will support this fully justified program.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this legislation (H.R. 7063) does more than effectively provide for the operations of the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1964. It also reflects great credit to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and to the Committee on Appropriations. It is, in my judgment, refreshing evidence of the practical application of prudence and economy in Government.

I make the observation that the bill does not provide funds for all the services and personnel requested, and the committee can readily justify its action in the elimination of several such requests.

Great fiscal integrity and wisdom are evident in the committee's findings which have resulted in a 14.3-percent reduction of the estimated budget for these departments and agencies. The significance of this achievement is heightened when we take into account the vastness of the programs it encompasses.

The committee's recommendation of a budget of $1,851,269,900 for these departments is $292,156,941 less than was appropriated for fiscal 1963. It is $308,622,000 less than the amount requested for 1964.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have taken special note of the State Department budget, which has been reduced to $305,051,000. This is $99,897,000 below the budget for the current year and $54,670,000 less than the estimates presented for 1964. And yet, I am pleased to note that in addition to the other many and varied programs of the State Department, the committee has provided $42,250,000 for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities.

While the committee has taken a determined stand against general increases in the numbers of Federal employees, it has wisely, I think, made provision for 200 additional FBI agents. The Government's drive on organized crime will go forward faster with this additional help.

We are well aware of the need for constancy in the never-ending struggle to improve the Nation's highways and I am pleased to note that the Department of Commerce budget of $833,818,000 includes additional funds for the Bureau of Public Roads. The allocation of $3,307,650,000 to the Bureau of Public Roads includes $3,249,650,000 from the highway trust fund.

In my opinion, the committee is deserving of commendation for a job well done, in its studies, findings, and recommendations that will improve and enhance the operations of the departments affected, and their employees. Because of these factors, and also because of the economies recommended, I am happy to support this bill.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a heavy heart to the criticism heaped upon the U.S. Travel Service here today, and although there may appear to have been abuses in the use of the funds provided for this Service, and I do not condone any misuse of public funds, I do feel that with the start of a new program, difficulties are bound to arise, and I would hope that those who are charged with the administration of the program would profit by any initial miscalculation and I know that would be the purpose of the able Director of the Travel Services, Mr. Voit Gilmore.

I want to see the Travel Service continued. I still believe the good it can do to promote foreign tourist travel to this country will far outweigh the initial cost of the program and for its continuation.

The July issue of Holiday magazine devotes much of its contents to "Travel USA 1963," and I want to see the people of other nations informed of the glories of our country and I do not know of a better way to exploit all the magnificent wonders to be found in our United States than through the promotional services performed by the U.S. Travel Service.

On May 21, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I outlined in detail the many accomplishments of the U.S. Travel Service and I would ask now that the Members of this great legislative body review the magnificent record made by Mr. Gilmore and his staff in their first year of operation.

Let us not destroy a worthwhile project. Let us give it our support and an expression of confidence in accomplishing that which it was designed for.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7063 appropriates $1,669,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Public Law 87–297, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act, authorized a total of $10 million to be appropriated for the Agency. To date the Agency has received $8,331,000. Today's appropriation exhausts the Agency's authorization under the act. It will be necessary to amend Public Law 87–297 to continue the work of this vital agency. I have introduced H.R. 4672 for that purpose. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has requested that $15 million be authorized for fiscal year 1964. I heartily approve of today's appropriation for this Agency and hope that later in the session we will authorize the full $15 million requested for fiscal year 1964.

Since its establishment in September 1961 the Agency has been responsible for three draft treaties of great significance—the draft treaty for general and complete disarmament and two draft treaties on a test ban. In addition, the Agency formulated the proposal for direct communication between the United States and Russia, the so-called hot line proposal. Most of the Agency's resources have been devoted to research. Before the Agency was created, very little research was being sponsored by the Government on arms control and disarmament. In 1962 the Agency allocated more than half of its resources to research. For fiscal year 1964 the Agency plans to allocate $11 million out of $15 million for research. This research concerns not only the technical questions of verification and inspection, but also the heretofore neglected areas of the political and social ramifications of arms control and disarmament.

Yesterday the other body voted to authorize $20 million for 2 years for the Agency. I hope and urge that the House be more generous. The need for disarmament under effective international control is greater now than ever before. For the first time man possesses the power to destroy Western civilization as we know it. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a vital instrument in the search for peace. It deserves our full support.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1131), $973,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 7, strike out "$973,000" and insert "$773,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. I think we could well save $200,000 in behalf of the taxpayers of this country on the $973,000 booze fund for the State Department. As I understand it, the total "for tools of the trade," as the gentleman from New York describes it, will run well above a million dollars for the State Department and its related agencies. I am sure in the interest of economy all Members of the House would want to save $200,000. I am sure they can get along very well with their liquid refreshments at $773,000. I would cut it more if I thought the House would support it, but I am willing to take one feeble little step in the direction of economy in the matter of the booze fund.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, realizes that this would make a veritable desert of the State Department.

This proposed cut of $200,000 is an inordinate one, for this reason: The committee was asked to appropriate $996,000. We have allowed the amount of $973,000, which would be only $23,000 above the amount appropriated in the current fiscal year.

The purpose of the allowance of this request, and the committee was in unanimous agreement on it and we did not have to spend many minutes on it, is that it is due to price and wage increases and the opening of new posts.

I will admit my first remark was a bit facetious, but to be serious, there are the tools of the trade. It is necessary for our diplomats to entertain other diplomats just as other diplomats entertain our people. It is necessary to have dinners, teas, luncheons, and so forth. This is the money to pay for them. We have considered this item very carefully over the years, and think it is not too much considering the State Department functions worldwide.

There is not a single other representation or entertainment item in this bill regardless of which department it is, including the State Department, which has been increased this year; and this item is increased only to the extent of $23,000.

I submit that it would be inordinate to even think of a cut to the extent of $200,000 as proposed by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa. I respectfully ask that this proposed amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 25, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, $81,305,000.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 5, line 12, strike out "$81,305,000" and insert in lieu thereof $61,814,000."

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce by $19,491,000 the amount included in H.R. 7063 for contributions to International Organizations for fiscal 1964.

The U.S. Department of Defense has over a period of several years incurred expenditures in behalf of the United Nations with regard to the Congo operation. The expenditures are continuing to the present time.

The $19,491,000 represents the amount which according to a recent tabulation, dated April 30, 1963, was at that time owing by the United Nations to the Department of Defense for expenditures incurred in behalf of the United Nations on the Congo operation for supplies, material, equipment, airlift, sealift and other services. The United Nations had been billed for this amount but it remained unpaid.

The purpose of this amendment is to recoup to the U.S. Treasury this amount and at the same time provide an understanding that the United Nations may consider paid to the U.S. Treasury $19,491,000 on account toward its present indebtedness as a result of the Department of Defense expenditures in behalf of the Congo operation.

The details concerning the $19,491,000 unpaid Department of Defense billings to the United Nations are as follows:

Statement of unpaid billings due from United Nations for Department of Defense support of the Congo operations

Appropriation	Reported unpaid, Mar. 19, 1963	Received	Subsequent billings	Unpaid billings, Apr. 30, 1963
Air Force:				
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1961	$373, 795. 17	----------	----------	$373, 795. 17
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1962	1, 005, 085. 83	----------	$94. 11	1, 005, 179. 94
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1963	168, 024. 20	----------	17, 250. 78	185, 274. 98
Military personnel, fiscal year 1962	183. 56	----------	----------	183. 56
Aircraft procurement	4, 573, 090. 20	----------	33, 471. 89	4, 606, 562. 09
Other procurement	22, 949. 00	----------	44, 680. 98	67, 629. 98
Industrial fund	5, 902, 646. 89	----------	2, 561, 825. 67	8, 464, 472. 56
Total, Air Force	12, 045, 774. 85	----------	2, 657, 323. 43	14, 703, 098. 28
Navy: Industrial fund	2, 689, 530. 22	----------	634, 282. 80	3, 323, 813. 02
Army:				
Stock fund	425, 896. 89	----------	4, 095. 07	429, 991. 96
Procurement of equipment and missiles	272, 515. 60	----------	----------	272, 515. 60
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1961	51, 233. 57	----------	----------	51, 233. 57
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1962	138, 687. 55	----------	----------	138, 687. 55
Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1963	34, 309. 49	----------	406. 93	34, 716. 42
Operation and maintenance [1]	536, 292. 07	----------	656. 30	536, 948. 37
Total, Army	1, 458, 935. 17	----------	5, 158. 30	1, 464, 093. 47
Total, Department of Defense	16, 194, 240. 24	----------	3, 296, 764. 53	19, 491, 004. 77

[1] Army accessorial charges, fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would reduce from $81,305,000 to $61,814,000 the amount included in the bill for contributions to international organizations. Of the $81,305,000, $31,330,445 is for contributions to the United Nations, and this amount under the amendment would in effect be reduced to $11,839,445.

In essence, however, the appropriation to the United Nations would not be reduced, for in addition to the $11,839,445 appropriated, a United Nations indebtedness of $19,491,000 due to the Department of Defense expenditures for the Congo operation as of April 30, 1963, would be settled. These two items, the appropriation and the settlement of the indebtedness, amount to $31,330,445, the amount proposed for inclusion in the bill for contributions to the United Nations.

The funds which would be recouped from the United Nations pursuant to the amendment represent, in part, longstanding debts. The United States, even without the special help by the Department of Defense, has been by far the largest contributor to the United Nations operations. I believe it is time to work toward squaring accounts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing I should like to point out is the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] previously referred to the situation concerning these regular U.N. contributions.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be a member of the United Nations and its specialized agencies we must pay our dues. If one does not like our being a member of the United Nations the proper forum is not here on an appropriation bill, but in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As long as we belong to the United Nations, we cannot at all welch on the payment of our dues. We all know what a precarious financial situation now exists up at the United Nations, and this amendment, if you please, is being offered at a time when the United States and other nations are seeking to reach agreement on the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations that would cover the costs of such operations after the resources generated by the U.N. bond issue are exhausted. The withholding by the United States of its cash contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations, which is what this amendment seeks to do, would make more difficult an agreement on an acceptable means of financing the peacekeeping activities and would tend to lead other countries to consider that the United States was as responsible as the Soviet bloc for the financial difficulties of the United Nations, and would weaken our efforts to persuade other governments to bear an equitable share of the peacekeeping costs.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has properly interpreted my statement during general debate. I do believe in an area where our country has a commitment that we must keep the faith of our country and pay our commitment. But when I say that, I mean that I believe also other nations should keep their word and meet their commitments.

Mr. Chairman, this is money owed to the United States that the gentleman seeks to recoup, some $19 million that has been expended which the United Nations had agreed to pay to us for services rendered. If we are going to keep faith and make our payment to the contribution, which we agreed to pay, it seems to me we have a right to expect the other nations to pay us what is coming to us, and that the United Nations should pay what is coming to us. They have failed to do that. Here is an item where it can be recouped to the Treasury, and I refer to payment for our services to the United Nations in the peacekeeping operations in the Congo. There is no question about it, there is no question that we owe the items we talked about in general debate.

I think I am consistent in supporting this amendment when I said in general debate I will keep all of the commitments of my country, even though I do not like some of the items. I will vote to furnish the money to pay them, because it is our obligation and our commitment; but I think, Mr. Chairman, the other nations of the United Nations should honor their commitments, too.

By this act let us convince the United Nations that we will pay them what we are obligated to pay, but we should also let them know that they should pay what is owing us. It is a simple amendment.

This amounts to $19 million. That amount is not going to wreck the United Nations, but it shows that the Congress has some control over these funds. This is important. We should not control it to the point of making any reduction in our commitments. We are meeting our commitments. When we take the $19 million and put it in the Treasury of the United States, which added to what we will owe the United Nations, it meets our commitment. That is our commitment. It also lets the United Nations pay its commitments.

I urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like as much as anyone to see a more realistic picture of our financial dealings with the United Nations. We pay more than our part. Other nations have taken advantage of our generosity. There should be a rewriting of the law on U.S. participation in the United Nations. But, as the chairman of this subcommittee has pointed out, the place to get correction is in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The floor of the House of Representatives, during discussion of an appropriation bill, is not the place to get correction.

Let me tell you what the situation is. Of the amount owed by the United Nations for peacekeeping operations, and that is what we are talking about, $59 million is owed to other governments and $33 million to the United States. If every nation were to do what is proposed here today, the United Nations could very well be out of business. There are some who think this would be a good thing, but this is not the place to precipitate it, and not the way to decide it.

May I point out also that of the money that is owed to the United States, we have in recent months been reimbursed in the amount of $7.7 million. An effort is being made to repay to this Government by the U.N. what is owed to us, and some progress is being made. If we can keep moving in the same direction, if the Secretary General is able to maintain a livable financial position, even though precarious, for a period of time, the stage is going to be set for a confrontation by the United States with the U.S.S.R. and its satellites on the issue of losing the right to vote in the General Assembly under article XIX. That is much more significant, I submit, than any money we might recover in the present suggested procedure.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered to H.R. 7063 by the distinguished gentleman from California which would reduce by $19,491,000 the appropriation for contributions to international organizations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Purportedly, the assumption of this amendment was that the figure represented an unpaid just debt owed by the United Nations to the U.S. Department of Defense for expenses incurred by the peacekeeping efforts in the Congo. The gentleman from California contended that this reduction would actually be taken only from the U.S. assessment for membership in the United Nations, which figure is $31,330,445. He held that the withholding of such funds would signify only a sense of fiscal responsibility on the part of Congress, and the fulfillment of just commitments both by the United Nations—in that it would thereby eliminate a debt, though without direct action on its part—and by the United States—as one principle of membership is cognizance by the member of the financial obligations of the body to which he belongs.

Unfortunately the amendment revealed a lack of awareness both of the nature of the appropriation itself, and of the purposes for which the funds will be employed. The appropriations recommended were for membership and other regular assessments pursuant to being an integral part of the United Nations, and were well within the 33⅓-percent ceiling imposed by American law on the financial obligations of our great Nation to any international organization. In addition, the money recommended had nothing whatsoever to do with peacekeeping operations in the Middle East, the Congo, or anywhere else, all of which was eloquently stated by the gentleman from New York in debate over the amendment. Such contingencies are seen to by other means, beyond the normal assessments which will be covered by the $81,305,000 recommended in this bill for contributions to international organizations. What the amendment entailed, in actuality, was a withdrawal by the United States from the fulfillment of its normal membership obligations, much in the manner with which the Soviet Union is accustomed to approach its financial obligations to the United Nations. In fact, it is for just such irresponsible fiscal behavior that the Soviet Union is facing the crisis of the loss of its vote in the General Assembly.

Most tragic, however, are the human implications presented in a discussion of the impact of such a cut in the international organizations appropriation. One need only review the list of agencies and organizations which will receive financial contributions from the proposed $81,305,000; among them are: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO; the World Health Organization—WHO; the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO; the International Labor Organization—ILO; the Inter-American Children's Institute; and the Pan American Health Organization. Contributions to these organizations alone total more than $27 million, and human assistance—and hope—rendered thereby more than justify the financial commitment. The improvement of standards of living, the amelioration of working conditions, the elimination of disease, the provision for children of greater opportunities for growing up in a world where they have a chance, the introduction of education, food, and other facets of societal well-being, and advancement into areas which have not yet entered the 20th century on equal terms with other nations of the world—all of these would suffer from any proposed cut.

What of defensive and political alinements which insure the security of the United States? The Organization of American States is one of the international organizations supported by this appropriation, as are NATO, SEATO, the Colombo Plan, and the OECD. Any proposals to reduce our commitments and/or support to these organizations must be viewed in the cold light of national security, and within the broader perspective of the respect in which we are held by other nations of the world. Relationships with our Latin-American neighbors, the question of the Atlantic Alliance, and the precariousness of the situation in Asia render a reduction in American support well-nigh inconceivable at this time.

Other organizations which would receive funds from the recommended appropriations are the international administrative organizations, the services rendered by which are essentially of a nonpolitical, cooperative nature among nations, and are aimed at international harmonization and coordination of such matters as weights and measures, telecommunications, and celestial exploration.

In summation, one can see that any reduction in the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for contributions to international organizations would be most detrimental to the U.S. position of leadership in the promotion of world peace, freedom from disease, freedom from hunger, advancement of educational opportunities, and in the preservation of that body which provides the forum for reconciliation and cooperation among nations. The proposed amendment, which would reduce the allocation by more than $19 million, seems to maintain as its underlying objective the weakening and eventual dissolution of the entire United Nations structure, for without U.S. leadership, commitment, and responsibility, that body is able to retain no truly effective hope for the maintenance of international peace or the reduction of tensions between states. Failure to live up to our obligations of membership places us in the position of tacit accord with the Soviet Union's objective of breaking up the United Nations, as the gentleman from New York pointed out in the debate on the amendment.

Even with a mature realization of its inherent limitations, we must recognize that the United Nations has played a highly significant role in international relations. The settlement of disputes between states and the containment of skirmishes which threaten wider conflict, the facilitation of independence and freedom for formerly dependent territories, the advances in human welfare in underdeveloped areas of the world, and the provision of a forum for peace—all these factors make it incumbent upon the Congress to approve the full amount of the contributions to international organizations, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have been more or less taken aback by the position of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I had assumed from his remarks in the well of the House earlier that if we were to discontinue being a member of the United Nations, any action to bring this about should be taken by another committee and not by the Committee on Appropriations. The pending bill, containing $57,052,542 for the United Nations and its specialized agencies, has nothing to do with the Congo or Middle East peacekeeping operations. These are only the regularly assessed dues, none of which may exceed 33⅓ percent under our law. This money has nothing to do with the so-called peacekeeping operations where there has been generated credit to the United States in the amount of $30 million plus, and to 25 other nations in the amount of $59 million.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, the House will realize how drastic would be the consequences of adopting such an amendment as is pending.

I respectfully suggest that to adopt the pending amendment would be an irresponsible action on the part of the House. I am one who believes that the House is almost never irresponsible and believe that today it is not going to be. It must be understood that this is money for our dues, not for operations in the Congo or Middle East, not for military operations, but membership dues to belong to the organization. To adopt this amendment at a time when we are trying to put the Soviet Union on the spot so they will lose their vote because of their failure to contribute their share of the U.N. costs and their having precipitated the financial crisis in the U.N. would be foolhardy. I respectfully submit that this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] said that the consequences of this amendment would be to put the United Nations out of business if all the other freedom-loving nations do the same thing. The United Nations would not only be put out of business; it would do more than that, because if the other freedom-loving nations would do the same thing, then the only peacekeeping operations the United Nations could finance or undertake would be those to which Russia would give its permission. We do not want the United Nations only being able to do what Russia would give them permission to do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 5 minutes following the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get something straight immediately. The gentleman from New York talks about the Russians losing their vote in the United Nations. The Russians are not going to, under any circumstances, lose their most effective vote in the United Nations. They could quit contributing today for any purpose and they would not lose their vote in the Security Council, where the veto power resides, because there is no way by which they can be thrown out of the Security Council of the United Nations. There is no provision in the charter for it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Not now. You just put a time limitation on.

Mr. ROONEY. Not on the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but I might have wanted 10 minutes. Who knows? Just 1 second, and I will try to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure if you did, you would have said so.

Mr. GROSS. Then we heard the gentleman from Florida recite the same old story of mañana, tomorrow, tomorrow. Do not do anything today because that might offend someone's feelings. Let us do it tomorrow. Let us wait, wait, wait. Well, we have been waiting for a long, long time. Turn to page 1166, if you will, of the State Department hearings and read for yourselves the uncollected assessments to the United Nations; the countries that refuse to pay up. You find them in these hearings year after year, yet no one does anything about it. Now, all the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] is asking, as has been so well stated by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], is that the delinquent countries pay their just obligations and that is all, in this case the $19 million obligation to take care of the emergency force in the Congo. What is wrong with that? When is this Congress ever going to request that they pay their honest obligations? We have been paying ours. Yes, pay their honest obligations, not tomorrow, not next week or next year. This is the day to serve notice on them that we have had about enough of this. And, you know, sometimes we go in and pick up the bad debts of those who refuse to pay. Not only do we forgive them their refusal to pay their legitimate assessments, but we pay in some instances by lowering their assessments while ours are being increased.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time and place to serve notice that we have had about enough of this. It is not going to impair the United Nations and, if paying honest debts does, they need to be impaired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I speak to you not as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations. It is always regretful to me when I have to differ with other colleagues on my side of the aisle, but in this instance I would be less than fair were I to let this pass and not speak of the consequences of the action we would be taking were we to enact and adopt the amendment before us at this time.

First of all, this is not the place for us to consider the end of the U.S. participation in the United Nations. I say "the end" because everything in the United Nations today is a matter of trend. We have a trend moving our way. Every African nation that has joined the United Nations has chosen a form of government similar to or close to our own. The trend is in our direction. This would be a deliberate slap to the free world that has been struggling to adopt a form of government free of communism and free of the encroachment of the Communists on the borders of all of the free world. We could do nothing that would be more harmful than using a meatax type of approach to a very delicate international diplomatic situation. I implore you to consider the consequences for a moment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. Not at the moment. I will yield when I am through.

When you consider the amount of money involved here in relation to the total, a reduction of $20 million out of $31 million, and then consider that the United States contributes over 30 percent of the cost of maintaining the United Nations, you can readily see you are cutting a very large chunk out of the administrative expenses required to run the United Nations. Let us look at the United Nations for a moment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. Not at the moment.

Mr. BOW. I am sure the gentleman's time is running out.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to say this: When the United Nations budget was originally established some years ago there were only 59 nations who were members. Today we have almost 110 members, or almost double the number of members of the United Nations on which the services of the United Nations must draw. We can say that they should get more money from the rest, and they are getting it, and our percentage is being cut down, but, nevertheless, the responsibilities of the United Nations have also grown.

I ask you all to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not belabor the House unduly with regard to this very important amendment. I could never say anything more sincerely when I say that adoption of the pending amendment might be the end of U.S. membership in the United Nations. At a time such as this when they have a financial crisis this action would precipitate the collapse of the United Nations. Again I say, at a time when the Soviet Union is about to be confronted with their responsibility for having caused this financial situation at the United Nations, a vote for the pending amendment, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is a vote for the support of the Soviet Union's position to try to wreck the United Nations.

I submit that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. As we look the world over, Mr. Chairman, we find that while there are a lot of disturbing questions and situations, that the emphasis has changed in the direction of the free world under the leadership of the United States. We find that to be true in India and we find evidences of unrest against communism in southeast Asia, as indicated by conferences only a few days ago between the Philippines and other countries in connection with the establishment of a new country of Malaysia. We find even within the Soviet Union itself evidences of unrest and tensions, which we can capitalize, and on which we should capitalize, and on which we will capitalize. Of all times this would be a bad time to adopt this amendment in the national interest of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to realize that history is in the making, that we are legislating not only for ourselves but for generations of Americans yet unborn, and that this is a matter of vital importance. History seems to be on our side. While one must ever be on our guard the Communist world is on the defensive because of conditions external and internal to the Communist world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Gross moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to get further into this debate, but I cannot let go unchallenged the statement that my colleague from California has introduced an amendment which would wreck the United Nations. If things are so bad in the United Nations today that the payment of a bill by it owed to the U.S. Government of $19 million is going to wreck it, then it is on rather unsound ground and maybe we had better take a good look at it. Then it is said that we will be playing into the hands of the Soviet Union, we will be doing what the Soviet Union wants us to do. That is an accusation against my distinguished colleague from California which does not bear up under scrutiny. What the gentleman from California is trying to do is to bring some soundness into the financing of the United Nations.

I repeat what I said before that we owe the United Nations every dime that we have agreed to pay. And I will say again that I will do whatever is necessary to sustain the full faith and credit of my country. But I expect the others to do the same thing. If the United Nations by paying this bill of $19 million is going to fold, then let me ask you how much faith do you have in the United Nations?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] who refused to yield to me, said that the proper forum is somewhere else. Let me ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry], what he has done in his committee to correct these situations for the people of America, who are beginning to be very much disturbed about this matter?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I do not yield to the gentleman at this time. I have propounded a question to the gentleman that he may answer in his own time when he has the opportunity. But he would not yield to me when I asked him to yield for a question.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the question.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman may answer it on his own time. The gentleman knows, when he says that this is not the proper forum to do this——

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the gentleman's saying that——

Mr. GROSS. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious question, of course. But we are legislating here, I would say to my distinguished and beloved Speaker, not only for the world on this question but we are also legislating to protect the interests of the people of the United States of America. We have been paying and paying and paying, to the point now where it has become rather difficult for the people of the United States of America to understand why we keep on paying and the other nations do not keep their obligations to us.

This is simply an opportunity for other nations to pay what they owe us. I do not believe it is going to wreck the United Nations. I have become convinced in my own mind we are not working into the hands of the Communists. The gentleman from California would not introduce any such amendment. So I urge that this amendment be adopted so that we show that the Congress is exercising some fiscal responsibility on how these funds are handled.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It seems inconceivable to me that the gentleman from New York and others would base the whole existence of the United Nations on this amendment. This amendment only brings some reason into the financial affairs of the United Nations. It is a $19 million just debt to the U.S. Department of Defense. If this is in effect going to ruin the United Nations, it is inconceivable. We have an opportunity here now to make the accounts right. We have been putting off year after year after year looking into the United Nations finances. The Department of State does not know the details of United Nations finances. They can answer few questions with any validity as to how the United Nations finances work. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], my distinguished friend from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BOW] are apparently unaware of the financial crisis which has been evident for some time in the United Nations. The fact is that although they sought to sell a $200 million bond issue they have been successful so far in selling bonds only to the extent of $144 million.

Once again I must point out we are not talking about money for the Department of Defense, we are not talking about peacekeeping in the Congo or the Middle East, we are talking about the regular assessments limited by American law to 33⅓ percent. I am sure that none of these gentlemen would wittingly or knowingly aid the Soviet Union in this financial crisis at the United Nations, but I must say the consequences of the adoption of this amendment might precipitate the breakup of the United Nations. This is what the Soviet Union and its satellites have been trying to do now for years. I cannot see any vote on this amendment other than to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LIPSCOMB and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 114, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAMA ROAD, NICARAGUA

For liquidation of obligations incurred for completion of the Rama Road, as authorized by section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1145–1146), $850,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, how far has the Clerk read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Clerk has read through line 10 on page 13 of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this time to ask one quick question of the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may have the gentleman's attention.

Is this definitely the last appropriation to the Rama Road?

Mr. ROONEY. That is my understanding, I will say to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we have had this same item before us for many years and each one was to be the last.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, this is the last, last payment. The Rama Road would have been completed a few years back but for the failure of cooperation on the part of the other body. They cut the Rama Road funds in the bill in order to make the bill look good. They reduced it, as I recall, one time, from $4½ to $1 million. The result is that we are still meeting the last payment, and I believe that that last payment is this $850,000.

Mr. GROSS. Can we have the assurance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], that the gentleman will sit down real hard on any further requests for money for this particular project?

Mr. ROONEY. I would be astounded if we were presented with a request for any further funds for the completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua. This, as the gentleman knows, is the road that was the brain child of a chat between Samoza and President Franklin D. Roosevelt many years ago.

Mr. GROSS. In one of those fireside chats?

Mr. ROONEY. But nobody ever stopped construction of that road during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. As a matter of fact, during the Eisenhower administration appropriations for the United Nations were going up, too. Which is the responsible party? When I just observed only four Members from the other side of the aisle who went up the aisle on the teller vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], we find an entirely different situation than was the situation during the Eisenhower administration when Democrats supported him in his responsible requests for the U.N.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The Democrats have provided the majority through the years, with four lonely exceptions as to years, for all of these appropriations, these giveaways to foreign countries. I am sure we can agree on that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to an item in this bill known as the Civilian Industrial Technology. It appears on page 28, of the bill which sets up $1 million fund limited to research in industrial technology in textiles.

I can understand the reluctance of the committee to appropriate more money for this purpose, but I would like to point out a few activities in this area that are taking place throughout the world.

In England the Scientific Industrial Research Group, similar to the one proposed here, is presently getting $40 million a year. It is through part of its activities that they are developing the Hovercraft machine which they hope will revolutionize water transportation on inland waterways. We call it a ground effects machine or GEM. It is a threat to us, because if they succeed in perfecting it, I can assure you that it will cause a boom in the English economy, and it will cause us to regret that we did not take the initiative in this area.

I point out to you that in Germany the Government pays about 30 percent of the cost of technical investigations for private industry. The little country of Belgium pays $10 million a year for industrial research.

I had the privilege of visiting and sitting in with the officials of the TNO, which is the Netherlands organization, last year. They spend about $20 million in this field, and they are perhaps as advanced in technology as any nation of Europe. They encourage technical uses to advance their economy. I might say this has reoriented the Netherlands economy from 25 percent industrial and 75 percent agricultural to 75 percent industrial and 25 percent agricultural.

They have developed radio, a very superior one, that is looked upon as the best in the world. It can compete with the Japanese radio.

Can we afford to sit back and not assist our own economy, our own small business, that needs money for technical investigations?

This is a part of the work of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. The big thing is how do we translate the advance in science into the civilian economy? This is a way that it can be done.

I am hopeful, even if we allow this million dollars to go into the phase of the economy this year, it will be such a successful demonstration, that next year the committee will be more generous and we can set up an orderly way of getting this done for the benefit of all American industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of upper air supplies for delivery through December 31, of the next fiscal year; and not to exceed $10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, as authorized by law; $63,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I notice language in line 20, page 31, reading "Purchase of upper air supplies." What in the world are we buying upper air for and, if so, why?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will kindly yield, and although I am not an expert on meteorology nor am I a balloonist, as is a certain distinguished gentleman across the aisle from Massachusetts, I assume this would have to do with blowing up balloons which proceed upward in the skies with equipment attached and give some scientific indications of the weather situation. Has the gentleman ever heard of this?

Mr. GROSS. I have heard of balloons being used by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, now you understand upper air supplies.

Mr. GROSS. But I did not know it was called "upper air" that was used to inflate balloons. I did not know whether it could be associated with the upper body.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the gentleman say the "other body" or "upper body"?

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses

> For expenses necessary for the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $985,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of any employee paid from funds provided under this head shall not exceed $20,500 per annum.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 51, line 1, strike out "$985,000" and insert "$410,000".

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also my remarks on the debate on the Lipscomb amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which is carried in this bill no money is allowed beyond the authorized amount. In the area redevelopment program carried in this bill no money is allowed which is not authorized by Congress.

But Mr. Chairman, when we come to the Commission on Civil Rights we adopt a different set of rules. For the Commission on Civil Rights the bill contains $985,000. That means that it provides funds for an entire year of operation even though the Commission is scheduled to expire on September 30, 1963. It could have an additional 60 days under the law, if not renewed, in order to close up its affairs. But even by spending hard the Commission should not use over $410,000 during that period of time if it follows the program which is outlined.

I want to call attention to the report on page 24 under "Commission on Civil Rights," the second paragraph, which reads:

> The amount allowed is based upon the assumption that the life of the Commission will be extended beyond its present expiration date of September 30, 1963, plus 60 days. If such is not the case it is expected that $575,000 will be retained in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, there is no bill before us to extend the Civil Rights Commission. No bill has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the proper committee, to extend the Civil Rights Commission.

I submit that to appropriate funds for an entire year for an agency which is scheduled to expire on September 30 is extremely poor fiscal policy. Certainly it is not in keeping with the very close fiscal policies exhibited elsewhere in this bill and which should be followed in all cases by the Congress. Possibly the Commission will be extended. I hope it will not be, because I seriously question its value. But there is no bill now before us for its extension. If it should be extended, funds can be provided just as they are for any other agency. But we should not appropriate funds for any agency before the Congress has acted to insure its existence. This one deserves no better treatment than is given other agencies. It does not become sacrosanct because its name is civil rights.

Under the language of the bill, if we appropriate all the money contained herein, the Commission can spend the entire $985,000 by September 30 if it chooses. That, again, is certainly not in keeping with good fiscal policy. I sincerely hope the Congress will be realistic and set aside the $575,000 which it is not anticipated this agency could use beyond September 30 and thereby exhibit the same sound fiscal policy that is shown elsewhere in this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the members of the committee and to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that beyond peradventure of doubt the Committee on the Judiciary will extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for at least an additional 4 years. It is interesting to note that some 140 bills have been offered on civil rights, many of which contain the extension provision, extending the Civil Rights Commission for at least 4 years.

Therefore, there is very strong bipartisan support for that particular item, so that I do not think the gentleman need be too much concerned that we will not adopt an extension of the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 4 years.

Mr. SIKES. If I may conclude my remarks, let me point out that in the event the Civil Rights Commission is extended it will be perfectly proper for the Commission to go to the other body and ask for additional money or to get a supplemental estimate from the Bureau of the Budget to the House. That is the customary procedure. We should not appropriate funds in anticipation that an agency is going to be extended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes following the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that time to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pending amendment offered by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. Of course, he is one of the ablest Members of the House. He knows very well that if the action of the subcommittee were subject to a point of order he would be the first to make it. But it is not. This item differs completely from the situation as to the requested funds for the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency, because in that instance there was a ceiling of $10 million on appropriations for the Agency, whereas in the instant case with regard to the Civil Rights Commission there is no ceiling at all. So rather than waste time, let us be realistic, let us realize that the life of the Civil Rights Commission is going to be extended by both Houses of the Congress in a bill to be signed by the President. The funding bill provides funds to continue the Commission through the next fiscal year.

I have never heard much complaint about the activities of this Commission. Its membership includes some of the most distinguished citizens of this country. The Chairman of the Commission is the president of Michigan State University, Dr. John A. Hannah. Another member is Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard University Law School. A third member is Rev. Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University. Another is Dean Robert G. Storey, of Dallas, Tex. Another Commissioner is Prof. Robert S. Rankin, of Duke University in North Carolina. The sixth member of the Commission is Dean Spottswood W. Robinson III, of Howard University School of Law.

This Commission has handled a highly volatile problem with discretion and should be commended for it. I am sure that the membership of this House is going to furnish the funds necessary to carry this Commission through the fiscal year 1964. They made a very satisfactory presentation.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask that the pending amendment of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to administer any program which is funded in whole or in part from foreign currencies or credits for which a specific dollar appropriation therefor has not been made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Gross, of Iowa: Page 62, immediately after line 18, add the following new section:
>
> "Sec. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is verbatim the amendment that I have offered and which has been adopted to two other appropriation bills. The purpose of this amendment is to prohibit the use of funds appropriated in this bill for any activities of the so-called Domestic Youth Corps Study Group.

As I said before, I have offered the same amendment to the appropriation bills for the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture. In each instance the amendment was adopted by the House. I would point out that all three departments for which funds are appropriated in the pending bill, State, Justice, and Commerce, have been involved in supporting the Study Group. In other words, they have provided manpower or money or both to this Study Group.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to point out that insofar as I am concerned, and I think I bespeak the thoughts of all the members of the subcommittee, there are no funds in this bill for the purpose to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there are no funds in this bill. There were no funds in last year's appropriation bills for this purpose. But they are using funds for the study group and they are using employees who are paid for other purposes. They are using funds previously appropriated and they are using manpower previously employed for other purposes, to promote this Study Group. That is the story. My amendment would stop them from using either money or manpower for it is not authorized by the Congress. The domestic youth corps is not authorized by the Congress.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVINE. The gentleman will recall on our visit to the Domestic Peace Corps headquarters earlier this year, they pointed out to us, and it was demonstrated here on the floor of the House today, that they use Justice Department stationery and the Justice Department frank to put out their information on this unauthorized committee that has not yet been created.

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so. Let me say this to my colleagues. Only this morning we had the Peace Corps before a subcommittee of which I am a member. The information was made available this morning that the Peace Corps is now spending almost $17,000 every 2 weeks in overtime on administrative personnel. Let me repeat, the Peace Corps is now spending nearly $17,000 every 2 weeks for overtime, yet the Peace Corps has a man full time, at least one man full time, a GS-15, promoting this Domestic Peace Corps Study Group. Again, I say without any authority on the part of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it may be said that it is legal that these people be used. There is not much question about the fact that there is some legality, but it was never intended by Congress that they should be without specific authorization. The legality, if such it be, comes through one of those gimmicks, one of those delegations of authority, by which money is spent and manpower used under the guise of promoting the natural welfare and national security.

If the various departments and agencies of Government have such a surplus of money and manpower that use can be made of both for promotions such as this then the appropriations committee and the legislative committees should give immediate attention to cutting down on both.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I believe the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] heard me mention a letter which I received with postage and fees paid by the U.S. Department of Justice, which constituted a lobbying effort for the so-called National Service Corps.

Would the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa prevent the expenditure of appropriated funds for this purpose by the Justice Department?

Mr. GROSS. Out of this bill; yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, as a Member serving on the subcommittee on Education and Labor Committee now considering legislation to establish a National Service Corps, I would like to report that the gentleman is absolutely right, the funds are now being spent. In fact, the Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy, admitted in response to a question I posed, that at least $90,000 has been spent in the last year of the taxpayers' money to study this proposal.

I believe the legislation which authorizes the establishment of a Presidential study group is limited to the studying of such a proposal and not the promotion of it. I think that the letter referred to by the gentleman from California and much of the evidence in the press and otherwise is available to indicate that a great deal of promotion has been going on with these funds, and not just study.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa has stated that the purpose of this amendment—which he has already attached to the appropriations for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture—is to put the President's Study Group on a National Service Program out of business—Congressional Record, April 30, 1963, page 7440. It is the Congressman's contention that such drastic action is in order because the President set up the Study Group without authority of Congress.

The official record shows that the Comptroller General as well as the Attorney General have formally ruled that the creation and activities of the Study Group are fully authorized by the laws of this Congress.

Let me state the facts. The President, in November 1962, established a Cabinet-level committee composed of the Attorney General as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Directors of the Peace Corps and the Veterans' Administration, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He asked this committee to study the feasibility of a National Service Corps at home patterned after the Peace Corps abroad. The committee, after a detailed study, submitted its report endorsing such a program, and the President asked these cabinet officers to remain in existence as a group to coordinate executive branch testimony on the legislation and prepare materials necessary to permit the Congress to make an informed judgment on the merits of the proposal.

The legislation to establish a domestic peace corps is now before the Congress—introduced by myself and 43 other representatives. The Special Subcommittee on Labor is holding hearings which will continue for at least another month. All parties will be heard, all points of view explored. The work of the Study Group has been of invaluable assistance to the committee and, I am sure, to the Congress.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to turn briefly to the suggestion that the President's Study Group is operating without congressional authority, for if this were so, I could understand the amendment. However, both the Comptroller General and the Attorney General have formally ruled otherwise—and they are the officials that we in Congress have made responsible for these judgments.

After an exhaustive review of the activities of the Study Group and the authority for its creation, the Comptroller General has ruled that its establishment and support by the participating agencies is entirely consistent with the act of this Congress of May 3, 1945—31 U.S.C. 691—which provides that appropriation of the executive departments and independent establishments shall be available to defray expenses of interagency groups engaged in authorized activities of common interest.

All of the facts concerning the creation, activities and staffing of the Study Group are reported in the Comptroller General's letter to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] dated May 17, 1963, which the gentleman has very graciously made available to me. This letter has been available to the gentleman from Iowa and was referred to in the debate on his amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. So that there will be no mystery here, I ask leave, Mr. Chairman, to include in the RECORD at this point a copy of the Comptroller General's letter of May 17, 1963:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1963.

Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: Further reference is made to your letters of February 28 and April 13, 1963, presenting certain questions involving the so-called Domestic Peace Corps.

As you were advised in our letters of March 25 and April 16, 1963, we requested the Attorney General to furnish us with a report concerning the matter. On April 24, the Attorney General replied to our letter and furnished information on the questions we presented therein which information is quoted as follows:

1. The statutory or other authority relied upon for the establishment of the committee.

"On November 17, 1962, the President appointed a Cabinet-level committee 'to study the feasibility of a national service program patterned after the Peace Corps.' The committee was composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Peace Corps, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and is under my chairmanship.

"In establishing this interagency committee, the President acted pursuant to the authority vested in him by the Constitution and statutes as Chief Executive and President of the United States, and in conformity with section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134, 31 U.S.C. 691) which provides that appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments shall be available to defray expenses of interagency groups engaged in authorized activities of common interest. Use of this authority to establish interagency committees to advise on matters of common concern to a number of agencies and to initiate new proposals for action follows well-established Federal precedents. See Executive Order No. 10483 of September 2, 1953 (18 Federal Register 5379), by which President Eisenhower used these same powers to create the Operations Coordinating Board. This Board continued in existence until 1961 (see 26 Federal Register 1463) and employed as many as 63 persons, exclusive of those assigned by the participating agencies. See also Executive Order No. 10308 of December 3, 1951, by which President Truman created the Committee on Government Contract Compliance (16 Federal Register 12303)."

2. The number of employees assigned by each department or agency concerned to the committee, together with their grades and salary rates and whether they worked for the committe on a full or part time basis.

"The Study Group began its activities on Monday, November 19, 1962. On January 14, 1963, after obtaining the advice and opinions of hundreds of public and private organizations most concerned with the objects of the proposed national service program, the Study Group submitted its report to the President endorsing the feasibility and desirability of such a program * * *. On April 11, 1963, the President transmitted to the Congress a draft bill, based on the findings and recommendations of the Study Group, to authorize the establishment of a National Service Corps. * * * The bill has been introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and 22 cosponsors in the Senate (S. 1321) and by Representative FRANK THOMPSON and 36 other Congressmen in the House (H.R. 5625).

"During the period from November 19, 1962, through April 11, 1963, when the report to the President and the draft legislation were being prepared, the following employees were assigned for portions of their time to the study committee:

"Number of employees	Department or agency	Grade	Period (months)	Time basis
2	HEW	GS-6	3⅓	Full.
	do	GS-12	2	Do.
1	Peace Corps	GS-15	3⅓	Part.
2	Labor	GS-6	3⅔	Full.
	do	GS-9	1½	Do.
1	Navy	GS-7	3½	Do.
2	Agriculture	GS-15	1½	Do.
	do	GS-9	1⅓	Do.
1	Justice	GS-15	1	Do.
1	Treasury	GS-3	2½	Do.
1	State	FSO-8	2	Do.
2	Commerce	GS-7	1	Do.
	do	GS-5	1½	Do.
3	Veterans' Administration	GS-7	1½	Do.
	do	GS-5	⅓	Do.
	do	GS-3	⅓	Do.
1	Interior	GS-10	1¼	Do.

"In carrying out my responsibilities as Chairman of the Study Group, I have been assisted by David L. Hackett, a special assistant, who is the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. At my request he has devoted a small portion of his time—mostly before and after regular hours—to supervision of the activities of the Study Group. In additon, members of the staff of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime have been coordinating activities of the Study Group and performing essential housekeeping functions. Of these, one, a GS–17 has been assigned full time to the Study Group as supervisor of program studies and planning. Eight clerical employees (GS–7) have devoted from 3 to 6 weeks full time, and four others with ratings of GS–16, 14, 11, and 4, and a consultant at $50 per day, have devoted a portion of their time in assisting the Study Group.

"During peak periods the Study Group employed 10 persons (2 GS–3's and 8 GS–7's) for clerical assistance for periods of 1 week to 1 month. These persons were paid from funds contributed by the participating agencies. In addition, four consultants were employed for periods of 1 week, 1 month, 5 weeks, and 2½ months and paid at rates of $40, $30, $35, and $55 per day, respectively, from these funds.

"There follows a description of some of the activities carried on by the Study Group in preparation of the report to the President and the draft legislation. It was necessary to make an intensive survey of the need for the proposed program; the type of projects which a domestic service corps would undertake; the views and recommendations of existing Federal, State and local government agencies presently working on problems proposed for corps action; the attitudes of the professional social service groups with whom the proposed corps would work; the willingness of men and women of various ages to volunteer for such service; and the proposed methods and cost of operating such a volunteer corps in the United States. In carrying out these survey activities, Study Group personnel have reviewed some 50 projects suggested by local groups throughout the Nation. Meetings have been held with groups representing migratory laborers, Indian tribes, mental health workers, and others who suggested projects, to determine firsthand the contribution which corpsmen would make and the skills, training and administration which would be required. To answer questions concerning recruiting, training and the availability of needed professional skills among persons expressing an interest in serving in the proposed program, the staff circulated detailed questionnaires and analyzed the responses of over 20,000 students from 65 colleges, over 4,000 senior citizens and approximately 1,000 Peace Corps trainees. I would be pleased to supply you with additional information of a more detailed nature, should you feel it necessary."

3. The amount of funds expended by each department or agency in connection with the committee's feasibility study of a national service program and the appropriations chargeable therewith. If additional expenses were paid by the committee from a common fund, please indicate the account symbol and title thereof, the amount of funds transferred thereto by each department or agency and the appropriation chargeable therewith, and the unexpended balance of funds in the account, if any.

"Through March 31, 1963, nine departments and agencies participating in the Study Group transferred a total of $13,500 for use in meeting expenses in connection with the group's activities. There follows a list of the participating departments and agencies and the appropriations to which their contributions were chargeable.

"Department or agency	Amount contributed	Appropriation chargeable	Amount
Agriculture	$1,500	1233100 1232001 1230502.040	$500 500 500
Commerce	1,500	1330120	
Labor	1,500	1630102.0014	
Interior	1,500	14X4523	
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,500	7530342 7530170	750 750
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,500	8630100	
Veterans' Administration	1,500	3630151	
Civil Service Commission	1,500	2430100	
Peace Corps	1,500	44-1131107	

"As of March 31, 1963, there was an unexpended balance of $1,199 in these funds transferred to the Study Group."

4. Whether the Committee was discharged after it submitted its report to the President, and if not, whether it is still in operation.

"Following its report, the President requested the Study Group to continue its activities. * * * Specifically the President stated: 'I am hopeful the Congress will act favorably on that recommendation (for the enactment of legislation authorizing a National Service program) in the near future, and I suggest that you continue your activities as a group to coordinate executive branch testimony on the proposal.'

"Pursuant to the President's request the Study Group has continued in existence with its activity directed primarily toward the survey, planning, and drafting work necessary to the preparation of the proposed legislation and the testimony to be given at the hearings to be held by the Congress."

5. Whether a National Service Corps or Domestic Peace Corps has been set up as a result of the feasibility study and is currently operating.

"Neither a National Service Corps, a Domestic Peace Corps, nor any comparable organization has been set up as a result of the feasibility study. No service corps is in operation and none will be established unless and until the Congress enacts the necessary enabling legislation which the President has placed before it."

We have been informally advised by a representative of the Department of Justice that the General Services Administration by agreement with the White House, under the terms of 40 United States Code 1, provided approximately 1,835 square feet of office space for Committee personnel in a Government-owned building at 736 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C., which building is scheduled for demolition or remodeling in the near future. The Department of Justice furnished, on a loan basis, used office furniture and equipment in its custody necessary for Committee activities. Telephone and telegraph services as well as expendable office supplies were purchased with funds contributed by participating agencies. Travel expenses covering employees of participating agencies were paid by the agency appropriation involved, otherwise they were paid from contributed funds. We were also informed that the Civil Service Commission, and the Departments of Commerce and Interior made contributions in addition to those listed above in the amounts of $2,500, $2,500, and $4,000, respectively.

Summarizing the facts as reported by the Attorney General, it appears that the President on November 17, 1962, appointed a Cabinet-level Committee, chaired by the Attorney General, to study the feasibility of a national service program patterned after the Peace Corps and to report its findings to him by January 1, 1963. In the White House Press Release of November 17, which announced the appointment of this Committee, it is stated that the President asked the Committee to consider all aspects of a national service program. Specifically, he asked the Committee to study possible program objectives and content, fields where the program could be most useful, probable response to the opportunity to serve, the relationship between the program and public and private agencies at the State and local level, the relationship with other volunteer programs being considered by the Federal Government, the organization and administration of the program, the size and makeup of a volunteer corps, training requirements, and estimated costs.

The Committee or Study Group, as it is referred to by the Attorney General, began its activities on November 19, 1962, and submitted its report to the President on January 14, 1963. The report of the Study Group endorsed the feasibility and desirability of a national service program and recommended that the Congress be requested to enact appropriate enabling legislation to accomplish that purpose. In preparing the report to the President and the proposed draft legislation, the Study Group sought the advice and opinions of leaders in education, business, labor, Government, farm groups, fraternal organizations, and service clubs around the country. Also contacted at the National, State, and local level were the professional fields that would be most concerned with the use of volunteers—social work, social service, mental health and retardation.

Based on the findings and recommendations of the Study Group, the President, on April 10, 1963, transmitted to the Congress a draft bill to authorize the establishment of a National Service Corps. As you know, S. 1321, relative to this matter was introduced in the Senate and a companion bill H.R. 5625 was introduced in the House.

The Attorney General states that neither a National Service Corps, a Domestic Peace Corps, nor any comparable organization has been established as a result of the activities of the Study Group. He further states that no service corps is in operation and none will be established unless and until the Congress enacts the necessary enabling legislation which the President has requested.

In justification of the statutory authority for the establishment of the committee, the Attorney General cites section 214 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, 59 Stat. 134, 31 U.S.C. 691, which provides, quoting from the code, as follows:

"Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government shall be available for the expenses of committees, boards, or other interagency groups engaged in authorized activities of common interest to such departments and establishments and composed in whole or in part of representatives thereof who receive no additional compensation by virtue of such membership: *Provided*, That employees of such departments and establishments rendering service for such committees, boards, or other groups, other than as representatives, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of such service."

This statute provides the authority whereby agencies of the Government may utilize appropriated funds under their control, through an interagency group, for the purpose of performing "authorized activities of common interest" to such agencies. See 26 Comp. Gen. 354; 28 id. 365; 35 id. 201. In other words, an agency's funds are available for contribution and deposit into a common fund for expenditure, through an interagency group, only if the work to be performed or the common objective to be accomplished is within the scope and purposes for which appropriations made to that agency are otherwise available therefor. See section 3678, Revised Statutes, 31 U.S.C. 628.

In view of the time necessarily involved, we have not communicated with each department or agency making up the President's committee or study group with the view of obtaining a statement pointing out the interest, within the framework of the agency's statutory functions, which could be considered sufficient to warrant the contribution and expenditure of its funds for the purpose of participating in the study of the feasibility of a national service program. However, we wish to point out that the legislative proposal of the President to establish a National Service Corps stemmed from the report of the committee or study group; that such study extended into fields of activity such as health, education, labor, housing, public welfare, etc., which activities come within the framework of the statutory responsibilities of the departments and agencies comprising the committee, and consequently, that the programs and problems connected therewith reasonably appear to be of direct interest to them.

In this connection, we note the provisions of section 906 of H.R. 5888, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, as passed the House of Representatives, as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Attorney General has made the same judgment as the Comptroller General, ruling that the creation of the Study Group is consistent with the act of May 3, 1945, and follows well-established Federal precedents, including the order by which President Eisenhower established the Operations Coordinating Board, for example, and that by which President Truman created the Committee on Government Contract Compliance.

I believe the position of the Attorney General and the Comptroller General is a complete demonstration that this Study Group is authorized. I might add that the Subcommittee on the Treasury Department and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations heard extensive testimony from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 14, 1963—pages 834–840—concerning the authority for and use of such interagency committees. This testimony demonstrates that there is authority now and has been for many years for agencies which have a common interest in a problem to share in the cost of the committee which is set up to carry out a directive of the President. As the Comptroller General has ruled, that is just the case here.

Far from being a subject of attack and opposition, I believe that the establishment and activities of the Study Group are in the highest tradition of responsible government. We as a nation pride ourselves on our initiative and our creative attack upon human and technical problems, but this can only be accomplished by study and evaluation of each new idea to determine its merits and possible deficiencies. This has been the task the Study Group has performed. Had the Executive presented legislation for the establishment of a Service Corps without this preliminary work, I believe it would have been subject to censure. The effort to shoulder this responsibility and evaluate this new proposal before making recommendations should be approved, not "put out of business" while the hearings are going on and there is still vital work to be done.

I believe the President's proposal for a domestic Peace Corps is sound. I believe the facts presented to the Congress by the Study Group prove the great potential of this idea. Many others share this judgment as is shown by the number of sponsors of the bill and the testimony we have received in the hearings to date. However, before the Congress makes its judgment, there will be a full debate on the merits of this proposal. This bill and the idea of the National Service Corps should be judged upon the basis of the hearing record and the later debates. I urge most strongly that we not foreclose that judgment here today by attaching this amendment to the appropriations for two of the agencies participating in the important Study Group activities.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Am I not right when I say that if, by the action proposed by this amendment, we cut off any funds for this purpose, we will make it impossible for the Congress to get the information which this study group might make available? Is that not right?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not also true that in taking this action with respect to this particular Cabinet-level study group we will be taking action that we have not taken in other instances where the same kind of authority legislatively exists?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is precisely the fact, and I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. This is the same amendment, however, that we have put on the bill for the HEW, Department of Labor, and also the Department of Agriculture. I might point out, as the majority leader has indicated, that this information can only come from the executive branch. I believe it is about time that the congressional branch, the legislative branch of our Government, started developing this kind of information itself and not always rely upon the executive branch of our Government to initiate this kind of a program.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As the chairman of the subcommittee working on this matter, I might say to the gentleman that I am in partial agreement. We are not relying, by any means, wholly on the executive branch.

We have had extensive hearings, and we are going to continue those hearings; but the fact is, you know, this committee restricted funds of the Committee on Education and Labor so that we need help from somewhere else.

Mr. LAIRD. In answer to the majority leader, who said only the executive branch could develop this information, I do not want to be a party to that statement, because I believe your committee and the Congress have the responsibility to develop this information, not the executive branch.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I did not say what the gentleman is reading into my remarks. I did say the information which the Cabinet-level Study Group might make available.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this Study Group acted pursuant to an act of Congress of May 3, 1945, which provides that appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments shall be available to defray expenses of interagency groups engaged in authorized activities of common interest. That is the legislative basis which this body itself created.

All the facts concerning the creation of activities of the Study Group were reported in the Comptroller General's letter to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine], dated May 17, which the gentleman has very graciously made available to me, and which has also been made available to the gentleman from Iowa.

There is no mystery about this. The Attorney General and the Comptroller General have handed down opinions on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 2 of which are to be reserved by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from New York for allowing me 5 minutes.

I would like to read a letter into the Record which I have received and was dated June 3, 1963. It has been referred to on two occasions in debate this afternoon.

It is written over the signature of William Anderson on the letterhead of the President's Study Group on a National Service Program, Washington 25, D.C. It arrived in an envelope addressed to me, which said in the upper right-hand corner "Postage and fees paid by United States Department of Justice." It reads:

Dear Congressman: As you know, the appropriate committees of both the House and Senate are holding hearings on H.R. 5625 and S. 1321, bills to create a National Service Corps. It is proposed that such a Corps could work in some of our areas of greatest need—among migrants and Indians, the mentally ill and mentally retarded, and other economically and culturally deprived areas.

Last week Clifton Clemens, a businessman and member of the City Council of Wasco, Calif., appeared before the House Special Labor Committee. He discussed the plight of migrant workers in Kern County and made several suggestions about how National Service Corpsmen might assist the community in meeting these problems. He recommended, for instance, that corpsmen work in elementary schools to help overcome language barriers through teaching of basic English in the migrant community, teaching additional farm skills, homemaking, basic child care and sanitation.

Mr. Clemens said he felt sure the local community would request corpsmen and that such a project "should be at least 2 years and possibly 3." He specifically pointed out, "The project would not duplicate or replace existing projects or personnel. Rather it would supplement and vitalize present inadequate efforts."

We are enclosing a copy of Mr. Clemens' full statement. If you would like further information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

William Anderson.

Enclosed was a copy of testimony on H.R. 5625, given before the House Labor Committee, by Mr. Clemens.

The first sentence of this testimony was, and I quote: "I am here today in support of H.R. 5625."

I do not know what fairer construction could be put on this letter and its enclosures than to say it is out-and-out lobbying of Congressmen with taxpayers' funds which were not appropriated for the purpose used. In private business the use of such funds in the manner employed by the Department of Justice would be embezzlement.

In government it is nothing less than the misuse of appropriated funds. With the widest stretch of my imagination, I cannot see where this is factfinding in any sense of the word. It is out-and-out illegal lobbying by the Department of Justice.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I would favor the establishment of a National Youth Service Corps, but at the moment this is beside the point. There is not a dime in this bill for the purpose of that corps or any other activity that is not set forth in these hearings. I think you will find that executive branch agencies are not going to play fast and loose with this subcommittee. I repeat, there is no money in this bill for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. Rooney.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 124.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thornberry, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 93, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—301

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—93

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Becker
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bray
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Chamberlain
Cramer
Cunningham
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Elliott
Everett
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Fuqua
Gathings
Goodell
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Lennon
McClory
McCulloch
McMillan
Marsh
Matthews
Mills
Moore
Murray
O'Konski
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Saylor
Schadeberg
Selden
Senner
Short
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stephens
Stinson
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead

NOT VOTING—39

Alger
Ayres
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Colmer
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dulski
Ellsworth
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Hall
Harris
Hébert
Horan
Hosmer
Kilburn
Madden
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Moss
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Reuss
Roosevelt
St. Onge
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Trimble
Tupper
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Alger against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Scott.

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 7063.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING FOR 2 YEARS EXISTING REDUCTION OF THE EXEMPTION FROM DUTY ENJOYED BY RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 405, Rept. No. 420), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6791) to continue for two years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to the bill at the conclusion of general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WALTER P. REUTHER SPEAKS OUT ON THE ISSUES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the AFL-CIO, delivered an important address at the industrial union department get-together dinner in Washington. In his address, Mr. Reuther outlined many of the problems facing our Nation. His analysis of these problems is most germane to our deliberations, and I suggest that we thoughtfully consider his cogent remarks which follow:

Address by Walter P. Reuther to Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO) Get-Together Dinner, Washington, D.C., May 8, 1963

By popular demand of my colleagues, I was asked to make a speech. Since every time we sit at the bargaining table and succeed in persuading the management to yield a fringe benefit in our new contract, we are always advised that you have to pay for fringe benefits. Now, the Congressmen and the Senators and our many other visitors from the executive branch of the Government have had the benefit of what was served at the bar and at dinner—that's your fringe benefit—and now you're going to pay for it by listening to me.

Jack was telling his story—and the reason I really like to make speeches at labor gatherings is because no one ever tells me what I'm to speak about, and I've been rather overly sensitive about being asked to speak about subject matters that are uninspiring. And I've had an experience that I've told about and that some of you may have heard, but I would like to share it with those who haven't.

I spoke out at the University of California some years ago and I was to give the last lecture at the Berkeley campus in a series on "The Economics of Collective Bargaining." Bill Green was the first speaker, and then Maurice Tobin, who was then the Secretary of Labor, was the second speaker, and I was the concluding speaker. I was met by Dr. Clark Kerr, now the head of the University of California, and I asked, "How many students really come out to hear a lecture on the economics of collective bargaining?" I just couldn't see that setting the campus on fire. He said, "Well, we get around 250 to 300." I said, "That's pretty good." He said, "But we're expecting a bigger crowd tonight."

And to our surprise there were 8,500 students who came to that meeting. And I was very excited and went home feeling very good because the president of the university said to me that this was the largest nonathletic gathering in the history of the university. But a year later, I got a note that disturbed me a great deal. The president of the university wrote me. "Dear Mr. Reuther," he says, "in all good conscience, I have to advise you that your record was equaled last week: Dr. Kinsey was here and his subject matter was the sex behavior pattern of the male species." Whereupon I sent a telegram protesting this, not only as unfair competition, but it was definitely an unfair labor act.

And so when I was asked to speak tonight, they didn't tell me what I had to speak about, and this is why it's a real privilege to have this opportunity.

Seriously, this meeting tonight really symbolizes, I think, what I believe is the genius of American democracy because the genius of our kind of free society is the ability of that society to achieve unity in diversity. You couldn't find a more diverse group in America. I believe that what Mr. Khrushchev doesn't understand is that a free society, while it may have many differences, is capable of resolving those differences so that it can get on with the main task of society.

But this is essentially the problem that we face. Why does Mr. Khrushchev believe that he is going to bury us? Anyone who has met with him—HUBERT HUMPHREY has spent time with him; I spent 4½ hours with him—cannot escape being impressed with the fact that Mr. Khrushchev really believes that he is riding the wave of future and that in due time his system will bury our system. And he believes that because he believes that we are incapable of rising above our pressure-group relationships and of finding the kind of common denominator or a sense of national purpose in dealing with the many complex problems that we face in the absence of war.

He knows, as history has demonstrated too often, that when we, as well as other people, are faced with the challenge of war, we are equal to a total sacrifice. But he does not believe that we are equal to that same kind of total effort in dealing with the problems of peace. He looks at America—as we need to look at America—and he sees that we have wasted 25 million man-years of potential productive employment because of unemployment. He sees a country which over a 10-year period has wasted, on the average, 20 percent of its productive potential because of idle factories and idle workers. He sees a country which has not achieved an adequate rate of economic growth.

And he believes that a country like ours that wastes these great economic resources just is not equal to the challenge that we will face, and because we are not equal to it, he believes that in due time he will bury us.

Now our country and the whole world is spending roughly $120 billion for the production of armaments and nuclear weapons that no one dares use because the human race has achieved the capability of total self-destruction. I share the view that unless we put an end to the nuclear arms race, the nuclear arms race in time will put an end to the human race. And while history and the realities of the world in which we live necessitate that America be strong in terms of military power, we all need to understand that military power is but the negative aspect of the total effort that we need to make if freedom is to prevail.

In the long pull, if we can avoid a nuclear war which no one can win, the contest between freedom and tyranny must ultimately be determined on the basis of which economic and social system can best improve the quality of the society which it develops. Because the people of the world are going to judge us, as they will judge communism, not by slogans, not by how powerful our megaton bombs may be, although we need them, but in the final analysis, they are going to judge which of these social systems can better deal with the basic problems of the human family, can better improve the quality of human life.

I believe that because we are blessed more richly than any other people in the world, we must of necessity assume the major responsibility for the leadership of the free world.

I believe that whether we win or we lose will primarily be determined by how effectively we harness the great unused economic potential we have within our reach, and how responsibly we relate that economic potential to the basic needs of the total community: how we relate it to the needs of education and housing and medical care and these many other human needs.

I would like very briefly to touch upon four areas that we in the labor movement are deeply concerned about, because these four areas are among the priorities that we consider essential if we are to eliminate the serious deficits in American society.

The first priority area in which we believe there is a very serious deficit in the quality of American society is in the field of education. We are the richest country in the world and yet we are denying millions of our young people educational opportunities adequate enough to facilitate their maximum growth and development. We are not only denying them as individuals the maximum opportunity of self-fulfillment, but we are denying society the greater contributions and the greater skills and competence that education would provide them.

We believe that Congress must find a way to rise above the sterile concept that Federal aid means Federal control. People who take that view do not have faith in the vitality and strength of democracy at the local and State level. We share the view that the increasing dimensions of our educational needs are beyond the economic resources and the tax structure capability of our local and State communities, and therefore, adequate aid to education is a compelling necessity.

The next priority is our senior citizens. Forty-five percent of them have an income of $1,000 or less, at the very time when the medical needs are the greatest, their economic resources are the most inadequate, and in this area we are not providing people with their basic needs.

It has been said that the most accurate measure of the quality of a society is what it does to provide its children and its youth with educational opportunities and what it does to provide its older citizens in the autumn of their lives with full economic security and human dignity.

Measured by what we have, by the great resources which we have at our disposal, we are doing less in these two important areas than is any other country in the world on a comparable basis; we are failing in both important areas.

This disturbs us in the labor movement.

The third area where we believe there is a serious deficit in the quality of our society is in the field of civil and human rights.

We are deeply disturbed, not only as representatives of labor, but as human beings by this very serious and widening moral gap between American democracy's noble promises and its ugly practices in the field of civil rights.

We are disturbed about the developments in Birmingham.

There are responsible members of both political parties here tonight, and neither political party can be proud of its failure to date. The platforms of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have stated time after time in their national conventions that they are committed to the protection of constitutional rights and the extension of civil rights to all of our citizens. And neither party has carried out the commitment they made to the American people.

It is our plea that this basic question of human rights, of equal opportunities for all of our citizens, is a great moral issue. What we do about it will determine whether or not our moral credentials will be in order in the world. And our plea is to both political parties and to men of good will in both political parties. Let's take the question of civil rights and equal opportunity and let's raise it to a high moral question above partisan politics and let's have a coalition of responsibility and public conscience so that America can move to bridge that moral gap between what we preach and what we practice in this important area. Because one ugly picture that goes on the front page of every paper in the world will do more to destroy the image of American democracy than all the work of the Peace Corps and all that our people can build. And as one American, I believe that if we continue to fail on this important front, we shall both be unequal and unworthy of leading the forces of freedom in the world against the forces of tyranny.

My fourth area in which there is a very serious deficit in the quality of our society is on the job front. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress under the able and distinguished chairmanship of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS issued a report in February in which they said that the true level of unemployment is at least 7 percent over the last 63 consecutive months. No other free nation in Europe, where they also work within the framework of a free enterprise market economy, has done so badly as we have. Over a million of our young people are walking the streets out of work and out of school. And Dr. Conant has said that this is the most explosive social dynamite on America's doorstep. In the next 10 years, 26 million young Americans will come into our work force, and because of technological progress and the growth in the work force, we will need to create 41 million new jobs, 80,000 new jobs every week for those 10 years, in order that unemployment will not increase, so that we will not accumulate a more difficult and sizable deficit on the job front.

We in the labor movement believe that essentially the source of our difficulty on the economic front is that we have mastered the technology of abundance but we have not learned to manage abundance. And the only way that you can learn to manage abundance is to learn to share it; share the wealth and the abundance of automation that our developing technology makes possible in factory and field, and gear that abundance to the equity of workers and farmers and investors and consumers, so that the relationship of the equities create the dynamics of growth and expansion without which full employment and full production are not possible.

In the period of 1953 to 1962, a relatively short period of 9 years, manufacturing production went up 28 percent and employment in manufacturing went down 12 percent.

In the automobile industry, 1957 was a good year, 1962 was a good year. In 1962 we made a million more cars and trucks with 43,000 less workers, and they were more complicated cars and trucks than we made in 1957.

Now we welcome the best tools that science and technology can give us. The American labor movement does not believe that you can stop the flow of the tide or the flow of technology. And we welcome these tools.

But we want these tools used sanely and sensibly and rationally and responsibly in terms of the needs of the total community. And this is the source of our difficulty. And yet the problems we face today will look microscopic when measured against the dimensions of the problem that we face in the period ahead.

Our technology in the automotive industry, the technology in the steel industry, in the electrical industry, in industry after industry is based upon the existing computers because the computer, the electric brain, is the core of automation. That is where within the memory of the automated brain, the machine keeps these complicated instructions and upon the right electrical impulse it directs the other machines what to do. The automation that we have now is built around an electric computer with an impulse cycle of three-tenths of a millionth of a second. But on the drawing boards of America there are new computers that make the existing computers as obsolete as a model T Ford. The new computers will have an impulse cycle of three-tenths of a billionth of a second; a thousand times faster.

What happens when that new and revolutionary dimension is fed into our technology? What will we do with it? Will it be good or will it be bad?

That is not a decision that the engineers who are perfecting that electric brain will make; that is a broad economic and social question which our whole society must find an answer to. If we gear the abundance that that tremendous revolutionary forward step will make possible to the needs of the total of our society not only in raising the living standards of the one-fifth of all Americans, families who live in poverty despite all the noble talk of an affluent society, it will give us the economic wealth to rebuild our cities and to build schools and hospitals and highways and resource developments.

Now we in the labor movement have never taken the position that automatically every wage earner or every citizen is entitled to economic security. What we do insist upon and we shall continue to insist upon is that when a wage earner is denied the right to work because of economic and social forces beyond his control, then it is the obligation of the whole of society to take such steps and pursue such programs and policies as are necessary to provide the opportunity of gainful employment for each of its citizens able and willing to work.

There is a crisis at the bargaining table in America. I know; I sit there. I have the responsibility in association with my colleagues in the UAW to represent more than 1,500,000 wage earners. And the crisis at the bargaining table in America is a reflection of a deeper crisis in the whole of America. We are in trouble at the bargaining table because America is in trouble. When you sit at the bargaining table, whether it be in the automotive industry or the steel industry or the newspaper industry or the railroad industry, and you are representing two workers and there is only one job, you are in trouble. We place upon the bargaining process in America, economic and social responsibilities which are beyond its competence—and no other free society does that.

They solve the broad problem of employment in the public arena, in terms of public policies. But when you place that burden upon the bargaining process, you place a burden which it can't carry, and it will face recurring crises. If you can achieve full employment in America, 95 percent of the problems at the bargaining table would evaporate. But they will pyramid unless we find answers to this problem of how does a free society relate its technology to the needs of people and maintain full employment and full production.

Why is the labor movement talking about a short workweek? It's because deep within the American wage earners there is a great sense of fear and uncertainty about tomorrow. The fight for the shorter workweek is not a fight for more leisure; it is a defense mechanism against unemployment because the whole burden of unemployment is placed upon the bargaining process.

We would like to suggest to our friends in Government in both the executive and in the legislative branches that we believe that getting America back to work is the number one priority responsibility of this country.

We also believe that it's sound public policy to make balancing the economy a priority consideration over balancing the budget.

We share the view that a continuing deficit in jobs is a much more serious threat to the future of America than a temporary deficit in the budget.

We hope the Congress will cut taxes. There is almost general agreement on this. Mr. Henry Ford, whom I see occasionally, has a business committee on cutting taxes. So there is general agreement between labor and industry on the need for a tax cut because the present tax burden is a kind of a hodgepodge that came out of two wars and it needs to be put into sharper focus in terms of our present economic situation.

But we disagree very sharply with Mr. Ford's tax committee. He would give it, we believe, to the wrong people. This is not a matter of economic justice alone, although I think you could make a strong case on that point in terms of the tax cut going to the low and middle income families. But this is a matter of economic necessity. You give a tax cut to the lower and middle income families and you will generate the maximum economic thrust in terms of high velocity purchasing power dollars, and that's what the economy needs.

And, therefore, we believe that the Congress ought to take action. We passed out here tonight a copy of the Employment Act of 1946. It's brand new; it's never been used. And we would urge the Congress to enact legislation to implement the purposes of the Employment Act of 1946, which commits our country to pursue public policies in cooperation with the private sector of our economy to achieve maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power. It's all spelled out there.

We believe that Congress ought to begin to take affirmative action to implement the purposes of that Employment Act of 1946.

Now we have everything in America that we need to solve these problems: we've got a productive economy, we've got a highly developed technology, we've got the largest reservoir of skill and competence of people in the world. All we need is the will, the will to commit these resources to the unfinished work of American democracy.

We believe that America can find the answers. And I have talked about these four items because they are the items in the areas in which we are most concerned. And we say to our friends who have been kind enough to be our guests here tonight and to break bread with us: Please get the legislative process in high gear and do the things that will make it possible to put America back to work.

You ask the average worker whether he wants a shorter work week or full employment, and you'll get the answer. The American workers want to do the work that has to be done so that America can do its job. But we cannot solve this problem at the bargaining table. We can make a contribution, and labor and management have a great responsibility. And I have articulated on other occasions the philosophy that I share: I believe that labor and management have their separate responsibilities, but together they have a joint responsibility to the whole of our country. That joint responsibility does of necessity transcend their separate responsibilities. But we can't solve the problem of unemployment at the bargaining table.

Our plea tonight to our friends in Congress is take the steps that need the taking on the tax and fiscal front, on the public works front, on the educational front, on the housing front, on the highway and public resources fronts, on the many other fronts in which there remains much unfinished work. And we will salute you because we want to go back to work building a better stronger America in a better and peaceful world.

Thank you.

QUALITY STABILIZATION

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone understand the truth about the quality stabilization bill when a learned professor tells the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee it will "give the manufacturers a blank check to write a price."

Maybe the professor, even if he is from my own State, is talking "learned nonsense." Surely, no such provisions appear in this bill as it is now written.

The fact is—he is. And his testimony is so typical of much of the nonsense heard about this simple quality stabilization bill that promotes, that fortifies our free, competitive enterprise system.

It is high time our sheltered theorists came down from their ivory towers and found out about the realities of the marketplace and stopped their unsupportable charges about the quality stabilization bill.

Earl Lifshey, the articulate columnist for Home Furnishings Daily, makes this point, and makes at the same time a good case for quick enactment of the quality stabilization bill.

I am a cosponsor of this bill. I agree 100 percent with Mr. Lifshey. I commend to you the reading of his May 28 column which follows:

If You Ask Me

(By Earl Lifshey)

As long as I've started to report to you on some of the strange concepts about marketing and merchandising that are to be found in the testimony of those opposed to the quality stabilization bill as revealed in the recent congressional hearings, let me tell you about another I'm sure you'll relish as much as yesterday's.

This one emanates not from the marketplace but from the field of higher learning. More specifically, it's contained in a 29-page statement by Albert B. Oxenfeldt, professor of marketing at the Columbia University Graduate School of Business in New York.

His position, he asserts, "reflects my analysis of current developments in retailing—and in particular what I consider the conditions and practices that may need improvement."

Conceding that the "worthy objectives" of the proposed bill "attempt, specifically, to correct deceptive practices, bait-and-switch selling and predatory pricecutting," he believes, nevertheless, that "it would go far toward obstructing the progress in distribution that represents the chief strength of our retailing system."

There isn't space here to cite all of his concepts and conclusions which, I believe, are wide open to question, so I'll confine myself to one of his major recommendations:

"The problem of predatory pricecutting is a special one and should be dealt with specifically. One way to do this is to give some administrative agency the power to set temporary minimum prices upon establishment of proof that injury is taking place. The systems might function as follows: Retailers or manufacturers suffering net losses on their total operations because of harmful pricecutting would petition the agency and provide proof of this. It would then issue an immediate preliminary order setting minimum prices for a designated brief period. After a more thorough investigation into the price cutting, the preliminary order would either be confirmed or lifted. The final order would be binding only for a limited period of time. Specific criteria as to what is unfair, what amount of damage is sufficient to merit action, how floor prices are to be set, and how long the order can run should be provided in the bill establishing this administrative agency.

"Instances of bait or misleading advertising would also be subject to the same type of review," he continues, and suggests possible penalties that include giving the manufacturer the right to withdraw his line from those who fail to comply with the agency's order as well as fines. "Injured consumers should also be permitted to bring action against this type of retailer and perhaps obtain a portion of the fine."

Among the gains of such a program, would be, he states: "(1) Generally lower prices; (2) continuing development of more efficient forms of retailing; (3) order and stability in retailing with healthy, well-operated retail stores; and (4) an economy operating at a higher level of efficiency and producing more output." He concludes with the hope that the committee "will reject the quality stabilization bill in favor of a constructive program."

Well, that's what the man said, and it's all right there in the record.

If there's anything that business needs less than a government agency which "after thorough investigation" would tell it how to price its merchandise I can't conceive of what it might be. The very thought of such an agency even attempting to undertake such an investigation, "thorough" or otherwise, especially after the performance record the Federal Trade Commission continues to make for itself, staggers the imagination. It is, obviously, an utterly impractical and impossible proposal.

The more such "constructive" programs to develop "more efficient forms of retailing" are suggested the better are the chances, it seems to me, for the success of the soundly conceived, carefully developed quality stabilization bill.

But before somebody manages to foist another Government agency on your neck to tell you—in addition to everything else—how to set your prices, you'd better tell your Senators and Congressmen how good the quailty stabilization bill really is.

Did you manufacturers know that you don't really own your own trademarks—that the public owns it because the people paid for it? If you haven't learned that yet, let me bring you up to date; after all, with something as important as a trademark it's always well to know who the real owner is.

The authority for this brilliant concept is none other than John Schwegmann of the well-known Schwegmann Bros. supermarkets in New Orleans. He outlined his logic at a recent hearing on the quality stabilization bill before a subcommittee of the House Interstate Foreign Commerce Committee, and I quote that gentleman's testimony on page 314 of the transcript:

"Now, I didn't hear it raised here today, but probably it has been, that this (a manufacturer's trademark) is a valuable trademark, and that they (the manufacturers) spend a lot of money on it and, of course, it should be protected. That really is not true. This valuable trademark that they have spent a lot of money on is all deducted from their income taxes. Mr. and Mrs. Consumer when they bought any product were charged for that type of advertisement. So, in effect they didn't have (don't own) that valuable trademark. The people paid for it when they bought the various merchandise at retail."

After hearing several more pages of testimony of his views on price maintenance Representative Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat, of California, remarked: "A very comprehensive statement, sir. It makes me think of the marble in a pinball machine the way you move it around * * *In the matter of trademarks, I am not sure whether you told us about your philosophy on trademarks."

The matter, Mr. Schwegmann replied has been argued many times (although I have yet to meet anyone who has ever heard of it before). Then, using Bayer aspirin as an example, he continued: "this vital trademark no longer belongs to them in the sense that they have this money invested as a capital account; in other words, it has been depreciated and deducted in a form of income tax * * * Bayer has spent millions of dollars on aspirin advertising it. But they don't have it set up with these millions and millions of dollars of advertising because they have taken off their taxes. And the consumer has paid for it when he bought his bottle of aspirin. And the U.S. Government didn't get it in the form of taxes."

The record doesn't show whether anyone has yet told Mr. Schwegmann that, based on his own logic, he, like manufacturers, therefore also doesn't own anything else in his business because, "The people paid for it." The buildings, equipment and, for all I know under his weird concept of economics and accounting, probably even the real estate belongs to the people. Maybe we're living in a socialistic rather than a capitalistic economy without knowing it.

No intelligent person, of course, takes such nonsense seriously. But I give it to you this morning as an example of some of the almost unbelievable arguments being advanced in opposition to the quality stabilization bill. That bill, as I have said here many times, in my judgment would simply restore to manufacturers a basic right to which they are entitled under our system of free, individual enterprise—if, indeed, that system still exists. That bill would give them the right to compete in the marketplace on the basis that they and not somebody else believes is the best way to develop their market—and don't let anyone including Mr. Schwegmann, try to make believe as they invariably do that this bill would eliminate competition, because it can't possibly do so. Yet that supermarket operator told the committee:

"People today want to earn money with the least amount of effort. That is true of most all people. And this (the quality stabilization bill) would be a wonderful way of making money, you understand, at the cost of the consumer without competition." No doubt that's why so many supermarket operators and other retailers are going in so strongly for private brands.

If you haven't written your Senators and Congressmen yet saying why the quality stabilization bill is important legislation that should be passed, it still isn't too late to do so.

If some of you have had occasion to wonder why so many important manufacturers are ardently supporting the proposed quality stabilization bill you need wonder no more. Now it can be told. It's because, "What this bill does is to give the manufacturers a blank check to write a price."

That profound declaration of merchandising madness, let me hasten to report, comes from Dr. Stewart M. Lee, chairman, Department of Economics and Business Administration, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. It is contained in the testimony he recently gave at a hearing on that bill before the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance.

This, of course, isn't the first time such learned nonsense has been heard from the opponents of the quality stabilization bill in particular or of legal resale price maintenance in general. And each time I come across it I find it completely incomprehensible that people who should know better engage in such loose talk.

Tell me, Dr. Lee, do you really believe that? Do you suppose for 1 single minute that a manufacturer, under the terms of the quality stabilization bill would have to be competitive no longer? Does your concept of economics and business administration hold that there is ever a time when a manufacturer in this country can sit back and dictate what should be done with his products in the market place without regard for his competitors? If you do then you teach a unique doctrine that no manufacturer I know ever has heard of, much less practices.

The inescapable fact of the matter is that regardless of whether or not legal resale price maintenance is involved in marketing a product, a product must be able to compete successfully—or else. And if a manufacturer believes he can compete successfully at a price he thinks represents the value he is offering, I claim that under the American free enterprise he should be given the right to compete on that basis. But you and those who use your arguments would deny him that right.

I note that you list yourself as president of the Council on Consumer Information. Need you be reminded that it is the consumer, always, who has the last word in the marketplace. And with or without the quality stabilization bill or any bill like it, the consumers will buy what they want. If they don't think products offered to them are worth the price, they just won't buy them. Furthermore, in today's highly intensified competitive market, they have greater freedom of choice than ever before. And that's exactly as it should be. But unlike you, I believe that the manufacturer is entitled to the very same freedom of choice in establishing his marketing policies.

You express great concern about what would happen if manufacturers were given more right to establish retail prices on their products, but you apparently are quite unconcerned over the fact that today, more than ever before, retailers in every field are establishing their own prices on their own private brands? By what law of logic is one so bad and the other OK?

You conclude by saying: "Evidence seems to indicate that retail price-maintenance legislation and an effectively competitive system are incompatible. A choice must be made between an economy in which Government regulation becomes more important or an economy which is to be based upon the free enterprise system. The choice does not rest upon the acceptance or rejection of resale price-maintenance legislation, but the passage of such legislation is indicative of a trend away from a freely competitive economic system."

Actually just the reverse is true. The quality stabilization bill, far from being "Government regulation" as you inaccurately term it, is designed to make free enterprise a reality for everyone, especially those to whom it is now denied so often.

Its use by any manufacturer, I must remind you, is purely optional; it is not Government regulation. Moreover, the quality stabilization bill is completely consistent and compatible with an effectively competitive system—except, of course, in the minds of those who are under the illusion that what this bill does is to give the manufacturers a blank check to write a price.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF A NOTED PUBLICATION, "DIARIO LAS AMERICAS"

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the fact that Diario Las Americas, the Spanish-language newspaper published in Miami "for liberty, culture, and hemisphere solidarity," is commemorating its 10th anniversary. Dr. Francisco Aguirre and Dr. Horacio Aguirre, noted hemisphere leaders, are the publishers.

This is a significant occasion. It attests to the popularity and strength of this fine publication and to its recognition as a leader in the cause of unity in the Western Hemisphere.

Diario Las Americas has special sections intended for the Spanish-speaking community of the city; however, it is received with positive interest in any inter-American sector, especially those of Latin American origin, due to the fact that its pages contain information on worldwide events, with special coverage of the inter-American scene and, also, because its editorial page comments on all matters of political, cultural, and social bearing for these communities. To the Spanish-American, because of his psychological nature, his educational background, and his temperament, no matter where he is, this kind of information always meets his interest.

Diario Las Americas is well received and read by Spanish-Americans of all nationalities who travel in inter-American flights; for that same reason, it is read in all the big hotels of cities important for their inter-American traffic, especially in Central and South America; and that is why it is read by the Spanish-American resident of New York, Tampa, Key West, Washington, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and many other cities of the United States, as well as in most capital cities throughout Latin America.

It should be borne in mind that the mentality and psychological nature of the Spanish-American drive him to learn what is going on in the other sister Republics, which generally speaking, constantly face problems similar to those of his own country in all spheres of human and political activities. They all share a common fate and, like Texans, New Yorkers and Floridians in the United States, they share a common language, with little variations which in no way impair their understanding of each other. What goes on in Colombia is of interest, in varying degrees, to the Cuban, and vice versa; the same is true with the Argentinian, the Brazilian, the Mexican, the Nicaraguan, the Venezuelan, the Panamanian, and so forth. They all have a common interest to know each other better, to find out about the human problems affecting all their nations. For these reasons, Diario Las Americas is welcome by all and is read by all who are interested in events of the Western Hemisphere.

But aside from its inter-American circulation, Diario Las Americas performs another very useful service right within these United States. It is a reliable source of information about Latin America to the businessman, to the exporter, to the Government official and diplomat, and to the student attending Spanish language classes in the many universities, colleges, and secondary schools where it is used as a supplementary textbook.

The distinguished Florida newspaper columnist, Mrs. Martha Lummus, commented as follows shortly after the establishment of Diario Las Americas in Miami:

> Diario Las Americas, bilingual newspaper which specializes in Spanish news and presents it in both English and Spanish, is a friendship project of great merit, and as such is worthy of consideration and support. Not only is the newspaper helping each nation in this hemisphere to understand the other, it is doing a large share in promoting friendships between countries and an informative job of keeping people abreast of the times, an effort directed toward quelling any communistic tendencies and promoting peace. After all, peace and friendship are in many ways synonymous—if there's friendship and understanding between nations, chances are there'll also be peace.

Born to serve the interests of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere in peacetime, Diario Las Americas is now doing its part in the terrible struggle that we face in the Americas since Cuba became a Communist stronghold. Diario Las Americas is on the honor roll for its efforts in the State of Florida, and especially in Miami, to assist in the readjustment of the hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees who have landed at our shores and who would be an even greater problem were it not for the efforts of so many private institutions and individuals. Diario Las Americas has done its part to keep up the morale of these refugees and has tried to give them encouragement not only for adjustment to a new way of life but also to continue their fight against communism in any way they can, that it may not spread to other nations of the Americas. Its daily contents, too, help toward this end by bringing to all corners of the hemisphere the truth about the tragedy that is the Cuba of today.

CONDITIONS IN POLAND

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the growing interest which Americans are displaying in conditions behind the Iron Curtain, the continued oppression of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and the failure of the Communists to provide legitimate economic improvements, I believe a recent address by Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Polish Prime Minister and Chairman of the Polish Peasant Party, is especially timely. This address was delivered on June 2 at the Polish Peasant Day celebration in Chicago.

ADDRESS OF MR. STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, FORMER POLISH PRIME MINISTER, CHAIRMAN OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY, DELIVERED AT THE POLISH PEASANT DAY CELEBRATION ON JUNE 2, 1963, IN CHICAGO

Dear brothers and sisters, friends and fellow countrymen; on Whitsunday, on the Peasant Day I send you the best and heartiest greetings.

On all Peasant Day celebrations held in the past, the Peasant Party members, while demonstrating their strength and will, demanded a free, democratic, and socially just

Poland, protested against the dictatorship of the Sanacja, that of Hitler and that of the Communists.

Loyal to the declarations adopted at the Peasant Day meetings, you have confirmed with blood your allegiance to the peasant ideology, to the cause of freedom and independence of fatherland, to the religion and the Polish soil.

Today, those who always faithfully defended and cared for the Polish nation do not have the right to celebrate in freedom the Peasant Day in Poland.

The former Hitlerite occupation has been replaced by the Soviet occupation.

You have been left with only this right: to participate in especially organized Communist manifestations at which the Communist and their rural agents do praise the Soviet masters and at which you are told to accept "voluntarily" the "increased norms of work and quotas of production."

Therefore, today on this Peasant Day, when the Polish nation continues to be enslaved by the Communist masters and cannot openly speak for itself, while the Warsaw agents of Moscow falsify its will and opinion—we together with the Polish nation do hereby appeal to all people of the free world.

The enslaved Polish nation—oppressed by the Soviets, deprived by them of its freedom and independence, religious and academic freedoms, as well as of the right of determining its political, economic and social regimes, has never renounced and shall never renounce its natural right to a free life in a free, independent, democratic and socially just Poland, and shall not rest until such a Poland will be won.

Together with the Polish nation we express our satisfaction that the ever growing number of peoples of Africa and Asia have recovered their freedom and independent statehood. Simultaneously we hold appropriate to remind that the free nations of the world—while unanimously granting the right of national self-determination in the whole world—in their self-interest cannot indifferently watch the fate of the Polish nation—a nation with a millenium of statehood and a millenium of its attachment to Christendom and thus to Western civilization.

Then, on this Peasant Day we do appeal to the citizens of the free world: Do not believe the falsehoods of Communist propaganda alleging that the Polish nations as well as other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Central and Eastern Europe are happy and do not wish any freedom or any change of the regime. Do not believe the false propaganda about the Red Commissar Gomulka and the Red cardinal in Poland.

As Khrushchev stated that there can be no pardon in the ideological struggle—so there can be fraternization between communism and Christianity—and about this very clearly spoke, in his public statements, the Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. The problem has been similarly treated in Pope John XXIII's two, socially progressive and peaceloving encyclicals: Mater et Magistra and Pacem in Terris.

Any comparison or equation of Gomulka, Khrushchev's agent in Poland, with the Primate of Poland Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski is not only an insult for the primate, but also for the whole nation. For the nation supports the cardinal without any reservations due to his determined stand against Communist efforts to take away from Polish hearts religious beliefs and to demoralize the Polish youth by means of atheist propaganda.

On this Peasant Day—we do stigmatize and accuse Moscow's Warsaw agents with Gomulka at their head for their having sold out the very vital Polish national interests to Moscow's imperialism and Communist aggression against the free world.

There are countless proofs to support this accusation.

It is enough to analyze the roster of Gomulka's many trips to the U.S.S.R. Bialowieza Forest, or East Germany. Analyze his visit to the Berlin wall, these last years as a traveling salesman for Khrushchev in the United States of American and Yugoslavia. Look at it—what were doing Rapacki in Cuba, Cyrankiewicz in Mexico, Lange in India, Mark Thee in Laos, and so forth? Should one need more proofs?

With great sums of money extracted from the Polish economy, the Polish Communists are helping out the Soviets to carry out their economic diversion and Communist aggression all over the world—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

With hard-earned money of the Polish people, against their interest, with Polish coal, with food supplied by Poland—even using the imported wheat—Gomulka has been helping Ulbricht to overcome his shortages caused by the too fast tempo of communization of Eastern Germany.

Sacrificing the most vital national interests, the Communists are investing huge sums of money into newly opened mines in the Soviet Byelorussia instead of using those investments for exploitation of potassium in Poland—a mineral already discovered, whose location and potential are known.

General Spychalski, the chief "politruk" of Gomulka in the Polish Army, during his visit together with General Hofman from East Berlin with the Polish garrisons on the recovered territories has given the Polish regiments stationed there the names of "German anti-Fascist fighters." One could forgive Spychalski visiting East Germany now and presenting to the German Communist regiments of the busts not only of Swierczewski, but also of Marchelewski, Rosa Luxemburg, and other international Communists, who, though of Polish origin, lived and passed away as members of the German Communist Party and as such they always faithfully served the interests of Moscow.

However, no one can forgive him the decorating of Germans for their services in the struggle for people's Poland when, after having joined the Communist cause, as former Hitler's executioners of Poles, later in the ranks of the P.P.R./Polish Communist Party, they were again murdering Poles in Silesia.

We accuse the Warsaw Communists for the wasting of hard-earned money of the Polish people with which they finance diversion and espionage among the exiles in the free world, carried out by Gromulka's agents for the benefit of Moscow.

We accuse them for having stopped the repatriation of Poles from the U.S.S.R. and thus sacrificing the lives of about 2 million Poles to disappear in the Soviets.

We accuse them for the crime of polonocide—being committed in the form of legalized abortions under the guise of the so-called policy of birth control. This is the helping out of Moscow in the work of biological destruction of the Polish nation.

We accuse them for their destruction of the Polish nation through the antiworker and antipeasant legislation. This legislation only deepens the genuine misery and shortages caused by the unproductive Communist economy and the Communist exploitation for the benefit of Muscovite imperialism.

We accuse the Polish Communists for their German Kaisers-like extermination policy with regard to the peasants. Like during the Kaisers the Communists are expropriating peasant land and giving it to the sovkhozes. Like during the Kaisers the peasants are being deprived of their family homesteads.

They are doing this despite the fact that they know that all foreign trade transactions with the West do supply the Warsaw treasury with 60 percent of hard currency and this high percentage is earned by the export of agricultural products and food processed goods toward which the Polish peasant has contributed in fourfold ways:

(1) In the form of cheap compulsory deliveries to the State.

(2) In the form of high prices for coal which the peasant may get only after the delivery of compulsory quotas.

(3) In the form of an especially high taxation of private farming.

(4) In the form of higher fees for use of tractor services, fertilizers, machinery, and so forth.

Assembled on this Peasant Day we do request that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain—both coresponsible for the Teheran and Yalta decisions—to present the question of freedom of Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain on the agenda of the United Nations.

We request that the question of the Katyn murder be submitted to the U.N. for deliberation.

We request that the United States and Great Britain recognize the border on the Oder and Neisse.

Recognizing the eastern frontiers of Poland based on the Riga treaty we request that freedom and independence be restored to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, and Ukraine so that a federation of these free and independent nations with Poland may be formed. Such a federation would enable these nations to establish better mutual relationships and cooperation and it would further create a basis for the formation of another federation including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria.

We request that the Soviets and the Warsaw regime fulfill the Potsdam decisions which did provide, above all, for the withdrawal of Soviet armies from Poland, for respect of religious freedoms, as well as of free, unfettered, and democratic elections in Poland.

We request that the Red army and all other Soviet functionaries be withdrawn from Poland.

We request respect for full religious freedoms in Poland, repatriation of Poles from the U.S.S.R., freeing of all political prisoners, restoration of freedom of speech, opinion, association, and the right to a free and true self-government, the right to form free political parties, cooperative professional youth, and cultural organizations.

We request that truly free and democratic elections under the international control be carried out in Poland.

Hereby we do make a pledge that, until the final victory, we will serve and fight for a free democratic and socially just Poland.

LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, WAYNE ASPINALL, and other colleagues in introducing a bill to stabilize the lead and zinc industry.

It seems pitifully ironic that a country, rich in these two natural resources, should continue to import large percentages of its yearly consumption from foreign producers while its own industry stockpiles a considerable portion of each year's production and experiences a gradual but marked decline in price. So serious has the situation become that the price per pound of lead dropped to 9½ cents in 1962, the lowest point since price controls were first established in 1946.

This is not to say that there has been no attempt in the past to improve these conditions; but the present record makes it abundantly clear that such action has been singularly ineffective in achieving a stable market. In 1958 inflexible quotas were established by Presidental Proclamation No. 3257 on the importation of unmanufactured lead and zinc ores based on 80 percent of the average annual commercial imports during a base period of 1953–57. This plan has proved generally inadequate since it has been treated by foreign producers as a guaranteed minimum figure rather than the absolute maximum tonnage allowable. Furthermore, American mines have continued to close and the industry today faces a major crisis.

The Lead and Zinc Stabilization Act of 1963 is calculated to avoid the ineffectiveness of this inflexibly high import program by linking import quotas to the prevailing price of the mineral. Under this plan an absolute maximum quota of 45,000 or 60,000 for lead and 80,000 or 100,000 for zinc would be placed in effect when the market drops below 13½ cents per pound. Should the market price exceed 13½ cents, the quota would be computed by finding the difference between consumption and domestic production during a specified period, thus guaranteeing a fair quota for foreign producers consistent with the interests of our own.

The bill is further strengthened by the concept of "global quotas," thereby avoiding the necessity for assigning percentage proportions among foreign producing nations and later juggling those allotments as sources fail or voluntarily reduce their export tonnage.

In short, I believe the proposed legislation takes a meaningful and realistic step forward by guaranteeing that effective action will be taken to halt failing prices and providing for a reasonable import program which can supplement rather than replace domestic production.

VETERANS IN FLORIDA

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the fastest growing segments of the fast-growing State of Florida is its veterans population. And leading the way is the older veterans whose numbers are climbing rapidly.

Veterans of mature years, men who have retired from productive jobs or profitable business, are attracted to the famous Florida climate and way of living. They flock to our State to enjoy their senior years. Many other veterans do not wait until retirement to come to Florida. Recognizing the State's opportunity and growth, they move to Florida earlier in life. With their wives and children they build new lives, new careers, and link their individual destinies with that of Florida.

There is an iron law, however, that increased population inevitably creates increased problems. One of the problems growing out of the migration of veterans is a need for additional medical facilities. Both in the Congress and in the executive branch, it is acknowledged that additional hospital beds are needed to meet the requirements of Florida's increasing veterans population.

In the 10 years between the 1950 and 1960 census, the population of Florida rose nearly 80 percent. This exceptional growth rate was the highest in the Nation of the major States. And the veterans population of Florida grew even faster. For every veteran in Florida in 1950 there are two in the State today. The veterans population has doubled itself in slightly more than 10 years.

Yet at the same time, the number of veterans hospital beds throughout the entire State barely increased. The number was 1,223 in 1950; it is 1,596 today.

If, in face of these facts, anyone is still complacent about the urgent need for more hospital beds for Florida's veterans, I would point out to him a small vital statistic. It is just over the horizon now, like a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, but unless we act now, that cloud will grow and grow until it engulfs us in a storm of problems.

I refer to the fact that the average age of some 15 million veterans of World War II is 43 years. Already in their middle years, these former fighting men constitute the largest segment of the veterans population. With each passing year, significant numbers of them will swell the ranks of the older Americans, slowly at first, but then in great waves. Since older Americans seem to prefer to live in Florida, many of these millions of World War II veterans will migrate to Florida. They are now our future citizens.

Florida welcomes these future multitudes. But Florida and the Federal Government must prepare for them.

For this reason, I have introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a 1,000-bed VA hospital in Hillsborough County, Fla.

This bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to construct such a facility at this location which would provide beds for general medical, surgical, and neuropsychiatric patients.

This new facility would partially meet the rising needs of veterans hospitalization in the State of Florida, where so many former soldiers, sailors, airmen, coast guardsmen, and marines choose to live the best years of their lives.

SURVEILLANCE OVER NEGOTIATED DEFENSE AND SPACE CONTRACTS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, $17 million down a rathole. The Army achieved this remarkable accomplishment in reverse with just one sole-source—no competition—contract that totaled $65,802,653. This contract was for the high production of a radio system identified by the nomenclature AN/VRC–12.

I take no pleasure today in relating this spectacle of an Army bureaucracy wallowing in waste, which it continues to do by discouraging healthy competition. My only purpose is to illustrate the specific kind of waste that we have within our power to curb through passage of legislation already introduced in this House and in the other body.

This proposed legislation—H.R. 4409—would create a new blue-ribbon nonpartisan joint committee of the Congress to maintain surveillance over our negotiated defense and space contracts. This is the kind of spending that accounts for 85 percent of our defense procurement budget. It would also require that the reasons for offering a contract without full competition, and the reasons for giving it to the manufacturer chosen, be made fully available to the public.

THE NEED FOR H.R. 4409

As you follow this sordid story in which $17 million was scattered to the winds, bear in mind the role that just such a bipartisan committee as I have suggested could and would have played if the Army had tried to slip through a negotiated contract such as this under its vigilant eyes. Keep in mind the impact H.R. 4409 would have had on this one contract. Then multiply that impact by all the examples of waste I have been laying before the House for the past 2 years.

Had such a committee as H.R. 4409 advocates been in existence, the Army would not have had the gall to waste another 17 million more tax dollars. Had it tried, industry would have been fully apprised of what was going on and would have ripped the Army case to shreds with the simplest of analyses.

Seventeen million dollars is not peanuts—even to us who deal with billions daily in our hearings. But to document the waste of this staggering amount, it is necessary that we go to school briefly and have the benefit of some background facts.

THE VRC–12 ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the AN/VRC–12 system is a tough, versatile new Army radio that is vehicle mounted. It communicates with foot soldiers in the field who are to be equipped with a mobile radio called the AN/PRC–25, and with air support units which will use a radio designated as the AN/ARC–54. The VRC–12 replaces a system now in use—the AN/GRC–3 through 8. The replacement is lighter, more compact, more powerful, and has among other attributes a wider frequency range.

The final development contract for the VRC–12 was awarded in May 1956 for $4,502,061. Work had actually begun 4 years earlier. In October 1960, with development finished, a production contract for $35,344,104 was handed out sole source—without competition—to Avco

Corp. This contract called for high production of these radios.

This was the first installment, if you please, on a 7-year purchase program for thousands of VRC-12 radios.

In October 1961, a year later, the Army gave Avco another sole-source—no competition—contract for the second-year production of VRC-12's.

Mr. Speaker, this award totaled $65,802,653—the largest single purchase in recent Signal Corps history. It was on this contract that the giveaway I mentioned in my opening remarks took place.

On this contract, the manufacturer generously agreed to drop its price from the year before by some 34.9 percent. Even this did not satisfy the highly competitive electronics industry. There were bellows of rage that were so loud that the Army was literally forced to open the third-year production contract to competitive bidding.

Over a score of companies submitted bids. In April of this year the Army awarded a contract totaling $18,667,746 to the Magnavox Co., a nationally known electronics producer, for 7,070 of the main units of the radio system. I do not want the importance of this to escape anyone. Therefore, I stress this: Magnavox's prices are less than one-half the prices paid Avco 2½ years earlier on the first sole-source $35 million contract. More important, they are 27.6 percent less than the prices paid Avco under its second sole-source contract of over $65 million.

At the end of this presentation, you will find a tabulation of bids for the first competitive procurement—appendix 1. You will note that Avco's bid of over $28 million is more than $10 million above that of Magnavox.

The figures by themselves are enormously significant. Compare in the bid tabulations the prices being paid Magnavox and then compare prices for the same equipment paid Crosley Avco under its second production contract and here is what you will find:

SEVENTEEN MILLION DOLLARS COULD HAVE BEEN SAVED

If the Army had let that second—October 1961—production contract through competitive bidding instead of handing it sole source to Avco, it would have saved $17 million for the taxpayers of this Nation.

The natural question that arises is, "Why wasn't competition used as Congress has directed it shall be used at every opportunity?"

Mechanically, when a defense agency feels it cannot allow competition for production of equipment, it must formally justify that desire in a document called a determination and findings. You will find the determination and findings attached to my speech as appendix 2. Take time to read it. It is two pages long. All the words necessary are there. The "i's" are dotted and the "t's" are crossed. It is a model of the slick tricks used by some of the Pentagon's word magicians to fool the public and, yes, the Congress.

Reading this determination and findings with no background, with no insight into technical details, and with no understanding of the circumstances surrounding this contract, it will seem as inviolate and sound as the Statue of Liberty. To question such an obviously high-sounding, patriotic document might be downright unpatriotic—and that is just what its authors intended.

Gentlemen, this determination and findings is so full of holes that, by comparison, a swiss cheese looks like the Rock of Gibraltar.

The so-called justifications and the entire circumstances surrounding this procurement are so shaky that the watchdog committee I have proposed would have stopped this sole-source procurement dead before it got off the ground, and $17 million would have been saved.

THE SOLE-SOURCE DETERMINATION AND FINDINGS

Now, what excuses does this determination and findings recite for avoiding the healthy business competition that has made this country great as it is today? There are several, and they boil down to this:

First. The equipment was needed speedily for Army units in Germany. Giving the job to Avco speeded up the timetable of supply from 7 to 5 years.

Second. Avco was the only company that could deliver the radio when the Army wanted it. Thirty months would be needed—until March 1964—for a newcomer to win a competitive contract and tool up for the job, while Avco could start delivery in 11 months.

Third. Plans, drawings, and specifications were not available so no other company could intelligently bid the job anyway.

Fourth. Avco had compiled a mass of test equipment and special tooling needed for production of the VRC-12 and those could not be made available until Avco finished its first production contract.

Fifth. Avco's sole-source price would be substantially below what any competitor could hope to offer in a first competitive crack at the equipment.

Mr. Speaker, every one of these justifications is substantially or totally in error. What small amount of truth there is in them results from manipulations of the first sole-source production contract during which problems were created to set up justifications for a second sole-source award.

Let us take point No. 1. The second sole-source award would cut down the timetable for supplying this radio to troops in Germany from 7 to 5 years. That was October 1961. What are the plans now?

SOLE-SOURCE BENEFIT EVAPORATES

According to the Army's own statements in 1963—complete acquisition of the VRC-12 will now take 7 years—and not the 5 years that were promised as a reward or the benefit from giving Avco the second sole-source prize.

All right. Why will it now take 7 years instead of 5? The Army says it does not have sufficient funds available to complete the program in 5 years. That is understandable since it poured $17 million down the sinkhole already. And, if you count inflated prices paid under the first $35 million sole-source contract—100 percent higher than the first competitive prices—then it might even be said that the Army wasted at least another $17 million.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Army today is right where it would have been had it opened that second contract to competition. The taxpayer is not that lucky. He has $17 million worth of tail feathers missing.

Now let us take point No. 3. The Army said Avco had assembled complicated special tooling and test equipment necessary for production of the VRC-12. That material would not be available for inspection or use by others until completion of the first production contract in January of this year. Anyone in the electronics industry would smell this one coming a mile away and would snort "poppycock."

EQUIPMENT IS GOVERNMENT OWNED

A simple examination of Avco's contract establishes that the Government owns the special test equipment and tooling because Avco was expressly authorized to assemble it with Government money. That means there are—or should be—plans, specifications, and drawings available for the test equipment. That means the Government could order that this data be made available to any other contractor.

Second, it is common knowledge in the electronics field that most of the so-called special tooling and test equipment consists largely of various components purchased from others, or taken off the manufacturer's stock shelf and assembled. No more than 5 to 15 percent of the special tooling really comes from special dies made expressly for a single contract. Refined, this simply means that the Government would have duplicated most of this test equipment and special tooling simply by reading Avco's plans and buying the tools. The remaining 5 to 15 percent could have been copied easily if the Army had wished to send in a task force of engineers to do the job. Since Avco was working only a normal week, no problems would have presented themselves to hinder this sort of an operation.

The normal question that arises is, "Wouldn't this be expensive?" Answering with candor, I will say it might have cost anywhere from $10,000 to $100,000—a pittance to spend to save $17 million. This material could have been made available by January 1962 in ample time for a competitive second procurement if that is what was really desired at all echelons of command in the Army.

THE NO-DRAWINGS BOGEYMAN

In its second point the Army contended that drawings, plans, specifications, and other needed technical material were not available and would not be available to permit competitive procurement until September 1962. Mr. Speaker, I get so weary of seeing those words "no drawings available" and ripping the mask away from this falsehood. However, it must be done again here today, so bear with me.

The first production units of the VRC-12 were delivered in February 1962. The contract called for drawings with the first delivery of production units, so it is easy to see they could have been made available. The tardiness, by the way, is another interesting facet of this Alice-in-Wonderland approach to national defense. The reason production units were not delivered until February 1962 was because it took Avco that much time to get started after its first sole-source contract award in 1960.

You might ask, "Why, after 8 years of development had been finished, wasn't the contract awarded until very late in 1960?" Why, indeed, since the Army, according to its own documents, were ready to award the contract at the outset of the fiscal year. Why, indeed, since the Army even had an earlier determination and finding all signed and ready to go in June of 1960—months before the contract was awarded?

The answers to these questions are contained in the rabbit warren that is defense procurement policy, practice, and procedure. The results are another thing, indeed. First delivery was pushed back into 1962 instead of September or October 1961, as could have been the case. Plans could have been made available in February 1962, and it would have been possible to let a contract on a crash basis in early 1962 and first deliveries would be coming in by now—mid-1963—and not March of next year, 1964, as the Army contends.

I admit that would be 9 months later than Avco's first deliveries, but there are three points to be made in regard to that topic. First, with a competitive procurement the Army would not have run out of money as it did because of two obviously wasteful contracts via sole source.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, almost every first production contract on a development item is awarded sole source to the developer. The Army could say that due to this it could obtain second-year delivery more quickly by giving the producer a follow-on contract. This is a schoolboy-type logic that ignores the facts of business life. The obvious answer is, "So what?" By the same token, then the third-year needs could also be had quicker from the sole-source developer and so on ad infinitum, ad nauseam.

The point is, this shoddy excuse has not been accepted in the past and should not have been in this case. It would not have been accepted had a congressional watchdog committee been on hand to scrutinize such goings-on. Instead, competition would have been forced on the second contract, because national policy established by Congress demands it.

Third, the Army's estimates of the amount of lead time it would take a new competitor to get into production are themselves open to question. For instance, in 1960 when the Army was out to justify giving Avco the first production contract sole source, the Army contended that any newcomer would need 30 calendar months from the date of contract to get into production, while Avco would need only 15 months—so Avco should—and did—get the job.

Yet when this equipment was finally put out for competition and a contract was signed this April, how long was it estimated that the newcomer who won the job would take to get into production? Fifteen months, according to the contract—not the 30 months estimated when an excuse was being sought to hand the work to Avco.

The first point in the determination and finding contended that only Avco could deliver the VRC–12 while the fourth point claimed Avco's prices were substantially low. The determination and finding supporting the contract said:

> It is estimated that reductions in cost of the six major items (in the radio system) from the present (first production) contract price will be well below the anticipated second competitive procurement cost, based on prior experience.

Mr. Speaker, I have already noted that when competitive procurement was finally permitted for this radio, the results totally demolished this argument. I am sure the Army knew this would be the case. In this case, as in others, it has been caught after the fact—after the waste has been proven. With a committee such as outlined in H.R. 4409, this would not be allowed to happen.

A CALCULATED DECEPTION

I want to stress here today that such a certification as I have just quoted is not a miscalculation. It is a calculated deception. My experience in the past 22 years has shown that never has a sole-source manufacturer turned out equipment cheaper than has a contractor figuring his costs closely under the impetus of competitive bidding.

No less an authority than Secretary of Defense McNamara has said again and again and again—and with increasing frequency since I started to bear down on the fine print, redtape and minute detail of defense purchasing policies and procedures—that every time the Defense Department shifts a dollar from sole source to competition, at least a quarter on the dollar is saved.

Faced with all this refutation of evidence, you might ask why the Army shut out competition as long as it did. Well, as a matter of fact, the Army did at one point plan to make the second-year buy competitive. Army records substantiate this. The Army admits it originally planned to set up not one but two sources of supply as early as the very first production contract. This, in my opinion, would have been the sensible thing to do—give one part of the contract to Avco, since it could start producing quickly, and a second part to another manufacturer through a limited form of competition, thus establishing a second source of supply.

This is precisely what the Army planned. The very existence of these plans, canceled later because of an alleged shortage of cash, establishes as sheer bunk the Army's contention a year later that competition on the second buy was impossible.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY COURTNEY JOHNSON

However, there is even more documentation establishing that the Army planned to go competitive on the second purchase of this equipment. Earlier, I mentioned that the Army had a determination and finding prepared to support an award of the first production contract as early as June of 1960. I am putting a portion of that determination and findings in the RECORD as appendix 3. You will note that the Assistant Secretary of the Army who signed it said:

> My approval is based on verbal assurances * * * that in the execution of this contract, sufficient production data will be obtained to insure competition in future procurements of these radio sets.

Mr. Speaker, will you please note who signed that determination and findings stressing that competition should be introduced on future purchases of these radio sets? It was Mr. Courtney Johnson, then Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, the Army's top procurement job. He is the same man who later signed another determination and finding canceling out this one. He is the same man who authorized that first negotiated contract which contained delivery schedules and other provisions which set up all sorts of flimsy excuses that could be seized upon later by someone wishing to give the second-year buy sole-source to Avco.

How were such provisions permitted in October 1960 if Mr. Johnson felt so strongly about competition in June of 1960? I suggest that some of you gentlemen ask Mr. Johnson, himself.

Where will you find him?

ON AVCO PAYROLL

Just call the Avco Corp.'s Washington office—783–2770—and you will reach him. That is where he works. He is on the payroll of the Avco Corp.

When did he leave the Army and join Avco? Just a few months before the Army tossed out its long-established plan to seek competition on the second-year purchase of the VRC–12 and decided, instead, to hand Avco a second and unprecedented $65 million sole-source contract.

If this startles you, remember Al Jolson's words, because "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

Courtney Johnson is a highly reputable, self-made corporation executive. He entered the Army November 16, 1956, after a distinguished career in private industry. He was assistant to the president of Studebaker-Packard Corp., in South Bend, Ind., when he was called to serve his country.

When the Kennedy administration came into office on January 20, 1961, Mr. Johnson resigned and joined a Washington firm of manufacturer's representatives and consultants known as Technical Industrial Consultants. But he was apparently so vital a man to the Army's procurement picture that it could not do without him. The Secretary of the Army asked Mr. Johnson to come back and help train his successor, Mr. Paul Ignatius.

Mr. Johnson patriotically returned to the Army March 15, 1961, to train Mr. Ignatius. I think the facts will show he did a remarkable job in some respects.

THE TRAINING OF PAUL IGNATIUS

It was at about this time that laborious policymaking machinery on the planning of future procurements began to grind away in regard to the coming fiscal year purchase of VRC–12's. Mr. Johnson served the Army during this critical period, training Mr. Ignatius and doing, as I said, a remarkable job in some respects. Then, on May 5, 1961, Mr. Johnson departed the Army once and for all. His work was done.

On July 12, 1961, Avco submitted to the Signal Corps a voluntary, unasked-for proposal that the Army give to Avco—sole-source again—the second-year contract for the VRC–12. It suggested one set of quantities and delivery dates with a price of $40 million and another set of quantities and delivery dates for which it would charge $50 million.

During this time, Avco was also in contact with Mr. Johnson. As he has put it:

> I went to work for Avco on August 15. But they put me on the payroll retroactive to August 1 because the president said he'd been talking with me about this for so long that the retroactive arrangement seemed only fair.

Not too long after Mr. Johnson joined Avco, his successor and trainee, Mr. Ignatius, officially tossed into the wastebasket the Army's earlier plans to go competitive on the second-year buy of the VRC–12 and signed a new determination and finding authorizing a second sole-source contract with Avco. That's the determination and finding I discussed earlier, and you now know how accurate it was.

On October 5, 1961, less than 2 months after Mr. Johnson joined Avco, the contract was received—not for $40 million or $50 million—for $65 million worth of VRC–12's.

THE RUBBERSTAMP EXCUSE

Mr. Johnson's comment on this is that it is all sheer coincidence. He insists that he never really knew much about the VRC–12, that it was just one of thousands of procurements with which he had contact during his Army service.

His words are so familiar:

> I just signed the papers. I relied on my staff for advice on things like that.

On the second sole-source contract to Avco, Mr. Johnson also states his unfamiliarity with detail, saying:

> I didn't even know that Avco had been given that second contract until 3 months after it was awarded. I wasn't even aware it was "in the house."

That statement, Mr. Speaker, merits some thought. Here is a $65 million contract—the largest in recent Signal Corps history. It is negotiated in Washington by Avco, and Mr. Johnson, sitting in Avco's Washington office where he plays a key role, did not even know it was "in the house."

When did Mr. Johnson learn of the contract? That following January, he says, when Avco encountered production problems with the VRC–12. Then, he says, he flew to Cincinnati and "solved their problems in a couple of days." I think you can agree, Mr. Speaker, that is not a bad performance for a man who knew nothing about the VRC–12 and only signed the papers for its procurement.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if what I have sketched disturbs you, but it deeply disturbs me. To say the least, Mr. Johnson's choice of an employer when he left the Government service was most unfortunate and showed something less than the best of judgment.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE NOT A DEAD END

Permit me at this point to make something crystal clear. I do not criticize the departure of a demonstrably able and honest man from Government back into private industry. We need top men for our defense jobs—men like Courtney Johnson who are rich in civilian manufacturing and administrative experience—men, who, we would normally hope, would introduce sound business practices into the profligate picture of Government procurement. We cannot rationally expect Government service to be a dead end for these men whom we ask to serve. Once their service has ended, it is expected that they will return to private industry to the field of business they know best or one they have come to learn. It is further expected they will utilize their experience and contacts gained in Government to obtain the best possible job on the outside. It is also reasonable to expect private industry to prize, value, and pay for their skills, contacts, and knowledge. All these points should go without saying. In a sense, Courtney Johnson was simply following those accepted standards in accepting employment with Avco.

THE TFX PARALLEL

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not as simple as that. There are grave questions of policy involved here, and I should like to illustrate my argument by drawing a parallel with a celebrated case now in the public eye—the award of contract for the TFX fighter plane, a job that will eventually be worth $6.5 billion. What would happen if one of the top men in the Pentagon involved in the decision to give the TFX award to General Dynamics left the Government and went to work for General Dynamics after General Dynamics had been given a contract at a price that later proved to be entirely too high? The uproar would be tremendous.

And what would Congress think if right after this man was hired, General Dynamics walked back into the Pentagon, suggested that plans for a competitive procurement of the TFX be junked and persuaded someone in the Department of Defense to give it a record-breaking sole-source contract—twice as big as the first one and still at a price that took the taxpayers for a ride? What if the justification used by the Defense Department in awarding that second contract was so full of holes it made a sponge look like steel?

Mr. Speaker, you know what the result would be. The Defense Department, the contractor, the individuals involved would all be ripped apart by a committee of this Congress. By comparison, the present TFX controversy would look like a little tiff in a men's room.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is a precise parallel to the circumstances surrounding the VRC–12.

WISER APPROACH NEEDED

Is it too unreasonable to ask that a man who holds high Government office; who knows how crucial the reputation of top Defense officials is to the morale and prestige of the procurement system—is it too unreasonable to ask this man to exercise some responsible judgment when choosing a job in industry after he retires?

Let us now turn to another facet of this case. Given the facts I have detailed here today, what does the public think of the VRC–12 matter?

If there is any doubt in a single Member's mind, I refer him to the electronic contractors in his district. What he will hear will take his ears off. I know, because I corresponded with more than 125 electronics manufacturers and their representatives during my 7-month long investigation of this case. The comments I received, including a dozen or so from firms who are subcontractors for Avco on this job, show clearly what the industry thinks. Putting it bluntly, they think the situation stinks. They feel it raises serious questions about the propriety of Government contracting. Some even think it provides a cynical insight into the level of morality prevalent in some quarters of the Department of Defense.

What is Mr. Johnson's job with Avco now? He says he is a consultant to Avco. However, he occupies a plush office in their Washington headquarters, and he acknowledges he receives a substantial fee from the company each month. Just exactly how much he gets he has not told me. From that office, I understand, he runs his own consulting business which, I would suppose, brings him substantial additional moneys.

NICE WORK IF YOU CAN GET IT

How does the old song go? "It's nice work if you can get it"?

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, if there had been a joint congressional watchdog committee on negotiated contracts, such as proposed by my H.R. 4409, do you think this contract would have gone through without serious question? If it had gone through regardless of congressional criticism, do not you think there would have been a congressional investigation of it? And the next time the Secretary of the Army trotted into the Appropriations Committee of this or the other body, which would each have two representatives on the watchdog committee I propose, do you think there would be no hell raised? I will say there would. The result would probably be that since the Army wasted $17 million on a contract last year it could jolly well do without $17 million it wanted for the next year.

Another bill I have introduced is H.R. 5258, which gives the General Accounting Office authority to overturn proposed negotiated procurements that are clearly improper. Do you think GAO would have endorsed what went on in the case of the VRC–12? I hardly think so.

Now, let us turn to Avco. What does it say about all of this?

WILL MAGNAVOX LOSE MONEY?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it suggests, first, that Magnavox will lose money at the low price it bid. Really, Mr. Speaker, please refer to appendix 1 again. Examine the companies that bid on this job.

You will find a blue-ribbon list of electronics firms, perhaps some from your own district, who bid on the VRC-12. And many of them bid below Avco. Are they all irresponsible? Does that list represent a bunch of money losing low bids by some unknown manufacturers out to worm their way into Government contracting? I suggest it represents a list of soundly conceived, closely figured competitive bids by nationally respected producers which show that past prices for this equipment have been far, far too high.

What else does Avco say? It contends its prices were higher, because it was the first producer. It could not predict production costs or foresee troubles, so it had to cushion its price against those eventualities.

Does anyone in this House believe that Avco, a major respected concern, was so unable to figure its costs accurately after 8 years of development that its cost estimates on its first production run were virtually 100 percent higher than estimates made by other manufacturers who have never worked with the equipment at all, and whose only information came from plans, specifications and models? And what of the second contract? That price was formulated after Avco had been setting up production facilities for a full year after obtaining the first contract. Were those prices a shot in the dark, too?

TAXPAYERS BEING BLED WHITE

Mr. Speaker, how long are the fatheaded, arrogant—perhaps corrupt—civil servants in the Pentagon going to be allowed to bleed the taxpayers white? What must be said, what must be shown to convince Congress that the procurement end of the Pentagon is infected with a cancer that needs radical treatment—treatment that might well start with the amputation of a few highly placed people who sit behind football-field-size desks and rubber stamp everything that comes their way?

How long will we permit the silver-tongued excuse-makers in the Pentagon to hand out contract after contract, negotiated under spurious justification, midst a stench of stupidity, cupidity, or both? When will we reach the point where we can stomach no more and start doing the job that needs to be done—and that is to draw tight the golden purse strings of the Treasury and really supervise and scrutinize spending by the Defense Department, instead of being mesmerized, terrorized, hypnotized, wooed, cajoled, and coerced into ignoring all the ignorance, laziness, and corruption that lies inside the five rings of the Pentagon? The five-pointed pentagraph is the mythological symbol of the werewolf, and there is a startling parallel between the five-sided Pentagon and the werewolf of waste that ravishes our tax dollar more and more each day.

Mr. Speaker, what do the dunderheads, the nitwits and, yes, sometimes the thieves across the Potomac have to do before we recognize there is something drastically wrong, even though we have a handful of sincere men at the top—including Secretary McNamara—working futilely much of the time to set things right?

ENTERPRISE AND FREE COMPETITION

How long are we going to let the Pentagon think-tank eggheads thumb their nose at the one thing that made America great—enterprise and free competition?

The free-enterprise system in this Nation is based on the "demand of the marketplace," with competition relied upon to hold prices down where the consumers can afford them.

But the Pentagon is daily destroying this system. Remember, gentleman, that the Department of Defense budget—$55 billion—takes up half of the entire Federal budget and is responsible for a sizable portion of our gross national product. Yet 85 percent of our defense contracts are negotiated—awarded without the benefit of fully advertised, open price competition. Gentlemen, this stifles the competitive tradition of our business community and perverts and distorts the entire structure of our economy.

Tax dollars that could have been put to other uses—or not taken out of our pockets in the first place—are drained needlessly into procurement and diverted unconscionably into the pockets of contractors who happen to have an "in" at the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we in Congress—the only ones with the power to do so—started cutting into that monstrous 85 percent of negotiated contracts. How do we do it? We have asked Secretary McNamara to do it for us, and we have asked numerous secretaries before him. And what have the results been? Negligible at best. The Secretary says he is making progress, of course. But, unfortunately, he is not a one-man Pentagon. And the progress made—compared with the progress that needs to be made—is miniscule.

CONGRESS MUST DO THE JOB

It is time for us to get in there and help do the job ourselves. It is time to set up the blueribbon, joint congressional watchdog committee proposed in H.R. 4409, and in legislation introduced in the other body by Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, to force the Pentagon to do what it should have started doing years ago.

I have, for 2 years now, been standing on this floor, pointing out how contracts have been awarded without competition under all sorts of spurious excuses. I am having increasing good fortune in getting many of those procurements cancelled or curtailed with a resultant savings of millions of dollars.

But I am just one lone Congressman, who can hardly scratch the surface. We need a full-time committee with a trained, alert staff to start poking holes in the "paper curtain" of redtape and technicalities that the Pentagon drops around so many of its contracts, limiting competition, and handing them to favored contractors.

Only when we get this new joint committee will the Congress start exercising the real control necessary to guarantee that the Department of Defense receives $1 worth of equipment and services for every $1 of the taxpayers' money that it spends.

APPENDIX I

PHILA SC IFB AMC-36-039-63-230—OPEN JANUARY 3, 1963, AN/VRC-12( )

AN/VRC-12( ), radio set group, to be in accordance with Military Specifications, Mil-R-55099A, Mil-R-55100A, and other specifications listed in the invitation for bid, together with gages, drawings of gages, production drawings, special packing, etc. Quantities required are shown below, subject to 100 percent additional units for production in a second plant—previous awards to Avco at prices shown:

	361 each, RT 246	3,535 each, RT-524	937 each, R-442
Prior awards to Avco under 2 different production contracts after their $4,500,000 development job: No. 1 at $34,978,213; No. 2 at $65,000,000:			
Avco No. 1	$6,598.32	$4,731.60	$2,333.79
Avco No. 2	4,951.67	3,153.60	1,531.33
Name of firm bidding IFB 63-230 and terms:			
1. National Stran Car Corp., East Dundee, Ill., ¼ percent-20; prices f.o.b. Addison, Ill., plus gages $28,014, $4,308, $640; gages $34,000, $4,454, $640; gages $14,670, $3,723, $512; test fixtures $46,691, $46,691, $26,738; packing from $1 to $1.79; item description $5	2,228.35	1,456.70	1,093.07
2. Magnavox Corp., Fort Wayne, Ind., and Urbana, Ark	2,692.00	2,036.00	1,034.00
3. Budd Co., Electronic Division, Long Island City, N.Y	4,692.00	2,595.00	1,624.00
4. Fairchild Camera, DuMont Division, Syosset, N.Y	3,388.00	2,623.00	1,299.00
5. Hoffman Electronics, Los Angeles, Calif	3,443.00	2,625.00	1,331.00
6. ITT, Camden, Ark	4,290.56	2,628.11	1,441.14
7. Admiral Corp., Chicago, Ill	3,568.00	2,693.00	1,380.00
8. Stewart-Warner/Hallicrafters, Chicago, Ill., if awarded both jobs	3,529.17	2,707.16	1,368.17
9. Fairchild Camera & Instrument Division, Clifton, N.J	3,545.00	2,746.00	1,359.00
10. Bendix Radio, Baltimore, Md	3,594.00	2,795.00	1,302.00
11. Sylvania Corp., Buffalo, N.Y	4,691.26	2,832.04	1,683.52
12. ITT Federal Laboratory, Fort Wayne, Ind	4,571.85	2,826.80	1,537.44
13. Stewart-Warner/Hallicrafters, Chicago, Ill., bid for ½ the total	3,746.51	2,928.09	1,434.68
14. Rauland-Borg Corp., Chicago, Ill	3,994.50	2,977.50	1,960.40
15. Otis Elevator, Defense & Industrial Division, Brooklyn, N.Y	4,256.00	3,014.00	1,463.00
16. Otis Elevator, Santa Ana, Calif	4,296.00	3,044.00	1,479.00
17. Amelco Inc., Los Angeles, Calif	3,931.00	3,078.00	1,486.00
18. Avco Electronics, Cincinnati, Ohio, bidding with preproduction	4,153.17	3,107.39	1,630.41
Avco Electronics, Cleveland, Ohio, bidding without preproduction [1]	4,095.50	3,101.54	1,619.19
19. Radio Corp. of America, Cambridge, Ohio	5,915.29	3,114.34	1,731.42
20. Model Engineering, Huntington, Ind	4,250.44	3,165.12	1,585.88
21. Martin Marietta, Baltimore, Md	4,484.00	3,282.00	1,683.00
22. Motorola Electronics Division, Chicago	4,726.00	3,642.00	1,874.00
23. Loral Electronics Corp., Flushing, N.Y	5,035.00	4,045.00	2,325.00
24. General Motors Corp., Delco Radio Division, Kokomo, Ind	5,867.60	4,728.14	3,230.05

---

[1] Avco bid plus production drawings, $4,204.33; gages, $30,445.22, $5,580.20, $3,127.15; gages, $29,173.29, $5,547.61, $3,127.15; gages, $21,388.49, $6,409.14, $2,719.66; test fixtures, $95,573.41, $95,573.41, and $55,648.30; packing, $5.76; and item description lists, at $17.77, $17.77, and $17.81.

APPENDIX 2

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—DETERMINATION AND FINDINGS—AUTHORITY TO NEGOTIATE AN INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT—AUGUST 9, 1961

1. I hereby find that:

(a) From the date hereof and for 1 year thereafter, the Signal Corps proposes to procure by negotiation, approximately 8,815 each of the AN/VRC-12 family of vehicular radio communication sets, by components, in sufficient quantities to equip approximately 1,264 tanks and 7,270 combat vehicles other than tanks, and to provide approximately 281 sets for maintenance float capabilities, together with concurrent repair parts to support the equipment, with a clause included in the definitive contract providing for a 40-percent increase in quantity at the option of the Government. The AN/VRC-12, a Signal Corps production planning list item, is a family of vehicular, transistorized radio communication sets, consisting of a grouping of compact lightweight, frequency modulated receiver and transmitter components and associated controls designed for tactical use. The AN/VRC-12 family consists of radio sets AN/VRC-12 and AN/VRC-43 through AN/VRC-49, which are assembled from the radio components to meet the needs of the specific military vehicles. These radio sets differ from each other in their component structure and application.

(b) The estimated cost of the proposed procurement is $54 million.

(c) The procurement by negotiation of the above-described property is justified because:

(1) The AN/VRC-12 family is a series of technical and specialized vehicular radio communication sets. The 50-kilocycle channel spacing necessary to obtain 920 channels in these radio sets over the specified frequency range as well as the pluckout modules incorporating highly compact design and the use of transistors and printed circuitry, demand special skills, experience, and production capabilities. This family of radio sets is especially suited for highly mobile operations experienced under modern warfare conditions which require frequent relocation with a minimum of setup time, and will be used by ground forces to transmit and receive frequency modulated communications in tanks, trucks, armored cars, and ground installations. The relative ease of channel selection across the entire channel spread of this equipment permits direct communication between armor, infantry, artillery, and all support units. There are no existing radio sets which can satisfactorily perform all of the functions of the AN/VRC-12 family of vehicular radio communication sets.

(2) AVCO Corp. is the developer of the AN/VRC-12 family and holds a first-time production contract for this item on a component basis. The company has designed, developed, and procured special tooling and test equipment on account of the Government under the existing initial contract in an approximate amount of $1,374,000. This special tooling and test equipment cannot be made available to any other source until completion of the initial production contract, or until January 1963. In addition, the basic contract includes an approximate amount of $932,800 for ancillary items such as operational and organizational maintenance literature, field and depot maintenance literature, production drawings, etc., of a nonrecurring nature. Substantial savings are indicated by placement of the proposed procurement with this supplier, through utilization of the special tooling and test equipment in possession of AVCO, the increased monthly rate of production, and a tie-in of material costs with those on the initial production contract. It is estimated that reductions in cost of the six major items from the present contract price will be well below the anticipated second competitive procurement cost based on prior experience.

(3) This company can begin delivery in September 1962. The earliest date on which an award under competitive solicitation procedures of compatible and interchangeable items is estimated to be September of 1962, with deliveries thereunder to commence approximately March 1964, should another source receive the award.

(4) AVCO Corp. has expended approximately 8 years in specialized development of this vehicular communications system and has therefore acquired extensive background knowledge and know-how, as well as experienced technical personnel and facilities not available to any other contractor. In addition, incorporation of approved important design changes and human engineering considerations to equipments being procured on the initial production contract are under negotiation with the contractor. These changes will be reflected in like items being procured under this proposed procurement.

(5) AVCO Corp. is the only known source capable of meeting the requirements of the proposed procurement in a timely manner, and at a significant monetary savings to the Government.

2. Upon the basis of the finding set forth above, I hereby determine that the proposed contract is for property of a technical and specialized nature requiring a substantial investment; and procurement of such property by formal advertising and competitive bidding would be likely to result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment.

3. Subject to the availability of funds and providing that the above property has otherwise been authorized for procurement, it may, therefore, be procured from the date hereof and until 1 year thereafter, by negotiation pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(14) and paragraph 3-214 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

PAUL R. IGNATIUS,
Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Installations and Logistics).

The statements made herein are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

EARLE F. COOK,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Deputy Chief Signal Officer.

APPENDIX 3

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—DETERMINATION AND FINDINGS—AUTHORITY TO NEGOTIATE AN INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT—JUNE 30, 1960

1. I hereby find that:

(a) From the date hereof and until 1 year thereafter, the Signal Corps proposes to prepare by negotiation, radio set, vehicular, tactical command-voice (X-AN/VRC-12), a Signal Corps production planning list item, by components, in sufficient quantities to equip approximately 692 tanks, 2,850 combat vehicles other than tanks, and maintenance float capabilities for 150 additional tank installations, together with concurrent repair parts to support this equipment.

(b) The estimated cost of the proposed procurement is $28,311,027.

(c) The procurement by negotiation of the above-described property is justified because:

(1) Radio set AN/VRC-12 is a technical and specialized, complex item of receiver-transmitter equipment requiring the highest degree of skill in its assembly, calibration, and testing during its manufacture.

(2) A firm which does not have experience and know-how, specialized personnel and facilities would require approximately 30 months to prepare for the manufacture of this equipment. This extended period of 30 months would be required to obtain specialized technical know-how and techniques already possessed by the developer.

(3) Crosley Division, Avco Manufacturing Corp., is the developer of radio set AN/VRC-12 and is the only company which can meet the existing requirements for this item. This firm has spent approximately 8 years in specialized development on this equipment and has thereby acquired background knowledge and know-how, as well as experienced technical personnel and facilities not available to any other contractor. During the performance of the development contract, extensive tests, and preparation, including specifications and test equipment as well as the acquisition of sources of supply for component parts, were necessary to develop existing models of this radio set, and formal advertising and competitive bidding would require duplication of preparation already made by the developer.

2. Upon the basis of the findings set forth above, I hereby determine that the proposed contract is for property of a technical and specialized nature requiring an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and procurement of such property by formal advertising and competitive bidding may require duplication of preparation already made.

3. Subject to the availability of funds and providing that the above property otherwise has been authorized for procurement, it may, therefore, be prepared by negotiation pursuant to 10 United States Code 2304(a)(14) and paragraph 3-214 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

COURTNEY JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics).

The statements made herein are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Signature is recommended.

JOHN C. MONAHAN,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Acting Deputy Chief Signal Officer.

JUNE 30, 1960.

Memorandum for the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.

Subject: Determination and finding, radio set AN/VRC-12.

1. I have signed the attached determination and finding for the negotiated procurement of radio set AN/VRC-12 authorizing sole source procurement of this item from Crosley Division, Avco Manufacturing Co.

2. My approval is based on verbal assurances from the Office of the Chief Signal Officer that in the execution of this contract sufficient production data will be obtained to insure competition in future procurements of these radio sets.

COURTNEY JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics).

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we in America are facing a crisis. In many areas of our Nation mob action is rampant. Riots are the order of the day and many, many peaceful law-abiding citizens are being deprived of their freedoms, rights, and liberties by a small minority group determined to have their way regardless of law and regardless of the rights and freedoms of others.

Much of this unrest, discord, disorder, and rioting has been brought about and incited by the present administration and those who hold high political office, apparently in an endeavor to secure the political support of minority pressure groups.

A fire has been lit and it is indeed doubtful whether it can be brought under control unless and until firm, positive action is taken by the executive branch of the Government to reassure Americans that law and order must prevail and that legislation is not written in the streets under threat of mob action. The radical leaders of the several groups should realize that the Negroes are in the vast minority, that they comprise only about 10 percent of the total population, that they cannot and will not be able to win in mob action because the overwhelming majority of the other 90 percent of Americans are not going to sit idly by and see their rights and freedoms taken from them by mob action on the part of a minority group who are apparently trying to seek not freedom but special privileges and preferred treatment. They apparently are contending for some supercitizenship, disregarding all rights of other segments of society.

Laws should be made by the legislative branch of the Government, interpreted by the judicial branch, and enforced by the executive branch of the Government.

Law enforcement officers in many sections have bent over backward in trying to deal gently with those who have been participating in these various mob actions. The officers have suffered abuse in silence. They have been spit upon and have been on the receiving end of bottles, rocks, brickbats and the like—without retaliating in kind. Many of them have received serious and painful injuries while those who are committing these dastardly acts do so under the guise of demanding their freedom. They have violated almost every law of the land, yet pretend to be seeking freedom and liberty and are encouraged by those in high places to continue these acts of lawlessness.

It is time to call a halt to such disregard of law and order. Firm and positive action must be taken immediately or else the majority of the white people will be forced to take necessary action to protect their own freedom and liberties.

The people of this Nation need to take a long, hard look at the request being made by those who are demonstrating in the streets. Most of them in our area are not demanding equality under the law but are demanding that the laws of the land be changed so that they may be given special privileges. Yes—so that freedom may be taken from others and special privileges given to certain segments of our society. Certainly, every person has a right to choose his associates and to use his private property as he sees fit so long as he does so in a lawful manner and does not disturb others.

EFFECTS OF THE BRACERO PROGRAM ON AMERICAN SMALL FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in our debates on the extension of Public Law 78, we have often overlooked the effects that the bracero program has had on American small farmers and farm workers. A letter I have and which I wish to place in the RECORD makes this point. In a few words, the message is that free labor cannot compete with Mexican contract workers who are not free in any important respect. One wise man has said, "Those who compete with slaves have to accept the conditions of slave labor." I commend this letter to you. I know that many of my colleagues will agree that Public Law 78 should not be extended.

CITY OF ALAMO,
Alamo, Tex., June 15, 1963.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH.
Senator JOHN TOWER.
Congressman JOE KILGORE.
Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ.

GENTLEMEN: The decision to not extend Public Law 78 is one of the finest things Congress has done this year. I am speaking from my own 17 years' experience as a fruit and vegetable shipper.

There is a considerable amount of bellyaching at this time from the large associations and combines of grower-shippers. They are all bleeding for the small farmer that is going to be hurt. I can tell you that nothing hurts the small grower as much as the large mass-production grower-shipper combines. They, with unlimited supplies of bracero labor, can mass-produce at a margin of profit that the smaller growers cannot survive on. The small grower who does most of his own work must figure his wages at bracero level. Is that good? It is not the small grower who overproduces and demoralizes the markets. The large combines would not be able to do it so conveniently, either, if they did not have unlimited supplies of cheap labor available to them.

I am going into my fifth year as mayor of Alamo. A large part of our community is made up of migratory laborers. So many times I have seen these laborers go to California when our own harvests are completed, only to return in a few weeks because the braceros are doing all the work. A migratory labor program is in my opinion what we need, rather than a bracero program.

I sincerely hope you will agree with me if the matter is brought up in Congress again.

Thank you and best wishes.

JOHN H. GINSBACH,
President, Rio Citrus & Vegetables, Inc.

CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL FAILS TO RECOGNIZE ECONOMIC FACTS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a reading of the statement by the President's Consumer Advisory Council opposing the quality stabilization bill which is sponsored by 25 Members of the House shows that little, if any, objective study was given the merits of this bill by the Council.

The Council says the quality stabilization bill "violates the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices."

Here are the facts: A manufacturer will not be able to use the quality stabilization law unless his product is in free and open competition with other products made by others for the same purpose. Under the quality stabilization law some manufacturers will stabilize the price on their trademarked product; other manufacturers will not use the law because they prefer to do business without stabilized prices at the retail level. And Sears, and Wards, and J. C. Penney, and Macy's, and Woodward and Lothrop, and hundreds of other distributors will have their own private brands.

So one thing is certain: The consumer under the quality stabilization law will have a choice between the widest variety of products, which widely vary as to quality and widely vary as to prices. That is the way it should be, and will be, despite what the Council says.

Second. The Consumer Advisory Council opposes "these bills and all similar attempts at price-fixing at the retail level."

Here are the facts: More than one-third of all trademarked products now sold in this country without a quality stabilization law are completely controlled as to price all the way from the manufacturer to the consumer. These are your "house-controlled brands." Today, without a quality stabilization law, Sears, Roebuck, for example, controls the price of its private brand products in all the many hundreds of Sears stores throughout this country. I have no objection to this. The consumer is free to buy or reject such merchandise on its merit.

But I do object to the Consumer Advisory Council being silent as to the marketing facts of life. The Council ignores what Sears and Wards and the other giant retailing syndicates are now doing, yet publicly opposes the right of a national brand name manufacturer to accomplish the same result in a positive, competitive way under the quality stabilization law to protect its valuable trademark and its thousands of ethical independent resellers.

Third. The Council says they are "not impressed by the argument that such legislation would aid small business." As the proprietor of a men's retail clothing store in California, I know it would aid small business. And small businessmen in the hundreds of thousands—as represented by more than 70 national trade associations endorsing this quality stabilization bill—feel the same way. I value more highly the opinion of the economists in business, the man on the firing line. He is the man meeting the payroll and he is in a better position to know what aids him and what will not.

Fourth. The Council says small business would not be aided because the quality stabilization bill "encourages the introduction by large retail businesses of private brands and other techniques for avoiding the effect of the legislation." The only reason for private brands is that the national brand has been made profitless by loss-leader tactics. The average retailer, if there is such, has no objection to private brands. Personally I hope all my competition resorts to private brands. I prefer to sell the Arrow or Manhattan or the Van Heusen shirt any day rather than a private brand.

What the President's Council somehow does not understand is that the need for a stabilized price forces the use of a private brand. A store—without the quality stabilization law—does not have a stabilized price in the national brand. It does with a private brand. But only the powerful retailer has the resources to move into the private brand area. This quality stabilization law will give the small ethical independent reseller the price stabilization for the national brand that the giant retail establishments of this country now have in the private brand.

AS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS VIEW INTEGRATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, hanging on the wall of my office is a framed photograph of the 1899 football team of the high school at Benton Harbor, Mich. It was taken 64 years ago when most of my colleagues in this historic Chamber were yet unborn.

We were photographed in three rows. I am in the second row and beside me is a schoolmate and a teammate, a Negro. Behind me in the third row is another schoolmate and teammate, a Negro. In the photograph also among others are the son of the leading physician in Benton Harbor at that time, the son of the wealthiest man in the town, and Willard Banyan, brother of Stanley Banyan, the long-time editor and publisher of the Benton Harbor News Palladium.

We were schoolmates and teammates and there was no consciousness of race, religion, or station that divided our affections and our loyalties. Perhaps that is why I grew up with no consciousness of color or of religious differences or of differences in station. To this day I can honestly say that I have never been conscious of the color of complexion of other men, at least no more conscious than I am of the color of their hair or the color of their eyes. Mr. Speaker, I think that will be true of all Americans in a time not very far away. The only thing that counts in any man is his character and his worth.

There is always distress in the transition from an established status quo. I suppose this could be called the pain of evolution. But always man is going forward. Always he is reaching for a plane of contentment and of dignity. He envisions brotherhood on earth as something very close to his religious faith, a brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of the Creator of all.

In recent years there have been great trends of population in Chicago and other northern cities. In a very large measure we in Chicago are meeting the challenge of change with wisdom, understanding, and with the cooperation of peoples of all races, all the religions, and all stations of life. We are working together as teammates, I think much in the spirit of the Benton Harbor High School football team of 1899.

I have been impressed with the attitude on race relations of the younger generation as reflected in the six prize-winning brotherhood essays in a contest sponsored by the Human Relations Committee of the South Shore Commission of Chicago.

The contest on the subject "What Makes a Good Community?" was conducted through South Shore public, parochial, and private high schools and drew nearly 500 entries. Among the schools participating were Mt. Carmel, Aquinas, South Shore, Hyde Park and Chicago Vocational high schools and the University of Chicago Laboratory School.

Winning essays were selected by a five-man panel of final judges which included three clergymen and two civic and business leaders. On the panel were Msgr. Vincent J. Moran of St. Philip Neri Catholic Church, Rabbi Eric Friedland of Beth Am Synagogue, Rev. Jesse Roberts of St. John's Methodist Church, architect John Macsai, 7141 South Oglesby, Chicago, and Jim Fuerst, 7739 South Island, Chicago.

Mr. Fuerst, who donated the trips to the National Capital, as prizes, in explaining the aim of the contest, said:

> The object was to learn how they feel they can help improve social conditions in their neighborhood. Their views are significant and of interest, for these youths live in a community facing the challenge of integration right this minute. A secondary purpose is to make their parents more aware of the problems which exist in the area of race relations and human relationships on the community level.

The six contest winners reached Washington today to begin their 6-day vacation, and will visit the gallery of this historic Chamber tomorrow to look down on the lawmakers of their country as we go about our legislative business.

Accompanying the girl students will be Sister Winifred, of Aquinas High School, who was awarded a free trip for being the teacher of several of the top contest winners.

The six winning students, all girls, come from South Shore High School and Aquinas High School, one a public the other a private school, both not only in the district I have the honor to represent but in the seventh ward, which has been my home ward for half a century. They are Margaret Eastlund, 17, 8514 South Woodlawn; Elizabeth Ann Hoke, 17, 7439 South Crandon; Dede Lewin, 15, 7739 South Louella; Karyn Loving, 15, 1749 East 73d Place; Kathy McKenna, 17, 9405 South Ridgeway; and Patrice Ward, 17, 6841 South Clyde.

Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in some brief excerpts from the essays by these high school students in whose hands is the molding of the tomorrow.

The first is by Karyn Loving, South Shore High School:

> In the summer of 1961, when my family decided to move into the South Shore community, I was fully aware that we would be one of the only two Negro families living south of 73d Street and I didn't really know just what to expect.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I know that I had certain ideas about what events might have occurred when we moved in and at the time, I was sure I'd regret the move later. But after living here for 2 years, I'd like to know why either my friends or I had such thoughts.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There was no violence and not very many people moved out. In fact, the very same week we moved in, a white family on our block gave a party to welcome us to the neighborhood. As time went on, all of the neighbors stopped to talk, their children played with my brother, and later they gave me babysitting jobs.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I must admit that it was pretty lonesome around here without anyone my age to associate with, but within a few weeks that lonesomeness had faded away because I had met some "terrific teens" at school and we were experiencing good academic competition, created by my presence in class with them; and our neighbors were becoming friendlier as they learned to know our family. So, I really couldn't ask for anything more * * * excellent schools, terrific teens, and friendly neighbors. South Shore is a good community and I want to keep it that way.

The next excerpt is by Elizabeth Ann Hoke, Aquinas High School:

> What makes a good community? When this question was presented to our English class, many ideas ran through my head. Every community should have a good housing situation, adequate shopping facilities, suitable recreational centers, and sufficient educational institutions. South Shore has all these; therefore, it can be rated as one of Chicago's finest communities. South Shore has offered its residents the best in all the things mentioned.
>
> * * * * *
>
> At Aquinas High School, we are completely integrated with equal opportunities and responsibilities. These Negro girls are eager to learn, and they often lead discussions about racial discrimination with no trace of bitterness. I am often embarrassed to learn that they know and understand much more than I do about current news affairs and the world situation, saying nothing about their scholastic ability and the other things in which they excel.
>
> The heart of the problem of racial discrimination is segregation. This segregation offends against the virtues of justice and charity. Although segregation is wrong in principle, this problem, in practice, has many varied aspects which may be taken care of either jointly or separately. The most significant phase deals with opportunities in regard to education and jobs.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Parental attitudes are responsible much more than any other single factor for the

> growth and fostering of prejudice in our youth of today. Youngsters will play together, learn together, and pray together without any thought of racial or religious differences.

The next essay is by Patrice Ward, Aquinas High School:

> South Shore is a prosperous and pleasant community in which to live. Residents are well satisfied with the excellent facilities their neighborhood offers—shopping, housing, recreation, transportation, schools, and churches. People in all walks of life live here, from politicians to factory workers. In addition, the residents represent a diversity of religious backgrounds, as shown by the 32 churches located in this area. Many families live in apartments, large and small, others in homes or in apartment-hotels. South Shore can be proud of the progress it has made in less than a hundred years from a sprawling swampland to one of the best-developed areas of the city. It is very interesting and something to be proud of.
>
> We must realize that it is our job—today's residents—to help keep South Shore as prosperous as it has been in the past. This we can do by our cooperation in community affairs. In my opinion, a matter of prime importance is the removal of racial prejudice. * * * From my acquaintances at school, I have learned that Negroes are intelligent, respectful, ordinary people just as the white people, and fun to be with. On the whole, I find them much more open-minded than most people I know. I never learned about the Negro in this light, at home, nor do I think very many children do.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Since South Shore is an ideal place in which to live and we are proud to say we belong, let's keep it that way.

And from Dede Lewin, of South Shore High School:

> At last the great community of South Shore has become perfectly, unbiasedly, and wholly integrated. We have 10, perhaps 20, Negro families living in our midst.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Economic and social fears are basic causes of prejudice. Some deny prejudice, but fear the admittance of Negro families will cause property values to go down.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The South Shore community slogan is "South Shore, the place to live." * * * The purpose of this slogan is to encourage those who now live in South Shore to remain.
>
> * * * * *
>
> South Shore's youth could be helped through integrated schools. Living through an experience is the best teacher.

And lastly from Margaret Eastlund, Aquinas High School:

> During the past few years, South Shore and the surrounding area have been under the scrutiny of the Nation's eye. Integration has long been a serious problem, especially in certain sections of Chicago. When the first Negro families moved into the Chatham area, a wholesale panic followed. This area changed from 10 percent colored to 95 percent colored in less than 5 years. I lived in Chatham, but my family had moved away before the first colored families moved in. But I saw what happened and I hoped then it would never happen to me, personally.
>
> * * * * *
>
> What makes people act so violently against integration? That might be an easy question for me to ask, being a teenager in Chicago. The integration problem has always been a part of my life.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A colored family has just moved in next door to my own family. Now is the time to practice what I have said and advocated for these past few months. My family will not move just because a colored family has moved next to us. It will take a much more serious reason to cause us to make such a serious decision as this.
>
> What I have said so far is strictly personal opinion. But it is a brand of thinking shared by a great many people in my community. Church leaders, political leaders, and many just plain citizens have voiced similar reactions. I have seen a strongly organized civic group crack down on the "panic peddlers." These unscrupulous realtors, by phone calls and repeated house calls, try to scare residents into moving so that they can realize tremendous profits. Besides causing a general panic, these men cast a degrading light upon the Negroes themselves.
>
> There has been no violent unrest among the residents of this area. The people with whom I have discussed this problem have shown a radically different attitude than many of their peers. I have always maintained that prejudice is a fault instilled in a person by others. It is not a self-gained idea. A majority of the people in my community are doing a tremendous job in showing their children a true spirit of Christian brotherhood. I have seen white and colored children playing together and when asked why, a noted reply is,
>
> "Why not, he's one of my friends."

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a bursting storage tank and a leaking tank farm pipe allowed 1,400,000 gallons of petroleum and 3 million gallons of soybean oil to spew into the Minnesota River. Cold water kept the effects from becoming apparent until the ice went out and the oil was carried down into the Mississippi River. Fish and wildlife for hundreds of miles down will be killed for months to come by the oil.

Ten thousand ducks were caught in the oil and killed. This is 1 day's bag limit for 5,000 duck hunters who this last fall had the lowest bag limit in recorded history. This occurred in a season so poor that many hunters have put away their guns, hung up their equipment and laid up their duck boats, and where several major species of waterfowl are approaching danger of extinction.

That negligence was involved in this matter is plain from the happening, in the language of the law, res ipsa loquitor, the very happening of the thing speaks for itself.

The oil will have an extremely harmful effect on the Upper Mississippi National Wildlife Refuge which runs for 300 miles along the Mississippi.

Perhaps the best thing that can be said is that if this disaster had struck in a waterfowl wintering area the entire resource of the Mississippi Flyway could have been endangered. This fortunately did not happen.

There are many other rivers where the same thing has happened. Pollution of the navigable waters of the Detroit River and Lake Erie and their tributaries within the State of Michigan have occurred on at least two occasions and it is sad to note that the International Joint Commission has disclosed that an average of 16,280 gallons of oil are dumped into the Detroit River every day. In 1948 there was an estimated loss of over 10,000 birds due to oil. In succeeding years recorded losses were not as high, but in 1960 there were oil kills of ducks on nearly the magnitude of 1948.

The prospects are that careless, indifferent, and willful men will continue to create situations from oil spill and other pollutants which will destroy or severely injure our migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources.

The Public Health Service continues to report on destruction of fish by pollution, in terms which indicate a steady and frightening increase in pollution destruction of our wildlife resources.

Last year the Public Health Service reported 2 extraordinary large fish kills from pollution with 3,180,000 fish killed at one time by pollution at its own front door, in the Anacostia River, one of the Potomac's tributaries.

Another extraordinary killing occurred outside San Diego Harbor with 37,800,000 fish destroyed at one time. The carcasses from this kill covered an area of 1,000 feet by 10 feet by 3 feet deep, or over 945 tons of dead fish.

There were 381 reports of significant fish kills, in 308 of which the pollution source was identifiable.

Industrial wastes were involved in 163. Agricultural poisons ranked second. Domestic sewage was the third major killer of fish.

Certain facts stand out from adequate but incomplete reports: First, the size of fish kills is increasing; second, the number of fish kills appears to be growing; third, the relative number of fish kills reported by different kinds of pollution appears reasonably constant; and fourth, about one-fourth of the fish killed were game fish and valuable species.

I need not point out that under the Constitution the navigable waters of America are expressly reserved to the Federal Government and that failure of our Government to act bears major responsibility for this continuing series of grisly losses to pollution. This legislation is aimed at meeting that failure.

For this reason I am introducing legislation which will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate suit to collect monetary damages on behalf of the United States for destruction of fish, wildlife, and migratory waterfowl and to authorize him to secure injunctive relief to abate such activities as common nuisances.

Since willful and grossly negligent men persist in destruction of this precious resource it appears the only thing which can be done is to afford this new weapon to the Secretary to protect the interests of all sportsmen, outdoorsmen, and lovers of nature.

EFFECT OF FAILURE TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I was most interested in listening to the letter received from one of his constituents by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] having to do with the failure of this Congress to extend Public Law 78. Though I did not anticipate this situation, and consequently did not bring the letter with me, I wish I could read into the Record a letter I received from one of my constituents. This was from a factory owner who supplies agricultural materials to the growers of tomatoes and strawberries who has a payroll of more than $70,000 a year. As of July 1, this gentleman is giving notice of termination of employment to 75 percent of his employees. He has canceled orders for $30,000 in equipment and orders for $100,000 of manufacturing raw materials.

In addition to this letter I have learned of an employer of 1,500 in a strawberry processing plant who is in Mexico at this very moment looking for a place to transfer his operation. In California there will be thousands of employees in industrial plants and many union members who will be out of work because this Congress did not see fit to extend Public Law 78.

FURTHER PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 20

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] has advised me that on Thursday he will call up under unanimous consent three bills unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means as follows:

H.R. 4174, 1-year continuation of suspension of duties on metal scrap.

H.R. 2827, 3-year continuation of suspension of duty on crude chicory and reduction in duty on ground chicory.

H.R. 2651, 1-year continuation of provision relating to responsibility for placement and foster care of dependent children.

In addition, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will call up under a rule H.R. 6791, 2-year continuation of existing reduction in exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents.

DECISIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago, on April 10, 1962, I joined my colleague from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] in a presentation to the House of Representatives. We endeavored to call attention to some disturbing patterns which were then emerging in the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board. In particular, we focussed attention upon the Board's handling of unfair labor practice cases in the light of a clear purpose on the part of Congress to curb certain abuses by its enactment of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—commonly referred to as the Landrum-Griffin Act.

On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, we advised the House and the Nation that instead of implementing and giving effect to the 1959 labor reform law, many of the NLRB decisions were actually frustrating and circumventing the intent of Congress. We then expressed a conviction and our deep concern that, through its decisions, the NLRB was moving rapidly toward the outright nullification of some of the most important provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act—provisions which had been carefully aimed directly at certain abuses of power.

We expressed particular concern about the trend of Board decisions which dealt with secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing practices. However, those were not the only areas of the law where we detected that a process of administrative repeal was in progress.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further, I should like to emphasize a point made in our presentation a year ago. At the close of my remarks, I state:

> We have singled out patterns of Labor Board decisions in recent months which give rise to our concern. We believe the developing trend of future decisions will bear close watching.
>
> I should like to reiterate—on behalf of myself and my colleague from Michigan—that it is not our intention to retry any of these cases on the floor of the House.
>
> It is, however, our intention to publicize what the Labor Board is doing; to focus attention on patterns of decision which conflict with the intent of Congress. (Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 5, p. 6194.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the preliminary statement being made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum]. We do not intend to retry particular cases on the floor of the House, nor to inquire into the mental processes by which individual NLRB members may arrive at their decisions. In that connection, I should like to repeat now a statement which was included in my remarks to the House a year ago:

> It is important to our very system of government under separate powers that Congress should respect the right of every judicial officer to make his decisions secure in the knowledge that he will not be subject to a later inquiry into the mental processes by which he arrived at particular decisions. To say this, however, is not to foreclose a Member of Congress from expressing disagreement concerning decisions made or to comment upon them. (Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 5, p. 6191.)

As we again focus attention here upon the NLRB and its activities, it should be emphasized that our remarks today are not directed at the Department of Labor, which administers and enforces certain other major portions of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

As was the case a year ago, our discussion today will relate primarily to the handling of unfair labor practice complaints which fall under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I regretfully report to the House today that there has been no improvement in the performance of the NLRB. Since our speech of a year ago, the record of the Board has provided only more evidence that our concern at that time was justified. The Board's subsequent decisions have carved even wider loopholes in the statutory ban against secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing. The right of free speech has been further curtailed. And the Board has ignored the intent of Congress in other important areas of the law.

In the time available to us today, we shall review some of the leading decisions in these several categories.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we did not suggest any legislative action to correct the situation. We did not wish to be hasty in making a final judgment or in suggesting a remedy. Frankly, I have had grave doubts for a long time about the appropriateness of the NLRB, as it is organized, to function as a judicial body. The Board's performance over the past year has not erased those doubts. Surely it is now apparent that major changes must be made if we are to have equal justice under law in unfair labor practice cases.

Mr. Speaker, corrective action should not be longer postponed. Year after year, month after month, the NLRB—through its own opinions—has repeatedly put Congress on notice that it is futile to entertain further hope that the Board will steer a reasonable course.

No longer can there be serious question about the need for legislation to shift or reorganize the structure under which unfair labor practice cases are handled. Mr. Speaker, the 25-year performance record of the National Labor Relations Board in the discharge of its judicial role represents one of the most lamentable episodes in the history of American jurisprudence.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Last year we pointed to a variety of strange secondary boycott rulings by the Board.

For example, in one case the Board permitted a secondary boycott by ruling that one who distributed candy and tobacco was also the producer of those items—*Teamsters Local 537 and Lohman* (132 NLRB No. 67, 1961). In another case the Board managed to legalize secondary boycott activity by ruling that a broadcasting station was a producer of automobiles because those automobiles were advertised in its commercials—*Electrical Workers Local 662 and Middlesouth Broadcasting Company* (133

NLRB No. 165, 1961). In other cases, the Board permitted boycotts by holding that the word "individual" as used in the Landrum-Griffin Act applies to some individuals but does not apply to others. In short, according to the Board, sometimes an "individual" really is not an "individual" at all. See *Carolina Lumber* (130 NLRB No. 148, 1961), and *Operating Engineers Local 324* (131 NLRB No. 36, 1961).

Many people probably hoped, Mr. Speaker, that in the period of a year the Board might have changed the course indicated by such ludicrous holdings. However, that has not been the case.

A bit of light and some hope has come from the courts. For example, in one judicial circuit—the ninth—the court has rebuffed the NLRB on two of its boycott decisions. When the Board applied its thinking in Middlesouth Broadcasting to legalize a boycott, the Appellate Court, in *Great Western Broadcasting Corporation* v. *NLRB* (310 F. 2d 591), rejected what it called the Board's "rather remarkable conclusion that a television station can be a producer of automobiles, bread, gasoline, and beer."

In another case the Board had applied its Carolina Lumber doctrine—the concept that sometimes an individual is not an individual. In reviewing that doctrine, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in *Servette, Inc.* v. *NLRB* (310 F. 2d 659), found the legislative language as clear as Congress had intended it to be. The court said:

> Congress intended by the plain, unambiguous language used to include supervisors in the category described as "any individual employed by any person."

One might think that such rebuffs by the courts on appeal would cause the Board to change its course. However, that result does not necessarily follow so far as the Board is concerned. Unless and until such a ruling is affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, this Board is likely to ignore a reversal except for its effect in the particular case decided. Accordingly, even a reversal by a court of appeals does not necessarily close a loophole, once it has been opened by an NLRB interpretation.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that many Board decisions are not appealed because of expenses involved, because issues become moot, or for a variety of other reasons. Of course, even when a Board decision is appealed, there is no right to a new and unbiased hearing. On appeal the Court can only review the record; and it is required to sustain findings of fact if supported by "substantial evidence." Often an appellate court is likely to defer to the supposed "expertise" of the Board in the labor-management field.

Another important consideration is the fact that, under the law, the General Counsel of the NLRB has complete and final authority to decide whether or not a complaint will be issued after an aggrieved person complains. If the General Counsel should arbitrarily refuse to issue a complaint, there is no appeal from his refusal. Of course, the General Counsel is not likely to issue a complaint in situations where the facts are similar to those on which the Board has previously dismissed a complaint, even though the Board's ruling in the earlier case was not appealed. Thus, the impact of Board distortions can be widely diffused, and complainants with meritorious cases can be precluded under present procedure from ever having a day in court.

Congress had good reason in 1947 to separate the functions of the General Counsel from those of the Board, as it did in the Taft-Hartley law. Prior to Taft-Hartley, the NLRB was a combination investigator-prosecutor-judge-and-jury. As a result, by 1947, public confidence in the Board's fairness had all but vanished. In an effort to correct that situation, Congress provided that the General Counsel should investigate and prosecute, and that he should be independent of the 5-man NLRB vested with judicial functions.

Those who enacted Taft-Hartley declared and insisted that the NLRB judges should be separate, and should not control or dictate to the prosecutor. From time to time, attempts have been made to undermine or eliminate the separate and independent status of the General Counsel; however, Congress has rejected such efforts and has repeatedly reaffirmed the fundamental principle of separation as established in Taft-Hartley.

Now, however, in view of the President's recent appointment of a new General Counsel, the importance of this principle needs once again to be emphasized. The appointment made by the President is not necessarily subject to criticism, but special circumstances which surround the appointment make it appropriate, I believe, to sound a note of caution. I say that because, prior to his recent appointment, the new General Counsel—who now is the prosecutor—served directly under the Chairman of the Board—the chief judge—as his chief legal assistant. In that capacity, he not only assisted in writing decisions but he publicly championed the ruling of the new Board.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have no quarrel concerning the new General Counsel's general qualifications or ability, and, certainly, I do not question his integrity. However, one cannot help but wonder how "separate and independent" an appointee will be under such circumstances.

Returning to secondary boycotts, Mr. Speaker, I believe that some special attention should be paid to one situation. For a number of years the law relating to ambulatory picketing had been well settled. In *Washington Coca-Cola Bottling Works, Inc.*, (107 NLRB No. 299), it had been held unlawful for a union to picket trucks of the Washington Coca-Cola Co., with whom it had a primary dispute, while the trucks were at customers' stores, where the union's object was to affect a secondary boycott, that is, forcing customers to cease doing business with the company. It was reasoned then that such picketing of company trucks at secondary customer premises should not be tolerated except in the unusual situation where there is no other way for a union to communicate by picketing with employees of the primary employer.

The rule of the Washington Coca-Cola case not only was followed for a number of years but it was specifically approved by Congress in the conference report on the 1959 Landrum-Griffin amendments to Taft-Hartley. Despite this clear approval, the new Board has seen fit to reverse the rule and now permits a union to follow trucks of a primary employer or its employees and picket at secondary sites, even though the union also has a reasonable opportunity to picket and could communicate thereby with employees at the site of the primary employer's place of business. See: *United Plant Guard Workers (Houston Armored Car Co.)*, 136 NLRB No. 9; *Electorical Workers, Local 861 (Plauche Electric, Inc.)*, 135 NLRB No. 41.

Mr. Speaker, the 1959 Landrum-Griffin amendments to Taft-Hartley's section 8(b) were carefully designed for the declared purpose of closing major loopholes in the ban against secondary boycotts. One by one those loopholes, in whole or in part, are being opened again by decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

For example: One provision of the Landrum-Griffin law closed a loophole which permitted secondary boycotts to be affected through coercion applied directly against a secondary employer—rather than against his employees. But in *Local 83, Teamsters Union*—Marshall and Haas—133 NLRB No. 116, the Board found no violation even though a union business agent directly threatened a secondary employer by ordering him to "straighten out" two subcontractors by 8 o'clock the next morning. The Board found that the union agent was merely notifying the secondary employer of a possible strike but that no strike threat was involved.

Another provision of the 1959 act closed a loophole which permitted secondary boycotts when aimed at railroads or municipalities because their employees did not fall within the technical definition of "employees" as contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the Board has partially reopened this loophole by holding that secondary boycott picketing of railroad employees is permissible if the railroad property is adjacent to the struck plant. *Steel Workers, Local 5895*—Carrier Corp.—132 NLRB No. 17. Thus, it would appear that, despite the 1959 amendments, railroads may be free from secondary boycotts only at locations which are remote from the property of a primary employer who is struck.

Such cases seem to reflect a consistent, almost aggressive purpose to rewrite the law so as to reflect the philosophy and thinking of the members of the NLRB—rather than the intent of Congress. Loopholes in the Taft-Hartley ban against secondary boycotts, which were so carefully closed by the 1959 act, are not just ajar—they have been opened wide again by the NLRB.

The Landrum-Griffin restriction against blackmail organizational and recognition picketing has been meeting a similar fate at the hands of the Board. This provision of the law, section 8(b) (7) was designed to give effect to the principle that employees should be free to choose whether they wish to be represented at all by a union—and if so, by which union. Obviously, this fundamental principle is rendered meaningless when a union that refuses to submit to an election is permitted by the Board to engage in prolonged picketing designed and carried on for the purpose of coercing employees—picketing that threatens to destroy the employees' jobs along with their employer's business.

Last year, we called attention to several decisions indicating that both the letter and the spirit of the law were being tortured in order to legalize blackmail picketing practices. For example, one union was permitted to picket even after the NLRB itself had certified another union as the representative of the employees involved. *Calumet Contractors* (133 NLRB No. 57). In another case, the Board indicated that a union would be allowed to picket if it merely filed an unfair practice charge against the employer, even though the charge later proved to be groundless *C. A. Blinne* (135 NLRB No. 121). And, despite the clear wording of the law, another union was permitted to picket even though an election had already been held within the preceding 12 months (*G. R. Kinney Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB No. 24).

In an article entitled "The Labor Board and Section 8(b) (7),," published in the December 1962 issue of the University of Detroit Law Journal, I have set forth a detailed analysis of Board interpretations of section 8(b) (7). At one point in the article, I commented on the holding in one case, *Barker Bros.* (138 NLRB No. 54), as follows:

> If the Constitution makes anything clear, surely it is that legislating is the function of Congress. At this writing, the holding in Barker climaxes a disturbing line of recent decisions which gives cause to wonder whether the new Board majority really concedes the constitutional authority of Congress to establish policy in the labor-management field.

The Barker Bros. case represents a degree of departure from the statutory language and the clear intent of Congress which even exceeds anything to be found in the secondary boycott cases.

The Landrum-Griffin restriction against blackmail picketing contains a proviso exempting certain picketing if it is carried on for the purpose of "truthfully" advising the public that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor organization. But the language specifically directs that the exemption shall not apply if "an effect" of such picketing is to interfere with pickups or deliveries or to prevent performance of "any" services at the employer's place of business.

In Barker Bros., an object of the union's picketing was to force recognition; the picketing had been carried on for 12 weeks at 18 of the employer's retail stores; the picket signs were not truthful; and the picketing did result in the stoppage of deliveries or interference with services on at least 5 different occasions, and possibly on more than 15 occasions.

It seems incredible but, despite these facts, the new Board majority refused to hold that the union had violated section 8(b) (7) and held instead that such picketing was legal.

The Board excused the untruthfulness of the picket signs by declaring that there was no proof of an "intent to deceive the public" and no evidence that the public was actually deceived. The majority of the Board further concluded that a literal reading of the statutory language concerning the effect of such picketing would "do a disservice to Congress." Then, instead of applying the test adopted by Congress on this point, the Board proceeded to substitute its own standard which allows picketing unless there is substantial interference with the operation of the business. Of course, such an interpretation shifts the burden of proof and operates to protect those engaged in blackmail picketing.

It can be said not only that the Board is ingenious in finding ways to circumvent the intent of Congress, but also that it is persistent. Take, for example, the case of *Jay Jacobs Downtown, Inc.*, 140 NLRB No. 127, 1963. The facts in the Jacobs case are worth examining. The union wanted to organize sales employees at a retail ladies' apparel store. It asked the employer's help and was given the names and addresses of all employees so the union could contact them. The employer also conveyed the union's invitation to a dinner meeting for employees after work hours.

Despite this cooperation on the part of the employer, apparently the union could make no headway in organizing the employees. After 4 months, the union demanded that the employer sign a contract without regard for the employees' wishes in the matter. The employer refused, and then the picketing began. The union admitted it was picketing to organize and obtain recognition. If this gave the Board any problems, it was not evident because the Board promptly slipped through a loophole it created for itself in the *Crown Cafeteria* case (135 NLRB No. 124), which was discussed in our speech a year ago. The Board came through this loophole in fine style because some of the signs said the employer was nonunion.

Next, the Board had to overcome the fact that some of the pickets gave information that they were picketing because of the employer's antiunion attitude. It should be borne in mind that, under the publicity proviso, the law requires that picketing must be truthful. But the Board had little trouble on this part. It decided that the employer was in fact antiunion. Why? Because he refused to sign a contract with this particular union since his employees had refused to join. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if an employer should sign a union contract under those conditions, he would be guilty of an unfair labor practice for conspiring with the union to thwart the wishes of the employees. Nevertheless, the Board found, in effect, that a refusal by the employer to violate the law made him antiunion in the eyes of the Board, which in turn subjected him and his employees to the very blackmail picketing which Congress had endeavored to prohibit.

Even after wriggling adroitly through those loopholes, the Board still had work to do to legalize picketing in the Jacobs case. Among its other effects, the picketing had stopped deliveries to the employer's business. However, this proved to be only a minor obstacle. The Board called upon a loophole which it had created in the Barker Bros. case. Even though the statute contains no such requirement, the Board found that the General Counsel had failed to bear the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Jacobs stoppages were serious enough to "interfere with, disrupt, or curtail the employer's business."

Mr. Speaker, in the presentation to the House last year, I said:

> Incredible as it may seem, the Board, with the application of strained and tortured reasoning, has handed down a series of decisions, which, in their total effect, operate to legalize many of the picketing and boycott abuses which Congress, through the Landrum-Griffin Act, sought to eliminate. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 5, p. 6194.)

Mr. Speaker, I believe that more recent NLRB decisions have rendered that analysis rather inadequate. It seems quite obvious now that no great amount of ingenuity would be required for any union official to follow the clearly marked NLRB routes to immunity in the use of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in our brief remarks here, we cannot provide a comprehensive analysis of all of the Board's recent decisions. The cases we have touched upon only begin to tell the story. However, I wish to call attention to an exhaustive study now available which measures and evaluates the full impact of the Board's activities in this field. The study, published as a book entitled "The New Frontier NLRB," was authored by Mr. Kenneth C. McGuiness, formerly an Acting General Counsel of the Board who also served in 1959 as a consultant on the staff of the Education and Labor Committee when the Landrum-Griffin bill was enacted into law. This book has just been published by the Labor Policy Association, Inc., 1815 H Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans should be concerned about NLRB decisions which restrict or deny the right of free speech. It is noteworthy that a double free speech guarantee exists in the field of labor-management relations. I refer, of course, to the fact that the right of free speech is protected not only by the U.S. Constitution but also by section 8(c) of the National Labor Relations—Taft-Hartley—Act. The statute expressly declares that statements which carry no threats or improper promises shall not constitute an unfair labor practice, nor may they be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice.

Last year we reported indications that the NLRB evidently could not resist the temptation to tinker with established free speech rights. Events since then reveal that the Board has yielded fully to this temptation. As a sign of what to expect, the Board has made it clear in *Dal-Tex Optical* (137 NLRB No. 89, 1962) that it will disregard the express free speech guarantee in section 8(c) when deciding what an employer may say prior to a representation election. The restrictions imposed by the Board, as to what employees may hear from their employers are in sharp contrast with the wide latitude accorded union officials. And the net result is to force an unbalanced package of information upon the employees, thus denying them access to all the facts necessary to an informed and intelligent decision.

In restricting the right of free speech, the Board is particularly resourceful—indeed ingenious. That was evident in *Plochman and Harrison-Cherry Lane Foods, Inc.* (140 NLRB No. 11, 1962). In that case, prior to the representation election, employees were shown a movie by their employer. The film included scenes depicting a wide variety of strike violence. The union lost the election and then filed objections because of the use of the film. A new election was ordered by the NLRB, even though it found no threats or coercion, and no falsehood or misrepresentation in the film. Saying that use of such a film was a new and somewhat different type of electioneering against union representation, the Board decided that the film was in the nature of misrepresentation, and that it therefore interfered with the election.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fair to say that motion pictures were not unknown to Congress in 1947 when the free speech guarantee was written in section 8(c) of the Taft-Hartley law. That provision expressly protects the right of free speech—whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to endorse or pass upon the manner in which any union official or employer conveys his views to employees during a union election campaign or at any other time. All I say is that so long as expressions contain no threats or improper promises, and are not coercive, the NLRB should not interfere. Why? Because of the simple, uncomplicated fact that the law says so.

In another case, *Union Carbide Corp.* case (NLRB No. —), employer spokesmen made a series of prepared talks to many groups of employees. The talks included the statement that customers bought the company's products because of prices, delivery, and dependability; that the company was the sole source of supply for some customers; and that this would not continue to be the case if the plant should become unionized. The Board decided such statements were made to implant fear in the employees. Also, the Board found that since the employer used the word "customers"—plural—when only one customer had actually talked to him on the subject, he had misrepresented the facts to his employees. The Court of Appeals reversed the decision (see *Union Carbide*, 310 F. 2d 844), and gave the NLRB some good advice in the process, saying:

> We think the utterances of either side in an election campaign ought not to receive a narrow or strained construction.

The court reminded the Board that the Constitution as well as the Taft-Hartley Act guarantee the right of free speech, adding with respect to the speech in question:

> Considering the record as a whole, we find in the speech no coercion, threat of reprisal or interference with the election. There was no misrepresentation, deliberate or otherwise.

In a decision issued only a few weeks ago (*Oak Manufacturing Co.*, 141 NLRB No. 121), we were provided with another illustration of the direction in which the Board is moving to nullify further the free speech which both the Constitution and the statute guarantee. This case involved an election which the union lost by a vote of more than 2 to 1. The Board set that election aside and ordered a new one because of two letters the employer had written to his employees. The letters cited for the employees the benefits they were already enjoying, told them the union was an ineffective union, and in general reminded them that being organized involved responsibilities and some risks as well as benefits. The Board viewed these letters as economic threats to the employees, and concluded that they therefore interfered with the employees' right of free choice.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more confidence in the intelligence and stability of America's working men and women than the NLRB seems to have. If employees are to be given real freedom of choice in deciding whether or not they want to vote for a particular union, then at the very least they should be permitted to hear the arguments of both sides. Evidently the Labor Board does not agree. Its decisions clearly indicate the Board is bent on denying employees access to all the facts—despite a clear and unequivocal congressional mandate to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, in our presentation to the House a year ago, only passing reference was made to the impact of Board decisions on collective bargaining as such. However, in the year that has elapsed since last April the Board has produced a series of decisions which, in their total impact, pose a serious threat to the free enterprise system itself as well as to the institution of collective bargaining.

This line of decisions encroaches heavily on the right of management to manage. In substance, they hold that a business enterprise must bargain with the union—not just on wages, hours and working conditions—but on a variety of other major business decisions as well.

In effect, the NLRB has said those who risk their capital by investing in a business may no longer decide whether their facilities are located at the most advantageous spot, considering such factors as sources of supply, transportation, availability to markets, and the like. They may no longer decide whether future prospects justify further risk of capital and effort—in a particular business, a particular department, a particular product or service. In fact, even though their company loses money, they may no longer decide whether to remain in business or go out of business.

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep this matter in perspective, it is well to point out that for a quarter of a century the law has required employers to bargain about wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. However, Congress neglected to declare explicitly that which it considered obvious, that is, that an employer shall otherwise have the right to manage his own business. This oversight on the part of Congress has not been seized upon by the Board as justification for a new line of decisions which actually denies management the right to manage.

It should be emphasized here, Mr. Speaker, that I am not referring to NLRB decisions which say that an employer may not retaliate against employees because they vote to be represented by a union. I am referring to management decisions which are based solely upon economic considerations.

Before the present Board majority began its free wheeling operations, the NLRB had confirmed in the *Fibreboard* case (130 NLRB 1558, 1961), that an employer should not be required to bargain with a union before contracting out work if such a decision is made for economic reasons. In that decision the NLRB said Congress had not intended "to compel bargaining concerning basic management decisions, such as whether and to what extent to risk capital and managerial effort."

Some 18 months after its original Fibreboard decision, the Board decided to reconsider the case. As might be expected the earlier decision was reversed. The new decision (138 NLRB No. 67) held that Fibreboard could not contract out work for economic reasons—even though it involved savings in excess of $200,000 a year. It first had to bargain with the union. In its decision, the Board did not even mention that Fibreboard Co. had, in fact, held several bargaining sessions with the union to discuss the proposed subcontracting and, at the close of the last such meeting, had even offered to meet with the union again if desired. Then, after overlooking that bargaining had in fact occurred, and after ignoring the fact that the company had been operating in reliance upon the Board's own 1961 order, the Board then issued a new order—which was retroactive. It required the company to reinstall the discontinued operations, reinstate the employees with back pay from the date of the new order, and bargain with the union before making any such decisions in the future. See also: *Renton News* (136 NLRB No. 55, 1962), and *American Manufacturing* (139 NLRB No. 57, 1962).

Congress should ponder well the impact of this strange course the NLRB has charted for itself. If allowed to stand, obviously, such decisions can have a profound effect upon the free enterprise system and the willingness to risk investment of capital.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a further observation concerning the Fibreboard line of cases. When the NLRB goes to the extreme of requiring an organized company to bargain with a union about purely economic management decisions involving the risk of capital, I wonder if the Board does not go so far as to do a disservice to unorganized employees and to the union movement itself.

I suggest this may be so because I am certain that many enlightened, reasonable employers today are not automatically or necessarily opposed to unions, as such, when bargaining activities are appropriately limited to the matters of wages, hours, and working conditions—as the statute so clearly provides. However, it clearly appears now that the Board is bent upon expanding the scope of the statute to require bargaining about such matters as locating a plant, discontinuing unprofitable operations, and even going out of business.

When confronted by such tortured Board rulings and requirements, is it not likely that even the most reasonable of employers will be driven to resist unionization, if at all possible, in order to avoid surrender of such basic, fundamental management prerogatives?

I raise this consideration to suggest that, in the end, such extreme and tortured rulings will not always work to the advantage of organized labor. Both labor and management, as well as the public, would be much better off if the Board would confine itself to applying the law as it was written and intended by Congress.

Mr. LANDRUM. That is an excellent contribution from the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier in my remarks I have for a long time held to the belief that the National Labor Relations Board as presently constituted is not a satisfactory organization to adjudicate complaints relating to unfair labor practices, in which essentially private rights are at issue. It is therefore my intention as soon as a bill which I have under preparation is completed, to introduce in the House such a bill calling for the separation of jurisdiction to try unfair labor practice cases, leaving to the Board, of course, a part of its present responsibility and authority to try representation cases and deciding those issues; but it is my belief that the time for action is now and that we can no longer await the time when the Board or the administrative agency may correct its own practices. We must legislate to take away from the Board the right to try unfair labor practice cases and place the jurisdiction for the trial of those cases in the U.S. district courts.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been clearly demonstrated over the years that a politically oriented five-man National Labor Relations Board, as it is now organized, is not appropriately suited for the performance of judicial functions. Like my distinguished colleague [Mr. LANDRUM], I have given much thought to a variety of possible remedies for correction of this situation.

In addition to the transfer of unfair practice jurisdiction to the Federal district courts, which my colleague recommends, there are other alternatives available for consideration. For example, some observers have suggested establishment of a labor-management court, comparable in function to the Tax Court of the United States. Like other Federal courts, appointments would be made for life, reducing the effect of political pressures.

It has also been suggested that concurent jurisdiction be conferred upon both the Board and the Federal district courts. Others have endorsed a reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board so it would operate with appellate jurisdiction over regional boards. It has been proposed that Board members have longer terms to provide more insulation from political considerations.

I thoroughly agree with my colleague when he indicates that the present situation cries out for correction. The public interest demands reform. At the very least, as a starting point, the appropriate committees in the House and Senate should be examining and considering this serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Law Review article to which I made reference earlier in my remarks be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the University of Detroit Law Journal, December 1962]

THE LABOR BOARD AND SECTION 8(b)(7)

(By Robert P. Griffin, U.S. Representative from Michigan's Ninth District; A.B., B.S., Central Michigan University; J.D., University of Michigan Law School; member of the Michigan bar)

"When the legislature has spoken, and declared one interest superior to another, the judge must subordinate his personal or subjective estimate of value to the estimate thus declared. He may not nullify or pervert a statute because convinced that an erroneous axiology is reflected in its terms."[1]

If there is a single most important principle underlying the complex of labor laws enacted by Congress, surely it is the principle that workers should be free to choose collectively whether or not they wish to be represented by a particular union, or by any union.

Of course, a cardinal objective of the Wagner Act[2] was to guarantee this freedom from coercion on the part of employers. With enactment of Taft-Hartley[3] in 1947, Congress evidenced a balancing concern about coercive union practices, directed at employers or employees, which interfere with the freedom of workers to make such a choice.

Beginning in 1957, and throughout the course of extensive hearings held by the McClellan committee,[4] public and congressional attention was focused upon a coercive union practice which is often referred to as "blackmail picketing"; i.e., picketing (usually by strangers) carried on for the purpose of forcing employer recognition of a particular union and compelling his employees to join that union—all without regard for the preferences of the affected employees.

Responding to strong public demands sparked by the McClellan committee hearings, Congress enacted the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959[5] (Landrum-Griffin), which provides additional safeguards designed to make effective the Taft-Hartley guarantee that employees shall be free to join and bargain through unions of their own choosing and shall also be free to refrain from such activities. One of the amendments to Taft-Hartley embodied in title VII of the 1959 act was aimed directly at blackmail picketing practices. This amendment added to Taft-Hartley a new section, 8(b)(7), which makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents:

"(7) to picket or cause to be picketed, or threaten to picket or cause to be picketed, any employer where an object thereof is forcing or requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees, or forcing or requiring the employees of an employer to accept or select such labor organization as their collective bargaining representative, unless such labor organization is currently certified as the representative of such employees:

"(A) where the employer has lawfully recognized in accordance with this act any other labor organization and a question concerning representation may not appropriately be raised under section 9(c) of this act,

"(B) where within the preceding 12 months a valid election under section 9(c) of this act has been conducted, or

"(C) where such picketing has been conducted without a petition under section 9(c) being filed within a reasonable period of time not to exceed 30 days from the commencement of such picketing: *Provided*, That when such a petition has been filed the Board shall forthwith, without regard to the provisions of section 9(c)(1) or the absence of a showing of a substantial interest on the part of the labor organization, direct an election in such unit as the Board finds to be appropriate and shall certify the results thereof: *Provided, further*, That nothing in this subparagraph (C) shall be construed to prohibit any picketing or other publicity for the purpose of truthfully advising the public (including consumers) that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor organization, unless an effect of such picketing is to induce any individual employed by any other person in the course of his employment not to pick up, deliver, or transport any goods or not to perform any services."

Nothing in this paragraph (7) shall be construed to permit any act which would otherwise be an unfair labor practice under this section 8(b).[6]

---

[1] Cardozo, "The Growth of the Law," 94 (1924).

[2] National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act), 49 Stat. 449 (1935), as amended, 29 U.S.C. secs. 151–68 (1958).

[3] Labor Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley Act), 61 Stat. 136 (1947), as amended, 29 U.S.C. secs. 141–88 (1958).

[4] Hearings before the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor Management Field of the U.S. Senate, 85th, 86th Cong. (1957–60).

[5] Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act), 73 Stat. 519 (1959), 29 U.S.C. secs. 401–531 (Supp. III, 1962).

[6] NLRA, sec. 8(b)(7), added by 73 Stat. 544 (1959), 29 U.S.C., sec. 158(b)(7) (Supp. III, 1962).

At this writing, section 8(b)(7) has been in effect almost 3 years. This article will examine certain key decisions of the National Labor Relations Board in the light of legislative history and the clear congressional purpose to proscribe blackmail picketing practices.

THE CROWN CAFETERIA DOCTRINE

One of the most far-reaching decisions involving section 8(b)(7) which has been rendered by the Board was *Crown Cafeteria*.[7] The case involved subparagraph (C) of the section since employees of the picketed employer were neither represented by another union nor had they expressed their choice in a Board election within 12 months preceding the picketing. These relevant facts were not in dispute: the picketing had gone on beyond a reasonable period of time without a representation petition having been filed with the Board; the picketing had not stopped outside deliveries or services to the employer; the picket signs truthfully proclaimed that the employer was nonunion; evidence extraneous to the picket signs showed that the picketing had recognition as one of its objects; and the union did not represent a majority of the employees.

On these facts, a Board majority of Members Leedom, Rodgers, and Kimball found the respondent union to have violated section 8(b)(7)(C). They reasoned that by using the words "an object" Congress clearly indicated its intent that 8(b)(7)'s general proscriptive clause should apply to picketing where an object thereof was recognition, * * * even though the picketing may have had other objects.[8] Conversely, continued the first Crown majority, the use of the words "the purpose" in the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) indicated that Congress had added this proviso only to make clear that purely informational picketing, which publicizes the lack of a union contract or the lack of union organization, and which has no present object of recognition, should not be curtailed * * * unless an effect of such picketing is to interfere with outside deliveries or services to the picketed employer.[9] Accordingly, concluded the first Crown majority, since recognition was an object of the picketing which had continued beyond a reasonable time without the filing of a representation petition, it was unlawful under 8(b)(7)(C). Members Jenkins and Fanning dissented [10] on the ground that the majority had misconceived the import of the second proviso to subparagraph (C).

Thereafter, in February 1962, after President Kennedy had appointed Members McCulloch and Brown in the places of Jenkins and Kimball, the Board, in a highly unusual step, granted the respondent union's motion for reconsideration, and reversed its initial *Crown* decision, adopted the rationale of the dissent therein.[11]

The reasoning of the original Crown dissenters, as adopted by the Kennedy Board majority, seems to be grounded upon two interdependent propositions. The first proposition is that all no-union or no-contract picketing has recognition as an object, and that all does-not-employ-members picketing has organization as an object. In the words of the new Crown majority:

"[T]he express words of the [second] proviso make it clear that the proviso applies where organization, recognition, or bargaining is an object. Thus 'does not employ members of' clearly imports a present object of organization, and '[does not] have a contract with' just as clearly implies a recognitional and bargaining object." [12]

This must be so, reasons the new Crown majority, otherwise there would be no need for the second proviso, because purely informational picketing—not being within the ambit of 8(b)(7)'s general proscriptive clause—would need no proviso to except it therefrom. This, then, is the second proposition of the new Crown majority; i.e., that the only function of a legislative proviso is to except from a general proscriptive clause a class of cases which would otherwise fall within its scope. Therefore, concludes the new Crown majority, the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) must be read as immunizing recognitional or organizational picketing which takes the form of truthfully advising the public that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor organization; and further, since such picketing so immunized concededly has an object of recognition, evidence extraneous to the picketing, such as concurrent recognition demands by union officers to show an object of recognition, is irrelevant and will not disturb the immunization.

It is submitted that this reasoning by the new Crown majority suffers from serious disabilities. Most apparent is its complete disregard of the temper of the times which led to the enactment of section 8(b)(7). As already indicated, this section was written and enacted into the law for the very purpose of supplying a means to terminate such blackmail picketing.

In Crown, the union did not represent a majority of the employees, and obviously, under such circumstances, it would have been improper for the employer to recognize the union. In view of the legislative history, can it be seriously argued that Congress, by enacting 8(b)(7), actually intended to confer its blessing upon interminable picketing even though its probable and clearly foreseeable effect is to force unlawful recognition of the picketing union without any regard whatsoever for the right of employees to a free choice? Yet, this is the conclusion left in the wake of the second Crown decision.

It is submitted that proper analysis will support a reasonable construction which gives meaning to 8(b)(7)(C) in keeping with the obvious congressional purpose to circumscribe organizational and recognition picketing. Whereas 8(b)(7)'s general proscriptive clause applies to all picketing where "an object" is organization or recognition, the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) speaks only of picketing for "the purpose" of truthfully advising the public of particular facts.

While the new Board majority concedes that a broad scope was intended by use of the term "an object" in the general proscriptive clause, the same majority seems to discount any intent on the part of Congress to limit applicability of the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) by employment of the words "the purpose." But those in Congress who were close to the legislation well understood, and attached significance to, the use of the terms "an object" and "the purpose." They were aware of the development and legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act, and of Senator Taft's statement when he carefully pointed out in the Senate that "section 8(b)(4), relating to illegal strikes and boycotts was amended in conference by striking out the words 'for the purpose of' and inserting the clause 'where an object thereof' is." [13] It was this very statement that the Supreme Court found persuasive in the *Denver Bldg. Trades* [14] case in holding that because the term "an object" was used in section 8(b)(4), "it is not necessary to find that the sole object of the strike was [the proscribed one]." [15]

In addition, the legislative history of the 1959 act clearly demonstrates that, in enacting 8(b)(7), Congress was aware of the important distinction between "an" and "the" as they relate to object or purpose. The versions of 8(b)(7) proposed in the original administration bill,[16] the Kennedy-Irvin bill,[17] and the Elliott bill [18] all employed the term "the object" in the general proscriptive clause. This term was pointedly discarded by the authors of Landrum-Griffin [19] in favor of the words "an object."

Surely, the foregoing circumstances do not nurture an assumption that Congress had no purpose whatsoever in differentiating between "an object" in 8(b)(7)'s proscriptive clause and "the purpose" in the second proviso to subparagraph (C). It should be apparent that the differentiation was precise and deliberate, and indicates clearly that the second proviso pertains only to picketing which is for the sole purpose of truthfully advising the public that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a union.

However, the new Board majority reasons that such an interpretation would make the second proviso a "useless appendage" [20] because purely informational picketing lies without the ambit of 8(b)(7)'s general proscriptive clause and, therefore, a proviso is not necesary to immunize it. But this argument rests on the premise that the only office of a legislative proviso is to except from the application of a general proscriptive clause particular conduct which otherwise would clearly fall within its scope. It is submitted that this is an invalid premise.

A proviso can also be used, and commonly is employed, to exclude some possible misinterpretation of general language, to caution against the possibility of extending application to cases not intended to be covered,[21] or to make clear that which has gone before and which might be doubtful because of the generality of language used.[22]

Thus, the term "proviso," from its origin, suggests the employment of prevision, as if Congress were to declare: "Look out for it. See that the general words of the enacting clause shall not have a particular effect." [23] Indeed, the very wording of the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) speaks out in just such a manner and cautions that "nothing in this subparagarph (C) shall be construed to prohibit * * *." [24]

---

[7] 130 NLRB 570 (1961), reconsidered and revised, 135 NLRB No. 124 (Mar. 5, 1962).

[8] 130 NLRB 570, 571 (1961). It would appear that even the currently constituted Board majority disputes this proposition. See Educational Supply Service, 134 NLRB 1505 (1961).

[9] 130 NLRB 570, 572 (1961).

[10] Id. at 574–77.

[11] 135 NLRB No. 124 (Feb. 20, 1962). Members Leedom and Rodgers became the new dissenters, adhering to and further explicating their original opinion.

[12] 135 NLRB No. 124 (Feb. 20, 1962), 49 L.R.R.M. 1648 (1962).

[13] 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6859 (1947).

[14] *NLRB* v. *Denver Building & Construction Trades Council,* 341 U.S. 675 (1951).

[15] Id. at 689.

[16] S. 748, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[17] S. 1555, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[18] H.R. 8342, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[19] H.R. 8400, H.R. 8401, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[20] 130 NLRB 570, 575 (1961). Adopted by the new Crown majority in 135 NLRB No. 124 (Feb. 20, 1962), 49 L.R.R.M. 1648 (1962).

[21] *Minis* v. *United States,* 40 U.S. (15 Pet.) 132 (1841).

[22] *American Express Co.* v. *United States,* 212 U.S. 522 (1909).

[23] Frequently a legislative proviso is even used to introduce new matter extending rather than limiting or explaining that which has gone before. See *ICC* v. *Baird,* 194 U.S. 25, 37 (1904).

[24] Reporting to the Senate on the bill agreed upon in conference, Senator Kennedy said: "Purely informational picketing cannot be curtailed under the conference report although even this privilege would have been denied by the Landrum-Griffin measure," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 13, p. 17898. See similar statement by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, New Jersey, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 13, p. 18127.

Of course, the new Board majority is correct in its reasoning that the general proscriptive clause of 8(b)(7) does not encompass or apply to purely informational picketing which has no other objective. But the purpose of the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C), which was inserted in conference, must be considered in light of the fact that opponents of the House-passed Landrum-Griffin bill had argued strenuously that its 8(b)(7) provision would outlaw purely informational picketing.[25]

It should be apparent that the language of the proviso was inserted in conference, even though it should not have been necessary, to clarify and make absolutely certain[26] (and thereby satisfy those Congressmen who were doubtful) that 8(b)(7) could not be construed so as to outlaw purely informational picketing which had no other objective. This clarifying language is now used to sustain an interpretation of 8(b)(7)(C), which interpretation all but nullifies the purpose of the section.[27]

Can there be purely informational picketing which advertises that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor organization? The then Senator Kennedy apparently thought so.[28] Other authorities have indicated that such picketing may be possible.[29]

It is suggested that the conferees attempted to balance competing theories on this point by expressly recognizing the possibility that under (and only under) certain conditions there might be picketing for the sole purpose of truthfully informing the public that an employer does not have a contract with, or employ members of, a labor union.

In striking what the conferees considered to be a proper balance, it should be noted that with respect to subparagraphs (A) and (B) of 8(b)(7) they pointedly omitted language similar to that in the second proviso of 8(b)(7)(C), thereby negating the possibility that, under conditions presupposed by subparagraphs (A) and (B), picketing such as contemplated by the second proviso could be other than for recognition or organization. Similarly, it should be noted that Congress expressly negated such a possibility in 8(b)(7)(C) situations where picketing actually interferes with outside services or deliveries.

It is suggested that the reasoning of those who drafted and proposed the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) went something like this:

Where a union pickets with signs proclaiming that an employer does not have a contract with, or employ members of, the labor union, the normal inference is that the picketing would stop if such a contract were signed or the employees became union members. This is picketing for recognition, bargaining, or organization and must be proscribed when it impinges on the right of employees freely to choose or not to choose a bargaining representative. Under 8(b)(7)(A) and (B) this impingement occurs immediately. Under 8(b)(7)(C) it occurs after the union has been given a reasonable time, not to exceed 30 days, to sell its wares to the employees. However, some of our colleagues were concerned about infringement upon constitutionally protected free speech rights and urged that under certain limited conditions such picketing might have as its sole purpose a different and legitimate object which should be permitted. Although perhaps not entirely convinced of this, we accepted the possibility in a spirit of compromise and inserted the second proviso in 8(b)(7)(C); but to make sure that the operative effect of the proviso would be as narrow as the professed possibility which spawned it, the second proviso was prefaced with the words, "the purpose," as a guarantee that blackmail picketing would not be perpetuated by sham or subterfuge.

In sum then, it would appear not only permissible but imperative that the words "the purpose" in the second proviso should be given effect and not discarded as in the reconsidered Crown Cafeteria decision. The practical import of the construction here urged is that the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) provides what amounts to a rule of evidence. Thus, in an 8(b)(7)(C) situation[30] where a union pickets with truthful signs stating, in effect, that the employer has no contract with, or does not employ members of, the union, it should not be inferred automatically—from the sign legends alone—that an object of the picketing is recognition or organization. This is so because in the second proviso Congress has expressly recognized the possibility that such picketing may be purely informational. However, since Congress has explicitly predicated the operation of the second proviso on the purpose of the picketing and not on its mere form, it seems not only clear, but necessary, that resort be had to evidence extraneous to the picket signs to determine such purpose, evidence of the sort adduced and credited in the first Crown decision. A contrary holding, it is submitted, such as that in the second Crown decision can be conducive only to rampant hypocrisy which, for all practical purposes, negates the explicit statutory emphasis on ascertainment of purpose.

Crown Cafeteria v. *Miratti's, Inc.*

Under section 9(c)(1)(B) of the act[31] an employer may file a representation petition with the Board when a union presents a claim for recognition as the representative of his employees. If upon investigation the Board finds, among other things, that there is in fact such a claim for representation, an election is directed wherein the employees are permitted to vote for or against the union by secret ballot. When faced with such a petition, it is not uncommon for a minority union to disclaim any object of recognition. If the disclaimer is accepted by the Board, the petition is dismissed and no election is held. But, if the disclaimer is not accepted by the Board, an election is held and, if the union loses, there cannot be another election for 12 months,[32] and the picketing proscriptions of 8(b)(7)(B)[33] come into play. Under such circumstances, it is not difficult to understand the importance to a union of an effective disclaimer when it represents none or a minority of the employees.

Further, and as pointed out by the Board majority in the first Crown decision,[34] it is well-established Board law that, to be effective, a disclaimer must be clear and unequivocal in the sense that any concurrent or subsequent action by the union inconsistent with such disclaimer will destroy its effectiveness.

With this background in mind, it is again recalled that the new Board majority in its reconsidered Crown decision held that a picket sign which proclaims that an employer "does not have a contract with" a union "clearly implies a recognitional * * * object."[35] The new Board majority also dropped this footnote in their Crown decision:

"We might note in passing, however, that while proviso picketing precludes the holding of an expedited election, nevertheless, if the proviso picketing is for recognition or bargaining, as distinguished from organization, a routine section 9(c) representation petition would, if other necessary preconditions were satisfied, be entertained."[36]

The footnote is ironic in light of the holding in Miratti's, Inc.,[37] which involved just such a "routine section 9(c) representation petition" filed by an employer. The case was decided by the same new Crown majority. In Miratti's, Inc. the union had capped a series of recognition demands with an oral disclaimer of recognition, and it then commenced picketing with signs stating that the employer did not have a contract with the union. The Board held that the union's disclaimer was effective on the ground that its subsequent picketing was not inconsistent therewith because such picketing had no recognitional object. It dismissed the employer's petition and no election was held.

Again in Andes Candies,[38] the same new Crown majority considered another "routine section 9(c) representation petition," and again the union was picketing with "no contract" signs. The Board dismissed the representation petition with the conclusion that the picketing was not for recognition.

To summarize, in the second Crown decision, the new Board majority refused to enjoin picketing as a violation of 8(b)(7)

---

[25] Senator GOLDWATER, one of the conferees, told the Senate: "In conference it was fundamentally the Landrum-Griffin proposal which was agreed to by the conferees after some modifications making for greater clarity and preciseness, making it easier to determine the prohibition's applicability in particular fact situations, and granting the very limited exemption from the prohibition described above. * * * Where the union engages in picketing or other publicity for the sole purpose of truthfully advising the public than an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor union * * * picketing may be carried on indefinitely * * *. However, if one of the effects of such * * * is to induce any individual employed by any other person—other than the picketed employer—in the course of his employment, not to pick up, deliver or transport any goods or not to perform any services, 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. A8523–A8525 (daily edition, Oct. 3, 1959).

[26] As noted by the majority in the first *Crown* decision, 130 NLRB 570 (1961), the effect of such an interpretation is to "render meaningless, at the whim of a union [or its sign painters], the stated objective of section 8(b)(7)." Id. at 572.

[27] Senator Kennedy summarized the conference report, in part, as follows: "Picketing in the absence of a contract or an election which has only the effect of notifying the public of nonunion conditions and asking the employees to join the union would not be banned," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 13, p. 17327. In his capsule summary, Senator Kennedy seemed to equate advice to the public that an employer does not employ union members with solicitation of employees to join a union. But even the new Board majority does not claim that the second proviso to 8(b)(7)(C) permits solicitation of employees. See *Atlantic Maintenance*, 136 NLRB No. 195 (Apr. 17, 1962).

[28] For example, see Whyte, "Some Dilemmas in the Injunction Against Recognitional Picketing," 3 Wm. & M.L. Rev. 15 (1961); McDermott, "Recognitional and Organizational Picketing Under Amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, 44 Marq. L. Rev. 1 (1960).

[29] Absent a stoppage of outside deliveries or services.

[30] 132 NLRB 699 (1961).

[31] NLRA, sec. 9(c)(1)(B), added by 61 Stat. 144 (1947), 29 U.S.C., sec. 159(c)(1)(B) (1958).

[32] NLRA, sec. 9(c)(1), added by 61 Stat. 144 (1947), 29 U.S.C., sec. 159(c)(1) (1958).

[33] NLRA, sec. 8(b)(7)(B), added by 73 Stat. 544 (1959), 29 U.S.C., sec. 158(b)(7)(B) (supp. III, 1962).

[34] NLRB 570, 572 (1961).

[35] 135 NLRB No. 124 (Mar. 5, 1962).

[36] 135 NLRB No. 124, n. 4 (Mar. 5, 1962).

[37] 132 NLRB 699 (1961).

[38] 133 NLRB 758 (1961).

(C) by reasoning that all "no contract" picketing is for recognition. But in Miratti's and Andes Candies, the same Board majority managed to deny the employer (and his employees) an election on the ground that "no contract" picketing was not for recognition.

Taken together, these three decisions do very little to reinforce the doctrine of stare decisis, and they do even less to provide implementation for the strong purpose of Congress to free employees from the coercion of blackmail picketing. It can only be wondered whether the "whipsaw" effect of such holdings presages atrophy for subparagraph (B) of section 8(b)(7) which depends upon elections as the vital instrument in its machinery to protect employees from prolonged blackmail picketing.

BLINNE AND ITS DICTA

In Blinne Constr. Co.,[39] the union picketed for several declared objectives, one of which was recognition. About 3 weeks after the picketing commenced, the union filed a charge alleging that the employer had engaged in unfair labor practices in violation of sections 8(a)(1), (2), (3), and (5). Three weeks later, the Board's regional director dismissed the 8(a)(2) and (5) charges and the union thereupon (more than 30 days after the picketing commenced) filed a representation petition. Thereafter, the regional director issued an 8(b)(7)(C) complaint and effected a settlement of the 8(a)(1) and (3) charges. Before the Board, the union advanced the argument that section 8(b)(7) should not be enforced where any employer violation of section 8(a) is alleged by the union.[40]

A Board majority of Leedom, Rodgers, Jenkins, and Kimball rejected the union's argument. They pointed out[41] that Congress had specifically rejected such a sweeping proposition and had determined, instead, to so amend section 10(l) of Taft-Hartley that only a charge of employer violation of 8(a)(2), if considered meritorious by regional Board officers, could be interposed to block enforcement of 8(b)(7).[42]

In addition to the legislative history relied upon in the first Blinne decision to support this conclusion, it should be pointed out that the Elliott bill,[43] as reported by the House committee, as well as the Senate-passed Kennedy-Irvin bill,[44] had proposed an amendment to section 10(l) to provide that where a charge is filed under what is now 8(b)(7), "it shall be a defense to show that an unfair labor practice within the meaning of section 8(a) has been committed." After the Elliott bill was rejected by the House in favor of the Landrum-Griffin bill,[45] the same sweeping proposal was urged again in the Senate-House conference where a compromise limiting the 10(l) amendment to a meritorious (8)(a)(2) charge was finally struck. Thereafter, Senator MORSE commented in the Senate on the conference agreement as follows:

"The Senate bill contained a provision saying, in effect, that where the employer committed unfair labor practices, the union had a right to picket for organizational purposes. The (conference) bill now preserves an unimportant shred of this provision. Company-union cases in violation of 8(a)(2) of the act are more difficult to prove and constitute a small part of the Board's business. The important unfair labor practices in this context are antiunion threats and discriminatory discharges."[46]

Where it is clear that the Congress has carefully considered particular language and has deliberately rejected it in favor of other language, one might reasonably expect that such a rejection and deliberate choice by Congress would be honored, particularly by an administrative tribunal which was created by Congress for the very purpose of honoring and implementing its policies. The Board majority in the first Blinne decision was eminently correct in its appraisal of the conference agreement and the intent of Congress with respect to the 10(l) amendment.

However, after the new Board majority came to power it granted reconsideration of Blinne. Although the Board, in a complicated and intricately divided new opinion, did not upset the result of the first Blinne decision, the new Board majority used a footnote to proclaim, through gratuitous dicta, their own "amendment" to section 10(*l*)—an amendment which Congress had already considered and rejected. The dicta writers in the second Blinne decision announced:

"We would, however, have had a much different case here if the section 8(a)(5) charge had been found meritorious so as to warrant issuance of a complaint. A representation petition assumes an unresolved question concerning representation. A section 8(a)(5) charge, on the other hand, presupposes that no such question exists and that the employer is wrongfully refusing to recognize or bargain with a statutory bargaining representative. Because of this basic inconsistency, the Board has over the years uniformly refused to entertain representation petitions where a meritorious charge of refusal to bargain has been filed and, indeed, has dismissed any representation petition which may already have been on file. The same considerations apply where a meritorious section 8(a)(5) charge is filed in a section 8(b)(7)(C) context. Congressional acquiescence in the Board's long-standing practice prior to the enactment of section 8(b)(7)(C) imports, in our view, congressional approval of a continuation of that practice thereafter. Cf. *Gullett Gin Co.* v. *N.L.R.B.*, 340 U.S. 361, 366. * * * So here, if a meritorious 8(a)(5) charge had been filed a petition for representation would not have been required.[47]

In short, the new Board majority announced that it will regard the filing of an 8(a)(5) charge, considered meritorious by regional officers, as an adequate substitute for a representation petition,[48] and, therefore, as a defense available against an 8(b)(7) charge. It follows from their view that when such an 8(a)(5) charge is filed, a representation petition will not be required, an 8(b)(7)(C) complaint will not issue, and the blackmail picketing proscribed by Congress will be allowed to continue.

This "solution" or "remedy" fashioned by the Board as a means for coping with an employer's unfair practice is a strange one in light of the congressional purpose to protect employees from the coercive practices of both employers and unions. In effect, the Board policy (which Congress rejected) approves and encourages the idea that the employer and the union may take a turnabout in cudgeling the employees.[49]

By rejecting the very policy which the new Board majority has now adopted, Congress indicated its determination that the interest of employees and the public would be better served by proscribing and halting such coercive practices on the part of both employers and the unions. If it should turn out that an 8(a)(5) charge filed against an employer is in fact valid, the Board will order the employer to bargain with the union, and there is no need to subject the affected employees to additional coercive picketing. Such picketing would be particularly deleterious to employee rights in the case where an 8(a)(5) charge eventually proves to be without merit[50] if in the meantime the employer has been coerced by the picketing to recognize, and his employees have been coerced to join, a union which is not the choice of the employees.

---

[39] 130 NLRB 587 (1961), reconsidered in 135 NLRB No. 121 (Feb. 20, 1962).

[40] 130 NLRB 587, 589 (1961).

[41] The union also argued that 8(b)(7) should not apply to recognition picketing by a "majority union." But the majority of Board members in the first Blinne decision pointed out that "sec. 8(b)(7)(c) permits only a currently certified union to engage in recognition picketing, and makes no exception for a majority union which lacks such current certification," 130 NLRB 587, 588 (1961). That the union in Blinne in fact represented a majority is doubtful. As the Board noted (p. 589), it is well established that a majority status coupled with an employer's unfair labor practices to dissipate the union's majority constitutes an 8(a)(5) violation. Yet the Regional Director had dismissed the 8(a)(5) charge while apparently finding merit to the 8(a) (1) and (3) violations.

[42] In a dissent from the first Blinne ruling, Member Fanning argued that Congress had not expressly repudiated, and, therefore, indicated approval of Board election procedures under which an election is stayed if an employer engages in certain unfair practices, among them the practice proscribed by 8(a)(5), 130 NLRB 587, 592 (1961). To the same effect, see Member Fanning's dissent in the reconsidered *Blinne* decision, 135 NLRB No. 121 (Feb. 20, 1962).

[43] H.R. 8342, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[44] S. 1555, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[45] This contained no provision.

[46] 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 13, p. 17860.

[47] 135 NLRB No. 121, n. 24 (Feb. 20, 1962).

[48] Note in the Blinne dicta quoted above the statement: "A section 8(a)(5) charge, on the other hand, presupposes that no such question (concerning representation) exists and that the employer is wrongfully refusing to recognize or bargain with a statutory bargaining representative." Cf. *Franz Food Prod., Inc.*, 137 NLRB No. 35 (May 25, 1962) where the same new Board majority dismissed an employer's representation petition and reversed a prior Board decision [*Humke*, 123 NLRB 310 (1959)] in holding that an extant 8(a)(5) charge is only a contention that the union represented a majority in the past, and is not inconsistent with a present disclaimer of recognition; i.e., an 8(a)(5) charge is not tantamount to a present demand for recognition.

[49] The author wishes to reemphasize that a primary purpose of both Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin was protection of employees from coercive practices. Section 8(b)(7) was enacted to provide protection for employees, as well as employers, against prolonged coercive picketing. Unlawful conduct by an employer ought not to extinguish the right of employees to be free from coercive conduct by a union. To that effect, see *Sunset Line & Twine Co.*, 79 NLRB 1487, 1492, n. 6 (1948); *Local 1150, UEW*, 84 NLRB 972, 979 (1949); *Smith Cabinet Mfg. Co.*, 81 NLRB 886, 888 (1949). This inordinate emphasis, on what some may regard as obvious, is considered necessary. Running through recent Board decisions there is an apparent reluctance to consider blackmail-organizational and recognitional picketing as the unfair labor practice that Congress proclaimed it to be; instead there seems to be a great tendency to treat this practice tenderly as an honored and "traditional means of enlisting public sympathy" [the new *Crown* majority, 135 NLRB No. 124 (Mar. 5, 1962)] which should be sheltered from 8(b)(7).

[50] It should be noted that the probable merit of an 8(a)(5) charge is usually determined ex parte by the Board's regional director whereas 8(b)(7) picketing is enjoined only after a full hearing in a U.S. district court pursuant to sec. 10(1) of the act. 29 U.S.C. sec. 160(1) (1958).

Instead of approving continuation of the proscribed picketing as a "remedy," the Board might do better to consider the General Counsel's permissive injunctive powers under section 10(j) [51] as a possible way of dealing with flagrant employer unfair practices.

The new majority's reliance on the Gullett case [52] for the proposition that congressional silence indicated approval of the Board's informal election procedures is interesting, but not very persuasive as support for their 8(a)(5) substitution theory. This use of Gullett is particularly interesting because of its solitary emergence in Blinne, and the fact it has not been mentioned, either before or since Blinne, by these same Board members in their reversals of some 50 formal Board decisions [53] which, presumably, represented settled law in 1959, when Congress last exercised its choice of speaking or remaining silent on Taft-Hartley provisions.

Finally, attention is directed to this admission in the Blinne dicta:

"Certainly the narrow proviso embodied in section 10(l) [making, in effect, section 8(a)(2) a defense to an 8(b)(7) complaint], and the failure to embrace a proposal that would exempt recognition and organizational picketing from the section 8(b)(7)(C) bar where [other than 8(a)(2)] employer unfair labor practices had been committed, suggest that Congress was reluctant to grant such an exemption." [54]

The circumstances are rather odd when the proponents of a theory concede, in the same decision in which it is unveiled, that the theory does not accord with the law as written. The rewriting of laws, it is submitted, is a function and responsibility which is more appropriate for the Congress.

BARKER BROS. CORP.

It is fitting that the last Board decision for comment should be *Barker Bros. Corp.*[55] Not only is it the most recent of the cases herein examined, but it probably represents the greatest departure from both the language of section 8(b)(7) and the intent of Congress. The essential and undisputed facts in Barker Bros. were that, without filing a representation petition, the union picketed an employer for more than 30 days (1) for the proscribed object of recognition, (2) with signs that were not truthful, and (3) with the effect of stopping or delaying deliveries and services to the employer on at least 5 (and probably more than 15) occasions. Incredibly, the new Board majority held that the union had not violated section 8(b)(7)(C).

Even if the picket signs had been truthful and there had been no interference with deliveries, it is submitted that the picketing, having recognition as an object, should have been enjoined under a proper interpretation of section 8(b)(7)(C) as indicated in the foregoing discussion of Crown Cafeteria. But in Barker, the new Board majority goes much further and flatly rejects the clear and precise language of 8(b)(7)(C)'s second proviso which recognizes only a very limited exemption for certain picketing which is "for the purpose of truthfully advising the public * * * unless an effect of such picketing is to induce any individual employed by any other person in the course of his employment not to pick up, deliver or transport any goods or not to perform any services."

Even though the picket signs in Barker were not truthful, the new Board majority excused the union with a footnote explanation that there was no evidence that the public was deceived. But the statute clearly turns on truthfulness of picket signs and not on deception of the public. The Board majority also placed emphasis on a lack of evidence to prove that the union intended by its untruthful signs to deceive the public. This rationale is interesting in light of the Federal penal statute dealing with perjury,[56] under which a prosecutor must overcome the strongest presumption of innocence by sustaining an extraordinary burden of proof, and yet the defendant's knowledge or belief of falsity may be inferred by proof of the falsity itself.[57]

With respect to delivery stoppages, the new Board majority concludes in Barker that Congress did not intend by 8(b)(7)(C) to proscribe picketing unless the stoppages "interfere with, disrupt or curtail the employer's business." Accordingly, under the Board's ruling, a picketed employer must prove not only that delivery stoppages occurred but also the extent to which such stoppages disrupt his business. That this is not the language of the statute appears to be conceded by the new Board majority. The law speaks clearly in terms of proscribing picketing with an effect of stopping any deliveries or any services. Notwithstanding that fact, the Board has blatantly legislated a new statute which it apparently considers more reasonable.

If the Constitution makes anything clear, surely it is that legislating is the function of Congress. At this writing, the holding in Barker climaxes a disturbing line of recent decisions [58] which gives cause to wonder whether the new Board majority really concedes the constitutional authority of Congress to establish policy in the labor-management field.[59]

The words of Mr. Justice Cardozo, quoted at the beginning of this article, bear repeating:

"When the legislature has spoken, and declared one interest superior to another, the judge must subordinate his personal or subjective estimate of value to the estimate thus declared. He may not nullify or pervert a statute because convinced that an erroneous axiology is reflected in its terms." [60]

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman for his usual clear and concise statement of the issues.

DEDICATION OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in my time the ceremonies marking the formal dedication of the new building of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation at 550 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., on the 30th anniversary of the Corporation, at 4:30 p.m., June 16, 1963.

On the dais: Erle Cocke, Sr., Chairman of the Corporation, presiding; Wright Patman, chairman of the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee; William Quinn, president, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., representing Leo T. Crowley, chairman of the railroad and Chairman of the FDIC from 1934 to 1945; Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate; Jesse P. Wolcott, Director of the FDIC and Chairman from 1957 to 1961; Thomas G. DeShazo, Deputy

---

[51] 29 U.S.C. sec. 160(j) (1958). A failure to rely upon and resort to the entire resources of a statute often leads to the overloading and subsequent distortion of a particular section of the law.

[52] *Gullett Gin Co.* v. *NLRB,* 340 U.S. 361 (1951), wherein the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Minton, said: "In the course of adopting the 1947 amendments, Congress considered in great detail the provisions of the earlier legislation as they had been applied by the Board. Under these circumstances it is a fair assumption that by reenacting without pertinent modification the provision with which we here deal, Congress accepted the construction placed thereon by the Board and approved by the courts." Id. at 366.

[53] Their very number prohibits enumeration, but see, e.g., *Pacific Tile & Porcelain Co.,* 137 NLRB No. 169 (July 17, 1962); *Montgomery Ward & Co.,* 137 NLRB No. 26 (May 25, 1962); and *A.P.W. Products, Inc.,* 137 NLRB No. 7 (May 2, 1962).

[54] 135 NLRB No. 121 (Feb. 20, 1962), 49 L.R.R.M. 1638, 1643 (1962). Dictawriters also conceded: "It seems fair to say that Congress was unwilling to write an exemption into 8(b)(7)(C) dispensing with the necessity of filing a representation petition whenever employer unfair labor practices were alleged. The fact that the bill ultimately enacted by the Congress did not contain the amendment to sec. 10(l) which the Senate had adopted in S. 1555 cogently establishes that this reluctance was not due to oversight.

[55] 138 NLRB No. 54 (Sept. 7, 1962).

[56] 62 Stat. 773 (1948), 18 U.S.C., section 1621 (1958).

[57] See, *United States* v. *Magin,* 280 F. 2d 74 (7th circuit 1960), certiorari denied, 364 U.S. 914 (1960).

[58] Of course, a number of other Board decisions could appropriately be included in a fuller treatment of this subject. For example, see *Calumet Contractors Association,* 130 NLRB 78 (1961), reconsidered in 133 NLRB 512 (1961), wherein the new Board majority reversed a long established rule and held that picketing by an outside union for "prevailing rates" while another union was certified did not indicate a bargaining objective, thereby immunizing picketing which theretofore had been proscribed by 8(b)(4)(C). Then see the application under 8(b)(7) cases such as: *Claude Everett Constr. Co.,* 136 NLRB No. 28 (Mar. 16, 1962), and *Fanelli Ford Sales, Inc.,* 133 NLRB 1468 (1961). In the reconsidered Calumet decision, it is interesting to note that the new Board majority adopts language directly from Member Fanning's dissent in 1958 in *Industrial Chrome Plating,* 121 NLRB 1298, 1302 (1958), wherein he said: "It may be argued—with some justification—that picketing by an outside union when another union has newly won Board certification is an unwarranted harassment of the picketed employer. But this is an argument that must be addressed to Congress." Apparently the new Board majority was unimpressed by the fact that Congress, in 1959, not only indicated (by its silence) approval of 8(b)(4)(C) as previously interpreted but went further and reinforced it with 8(b)(7).

[59] See remarks delivered in the House of Representatives by Representative LANDRUM [Georgia], and Representative GRIFFIN [Michigan], CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 5, p. 6190, wherein criticism is leveled at Member Brown's statement: "In my view the [National Labor Relations] Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal," Brown "The NLRB on the New Frontiers," NLRB press release R–838, at 8, Feb. 10, 1962; and his statement: "The present Board has freed itself from the self-inflicted dedication to per se rules. Fixed rules are easy to apply and provide the parties with knowledge upon which to predicate their actions. These are desirable results and must, of course, be accorded some weight. Certainty necessarily follows from the implementation of mechanistic rules, but it is a superficial certainty destined for dispute." Id. at 14.

[60] Cardozo, "The Growth of the Law," 94 (1924).

Comptroller of the Currency, representing James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency and ex officio Director of FDIC; Marshall R. Diggs, Director of the FDIC in 1938; L. A. Jennings, Director of the FDIC in 1953; and Ray M. Gidney, Director of the FDIC from 1953 to 1961.

PROGRAM

Mr. Cocke. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, naturally we are very happy indeed to have you with us this afternoon. To us this means a day somewhat different from other days. Thirty years ago today the Congress authorized a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We fully like the idea that we are housed in what we think is going to be a most efficient building and make a much more efficient operation. We can name other things to our privilege and pleasure, but nothing I know is better and more appreciated than this wonderful group of friends. We feel like even the weather has been good to us today. It scared us for two or three hours, but maybe the "Old Master" is taking care of people in need, and we are delighted that you all would brave any chances of getting in trouble or getting wet to be with us.

You might like to know a few things about the building. We want you to see each and every part of it, because it is a building here for service to the public and service to the bankers of America and service to the banking industry through Government officials, through Government employees, through our distinguished Congressmen and Senators, and we hope all of these groups will see fit to use its facilities. In doing so, it will be helpful to us in our endeavor to carry out our assignment. First, I might mention the street number is 550 17th Street NW. The architects were Chatelain, Gauger & Nolan of Washington and Perkins & Will of Chicago. The general contractor was Arthur Venneri Co. of Washington, D.C., and the building was under the supervision of the General Services Administration. They began work on January 30, 1961. We are only about 6 or 7 months late, but we started moving in May 15, 1963. You have in your building 28,000 cubic feet of "diamond grays" granite for its facing, from the Cold Springs Granite Co., Cold Springs, Minn. I will have to express regrets; I prefer Georgia granite. The powers that be would not go along with it.

The building has 246,000 square feet. I hope you go through it and see how we have endeavored to make it livable, serviceable, and workable. We did not desire, nor did we get, a monumental building. We think we did get a modern and useful office building.

The electrical contractors were Fishbach & Moore, of Washington. The Haughton Elevator Co. furnished the elevators. The landscaping was done by J. H. Burton, of Hyattsville, Md. Our two interior decorators were Miss Eleanor Hupp and Miss Helen Ginberg of the General Services Administration.

The bronze windows, sills, doors, and flagpoles were furnished by A. F. Jorse Iron Works, Inc., Arlington, Va., and Capital Bronze Co., Long Island, N.Y., and the mosaic tiles and acoustical tiles and ceilings came from Peter Bratti Associates, Arlington, Va., and John H. Hampshire, Inc., Bladensburg, Md., respectively.

We paid, in round figures, $1,600,000 for this lot. We have been offered a profit. We spent on the building $6,900,000 approximately, and on these two contracts we saved over $1,038,000 over original estimates of the cost.

This building site offers a fact or two upon which you might like to think. We can trace it back to 1685 and the original people who were living here. These stories bring out the fact that the lady of the house was the closest personal friend of Dolly Madison, who lived just across what are trees now looking to the then President's home. At that time you know we did not have a White House. We had a President's home, but the War of 1812 changed things a bit.

When you enter the building or even before you enter the building, I wish you would look out this way. So far as I know, it is the only building in Washington with two flagpoles. I have to admit my ignorance and my "flabbergastedness"—if that is a good word—when I saw the second flagpole, but it is here now and we hope you will see why maybe the architects were much smarter than I anticipated.

One will carry Old Glory, as you might expect, and on the left will be the official flag of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which was designed by the Army Institute of Heraldry. I understand that makes it official. We have another unique feature in our flag. The U.S. flag that you will look at, when it goes up in a few minutes, has already officially flown and been recorded as flying over the Capitol of the United States. That is a privilege that Congress, in its wisdom, has given the opportunity for to institutions such as ours, and we were pleased indeed to have the opportunity to take advantage of it. And I might say we had this privilege following the suggestion of one of our valued employees, Paul Butler, who hails from Arkansas and received the authority through the distinguished Congressman, Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas. So maybe we show a little prejudice, but we are still obligated to Arkansas.

When you enter the building, you will see the Great Seal of the United States. We did not intend for it to be the case, but are happy it turned out, that so far as we can determine, it is the largest seal of the United States recorded at this time, either in Washington or elsewhere. It weighs 4,000 pounds and is of bronze. It is 12 feet in diameter, much to the chagrin of the people in protocol over at the State Department who say, "Ours isn't but 11 feet across." We feel pretty chesty about that.

We want to tell you again we appreciate your presence here, and we want to tell any and all of you in banking, in government, and just outright good American citizens, we in this building want to hereafter be of service in any way we can.

I want to pay my respects and appreciation to Lt. Bennie Knudsen, the band leader, and to the authorities of the Headquarters Command of the U.S. Air Force for furnishing us this music and the four-man color guard.

We are particularly honored at this time in having our invocation by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Dr. Harris. Let us lift our hearts in prayer.

Our Father, God, who hath made and preserved us a Nation, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In Thee we trust. In Thee is our assurance that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope without the freer life and air. In every hour of destiny Thou dost use human talents to accomplish Thy tasks and human lips to blow the trumpets of Thy freedom. To us has been passed the torch of liberty. Help us to hold our stewardship in the solemn trust. Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy trust make us free, free from pride and prejudice, and from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. Enrich us, we pray Thee, with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in these things that matter most—the golden currency of faith and hope and love.

In this creative hour of human destiny, save us from surrendering to cynicism because of human evil, and of being made men of little faith by human folly. Open our eyes to see a glory in our common life with all its sordid failures and in the aspirations of men for better things and for a fairer world. Fit us to be channels for the good and the glory Thou desirest to give through us to all the waste places of this stricken earth. And as citizens of this land of the free and as servants of the commonwealth to which much has been given, and of which, in this global crisis, much is being required, solemnize us, we pray by the realization that—

We are watchers of the beacon whose
light must never die.
We are guardians of an altar that shows
Thee ever nigh.
We are children of Thy freemen who
sleep beneath the sod.
For the light of Thy heart we bless Thee.
Our God, our fathers' God.

We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

Mr. Cocke. Will the color guard come forward, please?

The color guard marched to platform and received national colors and FDIC flag from Mr. Cocke. The color guard then marched to the flagpoles and raised the colors, while the band played the National Anthem.

Mr. Patman, accompanied by Mr. Cocke, then approached the ribbon and cut it, formally opening the building. They then returned to the platform.

Mr. Cocke. We are particularly honored today; at this time it is my privilege to present the distinguished chairman of the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable Wright Patman, of Texas.

Mr. Patman. Chairman Cocke, distinguished guests, fellow citizens: In observing the 30th anniversary of the FDIC, we are marking an event that is indeed worthy of celebration. It was one of those rare events in our history when the American society took a long step forward to create a better money system; and a money system is, as we know, central to all economic activity in a free society.

In the fields of science and technology we expect giant strides almost daily. We expect continuous improvements in the ways of organizing man's knowledge, achieving better business methods and better ways of doing almost everything except perhaps operating our money system. In this field change and suggestions for change seem almost taboo. In any case we know that ideas have been very slow of adoption and large improvements have come in infrequent bunches. The giant strides have been made when Presidents of great purpose and courage have demanded improvements to bring the system up to the clear needs of the times. There have been 3 giant strides of the past 100 years.

The first was the National Bank Act which President Lincoln achieved, and the 100th anniversary of which we also celebrate this year.

The second was President Wilson's achievement in creating the Federal Reserve System.

The third was President Roosevelt's step in bringing about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Bretton Woods Agreement and the creation of the International Monetary Fund may also come to rank as a fourth pinnacle of achievement in this troublesome area of monetary affairs, but as yet this is not clear.

In citing the achievement of the FDIC it is customary, I believe, to emphasize that deposit insurance has brought comfort and peace of mind to millions of small depositors who may now enjoy the convenience of keeping their money in the local banks with confidence and certainty that they will not be wiped out through bank failure. Certainly this accomplishment must appeal to all of our humane instincts.

But the greater accomplishment of deposit insurance, I think, has been in making it possible for us to have a managed money system under which we may have a predetermined and controllable monetary growth.

We have long recognized the ideal of an elastic money supply, one that would grow with the growth in economic activity and also expand and contract in season with the changing needs of commerce and industry. And we know how far removed from this idea our money system was prior to the National Bank Act. At the time that act was passed, there were some 10,000 different varieties of currency in circulation issued by 1,600 banks, more or less in accordance with the various formulas and regulations of 34 different States. The National Bank Act was an important first step in the creation of a uniform currency and a reliable money system.

The great contribution of the Federal Reserve Act was that it put into one central system the power to create bank reserves and the power of decision over what the supply of money and level of interest rates will be.

But the Federal Reserve System, as we know, proved inadequate to prevent accidental collapses of the money supply, resulting in disastrous disruptions to industry and commerce. The failure of one bank could set off chain reactions, bringing about the failures of other banks; and perfectly sound banks frequently failed only because depositors became nervous and started a run on the bank.

The FDIC has insulated the banks from such runs and panics, and it has thus enabled us to have a managed money supply, free of irrational and accidental expansions and contractions.

The money system we have today is surely far superior to anything recorded for past history. In fact, it is a good system, although it could stand further improvements.

One of the obvious and not very radical improvements we could make is to raise the amount of the FDIC insurance coverage. I hope that we can raise this coverage from the present $10,000 to $25,000 at an early date, and at a time when it will be an appropriate token of esteem for the present great Chairman of the FDIC, the Honorable Erle Cocke. This would add relatively little liability against the insurance fund, and this fund seems adequate for the purpose.

I must tell you, however, that I think we should have more bank failures. The record of the last several years of almost no bank failures and, finally last year, no bank failure at all, is to me a danger signal that we have gone too far in the direction of bank safety.

Federal deposit insurance is intended to assure depositors that they will not lose their money in case of a bank failure. It is not intended to assure that no bank will fail. It should not be a cause to insulate the banks from competition or to prevent them from taking prudent risks. On the contrary, the American business system is one of risk taking, and if the commercial banks are to fulfill their purpose they must supply the commercial credit for these risk-taking enterprises.

I do not suggest that we should ever have a failure rate among banks as high as that in other lines of business. But I do point out that where there is risk taking, there are inevitably some failures. With no bank failure last year among more than 13,000 insured banks in operation, we must wonder whether the banks are actually doing the job they are supposed to do.

If the FDIC bank examiners are using their influential offices to prevent the banks from taking risks which are prudent in the judgment of the bank managers, I hope they will keep in mind that they have a bigger public purpose than protecting the insurance fund from losses, and the banks have a bigger public function than being mere bookkeepers and check collectors for the business system. When we are tempted to boast of no bank failures, let us remember that several thousand other business firms may have failed because the banks did not take as many reasonable risks as they might have taken. If you agree with me on this problem, I am sure the solution will not be hard to find.

The really tough problems, and the really serious inadequacies in our money system today, are pressing hard upon us in the international arena. In fact, as I see our problems here, they are fast building up to a crisis, where some bold step will be forced on us, whether we like it or not. Such a step will, I hope, be taken in cooperation with the other industrial nations of the free world. Fortunately or unfortunately, our money system is deeply enmeshed with those of the other free world nations, and the central bankers of Western Europe are having a large voice in deciding our domestic monetary policies—at the monthly meetings in Basle, Switzerland, at the OECD meeting in Paris, and elsewhere.

These voices are telling us to raise interest rates, as a means of stopping the flow of dollars abroad. And they are telling us that to overcome the depressing effect of this policy and also to boost our employment and growth levels, we should have big deficits in the Federal budget. After several years of a policy of substantially no action, both the Federal Reserve and the administration seem now to be adopting this policy advice. But it will lead, I suspect, to a deadlock with the Congress. So far, Congress has not been inclined to accept, as a solution to our domestic economic problems, a fiscal policy that involves massive Federal deficits. And one of the reasons is, I think, that the kind of deficit being proposed seems to promise no permanent solution, only a postponement of some solution to problems in the money system.

But because the problem of improving the money system is tough is no reason for despair. Improving the system has always been tough. In this peculiar area of social organization, the society has always been resistant to change. We have it as a matter of evidence, however, that far-reaching improvements can be made. Indeed, this beautiful new building stands as a monument to one such improvement. It stands as a monument to the unquestioned success of the FDIC, and to the fact that the FDIC now plays a permanent role in the Nation's life.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Cocke. We certainly appreciate your taking the time to be with us, Chairman Patman, and more so, we appreciate the wonderful opportunity that Mrs. Patman could be with us also.

As we think of this Corporation, we always think of those who came before. We have had in the life of the Corporation 15 directors, some of whom have passed on to the Great Beyond. Others, though continuing their interest in the work of the Corporation, for unavoidable reasons, health or other causes, were not able to be here today. We are fortunate, however, in those that are here, and we would like the opportunity to present them and if any or all of them would like to say a word, we would be glad to hear from them.

Chronologically, first among the former members of the Board is the

Honorable Marshall R. Diggs, of Washington, D.C., who served back in 1938.

(Mr. Diggs stood and was recognized.)

In 1953, we had the distinguished services of Mr. L. A. Jennings, who has had to leave on account of a plane connection. We are sorry that he was not introduced before he left.

We go on a little on the calendar and we come to the former distinguished Comptroller of the Currency, who, as did these former two gentlemen, served on the Board in an ex officio capacity. I refer to the Honorable Ray Gidney, chairman of the board of the Florida National Bank, Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. GIDNEY. I could not add anything to what Erle Cocke has said, but it is a real delight and pleasure to be here.

Mr. COCKE. On an occasion like this, there are certain regrets, again unavoidable, about the person who has served longest on the Board of the Corporation both as Chairman and member and who was to have talked about the FDIC for us today. Less than 48 hours ago his doctor forbade him to make the trip to Washington. I refer to the distinguished Leo T. Crowley. Most of you knew him and all of you knew of him. However, Mr. Crowley—Chairman Crowley, as we would call him—though ill and having to miss this event, never fails to toe the mark, and substituting for him this afternoon we are particularly honored in having his associate in business, William J. Quinn, president of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., who said he will tell us what Mr. Crowley would have told us. I hope Mr. Quinn will go on his own also.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Crowley was greatly upset when he found it impossible to be here. This would have been a great occasion for him, and he sends his warmest greetings to all his friends. However, he prepared these remarks:

Chairman Cocke, Director Wolcott, Director Saxon, Congressman Patman, Chaplain Harris, distinguished Government officials, guests, and men and women of the FDIC.

We have gathered here today to dedicate this handsome building in this beautiful setting. To me, who has an abiding interest in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, this is but one tangible item among many tangible and intangible expressions of the effectiveness of the measures taken 30 years ago to reestablish our banking system, and to maintain that system in private enterprise, and in what we call the dual system of National and State banks.

The enactment of the Federal deposit insurance law on June 16, 1933, provided the silver lining on the dark and sinister financial storms which had brought our banking system to prostration, had thoroughly demoralized our bank supervisory system, and, through the consequent breakdown of our payments mechanism, had slowed the pace of industry and commerce to a crawl. There are probably few among those present today who have personal knowledge and experience with the conditions which confronted our people, our Government, and its leaders in early 1933. There are even fewer who have personal knowledge of the efforts of those men of vision, courage, and oftentimes conflicting ideas but who, with an overriding common patriotism, worked together to create the banking climate which has made possible these present years of general betterment for all of our people.

I recall being in the company of President Roosevelt the evening before the declaration of the bank holiday. The decision was made that the banking system would be revived. Therefore, it had to be reliquefied in order to halt the destruction of economic values caused by the forced sale and liquidation of bank assets to meet deposit withdrawals. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was ordered to cooperate with bank stockholders in the recapitalization of their banks. The Home Owners Loan Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration were directed to refinance home mortgages and farm credits to aid in the restoration of bank liquidity. The Treasury moved to aid and facilitate the operation of these relieving agencies. The vision, courage, and energy directed to these objectives by Secretary of the Treasury Woodin, his successor Henry Morgenthau, Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, by the incomparable Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and his hard-driving assistant John W. McKee, by the Home Owners Loan Corporation, and the Farm Credit Administration, was magnificent. The able Walter J. Cummings was appointed to be the first Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and, with the aid of E. G. Bennett of Utah, proceeded to set up the Corporation in the National Press Building. The energy and devotion which Mr. Bennett addressed to the task of examinations and reorganizations of the banks, in order to qualify them for admission to deposit insurance, was tremendous. Erle, I believe you were in charge of the Atlanta office of the RFC at this time.

But the utilization by the President of these tools at hand, of themselves, would not be adequate. A means had to be found whereby the confidence of the public in our banks could be fully restored. It was essential that the public should resume normal banking relationships in order that our payments mechanism could again function and facilitate trade and commerce. The guarantee of bank depositors against loss would not accomplish the objective. A way had to be found to assure the immediate availability of bank deposits in failing banks without regard for the ultimate loss. This was the problem which confronted Congress and which its leaders immediately undertook to solve.

The Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress were headed by men of great stature, and the membership of these committees was studded with men from both parties possessed of great competence. In this time of great crisis these men worked together with a common patriotism which would not tolerate partisanship in dealing with the job at hand. I recall that the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Henry Steagall, always sought the counsel and relied heavily upon our valued friend, recent Chairman and presently Director of this Corporation Jesse P. Wolcott. Others of the committee whom I recall having contributed greatly to the Banking Act of 1933 and the Banking Act of 1935, were Congressmen T. Alan Goldsborough and Brent Spence.

On the other side of the Capitol there was the great Carter Glass who, with the powerful aid of Senator Vandenberg, was able to move constructive banking legislation through the Senate. They were most ably supported by Senators Townsend, Wagner, Walcott of Connecticut, George, Russell, Barkley, McAdoo, Byrnes, and Couzens among others. These men whom I have named were firmly convinced that our system of locally organized and privately owned banks was preferable to a socialized or nationalized system of banks. This judgment was commonly held throughout the Congress notwithstanding the excesses by banks and bankers during the 1920's and early 1930's, and notwithstanding the deficiencies of bank supervision which prevailed during this period. These men recognized that the national interest requires that bank deposits be made immediately available and that a new instrument had to be created to deal with bank failures.

Action was imperative and time of the essence. Three months after the declaration of the bank holiday a Federal deposit insurance law was drafted. It provided for a temporary plan to go into operation on January 1, 1934, and a permanent plan which was perfected by the Banking Act of 1935 and which went into effect on August 23 of that year.

Throughout the discussions and the debates preceding passage, Senator Glass and Congressman Steagall stressed certain principles which guided the members of their committees. These principles, which follow, are as valid today as they were 30 years ago when I participated in the councils with these men.

Congressman Steagall held very strong convictions concerning the value to the country of the community bank—locally owned and locally managed. He and his associates were zealous in their determination that the community banks should not be supplanted by a nationalized bank system. There was general unanimity that National and State banks should compete at the community level on a basis of equality. Therefore, the conditions under which branch offices may be established and the general climate under which banks may operate was to be left to the State legislatures as had been done theretofore. There was general unanimity also that the standards of bank supervision should be improved; that greater responsibility and matching authority should be placed upon bank supervisors; and, that coordination should be brought about with the National and State supervisory bodies. The Governors of the States and their banking commissioners were very cooperative in adopting laws to facilitate the purposes and objectives of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

There was general consensus that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could be the coordinating influence for the dual banking system providing first, it could not be used to federalize our banks and banking system, second, that it could not be used to determine the kind of loans which banks may make, and, third, that it not be used to promote variable monetary policies. These considerations led to the concept that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be a corporation, an instrument of Congress, and reporting directly to Congress, but separate from any other department of Government. It should have the authority to examine insured banks to determine the quality of their loans and investments, to prevent the accumulation of bad loans and losses in the banks, to require adequate capital, and to terminate membership of any bank which continues unsafe and unsound practices. The six banking factors which govern the admission of banks to deposit insurance, and the establishment of additional offices, definitely raised the standards of bank supervision throughout the country.

The uniform examination procedure agreement of 1938 provided for the evaluation and classification of loans and investments on the basis of credit worthiness and credit quality. This agreement freed the banks from evaluations determined by the vagaries of the marketplace and introduced a stability into bank examination which has been extremely beneficial to the banking system.

From the beginning of the discussions to the last few days of drafting of the Federal deposit insurance law, Congressman Steagall held that the administration of the Corporation should be by a nonpartisan three-man working Board of Directors. In his view this was essential to insure full confidence that strict impartiality would be observed, that the dual system would be promoted and that the supervisory system would be adequate. While agreeing in general, Senator McAdoo was insistent that the Treasury have a representative on the Board of Directors because of its purchase of $150 million of capital stock. It was with great reluctance that Congressman Steagall yielded to Senator McAdoo's request and the Comptroller of the Currency became a member of the Board ex officio. The original justification for this participation ceased when the capital stock was retired for cash in 1947 and 1948.

As a former Chairman and member of the Board of Directors, I am deeply interested in the furtherance of the basic objectives of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Its success was a great source of satisfaction to Henry Steagall and Carter Glass to the dates of their death. Due to the public confidence in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, depositors no longer hoard cash when business activity declines. Likewise bankers have found no need to call sound loans for payment during recessions or to decline to make sound loans as was their wont prior to the advent of deposit insurance. Because of this confidence and the consequent psychological impact, our banking system has been enabled to expand its service to the public in fields and forms which were unknown 30 years ago.

The success and the achievements of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have been due in large part to the excellence of the law which was so carefully thought out and put together by Congress. The members of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees are particularly to be commended for having perfected this fine instrument.

The public confidence in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the psychological benefits flowing therefrom will continue so long as the management of the Corporation is composed of able men of high principle and character. Adherence by the Board to the basic principles which guided its formation and have controlled its operations will assure continuation of the public's faith in the Corporation and resultantly in the banking system. To merge the Corporation into any other bank chartering or supervisory agency would destroy its public image and would shatter public confidence. Likewise to consolidate bank examinations into one Federal authority would strike a fatal blow to the dual banking system.

Over the 30 years which have passed there has been no demonstrated need for change in the purpose or functions of the Corporation, or for enlargement of the powers delegated to the Corporation. It is inconceivable to me that Congress will ever permit Federal deposit insurance to be used for any other purposes than as devised in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The Corporation has been most successful in carrying out the purpose for which it was created. In order to understand the full extent of its success we must turn back to our memories of 1933, and recall the great distress which was rife throughout the land when all the banks had been brought to a close. I strongly suggest and urge that changes in our bank supervisory structure be made only in consequence of need. Let not change be adopted simply because change may be advocated.

I am sorry you did not have the opportunity to hear Mr. Crowley deliver these remarks himself.

Mr. **Cocke**. Thank you very much, Mr. Quinn. We hope you will express to Leo Crowley our love and admiration and tell him that he or you wrote a good speech.

We have tried to praise some of these distinguished gentlemen who have gone before. Sometimes it is preferable to give a lot of praise, and I am glad to do it because each one of them so deserves it, to the fellow who is on the job now. We have two of them on the platform today, two active workers in the work of the Corporation. First, I would like to present the Honorable Thomas G. DeShazo, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and Acting Comptroller of the Currency today due to the absence from the city of Comptroller Saxon.

Mr. **DeShazo**. Mr. Chairman, Director Wolcott, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, on the occasion of the dedication of this new building, the home of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it is my pleasure on behalf of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to wish the staff the best of luck.

Mr. **Cocke**. It is nearly 6 years since Mrs. Cocke and I arrived in Washington. We have had a lot of fun; we have had a lot of challenges and have been associated with a great number of fine people. We hope we have accomplished something. And it is with great regret that we will soon be leaving the service of the Government. But I could not leave the service without paying my respects to the man who worked long hours, and gave particular judgment from a wonderful experience, always at my right hand. It is my privilege to have served under him as Chairman for 3 years, and for the past nearly 3 years—again I repeat—Jess Wolcott has been my right hand bower. Jess, get up and make a speech.

Mr. **Wolcott**. Thank you, Erle. You asked for it.

I have told Erle a good many times that he should not introduce a former Member of Congress to speak without some limitation on his time. But I think we are all conscious of the fact that we are very grateful that you are here, that so many of you are here.

In this audience there are all facets which make up the banking structure in this world. We are quite proud and happy to have represented here so many of the banks and agencies which have made this a tremendous success. Without your help it would not be the success it is today.

I like to think of the FDIC as probably the greatest institution ever conceived by man for his own safety and protection, and the protection of bank depositors. I do not think there is any organization in the world which has done so much to establish and perpetuate and maintain an economy such as that which makes America the greatest Nation in the world, and I say this with hope and a prayer that it may continue.

I am sure that with your help and the help of all these facets that are here represented, we will make sure that we are going to continue this symbol of safety and progress represented here by this building which you are here to help dedicate and we are going to perpetuate it and that for a good many years—forever, we hope—the American banking structure and American economy will continue to be forever the greatest that the world has ever known.

Thank you very much.

Mr. **Cocke**. Sitting here, I drew two conclusions. One was that this is a patient crowd. The other is that it is certainly a good-natured crowd, because I know these chairs are not comfortable, but you do not show it on your faces.

We hope we can in some way repay you for your charity, patience, and kindness.

Again, we want to thank you for being with us. We hope you will go through and tour the building and when you get up to the seventh floor, we would not give you much to eat, but we will give you something.

Thank you all for coming. God bless you.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, having read into the record the proceedings at the dedication of the FDIC Building 2 days ago I desire to speak briefly on a different subject.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CONGRATULATED ON VICTORY BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT IN PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL BANK MERGER CASE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent a letter of congratulations to the Attorney General, upon his impressive victory before the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank merger case.

During the past decade, we have witnessed the most alarming bank merger movement in the history of this Nation. Hardly a major community has not been hit by a series of mergers concentrating the banking business into fewer and fewer hands. The onslaught against banking competition and the drying up of alternative sources of credit for the small people of this country poses a tremendous threat to our free enterprise system. Absentee ownership has been sharply accelerated. Profit dollars in local communities move overnight to the big financial centers, such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Oakland-San Francisco—instead of providing the seed corn for local enterprise.

ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP DRIES UP LOCAL BUSINESS AND SMALL TOWNS

Mr. Speaker, absentee ownership first dried up local ownership of the grocery business. It then spread to the retail drug business. Then it hit the banking business. Because of the growth of absenteeism, local people are no longer presidents or vice presidents of thriving locally owned concerns. Instead, local people have become branch managers, or hired hands answerable to some distant head office. The local branch manager cannot support local development, community facilities, hospitals, and charities, simply because the profit dollars are returned to the home office.

As a matter of fact, profit dollars leaving the local community drain the reserve balances of the local banks, so that their power to expand credit is curtailed. Thus, for every profit dollar that leaves town, something in the order of $10 of potential bank created money for local loans evaporates.

Absenteeism has withered opportunities in the little towns of America. A profit dollar that would formerly circulate 20 to 50 times locally now is sped to distant financial centers. No wonder young people are migrating to the big cities. No wonder the small towns look to the Federal Government for help.

Merger, growing concentration, and absenteeism have reached such an aggravated state that I predict that one day the people of this country will revolt and demand a deconcentration of industry. Just as concentrations of land holdings in other countries have led to a breakup of huge estates, so the growing concentration of trade, manufacturing, and banking in America will lead one day to a similar demand by the people. Fortunately, the Supreme Court sees the dangers in such growing concentration and has called a halt.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION TOOK TIMOROUS APPROACH TOWARD BANK MERGERS

Under the Eisenhower administration, Attorneys General Brownell and Rogers took a most timorous approach toward bank mergers. They concluded that bank mergers were not subject to the 1950 Celler-Kefauver amendment to the Clayton Act, and that even the big ones could not be reached by the Sherman Act. Thus, they refused to challenge such gigantic bank mergers as Morgan-Guaranty and Chemical Bank-New York Trust, and formal clearance was granted to the Chase-Manhattan merger.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy knew that Messrs. Brownell and Rogers were wrong. Mr. Kennedy brought antitrust cases against major bank mergers. His program has now been vindicated, as the Supreme Court has found that the Philadelphia National Bank merger case falls squarely under Celler-Kefauver.

In his well-reasoned opinion, Mr. Justice Brennan points out that—

> The fact that banking is a highly-regulated industry critical to the Nation's welfare makes the play of competition not less important but more so.

BECAUSE BANKS CREATE MONEY IS NO REASON FOR PERMITTING INCREASE IN BANKING CONCENTRATION—INDEED SUCH INCREASE IN CONCENTRATION CREATES TREMENDOUS PRESSURE GROUP TO INFLUENCE THE FEDERAL RESERVE TO TIGHTEN UP THE MONEY SUPPLY AND INCREASE INTEREST RATES

Mr. Justice Harlan, in dissenting, takes a very tortuous position. He argues that because commercial banks "lend against fractional reserves" and thus—

> The banking system as a whole (is permitted) to create a supply of "money" * * * considerations other than simply the preservation of competition are relevant.

On the contrary, the very fact that the banking system can create money is all the more reason why there should be a large number of banks competing with each other. The growing concentration of banks inevitably dries up opportunities for small businessmen. At the same time, and this is most alarming, it augments a tremendous pressure group to influence the Federal Reserve Board to tighten up the money and increase interest rates.

As Mr. Justice Brennan so eloquently states:

> Unless competition is allowed to fulfill its role as an economic regulator in the banking industry, the result may well be even more governmental regulation.

As I point out in my letter to the Attorney General, no doubt efforts will be made by special interests to exempt banking from the antitrust laws, but I intend to oppose such efforts with all my strength.

I insert herein my letter to the Attorney General:

June 17, 1963.

Hon. Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: You are to be congratulated on the resounding victory you achieved before the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank merger case. In contrast to the previous administration, which failed to bring antitrust cases against such huge mergers as Morgan-Guaranty, Chemical Bank-New York Trust, and even granted formal clearance to the Chase-Manhattan merger, your program of vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws in the banking area is indeed vindicated. As Mr. Justice Brennan so accurately said in the opinion,

"The fact that banking is a highly regulated industry critical to the Nation's welfare makes the play of competition not less important but more so. * * * If the businessman is denied credit because his banking alternatives have been eliminated by mergers, the whole edifice of an entrepreneurial system is threatened; if the costs of banking services and credit are allowed to become excessive by the absence of competitive pressures, virtually all costs, in our credit economy, will be affected; and unless competition is allowed to fulfill its role as an economic regulator in the banking industry, the result may well be even more governmental regulation."

No doubt efforts will now be made by certain interests to exempt banking from the antitrust laws, but you may be assured that I shall oppose such efforts with all my strength.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
Wright Patman,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Saylor, for Monday, June 17, on account of official business.

Mr. Ellsworth (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the balance of this week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Landrum, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. Patman, for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bromwell (at the request of Mr. Roudebush), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Rooney the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and to include tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. Bow the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. Lipscomb the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today on the United Nations amendment and to include a table.

Mr. Gubser the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pike.

Mr. Murphy of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROUDEBUSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. ALBERT in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1006. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users Association; and

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 74. An act for the relief of certain aliens.

BILL PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

939. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds; Cheaha Creek, Ala.; Poteau River, Ark.-Okla.; and Middle Fork-Obion River, Tenn., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

940. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds; Johns Creek, Va.; and Upper Deckers Creek, W. Va., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

941. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

942. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Virginia, as administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

943. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred because the Navy failed to purchase leased automatic data processing components offered at reduced prices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

944. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

945. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excess costs of milk purchased by the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va., for the Guantanamo Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4955. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation; with amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 251. Resolution to provide for the printing as a House document of the eulogies and other pertinent matter presented in honor of the late Honorable James Patrick McGranery; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 343. Resolution authorizing the printing of eulogies delivered in the House of Representatives as a tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as a House document, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 357. Resolution providing for additional copies of House Report No. 119, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage"; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 358. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Youth Activities (Eighth World Youth Festival, Helsinki, Finland, 1962)," 87th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 359. Resolution providing for additional copies of "Communist and Trotskyist Activity Within the Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee", 87th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 398). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 360. Resolution providing for additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Propaganda—And the Truth—About Conditions in Soviet Russia (Testimony of David P. Johnson)", 87th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 399). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 161. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Document 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, the Communist Ideology"; and House Document 139, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, the Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev"; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 162. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Report No. 2559, 87th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 401). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 163. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States, Parts 1 and 2"; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 164. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments (Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and Friends of British Guiana), Parts 1 and 2"; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958"; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications"; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President; without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 37.

Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 and part 2 of the 1963 hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry"; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 393. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ two additional employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration House Resolution 291. Resolution authorizing the payment of death gratuities in the case of certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who are assigned to duty in the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2989. A bill to further amend the Missing Persons Act to cover certain persons detained in foreign countries against their will, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2998. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3179. A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4338. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4739. A bill to amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, with regard to the advance movement of dependents and baggage and household effects of members of the uniformed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6681. A bill to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6767. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6996. A bill to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4174. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 405. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6791, a bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7095. A bill to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7096. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain property at Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7098. A bill to clarify the meaning of "section 38 property" in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7099. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 7100. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7101. A bill to clarify the meaning of "section 38 property" in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse balls and sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7103. A bill to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7104. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7105. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to make certain medical institutions and hospitals engaged primarily in furnishing domiciliary care eligible for donations of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7106. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to restore free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving annuities or pensions under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 7107. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fire Island National Seashore, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7108. A bill to extend for 1 additional year certain of the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to the construction and maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7109. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credit against tax for investment in certain depreciable property); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7112. A bill to assist in providing training of teachers of mentally retarded children, to authorize grants for research relating to education of such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7113. A bill to assist in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers, grants to States for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded, and grants for construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7114. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7115. A bill to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights to include investigations of vote frauds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7116. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7117. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 7119. A bill authorizing performance of dust control measures at Long Island, Port Isabel, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 7120. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage adjustments in milk marketing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7121. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7122. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 7123. A bill approving an agreement entered into by the Navajo Tribe of Indians relating to oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 7124. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7125. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to limit the amount of noncash grant-in-aid credit for streets to that which directly benefits an urban renewal area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7126. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide that the District of Columbia may receive noncash grant-in-aid credits for urban renewal projects only on the same basis as other municipalities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 7127. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 480. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 483. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.J. Res. 484. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 485. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 486. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers and reading of the Holy Bible in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 487. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 488. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to religious worship by students in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Res. 406. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the murder of the late Medgar Evers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural, and fish products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to mail order drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 7128. A bill for the relief of Jillian Vera Griffiths Hussey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Dallis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Antonia Karpathios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7131. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Earl Spofford Brown, U.S. Army Reserve (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7132. A bill for the relief of Wetsel-Oviatt Lumber Co., Inc., Omo Ranch, (El Dorado County), Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7133. A bill for the relief of Heide Lomangino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7134. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Paula Cohen-Rehfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

161. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. O. Stevens, Stateline, Calif., relative to the construction of schools, which relates to a special use permit signed by the El Dorado National Forest and the Lake Tahoe Unified School District; to the Committee on Agriculture.

162. Also, petition of J. W. Danielson, Palo Alto, Calif., relative to the construction of schools, which relates to a special use permit signed by the El Dorado National Forest and the Lake Tahoe Unified School District; to the Committee on Agriculture.

163. Also, petition of Luis Rivera Santos and others, American Coffee Federation, Caracas, Venezuela, relative to requesting intervention in bringing about the procedure of confirmation in order to put into effect the international coffee agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

164. Also, petition of Esther N. Souli, deputy clerk, Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, Calif., relative to urging the adoption of Senate bill 1275, relating to Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Arkansas Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. This great State was admitted on June 15, 1836. I welcome the opportunity this commemoration affords to congratulate the people of Arkansas for having the good judgment and foresight to send its present delegation to the Congress. National leadership is fast becoming a tradition in Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, one of my most vivid recollections as a boy is that of my hometown county fair in October 1928. I remember so well the red, white, and blue bunting of the Democratic Party booth and the pictures of Alfred E. Smith, of New York, the Democratic nominee, and his running mate, Senator Joe T. Robinson, of Arkansas. Joe Robinson blazed a trail of brilliant national leadership for Arkansas, reaching a climax today in one of the most outstanding State congressional delegations in the history of the United States. No State in the modern history of our Nation has sent to this Congress a more distinguished delegation than that presently serving from the great State of Arkansas. This fact is all the more remarkable when we consider that the Arkansas delegation is comparatively speaking a small delegation composed of only six men. No State delegation wields more influence over the future destiny of this country and upon the free world than our colleagues from Arkansas.

It is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the people of Arkansas, and I congratulate them for sending to this Congress such an outstanding delegation, each a national leader of renown, men of integrity dedicated to the preservation of this Republic. Much could be written about the ingredients which molded this character and superb leadership. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the independent spirit, self-reliance, intense patriotism, and a Bible-belt philosophy of a great people moving forward in an agrarian environment.

Mr. Speaker, every American can point with pride to John L. McClellan, senior Senator and chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, who has conducted a relentless campaign against organized crime and racketeering; Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who is day and night involved in the great struggle to protect the free world against the onslaughts of ruthless communism; Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is one of the world's most influential men molding U.S. tax and foreign trade policy; E. C. Gathings, member of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Cotton, who aids in the formation of the cotton policy affecting millions of cotton growers and millions of textile employees as well as the taxpayers of the country; Oren Harris, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, scrutinizing and influencing the activities of television, radio, publications, interstate commerce, and foreign commerce; James W. Trimble, member of the powerful Rules Committee which supervises the flow of all legislation; and Mr. Speaker, I remind the House of our beloved former colleague of many years, Brooks Hays, who is now Special Assistant to the President of the United States.

First Woman Oklahoma State Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma State Legislature has adjourned and its first woman member to be elected in 15 years will have completed her first session. We are proud of the fact that that woman, Representative Pauline Tabor, is one of the representatives from Bryan County which is in the congressional district I represent. The Oklahoma House of Representatives last Friday adopted a resolution commending Representative Tabor. It reads as follows:

> The presence of Mrs. Tabor has helped make the arduous job of legislation more enjoyable, and all the members feel that this lovely woman should be commended for the fine manner in which she has represented the people of Bryan County and the State of Oklahoma.

In a recent article in the Tulsa Tribune, Mr. Nolen Bulloch wrote that house members liked Representative Tabor because "she asked no quarters and gave none in committee meetings and discussions." He added, "They respect her as a woman, but they treat her as another member in the legislative work."

She is a member of committees on education, social welfare, business, and industry, public health, and industrial development. She had a perfect attendance record at committee meetings until recently when she was called home because of an emergency.

"Mrs. Tabor has won respect of her colleagues by not trying to take advantage of her femininity," Mr. Bulloch wrote. "And like the well-coached freshman member she has taken the floor only on occasion. When she does the members listen attentively. She makes strong points and in strong tones."

I have known Representatives Tabor for many years and am proud of the record she has made in her first session as a Bryan County representative in the State legislature.

Government Lotteries of Cambodia, Japan, Malaya, the Philippines, and Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the Members of this House to the Far East where the human urge to gamble is also recognized and capitalized on by the governments in that area of the world. Cambodia, Japan, Malaya, Philippines, and Thailand are 5 more of the 77 foreign countries that utilize government-run lotteries as revenue producers.

Cambodia operates a national lottery which, considering its size and wealth, does very well. In 1962, the gross receipts came to almost $14 million. The annual net income to the government in 1962 was over $4 million. The profits to the government were consigned to a special account and devoted to financing projects of social and economic importance.

Japan has seen the merit in government control and regulation of the inextinguishable human urge to gamble. In 1962, the gross receipts came to over $12 million. The revenue derived from the operation of this lottery—almost $4½ million—was earmarked for public works, such as construction of schools, hospitals, roads, and bridges.

Malaya started its government lottery operation in 1950 and it has proven a success. The gross receipts for 1962 were over $11 million. The net income to the government was almost $4 million, used for social welfare purposes.

Philippines is another country that has the wisdom to see that gambling revenues can be used for beneficial purposes. Last year, the gross receipts of its lottery amounted to over $12 million. The net profit came to over $4¼ million. The funds were used for hospitals and health centers.

Thailand has also found a national lottery very productive. Last year, the total gross receipts from running a lottery amounted to over $34¼ million. After payment of expenses and prizes, the net income to the government came to over $9¼ million which was used for public charity, public housing, and social welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the governments of these Far East countries are not the only ones which have had the wisdom to see that gambling revenues can be used to further charitable and other beneficial endeavors. The United States is one of the few Western nations that has yet to come to its senses.

A national lottery in this country can easily raise over $10 billion a year in new income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt. Why can we not even follow the example of New Hampshire? What are we afraid of? Are not the American taxpayers entitled to a break?

Mass Deportations From the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to commemorate the 22d anniversary of the mass deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which occurred in June 1941. By so doing, we remind ourselves once again that we in the United States enjoy the blessings of liberties while many peoples are suffering the terrors of Communist oppression. It is fitting that we pause to pay homage to the freedom-loving peoples of the Baltic States on the 22d anniversary of the martyrdom of thousands of Baltic citizens at the hands of Soviet troops.

These outrages against humanity were the aftermath of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union 1 year earlier. To understand the full tragedy of the mass deportations of June 1941 one must recall the historical context in which they took place. Lithuania has been known to history since the year 1009, when a number of Eastern European principalities joined together to form a state. The king of a united Lithuania was recognized in the 13th century, and shortly thereafter the boundaries of Lithuania extended into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. During the Middle Ages, Lithuanians were respected as a powerful and independent European state which was capable of turning back foreign invaders. The "eastern Slavs" enjoyed far more freedom than the residents of Moscow and strove to live in peace with neighboring peoples.

Lithuania, like Latvia, fell under Russian control in 1795, when the czar seized a substantial part of Poland and that country lost its independence. For the next century and one-quarter, the Baltic peoples suffered under Russian rule but, firmly committed to their ancient traditions of freedom and national independence, repeatedly sought to throw out the foreign rulers. Revolutionary efforts were not immediately successful, but neither were the Russian overlords able to wipe out memories of earlier days.

The period of czarist rule came to an end after the First World War, when the Baltic countries regained their ancient sovereignty. Although caught between the overwhelming forces of larger neighbors, the Baltic peoples fought for their independence, and for a brief two decades between the world wars, the ancient dreams of a return to independent Baltic nations were realized. For these two decades the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia labored to establish modern governments and economies, while gaining respected places as members of the League of Nations. Yet even as they were immersed in their task of rebuilding their beloved homelands, new calamity struck. In 1939 the Soviet Union imposed mutual defense pacts on the Baltic countries in order to station Russian soldiers within their borders. In 1940 the three peaceful republics were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

It was then that the Soviet Union imposed a wave of terror on the three Baltic peoples. Looking backward, czarist efforts at the "Russification" of the Baltics appear mild when compared to Stalin's brutal techniques. On June 14, 1941, the wave of deportations reached its peak, continuing in Lithuania for 5 more nights. Fifteen thousand Latvian men, women, and children were rounded up by Soviet secret police during a single night and transported in cattle cars to the slave labor camps of Siberia. Thousands of Lithuanians and Estonians were similarly rounded up and deported under equally inhuman conditions. The courageous Baltic peoples resisted these efforts, at times with their lives, but this reaction only resulted in plans for the total deportation of the Baltic peoples to northeast Russia and Siberia.

On this 22d anniversary of the mass deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the American people renew their vow to continue the age-old struggle for freedom. The hopes of the Baltic peoples are the hopes of the whole free world. We look forward to the day of deliverance, when the Baltic nations will resume their rightful place in the community of nations. We salute the passionate desire for freedom of the Baltic peoples, a desire which they share with freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the University of Maryland, June 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the University of Maryland has emerged as an important contributor to the ever-widening field of science. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson lauded this fact, as well as the State of Maryland's stance among the top ten in science, scientific research, and scientific manpower, in a recent commencement address at the University of Maryland.

In a positive and forceful speech, Vice President Johnson also spoke about the possible results of man's dramatic progress in science, and the future relationship between government and science.

The text of Vice President Johnson's speech follows:

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the University of Maryland, College Park, Md., June 8, 1963

So long as there have been commencement exercises, it has been traditional to assure each graduating class that they were about to enter a disturbed, plagued and gravely threatened world. This year many speakers seem to have found a new horizon of hopelessness.

If communism doesn't bury us, if socialism doesn't engulf us, if our debt and taxes don't topple on us, if morality doesn't collapse beneath us, the class of 1963 is told to rest secure because, in due time, we are sure to be overtaken and destroyed by the advance of science.

I do not accept this verdict on the future of man—or the consequences of mankind's present dramatic progress in science and all the fields of human knowledge. If I may, I would like to talk with you about this today—and especially about the future relationship of government and science.

In the early 1950's, the University of Maryland ranked among the first 10 of the Nation in football. For reasons we won't go into here, that is somewhat changed. However, today the State of Maryland ranks among the first 10 in science, in scientific activity and in scientific talent.

Maryland is making a major and impressive contribution to our national efforts in science.

But some are asking the question—what contribution are those national efforts making for all the people of all the States?

Is our space effort too dominant? Is it usurping too much of our scientific talent and ability? Is the concentration of space science depriving us of opportunities to learn what remains to be learned on and about earth? Is the space effort leading us to neglect other work we ought to be doing on earth?

If we as a nation had no competition, if we had no stakes of national prestige, if we had no considerations of national security, if there were no Communist Russia or no Communist China, if we had nothing but our self-respect and our tradition of free scientific inquiry, our effort in space today should differ very little from its present magnitude or its present priorities.

What we are and what we aspire to be as a nation rests upon the predicate of maintaining peace on earth. If peace is to be maintained on earth, freemen must acquire the competence to preserve space as a field of peace before it can be made into a new battlefield by tyranny. Were there no other considerations, this alone would require us to do what we are doing in space—and would permit us to do no less.

We are not reaching for prestige in space—we are reaching for peace. And this is considerably more urgent than many realize or others will yet admit.

In large measure, this perspective helps to answer other questions now being raised.

Space is clearly the great breakthrough of human knowledge—for centuries to come. We do not know—and the Soviets do not know—what the stars will tell us. We do know that to default the exploration of the universe of space would surely be as catastrophic in its consequences as if we had defaulted exploration of the universe of the atom. Our superiority in any scientific field will be brief and fading if we do not win and hold competence in this new and decisive realm of discovery.

In exploring space, we are exploring the environment of the earth itself. We are finding paths through a new dimension—and historically civilizations have stood or fallen according to their ability to move through a dimension.

We seek to make space an instrument for peace and the development of mankind. But if we abandon the field, space can be preempted by others as an instrument for aggression.

And in a world of competing social systems, we would be naive indeed if we failed to recognize how bleak the future would be if this new dimension became the realm of tyranny. For your children, and your children's children, an iron curtain would be drawn across the pathway to the stars.

What concerns me today is the nature of the fashionable outcry against science itself—and the source from which much of the most vocal criticism comes. In our enlightened intellectual community, many are parroting George Bernard Shaw's often quoted phrase, "Science is always wrong—it never solves a problem without creating 10 more."

Science is not creating our problems—it is creating answers to our problems. A rare moment of opportunity is upon us. But many to whom we should turn for affirmation, confidence, and enthusiasm are offering doubt, disenchantment, and despair.

A free society can longer outlive the failures of its scientists than the lack of faith of its philosophers. We of America cannot lead the world, we cannot keep up with the world, we cannot even follow closely behind the world if we permit our sophistication and abundance to degenerate into cynicism and arrogance.

As Shakespeare put it, "Our doubts are traitors"—because they make us lose the good we might win "by fearing to attempt."

As the best fed, best clothed, best housed, best educated people in all history, Americans today must not fear to attempt.

Space is a boon, not a boondoggle. We are talking superstition, not sense, when we talk of machines overpowering men. We are selling ourselves short when we show the white feather to nuclear fission.

As David Lilienthal said some years ago, "A world of science and great machines is still a world of men; our modern task is more difficult, but the opportunity for democratic methods can be even greater than in the days of the ax and the handloom.

Our challenge today is not to turn back from the horizons of physical science but to turn toward the new and greater horizons of political science.

The struggle of this century is a struggle between two political systems, free and slave. If science is pressed into the service of those who would enslave mankind, science must also be marshaled to support those who would keep men free.

If that goal is to be served, we must not permit the pace of physical science to outrun the performance of our political science.

Our public policy as well as our popular philosophy must embrace the greater opportunities being opened to us by science and put these new capabilities to greater use. This is our real challenge today.

We have a long and undistinguished record in America of failing to anticipate the promise and potential of each new age of science, invention, and discovery. Early in our history, there was an effort to close down the Patent Office on the theory that everything worth inventing had already been invented. Even so farsighted an American as Woodrow Wilson spent time denouncing the automobile. The steamboat, the locomotive, the airplane all brought prophecies of doom and gloom. We have learned a lesson we surely do not need to be taught again.

You of the class of 1963 do not graduate into hopeless times. On the contrary, unlike the class of 1953 or 1943, or 1933, you graduate into one of the most hopeful times in the history of man.

Our world today is moved and motivated as it has never been before by the enthusiasm, optimism, and confidence of peoples everywhere. These is war, there is poverty, there is ignorance. But for the first time, nations of Africa and Asia along with nations of Europe and the Americas are working together for world peace, for economic growth, for better education.

We are climbing toward the summit of man's experience and science is the lifeline that ties us all together. We cannot accept, we do not accept, the sudden cynicism of those who tell us this rope which lifts us up is in reality a noose about our necks.

As has been said, "The feeling of distrust is always the last which a great mind acquires."

The feeling of distrust of the future should be the last which a great nation such as ours acquires.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1963, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its golden anniversary convention. All Members are aware of the enormous contributions this organization has made over the years toward developing the water resources of our country.

The greetings of this House were extended to the persons present at the convention by our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK. I am sure that all Members would be interested in his fine statement, as follows:

GREETINGS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Remarks by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives)

Mr. President, once again it is my happy privilege to extend a greeting to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

This is the 50th annual meeting of the congress. During 35 of those years, I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, and partially because my own district has been so concerned with the development of our water resources, I have had far more than a casual interest in the work and the objectives of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

It is not an exaggeration to say that most of the progress that has been made in recent decades in the development of America's water resources has been due to the sense of urgency which has been stimulated by the activity of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The success the Congress has had in encouraging and promoting the effective use of water and waterways is due in no small measure to the excellent leadership of such dedicated public servants as my good friend and your national vice president, Congressman BOB SIKES of Florida. Throughout his career he has been an outstanding exponent of the development of our water resources and his tireless work in behalf of the programs of this organization has made an exceptional contribution to the attainment of our objectives. He has earned the sincere gratitude of all who realize what the full use of water resources means to the progress and prosperity of America.

Organized more than 61 years ago, this congress has given invaluable assistance to regional, State, and local governments in the conservation, development, and control of the Nation's precious water supplies. It has always been nonpartisan in character and has never wavered from its singleness of purpose which is the sound and swift development of our water resources.

On the membership rolls of the organization are Governors, mayors, State legislators, water experts from industry, and I am proud to say—many of our colleagues in the House and Senate.

It is not mere coincidence that the period of greatest development of our water uses covers the lifespan of this congress. It has been the principal promoter of an ever-increasing degree of Federal participation in meeting State and local needs, notably in the fields of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and conservation.

Because the organization has no ax to grind except the progress of the national welfare as related to the use of water, it has historically had an influential voice in the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Its close relationships with committees of Congress, with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and some 40 other Federal agencies dealing with water problems have resulted in great benefits to the prosperity of the Nation.

Improvements to rivers, harbors, inland waterways, and the Great Lakes system under the Federal navigation program have now resulted in alltime high tonnage of more than 1 billion tons of waterborne commerce a year.

Under the Federal flood control program begun in 1936, about 400 projects costing over $1 billion have been completed while projects having an estimated cost of about $5 billion are under construction. These projects have been highly effective in reducing flood damages. During the limited period they have been in operation (generally averaging less than 14 years), they have prevented flood damages of over $11 billion, thus returning 11 dollars for every 1 dollar of cost. Over $660 million of flood damage was prevented during fiscal year 1962.

A problem closely associated with the activities of the Congress, the abatement of water pollution, is deserving of our energetic advocacy. Because it has such serious implications for the health of our people, pollution of our streams and rivers is becoming an increasingly grave national problem. I firmly believe this menace should be attacked on a broad national front. It cannot be lightly dismissed as wholly a local responsibility. If we do, the desired improvements will never be made.

The plain facts are that in local communities where the pollution problem is most acute, the local governments simply cannot raise the necessary funds to eliminate the sources of infection without Federal assistance. They are already carrying a heavy tax burden. Rivers recognize no State boundary lines and neither do the germs of pollution which too many of our rivers are carrying to the detriment of many communities.

From personal experience, I know of several communities in our New England area which will be unable to cope with their pollution problems without Federal aid, and there are several hundred cities and towns in a similar condition throughout the country. Nature has endowed our land with an abundance of water, but it is obviously a relatively fixed supply. An increasing population and expanding industry are drawing more heavily each year on the available sources. More water is being consumed and more wastes are being discharged into our streams. These wastes cause the pollution which imperils our domestic water supplies, industrial uses, agriculture, fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreational facilities.

When it is realized that two-thirds of our people get their drinking water from surface water supplies into which disease-carrying bacteria and toxic substances are being discharged, the menace in such a condition to the health of the Nation becomes real. The cure for this serious situation must be the construction of waste treatment and sewage disposal facilities wherever the problem prevails. I ask you if this is not a real problem for our Federal Government to aid?

The improvement of our waterways for shipping has resulted in enormous economic benefits to the Nation. We have seen countless instances as proof of this. Personally I am most familiar with the projects at Boston Harbor with which I have been closely associated throughout my congressional life. The development of this harbor has made possible the accommodation of ships of greater tonnage, bringing lower transportation costs to the industries in the area and encouraging new industry to locate there.

Unfortunately, expansion of the railroads is not likely in the future. Railroads are essential and we must not let them decay. But we must supplement their transportation efforts through progress in the expansion of our waterway system. History has borne out the economic value of our waterway projects. They will continue to contribute many advantages to a growing country. They will play a major role in the economic destiny of our country. We must do our full share in the greater and more prosperous America that lies ahead.

Like all of you, I am well aware that there are projects all over the country which, if further developed, would better serve not only local, but the national interests. As constructively exemplified in your work, however, there is a need to establish a priority system for such projects, even though we, by natural inclination, would like to accomplish the jobs all at once. Consequently, I am hopeful, that as soon as possible, the many meritorious projects still being held in abeyance can also be considered and approved soon in successive years.

As we face the future, I want to commend you again, and express appreciation for the splendid work you are doing in this significant field. Moreover, I shall look forward to what I know will be the constructive results of this convention. In your efforts, I am confident, you will write another significant page in the history of the Nation's rivers and harbors development programs.

Fire Island National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years six different bills have been introduced by eight separate Members of Congress, all generally supporting the concept of the establishment of a National Seashore on the south shore of Long Island at Fire Island, Suffolk County, New York. As the Member in whose district most of Fire Island is located, I have scrutinized all of these bills carefully. Until recently all of these bills were couched in vague and general terms and in the absence of specific details the people of Suffolk County were unable to express their sentiments on such matters as the mileage and acreage to be acquired by the Federal Government, the manner of taking land and improvements thereon, the status of existing State, county and town parks on Fire Island, whether the parkland was to be left wild or developed for maximum usage, how access was to be provided, whether erosion control measures would be carried out, whether local interests would have any voice in park development and management, and many other items of great interest to the people most closely affected.

On June 10, 1963, the Secretary of the Interior released his report on the two earliest bills filed. This report provided detailed answers to many of the questions which my constituents had asked—it left many unanswered. Most of the answers it provided were satisfactory to the district; some were not.

In an effort to make constructive and specific recommendations as to the development of the park in the manner most beneficial to Suffolk County within the framework of the Federal law, I have this day introduced my own bill on the subject. It represents a great many hours of study of existing seashore legislation and of the particular facts applicable to Fire Island. I am indebted to the existing seashore legislation and to the legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Interior for much of the language contained therein. I am indebted to the Committee for a Fire Island National Seashore, the Suffolk County Council of the League of Women Voters, the Patchogue Chamber of Commerce, many of the garden clubs and conservation organizations of Suffolk County for many of the details and, above all, for the spirit of this legislation.

This bill differs from that proposed by the Secretary of the Interior in several important respects, among them the following:

First. It is aimed more specifically at conservation for the future and less directly at recreation for the present. To this end, while the entire 31-mile beach front of Fire Island would be held in public ownership, two specific tracts, the Sunken Forest area and an 8-mile section lying east of Ocean Ridge, are required to be held in an undeveloped condition. While no portion of the island qualifies as true wilderness, these two relatively wild and undeveloped areas should be retained in their present state, without the intrusion of roads, parking lots, or any facilities designed to encourage high density usage at the expense of the existing remote and tranquil atmosphere of these areas.

Second. The bill limits the area to be acquired by the Federal Government on Fire Island to the area between the Fire Island State Park and the Moriches Inlet County Park. These two areas, already in public ownership, should be retained for the residents of the State of New York and of Suffolk County, respectively. Within the national seashore area, the county and town governments have the option of either retaining their existing parks or turning their ownership and administration over to the Federal Government.

Third. The bill specifically adds to the bill recommended by the Secretary the substantial acreage available on several nearby islands in the Great South Bay, Bellport Bay, and Moriches Bay.

Fourth. The bill does not provide for the acquisition of any land east of the Moriches Inlet.

Fifth. The bill does give the Secretary a limited power to condemn improved property. This power is limited to the 8-mile undeveloped area east of Ocean Ridge and is designed to enable the creation of a true conservation area in this section. The relatively few homeowners involved would have the option of retaining any property thus condemned either for their lifetimes or for a fixed period of 25 years.

Sixth. The bill otherwise prohibits the condemnation of any homes actually existing or under construction on July 1, 1963. The January 1, 1963, date recommended by the Department of the Interior seems unfair to those who in good faith have started construction this year.

Seventh. The bill directs the Secretary to participate in and contribute to such erosion control plans as have been developed by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army.

Eighth. The bill directs to the Secretary to contribute such land as may be necessary in the future for any new inlet in the Patchogue-West Sayville area upon the development of plans for such an inlet by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, and approval of such a project by Congress.

Ninth. The bill limits the area exempt from condemnation around existing residences to 2 acres, but would allow 10 acres around existing commercial enterprises such as hotels, beach clubs, and marinas.

Tenth. The bill establishes a Fire Island National Seashore Advisory Commission to insure that local interests would have a continuing voice in the development, maintenance, and operation of the seashore.

I know that this bill cannot please all of the divergent national and local interests, pressures, and voices which will be heard on this legislation. It is an honest effort to produce conservation legislation which both Suffolk County and the Federal Government can live with.

American Independence Day in Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this week the State of West Virginia celebrates its 100th birthday. Exactly 2 weeks thereafter, the Nation celebrates Independence Day and the 187th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

One of West Virginia's prominent steel executives, Borge Rosing of Huntington, W. Va., recently related to me in picturesque terms an annual event which occurs every July 4 in Denmark. Every Fourth of July, a meaningful and colorful celebration of American Independence Day takes place in the ancient heather-clad hills of Rebild National Park, Jutland, Denmark.

IMPRESSIVE AND COLORFUL CEREMONY

Ever since 1912, with the exception of a few war years, every Fourth of July has been celebrated in Rebild National Park, attracting upward of 40,000 Danish-born Americans and Danes, seated in the natural amphitheater around the platform. Borge Rosing has described graphically to me the scene at the golden anniversary festival of 1962 when the guests of honor were their Majesties King Frederik IX, Queen Ingrid, and Princess Nargrethe, heir to the crown of Denmark. The park has a natural bowl, formed by surrounding hills on which the 50 State flags of the United States are grouped, and over a speakers' platform on the floor of the bowl the American and Danish flags fly side by side. It is an impressive ceremony when selected American and Danish color guards hoist the respective flags of their Nations while everyone joins in singing the American and Danish national anthems. The colorful sight of the great silk flags, the large audience rising to sing the national anthems, and the stirring music by a large orchestra is a heart-moving event that no American can ever forget.

The late Dr. Max Henius, an eminent citizen and chemist of Chicago, Ill., first generated the idea of creating an American national park in Denmark. With his usual initiative and energy, Dr. Henius aroused interest among other Danish-born Americans in the project of a Danish-American park. The grounds in Rebild were bought for the purpose and after the first festival in 1912 the land was formally presented to the Danish Government as a gift from Americans of Danish origin.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY EXTENDS GREETINGS

Prior to the golden anniversary celebration in Rebild National Park, President Kennedy extended greetings with the following message: "Denmark and the United States have a great deal in common and a long history of cordial relations. No feature of the shared beliefs marking this pleasant association is more outstanding than our mutual respect for liberty and our jealous safeguarding of the dignity of the individual. Danes and Americans have celebrated Independence Day on July 4 at Rebild, Denmark, for 50 years. It is, I think, a most extraordinary example of international friendship when the people of another country celebrate American Independence Day on their own soil. In gathering each year at Rebild, Danes, and Americans pay solemn tribute to the democratic ideals and values cherished by each people. July 4, 1962, will mark the golden jubilee observance of the Rebild Independence Day ceremonies. I send my most cordial greetings on this occasion and hope that as many Americans as possible will take this opportunity to join with their countless Danish friends in enjoying this unique occasion."

THE GREAT CONTRIBUTION OF AMBASSADOR BLAIR

Planning and carrying forward these annual celebrations does not happen automatically. A direct and personal interest is being taken by the able American Ambassador to Denmark, His Excellency William McCormick Blair, Jr. To those who know Ambassador Blair, his energy, and leadership in this connection comes as no surprise. I had the good fortune to be associated with Ambassador Blair during the 1952 and 1956 presidential campaigns, particularly the latter, when he served as the closest adviser to Governor Adlai Stevenson. In his 2 years at our Embassy in Copenhagen, this keen and perceptive man has won the hearts of the Danish people.

WEST VIRGINIA IS PROUD OF BORGE ROSING

Ambassador Blair and his staff have provided magnificent help to the Rebild National Park board, under whose direction the celebrations are held. Three of the officers of this board reside in Denmark: Mr. Charles L. Hansen, president; Mr. Peter F. Heering, vice president; and Mr. Christian Moller, treasurer. The other two officers reside in the United States: Mr. Th. R. Knudsen, vice president, and Mr. Borge Rosing, secretary. Mr. Speaker, we in West Virginia are doubly proud that a man of Mr. Rosing's caliber should not only be a leader in our steel industry, but also is providing the enthusiastic support necessary to help make the annual celebrations in Denmark a great success.

These celebrations have strengthened the ties between Danes in the United States and their mother country. There is probably no other place in the world where Danish-American born American citizens and visiting Americans are so deeply stirred by pride and patriotism in and for their adopted country as in Rebild National Park on American Independence Day.

Commencement, Class of 1963, LaSalle Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the graduating class of 1963 at La Salle Military Academy on Thursday, June 13, 1963:

Reverend Brother Raphael, faculty members, graduates, their parents and guests, first, let me say how grateful I am for the invitation to take part in this commencement program. But no words of thanks, however happily expressed, can convey my warm appreciation of the honor. It is a deep satisfaction to come home to La Salle, a great school of great traditions. Now I have a suspicion that some of you graduates were dismayed to hear that a Congressman would speak here today; as a group, Congressmen have a reputation for long and windy orations, but I hope to prove the exception to the rule. Nor do I intend to ladle out large doses of advice; whenever I am tempted to do so, I recall the story of the boy who was asked in an examination, "Who was Socrates?" His answer was short and to the point. "Socrates was a Greek," he said. "He went around giving people advice. The people poisoned him." Instead, I want to discuss with you what I call the "can do" philosophy—a resoluteness of spirit that enables us to view life as a challenge and to surmount the obstacles that are a part of life's course.

One of this country's most profound men—Abraham Lincoln—once illustrated the point in a story he told on himself. In the days when he was a circuit-riding country lawyer in Illinois, Lincoln was driving in his buggy along a narrow lane when he met a woman in another buggy coming in the opposite direction. Woods on both sides of the lane prevented either from turning around, so they stopped and just looked at one another. Finally, the woman spoke up. "I do declare," she said, "you're just about the ugliest man I ever saw." "Well, madam," Lincoln replied, "I have been told that, and I am inclined to agree with you. But there isn't really anything I can do about it, is there?" The woman thought a moment. Then she replied, "Well, you could at least stay home."

It taught him, Lincoln said in later years, that there is always something that a man can do in any situation.

Unfortunately, we are living in an era in which the can-do philosophy is considered old-fashioned, if not downright antisocial. The rare person who wants to do something—to solve a problem with reasoned action, to forcefully resolve a dilemma—is shunned as an eccentric or a troublemaker. He is told, "Don't rock the boat." Too many of us swerve from high purpose; we follow the line of least resistance, accommodating ourselves to the convenient and the expedient only to find that, inevitably, a problem avoided is still a problem. The civil rights crisis in the South—and in the North, to a lesser degree—is a case in point. The thinking people in the South know and have known for years that racial discrimination is morally indefensible; yet, knowing this, they evaded their responsibility in not correcting it, telling themselves that time somehow would take care of the problem. The result is that extremists on both sides have created an explosive situation while the moderates sit futilely by, wringing their hands.

By compromising in situations that call for action we eventually compromise ourselves. To acquiesce in any delinquency is to condone it; when we shrug with cynical indifference at disclosures of graft and corruption in high places we in effect are encouraging more graft and corruption; when we accept a repairman's bill for work poorly done we are cheating ourselves and the repairman's subsequent customers. We are passive when we should be active. We tend to disengage ourselves from the responsibility that principle imposes. We would like to see a better world, of course, but we are unwilling to do anything about making it better.

But what, you might ask, can I do about it? Well, there are two approaches to life—the negative and the positive. Let's take the negative first. For an example of the negative carried to its ultimate, we have the beatnik. Here is a person who, having concluded that the world is rotten beyond redemption, decides to withdraw from it—unaware that the only real withdrawal is death.

He discards his razor and his inhibitions and sulks in his pad, where he devotes most of his time to writing long and largely incomprehensible denunciations of the world as he finds it. To a certain extent, he is right; there is a great deal wrong with the world. But he has convinced himself that nothing can be done about it—conveniently forgetting that the world is a far finer one to live in than it was even a century ago. Who made it so? Not beatnik types, most assuredly, but people with vision, with character, and with courage enough to be nonconformists in the true sense of that word. And, incidentally, nonconformity is a much abused term. It has come to mean the beatnik, the rebel without a cause, the misfit who feels that simply by flouting the standards of conventional behavior he is in some manner striking a blow for freedom of the individual. But nonconformity is a matter of the mind, not of dress and behavior. The men who founded this Nation were nonconformists in the true meaning of the word. They were rebels with a cause—the cause of freedom.

Now let's look at the positive approach. Is it possible in today's complex and regimented society for the individual to make himself and his ideas felt? Is it wise to speak out as a resolute minority of one? Are the rewards greater to the conformist who goes along with the crowd? Is security more satisfying than challenge? We hear on all sides that the day of the individual is long since over, that this is the day of the organization man, the day of mass this and mass that.

There is in Washington today a man who in himself is the dramatic answer to these questions. His name is Hyman Rickover—Adm. Hyman Rickover. Someone once said that Admiral Rickover has made a career of being unpopular and, in some areas, he is unpopular. But this bothers him not at all; had he chosen to be popular the world would never have heard of him—and our country would be the worse for it. But the admiral had an idea—the nuclear-powered submarine—and he determined to fight for it. He spoke out, forcefully, when he could have taken the line of least resistance and quietly shelved his project in the face of criticism from those in authority who felt he was rocking the boat. The opponents of the *Nautilus*—and there were many—felt the project was foredoomed to failure. Just couldn't be done, they said. It was the old story of the bumblebee all over again. Aerodynamically, you know, the bumblebee's heavy fuselage is so out of proportion to his wingspan and powerplant that it is impossible for him to fly. But the bumblebee doesn't know that, and flies anyway. As the admiral was to say later, it was fortunate that his critics didn't believe in the *Nautilus;* convinced he would fail, they left him alone to successfully complete his project. The result of Rickover's willingness to court antagonism for what he believed in has given the country perhaps its most potent deterrent weapon—the Polaris missile submarine. And his criticism of American educational methods has had a profound effect on educators, who more and more are beginning to see the wisdom of fundamentals in our school. His was a lone voice, but it was heard loud and clear above the plaints of those who say the individual cannot make himself felt in our society.

If Admiral Rickover had taken the easy way, the conformist's way, he would have proceeded uneventfully to an honorable but obscure retirement. He chose instead to do something; his reward is the satisfaction of making a major contribution to the defense of his country. What material gain could possibly compare to his achievement?

But what about opportunity in today's world? Is it true, as we are told by the pessimists, that the frontier is no more, that there is nowhere left for a young man to seek his fortune; that corporate rigidity, union solidarity and government regulation leave room only for the human cog who is content to take his place in the giant wheel and revolve slowly toward retirement? Must a man go along with his superiors, even when he feels in his heart they are wrong, in order to succeed in the business world? Is there really room for the man who wants to do something when all around him he hears the refrain, "don't rock the boat"?

Well, again I can provide you a living answer in a man you all have seen on television—George Romney, former head of American Motors and right now embarked on what appears to be a promising political career as Governor of Michigan. As an automobile maker, Romney was a midget among the Detroit giants, who felt he should be thankful with the few crumbs that fell from the big table. But Romney had an idea. He felt the standard Detroit product was too big, too cumbersome and too costly to operate. He voiced his opinion, too—loudly and at every opportunity. In his term, the big car was a "Detroit dinosaur." Obviously, this sort of thing did not endear him to the Detroit faction. And when he had the temerity to suggest that what the American buyer really wanted was a compact car, they derided him. Patiently, in the manner of a teacher with a not-too-bright pupil, they told him that they knew what the public wanted.

They had been in the automobile business much longer than he; they had spent millions on motivational research that told them, positively, that Americans would not buy a small car. Romney felt that motivational research was bunk, and said so, thereby exposing himself to additional scorn from various forward thinkers. But he decided to fly in the face of all this accumulated wisdom and build a compact car anyway; if he failed, the company stood a good chance of going under; yet he had the courage to challenge corporate conformity and go it alone. We all know the answer; a good many of you here today probably are driving one of the compacts that George Romney pioneered. It was also said that he couldn't be elected Governor of Michigan; but, like the bumblebee, he didn't know it. I would like to say that Governor Romney is a Democrat, but honesty compels me to admit that he is a Republican; anyway, this does prove that a Democrat can have nice things to say about a Republican once in a while. So, you see, there is room for the man of ideas in today's business world; it is still the individual who makes the impact, not what the pundits are fond of calling the masses. In fact, there is probably more room than ever before for the man with an idea and the determination to do something about it. In a time of creeping conformity, the nonconformist has a splendid opportunity.

Only a few years ago another man gave us a shining example of ideas in action. At 77—and not in robust health—he was chosen for a post of power and responsibility. Those who selected him for the position assumed he would be an interim head—a caretaker, so to speak, to keep things tidy for his ultimate successor. This man could have, with all respect and honor, done just that. But he had a dream—two dreams, really—and despite his age and failing strength he was determined to do something to bring his cherished dream to reality.

This man broke with tradition in many ways, not always to the pleasure of those around him. He was not content with the status quo, though he might have prolonged his life had he been so; he gave unsparingly of himself; whatever ill he could remedy, he did. I am speaking, of course, of our beloved Pope John XXIII, whose greatness in his brief reign can be measured by the unprecedented tribute paid him in every part of the world, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, upon his sad death. He left as his legacy the first tentative—but nonetheless epochal—steps toward the fulfillment of his golden dream—peace for the world and eventual Christian unity.

Consider the inspiring example of this stalwart man when you are tempted to think of security instead of challenge. Security is a word I feel we use too frequently today. Now, I am not opposed to foresight and prudence, certainly; every thoughtful person ponders security toward the end of his working life. But too many today sacrifice the future for security. I keep thinking of something that a friend of mine told me not long ago; this man, an executive, was interviewing a young man for a starting job with his firm, a job with a good potential. The young man was bright, personable, and articulate. He was a graduate of a good school, he seemed well grounded in the basics required for the job, and my friend had all but signed him on when he killed his chances with a single question. "What," he asked, "is the company's pension policy?" The young man was 22. "That question," my friend said, "told me volumes. Here was a young man simply looking for a job, not a future." What the young man had failed to learn was that success is its own security—and, anyway, as our President once observed, the only total security lies in prison. If total security is to be our goal, then a life-termer is a highly successful man.

Remember, the secure person is not necessarily a happy one; life without risk and challenge is like popcorn without salt; it soon cloys.

Admittedly, there are risks in today's world. The spector of nuclear holocaust haunts us all from time to time; but there have always been risks; in earlier times there were famine and pestilence; in the infant days of our own country the settlers lived under the constant and very real threat of death from marauding Indians. They accepted that risk, as we must accept those of our own time. This acceptance is one of the disciplines of life. We don't buy an automobile from the standpoint of how well it will hold up in a collision; neither do we live with the resignation that our demise in a nuclear Armageddon is inevitable. We consider the risks, and press on toward our goals.

There are challenges in today's world, too, more than ever before in history, though the hand-wringers will tell you that, in Alexander's anguished cry, there are no more worlds to conquer. That is bunk. We are right now on the threshold of the most dramatic era of exploration the world has ever known—that of space. When you are told that there are no more worlds to conquer, mention a name—that of Gordon Cooper. And space is but one area of opportunity—every day we read of breakthroughs in medicine, in electronics, in communications, in every field. It is a better world you are going into, also; we have made progress in social justice; not as much, perhaps, as we would have liked, but we have made progress nonetheless; all of us are far more conscious of injustice than we were only a generation ago; now we must translate our understanding into action; you of the younger generation will pioneer new breakthroughs in the humanities. The important thing is to be a doer, a participant, not a spectator. Get down out of the gallery and get on the stage. You may get a few boos from time to time, but you will get the rewards also.

Earlier, I mentioned that I would be sparing with advice—obviously, I don't wish to share Socrates' fate—and I hope I have been. But, in conclusion, I do wish to leave a few thoughts with you that, under close examination, appear suspiciously like advice. I would rather call them thoughts.

First, never sacrifice character to the spurious cult of popularity. It is far better to be respected than to be popular, whatever that loose word means. Have the courage of your convictions; speak out, not in anger or contentiously but from conviction, when you know you should; don't compromise and don't accommodate to what your heart tells you is wrong; if a friend was drowning, would you stop to think about getting your clothes soaked? Of course not. Your instinct would send you into the water in a second. Then let your instinct lead you in moral decisions; the inconvenience, the trouble, or the unpopularity your decision might bring you will be fleeting; the solid satisfaction of adhering to principle will remain and strengthen you. Do not fear to be a nonconformist; if all of us were conformists we would still be living in caves back in the dim, Jurassic dawn. If the boat needs rocking, rock it. Set yourself a goal and work toward it unswervingly; work without a goal is only pointless drudgery; with a goal it is a thrilling challenge. And above all, keep in mind the lesson learned by Abraham Lincoln in his encounter with the woman in the lane—you can always do something in any situation that faces you in life—so do it. To close, I should like to leave you with what, to me, is one of the most inspiring credos I have ever heard. It was written by Mr. Dean Alfange, who calls it, and I quote, "My Creed." It is also mine, and I hope it will be yours. I quote:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon, if I can. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the state calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and to say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Thank you.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whose merciful, yet just hands is the destiny of Thy children, and whose final appraisals we, who see but through a glass darkly, cannot discern clearly, help us to live and act as if each new day were to be the last with which we would be entrusted with the stewardship of life, knowing that—

The busy tribes of flesh and blood
  With all their cares and fears,
Are carried downward by the flood
  And lost in following years.

Yet, as life on this brief earth stage is granted us, save us from living on a small scale in a great day, and from toying with the tiny when we ought to be lured by the titanic.

In tempestuous days, in the midst of flaming national agitations, grant us the calm wisdom that will perpetuate for all the future the vision of unity in diversity, which is the pulsing heart of free government.

Even amid the fierce fires of national and global contention and division, may all barriers to brotherhood be burned away, as we—as citizens of one commonwealth—choose for the ruling passion of our hearts to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 17, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958";

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications";

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President;

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 and part 2 of the 1963 hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases;

H.R. 3517. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5377. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5932. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers;

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Document No. 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, the Communist Ideology"; and House Document No. 139, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, the Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev";

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Report No. 2559, 87th Congress, 2d session;

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States, Parts 1 and 2"; and

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments (Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and Friends of British Guiana), Parts 1 and 2."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 74. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; and

H.R. 6441. An act to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3517. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 5377. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5932. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. CON. RES. 161

Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Document 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, the Communist Idelogy"; and House Document 139, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, the Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities twenty thousand additional copies each of House Document Numbered 336, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, The Communist Ideology"; and House Document Numbered 139, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume II, The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev".

H. CON. RES. 162

Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Report No. 2559, 87th Congress, 2d session

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 2559, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1961."

H. CON. RES. 163

Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States, Parts 1 and 2"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies each of the publications entitled "Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States, Parts 1 and 2", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

H. CON. RES. 164

Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of the publications entitled "U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments (Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and Friends of British Guiana), Parts 1 and 2"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies each of the publications entitled "U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments (Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and Friends of British Guiana), Parts 1 and 2," Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Water and Air Pollution Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Donald C. Greenman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was seeking recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, and send to the desk, a bill which has been proposed by the President of the United States, dealing with one of the most compelling questions now facing the United States. This is the question of whether all our citizens, regardless of the color they may have been born with, shall have an equal chance to participate in the responsibilities and opportunities of our Nation.

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to eliminate discrimination in places of public accommodation. This is one aspect of the total legislative problem with which the President's message deals. The bill covers a particularly difficult problem in an area much in need of adjustment.

It is my hope that the bill will be referred to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Washington is chairman. I am confident it will there receive the careful examination and consideration which this new and complex area requires.

It is my intention later this afternoon, together with the distinguished minority leader, to submit to the Senate an additional bill which will cover a great many of the legislative questions involved in the present issue, and on which we are in accord.

Our Nation was built on the ideal that each individual, if given the opportunity to develop those gifts that God has given him to the fullest extent possible, would make the greatest contribution in return to both himself and his society as well. Upon this principle we have developed the greatest nation the world has ever seen. But we have not in all cases kept true to this ideal; and the time has come when those to whom we have denied it ask to be included. This is all they seek—elemental things, like a chance to go to school and vote, which the rest of us have enjoyed without a moment's thought. What they wish is only that which other Americans have always had.

In the last weeks, many people throughout the country have willingly begun what is always a painful process of change. They have recognized their obligation to resolve this question in those ways of which they are capable. Shortly, it will be our time here. We do not fool ourselves that it will be easy; but with the honest support of all those Members in this great body who truly believe that men are born free and that freedom was meant for all our people, we will pass a law which will advance this end.

Let me say that those men who agree on this end will have to bring their disagreement on means to a common point of view. Democrats, Republicans, liberal, moderate or conservative, we must respect the right of others to honestly defend their opinion. But if we are to bring this matter to a successful finish, we must be willing to exercise the most demanding qualities of the legislative process.

We will work and wrestle with each suggestion for improvement, in committee and on the floor. But if those who agree that something must be done do not, at the final moment, agree on something that can be done, there will be no bill. Those who then say the bill did not go far enough or went too far will do their cause and the Nation they serve and this institution in which they serve a great disservice.

It is in the attempt to approach this agreement on means that Senator Dirksen and I have worked together, in consultation with the President of the United States, on this bill.

We are not in accord on every point, such as the provisions dealing with public accommodations; but we are still constantly working toward agreement. Some approach—and we are greatly indebted to Senator Aiken for his concise statement of the problem—will, I predict, eventually be reached.

These bills will now be referred to the appropriate committees. It is my hope—and I now appeal to the chairmen concerned and all Senators—to give these measures their immediate and closest attention, so that we may begin debate on the floor at the earliest possible time.

In the days ahead, two great questions will be decided. The first I have already mentioned: it is simply whether American freedom and ideals are meant to be for all our people. The second question will be whether our free and balanced Government is capable of bringing to conclusion this issue which so divides us. I am hopeful that the answer of the Senate to both of them will be "Yes."

Mr. President, I ask that the two bills now introduced and the one to be introduced later this afternoon be held at the desk until the conclusion of business on Monday next, for the purpose of giving an opportunity to all Senators who may desire to do so to join in sponsoring them.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on the same subject——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the request of the Senator from Montana. Will he rephrase his request, so the Chair can understand to which bill he refers?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, Mr. President, the bill having to do with title II only—the public accommodations bill—and the administration's bill, both of which are at the desk. I ask that they and the bill which the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Dirksen, and I will introduce later this afternoon be held at the desk until the conclusion of business on Monday next, for the purpose of allowing other Senators who may desire to do so to join in sponsoring them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I believe that the majority leader, at the beginning of his statement, asked that a bill be referred to a particular committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I asked that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thought the Senator made the statement that one of the bills should be referred to the committee headed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I expressed the hope that it would be so referred.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The question I raise refers to that statement. There is a statute which provides what committees shall handle certain proposed legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am only asking that the law be carried out, and that no special or preferential treatment be started in the Senate in regard to the referral of bills. If it is, we shall have trouble in the future in regard to other subjects. I ask that the rules be strictly carried out in regard to the introduction of any bills.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in wholehearted accord with what the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina has said. For the edification of the Senate, I repeat the particular paragraph of my statement to which the Senator has referred:

> It is my hope that it will be referred to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Washington is chairman.

I did not ask that the bill be referred to that particular committee; I am hopeful that it will be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois wish the Senator from Montana to yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I seek recognition in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Montana concluded?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I should like to express my appreciation for the restraint which the majority leader has exercised over a considerable period of time with respect to the highly emotional subject of civil rights. Numerous conferences have been held at the White House. There have been party conferences on both sides of the aisle. We are aware of the sharp diversity of opinion with respect to the whole subject matter. The approach now taken will give every Senator an opportunity to manifest not only his interest, but what he proposes to do about its disposition.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would appreciate it if the Senator would permit me to conclude my statement.

We refer to the administration bill as "the package bill." It contains eight titles.

The first title of the bill deals with voting. It includes a presumption of literacy on the basis of a sixth grade certificate.

The second title is the highly controversial title dealing with accommodations and public services. It has been modified somewhat from the original draft, which is the one that I could not accept—first, because I do not believe it would be enforcible; second, I think it would contravene the Constitution and would be an invasion of a private right.

The third title deals with desegregation of schools. It provides for loans and grants as well as special training.

The fourth title deals with the setup of a community relations service in the Office of the President.

The fifth title would extend the Civil Rights Commission until December 1967 and would spell out some of its procedure in the statute.

The sixth title is a negative approach with respect to facilities and projects in which Federal funds would be used. Of course, it deals with segregation, discrimination and the interpretation which is to be placed upon them.

The seventh title is the so-called equality-of-job-opportunity title, presently covered by the President's Commission, of which the distinguished Vice President is now the Chairman. It has no statutory authority. It was created by Executive order and, of course, it must get its funds by assessing the appropriate agencies and departments of Government.

The eighth title deals with appropriations.

What is now before the Senate and will be before the committees in due course is the entire package containing eight titles. There will be another bill which will be introduced this afternoon, from which the highly controversial title II has been deleted.

Finally, there will be a separate bill which will deal entirely with title II and nothing more.

I believe everyone appreciates that the problem is a national one. As a party leader, I try to remember that I have some obligation to fulfill the pledges that my party made to the country in its platform of 1960. I have an obligation to my party members, and I try to see it as objectively as possible.

The bills will be at the desk until the end of business on Monday, and Senators who care to join in cosponsorship can do so. I do not believe a more extended statement is necessary at this time. Certainly there will be hearings, and those hearings will be thorough on every part of the program before it finally comes to the Senate for action.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. As a matter of information, will the Senator advise whether the so-called package of bills contains what is commonly called proposed FEPC legislation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that if the Senator will read the President's message with reference to such proposed legislation which has already been introduced, he will see that the President expressed his hope that it will be given serious consideration.

Mr. CASE. I have read the President's message. As the Senator said, the President indicates that he favors pending proposed legislation which a number of us have introduced, but it is not included in the package which he has presented.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be in order at this time to ask that the bill lie on the desk and that Senators be notified, say, 1 day before the bill is referred to the committee to which it is to be referred. The reason I make that suggestion is that heretofore such measures have been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Montana ask unanimous consent that the bills remain at the desk and not be referred until next Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I did not. I asked that the bills be referred to the appropriate committees.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed, and that they also be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 1731) to enforce the constitutional right of vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mansfield, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Act of 1963."

Sec. 2. (a) Discrimination by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin is incompatible with the concepts of liberty and equality to which the Government of the United States is dedicated. In recent years substantial steps have been taken toward eliminating such discrimination throughout the Nation. Nevertheless, many citizens of the United States, solely because of their race, color, or national origin, are denied rights and privileges accorded to other citizens and thereby subjected to inconveniences, humiliations, and hardships. Such discrimination impairs the general welfare of the United States by preventing the fullest development of the capabilities of the whole citizenry and by limiting participation in the economic, political, and cultural life of the Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare by eliminating discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin in voting, education, and public accommodations through the exercise by Congress of the powers conferred upon it to regulate the manner of holding Federal elections, to enforce the provisions of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, to regulate commerce among the several States, and to make laws necessary and proper to execute the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution.

(c) It is also desirable that disputes or disagreements arising in any community from the discriminatory treatment of individuals for reasons of race, color, or national origin shall be resolved on a voluntary basis, without hostility or litigation. Accordingly, it is the further purpose of this Act to promote this end by providing machinery for the voluntary settlement of such disputes and disagreements.

TITLE I—VOTING RIGHTS

Sec. 101. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended by section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637), and as further amended by section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 90), is further amended as follows:

(a) Insert "1" after "(a)" in subsection (a) and add at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) No person acting under color of law shall—

"(A) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law to vote in any Federal election apply any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied to individuals similarly situated who have been found by State officials to be qualified to vote.

"(B) deny the right of any individual to vote in any Federal election because of an error or omission of such individual on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material in determining whether such individual is qualified under State law to vote in such election; or

"(C) employ any literacy test as a qualification for voting in any Federal election unless (i) such test is administered to each individual wholly in writing and (ii) a certified copy of the test and of the answers given by the individual is furnished to him within twenty-five days of the submission of his written request made within the period of time during which records and papers are required to be retained and preserved pursuant to title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1974–74e; 74 Stat. 88).

"(3) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'vote' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (e) of this section;

"(B) the words 'Federal election' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (f) of this section; and

"(C) the phrase 'literacy test' includes any test of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter."

(b) Insert immediately following the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "If in any such proceeding literacy is a relevant fact it shall be presumed that any person who has not been adjudged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory or the District of Columbia where instruction is carried on predominantly in the English language, possesses sufficient literacy, comprehension, and intelligence to vote in any Federal election as defined in subsection (f) of this section."

(c) Add the following subsection "(f)" and designate the present subsection "(f)" as subsection "(g)":

"(f) Whenever in any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) the complaint requests a finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), and such complaint, or a motion filed within twenty days after the effective date of this Act in the case of any proceeding which is pending before a district court on such effective date, (1) is signed by the Attorney General (or in his absence the Acting Attorney General), and (2) alleges that in the affected area fewer than 15 per centum of the total number of voting age persons of the same race as the persons alleged in the complaint to have been discriminated against are registered (or otherwise recorded as qualified to vote), any person resident within the affected area who is of the same race as the persons alleged to have been discriminated against shall be entitled, upon his application therefor, to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that at any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. Such order shall be effective as to any Federal or State election held within the longest period for which such applicant could have been registered or otherwise qualified under State law at which the applicant's qualifications would under State law entitle him to vote: *Provided,* That in the event it is determined upon final disposition of the proceeding, including any review, that no pattern or practice of deprivation of any right secured by subsection (a) exists, the order shall thereafter no longer qualify the applicant to vote in any subsequent election.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State law or the action of any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote as provided herein. The Attorney General shall cause to be transmitted certified copies of any order declaring a person qualified to vote to the appropriate election officers. The refusal by any such officer with notice of such order to permit any person so qualified to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"The court may appoint one or more persons, to be known as temporary voting referees, to receive applications pursuant to this subsection and to take evidence and report to the court findings as to whether at any election or elections (1) any applicant entitled under this subsection to apply for an order declaring him qualified to vote is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. The procedure for processing applications under this subsection and for the entry of orders shall be the same as that provided for in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of subsection (e).

"In appointing a temporary voting referee the court shall make its selection from a panel provided by the Judicial Conference of the circuit. Any temporary voting referee shall be a resident and a qualified voter of the State in which he is to serve. He shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 16), and shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers conferred upon a master by rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed any persons appointed by the district court pursuant to this subsection shall be fixed by the court and shall be payable by the United States. In the event that the district court shall appoint a retired officer or employee of the United States to serve as a temporary voting referee, such officer or employee shall continue to receive, in addition to any compensation for services rendered pursuant to this subsection, all retirement benefits to which he may otherwise be entitled.

"The court or temporary voting referee shall entertain applications and the court shall issue orders pursuant to this subsection until final disposition of the proceeding under subsection (c), including any review, or until the finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), whichever shall first occur. Applications pursuant to this subsection shall be determined expeditiously, and this subsection shall in no way be construed as a limitation upon the existing powers of the court.

"When used in this subsection, the words 'Federal election' shall mean any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives; the words 'State election' shall mean any other general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for public office; the words 'affected area' shall mean that county, parish, or similar subdivision of the State in which the laws of the State relating to voting are or have been administered by a person who is a defendant in the proceeding instituted under subsection (c) on the date the original complaint is filed; and the words 'voting age persons' shall mean those persons who meet the age requirements of State law for voting."

(d) Add the following subsection "(h)":

"(h) In any civil action brought in any district court of the United States under this section or title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1974–74e; 74 Stat. 88) wherein the United States or the Attorney General is plaintiff, it shall be the duty of the chief judge of the district (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) in which the case is pending immediately to designate a judge in such district to hear and determine the case. In the event that no judge in the district is available to hear and determine the case, the chief judge of the district, or the acting chief judge, as the case may be, shall certify this fact to the chief judge of the circuit (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) who shall then designate a district or circuit judge of the circuit to hear and determine the case.

"It shall be the duty of the judge designated pursuant to this section to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be in every way expedited."

TITLE II—INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Findings

SEC. 201. (a) The American people have become increasingly mobile during the last generation, and millions of American citizens travel each year from State to State by rail, air, bus, automobile, and other means. A substantial number of such travelers are members of minority racial and religious groups. These citizens, particularly Negroes, are subjected in many places to discrimination and segregation, and they are frequently unable to obtain the goods and services available to other interstate travelers.

(b) Negroes and members of other minority groups who travel interstate are frequently unable to obtain adequate lodging accommodations during their travels, with the result that they may be compelled to stay at hotels or motels of poor and inferior quality, travel great distances from their normal routes to find adequate accommodations, or make detailed arrangements for lodging far in advance of scheduled interstate travel.

(c) Negroes and members of other minority groups who travel interstate are frequently unable to obtain adequate food service at convenient places along their routes, with the result that many are dissuaded from traveling interstate, while others must travel considerable distances from their intended routes in order to obtain adequate food service.

(d) Goods, services, and persons in the amusement and entertainment industries commonly move in interstate commerce, and the entire American people benefit from the increased cultural and recreational opportunities afforded thereby. Practices of audience discrimination and segregation artificially restrict the number of persons to whom the interstate amusement and entertainment industries may offer their goods and services. The burdens imposed on interstate commerce by such practices and the obstructions to the free flow of commerce which result therefrom are serious and substantial.

(e) Retail establishments in all States of the Union purchase a wide variety and a large volume of goods from business concerns located in other States and in foreign nations. Discriminatory practices in such establishments, which in some instances have led to the withholding of patronage by those affected by such practices, inhibit and restrict the normal distribution of goods in the interstate market.

(f) Fraternal, religious, scientific, and other organizations engaged in interstate operations are frequently dissuaded from holding conventions in cities which they would otherwise select because the public facilities in such cities are either not open to all members of racial or religious minority groups or are available only on a segregated basis.

(g) Business organizations are frequently hampered in obtaining the services of skilled workers and persons in the professions who are likely to encounter discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin in restaurants, retail stores, and places of amusement in the area where their services are needed. Business organizations which seek to avoid subjecting their employees to such discrimination and to avoid the strife resulting therefrom are restricted in the choice of location for their offices and plants. Such discrimination thus reduces the mobility of the national labor force and prevents the most effective allocation of national resources, including the interstate movement of industries, particularly in some of the areas of the Nation most in need of industrial and commercial expansion and development.

(h) The discriminatory practices described above are in all cases encouraged, fostered, or tolerated in some degree by the governmental authorities of the States in which they occur, which license or protect the businesses involved by means of laws and ordinances and the activities of their executive and judicial officers. Such discriminatory practices, particularly when their cumulative effect throughout the Nation is considered, take on the character of action by the States and therefore fall within the ambit of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(i) The burdens on and obstructions to commerce which are described above can best be removed by invoking the powers of Congress under the Fourtheenth Amendment and the Commerce Clause of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin in certain public establishments.

Right to nondiscrimination in places of public accommodation

SEC. 202. (a) All persons shall be entitled, without discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the following public establishments:

(1) any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transient guests, including guests from other States or traveling in interstate commerce;

(2) any motion picture house, theater, sports arena, stadium, exhibition hall, or other public place of amusement or entertainment which customarily presents motion pictures, performing groups, athletic teams, exhibitions, or other sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce; and

(3) any retail shop, department store, market, drug store, gasoline station, or other public place which keeps goods for sale, any restaurant, lunch room, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other public place engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, and any other establishment where goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent, or hire, if

(i) the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by any such place or establishment are provided to a substantial degree to interstate travelers,

(ii) a substantial portion of any goods held out to the public by any such place or establishment for sale, use, rent, or hire has moved in interstate commerce,

(iii) the activities or operations of such place or establishment otherwise substantially affect interstate travel or the interstate movement of goods in commerce, or

(iv) such place or establishment is an integral part of an establishment included under this subsection.

For the purpose of this subsection, the term "integral part" means physically located on the premises occupied by an establishment, or located contiguous to such premises and owned, operated, or controlled, directly or indirectly, by or for the benefit of, or leased from the persons or business entities which own, operate or control an establishment.

(b) The provisions of this title shall not apply to a bona fide private club or other establishment not open to the public, except to the extent that the facilities of such establishment are made available to the customers or patrons of an establishment within the scope of subsection (a).

Prohibition against denial of or interference with the right to nondiscrimination

SEC. 203. No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall (a) withhold, deny, or attempt to withhold or deny, or deprive or attempt to deprive, any person of any right or privilege secured by section 202, or (b) interfere or attempt to interfere with any right or privilege secured by section 202, or (c) intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person with a purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by section 202, or (d) punish or attempt to punish any person for exercising or attempting to exercise any right or privilege secured by section 202, or (e) incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the foregoing.

Civil action for preventive relief

SEC. 204. (a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 203, a civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may be instituted (1) by the person aggrieved, or (2) by the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States if he certifies that he has received a written complaint from the person aggrieved and that in his judgment (i) the person aggrieved is unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings and (ii) the purposes of this title will be materially furthered by the filing of an action.

(b) In any action commenced pursuant to this title by the person aggrieved, he shall if he prevails be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs.

(c) A person shall be deemed unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person is unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation by him would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person, his family, or his property.

(d) In case of any complaint received by the Attorney General alleging a violation of section 203 in any jurisdiction where State or local laws or regulations appear to him to forbid the act or practice involved, the Attorney General shall notify the appropriate State and local officials and, upon request, afford them a reasonable time to act under such State or local laws or regulations before he institutes an action. In the case of any other complaint alleging a violation of section 203, the Attorney General shall, before instituting an action, refer the matter to the Community Relations Service established by title IV of this Act, which shall endeavor to secure compliance by voluntary procedures. No action shall be instituted by the Attorney General less than thirty days after such referral unless the Community Relations Service notifies him that its efforts have been unsuccessful. Compliance with the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not be required if the Attorney General shall file with the court a certificate that the delay consequent upon compliance with such provisions in the particular case would adversely affect the interests of the United States, or that, in the particular case, compliance with such provisions would be fruitless.

Jurisdiction

SEC. 205. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this title and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the aggrieved party shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

(b) This title shall not preclude any individual or any State or local agency from pursuing any remedy that may be available under any Federal or State law, including any State statute or ordinance requiring nondiscrimination in public establishments or accommodations.

TITLE III—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Definitions

SEC. 301. As used in this title—

(a) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) "Public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution, and "public college" means any institution of higher education or any technical or vocational school above the secondary school level, operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated wholly or predominantly from or through the use of governmental funds or property, or funds or property derived from a governmental source.

(d) "School board" means any agency or agencies which administer a system of one or more public schools and any other agency which is responsible for the assignment of students to or within such system.

Assistance to facilitate desegregation

SEC. 302. The Commissioner shall conduct investigations and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, upon the extent to which equal education opportunities are denied to individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon the application of any school board, State, municipality, school district, or other governmental unit, to render technical assistance in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools or other plans designed to deal with problems arising from racial imbalance in public school systems. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies information regarding effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or racial imbalance, and making available to such agencies personnel of the Office of Education or other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with such problems.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or measures to adjust racial imbalance in public school systems. Individuals who attend such an institute may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance at such institute in amounts specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including allowances for dependents and including allowances for travel to attend such institute.

SEC. 304. (a) A school board which has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction, or a school board which is confronted with problems arising from racial imbalance in the public schools within its jurisdiction, may apply to the Commissioner, either directly or through another governmental unit, for a grant or loan, as hereinafter provided, for the purpose of aiding such school board in carrying out desegregation or in dealing with problems of racial imbalance.

(b) The Commissioner may make a grant under this section, upon application therefor, for—

(1) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance in public schools; and

(2) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance and of providing other assistance to develop understanding of these problems by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public.

(c) Each application made for a grant under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend certain of its own funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Commissioner shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance, and such other factors as he finds relevant.

(d) The Commissioner may make a loan under this section, upon application, to any school board or to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates if the Commissioner finds that—

(1) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to any such school board, either directly or through the local government within whose jurisdiction it operates, have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governmental action because of the actual or prospective desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board;

(2) such school board has authority to receive and expend, or such local government has authority to receive and make available for the use of such board, the proceeds of such loan; and

(3) the proceeds of such loan will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise have been used.

(e) Each application made for a loan under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Any loan under this section shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(f) The Commissioner may suspend or terminate assistance under this section to any school board which, in his judgment, is failing to comply in good faith with the terms and conditions upon which the assistance was extended.

Sec. 305. Payments pursuant to a grant or contract under this title may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, and on such conditions, as the Commissioner may determine.

Sec. 306. The Commissioner shall prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of sections 301 through 305 of this title.

Suits by the Attorney General

Sec. 307. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint—

(1) signed by a parent or group of parents to the effect that his or their minor children, as members of a class of persons similarly situated, are being deprived of the equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or

(2) signed by an individual, or his parent, to the effect that he has been denied admission to or not permitted to continue in attendance at a public college by reason of race, color, religion or national origin, and the Attorney General certifies that in his judgment the signer or signers of such complaint are unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief and that the institution of an action will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action in a district court of the United States against such parties and for such relief as may be appropriate, and such court shall have and shall exercise jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section. The Attorney General may implead as defendants such additional parties as are or become necessary to the grant of effective relief hereunder.

(b) A person or persons shall be deemed unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person or persons are unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or persons, their families, or their property.

(c) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or of a public college to admit or permit the continued attendance of an individual, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action if he certifies that, in his judgment, the plaintiffs are unable to maintain the action for any of the reasons set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and that such intervention will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action under subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The term "parent" as used in this section includes other legal representatives.

Sec. 308. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General or of the United States under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

Sec. 309. In any action or proceeding under this title the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

Sec. 310. Nothing in this title shall affect adversely the right of any person to sue for or obtain relief in any court against discrimination in public education.

TITLE IV—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Sec. 401. There is hereby established a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year. The Director is authorized to appoint such additional officers and employees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Sec. 402. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever in its judgment peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate local official or other interested person.

Sec. 403. (a) The Service shall whenever possible in performing its functions under this title seek and utilize the cooperation of the appropriate State or local agencies and may seek and utilize the cooperation of any nonpublic agency which it believes may be helpful.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing assistance under this title shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service.

Sec. 404. Subject to the provisions of section 403(b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation necessary for improvements in such internal administration.

TITLE V—COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Sec. 501. Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975a; 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"*Rules of procedure or the commission Hearings*

"Sec. 102. (a) The Chairman, or one designated by him to act as Chairman at a hearing of the Commission, shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing.

"(b) A copy of the Commission's rules shall be made available to the witness before the Commission.

"(c) Witnesses at the hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

"(d) The Chairman or Acting Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum and unprofessional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings.

"(e) If the Commission determines that evidence or testimony at any hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall receive such evidence or testimony or summary of such evidence or testimony in executive session. In the event the Commission determines that such evidence or testimony shall be given at a public session, it shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

"(f) Except as provided in sections 102 and 105(f) of this Act, the Chairman shall receive and the Commission shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

"(g) No evidence or testimony or summary of evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases or uses in public without the consent of the Commission such evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year.

"(h) In the discretion of the Commission, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Commission is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings.

"(i) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Commission.

"(j) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $6 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 10 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $10 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission or any subcommittee thereof.

"(k) The Commission shall not issue any subpena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written or other matter which would require the presence of the party subpenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State wherein the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process except that, in any event, the Commission may issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of written or other matter at a hearing held within fifty miles of the place where the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process."

Sec. 502. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(a); 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. (a) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2; 60 Stat. 808)."

SEC. 503. Section 103(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(b); 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835-42; 63 Stat. 166)."

SEC. 504. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c; 71 Stat. 635), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals in respect to equal protection of the laws, including, but not limited to, the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice?

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate the performance of its duties on those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs on one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, and shall submit to the President and to the Congress a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations not later than September 30, 1967.

"(c) Sixty days after the submission of its final report and recommendations the Commission shall cease to exist."

SEC. 505. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(d); 71 Stat. 636) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

SEC. 506. Section 105(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975 (g); 71 Stat. 636) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the United States Court of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed as agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof."

SEC. 507. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d; 71 Stat. 636), as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h); 74 Stat. 89), is further amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

TITLE VI—NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any such program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

TITLE VII—COMMISSION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 701. The President is authorized to establish a Commission to be known as the "Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity," hereinafter referred to as the Commission. It shall be the function of the Commission to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the United States Government is provided by way of grant, contract, loan, conferred upon it by the President. The Commission shall have such powers to effectuate the purposes of this title as may be conferred upon it by the President. The President may also confer upon the Commission such powers as he deems appropriate to prevent discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin in Government employment.

SEC. 702. The Commission shall consist of the Vice President, who shall serve as Chairman, the Secretary of Labor, who shall serve as Vice Chairman, and not more than fifteen other members appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President. Members of the Commission, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise serving at the request of the Commission, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by it but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 73b-2 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 703. (a) There shall be an Executive Vice Chairman of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President and who shall be ex officio a member of the Commission. The Executive Vice Chairman shall assist the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the members of the Commission and shall be responsible for carrying out the orders and recommendations of the Commission and for performing such other functions as the Commission may direct.

(b) Section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2205(a)), is further amended by adding the following clause thereto:

"(52) Executive Vice-Chairman, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity."

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and is authorized to procure services as authorized by section 14 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 a day.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 802. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The bill (S. 1732) to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations affecting interstate commerce; introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interstate Public Accommodations Act of 1963."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. (a) The American people have become increasingly mobile during the last generation, and millions of American citizens travel each year from State to State by rail, air, bus, automobile, and other means. A substantial number of such travelers are members of minority racial and religious groups. These citizens, particularly Negroes, are subjected in many places to discrimination and segregation, and they are frequently unable to obtain the goods and services available to other interstate travelers.

(b) Negroes and members of other minority groups who travel interstate are frequently unable to obtain adequate lodging accommodations during their travels, with the result that they may be compelled to stay at hotels or motels of poor and inferior quality, travel great distances from their normal routes to find adequate accommodations, or make detailed arrangements for lodging far in advance of scheduled interstate travel.

(c) Negroes and members of other minority groups who travel interstate are frequently unable to obtain adequate food service at convenient places along their routes, with the result that many are dissuaded from traveling interstate, while others must travel considerable distances from their intended routes in order to obtain adequate food service.

(d) Goods, services, and persons in the amusement and entertainment industries commonly move in interstate commerce, and the entire American people benefit from the increased cultural and recreational opportunities afforded thereby. Practices of audience discrimination and segregation artificially restrict the number of persons to whom the interstate amusement and entertainment industries may offer their goods and services. The burdens imposed on interstate commerce by such practices and the obstructions to the free flow of commerce which result therefrom are serious and substantial.

(e) Retail establishments in all States of the Union purchase a wide variety and a large volume of goods from business concerns located in other States and in foreign nations. Discriminatory practices in such establishments, which in some instances have led to the withholding of patronage by those affected by such practices, inhibit and restrict the normal distribution of goods in the interstate market.

(f) Fraternal, religious, scientific, and other organizations engaged in interstate operations are frequently dissuaded from holding conventions in cities which they would otherwise select because the public facilities in such cities are either not open to all members of racial or religious minority groups or are available only on a segregated basis.

(g) Business organizations are frequently hampered in obtaining the services of skilled workers and persons in the professions who are likely to encounter discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin in restaurants, retail stores, and places of amusement in the area where their services are needed. Business organizations which seek to avoid subjecting their employees to such discrimination and to avoid the strife resulting therefrom are restricted in the choice of location for their offices and plants. Such discrimination thus reduces the mobility of the national labor force and prevents the most effective allocation of national resources, including the interstate movement of industries, particularly in some of the areas of the Nation most in need of industrial and commercial expansion and development.

(h) The discriminatory practices described above are in all cases encouraged, fostered, or tolerated in some degree by the governmental authorities of the States in which they occur, which license or protect the businesses involved by means of laws and ordinances and the activities of their executive and judicial officers. Such discriminatory practices, particularly when their cumulative effect throughout the Nation is considered, take on the character of action by the States and therefore fall within the ambit of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(i) The burdens on and obstructions to commerce which are described above can best be removed by invoking the powers of Congress under the Fourteenth Amendment and the Commerce Clause of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin in certain public establishments.

RIGHT TO NONDISCRIMINATION IN PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION

SEC. 3. (a) All persons shall be entitled, without discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the following public establishments:

(1) any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transient guests, including guests from other States or traveling in interstate commerce;

(2) any motion picture house, theatre, sports arena, stadium, exhibition hall, or other public place of amusement or entertainment which customarily presents motion pictures, performing groups, athletic teams, exhibitions, or other sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce; and

(3) any retail shop, department store, market, drug store, gasoline station, or other public place which keeps goods for sale, any restaurant, lunch room, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other public place engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, and any other establishment where goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent, or hire, if

(i) the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by any such place or establishment are provided to a substantial degree to interstate travelers,

(ii) a substantial portion of any goods held out to the public by any such place or establishment for sale, use, rent, or hire has moved in interstate commerce,

(iii) the activities or operations of such place or establishment otherwise substantially affect interstate travel or the interstate movement of goods in commerce, or

(iv) such place or establishment is an integral part of an establishment included under this subsection.

For the purpose of this subsection, the term "integral part" means physically located on the premises occupied by an establishment, or located contiguous to such premises and owned, operated, or controlled, directly or indirectly, by or for the benefit of, or leased from the persons or business entities which own, operate or control an establishment.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall not apply to a bona fide private club or other establishment not open to the public, except to the extent that the facilities of such establishment are made available to the customers or patrons of an establishment within the scope of subsection (a).

PROHIBITION AGAINST DENIAL OF OR INTERFERENCE WITH THE RIGHT TO NONDISCRIMINATION

SEC. 4. No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall (a) withhold, deny, or attempt to withhold or deny, or deprive or attempt to deprive, any person of any right or privilege secured by section 3, or (b) interfere or attempt to interfere with any right or privilege secured by section 3, or (c) intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person with a purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by section 3, or (d) punish or attempt to punish any person for exercising or attempting to exercise any right or privilege secured by section 3, or (e) incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the foregoing.

CIVIL ACTION FOR PREVENTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 4, a civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may be instituted (1) by the person aggrieved, or (2) by the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States if he certifies that he has received a written complaint from the person aggrieved and that in his judgment (i) the person aggrieved is unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings and (ii) the purposes of this Act will be materially furthered by the filing of an action.

(b) In any action commenced pursuant to this Act by the person aggrieved, he shall if he prevails be allowed a reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs.

(c) A person shall be deemed unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person is unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation by him would jeoardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person, his family, or his property.

(d) In case of any complaint received by the Attorney General alleging a violation of section 4 in any jurisdiction where State or local laws or regulations appear to him to forbid the act or practice involved, the Attorney General shall notify the appropriate State and local officials and, upon request, afford them a reasonable time to act under such State or local laws or regulations before he institutes an action. Compliance with the foregoing sentence shall not be required if the Attorney General shall file with the court a certificate that the delay consequent upon such compliance in the particular case would adversely affect the interests of the United States, or that, in the particular case, compliance would be fruitless.

(e) In any case of a complaint received by the Attorney General, including a case within the scope of subsection (d), the Attorney General shall, before instituting an action, utilize the services of any Federal agency or instrumentality which may be available to attempt to secure compliance with section 4 by voluntary procedures, if in his judgment such procedures are likely to be effective in the circumstances.

JURISDICTION

SEC. 6. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this Act and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the aggrieved party shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

(b) This Act shall not preclude any individual or any State or local agency from pursuing any remedy that may be available under any Federal or State law, including any State statute or ordinance requiring nondiscrimination in public establishments or accommodations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1964, FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964, in the amount of $104,640, for the legislative branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FACILITATION OF WORK OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

H.R. 3872. An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1032. A bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916 (Rept. No. 261).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 535. A bill to extend the principles of equitable adjudication to sales under the Alaska Public Sale Act (Rept. No. 264).

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1122. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, and the recreation area contiguous to such lake in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area" (Rept. No. 279).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 130. A bill to change the name of Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case (Rept. No. 266);

S. 131. A bill to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe (Rept. No. 269);

S. 453. A bill to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala. (Rept. No. 267);

S. 850. A bill to change the name of the Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir in the State of Idaho to the Dworshak Dam and Reservoir (Rept. No. 268);

H.R. 5367. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam (Rept. No. 272); and

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir (Rept. No. 273).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 530. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the Saint Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year (Rept. No. 270).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1523. A bill to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 271).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 142. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Clark Canyon Dam in the State of Montana as Hap Hawkins Lake (Rept. No. 274).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1416. A bill to amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 275).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 626. A bill to increase the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects (Rept. No. 276).

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 254. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building (Rept. No. 277); and

S. 1139. A bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 278).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 5860. An act to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended (Rept. No. 280).

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 332 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (REPT. NO. 263)

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit a report on S. 979 to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit, together with individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating]. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1731. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1732. A bill to eliminate discrimination in public accomodations affecting interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Margitta McCannel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1734. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use; and

S. 1735. A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1736. A bill to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1737. A bill for the relief of Arthur Wendell Bolta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1738. A bill for the relief of Anita P. Daoang;

S. 1739. A bill for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 1740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiku Sakurai; and

S. 1741. A bill for the relief of Eusebio R. Balmilero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1742. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1743. A bill for the relief of Mary Collier Trotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1744. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1745. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to National and State political committees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1747. A bill to incorporate the Spacetown Drum and Bugle Corps of Derry, N.H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1748. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or highway bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1749. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of synthetic pile velvet ribbons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 1750. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Goldwater):

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of Delaware when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Beall when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; and

S.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Holy Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution relative to Bible reading and prayers in educational institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

TIME FOR PRAYERFUL MEDITATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HARTKE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 164) favoring a time for prayerful meditation in public schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Hartke, which appears under a separate heading.)

DISCOUNT RATE TO BE USED IN ANALYZING BENEFIT-COST RATIO IN LAND AND WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. Lausche) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 165) relative to the discount rate to be used in analyzing the benefit-cost ratio in land and water resources projects, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Proxmire, which appears under a separate heading.)

JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION OVER CERTAIN INTERSTATE SALES OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1734) to amend the Natural Gas Act to vest jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission over certain interstate sales of natural gas for industrial use, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am submitting herewith as part of the Commission's 1963 legislative program a proposed amendment to section 1 of the Natural Gas Act to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over direct interstate sales of natural gas by producers and by pipelines to industrial consumers. Most industrial consumers purchase natural gas from local distribution companies which, in turn, purchase it from interstate pipelines for distribution to residential, commercial, and industrial customers. Not infrequently, however, industrial customers buy from the pipeline directly or in some instances directly from a producer with a pipeline providing merely a transportation function.

Under existing law the Commission's authority is limited to sales for resale in interstate commerce; hence, the price and other terms of a direct sale by a pipeline to an industrial consumer are outside the sphere of this Commission's regulatory authority. Similarly, existing law can be construed to permit a natural gas producer to escape the Commission's rate jurisdiction by contracting directly with industrial consumers and having a new or existing pipeline transport gas for the producer's account.[1] As explained more fully below, this gap in the Commission's jurisdiction has not been closed by adequate State regulation. As a result, the pipeline companies have set industrial gas prices to some industrial customers at levels exceeding costs plus reasonable profits, and are free to discriminate between industrial customers. And natural gas producers seeking to escape the Commission's jurisdiction have attempted to make direct industrial sales of gas which would be transported over pipelines serving only industrial customers, even though this may lead to uneconomic transportation and may divert natural gas resources from consumer markets where its use is most in the public interest.[2]

The Natural Gas Act has been construed to leave the States free to regulate direct industrial sales, but many simply do not do so. In several States, attempts by regulatory commissions to assert jurisdiction over these sales have been thwarted by the pipelines in the State courts which have held that interstate pipelines selling to individual consumers on a contract basis are not "public utilities" [3] or that such sales are not "intrastate".[4] Consequently, these courts have held, the transactions are beyond the reach of the State commissions. Even the States which do regulate direct pipeline industrial sales frequently only require that the pipelines file rates negotiated between them and industrial customers, but, at least in the absence of complaint, do not examine the contracts to see if they are fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory.[5] The absence of effective State regulation of these sales may reflect the difficulty a State commission would face in determining the portion of an interstate pipeline's total cost of service applicable solely to direct industrial sales made within the particular State. That determination would be extremely complex and time consuming.

This system invites discrimination between customers on the basis of bargaining power—one of the principal evils public utility rate regulation is designed to cure.

Since State regulation of these sales, in most cases, is either nonexistent or ineffective, industrial rates charged by interstate pipelines are often much higher than could be justified by cost considerations. The attached schedule shows just how far out of line some pipelines' industrial sale prices are. Based on cost of service studies in connection with relatively recent rate cases, the figures show that seven out of eight major pipelines' revenues from industrial sales exceeded costs—including a reasonable return on investment—by amounts ranging downward from 57 percent. Only one company's revenues from such sales approximated costs (revenues were about 1½ percent greater) and one company's prices to its direct industrial customers yielded less than an adequate rate of return. The extent to which some industrial customers may have been required to pay prices higher than might have been the case had the Commission exercised jurisdiction over the rate is suggested by one case where the company's rate for a sale subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission to a local distributor was 23.2 cents per thousand cubic feet while its rate for an unregulated direct sale to an industrial consumer was 45 cents per thousand cubic feet.[6]

---

[1] See, e.g., *FPC* v. *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 365 U.S. 1 (1961) (dictum); Southern California Edison Co., CP61–172, application filed Dec. 23, 1960, Order Permitting Withdrawal of Application and Terminating Proceeding issued Jan. 3, 1963; Gulf Pacific Pipeline Co., CP63–223, applications filed Feb. 12, 1963.

[2] Southern California Edison Co., supra, note 1; Gulf Pacific Pipeline Co., supra, note 1.

[3] *Mississippi River Fuel Corp.* v. *Illinois Commerce Commission,* 1 Ill. 2d 509, 116 N.E. 2d 394 (1953); *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.,* 142 Colo. 361, 351 P. 2d 241 (1960). See *Mississippi River Fuel Corp.* v. *Hoffman,* 4 Ill. 2d 468, 123 N.E. 2d 503 (1955); *City of St. Louis* v. *Mississippi River Fuel Corp.,* 97 F. 2d 726 (8th Cir., 1938). Contra: *Re Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co.,* 21 P.U.R. 3d 267 (1957) (Illinois Pub. Service Commission); *Re: Cities Service Gas Co.,* 1931 E. P.U.R. 11 (Mo. Public Service Commission).

[4] *Texas Gas Transmission Corp.* v. *Mississippi Public Serv. Comm'n.,* 241 Miss. 826, 133 So. 2d 526 (1961); *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mississippi Public Service Commission,* 241 Miss. 762, 133 So. 2d 521 (1961).

[5] Minutes of the third meeting of the Federal Power Commission Natural Gas Advisory Council, Oct. 31, 1962, p. 5. A thorough search of reported State public utility commission decisions turned up only one case in which a State commission altered a rate an interstate pipeline charged an industrial customer.

In addition, very large percentage increases are sometimes forced upon industrial consumers: in one instance an industrial rate was raised almost 50 percent in 1 year.[7]

These facts strongly suggest that competition alone is often inadequate to prevent rates for industrial gas sales from rising beyond cost-justified levels. This is not surprising, since in some regions and for some purposes, gas is the only available or practical fuel [8] and a particular pipeline the only available supplier.

Not only is Commission jurisdiction over direct industrial sales necessary to protect industrial gas consumers, but it would also materially assist the Commission in better discharging its existing regulatory responsibilities.

One such responsibility is to make sure that wellhead prices for gas flowing in interstate commerce are "just and reasonable." Where producers make direct industrial sales outside the Commission's jurisdiction, the prices they receive are apt to exceed the Commission's area rate ceiling.[9] It is easy to understand that this gap in the statutory scheme for producer rate regulation provides an artificial incentive to producers to sell gas directly for industrial use rather than to pipelines for sale ultimately to domestic as well as industrial consumers. These above-ceiling sales also exert an inflationary pressure on jurisdictional sales by producers and may lead to widespread price increases under existing contracts for gas already flowing subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. This is because many existing contracts provide for price increases in the event a producer in the area receives a higher price than the seller is currently receiving from an interstate, jurisdictional pipeline.[10] As a result, unregulated direct industrial sales by producers may lead to increases in the prices of gas paid by pipelines and, ultimately by residential, commercial, and industrial customers whom the Natural Gas Act seeks to protect.

Another problem which would disappear if the Commission had jurisdiction over direct sales to industrial customers is the practice of some pipelines to refuse to deliver additional gas to local distributors for resale in order to sell it directly to industrial consumers.[11] Since the unregulated direct sale can frequently be made at higher rates, the reason for the pipeline's preference is obvious. But this practice often may not be in the public interest. In the first place, it means that less gas is available for resale to consumers for home heating—a use which the Commission, with court approval,[12] has found may frequently be the best use for natural gas.

Finally, direct industrial sales by pipelines or producers may, on occasion, prevent local distributors from making industrial sales within their service areas. These sales benefit home-heating customers by enabling local distributors to make sales during off-peak periods (i.e., when warm weather reduces demand for space heating), and thus to spread the cost of their distribution facilities and those purchased gas costs which do not vary with the amount taken [13] over a greater volume of sales. The cost per unit of gas that the residential and commercial space-heating customers must pay is, in turn, decreased. Thus, Commission jurisdiction to regulate direct industrial sales by pipelines could put an end to the pipelines' preference for such sales over sales to local distribtuors for resale, thereby benefiting the natural gas consumers for whose protection the Natural Gas Act was passed.

For these reasons—protection of industrial consumers, prevention of widespread field price increases under existing contracts, and removal of present incentives to withhold gas from local distributors in order to make it available for direct industrial sales—the Commission strongly recommends that it be given jurisdiction over direct industrial sales by natural gas companies. This authority will enable the Commission to require that interstate industrial gas sales will be made at such prices and on such terms as to realize the potential benefits of such sales to both industrial and domestic consumers.

Commissioner O'Connor has asked me to note his opposition to this proposal.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

---

[6] *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.*, 21 P.U.R. 3d 267, 276 (1957). The rate to the distributor should be somewhat lower to reflect certain economies. However, the magnitude of the difference is probably out of proportion to that which could be justified by cost considerations.

[7] *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.*, supra, note 3.

[8] See, e.g., *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Colorado Interstate Gas Co.*, supra, note 3, at 255.

[9] See authorities cited at note 1, supra.

[10] See, e.g., *Shell Oil Co.*, Docket No. RI61–515, Opinion No. 382 (decided Mar. 15, 1963), where new purchases from producers in west Texas were alleged to have triggered price increases under El Paso Natural Gas Co.'s contracts with other producers. The increases to which these producers were alleged to have become entitled, in turn, allegedly triggered price escalation clauses in a contract between El Paso and still another producer. See also *Pure Oil Co.*, 25 FPC 383, 387–91 (1961).

[11] The problem is illustrated by the proceedings in *Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.*, Opinion No. 355, Apr. 18, 1962, 27 FPC 697, reversed *sub nom Granite City Steel Co.* v. *F.P.C.*, C.A.D.C. Nos. 17150, 17151, May 23, 1963. Extension of the time in which to seek rehearing has been requested. There a group of Mississippi's distributor customers sought to compel the pipeline to sell them additional gas which it was making available to direct industrial customers at rates not subject to Commission jurisdiction and exceeding those the Commission permitted Mississippi to charge its distributor customers. The Commission's order allocating additional gas to the distributors was set aside on review.

[12] *F.P.C.* v. *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, supra, note 1.

[13] Many pipeline rate schedules provide for both a commodity charge—so much for each unit of gas taken—and a demand charge—so much for each unit of gas that the pipeline stands ready to deliver. The latter charge does not vary with the volume of gas the distributor actually uses.

Revenues from and cost of service to main-line direct industrial customers

Name of company	Revenues from direct industrial sales	Staff allocated cost of service (including return)	Excess of revenues over cost		Period	Source
			Amount	Percent		
United Gas Pipe Line Co	$156,782,000	[1] $154,369,300	$2,413,000	1.56	12 months to Mar. 31, 1962 [2]	RP-63-1.
Southern Natural Gas Co	29,586,741	27,099,448	2,487,293	9.18	12 months to June 30, 1959 [2]	G-20509 and RP-60-15.
El Paso Natural Gas Co	28,221,299	26,285,715	1,935,584	7.36	12 months to Mar. 31, 1962	RP-60-3.
Cities Service Gas Co.[3]	23,644,287	24,798,666	(1,154,379)	(4.66)	12 months to Mar. 31, 1961	RP-62-1 and rate increase application.
Mississippi River Fuel Corp	21,907,593	13,967,707	7,939,886	56.84	12 months to Nov. 30, 1962	RP-63-2.
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co	16,753,476	13,977,153	2,776,323	19.86	12 months to Sept. 30, 1960	G-14755 et al.
Houston Texas Gas & Oil Corp. (now Florida Gas Transmission Co.).	11,858,667	10,799,894	1,058,773	9.80	12 months to Mar. 31, 1961 [2]	G-9262 and RP-61-3.
Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Co	2,603,596	2,010,746	592,850	29.48	Year 1959	G-5471 et al.
Total	292,009,422					

[1] Based on average cost of service for all nonjurisdictional business. Cost of service to main-line industrial customers only may be lower than shown but is not readily determinable.

[2] Adjusted.

[3] Revenues are primarily from industrial sales but also include revenues from sales to public authorities and other nonjurisdictional sales. Costs are total cost of nonjurisdictional service.

NOTE.—Data are for most recent period available. Total revenues are 61.6 percent of revenues from industrial sales made in 1961 by all natural gas companies included in FPC statistics of natural gas companies.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 308(a) OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT, RELATING TO GRANT OF EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS AT AIRPORTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports. I ask unanimous consent to have a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1735) to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights

at airports, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. **Magnuson** is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed herewith is a draft bill "To amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports."

This proposal is part of the Federal Aviation Agency's legislative program for 1963 and enactment by the Congress is recommended. Its purpose is to make the law clear and consistent with respect to the sale of aviation gasoline and oil at public airports. Three statutes are involved in this problem.

Section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 prohibits the grant of exclusive rights for the use of landing areas "upon which Federal funds have been expended." Landing areas are defined to include airports (section 101). This prohibition appeared originally in section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and was carried over without change in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. In 1941, the Attorney General of the United States was requested to interpret the predecessor section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act. It was his opinion that the prohibition was directed to particular "aeronautical activities" and not solely to the use of an airport for all purposes, and that the purpose of the section was to prohibit monopolies and to promote and encourage competition in civil aeronautics.

The Federal Airport Act (40 U.S.C. 1101) authorizes the Administrator to require assurances from airport sponsors requesting Federal aid that the airport will be operated consistent with the terms of that act. This includes, among other things, assurances that the airport will be available for public use "on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination" (section 11(1)).

The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended in 1947 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)), provides that disposals of surplus airport property shall be subject to the condition that the grantee shall not grant any exclusive right for the use of the airport to the exclusion of others in the same class. For the purpose of this condition, section 13(g)(2)(C) of that act defines "exclusive right" to mean—

1. Any exclusive right to use the airport for conducting any particular aeronautical activity requiring operation of aircraft;

2. Any exclusive right to engage in the sale or supplying of aircraft, aircraft accessories, equipment or supplies (excluding the sale of gasoline and oil), or aircraft services necessary for the operation of aircraft (including the maintenance and repair of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers and appliances).

The effect of the foregoing is to prohibit the grant of exclusive rights involving aeronautical activities at airports obtained from the Government under the Surplus Property Act. However, the sale of gasoline and oil is expressly excepted from this prohibition.

In the administration of these three provisions of law over the past 20 years there have been numerous policy shifts with respect to whether airport owners should be permitted to grant or exercise exclusive rights for the sale of aviation gasoline and oil. For example, in the case of agreements entered into pursuant to the development of landing areas program which was initiated in 1940, the sale of gasoline and oil was uniformly held not to be an "aeronautical activity" for which the grant of an exclusive right would be prohibited by section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as construed by the Attorney General. On the other hand, grant agreements entered into pursuant to the Federal Airport Act from October 1946 until March 1948 expressly prohibited the grant of exclusive rights to sell gas and oil. However, this prohibition was premised on the authority contained in the Federal Airport Act, as distinguished from the Civil Aeronautics Act. Subsequently, these grant agreements were changed to prohibit only those exclusive rights barred by section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act and, as such, were not considered to prohibit the grant of an exclusive right for the sale of gasoline and oil. Additionally, deeds executed under the Surplus Property Act have uniformly incorporated the language of that statute, which excludes the sale of gasoline and oil from the exclusive rights prohibition. Besides the gasoline and oil provision, the various types of grant agreements have also contained differing requirements over the years with reference to other kinds of exclusive rights. A study undertaken by CAA in 1955 summarized the problem to that date as follows:

"The important thing, for purposes of this study, is that different exclusive right provisions were incorporated in the three types of airport operation agreements (grant agreements, surplus property instruments of disposal, and section 16 deeds) as has been seen. The importance of this lies not only in the fact that different airports have been treated differently in this regard but in the fact that 216 airports are now covered by 2 of the 3 types of agreements and 5 by all 3 types. This of course further complicates a situation already complicated by the fact that many of those and other airports are covered by 2 or 3 of the forms of grant agreements which have been used and the fact that 389 airports are covered not only by 1 or more forms of grant agreements and surplus property instruments of disposal but by at least 1 of the 5 forms of AP-4 agreements each of which, as previously noted, is like the form of section 16 deed in that it prohibits only the types of exclusive rights forbidden by the Civil Aeronautics Act."

Last year the issue as to grants of exclusive rights at public airports was squarely presented to this Agency for the first time. Disputes arose at several airports wherein the Agency was requested to determine that the airport operators were in violation of their agreements with the Government as a result of contracts which they were contemplating or had entered into granting an exclusive right to sell gasoline and oil or to conduct other aeronautical activities.

The matter was brought to my attention and I held numerous meetings with all of the parties involved, giving each an opportunity to present the issues directly to me. In the course of investigating the complaints, it became necessary for the Agency to review the entire history of the laws and policies relating to exclusive rights and determine anew what policies should prevail in light of airport operations as they exist today. From this review, the Agency developed for the first time a comprehensive definition of those "aeronautical activities" which should fall within the prohibition against exclusive rights contained in section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act. Such "aeronautical activity" is now defined as "any activity which involves, makes possible, or is required for the operation of aircraft, or which contributes to or is required for the safety of such operations." The term as defined would include charter operations, pilot training, aircraft rental and sightseeing, aerial photography, crop dusting, aerial advertising and surveying, air carrier operations, aircraft sales and services, sale of aviation petroleum products whether or not conducted in conjunction with other included activities, repair and maintenance of aircraft, sale of aircraft parts, and any other activities which because of their direct relationship to the operation of aircraft can appropriately be regarded as an "aeronautical activity."

It is the view of the Agency that this definition comports with the reality of the large-scale aviation business activities now being conducted on the Nation's airports, practically all of which have received or are receiving Federal funds. In our opinion, this definition is not only the legally correct one, but also the only one consistent with the traditional policy of our Government to foster fair competition and discourage the grant of monopolies.

Accordingly, in administering section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act, this Agency now takes the position that granting an exclusive right for the sale of gasoline and oil is unlawful at a public airport upon which Federal funds have been expended. However, because of the express exclusion of the sale of gasoline and oil from the "exclusive right" prohibition in the Surplus Property Act, the grant of an exclusive right for this purpose at a surplus property airport remains lawful. Consequently, we feel legally obligated to countenance such grants even though these airports may be currently receiving Federal funds. There is no logical basis for this distinction. The Federal policy of promoting fair competition is as valid when applied to an airport conveyed by the Federal Government pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act as it is when applied to a nonsurplus property airport "upon which Federal funds have been expended."

We believe that the factual situation has altered sufficiently since 1947 to warrant this clarification of congressional policy. Except for their derivation, there is nothing to distinguish the 531 surplus property airports from the approximately 1,400 other airports with which the Federal Government has agreements of one form or another. They receive identical consideration under the Federal-aid airport program and in the installation and maintenance of Federal air navigation facilities. For the same reasons, they should be equally subject to any statutory restrictions.

A more detailed discussion of the legal and policy considerations supporting this recommendation is set forth in the statement of Agency policy which I personally approved and issued on July 17, 1962, a copy of which is attached. If the Federal Aviation Act is amended as we are proposing, it is our intention to apply the same policies set forth in this statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. Halaby,
Administrator.

NATIONAL PARK DESIGNATION FOR ARCHES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the creation of Arches National Park in the State of Utah. This spectacular area is now a national monument, but it fully deserves the recognition, standing, and prestige which will come from national park designation.

Arches is located in the heart of the famed Red Rock country of southeastern Utah, just to the north across the Colorado River from the picturesque town of Moab.

Eighty-eight openings that are large enough to be classed as arches have been discovered within the boundaries of this national monument, hence the origin of its name. Other arches are probably hidden away in remote and rugged parts of the area. Spectacular towers, sweeping coves, shapes resembling figures of men and animals, balanced rocks, and other weird forms resulting from the combined action of running water, wind, rain, frost, and sun, form a setting to which the arches themselves are a majestic culmination.

Among the most famous scenic areas are the Windows section, and Devils Garden containing famous Landscape Arch, which is 291 feet long and is believed to be the longest natural-stone span in the world. Similarly, Klondike Bluffs and Delicate Arch must not be missed in any visit to Arches. The latter, delicately supported on either side by a slender column, rises sharply to achieve a towering pinnacle higher than a six-story building.

NEGLECTED FOR 27 YEARS

Although the Arches National Monument was set aside by Presidential proclamation on April 12, 1929, the area was sadly neglected for decades. It was not until 1956, 27 years later, that the first substantial development took place under the great Mission 66 program which was pioneered by President Eisenhower and initiated in that year. Since 1956, a great deal has been accomplished in building roads, trails, buildings, and utilities to make the area accessible to increasing numbers of visitors and to provide the facilities necessary to make their stay more comfortable, enjoyable, and informative.

I was pleased to work with the National Park Service in accelerating the construction of a new access road to Arches. It was completed in 1958 and climbs through the sandstone cliffs behind the monument's headquarters and passes through the Courthouse Towers section. Since that time, the number of visitors has skyrocketed from 25,400 in 1957 to 105,700 in 1962.

NEW VISITORS' CENTER

It was my pleasure in May of 1962 to attend and participate in the dedication of the Arches visitors' center, also an important part of the Mission 66 program. This splendid edifice, with its 14 exhibits that will be of endless fascination to visitors, including the new projection room, is an important step in the development of the tourist potential in southeastern Utah. It was first programed in 1958, and funds were made available on July 1 of that year. The center itself was finished and accepted by the National Park Service in 1960, although the special exhibits were not completed until March 1962.

ARCHES MERITS PARK STATUS

It is obvious to me that the Arches National Monument with its great new development now fully merits national park status. In 1961 I introduced a bill to give national park status to Arches, at which time I observed that it met every appropriate standard for a national park and noted, for example, that it is of virtually the same size as Bryce Canyon National Park but possessed of a unique beauty of its own. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has stated that acre for acre southern Utah contains the greatest concentration of scenic wonders in the Nation, and during a trip to this spectacular region in 1961, he singled out Arches National Monument as being one of the areas he considered fully deserving of national park status.

Yet, the spectacular towers, arches, and other weird formations of the present Arches National Monument make up a scenic splendor which is enjoyed by too few people. Even with the vast increase in visitors to Arches since the completion of the new access road and visitors' center, the number is far below that of the nearby national parks. While Grand Canyon was visited by 1,446,500 tourists in 1962, Zion National Park received 622,100 visitors, and Bryce Canyon National Park 251,000, the visitors to Arches National Monument numbered 105,700. Thus the people of America are being denied and are denying themselves the stirring experience of visiting this truly fantastic and awe-inspiring area.

A principal reason for the relatively small number of visitors is, I am sure, the fact that Archs has not received national park designation. Its present national monument status does not carry with it in the public mind the prestige associated with national parks. Such recognition is not only deserved, but long overdue.

I sincerely urge the Congress and the Department of Interior to lend their support to this measure to give Arches the additional recognition and prestige it so richly merits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1736) to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL AND STATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to allow a deduction, or credit, against tax for contributions to National and State political committees.

The proposed legislation is in line with the recommendations of the President's Bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs.

In a letter dated April 30, 1963, addressed to the President of the Senate, the President of the United States urged Congress to give this matter prompt and favorable consideration in order to encourage a greater percentage of the public to participate in the financial aspects of political campaigns.

Specifically, the proposal provides two tax incentives:

First, it would enable any person who so desires to contribute $20 or less to a National or State political committee, and in turn obtain a tax credit for one-half of the contribution made. In the case of a joint return the limit would be doubled. Thus the maximum tax credit in the case of a joint return would be $20 in a taxable year.

The second proviso would pertain to larger contributions, and would allow a taxpayer to deduct from his taxable income the full amount of his political contributions up to a maximum of $500.

Too often we have heard the hue and cry that too much reliance has been placed upon large contributions from special interest groups to candidates and the inference of undue influence being exerted, regardless of whether or not in fact this exists.

I believe the proposed legislation will encourage greater public participation, bringing about a freer flow of funds from small contributors, thus immeasurably reducing the impact of larger contributions on the political candidate.

It is a healthy situation to encourage the public with particular reference to the small contributor to take a more active financial participation in political campaigns.

I am confident that the public response will be greater where these incentives are provided to the taxpayer, and the good that is bound to result from them will very definitely be in the national interest.

I, too, hope that in line with the wishes of the President of the United States, prompt and favorable consideration will be given to this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1746) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to National and State political committees, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RECONSTRUCTION OF EXISTING 14TH STREET BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River.

The proposed measure refers to one of the two bridges authorized for the 14th Street crossing by Congress in 1946. The first of these bridges was opened to traffic on May 9, 1950, and the second bridge was completed and opened to traffic on January 26, 1962. During this period, the number of vehicles crossing the Potomac River in this corridor increased from about 52,000 in 1946 to approximately 124,000 in April of 1963.

It is increasingly evident that the authorization contained in the legislation of 1946 requires reappraisal if we are to meet the traffic demands for this area in the future. The lanes presently in use on the Southwest Freeway and the outbound lanes on 14th Street and 15th Street extended now carry an outbound traffic flow to the bridge crossing in excess of 6,600 vehicles during the p.m.

peak hour. This exceeds the practicable capacity of the crossing, and it is evident that the problem will become increasingly severe when the Southwest Freeway is connected with the Center Leg and the remainder of the Inner Loop Freeway System. After these connections are made, the 14th Street end of the Southwest Freeway can easily deliver 9,000 vehicles per hour to the river crossing, a volume which, according to the District Director of Highways and Traffic, H. L. Aitken, will require not less than 6 free-flowing lanes.

The Commonwealth of Virginia is also interested in the proposed project in relation to plans for reconstruction of the Shirley Highway on the general plan of a 3-2-3 configuration; that is, the outside roadways consisting of three lanes of each serving traffic in either a north or south direction, with the two inner lanes reversible, depending upon peak traffic requirements. District of Columbia traffic engineers have been planning in close coordination with the highway department of the State of Virginia.

General plans for reconstruction of the old 14th Street Bridge contemplate some reconstruction of the piers and the erection of a new superstructure similar in design to that of the new southbound bridge. The estimated cost would be in the range of $3 to $4 million.

It is worth noting, Mr. President, that the estimated cost will be more than compensated for in the time that would be saved by Government workers commuting from Virginia. Studies by the Department of Highways and Traffic of the District of Columbia indicate that between April 1953 and April 1963, the volume of traffic across the Potomac River has increased approximately 34.7 percent, so that the Potomac River bridges are now carrying a daily traffic in excess of 308,000 vehicles, or approximately half a million persons.

I am informed by Mr. Aitken that his traffic engineers have made comparative time studies of traffic on the Southwest Freeway corridor before and after opening of the present freeway section. They learned that as a result of the freeway work already accomplished there is an average saving of 5 to 6 minutes for each vehicle trip during peak traffic hours and approximately 2 minutes for each vehicle trip during nonpeak hours. The application of these savings to some 120,000 vehicles per day results in a saving in excess of 6,000 man-hours per day. The savings would be extended with the bridge reconstruction proposed in the pending proposal.

Since, under the best of circumstances, the proposed bridge could not be opened in less than 3 years from its authorization, it is my hope that the Congress will act expeditiously on this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1748) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Randolph, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON BIBLE READING AND SCHOOL PRAYERS

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the purpose of which is to override the recent decision of the Supreme Court wherein the Court prohibited the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools.

In my opinion, this decision is not in accord with the principles upon which our country was founded and upon which our Government was established. We as Americans have always prided ourselves upon being a Christian nation and have ofttimes—perhaps too righteously so—pointed the finger of scorn at atheistic nations. The early founders of our Republic were men who while determined to maintain a separation of church and state were also men who recognized our dependence upon the Supreme Being.

Congress just a few years ago added the words "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance.

Our national anthem contains this reference to God:

> And this be our motto "in God is our trust."

The Senate of the United States, under one of its established rules, cannot open a session without first having a prayer by the Chaplain or his representative.

Our coins bear the inscription "in God Is Our Trust," and over the main entrance to the Senate Chamber this same inscription appears in bold letters.

When a Member of the Senate takes his oath of office the last words in that oath are "So help me God."

Our whole system of government from its earliest establishment has been based on the fact that we do recognize ourselves as being a Christian Nation. This does not mean that we as a people do not respect the right of any individual to select his own religion. This does not mean that we do not extend to an individual his right to be an atheist; that is his individual right.

But we can respect those individual rights and still preserve our dignity as a Christian Nation, and certainly if the majority of the people in any school district wish to have the Bible read or the Lord's Prayer repeated in their schools that is an American heritage.

Much has been said about the importance of the American Government's portraying a good image to the nations of the world. There is nothing that could be more disastrous to the world's opinion of our country than to leave the impression that we who had prided ourselves upon being a Christian Nation are now renouncing our dependence upon our God.

I know of no stronger argument that could be made in support of the need of this constitutional amendment than to quote Mr. Justice Stewart, who in his dissenting opinion said:

> We err * * * if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and government must necessarily interact in countless ways.

Continuing, Mr. Justice Stewart cited example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the State support of chaplains to minister to those in the armed forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.

I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution lie on the desk until June 25 in order that any Senator who wishes to join as a cosponsor may have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 91) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. Williams of Delaware (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, or educational institution supported in whole or in part from any public funds from providing for the participation by the students thereof in any periods of Bible reading or nonsectarian prayer if such participation is voluntary.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which appeared under date of June 18 in Washington's leading newspaper, the Evening Star, following by the lead editorial of the Wall Street Journal of

June 19; in which both editors point out the error of this decision.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, June 18, 1963]

THE COURT BARS THE LORD'S PRAYER

The Supreme Court has spoken. Both the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading have been barred from the public schools. This comes not as a surprise. But in our view it is a shame.

It all seems so silly. Writing for the majority, Justice Clark conjured up dreadful prospects if the Court should allow a prayer to be said in a public school. To permit such a thing, he argued, would depart from the concept of a Government that must be neutral in religious matters. And he went on to say: "The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Perhaps there is something to be said for this as rhetoric. But it is nonsense when measured against the rise of secularism and materialism in this country since the Founding Fathers drafted the first amendment. We mention this because it helps a little in understanding what Justice Clark must have had in mind when he said that the application of his concept of neutrality requires "interpretation of a delicate sort." Delicate indeed.

Justice Stewart, the lone dissenter, stated his understanding of what is meant by the first amendment's guarantee of religious freedom. It is a forthright statement, and it appeals to us. "What our Constitution indispensably protects," he said, "is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or Agnostic, Christian or Atheist, Buddhist or Freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not worship, to pray or to keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government." To us, this is quite different from saying that the Constitution forbids one child, who may wish to do so, to recite the Lord's Prayer in a public school merely because some other child, who does not want to pray and who is not required to pray, objects.

Also interesting were some comments by Justice Goldberg in a concurring opinion, in which Justice Harlan joined.

Justice Goldberg, of course, agreed with the majority ruling. But he seemed a bit disturbed by Justice Clark's neutral concept. "Untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality," he said "can lead * * * to a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive, or even active hostility to the religious." For our part, we think the court's school rulings in the area of religion, although certainly not so intended, have already led to a climate of passive and perhaps even active hostility to the religious. At another point, Justice Goldberg, in what we take to be a reference to Justice Clark's trickling stream and raging torrent, added: "It is of course true that great consequences can grow from small beginnings, but the measure of constitutional adjudication is the ability and willingness to distinguish between real threat and mere shadow."

If we may put our own interpretation on this, we think it is a comment which hits the nail squarely on the head. For in this ruling, and in some of those that preceded it, the court has done precisely what Justice Goldberg warned against—mistaken mere shadow for real threat.

In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 19, 1963]

IMAGINED DANGERS AND REAL ISSUES

Of all the dangers to a free society of which our forefathers were fearful, and against which they sought to safeguard the people in the Constitution, the one that time has proved of no danger is that the state would prescribe a religious belief.

In our history we have had many constitutional crises, some of which nearly tore the country apart. We are torn today by a constitutional issue, that of the treatment of our Negro citizens, which will require the utmost efforts of great minds to resolve without lasting political wounds.

But nowhere in our history will you find any serious threat by any church or sect to seize the state or to persuade the state to use its power to establish it as the state religion.

This elementary fact of our history, quite apart from all of the philosophical arguments, seems to us to make absolute nonsense of the Supreme Court's decision about Bible readings in the public schools. A more ponderous effort upon a more trivial issue has rarely, if ever, emerged from the robed men who sit upon that Bench.

This is not to say that the result of the decision is trivial, or that its consequences do not now raise grave questions. For what the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the state, is to establish secularization—atheism, if you would have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the state's power will extend its protection.

Thus if you believe in the God of the Jews, the God of the Christians, or the God of Islam, you are denied absolutely any public expression of it in the schools which the public supports. Hereafter the views of the nonbeliever alone are sheltered by the full panoply of the state's police powers.

The legal and philosophical answer to this interpretation of the Constitution, it seems to us, has been well put by Mr. Justice Stewart. "We err * * * if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and government must necessarily interact in countless ways." He cites example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the state support of chaplains to minister to those in the Armed Forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.

And he puts his finger surely upon the specious argument of Government neutrality about religion. The duty of the state is to accommodate those differences of belief which a free society makes inevitable, not to try to set up impermissible categories and so throw its weight against those who may desire public expression of their beliefs.

"A compulsory State educational system so structures a child's life," he observes, "that if religious exercises are held to be impermissible in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage." In short, not neutrality but state action against religion.

Yet much as we share Justice Stewart's views, it is not alone the philosophy of the Court majority that troubles us. Surely it is a distortion of the Constitution to suggest that when the Founding Fathers put into it the prohibition against the establishment of religion" they were aiming even distantly at a prohibition against the reading of Scripture or of prayers in public bodies, including the schools. To them establishment meant literally setting up a state religion.

It is certainly a distortion of the views of such men as Madison and Jefferson and Rogers Williams to suggest that their devotion to religious liberty is somehow the seed of the view to which this Court has now come, depriving people of the liberty to express their religious views openly in the school.

And what are we to make of it when this Court, in order to buttress this opinion, reminds us of the danger that powerful sects * * * might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions? Are we to suppose that this danger, rightly guarded against by the Constitution, is somehow now threatened because schoolchildren hear the Bible read?

Apparently so. For in warning us against this minor encroachment against the Constitution, the Court thunders that "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Here, without doubt, is upside-down logic. For if there has been any consistent trend in our religious history, it is that what might once have been described as a raging torrent of religious intolerance has become by comparison a trickling stream.

It is this disparity between argument and reality, between cause and remedy, that troubles us in the Court's decision. Perhaps it is undesirable public policy—although we do not think so—to provide a moment of prayer, or a brief reading of the Scriptures, in a school whose purpose is to teach the ideas upon which Western society is based.

But it is wholly ridiculous to argue that this practice, followed by generation after generation without injury to our institutions, is now suddenly become a thing to undermine the Republic and demand the most absolute prohibitions against it in the name of the Constitution.

And it does not augur well for the future to see our highest judges torture history and turn metaphysical handsprings to justify that which they wish to decide. In the real constitutional issues which face the Nation today we should not have to fear that small minds will be brought to great questions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I would like to yield to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who wishes to address himself to the same subject.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I shall be happy to join as cosponsor with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am delighted to have the Senator join.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE READING OF THE BIBLE AND THE OFFERING OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution and ask that it lie on the desk until the close of business on Tuesday, June 25, so that my colleagues may have a chance to add their names as cosponsors.

The joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools.

This action on my part is prompted by the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court on Monday, June 17, in the case brought by a Baltimore, Md., woman who objected to her son's having to listen to Bible reading and the saying of the Lord's Prayer in the Baltimore public school which he attended. The Supreme Court ruled, 8 to 1, that it is unconstitutional to engage in Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools.

I respect the Court's decision. I am not critical of the Court. Its honorable and able members interpreted the provisions of the Constitution as it stands today. However, the Constitution itself makes provision for its own amendment—by two-thirds of the two Houses of Congress and the legislatures of at least three-fourths of the respective States.

If it takes a constitutional amendment to permit Bible reading and prayer in the public schools, the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the respective States should waste no time in amending the Constitution.

I believe the people of the Nation should be permitted to make their wishes known. This can be done effectively and fairly by giving them a voice in the matter through their respective State legislatures. As a constitutional amendment requires ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures, my measure gives the people an opportunity to speak through their local representatives in the State legislatures.

I recently took a poll in my State of Maryland and I found that 71 percent of the people favor Bible reading in the schools even if that should require new legislation, while only 20 percent were opposed and 9 percent were in doubt. I consider my poll a fair sampling of public opinion. And I have no reason to think that the people of other States feel differently on this subject.

There is a wealth of evidence from our traditions, customs, laws and practices which prove us to be a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.

None of our citizens, young or old, should be coerced into participating in any particular religious exercises. By the same token, none of our citizens, young or old, should be prevented from participating. The constitutional amendment would permit local authorities to provide opportunity to its citizens to exercise this phase of freedom.

Should we not get this situation straightened out by amending the Constitution, it is not unreasonable to say that Christmas and Easter displays, recognition of days of religious significance, study and appreciation of religious leaders and their contributions are marked for extinction.

Section 1 of the article of amendment states:

> Nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, or educational institution supported in whole or in part from any public funds from providing for the voluntary participation by the students thereof in the reading of passages from the Bible or in regularly scheduled periods of nonsectarian prayer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 91) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT REFERENCES TO RELIANCE UPON GOD IN GOVERNMENTAL MATTERS AND THE READING OF THE BIBLE AND PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I have a matter of vital importance, and I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 6 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, when the Supreme Court ruled last year that a government body could not require a specific prayer to be read in public schools, I hoped then that the Court would go no further in the restricting of religious education in our public schools. However, the Supreme Court on Monday rendered an ungodly decision, one contemptuous of God and religion.

Although some will argue that the Supreme Court simply ruled that no official of any public school system can require or sponsor the reading of the Bible or the reciting of prayers in our schools, the ruling in essence, if enforced and followed by the people, will abolish praying and the reading of the Bible in public schools.

Schoolteachers run our classrooms. Schoolteachers are officials of the school system, and therefore, under the ruling of the Court, they cannot even suggest, much less require, the reading of our Bible or the reciting of prayers in the classrooms.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling, I am urging schoolteachers and schools to continue the reading of the Bible and to continue praying in classrooms.

There is no statutory provision to penalize the school officials for defying the Supreme Court. They can continue to pray and read the Bible in schools until a court injunction is issued in each individual and every case, restraining them from continuing the practice in defiance of the Supreme Court.

Monday, as I stood in the Supreme Court prior to the rendering of this decision, the Court crier, in opening the session of the U.S. Supreme Court, declared, "God save the United States and this honorable Court." The Supreme Court never convenes for business without its crier calling out to God Almighty to save this Nation and the Supreme Court.

What court of justice is this which calls upon God to save it every day it works, when it turns around and denies the same privilege to the children in our schools?

Immediately after the Supreme Court's decision was announced, there came news reports from across the Nation concerning individuals who intend to bring suits up to the Supreme Court to eliminate the words "Under God" now contained in our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and to remove the language "In God We Trust" from our money.

No doubt other suits will follow concerning the religious aspects embodied in our Government and political life, which have been handed down to us since our Founding Fathers declared our independence and created this Nation. There was reference to God Almighty in our Declaration of Independence, and there have been close ties between our Nation and God Almighty throughout the generations.

Few Presidents have ever met the crises of the times without calling on God for help, and no nation that ever forgot God and departed from recognition of God Almighty ever survived in this world. Our Nation was created with the help of God, and it is our duty today to remember this fact and to thank God Almighty for what he has given us and done for us through the ages. It is a selfish, self-righteous, and sinful people who turn against their God.

Regardless of how rich this Nation is, regardless of how selfish some of our people may have become, and regardless of the wanton ways some people have developed, it is the duty of responsible people, including the Congress, to remain steadfast in our insistence that God remain a part of our Nation.

It is for these reasons and for this purpose that I send to the desk a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to preserve and protect references to the reliance upon God in our Government, and a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Holy Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools.

The first amendment will preserve references to belief in or reliance upon God and any invocation of aid from God in any governmental or public document, proceeding, ceremony, and upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States that is standing or may come in the future years.

The second amendment will enable any school to hold Bible readings and prayer recitations on a nonsectarian, voluntary basis.

For the sake of our Nation and our future generations, I ask that the Congress receive these joint resolutions and give them expeditious passage so that the people of the United States themselves may decide which road we will take in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; and

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the reading of the Holy Bible and the offering of prayer in public schools.

U.S. SENATE REAFFIRMS BELIEF IN FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution relating to freedom of prayer.

On Monday, the Supreme Court handed down two historic decisions. In the cases of the school district of Abington Township against Edward L. Schempp and William J. Murray against the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, it ruled that it is a violation of the 1st and 14th amendments of the Constitution to set aside time in public schools for reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer.

This, of course, is an extension of the Court's decision last year against the use in the public schools of a State official prayer.

Last year, after the Court announced its decision, I introduced a resolution, Senate Resolution 356, expressing the sense of the Senate that the Supreme Court's decision in no way interfered with the right of public school systems to set aside a time during the school day for prayerful meditation so long as no public official prescribes or recites a prayer which is offered. No final committee action was taken on the matter.

Today, Mr. President, in the wake of Monday's decisions, I am again offering a resolution expressing that prayerful meditation is permissible in public schools. This new resolution is substantially the same as that which I introduced last year. It is significant because it reaffirms the belief of the Senate in the constitutional guarantee of freedom of worship. It puts the Senate on record as believing that the Court's decision is not to be construed as a prohibition against individual prayer or prayerful meditation in our public schools.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to what I call the new harmony decision of the Court as it is expressed in dicta in the case on page 75 of the decision.

Justice Clark said:

> The "establishment" clause does not ban Federal or State regulation of conduct whose reason or effect merely happens to coincide or harmonize with the tenets of some or all religions.

Justice Clark continued further to say:

> I think a brief survey of certain of these forms of accommodation will reveal that the first amendment commands not official hostility to a religion, but only a strict neutrality in matters of religion.

Then he pointed out certain provisions by State and Federal Governments for chaplains in the Armed Forces, in the legislative groups, and in penal institutions. He referred to invocational prayers, such as those rendered by the Chaplain of the Senate, whom I see in the Chamber at the present moment. Our Chaplain is a wonderful man. His spiritual guidance has always been something I have looked to, and it has been of great help to me.

The Justice also pointed out:

> The holding of the Court today plainly does not foreclose teaching the Holy Scriptures or about the differences between religious sects in classes in literature or history. Indeed, whether or not the Bible is involved, it would be impossible to teach meaningfully many subjects in the social sciences or the humanities without some mention of religion.

I should like to point out that the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Goldberg, with which Mr. Justice Harlan concurs, states a point which I believe is important. He has shown the difference between the attitude toward religion of the United States and some of the other nations in the world, and especially communistic nations. We are a God-fearing society; others are godless societies. Lest someone misinterpret what the Court has said and place us in the field of being a godless people, I should like to point out the following language in Justice Goldberg's opinion:

> The first amendment's guarantees, as applied to the States through the 14th amendment, foreclose not only laws "respecting an establishment of religion" but also those "prohibiting the free exercise thereof."
>
> The basic purpose of the first amendment is to promote and assure the fullest possible scope of religious liberty and tolerance for all and to nurture the conditions which secure the best hope of attainment of that end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana for 1 additional minute? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. Justice Goldberg has pointed out that, unless we are very careful, people will interpret the Court's decision to signify that we are antireligious in America. That is certainly not true, and I most heartily commend the opinion of Mr. Justice Goldberg to all Senators.

I believe a resolution of the kind I have proposed is necesary, Mr. President, and I urge that it be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 164) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that—
>
> (a) notwithstanding the recent Supreme Court decisions relating to the reading of the Bible and the offering of prayer in the public schools, any public school system if it so chooses may provide time during the school day for prayerful meditation if no public official prescribes or recites the prayer which is offered; and
>
> (b) providing public school time for prayerful meditation in no way violates the Constitution because each individual participating therein would be permitted to pray as he chooses, but that such practice is consonant with the free exercise of religion protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

BENEFIT-COST RATIO FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at present, millions of dollars are being spent on reclamation projects based upon absurd estimates of their worth relative to other projects and other Federal programs. Last August 9 I made a very complete statement on this matter emphasizing the unrealistically long period of 100 years over which reclamation projects were calculated to yield benefits and the too-low discount rate of 2.5 percent which is applied to future benefits to give their present value. Today I am reintroducing legislation which would make plain the interest of Congress in how these important estimates are made and would take a modest step toward correcting this situation by calling for the application of a higher discount rate on long-term projects.

In deciding whether or not a proposed project is worthwhile, an evaluation of the benefit of the project as compared to its cost is the most important single determination. If the estimates of benefit and cost are equal or if benefit is estimated to exceed cost, the project is likely to be approved. The taxpayer's money is spent on it.

However, if cost is estimated to exceed benefit, the project is probably dead. It can easily be seen that the estimated ratio of benefit to cost is a crucial factor in determining whether or not the taxpayer's money shall be spent on a given project. It is especially crucial because it is a simple and apparently an objective and fair basis for deciding whether the taxpayer should make the investment. But everything depends not only on whether the benefit and cost are determined honestly and accurately, it depends on whether the benefit period and the discount rate are accurate too.

The estimate of cost is generally comparatively easy to make. Here we are dealing with tangibles such as men and materials, initial construction cost, and upkeep. However, estimating the benefit is not at all an easy job because it demands that a long look be taken into the future. The benefits of a dam, for example, may include the prevention of a flood 50 years from now, as well as next year, if the dam is functional 50 years hence.

Thus the first question asked in estimating benefit is: "What is the useful life of the object whose construction is under consideration?" This question is complicated by the fact that not only must the durability of the concrete which goes into the structure be estimated, but factors such as obsolescence and shifting populations must be taken into account. For instance, a dam which effectively produces electric power today may be made obsolete in terms of this benefit by the cheap use of atomic power 10 or 20 years from now. A facility which can economically serve 500,000 people may be unable to function effectively if the population in the area doubles or triples.

If the useful life of the project is estimated as very short, it is quite likely that the benefit will not be large enough to justify the cost. However, as the years of estimated use increase, the difficulty of justification decreases. A dam which stands for 50 years will prevent a great many more floods than a dam which crumbles in 25. Until recently 50 years was the standard estimate of the life of a project.

But now the Bureau of Reclamation practice is to use the life of the project or 100 years, whichever is shorter. Since it is difficult to predict the life of the project, practice has resulted in 100 years being used. Of course, this greatly increases the ease of justifying a project. However, a 100-year lifespan is absurd in view of the great changes that have taken place in the last 100 years and that can be expected to take place in the future.

This means benefits are enormously overestimated by doubling useful life far beyond a realistic estimate.

The second question asked in estimating benefit is: "What is a future benefit worth today?" In order to answer this question it is necessary to discount the value of future dollars. We do this because if we had these dollars today, we could invest them and through their use earn more dollars. But since we do not have these benefits, expressed in terms of dollars today, and cannot use them, we must estimate the present discounted value of future benefits.

If it is estimated that an investment would yield an annual return of 10 percent and the future benefit is discounted on this basis, the benefit would be so greatly discounted that the difficulty of justifying the project would be very great. On the other hand, if a low discount rate is used, it would be much easier to come up with a benefit-cost ratio justifying the project.

The discount rate now commonly used in calculating present value of future benefits is 2.5 percent. This is a ridiculously unrealistic figure since present investments, even in short-term Government bonds, are bringing a much higher yield. It is especially erroneous when used in connection with projects estimated to yield benefits for a period of more than 50 years. It enormously and artificially exaggerates the real benefits. The taxpayer is shoved by this device into commitments that cost far more—including the interest the taxpayer has to pay on the money the Government borrows—for the project than it is worth.

For these reasons, I submit a resolution which would make it the sense of the Senate that a discount rate equal to the interest paid on long-term Government securities be applied to projects whose life is estimated at more than 50 years. The current rate paid on these securities is approximately 4 percent.

Mr. President, this is a moderate proposal. It would serve notice that the Senate is interested in the means used by the executive branch to justify proposed projects. I am not proposing legislation declaring that 100 years is too long a life to be given to a project although this is an age of great change and uncertainty. I am not proposing legislation declaring that 2.5 percent is too low a discount rate to apply to 50-year projects. I am merely saying that using a 2.5 percent discount rate in measuring benefits over a period of 100 years is stacking the deck in favor of unjustified projects and against the taxpayer. We must not allow overly optimistic benefit calculations to channel money into bad projects or to divert funds from the pocket of the taxpayer into creating impractical physical resources.

Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I submit this resolution calling for a discount rate equal to the rate paid by the Treasury of the United States on long-term marketable securities of the United States for all projects which are anticipated to exceed 50 years in life. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors, and I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 165) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

> Whereas the sense of the Senate, stated in S. Res. 281, Eighty-fourth Congress and in S. Res. 148, Eighty-fifth Congress, is that the Congress will continue to exercise its constitutional powers to encourage the comprehensive conservation, development, and utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation, and that reports to the Congress in support of authorization of projects for such purposes should (1) include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress, and (2) fully disclose the results of studies and analyses of the potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, benefits, both direct and indirect;
>
> Whereas previous statements of congressional intent have been silent on the important matter of the proper discount rate (the interest rate on the Federal investment) to be used in such economic analysis of the benefits and costs of prospective water resource development projects, in spite of the fact that a small change in the present discount factor could significantly alter the benefit-cost ratio of many projects, thus affecting the choice of alternative projects;
>
> Whereas if public funds are to be used to best advantage, the most economically feasible projects should be selected for authorization, so that funds are not denied to prospective water resource projects which would yield larger economic benefits over the years, and to insure that public funds are properly allocated to all private and public uses;
>
> Whereas the proper choice of the best projects from many alternative uses requires that a discount rate be used which is realistic in terms of the public interest and all economic factors;
>
> Whereas it is important that any rate of discount used for these important economic choices should be determined by the Congress;
>
> Whereas the estimation of benefits for any project for any future time period includes the evaluation of many uncertainties and imponderables, and the longer the time period for which the projection is being made, the more uncertain the estimated benefits will be;
>
> Whereas the uncertainties associated with a longer period of analysis indicate that the discount rate should be higher so that the more uncertain benefits of the more distant future are not given the same weight as the more certain benefits which are estimated to come about in the near future in determining the selection of alternative water resource development projects; and
>
> Whereas the present policy is to use the same discount rate, which currently is approximately 2.5 per centum, in analyzing the benefit-cost ratio of projects where the period of analysis is more than fifty years and as much as one hundred years and of projects where such period is less than fifty years: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that in cases where the period of analysis with respect to the useful life of a water resource development project is more than fifty years the discount rate used for the purpose of such analysis should be greater than in cases where such period is fifty years or less and should be at least equal to the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding on the last day of the fiscal year preceding such analysis which on such day had fifteen years or more remaining before reaching maturity, such average rate being currently approximately 4 per centum.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference to the Foreign Relations Committee, two amendments. One of them deals with development research. The other deals with certain provisions for investment guarantees. They are amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act, Senate bill 1276, now before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND CONCILIATION SERVICE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 10, 1963, the names of Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1689) to establish a Community Relations and Conciliation Service to preserve domestic peace and to help insure to all persons the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER) on June 10, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HARRY PHILLIPS, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SIXTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 26, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Harry Phillips, of Tennessee, to be U.S. Circuit Judge, for the Sixth Circuit, vice John D. Martin, Sr., deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO CONSIDER NOMINATION OF DR. GERALD F. TAPE TO BE A MEMBER, AND REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. GLENN T. SEABORG AS CHAIRMAN OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I wish to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 20, 1963, at 10 a.m., in the Joint Committee's open hearing room, S. 407 of the Capitol, to consider the nomination of Dr. Gerald F. Tape, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1966, of Dr. Leland J. Haworth. Dr. Haworth is resigning from the Atomic Energy Commission to become the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the biographical summary of Dr. Tape that accompanied his nomination.

There being no objection, the biographical summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dr. Gerald F. Tape

Born: Ann Arbor, Mich., May 29, 1915.

Education: 1935, graduated from the Michigan State Normal College with the A.B. degree; 1936, received the master of science degree, University of Michigan; 1940, received Ph. D. degree in physics, University of Michigan.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: 1939–42, instructor in physics at Cornell University where he did research in nuclear physics; 1942–46, staff member of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Radiation Laboratory; 1946, joined the physics department at the University of Illinois; 1946–49, assistant professor; 1949–50, associate professor; 1950, became assistant to Dr. Haworth in his capacity as director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory; 1951, became single deputy director; January 1962, became vice president of Associated Universities, Inc.; October 1962, president of Associated Universities, Inc.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, at this hearing the Senate members of the Joint Committee will also consider the reappointment of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg of California, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, for a term of 5 years, expiring June 30, 1968. Dr. Seaborg's present appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission expires June 30, 1963.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 74) for the relief of certain aliens.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

Statement prepared by himself in response to advertisements in Idaho newspapers by private power companies attacking the decision that the Bonneville Power Administration will replace the Bureau of Reclamation as the marketing agent for public power in southern Idaho.

Article entitled "Berlin: A New Approach," written by Senator PELL and published in the June 22, 1963, issue of the Nation.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "Are We Being Too Peaceful in Space?" by Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, published in the Saturday Evening Post, of recent date.

STIMULATION OF INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION OF BUSINESS PEOPLE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, last week I attended the annual meeting of the Effective Citizens Organization, a bipartisan, nonprofit national group which is engaged in activities designed to stimulate the interest and participation of business people in political and governmental affairs.

Effective Citizens Organization was founded in 1954 and was the forerunner of the public affairs movement in the business community. The public affairs field is familiar, I know, to many of my colleagues; we all have benefited from the comments of aroused constituents who have developed an interest in Congress because of a company-sponsored political education course. Effective Citizens Organization initiated the public affairs movement within American industry and today remains the leader in spreading the public affairs gospel while providing valuable services to those companies already established in active public affairs programs.

The annual meeting of the Effective Citizens Organization had a dual purpose: the morning session was devoted to a public affairs orientation for top corporate management personnel, and the luncheon session was the vehicle for the presentation of an award to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower for his contributions to the cause of increased citizen interest and participation in political and governmental affairs. In a gesture befitting a bipartisan organization, the award was presented by the Honorable James A. Farley, now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. but once the political mastermind of Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidential campaign and one of the best known Democrats in the country. Mr. Farley's remarks on this occasion were a tribute to the bipartisan nature of a citizen's obligation to the American political system and, I believe, deserve the consideration of the Senators and of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed Mr. Farley's speech as part of these remarks:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Business and Politics

I am delighted to share in this occasion, where there is such graphic proof that business and politics can coexist. You will, I hope, forgive my obvious pleasure at this sight but I have spent a good many years of active participation in these two worlds. Occasionally I feel like the man who was asked, "Which is more affectionate—blondes or redheads?" He replied, "I can't say. My wife has been both."

There were days when my friends in the business community classed me as "one of those dirty politicians" and other days when the politicians put me in the "business czar" niche. Of course, the truth of the matter is that I just happened to be a man in business who has always enjoyed political activity and liked to have a part in determining the future government of my State and my country.

The virtual bill of divorcement between business and the political-governmental area is the most incongruous situation of our era. The average businessman complains to his circle of friends and associates that government is a headache—a nuisance infringing on his prerogatives in running his affairs. In the next breath, he proclaims that old saw, "Politics is dirty," and he simply will not be contaminated. I might say this is a rather unsophisticated comment for one who in any way is identified with our current society. From the politician's point of view, the businessman represents one of dozens of special interests which are not always willing to defer to the politician's judgment of what is the larger national interest. A politician has to be reelected if he's going to do anybody, including himself, any good and he often feels that the businessman fails to recognize the essential need for compromise in political matters.

I cannot deny, much as I would like to, that a breach exists between business and government. I do believe this breach is rooted in a lack of understanding and mutual respect on both sides. The differences between these two essential elements of our modern society rest on a kind of peculiar competitive fear that has developed within the two power structures of this Nation. Differences are not resolved when both sides withdraw into their shells and snipe away at each other. Wishing won't make it so when one says "Government, go away," any more than when politicians say, "Let me legislate in peace without considering the interests of business." Until permanent lines of communication are established between business and government and kept in good repair, a serious threat to the American system will remain.

Both sides can help to establish this rapport but the bulk of the responsibility rests with the business community. Government can try to bring business representation into a political administration through appointments but the businessman must accept the job. And business has the same obligation as labor or any other segment of our society and, for that matter, any individual citizen; namely, to take an interest in political affairs and then do something about it.

This brings up some practical problems. I am genuinely amazed by the attitude of many business people who are sincerely interested in politics. Take the one who is running a successful factory operation. He has demonstrated his leadership ability and now has developed an interest in politics. He didn't step into the top spot in the factory his first day on the job; yet he will present himself at his local party headquarters fully expecting to be named county chairman on the spot—or nominated for public office. While many of the qualities required for business success are the same factors necessary for political achievement, you can't transfer in grade. You must start at the bottom of the political ladder and prove your right to advancement, just as you do in business.

Of course, as we all realize, there is always an exception to the rule which has never been better illustrated than the appearance on this platform of General Eisenhower, our honoree who is to be the recipient of ECO's first award.

I know General Eisenhower remembers my conversation with him in SHAPE, in his headquarters in Paris the day before he was relieved of his command by General Ridgeway. On that occasion I told him that I was possibly one of the few men he had met or would meet who would advise him that in my judgment he was going to be nominated at the Republican Convention and subsequently elected in November.

In that same conversation I very frankly advised him that I wouldn't vote for him because I am a lifelong regular organization Democrat, and that I was going to be a delegate in the convention in Chicago and would, of course, support the Democratic nominee who would oppose him. We had a very friendly discussion which was too long to recite here. I am sure the General also recalls that conversation.

A second, and in the long run, more important practical consideration is your attitude as a businessman toward a politician. You have every right, and, in a very real sense, an obligation to represent your legitimate interests to any elected official. Your welfare is of vital concern to the ultimate health and soundness of the country, financially and socially. But you must remember that the politician is bound by an oath to assume responsibility for the public interest. Occasionally, he may possess facts and information not available to you which influence his decision. At other times, he may be trying to reconcile the divergent interests of many groups, molding a policy which will result in the greatest benefit to all. If an officeholder disagrees with your views once in a while, you have no right to condemn him—out of hand—as opposed to business.

Certainly, the protection of your own interests gives you a good practical reason to be concerned with politics, but I would point out another more fundamental justification if you need it. As Americans, we have so many blessings that we tend to be complacent. But have you stopped to think that your personal political freedoms are basic to everything else you enjoy? Without our political system and its foundation of principles, there would be no freedom of speech or press or assembly. There would be no protection from search and seizure. There would be no guarantee of the freedom to worship—or not to worship, as you choose. True, these principles can exist, even in a dictatorship, but they exist as privileges, not as basic natural rights. Their existence rests on the whim of a despot and not as the fundamental assumption underlying the law of the land. Without politics, force is our only recourse in defense of these principles. But politics provides an orderly mechanism through which any citizen can participate in their protection and implementation.

Today we face a challenge to these principles such as we have never known. Traditionally, our peace-loving Nation has been willing to take up arms in defense of our beliefs and rights. Since World War II, we have developed a military potential which makes an all-out war unprofitable for an aggressor. Thus the battleground has become men's minds and the weapons of war are ideas. If the house of democracy is to withstand the storm of communism, we must strengthen it from the inside as well as out. How can we hope to maintain that strength if the able, competent men and women of the American business community choose to sit on the sidelines, denying our political system the benefit of their support and leadership?

Our Nation is in one of its most difficult eras, and it requires the very best in leadership if we are to preserve the freedom of this Republic in an increasingly hostile world. Inevitably lasting, effective leadership must come in par from our responsible business leaders. Let me exhort all business leaders to reexamine your understanding of the processes of Government in this Republic, and its need for your contribution.

The last decade has seen great strides in this area. Ten years ago no major company in the United States had what we now call a public affairs program. Today more than 300 companies maintain such activities. Some of you here today were the pioneers of corporate public affairs; some of you are neophytes; and some of you are still our heathen brethren, open, we hope, to conversion.

The merits of public affairs have been widely recognized and many national groups have entered the field. Literally thousands of industrial employees have benefited from company-sponsored political and economic education courses. Communications programs and get out the vote campaigns have resulted in a better informed more responsive electorate. Bipartisan, in-plant political fund-raising drives are a valuable potential answer to the problem of broadening the base of political contributions. These public affairs activities are reaching and affecting hundreds of thousands of men and women and returning the investment of business and industry in them many times over.

I am pleased to appear in conjunction with this award presentation today, both as a personal admirer of the honoree and as a lifetime Democrat representing a bipartisan organization in the presentation of an award to a former Republican President.

It is particularly fitting that the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower be the recipient of ECO's first award for outstanding contributions to the public affairs field. ECO itself—and thus, in large measure, the public affairs movement—was born as the result of a casual conversation between two men present at this table today—H. Bruce Palmer and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Great credit goes to the men who struggled with the implementation of the general's suggestion, organizing and maintaining the Effective Citizens Organization.

To Dwight Eisenhower go the thanks of the American people, not only for the formation of organizations like ECO, but for his continued interest and support of all efforts to expand citizen interest and participation in the affairs of our Nation. He is an example of the citizen-turned-politician and he has lent his prestige to the cause of better government and increased acceptance of political responsibility by every American citizen.

Good government is not a partisan issue. Wherever we may disagree as party members, we share the concern of our Nation's future and the preservation of our system.

I have here the resolution adopted by the ECO board of directors which reads as follows:

"Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower has maintained a consistent interest in furthering the cause of increased citizen participation in political and governmental affairs; and

"Whereas he has willing given of his time and effort in support of those activities designed to increase citizenship responsibility; and

"Whereas he has offered leadership, inspiration, and encouragement to the public affairs movement and the Effective Citizens Organization; and

"Whereas he has personally exemplified through a life of devoted public service those qualities of good citizenship which have earned for him the respect and admiration of the American people and which are the characteristics that the public affairs movement strives to promote in every citizen: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Effective Citizens Organization expresses gratitude and appreciation to Dwight D. Eisenhower for his contribution to the cause of good citizenship and to the public affairs movement; and further

"That the board of directors of the Effective Citizens Organization directs the creation of an award in recognition of his personal contributions to be presented at the annual meeting of the Effective Citizens Organization.

"EFFECTIVE CITIZENS ORGANIZATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS."

"JUNE 12, 1963."

In accordance with this directive, it is my privilege to present this award to you, Dwight D. Eisenhower, inscribed with your words which are a fitting motto for the public affairs field: "Politics ought to be the parttime profession of every citizen who would protect the rights and privileges of free people."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week former President Eisenhower was the guest of honor at the annual meeting and luncheon of the Effective Citizens Organization here in Washington. The general received the Effective Citizens Organization award for his outstanding contributions to the cause of increased citizen interest and participation in political and governmental affairs.

Effective Citizens Organization is a bipartisan, nonprofit national organization dedicated to stimulating active participation of individual business people in the political party of their choice. This organization was founded by a group of businessmen, and for a decade it has served as the spearhead of the public affairs movement in the American business community. Today nearly 350 companies maintain a corporate public affairs program, providing political and economic education and information to thousands of employees.

The Effective Citizens Organization award, recognizing General Eisenhower's continued interest in and support of these efforts, was presented by the Honorable James A. Farley. Mr. Farley commented on the appropriateness of "a lifetime Democrat representing a bipartisan organization in the presentation of an award to a former Republican President."

Earlier today the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] submitted for the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Farley in the presenting of the award to Mr. Eisenhower. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD General Eisenhower's remarks accepting the Effective Citizens Organization award as a part of these remarks. A citizen's right and obligation to participate in the political processes which determine the nature of his government is an area in which political parties can unite wholeheartedly and which deserves the consideration and support of every American. In General Eisenhower's words, engraved on the Effective Citizens Organization award:

> Politics ought to be the part-time profession of every citizen who would protect the rights and privileges of free men.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower in Acceptance of the Effective Citizens Organization Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Cause of Citizen Participation in Political and Governmental Affairs

Thank you, Mr. Toastmaster. Mr. Barr, Mr. Farley, and distinguished Americans all, it is indeed a very great honor that has been awarded me by the Effective Citizens Organization, and I am particularly pleased to receive it from the hands of an old friend, one that I've admired and respected for years. Incidentally, he spoke of a prediction he made concerning me some years back. He omitted one remark that he later made. He said, "Welcome to the membership of those who now follow the ptomaine trail."

In that particular exercise he had had much more earlier experience than I had.

I should like to start by saying, first, that I concur with and applaud the sentiments expressed by Mr. Farley just now to this audience. Likewise, I am delighted and gratified by the report we had from Mr. Barr on what this organization is producing and the work they are accomplishing.

I should like to talk to you for a moment—possibly in generalities—on what I think about certain fundamentals. I think the most priceless heritage recognized by all that we have been handed from our Founding Fathers through succeeding generations is the right of self-government. And I wonder how often we stop to think what self-government means, what it entails. It includes and comprehends all those concepts of human dignity, individual liberties and all of the rights specified in our Constitution and as recited just a moment ago by Mr. Farley.

But self-government means just a little bit more than that, I think. If self-government is going to work, then we have to practice it. Let us assume anyone in this audience has not voted or has not done his best to further the ideals and concepts of government that he believes should prevail. Then I submit that man or that individual is not part of self-government. He's letting somebody else govern him, and if you make this practice too general—and it is far too general today when we have only what sometimes I call a pitiable percentage of our electorate coming to the polls—if this practice becomes too general, then government finally gets into the hands of a very few people and we have in fact an oligarchy.

What, then, are we going to do about it? I submit there is only one thing. You must, whether you choose to remain a private citizen at home, to go into politics itself, or to be a professional man, whatever you want to do—you still have the bound duty to express yourself through our system, our practical system of self-government, so that your voice may be heard and so that you may have your influence in making certain that those precepts and tenets of political doctrine can be observed in Washington and in the Governors' mansions and in the county councils so far as you possibly can.

This is the essence of self-government. And I think if it's neglected, taken for granted, like the man who finds he's taken his wife too long for granted, he just may lose her, and I believe that we, if we take self-government too much for granted, can lose it.

If we do this we keep, as Jefferson told us we should, government close to the people. We respect the power of our city councils and of our boards of commissioners in the counties, of our legislatures, and we give to Washington—with apologies to all of my congressional friends here present—but we accord to them and give to them only those residual duties that were specified or not reserved to the States and the people by the Constitution of America.

So we then have the problem, how are we going to do our best? I don't believe that anyone is doing his duty as a citizen merely because he registers at the proper date and goes down and makes some marks according to the symbol that heads a particular column on the ballot—unless he's on my column.

I believe that we have got to study; self-government demands intelligent consideration of all the problems that present themselves to a people. You've got to study, and when you contact any individual who for one reason or another, either through lack of education or lack of opportunity, has not studied, you have to help him. You are business leaders.

Why, then, can you not be leaders in the kind of government that has made this Nation what it is today? We know what happened to the Athenian city states. In Athens we had a democracy. It was lost, largely because of the fault of the people to call themselves citizens. The example was even more pronounced in the Roman democracy which, giving way to the Emperor, did so because of the citizen's neglect of his own duty both internally and in the problems of self-defense. We must never do this, and I see no way in which this constant rejuvenation of respect for self-government can be brought about except as the people are the natural leaders; in the intellectual world, the business world, the labor world, wherever it is, the people must bring about a study of the programs, issues and problems of the day, using their own God-given intelligence to make their decisions.

I am happy to have had a faint part in the development of this Effective Citizens Organization, because I believe by putting our brains and our strength and our dedication together we help to inspire each other, each to do a little bit more than he has been doing. And let me give you an example of what happens when you don't.

I have a great friend, a very brilliant young man who was elected Governor in my State. And I heard the story secondhand from him something to this effect: he thought, because of the economic problems that were besetting the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania he should get a number of businessmen, men of proved ability, to attack this problem. The cabinet of the State is much larger than the Federal Cabinet—and why this is I don't know—but anyway he had to go over quite a list of people. He made and finally selected a list of 20 businessmen that he wanted to invite into his cabinet. He began to look up the political records of the whole gang, which I think with the exception of two, were terrible. Some had not even registered; some had not voted for a number of elections. There was no way that he could find to justify appointing any of these particular people because they'd shown they didn't have any interest in government. We've had too many people who, because they differ with details within that particular party, say, "I will sit on my hands." What an abdication of responsibility and your God-given rights. I never have understood how anyone can say that—if he's got any concern whatsoever for the United States of America.

I've heard it said, "Well, we've nominated two men. They're both bad choices. What do I do?" You had a part in selecting one of those men. You must have a part, then, in helping to elect a man of your choice.

I cannot stress too much how deeply I believe in this system of government which is still revolutionary and still under test. Despotic government is as old as sin. This new form was brought to us only 175 years ago. This is still a revolutionary idea. The one practiced by the Communists today is as old as history. We've got to make our government successful. This doesn't mean yesterday or tomorrow. This means today. And make it successful so it can march healthily down the years, giving to our grandchildren and all their grandchildren the right that we have had to take part in our own government, the most precious political privilege that any person, any individual or any nation can have.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, 5 years ago a small group of executives of various companies in this country decided that businessmen were not adequately oriented in politics so they formed the Effective Citizens Organization known as ECO. This organization has become increasingly successful in interesting members of both parties who are at the same time in business in the importance of their attending to their political duties. On Wednesday, June 12, this group met at the Statler Hotel in Washington and they were addressed by two distinguished Americans, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mr. James E. Farley. Prior to their remarks, Mr. Charles Barr, who is chairman of the ECO and at the same time assistant to the president of Standard Oil of Indiana, described the history and activities of this group. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Barr's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address by Charles R. Barr, Chairman, Effective Citizens Organization, and Assistant to the President, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)

We are gathered here to honor a man who, nearly a decade ago, expressed his concern about the lack of civic responsibility among members of the business community. His expressed concern led to the creation of the Effective Citizens Organization, your host today. ECO has pioneered in the development of educational programs in public affairs for business personnel and in the servicing of public affairs programs created in the last few years as a result of the new and expanded interest by members of the business community in practical politics.

General Eisenhower's concern for the businessman's participation in public affairs inspired a group of men, ably led by Bruce Palmer, to do something about it. This group was the nucleus of ECO and their first effort was a seminar in practical politics held on the Princeton University campus in May 1956. Since then, ECO has conducted scores of these seminars throughout the country. ECO has also assisted organizations such as the United States Chamber, NAM, and hundreds of private groups, to develop their own public affairs programs, with the common goal of encouraging business people to accept their proper role in public affairs.

Since the beginning at Princeton, substantially more than half a million people have taken one or more formal public affairs courses. These people have been entering into politics in the party of their choice or for the candidate of their choice by the thousands. After thousands of people attended business seminars, many corporations

found it necessary to set up a new department for the guidance of these employees—in the vernacular, a public affairs department—responsible for (1) The creation and development of company policy in public affairs, (2) training programs, (3) education on issues, (4) research, (5) to advise top management on public issues of concern to the company and to the general economy.

More and more business managers have become conscious that the day to day operation of their business is affected by a new participating partner—Government—an agency actively concerned with prices, mergers, wages and salaries, prices of commodities and the supply thereof, and almost every other aspect of the routine operating problems of any business. Thus, the manager of a modern company must have advice in the area of political affairs just as he has legal, public relations, or economic advice. This role now is being filled increasingly by the public affairs department and its officers. Business has further come to realize that it can survive only in a healthy, free political atmosphere and that its best interests are served by the intelligent, active political participation of its employees, stockholders, and customers.

Individuals have come to learn that great satisfactions can accrue through participation in public affairs:

1. Political participation is a practical way to do something to preserve, develop, and enhance political, economic, and social beliefs.

2. It is a practical and satisfying way to fulfill each man's yearning to do something for his fellow man by leading and guiding him to use the facilities of his government to its best advantage. People today are looking for leadership. The political leader, no matter how minor, is playing an ever-increasing role in the leadership of his community.

3. Political participation is a way to meet new and interesting people—it's a way to have some fun and to venture into a new and exciting area heretofore unknown to thousands of people who never quite knew what it was all about until public affairs programs were developed.

4. Political participation points a way toward personal growth. A man or woman who can lead a precinct or a volunteer organization learns many lessons in diplomacy, tact, leadership, and other skills which will aid him in his job and in his daily living. I think it can be said without challenge that anybody who can run a precinct will have less difficulty in running a department in any corporation.

The Effective Citizens Organization has gained the know-how and experience to help companies set up public affairs programs. It can guide them in the operation of these programs. It is to this end that we in ECO are dedicated. And it is to serve this end that ECO's activities are structured.

ECO maintains a national clearinghouse—the only one of its kind—for information pertaining to public affairs. The ECO library includes books, speeches and articles on public affairs as well as examples of individual company programs, such as policy statements, political and economic education courses and reports on special projects.

A monthly newsletter, the Echo, contains items of general public affairs interest. Matters of concern to professional public affairs people appear in the Clearinghouse bulletin, a more sophisticated periodical with limited circulation. ECO is currently in the midst of a series of monographs dealing with specific questions of interest to public affairs officers, such as effective committee testimony, corporate communications and bipartisan fund-raising drives.

ECO is equipped to handle questions of all kinds in the public affairs field. A letter, wire or telephone call will bring immediate attention to any research problem or inquiry—no matter how small or large.

The ECO staff comprises trained specialists in the public affairs field. These people will travel anywhere at any time to meet a company's problem on its own home ground. This personal consultation service is available to the company interested in starting a public affairs program, as well as the business already firmly established in these activities.

We stand willing and ready to do all these things and we extend a cordial invitation to those who think that we can be of assistance to aid in the development and operation of a public affairs program.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] had the floor. The Chair understood the Senator yielded for a request by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The Senator from Montana made the request. The Senate acted upon it. Then the Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. Now the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to know what is the position of the bill now. Where is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands the situation, if the Chair may have the attention of the Parliamentarian until a ruling can be made, two bills have been sent to the desk. One is the President's bill, the administration's bill, which is introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Is any other Senator a cosponsor of that bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Only the Senator from Montana, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana. The Senator has asked that that bill be referred today, although he has asked that the bill remain at the desk before printing, so that Senators may add their names to it. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that that bill, containing all eight sections, would go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That suits me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a separate bill on public facilities being introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which deals with interstate commerce, which would go to the Committee on Commerce, when referred.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is another bill to be introduced, as the Chair understands the situation, under the sponsorship of the Senate leaders later today. The Chair cannot refer that bill until it is received.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer emphasize the fact that that bill will definitely be introduced today and it is withheld for the moment because I felt under obligation to confer with my colleagues on the subject. It will, however, be introduced today; and it will be the package minus title II.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair emphasizes the fact that later in the day the two leaders will introduce another bill, which will be the same as the President's package bill minus section II.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from South Carolina concluded and yielded the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

This is a bold, courageous, and comprehensive message and program on civil rights. It is the product of long and intensive consultation with congressional leaders and with representatives of all segments of the American public. The legislation proposed by the President is the minimum necessary to close the citizenship gap in America today. I will be a sponsor of this new civil rights program, and pledge my time and energy in the effort to win congressional approval this year. The country wants and needs effective civil rights legislation. I predict the administration's program will be approved.

Mr. President, I merely wish to add that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself are asking to join as cosponsors of the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], representing the total package bill. Other Senators will join as cosponsors. It will be a bipartisan cosponsorship.

I am working closely with the Senator from California in an effort to obtain equal representation of cosponsorship upon this total, overall, comprehensive civil rights program.

The effort will be made to balance it off, so to speak, with a Democrat and a Republican, a Republican and a Democrat, in an effort to have genuine bipartisanship in cosponsoring this very important measure.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from California for his consistent cooperation in these matters. He has been most helpful.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, perhaps during the lifetimes of Members of the Senate the debate and ultimate action on the legislative proposal introduced today will be the most far-reaching, the most difficult, and one of the most important before the Senate, the Congress, and the people of the country.

In attempting to solve a tragic National problem Senators need to act not as partisans, but as Americans. Thus I am very glad that in the introduction of the bill today, sent by this administration, reflecting the views of each national political party in great part, we who sponsor it will come in equal numbers from both sides of this aisle that separates the two parties.

I thank my friend from Minnesota for his comments; and, on behalf of my own colleagues, who can speak far more eloquently for themselves, I merely say that we shall act as men of good will, recognizing that there are divergencies of view in each party and recognizing also that at this late hour the Congress of the United States has a responsibility to participate in the solution of a tragic problem and in demonstrating to the people of the entire globe that equal justice under law is not a sham but a constitutional right to be enjoyed by every American citizen regardless of his caste or of his blood.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BURDICK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. OLAV HORDVIK, MEMBER OF THE NORWEGIAN STORTING

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, we are honored to have with us this afternoon a very distinguished visitor. I wish to introduce the Honorable Olav Hordvik, Member of the Storting, otherwise known as the Norwegian Parliament.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is happy to welcome this distinguished visitor, on behalf of the Senate.

THE PHILADELPHIA BANK MERGER CASE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I was shocked to hear of the Supreme Court's decision in the Philadelphia bank merger case. This is one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down.

I was shocked both at the result and at the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose.

The case holds that section 7 of the Clayton Act applies to bank mergers. Before 1950, section 7 of the Clayton Act applied only to stock acquisitions, where one corporation bought and held stock of another company. In 1950, by the Celler-Kefauver Act, an additional prohibition was added—a prohibition against asset acquisitions by corporations subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. Banks were not and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the FTC, but to the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board.

Neither the original section 7 nor the Celler-Kefauver amendment applied to bank mergers carried out under the merger provisions of the National Bank Act. But somehow the Supreme Court, or at least five judges, reach the conclusion that the amended act applies to such bank mergers.

This interpretation is an original and novel idea. Congressman CELLER did not think he had accomplished this result. The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1959 and testified as follows:

> Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. Moreover, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of various antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of the Celler-Kefauver Act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission.
>
> Beyond this, virtually all bank mergers are accomplished by asset acquisitions by virtue not only of provisions of Federal laws prohibiting member banks of the Federal Reserve System, with a few exceptions, from purchasing corporate stocks, but also of various State statutes prescribing similar limitations. For these reasons, section 7 of the Clayton Act has little value in coping with the mounting trend of bank merger activity.
>
> To close this loophole in section 7 and provide Federal enforcement agencies with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions, I introduced H.R. 5948 in the 84th Congress. This bill was adopted by the House without dissent on February 6, 1956, but was not brought up on the Senate floor for vote. I might add that the measure was in accordance with the President's recommendations submitted to the Congress in 1956 and repeated in 1957, 1958, and 1959, calling for revision of antitrust legislation to cover the bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions.

Five distinguished representatives of the Justice Department—Attorney General Brownell in 1957, Deputy Attorney General Walsh in 1959, and three heads of the Antitrust Division—Judge Barnes in 1956, Judge Hanson in 1957, and Hon. Robert A. Bicks in 1960—recommended enactment of a bank merger act. They recommended that such an act should apply the principles of section 7 to bank mergers. All of them based their recommendations on their understanding that section 7 did not apply to bank mergers.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate, in considering the bill which finally became the Bank Merger Act, clearly and repeatedly stated their understanding that section 7 did not apply to bank mergers and clearly and repeatedly decided not to apply section 7 to bank mergers.

In the face of this background, the majority of the Supreme Court, as far as I can grasp their reasoning, simply say the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950 was intended to prohibit mergers. Bank mergers are mergers. Therefore, the Celler-Kefauver Act applies to bank mergers.

This is false logic. Anyone with legislative experience knows that what a statute does not cover is as important as what it does cover. The limits on a statute's scope are vitally important in getting legislation through Congress. Legislative bodies deal with specific problems and issues, and the statutes they enact should be limited to what the statutes cover—not extended endlessly at the whim of the Court.

The Court often quotes Chief Justice Marshall, "It is a Constitution we are expounding," when it is stretching constitutional provisions. Whether we agree or not with these judicial amendments to the Constitution, we are by now well used to them. But the reverse is equally true. Statutes should not be expounded with the same freedom the Court applies to constitutional provisions.

The Court, I am glad to say, does not always rewrite statutes. When it wishes, the Court adopts the policy of following the terms of a statute and the clear will of Congress, leaving it to Congress to amend the act. A leading case along this line is *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees*, 346 U.S. 356.

I am also glad to say that Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Stewart dissented in a clear and compelling opinion written by Justice Harlan. Mr. Justice Harlan made it entirely clear that—

> For 10 years everyone—the department responsible for antitrust law enforcement, the banking industry, the Congress, and the bar—proceeded on the assumption that the 1950 amendment of the Clayton Act did not affect bank mergers. This assumption provided a major impetus to the enactment of remedial legislation, and Congress, when it finally settled on what it thought was the solution to the problem at hand, emphatically rejected the remedy now brought to life by the Court.

He pointed out that—

> The legislative history of the 1950 amendment also unquestionably negates any inference that Congress intended to reach bank mergers.

Mr. Justice Harlan continued by pointing out:

> The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy.

It is too early to tell just what this decision means. At the least, it means that the Justice Department has the controlling voice in bank mergers, instead of the advisory role the Congress intended when it passed the Bank Merger Act. This decision may mean that there will be no more bank mergers. It certainly means there will be none unless the Justice Department agrees. It is not clear how far this decision will be applied to past mergers—how far the Department of Justice may go in seeking to upset mergers which have been effected since the 1950 amendment to section 7.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay down the message of the President, that it be appropriately referred, and that it be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the reading of the message be waived, since it was read in the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, may I add my comment to the statement of the Senator from Minnesota? I think this is one of the most historic messages that will be delivered to the Congress in our time. This is a message for which the Kennedy administration will be historically known possibly more than any other act it makes. This is an effort to implement the Emancipation Proclamation, the fruits of which have been denied the Negroes of this country for a hundred years. It is such a great message that the senior Senator from Oregon requests the message be read by the clerk, publicly to the American people, this morning.

Several Senators addressed the chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to express my gratitude to the Members of both sides of the Senate who have, as expressed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], desired that an approach to this most important package of legislation as proposed in the President's message be handled on a bipartisan basis. I have therefore joined the Senator from California and others of my colleagues in agreeing to cosponsor the legislation as presented, and to state that, while some of us had proposed measures which would have further implemented civil rights legislation, we are still prepared to support them.

Nevertheless, in the interest of the avoidance of violence, recognizing the importance of the principles of our Constitution, the declaration made by so many people over so many years, of the essential dignity of man, recognizing that I would like to remove from the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag the unintentioned hypocrisy which now appears in its closing phrase, "with liberty and justice for all," and in an attempt to implement our high principles, and because I feel bipartisan support of this legislation offers it a far better prospect of success, I am very happy to join with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and other colleagues on my side, and I believe an equal number of Senators on the Democratic side, in the support of this proposed legislation.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there has been no opportunity as yet to study the President's message, although, from a cursory perusal of it, I can say that I can support many of the recommendations.

I presume that the President's message and the proposed legislation are intended to assure equal justice and a guarantee of constitutional rights to those who have been the victims of discrimination in one form or another. However, there is something about the President's message which disturbs me, because no less than 34 times he refers to these people as Negroes. This repeated reference to these people who have been discriminated against as Negroes seems to me to be a form of discrimination in itself.

It is my hope that in considering the proposed legislation, Senators will refer to these victims of discrimination as people and citizens of the United States, rather than a separate class of our population for whom special legislation may be required.

NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1956 the U.S. Congress authorized the construction of a ship that would carry passengers and cargo and be propelled by nuclear power. That ship cost $80 million to construct. It is the pride of the American people and those with technique and scientific knowledge.

Seven years later, in May of 1963, that ship was ready to sail. It was contemplated that it would make stops at certain ports of European nations. When the time came for the signaling of the departure of the ship, it was found that certain union leaders called a strike of needed men for the operation of the ship. Hence it was compelled to lie idle at the dock.

The dispute which arose was over the fact that certain employees on this ship, having been trained at governmental expense, and having obtained technical knowledge which was rare, said to the operators, "Unless you give us a special wage increase, we will not work."

Even though that special increase had been granted, the ship would not have been able to leave the dock, because other workers said, "If you increase the wages of these experts, you must increase ours in conformity with the collective bargaining contract."

When this act came to the knowledge of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges made a statement in which he said that he thought it could be said without exaggeration that the labor disputes involving the *Savannah* crew and resulting in the present deplorable, if not disgraceful, situation have a strange Alice-in-Wonderland character.

Since that time, articles have been published in various magazines. I have before me a copy of Life magazine of June 14, 1963. The article is written by Robert Rosenfeld, under the title "Atom-Powered Ship Is National Disgrace."

The Secretary of Commerce, finding himself in this embarrassing dilemma, on June 11 issued a release in substance, as follows:

> The Department prefers that the *Savannah* be operated by a private carrier under a general agency contract; but, however, if satisfactory arrangements for this type of operation cannot be made, the *Savannah* would be operated directly by the Government.
>
> A copy of the general agency agreement containing the requirements of the United States was enclosed with Under Secretary Martin's letter. The letter stated that the enclosed contract was similar in most respects to the agreement previously in effect between the Department and States Marine Lines, Inc. However, an important new section has been added to the general agency contract, pertaining to crew personnel provisions.
>
> This new section of the contract provides that: (1) Job descriptions for all crew positions on the *Savannah* and the manning requirements of the *Savannah* will be set by the United States; (2) that wage rates and employee benefits on Class A–1 vessels (the power-tonnage class of the *Savannah*) as provided by collective-bargaining agreements which a general agent has in effect from time to time for the operation of nonnuclear-powered class A–1 vessels, would be applicable for crew personnel assigned to the *Savannah;* and (3) the United States must have assurance from any union representing crew personnel assigned to the *Savannah* not to order or to permit any strike or unauthorized work stoppage affecting the *Savannah*, and further, each person assigned to the crew of the *Savannah* in the future would individually agree not to engage in any strike or unauthorized work stoppage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as you will note the Secretary of Commerce, wanting to get this ship on the high seas, issued a statement on June 11, in which he called upon private enterprise to run the ship, and stated that a contract would be made with one of several companies that were interested, but that the Federal Government would prescribe the ways and means of hiring the employees, constantly having in mind collective bargaining agreements but wanting a pledge of no strike from the unions.

Yesterday, I received two telegrams from representatives of the labor unions who are responsible for this disgraceful condition.

One telegram reads:

> Hon. Frank J. Lausche,
> *Senate Commerce Committee,*
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> We protest the attempt by the Department of Commerce to scuttle bona fide collective bargaining and substitute yellow dog agreements in the leasing of the NS *Savannah* to private operator. Fixing wages and conditions of employment by Government departments instead of free collective bargaining smacks of governmental dictatorship. Any private operator designated by the Government to operate the *Savannah* should enter into bona fide collective bargaining with the duly authorized representative of the national Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. We urge your immediate assistance in this matter.
>
> Paul Hall,
> *President.*
> Peter M. McGavin,
> *Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO.*

Mr. President, these people urge my immediate assistance to help them keep this $80 million ship from going on the high seas. My answer to these two telegrams I now make publicly on the floor of the Senate. As far as I am concerned, they will not have my help, but, instead, my opposition to the disgraceful conduct they are following.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while we have not had an opportunity to study the President's message in detail, or may not agree with all its provisions, we know that the situation which we face is a serious one which calls for affirmative action coupled with a realistic, dispassionate approach to the problem. All Americans have a responsibility to insure that equal opportunity is afforded all our citizens. This responsibility falls on us in what ever capacity we may be serving. As a Member of Congress I welcome the opportunity to participate in the effort to achieve this goal.

Some of the inequities which exist can and should be redressed by legislation, and those we should move to accomplish. I have introduced and supported meaningful civil rights legislation in the past and will continue to support it. I hope that the bills to be presented today will be considered expeditously and thoughtfully in committee, so that we can move forward in this most important area very soon.

In meeting our responsibilities we must be sure that we are being realistic and we must be careful to keep our feet on the ground. We must not be carried away by emotion and led into actions which we may later have cause to regret. The problem before us requires the cooperation and understanding of all Americans. I am confident that that cooperation will be forthcoming and that we can solve this problem in the traditional American way—by working together in a united effort.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suppose that we would be justified in expressing our gratification that at long last it has been recognized that the subject of civil rights represents a national crisis, and that it has many friends in the Senate. We always knew that, but unfortunately, we have been divided for various reasons.

Today is not a day for reservations, however. Today is a day on which to close ranks. It requires all Americans to close ranks. Accordingly, I pledge my support to the President.

In return, I believe that the President must make it clear to the country—and he has certainly made a beginning toward that end in his message to Congress—that he has pledged not only his head, but also his heart to this struggle; that civil rights legislation must displace tax reduction as the No. 1 priority, tax reduction now being assigned No. 2 priority; and that the key vote will come on cloture to stop a filibuster in the Senate.

Success in the battles ahead will require not only an aroused country but an aroused President.

It will be my duty and that of other Senators to do all we can to see that the necessary measures are taken up in Congress at the earliest possible moment.

I note with the greatest of interest that title II now replaces the famous part III as the big storm center, title II being the effort to do away with segregation in places of public accommodation. This follows the bill, based on the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution, which I and six other Republican colleagues had introduced in March. Not only is that constitutional, Mr. President, but I have introduced numerous measures, as has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to cut off Federal funds from programs which violate the antidiscrimination principle. The President is also at long last adopting this principle, whether it is in the form of a Powell amendment, a Javits amendment, or a Morse amendment. At long last there has been recognition that justice requires this to be done.

Title II now replaces "part III" as the storm center, as I have said, guaranteeing against discrimination and desegregation in places of public accommodation. But such a statute is now on the books of 31 States and is known and accepted. One of the States which have adopted such a law is the State of Illinois, the State of our minority leader. The State of New York has had such a law for a long time. These laws are essential. I am honored to join in this part of the package, and it needs to be passed.

Finally, Mr. President, let us understand that, although this is something of a day of celebration for many of us, it is also a day of beginning; there is a long, tough fight ahead. Let us hope that we will not start to vote on these measures in September or October, but that we will start on them promptly; let us hope that we shall start to vote on them in July. I believe that the debate should begin promptly. It can start with the submission of a simple amendment to a bill. All of us know that unless this is done by the leadership, such an effort will not have validity or force.

I am delighted to pay my tribute to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for his leadership in this fight. Knowing him as I do, with the path now before us, we will march on that path quickly.

I do not say what I have said in any sense of criticism, but only to emphasize from past experience what now must be done in view of the national crisis on civil rights, which the President has recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority whip. I hope that each and every one of the bills on civil rights that are being introduced will be available for cosponsorship by all Members of the Senate who have fought for civil rights for many years. I am not certain that I correctly understood the comment by the majority whip a few moments ago; but he left me with the impression that an equal number of Democrats and Republicans would sponsor the Humphrey-Kuchel bill. The substance of the Humphrey-Kuchel bill is of interest to all Members of the Senate who believe in civil rights; therefore, I respectfully request that there be cosponsorship by all of us who wish to be cosponsors.

There is an additional reason. It is important that the country on this historic day—and I intend to say something about its historic significance in just a moment—understand that there is a very broad sponsorship of these bills in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that, so far as possible, there would be an alternation of sponsorship—Democrat, Republican, Democrat, Republican—in an effort to maintain a strong bipartisanship spirit. But obviously there will be many more of one group than another.

As the distinguished majority leader said, the bill will be open for cosponsorship by all Senators who wish to join as cosponsors. I know the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon will be among the first to join, and rightly so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think in this historic hour and day, as we discuss the issue of civil rights this afternoon, we perhaps fully appreciate the importance of the hour. But historians of the future will as they write about it; for, in my judgment, a great chapter in American history is being written in the Senate today as a result of the action by the President of the United States in sending this message to Congress.

During my many years as a Member of the Senate, I have heard many Presidential messages read from the reading clerk's desk. In my opinion, few of them compare in historic significance with the great message that President Kennedy has sent to us today. That is why, a few moments ago, I took the position that the message should be read into the RECORD and to the American people from the floor of the Senate today, and why I objected to the request that was made that the message merely be printed in the RECORD. I think it is important that the message be emphasized through every medium of public information available. After all, the final decision will not be made by the Senate and the House; the final decision on this great issue will be made by the American people.

I listened to the comment of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] concerning the President's references, some 30 times in the message, to Negroes. That is true. But a reading of the message shows that on the first three pages the President refers also to Negro citizens; and later in the message he refers to whites. Let us face it: We are dealing with a problem that concerns the denial of rights for 100 years to Negro citizens. We are concerned with a problem that involves discrimination by whites against Negroes for 100 years in this country. Taking the message from its four corners, the President appropriately emphasizes the importance of this problem to Negro citizens and says so throughout the message.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be yielded 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Throughout the message, the President refers to Negroes, as we must refer to Negroes, when we discuss civil rights problems, and he refers to the whites as well. At the top of page 3 of the mimeographed copy of the message, the President says: "For these reasons, I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted" civil rights legislation. I cannot too strongly endorse that statement by the President and emphasize the clear obligation of Congress to remain in session until this question is settled. In my judgment, all else should be put aside, if necessary, finally to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of the country. The senior Senator from Oregon will oppose any attempt to trim this proposal, any attempt to water it down, any attempt to give Negroes half a loaf; for the Negroes of America are entitled, in the year 1963, to the full deliverance of their constitutional rights.

On the question of equal accommodations in public facilities, I emphatically disagree with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] when he questions the constitutionality of this aspect of the President's proposal. In my judgment, on page 3 of the message, the President makes an unanswerable argument when he points out that such legislation is clearly consistent with the Constitution and with our concepts of human rights and property rights. At the top of page 4, the President points out:

> Indeed, there is an age-old saying that "Property has its duties as well as its rights"; and no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color.

Let us face that issue without the slightest trimming of any of the legislation that is passed to assure the right of the Negroes to full accommodations in the public places of this country and in public facilities that hold themselves out for the making of a profit.

I think such a legislative requirement is constitutional both under the commerce clause and under the 14th amendment, and I have already cosponsored with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a measure protecting under the 14th amendment the right of colored citizens to patronize public businesses.

Lastly, as was referred to by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I am, of course, flattered that the President at least approved the principle of my bill, S. 1665, respecting the denial of Federal funds for any State or local service or project in which segregation exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be granted 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, State-supported segregation is illegal and has been illegal for many long years. It is time for the Negroes of this country to be protected from a continuation of that illegality. I go further, however, than the President goes in his message. The President would leave it up to Federal administrators, by way of discretion, to deny Federal funds to any Federal project or service in which there is segregation. I say that the Negro citizens of America have the right to expect their Congress to stop supporting an illegality. This should not be discretionary; it should be mandatory.

In my judgment, every dollar of Federal taxpayers' money that goes into a Federal project or a Federal service which sustains segregation is an illegal expenditure of Federal money. Therefore, I shall seek, as the debate proceeds, to strengthen the proposal of the President by offering my proposal, which would deny the expenditure of Federal money by the Federal Government in any service or project that in any way, shape, form, or manner whatsoever sustains segregation.

I close by congratulating my President and saying to him how proud I am to be an American citizen today under a President who has taken the position that the great promises of Abraham Lincoln, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the 14th amendment must now be carried out, and the Constitution delivered to the Negroes of America.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my commendation to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader for the effort which they have put into this problem; and also to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for the manner in which they have made it possible for these proposals to be truly bipartisan, by inviting bipartisan cosponsorship of the proposed legislation.

The President's message sets forth very important objectives and enactment of the legislation he has proposed would represent substantial progress. However, I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it is illegal to expend Federal funds for projects or services which deny their use to Negroes, and have cosponsored his bill. If such practices are not prohibited by Executive order, as they can and should be, I shall join with the Senator from Oregon in an effort to include such a provision in the civil rights bill.

This bill, like all others, undoubtedly will be improved and modified both in the committee and on the floor; but certainly it represents a great step forward in meeting the challenge of civil rights. All of us must approach this challenge with a determination to succeed. The time for alibiing on civil rights is obviously over. Those of us who have been fighting over the years for equal rights for all our citizens must be just as resolute and just as tireless in working for our causes as those who are opposed to the legislation and who respond to the demands for freedom now with promises to filibuster forever.

If a filibuster develops, the crucial test will come on the decision of the Senate cloture. It is essential that a civil rights coalition develop in the Senate. We have heard much about other coalitions; but a civil rights coalition consisting of the advocates of such legislation in both parties— a coalition which, in the interest of the Nation's welfare, will submerge party labels and any narrow political considerations, is essential for the success of our efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from New York in the morning hour has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I proceed for 2 more minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the cosponsorship of the President's program by Senators on both sides of the aisle is a good omen of future unity and cooperation. This approach must be continued at the committee sessions, in the debates, and the consideration of amendments on the floor. We must join forces if we are to overcome the vigorous opposition which we must expect if history is to repeat itself.

We are faced with a long, hard session. But, speaking for myself—and I know I am not alone in this—I am ready to stay here until the snow flies; and I agree emphatically with the part of the President's message in which he indicates that Congress should remain in session and should not consider leaving here until it has enacted legislation in this field. In the coming debates, America will be on trial; and we must not fail in our responsibilities.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad the President has sent to Congress his bills and message on civil rights.

Although I believe that some sections of the bill are not the best that could be recommended, I have joined in sponsoring the omnibus civil rights bill because it will place the issue of civil rights before the Senate, and because it represents the recognition of the administration, at long last, that there must be a legal framework for the definition and enforcement of equal rights.

It is an issue with which the Congress and the administration must come to full grips, for it is our responsibility to do all possible to help achieve the equal rights to which all our citizens, regardless of race or color, are entitled.

I do not expect the proposed legislation, even if enacted, to achieve fully the objectives of those who are now denied equal rights. But at least it will provide the legal basis and background which has been needed for 10 years since the Brown decision—and especially during the last 2 years—to enable the Federal Government and the President to act in a legal and effective way. It will play a part in removing the frustrations of those who are denied their equal rights. These matters must be determined by law, and not by violence.

I join as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation because its objectives are right, and because it brings the essential issue before Congress and the country. Nevertheless, as I have said, I do not believe that the measures the President has suggested are necessarily the best possible. I have always had doubts that the administration's proposal on voting rights is constitutional. But this is a matter of which there is disagreement and I hope that the section can be perfected.

In addition, I dislike having the public accommodations issue based upon the commerce clause. If our fellow citizens have the equal right to the use of public accommodations—and I believe they do—it is based on the 14th amendment. It derives from the equal rights of citizenship accorded to all persons by the 14th amendment, irrespective of race or color, and is not one tied to or predicated upon commerce. Even though I would say that using the commerce clause to guarantee equal access to public accommodations is, in my opinion, constitutional, I do not like the approach. It would create new inequalities and provoke litigation.

Several weeks ago the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and I introduced three bills on civil rights, dealing with three subjects—voting rights, school desegregation, and public accommodations. We agree that although we prefer the approach adopted by our bills, and will offer our bills as amendments when the administration bills come before the Senate, we join as cosponsors of the administration bill because it is essential to act upon civil rights legislation.

So I am happy to become a cosponsor of the proposed legislation. I hope that legislation will be enacted, and I believe it will be enacted if we have the will. We are dealing with a national issue—one of the greatest of our country and time.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT DEDICATION OF EAST COAST MEMORIAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the company of the President of the United States, I had the honor to attend the dedication ceremony of the East Coast Memorial, at New York City, on May 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks I made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT DEDICATION OF EAST COAST MEMORIAL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 23, 1963

It was not a long time ago, as time goes. It was scarcely 20 years ago when it all took place.

In the dawn and in the dusk and through the day, men and women went forth from this Nation—to Africa, to Asia, to Europe, to the South Pacific, and to all the far places of the world. Week after week, they went, and month after month, and year after year.

Before it was done, 8 million men and women in battle dress were outside the borders and, within, millions more were ready to go. And behind them, there was a Nation with a whole people united in common purpose.

They came, these men and women in the Armed Forces, from the farms, the mines, the desks, and the work benches. They came from slum and suburb, from country and town. They came from Utah and New York, from Puerto Rico and Georgia, from all the States and places in the land. They came from the long-rooted strains of Americans and from those so new that even the English language was still halting on the tongue. They came in all colors, all faiths, all creeds. And they were welcome in all colors, faiths, and creeds.

Some came with fierce anger. Some came with cold hate. And some came with neither hate nor anger. Some knew why they came and some did not. Some came because they were told; and some because they told themselves.

In the end, it did not matter who they were, what they were, what they did, where they had come from, or why. They became—all of them—the sinew and bone and muscle of a mighty arm of a nation. The Nation's purpose was their purpose and it was they who bore the great costs and dangers of that purpose through the long years of the war.

A common human hope joined these Americans with others—with the English, with Russians, with Chinese, with Frenchmen, and many more. And, in the end, this massive force swept, as a great wave, over the ramparts of the tyrants. It tore loose a deadly weight from the minds and backs of hundreds of millions and flung it into the cesspools of history.

And when this force had spent itself, for a brief moment, men and women throughout the world drank deeply of the meaning of peace and freedom. Many clutched that moment and held it. Many soon forgot or were compelled soon to forget.

And millions of those who had done so much to forge the moment were not there to live it when it came. Some had fought and died years before and some the day before. They had died in their homes or down the street or on the edge of town, against a wall, in a ditch, a courtyard, or an open field. And others had died a long way from home, in an alien land, or against a vast sky or in the pitch dark of the sea's depths.

Countless Americans were among those who did not see the bright flash of freedom and peace which swept the earth when the conflict ended. They died in all the places and in all the ways of war's death. Today, most of them lie here in the earth of America or in a plot apart in other nations which is of this Nation because they are there. But for others, we are not able to provide even a grave with a cross or a star to mark their last traces.

These are the missing, and it is they who have summoned us.

How much do we know of these missing men, we who stand here today? We know their names. We know the numbers they bore in the Army and Air Force, the Coast Guard, in the Navy and the Marines. But what do we really know of them? Do we know them as a wife, a mother, a father, a sister, brother, or friend might know them? For those close to them, each life lost was as a star in a human universe, a star whose light was bright for awhile and then, in a moment, ceased to burn.

We cannot know that world, we who stand here, that closed but infinite world of each man's circle. What we can know, what all in this Nation can know, and all the world's people should know, is that these deaths are a debt yet to be redeemed. And those whom we could not even bury are of its pledge.

Let us not delude ourselves. We do not pay the debt with these words today. We do not end it with these steles of granite pointed toward the sky nor with names struck upon stone.

We seek the words to praise these men, and they are wanting. We search to express our thanks to these men, and even the genius of the sculptor is not enough.

The debt remains unpaid. What we do and say here today is not needed by these men whom we honor. It is needed by ourselves. It is needed to remind us that the debt is unpaid, for these men whose names we record, and the countless others throughout the world whose passing was marked or unmarked, did not die for words of praise or memorials of stone. They died that those who lived might have a chance to build this Nation strong and wise in justice and in equity for all, in a world free, at last, from the tyrants of fear, hate, and oppression.

It was a long time ago, as time goes, that they died. It was not 20 years but 50 years ago or a century or a millennium. For they died, not only on the Normandy beachhead but at Verdun, at Gettysburg, at Valley Forge, and in all the places and in all the times that the human right to be human has been redeemed.

If we would honor these dead, then—all of them—if we would praise them, if we would repay them, let us ask ourselves what we have done with this chance which they have given us. And let us ask ourselves again and again what we have done until there is, in this Nation and in this world, the need to ask it no longer.

BERLIN: A NEW APPROACH—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PELL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has made many valuable contributions to our understanding of the situation in Europe and Germany, and from time to time he has offered a constructive contribution of ideas for consideration in connection with our policies respecting that region. The latest effort of the Senator appears in the June 22, 1963, issue of the Nation in an article entitled "Berlin: A New Approach."

I have read this article with great interest. It reveals a deep insight into the diplomacy and psychology of Europe and a clear perception of the strengths and weaknesses of the contemporary Western position in Berlin and central Europe.

What the Senator from Rhode Island does is to propose specific revisions of this position which, in his view, would attune it more closely to the present realities of Europe and, at the same time, strengthen in a real sense our policies with respect to Europe in the overall interests of the people of the United States.

It is not necessary to accept every specific proposal which the Senator from Rhode Island has made in order to recognize that his article is, in total, a highly constructive contribution of thought on a most complex question of policy. It would be my hope that Senators who have evinced a deep interest in this question and members of the executive branch who have direct responsibility in dealing with it would study this article most carefully. To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Berlin: A New Approach

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL)

Of the many centers of international crisis today, none is more potentially dangerous nor has festered longer than the situation in Berlin. For 18 years we have been confronting this problem, which has been sometimes deceptively quiescent, sometimes productive of violent localized struggle and loss of life, more often verging on eruption into conflict which could engulf us all. We have witnessed policies of "brinkmanship" and the maneuvering of armed forces into positions from which withdrawal is increasingly hazardous. We have gained at best a form of status quo—made, however, less favorable to our own national interests, to the interests of the German people and, indeed, of all who desire freedom everywhere by the construction of the Berlin wall.

In my opinion, we have for too long promoted expedients rather than a basic resolution for the problem. We need a fresh approach, and we need to take the initiative in this respect—before we are compelled once again to counter Communist-motivated action.

Recent diplomatic exchanges have produced nothing to encourage great optimism. Nevertheless, it would seem that the Communist armor is not as solid as it once appeared. Moscow and Peking are scarcely in total harmony. Premier Khrushchev has expressed a wish to negotiate, perhaps because all is not well within the monolithic structure of communism, perhaps because of his clumsy failure in Cuba to change the nuclear balance of power, perhaps because the threat of nuclear holocaust makes him realize that he has more to gain through peace. We should not place undue emphasis on any of these aspects; but the fact is that negotiations are possible. We should, therefore, come to the conference table well prepared.

What are the goals we should espouse for an honorable settlement vis-a-vis Berlin? We are pledged to preserve the liberty and the economic viability of the western part of the city, and we are committed to defend our right to maintain an appropriate garrison there. But there is one more goal for which we ought to strive: guaranteed land access to the city itself.

At the conclusion of World War II, before hostilities between East and West became manifest, we did not insist on specific land access to Berlin. Instead, we preferred to have rights of general access. These were never formalized by treaty, and they have grown into a source of dispute which goes to the very root of the Berlin problem. Furthermore, West German travel to the city is subject to the whim of East German authorities; constant turmoil and confusion are the result. Thus, explicit land access to Berlin, through 110 miles of East German territory, is essential to the agreement we should now seek to reach.

I believe that the Berlin-to-Helmstedt highway is ideally suited to this purpose. There would be virtually no interference with the economic life of East Germany; the highway is equipped with 79 overpasses and 65 underpasses, which traverse without obstruction not only other thoroughfares, but the 21 railroads in the area. The highway could be internationalized, as President Kennedy has suggested; but, in any case, it must be defined by irrevocable guarantee.

Are the policies we have so far been pursuing geared to a formalizing of such an agreement? Since World War II we have championed the cause of a unified Germany. Is this stipulation—here and now—realistic? Or does it lead to irresolvable stalemate? Let us examine the situation more closely.

At present in Berlin two armed camps face each other across a monstrously inhuman barrier made of stone and barbed wire. The slightest jar on one side sets off a similar seismic rumble on the other. The Russians "create" an incident; we maneuver conspicuously a squadron of tanks—and meanwhile, East Berliners cannot cross to West Berlin, even to attend burials; only the coffin with its dead body is permitted through the wall. There is inordinate suffering; and times of crisis, though they may pass without catastrope, leave tensions higher than before. If we in the free world, as members of the NATO alliance, allow this process to continue, surely there must come a day of reckoning.

How can we ease these tensions without jeopardizing the pledges we have made and which, at all costs, we must keep?

Our current policies provide no answer. Since 1954 we have encouraged and assisted Western Germany to build up its military might. Western Germany can now boast the most powerful non-Soviet ground force in Europe: an army of 11 divisions and 253,000 men; a navy of 177 ships and 28,000 men; an air force numbering 90,000. East Germany, in turn, has raised an army of approximately 200,000, with a 14,000-man navy, and an air force of 10,000. These two establishments are, of course, the antithesis of the West's original 1946 concept of a unified Germany, stripped of its military potential and in a world at peace.

Times and circumstances obviously have changed; yet we persist in maintaining attitudes and frames of reference which look backward instead of ahead. It is high time we face the facts as they exist in 1963.

It seems inconceivable to me that either the United States or the Soviet Union, the Western Alliance or the Eastern bloc, will agree on a disarmed, neutral Germany in the immediate future. The NATO nations certainly would not want Western Germany, the bulwark of their land forces, to withdraw its troops from their command. Nor will the Warsaw Pact Communist nations permit East Germany, with its military resources, to withdraw from the Communist orbit. Let us acknowledge these facts. The mere acknowledgment allows us to proceed to a new, present-day evaluation of the German situation.

To achieve a formal, ironclad guarantee from the Communists on our rights of land access to Berlin, certainly we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of the two German Governments and agree, moreover, on the Oder-Neisse line as the East German-Polish border. Such an agreement would in no way infringe on our commitments for preserving West German freedom—and the Communists would not have gained control over a single human being or a single square inch of territory not already under their rule. By consistently refusing to deal with the de facto East German Government, we strengthen the Soviet hand, rather than—as we would prefer to think—enfeeble it. We simply augment the stalemate.

But if we accept reality, not only do we open the door for a conclusive accord, but we would be nurturing an environment which could ultimately and successfully undermine the Communist satellite regimes. Poland is the leading industrial satellite nation in the Soviet European empire. Its estimated gross national product of $21.5 billion tops by $2 billion the GNP of East Germany. Only the Communist countries formally recognize the 283-mile Polish Oder-Neisse frontier. If the West recognized this boundary as well, one of the chief bonds tying Poland to Russia would be severed; and the fundamental anti-Russian feelings of the Polish people, who inhabit the Oder-Neisse territories to the virtual exclusion of all other nationalities, would be given stimulating impetus. A spirit of unrest, of rebellion, is latent in all satellite countries. It cannot grow contagiously, however, while it is enclosed in the vise of unmoving policies.

I believe that the agreement I suggest would have immense, long-term benefits. To begin with, by seizing the initiative in the easement of tensions, we could concentrate more vigorously on the relaxation of the Communist controls at the Berlin wall itself. Amelioration of these conditions is of prime concern to Berliners, both East and West.

We could follow through with other methods of tension reduction. It would be possible to work out a revised status of forces in West Berlin, whereunder American, British, and French forces would be garrisoned in West Berlin at the invitation of the West Berlin government. In turn, this would strengthen the position of Mayor Willy Brandt.

We could initiate steps with the Communists for a mutual slackening off of propaganda and intelligence operations and, in keeping with efforts presently being made by the West German Government, trade could be normalized between West and East Germany and between West Germany and other nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary—behind the Curtain. In actuality, trade between East and West Germany today amounts to almost half a billion dollars annually; but it is hampered by lack of legitimization. It is well known that communism feeds on areas where poverty and low standards of living prevail. Prosperity has never been a Communist ally in the lands the Kremlin dominates; nor do we find in these lands the higher living standards which prosperous trade relations engender.

It has been suggested that the United Nations headquarters be moved to Berlin. To me this particular step appears somewhat extreme, and I would question its practicability. However, I see no reason why the European headquarters of the U.N., presently at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, presently in Paris, should not be shifted to Berlin. I would prefer to see them in East Berlin, where their salutary effect, I feel, would be most productive; but no matter in what part of the city they were based, these two bodies would help ease political temperatures.

As tensions are reduced, so also would be reduced our current adverse balance-of-payments position. We are now spending more than $50 billion a year for national defense and supporting more than 400,000 men in Europe. No other NATO member makes a comparable outlay; no other has a longer draft period than our own. Yet our NATO allies are today enjoying a $4 billion-plus trade in consumer, nonstrategic goods with the Soviet bloc. In an environment where some military relaxation could be implemented, wouldn't it be possible for us to share in an expansion of peaceful and profitable trade?

We must face other realities, however, before considering a more serene future. Unfashionable as it may be to mention, the prospect of a rearmed and reunified Germany looms with a dark foreboding over a great many European minds. Not easy to forget is the fact that Germany has engaged in three aggressive wars in the past 100 years. The memory bolsters today's general acceptance of the premise that Germany should not be equipped with nuclear weapons; and it gives emphasis to our own point of view that the proliferation of these weapons should be prevented. On this most important single policy, for once, we and the Soviets agree. From a long-term viewpoint, though, no one nation can or should be singled out in this connection, no matter what her history or whether she has been victorious in a war or defeated.

For Eastern Europeans, the specter of a rearmed Germany has more alarming connotations. Communist authorities and satellite leaders exploit this apprehension, which is none the less genuine. Eastern Europe's fears are deeply rooted, stemming not only from brutalities suffered during World War II, but from centuries of earlier German attacks and occupation. We must not ignore the fact that a great majority of Eastern Europeans fear the Germans even more than they do the Russians.

The Poles, remembering all too vividly German conquest and subjugation, listen most uneasily when the usually reasonable Dr. Adenauer says that "the Oder-Neisse line is not Germany's frontier" and they are placed in the ironic position of having to choose the Russians as their defenders. A much more strident neo-Nazi West German minority calls for regaining the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. Surely, if a rearmed Germany should ever move eastward again, we would witness once more a European inferno.

Europeans also remember that twice within the past half-century Germany's future ability to wage war has been strengthened by arrangements and understandings reached with Russian rulers. Both the Rapallo Agreement in 1922 and the Ribbentrop Agreement in 1939 were calculated to allow Germany to concentrate its efforts against the West.

For these reasons alone, practical as well as psychological, I submit that a rearmed, reunified Germany is not necessarily the best bulwark against the Soviets.

Many intelligent and moderate Germans are today fully aware of the dangers inherent in militant reunification. As long ago as 1959, the German Social Democrats advanced the Deutschland Plan, accepting the Oder-Neisse frontier. Klaus von Bismark, grandson of the almost legendary old "Iron Chancellor" and now Director of the North Rhine-Westphalia radio network, recently added his support to this concept and suggested that, in accord with the current thinking in West Berlin, priority be given to the bettering of East German conditions. President Charles de Gaulle, whose opinions are frequently controversial, but whom we should seek to understand as basically a European realist, accepts the Oder-Neisse frontier as valid.

Our diplomatic tasks have never been more complex. The maintenance of a strong, coordinated Western alliance, with all parties in harmony, requires in itself exceptional energies. We must never for a moment forget, however, that the Communists are our chief enemy and that we are their number one target. And in this respect I firmly believe that a policy of total inflexibility is purposeless.

It seems obvious to me that a reunified, rearmed Germany—even if it were desirable—is not to be achieved by any means short of the violent upheaval which even the most sanguinary among us strenuously wish to avoid. By gaining what we lack—guaranteed land access to the island of freedom which Berlin has come to be—in exchange for recognition of the de facto East German regime, we would be taking a long stride toward ending the cold war.

In effect, we would be exchanging hope for hopelessness—and we would be fostering those very conditions which, in my opinion, can alone lead to the ultimate goal we have traditionally championed: a unified, unarmed Germany in a peaceful community of nations. Two armed camps cannot in this case be forged into one. Patently, the Russians will never make this concession, but two armed camps, clearly and objectively acknowledged as such, can eventually be disarmed. There is the hope.

We must assume that the Soviet Union, confronted with its own internal and external anxieties and problems, is willing for an abatement of tensions. After all, the Russians, too, are realists. Let us, therefore, take the initiative in Berlin. For the first time in many years, we would have much to gain in this vital area, and nothing that is fundamental to our honor to lose.

ARTHUR LAMEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, while I was in Montana, one of my dearest and oldest friends, Mr. Arthur Lamey, a former State chairman of the Democratic Party, a former State commander of the American Legion, and a former delegate of the United States to the United Nations, passed away.

I owe a great deal to Arthur Lamey for the advice, the counsel, and the consideration he gave me through the years. He was one of Montana's truly great citizens, a close personal friend, and one upon whom I depended for counsel long before I entered the field of politics. His passing is an almost irreplaceable loss. Those of us who knew him respected and loved him.

I feel it a sad duty at this time to tell Mr. Lamey's friends in this body—on both sides of the aisle—of this event, which occurred several weeks ago. In Mr. Lamey's passing, we have lost a great man, Montana has lost a fine citizen, and his family has lost a man who has meant much to all of them in a devoted and Christianlike manner down through the years.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in tribute to the late Arthur F. Lamey, distinguished American who served this Nation and the State of Montana for almost half a century.

Art Lamey earned the respect of all Montanans by his unceasing contributions to governmental and service organizations. His ability was recognized nationally, by his appointment to the President's Advisory Committee on Civil Rights in 1958, and to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in 1960.

He served 6 years in a difficult position to which reelection is the exception, that of State Democratic chairman in Montana. It was in this capacity that I first met Art Lamey more than a quarter of a century ago when I was a successful candidate for the legislature under his leadership. Later we worked together drafting legislation for Montana's participation and cooperation with the early programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term.

Subsequently, as an assistant attorney general, I frequently consulted with him on interpretations and enforcement of this pioneer legislation. He was chairman of the Montana delegation to the National Democratic Convention which nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt to a fourth term. He was twice nominated as the Democratic candidate for Governor.

Born in a section house in the town of Big Sandy, Art Lamey became head of the largest law firm in Montana. He served on the board of directors of the Montana Power Co., the Midland National Bank of Billings, and businesses in the city of Havre, where he began the practice of law in 1914.

A track star at the University of Michigan, Art Lamey served with valor in the Battle of Argonne Forest and other engagements during World War I, having enlisted as a private in the Marines and being discharged as a first lieutenant. Shortly after the war he was crippled by polio, which left him with only partial use of his legs. As chairman of the Orthopedic Foundation, Inc., of Billings, he helped many persons afflicted with the same disease which struck him, but could not stop him.

Art Lamey was a friend, whose counsel was prized by lawyers, by businessmen, by Government leaders. He was ever humble and straightforward, and bore malice to no one. Mrs. Metcalf and I extend to his widow, Catherine, to their son and two daughters, our deepest sympathy in the loss of a devoted husband and father who gave much to his State and country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The American people have lost a dedicated public servant and a great citizen. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I served with Arthur Lamey on the American delegation to the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. I raise my voice to say that he was truly a dedicated citizen-statesman. He was a practicing Christian. He was a good man. He was an inspiration and a great help to all of us who served with him at the United Nations.

I know that Mrs. Morse, who happens to be out of the city at present, would want me to express to Mrs. Lamey on behalf of both Mrs. Morse and myself our deepest sympathy and our most sincere and great regret to hear of the great loss.

I express my deep sympathy to the members of his family.

I wish to say to Mrs. Lamey that I am a better person for having had the opportunity to be associated with the Lameys in New York City during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I deeply appreciate the remarks of my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Oregon has so well said, no one could be associated with the Lameys without being the better for it. It was in the autumn of 1960 that, together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and others, and particularly Arthur Lamey, I was privileged to be a member of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations. At that time I established a friendship with Mr. Lamey which lasted until his death a few days ago.

Art Lamey, as we knew him, was one of the really great men whom I have been privileged to meet. He had a very great understanding of people and their problems. He was meticulously fair, always being willing to listen to those with whom he presumed to disagree. He was intensely loyal to the people of his State and the United States. In his passing Montana and the United States has lost one of its finest citizens. I, too, wish to extend my very deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lamey and to Arthur's sister, Ellen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Oregon for what they said because they knew Mr. Lamey personally and knew him well. Mr. Lamey was a gentleman, a Christian in the best meaning of that term, and a man of tolerance and understanding. He was more than a personal friend. He was a great man, as we who knew him have said. His passing will be mourned. To his wife Catherine, his children, his sisters and other relatives, Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our deepest condolences.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various editorials and statements concerning the passing of Arthur Lamey be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, June 5, 1963]

POLITICAL, CIVIC HEADS PAY TRIBUTE TO LAMEY

Political and civic leaders saw the sudden death of Arthur F. Lamey, Sr., Tuesday as a great loss to Billings, Mont., and the Nation.

"We are all terribly shocked," U.S. District Judge W. J. Jameson said. "I was his law partner for 17 years."

"He certainly was one of Montana's outstanding lawyers and citizens. It is a tragic loss in every way."

U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD said Mr. Lamey "was one of Montana's truly great citizens, a close personal friend and a man upon whom I depended for advice and counsel long before I entered the field of politics."

Mayor Willard Fraser echoed the statement, saying he turned to him a few days ago for advice and consultation.

"And in his passing we're all the poorer, but the richer for his having lived and worked among us," Fraser said. He said Mr. Lamey was "one of the real gentlemen of Montana."

"His passing leaves a void that will never be filled," Fraser said.

"Art Lamey's sudden passing is a great loss to Billings, to Montana, and to the Nation. Certainly he was one of the outstanding men of his generation in Montana," said Russ B. Hart.

"His passing is an almost irreplaceable loss," Senator MANSFIELD added.

"Those of us who knew him, respected him, and loved him will do our best to follow the fine Christian understanding which was so much a part of his life," he said.

Gov. Tim Babcock was traveling to Billings late Tuesday so no comment was available.

MANSFIELD SAYS LAMEY TRULY GREAT CITIZEN

BILLINGS.—Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, called Arthur F. Lamey, Billings attorney, one of Montana's truly great citizens. Lamey died in Billings Tuesday.

MANSFIELD said Lamey was "a close personal friend and a man on whom I depended for advice and counsel long before I entered the field of politics.

"His passing is an almost irreplaceable loss. Those of us who knew him, respected and loved him and will do our best to follow the fine Christian understanding which was so much a part of his life."

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, June 6, 1963]

A MAN OF BROAD VISION

A man can live in a town for his lifetime and when he's gone people will try to say the things they think should be said about the goodness of him.

They'll talk about his affection for family, his devotion to his church, his sense of public service, his dedication to his profession and his love of his fellow man.

Art Lamey didn't live a lifetime in Billings—but these are the things people here who knew him are talking about today.

He was a gentleman in whose heart there was room for anyone and everyone who knew him, however briefly.

He was a lawyer and a politician—and both his profession and his party are the better today for having called him theirs.

But, above all, he was the kind of American whose mind and whose vision reached beyond his hometown, beyond his State and even beyond the oceans that bordered his Nation.

We are poorer that he has gone—but we are grateful that, for the years he spent here, we could call him ours.

[From the Montana Standard, June 9, 1963]

MONTANA MOURNS ARTHUR N. LAMEY

(By Thomas E. Mooney)

BILLINGS.—Montana mourned this week for one of her able sons, not only in his home county of Yellowstone but throughout the State wherever he was known.

In Billings, in Havre, in Helena, and in Butte—and elsewhere—friends of Arthur N. Lamey were sorrowed by his sudden passing.

And Arthur Lamey had a special spot in his heart for Butte.

He made a major address in the mining city last in October 1960. At that time, he was serving his country as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, under appointment by President Eisenhower.

IT WAS A PROMISE

The U.N. at that particular time, was in the midst of a serious disturbance over the Congo situation. Things were hot. Mr. K. was pounding the table and doing his best to break up the whole proceeding. It was at this time he was particularly rough on Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General. He wanted to replace Hammerskjold with three secretaries.

In the middle of all this—with the U.N. General Assembly meeting every day and continuing its sessions far into the night—Arthur Lamey took time out from his duties there to make a speech in Butte. It wasn't just another speech to him. It was something he had promised to do.

He had made advance arrangements to address the Montana Chamber of Commerce convention and he made a special flight to Butte in order to keep that commitment. He had promised a friend and it was a promise kept, even though he was tired from the bitterness and difficulties of the U.N. session and his health, not robust for years, made such a plane trip a strain.

PERSONAL INTEREST

I had a personal interest in his appearance in Butte, serving on a local committee to welcome the distinguished guest. It was in our little two-door sedan that Arthur Lamey, bearing the troubles of a leg-brace and cane, rode from the Butte airport to the Finlen Hotel. There were many more pleasant and opulent accommodations, I'm sure, available for that trip—but those of us on the committee who greeted him at the airport were the ones with whom he rode. And a pleasant trip it was.

I got a first-hand tip as to his subject matter for the speech he made later that afternoon. And I had the pleasure of renewing an acquaintanceship of years past with one of the most pleasant men who ever lived.

At the Chamber meeting, Arthur Lamey spoke for something like an hour. He told the statewide audience that since Khrushchev "couldn't rule the U.N., he will ruin it if possible."

He recounted for the audience the 3 weeks of debate over the Congo that even then was shaking the foundations of the U.N., but he expressed a belief in the future, claiming the U.N. had shown its value in many ways.

CALLED FOR CONFIDENCE

"In the days ahead, I suggest we look forward with confidence in our ability to attain any goal to which our country aspires," he said. "And we should do this with a prayer for guidance and strength as we chart our course upon the sea of domestic and world affairs."

The talk was well received and the large audience kept the speaker on the rostrum for another hour, answering questions about the world situation at the time and the part the United Nations was playing.

All this came about despite a serious distraction which almost disrupted the meeting and the convention itself.

TRIBUTE

Arthur Lamey appeared before the convention on October 28, 1960. It was that day that a commercial airplane inbound for Missoula flipped over and crashed about 10 miles west of that city.

When news of the accident reached the Butte meeting, there was some consternation. Several present knew one or more of the 12 persons aboard the plane who were killed. Many of those attending the convention had planned to board the plane when it landed at Butte for flights eastward.

There was great shock and some men wept openly.

But as a tribute to Arthur Lamey, the meeting went on. The questions piled one upon another and the tired man on the speaker's platform answered every one—kindly, patiently, and thoroughly.

It was the way Arthur Lamey did everything in his life.

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian, June 9, 1963]

AN INSPIRATION TO YOUTH WITH AMBITION

In the 70-year life of Arthur F. Lamey every youth fired with ambition may find inspiration.

When overcome by a heart attack last week he headed the Treasure State's largest law firm. The Billings barrister had long been a highly respected leader among lawyers, in politics, in a wide field of business and civic activities.

But for affable, considerate, persevering, tenacious Art Lamey, the ascent was a long and steep one. Few men have been born in more humble circumstances than this native Montanan. His birthplace was an obscure home along the Great Northern Railway tracks in the little town of Big Sandy, where his father was a section hand.

To Art, straitened financial circumstances were but a spur to endeavor.

His career as an attorney, launched at Havre immediately after 1914 graduation from the University of Michigan Law School, was soon interrupted by military service in World War I. He emerged from that conflict as a Marine Corps first lieutenant, and resumed the practice of law. Early in the

1920's a bout with polio left him with only partial use of his legs. From then on he wore braces, limped noticeably, and used a cane. Despite his calm and unruffled demeanor, it was often obvious that he was in considerable pain.

But the extent of his suffering is something he kept to himself as he continued his active and constructive interest in many activities entirely apart from his growing law practice. An inkling of the variety of these endeavors is evidenced by the positions of statewide leadership in which he served. He was a past District Governor of Rotary International, a former State commander of the American Legion, and a past president of the Montana Bar Association. He served three consecutive 2-year terms as chairman of the Democratic State committee, twice was a candidate for Governor.

His forthright advocacy of what he considered fair and just often resulted in his being at variance with fellow Democrats as well as with Republicans. But his integrity and motives were never subject to question. In the tributes to his memory there is a complete absence of political demarcation. That would be very pleasing to the hardworking, conscientious son of a Big Sandy section hand who would not be downed by polio.

[From the Havre Daily News]

ARTHUR F. LAMEY EXEMPLIFIED GREAT CHARACTER

Good character, exemplified in life, is as enduring as the ages. It is never forgotten because it always inspires and though Arthur F. Lamey's course on this earth has been run, what he stood for and exemplified will be remembered by succeeding generations.

Mr. Lamey had an inherent quality which stamped him as a person of unusual stature. This strength of moral qualities was most apparent to all of us who knew him. He stood for that which is recognized as fundamentally sound and vital to unimpeachable performance.

Easy to understand because he adhered to the strongest of principles, Mr. Lamey has enriched our lives and left us with a lesson that being deliberate and conscientious leads to personal success. We know that procrastination was never a part of this man who was recognized as one of Montana's greatest thinkers. He had ideas consistent with justice and this was reflected in his desire to be of service to his community, to his State and to his country.

If he was mistaken in judgment the occasion was rare and he readily admitted it but the very fact that he was right so often shows that he thought things through carefully and acted accordingly. His counsel was wise and dependable. He readily grasped any difficult task and his work was thorough and could be comprehended by all whom he served.

Many of us will always recall that Mr. Lamey was a man concerned with the truth. He was not interested in speculation or conjecture if there was a direct answer. His serious thoughts and opinions were valued because they represented straight thinking.

All of this was a serious part of Mr. Lamey and with it all he had unforgettable personality and rich humor. His stories, many based on personal experiences, often had a moral. Listening to Mr. Lamey provided us with an education. He was a person of ideas as well as ideals and was interested in the development of anything which was good for all of us. Thus, he applied himself to translating into action sound projects.

Those persons who have maintained a file of correspondence with Mr. Lamey will be looking at his letters again, recapturing the memory of compassion, of a chuckle, of serious and dependable advice.

This portion of Montana can be proud that it was home to Mr. Lamey. He grew up here and went forth to be of service to his fellow man. Nothing seemed beyond his talents.

He was a picture of courage and determination in living with a physical handicap which never deterred him because he felt that you can win over difficulties if you set your heart and mind to the task.

Mr. Lamey was constantly active and his activity meant that he was able to do so much for so many people. His interests were numerous and they were interests which were directed toward making this a better Montana. His honors were legion. The life of Mr. Lamey was filled with that which we can borrow to make our own lives richer and more meaningful. God in His wisdom was very good to all of us when He put Arthur F. Lamey in our midst, to help us and to be our friend.

To his family and close friends we express our heartfelt sympathy. There is so much which can be said and yet so little. That's the way it is when tribute is paid to truly a great man with the leadership qualities and the intelligence of Mr. Lamey.

Beloved by so many, his character is his memorial which will endure for coming generations to use in building fine and useful lives.

[From the Montana Standard, June 5, 1963]

A. F. LAMEY, ONCE U.N. DELEGATE AND STATE DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN, DIES

BILLINGS.—Arthur F. Lamey, Sr., Montana attorney for 47 years and former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and State Democratic chairman from 1938 to 1944, died Tuesday.

A legal associate said the 70-year-old lawyer was laughing and joking in his law office Tuesday when he put his head on his desk and died, apparently the victim of a heart attack. He had not been recently ill.

Funeral services were pending.

Lamey was born December 24, 1892, at Big Sandy. He distinguished himself as a track star while at the University of Michigan before he was graduated in 1914 from the Michigan Law School. He entered practice in 1914 in Havre where he lived until 1940 except for 2 years as a U.S. Marine who experienced the Battle of the Argonne Forest in France. Enlisting as a private he was discharged a first lieutenant.

During his nearly half century as a Montana lawyer he ran for Governor on the Democratic ticket twice but was unsuccessful both times.

MOVED TO BILLINGS

He moved to Billings in 1940 from Havre to become associated with the law firm of Coleman, Jameson, and Lamey. The firm is now that of Lamey, Crowley, Kilbourne, Haughey, and Hanson.

His only son, Arthur F. Lamey, Jr., is an associate of his father's law firm. A daughter, Mrs. F. J. Boyd, lives in Bozeman. His only other daughter is Sister Barbara Mary, a Roman Catholic nun in Minneapolis, Minn. His wife, Catherine, several grandchildren and a brother and sister are among survivors.

A lifetime member of the Roman Catholic Church, Lamey was one of its outstanding laymen in Montana.

In 1958 after twice serving as head of the American Legion of Montana he was appointed by then President Dwight Eisenhower to the President's Advisory Committee on Civil Rights. In 1960 he was named alternate delegate to the United Nations, also by Eisenhower.

Returning home to tell of his experiences of 3 months he predicted Nikita Khrushchev would be unsuccessful in his attempt to wreck the United Nations, giving a firsthand report of the Congo crisis.

THRICE DEMOCRATIC CHIEF

His offices included three terms as State Democratic chairman, and was chairman of the Montana delegation to the National Democratic Convention which nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term as President.

W. J. Jameson left the firm in 1957 to become U.S. district judge at Billings.

Intermittently, from 1935–51 he was a special assistant attorney general of Montana. He was a member of the Michigan Bar Association, president of the Montana Bar Association in 1939 and was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit Court.

He was a member of the American Judicature Society of the American Bar Association and a member of the American College Trial Lawyers.

His first public office was as Hill County administrator at Havre and was Hill County attorney from 1923–28. It was at Havre also where he first affiliated with the American Legion in which he later served in several key national and State positions. He was a former district governor of Rotary International.

He was a former director of the First National Bank of Havre and at his death was a director of the Montana Power Co., Midland National Bank of Billings and Havre Savings & Loan and was president of the Orthopedic Corp., of Billings.

Various Governors called upon him for assistance in the field of social legislation.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, June 5, 1963]

A. F. LAMEY HEART VICTIM

Arthur F. Lamey, Sr., 70, prominent Montana attorney, business and civic leader, and former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, died unexpectedly of a heart attack while attending a conference in his law offices Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. Lamey slumped in his chair. He was pronounced dead on arrival at St. Vincent Hospital.

Mr. Lamey had resided in Billings since 1940 when he became a member of the law firm Coleman, Jameson & Lamey. He was senior member of the firm of Lamey, Crowley, Kilbourne, Haughey & Hanson at the time of his death.

The civic and political leader was born December 24, 1892, in Big Sandy where he attended grade schools. He graduated from Havre High School. He received his law degree from the University of Michigan in 1914. He was a member of the Michigan track team.

Mr. Lamey opened law practice in Havre in 1914. It was interrupted by World War I. He joined the U.S. Marine Corps in 1917 and was discharged as a first lieutenant in 1919 after action in France, including Argonne Forest.

Mr. Lamey was a life-long Democrat. The only elective political offices he held were Hill County public administrator in 1915–18 and county attorney 1923–28. He was a candidate for Governor in 1940.

Mr. Lamey had a long record of public service which culminated with his appointment as U.S. delegate to the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly in the fall of 1960. He attended the turbulent session at which Russian demonstrations were most violent.

Mr. Lamey was special assistant to the Montana attorney general in land acquisitions in 1935–38 and conducted hearings under the Selective Service Act in 1940 and 1943–51.

SERVED NATION

He was chairman of Yellowstone County war finance drives during World War II. From 1958–60 he was a member of President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Commission.

The late Gov. Elmer Holt named him chairman of a committee to draft Federal-State legislation coordination for old-age assistance, child welfare, unemployment compensation, and related fields.

Mr. Lamey was Montana Democratic chairman 1938–44, chairman of the Montana delegation to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1943 and served as Hill County Democratic Central Committeeman and State committeeman.

In 1939 Mr. Lamey was Montana Bar Association president. He was a member of the American Bar Association, the American Judicature Society of the ABA, the American College of Trial Lawyers and the Yellowstone County Bar Association. He served on the ABA committee on publications.

Mr. Lamey was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, the Ninth Circuit Court and the Supreme Courts of Michigan and Montana. He practiced law from September 1, 1940 until April 17, 1957, with U.S. District Judge William J. Jameson, who was senior partner of the law firm, one of the largest in Montana, until he went on the Federal bench.

Mr. Lamey also was a past commander of the Montana American Legion, 1931–32. He served on the Legion's national executive committee 1932–35, and the national Americanism commission 1935–39. He was on the Legion's national defense committee 1939–44.

ROTARY LEADER

Mr. Lamey was district governor of Rotary International for Montana in 1926–27 and was a past president of the Havre Rotary Club.

At his death he was Orthopedic Foundation, Inc., of Billings president and a member of the advisory committee for St. Vincent Hospital.

Mr. Lamey was attorney for many Montana business firms and financial organizations. He was a Montana Power Co. director, Havre Federal Savings & Loan Association director, Midland National Bank director, and a retired director of the First National Bank of Havre.

Mr. Lamey had traveled extensively in Europe, including visits to Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, France, England and Ireland both during and after World War I. He was stricken by polio after World War I which left him with partial use of his legs. It did not prevent him from active professional, civic and community life. He was a member of the Roman Catholic Church.

Survivors include his widow, Catherine, 501 Chancery Lane; two daughters, Mrs. F. J. (Dorothy) Boyd of Bozeman and Sister Barbara Mary of Minneapolis, and a son, A. F. Lamey Jr., associated with his father's law firm.

The body is at Michelotti-Sawyers Mortuary.

Arrangements are pending.

[From the Independent-Record, June 5, 1963]

ARTHUR LAMEY, STATE CIVIC, POLITICAL LEADER, DIES

BILLINGS.—Arthur F. Lamey, 70, Billings lawyer and a candidate for Governor of Montana, died Tuesday of a heart attack.

Born in a section house along the Great Northern Railway tracks at Big Sandy, Lamey was widely known as an attorney, businessman, civic leader, and politician He was a former delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

STRICKEN AT CONFERENCE

Lamey was attending a business conference in his law offices when he slumped in a chair. He was pronounced dead at a Billings hospital.

He was a resident of Billings since 1940 but his early education was in rural schools in the Bear Paw Mountain area and in Havre.

SOUGHT GOVERNOR POST

Lamey twice was a candidate for Democratic nomination as Governor, in 1940 and 1948. He was State chairman of the Democratic State central committee from 1938 to 1944. In 1943, he led the State delegation to the Democratic National convention in Chicago.

Lamey held a number of offices in Montana organizations.

He was past commander of the State American Legion, past district governor of Rotary International and past president of the Montana Bar Association.

DIRECTOR OF POWER FIRM

His business affiliations included directorships of the Montana Power Co., the Midland National Bank, Billings, the First National Bank of Havre, and the Havre Federal Savings & Loan Association which he helped organize in 1927.

Lamey's only successes in running for elective office included terms as Hill County public administrator from 1915 to 1918 and county attorney from 1923 to 1928.

He was appointed a U.N. delegate in 1960 and served during the tumultuous 15th session marked by violent Russian demonstrations.

Lamey was a special assistant in the thirties to the State Attorney General, specializing in land acquisition. In the forties he conducted hearings under the Selective Service Act.

ON CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Former President Eisenhower appointed him to a term on the Federal Civil Rights Commission in 1958. The late Gov. Elmer Holt named him chairman of a committee to draft Federal-State legislation coordination for old-age assistance, child welfare, unemployment compensation and related fields.

Lamey was crippled by polio after serving as a Marine lieutenant in World War I: It left him with partial use of his legs. He was chairman of the Orthopedic Foundation, Inc., Billings.

He was a graduate of Havre High school and the University of Michigan Law School. He opened a law office in Havre in 1914, the year he was graduated from Michigan. He was a Roman Catholic.

Survivors include his widow, Catherine, Billings; two daughters, Mrs. F. J. Boyd, Bozeman, and Sister Barbara Mary, Minneapolis; and a son, A. F. Lamey, Jr., associated with his father's law firm in Billings.

Funeral arrangements have not been announced.

[From the Inter Lake, June 5, 1963]

LONG-TIME STATE ATTORNEY DIES

BILLINGS.—Arthur F. Lamey, Sr., Montana attorney for 47 years and former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and State Democratic chairman from 1938–44, died Tuesday.

A legal associate said the 70-year-old lawyer was laughing and joking in his law office Tuesday when he put his head on his desk and died, apparently the victim of a heart attack. He had not been recently ill.

Funeral services were pending.

Lamey was born December 24, 1892, at Big Sandy. He distinguished himself as a track star while at the University of Michigan before he was graduated in 1914 from the Michigan Law School. He entered practice in 1914 in Havre where he lived until 1940 except for 2 years as a U.S. Marine who experienced the battle of the Argonne Forest in France. Enlisting as a private, he was discharged a first lieutenant.

He ran for Governor on the Democratic ticket twice and was unsuccessful both times.

He moved to Billings in 1940 from Havre to become associated with the law firm of Coleman, Jameson and Lamey. The firm is now that of Lamey, Crowley, Kilbourne, Haughey and Hanson.

His only son, Arthur F. Lamey, Jr., is an associate of his father's law firm. A daughter, Mrs. F. J. Boyd, lives in Bozeman. His only other daughter is Sister Barbara Mary, a Roman Catholic nun in Minneapolis, Minn. His wife, Catherine, several grandchildren and a brother and sister are among survivors.

A lifetime member of the Roman Catholic Church, Lamey was one of its outstanding laymen in Montana.

In 1958 after twice serving as head of the American Legion of Montana he was appointed by then President Dwight Eisenhower to the President's Advisory Committee on Civil Rights. In 1960 he was named alternate delegate to the United Nations, also by Eisenhower.

Returning home to tell of his experiences of 3 months he predicted Nikita Khrushchev would be unsuccessful in his attempt to wreck the United Nations, giving a firsthand report of the Congo crisis.

His offices included three terms as State Democratic chairman; he was chairman of the Montana delegation to the National Democratic convention which nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term as President.

[From the Daily Missoulian, June 15, 1963]

ARTHUR F. LAMEY OF BILLINGS DIES

BILLINGS.—Arthur F. Lamey, 70, well-known Billings attorney and two-time candidate for Governor, died Tuesday about 3 p.m.

K. O. Crowley, Lamey's law partner, said Lamey suffered a stroke during a business conference and was dead on arrival at a Billings hospital.

Lamey was born in a section house at Big Sandy and was the son of a Great Northern Railway section hand. His early education was obtained in Bear Paw Mountain area rural schools and in Havre.

After graduation from the University of Michigan Law School in 1914, he served overseas with the Marine Corps during World War I and was discharged as a first lieutenant. After the war he returned to Havre.

He was Montana district governer of Rotary International in 1916–17, served two terms as Hill County administrator and two more as county attorney, from 1923 to 1927.

Lamey served as Montana Department Commander of the American Legion in 1931 and 1932 and president of the Montana Bar Association in 1938 and 1939.

He was State chairman of the Democratic State central committee from 1938 to 1944 and twice was a candidate for the party's nomination for Governor, first in 1940 and again in 1948.

Lamey was a leader in Billings civic affairs and in advocating irrigation development in eastern and northern Montana. He was chairman of the committee which drafted Montana's social security, unemployment and public welfare laws.

Survivors include the widow, two daughters and a son.

SENATE SPEECHES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on this day of gravity and somber soundings in this body, I desire to read something that was mentioned by my uncle, who was vice president of the constitutional convention in the territory of Arizona back in 1910. He was also one of the founders of the Democratic Party in that territory. I am prompted in reading the brief paragraph, too, by the constant disregard of our 3-minute rule:

Mr. Goldwater offered the following resolution:

"Resolution No. 1

"*Resolved*, That any member having a prepared speech of which he is proud and which he desires to have perpetuated, be given leave to file a typewritten or printed copy of the same, prepared at his own expense, with the secretary of the convention to be published in the journal: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary be authorized to insert at such intervals as he may deem proper, in said speech these words in parentheses, 'hear,' 'hear,' 'applause,' 'loud applause,' 'laughter,' etc."

SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS ELECTED TO ORDER OF THE COIF

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Monday, June 3, our able and distinguished colleague, Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, was honored by the George Washington University Law School by election to its chapter of the Order of the Coif. On the occasion of his induction into this honorary legal society, whose membership is limited to outstanding legal scholars and members of the legal profession who have attained unusual distinction, Senator Moss gave a noteworthy address in defense of the Supreme Court. As his remarks on the importance of preserving the traditional prestige of the judicial branch of the Government and his review of the history of the Supreme Court are especially significant at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Subject: The Supreme Court and Its Critics

In his delightful book of anecdotes about the Algonquin Hotel in New York, Frank Case tells of the after dinner speaker who knew a good story about a gun and wanted to tell it but couldn't think of any graceful way of introducing it into the speech he was making. Desperate at last, he cried, "Bang! Was that a gun I heard?" and went on happily to unleash his gag.

Tonight, I'd like to talk to you about the Supreme Court, its role in our Government, its critics and the role of the lawyer with respect to the critics. There is probably a very graceful way to lead into these topics. I might, for instance, tell you how honored I am to have been tapped for induction into the Order of the Coif, as indeed I am. This would lead logically to the observation that it was from the Serjeants-at-Law, the original members of the Order of the Coif, that the judges were chosen. Or I could reach the subject of judges by reminding you that I did a little time on the bench myself and have, in a small way, some first-hand knowledge of what takes place in the mind of a judge. Or, just mentioning the State I represent would lead us right to the subject of the critics of the Court. The people of Utah are presently in throes, I'm sure that's the right word, of being organized for the John Birch Society by a young man named Reed Benson. Having mentioned all these things I would be well on my way.

Yet, whatever the technique used by Frank Case's speaker lacks in grace, it makes up for in directness, and I am inclined to adopt it myself, though it's not a gag I'm unleashing.

"Bang, was that a gun I heard?"

As a matter of fact, it was a gun. Some superpatriot, I think he calls himself a minuteman, grew impatient with the efforts to eliminate the Chief Justice by impeachment and took the matter into his own hands.

Those of you who have been reading as closely as I have the literature of some of the groups spawned and suckled by the John Birch Society will realize that this bang I mention is not an unlikely report. The Welch-Birch argument for the impeachment of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, is not based upon any bill of particulars which is specific, clear-cut and subject to proof and analysis. His argument is pitched on an emotional plane.

"We believe that the impeachment of Warren would dramatize and crystallize the whole basic question of whether the United States remains an independent Republic, or gradually becomes transformed into a province of the worldwide Soviet system," says Robert Welch. On such stuff as this are mad men nourished.

Criticism of the Court, its members or its decisions is not an evil. Indeed, it would be a great evil to espouse and advocate the doctrine that the Court is above criticism. The evil of much of the current criticism is that it does not rely on facts. It relies on sordid imputations of conspiracy with a foreign power. Its basic thrust is directed at undermining the prestige of the Court as an American institution, as one of the three coequal branches of our Government.

This prestige and strength did not spring into being with the adoption of our Constitution. The pages of history clearly point the long climb of our Supreme Court to its stature as an institution, as a fully equal pillar of our tripartite check-and-balance Government.

The early years of the Court were marked by neglect and indifference by our people, our States, and the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. President Washington, who had the envious job of appointing the full Court, was hard put to find men willing to accept. To the men who wrote the Constitution, the Court apparently seemed the least interesting, perhaps even the least equal, of the branches of the new Government. John Jay, who accepted the appointment as the first Chief Justice, left the Court twice, once to go to England as ambassador-extraordinary to negotiate the treaty which bears his name, then permanently when he became Governor of New York. At the Court's first session, on February 1, 1790, in New York City, only three of the Justices were present. One Justice, Iredell, from North Carolina, was unable to reach New York before the first term, which lasted only 10 days, had ended. He was not sworn in until the summer session which began on August 2.

Today, membership on the Court cannot be described as unappealing or unsought. I doubt that any lawyer worth his salt wouldn't give up his right arm, or at least his eyeteeth, to be appointed to the Court. A man's refusal of an appointment now would more likely be based upon a conviction that he was not worthy of the Court than that the Court was not worthy of him. Perhaps the incident which symbolizes the nadir as well as the zenith of the Court's prestige was the Roosevelt effort to pack the Court. The congressional rebuff to this effort certainly accorded with the popular feeling of that time. Forgotten were earlier "packings" of the Court by a strong-willed executive. Now the Court stood inviolate even as to number of Justices.

Although our Court did not have prestige from the beginning, from the beginning and ever since it has had critics.

Article III of the Constitution provided that the judicial power vested in the Supreme Court should extend to controversies "between a State and citizens of another State." In 1791, two citizens of South Carolina acting as executors for a British creditor sued the State of Georgia. In *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 Dallas 419 (1792), the Court found against Georgia. The Georgia Legislature immediately passed a law imposing the death penalty on anyone trying to execute the order of the Court.

There is no record that anyone tried to enforce the order. The Nation was so aroused, however, at what was considered an invasion of States rights that the 11th amendment was adopted. This, of course, provided that the judicial power of the United States should not be construed to extend to any suit against a State by citizens of another State or by citizens of a foreign state.

It was in 1801, however, that the Court became embroiled in what may well be its most significant struggle for prestige. In February, just before Jefferson was to be inaugurated, Congress changed the judicial system of the country with the passage of the Circuit Court Act. The Supreme Court Justices would no longer be circuit riders and (note) their number was reduced to five. The obvious reason for the reduction was to prevent Jefferson from filling the vacancy likely to occur with the departure of Justice Cushing who was old and in ill health. In another act, Congress created the positions of more than 20 justices of the peace to be filled by the President. Adams signed the acts and began feverishly making appointments to the new positions. As Secretary of State, it was up to John Marshall to fill out, seal and deliver the commissions to these new appointees. By midnight of March 3, 1801, all had been sealed but a few remained undelivered. Upon his inauguration, Jefferson vowed to do everything in his power to prevent these midnight appointees from taking office. He ordered James Madison, his Secretary of State, not to deliver the commissions which remained on his desk.

It was just a little more than a month earlier that John Marshall had been confirmed by the Senate as Chief Justice. When one of the midnight appointees named Marbury, petitioned the Supreme Court for an order directing Madison to deliver to him the commission which had been signed and sealed, it was the Court of Chief Justice Marshall which agreed to hear argument on the petition during the next term of the Court. Jefferson was outraged and demanded the immediate repeal of the Circuit Court Act, and this brought Congress into the fray which had started as a battle between the Executive and the Court.

Congress repealed the act, passed a new one putting the Justices back on the circuits, and by revising the terms of Court forced an adjournment for 14 months.

Marshall and the Court were patient, however, and began hearing the Marbury case on February 9, 1803. Madison and Attorney General Lincoln were completely uncooperative. No one knew what had become of Marbury's commission. The Chief Justice, of course, knew that it had existed since he signed and sealed it. It was an affidavit of a clerk and another by James Marshall, the brother of the Chief Justice, however, which the Court accepted as evidence of the existence of the commission.

You all know what the Chief Justice did in his opinion. He asked three questions:

1. Has Marbury a right to the commission?
2. If he has a right, do the laws of the country afford him a remedy?
3. If they afford him a remedy, is it a mandamus issuing from this Court?

He answered "Yes" to the first two questions and "No" to the third. In answering "No" to the third question, it was necessary for him to hold that the act of Congress which conferred original jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to issue writ of mandamus to persons holding office under the authority of the United States was unconstitutional. This is the result Jefferson actually wanted. Marbury did not get his commission. Yet in reaching it, Marshall made it very clear that had the Court the jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus at all, it would have issued one to the Secretary of State in this case.

Almost overlooked at the time was the importance of Marshall's answer to the third question. The principle, firmly established now, that in the exercise of its judicial power the Court may find an act of Congress unconstitutional is the one which distinguishes our Government from any other which has been known. There were other governments in which there was a separation of powers. There were other governments in which there were checks and balances. But there were no other governments in which acts of the parliament or legislature could be held invalid by the courts.

There is very little doubt that the framers of the Constitution intended this result. There is even less doubt that the framers intended that the Court have the power to strike down State legislation which was contrary to the Federal Constitution. Were it possible for the State legislatures to make the final determination of the validity of their acts, the whole character of our Federal system would be altered. There is no doubt in my mind that such an alteration would be a disastrous one. Yet today there is a ground-swell of opinion for making such a change—for creating a supreme court of the States which would be the ultimate arbiter of any alleged conflict between State law and Federal law.

Some of the advocates of this change are the same people who would impeach the Chief Justice because he is identified with a few decisions they do not like—with Brown against Board and Pennsylvania against Nelson. They are the same people who in the name of fighting an enemy would give up the very institutions which distinguish our way of life from that which would be imposed upon us by the enemy. The groundswell may grow to a tidal wave that engulfs us unless those who are most qualified to speak out against these changes do speak out. This is the role of the lawyer.

The lawyer, more than any other man, has the ability, has the duty, to silence the critics—not by muffling their voices—not by making them outlaws—no, the lawyer's duty is to silence the critics by inundating them with a wave of logic.

When the critics say that the Nelson case has left the States defenseless against those who would subvert the State, publicize the facts. The Nelson case leaves a State free to punish those who would subvert the State. It is the punishment of those who would subvert the Nation that is the exclusive province of the Federal Government.

If this fails to satisfy the critics, the lawyer must point out that it is not necessary to change the Supreme Court in order to change the result. It is necessary only to change the law. But by all means let the critics know what troubles in the war against communism a change in the law would entail. Let them know how 50 State laws paralleling the Smith Act and the Communist Control Act would hamper the FBI. And by all means let your Congressmen know how you feel about H.R. 3, the perennial measure to overrule Nelson which would at the same time open a pandora's box of legal miseries. Let them know also that you can't change the Constitution by changing the Court or its functions. Let them know too that until the 14th amendment is repealed it must be enforced.

The proposal to create a "court of the Union" composed of the chief justices of the 50 States, was presented last December in Chicago to an assembly of State delegations held by the Council of State Governments. It was one of a package of three proposed amendments to make basic changes in the Constitution. The other two amendments would equally alter its purpose, and in my opinion, would challenge the Federal Union of the States. But I will not take the time to discuss them here. Sufficient to my purposes is the fact that all three of the proposed amendments were approved by the council, and it was decided to present them to the 48 State legislatures which would be meeting this year.

The first two proposals have already been quietly approved by one-third of the States needed to compel Congress to call a national convention on them, while the third one, the proposal which would, in effect, overturn the Supreme Court, has been acted upon favorably by State legislatures in four States (Arkansas, Wyoming, Florida, and Alabama).

It seems incredible that constitutional changes of such magnitude could be under consideration in our Republic with such little talk about them. There have been several newspaper stories about their impact, but I am sorry to say, there has been little more than a murmur in the legal profession. A proposal to subvert the Supreme Court with a "court of the Union" should be a clarion call to the legal profession, and their voices should be ringing in debate from one end of the land to another.

Can you imagine such a proposal going unnoticed by the members of the bar in the early days of our Republic? Lawyers would have been asking one another whether such a proposal would in any way endanger our liberties, or suppress our minorities. Would it strip the Court of powers essential to a strong Federal Union of the States? Would it lead to confusion and chaos and squabbling among the States reminiscent of that which existed almost 200 years ago under the Articles of Confederation?

I am sure that our legal forebears would have analyzed the proposal anxiously and sharply from every angle, and that is what we of the mid-20th century bar must do. For after all, if the legal profession is not the watchdog for the Supreme Court, who is?

No lawyer should ever give up his right to disagree with the Court. But every lawyer should be very conscious of the role he must play in the defense of the Court as an institution. There is a very special reason for the lawyer to plead the case for the Court. Whenever a President is attacked, he may strike back at his critics. Whenever a Member of Congress is attacked, he may strike back at his critics. When a Justice is attacked, he has no voice but that of the members of his bar. The current wave of anti-Court propaganda must surely pass as have earlier assaults upon our third coordinate branch of government. But we should shorten this misguided and somewhat ridiculous emotional outburst so that the discussion and disposition of substantive issues can proceed without distortion and clouds cast by this attack upon the institution of the Supreme Court.

In this attack by misguided zealots we need attorneys for the defense of the Court as an institution.

That is your role as a lawyer. That is my role as a lawyer. You as newly elected members and I as an honorary member of the order of the Coif, must, more than ever before, be conscious of the importance of that role. May God help you and me to play it well.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the President's civil rights proposals. I consider them a charter for human rights which America needs and needs badly.

I understand that at the request of the Senator from Oregon the full text of this historic statement will be read to the Senate later this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the intention to have a quorum call—a live quorum—and to have the full text of the President's message read. It has been read in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I concur, and I am delighted that the leadership has decided to have the message read. I should like to emphasize the last paragraph, in which the President says:

> I therefore ask every Member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties, and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans—a sense of justice. In this year of the emancipation centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I fully and enthusiastically endorse the civil rights message sent to the Congress by the President today and shall vote for the comprehensive legislation program it recommended. I will take every measure possible to see to it that Congress stays in session until this program has been voted upon, however long that may be.

I am pleased to note that many of the President's recommendations are almost identical to bills which I have introduced and cosponsored in the past, including legislation on voting rights, school desegregation, financial and technical assistance to desegregating school districts, equal accommodation in public facilities, and fair employment practices legislation. There are some differences of approach, and where there are differences I shall certainly support that legislation which seems the strongest and most effective.

The President's emphasis on economic measures and educational and vocational programs to attack the shocking problem of unemployment among Negroes should be applauded.

The proposal for general legislation prohibiting the use of Federal funds under any guise for segregated facilities of any kind also has my vigorous support.

I have supported this principle consistently on specific appropriation bills for many years, and believe the matter should be settled once and for all through general legislation.

I commend the statesmanlike tone of this message. It was strong, it was responsible, it was comprehensive. This is a program worth fighting for to the ultimate degree, whatever the cost may be in terms of other legislation or in terms of political unity. The passing of this civil rights legislation is a moral and constitutional imperative that must be achieved if we are to redeem our historic promises and restore our national image as the unqualified champion of human freedom at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I received this morning from the president of the Jefferson Club of Ridgefield, Conn., a resolution passed by that group in support of Federal legislation in behalf of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Negro citizens of our country are engaged in a crucial struggle to obtain all the civil rights guaranteed to them by the 14th amendment to the Constitution; and

Whereas in various areas both in the South and in the North these basic rights are denied to them in full or in part; and

Whereas it appears necessary that certain Federal legislation must be enacted to provide the Federal Government with the power to assert and maintain the civil rights of minorities in courts of law; and

Whereas the President of the United States has submitted or is about to submit to the Congress proposals for the enactment of such laws relating to (1) eradication of discrimination in places of public commerce and assembly and accommodation, (2) more prompt and encompassing desegregation of schools in compliance with the Supreme Court decisions of 1954, and (3) for the protection and guarantee of voting rights of minorities especially in the Southern States: Now, therefore, it is unanimously

Resolved by the Jefferson Club of Ridgefield, Conn., as follows:

1. That it fully supports the American Negro in his struggle for civil rights.
2. That it fully supports the program of the President of the United States designed to defend and secure those rights.
3. That it respectfully urges its Representatives in Congress to vote for and vigorously support the legislation proposed or to be proposed by the President.
4. That the two Senators from Connecticut do all within their power to prevent a Senate filibuster which would debar the legislation from coming to a vote on the floor of the Senate.
5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following persons in Washington: Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, U.S. Senator; Hon. Abraham A. Ribicoff, U.S. Senator; Hon. Abner Sibal, Representative, Fourth Connecticut District; Hon. Bernard Grabowski, Representative-at-Large.

Jefferson Club of Ridgefield.
By Peter S. Alexander, *President.*

Attest:

Peter J. Robutucci,
Secretary.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN POULTRY PRODUCTS BY EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to the manner in which under our foreign-aid program the poultry farmers in foreign countries have received over $6 million from the American taxpayers to finance the expansion of their poultry industry. This has been done at a time when our own domestic poultry industry has been facing a grave situation as the result of losing its export markets.

Since the establishment of the European Common Market, there has been continuous discrimination against American poultry products.

The most recent action was the further increase of 1¼ cents in the variable fees, bringing the present charges to around 14 cents per pound.

Many of us in Congress have been urging Governor Herter, as our trade representative, to insist upon a correction in these discriminatory tariffs and to advise the European Common Market countries that, unless some correction is made, we shall be forced to take retaliatory steps. However, rather than obtaining favorable action, we now find that under our foreign-aid program the Federal Government has during the past couple of years been financing the expansion of the poultry industry in many countries which in turn will be supplying the European Common Market on more favorable tariff arrangements than those accorded to the American farmers.

For example, under our foreign-aid program we have made available, in outright grants and loans, over $6 million to finance the expansion of the poultry industry in these countries. Those loans and grants are broken down as follows:

Libya: $50,000 to introduce and distribute improved breeding stock.

Morocco: $88,000 to provide a poultry adviser and equipment for a poultry station with 10,000 Rhode Island Red chicks plus another $2 million made available to buy 18,000 tons of surplus grain. Just how they expect 10,000 chicks to eat 18,000 tons of feed has as yet not been explained.

Tunisia: $659,000 to encourage the development and enlargement of a commercial poultry industry.

Sudan: $200,000 to establish a 3,000 hen breeding flock, 30,000 egg hatchery, and a feed mixing plant.

Nigeria: $486,000 to improve its poultry industry.

The Dominican Republic: A development grant of $40,000 to build up its poultry industry.

Greece: A $300,000 loan was made to the Voktas Feeds, Inc., in Greece, to expand its poultry-raising facilities.

India: The Arbor Acres Farm, an affiliate of IBEC—International Bank Econ-Corp.—in India, received a loan of $2.5 million for the purpose of improvement of poultry production in that country.

Altogether $6,323,000 of the taxpayers' money has been spent in these various countries to build up the poultry industry in competition with our already hard-pressed poultrymen. Of course, as taxpayers our American poultrymen are paying both ways.

CREDENTIALS OF USURPING POWERS OF HUNGARY ACCEPTED IN UNITED NATIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, within the last 10 days it was decided in the United Nations to accept the credentials of the representatives sent to the United Nations by the usurping powers of the government in Hungary. Since the Hungarian revolution in 1956 each year the credentials of the usurping Communist leaders, under the direction of Kadar, were rejected. This year our Government abstained from making a protest. Hence the representatives of Hungary were accepted, and they were recognized; and in that way we recognize that the Communist Government of Hungary is a duly constituted government. The people of the captive nations have been seriously wronged. In my opinion, nowhere except in the western part of Europe, and of course in Great Britain also, are there people more devoted to our cause than the people living within the nations that are now the captives of tyrannical Russia. My fear is deep that the abandonment of the cause of the Hungarian patriots in their brave uprising against the Communist dictatorship in 1956 is a course which will be painfully regretted by our country and the people devoted to the free west.

We should not have abandoned the people of the captive nations. Abandoning the Hungarian patriots, as recently evidenced by the United States representative in the United Nations abstaining from a vote on whether the Kadar Communist representatives should officially be recognized by the United Nations, in my opinion is unpardonable. It is a grave mistake. Our State Department has been brainwashed into accepting and approving this course.

I am obliged to state, however, that the handwriting of what happened was on the wall more than a year ago, when arrangements were made in the United Nations for the abandonment of Sir Leslie Monroe, a devoted advocate of the cause of the Hungarian freedom fighters, and the substitution for Leslie Monroe of U Thant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I be permitted to speak for 2 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a London newspaper about a year ago carried a statement that a deal had been made, that the Hungarian representatives be accepted and that, in exchange, the Russians would approve of the selection of U Thant. I, of course, cannot say that that is the fact. However I can say that the story was carried in the London press about a year ago. What was stated in the London newspapers is now occurring. We should not, and in my opinion eventually will not, forget the sacrifices of 1956 made by the Freedom Fighters in Hungary. Undoubtedly the Communist bloc and its many international backers now will be strengthened in their efforts at subversion, infiltration, and the destruction of the cause of freedom with the new prestige which has come from the recognition by the United States and the United Nations of the Kadar Communist puppet government.

Mr. President, we cannot continue interminably abandoning people who are willing to fight and die for freedom. We threw overboard the patriots of Cuba. Now we threw overboard the patriots and the lovers of freedom in Hungary. It is a tragic day, and in my opinion we shall regret what has happened before a long time has passed.

ANNIVERSARY OF EAST BERLIN UPRISING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this week marks the 10th anniversary of the East Berlin uprising of 1953, during which many brave East Germans lost their lives struggling against overwhelming forces of their Communist masters. It is a tragic commentary on the state of our world that we in the free Western nations must make repeated statements on Communist brutality. I hope the day will soon come when such statements will no longer be necessary. However, as long as Communist regimes persist in their evil works, such statements will be made. We of the free world, who subscribe to the concepts of human liberty and dignity, will never cease to condemn the atrocities perpetrated by dictatorial rulers and the masters of closed societies.

I am sure that all the members of this distinguished body remember clearly the photographs dealing with the 1953 East Berlin events. The picture most vivid in my mind depicts a heavily armored tank bearing down upon an unarmed civilian, who, out of desperation, is pelting the tank with fist-sized stones. This scene, Mr. President, is symbolic of the structure of Communist societies. On the other hand, there is the rule of a clique imposed by naked force. On the other hand, there is the powerless citizen, whose only recourse to protest is primitive violence.

One of the most basic of man's drives is the search for freedom. As long as freedom is absent in Communist societies, events such as the Berlin uprising and the later Hungarian revolution of 1956 are inevitable. I join thousands of Americans in paying tribute to the brave men and women behind the Iron Curtain who have lost their lives battling against Communist tyranny.

SUGAR PRICES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, many Americans, from the housewife who puts a teaspoon of sugar in her coffee to the candy or soft drink producer who buys sugar by the carload, are concerned about today's high sugar prices.

My esteemed colleague, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, recently made some illuminating remarks about high sugar prices in an address delivered before the Sugar Club in New York City.

In view of what I know is our mutual concern with this problem, may I commend Senator MCCARTHY's address to all my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, THE SUGAR CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 27, 1963

When the Sugar Act was enacted last year there were some who were convinced that this issue could be put away for another 2 years and that the American public would proceed, as it had for many years, to take sugar for granted.

Sugar is back in the news, and it is back in a manner which is disturbing to all consumers and producers and to the Congress. I think it well this evening to review both the general theory behind the sugar program and the experience of the past 30 years, and also to inquire as to the causes of the unsettled condition which has developed in the past year.

I am concerned about the sugar industry and the stability of sugar prices as a representative of the consuming public and as a representative of what I consider the best beet sugar producing State in the Union. As a Member of the House of Representatives from 1949 through 1958, I supported extensions and adjustments of the Sugar Act, and during my service on the House Committee on Agriculture I had an opportunity to study the problem in some detail. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I was involved in the debate last year.

The sugar program is an example of commendable cooperation between Government and industry. The Government acted only after the whole industry was faced with disaster. It dealt with a problem made more complex because it also involved the economic and sometimes the political stability of other nations.

The Sugar Act did not destroy private initiative or responsibility. Rather, major responsibility was left with the industry to work out its operations within the broad framework set by law.

The original Federal interest in sugar, of course, was that of producing revenue. The first tariff of 1789 imposed an import duty on raw sugar and during the next century the duty averaged about 2.5 cents per pound. The revenue tariff also turned out to be useful protection and assisted the development of the cane industry in the new territory of Louisiana. However, it was not until 1894 that protection of domestic producers became the primary purpose of the tariff. The protective tariff program for sugar remained in effect until 1934, during which time the beet industry expanded greatly.

The experience under the tariff was uneven. There were some periods of large profits and others of severe depression. The world price of raw sugar averaged 19 cents per pound in May 1920, but dropped to less than 5 cents per pound in December of the same year.

Under the tariff system, when the world price dropped, there was pressure to increase the tariff to protect domestic producers. The limitations of the whole system became apparent in 1932 when the world price of raw sugar dropped to less than 1 cent per pound. Domestic producers, foreign suppliers and consumers all experienced the disastrous effects of instability during this period. The need for reexamination of the whole sugar structure was evident by 1933.

Sugar was not classed as one of the basic commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; the complexity of the problems indicated the need for separate treatment. The Jones-Costigan Act of 1934 laid down the basic provisions for division of the sugar market among domestic and foreign producers, for the allotment of quotas, and for the imposition of a processing tax. The Sugar Act of 1937 met the constitutional test, and the program was initiated.

The sugar legislation of the past 30 years has had four basic objectives: One, to provide reasonable protection for domestic producers; second, to guarantee that we can produce a substantial amount of our national sugar needs in the name of national security and well-being; third, to assure a share in our market to traditional suppliers of other nations—this has been accomplished by establishing quotas and by providing for an equitable price, which is often a premium price; fourth, to protect American consumers from widely fluctuating prices and to guarantee adequate supplies for them.

In my judgment the program was based on sound principles, and it worked well, but there have been problems along the way.

The rise of Castro and the suspension of the Cuban quota created a most serious problem. Some adjustment was needed. Without, insofar as I recall, any demand on the part of domestic or foreign producers or of processors or of retailers or consumers, a decision was made to drastically redistribute the Cuban allotment: not through temporary quotas but by purchase in a global market. The premium price, which had played an important part in securing adequate suppliers, good will and cooperation of foreign nations, was to be withheld from foreign suppliers and steps taken to reduce the premium return paid to traditional quota nations.

It was argued that the premium price represented "gold going out of our own treasury." It was stated that there would be a saving to the taxpayers of $100 million or more. Others suggested that the recaptured premiums could be channeled through the Alliance for Progress and other foreign aid programs so as to assure great benefits to the common people. It was argued that the allotments of quotas was itself a questionable procedure. It was charged that improper forms of representation were used in order to secure quotas; the motives of Members of Congress who dealt with sugar legislation were questioned.

Undoubtedly the assignment of quotas attracted lobbyists. Whenever licenses are to be assigned or special legislation enacted, those who are affected try to make a case for themselves or secure someone to speak for them. This in itself is not immoral or improper.

These risks have to be judged beside the risks of adopting a new system.

The State Department could have recommended the temporary allotment of the Cuban quota along traditional lines with quotas going to nations with great need or who were responding with efforts to improve economic and social conditions. Temporary quotas, it was said, would encourage false hopes, if not greed, on the part of the nations receiving them and would lead to diplomatic difficulties in the future. The safe and sure road, it was argued, was that of the global quota, of purchases in a so-called world market, with premiums being retained by the Treasury.

I thought this case faulty last year and note that some who attacked the sugar quota system last year were among the strong advocates last week of the International Coffee Agreement.

The coffee situation, of course, is not identical with the sugar program since the United States is not a coffee-producing nation. But the principles involved in the International Coffee Agreement are much the same. In his letter of transmittal, Secretary of State Rusk wrote that it is the Department's view:

"The agreement is designed to assist in increasing the purchasing power of coffee-exporting countries * * * and * * * to bring about long-term equilibrium between production and consumption.

"The agreement contains adequate safeguards to protect the United States against unwarranted price rises and inadequate supplies of coffee."

These objectives will be accomplished, of course, by means of export quotas on the part of the coffee-producing nations. Importing countries agree to limit their purchases from countries not parties to the agreement.

Last year in opposing the disruption of the historic sugar program, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

"I do not think the record in connection with this program is so bad that we should take the drastic action of throwing all of this sugar into the world market and then proceeding to buy the sugar we need for whatever price we have to pay for it—whether 2 cents, or 5 cents, or 10 cents, if the prices were to go to that."

"We have set the stage for future trouble. From 5 o'clock to 7 o'clock is what might be called the hour of prophecy in the Senate, so I will prophesy: We will be back time and time again in the course of the next 2 years, seeking adjustment of the Sugar Act in such a way as to meet new problems and crises as they arise."

As you know, in the conference agreement between the House and Senate last year about 1.5 million tons of the quota reserved for Cuba was placed in a global quota. It was to be purchased in the world market and the difference between the world market price and the U.S. price—less freight, insurance, and duty—was to be recaptured by an import fee. This represented a deviation from the country-by-country quota pattern and, in effect, it removed all special incentives for suppliers of the global quota sugar to the United States—except the desire to earn dollars. In addition the law also provided an import fee on quota sugar through 1964 equal to 10 percent a year of the difference between the world price and the U.S. domestic price. Thus at the end of 3 years the premium incentive for foreign quota holders would be reduced by 30 percent, and if this phaseout technique were continued to the expiration of the Sugar Act in 1966 it would be reduced 50 percent.

The spot price at the time of the Sugar Act of 1962 was enacted was about $2.72 per hundred on the New York exchange (f.o.b. producing area), and the domestic raw sugar spot price paid in New York was $6.37 per hundred. The quoted price for refined sugar in the northeast territory was $9.60 per 100-pound paper bag.

By January 21 of this year the spot price for world raw sugars had risen to $5.60 per hundred, f.o.b. producting area, more than double what it had been 7 months before. The import fee which the Department of Agriculture had fixed at $1.40 per hundred was totally unrealistic. On January 21 the world spot price was $5.60, f.o.b. Caribbean, and the duty paid New York spot price was $6.72. Subtract the $1.00 for insurance and duty and freight and the $1.40 import fee from the $6.72, and the import price, f.o.b. producing area, would be about $4.32 or $1.28 per hundred less than the comparable world price. On January 21, the Department eliminated the import fee entirely for a three-week period.

Even at this time, before the recent sharp price increases, the dangers of subjecting the U.S. sugar needs to the fluctuating world market were evident. The world market instability should not be a surprise. For instance, during the Korean conflict the world price went from $4.25 per hundred in June 1950 to $8.05 on June 22, 1951, but during the same period the United States price advanced only from $5.30 to $6.30.

Again, at the time of the Suez crisis, the world price went from $3.23 (October 29, 1956) to $6.85 on April 22, 1957, while in the United States the price actually declined from $6.00 to $5.60 per hundred.

The events since January have been even more startling, and they have now been reflected in the prices paid by the consumer. From the time the Act was changed last year, American consumers have paid over $100 million more for sugar than they would have paid if the average price of 1962 prevailed.

If prices for refined sugar continue at the level of $15.00 for the rest of 1963, the American consumers will have to pay another $600 million for sugar in the remaining months of the year. This added to the more than $100 million already paid in price rises would bring the total cost in the first 18 months of the Sugar Act of 1962 to more than $700 million above what it would have been if prices had continued at the level when the changes were made in the Sugar Act.

This is certainly an unhappy development, and it is dangerous to everyone involved in the sugar program.

The sugar program has been defended in the past because it did provide price stability to consumers, but I do not believe we can expect consumers quietly to pay a premium price when supplies are in surplus if the system fails to protect consumers when supplies are tight.

As a Congressman and Senator, I have received a good deal of mail over the years from farmers and producer and processor groups regarding the mechanics of the sugar program, and much mail from farmers in Minnesota who would like to be able to raise more sugar beets. I do not recall any mail protesting the price of sugar until the past few days.

The recent price rises have been attributed to a number of causes. Increased consumption is cited, along with the poor European beet crops. The boycott on Cuban supplies, of course, and the reported decline of Cuban production have contributed to the instability. But I believe that part, perhaps a substantial part, of the blame for the current situation is the change in the Sugar Act of 1962.

There is no shortage of sugar today. The Department of Agriculture report of last month showed that deliveries were up 13 percent above the same period last year. There is no reason to believe there will be a shortage this year, but what has happened is that our domestic prices have been tied into the world price by the new legislation.

As the Sugar Act operated prior to last year, the U.S. quotas were valuable to foreign sugar producers and suppliers. The penalty of losing this quota permanently if they did not fill them during periods of high prices was a strong incentive for them to fill the quotas when world prices were above U.S. prices. And the promise of a premium in our market when world prices were below our domestic price gave them an incentive for adjusting their production and practices and to maintain stable supplies for our consumers.

We must now outbid on the world market to get the supplies we need, competing with every other sugar-purchasing country in the world.

It does not appear that much can be done within the existing law to change the situation. The import duty of 62½ cents per hundred might be removed by the President, but this would have very limited effect. Elimination of the processing tax of ½ cent per pound might cause an immediate reduction of refined sugar prices by this amount, but this small gain would endanger the domestic sugar beet and cane programs which are subsidized with revenue derived from the ½ cent per pound processing tax.

Tinkering with existing law will not provide any effective answer to the complicated difficulties in the sugar market. We should return to the system of allocations of quotas to foreign suppliers to provide that sugar which is not produced by U.S. sugar producers, and continue the orderly and balanced expansion of the domestic industry.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE AMERICAN SHIPPING OPERATIONS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in a recent address before the Washington Propeller Club, my distinguished colleague, Senator Russell B. Long, of Louisiana, made an interesting proposal designed to increase American shipping operations.

The interesting part of this proposal is Senator Long's claim that it could cancel out our balance-of-payments problem which exists today. I commend the address to all my colleagues as a proposal which could have real significance on our global economic front and could also reinforce the American shipping industry which has proven so vital to our successes in time of war.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Russell B. Long Before Washington Propeller Club, Washington, D.C., May 22, 1963

As you know, my home State of Louisiana is probably more dependent on water transportation than any other State in the Union. Very substantial segments of our economic life and a great deal of our recreational life are centered around the water. This is obvious when you note that Louisiana has 7,548 miles of navigable streams. Of this total 1,800 miles are improved navigable waterways. Our major seaports at New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Lake Charles have constantly occupied my interest and attention since I came to Congress in 1948. The problems I have encountered in relation to these ports and to the various other maritime activities within my State are, I am sure, quite similar to your own problems and interests.

So, while I am perhaps not as much at home or as authoritative on this subject as Wernher von Braun speaking on rocketry, or as Dr. Van Allen on space radiation, or as Admiral Rickover on atomic submarines, I can at least assure you that your interests and mine are in the same boat.

One of the biggest problems that some of us in Congress have in promoting legislation to improve conditions in the maritime industry, is the average American's lack of firsthand contact with the industry. Its effects on our national security and our national economic posture are tremendous. But the average American seldom stops to realize how dependent he is on the shipping industry. He sees the trucking industry in operation each time he drives out onto the highway. He sees the railway industry in operation almost as often. But he knows very little about the function of shipping or its tremendous importance to the life of this Nation.

Without a strong merchant marine to serve the needs of modern American industry, our industrial complex could not possibly support the standard of living we Americans enjoy today. Without a strong merchant marine, we could not support the type of military operations that are necessary to preserve both our freedom and the freedom of other peoples throughout the world. If these facts were fully impressed on the average Joe American, his representatives in Congress would have a much freer hand in giving assistance to the industry.

When I speak of the merchant marine, I must speak of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. Several years ago when I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman Senator Dick Russell requested me to serve as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island. As it turned out, I was not just a member of the Board of Visitors—I was the Board of Visitors. What I saw on that occasion impressed on me the complete lack of wisdom in the ridiculous economies being forced upon that fine institution. The boys actually were being forced to get by with a single light bulb in their rooms. If a youngster wanted to study at his desk he would have to push his bed under the fixture, remove the light bulb, and switch the bulb to his desk. Later, he would return it before he retired. When I returned I wrote a report in which I chastised the Congress unmercifully for pennywise and pound-foolish economy being practiced at Kings Point.

I don't say that this was entirely responsible for the changes that occurred, but several times it was quoted by witnesses who appeared before our pennypinching subcommittees and I am sure that it at least contributed in some way in causing some of our more conservative Members to see the light and contribute a little bit toward making that fine institution what it should be.

Incidentally, I believe I am the only member of the Louisiana congressional delegation who has consistently named his appointees to the service academies based entirely on the grades these young men make in a competitive examination. In view of the fact that a lot of young men who take the examination are disappointed that they cannot go to Annapolis, West Point, or Eagle, Colo., I encourage the best of them to apply for Kings Point. Without exception, everyone who has applied has become an enthusiastic devotee of that fine academy.

I don't want to claim this evening as a Louisiana Day, but, in passing, I would like to mention the fact that it was my colleague, Hale Boggs, who established the Board of Visitors to Kings Point, and in my judgment, it was the existence of the Board of Visitors that did more than any one thing to see to it that the Academy's needs were recognized.

While our merchant marine's national prominence is perhaps most spectacularly illustrated in its capacity to sustain American industry and to serve our defense efforts in time of emergency, its function as a buttress to a sound national economy should not be overlooked.

Perhaps it would be interesting to look at this particular aspect—the hidden economic aspect—of U.S. shipping to see what a great contribution it is making to the country and what an even greater contribution it could make under improved circumstances.

For many years it has been my privilege to help you fight your battles to keep the American flag on the high seas. Naturally, this requires a subsidy. Without a shipping subsidy, American ships could not compete against pitiful wages paid to Indians, Africans, Chinamen and seamen of other low wage nations. Without a subsidy American shipyards could not compete against the pitiful wages paid by shipyards in Italy, Greece, Japan, and other low-wage nations.

Yet, in war-time, we have seen the importance of the American merchant marine. Without the American merchant marine, this Nation would have been powerless to work its will in World War II. Without the American merchant marine, this Nation would constantly be subject to international dangers and international extortion of a character which we do not even bother to imagine.

In my college days, I recall a wax record by colored singers known as the Ink Spots. This record was entitled "You Never Miss the Water 'Till the Well Runs Dry." This song could well describe those who fight against the subsidies which we accord to certain essential American industries.

During World War I this Nation learned what it meant to go without sugar. The price of sugar went over 26 cents per pound. We consider the retail price of between 12 cents and 20 cents per pound very high today. Based on today's economy, the 26-cents-a-pound-plus of 1920 actually represented something approaching $1.00 per pound. For that reason, the United States determined that it would maintain a sugar industry at the beginning of World War II. For many years we hear people screaming to the high heavens about the high cost of our sugar subsidy. It amounted to about 1½ cents on each pound of sugar. It cost the average family about $2.25 per year.

This year we are experiencing a world shortage of sugar. Fortunately for the United States, this Nation plus Puerto Rico produces about 60 percent of our total requirements. As I said, this year we are experiencing a worldwide shortage of sugar. Goodness only knows what we would be paying for sugar were it not for the U.S. Sugar Act which has preserved a domestic sugarcane and sugarbeet industry. We pay a little more but we know that it will be there when the time comes. If worse came to worse, we could survive with the sugarcane and sugarbeets that we produce here in America. We are not prospects for any international blackmail.

Likewise, we have quotas on the amount of oil which can be imported from foreign nations. While it is true that oil can be produced more cheaply in Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and even in the Soviet Union, we do not propose to gamble with our National security on uncertain shipping lines or even rely without recourse on neighbors as friendly as Canada or Mexico. Any nation which is as great and powerful as the United States, the hope and the inspiration of the free world, must not have an Achilles Heel.

At this moment, the weakest link in our security chain is the fact that this Nation is no longer able to pay in gold the many foreign claims upon our Treasury. Prior to the Marshall plan in 1948, we had buried at Fort Knox almost all of the gold bullion that the world possesses. Now that we have given away $100 billion in foreign aid and now that we have maintained large numbers of American troops to confront Soviet power in Europe for almost 15 years, our foreign allies hold enough American dollars and credit to empty Fort Knox, Ky.

When President Kennedy ran for his office he made more than 25 speeches in which he denounced the tight money and high interest rate program of the Eisenhower administration. The Democratic Party platform loudly proclaimed that the first act of the Democratic President would be to end the tight money and high interest rate program of President Eisenhower. The Democratic platform strongly renounced the Republican argument that tight money and high interest rates were necessary to prevent inflation. In fact, the Democratic platform contended that the tight money and high interest rate program had exactly the opposite effect. In other words, it contended that tight money and high interest rates had contributed to inflation rather than stopping it.

I regret to say that President Kennedy has done nothing to make good his promise to reduce interest rates. He has earnestly contended that the international drain on the American gold supply made it necessary to keep interest rates high in order to encourage foreign investors to leave their gold here rather than demand payment.

If we take the President and the Secretary of the Treasury at their word, then it is amazing to see how much the balance-of-payments problem is costing the American people.

If we compare the general level of interest rates as of mid-1952 when the Truman administration was holding the lid on, with the interest rates that prevail today, we would see that the high interest rates existing at this time are costing us more than $3 billion extra on the national debt alone. On a public and private debt approaching $900 billion, these high interest rates amount to a $9-billion drag on the American economy.

Sometime this month we will find it necessary to increase the national debt limit to $309 billion. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee, recently put in the RECORD a tabulation that shows we would be reducing rather than increasing our national debt had we been able to maintain the low-level interest rate which our President advocated during his campaign.

Now, what has the high interest rate situation got to do with the merchant marine? Well, it has this much to do with it: When we pay for American ships to sail the high seas, almost all of those dollars come back to the United States. It is true that our sailors might spend a few dollars in foreign ports and, after a long voyage at sea, we would want them to do that. But they maintain their families and their homes in the United States and the money spent for food, clothing, and shelter is, for the most part, spent here in this country. Our American merchant marine relieves our balance-of-payments problem by more than $1 billion each year.

As you know, the American merchant marine is now carrying only 30 percent of the total "cargo liner" movement in our foreign trade. Even more astonishing is the fact that American flagships, liners, tramps, bulk carriers, and tankers transport only about 10 percent of our total volume of foreign trade.

If this Nation was to take steps to increase our volume of foreign trade to see to it that 50 percent of our foreign trade was hauled in American bottoms, this could cancel out completely our balance-of-payments problem as it exists today. There would no longer be an excuse for a monetary policy which is costing the Nation as much as $15 billion a year in excess interest payments.

To increase American shipping to an extent which I would advocate might cost us as much as $500 million in additional subsidies but it would save in interest charges on the national debt alone an amount that would exceed the additional cost by more than 6 to 1.

Furthermore, we would be running our bank in such a way that we would be solvent whether the other fellow wanted us to be solvent or not. We could continue our present foreign aid policies of economic and military aid as well as that of maintaining almost a million Americans on foreign soil without worrying about being unable to pay for it in standard international exchange.

Such increases in American merchant shipping may sound optimistic to the point of being considered absurd, but may I point out that the United Kingdom carries 53 percent of her total foreign commerce; France carries 62 percent; Italy carries 53 percent; Japan carries 50 percent; Norway carries 50 percent; and Spain carries 73 percent.

Only last year we passed a trade act, the purpose of which was to benefit our friends abroad as much as it was intended to benefit the United States. We proposed to reduce tariffs by as much as 50 percent on many items and to reduce tariffs to zero in some cases. In the negotiations which are now taking place, we are discovering how tough some of our friends in France and elsewhere can be. We should not complain about this—they have every right to protect their interests. If they care to be selfish or greedy, that is entirely their privilege. The only point that I object to is the failure of some of our soft-headed negotiators to realize that it is their duty to protect the interests of the United States.

It is completely within the power of this Nation to preserve its solvency and to preserve its preeminence as the leader of the capitalistic world merely by maintaining a proper control and administration of those items which are completely within the discretion of this Government and with regard to which we are not answerable to any foreign power.

We have a perfect right to reduce the number of Americans that we are maintaining in Europe. We could thin down from five divisions to two divisions in Western Europe and we could, accordingly reduce the number of servicemen and military dependents from 600,000 to 250,000 without the slightest danger to Europe or anyone else. The main role of these divisions in Europe has been to assure Europeans of U.S. commitment to defend the Continent against Russian aggression. But today, their presence there in such large numbers is taxing the economy unreasonably. Actually, we would be just as fully committed if we had only two divisions there instead of five. This could save us as much as $1 billion a year in our payments problem.

If need be, we could further reduce the import quotas of foreign oil although a mere increase in our world shipping would solve the problem better and perhaps with less dislocation to the economy of free nations.

With as much criticism as I have directed to the U.S. foreign-aid program, I cannot for the life of me see why, if we are going to give something away, we should not give it away in American bottoms. This is especially true when we face the prospect of becoming an international bankrupt by giving it away in the other fellow's bottoms.

The President of the United States is proposing a major reduction in taxes as a spur to the American economy. To me, this makes a good sense only if accompanied by a general reduction in interest rates. Without a monetary policy to coincide and complement our tax cut, we will find ourselves wedded to big deficits for many years to come.

Your industry can help us to bring this program about. Your industry can help America to expand its production, its employment and its prosperity and America should help you do it.

DISCIPLINE IN THE GOP RANKS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the task of leading the minority forces in the Congress is admittedly a difficult one under the best conditions. At present the ratio of the minority to the majority partv members is far from close. In the Senate there are 67 Democratic Members and 33 Republican Members, or a more than 2 to 1 ratio. In the House of Representatives there are 256 Democratic Members and 178 Republican Members, 1 vacancy, or 3-to-2 ratio.

The high quality of the Republican leadership exemplified by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Everett McKinley Dirksen, and the Representative from Indiana, Mr. Charles A. Halleck, is, of course, well known to the Members of both the Senate and the House. Their effectiveness, skill, and courage are beyond dispute. These leaders have continuously encouraged a Republican task force to try to bring about substantial reductions in President Kennedy's "planned" $12 billion deficit for 1964.

It is with great satisfaction that we read the suggestion by the noted columnist, William S. White, that the "congressional managers-of-the-year title should go to Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck for 1963."

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's column, published in the Washington Star, May 20, 1963, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Discipline in the GOP Ranks

On the homely, old-fashioned bread-and-potatoes issues, the Republicans are drawing together against President Kennedy in massive and extraordinarily disciplined party unity as the last phase of this session of Congress now opens.

Whatever their divisions otherwise, the Republicans, unlike the Democrats, have no great difficulty in speaking with one voice on one subject, at any rate—that of Federal spending. Their congressional leaders—Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, and Representative Charles Halleck, of Indiana—are coolly and skillfully exploiting this single area of built-in Republican union.

ACCENTING THE POSITIVE

They are hitting the Democrats at their weakest point, their lack of general party agreement on fiscal matters. In short, the congressional Republicans are accentuating their party's one, absolutely positive quality—the fact that Republican conservatives, moderates and liberals alike are able to take an almost unanimous position in the spending field. And they are playing down the negative—those areas, like civil rights and foreign policy, in which GOP divisions are actually no less deep than those of the Democrats.

On budgetary matters, if on no other, they are writing a party record in this Congress on which any conceivable Republican presidential nominee of next year—be he a Senator Barry Goldwater on the right or a Governor Nelson Rockefeller on the left—could stand with reasonable comfort.

It is a job of great professional expertness, and it is giving the Kennedy administration causes for discomfort already. Within the space of 2 days all this has been clearly illustrated in both the House and Senate.

In the House, the Republican leadership marshaled 172 out of the 173 voting Republicans against a bill to permit a rise in the legal Federal debt limit from $305 billion to $307 billion and, later, to $309 billion. While a single Republican was lost in this contest, the Democratic House leadership saw 32 Democrats rebel and vote with the Republicans. The bill thus barely survived—by 213 to 204.

In the Senate, on the passage of the administration's feed grain subsidy bill, eight Democrats rejected their party's line to stand with the Republican opposition. Only three Republicans, all from farm States deeply involved in the subsidies, refused to follow the Republican leadership against the measure.

These statistics may seem dry as dust. All the same, there is much political juice of a potent sort in them. What they plainly mean is that on bread-and-potatoes—and bread-and-potatoes in the end settle most elections—the Republican congressional minority is functioning as the most disciplined party team within recent memory.

CONTROL SLIPPING AWAY

They mean also that the President's control in budgetary and fiscal matters is slipping away and may, in fact, be wholly lost before this session of Congress is done unless he can find a way quickly to plug the gaps in his own Democratic line.

And, finally, they mean, beyond further doubt, that the Republicans are highly fortunate in their present congressional leadership. Of late years most of the great congressional pros had been Democrats. Now, there has been a turnabout. No detached analysis could reasonably deny the congressional managers-of-the-year title to Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck.

They have earned this title by wisely limiting their partisan activity primarily to those areas where they knew their troops would be with them and by wisely restraining GOP attacks in those areas where there was no point, really, in attacking at all.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have just had the opportunity to read and study a series of three articles published by Mr. Dan Smoot, of Dallas, Tex., in his weekly publication, the Dan Smoot Report. These articles are concerned with the subject of disarmament. They are well written and most carefully footnoted to support the points made in Mr. Smoot's articles.

Mr. Smoot is a well-known American citizen who has dedicated himself to the enormous task of trying to inform and alert the American people to the menace and dangers of the world Communist movement, and also as to actions and proposals by our Government which, unfortunately, serve to assist the Communists in the attainment of their goal of world domination. A native of Texas, Mr. Smoot holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from Southern Methodist University, later serving on the faculty at Harvard as a teaching fellow in English and doing graduate work there for a doctorate in American civilization.

In 1942, he left Harvard and joined the FBI. As an FBI agent, he worked for 3½ years on Communist investigations in the industrial Midwest; 2 years as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover on FBI headquarters staff in Washington; and almost 4 years on general FBI cases in various parts of the Nation.

In 1951, Mr. Smoot resigned from the FBI and helped start Facts Forum. On Facts Forum radio and television programs, Smoot spoke to a national audience, giving both sides of controversial issues.

In July 1955, he resigned and started his present independent publishing and broadcasting business—a free-enterprise operation financed entirely by profits from sales: sales of the Dan Smoot Report, a weekly magazine; and sales of a weekly news analysis broadcast, to business firms, for use on radio and television as an advertising vehicle. The report and the broadcast give only one side in presenting documented truth about important issues—the side that uses the American Constitution as a yardstick. The report is available by subscription; and the broadcasts are available for commercial sponsorship, anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, because of the vital facts set out in this series of articles by Mr. Smoot and because the U.S. Senate has an important responsibility to fulfill in the field of foreign relations, I feel that every Member of this body should read this series of articles. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that these articles, together with the footnotes at the end of each, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, May 6, 1963]

DISARMAMENT—PART I

A PARABLE

"Last week, top law-enforcement officials of Chicago and New York held another meeting with criminal leaders of those two cities. This was the latest of a lengthy series of such meetings, called in response to pleas made by the criminals for the purpose of eliminating the costly struggle between organized society and the criminal underworld.

"The criminals have for many years insisted that huge police forces, equipped with weapons and in command of jails and other places of detention, have necessitated a corresponding expenditure of effort and money on their part to protect their own interests. They have made repeated offers to disarm every criminal in Chicago and New York and to disband every criminal organization, if the law-enforcement agencies will also disarm and disband.

"The law-enforcement officials are also eager to eliminate crime and to save the taxpayers of Chicago and New York the enormous expense of maintaining police forces. They have offered to disband the police forces of both cities, except for skeleton crews of unarmed men to handle traffic problems.

"The only point of disagreement involves the question of effective inspection to guarantee that both sides keep the disarmament agreements. Law enforcement officials feel it would be dangerous to disband police forces and leave Chicago and New York totally helpless if the criminals should break their promise and launch a sudden, all-out attack on the citizens of those two cities.

"Law enforcement officials want a firm agreement which would authorize them to send neutral inspectors into criminal haunts of Chicago and New York to investigate any report of criminal activity. The agreement would, similarly, authorize neutral inspectors to investigate any suspicion or complaint on the part of criminals that the police were rearming and hiring new personnel.

"In the more than 1,000 previous meetings with law enforcement officials, criminal leaders of Chicago and New York have flatly refused this inspection system demanded by law enforcement. They accuse law enforcement officials of bad faith in making such demands, claiming that the officials are merely trying to set up a stool-pigeon system to spy on criminals and violate their private rights.

"On the eve of the latest meeting which began last week, however, spokesmen for law enforcement officials expressed cheerful optimism. They claimed that criminal leaders, displaying a genuine interest in peace, now seem willing to make significant concessions to law enforcement demands. Although they gave no details, law enforcement spokesmen said the criminals have 'considerably modified' their previously firm stand against inspections, and have offered to permit a limited number of annual inspections, by neutral observers, in specified criminal hangouts in Chicago and New York."

That fictional news story has never been written, and never will be, because no such ludicrous thing will ever happen.

The story is not nearly so ludicrous, however, as the news stories which were making headlines throughout the world in April and May, 1963—concerning determined and hopeful efforts of Western leaders to negotiate a peace-and-disarmament pact with international criminals who control the Communist slave empire.

COMMUNIST INTENT

Communists consider anything "good" which promotes the cause of socialism (that is, communism): war, mass murder, the extermination of whole races through enforced starvation, torture of human beings, rape, pillage, betrayal of friends and family, theft, vandalism—all are "good" if they help communism. On the other hand, anything is "bad" which hurts communism: love of God and country, kindness, charity, honesty, thrift, hard work—all are "bad" if they in any way interfere with the Communist drive for world conquest.

"World peace," to Communists, means Communist conquest of the world. All non-Communists are regarded as enemies of communism, who will destroy Communists if given a chance. Hence, there can be no peace on earth until all non-Communists are eliminated. Until such time arrives, strategy requires periods of "peaceful coexistence" between Communists and non-Communists. To a normal mind, "peaceful coexistence" means living side by side, leaving each other alone. To the Communist mind, "peaceful coexistence" means a cessation of all hostility and opposition on the part of non-Communists (and cessation of preparation for possible hostility), while Communists gather strength and make plans for renewed assaults on non-Communists.

Weapons in the hands of Communists are considered benign tools for achieving world peace; weapons in the hands of non-Communists are considered horrible instruments for oppression and conquest.

Communists do dream of a time in the distant future when they themselves can be relieved of the burden of producing and maintaining armaments; but that is to come only after Communist conquest of the world is complete. Communists regard it as treason to their own cause even to think of disarming Communists before all non-Communists have been disarmed and destroyed.

Communists have been advocating "total disarmament in a peaceful world" since 1916. Their program is simple and openly stated by Communist leaders: to disarm all non-Communists so that they can be destroyed. The objective of every disarmament discussion is to disarm non-Communist nations (specifically, the United States) while increasing the armaments of the Soviet Union.

These facts being known, it is ludicrous and dangerous for our political leaders even to discuss disarmament with Soviet leaders. These facts have been known since 1916.

Below are a few quotations from Communist leaders to prove the point. Readers not familiar with Communist dialectics may need a glossary. In the Communist language quoted below:

Proletariat, revolutionary proletariat, peoples, forces struggling for socialism, the working class, the masses—all mean Communists;

Revolutionary wars—means wars fought in the interest of communism;

Proletarian revolution, national liberation movement, class struggle, struggle for peace, struggle against imperialism, struggle for national independence—all mean efforts of Communists to seize power;

Imperialists, bourgeoisie—mean non-Communists.

In 1916, Lenin said: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap." [1]

In 1917, Lenin said: "We are no pacifists * * * we have always declared that it would be stupid if the revolutionary proletariat promised not to wage revolutionary wars which might become indispensable in the interest of socialism." [1]

A policy statement adopted at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, in 1928, says: "The aim of the Soviet proposals is * * * to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulates that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism." [1]

In 1954, V. Cherpakov (representative of the Soviet Ministry of Defense) said: "Communists link the cause of peace with the cause of victory of the proletarian revolution." [1]

An editorial in the February 1955 issue of National Affairs Monthly (official Communist publication) said: "The idea that peaceful coexistence must include the maintenance of the status quo is imperialist propaganda." [1]

On October 20, 1960, Khrushchev told Communists of the world about the need to "force" the capitalist countries to come to an agreement on disarmament.[1]

In December 1960 at a Moscow meeting of representatives from 81 Communist parties throughout the world, Communist leaders laid down a directive that "an active, determined struggle" must be waged to "force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament." [1]

Here are excerpts from a speech which Khrushchev made on January 6, 1961:

"Peaceful coexistence helps * * * the forces struggling for socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of Communist parties * * * it helps the national liberation movement to gain successes.

"Peaceful coexistence implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas. * * * It is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena.

"Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle * * * the coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

"The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace.

"The slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism.

"The struggle for disarmament * * * is an effective struggle against imperialism * * * for restricting its military potentialities." [1]

In his January 6, 1961, speech, Khrushchev quoted Lenin to the effect that, in promoting their program of disarming non-Communists, Communists must establish "contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie who gravitate toward pacifism." [1]

On July 10, 1962, speaking to the World Congress on General Disarmament and Peace, Khrushchev said: "The struggle for general disarmament facilities the struggle for national independence. For their part the success of the national liberation movements strengthen the cause of peace, contribute to strengthening the struggle for disarmament. Disarmament means disarmament of the forces of war, the liquidation of militarism." [1]

An editorial in the October 1962, issue of World Marxist Review said: "General disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence * * * disarmed, the imperialists would be powerless to prevent the people from attaining freedom. Disarmament primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries." [1]

In a public statement at Berlin on January 16, 1963, Khrushchev said: "The duty of Communists at the helm of state power is to do everything possible to insure that our strength will grow."[1]

---

[1] The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation, by Stefan T. Possony, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 21, 1963, pp. 4614–4626.

COMMUNIST PERFORMANCE

Unless our political leaders profess abysmal ignorance, they can find no excuse for not knowing the intent of Communist disarmament discussions. How about the performance of Communists in keeping their treaty commitments?

In 1955, when President Eisenhower was planning a summit meeting with Communist leaders at Geneva, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (by way of showing Eisenhower that any kind of negotiation with Soviet leaders is not only fruitless but dangerous) released to the press a staff study of the Soviet treaty record. Here are passages from the foreword to the staff study, later (1956) published as Senate Document No. 125:

"The Subcommittee on Internal Security authorized a staff study of the Soviet treaty record from 1917, when a handful of Bolsheviks seized power over 150 million non-Communists in Russia, to the present, when 800 million people on two continents suffer under Red despotism. The project was part of the subcommittee's examination of the strategy and tactics of world communism. It contemplated a scrutiny of treaties and agreements involving peace, accord and fraternity, collaboration, friendship and neutrality, diplomatic recognition, frontier disputes, nonaggression pacts, conferences of conciliation, mutual aid, renunciation of war, and international promises to the peoples of the entire world—such as the Atlantic Charter.

"The staff studied nearly a thousand treaties and agreements of the kinds described above, both bilateral and multilateral, which the Soviets have entered into not only with the United States, but with countries all over the world. The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It signed treaties of nonaggression with neighboring states and then absorbed those states. It signed promises to refrain from revolutionary activity inside the countries with which it sought 'friendship,' and then cynically broke those promises. It was violating the first agreement it ever signed with the United States at the very moment the Soviet envoy, Litvinov, was putting his signature to that agreement, and it is still violating the same agreement in 1955 * * *. It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union.

"I seriously doubt whether during the whole history of civilization any great nation has ever made as perfidious a record as this in so short a time.

"On the basis of the record, this question inevitably arises: Is the Soviet record merely a series of individual and unrelated misdeeds, or has treaty breaking been an instrument of national policy since the U.S.S.R. itself came into existence?"[2]

COMMUNIST TECHNIQUES

The staff of the Internal Security Subcommittee concluded that treaty breaking is, provably, an instrument of Soviet national policy.

When the Soviets engage U.S. leaders in negotiation for some agreement, they make proposals which could not, in sanity, be accepted; but their propaganda machines in the United Nations, in Moscow, and in Soviet embassies throughout the world (aided and abetted by the pro-Communist and Communist-following liberal forces in the United States) attempt to conceal the fact that the Soviets have made unreasonable demands. The propaganda berates the United States for being unyielding, accusing us of acting in bad faith because we will not truly engage in the "give and take" necessary in such negotiations.

Most thoughtful people see through the Soviet propaganda and say so; but the Soviets, caring not a fig for "world opinion," keep hammering away. Large numbers of fools, fatheads, pacifists, and brainwashed liberals are, however, deceived. They join the Communist chorus, criticizing the United States for refusing to "negotiate in good faith."

American leaders (sensitive, to the point of nausea, to "world opinion") begin to wince and apologize—and to make concessions.

After milking all possible propaganda benefit out of the situation, the Soviets may decide to enter into an agreement. If so, they generally capture whatever is to be gained from the approval of "world opinion" by making some meaningless concession which our own officials help to puff up as something important, in order to convince American voters that our leaders have "driven a hard bargain" with Communists.

Once the U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreement is made (either through formal treaty process, or by the informal means of verbal acknowledgment as in the case of the 3-year ban on nuclear testing which began in October 1958), we are, of course, bound by the terms of it. The Soviets do not consider themselves bound at all.

As a matter of policy, they violate the terms of the agreement they have made—sometimes openly, to show arrogant contempt for us, as in their immediate and continuous violations of the Korean armistice agreement made in July, 1953; sometimes surreptitiously, as in their violations of the nuclear test ban agreement of October 1958.

Even if we should, eventually, repudiate the agreement because of Soviet violations, we have been (during the period of our compliance) hobbled by it, while the Soviets feel free to do whatever the agreement was intended to keep them from doing.

The Soviet technique of negotiating and propagandizing U.S. leaders into surrendering the vital interests of our country have been particularly harmful in the area of disarmament. Indeed, the record proves that unless the American people can somehow manage, through their Congress, to reverse present, settled trends, we are headed toward total surrender of the United States to a Communist-controlled world superstate system.

A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY

In December 1945, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain and the U.S. Secretary of State met with the Soviet Foreign Minister in Moscow to discuss disarmament. They agreed to sponsor, at the first session of the U.N. General Assembly, a resolution creating an International Atomic Energy Commission.[3]

The resolution was introduced—and was adopted by the first session of the U.N. General Assembly, meeting in London, on January 24, 1946. The Atomic Energy Commission was empowered to make proposals concerning the elimination, or control, of atomic weapons—and to make recommendations concerning international exchange of scientific information. Bernard M. Baruch was the first U.S. representative on the International Atomic Energy Commission.[3]

On March 28, 1946, Dean G. Acheson and David Lilienthal submitted a report, outlining U.S. proposals for the international control and sharing of atomic energy knowledge and materials. Baruch was given some leeway to revise the proposals before formally submitting them, on behalf of the U.S. Government, to the United Nations.

On June 14, 1946, Baruch submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission the U.S. proposals—which came to be known as the "Baruch Plan" and the "Baruch-Lilienthal Plan."

The Baruch plan proposed the creation of a new International Atomic Development Authority, which, operating under the broad control of the U.N. General Assembly, would have absolute "control, or ownership, of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security"; and would have the "power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities." The new Authority could seize and dispose of all existing atomic bombs, prohibit further manufacture of bombs, and prescribe "serious" penalties against any nation for violating regulations issued by the Authority.

The Baruch plan also suggested total disarmament (elimination not only of atomic weapons, but of all conventional weapons and military forces)—to be achieved in stages.[3]

On July 19, 1946, Andrei A. Gromyko presented the proposal of the Soviet Union. The Soviet plan ignored the Baruch proposal for total disarmament; but, insofar as it concerned atomic disarmament, the Soviet plan was virtually identical with the Baruch plan. There was, however, one essential difference in approach. Whereas the Baruch plan called for a new International Atomic Energy Authority to operate under the control of the U.N. General Assembly, the Soviets wanted the old Atomic Energy Commission to handle atomic energy affairs, under control of the U.N. Security Council.[4]

The Soviets were shortsighted. They wanted a U.N. agency which could strip the United States of its atomic weapons, since they were years behind us at that time and knew that the agency would not limit their own plans for research and development. They did not foresee, however, the day (now arrived) when they and their "neutralist" friends could control the U.N. General Assembly. They wanted control of atomic energy centered in the U.N. Security Council where they had a veto, fearing that the U.N. General Assembly might make a decision they did not like.

It seems more than likely that the United States would have modified the Baruch plan enough to meet all objections offered by the Soviets. This was never done, however, largely because Congress (despite the large and powerful peace claque of liberals which it contained) reflected the deeper instincts of the Nation: namely that the Baruch plan, modified or not, was a blueprint for the surrender of our national independence.

As time marched on, the Soviets became less interested in the Baruch plan, because they had begun to catch up with us in atomic research and development—thanks to our voluntary deemphasis of activity in this field; to the atom spies who delivered our major secrets to the Soviets; and to German scientists whom we had permitted the Soviets to kidnap and take to Russia.

On January 11, 1952, the U.N. General Assembly, at the urging of the United States, created a Disarmament Commission to study and supervise the problem of general disarmament; but the propaganda for "international control" of atomic energy subtly changed. There was less and less emphasis on controlling atomic energy, more emphasis on the "have" nations sharing their atomic energy knowledge and materials with the "have not" nations.[4]

---

[1] See footnote 1 on p. 11114.

[2] "Foreword," by U.S. Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, to Soviet Political Agreements and Results, a Staff Study, Internal Sercurity Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, May 21, 1956, p. VIII.

[3] The United States and the United Nations: Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1946. Department of State publication No. 2735, Feb. 5, 1947, pp. 44-53; 169-194.

[4] Review of the United Nations Charter, A Collection of Documents, Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jan. 7, 1954, pp. 436-442; 450-459; 474-480.

By the middle of President Eisenhower's first year in office (1953), "diversion of nuclear materials from military use to peaceful purposes" had become the cardinal theme of nuclear disarmament propaganda. Communists emphasized this theme, of course, because, in Communist dialectics, it meant giving United States nuclear materials away abroad so that the United States could not use them for military purposes, while the Soviets could concentrate on military use for their nuclear materials.

In December 1953, President Eisenhower (with his "atoms for peace" plan) gave a great boost to this "diversion of nuclear materials" scheme.

In an Atoms for Peace speech to the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower recommended that the U.N. create an International Atomic Energy Agency, to which all governments producing atomic energy could make contributions of normal uranium and fissionable materials.

The U.N. agency would store the materials and allocate them around the world (to nations not producing such materials) for peaceful uses.[4]

Almost 3 years later—on October 23, 1956—the General Assembly of the U.N. approved a charter for the atomic energy agency which Eisenhower had recommended. Three days later—October 26, 1956, before any nation had had opportunity to ratify the charter—President Eisenhower pledged the United States to give the new agency, immediately, 5,000 kilograms (11,000 pounds) of uranium 235; and, after that, to match combined contributions of all other nations on earth.

At the time, the estimated production cost of 11,000 pounds of uranium 235 was $110 million.[5] Without consulting Congress (indeed, before the International Atomic Energy Agency charter had even been submitted to the Senate for approval of American membership) President Eisenhower promised to start the international atom bank off with a gift of $110 million worth of uranium 235, and promised that U.S. gifts would stay at least that far ahead of the gifts of all other nations put together.

The late Senator Joseph McCarthy fought hard against Senate ratification of the IAEA charter, predicting that Communists would take the thing over and use it against us.

The Senate Atomic Energy Committee held hearings—receiving abundant and repeated assurances from the State Department and from the Atomic Energy Commission that there was no possibility of Communists taking over the new Agency. The parade of witnesses from the executive branch of Government virtually guaranteed that the International Atomic Energy Agency, being an American idea, would always be run the way the United States wanted.

Internationalist supporters of the IAEA were scornful of McCarthyites for suggesting that the President and the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission would recommend anything dangerous for America.

The Senate ratified the IAEA charter on June 18, 1957, by a vote of 67 to 19. The Agency came into being on July 29, 1957, when 18 nations had ratified the charter. By the end of October 1957, Communist-bloc nations had gained control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the U.S. State Department was professing to be "indignant" and "perturbed."[6]

Almost simultaneously with the capture of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Soviets (October 1957), launched the first man-made earth satellite, thus dazzling the world with their achievements in nuclear, and related, research.

Since then, frightful events have taken the United States to the very brink of national surrender. We are on that brink now. The Kennedy administration, under the guise of promoting world peace, has already planned the surrender.

Administration spokesmen insist that no international agreement concerning disarmament will be made without specific approval of the U.S. Senate. But past behavior, developed plans, and known attitude of the Kennedy administration indicate otherwise.

The machinery is already established for Kennedy (if and when he finds just the right crisis) to surrender the Armed Forces (and, therefore, the national independence) of the United States to a Communist-dominated world organization.

DISARMAMENT—PART II

[From the Dan Smoot Report, May 13, 1963]

If the United States had an effective defense against enemy missiles, Communists could not blackmail us with threats of nuclear destruction. We would not need to engage in an armaments race, or bankrupt ourselves with defense expenditures. We could maintain a small professional establishment of conventionally armed military forces—as was once American tradition—and thus defend our Nation without converting it into a police state, through taxation and controls, and compulsory peacetime conscription.

But an effective anti-missile missile—the most desperately needed weapon in this century—is the weapon we do not have. Officialdom says American prospects of developing such a weapon are virtually nonexistent—but admits that the Soviets may be on the point of developing one, if they do not already have it.[1]

OUR SUICIDE STRATEGY

There is evidence that American officialdom does not want the United States to have an effective defense against missiles. Such evidence can be found in the State Department disarmament plan (presented to the United Nations in September 1961) which stresses the outlawing of antimissile weapons, and the outlawing of research and testing intended to produce such weapons.[2]

In a treatise entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," Dr. Stefan T. Possony (of the Hoover Institute) also presented evidence that American officialdom does not want this Nation to possess an adequate defense against missiles. Dr. Possony said:

"Mr. [William C.] Foster's statement * * * discloses the true attitude of the administration to antimissile defense: they just don't want it."[3]

Foster—a member of the Council on Foreign Relations—is head of the Disarmament Agency.

In a broadcast on The Manion Forum, U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND said the Defense Department has already made a decision: "To postpone the production and deployment of an antimissile defense system until 1970 or later, if, indeed, we are ever permitted to deploy an antimissile system."[4]

Extensive testing of nuclear weapons—especially in the atmosphere—is necessary for research to develop a defense against missiles.[3]

---

[4] See footnote 4 on p. 11115.

[5] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 3, 1954.

[6] "Reds Grab Key Jobs In World Atom Agency," by Robert S. Allen, The Tablet, Brooklyn, N.Y., Nov. 2, 1957.

[1] Article by Fred Farris, New York Herald Tribune News Service, dateline Washington, in the San Francisco Examiner, Mar. 12, 1962.

[2] The American plan for total disarmament was published in September 1961, by the Government Printing Office as State Department Publication 7277, entitled "Freedom From War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." Here are passages from the official text:

"The nations of the world * * * set forth as the objectives of a program of general and complete disarmament. * * *

"The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order; * * *

"As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened. * * *

"Stage I. * * *

"An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations. * * *

"Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed level. * * * The reduction shall be accomplished * * * by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO. * * *

"Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

"Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted. * * *

"Stage II. * * *

"Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out. * * *

"During Stage II, states shall develop further the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in Stage III deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. * * * The U.N. Peace Force shall be established and progressively strengthened. * * *

"Stage III. * * *

"In Stage III, progressive controlled disarmament * * * would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force. * * *

"States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

"The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

"The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order."

[3] "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 21, 1963, pp. 4614–4626.

[4] "Are We Trying To Lose the Cold War?" by U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat of South Carolina, Weekly Broadcast No. 447, the Manion Forum, South Bend, Ind., Apr. 21, 1963.

Yet, in the interest of negotiating with the Soviets, the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations forfeited the security interests of their own country and, for more than 4 years, gave the Soviets unchallenged monopoly in the field of nuclear testing.

This was done with full knowledge that there is no possibility of developing an inspection system to detect and identify illegal testing of nuclear weapons, even if the Soviets should agree to outlaw testing and should accept an international inspection system which we specified.[3]

Suppose that a ban on nuclear testing were in effect, with an international inspection system operating; and suppose the system detected a major high-altitude nuclear explosion somewhere above the Pacific Ocean. At best, it would take several days for the system to correlate all data and determine the exact latitude and longitude of the explosion. By the time international inspectors reached the scene, what would they find? Nothing. Submarines which fired the tests would be gone. Communist propaganda would accuse the United States of making the shot. Our officials would make denials. There would be charges and counter-charges in the United Nations. The wrangle would be protracted for weeks, while the Soviets prepared for another sneak shot somewhere over the Atlantic Ocean.

Aware of all this—and aware also of the unassailable proof that it is folly to negotiate with the Soviets at all, because treaty-breaking is a matter of policy and strategy with them[5]—Eisenhower and Kennedy, during a critical period, prohibited the nuclear testing which might have developed a defensive weapon to save this country.

The only official reason for the prohibition was that we must show "good faith" during negotiations with the Soviets.

THE EISENHOWER RECORD

On March 31, 1958, Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, announced that the Soviet Union was halting all testing of nuclear weapons; and he called upon other nations, possessing such weapons, also to stop testing, in the interest of "peace and security for all peoples."[6] Why? The Soviets had just finished a series of tests; it would take them a year or more to correlate and evaluate all information thus produced; and in the interim they could not profitably do any more testing. Gromyko's announcement, in other words, was a trick designed either to stop U.S. nuclear testing or to give the Soviets some propaganda fodder against us if we did not stop.

Officials of the Eisenhower State Department correctly called the Soviet plea a fraud, but challenged the Soviets to approach the subject in "an orderly way," through negotiations to work out a supervised suspension of nuclear testing.[7]

For years, the Communist "peace" offensive had prepared for this situation. Organizations of nuclear scientists, controlled by Communist frontiers; and "peace" organizations composed of preachers, teachers, and professional liberals of all kinds, had been drenching the American public with horror stories about the dangers of fallout from nuclear testing.

Gromyko's announcement on March 31, 1958, put the "peace" organizations into high gear. For 7 months, leftwing thunder for "banning the bomb" was deafening—until October 31, 1958, when the United States and the Soviet Union met for "test ban talks," and agreed to suspend all testing of nuclear weapons, without inspections, while the talks continued. Eisenhower ordered a halt to U.S. testing, accepting Khrushchev's unsupported promise that he would do likewise.[8]

Week after week, month after month, year after year, the "test ban talks" continued, fruitlessly. The Soviets, busy assimilating information already produced by tests, did not need to make any nuclear shots in the atmosphere; but—as the whole world was aware—they went right ahead with underground shots and any other testing they pleased, ignoring their agreement to halt all tests for the duration of the negotiations.

Eisenhower kept the agreement, however, permitting no more American testing during the remainder of his administration.

Dreary communiques from Geneva about another nonproductive session of the "test ban talks" often seemed timed, with sardonic humor, to coincide with other events which underscored the absurdity of the talks. For example, on August 3, 1959, a report from Geneva revealed that the 118th "test ban" meeting between representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain was deadlocked. On that same day, the White House announced that Eisenhower had agreed to a personal exchange of visits with Khrushchev.[9]

Khrushchev was in the United States on September 17, 1959, when Selwyn Lloyd, British Foreign Secretary, spoke to the U.N. General Assembly urging total disarmament in three stages: (1) an international agreement fixing a date for disarmament and size and quality of national forces that would be left after disarmament, and deciding on the quantity and kind of weapons for an international army; (2) progressive steps in disarming nations and in arming the international army; (3) final national disarmament, with rearming outlawed, and a fully established international army to enforce the peace, control national military budgets, space exploration, and so on.[10]

Selwyn Lloyd demanded "effective inspection to insure compliance" at every stage in the plan; yet he proposed that inspection control would be established after disarmament. So, in effect, Selwyn Lloyd recommended total disarmament without inspection.[10]

The next day—September 18, 1959—Khrushchev also spoke to the U.N. General Assembly, and recommended total disarmament without inspection.[11]

One month later—October 18, 1959—Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (and member of the Council on Foreign Relations), speaking to the Greater Miami Association for the United Nations, said that the problem of determining which should come first, disarmament or controls, is as baffling as the old riddle about which came first, the chicken or the egg.[12]

On March 15, 1960, five Western powers and five Soviet bloc powers met at Geneva for general disarmament talks. These were in addition to the "nuclear test ban talks" which had been going on at Geneva since October 1958.[13]

On May 12, 1960, United States Senator THOMAS J. DODD (Democrat, Connecticut) made a speech to the U.S. Senate saying:

"Before it is too late, we must call off the (nuclear test) ban. At stake is the preservation of peace and the survival of our Nation and of freedom on this earth. Our guileless approach to the moratorium places us in mortal peril, for it rests on blind trust in the honesty of the Kremlin, a dictatorship with a shocking record of violations of its pledges.

"Some American experts are convinced that the Soviets are already testing secretly. No one can seriously doubt that they will do so whenever it suits them."[14]

In June 1960, the Soviets walked out of the Geneva "test ban talks," and stayed away for several months.[13]

On September 22, 1960, in a speech to the U.N. General Assembly, President Eisenhower gently reproved the Soviets for not entering into disarmament agreements, and rebuked them for walking out of the "test ban talks," pleading with them to come back for more.[13]

Eisenhower's plea set the stage for the Soviets who, the next day (September 23, 1960), presented to the United Nations their plan for total, worldwide disarmament (the same plan which Khrushchev had presented to the U.N. a year before).[13]

THE KENNEDY RECORD

Kennedy, inaugurated President in 1961, continued the ban on American nuclear testing; and he appointed Paul Nitze to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Walt W. Rostow to be Deputy Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. It later became known that these two high officials of the Kennedy administration (together with others from the Council on Foreign Relations, whose members occupy key positions in the Kennedy administration) had lectured, almost a year before, to a National Strategy Seminar at Asilomar Conference Grounds on the Monterey Peninsula, in California.

The general argument of lectures which Rostow and Nitze, and the others, gave at the Strategy Seminar was that the United States cannot win a nuclear war; that continued attempts to produce nuclear superiority will spur the Soviets to do likewise and thus increase the danger of a holocaust; that we should, therefore, de-emphasize nuclear weapons on the theory that the Soviets will follow our lead; that we should build up our conventional military power in order to increase our capacity to fight in limited wars;

---

[3] See footnote 3 on p. 11115.

[5] "Soviet Political Agreements and Results," a staff study, Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, May 21, 1956.

[6] "Text of Gromyko Announcement of the Soviet Decision To Suspend Nuclear Tests," Reuters dispatch from London: the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1958, pp. 14–15.

[7] "U.S. Statement on the Soviet Decision," AP dispatch from Washington, the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1958, p. 15.

[8] Special to the Times, the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1958, p. 1; and Special to the Times from Geneva by Drew Middleton, the New York Times, Nov. 1, 1958, pp. 1, 3.

[9] "Khrushchev Coming to U.S. Next Month," Special to the Times from Washington by Felix Belair, Jr., the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1959, pp. 1, 3; and "Nuclear Talks Proceed: 3 Powers Reiterate Stands on Controls in Geneva," Special to the Times from Geneva, the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1959, p. 3.

[10] "Lloyd Remarks," Special to the Times from the U.N., the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1959, pp. 4–5.

[11] "Text of Premier Khrushchev's Address to the U.N. General Assembly," and "Text of Soviet Government Declaration Proposing Complete Disarmament," the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1959, pp. 8–9, 12.

[12] "U.S. Said Willing To Equal Soviet Disarmament Steps," UPI dispatch from Miami Beach, Durham (North Carolina) Morning Herald, Oct. 19, 1959.

[13] "Documents on Disarmament, 1960," State Department Publication No. 7172, July 1961, pp. xii, 66, 131, 225–229, 229–248.

[14] "The Summit and the Test Ban Fallacy," speech by U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 8, pp. 10135–10146.

and that we should work toward some form of world government strong enough to eliminate wars altogether.[15]

Paul Nitze told the Strategy Seminar that the United States should begin disarmament without requiring disarmament of other nations, in the hope that our action would "produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies."

Nitze said we should stop all efforts to build a class A nuclear capability, which could strike first or take offensive action; and that we should build purely retaliatory defense systems, and then surrender command of those systems to international authority. He proposed that we make this surrender by giving NATO command of our Strategic Air Command, and by notifying the United Nations that NATO will turn over to the U.N. the ultimate power of decision on the use of American retaliatory systems.[15]

After Nitze became Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of Defense, and the public found out what his real "defense policy" is, alarmed citizens wrote Washington officialdom demanding explanation. Official explanations from Washington included: (1) flat denials that Nitze had ever made such a proposal; (2) assertions that Nitze did not really mean that he wanted SAC to be made a NATO command; (3) explanations that in making such a proposal, Nitze was really suggesting that such a thing should not be done—that he was merely throwing it out as a "grand fallacy"; (4) explanations that Nitze's proposal had no official standing, because Nitze was not a member of the administration when the proposal was made.

Dr. Lawrence G. Osborne, Santa Barbara, Calif., got replies from two Washington officials: one from Timothy W. Stanley (Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs) saying that a proposal to turn SAC over to NATO was not under consideration by the Kennedy administration; another from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, saying: "The proposal that the Strategic Air Command be placed under the overall administration and command of NATO is one which is being given a great deal of thought and deliberation."

On March 23, 1961, a briefing session on disarmament was held at the State Department. About 75 persons attended, representing such organizations as the United World Federalists, Americans for Democratic Action, Women's International League for Peace, American Association for the United Nations, Federation of American Scientists, Twentieth Century Fund, UAW–CIO, and the General Federation of Women's Groups.

Mr. E. A. Gullion, Deputy Director of the Disarmament Administration (and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) presided. He urged the groups to propagandize for the establishment of a permanent Disarmament Agency under the control of the State Department, and not answerable to Congress. An agency free of congressional controls would have more latitude for doing what it felt necessary in the field of disarmament, Mr. Gullion explained, pointing out that it is "difficult to work under the 18th century Constitution."

On March 28, 1961, President Kennedy sent to Congress a defense message modeled on a confidential memorandum submitted to him by his Deputy Assistant, Walt W. Rostow, who had had a private meeting in Moscow with Vasily V. Kuznetsov. Rostow told President Kennedy that the Soviets do not think Americans really want disarmament because we continue to build a "first-strike" capability against the Soviet Union. Rostow recommended that we allay Soviet suspicions by deemphasizing offensive weapons and by emphasizing defensive weapons.

On March 30, 1961, the Chicago Sun-Times published a story headlined: "Inside Story of a Big Switch: Kennedy's Defense Strategy Tailored To Ease Red Fears." The story was written in Washington by Thomas B. Ross, who commented on the relationship between Kennedy's defense program and the Rostow memorandum, saying:

"The similarities in the statements of Rostow and Mr. Kennedy were no coincidence. It is known that large sections of the President's defense message were written explicitly for the consumption of top Russian officials.

"Moreover, on the recommendation of Charles E. Bohlen, the State Department's leading expert on Russia, certain Communist phraseology was inserted in the message. * * *

"That much of the defense message was directed to the Soviet leaders is evident in the fact that Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., Ambassador to Russia, was given a special briefing on it. * * * The message will now be forwarded to him in Moscow so he can reassure Soviet officials that the United States is taking care not to produce a 'first-strike capability.'

"Emphasis on a 'second-strike' capability ran through all the White House meetings on the message. Most of the sessions were directed by Mr. Kennedy's chief aid, Theodore Sorensen, who repeatedly made it clear that the President wanted to avoid provocative, offensive weapons."

Charles Bohlen, who recommended "Communist phraseology" in Kennedy's defense message, is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Another key figure in Kennedy's defense-disarmament planning is Dr. Jerome Bert Wiesner, also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Here is information about Wiesner, from the New York Times Magazine:

"Dr. Jerome Bert Wiesner, a former professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology * * * is the top planner, arbitrator and counselor of scientific policy within the Government, and, thus, throughout the scientific community at large * * * Wiesner oversees the operations of all scientifically oriented agencies, such as the Defense Department, Atomic Energy Commission and National Science Foundation.

"He operates behind a wall of White House secrecy, somewhat to the dismay of Congress which would like to be privy to his scientific policy advice.

"Before joining the administration, Wiesner made no secret of his belief that the United States at times had been almost as much to blame as the Soviet Union for blocking agreement on arms-control measures.

"One of the principal obstacles standing in the way of disarmament, in Wiesner's opinion, is a 'communications block' between the two sides.

"It was largely because of his desire to break down the 'communications block' that Wiesner last fall took the potentially impolitic step of going to Moscow to attend a nongovernmental conference of East-West scientists on disarmament."[16]

On May 25, 1961, President Kennedy, in a special message to Congress, asked for establishment of a Disarmament Agency.[17] This was the first formal step toward the Agency which the March 23, 1961, State Department "briefing" of leftwing leaders had prepared the propaganda campaign for.

On June 23, 1961, John J. McCloy, Special Adviser to the President on Disarmament (and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations), sent to the President a draft of a bill to create the new Agency. In his letter of transmittal to the President, McCloy revealed that the fundamental purpose of the Disarmament Agency is to work for world government.[17]

On June 29, 1961, President Kennedy sent McCloy's proposed bill to the Congress. In his letter of transmittal, the President also revealed that the purpose of the bill was not only to work toward elimination of national armaments, but to "strengthen international institutions" into world government.[17]

On August 15, 1961, four former high officials in the Eisenhower administration—Christian A. Herter, Thomas S. Gates, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, and Henry Cabot Lodge (all members of the Council on Foreign Relations)—testified before a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in support of President Kennedy's Disarmament Agency. Lodge urged that the Western powers also set up a "unified diplomatic command" so that our "decisionmaking machinery" will not be cumbersome.[18]

Former President Eisenhower wrote a letter strongly endorsing the proposed Agency.[18]

On August 30, 1961, the Soviet Union abruptly announced that it would resume massive testing of nuclear weapons.[17] The moratorium which the Soviets had asked for in 1958 was at last to end: they had completed their analyses of the 1958 tests and were ready for another series.

One interesting aspect of the Soviet announcement is that it came on the eve of a meeting of 24 neutral nations at Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Ostensibly, a major purpose of the meeting was to underscore the neutral nations' oft-repeated plea for major powers to stop testing nuclear weapons. The oddly timed Soviet announcement looked like a deliberate affront. The liberal press of America predicted that this arrogant act would outrage the neutralist leaders gathering at Belgrade and would, thus, backfire on the Soviets.

But when the neutralist leaders gathered, they expressed sympathy for the Soviet Union, and blamed the United States for causing the Soviets to resume nuclear testing.[19]

The 24 neutral nations, whose leaders took this action, had all received (and are still receiving) great quantities of aid from the United States, little or nothing from the Soviet Union.[19]

The announced Soviet plan to resume nuclear testing did not slow down the American drive for disarmament. On September 23, 1961, the House of Representatives authorized a final version of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 (H.R. 9118, Public Law 87–297), to establish an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Just as E. A. Gullion had demanded at the State Department briefing 6 months before, the Agency was set up free of congressional controls.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 confers upon the Director of the new Disarmament Agency broad authority (under the general supervision of the President and the Secretary of State) to do just about anything the Director may claim to be in the interest of peace and arms control. The Director can formulate U.S. disarmament policies, conduct negotiations with foreign powers and international organizations, command the services of other Federal agencies, obtain restricted information from the Atomic Energy Commission—and enjoy specific exemptions from laws written by Congress. For example, section 43, of title IV of the act says: "The President may, in advance, exempt actions of the Director from the provisions of law relating to contracts or expenditures of Government funds whenever he determines that such action is essential in the interest of United States arms control and disarmament and security policy."

---

[15] "Proceedings of the Asilomar National Strategy Seminar," prepared by Stanford Research Institute, sponsored by Sixth U.S. Army, Western Sea Frontier, Fourth Air Force, Apr. 1960; and "Idea Promoted; Defeatism Big Danger," by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 17, 1961.

[16] "Top Scientist on the New Frontier," by John W. Finney, the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 3, 1961, pp. 8 ff.

[17] "Documents on Disarmament, 1961," U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication No. 5, Aug. 1962, pp. 151–161, 196–199, 214–227, 317–350.

[18] Letter, U.S. Representative WALTER ROGERS, Democrat of Texas, in support of Disarmament Agency, Feb. 2, 1963.

[19] "Text of the Declaration of Belgrade," the New York Times, Sept. 7, 1961, p. 8, "When 'Neutrals' Get Together," U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 11, 1961, pp. 74 ff.

Only in section 33 of title III of Public Law 87-297 did Congress insert a provision indicating an intent to retain, in Congress, some control over policies and programs devised by the Director of the Disarmament Agency. A clause in section 33 provides: "That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

This provision is meaningless, because modern (and incorrect) Supreme Court interpretations of the Constitution hold that the "treatymaking power of the President" includes the power to enter into executive agreements with foreign nations—without the advice and consent, or even the knowledge of the U.S. Senate.[20]

On September 25, 1961—2 days after the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 was passed in the House—Adlai Stevenson presented, to the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations, the American plan for total worldwide disarmament. This American plan (almost identical with the plan which the Soviet Union had submitted to the U.N. on September 23, 1960)[21] would transfer control of U.S. nuclear weapons to the United Nations, restrict the American Military Establishment to the size and kind needed for control of the American population, and prohibit us from possessing or even trying to develop a defense against weapons of mass destruction.[2] [21]

Senator **Strom Thurmond**, Democrat, of South Carolina, made several speeches in the latter part of 1961, sharply criticizing the State Department plan to surrender American nuclear weapons to the U.N. Although the plan had been formally presented to the U.N. and the text published in an official State Department pamphlet, Washington officials, when receiving inquiries from the public, flatly denied that the plan existed. Here are passages from a typical official letter of denial—this one written by John E. Carland, Director of Special Activities, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, to Mrs. W. M. Walters in Spokane, Wash.:

"This is in reference to your recent communication relative to reports that the United States is considering turning over nuclear weapons or information about such weapons to the United Nations.

"The Department of Defense has received other similar letters, apparently stemming from erroneous articles that have appeared in some newspapers. The Defense Department has no such plans and we know of no Government proposal which would involve turning nuclear weapons or information about them over to the United Nations."

By the end of 1961, plans for disarming the United States (and, thus, surrendering her sovereignty) were formulated and announced. In 1962, as will be shown in this report next week, came further development of the plans—chiefly in the form of concessions to entice Soviet agreement.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, May 20, 1963]

DISARMAMENT—PART III

As early as 1917, international Communists began to use worldwide disarmament propaganda as a means of attack against non-Communist nations, particularly the United States. To Communists, worldwide disarmament does not mean elimination from the world of all weapons of war. It means taking all weapons away from non-Communists so that they can offer no resistance to communism.

Lenin said, and Khrushchev has repeated, that Communists are contemptuous of pacifism, but can effectively use pacifists in non-Communist nations.

Pacifists believe that war is horrible; and every decent and sane person on earth agrees with them. Pacifists, however, are not willing to accept reality. Reality is that wars are inevitable until human beings are better than they have ever been since Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden.

Human beings cannot be improved through legislation or disarmament pacts. They certainly cannot be improved by having their weapons taken away from them.

Suppose non-Communist nations could make an agreement with Communist dictators which resulted in the actual worldwide elimination of all modern weapons of war. What would then prevent the hordes of Asia and Africa from overrunning the civilized world with butcher knives?

To avoid such a catastrophe, why not disarm all nations, but at the same time arm an international authority to keep the peace? This would be worse than total disarmament without an armed authority to enforce order. Any agency with enough authority to police the world, and with a monopoly of weapons, will enslave and oppress the world. That fact also derives from the nature of man. Civilized people stripped of weapons would, at least, have a better chance to defend themselves against lawless and ravaging hordes than to defend themselves against an international authority armed with modern weapons, and in control of the world.

Men will become "good" enough to refrain from warring on each other only when, and if, all men accept for themselves the saving grace that God offers. Meanwhile, it behooves all nations (most especially civilized Western nations whose culture is founded on faith in God) to maintain whatever weaponry is necessary to protect their civilization against all threats, within or without.

Before the councils of the world, there are, at present, two basic proposals for so-called worldwide disarmament: The Soviet Government's proposal and the American Government's proposal.

The Soviet Government pretends to want worldwide disarmament without a strong international authority to keep the peace. Even if the Communist proposal were honest (which it most certainly is not), it would eventuate in the catastrophe of a defenseless civilized world being overrun by hordes of barbarians.

The American Government wants total disarmament of all nations, with an international authoritgy armed and empowered to enforce the peace—a plan which would eventuate in a universal, all-powerful dictatorship even more horrible than anarchy.

How we arrived at the point where the nations of the world are seriously considering these two alternatives for disaster is an amazing story—parts of which are sketched in the two previous issues of this report.

A REVIEW

The testing of nuclear explosions—in the air, underground, underwater, and in space—is necessary for research to develop nuclear weapons, particularly defensive weapons: antimissile missiles, for example. Each nuclear explosion produces a mass of new information which is useless until it has been studied, evaluated, and correlated with other technical information.

Yet, the time and cost of preparing for a nuclear shot make one-shot nuclear testing impractical. The practical way is to arrange a series of nuclear explosions, and then to suspend all testing until the whole mass of information produced has been assimilated. The work of assimilation may take years. During that time, it is not sensible to do any major testing.

In the spring of 1958, the Soviets, having concluded a major series of nuclear tests, asked for a moratorium on testing. Peace propagandists raised a clamor in support of the Soviet proposal. On October 31, 1958, Eisenhower halted all plans for American nuclear testing, accepting Khrushchev's unsupported promise that he would do likewise.

Kennedy continued the ban on American testing, though it was universally known that the Soviets had never kept their word. The men whom Kennedy placed in charge of defense and disarmament policies were on record as wanting American disarmament, with or without Soviet disarmament; they devised a defense program admittedly intended to please the Soviets; they rammed through Congress an act creating a Disarmament Agency[1] with a Director empowered to

---

[2] See footnote 2 on page 11115.

[20] Discussion of the Executive Agreement and its binding powers, various Supreme Court decisions contained in "The Constitution of the United States of America, Analysis and Interpretation," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Edward S. Corwin, Editor, U.S. Senate Document No. 170, 82d Congress, 2d sess., 1953, pp. 434–435.

[21] "This Time, Russians Really Did It First," Amarillo, Texas, Daily News, Feb. 16, 1963, p. 4—setting out, side by side, the Soviet disarmament proposals of Sept. 23, 1960; and the American disarmament proposals of Sept. 25, 1961.

[1] The list below gives the names of all U.S. Senators and Representatives who took a stand, in rollcall votes, against the Disarmament Agency Act in 1961. If your Senator or Representative was in Congress at that time and is not listed below, he was in favor of the Disarmament Agency. The votes are taken from the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report of Sept. 15, p. 1602; Sept. 22, pp. 1640–1641; and Sept. 29, pp. 1686–1687; all 1961.

Senate: Arizona, Goldwater, Republican; Arkansas, McClellan, Democrat; Florida, Smathers, Democrat; Georgia, Russell, Democrat, Talmadge, Democrat; Kansas, Schoeppel, Republican; Louisiana, Ellender, Democrat; Mississippi, Eastland, Democrat, Stennis, Democrat; Nebraska, Curtis, Republican, Hruska, Republican; South Carolina, Thurmond, Democrat; South Dakota, Mundt, Republican; Texas, Tower, Republican; Virginia, Byrd, Democrat.

House: Arizona, Rhodes, Republican; Arkansas, Alford, Democrat, Gathings, Democrat, Norrell, Democrat; California, Bell, Republican, Hiestand, Republican, Lipscomb, Republican, McDonough, Republican, Rousselot, Republican, Sheppard, Democrat, Smith, Republican, Utt, Republican; Colorado, Dominick, Republican; Florida, Haley, Democrat; Georgia, James C. Davis, Democrat; Illinois, Anderson, Republican, Findley, Republican, Hoffman, Republican; Indiana, Bruce, Republican, Roudebush, Republican, Wilson, Republican; Iowa, Hoeven, Republican, Gross, Republican, Jensen, Republican; Kansas, Dole, Republican, McVey, Republican; Louisiana, Hébert, Democrat; Michigan, Bennett, Republican, Harvey, Republican, Hoffman, Republican, Johansen, Republican,

do anything (including violations of Federal law) which he might claim to be in the interest of peace and disarmament; and they submitted to the U.N. a proposed treaty which would disarm the United States and surrender her nuclear weapons.

By the end of 1961, military men were expressing grave fear that the Kennedy defense and disarmament programs would leave the United States virtually helpless against the Soviets.[2]

1962

On March 2, 1962, President Kennedy said the Soviets, in their nuclear tests, were pressing hard toward the goal of developing the most desperately needed weapon of our time—a means of destroying attacking enemy rockets before they explode on target. The President said the Soviet tests of 1961 "reflected * * * the trial of novel designs and techniques, and some substantial gains in weaponry." Mentioning the powerful "nuclear attack and defense capability" which the Soviets are developing, the President warned that further Soviet tests would put the free world in grave danger. He said that the United States "cannot make similar strides without testing in the atmosphere as well as underground," and that "in many areas of nuclear weapons research we have reached the point where our progress is stifled without experiments in every environment."[3]

Concerning the possibility of negotiating some effective ban on Soviet testing, the President said: "The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban * * * as long * * * as * * * a new uninspected moratorium or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret."[3]

On March 11, 1962, Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, said the United States has no reasonable prospect of developing a successful defense against missiles. At the same time, American officialdom generally was reflecting the expressed conviction of the President that the Soviets may be on the point of developing such a defensive weapon.

In view of all this, it was reasonable to assume that the President would order immediate preparations for massive American testing of nuclear weapons. He did not. He ordered a new series of atmospheric tests to be held in the Pacific beginning in late April 1962—but promised that the tests would not be conducted if the Soviets would sign a nuclear test ban by mid-April.[4]

On March 14, 1962, when the 18-nation Disarmament Committee began another series of disarmament conferences at Geneva, the United States and Great Britain proposed the outlawing of underground nuclear tests, suggesting an international inspection system to detect and investigate suspicious earth tremors—that is, earth tremors which seismic instruments could not positively identify as earthquakes. The Soviets held out for an unpoliced moratorium on underground tests, pending the development of a control system for general and complete disarmament.[4]

On April 9, 1962, President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan personally appealed to Khrushchev to reconsider the Soviet position, pointing out that scientific instrumentation is not fully capable of distinguishing earthquakes from underground explosions.[5]

On April 12, 1962, Khrushchev replied by saying Kennedy and Macmillan wanted inspection as a means of choosing the moment to attack the Soviet Union.[5]

On April 12, 1962, various members of the 18-nation Committee appealed to the Soviet Union and the United States to enter another unpoliced moratorium on testing for the duration of the Conference. The Soviet Union agreed to this proposal.[4]

On April 16, 1962, 8 small-nation members of the 18-nation Disarmament Committee suggested a compromise solution, which was, in effect, that existing national control and detection systems be used instead of the international inspection system demanded by the United States. An impartial International Commission would process data produced by the various national detection systems. If the International Commission noticed data which might indicate an illegal nuclear test somewhere, it would notify the nation on whose territory that event occurred. The suspected nation would then cooperate with the International Commission in determining the precise nature of the explosion in question.[5]

The United States and the United Kingdom accepted this eight-nation proposal as a basis for negotiation. The Soviets also accepted it, saying it was practically identical with their own proposal.[4]

On April 18, 1962, U.S. Ambassador Arthur H. Dean presented to the 18-nation Disarmament Committee an "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This plan, developed by the U.S. Disarmament Agency, has been officially characterized as "the most comprehensive blueprint for peace through multilateral international disarmament that the United States or any other country has ever undertaken."[4] William C. Foster, Director of the Disarmament Agency, sums up his 1962 general disarmament proposals in these words:

"The United States proposes to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament in three stages. In each stage all major armaments, including nuclear delivery vehicles, would be reduced by one-third. * * *

"Stage I of the U.S. plan contains essential measures to meet the nuclear threat, especially by a cutoff of the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons purposes. Further measures to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons remaining in National arsenals would be carried out in stages II and III of the U.S. program after the completion of international expert studies."[4]

The American disarmament proposal which Foster thus describes, and which was formally presented at Geneva on April 18, 1962, is basically the same as the treaty which Adlai Stevenson submitted to the United Nations in September 1961—proposing to strip the United States of nuclear, and other modern weapons, by turning them over to the United Nations. The 1962 proposal, however, went into detail about how the reduction in national armaments would be carried out in a three-stage plan. Nations would reduce their armaments by one-third each year for 3 years. Combat aircraft and ships and missiles of all kinds, antimissile missile systems, tanks, armored cars, and so on—all would be placed in a depot under supervision of an International Disarmament Organization. The IDO would have power to destroy them, order them converted for "peaceful" purposes, or order them turned over to a United Nations military force to strengthen the UN peacekeeping machinery. The Soviets rejected the American proposal.

No agreement having been reached at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, President Kennedy ordered a resumption of American testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. The series began on April 26, 1962. But the testing was timid and halting, hobbled by politics and propaganda. Kennedy permitted only a few tests in the atmosphere before again suspending them.

The first session of the 18-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva ended, with no accomplishments, on June 14, 1962.[5]

When the second session opened on July 16, 1962, American representatives startled the world by reversing the American stand on the question of inspection and control. Consistently, American officials had insisted that disarmament would not work unless there was an international inspection and control system. Khrushchev had consistently insisted that existing national inspection and control systems would be adequate—since these systems could report to an international commission on any suspicious activity which they detected. In April 1962, President Kennedy had rejected Khrushchev's proposal for an unpoliced moratorium on underground nuclear testing for the specific reason that there is no positive means of telling whether an earth tremor is caused by earthquake or by underground explosion.[4] [5]

On August 1, 1962, President Kennedy announced that, whereas in April he had not believed that there was adequate seismic instrumentation for identifying earth tremors, he now believed there was such equipment and that he was, therefore, willing to abandon the previous American demand for an international inspection and control system. The President said he is now willing to accept the proposal (perennially made by Khrushchev) for a national system under international supervision.[4] [5]

The President laid down one proviso: the Soviets must accept the American principle of on-site inspections of unidentified seismic events. This means that if detection equipment records and locates an earth tremor which connot be identified as an earthquake, international inspectors should be permitted to go to the locale of that tremor (within the Soviet Union or elsewhere) and make an on-the-spot (on-site) inspection.

As usual, the Soviets rejected the on-site inspection proposal.

The United States tried again. On August 27, 1962, the United States and the United Kingdom introduced at the Geneva Conference two new treaties which the U.S. Disarmament Agency had drawn up. One provided for a total ban on all kinds of nuclear testing, the ban to be policed by a nationally manned detection system under interna-

---

Meader, Republican; Mississippi, Williams, Democrat, Winstead, Democrat; Missouri, Hall, Republican; Montana, Battin, Republican; Nebraska, Beermann, Republican, Cunningham, Republican; New Jersey, Auchincloss, Republican; New York, Derounian, Republican, Kilburn, Republican, King, Republican, Pillion, Republican, Ray, Republican, St. George, Republican, Taber, Republican; North Dakota, Short, Republican; Ohio, Ashbrook, Republican, Devine, Republican, Scherer, Republican; Pennsylvania, Gavin, Republican, Goodling, Republican, Saylor, Republican; South Carolina, Ashmore, Democrat, Dorn, Democrat, Riley Democrat, Rivers, Democrat; Texas, Alger, Republican, Burleson, Democrat, Casey, Democrat, Dowdy, Democrat, Rutherford, Democrat, Teague, Democrat; Virginia, Abbitt, Democrat, Tuck, Democrat; Wisconsin, Laird, Republican, O'Konski, Republican, Schadeberg, Republican, Van Pelt, Republican.

[2] For a complete discussion of the background of disarmament, including documentation, see this Report, "Disarmament—Part I," May 6, 1963; and "Disarmament—Part II," May 13, 1963.

[3] The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation, by Stefan T. Possony, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 21, 1963, p. 4614.

[4] Second Annual Report to Congress, Jan. 1, 1962–Dec. 31, 1962, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication No. 14, February 1963.

[5] International Negotiations on Ending Nuclear Weapon Tests, September 1961–September 1962. U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication No. 9, October 1962.

tional supervision. The other Disarmament Agency proposal of August 27 provided for a limited ban on nuclear testing—without any international verification machinery.[4][5]

The "Draft Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests In All Environments," which the United States and the United Kingdom proposed on August 27, 1962, would place an International Scientific Commission in charge of all arrangements and agreements. This Commission would be composed of representatives of 15 nations.

The United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain would each be a permanent member. Of the remaining 12 members, the Soviet Union would nominate 3; the United States would nominate 1; Great Britain would nominate 1; and all 3 powers together would nominate 7.[4]

The Soviet Union rejected both of the American August 27 proposals and demanded an uninspected moratorium on nuclear testing to begin January 1, 1963. The Soviets were near completion of their 1961–62 tests and wanted to call time-out in 1963 for the necessary period of study and evaluation. President Kennedy replied that the United States was willing to ban all nuclear tests beginning January 1, 1963, if an effective agreement could be reached by then.

The 10th Pugwash Conference, held at London in September 1962, proposed that detection of nuclear explosions be achieved by unmanned nuclear detection stations (little black boxes). Pugwash Conference refers to meetings of Soviet and Western scientists which have been held at intervals since July 1957—when the first such conference was held in Pugwash, Nova Scotia,[4] at the home of Cyrus Eaton, an American industrialist whose sympathy with the Soviet Union is notorious.

No unmanned detection stations, of the kind suggested by the pro-Soviets at the Pugwash Conference, have yet been developed. If developed, they would be small, portable, sealed boxes, containing seismic equipment. A specified number of them would be placed in specified locations throughout the world. If other detection equipment recorded an unidentifiable earth tremor located, say, on Soviet soil, the United States (or any other nation) could request that international inspectors examine the seismic boxes located in the Soviet Union to see what they had recorded. The Soviets would then fly the boxes to some designated place and let international inspectors examine them. That is the "little black boxes" scheme, devised by Cyrus Eaton's pro-Soviet Pugwash Conference at London in September 1962.

On December 10, 1962, the Soviets formally adopted the Pugwash proposal as their own, suggesting a nuclear test ban to be monitored by the little boxes. The Soviets said they were willing to have two or three such boxes placed in Soviet territory. They even promised to permit international inspectors to enter the Soviet Union periodically to collect readings from the little boxes—provided the inspectors were under tight Soviet escort and security screening while on Soviet territory.

U.S. officialdom welcomed this Soviet proposal as a heartening sign and as a hopeful forerunner of things to come, although admitting that the Soviet proposal did not provide the foolproof inspection and control which the United States wanted.

On December 12, 1962, the fourth treaty or set of arms-control proposals devised by the U.S. Disarmament Agency, was submitted to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva. Made "in the wake of the Cuban crisis," this December 12 proposal included six measures designed to reduce the risk of war through accident, miscalculation or the failure of communication. Those six measures:

"First, the exchange of military missions among nations. We currently exchange military attachés with the Soviet Union: this proposal would be a broadening of this precedent.

"Second, advance notification to all countries of military maneuvers.

"Third, the improvement of communications between major governments. This would include the so-called 'hot line' or 'purple telephone' between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev but would also take in lower echelon communications as well.

"Fourth, observation posts established at major ports, railway centers, motor highways, and river crossings.

"Fifth, an international committee to study other methods to reduce the risk of war through miscalculation.

"Sixth, additional observation procedures—not specified." [6]

On December 19, 1962, Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy that the Soviet Union would accept two to three on-site inspections per year on Soviet territory, and would permit three unmanned seismic stations in the Soviet Union.[6]

On December 28, 1962, Kennedy wrote Khrushchev saying he was encouraged that the Soviet Union could "accept the principle of on-site inspections," but said that three unmanned seismic stations were not enough and that the location suggested by Khrushchev might not do.[6]

1963

On January 7, 1963, Khrushchev wrote Kennedy again, making it clear that his acceptance of the principle of on-site inspections means that any inspectors entering the Soviet Union will enter only on the invitation of the Soviet Government; that they will be under careful guard and escort by the Soviets while there; and that the Soviets reserve the rights to keep the inspectors from seeing anything which the Soviets may not want them to see.[3]

This seemed to satisfy President Kennedy. On January 20, 1963, he again stopped all American nuclear testing (even underground)—at a time when the Soviets had finished all the testing they wanted and needed leisure to digest the information. On January 31, 1963, the Soviets (having reached their objective of stopping American nuclear testing) abruptly ended the disarmament conference. The next day, February 1, 1963, President Kennedy ordered preparations for new nuclear tests in Nevada.

On March 11, 1963, William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified before the Joint Atomic Energy Commission of Congress, saying he is confident that the Soviets will not cheat on a nuclear test ban, once they accept a treaty.

As to further concessions which the United States may make in the interest of negotiating a test ban treaty, Mr. Foster said we now demand seven annual inspections of specified installations on Soviet soil, and that we will not reduce that number "until there is some movement away from the Soviet position." [7]

When the nuclear test ban negotiations first began in 1958, the United States was demanding an elaborate international inspection and control system, implemented by 20 annual, unconditional, on-site inspections. By March 1963 U.S. officials had abandoned the international inspection and control system, and were willing to accept only seven on-site inspections.

On April 24, 1963, Western leaders made another appeal to Khrushchev, this time indicating willingness to make further concessions in the matter of on-site inspections. They asked Khrushchev to quit thinking about the number of annual on-site inspections, and to please concentrate on modifying his requirements about how the inspections will be conducted.[8]

Complicated programs of nuclear testing cannot be turned on and off like water taps. Preparations for a series of nuclear tests in Nevada (which Kennedy ordered on February 1, 1963, after ordering suspension of preparations on January 20) cost taxpayers a lot of money but produced nothing.

On May 13, 1963, the Atomic Energy Commission announced cancellation of the planned series of tests in Nevada—giving no reason and no date for resumption of the plans.[9]

WHAT TO DO

The danger we face—of having the armaments and the sovereignty of our Nation surrendered by bureaucrats who man the Disarmament Agency—is grave.

The most immediate need for action is strong public support for H.R. 3613, a bill introduced by U.S. Representative James B. Utt, Republican, of California, to abolish the Disarmament Agency and repeal the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961.

On February 7, 1963, U.S. Representative Omar Burleson, Democrat, of Texas, introduced in the House as House Concurrent Resolution 83; and on February 20, 1963, Senator Carl T. Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska, introduced the same resolution in the Senate as Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. This Curtis-Burleson resolution attempts to guarantee congressional supervision of Disarmament Agency proposals and to guarantee that any disarmament agreements that may be negotiated must be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent.

In my opinion, the Curtis-Burleson resolution is not enough. It may be comforting to some to know that committees of Congress will be looking over the shoulders of men negotiating the surrender of the United States and that the Senate must approve the surrender. But it does not comfort me. I think we should stop the negotiating. A major step in that direction would be adoption of Utt's bill to abolish the Disarmament Agency.

THE SUPREME COURT, THE LORD'S PRAYER, AND BIBLE READING

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court made another ruling which further serves to promote the interests of the forces of atheism and secularism at the expense of religion and our national religious heritage in this country.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the Constitution which says that the States cannot provide for prayers and Bible reading in the schools, if this is the desire of the people in the various States to do so. The Constitution, in the first amendment, only provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In the two cases decided by the Court on Monday, it was shown that provision had been made for dissenting students not to participate in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible. In other words, as Justice Potter Stewart pointed out in his dissent, there was no coercion involved.

---

[4] [5] See footnotes 4 and 5 on p. 11120.

[3] See footnote 3 on p. 11120.

[6] Remarks of U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, Congressional Record, Feb. 11, 1963, p. 2040.

[7] "Foster Expects No Cheating if Reds Accept Test Ban," the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 12, 1963.

[8] The New York Times, Apr. 25, 1963, pp. 1, 4.

[9] AP dispatch from Washington, the Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1963, p. 1.

Mr. President, tonight I will appear on a nationwide CBS television program on the subject of the Court decision in these two cases. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of these remark a copy of the statement I will make on this program be printed in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from the Evening Star of June 18, 1963, entitled "The Court Bars the Lord's Prayer" also be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina

The Supreme Court's decision against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading constitutes another major triumph for the forces of secularism and atheism which are bent on throwing God completely out of our national life. Many people didn't believe the Court actually meant business on this score last year when it ruled out the nonsectarian prayer in New York. The public was told that this prayer was only invalidated because it was composed by State officials. I predicted, at that time, however, that this week's decision would follow.

The pattern of this conspiracy to remove God from our national life, as Dr. Billy Graham has called it, is crystal clear. Already the Christmas tree is being attacked, as well as the singing of the national anthem, with its reference in the second stanza to the national motto, "In God We Trust." All of this is being done in the name of freedom of religion. Actually, this is designed to insure not freedom of religion, but freedom from religion.

In this age of peril our Nation needs to stand for God and against atheistic communism. Yet, we are told this week by the Court that we as a Nation must be neutral toward God, while last week the President urged our people to reexamine our attitudes toward the Soviets and be neutral toward communism by accepting the status quo.

This decision drives another nail in the coffin being prepared for a free and God-fearing America by the secularists and Socialists of the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 18, 1963]

The Court Bars the Lord's Prayer

The Supreme Court has spoken. Both the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading have been barred from the public schools. This comes not as a surprise. But in our view it is a shame.

It all seems so silly. Writing for the majority, Justice Clark conjured up dreadful prospects if the Court should allow a prayer to be said in a public school. To permit such a thing, he argued, would depart from the concept of a government that must be neutral in religious matters. And he went on to say: "The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Perhaps there is something to be said for this as rhetoric. But it is nonsense when measured against the rise of secularism and materialism in this country since the Founding Fathers drafted the first amendment. We mention this because it helps a little in understanding what Justice Clark must have had in mind when he said that the application of his concept of neutrality requires "interpretation of a delicate sort." Delicate indeed.

Justice Stewart, the lone dissenter, stated his understanding of what is meant by the first amendment's guarantee of religious freedom. It is a forthright statement, and it appeals to us. "What our Constitution indispensably protects," he said, is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or Agnostic, Christian or Atheist, Buddhist or Freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not worship, to pray or to keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government." To us, this is quite different from saying that the Constitution forbids one child, who may wish to do so, to recite the Lord's Prayer in a public school merely because some other child, who does not want to pray and who is not required to pray, objects.

Also interesting were some comments by Justice Goldberg in a concurring opinion, in which Justic Harlan joined.

Justice Goldberg, of course, agreed with the majority ruling. But he seemed a bit disturbed by Justice Clark's neutral concept. "Untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality," he said, "can lead * * * to a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive or even active, hostility to the religious." For our part, we think the Court's school rulings in the area of religion, although certainly not so intended, have already led to a climate of passive and perhaps even active hostility to the religious. At another point, Justice Goldberg in what we take to be a reference to Justice Clark's trickling stream and raging torrent, added: "It is of course true that great consequences can grow from small beginnings, but the measure of constitutional adjudication is the ability and willingness to distinguish between real threat and mere shadow."

If we may put our own interpretation on this, we think it is a comment which hits the nail squarely on the head. For in this ruling, and in some of those that preceded it, the Court has done precisely what Justice Goldberg warned against—mistaken mere shadow for real threat.

In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

IS RUSSIA SOFTENING?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have heard much talk within the last 2 years to the effect that the Soviets are mellowing and that the winds of change are blowing throughout the Soviet Union and its Communist empire. Even the President has indicated as much in his June 10 address at American University on the subject of foreign policy and test ban negotiations.

Mr. President, the alert and informative weekly publication Human Events, has published in its June 15, 1963, issue an article by a leading Socialist writer, Mr. Julius Jacobson, refuting this false notion which seems to provide the soft underbelly of our no-win foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article with the introductory statement and the comment on Stalinism, both of which are incorporated in the article in special boxes, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Russia Softening? "No," Says Leading Socialist Writer

(By Julius Jacobson)

(In a recent speech at Tufts University in Massachusetts, Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, explained why we should attempt to coexist with Soviet Russia. "We should," said Fulbright, seek "in every way" to encourage Khrushchev to pursue the "moderate" course Russia has been following since the death of Stalin.

(In time, Fulbright suggested, the stern Soviet Russia of today, under the impetus of Khrushchev's "reforms," will evolve into a benevolent, nonaggressive, open society.

(How true is this thesis repeatedly espoused by the Fulbrights of the New Frontier? Is Soviet society really moving toward an era of internal enlightenment?

("No," says Julius Jacobson, editor of New Politics, in the article below, condensed from the 1961 fall issue of his magazine. What makes Jacobson's remarks so interesting is the fact that he is an idealistic, unequivocal Socialist. While Human Events would never subscribe to Jacobson's socialism, we do feel he has made, in the following essay, a brilliant analysis of Soviet society.)

The most common misimpression created is that Russia is in the process of political democratization. This is simply not so. In Russia, there has been a relaxation of terror. But lessening of terror and growth of democracy are two separate propositions. There was not a single democratic institution under Stalin. There is not a single democratic institution under Khrushchev.

There is no right to organize a critical press.

There is no right to organize political parties.

There is no right to freedom of speech.

There is no right to free elections.

The denial of these rights is codified in many sections of Russian law. For example, in the statutes on "state crimes," article 7, labeled "Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda," outlaws: "Slanderous fabrication defaming the Soviet state and social system, or the dissemination, production or keeping the literature of such content for the same purpose."

Obviously, any organized movement of opposition to the party line via a political party, press, publication, speech, etc., would be for the purpose of "slanderous fabrication defaming the Soviet state and social system," punishable by imprisonment for up to 7 years or exile and banishment for 2 to 5 years.

There were no trade unions under Stalin. There are no trade unions under Khrushchev. In Russia, there are institutions called trade unions with no internal democracy, which exist as an integral part of the state.

The simple freedom of physical movement is still sharply curtailed in Russia. All citizens are required to carry internal passports, and permission must be granted by the police before one can change his locality.

The campaign for Socialist legality has eliminated some excesses of Stalinist terror; but Socialist legality under Khrushchev remains a brutal hoax.

Some striking examples:

A number of smaller Union Republics have introduced new legal codes which permit nonjudicial bodies of local citizens to exile, banish, and imprison those found guilty of a "parasitic way of life." On May 4, 1961, the Presidium of the U.S.S.R.'s largest Republic (the Russian Republic) joined the smaller republics with its decree "On intensifying the struggle against persons who avoid socially useful work and lead an antisocial, parasitic way of life." This decree permits someone accused of leading an antisocial life to be hauled before a kangaroo court in his collective, enterprise, shop, or other institution and, if found guilty, sentenced to exile and forced labor for 2 to 5 years. If this public sentence is approved by the district Soviet executive committee, it is final. There is no appeal.

These decrees provide the legal basis for future mass deportation to concentration camps. They are put into practice today on a relatively wide scale—how wide, this writer is frankly in no position to estimate.

In Russia, the intent to commit a crime can be punished as though the crime had been committed.

Capital punishment is prescribed for a long list of crimes.

An accused can be held incommunicado, legally, for a period up to 9 months.

SOVIET LIVING CONDITIONS

Despite improved living standards, the Russian people are worse off than almost any other people in a modern industrial nation.

In the 7-year plan—which is to introduce Russia to the lower range of the higher stages of communism—the average wage of the Russian worker is to increase by a grand total of 26 percent, rising from 78 to 99 rubles a month after 5 years. In dollars, this is from $86 today, to $109 per month by 1965—about $25 a week for the average worker. Even if the percentage increase is doubled, that would still leave the average weekly take home at about $30.

Much is made of the added free social services provided for the Russian worker.

On the other hand, what needs to be emphasized no less is that the worker pays through the nose for these free services via the infamous "turnover tax"—a tax on consumer goods added to the normal price, which Socialists have traditionally fought. Some consumer foods are taxed as high as 50 percent of their normal selling price.

But there have been widely touted tax reforms in Russia. By 1965, the personal income tax is to be completely eliminated. This will mean a saving of about three-fourths of 1 ruble per week for the average Russian worker in a factory or an office. Peasants with income from private plots are not even granted this insignificant relief.

But if wages are low and taxes high, at least the Russian worker lives virtually rent free. What is often omitted, however, is that the working class lives virtually space free as well.

In 1960, there were approximately 7 square yards of living space for each Russian worker. This provided one average-sized room for every three people.

By the end of 1965—if the 7-year-plan quota is met—the average family in an industrial Russian city will not have much more living space than its parents had in 1917.

ANTI-SEMITISM ENDURES

One of the worst outrages of the Stalin era was the mass persecution of the Jews.

In the present period, Jews are not murdered by the regime en masse. That is certainly an improvement. But the false image of Russia as a self-reforming system blurs the view of a society in which anti-Semitism has been raised to a thinly veiled government policy. Russia, today, is the most anti-Semitic of any industrial nation.

On every internal passport, a Russian citizen must mark his nationality. A Georgian puts down "Georgian"; a Great Russian puts down "Russian," but a Georgian Jew or a Great Russian Jew must mark down as his nationality—"Jew."

The above is an anti-Semitic act of gross proportions. There is also irony in it, for the Jew who is forced to write "Jew" as his nationality, is deprived of all the cultural rights of a national people, as well as of a cultural and religious minority. There is no Yiddish theater, no Yiddish publishing house, no Yiddish national organization permitted.

PARTY-GUIDED CULTURE

In what other country can one find a parallel to Khrushchev's following instructions on literary matters to a central committee plenary session: "Among the writers in our country are individuals who say: How can there be party guidance of literature? We tell such people: Do you mean to say, my dear fellow, that you do not recognize party guidance? What is party guidance? It is the * * * collective wisdom of millions. But one writer or another may sit at his country house, hatching a sniveling book, yet want it to be recognized as an expression of the sentiments of * * * all the people. Is that not a real cult of one's own personality, which, you see, does not want to suffer the guidance of the party, expressing the will of millions?"

The writer of a "sniveling book" in Khrushchev's inspirational message on literary criticism was Pasternak. Pasternak was permitted to live, even after he wrote "Doctor Zhivago." That is a reform compared to what would have occurred during the Stalin era. Pasternak's punishment was meted out posthumously by Khrushchev with his vengeful sentencing of Mme. Olga Ivinskaya, Pasternak's Larisa, and her daughter, Irina, to a prison labor camp for 8 years and 3 years respectively. This is the true measure of the limits of reform when sniveling authors impinge on beloved and reforming tyrants.

PURGES STILL ENDEMIC

Under Stalin, bureaucratic purges and extorted confessions were endemic to the system. That remains the case under Khrushchev.

Probably as many leading figures in the party, in government, and in the economic apparatus have been purged in totalitarian fashion in the 8 years since Stalin's death as in any comparable period when the Great Sun illuminated Russia.

The Presidium, itself, has had several turnovers in personnel. And if the victims do not confess with the same degree of abjectness, this is not to say that the style and form of Russian confessions do not remain a distinct contribution to political psychopathology: Malenkov "could see with clarity [his] guilt and responsibility for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in agriculture." Molotov realized that his "formulations [are] theoretically erroneous and politically harmful," Pervukhin grew "profoundly aware of [his] guilt before the party."

STALINISM DEAD?

"It is, of course, a bad thing that Stalin launched into deviations and mistakes which harmed our cause. * * * But in the * * * fundamental and main thing, I * * * would to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought. The enemies of communism have deliberately invented the word 'Stalinist' and are trying to make it sound abusive. For all of us, * * * Stalin's name is inseparable from Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, each one of us, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, strives to be as faithful to Marxism-Leninism * * * as Stalin was faithful to this cause.—Nikita Khrushchev, January 17, 1957, Moscow.

AFTER THE REFORMS

A society without a single democratic institution, without a free labor movement, with a populace ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-paid; with all the "normal" trappings of an abnormal society: anti-Semitism, cultural barbarism, large-scale purges, bizarre confessions and an antediluvian code of justice—all this remains in Russia after the reforms. Yet, it is this frightful society that has captured the imagination of many.

What more distressing evidence can there be of the decline of radical culture and the loss of nerve and intelligence?

ROBERT A. TAFT: BOY AND MAN

Mr. MUNDT. During the course of the past few years many honors and titles have been conferred on our late colleague Robert A. Taft.

Some call him "Mr. Senator," some "Mr. Republican," and others "Mr. Citizen." Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats agree that Robert A. Taft was a Senator's Senator. His work continues to live not only in the laws of our land but in the splendid traditions of service which he espoused.

Now from the pen of Miss Phyllis Robbins comes a book which I know will be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans, no matter what their party, throughout the country. In her book "Robert A. Taft: Boy and Man" Miss Robbins sets down many new or little known facets of the character, life, and political convictions of our late colleague.

Miss Robbins has based her book not only on voluminous research but on exhaustive interviews with members of the Taft family, their friends and associates. She also had available many of the Taft letters and family photographs. She has used the wealth of material to give us a most interesting and informative book.

Readers of this book travel with Miss Robbins through the formative years she has so aptly titled "The Making of a Conservative." Many of us have vivid recollections of many of the incidents in the section "The Ordeal of a Conservative."

I recommend this book to the attention of my colleagues and to Americans everywhere.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], I wish to present House Joint Memorial 26, adopted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

The memorial urges appropriation of funds for construction of access roads into a scenic recreation section of the Deschutes River area.

I ask consent that the text of the memorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 26

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the lower 100 miles of the Deschutes River, one of Oregon's top fishing streams, is accommodated with limited public access; and

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, administers approximately 35,000 acres of public domain along this section of the river; and

Whereas access to these public lands would provide the Bureau of Land Management access for administrative purposes, public access for fishing, and recreational uses; and

Whereas a 1959 resolution of the Oregon State Water Resources Board states the maximum beneficial use of the waters in this part of the river is for "recreation, fish and wildlife purposes, and no appropriation of water in this area shall be permitted except for domestic, livestock, recreation, fish and wildlife uses"; and

Whereas fishing in this stream is of national fame and would accommodate citizens from outside the State as well as local sportsmen: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for appropriation to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management of an adequate sum of money to construct access roads to and through its lands bordering this section of the Deschutes River and to maintain a portion of this area available to the public in a relatively wild and wilderness State free of roads and motor vehicular access.

(2) The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house May 3, 1963. Readopted by house May 23, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by Senate May 22, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution, adopted by the New York State Bar Association, at its recent summer meeting at the Hotel Concord, on Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., relating to the representation of persons accused of crime, who are unable or are without means to represent themselves in trials.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the New York State Bar Association has on previous occasions endorsed legislation to provide counsel for indigent persons accused of crime in the criminal courts of our State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association acting through its executive committee endorses the proposed Criminal Justice Act of 1963 now pending in Congress to insure representation by counsel of indigent defendants accused of crime in the U.S. district courts; and be it further

Resolved, That all local bar associations of our State are urged to give serious consideration to improving the provisions made in their respective jurisdictions for representation by counsel of all persons accused of crime who do not have the means to retain a private attorney.

THE GEORGIA COUNTY CASE OF 1963

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Mr. Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., is one of the most distinguished trial lawyers in America, and, in my judgment, has no superior and very few, if any, equals as a constitutional lawyer. He is author of an article appearing in the May 1963 Georgia Bar Journal, concerning Gray against Sanders, the Georgia County unit case of 1963, which bears reading by every Member of this body. This case is a vivid example of repudiation of legal precedent—a case which overruled four previous contrary decisions, the latest in 1958. Mr. Bloch shows the implications of a government of men instead of laws in abrogating the rights of States to control their own primary elections systems. As author of a major work on State's rights and federalism, "The Law of the Land," Mr. Bloch writes with rare competence.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GEORGIA COUNTY UNIT CASE OF 1963

[*Gray* v. *Sanders*, 31 L.W. 4825, — *U.S.* —]

(By Charles J. Bloch, of the Macon bar, editor, Georgia Bar Journal)

Lawyers of Georgia, and others, who may still be laboring under the delusion that ours is a government of laws not of men, should read the opinion of Justice Douglas and the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan in the Georgia County Unit case[1] decided March 18, 1963.

The Georgia statute which was reviewed is colloquially known as the Neill Primary Act. It was originally adopted in 1917. As codified,[2] it commences: "Whenever any political party shall hold primary elections for nomination of candidates."

The key words are "political party"; "primary"; "nomination"; "candidates."

The law applied only to primaries in which political parties nominated candidates for offices to be elected subsequently.

Judge Samuel H. Sibley, writing for the court in *Chapman* v. *King*, 154 F. 2d 460, 462, discussed the statute, gave the history of party primary elections, and succinctly said of them: "The primaries do not and cannot elect anyone to office" (p. 462).

Despite the fact that the statute was used exclusively for the nomination of candidates for offices subsequently to be elected, Justice Douglas treated the statute as if it were used in the election of officers. In applying the shibboleth "one person, one vote," he ignored the fundamental fact that no one in Georgia was elected under the county unit system. He quoted from Judge Sibley's opinion in *Chapman* v. *King*, but he neglected to mention the care with which Judge Sibley meticulously demonstrated that primaries do not elect. On the contrary, he treated the primaries as if they were statewide elections. Throughout the opinion he uses the phrase, "statewide election." Says he, "Georgia gives every qualified voter one vote in a statewide election; but in counting those votes she employs the county unit system which in end result weights the rural vote more heavily than the urban vote and weights some small rural counties heavier than other larger rural counties."

On and on he goes, making no distinction between real elections and nominating primaries, until he seems forced to say something in recognition of the facts. So he says: "And these rights must be recognized in any preliminary election that in fact determines the true weight a vote will have. See *United States* v. *Classic*, supra; * * * The concept of political equality in the voting booth contained in the 15th amendment (sic) extends to all phases of State elections."[2a]

He seems to overlook that in the very *Classic* case[3] which he cites, he (along with Justices Black and Murphy) had dissented from the views of the four who constituted the majority. Under consideration there was section 19 of the Criminal Code which condemned as a criminal offense any conspiracy to injure a citizen in the exercise "of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States."[4]

Said Justice Douglas in his dissent: "So I agree with most of the views expressed in the opinion of the Court. And it is with diffidence that I dissent from the result there reached. The disagreement centers on the meaning of section 19 of the Criminal Code, which protects every right secured by the Constitution. The right to vote at a final congressional election and the right to have one's vote counted in such an election have been held to be protected by section 19 * * * citing cases * * * Yet I do not think that the principles of those cases should be, or properly can be, extended to primary elections."[5]

Now, though, he abolishes all distinctions between final and primary elections. The abolition perhaps stems from his application to the case of the 15th amendment, which only provides: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Is any voter's right to vote in a primary conducted under the county unit system abridged or denied on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude? In such primaries, the vote of the white voter has just the same weight as that of the Negro voter. Where does the 15th amendment come into play?

Further in the Classic case, recognizing the legal difference between elections and primaries, Justice Douglas had said: "For the failure to count votes cast at a primary has by the same token only an indirect effect on the voting at the general election."[6] And: "In absence of specific congressional action we should assume that Congress has left the control of primaries and nominating conventions to the States. * * *"[7]

When and where did Congress remove that control to itself or to the Federal courts?

And, do I hear one say: "Oh, you're trying to distinguish between tweedledum and tweedledee—you know that nomination in primaries in Georgia has been the equivalent of election. Judge Sibley exploded that myth in Chapman against King, supra. But, more important here, perhaps, when Justice Douglas was writing in the Classic case in 1941, he thought the distinction a valid one.[8]

The only dissenter was Justice Harlan. An examination of his dissent demonstrates how ours has become a government of men, not of laws. Wrote he: "Preliminarily, it is symptomatic of the swift pace of current constitutional adjudication that the majority opinion should have failed to mention any of the four occasions on which Georgia's county unit system has previously been unsuccessfully challenged in this court. Cook against Fortson, decided with *Turman* v. *Duckworth*, 329 U.S. 675 (1946); *South* v. *Peters*, 339 U.S. 276 (1950); *Cox* v. *Peters*, 342 U.S. 936 (1952); and *Hartsfield* v. *Sloan*, 357 U.S. 916 (1958). It is true that none of these cases reached the stage of full plenary consideration, but, in light of the judicial history recounted by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion in *Baker* v. *Carr*, supra, at 266, 278, et seq. only the guileless could fail to recognize that the prevailing view then was that the validity of this county unit system was not open to serious constitutional doubt. This estimate of the earlier situation is highlighted by the dissenting opinion of Justices Black and Douglas in *South* v. *Peters*, supra, at 277, in which they unsuccessfully espoused the very views which now become the law. Presumably my two brothers also reflected these same views in noting their dissents in the Cox and Hartsfield cases. See also Cook against Fortson, etc., supra, in which Mr. Justice Black also noted his dissent. But even if the Court's present silence about these cases can be deemed justified on the premise that their summary disposition can be satisfactorily accounted for on grounds not involving the merits, I consider today's decision not supportable." [9]

---

[1] *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 31 U.S. L.W. 4285.

[2] Georgia Code, secs. 34–3212, et seq.

[2a] 31 L.W. at p. 4288.

[3] 313 U.S. 299.

[4] Op. cit., p. 309.

[5] Op. cit., pp. 330–331.

[6] Op. cit., p. 333.

[7] Op. cit., p. 337.

[8] 313 U.S. at p. 341.

It does not require exegesis to demonstrate that those "views which now become the law" prove that ours is now a Government, not of laws, but of men.

The law has not change since *Cook* v. *Fortson* was decided with *Turman* v. *Duckworth* in 1946. Men who are charged in the Constitution with declaring and construing the law have.

In 1946, the Court was composed of Chief Justice Vinson, and Associate Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, Murphy, Jackson, Rutledge, and Burton. Appeals seeking to invalidate Georgia's county unit system were dismissed. Of those who remained on the Court March 18, 1963, only Justice Black was even of the opinion that probable jurisdiction should have been noted.

South v. *Peters*, supra, was decided April 17, 1950. The Court then was composed of Chief Justice Vinson, Associate Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, Jackson, Burton, Clark, and Minton. In that case, again, appeals seeking to invalidate Georgia's county unit system were dismissed with a per curiam opinion (339 U.S. 276). Of the nine on the Court in 1950, which included only Justices Black, Douglas, and Clark of the present Court, only Justices Black and Douglas dissented with the dissenting opinion written by Justice Douglas. That dissenting opinion clearly demonstrates that the real basis of their dissent was their belief that the purpose of the county unit system was to abridge the voting rights of Negroes.

They completely overlooked or ignored the fact, pointed out by the majority of the Court, that "Although this particular statute was enacted in 1917, the county unit has been basic in the State electoral scheme since Georgia's first constitution in 1777."

In 1777, the law of the land was that slavery was legal so there was no need of Georgia's adopting a county unit system to avoid or dilute or abridge the right of the Negroes to vote. They had no such right. They were not even citizens.

When, 140 years later, "this particular statute was enacted in 1917," the "law of the land" as then, and for almost 20 years thereafter, declared by the Supreme Court, was that Democratic white primaries were perfectly legal. There was no need of Georgia's enacting this statute in order to affect the Negroes' right to vote in a white primary conducted under the statute for the law of the land as declared as late as 1935 in *Grovey* v. *Townsend*, 295 U.S. 45, permitted the exclusion of Negroes from participating in primaries. The "law of the land" as declared then and until it was changed by the Court in 1943, was that the exclusion of Negroes from primary election under resolution of Texas State Democratic convention limiting membership in party to white citizens was not violative of the Federal Constitution as in effect denying the Negro the right to vote at general election, though it appeared that in Texas at that time nomination by the Democratic Party was equivalent to election.

Why should Georgia have been enacting statutes to abridge the right of a Negro to vote in a primary when without dissent the Supreme Court was holding that the Democratic Party could confine its membership to white people? The court which so held in 1935—18 years after the enactment of the Neill primary law—was composed of Chief Justice Hughes, and Associate Justices VanDevantre, McReynolds, Brandeis, Sutherland, Butler, Stone, Roberts, and Cardozo.

Justice Douglas commenced his dissent in *South* v. *Peters* in a sarcastic vein: "I suppose that if a State reduced the vote of Negroes, Catholics, or Jews so that each got only one-tenth of a vote, we would strike the law down."

The Court which in 1935 upheld the Democratic white primary had among its members at least one Catholic, and two Jews.

Cox v. *Peters*, supra, was decided March 3, 1952, rehearing denied April 7, 1952.

The Supreme Court of Georgia had decided in that case [10] that a party primary held under Georgia Code, section 34–3212 "merely chooses candidates or nominees of a political party to be submitted to the entire electorate in the general election, and is not an 'election' within the meaning of that term as used in the statutory and constitutional provisions of Georgia conferring upon its citizens the right to vote in an election."

There was an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. A motion to dismiss the appeal was granted and the appeal dismissed for want of a substantial Federal question.

That was just 11 years ago. Only Justices Black and Douglas were of the opinion that probable jurisdiction should have been noted.

The other members of the Court, Chief Justice Vinson, and Associate Justices Reed, Frankfurter, Jackson, Burton, Clark, and Minton deemed the question not to be a Federal one.

Time marched on. Judicial careers ended. There was no change in the organic law nor in the Georgia statute.

By June 16, 1958, the personnel of the Court had changed somewhat. Justices Black, Douglas, Frankfurter, Burton, and Clark remained of the Court of the spring of 1952. Chief Justice Warren had succeeded Chief Justice Vinson. Associate Justices Brennan, Whittaker, and Harlan had been appointed.

On that day, just 5 years ago, with Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan along with Justices Black and Douglas, not agreeing, the Court refused to permit this filing of a petition for the writ of mandamus seeking to compel the convening of a three-Judge Court to decide the same question which the Supreme Court had held not to be a Federal one.[10a]

But when *Baker* v. *Carr* was decided in the spring of 1962, that was the kickoff whistle which opponents of the county unit system were awaiting. As soon as that whistle blew, they "kicked off" by filing another suit raising the same old question.

Chief Justice Warren, and Associate Justices Black, Douglas, Brennan and Harlan were still on the Court when the question again came before it. Justices Frankfurter and Burton had retired; so had Justice Whittaker of the 1958 Court.

So on March 18, 1963, there was a new declaration of the "law of the land." What had not been a "Federal question" in 1946, 1950, 1952, and 1958, became one. The conversion occurred not because the Federal Constitution had been changed nor because of any change in the Georgia statute. The conversion occurred merely because men had become Justices who had the same views as had Justices Black and Douglas, and because Justice Clark joined with the novitiates to make a majority of eight against the lone adherent to the previous declaration of the law of the land—Justice Harlan.

Yet we are told: "This is a government of laws not of men."

This is not an effort to restore the county unit system. Its restoration will not come as the result of any reversal of the recent Supreme Court decision. This article has no such futile purpose.

It has quite other purposes.

Almost a century ago a Court composed of Chief Justice Chase, and Associate Justices Wayne, Nelson, Grier, Clifford, Swayne, Miller, and Field made a solemn pronouncement. It was one which we thought was a guide and rule of conduct for bench and bar.

"Legislatures may alter or change their laws, without injury, as they affect the future only, but where courts vacillate and overrule their own decisions on the construction of statutes affecting the title to real property, their decisions are retrospective and may affect titles purchased on the faith of their stability. Doubtful questions on subjects of this nature, when once decided, should be considered no longer doubtful or subject to change. Parties should not be encouraged to speculate on a change of the law when the administrators of it is (sic) changed. Courts ought not to be compelled to bear the infliction of repeated arguments by obstinate litigants, challenging the justice of their well considered and solemn judgments." [11]

Certainly, the validity of a political system, originating in 1777, prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, repeatedly declared valid so far as the Federal Government was concerned, is a subject of this nature—one which ought not to be subject to the changing ideas of a changing court.

One of our purposes, therefore, is to express a wonder whether that rule of conduct solemnly pronounced by the court for the guidance and conduct of the bar and the court has been changed. If so, will the "law of the land" become chameleon-like, shifting to and fro with the pendulums of the times?

Another purpose is to warn that under a government of men, not of laws, no rights of person or property are secure. If without a change in the supreme law of the land, without any amendment or repeal by a legislative body, the "law" in one respect may be changed by five men, why may it not be so changed in all respects?

Another purpose is to express the hope that the body which has power to reconvert ours into a government of laws will become sufficiently aware of our domestic danger to exercise its power. The Supreme Court of the United States is "supreme" only in the sense that it is made so by the Constitution of the United States.

There must, under the Constitution of the United States, be a Supreme Court. In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, that Court has original jurisdiction. In all the "other cases" of which the Federal judiciary is given jurisdiction, the Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction, "with such exception, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

---

[9] 31 L.W. 4289.

[10] 208 Georgia 498; 67 S.E. 2d 579.

[10a] *Hartsfield* v. *Sloan*, 357 U.S. 916.

[11] *Minnesota Co.* v. *National Company*, 3 Wallace 332, 334 (1865).

If the Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—sits silently by, and permits this constant, evergrowing usurpation of power by the Supreme Court, there will come a day when there will be no Congress, except such a one as conforms to the ideas of those who compose the Court.

If the States of the Union sit silently by and permit their Senators and Representatives to ignore this constant, ever growing usurpation of power by the Supreme Court, there will come a day when the States will be powerless to exercise any function of government, except such as conforms to the views of those who compose the Court.

Already the Court has assumed complete jurisdiction over the schools and courts of the States. Now it threatens all of the processes by which a State nominates those who administer its government. For if the rule announced in the county unit case—"one voter, one vote"—is sound, and to be followed, what will become of the laws of those States which do not nominate their officers in primaries, but still have nominating conventions? Will such conventions now be abolished, and all States, counties, and municipalities be compelled to nominate all of their officers in primaries under the "one voter, one vote" system? Will the Court dictate the qualifications of those who may vote in such primaries?

Already, too, the Court has begun to assume jurisdiction over the composition of the legislative bodies of the States.

How long will it be before the people of the States of this Union—lawyers and laymen—awake to the danger which confronts their constitutional government?

THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY OWNERS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star reported in its issue of June 6, 1963, an official statement of the National Association of Real Estate Boards which calls attention to the erosion of private property rights today in the United States.

This statement explains how the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution apply to property owners. The cherished right of all Americans to hold and dispose of property as they see fit is being undermined by those who seek to impose extensive Government restrictions on that right. This effort is justified by claiming that adequate housing for a minority group can only be achieved by depriving all Americans of their property rights. It is not compatible with our system of government that the rights of all should be destroyed in order to grant special privileges to special groups.

Property rights are a cherished part of the American heritage. The National Association of Real Estate Boards has stated correctly that "loss of these rights diminishes personal freedom and creates a springboard for further erosion of liberty."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALTORS ATTACK UNITED STATES ON HOUSING BIAS BAN—NATIONAL UNIT SEES VIOLATION OF PROPERTY OWNERS' RIGHTS

The National Association of Real Estate Boards called today for a halt to what it termed "governmental interference" in the sale and rental of housing.

In its first official statement related to Government moves to bar racial discrimination in housing, the board of directors of the 73,000-member group said:

"Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. This endangers the rights and freedoms of all Americans. It is self-evident that the erosion of these freedoms will destroy the free enterprising individual American."

BILL OF RIGHTS

President Daniel F. Sheehan, of St. Louis, announced adoption of the group's major policy statement at a just-completed directors' meeting in Chicago. Called the "Property Owners' Bill of Rights," it states:

"It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be allowed, under law, to retain:

"1. The right of privacy.

"2. The right to choose his own friends.

"3. The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates.

"4. The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.

"5. The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference giving special privilege to any group or groups.

"6. The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants.

"7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions.

"8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property.

"9. The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns—to maintain the stability and security of his income.

"10. The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others."

PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR MUTUC DELIVERS STIRRING PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE DAY MESSAGE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the great progress being made in the Philippines under the fine leadership of President Macapagal is deeply gratifying, and I am sure my fellow countrymen are well aware of its significance to the free world.

The Honorable Amelite R. Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, broadcast a moving and eloquent address by the Voice of America in commemoration of Philippines Independence Day, June 12, 1963. The long friendship between the Philippine and American peoples is known worldwide. Both believe in and fight for democracy.

In his speech, Ambassador Mutuc discussed the development, the problems, and the high goals of his country and its administration. It is a highly informative and interesting speech. All Americans will be interested in his stirring address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE AMELITO R. MUTUC, AMBASSADOR OF THE PHILIPPINES, TO THE UNITED STATES, ON THE OCCASION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE DAY, JUNE 12, 1963, BROADCAST BY THE VOICE OF AMERICA TO THE PHILIPPINES

It is with a sense of profound gratification and a feeling of joy and hope that we observe Philippine Independence Day this year.

To those of us who are so far away from home, Filipinos living as far west as Guam, or as far north as Vancouver and Chicago, or as far south as New Orleans, and as far east as New York and Washington, an independence day celebration always has a deeper significance and a warmer meaning.

Those of us who are fortunate in being a part of the new administration in the Philippines are pleased that today there is recognition, at home and abroad, as the "dynamic year-and-a-half administration" of President Macapagal.

In his state of the nation address early this year, President Macapagal listed the concrete measures taken and enumerated the first tangible results of his program in regard to the moral regeneration of the people and the faster rate of economic growth of the country.

The performance of his administration matches the promise he made in January 1962 eliciting the evaluation by foreign observers, including the American press, that the Philippines has accomplished the first phase of the socioeconomic development program to make full use of Philippine material potentialities. There is now evident an atmosphere of confidence among Filipino and foreign business executives, industrial leaders, bankers, and investors—confidence in President Macapagal and his administration, confidence in the future, and above all, faith and confidence in themselves.

It is equally clear that many Filipinos, recognizing the intense reformist zeal of the new leadership in the Philippines, and aware of the implications of the 5-year integrated socioeconomic development program, look with high justifiable hopes for "the good life, which is the rightful heritage of all mankind."

Gratified then by what has been accomplished, we are now hopeful that we can achieve a steady, self-sustaining growth, and at the same time safeguard the value of individual freedom and enhance human dignity.

The marginal, and sometimes, submarginal lives of Filipinos as reflected in inadequate housing, food, and shelter, are compounded by a rapid growth in our population.

It is the recognition of this overriding fact, a fact prevailing in other countries of the world, that has made the 5-year socioeconomic development program a vital factor in our national life and economy. In this regard, in the comparatively short period of 1½ years, President Macapagal has accomplished the following:

1. The most disturbing elements deterring our paramount objectives have been removed. The foreign exchange control system, which was the main breeding ground of graft and corruption, has been abolished. This was followed by the prosecution of those who have "utilized organized political power to build business empires, and vice versa; misused public trust to amass wealth; perpetrated smuggling, committed overpricing;" and "labor leaders who have exploited their followers for selfish purposes."

2. Price levels have been stabilized. This is particularly true in the case of rice and corn which are the staple food of our people.

According to an Associated Press survey late last year, prices in the Philippines are second to the lowest in the world.

3. These price levels have been accompanied by the rise in income in the public sector and the increase in wages in private enterprise.

4. Philippine export receipts increased by $103 million over the previous year, while the import bill decreased by $72 million.

5. Philippine international reserves grew from a level of $103 million at the beginning of 1962 to $140 million at year's end.

6. Agricultural production increased by 7.1 percent for all food crops.

7. Industrial production for the first 6 months in 1963 increased by 7.3 percent.

The stability of the exchange rate continues and together with fiscal discipline exercised by the Government, public spending has been kept to the minimum and revenue collections have been increased.

The pattern of these figures—impersonal and dry as they may appear—reveals that the magnitude of the responsibilities which, a year and a half ago appeared insurmountable, has been lessened substantially.

As the Philippines moves with confidence into the decade of the sixties, it is now clear that it is engaged in a peaceful revolution of economic growth that compels greater productivity and savings; that it is in the midst of fulfilling the basic requirements of modernization: better farming, more production, the building of roads, the establishment of power utilities, transportation, and public communication facilities.

Our people fully realize that in this movement there are prerequisites, which impel a sense of dedication and greater effort.

That is why under the emergency employment administration, the blueprint for a $15 million fishery development project is being planned; the program of agriculture extension intensified; and with the cooperation of the national resettlement and rehabilitation administration, 12 projects for resettlement and construction of feeder roads are now underway; intensive work in forest conservation and reforestation is being undertaken; and the training and recruitment of the necessary labor for handicraft industries being done with the collaboration of the national cottage industries administration.

The construction of multistory tenement projects has started in Manila's most impoverished district, which will be followed by the construction of similar projects in Philippine Provinces.

At the same time, the Government and the Textile Mills Association have embarked on a program to produce and distribute the low cost, durable cotton material, the "Pagasa" cloth, for our people.

The department of education has formulated policies and implemented measures to improve the quality of instruction and strengthen the curriculum in all levels of instruction.

The department of health has contained the El Tor epidemic and controlled the threat of smallpox. As part of its public health program, it established additional rural health units and completed 31 hospitals.

Attention has been paid to the blind and other physically handicapped citizens by the social welfare administration when it constructed the Regional Vocational Training Center.

Industrial peace prevails in the country, the disputes between labor and management having been reduced by 17 percent in 1962, a figure twice less than that for 1961.

A drastic modification in the plans of the Philippine armed forces was effected so as to make its activities more responsive to actual conditions such as the modernization of equipment and weapons, the creation of task forces to carry out peace and order and wage campaigns against internal disturbances.

The most significant developments in Philippine foreign affairs include the maintenance of relentless vigilance in combating the infiltration of communism in vital sectors of the Government and Philippine society; the institution of administrative reforms, which have resulted in safeguarding and enhancing the career service; closer relations with other countries; the filing of the Philippine claim of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and proprietory ownership over North Borneo; and the continuance of close Philippine-American relations. Never has this relationship been closest than now, President Macapagal has said. The American Government has shown its willingness to assist the Philippines in every practical way: the U.S. Congress has just enacted laws extending hospitalization benefits and other privileges to Filipino veterans; the Philippine war damage bill appropriation of $73 million was approved last year and although there is some movement afoot to cure certain alleged misdeeds connected with its enactment I am sure that the Congress will treat this matter with its usual sense of fairness and justice. The U.S. Agency for International Development, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and even many private American banks are more than ready and willing to extend loans and investments to Philippine projects.

The interest in Philippine economic development is not confined to the United States. Other businessmen, bankers, and investors in Europe and in Asia, are now exploring the investment opportunities in the Philippines.

This perfectly fits into the desire of our Republic to welcome foreign capital because domestic capital is inadequate to sustain the economic enterprises needed for expansion and for progress.

That these things have come to pass are due to the zeal, selflessness, and dedication of the present leadership in our country; to the cooperation, and energies of our people; and to the understanding engendered among the peoples of other nations, which share our political persuasion, and our economic aspirations.

It is in line with this direction in Philippine affairs that recently as the representative of our Government in the United States, I convoked the First Philippine Foreign Service Regional Conference in North America.

That conference examined with care and admirable diligence the workings of the Philippine Foreign Service in a changing world, and laid particular emphasis on how best the service could help implement the 5-year socioeconomic development program.

Since assuming my post in the American Capital, I have been fortunate in having been able to project the image of the Philippines and detailed some of the most important characteristics of Philippine conditions. That many Americans, in the public sector, and in private, have expressed a wish to go to the Philippines and assist us in giving hope and shape to our national economy, is, to me, a singular source of satisfaction.

I am one of those who deeply believe that there are certain special dislocations in our time, which give us neither security nor solace. The first rests on the discovery of the secret of the atom, which can lead into one of two directions: limitless energy harnessed in the interest of peace or searing energy, which if uncontrolled can reduce the world to cinders and mankind to dust. The second revolves around the conflict between two power systems: the Communist system with its relentless thrust toward world domination; the free, open society, which stands for a climate of freedom under which the liberties and the dignity of individuals, can flourish.

I believe that the Philippines, as a middle-sized state, can contribute to universal peace and progress because as has been aptly remarked, it believes in the "interdependence of nations and the integration of humanity."

This belief, which of course, is not new, was dramatized recently when Pope John XXIII died and the world, mourning his death, remembers with gratitude and admiration, his two great encyclicals, the "Mater et Magistra" and the "Pacem in Terris." These pronouncements stressed the obligations of individual societies to their underprivileged members, the poor, the disinherited, the displaced; the responsibility of affluent nations to the less fortunate; and the urgency of close cooperation between rich and poor countries, such cooperation to be effected "with the greatest respect for the liberty of the countries being developed."

It is within this perspective, then, that as I deliver these remarks from Washington, D.C., for rebroadcast to the Philippines, I am hopeful that all our friends in this country and in other nations will extend to us their friendship, understanding and guidance for the importance of June 12, in the words of President Macapagal, "demands that it be observed with fitting ceremonies to the end that it will be cherished forever in the hearts of the Filipino people and inspire them and posterity to greater dedication and endeavor for the welfare of the country and well-being of mankind."

WORLD HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the lead article in the June 17 issue of Newsweek magazine is an excellent statement of the problem of world hunger. It relates directly to many of the themes that have been discussed during the past 2 weeks at the World Food Congress in our Capital, which adjourned yesterday. The article makes the following arresting statements:

> Every day of this week some 10,000 people will die of malnutrition or starvation. In India alone 50 million children will die of malnutrition in the next 10 years. More than half the world's 3 billion people live in perpetual hunger.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are attempting to attack this problem on two broad fronts. First of all through our unilateral food for peace program we are contributing approximately $2 billion worth of agricultural commodities to the food deficit nations of the world each year. Secondly, through our participation in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, we have joined in an effort to raise agricultural production in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the superb story from Newsweek magazine referred to above and an article appearing in today's Washington Post relative to the World Food Congress with a closing statement by Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of FAO, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story, article, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, June 17, 1963]

HUNGER ROUND THE WORLD—10,000 DIE EVERY DAY

First the belly swells. Then the hair turns gray and the skin cracks crazily. After a while the victim dies in mute misery—and since the victim is always a child his fate seems that much crueler. In Africa the people call it kwashiorkor—"the disease the old baby gets when the new baby comes," because then there is no mother's milk and hardly any protein for the child. And when there is drought, too, as there now is in the "black reserve" of South Africa's Transvaal, things get even worse. There, the crops of Kaffir corn, maize, and peanuts have been killed and more than 100,000 Venda tribesmen are ravaged by hunger.

High in the Peruvian Andes, Angel Pardo hoes a tiny plot of camotes (sweetpotatoes). In his cheek swells a wad of cocoa leaf dipped in lime juice, to dull his hunger pangs and his senses. A hundred miles away, in the capital, Lima, his 3-year-old son, Roberto, eyes staring from a sunken face, lies quietly in an iron bed in the Hospital del Nino—one of the 11,000 starving children that the hospital treats each year. If he's lucky, Roberto will walk out of the hospital on wobbly legs, with a 50-50 chance of living to be 40.

In his mud hut in the village of Sultanpur, 55-year-old Har Lal watches dully as Nathia, his wife, cooks a meal over a cow-dung fire. Then, with their six ragged children, they sit around the fire chewing chappatties (wheat cakes) and perhaps a bit of chutney. Lal smiles brightly when he recalls his days as a soldier, when he enjoyed at least one square meal a day. Now, he and his family, like 50 percent of India's 456 million, live in semistarvation.

This eternal compulsory fast, as Mahatma Gandhi called it, was the haunting subject last week as the President of the United States addressed some 1,200 delegates from 100 countries to the World Food Congress in Washington. Barely acknowledging the thunderous applause that greeted his entrance, Mr. Kennedy turned solemnly to his audience and said: "The war against hunger is truly mankind's 'war of liberation' * * *. There is no battle on earth or in space more important [for] peace and progress cannot be maintained in a world half-fed and half-hungry.

"We have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth," Mr. Kennedy continued. "Victory will not come in the next year * * *. But it must in our lifetime."

Behind this arresting declaration of war against hunger were some appalling facts.

Every day of this week some 10,000 people will die of malnutrition or starvation—more than at any time in history.

In India alone, 50 million children will die of malnutrition in the next 10 years.

More than half the world's 3 billion people live in perpetual hunger.

To translate these statistics into language everyone could understand, Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland said, after a Spartan dinner in keeping with the occasion: "If we were suddenly to join the less fortunate, our next meal * * * would be a small bowl of rice and perhaps a piece of fish an inch square the day after tomorrow."

This, indeed, was the situation that had brought the congress to Washington. For the most part, the delegates were not politicians. They were agronomists and economists, nutritionists and philosophers, called together by the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization. For 2 weeks, they are to discuss the mysteries of soil and seed and commodity agreements. And in the end, theirs would be the monumental task of charting the strategy against world hunger.

Were the population of the world to stop growing today, there is little doubt that the battle could be won. Science and technology, commonsense and goodwill—these are the key weapons in the human arsenal that could guarantee victory. But with every tick of the conference room clock in Washington, there were three more mouths to feed. In 17 years, there will be 4 billion people on earth; in 37 years, 6 billion—more than three-quarters of them in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. As Arnold J. Toynbee told the conference in a speech (conspicuous for its pessimism), there is little hope without worldwide birth control. "Today," the silver-haired British historian warned, "mankind's future is at stake in a formidable race between population growth and famine."

RICH RICHER, POOR POORER

Even more alarming than the burgeoning population of the world is the brutal and ever-growing disparity between the haves and have-nots. One-fifth of the planet's population, the people of North America, Western Europe, and Australia, live in plenty. The American, for example, consumes 4.66 pounds of food a day. If he's lucky, the average Indian eats 1.23 pounds of food a day, mostly rice. Some experts estimate that enough food is thrown away in the United States each day to feed China's 650 million for several days. Even the family pet dog in the United States eats more and better food than the Indian worker.

Some of the background to this shocking state of affairs can be seen in Sultanpur, the village where Har Lal lives in his "eternal compulsory fast." Sultanpur is neither the worst nor the best of India's 558,000 villages. It is typical. Around a well in the center of the village, eight bullocks plod, drawing up leather tubs of water. Behind his two oxen and wooden plow, Lal furrows his quarter acre. And while his wife collects cow dung, the children chase the aggressor crows which—with monkeys, rats, and cows—destroy 35 percent of India's grain. Hungry and illiterate, Lal has neither the money nor the energy to improve his lot, and if his crops survive the fall monsoons he is satisfied to reap enough barley and millet to feed his family. "I am lucky," says Lal, "others have less."

ONE FEEDS 26

Lal's subdued fatalism may make life tolerable for him. But in the larger economy it points nowhere. He cannot feed other than his own family and the same sad story is repeated throughout Asia and most of Africa. There is nothing to share, nothing to sell, nothing to set aside against the day when the crops dry up. By contrast, admittedly the most extreme contrast, there is the U.S. farmer who produces enough food to feed himself and 26 others with mechanization and modern farm methods.

A good part of this huge U.S. production is given away—but food aid is, at best, only a palliative. "Give a man a fish, and he will eat for a day," goes the ancient Chinese proverb. "Teach him how to fish, and he will eat the rest of his life."

To teach others to grow food, the United States, other advanced agricultural nations, private foundations, and churches send thousands of experts into fields and paddies each year. What they teach is not the extreme mechanization of U.S. agriculture, where the fields are leveled by machine, where another machine may build dikes, and where seeds are sown by airplane and the crop harvested by self-propelled combines. They show Nepalese herdsmen how to make cheese, teach Chilean farmers to rid their fields of the potato blight. In Thailand, FAO technicians proved to farmers that the edible tilapia fish of East Africa could be cultivated in the paddies along with rice. In Libya, they exterminated fruit flies, helping farmers increase their citrus export by 200 percent; in Yugoslavia, they introduced Italian varieties of wheat, and production doubled.

Yet these small success stories are but clearings in the jungle. In most of Africa and Latin America, food production has barely kept pace with new births, and FAO director B. R. Sen reports: "In the Far East, including the most densely populated countries of South and Southeast Asia but excluding China, food production has increased by 25 percent since before the war, while the population has gone up by 30 percent." His prediction: short of Draconian measures, widespread famine by 1980.

HOPE

In the face of the alarming facts, there are optimists who put their faith in the genie of science. New foods may not be acceptable, they admit, but the amount of land under cultivation can easily be doubled. Better tools and methods can increase yields massively and quickly. "Science and technology," U.S. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman told the World Food Congress last week, "have now, in this generation, opened the door to a potential abundance for all."

And to buttress their case for potential abundance, the optimists cite Japan, whose farmers have learned to produce three times as much rice per acre as the farmers in the rest of Asia. They point to Israel's agricultural miracle, which in recent years has made large parts of the desert bloom. And they cite the ancient fields of Europe, where the machine is also taking over. With but 4 percent of its workers on the farm, Britain, long a food importer, is on the road to self-sufficiency. France now has wheat surpluses of its own, enough—hopes Charles de Gaulle—to compete with the U.S. for the European market. In the Soviet Union, where people are adequately nourished but not much more, 50 percent of the population must still till the soil, but this may change with new Soviet attitudes toward agriculture. Above all, there is the example of the United States, where warehouses and mothballed Liberty ships bulge with enough surplus wheat to satisfy world demand for a year.

Few dispute the fact that present technology, properly applied, would put an end to hunger. But most of the underfed, unlike the Japanese or the Israelis or the Europeans, have neither the education, the capital, nor the will to apply it. In Africa, for example, the tall and aristocratic-looking Masai drive thousands of head of scraggly cattle across the plains of Kenya, turning the land into a giant dust bowl. His children may be starving, but when advised to slaughter a few cattle, the Masai tribesman replies haughtily: "No, I can easily get more children, but I cannot get more cattle." For protein, he drinks a concoction of cow's blood, milk, and urine.

COW GODDESS

Har Lal's attitude is not much different. A good Hindu, he (and 360 million others) would rather sit silently and starve than stop a monkey or a sacred cow from eating his food grain. "Well, they do eat the crops," he smiles, "but after all, the blessing of the Gau Mata [Cow Goddess] is a great thing." In a similar spirit, the African tribesman says "it is in the hands of God" when his corn dies on the stalk. The Moroccan farmer, behind his camel-drawn plow, murmurs "Allah-y-jib" (God will provide) as the sun burns his barley to a frazzle.

The archiac systems of land ownership are another block to agricultural progress. When an absentee owner or a tribal chief takes all the profit, why should the farmer improve his methods or his soil? Some agronomists, like France's René Dumont, emphasize political and social solutions. "The real cause of hunger in the world," says Dumont, "are the latifundia [large private estates] and minifundia [minute holdings] in South America, sharecropping and usury in India, and the growth of a privileged caste system among African civil servants * * * New agricultural technology can bring only limited results unless the way is cleared for profound reform * * * If you wait too long, it will be a Fidel Castro type of reform."

Yet all too often, land reform has defeated its purpose. "Some of those estates were too damn big," says an American farm expert in Syria. "But where do you stop? I saw them handing out parcels of land so small a man couldn't possibly support a family on them * * * and each new farmer dug himself a well. Now the water table is dangerously low, and whole areas may revert to barren land, destroying the whole purpose of the land reform."

TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS IN FERTILIZER

Sunk in ignorance, tradition, and taboo, it will take decades for primitive farmers to apply even the simplest ideas of modern food technology. And the capital required will be enormous. Adequate fertilizer alone, it has been estimated, would cost some $20 billion over the next 10 years, and in a world of orbital flights and nuclear bombs there is little money left for fertilizer. The world spends $120 billion a year on soldiers and military hardware; the United States, $20 billion on putting a single human being on the moon; but the FAO must skimp along on a budget of $15.5 million. And so the pace of increased food production seems destined to crawl rather than gallop, but meantime, laments a Filipino official, "we are producing more babies than food."

For many of the underfed nations, the race against population is like running on a treadmill. Over the past 25 years, the underdeveloped countries have raised farm production at the rate of 1.6 percent a year. Even if this can be pushed up to 2 percent, it will not be enough to feed the new mouths. Egypt's Aswan High Dam is expected to increase arable land by 30 percent—or 1 million acres. But by the time the dam is built, in 1972, Egypt's population will have soared by slightly more than 30 percent. "We cannot go on at this rate," warns President Gamal Adbel Nasser. "I consider it the duty of the State to advise people on methods of birth control."

Many leaders in the underdeveloped nations agree, and even the U.S. Government, fearful that all its foreign aid might come to naught, has stated publicly that it will offer birth-control advice and assistance to any country which requests it. But in the absence of an international "crash" program, birth-control measures are not likely to have much effect on the fight against hunger in the years ahead. "All those birth-control devices are great," snaps S. Y. Krishnaswamy of the FAO, "but none is going to change appreciably the situation we must deal with: in less than a generation the world's population will double. This is the working hypothesis with which we must deal—and with which we must make our plans with putting an end to world hunger."

BREAD OR PAMPHLETS

What is to be done? Men like Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the U.N. Special Fund, and Lord Boyd Orr, first chief of the FAO, would like to see governments channel massive amounts of food, technical aid, and money through U.N. agencies. Indeed, Boyd Orr has accused the United States of blocking the development of the FAO into just such a supranational agency controlling the flow of world surplus food to the hungry. Now, he snorts, "men cry for bread, and the FAO can only give them pamphlets."

Others, like Sicco L. Mansholt, vice president of the European Economic Community and the Common Market's top agricultural expert, see the answer not in aid but in trade. (During the year 1957–58, all foreign aid to the underdeveloped nations amounted to some $2 billion. But in the same period, these same countries lost $2 billion, i.e., the drop in prices of their raw materials and primary products on the world market.) To begin with, Mansholt believes, the United States and Europe must agree to give the underdeveloped countries special trade benefits—guaranteed prices, guaranteed markets, low tariffs.

"If we want to help," Mansholt concludes, "we must make it possible for the underdeveloped to sell their products to us. We must not give them handouts but the chance to produce, to develop their industries and to sell to us. Until we do we should shut our mouths about our aid to the hungry."

And at the World Food Congress in Washington, famous Swedish economist, K. Gunnar Myrdal, placed the blame for hunger on both rich nations and poor. All too often in the underdeveloped countries there is "corruption in government, administration, and business, powerful vested interests prevent enactment of institutional reforms, particularly when the disposal of land is involved." Rich nations, like the United States, Myrdal added, like to "appear to be charitable when it does not cost anything. I have always been convinced that to a large part this is a self-deception of the type I have called perverted puritanism."

TWO-EDGED BLADE

To some of the Western delegates, hunger was a two-edged blade. Continued Western prosperity, they reasoned, will depend to a large extent on the growth of consumer demand in the underdeveloped nations. Continued hunger in Asia, Africa, and Latin America could, in the long run, bring hunger to the well-fed industrial countries of the north.

Even now, many economists believe the world is moving toward a slump. British economist Barbara Ward explains: "On the one hand America and Britain, and increasingly Europe, have a problem of a slowing down of production owing largely to a lack of effective demand. On the other hand there is the whole developing world where demand is checked simply because incomes have fallen, capital is not adequate and demand therefore is not sufficiently stimulated." Charity, therefore, is not enough, warns Miss Ward. "If we can use capital and trade policies to raise the possibilities of the poorer countries, to raise their standards of living, to make it possible for them to buy—then we would get a new balance. We need the demand. The poor countries can provide it."

Mansholt's "total development," the blend of capital and trade policies outlined by Barbara Ward, and Boyd Orr's dream of a supranational FAO may one day change the map of world hunger. But they are designs for decades. Something must be done now. Science, well-planned land reform, education, birth control, all are partial solutions for the immediate future. But to begin with, says FAO's Sen what is needed is world awareness. "What is needed now is a sense of urgency about the problem, a climate to create the will to act, each country must take immediate action to do something about it in real terms."

As India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru warned: "It is really folly to talk of culture or even of God when human beings starve and die. People are not in the mood to tolerate this suffering and starvation and equality when they see that the burden is not equally shared."

NEW FOODS AND NEW HOPES

It is a sad paradox that a child with a full stomach can die of malnutrition. The problem is not how much he eats, but rather what he eats. Without an adequate supply of protein, which enables a child's body and mind to grow, all the fats and carbohydrates he can eat will not help him.

One of the most promising ways out of this paradox is the development of new, high-protein foods, to supplement standard native fare of starchy foods such as cassava, manioc, yams, or plantains. Any number of ingenious proposals have been made, but many of them are impractical or unrealistic. Green algae are high in protein, but difficult to produce in quantity. (Besides, says one nutritionist: "Would you like to eat some green slime spread on a piece of bread?") The minuscule sea life called plankton could be scooped directly from the ocean, but any heavy harvesting of plankton would deprive fish of their basic food, thereby correcting one food shortage and creating another.

Soybean and coconut

In the end, all discussions in organizations such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organization boil down to two main foods—fish flour and a variety of substances made from oil seeds, including soybeans, peanuts, cottonseeds, and coconuts.

In India, one of the world's hungriest nations, but also the world's largest producer of peanuts, two peanut-flour plants have begun production. Many local school-lunch programs throughout the world are built around the peanut, with uniformly good results.

In Latin America, a powder made of cottonseed, corn, and sorghum called Incaparina is becoming common fare. It was developed by nutritionist Nevin S. Scrimshaw of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and it is comparable in nutritional quality to milk. Usually it is taken like Metrecal—mixed with water, and flavored with sugar, chocolate, or spices. It can also be tossed into the family pot.

UNICEF has helped start a project in Indonesia promoting Saridele, a soybean extract ideal for infant feeding. With such supplements, a child can be kept healthy from the time he is weaned, and loses his original source of protein, until he is 7 or 8, and the need for protein begins to diminish.

Tasteless

Accordingly, a great deal of attention has lately been directed to a pale tan powder called fish flour, made by shoveling dogfish, sea robins, skates, and other trash fish into a hopper—eyes, bones, and all—grinding it up, washing with solvents deodorizing it, and finally dehydrating it into a powder. The final product is tasteless and odorless, and contains at least 70 percent protein.

Although pilot plants are already in operation in Chile, not very many are adding fish flour to their diets. One of the major reasons is that U.S. Food and Drug Administration head George Larrick has called it "filthy." Most nutritionists consider Larrick's opposition to fish flour an arrogant absurdity. But when U.S. and U.N. agencies offer up a new food supplement that some American experts consider unfit for human consumption, the seeming hypocrisy inevitably causes trouble.

Nevertheless, if enough dramatic results with new foods occur in enough villages and native communities, the decision between life and death will be made on a more rational basis than flavor and dubious origins. UNICEF is cautiously optimistic. The agency's senior food technologist, Max Milner, said last week: "We are beginning to see some glimmers of light."

[From Newsweek magazine, June 17, 1963]

FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The forests of grain elevators across the United States have become components in the American arsenal as vital as any skyward-trained ICBM complex and mercifully, more active.

"Food for Peace" is what the United States calls these weapons. The arsenal is based on a 1954 statute called Public Law 480 which, as Food for Peace director, Richard W. Reuter, frankly admits, "was conceived as a vehicle for getting rid of our agricultural surpluses" and was expected to lapse within a year when some thought the surpluses would be wiped out.

From mid-1954 to the end of 1962, under Public Law 480 more than 100 million tons of surplus American wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities have moved overseas to 114 countries and colonies. Worth more than $12 billion, the American bounty has flowed at the rate of three 10,000-ton shipfuls per day for 8½ years.

"The basic lesson we have learned is that our food stocks should be treated as an asset instead of a liability," says Reuter. And as he moves about his "chart room" in the executive office building next to the White House, the 45-year-old former head of CARE can point with legitimate enthusiasm to the varied examples of U.S. food at work.

In Poland and Yugoslavia, Public Law 480 sales for local currency ($1.5 billion since 1954) have enabled both to be more independent of Moscow.

In India, surplus foods with a market value of more than $2 billion have built a precious reserve against future famine, and sale of some has financed agricultural research.

Nowhere has the disaster-relief function of Public Law 480 worked more dramatically than last year in war-wracked Algeria. Some 300,000 tons of American farmers' bounty fed 4 million people for a winter and pushed a newly independent nation back from the brink of starvation and chaos.

Public Law 480 food is being used to entice primitive montagnards in Vietnam down into the strategic hamlets on which the government's anti-Viet Cong guerrilla campaign is based.

Food is also one of the strongest levers working for the Alliance for Progress. On the shore of Lake Titicaca, 12,000 feet up in the mountains of Bolivia, Public Law 480 beans, flour, cornmeal, and dried milk pay Bolivian soldiers and workers for their work in building schools. In Peru, children who used to spend their days scavenging for food are now eating Public Law 480 hot lunches in school. This year 400,000 Peruvian kids will be fed, and for many it will be their only decent meal of the day; by 1964 the number is expected to hit 1 million. In all, 37 million children around the world supped at the American farmers' table last year. And as Maryknoll Missionary Father Kearns says in Peru: "Even the containers and boxes are sold and the funds used to buy furniture and building materials for the schools."

With each wheat sack and cotton bale plainly marked as coming "from the people of the United States," Public Law 480 food has become, in the words of one AID official, "the best-known food label in the world."

Since the program began, some two-thirds of the $12 billion committed under Public Law 480 has been food sold for local currency. In most cases the buying countries simply didn't have the foreign exchange to make these purchases on the world market. The United States has used 23 percent of these foreign currencies to finance American activities in those countries—from the expenses of traveling Congressmen to the construction of new embassies—and usually lends the balance to finance a wide range of local economic development projects.

CANNED CHEESE

It is not everywhere an unqualified success; nor is Public Law 480 a panacea for either hunger or U.S. foreign policy. Occasionally, as in the Congo, Public Law 480 food does find its way into the black market. And occasionally people such as the mountain aborigines of Formosa try to use canned cheese as soap. Often in the most underdeveloped countries sorely needed food simply does not get past the capital for lack of even a rudimentary internal distribution system. Always a careful balance must be struck between feeding the hungry and encouraging them to develop their own agricultural productivity.

Public Law 480 largess also runs the risk of disrupting normal commercial trade patterns. When the United States sold a major amount of wheat to India in 1960, for example, it found itself faced with a hurt and angered Thailand, which had thought a rice-to-India sale of its own was in the bag.

Interestingly enough, the cost of shipping Public Law 480 commodities around the world is less than surplus storage costs at home (nearly $400 million last year). And normal commercial agricultural exports have increased by the same amount as Public Law 480 sales and donations.

Abroad, the verdict is also generally enthusiastic, and most governments give the United States high plaudits for the aid. Algeria's Minister of Agriculture Amar Ouzegane is typical: "These shipments of food kept our people alive. Don't ever underestimate the political value of this aid."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1963]

ACTION TO FEED WORLD URGED TO AVERT DISASTER

(By Anita Ehrman)

The World Food Congress was warned yesterday that failure to translate its 2 weeks of talk into direct action would doom this planet to "disaster."

B. J. Sen, Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, in issuing the warning to the closing session of the conference, said that "peace and war will be determined by the outcome of the race between population and resources."

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman followed up Sen's declaration with a pledge that the United States would reevaluate its aid program to see what more can be done to meet "the goal of freedom from hunger."

Freeman, chairman of the Congress, echoed Sen's demand that the 1,330 delegates from 104 countries now move from the realm of high-sounding ideals into the world of reality, where more than half the people are undernourished.

DECLARATION APPROVED

Earlier, the Congress approved by acclamation a declaration calling for a worldwide plan to feed today's hungry and meet the challenge of a quadrupled population by the year 2000.

The declaration specifically urged the underdeveloped countries to institute land reform and improve their administrative apparatus and planning programs.

The developed countries were called upon to give more foreign aid and adopt new trade policies to allow a greater and more stable export of goods by the poorer countries.

Freeman urged the delegates, who in the course of their deliberations had consumed 2,200 cups of coffee daily and produced more than 15 tons of document, not to just "carry the declaration in your briefcases."

Both Sen and Freeman stressed that the potential force of the conference stemmed from the fact that its representatives were top economists, scholars, politicians, and scientists whose influence can change Government policy.

Sen's speech brought out points that had been emphasized in conference sessions but would have evoked bitter controversy if incorporated in the general declaration.

He said the time may soon come when the world, as a whole, will have to institute birth-control measures—a subject skirted over in the final document.

The Director General also declared that in the near future a system of progressive international taxation, similar to that applied on a national scale, would have to be created to stop the downward economic trend of the poor countries.

Despite the harmonious public ending of the conference, there was some private grumbling behind the scenes over FAO steamrolling tactics.

Many delegates felt that the final declaration should have contained stronger and more concise plans for internationally handling the population explosion and distribution of food surpluses.

OPENED ON JUNE 3

Nevertheless, most of the delegates agreed with Freeman that if the impetus started in Washington could be maintained, the Congress will go down in history as a great historic occasion.

The Congress was opened on June 3 by President Kennedy and Indian President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. During the 2 weeks of deliberations, it was addressed by such world figures as Historian Arnold J. Toynbee, Swedish Economist Gunnar Myrdal, and former Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek.

In closing, Sen said that President Kennedy's speech "will stand out as the most important statement made on this important problem since President Roosevelt's address to the 1943 Hot Springs conference, which gave birth to FAO."

President Kennedy, predicting that the war against hunger can be won in our lifetime, told the conference:

"No battle on earth or in space is more important than the food battle."

DAIRY MONTH IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to join with the Governor of my State, as well as all New Yorkers, in recognizing the month of June as Dairy Month in New York State. It is only fitting that this small tribute be paid to those industrious farmers who, beset by problems of surplus production, have contributed so much to the health of the people of our State as well as to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, the milk industry is one of New York State's primary agricultural enterprises. Over one-half of all agricultural income derived in the State is earned by dairy farmers. In recent years, the improved methods of milk production, although adding substantially to the surplus milk problem, have resulted in more vitamin-enriched milk at a lower cost to the consumer.

We have much for which to thank the dairy farmers of New York State—in fact, of the entire Nation. Through their enterprising labors Americans of all ages can obtain the necessary health-providing benefits of milk. In this connection, I am pleased to learn that Governor Rockefeller has proclaimed the month of June as Dairy Month in New York State.

Mr. President, this is indeed a fitting tribute to the dairy industry of New York. I therefore ask unanimous consent that following my remarks this proclamation be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Our primary agricultural enterprise in the Empire State is dairying. Moreover, our milk industry is one of the greatest factors contributing to our health. It is rated as the most readily available source of riboflavin, vitamin A, vitamin B complex, vitamin D and protein.

Dairying in New York State accounts for more than one-half of all the income derived by our farmers. Dairying in all its phases represents an investment of many hundred millions of dollars and a wonderfully coordinated effort to keep our milk supply as adequate and constant as it is clean.

Milk production in New York State has climbed to an annual high of 10.738 billion pounds. This enormous production is derived from advances in feeding, breeding, and care which results in larger yields per cow. It creates problems of surpluses for the producer but the consumer benefits through lower prices.

This volume last year had a total value of $466 million at the farm.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim June, 1963, as Dairy Month in New York State.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

PUERTO RICAN DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Puerto Ricans in this country have made many contributions to the progress of our Nation in numerous areas of endeavor. Particularly in New York City, where a language barrier and the obvious problems of adjusting to a new environment has oftentimes made assimilation difficult, these people have demonstrated the hardworking perseverance that characterizes their community.

The Puerto Rican community, demonstrating a full awareness of the responsibilities attending citizenship in the United States, has sought in every area to prove itself worthy of this privilege. The Puerto Ricans have distinguished themselves nobly in their participation in three major wars; and they have contributed substantially to the general welfare of the country in peace.

Mr. President, in New York State, where the problems of assimilation are sometimes difficult, the Puerto Rican community has taken the matter in hand: beset by problems that have remained problems for decades, it has formed community organizations that deal directly with efforts to adapt to new customs and environments. Over 160 organizations, united in a community program, have sought to improve the material and social welfare of these spirited people. The initiative they have demonstrated should provide inspiration for American minorities everywhere.

Mr. President, early this month, celebrating Puerto Rican Day, the Puerto Rican community of New York joined together in a colorful and musical parade. The day's festivities were reminiscent of the rich heritage of these people, a heritage that has persisted through generations of living in this country.

In this connection, I am pleased to note that June 2, 1963, was, by proclamation of Governor Rockefeller, Puerto Rican Day in the State of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the text of the Governor's proclamation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation of the State of New York

The parade arranged every year by the Puerto Rican community of New York has become symbolic of this group's many contributions to the progress of the city and State.

Puerto Ricans among us, with their cheerful manners, their capacity for gaiety and their love of music, have endeared themselves solidly as neighbors. They have shown in three major wars and in peacetime, full appreciation of their responsibilities as well as their privileges as citizens of the United States. In New York they have 160 organizations banded together in a community program to help solve problems which have gone unsolved for decades.

They command our admiration for their success in adapting themselves, despite the difficulty of the language barrier, to new environments, new customs, a whole new way of life. They are overcoming many obstacles and are making a happy adjustment.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim June 2, 1963, as Puerto Rican Day in New York State.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

COMMEMORATION OF DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during this month and particularly on June 14, 15, 16, and 17, Americans are marking with somber reflection the tragic deportation of the people of the Baltic Nations to Siberian slave labor camps. It was just 22 years ago, in 1941, that Soviet troops marched into the three tiny self-governing countries of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia with the sole purpose of occupying and controlling them. And for 22 years, the courageous, yet cruelly suppressed people of the Baltic countries have suffered under the terrible yoke of Communist tyranny.

Yet freedom in the Baltic countries has not been an unrealized objective. Born out of the idealistic dreams and hopes of the First World War, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia enjoyed their freedom during the interwar decades. For 20 years, these countries began to develop a unanimity as they developed their economies and strove for the utmost in political freedom and self-determination for their people.

And then, while the rest of Europe was embroiled in the greatest war of all time and while Hitler was sediciously making Mein Kampf a reality on the continent of Europe, the Soviet imperialist military machine occupied the Baltic countries and divested their governments of all control. This brutal Soviet march on these tiny countries came in spite of their declaration of neutrality at the beginning of the war and in spite of their nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union made in the early 1930's and effective until 1945.

Mr. President, after the march on the Baltic nations—and clearly indicative of the cruel intrigue of the Soviet imperialists—Kremlin strategists secretly negotiated with the Nazis and drummed up the story that there were so-called antisocial elements, that is pro-German elements within the governments of the Baltic nations. This was obviously antagonistic to Soviet policy so the Soviets instigated a policy of mass deportation of the Baltic people to the Siberian slave labor camps. This brutal wresting of loved ones from their homes and the splitting of families was only halted with the German invasion of Russia and the Baltic countries—resulting in German control of these lands.

After the fall of Hitler, there was hope that freedom would be returned to the Baltic nations but all these dreams were quickly crushed when Soviet troops returned to the three countries and the harsh Communist rule was strictly reenforced. To this day, the people of the Baltic nations are still suffering under this tyranny.

Freedom was short lived in the tiny Baltic countries yet despite this short history, yearnings for liberty remain deeply imbedded in the hearts and minds of the Baltic people. In this connection, Mr. President, I introduced a resolution earlier this session with regard to the Baltic nations. This resolution urges the President of the United States to take all necessary steps to bring the Baltic question before the United Nations in order that the U.N. request the Soviets to first, withdraw all troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and second, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union. My resolution further calls for the U.N. to conduct free elections in the Baltic States and to take appropriate action against any Communists guilty of crimes of extermination of the peoples of the Baltic States.

Mr. President, my resolution reaffirms a basic principle of U.S. foreign policy—self-determination of all peoples, the right of people to choose their own form of government. In the past, the United States has protested the illegal annexation of territories and people by the Soviets by consistently withholding recognition from these territories. In my judgment, it is now time for the United States to do more—to urge that the question of these captive people be brought into the world forum of debate—the United Nations. Let us show to the world the atrocities of Communist imperialism and let us get the force of world opinion behind our position in our efforts to make the self-determination of people not only a U.S. but a world privilege.

Mr. President, during this month, many sad memories of the deportation of the Baltic people are recalled.

Citizens of America, in fact of the entire free world, somberly pay reverence to these memories. But now, let us rededicate ourselves to the principle which is such a basic element in our foreign policy—the self-determination of people—and let us renew the hopes of the people in the Baltic States so they can be assured that we understand and sympathize with their plight and that we are hoping and praying for their eventual liberation.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, when the original Peace Corps authorization legislation was before the Congress, of which I was a cosponsor, there were those Members of Congress and of the general public who were fearful that such a newly created agency with idealistic aims would have great administrative problems. However, the opposite has been true. The Peace Corps has operated, to my mind, in a most efficient manner, and much of the credit for this is due to its Director, Sargent Shriver.

On May 29 of this year there was a most complimentary article which appeared in the Boston Herald written by Holmes Alexander entitled "Is Peace Corps Merely Shriver?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, May 29, 1963]

Is Peace Corps Merely Shriver?

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington, D.C.—It's fair to say for Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, that he now carries the undeserved handicap of being a Kennedy in-law.

Any other Frontiersman who had proved his administrative ability as Shriver has in a minor post would have been promoted long before now. But the Cabinet is closed to him because a Kennedy is already there. The governorship of Illinois is presently blocked by local political complications. Shriver seems likely to keep his present post until after next year's elections.

Meanwhile, imitation being the sincerest form of flattery, Shriver is being internationally complimented in a manner that no administration figure can boast. Eight nations are in the process, or on the verge, of forming volunteer oversea agencies on the American Peace Corps model. West Germany has appropriated $1.4 million for the purpose, and is expected to hold some sort of inaugural ceremony when President Kennedy, accompanied by Shriver, visits there next month. Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and New Zealand have made starts. Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium are discussing ways and means with Shriver. Honduras, El Salvador, and Jamaica are instituting domestic versions of the Corps. Argentina plans to send Spanish teachers to the United States in a gesture of reciprocity.

Shriver has showed rare signs of administrative talent. He recovered from a very rocky start when the corps got some bad publicity at the outset. Although his outfit is growing faster than Congress and other critics would like (he is aiming for an enlistment of 13,000 by September 1964), Shriver has done the truly remarkable thing of cutting the adminstrative spending ratio. He began by spending 33 cents to the dollar on headquarters money, and now has it down to 19 cents. It costs $7,000 to keep a volunteer corpsman in the field and only $2,000 to keep an administrator behind him. By bureaucratic standards, these are economical operations.

But Shriver may have outgrown his job. He also may have made things very tough for his successor. Now that the novelty of the Peace Corps has worn off, it bears the burden of proving its worth. The first year's appropriation was $30 million, the second was $59 million, the present year's asking price is $108 million. Congress has already refused to underwrite $150,000, which Shriver asked to pay the first-year expenses of founding an International Secretariat. The danger of overevangelism, which always besets do-gooder organizations, is beginning to show. The next Peace Corps director will have to trim ship.

That will be the time, with Shriver gone and his fledgling out of the nest, to ask if this idealistic effort is worth pursuing. The test, I think, will not come on the elevated but unprovable thesis that the Peace Corps is, in William James' famous concept, a "moral equivalent of war." This kind of down-to-earth, secular missionary work does not remove the international causes of conflict for the plain reason that people do not make war. Their politicians do that for them. The causes of war are so complex that not even the greatest historians have ever devised a credible explanation for mankind's organizational pugnacity.

But the Peace Corps idea will prove its worth, if at all, on a much lower scale. It has already demonstrated the usefulness of what is known in Shriver shoptalk as "middle-level manpower." The scientist and the economist at the top, and the common laborer at the bottom, are not the full answer to community development at home or abroad.

Something else is needed. Call it the missing link. And it may be that Peace Corps idea of personal instructorship is it.

PAUL J. BROUSSARD—AN ACT OF HEROISM IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last month an act of heroism was performed in the State of Massachusetts by a young boy which I believe deserves to be drawn to the attention of the Senate.

On the afternoon of May 16, Paul J. Broussard, age 13, was approaching the Boston & Maine station at Malden, Mass., en route to his home from school. He observed a man who was walking on the railroad tracks and who appeared to be in some physical distress.

As young Broussard approached, the man collapsed. In the distance, Master Broussard saw a B. & M. Buddliner, which was proceeding at a high rate of speed outbound from North Station. The youngster ran to the man and sought to lift him to his feet. This proved beyond his physical strength. He then sought to remove the man from the tracks by rolling him over on his side.

This episode was witnessed by Engineer Henry L. Gelinas, of B. & M. train No. 867. As Mr. Gelinas was on an express run which did not call for a stop at Malden, he was proceeding at a rate of speed that made it impossible for him to brake the train in time to avert what appeared to be a fatal accident. Indeed, when the Buddliner had passed the Malden station, Engineer Gelinas was certain that one or possibly even two fatalities had occurred. It was not until he brought the train to a halt and looked out his cab window that he saw that young Broussard and the man he had aided had escaped death by a matter of inches.

We in Massachusetts are proud of Paul Broussard and his family. This type of heroism is in the finest tradition of American youth and the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business If not, morning business is closed.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 625, to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION RULING CLIQUE OPPOSES WISHES OF ITS MEMBERS: IS OBSTRUCTIONIST LOBBY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the American Medical Association, which in my opinion misrepresents many thousands of physicians and surgeons of the United States, is now in convention in Atlantic City. This association is ruled in a high-handed manner by a house of delegates, so-called. The membership of the house of delegates consists of approximately 150 political doctors. In addition, there are approximately 40 practicing family physicians and surgeons who succeeded in being elected to this all-powerful group. They are outvoted by the political doctors. For many years a small group of political doctors have been running the American Medical Association in flagrant disregard of the welfare of their membership. They publish a magazine, Today's Health. Its circulation is very limited; its advertising rates are very high. Pharmaceutical groups advertise extensively and expensively.

The hierarchy of the American Medical Association maintains one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington. They reported expenditures for the year 1962 of $200,000. This lobby is spending more money than that this year trying to prevail upon Members of Congress to vote against legislation for the welfare of the country, and for the particular benefit of the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association is the "spendingest" and most aggressive of all lobbying organizations in Washington. Without doubt this association will actually spend several million dollars lobbying this year against hospital and nursing home care for the elderly under the social security system.

American Medical Association officials claim that the AFL–CIO maintains a more expensive lobby and they may make the same claim against the American Legion. Figures filed with the Secretary of the Senate prove otherwise.

The American Medical Association represents about 180,000 members. The AFL-CIO represents 18 million members. Of course, the American Legion represents millions of veterans. There is no more reactionary group in the United States than those majority members of the House of Delegates of the AMA. They arbitrarily overlook the will and wishes of their own membership. Other lobbying organizations in Washington accurately represent the views of the majority of their membership.

For example, recently the Michigan Medical Society took a referendum of its members. The question was simple. Do you desire to be included under coverage of social security? The vote was 3,099 in favor of social security for doctors with only 1,845 against. This result was typical of the results of similar referendums in various States. For example, in Ohio, 4,095 physicians and surgeons voted for social security coverage and only 2,737 voted against social security coverage. This affirmative vote was ignored by officials of the American Medical Association and the ruling clique of the AMA. In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maine, Illinois, Connecticut, Delaware, and other States physicians and surgeons overwhelmingly voted that they desired to be included under social security coverage. Their wishes have been ignored. In fact, the ruling clique of the AMA invariably seeks to suppress the views of the majority of its membership. Approximately two-thirds of the physicians and surgeons of the State of Utah voted in favor of social security coverage and sent delegates to the convention of the AMA, held a short time after the results of this referendum had been announced. Their delegates were not permitted to report nor to express their views. They tried unsuccessfully to secure recognition.

Despite these clear and repeated expressions in favor of social security by approximately 65 percent of physicians and surgeons voting in many States, the dictatorial house of delegates maintains its opposition to social security. Physicians and surgeons are the only self-employed professional men and women in our country ineligible for social security coverage.

They are denied the protection of social security for themselves and their families because the powerful AMA lobby has misrepresented and is misrepresenting them and has prevailed on the Congress to deny this needed coverage. In 1960, the House of Representatives voted to extend social security to self-employed physicians. This coverage provision was deleted in the Senate Committee on Finance "because of lack of definitive information on whether a majority of doctors wished to come under the program." This was the reason given. The facts are that the president of the American Medical Association filed a letter with the Senate Committee on Finance expressing strong opposition to placing practicing physicians under social security coverage. He stated that the social security program "does not fit the economic pattern of the practicing physician." Just what that is, I would not know, but according to him, everyone in the Nation is out of step except the members of the American Medical Association. Due to this, the widows and fatherless children of doctors are denied social security protection, and doctors themselves following retirement are denied the benefits which could have been theirs by payments of modest sums as premiums.

In all, in 19 States, doctors representing a total of approximately 130,000 physicians and surgeons have voted overwhelmingly in favor of social security coverage. It is true that in only six States, representing 18,000 physicians, by small margins they have voted against coverage. It is evident that 65 percent of the total physicians and surgeons of our Nation now favor compulsory social security coverage for physicians and surgeons. Oh, yes, in a few instances when some members of the house of delegates of the AMA desiring special privileges for physicians and surgeons proposed that doctors should be covered on an optional basis, in other words voluntary coverage, a majority favored voluntary coverage. It is evident that were workers and professional men permitted to enter or stay out of social security coverage on a voluntary basis, this insurance system would not be actuarially sound as it is and always has been, nor would there be anything like the present surplus of $23 billion.

Mr. President, elective coverage under social security law is unthinkable. It would prove actuarially unsound. How could any thoughtful person justify permitting self-employed physicians and surgeons to elect whether or not they desire to be covered by social security? Were they to be granted this special privilege, obviously young professional men might not be interested. If they chose not to join the social security system and have that coverage, the social security fund would not have the premiums paid in as paid by other professional men at the time of payment of their income taxes. Physicians and surgeons when in their sixties naturally would join the social security system and eventually enjoy the benefits.

Mr. President, obviously, no insurance and survivors system would long continue to be actuarially sound if coverage were granted to certain favored professions on an optional basis.

Our social security system should be universal, covering all employed and self-employed and providing retirement and disability payments adequate in amounts for those who have paid premiums during their working years.

Mr. President, the defeat last year of the proposal for hospital and nursing home insurance for the elderly, usually termed "medicare," was a defeat for every American family. There are more than 17 million Americans over 65 years of age. The basic problem is that most of these people cannot purchase adequate hospitalization insurance from private corporations except at exorbitant rates. In my State of Ohio, the Blue Cross recently raised its rates substantially, beyond the reach of many persons who were formerly covered.

Furthermore, all Americans, regardless of age, have parents likely to be ill at one time or another. These families desire—in fact, find it necessary—to save for their children's education and for other necessary future expenditures. If prolonged illness afflicts a parent, father-in-law, mother-in-law, or other elderly relative, average American families should not be compelled to incur colossal debt or payout from savings accumulated for other purposes.

Under the social security program, a working man or woman can pay premiums into the social security fund during his economically productive years for the hospitalization needs of his later years. Our social security program is an actuarially sound insurance system and will continue to be so under President Kennedy's proposal to meet this need of our older citizens.

It is a tragedy that here in the richest country in the world, millions of our elderly live in constant fear that their savings, if any, will be washed away by a prolonged illness or a serious accident. Under President Kennedy's proposal over 900,000 men and women in my State of Ohio will be immediately eligible for assistance.

The American Medical Association lobby spent more than $7 million to defeat medicare last year. The small band of willful men who control American Medical Association policy assert our people do not support this program. Yet, a recent Gallup poll indicates that two out of three persons interviewed are in favor of medicare under social security. Only 26 percent were opposed. Apparently Americans refuse to swallow the propaganda pills prescribed by the professional medical politicans who presume to speak for 180,000 American physicians and surgeons.

It is noteworthy that the National Association of Trained Nurses, representing 170,000 nurses, has at all times supported medicare, so-called, under the social security program. It has always expressed its desire that nurses be covered by social security, and they are covered.

Powerful though the American Medical Association lobby is, has been, and will be, I believe President Kennedy's proposal for hospital and nursing home care for the elderly under social security will be enacted into law before the 88th Congress adjourns. Like social security retirement payments, hospital care will be made available to all persons 65 or older, as a matter of right, not as a charity handout.

This proposal will in no way alter or affect the traditional doctor-patient relationship. I would never advocate any change in the freedom we Americans enjoy to be attended by doctors of our choice, or in the doctor's freedom to select his patients and determine for himself all the details of his treatment. Furthermore, every effort has been made in writing this legislation to assure that there will be a minimum of Government activity in the operation of this program.

Mr. President, this proposal was defeated in the Senate by two votes last year. We will not go back. There are votes in the Senate now to pass the administration's medicare program. We will go forward and improve upon and liberalize the social security system, of which we are all so proud today.

SUPPORT CIVIL RIGHTS FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, along with other Democratic Senators from Northern States, I attended a Democratic leadership conference. Attorney General Kennedy and others discussed the administration program for civil rights legislation. I expressed myself as supporting the administration civil rights program, including ending forthwith discrimination in all public facilities, including restaurants and motels; accelerating integration in public schools; compelling registration of Negro citizens desirous of voting; and according full civil rights to all citizens, regardless of color. At that time I stated, as I state today, that there can be no compromise on the issue of civil liberties and civil rights for all Americans.

It is most unfortunate that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation there are in certain sections of the country violations of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I am happy to be a cosponsor of the civil rights bills which were introduced today. Although I, along with others, hope for adjournment of this session of Congress in September or October, we will probably be extending Christmas greetings to our colleagues here in Washington. However, I feel that it is of the utmost importance that we remain here and have this question fully and thoroughly debated at length in this Chamber, even though this may later on result in prolonged sessions. Then, after the issues have been fully and fairly debated and after all Senators have been given an opportunity to express their views, I, for one, will, if necessary, vote to terminate any prolonged debate—any long continuing filibuster by voting in favor of cloture, as I did on two occasions in May of last year.

ARTS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the report on "The Arts and the National Government" which August Heckscher has just submitted to the President is undoubtedly one of the major documents in this field. I am especially gratified by the report because it also gives recognition to a long-standing effort in arts legislation which I have made, going back to 1948, and which is represented in the present Congress by a bill I joined the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in introducing. In short, my views and those of the Senator from Minnesota and those of others are combined in the one bill, which calls for a National Arts Foundation, which Mr. Heckscher describes as the natural crowning step in a national cultural policy.

The wonderfully creative step taken by Mr. Heckscher, who is a New Yorker and a constituent of mine as well as a personal friend, not only is the most comprehensive summary of the Federal Government's present activities in the arts since the report of the Fine Arts Commission many years ago, but it also fairly sparkles with creative ideas and recommendations for improving programs, procedures, and artistic results.

As the President's Special Consultant on the Arts, Mr. Heckscher pioneered in a new function with extraordinary success. Recognizing that the Government's role must remain supplementary, he pointed out nevertheless that the Government's impact on the arts at the present time under current programs is considerable and can be made stronger and better without necessarily incurring particularly greater expenditures. Indeed, if Mr. Heckscher's recommendations were to be acted upon, substantial economies might conceivably be effected in our building program by giving more attention to standards of good art. The principles of good art should also be applied to roadbuilding and landscaping as well as architecture, to airports as well as Embassies, to medals, stamps, posters, and typography, to the photographic and film projects of the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture, and to a whole host of Government activities which we do not usually relate to the visual or performing arts.

In this, Mr. Heckscher is expressing, in my view, the finest attributes of our civilization and what they mean in terms of satisfaction to our people; and he is entitled to great support and praise for the fine job he has done.

The report has already been placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; so I confine my remarks to comments upon it.

The core of the report is the proposal for the establishment of the President's Advisory Council on the Arts. Here, too, although I have felt that this step would be time-consuming, and believe that we could move directly into the Arts Foundation idea, which is fundamentally premised on giving supplementary governmental aid in the nonprofit field to both the performing arts and the visual arts, in order to reach parts of the country which are not now reached with such performances and exhibits, nevertheless, because I believe it important that we move expeditiously in this field, I welcome even the first step, which is the Advisory Council on the Arts.

I have done my best to bring to the President suggestions for membership on the Council which I believe would most effectively promote this work and give it the broadest possible consensus of American society; and I am sure the President will make good choices.

I urge that when the Advisory Council is formed, it move immediately, as Mr. Heckscher in his magnificent report has suggested, into the area of recommending for the Nation a program which really will represent an embodiment of the Nation's cultural progress and will bring to bear upon our leisure time, our recreational activities, and our spiritual and cultural development the tremendous values which exist in our country. Such a program also will enable us—far better than we do today—to meet the challenge of the Communists' cultural ideas in the world, on which they are spending great amounts of money for their propagation and which represent the key aspect of their activities, which are designed to "bury" the free world.

In emphasizing the enormous influence on American art that the Government exerts through its manifold activities, Mr. Heckscher has performed an invaluable service to the American people. His report, which is also his valedictory, offers guidelines to the new Advisory Council on the Arts, which has just been established by Presidential Executive order. These guidelines give it the opportunity to influence the whole direction of the role of art in Government programs. The announcement of the establishment of the President's Advisory Council on the Arts contains in itself the potential of a large step forward toward a comprehensive program to implement our national responsibility in the arts. It is a real recognition by the Federal Government of the tremendous renascence of the arts which has been taking place throughout the country.

No one who recognizes the prestige and international impact of the arts in projecting American civilization will seek to minimize the importance of this report and the part that the Advisory Council can play. I am especially pleased to point out also the emphasis placed in the report on the establishment of a National Arts Foundation, such as I have sponsored in the Congress, which Mr. Heckscher describes as "the logical crowning step in a national cultural policy," and his support for the objectives which such a Foundation would make possible. I shall continue to work for the creation of a U.S. Arts Foundation in order to bring the arts to our people in areas of the country not now effectively reached, and I hope that the new Advisory Council will address itself promptly to this problem. Although Mr. Hecksher has resigned as the President's special consultant, after having remained in the post for longer than he had originally intended to stay, we shall not entirely lose the benefit of his counsel and guidance, for I am happy to note that he has consented to serve on the new Advisory Council. We need his help in formulating and developing the role of the Federal Government in the arts which he has so brilliantly summarized in his report.

I hope very much that the American people will take this proposal most seriously.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a feature on the subject which was published in the New York Times, June 17.

There being no objection the feature was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTS COUNCILS ARISE IN 13 STATES—GAIN IN LEISURE AND KENNEDY BACKING SPUR MOVEMENT—POSITION ON SUBSIDY VARIES—FEDERAL INCENTIVE ASKED

(By Milton Esterow)

A growing number of State councils on the arts, to provide cultural opportunities in thousands of communities, are developing throughout the Nation.

Thirteen States, reflecting the national upsurge of interest in the arts, have such groups or plan to establish them according to a survey by correspondents of The New York Times. Most of the councils have been formed in the last 3 years.

The councils are established by State legislatures to raise artistic standards and increase public exposure to all the arts. Some use State funds; others believe their main duty is to spur private patronage.

Stimulants to the councils have included President Kennedy's support of the arts, the rise in leisure time and an increasing respect for the role of the arts in a democratic society.

The States that have councils or plan them are New York, California, New Jersey, Connecticut, North Carolina, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Nebraska, Nevada, Washington, and Virginia.

The councils vary from 11 members to 100 and include leaders in the arts and in business.

WORK IN LOCALITIES

The councils are stimulating arts activities locally, spurring the establishment of community groups and bringing live performances to people who have never had an opportunity to see them.

The Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, which President Kennedy established last week, is expected to stimulate the council movement further.

In addition, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and nine other Senators have introduced a bill to grant up to $100,000 annually to States that have set up arts councils.

The bill, first introduced in 1957, is in committee. Senator JAVITS said yesterday that the bill's chances of coming to the Senate floor were excellent. "Action on the floor," he explained, "depends on recommendations made by the President's Advisory Council." But there is pessimism about the bill's chances of passing the House.

NO WISCONSIN PROGRAM

Some Governors believe arts councils are not the responsibility of State governments. A number of States are still considered "cultural dust bowls."

A correspondent of the Times in Wisconsin reported: "No State program for support of the arts is contemplated here. People are struggling to convince the legislature that support of schools is a legitimate concern of the State."

One of the most significant contributions is being made by the New York State Council on the Arts, which was established 3 years ago at Governor Rockefeller's request.

The State council has supported extended tours by organizations such as the Phoenix Theater, the New York City Opera Co., and the Buffalo Philharmonic. Its budget this year is $653,000.

John H. MacFadyen, the council's executive director, said the council received frequent requests from other States for information on setting up a program. He has prepared a guide outlining it.

"Each State has its particular artistic identity, and to this extent the programs that emerge will naturally differ," Mr. MacFadyen said.

CALIFORNIA AWAITS BILL

In California, a bill to establish a fine arts commission is expected to pass the legislature. The measure, modeled on the New York State Council, is supported by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Economy has influenced legislators to favor State assistance to the arts. Unions affected by the movie slump have argued that State and community help for theaters would ease the Hollywood recession.

A Connecticut bill creating a State commission on the arts was signed into law on June 6 by Gov. John Dempsey. The 15 members will survey public and private cultural facilities in the State.

In New Jersey, Gov. Richard J. Hughes recently named an 11-man commission to study the arts. Members include the artist, Ben Shahn, and the playwright, Selden Rodman. The State's first cultural center, which will cost $6 million, is being built in Trenton. It is scheduled for completion next year.

For many years, North Carolina has considered support of the arts a vital concern. It owns and supports an art gallery in Raleigh and has contributed to the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra and subsidized outdoor dramas.

The General Assembly of North Carolina is considering a proposal to appropriate $325,000 for a school for the performing arts.

The proposal, strongly supported by Gov. Terry Sanford, is said to have a better-than-even chance of acceptance. The State school for music, dance, and drama would operate at the high school and college levels.

In Missouri, Gov. John M. Dalton named a 25-member arts committee last December. A bill has been introduced in the legislature to create a Missouri Council on the Arts.

In Minnesota, the legislature has rejuvenated a lagging arts program that is 60 years old and has passed a State Arts Council bill.

Kentucky has a varied program—all instituted since 1960. Through the State Council on Public Higher Education, the State contracts with the Louisville Symphony Orchestra—at $50,000 annually—for performances at State colleges. The Lexington Little Symphony, backed by State funds, plays in small cities in cooperation with local civic groups.

The Kentucky Council of Performing Arts was recently set up.

Michigan established a cultural commission in 1960, and it now has 100 members. William E. Stirton, a vice president of the University of Michigan who was serving as chairman, resigned in January, but he has continued his interest in the commission's activities.

Mr. Stirton said the commission had helped in establishing an artist in residence—a pianist—in Flint, and had encouraged communities to hold concerts and to develop arts centers.

VIRGINIA SUPPORTS THEATER

In Virginia, the Barter Theater at Abingdon has received an annual appropriation of $12,500 to $15,000 for many years.

The Virginia Museum of Fine Art in Richmond sends "artmobiles" with exhibitions to cities and towns. The museum helps plan programs through a statewide Confederation of the Arts established 2 years ago.

Nebraska created the Council for Nebraska's Cultural Resources in 1961. Its financing has come through private subscriptions and donations from individuals and corporations.

Dr. Walter Militzer, chairman of the council and dean of the University of Nebraska's College of Arts and Science, said that "at this point the council is a State coordinating agency for various local groups in cultural pursuits."

In Nevada, Gov. Grant Sawyer is appointing a 10-member committee to determine possible steps toward a program. Dr. Craig Shepherd, head of the University of Nevada's Art Department, will be chairman of the council.

Washington created a State arts council in 1961, but only $2,000 has been appropriated for the next 2 years.

In Ohio, a bill to create an Ohio Arts Evaluation Commission to help in determining the role of State agencies in the growth of the arts is being considered in the legislature.

"It has not yet been conclusively determined that new government support for the arts will be truly effective," Mr. MacFadyen said. "However, I believe that if this support develops with sound artistic objectives, a significant contribution to the arts in America will follow."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit this report because it emphasizes that in this case we are dealing not with afternoon tea parties, but with hard realities of power, culture, the theater, music, and other artistic performances, including those in the visual arts, and their exhibition. These represent a major factor in the world. All of them depict in ways that nothing else can what we have accomplished in these fields.

Therefore, this is a critically important arm of the American effort to achieve freedom in the world. I feel that this is the first time it is really beginning to receive the attention it deserves to receive. I urge that it be carried through, not with the idea of being a parlor enterprise for some very nice people, but as being one of the true indications of power and success on the part of our society.

DONOVAN AWARD TO JOHN J. McCLOY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of our great New Yorkers is John J. McCloy, a most distinguished American who has served his Nation in many high places, and who the other evening was honored to receive from an organization known as the Veterans of the OSS—the Office of Strategic Services—the "Wild Bill" Donovan Medal. As General Donovan has carried on the great tradition of his really heroic life as a soldier and statesman, this organization gives a medal annually to a very distinguished American whose record of public service is deemed to exemplify the major aspects of General Donovan's own career. I know few people in our country more deserving of the honor than Jack McCloy, as we all know him so affectionately.

Like the general, a veteran of World War I, John J. McCloy has served as the Assistant Secretary of War during World War II, as U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, as President Kennedy's coordinator of disarmament activities, and in 1962 was appointed by President Kennedy as Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the U.S. Government in connection with the Cuban crisis. In private life, Mr. McCloy is chairman of the board of directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

In accepting the William J. Donovan Award, Mr. McCloy described his friend as he had known him through the years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the address of the Honorable John J. McCloy, which he delivered at the annual dinner of the Veterans of the OSS, in New York City, June 5.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. McCLOY

I have been honored from time to time by awards of varying character, some of which have puzzled me as I could see little justification for my selection. On the other hand, there have been some which have meant so much to me that I simply have cherished them and have been so thankful that I was thought of in that connection that I have swept modesty aside in my delight to receive them. Tonight is one of those. Bill Donovan and his friendship meant so much to me over the years that to possess an award which bears his name, given by those who worked with him—by people who knew him and know me—that it was hard for me not to give the impression, to those who asked if I would receive it, that I was unseemingly eager.

I first met Bill Donovan in the course of World War I. I was traveling along the line with an old chief of mine who not only served in that war but who had fought the Indians on the Plains. So short is the span of U.S. history that this man who had been in the Indian wars only died relatively recently—a considerable time after the close of World War II. One of the divisions which we visited was the old 42d Rainbow Division, then commanded by General Menoher, and my chief, whose name was Guy Preston, had been at West Point with Menoher. In the course of the visit, he asked Menoher how he was getting along with his division. I remember Preston called Menoher by his West Point nickname, "Minnie," a familiarity in which I did not join as at that time I was only a lieutenant. Menoher replied that his division was getting along fine and if it could only continue successfully to contain two such extraordinary personalities as Douglas MacArthur and "Wild Bill" Donovan, he did not fear anything that the Germans would throw at him. I remember seeing both of them then—young, handsome, gallant, colorful—they seemed in their appearance to express all that I had ever heard about them and everything that was gallant and soldierly. Each had the Distinguished Service Cross and yet, it is significant that each of them, with all their great achievements in that war, had yet to make their greatest contribution to their country. Each of them went on to win the Medal of Honor and to render such mighty service to the winning of World War II.

I cherish among my possessions a picture of Bill Donovan taken at about that time, with his helmet cocked slightly on one side of his head and though it was not a color photograph, you can almost see the blue of his penetrating eyes. There is no doubt about your being able to see the burning spirit of the man.

There are a number of you here tonight who served with him in the AEF. To them, I do not need to recall the electric effect the mention of his name had among us.

Father Duffy tells how his personality pervaded the old 69th Regiment but that personality and his spirit also pervaded the whole 42d Division and from that division it went out to the entire AEF.

The tale of his exploits, his drive and his courage, went from dug-out to dug-out all along the line. There were no orders or messages or newspaper or radio broadcasts to pass it on—it was all word of mouth. What he had done on the Ourcq at St. Mihiel and the Argonne was mess talk everywhere. Many an officer led his troops better and more courageously through merely having heard the stories of Bill Donovan's energy and courage.

Homer said of one of his heroes that he was the bravest man that had come up under the walls of Troy. Maybe Bill was not the bravest man on the Western Front but he was among the bravest few. But he had more than courage—he had foresight and discernment. He saw the need for information and intelligence and the folly of attempting to face a challenge of the character of World War II without an organization thoroughly equipped to deal with all the ramifications that this need entailed. I like to think that I did a few things to help smooth his rather rough way toward the accomplishment of his objective, but as I look back on it now, I wish that I had done much more.

What a man. I used to think in World War II that all the Germans and Japanese needed to do was to put a tail on Bill Donovan and they could quickly identify the area of our next offensive. He ran to every fire. You couldn't anymore hold him in Washington when an attack was on than you could hold in a storm.

Bill knew everybody and most everyone knew him, but he had an inner quality that made him at times seem to me to be a rather lonely spirit. There was no one like him, in many ways quite unpredictable, unfathomable. I was at times in turn struck by his conviviality and his independence—almost his aloofness, but always he was a leader and a fighter and a friend. But really how uncalled for it is for me to describe Bill Donovan's character to a group consisting of his widow and his friends and fellow workers. It is not only uncalled for but presumptuous.

Let me just add this: Father Duffy, writing as of the time the 69th was stationed, after the close of hostilities in World War I at Remagen where another American unit was to cross the Rhine a quarter of a century later, spoke of the men whom he had been associated with in the regiment—some dead, others in hospitals or for one reason or another, about to leave the regiment.

"In a very special degree," he wrote, "I am going to miss Donovan." He went on to describe in a vivid manner some of his experiences with him during the fighting and then he ended up by writing, "I liked him for his alert mind and just views and ready wit, for his generous enthusiasms and his whole engaging personality. The richest gain I have gotten out of the war is the friendship of William J. Donovan."

In a very special degree all of us continue to miss Donovan and so I think you understand how much I am warmed by this award which will always refresh my memory of the ever-vital spirit of this outstanding patriot.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to supplement the statement which I made earlier today on the civil rights issue, which is a critically important issue before us, and to point out that every one of the items recommended by the President is an item which many of us here have worked on and put forward over the years. In the main—though there is at least one exception, that is, the so-called public accommodations section—they represent also recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which in my opinion has more than richly deserved the President's recommendation that its life be made permanent, as many of us have contended.

We have now come to a day of reckoning for the Nation, when the President has begun to assume the moral as well as the lawful leadership of the whole Nation in expressing what must be done in legislation in order to give redress to grievances of millions of Americans which they feel so deeply that they are willing to shed their blood in order to see them redressed. It must be noted that on the very same day there is the funeral at Arlington Cemetery of Medgar Evers, a martyr in this cause, assassinated because of his advocacy of it, in a part of our native land which is so inhospitable to these ideas that it harbors such an assassin.

All these events should not for a moment induce us to forget the tribute which is due to Members of this body—my own associates on the Republican side as well as those on the Democratic side—and to Members of the other body who, in and out of season, when the issue was not quite the intense cause which it now is, have advocated the cause with vigor, dedication, and considerable sacrifice. Many of those, including myself, have anticipated the time when the issue would burgeon into a national crisis, and have pointed out what a great mistake it is to wait until it is upon us, in violent terms, before we give some attention to grievances so deeply felt by so many millions of Americans merely because their skin happens to be of a different color from that of the majority.

The gratification for this day must at the same time represent a spirit of appreciation to those who have fought so hard to bring this day about, notwithstanding the fact that even now we have overstayed our time on this question.

I should like also to express a sense of dedication for the trials and struggles which lie ahead. This Chamber will be the scene of a bitter battle. I have deep confidence that we shall prevail, at long last, historically, in imposing cloture on a civil rights measure. But it will not be easy. Let every Senator steel himself to all-night sessions, the cots, and that sleepy look on the faces of Senators when they come into the Chamber three or four times a night to answer quorum calls. Then it will really be true, as it was in 1957, though we did not get out of that exercise what we should have in terms of the country's security, that they also serve who stay at home—home in the Senate Chamber.

We shall be at home, but we shall be serving the great interests of our country, and I think the great interests of freedom in the world. Our friends all around the world should take great heart today from what is happening in this Chamber with relation to the President's message, the united support which that message and the measures following it are receiving, and also the spirit of determination prevalent in this Chamber that this time we will not be turned aside or thwarted in our course.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York and point out that if the opponents of civil rights legislation make the great mistake of seeking to prevent passage of the measures against what I am certain is the overwhelming will of the great majority of the American people, they must follow exactly the parliamentary procedure the Senator from New York has outlined. He and I discussed the same subject the other day on the floor of the Senate. At that time we both expressed the point of view that we must break the filibuster, and that if it develops, the filibuster will be broken by American public opinion. But to get American public opinion pointed toward the breaking of a filibuster, the attention of the American people must be riveted on the Senate. It will be necessary in order to do that for the Senate not to keep banking hours in connection with the filibuster, but to remain in session week in and week out for as many weeks as it takes to break the filibuster. That means setting aside all the business of the Senate, because when all is said and done, in the year 1963 there is no business as important to American history as the deliverance of constitutional rights to all Americans, irrespective of the color of their skin.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague for his observations which are constructive and helpful. My colleague has emphasized what needs to be emphasized.

We shall not only sacrifice time and our personal disposition to be with our families, but also we shall sacrifice perhaps some very pet measures—perhaps even measures urgently needed by the country. But it seems to me the Senator is entirely correct in saying that the civil rights measures must have No. 1 priority. The President, as I read his message, has dedicated not only his head, but his heart. He is also dedicating his top priority program, displacing tax reduction. He has made that issue second, making civil rights first. Again I express my gratitude to the Senator for his statement.

I yield the floor.

FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in what appears to be fast becoming an annual affair, the Supreme Court has concluded its 1963 term with another controversial first amendment decision. The trend toward absolutism which has marked the Court's more recent approach to the religious guarantees has again manifested itself in the decisions in Murray against Curlett and Schempp against Abington Township School District. According to this latest pronouncement the reading of a verse from the Bible or recitation of the Lord's Prayer constitutes a breach of the law of the land in that they violate the first amendment to the Constitution.

Dean Griswold, of Harvard, has observed;

> Absolutes are likely to be phantoms eluding our grasp. Even if we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge * * * absolutism * * * is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light.

The spectre of religious sterility raised by the absolute construction of the establishment clause in the Regents' Prayer case—*Engel* v. *Vitale,* 370 U.S. 421 (1962)—is now upon us. These decisions should be disturbing to all God-fearing people everywhere. I am a stanch believer in the separation of church and state but not in the separation of God and government. The Constitution was written and this Government established by men of great religious conviction. The faith of the Founding Fathers was instilled in them at an early age, and permeated every aspect of not only their private but also their public lives. It is apparent that our children and all future generations are to be denied some of the religious opportunities which our forefathers so zealously sought to protect from Government interference.

As Dean Griswold points out, these decisions are based on the erroneous assumption that the first amendment was designed to effect an absolute divorcement of religion from every aspect of American public life. A cursory examination of American constitutional history indicates that this was never intended by the framers of the Constitution. The Court recognized this in *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (343 U.S. 306, 312–313 (1952)) wherein it said:

> The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the commonsense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be alien to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for Government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence.
>
> When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions.

Thomas Jefferson, Mr. President, paid eloquent tribute to this tradition when he said:

> God who gave us life, gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secured when we have removed the conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?

I appreciate the enormous difficulties implicit in constitutional interpretation, but even this endeavor requires due regard to the intent of the framers. Did the author of the first amendment comprehend the result announced earlier this week? James Madison, the father of that amendment, apprehended it to mean that:

> Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience * * * if the word "national" was inserted before religion, it would satisfy the minds of the honorable gentlemen. He believed that the people feared one sect might obtain a preeminence, or two combine together, and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform. He thought if the word "national" was introduced, it would point the amendment directly to the object it was intended to prevent. (I Annals of Congress 730–31 (1789–91).)

As noted by the late Professor Corwin:

> In short, "to establish" a religion was to give it a preferred status, a preeminence, carrying with it even the right to compel others to conform. But in fact, before Madison's proposal was passed by the House and went to the Senate it had been changed to read: "Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience"; and in the Senate this proposal was replaced by the following formula: "Congress shall make no law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship or prohibiting the free exercise of religion." That is, Congress should not prescribe a national faith, a possibility which those States with establishments of their own—Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Maryland, and South Carolina—probably regarded with fully as much concern as those which had gotten rid of their establishments. And the final form of the first amendment, which came from a committee of conference between the two Houses, appears to reflect this concern. (14 Law and Contemp. Prob. 9 (1949).)

Joseph Story thought that while the no-establishment clause inhibited Congress from giving preference to any Christian sect or denomination, it was not intended to withdraw the Christian religion as such from the protection of Congress. Thus, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution" he wrote:

> Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it * * * the general, if not the universal, sentiment in America was that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state, so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation if not universal indignation. (Joseph Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution," sec. 1874 (1833).)

Another constitutional authority of an earlier day had the same conception of "an establishment of religion."

Cooley wrote in the "Principles of Constitutional Law":

> "By establishment" is meant the setting up or recognition of a state church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be prohibited from recognizing religion, * * * where it might be done without drawing any invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organizations, or sects. (Cooley, "Principles of Constitutional Law," 224–225 (3 ed. 1898).)

Justice Holmes, Mr. President, said:

> The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience. (Common Law 1 (1881).)

The American experience in the area of religion has been marked by a toleration hitherto unknown in the annals of human history. This spark of religious freedom has now been raked up in the ashes of blind, ironclad, unreasoning, legal dogma.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week I announced that I intended to speak with some frequency on the floor of the Senate during the period of time that the foreign aid bill was pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and during the time it would be before the Senate itself for debate prior to a vote.

I announced that one of the reasons why I would follow that parliamentary course of action was that I think it is impossible, in the limited time we have in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, to get across to the American people the serious problems involved in the proposals of the administration on foreign aid this year.

It is important that those of us who are going to be called upon to vote on this subject matter carry out our trust of taking the facts of this issue to the

American people. It is one of the three or four most vital issues to the destiny of this country that will be considered by this Congress. The one we have discussed so much already today, the question of civil rights, I would put at the top of the list, because no matter from what angle one looks at the civil rights issue, he cannot escape the fact that it is of vital importance to the destiny of this Nation.

Thus far, the Foreign Relations Committee has been listening to the administration witnesses in support of the bill. It is my evaluation of the testimony to date that they have made an exceedingly weak case in support of the bill. They have dealt for the most part in broad generalities. But the time has come for us to examine the foreign aid bill in minutia, and present what I am satisfied are facts that clearly justify drastic reductions in the amount sought by the administration for foreign aid, and also a reduction in the number of countries that now receive foreign aid. The administration witnesses admit the number of 107. The Senator from Idaho, in a great speech the other day on the floor of the Senate, pointed out that, outside the Communist bloc, there are only eight nations in all the world who are not recipients of some form of American foreign aid.

The record is clear that since 1946 the American taxpayers have made available, in round numbers, $100 billion through fiscal year 1963.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion before our committee about the problem of loans. Some of the administration witnesses have countered that loans have increased. Our reply is, "Not fast enough."

It is true that 5 years ago some of us started strenuous objections to the maintenance of a foreign aid program of the proportions then being asked for. Five years ago 95 percent of our aid money was grant money and 5 percent loan money. We finally whittled the grant money down until a few years ago, 65 percent was grant money and 35 percent loan money.

The administration's bill this year would result in approximately the same proportion. But, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, that is not nearly good enough. Until the ratio is somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 percent loan money and 25 percent grant money, the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to vote against foreign aid.

I want to stress this again, because it needs to be said over and over again in order to get the American people to understand the facts. Here, as in the case of the civil rights issue, the final decision will not be made by the Congress of the United States: the final decision will be made by American public opinion. Members of Congress will discover that fact if they do not know it now. If the American public is to render an enlightened opinion in regard to the form that foreign aid should take, we must get the facts to the public, and we must answer such arguments as administration witnesses have been making on the subject matter of loans.

They have been testifying before our committee that there have been some increases in loans. But they use generalities. They talk about loans. It is necessary to ask—and we have been doing it—what kind of loans? What variety of loans? Of course, there is an interesting variety of loans. There are hard loans and soft loans. Hard loans are loans that are supposed to be paid, eventually, in American dollars. Soft loans are repaid in terms of foreign currency, available to us only in the country of the currency. We can spend that currency in those countries, in most instances, only with the permission of the country itself. Of course, that is not a loan—that is a subterfuge. To talk about that kind of financial arrangement as a loan, without being very careful to qualify it every time the administration spokesmen talk about loans, is, in my judgment, grossly misleading.

When we talk about loans, the average citizen assumes that the American taxpayer is going to get interest. We have asked for memoranda giving us a detailed account. It is interesting that in the formal testimony the administration witnesses presented to the committee they omitted any analysis of the loans themselves. The testimony was notable for what it did not say more than for what it did say. It was noticeable that the testimony failed to point out that a very large percentage of loans bear an interest rate of three-quarters of 1 percent, which, as we said in our cross examination of the witnesses, probably does not even cover the service charge of the loan. We asked for information on that subject, too. We want to know exactly what the American taxpayer is out of pocket in connection with every dollar of foreign aid.

If a loan is obtained at three-quarters of 1 percent interest, the American taxpayer is out of pocket additional millions of dollars. Do not forget, hard American dollars cannot be loaned to country X, Y, or Z at three-quarters of 1 percent without the American taxpayer in fact giving a substantial additional amount of aid to the country that is the recipient of a low interest loan.

Why? It is because of the operation of our monetary system that the American taxpayer must pay the cost of the use of that money, for the American taxpayer, through the Department of the Treasury, borrows the money that is loaned to a foreign country, and the American taxpayer, in fact, pays an interest charge for the use of that money by his own Government. That is a flexible figure, but the last one I saw from the Treasury Department was that such loans cost the American taxpayer 3¼ percent.

If we are getting no higher than three-quarters of 1 percent in interest from a foreign country, it means that we are making an additional subsidy grant to the country that obtains this kind of loan.

The American people must understand that point. I find that as they understand it, increasing numbers of them share the point of view of those of us who are critical of the foreign aid programs.

It was also brought out in the cross-examination of the administration witnesses that there is a grace period on many loans for as long as 10 years; that is, for 10 years the countries do not have to pay a cent in reduction of the principal.

We have tried in the Committee on Foreign Relations hearings to bring out the fact that this creates some very serious psychological barriers in the way of the final payment of the loan, and that it will create in the opinion of some of us a feeling on the part of many nations, "Well, eventually they will forgive the whole thing; there will not be 10 years of grace, but there will be grace in perpetuity; and eventually, we can get a final cancellation of the loan."

As we go around the world, as some members of the Foreign Relations Committee do from time to time, we find—at least I have found—the increasing impression developing that in many instances Uncle Sam probably will not ever even attempt to collect the loan. This must be stopped. We have a great, solemn obligation to protect the financial interest of the American taxpayer in our foreign aid program; and we have not been doing it.

I make these comments in further explanation of why I will follow what in some quarters is regarded as an unpopular course of action in using this desk in the Senate as the medium for disseminating factual knowledge to the American people about the operation of the foreign aid program.

AID PROGRAM RELATES TO NATO NUCLEAR FORCE

Mr. President, the debate this year over foreign aid foreshadows another international issue that promises to be costly, and, in my opinion, valueless to the United States. It is the issue of the surface fleet of missile-carrying freighters being proposed by the United States for the use of NATO. It involves another heavy expenditure. It involves another subsidy to NATO, at a time when most of the NATO countries are in better financial position than the United States, and when they ought to be required to start paying a greater share of the burden of protecting freedom in the world.

Because West Germany is denied by treaty the right to manufacture nuclear weapons or missiles, and because many Europeans fear that the United States would not use its domestic-based weapons in defense of Europe, the administration believes that a NATO nuclear force will accommodate the objections of our allies to the current U.S. monopoly over the nuclear forces of the Western World. Our proposal calls for the manning of these vessels by mixed crews from all participating nations; neither the crews nor any of the component forces could be withdrawn from NATO command by the contributing country.

This subject was discussed in some depth at the recent Ottawa Conference. In my judgment, that conference bodes ill for the United States, if we carry out the U.S. proposal for further aid to NATO, to which the Ottawa meeting was only a preliminary. Today I direct my attention to this particular proposal.

It stems from a great dilemma facing the United States. On the one hand, our allies are more economically and politically independent than at any time since World War II; they doubt that they should continue to rely completely on the U.S. nuclear force for their protection. The European members of NATO are impatient to have nuclear forces of their own, that will not be subject to American control and American veto.

On the other hand, the United States is anxious to prevent the spread of independent nuclear forces. We know that so long as only we and the Soviet Union have the nuclear capacity, the possibilities of nuclear war can be controlled by our two countries. Once many nations have the nuclear capacity, we will lose control of the peace or war issue, so far as the Western World is concerned.

The answer of the administration has, in effect, been an effort to preempt nuclear forces by almost literally "buying them up." We know it would be very expensive for our European allies to finance the huge development of nuclear and missile forces. So we are offering to pay 40 percent of the cost of a nuclear force under NATO command, with the understanding that although they will share in its operation, we will continue to have a veto over its use.

We are proposing that the United States and Germany each pay 40 percent of the cost of this surface fleet, which will amount to about $2½ billion apiece, with Britain scheduled to pay only 10 percent and all the others the remaining 10 percent. Moreover, we are trying to "sweeten the pot" for the Europeans by telling them the freighters will be built in their shipyards. Nothing is being said about how many will be built in American shipyards, which need business much more, in many cases, than do the Europeans, nor about the further drain of U.S. dollars into Europe which this will cause.

UNITED STATES CANNOT CONTROL ALL WESTERN NUCLEAR FORCES

It is my present opinion that the venture will be a failure. It will fail because in the end, we not only will have paid much more than our share, but we will lose control of it, too. The effort to maintain complete control over western nuclear forces is an impossible objective to achieve. We all recognize the fact that it was only possible while the United States alone was financially able to develop such forces.

Today, France, Britain, and Germany are all capable of developing them alone, and certainly on a cooperative basis. Right now, France is going ahead with her independent nuclear force, and having nothing to do with the surface fleet because of our veto over it. So even if we proceed, we still will not accomplish our objective of monopolizing western nuclear power.

The only way we can bring France into this force and persuade her to give up her independent force, is to give up our veto. That is why I say that in the end we not only will be paying France's share of this force, but we will lose control of it, too.

In short, the whole idea is unsound financially and militarily for the United States. I am sorry to see President Kennedy going to Europe to promote something that seems to me so ill-advised. However I do not see how he can possibly go to Europe and not have this subject matter raised in one or more of his conferences.

The current debate on foreign aid will center on the undue share of the military burden of the Western World already being borne by the United States. We must immediately bring home to our allies and to the administration that there is a limit to what can be bought with American money. The time to start bringing that home is in the consideration of the foreign aid bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that he may raise the point of no quorum, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my request.

Mr. MORSE. Is this a call for a quorum prior to a speech that the distinguished Senator from Virginia plans to make? If so, I shall be delighted to join in the request.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The call for the quorum will be to enable several Senators who wish to be present when I make a brief speech concerning the decision of the Supreme Court on Monday, last, in the prayer case, to come to the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to know that. The only reason why I inquired was that I assumed that later in the afternoon the President's message on civil rights would be read.

Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that in accordance with understandings previously reached today, the President's message on civil rights will be read to the Senate later this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The message is at the desk; it has not been read. The Chair does not know what the pleasure of the Senate is.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to hear the speech by the Senator from Virginia. Following the delivery of that speech, the Senator from Oregon will request that the President's message on civil rights be read. At that time, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FONG. The Republican Senators are now having a conference on the civil rights bill. It is our hope that if there is to be a call for a live quorum, it will be deferred until after the conclusion of that conference.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The call that is about to be requested by the Senator from Tennessee will not be for a live quorum.

Mr. GORE. I do not intend to insist upon a live quorum. Some Senators have expressed a desire to be notified in order that they may be present when the distinguished Senator from Virginia speaks. I am about to renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum; and after the call has proceeded for a few names, I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. FONG. Very well.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRAYER CASE DECISION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the decision announced on Monday by the U.S. Supreme Court in the prayer cases from Pennsylvania and Maryland is so long, so involved, and so contradictory, that it is difficult to accurately appraise what it actually means. Of course, it carries forward the two basic errors of the New York prayer case of last year; namely, a misinterpretation of the meaning of the words "establishment of religion" and the application of the due process clause of the 14th amendment to State laws on the subject of prayers in public schools.

As I pointed out last year, and as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] so effectively pointed out on the NBC television program last Monday night, what Jefferson, Madison, and other advocates of separation of church and state complained of in colonial days was the maintenance by taxation of an official state religion. In Virginia, it was the Church of England. There can be no doubt about the fact that when Madison framed the first amendment and used the words "establishment of religion," he used them in the sense that everyone in his day and time used that phrase, mainly to designate a religious institution, commonly called a church. That interpretation was concurred in by the Congress, which shortly after the adoption of the first amendment voted to employ Chaplains for the House and Senate and for the Armed Forces. Needless to say, the authority, under the first amendment, to spend the taxpayers' money to employ a minister to offer official prayers in the House and in the Senate was challenged on the ground that it violated the first amendment. By a very substantial majority, Congress voted against that contention.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he is making. I think it is both timely and appropriate.

Is it not true that in determining the construction of constitutional amendments or statutes or any piece of legislation, if there is the slightest contradiction in the amendment or the statute, it is the duty of the courts to go back and determine the intent of the framers of the constitutional amendment or piece of legislation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely true. Furthermore, all the great writers on the interpretation of the Constitution say that one must interpret its words in accordance with their meaning when they were written in 1787.

Mr. TALMADGE. The distinguished Senator's statement is quite true.

I am sure he has studied all the various opinions of the Court in connection with this decision. In studying that decision, was he not shocked, as I was, to find that they went back very little, if at all, to the writings of Jefferson and Madison, to determine what the first amendment meant when it was adopted?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is entirely true.

It may surprise the Senator from Georgia when I call as a witness in his behalf the distinguished dean of the Harvard Law School. That law school may not be—as some claim—the greatest one in the world; but certainly it is a great law school, and it is known for its liberality. Yet Dean Griswold, of Harvard Law School, when speaking last March to the law class of the University of Utah, had this to say about the misinterpretation by the Court of the words involved:

> An institution charged with the role which the Supreme Court has successfully filled for so many years is entitled to our respect and understanding. If one criticizes the Court (as people have always done in the past, and should continue to do in the future), it should be essentially for the purpose of trying to contribute to that respect and to that understanding. The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task. It is in that spirit that my remarks are offered.
>
> A TEXT CITED
>
> A number of years ago I saw in the Saturday Review a little item which may serve as a text for my remarks.
>
> It reads as follows:
>
> "In the land of Absolute, where everyone and everything is perfect, there is no light at night.
>
> "The annals of the Absolutians record that they once discovered the electric light, but as is known, the perfect electric light burns in a perfect vacuum.
>
> "Absolute is in the dark."
>
> Absolutes are likely to be phantoms, eluding our grasp. Even if we think we have embraced them, they are likely to be misleading. If we start from absolute premises, we may find that we only oversimplify our problems and thus reach unsound results. It may well be that absolutes are the greatest hindrance to sound and useful thought—in law, as in other fields of human knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases, in a species of absolutism in its reasoning, which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging.
>
> The most extreme form of the absolutist position has been taken by Mr. Justice Black, particularly in certain extrajudicial pronouncements. Thus, in his James Madison lecture at New York University, he said: "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.'"
>
> And he reiterated this, and extended it in a publicized interview in which he dealt specifically wth the first amendment, which you will recall, reads in the following terms:
>
> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."
>
> Justice Black lays great stress on the words "no law" in the opening phrase which says: "Congress shall make no law." Just to make it clear that he would not be misunderstood, he went on to say that laws about libel and slander are invalid. And he added: "I have an idea there are some absolutes. I do not think I am far in that respect from the Holy Scriptures."
>
> THE NEW YORK CASE
>
> Within the last year, a case came before the Supreme Court which directly involved the interpretation and application of the first amendment. This was the New York school prayer case. Its name is *Engel* v. *Vitale*. It involved a prayer formulated by the State board of regents in New York, and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State. The prayer, in its entirety, was as follows:
>
> "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."
>
> The Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, held that the reciting of this prayer in the public schools of New York violated the Constitution. It was, the Court held, an "establishment of religion," forbidden by the first amendment. Five of his colleagues joined with him. Mr. Justice Stewart dissented. Justice Douglas wrote a concurring opinion which, though differing some in his reasoning, showed the absolutist approach. He recounted all of the ways in which governmental bodies now finance some activity with a religious element or overtone: Chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services; compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services in Federal hospitals and prisons: religious proclamations by the President: "In God we trust" on our money; Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia; and many other things, including exemption from the Federal income tax and postal privileges for religious organizations. All of this is bad, according to Justice Douglas. After recognizing that "Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with" such things, he said, summarily, and absolutely: "Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." It's as simple as that. They are all bad. And perhaps they are if the absolutist approach to such matters can be accepted as sound. These are the lengths to which absolutism takes us.
>
> LOOK AT THE WORDING
>
> But is it all as clear as this? Do words convey such positive and overpowering meaning? Is there no room whatever for thought or consideration? Perhaps it would be worthwhile just to look carefully at the words of the first amendment, in all its majesty. I will not yield to any Justice of the Supreme Court in my respect for those words, or, in my conception of their importance not merely in our history but in their present function and worth in helping us to preserve a free Nation. But what do they say? "Congress shall make no law."
>
> Congress had made no law in the Engel case; no law of Congress was in any way involved.
>
> What is it that Congress can make no law about? It is an establishment of religion. What does that term mean? That takes some construing, too. Certainly there was much history behind the phrase. Not only did England (and Scotland) have an established church, but there were established churches in a number of the States at the time the first amendment was adopted. And they were something very different from a regents' recommended prayer. It takes a measure of construction to bring this prayer within the no-establishment clause. "No law" may well mean no law.
>
> But "establishment of religion" might mean establishment of religion; and those who wrote the establishment of religion clause might be rather perplexed by the use which has been made of it in 1962. "No law" means no law. It is as simple as that—that is, if one ignores the other words which are involved in the task, such as "Congress," "establishment of religion," "the free exercise thereof," and "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not say that these are meaningless words. I do suggest they are words which require construction, which are by no means absolute in form or content, and that to ignore them under the guise of the absolutist approach is to fail to recognize and perform the most significant and fundamental part of the task of judging.
>
> UNFORTUNATE MOVE
>
> Let me now turn to another aspect of the matter. I think it was unfortunate that the question involved in the Engel case was ever thought of as a matter for judicial decision, that it was unfortunate that the Court decided the case, one way or the other, and that the unhappy situation resulted solely from the absolutist position which the Court has taken.
>
> What do I mean by this? I have in mind at least two separate lines of thought. One is the fact that we have a tradition, a spiritual and cultural tradition, of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution itself, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect. The other is that there are some matters which are essentially local in nature, important matters, but nonetheless matters to be worked out by the people themselves in their own communities, when no basic rights of others are impaired.
>
> First, as to the long tradition. Is it not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian Nation? Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian Nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

PROVISIONS OF SWEEP

It is perfectly true that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These are great provisions, of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any sort of public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces, chapels in prisons, "in God we trust" on our money, to mention only a few. Must all of these things be rigorously extirpated in order to satisfy a constitutional absolutism?

Does our deep-seated tolerance of all religions—or, to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the Founders that it would. It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come before the Court in the first 150 years of our constitutional history. I do not believe that the contentions now made would occur to any man who could free himself from an absolute approach, to the problem.

MATTERS FOR COMMUNITIES

Now let me turn to the other point—that there are some matters which should be settled on the local level, in each community, and should not become great Supreme Court cases. The prayer involved in the Engel case was not compulsory. As the Supreme Court itself recited, no pupil was compelled "to join in the prayer over his or his parents' objection." This, to me, is crucial. If any student was compelled to join against his conviction, this would present a serious and justiciable question, akin to that presented in the flag salute case. The Supreme Court did not give sufficient weight to this fact, in my opinion, and relied heavily on such things as the history of the Book of Common Prayer, which, under various acts of Parliament, was compulsory on all.

COMMUNITY DETERMINATION

Where there is no compulsion, what happens if these matters are left to the determination of each community? In New York, this determination was made by the elected authorities of the school district. It was, indeed, a fact that a large number of the school districts in New York did not adopt the so-called regents' prayer. Where such a decision was reached, there can surely be no constitutional objection on the ground that it was a decision locally arrived at, or that it amounts to an "establishment" of "no religion." But, suppose that in a particular school district, as in New Hyde Park, it was determined that the prayer should be used as a part of the opening exercises of the school day. Remember that it is not compulsory. No pupil is compelled to participate. Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? This would suggest that no school can have a pledge of allegiance to the flag if any student does not wish to join.

This is a country of religious toleration. That is a great consequence of our history embodied in the first amendment. But does religious toleration mean religious sterility? I wonder why it should be thought that it does. This is a Christian country, in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics, I think it can be said, that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious belief, and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief. But does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition? The Moslem who comes here may worship as he pleases, and may hold public office without discrimination. That is as it should be. But why should it follow that he can require others to give up their Christian tradition merely because he is a tolerated and welcomed member of the community?

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Though we have a considerable common cultural heritage, there have always been minority groups in our country. This, I am sure, has been healthy and educational for all concerned. We have surely gained from having a less homogeneous population. Of course, the rights of all, especially those of minorities, must be protected and preserved. But does that require that the majority, where there is such a majority, must give up its cultural heritage and tradition? Why?

Let us consider the Jewish child, or the Catholic child, or the nonbeliever, or the Congregationalist, or the Quaker. He, either alone, or with a few or many others of his views, attends a public school, whose school district, by local action, has prescribed the regents' prayer. When the prayer is recited, if this child or his parents feel that he cannot participate, he may stand or sit, in respectful attention, while the other children take part in the ceremony. Or he may leave the room. It is said that this is bad, because it sets him apart from other children. It is even said that there is an element of compulsion in this—what the Supreme Court has called an indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform.

But is this the way it should be looked at? The child of a nonconforming or a minority group is, to be sure, different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable and educational for him to learn and observe this, in the atmosphere of the school—not so much that he is different, as that other children are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted? No compulsion is put upon him. He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and to respect what they feel is significant to them.

SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

Is this not a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the majority group? They experience the values of their own culture; but they also see that there are others who do not accept those values, and that they are wholly tolerated in their nonacceptance. Learning tolerance for other persons, no matter how different, and respect for their beliefs, may be an important part of American education, and wholly consistent with the first amendment. No one would think otherwise were it not for parents who take an absolutist approach to the problem, perhaps encouraged by the absolutist expressions of justices of the Supreme Court, on and off the bench.

It is appropriate here to say something about the problems of the Sunday law cases. Because of the absolutist approach, these cases were very hard for the court, when I think they should have been quite easy—as is evidenced, I believe, by the fact that no such question was ever raised for 150 years after the adoption of the first amendment. It is true that many of the State statutes were a hodgepodge, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. But it is perfectly plain that the observance of Sunday has religious roots and origins. This is equally plain as to the observance of Christmas and Thanksgiving. Is that bad? Are these things not all part of our history, our culture, our heritage, our tradition? Must we give them all up because of a newly found absolutist approach to a problem which cannot possibly be resolved wisely in absolutist terms?

THE DAY OF REST

A day of rest is very deeply seated in all societies. Generally, as in our culture, it has an origin which is at least partially religious. But it has a wider basis than that. And it is a thing, good in itself, which loses much of its good unless it is observed by all on the same basis. If a majority of the people want to observe Sunday as a day on which ordinary work is not performed, even though there may be some religious motivation in picking that day, I find it hard to see that there is anything wrong or oppressive in making that law applicable to all members of the community—as long as the persons who do not care to observe Sunday themselves are not compelled to do anything.

Cannot much the same thing be said for Thanksgiving and Christmas, and Christmas carols in the school, and simple, thoughtfully chosen Bible readings, and Christmas decorations in public places, and all the many other things which are a happy part of the culture and tradition of a large portion of our society?

TOLERATION BY MINORITIES

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the first amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the 14th amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as anyone else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia is entirely correct; and I think Dean Griswold, of Harvard Law School, in that instance also was entirely correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the Senator from Georgia is correct, and that Dean Griswold was correct in stating that the Supreme Court has simply ignored the ordinary meaning of the words used, and has deliberately misconstrued their meaning, both in the case decided last year, and in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases decided this summer.

Of course, logic is reduced to a farce when the Supreme Court holds that if a schoolchild reads a sentence from the Bible or if the class joins in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and attendance at such exercises is not compulsory, it is an exercise of religion which amounts to the establishment of a religious institution, namely, a church, but that when taxpayers' money is appropriated for the employment of ministers who, under the law are required to offer a prayer at the opening each day of both the House and the Senate, that is not a religious exercise, but simply is a ceremony.

Not many Senators were present today when our Chaplain, Dr. Harris, complied with that law. He is a Government official, and he is paid with the taxpayers' money. Whenever we meet, he is required to pray. I thought his prayer today was a very appropriate and very effective one. He prayed as follows:

> Our Father, God, in whose merciful, yet just hands is the destiny of Thy children, and whose final appraisals we, who see but through a glass darkly, cannot discern clearly, help us to live and act as if each new day were to be the last with which we would be entrusted with the stewardship of life, knowing that—
>
> "The busy tribes of flesh and blood
> With all their cares and fears,
> Are carried downward by the flood
> And lost in following years."
>
> Yet, as life on this brief earth stage is granted us, save us from living on a small scale in a great day, and from toying with the tiny when we ought to be lured by the titanic.
>
> In tempestuous days, in the midst of flaming national agitations, grant us the calm wisdom that will perpetuate for all the future the vision of unity in diversity, which is the pulsing heart of free government.
>
> Even amid the fierce fires of national and global contention and division, may all barriers to brotherhood be burned away, as we—as citizens of one commonwealth—choose for the ruling passion of our hearts to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God.
>
> In the dear Redeemer's Name we ask it. Amen.

The Supreme Court has said that is not a religious exercise, but is a ceremony so inconsequential, from a religious standpoint, that it is beneath the notice of the Court; and the Court has said it will not pay any attention to it.

Surely we could have that prayer. Yet the children in New York cannot offer a little prayer. In New York it was voluntary with each school board whether or not the prayer should be offered, and they only asked God to bless the country, to bless their parents, and to bless their teacher and their school. But, no. That was a religious exercise which had to be prohibited. We can meet here and pay a distinguished minister of the Methodist Church taxpayers' money, and yet New York school boards could not permit a prayer which blessed the children's parents, the Nation, and their teacher. That is reducing logic to an absurdity.

What I wish to point out today is, first, the Court has continued to misconstrue the meaning of the first amendment, and, secondly, it has continued to abuse the due process clause of the 14th amendment by applying it to State laws relating to school prayers just as it abused it when it was applied to the question of segregation in public schools.

I criticize no minister of the gospel who approves the recent ruling of the Court because it emphasizes the fundamental principle of separation of church and state. I believe in and endorse that principle as strongly as anyone and I, of necessity, realize that when lawyers disagree concerning the interpretation of the Constitution, we should not expect ministers of the Gospel to take into consideration that phase of the issue confronting us.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has so effectively pointed out, the first amendment provides Congress shall make no law, and so forth, and the answer, of course, is Congress has not done so. He also pointed out the fact that Congress should make no law to prohibit the free exercise of religion and that, of course, includes the Supreme Court. But, when the Supreme Court prohibits a group of children from either reading a passage of Scripture or reciting the Lord's Prayer as an evidence of their belief in God, it has passed a law which prohibits the free exercise of religion as contemplated by the first amendment. State aid to religion is one thing. A roadblock thrown by a State agency is another.

There is one definite holding in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases which frankly surprised me, but I am not sure the Court will not subsequently reverse its position on that phase of the matter.

The Court claims that its holdings in the three prayer cases do not prohibit the teaching of the Bible as history or literature in public schools. Personally, I have never favored any State legislation on the subject, but I have taken the position, first, that the reading of Scripture in the schools was beyond the reach of the Federal Government and, secondly, that the study of the Bible in the schools was under the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. Previous Court decisions have prohibited the study of the Bible in public schools, and in no State is such study now included during regular school hours. Yet, the Supreme Court in the two prayer cases says that one's education is not complete without such a study.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. In effect, did not the Court hold that religion could be studied along with ancient Greek mythology and in the same category?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, provided it was not called teaching the Christian religion. If it is called history, if its influence on civilization is shown, or if it involves the question of whether or not Job was scientifically accurate in his statement about the power of God some 3,000 years ago, that would be all right, provided, the Court said, it were done in an objective way.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not also true that under the decisions the Court handed down on Monday of this week it is legal to use God's name irreverently in the school and illegal to use it reverently?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what it adds up to. That is the holding according to the leading editorial of today's issue of the Wall Street Journal. The decision would make us a godless nation. I should like to read that editorial. It is as follows:

> IMAGINED DANGERS AND REAL ISSUES
>
> Of all the dangers to a free society of which our forefathers were fearful, and against which they sought to safeguard the people in the Constitution, the one that time has proved of no danger is that the state would prescribe a religious belief.
>
> In our history we have had many constitutional crises, some of which nearly tore the country apart. We are torn today by a constitutional issue, that of the treatment of our Negro citizens, which will require the utmost efforts of great minds to resolve without lasting political wounds.
>
> But nowhere in our history will you find any serious threat by any church or sect to seize the state or to persuade the state to use its powers to establish it as the state religion.
>
> This elementary fact of our history, quite apart from all of the philosophical arguments, seems to us to make absolute nonsense of the Supreme Court's decision about Bible readings in the public schools. A more ponderous effort upon a more trivial issue has rarely, if ever, emerged from the robed men who sit upon that Bench.
>
> This is not to say that the result of the decision is trivial, or that its consequences do not now raise grave questions. For what the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the state, is to establish secularization—atheism, if you would have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the state's power will extend its protection.
>
> Thus if you believe in the God of the Jews, the God of the Christians, or the God of Islam, you are denied absolutely any public expression of it in the schools which the public supports. Hereafter the views of the nonbeliever alone are sheltered by the full panoply of the state's police powers.
>
> The legal and philosophical answer to this interpretation of the Constitution, it seems to us, has been well put by Mr. Justice Stewart. "We err * * * if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and government must necessary interact in countless ways." He cites example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the state support of chaplains to minister to those in the Armed Forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.
>
> And he puts his finger surely upon the specious argument of Government "neutrality" about religion. The duty of the state is to "accommodate those differences" of belief which a free society makes inevitable, not to try to set up "impermissible categories" and so throw its weight against those who may desire public expression of their beliefs.
>
> "A compulsory State educational system so structures a child's life," he observes, "that if religious exercises are held to be impermissible in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and State-created disadvantage." In short, not neutrality but State action against religion.
>
> Yet much as we share Justice Stewart's views, it is not alone the philosophy of the Court majority that troubles us. Surely it is a distortion of the Constitution to suggest that when the Founding Fathers put into it the prohibition against "the establishment of religion" they were aiming even distantly at a prohibition against the reading of Scripture or of prayers in public bodies, including the schools. To them "establishment" meant literally setting up a state religion.
>
> It is certainly a distortion of the views of such men as Madison and Jefferson and Roger Williams to suggest that their devotion to religious liberty is somehow the seed of the the view to which this Court has now come, depriving people of the liberty to express their religious views openly in the school.
>
> And what are we to make of it when this Court, in order to buttress this opinion, reminds us of the danger "that powerful sects * * * might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions"? Are we to suppose that this danger, rightly guarded against by the Constitution, is somehow now

> threatened because schoolchildren hear the Bible read?
>
> Apparently so. For in warning us against this "minor encroachment" against the Constitution, the Court thunders that "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Here, without doubt, is upside-down logic. For if there has been any consistent trend in our religious history, it is that what might once have been described as a raging torrent of religious intolerance has become by comparison a trickling stream.
>
> It is this disparity between argument and reality, between cause and remedy, that troubles us in the Court's decision. Perhaps it is undesirable public policy—although we do not think so—to provide a moment of prayer, or a brief reading of the Scriptures, in a school whose purpose is to teach the ideas upon which Western society is based.
>
> But it is wholly ridiculous to argue that this practice, followed by generation after generation without injury to our institutions, is now suddenly become a thing to undermine the Republic and demand the most absolute prohibitions against it in the name of the Constitution.
>
> And it does not augur well for the future to see our highest judges torture history and turn metaphysical handsprings to justify that which they wish to decide. In the real Constitutional issues which face the Nation today we should not have to fear that small minds will be brought to great questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to read a brief excerpt from James Reston's column in today's issue of the New York Times. Apparently Mr. Reston thinks that when the decision is understood it will be all right. Nevertheless, I desire to read a quotation from Lord Bryce which he includes in his column:

> "One is startled by the thought," Lord Bryce wrote in the American Commonwealth 80 years ago, "of what might befall this huge yet delicate fabric of laws and commerce, and social institutions were the foundations it has rested on to crumble away * * *
>
> "It is an old saying that monarchies live by honor and republics by virtue. The more democratic republics become, the more the masses grow conscious of their own power, the more do they need to live, not only by patriotism, but by reverence, and self-control, and the more essential to their well-being are those sources whence reverence and self-control flow."

Mr. ROBERTSON. In my history course I studied Lord Bryce's Commonwealth. There could not be a more fundamental proposition than that a democracy rests upon democratic people who practice self-discipline and control. There is an old English adage which states that "a law never rises above its enforcement." It goes beyond that. A law never rises above the moral level of the people for whom it is to be applied.

Lord Bryce said that in our unique experiment, in which we are to have a maximum of freedom, we must exercise such freedom with self-control.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And reverence.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And reverence. Where do we get the doctrine of a good neighbor? Where do we get the Golden Rule? Where do we get the Sermon on the Mount, or the concept of meekness, justice, and fairness.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In effect he said that great pains must be taken to make certain that the sources from which we derive reverence and self-control shall not crumble away.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am gratified that the head of the great Harvard Law School emphasized that point also.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, Dean Griswold.

Mr. ROBERTSON. He said:

> First, as to the long tradition. It is not clear as a matter of historical fact that this was a Christian Nation? Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchison, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian Nation, having developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought. Nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The various opinions—concurring, dissenting and otherwise—serve to create a great deal of confusion as to what is really intended.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is quite correct. Mr. Justice Clark wrote 23 pages by himself, and Mr. Justice Brennan added 77 pages.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I correctly understand what the Supreme Court said, in effect, it said it was illegal or unconstitutional to compel students in school to observe these religious exercises.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. The Court went beyond that. Both in Pennsylvania and in Maryland the students could be excused. Nobody was compelled to attend.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the point I was about to make.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Apparently when the Court first laid down the rule and set up the various exemptions it seemed that what it was trying to get at was that it was illegal to compel attendance.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was about to point out that in the case before the Court no student was compelled to attend the exercise. I believe they exempted the Chaplain of the Senate on the ground that Senators were not compelled to attend the prayer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. They merely said that we engaged in a ceremony which did not amount to anything.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I take that to mean practically the same thing. I do not understand the distinction between a religious ceremony and a religious exercise.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The argument was reduced to a farce. Who can understand the distinction when the argument has been reduced to a farce?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is there any difference between a student in Baltimore being excused from class and a Senator who does not wish to attend not having to attend to hear the Chaplain's prayer?

Mr. ROBERTSON. My distinguished friend from Alabama, who is a Phi Beta Kappa from a great university, is absolutely correct. We have in the Senate only an opportunity. We can come to the Senate to hear a beautiful prayer such as that delivered today, or we can stay in our offices or go to the cloakroom when the prayer is being offered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Exactly as the student could do at the Baltimore school.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. What did the Court say? It said, "We will put all the rights in this country behind the few atheists who deny God and the Bible."

That was said after all our history, which has shown our Nation to be a Christian nation.

There is inscribed in this Chamber, under the clock on the wall, "In God we trust." Do we mean it? The Supreme Court says, "You had better not say it officially."

Mr. SPARKMAN. What did Congress and the President mean, when, acting together, they wrote into the law a requirement that in the pledge of allegiance to the flag we should say, "One nation, under God"?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We meant that we were not a communistic nation which denied God and repudiated the Bible. We meant to say that we believed in God, that our forefathers were Christian people, that they founded a Christian nation, and that as one people undivided we wanted to preserve it that way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator feel that decisions such as this are contributing to the crumbling of the sources of reverence and self-restraint which Lord Bryce spoke of as being the virtue of the American Republic?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no doubt about it.

This is our lovely capital city. In this city there is eventually to be the most beautiful and costly cathedral of the whole United States, challenging even the best of Europe. There are beautiful churches for all denominations. There are wonderful boulevards and parks.

Yet this city leads the Nation in crime of all kinds, as well as disrespect for the Bible and for the fact that we are a Christian nation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more? Then I shall not impose on him further.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield. I am glad to have these questions, because it indicates that my colleague the Senator from Alabama realizes we are dealing with a very serious problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had the privilege of reading the Senator's speech before he started to deliver it. I commend and compliment the Senator for giving it. I hope the speech will be widely read.

I say this not merely because I am in the presence of the Senator from Virginia. I consider the Senator to be one of the great Bible scholars and religious leaders of this Nation. In fact, if the term is proper, I would say he is one of the greatest lay theologians there are, and great weight should be given to the opinions he is expressing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my friend praises me beyond my just deserts, but naturally I greatly appreciate such high tribute.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I wish to associate myself with the wonderful speech which the Senator has prepared. I appreciate the fact that the Senator sent me a copy, so that I could read it before I came to the Chamber. I have read it. It is a great speech. I wish that everyone in the United States who can read could read it. It would do everyone good.

I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Is it not true that nearly all of the laws which govern this Nation were originally taken from the Bible?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The whole concept of private enterprise was based upon the Bible. Foreign nations did not have it. The king took what he wanted. The nobles took what they wanted. The poor "run of the mine" people were lucky to get enough to eat.

The Bible condemned Ahab for taking Naboth's vineyard, and the prophet said that the dogs of the street would lick his blood.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. And they did.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And they did. A commandment was handed down on Sinai to Moses which said, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Neither shalt thou steal" another man's property.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That provision is in our law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. From where do we get that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. From the Bible.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. From where did we get "Thou shalt not kill. Neither shalt thou commit adultery. Neither shalt thou steal"?

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is killing the Macmillan government in England today? Of course, there is a little debate going on as to whether it involves adultery or lying about it, but it is all hooked up together, and it will defeat the Conservative government in England today.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That comes back to "Neither shalt thou bear false witness against thy neighbor," which came from the Bible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That came from the Bible.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Is it not true that if we should stop teaching the Bible concepts in the schools, or even referring to the Bible at all, the younger generations now in the first, second, and third grades would not know about it and would not have any conception of the key language by which we determine right and wrong?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The atheists have said, "We do not want them to learn about it." Others say, "Well, teach them at home."

How many homes open the morning with a prayer? How many even say a simple "Thank God" before they break bread for the morning meal? The children get up and rush off to school or somewhere else. Many no longer learn much at home.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Most of them do not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Many of them do not. At least, the child is afforded some means of paying reverence to a Supreme Being.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I was telling someone the other day that we got our speed laws from the Bible. He asked "How?" I said, "From the words 'Thou shall not kill.'" If people did not go racing down the roads, and running into people, there would not be any need for speed laws. The States have laws to stop people from killing others. Of course, they can kill themselves.

Our form of government, and what is good about it, virtually and basically came from the Bible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Justice Clark concurs. Listen to what he said:

> In addition, it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization.

We are talking about ethical principles based upon the teachings of the Bible. That is what has advanced civilization. Civilization has not advanced because of the law of the jungle, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

Justice Clark goes further:

> It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic values. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively—

Whatever that may mean—

> as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I think Mr. Hoover, Director of the FBI, has stated on many occasions that every year the crime rate goes up. It is going up more from the bottom of the age groups than from the top; that is, it is increasing more among the younger generation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There has been an increase in juvenile delinquency.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It has been growing every year. Has not the Bible been pushed out of the schools?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The schools have been prohibited from teaching it. Atheists have brought suits, and that has been prohibited.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It seems to me that instead of prohibiting it, we ought to put a law on the books to make it compulsory.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not go that far. I say we should leave this matter to the States and the localities, because the Federal Government has no power in such a matter as the reading of the Bible. The first amendment related to a State church, to make sure that Congress did not enact a law establishing one.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And it prohibited the throwing of a roadblock in the path of those who wanted to study religion—which the Supreme Court has done in this case.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I commend the Senator for the fine stand he has taken.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Did not the language the Senator read from Mr. Justice Clark's opinion say, in effect, that we may study the Bible, but we may not study it reverently?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the effect of it. In public schools we cannot study it as the Bible. We must study it as a part of comparative literature or history as it affects civilization.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the fine speech the Senator from Virginia has made. He did us the courtesy of sending us a copy briefly before he was to speak, so that we might have an opportunity to look it over.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama, and go a little further: Unquestionably, the Senator from Virginia is the best Bible scholar in the Senate. He also lives up to the spirit of his own teachings and preachings.

The Senator from Virginia and I had some debates, and appeared before a committee last year, on this same subject. I want to express gratification that it seems to me at least the force and implications of the special concurring opinion of Justice Douglas in the New York case of a year ago have been avoided. There has not been an outlawing by the Court, in this decision, of a number of the matters that Justice Douglas said he thought were unconstitutional, including even the idea of "In God we trust," which words appear on our coins; the Chaplains in the House of Representatives and the Senate; and the pledge to the flag of the United States. Certainly, we have moved a step forward in that field.

Does the Senator agree that at least the Court has not followed the implications to which I have referred?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think we got under the skin of the Court when we criticized it for what Mr. Justice Douglas said—"You must outlaw the chaplains in the armed services; you must dispense with the chaplains in the Capitol; you must not put your hand on the Bible and swear to uphold the Constitution; you must not retain the words 'In God we trust' on the walls of the Senate Chamber."

That was a little too much for them. They backed off. In backing off, they have said, "If you do not treat it as the Bible, you can study it in the schools." I want to know when they are going to back away from that position.

Mr. STENNIS. Passing up for the time being the constitutional question which may be involved in the interpretation of the Constitution, is it not undeniably true that opinions along this line, which are unnecessary, as the Senator has pointed out, unmistakably tend to downgrade and do downgrade the reading of the Bible, and the offering of prayers, and minimize the importance of them, as well as destroying for many children the influence of such practices and such readings? Apart from anything else, does not that represent a terrific blow against the spiritual training of the youth of our land?

Mr. ROBERTSON. My distinguished friend is eminently correct. That is mentioned in the editorial from the Wall Street Journal which I placed in the RECORD. The Supreme Court should never have taken notice of it. It should have said, "It is not a church. You have not passed a law. We leave it to the States to work it out."

In rendering this decision, the Court downgraded respect for religion.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not unfortunately true that a great percentage of the children who are not going to hear the Bible read or hear the Lord's Prayer repeated are those who will scarcely have an opportunity to hear them elsewhere? It should not be that way, but, as a practical matter, is that not true?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is one fortunate aspect. In the parochial and private schools the children will be taught religion. However, children in those schools do not constitute a majority of the schoolchildren. As the Senator from North Carolina pointed out, many of the children in the public schools will never hear anything about God or the Bible.

Mr. STENNIS. The children who need most to hear them are the ones who will be hurt most by the new practice. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me give an illustration of what has happened. A friend of mine told me this morning that his little girl came home from school yesterday afternoon and said, "Mommy, why did the teacher forget to read us the Lord's Prayer this morning?" That was the 6- or 7-year-old girl's understanding of what had happened. She thought the teacher had forgotten it. But her older sister asked the mother, "Mommy, why did Congress pass a law that will not let us say the Lord's Prayer in school?"

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. That is the way people construe what has happened.

Mr. STENNIS. They both felt something had been taken away from them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. STENNIS. These girls have had training at home, too.

Let me ask one further question. In spite of this opinion, is it not true that it is still possible, and that it will not be unlawful, in any school where the teacher wishes it to be done, for children to recite the Lord's Prayer?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should say so. But there cannot be a State law that requires it. In my opinion, the children could recite the prayer and they could study the Bible in school hours if they studied it as literature or history.

The Supreme Court ducked the decision on Christmas and Easter in the Florida case. That was another issue that was a little too hot for it to handle. Those two holidays represent the most precious anniversaries in a Christian nation, the anniversary of the birth and resurrection from the grave of our Lord and Saviour. An atheist in Florida brought a suit to outlaw their observance. The Court remanded that case to the Florida court with instructions to write a new opinion in keeping with the decision it was announcing today in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Virginia that, in spite of this decision, it is still not unlawful, or against the law, as we use that term, for a school that wishes to do so, on a voluntary basis, to exercise the right of reading the Bible or having children recite together the Lord's Prayer. I think we ought to make that clear, because certain schools are discontinuing that practice when they really do not have to do it. It is not a violation of the law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Inasmuch as the decision rests upon a law or a school board regulation which has the force of law, it is only fair to assume that it does not include any voluntary action.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Court said:

> In addition, it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment.

What I would like to know, and what every other citizen of our Nation who believes that the most inherent distinction between our representative democracy and communism is our belief in God and the acceptance of the Bible as His Holy Word, is how long will it be before the Court reverses its decision of last Monday that if you call it comparative religion or history with relation to the advancement of civilization you can "when presented objectively" study the Bible in the public schools during school periods.

It also interests me to note that the Supreme Court ducked an outright decision on a case brought by atheists from Florida, in which a Florida court had held illegal school celebrations of the birth and resurrection from the grave of Jesus. Instead of rendering a decision in the case, the Court merely remanded the case to the Florida court with instructions to write a decision in keeping with the decision handed down in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases. That may not be too easy to do because, as I have indicated above, it is no easy matter to draw a distinction between what the Court in those two cases outlawed and what it held to be legal. But the inference, of course, is that since the Court did not uphold the Florida cases it has ruled that celebrations in public schools of two of the greatest events in Christian history—the birth and resurrection of our Lord and Savior—are not religious exercises, but just ceremonies. According to my dictionary a ceremony may be "any formal act or observance, especially a meaningless one."

It was approximately a year ago that the Supreme Court handed down its first decision which outlawed a simple prayer used in New York schools which merely asks that God bless our country, our parents, and our teacher. When he learned of that decision, a former distinguished President of the United States, a great American, and a noble character named Herbert Hoover issued this statement to the press:

> This interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court on prayer in our schools is a disintegration of one of the most sacred of American heritages. The Congress should at once submit an amendment to the Constitution which establishes the right to religious devotion in all governmental agencies—National, State or local.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to express my congratulations to the able Senator from Virginia on the magnificent speech he has made today. I consider the Senator from Virginia the ablest Bible scholar in the Senate. I consider him also as one of the most able historians in the Senate. I do not believe there is anyone who has more knowledge of the origin and history of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States than my distinguished friend from Virginia. He has read virtually everything that has been written about Thomas Jefferson and written by Thomas Jefferson. I believe he has read everything that has been written about James Madison and everything that has been written by James Madison.

The first amendment, in part, reads as follows:

> Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

It is my belief that when the Lord's Prayer is said in school or the Bible is read in school, it does not establish a religion, but, in my judgment, when students are prevented from hearing the Lord's Prayer or having the Bible read to them in school, it certainly prohibits the free exercise thereof. Is that the view of my distinguished friend?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I fully agree with the construction that the mere recitation of the Lord's Prayer, whether it is the Protestant version or the Catholic version, does not establish the Baptist church or the Episcopal church or the Catholic church.

However, when persons are prevented from paying tribute in any way, shape, or form, to God as our Creator, we have, in effect, enacted a law restricting the free exercise of religion, which is prohibited in the first amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL, DOMESTIC, AND INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 219, H.R. 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending business will be temporarily laid aside. The bill (H.R. 131) will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 131) to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 131) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose, need, and cost of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 131 relates to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1959. It is intended to overcome certain deficiencies in long-term contracts written under this subsection for furnishing municipal, domestic, and industrial water from Federal reclamation projects. The bill provides that the other party to any such long-term contract may have a right of renewal, subject to renegotiation, and a continuing right to its share of water so long as it is beneficially utilized. The bill is generally similar in these respects to Public Law 643 of the 84th Congress (70 Stat. 482) which was written for the irrigation water users.

NEED

This legislation is needed to permit assurance to be given to parties contracting with the Federal Government for municipal, domestic, and industrial water service under the Federal reclamation laws that their contracts will be renewed upon expiration and that they will continue to receive a stated share of the water available for municipal, domestic, and industrial use. Such assurance is particularly needed in instances where a city or other contracting organization has to finance municipal water systems by the issuance of revenue bonds.

COST

The enactment of this legislation would not involve any cost to the Federal Government.

This legislation would be applicable to about 25 existing municipal and industrial water-service type contracts and would apply to all contracts negotiated in the future.

The bill passed the House of Representatives on April 1, 1963.

AVAILABILITY OF WATER FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES AT COCHITA RESERVOIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 236, S. 614.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 614) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for recreation purposes at Cochiti Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "authorize", to insert "for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources and for recreation"; as as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso to subdivision (e) of the conditions applicable to the project for improvement of the Rio Grande Basin authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 493) is hereby supplemented to authorize for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources and for recreation, approximately fifty thousand acre-feet of water for the initial filling of a permanent pool of one thousand two hundred surface acres in Cochiti Reservoir, and thereafter sufficient water annually to offset the evaporation from such area, to be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from water diverted into the Rio Grande Basin by the works authorized by section 8 of the Act of June 13, 1962 (Public Law 87–483; 76 Stat. 97), subject to the conditions specified in sections 8, 12, 13, 14, and 16 of said Act. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreation purposes at Cochiti Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with respect to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

Page 1, line 7, after the word "authorize", insert the following: "for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources and for recreation,".

Amend the title of the bill to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreation purposes at Cochiti Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project."

In its report the Department of the Interior recommended the above amendments in order that the concept of multiple use of water resources should be served whenever it is possible to do so. The committee supports this position and agrees that fish and wildlife purposes are of sufficient importance to specifically provide for them in the bill.

The Cochiti Reservoir was authorized solely for flood and sediment control by the Flood Control Act of 1960. Although the authorizing legislation recognized that a permanent pool for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes might be provided at some future date, no provision was made for the allocation of waters for this purpose. The act of June 13, 1962, that authorized the San Juan-Chama project made no provision for water for other than irrigation, and municipal and industrial purposes.

This bill would permit the Secretary of the Interior to make 50,000 acre-feet of water available for the initial filling of a permanent pool in the Cochiti Reservoir. After the pool is formed, the Secretary would be permitted to divert an estimated 5,000 acre-feet annually into the reservoir to offset evaporation and to make the reservoir useful for fish and wildlife as well as for other recreational purposes.

Testimony presented to the committee indicated that the water necessary to initially fill the pool would be supplied from that allotted to the city of Albuquerque under the San Juan project prior to the time that it is required for municipal and industrial uses. The testimony also indicated that the diversion would not adversely affect the financial feasibility of the San Juan-Chama project. It would, however, reduce the obligation of the city of Albuquerque approximately $2,906,600. This amount would become nonreimbursable as a cost chargeable to the maintenance of a recreation pool at Cochiti. It is noted that the city of Albuquerque in the interest of recreation development adopted a resolution in September 1960, indicating a willingness to release a portion of its share of the San Juan River waters in order that the permanent pool at Cochiti could be established.

The Department of the Army in its report on the bill stated that the proposal would be highly desirable because of the great need for water-associated recreational development in this section of New Mexico.

The population of the area within a 100-mile radius is in excess of 440,000. It was estimated that the proposed pool would result in an annual increase in visitation of approximately 700,000 people. No additional lands would be required for the construction of the project. In light of the urgent need for additional recreational and fish and wildlife facilities in the area, the committee feels that the authorization for this project is of vital importance to the Rio Grande Valley. The committee recommends enactment of the bill.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN STATE OF OREGON AND C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 239, S. 1185.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 4, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, shall pay to the United States such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to compensate the United States for its administrative costs in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which sum shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 north, range 28 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved in the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, shall pay to the United States such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to compensate the United States for its administrative costs in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which sum shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with respect to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 1185, introduced by Senator MORSE permits the Secretary of the Interior upon conveyance to the United States of an 80-acre tract by the State of Oregon to grant this land (including all minerals contained therein) to the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., without a reverter clause subject to right-of-way for ditches and canals, provided the C. & B. Livestock Co. will grant to the United States an equal value tract. This tract then is to be granted to the State of Oregon, to be used for public purposes under the same procedure whereby the State of Oregon obtained the original tract the Secretary will grant to the C. & B. Livestock Co., except that all minerals in this tract shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The transaction is to be without cost to the United States. The bill provides for compensation of the United States in cash if the values of the lands involved are not equal. The State of Oregon is to use the lands it receives for agricultural purposes and research use, which is the use now being made of the 80 acres. The transactions involved will take place only on the initiation of the State of Oregon, not upon the initiation of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary is involved only because the basic 80-acre tract will revert to the United States if it is not used for public purposes. The State of Oregon's interest in having land for agricultural and research use is adequately protected by the exchange procedure and the dual exchanges and transfers permit the State of Oregon to decide whether it wishes to proceed at all.

NEED

Oregon State University now desires to effect an exchange agreement with the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., which would be of benefit to the university, and which would also permit the C. & B. Co. to establish a new modern livestock feedyard in the Hermiston area. The 80-acre tract involved in this exchange was part of 460 acres patented to the State of Oregon without consideration on September 17, 1954, under the act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981). This patent (No. 1308889) reserved all minerals to the United States together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under regulations that the Secretary might prescribe.

The legislation is necessary to avoid a breach of the condition in the patent that:

"The property interest hereby conveyed shall be devoted to, or used for, cooperative agricultural experimental work of the Department of Agriculture and the State of Oregon. In the event that the State of Oregon shall at any time cease to use such property for agricultural experimental work for a period of 1 year, or attempt to alienate all or any part thereof, all right, title, and interest in and to the said property shall revert to the United States."

The Geological Survey indicates that its records show that all the lands described in the bill are valuable prospectively for oil and gas. The Geological Survey, however, believes that such value per acre is nominal.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendment adopted provides for the payment to the Treasury by the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co. the cost of administering this act, thus eliminating the direct costs involved in title transfers being borne by the United States.

COST

It is not anticipated that there will be any increase in the budgetary requirements as a result of enactment of S. 1185. The bill meets the Morse formula.

CONTINUED USE OF CERTAIN LAND WITHIN THE SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 240, House Joint Resolution 180.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 180) to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 180) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement with respect to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 180, introduced by Congressman Hagen of California, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend until 1974 a permit granted to the Southern California Edison Co. to occupy certain lands within Sequoia National Park.

NEED

The permit in question was originally granted in 1912, pursuant to the act of February 15, 1901 (31 Stat. 790, 16 U.S.C. 79). It expired last year and the Secretary of the Interior has been advised by the Solicitor of his Department that he is without authority to renew it in the absence of such legislation as House Joint Resolution 180 contemplates.

The land covered by the permit is used by the company for works to divert water from two forks of the Kaweah River and for a conduit leading to a 4,500-kilowatt powerplant on the boundary of the park. The fee paid to the Government by the company for the use of this land varies with the amount of power generated at the plant but ranges between $6,000 and $9,000 a year.

The 1974 expiration date for the renewed permit coincides with the expiration date of the company's present Federal Power Commission license.

COST

Enactment of House Joint Resolution 180 will entail no cost to the Government.

WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS AT CUDDEBACK LAKE AIR FORCE RANGE, CALIF.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 241, H.R. 3574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 3574) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement with respect to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3574, which was introduced by Representative Sheppard, is to withdraw from the public domain 7,546 acres of land in San Bernardino County, Calif., and reserve them for the continued use of the Air Force as the Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range.

NEED

H.R. 3574 describes the Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range which has been used by the Department of the Air Force since 1956, following application to the Department of the Interior on October 21, 1954, for withdrawal and reservation of the area. Before the withdrawal was completed, the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27) became effective providing, among other things, that no withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres for any one defense project or facility may be accomplished except by act of Congress.

During consideration of the bill, which was submitted as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1963, Air Force witnesses demonstrated to the committee's full satisfaction the military need for use of the lands involved.

The proposed withdrawal and reservation will be for a period of 10 years with option to renew for an additional 5 years. This assures a review by the administrative agencies involved 10 years from now and a further review at the end of 15 years. If the Air Force desires to extend its use beyond this term, it will have to request further legislative action, thereby assuring congressional scrutiny of the necessity for such continued use.

COST

Enactment of H.R. 3574 will cause no increase in the budgetary requirements.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that completes the call of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. I am glad the Senate allowed them to be taken up this afternoon.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, in connection with Senate bill 625, a statement by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which considered the bill this year and previously. Unfortunately, the Senator could not be in the Chamber at the time of the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

This bill will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide hospital care for non-service-connected disabilities in private contract facilities if there is no veterans' hospital located within a State or within 500 miles of the State's border. As a practical matter this bill will apply only in the States of Alaska and Hawaii which are the only two States without a Veterans' Administration hospital. In effect, this bill will restore the situation existing in the two States prior to their admission to statehood. When Alaska and Hawaii were Territories, they were covered by a special provision which permitted the use of private contract facilities for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities in the territories. This was an exception to the general limitation that hospitalization for such disabilities would be provided on a bed-available basis in the Veterans' Administration hospitals or other Federal Government facilities. This exception was provided due to the remoteness and lack of available Government facilities in the Territories and the problems and expense of transportation. However, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood automatically prevented the application of this exception. The Veterans' Administration submitted an unfavorable report on this bill but the same reasons and conditions that initially caused the Congress to authorize the use of private contract facilities in Alaska and Hawaii for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities still exist, and the intent of this bill is merely to allow the veterans living in those two States to receive exactly what they were receiving before the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

It has been contended that this bill would give preferential treatment to Alaska and Hawaii over the rest of the States; but according to data furnished by the Veterans' Administration, the percentage of the veterans population of Alaska and Hawaii treated for non-service-connected disabilities in both Federal Government and private contract facilities in those States was lower than the national average. This bill will rectify the unfavorable situation existing in the two States due to the lack of VA hospitals and the difficulty of transportation.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senate bill 625 was introduced by me, with the cosponsorship of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the two Senators from Hawaii [Mr. Fong and Mr. Inouye]. I note the presence in the Chamber at this time of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], one of the cosponsors of the bill.

S. 625 is similar in nature to a measure approved by the Senate in the last session of the Congress. Unfortunately that measure did not receive the approval of the other body.

Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 625. This year, due to the skill and diligence of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, and with the able assistance of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we now have this measure before us in good time. It is my hope both the Senate and the House will be able to give favorable consideration to this measure before the end of the Congress.

S. 625 is a simple bill. It is designed to give the veterans of Alaska and Hawaii parity of treatment with their fellow veterans in the other 48 States.

Neither Alaska nor Hawaii has Veterans' Administration hospitals. They are the only two States in the Union who do not have a VA medical facility.

Until statehood, veterans with service and nonservice connected illnesses in the two States were treated either on a beds-available basis in other Government hospitals or in private hospitals on a contract basis. Due to a technicality, the advent of statehood meant the continuance of this arrangement so far as service-connected illnesses were concerned. Unfortunately, non-service-connected illnesses could no longer be treated in private hospitals on a contract basis.

S. 625 is designed to correct this hardship on Alaska and Hawaii veterans inadvertently caused by statehood. As the Veterans' Administration once said in explaining why private contract arrangements in private hospitals were necessary:

> The exception to permit hospital care in private facilities for war veterans with non-service-connected conditions in a territory or possession was based upon special considerations. These apparently included the factors of great distances from the mainland, difficulty in transferring patients to the States, and the relatively small volume of patient demand in the territories and possessions. (Letter from Administrator Gleason to Senator LISTER HILL, March 29, 1961.)

Statehood changed the political status of Alaska and Hawaii. It did not change the geography, the transportation difficulties or the needs of the veterans. It did not change the reasons advanced by Administrator Gleason.

Under present arrangements the Veterans' Administration has under contract 35 hospital beds in Federal hospitals for the use of Alaska veterans, of which there are 15,000. A veteran with a non-service-connected illness may receive hospital care only if one of these 35 beds is available.

Distances in Alaska are long and transportation costs are high. There are almost no highways and the only available means of travel is often by plane. To fly from Nome to Anchorage and return would cost a veteran $132. If there are no hospital beds available in Anchorage the veteran with non-service-connected illness would be forced to fly to Seattle which would cost an additional $245 round-trip. Barring a pauper's oath he would have to pay these costs. Even then he would not be guaranteed treatment. Alaska veterans are like orphans in the storm when it comes to medical treatment.

Mr. President, an estimated two-thirds of all hospital beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals are filled with veterans with non-service-connected illnesses. We do not have a veterans hospital in Alaska. Alaska veterans do not now have parity of care regarding non-service-connected illness.

This bill is designed to give them parity. It does no more than that. It is to restore a practice which operated to the satisfaction of everyone for many years until it was inadvertently brought to an end by statehood.

This bill permits the Veterans' Administration to contract for the care in private hospitals of veterans with non-service-connected illness. It provides that should a veterans hospital ever be built in Alaska or Hawaii, the practice of private contract care would be brought to an end.

This bill is strongly supported by both State and national veterans groups.

It is strongly supported by the State government of both Alaska and Hawaii.

It is supported by Senators of both States and of both parties.

I urge its passage.

In brief, Mr. President, this bill seeks to restore to Alaska and Hawaii veterans the medical treatment procedures which existed prior to statehood. At that time the Veterans' Administration contracted with private hospitals in both Territories for the care of ill veterans. Unfortunately and inadvertently the advent of statehood, that it would no longer be possible to treat veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in private hospitals through contract arrangements.

The pending bill seeks to restore this practice for these worthy veterans, because although the legal status of Hawaii and of Alaska has changed, the conditions which made these contract arrangements necessary before have not changed. In fact, in my opinion, they make them necessary now.

The cost to the Government would be compartively small—smaller, I suspect, than the cost under the present arrangements.

I send to the desk an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 2. The authority granted to the Administrator under clause IV of section 601 (4)(C) of title 38, United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I believe the purpose of the amendment is clear. It merely provides a trial period during which the Veterans' Administration can return to the type of care for veterans in the private hospitals which was provided before statehood.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for his very able assistance in connection with this bill. He has consistently worked for the enactment of this legislation, and of similar legislation in the preceding Congresses. I commend him for his sympathetic understanding of the problems of veterans in Hawaii and in Alaska. With his very strong help, a similar bill reached the floor of the Senate in 1960, and was passed by the Senate.

Again, last year, he succeeded in obtaining committee approval of a similar bill.

Now—for the third time—he has succeeded in bringing this measure to the floor of the Senate. In behalf of the veterans of Hawaii, I wish to extend to him my personal appreciation for his efforts.

I also wish to pay great tribute to the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and to the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for their very vigorous efforts in pushing this bill forward, so that it is now before the Senate.

It seems to me important to emphasize that what we are asking in this legislation is no different from what was authorized by Congress for both Alaska and Hawaii when these two areas were territories of the United States; namely, the exception, when Alaska and Hawaii were territories, to permit hospital care in private facilities for war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. That exception was based upon special considerations, which included the following factors: The absence of Veterans' Administration hospitals in these territories; the great distances of these territories from the mainland; the difficulty in transferring patients to the mainland; and the relatively small volume of patient demand in the territories and possessions.

The change in legal status of Hawaii and Alaska has not altered the geographical handicaps facing veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in these two States.

The same reasons and conditions that initially caused the Congress to authorize private contract facilities in Alaska and Hawaii for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities still exist today. The geographical, transportation, and population factors present the same difficulties as prior to statehood, and create a vital need for this legislation. This legislation affords an inexpensive opportunity for the Government to provide humanitarian treatment to deserving veterans of the armed services.

There is still not a single Veterans' Administration hospital in the entire State of Hawaii.

I know that is also true of Alaska; in other words, there is no Veterans' Administration hospital in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct; neither State has one.

Mr. FONG. The nearest one is still more than 2,000 miles from Hawaii. The only place where hospital care is available under VA auspices is the U.S. Army's Tripler General Hospital in Honolulu on the island of Oahu.

This is not readily accessible to veterans living on our other populous islands in the State: Kauai, Molokai, Maui, and Hawaii. Each of these islands is separated by ocean. The only passenger transportation available is by air, which is relatively costly. There are no railroads nor highways between the islands.

Until 1959, the year of our statehood, war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities could obtain care in private or territorial hospitals which had contract arrangements with the Veterans' Administration. In the last fiscal year before statehood, there were available to war veterans three hospitals on Kauai, two on Maui, one on Molokai, four on our largest island, Hawaii, and four on Oahu—all under contract with the Veterans' Administration. Veterans living on the respective islands could reach these medical facilities easily by auto in no more than a few hours' time.

These arrangements spared veterans living on islands away from Oahu the relatively costly journey by air to Tripler Hospital. Local hospitalization also greatly facilitated family visitations, so important to morale of veteran patients.

Traveling and lodging costs entailed by visitors from outer islands to Tripler Hospital impose great financial hardship, particularly if the veteran is confined for a prolonged period. Moreover, air travel is medically inadvisable for certain patients such as those suffering heart ailments.

While it is true the Veterans' Administration will pay transport costs for veterans who state they cannot afford to pay, the Veterans' Administration cannot reimburse costs for family or other relatives.

Senate bill 625 would restore the authority for the Veterans' Administration to arrange for local care of war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. If previous experience is any indicator, costwise, S. 625 may be advantageous. Figures obtained in 1960 showed the Veterans' Administration reimbursing Tripler Hospital at the rate of $21 per day for each veteran treated there. Under its prior contracting arrangements with territorial and private hospitals VA paid on $13.80 per day for each patient.

Official data clearly show that, both before and after statehood, the percentage of non-service-connected disabled veterans receiving hospital care, compared with the total veteran population, was smaller in Alaska and Hawaii than in the country as a whole and in States with comparable populations. In the unlikely event that this legislation should result in inequitable advantage to veterans in the affected States, the VA would be expected to apprise the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the pertinent facts so that corrective action could be taken.

I urge the passage of this bill. I am in accord with the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett]. I think the 10-year period is a very reasonable one, and I support his amendment.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of S. 625, jointly cosponsored by Senators Bartlett, Gruening, Fong, and myself, be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Inouye

Prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the Veterans' Administration was authorized to enter into contracts with territorial—now State—and private facilities to provide hospital care for war veterans. As a result of this authorization, the Veterans' Administration was able to contract for hospital care at the Territorial Hospital, a hospital caring for the insane and mentally deranged; the Kalaupapa Hospital on the Island of Molokai and the Hale Mohalu Hospital in Honolulu for veterans afflicted with Hansen's disease; the Leahi Hospital for veterans afflicted with tuberculosis and a few other county hospitals located on the several islands to provide our war veterans general medical and surgical assistance. Since the admission of Hawaii as a State, all war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities have been required to receive their medical treatment for Hansen's disease, tuberculosis, mental derangement and other ailments at Tripler Army Hospital, the only Federal hospital in the State located in Honolulu, Oahu. The status of statehood did not affect the many war veterans with service-connected disabilities.

The Veterans' Administration must reimburse to the Department of Defense the sum of $21 per day for every veteran receiving treatment at Tripler Army Hospital. It is very interesting to note that under the contract provisions permitted under section 601 of title 38, the cost to the Veterans' Administration per patient-day was the sum of $13.80. In other words, the Veterans' Administration saved the sum of $7.20 per patient-day by hospitalizing war veterans in private and territorial hospitals.

Tripler Army Hospital is a fine hospital providing for most of the advanced services now available in some of our better hospitals in the continental United States. However, Tripler Army Hospital has no facilities for the treatment of persons afflicted with Hansen's disease nor does it have facilities for long-term institutionalized care for the mentally deranged, nor does it have facilities for long-term institutionalized care for tubercular persons. As a result, although our laws state that an indigent war veteran with a non-service-connected disability is entitled to hospitalization in a Federal hospital, since Tripler Army Hospital is lacking in facilities as stated above, many of these veterans will have to receive services from State hospitals as wards of the State. This sudden change in medical indigent responsibilities brought about by statehood has resulted in certain budgetary difficulties for the State of Hawaii.

Prior to statehood, approximately 165 veterans with non-service-connected disabilities—psychiatric, tubercular, and Hansen's disease cases—received medical and surgical assistance in contract hospitals located on islands other than Oahu. Since statehood, all veterans with non-service-connected disabilities requiring medical and surgical care have received such care from Tripler Hospital. The treatment of these veterans is now costing the Federal Government $21 per patient day instead of $13.80 at contract hospitals. It has further resulted in other additional costs made necessary by the transporting of such veterans from the outlying islands to Tripler Army Hospital. In addition to the extra added cost to the Government for treatment of veterans at Tripler Army Hospital, the disruption of family relations brought about by the necessity of separating these war veterans from their respective island areas have resulted in misery and inconvenience heretofore not experienced by the veteran and his family. Because these veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are indigents, it should be assumed that their families would be without funds to visit the veteran patients in Tripler. Undoubtedly, the morale of these veteran patients from the outlying islands is very low. The anxieties experienced by their families on the outlying islands have undoubtedly caused family difficulties. Therefore, I am respectfully requesting this body to favorably consider S. 625, first as the most economic use of our tax dollars, and second, with compassion for veterans and their families who live on the outlying islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii has spoken about the dedicated efforts of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] in connection with the bill. I shall only add to that statement that the veterans of Alaska are well aware that the bill would not be under consideration by the Senate today if it had not been for the Senator from Texas. From the start he has seen the justice and the equity in the proposed legislation. As the Senator from Hawaii has said, the Senator has worked hard and successfully more than once to bring the bill to the floor. I hope that this will be the last time such effort will be necessary. I hope the bill will be passed by the Senate and accepted by the House of Representatives. It is not only just legislation. It is legislation long overdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 625) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 601(4)(C) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or (iii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(iii)", and by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; or (iv) for veterans of any war in a State (not including a territory, Commonwealth, or possession) if no hospital under the direct and exclusive jurisdiction of the Administrator is located in such State on or after the date of enactment of this clause (iv), and if no such hospital is located within five hundred miles of the border of such State."

Sec. 2. The authority granted to the Administrator under clause iv of section 601(4)(c) of title 38, United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, shall terminate ten years after the date of enactment of this Act.

STABILIZATION OF PROFITS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some 2 years after the unveiling of the fine-sounding phrase "quality stabilization," it is becoming increasingly evident that the legislation shrouded by that title represents nothing less than semantic warfare against the consumer.

More than a year ago Representative Celler, the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and one of the great and potent allies of the consumer in the Congress, in testimony before the Special Senate Subcommitee on Quality Stabilization, disposed of the proposed quality stabilization resolution with ironic dispatch:

Senate Joint Resolution 159 is the latest verson of that hardy perennial, a national fair trade bill which has come before the Congress repeatedly. Concealed as usual behind a fog of euphemisms, this old wolf is presented to you this session dressed up in the seductive sheep's clothing of a "quality stabilization" resolution. The hard-to-hide wolf's tail this time carries the label "price stabilization." Tug the tail, however, and a telltale price-fixing howl is emitted. Once again fair trade antics must rely upon semantics.

Today we are witnessing a concerted and determined effort to enact this legislation, yet hearings before both House and Senate committees have revealed again that the only "stabilization" envisaged is the stabilization of the profits of inefficient competitors and the stabilization of high prices to the consumer.

The President's Consumer Advisory Council, boldly living up to its assigned tasks as consumer watchdog, has now expressed itself in unequivocal opposition to the pending quality stabilization bills:

> Such attempts to limit freedom of individual merchants to sell goods at prices they choose—

Stated the Council—

> are antithetical to the free enterprise system, hence to the best interests of American consumers.

I commend the Council for its forthright stand and ask unanimous consent that the text of its statement be included at the close of my remarks together with a perceptive analysis of "quality stabilization" by the able and distinguished consumer authority Sidney Margolius, and letters which I have received from President Joseph A. Bierne, of the Communication Workers of America, and from Oregon consumers.

There being no objection, the statement, analysis, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C.

The Consumer Advisory Council, at its meeting on June 3-4, expressed its opposition to the principles and purposes of the "quality stabilization" bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669, and urged the administration to take additional steps to combat the denial of consumer rights on the grounds of race.

The statements are attached.

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON QUALITY STABILIZATION BILLS, INCLUDING S. 774 AND H.R. 3669

We oppose these bills and all similar attempts at price fixing at the retail level which have been sponsored under the name of "fair trading," "resale price maintenance," and "quality stabilization." Such attempts to limit freedom of individual merchants to sell goods at prices they choose are antithetical to the free enterprise system and, hence, to the best interests of American consumers.

These bills propose, in effect, that the Federal Government should protect a manufacturer who wants to establish the minimum price at which his product will be sold at retail. It would give manufacturers the right to prohibit retailers from selling brand name or trademarked goods at prices other than the retail price established by the manufacturer. Such legislation would limit competition, inhibit innovation and progress at the retail level, and would also tend to encourage price fixing at the manufacturers' level. In any event, it would tend to deny consumers the benefit of downward price adjustments which flow from increased efficiency and improvements in production and distribution.

We are not impressed by the argument that such legislation would aid small business. The evidence in States which have "fairtrade" legislation indicates the contrary to be the result, since it encourages the introduction by large retail businesses of private brands and other techniques for avoiding the effect of the legislation.

We believe that so-called "quality stabilization" (fair trade) bills are inimical to the interests of consumers. They violate the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the "right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices * * *." We, therefore, commend the administration for its opposition to these bills.

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DENIAL OF CONSUMER RIGHT ON GROUNDS OF RACE

Whereas the President of the United States of America, in his message on consumers protection and interest program of March 15, 1962, emphasized among the basic rights of the consumer (1) the right to safety, (2) the right to choose, (3) the right to be heard, and that "consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy"; and

Whereas thousands of Negro consumers in all parts of the Nation are denied their rights as consumers to purchase goods and services freely in the marketplace: Be it

Resolved, That we urge immediate and positive action by the administration through all available administrative and legal means and by the support of legislation prohibiting discrimination against customers by stores, hotels, theaters, restaurants and other businesses on the ground of race.

We are heartened by the news that the President will deliver a special message on basic human and civil rights and urge that this message stress the relationship of these rights to the rights of citizens as consumers, as a followup to his original basic address on consumer protection and interest program.

MEMBERS OF THE CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, chairman, dean, New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Mr. David W. Angevine, public relations director, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Persia Campbell, professor and chairman, economics department, Queens College of City University, Flushing, N.Y.

Mr. Stephen M. Du Brul, Jr., partner, Lehman Brothers, 1 William Street, New York, N.Y.

Mrs. John G. Lee, past president, League of Women Voters, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Edward S. Lewis, executive director, Urban League of Greater New York, 202 West 136th Street, New York, N.Y.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale, attorney general, State of Minnesota, 102 State Capitol, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, professor and head, department of family economics, Justin Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, California Consumer Counsel, Governor's Office, Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Caroline Ware, consultant, RFD 1, Box 138, Vienna, Va.

Dr. Colston E. Warne, president, Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., professor of economics, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

NEW PRICE-MAINTENANCE LAW SLIPPING THROUGH CONGRESS UNNOTICED

(By Sidney Margolius)

A new price-maintenance law is slipping through Congress unnoticed and unprotested by the public which would have to pay higher prices as the result. This was the frank warning sounded at the annual conference of the Council on Consumer Information in Washington recently, by a group of consumer-minded Congressmen.

The proposed measure is called the quality stabilization bill. It is really the old "fair trade" law under a new name, and fair trade itself is really price-fixing. If passed, quality stabilization, would enable manufacturers to revoke the right of a retailer to sell their brand-name products if the retailer cut the prices.

"Quality stabilization" sounds like something desirable. But like the "right-to-work" name on antiunion legislation, it is an attempt to fool the public as to its real intent. In this case, the real intent is to limit competition among retailers, and require all retailers to sell a manufacturer's brand at the same price if the manufacturer so desires.

The reason some manufacturers and retailers, especially in the drug industry, are pushing to get this new law, is that the State fair trade laws have been declared unconstitutional in about half the States. In the other States, fair trade either was never enacted or is being ignored to a large extent by price-cutting retailers and manufacturers.

But quality stabilization could damage your pocketbook even more than the fair trade laws ever did, because it would make it even easier for manufacturers to fix prices. The manufacturer would not even have to seek price agreements with retailers State by State. His fixed price would apply in all States, including those that previously never had a fair trade law.

The effect on prices you pay would be drastic. Congressman JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, warned the educators and organizations at the consumer conference that a shopping survey by the U.S. Justice Department indicated that prices of such goods as household equipment could be raised as much as 27½ percent. Another serious effect would be to freeze prices of medicines at their present high levels.

The alarming fact is the speed at which the quality stabilization bill is moving through the U.S. House of Representatives with no protest from the public. The public itself has had no warning and does not realize the danger that has suddenly developed. Congressman DINGELL reported that he has had heavy mail from his own district in favor of the bill, but not a single letter in opposition. Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, also reported heavy mail in favor of the price-fixing measure but no opposition. Mrs. SULLIVAN, warned that once the bill gets out of committee it will pass the House of Representatives.

Senators ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, also warned that the new price-fixing bill could be enacted before the public knew what had hit it, and that they too got heavy mail from businessmen against consumer legislation but little from consumers, supporting their own interests. Senator METCALF reported that California Retail Druggist published a "model" letter in favor of price-fixing laws, that druggists could adapt to send to local newspapers.

The quality stabilization bill is being sponsored by Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee. He has been trying for some years to get a price-fixing law passed. His bill is known as H.R. 3669, but 20 other identical price-fixing bills also have been introduced by other Congressmen.

The critical stage will come late in April when a House Interstate Commerce subcommittee, headed by Representative HARLEY STAGGERS, Democrat, of West Virginia, holds hearings on it.

The Government agencies which have the responsibility for fighting price fixing of the things you buy are strictly against such laws. The Federal Trade Commission, Justice Department, and Commerce Department all have attacked the quality stabilization bill as a price-boosting measure. Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, last year told a Senate Commerce Subcommittee, that quality stabilization would let manufacturers fix prices at high, noncompetitive levels "calculated to yield what the traffic could bear." Moreover, under the proposed measure, price fixing could be extended to fresh produce, canned goods, clothing, gasoline, building materials, even meat and potatoes, Loevinger warned.

Some retailers themselves are opposed to price-fixing laws. Writing in Home Furnishings Daily, Maurice M. Cohen, a leading Massachusetts retailer, pointed out that manufacturers would protect quality for their own sakes without the quality stabilization measure, and that even though appliance prices have been reduced by sharp competition, recent models have been improved. The proposed law actually would bar "Mrs. Consumer" from the privilege of buying at competitive prices since she would pay the same fixed price at all stores. "Why should a low-markup store be forced to maintain an artificially high margin which he doesn't need and doesn't want?" Mr. Cohen asked.

The danger, however, is that several influential Senators often otherwise considered among the Senate liberals, do support price fixing. These include HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, himself a former druggist; MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, a former furniture merchant, and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

A revealing example of how you would have to pay more if quality stabilization passes, is the dual price system now used by one leading manufacturer ((, Sunbeam)). This manufacturer's appliances, generally considered very high quality, now are sold under one name ((, Sunbeam,)) at cut prices, and under another name ((, Vista,)) at fixed prices. Thus, unwary shoppers may pay several dollars more for an iron under one name than for a similar iron under another name. In this case the manufacturer has worked out a way to fix prices on the theory that he still owns the merchandise even when it is in the hands of the retailer.

MAY 30, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. NEUBERGER: In an economy which permits the consumer to enjoy "EOM sales," "inventory clearances," white sales, etc., as a means of obtaining what may otherwise be out of his financial reach, H.R. 3669 appears as a black cloud over this Nation. This bill could do no good for anyone. May I ask that you oppose it as well as the several other similar bills now before Congress.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. DONALD R. FROMWILLER.
PORTLAND, OREG.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1963.

Hon. MAURICE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I thought you might like to know that the Communications Workers of America is opposed to the adoption of S. 774, the proposed Quality Stabilization Act.

In my opinion, its title is a misnomer, since its provisions do not in any way either stabilize or guarantee the element of quality so prized by the housewife. Quality stabilization sounds very fine, but like the right-to-work tag on labor legislation which gives no one a right to work, it misleads the American consumer as to its real intent.

This bill is actually a "fair trade" bill under a new name. Its primary purpose is really price fixing, and at a higher than necessary level. Its primary effect would be to increase the cost of living. The members of CWA are vitally affected. It does little good to negotiate a wage increase only to have it taken away through such legislation.

The American taxpayers have a right to better treatment from their elected representatives.

Sincerely yours,
J. A. BEIRNE,
President.

MEDFORD, OREG., *June 10, 1963.*

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Please work against the Quality Stabilization Act—H.R. 3669.

We need competition, not Government regulation to keep our country going. This "act" would be another serious step toward the social welfare state and we have too much of that now. This would be very hard on the consumers. We need drugs, etc., at lower prices, not set by the companies that produce them, but by competition.

M. R. DAVENPORT.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. My colleague has commended the Consumer Council. I am glad she has done so. I wish to commend my colleague for once again taking up the cudgels in defense of the consumers of America, as she has done time and time again.

I am a veteran in the war on so-called fair trade legislation. For many years I have fought attempts on the part of business to engage in price rigging. When all is said and done—and the figure of speech my colleague used this afternoon was very proper; she referred to the "wolf in sheep's clothing"—when we strip the bill of its camouflage, what we really see is an attempt on the part of certain businesses in this country to fix prices.

I have always taken the position that price control, if we must have it—and it is never justified except in a time of economic crisis or emergency—is a prerogative that must be retained by the Government, and not delegated to any group of businesses in this country.

One would think that the supporters of fair trade would have read the court decisions of recent years on this subject, for they have "taken" it on the jaw and the nose, at the same time, in one case after another that has reached the courts. The courts have told business that this is a policy that cannot stand up against existing judicial criteria.

My colleague from Oregon is correct in stating that there is again a concerted lobby drive to push through legislation under the catch name "fair trade." Who is not for fair trade? But "fair trade" is not involved in this proposal. This is an attempt on the part of certain businesses to get themselves into a position where they can gouge consumers. I want them to know that the senior Senator from Oregon has never felt better, has never felt that he could engage in a more vigorous debate than he can this year, and does not intend to let the bill pass, if he can stop it.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that there is at the desk a highly privileged matter—the message of the President on civil rights.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senate first to consider several other matters?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader has several matters that he wishes to ask the Senate to consider. I yield to the majority leader.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS IN PROPERTY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 235, Senate bill 1326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1326) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "the sum of $200" and insert "such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to those persons who, on the date of enactment of this Act, are the record owners of the surface rights thereof, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property consisting of fifty-three and three-tenths acres and more particularly described in the conveyance entered into between Gus Loskoski and Ola Loskoski as grantors and L. T. Vaughn and Sheron K. Vaughn as grantees, which conveyance is recorded in the office of the clerk of court for Anderson County, South Carolina, in deed book A–9 at page 257. Such conveyance shall be made only if application is made therefor by a record owner of the surface rights within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and upon payment to the United States by such record owner of such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary to reimburse the United States for the administrative cost of the conveyance plus the fair market value of the minerals as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, S. 1326 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the record surface owners of the land the mineral rights reserved by the United States in a tract of 53.3 acres located in Anderson County, S.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question? I may be able to save some time.

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, the transaction is to be a sale. Due compensation will be paid for the Federal interest.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct—if there is any value in the interest now owned by the Government. As I understand, there will probably be no charge, or perhaps only a nominal charge. I believe the report explains it.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I am interested in being informed as to whether the bill conforms to the Morse formula in regard to the transfer of a Federal interest.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not believe there would be any objection under the Morse formula.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon is examining the report, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record excerpts from the report on the bill, No. 253, be printed.

The report contains an explanation of the purpose of the measure, the committee amendment, the recommendation, executive reports, and also a letter addressed to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from the Department of the Interior, and also a letter from the Executive Office of the President addressed to the chairman of the committee [Mr. Jackson], signed by Phillip S. Hughes.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 1326 would require the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the record surface owners the mineral rights reserved by the United States in a tract of 53.3 acres of land located in Anderson County, S.C.

The Federal interests comprise 75 percent of the mineral estate, but the Department of the Interior, both in oral testimony and in its written report, states the subject lands are deemed to be without value for minerals, either metalliferous or nonmetalliferous, and that there are no outstanding Federal mineral leases or applications therefore on them.

The acreage, as a part of a larger tract, was acquired by the Federal Government in 1937 under an emergency relief program. In 1945, the then Farm Security Administration (now the Farmers Home Administration) quitclaimed the land to private individuals, reserving the 75 percent of the mineral estate to the Federal Government. In 1950, the tract was conveyed to the present titleholder.

Just prior to this conveyance, Congress by the act of September 6, 1950 (found in 7 U.S.C. 1033–1039) authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such mineral estates to the surface owner if application therefor was filed within 7 years from the effective date of the law or from the date of the acquisition of the minerals estate by the United States, whichever is later. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determined, after consultation with this Department and competent local authorities, that there was no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application would be sold for $1. In other areas, the mineral interests were to be sold at their fair market value.

Any mineral estates not conveyed to the surface owners under the act of September 6, 1950, were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior after the expiration of such periods, and now are available for leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359).

While enactment of the statute and publication of implementing regulations were public acts and personal notice given owners in most instances, it appears that in some cases successor surface owners did not have actual knowledge of their rights. The time for exercise of those rights now has expired, and hence special legislation for specific, individual cases such as the instant one is necessary.

Senator Thurmond informed the committee that although the present owner's predecessor in title was given personal notice of his rights to acquire the whole of the mineral estate, such notice was not in fact served upon the then actual owner.

The surface owner now desires to build a house on his land, but finds that the outstanding Federal reservation constitutes a cloud upon his title and makes financing extremely difficult. Thus, unless the owner is permitted to clear his title, in effect he is foreclosed from building a home on his land.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee adopted an amendment recommended by the Department of the Interior at the suggestion of the Comptroller General to provide that the surface owner should pay full costs of conveyancing. The committee went into the matter of probable amount of such costs with some care and was assured that in this case it was unlikely that costs would amount to as much as the $200 called for in the bill as introduced.

RECOMMENDATION

The committee finds that the Federal Government's reservation of 75 percent of the mineral estate in the subject lands are of no probable or foreseeable value to the Federal Government, and recommends enactment of S. 1326, thus enabling the surface owner to develop his land. No appropriation or cost to the Federal Government is called for under the bill.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

The "no objection" reports of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget are herein set forth in full.

Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1963.

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jackson: Your committee has requested a report on S. 1326, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property.

We would not object to the enactment of the bill, subject to the committee's consideration of our recommendations below.

The bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the surface owners all of the rights of the United States in and to the minerals contained in 53.3 acres of land located in Anderson County, S.C. The bill requires that application for the conveyance must be filed within 1 year after enactment of the bill and that the surface owners shall pay to the United States the sum of the fair market value of its interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance.

We have been apprised that the Farm Security Administration (now the Farmers Home Administration) quitclaimed on January 6, 1945, a tract of land to Gus and Ola Loskoski, reserving to the United States a 75-percent interest in the mineral estate. A portion of the tract was conveyed by the Loskoskis to L. T. and Sheron K. Vaughn on October 13, 1950.

The act of September 6, 1950, 7 U.S.C. 1033–1039, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such mineral estates to the surface owner if application therefor was filed within 7 years from the effective date of the law or from the date of the acquisition of the minerals estate by the United States, whichever is later. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determined, after consultation with this Department and competent local authorities that there was no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application would be sold for $1. In other areas, the mineral interests were to be sold at their fair market value. Any mineral estates not conveyed to the surface owners under the act of September 6, 1950, were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior after the expiration of such periods. Our Geological Survey states that although the land is located in an area where deposits of mica and monazite are known to occur, this specific land is believed to be without value for minerals, either metalliferous or nonmetalliferous.

Our only interest in this matter stems from our authority to issue mineral leases pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359) and section 402 of the Reorganization Plan of 1946 (60 Stat. 1099). The records of our Bureau of Land Management indicate that there are no outstanding leases or applications covering the Government's interest in the minerals.

If the committee finds that there are justifiable reasons for the failure of the surface owners to avail themselves of the act of September 6, 1950, supra, or that the existence of the mineral interest owned by the United State militates against intensive development of the land, we would interpose no objection to the enactment of S. 1326, subject to the following amendment. We believe that the Government should be compensated in full for the administrative costs attendant upon making the conveyance. We, therefore, suggest that the bill be amended on page 2, lines 6 and 7, by substituting for the words "the sum of $200" the following: "such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary." With respect to similar legislation, the Comptroller General's office informally has posed the question whether the sum of $200 is sufficient to cover the costs relating to appraisal of the mineral estate and the issuance of the document of transfer. The suggested amendment would permit the Government to recover its costs in full.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1963.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1326, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property.

The report which the Secretary of the Interior is submitting sets forth the facts in this case and raises no objection to enactment of the bill subject to consideration of certain recommendations.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of S. 1326 if amended as suggested by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked with the Senator from South Carolina and I have read the bill. I am advised—and the report seems to indicate that it is true—that there is no Federal value involved. The report states:

> In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determined, after consultation with this Department and competent local authorities, that there was no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application would be sold for $1. In other areas, the mineral interests were to be sold at their fair market value.

I have been assured that no Federal value for which the Federal Government would be entitled to receive compensation is involved. The Senator from South Carolina can check me carefully on the language I am about to state. The bill is needed in order to place the owners of the property in a position in which their title would be cleared. Is that correct?

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection. The record will show that the Morse formula is not involved.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 234, Senate bill 1154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1154) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Incorporated, and Karlson Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "$200" and insert "such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior"; in line 9, after the word "Incorporated", to strike out "and Karlson Development Corporation, both"; and in line 10, after the word "Minnesota", to strike out "each as owner of an undivided one-half interest,"; so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, in return for the payment of an amount equal to the sum of the fair market value of the rights conveyed and such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance, to Christmas Lake, Incorporated, in Minnesota, all oil, gas, and other mineral rights which are held by the United States in the following described lands situated in Carver County, Minnesota: Tract A, registered land survey numbered 14, files of registrar of titles, Carver County, Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] one question.

Can the Senator from Minnesota tell me whether or not any Federal value is involved in the bill calling for a transfer of mineral rights?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell for fair market value, plus the administrative costs of conveyance, the mineral rights reserved by the United States in a tract of approximately 56 acres. There are, however, no minerals there.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I compliment the Senator. I want him to know how much I appreciate the great respect he has paid to the Morse formula.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has been in the Senate long enough to fully respect the Morse formula.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is my understanding correct that the bill deals only with the transfer of mineral rights? Do the people involved already own the land itself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The bill would merely extend the exercise of a law that was placed on the books in 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 254), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 1154 would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell, for fair market value plus the administrative costs of conveyancing, the mineral rights reserved by the United States in a tract of some 56 acres in Carver County, Minn., to the surface owners.

Officers of the Department of the Interior testified at the hearings that there were no Federal mineral leases or lease applications pending on the tract, and that the U.S. Geological Survey did not believe the lands to have any mineral values. There is no record of mineral activity in the vicinity.

The subject lands had been owned by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and were conveyed to the predecessors in title of the Christmas Lake Co. in 1942 with a reservation of 50 percent of the minerals in them. In 1950, Congress enacted general legislation authorizing surface owners of lands the status of which was similar to the subject lands to purchase the reserved mineral rights if application therefor was filed within 7 years from the effective date of the law or from the date of the acquisition of the minerals estate by the United States, whichever is later. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determined, after consultation with this Department and competent local authorities that there was no active mineral development or leasing, the mineral interests covered by a single application would be sold for $1. In other areas, the mineral interests were to be sold at their fair market value. Any mineral estates not conveyed to the surface owners under the act of September 6, 1950, were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior after the expiration of the cutoff periods specified in the statute (act of September 6, 1950; found in 7 U.S.C. 1033–1039).

While enactment of the law was of course a matter of public record, and regulations for implementing it were duly published in the Federal Register, individual surface owners were not in every case informed personally of their rights. Hence in some instances such owners failed to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the statute because of lack of knowledge.

Christmas Lake, Inc., came into possession of the property in 1959, after the cutoff period provided by the law and after the Federal mineral interests had been conveyed by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation for leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359), and section 402 of the Reorganization Plan of 1946 (60 Stat. 1099).

The Federal Government's reservation of 50 percent of the mineral rights constitutes a cloud on the title of the surface owner and interferes with title insurance, thus hampering development. The reserved rights appear to be of no probable value to the United States.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

At the time S. 1154 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, title to the tract was held by Christmas Lakes, Inc., and the Karlson Development Corp. by undivided one-half interest in each. Subsequently, however, Senator HUMPHREY informed the committee that the Karlson Development

Corp.'s one-half interest had been purchased by and conveyed to Christmas Lake, Inc.

Hence, the committee amended the bill to provide for conveyance only to Christmas Lake.

The amendment with respect to payment of the full administrative costs of conveyancing was adopted at the request of the Department of the Interior which stated its recommendation was based upon questions raised by the Comptroller General. The committee was informed that while the Comptroller General advised that $200 might in some instances be insufficient, and that the cost provision should be on an ad hoc basis, there was no reason to believe that in this instance such costs would exceed $200 and well might be less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Incorporated, in Minnesota."

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 231, H.R. 220, and that the bill be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "National Service Life Insurance Amendment Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. Subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 725. Limited period for acquiring insurance

"(a) Any person (other than a person referred to in subsection (c) of this section) heretofore eligible to apply for National Service Life Insurance after October 7, 1940, and before January 1, 1957, shall upon application in writing made within one year after the effective date of this section, submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator at the time of such application, and payment of the required premiums, be granted insurance under the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday; (2) the net premium rates shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table, increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations, and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be so necessary but at intervals of not less than two years; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto, and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (4) all cash, loan, and paid-up insurance values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table and all extended term insurance values shall be based on 130 per centum of such table; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of the Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (7) all rights under such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto, whether in force or lapsed, shall terminate effective upon the date the policyholder enters on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more; (8) the insurance shall not be payable for death which occurs while the insured is on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of less than thirty-one days, if dependency and indemnity compensation is payable in such case at the time of death, however, the cash value, if any, less any indebtedness shall be paid to the designated beneficiary, if living, otherwise to the insured's estate; (9) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (10) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such insurance and disability provision shall be made directly from such fund.

"(b)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to provide capital for the revolving fund to carry out the purpose of this section. Such appropriations shall be advanced to the revolving fund as needed and shall bear interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt and shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund established under subsection (a) of this section such reverse amounts as may be required under accepted actuarial principles to meet all liabilities on insurance issued under subsection (a) of this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell, and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield.

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, there are hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the revolving fund such sums as Congress may deem appropriate to pay the cost of administration of insurance issued under subsection (a) of this section, and any total disability income provision attached thereto, for transfer to the appropriation, 'General operating expenses, Veterans' Administration', or as may otherwise be specified in appropriation Acts.

"(c) Any person who applies for insurance under subsection (a) of this section and who cannot qualify for insurance thereunder solely because of a service-connected disability for which compensation would be payable, if 10 per centum or more in degree, shall be granted insurance under the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday (2) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at the time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto (for which the insured may subsequently become eligible) and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (3) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis; (4) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (5) all rights under such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto, whether in force or lapsed, shall terminate effective upon the date the policyholder enters on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more; (6) the insurance shall not be payable for death which occurs when the insured is on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of less than thirty-one days, if dependency and indemnity compensation is payable in such case at the time of death, however, the cash value, if any, less any indebtedness shall be paid to the designated beneficiary, if living, otherwise to the insured's estate; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) all premiums and other collections on the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited directly to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation and any payments on such insurance and total disability income provision attached thereto shall be made directly from such appropriation. Appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection are hereby authorized. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, there are hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the National Service Life Insurance appropriation such sums as Congress may deem appropriate to pay the cost of administration of insurance issued under this subsection, and any total disability income provision attached thereto, for transfer to the appropriation 'General operating expenses, Veterans' Administration,' or as may otherwise be specified in appropriation Acts.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, a medical examination (including any supplemental examination or tests) when required of an applicant for issuance of insurance under this section or any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be at the applicant's own expense by a duly licensed physician.

"(e) No insurance shall be granted under this section to any person referred to in section 107 of this title or to any person while on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more.

"(f)(1) Whenever insurance issued under this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto is terminated as provided in this section, the cash value, if any, less any indebtedness, of a permanent plan policy shall be paid to the insured. Any person whose term or permanent plan policy, not including a reduced paid-up policy, was so terminated while it was not lapsed may, upon written application and payment of the required premium made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from active duty or active duty for training, replace such policy and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at the time of termination. The policy and provision issued to replace the terminated insurance shall be on the same plan and shall not be in excess of the amount of insurance which was terminated. Any person whose permanent plan policy was so terminated while such insurance was not lapsed may reinstate such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at time of termination, upon written application, payment of the required premium and reserve within the one hundred and twenty day period specified above. A person whose paid-up policy was so terminated may reinstate such paid-up insurance within the one hundred and twenty day period specified above, and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at time of termination, upon written application and payment of the required premium and reserve. Waiver of premiums and total disability income benefits otherwise authorized under this chapter shall not be denied in any case of reinstatement or replacement of insurance or the disability provision under this paragraph in which it is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the total disability of the applicant began before the date of his application for such reinstatement or replacement. The provisions of the immediately preceding sentence shall not be applicable in any case in which such total disability existed prior to the date of application for, or the effective date of, the insurance originally issued under this section.

"(2) Any person whose rights under a term or permanent plan policy or any total disability income provision attached thereto were terminated under this section, while the insurance and provision were in a lapsed status, may upon separation from active duty or active duty for training, replace such policy and provision on the same plan and not in excess of the amount of insurance terminated, upon written application made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from such duty, payment of the required premium and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator.

"(3) Any person whose rights under a term or permanent plan policy or total disability income provision attached thereto were terminated under this section, whether the insurance and provision were in force or lapsed, may upon separation from active duty or active duty for training (A) reinstate such permanent plan policy and provision upon written application, payment of the required premium and reserve, and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator; or (B) reinstate such term policy and provision (within the term period) upon written application, payment of the required premiums, and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator.

"(4) Five year level premium insurance may be issued under this subsection but not renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday. Insurance replaced under this subsection shall be issued at the premium rate for the applicant's then attained age."

SEC. 3. Section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium.

"(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a), or section 725 of this title may be granted a modified life insurance policy under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a) or section 725, whichever is applicable.

"(d) Any insured whose modified life insurance policy is in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday may upon written application and payment of premiums made before such birthday be granted National Service Life Insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance policy in force on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under the modified life policy. Settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settlements on the modified life policy. If the insured is totally disabled on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance policy are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured."

SEC. 4. The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"725. Limited period for acquiring insurance."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as of the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than six calendar months after the date of enactment of this Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 124)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is pending at the desk a highly privileged matter, a message from the President of the United States on civil rights issues and proposed legislation.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I think this is a matter of great historic significance in the history of our Republic. In years to come the historians will write of this great message of the President of the United States in veins similar to those of writings on the message of Abraham Lincoln in respect to the Emancipation Proclamation, for the message of President Kennedy today is a message which seeks to put into effect the rights and guarantees of the Emancipation Proclamation in respect to making the Constitution a living instrument of value to the Negro citizens of America.

I indicated earlier this afternoon that I think the highest respect should be paid to the President of the United States and to this message, and that the message should be read in this forum today, rather than merely filed and printed in the RECORD.

The American people are greatly concerned about all the implications of this message. As I have served in this Chamber for many years, I have listened to messages from Presidents read from the clerk's desk of this body when those messages did not have anywhere near the historic significance of the glorious message of President Kennedy today.

Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully request that this privileged matter be taken up at this time. If my request is granted—I think, parliamentarily, I am entitled to have it granted because of the privileged nature of the message—I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I shall request a live quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 106 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Humphrey
Javits
Johnston
Kennedy
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Miller
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Pell
Prouty
Scott
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Allott, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last week I addressed to the American people an appeal to conscience—a request for their cooperation in meeting the growing moral crisis in American race relations. I warned of "a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety" in many parts of the country. I emphasized that "the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them." "It is a time to act," I said, "in the Congress, in State and local legislative bodies and, above all, in all of our daily lives."

In the days that have followed, the predictions of increased violence have been tragically borne out. The "fires of frustration and discord" have burned hotter than ever.

At the same time, the response of the American people to this appeal to their principles and obligations has been reassuring. Private progress—by merchants and unions and local organizations—has been marked, if not uniform, in many areas. Many doors long closed to Negroes, North and South, have been opened. Local biracial committees, under private and public sponsorship, have mushroomed. The mayors of our major cities, whom I earlier addressed, have pledged renewed action. But persisting inequalities and tensions make it clear that Federal action must lead the way, providing both the Nation's standard and a nationwide solution. In short, the time has come for the Congress of the United States to join with the executive and judicial branches in making it clear to all that race has no place in American life or law.

On February 28 I sent to the Congress a message urging the enactment this year of three important pieces of civil rights legislation:

1. Voting: Legislation to assure the availability to all of a basic and powerful right—the right to vote in a free American election—by providing for the appointment of temporary Federal voting referees while voting suits are proceeding in areas of demonstrated need; by giving such suits preferential and expedited treatment in the Federal courts; by prohibiting in Federal elections the application of different tests and standards to different voter applicants; and by providing that, in voting suits pertaining to such elections, the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant creates a presumption that he is literate. Armed with the full and equal right to vote, our Negro citizens can help win other rights through political channels not now open to them in many areas.

2. Civil Rights Commission: Legislation to renew and expand the authority of the Commission on Civil Rights, enabling it to serve as a national civil rights clearing house offering information, advice and technical assistance to any public or private agency that so requests.

3. School desegregation: Legislation to provide Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Other measures introduced in the Congress have also received the support of this administration, including those aimed at assuring equal employment opportunity.

Although these recommendations were transmitted to the Congress some time ago, neither House has yet had an opportunity to vote on any of these essential measures. The Negro's drive for justice, however, has not stood still—nor will it, it is now clear, until full equality is achieved. The growing and understandable dissatisfaction of Negro citizens with the present pace of desegregation, and their increased determination to secure for themselves the equality of opportunity and treatment to which they are rightfully entitled, have underscored what should already have been clear: the necessity of the Congress enacting this year—not only the measures already proposed—but also additional legislation providing legal remedies for the denial of certain individual rights.

The venerable code of equity law commands "for every wrong, a remedy." But in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens for which no effective remedy at law is clearly and readily available. State and local laws may even affirmatively seek to deny the rights to which these citizens are fairly entitled—and this can result only in a decreased respect for the law and increased violations of the law.

In the continued absence of congressional action, too many state and local officials as well as businessmen will remain unwilling to accord these rights to all citizens. Some local courts and local merchants may well claim to be uncertain of the law, while those merchants who do recognize the justice of the Negro's request (and I believe these constitute the great majority of merchants, North and South) will be fearful of being the first to move, in the face of official, customer, employee or competitive pressures. Negroes, consequently, can be expected to continue increasingly to seek the vindication of these rights through organized direct action, with all its potentially explosive consequences, such as we have seen in Birmingham, in Philadelphia, in Jackson, in Boston, in Cambridge, Md., and in many other parts of the country.

In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife—causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquillity, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us. No American, I feel sure, would prefer this course of tension, disorder and division—and the great majority of our citizens simply cannot accept it.

For these reasons, I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fair-minded men. This bill would be known as the "Civil Rights Act of 1963," and would include—in addition to the aforementioned provisions on voting rights and the Civil Rights Commission—additional titles on public accommodations, employment, Federally assisted programs, a Community Relations Service, and education, with the latter including my previous recommendation on this subject. In addition, I am requesting certain legislative and budget amendments designed to improve the training, skills and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike. Certain executive actions are also reviewed here; but legislative action is imperative.

I. EQUAL ACCOMMODATIONS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES

Events of recent weeks have again underlined how deeply our Negro citizens resent the injustice of being arbitrarily denied equal access to those facilities and accommodations which are otherwise open to the general public. That is a daily insult which has no place in a country proud of its heritage—the heritage of the melting pot, of equal rights, of one nation and one people. No one has been barred on account of his race from fighting or dying for America—there are no "white" or "colored" signs on the foxholes or graveyards of battle. Surely, in 1963, 100 years after emancipation, it should not be necessary for any American citizen to demonstrate in the streets for the opportunity to stop at a hotel, or to eat at a lunch counter in the very department store in which he is shopping, or to enter a motion picture house, on the same terms as any other customer. As I stated in my message to the Congress of February 28, "no action is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities."

The U.S. Government has taken action through the courts and by other means to protect those who are peacefully demonstrating to obtain access to these public facilities; and it has taken action to bring an end to discrimination in rail, bus and airline terminals, to open up restaurants and other public facilities in all buildings leased as well as owned by the Federal Government, and to assure full equality of access to all federally owned parks, forests, and other recreational areas. When uncontrolled mob action directly threatened the nondiscriminatory use of transportation facilities in May 1961, Federal marshals were employed to restore order and prevent potentially widespread personal and property damage. Growing nationwide concern with this problem, however, makes it clear that further Federal action is needed now to secure the right of all citizens to the full enjoyment of all facilities which are open to the general public.

Such legislation is clearly consistent with the Constitution and with our concepts of both human rights and property rights. The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control, and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest. While the legal situations are not parallel, it is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln, in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation 100 years ago, was also accused of violating the property rights of slave-owners. Indeed, there is an age-old saying that "property has its duties as well as its rights"; and no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public. Both human rights and property rights are foundations of our society—and both will flourish as the result of this measure.

In a society which is increasingly mobile and in an economy which is increasingly interdependent, business establishments which serve the public—such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, stores and others—serve not only the members of their immediate communities but travelers from other States and visitors from abroad. Their goods come from all over the Nation. This participation in the flow of interstate commerce has given these business establishments both increased prosperity and an increased responsibility to provide equal access and service to all citizens.

Some 30 States,[1] the District of Columbia and numerous cities—covering some two-thirds of this country and well over two-thirds of its people—have already enacted laws of varying effectiveness against discrimination in places of public accommodation, many of them in response to the recommendation of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947. But while their efforts indicate that legislation in this area is not extraordinary, the failure of more States to take effective action makes it clear that Federal legislation is necessary. The State and local approach has been tried. The voluntary approach has been tried. But these approaches are insufficient to prevent the free flow of commerce from being arbitrarily and inefficiently restrained and distorted by discrimination in such establishments.

Clearly the Federal Government has both the power and the obligation to eliminate these discriminatory practices: first, because they adversely affect the national economy and the flow of interstate commerce; and secondly, because Congress has been specifically empowered under the Fourteenth Amendment to enact legislation making certain that no State law permits or sanctions the unequal protection or treatment of any of its citizens.

There have been increasing public demonstrations of resentment directed against this kind of discrimination—demonstrations which too often breed tension and violence. Only the Federal Government, it is clear, can make these demonstrations unnecessary by providing peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off.

For these reasons, I am today proposing, as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, a provision to guarantee all citizens equal access to the services and facilities of hotels, restaurants, places of amusement and retail establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure. The proposal would give the person aggrieved the right to obtain a court order against the offending establishment or persons. Upon receiving a complaint in a case sufficiently important to warrant his conclusion that a suit would materially further the purposes of the act, the Attorney General—if he finds that the aggrieved party is unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for a suit on his own (for lack of financial means or effective representation, or for fear of economic or other injury)—will first refer the case for voluntary settlement to the Community Relations Service described below, give the establishment involved time to correct its practices, permit State and local equal access laws (if any) to operate first, and then, and only then, initiate a suit for compliance. In short, to the extent that these unconscionable practices can be corrected by the individual owners, localities and States (and recent experience demonstrate how effectively and uneventfully this can be done), the Federal Government has no desire to intervene.

But an explosive national problem cannot await city-by-city solutions; and those who loudly abhor Federal action only invite it if they neglect or evade their own obligations.

This provision will open doors in every part of the country which never should have been closed. Its enactment will hasten the end to practices which have no place in a free and united nation, and thus help move this potentially dangerous problem from the streets to the courts.

II. DESEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS

In my message of February 28, while commending the progress already made in achieving desegregation of education at all levels as required by the Constitution, I was compelled to point out the slowness of progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation. The Supreme Court has recently voiced the same opinion. Many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court decision in 1954 will enter segregated high schools this year, having suffered a loss which can never be regained. Indeed, discrimination in education is one basic cause of the other inequities and hardships inflicted upon our Negro citizens. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity, restricts his contribution as a citizen and community leader, encourages him to drop out of school and imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices and prejudices from our national life.

The Federal courts, pursuant to the 1954 decision of the United States Supreme Court and earlier decisions on institutions of higher learning, have shown both competence and courage in directing the desegregation of schools on the local level. It is appropriate to keep this responsibility largely within the judicial arena. But it is unfair and unrealistic to expect that the burden of initiating such cases can be wholly borne by private litigants. Too often those entitled to bring suit on behalf of their children lack the economic means for instituting and maintaining such cases or the ability to withstand the personal, physical and economic harassment which sometimes descends upon those who do institute them. The same is true of students wishing to attend the college of their choice but unable to assume the burden of litigation.

---

[1] Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming. Cities with public accommodations ordinances which are outside the above States include Washington, D.C., Wilmington, Del., Louisville, Ky., El Paso, Tex., Kansas City, Mo., and St. Louis, Mo.

These difficulties are among the principal reasons for the delay in carrying out the 1954 decision; and this delay cannot be justified to those who have been hurt as a result. Rights such as these, as the Supreme Court recently said, are "present rights. They are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now."

In order to achieve a more orderly and consistent compliance with the Supreme Court's school and college desegregation decisions, therefore, I recommend that the Congress assert its specific constitutional authority to implement the 14th amendment by including in the Civil Rights Act of 1963 a new title providing the following:

(A) Authority would be given the Attorney General to initiate in the Federal district courts appropriate legal proceedings against local public school boards or public institutions of higher learning—or to intervene in existing cases—whenever—

(1) he has received a written complaint from students or from the parents of students who are being denied equal protection of the laws by a segregated public school or college; and

(2) he certifies that such persons are unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for the initiation and maintenance of such legal proceedings for lack of financial means or effective legal representation or for fear of economic or other injury; and

(3) he determines that his initiation of or intervention in such suit will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. For this purpose, the Attorney General would establish criteria to determine the priority and relative need for Federal action in those districts from which complaints have been filed.

(B) As previously recommended, technical and financial assistance would be given to those school districts in all parts of the country which, voluntarily or as the result of litigation, are engaged in the process of meeting the educational problems flowing from desegregation or racial imbalance but which are in need of guidance, experienced help or financial assistance in order to train their personnel for this changeover, cope with new difficulties and complete the job satisfactorily (including in such assistance loans to a district where State or local funds have been withdrawn or withheld because of desegregation).

Public institutions already operating without racial discrimination, of course, will not be affected by this statute. Local action can always make Federal action unnecessary. Many school boards have peacefully and voluntarily desegregated in recent years. And while this Act does not include private colleges and schools, I strongly urge them to live up to their responsibilities and to recognize no arbitrary bar of race or color—for such bars have no place in any institution, least of all one devoted to the truth and to the improvement of all mankind.

III. FAIR AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups. The unemployment rate of Negro workers is more than twice as high as that of the working force as a whole. In many of our larger cities, both North and South, the number of jobless Negro youth—often 20 percent or more—creates an atmosphere of frustration, resentment and unrest which does not bode well for the future. Delinquency, vandalism, gang warfare, disease, slums and the high cost of public welfare and crime are all directly related to unemployment among whites and Negroes alike—and recent labor difficulties in Philadelphia may well be only the beginning if more jobs are not found in the larger northern cities in particular.

Employment opportunities, moreover, play a major role in determining whether the rights described above are meaningful. There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job.

Relief of Negro unemployment requires progress in three major areas:

(1) More jobs must be created through greater economic growth. The Negro—too often unskilled, too often the first to be fired and the last to be hired—is a primary victim of recessions, depressed areas, and unused industrial capacity. Negro unemployment will not be noticeably diminished in this country until the total demand for labor is effectively increased and the whole economy is headed toward a level of full employment. When our economy operates below capacity, Negroes are more severely affected than other groups. Conversely, return to full employment yields particular benefits to the Negro. Recent studies have shown that for every 1 percentage point decline in the general unemployment rate there tends to be a 2-percentage-point reduction in Negro unemployment.

Prompt and substantial tax reduction is a key to achieving the full employment we need. The promise of the area redevelopment program—which harnesses local initiative toward the solution of deep-seated economic distress—must not be stifled for want of sufficient authorization or adequate financing. The accelerated public works program is now gaining momentum; States, cities, and local communities should press ahead with the projects financed by this measure. In addition, I have instructed the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare to examine how their programs for the relief of unemployment and economic hardship can be still more intensively focused on those areas of hard-core, long-term unemployment, among both white and non-white workers. Our concern with civil rights must not cause any diversion or dilution of our efforts for economic progress—for without such progress the Negro's hopes will remain unfulfilled.

(2) More education and training to raise the level of skills. A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking in adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants. And too many who have attended nonsegregated schools dropped out for lack of incentive, guidance or progress. The unemployment rate for those adults with less than 5 years of schooling is around 10 percent; it has consistently been double the prevailing rate for high school graduates; and studies of public welfare recipients show a shockingly high proportion of parents with less than a primary school education.

Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort today is failing millions of our youth. It is especially failing Negro youth in segregated schools and crowded slums. If we are ever to lift them from the morass of social and economic degradation, it will be through the strengthening of our education and training services—by improving the quality of instruction; by enabling our schools to cope with rapidly expanding enrollments; and by increasing opportunities and incentives for all individuals to complete their education and to continue their self-development during adulthood.

I have therefore requested of the Congress and request again today the enactment of legislation to assist education at every level from grade school through graduate school.

I have also requested the enactment of several measures which provide, by various means and for various age and educational groups, expanded job training and job experience. Today, in the new and more urgent context of this message, I wish to renew my request for these measures, to expand their prospective operation and to supplement them with additional provisions. The additional $400 million which will be required beyond that contained in the January budget is more than offset by the various budget reductions which I have already sent to the Congress in the last 4 months. Studies show, moreover, that the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school; and, when welfare and other social costs are added, it is clear that failure to take these steps will cost us far more than their enactment. There is no more profitable investment than education, and no greater waste than ill-trained youth.

Specifically, I now propose:

(A) That additional funds be provided to broaden the manpower development and training program, and that the act be amended, not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program;

(B) That additional funds be provided to finance the pending youth employment bill, which is designed to channel the energies of out-of-school, out-of-work youth into the constructive outlet offered by hometown improvement projects and conservation work;

(C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school drop-outs and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

(D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high-school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training;

(E) That the ceiling be raised on the adult basic education provisions in the pending education program, in order to help the States teach the fundamental tools of literacy and learning to culturally deprived adults. More than 22 million Americans in all parts of the country have less than 8 years of schooling; and

(F) That the public welfare work-relief and training program, which the Congress added last year, be amended to provide Federal financing of the supervision and equipment costs, and more Federal demonstration and training projects, thus encouraging State and local welfare agencies to put employable but unemployed welfare recipients to work on local projects which do not displace other workers.

To make the above recommendations effective, I call upon more States to adopt enabling legislation covering unemployed fathers under the aid-to-dependent children program, thereby gaining their services for "work-relief" jobs, and to move ahead more vigorously in implementing the manpower development and training program. I am asking the Secretaries of Labor and HEW to make use of their authority to deal directly with communities and vocational schools whenever State cooperation or progress is insufficient, particularly in those areas where youth unemployment is too high. Above all, I urge the Congress to enact all of these measures with alacrity and foresight.

For even the complete elimination of racial discrimination in employment—a goal toward which this Nation must strive (as discussed below)—will not put a single unemployed Negro to work unless he has the skills required and unless more jobs have been created—and thus the passage of legislation described above (under both sections (1) and (2)) is essential if the objectives of this message are to be met.

(3) Finally racial discrimination in employment must be eliminated. Denial of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden on an individual because of his race or color. Men who served side by side with each other on the field of battle should have no difficulty working side by side on an assembly line or construction project.

Therefore, to combat this evil in all parts of the country,

(A) The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity under the chairmanship of the Vice President, should be given a permanent statutory basis, assuring it of adequate financing and enforcement procedures. That Committee is now stepping up its efforts to remove racial barriers in the hiring practices of Federal departments, agencies, and Federal contractors, covering a total of some 20 million employees and the Nation's major employers. I have requested a company-by-company, plant-by-plant, union-by-union report to assure the implementation of this policy.

(B) I will shortly issue an Executive order extending the authority of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to include the construction of buildings and other facilities undertaken wholly or in part as a result of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

(C) I have directed that all Federal construction programs be reviewed to prevent any racial discrimination in hiring practices, either directly in the rejection of presently available qualified Negro workers or indirectly by the exclusion of Negro applicants for apprenticeship training.

(D) I have directed the Secretary of Labor, in the conduct of his duties under the Federal Apprenticeship Act and Executive Order No. 10925, to require that the admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis.

(E) I have directed the Secretary of Labor to make certain that the job counseling and placement responsibilities of the Federal-State Employment Service are carried out on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to help assure that full and equal employment opportunity is provided all qualified Negro applicants. The selection and referral of applicants for employment and for training opportunities, and the administration of the employment offices' other services and facilities, must be carried on without regard to race or color. This will be of special importance to Negroes graduating from high school or college this month.

(F) The Department of Justice has intervened in a case now pending before the NLRB involving charges of racial discrimination on the part of certain union locals.

(G) As a part of its new policy on Federal employee organizations, this Government will recognize only those that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color.

(H) I have called upon the leaders of organized labor to end discrimination in their membership policies; and some 118 unions, representing 85 percent of the AFL-CIO membership, have signed nondiscrimination agreements with the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. More are expected.

(I) Finally, I renew my support of pending Federal Fair Employment Practices legislation, applicable to both employers and unions. Approximately two-thirds of the Nation's labor force is already covered by Federal, State and local equal employment opportunity measures—including those employed in the 22 States and numerous cities which have enacted such laws as well as those paid directly or indirectly by Federal funds. But, as the Secretary of Labor testified in January 1962, Federal legislation is desirable, for it would help set a standard for all the Nation and close existing gaps.

This problem of unequal job opportunity must not be allowed to grow, as the result of either recession or discrimination. I enlist every employer, every labor union, and every agency of Government—whether affected directly by these measures or not—in the task of seeing to it that no false lines are drawn in assuring equality of the right and opportunity to make a decent living.

IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

I have repeatedly stressed the fact that progress in race relations, while it cannot be delayed, can be more solidly and more peacefully accomplished to the extent that legislation can be buttressed by voluntary action. I have urged each member of the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish biracial human relations committees in every city; and I hope all communities will establish such a group, preferably through official action. Such a board or committee can provide invaluable services by identifying community tensions before they reach the crisis stage, by improving cooperation and communication between the races, and by advising local officials, merchants, and organizations on the steps which can be taken to insure prompt progress.

A similar agency is needed on the Federal level—to work with these local committees, providing them with advice and assistance—to work in those communities which lack a local committee—and generally to help ease tensions and suspicions, to help resolve interracial disputes, and to work quietly to improve relations in any community threatened or torn with strife. Such an effort is in no way a substitute for effective legislative guarantees of human rights. But conciliation and cooperation can facilitate the achievement of those rights, enabling legislation to operate more smoothly and more effectively.

The Department of Justice and its Civil Rights Division have already performed yeoman service of this nature, in Birmingham, in Jackson, and throughout the country. But the problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service—to fulfill the functions described above, working through regional, State and local committees to the extent possible, and offering its services in tension-torn communities either upon its own motion or upon the request of a local official or other party. Authority for such a service is included in the proposed omnibus bill. It will work without publicity and hold all information imparted to its officers in strict confidence. Its own resources can be preserved by its encouraging and assisting the creation of State and local committees, either on a continuing basis or in emergency situations.

Without powers of enforcement or subpena, such a service is no substitute for other measures; and it cannot guarantee success. But dialog and discussion are always better than violence—and this agency, by enabling all concerned to sit down and reason together, can play a major role in achieving peaceful progress in civil rights.

V. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Simple justice requires that public funds, to which all taxpayers of all races contribute, not be spent in any fashion which encourages, entrenches, subsidizes or results in racial discrimination. Direct discrimination by Federal, State or local governments is prohibited by the Constitution. But indirect discrimination, through the use of Federal funds, is just as invidious; and it should not be necessary to resort to the courts to prevent each individual violation. Congress and the Executive have their responsibilities to uphold the Constitution also; and, in the 1960's the executive branch has sought to fulfill its responsibilities by banning discrimination in federally financed housing, in NDEA and NSF institutes, in federally affected employment, in the Army and Air Force Reserve, in the training of civilian defense workers and in all federally owned and leased facilities.

Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the Administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients that the amount of administrative discretion remaining—which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended—is at best questionable. No administrator has the unlimited authority to invoke the Constitution in opposition to the mandate of the Congress. Nor would it always be helpful to require unconditionally—as is often proposed—the withdrawal of all Federal funds from programs urgently needed by Negroes as well as whites; for this may only penalize those who least deserve it without ending discrimination.

Instead of permitting this issue to become a political device often exploited by those opposed to social or economic progress, it would be better at this time to pass a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guaranty, insurance, or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs. This would not permit the Federal Government to cut off all Federal aid of all kinds as a means of punishing an area for the discrimination occurring therein—but it would clarify the authority of any administrator with respect to Federal funds or financial assistance and discriminatory practices.

CONCLUSION

Many problems remain that cannot be ignored. The enactment of the legislation I have recommended will not solve all our problems of race relations. This bill must be supplemented by action in every branch of government at the Federal, State, and local level. It must be supplemented as well by enlightened private citizens, private businesses and private labor and civic organizations, by responsible educators and editors, and certainly by religious leaders who recognize the conflict between racial bigotry and the Holy Word.

This is not a sectional problem—it is nationwide. It is not a partisan problem. The proposals set forth above are based on a careful consideration of the views of leaders of both parties in both Houses of Congress. In 1957 and 1960, members of both parties rallied behind the civil rights measures of my predecessor; and I am certain that this tradition can be continued, as it has in the case of world crises. A national domestic crisis also calls for bipartisan unity and solutions.

We will not solve these problems by blaming any group or section for the legacy which has been handed down by past generations. But neither will these problems be solved by clinging to the patterns of the past. Nor, finally, can they be solved in the streets, by lawless acts on either side, or by the physical actions or presence of any private group or public official, however appealing such melodramatic devices may seem to some.

During the weeks past, street demonstrations, mass picketing and parades have brought these matters to the Nation's attention in dramatic fashion in many cities throughout the United States. This has happened because these racial injustices are real and no other remedy was in sight. But, as feelings have risen in recent days, these demonstrations have increasingly endangered lives and property, enflamed emotions and unnecessarily divided communities. They are not the way in which this country should rid itself of racial discrimination. Violence is never justified; and, while peaceful communication, deliberation and petitions of protest continue, I want to caution against demonstrations which can lead to violence.

This problem is now before the Congress. Unruly tactics or pressures will not help and may hinder the effective consideration of these measures. If they are enacted, there will be legal remedies available; and, therefore, while the Congress is completing its work, I urge all community leaders, Negro and white, to do their utmost to lessen tensions and to exercise self-restraint. The Congress should have an opportunity to freely work its will. Meanwhile, I strongly support action by local public officials and merchants to remedy these grievances on their own.

The legal remedies I have proposed are the embodiment of this Nation's basic posture of common sense and common justice. They involve every American's right to vote, to go to school, to get a job and to be served in a public place without arbitrary discrimination—rights which most Americans take for granted.

In short, enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 at this session of the Congress—however long it may take and however troublesome it may be—is imperative. It will go far toward providing reasonable men with the reasonable means of meeting these problems; and it will thus help end the kind of racial strife which this Nation can hardly afford. Rancor, violence, disunity and national shame can only hamper our national standing and security. To paraphrase the words of Lincoln: "In giving freedom to the Negro, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve."

I therefore ask every Member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans; a sense of justice. In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1963.*

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, a bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with respect to the bill that the majority leader just introduced, that it lie on the desk until the end of the work day on Monday, for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, under the order previously entered, printed in the Record; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1750) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and Mr. Dirksen), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Act of 1963."

TITLE I—VOTING RIGHTS

Sec. 101. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended by section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637), and as further amended by section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 90), is further amended as follows:

(a) Insert "1" after "(a)" in subsection (a) and add at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) No person acting under color of law shall—

"(A) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law to vote in any Federal election apply any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied to individuals similarly situated who have been found by State officials to be qualified to vote.

"(B) deny the right of any individual to vote in any Federal election because of an error or omission of such individual on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material in determining whether such individual is qualified under State law to vote in such election; or

"(C) employ any literacy test as a qualification for voting in any Federal election unless (i) such test is administered to each individual wholly in writing and (ii) a certified copy of the test and of the answers given by the individual is furnished to him within twenty-five days of the submission of his written request made within the period of time during which records and papers are required to be retained and preserved pursuant to title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1974–74e; 74 Stat. 88).

"(3) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'vote' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (e) of this section;

"(B) the words 'Federal election' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (f) of this section; and

"(C) the phrase 'literacy test' includes any test of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter."

(b) Insert immediately following the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "If in any such proceeding literacy is a relevant fact it shall be presumed that any person who has not been adjudged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory or the District of Columbia where instruction is carried on predominantly in the English language, possesses sufficient literacy, comprehension, and intelligence to vote in any Federal election as defined in subsection (f) of this section."

(c) Add the following subsection "(f)" and designate the present subsection "(f)" as subsection "(g)":

"(f) Whenever in any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) the complaint requests a finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), and such complaint, or a motion filed within twenty days after the effective date of this Act in the case of any proceeding which is pending before a district court on such effective date, (1) is signed by the Attorney General (or in his absence the Acting Attorney General), and (2) alleges that in the affected area fewer than 15 per centum of the total number of voting age persons of the same race as the persons alleged in the complaint to have been discriminated against are registered (or otherwise recorded as qualified to vote), any person resident within the affected area who is of the same race as the persons alleged to have been discriminated against shall be entitled, upon his application therefor, to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that at any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. Such order shall be effective as to any Federal or State election held within the longest period for which such applicant could have been registered or otherwise qualified under State law at which the applicant's qualifications would under State law entitle him to vote: *Provided,* That in the event it is determined upon final disposition of the proceeding, including any review, that no pattern or practice of deprivation of any right secured by subsection (a) exists, the order shall thereafter no longer qualify the applicant to vote in any subsequent election.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State law or the action of any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote as provided herein. The Attorney General shall cause to be transmitted certified copies of any order declaring a person qualified to vote to the appropriate election officers. The refusal by any such officer with notice of such order to permit any person so qualified to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"The court may appoint one or more persons, to be known as temporary voting referees, to receive applications pursuant to this subsection and to take evidence and report to the court findings as to whether at any election or elections (1) any applicant entitled under this subsection to apply for an order declaring him qualified to vote is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. The procedure for processing applications under this subsection and for the entry of orders shall be the same as that provided for in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of subsection (e).

"In appointing a temporary voting referee the court shall make its selection from a panel provided by the Judicial Conference of the circuit. Any temporary voting referee shall be a resident and a qualified voter of the State in which he is to serve. He shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 16), and shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers conferred upon a master by rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed any persons appointed by the district court pursuant to this subsection shall be fixed by the court and shall be payable by the United States. In the event that the district court shall appoint a retired officer or employee of the United States to serve as a temporary voting referee, such officer or employee shall continue to receive, in addition to any compensation for services rendered pursuant to this subsection, all retirement benefits to which he may otherwise be entitled.

"The court or temporary voting referee shall entertain applications and the court shall issue orders pursuant to this subsection until final disposition of the proceeding under subsection (c), including any review, or until the finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), whichever shall first occur. Applications pursuant to this subsection shall be determined expeditiously, and this subsection shall in no way be construed as a limitation upon the existing powers of the court.

"When used in this subsection, the words 'Federal election' shall mean any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for the office of President, Vice-President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives; the words 'State election' shall mean any other general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for public office; the words 'affected area' shall mean that county, parish, or similar subdivision of the State in which the laws of the State relating to voting are or have been administered by a person who is a defendant in the proceeding instituted under subsection (c) on the date the original complaint is filed; and the words 'voting age persons' shall mean those persons who meet the age requirements of State law for voting."

(d) Add the following subsection "h":

"(h) In any civil action brought in any district court of the United States under this section or title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1974–74e; 74 Stat. 88) wherein the United States or the Attorney General is plaintiff, it shall be the duty of the chief judge of the district (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) in which the case is pending immediately to designate a judge in such district to hear and determine the case. In the event that no judge in the district is available to hear and determine the case, the chief judge of the district, or the acting chief judge, as the case may be, shall certify this fact to the chief judge of the circuit (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) who shall then designate a district or circuit judge of the circuit to hear and determine the case.

"It shall be the duty of the judge designated pursuant to this section to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be in every way expedited."

TITLE II—COMMISSION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 201. The President is authorized to establish a Commission to be known as the "Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity," hereinafter referred to as the Commission. It shall be the function of the Commission to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the United States Government is provided by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise. The Commission shall have such powers to effectuate the purposes of this title as may be conferred upon it by the President. The President may also confer upon the Commission such powers as he deems appropriate to prevent discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin in Government employment.

SEC. 202. The Commission shall consist of the Vice President, who shall serve as Chairman, the Secretary of Labor, who shall serve as Vice Chairman, and not more than 15 other members appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President. Members of the Commission, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise serving at the request of the Commission, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by it but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 73b–2 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 203. (a) There shall be an Executive Vice Chairman of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President and who shall be ex officio a member of the Commission. The Executive Vice Chairman shall assist the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the members of the Commission and shall be responsible for carrying out the orders and recommendations of the Commission and for performing such other functions as the Commission may direct.

(b) Section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2205(a)), is further amended by adding the following clause thereto:

"(52) Executive Vice Chairman, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity."

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and is authorized to procure services as authorized by section 14 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 a day.

TITLE III—DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Definitions

SEC. 301. As used in this title—

(a) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) "Public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution, and "public college" means any institution of higher education or any technical or vocational school above the secondary school level, operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated wholly or predominantly from or through the use of governmental funds or property, or funds or property derived from a governmental source.

(d) "School board" means any agency or agencies which administer a system of one or more public schools and any other agency which is responsible for the assignment of students to or within such system.

Assistance to facilitate desegregation

SEC. 302. The Commissioner shall conduct investigations and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, upon the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied to individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public education institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon the application of any school board, State, municipality, school district, or other governmental unit, to render technical assistance in the preparation, adoption and, implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools or other plans designed to deal with problems arising from racial imbalance in public school systems. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies information regarding effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or racial imbalance, and making available to such agencies personnel of the Office of Education or other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with such problems.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation or measures to adjust racial imbalance in public school systems. Individuals who attend such an institute may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance at such institute in amounts specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including allowances for dependents and including allowances for travel to attend such institute.

SEC. 304. (a) A school board which has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction, or a school board which is confronted with problems arising from racial imbalance in the public schools within its jurisdiction, may apply to the Commissioner, either directly or through another governmental unit, for a grant or loan, as hereinafter provided, for the purpose of aiding such school board in carrying out desegregation or in dealing with problems of racial imbalance.

(b) The Commissioner may make a grant under this section, upon application therefor, for—

(1) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel in-service training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance in public schools; and

(2) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance and of providing other assistance to develop understanding of these problems by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public.

(c) Each application made for a grant under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend certain of its own funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Commissioner shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation or racial imbalance, and such other factors as he finds relevant.

(d) The Commissioner may make a loan under this section, upon application, to any school board or to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates if the Commissioner finds that—

(1) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to any such school board, either directly or through the local government within whose jurisdiction it operates, have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governmental action because of the actual or prospective desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board;

(2) such school board has authority to receive and expend, or such local government has authority to receive and make available for the use of such board, the proceeds of such loan; and

(3) the proceeds of such loan will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise have been used.

(e) Each application made for a loan under this section shall provide such detailed information and be in such form as the Commissioner may require. Any loan under this section shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(f) The Commissioner may suspend or terminate assistance under this section to any school board which, in his judgment, is failing to comply in good faith with the terms and conditions upon which the assistance was extended.

SEC. 305. Payments pursuant to a grant or contract under this title may be made (after necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, and on such conditions, as the Commissioner may determine.

SEC. 306. The Commissioner shall prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of sections 301 through 305 of this title.

Suits by the Attorney General

SEC. 307. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint—

(1) signed by a parent or group of parents to the effect that his or their minor children, as members of a class of persons similarly situated, are being deprived of the equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or

(2) signed by an individual, or his parent, to the effect that he has been denied admission to or not permitted to continue in attendance at a public college by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin,

and the Attorney General certifies that in his judgment the signer or signers of such complaint are unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief and that the institution of an action will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action in a district court of the United States against such parties and for such relief as may be appropriate, and such court shall have and shall exercise jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section. The Attorney General may implead as defendants such additional parties as are or become necessary to the grant of effective relief hereunder.

(b) A person or persons shall be deemed unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person or persons are unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or persons, their families, or their property.

(c) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws by reason of the failure of a school board to achieve desegregation, or of a public college to admit or permit the continued attendance of an individual, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action if he certifies that, in his judgment, the plaintiffs are unable to maintain the action for any of the reasons set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and that such intervention will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. In such an action the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action under subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The term "parent" as used in this section includes other legal representatives.

SEC. 308. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General or of the United States under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

SEC. 309. In any action or proceeding under this title the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

SEC. 310. Nothing in this title shall affect adversely the right of any person to sue for or obtain relief in any court against discrimination in public education.

TITLE IV—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

SEC. 401. There is hereby established a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year. The Director is authorized to appoint such additional officers and employees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 402. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever in its judgment peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate local official or other interested person.

SEC. 403. (a) The Service shall whenever possible in performing its functions under this title seek and utilize the cooperation of the appropriate State or local agencies and may seek and utilize the cooperation of any nonpublic agency which it believes may be helpful.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing assistance under this title shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service.

SEC. 404. Subject to the provisions of section 403(b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation necessary for improvements in such internal administration.

TITLE V—COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SEC. 501. Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975a; 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION, HEARINGS

"SEC. 102. (a) The Chairman, or one designated by him to act as Chairman at a hearing of the Commission, shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing.

"(b) A copy of the Commission's rules shall be made available to the witness before the Commission.

"(c) Witnesses at the hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

"(d) The Chairman or Acting Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum and unprofessional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings.

"(e) If the Commission determines that evidence or testimony at any hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall receive such evidence or testimony or summary of such evidence or testimony in executive session. In the event the Commission determines that such evidence or testimony shall be given at a public session, it shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

"(f) Except as provided in sections 102 and 105(f) of this Act, the Chairman shall receive and the Commission shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

"(g) No evidence or testimony or summary of evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases or uses in public without the consent of the Commission such evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year.

"(h) In the discretion of the Commission, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Commission is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings.

"(i) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Commission.

"(j) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $6 a for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 10 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $10 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission or any subcommittee thereof.

"(k) The Commission shall not issue any subpena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written or other matter which would require the presence of the party subpenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State wherein the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process except that, in any event, the Commission may issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of written or other matter at a hearing held within fifty miles of the place where the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process."

SEC. 502. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(a); 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. (a) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2; 60 Stat. 808)."

SEC. 503. Section 103(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(b); 71 Stat. 634) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–42; 63 Stat. 166)."

SEC. 504. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c; 71 Stat. 635), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate performance of its duties on those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs on one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, and shall submit to the President and to the Congress a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations not later than September 30, 1967.

"(c) Sixty days after the submission of its final report and recommendations the Commission shall cease to exist."

SEC. 505. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(d); 71 Stat. 636) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per diem."

SEC. 506. Section 105(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(g); 71 Stat. 636) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the United States Court of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof."

SEC. 507. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d; 71 Stat. 636), as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h); 74 Stat. 89), is further amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

TITLE VI—NON DISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any such program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 702. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are indebted to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for reminding us that this historic and courageous message of President Kennedy, on proposals and programs to strengthen human rights, has been read in the Senate. Of course, it is now a matter of public record, not only for the Congress, but throughout every country in the world, and for the ages.

Mr. President, I feel that this message is not only courageous and forceful, but wise. It is designed to meet the needs of the times, and, as has been said so frequently and eloquently here today, it is designed to bring the fulfillment and and achievement of the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation that was made 100 years ago.

In President Kennedy's historic message to Congress concerning our crisis of race relations in the United States, he has wisely stressed both the moral and legal aspects of the crisis. He has reminded us that we are faced with an urgent crisis to secure for every American full political and legal equality and full citizenship. This is what he meant by the so-called civil rights of every citizen.

Such civil rights include, among others, the right to vote, the right to attend nonsegregated schools, the right of access to public accommodations, the right of peaceful assembly and petition.

The exercise of these freedoms and rights is regarded, quite properly, as the foundations of American citizenship. They cannot be denied to any citizen of this Nation. The Civil Rights Act of 1963, introduced today by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and cosponsored by a substantial number of Senators, provides the means to end such denials.

But even if every trace of civil inequality suddenly were to vanish from this land, there would still exist vast barriers of inequality, discrimination, and segregation that would constitute great barriers to racial tranquillity and harmony. Thus, the President forthrightly outlined the need for concurrent action to remove the barriers of job discrimination, educational incapacity, technical illiteracy, and social instability. One of the most tragic evidences of generations of flagrant racial discrimination in every section of America is the vast gap that exists between too many white and Negro Americans in job training and opportunity. The facts are patently clear: the Negro American, as a group, has been systematically denied the opportunity for equal academic, vocational, and technical education in many areas of America; thereby he is poorly equipped to maintain steady employment in our industrialized economy. Moreover, he has also been systematically denied access to the more desirable jobs that certain Negroes are prepared, by education and training, to perform. The self-perpetuating and self-reinforcing system of job discrimination and training discrimination has made the economic prospects for our Negro citizens very dim indeed.

This system must be broken; and it is being broken today. The racial crisis in America will never be resolved until this system is finally destroyed.

The President has recognized this fact by recommending a massive program of job training designed specifically for untrained and unemployable Negroes throughout the United States.

When I say "unemployable" I mean unemployable because they have been denied the education and training that should have been accorded to them. The President has recommended legislation to remove all racial barriers from job opportunities. I am hopeful that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will report to the Senate a fair unemployment practice bill providing for full equality of opportunity in employment. It was my privilege to sponsor such a bill several years ago and I am currently working on a totally new version. An earlier version of FEPC legislation was reported favorably by the committee, but, regrettably, it failed to pass the Senate.

I believe the times are different today. There is a different temperament in America. The country feels differently today about the necessity for the enactment of effective civil rights legislation.

I am now preparing fair employment legislation which will offer a totally new approach to the problems of fair employment opportunities. I sincerely hope the Senate will give this legislation full and complete consideration when it is introduced.

It was my privilege, as mayor of a great city, in the year 1946, to propose the first municipal fair employment practice ordinance, with enforcible provisions. That ordinance was presented to the city council, and was made the law of the city. It has been operative for 17 years. It has worked advantageously for employer and employee alike, and has been of substantial benefit to the community.

Therefore I say that in the immediate future I will spell out the details of the new proposed legislation. In line with the President's emphasis in today's message, fair employment legislation must permit employers to develop maximum employment opportunities for every American, as opposed to providing merely for the enforcement of nondiscrimination in employment. This distinction is most important. Only through such a comprehensive approach to fair employment practices, which is, after all, an integral part of the total employment process, can we ever hope to bring the Negro into our economic system in such a manner that his talents can be developed and utilized to the fullest.

We have passed the point in history where this Nation can afford to throw away the productive labors of any specific group on the basis of institutionalized and outdated habits of employment.

This is the challenge we face; and I believe the 88th Congress has the historic opportunity to respond to this challenge.

I emphasize, for the moment, the employment aspects, because I believe this is one of the important problems we face. However, let me be crystal clear that the American citizen wants more than a job; he wants to be treated in a way in which he has every right to be treated.

When I speak of the American as a citizen, I do not speak only of the American Negro, who has been discriminated against, but I speak also of every minority group. I speak of the Indians. I speak of the Spanish-speaking people. I speak of people of Mexican descent. I speak of all people who too frequently have not been given the opportunity which they so justly and richly deserve.

I will be saying a great deal more about the new approach to fair employment that is required in light of present circumstances and past experience.

We are speaking of only one kind of citizenship, and that is full American citizenship; of only one kind of opportunity, and that is equal opportunity; of only one kind of education, and that is the best that this Nation can offer to all its people.

When we start to think in terms of Americans rather than national or ethnic groups, when we begin to speak in terms of one constitution, the Constitution of the United States of America, instead of 50 State constitutions, we will begin to find solutions to the grave national problems that confront us in this area of human relations.

All Americans should feel great personal pride in the actions proposed today by their President, John F. Kennedy. This is a memorable day. This is a historic occasion. This day will go down in the history of our country as one of the great days of freedom. It will be a day like July 4, 1776, when a whole people declared themselves free and independent. It will be a day like January 1, 1863, when the President of the United States proclaimed the end of slavery and the emancipation of a race of people.

It will go down in history as one of the truly great landmarks in the attainment of full democracy and full freedom.

The President of the United States has displayed great personal courage and determination in making these numerous proposals to Congress. No one harbors any illusions about the difficult weeks and months that lie ahead. However, as I have previously said, the die is cast. The promise of emancipation can no longer be postponed or denied. Americans of every race and section of the country must face this challenge with the sense of justice noted in the President's closing remarks. Let me repeat these historic words:

> In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

Mr. President, to illustrate the great importance of providing fair employment opportunities for Negroes, in combination with expanded education and training opportunities, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times relating to the urgent need for jobs and job training.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGROES HERE HELD MORE UPSET OVER JOBS THAN SEGREGATION—SURVEY FINDS MANY TOO POORLY EDUCATED TO COMPETE FOR WORK—NAACP AND URBAN LEAGUE CRITICIZED

(By Martin Arnold)

The northern Negro is more concerned with finding a job than with the problems of Birmingham, according to a study being made for the Fund for the Republic.

Joseph P. Lyford, a staff member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, is making the survey. He said yesterday:

"I think the Negro on the West Side of New York is beginning to see his problems as not exclusively arising from racial discrimination but from the fact that he is poor."

The center was financed by the Fund for the Republic. One of its projects is a series of studies of American communities and the American character.

"We are trying to do the job not by speaking to experts or compiling studies or talking to community leaders," Mr. Lyford said. "But by speaking to the people themselves."

STUDIES 40 BLOCKS

The first in the series, "The Talk in Vandalia," a profile of a small town in Illinois, was published last year. Since last August Mr. Lyford has been studying a 40-block area on the upper West Side of Manhattan.

Mr. Lyford estimates that 35,000 to 40,000 persons live in the area, and that at least 25 percent of them are Negroes, most of them with low incomes.

"They [the Negroes in New York] have different preoccupations than the Birmingham Negro who is striking for recognition of the most fundamental rights of human life, many of which the New York Negro has had for a long time," he said.

POOR EDUCATION CITED

Mr. Lyford said that the Northern Negro's "real problem is not racial discrimination per se but that he is becoming permanently unemployed."

"He has been crippled by the fraudulent education in the South, which has prepared him for nothing," Mr. Lyford said. "This fact alone should prove that equal but separate education is a fraud."

Mr. Lyford found that most of the Negroes he interviewed in the West Side, because of their education, "can't get far enough along in the hiring process to really find out if discrimination exists."

Unskilled workers are nearly all being replaced by automation, he found, and the semiskilled factory worker also is rapidly being replaced by machinery.

"This plus the fact that the unions—such as those in the buildings and garment trades—discriminate against Negroes makes it very difficult for the Negro to develop qualifications for a trade."

He found that the only Negroes who were not suffering economically in the West Side were the professional people—doctors, lawyers, and architects.

"And many middle-class Negroes line up with the whites on given issues," he said, "so that the poorer Negroes have no one to help them.

He criticized the larger groups such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League as "doing nothing for these people."

Political leaders and city commissioners promise the Negro everything from jobs to housing, Mr. Lyford said, but "deliver nothing."

The NAACP and the Urban League "do nothing for the West Side Negro on the local level such as code enforcement in housing so the Negro is left defenseless."

The single exception to local indifference that Mr. Lyford found was the school system.

Mr. Lyford said that the primary concern that the Negro family has about education is that the "children get a good one, not whether there are 20 percent whites in the class."

He said that in the North the Negro is concerned over whether his child likes the school and the teacher and whether the child is learning to read and write.

The Negro family does not want his child in a segregated school in the North, he said, "but is not as terribly concerned about that question as he is over the quality of the education."

"I have found that there are three excellent elementary schools in this area, and the parents are very happy with the schooling."

HOPES IN CHILDREN

Mr. Lyford said that the Negro adult in the North had "given up."

"All his hopes are in his children," he said. "While the parent doesn't want discrimination in school, he is mainly concerned that his child gets a good education."

The question is, according to Mr. Lyford, what happens "if the child gets a good education and then can't find a job?"

His survey has found that while the Northern Negro admires and respects Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s work in the South, "he feels the need for a Dr. King in the North."

"Only when the Negroes have sit-in demonstrations in New York—when they lie down on the stairways in some of the slums in which they live—will they get better housing," he said.

The area that Mr. Lyford is studying is bounded, roughly, by the middle 80's and 110th Street between Central Park West and Riverside Drive.

Mr. Lyford lives in the area, on 105th Street. His study will include among other things the whites and the Puerto Ricans on the West Side, police protection, narcotics and housing.

It should be completed in about a month and published soon after.

Mr. Lyford has been a staff member of the Fund for the Republic since 1955. Before that he had been a newspaper reporter and twice was an unsuccessful Democratic candidate for Congress from Connecticut.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last evening it was my privilege to address a meeting of the alumni and friends of Brandeis University. It was attended by the Chief Justice of the United States and by several of our colleagues in the Senate, and also by that great educator, Dr. Sachar, president of Brandeis University.

It was a great privilege to be one of those who have received an honorary degree by Brandeis University, which is currently celebrating its 15th anniversary. I could not help noting that it came into being as a university in 1948, at about the same time and about the same month that a very important political convention was taking place in Philadelphia.

I noted in my address last night that a recent Gallup poll had indicated that about 36 percent of the people believed that the administration was moving too fast on civil rights. My response last night was the same that I gave 15 years ago in Philadelphia; namely, that this Nation has been moving too slowly.

Fifteen years ago, in the summer of 1948, I spoke on this subject at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia.

I see in the Chamber my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He was the first to take up the standard of the great State of Illinois and lead that State in the parade and subsequently in the roll call that made possible a minority report on civil rights which became the majority report and commitment of the Democratic Party at that convention.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In my judgment, the eloquent speech of the then mayor of Minneapolis, now the senior Senator from Minnesota, was the greatest political oration in the history of the country, with the possible exception of William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech. The speech had a strong influence not only on the Democratic platform, but on the development throughout the country of a proper feeling on the question of civil rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my good friend from Illinois, who has never for a moment faltered in his dedication and devotion to the principles of human rights and civil rights. He has been as true as a man ever could be to his convictions and ideals. I know he feels today as I do, a moment of exhilaration and happiness.

I recall that when I came to the Senate 14 years ago if one stood up for civil rights, he was frowned upon; indeed, he was fortunate if that was all that happened to him. It was an unpopular position. I can say tonight that the need for civil rights legislation is so imperative that not only is it more popular to be for it, but now, as then, it is right. Congress will not adjourn until the President's program, which is minimum legislation, is adopted. We are prepared for the struggle for which many of us have waited during these years, and we are prepared for it because there is no other answer, there is no other means, there is no other alternative. The people of the United States want Congress to act in a forthright and effective manner on civil rights legislation. And we will act.

The American Negro has waited too long. He is not only asking for his rights and his full citizenship; he is demanding them and fighting for them. He ought to know that he has loyal allies in his fellow citizens in vast areas of the Nation.

Fifteen years ago, I said these words:

> There are those who say to you, "We are rushing this issue of civil rights." I say we are 172 years too late.
>
> There are those who say, "This issue of civil rights is an infringement of State's rights." The time has arrived to get out of the shadow of State's rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights.
>
> People—human beings—this is the issue of the 20th century. People—all kinds and sorts of people—look to America for leadership, for help, for guidance.
>
> I ask you for a calm consideration of our historic opportunity. Let us forget the evil passions, the blindness of the past. In these times of world economic, political, and spiritual crisis, we cannot—we must not—turn from the path so plainly before us.

Mr. President, those words are as true today as they were then. I still ask, as a Senator and as the assistant majority leader of this body, for a calm consideration of our historic opportunity. I hope and pray that we shall not have to go through the unsightly experience of a filibuster to obtain legislation that is so fundamental to human dignity. But if a filibuster should be forced upon us, let it be known that we are prepared for the test. We will be on this line, if need be, until the end of this year and into the next, because the decision has been made, not only by some of us in Congress, but by the American people, that the issue of human rights can no longer be delayed. We must face it, and we must answer it.

Our forefathers declared that there are such things as inalienable rights, natural rights, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They enunciated the doctrine of human equality. Our Constitution proclaimed the supreme citizenship of a citizen of the United States. The Constitution provided that no State may deprive any citizen of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Slavery was abolished. The doctrine of equal rights and equal opportunities, privileges, and immunities for all citizens was proclaimed. There is nothing in the Constitution that speaks of Jew or gentile, of Negro or white. The Constitution speaks only of a Nation or a Union of States, of a Republic of the United States of America, of one people, one law, and one citizenship.

This great American dream must become a living force. That living force needs, today and in the months ahead, the sustenance and encouragement of action by Congress.

There have been many gaps, as I indicated to my friends last evening. Congress has become very emotional over what is called the missile gap in our contest with the Russians. Many speeches have been made from the floor of the Senate about the missile gap. Billions of dollars have been appropriated to overcome the missile gap. Now it is said that there is no missile gap; that we have closed it. It is said that we are ahead.

Today we worry about being behind in space. We refer to the space gap.

In truth, the greatest weakness in America, the greatest danger, is the citizenship gap, the gap between the promise of citizenship and its actuality. The citizenship gap is being closed by the message of the President of the United States and the proposals he has sent to Congress. I am not sure that those proposals are all that is needed; but I know they will go a long way toward closing the gap between the promise of American citizenship and its reality for millions of people.

Today I feel as one who has come into a great victory, because I see a leader in our Nation, giving us not only leadership in Congress—political leadership—but great moral leadership. The President of the United States has told us that the struggle is on, that the die is cast, and that there will be no retreat from the position that has been taken, the position of full, responsible citizenship for every American, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

I am confident that victory will crown the efforts of those in this body who seek to pass the proposed legislation and make it a reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from my remarks of last evening. I was most appreciative of the presence of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 18, 1963

The issue of freedom has come home, and it's always painful. Almost 200 years ago, our Nation was born with a cry for freedom which still echoes across every continent.

Our American Revolution set a new and attainable goal for all men who aspired to freedom. It was a warning to the tyrants who sponsored oppression, and to the indifferent who tolerated injustice.

The idea of our Revolution took root in other lands, and spread. Over the years, we have watched the results as the people of other countries stood up and demanded freedom for themselves.

Our American idea of freedom for all men has circled the earth, moulded new nations and shaped history.

Idea of freedom has now returned to this land with vitality and force—to challenge us again or to haunt us.

The Negro—the American Negro—wants full freedom. And he is standing up to demand it and he is fighting for it. Nor should we be surprised by his demand or by the steps he is taking to win his rights. The surprise is that he had enough patience to wait so long. And the Negro's demand for full freedom is not new; nor does it represent some alien philosophy. It's 100 percent American. Our forefathers gave him the idea almost 200 years ago, with our Declaration of Independence. We promised him realization of the idea 100 years ago, with the Emancipation Proclamation.

But today, there is a tragic gap between the promise and the fulfillment of the Emancipation Proclamation. It is that gap which is now being closed.

As a nation, we have in recent years been preoccupied with the contest with communism.

We have poured our resources and energies into a massive effort to close what we called the missile gap, and now the space gap.

But, we have neglected the most tragic failure of America—the citizenship gap.

There is a gap between what we should be and what we are. All of our people are proud to be Americans. But many of our people have not been respected as Americans. All of our people are, by the words of the Constitution, free and equal citizens. But many of our people have not enjoyed full citizenship privileges, rights, and duties. The gap exists—and it is wide. It must be closed.

America is behind in guaranteeing first-class citizenship to every American.

America is behind in guaranteeing voting opportunities to Negro citizens.

America is behind in opening educational opportunities to Negro citizens.

America lags in assuring equal job opportunities to Negro citizens; also lags in training them.

America, in short, is short on the freedom about which it boasts.

Our Nation suffers from a lingering disease—a corroding and crippling disease of prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination which take its toll in poverty, illiteracy, and social injustice.

We must dedicate ourselves, our energies and our knowledge to the imperative task of closing America's citizenship gap.

We must remove the disease of discrimination through new laws, new practices, through our communities and States—and with Federal standards.

Discrimination is not a local problem, or the problem of one State or area of the country. This is a national problem—and in some ways, international. It weakens us at home and embarrasses us abroad.

The basic issue today is not whether the wrongs of discrimination will be righted—they will be.

The issue is not even when equality and full freedom will be realized for every American—that time is now, this year.

The basic issue is how first-class citizenship will be won for all Americans.

This is the question: Will full citizenship rights be won and assured for every American by law and by practice or by violence, disorder, and demagogery?

Tomorrow, President Kennedy will offer part of the answer to this question. He will give to the Congress and the country a courageous, comprehensive and strong message on the steps needed to bring first-class citizenship to every American. His proposals will represent a massive effort to resolve the major issue of our time by orderly, legislative steps.

There will be a long and difficult debate in the Congress on the administration's civil rights program. I pledge my energies and whatever legislative ability I may have to securing congressional approval for that program. It must be approved; and it will be approved.

A Gallup poll of this week reports that 36 percent of the people believe that the administration is moving "too fast," on civil rights. But, I believe that this Nation has moved too slowly.

Fifteen years ago, in the summer of 1948, I spoke these words at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia:

"There are those who say to you, 'We are rushing this issue of civil rights.' I say we are 172 years too late.

"There are those who say, 'This issue of civil rights is an infringement of States rights.' The time has arrived * * * to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights.

"People—human beings—this is the issue of the 20th century. People—all kinds and sorts of people—look to America for leadership, for help, for guidance.

"I ask you for a calm consideration of our historic opportunity. Let us forget the evil passions, the blindness of the past. In these times of world economic, political and spiritual crisis, we cannot—we must not—turn from the path so plainly before us.

* * * * *

"For all of us here, for the millions who have sent us, for the whole 2 billion members of the human family—our land is now, more than ever, the last best hope on earth. I know that we can—I know that we shall—begin here the fuller and richer realization of that hope—that promise of a land where all men are free and equal, and each man uses his freedom and equality wisely and well."

We did make a new beginning in that summer 15 years ago. Much has been done in those 15 years to advance the cause of civil rights and human rights in the United States.

I am confident now that more will be done in the next 15 months than in the past 15 years.

I am confident that the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation will be matched by performance in the next 15 months.

My confidence is based on trust in the people of the United States—in their basic goodness, their intrinsic decency, their enduring respect for the principles which shaped this Nation's philosophy of freedom.

And my confidence is based on the sense of a new climate in America—an awareness of the moral crisis we face, and a determination to resolve it.

In this new climate, indifference has changed to concern and personal involvement.

All of us, every citizen of this Nation, are concerned today about the moral crisis of civil rights and human rights. All of us must recognize that we are personally involved in this crisis—no matter what part of the country is our home.

Edmund Burke said it best to the House of Commons:

"All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world," he said, "is for enough good men to do nothing."

We have the good men. And today, they are doing something.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the President of the United States deserves the praise and support of all Americans for the very thoroughgoing program which he has laid before Congress in his message on civil rights and job opportunities. The message deals with virtually every phase of the difficulties which the Negro race and other minority groups experience in the United States. It strengthens the provisions for voting rights, for school desegregation and, at the same time, urges more adequate financing for schools and for the vocational and general training of those who, in the past, have not had the advantages of adequate education.

The President's program provides also for Federal protection of the right of all Americans to be served without discrimination on the basis of color in places of public accommodation. It lays down a program to assist in securing equal opportunities in employment for all Americans. What the President is trying to accomplish is the legal affirmation and protection that men may be judged on their own merits.

What the President is urging is that men may have a chance to be judged on their own merits and be really free to succeed or not succeed in proportion to their abilities and their character. In this effort we should give him not only our commendations today, but our support in the difficult months, and perhaps years, which lie ahead.

Protection of the right to vote, protection of the right to a decent education, without forced segregation, protection of the right to be served in places of public accommodation, protection of the right to be considered on one's own merits in obtaining employment—these would seem to be standards to which honest and conscientious Americans of all races should rally.

I know the President will be criticized for laying down such a thoroughgoing program as this; and it will be charged that by asking for so much, it will be difficult for him to obtain very much. The point is that we have slept on this job for more than a century—in particular, for the last 85 years. The Nation stood aside despite the Constitution and permitted the Southern States to disfranchise the Negro population. It stood aside and permitted the Southern States and municipalities, and, indeed, some Northern States and municipalities, to segregate Negroes in schools and in public places. This action of the South was indeed blessed by the Supreme Court in 1895, in the famous case of Plessy against Ferguson, to which there was only one dissent—that of the sturdy and heroic Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, of Kentucky. Only in the last 20 years has America begun to wake up on this question; and, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, the 15 years of battling which some of us have conducted on the floor of this body have not been productive of very much legislation on the part of Congress.

If we had provided more adequate education for the freed slaves of the South; if we had treated them more as human beings and less as inferior persons; if we had lived up to the pledges of the 14th amendment that no State should discriminate against individuals or deny to any person the equal protection of the laws; if we had moved earlier in the field of voting; if we had tried to improve public education; if we had tried to open up employment on the basis of ability, then possibly these reforms could have been introduced gradually, and in this country there might have been adjustments without violence and without disturbance.

But, no, the dominant forces of the country and in the Congress refused to act; and, as a result, the tides of change were arrested; and Congress and the National Government remained largely isolated from the streams of thought. So—as was inevitable—the forces of change have boiled up in an open manner; and today measures which might have produced unity 85 years ago, 75 years ago, 50 years ago, 25 years ago, 15 years ago, 10 years ago, 5 years ago, are no longer adequate.

The 18 million to 20 million Negro citizens have lost a great deal of the fear of the white man which formerly restrained them. They have lost the servility which formerly characterized them. The inferiority complex which many felt in the presence of white civilization has departed. They have been inspired by the creation of approximately 30 new African republics. They have been heartened by the development of able members of their race who, even with all the disadvantages under which they have suffered, have nevertheless demonstrated their ability; and through the Negro population of the country there now runs a deep demand for change—for thoroughgoing change—and for no compromise.

Let me say that I think it is extraordinary that thus far these protests have taken place with so little violence and with so few threats of violence on the part of the Negro race. They have suffered under great wrongs. What have been their methods? Peaceful parading, in the main; peaceful petitioning—supposedly guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution; nonresistance, or perhaps I should say physical nonresistance, but spiritual super-resistance. For the new and young leaders of the Negro race have adopted the methods of Ghandi, and have practiced moral protests and spiritual super-resistance, in an effort to pierce the conscience of the white race and to effect a peaceful change—but a thoroughgoing change.

The NAACP has given and is giving heroic service not only in its noble work to free Negroes from the legal disabilities which have hampered them, but also in the struggles for civil rights here in Congress and in the various State legislatures and city councils. They have laid the foundations for the developments which are taking place today. I want to pay my tribute to them and to the unselfish leaders who have truly worked for their people.

I have also tried to study not only the speeches and writings, but also the actions, of Martin Luther King and his great associates, Ralph Abernathy and Fred Shuttleworth and the host of followers they have attracted.

I have never found one word of hatred in what they have uttered. They have spoken of the necessity of loving white people and cooperating with white people. They have emphasized the need for whites and blacks to work together. But they have been adamant in their demands that the Negro should not be content with the position to which he has been assigned. So has been the NAACP.

Thus far these groups have been amazingly successful in restraining their fellow Negroes. I believe it is probably true that we would not have had the message from the President, and we would not have had the wide support which that message has called forth, if it had not been for these mass demonstrations. If the Negroes had continued in their former habits of servility, if they had maintained what some members of the Negro race call the "Uncle Tom attitude," I do not think we would have had any proposals of the type now offered.

So the method of Gandhi—and I believe it is also the method of Jesus—has caught fire and has touched the hearts of many members of the white race as well. We hope that it will penetrate farther.

But while I rejoice in the message of the President, we should all be aware of the long, difficult course which lies ahead.

Four leading Senators from the Southern States have publicly announced that they will oppose these measures with all their strength, and that they will carry out, if necessary, a prolonged filibuster to defeat them. That is a frank statement. The men who make such statements are skilled parliamentarians who know every crevice and every delaying device in the Senate rules and procedures. I think we can be quite certain that all of them will be employed.

I notice that three bills have been introduced. I have them here on my desk. Two of them seem to be administration bills, one an omnibus bill dealing with all the subjects which the President outlined in his message, including the right of accommodation in public places, and the second dealing only with the matter of public accommodations. A cursory examination makes me somewhat uncertain as to the reason for the second bill in view of the first bill. This duality may appear to be well founded upon closer analysis. But these two bills are separated at their very origin. The first, the omnibus bill, is being referred to the Judiciary Committee. It contains, as I have said, sections on public accommodations. But the bill which concentrates exclusively on public accommodations is being referred to the Committee on Commerce. So these two bills seem to move in different directions.

Then there is a third bill which only a few minutes ago was jointly introduced by the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have not had sufficient time to examine that bill in minute detail. But it seems to leave out all reference to public accommodations.

The question which immediately arises is which of the bills is the Senate leadership supporting? Is it supporting the President's omnibus bill, which deals with public accommodations, or is it supporting the Mansfield-Dirksen bill, which omits reference to public accommodations? We should have a clarification on that point before we go much further, because we may find that it is the first movement of attrition or erosion being conducted against the administration program.

I make no charges in that connection, but it seems to me extraordinary that the two leaders should introduce a bill which omits the vital feature of public accommodations, if I read the bill correctly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. At the very minimum, eight Republicans and eight Democrats have joined in the omnibus bill as well as in the single bill on public accommodations, both of which have been introduced, one by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the other by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

When the Senator asks the question about the leadership, I think this pictures the situation: as I see it, the minority and majority leaders have gotten together as much as they, as individual Senators, can get together, on the bill omitting public accommodations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I am correct in stating that the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen bill omits reference to public accommodations.

Mr. JAVITS. It does. A bipartisan group, which we think will grow, but which, as I say, at the very minimum starts with 8 on each side, supports the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in his omnibus bill and in his public accommodations bill. The significance of that is that, when the Senator speaks about the leadership, there is always implied a solid phalanx of a party which is following a leader. We well understand the southern situation on the other side of the aisle. But what I have stated indicates that on our side there is great support—and I think it will be a growing support—for the total administration package. Therefore, I think it is extremely important that those facts be made clear, because they are just as pertinent as is the question of the Senator from Illinois: "Where, oh where, is the leadership, and what will it be?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York. His concern and his frankness are characteristic of him. I hope that, like Abou Ben Adhem, his tribe will increase.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been privileged to participate in many, if not all, of the conversations relating to the proposed legislation as it was developed and as the message of the President was developed. The majority leader is unqualifiedly in support of the administration bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Including public accommodations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Including public accommodations. I make that statement because I have explicity discussed the question with the majority leader. When the majority leader today introduced the administration bill, he did so because he desired that it be clear to all persons that his support was for the total package.

As Senators may recall, he also introduced the public accommodations feature, which is title II of the administration bill, so that it could be the subject of separate hearings before the Committee on Commerce. He was joined in the introduction of that bill by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The situation relating to the bill that has been introduced by the majority leader and the minority leader—the Mansfield-Dirksen proposal—is as follows:

The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not fully agree at this time with the administration's proposal on public accommodations. He did feel that there was need for some legislation in that area. The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], knowing full well that we may be faced with a cloture vote in this body, was seeking, as a leader, to maintain the broadest possible support for the time when we may have to apply cloture.

Therefore, he has worked carefully and painstakingly with the minority leader in an effort to arrive at the broadest area of agreement. Interestingly enough, all the administration proposals are supported by the minority and majority leaders in the Mansfield-Dirksen bill with the one exception of excluding public accommodations. I do not minimize that section. It is very important.

In the light of the meetings I have attended—and I believe it is fair to say that I have attended most, if not all, of them—an effort has been made, and is still being made, on the part of the minority leader and majority leader to find the language, as a result of hearings which will be held, so that whatever bill is ultimately reported can have the wholehearted support, in public accommodations as well as other areas, of both leaders.

I think the present situation lends itself to some confusion. The Senator from Illinois has appropriately and properly and rightly pointed this out. This has been discussed at length.

One of the reasons why I was so pleased today with the action by the majority leader in introducing the administration bill, and by the broad cosponsorship of it, is the fact that it should be noted that this is the position of the leader. This is a bipartisan position for a large number of Senators—a number which is growing. It is my view that before Monday there will be more than 50 cosponsors for the administration bill, and many of them from the Republican side of the aisle.

In my judgment there will also be a public accommodations bill on the calendar when the Senate Committee on Commerce shall have completed its hearings. So there can be no doubt of what is the position of responsible Members of this body. I have a feeling that, by the time civil rights legislation is enacted, there will be broad agreement.

If the Senator, who has been very generous with time, will permit me to take a moment more, I should like to make one additional comment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my view that the House will pass the administration bill pretty much as it is, judging from consultations with House Members. In other words, the House will pass a strong civil rights bill in one package.

That bill will come to the Senate from the House. I would hope we could have reported from the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate to the Senate Calendar the full and comprehensive bill. But, if that should not be the case, we shall have the option of using rule XIV, which permits the Senate to intercept a bill as it comes from the House, place it on the calendar, and then either consider it from the calendar or refer it to a committee for a limited number of days and for a report on a day certain.

In the meantime, there will have been hearings on all proposals in the Senate committees, so that no Senator will be able to say that there have been no hearings or that this is new material and we know nothing about it. By majority vote we shall be able to do that.

I wish to make the record clear that these matters have been thought through very carefully, and the President has been involved in these discussions, as have the Vice President and the leadership on both sides, as well as members of certain committees.

I have been impressed with the degree of cooperation we have received. I regret that there was not a fuller understanding and agreement on the public accommodations feature, but I believe that the majority of this body favors a strong public accommodations feature, as will be indicated by the number of cosponsors on the administration bill.

I reassure my colleague from Illinois that the majority leader has no doubt as to his position. I wish he were present to speak for himself, but in this instance I know he will permit me to do so, because this question was brought up yesterday in conversation and in conference. I believe not only that I am permitted to say, but that the majority leader would want me to say, that he sponsored the comprehensive bill and the separate public accommodations bill as a clear demonstration of his unqualified, open support of that proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement made by the whip on our side of the aisle. I think his statement will be reassuring. I think, however, that the presence of the two bills, with sponsorship of this peculiar nature, tends to lead to public confusion. I welcome this reassurance on the part of the Senator from Minnesota. I hope it will be reflected in vigorous action and leadership on the part of others.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois find it convenient to yield for one moment further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to state to the Senator, because the Senator from Minnesota was too modest to state it himself, that the two architects of a good deal of the bipartisanship which has entered into this matter have been the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I do not think the record would be complete, especially on my part, since, like the Senator from Illinois, I have been so deeply concerned, if I did not pay those Senators the respect and honor which they deserve for great skill and patience in working through this labyrinth and coming out as well as they have.

As I am sure the Senator from Illinois understands, there are possibilities of confusion; nevertheless this bipartisan base on the main issue is most helpful and extremely important, and will represent the reason why we shall succeed rather than fail.

While I am on my feet, I wish to say to the Senator that I listened with the greatest of respect to his historical analysis of the situation. I feel that the Senator has put his finger on what will be supremely important in the days ahead; that is, that we are no longer talking about what will mollify the Southern Senators and happily induce them not to press their powers of filibuster to the very outermost limit, but that this time we shall be thinking about what will produce order, tranquillity, and justice in the United States. I believe that is the way the vote will go. That in itself is a revolution in civil rights in the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York. He has been a leader in this movement. The great Senators from California and Minnesota have played magnificent parts, and I am sure they will continue to do so.

I should like to emphasize, however, that there is a very long and difficult road ahead of us. Verbal support for the President's program on the 19th of June, however desirable, does not necessarily mean that we shall be able to pass a civil rights bill, because we can look forward to the prospect that every parliamentary obstacle which can be thrown in the way of action will be carried out. The experience of the past 25 years so indicates.

The Senator from Minnesota correctly said that it might be better strategy to let a bill first come from the House, and then either consider it directly or, if it is to be referred to a committee, refer it to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report on a given date.

That was tried in 1956. The Senator from Illinois made such a proposal in connection with a civil rights bill which came from the House. I remember that there were only six votes against a tabling motion, then made by the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate, the then Senator from Texas. I cast one of these and there were only five others.

If we do get a bill to the floor of the Senate—and it is by no means certain that we shall be able to get such a bill to the floor—we shall then face the possibility, and probability, of two filibusters: The first on the motion to take up, or proceed to take up, and the second on the bill itself.

These filibusters will be determined and skillful. Judging by past experience, they will probably be supported by at least 18 Senators. Those Senators, divided into teams of two, each one taking 4 hours, will mean that a man will have to speak only once in 2 days, while his scout, or "lookout," can protect him on the floor. And if the Senate goes into round-the-clock sessions, which have been urged as a means of breaking the filibuster, judging by past experience, the scout, or "lookout" can ask for quorum calls every 2 hours, at 6 o'clock p.m., 8 o'clock p.m., 10 o'clock p.m., 12 o'clock midnight, 2 o'clock in the morning, 4 o'clock in the morning, 6 o'clock in the morning, 8 o'clock in the morning, 10 o'clock in the morning, noon, 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The burden of obtaining a quorum of 51 Senators will then fall on those who believe in civil rights.

The 20 Senators who openly oppose civil rights can absent themselves and sleep, but those in favor of civil rights will have to show up. And if by chance any Senator who favors civil rights but is exhausted by lack of sleep fails to answer to a quorum call, we can be certain that official voices will denounce him as not being interested in civil rights. The opprobrium of failing to maintain a quorum will fall upon those who are really interested, and powerful and influential voices will be raised, judging by the comments of last summer, against them. So, to maintain quorums against the filibuster will be very difficult.

When the vote finally comes as to whether debate should be limited and thereafter Senators be restricted to an hour each, it will be necessary to get not a majority, but a two-thirds vote. Thirty-four Senators, by voting against the limitation of debate, can, under our present rule XXII, permit the filibuster to go on.

A few weeks ago I commented on the difficulties of breaking a filibuster under the two-thirds rule. On that question, in all probability the 22 Southern Senators would vote against breaking the filibuster. In the past, the Senators from the Southwest, and a goodly percentage from the Mountain States, have also voted against limiting debate. There are also crypto-sympathizers with the anti-civil-rights group who, while they would not themselves vote against a civil rights measure, would vote against a cloture motion in the name of full and unlimited debate.

As in the past, Senators who believe in a genuine civil rights measure will probably be very lonely as we work here on the Senate floor. I hope there may have been a sufficient change in public opinion and a sufficient realization of the severity of the issue, so that the precedents of the past will no longer apply to the future.

I pride myself on being not only an advocate of civil rights, but also on being a realist with an understanding of some of the difficulties which we face. As such difficulties develop, there will be those who will say, "Yes, you can get a bill through, provided you strike out the provisions on public accommodations." It will be remembered how, in the civil rights debate of 1957, under such siren calls, part III was eliminated.

There will be those who will say, "Eliminate the provisions on public accommodations. Then we can get an antifilibuster vote, but you never can get it as long as you keep the public accommodations section in the bill." I only hope that the strange combinations of sponsorships which have been revealed today are not harbingers of such tactics.

When that section is thrown overboard it will then be said, "We can get the bill through provided you eliminate the fair and full employment practices provision"—just as the provisions, under equity proceedings, for punishing violations of injunctions were thrown out in 1957 under the plea that our southern friends and their sympathizers would never consent to that.

Then there will be the cry, "Eliminate part III. Eliminate the right of the Attorney General, in school desegregation cases, to intervene. You never can get by with that."

So gradually movements will be made to strip the bill of all meaning, with the final result that a bill may emerge that will be completely innocuous and completely ineffective. And then it will be hailed by some as a great victory for civil rights.

It might have been possible to get by with that in 1957 and 1959, but I do not think it is possible today, because what the leadership is dealing with now is not merely a group of liberals in the Senate. What they are dealing with now is the alarmed and deeply concerned public opinion of the vast majority of the Nation; and the little parliamentary tricks and devices, the backroom whisperings, and the cloakroom deals will not be effective in meeting this situation out in the country.

What we need is a stern determination. We are encompassed by opponents. We are encompassed by persons who will try to rob this measure of all real meaning. We must be faithful to the principles, work for the President's program and resist all the efforts and blandishments to emasculate the measure.

We will debate without bitterness, without malice, without any false sense of sectional superiority, but some of us, at least, will insist that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution be applied all over the Nation. And in this we are not disturbers, nor are we, as some columnists have said, "knee-jerk liberals."

We believe in the rights of man. We believe in the eternal principles upon which this Republic was founded. Since when are those principles to be sneered at?

I am not too optimistic about the outcome, but if we fail, if either no bill or a badly emasculated bill emerges, it will be a great blow inside the Nation to the cause of righteousness. It will be a great blow to the standing of the United States in the public opinion of the world. If we go on month after month with a filibuster and a progressive whittling down of the program, we shall make ourselves not only ridiculous, but despicable, in the sight of the whole world. Our enemies will take full advantage of that fact.

American prestige will be lowered. We must make the decision. Do we believe in Thomas Jefferson's preamble to the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,

Do we believe in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, that this is a government not only of the people, but by the people and for the people? Do we believe in the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which provides that no State shall deprive any citizen of the equal protection of the laws; that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are not only citizens of a particular State but also citizens of the United States, and that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law? There is no room for second-class citizenship under the 14th amendment.

These are things we talk about on the Fourth of July. These are subjects for orations. However, do we really believe in these principles? The test is coming. We must stand fast behind the program which the President of the United States has laid down, resist the processes of erosion which inevitably will be employed, and answer quorum calls, even to the point of dropping from fatigue. Without indulging in mock heroics, it may be from something else than fatigue.

We must do this without bitterness or any imitating air of moral superiority. We recognize that our Southern friends—and they are our friends—are in fact prisoners of history and geography, and that an evil system was fastened upon them—slavery—which was bad and terrible for the slave, and bad and terrible for the master. When the slaves were freed, the social conditions which had prevailed under slavery continued, and they poisoned the life of the South and the life of the North.

Now at a tardy hour we are seeking to make atonement. Therefore, I wish to commend the President of the United States for his brave and sweeping and comprehensive message.

I pray to God that in the difficult months which are to follow we will resist the temptations of expediency and seek to do what is right, and to remember the hymn of Isaac Watts, which we used to sing in Sunday School and church:

> Tasks in hours of insight willed
> May be in hours of gloom fulfilled.

The hours of gloom will soon set upon us. I hope that the inspiration of this hour, the stirring words of our President, may be carried out in the months of gloom which I fear lie ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise only to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois how much I have been moved by his address, which was truly a great address, and his recitation of things as they were in the past and as they are historically, and regrettably true. However, his understanding of things as they are now is equally true. The same parliamentary tactics which have defeated many efforts in this body throughout the years of yesterday will not be effective in the present situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope they will not be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason they will not be is that the country feels differently. There has been an awakening. The specter of innocent people peacefully demonstrating being set upon by the police, and the ugly scene on television and in the newspaper photographs of a police dog biting the arm of an American citizen who sought only the privilege of citizenship, who had committed no crime, who had incited no person, who in no way was intruding upon anyone else's privileges or rights, have shaken the American people.

Americans were somewhat accustomed to seeing such scenes in other countries. When the fight for freedom came home, and when the evil practices of yesterday and today were used to subdue the legitimate demands of people who sought only their constitutional rights, the American people said, "We have had enough." They want Congress to act morally and equitably and promptly. There is no doubt about it. This situation is no more comparable to what existed a year ago than the world before the atomic bomb was comparable to the world after the atomic bomb; or the age of space compared with the age of the covered wagon.

It is an entirely different period of human history. The change has taken place almost within a fortnight. It took place in one afternoon at Birmingham. It had been taking place in many other scenes, but all at once public sentiment was crystalized. There was a climactic moment when every man knew that in the affairs of men as in the affairs of the Nation there is what we call timing. This time, today, is the time for the American people to act.

They are acting through their representatives.

I say to my friend from Illinois that if we were only going through another effort on civil rights, and if that were all that were involved, it would be a shameful mockery. Not only that, but we would be unworthy of the responsibilities and honors that the office of Senator or Representative places upon us. The simple truth is that it is not a question of whether these wrongs and discriminations are to be corrected, because they are. It is not a question of when they are to be corrected, because they are going to be corrected now. The only question is, and the only issue is how the correction is to be made. Will the situation be corrected out on the streets, where a peaceful demonstration turns into a disaster, or is it going to be corrected by a representative government? Is it going to be corrected by legal processes or by individual action?

In the last month we have seen more advance in the cause of civil liberties and civil rights and constitutional guarantees than we have seen in the preceding 10 years. I submit that more will be accomplished in the next 15 months than was accomplished in the last 15 years. That is my honest judgment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. I realize that it is necessary to have optimism about these matters.

However, after 15 years' experience in seeing how the organization of the Senate and the rules of the Senate and the leadership of both parties in effect have been successful in defeating every civil rights measure, virtually, that has come before the Senate, with the exception of the innocuous bills of 1957 and 1960, I must admit that I am skeptical. I have seen us lose the ball game, year after year, when we have refused to change rule XXII.

Many of us have argued for years that with the sectional composition of the Senate as it is, with the equal representation of the States, with the alliance among the South, Southwest, Mountain States, and sections of the Republican Party, it is almost impossible to get a two-thirds vote. If we could bring these measures to a vote, of course, we would get a majority.

But the difficulty will be to bring the bill to a vote. I hope that people will realize now that we are being afforded another chance, a chance which we lost when we refused to change rule XXII, and were accused of being "knee-jerk liberals" because we advocated such a change.

Arthur Krock, the highly conservative columnist of the New York Times, has said, and said truthfully, that the Senate is the graveyard of civil rights legislation, and that rule XXII is the gravedigger. I think we may have lost the ball game last January and February when the Senate refused to change rule XXII, and when rulings were made from the chair which made it almost impossible for us to bring the proposal to a vote.

I shall not indulge in recriminations about the past. There is always a chance for people to change; and we always hope that there will be a change. I simply say that to date the Senate has devoted its abilities, ingenuity, and energy to preventing the passage of civil rights legislation. A thorough breach with past practices is needed. A certain sense of direction would be helpful. A desire to reform is important. But if we are to go through with the political shilly-shallying and maneuvering that we have gone through for 15 years, I personally do not expect great progress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think we are going to go through a political shilly-shally. I understand the reasons for the Senator's concern. I will not say it is pessimism, because I think in a very real sense it is realism—at least, so far as the history of this body is concerned.

But we have seen several things happen. Never before has a President of the United States met day after day with great leaders from every segment of our society on the question of civil rights. Those leaders come from all walks of life. When they come, while they are there, and when they go home, they now understand that the America of June 1963, is a different America; it is an aroused America. The people who were docile and quiet, who were willing to suffer under economic and social oppression, are no longer willing to do so. They are standing up and fighting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Pray God that this may be so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is so. When the galleries of this Chamber are filled with our fellow Americans as we debate these measures, they will not be that filled with people who are looking down upon us and wondering why this is going on; they will be looking at us and saying, "Get on with the job."

Many a Senator weakened in the cause of civil rights in the City of Washington, which is basically a Southern city, because he found it very undesirable, very unhappy for him to be fighting on that side. But now the whole situation is changed. There is not a Member of this body who does not know that he cannot go home and face his own people, wherever they may be in any section of the country, unless he faces up to this question. So the issue is a different one. It is no longer merely a platform commitment in political terms. It is no longer merely the introduction of a bill. Bills are introduced with conviction; yes, with sincerity. In a very real sense, this is a struggle. We are now fighting against the basic bad practices of the past. They must be removed from the American scene. This is why the President has carefully sought the guidance and counsel of many people.

There were those of us a month and a half ago who sat down and discussed the proposed legislation. At that time our thought was that we should not move precipitately, but should move carefully, prudently, and wisely, after broad consultation, seeking the advice of others, and informing the people of what we hoped to do. We are proposing to build stone by stone, step by step.

As those legislative meetings have been held, the President of the United States has been meeting, as he is today with some three or four hundred educators, and yesterday or the day before yesterday with persons who are virtually the leaders of our country, including labor leaders, leaders on the industrial scene, and religious leaders.

We shall win this fight because the battle is being won for us. It is being won for us by the people. We are merely being asked to ratify it. The victory is being won in many places in America. It is being won in the towns, villages, counties, and States. It is being won by thousands of persons in restaurants, theaters, and hotels across the land. Right now, the only question is whether Congress will catch up. I hope it will, because it has no other choice. If it does not catch up, there will be many new faces in a new Congress, because the people have made up their minds that America will "get right" on this issue.

I think we shall be faced with that issue promptly, and we shall answer it right here.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I know that I shall save much of the Senator's and the Senate's time by associating myself with the remarks of my dear friend, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and I do so. I have said these things many times, as we all know, because I feel very deeply on this subject.

At this moment I wish to pay a tribute to the senior Senator from Illinois, who is a veteran fighter in the struggle for civil rights. This is his crown of glory, especially today, because he demonstrates that he never tires, and so far as we can see, he never will. I pray God that that may be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York, who has given inestimable service to this cause.

INTEREST RATES ON CONSUMER LOANS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have just received from the executive vice president of the District of Columbia National Bank, Mr. William F. Collins, a former banker and resident of my city of Chicago. It is most reassuring to have the newest bank in our Nation's Capital take the lead in helping to bring about realistic and fair interest rates for consumer loans. To my knowledge, the District of Columbia National Bank is the only bank in this area to recognize that the 8 percent maximum interest rate established by the antiusury statute of the District of Columbia is applicable to consumer loans. I have every expectation that this forward-looking policy will in the end prove beneficial to that bank, and I hope that its practice will be followed in short order by a change in policy in all the other banks in Washington. It is highly improper to have an interest rate practice which penalizes those consumers who most need the borrowing facilities of a bank.

I commend the officers and directors of the District of Columbia National Bank for their foresight in demonstrating that proper banking practices in our community can be perfectly consistent with fulfilling proper responsibilities of good citizenship.

Approximately 4 weeks ago I addressed a letter to Mr. Walter Tobriner, Commissioner of the District of Columbia, asking why many banks and department stores in Washington, D.C., were openly and regularly charging an annual rate of interest on credit transactions of 12 to 18 percent, when the District of Columbia usury law permits only a maximum rate of 8 percent per year. This matter was referred by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the Corporation Counsel for study and a reply.

Over a week ago, having received no reply from the Corporation Counsel, I publicly, on the floor of the Senate, asked the Corporation Counsel for a reply to my inquiry.

I still have not heard from the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, so once again I publicly request that the Corporation Counsel explain why so many banks and department stores have been permitted for so many years to charge a 12- to 18-percent rate on personal loans and installment credit, when the District of Columbia usury law does not permit an interest rate in excess of 8 percent per annum to be charged. The Corporation Counsel has had all the time in the world to study this matter.

Is he stalling? Does he hope to wear me out by his refusal to answer? I serve notice on him that I shall not stop in this battle, and that until he answers, I shall periodically bring this matter up on the floor of the Senate and demand that he answer, one way or the other.

The citizens of the District of Columbia, and particularly those who regularly borrow from commercial banks and buy on department store revolving credit accounts, have a right to know whether or not they are being overcharged for the credit that they are using.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

District of Columbia National Bank,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.
Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We were pleased to learn of your discussion with the chairman of our executive committee, Dr. Max M. Kampelman, who shared with us your concern with respect to the interest rate structure governing consumer loans within the District of Columbia. It is indeed my pleasure to reaffirm in writing that the District of Columbia National Bank, by order of its board of directors, has resolved to establish maximum interest rates and finance charges for all consumer loans within the permissible 8 percent level on unpaid balances established by title 28, section 2702 of the District of Columbia Code.

We are aware of the legal differences of opinion as to the application of the statute to the practices that have become universal for financial institutions in the consumer loan field. The well-established add-on or discount features of consumer loans, together with the finance charges that have habitually attached to those loans in order to cover additional expenses to the bank in administering them, have in reality resulted in costs to the consumer substantially higher than the equivalent 8 percent interest provided by statute. This practice was further encouraged by the FHA home improvement loan procedures established by the Federal Government. Whatever the technical reading of the statute may produce, however, the District of Columbia National Bank desires that its practices be consistent with the spirit of the antiusury statute.

Our bank is today the newest bank doing business in the District of Columbia and the first to receive a charter here in more than 29 years. We opened our doors on October 3, 1962. Our policy of providing interest rates for consumer loans that are lower than those prevailing in the community may result in momentary reduced earnings to the bank. We believe, however, that this service to the consumer will in the long run prove beneficial to us and enlarge the respect with which banks are regarded in our community.

I have been authorized by our bank's board of directors to commend you for your efforts. I am particularly pleased to do so as a recent resident in this area after a lifetime career in banking in your own city of Chicago.

Sincerely,
William F. Collins,
Executive Vice President.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—COSPONSORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, at the time when the majority leader introduced the administration's civil-rights bill, I announced that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and I had undertaken to add as cosponsors a bipartisan group. This had been cleared with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the majority leader.

I now announce the cosponsors, with Senator Mansfield, of the so-called package civil-rights bill, the administration's bill. The list will read as follows—and I ask that their names be printed on the bill: Senators Humphrey, Kuchel, Morse, Keating, Douglas, Scott, Symington, Beall, Clark, Fong, Hart, Javits, Young of Ohio, Case, Dodd, and Cooper.

I also ask that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors; they are Senators who were contacted prior to the introduction of the bill, and were very instrumental in helping us bring about bipartisan cooperation—and at this moment I should point out that other Senators, on both sides of the aisle, will join in sponsoring the bill; and it will be recalled that the majority leader asked that the bill be held at the desk until Monday, for additional cosponsors: Senators Bayh, Brewster, Burdick, Engle, Gruening, Hartke, Inouye, Jackson, Kennedy, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McCarthy, McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, Metcalf, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Ribicoff, and Williams of New Jersey.

It is my understanding that this means there are presently 42 Senators—the sponsor and 41 cosponsors—who are sponsors of the administration's proposal; and I have reason to believe that tomorrow there will be several more, so that by Monday of next week we should have a majority—and better than a majority—of the Members of the Senate as cosponsors.

Again I wish to pay my respects to the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], who has been most cooperative in connection with this matter, and, of course, also to the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], who permitted us to join with him as cosponsors.

I have made this announcement because the 16 Senators I named first were the ones who had joined originally as cosponsors; and the others have joined us today—for which we are most grateful.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for his announcement, which puts the matter into focus and is most helpful in connection with the bipartisan cooperation which will bring about the desired result.

I may state that the announcement applies to both the so-called package bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and the public-accommodations bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I was asked to have the same list, in the same order, included for the so-called public-accommodations bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield again, let me pay my respects for the magnificent job done in connection with the first step of putting a solid platform under this great effort, which has been participated in so effectively by the distinguished deputy majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], and the distinguished deputy minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. I am deeply gratified; and it is one of the finest jobs I have seen done in this bipartisan area, in which I, myself, have been active so long. I think I know a good job when I see one; and this was extremely well done. So I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader about the schedule for the remainder of the week and, if possible—if he knows—about what will obtain during the following week.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is our plan to take up, tomorrow, Calendar No. 216, Senate bill 684, to clarify certain provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. If there are to be any yea-and-nay votes or if amendments which necessitate yea-and-nay votes are offered, we shall put off the yea-and-nay votes until next Monday. However, we shall attempt to complete all other legislative action on that bill by Thursday, tomorrow—but if we are unable to do so, we shall have to meet on Friday—with the exception of legislative action by means of yea-and-nay votes. In other words, in connection with Calendar No. 216, Senate bill 684, on tomorrow we shall try to take final action on all matters which do not require yea-and-nay votes; but if we are unable to do so, we shall have to have a session on Friday. However, I do not think we shall have to face that possibility. On Monday, we shall have the yea-and-nay votes, if such are required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it the plan, then, to go from Thursday to Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

When we complete our business today, I shall move that the Senate adjourn until noon, tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON, TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow, at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. From Thursday, we shall go over until Monday, if on Thursday we finish all but the yea-and-nay votes—if any there be—on Calendar No. 216, Senate bill 684.

In response to the question asked by the minority leader, I may say that we hope to take up, next week, the Export-Import Bank bill. It has recently been reported, and is on the calendar.

There is also the possibility that we shall take up Calendar No. 230, Senate bill 1163, to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

These are the two key measures which we would hope to dispose of next week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understood the latter measure was set for Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have tentatively set the area redevelopment bill for Tuesday. That is subject to change; and we shall know by tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Sidney W. Bishop, of California, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice H. W. Brawley.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Alexander Henry Flax, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Brockway McMillan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19, 1963:

IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The nominations beginning Michael Canelis to be senior surgeon, and ending Bernard W. Dahl to be assistant sanitary engineer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 4, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Alfred S. Nelson to be senior surgeon, and ending Richard A. Mackey to be senior assistant health services officer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 4, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Alice M. Waterhouse to be medical director, and ending Heber J. R. Stevenson to be senior health service officer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 11, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 3: 12: *The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another and toward all men.*

Most merciful and gracious God, give us this day a clear insight into what is worthwhile and a scale of moral values that we can carry into the tasks and struggles of each new day.

Make us more sensitive and responsive to our high calling to respect and reverence human personality and advance its welfare.

Grant that we may give to all the members of the human family an equal opportunity and chance to develop their inborn capacities to the utmost.

May we have broad horizons that will link our life with the whole social order, made up not only of the life of our fellow men around us but also of those who have lived before us and those yet unborn.

Show us how we may release our minds from every trace of suspicion, prejudice, race-hatred, and from all those animosities which destroy happiness and impede the world's progress toward a nobler civilization.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 13, 1963, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, June 21, to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 124)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last week I addressed to the American people an appeal to conscience—a request for their cooperation in meeting the growing moral crisis in American race relations. I warned of "a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety" in many parts of the country. I emphasized that "the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them." "It is a time to act," I said, "in the Congress, in

State and local legislative bodies, and, above all, in all of our daily lives."

In the days that have followed, the predictions of increased violence have been tragically borne out. The "fires of frustration and discord" have burned hotter than ever.

At the same time, the response of the American people to this appeal to their principles and obligations has been reassuring. Private progress—by merchants and unions and local organizations—has been marked, if not uniform, in many areas. Many doors long closed to Negroes, North and South, have been opened. Local biracial committees, under private and public sponsorship, have mushroomed. The mayors of our major cities, whom I earlier addressed, have pledged renewed action. But persisting inequalities and tensions make it clear that Federal action must lead the way, providing both the Nation's standard and a nationwide solution. In short, the time has come for the Congress of the United States to join with the executive and judicial branches in making it clear to all that race has no place in American life or law.

On February 28, I sent to the Congress a message urging the enactment this year of three important pieces of civil rights legislation:

1. Voting: Legislation to assure the availability to all of a basic and powerful right—the right to vote in a free American election—by providing for the appointment of temporary Federal voting referees while voting suits are proceeding in areas of demonstrated need; by giving such suits preferential and expedited treatment in the Federal courts; by prohibiting in Federal elections the application of different tests and standards to different voter applicants; and by providing that, in voting suits pertaining to such elections, the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant creates a presumption that he is literate. Armed with the full and equal right to vote, our Negro citizens can help win other rights through political channels not now open to them in many areas.

2. Civil Rights Commission: Legislation to renew and expand the authority of the Commission on Civil Rights, enabling it to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse offering information, advice, and technical assistance to any public or private agency that so requests.

3. School desegregation: Legislation to provide Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Other measures introduced in the Congress have also received the support of this administration, including those aimed at assuring equal employment opportunity.

Although these recommendations were transmitted to the Congress some time ago, neither House has yet had an opportunity to vote on any of these essential measures. The Negro's drive for justice, however, has not stood still—nor will it, it is now clear, until full equality is achieved. The growing and understandable dissatisfaction of Negro citizens with the present pace of desegregation, and their increased determination to secure for themselves the equality of opportunity and treatment to which they are rightfully entitled, have underscored what should already have been clear: the necessity of the Congress enacting this year—not only the measures already proposed—but also additional legislation providing legal remedies for the denial of certain individual rights.

The venerable code of equity law commands "for every wrong, a remedy." But in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens for which no effective remedy at law is clearly and readily available. State and local laws may even affirmatively seek to deny the rights to which these citizens are fairly entitled—and this can result only in a decreased respect for the law and increased violations of the law.

In the continued absence of congressional action, too many State and local officials as well as businessmen will remain unwilling to accord these rights to all citizens. Some local courts and local merchants may well claim to be uncertain of the law, while those merchants who do recognize the justice of the Negro's request—and I believe these constitute the great majority of merchants, North and South—will be fearful of being the first to move, in the face of official, customer, employee, or competitive pressures. Negroes, consequently, can be expected to continue increasingly to seek the vindication of these rights through organized direct action, with all its potentially explosive consequences, such as we have seen in Birmingham, in Philadelphia, in Jackson, in Boston, in Cambridge, Md., and in many other parts of the country.

In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife—causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquillity, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress, and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us. No American, I feel sure, would prefer this course of tension, disorder, and division—and the great majority of our citizens simply cannot accept it.

For these reasons, I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fair-minded men. This bill would be known as the Civil Rights Act of 1963, and would include—in addition to the aforementioned provisions on voting rights and the Civil Rights Commission—additional titles on public accommodations, employment, federally assisted programs, a community relations service, and education, with the latter including my previous recommendation on this subject. In addition, I am requesting certain legislative and budget amendments designed to improve the training, skills and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike. Certain executive actions are also reviewed here; but legislative action is imperative.

I. EQUAL ACCOMMODATIONS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES

Events of recent weeks have again underlined how deeply our Negro citizens resent the injustice of being arbitrarily denied equal access to those facilities and accommodations which are otherwise open to the general public. That is a daily insult which has no place in a country proud of its heritage—the heritage of the melting-pot, of equal rights, of one nation and one people. No one has been barred on account of his race from fighting or dying for America—there are no "white" or "colored" signs on the foxholes or graveyards of battle. Surely, in 1963, 100 years after emancipation, it should not be necessary for any American citizen to demonstrate in the streets for the opportunity to stop at a hotel, or to eat at a lunch counter in the very department store in which he is shopping, or to enter a motion picture house, on the same terms as any other customer. As I stated in my message to the Congress of February 28, "no action is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas and other public accommodations and facilities."

The U.S. Government has taken action through the courts and by other means to protect those who are peacefully demonstrating to obtain access to these public facilities; and it has taken action to bring an end to discrimination in rail, bus, and airline terminals, to open up restaurants and other public facilities in all buildings leased as well as owned by the Federal Government, and to assure full equality of access to all federally owned parks, forests, and other recreational areas. When uncontrolled mob action directly threatened the nondiscriminatory use of transportation facilities in May 1961, Federal marshals were employed to restore order and prevent potentially widespread personal and property damage. Growing nationwide concern with this problem, however, makes it clear that further Federal action is needed now to secure the right of all citizens to the full enjoyment of all facilities which are open to the general public.

Such legislation is clearly consistent with the Constitution and with our concepts of both human rights and property rights. The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control, and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest. While the legal situations are not parallel, it is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln, in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation 100 years ago, was also accused of violating the property rights of slaveowners. Indeed, there is an age-old saying that "property has its duties as well as its rights"; and no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public. Both human rights and property rights are foundations of our society—and both will flourish as the result of this measure.

In a society which is increasingly mobile and in an economy which is increasingly interdependent, business establishments which serve the public—such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, stores, and others—serve not only the members of their immediate communities but travelers from other States and visitors from abroad. Their goods come from all over the Nation. This participation in the flow of interstate commerce has given these business establishments both increased prosperity and an increased responsibility to provide equal access and service to all citizens.

Some 30 States,[1] the District of Columbia and numerous cities—covering some two-thirds of this country and well over two-thirds of its people—have already enacted laws of varying effectiveness against discrimination in places of public accommodation, many of them in response to the recommendation of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947. But while their efforts indicate that legislation in this area is not extraordinary, the failure of more States to take effective action makes it clear that Federal legislation is necessary. The State and local approach has been tried. The voluntary approach has been tried. But these approaches are insufficient to prevent the free flow of commerce from being arbitrarily and inefficiently restrained and distorted by discrimination in such establishments.

Clearly the Federal Government has both the power and the obligation to eliminate these discriminatory practices: First, because they adversely affect the national economy and the flow of interstate commerce; and secondly, because Congress has been specifically empowered under the 14th amendment to enact legislation making certain that no State law permits or sanctions the unequal protection or treatment of any of its citizens.

There have been increasing public demonstrations of resentment directed against this kind of discrimination—demonstrations which too often breed tension and violence. Only the Federal Government, it is clear, can make these demonstrations unnecessary by providing peaceful remedies for the grievances which set them off.

For these reasons, I am today proposing, as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, a provision to guarantee all citizens equal access to the services and facilities of hotels, restaurants, places of amusement, and retail establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure. The proposal would give the person aggrieved the right to obtain a court order against the offending establishment or persons. Upon receiving a complaint in a case sufficiently important to warrant his conclusion that a suit would materially further the purposes of the act, the Attorney General—if he finds that the aggrieved party is unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for a suit on his own (for lack of financial means or effective representation, or for fear of economic or other injury)—will first refer the case for voluntary settlement to the Community Relations Service described below, give the establishment involved time to correct its practices, permit State and local equal access laws (if any) to operate first, and then, and only then, initiate a suit for compliance. In short, to the extent that these unconscionable practices can be corrected by the individual owners, localities and States (and recent experience demonstrates how effectively and uneventfully this can be done), the Federal Government has no desire to intervene.

But an explosive national problem cannot await city-by-city solutions; and those who loudly abhor Federal action only invite it if they neglect or evade their own obligations.

This provision will open doors in every part of the country which never should have been closed. Its enactment will hasten the end to practices which have no place in a free and united nation, and thus help move this potentially dangerous problem from the streets to the courts.

II. DESEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS

In my message of February 28, while commending the progress already made in achieving desegregation of education at all levels as required by the Constitution, I was compelled to point out the slowness of progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation. The Supreme Court has recently voiced the same opinion. Many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court decision in 1954 will enter segregated high schools this year, having suffered a loss which can never be regained. Indeed, discrimination in education is one basic cause of the other inequities and hardships inflicted upon our Negro citizens. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity, restricts his contribution as a citizen and community leader, encourages him to drop out of school and imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices and prejudices from our national life.

The Federal courts, pursuant to the 1954 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and earlier decisions on institutions of higher learning, have shown both competence and courage in directing the desegregation of schools on the local level. It is appropriate to keep this responsibility largely within the judicial arena. But it is unfair and unrealistic to expect that the burden of initiating such cases can be wholly borne by private litigants. Too often those entitled to bring suit on behalf of their children lack the economic means for instituting and maintaining such cases or the ability to withstand the personal, physical and economic harassment which sometimes descends upon those who do institute them. The same is true of students wishing to attend the college of their choice but unable to assume the burden of litigation.

These difficulties are among the principal reasons for the delay in carrying out the 1954 decision; and this delay cannot be justified to those who have been hurt as a result. Rights such as these, as the Supreme Court recently said, are "present rights. They are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now."

In order to achieve a more orderly and consistent compliance with the Supreme Court's school and college desegregation decisions, therefore, I recommend that the Congress assert its specific constitutional authority to implement the 14th amendment by including in the Civil Rights Act of 1963 a new title providing the following:

(A) Authority would be given the Attorney General to initiate in the Federal district courts appropriate legal proceedings against local public school boards or public institutions of higher learning—or to intervene in existing cases—whenever

(1) he has received a written complaint from students or from the parents of students who are being denied equal protection of the laws by a segregated public school or college; and

(2) he certifies that such persons are unable to undertake or otherwise arrange for the initiation and maintenance of such legal proceedings for lack of financial means or effective legal representation or for fear of economic or other injury; and

(3) he determines that his initiation of or intervention in such suit will materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education. For this purpose, the Attorney General would establish criteria to determine the priority and relative need for Federal action in those districts from which complaints have been filed.

(B) As previously recommended, technical and financial assistance would be given to those school districts in all parts of the country which, voluntarily or as the result of litigation, are engaged in the process of meeting the educational problems flowing from desegregation or racial imbalance but which are in need of guidance, experienced help or financial assistance in order to train their personnel for this changeover, cope with new difficulties and complete the job satisfactorily (including in such assistance loans to a district where State or local funds have been withdrawn or withheld because of desegregation).

---

[1] Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming. Cities with public accommodations ordinances which are outside the above States include Washington, D.C., Wilmington, Del., Louisville, Ky., El Paso, Tex., Kansas City, Mo., and St. Louis, Mo.

Public institutions already operating without racial discrimination, of course, will not be affected by this statute. Local action can always make Federal action unnecessary. Many school boards have peacefully and voluntarily desegregated in recent years. And while this act does not include private colleges and schools, I strongly urge them to live up to their responsibilities and to recognize no arbitrary bar of race or color—for such bars have no place in any institution, least of all one devoted to the truth and to the improvement of all mankind.

III. FAIR AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups. The unemployment rate of Negro workers is more than twice as high as that of the working force as a whole. In many of our larger cities, both North and South, the number of jobless Negro youth—often 20 percent or more—creates an atmosphere of frustration, resentment and unrest which does not bode well for the future. Delinquency, vandalism, gang warfare, disease, slums and the high cost of public welfare and crime are all directly related to unemployment among whites and Negroes alike—and recent labor difficulties in Philadelphia may well be only the beginning if more jobs are not found in the larger Northern cities in particular.

Employment opportunities, moreover, play a major role in determining whether the rights described above are meaningful. There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job.

Relief of Negro unemployment requires progress in three major areas:

(1) More jobs must be created through greater economic growth: The Negro—too often unskilled, too often the first to be fired and the last to be hired—is a primary victim of recessions, depressed areas and unused industrial capacity. Negro unemployment will not be noticeably diminished in this country until the total demand for labor is effectively increased and the whole economy is headed toward a level of full employment. When our economy operates below capacity, Negroes are more severely affected than other groups. Conversely, return to full employment yields particular benefits to the Negro. Recent studies have shown that for every 1 percentage point decline in the general unemployment rate there tends to be a 2-percentage point reduction in Negro unemployment.

Prompt and substantial tax reduction is a key to achieving the full employment we need. The promise of the area redevelopment program—which harnesses local initiative toward the solution of deep-seated economic distress—must not be stifled for want of sufficient authorization or adequate financing. The accelerated public works program is now gaining momentum; States, cities, and local communities should press ahead with the projects financed by this measure. In addition, I have instructed the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare to examine how their programs for the relief of unemployment and economic hardship can be still more intensively focused on those areas of hard-core, long-term unemployment, among both white and nonwhite workers. Our concern with civil rights must not cause any diversion or dilution of our efforts for economic progress—for without such progress the Negro's hopes will remain unfulfilled.

(2) More education and training to raise the level of skills: A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking in adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants. And too many who have attended nonsegregated schools dropped out for lack of incentive, guidance, or progress. The unemployment rate for those adults with less than 5 years of schooling is around 10 percent; it has consistently been double the prevailing rate for high school graduates; and studies of public welfare recipients show a shockingly high proportion of parents with less than a primary school education.

Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort today is failing millions of our youth. It is especially failing Negro youth in segregated schools and crowded slums. If we are ever to lift them from the morass of social and economic degradation, it will be through the strengthening of our education and training services—by improving the quality of instruction; by enabling our schools to cope with rapidly expanding enrollments; and by increasing opportunities and incentives for all individuals to complete their education and to continue their self-development during adulthood.

I have therefore requested of the Congress and request again today the enactment of legislation to assist education at every level from grade school through graduate school.

I have also requested the enactment of several measures which provide, by various means and for various age and educational groups, expanded job training and job experience. Today, in the new and more urgent context of this message, I wish to renew my request for these measures, to expand their prospective operation and to supplement them with additional provisions. The additional $400 million which will be required beyond that contained in the January budget is more than offset by the various budget reductions which I have already sent to the Congress in the last 4 months. Studies show, moreover, that the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school; and, when welfare and other social costs are added, it is clear that failure to take these steps will cost us far more than their enactment. There is no more profitable investment than education, and no greater waste than ill-trained youth.

Specifically, I now propose:

(A) That additional funds be provided to broaden the manpower development and training program, and that the act be amended, not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program;

(B) That additional funds be provided to finance the pending youth employment bill, which is designed to channel the energies of out-of-school, out-of-work youth into the constructive outlet offered by hometown improvement projects and conservation work;

(C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

(D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training;

(E) That the ceiling be raised on the adult basic education provisions in the pending education program, in order to help the States teach the fundamental tools of literacy and learning to culturally deprived adults. More than 22 million Americans in all parts of the country have less than 8 years of schooling; and

(F) That the public welfare work-relief and training program, which the Congress added last year, be amended to provide Federal financing of the supervision and equipment costs, and more Federal demonstration and training projects, thus encouraging State and local welfare agencies to put employable but unemployed welfare recipients to work on local projects which do not displace other workers.

To make the above recommendations effective, I call upon more States to adopt enabling legislation covering unemployed fathers under the aid-to-dependent children program, thereby gaining their services for work-relief jobs, and to move ahead more vigorously in implementing the manpower development and training program. I am asking the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to make use of their authority to deal directly with communities and vocational schools whenever State cooperation or progress is insufficient, particularly in those areas where youth unemployment is too high. Above all, I urge the Congress to enact all of these measures with alacrity and foresight.

For even the complete elimination of racial discrimination in employment—a goal toward which this Nation must strive (as discussed below)—will not put a single unemployed Negro to work unless he has the skills required and unless more jobs have been created—and thus the passage of the legislation described above (under both sections (1) and (2)) is essential if the objectives of this message are to be met.

(3) Finally racial discrimination in employment must be eliminated: Denial of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden on an individual because of his race or color. Men who served side by side with each other on the field of battle should have no difficulty working side by side on an assembly line or construction project.

Therefore, to combat this evil in all parts of the country,

(A) The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, under the chairmanship of the Vice President, should be given a permanent statutory basis, assuring it of adequate financing and enforcement procedures. That Committee is now stepping up its efforts to remove racial barriers in the hiring practices of Federal departments, agencies, and Federal contractors, covering a total of some 20 million employees and the Nation's major employers. I have requested a company-by-company, plant-by-plant, union-by-union report to assure the implementation of this policy.

(B) I will shortly issue an Executive order extending the authority of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to include the construction of buildings and other facilities undertaken wholly or in part as a result of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

(C) I have directed that all Federal construction programs be reviewed to prevent any racial discrimination in hiring practices, either directly in the rejection of presently available qualified Negro workers or indirectly by the exclusion of Negro applicants for apprenticeship training.

(D) I have directed the Secretary of Labor, in the conduct of his duties under the Federal Apprenticeship Act and Executive Order No. 10925, to require that the admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis.

(E) I have directed the Secretary of Labor to make certain that the job counseling and placement responsibilities of the Federal-State Employment Service are carried out on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to help assure that full and equal employment opportunity is provided all qualified Negro applicants. The selection and referral of applicants for employment and for training opportunities, and the administration of the employment offices' other services and facilities, must be carried on without regard to race or color. This will be of special importance to Negroes graduating from high school or college this month.

(F) The Department of Justice has intervened in a case now pending before the NLRB involving charges of racial discrimination on the part of certain union locals.

(G) As a part of its new policy on Federal employee organizations, this Government will recognize only those that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color.

(H) I have called upon the leaders of organized labor to end discrimination in their membership policies; and some 118 unions, representing 85 percent of the AFL–CIO membership, have signed nondiscrimination agreements with the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. More are expected.

(I) Finally, I renew my support of pending Federal fair employment practices legislation, applicable to both employers and unions. Approximately two-thirds of the Nation's labor force is already covered by Federal, State, and local equal employment opportunity measures—including those employed in the 22 States and numerous cities which have enacted such laws as well as those paid directly or indirectly by Federal funds. But, as the Secretary of Labor testified in January 1962, Federal legislation is desirable, for it would help set a standard for all the Nation and close existing gaps.

This problem of unequal job opportunity must not be allowed to grow, as the result of either recession or discrimination. I enlist every employer, every labor union, and every agency of government—whether affected directly by these measures or not—in the task of seeing to it that no false lines are drawn in assuring equality of the right and opportunity to make a decent living.

IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

I have repeatedly stressed the fact that progress in race relations, while it cannot be delayed, can be more solidly and more peacefully accomplished to the extent that legislation can be buttressed by voluntary action. I have urged each member of the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish biracial human relations committees in every city; and I hope all communities will establish such a group, preferably through official action. Such a board or committee can provide invaluable services by identifying community tensions before they reach the crisis stage, by improving cooperation and communication between the races, and by advising local officials, merchants, and organizations on the steps which can be taken to insure prompt progress.

A similar agency is needed on the Federal level—to work with these local committees, providing them with advice and assistance—to work in those communities which lack a local committee—and generally to help ease tensions and suspicions, to help resolve interracial disputes and to work quietly to improve relations in any community threatened or torn with strife. Such an effort is in no way a substitute for effective legislative guarantees of human rights. But conciliation and cooperation can facilitate the achievement of those rights, enabling legislation to operate more smoothly and more effectively.

The Department of Justice and its Civil Rights Division have already performed yeoman service of this nature, in Birmingham, in Jackson, and throughout the country. But the problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service—to fulfill the functions described above, working through regional, State, and local committees to the extent possible, and offering its services in tension-torn communities either upon its own motion or upon the request of a local official or other party. Authority for such a Service is included in the proposed omnibus bill. It will work without publicity and hold all information imparted to its officers in strict confidence. Its own resources can be preserved by its encouraging and assisting the creation of State and local committees, either on a continuing basis or in emergency situations.

Without powers of enforcement or subpena, such a Service is no substitute for other measures; and it cannot guarantee success. But dialog and discussion are always better than violence—and this agency, by enabling all concerned to sit down and reason together, can play a major role in achieving peaceful progress in civil rights.

V. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Simple justice requires that public funds, to which all taxpayers of all races contribute, not be spent in any fashion which encourages, entrenches, subsidizes, or results in racial discrimination. Direct discrimination by Federal, State, or local governments is prohibited by the Constitution. But indirect discrimination, through the use of Federal funds, is just as invidious; and it should not be necessary to resort to the courts to prevent each individual violation. Congress and the Executive have their responsibilities to uphold the Constitution also; and, in the 1960's, the executive branch has sought to fulfill its responsibilities by banning discrimination in federally financed housing, in NDEA and NSF institutes, in federally affected employment, in the Army and Air Force Reserve, in the training of civilian defense workers, and in all federally owned and leased facilities.

Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the Administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients that the amount of administrative discretion remaining—which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended—is at best questionable. No administrator has the unlimited authority to invoke the Constitution in opposition to the mandate of the Congress. Nor would it always be helpful to require unconditionally—as is often proposed—the withdrawal of all Federal funds from programs urgently needed by Negroes as well as whites; for this may only penalize those who least deserve it without ending discrimination.

Instead of permitting this issue to become a political device often exploited by those opposed to social or economic progress, it would be better at this time to pass a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guarantee, insurance, or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs. This would not permit the Federal Government to cut off all Federal aid of all kinds as a means of punishing an area for the discrimination occurring therein—but it would clarify the authority of any administrator with respect to Federal funds or financial assistance and discriminatory practices.

CONCLUSION

Many problems remain that cannot be ignored. The enactment of the legislation I have recommended will not solve all our problems of race relations. This bill must be supplemented by action in every branch of government at the Federal, State, and local level. It must be supplemented as well by enlightened private citizens, private businesses and private labor and civic organizations, by responsibile educators and editors, and certainly by religious leaders who recognize the conflict between racial bigotry and the Holy Word.

This is not a sectional problem—it is nationwide. It is not a partisan problem. The proposals set forth above are based on a careful consideration of the views of leaders of both parties in both Houses of Congress. In 1957 and 1960, members of both parties rallied behind the civil rights measures of my predecessor; and I am certain that this tradition can be continued, as it has in the case of world crises. A national domestic crisis also calls for bipartisan unity and solutions.

We will not solve these problems by blaming any group or section for the legacy which has been handed down by past generations. But neither will these problems be solved by clinging to the patterns of the past. Nor, finally, can they be solved in the streets, by lawless acts on either side, or by the physical actions or presence of any private group or public official, however appealing such melodramatic devices may seem to some.

During the weeks past, street demonstrations, mass picketing and parades have brought these matters to the Nation's attention in dramatic fashion in many cities throughout the United States. This has happened because these racial injustices are real and no other remedy was in sight. But, as feelings have risen in recent days, these demonstrations have increasingly endangered lives and property, enflamed emotions and unnecessarily divided communities. They are not the way in which this country should rid itself of racial discrimination. Violence is never justified; and, while peaceful communication, deliberation, and petitions of protest continue, I want to caution against demonstrations which can lead to violence.

This problem is now before the Congress. Unruly tactics or pressures will not help and may hinder the effective consideration of these measures. If they are enacted, there will be legal remedies available; and, therefore, while the Congress is completing its work, I urge all community leaders, Negro and white, to do their utmost to lessen tensions and to exercise self-restraint. The Congress should have an opportunity to freely work its will. Meanwhile, I strongly support action by local public officials and merchants to remedy these grievances on their own.

The legal remedies I have proposed are the embodiment of this Nation's basic posture of commonsense and common justice. They involve every American's right to vote, to go to school, to get a job, and to be served in a public place without arbitrary discrimination—rights which most Americans take for granted.

In short, enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 at this session of the Congress—however long it may take and however troublesome it may be—is imperative. It will go far toward providing reasonable men with the reasonable means of meeting these problems; and it will thus help end the kind of racial strife which this Nation can hardly afford. Rancor, violence, disunity, and national shame can only hamper our national standing and security. To paraphrase the words of Lincoln: "In giving freedom to the Negro, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve."

I therefore ask every Member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties, and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans; a sense of justice. In this year of the emancipation centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1963.*

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the message just submitted to the Congress, the President has laid it on the line. He has set forth the guidelines of a program which can produce justice for all Americans this year. If this Congress can pass this measure, it will have made a monumental contribution. In the area of human rights this could be the most productive Congress of the century.

The President has set the tempo of our work and we should proceed without delay.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard with interest the reading of the message of the President on civil rights. I rise to comment briefly upon it, because I fear that this message is in keeping with the thinking of too many people who are ignoring the rights of the majority in our country.

As the message was read, I noted the recommendation that the commerce clause be extended and stretched in a method never contemplated by the writers of the Constitution. I heard also reference to implementing the 14th amendment to the Constitution in a way which I believe even those who voted for it freely—as well as those who voted for it under force—never contemplated. I was impressed by the fact that in the message there was not the slightest reference to the 10th amendment to the Constitution and that is an equally important section of our Constitution.

The 10th amendment is brief and clear. It says:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In my judgment, the proposals contained in the President's message would, if enacted into law, constitute a usurpation of the powers, rights, and privileges of the States and the people.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for 19 years as a member of the New York State Legislature and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I have pursued the policy of never voting for a motion to discharge a committee or signing a petition to discharge a committee from consideration of a piece of legislation affecting our material wants. But, with the Supreme Court decision of June 25, 1962, and the Supreme Court decision on Monday of this week which intends to and will bar prayer from public schools in the United States, I intend for the first time to give the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the people of the various State legislatures the right to determine whether the Constitution shall be amended to permit prayer in public schools and in all public places.

To this end, today I have for the first time in my history as a legislator presented a resolution to the House that will discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 9, to so permit prayer in our public schools.

After the expiration of 7 legislative days, I will place a petition at the desk to give the Members of this House the opportunity to sign it and to bring before this House and let the American people have the opportunity to have a constitutional amendment which, I believe, they are entitled to.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL RIGHTS MESSAGE

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on one aspect of the President's message which we have just heard here in the House of Representatives. That is the necessity for any legislation affecting civil rights to be of a bipartisan nature.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this is certainly an area where bipartisan action is essential. There have been too many instances of playing politics with the inherent civil and constitutional rights of individuals in this country. Certainly the President must have some assurance that there is strong Republican support and strong Democratic support for civil rights legislation of a moderate and a reasonable nature.

Mr. Speaker, while serving in the legislature of the State of Illinois I had an opportunity to help make equal job opportunity legislation a bipartisan issue there. I know that the great majority of the Members of this Congress recognize that the time for equal opportunity, the time for equal citizenship for all, is here and now. We should see to it that this subject of legislation is placed on a bipartisan level in order that we can work together as Members of this Congress in supporting reasonable legislation.

BETTER TAKE A "PRO'S" ADVICE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the reading of the President's message, I would predict that during the next few weeks it will become abundantly clear that the President might well have followed the advice of a real pro, former President Truman, who only last week stated that in his opinion no further civil rights legislation was needed, only the enforcement of laws presently on the books and the Constitution.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration, abetted by the Republican leadership, seeks to stampede Congress into enacting the most far reaching racial legislation since reconstruction.

It is common knowledge that until a month ago neither the administration nor the Republican leadership had any plans to advance so-called civil rights legislation at this session of Congress. A tragic day has arrived in American history when mob action can drive the Nation's political leadership into proposing hasty, ill-considered legislative programs.

It remains for the American people, from all parts of the country, to resist this political descent into mobocracy. Those of us in Congress who plan to fight this bill will need all possible help. Americans everywhere—North and South, Democrats and Republicans—must act now to let their Washington leaders know of their objection to this force legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's message on civil rights. I believe he has made a sincere, courageous, and statesmanlike message.

The President strikes out boldly to attack segregation on many fronts. He wisely asks for bipartisan support of this program, and I hope he shall receive it. He recognizes that present wrongs require legal remedies too long delayed. He generally seeks to restore peace and tranquillity to our land, and to quell the fires of frustration and discontent. He wishes to prevent extremists from taking leadership of the malcontents of certain elements in our population.

Undoubtedly the message and the bill accompanying it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope to renew hearings on this important message and bill this coming week.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 100 years ago tomorrow, June 20, 1863, West Virginia achieved statehood.

Our wild forests, rugged mountains, and trickling streams make West Virginia an ideal spot for hunting, fishing, and vacationing. There is lots of elbow room in West Virginia, and the State is easily accessible to the major population centers of the Atlantic seaboard and the Middle West. There are tremendous industrial opportunities in all areas of the State, and the most rapid growth has been scored in the Ohio River and Kanawha River Valleys.

A mark of West Virginia's participation in the space age is the National Radio Astronomy Laboratory at Green Banks, W. Va.

During the Civil War, a delegation called on President Abraham Lincoln and asked whether the materials being used to complete the Capitol dome might not better be used as sinews of war. President Lincoln quickly answerd that the work on the Capitol should go on as a symbol that the Union would go on. When the Statue of Freedom was hoisted to the top of the Capitol in December 1863, 35 guns boomed out in salute. The 35th gun was fired in honor of West Virginia, which had 6 months earlier been admitted as the 35th State in the Union.

Tomorrow, it is entirely fitting that President Kennedy should return to West Virginia. The President of the United States will fly to Charleston, W. Va. to help us celebrate our 100th birthday. To my colleagues and to everyone throughout the Nation, may I say: Please come to West Virginia during our centennial year. Come and relax with the most friendly, courteous, and unselfish people in the world. You will want to stay in West Virginia—a land of unlimited opportunity where you can share the fruits of freedom with those who live under our banner which proclaims: "Mountaineers are always free."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 84]

Ashley
Ayres
Bolling
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Colmer
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Ellsworth
Forrester
Giaimo
Grabowski
Grant
Hall
Hébert
Hosmer
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
McMillan
MacGregor
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Moss
Norblad
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
St Germain
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Sisk
Tupper
Ullman
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT FOR 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling], and by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 402, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Joint Resolution 247 relating to radio and television time in presidential campaigns. It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that a couple of years ago there was some embarrassment and trouble precipitated by the fact that under the law if time is given to one candidate for an office then equal time must be given to his opponent. There was an effort apparently in which certain people who were candidates for the Presidency and for the Vice Presidency who were not legally qualified candidates desired to get time and it therefore created some trouble.

Mr. Speaker, we passed a joint resolution at that time providing that that general provision should not prevail during the 1960 campaign; in other words, that candidates must be qualified party candidates in order to be recognized for this equal-time provision of radio and television. That applied only to the 1960 election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 1964 election is approaching and it has been thought advisable that it should be extended and made to apply to the 1964 election. So, with minor amendments, this is merely the resolution that was adopted by the Congress for the 1960 presidential election.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate. There was no objection to the granting of the rule in the Rules Committee when we had the hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] explained the resolution itself and the effect of it, if adopted. Perhaps a little more information on the background might be of interest, particularly to some of the newer Members of the House who were not here when this first suspension of section 315 was approved by the Congress previous to the 1960 election.

Mr. Speaker, section 315 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 of course provides that whatever broadcasting facilities are made available to one candidate, the same facilities and opportunities must be available to every other qualified candidate for that same office and in the same manner.

Even though this provision has been in the act since 1934, it was just presumed that the networks and the licensees could broadcast the national political convention proceedings of the two major parties and provide equal time to the candidates of the two major parties, without giving serious concern to any other candidates from any other party. This seemed to meet with popular acceptance. So this practice—and it was just a practice—was not challenged. However, in 1959 when present Mayor Richard Daley was a candidate for reelection as mayor of the city of Chicago another candidate by the name of Lar Daley requested equal time to compensate for some news coverage that had been afforded Mayor Richard Daley. The station denied that request. Candidate Lar Daley appealed to the Federal Communications Commission and they—the Commission—held in his favor, that he should be permitted although he was not a major candidate for the office in the eyes of the licensee involved, to have equal time. Equal time was given to him. It was on viewing the film as to how he utilized that equal time award that persuaded me to support suspension of the equal-time provision in section 315 for the 1960 election. Then the Congress proceeded by a resolution to suspend this provision for the 1960 campaign. Obviously we are now approaching the 1964 campaign. So this proposal is again before the House.

Let me direct my remarks now over on the Republican side of the aisle. I notice some opposition on our side of the aisle. You perhaps believe, and I think, and Attorney General Kennedy has said publicly, if it had not been for the television coverage of the 1960 candidate debate the now President Kennedy would not have been elected. So this naturally brings up some reservations over here whether or not this is in our party interest and whether this is in the public interest to approve this suspension.

Mr. Speaker, we have two things to consider, and again I am directing my remarks pretty much to those on our side of the aisle. I think there are two aspects to this.

In 1960 our candidate obviously had the responsibility for all the problems that were then prevalent, and he undertook to defend them; whereas the challenging candidate, then Senator Kennedy, had no responsibility and could criticize without having to take the responsibility for any of the misfortunes or any of the undesirable developments that had transpired in the previous 8 years.

This time it is going to be turned around. I say this to my friends on my right: In 1964 the situation is going to be reversed, because the Republican candidate, whoever he may be, and he will be a good one and probably a very successful candidate, but as to what his identity is by name I cannot say, will not have the responsibility of explaining all of the misfortunes and mistakes in the last 4 years.

I think the public interest will be well served. Regardless of the political responsibility on our side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle, every licensee, of course, has a public responsibility as well, and that is to use his privilege as a broadcaster in order to bring such public events to the attention of his listeners or his viewers, as the case may be, or as he deems to be in the public interest, and to fulfill his responsibility as a public licensee.

So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I recommend approval of the resolution after it has been fully considered in the Committee of the Whole. I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when this matter was first considered by that committee in 1959. I supported the suspension at that time, and I remain in that position today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF VA HOSPITALS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4347) to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 403 provides for consideration of H.R. 4347, a bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

According to the testimony presented to the Committee on Rules, under existing law, whenever the Veterans' Administration desires to build a new hospital, it submits appropriate plans and specifications to the Bureau of the Budget and after approval by the Bureau of the Budget, the proposal is then submitted to the President. If and when the President gives his concurrence, funds are requested in the next budget for the specific project and if voted as a part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, then the hospital is built in accordance with the plans previously agreed upon by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

As the committee report points out, in 1961 the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made a detailed study of the medical program of the Veterans' Administration, and there was developed a long-range program for construction of new hospitals, and for modernization and improvement of the existing hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration. No changes were required to be made in the law for this program to be carried out, but it was generally understood according to the committee report that the committee would keep in close touch with the program as it developed.

The committee report further states that recently the Veterans' Administration has, on its own, initiated changes in this long-range program without any advance consultation with the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and in some instances, without any advance notice. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs contends that this trend endangers the successful accomplishment of the long-range program already worked out, and that the law should clearly reflect the right of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to be notified in advance and consulted about changes proposed to be made in the program.

Under H.R. 4347, as reported, future major hospital construction or alteration by the Veterans' Administration must be justified in advance to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the committee must affirmatively approve such construction or alteration.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the adoption of House Resolution 403.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 403 provides for 1 hour of general debate, with an open rule, for the consideration of H.R. 4347, a bill entitled "Construction of Veterans' Administration Hospitals."

Mr. Speaker as a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4347.

This bill simply stated seeks to give the Congress the power of review over the location of new Veterans' Administration hospitals and the renovation and modernization of existing structures. I think this is entirely appropriate and a very reasonable proposal.

There are 168 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration medical system and 17 domiciliaries in addition. On any given day, approximately 110,000 veterans are hospitalized in the Veterans' Administration system and approximately 17,000 members are in its domiciliaries.

At the present time, the location of Veterans' Administration hospitals and the renovation and modernization of existing structures is entirely at the discretion of the executive branch of the Government. This bill, H.R. 4347 which is patterned on existing law applicable to public buildings programs and which has been tested in the courts, is a desirable step in order to give the Congress a greater control over the expenditure of public funds.

Having served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am sure that this bill when enacted into law will not result in the delay in approval of any worthwhile project sought by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when it is considered that the capital value of the existing structures in the Veterans' Administration medical system is estimated at in excess of $2½ billion and further that each new bed constructed in the Veterans' Administration costs between $15,000 and $30,000, controls by the Congress are not only reasonable and proper, but essential. I know of no objection to the rule. I urge adoption of the rule and the passage of H.R. 4347. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL-TIME PROVISIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 247, to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 247, with Mr. Denton in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers], chairman of the subcommittee conducting hearings on this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, House Joint Resolution 247, is actually very simple. I would call to your attention in the report on page 3 the letter from the Deputy Attorney General addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris]. In the first portion of that letter he sets out section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. That section reads as follows:

> If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station.

The legislation presently pending before the committee simply suspends the application of section 315 during the anticipated presidential campaigns in 1964.

There are two amendments that were adopted by the committee to the original resolution as it was originally introduced. One of those was an amendment limiting the time of suspension on an exact time basis; that is, the language in the original proposal was not clear as to how long this suspension would be in effect—when a campaign begins and when it ends. We know a campaign usually ends on election day, but no one knows when it begins.

So the committee felt that 75 days prior to the election would be sufficient time for the suspension of this section of the Communications Act. That is one of the committee amendments.

It begins on August 20, 1964, and ends on November 2, 1964.

The other has to do with a word; a word that was in the original proposal that referred to nominees who were running for the office of President and Vice

President. This was changed to "legally qualified" candidates. There has been quite a bit of discussion why this was done and what the difference is. The reason it was done is very simple. If you will refer to the language of the Communications Act itself you will find that the term therein used is "legally qualified candidates." That is the reason for this suggested change in the language of the resolution, which was changed to conform to the act so there would be no misunderstanding.

There were quite a number of people who came before the subcommittee on this measure and if you will refer to page 2 of the report you will see them listed; the National Committees of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, the National Association of Broadcasters, the three television networks, together with a number of other people who came before the subcommittee in favor of this legislation.

There was some opposition to the legislation. Witnesses representing the Socialist Labor Party of America, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the American Civil Liberties Union testified in opposition to the legislation.

I might say at this point that there are others who are opposed to this legislation for various and sundry reasons. But the point is simply this, that if the people of the United States are going to have the opportunity of seeing their candidates in the coming presidential election—unless this resolution is adopted I am afraid they will be denied that opportunity, primarily because there are so many small parties, some of them frivolous, some of them very serious, but all having their candidates. In many instances the people in California do not know about the man who is running on a New York party ticket because they never heard of the party or the candidate. The broadcasting people, radio and television, cannot subject their facilities to demands by all of these people from these parties that can be gotten up overnight to nominate a man for President or Vice President of the United States.

So it was the feeling of those of us on the committee who were in support of this legislation that we ought to make it possible for the people in this country to have the opportunity to view the man or the men who were running for President and Vice President, the highest offices in this land, without the broadcasters being subjected to unfair demands and abuses.

I grant you there are many arguments against the legislation and you are going to hear some today. One of those is that sometimes television is not fair, it is too tough a taskmaster; a man may be an excellent fellow, but he does not make a good appearance on television. That may be a good argument, but the fact of the matter is that television is here and it is here to stay. It would be my recommendation to any political party nominating a candidate for President or Vice President, that they do not nominate somebody who does not make a pretty good appearance on television because he is going to end up there sooner or later, whether he likes it or not. Some of these people, especially in the broadcasters' field and in the networks' field, came in and wanted section 315 wholly repealed; that is, wiped out.

If this should be done, a broadcasting station, whether it be a network broadcasting station, a single TV station, or a remote radio station, could permit the use of their facilities by any political candidate they wanted to on such terms as they wanted to, and not be responsible to afford equal opportunities, as is now required by law, to other candidates for that same position, whether the office be Governor, representative in the State legislature, or President of the United States.

This is a question that is entirely controversial, as you can all appreciate. It is a continuing question, that is going to be with us for some time. I may say that in this regard the Communications Subcommittee hopes to hold some hearings in the near future with regard to the overall problem, but the problem and the issue here today is not the repeal of section 315 insofar as equal rights is concerned; it is simply the suspension of this section of the law for 75 days next year in order to permit the American people to see for whom they are being asked to vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there is merit to the gentleman's argument as it applies to the President and Vice President, why not carry it right on down to other candidates?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There are several reasons for that. The President and Vice President are candidates for national jobs, that is, jobs that cover the entire country. The other areas involve limited areas such as your congressional district. Airways or beams, whatever you want to call them, television or radio beams, are no respecters of the boundary lines of the districts, so this would create many, many complex problems if you tried to do that. The gentleman understands that this does not deny the candidates of these smaller parties, or these splinter parties, for want of a better name, access to the radio, but it makes it possible for the major candidates to be seen and heard by the people without subjecting these broadcasting stations to the abuses that would be visited upon them as was the case several years ago.

Mr. GROSS. Up to this point I have heard of only one case which you can really hang your hat on in asking for this suspension for the President and Vice President. I have yet to be convinced that one swallow makes a spring.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What case is that?

Mr. GROSS. The Lar Daly case in Chicago.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, I think he will find a source of information there where he can find there are other situations on a similar scale which have arisen that created problems. I grant you that there is definitely a problem. We are going to try to get this worked out. But when we open up the airways which are heard by the public, in the manner which the broadcasting companies or the owners want to handle them, we are treading on dangerous ground. The minority report expressed that danger very well, I think.

Mr. GROSS. Let me clarify the record. Let me say I am not advocating a waiver for anyone, I mean for any of the broadcasting stations, for any candidate. Let me make that clear. I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the gentleman tell me if section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 were suspended as recommended in this resolution who would benefit or be discriminated against from this suspension?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think generally you could say that the American people would benefit from the suspension because it would make it possible for them to see and to hear these candidates on the national networks. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to, but if he is referring to the networks benefiting, I just do not follow the gentleman's question.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Perhaps the gentleman does not understand the question. I will forgo that question only because time is limited simply to make this statement and maybe to define for you and set out to you and the committee what my thinking is. I hold in my hand here a copy of the President's message delivered to the Congress today on civil rights setting forth the fact that all Americans everywhere and at every instant of the day and night should have equality in every walk of life, and it is inconceivable to me that this administration or anyone else should bring in on this same day a piece of legislation, House Joint Resolution 247, and ask that equality for somebody who seeks political office should be denied. The report says the administration approves this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I must decline to yield further to the gentleman on that. Let me straighten the gentleman out right here and now with reference to it.

The administration did not bring this bill to this committee or to this House of Representatives and it was not introduced in the first instance at the request of the administration. This resolution has been discussed for a long, long time. The same resolution was adopted during the past presidential campaign. This proposal was considered by the subcommittee; it was considered by the full committee; it was taken before the Committee on Rules and it has been brought to the House in the regular order.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was before us 2 years ago, I expressed concern that the networks, having had the benefit of the suspension of equal time provisions of law for the 1960 campaign, would be back shortly to ask for a complete repeal of section 315.

Mr. Chairman, if we may have order, I realize I am in the minority on this and probably that is why I have concern for the minority who are excluded from consideration by virtue of this suspension.

Mr. Chairman, my point is this. The fears that I expressed about the networks' desire to control political time given to candidates of all parties in this country have been borne out by the recent hearings of our subcommittee. Everyone from the networks and the National Association of Broadcasters came before us and asked not for the suspension which this bill provides, but for complete repeal of section 315 which at the present time guarantees candidates for political office the right equal to that given to their opposition by a radio or television station. Now that is an American right, an American privilege and an American heritage. What we are doing here is the same thing we did in 1960, whittling away at these rights. It is curious that in 1960 the networks said they were not able to provide the major parties with the amount of time without the suspension that they would provide them, if the suspension were granted. I have contacted the FCC to get the figures on the time that was given to the presidential candidates or their spokesmen—Republicans and Democrats. These figures have to do with 1956 and that is before this suspension went into effect and when the equal time provisions of section 315 were in full operation.

Mr. Chairman, in 1956 the radio networks gave the Democrats 9 hours and 3 minutes. They gave the Republicans 11 hours and 45 minutes. All other candidates for President and Vice President were given 11 hours and 45 minutes. Now, in 1960, after we suspended this provision, they gave the Democrats 10 hours and 48 minutes, and the Republicans 10 hours and 48 minutes. So from the standpoint of actual time consumption there is very little difference in the radio time given the two major parties in the 1956 and 1960 campaigns. Remember the big argument used by the networks was that "if you suspend this we will be able to give the Republican and Democratic Parties more time because we will not have to devote this time to the fringe parties, to the minority groups, and we will give it all to the major groups."

Well, Mr. Chairman, they did not do it. They gave them practically the same amount of time in 1956 as they did in 1960.

Mr. Chairman, here is what they did in television: In 1956 they gave the Democrats 8 hours and 25 minutes. In that same year they gave the Republicans 10 hours and 43 minutes. They gave all others 10 hours and 30 minutes.

Now, in 1960 they gave the Democrats 8 hours and the Republicans 8 hours, and all other parties 1 hour and 20 minutes.

In 1960 over the radio networks they gave all other parties 51 minutes. For all practical purposes no advantage was taken of the argument used as the main basis for granting this suspension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

It boils down to the fact that the radio and television networks of this country want to control all political time.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress wants to give them that right I guess that is what Congress can do. But I doubt very much that the American people want the television and radio networks, an industry in this country, to control political time. I believe they agree with the provisions of section 315, which provide for equality.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is too bad if some crackpot candidate like Lar Daley was given 5 or 10 minutes on radio or television. It is too bad, is it not, in a democracy that someone who disagrees with the majority view is given an opportunity for a few moments to express his viewpoint? Certainly in all of our history—and if you will look it over carefully you will find not only in the history of the debates in this great body, but in the debates that took place by candidates over the years—that very often time demonstrated that the minority view was the right view and it later became the prevailing view.

So, Mr. Chairman, when you deprive a minority group, regardless of who makes it up, of the right to be heard—and that is what the networks did in 1960—we are not following the spirit of the American concept. They gave all candidates for President and Vice President, other than the two major parties, 51 minutes on the radio and they gave all parties other than the Republican and Democratic Parties 1 hour and 20 minutes on television. Granted, I personally think that most of those minority parties are crackpots, and I disagree completely with their philosophy, but I say, like Voltaire, they have a right to be heard. We are depriving them of that right if we approve this legislation. Even though we only suspend it for the presidential campaign, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The gentleman has cited some figures indicating the performance in the last campaign in regard to the Democratic and Republican Parties. May I inquire of the gentleman, if this suspension goes through will there be any assurance in law that any of these broadcasters will be compelled to assure equality of time as between the two major parties?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. No.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Will it say they must give the Republican Party the same as they give the Democratic Party?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. No. It is left to the discretion of the network or station. The section of the law providing equal time is suspended. We are merely giving the networks a little easier way to present the candidates of the major parties. I indicated that even after the 1960 suspension they did not give more time than they did in 1956.

But here is another thing that should be considered. There are plenty of programs today of the news and interview type, such as "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," and a half dozen others, produced by the networks which are perfectly logical and perfectly good formats and upon which a Republican or Democrat candidate for President can appear and present his views to the American people without violating the provisions of section 315. As long as it is done on regular news interviews or regular news documentaries it is completely exempt under present law. But they are not satisfied with being exempt. They want to be exempt in their own way. They want to control the distribution of the political time in their discretion.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is unfair and un-American to permit them to do so.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I agree with the gentlemen about the section protecting the rights of the minority. We should do that and look ahead and try to take care of ourselves.

I am particularly interested in a phrase used by the minority in its report. I would like to read it and ask the gentleman a question:

> Our friends in the broadcasting industry, having been given merely a glimpse of power in the political arena, are now hungrily pursuing its ultimate; the right to hound people out of office who do not please them, the right to openly groom a successor for an official in disfavor, the right to control completely what an official or candidate may say to his audience in his own behalf, the right to use the airwaves to argue for its own political point of view, its own candidates, and with impunity. A license renewal each 3 years is no defense against the mischief possible under such conditions. Damage done cannot be undone and history indicates that the probabilities of the loss of a license are too small to create a deterrent.

The implication there is that you can buy a radio station and give a broadcast and not give another person the right to be heard. Would that necessarily follow in small stations around the country?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. As far as the presidential and vice-presidential candidates are concerned, it would.

Here is another thing to which I would like to call attention. Inequality under the present rulings of the Federal Communications Act in the last few years have been referred to. Radio and television stations are now encouraged to editorialize, which means they can express their opinions on any subjects, political or otherwise. If you listen to a television station or a radio station here in Washington editorialize, you will find they are getting into the area of political discussions, criticizing one party and defending another, criticizing one public official and defending another, all under the guise of editorializing. Our committee is going to go into that subject. What can be done about it, I do not know. But I call your attention to these things to indicate the vast freedom that the radio and television stations have at the present time, the vast power they have at the present time, the additional power we are giving them when we grant this suspension and the even greater power they desire.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to ask, if we pass this resolution today, the States to the South cannot use the airways to promote their candidate for President; or if the gentleman's party decides to split, you cannot do it under this?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STAGGERS. The only thing involved is the two major parties.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. You cannot be heard unless the network and the radio industry is willing. They can grant or deny time to anybody they please, but, after a suspension was granted to them in 1960 they gave the generous allowance of 51 minutes to all minor parties on radio and 1 hour and 20 minutes on television.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this joint resolution. I believe that notwithstanding the problems and the difficulties in the use of these broadcast media, it will be, overall, in the best interests of the American people.

Now, this matter is brought to the attention of the Congress now instead of next year because it is felt that it would be better for it to be considered before we get into the heat of the campaign. I personally felt that it would be a whole lot better to consider it in a calmer atmosphere.

As has been said and explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such a good job in the explanation of this proposal here, this suspension of section 315 has been tried. We have had the experience in 1960 and we know what the result was. I will say to my distinguished friend from Kansas that consideration is being given to extending the suspension of this provision of law to candidates for Governors and to other State offices, such as the U.S. Senate. There are those who would like to extend it to Members of the House.

As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, there are those in the broadcast industry that want to repeal section 315 outright. Now, the committee did not feel that we should give them that latitude, and I do not, either. This bill has the strong support of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, who testified before the committee. It has the strong recommendation of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who testified before the committee.

Something was said a moment ago about the comparison of the hours that were used in the campaign of 1956 with 1960. Let me read to you what Mr. Sarnoff of the National Broadcasting Co. said in his appearance before the committee:

> The limited suspension in 1960 not only made these debates possible, but it enabled the Democratic and Republican candidates for President and Vice President to appear in other programs. For example, their appearances on the NBC television networks during the 1960 campaign totaled 10½ hours, apart from appearances in paid political programs. If the candidates had been paying time and program charges for these 10½ hours of network presentations, the bill would have come to about $1,700,000. This compares with the $1 million which the major parties spent for all the paid political broadcasts on the NBC television network in 1960.

Now let me read what Dr. Stanton, president of CBS, said:

> In 1960 the CBS radio and television networks devoted a total of 16¼ hours to personal appearances of the Democratic and Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates, at no charge to them. This, compared to 36 minutes in 1956. In 1960, another 16 hours were given supporters of the major candidates. Time costs of these 1960 broadcasts exceeded $2 million, and additional time worth another $700,000 was offered to the candidates but not accepted.

Let me remind you of two things. This is a voluntary provision insofar as the broadcasting industry is concerned. It does not have to give any free time. It is permissive. From a practical standpoint it can work only on the basis of an understanding between the candidates and the broadcasting companies. Therefore, from a practical standpoint it must be worked out on a fair basis.

The second thing is with reference to what the gentleman from West Virginia said a moment ago. This permits any broadcasting facility in any given area, or State, or section, to take advantage of this suspension. They can do it in West Virginia, or they can do it in the South, or it can be done on a national basis. So it seems to me with the experience we have had, this legislation would be in the public interest. I have confidence that if there is a minority candidate for the Office of President and Vice President in any section of this Nation who has a chance to make a substantial impact in the campaign, that the networks or broadcasting facilities will in all fairness have to make time available to such a man.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to refresh my memory, but if I do remember correctly when we considered this legislation first in 1960 was there not some testimony as to probably what would have come about in the election of 1948 when we did have a third candidate for President with a substantial amount of support? Of course, in retrospect you could not go back and make a firm determination as to what would or would not have happened, but it was certainly my impression from that discussion that that candidate would have been permitted to have equal time with the two principal candidates.

Mr. HARRIS. I can say to the gentleman that the committee had this in mind when we decided again that this was going to be only temporary. Until we find out from an abundance of experience here just how it will operate I do not think it should be turned loose. For that reason I strongly favor that we make this suspension applicable only for the 1964 campaign. As time goes on and we get more experience then I think we will be in better position to know what to do.

Mr. AVERY. Will the gentleman permit me to say that it certainly is not fair to conclude here today that a third candidate for President or Vice President will be precluded from sharing in time.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think it would be and that is what I want to see, from experience, just how it turns out. It will have some bearing on my position regarding this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the same token, if this legislation is passed, is there any requirement that would compel the broadcasters to give equal time to this third candidate?

Mr. HARRIS. Nothing except their fairness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So the question as to whether a person is a major candidate rests entirely in the hands of Frank Stanton and the other broadcasters, rather than in the U.S. Congress, and rather than in the people?

Mr. HARRIS. The Congress cannot administer these broadcasting facilities, we know that. All we do is provide as a matter of policy how it will be used.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that the broadcasters themselves will become the sole judges of who the major candidates are?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is true, and I think that was intended here. I think it was intended that they make judgments on the basis of fairness, and if they are not fair they know they will be dealt with in the future.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Mississippi makes a reference to the president of one of the major networks. As far as the legislation is concerned, the networks per se are not involved. It is the licensee that this legislation is directed to, and it is the licensee that is being held responsible. Is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the practical application of it, yes.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been explained so well by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman of the subcommittee, the purpose of this legislation is exceedingly simple. It is to suspend the equal opportunity requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the 1964 presidential and vice presidential campaigns.

Section 315 requires a licensee of a broadcasting station who permits a legally qualified candidate for public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting stations.

The legislation is substantially identical with provisions of legislation enacted by the 86th Congress which made possible the joint Kennedy-Nixon appearances on television and radio during the

1960 presidential and vice presidential campaigns.

Under the provisions of the 1960 legislation, the Democratic and Republican candidates for President and Vice President received many hours of free broadcast time which they might not have received if the broadcast licensees had been required to allow equal time to the several fringe candidates for those offices.

The committee adopted two amendments. The first amendment would specify that for purposes of this legislation the period of the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns shall be the 75-day period immediately preceding November 3, 1964. This, in effect, makes the period of suspension from August 20, 1964, through November 2, 1964, both dates inclusive. The second amendment is a conforming amendment which substitutes the term "legally qualified candidate" for the term "nominee." This conforming amendment brings the language of this legislation in line with the provisions of section 315 which speaks of "legally qualified candidates" rather than "nominees."

I need not remind the Members of this body that television and radio have become integral parts of political campaigns. By suspending the equal opportunity requirement of section 315 for presidential and vice-presidential candidates, better television and radio coverage of the campaigns of major presidential and vice-presidential candidates is made possible.

The minority views which were filed by four members of our committee stress that the Kennedy-Nixon appearances could have been accomplished under the 1959 amendments to section 315 which exempted from the equal time requirement, bona fide news interviews and bona fide news documentaries. While the minority is correct in this contention to a certain extent, it should be pointed out that the format which was adopted by the candidates for their joint appearances during the 1960 campaign would have had to be modified substantially in order to come within the aforementioned two exceptions.

This format was agreed upon by the candidates themselves and the representatives of the networks. Of course, the same will be true in 1964. Agreement will be necessary with regard to the format and such agreement requires concurrence of the candidates themselves.

The minority views also stress that the 1960 legislation had been used by the broadcasters as an argument in favor of outright repeal of section 315. Our committee in favorably reporting House Joint Resolution 247 had no notion of giving any support to the arguments advanced by several of the broadcast witnesses favoring outright repeal.

Furthermore, some warnings were advanced by the minority members with regard to editorializing by radio and television licensees. Of course, the committee in no way desires this legislation to be construed as taking any position with regard to the desirability or undesirability of editorializing by radio and television licensees. This is an entirely separate question and an announcement has already been made that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power will hold hearings on the subject of editorializing.

As I read the minority views, those who concur with these views do not primarily oppose House Joint Resolution 247. They seem to question the motives of the broadcasters who seek outright repeal of section 315 and they urge a review of present policies with regard to editorializing.

I want to stress that this legislation, as was the 1960 legislation, is strictly limited. It applies only to presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Its application is limited to the 1964 election. And, in order to assure that there will not be abuse, by radio licensees or networks, of this legislation it is specifically provided that the Federal Communications Commission shall submit a detailed report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1965, on the effect of the suspension on the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns including information concerning requests for time, amount of time made available, total charges, rates, editorializing, distribution of time during various phases of campaigns, and clearance by individual stations of network programs concerning the candidates or the issues. In order to enable the Commission to make this report to the Congress the legislation requires broadcast stations and networks to submit such information as may be necessary for the compiling of this report.

The legislation also provides that the temporary suspension shall not be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under the Communications Act to operate in the public interest. I believe the membership of the House will agree that the American people expect to have every opportunity to observe the major presidential and vice-presidential candidates during the 1964 campaign by means of radio and television. It has been estimated that an average of 85 million people watched the joint Kennedy-Nixon television appearances during the 1960 campaigns.

The adoption of this legislation will assure that the 1964 campaigns of the major presidential and vice-presidential candidates will receive equally extensive, if not even greater, television and radio coverage.

I, therefore, urge the membership of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this resolution. In retrospect we ought to see what happened the last time. I voted for this resolution in 1960 on the promise that they would have debates. The whole argument was that we would have grand debates similar to the Lincoln-Douglas debates. What did we get? We got only a glorified newspaper interview. That is all it was.

Previously we had exempted such programs as "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," programs of that kind. They were already exempt. We had taken care of the Lar Daley case by exempting a candidate who appeared in a newscast, where the appearance was incidental to the newscast. So we had taken care of those essential matters. The program that was presented could have been presented on "Meet the Press" or "Face the Nation," which was already exempt and it is still exempt.

The only difference is they had two candidates instead of one appearing on the program. But they could have had two just as well as one. So that from a practical standpoint there is absolutely no necessity for the adoption of this resolution.

I hate to disagree with our excellent chairman about bringing this matter before the Congress at this time, but I think there is a very well thought out program of bringing it to us at this time, for fear that there might well be a third party or a third candidate of some prominence who could be absolutely excluded from any program.

They talk about this being a matter of fairness. Just the other day, if I was informed correctly—I did not see the article, but it was in Mr. Laurent's column in the Post—the present Chairman of the FCC recommended that section 315 be repealed. I want to say to this House that if the time ever comes when you repeal section 315 you are going to put into the hands of the broadcaster the election of your Congress, your Senate and all of your public officials, without any question. If you want to set up in this country a royal family this is the way to do it, without any question. And tack onto that the recommendation of Mr. Minow when he left, to do away with the FCC and to put in an administrator appointed by the President. This is a far-reaching proposal. If you can see what is being done here I do not believe that this Congress at this time should extend this kind of waiver of section 315. Every time you whittle away part of it, you give to those who want to repeal 315 a reason for repealing it. That is certainly what has happened.

The networks came before us with the idea that the networks did so well with the last exemption that now we should repeal section 315.

That is the purpose of this present action. It is the same old story. You never saw an alcoholic who did not take the first drink. It is the same with this. You will never repeal 315 if you hold tight to it and do not chisel it away, but if you start chiseling it away you are surely going to have 315 repealed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; I yield gladly to my chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman not feel that the communications media, which are a public national resource, belong to the people, and are franchised through the Commission for their operation, should be used, then, to the best advantage of all the people?

Mr. YOUNGER. In answering my chairman, I am so strongly in favor of that, and the record will show and the hearings will show that I disagree with the editorializing. I think that the broadcasters who came before us, want the right to editorialize, and want the same right as newspapers, are just as wrong as rain, and that right should never be granted.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows that the question of editorializing is not involved here. I will say, though, that on July 15 we are going to initiate hearings in the Subcommittee on Commerce and Power on the question of editorializing and other things involved with the overall problem. As the gentleman remembers, I told the committee that we would have further hearings at the discretion of the subcommittee in order that additional points not involved here may be considered and decided as the committee thinks best.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is true. The gentleman remembers I was going to submit an amendment to this joint resolution, which I withdrew when the chairman of our subcommittee promised to hold hearings on editorializing. My record is rather clear on that, as the chairman of the subcommittee well knows.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill to suspend the equal-time provision of the Communications Act with respect to the 1964 presidential campaign. This is a realistic measure, and one which served its purpose well in the past.

This is not, however, a solution to all the problems which may arise concerning the use of radio and television in a presidential campaign. I want to call attention, in particular, to the fact that no solution has been evolved to solve the campaign problem of an incumbent President delivering a speech or making an appearance on radio or television, respecting a subject of national importance. There is a history of controversy on this point which has affected both parties.

In 1936, during an election year Republicans were denied by the networks an opportunity to reply as they chose to President Roosevelt's fireside chats. Yet no action was taken by the FCC. In 1956, President Eisenhower addressed the Nation on the Suez Crisis, an appearance his political opponent Adlai Stevenson considered partisan. A request from the networks for a ruling by the Federal Communications Commission was met with silence at first, the Commission deeming it too complicated an issue for an immediate reply.

Reasonably confused, the networks of their own accord then offered the time to reply to Mr. Stevenson and to the presidential aspirants of the Socialist, Socialist Workers, and Socialist Labor Parties. The Republican Party, in turn, considered this to be a partisan presentation, and asked for equal time. The day before election, the FCC broke its silence and decided that the speech by President Eisenhower did not necessitate a reply. Three members formed the majority opinion, a fourth contended that no reply was required at any time to a Presidential address. Two Commissioners refused to rule because of the complicated nature of the case, and one said the equal-time rule applied. The networks then offered time to President Eisenhower to reply to Mr. Stevenson, and the others, but this was declined.

Ironically, the man who wrote a legal memorandum for Mr. Stevenson's position in this case later became Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Minow, left behind a number of accomplishments when he resigned, but the settlement of this problem was not one of them.

Of course, if this suspension of the section 315 equal time requirement is passed, the question of equal time will not apply. This fact makes the need for setting up some sort of a rule of thumb all the more imperative. Certainly, there are times when the President should have an opportunity to address the Nation on a crisis situation without the pressure of any additional partisan comment. Even here, however, the crisis may be such that it will continue over into the next administration and the people have a right to know what is the position and opinion of the man who may be the next President, though not the incumbent.

Other problems arise from the length of congressional sessions, the possibilities of additional Presidential messages and press conferences, during an election campaign. I would urge the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas to include in any further probes of the communications media the use of political broadcasting, taking into consideration the problem of the incumbent President. Perhaps consultations between the FCC, the committees involved, and the industry itself, would be appropriate. Certainly this is the year to settle the problems involved, and to lay the ground rules, rather than wait until the inevitable heat of an election campaign clouds the issue.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the resolution under debate would seem to help relieve our radio and television stations from an unreasonable control provided by the equal-time requirements of section 315. My familiarity is principally with several radio stations which might be regarded as small as compared to our larger network stations.

The manner in which section 315 has been applied with regard to all nominees imperils the licenses of these smaller stations in their efforts to apply these provisions fairly. As for me, I have confidence in the operators of our radio and television stations to accord equal time to any legally qualified candidates for President and Vice President.

This resolution appears to me to be in the interest of greater freedom for the radio and television operators and greater freedom for the American people.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the subcommittee that studied this legislation, I want to state for the record that I am wholeheartedly in support of it. I think it will serve a useful purpose, and I hope it does pass.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 247. I, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] am a member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, which heard the testimony on this joint resolution, and listened with interest to the testimony given to the committee.

At the present time, section 315 of the Communications Act requires broadcasters to adhere strictly to an equal-time provision in regard to political candidates. While in theory the equal-time requirement seems consistent with a basic desire to insure fair play and full discussion, inflexible application of this principle will frustrate the very reason for its adoption.

The problem, of course, is the proper coverage of a political contest, and how to achieve the maximum of coverage with a minimum of unfairness. In 1960 the Congress examined this question and suspended for the 1960 campaign the application of section 315, as applied to the nominees for President and Vice President. Without a doubt the 1960 campaign was viewed and discussed by far more people than ever before. It is estimated that untold millions of people followed the campaign with interest. The section 315 suspension at that time encouraged the networks as well as the local broadcasters to devote free air time to the fullest coverage of the political campaign. I say we must lift this restriction again and take the broadcasters out of their straitjacket. The broadcasting industry, I feel, has proven that it is responsible and that it will respond rapidly to serve the public interest with fairness with regard to coverage of the presidential campaign. Yes, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, some of the broadcasters did want to see section 315 repealed entirely. The committee heard their views but took no action on this question. The question is on the repeal of section 315 only in regard to nominees for President and Vice President. I say that this suspension is made with the realization that the national spotlight will quickly reveal any favoritism that might occur and that any favoritism will quickly reflect on the national reputation of any network or any station that might be involved.

As everyone knows, the cost of presidential campaigns has been increasing by leaps and bounds. There is the danger of direct intervention by the Government in the subsidization of national political campaigns unless some means are found to reduce these costs. This I would resist.

So, I believe that this House should support House Joint Resolution 247, so that the broadcasting industry can again voluntarily render a service, at great cost to them, which in my opinion, is in the national interest.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, let us look at the 1960 campaign. The important thing about it is, did it work? This is the first time it was tried. Did it work?—that is the test. If we said it worked for the Republicans—our candidate presented his case. If we say it worked for the Democrats—it probably did also.

I do not think there is anyone here who believes that the President now sitting in the White House would be there without the exposure that he got side by side with the Republican candidate. May I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that the only chance you are going to have to expose your candidate, whoever he is going to be, is going to be over these hours which will be allotted in 1964. It is a very practical matter. It is important on this side of the aisle that we have time which will be given side by side with the candidate in the White House. It is my understanding, if I read his words correctly, about 3 months after he came into office, that he would abide by the same rules that we had in 1960 and that he would meet the Republican candidate in debate. It seems to me this is a fair proposition. We are talking now about getting before the American people the two candidates who have a chance to be elected. The purpose of this is to get the two big parties before the electorate to give them a chance to see the candidates and know what they stand for.

This is the test and this is why I believed in 1960, when I voted for this, that it was good legislation. I believe it is just as good legislation in 1963 as it was then. I will admit just one thing, the networks are going to have to improve on the kind of programing that they gave us in 1960. I do not believe that either party was satisfied with the type of programing that was given in 1960. The networks have appeared before our committee and assured us since then that they will improve their programing and it will give us a better perspective of the candidates in 1964, and that is a good thnig.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to ask what right the minority candidate has, if we pass this bill now?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that it is in the discretion of the networks as to the time that they want to give. May I say in addition to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bennett] just mentioned a moment ago, in many of the States the candidates for President who were running only in that State, were exposed.

In the State of New York you had the Liberal Party and several candidates appeared on one program. It is in the discretion of the networks, but I do not see that they are absolutely kept from exposing themselves and having the opportunity to present their case.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, there appears to be nothing more permanent than legislation which is designated as "temporary" by this body. This appears to be another "temporary" suspension of section 315 of the Federal Communications Commission Act.

Mr. Chairman, one thing which the Members of the House should keep in mind is that we are dealing with a public commodity; that is, the air waves that are supposed to be under the control of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I received a letter in the last day or two to the effect that the American Civil Liberties Union is opposed to this bill. This is the first time, I think, in 12 or 13 years of public service that I have been on the same side as that organization.

Mr. Chairman, I still feel that this is not good legislation. I would invite the attention of the Members of the Committee to the minority views, specifically as they appear on page 6 of this report. Are we going to put in the hands of certain persons that have control over the networks the decisions as to who are the major candidates and who are the major parties and what are the major issues?

Mr. Chairman, I quote from page 6 of the minority views as contained in the committee report:

> Our friends in the broadcasting industry, having been given merely a glimpse of power in the political arena, are now hungrily pursuing its ultimate; the right to hound people out of office who do not please them, the right to openly groom a successor for an official in disfavor, the right to control completely what an official or candidate may say to his audience in his own behalf, the right to use the airwaves to argue for its own political point of view, its own candidates, and with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, that is the key issue in this particular legislation. That in my opinion is objectionable, and any of us can turn on any of the local radio and television stations and hear them say "this is a TV editorial." It gives this right to the local licensee dealing in a public commodity, the right to express their personal views, but equal time for the opposition is not permitted.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I wish to associate myself with the minority views that are submitted to this body.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that there have been requests for the complete repeal of section 315. In my judgment such a move would be a complete threat to the future independent operation of our communicative media. I believe the networks should have in mind that perhaps the equal time rule may be a protection to the networks themselves. When a license comes up for renewal, pressure can be exerted on them if this goes all the way.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a recent memorandum that went out from the Department of Agriculture to the various ASC committees all over the United States just before the recent wheat referendum. This memorandum was issued for the purpose of calling to the attention of ASCS committeemen the availability of free public service time. It pointed out that stations would be responsive to suggestions since their licenses come up for renewal every 3 years. It was suggested, of course, that care be exercised to avoid giving the impression of coercion.

Mr. Chairman, an article which appeared in the June 16 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune also calls attention to pressures that have been put on the stations. I ask that this article by Richard Wilson be included at this point in my remarks.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, June 16, 1963]

ARM TWISTING ON A HIGH LEVEL

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques of the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm-twisting method was previously noted in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million national cultural center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it, for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government action. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up.

He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough. They wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service times of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they will come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, if we repeal section 315 or whittle away at it we can assume, regardless of political party, whether we be Democrat or Republican, that the licensing of radio and television facilities in our country could be subject to pressures exerted on the networks and stations to do what is politically expected and what would please, depending upon who is in power.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if we continue to extend this suspension of 315 we are going in the wrong direction as to the protection of the networks and as to the protection of the public.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion here today, and I join with those who have made the minority views available to us.

I should like to make one further observation to the Members on my side. If the rules herein, implied with this legislation, had been applied 104 years ago, there would be no Republican Party for us to belong to. This makes it impossible to get minority views that might be good views before the public for consideration. The public interest nor the best interest of freedom are served by this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill after having had the assurances of the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the committee that there will be further hearings on this idea of editorializing by radio stations and the unfair tactics of some stations of allowing members of a political party to come there and attack members of the other party without giving them a chance to answer.

Two Members of Congress came before our committee and told of certain stations that allowed people to be attacked day after day and day after day on free time, and they did not have the time to come in and answer. I do not believe that should be allowed. We have been assured we will have brakes put on that; therefore I am in accord with the bill we are voting on today.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That that part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended for the period of the 1964 presidential and vice presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under that Act to operate in the public interest.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "period of the 1964 presidential and vice presidential campaigns" and insert "seventy-five-day period immediately preceding November 3, 1964,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "nominees" and insert "legally qualified candidates".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that general debate on House Joint Resolution 247 was limited to only 1 hour because it has unduly restricted the debate which should have been had on this question. I also regret, Mr. Chairman, that due to conditions over which I had no control it was not possible for me to be present at the time this bill was voted out of the committee. Neither was it possible for me to be included in the minority views which I wholeheartedly support.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly recommend that all of our colleagues pay very close attention to the minority views as expressed in the committee report. And, while this House Joint Resolution 247 purports to be only a temporary measure, I would respectfully suggest that it has all the earmarks of being the entering wedge effort to make this a complete and permanent deletion of section 315.

Now, Mr. Chairman, such a wide open suspension would increase the power and the influence and the control which can be exercised by the Federal Communications Commission, radio station and television station management and the networks, at any time, and this generates a fear which may or may not be well founded but which exists, that the radio or television stations which do not comply may run into all kinds of roadblocks at the Federal Communications level when their renewal licenses come up for consideration especially if these radio stations and television stations have not granted time in accordance with the views and desires of some influential person.

I had a circumstance related to me, Mr. Chairman, very much along this line, and I think it can be well documented.

It will no doubt be denied publicly, Mr. Chairman, but nonetheless, I think it is true, that the networks have practically life or death control over the financial success or failure of an individual radio or television station. It is my impression that an individual radio or television station cannot remain a profitable operation unless it receives network programs. Thus it becomes an obligation upon an affiliated radio or television station to carry a network program whether or not the subject of the program and its contents appeals to the local stations. With this kind of a stranglehold, and if section 315 is deleted, the networks could become a tremendous if not overpowering influence in determining the election of the President of the United States or the election of any other public official who might be included in any future broadening of such a program.

Now, again I say to my colleagues, it is my understanding that the approval of this bill today is but the beginning of an effort to get a complete deletion of section 315 from the Federal Communications Act, as amended, and I submit this is not in the best public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to disapprove this resolution, House Joint Resolution 247.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I had been told 20 years ago that there would be legislation before this House which had for its purpose a restriction on free speech, I would have thought such a suggestion completely fantastic.

Voltaire has been quoted here many times, even by those who support this legislation in this House when he said, in effect, "I may not agree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." This bill certainly cannot be reconciled in the light of that statement.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], a few minutes ago, speaking in support of this legislation, said that its purpose was to provide a maximum of political coverage with a minimum of unfairness. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the very purpose of this legislation is the exact opposite: to provide a minimum of coverage with a maximum of unfairness.

The name of a man out in Chicago, Lar Daly, has been brought into this discussion. Now, I do not know who Lar Daly is, and I do not much care, but if under the laws of the State of Illinois Lar Daly, being an American citizen, had qualified as a candidate for public office, who are we to say that Lar Daly does not have the right to exercise the same rights and prerogatives that any other American citizen has who is running for public office?

Now, I have seen the manner in which the Federal Communications Commission administers their rule of fairness. As a matter of fact, I have had some experience with this. I have been the victim of one of their blackmail operations in one of my campaigns. I have seen the way that they administer the rule of equal time. Just the other day, when the President went on the radio and propagandized his civil rights bill, the opponents of that preposterous legislation were denied equal time to plead their case.

As bad as the FCC administration of the fairness doctrine and the equal time doctrine is, I trust their administration much more than I do that of CBS Frank Stanton, NBC's Mr. Sarnoff, or Mr. Moore of ABC. I know it is said that the stations themselves govern this, but everybody knows that the stations cannot divorce themselves from the networks.

If I remember correctly, back in 1948 we had a campaign for President. To read the newspapers back in that day, and to read the Gallup polls you would have thought there was but one major candidate in the race, and no one else could win. If this bill had been in effect in that day, they could even have cut off Harry Truman from radio and television because nobody thought he was really a serious candidate. Even so, he surprised nearly everyone in America by winning by a wide margin. At the time of the conventions he may not have been a major candidate, but he became a major candidate.

Mr. Chairman, who is to make the determination as to who is a major candidate? Is it to be a matter of congressional policy? Is it to be a matter which is to be determined by the people? No. Under this bill three people will determine who will be the major candidates. Those people are General Sarnoff of NBC, Mr. Frank Stanton of CBS, and Mr. Tom Moore of ABC, and that is too much power to put in the hands of anyone. As far as I am concerned any candidate, no matter now minor he might be, so long as he is a legally qualified candidate, has the same rights, privileges, and immunities as any other candidate for the office that he seeks, no matter how little his chances of election may be.

I hope this legislation, Mr. Chairman, is defeated.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN of New York: Page 1, beginning with line 9, strike out all down through "United States." in line 4 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "is suspended for the seventy-five-day period immediately preceding November 3, 1964, in the case of any program in which the presidential candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties, or any other legally qualified candidates for President, are presented together."

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the purpose of the bill before us today, it is to provide opportunity for the candidates for President to debate the issues in the same way in which the presidential candidates in 1960 debated. I have offered this amendment to make sure that in doing this, in trying to achieve this objective, we allow for television debates, but we do not at the same time eliminate the equal time requirement for all broadcasts involving the presidential and vice-presidential campaigns. In other words, my amendment would suspend the equal time provision only for joint appearances between presidential candidates, joint appearances between the Democratic candidate and the Republican candidate, or joint appearances between any two or more legally qualified candidates. This, it seems to me, meets the purpose of the proposed bill. It provides an opportunity for the kind of debate which was so worthwhile, and instructive, and constructive during the 1960 presidential election, and at the same time preserves for every other facet of the campaign the law as it now stands requiring equal time for all candidates.

I hope that this amendment will meet with approval. I seriously believe that the proposal to which it is offered as an amendment, the original proposal, is entirely too broad and leaves complete discretion in the hands of the broadcasters. It can have the effect of preventing third party candidates or other candidates from having the opportunity to present their views before the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it is vital to our democratic system that the electorate be afforded the opportunity to consider all candidates and the pros and cons of all issues. Broadcasting is a principal source of such information. First radio and then television have become powerful political instruments. Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act was enacted to insure equal treatment for all candidates. If the pending bill is passed, not only third party candidates but the major party candidates will be dependent upon the discretion of the broadcasters. Broadcasting is a public trust which should be subject to public regulation. Freedom of expression for a minority point of view should be protected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. What does the gentleman mean by his amendment when he says "are presented together"? Does that mean that if there are half a dozen candidates for President and Vice President they have all got to be on the stage together?

Mr. RYAN of New York. No, sir; it means that any two candidates must be presented together.

Mr. HARRIS. That is not what the amendment says.

Mr. RYAN of New York. That is my intention. The key word is "or."

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman says in his amendment, "in the case of any program in which the presidential candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties, or any other legally qualified candidates for President, are presented together."

In other words, if you had 18 candidates, as you did in 1956, I suppose the amendment would mean, if they were all recognized as legally qualified candidates, that all 18 would have to be presented together. Is that the interpretation of it?

Mr. RYAN of New York. My interpretation is that this would apply to the 75 days, as the joint resolution does, before the election. It would apply to those presidential candidates who were legally designated by the Democratic and Republican Parties or any other legally qualified candidates. And if any two of these candidates agreed to appear together, then there would be an exemption from the equal-time provision.

Mr. HARRIS. In my judgment that is not what the amendment says.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I would be happy to accept any language the distinguished chairman feels would express that purpose more adequately. I believe this does express that purpose. The word "or" means what it says. The language does not say "and," I might point out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. HARRIS. I am opposed to the amendment and therefore I have no language to suggest to the gentleman that would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I suspected that was the case, Mr. Chairman. However, I do think that the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the committee and myself has made it clear, if the language does not—I believe the language does—make it clear what my intention is. This would certainly guide the Federal Communications Commission in administering the act. I hope we can limit the suspension of equal time to the debate proposition.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think the gentleman would accomplish the purpose he seeks by his amendment by simply voting against the bill.

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the bill is not amended, I intend to vote against it. On the other hand, it has been argued that without some amendment to section 315 the broadcasters would not provide a forum for debate. So the real purpose of this amendment is to provide that forum.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise not only in opposion to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] but in support of the bill, because it has been my basic philosophy here to legislate in a way that whenever we can we avoid regulation of any industry—and I refer in this instance particularly to the communications industry—when we do so we are accomplishing something in the interest of free enterprise in this country. As I understand the conditions today we have on the one hand a free press, which is free to give time or to give editorial support or perhaps editorial criticism, or perhaps to slant news, if it wants to slant it for or against any public official, and this freedom is far too often abused. On the other hand, we have the Federal Communications Commission, sitting as it were as a monitor or a policeman on top of the communications industry which has to compete with the newspaper industry, compete every day.

In 1960, in order to give that industry a chance to prove what it could do for the American people in bringing to the American people the messages from the candidates for President of the United States, we suspended the provisions of section 315 for the debate which has now become a part of our political history.

I do not think the gentleman from New York wants this, but if the gentleman's amendment is adopted its effect would be to kill this bill which the committee has worked out. It will cast into the trash can the bill which the committee has approved. Not only that, I fear that the amendment as written, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, will give stature to those candidates to whom nobody wants to give stature, such as candidates of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and some others, time, publicity, and stature they do not deserve. That is what this amendment will do if it does not kill this legislation.

It seems to me there is an opportunity here not only in opposing this amendment but in passing this legislation to say to the American people that Congress in its wisdom, having had the experience of 1960, in keeping with the free enterprise idea of America, because of its previous experience will use that experience in 1964 to see whether or not in the future, and this would be my hope, section 315 of the Federal Communications Act would be entirely unnecessary.

We must not forget that if we were to delete the entire section we still have the regulatory commission, which I hope will continue as an arm of the Congress, and the communications industry recognizes, because I have talked to many of them, that if they abuse any of their privileges not only can they be faced with the loss or delay of their license renewal when it is called up, but the Federal Communications Commission has certain rulemaking power, the Congress is still sitting, the Congress is meeting every year, and if this were abused in 1964 certainly we could correct it in 1965. We did not find it necessary to correct in 1961 what was done in 1960.

So I hope this amendment will be defeated, because we do not want to kill what the committee has intended, effecting the regulation, for once, by the Congress. Not only that, but we do not want to give stature to someone who may become a presidential candidate and demand that he be put on the radio or television with those men who are candidates of the Republican and Democratic Parties, and give stature to people who do not deserve it and who are running only to get publicity or getting the time which the gentleman's amendment would require. I certainly think he does not want that, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman says that these minority parties we have been talking about do not deserve any consideration. Does the gentleman think that whether they deserve consideration or not should be within the discretion of the broadcasting industry?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think we should go to the pending legislation, on page 2, lines 4, 5, 6, and 7, which requires that the station act in the public interest. They deserve consideration, but they must earn stature.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. In 1956, the so-called other parties got 11 hours and 45 minutes' time on the radio. When we suspended that section in 1960 they got 10 minutes, in toto. Does the gentleman consider that to be in the public interest?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I did not hear any kick about it. The public did not demand any more time for them.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. There was no kick about it at the time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment ought to be defeated. It is a nuisance amendment and it would cut the heart out of the bill. It will serve no useful purpose. As a member of the subcommittee, may I say we studied this legislation carefully. We heard many witnesses. Perhaps some of the Members were not on the floor when the details of the bill were discussed today but this is a very simple proposition. We want to have, or at least some of us want to have, a confrontation between the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, that is, the candidates of the two major political parties.

In order to have this confrontation, sometimes called debates, we have need for this legislation because if this legislation is not passed, there will be no debates or confrontation between the two nominees of the two major political parties. The reason for that is we will have to enforce the equal time provision, and if a network or station would have to give time to all candidates, it would be an impossible situation and would result in no time given to any candidate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is certainly making a very appropriate statement. I would like to say, with the permission of the gentleman however, that this is not a requirement that the candidates must have such confrontation. It is a voluntary thing and an arrangement that must be worked out with the candidates themselves. That, of course, adds to the rule and doctrine of fairness that must be applied.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The distinguished Chairman is absolutely right. The point I was trying to make is that if we do not pass this legislation, there will be requests made by a score of minority party candidates, candidates like the Socialist Party candidate for President or the Vegetarian Party or the Prohibition Party and all of the other nuisance groups that are trying to get publicity. If a network or radio station is confronted with such requests, they are going to have to turn them all down including those of the two nominees for the major political parties. So the only way we are going to be able to hear debates and have this confrontation between the nominees of the Democratic and Republican Party is to pass this legislation. If we do not pass it, there will not be any public debates and confrontations such as we had in the 1960 campaign.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman had listened to the remarks I made in support of my amendment, he would realize that the very purpose of my amendment is to exempt from the equal time provisions of the law presidential debates and confrontations which are a part of the democratic process. We looked at them in 1960, and we are looking forward to them in 1964. The very purpose of my amendment is to exempt such debates by presidential candidates and to provide that no equal time is required to be given where there are debates between presidential candidates. Otherwise the law is kept intact. If the intent of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to provide an opportunity for debates between presidential candidates, then my amendment will accomplish the purpose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. But I do think this is a nuisance amendment and would knock the heart out of this bill and I recommend that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman from Nebraska is a very able and distinguished member of our committee. However, I cannot agree with him that if this bill is not passed, we could not have Presidential debates. There is nothing under present law to prevent the networks and the candidates from getting together and arranging for the same identical kind of debates as were arranged for in the 1960 campaign. There is not a single solitary thing in the present law that would prevent that. So if the gentleman thinks that without this bill there will be no debates, I am sure he is honestly mistaken in his views.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not think the gentleman from Nebraska is mistaken. The effect of this is that it will facilitate debates, and if it is not passed, the networks will not assume the responsibility of providing equal time for perhaps a dozen major and minor party candidates and, therefore, there will not be any debates or confrontations. This legislation is endorsed by the two great political parties, by Mr. Bailey of the Democratic National Committee and by Mr. Miller of the Republican National Committee. This has nationwide support. We want to hear our two major political Presidential nominees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us straighten the record on the testimony. If the members of the Committee will read the testimony, they will find nothing in the record that the networks said they would improve the program. As a matter of fact, they cannot improve the program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in honesty to the networks that they did want the debates; they would have preferred a debate, but the two candidates in 1960 would not agree. The only kind of a program they would agree on was this press interview. That same press interview could have been had on "Meet the Press" and it can be had today on "Meet the Press" or "Face the Nation," or any similar program that is already on the networks.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is not one thing to be gained by this resolution that is not possible and legal today under the present law to put on the same kind of a program that we listened to in 1960, because the "Meet the Press" program can have both candidates present and they can have them interviewed and questioned by the press. That is all in the world that we had in 1960, so let us have the record straight on that question as to what would be accomplished by the passage of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have been amazed to hear this argument that there cannot or will not be a confrontation of presidential candidates unless this bill is enacted. I just do not understand this line of argument.

What is to prevent there being a confrontation on television or radio? What is to prevent it?

Mr. YOUNGER. Nothing except the unwillingness of the candidates to meet; that is all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me in order to respond to the question of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi. He was on his feet first.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that this legislation rather than providing a vehicle by which the public can become better informed actually restricts information that would be given to the public by eliminating from the air certain viewpoints which the public certainly could well consider?

Mr. YOUNGER. I think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. What happens to this doctrine about which we hear so much of equal rights if we adopt this bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. I think you will have the airwaves segregated.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, if this is so good—I ask the question a while ago and got no answer to it—why not go down the line and take in all of the candidates, the candidates of the Vegetable Party and the Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise, and those who are running against Members of Congress? Why not? Why not the same rule all the way down? I am not for this kind of manipulation as is contained in this bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think what is good for the goose ought to be good for the gander.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I was going to attempt from a very practical and realistic standpoint to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa. There are two things which would prevent a confrontation of the major candidates. No. 1 is that they are not likely going to agree to appear on the same program where the parties have to pay for it. No. 2, it means that $2 million has to go into such a program. That is a rather rigid restriction, in my judgment.

Mr. YOUNGER. May I answer the chairman by saying that I am rather positive that the program, "Meet the Press," will be very happy to have both candidates before them, and also the other programs such as "Face the Nation" will be glad to have them. And that with the $1,000-a-plate dinners I think the parties can well afford to buy the time, if that is necessary. There is no guarantee in the passage of this bill that you will have anything at all in the way of the two candidates appearing, because that depends on whether the candidates themselves will agree.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not on the bill as a whole?

Mr. HARRIS. On this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARRIS. This does not include the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can be helpful in getting this minority thing straightened out.

May I say that by this legislation there is not any guarantee of anything. There was not any guarantee of anything in the legislation of 1960. But the networks did assure us in 1960 that they would do their best to have these debates if the two candidates would be willing to come on the program.

As the gentleman from California said, there is no guarantee and there will not be any guarantee if you pass this bill. If you can get the President and the Republican nominee to agree, there will be confrontation. That is all there was in 1960. But I think the President did say about 3 or 4 months after he came into office, after his brother had said he would not appear, the President said, "I will appear," and I think the President means to keep his word. We will see that the candidates will confront each other in 1964.

Let us come to the minority matter and show why it is impractical to do anything if you insist that every small party, regardless of its size, insists on being heard. I think the chairman told you that the three together cost about $3 million, including NBC, ABC, and CBS. If you want to multiply that by 12 more, and there were 12 other parties that were on one State ticket that ran nationwide in the last election, if you want to multiply that 3 by 12, it is 36.

May I say if you are going to allow the other 12 minority parties, some of whom appeared in only one State of the Union, to have equal time, which they are now entitled to under the act, it would cost the networks $36 million. Naturally, they are not going to agree to give equal time to every party when it demands time.

The purpose of this legislation is to get before the American people the two nominees who have a chance to be elected in 1964. That is about as practical legislation as I know.

Mr. Chairman, this has been supported editorially from coast to coast. I have not seen an editorial against it. There may be some to which the Members may refer, but all of the editorials I have seen, and I think I have read them all on the rack out here, have supported it. They supported it in 1960 and they will support it in 1964 because they believe that is the only way the American people can see the two candidates of the two major parties confront each other, and they can then decide after seeing them on television which one of those candidates they want.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I merely want to say and emphasize what the gentleman has just said, the practical situation that the committee had to consider when we were asked to extend this suspension to other candidates for office. The gentleman knows we considered extending it to candidates for Governor, to candidates for the U.S. Senate, and to the candidates as Members of the House, and even on down to the smaller candidates on the local level. There is not enough time, there are not enough hours in the day if that requirement is carried out for any facility, even if it devoted all 24 hours to the innumerable candidates that exist.

We had some discussion of what happened in New York, in that particular area where we had Members of Congress in the great State of New York, in one small area. If the facilities were to be opened there would not be enough time during the day to give time to all candidates, much less if you limited it to the major candidates of the two parties.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished chairman that in the State of New York, because I saw it on TV, there were broadcasts for presidential minority candidates where they were actually on the ballot in the State of New York. The networks did not exclude everybody. They did try to give some of these minority parties hearings in the States where they were on the ballot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the argument that has been made here repeatedly by my distinguished chairman and others is—and it is repeating the argument that the networks made—and that came up in our hearings and elsewhere—that if you suspend this, you take less out of the treasuries of the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Well, that is just not the case. In 1956 the networks, both on radio and television, gave more free time than they did in 1960 after you suspended this.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes; but I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman quoted these figures a moment ago, and I read to the House the statement of Mr. Stanton. He is president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, and certainly he knows or should know how much time CBS gave to or devoted or made available for this purpose both in 1956 and 1960. He said that "In 1960 the CBS radio and television networks"—I do not know what the gentleman's figures are or where they are from. This is the CBS networks figures.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I got mine from the FCC, the list being prepared by our staff. I am certain their figures are correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, this is from the network itself that operates it:

> In 1960 the CBS radio and television networks devoted a total of 16¼ hours to personal appearances of the Democratic and Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates, at no charge to them. This, compared to 36 minutes in 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. "This," Dr. Stanton said, "compared to 36 minutes in 1956." Now, that certainly does not jibe with what the gentleman stated.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, I got these figures from the Federal Communications Commission. If the Federal Communications Commission has given me the wrong information, that is not my fault.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I think where the discrepancy is, the Federal Communications Commission is not only reporting on the time the candidates used but time representatives of candidates used. This does not extend to representatives of candidates.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. This is network time used by presidential candidates and representatives in their behalf in the years cited.

Mr. HARRIS. I quoted the statement of the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. In this instance, I will take the word of FCC rather than the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it would appear there is much made over the fact that under the present regulations, present law, the stations could cover the activities of candidates with bona fide news coverage. This is true. But, the fact remains that the networks and the broadcasters stated in the hearings, that they wanted to use new innovations, they wanted to use new methods of presenting candidates to the American people.

I feel we should give the broadcasters this opportunity. I want to make it clear again that this legislation is only involved with the presidenial and vice presidential candidates and, when we say candidates, we mean these candidates only, and not local candidates and local contests.

I would like to say that in participating in that 1960 election and in listening to all of the hearings, that I feel that the networks were fair and they should be given another opportunity to prove they can do a good job. I certainly hope that this House will vote for this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine] is recognized.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, section 315 of the Federal Communications Act is either good legislation or bad. It has been approved by this House heretofore and the efforts here today are again, as they were in the 1960 campaign, to suspend these provisions as they relate to presidential and vice-presidential candidates. I think there is a clue that reflects on what some of the Members have been saying about who is going to control air time and what candidates will appear and what will be said. That appears in the first full paragraph on page 2 of the report which says, in effect:

> The Federal Communications Commission shall require broadcasting stations and networks to make such reports * * * on the effect of this legislation on the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns.

The broadcasters, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Sarnoff, and Mr. Moore, will make a report to the Congress or to the Federal Communications Commission on the effect of this legislation. Are they the ones also to adjudge what the effect of the legislation will be? That is a purview of the Congress of the United States, but here we are telling them, "You fellows decide who is going to have what time and who is to address the American people, and you make your report to the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission of what the effect has been." You can well imagine what the broadcasters and persons who have a monetary interest in this are going to report to the Federal Communications Commission and the Congress.

I say this is a bad bill and should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Sec. 2. The Federal Communications Commission shall require broadcast stations and networks to make such reports as may be necessary to enable the Commission to make a detailed report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1965, on: (1) The effect of the suspension of the equal opportunities requirement of section 315 on the 1964 presidential and vice presidential campaigns, including information concerning requests for time, amount of time made available (including amount of free time, time paid for by candidates or political organizations, and time paid for by others), total charges, rates, editorializing, distribution of time during various phases of the campaigns, and clearance by individual stations of network program concerning the candidates or the issues, and (2) the role of broadcast stations and networks in other political campaigns during 1964.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and wish to bring one matter to the attention of the House. Under the minority views I have been quoted by my good friends and colleagues who represent the minority on this particular resolution. For their quotes, I am, of course, very grateful, but at the same time I would like to make it abundantly clear that I am in support of this resolution, and I urge its adoption by the House. The quote which has been credited to me appears on page 5 of the Committee report and it says:

> It boils down to the question of who is going to determine what the issues in a campaign are. Are the candidates going to do it or are the television and radio stations going to do it?

The statement was made by me during a colloquy with Gov. Leroy Collins and after which Governor Collins had advocated the complete repeal of section 315. It was the view of the committee that section 315 should certainly not be repealed, but I say to the House that this resolution merely exempts it in one particular instance—in the case of presidential and vice presidential elections for 1964. Whether or not the networks will be fair is a question that seems to have been raised here today. Let me simply say this: And I quote from Governor Collins, who, of course, represents the broadcasting industry but certainly is a man of great honor and integrity, when he said:

> He is bound under the law without section 315 to operate in the public interest and to be fair in the presentation of his whole programing schedule.

What are the reasons for the adoption of this resolution? Why does it make good sense on this occasion to suspend the operation of section 315 in the case of the presidential and vice-presidential race? There is tremendous concern throughout this country, and I am sure that concern is extended to both the Republican and Democratic Parties, over the expense of putting on presidential campaigns. As has been pointed out in the debate today, if we pass this resolution it will mean a saving of approximately $2 million to the major political parties of this country, money that can well be spent by those parties in other areas and for other purposes.

And as our chairman has so ably pointed out it is a question of whether or not the major candidates will be put on the air. When there are a number of minor candidates, with the equal-time provision in effect, the networks are extremely reluctant to extend time to any of them, due to the constant harassment to which they would be subjected. So if we are to get the major candidates before the country as is so necessary in this day and time certainly this is the way to do it.

I urge that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to inquire something of the distinguished chairman of the committee. As I understand, the resolution provides only for the Offices of President and Vice President. Yet in paragraph 2 of section 2 you have the language "the role of broadcast stations and networks in other political campaigns during 1964."

What is the purpose of that if this is to apply only to the Office of President and Vice President?

Mr. HARRIS. The first section of the resolution is applicable to the purposes that brought this resolution to the attention of the committee and the House. The second section is to meet some of the appropriate criticism that we have experienced in campaigns with reference to the requirements of stations to file with the Federal Communications Commission reports of political broadcasts by that station. This was brought on principally by the activity of the committee in the other body, which was a continuing committee, to look into these matters during the recent campaign, and the difficulties that they had in the immediate campaign with reference to reports being filed with the Federal Communications Commission. So the purpose of this is to require the stations to file with the Federal Communications Commission these reports in connection with all of their political broadcasts. An effort was made by the FCC to get this information and it has finally got it.

Just a few days ago a voluminous report was filed with the Congress showing just how these facilities were used all over the country in connection with political broadcasts in 1962.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to clear up one question with the chairman of the committee, if I may. I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest. I have frequently heard the phrase "legally qualified candidates" being used by almost every speaker. It is still not clear in my mind what a "legally qualified candidate" might be. One speaker indicated that that would be determined by State law. Another indicated the Federal Communications Commission or the major communication networks would decide. Reference was also made to the fairness doctrine. Can the gentleman clear this up for my benefit?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is quite familiar with the selection of candidates by the national parties. There have been conventions or other methods of selecting candidates of minority parties in the past. The networks, of course, take cognizance of this fact. If there is any party with a candidate with substantial support, they endeavor under the fairness rule to give some attention to him. As was stated a moment ago, under the laws of the State of New York there was a minority candidate for President and as I understand time was made available. Insofar as the application to the Nation is concerned, where we do not have any Federal law as such on it, the Federal Communications Commission has in its rules and regulations definitions of a legally qualified candidate. It is the definition of the Federal Communications Commission that is followed. Certainly it is not left up to the networks altogether to decide.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal-opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the Offices of President and Vice President, pursuant to House Resolution 402, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BENNETT of Michigan moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 247 to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 46, noes 97.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 126, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—263

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baring
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bufrke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—126

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baldwin
Barry
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Calif.
Bruce
Burton
Celler
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Curtin
Dague
Dent
Derounian
Devine
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Farbstein
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Fraser
Gathings
Gilbert
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Halpern
Hawkins
Hays
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Huddleston
Joelson
Johansen
Kastenmeier
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McCulloch
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Morse
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
Pike
Pillion
Powell
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel
Selden
Senner
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Wharton
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Taft

NOT VOTING—42

Ayres
Barrett
Boggs
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Carey
Colmer
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Ellsworth
Finnegan
Forrester
Hall
Hébert
Henderson
Hosmer
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
McMillan
MacGregor
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Moss
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Rains
Reuss
Roosevelt
St. Onge
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Sisk
Trimble
Tupper
Weaver

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Henderson with Mrs. May.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Sikes with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. POOL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended to read: "Joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State ofthe Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4347) to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4347, with Mr. STAGGERS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Medicine and Surgery has 168 hospitals and 17 domiciliaries. As of April 30, 1963, there were 109,791 patients in the Veterans' Administration medical system and approximately 17,000 members in the domiciliaries. I agree with the observation in the Administrator's report on the introduced bill that "effective discharge of this responsibility obviously requires an orderly system of long-range planning to achieve the best and most equitable results." This bill will facilitate the orderly system of planning advocated by the Administrator.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is charged under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with legislative oversight over these activities, and believes that the effective discharge of this responsibility obviously requires that the Committee be advised, in advance, and consulted with, in advance, with respect to the carrying out of the long-range construction program, and other programs, designed to provide medical care and treatment for veterans.

Under existing law, whenever the Veterans' Administration desires to build a new hospital, it submits appropriate plans and specifications to the Bureau of the Budget and after approval by the Bureau of the Budget, the proposal is then submitted to the President. If and when the President gives his concurrence, funds are requested in the next budget for the specific project and if voted as a part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, then the hospital is built in accordance with the plans previously agreed upon by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill seeks to provide a new control over the renovation, modernization, and construction activities of the Veterans Administration similar to that provided in the Public Buildings Act of 1959. Thus, this bill as reported to the House would prohibit any new hospital construction or acquisition of medical facilities involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000 unless the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has submitted to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a prospectus of this project and the project is thereafter approved by a resolution of the Committee. Said prospectus will include a description of the facilities to be constructed or acquired, the location thereof, and an estimate of the maximum cost. The same requirement would be added with respect to the alteration of existing medical facilities where the cost would exceed $200,000. This latter requirement would apply only with respect to projects which require appropriations to be made after the enactment of this legislation.

The bill recognizes that there may be cost increases over those set out in the original prospectus submitted by the Administrator, and, therefore, authorizes an increase in the maximum authorized cost of any project after approval by the committee, up to 10 percent of the estimated maximum. If the increased costs will exceed this 10-percent limitation, the Administrator must submit another prospectus with respect to the project and obtain approval by the committee before funds may thereafter be appropriated for the project.

It is also provided that if appropriations are not made for any approved project within 1 year after the date of approval, the committee may rescind its approval of the project at any time before appropriations are made for the project, and thereafter no funds may be appropriated for the project.

Basically, this proposal is an authorization bill with which this House is thoroughly familiar.

No additional cost will result from the enactment of this legislation and perhaps some savings may be anticipated.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman and to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Administrator, Mr. Gleason, on the progress we are making on the veterans' hospital in Gainesville, Fla. Will the gentleman tell me if this bill will have any adverse effect on the appropriations already made for this hospital?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There are a number of hospitals around the country in the same position as that at Gainesville, Fla.; $802,000 is included in the appropriations for the 1963 fiscal year, and $8,793,000 is in the budget for the fiscal year 1964 for this hospital. It is not the intent of the committee or of this bill to affect any hospital in a retroactive way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state for the edification of the members of the committee what necessitates this legislative action?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say that across the country we have a number of hospitals that have been built in places that were not to the best advantage of the veterans population. This bill is designed to make both the executive and legislative branches of the Government take a more careful look at the building and location of the hospitals. You might say it will more nearly make our Government a government of laws instead of men.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that the Veterans' Administration has been selecting the sites and carrying on the building expansion, the renovation, and so forth, without the knowledge of the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of this House and the other body?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Within the past year the Veterans' Administration made a survey in the State of Texas. The Veterans' Administration then recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that a new hospital be built in Texas. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs were not permitted to see that survey. We did not know one thing about it until it was announced in the newspapers.

Mr. GROSS. So what you are saying is that this is necessitated by the fact that the committee has not been informed, that is, the legislative committee has not been informed as to what the Veterans' Administration is doing? Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct. For a number of years we have felt that we were not kept adequately informed as far as new hospital construction, location, and modernization is concerned.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. First, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing this legislation to the House. I think there are very good and sound reasons for it. I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs if there are precedents for this type of precedure, that is, to require governmental agencies to get clearance with congressional committees before making expenditures of various types.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There are any number of precedents. The bill is based primarily on the Public Buildings Act of 1959. There are any number of precedents, which involve the Defense Department, Civil and Defense Mobilization, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of the Air Force, NASA, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, National Parks Service, and Department of Agriculture. Among the committees involved are Armed Services, Interior, Agriculture, Public Works, and Science and Astronautics. There are any number of precedents for this type of legislation.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, there is a general policy which runs all through this with reference to various agencies of the Government at this time, that plans for outlays of money for various types of expenditures be cleared through the congressional committees and through the Congress before the agencies are permitted to proceed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. I do know in the case of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, every construction and every outlay of money is first cleared through the committee even though it has been previously authorized by the Congress. That gives the Congress a chance to maintain control and supervision over the general outlays and programs that are engaged in through expenditures of money appropriated by the Congress.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for reporting this bill to the Congress.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I notice on page 4 of the committee report in the letter by the Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration some language that disturbs me a little, and I would like to get the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with reference to this language. The Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration writes:

> I am fearful that enactment of the proposed measure would completely disrupt the orderly system of administrative planning which, we believe, has proven effective over a period of many years. One of the most difficult problems in any construction program is that of meeting schedules and commitments. The period of deferment of action required by the bill could interrupt timely implementation of systematic planning by a period of several months.
>
> As an even more serious consequence, the veto authority invested in the committee would create uncertainty and could nullify decisions reached after months of intensive study, review, and final consideration at the highest level of the executive branch. Exercise of this authority would appear, also, to impinge upon determinations of the whole Congress based upon fund authorizations recommended by the Appropriations Committees.

The first question I would like to ask the able gentleman from Texas is: Does the gentleman believe that this provides a veto authority to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the sense that this letter indicates?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It gives the Committee on Veterans' Affairs an authorizing authority.

Mr. HECHLER. If the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on some of the other observations which are contained in the letter?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I shall be glad to comment. If there is anything that goes on in a slow, methodical manner, it is the construction of veterans hospitals. I say it will have much less effect here than with the construction programs of the NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Defense. I do not expect this bill, when enacted, to result in any unreasonable delay.

Mr. HECHLER. If the gentleman will yield for one further question, I want to ask this: Has the President taken a position, or the Bureau of the Budget taken a position on this legislation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, I understand they are against it, judging from the contents of the letter from which the gentleman from West Virginia has just read. I suppose that represents the position of the Bureau of the Budget and, therefore, the President. The letter speaks for itself.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman from West Virginia has referred to this paragraph of the letter that refers to the "orderly system of administrative planning." I wondered if the Oteen, N.C., veterans' hospital is a good example of this "orderly system of administrative planning" that is referred to?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, the gentleman from North Carolina himself can answer that question better than I.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee know that with each change of season there is a change of plans, and all of them seem to cut away on the veteran more than the one which they had before.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the Legislative Reorganization Act is charged with legislative oversight. The truth of the matter is that we have not been doing the job we should have. This is not something which we have started in the last few months, but it is something which our committee has been considering for a number of years.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler], that the finest example I can give to them of the need for this legislation has occurred as a result of the action of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in concert with the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee. Several years ago, a long-range plan for the construction needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital system was developed. It called for $900 million over a 12-year period for the construction and rehabilitation and betterment of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Although this plan had been approved by every agency and department of Government involved, the Veterans' Administration recently initiated changes in their long-range plans without any advance consultation with the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Certainly this is not in the interest of good planning. While the Veterans' Administration in its report indicated that enactment of the proposed measure would disrupt the orderly system of administrative planning, I believe the proposed legislation will have the opposite effect and will insure the orderly system of administrative planning.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman, the chairman of the full committee, yield to me at this point?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman, and I want to be certain of my understanding of a statement which the gentleman made a moment ago to the effect that this bill was not intended to have any retroactive effect, and that it was not intended to affect in any way either hospitals already constructed and in operation or improvement programs now underway and under construction of the hospitals already in existence.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4347. This legislation is long overdue. It will require the Veterans' Administration to submit plans for major hospital construction to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for approval.

At the present time, when the Veterans' Administration wishes to build a hospital, plans and specifications are first approved by the Bureau of the Budget and then by the President. Funds are then requested in the next budget request submitted to Congress. The role of Congress in this process is limited to voting the construction funds contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act.

The legislation being considered makes it mandatory that an arm of this legislative body, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, be notified in advance and consulted about changes to be made in plans for construction of new hospitals and for modernization and improvements of existing hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system.

Mr. Chairman, there are 168 hospitals and 17 domiciliaries in the Veterans' Administration system. Millions of dollars are appropriated each year to keep this physical plant modern. It seems reasonable that the Congress should exercise some measure of control over an undertaking of this size.

The bill under discussion will vest in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs authority similar to that vested in the Committee on Public Works with respect to the construction of public buildings.

An analysis of this matter, Mr. Chairman, reveals that the Congress in many instances has reserved some measure of control over activities of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Title 40 of the United States Code, for example, prohibits an appropriation for the construction of any public buildings involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000 unless the project has been approved by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The law requires that concession leases or contracts in national parks be reported by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress 60 days prior to the award.

The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House maintain some measure of control over real property transactions entered into by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, by the Department of Defense and the military department.

The Department of Agriculture; Department of the Interior, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, all are subject to congressional control or prior approval of many of their transactions.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that a program of the magnitude of the Veterans' Administration hospital system deserves and requires continuing cooperation and consultation between those agencies of Congress and the executive branch responsible for veterans' affairs. H.R. 4347 makes such consultation mandatory. I urge its support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and my good colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair], for the handling of this piece of legislation.

However, I want to correct an inference which I am afraid some people may have drawn from certain of the debates on this bill. An expenditure in excess of $200,000 for rehabilitation of any existing hospital will require the approval of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. To this extent, therefore, the bill does affect existing and already approved hospitals. With this understanding, everything else that has been said about this bill is correct. At the proper time, I will ask unanimous consent to include some excerpts from other legislation showing the manner in which other standing committees of the House exercise varying degrees of control over construction and other activities of agencies in the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, the following citations from various laws will illustrate the manner and extent to which activities of the executive branch are subject to the scrutiny and control of Congress and its committees.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

SEC. 51. SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL.—The Commission may determine from time to time that other material is special nuclear material in addition to that specified in the definition as special nuclear material. Before making any such determination, the Commission must find that such material is capable of releasing substantial quantities of atomic energy and must find that the determination that such material is special nuclear material is in the interest of the common defense and security, and the President must have expressly assented in writing to the determination. The Commission's determination, together with the assent of the President, shall be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of thirty days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such thirty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment for more than three days) before the determination of the Commission may become effective: *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee, after having received such determination, may by resolution in writing, waive the conditions of or all or any portion of such thirty-day period.

* * * * *

Sec. 58. Review.—Before the Commission establishes any fair price or guaranteed fair price period in accordance with the provisions of section 56, or establishes any criteria for the waiver of any charge for the use of special nuclear material licensed or distributed under section 53 the proposed fair price, guaranteed fair price period, or criteria for the waiver of such charge shall be submitted to the Joint Committee, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days there shall be excluded the days in which either House is not in session because of adjournment for more than three days): *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee, after having received the proposed fair price, guaranteed fair price period, or criteria for the waiver of such charge, may by resolution waive the conditions of or all or any portion of such forty-five day period.

* * * * *

Sec. 61. Source Material.—The Commission may determine from time to time that other material is source material in addition to those specified in the definition of source material. Before making such determination, the Commission must find that such material is essential to the production of special nuclear material and must find that the determination that such material is source material is in the interest of the common defense and security, and the President must have expressly assented in writing to the determination. The Commission's determination, together with the assent of the President, shall be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of thirty days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such thirty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days) before the determination of the Commission may become effective: *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee, after having received such determination, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of or all or any portion of such thirty-day period.

* * * * *

Sec. 123. Cooperation With Other Nations.—No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

a. the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 144b., the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendation thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any Restricted Data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;

b. the President has approved and authorized the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation, and has made a determination in writing that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

c. the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and the determination of the President, has been submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of thirty days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such thirty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days).

Department of Defense

(Title 10, United States Code, ch. 3, sec. 125)

§ 125. Functions, powers, and duties: transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition.

(a) Subject to section 401 of title 50, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action (including the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition of any function, power, or duty) to provide more effective, efficient, and economical administration and operation, and to eliminate duplication, in the Department of Defense. However, except as provided by subsections (b) and (c), a function, power, or duty vested in the Department of Defense, or an officer, official, or agency thereof, by law may not be substantially transferred, reassigned, consolidated, or abolished unless the Secretary reports the details of the proposed transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives. The transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition concerned takes effect on the first day after the expiration of the first 30 days that Congress is in continuous session after the Secretary so reports, unless either of those Committees, within that period, reports a resolution recommending that the proposed transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition be rejected by the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, because it—

(1) proposes to transfer, reassign, consolidate, or abolish a major combatant function, power, or duty assigned to the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by section 3062(b), 5012, 5013, or 8062(c) of this title; and

(2) would, in its judgment, tend to impair the defense of the United States.

If either of those Committees, within that period, reports such a resolution and it is not adopted by the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, within the first 40 days that Congress is in continuous session after that resolution is so reported, the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition concerned takes effect on the first day after the expiration of that forty-day period. For the purposes of this subsection, a session may be considered as not continuous only if broken by an adjournment of Congress sine die. However, in computing the period that Congress is in continuous session, days that the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are not counted.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if the President determines it to be necessary because of hostilities or an imminent threat of hostilities, any function, power, or duty, including one assigned to the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by section 3062(b), 5012, 5013, or 8062(c) of this title, may be transferred, reassigned, or consolidated. The transfer, reassignment, or consolidation remains in effect until the President determines that hostilities have terminated or that there is no longer an imminent threat of hostilities, as the case may be.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may assign or reassign the development and operational use of new weapons or weapons systems to one or more of the military departments or one or more of the armed forces.

(d) In subsection (a)(1), "major combatant function, power, or duty" does not include a supply or service activity common to more than one military department. The Secretary of Defense shall, whenever he determines it will be more effective, economical, or efficient, provide for the performance of such an activity by one agency or such other organizations as he considers appropriate. (Added by Public Law 87–651, title II, section 201, September 7, 1962, 72 Stat. 513.)

Department of Agriculture

(Title 7, United States Code, ch. 33 (farm tenancy), subch. III (retirement of submarginal land))

Sec. 1011. Powers of Secretary of Agriculture.—

* * * * *

(e) to cooperate with Federal, State, territorial, and other public agencies in developing plans for a program of land conservation and land utilization, to assist in carrying out such plans by means of loans to State and local public agencies designated by the State legislature or the Governor, to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title, and to disseminate information concerning these activities. Loans to State and local public agencies shall be made only if such plans have been submitted to, and not disapproved within forty-five days by, the State agency having supervisory responsibility over such plans, or by the Governor if there is no such State agency. No appropriation shall be made for any single loan under this subsection in excess of $250,000 unless such loan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. Loans under this subsection shall be made under contracts which will provide, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate, for the repayment thereof in not more than thirty years, with interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury on its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan is made, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue. Repayment of principal and interest on such loans shall begin with five years. (Section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended by Public Law 87–703, section 102(c), September 27, 1962, 76 Stat. 607–608.)

Department of the Air Force

(Title 50, United States Code)

The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized in discharging the authority given in the preceding section to make surveys, to acquire lands and rights or other interests pertaining thereto, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended. Prior to the acquisition under the authority of this section of any lands or rights or other interest pertaining thereto, the Secretary of the Air Force shall come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition of such lands, rights, or other interests. (Chapter 19 (guided missiles), section 502. Acquisition of land. Act of May 11, 1949, sec. 2, 63 Stat. 66)

Department of the Interior; Bureau of Indian Affairs

(Title 25, United States Code)

Except for electric utility systems constructed and operated as a part of an irrigation system, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract under such terms and conditions as he considers to be in the best interest of the Federal Government for the sale, operation, maintenance, repairs, or relocation of Government-owned utilities and utility systems and appurtenances used in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Secretary shall not execute a contract pursuant to this Act until he has submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a copy of the contract and a statement of his reasons for proposing the contract, and until such materials have lain before the Committees for sixty days (excluding the time during which either House is in recess for more than three days) unless prior thereto the Secretary is notified that neither committee has any objection to the proposed contract. (Chapter 1, section 15. Utility facilities used in administration, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Public Law 87–279, September 22, 1961, 75 Stat. 577.)

Department of the Interior; National Park Service

(Title 16, United States Code)

Sec. 17b–1. Reports to Congressional Officers.

The Secretary of the Interior shall on and after July 31, 1953, report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts involving a gross annual business of $100,000 or more, or of more than five years in duration, including renewals thereof, sixty days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees. (July 31, 1953, ch. 298, title I, sec. 1, 67 Stat. 271; July 14, 1956, ch. 598, 70 Stat. 543.)

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Title 50 appendix, United States Code

Sec. 2285. Real property transactions—Reports to the Armed Services Committees.

(a) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following listed transactions by or for the use of that agency until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives:

(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than $50,000.

(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department, or to a State, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the report must include a summarization of the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

(b) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization shall report quarterly to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than $5,000 but not more than $50,000.

(c) This section applies only to real property in the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive. (August 10, 1956, c. 1041, sec. 43, 70A Stat. 636, amended June 25, 1959, Public Law 86–70, sec. 37, 73 Stat. 150; June 8, 1960, Public Law 86–500, title V, sec. 512, 74 Stat. 187; July 12, 1960, Public Law 86–624, sec. 38, 74 Stat. 421.)

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

(Public Law 86–45)

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress. (Public Law 86–45, section 4, June 15, 1959, 73 Stat. 75.)

* * * * *

(Secs. 3 and 4 of H.R. 5466, 88th Congress)

Sec. 3. Not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorization for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

Sec. 4. The Administrator is hereby authorized to transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, to any other agency of the Government whenever the Administrator determines such transfer necessary for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives for which the funds have been appropriated. Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds authorized by this Act may be transferred by the Administrator under this section, and no transfer in excess of $250,000 shall be made under this section unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a written statement concerning the amount and purpose of, and the reason for, such transfer, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to that transfer, or (2) thirty days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such statement to those committees. (H.R. 5466, 88th Congress; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1964.)

(Title 50, United States Code)

The Administrator is authorized, in implementation of the unitary plan, to construct and equip transsonic or supersonic wind tunnels of a size, design and character adequate for the efficient conduct of experimental work in support of long-range fundamental research at educational institutions within the continental United States, to be selected by the Administrator, or to enter into contracts with such institutions to provide for such construction and equipment, at a total cost not to exceed $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, after consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses of the Congress, vest title to the facilities completed pursuant to this section in such educational institutions under such terms and conditions as may be deemed in the best interests of the United States. (October 27, 1949, ch. 766, title I, sec. 102, 63 Stat. 936; July 29, 1958, Public Law 85–568, title III, sec. 301(d)(2), (3), 72 Stat. 433.)

Authorization of Public Buildings

(Title 40, United States Code, ch. 12, sec. 606: Approval of proposed projects by Congress)

(a) Limitation of funds; transmission to Congress of prospectus of proposed project.

In order to insure the equitable distribution of public buildings throughout the United States with due regard for the comparative urgency of need for such buildings, except as provided in section 603 of this title, no appropriation shall be made to construct any public building or to acquire any building to be used as a public building involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000, and no appropriation shall be made to alter any public building involving an expenditure in excess of $200,000, if such construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and such approval has not been rescinded as provided in subsection (c) of this section. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a prospectus of the proposed project, including (but not limited to)—

(1) a brief description of the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired under this chapter;

(2) the location of the project, and an estimate of the maximum cost of the project;

(3) a comprehensive plan for providing space for all Government officers and employees in the locality of the proposed project, having due regard for suitable space which may continue to be available in existing Government-owned buildings and in rented buildings;

(4) a statement by the Administrator that suitable space owned by the Government is not available and that suitable rental space is not available at a price commensurate with that to be afforded through the proposed action; and

(5) a statement of rents and other housing costs currently being paid by the Government for Federal agencies to be housed in the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired.

(b) Increase of estimated maximum cost. The estimated maximum cost of any project approved under this section as set forth in any prospectus may be increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase, if any, as determined by the Administrator, in construction, or alteration costs, as the case may be, from the date of transmittal of such prospectus to Congress, but in no event shall the increase authorized by this subsection exceed 10 per centum of such estimated maximum costs.

(c) Rescission of approval for failure to make appropriations for project.

In the case of any project approved for construction, alteration, or acquisition by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, for which an appropriation has not been made within one year after the date of such approval, either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, may rescind, by resolution, its approval of such project at any time thereafter before such an appropriation has been made.

(d) Restriction on approval of new projects.

The Committee on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall not approve any project for construction, alteration, or acquisition under subsection (a) of this section whenever there are thirty or more projects the estimated maximum cost of each of which is in excess of $100,000 which have been approved for more than one year under subsection (a) of this section but for which appropriations have not been made, until there has been a rescission of approval under subsection (c) of this section or appropriations are made which result in their being less than thirty such projects. (Public Law 86-249, par. 7, Sept. 9, 1959, 73 Stat. 480.)

REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title 10, United States Code, section 2662, real property transactions—Reports to the Armed Services Committees

(a) The Secretary of a military department, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following-listed transactions by or for the use of that department until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives:

(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than $50,000.

(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department or to a State, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the report must include a summarization of the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

(b) The Secretary of each military department shall report quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than $5,000 but not more than $50,000.

(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements, of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section is conclusive. (As amended June 25, 1959, Public Law 86-70, sec. 6(c), 73 Stat. 142; June 8, 1960, Public Law 86-500, title V, sec. 511(1), 74 Stat. 186; July 12, 1960, Public Law 86-624, sec. 4(c), 74 Stat. 411.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand, then, under this legislation an authorization bill could be brought to the floor of the House which would authorize an appropriation in a lump-sum amount, then that would be distributed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as to where these hospitals shall be built? Will the gentleman explain the procedure on that?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. That is just what we are trying to get away from. There is already the authorization for $75 million each year. What we are trying to do is to make sure that the plans for hospitals that are to be rehabilitated and the new hospitals that will be built are approved first by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs determines where a hospital shall be built or when there shall be alterations under the bill of the amount provided in the bill, they will then come to the House for authorization? The determination is not made by the committee but is actually made on the floor of the House, so far as determination of location is concerned?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, that is not correct. The Veterans' Administration will make a determination of location, construction, modernization, or repair. Then the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will review that decision if it involves $100,000 for new construction or $200,000 for renovation of existing facilities.

Mr. BOW. In other words, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will have sole authority on where the hospitals will be built and where the alterations will be made, and there will not be an opportunity on the floor of the House for other Members to voice their opinion as to where hospitals may go or to vote for or against the location? This puts authority completely within the Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It puts the authorizing authority strictly with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but the whole House will have an opportunity on the appropriations to state their objections and views. Today, only the Committee on Appropriations considers these matters.

Mr. BOW. They would have the first opportunity to vote on the appropriations. But let us assume that on an appropriation bill it should be determined that hospitals should be built elsewhere, there would be no such authority by the Appropriations Committee to do that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There would not be, and that is true in other laws such as under the Public Building Act of 1959.

Mr. BOW. I do not think there should be. I do not think it is a matter for the Appropriations Committee. Is there ever a time when the House itself makes a determination or is the sole authority going to be with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It will be with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURKHALTER].

Mr. BURKHALTER. Will the gentleman tell me if the representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, their legislative committees or legislative commissions have taken any action one way or the other on this proposed legislation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No. This is something that was simply within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We did not ask them to testify.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill for several reasons, first and foremost, because of the method and manner in which this bill was entertained. As far as I can ascertain, the Veterans' Administration has not had an opportunity to present its case to the committee. If you will notice your copy of the bill, you will see that the committee struck out the original version of the bill which would have altered quite a bit the procedure which, if the House approves the present version of the bill, will be sanctioned by the House. The net effect of this bill, if passed and approved, will be basically unconstitutional, in my opinion.

For one thing, it will give unprecedented veto power to one single committee in the Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This committee will have the veto power over the administrative branch of the Government in its study, selection, and choice of sites, or remodeling and reconstruction. It will have the veto power over the appropriation subcommittee of the House. It will have veto power over the President. It will have veto power over every single aspect of study and scrutiny in the selection and fixing of sites for the construction of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

If you will notice, the date of this bill is March 28, when it was approved and passed out. You will notice in the report printed by the committee that there is no actual comment on the version that you are acting on today or being asked to act upon today. The letter by way of criticism which is printed in the report is a letter from the administrator with reference to the version which he thought would be passed out by the committee but not the present version. If you will read carefully the provisions of the act which you are being asked to approve, you will find that this committee will have an unlimited amount of time in providing the selection of sites or the construction of a hospital. If you will notice the original version, which was struck out here, there was a 90-day limitation. There was a 90-day period in which it was mandatory that this Veterans' Affairs Committee should come in and by resolution disapprove the site selection of the Veterans' Administration, but that limitation has been removed and does not now exist in the present version which this House is being asked to sanction.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if we were to carefully study this bill and the effect and impact of this legislation, that in your sober judgment and wisdom you will reject this bill. I believe the genesis, the history of this bill, is one that is born out of anger, so to speak, and not because of mature judgment and study as to the actual need for the type of legislation which is actually written in this bill which we are being asked to vote upon today.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that you not approve this bill in its present form.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just spoken says that this bill will not stand a court test. I want to inform my friend that this legislation is based on the Public Buildings Act of 1959. It has already stood a court test. This authority that this committee particularly is asking for is no different than that of any other committee.

You have a similar provision in the Department of Defense, in Civil Defense, in the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Air Force, the National Park Service, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Foreign Buildings Service Act. So this is not unusual authority to give to a committee. It is already well grounded and has passed the test of time here in the House of Representatives and certainly has stood the test of a court case.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation in part, but I am opposed to it in part. What members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee are attempting to do here today is to inflict upon the House the same discrimination that is being practiced upon them by the Veterans' Administration, and they ought not to be allowed to do that. All Members of the House have a vital interest in the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been and will be spent upon veterans hospitals all over the country. For the committee to come here and say, in effect, that it will be the sole arbiter in the matter of authorization I say is wrong.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will prepare an amendment to give the whole House the same thing, I will be glad to support it.

Mr. GROSS. I do have such an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will submit it I will support the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I wonder how this works over in the Senate. Does the Senate have anything to say about it? Shall the House have complete jurisdiction? Does their committee have the same authority?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, the Senate can fight its own battles. I am not primarily interested in that. I am interested in the House of Representatives and all of the Members of the House of Representatives having something to say about these building programs that are going on. This applies to the Public Buildings Act. Except for the members of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives we are being shortchanged insofar as having anything to say, or practically anything to say, about the construction of public buildings. Of course they go to the Committee on Appropriations, but how many Members of the House are members of the Committee on Appropriations, and how any Members of the House are members of the Committee on Public Works? The great majority of the Members are being shortchanged, and I do not propose to stand idly by today and be shortchanged insofar as having something to say about the veterans' hospital building program. I want the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to have primary jurisdiction. This business of delegating authority exclusively to the Veterans' Administration is no good. If it were possible to amend this bill to deal with the Public Buildings Act and the House Committee on Public Works I would certainly do it, but an amendment of that nature would be subject to a point of order because it would not be germane to the bill.

It is high time that Members of the House, and not merely members of two or three committees, asserted the right to know what is going on and have something to say about what is going on with the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on Federal buildings.

I will offer an amendment if I can be recognized for that purpose that will take care of the committee and all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. I will support such an amendment as the gentleman proposes, but I would also like some time along the road somewhere to go back and take this same authority away from these various other departments and committees.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman and I am perfectly willing to go all the way on it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose of the gentleman by his proposed amendment to make it necessary that this House vote on every remodeling and repair job of $200,000 or every new construction of $100,000 in veterans' hospitals? Because that is what the amendment would do, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, why not?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I think it would make this House rather busy, if we were to have to consider every repair job or every new construction, in the huge system of veterans hospitals.

Mr. GROSS. We get that in other legislation. We get a military construction bill on the House floor dealing in hundreds of millions of dollars and in detail.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That may be true, but these repairs may not be routine. Let us say that a hospital is damaged by a sudden flash flood or by a storm of some kind, making repairs necessary. Then the House would have to go into session and go through all this rigmarole of passing enabling legislation before the Veterans' Administration could act. And recall also, the gentlemen's amendment would likewise imply action by the other body. I cannot concur in the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. A few years ago in California one of our major hospitals was seriously damaged by an earthquake. It had to be repaired immediately in order to take care of the need. Personally I do not think we should have this kind of limitation of having the House of Representatives approve a repair job of $100,000. Sometimes we may require fairly rapid action. The committee can take that action. On past experience, the House frequently is not able to do so.

Mr. GROSS. What is insurmountable about that? You can set up a $500,000 or a $1 million contingency fund, if you want to, and these cases can be scrutinized and supervised by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This could happen to any other Government building.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I recall, in the earthquake I mentioned, the repairs involved exceeded $1 million.

Mr. GROSS. All right; so what?

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me that in that case it should be possible to act more rapidly than the House has demonstrated its capability of acting in the past year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation; but also in support of an amendment which I intend to offer at the proper time, if I am given the opportunity to do so, based partly upon the question asked by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews] and on a similar situation which is known to exist, relating to a hospital in my district. That is where you have "Technical surveys" money already appropriated, and a project already underway. I am speaking of the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital in my district for which $1.722 million has already been appropriated. But, because construction has not yet started, under the language of this bill, this authorized hospital would have to be reauthorized.

It has been stated here that it is not the intention of the committee to include such projects. However, in reading the bill, I think it would certainly be subject to such a construction, because, as reported out, the bill says:

> No appropriation shall be made to construct any hospitals, domiciliaries, or outpatient dispensary facilities—

And so forth, without the approval under certain conditions of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Let me say that I very much favor the Congress having something to say about veterans' hospitals and matters under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee; just as I did in connection with public works, when we had in 1959 the public works bill before the Congress, relating to the construction of public buildings. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Congressman Jones, and myself and members of our committee spent many hours in evolving that legislation. This follows the same procedure. But in that legislation I pointed out there is a definition of "construction." I asked if there was such a definition in this bill and, of course, obviously there is not. In that other legislation, as appears in title 40, section 612, the term "construction" is specifically defined. Of course, this is the definition that I would expect of "construction" that would be given to this legislation, particularly in that the public buildings bill has been cited as a precedent.

That definition is:

> The terms "construct" and "alter" include preliminary planning, studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other similar actions necessary for the construction or alteration, as the case may be, of a public building.

I think obviously this would be a definition of "construction" in this bill. Therefore it would be my intention to offer an amendment to clarify the situation and make certain that it does not apply to instances where architectural, engineering, and planning surveys money has been appropriated in the past.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Chairman of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have read the gentleman's amendment. I do not believe it changes the intent of the bill at all and I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I concur in the statement just made by the Chairman of the committee. I am familiar with the proposed amendment and find no objection to it.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank both the gentlemen very much. It has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that some reference be made to the effective date of the act in the amendment. The amendment has been amended accordingly. I think this gives the Congress more to say about veterans' hospitals today than it has had in the past, because it has had little or nothing to say in the matter of authorization or legislatively as it relates to veterans' hospitals through the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is about time Congress recaptured some of the authority which has been here usurped by or delegated to previously to the executive branch of the Government, in this instance the Veterans' Administration.

I hope the bill passes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague].

Is it not true that the overall planning of the location of hospitals would still rest with the Veterans' Administration under this legislation, but you would have the right to audit and approve these plans before they were finalized?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. It is going to give Congress through its Committee on Veterans' Affairs the right to look into these plans of the Veterans' Administration and not be kept in the dark. The Veterans' Administration will have to come to your committee, so that you may find out where these projects are to be constructed or renovated?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. With that explanation, I think this legislation can serve a worthwhile purpose.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I am not aware of their problem but I rather feel I am sympathetic in a way, because in our Committee on Atomic Energy we are in this position from the standpoint of authorization.

Gradually over the years facilities of the atomic energy program have been built. The Joint Committee now finds itself in the position of scrutinizing only 8 percent of the budget. We are going to come in here next week with an approximately $200 million authorization bill. This is in relation to the $2.7 billion budget of the atomic energy program.

In 1946 when the original act was passed and again in 1954 when it was amended the basic act authorized operation, maintenance, research, and development as the basic statutory authorization for the Atomic Energy Committee. Therefore, we in the Joint Committee had no chance to look at their budget and scrutinize it line item by line item except in a narrow area. So, gradually over the years we have found programs started by the Atomic Energy Commission and maybe several tens of millions of dollars in some instances have been spent on a particular project, and then they come to us for a $5 or $10 million facility to further this particular program.

We are faced at that time with a program that has been started and carried on for 2 or 3 years, and we are placed in the position of either denying a vital facility or, if we authorize that vital facility, which may be small moneywise in relation to the entire program, then we commit ourselves not only to the program in the past but maybe a rapidly expanding program in the future.

So the subcommittee on authorization which I chair this year has taken action on this, and we intend to come in with legislation similar to this, although not identical, because we have been thinking about this and working on it for several years. We will come in with an authorization bill which will expand the authority of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy both in the House and the other body to explore more thoroughly these programs at their inception, so that we can do something about them. We are bringing this year's authorization bill in with an approximate 10-percent reduction over what the Atomic Energy Commission has asked for.

As the result of scrutinizing some of these programs, and in one instance we have refused to go ahead with an appropriation for a facility on a program. We want to look at it more carefully before we go ahead. When we bring the authorization bill to the floor it will be very carefully thought out. It is going to broaden the Joint Committee's authority for authorization. The House will have the opportunity to act upon that authorization. We are not taking unto the committee itself this power to do this without bringing it to the House, and we will bring to the House this bill, I hope, within the next 10 days or 2 weeks. It will, in effect, give our committee and the Congress the chance to look at these tremendous expenditures of tens and hundreds of millions of dollars and the House can work its will upon it and not have it done by administrative action. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, this is partly the purpose or the main purpose of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to obtain scrutiny in these areas which they have not been allowed to scrutinize before. The legislation that we hope to bring to the floor within a week or 10 days will be carefully thought out to guard against that particular point that the gentleman from Iowa raised.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California will yield, what really disturbs me about this bill is that it imposes a tremendous administrative burden on the Congress at a time when all Members and committees of Congress are overburdened with detailed work. I am concerned with the assumption of power by Congress which does not in fact belong in this body. I am also disturbed that perhaps we are forcing an advance agreement to be made by an executive department with a congressional committee which, although, constitutional, seems to be giving the power of a detailed veto to a single committee of Congress. I wonder if this power really belongs in Congress rather than in the orderly administration of the executive branch. Would the gentleman from California indicate to me whether he feels that this gets Congress involved in too much detailed work, and the minute administrative details which might more properly be handled elsewhere? I was disturbed by the description that the gentleman from California gave us in light of the tremendous administrative burden which the Members of Congress and their committees already have. When you add additional burdens of a detailed administrative nature on top of that, it would seem to me to be entirely the wrong direction for the Congress to go.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not think the Congress should go into the detail—and I do not know what the gentleman's interpretation of that word is—but I think the executive department does have the right to administer the programs which the Congress legislates. I do not think, however, that tremendous programs should be embarked upon without the consultation of the committee having jurisdiction. I am looking at this in terms of broad authorization and not as to the detailed administrative part which the gentleman seems to be worried about.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5001(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Whenever a report is submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on any plans, surveys, or studies which have been conducted with respect to construction, modernization, renovation, or major repair of any facility under this section, the Administrator shall submit an identical copy thereof to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Before any construction modernization, renovation, or major repair of any facility is actually begun under this section, the Administrator shall submit a report thereon to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and no appropriation may thereafter be made or used for such construction, modernization, renovation, or major repair if before the expiration of the first ninety day period of continuous session of the Congress which ends after the date of the submission of such report there is adopted by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs a resolution stating in substance that the committee disapproves the use of appropriated funds for such construction, modernization, renovation, or major repair. For the purposes of the previous sentence, continuity of session of the Congress shall be considered as broken only by adjournment sine die."

With the following committee amendment.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 5001 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(g) (1) No appropriation shall be made to construct any hospitals, domiciliaries, or outpatient dispensary facilities or to acquire any such facilities involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000, and no appropriation shall be made to alter any such facility involving an expenditure in excess of $200,000, if such construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by a resolution adopted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and such approval has not been rescinded as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Administrator shall transmit to Congress such prospectus of the proposed project, including (but not limited to)—

" '(A) a brief description of the facilities to be constructed, altered, or acquired; and

" '(B) the location of the project, and an estimate of the maximum cost of the project.

" '(2) The estimated maximum cost of any project approved under this subsection as set forth in any prospectus may be increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase, if any, as determined by the Administrator, in construction or alteration costs, as the case may be, from the date of transmittal of such prospectus to Congress, but in no event shall the increase authorized by this paragraph exceed 10 per centum of such estimated maximum cost.

" '(3) In the case of any project approved for construction, alteration, or acquisition, by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection, for which an appropriation has not been made within one year after the date of such approval, the Committee may rescind, by resolution, its approval of such project at any time thereafter before such an appropriation has been made'."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cramer to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike out "No" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Except in the case of any project of construction, alteration or acquisition, or any phase thereof, with respect to which any appropriation has been made prior to the effective date of this act no".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Let me say for the benefit of my colleagues that this amendment does not have any retroactive effect on hospitals on which appropriations have already been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross to the committee amendment: On page 2, strike out line 25, and strike out all of page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not been specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would like to say to the gentleman that we have each Congress between 500 and 600 bills in the Veterans' Affairs Committee that we examine, and on which we take action. The action of the committee in this particular matter was in the belief that we were being helpful to the House of Representatives and not taking something away from it.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am personally concerned, I will accept the gentleman's amendment, though I would point out there is ample precedent for the bill as it was reported.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], that as much as I respect him and appreciate his view, I think this is the wrong time to have this amendment adopted. I think it goes entirely too far and will be a burden which the House should not be asked to assume at this time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. The amendment simply provides than any Veterans' Administration construction will have to come to the House of Representatives. This is the procedure for other committees of the House, the notable exception being the Public Works Committee, and as I have previously stated the House ought to insist upon the right to scrutinize all public works projects.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman strikes all on page 3.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. I wonder if it is the intention of the gentleman, however, that the procedures set out on page 3 for submitting a project through the prospectus method to the committee for action by the committee and subsequently by the Congress be abandoned?

Mr. GROSS. There is no necessity for the language on page 3. It is superfluous, if my amendment is adopted, because all VA projects would have to come to the committee and through the legislative process to the full House.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. That is the very point I wish the gentleman to state, as a matter of record.

Mr. GROSS. Surely.

Mr. CRAMER. I wish for the gentleman to state that as a matter of legislative history—that it is not the intention of the gentleman to strike out the requirements for the submission by the Veterans Administration of a prospectus to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. CRAMER. But, this is an additional responsibility, and that the Congress itself must act after the committee acts?

Mr. GROSS. There is only one place where the Veterans' Administration can go, and that is where they ought to go, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and that committe should then come to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of sudden disaster or calamity, I do not know the law, but I am sure the President's disaster fund would take care of a hospital that was damaged by fire or earthquake or some similar catastrophe.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason I ask the question was that the Public Buildings Act specifically sets out the procedure that shall be followed by the Administration in submitting the prospectus and proposed buildings to the Congress. I wanted to make sure that the record showed that even though the bill does not so state now, it is not the intention of the gentleman that the prospectus in the future should not be submitted to the committee, as would otherwise be required under the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I say again there is only one place the Veterans' Administration should go, and that is to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and its counterpart in the other body.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to make certain that I fully understand the gentleman's amendment, because under the explanation just given by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] the gentleman is proposing a requirement with regard to the building of any hospital or the modernization or improvement of any hospital that costs over $100,000 that goes beyond the present requirements on public buildings under the Public Buildings Act.

It would actually require statutory enactment and passage by both the House and Senate, and the full body of both the House and Senate, before you could have even a $150,000 repair project on one of these hospitals; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. I just got through saying I am sure if an emergency arose, anything in the nature of an emergency, the President's Disaster Fund would take care of it. You can also establish in appropriations for the future a contingency fund for that purpose.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Nevertheless, the gentleman is in agreement that he is taking a step beyond what we require in the case of the construction of post offices or other public buildings under present procedure, making it more difficult to make improvements, repairs, and modernization, as well as construction on our veterans hospitals.

Mr. GROSS. The first thing to be considered is that all the Members of Congress ought to have something to say about the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being spent. The committees dealing with veterans legislation ought to know first what is being proposed and why, and have something to say about it. Then the Veterans' Affairs Committee ought to come to all the Members of the House. My amendment provides that they specifically do just that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am not in agreement with the gentleman on that. We have that review of the administrative funds and the appropriation funds.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of hoping to help accomplish perhaps what the gentleman desires to accomplish but without taking away from the bill the beneficial aspects of it. I am concerned that the proposal offered by the gentleman from Iowa will strike out page 3 which contains certain provisions that in my opinion are essential for proper management and administration of the program, including the submission of prospectuses to the committee by the Veterans' Administration, a permission as contained in paragraph 2 for a 10-percent discretionary or latitude in the Veterans' Administration over and above what is authorized in a monetary figure by authorizing legislation. Then the third paragraph that deals with the case of any project approved for construction, alteration, and so forth by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In accordance with paragraph 1 of this subsection, for which an appropriation has not been made within 1 year after the date of such approval, and so forth, it is an approval which gives some policing authority and will not leave projects laying on the shelf indefinitely without action. It is the same problem we had in connection with the 1959 act on public buildings. The important proposal will be that on line 1, page 3, after the word "Representatives" add the words "and the Congress," and on line 21, page 3, after the word "Veterans' Affairs" add "and the Congress." That will be so that the Congress will still be in the picture but the procedural aspects of this legislation that are sound will still be in the legislation and the Congress will have to act upon what the Veterans' Affairs Committee does but after the procedure set out for VA is followed, including the filing of prospectuses, the 10-percent discretionary authority, then the 1-year deletion of approval by the committee. So there can be some proper policing or proper review of these different authorizations, and they do not sit on the shelf without appropriation. I think that is one of the most salutary effects of the Public Buildings Act. That is, to have these projects acted upon within a reasonable period of time. If not, the committee can reconsider them in the light of other projects that have been authorized and in the light of available funds, and they do not sit on the shelf forever, which has happened in the case of a number of public works projects.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLFIELD. Will the gentleman explain what he means by the 10-percent contingency and where he introduced it?

Mr. CRAMER. It is in the present legislation, in paragraph 2, page 3, line 4, which provides there is a 10-percent discretionary amount that can be spent in excess of the actual dollar value of the project authorized. There has to be some discretion, and the 10-percent discretion is the same as contained in the Public Buildings Act.

My substitute, which I have at the desk and will offer at the proper time, will still do as the gentleman from Iowa wishes. I am in favor of that. That was my position on the Public Buildings Act, but we could not get an agreement on it. The minority was in favor of action by the Congress in addition to the committee.

So, I am very much in favor of it, but I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa goes farther than even he intends.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment to the bill if the gentleman can assure me that he has an amendment which will bring these authorizations to the House floor. My only object in offering the amendment is that the Members of the House, and all of them, have something to say about this program.

Mr. CRAMER. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the gentleman, and I have stated what the amendment is; that on page 3, line 1, after "Representatives" we add "and the Congress," and where the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is referred to in the second place, page 3, line 21, add "and the Congress." That retains the procedure but does not destroy the legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Without taking the gentleman off his feet, I should like to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I do not want to take the gentleman off his feet, and I realize that in asking unanimous consent, because he arose to speak on my amendment, that it would be taking him off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does this unanimous consent request have the effect of substituting the amendment of the gentleman from Florida for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman from Florida can then offer his amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the committee amendments:

Page 3, line 1, after "Representatives" insert "and the Congress."

Line 21, after "Affairs" add "and the Congress".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, as I have explained, the purpose of this amendment is to require approval of the Congress of any action taken by the Veterans' Affairs Committee and not destroy the proper procedure set out in the legislation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I say to the gentleman that I concur in his objective in what seems to be the sentiment here today, that the Congress should have the authority to pass on and authorize these various projects of the Veterans' Administration. But, I want to be sure that we are not confused or mixed up as to the expansion of this review by the Congress. When you say "the Congress" I assume that means and includes the other body. So, in one part of the bill it would refer to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, which is part and parcel of this body, but no reference is made to the other body, the committee, or the Congress as a whole. So, I assume when you amend this to include "the Congress," it means with the approval of both bodies.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct, and that was the intent and purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, that both the Senate and the House have to act. Frankly, I cannot see how the House of Representatives can enact a bill without the Senate acting, and that is the reason I had a few reservations about the proposal; namely, how the House can act on public buildings, Veterans' Administration or otherwise, without concurrence of the other body. I think that is a question which this helps to solve.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the gentleman knows there is no committee on veterans' affairs in the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. I wholeheartedly agree that there is no veterans' affairs committee in the other body, but at the same time I think there is a very serious constitutional and otherwise question as to whether the House could act in authorizing legislation without concurrence of the Senate, regardless whether there exists one committee in one body and not in the other.

I think this helps to cure that serious legal question which might otherwise be involved, and I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me perhaps we are endeavoring today too much from the standpoint of writing or rewriting this bill on the House floor. I do not believe there will be much opposition by the members of this group to bringing back to the House floor for authorization, the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital. In fact, I would be in favor of that provision. However, this amendment would go beyond that and would require any repair to any existing Veterans' Administration hospital, if such repair costs more than $200,000, to come back to this House floor for approval. This is entirely different.

As I mentioned, we have had earthquakes in California which caused serious damage to hospitals and involved repairs in amounts of hundreds of thousands of dollars and running up to as high as $1 million. It is perfectly possible that you could have a fire in a Veterans' Administration hospital and you would be required to move out several hundred patients, and it might be most urgent that you do those repairs almost immediately in order to move those patients back in. The approval of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is something practical because that can be done in a matter of 24 to 48 hours. However, the approval of the House of Representatives is something very different. From past experience we know that just does not work this fast. It seems to me this amendment goes entirely too far under the circumstances.

The committee looked over this bill and came out with a usable compromise and said that the Veterans' Administration shall not act independently but shall come back to their committee and ask for approval of their specific proposals. It seems to me it is a reasonable compromise. The House Public Works Committee, on which I serve, I might say has the authority itself to approve public buildings and, because of the volume of small flood control projects, for example, the House of Representatives and the Senate collectively last year passed a bill authorizing the Corps of Engineers itself to make a decision on flood control projects up to $1 million. If you delegate the authority for a public building or for a flood control project but retain the authority for something as urgent as repairs to a hospital that might be damaged by earthquake or fire, where urgency is far greater than in the case of building a new public building, then it seems to me we are not being realistic about the situation. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in pretty complete agreement with the statement of the gentleman from California just concluded. I had the honor of serving for a while on the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House and I have the highest regard for the able chairman of that committee and for the membership of that committee.

Personally I find no difficulty in going along with the bill as it was reported out of the committee, but I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from California that when we insert in this bill, as reported by the committee, the further requirement that for any kind of a construction project, and any kind of an improvement or alteration project that involves over $100,000 that you have to bring it to the floor of this House and bring it to the floor of the Senate and get the concurrence of both of those bodies, then you are making a very burdensome thing out of the administration of the plant of the Veterans' Administration. That is a tremendous plant and it is nationwide in scope. It is something that up to this time, I think, has been as free from politics as anything we have in our Government. When you start bringing in to active floor consideration of the House of Representatives and the Senate comparatively minor repair projects and alteration projects in these hospitals you do a disservice to the veterans' program.

I earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be defeated.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order that I might ask questions of the gentleman from Florida concerning the purpose and intent of his amendment. I am not quite clear and I suspect that many other Members of this House are not quite clear on it. I would like to ask this of the gentleman from Florida: First, under your amendment would it be necessary whenever an addition, or renovation, or repair of an existing Veterans' Administration hospital is accomplished that prior authority must be granted by both Houses of Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. If in fact for construction purposes the cost is in excess of $100,000 the answer is "Yes." If it relates to alterations and the cost is in excess of $200,000, the answer is "Yes." I will say to the gentleman those are the same figures and the same authorizing limitations as set out in the Public Buildings Act of 1959 requiring committee approval, but not House and Senate approval.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, I will say to the gentleman that this is going to require House and Senate approval twice, both in the authorizing procedure and also in the appropriations procedure.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that was my impression. I want to make my feelings perfectly clear for the edification of the body. Certainly I do not want to take any authority away from this floor of Congress and I do not think any other Member does. But I do feel that this amendment could cause possible confusion and delay on repair and renovation of our Veterans' Administration facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unless you adopt the Cramer amendment, that is exactly what you are going to do, short-circuit again Members of the House of Representatives who are neither on the Appropriations Committee nor on the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. That is exactly what you do without it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I do not see the gentleman's point. First, you are going to require two actions by the House and the Senate, appropriating and authorizing for a particular repair job. Why does the gentleman say we would not be delaying a project? I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. I simply want to say that it appears to me, on listening to the discussion here, that the legislation would improve what has been a bad situation and the amendment will only improve it to death.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 40, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STAGGERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4347) to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals pursuant to House Resolution 403, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NEED FOR MODERNIZATION OF VANCOUVER VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in supporting H.R. 4347 today, it is my distinct understanding—and if this is not true, I would appreciate being corrected by the chairman of the committee—that through the passage of this bill, Congress will be enabled to better weigh hospital expenditures in all areas of the United States and take fuller cognizance of the actual bed needs of an area. In my own district in the State of Washington, we have a Veterans' Administration hospital constructed in 1941 for the care of war wounded, a cantonment type of hospital, known as Barnes Veterans Hospital.

This hospital serves not only Southwest Washington but it serves other areas of Washington and Oregon. In my office is a file of correspondence from commanders of service groups throughout our State and from the State of Oregon, urging not only the continuance of the Barnes Hospital for the benefit of our veterans, but urging its reconstruction and the necessary expenditure of funds to modernize it.

Veterans who have used this hospital and who seek to use it, do so for a multiplicity of reasons, but particularly because of its fine staff, its reputation for good will, individual attention, and the one-story type of service, enabling activities denied in high-rise institutions.

The average cost for the care of a patient at Barnes is low, ranking with the lowest among all veterans' hospitals, yet it consistently ranks among the highest in efficiency ratings conducted by the Administrator of Veterans' Hospitals. Total bed capacity is 501, the average daily patient total is 441, and it serves about 3,500 veterans each year. Here I list costs per day in four hospitals in the Northwest:

Cost per day per patient	1961	1962	1963 (estimated)
Vancouver Hospital	$25.00	$27.00	$28.00
Portland Hospital	28.44	29.05	28.61
Seattle Hospital	31.79	32.72	32.08
Spokane Hospital	28.00	29.00	28.00

Yet, in spite of this support by veterans, in spite of its high efficiency, its low cost and the number of veterans served each year, the Veterans' Administration has to date spent not 1 cent on reconstruction or rehabilitation of this hospital.

If this bill will assist in bettering the veterans' hospital situation throughout the United States, then I cannot but wholeheartedly support it.

If it did not meet these needs and did not recognize the necessity of using all types of standards for determining reconstruction and rehabilitation expenditures, I would not support it.

WHY HARASS SECRETARY McNAMARA?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, each day there is new evidence of the growing awareness throughout the country of the ill-conceived and deliberate attempts on the part of some to harass and embarrass our extremely able and deeply dedicated Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

The thinly veiled campaign against Mr. McNamara is not succeeding. The public appreciates his determination to bring about meaningful unification of our armed services.

As evidence of the growing concern throughout the country, I am including here four articles of editorial comment which have appeared during the past few days in the Nation's press.

The first is an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of June 5.

The second is a column by Jim G. Lucas, writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The other two are columns by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which appeared in the Washington Post on June 7 and June 19, respectively.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 5, 1963]

CAMPAIGN TO GET McNAMARA UNDERWAY

Representative JIM WRIGHT, the Texas Democrat, has put the suspicion into the very bluntest of words: In a current newsletter to his constituents, Congressman WRIGHT wrote that a certain group in the military—long accustomed to have its own way—is out to get Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Under our system, the Secretary of Defense must and should be accountable to some kind of second guessing on his weapons procurement decisions, as on other decisions that materially affect the overall defense posture of the country. This is a function which the several committees of jurisdiction in the Congress can be entrusted to perform.

In reality, the trouble is not in the investigations themselves so much as the partisan political use made of their findings at a time when the returns are by no means all in.

An example was last week's broadside attack by Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, one of the loudest congressional champions of economy in Government. The irony here is that of all the men in the Government at Washington today, Robert McNamara is doing the most acting (as distinct from talking) to effect the kind of economies that possibly alone can assure us a viable future as a nation. The economies the Secretary of Defense is called upon to effect are inherent in the job, for the money saved thereby must go toward providing the ever more expensive weapons of the future. The job thus involves selection of a most sensitive kind, and it is next to impossible to avoid stepping on somebody's toes in the process. We have disagreed with some of Mr. McNamara's weapons decisions in the past, at the risk of being proved wrong by events, and likely will disagree again in the future. But we have never disagreed with the starting proposition that these final decisions are properly his—and his alone.

There are no indispensable men in our governmental scheme of things, but there are some indispensable jobs. And while it is possible that Mr. McNamara's unique blend of dedication and professional skills could be matched somewhere out there in the wilderness, it is by no means certain that "another McNamara" (if, in fact such a creature exists) would willingly have his neck measured in advance for the same guillotine.

The Other McNamara

(By Jim G. Lucas)

When the French and German Defense Ministers were here early this year, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara asked them around to his home for breakfast.

Since the McNamaras have no regular cook, Mrs. McNamara fried bacon and eggs, brewed coffee, and toasted buns. Her husband waited table.

This is the "other" McNamara, often obscured by the controversies surrounding the man and his policies. Even his critics say Mr. McNamara is able, that he runs the Pentagon. But they say he lacks heart, is arrogant, not interested in people.

This hurts and alarms his friends. They know him, instead, as a decent fellow, a gracious host, a considerate boss. They are puzzled how such a legend could grow up around a genuinely warm human being.

But they also admit—a bit sadly—it probably is his own fault.

"Bob has none of the instincts of a commander or a politician," says one White House adviser. "He could use both. But you just cannot get him to do something he considers the slightest bit phony. That doesn't come naturally for him."

There is a strong human side to the man. It is revealed, in part, by these stories, gleaned from talks over a period of weeks with his friends.

Story No. 1: A GS–9 ($7,500 a year) worked late into the night, several nights in a row, on a classified report. He was so far down the totem pole he didn't know Mr. McNamara was aware of his existence. Late one evening, Mr. McNamara called the man's wife at home, thanked her "for being so patient with us," remarked that her husband's work "means a lot to this country of ours," and wound up saying, "I know you're proud of such a man."

Story No. 2: Mr. McNamara stopped briefly in a corridor to chat with a senior Air Force officer and noted he looked tired. That evening, the officer got a call from Mr. McNamara at home. The Secretary "ordered" him to take off a week or so and rest up.

Story No. 3: An Assistant Secretary turned down an invitation for a Caribbean cruise. Mr. McNamara suggested he reconsider. The assistant said he was far too busy. "All right," Mr. McNamara said, "I'll take no vacation, either, this year. Damned if I'll admit you're more valuable around here than I am." The man went, came back refreshed.

None of these stories is particularly newsworthy. They lose a lot in the telling. Their punchlines could be sharpened. But they are not the kind of stories other people tell about IBM machines.

Mr. McNamara could be in deep trouble with Congress. The TFX inquiry has slowed his programs. There have been no major reforms in months. But his main source of power is intact.

"Aside from his brother, Robert Kennedy, no one is closer to the President than Bob McNamara," a White House adviser says.

Has TFX hurt him?

"Undoubtedly," this source said. "In some quarters. But it has not hurt him with the President."

Meanwhile, the McNamaras' idea of a night on the town is to pick up the (Deputy Secretary) Roswell Gilpatric, drive to their favorite German restaurant and "waste" the evening eating German sausages, drinking German beer, and singing German songs.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1963]

The TFX Loser

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Though the interminable TFX investigation is months away from being buttoned up, the big loser in this dreary business has now emerged: Senator John L. McClellan and his famed Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

McClellan's investigation of the Defense Department's contract award for the futuristic TFX fighter-bomber will produce no clean winner. Certainly not Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. His maladroit handling of McClellan has exploded the myth of computer infallibility. Congressional respect for McNamara never will be quite what it was before TFX.

But McClellan's reputation has suffered much more. For the first time in his career of shielding the Nation from sin, the imperious moralizer from Arkansas has failed to drive home his sermon. He and the subcommittee staff have been unable to convict McNamara and his bright young men of sinister deeds in giving the TFX contract to General Dynamics instead of Boeing.

The TFX award will not be canceled. There will be no competition of prototypes between General Dynamics and Boeing, as McClellan has suggested. And most definitely, McNamara will not resign from the Cabinet in disgrace, which became the real aim of McClellan.

This failure to add McNamara's scalp to his long collection leaves McClellan in a dilemma new to him.

If his subcommittee issues a noncommittal report on the TFX affair or no report at all, it will be an admission of gross error that would be difficult for anyone so self-righteous as McClellan.

But if he insists on a tough anti-McNamara report, he might get no better than a 5-to-4 vote of support from his sharply divided subcommittee. Worse yet, the parent Government Operations Committee might reject the subcommittee's report, which would be an insufferable humiliation.

The decline of John McClellan goes deeper than his failure to destroy a Defense Secretary. There are signs that more than a few Senators are fed up with the headline-hunting antics of the Investigations Subcommittee.

Created in 1946 to watch over Government agencies, the subcommittee soon diverted its talents to hunting Communists under the leadership of Senator Joe McCarthy. Though McCarthy was condemned by the Senate in 1954, the Senate put no restrictions on the subcommittee.

From 1957 to 1961, McClellan and the investigating staff (then headed by Robert F. Kennedy) conducted a wild-swinging special investigation of labor racketeering. It has lashed out in all directions the last 2 years, including investigations of B-girls and Jimmy Hoffa—with no discernible purpose other than newspaper publicity.

What is new today is a quiet rise of anti-McClellan sentiment within his own subcommittee. There is growing disgust with staff investigators who act like grade B movie district attorneys trying to humiliate everybody they investigate. Senators are getting sick and tired of lurid subcommittee reports reading like paper-back detective novels.

Despite all this, the Senate is not about to rebuke McClellan by requiring more orderly procedures for his subcommittee. McClellan is undergoing a more subtle form of punishment. He has lost the confidence of his peers.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1963]

The V/Stol Nonsense

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

There was a little noticed but graphic illustration on Capitol Hill last week of the kind of investigation Congress simply should not be making.

At issue was the year-old award of a research contract for the proposed V/Stol, a highly experimental plane that is supposed to take off and land vertically like a helicopter but fly like a regular airplane. The contract went to Bell Aerosystems Co., even though Navy brass lined up solidly with Douglas Aircraft, a longtime Navy favorite.

Sound familiar? This is the same question of Defense Department civilians overruling uniformed officers that lies at the heart of the uproarious investigation of the TFX fighter-bomber contract.

The TFX investigation has been staggering along in Senator John McClellan's Permanent Investigations Subcommittee all year, but the V/Stol question was cleaned up in 3 days last week by Senator John Stennis' Preparedness Subcommittee. The explanation of this contrast is easy: McClellan is a notorious headline milker, and Stennis isn't. Stennis always tries to hold down the fireworks and complete an investigation with all deliberate speed.

Brief as it was, however, there remains the question of whether the Stennis investigation was not 3 days too long.

Unlike the intricate TFX affair, the V/Stol facts are simple enough. The admirals advised that the Douglas proposal was superior to Bell's on a technical basis, though both were acceptable. In addition, they declared, the Douglas plan would be a little, though not much, cheaper.

But Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric overruled the Navy and awarded the contract to Bell. As Pentagon men testified last week, Bell has had much more experience with vertical take-off-and-landing aircraft than Douglas.

Even more to the point (although they were loath to say it out loud last week), top Defense Department officials simply have lost confidence in the management team at Douglas to deliver on risky experimental contracts. Although the Navy and Douglas have had a happy partnership in producing the AD series of attack planes, the company's performance in trying to develop the ill-fated Skybolt air-to-ground missile was considered subpar by the men who run the Pentagon.

There's room to complain about the V/Stol contract procedure only if one applies the most strained and questionable interpretation of procurement regulations. But such an interpretation would prevent the civilian command from exercising any discretion at all. It would compel them to accept as final the opinion of Navy engineers .

Most Senators accept the wisdom of present law permitting the Secretary of Defense to overrule the faceless technicians. Accordingly, all that is really left to investigate is whether Gilpatric was correct in preferring Bell's management to the Douglas crew. But STENNIS never had any intention of investigating the relative merits of two private companies, and properly so.

Why then was this obscure contract award investigated at all? This is a murky area, but there seems to be two reasons. And both go back to the TFX investigation.

First, uniformed naval officers wanted V/Stol investigated. There is a not-so-quiet war currently raging between Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and the uniform Navy. It wouldn't be surprising if rebellious naval officers, noting the embarrassment McNamara has been subjected to in the TFX affair, would try to further discredit tough civilian control at the Pentagon.

Second, there is good reason to believe MCCLELLAN's investigators ran into the V/Stol affair while digging into the TFX award. Though the Stennis staff denies it, some well-informed sources in Congress actually believe STENNIS took over the V/Stol investigation to keep it out of MCCLELLAN's hands.

At any rate, the Pentagon has good reason to be thankful that V/Stol wound up in the STENNIS subcommittee. The investigation offered headline-producing possibilities of conflict-of-interest and White House influence that STENNIS intentionally ignored as irrelevant.

But to concede that the investigation was orderly is a long way from declaring it necessary or even useful. It was neither.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, to complete my introduction of legislation needed to implement the President's proposals relative to mental illness and mental retardation, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill designed to provide for Federal support for the construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers.

The bill is nearly identical to H.R. 3688, on which hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in March. I am including a summary of it at the end of my remarks.

My motives for introducing this bill are twofold. First, as a longtime advocate of effective legislation in the mental health field, I wish to leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to where I stand in relation to the provisions of this bill. I am for these provisions, and I consider their adoption by this House to be of critical importance.

Second, I wish to emphasize, by my introduction of a separate community mental health centers bill, my conviction that the omnibus approach to this type of legislation is ineffective, and needlessly delays the passage of necessary legislation by this House.

Briefly, the two major provisions of this bill are these: First, that congressional authorization be secured for grants to the States to construct comprehensive community mental health centers beginning in fiscal year 1965, with the Federal Government providing 45 to 75 percent of the project cost; and, second, that Congress authorize short-term project grants for the initial staffing cost of these centers, with the Federal Government providing up to 75 percent of the costs in the early months, on a gradually declining basis, terminating such support for a project within less than 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I need not detail for the Members of this House the great need we have for this legislation. As the President stated in his message of February 5:

> We cannot afford to postpone any longer a reversal in our approach to mental affliction. For too long the shabby treatment of the many millions of the mentally disabled in custodial institutions and many millions more in communities needing help has been justified on grounds of inadequate funds, further studies, and future promises. We can procrastinate no more.

The provisions of this bill, and the community mental health centers as conceptualized in the President's message are soundly based upon recent developments in mental health activities throughout the country. These developments indicate that a large proportion of the mentally ill who previously were thought to require a long-term stay in a State mental hospital can be effectively cared for within their home communities if adequate community services are provided.

For example, some studies show that only approximately 7 percent of the psychiatric patients treated for 2 or 3 weeks in a general hospital are transferred to mental hospitals offering long-term care. In addition, modern treatment methods have made it possible to treat effectively in outpatient facilities many patients who formerly would have required long-term hospitalization. In one study, psychotic patients cared for in a day center were returned to their jobs within 6 weeks. Other patients, with a similar degree of illness, were hospitalized in a State hospital, where their average length of stay was 6 months.

However, in all but a few communities in the country and for all but a few of the mentally ill, patient care within the community is inadequate and poorly coordinated.

The comprehensive community mental health center will provide prompt and comprehensive services—early diagnosis, outpatient and inpatient treatment, and transitional and rehabilitative services. It will be close to the patient's home so that he can reach it when it is needed, and so that his problems can be quickly and effectively dealt with. As his needs change, the patient in such a center can move quickly from one appropriate service to another—basically, he will be able to proceed from diagnosis through treatment and recovery to rehabilitation in the shortest possible time.

In addition, the centers will place a heavy emphasis upon preventing mental illness wherever possible, and in improving the mental health of the community in which it is located.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope and believe that the effect of this legislation, if fully implemented, will be to revolutionize our present system of caring for the mentally ill. It will insure that mentally ill persons are not needlessly hospitalized in State mental hospitals when their illnesses are such that they can appropriately be cared for within the community. And it will insure that the State mental hospital of the future, relieved of the burden of caring for patients who can appropriately be cared for in the community, will function as an effective essential resource within a comprehensive program of mental health care.

However, this bill, as a legislative proposal, is evolutionary, rather than revolutionary. Under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, Federal funds have long been used to help meet the cost of constructing health facilities. And, through grants-in-aid programs to the States, the Federal Government has given some assistance in meeting the costs of staffing outpatient psychiatric clinics.

This new legislation fills out currently existing gaps in Federal legislation designed to help States and Communities meet the health needs of their citizens. It is needed to stimulate the construction of this new type of health facility—one which will, as the President said, "return mental health care to the mainstream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services."

Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have consistently brought the needs of the mentally ill to the attention of this House.

As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that annually considers the administration's Budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have, year after year, urged that adequate funds be appropriated to mount truly effective programs in this field.

Faced with the exciting new possibilities contained in the President's proposals for a national mental health program, the Appropriations Committee reported favorably on the administration's request for increased appropriations to implement many of the President's proposals for which no new legislation is needed.

However, without the passage of a community mental health center bill, it will be impossible to implement the pivotal features of the President's program. I therefore urge that this great legislative body enact this bill.

I am submitting for the RECORD a summary of the bill I now introduce:

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS OF 1963

TITLE I. CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Title I would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make project grants for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers: That is, facilities providing services for the prevention or diagnosis of mental illness, or care and treatment of mentally ill persons, or rehabilitation of persons recovering from mental illness. To be eligible, the centers must provide at least those essential elements of comprehensive mental health services which are prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with regulations, and would have to provide such services in the community. Applications would be submitted to the Secretary after approval by the State agency designated by the State to administer the State plan.

APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations of such sums as the Congress may determine would be authorized for the 5-year period from July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1969.

ALLOTMENTS

The funds appropriated would be allotted among the States on the basis of population, extent of need for community mental health centers, and the financial need of the respective States, with a minimum of $100,000 for any State. Some flexibility in the allotment structure would be permitted in certain situations. First, where two or more States have a joint interest in the construction of a single mental health center, part of one State's allotment could, with the Secretary's approval, be transferred to the allotment of another State to be used for that purpose.

FEDERAL SHARE

A State would be given the alternative of varying—between 45 and 75 percent—the Federal share of the cost of construction of projects within that State in accordance with standards providing equitably for variations among projects or classes of projects on the basis of the economic status of areas and other relevant factors, or of choosing a uniform Federal share—which would not be less than 45 percent and could go as high as 75 percent for some States—for all projects in the State.

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

A State advisory council, composed of representatives of non-Government organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with planning, operating, or utilizing community mental health centers or other mental health facilities, as well as representatives of consumers of the services involved, would consult with the State agency in carrying out the State plan.

STATE PLANS

The State plan would be required to set forth a program for construction of community mental health centers based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities and survey of need for facilities, and to provide for construction in the order of relative need for the facilities, insofar as permitted by available financial resources. The State plan would also have to meet several other requirements, including designating a single State agency as the sole agency to administer the plan; providing methods of administration necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; providing minimum standards for the maintenance and operation of centers constructed under the title; and providing for affording applicants an opportunity for hearing before the State agency.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The Secretary would be required to issue regulations within 6 months after enactment of this title, and after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council—the advisory council for the hospital and medical facilities construction—Hill-Burton—program. The bill would provide for increasing the membership of the Federal Hospital Council from 8 to 12 members, and would require 1 member to be an authority in matters relating to mental illness. The regulations so issued would prescribe first, the kind of community mental health services needed to provide adequate mental health services for persons residing in a State; second, the general manner in which the State agency shall determine priority of projects based on relative need in different areas, giving special consideration to projects on the basis of the extent to which the centers to be constructed will, alone or in conjunction with other facilities owned or operated by or affiliated or associated with the applicant, provide comprehensive mental health services for mentally ill persons in a particular community or communities, or which will be part of or closely associated with a general hospital; third, general standards of construction and equipment of different classes of centers and in different types of location; and fourth, that the State plan shall provide for adequate community mental health centers for people residing in the State, and for adequate centers for serving persons unable to pay therefor.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT APPROVAL

Applicants would have to meet several other requirements set forth in the bill, such as providing assurances that adequate financial support will be available for construction of the project and for maintenance and operation of the center when completed, and that in the construction of the centers all laborers and mechanics will be paid not less than the prevailing wages in the locality, and overtime pay in accordance with and subject to the Contract Work Hours Standards Act.

TITLE II. INITIAL STAFFING OF COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Title II would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to assist in meeting the cost of initial staffing of comprehensive community mental health centers.

APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations of such sums as may be necessary would be authorized for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965.

ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS

To be eligible for grants an applicant must be a public or other nonprofit agency which owns or operates a community mental health center which has received a construction grant under title I of this legislation. Furthermore, the program of services to be provided by the center must include, at least, the following types of service: Diagnostic services, inpatient care, outpatient care, and day care. This program of services must be provided by the center—alone or in conjunction with other facilities owned or operated by, or affiliated or associated with the center—principally for persons residing in a particular community or communities in or near which the center is situated.

DURATION AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS

Grants for staffing a community mental health center could be made only for the period beginning with the commencement of operation of such center and ending 4 years and 3 months later. For the first 15 months of the center's operation, the Federal grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing costs of the center; for the following 3 years the Federal participation in such costs may not exceed 60, 45, and 30 percent, respectively.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The Secretary would be required to consult with the National Mental Health Council in the development of regulations concerning the eligibility of centers and the terms and conditions for approving applications under this title.

EQUAL RIGHTS MEANS EQUAL JUSTICE FOR ALL

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the entire country was shocked at the brutal and cowardly murder in Mississippi of the Negro leader, Medgar Evers. Murder is a dastardly business and its perpetrators should be found and punished.

There is a disturbing element, however, in the murder of the Negro leader and other news items which have gone almost unnoticed. In Hoboken, N.J., last week Walter Glockner, a 27-year-old truckdriver, was shot in the back and killed. He left two small daughters and a young widow. Mr. Glockner was murdered because he was fighting for more democracy and better treatment for the members of his local union. As the Nation mourned for Medgar Evers and the President sent a message of sympathy to his widow and the Attorney General promised full cooperation of the FBI to bring the murderers to justice, there were few who knew of the murder of Walter Glockner, and as an editorial in the Wall Street Journal asks, "who mourns for Walter Glockner?"

This morning the radio newscasts are telling of a young white soldier here in Washington who was stomped to death last night after being dragged from his car by seven Negroes. Where is the outcry for this boy? Will the President call his mother? Will the Attorney General turn out the full force of the FBI to bring to justice the ruthless thugs who unconstitutionally murdered him?

Mr. Speaker, the scales of justice must be balanced for the protection of all law-abiding citizens of every color, race, and national origin. We cannot allow white men to die at the hands of Negroes without just as vigorous protest and all-out effort to bring to justice the murderers as when a Negro dies. Medgar Evers was fighting for a cause in which he believed as was Walter Glockner and the American soldier died for no reason at all at the hands of depraved assailants, but they will all have lived and died in vain and others of both the white and black race will die at the hands of mobs or cowards unless the forces of law and order and power of the Government dispenses justice equally and does not make martyrs out of slain Negroes, and just statistics of white men who die at the hands of thugs or, as in the case in Washington last night, at the hands of Negroes.

Let us pray that the God-fearing people of America, both colored and white will rise in justified anger at using death as a political weapon and demand that all the forces of law and order be brought into play to bring to justice those who defy the laws, those who commit murder.

As a part of these remarks and so that there will be some to mourn Walter Glockner, I include the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 18:

Two Murders

As he left home early that morning, three .38 caliber bullets tore into his back. Thus, on a Hoboken, N.J., street, ended the life of Walter Glockner, 27, truck driver. Besides his young widow, he left two small daughters, one only 2 months old.

As Medgar Evers returned to his Jackson, Miss., home from a church rally last week, he was shot to death by a sniper in ambush. Thirty-seven years old, Mississippi field secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Evers left a wife and three children.

For years Mr. Evers, a veteran, had been working actively for better treatment—more democracy and fuller freedom—of Negroes. That is why he was killed.

For some time Mr. Glockner, a veteran, had been working actively for better treatment—more democracy and fuller freedom—of members of his union local. That, beyond any reasonable doubt, is why he was killed.

So both men fought for justice, each in his own way, and each suffered the most unjust penalty. The murder of the Negro was, as the President said, an act of appalling barbarity. The Nation, North and South, agreed and, mourning, will inter Medgar Evers in Arlington National Cemetery.

But who, outside his family and friends, mourns for Walter Glockner?

Remembering Walter Glockner, the young soldier, and many others who have been attacked by Negroes we can well conclude, in view of the President's lopsided interest, that we are now indeed witnessing discrimination for Negroes and against whites with death being used one-sidedly as a political weapon.

ADDRESS OF HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN AT UNITED JEWISH APPEAL DINNER

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 17, I was privileged to be the guest of honor at a dinner given in New York City by the United Jewish Appeal. In my address I took exception to the suggestion recently made by our Secretary of State that massive aid be given to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

I submit herewith my address in its entirety:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished rabbis, and guests, all of us sometimes find that we must disagree most vigorously with people whom we respect and admire. I find myself in this position with respect to our Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, whom I admire greatly, but whose position on some aspects of our foreign policy is in my opinion outrageously shortsighted.

I refer, for the moment, to Mr. Rusk's policy of granting the United Arab Republic massive aid under our food-for-peace program. Supporters of such aid point out that most of our money and resources goes to feed the hungry people of Egypt directly. They ignore the indirect effect of such massive food shipments. Clearly as a result of our aid it becomes unnecessary for Mr. Nasser to sell his cotton to obtain funds with which to buy food. The millions of dollars Nasser would otherwise have to spend for food, he now has available for his own designs. He uses these millions to stir up revolts in peaceful nations by means of the best financed propaganda machine in the Middle East. He uses the money to pay German scientists to develop modern weapons of war and destruction to use against America's friends. He uses the moneys to bomb and terrorize open and unprotected villages in Yemen.

We in the United States, through our shipments of food to Nasser, are contributing immeasurably to Nasser's ability to carry out his destructive plans just as though we gave him the cash. He uses the money we save him to purchase arms and equipment from the Soviet Union which his constitution decrees should be used to destroy, or as he puts it, liberate, the State of Israel.

We are gathered here as friends not alone of Leonard Farbstein but as friends of Israel. This little nation oriented to the West is (as you all know) surrounded by those who would drive it into the sea.

Therefore it is hard to believe that any official agency of the United States would not be sympathetic to the survival of this remnant of 6 million Jews who were incinerated not so many years ago. However, the State Department has subordinated Israel's interests to that of the Arab nations since President Truman imposed recognition upon it. In the presence of clear threat, we find that the State Department of our great Nation continues to play it cool insofar as Israel is concerned. This unfortunate situation has existed in this country since the recognition of Israel 15 years ago. At that time the State Department, under Secretary Acheson, objected to the recognition of Israel, but to his great credit, President Truman wisely met the situation and the United States was the first major power that recognized Israel.

Under President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles caused the withdrawal of England, France, and Israel from the Sinai Desert. In my opinion and in the opinion of authoritative sources, one of our greatest blunders.

The answer to the constantly negative position of the State Department in its approach to what we all believe should be their attitude toward the Arab-Israeli situation must be the attitude taken by the President of the United States. Fortunately President Kennedy has made his position clear in his news conference which followed my letter objecting to the State Department's answer to the threat posed by the German scientists in Egypt.

President Kennedy stated: "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I introduced a resolution that would authorize the withholding of all foreign aid to nations who would use such aid to obtain weapons of aggression. However, the record of the Foreign Affairs Committee in my time is such that the passing of an amendment making such withholding of aid mandatory unlikely. Therefore, in pursuit of the possible, I am offering the following amendment to the foreign aid bill and hope and expect that it will be enacted.

"It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which do not, as a result of U.S. assistance, divert their own economic resources to military and propaganda efforts, directed against the United States or against other countries receiving said aid under this act, and whether or not such efforts are supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China."

The adoption of this amendment will serve to inform both our State Department and the nations of the world, particularly of the Middle East, the position of the Congress toward nations that divert their resources to military and propaganda efforts directed against the United States and our friends.

I do not oppose feeding the hungry in Egypt, no thinking person or persons of good will could possibly do so. It is unreasonable, however, for conditions to be imposed upon the recipients of our largesse. Is it unreasonable to request, yes, demand—

1. That the granting of aid be preceded by agreement to preserve the peace?

2. That those countries receiving our aid who are not being threatened by external forces, forgo building aggressive arsenals using our aid as a means?

I think my amendment is fully in line with the President's position. Whether the nation be Egypt or any other power that seeks to expand its offensive ability, our foreign aid should certainly not contribute to that nation's ability to wage aggressive war.

For those of us who are gathered here, the preservation of the integrity of the State of Israel is a matter of great concern. To those of us who are Jews, Israel represents the fulfillment of an ancient and burning vision. It is an outpost of popular, democratic government in a part of the world otherwise ridden with tyranny and despotism. It stands as a fortress of freedom and a haven of refuge for the homeless and oppressed. For all Americans it stands out as an example of what youth, dedication, and courage can achieve against overwhelming obstacles.

Your presence here today is a tribute to the cause of freedom, democracy, and peace in the Middle East and elsewhere.

I am personally grateful to each of you for being with me here tonight and I give you my solemn assurance that I will fight this battle for freedom, democracy, and peace as a Jew and as an American.

Thank you.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, since the 1 minute allotted us at this time is totally inadequate to intelligently address myself to the President's message just presented to Congress, I have asked unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

Today's request by the administration for new authority in the field of civil rights will go down as the most excessive grab for power in the history of this country. This demand for unconstitutional and unwarranted legislation will not accomplish its stated objectives but will serve only to inflame an already inflamed situation. It will add to and perpetuate chaos rather than provide solutions. It will inflame passions rather than pacify or eliminate current tensions.

As I, and many others, have often observed, legislation without education will yield far more harm than good in this field. One does not have to read very closely the demands by current mob leaders to realize that their demands exceed their capability to absorb. A yielding to such demands would result only in greater frustration when the emptiness of their victory was realized. Only through education and the efforts and understanding of men of good will can any meaningful progress be made in human relations. Punitive legislation can only embitter.

As strongly as I condemn mob rule and excessive Federal power, I condemn even more so the do-gooders, liberal eggheads, and political power seekers who seek to cloak their lust for power with the Constitution and to disguise their selfish interests with the respectability of lawful authority. They are more interested in votes than in solutions. Their interest in their own political security obliterates their interest in our national security. They seek to perpetuate problems rather than solve problems. To many of them accelerated tensions guarantee fatter pocketbooks. Solutions would kill their golden goose.

Today's proposals will take away from our businessman, already harassed by Federal tax laws and the regulations of countless agencies, the basic right to risk his capital and run his business as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, is it not axiomatic that if one presumably has a right to buy from whomever and whenever he pleases there is a corresponding and coequal right for one to sell to whomever and whenever he pleases? Already we have seen naked Federal power used without lawful authority in the field of Government contracts. Now we see an attempt to control the businessman's dealings with private citizens. No longer will he be willing to reinvest his profits, enlarge his business, and create additional employment opportunities. Our employment situation, already a significant national problem, will be further aggravated.

Why are the proponents of these measures so obviously inconsistent in their approach to this matter? We have seen the murder of a white man in North Carolina dismissed as an unfortunate incident while the murder of a black man in Mississippi is said to be a blot on the conscience of the Nation. We have heard the President tell the mayors of this country in Hawaii that the problem was local in nature and two nights later tell the world that the Federal Government must provide the solution.

Why should the administration, the do-gooders, leftwingers, and vote-seeking politicians continue to make the great Southland the whipping boy on this issue? We have heard them condemn the use of police dogs in Alabama and ignore their use in Harlem. Nor have they mentioned that police dogs have to be used on the steps of the Capitol here in Washington nor that policemen without dogs are ordered to walk their beats in pairs for their own safety in this model city. No mention has been made of the firing on police cars that have occurred in Maryland and Virginia. These observations show a most unjustified double standard which utterly fails of comprehension.

Yielding to no man in my love of liberty and the Constitution and my desire to see every man, regardless of the color of his skin, treated fairly, I will oppose these measures with all the fervor of my being, aided and abetted by the knowledge that in doing so I labor in the cause of mankind rather than in the cause of turmoil and strife. The experience in Cambridge, Md., should prove conclusively to any openminded person that passage of laws alone, without the accompanying patience, education, and good will, will do more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen must realize that issues are not settled in streets.

MORE ON WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a little more to say today about the expenditure of your defense dollars. On June 3 I received a procurement document providing for sole-source procurement of 421 attitude indicators.

Most Members are by now familiar with my study of defense procurement and the waste and inefficiency I have uncovered. Even the most blase should listen to this latest case I have developed against the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency. It will curl your hair, if it doesn't get you so hot that the hair turns off the top of your head.

On May 28, 1963, the Army Electronics Materiel Agency issued a sole-source—no competition—procurement document—RFP No. AMC(E) 36-039-63-10651-B4. It proposed to buy 421 equipments known as the ID-999/ASN Attitude Indicator. On the front of the request for proposal—which was mailed to only one company—was a printed warning:

> Notice is hereby given that specifications, plans, or drawings relating to the procurement described below are either not available or are insufficient to provide all necessary manufacturing and construction details.

Curious as to what sort of specialized equipment this might be, and feeling that, as in the past, this certification of no drawings might be an attempt to channel a contract to a favored producer, I requested U.S. Army liaison officers to obtain for me: First, all copies of past contracts for this equipment; second, a set of manufacturing drawings for the equipment; third, a copy of the documents that justified the sole-source procurement. That request was made on June 3, 1963, the day I received the bid set in my office.

On June 7, Brig. Gen. Allen Stanwix-Hay, commander of the Army Electronics Materiel Agency at Philadelphia, wrote me, supplying me with part of the information I requested which showed that:

First. The Army planned to spend $338,000 for 421 of the attitude indicators used to provide a visual indication of flight attitude.

Second. The reason for the sole-source (no competition) award was that the Government has insufficient technical information and cannot define the item in detail.

General Stanwix-Hay added two paragraphs at the end of his letter. One said it was the first time this item had been bought by USAEMA. The second said that he had directed the procurement be canceled since the investigation I requested uncovered available stock in other agencies of the Department of Defense to fill the need. Of course, this last statement represented an immediate saving of $338,000 to the taxpayers of this country, and for that I was grateful.

But I was also curious. I telephoned General Stanwix-Hay and asked him who had made the equipment before, how much was paid for it, and how many were on hand. At the same time, I also requested the Army, Navy, and Air Force liaison offices to make a similar check. To date, this is what I have learned. The equipment has been purchased since 1950. It costs about $800 per unit. It has been purchased by both the Navy and Air Force. At this very moment, there are over 12,000 pieces of this equipment scattered around in depots all over the country. Over 8,500 can be used right now. Another 3,600 can be repaired and placed in use.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is no scarcity of this equipment. The Army's needs can be filled from present stocks without even making a dent in this huge surplus. There is no reason for there being insufficient procurement data available. This item has been purchased for over 13 years.

The Navy has even told me that its ID-999/ASN equipment is being used simply as a backup for later-model equipment and that an entirely new attitude indicator is soon to be developed.

I might add at this point that I have asked other questions to get to the bottom of this fantastic hoax. I want to know who was responsible for this attempt to pick the taxpayers' pockets to the tune of $338,000. Thus far, the only name I have is that of Mary D. Regan, a contracting officer at Philadelphia. I am sure there will be more names when my questions are answered.

Mr. Speaker, this proves what I have been contending for 2 years. In this one instance there has been an attempt to shove through an emergency sole-source purchase for 338,000 U.S. taxpayers' dollars for equipment that, first, exists in abundant stockpiles; second, has been bought for over 13 years; and third, is almost obsolete.

This is another illustration of what a single Member of this House can do when he gets bidding information at the same time the various procurement arms of the Defense Department mail them out. When you spot the waste in front of the deal, you can save the taxpayers' money.

Yesterday, I chronicled waste of $17 million. Today, I point to a $338,000 saving for the taxpayer. Tomorrow, I shall show how officials, through ignorance or design, ignore laws this Congress passes which are intended to control just this sort of activity.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 4409, will set up a joint, nonpartisan committee of this Congress to maintain surveillance over just such negotiated procurements. Such a committee could spot hundreds of instances of waste such as the one I have detailed today. Such a committee, properly constituted, could more than pay for itself the first day it started operations. It could also bring the procurement branches into line, force more efficient buying of defense hardware and bring about sizable and significant reductions in the cost of national defense.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL RIGHTS MESSAGE

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the President at long last has sent Congress a civil rights message and legislation. With some exceptions, I think it is good legislation. The bulk of it in fact is legislation that I and 30 other Republicans in the House have introduced and have long pressed.

The President's legislation is more limited than ours. It is padded with unnecessary verbiage to give the impression that it goes further than it does, and parts of it are inartistically drafted. But on the whole it is good and should be considered without delay by the Judiciary Committee. The administration has already delayed legislation far too long on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I must express my concern also over the President's trip abroad at this time. I question the wisdom of it under the present circumstances, and I would urge him to reconsider. I can see no specific purpose that can be served by the trip, particularly in view of the fact that since the plans were made the Pope has died and a new Pope has not been elected, the Italian Government is in disarray, there are political pressures in Germany over Adenauer's successor, De Gaulle remains adamant, and an explosion in England over the Profumo case would not assist any constructive discussions with Macmillan.

Meanwhile, our own country is faced with the possibility of severe and imminent explosion. President Kennedy and his brother are only beginning to comprehend the meaning of the demonstrations that have occurred, and I think it most unwise for the President to leave the country in the midst of such heat and tension. If he really means business with this legislation he should mobilize the people of the United States behind it — now, not later.

POLICIES OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the evidence is now overwhelming that the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, has either established or is actively condoning a system which requires commissioned officers of the U.S. armed services and their civilian subordinates to deceive Members of the Congress of the United States with respect to the award of contracts. In setting a pattern that requires officers and civilians to hoodwink Members of Congress, the Secretary of Defense is thrice guilty. By deliberately misleading in small matters the Department of Defense destroys the confidence of the Congress in any information that it may transmit. In requiring professional military men to participate in these uncouth deceptions the Secretary is corrupting the code of honor that has been a badge of pride for America's fightingmen for 187 years. In unsuccessfully attempting to deceive me, the Department of Defense does not so much do me a disservice as it insults the nearly 700,000 people who sent me here.

The following telephone messages were received by, or originated in my office on Tuesday, June 18, 1963, at the approximate times indicated:

> Noon: Received message that the News, a daily paper in Frederick, Md., had just got a news release concerning the award of a $4.5 million contract for the construction of additional facilities at Fort Ritchie.
>
> Immediately called House Army liaison to ask who in the Department of Defense could provide wording of the release. Was referred to code 11, extension 53357.
>
> At 12:05 p.m.: Called the office of the Chief of Contract Support Division, Mr. Webb, code 11, extension 53357, and was advised Mr. Webb was not available and the office had no information concerning the contract. Referred to Mr. Hillman, code 11, extension 79085.
>
> Immediately called Mr. Hillman's office and was referred to Mr. Richardson or Mr. Millard, code 11, extension 74529 or extension 53941.
>
> Immediately called code 11, extension 53941, Mr. Richardson, who regretfully declined to give any information and referred call to code 11, extension 78131.
>
> Immediately called code 11, extension 78131, and was told by an unidentified staff member that news of any such contract had not been released and that it was not known when it would be available. Requested further details by 12:30 p.m., but no further response was forthcoming by that time.
>
> At 12:45 p.m.: Called House Army liaison and was assured that an attempt would be made to secure the information.
>
> At 1 p.m.: Received call from House Army liaison advising, on the authority of Col. William J. Love, code 11, extension 78131, that a release would be made at 3 p.m. from the Pentagon and that Mr. MATHIAS would be advised at that time.
>
> At 2:58 p.m.: Received call from Mrs. Dugan, code 11, extension 78131, stating: "Baltimore district engineer awarding the contract today to Frederick Construction Co., Inc., 615 North Market Street, Frederick, Md., $4,407,527. The contract is for classified increment No. 2 for Alternate Joint Communications Center at Fort Ritchie, Md."

WHO NOW MAKES THE LAW?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Arizona against California water dispute has left many unanswered questions.

I do not intend to challenge the judgment of the Court in as far as the normal allocation of the Colorado River water is concerned. The water allotments the Court decided were fair and equitable for the States involved are not an issue.

However, the outstanding question yet to be answered is—how much or how little water will the States get if there is a water surplus or a water shortage?

The special master, appointed by the Court to report on the case, heard 340 witnesses, compiled a transcript of 25,000 pages, and filed a report of 433 pages. It was his considered opinion that any water surplus should be divided equally between California and Arizona, and that in the event of a shortage water should be divided between the States in proportion to their normal allotments.

This proposal, while not perfect, appears to have considerable merit.

A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, however, have arrived at a different solution. The Court has decided that the Secretary of the Interior shall decide, in any way he sees fit, the apportionment of water to the various Western States in the event of a surplus or a shortage. Furthermore, in reaching his decision he shall not be bound by any prior contract, compact, or formula.

Mr. Speaker, from where does the Secretary of the Interior draw this broad authority? By what right does the Secretary of the Interior have the power to give or withhold the lifeblood of the West—water?

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior has been given this economic stranglehold by the Congress of the United States. At least, that is the opinion of a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court. Congress has thought so little of its legislative authority that it has passed vital questions of policy, life and death questions of economic importance, to the head of a department operated by Federal civil servants.

I do not believe it, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States would knowingly relinquish such vital authority to a bureaucrat, and in fact at least three members of the U.S. Supreme Court do not believe it either.

Justices Douglas, Harlan, and Stewart have defended the right of the Congress to make its voice heard in these matters.

Justice Douglas has said in this case:

> It will, I think, be marked as the baldest attempt by judges in modern times to spin their own philosophy into the fabric of the law, in derogation of the will of the legislature. The present decision, as Mr. Justice Harlan shows, grants the Federal bureaucracy a power and command over water rights in the 17 Western States that it never has had, that it always wanted, that it could never persuade Congress to grant, and that this Court up to now has consistently refused to recognize.

Mr. Speaker, could anything be plainer than that? A respected Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, in council with two of his colleagues, has handed this Nation the real question of the latter half of the 20th century.

Who now makes the law? Does Congress make the law? Does the executive branch make the law? Does the U.S. Supreme Court make the law? Or, does the Federal bureaucracy make the law?

This is the real and vital issue now struggling in the sinews of the American body politic. I have not been a Member of this distinguished House for long, but I have found that this question presents itself to me almost every day.

I have had letters, Mr. Speaker, from agencies of our Government questioning my right as a Congressman to ask simple questions for information on matters pending before the Federal departments and agencies.

I have been warned by officials within the giant structure of the bureaucracy that a request for information can constitute an improper communication. I have been threatened that any letter I write will be made a matter of the public file, as though this should be something I would shy away from.

I have found agencies of this Government, created by the Congress, refusing to supply information to the Congress, and furthermore adopting rules and regulations that are never written or printed and cannot be questioned by either a member of the public or a Member of this House. In none of these instances, Mr. Speaker, was the agency involved engaged in any secret or security matters.

It is clear to me, from my own experience, that the Federal bureaucracy day by day is in fact making law. We have of necessity created this monster, and have given it broad authority within which to manage the public's affairs. I fear we have given it far too much authority for the public good.

It used to be said, Mr. Speaker, that the President proposes and the Congress disposes. Of course it has been a long time since that was true. By a hundred and one different ways the executive branch is making law. It makes little difference whether the President of the day is a member of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. The trend is always in the same direction. World events in the past 50 years have done much to aid this drift, and Congress has clearly failed to insist on all its rightful authority and on all its rightful privilege.

The U.S. Supreme Court was intended, if my education is not in error, to interpret the Constitution and to advise the legislative authority on constitutional matters. There is no question but that the Court has strayed a long way from that original path.

With every major decision the Court hands down new laws are made. Our entire way of life in this country is being revised and remolded by the nine Justices of the Supreme Court. Our Founding Fathers would stand in shocked amazement if they could see the changes this last century has made in traditional concepts and attitudes.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that almost everyone is making law except the Congress. Many of our citizens wonder where it will all end.

However, this reversal of roles within our society can be brought to an end. I am sure of that. If Congress will stand up and demand its rightful place within our Government all these unconstitutional empires will crumble and wither away.

The Congress must make the law. Our Government was created around this central concept. Mr. Speaker, I trust a committee will be empowered to review this entire problem and will make a full report, with recommendations to this honorable body as soon as may be practical.

ARM TWISTING ON A HIGH LEVEL

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted an excellent column that recently appeared in one of America's great newspapers, the Minneapolis Tribune. The column was written by Richard Wilson, chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau. He reflects a point of view that I would like to share with my colleagues. Mr. Wilson brings to our attention an alarming situation that many of us have noted; a situation that threatens basic freedoms of many Americans through unwarranted pressures from certain areas of the Federal Government.

The article is as follows:

ARM TWISTING ON A HIGH LEVEL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques of the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm twisting method was previously noted in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million national cultural center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it, for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of physchologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government action. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up.

He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issue in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, deputy administrator for State and county operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough. They wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service times of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Mr. Speaker, it is alarming that radio and television stations should be subjected to these kinds of Government pressures. These stations, of course, are required to present divergent points of views, but they constitute great forces in the distribution of news and information to the public, much like our great newspapers. Therefore, our electronic media must be guaranteed the same freedom of press to make sure they operate in the public interest and not for what could be a one-sided Federal view. This danger to broadcasters' right and responsibility could lead to even more serious problems in the distribution of public information. The licenses of these stations do not belong to the Government; they belong to the people.

MILLBURY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and very much pleased to bring to the attention of the House that the town of Millbury, Mass., in my district is celebrating this week its 150th anniversary with an outstanding program of activities to commemorate this great event.

In recognition of this anniversary, I am introducing an appropriate resolution for the consideration of the House which extends greetings and congratulations to the community on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Millbury from a part of Sutton in 1813.

It was on June 11, 1813, that Gov. Caleb Strong signed the bill approved the day before by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to incorporate the town of Millbury. At the time of incorporation, Millbury had a population of about 500.

Town annals indicate that Millbury was almost named Moscow, but this proposal was defeated in town meeting.

Located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the early days of American history, Millbury has grown from this small beginning into a thriving and prosperous community of some 10,000 people. Today, Millbury is a busy business and industrial town, offering steady employment for many of its residents. In addition, nearby Worcester employs many townspeople.

As far back as the Revolution, the manufacture of firearms and ammunition brought renown to Millbury. The first armory employing water power in the manufacture of guns was established in Millbury. The only powdermill in this section was erected by the Province in the early days of the Revolution. The production of the Sutton Waters Armory, owned by the Waters brothers, Asa and Andrus, was a most valuable contribution to the cause of freedom since the colonies were hard pressed for arms at the beginning of the Revolution when imports were cut off.

Millbury arms were used in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Civil War.

The first papermill in central Massachusetts was established in Millbury. The first scythes and many improved agricultural implements made in the country were manufactured in Millbury.

Millbury can also lay claim to the principle of mass production through the interchangeability of parts and machines and implements because it is in Millbury that Thomas Blanchard conceived and perfected the cam-motion principle.

While the U.S. armory at Springfield has been cited as the birthplace of the Blanchard eccentric lathe for turning irregular forms, Millbury is actually the place where the eccentric lathe was invented and first constructed. Blanchard was later connected with the Springfield Armory and later supplements of the machine were produced there.

However, history shows that the first Blanchard machine to be set up in Springfield was carted over the roads from Millbury. After another model was produced in Springfield, the original lathe was returned to Millbury where it was used for about 20 years in the Waters Armory.

This and other Blanchard inventions were the forerunners of mass production and it can be truly said that the Blanchard eccentric lathe revolutionized gunmaking and later affected every industry where irregular forms were made or used.

Millbury also claims Dr. Leonard Gale, who assisted Samuel B. Morse in perfecting the telegraph.

Long before women's suffrage became a reality, Millbury voted in town meeting on March 20, 1882, to request the State legislature to extend to women who are citizens the right to hold town offices and to vote in town affairs on the same terms as male citizens.

Millbury is justly proud that President William Howard Taft spent part of his boyhood in the town and maintained his ties with the town throughout his life. In fact, Taft attended the Millbury centennial celebration in 1913 and was a guest speaker at the centennial banquet.

His mother was a member of the highly esteemed Torrey family of Millbury. After her husband's death, Mrs. Taft resided in Millbury. As a boy, Taft attended the public schools of Millbury and in later years often visited his grandfather, Samuel D. Torrey.

In these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible for me to recount in full the story of this historic Massachusetts town, but I would like to pay richly deserved tribute to the early settlers of Sutton and Millbury who helped to build this great country of ours with their magnificent sacrifices, struggles, and accomplishments. The record of their superb work and contributions lives to this day and Millbury can take justifiable pride in the remarkable legacy it now possesses.

After several previous attempts to form a separate township, Millbury became a reality in 1813. Farming was the main occupation, but swift running streams in the area led to small industrial enterprises, some to meet the need for farm implements and other goods.

Completion of the Blackstone Canal in 1828 helped speed the growth of the town. In 1830 alone some 1,000 new residents were attracted to Millbury and the growth of the town can be linked to its advantageous position on or near major travel routes. First it was the Blackstone Canal, which gave way in 1847 to the Providence & Worcester Railroad. With the decline of the railroads, industry in the town turned to the nearby fast highways to carry Millbury-made products to the big distribution centers of Boston and New York.

I am prompted on this occasion to say a word about the leadership and the people of Millbury with special emphasis on the founding fathers. Like most New England communities, Millbury originated in the painstaking work and bitter sacrifice of pioneer settlers. On April 19, 1775, the alarm from Lexington reached the mother town of Sutton and 11 minutemen immediately rallied to the cry for aid from the embattled farmers and subsequently 56 men from the area served in the Revolution. During the Civil War, Millbury furnished 346 men, which was 26 over the town's quota. In World Wars I and II and the Korean war, Millbury men fought and died on battlefronts far from home.

The Millbury of today embodies these same pioneer qualities of outstanding leadership, patriotism, and devotion to basic values and fundamental institutions and I am very proud that this great community with its capable, public-spirited leaders and devoted and loyal people is a part of my great congressional district.

Millbury, after 150 years of progress and accomplishment, looks to the future with vibrant confidence born of its illustrious heritage and past successes, inspired by an able and vigorous leadership and sustained by a loyal and devoted people.

I predict that Millbury will continue to move ahead in growth, progress, and prosperity in the years to come, ever growing stronger in a material sense and ever preserving and enhancing that quality of spiritual dedication for which it is noted and which will continue to engender in its citizenry those close ties of loyalty, respect, and affection which are so essential to American community life and so valuable in safeguarding the fountainhead of American enterprise and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to introduce in the House a special resolution bringing attention to the 150th anniversary of Millbury, which I have had the honor to represent in Congress for more than 20 years, and extending the congratulations of the House to the people of this fine community. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of my resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. RES. 404

Whereas the year 1963 marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Millbury, Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of settlement in 1716 the people of Millbury have figured conspicuously in the founding and growth of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Millbury is being celebrated during the week of June 16 with impressive community ceremonies which will attract many visitors to central Massachusetts; and

Whereas Millbury is a progressive community rich in historic interest, distinguished for its fervent civic spirit, and faithfully devoted to American institutions and ideals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Millbury, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Millbury during the past one hundred and fifty years.

PRAYER IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision, a decision which strikes a blow at the very heart and essence of America—its spiritual heritage.

For as the Supreme Court spoke, it barred from the public schools both the Lord's Prayer and the Bible. It ruled that the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in our public schools is unconstitutional.

As I watched a number of television newscasts that evening following the decision, a number of commentators said that Members of Congress had not raised a sharp cry of protest as in the New York case in 1962. I think we hardly had time to do so, but I feel that a deep feeling of shock is in many of us, and I for one proudly raise my voice in protest.

This is the Nation which Lincoln declared "Under God shall have a new birth of freedom," this is the land which places upon its currency the legend "in God we trust," a land which was built by a deeply religious people.

I need not remind you that only a few short weeks ago, Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper stood in this House and uttered again the prayer that he had given while on his historic flight. Contrast this if you will with the Russian Cosmonaut who mocked after he descended that he saw no God up there.

I think this is the fundamental difference in our two nations, the difference between freemen and those who live under atheistic communism. And I believe our deep religious faith has sustained this land.

The first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This provision was adopted so that no state religion could be adopted, and with this principle we all agree.

But we do not agree that the simple recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of the Bible violate the Constitution. Justice Stewart in his dissent in the New York case in 1962 said that the Court had "misapplied a great constitutional principle." For him, the question presented by the case was whether "those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each schoolday."

In writing for the majority in the present decision, Justice Clark conjured up all sorts of dreadful prospects if the Court should allow prayer to be said in the public schools. He said that this departed from the concept of a government that must be neutral in religious matters. Why so long in finding this out?

It seems to a great many of us that it is quite a different thing to say that the Constitution forbids one child, who may wish to do so, to recite the Lord's Prayer in a public school, merely because some other child, who does not want to pray and who is not required to pray, objects.

I, and many of my colleagues, have introduced bills to amend the Constitution to allow prayer in the public schools. They await committee hearing. Under this latest ruling, I would say it is doubly important that they be given a hearing and begin moving.

The Constitution was adopted by men, and in my personal opinion has been woefully and willfully misinterpreted, and it has been and can be changed by men.

And I say that we need that change, and we need it now. We need to allow our schools to continue these short devotionals.

This is a very real challenge for us today as Members of the Congress. Let us live up to that challenge. Let us begin to move here and now to pass this constitutional amendment to allow prayer in our public schools.

And then let the people of these United States through the due process of law have the opportunity to speak on the subject. Religious freedom must be protected, but this decision is religious oppression and it was never intended that it be thus by the founders of our land and the framers of the Constitution.

I hope we will be able to get a bill before the House for a constitutional amendment to rectify this mistake.

POSTAL GUIDELINES PROGRAM SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the Postal Operations Subcommittee in opposition to the continuation of the guidelines system in the Post Office Department:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE POSTAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, JUNE 18, 1963

Mr. Chairman, to anyone concerned with the rights and dignity of man, the latest work measurement system put into effect by the Post Office Department is an affront. It is a system which takes no account of the human element and postal clerk morale has suffered badly as a consequence. The United Federation of Postal Clerks has made repeal of this system its most important issue this year and has turned to the Congress for aid.

The postal clerks have been forced to involve the Congress as the Post Office Department has refused to negotiate the issue. Although the federation has obtained exclusive right to represent all postal clerks nationally on working conditions and other matters, the contract signed March 20 ignores work measurement. Perhaps the Post Office Department feels that this system is a part of management "rights" or "prerogatives." But any system which has aroused so much hard feeling among loyal employees merits negotiation. Industrial unions have been able to bring similar issues into the bargaining sphere and the Post Office's attitude seems unduly rigid.

Let me quote a few references to this system by the affected postal employees in various sections of the country. The president of the postal clerk union in Boston said that "* * * the use of entirely unrealistic standards has caused a new low of employee morale in the post office. The honest and hard worker who for many years has given the Department good production is being discriminated against due to the unrealistic standards and the deceit of fellow workers who have less scruples in the means they employ to secure production slips." A postal clerk from Worcester, Mass., writes "* * * that this system has been a destructive double-talking instrument that has said what it didn't mean, and meant what it didn't say * * * it has inflicted an injustice and disservice to every distributor in the postal service." A Columbia, S.C., local felt "* * * that this system can lead employees into a mental state that may result in individual nervous disorders." Seattle, Wash., clerks call the system a "* * * hateful and unfair practice of individual harassment." Members of a Brooklyn local paraded in our National Capital carrying placards which demanded the burial of the guidelines. Surely this is an authentic grassroots cry for redress.

Why has the Post Office Department inflicted this system upon its workers? It claims that it would have to spend $100 million more a year if the work measurement system were eliminated, but this estimate is open to question. Frankly, I do not believe it. How much money is spent to operate this system—to count and tabulate, to revise and restudy standards? In some cases employees have been told that standards which have been heretofore vigorously defended by management are to be changed. Of course, most of these standards are changed in the upward direction, sometimes as much as 15 percent. How accurate and scientific is such a system?

The fallacy of all work measurement systems from the time of Frederick Taylor, the pioneer of the scientific management movement, is the failure to take into account the individual differences of workers. Taylor's standard of the "quickest time of the most expert men" is no longer used, but some of the current standards are as open to question. They all assume that there is one best way for all of the workers performing the task. They all proclaim that they are scientific but fail to prove it.

An Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Frederick C. Belen, in testimony before House Appropriations Committee hearings last February, stated his belief in the superiority of the Post Office measuring system over that carried on in private industry. "I think," said Mr. Belen, "in almost every instance where a job is measurable, private enterprise measures it, but I do not think it is done as scientifically or on as widespread an area as we do. I believe that we have the largest work measurement system that exists." Perhaps the Post Office does have the largest system but that hardly proves that it is the best or the most scientific. Indeed, the Post Office has had to abandon national standards in favor of local standards. Applying generalized data to specific widespread operations must have been too much even for the Post Office's superscientific staff.

What basis does the Post Office have for thinking that its work measurement system is more scientific than those existing in industry? Industry assembly lines work with standard components and products but the product of the Post Office is not uniform. The legibility of addresses will vary. The size and thickness of letters will vary. Business metered mail is often presorted. One clerk was able to sort at a rate 250 percent above the standard by handling metered mail. Also, the Post Office cannot control the volume of mail handled as a manufacturing plant can control its output. Post offices must service the mail as it comes in. All of these variables make it highly unlikely that Post Office standards can ever be the same as those of industry.

Over the years, the Post Office has had a number of systems; WPS, work performance standards, BMT, basic motion time study, and equated pieces of mail production, EPOM. All of these purported to be accurate and scientific, yet they were all superseded. The newest system is an outgrowth of the other systems and it is still a work-counting system and a speed-up.

It seems to me that the speed-up aspects of the current Post Office work measurement system were admitted by Mr. Belen in another part of his testimony. "Basically," he said, "what we have is a system that measures units. The individual is only measured 25 percent of the time. We find there is a definite increase in productivity during the individual count week. Now, we do not propose to say that they could maintain that for 4 weeks in a row." If an individual is forced to work at a pace 1 week exceeding what he can possibly be expected to maintain for a month, it seems to me that this is certainly a speed-up. Furthermore, Mr. Belen admits that 99 percent of the postal employees are doing a good job. Why, then, have a work measurement system costing millions to maintain? Just to find the 1 percent or less who are doing a poor job? This tiny minority always finds a way to beat the system, as their fellow employees have pointed out. An elaborate system is not needed to ferret out this type of employee. Firm supervision will do the job.

The Post Office Department has to cope with an increasing volume of mail, and it is all well and good to look for ways to increase productivity. The human element, however, must never be forgotten. A high morale is essential to high productivity.

In the past the Congress has demonstrated its concern for the workers affected by work measurement systems. A bill was passed in 1915 which provided that no Federal funds could be used to pay anyone "making or causing to be made with a stopwatch or other time-measuring device" a time study. Today stopwatches are no longer used, but the aim of the work measurement system is the same—to impose rigid standards upon workers. I join with my many colleagues who have already expressed disapproval of these standards. The Congress must act to remove this system which has been so damaging to the morale of the postal clerks. It is doing no good. It is doing a great deal of harm.

PUBLIC LAW 78, THE BRACERO ACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this House was recently urged to grant a 2-year extension to Public Law 78, the Bracero Act.

This House in its wisdom saw fit to reject the extension. I should hope that we will reject any extension of this law. One of the reasons is that this act perpetuates a kind of peonage.

How this can happen was described some years ago by a man familiar with this program. This man, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, wrote:

> The life of a Mexican national working in American agriculture is not all sweetness and light. On paper he is protected by the International Agreement and the standard work contract approved by our Government and that of Mexico. Wages, food, housing, collective bargaining, and guaranteed employment are all covered in these documents. Take, for example, the question of wages. The International Agreement states: "The Mexican consulate and the representatives of the Secretary of Labor will be given a reasonable opportunity to ascertain that the Mexican worker has been paid all amounts due him under the work contract or this Agreement." Mexican consuls are not numerous and the representatives of the Secretary of Labor are chiefly compliance officers who are few and far between. If a bracero is cheated out of half of his wages and the nearest Mexican consul is 300 miles away, just what does the poor bracero do? Should he start walking around the country, looking for a compliance officer? And what about his job when he takes a walk?
>
> But even if the woods were full of consuls and compliance officers, the Agreement would be unworkable. The bracero is a stranger in a strange land. He does not speak our language. He needs work desperately to live and to send a few dollars to his family in Mexico. He is practically defenseless against the greed and rapacity of an unscrupulous employer. He may be compelled to live in a filthy hovel without heat, without a blanket, without a decent bed. He may work 12 long hours for 6 hours' pay. Or he may encounter bad weather and have no work at all, not even the work guaranteed by his contract. Yes, he can complain to his employer but he had better not say too much because he can be fired and returned to Mexico. And so the poor bracero, compelled by force and fear, will endure any sort of injustice and exploitation to gain the few dollars that he needs so desperately. This is our national disgrace.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am bitterly opposed to the so-called civil rights proposals of the President. Most of them tend to expand unreasonably the powers of the Federal Government over the rights and privileges of the vast majority of the citizens of our Nation. In an effort to give favored treatment to a small minority, the proposals, if enacted into law, will deprive the majority of the right to choose their associates and give to a favored minority special privileges and preferred treatment.

In addition, some of the proposals deprive citizens of the right of the free use of their property and are clearly unconstitutional. They are an invasion of the personal liberty and freedom of the people guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

The proposals are an attempt by the administration to buy the political support of an organized minority to the great detriment of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. It is a sellout of our freedom which has meant so much to the peace and tranquillity of our country.

I propose to fight these proposals to the last ditch in the hope that the people of America will awaken to what is happening before it is too late. It is an attempt to set up a small minority of superclass citizenship. We must not let this happen.

THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, two recent actions have dealt severe blows to the vital oil industry of this Nation. These two actions have seriously disturbed me because of the serious situations which already have engulfed this industry in a struggle for economic survival.

The first of these two disturbing events was Presidential Proclamation No. 3541, which appeared in the Federal Register on June 13, 1963. This proclamation had the effect of increasing oil imports, according to my information, by about 28,000 barrels per day effective July 1 over what these imports would have been in absence of the proclamation.

Acting under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the President proclaimed that, effective July 1, 1963, "the maximum level of imports, subject to allocation, of crude oil, unfinished oils, and finished products other than residual fuel oil to be used as fuel shall be an amount equal to the difference between 12.2 percent of the quantity of crude oil and natural gas liquids which the Secretary of Interior estimates will be produced in these districts—I-IV—during that allocation period and the quantity of imports * * * which the Secretary of Interior estimates will be imported into these districts during that allocation period."

The effect of this proclamation, as I said, will be to increase the imports of oil by about 28,000 barrels daily over what the imports would have been in absence of the proclamation.

To say the least, I am very disappointed by this latest development in favor of foreign oil interests and further discriminating against the domestic oil producers on whom we must depend for oil supplies in event of national emergency. This further move toward deterioration of the domestic oil industry is part of a long-range trend which must, in the interests of national security, be reversed before our ability to find and produce oil domestically is irreparably impaired.

The second disturbing event was the action earlier this week by the Committee on Ways and Means to increase the tax burden on the oil industry by approximately $50 million per year.

On June 10, the committee had wisely decided to reject the administration proposals relating to the carryover of deductions for intangible drilling and development costs, aggregation of oil and gas properties, and foreign operations.

Then, on June 17, the committee reversed its field and tentatively approved language under which "gain on the sale or exchange of mineral interests would be treated as ordinary income to the extent that intangible drilling and development costs which have been expensed are attributable to that portion of the property still remaining in the ground. The provision would apply in the case of intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil. This does not apply to depletion taken or deductible exploration costs. Remaining gain would be treated as capital gain, and eligible for the 30-percent inclusion factor where the property had been held for 3 years or more.

According to the Treasury Department, this tax revision, if adopted, would result in a tax increase of $20 million on the oil industry. The very nature of the oil business and this particular provision will result in almost all of this tax load being placed on the small oil operator who can least afford it.

The other provision adopted by the committee relates to the aggregation of oil and gas property. The recommendation of the administration was tentatively approved by the committee. Treasury estimates that this provision would result in an added tax burden to the oil industry of $30 million per year.

Under this provision, the operating unit rule of present law in the case of oil and gas properties would be eliminated, and instead of this, the taxpayer could either maintain separate deposits as separate properties or could elect to combine all deposits falling within a single lease or acquisition, but could not combine different leases or acquisitions. An exception would be permitted to the lease rule where an oil or gas producer enters into a so-called unitization agreement.

Mr. Speaker, as I told the Committee on Ways and Means when I appeared before them in opposition to the oil-related tax proposals on March 27, 1963, the oil industry now enjoys only average profits when compared with other industry. This industry must compete with other industry for capital. These new tax burdens, if adopted, would decrease the profits of the industry, and make it more difficult for the oil industry to obtain vital new operating capital.

This involves much more than just a decrease in profits. Far more than just a loss of jobs in the oil industry is involved. As I told the committee:

> It involves the possible loss of jobs in steel mills and fabricating plants; the loss of cement sales, machinery sales, truck sales and corresponding losses in many other areas.
>
> Oil producers would find it less attractive to reinvest their own money in oil ventures. They would find it increasingly difficult to attract the outside risk capital that now contributes to their operations. The seriousness of the resulting slowdown in drilling activity would grow as the Nation's burgeoning demand for energy bit deeper and deeper into our presently held reserves.
>
> Eventually, to rekindle interest in drilling, prices would rise and the consuming public would feel the real impact of the change in the tax laws.

Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, any governmental actions that depressed our petroleum producing industry would jeopardize the Nation's future safety. In case of war we must have enough oil available to assure victory. In other short-of-war emergencies, such as Suez, our domestic producing capability might well be invaluable.

Lest we forget, the Soviet Union is trying to force its way into many free world oil markets long served by American concerns. This Russian activity is politically inspired. They are obviously attempting to use their growing supplies of crude as an offensive weapon in the cold war.

Any change in the tax laws which would further impair our oil producing capacity in the United States is clearly not in the national interest Any such change would clearly be in direct conflict with our goal of stimulating the national economy. Any such change would damage our cold war position by reducing our capacity to find and produce this vital product, petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, my fervent hope is that the Committee on Ways and Means will again reconsider their position on this matter and adopt their original position of rejecting the whole package of oil-related tax proposals. It is my further hope that the trend of Executive action indicated by Presidential Proclamation No. 3541, and other actions in this area in the past, will be quickly reversed, and that we will see future actions reserving an adequate portion of the domestic petroleum market for the domestic producing industry.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, because Public Law 78 was not extended by action taken in this Chamber, the California strawberry industry is in very serious danger. I should like to point out that this is a $35 million industry which provides $28 million in income to other industries that serve the growers of strawberries.

I have today received a letter from a very reputable grower and shipper of produce, including strawberries, Mr. W. C. Day, of Day & Young, Inc., in my congressional district. So that Members may have the benefit of the views expressed in this letter, I am including it in my remarks. It reads as follows:

> Day & Young, Inc.,
> *Santa Clara, Calif., June 17, 1963.*
>
> Hon. Charles S. Gubser,
> *Representative in Congress 10th District,*
> *House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Believe me Charley: The recent action relative to Public Law 78 has thrown your good district into quite a turmoil. I can't see why our California Congressmen failed to realize the importance of Mexican labor in continuing that tremendous agricultural activity we have here.
>
> I am referring not only to agriculture generally but to strawberries in particular. For your information the strawberry crop of California is worth about $35 million a year. Then when one considers others who live off the California crop such as local field labor, shipping carton manufacturers, freight, express, plants fertilizers freezing industry, it amounts to another $28 million.
>
> I am only dealing with the strawberry industry because with that I am more familiar. I don't believe enough local labor could be accumulated to handle a crop of strawberries 10 percent the size of our present industry.
>
> I certainly hope you will throw all of your weight behind this thing for a reconsideration to make possible reimportation of the Mexican braceros in future years. You will doubtless receive many letters and you will obtain information relative to many other row crops requiring men that will spend the day with their bodies in the shape of a horse shoe and believe me there's no local men that will do it.
>
> I don't think you could perform a finer service for your district nor for California generally in agriculture then to exert your very best efforts toward a reconsideration which might result in an extension of Public Law 78. I do not hesitate to bring this to your attention and I haven't bothered you very much but this is so very important to agriculture that I felt sure that some letters from your constituents would be in order.
>
> I enjoy your letter which has reached me regularly and I believe you are doing a fine job.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
> W. C. "Jerry" Day.
> Day & Young, Inc.

THE UPSET VICTORY IN CALIFORNIA—A TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA VOTERS AND TO BOB WILSON

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the election of Republican Del Clawson of Compton, Calif., to fill the vacancy in our ranks created by the untimely death of our distinguished colleague, Representative Clyde Doyle, is significant.

It is significant because this was another seat which the Republicans were not supposed to win.

Above and beyond the outstanding qualifications of the Republican candidate, Del Clawson, and the dedicated, hard working organization which turned out the votes for his victory, we must not lose sight of the role of the gentleman from California, Congressman Bob Wilson who fills a hard and difficult position as chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee which coordinates the activity behind every Republican congressional campaign and particularly those where special elections are necessary.

You can look at the outcome of elections like this and know how effective the gentleman from California, Bob Wilson, is in directing his committee. In this particular instance he led other Californians in developing a plan and strategy which resulted in victory. You can be sure that on our side of the aisle, we are deeply grateful for his leadership.

Two other factors stand out in this election: One is the presence of President Kennedy in California immediately before this election. This is a setback to his prestige and to his programs. A predominantly Democratic district has elected a Republican in the face of President Kennedy's visit to the scene. This brings us to the other factor which is the good judgment of the California voters to whom I wish to pay tribute. They have expressed an independence of the outside influences which are brought to bear in elections of this kind and they have exerted good common sense in the Lincolnian tradition by electing Del Clawson.

THE LATE CARL BROWN

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Watershed Letter of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts for June 3, carries a tribute to the late Carl Brown, an authority on watershed protection and flood prevention for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Before his death, Carl Brown was of inestimable service to my staff and me in drafting many of the details of the "Mission '76" program which I am promoting to complete all of the Nation's major watersheds by 1976 instead of year 2000 as originally proposed.

It is appropriate, therefore, for me to join in this recognition of Carl Brown's great contributions to watershed development by placing in the Record the tribute which was carried in the Watershed Letter:

A Tribute to Carl Brown

Early last month the watershed movement lost one of its true champions—Carl B. Brown, who died in Washington, D.C., following a heart attack. A tribute was paid to Carl, who was assistant to Hollis R. Williams, Assistant Administrator for Watersheds in SCS, at the 10th National Watershed Congress in Philadelphia. Presented at the opening general session by C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, this tribute expresses in words more fittingly and eloquently than ours, the feelings of thousands about Carl's most untimely death. The tribute:

"This is our 10th National Watershed Congress in 9 years.

"But long before we first met—many years before—a young man dedicated all his days and most of his nights to the idea in which we have been joining for a decade.

"The young man was Carl B. Brown. The idea, of course, was the management and treatment of our small watersheds—the long neglected area that lay between our vast programs for water resource development in major river basins and the soil and water conservation programs for individual landowners.

"Carl Brown, still a young man at 52, died suddenly on May 5. The gap left by his departure is fully as great as the gap filled by the small watershed program.

"Carl Brown was a brilliant young man in a hurry. He earned his first college degree at the age of 18 and a graduate degree at 20. By the time he was 24 he was nationally recognized as an authority on sedimentation. His career was marked by what engineers and scientists, even when they opposed him characterized as 'the highest level of professionalism.'

"More than any man, Carl Brown deserved the title of 'Mr. Watershed.' He earned it during 20 years of factfinding and studying and dreaming and speaking and writing and cajoling.

"He earned it at endless conference tables amid debates and agency discussions. He earned it in the dark hours of the night at home, pouring into a dictating machine new ammunition for a cause that so often appeared to be lost.

"He earned it as one of the principal architects of history-making legislation that gave life to the small watershed idea. He earned it before the committees of the Congress and in the privacy of the offices of influential men who learned from him, as indeed did we all.

"He earned it by continuing to the day of his untimely death complete devotion of mind and heart to the daily implementation of the program, to improving it by legislation amendments, to defending it from its attackers, to making it work better.

"Most of Carl Brown's adult life was given to this cause. Perhaps, as he gave to it, so it also took from him and lessened his days upon earth.

" 'Mr. Watershed,' we pray that you rest in peace."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the President's support of a number of civil rights proposals whose enactment, I feel, is essential to the welfare of this nation.

Early this year, when I introduced the first of two civil rights bills, I urged that Congress extend greater legal protection to those being denied their Constitutional rights. Recent events have made the prompt passage of such measures assuring equal protection of the laws even more imperative.

The time for talking is over. The time for action is here. Let us lay aside whatever political, social and economic differences that divide us and unite in providing the necessary legal tools which will guarantee all citizens the rights which are inherently theirs.

I accept the challenge to stay in session until such legislation is enacted. No domestic issue holds higher priority.

UNITED STATES-HUNGARIAN POLICY

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Government's policy toward Hungary has long been of concern to me, going way back to the time that Winston Churchill recommended that we invade through the Balkans. Had we done this, there probably would never have been the dismal record of satellite suppressions by the Soviet Union that have been the fate of the Balkan peoples.

I believe that it was wrong for us, through Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, and in many other ways, to encourage peoples in satellite nations to rise up and rid themselves of communism only to do nothing to give military help when this happened in Hungary. It seems to me that if it is to be the policy of the Western World to encourage peoples living crushed under communism's heavy heel to rebel against communism that it should also be the policy of the Western World to be prepared to give material assistance if this should happen as it did in Hungary.

We were no more prepared with a definitive and realistic policy for the Hungarian uprising than we were for the contingency that a U-2 might be shot down over the Soviet Union. America's handling of foreign policy ever since the end of World War II has, for the most part, comprised an astonishing series of grievous errors that in any ball game would probably result in a new manager. Amazingly, however, the propaganda mills of the State Department as well as those of the White House, under whatever administration, have succeeded in persuading too many Americans that retreat has been victory, appeasement has been progress, and compromise of principles has been statesmanship.

Recently, rumor had it that this country's policy toward the present Hungarian Government might change again. With this in mind, on May 16, 1963, I wrote to the Secretary of State affirming my personal opposition to recognition of Communist governments anywhere and particularly the Hungarian Communist Government. Yesterday, June 18, more than a month later, I received a reply from Assistant Secretary of State Dutton that I believe is of interest to the House in relation to Hungarian affairs. This correspondence read as follows:

May 16, 1963.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A recent flurry of news reports and rumors hint there is thought of resuming full diplomatic relations with Communist Hungary on the part of the U.S. Government. One Associated Press reporter stated that congressional sanction is not necessary to restore full diplomatic relations with Hungary.

I would appreciate it if you would advise me whether or not this is so; (a) That the Department is considering such recognition, and (b) that it requires no congressional sanction.

I am unalterably opposed to recognition of Communist governments anywhere, and most particularly the Hungarian Communist Government. I believe it is a blot on our honor that we should have encouraged the Hungarian people to rise up and rebel against communism only to fail to help them in their hour of need. Whether by way of Radio Free Europe, Crusade for Freedom, or whatever means, it has long been implicit in our policy that we would help our friends. To me, our failure to do so in Hungary is just one more illustration of the kind of wizening up of American character and principle that has reached alarming proportions in the last 15 years.

I do most sincerely urge upon you never to let it be a part of the record of your administration as Secretary of State that you recognized a Communist government as a lawful Government of Hungary.

Respectfully,
Louis C. Wyman,
Member of Congress.

Department of State,
June 18, 1963.

Hon. Louis C. Wyman,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Wyman: The Secretary of State has asked me to reply to your letter of May 16 in which you express your opposition to recognition of and restoration of full diplomatic relations with the Hungarian Government. The Department appreciates your interest in this matter and welcomes the opportunity to discuss the questions that you have raised and to clarify the U.S. position in the Hungarian situation.

Recent developments in Hungarian affairs do not, in fact, involve any question of recognition or resumption of diplomatic relations. At the end of World War II, the U.S. Government recognized and entered into diplomatic relations with the Hungarian Government. Although there have been various government changes in Hungary since that time, U.S. recognition has never been withdrawn, and there has been no interruption or suspension of diplomatic relations with Hungary. The American Legation in Budapest has remained in existence and in operation throughout the period since 1945.

At the time of the Soviet armed suppression of the Hungarian national uprising in November 1956 and during the period of harsh internal repression that followed the Soviet intervention, the U.S. Government withheld the accreditation of its minister who had arrived in Budapest immediately prior to the Soviet attack. Subsequently, in February 1957, this Government withdrew him from Hungary. The American Legation in Budapest has since been headed by a Charge d'Affaires ad interim, as has the Hungarian Legation in Washington. In the period since 1956, United States-Hungarian relations have been subject to strain and have remained generally inactive and minimal in all fields.

It is the Department's view that the reduction of bilateral relations to minimal levels after the events of 1956 and the pressures brought to bear on the Hungarian Government in the United Nations over the same extended period have served a useful purpose. This course of action, reinforced by the continuing impact of the Hungarian revolution and the by the quiet but persistent efforts of this and other Western governments through diplomatic channels to encourage the Hungarian Government to moderate its internal policies, has undoubtedly helped to bring about the favorable developments and changes which have improved the lot of the Hungarian people during the past 2 years and made their situation comparatively better than that of the peoples in other Soviet bloc countries except Poland.

It is true, of course, that the present Hungarian Government was imposed on the Hungarian people by Soviet armed intervention in 1956. But it is equally true that the harsh regime of Matyas Rakosi, which usurped power in Hungary in 1947 from a freely elected government and ruled by repression and terror until 1956, was also imposed as a result of Soviet duress and Soviet intervention in Hungarian internal affairs. Moreover, the Communist governments in the other Soviet bloc states of Eastern Europe, no less than the Government in Hungary, were forcibly imposed on the peoples of those states, owe their existence to the support of Soviet power, and (except for Poland) are no less subject to Soviet domination. The continued U.S. recognition of and maintenance of diplomatic relations with the Hungarian Government is not, therefore, of essentially different aspect than continued U.S. recognition of and maintenance of diplomatic relations with other Soviet bloc governments. The maintenance of diplomatic relations at any level with these governments in no way signifies U.S. approval of the origin, character, or policies of these governments. The U.S. Government has clearly and repeatedly affirmed that it does not accept the status quo of Soviet domination in Eastern Europe as a satisfactory or permanent condition of affairs in that area.

The situation in Hungary, as in Eastern Europe generally, is not a static but rather an ever-changing situation. In such circumstances, it is a basic U.S. concern, in advancement of U.S. interests and the just aspirations of the Hungarian and other Soviet-dominated peoples, to utilize all appropriate opportunities for maintaining and broadening U.S. contacts with these peoples, for manifesting continuing interest in their welfare, and for making the U.S. presence and influence felt in that area in as many effective ways as possible.

The future course of U.S. bilateral relations with Hungary will depend on many factors and developments, and we do not anticipate any dramatic or sudden changes in this regard. In the further examination and consideration of United States-Hungarian relations, however, it is reasonable that this Government should regard those relations as subject to adjustment as conditions and developments may warrant from the point of view of U.S. interests and advantage. As this suggests, the Department has no plan to send a Minister to Budapest at this time. You know, of course, the President appoints Ministers by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

There is a further point raised in your letter that the Department believes may reflect some misunderstanding and should, therefore, be clarified. This concerns your expressed belief that it is a blot on our honor that we should have encouraged the Hungarian people to rise up and rebel against communism only to fail to help them in their hour of need.

The U.S. Government at no time encouraged the Hungarian people to open and violent rebellion. The 1956 Hungarian uprising did not result from incitement to revolt from abroad but rather, as the findings contained in the authoritative Report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary (United Nations General Assembly Official Records: 11th Session, Supplement No. 18, Document A/3592, New York, June 1957) make clear, was entirely indigenous and spontaneous in origin and character. In concluding its report, the Special Committee stated:

"What took place in Hungary in October and November 1956 was a spontaneous national uprising, due to long-standing grievances which had caused resentment among the people. * * *

"The thesis that the uprising was fomented by reactionary circles in Hungary and that it drew its strength from such circles and from Western imperialists failed to survive the committee's examination. From start to finish, the uprising was led by students, workers, soldiers, and intellectuals, many of whom were Communists or former Communists. * * *

"The uprising was not planned in advance. It was the universal testimony of witnesses examined by the committee that events took participants by surprise."

Upon the outbreak of the uprising, this Government did affirm its belief in the justness of the Hungarian people's cause and of their aspirations for national independence and freedom. It played a leading part in placing the Hungarian case before the United Nations and in organizing and supporting humanitarian relief assistance and refugee resettlement measures aimed at alleviating the suffering of the Hungarian people. We believe that these and other actions taken by this Government in the circumstances existing at that time were entirely consistent with our national honor and principles.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, though the refinements of the sophisticated phraseology of this letter imply that American policy in relation to Hungary is not about to change, there is nevertheless the implication that because the U.S. Government at no times encouraged the Hungarian rebellion, and spoke in protest on behalf of the Hungarian people in the United Nations after the rebellion had aborted, that we should get some kind of a medal.

The process of training for expertise in international diplomacy is a long and complicated road. Unfortunately, many who take this road seem to lose sight of where they are going. They do not see the forest for the trees. Here I fear that we fail to recognize that the only course for America that can assure the world's respect for our leadership is a course in which our devotion and adherence to the fundamental principles of freedom and justice for all shines clear as a beacon light. Firmness in decisions to stand up for freedom has been so notoriously lacking in the policies of the Department of State it is difficult for us to claim much credit in world leadership. In Guatemala, in Lebanon, in Quemoy and Matsu, and in Formosa, yes. But almost everywhere else it has been compromise, surrender, or outright appeasement.

This country can honestly derive little satisfaction in being the champion in the U.N. of once freedom-loving but now dead Hungarians. Our policy must be changed so that we will not engage in diplomatic relations with Communist gangsters and murderers whether the interchange is in the form of an embassy or a legation. We must let the peoples of the world know that we stand with those who are ready to fight and give their lives for freedom and that we will help them in their struggle, not just by applause from the sidelines, but as an actor like F.D.R. was with lend-lease.

Our sorry record of pussyfooting with halfway measures or excuses for failure to fight for freedom in the face of one showdown after another should be ended once and for all. Within the Department of State are hundreds and hundreds of personnel whose contributions to these sorry policies are a matter of record and who continue to influence these policies every day. I am convinced that it would be in the best interests of this country to shake up this Department radically and to put most of these architects of disaster out to pasture for good.

I fail to see how any of us can derive pride, satisfaction or comfort from the continued gains by the Soviet Union and its bloc in the tremendous struggle for the balance of power in the world. Our sorry performance in Hungary is another unhappy chapter in this book.

DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the recent defeat of the Area Redevelopment Act. As the record will show, I was the only Kentuckian who voted against this legislation. I have been chided in my local press for this action. While usually only objectors write, I have received innumerable complimentary letters and only one lone critical postcard. This is despite much supposed "bad" publicity by my local press.

This criticism of my vote is reportedly because eastern Kentucky is what is called a depressed area by advocates of this legislation. In this connection, the following is just one of the favorable letters I have received:

> LONDON, KY., *June 17, 1963.*
>
> Hon. M. C. SNYDER,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> CONGRESSMAN SNYDER: I would like to congratulate you for standing up and voting your conscience on the Kennedy giveaway program, the so-called depressed area bill. You sure voted right. I operate two mining companies and employ about 250 men. It is a tough struggle to stay in business, especially coal business, which we are operating on less than 1 percent profit on sales and investment. We are paying the maximum unemployment insurance 4½ percent. We need at least 50 more men to work but just can't get them, in fact we have the worst labor shortage that we have ever had in all our mining profession. The combined field in Leslie County needs at least 500 miners, yet the Kennedys say we are in a 22 percent unemployment bracket. Does this make sense to you? This section has become a complete welfare State. Unemployment insurance and free food has trained them not to work for a living.
>
> Enclosed in this letter is an article written by me which states facts about eastern Kentucky as I know them. Please do what you can to help straighten this mess out.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MR. LEWIS HOWARD.

OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a report presented at a joint meeting of the sections on radiology and diseases of the chest of the American Medical Association and the American College of Chest Physicians on June 17, 1963, at Atlantic City, N.J. The study was prepared by Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, Dr. Jacob Churg, and Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond. It indicates to me that we are lagging in the protection of American workers from occupational diseases.

This report studies the problem of lung cancer as well as cancer generally in asbestos workers. It traced the case histories of 632 members of metropolitan locals of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers from 1942 to 1962. The report found that the death rate from cancer of the bronchus and pleura was 6.8 times as high among these asbestos workers as in the general white male population of the United States, both age and date being taken into consideration. The report further stated:

> The death rate from cancer of the stomach, colon, and rectum was higher among the asbestos workers than would be expected from the rates reported for the white male population of the United States.

The research paper reported:

> Asbestos exposure in industry will not be limited to the particular craft that utilizes the material. The floating fibers do not respect job classifications. Thus, insulation workers undoubtedly share their exposure with their workmates in other trades and intimate contact is possible for electricians, plumbers, sheet metalworkers, steamfitters, laborers, carpenters, boilermakers, foremen; perhaps even the supervising architect should not be omitted.

This report makes a most valuable contribution. As an author of an occupational safety bill, I am convinced that we must do more to encourage State programs to eliminate the human suffering caused by industrial diseases.

Dr. Irving J. Selikoff is practicing internal medicine in Paterson, N.J., and has done considerable research in diseases of the lung. Dr. Jacob Churg is the director of laboratories for Barnert Memorial Hospital, also in Paterson. Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond is the director of the statistical research at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City, and their work was supported by the Health Research Council of the City of New York.

ALLOWING DEFENDANTS IN SUITS UNSUCCESSFULLY BROUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES TO RECOVER CERTAIN COSTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7140, a bill which is designed to allow defendants in suits unsuccessfully brought by the U.S. Government to recover certain costs. This bill would amend title 28 of the United States Code by adding a provision for the assessment of reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness' fees and, in the court's discretion, any and all other direct or indirect costs that may be occasioned by a successful defendant in any criminal or civil suit initiated by the Federal Government.

My purpose in seeking enactment of this measure is to require the Government to take a hard look at any litigations which it may propose to prosecute. My attention was directed to a case of three companies that last year went to court and proved their innocence of charges that they had conspired to fix the price of a commodity. They totaled up the bills later and learned that their collective costs exceeded $750,000. If they had not contested the charge, each would have faced a maximum fine of $50,000, or a total of $150,000. It was noted that several other companies in which similar charges were made decided they could not afford the high price of proving their innocence. It was commented that in a sense, because of the high cost of fighting the Government, those companies were robbed of the chance to prove their innocence. Concern was expressed that the Department of Justice might begin to use its power to make less than responsible charges knowing that the accused could not afford to defend itself.

While I do not at this time intend to criticize the present operations of the Department of Justice in this regard, I feel that there should be some law on the books in the event circumstances might develop in which overzealous officials in the Department might use their powers in such a manner.

It is in view of this situation that I feel remedial legislation should be enacted to insure that the Justice Department will wisely and reasonably evaluate any legal case in which it may be involved.

FREE TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Tollefson] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, business has shown some improvement recently and the April employment reports indicate that 100,000 workers were added to the employment payrolls in manufacturing industries. However, while total nonfarm employment rose to a plane of 1 million jobs above a year ago, the percentage of unemployment this April stood at 5.7 percent compared with 5.6 percent a year ago—in other words, a slight increase.

This means, of course, that we are not employing workers as fast as they come on the scene as a result of population increase. One reason lies in more and more automation, which spells displacement of workers.

Automation is usually applauded because it reduces cost of production. It was our ready acceptance of technological advancement and mass production that together with some other factors brought us to the forefront in the industrial world. In the past it could always be said that while the installation of laborsaving machinery and equipment temporarily displaced workers, these always found new jobs and before long the increased consumption of the goods offered at lower prices led to such an expansion in production that even more workers were hired.

This was true in numerous instances such as the automobile industry, where new developments, discoveries, and inventions made it possible to reduce costs radically and to sell the output at popular prices. If the demand for the goods was elastic, each significant cost reduction meant a further swelling of consumer demand.

It was in pursuit of this principle, plus recognition of the function of fairness of competition and consumer purchasing power, that we came to lead the world in production.

Yet, the magnetic element in all of this was the confidence, derived from observation and experience, that a business well put together and well run, repaid the struggles, disappointments and hardships encountered on the way. The vision of good profits acted as a strong pulling power from the future to the present; and if all went well the future continued to beckon and to justify effort, alertness, and risk.

The path was strewn with failures but the visible examples of success were sufficiently compelling to keep enterprisers, new and old, forever at it. The results amazed the world. The Second if not the First World War was won by the side that was joined by our industrial power.

Today something is wrong with the smooth working of this principle, but it is not a lack of mechanization and utilization of technology. We are producing yearly more goods with fewer workers. This does not spell industrial inefficiency.

I believe that one source of serious trouble lies in our trade policy. Everyone knows that American costs have been driven to high levels. We had high war costs, foreign aid, high defense outlays, high wages and high taxes. In recent years other countries have begun to follow our footsteps in technology and production methods. We have shipped abroad or exported over $50 billion of modern machinery and equipment in the past 10 or 12 years. With the use of this machinery other industrial countries have greatly increased the productivity of their workers while their wages have continued far below ours.

Import competition began to confront many of our industries with very difficult problems, the principal one being the lower prices at which imports come into this country. These imports knifed right through the domestic market, at first taking 5 then 10 percent and before long 15 or 20 percent and in some cases on up to 50 percent or more.

The cry went up that we must become more efficient; and we did—at least to the extent of displacing over a million production workers from 1950 to 1960 in a score of leading industries. It is true that employment rose elsewhere but it was in the nonproductional activities and in State and local government. These increases were not enough to overcome the losses of production workers, farm labor, and so forth and at the same time offset the number of new workers arriving every year.

Now, let us see is we can detect a difference between the effects of laborsaving installations under the circumstances of the past when the effort was made in response to the lure of a fast-growing market if lower prices were achieved, on the one hand, and the same operation in response to desperate efforts to stay in business, to hold ground already held and to avoid being driven out, not by domestic competition but import competition, on the other.

When industry is driven to automation, not because the market outlook is good but because it is bad, and not as a means of growing up with or opening up a growing market, the effect on employment is vastly different. Imports capture the increase in demand generated by lower prices and domestic industry ends up by perhaps holding its own but with the dividend of net displacement of workers. This becomes a drag on purchasing power and augments a national problem.

If the competition were domestic, at least domestic employment would reap the harvest from lower prices; but inflexible costs prevent domestic producers in many instances from meeting import prices. If they do, they sacrifice profits and reserves for research and development, advertising and reinvestment.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the Record, under leave to extend my remarks, a paper prepared by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy on this important subject. His paper has been referred to as "an extremely orderly and forceful yet reasonable presentation of the subject."

I commend it to the attention of all who are interested in our besetting problem. The paper follows:

Free Trade Policy Throttling Our Economy

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

The American economy is or was a dynamic organism. It is or was preeminently an economy of abundance. It will either maintain that characteristic or it will be transformed into a state-governed system in which both dynamism and abundance will disappear. This follows from the very nature of economic dynamism and from its origin in the nature of human demand for goods. Abundance, in turn, depends on the fortunes of an economic system that is essentially self-propelling and self-renewing but inclined to balk if excessively cluttered, burdened or restrained.

All economies are dedicated to the fulfillment of man's needs and desires. These needs are highly variable but may be regarded roughly as falling into two broad categories, namely, the primary and secondary ones. The primary needs, very simply, are those that must be satisfied if man is to subsist.

The secondary needs are those that lie above the minimum level. They may be denied satisfaction without courting extinction but not without withholding from life the gratifications that distinguish man from the lower animals and mark his progress in civilization.

An economy that is dedicated to nothing more than provision of goods at the minimum level is necessarily a static economy. It will do no more than provide food, clothing, shelter and the necessary tools and means of locomotion required to furnish these goods. Its growth is limited by the population it serves. If the number of people remains the same so will the output of the economy. The latter will grow only in step with the increase in population.

On the other hand, an economy that undertakes to provide means of satisfying the secondary needs and desires has before it great possibilities of growth and ramification. The extent to which it will meet these needs depends on a variety of factors. Some of the most perplexing problems of economics and government arise over this question.

Most economies of the world do much more than merely provide the means of satisfying the primary needs. There are some others, however, that hover close to the subsistence level.

Of all the countries, the United States developed the most productive economic system in the world and has catered most extensively to the secondary needs and desires of the people. This productive explosion became most visible in the first half of the 20th century. As a material civilization this country as a result of this forward surge has hitherto seen no equal.

Strangely enough as a country we were barely conscious of the origin of our industrial and agricultural leadership. As a result it has been too much taken for granted. In fact, some of the most fruitful factors of the combination of elements that together achieved the peak of productivity have been under heavy attack from some quarters. Many heavy-handed efforts have been made to discredit and to clothe with ill repute some of the very elements that have been responsible for the success of the system. It may be granted both that some of the criticism has been innocent and sincere and that some of it was deserved. Nevertheless it would be a most unfortunate retribution to the critics if their notions should prevail and should succeed in deranging our system to the point of perverting its genius in the guise of reform.

To be sure, any system breeds evils; and reform is a necessary accompaniment of progress; but not all that goes by the name of reform is reform. It may entail changes so radical that the system can no longer be what it was or perform as it did. This may be the result even if the reform bore no such intention. At the same time it must be clear that not all reform will be fatal or even burdensome to the economy. The question is how the changes comport with the inner genius of the system.

Obviously this genius must be understood if a judgment is to be made with respect to the soundness of past or prospective changes and reforms.

It is important that the composite elements and nature of the system be clearly set forth.

We have, to begin with, the people who settled this country. The natives who were displaced were not in a stage of development that would soon have produced the phenomena of production that were witnessed here after a few centuries. Therefore the character of the people who displaced the red Indians must be given a great part of the credit; for the rich resources of this country were no less present to the aboriginals than to the Europeans who displaced them.

Nevertheless the presence of diversified and rich resources was necessary to support the productive system that was launched as time went by.

The settlers had a strong penchant for freedom and established a system of government that incorporated freedom as the very essence of its genius. That this was a basic ingredient of success of the system may be concluded from the settlement of other areas of the world equally endowed with natural resources by people who established different systems of government or if they modeled their organic law after ours and hailed freedom as an ideal veered seriously from its mandates in practice. None of these countries achieved the productive apparatus devised in this country, even though they had the example before them for some decades.

We may therefore set down freedom and a government that in practice accepted the restraints of power as constituent and essential elements of the combination that led to industrial and agricultural supremacy.

If we cast about for other elements that were indispensable we will recognize initiative and self-propulsion as characteristic companions of the long period of our development and accumulation. These were but reflections of the motivating forces at work; namely, reasonable assurance that the enterpriser, developer, and exploiter would enjoy the fruits of his visions, labors, and efforts. There are those who think that this assurance was overdone. Yet, to build productive empires needed not only vision, resolution, courage, and aggressiveness but also ambition and a strong ego. To convert a continent of mountains and vast ranges of prairies, forests, and streams, into a tame urbanity in a matter of 150 years needed men of acumen and strong inclination, who used as grist the ruder characteristics of the frontier and the rougher qualities of the untamed.

They smote savages and mountains and drilled through both, deflowered the forests and dammed the rivers, connected the plains with iron and plowed deep the virgin soil. This they did and they built cities and laid the groundwork for a culture and civilization that ironically enough takes their work for granted or even despises them for their rude strength and want of savoir faire. To be sure, they were not idle boulevardiers or cynical drones.

Very well, the land, the soil and the forests, the plains and the streams were rich in potential products. The settlers were people who were already inured to hardship, disciplined in their own fatherlands or motherlands by the ice of winter to stand against privation and to look ahead and to worry; yes, to worry whether the provender from the sparse harvests would carry through the winter or whether the specter of want would pursue them before the sun again turned toward the meridian for enough warmth to kindle new buds and seeds put in the earth for new harvests.

Searching for freedom and thereafter schooled to the marrow in freedom and jealous of its blessings; then devising and building a government designed to preserve freedom and to respect mutual rights; and accepting the responsibilities and restraints of self-government, yet giving to individual competence, skill and capability (with some exceptions) full leash to prove and establish themselves and to build private empires: these assets, too, our people had—and a strong faith.

Yet it will be quickly discerned that even this rare combination was not enough. A complicated machine has many vital parts; without the proper functioning of one part among them it will squeak, grate, rattle, or falter. We learned on the way, after the Civil War, that the tendency to monopoly was contrary to the function that we foresaw or sensed for our economy; namely, the furnishing of more goods to more people who previously had not enjoyed them, i.e., a proliferation and extension of the means of meeting more and more of the secondary human needs. Monopoly power could and probably would stand in the way.

The concept of competition answered to the quest. Competition would keep productive efforts at their highest and the flow of goods to consumers at its greatest volume. Soon we learned, however, that competition as competition was not the total equation: the competition must be fair. We supplemented the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 with the Clayton and the Federal Trade Commission Acts and other legislation. The purpose was not merely to keep industry doing its best but also to make sure that the lower costs achieved through installation of laborsaving devices and machinery would be passed on to the consumers. In so doing, however, we did not endorse cutthroat competition.

It soon became clear that low prices of themselves will not assure an absorbent market for a mountainous volume of goods pushed out willy-nilly from production lines. The market must have purchasing power. Henry Ford is often credited with perception of this fact—something that now seems obvious. He instituted the $5 per day wage to demonstrate his faith. A people armed with good purchasing power could be converted into a mammoth market if the right product were offered at the right price.

This concept took hold and our production broke all known bounds; but in 1929 as a result of the distortions of war and unwise postwar operations here and abroad we suffered a spectacular crash. The depression following the crash led to much regulatory legislation and the institution of governmental controls in areas that were previously free of them. In many instances the legislation led to increasing costs and less competitive flexibility. One order of legislation, however, was in keeping with the genius of our system. It bolstered the mass-production, mass-consumption concept by removing wages (the most important support of the mass market) from the ravages of unfair competition. The most important of these was the minimum wage law. Outlawing of child labor was another. The tariff was already standard equipment as an outward defense against low-wage competition.

If purchasing power were undermined by employers who paid relatively low wages, as it would be but for the requirement of fairness of competition in the wage field, an important support of our uniquely productive system would have failed. Goods would have crowded our warehouses and shelves while facing a sluggish market. By introducing the element of fairness into wage competition as it had already been introduced into the field of industrial competition, the way was open for expansion of purchasing power, not only as the population grew, but hand in hand with the productive magic of our technology. The cross-fertilization acted as a catalyst; i.e., higher wages enriched the market while costs were lowered through technology. This in turn increased the output of goods at still lower costs thus opening a yet broader market. Previously the lagging of wages always meant the overaccumulation of inventories or stock to the point of a breakdown. Consumption lagged and an economic crisis was frequently the result (with the help of other factors).

Yet, the self-propelling feature that was characteristic of our system needed something more, something already mentioned, i.e., the magnetic drawing force of profits as a reward for success. To repeat, some have said that this reward was overdone but the men of enterprise needed something to draw them on, something to sustain their hopes in the dark beginnings of a new industry or a new product, and something to justify their chafing disappointments and discouraging setbacks as they sought the key to a market that was thought or hoped to be there waiting for them. These men were not artists, musicians or poets who might be satisfied with the plaudits of their viewers, hearers, or readers.

After all, there was no special honor in being known as a leading sardine canner or maker of rubber tires or talking machines. Also there was no lasting esthetic satisfaction to be gained from contemplation of an accumulation of shovel handles or brooms turned out by the thousands. The reward must be more robust.

The manufacturer is no dilettante or virtuoso and must often come to terms with the very entrails of production, not always pleasant, wherein the processes of tearing, crushing, boiling, shredding, rasping, cutting, stripping, or melting encompass a raw realism that sometimes suffuses the atmosphere with special stench, noise, heat, clatter, dust, and unrelieved grimness in general. The bright products that emerge and give the glitter and gilding to our civilization were unrecognizable in the bowels of the factories and mills, in the course of the processes that smelted out the dross, dissolved raw stock; pressed, extruded or twisted malleable compounds or leeched this material and that out of its original crudeness with hostile and caustic liquids. To court this sort of world calls for a species of nerves and sensory insulation not given to everyone, plus a tangible incentive. Between the esthetic world and the processors of the goods that delight the esthetes there is no early or natural affinity. The latter often express their hostility while the former simply endure it.

Yet it is the uninspiring acts of travail and parturition that set before us most of the esteemed goods that we all, esthetes and commonalty, consume. As the child takes for granted the delights of toys, the delicious magic of varied candies, or the sheen and freshness of new-bought items, so are consumers inclined to take for granted the great array of goods in the show windows, the showcases, on the floors and on the shelves. All manner of desires and needs are excited by these goods, but little thought is given to the effort involved in producing them. Window shoppers spend their budgets many times over in their roaming fancies, usually admiring the goods that are out of their financial reach. In their unthinking wonderment they do provide a measure of the unsated potential demand that greater purchasing power would bring to life.

The teasing through displays goes on, guided by the designers and manufacturers who have mastered the techniques of production and management and are now seeking their justification at the far end; namely, consumer demand, which they seek to excite. Without consumer acceptance the producers could not live. Their initial incentive, profit, would not be fulfilled. Thus the consumers are used in turn as guides to point the way to further production.

As there are many failures of productive enterprise because of misreading of consumer desires, poor management, etc., the abundance nevertheless achieved by our economic system, not only in gadgets and gew-gaws but in the solid appurtenances of civilization, represents a tribute both to the fortitude and persistence of the enterprisers in seeking consumer preferences and the power of incentive.

Erosion of this incentive (i.e., profit, status, and power) would therefore be expected to produce negative and regressive consequences. Since the incentive of profits has provided the element of self-propulsion of our system, for which no satisfactory substitute has yet been found, its function should be taken seriously. It is not simply a callous motive, although it often lends itself to callousness, but represents a magnetism that finds a deep affinity in human character; and instead of being maligned and despised it should be studied and refined. There is an unspoken as well as articulate sentiment in this country, alluded to above, that holds our productive system in contempt, as something crass, ugly, cold, or even offensive. Such sentiment, often held by people who would not soil their hands of expose their sensibilities to the unavoidable offensive aspects of manufacturing processes, is apparently blind to the distance our industry has already moved, not only in providing means of filling needs and desires of a large population, far beyond anything accomplished elsewhere, but moving increasingly toward the satisfaction of the secondary needs and desires, always with progressive (if seemingly slow) refinement, of more and more people. Indeed the degree to which this is accomplished measures the attainment of productive civilization.

Finally, the combination of factors here paraded, still leaves out of account the crucial characteristic that is seated in the nature of demand itself.

It is sometimes assumed that demand is indefinitely expansible. Much mischief may result from this error. The demand for rice or wheat or any of the staples, such as salt, sugar, milk, eggs, meat, etc., is biologically limited by the number of stomachs possessed by the population. This is normally one per person. In a country that is not underfed, the magnitude of demand for these and similar products is limited by the number of people.

No productive system such as the American could be built on a foundation of staple products for which the demand is quite static. Most of these items lie in the field of necessities and fall into the area of primary needs. Much of agricultural activity is devoted to production of such goods. Specialty crops, such as tree nuts, strawberries, melons, artichokes, and spices, are exceptions.

Demand for staple goods is characteristically inelastic; i.e., it does not oscillate much with price changes.

There is, however, a class of demand that is amazingly expansible. This lies in the field of secondary needs and desires. Such demand is usually elastic, meaning that its volume is sensitive to price changes. This is readily understandable when we reflect that disposable income for items beyond the necessities will only reach so far. If prices go up while income remains the same, some purchases must be sacrificed, whereas if prices fall, more goods can be bought. The sacrificial items will fall largely into the luxury or near-luxury field; and it is these that will be bought more freely if prices fall or if income rises while prices remain steady or rise less rapidly than income.

This is preeminently the field that provided the soil for magnification of the American productive system. The attack was on two fronts (1) reduction of costs in relation to the mass income and (2) increase in the volume of such income. This was accomplished in the manner already described.

If an enterpriser had before him an invention or a product for which the demand was unknown, he was faced with a difficult problem, mostly financial in character. How test demand? Demand might appear to be very cold and unresponsive if the cost of the product was too high while it might burst into a bonanza if the price were brought down sufficiently; but how sense this latent response? The solution to the problem called for a strong faith, much patience and fortitude—and money. How bring down the price? This would require new machinery and special equipment. Who would provide this on a gamble that the lower cost would tap a rewarding market? Money is sometimes bold but it is not always on the prowl for palpable risks. It is easily scared off. The sources of its timidity are many. Risk is nevertheless often taken if a handsome reward looms as a fair probability.

If this probability of a reward is offset by external circumstances or if the magnitude of the probable reward is not heartlifting, the risks and agonizing uncertainties will hardly be assumed. Yet again if the outlook is that the reward will be greatly reduced (possibly by governmental action, such as taxation or onerous regulation) or that conditions unfavorable to further success will likely arise, a hesitancy that will sap the vigor of venture will spread.

It was in the production of goods with an elastic demand that American industrial supremacy found its cradle. Since, however, such goods could be and were also produced in other countries without duplicating the highly productive American economy, it follows that elasticity of demand of itself did not generate the American leadership, even if it was an indispensable ingredient.

The OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) in a report of April 1962, more nearly laid its finger on the spot. It said:

"The first and basic condition for growth is that private firms should want to grow, and this, in turn depends on their having confidence.

"They need to be confident that they will be able to dispose of increases in output at a profit."

This is a statement that implies understanding of the function of profits in a capitalistic economy and no less the essential role played by confidence in such a system.

The American system, more than any other, spread its ventures into all fields of production supported by confidence that profits would smile at the end of the road if the consumer were approached with a suitable product at an attractive price. Unquestionably the ground on the way was strewn with failures, more numerous by far than the successes. Yet, self-confidence and a knack for business in a variety of men, kept the ventures flowing.

Enough of them flourished to act as examples to others, and the ranks did not thin out but were everywhere replenished and kindled anew.

What was it in the very makeup of goods that opened consumers' pocketbooks? The necessities, to be sure, came first, but the great proliferation of goods that in their making employed millions of workers, was not found in this field. It was found in goods that consumers desired but did not need, or did not need in the qualities in which they bought them or in the refined state or quality that they preferred. A pair of shoes may be a pair of shoes, but milady does not merely seek a foot cover but much else beside, in a variety of forms. Immediately such demand, if supported by cash, or credit, jumps the biological limit of two feet per person by introducing variety, style, hues and tints to match this or that design, etc., into this lowly appurtenance of living. At the same time the primary need is converted into the secondary. Some consumers make do with two or three pairs of shoes, possibly of the same color, while others would feel poor and bereft with less than a dozen pairs or a score in a variety of styles, colors, and stitches.

Undoubtedly the automobile embodies the supreme example, not only of the genius of the American productive system, in which it was a pioneer, but also of the inner possibilities and peculiarities of consumer demand.

The automobile has the advantage of being supremely useful while at the same time serving other human cravings, weaknesses, or inclinations. As a useful vehicle it represents a means of locomotion, taking man off his feet, as did and does the horse; and it bears burdens. Locomotion represents a primary need and the automobile was superior to the equine form of this commodity both in terms of speed and the poundage it could carry.

This combination would possibly have given us little more than the automotive truck; but the automobile had other advantages, real or spurious. It not only moved faster currently than the horse but promised to go faster and faster with improvements in the motor. This fact alone gave the vehicle an enviable claim on the pocketbook. Americans had an inborn desire to move faster no less than to break previous records.

Equine beauty may be of a high order if special care is blended with breeding but the ordinary horse presented no great esthetic phenomenon while the automobile could be designed to combine speed with handsome features (although it must be admitted in retrospect that automobile designers in the early years did not, contrary to the opinion of the time, hit profusely on beautiful form).

Since the automobile was never cheap, ownership set the owner apart from those who continued in a pedestrian status, and beyond that, it separated the owner of a prestige car from those who must be satisfied with a flivver or a jalopy.

This ingredient of ownership was invaluable as a sales lure and as an advertising symbol; and it came to be exploited severely. Since the automobile was not cheap but very desirable, a sharp reduction in costs would open a gold mine. To the manufacturers it was like striking at a baseball with bases loaded. A home run would deliver the thrill of a jackpot. Money would roll over the gunwales to the floor. Here was a product that had an admirable combination of assets that fitted it to the mission of bellwether of the American system. The demand was elastic and therefore could be expanded and proliferated if the right key were used.

Either actually or by legend Henry Ford (once more) perceived the golden ore that lay below the surface of ordinary purchasing power, if he but had the wit to mine it. He discovered that the best implement was a low price and used it. It did wonders; but he could not have done it with butter or eggs, wheat flour or beef—i.e., not in the sense of laying a foundation for an industry that in turn generated and heavily supported other big industries, such as petroleum, iron and steel, rubber, glass, repair shops, garages, filling stations, finance companies, not to mention mortuaries.

Between automobiles on the one end and silk hats and carillons or sweet potatoes and onions, eggs and butter on the other, there are many gradations of potential consumer demand. Not all fields are equally attractive. Some are very limited, pedestrian, and even dead or moribund. Others offer veritable fortunes to bright and energetic enterprisers. Yet, all segments are under constant probe by some bright or desperate entrepreneur who seeks not only a livelihood but may also be on the lookout for an upgoing elevator or at least an escalator to carry him to greater heights; this, so long as the outlook is considerably better than the security of working for the Government or a large corporation. These ambitious enterprisers of many ilk are the original breeders of employment.

In recent years the quest for lower costs, so essential to penetration and holding of a market, has run so hard in the old established industries that jobs have been falling by the wayside in one industry after another even as more goods come tumbling from the production lines; and our plowboys are being decimated by our agricultural efficiency and turned into tractor riders or city slickers. This means that too many are looking for too few jobs.

Even the packagers, freezers, slicers, precookers, etc., who have gone far to replace the housewives who in turn have deserted the kitchen for the office and factory, have not filled the gap. These caterers to convenience employ such highly productive methods that one worker does the work of a dozen or a score of housewives, all the while working less than half as hard.

The lag of employment in this country is very serious and will become worse as more men are disgorged from employment and whole new armies of war babies come knocking on the doors of the employment offices.

What then has happened to the vaunted American industrial system? Has it become too efficient or is it getting old and afflicted with hardening arteries, conservatism and timidity? Many are tempted to say the latter; but the characterization is solidly belied by many visible phenomena. Mechanical, chemical and other technological efficiency is displacing workers very rapidly in some industries and other pursuits, such as coal mining and agriculture while output rises. Without progressive efficiency this would not happen. Therefore the indictment of inefficiency falls.

There is another measure of the stamina of our industry that negates the charge of anemia. This is foreign investment and expansion of American business activity abroad. In this country outlays for new plant and equipment in the manufacturing industries declined 6 percent between 1957 and 1962 whereas in the foreign field they expanded at a lively rate. Output of U.S.-owned companies in Europe increased 70 percent in 1961 over 1957, compared with only a 6-percent rise in volume of manufacturing and mining production in this country from 1955 to 1961.

Employment in this country shifted heavily into the service trades, professions, commercial and governmental activities, particularly State and local government between 1950 and 1960. Since 1957 investment in these fields, such as insurance, banking, real estate, wholesale and retail trade, increased 30 percent. That is also where employment since 1950 increased faster than population growth. Again, it is an area that is not damaged by import competition. In other words, while manufacturing, mining and agriculture, all of them confronting import competition or subject to it, were releasing workers, nonmanufacturing employment rose, but yet not sufficiently to offset the declines elsewhere. The result has been a stubborn residual unemployment.

Our problem quite surely is not inefficiency; nor is it entrepreneurial anemia. Our industries are producing abundantly and many of them have idle capacity.

Why then do we not grow as fast as some other countries and in any case not fast enough to employ the unemployed? The latter is the real question, because Europe and Japan represent rather special cases. Their burst of speed was delayed about 10 years behind our feverish postwar activity; and they built more modern plants than ours to replace bombed-out facilities and obsolete plants. Their gain in productivity was phenomenal but readily explained. We were already far ahead; and they too will catch up with the pent-up war demand even as we did.

Taxes are mentioned as restraints on industrial activity; and the complaint undoubtedly has merit. High wages and high profits are also cited, but they do in any event provide purchasing power. In some industries rates of profit, moreover, are declining. This fact is widely and properly regarded as detracting from incentive to growth and expansion.

Yet there is an obvious element of industrial discouragement that is seldom cited if not ignored altogether. This is rising import competition, stimulated by the national policy of tariff reduction. The far-reaching effect of this policy in stifling growth and expansion while encouraging laborsaving installations and automation as a means of remaining competitive, has not been officially recognized. Rather, there persists a wholly irrational obstinacy against entertainment of the subject.

The effects of the policy are becoming yearly more obtrusive. Scores of our industries have been browbeaten and intimidated into silence or acceptance of a fate they know to be regressive, by a stubborn and egregious official wrongheadedness.

We witness hundreds of our firms investing billions of dollars in enterprises overseas for no reason other than the more favorable outlook for profits abroad. No surer barometer reading is needed. The signals proclaim the tragic fallacy of our policy; and we will persist in it at our national economic peril.

The problem of unemployment in the face of galloping technology has indeed been recognized; but an almost pathological shrinking from hard realities has marked the official reaction.

Unless steps that conform to the genius of the American system are taken the remedies will aggravate the problem. An increase in employment, for example, that is achieved through spot or ad hoc pumped-in money will be temporary. Pump priming cannot succeed by itself because it does not shift the self-propelling mechanism of our system into gear. It is therefore good as long as it lasts and no more, unless it is accompanied by other corrections that do restore the self-propelling mechanism to health.

The profit system, as a system, also will not come to the rescue. It is a question of the climate in which it is to operate. Our system is not one that can constantly be discouraged, handcuffed, confronted with a nagging hostility, repression and grudging toleration, and yet be expected to function bountifully. Prosperity cannot be imposed on our economy for this reason. It must be induced by looking to the climate.

The profit system can again, as it has in the past, unlock and liberate productive and managerial energies that cannot be reached or ignited by discontinuous projects dependent upon legislative appropriations. There is no likeness between such efforts to impose prosperity and the Promethean magnetism that draws forward from ahead. The one is a dead hand; the other represents the beckoning future. If that future is attractive no whip is needed. There is no future; no amount of either sticks or carrots will beget sustained locomotion.

American capital produced expansion, growth, and employment because vast potentials lay before many enterprises. The fortunes of these enterprises (with a few notable exceptions such as land grants to railroads) did not rely on doles of public money dependent in turn on legislative sentiment. They prospered because the way was open for a $500 enterprise to grow into a million or a billion dollar operation, not indeed tomorrow, but in a generation. Ramifications and growth were not only possible but beckoned to those who had the vision and the necessary qualities to fulfill it.

The real magnet was the prospects of an expansive profit, not merely on one large transaction, such as building a dam or some other public work, but through a continuing and indefinite future.

Today actual and prospective import competition is closing the door to the type of expansion that is most prolific in generating jobs. This is industrial expansion, not public works or foreign trade. In 1940 the ratio of industrial, mining and agricultural jobs to nonproductional jobs was 1 to 1. By 1950 this ratio had grown to 1 to 1.5 while by 1960 it had risen to 1 to 2. In other words one job at production now supports two nonproductional jobs; and the trend is still upward. The best employment seed is therefore the production job. Each gives rise to two others, with prospects of progressive future expansion.

Imports of finished products represent the poorest job-seeds. Raw-product imports are better, but only if they do not displace raw products produced in this country. If they compete directly they displace domestic production and do not add to employment in this country.

Exports consisting of manufactured products do represent as good employment-generating activity as production for the domestic market, and in the past our exports consisted principally of such goods.

In recent years, however, our imports have come to consist increasingly of finished manufactures and manufactured foodstuffs while the trend in our exports has been in the opposite direction, finished products representing a declining share.

These trends, which may be expected to continue, represent for us a losing game in terms of employment. Foreign trade is not our economic forte.

Yet, the impact of import competition on our economy is much more negative and repressive in other respects. The difficulty comes from pitching our system against outside systems that have not in the past or do not even now obey the economic mandates of our system, such as fair competition, both in industry and in wages, prevention of monopoly, achievement of a high mass purchasing power through high wages, freedom of enterprise, etc. Some countries appear to be following in our footsteps but their lower starting point, particularly in point of wages, confronts us with great difficulties.

We face several other stubborn difficulties. Our industry cannot be driven to do what comes naturally to it in the right climate. This is the same as saying that if the climate is not right our system will not behave in the manner that brought it world leadership. If the climate is right it will move ahead.

Do we lack products of the kind that gave to our system its many sprouting and spreading branches? Is all demand for all products saturated? Of course not. We have only to glance at the window shoppers to answer such questions.

Something else then must hinder the operation of the system.

An entrepreneur in the past could be quite confident that if he launched a new product for which there was an elastic demand he would be handsomely repaid if he found the mechanical means of reducing the costs to the common pocketbook level. If the introduction of laborsaving machinery at first displaced a number of workers, the lower price opened more than enough new demand to rehire the displaced workers. In a few years he doubled or tripled his work force. In 10 years he might have a payroll of 10 or 20 times the original.

If he found a way to reduce radically the cost of producing an existing product for which there was a greater potential demand if the price were sufficiently reduced, he might perform a similar employment feat. After first laying off workers he might in a few years' time recoup his work force and hire still more hands, perhaps many more.

The difference between the employment potentials in enterprises built around production of consumer goods, which if successful reverberate through the capital goods in the form of more demand on them—the difference between such developments and public works as generators of jobs for the present and the future, must be obvious.

Since the mid-1950's this pattern has been shattered in this country, with the exception of a handful of growth industries, such as electronics, aircraft, plastics, synthetics, biologicals, certain types of machinery, etc.

The established industries have moved backwards in terms of employment even while increasing output. A dozen leading industries during the 1950–60 decade reduced employment of production workers by 1,056,000. This means that technologically they have advanced. In point of employment, however, they have shrunk. The surge of demand that would have been expected in the past, calling for expansion of the work force, has not in many important industries come to the rescue.

The technological efforts were more negative than positive. They represented efforts to remain competitive with imports. They were not in response to a buoyant confidence that saw in the future a burst of demand that would swallow a large increase in output year after year. Instead the industries had seen their future field of demand invaded by imports that boasted the advantage derived from lower wage costs. These lower wage costs lying beyond our legislative control, were of the kind that had been regarded as competitively unfair in this country and had been outlawed through minimum wage and similar legislation to avoid shrinkage of mass purchasing power.

Little wonder then that the technological improvements that were insituted in recent years, while indeed displacing workers, did not produce the happy results of the past. An element that we could not reach (lower foreign wages) was in the field and we had dismantled our defenses or protection against it. Imported goods were supplying the increased demand that responded to lower prices and our industries were left with net displacement of workers. The backwash of newly opened demand that would have called for hiring more and more workers did not rise to a swelling tide. It was despoiled by imports.

Under these circumstances whence could come the confidence that the industries would "be able to dispose of increases in output at a profit?" (OECD quotation.)

It could come only if there were assurance that if operations were expanded or a new product launched the market would respond favorably. Such assurance cannot be given if imports have already demonstrated their capacity to capture a growing share of the market and, moreover, have access to greater shares of the market virtually without further restriction.

Indeed, today, under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the domestic market outlook for industry after industry is not only bleak so far as holding the present share of the market is concerned, but forbidding so far as any expansion plans that would be of sufficient magnitude to help employment is concerned.

This would be true even if taxes were reduced both for the purpose of expanding consumer spending and industrial expansion. If consumers gain a greater disposable income they will as readily buy imports as the products of domestic industry—often more readily because of the cost-conscious nature of elastic demand. Therefore the market for competing domestic goods would not flourish sufficiently to increase employment appreciably.

Moreover, the confidence-dampening specter of a market contest with goods that do not bear the burdens of costs (i.e., imports), will not have been lifted from our manufacturers.

The genius of the American productive system which has provided unprecedented abundance, demands recognition of the conditions that gave it birth, nourished it and swept it to great heights. It cannot survive half intimidated, half free. It can live with domestic curbs and regulations within reason but it cannot surmount a paralysis of its incentive. That is what an invitation to rising competitive imports produces. These are already hitting at our leading labor-intensive industries, i.e., those heaviest in employment, while our automating industries, facing the same dismal prospect, are investing heavily overseas rather than here.

Even our growth industries such as electronics (TV, computers, etc.), synthetic fibers, plastics, antibiotics, aluminum, pleasure water craft, household appliances, etc., to which we have looked for employment that exceeds population growth can themselves no longer look forward with bold confidence to an expanding market when imports, usually with clear cost advantage, intrude upon the scene to spoil the market's promise. Seeing their market's bright future, such as would entice greater outlays, greatly bedimmed, these industries become victims of caution one by one. The old assurance of the past that lower costs would tap a rewarding consumer response is now the special stimulus to imports since they can undersell us. They gobble up a great part of the demand thus awakened and leave our industries with such little room for expansion that employment is boosted very little, if at all. Thus is lost the very matrix of our former self-propelling expansion.

This matrix must be restored not only to our growth industries if they are to continue their upward career, but to the old established industries to prevent their progressive employment shrinkage; and the hand of assurance that our system previously extended, not by way of help but through a conducive climate, to new industries must again be held out not only to new industries but to those not yet born if we are to recoup our lost ground.

The point of no return is not far distant. Therefore, early action is imperative.

Great segments of the American productive economy face a barren outlook for domestic expansion. A veritable pall has been lowered over the scene by abandonment of the unique American formula of economic growth. This formula must be restored.

Action should include an immediate 5-year moratorium on further tariff cuts such as were authorized in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Second, our future policy should hold tariff reductions to 25 percent in 10 years or not over 2½ percent per year.

Third, a true remedy for the serious injuries caused by past tariff reductions should be provided.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Finnegan (at the request of Mr. Rostenkowski), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Edmondson, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, June 25.

Mr. Moore (at the request of Mr. Roudebush), for 60 minutes, on June 24, 1963.

Mr. Tollefson, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Alger and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Nelsen to revise and extend his remarks on House Joint Resolution 247 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor to include extraneous matter in his remarks made today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

946. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for water resources projects for the fiscal year 1964 involving a net decrease in the amount of $360,000 (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

947. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during May 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

948. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on certain deficiencies in the negotiation and administration of concession contracts for national park areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

949. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HEMPHILL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to permit freight forwarders to acquire other carriers subject to such act, to place such transactions under the provisions of section 5 of such act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 372. Resolution disapproving the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., with amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2675. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3272. A bill to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5712. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6011. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 5171. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; with amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fifth report on common trust funds—overlapping responsibility and conflict in regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 7135. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7137. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of the St. Francis Levee District, Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7139. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7140. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to allow defendants in suits unsuccessfully brought by the United States to recover certain costs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7141. A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act to permit the 10 percent of the financing of industrial projects required to be met by a local public or semipublic body to be repaid over the same period as the Federal share of such financing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7142. A bill to modify the application of section 207 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the disqualification of former officers and employees in matters connected with former duties or official responsibilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7143. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7144. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to limit the amount of noncash grant-in-aid credit for streets to that which directly benefits an urban renewal area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7145. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide that the District of Columbia may receive noncash grant-in-aid credits for urban renewal projects only on the same basis as other municipalities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7146. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7147. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Amelia Earhart Putnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 7148. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 490. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic

Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as National Public Works Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning February 10 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution relative to the Supreme Court decision on the reading of the Bible and offering of prayers in the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution favoring observance on July 4 of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Res. 407. Resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 9) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 408. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7149. A bill for the relief of Adamantia G. Kounoupis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Alan Paley and Dorothy Paley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7151. A bill for the relief of John R. Devereux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

165. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Frank C. Balfour, national executive secretary, American Right-of-Way Association, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the board of directors of the American Right-of-Way Association being requested by the National Utilities and Pipeline Committees to take active measures in opposition to certain regulations governing the use of rights-of-way over Federal lands which were issued by the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture, and published in the Federal Register of March 23, 1963, and being in support of equitable revision of certain regulations of November 16, 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Marketing Agent for Public Power in Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, since the announcement that the Bonneville Power Administration will replace the Bureau of Reclamation as the marketing agent for public power in southern Idaho, advertisements have appeared in many newspapers in Idaho, paid for by the private power companies, attacking the decision. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARKETING AGENT FOR PUBLIC POWER IN SOUTHERN IDAHO

It is said that BPA power is subsidized, or is paid for by the taxpayers, and from this it is argued that the cheaper rates will not really be an advantage to Idahoans. This is not so. The BPA rate structure is geared to take care of all operating costs of the marketing agency, and to repay the capital costs of the generating and transmission facilities, with interest, within a reasonable amortization period. Funds accumulated for this purpose are now substantially ahead of schedule. The law requires that the repayment schedules must be met, from power revenues, in the years ahead. BPA rates are cheaper because the giant dams on the lower Snake and Columbia generate power efficiently, and because interest on the money to construct them is charged at about 3 percent (which is all it costs the Government to borrow this money) whereas private power companies pay to their stockholders rates ranging upward from 6 percent on the money invested. Anyone who has ever made mortgage payments knows what a difference it would make to double the rate of interest.

Some say that the private power companies now doing business in southern Idaho will be injured. This has not been the case in Oregon and Washington, where the private companies have prospered, while reducing their rates, in areas long served by BPA. There is a reason for this. The private companies justify their high rates in Idaho by saying that it costs more to deliver power to thinly populated areas, and that they could match the performance of the private companies in our neighbor States if they had large metropolitan areas to serve. Perhaps this is true. But BPA will not compete directly with the private companies. It will sell at reduced rates to the wholesale customers now served by the Bureau of Reclamation, and its lower rates will make it possible for large industrial users of electricity to bring their businesses to Idaho. This, in turn, will create new customers for the private companies, which will continue to sell to the new homes and ordinary business establishments, just as they do now. Experience in Oregon and Washington indicates that the private companies will then be able to reduce their rates, since they will be serving more customers in the same area, and still make a better profit for their stockholders.

It is argued that Idaho citizens will lose the taxes now paid by the power companies. But the private companies will continue to collect taxes from their customers, and pay them to local, State, and National governments, just as they do now. With more customers to collect from, they will pay more taxes, not less.

It is said that the lower BPA rates will not actually come to Idaho, because it will first be necessary to construct a transmission line which the Congress will not approve. This, too, is not the whole truth. The co-ops and municipalities which are now buying power from the Bureau of Reclamation will have their rates reduced, by an average of 40 percent, just as soon as new contracts can be negotiated. BPA does not have one set of rates for customers in Oregon and Washington and another for Idahoans. Co-ops, municipalities, and industrial users in Idaho will be able to buy this power at exactly the same rate they would pay if they were located next door to one of the big dams on the Columbia. BPA absorbs the cost of transmission to remote customers, just as the postal service absorbs the higher cost of rural mail delivery, from a uniform rate structure. For the time being, the power sold in Idaho will be the same power heretofore sold by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is generated in Idaho. The immediate difference is that the rates will be lowered to the BPA scale, and all of the revenues of the BPA system will be balanced against the cost of generation and distribution (which includes the cost of present and future reclamation projects repayable from power revenues) in Idaho. Studies show that new transmission facilities can be constructed when needed, and paid for, with interest, out of power revenues at the uniform BPA rate.

It is said that only a few in southern Idaho will benefit, and that this will be at the expense of those who still have to buy power from the private companies. In the first place, the number who will benefit right away from the lower BPA rate is substantial, about 25,000 farm and city families who now buy public power through their co-ops and city-owned distribution systems. In the second place, there will be no expense to the customers of the private companies. Finally, all who live in southern Idaho will eventually benefit, even if they continue to buy power from the private companies, through the lower rates made possible by increased demand, and resulting greater efficiency, in the operations of the private companies.

A few have asserted that there is something socialistic, or even communistic, about bringing BPA power to Idaho. Those who will be customers of the BPA are already buying power from the Government through the Bureau of Reclamation. It seems hardly necessary to point out that no "step toward socialism" is involved in transferring marketing responsibility from one agency of the Federal Government to another.

There are always some who resist change and progress, either because they do not understand its implications, or because they have been misled into believing that their personal interests will be adversely affected. No doubt this will be the case, at least for a time, with the extension of the BPA marketing area to southern Idaho. I am confident, however, that this change will have very general approval when the facts about it are widely known, and the benefits become visible to all.

Inadequacies in Military Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the first Member of this body to call the attention of the American people to our woeful inadequacies in military space was the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. The axiom that "he who controls the air controls the world" can be moved up a few hundred miles and changed to "he who controls aerospace controls the world."

Ours is a peaceful mission in space according to the administration but our enemy's mission is military. The Senator from Nevada in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post has written a very forceful and penetrating article "Are We Being Too Peaceful in Space?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE BEING TOO PEACEFUL IN SPACE?

(By Senator HOWARD W. CANNON)

A perilous notion grips Washington—that through some sort of gentleman's agreement with Russia we can quarantine space, can keep it from becoming a theater of war. Wishfully the Nation gears its space program to peaceful purposes, blind to the fact that the Russians have no such inhibitions. While we dream, the Russians bend every effort to develop military space systems. Quite openly they are striving for a decisive advantage in that newly penetrated region.

"Peaceful purposes," the administration admits, means "keeping the peace" as well as engaging in scientific exploration and in commercial activities in space. President Kennedy has said we must insure that no other nation gains a position in space that would threaten our security. And we are orbiting numerous unmanned space vehicles which could have significant military purposes. But the disturbing fact is that we continue to put overwhelming emphasis on nonmilitary space programs and limit military efforts to a small list of defensive possibilities.

Elaborate reasons have been advanced for pursuing this policy. One used frequently is that we might somehow be able to keep space out of bounds for active warfare. The theory is that, by unilaterally avoiding development programs that could make space a combat theater in any war, we might induce the Russians to follow suit. This kind of thinking flies in the face of history. We have generally been able to discourage the Russians from a course of action only by confronting them with impressive deterrent power.

I see a discomforting parallel between our "space is for peace" attitude and our attempt from 1958 to 1961, to end competition in nuclear weapons by voluntary halting our nuclear test program.

While cobwebs gathered on our test installations in the Nevada desert and the Pacific, the Russians blithely went ahead with preparations for what was to be the most concentrated series of nuclear tests that has been held to date. Suddenly, after 3 years of naive inactivity on our part, the Russians broke the gentleman's agreement and wiped out much of this Nation's vital lead in nuclear technology.

What makes our wishful thinking in space all the more dangerous is that we do not enjoy the lead in space that we held in the nuclear field. Rather, we are still far behind the Soviet in some technical areas with enormous military potential. We are still handicapped by the inferior thrust of our largest rockets. The Russians can hurl much larger payloads into orbit, including their 50-megaton and 100-megaton bombs. We are still nowhere near matching the Soviet accomplishment of last summer in orbiting two manned Vostok spacecraft within a very short distance of one another. The date for our first rendezvous of two Gemini capsules, it would appear, has just been put back to 1965. It will greatly surprise me if the Russians have not actually joined two spacecraft in flight before this year is out and perhaps even transferred the cosmonauts flying them.

The logic of history should be enough to convince this Nation that, without an enforceable treaty limiting space activities—an unlikely eventuality—the Russians will do everything possible to exploit the military uses of space. But we need not content ourselves with the logic of history. Soviet leaders, starting with Nikita Khrushchev, have given repeated indications that the Soviet space program is aimed squarely at attaining military dominance in space.

In a speech delivered in December 1961, the Soviet Premier said: "When the imperialists decide the question of whether or not they should unleash war, the 50- and 100-megaton Soviet bombs will hang over their heads like the sword of Damocles." Later, in the same speech, he said: "If I could send up Gagarin and Titov, we could, of course, replace Gargarin and Titov with other freight, and land it where we would like to land it."

A second argument for limiting U.S. military space efforts has to do with the type of space threat we tend to think of first: bombs in orbit. The nub of this argument is that there is no point in anyone putting bombs in orbit, or on the moon, because such space-based nuclear systems would inevitably be costlier, less reliable, and less accurate than earth-based systems.

A big flaw in this reasoning is that it tends to view the Russians as mirror images of ourselves. I admit I see no immediate need for this country to push development of orbital bombers, although I do not rule out such a need at a later date. But just because space-based bombers might not fit our strategic needs for the moment, it does not follow that they would not fit Soviet ambitions. Soviet strategists may well have decided to capitalize on their advantages in rocket thrust and 100-megaton bombs.

A limited force of supersatellites carrying 100-megaton bombs might not be able to deliver nuclear blows as discriminatingly or efficiently as a bomber-Minuteman-Polaris force. Still, for a nation that has shown little hesitancy to employ blackmail, a satellite force might represent a decisive psychological weapon. You do not, after all, have to shoot something at someone to weaken him. Think what a psychological advantage the Russians would have gained had they got away with stationing offensive missiles in Cuba. What if they now turned around and placed comparable nuclear power in orbits not much farther vertically from U.S. targets than Cuba is from Miami horizontally?

To counter such a move, we might not see any gain in orbiting bomb-carrying satellites of our own. What we might urgently want would be satellites able to rendezvous with suspicious Soviet craft, detect whether they had weapons on board and, if need be, destroy them.

There are officials who, while granting such a possibility, put forward still another argument for deemphasizing military space programs. They are exponents of the so-called fallout theory, which runs this way: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) plans to spend $20 billion putting a two-man expedition on the moon by 1970. In doing so, the civilian space agency will investigate almost every technical aspect of space operations. The Defense Department needs only to adapt the technical "fallout" of this and other NASA programs to its own requirements if a Soviet military threat in space materializes.

This pat theory will not withstand close examination. While many requirements for space flight apply equally to civilian and military operations, there are some unique military requirements no amount of civilian oriented effort will satisfy.

Military vehicles must react instantaneously to enemy thrusts. The launching of a scientific vehicle, by contrast, can ordinarily be delayed to await improvement in the weather or to permit a last-minute item-by-item checkout of the rocket. Military vehicles must operate from places dictated by military needs, not from a limited number of well-established launch pads at Cape Canaveral and other research centers. They must be able to return to base and fly another day, since military operations are likely to be repetitive, and the cost of launching one-shot vehicles would be unbearable.

There is another decisive difference. A military operation—in tanks, subs, planes or space vehicles—is not just a matter of having the right hardware. The best hardware is useless in war without crews trained for their mission, a well-oiled maintenance and supply system and an operational doctrine worked out not simply in a "think factory" but through field trials, the field in this case being space.

It takes time to build a ready-to-go military capability. Right now it may look as though earth-based systems constitute a force adequate to deter any strategic attack. But technology is advancing so swiftly it is possible that scientists might at any moment accomplish another "breakthrough" as significant as the perfection of the H-bomb. If they do, the capability to conduct military operations in space may suddenly become decisive.

The same objections hold, only more firmly, for the contention that the United States can take out adequate space insurance by developing a storehouse of "building blocks." The Titan III workhorse rocket booster; various infrared, optical and other apparatus for detecting what is aboard other nations' satellites; and an exotic line of winged space vehicles are examples of "building blocks" now being worked on. The theory is that if a Soviet space threat did become evident, the blocks could be pulled off the shelves and a military space force put together in short order. But what about mission training, supply and operational doctrine? There are months, more likely years, between the production of military equipment and the ability to use that equipment in an efficient way, particularly in a forbidding new environment.

There have been recent signs that highly placed officials are beginning to recognize the reality of the Soviet space threat. But in the past there have been similar ripples of interest that soon dissipated. Whatever new interest there is has not yet been translated into specific new space programs. Nor is there anything like adequate funding in the proposed space budget for the fiscal year starting July 1. I would like to see the Defense Department come to the Congress with a program calling for:

First. Speedy development of orbiting vehicles able to rendezvous with, inspect and, if necessary, disable potentially hostile spacecraft.

Second. An early opportunity for the Air Force to conduct complete space missions on its own so as to acquire vital across-the-board experience in space operations. The best course is for the Air Force to be authorized, as agent of the Defense Department, to orbit its own versions of the wingless, ballistic, two-man Gemini capsules NASA is building as a step in its man-on-the-moon program.

Third. NASA-Defense Department joint planning for development of an orbiting space station large enough for 20 to 30 crewmen. Provision would be made for crews to rotate every 2 to 4 weeks through use of space taxis. The permanent space station could serve as a command post for controlling space interceptors, orbital antimissile systems and other components of a military space force. Eventually we might want to orbit strategic space stations able to carry heavy payloads. When it becomes possible to deploy as many as 100 weapons, or several hundred, on a single space platform, the space bomber might for the first time become economically competitive with earth-based strategic systems.

(4) Stepped-up work on rocket boosters that could be recovered after launch and used again. An alternative is the ambitious concept of an "aerospace" plane that could takeoff conventionally from a runway, propel itself into orbit and eventually return to the takeoff runway.

TOO MUCH BUCK ROGERS?

The above proposals, prior to Sputnik I, would have sounded like the notions of someone who had read too much Buck Rogers. So much has happened since Sputnik I, however, that they should sound now like simple prudence for any nation intent on preserving its security.

They should. But will they? There are well-meaning scientists, some in high places, who doubt that space-based weapons could accomplish anything not better accomplished from nearer the earth. History indicates they are wrong, that they underestimate the speed of advancing technology. In any case, we cannot afford to gamble. If we dismiss the military potential in space, we may be startled one day—like the day Sputnik I was orbited—to discover, from the accomplishments of potential enemies, how wrong we have been. And by then, because technology is advancing in ever longer quantum jumps, it may be too late to do anything about it.

Berlin: A New Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, recently delivered in the Senate an eloquent and perceptive address devoted, in part, to a discussion of our tendency to become transfixed in "frozen positions" on major questions of foreign policy. He called for creative efforts to attack old stalemates in new and different ways.

The Nation for June 22 carries a fine article by Senator PELL, summarizing his own suggestion for a new approach to the Berlin problem. It is a splendid example of fresh thinking, tightly reasoned and cogently presented. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN: A NEW APPROACH

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island)

(NOTE.—CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1960 by the largest plurality in the history of his State.)

Of the many centers of international crisis today, none is more potentially dangerous nor has festered longer than the situation in Berlin. For 18 years we have been confronting this problem, which has been sometimes deceptively quiescent, sometimes productive of violent localized struggle and loss of life, more often verging on eruption into conflict which could engulf us all. We have witnessed policies of "brinkmanship" and the maneuvering of armed forces into positions from which withdrawal is increasingly hazardous. We have gained at best a form of status quo—made, however, less favorable to our own national interests, to the interests of the German people and, indeed, of all who desire freedom everywhere by the construction of the Berlin wall.

In my opinion, we have for too long promoted expedients rather than a basic resolution for the problem. We need a fresh approach, and we need to take the initiative in this respect—before we are compelled once again to counter Communist-motivated action.

Recent diplomatic exchanges have produced nothing to encourage great optimism. Nevertheless, it would seem that the Communist armor is not as solid as it once appeared. Moscow and Peking are scarcely in total harmony. Premier Khrushchev has expressed a wish to negotiate, perhaps because all is not well within the monolithic structure of communism, perhaps because of his clumsy failure in Cuba to change the nuclear balance of power, perhaps because the threat of nuclear holocaust makes him realize that he has more to gain through peace. We should not place undue emphasis on any of these aspects; but the fact is that negotiations are possible. We should, therefore, come to the conference table well prepared.

What are the goals we should espouse for an honorable settlement vis-a-vis Berlin? We are pledged to preserve the liberty and the economic viability of the western part of the city, and we are committed to defend our right to maintain an appropriate garrison there. But there is one more goal for which we ought to strive: Guaranteed land access to the city itself.

At the conclusion of World War II, before hostilities between East and West became manifest, we did not insist on specific land access to Berlin. Instead, we preferred to have rights of general access. These were never formalized by treaty, and they have grown into a source of dispute which goes to the very root of the Berlin problem. Furthermore, West German travel to the city is subject to the whim of East German authorities; constant turmoil and confusion are the result. Thus, explicit land access to Berlin, through 110 miles of East German territory, is essential to the agreement we should now seek to reach.

I believe that the Berlin-to-Helmstedt highway is ideally suited to this purpose. There would be virtually no interference with the economic life of East Germany; the highway is equipped with 79 overpasses and 65 underpasses, which traverse without obstruction not only other thoroughfares, but the 21 railroads in the area. The highway could be internationalized, as President Kennedy has suggested; but, in any case, it must be defined by irrevocable guarantee.

Are the policies we have so far been pursuing geared to a formalizing of such an agreement? Since World War II we have championed the cause of a unified Germany. Is this stipulation—here and now—realistic? Or does it lead to irresolvable stalemate? Let us examine the situation more closely.

At present in Berlin two armed camps face each other across a monstrously inhuman barrier made of stone and barbed wire. The slightest jar on one side sets off a similar seismic rumble on the other. The Russians create an incident; we maneuver conspicuously a squadron of tanks—and meanwhile, East Berliners cannot cross to West Berlin, even to attend burials; only the coffin with its dead body is permitted through the wall. There is inordinate suffering; and times of crisis, though they may pass without catastrophe, leave tensions higher than before. If we in the free world, as members of the NATO alliance, allow this process to continue, surely there must come a day of reckoning.

How can we ease these tensions without jeopardizing the pledges we have made and which, at all costs, we must keep?

Our current policies provide no answer. Since 1954 we have encouraged and assisted Western Germany to build up its military might. Western Germany can now boast the most powerful non-Soviet ground force in Europe: an Army of 11 divisions and 253,000 men; a Navy of 177 ships and 28,000 men; an Air Force numbering 90,000. East Germany, in turn, has raised an Army of approximately 200,000, with a 14,000-man Navy and an Air Force of 10,000. These two establishments are, of course, the antithesis of the West's original 1946 concept of a unified Germany, stripped of its military potential and in a world at peace.

Times and circumstances obviously have changed; yet we persist in maintaining attitudes and frames of reference which look backward instead of ahead. It is high time we face the facts as they exist in 1963.

It seems inconceivable to me that either the United States or the Soviet Union, the Western Alliance or the Eastern Bloc, will agree on a disarmed, neutral Germany in the immediate future. The NATO nations certainly would not want Western Germany, the bulwark of their land forces, to withdraw its troops from their command. Nor will the Warsaw Pact Communist nations permit East Germany with its military resources to withdraw from the Communist orbit. Let us acknowledge these facts. The mere acknowledgment allows us to proceed to a new, present-day evaluation of the German situation.

To achieve a formal, ironclad guarantee from the Communists on our rights of land access to Berlin, certainly we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of the two German governments and agree, moreover, on the Oder-Neisse line as the East German-Polish border. Such an agreement would in no way infringe on our commitments for preserving West German freedom—and the Communists would not have gained control over a single human being or a single square inch of territory not already under their rule. By consistently refusing to deal with the de facto East German government, we strengthen the Soviet hand, rather than—as we would prefer to think—enfeeble it. We simply augment the stalemate.

But if we accept reality, not only do we open the door for a conclusive accord, but we would be nurturing an environment which could ultimately and successfully undermine the Communist satellite regimes. Poland is the leading industrial satellite nation in the Soviet European empire. Its estimated gross national product of $21.5 billion tops by $2 billion the GNP of East Germany. Only the Communist countries formally recognize the 283-mile, Polish Oder-Neisse frontier. If the West recognized this boundary as well, one of the chief bonds tying Poland to Russia would be severed; and the fundamental anti-Russian feelings of the Polish people, who inhabit the Oder-Neisse territories to the virtual exclusion of all other nationalities, would be given stimulating impetus. A spirit of unrest, of rebellion, is latent in all satellite countries. It cannot grow contagiously, however, while it is enclosed in the vise of unmoving policies.

I believe that the agreement I suggest would have immense, long-term benefits. To begin with, by seizing the initiative in the easement of tensions, we could concentrate more vigorously on the relaxation of the Communist controls at the Berlin wall itself. Amelioration of these conditions is of prime concern to Berliners, both East and West.

We could follow through with other methods of tension reduction. It would be possible to work out a revised status-of-forces in West Berlin, whereunder American, British and French forces would be garrisoned in West Berlin at the invitation of the West Berlin government. In turn, this would strengthen the position of Mayor Willy Brandt.

We could initiate steps with the Communists for a mutual slackening off of propaganda and intelligence operations and, in keeping with efforts presently being made by the West German government, trade could be normalized between West and East Germany and between West Germany and other nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary—behind the curtain. In actuality, trade between East and West Germany today amounts to almost half a billion dollars annually; but it is hampered by lack of legitimization. It is well known that communism feeds on areas where poverty and low standards of living prevail. Prosperity has never been a Communist ally in the lands the Kremlin dominates; nor do we find in these lands the higher living standards which prosperous trade relations engender.

It has been suggested that the United Nations headquarters be moved to Berlin. To me this particular step appears somewhat extreme, and I would question its practicability. However, I see no reason why the European headquarters of the U.N. presently at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, presently in Paris, should not be shifted to Berlin. I would prefer to see them in East Berlin, where their salutary effect, I feel, would be most productive; but no matter in what part of the city they were based, these two bodies would help ease political temperatures.

As tensions are reduced, so also would be reduced our current adverse balance-of-payments position. We are now spending more than $50 billion a year for national defense and supporting more than 400,000 men in Europe. No other NATO member makes a comparable outlay; no other has a longer draft period than our own. Yet our NATO allies are today enjoying a $4 billion-plus trade in consumer, nonstrategic goods with the Soviet bloc. In an environment where some military relaxation could be implemented, wouldn't it be possible for us to share in an expansion of peaceful and profitable trade?

We must face other realities, however, before considering a more serene future. Unfashionable as it may be to mention, the prospect of a rearmed and reunified Germany looms with a dark foreboding over a great many European minds. Not easy to forget is the fact that Germany has engaged in three aggressive wars in the past hundred years. The memory bolsters today's general acceptance of the premise that Germany should not be equipped with nuclear weapons; and it gives emphasis to our own point of view that the proliferation of these weapons should be prevented. On this most important single policy, for once, we and the Soviets agree. From a long-term viewpoint, though, no one nation can or should be singled out in this connection, no matter what her history or whether she has been victorious in a war or defeated.

For Eastern Europeans, the specter of a rearmed Germany has more alarming connotations. Communist authorities and satellite leaders exploit this apprehension, which is none the less genuine. Eastern Europe's fears are deeply rooted, stemming not only from brutalities suffered during World War II, but from centuries of earlier German attacks and occupation. We must not ignore the fact that a great majority of Eastern Europeans fear the Germans even more than they do the Russians.

The Poles, remembering all too vividly German conquest and subjugation, listen most uneasily when the usually reasonable Dr. Adenauer says that "the Oder-Neisse line is not Germany's frontier," and they are placed in the ironic position of having to choose the Russians as their defenders. A much more strident neo-Nazi West German minority calls for regaining the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. Surely, if a rearmed Germany should ever move eastward again, we would witness once more a European inferno.

Europeans also remember that twice within the past half-century Germany's future ability to wage war has been strengthened by arrangements and understandings reached with Russian rulers. Both the Rapallo Agreement in 1922 and the Ribbentrop Agreement in 1939 were calculated to allow Germany to concentrate its efforts against the West.

For these reasons alone, practical as well as psychological, I submit that a rearmed, reunified Germany is not necessarily the best bulwark against the Soviets.

Many intelligent and moderate Germans are today fully aware of the dangers inherent in militant reunification. As long ago as 1959, the German Social Democrats advanced the Deutschland Plan, accepting the Oder-Neisse frontier. Klaus von Bismarck grandson of the almost legendary old "Iron Chancellor" and now Director of the North Rhine-Westphalia radio network, recently added his support to this concept and suggested that, in accord with the current thinking in West Berlin, priority be given to the bettering of East German conditions. President Charles de Gaulle, whose opinions are frequently controversial, but whom we should seek to understand as basically a European realist, accepts the Oder-Neisse frontier as valid.

Our diplomatic tasks have never been more complex. The maintenance of a strong, coordinated Western alliance, with all parties in harmony, requires in itself exceptional energies. We must never for a moment forget, however, that the Communists are our chief enemy and that we are their number one target. And in this respect I firmly believe that a policy of total inflexibility is purposeless.

It seems obvious to me that a reunified, rearmed Germany—even if it were desirable—is not to be achieved by any means short of violent upheaval which even the most sanguinary among us strenuously wish to avoid. By gaining what we lack—guaranteed land access to the island of freedom which Berlin has come to be—in exchange for recognition of the de facto East German regime, we would be taking a long stride toward ending the cold war.

In effect, we would be exchanging hope for hopelessness—and we would be fostering those very conditions which, in my opinion, can alone lead to the ultimate goal we have traditionally championed: A unified, unarmed Germany in a peaceful community of nations. Two armed camps cannot in this case be forged into one. Patently, the Russians will never make this concession; but two armed camps, clearly and objectively acknowledged as such, can eventually be disarmed. There is the hope.

We must assume that the Soviet Union, confronted with its own internal and external anxieties and problems, is willing for an abatement of tensions. After all, the Russians, too, are realists. Let us, therefore, take the initiative in Berlin. For the first time in many years, we would have much to gain in this vital area, and nothing that is fundamental to our honor to lose.

Fifth Texas District Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the results of the annual questionnaire sent to the people of the Fifth District of Texas.

I am always more than gratified at the excellent response to this questionnaire by the people of Dallas County. The return is usually between 10 and 12 percent and this year was no exception with an approximately 10-percent return. With a wide cross section of the district represented in the answers received, I can report the people of my district still support constitutional-limited government and would rather depend on local and individual initiative in the fields of human endeavor instead of looking to the Federal Government to solve each and every problem.

I would like to thank the people of Dallas County for their cooperation in helping me to be a better Representative in Congress by sharing with me their views on the more pertinent issues we face.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. Do you approve of the current U.S. policy with regard to—			
(a) Cuba?	7	92	1
(b) Berlin?	32	57	11
(c) Laos?	9	79	12
(d) The Congo?	9	76	15
2. Do you favor continuance of our foreign aid program at its present $4,000,000,000 annual rate?	4	94	2
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor medical care for the aged by—			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance such care?	5	93	2
(b) Expanding the present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation?	10	88	2
(c) Promoting a low-cost Blue Cross type plan whereby the Federal Government would assume full financial responsibility only for persons below a certain income level?	13	85	2
(d) Or do you favor private, voluntary medical plans with no Federal participation?	70	28	2
2. Do you favor a proposed Federal bill to authorize a 3-year matching grant program costing $500,000,000 to help local communities solve their urban mass transportation problem re railroad and bus transportation?	7	89	4
3. Do you favor the establishment of a federally financed Youth Conservation Corps to provide outdoor employment for young men, as a means of alleviating unemployment in this age group?	19	78	3
4. Do you favor the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?	12	83	5
5. Do you approve the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level to handle housing and other predominantly city problems?	6	90	4
EDUCATION			
1. Should the Federal Government provide—			
(a) Tax allowances for parents paying the expenses of children in college?	49	47	4
(b) Tax allowances for students working their way through college?	55	41	4
(c) Or should all Federal influence be removed and individuals determine and pay for college educations for themselves or their children?	52	41	7
2. Should Federal Government funds for college student loans and scholarships be—			
(a) Increased?	14	74	12
(b) Decreased?	7	81	12
(c) Kept at existing levels?	20	68	12
(d) Eliminated?	47	41	12
3. For construction purposes should the Federal Government provide colleges and universities with—			
(a) Loans?	30	64	6
(b) Outright grants?	2	92	6
(c) Combination of both?	8	86	6
4. Do you favor a proposal of grants amounting to some $75,000,000 for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and public health schools?	13	76	1
5. Do you favor Federal financial grants for assistance to elementary and secondary schools for—			
(a) School construction?	10	88	2
(b) Teachers' salaries?	6	92	2
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal Government should operate within a balanced budget?	94	4	2
2. Within a balanced budget would you approve of setting aside a certain percent of the budget receipts each fiscal year for the sole purpose of reducing the Federal debt?	94	3	3
3. Do you believe we should institute new programs and new public works at a time of deficit financing and borrow money to pay for such projects?	3	94	3
TAXES			
1. Would you favor a personal and corporate tax reduction—			
(a) Without tax reform which would mean that the Government would suffer a large net loss of income?	6	84	10
(b) Only if accompanied by compensatory tax reform and a cut in Federal spending?	80	12	8
(c) With no reform, but with a substantial cut in Federal spending?	56	26	12
(d) No reduction at this time?	46	29	25
2. Should tax reduction emphasis be in the area of—			
(a) Personal tax?	25	61	14
(b) Corporate tax?	12	74	14
3. As a basic principle, do you believe we should have a flat percentage tax rather than the present graduated income tax based on ability to pay (Alger bill, H.R. 737)?	62	30	8
4. I have also introduced a bill (H.R. 739) to repeal the withholding tax so that each person would pay his own tax. Would you favor this bill?	62	32	6
LABOR			
1. Would you favor tougher emergency strike provisions granting the President more flexibility in handling national emergency strikes by providing for back-to-work injunctions and compulsory arbitration machinery?	61	32	7
2. Would you favor new labor laws which would prevent the Federal Government from interfering with or influencing collective bargaining?	54	35	11
3. Would you approve of applying antitrust statutes to unions to break up industrywide bargaining?	85	9	6
4. Would you approve of setting Federal standards under the unemployment compensation law for State jobless benefits?	16	58	26
UNITED NATIONS			
1. Would you favor withdrawal of U.S. membership in the United Nations and creating stronger alliances with nations of the free world?	56	38	6
2. Would you favor action by the United Nations to force member nations to live up to the charter, pay their full obligations or be expelled?	94	5	1
3. Do you approve the building up and strengthening of Communist nations through U.N. member organizations such as UNESCO, WHO, and the U.N. Special Fund?	2	97	1

Government Lotteries of Greece, Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, among the 77 foreign countries throughout the world, Greece, Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey are 4 nations which operate government-run lotteries because they recognize the merit in regulation and control of the normal human urge to gamble and the tremendous benefits that result from such activity.

Greece is a small nation and one not overly blessed with natural resources. The Greeks work hard to earn their money and they, too, know a good revenue device when they see one. In 1962, the gross income of the two state lotteries came to almost $18 million. The government retained almost $4 million of which two-thirds went to various welfare, educational and scientific agencies and the balance reverted to the general revenue. It might be interesting to point out that last year's gross receipts were almost $3 million more than the previous year.

Cyprus first started its lotteries in 1956 but only three drawings were held before its independence in 1957. It started again in 1961. The gross receipts from running this government lottery amounted to almost $2 million in 1962. The net profit to the government came to almost $900,000. The funds are intended for development.

Malta has a government-run lottery which has only been in operation a short time but it has well proven its worth. In 1962, it took in over $1,317,000. The total annual net income to the government came to almost $200,000 which was applied to the general revenue funds of the Maltese Government.

Turkey has found the concept of a national lottery a happy and profitable device. Last year, the gross annual receipts came to almost $9 million. This represents a gain from the previous year. The net income to the government, after prizes and expenses, amounted to almost $4 million. These lottery revenues were transferred to the treasury without being specifically earmarked.

Mr. Speaker, if these small countries can operate successful national lotteries, why cannot the United States also do so? Here in America, where more money is gambled than in any other country in the world, we refuse to admit to reality, and as a consequence, billions of gambling dollars flow each year into the treasuries of the crime empires.

When, Mr. Speaker, will we wake up? When will we allow gambling dollars to work for the public good rather than against it?

How long must the hard-pressed taxpayers of America wait for financial and sociological reality to prevail over entrenched hypocrisy?

A national lottery in the United States can easily pump into our treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our national debt.